UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 12

AUGUST 21, 1963, TO SEPTEMBER 12, 1963
(PAGES 15507 TO 16936)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109
pt.12

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 3: *Endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*

Almighty God, on each new day may we come nearer unto Thee than ever before and may our human wills be brought into a harmony with Thy divine will which nothing can break.

Grant that as coworkers, charged and challenged by a great mission, we may also be firmly and closely united with one another in achieving for all mankind the blessings of the more abundant life.

Inspire us to strive for that blessed day when all the tyrannies which oppress and the terrors which frighten the soul of humanity shall be forever destroyed and supplanted by the spirit of peace and good will.

Guide us by Thy holy spirit to new ventures of faith and new vistas of outlook and a new sense of social obligation and responsibility as we seek to embody and express a nobler kind of democracy.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 8, 1963:

H.R. 2675. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty;

H.R. 5712. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; and

H.R. 6011. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

On August 12, 1963:

H.R. 1518. An act for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus;

H.R. 5207. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States.

On August 20, 1963:

H.R. 2192. An act authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy; and

H.R. 3872. An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Beg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas;

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carta Gallitto;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;

H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith;

H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski;

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;

H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Glazikis; and

H.R. 7824. An act to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 31. An act for the relief of Sonja Dolata;

S. 49. An act to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe;

S. 198. An act for the relief of Mother Azucena de San José (nee Carmen Hernández Aguilar);

S. 202. An act for the relief of Yom Tov Yeshayahu Briszk;

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun;

S. 479. An act for the relief of Chung K. Won;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Karolina Rado;

S. 585. An act for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth;

S. 669. An act for the relief of Vincenzo DeLucia and Angela DeLucia;

S. 789. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa;

S. 820. An act for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.;

S. 838. An act for the relief of George Crokos;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios;

S. 1272. An act for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets;

S. 1313. An act for the relief of Tim L. Yen;

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of Margaret Ann Cover;

S. 1828. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof;

S. 1914. An act to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America;

S. 1942. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America;

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as National Public Works Week; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7500), an act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to thank the chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], for the opportunity during the past several days for Members on the Republican side to make emphasis on certain points in the legislation. I, therefore, today will not object.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have asked for this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the majority leader if they can say when in all probability we might expect the final vote on the foreign aid bill, consideration of which will be taken up, of course, in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MORGAN. We can answer by saying that we have an hour and 29 minutes left of general debate. From my last count, there are about 16 amendments or more at the Clerk's desk. I think certainly if we make progress on the amendments today, I expect to finish the bill by tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank you.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLER of California, TEAGUE of Texas, KARTH, HECHLER, MARTIN of Massachusetts, and FULTON of Pennsylvania.

ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6996) to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "be." and insert "be, or satisfactorily performs such other Ready Reserve service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense."

Page 2, line 14, after "of" insert "such".

Page 2, line 15, strike out "an organized unit of such" and insert "the".

Page 5, line 5, after "shall" insert "subject to section 269(e) (4 of this title,".

Page 5, line 15, after "duty" insert "or active duty for training".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an explanation of the amendments.

The Senate amendments make no substantial changes to the House-passed bill. The purpose of the Senate amendments is twofold.

First. The amendments will preserve a statutory exemption for those Reserve trainees who through no fault of their own are unable to continue to participate in Reserve training with an organized unit, but who will find it possible to satisfactorily perform such other Reserve service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Second. The amendment will also permit Reserve trainees to reduce their Ready Reserve obligation from 6 to 5 years in those instances where the reservist may have been involuntarily recalled to extended active duty after his period of active duty for training had been completed. This change will permit a reduction in the Ready Reserve obligation for such reservists if they should be recalled to duty in another Berlin or Cuban crisis.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 18th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period January 1 through June 30, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 21, 1963.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Abele
Ayres
Barry
Blatnik
Buckley
Celler
Clark
Corman
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Edwards
Elliott
Giaimo
Grant
Gray
Healey
MacGregor
Miller, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Pillion
Powell
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Smith, Va.
Trimble
White
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, AND MANPOWER OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7885, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] had 44 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] had 45 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, there was much said in the past few days and in the past months preceding this debate about foreign aid. Indeed, much has been said on the subject before. The debate each year has assumed the tendency to take on a certain ritual. Most have predetermined positions on the whole question of foreign aid. Those who support the bill and those who oppose the bill do so from a conviction that their position is in the best interest of our Nation. A significant point in the history of the foreign aid debate, however, is that down through the years even the most able of the opponents of foreign aid have never offered an alternative to accomplish the purpose that the foreign aid program seeks.

Another method of opposition is to hit it with a meat axe until it finally dies or is abandoned. I have heard the case against foreign aid eloquently stated by men of eloquent words who also eloquently describe their hatred of communism. The fact of the matter is that short of a military effort foreign aid is the best offensive weapon we have against communism. It is an exercise of our responsibility as a leader of the free world and an assumption of the obligation that this leadership requires for a mighty have nation with regard to the less fortunate have-nots.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], has pointed out, this committee entertained over 100 amendments during the marking up of the bill, so that this bill is the product of the thinking of many people. Regrettably some people consider this program as a reward for partisanship, or for the withholding of aid as a penalty for the lack of display of partisanship. However, since this is a mutual security program we must consider that different nations cannot always adapt their positions to ours at every point of the compass.

Mr. Chairman, each year as the Congress begins debate on the foreign aid bill, the amount of information—and misinformation—circulated about the nature of our foreign assistance program reaches a peak. This year the peak seems to be higher than usual. There is one area in particular that is receiving special attention this year—the number and condition of our aid recipients and the amounts of assistance they receive. The charge usually runs something like this: "The United States is draining its own economy to spread dollars to every country in the world—friendly and unfriendly, developed and underdeveloped." I think it is important for the Members of this House to analyze this charge, since I believe close examination will reveal that the charge is untrue in every detail.

Mr. Chairman, there are four points which I would like to bring before the House:

First. The thrust of the foreign aid program is highly concentrated in a relatively small number of key countries.

Second. The burden of foreign assistance to the United States has declined steadily over the past 15 years. It is not a "drain" on the U.S. economy.

Third. Military assistance has been reduced and economic assistance eliminated to the developed countries of the world—many of which, incidentally, are now economically developed as a result of previous U.S. assistance.

Fourth. Our small foreign assistance programs in many of the small, newly independent countries of the world constitute in many ways the best bargain of our foreign assistance program.

Let us look at each of these points a little more carefully.

First. Our aid program is now highly concentrated. In fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that 20 countries will receive 80 percent of total economic assistance and 10 countries will receive 80 percent of total military assistance. If we examine the appropriations categories, assistance is even more concentrated. Six countries will receive 80 percent of Development Loan Funds, six countries of Latin America will receive 80 percent of Alliance for Progress loans, and seven key countries will receive 80 percent of supporting assistance.

This concentration of assistance enables the United States to have a significant impact on the development and security of key and strategic countries throughout the world. Even in these countries where assistance is concentrated, the United States is not attempting to do the whole job of generating economic development or providing security. This job can only be done by the recipient countries themselves. One condition upon which our substantial country programs are based is that the country be willing and able to undertake as much of the job as possible, and to insure that through self-help and reform they do an increasing part of the job. What the aid program is attempting in these countries where assistance is concentrated is to provide the critical difference in external resources between progress toward self-sustaining growth, economic stagnation and between successful establishment of internal and external security, and vulnerability to Communist aggression and subversion.

Second. The foreign aid program is less of a burden to the United States today than 15 years ago. One important trend is the shift from grants to loans. Under the Marshall plan almost 90 percent of aid to Europe was in the form of grants. The fiscal year 1964 economic assistance program proposed by AID calls for 60 percent of assistance to be in the form of dollar repayable loans. Another important trend is the increasing amount of aid dollars that never leave the United States and are spent right here at home. Over 80 percent of the proposed fiscal year 1964 AID program will be spent in the United States.

The Agency for International Development is taking every practical step to insure that the foreign assistance dollars that leave our shores will be reduced to an absolute minimum. At the time of the Marshall plan, direct economic and military assistance accounted for 2 percent of the U.S. gross national product. It now accounts for only six-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product. Foreign aid accounted for over 11 percent of the Federal budget in 1949—in 1963 it accounted for only 4.1 percent.

Third, military assistance to developed countries has been sharply reduced and economic assistance eliminated. Twenty-three countries of the free world other than the United States are considered to be economically developed nations. Six of these countries have never received U.S. economic or military grant assistance under the foreign assistance act or predecessors. Seventeen more countries are no longer receiving economic assistance under this act. These countries include France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, among others. In fiscal year 1964, no developed countries are scheduled to receive economic assistance. A successful major effort has also been made to end military assistance to countries which are becoming sufficiently prosperous and developed. In 1953 over 75 percent of the military assistance program went to the advanced countries of Europe and Japan. In fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that only about 25 percent of our aid will go to these countries. Despite this substantial reduction, further programs will be carried out in eight developed countries in fiscal year 1964.

These programs encompass completion of deliveries under previous commitments to six countries, and military training programs in these countries and two others. Successful sales programs in Europe of U.S. military equipment, some generated by incentive cost-sharing arrangements, are now making a substantial contribution toward our balance of payments.

Fourth, the many small programs of assistance which we mount in small and newly independent countries provide substantial returns to the long-term success of U.S. foreign policy. When we talk about the large number of countries receiving foreign assistance, we are really talking about the 45 countries which will receive only 10 percent of our economic assistance and 7 percent of our military assistance during fiscal year 1964. Our limited aid programs in these countries are strongly in our national interest and are effective. In seven of these countries our assistance helps to secure important base rights or access to other strategic facilities. In about 19 countries, U.S. foreign assistance provides an effective counter to Soviet bloc influence. In seven other countries, our assistance is primarily designed as a holding action to provide a minimal U.S. presence and influence pending changes more favorable to free world interests.

In about 21 countries, our program is almost solely technical assistance or limited capital loans. Almost all of these are in Africa. These limited technical assistance programs provide assistance in key problem areas, demonstrate U.S. interest in the progress of these countries, and assert a U.S. presence. Most of these countries are newly independent and are just beginning to grapple with the basic problems of economic and social development. The choices that these countries make now about how they will develop, the decisions they make about whether they will face east or west, will determine in large part the makeup of the world community in 25 or 30 years. If these countries squarely face the problems of development and take sound steps to meet them, there can be progress and peace. If, instead, they turn to the quick solutions offered by the Communists or engage in ultranationalistic adventurism, there will be constant strife and crisis. We have learned in the last 10 years that strife in any part of the world can generate crisis between the free world and the Communist bloc. Our limited assistance programs in these countries attempt to help these nations choose the path of sound growth and development. To cut off these programs now would remove the most effective influence the United States has on the paths that these countries will take.

Mr. Chairman, let me add one final point. There are many examples of failures in our foreign aid program. Many old, some new. Some true, and some false. But there is no doubt that the successes far outweigh the failures. The successes do not make headlines. They do not provide funny stories. But they are quietly helping to build a better and more prosperous world. The dividends on the large investment we have made abroad in our foreign aid program are only slowly beginning to come in. But they will increase steadily as the years go by, as more and more nations become self-supporting and our assistance efforts become even more effective.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in our consideration today of H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, there are a few points which should be kept in mind.

The first is that none of us on the House Foreign Affairs Committee pretends to have all the answers to the many programs and policies encompassed in this bill.

The issues are too global in scope, too interrelated with implications in every corner of the world to be solved by glib phrases or pat answers. We well realize the complexities of the world in which we live, and we are more than a little awed by them.

The second point to remember is that the bill before us today is not a perfect bill. There are flaws in it, and I intend to speak about these flaws later in the debate.

But while this bill is not perfect, it is not a bad bill at all.

To understand what this bill is, I think we should first see what it is not.

It is not a rubberstamp for the administration to do as it pleases with American funds anywhere in the world. There are a number of safeguards, checks and balances written into this bill with which the Agency for International Development and the State Department do not concur.

This bill is not a solution to our worldwide problems. It does not automatically guarantee a firm and effective foreign policy in every part of the world.

It does not guarantee that aid dollars will never again be wasted, or that our balance-of-payments problem will improve. It gives us no assurance that we will walk in a world of friends, that our Nation will be held in the highest esteem, or that another international crisis will not spring on the scene in a moment's notice.

We have not yet come that close to heaven.

What is this bill, then?

It is a framework, a skeleton upon which we can hang a foreign policy and a program—rigid enough to provide the backbone and the strength to make hard decisions in the face of sometimes fanatic opposition abroad yet flexible enough to turn quickly to meet the inevitable emergencies which will occur in the months and years to come.

To a great degree, I think the House Foreign Affairs Committee has been successful in giving this bag of bones a strong, flexible structure, one into which life can be breathed to further the objectives of our Nation abroad.

I will not say that the birth was an easy one. It took hours, weeks, and months of hearings, deliberations, and controversy to give this bill its present shape and form.

I would like to pay my highest compliments to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for putting up with us through these deliberations, and the committee staff for sticking with us through some trying moments.

The total dollar amount to be authorized—$2,424,050,000—is only a small part of the story. What can or should be done with our dollars should be our main concern.

I think many of the steps taken in the committee are significant. Some of them are "sleepers," in that they have not made the headlines nor received much attention outside of the committee and the affected Federal agencies.

But in every instance, they have cleared up, cleaned up and made more efficient the authorization under which the respective agencies of our Federal Government responsible for our oversea programs can work more effectively and more efficiently.

In a number of instances, the committee is recommending that decisions be reached by these agencies. In a few instances, the committee is recommending that decisions be forced upon the executive branch.

One of these amendments offered in committee would cut off all further economic and military assistance to Indonesia unless there is a Presidential declaration that such assistance is in the national interest.

Another would ban military grants to any African country except where such aid is needed to maintain internal security and for civic action programs carried out by the military. In essence, this amendment would attempt to keep Africa out of the arms race.

Still another amendment agreed upon in the committee would prohibit U.S. voluntary funds from being used to assist Cuba, either directly or indirectly through international organizations.

Another amendment would require, wherever possible, that our oversea aid not be diverted to short-term emergency purposes in lieu of long-term developmental use. This amendment is an attempt to keep aid funds from being used as a substitute for foreign policy; an unfortunate practice in the past and one which has rightly caused a great deal of criticism of our oversea assistance programs.

In all, the committee considered 83 amendments and adopted 43 of them. Since almost every one of these amendments was aimed at tightening up the program, in making it more efficient and of greater benefit to our Nation, I think you will agree that this is a remarkable record.

Members of the committee, including myself, will go into the details of these amendments and the reasons for the action we have taken as the debate develops.

There are many of us who agree with the fact that there is need for a foreign aid program.

Few will argue with the necessity of a continuance of our military assistance in South Korea, for instance, and the need for keeping South Korea out of the hands of the Red Chinese.

Few would quarrel with the fact that our economic assistance to Western Europe following World War II was a success and was largely responsible for keeping that important part of the world on the side of freedom.

There will be some who may argue that our Alliance for Progress program in Latin America is not doing all it can, that it can be better administered and funds put to better use.

But there are many who realize that the Alliance has kept Latin America out of the hands of Castro-type communism.

So it seems that what we are arguing is not whether we should have an aid program, but how much of an aid program—and what kind.

The time to argue "how much" is when the foreign aid appropriation bill is before us. The time to argue "what kind" is now.

To say that all our aid programs have been models of efficiency would, of course, be false.

It would be equally false to say that all of our aid programs have been total failures.

We have had more good programs than bad programs.

We have all heard of roads leading to nowhere, of air-conditioned yachts for monarchs, of television sets in areas where there was no electricity.

I will not excuse these mistakes in judgment.

In almost every instance these errors were undertaken because somebody wanted to please somebody in some particular country for political purposes.

In other words, somebody was using aid funds as a substitute for diplomacy so that a short-term objective could be accomplished, often with no regard for long-term goals.

I believe in the necessity for foreign aid. I believe in the need for our Nation to help raise living standards in areas we have a chance of holding to our side of the Bamboo or Iron Curtain.

I believe we should do what we can to help people defend themselves from oppression and from becoming nameless, faceless machines under communism.

One of the witnesses before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, stated the need very ably. Mr. Teeter, who was speaking on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said:

> The most important reason [for aid] is because an effective U.S. foreign-aid program is essential to our national security and our foreign-policy objectives. Properly conceived and carried out, foreign aid should, can, and does promote the American system; provide a counterforce to international communism; promote responsible local foreign development, and protect our increasingly important oversea markets and sources of supply, as well as our military security.

Foreign aid aims at fostering the national interest in several ways. It is designed to provide military protection at less cost than the United States could undertake alone.

Longer range, in addition to furthering political freedom and democracy abroad, it is intended to help develop strong free world markets in the less developed areas—markets whose strength and growth can expand and strengthen our domestic economy as well.

Certainly Mr. Teeter's words make sense. We realize the need for our goods abroad, because it is easy to see that we can realize full employment only through greater oversea trade.

Training people in other lands to fight for their own countries rather than sending more American boys abroad is in our national interest and a desirable economy.

Raising living standards in Latin America is necessary because we must not permit Communists, either the Russian or Chinese variety, to capture an essential source of the raw materials necessary to keep our businesses and industries going.

We do not stand alone in the world. A look at the raw materials we buy from abroad, the markets we have for our products overseas, gives us an inkling of the extent to which we depend upon a strong free world.

As the Clay report pointed out:

> There should be no doubt—of the great value of properly conceived and administered foreign aid programs to the national interests of the United States and of the contribution of the foreign assistance dollar in such programs to the service of our Nation's security.

The Clay report recommended a number of steps to tighten up our program of overseas assistance. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has acted favorably upon a number of these changes, two of which I sponsored.

The Clay report recommended that arms to Africa be limited. My committee amendment to this effect was adopted.

The Clay report recommended that aid to Indonesia be curtailed until that Nation stops its international adventures and starts solving its internal economic problems. The committee approved an amendment I sponsored to this effect.

The Clay report deplored the practice of using our foreign aid funds for gifts to appease foreign heads of state. The Committee opposes this practice and has included language in the bill to end these excesses.

In each of the instances mentioned, the Committee has written in sound, workable guidelines which give us a better chance of having an improved program; not with more money, but with greater efficiency and a sharper focus on overall goals.

I intend to offer an amendment to this bill which will further strengthen it. In essence, this amendment will give Congress the power to act on authorizations of projects on an individual basis whenever more than $100 million in U.S. funds are involved.

In my estimation, the bill we have before us today—with this amendment which I plan to offer—should accomplish a great deal.

It makes some tough decisions in regard to the way our oversea assistance should be administered.

It provides realistic guidelines to follow in the expenditure of U.S. funds, whether for military assistance or economic assistance, loans or grants, or, in the case of many items, through sales abroad.

It places the burden of initiative upon the country we are attempting to assist.

This bill, by itself, cannot assure a foreign aid program of maximum efficiency. The reason is quite obvious.

The efficiency of the aid program is going to have to depend upon the decisions reached in the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Agency for International Development.

Particular responsibility for a sound aid program is—and should be—borne by the Agency for International Development.

I do think that AID's new Administrator, Mr. David Bell, is moving in the right direction.

Anyone who takes on the task of attempting to administer the foreign aid program lays his head on the chopping block.

But I do think we will see tighter administration, greater efficiency and better liaison with this Agency than we have enjoyed in the past. I admire Mr. Bell's courage in attacking the internal problems of his agency as thoroughly as he has.

All of us wish fervently, I am sure, that the ingredients which make this authorization bill necessary and essential were not present in the world. But they are here, and the Congress would not be doing its duty if it did not face up to them.

The committee has deliberated long and diligently on this bill. It has provided a lean bill, long on muscle and short on fat, to accomplish a variety of difficult tasks in many parts of the world.

I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this bill. It is a strong, to-the-point directive for a more efficient foreign aid program.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, we are called upon to judge a program that is a fundamental part of this Nation's relationship with other free world countries. The bill now before the House is to authorize foreign assistance appropriations for fiscal year 1964 amounting to more than $4 billion.

I am in favor of the United States providing help to other nations. Our security is reinforced by the strength of our international allies. The health of their economies and strength of their defenses, therefore, are essential to our welfare.

Notwithstanding my support of the principle of foreign assistance, I feel the entire program should be established on a more realistic footing. Waste and inefficiency must be removed and point-by-point justification substituted in their place.

The immediate need is to sharpen our objectives and make our foreign aid reflect the national interest of the United States. There has been too great a tendency to make loans and grants simply on the basis of our esteem for foreign heads of state or as gambles to maintain existing governments in power.

If the United States is to be an example for others seeking to emulate our achievements, then our foreign aid should be administered on that basis. All too plainly, economic assistance from this country has become an engine of socialism, designed to stimulate public rather than private development. State planning and Government-owned projects are hardly the way the United States found its well-being. Why encourage such practices elsewhere?

A case in point is India, the nation which now receives the most aid from America. The emphasis there unquestionably has been on central planning and bureaucratic control. The result: Retarded economic progress. India's answer to poverty, I submit, is an incentive approach which rests in the hands of the people themselves.

Aid officials of our Government presently are proposing to help India build an extremely expensive steel mill at Bokaro. It is a state project that would operate in direct competition with private enterprise. Mr. Chairman, it is inconceivable to me that this Nation, a bastion of free enterprise, should be indulging in such a social experiment.

Would not a far better determination of foreign aid allocation be one that recognized a country's determination to help itself? American support of foreign economies should be predicated on its ability to be diminished in the years ahead. We cannot forever shoulder the burden of assisting underdeveloped nations. Our assistance programs should be designed only to put themselves out of business.

I also am concerned that in the field of foreign assistance we take sufficient precautions against awarding this help to nations which cannot live in peace with other nations we are helping. The prohibition against assistance to any country which engages in or is preparing for aggressive military efforts against the United States or against any country receiving our aid, which has been written into this measure, is sound. I endorse it without reservation.

The committee report states this restriction well:

> Any government which devotes its energies and its resources to the harassment of neighboring countries and to a military buildup directed against them reduces the effectiveness of its efforts to develop its resources and to improve the condition of its people.

I believe this represents a favorable departure from the once prevalent attitude that foreign aid was necessary as a counterproductive bludgeon. The argument that various foreign nations would have gone Communist without our assistance is at best a negative justification. As many editorial writers have stated: Money as the sole criterion of national policy and interest is pretty cynical.

One editorial writer, in particular, has impressed me with his presentation on the need for reform and rethinking of U.S. foreign aid programs. I refer to Andrew D. Wolfe, editor and publisher of the four Genesee Valley newspapers which serve a large area of my congressional district. In March of this year, following the publication of the Clay Committee report on foreign aid, Mr. Wolfe addressed himself to the report in an editorial which appeared in the following newspapers: The Brighton-Pittsford Post, the East Rochester Herald, the Penfield Republican, and the Henrietta Post. I take pleasure in sharing that editorial with my colleagues:

END OF AN ERA?

For the generation that grew up in the 1930's and fought World War II, an article of faith has been the conviction that America's "go it alone" diplomacy from 1918 to 1940 led to disaster.

This generation has felt that isolationism, economic as well as diplomatic, was criminally stupid in a world grown progressively smaller.

We have regarded as major sins the failure to join the League of Nations, the high tariff protectionism, and the refusal to effectively back disarmament programs. People thought of these amid the trials of Normandy and the Ardennes, in the Middle East and in the Pacific islands.

All of us rode the pendulum swing which took America into the United Nations, fostered the Marshall plan, and gave birth to the other foreign aid programs.

From time to time most of us have had misgivings about details of some of the programs, but we have clung stubbornly to the theory that no nation, any more than any man, in John Denne's phrase, "is an island unto itself." We have recognized that stupidities were bound to creep into the huge aid program, but we have believed that even with its mistakes the program was infinitely better than no program at all.

Here in Monroe County, the Rochester Association for the United Nations and scores of other organizations have worked unceasingly for international good will. They have not hesitated to go to the mat when foreign aid programs were being attacked.

Last weekend, the Nation and many of us of the between wars generation came to the crossing of a height of land—or perhaps the end of an era.

A committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay recommended a major slash in foreign aid funds. More important than the cut in funds, however, was the fact that the recommendation came not from diehard isolationists, but from such internationally minded men as General Clay and former Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett. That such men feel a policy pullback desirable is significant.

Although the report recommends the continuance of foreign aid in major amounts, the philosophy behind the aid is changing—and is, in fact, a reflection of the changes being worked out in the Nation's basic foreign policy.

The success of the Common Market, De Gaulle, the changes in Russia, the Russian-Chinese friction, the rise of the newly independent nonwhite nations, and many other things tell us that 1945 no longer is with us.

Thus we must not think of the foreign aid change primarily as so many hundreds of millions of dollars cut out of the budget. Rather it must be seen in terms of fluid and sometimes chaotic world politics.

A generation ago the Owen D. Young reparations plan and the Smoot-Hawley tariff were among the events which catapulted the world into the economic paroxysms of the 1930's and ultimately helped set the stage for war. These bits of history are food for thought.

Obviously it is high time for a review of the foreign aid program, and obviously the march of world events now forces America to rethink its foreign policy.

But let us hope that our leaders are fully alert to the explosive effects that can result from far-reaching changes in the aid program. The program is so large that for the rest of the world it's been like sleeping in the same bed with a giant; a change of position can seem ever so slight, yet have disastrous effects on the bedmates.

Mr. Chairman, one notes the reference in the above editorial to the Rochester, N.Y., Association for the United Nations. I share Mr. Wolfe's high regard for this organization and its many accomplishments. I am personally acquainted with many of its members and can attest to their dedication.

The policy committee of this association has conducted a searching study of U.S. foreign aid in recent months. Further, they have thoughtfully kept me abreast of their findings. I believe a report issued by this committee in May of this year dealing with the question of how best to channel foreign assistance funds from this country is worthy of consideration by every Member of the House. The report follows:

REPORT OF POLICY COMMITTEE, ROCHESTER ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, RELATING TO FOREIGN AID

The policy committee of the Rochester Association for the United Nations is appreciative of the many diverse opinions which were expressed at the recent hearing on the subject of foreign aid and specifically on the question: "Should U.S. foreign aid through the United Nations be increased?" During the last 2 months of exploration of this subject the committee has become increasingly aware of its complexities. The following findings and conclusions are presented to stimulate thought and discussion.

TYPES OF AID

In considering any question relating to U.S. foreign aid policy, it is essential to carefully distinguish aid which is of a military or short-term nature and aid which is long term and for the purpose of basic development of the recipient nations. In other words, there is a sharp distinction between strategic aid and developmental aid. We recommend that these two basic types of aid, in the interest of a more informed public opinion, be more clearly segregated in the proposals made to Congress and in the enactments of Congress. Strategic aid comprises approximately one-half of the U.S. aid program, and the conclusions of this committee do not relate in any way to this type of aid which, for obvious reasons, could not be successfully administered by an international organization.

Recommendation: In the interst of an informed public opinion, long-term developmental aid should be clearly separated from short-term strategic and military aid in all appropriations.

THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL AID ADMINISTRATION

The problem of the underdeveloped nation is basically a world problem which is shared by all advanced nations and is most logically solved by international cooperative efforts. This concept has been fully recognized from time to time in the proposals to Congress, in the wording of the acts of Congress, and in the writing of many scholars who have examined this subject. The departure from this ideal is caused by practical considerations of a political or administrative nature. The extent of the departure is indicated by the fact that, while giving lip service to the ideal of international administration, the expenditure of only a tiny fraction of U.S. aid funds is made through this channel. The President's request for aid in the 1963–64 fiscal year calls for less than 5 percent of the total U.S. foreign aid to be expended through international organizations.

It is well to keep in mind the basic advantages of international administration. These advantages include a wider sharing of the burden of developmental aid, a larger available pool of technical assistance talent, the possibility of improved clearance and fixing of priorities in the administration of aid and an increased separation of aid from nationalistic political considerations. The bilateral administration of aid, as we already are learning from some of the U.S. experience in South America, often offends national sensitivities and may create bad will when conditions are attached to the granting of aid or when aid has to be terminated even though the conditions or the reasons for termination are reasonable. It is generally believed that conditions are more acceptable when imposed by an international organization.

We should continually strive toward the development of international organizations which can fulfill this logical role. Substantial progress in this direction has been made by the creation of the United Nations Special Fund, the International Development Association and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

For these reasons the policy committee of the Rochester Association for the United Nations concludes that the proportion of U.S. aid for developmental purposes expended through the United Nations and affiliated international organizations should be gradually increased from the present low level to a substantially higher proportion of the total U.S. aid program. The committee does not have research facilities available to permit a recommendation in terms of exact amounts.

Recommendation: The proportion of U.S. foreign aid expended through international organizations should be gradually increased.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Those who participated in the policy committee hearing strongly urged a larger role for free private enterprise as a basic part of the foreign aid program. The policy committee agrees with this position but wishes to emphasize that any guarantees or other assistance to private enterprise should be reflected in higher profits, higher wages, and lower consumer costs for the benefit of the citizens of the underdeveloped nations, and should give them an equitable share in the management of the enterprise. Aid funds should not be used as a means of fostering international competition for new markets.

We recommend the encouragement of international subsidies for private enterprise within the underdeveloped countries and especially the expansion of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD). We believe that this form of administration is least likely to create dangers of exploitation. We note with approval that the Clay report to Congress urges an increased use of the International Development Association (IDA), an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Recommendation: Private enterprise can play an important part in the foreign aid program, but there must be safeguards against exploitation.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance is increasingly recognized as a very important part of the foreign aid program. It is essential in preparing a country for the wise expenditure of aid funds. This is sometimes referred to as "predevelopment" aid. It is also a very important part of any program to foster long-range development and independence for aid-receiving nations. The United Nations and its related agencies, embracing a worldwide variety of experience and background, offer a rich source of technical assistance. We should like to add a thought to the Clay committee recommendations on technical assistance. The Clay committee indicates its doubts as to the ability of the Agency for International Development (the U.S. Agency for Aid Administration) to mobilize highly qualified manpower necessary to implement the current technical assistance programs and urges a review of the facts. We suggest that, if the review confirms the fears of the Clay committee, there may well be international agencies which can meet the needs. We urge that a study be made of the technical assistance capacity of existing international organizations, such as the U.N. special fund and the expanded program for technical assistance, and that these international resources be more fully utilized in the area of technical assistance.

Recommendation: The technical assistance resources of the United Nations should be more fully utilized.

Respectfully submitted.

Policy Committee, Rochester Association for the United Nations: John W. Branch, Chairman; Mrs. David M. Allyn, Mrs. Morton Baum, Jr., C. Wendell Beck, Dr. William Bluhm, Mrs. Caroline Branch, Mrs. Albert Craig, Jr., Edward P. Curtis, Jr., Horace A. Dutton, John A. Emery, Dr. Alf M. Glasoe, David S. Greenlaw, John W. Handy, Mark C. Hargrave, Jr., Dr. Otakar Kutvirt, Mrs. Irwin Karron, Stephen May, Miss Mary Sheehan, Frank Steinhilper, Mrs. Clarence Wynd, Leonard Zartman, Dr. Carl Zuehlke.

Mr. Chairman, there are many recommendations for improved administration of our foreign assistance programs. Certainly, among them there can be found conflicting points of view and differences of opinion. However, I feel rather than to dwell on what separates the various proposals we should recognize the existence of widespread and allied interest in bringing about improvements. Obviously, there is more that unites these suggestions for higher quality in foreign aid than divides them.

For the future of the world and the stake America has in it, let us resolve that foreign assistance provided by this Nation bear living testimony to the strength and vitality of our free society. Let us transfuse into the developing nations some of the lifeblood of free enterprise.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before us for the following reasons:

Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of the debate on foreign aid this year which I find to be of unusual interest. This year the decision as to whether we continue, cut back, or halt foreign aid will be reached at the very time that the Senate is engaged in debate on ratification of the first test ban treaty ever to be signed between nations of the international community.

I find it interesting, Mr. Chairman, that those who attack the test ban treaty on the basis that it lacks adequate safeguards to protect our national security are the very people who are willing to scrap foreign aid without giving a moment's consideration to possible alternatives which most certainly would be needed in the short- and long-range interests of national security.

At best this is inconsistent, at worst it is as phony as a $3 bill.

It is not hard to distinguish inconsistency from phoniness. Surely everyone agrees that the economic aid and military assistance that this country has made available throughout the world has been an important, an indispensible weapon in the cold war against communism. To deny this is to deny the very basis of European recovery following World War II, a recovery which has been fundamental to the defense of the West. No one can dispute the dramatic economic and political consequences of our aid programs elsewhere: In Greece, Turkey, Iran, Thailand, Japan, and scores of other countries which have received U.S. aid. This has not been a dole, Mr. Chairman, it has been an investment and no country has ever made a better one. This farsighted program has been responsible for the salvation of free nations, a better life for hundreds of millions of people, and a global defense posture which has effectively checked Communist armed aggression.

We get to the question, then, of whether the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars can be justified for a continuation of this type of assistance. Those who say that it cannot be justified must do so either on the basis that a need no longer remains or, if it does, that it has been so reduced that the amount of the foreign aid authorization can be substantially cut back.

Do the facts bear out any such picture of the world today? It has been noted before that those who berate this program are the first to march up the aisle in favor of $50 billion a year defense appropriations—a small admission that dangers continue to confront us. These critics give many righteous reasons for gutting foreign aid but no one has yet heard them offer a single alternative. Perhaps some day they will see that the strength and security of a free world require positive action rather than pious protestations.

We have heard a great deal said about the cost of foreign aid, Mr. Chairman, but seldom with any regard for logic or perspective. Certainly the program costs money. Yes, it is expensive—a hundred billion dollars since World War II. But does anyone mean to say that the tangible benefits have not been worth the price, and does anyone mean to say that what we want for South America and other developing areas of the world will not be worth the investment we are talking about today?

Mr. Chairman, I am sick of speakers who get up and with righteous indignation denounce foreign aid as fiscal irresponsibility because it authorizes foreign assistance funds at a time when our national budget is in the red. Do they want to take the position that it was immoral for our country to go more than $200 billion into debt to win World War II?

Was lend-lease immoral because we did not have cash on the barrelhead?

If there is any question of morality to be raised, Mr. Chairman, it is in connection with the attitude of those who think that it is a sin to vote funds to assist other countries or who take the position that if this must be done, it should only be after a rigid political blood test and insistence upon conditions which certainly have no precedent in our own history.

Mr. Chairman, surely we must recognize by this time that the political and economic aspects of our national security are as important as the military. It does not make any sense to jeopardize a $50 billion expenditure for defense by refusing a $4 billion authorization to support military and economic activity abroad. Those who vote against this program, Mr. Chairman, will do so without offering a positive alternative; by so doing they are saying that our national security must rest wholly on our military capability and whatever efforts other free nations are able to make for themselves. This is a collision course with catastrophe pursued by those who have neither hindsight nor foresight.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, wisdom, logic, commonsense, and morality are all on the side of enactment of the bill before us.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Toll].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in supporting the committee bill authorizing $4.1 billion in new funds. This bill is already $800 million below the $4.9 billion originally proposed by President Kennedy and $400 million below the President's modified $4.5 billion request. Furthermore, it is $200 million below the $4.3 billion recommended by the Clay Committee.

These funds will provide for an effective program to preserve and extend freedom in other nations and for a reasonable contribution toward winning the cold war. This legislation is in the national interest and strengthens the security of our country.

The bill has a special impact on domestic employment because 80 percent of the commodity procurement funds under the foreign aid program are spent in the United States.

The bill contains a provision offered by our distinguished colleague, Representative LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York, which would ban assistance to any country which engages in or is preparing for aggressive military efforts against the United States or against any country receiving our aid. Any government which devotes its resources to the harassment of neighboring countries reduces the effectiveness of its efforts to help its own people. Nations which are subjected to military threats may come to believe that the United States is willing to tolerate if not endorse such action. This provision may be effective in maintaining peace in the Middle East.

I urge the Members to support this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, last night we had an example of what a monsoon season can be. For that reason I think we all ought to be very thankful that we do not live in a country where we have that. Therefore, I think it is very pertinent at this moment that we are considering a bill whereby some of those countries will be helped through our aid to them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for the work he has done on this bill and to thank him for his kindness to us during the hearings. Also, I want to compliment the gentleman on his appearance on the radio this morning together with our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in an endeavor to explain this program and in the effort to have us continue and maintain the authorization for the program as requested.

Mr. Chairman, I have always believed in the foreign assistance act. I have always supported foreign aid and I will continue to do so. But I have also been very selective with reference to where that aid should go. I have voted for foreign aid for $10 billion, for $9 billion, for $7 billion and so on. I want at this point to agree with the previous speaker that I, too, have been selective as to our foreign aid program and I, too, do not believe that our aid should go to any nation behind the Iron Curtain. I have fought for amendments along that line in committee and I have also voted against aid going to Indonesia and certain other countries as well which I believe are able to carry on economically and, perhaps, also able to give mutual assistance to other nations as well.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the remark of the previous speaker to say that European countries alone in 1961 gave $2.4 billion in foreign aid to underdeveloped areas. I just want to bring out the fact that under Public Law 480 which has nothing to do with this foreign assistance act, most of the accrued local currencies are accrued in nations abroad. So if one wants to cut out much of the outflow of gold and the accrual of local currencies, let them stand up and vote against Public Law 480. But I always note that those who come from areas supporting Public Law 480 legislation are opposed to foreign aid. So it is not understandable that those who have so much of the bounty and abundance of their land should refuse to share it with other nations of the world.

Maybe I support foreign aid, Mr. Chairman, because I am selfish and I believe it is a part, a great part of our national security. It is now, and should be and must be a pattern of U.S. policy.

I believe that our great Nation, endowed as it is and has been, and will continue to be, dedicated to the inherent rights of a person, must share the responsibility to expand and extend these principles to the less fortunate, and must share the bounty of our Republic with the less fortunate.

I will continue, Mr. Chairman, to support foreign aid but I will also continue in my right, as the minority has fought for it on so many occasions, to be selective. Maybe I remember, Mr. Chairman, the first vote I ever cast as a Member of this body. I remember, Mr. Chairman, on January 19, 1950, on the passage of aid to Korea, H.R. 5330, which was defeated by one vote, that shortly after that the aggression occurred in Korea. I saw and I am thankful to have partaken of the revival of Europe to the present day when they are economically and militarily strong. I am encouraged by this and believe that these countries must share in the mutual responsibility of carrying on assistance to underdeveloped areas. I saw, too, Mr. Chairman, the boys come home from Korea and as a result, the military buildup of new and advanced weapons of Red China by the Soviet in that area of the world. I saw, too, the buildup of North Korea by the Soviet and I saw the division of Vietnam.

At the same time I remember well the other side of the globe when the U.S.S.R. bypassed Europe because of its buildup and went into the Middle East where it secured a foothold. At the same time I remember Hungary and I remember we sat by on that occasion and did nothing. Now I remember Cuba. All of these make me believe in foreign assistance, and I much prefer to call it mutual cooperation because I feel the United States can no longer go it alone, but I feel that these nations of the free world must play their part, and secure a greater share in mutual security of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, today peoples in all parts of the world anxiously await the outcome of our annual foreign aid debate. They wonder what we will do. Will the Congress of the United States recognize their continuing problems and help to furnish them with their needs or will the representatives of the people of the most prosperous and powerful nation in the world ignore their role of free world leadership and forget the urgent needs of their less fortunate fellow men.

Will the peasant in Chile finally be able to own his own land as a result of land reform?

Will the soldier in Turkey, guarding his country's border against Russia, be issued a new rifle to replace his single shot weapon which dates back to 1915?

Indian soldiers guarding high mountain passes against Communist Chinese incursions wonder whether they will receive proper clothing to protect them against the bitter cold of the approaching winter.

Will farmers in many countries be assisted in irrigating their crops?

These are but a few examples of how the average man in so many nations of the world will be affected by what we do.

All admit the need and success of the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan in halting Communist aggression. Over the years the foreign aid program has been reasonably successful in the huge task it undertakes to perform.

Today, however, the program is something more. The foreign assistance program is a recognition of the moral responsibility of the strong and fortunate to help protect the less fortunate. This is based on the Christian-Judeo concept which is part of our national heritage. The development and expansion of international communism compelled us to extend the bounty of our Republic to those in need, until today—we find this legislation again before us for action.

Due to Communist expansionist activities in Europe following World War II, the granting of military and economic assistance became a pattern for U.S. security. The European nations recovered and today spend 2.5 to 3 billion on their foreign aid programs.

This legislation, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, is composed of a series of amendments to the basic law. These include many perfecting amendments and some technical amendments. They were adopted after long hearings and most careful consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Many amendments considered by the committee were rejected by narrow margins. Many of these will be introduced during the reading of the legislation, and I hope, after careful consideration, the final action will be the just action for our country.

Basically, this legislation will continue the support which Congress has provided for many years to carry out foreign policy objectives. Most of us agree with these objectives, but many of us disagree with the operation. However, I feel, Mr. Chairman, that all the amendments have strengthened the foreign assistance program, have placed additional safeguards on the operation, and generally constitute steps in the right direction by placing aid on a more selective basis. This, I think, is a very important point. I have repeatedly criticized our aid program for being too diffuse, and too indiscriminate. We corrected some of those abuses last year when the Congress placed new restrictions in the law on aid to certain countries. Some of the amendments adopted this year by the Committee on Foreign Affairs continue this process and deserve the full support of the House.

Mr. Chairman, these are days of challenge. These are days of crises—between allies—between parties. These are days when we must decide certain basic policies. Should the United States continue to help all nations and peoples regardless of the principles they pursue? Should the United States assist only those who are alined to the West? Should the United States cut the aid to those nations which do not carry their mutual share of the free world responsibilities? Should the United States insist that those peoples who seek independence share the responsibility for this independence? Should not the United States insist that there is a correlative responsibility with freedom?

The Committee on Foreign Affairs reviewed all these issues and questions in the light of present day needs and critical situations. For that reason, I believe this legislation is more constructive in dealing with the crises of the day—crises which must be met daily; crises instigated and augmented by the leaders of the Kremlin; crises brought to our very shores by the saber rattling of Khrushchev in Cuba. Khrushchev's olive branch offering of recent date must be accepted with reservations. The United States must keep up its guard. This bill represents U.S. efforts to maintain this guard—not only for the United States but for the free world. Khrushchev's plan to establish his military base in Cuba was defeated by the courageous decision of President Kennedy to risk a major war in this nuclear age. The result was a temporary Russian-Soviet retreat. What next—only Khrushchev can answer.

PIPELINE

For the past several years, we have heard much talk about the foreign aid pipeline. During yesterday's debate, much was said about this subject. What is the pipeline, what are the reasons for it, and how much money is in it?

The easiest definition of pipeline is funds that have been previously appropriated but have not as yet been spent. Those who seek to undermine the foreign aid program always utilize this figure. It is estimated that on June 30, 1963, this amount was $6.43 billion. This figure, however, does not take into consideration funds which have been committed and obligated to specific projects and uses and are being held in reserve for disbursement as the projects progress. If these commitments are taken into consideration, only $160 million, including the fiscal 1963 appropriation, remains available for commitment to new programs and projects.

The foreign aid program, as almost all other program activities of Government obligates funds but expends funds only upon delivery or completion of work. Thus, if the United States obligates itself to furnish a loan for highway construction, it does not disburse the funds in a lump sum. As each portion of the highway is completed and accepted, it is paid for. If a project requires 5 years to complete, as many do, all of the moneys reserved for this project will not be disbursed until the end of 5 years.

The pipeline concept is not unique to the foreign aid program. I never hear mention made of it when other programs are involved and am beginning to suspect that it has been set up as a proverbial strawman which will fall from the slightest blow. On June 30, 1963, it is estimated that all U.S. Government agencies had unexpended balances or a pipeline of $76.6 billion. The foreign aid program represented some 10 percent of the total, which the Department of Defense accounted for $39.6 billion, or more than 50 percent, and the Department of Agriculture $4.4 billion or some 5.7 percent of the total.

In recent years, there has been an increase in the pipeline. This has been caused by several factors:

First. Loans—60 percent of economic program for fiscal 1964—rather than grants of economic aid are being utilized to a greater extent. Since loans require more negotiation than grants, a longer period of time elapses before the first expenditures are made.

Second. The Alliance for Progress, which was instituted 2 years ago, required extensive planning and the undertaking of self-help measures by Latin American countries before funds were disbursed.

Third. Modern military equipment requirements need longer leadtimes than in the past. More than 70 percent of military pipeline is in long leadtime items such as aircraft—18 to 24 months—ships—3 to 4 years—and complicated electronic equipment.

Thus, there is only $160 million left unobligated. This is all that is available for commitment to new projects and programs for fiscal 1964. It should be made clear that there are practically no military aid funds presently available to order equipment which will require a long time to produce to be available next year and the year after. If we deplete the pipeline, the entire program will come to a standstill in a very short time.

The major outflow of gold from the United States is critical—but do not blame it on foreign aid. While the program does spend dollars abroad, it constitutes but a very small factor in the overall problem.

In 1962 U.S. tourists spent some $2.5 billion abroad.

In 1963, private raising of new capital in the United States by foreign business firms and governments will probably reach $2.5 billion.

These are the major problems—not foreign aid. In fiscal 1964, 80 percent of all economic assistance funds and almost 100 percent of the military assistance funds will be spent in the United States. In addition, we must consider that the U.S. sales of military equipment to our allies in fiscal 1962, for example, amounted to about $1 billion. As one who has long been aware of this problem, I sponsored, and with your committee, enacted an amendment which has, through mutual defense procurement, brought more than $1 billion in business to U.S. firms. More than 40 percent of this money was spent in areas of substantial labor surplus in procurement for the F-104G fighter aircraft.

It is indeed strange that, among those who most vigorously oppose foreign aid are Members who support and vote for continued operations under Public Law 480—Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954, as amended.

Let us take a moment to compare Public Law 480 and the foreign aid program. Under title I of Public Law 480, sales of agricultural commodities are made by the United States for foreign currency. Does the U.S. Treasury receive these foreign currencies? No. They remain in the purchasing nation and to the greatest extent can only be used in a manner acceptable to the foreign government. This usually takes the form of a loan to that government, repayable in foreign currency. In less than 10 years, agreements for more than $9 billion have been made under title I. These are moneys, most of which will never be seen again, and are sometimes referred to as "funny money" by the U.S. Government personnel, because they are next to meaningless and repayment can and has been waived by the executive in several instances. Does anyone raise a great protest about this program? Are detailed battle plans formulated before this legislation reaches the floor? No—hardly a voice is raised in protest because agriculture, the "sacred cow," is involved.

I have attempted to explain to you why I ask you to support this legislation. I believe the bill has some shortcomings and it contains some provisions I do not like. There is no question that the Foreign Assistance Act is bulky and in many ways difficult to understand. I hope that next year this legislation will be rewritten and put in simpler form—but I do feel that the overall effect is positive and I ask your support for this legislation.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 days we have listened to some brilliant outbursts of oratory in praise of this particular program. I hope that the brilliance of those statements has not dimmed the vision of this body to the point where it cannot look closely at those areas of this program and its administration which are in need of critical attention.

Yesterday I received a Multilith letter which I presume all Members of the House received from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Among the things that they urged us to keep our fingers off of, not to touch, were the areas of military assistance, supporting assistance and the President's contingency fund.

I would like to direct your attention briefly to the President's contingency fund. There is no criticism of the benefits that flow from this program. There is no criticism of the good that it does and can do. But I think in the administration of this program the critics are correct when they tell us that this program needs to be tightened up, that we need better administration, that we need more thought and planning in the use of this money. And, in that area I think the contingency fund is one that this body can well cut some of the fat out, in considering this bill.

The bill, as it comes from the committee, carries for the President's contingency fund an amount of $200 million. They tell us, "Oh, we have cut down $100 million already from this fund; do not touch it." But hand in hand with the contingency fund goes supporting assistance in the amount of $380 million that is subject to the will and the discretion of the President himself and no one else. So, in fact, we are talking about a sum of $580 million. If you add the section on "Development Grants and Technical Cooperation" you add $217 million, for a total of $797 million that is practically all available at the discretion of the President.

Now, take a look briefly at that contingency fund. In the committee I offered an amendment to reduce the contingency fund to $150 million which I think is adequate under all the facts and the circumstances. At the appropriate time later today I expect to reoffer the amendment to reduce the contingency fund to $150 million.

Mr. Chairman, to take a look at the last 3 years of the contingency fund or beginning in 1960, the contingency fund used $123.5 million; in 1961, they used $272.6 million; in 1962, they used $293.4 million; and in fiscal year 1963, they used $160 million. But of the $160 million they used last year, $17 million of it was given to Indonesia. This Congress had reduced the amount of money available for Indonesia, the President had signed the bill, but his signature was hardly dry on that legislation before he turned around and made available to Indonesia $17 million, in complete disregard to the wishes of Congress and solely under the authority of his discretion.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the history of the use of the money in that fiscal year, you see that as the fiscal year draws closer to its conclusion the emergencies throughout the world increased in direct proportion to the time remaining in which to spend the money before the fiscal year ended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, as we begin to take up the various amendments proposed to be offered to this bill, I wish here and now to state the position I intend to take.

What I have to say is in effect my response to the letter we received from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. They complain that the bill as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs is insufficient in the allowable dollars to be spent and too restrictive as to where and how they can be spent.

My answer to them is that unless amendments are adopted to make the bill even more limited and even more restrictive I shall vote against the measure. And this will be the first time in the long series of so-called foreign aid bills, beginning with the Marshall plan effectuated by the 80th Congress, that I will have voted in the negative. Heretofore I have sought to have restrictive provisions written into measures and reductions made in the funds; but, failing that, I have voted for the bill nonetheless.

The time has long since arrived when there should be both a retrenchment and a revision of this foreign aid program. The change in the official title of the program from "mutual security" to "foreign assistance" is quite appropriate. The program has become less and less a "security" program and more and more a "gratuity" program.

There is a limitation as to what the United States should do in providing foreign assistance. And there is a limitation to what the United States can do. The time has long since arrived when we give recognition to these limitations.

Our national budget is dangerously out of balance. Six times in 3 years we have been called upon to enact statutory debt limit legislation. And we will shortly have before us a request for another increase in the debt ceiling.

And our international balance of payments is also dangerously out of balance. For the second quarter of this year the gold outflow is over $1 billion—the highest it has even been.

I am not advocating that our foreign aid program be summarily terminated. As a matter of fact, even if this authorization bill is not enacted, there is available an accumulation of unexpended balances from prior years of between $6 and $7 billion.

Nor do I say that the military and economic aid we have extended has been entirely wasted. Had I not recognized its value in our own self-interest—to restrain the spread of communism and to further our security—I would not have supported the program to the degree I have.

It was, as I said, the Republican 80th Congress, in which I was privileged to serve as majority whip, that inaugurated the Marshall plan and authorized the Greek-Turkish loan. This was a program for the rehabilitation of war-devastated Europe. At that time we never envisaged anything like the size and kind of foreign assistance program we have today. The Marshall plan had a realistic objective. Allies once prostrate are now prosperous. Yet we are continuing to give financial assistance to some regardless of their economic strength. We are not only giving assistance to prosperous allies, we are even giving aid to Communist-controlled countries and to so-called neutrals.

We need to make a determination as to our objective. We need to set up a realistic criteria in the determination of what countries and for what purpose they should be extended aid. There needs to be more of a quid pro quo in the aid arrangements.

With respect to these so-called neutrals, I am obliged to ask: Neutral for whom? Have we learned nothing from the Belgrade Conference. Have we learned nothing from the Punta del Este Conference in Uruguay? Have we not yet learned that we cannot buy prestige? We must earn it. And only by firmness in any and all respects can it be earned.

There is nothing partisan about the position I am taking on this pending bill. The program has long had bipartisan support.

One must ask just how nonpartisan can a program be when President Kennedy went out of his way to insure the political defeat of the leading Republican advocate of the program—Dr. Walter Judd? And when President Truman condemned the Republican 80th Congress that put the Marshall plan into effect as a "do-nothing" Congress?

I repeat what I said at the outset: I intend to support amendments that will bring this program under control and make it more realistic. If we are unsuccessful in this effort during the reading of the bill I shall then, for the first time, in something like 15 years, vote against the entire bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to pay a word of tribute to the distinguished Republican whip for the great record he has made in the area of foreign policy ever since he helped write and put on the statute books the Greek-Turk loan and the Marshall plan back in 1947 and 1948. I sincerely hope that the record he has made over the years will not be marred this week because he may or may not agree with every item in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill as it has been reported by the committee. I feel the committee consideration of this bill has been as ample, as thorough, as extensive as any committee has ever given to this subject since its inception. I commend the committee for the long weeks of hard work that it put into this matter. I commend the amendments it has written into the legislation. The committee has done a fine piece of work in a difficult and complex legislative field.

Although the test ban treaty is now making the headlines in foreign affairs, I believe the bill we are debating here today is of no less significance to the future security of the free world.

This bill, as I understand it, seeks to widen the roadbed to freedom over which all the peoples of the world may travel, although their commitment to freedom is in many cases yet uncertain.

It is a certainty, however, that there will be no letup in the battle against Communist control of the underdeveloped areas of the world. It seems to me this is the point my distinguished friend from Illinois may have missed. This job of keeping the newly emerging nations on the side of freedom is as important as the job of giving military assistance to those friends of the free world who happen to live on the edge of the Iron Curtain.

General Clay stated accurately, I think, both the prescription and the prognosis of foreign aid when he said:

> I do not think foreign aid has of itself won us any friends. I think it has created already, though, a number of strong, independent nations who want to preserve their freedom and who are willing to fight for it, not because of friendship for us but because they

have their own pride and strength restored to them.

There is broad area of agreement, and I am sure the gentleman from Illinois is among those who hold this opinion, that our national policy must seek to extend the borders and shores of the free world. Can this goal be reached by a route other than the foreign assistance route? Is there a workable alternative to be had at less than our present cost of 1 percent of our gross national product per year? Does not the fact that the Soviet Union is spending at the rate of $1 million per day in Communist Cuba challenge us to continue spending just about twice that much in the whole of South America?

The foreign aid authorization bill has been cut and cut drastically. It was cut in the White House. It has been cut by the committee $200 million more than recommended by General Clay when he appeared before the committee. It is my understanding that there will be a move to vote additional cuts and additional restrictions. I hope that the House will reject these efforts.

The Congress provided substantial safeguards in the use of funds in the original Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, amended last year, and again this year in committee.

The President must have the ability to react quickly in matters involving national security. Further attempts to limit the President's discretion would deprive him of the ability to exercise the full authority of his office in the conduct of our foreign policy and, in crisis, to act promptly in the best interests of the Nation.

The philosophy and approach of both great political parties in this country under both President Truman and President Eisenhower recognized that only the President can act in the area of foreign affairs. This is a realistic and proper approach. It is, of course, the constitutional approach. Surely we will give no less discretionary authority to President Kennedy than we have given to other Presidents since the inception of the Marshall plan. Surely in this phase of the cold war, when this country must be alert to every possible opportunity to strengthen the relative position of our own country, this Congress, dedicated as it is to the preservation of freedom, would not willingly tie the hands of the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we have been engaged by the enemy, whether we like it or not. He has engaged us with arms, with his own foreign-aid programs, and with his conflicting ideology. If we do not help the underdeveloped nations to create prosperous societies which they are willing and able to defend they may well fall into caretaker status of the Soviets. We are winning this struggle, but unless our efforts are sustained we cannot be sure of the outcome.

The issue is not partisan. It is American. It is vital. It is an exercise in long-range constructive national policy and leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill, as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure to appear before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to discuss H.R. 5666 on June 5, 1963, now encompassed in the amendment I will offer later dealing with a limitation on our contribution to all U.N. assistance agencies. I want the members of the committee to know of my appreciation for their consideration and tolerant understanding for one who is not a member of the committee, and certainly makes no pretense of sharing their background in the field of foreign affairs. Yesterday, just prior to close of debate on H.R. 7885, I inserted the amendment, and some background data for all to see, page 14653.

I also compliment the committee for taking a first step toward insuring that U.S. contributions to U.N. assistance agencies are not used to strengthen the Castro regime in Cuba.

I have some doubts whether this will accomplish the objective, or will merely result in American dollars going in one pocket and coming out the other bearing a different currency. But at least, through this amendment, the committee has demonstrated its concern to our own U.N. delegation over American dollars being used to strengthen Communist bloc governments.

However, Mr. Chairman, the basic problem remains, and it involves both money and principle. In a previous letter I have tried to document the background leading to the amendment which I first offered as H.R. 5666 on April 11, 1963. Many will recall the research early this year leading to 15 consecutive reports to this House, and in the RECORD.

While United Nations aid to Communist-bloc countries is, in part, responsible for the submission of my amendment, I want to stress that there is a principle involved here which would be just as true if there were no U.N. aid going to Communist-bloc nations. The principle of paying one's fair share is just as true in international organizations as it is in the operation of a local chamber of commerce; that is, which must rely on voluntary rather than compulsory subscriptions. In my hometown of Springfield, Mo., we have a progressive chamber of commerce with just under a thousand members, more members, it is true, than belong to the United Nations, though if they carve up a few more countries in Africa they will soon catch up.

In my hometown chamber of commerce—and I suspect in yours also—each member pays according to his ability as determined by many things—his gross income, number of employees, and other factors. Large members pay more than smaller members, but no one is exempt and each is expected to bear his fair share of the load of working for the betterment of the community.

It is the same in the United Nations, which is also a voluntary organization, to which members may or may not join. Each member is assessed a fair share of the cost, and none, however poor they allege to be, are exempt from paying their assessed dues.

Back in the 82d Congress, a law was passed establishing a statutory limit upon our contribution. It was determined that the United States would not pay more than 33⅓ percent of the assessed budget of the United Nations. It was our rightful expectation, that even this figure would be reduced, as all of our aid programs began to take their effect and other nations began to stand on their own two feet. Even though the 33⅓-percent figure is still in effect, we are in fact paying only 32.02 percent of the assessed U.N. budget. One might draw from this, the conclusion that, however slowly, other nations are beginning to pay their fair share. But, other factors have taken place which belies this assumption. Since the 82d Congress, a number of so-called voluntary U.N. budgets have been established—and the State Department has determined that it is not bound by the previous 33⅓-percent limitation in its subscription to those budgets. Today, in fact we pay more than this 33⅓-percent limitation, to 10 of the 28 U.N. budgets. In some cases, as I have pointed out, we pay as much as 100 percent, and have been doing so since 1959, without encouraging participation by others.

The only limitation applied to any of these voluntary budgets is a 40-percent limitation adopted in 1961 by the Congress in respect to the U.N. Special Fund and the U.N. expanded technical assistance program.

Now, what was our purpose in picking up an excess share of the price for these U.N. assistance programs, or perhaps I should say, what was the purpose of those who man the "ivory towers" at the Department of State?

When I first involved myself in this problem, I invited representatives from the State Department to visit my office for a discussion of the issue. They explained that it was necessary for us to contribute more than our fair share in order to show other countries, how worthwhile they were and to motivate their participation.

Overlooked somehow, was the possibility that so long as we were willing to pay more than our fair share, other countries would be satisfied with paying less than theirs.

Also bear in mind that this country does not share directly in any benefits from any of these programs except as we contribute from something hazily described as a "better world." For us in a sense, it might better be compared to a "United Fund drive" than a chamber of commerce. We put in and others take out.

The so-called voluntary programs for which we give a State Department a free hand in determining our contribution are now as great or greater than the assessed U.N. regular budget. We still control through the Congress, the dog, but the tail has outgrown it, and is in fact, wagging it.

Have we motivated increased participation by other U.N. members? Is this truly an international program? Has our participation in even a so-called multilateral program eased the demands on our own foreign aid program? Let us look at the record:

Since 1959, we have been paying—and are still paying—40 percent of both the U.N. Special Fund and the expanded technical assistance program. We have paid 100 percent of the two WHO projects—community water development and research—since 1959 without encouraging any participation, let alone increased participation. Our share of the U.N. Palestine relief program has, in fact, increased from 67.48 percent in 1949 to its present alltime high of 70 percent. Apparently we are almost three times as concerned about this problem as the rest of the world combined. They were squabbling again with the United Arab Republic as late as yesterday. I wish we could be as concerned about another problem only 90 miles off our shore.

Now you may well ask, what will all the other countries of the world say when we suddenly announce to the world that we no longer intend to pay more than one-third of the budget for these U.N. programs? Will they throw up their hands in terror? Will they insist that we go on being not one, but two Santa Clauses—ours and the U.N.'s?

I must regretfully confess, the Kremlin has a better insight than does our own State Department. The Soviet Union contributes no more to the Special Fund now than she did in 1959. Her pledge each year, then and now, is a nice round figure—$1 million. That incidentally, is less than is paid by the tiny country of Switzerland. She puts out propaganda about her economic growth and overtaking the United States but her contribution to this international aid program is less than 1 percent of its cost compared to our 40 percent. Yet she shares in the credit.

The U.S. contribution to the Special Fund alone has grown from $10 million in 1959 to $29 million in 1963, an increase of 300 percent while the Soviet Union—and many other countries as well—have not budged an inch, or a ruble—which incidentally they also require.

Furthermore, Red bloc currencies are mostly in nonconvertible currencies, so do not be misled by figures that purport to show that they contribute more than they receive. Yugoslavia, for instance, receives almost 10 times as much as she contributes. And yesterday's paper shows Tito and Khrushchev embracing as though they were Siamese twins.

Total U.N. aid to or programed for the Red bloc in 1963–64 totals 93 projects, 16 for Cuba, 30 for Poland, 32 for Yugoslavia, 3 for Albania and 23 interregional projects with Red nations involved. I have documented each of these in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—See page 1514, hearings.

Mr. Chairman, this aid, these so-called voluntary programs, are being channeled out of our aid funds. We are really debating on this floor, not one, but two aid programs to which we contribute all in the case of ours, and almost all in the case of the U.N.'s.

We examine carefully the dirty linen in our own aid closets, the jet airports in Afghanistan, the University in Ethiopia, and so forth. We barely have access to the dirty linen in the U.N. aid program. The press does not bother with them. Yet I have here hundreds of pages listing these U.N. assistance programs in detail and I suggest that the inefficiency and waste in many of them is at least no less, and probably far more than our own. They are privileged sanctuary's as far as our own GAO and Comptroller General are concerned. Worse, they admit to no auditing proven of their own.

Mr. Chairman, the point is sure to be made, but is not the Children's Fund one of these voluntary agencies and how can you be against children? I submit that when one pays a third of the total budget of any international organization, it is grossly unfair to say that one opposes, or does not believe in, being kind to children. If we have to pay more than that, then we may as well assume the responsibility of the whole program.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an argument involving whether we should get the "U.N. out of the U.S." or vice versa. I leave that to others to debate and consider.

In fact I believe that adoption of my amendment will strengthen the U.N. It will serve to make it fiscally responsible. It may even serve to diminish some of the outcries against the organization itself. It will give our own State Department a stronger bargaining position, by substituting law for the option of a bureaucrat who is subject to pressure. As stated on this floor the day I submitted H.R. 5666, I believe in and want to enhance the basic principle of the U.N.

But if we do not adopt this type of amendment, it will surely increase the pressures within this country against the U.N. itself. I have not mentioned our own budget deficit. How can we continue to pay more than our fair share of U.N. foreign aid, when we cannot raise enough money to pay for our own domestic programs?

Based on our 1962 expenditures, for this purpose, I estimate the savings to be in excess of $38 million, and possibly as high as $50 million. If other countries fill the partial vacuum, our expenditures will not be reduced at all, but at least we will have established the principle of paying our fair share, and not a penny more. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, 15 years ago it was my privilege to serve as the first counsel to the first joint congressional committee established by this House and the Senate to watch over our first foreign aid programs. In the course of this work I traveled in Europe and the Mideast submitting reports to the Congress consistently critical of the levels of our foreign spending. The situation has not changed to this day.

In the beginning—in the days of what might be described as the reconstruction of a war-ravaged Europe after World War II—there was a genuine need for a reasonably sound foreign aid program to get disaster-stricken countries back on their economic feet and to help them establish a viable economy. As the years went by, however, as is the way with all Government programs, the foreign aid appropriations came to be an annual built-in fixture with a hard core of Government employee protagonists and a coterie of financially interested private industrial supporters. Like a cyst, this group has grown harder and harder and the programs wilder and wilder until an aroused public opinion a few years back toned the situation down a little but not enough.

Today, 15 years later, we find ourselves on the short end of the fiscal stick. A hundred billion dollars has been spent when twenty would have done the job and done it better in terms of the tidal waves of competing products that now inundate the American market from cheap labor sources abroad.

European creditors hold $26 billion of demands on our dollars, supposedly backed by only $16 billion worth of gold at Fort Knox. The European Common Market, vitalized and literally created in large measure by our foreign aid assistance, now combines against us in world competitive markets when it is in its interest to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it has been well said that the dollar is not patriotic. In the same vein, it should perhaps be observed in retrospect that Americans are generous to the point of profligacy and naive to the point of recklessness. There are 100 nations of the world to be aided in this bill. At the very beginning of the debate on this bill I asked the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee whether there was anything in the bill that required a nation as a condition of receiving a gift to have an imbalanced budget. There was not. There is not. Under this bill it is possible to take money from the American people by taxes, adding to the national debt and further aggravating an already unbalanced budget, and give the money away to a foreign nation that has no debt and has a balanced budget. This is ridiculous. It is wrong. It is another illustration of fiscal irresponsibility. And it is no answer to say that the President or those in the executive branch in charge of this program would not give this money to a country that does not need it for this has been done again and again and again. The question seems to be what constitutes need and there are always so many ways of devising so many needs if the right person is persuaded by the right pressures that a need should be found. We have a real need, an acute need, for these dollars right here in the United States.

For a long time I have been convinced that this country should end foreign aid on a grant basis. This conviction has ripened to a certainty in direct proportion to our mounting national debt. We have no valid reason to give deficit dollars charged to the next generation to foreign countries in the guise of foreign aid. It is morally wrong and fiscally irresponsible to do in foreign affairs what is prohibited by our Constitution in domestic affairs. We cannot raise money by taxes and give it to private institutions. We should not be able to collect money by taxes and give it to foreign governments. This is something that Congress should have imposed as a requirement upon an unwilling Executive many long years and many tens of billions of dollars ago. We need a profound change in foreign policy. No more money giveaway programs from a country facing bankruptcy.

At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to eliminate from this bill all gifts and grants of purely economic assistance without military significance. I shall do this with full confidence that I am keeping faith with the American people who are fed to the teeth with paying with borrowed dollars for largely useless foreign gifts. And this is not to say that we dislike our foreign friends or that in any sense we are less friendly toward them nor less inclined to look out for their best interests. It is just that the hour has come that we need to conserve our resources here at home. We need to tighten our outflow and to bring into balance the expenditures of Government with its revenues. Let us face it. Let us have the courage to say, "No more of this foolishness." Instead of yielding to the pressures of the foreign lobbyists, the AID propaganda and the international do-gooders, let us do something for Americans first for a change.

In this day of vastly expensive Government programs such as the moonshot, a nation in debt over $308 billion and spending at a rate of a billion a month more than it receives in Government revenues must call a halt to giveaway programs.

To the extent that this legislation authorizes loans upon reasonable collateral and over a reasonable term of years and with a reasonable rate of interest, I do not object. Likewise, with military assistance that in the opinion of the military and the Department of Defense is essential and not procurable elsewhere during this fiscal year. Even here, however, to the extent that such military assistance is by grant—which means gift—I believe it important that our friends should realize that those that can afford it and that want such military protection should be required to pay for it rather than have it given to them. There is no reason why they should not pay for it. If hard currencies are not available, the payment may be by barter or other forms of exchange.

Mr. Chairman, this House has no reasonable alternative to this course of action. Program after program costing hundreds of millions of dollars is proposed to the Congress without any funding whatsoever. Many of these programs are being authorized by the House at levels considered by the House to be prudent only to have the Senate increase them by more hundreds of millions. This leaves the spadework to the Appropriations Committees and unfortunately even within these committees there is an indisposition among the majority to protect the economy and to achieve balance in the budget necessary to preserve the fiscal strength of America. Lacking the will in the executive branch and facing strong pressures that too often put political considerations above the public interest, there is only one course today for this House to take in the matter of the foreign aid program on behalf of the American people. This is to reduce it substantially and this I am confident the House will vote to do. It is not as though there was nothing left. It is not as though there was a radical cutoff. There are billions of dollars in the pipeline authorized, appropriated, but unspent.

For the sake of ourselves, our children, our savings, our insurance and for similar vital concerns of every American man, woman, and child, I plead with the House to stand firm for America, cut out this foolishness and act decisively to weed out the waste and the giveaway in these foreign programs.

Mr. Chairman, it is in the people's interest that this bill should be amended to eliminate authority for any more giveaway foreign aid.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN], for his very fine presentation. His remarks and his reasoning regarding the foreign aid program are sound and responsible indeed. I support his position and am pleased to associate myself with his remarks, and also those appropriate and excellent remarks made earlier by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of assistance to foreign countries has indeed become a subject of great controversy. Some criticism is warranted and some is not. This, of course, is to be expected during a debate such as is now being conducted and I believe a better understanding of the problem will be the end result. Thank God we have the privilege of exchanging views under this great system of ours.

After listening to many of the remarks, I have concluded that there is a very definite trend taking place today—a trend that reflects a basic change of direction—in our philosophy relating to foreign aid—a trend toward greater emphasis in the private sector and a lesser emphasis in the public sector, in funding recommended programs. I believe the credit for this trend must be shared three ways. First, a disturbed electorate has advised the Members of their dissatisfaction with the general philosophy and administration of past programs. Second, the Foreign Affairs Committee has worked diligently in a very difficult area to adopt amendments directing more recognition to the private sector. Third, a majority of the Members of this House have introduced and are adopting amendments carrying out this trend.

Some people have been criticized for accepting this attitude—some even suggest that people who vote for these amendments are against helping the people of foreign lands to a better way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth. I believe the trend that is taking place this session will set the stage for future foreign assistance programs. In the field of foreign affairs, I believe we must remember one thing—a government-to-government program will always have limitations if you believe in a private enterprise system. A people-to-people program with greater emphasis in the private sector has no limitations. For those who ask for a constructive alternative, I suggest they recognize this basic trend. Herein lies the foreign aid program of the future.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], on his wonderful job in guiding this foreign aid bill to what I hope will be a successful conclusion. But, Mr. Chairman, so long as there is a cold war, just so long will it be necessary to extend foreign aid. Even after the end of the cold war it still will be necessary to aid those still impoverished and underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, indulging in generalities is very simple, but that is no answer. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to state here that I unequivocally favor this foreign aid bill.

Mr. Chairman, aid given by the United States is not going to effect an immediate and dramatic change in the world situation. The problems are too big and the resources available too small. Nonetheless our efforts must be continued, for, over time, they will have an enormous effect upon the world's economic structure. It has often been said that a man fights better when he is hungry than when he is satisfied. A starving man will always be fair game for any militaristic activity. Only when people are adequately fed, housed, and clothed will lasting peace be assured. Lasting peace is a goal that has been pursued throughout the ages. Our aid program is one of the means used in this pursuit.

To date, I believe that we can be pleased with the results of our efforts. In the past 15 years only one country has been seized by the delusion that is communism. Only Cuba has chosen to embrace the fallacious Marxist ideology. No other country has chosen the Communist road.

I will not say that our foreign aid program is solely responsible for this occurrence. But it has played a major role. A reduction in our aid allotments would not spell catastrophe, nor would doubling the expenditures cause an immediate millenium. The problem is not susceptible to quick solutions and facile schemes. Rather it must be met in many ways. Our aid programs make provision for many of the necessary components, such as grants, loans, incentives to private investment, and food shipments. These programs must be continued. This country which has been blessed with vast natural resources, with a geographic position that has spared it the devastation of many wars, and with a diverse and highly skilled population has a moral obligation to help those who have been less fortunate. Moreover, this aid is certainly required by the national interest of this country.

We cannot stand alone against the Communist menace. Only if the nations of the world are strong and independent can we be assured of survival. The aid program is not in itself a solution, but it is a vital component of any long range effort to ameliorate the present situation. Morally, aid is right; politically, it is sound; strategically, it is mandatory.

I will not make dire predictions of what will happen if we discontinue our aid programs, nor will I suggest that these programs are a panacea for our international problems. They are neither—but they are a significant implementation of our foreign policy.

Foreign policy is what results from a careful weighing of facts, goals, and assumptions relating to the international scene. Foreign aid, like military preparations and diplomacy, is one of the tools by which foreign policy is implemented. It is in no way isolated from the objectives of a country's foreign policy. Rather it is a means of achieving these objectives.

There is no precise figure that can be given as that of good foreign aid program. Relative to other countries we can consider ourselves generous. Yet we have given more primarily because we have more to give. Though our current aid program involves billions of dollars, we are currently giving, as a percentage of gross national product, far less than France.

Now we must face the question: "What is the long-range goal of the U.S. foreign policy?" As generally stated, our international efforts are directed toward creating the conditions under which the people of the world's nations will be free to govern themselves and to seek to improve their living standard. This is a goal. It does not contain a statement of the steps to be taken to further its achievement. These steps must be outlined in a well-defined policy. Now foreign aid is not usually deplored as a means of achieving this goal. However, aid is combated on the grounds that expenditures in other areas are more important for our national interest. Thus the need for a balanced budget and a not unfavorable balance of payments is often considered as preempting the need for a foreign aid program.

Since these are the two arguments most often used to oppose foreign aid, I shall consider them separately.

It cannot be denied that by terminating all our aid programs, we would alleviate our current budget deficit. However, it seems apparent that the international repercussions of such a move would be far greater than its salutary effects on the domestic economy.

With respect to military aid, I would like to point out that it is probably the least costly means available to us of assuring our national security. What other means are at our disposition? We could give no military assistance and, instead, use only our own troops and material to defend the nations we are now aiding. This would obviously be far more costly than our present programs. Another possibility is that of relying on the United Nations to defend the free world countries. This also would prove more costly because the United States has always provided the lion's share of U.N. funds. Thus it seems certain that our present programs, which concentrate 80 percent of our military aid in 10 countries, are, on a cost-performance basis, the optimum solution for our defense problems.

Concerning our development aid, I can only say that it has proved reasonably successful in maintaining stability in certain countries by raising their standard of living and thereby reducing the unrest that is bred by poverty. If by this aid, we have changed conditions which otherwise would have called for military intervention by the United States, then it is highly likely that we have actually saved money by the aid program. It is certain that we have saved prestige.

Regarding the balance-of-payments deficit, I can only remind you that 80 percent of U.S. aid is tied to purchases in the United States. Thus of every billion dollars given in aid, only $200 million is used for purchasing goods outside the United States. The other $800 million is used to buy U.S. products. Thus the deficit caused by foreign aid payments is far smaller than is generally known and is not responsible for a large percentage of the total deficit.

Moreover, it can be argued that the budget deficit increase caused by our aid expenditures actually has a salutary effect on the economy in that it provides for the utilization of plant, men, and equipment that would otherwise lie idle. Thus, since our aid program is so extensively tied to purchases in the United States, it serves as a stimulant to the economy and results in a definite alleviation of our unemployment problems.

Another aspect of the U.S. aid program is the encouragement of investments by individuals. Only a combination of government and the individual will be able to surmount the enormous economic difficulties of many countries. The role played by private investors will increase as countries succeed in completing the economic infrastructure needed by any business venture. Once these countries have an adequate network of roads, electricity, and available sources of water, private investors will begin to build plants to provide for the ever increasing demand for goods. The employment they provide will raise incomes, thereby making possible the purchase of these new commodities.

Our economic aid program plays an important role in providing for the long-term security of the United States. The short-term aspects of our security problems are under the purview of the military assistance programs. However, the United States constitutes an increasingly smaller percentage of the world's people. Thus military might will not suffice. Only if the peoples of the world achieve a reasonable living standard coupled with individual freedom will stability ever be achieved. The U.S. aid program plays a large role in the quest for this stability.

This quest is rarely an easy one. Too often the potential gains in a country's standard of living are overshadowed by the rising expectations of its people and by a population that expands faster than the economy. Yet the difficulty of the task does not mean that it should not be undertaken. The problems will only increase in the future. Thus, it is imperative that our efforts be continued.

In conclusion, I want to make one point clear. I am in no way advocating that the United States blithely offer its largess to all the countries of the world, or that it support any project that is suggested. The Clay report made clear the dangers of our attempting to do too much for too many. In distributing our aid we must be extremely careful to support only those projects that will benefit the affected communities as a whole. Moreover, we must ascertain that the recipient country will be able to fulfill its share of the task. Too many times have we built superhighways for countries that have few cars, or provided electric equipment to countries that have inadequate electricity. Any project we support should be thoroughly investigated concerning its feasibility and necessity before an aid commitment is made. I sincerely believe that the bill now considered assures that these investigations will be made.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, some years ago when the Armed Services Committee placed a 3-year limitation on authorizations, killing them automatically when they had not been used for that time, many cries of alarm went up. But practice has shown this to be not only a money saving device but a method of concentrating primary efforts on places of primary need. No one would want to return to the old system. I hope we can apply this principle to foreign aid. There are many other places where the legislation before us should be tightened up.

Although I have much more often than not, voted for foreign aid, I am seriously considering voting against this bill as a protest against the extravagance of this legislation when measured against today's circumstances.

Two facts of life in 1963 require the foreign aid program to be tightly limited. The first is the alarming outflow of gold from America, the balance-of-payments deficit. Even France's President de Gaulle has suggested curtailment of American aid as the logical way to meet this crisis. The stability of the American dollar is of international concern, not just a domestic problem here.

The other fact is that most economists and practically every sector of American society, including the leadership of both management and labor, have demanded a substantial tax cut in 1963. This, in the presence of a tremendous national deficit, both accumulated and current, is a phenomenal thing. Personally, I feel that most of my constituents want the tax cut but that they want it with substantial reductions in Federal expenditures. Foreign aid is admittedly a loosely managed program when compared with domestic programs like defense and public works. The charitable parts of it are of doubtful constitutionality.

For these reasons our country should have only a limited foreign aid program in 1963. The presence of over $7 billion in the pipeline, already committed by our country, allows a flexibility that could include an actual 2-year moratorium; and in the present circumstances that would seem wiser to me than a liberal, relatively unchecked program of the type we have had in the past.

A negative vote on this bill cannot be sustained on the theory that the bill is all bad. Far from it. There is much good in the bill; but in 1963 with the serious financial problems facing our country we must do whatever we can to preserve our national fiscal strength.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, while I have always been one of the strongest advocates of foreign aid to assist other nations to achieve independence, freedom and self-sustaining economic growth, I have also made it clear that we should be vigilant in protecting the interest of U.S. citizens and in requiring the program be administered in the interest of world peace and stability.

In this regard I have been concerned particularly with the granting of foreign aid to Egypt. Ever since I entered the Congress, the situation in the Middle East and the continuance of aid to Nasser's Egypt have been a constant concern. When the foreign aid bill was before us in 1961 and again in 1962, I spoke in favor of the inclusion of strong language in the foreign aid bill to make clear the Congress deep concern over the discriminatory practices of Arab States against American citizens. I have introduced resolutions in the 87th and 88th Congresses which clearly articulated this concern.

I have also voiced great anxiety over the increasing arms race in the Middle East. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 152 urging the President to use his good offices to negotiate with the states in the Middle East an agreement banning the production of nuclear weapons or the introduction of nuclear weapons in that area. The resolution also urges that the United States takes all necessary and appropriate action to prevent any violation of the existing frontiers or armistice lines in the Near East.

As we consider H.R. 7885, we are faced again with the question of foreign aid to Egypt. Nasser has not halted his aggressive designs in the Middle East. Nasser's determination to destroy the democracy of Israel is adamant. His attack on the Government of Jordan continues. A large Egyptian force remains in Yemen. Nasser's action in Yemen is of particular concern since he has not yet lived up to the agreement negotiated on April 8, 1963, by U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. According to the agreement between the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia and the Secretary General of the United Nations, Nasser agreed to withdraw his troops. Nasser has also been a disrupting force in Africa. In recent years in the Congo, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, United Arab Republic diplomats have been asked to leave.

Nasser's various activities have created great unrest and increased tensions in a critical area of the world. The arms buildup in Egypt, however, is perhaps the most menacing.

Mr. Chairman, since 1955 the Egyptians have been receiving arms from the Soviet Union in increasing quantities and sophistication. It has been reported that the Soviet Union agreed to provide approximately $450 million worth of arms to Egypt during the 3-year period 1961-64. In June 1963, a 15-man United Arab Republic military delegation headed by Field Marshal Amer went to Moscow to negotiate a new weapons agreement. The Soviet Union has provided Egypt with modern up-to-date weapons. Nasser has received the long-range Soviet "Badger" bomber, the Mig-21 fighter plane—there are rumors that Egypt will be receiving the Mig-23—the only really heavy tank available in the Middle East—the JS-3, air-to-air missiles, ground-to-air missiles, sea-to-shore missiles, and about 10 submarines. In addition, Egypt has received from the Soviet Union a very large number of recoilless guns, other items of artillery, transport planes, helicopters, a number of TU-54 medium tanks, armored personnel carriers, as well as small arms. Egyptian officers have been trained in Soviet bloc countries.

In addition to the massive Egyptian arms buildup, German scientists have been working in Egypt on missile and nuclear warhead development. Recent evidence was introduced in a trial in Switzerland, and reported in the New York Times on June 10, 1963, that Egypt has bought $1 million worth of fissionable materials, including deadly cobalt, from Great Britain and Canada.

It is not in the interest of the United States and the preservation of world peace to facilitate the arms race in the Middle East by giving aid to Egypt. Foreign assistance to Egypt has been substantial. From fiscal year 1956 through fiscal year 1963 U.S. economic aid to Egypt totaled about $700 million. Economic aid under this act for fiscal year 1963 totaled $48.6 million. Also in fiscal year 1963 Egypt received the equivalent of $140 million under the Public Law 480 program.

The committee report on H.R. 7885 at page 5 states:

> The committee believes that an arms race cancels out the salutary effects of U.S. economic assistance and accentuates the threat of a new outbreak of hostilities.

The committee urges:

> Our aid to Israel and the Arab States should be administered so as to discourage conflict and to promote stability in the area.

Section 306 of H.R. 7885, the bill before us, states:

> No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—
>
> (1) the United States,
>
> (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or
>
> (3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.
>
> until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this act.

I strongly support section 306. I now put the President, the Department of State, and the Agency for International Development on notice that I will do everything I can to insure that the future administration of our foreign aid program conforms to this unambiguous policy directive of the Congress.

I also wish to point out that the Committee in its report on H.R. 7885 further states at page 5:

> Consideration should be given to the withholding of economic assistance from those countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparations for their execution and to entering into security guarantees with those nations that would be willing to make appropriate commitments for promoting peace and stability in the area.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs deserves commendation for its wisdom. It is time for the United States to reappraise its policy in the Middle East with a view to promoting peace and stability in that area. The committee has laid down guidelines for such a reappraisal, and I hope that its initiative will not be disregarded.

Although today I have emphasized the arms race in the Middle East and Nasser's determination to destroy Israel, we should not overlook the fact that Egypt and other Arab States receiving U.S. aid still persist in discriminating against American citizens. The Committee points out at page 10 of the report that:

> Some Near Eastern countries have eased travel restrictions affecting American citizens of the Jewish faith. However, forward movement has been slow and further effort is required.

Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, includes a nondiscrimination declaration. This section must be fully implemented. This firm policy declaration by the Congress against discrimination against American citizens has no doubt played a substantial role in whatever progress has been made. However, the administration must vigorously pursue this policy. Arab nations must be told in no uncertain terms that they cannot on the one hand expect to receive money from all American taxpayers and on the other hand discriminate against Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the language of H.R. 7885 and the accompanying report spell out the sense of Congress that foreign aid must be administered in the interest of world peace.

No assistance is to be provided to any country which the President finds is engaging in, or preparing for, aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under this or any other act. I interpret this language to mean that Egypt shall not receive assistance as long as she continues to prepare for aggression against the democracy of Israel, our steadfast friend in the Middle East.

Those who advocate a policy of aggression and take actions calculated to destroy their neighbors and disrupt the security of the world can no longer look forward to aid from the United States if the policy expressed in this bill is adopted and carried out.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, soon after World War II, when many of our allies were broke, desperate, frustrated, disillusioned and even hungry, we in the United States came up with the so-called Marshall plan to give aid and succor to them. This was not only a charitable act but it kept many free nations of the world from sinking financially and it prevented many others from being taken over by communism. Upon this premise, I have supported foreign aid for the past 15 years.

I can recall an expression which I used in a House speech over a decade ago in which I urged the passage of such legislation. I said:

> It is most difficult to teach a man democracy on an empty stomach.

However, the original 1948 idea, intent, purpose and mission of the Marshall plan has been accomplished.

A decade and a half later, we are still taking care of the needs of not just our former allies, but out of the approximately 110 duly recognized nations of the world today, we are aiding directly or indirectly 100 of them. Is it any wonder that our U.S. gold is melting away? We simply cannot take the whole world on to support. It is like the head of a household running off his own family in order to take in all of the neighbors on the block.

Through the intervening years this saddle of giving away our heritage has grown most heavy and the bellyband that holds it on is strapped so tightly that it is rubbing sores into the already raw backs of the American taxpayers. To feed, clothe, house and give succor to our friends after World War II in order to prevent the spread of communism is one thing but trying to solve all of the problems of 100 nations and to support their governments, is quite another thing.

Oh yes, the proponents of this legislation argue loud and long—as they have for years—that 90 percent of all of these billions—sent abroad—is spent here in the United States. Unfortunately, we have given away over $100 billion since this endless program was originated. The proponents also lose sight of the fact that all of this money appropriated and spent comes out of our store of goods and that we are absolutely depleting our own resources and permanently "gutting" our economy.

I ask you, What good is the 90 percent of the funds spent with our industry and economy when we wind up giving it all away to those overseas and at the expense of our taxpayers? For instance, look at our gold situation: $15,800 million is our estimated balance at Fort Knox today, $12,300 million is needed to back our dollar. According to simple arithmetic, this leaves $3,500 million "in the green." However, I have bad news for you. There are foreign claims against the U.S. Treasury to the tune of $20,500 million. Deducting the $3,500 million balance from their foreign claims leaves us with a face-reddening deficit of $17 billion. Add to this sad picture the $8 billion in foreign commitments and other obligations, and we find ourselves deeper in the red, to the high note of $25 billion. And this does not include our present $285 billion Federal debt which, as you know, the other day was increased to $309 billion. As Representative RICH used to say: "Where are we going to get the money?" I say to you: We do not have it because we are overdrawn at the bank.

My colleagues, I represent the Fourth District of Kentucky which includes Fort Knox where our gold was buried. I must inform you that my civilian friends in my native county of Hardin tell me that this gold is constantly and surreptitiously on the move out of its depository there. It is done as quietly as a church house.

On my trip to an immigration conference in Geneva last fall I questioned many bankers, businessmen, Government officials and other leaders about the strength of the American dollar overseas. A leading European banker told me that he sees devaluation of the dollar as an absolute necessity. He suggested that if the U.S. payments deficit could be eliminated, or reduced, the dollar has a chance to regain its former popularity among the world currencies. A major worry, this gentleman said, for the United States is the steady and persistent loss of our gold reserve. For instance, since 1950 we have been forced to ship $7 billion in gold out of the country. Businessmen in Europe advise me that they are in agreement that our dollar is being expected to carry too heavy a load. They said to me that the only long-term solution for the United States is to cut down on its foreign aid and its military spending abroad, particularly in the Far East.

What is needed, said European financiers, is to get the prosperous countries of Europe to help pay the cost of preventing the spread of communism. They said that in order to do this, we ought to give some worldwide political recognition to these nations holding our I O U's payable in our gold. They added that if we did this, the United States could then expect some agreement from other free nations who are now hoarding the gold which we ship to them and who then would be more inclined to share the U.S. financial load abroad.

My honest belief is, as a result of my trip last fall, that Europeans of all walks of life think the leaders of the United States are either nuts or irresponsible to continue a heavy program of assistance to countries who could do more to help themselves or who could borrow money on long-term development loans.

An economist pointed out to me that German bankers are particularly unhappy with the United States and our aid program. I was informed that German banks have a policy of making so-called hard loans to countries who want to develop their resources. It was said by one European banker:

> The world has substituted the American taxpayer for the former European colonial system.

A recent study by me reveals that all debts in the United States add up to more than $1 trillion. The Federal debt is $303.5 billion while State and local governments are in the red $73.7 billion. These two debts total $377.2 billion. However, the grand total of all of our indebtedness, Federal, State, local and private, adds up to the sum of $1 trillion $17 billion $300 million.

Recently the Washington Post said:

> U.S. gold outgo tops $1 billion—deficit in balance of payments rises in second quarter. This country's deficit in the international balance of payments ran considerably more than $1 billion in the second quarter of this year, the Department of Commerce announced. The Department figures could add up to an annual deficit of $4.2 billion for 1963 if the large second quarter deficit continues for the rest of 1963. Such a deficit could result in a loss of more dollars than the record $3.9 billion outflow in 1960.

Unfortunately, we are far too busy spending money that we do not have, on people that we do not know, to impress people who hate our insides.

Due to these and many other factors, as a former supporter of this program, I am casting a vote for what I consider to be in the best interest of America and which I believe will help to get us out of "hock" to the very foreign governments that we have helped to survive over the past 15 years.

The boys in State, Defense, and aid that are jointly running this show somehow remind me of the egotistical fellow who was imbued with the belief that if he had never been born, people would have wondered why.

Since we are flat broke, owe over $285 billion without even counting the many billions that the Government has insured, this authorization bill today for additional foreign aid funds is about as necessary as earmuffs for a sick bumblebee lost in a nursery hothouse. Why? Because we now have billions of dollars in the so-called pipeline that are unspent funds. Enough, I am told, to run this "freeloading" mess for several years without the additional appropriation of 5 cents. This is true because AID absolutely could not, even with all of their pipedreams, come up with an idea as to just where they could give these funds away, such as that unneeded, unnecessary steel mill in India that would cost $1½ billion and on which over $30 million have been spent for preliminary studies.

The letter that all of us received, signed by Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, stated, among other things:

> As we view our * * * relationship with the Soviet Union * * * the continuing crises in Laos and Vietnam * * * we believe we cannot now afford to retreat in our foreign assistance efforts.

My colleagues, I hate to say this, but ever since we undertook to save our friends and allies back in 1948, this business of foreign aid has been one crisis after another. Frankly, I am getting a bit "punchy" at the constant playing of this old, broken record. Our inability as Members of Congress to shut off the water, cool the boiler, put out the fire and thereby stop the flow of aid which we are now financially incapable of giving, has practically ruined our country. I repeat—the primary object, intent and original purpose of the Marshall plan was to save free nations from communism. However, today these very same nations have not only been saved but they hold our I O U's for the gold that we do not now have in my Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky at Fort Knox.

In summation, I am reminded of that old statement: "Don't give that fellow on the floor of the car another drink—because he's driving." Paraphrasing this, I would say: "Do not give that guy in 'AID' another dollar while he's lying on the floor because he is actually attempting to drive this 'handout vehicle'—and without any steering wheel or brakes."

Shortly after World War II most all of Europe was broke—knew it—admitted it—and begged us for help. Today, the situation is in reverse. We are broke—do not know it—will not admit it—and are throwing our dollars away like a Bowery bum playing mumble peg with the D.T.'s.

For the reasons herein stated, I shall vote for any amendment or motion to recommit if it provides for a reduction in the amount. If H.R. 7885 is not substantially cut, I shall have to vote against this project.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the debate nears its end I should like to join in paying tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. His levelheadedness, his fairmindedness, and his leadership have provided a reasonable degree of calmness in a committee where there are many different points of view on a subject which has some elements of controversy. It is a tribute to him that we have come up with a bill which so many members of the committee are supporting without qualification.

I should like also to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] for her leadership on the minority side.

President Kennedy yesterday seemed to express surprise that more than half the Republican membership of the House Foreign Affairs Committee were in support of his bill. I am not sure he was surprised, but at least he expressed his opinion that it is fortunate that the bill now has bipartisan political support. Of course it does, because there are those of us on both sides of the aisle who feel that this bill is important to our own security, that the amounts which we propose to expend are reasonable, and that we should not falter at this time.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach the time for offering amendments to this bill, it may be timely to make a few observations. I have hesitated about speaking at all during the debate. In the first place, I doubt if many individuals will change their minds on how they will vote on the bill because of what has been said—thus far at least. Secondly, I have had some doubts about what to say and how to say it in this vast, complex and sometimes controversial field of foreign aid.

Though most Members have decided how they will vote on the bill itself, the amendments are another matter. I have decided to speak, primarily to urge that each Member remember the value of certain qualities as he considers the various amendments soon to be offered. Let each of us have patience with another's point of view. Let us remember the value of an open mind as we consider the merits of these proposals. Let each of us take time to think twice; let us weigh carefully both the pros and cons as each suggestion is offered. Let us not act hastily in adopting proposals, the significance of which we have not examined closely. Let us seek the path of true wisdom, and seek diligently to identify and protect the interests of our country.

By these suggestions, Mr. Chairman, which I offer with hesitation, I mean to cast no aspersions on anyone. Honest differences of opinion are inevitable, and they can be healthy as we seek to develop reasonable positions for maintaining and strengthening our foreign aid program. What we should avoid, in my opinion, are the needless—even dangerous—efforts to invade executive responsibility. Furthermore, as the Clay Committee points out, "we should be mindful of the risks inherent in using an ax to achieve quickly" the changes which may be needed.

The Clay Committee report, let me say, is a mixed blessing. To a considerable extent it invites the very trouble which it professes that we should avoid. If it is true that "we are indeed attempting too much for too many," why not use the ax now? We have only to read the minority views to see how those opposing foreign aid use this assertion to argue for complete revision—or as it was more candidly put yesterday, that we should "embalm" foreign aid. They question whether this country can afford to "police and wet nurse" the whole world. Of course foreign aid has never been designed to police anything. It aims at helping the free world help itself and thus help us. Calling this pursuit of the national interest "wet nursing" should not distract us from the importance of what is being attempted.

Mr. Chairman I believe strongly that the foreign aid program needs no drastic retrenchment, as some contend such retrenchment is likely to lead to a far less effective program than we have today. So too, the contention that a drastic revision of foreign aid is essential appears to me highly arguable. After nearly 20 years of foreign aid, the shakedown part of the cruise should be over. As President Eisenhower has said, one of the problems with the development of sound programs has been a continuing lack of stability. This prescription is one which does not depend on being shaken well before each use.

Nor do I find particularly helpful the Clay Committee's assertion that a reduction in the quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could accomplish more. This gives the impression, though it may be unintentional, that we spread our aid too thinly for it to be effective, but that if it were even thinner, we could do more. Or does it mean that if the effort were less diffuse, and some countries now receiving aid should receive less—or none—that more could be accomplished? But then it should be remembered, as I pointed out yesterday, that General Clay had no specific recommendations of reductions, or eliminations, this year of any consequence whatever. Like so much in the Clay report, many recommendations can be read in so many ways as to be virtually meaningless. An army receiving such commands could be expected to march off in quite opposite directions at the same moment.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I must comment briefly on two amendments which I personally believe to be unwise. One unfortunately was adopted in committee, and the other was only narrowly rejected. Adoption of either of these proposals, in my opinion, would needlessly complicate the problems faced by those who administer the foreign aid program, and achieve nothing in the way of developing a more realistic program.

We are soon to consider whether or not to require prior and specific approval by Congress of every project over a certain size. The figure in committee was $100 million; the figure to be suggested is reportedly $50 million. Whatever the figure, I doubt whether such a restriction will help Congress discharge its responsibilities more effectively, and it will surely complicate the administration of the program.

The reason this amendment was first offered was because of the Bokaro steel mill in India. I would not object so much if language were being offered which sought to prohibit aid to this particular project. As yet, however, I should point out, the facts are not yet known on which we could objectively judge the feasibility, and advisability, of this steel mill. What I do object to is the principle that prior approval must be formally given to certain projects.

This principle assumes, quite erroneously I believe, that the cost of the project should be the test of congressional interest. It seems to assume that the executive branch is incapable of exercising good judgment on big projects. By implication at least, it suggests that Congress is not interested in how the taxpayers' money is spent on the many projects estimated to cost less than the magic figure.

Adoption of this requirement would require congressional committees to acquire the experts which would be needed to study the many technical, political, and economic factors which underlie the decision to proceed on a major project. Adoption of this limitation makes it appear that Congress is shirking its present responsibility of overseeing and "watchdogging" what the executive is doing. It is an attempt to transfer to the legislative branch responsibilities which more naturally, and rightfully, belong to the executive.

Furthermore, if this principle is valid, and the Foreign Affairs Committee should become a Foreign Public Works Committee, the cutoff point could be lowered at will. As one member of the other body has already suggested, why not require prior, specific approval by Congress of every foreign aid project estimated to cost over $1 million? Why not indeed, if only to keep us busy during the slack periods of our present 12-month sessions?

Another amendment which to me appears inadvisable involves new language in section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act. It appears on page 15, starting at line 8 and continuing to the bottom of the page. In brief, this provision would forbid aid under this act or under Public Law 480 to any country which the President determines is "engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts" directed against this country or any country to which we are giving aid. The committee's explanation of this language, I might point out, appears on page 32 of the report.

A sweeping prohibition against aid to any country "preparing for aggressive military efforts" against any country to which we are giving aid should constitute a real nightmare for the executive branch. How could they analyze any country's intentions? How much reliance could the administration place on the reassurances of any country that it was not going to renew its preparations for military action?

Is there any country in Central or South America which has no contingency plans, involving aggressive military efforts, for possible use against its neighbors? Would this language prohibit any aid to Israel, or other countries in the Near East? Is there any country in Africa which has had no evil thoughts about its neighbors? In the Far East, could no aid be given to Cambodia, Laos, or Vietnam? Can neither Pakistan nor India henceforth get anything? The possibilities for paralyzing the aid program are infinite. In every case, it would seem, our aid must cease forthwith. Barring aid to countries actually engaged in aggression would be far-reaching, but on its face this language would be a sure method of killing the foreign aid program.

The committee report indicates that this new language is intended to reduce harassment and military threats by one country against another. Perhaps so, but the language is far more sweeping than that. Even the Clay Committee report recognizes the value of military assistance programs though only "in extraordinary circumstances," in their opinion, should military assistance programs be established "where the principal quarrel of the recipient country is with a non-Communist neighbor with which the United States also maintains friendly relations"—page 18. This is quite a different point from a contention that the mere threat that the United States will withhold aid will bring peace to the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say what by now must be obvious. I believe in the importance of foreign aid. It is important to our own security. It is of decisive importance also to the countries which receive our help. We should not now lose faith in the value of what we are doing. I cannot conceive that Congress will suddenly abandon what has been so nobly begun.

This is not to say, and I am not so contending, that this program cannot be improved. Perhaps more can be accomplished for less money. Perhaps more selectivity would produce more dramatic results. All this is only another way of saying that Congress, together with the executive branch, has a continuing responsibility to improve and strengthen the program. Each year we must face up to the problem of how much is needed and to whom it should be given. The goal is a worthy one, and well within our means to support.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, each year when this bill comes before the House we are promised a complete reexamination, agonizing reappraisal, or thorough overhaul of our foreign aid program. But despite the appalling revelations of useless expenditures, despite the fact that there is very little tangible evidence that our huge outlays have achieved any good, and despite the apparent weakness of the basic doctrines on which the aid program is predicated, we are still operating the world's longest gravy train.

I believe it is unrealistic to assert that failure to extend economic assistance to underdeveloped countries will lead to their eventual subjugation by the Communists. At the same time, I think unrealistic the theory that you can reform societies, create politically mature and sound governments, and raise living standards in these countries merely by giving them money.

One of the great weaknesses of our aid program is that so little of the money goes to stimulate private enterprise. The money just does not filter down to benefit the individual citizens in the countries we are attempting to assist.

I believe that technical assistance programs are preferable to direct financial grants. And I do not believe in rendering any assistance whatsoever to those nations who have alined themselves with the Communist bloc. In this category I would include Poland and Yugoslavia where we have poured millions of dollars while witnessing the strengthening of ties with the Soviet Union. I am glad the committee did not approve the proposal to reverse the withdrawal of "most favored nation" tariff treatment for these countries.

Mr. Chairman, I am unequivocally opposed to enactment of H.R. 7885. Criticism of this program has been long and loud, yet efforts to curtail its excesses and redefine its objectives have been weak and dispirited.

So here we are again borrowing money so that we can give it away, while our gold reserves are running out. Meanwhile, we have yet to see concrete proof of the value of this aid to recipient countries and proof of its value to the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, although I take the floor during the discussions on the foreign aid bill I want it clearly understood that I recognize the seriousness of the situation both worldwide as well as in our national economy because of direct and indirect effects of a shutoff of this aid at this time.

It is regrettable that what started out as a most humanitarian effort to help our allies recover their lost economies has been degenerated in some instances into a wasteful, profiteering grab bag by the exploiters who are always around when hunger and need are on the scene.

Today I intend to cover one facet of this aid program. This deals with U.S. sponsored and supported competitive industrial facilities and the effect upon our job economy.

I am aware of the fact that the proposed Indian steel mill is not authorized by this legislation but I am also aware of the fact that the first $50 million toward the project has already been committed.

Whether the steel mill is built or not is not the issue before us. The issue is whether the Nation can face up to the realities of life and admit that the more we help Nations to become self-dependent the more we face a cut in our export trade.

I do not object to helping nations to help themselves. I do object, however, to helping nations under the fake impression and propaganda that we are helping our economy when we build competitive plants overseas.

It has been said that this mill will only produce for the needs of the Indian economy. That is what has been said in the past about mills in Europe, Greece, Japan, Turkey, and elsewhere.

The truth of the situation can be found in today's story on page 1 of every major newspaper. This story reports an appeal by both steel labor and the steel industry for protection against steel imports. I know it is only a thinly guised appeal for higher tariffs, by calling for relief from so-called dumping practices.

Every businessman knows that dumping or selling off your surplus at a price lower than your regular price is a time-honored business practice. This Nation does it with wheat, cotton, peanuts, and every other item over which the Government has control of production and distribution. It is natural for foreign producers to do the same and especially so when they are paid in U.S. dollars.

I would refer you to the hearing of the Select Committee on Imports and Exports and direct your attention to the testimony of both steel labor and management. Their positions were the same in that they testified against protective covenants in our trade pacts. However, both claimed immunity from import injury for very different reasons.

Steel management said it feared no import injury if labor would reduce its wage demands.

Steel labor said they feared no import damage if management cut their profit to reduce prices competitively. Of course, if both profits and wages are to be set aside to compete in world trade, then we can start reducing our standard of living to the level of our competitors.

However, neither side will agree to the other's stipulations and the results are exactly what I predicted—serious job displacement, serious import impact upon the steel economy.

The proof, if any is needed, can be found in the Presidential appeal for help against imports by the steel producers and steel labor.

When we voted an amendment to the foreign bill restricting exports from facilities in foreign countries aided by this program I started being a supporter of this legislation. I had always believed in the principle of helping your neighbor but never believed we should help him to cut our economic throats.

I asked for a report from AID on the results of this amendment. I got what I expected—an answer that tells all and proves nothing. Here is the answer I received:

> The routine practice on each loan for a productive endeavor is to determine by means of a checklist whether or not the production will compete with the United States. No more than 20 percent of their annual production may be exported to the United States. If there are any dangers in this regard the Capital Development Agency investigates and negotiates. A list of commodities is not used.

The information was received from Mr. Britt of AID.

You will note that the word "if" is used. So far no danger has been found since no report of any action is on record.

The admission that a list of commodities is not used in determining the danger or damage under this section of the law makes it a laughing stock amendment.

I was told when the amendment was passed that it was a sop to me and others of the same mind. Now I believe it. In order that the departments have one commodity at least to investigate I suggest that the steel imports be investigated as to place of manufacture.

If steel does not suit their fancy since it is rather obvious that steel could be one of the violators, I would suggest AID study the fertilizer imports, the cement imports, the shoe imports, the glass imports, and the truck farm products; study their place of origin and then find out where the money came from for the facilities that produced the products.

FOREIGN TRADE IN STEEL: PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, EXPORTS

World steel production in 1962 rose to a new record level of 394 million tons. This was an increase of 4 million tons, or 1 percent, over 1961 production.

Most of the increase was accounted for by the U.S.S.R., India, and Canada.

The United States share of world steel production in 1962 was 25 percent. Western Europe accounted for 29 percent, U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, 28 percent; and Japan, 8 percent.

For the fourth consecutive year, the United States was a net importer of steel mill products. Imports increased from 3.2 million net tons in 1962 as steel export also rose slightly.

The major sources of imported steel were Belgium-Luxembourg, Japan, West Germany, Canada, France, and the United Kingdom. About a third of the imports entered this country through the Atlantic Coast Customs District. Wire and wire products, pipe and tubing, wire rods, reinforcing bars, and sheets and strip led the list of steel imports.

The import trend has been ever upward, climbing from what was considered a very large volume of imports in 1958 of 1,700,000 tons to 4,100,000 tons in 1962. The type of imports has changed considerably in that we are now importing all types of steel mill products as against a limited variety of products prior to 1958.

In fact, we are now importing wire and wire products, piping and tubing, wire rods and reinforcing bars, at a rate of about 650,000 tons—of each type—per year, and sheets and strip, structural shapes, and bars at the rate of about 300,000 tons of each type per year.

The main source of imports has changed, with Japan coming from the bottom of the list to the top—with the total of 1,072,000 tons—the highest tonnage coming from any single country. In fact, Japan's tonnage now exceeds that of West Germany, France, and the United Kingdom combined.

This holds true to the oldest economic trade fact in that buyers will seek the cheapest market from which to buy, and since Japan's wages are only 63 cents an hour, compared to an average of $1.25 an hour in the European market, you can easily understand why the American importers have shifted their orders to Japan.

The latest figures on wages paid from exporting countries are as follows:

Comparisons of average hourly employment costs of steelworkers in United States and abroad in 1961 converted into dollars at the official rate of exchange

United States[1]	$3.99
Luxembourg	1.47
Netherlands	1.40
West Germany	1.37
Belgium	1.26
United Kingdom[2]	1.11
France	1.11
Italy	1.04
Japan	.63

[1] For 1962, the average hourly employment cost for U.S. steelworkers was $4.16. The 1961 figure was used here to provide a fair comparison, since foreign employment costs for 1962 were not yet available.

[2] Partly estimated.

Sources: European Coal and Steel Community; British Iron and Steel Federation; Japan Iron and Steel Federation (in addition to American Iron and Steel Institute).

Indirectly India is now having labor trouble because of its wage levels being far below the Japanese standard.

In 1958 this Nation exported 2,800,000 net tons, and in spite of the increased population of the whole world, and the fantastic increase in the use of steel in the foreign countries, our exports dropped to 2 million tons a year—a net loss of 2,100,000 tons in our foreign trade.

Our markets have also shifted in that now our main markets, accounting for 65 percent of all our exports, are Asia and Latin America. If this Nation continues in this policy of building competitive steel mills all over the world, it can hope for nothing less than a complete elimination of our foreign markets and a devastating increase in imports, thereby demoralizing our domestic market.

In fact, steel production in India, after the completion of the proposed mill, will put India in a position of not only supplying all of its own needs, but will practically wipe out our Asian market, which accounts for 50 percent of our total exports at the present time.

There are those amongst us whose answer is always the same. I would like to quote from Charlie Taft's Committee for a National Trade Policy:

> The high percent of unused capacity in the United States stems from factors such as chronic overcapacity, ease of entry into the industry, and chronic business failures.

The same organization opposes all antidumping bills by coming up again with the worn, outtimed fallacious arguments—unsound in principle, and the largest single contributor to our economic dilemma.

In a recent issue of Trade Talks, by this organization, they covered this situation by saying:

> Legislative proposals aimed at eliminating loopholes in the antidumping legislation will, in fact, open up new and serious loopholes to the awakened national policy of freer international trade, and in practice, they would complicate the trade restrictive tendencies of the law.

This statement was made in spite of the fact that 27 Senators and 37 Representatives, including some leading congressional spokesmen for the liberal trade view, have introduced antidumping legislation. It is interesting to note that this organization has bitterly fought congressional petitions signed by 33 Senators and 235 Representatives, calling for a restrictive trade covenant to help save the dying shoe industry, an industry that has witnessed an increase in imports that, in any other nation, would be the cause of a major crisis in government, since we now import 9 percent of the total domestic shoe output.

Although shoes may be a long way from steel, the policy involved is the same. I refuse to believe that it is the national policy of this country to destroy its domestic enterprise, to weaken its industrial complex, to create chronic unemployment on the false altar of international free trade based upon foreign governments' desires for U.S. dollars and foreign and domestic traders for increased exorbitant profits.

No nation can survive in an industrial economy that disregards its cost of production and instead of following the sound economics of production employment as the base for its economic wellbeing would pursue the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign trade.

Outside of a few dedicated individuals and many of them sincerely believing that open trade will create a world of peace and good will, it is my estimate that—in the main—the majority of those who promote free trade in this day and age have a financial and personal interest.

Two years ago this Congress passed an amendment to the foreign aid bill in which it was stated by this Congress that no facility of production anywhere in the world, aided by funds for the foreign aid legislation, could export products from these facilities to the United States.

The conference committee, although realizing that it was an economic handicap for the U.S. industries, amended it to allow 20 percent of the products to be returned to the United States. What has happened to this legislation? To date, not one single report, or one single instance of activity to implement this legislative act—with proper administration—has been reported.

I need not, at this time, take the time of the Congress to review that which has been said many times before; that many of the foreign aid dollars are spent at the insistence and persuasion of American go-betweens, acting for foreign governments—for a profit, or a fee.

I want to vote for this legislation, but it becomes increasingly difficult, and if it were not for the fact that I have a close and warm regard for the chairman, Dr. Tom Morgan, my friend and neighbor in Pennsylvania, and his statement to me that this is the last piece of legislation of this nature, that he will sponsor and support unless it carries with it a definite program for phasing out.

I say now that commitments made, even if they were made in error, or in bad judgment, must be honored by these United States. I would vote in a minute to delete the funds for the steel mill in India, but failing in this, I find myself in the throes of a dilemma in that I want to share the responsibility—that of this Nation's at this time, in keeping its commitments.

Although a full 1962 report has not been made public, some information can be found in the April 1963 Steel Facts.

In a special report on imports-exports this magazine bluntly states:

> ### Employment Adversely Affected by Import-Export Imbalance in Steel
>
> "It has been estimated that if the American steel industry had maintained its 1953–57 average participation in world export trade, and had prevented further import erosion, the industry in 1962 would have provided employment for at least 50,000 additional steel workers and paid out $300 million more in wages." This is the statement of a leading steel company executive.
>
> ### IMPORTS ON UPTREND
>
> In 1953 imported steel mill products totaled 1.7 million tons and exports were 3 million net tons—almost double the imports. In 1954 imports dropped to 770,822 net tons, compared to exports of 2.8 million net tons. However, since 1954, imports have risen while exports have declined after reaching a peak of 5.3 million net tons in 1957. During 1962 imports exceeded exports by 2.1 million net tons. The totals were: imports, 4.1 million tons; exports, 2 million tons.

If any Member of Congress is interested in the reasons for our chronic unemployment he might find an answer if he takes industry by industry import-export balances and then strikes an average of all industries. He will find that the main cause of the failure of our job economics can be traced to our persistent adherence to a trade policy which is a mixture of the Adam Smith theory of free trade, international mercantilism, and just plain propaganda for profit.

The direct unemployment caused by our trade deals runs into the millions but the indirect unemployment and underemployment amounts to a fantastic figure when we equate the price structure of U.S. produced goods against foreign products.

You will note that Steel Facts shows a loss of 50,000 jobs in steel alone by our loss of a "mere"—this is the term the freeloaders on the trade wagon use—2 million tons—export-import differential as for the 1953–57 period.

These were direct steel making jobs. Wages lost would average about $300 million a year.

Even the sophomoric economists who appear to have the center stage today have to admit that the mean average of jobs dependent upon industrial output runs about 3 for 1. If you bring 50,000 new jobs to a community you will have 200,000 income earners within a few months. The doctor, the lawyer, the butcher, and the baker will follow the production jobs. Then come the schoolteachers, the hairdressers, barbers, streetcleaners, and the tax collectors.

In a 200,000-income-earner community you will have a population of at least 500,000.

The U.S. Department of Labor claims 71 million wage and income earners in the United States out of a population of 184 million. Of this total of 71 million earners, 16 million are industrial workers.

Even a sophomoric economist can see where the burden of our economy rests; squarely on the shoulders of the workingman and the investor.

Somewhere in our grandiose schemes of one happy contented people all over the world, we upset this combination of worker and investor.

This Member of Congress believes it stems from unsound foreign trade policies as much or more, than from domestic blunders in our unplanned but deliberate growth of diversified monopolies with their only interest profit through elimination of jobs by automation, consolidation, and exploitation.

First in our trade policies, we deliberately and unwisely lost control of the selling price structure necessary to carry on in a high-priced economy by allowing foreign made products to infiltrate our marketplaces, not only with the blessing of our leaders but a hidden threat of a charge of treason against humanity if any American Congressman dared oppose free trade as it is known among those whom Lincoln so well described as the "Know Nothings." Today many of them edit some of our hearing reports and Department statistics and become economists.

By following the advice of these experts who in the main have belonged to the "parasitic" earner group all their lives, we curtailed growth of productive labor by displacement of goods for the consumer market.

This is particularly true in textiles where we sell cotton and buy back cotton products. It is true in leather where we sell hides and buy leather products; it is true in feed grains where we sell grains and import beef and beef products.

It is true in many fields of productive enterprise. We seem to forget that the real forward thrust of an industrial economy comes from the added value put on raw materials by the processing and manufacturing step between producer and consumer.

Having stagnated our job growth per population growth ratio, we then went one step further and invited, yes even coaxed with speeches of patriotism and tax concessions, our investors to build plants overseas, to invest in foreign based corporations, and to license foreign countries to produce U.S. patented products, to give them know-how, and, to top it off, we even gave our future competitors easy or free money.

When this tax concession was first proposed, some of us opposed both the suggestion for tax concessions as well as the theory advanced that this would help the U.S. economy.

Again we were right, for not long ago the President of the United States asked for a reversal of this policy and even today the Secretary of the Treasury, one of the chief proponents of the outmoded free trade theory, is asking for a special tax on foreign investments.

It is never too late, but time is getting short.

If we are to survive in this industrial economic rat race, kicked off by our tariff policies, we must reevaluate our position.

Nothing short of a return to Congress of the powers inherent in the Constitution can resolve this issue of free versus survival trade policies.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, "Cast thy bread upon the waters and thou shalt find it after many days."

France did that when we were a young country. To some people in France at that time that was a giveaway. But the bread that France threw upon the waters was returned to her in two great wars—when America, grown strong and big and powerful, saved France, the country that had thrown her bread upon the waters.

Mr. Chairman, some of these small nations that we are now helping to fight poverty, to fight disease, to fight ignorance and helping to find their place in the world will be strong and powerful when we will need them; and then our bread will be returned to us.

If war should come, our loss in lives and in money would be so great that we cannot contemplate the depth of the tragedy. We in the Congress have a responsibility greater than that faced by the members of any legislative body in the history of the world. The lives of the men and women and the children of the present are the stake of our decisions. The challenge of this generation is to build a world of peace. Other generations have failed. With faith and with courage, this generation can succeed.

There can be no peace in a world of poverty. There can be no peace in a world of ignorance. There can be no peace if in any part of this great universe of ours hunger and disease and ignorance go unheeded. There can be no peace and dignity to human life in a world in which God has been dethroned. When we have lost our faith in prayer, we will have lost everything that gives us strength and enriches our lives with a sense of purpose.

Communism is godless. That is an ideology so repugnant to our every sense of purpose that we risk in its containment and ultimate elimination an atomic war that would destroy civilization.

I think that at long last we are seeing in the heavens a star of hope. Because of the long, hard effort of the American people up to this time, the sweat and the sacrifices, Republicans and Democrats working and sacrificing and praying together, and at the ocean front forgetting politics, the blackness of the night has started to break and in the heavens is a star of hope.

Shall we now become faint of heart? Shall we now retreat, beaten when victory is in sight, because we are tired under the load of our sacrifices?

Pray tell me what alternative have we for the foreign aid program? America cannot retreat into its own shell. We cannot live in a world in which men and women and children in many other countries go to bed hungry and awaken to a new day of hopelessness, prey to devastating diseases and victims of ignorance.

Mr. Chairman, I speak with great emotion and the conviction of a long life. Every year we vote some $50 billion for arms. This is money spent with the hope that by its expenditure we will build a deterrent to prevent a war that nobody wants. But it is $50 billion for arms and weapons that if used will mangle and kill, bring death to men and women and even babies in their cribs, and will rob the soil of its fertility. You all vote for these appropriations and you all accept the judgment of the members of the committee that has the responsibility. It is insurance against the possibility of a war that nobody wants. It consumes 10 percent of the gross national product—10 percent for arms and ammunition and the things by which men are not brought into a fuller existence but are mangled and destroyed.

The foreign aid program is also insurance against the possibility of war or the possibility of the triumph of a godless ideology. It is aimed at poverty, disease, ignorance. It is aimed at a better world, a world with prosperous economies, a world in which we, our own United States, can find markets for the products of our skill and of our industry.

The foreign aid program consumes seven-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product. Ten percent you vote for arms and weapons, the instruments of death, and you do not question your committee; you do not argue; you do not do anything but accept the sacrifices we must make for our security and to stop the spread of godless ideology.

Seven-tenths of 1 percent for the instruments of peace, for winning the hearts and the minds of people, for building markets for our own products, for building a world in which there can be peace—and you hesitate and question.

Mr. Chairman, from the bottom of my heart and with a great sense of love of my country and of faith in its future and, Mr. Chairman, with unwavering reliance upon that which is above our heads, engraved in the wall of this historic Chamber, "In God We Trust," I hope and I pray that this committee will accept the bill in toto as it has come from the committee and that you will give to the great Committee on Foreign Affairs the same credence that you give to the great Committee on Armed Services when it comes in with an authorization for billions of dollars for arms and you vote your approval unanimously.

There is a star of hope in the heavens. Ahead for us, our children and our grandchildren, for all future generations, may be a world of peace, a world stripped of unnecessary poverty and disease and ignorance—a world of law and order and human dignity. Let us take no backward steps. To falter and retreat, when the light is breaking and the dream of centuries may be on the threshold of realization, would constitute one of the great tragedies of history.

With courage and with faith, we cannot fail. It is a time of decision.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, during the last 2 days of debate on H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, the Ways and Means Committee has held daylong hearings on H.R. 8000, the Interest Equalization Act. It is difficult to be both places simultaneously. Since we cannot, it has been necessary to do both part time. My partial absence does not indicate a lack of interest, nor desire to participate.

I have read the bill and the report and listened to part of the debate. To me the message is loud and clear. Foreign aid must be substantially changed and drastically cut.

Since World War II we have given away over $100 billion to approximately 110 countries. There is $6.8 billion in the economic and military assistance pipeline, that is unexpended money, earmarked for foreign aid, now we are being asked to authorize $4.1 billion more to 95 countries. Are American taxpayers considered to be a bottomless barrel of money? How easy it is to give away someone else's money, is the way it seems.

Indeed, we are not even giving our money away. We are borrowing money we do not have, borrowing from future generations of children and grandchildren to give it away. How fiscally foolish, how reckless, how careless, how immoral we are.

Our national debt is $305 billion and skyrocketing up. Our gold reserves are dwindling. And here we are, being asked to give away some more. Our debt, our taxes are the highest in the world. Yet, we must borrow more and either tax or inflate our currency more.

All evidence and information garnered from our past giveaways now tells us that we have failed to accomplish our objectives. The Communists, of the international conspiracy, are firmly entrenched 90 miles from our land. The Monroe Doctrine is discarded. We have not only failed to prevent the spread of communism, we have been subsidizing it. Our foreign aid to Communist satellites has been transhipped to help the Communists in Cuba, in Laos, in Vietnam, and elsewhere.

The United Nations has aided in this effort. We have footed the bill. Now it is British Guiana the Communists are preparing for takeover. There are other areas, too.

Our foreign aid has not only failed to stop the spread of communism, it has accelerated it. The shotgun techniques of scattering money promiscuously in grants, soft loans, Public Law 480, and gifts of every sort have helped the Communist enemy spread the teachings of socialism, educationally aided the unfriendly neutrals, and alienated our friends. We bewilder everyone.

You cannot buy friendship but we give the appearance of trying. We pledge no strings attached, and as a result, unfriendly neutrals and enemies benefit. We talk moral and spiritual virtue, and practice materialism. We declare our belief in do-it-yourself and self-determination and then expect foreign nations to act, to develop, to want to be, like us. Then we waste goods, we duplicate orders, we plan the wrong projects, and generally discredit careful planning and sensible goals, until it is no wonder foreign nations think we are fiscally irresponsible.

Couple with this free and easy careless giveaway the liberals belief in easy money and you can readily understand what has brought us to a crisis in our balance of payments.

We are told by Secretary Dillon and foreign aid exponents that giving our dollars away does not affect the balance of payments. What nonsense. Even the material bought in the United States with some of this money does not obscure this fact.

The 42,500 employees in Federal aid are too many. We should cut back the personnel. We should streamline the administration. All money expended must be carefully scrutinized yearly by Congress, no back-door spending. No money should go to Yugoslavia, Poland, or any other Communist country nor to the U.N. for transshipment to a Communist country.

In this connection we should not even trade with Communists and build up their economies. Otherwise, "Trade not aid," while a forgotten slogan should be remembered and practiced. Section 231 of the 1963 Trade Expansion Act must be observed not violated, by this administration.

Even the Clay Committee report stresses too much has been spent on too many. Strong as we may be, we cannot throw our money around. Nor should we invest without our own interests at heart.

I suspect that members of this administration in the White House would devalue our money before cutting foreign aid or big Federal deficit spending. This fact must be faced and the American people must choose either fiscal responsibility, the balanced budget, or the "spend ourselves into bankruptcy" so confidently expected by Khrushchev and the Communists.

The rest of the world must help bear the financial burden of foreign aid. United States great contribution can and must be, the demonstration of capitalism; of free enterprise at work. We should export our business know-how in American business moneymaking activities—not loans and grants, unless the cause of capitalism can be advanced. Free enterprise, a free money market, new American factories at home and abroad, that hire employees and help the local economies, standards of living and governments, through taxes on profits—these are our legitimate forms of foreign aid. By precept and example we demonstrate capitalism at work. Others can follow our examples and we help them as we benefit simultaneously from profits on our industry.

Competition is the key, "Trade, Not Aid" the slogan, inventiveness and initiative the origin, and capital the fuel. Our foreign aid should be self-interested and designed to serve capitalism and us capitalists. United States must lead. We must lay down our goals, our policy, and then show others how through sound business endeavor which we earn. We do not ask gifts, nor do we give away. We respect our endeavor and profit, we do not want to do anything to take away or discredit someone else's self-respect or desire to earn what they get. Commonsense, constitutionalism, and taxpayers demand no less.

I want to commend those members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who prepared the minority report. I share their views.

ACTION URGED ON LEGISLATION TO REIMBURSE OWNERS OF FISHING VESSELS SUBJECTED TO HARASSMENT BY OFFICIALS OF COUNTRIES OF SOUTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, while the House is considering the foreign aid bill, I would like to call attention to H.R. 7602, which I introduced on July 16. It provides for a set-aside of $200,000 in aid funds destined for any country which harassed American fishing boats during the past year.

It is regrettable that the State Department has not sent a report on this bill to the committee so that it could be included in the measure before us. I am hopeful that action will be forthcoming from the Department of State so that Congress can move ahead to provide monetary protection for our fishing boats. The committee cannot justifiably act on my bill until the agency report has been received.

The measure was introduced as the result of an unfortunate incident earlier this year which demonstrated that our Government is unwilling, or unable, to afford protection to our fishing boats on the high seas. A South American country committed petty piracy against U.S. tuna fishing boats. The vessels were held in port. Fines were levied. The owners have since been promised reimbursement by our State Department; thus, the precedent of paying for the transgressions of international delinquents has been established.

My bill would simply withhold $200,000 of foreign aid money to cover any costs such as fines, inspection fees, port fees, licenses, and loss of revenue should our vessels be accosted and detained. It is in no measure discriminatory. A country could avoid the set-aside by pledging to observe the 3-mile maritime regulation accepted by an overwhelming majority of the world's countries, and by promising not to interfere with free and lawful use of nonterritorial waters by fishing craft.

If our Government does not choose to provide naval protection, I feel it is only fair that we in the Congress provide financial shelter for fishing fleets which brave the rigors of the sea to provide an important segment of the Nation's food supply.

In today's New York Times it is reported that Theodoro Moscoso, coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, is en route to Peru today to discuss details of Peru's request for $80 million of Alliance funds. Peru is one of the countries that is currently harassing our American-flag vessels in international waters, over 30 miles from the Peruvian coast. On Monday of this week, units of the Peruvian Navy shot at the vessel *Intrepid*, boarded the *Ruthie B* from San Diego. These are acts of piracy on the high seas, and I resent the payment of tribute in the form of foreign aid payments authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 which we are considering today.

For 10 years I have supported the foreign aid program of this country. I intend to cast my first vote against this program in protest to the discriminatory treatment of American citizens by recipients of this aid.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1963".

PART I

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 101. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby redesignated "POLICY" and section 101, which relates to short title, is hereby deleted.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID TO THE NEAR EAST

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I call particular attention to the provisions of the bill, page 15, section 306, which in part reads as follows:

> (1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—
>
> (1) the United States,
>
> (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or
>
> (3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

This is not a recommendation we can afford to dismiss. The testimony is clear that a dangerous condition exists in that area which is the bridge of three continents. Egypt presently is violating the substance of the provision referred to.

A billion dollars of foreign aid has gone to Nasser. While our dollars have been poured into the United Arab Republic, the Nasser regime has been receiving arms from the Soviet Union. President Nasser has weapons including supersonic Mig-21's, antiaircraft missiles, and an arsenal of Egyptian-made weapons.

Egypt is making jet aircraft and rockets with the help of foreign experts. Its regular army numbers from 60,000 to 100,000. To say that the world has nothing to fear from Egypt's military buildup plus Nasser's insatiable ambition to rule over all Arab governments is to turn our backs upon reality. Every dollar we send Egypt releases Nasser from the obligation of developing the economy of that country. He would have you believe that the main Arab enemy is Israel. Yes, Egypt has enemies; and these enemies are poverty, disease, illiteracy, and ambitious politicians. Were our dollars used to the productive end of wiping out disease and poverty and illiteracy of Egypt I would be the very last to suggest that any conditions be set upon aid to Egypt.

Tension in the Middle East, whether it springs from Nasser's desire for an Arab empire or from his hostility to Israel, brooks ill for the Western World. It is a completely reasonable request that American dollars be used to promote peace. Offer after offer by the Israeli Government to sit down at the peace table with Nasser has been spurned. When Nasser's ambition to overcome other Arab governments fails, he turns his wrath toward Israel. Only recently, when Egyptian troops returned from Yemen, unable to admit to his discomfort, Nasser spoke to these troops, saying:

> Our armed forces are getting ready to wash out the shame of Palestine and face Israel and those who support her * * *. You must prepare to restore to the Palestinian Arabs their usurped rights. We must put aright the humiliation which the Arabs suffered in 1948 * * *. For us in Egypt, disarmament is impossible unless the rights of the Palestinian Arabs are restored.

Mark his language. I quote specifically the words, "and those who support her."

Our billion-dollar aid has not persuaded Egypt to refrain from getting military hardware from the Soviet Union. Our billion dollars have not persuaded Egypt to turn aside from her practice of vilification and hate aimed directly against Israel. Our billion dollars have not persuaded Nasser to turn his attention to the development of Egypt's economy and leave other Arab governments to work out their own destinies. In the words of the committee report:

> Any government which devotes its energies and its resources to the harassment of neighboring countries and to a military buildup directed against them reduces the effectiveness of its efforts to develop its resources and to improve the condition of its people. Funds provided by the U.S. taxpayer should not be used to make up for the money and effort diverted by the beneficiaries of our aid to such military activities. Furthermore, U.S. financial support to a government engaged in such activities must inevitably be regarded by those nations which are subjected to such harassment and military threats as evidence the United States is willing to tolerate, if not endorse, such action.

In the name of peace, these words merit the endorsement of every Member of the House. Peace in the world and the security of the United States are indivisible. The foreign assistance program recognizes this fact, but at no time shall it be said that the United States is for peace at any price. Thus, I am in wholehearted accord with the statement of the policy of the United States committed in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963:

> To support the principles of increased economic cooperation and trade among countries, freedom of the press, information, and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion. The Congress further declares that any distinction made by foreign nations between American citizens because of race, color, or religion in the granting of, or the exercise of, personal or other rights available to American citizens is repugnant to our principles.

I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for foreign aid, because I believe that the reduction of world tension and insecurity is our greatest insurance for peace, but wherever there is the possibility that the purposes of our foreign aid may be perverted, we must demand that reasonable conditions be met.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take this additional 5 minutes unless it is necessary. However, I would like to refer to the minority report, on page 123 thereof, where it states as follows:

> Five years ago, for instance, while foreign aid appropriations were running at a level comparable to that in fiscal 1963, U.S. military aid/or economic assistance went to some 80 countries. Today, an estimated 95 countries and territories are benefiting from our largess. And in the proposed program for fiscal 1964, the number of prospective recipients of our aid remains about the same.

At the top of page 14 appears the following:

> We have been troubled by continuing evidence of lack of reasonable criteria in the selection of the recipients of our aid.

Mr. Chairman, this has concerned many of us, I am sure. I recognize that we have had a number of administrators in this program and we can understand the difficulties there must be to administer as complex a program as this.

However, on August 14, 1962, our former colleague, Chester Bowles, who has been serving in the State Department and is also an adviser of the President on foreign affairs, made a speech, the title of which is "The Need for More Specific Criteria in Programing Economic Assistance."

This was in August of last year, and I want to quote a few statements from this speech because I think there are some things in this area that need attention that I do not believe have received sufficient attention in the administering of this program. I assume Mr. Bowles made this speech because he had some authority from the State Department or the President to do so, and it ought to be put into effect. He states:

> Although bipartisan recognition of the importance of the program is widespread, even its most loyal supporters suggest the need for a more coherent pattern in the programing of loans, grants and technical assistance.

Then he goes on to say:

> The lack of such a pattern may be explained in large measure by the crazy quilt of political commitments which we inherited from the previous administration.

I would like to know if anyone on either side of the aisle knows anything about these political commitments that were inherited by a previous administration in this program. No one appears to know.

Continuing, Mr. Bowles states:

> Together with continuing pressures from within our own Government and from recipient nations to use economic aid for a number of shifting political purposes.
>
> If the aid program is to remain creative and with instrument of foreign policy some means must be found to create a greater sense of programing integrity and consistency.

We can all agree with that last paragraph.

Turning to page 12 of the speech, he says:

> Our first task is to develop a practical basis for classifying the nations which desire our assistance on the basis of economic need, capacity and will. In placing each nation in its proper category the following questions, each of which reflects the spirit of the act for international development, suggest themselves:

I will not have time to read them all. The first is:

> Is the present per capita income of the country adequate to provide a reasonable minimum living standard and a satisfactory rate of capital savings and investment if it were distributed and used more equitably?
>
> Does the country have a competent government, sensitive to the needs of our revolutionary times, with the ability to maintain order and to carry out a comprehensive economic and social program?
>
> Has it prepared a well conceived, long-range national economic development plan for the effective and realistic allocation of national resources and foreign assistance?

Then he goes on and says further:

> Yet I believe that they may serve as a basis for placing each nation seeking U.S. assistance into one of the following four categories:
>
> 1. Nations whose current problems are sufficiently acute to require aid from the United States but whose difficulties result primarily from the misuse and maldistribution of existing gross national product.

Then he goes on to say:

> As a rough rule of thumb, I would characterize the nations in category 1 as those with a per capita gross national product substantially in excess of $350. On this basis, Greece, Venezuela, Lebanon, Cyprus, Singapore, Chile, Panama, Uruguay, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Argentina might be included.
>
> In order to qualify for U.S. assistance these governments should be determined and able to put their financial houses in order. The corrective measures on which we should insist would include tax reform, land reform, and more effective control and use of existing foreign exchange.

He says that if they do not do this and their aid should be on a temporary basis, the Government and the people should be tactfully told that U.S. assistance is being offered solely on a stopgap basis. In most cases 3 to 5 years is the maximum time they should receive it.

This was 1962. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, in view of this, are there any nations that he knows of that are going to be denied assistance in the future or that will not be receiving assistance, and I name these particular countries, because they have put their financial house in order, and we plan to stop their aid in 3 to 5 years as a maximum.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman repeat the names of the countries?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Greece, Venezuela, Lebanon, Cyprus, Singapore, Chile, Panama, Uruguay, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Argentina. Do we intend to stop aid to any of these countries in the next few years?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. I understand that they are making substantial economic progress and that we should be able to cut them off before too long. Formosa and Venezuela are making rapid progress and are getting on their feet. Several of the other countries are not doing so well.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Can the gentleman tell me whether these countries specifically mentioned in this category by Mr. Bowles have taken the necessary steps in tax reform, land reform, and so forth? If they have not, and I quote this one other question before the gentleman answers that:

> Why should American taxpayers continue to underwrite governments of nations with relatively high per capita incomes which are unwilling to collect the necessary taxes from their own privileged people?

This has been a matter of concern to many of us. I wonder if there has been any tax reform in these areas.

Mr. MORGAN. Venezuela has accomplished substantial reforms. The committee was told that 11 countries in South America have reformed their tax systems. I do not think they have accomplished all the reforms the gentleman listed, but there is progress in Colombia, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Venezuela.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is it the intention of the committee that unless these countries do conform to the formula set forth and do something about their own problems, the U.S. Government should no longer participate in giving them aid as suggested in this speech?

Mr. MORGAN. I think we should conform to the conditions laid down in the Act of Bogotá and to the conditions laid down in the Punta del Este Agreement, which included most of the conditions the gentleman just elaborated.

Mr. CEDERBERG. But the gentleman will admit there are many countries in this particular area, inasmuch as we are discussing the Latin American-South American area, who have not instituted any reforms or practically no reforms under the Punta del Este Agreement, but are still receiving aid? How can we justify that?

Mr. MORGAN. Most of them have made an attempt to meet the conditions. As the gentleman knows, the agreement signed with Brazil set forth certain conditions. We are withholding aid temporarily because the conditions agreed upon were not met.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The reason I bring this up is I think this was a major statement by Mr. Bowles, who at that time was an adviser of the President. Looking at this, there are many substantial things I can agree with in this speech for needed reforms if we are going to have a program, but looking over the number of nations receiving aid, we still are in the same place we always were.

There is another category in which he says:

> Nations whose gross national product is wholly inadequate and which at present lack the competence, organization, or will to use our project or budget assistance effectively.
>
> Such nations should be tactfully denied direct project assistance until they can absorb it effectively.

Can the gentleman give me any statement of a nation that is in that category?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I am sure that there are certain countries which are not able to use any large amount of aid effectively and we try to restrict what we give them.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I close in suggesting that it is not enough to make speeches. We need corrective action in this program.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. Section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to statement of policy, is amended as follows:

(a) In the last sentence of the seventh paragraph, strike out "should emphasize long-range development assistance" and insert in lieu thereof "shall emphasize long-range development assistance".

(b) Immediately after the seventh paragraph, insert the following:

"The Congress further declares that, in order to assure that each program of assistance under this part is administered in such a manner as will most effectively carry out the policies stated in this section, each request for authorization of funds for such program shall be accompanied by a detailed statement setting forth—

"(1) the purposes of such program,

"(2) the specific objectives of such program, and

"(3) the priorities assigned to such purposes and objectives,

which will be adhered to in the administration of such program."

(c) The eighth paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"It is the sense of the Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and which do not, as a result of United States assistance, divert their own economic resources to military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States or against other countries receiving aid under this Act, whether or not such efforts are supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China."

(d) Immediately after the tenth paragraph insert the following:

"It is the sense of the Congress that, in the administration of programs of assistance under chapter 2 of this part, every possible precaution should be taken to assure that such assistance is not diverted to short-term emergency purposes (such as budgetary purposes, balance-of-payments purposes, or military purposes) or any other purpose not essential to the long-range economic development of recipient countries. It is further the sense of the Congress that short-term emergency purposes such as those referred to in the preceding sentence should be met, to the extent possible, through international institutions (such as the International Monetary Fund) which are equipped to condition assistance on immediate economic and monetary reform."

(e) The first sentence of the last paragraph is amended by inserting "(including private enterprise within such countries)" immediately after "countries".

(f) Immediately after the first sentence of the last paragraph insert the following new sentence: "In particular, the Congress urges that other industrialized free-world countries increase their contributions and improve the forms and terms of their assistance so that the burden of the common undertaking, which is for the benefit of all, shall be equitably borne by all."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the section that has just been read contains four amendments which were considered and adopted by the committee. They are 4 of the 46 amendments that were adopted by the committee of the 100 amendments that were presented to the committee.

These four amendments deal specifically with the analysis of this program by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The amendments had the purpose of expressing their recommendations on general guidelines.

Specifically, the guidelines which were proposed were to accomplish better administration of the program, which, Mr. Chairman, has been the subject matter of a great deal of the discussion on this legislation both in general debate and during the reading of the bill for amendment.

The purposes of the amendments are as follows:

First. A clear delineation of program objectives as these relate to U.S. foreign policy, and a tighter commitment to them.

Second. Specific identification of the various purposes of foreign aid, in order to set priorities and budget expenditures accordingly, and tighter controls to assure that funds are not used for purposes other than those for which they are intended.

Third. New authority to encourage positive planning for private investment, trade, and initiative—local and foreign—in the developing countries, as well as to improve existing incentives for private participation in the program.

Fourth. New emphasis on long-range economic development, assuring a full role for private enterprise, and corresponding reduction in short-run emergency aid for financial "bailouts," military purposes and politically inspired projects.

Mr. Chairman, these generally are the objectives in filling the gaps in the program as the chamber of commerce saw them in its analysis. I believe that a good job has been done by your committee in achieving the objectives which a constructive analysis of the program has brought to you.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to take only a minute, Mr. Chairman, to address myself to the remarks just made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell]. If I may add a bit more legislative history, the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. Fascell], and the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. Adair], were especially interested in what we have broadly called the free enterprise amendments to the bill. They worked hard in committee to obtain approval in this section or chapter that we just covered. We also have an amendment that expresses the sense of Congress that any nation receiving aid should not divert its economic resources to military or propaganda efforts against another country. The purpose of this, of course, is to see that our aid is not used for cross purposes and to see that there is some intelligent application of aid not only on the part of the dispensers, but also by the recipients. This amendment received serious consideration and support in the committee, and I wish to indicate it is one of the most practical and far-reaching amendments accepted and one of the good items in this bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Findley: Page 2, line 24, after funds, strike out the word "great"; and on line 25 strike out the word "given", and insert the word "limited."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strengthen the language which presently reads as follows:

> It is the sense of the Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and which do not, as a result of U.S. assistance, divert their own economic resources to military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States, or against other countries receiving aid under this act, whether or not such efforts are supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

My question is: Why should any attention and consideration be given to any country which does not share the view of the United States on the world crisis; any country which would as a result of U.S. aid divert their own resources to military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States.

The effect of my amendment would be to make the language of the bill read as follows:

> It is the sense of the Congress that in the administration of these funds attention and consideration should be limited to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and so on.

It seems to me this strikes right at the heart of our foreign aid problem. Are we to continue foolishly to try to buy the friendship of countries that oppose and thwart U.S. objectives? We surely should limit attention and consideration under foreign aid to countries which are with us in this great world crisis. The distinguished majority leader earlier today said, and I quote:

> We have been engaged by the enemy whether we like it or not.

The effect of my amendment would be to recognize this vital engagement in the legislative language before us.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some member of the committee in relation to this last amendment, and particularly to this section, how you can justify not having some kind of stronger language than is now in the bill, and particularly what is referred to when you say at line 5 on page 3, "whether or not such efforts are supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China."

I want to be specific about it. I think we know in the Middle East, for instance, that Egypt at the moment is receiving arms from Communist Russia or from other Communist sources. How do we then justify turning around and building up an arms situation in the Middle East, which at any moment might flame into war—and all you have to do is read the morning paper to know the situation in the Middle East at this very moment—how do you turn around in this language and justify any aid to Egypt under these conditions?

If some member of the committee would reply, I would be interested to know.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I cannot speak for the majority of the committee; but I wish to point out to the gentleman that he has answered his own question. If the House, and eventually the other body, accepts the amendment that the committee has added to this bill, we could not provide Egypt with assistance under this act if they continue on their present course of accepting arms from the Soviet Union or engaging in any direct or indirect transgressions against the State of Israel, Saudi Arabia, or any other country.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman really mean that the State Department will take as a direction from the Congress the words "great attention and consideration should be given"? It seems to me that if you do not want the aid to be given, you might as well say that you do not want it to be given. The gentleman tells me that this is going to happen. I want to be sure that it is going to happen.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would prefer that other members of the committee join in providing the answer. But may I point out to the gentleman that he personally would have more influence with the State Department than some of the members of the committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that my influence in the State Department is not very great, I am afraid. So, if any member of the committee would give me an answer to this question, I should be happy to know what it is. I do not want to oppose the committee, but I will say that I want to vote for an amendment that would stop building up more war in the Middle East, when I can see it facing me this very moment. So I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I presume that this is in part at least in reply to the amendment that I have offered which would clearly strengthen the language of this section. I would like to know if the gentleman does support the amendment that I have just offered.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will have to say to the gentleman that I am uncertain. I would want more information before I could support it. I am trying to get the information. I am not getting very far in getting the information. One of the things that bothers me is the question of aid that might be furnished to some countries like Poland, who I do not think are with us on many things, but who I think in the long run will help our aims; and I am afraid the gentleman's amendment might stop some of that aid. On the other hand, where there is direct military aid by Soviet Russia, I want to know that other kinds of aid are not going to go to that country.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the effect of my amendment would be to declare the intent of Congress that Communist Poland or Communist anyone else would not be eligible for consideration or help under this act.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I addressed the Committee and pointed out that section 306 of the proposed act, which is on page 15 of the bill, is, in my opinion, directed against the situation to which the gentleman from California has referred. Under this it is clearly stated that:

> No assistance shall be provided under this or any other act * * * to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against * * * any country receiving assistance under this or any other act.

It is my interpretation that under this provision, if the President finds that Egypt is preparing aggression against Israel, then aid to that country shall be terminated.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It seems to me that we should try to get a direct answer to the question. In fact Nasser just a week ago said:

> We are just waiting for our armed might to move into Israel.

Would not that be sufficient to cut off all aid to a country the leader of which made that kind of statement?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I agree with the gentleman, and I hope that all Members of Congress who feel the same way, after this bill is enacted, will join in urging the President to use this authority to cut off aid to Egypt. I also urge the conferees to insist that this language be retained in the conference bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the author of the amendment a couple of questions about what he anticipates will be the effect of his amendment. For example, a country which was neutral, which did not share our views, at least which did not side with us, as many of our small African nations do not, would the gentleman's amendment preclude any aid to them?

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I am afraid that words such as would still remain in this section would be open to wide interpretation. I do not presume to judge what the interpretation of the State Department would be. But my own interpretation would be that it would be clearly limited to countries which share the U.S. view on the world crisis. I would certainly hope there are some such countries in Africa, but if there are none, then it would certainly exclude Africa.

Mr. HAYS. I am not so much interested in the gentleman's interpretation of what the State Department would do as I am the gentleman's interpretation of his own amendment. Would it be the intent of the gentleman—and I am not trying to harass the gentleman, I am just trying to get some clarification here—would it be the gentleman's intent if the gentleman's amendment were adopted, shall we say, to prohibit India from getting any aid at all under this bill?

Mr. FINDLEY. My own opinion is that my amendment would make India's qualification very dubious. I tried to express it clearly when I said this amendment would have the effect of expressing the intention of Congress for withholding aid from countries which are not with us in spirit in this great world crisis.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. I think, if this is the intent of the amendment, then it is pretty clear that if we want to have a foreign aid bill with any flexibility whatever in it, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I will say very frankly that I was going to reserve this little speech until perhaps an amendment came up on India. It is my opinion that the Indians have exhausted their reservoir of good will in this country. When I was a small boy I remember that when we took contributions to church on Sunday we took one for the church and we took one for India. India was a nation that everybody in the United States wanted to help. But after 10 years of the evil visage of Krishna Menon on television and in the U.N. in New York, I think it is fair to serve notice on the Indian nation that that reservoir of good will has been drained off.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be a part and parcel of any amendment or any legislation which, if the Chinese Communists attack India, would prohibit us from giving them any aid. I might not like some of the things the Government of India has done. In fact, I will say, frankly, I do not. But if the chips are down and if it came to a choice between Mr. Nehru's government and the government in Peiping, I think I could beyond any doubt turn my sentiments to India.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see an amendment riveted into this bill in the very beginning which would not prohibit us from coming to the assistance of India if it were in our self-interest, and I think it would be in that case.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in that instance certainly the world crisis would center on the military action against India and we would then, I hope, share the policy of India in resisting aggression on the part of the Chinese Communists. So, I am sure my amendment would not preclude such assistance.

Mr. HAYS. Then, we are transposing language. As I understood the gentleman in the beginning they had to share our views. Now the gentleman is talkink about us sharing their views.

Mr. Chairman, I think this provision further illustrates how confusing it can be to try to write the intent of Congress as to language on the floor of the House. Frankly, I thought it was rather confusing to try to write it in the committee. A good many of these amendments which were offered have undertaken to express on the part of somebody their intent for doing something or other.

Mr. Chairman, I have brought this up not necessarily because I was in basic disagreement with what the gentleman is trying to do, but I am in disagreement with the language which has confused the issue.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think this discussion has indicated the difficulty of discussing in a brief period language such as we are now considering. One of the problems, for example, is: What is the meaning of the expression regarding the view of the United States on the world crisis? Is it that the crisis is serious? Is that enough to make a country eligible to qualify for assistance? It is my opinion that the fuzziness of that expression as presently contained in the bill is not going to be corrected by the language offered by the gentleman from Illinois. That language, I might add, I think is objectionable.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey. As a matter of fact the language in the bill now is fairly fuzzy but when you say consideration shall be given to fuzzy language, that is one thing.

But when you say "consideration shall be limited to fuzzy language," then I think you are really compounding the error.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would not the gentleman agree if this amendment is adopted, however good its motives may be, it would make it impossible to move into an area where you have an undecided nation to give help to them and try to bring them over to our side?

Mr. HAYS. That would be the effect of it, and for that reason I find myself in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were; ayes 66, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 103. The second sentence of section 201(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to considerations to be taken into account in making loans from the development loan fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out clauses (1) and (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) whether financing could be obtained in whole or in part from other free-world sources on reasonable terms, including private sources within the United States, (2) the economic and technical soundness of the activity to be financed, including the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest,".

(b) Strike out "and" at the end of clause (5).

(c) Insert immediately before the period at the end of such second sentence the following: ", and (7) the economic development plans of the requesting country, which plans should specifically provide for appropriate participation by private enterprise and include an analysis of current human and material resources, together with a projection of the ultimate objectives of the plans with respect to the overall economic development of such country".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 104. Section 202(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to authorizations for the Development Loan Fund, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided further*, That, in order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 201, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, respectively, shall be available only for loans made for purposes of economic development through private enterprise'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, reference was made earlier this afternoon to the fact that those of us who are in favor of increased private enterprise participation in this program have made efforts to write amendments to further that aim in this bill. A number of such amendments, and some of these have been referred to earlier, have been written into the bill and I think have strengthened and improved it.

The amendment which I present to you at this time provides, quite simply stated, that 50 percent of the development loan funds should be used for the purposes of private enterprise. This is an effort to increase the participation of private enterprise in this program.

Witness after witness before the committee testified that if the program is to be successful it must have a large and increasing amount of participation by the private sector in it. It was pointed out particularly with reference to the Alliance for Progress that if our programs in Latin America are to do the things which it is hoped they may do, then they must rely to a great extent upon the participation of private enterprise.

Members of the committee will notice that this amendment is somewhat different from the form in which it was when I offered a similar one to the committee. It now applies to the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. In other words, I have made it applicable a year later than the proposal made in the committee.

If this amendment is adopted it simply says to the AID Administrator and those who work with him that 50 percent of the development loan funds, wherever used in the world, must be channeled to private enterprise. It does not say U.S. private enterprise. So it could be private enterprise from this country, to our own businessmen going here and there throughout the world to develop businesses and to bring prosperity and increased employment with them. But it could also be local private enterprise in the countries in which the loans are made, or it could be a combination of both.

Some will say, "Well, you are not giving flexibility enough to the Administrator, if you say you must put 50 percent of these loan funds in private enterprise." It is not even necessary that 50 percent of the loans to each country be on the basis of private enterprise. It can be on the broadest possible basis. It could be as to the program as a whole.

So I do feel that we are giving a completely adequate amount of flexibility to the AID organization in this amendment. We do say that we believe in the private enterprise system, that we know as a result of the testimony of virtually every witness who spoke upon this point that if the AID program is to succeed it must have this large ingredient of private enterprise. We are saying, "Upon the broadest possible basis, Mr. Administrator, see to it that half the funds find themselves used on the basis of private enterprise."

This amendment does not affect the World Bank or the Eximbank or Cooley loans or anything of that sort. It applies simply to development loans under this act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that when the gentleman offered this amendment in committee and it was up for discussion that the gentleman admitted, as he probably will now, I am sure, that a great part of our funds now go through private enterprise? In other words, the gentleman's amendment in no way should be interpreted as a statement that we do not now sufficiently put our aid funds through private enterprise.

Mr. ADAIR. What the gentleman says is correct. There is a substantial portion of our development loan money channeled through private enterprise. The exact amount we are unable to find out. Inquiry was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. In further answer to the question the gentleman raised, the AID Administrator, Mr. Bell, himself, said that it was his philosophy that increasingly this type of loan should be made.

Mr. FASCELL. If I may ask the gentleman one further question very briefly. Is it not true, the only point at difference was the question of flexibility? In other words, whether or not this criteria should actually be written into the law, notwithstanding the fact that the main thrust of the program seems to be toward increasing our efforts through private enterprises.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct. As I pointed out, I have revised my proposal, trying to meet that objection, and I am trying to make it clear here today that it now offers great flexibility.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I am curious to know—it was difficult to hear the reading of the amendment in detail—does this mean 50 percent of the development loan funds must be made directly to private enterprise?

Mr. ADAIR. Not necessarily. They may be made through existing organizations. For example, if a lending institution in a Latin American country had AID funds which it then wanted to place in the hands of a private organization to build housing, that, in my opinion, would be a private enterprise use.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Suppose, just for example, some country was required to build a highway; would your amendment be satisfied if we lend the government the money and the government put it out to private enterprise to bid?

Mr. ADAIR. In my opinion, it would—if, however, the government itself builds the highway, and it would have to use a percentage of the loan funds available for that purpose, then it would not meet the requirement of my amendment. I am glad the gentleman is making these points because I am trying to point out it has the broadest and most flexible application.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I wish I could share the gentleman's certainty that the wording of his amendment has that effect. I am not at all sure it does.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will read carefully the amendment, he will find a lack of restrictiveness in it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The language worries me. The expression, as I understand it, is that loans must be made through private enterprise?

Mr. ADAIR. No, not through private enterprise.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Again, I do not know what the language means. The amendment offered in committee was with reference to loans made through private enterprise.

Mr. ADAIR. No—the language is, "shall be available only for loans made for purposes of economic development through private enterprise."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure what the language means. The gentleman uses the expressions "channel through private enterprise" and "for purposes of private enterprise." Of course, I assume we are all very much in favor of private enterprise, but many of these expenditures might benefit private enterprise if they went for a public purpose such as building a highway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is subject to different interpretations. If it means that 50 percent of the loans must be made directly to private enterprise, there are many situations where private enterprise would get more benefit if such loans were made to provide roads, power, and other basic requirements of private industry.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he read the amendment to say that the loans had to be made directly?

Mr. MORGAN. I raised a question as to what the amendment did mean.

Mr. ADAIR. I will assure the gentleman it does not mean that. The end use is the important thing.

Mr. MORGAN. In undeveloped countries we have frequently financed highway construction and railroad improvements, waterworks and sanitation projects, which were beneficial to private enterprise.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. I am aware of the fact that there is need for these facilities that the gentleman refers to. The AID people, I believe, use the term "infrastructure" with respect to it. However, I point out again if my amendment is adopted, there is still 50 percent available for these purposes.

Mr. MORGAN. As the gentleman is well aware, the Subcommittee on Mutual Security conducted a staff survey in Korea several years ago where we found a number of private enterprises which have received U.S. aid, that were bogged down because power transmission lines were inadequate. We had provided the means to finance the construction and operation of their plants, but they still could not get going. There are many cases where an undeveloped country does not have any private capital. I am not sure how the gentleman's amendment would operate. The gentleman will remember his colloquy with

Mr. Teeter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce during the hearings. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair] asked Mr. Teeter about the chamber's position on the 50–50 free enterprise amendment. Mr. Adair said:

> There is a provision for channeling 50 percent of loan funds and Alliance for Progress funds to private enterprise.
>
> Would you give us your comments and reaction?
>
> Mr. Teeter. Yes, sir, I would.
>
> I am afraid that I cannot fully agree with you in stating the chamber's position on this. We feel that it is too rigid to have such a stipulated requirement as 50–50. I think it is admirable that we work toward a goal. Certainly the goal would be even greater than the 50-percent figure for the private sector, that you are now proposing.
>
> I think perhaps it would be somewhat premature or inflexible to insist on the 50–50.
>
> Mr. Adair. You think the figure may be too great?
>
> Mr. Teeter. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. ADAIR. In an effort to meet this charge of inflexibility I would point out that we did move the effective date forward a year to give additional time for preparation. So I think we are meeting the objection of Mr. Teeter. I believe we ought to move in this direction and we are giving an additional year for us to prepare so to move.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think that this premature baby is going to grow up in 1 year.

Mr. ADAIR. I will agree with the gentleman, if he will yield, this is certainly not a cure-all to all of the problems involved in this portion of the bill, but it is a proper and necessary step, I think, in the direction of achieving the things which I take it most of us in this Chamber desire to achieve.

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan].

Mr. MONAGAN. I want to ask whether or not, in addition to the investment guarantee program that is certainly in support of private enterprise, if that is not presently in the law in section 601, where the specific section is dedicated to the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, which includes certain standards that the President had to take into consideration in administering this program. All of us are in support of extending private enterprise under this act.

Mr. MORGAN. Besides that, the AID administration has been reorganized to give greater emphasis to private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Adair) there were—ayes 89, noes 100.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Adair and Mr. Morgan.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Derwinski: Page 5, after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 104. Section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to interest rates on development loans, is amended by inserting immediately after 'in no event' the following: 'less than 2 per centum per annum nor'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises the interest rate on development loans to a minimum of 2 percent per annum.

Since gradual emphasis on the aid program has been from grants to loans, the interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent on development loans is becoming increasingly common. My amendment would raise this ridiculously low rate to 2 percent. In view of the rising short-term interest rate in the United States, the naturally increasing national debt, and concern in the Congress over the stability of the dollar, my amendment would produce substantial savings to the United States, and merits the support of the House.

Last week, when we had under consideration H.R. 6143—the Higher Education Facilities Act—I deliberately offered an amendment lowering the interest rate called for in that bill from one-fourth of 1 percent above the cost of money to the Treasury, to 2 percent. As I expected, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 97 to 9, Members raising objections to the 2-percent rate is "impractical, too low, additional burden to the taxpayer," and so forth. We all consider consistency one of our great virtues. Therefore, to be consistent with this legislative record, my amendment deserves support.

Certainly, if we are practical enough to charge American educational institutions a rate that is not less than a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States, consistency would dictate that foreign nations—friend, neutral or foe, democracy or dictatorship—pay at least 2 percent on loans provided through the courtesy of the American taxpayer.

Just yesterday all Members should have received a press rélease from the Agency for International Development, indicating that loans for $3 million have been supplied Chile at a rate of three-fourths of 1 percent; $6.5 million to Tunisia at the same rate, and $7.2 million to Bolivia.

In the fourth quarter of fiscal 1963, loans totaling $587 million at rates below 2 percent were authorized. Using the figures for that quarter alone, my amendment would save the American taxpayers $7½ million a year.

However, I am also concerned with the fact that loans at such readily low rates really could not qualify for a description as a loan. They are, in effect, disguised grants and as such, the entire program is an insult to the intelligence of the American public and to fiscal commonsense.

If the program is to be a legitimate loan program, a reasonably responsible rate of return is called for. Certainly, 2 percent is not an abnormal sum.

As I have indicated to you, the House last week set a rate of one-fourth of 1 percent above the cost of money to the Treasury in the Higher Education Facilities Act; REA co-ops have been qualified at a 2-percent rate; U.S. veterans drawing direct loans from the Federal Government must pay a rate of 5¼ percent. In the housing bill of 1961, cooperatives and other not-for-profit groups qualify under a special program at a rate of 3⅛ percent. FHA loans guaranteed by the Federal Government cost the American homeowner 5¼ percent.

The very least the Congress deserves is to have the program presented honestly. If it is to be a grant program, honestly call it that. If it is to be a loan program, an interest rate of 2 percent should be an acceptable figure.

Mr. Chairman, to repeat, my amendment would set a minimum interest rate of 2 percent per annum on the Development Loan Fund. The motivation for the amendment is the fact that at the present time approximately 70 percent of the loans from the Development Fund have been granted at the rate of three-fourths of 1 percent and most in addition bear a 10-year grace period.

Yesterday all of us received from the Agency for International Development three of their standard press releases, informing you of the loans that were recently made. One, for example, was to the Government of Bolivia for a grand total of $7.2 million, bearing a credit fee of three-fourths of 1 percent with a 10-year grace period. Also a loan for the purchase of tractors in Tunisia with an annual credit fee of three-fourths of 1 percent totaling some $6.5 million. Then there was a new loan recently granted to Chile for a total of $3.5 million with a 10-year grace period and a credit fee of three-fourths of 1 percent.

In the last 3 months of fiscal year 1963 approximately $585 million were processed in loans at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent, most also with the 10-year grace period. I do not quarrel with the 10-year grace period, but I do feel an interest rate of 2 percent might be applicable.

If it is the intention that this be a loan program, I submit that 2 percent is a most reasonable and practical rate. If this is to be a grant program, let us call it a grant program. Let us not disguise the fact by talking about fees or credit fees or interest of three-fourths of 1 percent. Let us say it is a grant. But if it is a loan program, I think the very least we could do is to set this rate at 2 percent.

I can well imagine some people objecting on the ground that the rate should be the going cost to our Treasury.

Some people urge a 3- or 4-percent rate. I do not feel my 2-percent rate as such has any magic to it except the principle should be set forth that we should have at least a rate of interest that would qualify these loans for a legitimate description as loans. If not, call it a grant program.

Let me say in anticipation of objections that this amendment is offered with the intention of helping the bill, helping the program. I do not think it qualifies, and I say this in advance, for a charge of an attempt to gut the bill.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McLOSKEY. I am intrigued by this credit fee. Actually, are we not just kidding ourselves when we call this a loan? In my opinion, this is just a subterfuge. It is not a loan.

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman will permit a comment I did not wish to make, I would not be surprised if the party responsible at the Agency for International Development who wrote this release to which I refer is either in violation of the law or in ignorance of the law. The present law requires that the rate of interest charged be not excessive or unreasonable. But it is presumed that it will be an interest rate. Yet the press releases which I referred to distinctly say "an annual credit fee," which I am not so sure is a play on words, but at least might indicate to me that a 2-percent interest rate would be far more reasonable, practical, and worthy of acceptance and support by the House at this time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment goes right to the crux of the whole foreign aid bill. The disposition of this amendment may well determine the future course of foreign aid.

I have been one, and there have been many voices raised in this Congress, who has said, "Let us try to put this on a repayable basis." I said that in the previous administration, and they made the attempt. But you cannot charge more than a country can pay. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, if it were agreed to, would be to drive this back to a straight grant program.

How are you going to charge a going rate of interest to a Bolivian peasant who has never had any land before, to sell him a tractor? If we are trying to bring these people into an area where they can have a standard of living where communism will not appeal to them, then we have to use some extraordinary methods. You cannot charge the same rate of interest that you can charge to a fellow who finances 50 percent of the cost of a new Cadillac. I admit it is an appealing argument to say we are letting them have this at far below the cost of money, but this is a program designed to help these nations carry on their fight to resist communism.

And if it is not that, then we ought to scuttle the whole program. We ought not try to do it by halfway measures. I think the acid test of some of these loans is that some of them are being repaid. Therefore, they are loans. I have been critical in the past of loans that were really grants, and I think all of us on the committee are realistic enough to know that some of these may turn out to be grants. But if you are going to make them with a realistic idea, and hopefully, that they can be repaid, and if you are doing this to help a country fight communism, then you cannot do it on the same basis on which you make loans for going enterprises and industrial businesses. I think this is a very fundamental amendment. I think if it passes, the net result, as I said before, simply will be to put this back on a straight grant basis. It will be a step backward. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to back up what the gentleman from Ohio said. Of course the gentleman from Illinois unquestionably does not intend to gut the bill. But if we should adopt this proposal, this loan program would certainly be ineffective in a great many countries that lack the capacity to repay at any significant rate of interest. I might say that the difference to this country would be very small.

The reason why we are lending this money at low rates of interest is because projects which are being built with the money provided produce small revenues, and the recipient countries are not in a position to support anything more. This may be a reasonable proposition from our point of view, but it would not be practicable from the point of view of the recipient countries. We have to recognize that this would be a very damaging direction in which to move.

In that connection, I would like to quote from the Clay report on this problem. They point out on page 14 of the report, the necessity of other countries which lend money to liberalize their rates. They point out that Italy should liberalize her terms of lending, that the United Kingdom should lower her interest rates, that Germany should soften its terms, and that France should soften its aid terms.

> The importance of improving loan terms—

And I quote—

> including maturities, interest rates, and grace periods is particularly apparent in the case of those nations undertaking comprehensive development programs. Unless the lending terms to other countries improve greatly.

That means unless the terms are made more liberal, not made higher.

> and approach U.S. terms, international consortia and coordinating groups for such countries as India, Pakistan, Turkey, and Nigeria will saddle those countries with impossible debt service requirements, and U.S. funds would pay for these short term and shortsighted debts.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that in 1961 we deliberately set the rates at low interest. We did not desire to saddle these new countries, these countries in need of development assistance, but not having the financial resources within themselves, with heavy debt service burdens. They should qualify for this assistance.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I know the gentleman from New Jersey attempts to be fair in the presentation of all arguments. I would like to point out to the gentleman, first of all, these loans are loans made directly to a government that then relends them at a higher rate. Furthermore, the Clay Committee section that the gentleman just read substantiates my argument because it does not say that these other countries shall lower their rates to the low level that we provide, but merely that they liberalize their terms, which in the case of West Germany especially, the rates run as high as 5½ percent on some of their loans and in the case of the United Kingdom it is a consistently high rate. We would be rising to meet the recommendations of the Clay Committee. May I take 1 more second of the gentleman's time to correct some misinformation which the gentleman from Ohio did not mean to leave.

This rate of three-quarters of 1 percent is not available to any poor Bolivian peasant. This rate is available to the Government of Bolivia or any other country. They relend it to the people. A Bolivian peasant drawing a loan from his Government will be paying in the neighborhood of 10 percent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say regarding the interest rate on loans we make to foreign governments, that the relending institutions which receive this money from those governments will in turn have to demand increased amounts from local borrowers, such as a small business in Bolivia or housing projects or whatever. The cost that would be demanded by us will be reflected all the way down to the small businessman or farmer or whoever else might benefit. So in effect we would be very effectively gutting this development loan program if we should increase the rate.

The gentleman's amendment recognizes the necessity for a subsidy. He is not getting away from the fact that in these cases at least a subsidy is a desirable thing. In my opinion liberal interest rates are absolutely essential if we are to provide aid to developing countries. This applies both to this country and to Allied countries capable of making loans.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to emphasize what the gentleman from Ohio said. During the period 1948 to 1952 I would estimate that approximately 80 percent of the Marshall plan funds were grants. From 1952 on until 1957 until the Development Loan Fund came into being, again as I remember it approximately 75 percent of the economic aid was in grants. The past administration under then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles began to transform from a grant program to a loan program. They came up here with a development loan program with loans repayable in both dollars and soft currency and the President had the same discretion as to interest rate that he has in the present act. When we rewrote the Mutual Security Act of 1961, we stated that all development loans should be repayable in dollars and gave the President flexibility as to setting the interest rate.

Somebody a moment ago questioned whether all of these loans are really loans or whether they are grants. I want to say that in the fiscal year 1962-63 over $397 million has been repayed in principal and interest on development loans. This is a good loan program. It is a sound loan program. Let us not lose sight of the basic reason, why we make loans at a low interest rate. We are trying to help some of these undeveloped countries move along the road to economic stability. We are trying to keep international communism out of their countries. That is the purpose of this loan program. These undeveloped countries with no capital at all are attempting to build schools, roads, and such installations. It will take them a long time to do this unless we do have a low interest rate. If we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, it would not bring in a great amount of return in money compared to the magnitude of the expenditures which we make under this program.

I think we have to look at the basic reason why we have a development loan program. A basic purpose of the foreign aid program is to help the undeveloped world.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Permit me to make one comment before the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier] directs himself to this amendment. I would like to indicate to the chairman of the committee that from all of the figures which I have available—I am not sure I have all of the figures available on which to base the calculation—the annual saving itself from this increase in interest rates from three-quarters of 1 percent to 2 percent a year would be approximately $13 million a year. This is not taking into account any future loans we make in coming years at a more realistic rate.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I am not convinced that the amendment should embrace a set interest figure, but for the purpose of gathering light out of darkness in this discussion perhaps someone on the committee would tell me if they would support an amendment which would restrict the interest rate, which is charged by the Government to the poor peasant to buy a tractor, to the same interest rate which we are charging them on the loan.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The problem there is that our loans are repayable by the participating government in our dollars, whereas the loan that they may be making to the poor peasant would be in the currency of that country. Therefore, the risk to them is a lot less than it would be to us. Our return is in hard dollars; theirs is not in hard dollars.

Mr. COLLIER. In the light of that explanation, will the gentleman tell me this——

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New Jersey meant to say that the risk to them would be greater; he said it would be less.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is correct. The risk to them is far greater on those private loans by the country to the peasant than the risk to us on the hard-dollar loans.

Mr. COLLIER. In the light of that explanation, am I to assume that these nations at no time charge interest to gouge the borrower in those countries? Or does he feel that the interest rate established by these countries is a fair rate designed to provide the economic stimulus that it is hoped to provide?

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is far lower than the normal bank loan, because these countries are not trying to gouge their own people as some bankers would do on the same type of loans.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is going in the right direction though his concern over interest rates charged by foreign Governments on relending our funds. Much has been done by recipient country Development Banks set up by the AID in getting interest rates reduced as a matter of banking policy. We do not want to set up a government bank in a country to go in competition with loans of private enterprise banks. Accordingly, the gentleman is suggesting we should put a limitation on the interest rate that could be charged by a Development Bank which our AID sets up which would undercut the money rates within a recipient country.

Mr. COLLIER. Did the gentleman say that we have some reservation about competing with private banks and private enterprise? If so, that is a new twist.

Mr. BARRY. If you set an interest rate for lending money in a country under the Foreign Assistance Act, you might then undercut private enterprise in the recipient country.

Mr. COLLIER. Are we being concerned now with undercutting private enterprise?

Mr. BARRY. It has been the policy of the AID, through the Development Banks to try to get interest rates low in recipient countries. We try in many ways to bring this about.

Policy is one thing, but to write it into law would create a conflict with private enterprise. If you set up a greatly lower money rate than currently prevails, you would drive out private bankers all over South America. That is what the amendment would do.

Mr. COLLIER. I am not convinced that that would in fact be a result of the amendment. But there was concern expressed that a high interest rate would make it difficult for these countries to repay. The fact of the matter is they do not and will not make repayment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, although I certainly think the interest rate on these so-called loans to foreigners ought to be 3½ or 4 percent instead of 2 percent.

Now, it has been said that foreign countries cannot pay a higher rate. Well, the British are loaning some of them money at a much higher rate. The British rate, although I do not have the figures here, they are available in the committee——

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. No, not at this time. Just let me have a minute or two, if you will.

The British are loaning at what rate? Four or five percent, and if there is any appreciable risk involved they add a half to 1 percent premium on the interest rate. They are loaning to some of the countries to which we are putting out these 40- and 50-year loans bearing no interest.

Mr. Chairman, what are the Japanese charging? Those of the majority of the committee who oppose this amendment know because they had the figures before the committee. The Japanese are charging up to between 5 and 6 percent. Yet, some of you do not want to put a floor of 2 percent on American loans. Some Members of the House were perfectly willing to fix an interest rate in the education bill the other day of—I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski], What was the interest rate in the education legislation the other day?

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman will yield, one-fourth of 1 percent greater than the present cost of financing our debt in the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Which is 3½ or 4 percent these days—mostly 4 percent. And, yet you do not want to put even a paltry 2 percent on the millions which you are dishing out with the greatest of abandon to these countries in 40- and 50-year loans. Incidentally, on these loans, the first 10 years is a grace period during which nothing is paid, neither on the principal nor interest. I ask anyone to correct me if I am wrong. There is a three-quarters of 1 percent carrying charge but no payment on the principal and interest in the first 10 years. The second 10 years, on a 50-year loan, the carrying charge and a 1 percent repayment on the principal. In the last 30 years there is an annual 3-percent payment on the principal. Never in the history of the 50-year loan is there one stinking penny of interest paid. Only a three-quarters of 1 percent carrying charge. That is all.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not yield to the gentleman.

You say these soft loans will be repaid. How in the world do you know whether this money is going to be repaid at all on the 40- and 50-year loans which have been made in the last few years? The only person who is going to know—I hope to be around here—but the only persons who are going to know whether they are paid or not will be those who are alive 40 or 50 years from now. But you and I know they are not going to be repaid, these soft loans that are being dished out all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, the least we can do is put a floor under them of 2 percent. It should be 3½ percent or 4 percent. But there ought to be a minimum of 3½ percent. Let us put this 2-percent floor under these loans and then come back next year and raise it to 3½ percent or 4 percent and take it right on up to what the taxpayers pay for money borrowed by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, that is the only thing to do.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would not get so worked up if I were the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Because I remember when the gentleman was on the floor here talking against giveaways, we were hearing "You are giving away this and you are giving away that." It seems as though the gentleman is never satisfied. We have stopped giving away. We are now lending. I think that the gentleman ought to be satisfied. I do not think that the gentleman wants to be known as a Shylock.

It must be remembered that this money is being lent to impoverished and to underdeveloped countries. These people have not got the interest to pay and I believe three-fourths of 1 percent is ample in the circumstances. It is tough enough for them to get the money with which they can purchase food. The fact is that the money is going to be returned if not today then next year or the year after. But there is an obligation. These people signed an agreement that they will return this money. I think the entire purpose of the legislation would be defeated, as has been stated earlier by the gentleman from Ohio, if we take the position that we are going to insist on a greater rate of interest together with principal.

This is a very unfair amendment, and should be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not adverse to saving money in this bill, and in a few minutes I am going to give the Members an opportunity to reduce this authorization by several hundred million dollars. But this particular provision which, according to the testimony of the proponents, would involve some $13 to $15 million, misses the entire point of the bill. The purpose of this program is to advance the national interest and security of the United States of America. It is not to make money.

It seems to me if there is an Administrator of AID who extends a loan on the basis of any other consideration there is a constitutional proceeding which can be instituted in this body to correct the situation.

It has been stated here that these loans are not in fact loans. I believe that they will be repaid. But if we destroy the loan provision in this act, and I fear that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would have that effect, we will necessarily have to rely to a far greater extent on development grants, and there is considerable sentiment in this body against the modest grant program that now exists in the bill.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 113, noes 123.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DERWINSKI and Mr. MONAGAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 167, noes 143.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PELLY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: On page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 104. Section 203 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to fiscal provisions concerning the Development Loan Fund, is hereby repealed."
>
> And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, part 1, Chapter 2: Development Assistance, section 203, reads as follows:

> Fiscal provisions: All receipts from loans made under and in accordance with this title shall be available for use for the purposes of this title. Such receipts and other funds made available under this title for use for the purposes of this title shall remain available until expended.

What this section 203 does is authorize reloaning of funds without reappropriation. It is one of the devices known as back-door spending.

Assume, if you will, that out of properly appropriated funds a 40-year development loan is made and repayments of principal and interest in due course are received. Under authority of section 203 these payments as received can be reloaned. Thus, we have an endless authority. Thirty years from now the Agency could be loaning for 40 years more and so on ad infinitum. No annual revaluation and justification would be required before the Committees on Appropriations. My amendment would require the usual appropriation before receipts could be reloaned.

I urge support of my amendment. Let us get this program on a fiscally and constitutionally sound basis.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

A moment ago we heard the story that the loans that we have been making are not going to be returned. You heard the statement made in the form of a complaint that these are grants. Well, if they are grants, what are you worried about? On the other hand, if they are loans of 40 or 50 years' duration, we will not be here to worry about whether they are being loaned again. At least I will not. I do not expect to, at any rate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Surely.

Mr. GROSS. I have some children and grandchildren who would be interested in what you do here today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Well, I am certain that their hearts would not be quite so steely that they would refuse to aid the poor, the underprivileged children in underdeveloped countries that are unable to get food, milk, clothing, and housing, and that is the purpose and the basis for this entire legislation. What are you going to do? Do you want to destroy the legislation altogether? If that is your purpose, there is nothing for me to say. On the other hand, if you intend that this program shall have any effect, if you intend that this program shall say to the people of underdeveloped countries of the world that we want to come to their assistance and that we will do so and we will not try to scuttle the bill as we are doing here, then this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind our colleagues that this section was written into the law in 1957. The outstanding advocate of this provision was our former colleague from Ohio, Mr. Vorys. The very purpose of this amendment was to encourage development loans in place of grants. It was at that point that we departed from the policy which emphasized grants and went to a policy emphasizing loans. If we now follow the suggestion contained in the proposed amendment that this section be repealed, we will in fact undercut the very program we initiated in order to get away from grants and in order to make this program a sound program of foreign aid.

The question was raised that in order to improve supervision, the funds for development loans ought to be authorized and appropriated annually. I want to point out that the Congress can and does indeed conduct reviews, impose restrictions, and give directions to the Development Loan Fund every year. The Appropriations Committee always considers the repayments coming into the fund when new appropriations are made. Therefore, the Congress does not presently lack control over this program.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House page 210 of the hearings held on this legislation before the Committee on

Foreign Affairs which contains a chart listing past and projected loan repayments. The amounts listed are impressive. Funds provided for development loans are being repaid and will continue to be repaid with interest. The repayments will be made available for future lending as development loans and will encourage other countries to follow this type of procedure. This program will encourage greater reliance on sound methods of financing economic development, and wider participation in this task by other free nations.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated because, if adopted, it will undermine the development loan program.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is all right to walk up the hill, then walk down the hill and then attempt to walk back up the hill again. This amendment simply seeks to undo in a very short time what it took a very long time to write into this law. I would trust that whatever voting cohesion exists on the Republican side with respect to the other amendments will not be applied to this one and some consideration will be given to the background and the history of the Development Loan Fund.

We struggled very hard in the committee and under two administrations to strengthen the administration of the program. One of the strongest criticisms directed against the program before this provision was written into law and before we had the Development Loan Fund was by the Comptroller General of the United States. We could not do long-range planning with funding on an annual basis; therefore it became very wasteful and inefficient, and it was recommended that long-term funding be authorized.

For whatever it is worth, that is, if efficiency and the elimination of waste means anything, an effort was made to write into law those recommendations of the Comptroller General and those others who had reviewed the administration of the foreign aid program, along two counts. One was to change the emphasis from grants to loans and to set up a development loan program, to encourage in every way possible the development in the underdeveloped nations of a feeling of responsibility and to create the idea of a loan, even if in name only.

The other was to provide for long-range planning and funding of this program, in order to achieve this sense of responsibility in the recipient nations, in order to get away from the idea of grants. Admittedly, this cannot be done overnight, and it will not be done overnight; it may take a long time, such as 30, 40, or 50 years. I do not know, but as long as the fight with communism exists, as long as the challenge of the developing nations exists, as long as the problem is here, so long will we have to face it. But we are not going to do it by fast semantics

Mr. Chairman, the idea of a revolving fund for long-term planning has a sound basis in economics; it has a sound basis in accounting; it has a sound basis for proper administration of this type program.

Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee want to go back down the hill again—and that is what this amendment does—to the annual authorization and appropriation in the Development Loan Fund, they are giving rise to all of the arguments and criticisms which the Comptroller General, the previous administration, this administration, your committee, and this House by previous votes have tried to correct by writing these fiscal provisions into law.

Mr. Chairman, I just make this statement so we can have it clear as to the course and direction of our vote. I would hope that having had this long struggle to change from grants to loans; having had this long struggle to put long-range planning into the program and to have a Development Loan Fund into which we could get dollar repayments; by which we could achieve some sense of responsibility; by which we could have some efficiency and economy; that we would not now in 5 minutes turn around and go back down the hill some 10 years in the program.

I trust that this committee will defeat the pending amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just take these few moments to congratulate those of my colleagues who applauded so vociferously at the passage of the last amendment, because we are creating a new image to the people of the world. It is no longer the image of the United States of America as idealistic, as the fighter against communism and against tyranny. It is no longer the picture of a nation that cares about the defeated and the dispossessed, the sick and the hungry of the world. It is a new image. It is not the image of the United States of America. It is the image of the "Friendly Loan Co." It is an image of a company that says to the people of the world, "We will help you fight tyranny at 3 percent on the barrelhead."

Mr. Chairman, it will be a sorry day for the democracies in this world when the United States has this kind of an image created in the eyes of the people of the world.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I had not intended to speak this afternoon on this section of the bill, and I shall not speak for the full 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those mentioned earlier, who testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee for 2 solid hours on the subject of the relation between private enterprise and foreign aid, and can claim some credit for the language that is now in the bill on page 4 which requires that the AID Administrator turn to the private sector to discover whether or not a development loan can be made privately before the Government undertakes to make it. This is important language. It is intended to gear in the private system more systematically than in the past. I would like to compliment the very capable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] for his accomplishment in steering this amendment through the committee and to thank him for it.

To say, however, that this program has to be eventually phased into the private sector does not go so far as to suggest that the development loan program be literally scuttled. If the development loan program has any merit to it at all it should not be chipped to death by these amendments.

I have always supported the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] during the last 2 years on the subject of back-door spending, but I do not think his well intended effort has a place here. When this amendment is combined with the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] and carried, under which, as far as I can see, no development loan could be granted for a small school building in Guinea, to name one example, plus the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] and carried—and I might add that the 2-percent amendment by itself probably is not devastating—and you have in the total combination a hamstringing that can end the usefulness of the program.

Several days ago I participated in special orders on the floor. I said I agreed with the Clay Committee report, but as a matter of tactics I wondered if the administration was so smart in adopting it as their own as fast as they did—in about 12 hours. They should have known this would whet a few appetites.

I as a Member on the minority side, not a member of the committee, would like to take these few minutes in order to support the ranking minority member and other minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have worked with the majority members in order to slice this bill down, but not to kill it. They have insisted on selectivity in its application, on loans rather than grants, on tightening it up and phasing parts of it out. They have cut it down, substantially. We are making a shambles here of this bill with the result that the entire development loan section will be placed in jeopardy.

I wish that more Members had been on the floor yesterday when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] spoke. He addressed his remarks to the job the committee has done to better the program, to cut it, narrow it, define its points and improve its administration. He and some others, like the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], have done a constructive job and should be supported.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to say to the gentleman that under the amendment I proposed and which the committee adopted it would be possible to build that school in Guinea of which the gentleman spoke. The other 50 percent of the loan fund would be available for that.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, I understand that, but 50 percent would not be.

I think the time has come when it is important to stand by the committee which has cut this measure down as far as it should be cut at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing this program yesterday with my delightful friend and colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], we spoke about proposed amendments to this foreign aid bill, and he assured me that the amendments in his opinion were designed to perfect the legislation. I knew at the time that he was not for the foreign aid bill, but I was willing to accept at that point his evaluation of the amendments that were to be presented today as being perfecting amendments. With the last amendment that was adopted, you do not perfect foreign aid. You guarantee its failure.

We paved the way to defeat foreign aid, whether by votes on this floor or by the judgment of world opinion upon the actions of this Congress. I cannot really believe that is the objective of those who are voting for and supporting these vicious amendments. Your actions have invited the Communist press to headline the passage of this and the last amendment to the foreign aid bill as the "Uncle Midas" amendments. I cannot really believe that all of those who are now voting for these amendments, which have no other end result than to insure the failure of this legislation from now on, have that as their real objective. I care not whether they vote for or against this legislation, let it have a chance to be effective. Either that or let us now cast it aside and see if those who are so violently opposed to foreign aid as we know it today, and which is documented in this bill as it came from the Foreign Affairs Committee, have any alternative. They have not presented any such alternative here on the floor in any of the arguments we have heard so far, no single alternative except to discontinue foreign aid as such.

I, for one, shall watch the final rollcall to see who is sincere in his desire to support foreign aid and foreign policy under the Kennedy administration by the adoption of these so-called "perfecting" amendments.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in response to what has just been said I would say to the gentleman that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana was offered in good faith, and it was offered in the belief that it is a strengthening, perfecting, and improving amendment. As I said when I offered the amendment, I believe it makes the bill a better one. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion, as is everyone in this House, but as for me, I take the point of view that when amendments are offered they are offered in good faith, whether by myself or any other Member of this House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the honor of being the floor manager of this bill in 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. I have had occasion to go down to the White House many times during the last administration in behalf of the foreign aid bill. I devoted all my energy to the fight for foreign aid because I believe it is part and parcel of our security program. I held faith with then President Eisenhower. I was convoyed down to the White House many times and taken in the back door to meet with the President in behalf of foreign aid. I know how strongly President Eisenhower felt about this program.

I can see developing here today in this debate just a tinge of politics. I know President Eisenhower believes in this program. He recommended the establishment of the Development Loan Fund in 1957. This is not back-door spending; this is a revolving fund.

We are losing sight of the real reason for foreign aid. It is part and parcel of our own security. Nobody ever fought harder for this revolving fund than the great John Vorys, of Ohio, who served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for a good many years. He fought for this principle.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman never said truer words. He would say that if he were here today. If he were here we would do differently.

Mr. MORGAN. If he were here, he would fight his very heart out for this principle.

Some new Members have come along since John Vorys left this House, but those who were here know that he understood and supported the principle of the revolving fund for foreign aid. I do not want the gentleman from Washington to be misled. The figure I read of $387 million repayment, includes Marshall plan loans—not just development loan funds. Including all the Marshall plan loans the repayment this year is $387 million. This amendment does not touch the Marshall plan loans. Next year we expect a repayment of only $36 million in this revolving fund for the fiscal year 1964. You are not saving a large amount of money. For what we are getting overseas in our fight against international communism, this does not cost much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I assume the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Judd, also fought his heart out?

Mr. MORGAN. He certainly did.

Mr. GROSS. And he went right down the drain with the help of the President.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think he went down the drain with the help of the President—he was defeated by the vote of his constituents. Nobody has more affection and respect for Dr. Judd than I have.

Mr. GROSS. I am well aware of that. Will the gentleman yield further, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Vorys, when he was here, the national debt was somewhere around $286 billion and we did not have any imbalance in our trade and the outflow of gold the way we have today.

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes, we did; we have had an outflow of gold nearly every year since 1949.

Mr. GROSS. Not the way it is today, because today the gold reserves are at the lowest point since 1939.

Mr. MORGAN. I am talking about the outflow of gold.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I know my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, would not want to leave the impression that there was any political tinge to this amendment I put in. I have been fighting for the principle of the appropriation process for years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may have been referring to some other amendment, but I would like him to clear the record on that point.

Mr. MORGAN. I have a great deal of admiration for the gentleman. I know in 1961, when the Treasury borrowing authority was sought to finance the Development Loan Fund, he was one of the strongest fighters against it. I give him credit. He fought for his principles. But I cannot consider that this revolving fund is the same thing as Treasury borrowing. This is a revolving fund and it is not Treasury borrowing.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to say there are four devices we commonly call back-door spending. This happens to be one of them. But I did not want the record to indicate in any way that there was any partisanship in my attitude in this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say, the Committee on Appropriations always considers anticipated repayments when they make their appropriations for the Development Loan Fund. This income is always taken into consideration. This is not a fund that just lies there until the Executive reaches into it and lends it out. These repayments have always been taken into consideration by the Appropriations Committee. I am sure everybody in this House knows the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana who heads that subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for foreign aid. You can be sure he knows every dime that is in this revolving fund and takes it into consideration when he makes an appropriation for the Development Loan Fund.

Please give careful consideration to this vote. This involves a fundamental issue. We are fighting against the most dangerous enemy we have ever faced in our history.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, without in any way discussing the other two amendments that have been adopted and addressing myself solely to the pending amendment, it is my firm conviction that if this amendment is adopted, it will seriously impair the Development Loan Fund.

As I view the world of today, not only we ourselves but future generations are involved. I think everyone knows of my strong convictions, going back to 1934, in an appreciation of the evil mind and intent of the Communists and of the fact that I have always stood for strength. If I am going to err in judgment as a legislator on the question of strength or weakness, everyone knows that I prefer to err on the side of strength. I feel that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power on our part greater than they possess themselves. I feel that the only level upon which we can deal with them is on the basis of self-preservation, because communism has no moral origin and, having no moral origin, it has no level of idealism. However, Communists cannot deny that the law of self-preservation applies to the people of the Soviet Union the same as it applies to the people of any other country, or the people of our own country. Military strength I have always stood for, but in a sense it is negative. Foreign assistance to me has been the affirmative side of democracy in this great battle in this trying period of world history. We know that there are tensions in the Communist orbit. To what extent we cannot fathom now. Time passes and history is being made, being made as we are now deliberating this particular bill. We know there is tension within the Communist oribit. It is our job to explore, to probe, and to capitalize on those tensions in the national interest not only of our own country but of all the countries and peoples who want to be free under their own law.

Coming to this particular amendment, this particular provision was enacted into law under former President Eisenhower. Are we going to deny to President Kennedy what we gave to President Eisenhower? I am not. Others might; I am not. We Democrats loyally supported it only a few years ago. I am not going to say politics, but I see the vote and I see the transformation within a few years. The question enters my mind as to whether, if there were a Republican in the White House, would we see the vast number of Republicans voting here as they have? It is a fair observation. I do not like to talk about a Republican or a Democrat in the White House, but when there is a President in the White House who is either a Republican or a Democrat, he is the President of the United States to me, and I think you all get the importance of that observation. When there was a President in the White House who was a Republican, we on the Democratic side as Members of Congress loyally supported this particular program.

I am not going to talk about the other two amendments, and I do not think anyone's motives should be impugned, and nobody is impugning them. I respect all of my colleagues, even when I am in disagreement with them. I give them credit, as I hope they give me credit, for purity of mind and cleanliness of motive. However, this amendment is not direct Treasury financing or, as others call it, back-door spending. This involves a revolving fund, and we have tens of revolving funds in other agencies of the Government. So, I respectfully submit that this particular amendment will seriously impair a worthy program initiated under a President who was a Republican. The provision to which the amendment is offered certainly should be continued under a Democrat. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must follow the distinguished Speaker of the House in discussing this amendment. I would not presume to do that under ordinary circumstances, but I have been trying for some time to get the opportunity to say a word or two about this amendment. I want to put my 2 cents' worth in and then I shall yield the floor.

I do not think the argument that since this provision was put into the bill under a former President and therefore should stay in now is a sound one. If you want to put it on that basis, then it could be argued that we allowed the former administration about 3 years with this provision and we have permitted the present administration to go along with it for about the same period of time. But just because it was enacted under a previous administration is no argument in favor of continuing it in perpetuity if it is wrong. Let us vote on this amendment on the basis of whether it is a good amendment, whether it is in the best interest of the people of the United States, and not on the basis of what political party will benefit, or on the basis of who supported it 2 or 3 years ago, or who recommended it or who was in the White House when it was enacted into law originally.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good amendment, because I think the Congress of the United States should not abdicate its responsibility to determine how money should be spent to any President, regardless of which party he represents. The Constitution charges Congress with the responsibility of determining what money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States.

It will not damage this program one iota to have Congress reserve to itself the right to determine what part of the loan repayments will be reappropriated from year to year. You may say it is not back-door spending; you may call it a revolving fund. I call it giving the executive a blank check; and and I am tired of voting blank checks to any executive agency of this Government.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the little demonstration a tribute, because frankly I will say to you that on many occasions there is no more political fellow in the House, or one who enjoys being political, than myself, unless from what I read in the papers it is the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HALLECK]. I enjoy a good political fight. I would not deny it. But I want to say to you that under the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration I was down in the well of the House every year for 8 years defending this bill from amendments that I thought would destroy its effectiveness. It is one thing to be political on something that does not matter and it is another thing to be political on something that affects the security of the country. I want to say about my friend from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], who is the ranking member on my subcommittee, that I believe I have not a better friend in Congress than he. I respect him and he can testify himself on matters before the subcommittee we work until we have a meeting of minds.

Every bill that I have brought from that subcommittee to the full committee has come out unanimously. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], has the best of intentions in the world in offering his amendment. I did not support it. If it applied to selected countries, I would have been down here fighting for it. But I think even the gentleman from Indiana will admit that in the case of some countries in Latin America it may force us either to only make 50 percent as many loans as we would have, or make the loans to the very people who are now funneling the money out of Latin America into Swiss banks. The gentleman does not intend that. His intentions are not that at all. But we do not have any selectivity under that amendment. That is why I opposed it, not because I thought there was anything wrong with the gentleman's motives, because he wants to get at the same thing at which I want to get, and that is to put as much money into the private business sector as we can. But, Mr. Chairman, we have got to trust the administrator. If you do not trust the one who is there now, and may I say I do, it seems to me we ought to get one we can trust.

Mr. Chairman, I went along with the various administrators in the other administration. What about this present amendment? Talk about back-door spending. There is $36 million involved. As the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], has said there is a revolving fund and presumably—and if I know the gentleman from Louisiana, and I think I do, presumably he will deduct $36 million in appropriations in order to take care of the $36 million that is coming in, and I think he should, frankly, if he thinks that is the amount they ought to have.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what are we doing here this afternoon? Are we making a fight because it is a lot of political fun on every amendment, or are we going to try to write a bill that once it becomes law it will be in the best interest of the United States of America?

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that a good many of the Members on my left think that if their champion—and I am now looking at my friend who represents the congressional district next to the one which I have the honor to represent from Ohio—if your champion [Mr. GOLDWATER] is elected there will not be any foreign aid. I have news for you. There will be and you will be in here asking for it, or you will be hiding out so he does not know about it, if you do not vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PELLY and Mr. McDOWELL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 155, noes 169.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

REQUEST FOR HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I am going to object to this request on the ground that a number of committees including one of mine have some hearings that are going on tomorrow. I believe Members have been going on the assumption that we were going to take 3 days to consider this bill. We have been adjourning many days here and losing time, and I do not see any reason why we cannot come in at the regular time tomorrow. So, Mr. Speaker, I object to coming in at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ETHICAL CONDUCT IN HIGH OFFICE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in the August 7 issue of the Washington Evening Star there appeared an editorial by Richard Wilson entitled "Ethical Conduct in High Office." This portrays clearly the question surrounding Secretary of Navy Korth's personal involvement in the TFX contract award, the question of whether a person who is involved in any way with a firm negotiating for Government business should place themselves in a position which "tempts dishonor."

The strength of a democracy such as ours rests in no small part in the confidence with which the public views its appointed public officials. Such officials are not subject to removal by vote of the electorate. For this reason it is particularly incumbent upon these men and women to avoid any situation which might in any way cast doubt on the conduct of his office.

We, the citizens, believe in our American democracy. Such faith must and will be justified. For this reason above all others Secretary Korth owes the American people an unqualified pledge, a pledge that a situation such as the one which arose over his involvement in the TFX contract will not repeat itself.

I commend the following article to your attention:

ETHICAL CONDUCT IN HIGH OFFICE

(By Richard Wilson)

The level of indignation on the ethical standards of high officials seems to fluctuate from one presidential administration to another.

This particular comment has only to do with how the conduct of public officials is viewed and reported, not with the substance of an official's ethical conduct.

But it is, at the same time, a strange contrast that there was so much public and press indignation over the conduct of Adolphe H. Wentzell in the Eisenhower administration and so little over the conduct of Fred Korth in the Kennedy administration.

Yet, both are bankers. Both are or were involved in the award of Government contracts to concerns which were doing business with their banks. Mr. Wenzell was a vice president of First Boston Corp., a major financial institution, and gave financial advice to sponsors of the Dixon-Yates contract for a generating plant at Memphis, Tenn., while serving as an unsalaried consultant to the Budget Bureau on the same general subject.

Fred Korth is former president and still a large stockholder in the Continental Bank of Fort Worth, Tex., which made a substantial loan to help keep financially afloat Fort Worth's biggest industry, General Dynamics Corp. Mr. Korth also is Secretary of the Navy. He favored granting an $8 billion contract to General Dynamics for construction of a big new fighter-bomber aircraft called TFX.

Evidence before the McClellan Committee shows Mr. Korth had 16 conferences with and 5 phone calls to "longtime friends" of General Dynamics during the period when it was decided to give the contract to the Fort Worth firm instead of to the lower bidding Boeing Corp.

Some strong statements have been made in Congress on his continuing interest in the bank which made the loan to the company that got the TFX contract. The relationship is called in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "a pattern of activity that compares with the RFC scandals, the activity of T. Lamar Caudle of the Truman era, or the Talbot case and Dixon-Yates case of the Eisenhower administration." It is stated that this is a "real Texas-size scandal."

Whether Mr. Korth was involved in a statutory conflict of interest is something a court could decide, if the matter were of a nature to be submitted to a court.

In this connection the comments of Chief Justice Earl Warren in *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Co.* might be held to be applicable. This case involved the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract in a hot political atmosphere and whether or not the Mississippi Valley Corp. was entitled to $1,867,545.56 in damages. The Court of Claims awarded these damages. But the Supreme Court vacated the award on the ground that the contract was invalidated and tainted by Mr. Wenzell's dual role.

Justice Warren chose the occasion for a Supreme Court sermon on what "conflict of interest" is, and it proved to be a highly moralistic and, some would say, extralegal concept. But it is the law of the land, as interpreted.

To be guilty of conflict of interest, it is not necessary to have been corrupt. It is not necessary to have gained anything personally or to have been promised anything personally. It is only necessary to be willfully involved in a situation that "tempts dishonor."

"The statute," said the Chief Justice, "is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened. It attempts to prevent honest Government agents from succumbing to temptation by making it illegal for them to enter into relationships which are fraught with temptation."

This stern and truly Presbyterian morality sets a high standard of conduct. The logic of circumstances alone is enough, in the Warren version, to taint a public official, for he may be subconsciously tempted to ingratiate himself to sponsors who were in a position to affect the fortunes of himself and his firm.

How many Federal public officials really know what Spartan righteousness the law demands of them? How much longer are they to remain ignorant?

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me, as Vermont's Member in this House of Representatives, to place in the RECORD a joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, approved June 27, 1963.

The resolution urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I, comparable to grants to veterans prior to World War I.

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Whereas the national policy of the United States concerning veterans of the United States has been to grant assistance to them in their declining years by a pension in consideration of their military services in defense of our country; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state of Vermont to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from the State of Vermont.

Approved: June 27, 1963.

THANKS EXTENDED TO RETIRING POSTMASTER GENERAL J. EDWARD DAY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend thanks to retiring Postmaster General J. Edward Day on behalf of myself and the people of the 25th Congressional District of the State of New York.

Postmaster General Day has done an admirable job in handling one of our Government's most difficult Departments. Many innovations to the national postal system have been a direct result of his personal interest and diligence. Employees of the postal service have been provided with the most modern types of equipment available, resulting in improved working conditions for them as well as increased productivity and service. Many self-service operations have been introduced to improve service to patrons and reduce post office costs.

Mr. Day has served in his post in what to me has been an impartial manner, without regard to political affiliation. He has done a most commendable job.

I personally wish Mr. Day well on his return to private life. The Congress, as well as the people of this country who have benefited from his tenure as Postmaster General, will join with me, I am sure, in extending our appreciation to J. Edward Day for his outstanding service to his country.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the civil rights march on Washington comes and goes without violence, the entire Nation will heave a sigh of relief and especially those of us in Washington. Predictions as to the crowd range from 100,000 to 300,000 people.

Every mass gathering has the potential for violence. Crowds at sports events easily reach the frenzy pitch. We quickly roar disapproval of the umpire, or what appears to us to be unfair tactics by one of the players. Even the best-mannered crowds can quickly get out of hand.

The crowd is added to the movement of people and cars which keeps Washington in a near traffic jam perpetually day and night. A few people of the lunatic fringe—and every mass gathering has its lunatic fringe—can quickly cause friction, disorder, and violence.

The demonstration occurs just 100 years after the great conflict which ended slavery in the United States. It will start at the Washington Monument grounds and end at the Lincoln Memorial.

These two monuments remind us of our struggle for freedom. George Washington commanded the armies that broke with British tyranny and established a government founded on the unique principle that government itself is instituted to protect the freedom and rights of the individual citizen. Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation which freed the slaves just 100 years ago.

I am showing visitors to my office a yellowed document I acquired several years ago: A bill of sale for five Negro slaves, dated 1806. It is a relic of a sorry past, and shows we have come a long way in providing equal rights to all Americans.

Wednesday's demonstration is a vivid reminder that we still have some miles to travel.

SEE AMERICA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the current deficit in our balance of payments is a matter of concern to all Americans. My colleagues have ably demonstrated the measure under consideration today—the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—will not measurably affect our balance-of-payments problem—and this is one of the reasons I intend to support the bill.

However, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon the Congress to continue to focus its attention on the balance of payments. To help alleviate this situation, the Federal Reserve Board raised the discount rate in mid-July from 3 to 3½ percent. Although the increase was instituted specifically to remedy the balance-of-payments problem, there have been serious apprehensions that this action would also have a harmful effect on the domestic economy. We must, of course, make a concerted effort to reduce this deficit, but—and I emphasize this Mr. Speaker—we must concentrate our efforts in areas which will not have a dilatory effect on our economic recovery.

There are balance-of-payments items in which the deficits have been chronic; in other areas, the surpluses have not been sufficient. In many of these areas, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Congress can initiate action which will reduce the current deficit and eventually produce a surplus. In the next few weeks, I will submit measures designed to accomplish this goal. These bills will deal with problems such as U.S. tourist spending overseas, offset defense spending, incentives to exports, and others.

Today I am introducing a resolution directed at the burdensome annual deficit in tourist spending on travel and transportation overseas. In 1962, U.S. residents spent nearly $2.9 billion for foreign travel—an increase of more than 10 percent over 1961. The Treasury Department estimates that the deficit in this category last year was $1.4 billion—approximately half the total dollar loss in 1962. And data for the first half of 1963 indicates that despite our efforts to attract tourists to the United States, there will be an even greater deficit in the travel and transportation item this year.

Several methods to control this deficit have been suggested, Mr. Speaker. One is to place a tax on oversea transportation. In 1962 U.S. residents spent almost $1 billion for foreign travel. It is possible that a tax on transportation could reduce that amount; however, it seems likely that this action would result in immediate retaliation by foreign carriers and, in effect, we would have accomplished nothing.

Another means—now employed by many foreign nations—to minimize tourist expenditures is to place direct controls on the flow of currency. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we should reject this type of measure as not being consistent with the principles of freedom of movement that we have always guaranteed to our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, 1964 will be a crucial year for the U.S. balance-of-payments situation. It is evident that we must make every effort to reduce the deficit arising from U.S. tourism and yet it is also obvious that it is difficult to initiate direct legislative action in this area. Instead, Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the Congress pass a resolution proclaiming 1964 as See America Year—a year in which the President and Congress will encourage citizens contemplating oversea travel to first see the wonderful vistas of the United States.

This is a voluntary approach to the problem, Mr. Speaker but our citizens have always had a deep sense of pride in their Nation and in their heritage. The American people will respond to this appeal from their elected representatives and, in so doing, we will accomplish two important goals. First, we will help to relieve this balance-of-payments deficit item, and, perhaps of greater consequence in the long run, Mr. Speaker, we will help to motivate our citizens to become more familiar with the history and great beauty of our Nation.

Thus, in my judgment, an ideal way to help relieve a serious national problem is to encourage patriotic Americans to see America in 1964.

COLD WAR GI BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the House passed a bill to provide Federal grants and loans for the construction of academic facilities at institutions of higher education. In supporting that bill, I said that it represented an investment program for the future.

Today I have introduced a bill which represents another investment—an investment in the youth of America which has served in the Armed Forces during the cold war. Berlin, South Vietnam, Cuba remind us that we live in perilous times in which our young men have experienced compulsory military service in peacetime. The veterans of the cold war have been called upon to make heavy sacrifices. They should receive readjustment assistance as did the GIs of World War II and the GIs of the Korean conflict.

The cold war GI bill, which I am sponsoring, is a companion measure to S. 5. S. 5 has been reported out of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill is divided into two sections: First, education and vocational training assistance; and second, guarantee and direct loan assistance. The conditions of eligibility for both sections are active duty in the Armed Forces for more than 180 days between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, the date of termination of the Selective Service Act, and discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. An individual who was discharged or released during the period for service-connected disability would also be eligible.

The period of education or training is not to exceed 36 months and is calculated by multiplying each day of active duty by 1½. For full-time college training the veteran would receive a monthly allowance as follows: no dependents, $110; one dependent, $135; more than one dependent, $160. A veteran must begin his education or training within 3 years after discharge or the enactment of the bill.

The guarantee and direct loans are for the purpose of purchasing homes, including farm homes, and farmlands, livestock, and so forth, to be used by the veteran in farming operations. Banks or other lenders would make loans with the Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate.

With some exceptions the readjustment assistance is similar to that awarded by Public Law 88–2 to veterans of the Korean conflict. The differences are: First, a minimum of 6 months' service on active duty—unless discharged for a service-incured disability—instead of 90 days prescribed for Korean conflict veterans; second, the preservation of the education and training entitlement of career personnel until after their final release from the Armed Forces; third, a requirement that the beneficiary pay a fee—not in excess of one-half of 1 percent of the loan amount—as a prerequisite for the guarantee of the loan or the making of a direct loan; and fourth, unlike the Korean GI bill, no mustering-out pay and no business loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a just bill, and I hope it will receive broad support in the House. In anticipation let us examine some of the arguments which have been advanced against it.

First, it has been said that benefits should not be given to cold war veterans because we are not involved in a shooting war and the present military service does not disturb the lives of men as greatly as did World War II or the Korean conflict. Yet the original GI bill provided benefits to all servicemen and women regardless of whether or not they engaged in actual combat or even left the shores of the United States. Soldiers in a cold war serve their country just as truly as those in a shooting war, and at considerable risk. According to a report of the Department of Defense, since 1946 80,787 servicemen have lost their lives as a result of violence, instrumentalities of war, accident and disease—all in a period of so-called "peace." Korean war casualties are not included in the 80,787.

The cold war GI bill is not intended as a reward but as a means to help the veteran to readjust to society. The serviceman of today finds his life more disrupted and a greater loss of opportunities than did the Korean or World War II servicemen. His period of service is longer—an average of 22.6 months during the Korean conflict and 28.3 months for post-Korean service. But an even more important statistic in determining whether a serviceman indeed has been penalized by lost opportunities is the percentage of men rendering substantial military service. For 1963 this figure is 45 percent and by 1965 it is expected to be below 40 percent. This means that 45 percent or less of American men between the ages of 21 and 26 are serving in the Armed Forces, while the majority of their peers are receiving vocational or educational training or are already establishing themselves in their business, profession, or job. The sacrifices for a serviceman are greater now than during a "shooting war" when a larger percentage of the men of his age are involved. Because of deferments for education, the draft increases the economic gaps in society. Many of those who can afford a college education are protected from the draft. Those who cannot must serve. It is an untenable situation when the man who serves his country is penalized in his life pursuits.

A second argument against the bill is that it amounts to a "free ticket," which will encourage trained personnel to leave the Armed Forces and accept the bill's benefits.

The fallacy of the "free ticket" notion is apparent from the high cost of education today—twice what it was in 1950. Yet the educational benefits under this bill are the same as those granted Korean war veterans. And even for the Korean veterans the funds did not constitute a "free ticket." About 80 percent of the veterans in the program worked in college. If in 1950 only 20 percent of the veterans subsisted on their payments alone, less will be able to do so now.

With the degree of mechanization of the Armed Forces and the new sophisticated weapons systems involved in our defense, the period of training qualified men has become so prolonged that in some field careers men have become a necessity. Instead of inducing men to leave the service, why should it not be an inducement to join the Armed Forces in order to take advantage of the bill's opportunities? It should stimulate a desire to serve at least longer than the 6-month trainees under the Reserve program who would not be eligible.

Finally, this bill provides that persons who choose to pursue a military career would have their benefits preserved. This should encourage those who wish to serve longer to do so without losing their chances for further education.

If this bill does serve as a siren to a few, these individuals will still provide a pool of trained manpower, better trained in some instances because of the higher educational level attained as a result of the bill's benefits.

A third opposing argument is the cost—an estimated $289 million annually. However, the same Veterans' Administration, which objected to the cost at the hearings on S. 5, on June 22, 1954, the 10th anniversary of the World War II GI bill, issued the following statement:

> Through the GI bill the World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States. Because of their training, they have raised their income level to the point where they are now paying an extra $1 billion a year income taxes to Uncle Sam.
>
> At this rate, GI bill trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, the losses sustained by the Veterans' Administration under previous GI loan programs are one-fifteenth of 1 percent, a record to be envied by any commercial banker. But under this bill the one-fifteenth of 1 percent loss will be covered by the requirement that each beneficiary pay a guarantee fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the loan.

Mr. Speaker, the cold war GI bill offers many advantages. One is in the area of employment. While we are suffering from 6 percent unemployment, numerous skilled jobs are going begging. In the skilled trades 250,000 workers must, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, be trained every year just to maintain our present skilled forces, without allowing for expansion. Our present supply of skilled labor is only about 20 percent of that needed. The Labor Department expects a weekly average of

49,000 peacetime veterans to file unemployment claims—a total of 350,000 claims in fiscal year 1962.

Not only will the veterans benefit by this training, but the country will find it has a larger stock of skilled workers, which it so sorely needs. There is no market for unskilled labor today, but there is a demand for capable, well-trained people.

A look at the World War II GI bill will show that this bill is an effective method of relieving unemployment and producing the skills America needs. The World War II bill raised the average educational level of veterans by a full three grades—from the second grade of high school to the freshman year of college. It trained 18,000 doctors and registered nurses, 113,000 physical and research scientists, 450,000 civil engineers, 36,000 clergymen, and 711,000 skilled mechanics.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves congressional support. It is a method of compensating our cold war veterans for their sacrifice of time which otherwise might have been spent in furthering their education or careers. The bill will help to create full employment and will advance education. Finally, it will strengthen America in her greatest struggle—the cold war. For as Senator WAYNE MORSE said about S. 5:

> It is not just a bill to help the young men drafted for cold war defense needs to resume their civilian life; it is needed to give us at least some of the trained minds we must have to fight the cold war at all.

SAWTOOTH NATIONAL PARK URGED

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the Sawtooth Mountains of Central Idaho are unsurpassed in magnificent mountain scenery and picturesque lakes. Miss Lena Shoup, an early visitor to the area, wrote the following impressive account of the Sawtooth area nearly 50 years ago:

> The first glimpse of the magnificent Sawtooth Mountains is one never to be forgotten. A sharp turn in the road brings the first view—you see them as through a vista—this noble range so truly named and so stately with its sharp snow-capped peaks. At the little village of the Stanley one finds a warm welcome, and after a refreshing rest we again start on our journey, a journey still of interest but so unlike our river trip. The arrival at Campers Park and Redfish Lakes again brings keen delight, for this is truly a glorious wonderland. The exquisite setting of the Redfish Lakes is quite beyond description, the great trees towering over these emerald ports and the lofty mountains forming a most fitting background of this artwork of nature. A few hours more of driving brings one to the pass in the Sawtooth Range between Salmon River and Wood River, called Galena Summit. It seemed we saw worlds during our 2 days' drive; think what could be seen in a 10-day outing there.

The future of this glorious wonderland is being charted now. On September 4, the Forest Service is scheduled to hold hearings in Boise, Idaho, on their proposal to change the status of the Sawtooths from a "primitive area" to a "wilderness area." Everyone who is interested in the Sawtooths and their potential must now decide what course of action they favor in regard to this outstanding area.

Mr. Speaker, after careful study, I am convinced that the Sawtooth's contribution to Americans and to Idahoans will be greatest as a national park. Therefore, I am proud to join the ranks of great Idahoans who have supported and do now support a Sawtooth National Park.

It was in 1913 that Representative Burton L. French first proposed a Sawtooth National Park. In following years, others from the Idaho congressional delegation, including the Senators William E. Borah and James P. Pope, and Congressman Addison T. Smith introduced legislation to authorize a Sawtooth National Park.

I was particularly intrigued with the qualified description of the chief geographer of the United States, who, on December 1, 1915, reported:

> This section of the Sawtooth Range is unusually striking in mountain sculpture and is a brilliant composite example of the characteristics of three of the main mountain ranges of the United States. The southern portion strongly resembles the Rocky Mountains in Colorado, the middle section is a counterpart of the Sierra in California, and the northern end is a rugged brother of the Cascade Range in Washington. The lakes are rare in their brilliant transparency, reflecting the mountains and the black pine forest fringing their edges, making most inviting places for campers and tourists to rest and enjoy nature in all its glory.

Twice in 1915 and 1917 the Idaho State Legislature memorialized the Congress of the United States to create a national park in this area. Woodrow Wilson's administration endorsed its establishment and on January 25, 1917, the first favorable report was written on a bill to create a Sawtooth National Park. Time passed but interest never lagged in this great proposal and on April 7, 1960, Senator FRANK CHURCH introduced a bill to authorize a feasibility study of the proposed Sawtooth National Park.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it absolutely clear that I am not opposed to the wilderness concept nor am I opposed to the Forest Service's program of multiple-use management of forest resources. I support both wilderness and multiple use in their proper place. However, in Idaho we presently have both but we do not have a national park. When we consider that the proposed Sawtooth National Park would encompass approximately 200,000 acres, and that the Forest Service presently administers 20,300,000 acres in Idaho including 988,000 acres in wilderness area, 1,642,000 acres in primitive area and a balance of 17,670,000 acres in a general multiple-use status. Therefore, the approximately 200,000 acres we are considering for a Sawtooth National Park represents less than 1 percent of the Forest Service lands in Idaho.

I support a Sawtooth National Park because a national park preserves in public ownership areas that are outstanding for scenic, natural, recreational or historical values for all Americans to enjoy.

However, at the same time, it has been proven that national parks have a stimulating effect on the economy of a region.

Investigations made in several parks have shown that commercial enterprises have expanded and new enterprises have been developed adjacent to the parks to meet the needs of park visitors, and that local tax receipts have increased as adjacent property values increased. Also, employment in the region usually increases substantially.

An example of these beneficial effects of national park status is found at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. A reporter from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard recently visited this area and reported his findings. He examined the tax records of Dare County, N.C., where the national seashore is located. He found that total assessed valuation within the county more than doubled from 1950 to 1958, going from $11 million to $25 million. At the same time, tax rates were reduced by 20 percent. The volume of business from the tourist trade almost doubled within a 6-year period in the vicinity adjacent to the national seashore. Bank deposits doubled from 1950 to 1959. While some property was removed from the tax rolls for park purposes, land remaining on the tax rolls showed astounding increases in value as the park increased the general economic activity of the region.

A travel study at Glacier National Park showed that in the 12-month period ending in September 1951 people from all the States, the District of Columbia, Canada, and other countries spent some $4 million in and around the park and spent an additional $8 million in the State of Montana.

A similar survey of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, made in 1956 by State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads, revealed that the 2.5 million people who visited the park during 1 year spent more than $28 million within a 30-mile radius of the park.

The University of Wyoming made an economic study of Teton County, where Grand Teton National Park is located, and found that between 1950 and 1958 trends in a variety of economic indicators were upward. In 1950, the year in which Grand Teton National Park was enlarged, total assessed values of real and personal property amounted to $4.7 million. By 1958 total assessed values increased to $8.2 million. The sales and use tax in Teton County amounted to $76,457 in 1950. Eight years later revenue from this tax had doubled to $153,706. During the 8 years, the permanent population of Teton County increased only 27 percent, but retail sales went up by 79 percent, and bank deposits nearly doubled.

Dr. W. Paul Strassman, of Michigan State University, in a report on economic growth in northern Michigan, pointed out that the leading industry of that region is the tourist industry and that it is more profitable than either mining, manufacturing, or agriculture. He stated that the main attraction of northern Michigan is "relief from the noise and tensions of city life at a cool expanse of forest and water." His conclusion as to the major step that could be taken to stimulate and promote economic development in the region was:

> If parks and recreational facilities are expanded generously, tourists will spend 100 to 150 percent more money in 1970 than the average of 1954–56. An area with a major industry that is likely to expand two or three times as fast as the national economy may, in this respect, consider itself fortunate.

Studies made at State parks have also shown the importance of parks in the economy of the surrounding area.

A banker living near Porcupine Mountains State Park in northern Michigan wrote that the park had established itself as an economic benefactor for Ontonagon County throughout the four seasons. According to his article in the magazine Michigan Conservation:

> Use of park facilities generates employment and new income for the service industries of the entire area. Serving as a major local attraction, the Porcupine Mountains State Park has acted as a catalyst in motel and cabin construction. Expenditures by tourists represent a sizable chunk of new and primary money that has been pumped into the economic bloodstream of the area, which to a very substantial degree helps stabilize and expand the country's economy.

Dr. Maurice Goddard, secretary of Pennsylvania's Department of Forests and Waters, in a speech at Angola, Ind., on February 23, 1961, said:

> The fact that the recreational facilities in a park draw from a wide area has served as a great economic boost to communities located near them. Presque Isle State Park on Lake Erie, for instance, was directly responsible for $10 million in new business last year for the city of Erie according to the Erie Chamber of Commerce. Indirectly, the benefits of recreation in the Erie area alone, totaled $33 million in 1959. The resulting impact on land values is interesting. At the new Gifford Pinchot State Park, south of Harrisburg, for instance, land values have more than tripled since the park was first announced and placed under construction. We took 2,300 acres out of tiny Warrington Township to create the park, yet the tax revenues in the township today are more than before we acquired the land. There is a very measurable economic dimension to recreational development and communities that ignore it are only denying themselves some very real benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the above is ample evidence of the stimulating effect that a national park has on an area. That the people of Idaho are aware of this effect is evidenced by the following paragraph from a letter I recently received from N. E. Van Sant, of Boise, Idaho:

> I had the pleasure of attending the opening ceremony of Old Faithful Inn in Yellowstone National Park early this May. One of the speakers was Thomas M. Murphy, director of State and community affairs for Western Air Lines. Mr. Murphy told of the package tours being put together by the airlines and travel agencies, and explained how they will bring more guests not only to Yellowstone Park, but will take them on to Glacier National Park in Montana and Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming. I waited and waited and waited for him to say where in Idaho these package tours would bring these needed extra tourists, but I waited in vain, for Idaho wasn't even mentioned. It seems we lack that magic word "national park" that seems so necessary to attract the vacationing tourist.

In the creation of a national park in the Sawtooths we do not face the multitude of problems that are often faced in the birth of a national park.

The land that would be included in such a park is presently all or nearly all federally owned, depending upon the finally determined park boundaries.

The area is limited in its multiple-use value other than for scenic use. There are no active mining operations in the area. There are no lumbering or timber operations being carried on in the area. Grazing is limited to a permit for some 9,600 sheep and a few horses, used by vacationers, and hunters, that graze within the area during short periods of the summer. There is no private property included within this area.

In addition to the national advertising including designation on all future maps and road atlases, national park status would provide for full development of the area for scenic value, including necessary roads and facilities to enable people to fully enjoy the Sawtooths as they now enjoy Yellowstone in Wyoming, Glacier in Montana, and the Olympic Peninsula in Washington.

When we further consider that nearly 90 million Americans visit the national parks annually and a great many of these spend their entire vacation traveling from one national park to the next, Idaho is missing a great economic potential by not having a national park. It is interesting to note that Idaho and Nevada are the only Western States without a national park.

The establishment of a Sawtooth National Park would entice many of the tourists who presently go from Yellowstone to Glacier and on to Washington State and others who presently travel from Yellowstone to the Utah national parks to spend a couple of days in Idaho visiting the Sawtooth National Park. Tourism is already a major producer of income in Idaho. A Sawtooth National Park would result in the increased business of the motel, service station, cafe, and servicing industries of the State of Idaho. Every small businessman knows that these tourist dollars benefit the entire economy of the State.

Idahoans in return would share the Sawtooths with Americans from throughout the United States who would enjoy a scenic beauty that is unsurpassed. Everyone who has visited the area raves of the majestic ruggedness of this great mountain range and the unsurpassed beauty of its lakes.

Not only Idaho, but the Nation as a whole would benefit from a Sawtooth National Park. However, we must decide the fate of the Sawtooths. Should they be left as at present a "primitive area" with limited access and facilities and no advertising? Should they be transferred from their present "primitive area" designation to a more permanent "wilderness area" status? Or finally should the Sawtooths be elevated to full national park status including the access roads, facilities and national advertising that would result from national park status?

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the latter. I am fully convinced that a Sawtooth National Park is in the best interests of Idaho and the Nation. Therefore, I am going to introduce legislation authorizing the creation of the Sawtooth National Park.

MINE SAFETY—H.R. 23

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States I have been trying to have adopted by the Congress an amendment to the Mine Safety Act which would cover title I mines under the Federal coal mine inspection law.

Up to this date the best we have been able to get is a bill as far as the Rules Committee. This year hearings have again been held on this legislation and we are hopeful that we can persuade the Rules Committee to join us in our efforts to stop the useless loss of life and the numerous injuries to coal miners working in mines employing 14 or less employees.

All of us were shocked a few days ago by the entombment of three miners in a small title I mine where the miners have been denied the benefits and protection of Federal mine safety inspection.

We are still hopeful that through the efforts of the United Mine Workers of America who, disregarding the fact that these miners are not members of their union, are putting an all-out effort forward to save these entombed men. From President John L. Lewis, through Tom Kennedy, and now under W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers, this organization has made a valiant effort to convince the Members of Congress that their sole interest in the passage of this legislation is in the welfare of the mineworkers, union or otherwise.

I believe the unselfish action of President "Tony" Boyle and his officers and members in working around the clock, giving all of their knowledge, and their own finances to the rescue work in this incident proves to the "doubting Thomases" the sincerity of the mineworkers' plea for mine safety legislation.

H.R. 23 needs support and it needs it from the Members of this Congress, particularly those among us who have coal mines in their districts. To show you how serious this matter is, I have been informed that at one stage hope was given up as to the possibilities that the men were still alive. The shaft was to be sealed and after a period of 30 to 40 days they would sink a new shaft to recover the bodies.

Joseph Fellin, a brother of one of the trapped men, approached the United Mine Workers of America officials in that area Friday night and asked them for their aid in continuing the rescue operation.

Mr. Martin Brennan, president of district 7, United Mine Workers of America; Mr. Emmett Thomas, and Mr. Boley Overa, international representatives of United Mine Workers of America, agreed that the plain bore hole drilling method was feasible. They in turn contacted President Boyle in Washington who instructed them to continue this work until these coal miners had been found. He also assigned Louis Evans to the area, who was former State secretary of mines, to render whatever assistance would be necessary for carrying out the drilling.

Again I wish to remove any doubt by some Members of Congress as to why the United Mine Workers of America has been supporting a bill which would place title I mines under the Federal coal mine safety law.

The action that is now being taken by the United Mine Workers organization in the rescue of these entombed men, who are working in this nonunion operation, should prove beyond any doubt that their only concern is the safety of each and every coal miner in the country.

This legislation has been introduced by many Members of the Congress, including such stalwarts in this Congress as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. THOMAS MORGAN, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee from the soft coal region of Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD, representing the hard coal region, the site of this disaster. Both these men have given of their time and efforts over the years sponsoring and supporting this legislation.

The inquiring reporter, Robert J. Salgado, from Philadelphia, has covered the story of the trapped miners which I believe should be made part of the RECORD at this time:

TWO TRAPPED MINERS DIRECTING RESCUE; FEAR GROWS FOR THIRD

(By Robert J. Salgado)

HAZLETON, August 19.—In an epic of courage, two miners trapped 300 feet underground directed their own rescue late Monday as fears were expressed for a third man buried behind a pile of debris.

David Fellin, 58, of Sheppton, part owner of the mine, and Henry Throne, 28, of Hazleton, were reported in good spirits. They directed rescue workers by a microphone lowered to their tunnel where they have been prisoners since last Tuesday.

But H. B. Charmbury, State mining secretary, said he was "quite concerned" about Louis Bova, 52, of Pattersonville, who was injured slightly in the cave-in and is cut off from Fellin and Throne by a wall of rubble.

BOVA SILENT

Fellin said via the loudspeaker to the surface that he and Throne have been talking to Bova at intervals, and that the miner apparently suffered an injury to his hip in the rockfall.

At last report, Bova had been silent for nearly 8 hours, but may have been asleep. It was additionally feared he may be in shock.

Fellin and Throne, rested and cheerful after their subterranean ordeal, cautioned workers on the surface to drill slowly down to them to prevent a recurrence of the cave-in.

MISSES MARK

A 6-inch hole being drilled to Bova's side apparently missed its mark and veered away to follow a line of rock stratum. The drill was recovered, and a second hole was begun 10 feet away from the first one at 8:32 p.m. It took 12 hours to drill the tiny hole to the two other men.

Fellin and Throne, meanwhile, had finished shoring up their side of the tunnel and reported to the surface that they were going to try to reach Bove, trapped across a 12-foot-wide mine slope.

HUGE DRILL

Above the trapped men, a huge drill capable of boring a 2-foot hole in the earth was being moved into position, scheduled to start operating at midnight.

The giant boring machine was rushed to the scene from Scranton. The machine will first drill with a 12¼-inch bit, which was flown from Dallas, Tex., and then will enlarge the opening with two wider bits.

The second bit was en route from Clearfield, Pa., and is 17½ inches wide. The third and final hole, through which it is hoped the miners will reach the surface, will be bored with a 24-inch bit. This was to be flown in from Los Angeles. The airplane carrying the largest drill was scheduled to arrive at International Airport in Philadelphia at 1:08 a.m. Tuesday.

DETERMINATION GROWS

Gone was the jubilation that arose when it was reported late Sunday night that the men had been found alive. In its place was a sense of grim determination as scores of volunteers and miners began the gigantic task of getting them out.

Relatives and friends of the trapped men continued their vigil, occasionally conversing with the men over the microphone setup.

Most of them wept openly and unashamed when word spread that the miners were alive. Nearly all of them offered thanks to God.

THERE'S A GOD

Fellin, speaking in a distorted voice to the surface crowd.

"If you don't believe in God, go through a thing like this. Then you'll know there's a God."

After the trapped miners were discovered, food, water, blankets, first-aid supplies, cigars, and the microphone were lowered into the first hole where Fellin and Throne were imprisoned. Fellin and Throne then took a nap.

The nap lasted into early Monday afternoon, after which Fellin gave instructions on where to drill the escape hatch.

He said not to worry about himself and Throne as they had about 9 feet in which to maneuver.

A mining official reported the distance down the slope was 420 feet. He said some timbers had "kicked out" on the east side of the slope, and the resultant fall of timbers, rock, and coal blocked 330 feet of the shaft. The fall, he said, was blocked by broken timbers and huge pieces of coal some 70 feet above the gallery where the men took refuge.

Fellin and Throne reported they were shoring up the gallery where the drill hole had reached them. At 3:10 p.m. Fellin reported the microphone had fallen apart.

"Do you have a new speaker up there," he asked. "This one's got three holes in it."

The speaker had been sent down the 6-inch hole about 2 a.m. Monday because the men's natural voices became muffled in the long trip to the top of the hole.

BOVA SILENT

Fellin reported later Monday that he had not talked for hours to Bova, separated from him by about 25 feet, but presumed he was sleeping.

He said he and the others jumped for the galleries when the mine started to fill up.

PERSISTENCE PAYS

The fact that the men were reached at all is a tribute to the hopeful persistence of friends and relations who insisted that rescue attempts continue even when plans had been talked over for abandoning the effort last Friday.

Black damp had been seeping from the collapsed slope and some experts believed it was impossible for the men to have survived this even if they had been unhurt in the fall.

A hose line still led into the mouth of the slope to force out the deadly black damp gas as the drilling continued.

Only workers and relatives were permitted in the area of the rescue operations. State police threw up roadblocks to keep curious at a distance.

CLOSED IN 1961

The mine, operated by Fellin, is owned by Gene Gibbons, who is not a miner.

Boley Overa, international representative of district 7, United Mine Workers, at Hazleton, said the mine had been closed in January of 1961 because of water.

He said Fellin went down in March to drill holes to get some of the water out and continued his visits 1 or 2 days a week.

Work of getting coal out of the mine was started on a steady basis a month ago.

DRILLING HOLES

The three men went down at 7 a.m. Tuesday to the bottom of the slope to drill additional holes to let water out. Two hours later the cave-in occurred.

Later, Fellin's brother, Joseph, went to the UMW and asked for help. Joseph, an experienced miner, has been retired. Overa said the UMW prevailed upon the State to find the equipment and drill the exploratory holes.

The first drilling rig started at 7:30 p.m. It came from Scranton. The other rig was brought in from Pittsburgh and began drilling at midnight Saturday.

THE DELAWARE STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE REBUTS LIFE MAGAZINE

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for several months, the public has been consistently exposed to concerted efforts by certain national organizations and lobbyists clearly designed to degrade in the public mind various Federal programs and agencies which have effectively served the public in the national interest through the great depression of the 1930's, several wars, and several recessions. Many Members of Congress believe that sound public policy, mercy, sympathy, and humaneness require that assistance be extended to millions of Americans who have yet to share fully in the gains of our affluent society. The great majority of voters, I am sure, share the concern held by many Members of Congress as to the disturbing and shocking school dropout problem, youth unemployment, lack of job opportunities, and the antisocial behavior which is rooted in large-scale unemployment and the deprivation and disappointment that accompany it and for which our society pays an unnecessary high price.

The U.S. Employment Service has been helping people find new jobs in those areas of commerce and industry where automation has now become an important factor in job dislocations. It has been signally successful in alleviating the human distress, loss of employment, and loss of livelihood caused by automation. That automation has become a matter of major concern in our onrushing industrial society is reflected by Life magazine which reported in an earlier issue that "today the machines are marching against the blue-collar workingman and the battle is elemental—the struggle for survival."

Unfortunately, nobility of concept, a trait normally exhibited by Life magazine, was conspicuously missing in the August 16 issue. In this particular issue the U.S. Employment Service was the victim of distorted reporting.

In a recent letter to the editor of Life magazine the chairman-executive director of the Employment Security Commission of the State of Delaware, Mr. Joseph A. Bradshaw, offered a rebuttal to these distortions, a rebuttal based on facts as they relate to the true role and activities of the U.S. Employment Service and its affiliates in the several States and territories.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Mr. Bradshaw's letter for the information of my colleagues, since Life magazine has not seen fit to print it:

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION,
Wilmington, Del., August 15, 1963.

Mr. EDWARD K. THOMPSON,
Editor, Life Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In brewing up your imaginary "pork casserole" your staff apparently closed its eyes to the ingredients on the label of the U.S. Employment Service, otherwise it is hard to imagine how the USES meets the requirements for such a poisonous potpourri as you have tried to concoct.

It is also hard to understand how a magazine such as Life can show so much insight, understanding and compassion in one issue, then turn around and show such a complete lack in a subsequent issue. Recently you presented a large, comprehensive and detailed study of automation and its effect upon employment. Your presentation was worthy of the highest praise. Why the about face? Why attack an agency in the forefront of the battle to help today's bewildered displaced and disoriented worker who can not earn a living through no fault of his own except that he is more expensive than a machine?

Life makes several basic errors, both of fact and of background, in its brief but powerful diatribe against the public employment service, which nevertheless is one of the most important stabilizing forces in our economy. It's a pity that such talents for polemics cannot be used on more deserving victims. Among the most important errors Life makes are:

1. Comparing the job assigned to the U.S. Employment Service in 1933 to its many diverse functions today is like comparing an abacus to an electronic computer. Such a comparison shows either lack of knowledge and insight or a complete disregard for the realities of those bitter years of the great depression.

2. Comparing the budget of the small pilot operation launched in 1933 to the present budget for a major service agency is like comparing a rowboat to an aircraft carrier. If we were to follow your reasoning to its logical conclusion, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency and the Air Force should be using Roman catapaults instead of guided missiles. In 1933, the USES received a limited budget with which to hire personnel who had none of the necessary background, experience, training, and education required even then. Today personnel requirements are infinitely higher than those required to certify recipients of relief, really the Employment Service's basic function in the 1930's.

3. The characteristics of the labor force and of the unemployed were far different from now. The population was less mobile, most job requirements for industry called for unskilled or semiskilled workers at best; job specifications changed little from year to year; less training or education was required then than today to fill even the best jobs. As a result a reasonably intelligent man then could qualify for a variety of jobs instead of one or two today (none when he has been displaced by machinery and his skill is no longer marketable).

4. Fortunately the meager million-dollar appropriation provided for the USES in 1933 to assist an army of 12,800,000 unemployed was not the only emergency program inaugurated by the Federal Government. There were the WPA, the PWA, the CCC, and other programs designed to provide employment and stimulate business and industry.

5. In 1962, the USES found jobs for nearly 1 million youth and provided special guidance and counseling for nearly 600,000.

6. The USES found jobs for more than 1,300,000 workers over age 45.

7. The USES led in efforts to break down discrimination in hiring.

8. The USES led the attack of problems of the long-term unemployed through the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act.

While the Delaware agency cannot speak for the other States, we can rebut your statements as far as Delaware is concerned. We have no separate offices in slum areas for unskilled labor. All three of the States local offices serve all applicants in the same building and all receive as much service and assistance as this agency is able to provide. None of our offices have special parking facilities for applicants. Approximately 90 percent of our applicants are unemployed and receive first priority consideration. Most of Delaware's unemployed are those who have been laid off for lack of work or are new entrants in the labor market (graduates and dropouts from the State's high schools) who are looking for work. Only 10 percent of our applicants are looking for new or different types of work. We consider it a contribution to society if we can help the individual to better himself and if we can help employers to find the best possible workers.

It is interesting to note that the number of persons working for our Delaware State Employment Service (the State affiliate of the USES) is smaller now than in 1942, when the agency was under the War Manpower Commission. Then the demand for workers far exceeded the supply.

We are convinced that Life would present an entirely different view of the manpower and employment problems facing this country and how the USES is meeting them if you were to make a definitive study comparable to the one you made of automation and its effects on the jobseeker.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH A. BRADSHAW,
Chairman-Executive Director.

STATISTICS USED IN THE FOREIGN AID LEGISLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss further the statistics involved in the question of how much of our foreign aid is actually spent in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate on the foreign aid bill I interrogated the members of the committee in an effort to try to find out just what were the substantiating statistics behind the figure that they used on page 4 of the committee report, which was to the effect:

> It is estimated that 81 percent of the economic assistance funds obligated in fiscal 1963 will be spent in the United States.

And so forth.

Mr. Speaker, some information was provided during that discussion, on page 128 of the committee hearings, and likewise on page 1603 of the committee hearings. The only information, of course, in the report of the committee, as I pointed out yesterday, was page 1731 of the hearings, which turned out to be only in the appendix and consists of an unsigned statement, undated, so we cannot tell very much about it, purporting to be "AID comments on Passman letter."

Inasmuch as the Passman letter apparently was written on April 5, 1963, it must have been after that date, but this entry on page 1730 and page 1731 of the appendix of the hearings is really no more than a statement. The remarks on page 4 of the report really is a restatement of this, and all these are mere conclusions.

I might say that the statement by the witness on page 1603, John O. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, appearing on behalf of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is a bald statement, only it had a different figure:

> An estimated 84 percent of all current aid disbursements are now tied to purchases of U.S. goods and services and the Agency for International Development is seeking ways to increase the percentage to 90 to 95 percent, a step which incidentally considerably reduces the balance-of-payments strain on the U.S. economy.

There is no documentary evidence to support such a statement and, as a matter of fact, it is in conflict with the statement on page 1731.

Going to page 129 of the hearings, we get our first real information, which was provided apparently by Mr. Bell, Director of AID. This is a chart showing foreign assistance program expenditure analysis in millions of dollars, fiscal year 1962, fiscal year 1963—an estimate, by the way—and fiscal 1964, also an estimate.

The chart follows:

Foreign assistance program expenditure analysis

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1962				Fiscal year 1963 estimate				Fiscal year 1964 estimate			
	United States	Outside United States	Total	Percent, United States	United States	Outside United States	Total	Percent, United States	United States	Outside United States	Total	Percent, United States
Economic assistance	922.0	922.0	1,844.0	50	1,327.2	772.8	2,100.0	63	1,564.5	670.5	2,235.0	70
Commodities	517.8	298.0	815.8		963.5	283.2	1,246.7		1,002.0	185.0	1,187.0	
Cash transactions		342.5	342.5		57.0	195.9	252.9		256.0	130.0	386.0	
Contributions to international organizations		119.6	119.6		7.9	106.6	114.5		.5	136.0	136.5	
Other	404.2	161.9	566.1		298.8	187.1	485.9		306.0	219.5	525.5	
Military assistance	1,176.9	227.7	1,404.6	84	1,504.7	290.3	1,795.0	84	1,277.7	237.9	1,515.6	84
Offshore		101.1				113.0				82.1		
NATO infrastructure		35.3				84.8				74.5		
All other		91.3				92.5				81.3		
Total, economic and military	2,098.9	1,149.7	3,248.6	65	2,831.9	1,063.1	3,895.0	73	2,842.2	908.4	3,750.6	76

We find under these statistics the percent of economic assistance which is the program we are talking about, in 1962 50 percent was spent in the United States. The estimate—again only an estimate—for fiscal 1963 is 63 percent, and the estimate for fiscal 1964 is 70 percent.

One has to go back a little bit in the testimony of Mr. Bell to begin to get any reference to an 80-percent figure.

On page 108 of the committee hearings Mr. Bell makes this statement:

> Second. During the present period of U.S. balance-of-payments difficulties, the adverse effect of our aid program must be reduced to the minimum consistent with our foreign policy objective.

If you increase this to 80 percent you are being inconsistent with your foreign policy objectives.

To continue to quote:

> Again, procedures for programing and procurement have been put into effect which have raised the proportion of the 1963 funds that will be spent in the United States to over 80 percent, as shown in the accompanying chart.

The accompanying chart does not show that.

> In 1964 and future years we intend to raise this proportion even further. Expenditures outside of the United States will only be made in cases where program objectives would otherwise be jeopardized.

On page 110 of the hearings, the bottom of the page, is a diagram of procurement in United States under the AID program, which I again point out does not conform with the table that appears on page 29, although it is a little bit consistent, more consistent, because it shows their estimated expenditures in the United States 50 percent, which conforms to that figure for 1962. For 1963 they have 63 percent, which does conform, and the 70 percent conforms. But the next reference in the diagram has this statement, "Obligational basis," and here is the first time we begin to get these 80-percent figures: 81 percent in 1963 and 85 percent in 1964. This is estimated obligation for expenditures in the United States. Here is where a lot of this confusion comes from.

On page 127 of the hearings our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pilcher], interrogates Mr. Bell and asks him about that. On page 127 Mr. Bell says this:

> Mr. Pilcher, if you will note the chart, the expenditures in fiscal year 1962 were certainly not 80 percent in the United States. They were only 50 percent, for the reason that in prior years, when those commitments were made, we did not have the policies that we have today.
>
> Mr. Pilcher. That 50 percent——
>
> Mr. Monagan. What chart?
>
> Mr. Bell. The chart in my testimony, Mr. Monagan, that is after page 11. The statement I made was that, of the funds now being committed in fiscal 1962, we expect that 81 percent of those funds will be spent in the United States. Some of them won't be spent for some time because they are for projects—

And then it breaks off.

The point is this, that the expenditure rate for fiscal 1962, 1963, and 1964 depends to a large degree on obligations that have been committed in prior years. As you blend in your commitments in the contracts where you obligate your new funds you may come in with an 81 percent, but if you are mixing it with a 50 percent you are going to be some time before you reach this so-called 81 percent.

In the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning by Mr. Ames, president of the Investment Bankers Association of America, and Andrew Overby, chairman of the IBA Foreign Investment Co.—this incidentally was on the Interest Equalization Tax Act of 1963—Mr. Overby makes this statement on page 14 of his mimeographed copy:

> It is estimated that something over 50 percent of AID expenditures are currently being spent on U.S. goods, and it is our understanding that an 80-percent target has been set.

I asked him where he got those figures. He said he was not quite sure himself, but it looked like 50 percent was an accurate figure. That is the only accurate figure we have. All these others are estimates, and even that figure of 50 percent is one I questioned. I want to know where are the working papers behind this figure and how these sums have been computed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to try to inform the gentleman about the working papers.

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield when I have finished here, but I am doing this because I want to get information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Part of this confusion arises from narrative statements that have been made by the press and the President.

President Kennedy in his message to Congress on April 3, 1963, said:

> A few years ago, more than half of U.S. economic aid funds were spent abroad, contributing to the drain on our dollars and gold.
>
> Of our current commitments, over 80 percent will be spent—

Note the "will be"—

> spent in the United States, contributing to the growth of our economy and employment opportunities.

It is this kind of very loose presentation that has permitted the press and even the committee to make these statements on the floor of the House to the effect that 80 percent is an actuality, when actually this is only what is anticipated in the future. Indeed, the statement appearing on page 4 of the committee report is highly inaccurate in the light of this. And the statement of AID which appears in the appendix of the hearing is inaccurate and can only lead to a deception as to the real impact of the foreign aid programs on the balance of payments.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am very happy indeed that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki] and I are here to listen to the gentleman because otherwise I doubt that he would have gotten the information that he took the time to seek by making this speech on his special order. I am sure he would have gotten it anyway, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. I will say this to the gentleman. If the committee had given me time during the general debate, I would have been happy to go into this, but I think the gentleman from Florida was here during the debate this afternoon and he could see that there was not much opportunity for Members who were not on the committee, or speaking with reference to a particular amendment, to participate in the debate.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman from Missouri is one of the leaders in this House and I am sure he would not want to leave the impression in the Record or otherwise that he could not be recognized on a pro forma amendment under the 5-minute rule to ask any kind of question he wanted to.

Mr. CURTIS. Not as a matter of procedure—no, but under the circumstances of the debate on these amendments, I did not think it was appropriate to take time on something that was not related to these amendments. My idea was to put this in the Record. In fact, the reason I did not type it out and just hand it in is that I am quoting from about four different documents and I thought it would be best to have it in the Record and then just refer to it tomorrow as I intend to do, so that we could move forward on this. I am very pleased that the gentleman is here because if he can contribute further information in this area, I know I will be very, very happy to get it.

Mr. FASCELL. I will be delighted to offer information on the subject, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. But before I do so, I would like some assurance as to how the gentleman is going to characterize the information because so far I have heard the words "deception," "fraud."

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. And the word "mistake."

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think I have used the word "fraud."

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman used the word "inaccurate."

Mr. CURTIS. But I do not think I have used the word "fraud," I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I am delighted to hear the gentleman is not going to use that word and that no one could infer that. But I do think he did use the word "deception."

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I did. I said what it does is it tends to deceive—and I think it does.

Mr. FASCELL. Which would indicate, as I understand the gentleman's remarks—an intentional desire.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes, oh, yes—I think there is. I think there is an intentional desire.

Mr. FASCELL. Which would indicate, as I understand the gentleman's remarks, an intentional desire on the part of the persons who were testifying.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I think there is an intentional desire on the part of the AID and their public relations department. There is no question in my mind.

Mr. FASCELL. And an intentional desire on the part of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS. No, no.

Mr. FASCELL. Both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I do not say that because I think they were relying on the material and on the statements that were made to them. My criticism of the committee is that they did not interrogate in depth in this area so that we could find out what the situation was. That has been my only criticism of the committee. No, I do not think the committee was doing anything intentional in that way. I think they were relying on the data that AID provided.

Mr. FASCELL. Now on that point then, may I inquire if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Now using the very chart the gentleman uses as the basis for his charge, reading from the chart on page 110.

Mr. CURTIS. That is a graph and not a chart.

Mr. FASCELL. You called it a chart, but if I may use the word that my colleague used.

Mr. CURTIS. I was referring to the chart on page 129, if you are referring to the chart.

Mr. FASCELL. Using the words that the gentleman used, if I may be permitted to do so then, referring to the graph on page 110 of the hearings—are we talking of the same thing?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, we are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri has completed his special order, the House is ready to adjourn. But the motion to adjourn will be suspended if the gentleman cares to ask for additional time, and if he wants information along the line that he has indicated, I suggest the gentleman ask unanimous consent to proceed further.

Mr. CURTIS. If you do not care to make the request, I will do so.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes to get the information because I think he has made some very serious charges.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I have.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has stated that there were inaccuracies in the report.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has stated that there were inaccuracies in the report of the committee and in the hearings by witnesses. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I renew the unanimous-consent request that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes to enlarge on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman questioned the reason why some of the figures differed in the chart on page 4 of the report and on page 129 of the hearings and in the comments of the gentleman from Louisiana's [Mr. Passman] letter on page 1730 of the hearings.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the gentleman knows the reason why the percentage of expenditures of foreign aid money in the United States increased in recent years. It was as a result of the buy-America policy.

Mr. CURTIS. I know what the reason is.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. This policy, as the gentleman knows, was enacted 2 years ago. If the gentleman had read a bit further on page 128 of the hearings, he would have found that Mr. Bell——

Mr. CURTIS. I read it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But the gentleman did not quite finish Mr. Bell's testimony. The gentleman did not read the reply of Mr. Bell to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pilcher]. Mr. Bell states:

> These figures do include an estimate of the amount of money that our employees abroad spend abroad and the amount they return to the United States in savings accounts or for purchases of U.S. commodities.
>
> Furthermore, this incidentally is based on a survey of the actual spending experience of our employees. We have tried to find out from contractors where they spend the funds we make available to them. This estimate has been prepared on the basis—

Mr. CURTIS. Let us go ahead and finish.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. These are the working papers.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us finish the quotation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. But I first want to get the final quotation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pilcher].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pilcher] interrupted and said:

> That is what you hope will be spent.

And Mr. Bell said:

> What the contractors tell us on the average they do spend. We will be glad to supply for the record the further information.

Mr. CURTIS. And "The information is as follows." And the only information is the chart. In this instance it is a chart on page 129, and that is all. There are no working papers, and none of this information is here. There is a blank half page.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Bell never advised the committee he was going to supply the working papers.

Mr. CURTIS. He said we will supply for the record further information, and the only information is this chart here.

The point I am making to the gentleman from Wisconsin is that the only information that follows is this chart which I refer to on page 129, and these are not the working papers, but there is a breakdown, and that is the breakdown, apparently, which is the basis for the graph that appears on page 110 that the gentleman from Florida and I were discussing.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Of course the working papers were not included. The volume of hearings is 1,790 pages long. If the working papers were included, we would have a tremendous volume. But I do want to point out, if the gentleman will yield further, that the chart on page 129 refers only to the expenditures in the United States from the foreign assistance program, both economic and military assistance, including offshore, NATO infrastructure and other military expenditures. The comments on page 1730 of the hearings include beside the foreign aid program, the Export-Import Bank, the food-for-peace program, and the Peace Corps. That is why the percentage is higher in the estimates made by AID on that page.

Mr. CURTIS. Exactly.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman had read AID comments on the Passman letter carefully, he would have known that.

Mr. CURTIS. As a matter of fact, I will say I did read them carefully, and that is why I said some of this is, in my judgment, designed to deceive because it is carefully pointed out, just as the gentleman says, and I will read it, because I have it underlined in my book:

> Most of the expenditures in the foreign aid program are in the United States and do not cause any outflow of gold or dollars.

This I deny and say is untrue.

> The total amount of the U.S. foreign assistance effort [including economic assistance, military assistance, Export-Import bank, food for peace, and the Peace Corps] which is obligated for expenditure in the United States—

Notice the word "obligated," not "expended." This is all in the future—

> is between 85 and 90 percent.

This I do not believe is so. And in this instance I am not impugning motives because I do not know; other than to say that these are unsubstantiated conclusions, and if these are true then the very theory of the foreign aid program is being undermined.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. McDowell, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Giaimo, for 30 minutes, on August 22.

Mr. Morrison, for 30 minutes, on August 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Harding in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Purcell.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Findley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cunningham, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $337.50.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Zablocki) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Macdonald.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 31. An act for the relief of Sonja Dolata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 49. An act to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 71. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 198. An act for the relief of Mother Azucena de San José (nee Carmen Hernández Aguilar); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 202. An act for the relief of Yom Tov Yeshayahu Briszk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 479. An act for the relief of Chung K. Won; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 561. An act for the relief of Karolina Rado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 585. An act for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 669. An act for the relief of Vincenzo DeLucia and Angela DeLucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 789. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Clotilde Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 820. An act for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 838. An act for the relief of George Crokos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1272. An act for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1313. An act for the relief of Tim L. Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1678. An act for the relief of Margaret Ann Cover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1828. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1914. An act to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1942. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing September 8, 1963, as "National Public Works Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7824. An act to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act;

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1366—An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Beg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas;

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carta Gallitto;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;

H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith;

H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski;

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi; and

H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Giazikis.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1140. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for more effective management action to reduce costs by filling private physicians' prescriptions in Veterans' Administration pharmacies under the program for hometown medical care; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1141. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with Evelyn Hill, Inc., Statue of Liberty National Monument, which will extend the expired contract to December 31, 1963, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1142. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1143. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1144. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to further amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6225. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on pulp, paper and board supply-demand (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1576. An act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7235. A bill to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Clerk and the Marshal of the Supreme Court; with amendment (Rept. No. 695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 8185. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 8186. A bill to amend title I, "Tariff Schedules of the United States, of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962," to correct certain inequities in the classification and duty provided for certain aluminum products, television picture tubes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 8187. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the girls' State program of the American Legion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 8188. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 8189. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 8190. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 8191. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the publication or distribution of fraudulent endorsements of candidacies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 8192. A bill to amend the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 to give certain veterans an election as to the pension laws that will be applicable to them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 8193. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 8194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable treatment of capital losses sustained by individual taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 8195. A bill to amend section 510 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8196. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8197. A bill to amend section 510 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8198. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to permit funds appropriated under title III of that act to be used for the acquisition of equipment for use in teaching the English language to students whose pirmary language is not English; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 8199. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, to provide that the Corregidor-Bataan memorial shall include a Corregidor-Bataan Memorial High School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 8200. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.J. Res. 656. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projections, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McLOSKEY:

H.J. Res. 657. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projections, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 8201. A bill for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 8202. A bill for the relief of Josef Enzinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8203. A bill for the relief of Robert Peraza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Democrats Urge Ties With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH R. HARDING
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star, on August 19, carried the following account of resolutions adopted by Young Democrats from 13 Western States in a convention at Berkeley, Calif.:

> DEMOCRATS URGE TIES WITH CUBA
>
> BERKELEY, CALIF., August 19.—Young Democrats from 13 Western States ended their convention in Berkeley yesterday with resolutions concerning Cuba, civil rights, and American military deployment.
>
> A total of 32 resolutions demanded, among other things, that the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba, that the August 28 Negro civil rights parade on Washington be "carried out as planned," that a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations and that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam.
>
> Other points covered included demands for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act, revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, the elimination of compulsory arbitration in strikes and abolition of the death penalty.
>
> The delegates condemned various organizations, the aim of which they said is to limit the civil rights of nonwhites. These included, the Young Democrats said, the John Birch Society, the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Christian Crusade.

I find that I am in personal disagreement with several of the resolutions. While I respect the views of those on opposite sides of most of these issues, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the three resolutions demanding the signing of the nonaggression pact between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations, the resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam are not only unwise but extreme.

I have not hesitated to denounce extremism on the right and point out the folly of withdrawing from the U.N., abolishing the Federal income tax, or impeaching members of the Supreme Court. By the same token I feel I have an obligation to oppose extremism on the left and that is exactly what I consider these three resolutions to be which were reportedly adopted by Western Young Democrats at San Francisco.

When we consider that today the President of the United States with the advice of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Justice Department—including the FBI—is making intelligent decisions on NATO, Cuba, and South Vietnam, I believe that it is not only unwise but extreme for any group of young Americans, be they Democrats or Republicans, to adopt these resolutions that were reportedly adopted at San Francisco.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to completely disassociate myself from these three resolutions. I hope that the various State Young Democrat Committees as well as the National Young Democrats will let the people of America know that they support our President in his decisions on NATO, Cuba, and South Vietnam and disassociate themselves from these three extremist, leftwing resolutions reportedly adopted at San Francisco.

Boyd's Board in Blunderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board is in the midst of another blunder. This time the blunder is a multimillion one. This Boyd Board blunder directly involves the livelihood of 2,100 Northeast Airline employees and irrevocably injures the air service presently being enjoyed by the entire Eastern Seaboard.

The Boyd Board decision, a tragic comedy of error in reasoning, is a matter of grave concern to the people of New England. The present availability of air transportation has enhanced the Greater Boston area as one of the foremost educational, cultural, scientific, and medical centers of the world. Air transportation by three major carriers has helped to make tourism the third largest industry in Massachusetts and the mainstay of the summer economy of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. All the taxpayers of the United States, along with the traveling public in the Eastern Seaboard, have just cause for alarm over a 3–2 Civil Aeronautics Board decision denying Northeast Airlines all routes south of New York.

With his right hand, Chairman Boyd, together with two other members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has taken away Northeast Airline's only lucrative runs. With his left hand, Boyd has gently patted Northeast Airlines and its 2,100 employees with the false reassurance: "Don't worry, the taxpayers of the United States will now subsidize you as a regional carrier." Chairman Boyd's proposed subsidy represents a cost of at least $3.7 million of the taxpayers money. This figure, while being Mr. Boyd's estimate, could possibly exceed $4.5 million, according to the testimony of record in the Board proceeding. The $3.7–$4.5 million price tag is only one aspect of the multimillion-dollar loss engendered by the Boyd Board decision. Chairman Boyd failed to note that Northeast Airlines had saved the taxpayers of the United States some $15 million as a result of their subsidy-free operation of its New England routes during the past 7 years.

The timing of the Civil Aeronautics Board pronouncements is open to serious question. In 1962, the Civil Aeronautics Board approved the acquisition of Northeast Airlines by the Hughes Tool Co. on the basis that it would improve the airline's financial prospects. On July 22, 1963, the Hughes Tool Co. announced that it had put up $26 million to take care of Northeast's debt. Instead of proceeding to examine the effect of this major refinancing, the Boyd Board issued a press release only 4 days later on July 26, 1963, and announced their intention to deny Northeast of all routes south of New York. To add insult to injury, the Boyd Board delivered its "final" decision on the Northeast Airlines case at 10 minutes of 10 on Thursday morning, August 15, 1963. At 10 o'clock that same day, the Senate Aviation Committee was scheduled to hold a hearing on airline service to the New England States.

After reading and rereading the Boyd majority opinion, I was shocked and dismayed with the shallow and shortsighted reasoning expressed by the Chairman of this quasi-judicial agency entrusted with a congressional mandate to safeguard the public interest. The Washington Post, certainly a neutral in this matter, in an editorial of August 17, 1963, entitled "Airline Amputation," stated:

> Issuing what amounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route is a step that should not have been taken without a closely reasoned explanation.

Instead of a "closely reasoned explanation," the Boyd majority opinion is a tremendous display of illogic, inconsistency, and absurdity. The minority opinion correctly concludes:

> The majority decision does not rest upon any major policy grounds. It does not go beyond holding that Northeast shall not be permitted now, and now only, to furnish services in the Boston-New York-Florida markets. It establishes no guidelines, which the industry has a right to expect, as to the degree of competition which the Board will be prepared to consider seriously tomorrow or in the days thereafter.

In order to arrive at its decision, "Boyd's Board in blunderland" opinion is a classic example of circuitous reasoning which undermines past CAB policy and puts a dark cloud on the future of adequate airline service to the people of New England. The CAB's statutory mandate is to apply the test of public convenience and necessity. The Boyd Board's policy in this case does the direct opposite. Instead of carrying out the policy of giving maximum service to the public and assuring a minimum subsidy wherever possible, the Boyd decision drastically minimizes service to the public and greatly maximizes the need for subsidy.

The policy of the President's Interagency Group on Transportation calls for the preservation of competition where the traffic density can support it. The Boyd majority opinion, in complete disregard of the facts presented at the hearing, promotes monopoly in the air routes on the eastern seaboard. The Boyd decision reverses the longstanding policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board of promoting multiline competition on all major routes. Under this policy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has added a third competitive carrier to the 13 routes in recent years, and I point out that all of them are in smaller markets than this one. The two dissenting members of the Board, relying on the facts presented at the hearing, concluded that a third carrier is required as the need for service has greatly increased since Northeast's Florida operation was first approved by a unanimous board.

Chairman Boyd stated that the public benefits anticipated when temporary certification was granted to Northeast have not materialized. The facts presented at the hearing indicate that the direct opposite conclusion is true. The record shows that there are more nonstop flights in Florida operating now than when Northeast received its temporary certification. The record also shows that more cities are being served along the Florida route. The competition engendered by Northeast Airlines has forced National and Eastern to double their schedules. As a result of this competition, the public has been allowed to fly south at convenient times and at prices it can afford to pay. As the dissenting Board members pointed out, the majority opinion now turns the clock back to 1956 with the same stultifying effects on the market which were present that year. The Boyd decision also results in turning over this recently developed and expanding market to just two carriers as a "captive market." Most important, the Boyd decision may strike the death knell for the demise of Northeast Airlines as an operating carrier.

Mr. Boyd also stated that the decision is based on the ground that future prospects for Northeast Airlines are not financially sound. The financial status of Northeast Airlines is not a unique one. It has been shared at various times by one or both of the carriers that are competing with it on the Florida route. Many of Northeast's financial difficulties were caused by the uncertainties brought about by the Board's temporary certification. In handing down the majority decision, Chairman Boyd has failed to take into proper consideration that crucial fact that major refinancing actions had been taken by the Hughes Tool Co.

The Boyd opinion takes away from Northeast the only route over which it can hope to make any profit. The only sentence of the Boyd decision which smacks of reality is the majority opinion's gross understatement that this action "will inevitably have adverse effects on its (Northeast's) employees, the New England communities in which those employees reside, its creditors and its stockholders." The effect on public air service on the East Coast and on the taxpayers of the United States is a staggering one.

I believe that an investigation of the "Boyd Board's blunder" by the Legislative Oversight Committee is in order unless the Board reconsiders this decision. The Legislative Oversight Committee was specifically set up by Congress to oversee the operations of the so-called independent agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board and an investigation of the real reasons behind this erratic decision would certainly be in order.

The Boyd Board decision places an additional burden on the taxpayers of New England on the rest of the United States while at the same time reducing the air carrier service they now enjoy. The Boyd Board decision is a disastrous giant step backward on the promotion of a healthy and competitive public service air system for the people of New England.

Burns Creek Dam Will Stimulate Need for Western Coal Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, Gracie Pfost, a distinguished former Member of this body from the Second District of Idaho, appeared before the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee in support of the much-needed Burns Creek project in eastern Idaho. In her testimony before this great committee of the Congress, Gracie Pfost stated:

> The private power companies from southern Idaho are using coal miners from throughout the Nation to oppose Burns Creek. Mr. Chairman, I want to say here today that this is exactly what the power companies are doing. They are using the coal miners and the coal people for their particular advantage in opposing multiple-purpose projects containing hydroelectric generation. However, these same power companies will not hesitate to build hydroelectric dams themselves—they will not hesitate to switch from the use of coal to pitch or residual oil or natural gas if they can find a cheap source of power for their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I fully concur with these charges that were made by our former distinguished colleague. I know that the record shows that this is true. One of the power companies in question—the Idaho Power Co.—boasts that it is the only major all hydro private power company remaining in America. In other words they do not use any coal. The other company, the Utah Power & Light Co., has eight large steam electric plants. The fuel used in these plants is a combination of oil, gas, pitch, and coal. However, only one of the eight plants uses coal alone. Three of the plants use only pitch and gas. One plant uses only pitch. One plant uses oil and coal. Two plants use gas, oil, and coal. In addition this company has a total of 22 all hydroelectric plants and one large internal-combustion plant. However, it is interesting to note that four of its eight steamplants do not use any coal, relying entirely on pitch and gas. At the same time this large power company has been complaining about what Burns Creek would do to the coal miners, it has not hesitated to switch fuels in its steamplants from coal to pitch, gas, and oil.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested not only in the construction of Burns Creek and other much needed multiple-purpose projects which produce hydroelectric power in Idaho and throughout the Nation. I am also interested in the welfare of the coal miner. I do not believe that there is any doubt among people who know the facts that hydroelectric power produces a need for fuel-generated power to firm it up. In many cases this can and should be power generated with coal.

As has been pointed out many times by our distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Mr. Davis, the largest user of coal in the world today is the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am sure great amounts of coal will be required shortly to firm up the hydroelectric power that is being produced at multiple-purpose projects throughout the West.

In 1956, the Congress authorized the upper Colorado River project. Now we are on the threshhold of the first power coming from this great project and it has created a coal rush in Utah. I would like to ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record the following article by Robert W. Bernick, the business editor from the Salt Lake City Tribune of July 14, 1963:

UTAH COAL RUSH ON—POWER PLAN KEY

(By Robert W. Bernick)

Utah is experiencing a coal rush unique in the history of American mining

By Saturday, prospectors had applied for an estimated 300,000 to 500,000 acres of coal permits, most of them within the Kaiparowits Plateau area of eastern Kane County.

No such volume of coal prospect permits had ever been sought in a single area within a relatively short space of time in the history of the U.S. Department of Interior, the Tribune was told.

And why anyone would seek to prospect for coal—when the coal industry is generally reported to be sick, sick, sick—is something for the average citizen to puzzle about.

But such contact as can be established with applicants—most of them individuals and firms from Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Ariz., Grand Junction, Colo., Denver, Colo., Los Angeles, and even St. Louis, Mo.—discloses a view that something big may be happening in the western energy picture involving coal.

Here is some of the thinking going on in this line.

The completion of Glen Canyon Dam and consequent creation of Lake Powell provokes a future need for parallel supplies of energy from fossil-fueled, steam-electric plants.

This is the history of hydroelectric generation elsewhere in the United States—including the controversial Johnson steamplant, a part of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For steam generation smooths out the peaks of hydroelectrical energy output.

Glen Canyon Dam may have an installed capacity of up to 1,200,000 kilowatts eventually. But its load factor will be at around 58½ percent, according to some engineers. This means that the differential between peak deliveries and firm generation of energy might be as high as 500,000 kilowatts.

On farther south is Hoover Dam, with an installed capacity of 1,344,500 kilowatts and a firm load factor of around 38 percent. This presents an even greater "peak and valley" relationship in energy deliveries.

Conceive of a new desert-spanning grid of 500,000- to 750,000-volt lines wheeling energy from a hydroelectric and steampower complex involving Glen Canyon Dam, Hoover Dam, and coal from southwestern Utah.

That, it is alleged, is what provokes the gleam in the coal prospector's eye. Most important: This may be one means by which the coal people really can compete with growing potentials of nuclear power on the west coast.

If such a Kane County complex were to include Hoover Dam, too, as a balance wheel to peaking problems, then the figures get even wilder and you start talking about 1-million-kilowatt steamplants, etc., and coal reserves of more than 500 million tons.

Actually, the Kaiparowits Plateau may contain reserves of 3 billion tons—but where it is and the cost of mining are key issues which the prospectors must resolve in the future.

The U.S. Geological Survey has set aside two areas—at Last Chance and Warm Creek—on which it says coal prospectors must take leases, rather than the nominal permits. Such leasing involves competitive bidding. Prospectors are challenging this action. These two areas are relatively near the future water sources to be created by Lake Powell.

One individual is permitted only 10,240 acres in both coal leases or prospect permits in Utah—although an added 5,120 acres may be obtained following a public hearing.

Obviously, no power company could control the necessary reserves for construction of hundreds of millions of dollars in generating capacity if such reserves were limited to 15,360 acres. So some change in the leasing and prospecting laws relative to Federal coal laws should be effected if future problems of developing Kaiparowits coal are to be resolved.

The prospect in the Kaiparowits is a heady one. Some 20 individuals and firms are represented in the search for economically minable coal—among them Arizona Public Service Co. of Phoenix; Richfield Oil Co., Sentry Royalty Co., an affiliate of Peabody Coal Co., St. Louis, Mo., and reportedly Consolidation Coal Co.

Others may be speculating on what may occur in the next few years as others prospect. Richfield has a couple of rigs at work in the Last Chance area and drilling reportedly is planned in the Warm Creek region. New roads have been built into the Warm Creek and Last Chance lease areas from near Glen Canyon City, Utah. Approach also may be made from Escalante.

Mr. Speaker, because of the upper Colorado River project, the Palisades project and, yes, in the future, the Knowles Dam in Montana, and the much-needed Burns Creek project in Idaho, thousands of tons of coal will be mined to be used in steamplants to produce power to firm up the hydropower generated at these projects.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are some who say that if it was not for the hydropower that was generated at these projects, that all of the power needs of this area would be supplied with power from steamplants utilizing coal. This simply is not true. We are finding today many farmers are using natural gas to operate farm irrigation pumps, consumers are using gas furnaces, gas air conditioning, and gas appliances because it is cheaper than some of the power rates. On the other hand often a combination of cheap hydropower firmed up with coal-produced steampower produces energy cheaper than gas and is cheaper than power produced with pitch, natural gas, or oil.

Today I have written the following letter to the Secretary of Interior requesting a study on the feasibility of a steam plant to firm up all of the hydroelectric power now being produced in southern Idaho. Such a steamplant would mean work for hundreds of coal miners in Utah and Wyoming.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1963.

The Honorable STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: I would like to request that you consider the possibility of a study of the feasibility of a steam powerplant utilizing coal to firm up all of the hydroelectric power presently being produced at Federal projects in southern Idaho.

It has been called to my attention by reputable engineers that the power produced at Burns Creek and Palisades will have a hydro peaking capacity of 77 megawatts which could integrate successfully with a thermo baseload of 171 megawatts providing a firm load of a total of 248 megawatts.

I am sure you are aware of the great deposits of coal in southern Wyoming and northern Utah that could be utilized for a steamplant to firm up the Palisades-Burns Creek power. Such a coal-utilizing steamplant would employ many coal miners in the area.

Please inform me at the earliest possible date your views on such a feasibility study.

Best personal regards,

RALPH HARDING,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Burns Creek will result in increased employment of coal miners and the increase in consumption of coal just as TVA resulted in the increased consumption of coal in the Southeast. Because the combination of cheap hydropower firmed up with steampower produced from coal provides a firm power system that can more than compete with natural gas, pitch, and oil. Therefore, it is my sincere hope that the coal miners of America will realize that the Burns Creek Dam in Idaho and the Knowles Dam in Montana will result in the need for additional coal throughout the West.

Nebraska Congressional Delegation, 1855-1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska has been represented in the U.S. Congress since 1855. In all those years, the State has had 82 men from four political parties as Members of the House of Representatives, 29 men and women from three parties as Senators, and 6 men from two parties as Delegates to the Congress, before the Territory was admitted to the Union as a State.

No one has served fewer days than our first Representative, Turner M. Marquette, of Plattsmouth. He was sworn in March 2, 1867, and served only the last 2 days of the 39th Congress. He was succeeded March 4 by John Taffe, of Omaha. Both were Republicans.

Longest term of service was by George Norris, with 10 years in the House and 30 years in the Senate. The McCook Republican served from 1903 to 1943.

Representative Moses P. Kinkaid, an O'Neill Republican, served in the House from 1903 to 1922 to set the record for Nebraska service in that body.

Besides Republicans and Democrats, Nebraska has been represented by five Populists and by one Fusionist, Samuel Maxwell of Fremont, who served in the House 1897-99. One of the Populists served in the Senate, William V. Allen, of Madison, while four had House service between 1891 and 1903.

But through the years, Nebraska has had a strong Republican flavor, especially in the Senate. There have been 24 Republican Senators who served a total of 170 years, 4 Democratic Senators who served just under 20 years, and the Populist with 10 years.

In the House, 51 Republicans have served 258 years, 26 Democrats served 127 years, the 4 Populists totaled 15 years, and the lone Fusionist had just the one 2-year term.

Our first Delegate to Congress was Napoleon B. Giddings, of Nebraska City, a Democrat who served in the 33d Congress in 1855. Our first Senators in 1867 were John M. Thayer, of Omaha, and Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, both Republicans.

Our Delegates had some unusual names. Besides Napoleon Giddings, there was Bird Chapman, of Omaha; Fenner Ferguson, of Bellevue; Experience Estabrook, of Omaha; Samuel G. Daily, of Peru; and Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha.

Hitchcock later served as a Senator, and his son, Gilbert, was both a Representative and Senator. I believe this is the only father-son team in our State history who both served in Congress. Gilbert Hitchcock founded the Omaha World, forerunner of the World-Herald.

In 1867 when Nebraska was first admitted to the Union as a State, we had one Representative. The number grew rapidly as settlers moved west into the State until we had six Representatives by 1893, where it remained until 1933. The depression, drop in farm population, and rapid growth of the Southwest and west coast since World War II have caused a decline in our delegation to three Representatives.

I include now a list of the men and women who have served Nebraska in the Congress, including the number of each Congress, years of the Congress, name, home town, congressional district—where appropriate—and party affiliation of each Delegate, Representative, and Senator.

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963

Nebraska Territory was granted a delegate in Congress by Act of Congress, May 30, 1854.

Year	Congress	Delegate
1853–55	33d	Napoleon B. Giddings, of Nebraska City, Democrat. Took seat Jan. 5, 1855.
1855–57	34th	Bird B. Chapman, of Omaha City, Democrat.
1857–59	35th	Fenner Ferguson, of Bellevue, Democrat.
1859–61	36th	Experience Estabrook, of Omaha, Democrat. Served until May 18, 1860, when election was successfully contested.
		Samuel G. Daily, of Peru, Republican.
1861–63	37th	Samuel G. Daily, of Peru, Republican. J. Sterling Morton, of Nebraska City, Democrat, elected Oct. 9, 1860, but 6 months later Gov. Samuel W. Black without any recanvass issued certificate of election to Daily who had months before contested Morton's right to the seat. Contest was never decided, but Daily held the seat under the second certificate.
1863–65	38th	Samuel G. Daily, of Peru, Republican.
1865–67	39th	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican. Served until Mar. 1, 1867.

Nebraska granted statehood on March 1, 1867.

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1865–67	39th	Senate	John M. Thayer, of Omaha, Republican. Elected but did not take seat until Mar. 4, 1867.
		Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican. Elected but did not take seat until Mar. 4, 1867.
		At large	Turner M. Marquette, of Plattsmouth, Republican. Took seat Mar. 2, 1867; served 2 days.
1867–69	40th	Senate	John M. Thayer, of Omaha, Republican. Took seat Mar. 4, 1867 to expire Mar. 3, 1871, as determined by lot.
		Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican. Took seat Mar. 4, 1867, to expire Mar. 3, 1869, as determined by lot.
		At large	John Taffe, of Omaha, Republican.
1869–71	41st	Senate	John M. Thayer, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican.
		At large	John Taffe, of Omaha, Republican.
1871–73	42d	Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican.
		Senate	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	John Taffe, of Omaha, Republican.
1873–75	43d	Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican.
		Senate	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	Lorenzo Crounse, of Fort Calhoun, Republican.
1875–77	44th	Senate	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		At large	Lorenzo Crounse, of Fort Calhoun, Republican.
1877–79	45th	Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		Senate	Alvin Saunders, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	Frank Welch, of Norfolk, Republican. Died Sept. 4, 1878.
		At large	Thomas Majors, of Peru, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Welch, and took seat Dec. 2, 1878. Majors had been elected as a contingent (or additional) Member and was also so elected to the 46th and 47th Cong., but the House, on Feb. 24, 1883, disallowed Nebraska's claim to an additional Member and refused to seat him.
1879–81	46th	Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		Senate	Alvin Saunders, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	Edward K. Valentine, of West Point, Republican.
1881–83	47th	Senate	Alvin Saunders, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Charles H. Van Wyck, of Nebraska City, Republican.
		At large	Edward K. Valentine, of West Point, Republican.
1883–85	48th	Senate	Charles H. Van Wyck, of Nebraska City, Republican.
		Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Archibald J. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican.
		3d	Edward K. Valentine, of West Point, Republican.
1885–87	49th	Senate	Charles H. Van Wyck, of Nebraska City, Republican.
		Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Archibald J. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican.
		3d	George W. E. Dorsey, of Fremont, Republican.
1887–89	50th	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		1st	John A. McShane, of Omaha, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican.
		3d	George W. E. Dorsey, of Fremont, Republican.
1889–91	51st	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		1st	William J. Connell, of Omaha, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican. Died Aug. 17, 1889, before Congress assembled.
		2d	Gilbert L. Laws, of McCook Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Laird, and took seat Dec. 2, 1889.
		3d	George W. E. Dorsey, of Fremont, Republican.
1891–93	52d	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		1st	William J. Bryan, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	William A. McKeighan, of Red Cloud, Democrat.
		3d	Omer M. Kem, of Broken Bow, Populist.
1893–95	53d	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		1st	William J. Bryan, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	George D. Meiklejohn, of Fullerton, Republican.
		4th	Eugene J. Hainer, of Aurora, Republican.
		5th	William A. McKeighan, of Red Cloud, Democrat.
		6th	Omer M. Kem, of Broken Bow, Populist.
1895–97	54th	Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		Senate	John M. Thurston, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Jesse B. Strode, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	George D. Meiklejohn, of Fullerton, Republican.
		4th	Eugene J. Hainer, of Aurora, Republican.
		5th	William E. Andrews, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Omer M. Kem, of Broken Bow, Populist.
1897–99	55th	Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		Senate	John M. Thurston, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Jesse B. Strode, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Samuel Maxwell, of Fremont, Fusionist.
		4th	William L. Stark, of Aurora, Democrat.
		5th	Roderick D. Sutherland, of Nelson, Populist.
		6th	William L. Greene, of Kearney, Populist.
1899–1901	56th	Senate	John M. Thurston, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Monroe L. Hayward, of Nebraska City, Republican. Died Dec. 5, 1899.
		Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist. Defeated in 1899 by Hayward; appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Hayward, and took seat Dec. 19, 1899.
		1st	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	John S. Robinson, of Madison, Democrat.
		4th	William L. Stark, of Aurora, Democrat.
		5th	Roderick D. Sutherland, of Nelson, Populist.
		6th	William L. Greene, of Kearney, Populist. Died Mar. 11, 1899.
			William Neville, of North Platte, Populist. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Greene, and took seat Dec. 4, 1899.

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963—Continued

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1901-03	57th	Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		Senate	Charles H. Dietrich, of Hastings, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Hayward, in preceding Congress and took seat Dec. 2, 1901.
		Senate	Joseph H. Millard, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	John S. Robinson, of Madison, Democrat.
		4th	William L. Stark, of Aurora, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	William Neville, of North Platte, Populist.
1903-05	58th	Senate	Charles H. Dietrich, of Hastings, Republican.
		Senate	Joseph H. Millard, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican. Resigned Mar. 4, 1905, before commencement of 59th Cong., to which he had been reelected, having been elected a Senator.
		2d	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	John J. McCarthy of Ponca, Republican.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1905-07	59th	Senate	Joseph H. Millard, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		1st	Ernest M. Pollard, of Nehawka, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by resignation of Burkett in preceding Congress, and took seat Dec. 4, 1905.
		2d	John L. Kennedy, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	John J. McCarthy, of Ponca, Republican.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1907-09	60th	Senate	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		Senate	Norris Brown, of Kearney, Republican.
		1st	Ernest M. Pollard, of Nehawka, Republican.
		2d	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	John F. Boyd, of Neligh, Republican.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1909-11	61st	Senate	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		Senate	Norris Brown. of Kearney, Republican.
		1st	John A. Maguire, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	James P. Latta, of Tekamah, Democrat.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1911-13	62d	Senate	Norris Brown, of Kearney, Republican.
		Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	John A. Maguire, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	James P. Latta, of Tekamah, Democrat. Died Sept. 11, 1911.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Latta, and took seat Dec. 4, 1911.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1913-15	63d	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	John A. Maguire, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Silas R. Barton, of Grand Island, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1915-17	64th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1917-19	65th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1919-21	66th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Albert W. Jefferis, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert E. Evans, of Dakota City, Republican.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	William E. Andrews, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1921-23	67th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican. Resigned June 3, 1922.
		1st	Roy H. Thorpe, of Lincoln, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by resignation of Reavis, and took seat Nov. 27, 1922.
		2d	Albert W. Jefferis, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert E. Evans, of Dakota City, Republican.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	William E. Andrews, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican. Died July 6, 1922.
		6th	Augustin R. Humphrey, of Broken Bow, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Kinkaid, and took seat Nov. 20, 1922.
1923-25	68th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963—Continued

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1925–27	69th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1927–29	70th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	John N. Norton, of Polk, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1929–31	71st	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Fred G. Johnson, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1931–33	72d	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	H. Malcolm Baldrige, of Omaha, Republican..
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	John N. Norton, of Polk, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1933–35	73d	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican. Died Mar. 11, 1933.
		Senate	William H. Thompson, of Grand Island, Democrat. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Howell, and took seat May 26, 1933.
		Senate	Richard C. Hunter, of Omaha, Democrat. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Howell, and took seat Nov. 7, 1934.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		5th	Terry M. Carpenter, of Scottsbluff, Democrat.
1935–37	74th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	Henry C. Luckey, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Charles G. Binderup, of Minden, Democrat.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1937–39	75th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	Henry C. Luckey, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Charles G. Binderup, of Minden, Democrat.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1939–41	76th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	George H. Heinke, of Nebraska City, Republican. Died Jan. 2, 1940.
		1st	John Hyde Sweet, of Nebraska City, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Heinke, and took seat Apr. 17, 1940.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1941–43	77th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Oren S. Copeland, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1943–45	78th	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1945–47	79th	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1947–49	80th	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1949–51	81st	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Eugene D. O'Sullivan, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1951–53	82d	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican. Died Nov. 29, 1951.
		Senate	Frederick A. Seaton, of Hastings, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Wherry, and took seat Jan. 8, 1952.
		Senate	Dwight P. Griswold, of Scottsbluff, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Wherry, and took seat Jan. 3, 1953.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican. Died Oct. 2, 1951.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Stefan, and took seat Jan. 8, 1952.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.

***Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963*—Continued**

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1953–55	83d	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican. Died July 1, 1954.
		Senate	Sam W. Reynolds, of Omaha, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Butler, and took seat July 7, 1954.
		Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Butler, and took seat Nov. 8, 1954.
		Senate	Dwight P. Griswold, of Scottsbluff, Republican. Died Apr. 12, 1954.
		Senate	Mrs. Eva K. Bowring, of Merriman, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Griswold, and took seat Apr. 26, 1954.
		Senate	Mrs. Hazel H. Abel, of Lincoln, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Griswold, and took seat Nov. 8, 1954. Resigned Dec. 31, 1954.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by resignation of Mrs. Abel. Appointed Jan. 1, 1955, but was not able to take seat because Congress was not in session.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican. Resigned Dec. 31, 1954.
		2d	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican. Resigned Nov. 8, 1954.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1955–57	84th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Jackson B. Chase, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1957–59	85th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1959–61	86th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Lawrence Brock, of Wakefield, Democrat.
		4th	Donald F. McGinley, Ogallala, Democrat.
1961–63	87th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Ralph F. Beermann, of Dakota City, Republican.
		4th	Dave Martin, of Kearney, Republican.
1963–65	88th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Ralph Beermann, of Dakota City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Dave Martin, of Kearney. Republican.

The Current Attack on REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century and more has passed since the Congress ordered the lights turned on in rural America.

It was in July of 1935, in an Executive order by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, that the Rural Electrification Administration was born. Congress passed the REA Act in 1936.

I doubt if any agency of the Government in Washington has carried on its mission so well as the REA. It indeed has turned on the lights in rural America. Its benefits are felt by all our people, in terms of conveniences and comforts hitherto unknown on our farms and in the contributions REA has made to the efficiency of our agriculture which has blessed our consumers with the best and cheapest food anywhere in the world.

But, I also doubt if any agency has been the center of greater controversy in all these years. REA today is under heavy criticism and attack, from certain quarters.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to a speech delivered last Wednesday by the gentleman from Texas, Hon. W. R. (BOB) POAGE, a great champion of REA. Our colleague spoke before the Tarheel Electric Membership Association, at Durham, N.C.

When the gentleman from Texas, BOB POAGE, speaks he leaves no doubt where he stands. He shaped up the issues around REA, clearly and eloquently. I think that each Member of this body, whether he is for REA or against REA, will want to read what the gentleman from Texas, BOB POAGE, had to say. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I am publishing this speech in the RECORD:

THE CURRENT ATTACK ON REA

(Speech of Congressman W. R. POAGE before Tarheel Electric Membership Association at Durham, N.C.)

It is always a pleasure to appear on the same program with my beloved chairman. HAROLD is probably my closest friend in the Congress. I respect his ability and leadership just as you do, but it is a special honor to appear with him in his home State and to talk with him to rural people, for I can say, in all candor, that I know of no Member of Congress who has done so much for the welfare of the farm people of his home State as has Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, Representative of the Fourth District of North Carolina.

He has worked effectively in all phases of agriculture, but, as I see it, he, and he alone, is responsible for the present and the long continued prosperity of the growers of tobacco. No agricultural commodity today enjoys the stability of income which is assured to North Carolina's great crop—and without HAROLD COOLEY I fear you would be in no better position than the producers of oats, chickens, and castor beans.

But I came here to talk about the current attack on REA.

Thirty years ago there was pretty general understanding as to the need for REA and the need for local cooperatives. About 96.2 percent of the rural homes in North Carolina were then without central power service. Power companies insisted that there was no need to supply further rural service and their then spokesman officially stated before a congressional investigating committee in 1937 that: "There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm needs that are not now served." Of course, the truth was that there were practically no farms served but the power companies felt that there was no profit to be had in serving them and hence they were not interested.

I have never felt, as some of my friends have, that the power companies were under an obligation to serve these farms. They had a right to decline this business which they considered unprofitable, but I have questioned the validity and the morality of their action in later objecting to others servicing this market which they rejected. But there is no question but that just as soon as farmers began to organize cooperatives, the private power companies came to life. They built their lines down many of the roads and highways. They skimmed the cream of the then existing business and they built spite lines to make it impracticable for local groups of farmers to serve given areas, but farmers kept organizing cooperatives. They kept borrowing money from REA, and repaying it with interest, and they kept building lines until today, instead of 96 percent of your North Carolina farms being in darkness, 98.1 percent of them have central station service. The figures, which are very comparable for the Nation, have been almost exactly reversed in the last quarter of a century. But the job is not done.

It is true that some of our power companies have been prematurely celebrating. "The job is finished," they have cried. "Now, let REA and the rural cooperatives get out of business and let them be quick about it. Now the Congress can quit providing REA loan funds. The great day is here. Let there be dancing in the streets." Friends, I am no less pleased than the power companies are with the magnificent work of providing electric service to our rural areas. The REA, its local borrowers, and in many instances their privately owned competitors, have all done a great job, but the job is not yet finished. This is no time for "singing in the streets" and it is no time to stop REA loans. The need for additional capital to provide service to our rural consumers is probably just as pressing today as it was 30 years ago. The difference is that a generation ago we were thinking only in terms of light. Today we are thinking in terms of power. We were building lines to supply an average demand of about 25 kilowatts per consumer. Today that demand is more than 10 times that great.

We all understand that a ½-inch water pipe that could supply a rural home is utterly inadequate to supply a suburban development, but we do not seem to realize that the old single-phase equipment that brought such a revolution in the family parlor is not adequate to provide the power needed for modern pumps, feed mills, and milking machines. We all understand how a well and water tower can supply a village of 2 dozen homes and that a city of 100,000 must provide itself with a terribly expensive reservoir and with large pipes and pumping stations, but all too many of us seem to be unable to understand, or we are reluctant to recognize, that while the early cooperatives could buy their power from the local company and deliver it over inexpensive lines, the modern farmer-owned distributing system must have a large supply of power, expensive standby, complicated substations, and an adequate distributing system.

These current requirements cost money, and lots of money—far more per mile than the old single-phase equipment of the early days. But in many instances there are no more subscribers than there were right after the co-op was organized. The population of most rural areas simply has not been growing and today the average privately owned power company in the United States enjoys a density of more than 30 connections per mile. The average REA-financed cooperative has less than three connections per mile. Obviously, the power companies enjoy a tremendous advantage, and I think right here is where we should understand the fallacy of one of the basic arguments which the power companies make against the cooperatives.

They say that the 2 percent interest which the Government charges on REA loans is "a subsidy"; that it is unfair to the people of America; and that it should be abolished. Indeed, just before I left Washington I had a member of our committee from California call me telling me that he, as well as a number of other members, had introduced legislation to raise this interest rate, and that he wanted us to give him a hearing on his bill. Of course, we are going to give him a hearing, and of course he is going to show that the Government is today paying more than 2 percent for the money which it borrows, but I don't think he is going to call attention to the fact that when REA was first established the Government was paying a good deal less for the money it borrowed than it was collecting from the cooperatives. I don't think he is going to want to point out that today the Government is advancing hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign countries at 2 percent, and even less. Actually, we are even now negotiating to finance a billion dollar steel mill in India at three-fourths of 1 percent interest. I don't think he is going to want to talk about the subsidies that we are paying on transportation, to airlines, to bargelines, and even to railroads and trucklines in the form of land grants and highway improvements. And, above all, I don't believe that my colleague from California, or any of the others who would destroy REA, is going to emphasize the fact that the REA law specifically provides for loans to private power companies who will assume the same obligations to provide service in rural areas on the same terms that it offers to farmer-owned cooperatives.

It is very easy for city people to honestly assume that they are having to carry a part of the load of providing electricity in rural areas, and I think that is probably true. But they would certainly not help their situation any by turning this service over to the power companies. Power companies cannot make a profit on it either unless they can get some kind of especially cheap power or low interest. And interesting enough, most of them don't want cheap interest on the terms the cooperatives are getting it. What the power companies can do, and what they really want to do, is to throw these rural areas in with their other service areas and then establish a rate over the entire area. Since utilities are always allowed to charge enough to make a reasonable return, that will give the companies a profit on a larger volume of business. So, if they can take over the rural service, they will of course try first to raise the local rates to rural customers, and undoubtedly they will succeed to some extent. To the extent they do not succeed, they will simply raise rates in general, making the people in the cities and towns more directly than ever subsidize the rural areas.

No, the co-op members may not get an immediate doubling of their rates if the power companies take over, but electric consumers are going to pay the full bill plus a very substantial profit which they are not now paying to the cooperatives, and service is going to suffer as it always does when it falls in the hands of a monopoly.

I know that power companies say that the distribution of power is a natural monopoly and that there is no competition within given areas, but at the present there is the overall recognition that if the power companies don't provide reasonable service at reasonable rates in rural areas, there is somebody else who could provide it. To me that is worth a great deal—more than any regulation which any Commission can pass.

I went to the Legislature of Texas a good many years ago. I was sold on the idea that we ought to have a utility commission, but I hadn't been around Austin 6 months until I began to realize that utility commissions are always—or at least almost always—exactly what the name says they are—"utility" commissions—controlled by and functioning for the benefit of the utilities. For 35 years I have given thanks that Texas does not have such a commission because I believe we get better service when we have different agencies offering service. It is for this reason that I have often stated at REA meetings that while I certainly would not want the power companies to put the cooperatives out of business, neither do I want the co-ops to put the power companies out of business. I think that both groups give better service because of the existence of the other.

No, my friends, you cannot continue to operate a successful electric cooperative and serve two customers per mile of line if you have to pay 4 percent on your money. Nearly one-third of the cost of the average electric cooperative is accounted for by interest. Power costs about one-third, and labor accounts for about one-third. I don't think that you can increase your costs by one-sixth and still provide service at a competitive price. The only way in which the rural cooperatives of this State could stay in business under such circumstances would be for them to enjoy some of the cream. Are those who want to raise co-op interest rates willing to give them an opportunity to compete with the power companies on equal terms for the profitable city business? Of course not. Indeed, they are doing their very best to prevent them from keeping any profitable territory they may now have. I want to make it plain that I am not asking that the farmer-owned cooperatives should go into the cities and compete with the power companies, but I am suggesting that we should not create a situation which will push them into this field.

Actually, some of these cooperatives are today serving some very profitable business on the outskirts of all of our growing cities. The co-ops went there when this was strictly rural area. They went there when nobody else wanted to serve the area. They built their lines and then the people built their homes. As our cities expand and incorporate in these areas which are served by rural cooperatives, we find the laws and the court decisions of many States taking these territories away from the cooperatives and deliberately giving them to the private power companies.

I am, of course, now speaking of what we know in Texas as the Gilmore case. In this case our supreme court held that even though the Upshur County Electric Cooperative had developed a given rural area, that when that area was annexed by the city of Gilmore, the private power company holding a franchise in that city became the only agency which could legally give service in that area, and although we have repeatedly received adequate preelection pledges the legislature of our State has continued to refuse to correct this injustice.

As a Congressman, I don't want to try to pass judgment upon what the legislature should do, but I have no hesitancy in saying what this policy is bound to do to our rural cooperatives. Within 20 years it must deprive them of a large part of their essential revenue, and during that time it must aggravate their need for lower interest and cheaper power. How can any business succeed if, as fast as it builds up profitable customers, those customers are taken from it and turned over to its competitor? But that is exactly what is happening in Texas and a number of other States today, and, I repeat, our rural electric cooperatives cannot continue to live under such a system. They will be forced into a struggle to serve cities and towns. I think our great power companies would be well advised to let these cooperatives continue to serve all rural areas and to serve all areas which have been rural and leave the big cities to the private companies.

But I would not want you to feel that the only threat to the existence of the REA lies in the State capital. There is a continuing threat in Washington. Twenty-five years ago an overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress were expressing their support of REA, and voting just like they talked. A majority still gives lip service to REA, but are likely to say: "I am for REA—But." Some, as the Member I referred to awhile ago, seek to increase the interest rate the co-ops must pay. Some seek to prohibit the construction of generation and transmission plants. They say that REA was created simply to finance the distribution of power to rural people—that the private power companies will build all of the generation plants that are needed. And I am sure they will—that is, all they think they need. They are certainly not going to build any they don't think are helpful to their own systems.

And right here seems to be probably the strongest argument in behalf of REA-financed generation plants. The co-ops must have increasing sources of power, just as the private power companies must, and private distribution companies have been building generation plants at a remarkable rate. If they need these new generation plants, if they need these new transmission lines—and I am sure they do—why don't the rural co-ops need the same kind of new facilities? They are growing too.

The companies say they must have their own sources of power in order to protect their customers and each company tries to build to meet its now need. No first-class power company will rely on a neighboring power company. They distrust each other. Why should the cooperatives be forced to trust them? If it is essential to them to own their own sources of power, why isn't it essential to co-ops to do likewise? Of course, it is obvious that not every REA-financed cooperative is going to build its own plant. There are many cases where it is just not feasible, but the knowledge on the part of the private supplier that the co-op could get a G. & T. loan if he needed it seems to me to be the most valuable bargaining lever available to the rural system—and actually it is about the only lever which most of them have.

The authority to make such loans is already in the basic REA Act, and it should remain there. The Congress properly looks to the discretion of the REA Administrator in his use of this bargaining tool, and yet there are many Members of Congress who, in all good faith, would like to so limit the authority of the Administrator to make G. & T. loans that this bargaining power would be completely destroyed. Not only are there bills pending to destroy this lending power, or to make it ineffective, but the Appropriations Committee actually wrote instructions into the report on its recent appropriation bill which in effect required the Administrator to turn over the financial statements of his borrowers to the private companies. I don't believe that the Appropriations Committee actually realizes what they are doing—and I don't believe that that committee had any moral or parliamentary right to, in effect, write new legislation in its appropriation bill. I protested this action on the floor but to no avail.

The REA is nothing but a banking institution. The cooperatives are its customers. I don't want my banker to turn my financial statement over to my competitor, and I don't believe any honest banker would do so. I don't believe that it is proper or moral for the REA Administrator to call in the co-op's competitors, tell them what the co-op proposes to do, and ask them if they can't take this information and come up with a more attractive plan—and yet on page 8 of the report of the House Appropriations Committee on June 3, 1963, we find the following wording: "Before public funds are loaned for power, generation, or transmission, a majority of the committee believes the REA Administrator, in connection with any such loan, should make a survey, determine wherein the existing contract for power or the proposed contract is unreasonable, advise the supplier wherein such contract is unreasonable, and get such contract modified to make it reasonable. Loans should be made only when reasonable contracts cannot be obtained." And a little further down they state that such loans "should not be made where local private business can meet the need or where it is determined that the local borrower will provide unnecessary competition."

To me this is a clear requirement that the power companies shall be told what the co-op proposes and shall then be given an opportunity to see if they could not beat the co-op's bid. I think that of course there should be a clearly established need for the service, but the power companies should be required to ignore that need at their own peril.

In other words, it seems to me that the private power company which deliberately refuses to provide adequate service or reasonable rates should not be allowed to continue this policy indefinitely and then when the co-op makes arrangements to finance another source of power to be permitted to come in, make a "death-bed confession" and plead that it is now ready to give that which it would not give until seriously and specifically threatened with a competitive source of power. Obviously, if we are to adopt this policy, and that is exactly what the Appropriations Committee asks us to do, there is going to be no pressure whatever on the private power companies to make any concessions until after the cooperative has gone to the REA seeking a G. & T. loan. This will force every cooperative which needs a power source to apply for a G. & T. loan.

I therefore repeat, private power companies should be required to ignore legitimate needs of the co-ops at their peril. Of course, if a private power company has offered to meet the needs of the co-op, before the co-op takes any steps to get power from another source, I should think that the Administrator should, and must, take that into consideration, and if he found that such an outstanding offer was bona fide and within the power of the company to perform, then he would not approve the loan application.

My quarrel with the Appropriations Committee is not that they want to limit loans to those instances where a reasonable supply of power at reasonable prices cannot be obtained from private sources, but it is in regard to the time at which they want to allow the company to make such an offer, having refused to provide needed power at proper prices. I do not believe that the power companies should be privileged to purge themselves of their default by coming in after a cooperative has made other arrangements.

Again, I would point out that I do not contend that any power company, in the absence of a special contract, is under obligation to supply wholesale power to a cooperative, but if it wants this cooperative business it should not be allowed to force the cooperative to expose its needs and its possible opportunities of supplying those needs. The company should be required, if it wants the business, to make an attractive offer before, not after, the cooperative applies for a G. & T. loan.

Of course, the real problem in Congress is to get the Members of Congress to understand the situation. Most of the Members of Congress are from large cities and the percentage from large cities is rapidly increasing. These Members naturally feel that they have no interest in REA. It is the responsibility of associations such as yours to educate these Members. Most of them are fair if they can but understand the facts. We should not, however, expect them to have a very clear understanding when so many Representatives from strictly rural areas do not bother to learn the facts except from power company lobbyists.

Of course, I know that you cannot match the power companies in the funds they expend in lobbying but you can see your Congressman. Each local cooperative can make it a definite project to present your problems to your own Congressman. I know that there is a natural disposition to ask: "How can I influence the Congressman in somebody else's district?" I would suggest that except for the big city Congressmen that you not try to influence the Congressman in somebody else's district. Every one of you should be in a position to talk to your own Congressman, but there is mighty little reason why ROY TAYLOR should be concerned with what the people of Chatham County want, or why HERBERT BONNER should be especially interested in the views of the folks of Cherokee County.

When it comes to the big cities, I realize that we must depend more upon a general basic understanding of the people. Probably it is here that organizations like National Rural Electric Cooperative Association can do its best work, and it is here that you are going to find attitudes vitally influenced by party affiliation, but it is also here in the big cities that you are going to obtain or lose the majority in Congress which REA must have if it is to continue to serve our rural people as it has served them in the past.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 19: 14: *Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer.*

Eternal God, our Father, in whose divine wisdom, righteousness, and love, we trust, we earnestly beseech Thee that Thou wilt direct us in our halting and hesitant search for the right solution to our many difficult national and international problems.

We pray that our statesmen and diplomats, who are assembling for counsel and conference, may be blessed with Thy favor and a special manifestation of Thy guiding spirit.

Grant that in these days of darkness and danger we may not become disheartened and discouraged, but show us how we may lay hold of the great spiritual resources with increasing tenacity of faith.

May our trust in Thee be a blessed experience and may we make a definite and distinct contribution to the glorious adventure of establishing peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as Members to the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], Chairman; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY]; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]; the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order anytime during the coming week to take up and to consider a House joint resolution to provide continuing appropriations.

I have consulted the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen] and am assured the order would have his approval.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES A. HALLECK, MINORITY LEADER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it just occurs to me that today marks another milestone in the busy and useful and eventful life of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the minority leader of the House.

I believe he is approaching some 30 or 40 years—more or less, as the case may be—and am glad to take advantage of the opportunity to felicitate him and the House and the country on the admirable and tactful and gracious manner in which he has conducted the responsible and important duties of that great office. I have always entertained the warmest admiration for the gentleman—personally and officially—if not politically.

And in this connection it has been interesting to note in the press the widespread and growing sentiment in favor of his nomination for the Presidency. May I assure him that he has my ardent and unqualified support for a position on that ticket.

But at the same time I would be remiss in my friendship if I did not also call attention to the fact that in view of the universal and practically unanimous support of the Nation at large, and apparently of an overwhelming majority of the Senate, of President Kennedy's peace treaty, any nomination at San Francisco will be an entirely futile gesture.

May I extend heartiest congratulations to the gentleman from Indiana and wish for him many happy returns of the day. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have served with him in the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. In view of the announcement previously made, the Chair will recognize the happy event in the life of our distinguished minority leader and in this instance will make an exception.

THE HONORABLE CHARLES A. HALLECK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has called the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this is the anniversary of the birth of the distinguished minority leader.

One of the rewarding things about service in the Congress, and one of the great things about the House of Representatives from the standpoint of the welfare of the country, is the fact this House does attract and has attracted over the years many men of outstanding ability, men of great character and devotion to duty. Among the greatest of the great is my friend, the distinguished minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, Charlie Halleck, and on this, the anniversary of his birth, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Missouri in extending to him many happy returns of the day, and many more of them in the years to come.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members on this side of the aisle join with those who spoke a moment ago in extending our very best birthday wishes to the minority leader of the House of Representatives who on two occasions has been majority leader. We wish for him the best of luck and good health in the years to come.

I came to Congress quite a number of years ago, at approximately the same time as did our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck]. He and I have become very warm personal friends. Charlie Halleck has been a great and outstanding leader for our party, he has been and is exceedingly versatile in many ways. He does his job extraordinarily well. We have great admiration and respect for him. We have the utmost confidence in him.

My sincere congratulations to our distinguished leader on his birthday. We hope he will have many more. We trust we will have the benefit of his service in Congress for many years to come.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Illinois and others in what they have said about our outstanding minority leader, Charlie Halleck. He has had a long and illustrious career in public service. I congratulate him on his birthday and hope that he will be able to continue serving his district, State, and Nation for many years in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Anderson
Baring
Blatnik
Celler
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Edwards
Elliott
Gibbons
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Knox
McIntire
O'Brien, Ill.
Pillion
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Short
Smith, Va.
Whitten
Willis
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 405 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 7885, with Mr. Rains in the chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 103, ending in line 4, page 5 of the bill.

Are there any further amendments to this section?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we wasted no end of time and it was never possible to clarify certain matters because of continuous conversation on the floor. If there is any idea that Members want to get through today with this bill I would suggest that conversation be held outside the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to say "Amen" to that statement.

The Committee will please be in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Morse: On page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 104. Section 202(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to authorizations for the development loan fund, is amended by striking the words 'and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and substituting therefor the words ', $1,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1963, and $1,200,000,000 for each of the next succeeding fiscal years'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. MORSE. The effect of the amendment I have offered would be to reduce from $1,500 million to $1,200 million the authorization for the development loan funds in the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966. This amendment will put our authorization more in line with the demonstrated needs of the program, and will not, in my view, impair the effectiveness of our development program.

Under section 202(a) of the 1961 act, $1.2 billion was authorized for development loans in fiscal 1962. Of this amount, $1,112,500,000 was actually appropriated. In fiscal 1963, for which $1.5 billion was authorized, only $975 million was appropriated. The Agency for International Development has requested only $1.06 billion of its $1.5 billion authorization for fiscal year 1964. Thus, over the past 3 years, including 1964, the funds actually appropriated or requested to be appropriated have totaled $1,102,500,000 less than that which was authorized by Congress in 1961.

Under section 202(a) of the 1961 act, the unappropriated portion of the amount authorized for any fiscal year could be appropriated in a subsequent year in addition to the amount already authorized for that year, yet the Agency for International Development has not included the unexpended amount in its request for appropriations.

I do not mean to suggest that AID has been less than alert to its opportunities and responsibilities in the development loan field. During the past 5 years AID has made more than 300 loans totaling about $3.5 billion to countries in various stages of growth and development. As AID has pointed out in its request this year, a number of countries have become practically independent of our assistance. A number of others are moving rapidly toward self-sustaining growth. We can be proud of the part we have played in helping them stabilize their economies, seek new avenues of internal development, strengthen the private sectors of their economies, and move toward a more favorable position in world markets. While we cannot be complacent about the progress we have made, we can stop to appraise the present structure of our program and determine whether it is time to make adjustments in our authorizations for such countries.

The fact that much of the money authorized for development loans has not been spent does not indicate a decreasing need for economic development in many areas of the world. Rather it indicates that the character of our program has changed considerably since 1961.

It further indicates that we are receiving a far greater degree of cooperation from other free world nations than we have in the past.

For example, the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD is now providing about 40 percent of total free world bilateral aid. These developments are extremely heartening, and they coincide with suggestions made by the President, the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Clay Committee and many other experts in the foreign assistance field.

In the light of our own balance-of-payments problems, it seems to me we should cut back our assistance authorizations whenever such action is consistent with our national interest.

This is such an occasion, Mr. Chairman. Decreasing our development loan authorizations for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 will more accurately reflect the demonstrated need for this part of our assistance effort without weakening its effectiveness.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nothing but a paper cut. Let us go back to the Mutual Security Act of 1961. The House will remember that the bill, as it passed the House, had the Treasury borrowing authority stricken from the bill and provided for a 1-year development loan program as a result of the so-called Saund amendment. The bill, as it passed the other body, provided for a 5-year development loan program with authority to borrow from the Treasury $1,700 million per year over a 5-year period.

As the chairman of the House Committee of Conference, it was my duty to go to conference and oppose the Treasury borrowing principle, which I did. But I did not do it until I came back here and consulted the leaders on both sides of the House, the leaders of the minority and the leaders on the majority side. We worked out a compromise arrangement for a long-range development loan program, where we authorized annual appropriations of $1,500 million a year for 5 years. We lowered the figure to $1,500 million a cut of $200 million below the Senate authorization of $1,700 million a year projected over a period ending in fiscal year 1966.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts said, the Executive did not request the full amount of the money authorized although $1,500 million was authorized. In 1963, only $975 million was appropriated and, this year they requested an appropriation of only $1,060 million.

I have great faith in the Committee on Appropriations and especially the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Appropriations. They are going to screen the Development Loan Fund requirements very carefully before approving an appropriation. As I said, this is only a paper cut. This is not going to cut a dime out of the bill or require any reduction of the appropriation. The authorization is already contained in existing law. The bill authorizing the money for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 was signed by the President in 1961. We have an established Development Loan Fund projected until 1966, and I cannot see any reason why the House should now backtrack and make a paper cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Morse) there were—ayes 52, noes 90.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Morse and Mr. Hays.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 129, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 5:

TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT GRANTS AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Sec. 104. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development grants and technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 211(a), which relates to general authority, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (5) contained in the second sentence thereof; and

"(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: ', and (7) whether such activity could be financed through a development loan available under title I of this chapter'.

"(b) In section 212, which relates to authorization, strike out '1963' and '$300,000,000' and substitute '1964' and '$217,000,000', respectively.

"(c) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a) strike out 'use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds made available for the purposes of section 211 for' and substitute the word 'furnish'.

"(2) In subsection (b) strike out 'to use' and 'foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of subsection (a) of this section and for' and substitute 'to furnish' before the word 'assistance'.

"(3) Add the following new subsection:

" '(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, for the fiscal year 1964, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of the sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, not to exceed $2,200,000 shall be available for direct dollar costs in carrying out subsection (b) and $2,000,000 shall be available solely for the purchase of foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act'."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time principally to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee handling this bill as to the project about which many Members in the House feel a genuine concern and have felt such concern for a number of years.

Mr. Chairman, in previous considerations of this bill the chairman of the committee has made it very clear that the funds in this bill are designed to assist Project Hope, which is the mercy ship operated by the People-to-People Foundation, and which has rendered so much beneficial help to the people of Vietnam and most recently in Peru in trying to meet the health problems in these underdeveloped countries and to give assistance in training doctors and public health personnel to better cope with the diseases and the lack of medical training and medical personnel available in those countries.

Mr. Chairman, I know based upon letters which I have read recently by Assistant Secretary of State Fred Dutton and by Mr. David Bell, the very able Administrator of AID, that this project is regarded very highly for the contributions that it has made.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] has indicated his interest and support in this project in the past. I would like, however, to obtain an expression from the chairman of the committee as to the gentleman's feelings about funds for this purpose in the section now under consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the gentleman that I am very familiar with Project Hope. As a physician I have had many of my friends take part in this very worthy project. I feel confident that under section 104, subsection (c), the administration would have authority, if money were available, to make loans or grants under this section.

The gentleman recalls that back in 1960, I believe it was, Project Hope did borrow $1 million from the mutual security program. Their payments on their loan are on schedule. I think they have repaid $30,000 of the loan.

This has been a project, financed by private fundraising. I feel that this is a very worthwhile project for helping other peoples of the world that could be assisted under the authority of section 104(c). I think it would be a worthwhile project.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much. Of course, the principal funds for Project Hope do come from private subscription. The physicians who participate in the program donate their services and do not require any payment from the Government or from any source for what they give to the project. The great pharmaceutical houses of the country contribute millions of dollars in medicines and supplies for this project.

I think when our Government makes a contribution to aid in meeting the operating differential costs which are necessary to keep American seamen aboard it and the American flag flying on it—incidentally, it is also flying proudly the Alliance for Progress flag in Latin America—that we are making a solid contribution to a very worthwhile project.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. There is just one point which the gentleman neglected to emphasize. I should like to point that up. That is the fact that this project also, according to the unanimous testimony of our U.S. Ambassador in the countries which it has visited, has made a tremendous impact upon the people of those countries, one that has been favorable to us and helpful to our foreign policy.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the fact that it has made a tremendous impact. Forty-six thousand people in Peru were directly benefited through medical attention and help during the recent cruise to Peru. I am informed that when rioting was taking place and the American flag was being stoned and attacked in some parts of Peru, no gesture of any kind, no attack of any kind, was made upon Project Hope where it was anchored at Trujillo in Peru. As a matter of fact, the community support for the project was overwhelming.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wyman: "On page 5, strike out lines 19 through 21, inclusive, and on page 5, line 22, strike out '(c)' and insert in lieu thereof '(b)'."

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about the amendment I have offered. It would end a portion of our foreign giveaway. I have waited some 14 years for the opportunity to put a question like this before the House and before the Congress. I used to serve as counsel for the watchdog committee on foreign aid programs way back 14 years ago, and I have deep convictions that the levels, policies, and administration of our foreign aid program has wasted billions of tax dollars.

My amendment would knock out a portion of the outright gift of money in the foreign aid program; $217 million in lines 19 to 21 would come out if this amendment is agreed to.

I would like to make it clear to the House this amendment deals with gifts of American tax dollars, not loans. It does not deal with the Alliance for Progress. It does not affect money in connection with the so-called claimed-to-be strategic section dealing with supporting assistance. This would cut out and end outright gifts to the extent of $217 million.

If you will look at page 2 of the committee's report you will find $6.7 billion is still in the pipeline even if not a single dollar is authorized today.

Mr. Chairman, this program ought to be ended here and now to the extent it is on a giveaway basis. We have been giving away billions of dollars for years as an integral part of the foreign policy of the United States. Our national debt now is over $308 billion and mounting at the rate of a billion dollars a month—$217 million in added gifts from a nation $308 billion in the red is resented by our people.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have had enough of these foreign aid handouts. In the grassroots of America they want this sort of boondoggle ended once and for all. Put your ears to the ground and listen. If you do not hear the peoples' protests now, I assure you you will hear them next fall. To those who say if we cut off our aid and gifts we are playing into the hands of the Communists, I say, Mr. Chairman, I have helped to fight against communism for many, many years, and, mark this well, there is nothing the Communists would like any more than to see this country spend itself broke with these continued foreign giveaways.

To those who are concerned about our image—and I would like to make it clear I do not impugn the sincerity of any of the gentlemen who have expressed that thought—to those who are concerned about our image abroad may I say that our image abroad during the past 14 years has been one of increasing astonishment, as the people over there and around the world have come to the conclusion that Americans are some kind of genial jackasses with more money than brains and Mr. Chairman we are running out of money. I hope we still have enough brains left to end this foolishness.

With the country in the financial shape it is, the people are demanding that we do not give away any more of our money. If Timbuktu or some distant land needs sidewalks or some other improvement, they should borrow the money for that. Nothing in this amendment affects the lending authority proposed.

To those who raise the security question, the President has $380 million under section 108 to give away. This amendment does not affect these millions. But as far as outright gifts and grants are concerned, I say let us act for America for once. Let us keep faith with our own people. If we do this our image will have been strengthened, not weakened. So will our self-respect. We in this House are closest to the people. We owe it to our people to lay a greater emphasis on representing them for a change.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. In view of the limitation of 2 percent on development placed in the bill yesterday, how would underdeveloped countries build their water supply systems?

Does the gentleman from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I say borrow it.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will look at the proper sections of the bill he will find that there is appropriated under another section of this bill $380 million which is given to the President for so-called support assistance. Almost a blank check. This is also grant—gift—money.

From such funds it would be possible for this kind of loan to be made, whatever country may be concerned. But these countries can borrow from this country on extremely liberal terms over 40 years. I do not think they can get terms like that anywhere else in the world.

Mr. BARRY. I have great respect for the gentleman's sincerity. I wish however to point out, that if we were to lend over $1 billion this year, which we are authorized to do under our development loan program, we would charge only $300 million in interest, were the interest rate to remain at the rate prior to our putting in the 2-percent limitation yesterday; but now we are imposing an additional $500 million obligation on the repaying countries for the $1 billion that we are lending them. In other words, a total of $800 million will now be collectible by the United States on $1 billion of development loan funds.

Mr. WYMAN. Over a 40-year period it should.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take out the complete section which finances the point 4 program. This has been a part of our foreign aid program dating back to 1949. In my opinion this is the most effective part of the program. This is the money that finances the sending of American technicians into these undeveloped countries. Under this program we have 5,000 of them overseas including teachers, engineers, surveyors, and other specialists, helping these undeveloped countries. This money is not all packaged up in bushel baskets to be handed out to countries as grants. This is the point 4 program. If we are ever going to help these underdeveloped countries to develop their own resources we are going to help them by means of a program like this.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Sometimes this program is known as the technical assistance program. Is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. Is it not true that there is not a religious group in the United States, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or what have you, that does not endorse this program?

Mr. MORGAN. One thousand percent correct.

The committee went over this section very well. The executive asked for $257 million. We screened the projects, and we cut the bill. We cut this section by $40 million, a substantial cut. Under this program we bring many people from undeveloped countries to this country for training. This is not actually a program, as the gentleman seemed to indicate where we take this money over there and give it away.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Do they pay us anything back on this?

Mr. MORGAN. Most of this money goes to pay for our own people we send over there. Their salaries are paid out of this.

Mr. WYMAN. Their salaries are paid under this authorization?

Mr. MORGAN. Their salaries are paid out of this authorization, but we are not giving this money to foreign countries.

Mr. WYMAN. Is all of this not an outright grant or gift for the purpose of technical assistance in point 4 as well as these salaries? Is it all not an outright gift?

Mr. MORGAN. If this troubled world needs any kind of economic aid, it needs this technical assistance program.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not true that American programs in the United States have benefited by this program?

Mr. MORGAN. It supplements the work of CARE, the Red Cross, and similar organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I should like to add to what the gentleman said about foreigners being unable to understand how we can be suckers enough to give away all this money.

Let me quote very briefly from the London Weekly Review, under date of August 2 of this year. After asking in effect, the question of, "How can they be doing these things?" it says:

> The true cause of the dollar's weakness is the huge sums doled out by America to Communist or semi-Communist countries. Not only is this money being used against American interests, but it is causing the drain on America's vital reserves.
>
> If this were not actually happening, no one would believe such an incredible policy to be possible. What influence behind the state scene compels this suicidal policy?

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House says this fund promotes technical assistance throughout the world. I hope there are enough of these books available, a copy of which I have here, that are put out by the Agency for International Development entitled "Current Technical Service Contracts," so that every Member who would like to see what is going on can get a look at some of these contracts and the amounts of the contracts; the consultants that are being hired and sent out all over the world. There is $438 million worth of contracts and consultants represented in this one book.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Our friend, the gentleman from New York, used as an example, Tunisia and the waterworks project that might possibly be built in Tunisia through funds authorized by this particular section in the bill. I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa and our friend, the gentleman from New York, that we have a Public Law 480 program in Tunisia which is generating annually approximately $9 million of the currency of Tunisia. These funds, which are in two categories—counterpart and U.S.-owned, are available for economic development purposes in Tunisia, and could be made available for the waterworks project which the gentleman from New York is worried about. I do not think Tunisia is a very good example for the gentleman to use.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to call attention again to the Members of the House, if they have considered this whole question in the report of the committee which talks about this grant criteria which indicates a different picture than the chairman just indicated.

On page 13, it appears the committee itself says:

> Over the past several years there has been a slight decline in development grant and technical cooperation programs in various countries as a result of greater use of loans.

Then a little bit below it says that they cut the authorization to $217 million and they state:

> There is a perceptible trend toward loans in lieu of grants, a trend which the committee wishes to encourage.

Then, further in the report on page 50, we find in the report the committee itself has inserted a new condition in italics:

> Whether such activity could be financed through a development loan available under title I of this chapter.

I would like to observe this, Mr. Chairman. We need more attention to the needs of America and the needs of this country rather than the undeveloped countries on this grant basis. There is plenty of money in this program and plenty of money in the pipeline to take care of this situation. But at this point, the resentment of the American people is focused on this fact and they want this kind of grant cut out of our program.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire, who, in his first year in Congress is making excellent contributions to this debate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to clear up something that the gentleman mentioned. Of course, wherever an undeveloped country recovers as a result of technical assistance, we want to shift from a grant basis to a loan program, and that is what the report says.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree with me, there is no underdeveloped country anywhere in the world—not a single one that has been left untouched to the tune of several million up to several billion dollars of American cash?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes, there are underdeveloped countries throughout the world that can be helped.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a single country that has been left untouched.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if there were any single section of this bill that ought not to be cut out it is this section. This is the section that has done, in my opinion, more good than anything in the foreign aid program. This section gets down to the grass roots and it gets down to the things that need to be done. As I said earlier, there was not a single religious group that has not written to this committee or that has not testified before this committee in support of this section. I do not agree with what the gentleman says about the image of America. I have traveled abroad—sometimes my opponents say, too much—but I have successfully weathered that. And I do not profess, as he apparently does, to be an expert on jackasses, but I do not think the people of the world think Americans are that. I think the people of the world who have had the benefit of the expenditures under the technical assistance program think this is an American program that is designed to help them to find the way to live like human beings.

This is a program that goes to the village level. This is a program that teaches them how to bore a hole in the ground to get water instead of drinking out of some contaminated stream.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to concur wholeheartedly in what the gentleman is saying. I know of contracts that have been entered into under this program involving medical programs which have done tremendous good, particularly in Latin America. We are concerned about the spread of Castroism and we are concerned about what has happened in Cuba, but undramatically and without fanfare and without publicity these programs have been carried on which have done much to defeat Castroism and communism.

I will give you an example or two. This agency made a contract with Tulane and Louisiana State University Medical Schools to go into Colombia, one of our neighbors in South America. That country was literally scourged with a disease called yaws, which disease can be cured, as most of us know, by the use of simple antibiotics. Today those people who suffered from a crippling ailment which incapacitated them completely are, most of them, operating through this program, cured. In my judgment, that does more to stop communism and create a proper image of the United States of America working through our established universities and research grants and so on than anything that I can think of. To defeat this program, in my judgment, would be the finest thing we can do to help the spread of communism in Latin America.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I just want to say that this is the program which is the theme of the book "The Ugly American." You hear that book quoted in many places and you hear it quoted as criticising parts of the program. However, the hero of the book, the man who made friends for America, was a technician who was out there working under the point 4 program down at the village level, helping the people to help themselves. If we want to help these underdeveloped countries and help them to help themselves, this is the one program to do that and it is the last thing we ought to cut out of this bill.

I want to say to you I am going to vote for some cuts in this bill and for some amendments offered on the other side, but I plead for you to vote against the amendment on this one. This is the heart of the program and this is the thing that is making friends for America in the world. If you want to destroy that, then I say vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to speak at this time in favor of the amendment. In view of the points made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Louisiana, I realize that, like many things, there are many illustrations and examples of what is done that are good. However, this program in the overall is so bad, and I believe now dangerous, that we need, after 15 or 18 years, to begin to wake up to the fact that this type of foreign policy has failed and that it is high time that we begin to review it and see if we do not need to approach this thing in some other way.

Now, with reference to the particular point before us, I happen to serve, as you know, on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, where we have a chance to go into these subjects perhaps less thoroughly, may I say, than the members of this committee. I happen to have the problem of getting through the Congress the funds for the Department of Agriculture, at least I serve as chairman of the subcommittee. Let me tell you that in this program, despite the fine work mentioned by the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Ohio, a few years ago when our agricultural commodities were backing up on the United States to the extent of billions of dollars worth and such commodities were being counted by the Department to reduce the acreage in the United States, putting thousands of Americans out of business, our investigation showed that our Government through this program was paying 728 agricultural experts to increase the agricultural production in the competitive countries to us around the world, and that is a matter of record.

May I say to you at this time that our Nation promoted the Common Market in Europe on the theory that it would strengthen these countries so they could help defend us. Now it has gotten strong and we are there on their doorstep beseeching them not to exclude our commodities from coming in. And if we are excluded, may I say to you they will be able to do it because the very commodities that in the past the United States exported to the Common Market countries, they can now get from other foreign countries whom we put into business for export.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Greek-Turkish loan and for a number of years, in my district thereafter I said that if I had to cast the deciding vote, I would have voted for it, because it was the only foreign policy that we had. Time has passed. We should have learned; but how long will it take us to wake up? Do you not realize that in foreign aid we are sticking ourselves and our money into the internal affairs of 100 countries around the world, underwriting the powers that be, so that the other side will hate us as soon as they kick the present authorities out?

Take the situation in Vietnam. I heard the testimony of our experts about Vietnam. We are trying to make villages that never heard of a central government submit to a central government of our choosing. Yes, and talk about religious freedom—just read the pages of the daily newspapers.

We talk about Cuba. Our problem in Cuba was because of this. We had committed ourselves around the world, when we had the atomic bomb and Russia did not, and we said, "We will take care of you"; we said that right and left around the world. And this is a matter of record.

Then when Russia, through Castro, moved into Cuba, there is no doubt we could have shoved them out, but we had gotten ourselves so extended around the world that we could not shove them out without being forced out of a half dozen places ourselves.

And then right here in the United States, it is my recollection that we voted out $600 million right off to South and Central America without even a plan, in an effort to try to slow the march of events in Central and South America and in effect pay tribute to keep them from following Cuba.

You cannot go into the other fellow's country with your money and your personnel, with your people, and make them submit to the powers that be, the government that we choose, without the other side hating us as soon as they do kick them out. And you can look around the world today and see that this has happened in many places.

As long as we are overextended, as long as we have promises that we cannot carry out around the world, you are going to see what will happen to our Government in places other than Cuba, in my opinion. Even now many are bowing and scraping to Castro. Of course, we could whip him in a minute, but we cannot in view of all this involvement in the four corners of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that I have been right through the years, but I do say when you look around us today and see that things are worse instead of better, then it is high time that we looked at this program to see if perhaps we need some other approach.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one, may I say to my distinguished colleague, to say that there have not been mistakes in the point 4 program. The gentleman mentioned Vietnam. The military setup in this bill is almost sacred and the effort in Vietnam has been military. Who is going to sit here this afternoon and say that that has been a howling success?

Certainly there have been some mistakes in the point 4 program. As I said I would be the last to deny it, because probably nobody has been more critical of these people than I have before the committee. But because there have been mistakes, are you going to wipe out all of the good, do away with all of the technical assistance, wipe out the one part of the program that the groups who have really been in the field, the missionaries, the religious groups, say is good? Are you going to wipe that out and leave the sad spectacle of what is going on in Vietnam and other places, where the operations are purely military?

Mr. WHITTEN. I recognize the two points that the gentleman made earlier. Let me read to you briefly, if I may, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think it is generally accepted that our friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], longtime chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the foreign aid appropriation, probably knows as much about this bill and about this program as anybody. I think nobody on the floor would disagree with that. I agree with what he said to us last year.

I quote:

> Now I want to make the following 11 statements:
>
> First. The appropriations for foreign aid, including interest on the public debt for fiscal 1963 on the money that we have borrowed to give away, and back-door financing will exceed $12 billion this year.
>
> Second. The foreign aid program is a major factor contributing to the continuing annual increase in our public debt.
>
> Third. Foreign aid is primarily responsible for our annual budget deficits.
>
> Fourth. Foreign aid is almost entirely responsible for our balance-of-payments deficit.
>
> Fifth. Foreign aid is responsible to a very large extent for the flight of our disappearing gold reserves to other nationals all over the world.
>
> Sixth. The cost of foreign aid is the major reason for our ever-increasing noncompetitive position in world markets.
>
> Seventh. Foreign aid is rapidly depleting our wealth and resources.
>
> Eighth. The claim to the effect that 80 percent of our foreign aid money is spent in America and thereby creates prosperity is a myth, and a calculated misrepresentation intended to keep the American people supporting the program. Foreign aid contracts are now carefully shuffled out to manufacturers, schools, colleges, universities, workshops and consultants in the 50 States of the Union, so as to attract support and cause it to appear that this giveaway of our wealth is making our Nation prosperous.
>
> Ninth. The foreign aid program as presently operated is uncontrolled and uncontrollable.
>
> Tenth. Many of the nations which are recipients of our aid are rapidly losing faith in America's ability to manage its economic and monetary systems.
>
> Eleventh. We are, in this bill, setting up the machinery by which to borrow money from former and present aid-recipient nations in order to indirectly finance the aid program for this year if other means fail.

Mr. Chairman, that is a statement from the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid, made to the Members of this House last year.

May I make this one statement: I repeat, if ever in history any group has made speeches, every one of which on this bill up to now indicates that there should be a thorough review of our foreign policy, you have done it, you have done it, and all of the rest.

Mr. Chairman, I plead in the interest of our own safety and security that you gentlemen with this responsibility realize that you are going to have to draw some lines, take a look at it, and let us pull in our ducks where we can protect them, instead of inviting the Castros in Cuba that we are helpless to push out.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a broadside attack on certain areas of foreign aid. But does the gentleman realize the impact that this amendment would have? It would strike the entire development grant program around the world. Does the gentleman realize the impact that it might have on the malaria control program? Does the gentleman realize the impact that it might have on training people in Africa and newly emerging nations? Do we know, based upon anything that has been said here by the gentleman or the author of the amendment, what the worldwide impact of this amendment would be?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say this to my majority leader? May I say that the motion I made was to strike out the requisite number of words, because I believe that this should be done thoroughly and with our eyes open, because of the points that the gentleman from Oklahoma has made.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned the Congo. There is an example of what we have done. Our Nation did not insist that other Congo provinces be subjected to Katanga Province, which had shown some ability to govern itself. No, this Nation through the foreign aid-United Nations approach made the Katanga Province subject itself to the central government, of the Congo, neither province of which has ever shown any ability to govern itself.

May I say again that I do not know of a single speech that has been made in behalf of this bill which did not show the need to review foreign aid and the United Nations approach and change our direction.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a profound respect for my friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Mississippi who just addressed the Committee. But if my memory serves me correctly, the gentleman has never supported this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I supported the Greek-Turkish loan but I have not voted for it since. I repeatedly said in earlier years that if it took my vote to pass the Marshall plan I probably would vote for it because it represented the only foreign policy we had. I said subsequently I would not vote for it under any condition because of what the years have shown. It is competing on production we have promoted for export, I pointed out.

Mr. BOGGS. I have not misstated the gentleman's position. I am glad the gentleman said that since the Greek-Turkish program he had not voted for any of these programs, which would mean the Marshall plan and all of the other programs that have come along since the conclusion of World War II.

I realize that the gentleman has made a broadside attack also on the whole foreign policy of the Government of the United States. I think in order to set the record straight we should look back just a little bit and realize that back in 1952 this country changed administrations and we elected a great general as President of the United States. He brought in his own team.

He brought in his own team and called it a team, as a matter of fact. He brought in Mr. John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State, a distinguished American, now gone to his reward. He brought in other people. He brought in a former Governor of Massachusetts and a former Member of this body, Governor Herter, as Secretary of State later in his administration.

Throughout the 8 years of the Republican administration teams went all over the world looking at the foreign aid program, mutual assistance program, the Development Loan Fund, the predecessor to the Alliance for Progress program, and so on. Did they change them? They did not. Did President Eisenhower say this program was ineffectual and that we ought to abandon it? He did not. Did Secretary Dulles say we should abandon it? He did not.

I would be the last person on earth to say there are not difficulties and problems, maladministration, and misinformation, in a program of this kind. Certainly there is. We are the leading nation in the world. How does the gentleman from Mississippi propose that we maintain our leadership if we are not a part of the world? I wonder where the notion comes from that we can be the richest nation on earth, the strongest nation on earth, and yet not participate in the affairs of the earth? That is really what is involved here.

The gentleman from Mississippi did not speak to the specific amendment. He did not speak to the specific proposal. But if we abandon this part of the programs we are not saying to the world that we will not share any of our wealth, any of our supply of material resources. What we would be saying to the world is that we will not share our knowledge, we will not share our know-how.

The gentleman from Mississippi complains about our teaching people in backward places how to grow food because it may be competitive. What does the gentlemen want to do? Does he want us to let them starve to death so that we can have some more Public Law 480 prorgams and send it to them free so we can pay his farmers and the farmers in my State?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Mississippi complained about the growing of food while we are piling up surpluses. Does the gentleman think there would be any hungry people in any foreign country or in this country if they could afford to buy those surpluses? We are trying to teach them how to help themselves to fight hunger.

Mr. BOGGS. The population of this earth is exploding. All of us know that. The population all over this earth is growing at a tremendous rate. Are we going to say to peoples living everywhere that we will not share our know-how with them?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I can no longer remain silent in this debate. I have great respect for my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire. I, too, am concerned about some of the costs involved in the foreign aid program. I am sure that we do have clear balance-of-payments problems, and I believe we can cut down on some of our foreign aid costs in some areas.

But it seems to me that the debate in the House has not been directed clearly and affirmatively to leaving with the various embassies and the chiefs of mission that we have throughout the world the tools and the flexibility with which to conduct effective and well administered foreign aid programs. I do not believe that it is wise to support a proposition that would raise our loans from three-fourths of 1 percent to 2 percent. This reduces the flexibility.

Very clearly there are some areas of the world where we must make low interest loans. We must help build roads and other public facilities. This can only be conducted by some of the governments. There are no free enterprise entities to do it. To the extent we do not help in the construction of some public facilities which are not revenue producing we can also hurt the development of the private sector in many of these countries.

In the case of the technical assistance program—this program can be and over the years has been very important. This is the guts of our foreign aid program. A number of administrations have supported it. It is essential, in my opinion, in many areas of the world.

If we wish to cut foreign aid, that is one matter, but let us not cut the tools and the flexibility of our program. Let us not handcuff our ambassadors in the field.

In the TC programs there are a number that have been phased out. I was one of those who on instructions from the State Department phased out our first TC program in Israel, because in that country they had developed the skills and techniques necessary. The program had served its purpose and Israel was already exporting some of these skills.

I can assure you in all earnestness that this TC and development grant program is important. It has been the backbone of our USOM and AID missions. I believe it is essential to the effectiveness of our foreign aid program. A number of these TC programs can be phased out, but we should by all means support, and vigorously support, the TC programs in a number of areas where we need technical experts, where Americans have to go in and help the people in connection with health, agriculture, industry, marketing, schools, public administration, and a variety of technical services. This I think is essential.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to compliment the gentleman. I happen to have had the good fortune of visiting the gentleman when he served with distinction as one of our Ambassadors. I congratulate him on the statement he is making. The gentleman speaks from experience.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I, too, should like to compliment the gentleman on his statement. He has underlined the importance of the technical assistance program, which is now under consideration. In view of the action taken yesterday with respect to development loans, and the acceptance of a floor on the interest rate which can be charged, these development grants become even more important, rather than less important. They are an essential part of the foreign aid program itself.

Mr. REID of New York. I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. This is very important. I think it is important to our foreign aid program. I hope the House will support our ambassadors in the field and give them the tools to do an effective kind of job or else administer the kind of job that our country should have and the kind of job that is essential to further social and economic justice and to the cause of freedom and independence of many countries throughout the world.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In line with the gentleman's statement, I should like to state that under this grant program we have presently over 70 contracts with American universities. We have over 5,000 technicians from the universities in the field.

I would like to point out we have 5,000 technicians from the underdeveloped countries presently studying in American universities. So we are creating a dialog with people from foreign countries and underdeveloped countries and also establishing person-to-person contacts in those countries that will be mutually beneficial, and I compliment the gentleman, who shares the views expressed by former President Eisenhower.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I share the opinion as expressed in the gentleman's remarks that the guts of the program at one time was in the point 4 program. In fact the theory of foreign aid was very much in this area. When you talk about the amount though, which is now down to around $200 million or thereabouts, it becomes very obvious what has happened to the basic theory of foreign aid. When we hear some of the comments that were made by people who are knowledgeable, including the majority leader, talking about malaria control which has nothing to do with this particular program, or my good friend, the gentleman from New York, who talks in terms of a water project in Morocco, which is better suited to fit under a loan program, certainly in my judgment, we begin to realize how far removed we are from these basic concepts. May I say this, the real theory behind the point 4 program, which I share by the way, is the person-to-person approach. Back in 1954, the feeling was that the best way to move forward in our foreign aid programs, the theories of which I have supported, was to do as much as we can through the private sector. I offered an amendment which became law to the Internal Revenue Code to provide an additional 10 percent reduction for donations to churches, hospitals and educational institutions. I was anxious to channel as much help into the real person-to-person programs, which are in the private sector. These have been our missionary programs, and I do not mean just our church missions but I mean our educational missions and our public health missions, in the private sector. And I heard their names taken in this debate, to me, almost in vain, because your point 4 program, whatever it is, is a Government program and not private; not really person to person. If we would only call attention to what is being done in the private sector and see if we can build upon that. Now I think that probably there is still some need to enlarge this person-to-person approach, and there is a place besides to supplement the real person-to-person program in the private sector. But to supplement it, let us understand it. I have yet to see our Foreign Affairs Committee come in or our Appropriations Committee come in with any estimate or understanding of the tremendous work still going on in the private sector; and not in Government.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has mentioned my name, will he yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has accused me of being clear off base on this matter, I would like to read from printed policy statements or publications of the Department of State.

Mr. CURTIS. Wait; before the gentleman begins, may I direct his attention to what I said. The gentleman mentioned malaria control, that is under a different section of the bill. That is all I said. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ALBERT. That is not all of it.

Mr. CURTIS. All right, go ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. This statement says:

> About a fifth of the total grant program for the region is in the field of health, including extensive malaria eradication programs. The fight against malaria, however, has passed its peak, and the funds spent on all health programs have declined about 15 percent since 1961 as a result.

Then it gives examples and specifically states that the grant program has been important in the eradication of malaria.

Mr. CURTIS. My basic comment would be that the malaria program is under a different section and obviously this is an example of the redundancy that exists.

I have one other remark I want to make, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The day before yesterday and yesterday I was trying to call attention to the figures that have been used by proponents of this foreign aid program stating that 80 percent of the moneys are being spent here in this country. Because of my great concern with the balance-of-payments problem—and this really bears directly on it—I felt first of all that the 80 percent figure was unsubstantiated.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CURTIS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CURTIS. I think the record is pretty clear that that 80-percent figure is unsubstantiated. But the point I was seeking to drive home is that if the 80-percent figure were true, we would be going against the basic theory of foreign aid which is embraced in this person-to-person approach that your point 4 program seeks to supplement. The bulk of point 4 money is spent in the country concerned, not in the United States.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to say to the gentleman that there is concern in the Committee on Foreign Affairs about the private sector and about the work being done by the various religious groups. We had them before us year after year and they testified before us, so we know what they are doing. As a matter of fact, I think I share the gentleman's concern, and I said to them a couple of years ago, "I just wish it were possible to turn this whole technical assistance program over to you people to run it." I think they might run it better, but they are unable and unwilling to take that responsibility but they have testified repeatedly that the people in the field work with them and supplement what they are doing and that there is a great deal of cooperation and collaboration between them.

Mr. CURTIS. May I say to the gentleman—and I appreciate his making these statements—that if I unwittingly in my remarks implied that there is no concern on the part of the committee, I had no intention to do so, but what I was directing your attention to is that in the reports and the hearings we never did get the figures on how much was being done dollarwise in this area so that we could evaluate the supplements. I know you have the concern for it, and I do not know but what, from what the gentleman says, that we might share the same approach to it.

Mr. HAYS. It is difficult to get the figures because some organizations do not want to make them public and do not like to give them to us for fear that somehow or other the Government might be running their business. We would like to do this if we could, I think.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been concerned in listening to the arguments made in the well of this House here today by some of the supporters of this program who say, "Are you not concerned about the poor people in India?" or "Are you not concerned about the poor people in Africa?" or "Do you not care about the hungry people in Pakistan?" Sure I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about tax burdened folks in west Texas who are paying for this giveaway, and I am more concerned about the poor and hungry people in the 50 United States than I am about the hungry people in the various 100 or 112 countries around the world. Sure I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about my own family's security and about clothes and shoes for my own children and the children within our own country. Before we start paying out our hard earned money to pay for someone else's groceries, medicines, and pleasures, let us take care of our own, let us be concerned about our own country and our own families first.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. You are also concerned about boring holes in the ground to get water in Texas, are you not? With the water problem we have here in America if the United States is going to give away millions looking for water we need it right here.

Mr. FOREMAN. Yes, certainly I am. But we are not asking for Federal aid to do it with. We only ask for a little tax freedom, a little reduction in foreign aid giveaways, so we can do it ourselves.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will permit me to make an observation, there has been a little more heat than light cast on many of the aspects of this program in relation to this amendment. This is a $4 billion bill. Where are you going to cut if you are going to cut out any of the money for this program? Out of the most likely candidate for savings of our dollars. Out of the grant program and gifts. There are two sections that relate to grants principally. One is $217 million authorized in this bill for the purpose of technical assistance and development, and the other is $380 million authorized for so-called supporting assistance in section 108. This supporting assistance, as I read the committee's report, is claimed to be directed primarily to political and security objectives allied with our own. There has been talk about the countries in various areas of the world where their economic stability is considered to be relatively important to our security here. But in the testimony to the committee itself on page 104 of the hearings let us see what are the true facts. Mr. Bell testified to a claimed need for $435 million for supporting assistance and $1.4 billion for military assistance.

None of this is touched by this amendment.

For the Alliance for Progress, $850 million, under a previous administration. That is not touched by this amendment.

> For development loans outside Latin America, $1,060,000,000;
> For development grants outside Latin America, $257,000,000;
> For all other purposes, $218,000,000:

None of this except grants, better called gifts, outside Latin America is affected by this amendment.

This amendment has nothing to do with Latin America.

The $217 million that would be taken out by this amendment deals solely with give-away programs outside of Latin America.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may ask the author of the amendment a question?

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could the gentleman tell us how many hundreds of millions of dollars would be left in the pipeline for this program in the event his amendment were adopted? I am sure it would be a considerable amount.

Mr. WYMAN. In the committee's report the estimate was that the unexpended balances in the foreign assistance program, military and nonmilitary, including the Alliance for Progress, but excluding investment guarantees, $6.7 billion.

Mr. MORGAN. But very little technical assistance money is included in this total.

Mr. WYMAN. The purpose of the amendment is clearly to eliminate these grants. This amendment is designed to tell our friends that with our fiscal crisis here at home we have reached the end of the road on grants and gifts—at least until the budget is in balance once again.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I commend him for his sound, responsible approach to cut down the many irresponsible giveaways in the costly programs. I endorse his amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 77; noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARRY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: On page 5, line 21, strike out "$217,000,000" and insert "$317,000,000.".

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, for want of a better title to my amendment rather than calling it a $100-million increase, I should say this is a "help Pakistan amendment."

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we took action on increasing interest rates. I just want to give the members of the committee an idea of what the action of the committee will do to the country of Pakistan. There will be other countries which will be affected by that amendment. They also are our stanch allies. However, let us just take Pakistan and consider the future of our loan policy with respect to that country.

The loans I am about ready to read to you have already been made. So these particular loans will not be affected. But since we have a 5-year consortium which involves both Pakistan and India, I would like very much to show the members of the committee the damaging effect of what we did yesterday.

Pakistan has a total of $250 million worth of loans at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent interest with us at the present time. Were this 2-percent increase to apply to this group of loans, they would pay over $100 million more in interest over the life of those loans than they will pay under the present rate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what about the situation in Pakistan? The gentleman from Texas rose and said he was interested in the people of west Texas. I do not think there is a Member in the House today who is not interested in the people of west Texas or any other constituency. But let us examine and compare the capability to support themselves and to advance economically of the people of west Texas and the people of Pakistan. The average per capita income in Pakistan is $75 per person. The average per capita income in this country is 30 times greater. The opportunity for the people in west Texas to better themselves is obviously clear. The misfortune of birth in Pakistan insofar as economic betterment is concerned is obviously clear. Therefore, the comparison is perfectly ridiculous, when we are talking about the great effort now being made in the world for economic improvement. I hope that we can have some kind of economic betterment in other nations who are willing to die for us and who are willing to support the underbelly of Asia against the onrush of communism. Surely we should be willing to support them with military assistance to maintain their independence, and economic aid to create the economic stability and viability that prevents communism from getting a foothold.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to mention a few projects in Pakistan that would have been affected if the 2 percent interest rate had been in effect at the time the loans were negotiated. Malaria control over $3 million would have been affected. The salinity control program in the amount of $10.8 million would have been affected. The general commodity loan program amounting to $30 million—a program involving commodities that Pakistan needs badly to maintain itself economically and in a position to be a stanch ally of the United States—would be affected.

There is further a $2 million loan for a feasibility study to determine how Pakistan can be a stronger nation in the future.

Some Members might ask, what has a $100 million increase in technical assistance to do with our loan program? Well, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said, in the course of the debate on the last amendment, that technical assistance is all the more important because of what we did yesterday. He was undoubtedly suggesting that a larger technical assistance program will now be necessary because grants will be needed instead of loans in some instances when the country involved will be unable to pay the higher interest rate. I agree with that and I feel that we ought to increase our technical assistance because of what we did yesterday. The shortsightedness of one day has to be paid for on the following day.

Mr. Chairman, I say that in order for us to act responsibly on legislation affecting our Nation's position in world affairs, we must dig out the facts, review them carefully, and ascertain what may happen in the future as a result of our decisions. We must be aware of the consequences of our actions—consequences which may reverberate throughout the entire world and adversely affect our good allies—allies like free China, Pakistan, India, Greece, Turkey, and others. We cannot realize the effect of what we are doing on the floor of the Congress unless we dig deep and get all the facts. In the very limited time that was available to me, I have tried to put together some facts relating to our programs in just one country, and to show what effect the action of the House yesterday could have on our activities in that country. This, however, is just a single example. To understand the full import of the amendment adopted yesterday, we must consider our programs in many other countries—programs which will be also placed in jeopardy by the operation of that amendment.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I have offered the amendment to increase the authorization for technical assistance. I think this increase is fully justified in view of the action of the committee with respect to the interest rate on development loans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the adoption of my amendment will serve to restore some respectability to the great 15-year-old technical assistance program and show that America is willing to teach less privileged people how to improve themselves. This is a "show-how" program in which we use our technical ability, our engineers and our "know-how." This money does not flow away to other countries to be spent. This money is used to bring American industry and engineering ability to those people, who recognize our leadership, and show them how they can improve themselves through the industrial genius that has brought America the highest standard of living in the history of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—INVESTMENT GUARANTIES

SEC. 105. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence after "wholly owned" insert "(determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the parent corporation)".

(2) In paragraph (1) strike out "$1,300,000,000" in the proviso and substitute $2,500,000,000".

(3) In paragraph (2) strike out "$180,000,000" in the third proviso and substitute "$300,000,000".

(4) In paragraph (2) strike out "1964" in the fourth proviso and substitute "1965".

(b) Amend section 222(a), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by striking out "section 221(b)" in both places it appears and substituting "sections 221(b) and 224".

(d) Amend section 222(d), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of this part, sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b)(3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 222(b) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b)(4)(F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c)(2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 222(f)."

(e) Amend section 222(e), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with the other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 222(d) of this part."

(f) Amend section 222 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In making a determination to issue a guaranty under section 221(b), the President shall consider the possible adverse effect of the dollar investment under such guaranty upon the balance of payments of the United States."

(g) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b) strike out "$60,000,000" and substitute "$150,000,000".

(2) Strike out subsection (c).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I had intended at this point to offer an amendment, but I think instead I shall try to make my point by simply explaining the objectives of this amendment. As shown by the committee report on this bill—page 19—in order to encourage private investments in underdeveloped countries, the Government guarantees certain approved private loans. In order to provide a guarantee for these private investments, a reserve has been established to back up the full faith and credit of the United States.

This pooling arrangement of reserves, I think, is a very meritorious arrangement. Under it, various categories of funds are used to discharge any liabilities under Government guarantees. In order of priority, these categories are first, fee income; second, currencies or other assets collected in connection with the loan; third, funds previously appropriated to provide the guarantee reserve; fourth, funds realized from sale of notes issued under authority of the Mutual Security Act and the Economic Cooperation Act—I point this category up especially because, as will be recognized, this is Treasury borrowing authority or back-door spending—and, fifth, funds hereafter appropriated.

As I said, I think the pooling arrangement is good, but my amendment would have changed it in order that after June 30, 1964, the authority to sell notes, as in four above, would terminate. In other words, what my amendment was intended to accomplish was to provide that borrowing authority would not be used as a means of settling liabilities. Rather, future appropriations would be necessary if there were losses under this guarantee.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that to borrow money to pay losses when such borrowing will have to be paid by an appropriation later is hardly a proper way of facing up to payment of a Government liability. It is just putting off until some future day the accounting for the losses under such programs. I think it is logical to specify that fees charged for the investment guarantees should be called on to pay any losses first. That makes sense. Then, when these fees are exhausted, the next call is on proceeds from the sale of any assets acquired in the course of closing out a guarantee case in which a loss has been incurred. That also makes sense. Then funds previously appropriated for the purpose would be next called on to cover any losses. When these three sources are exhausted, it seems to me, and my amendment would have so provided, that appropriated funds would be in order and not the unnecessary, illogical, and confusing back-door Treasury borrowing authority as a source of ready funds to pay losses that can never be repaid to the Treasury except by direct appropriation or note cancellation.

I would have liked to have seen the withdrawal of this back-door borrowing authority after June 30, 1964, but I sense the temper of the House and feel that this technically complicated matter would probably not be adopted, or even if it were, would probably come out in conference with the Senate, so I simply raise the issue and urge that in the course of time this $199 million for back-door authority should be eliminated. Perhaps the Foreign Affairs Committee will give me an opportunity, before next year's authorization bill is reported to the House, to appear and present my views on this matter. Meanwhile, let me say that I appreciate the patience of the Committee in letting me present this matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

SEC. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), amend the next to the last sentence thereof by inserting immediately after "reasonable terms" the following: "(including private sources within the United States), the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest".

(2) In subsection (e) strike out "economical" and substitute "economically".

(3) In subsection (f) strike out "Agency for International Development" and substitute "agency primarily responsible for administering part I".

(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended by inserting immediately after "1963" the second time it appears therein the following: "and not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 10 strike lines 6 through 10 and substitute the following:

"(b) Amend section 252, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, which relates to authorization to read as follows:

"'AUTHORIZATION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this title, in addition to other funds available for such purposes for fiscal year 1964 not to exceed $450,000,000, which sums are authorizd to remain available until expended, and which except for not to exceed $50,000,000 shall be available only for loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars.'"

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], a little while ago said that he was going to be voting for some cuts in this bill. I hope he starts about now to vote for a few cuts because I want to reciprocate. I want to vote for the amendment that he promised the Foreign Affairs Committee he would offer dealing with a character known as Dictator Sukarno over in Indonesia. So, I hope the gentleman begins now to help out in voting for some cuts.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield, I would prefer to get to that a little later, if you do not mind.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought—that it would be manana or something like that.

Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provides an annual authorization of $600 million to the so-called Alliance for Progress for each of the fiscal years 1963 through 1966. This amendment would reduce the authorization from $600 million to $450 million, a cut of $150 million.

Equally as important, it would attempt to bring this fast blossoming program under a measure of control by limiting the authorization to fiscal 1964.

It would also cut the economic grant money to $50 million for the fiscal year, a reduction of $50 million in this authorization.

With expenditures in fiscal years 1962 and 1963 relatively small in the three categories of economic grants, social progress trust fund, and development loans, and with a carryover of approximately $1 billion, it is my contention that with the $150 million reduction there will be more than ample financing available for this program.

I want to reemphasize that there is already such a proliferation of funds in the Alliance for Progress program as to raise serious questions as to their justification and use.

Aside from the money involved, it is scarcely necessary to remind the House that this Government has met with but little success in obtaining the governmental reforms in Latin America that will produce a climate favorable to the investment of either public or private funds.

Mr. Chairman, I would cite to you the example of Brazil. Brazil came in last year and got $80 million and a promise of $398.5 million. They have not carried out the governmental reforms they promised this country they would carry out. As a matter of fact, Brazil wanted the first bite of $80 million in a hurry to meet their payments on the loans and credits that they had been extended by Russia and other nations of the Soviet bloc; in other words, using our money to pay off the maturing obligations to the Communists.

Argentina has been the beneficiary of the Alliance for Progress and other funds—Argentina where they obtained more gold or almost as much gold in 1 recent year as we gave them in aid.

It is time to tighten the strings on the Alliance for Progress. This money is not needed and this fund can well be drawn down and we can save another $150 million in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for certain amendments to these foreign aid authorization bills. I think, however, if we are going to cut anywhere in this program, we must not cut in the Alliance for Progress.

Look at it from any standpoint you wish, and I think you are going to have to conclude that Latin America is not only closer to us but is more indispensable to us and to our future than any other part of the world.

Look at it from the standpoint of our military security. The missile age has not reduced but, rather, it has dramatically accentuated the need for hemispheric solidarity.

Look at it from the standpoint, if you wish, of economy. The 20 Republics of Latin America buy more of our American goods and provide for us and our economy more of the essential strategic materials necessary for the operation of our economy than does any other regional grouping in the world.

If the nations of Europe should, heaven forbid, incestuously draw inward in economic isolation, then our only natural outlet for markets would be in the direction of an awakening and expanding economy to the south of us.

Or, we can look at it, if you please, from the standpoint of our obligation. This hemisphere is our special responsibility. Charity begins at home, though it need not end there. But he who does not provide for his own, we are told, is worse than an infidel.

Or, perhaps you would like to look at it from the standpoint of the future. The nations of Latin America have the fastest growing population in the world. Today there are 200 million people in those nations. By 1975 there are going to be 300 million people. By the end of this century there will be 600 million people in the land that lies south of us, bigger than the United States and Canada put together. This is the wave of the future. This is the place where perhaps within the next 10 years the decisive battle of the cold war may well be fought.

Latin America today is a seething caldron of keyed-up emotions, long-spent-up hopes, and long-smothered aspirations gasping for air. It is a combustible combination.

We lost Cuba because the people of that unhappy island had completely lost hope of ever achieving their legitimate objectives through the slow and orderly processes of evolutionary government.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will be glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend my friend on his fine statement, but since he mentioned Cuba, I think it might be well at this stage to point out that the Soviet Union is estimated to be spending something like $400 million a year in Cuba. Are we unwilling to spend less than half of that much after making a commitment in the rest of South America?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point is very well taken. Certainly in good conscience and intelligent self-interest we can do no less than we have pledged. After generations of inattention toward our southern neighbors in the priorities of our international commitments, finally at long last the Alliance for Progress has raised some hopes and raised some expectations and has staved off the hands of futility and despair. But now are we to dash those hopes after having raised them?

Yes, admittedly the Alliance for Progress has been a little slow in getting off the ground. It took some time for us to convince Latin American leaders that we meant it when we said that this has to be a cooperative effort in which they too have to do certain things.

But in the hearings on this bill it is revealed that 11 of those countries now have done those very things we said they should do. They have reformed their tax structures. They are reforming their land tenure acts. At last they are making it possible for the "plain vanilla" fellow out on the streets or on the land to see some hope for him and his children on down the road.

Are we going to dash that hope? Now, having set our hand to the plow, are we going to turn back and say, "We did not really mean it? Now that you have done your part of the bargain, we are going to welsh on ours?"

Are we going to cut off this thing that we told them was going to be a 10-year cooperative program and say that, "We are going to give you only 1 year" and that at a cut rate? I think not. I think the American people want us not to. The stakes are too high. Latin America is too important. The Alliance for Progress is a good program. We can win this fight. We must win it. And we will not win it by throwing in the towel.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. It would reduce the authorization for the Alliance for Progress by $150 million for fiscal year 1964. In the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 the Congress authorized $600 million for each of fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966. Although the committee did not authorize carrying forward the unused authorization of $75 million from fiscal year 1963, the committee made it clear that the people of Latin America should be assured of the confidence of the United States in the basic objectives and purpose of the Alliance. The adoption of this amendment would jeopardize the program which we authorized last year.

Mr. Chairman, impatience with the Alliance for Progress is apparent in some of the committee hearings on the foreign aid program. No one contends that the Alliance has brought a millenium to Latin America. But the program does not merit a lack of confidence on the part of Congress, to be demonstrated by a slash in funds.

In assessing the achievements or failures of the Alliance to date, any fair evaluation must take into account a number of factors. First, an international program designed to restructure rigid societies—frozen in centuries-old patterns—is itself experimental, following an unchartered course. Hence, some trial and error should be expected.

Second, the lack of trained personnel and no clear knowledge of available resources are great obstacles to modernization. These deficiencies—which did not exist in Europe at the time of the Marshall plan—are bound to hinder the rapid transformations we hope to see in the region.

Third, the attitude on the part of great masses of the Latin American people is itself an inhibiting factor to achieving Alliance for Progress goals. After centuries of empty promises, neglect, and venal administrations, the Latin American people frequently distrust their own governments. This cynicism nullifies the creative energy of the people. Unless overcome, it prevents their enthusiastic participation in efforts to help themselves.

Fourth, the backlog in Latin America of housing, school, potable water, and other requirements for a decent life is staggering. Existing housing shortages are estimated in the millions, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of dwellings necessary each year to accommodate new family formations. Over half the children in the 7 to 14 age bracket are not in school. Over 100 million people are without adequate water supplies.

Critics of the Alliance for Progress stress the program's weaknesses. Yet there have been a number of promising developments in the last year.

It is true that the program got off to a disappointingly slow start. Many of the governments who signed the Charter of Punta del Este took their commitments for self-help lightly. A number of governments thought that all they had to do to qualify for assistance was to plead necessity or the threat of communism. Some made gestures toward self-help reforms.

In the past year Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and his aids have increasingly got the message across that something more than token or paper reforms are required. Convincing the Latin Americans that the key to sound economic and social development lies in their own self-help is of major importance in achieving the goals of the Alliance.

The 140,000 houses and 8,200 classrooms constructed under Alliance aegis in 2 years, the 700 community water systems and wells installed, the 160,000 loans to small farmers, and the increase of income tax receipts by 15 percent last year may seem like slow progress measured against the region's needs. But the Alliance is registering some remarkable accomplishments.

For the fact is that the Alliance is taking root in Latin America. It is changing attitudes in Latin America toward the United States, toward communism, toward private enterprise, and toward change itself.

Under the Alliance for Progress the United States has associated itself with the long-continuing Latin American desire for improved economic and social progress. This association has removed much of the bitterness which marked United States-Latin American relations in the past. The United States has even moved ahead of some Latin American thinking by emphasizing social change as a concomitant of economic change.

Meanwhile, rightest elements in Latin America—frequently concentrated in the ruling few—are themselves becoming more amenable to change. Although many still resist, others are becoming convinced of the wisdom of President Kennedy's remark that "those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." Now that the Alliance for Progress exists, backed by our insistence on internal reforms, there is a growing inclination on the part of the more conservative groups in Latin America to accept evolutionary change.

With the United States urging reforms and Latin America's own conservative elements becoming less obstructionist, the belief among many Latin Americans that change is only possible through violent upheaval is receding.

The psychological impact of providing Latin America with an alternative to revolution and communism is apparent in recent developments in the Latin American student movements, ever a barometer of popular feeling. The student body of Mexico's National University, for instance, elected a liberal-moderate slate in the November elections replacing the Communist-dominated student council.

In the University of Cordoba in Argentina, moderate anti-Communist student groups are now in the majority in the student council, once controlled by Communists.

In Chile the Christian-Democratic students obtained virtual control of all commercial, secondary, and university student organizations.

In the University of Honduras anti-Communist students won a substantial victory over the Communist-dominated student organization.

This is not to say that the Alliance for Progress alone is responsible for the changing Latin American student picture. Soviet and Cuban actions, as well as the rift between the Soviet Union and China, no doubt have contributed to a weakening of Communist appeal.

Nevertheless, the Alliance for Progress is a powerful constructive influence. With its thrust toward social reforms and the encouragement by the United States of such reforms, the Alliance at once erases past misgivings about the United States and its dollar diplomacy, while at the same time creating an alternate solution to Latin America's pressing problems.

In walking the tightrope between insisting on the self-help criteria inherent in the Charter of Punta del Este—and incensing the Latin American sensitivities by intervening in their domestic affairs—the Alliance for Progress has a difficult task.

Mr. Chairman, the road ahead is long, tough, and largely unpredictable. The experience of the last 2 years has better defined the difficulties in stirring the stagnant economies in Latin America toward self-sustaining growth.

But the obstacles must not deter us from pressing ahead with the program.

The men and women who have the day-to-day job of coping with the setbacks and the disappointments, along with the occasional resounding successes, deserve Congress most ardent support.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 10, immediately after line 10, insert the following:

"(c) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

" 'In order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 251, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the loan funds appropriated pursuant to this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, respectively, shall be available only for loans made for purposes of economic development through private enterprise.' "

Mr. **MORGAN.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ADAIR.** I yield.

Mr. **MORGAN.** Do I understand the gentleman's amendment is identical in language to that which was offered to the Development Loan Fund but that this now applies to the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. **ADAIR.** That is true. I think I can be brief in explaining this amendment. This is the second of three private enterprise amendments which I have. It is the companion to the one which the committee adopted yesterday which provides that 50 percent of the Development Loan Funds shall be used for purposes of private enterprise. Simply put that is it.

As I pointed out yesterday when the committee adopted the amendment to the Development Loan Fund section of the bill, this is in the broadest possible terms. It gives the AID administration great flexibility. The 50 percent is not measured in terms of individual countries but in terms of the program as a whole.

In this case I would agree with the gentleman from Texas who just preceded me, that one of the things we are seeking to do is to build a strong private sector of the economy in Latin America. I believe that this will contribute to that effort.

The main thrust of the amendment adopted yesterday would be in the direction of the countries of the continents of Asia, Africa, and Europe. This would apply to Latin America.

I repeat, the committee adopted a similar amendment yesterday and I should hope that the committee will adopt this one today.

Mr. **HARVEY** of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ADAIR.** I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. **HARVEY** of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague on this amendment and state that while I am not an authority on the affairs of South America I have had some experience there. I think this is a sorely needed policy direction from the Congress in this area.

Mr. **ADAIR.** I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **HAYS.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday there is no Member of this House for whom I have a higher regard than I have for my colleague from Indiana. For that reason I hesitate to oppose his amendment.

I hate to oppose it for another reason, because I know what he wants to accomplish by it is the same thing I would like to see accomplished. I know his intentions are well grounded and I know that he wants to do the thing that he said, which is to channel as much of this as possible into the private sector. I do not mind telling the members of the committee that I have been less than optimistic about the Alliance for Progress program. I believe in it. I believe in its concept. But I have been less than optimistic about its success because of the fact that until we can get the big-business people, the people of wealth in Latin America to believe in their own countries and to invest their own money in Latin America, it seems to me we cannot have much chance of salvaging a successful free enterprise there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with the amendment as I see it? The one thing that bothers me about it is this: By putting this rigidity into it, by taking from the Administrator any flexibility, we might force him to face up to one of two things. Either do not put any money in a country and write it off, or if he puts money into that country, put half of it into the so-called private sector and give it to the very people who are channeling and funneling the money out of Latin America into numbered accounts in Swiss banks.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], will admit that we have impressed upon these people that we want this done. We have told them we want it done. But I really believe that the gentleman from Indiana would not want the Administrator to be faced with the Hobson's choice that I have mentioned.

Mr. **ADAIR.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HAYS.** I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. **ADAIR.** In response to the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio, I would say that I am certain that the committee has impressed upon the Administrator and his immediate associates and aids the fact that we are concerned about the private sector. I would differ with the gentleman as to the fact that we are tying his hands too tightly. I think the amendment does give him a very great degree of flexibility.

Mr. HAYS. Except, may I say to the gentleman, if you interpret the amendment strictly—and I see no other way to interpret it if he puts any money in at all—is to put half of it into the private sector. Now, presuming that he cannot find in some country a private business in which he has confidence? Then he is faced with the choice of putting in no money at all. This is one danger I see to it. I think they are going to do this in the extent feasible. But I do not like the idea of tying his hands.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman has made the argument that was made in the committee many times when this amendment was offered in committee. The principal objection that I saw to the amendment was that in the long run this could create a bigger burden for the American taxpayer. What the AID has been trying to do is to bring as many countries as possible into this program on a multilateral basis on many of these public projects. If the free enterprise sector could siphon off the cream of these projects where there is going to be a return, we would find that these other countries would not join in the multilateral agreements which we have been seeking in order to create wider participation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment and the amendment that we adopted yesterday would possibly create a greater burden on the American taxpayers.

Mr. HAYS. I would say to the gentleman this: We have the amendment which was adopted yesterday. I would like to see this one defeated and let the program work with the amendment in one sector and without it in the other. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that next year, if his amendment works the way he thinks it will, I will be one of the first ones in here supporting it. But I do not think we ought to make the program so rigid that we have no alternative but to either grant the money to people about whom we have doubts or grant no money at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer in the system of private enterprise in Latin America, just as is the gentleman from Indiana. I supported last year and joined in sponsoring the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], to try to concentrate more of the effort in this program along those lines in order to try, with this program, to stimulate individual enterprise, small business, and small farmers in their efforts to become self-sustaining. But I want to point out two things that we are going to do which I think are very undesirable if we adopt this amendment in the case of Latin America.

In the first place, one of the real propaganda battles we are having to fight in Latin America is the Castro charge that the United States aid programs are designed to help the wealthy and to help those who are in power in Latin America; that they do not reach the people themselves. If we say we have to channel 50 percent of our aid into the private business sector, you can bet your bottom dollar there are going to be a lot of people alleging that a big portion of this aid is going to the big banks and the big businesses of Latin America and will be channeled through them.

Why is that important, and why is it dangerous to this program? The State Department has published a booklet entitled "Building on Experience." That booklet contains this statement about your housing program in Latin America:

> In most of the less developed countries, the only way to own a home is to pay cash or borrow the money at high interest rates (20 percent per year and up) to be repaid within 3 or 4 years at the most. The result is to put home ownership beyond reach of all but the wealthy.

If we adopt the amendment we will say in effect that at least half of our program in housing, for example, in Latin America, is going to be channeled through private lending organizations that are levying this kind of interest and requiring short-term repayment of these loans, and we are going to freeze the situation as it stands right now where they are not able to build homes and get home ownership money for your low income and medium income people in Latin America.

I believe home ownership is the foundation of a society that wants to resist communism. I am a firm believer that you strike a basic blow for private enterprise when you provide an opportunity for the average citizen to borrow money and use that money to develop a business, to farm his own land, or to build a home.

Mr. Chairman, unless we are able to get some change in the lending practices of large segments of the private industry sector in Latin America, and nobody knows that we can do it, we are going to tie the hands of the Administrator in a most undesirable way. I hope we do not play into the hands of the Castro group by tying this amendment to our efforts in South America.

I hope you will follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio and defeat this amendment on the Alliance for Progress approach in Latin America. In that way we certainly take out of the hands of the Castro group one of the most damaging propaganda weapons against the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I want to be entirely certain that the gentleman understands this amendment. It does not say that 50 percent of any particular project nor 50 percent of the funds in any country, but 50 percent of the program as a whole.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do understand that point, and I am sympathetic with your overall objective, but I am afraid it is going to be misconstrued and misrepresented all over Latin America. For another thing, it operates in many countries to the disadvantage of the Administrator in carrying on an effective program. With all regard in the world for the gentleman's objective and the worthwhile desire he has in attempting to improve the private sector and the economy down there, I do not think we ought to paint ourselves into that corner and tie the hands of the Administrator in South America.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk here by the two gentlemen who preceded me about this money going into the hands of private individuals and going into Swiss banks and numbered accounts.

I might call to the attention of the House the fact that some of this money obviously has been going into the hands of government officials as well. When you take the history of individuals and the history of government officials in Latin America, with the Batistas, the Perons, and Jimenezes, and a lot of others, it seems to me the story is just as black on that side as it is on the private sector.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was not this entire Alliance for Progress program originally sold to the Congress on the basis that it would create a favorable climate in South and Central America for private investment?

Mr. WESTLAND. I just do not think there is any guarantee that if we spend a billion dollars or 20 billion dollars and put the money in the hands of government officials in Latin America it necessarily is going to get into the economy proper.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The thing I am saying is that the Administrator has to the best of his ability to try to determine that whichever one he makes a loan to is reasonably honest and is reasonably likely to let the money stay in the country and do something for the people of the country.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would agree with that. I think the private industrialist in South America is just as honest as any government official down there.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further; yes, we helped Dictator Batista of Cuba, not under the Alliance for Progress, but with economic and military assistance. We helped Batista, and what did we get? Castro.

This is all too often the result when we support governments that are in fact ruled by the military. This is why millions and billions of our dollars have gone down the drain and the present policies of this administration mean that more will go the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ADAIR and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 162, noes 159.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] for his patience, forbearance, and kindness during the long and involved hearings, and to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] for her patience in dealing with the new members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, if I had been a Member of Congress when the Marshall plan was considered, a plan to help rebuild and reconstruct the cities and industries of our allies in World War II, I would have supported the plan. When the program changed to the technical assistance program—the point 4 operation—perhaps the warning flag would have been raised. Yet since this was an effort by the United States to share its technical knowledge and know-how with friendly countries of the world it too had merit and would have received my support.

Unfortunately, at times our great Foreign Affairs Committee is referred to as an international public works committee. This, of course, is unkind, yet one merely has to examine the bill and it is hard to come to any other conclusion. In examining our efforts in the field of foreign assistance, particularly on the economic side, we find some unexplainable and serious deficiencies. For example, we find that in some of the recipient countries, their tax laws are such that they are not making an attempt to help themselves; that they would prefer to look to the United States for aid and until we get realistic and insist upon reforms and self-help we shall continue to be referred to as "Uncle Sugar."

Indeed the land reforms that are needed in some countries would aid the depressed and give self-respect to those who wanted to achieve change. Yet such reforms are not forthcoming.

There was a book published recently by D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., called "The Achieving Society" and it was written by David C. McClelland, of Harvard University. The book really is a textbook on sociology which has as its main premise the theory that until a person or a people want a change and want to improve their conditions that all the aid and money in the world will be of no benefit. The desire must be more than in the minds of men and their leaders, but it must also be in their actions. The will must be there. They must be willing to help themselves.

On Tuesday we heard a very excellent discussion by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], who quoted a saying he had read on the wall of one of the superintendents of schools in his district. Whoever had reproduced the quote changed the most important part. The quote comes from Dante's "Inferno" and reads:

> The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crises, maintain their neutrality.

Mr. PIKE used his quotation for examining his own conscience and I will use Dante's to examine the action of some nation's who remain neutral or at least in theory remain neutral. We find some who play the great game of trying to stay in the middle in the fight between East and West and try to gain from both a special advantage. Our policy seems to be that these people should not have to make a choice, and to keep them in the middle is a good thing. I cannot agree with this premise for should the time ever come when they have to make a choice I would like to know which side of the middle they would be inclined to jump.

We give aid to Communist countries with the thought in mind that we are going to win them from the Communist bloc. We insist that our goal in world affairs is nothing more than wanting self-determination for all peoples of the world; yet by our aid and our actions we help keep a dictator like Tito in power in Yugoslavia. This to me is totally inconsistent.

In comparing our situation today to what it was at the end of World War II and considering the billions of dollars that have been spent through various foreign aid programs, one could almost come to the mathematical certainty that the more dollars that are spent around the world, the more precarious our position becomes. It would appear that we become inconsistent in our purpose and direction.

It is no secret that this country is heavily in debt and that the tax burden that our people have to bear is very substantial. We also find by comparison that some of the European countries who received Marshall plan aid and who have made phenomenal recoveries economically do not pay their fair share of the cost of financing programs and development in the underdeveloped countries of the world or the newly emerging nations. We also find that in the countries that they do aid they have direct ties and conditions upon which the aid is given. Could it be that their view of an aid program is directly related to their own economic well-being?

We heard yesterday that our grant programs were gradually being changed to loan programs and that this was a step in the right direction. I personally believe that this leaves the wrong impression with some Members of Congress and certainly with the people of the country who understand that a loan must be repaid. Part of our loan program requires a repayment in local currency of the recipient country or soft currency, but the repayment agreement has a further restriction that this money must be respent in the recipient country by the United States to finance other programs for the benefit of that country, and that we can spend a small portion of it for financing our embassy operations and for other purposes, so long as that money does not leave the country. It, therefore, might be repaid in a sense of the word, but it will never find its way back to the U.S. Treasury to ease the burden of the American taxpayer.

We also find that we are going to have to borrow a substantial amount of money at about 4½ percent interest to loan to a foreign power at three-fourths of 1 percent interest, who in turn will loan it to an entity within that country to build a plant and the loan from the foreign power will draw 5¾ percent interest. The foreign power will make 5 percent on the transaction, while this country will lose 3¾ percent. Again, this is carrying generosity a little bit too far.

It was suggested yesterday during the debate what a terrible thing it would be to scrap this program and turn our back on our allies and friends around the world and leave them to the onslaught of communism. Such a suggestion is not only unwarranted, but a little bit degrading. We never have, in our history, turned our back on people in need. We have given aid to those who needed it, but we have not always used the shotgun approach that we are using at the present time.

It has always appeared a strange practice to me to include both the economic assistance with the military in one bill, instead of giving them separately to the House, which to me would be a better practice.

I think through the years we have proven that we cannot buy friends with dollars. Yet we continue with our dollar diplomacy. We confuse our allies and unfortunately tend to mislead the American taxpayer.

We must indeed examine our position and we must be prepared to vote and then under our system explain our vote to the people back home. I for one will not remain neutral, for to me it is morally wrong to ask the American people to make increasing sacrifices to finance the operation of governments who have done little or nothing to help themselves or to give aid to Communist dominated countries under the guise of trying to win their friendship.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment later in the bill which will deal specifically with our allies and friends who continue to do business with Cuba by allowing their ships to trade with Cuba. We passed an amendment in the appropriations bill last year which we thought would do the job but it was not successful. The purpose of my amendment, which I shall discuss further under the 5-minute rule, is to deal specifically with the problem of ships in the registry of any country which receives either economic or military aid from the United States. It is about time some of our friends in the world who claim to be our allies, and who are not by any stretch of the imagination to be considered neutral—to change their policy and stop allowing ships of their registry to trade with Communist Cuba. It is a direct violation of our President's stated policy of an economic blockade of Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the gentleman on his announced intention to introduce an amendment which would deal with and stop shipping by free world nations to Cuba. I have drafted a similar amendment and am hopeful Congress will put an end to our aiding countries that continue to do business with Communist Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended by striking out "1963" and "$148,900,000" and substituting "1964" and "$136,050,000", respectively.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 10, lines 16 and 17, strike out "$136,050,000" and substitute "$120,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get an amendment that my friend from Ohio, Mr. HAYS, can support. I am trying to get one down to his size if that is possible. I am going down this time to $16 million—only $16 million. I would hope I could get a little help from the gentleman, because the next one that I introduce is going to be considerably higher in terms of cutting the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. I just want to encourage the gentleman. If you keep trying, I am going to come with you.

Mr. GROSS. I will be right here.

This amendment in comparison with others that has been and will be offered provides for the relatively small cut of $16,050,000 in the funds contributed by the United States to international organizations for various and sundry purposes. The administration has requested $136 million for this purpose for fiscal 1964. Get this. The administration requested $136 million for this purpose, and estimated its expenditures at $127 million. So it wanted a nice little cushion somewhere along the line. I contend that $120 million together with an estimated carryover of $74 million is more than adequate to meet all the U.S. commitments to these international organizations in fiscal 1964.

Incidentally, these expenditures are in addition to approximately $85 million contributed by the United States as its share of the expenses of international organizations. Nor does this take into account the financing of the Peace Corps, which also presumably provides technical assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to belabor the issue. I think it is clear cut. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. AVERY. As I listened to the gentleman explain his amendment, I was reminded of the fact that I think it was last April the press carried a story that a subsidiary organization of the United Nations had made allocations to Cuba for an economic survey as it related to their agricultural production. Does the gentleman recall the incident I am referring to?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. AVERY. Is this the title of the bill that would make a contribution to such international organizations as made the allocation to Cuba?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. As I understand it, this includes the United Nations special fund.

Mr. AVERY. If the gentleman will yield further, as I recall it, the United States is contributing about 40 percent to that particular organization.

Mr. GROSS. I think that is right.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I also want to be fair. Does not this section bar any contributions to Cuba?

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid that amendment was watered down to the point where I doubt that it will do what the chairman thinks it will do.

Mr. MORGAN. I call the gentleman's attention to page 13 of the bill, line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask, particularly the gentlewoman from Ohio who I know has firsthand experience and information on this subject, this question. This section covers, does it not, the so-called contribution to the Palestine refugees? And if I am correct in this, then may I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that this is a problem which is at the core of the whole problem in the Middle East. We will never get peace in the Middle East, I think it is fair to say, until we find a solution to the Palestine refugee problem. I feel rather strongly that inasmuch as—I think again I am right—we are giving 70 percent of that fund here in the United States, it is time that we looked somewhere for its more effective use. We may have to drive a bargain to solve this admittedly very difficult but nevertheless important problem if we are not to have a tinder box in the Middle East.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Ohio if she does not agree that perhaps we should do something, and I hope through this committee, to step up a solution to that Palestine refugee problem.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman has put before us one of the problems that has been brought up for many years, and if we could find a solution to it, that would be quite marvelous. I was on that committee; I am not now and have not been for some years and I am not as well versed in the details as I used to be. But I feel that in reality this will have to be straightened out between the two factions. We cannot go in and say, "You must do this or that." We have done altogether too much of that all over the world. I hope that a solution will be found because I agree with the gentleman that it is a most important matter—the peace of mankind.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentlewoman. May I also point out that unless you indicate in some way that you are not going to support people forever on a dole, as these people have been for 15 years, it seems to me somewhere along the line we should say—not 70 percent, maybe 50 percent—something that would indicate some urgency that they arrive at a solution.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how the Palestine refugee question can be determined for quite a few years. Unfortunately, the Arab countries are intransigent as far as that matter is concerned. I have recommended to the State Department that we should gradually reduce the amount of money that is being turned over to the organization that is taking care of these refugees in order that they may be made to realize that there must eventually come a termination to this problem. Unfortunately, not enough of them are being educated so that they can go out on their own and earn a living. But I learned this year that the State Department, in reply to a report that I wrote after going to the area—that they are beginning to reduce the amount that is being turned over to the refugee organization for the purpose of maintenance and support. I was advised that 5 percent of the money will be used for the purpose of educating the refugees and teaching them trades so that they can go out into the other Arab countries and earn a livelihood. The intention of the State Department, in my opinion, is a good one. Of course, it is a belabored one.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very difficult problem. I do not see how they can possibly dispose of it shortly. There are too many questions that are raised with relation to the question. There is no simple answer. Nevertheless, I do think that we have made a start toward disposing of the question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Who created this refugee situation, this camp of a million displaced persons in the Middle East? Who created it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it was created, as the gentleman knows, at the time of the so-called creation of the State of Israel.

Mr. GROSS. Who created it? Was it not created by the United Nations?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was created in conjunction with the United Nations and the United States was the first nation to recognize the new State of Israel.

Mr. GROSS. Why does the United Nations not take care of it, then?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They are. But the most important part, financially at least, of the United Nations happens to be us.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the international organization authorization of the mutual security bill has always been approved 100 percent both in the authorization and in the appropriation. Last year we authorized and appropriated approximately $148 million. This year it is $136 million. These are amounts that have been pledged to finance programs adopted by the organizations concerned. This includes the Children's Fund, it includes the U.N. technical assistance program and special fund, the U.N. food and agricultural program, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the World Health Organizations, the NATO science program, and other programs.

Mr. Chairman, these are amounts agreed to by the representatives of the member nations. Even though the cut which has been offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], is a modest one, it is still going to make us shortchange some of the pledges to which we have already committed ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GROSS and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: Page 10, immediately after line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. Section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general authority to make contributions to international organizations, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'(b) Contributions, whether in cash or in goods and services, and other payments made by the United States for the calendar year 1964 or any subsequent calendar year to the United Nations or to any program or activity thereof (whether or not financed in whole or in part by assessments against member nations) may not exceed 33.33 per centum of the total amount contributed and paid by all nations for the calendar year involved to the United Nations, or the program or activity thereof, as the case may be'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment to be noncontroversial except for those with pets and penchants; that is, the intent is simply to collate all U.S. spending to our second foreign aid program via the United Nations; and to delineate and clarify for, first, our U.N. Ambassador, second, the director of the nonbudgeted extra and additional programs established by the U.N. parent organization, and third, our State Department, the legislative intent of this Congress. In so doing we will quite properly assume our prerogative of limiting the executive branch, namely, the State Department, in their propensity for and dispersal of, our taxpayers' moneys.

As read by the Clerk, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would clarify our original intent. Broadly this would limit U.S. contributions to the budget of all organizations developed and devised by that body to our currently established—Public Law 82-495—maximum share of the regular—assessed—U.N. budget, which is 33⅓ percent. We are now paying 32.02 percent and I propose that this same limit be applied to all U.N. assistance agencies to whom we voluntarily contribute through the U.N. or AID, and that all hands comply therewith.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 2 days' CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in a letter to all Members, plus appearance before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and many reports to this House the first 3 months of this year; and as a result of research into the U.N. diverse funds situation, I have pointed out that we contribute in excess of 33⅓ percent to 10 of the 28 U.N. budgets. I submitted to each of you a table indicating the savings that would accrue if this amendment had been in effect in 1962. It would have amounted to approximately $38 million, and it is estimated that based on the budget for 1964 it could amount to $50 million.

American taxpayers now finance the U.N.'s myriad budgets and funds in widely varying amounts—often at the discretion of the State Department or by virtue of their wiles in interpreting through implementation, counsel, and regulation our legislative efforts.

We pay 40 percent of the Special Fund by special legislation. The same applies to the extended technical assistance program. Seventy percent of the U.N. relief and works agency in the Near East, and 100 percent to the WHO community water development and research programs. I am certain there are those representing special interest groups who will claim that by offering this amendment we do not love little children. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I submit that when we pay, and will continue to pay—33⅓ percent of the costs of UNESCO, UNICEF, and refugee relief in the Near East we are doing more than our fair share. Besides they have their own fundraising activities, in addition. Actually, we have been paying the same disproportionate share of the U.N. Special Fund and ETAP since 1959. We have paid 100 percent of two WHO projects since 1959, without encouraging any participation by anyone, excepting benefits. Our share of the U.N. Palestine refugee relief program has, in fact, increased from 67.48 percent in 1949 to its present alltime high of 70 percent. As a physician, humanitarian, congressional adviser to WHO, and one continually interested in the United Nations, I do not decry the merit of these works, or even our excessive expenditure to get them on the road. However, I maintain that it is extremely important for us to let these people develop their own resources and build souls of steel, as we did after the Declaration of Independence, instead of feet of clay.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, with the prosperity evidenced in recent years, and the participation of a hundred nations in these programs through U.N.—including all the Communist and so-called neutralist countries—we could logically expect them to pick up the burden more rapidly. Aside from the relative merit of these multilateral programs, they are not nearly so international in cost, as they are in benefits. Nor has our increasing contribution to them resulted in any reduction of our foreign aid program. As I indicated yesterday, nations will have the Santa Claus complex as long as we act the role of the giver, which is about to play out due to our own domestic indebtedness, gold outflow, and imbalance of payments.

In the case of the special fund and ETAP I have previously documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD examples of substantial aid to Communist bloc countries. Total U.N. aid to, or program for, the Red bloc in 1963-64 includes 16 projects for Cuba, 30 projects for Poland, 30 projects for Yugoslavia, 3 projects for Albania, and 12 interregional projects with Red nations involved—a total of 93 projects costing $10 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union contributes no more to the special fund now than she did in 1959. Her pledge each year is for $1 million—less than the contribution of tiny Switzerland—yet the U.S. contribution to the special fund has grown from $10 million in 1959 to $29 million in 1963. This is an increase of almost 300 percent. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Red-bloc contributions are in nonconvertible currencies.

Mr. Chairman, if benefiting or recipient nations do not criticize Russia for paying less than its fair share, no nation can criticize us for not paying more than one-third of the world budget, which is well beyond our fair share. I hope all Members will support this amendment to establish a fair and limiting ceiling on all U.S. contributions to the United Nations assistance budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman intend his amendment to have application to peacekeeping operations of the United Nations?

Mr. HALL. It would. It already applies to peacekeeping operations of the United Nations; they are in the budgeted programs of the United Nations, to which the Congress intended in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that the 33⅓ percent apply.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with that. Insofar as voluntary contributions of the peacekeeping functions; would the gentleman's amendment apply?

Mr. HALL. It would apply to all voluntary funds—yes; under the amendment as written, that is correct.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I think, perhaps, the gentleman may be in error because there is a difference between housekeeping and peacekeeping. There is a restriction of 33⅓ percent as to the housekeeping funds of the United Nations and that is so far as salaries and buildings and things of that nature, meetings of staff officers and so forth. But on the peacekeeping voluntary phase of it, there is no such restriction.

Mr. HALL. I think I made it quite clear that I intended it to apply there.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this Committee just turned down one amendment to cut funds in this program and the pending amendment is another method of cutting the funds. I would hope the Committee would act with respect to cutting percentages in the same way it did with respect to the proposed cut in authorized funds.

Let me say this first. A question came up in the earlier discussion about Cuba. There is an amendment in the bill now on page 13 which I sponsored which reads as follows:

> No funds provided under this Act shall be used to make any voluntary contribution to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the present Government of Cuba.

So there should be no further question in your mind about voluntary contributions to the U.N. on Cuban projects.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to the pending amendment of fixing a ceiling of 33⅓ percent on all voluntary contributions, I was very pleased to hear the sponsor of the amendment say that he does not question nor is he opposed to any of the work being performed by any of the agencies of the United Nations. The United States is trying to get more firmly established and to get other nations organized into multilateral effort for training and development in projects. This is the very reason the Congress has given the administration the flexibility in providing for voluntary contribution over and above the percentages for regular assessments.

We have certain specific limitations in the law now. Under proper study by this committee and by this House we have fixed a limitation of 40 percent on the special fund and the expanded technical assistance fund. But the sponsor of this amendment does not make a case that voluntary contributions are getting out of hand. Let me respectfully show you these facts. In the United Nations Children's Fund, for example, we started U.S. contributions at 71.55 percent and we are now down to 40 percent. In the United Nations expanded technical assistance program we started at 59.93 percent and we are down to 40 percent. In the World Health Organization we started out at 100 percent, but that program was absorbed into the regular budget and we now pay 31.12 percent on that particular program.

I could go on, but the point I am making is that the administrators of this program under both recent administrations have worked very diligently under the scrutiny of both the Committee on Appropriations and the Foreign Affairs Committee to scale down our voluntary contributions to these U.N. programs. They have a good record. There is no reason, therefore, to arbitrarily apply the same percentage to all U.N. programs.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. On the peacekeeping operations, would not this amendment in effect give the Soviets a veto over our putting money into a program that they did not like and that they refused, where the budget cannot be met and we decided to absorb a bigger share of it? If we are limited, we cannot do it. Would that not have this effect?

Mr. FASCELL. There is no question about it. The principal reason why this amendment should be defeated, as I see it, is this: The purpose is fine as far as keeping down your contributions and encouraging others to come in, but you cannot club a horse to water. You have to lead him. I respectfully submit this is what the records and statistics of these programs indicate as far as the efforts of the United States are concerned and as far as our contributions to these programs are concerned. Our records show we started out with a high percentage and over a period of time we kept scaling it down while other countries make more contributions to these multilateral programs. This is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted the gentleman to spell out the answer to the question that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays], directed to him, namely as to the veto this would give to the Soviet Union on the peacekeeping operations. I am told, had you had such a limitation, such a veto would have come about in several places in the world.

Mr. FASCELL. There is not any question about the fact that if you write a specific limitation on our voluntary contributions you are tying our hands in dealing with peacekeeping operations. In that way you do give the Soviets a veto, because they withdraw from all of these peacekeeping operations that do not suit their specific purpose.

Mr. BOGGS. And put up nothing.

Mr. FASCELL. And put up absolutely nothing. So we just play into their hands with this kind of foolishness.

I submit that our record is good. We do contribute on a percentage basis to these voluntary agencies. We started at a high rate and we have been scaling them down. So our record in this respect is good. The amount of the contributions from other nations has increased. There is no valid reason, therefore, on this score why we should now arbitrarily place an inflexible ceiling.

One more point, Mr. Chairman. Communist countries contribute to the United Nations program of technical assistance $20.4 million. They get out of that program $10.1 million. In other words, they get out less than they put in. The free world countries, on the other hand, have a fine record of getting 94.97 percent of all the projects under the U.N. program of technical assistance.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman for giving us a very concise, accurate and statistical analysis of the various funds that go to make up our entire United Nations picture. I would like to ask him if he believes that we would have gone into Korea if there had been such a limitation on the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

Mr. FASCELL. It would be more difficult to obtain functioning of U.N. peacekeeping operations if you tied the hands of the administration with a ceiling on voluntary contributions.

Mr. BARRY. Let me put the question this way. Would we not have had to go into Korea on our own rather than through the United Nations if we wanted to carry out our policy as a nation?

Mr. FASCELL. May I answer the gentleman this way. If you place this limitation on our contributions to voluntary programs in the United Nations, when we seek to initiate a peacekeeping function in the U.N. which is in the best interest of the United States, it would require us, if we are not able to do it multilaterally, to pay the entire cost ourselves.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the gentleman whether or not the refugee program in Palestine toward which we are now paying about 70 percent would not fail under this limitation, because the Arabs do not pay their proportionate share.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will permit me, he has raised a very good point. You apply the ceiling now and you apply it automatically and arbitrarily on all the existing programs.

Mr. BARRY. In other words, these programs would not be possible and would fail if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. FASCELL. I would agree that they would be injured seriously. I say that an arbitrary ceiling is a very ineffective way to deal with these particular programs. The very thing we are trying to preserve in the best interests of and to carry out the policy of the United States is our flexibility. To go in at 4 percent, if we want to, or at 70 percent, if we have to, and to work always toward trying to scale down our contribution and raise the contributions of other nations. The record indicates that this is what we have been doing. Therefore, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not only unnecessary, but is dangerous and is not in our best interests.

Mr. BARRY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and

I should like to make an observation with respect to the amount of money to be saved by this amendment. It is an absolute fact that the total contribution we make to all of the United Nations peacekeeping operations of which the Congo, for instance, was only a part, is less than the total cost to garrison only one unequipped division in West Germany. There is no economy in this. I hope the amendment is defeated.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time merely to inform the committee that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], who was just in this well, is the chairman of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs we regard the gentleman from Florida as one of the ablest and certainly one the hardest working members of our committee. He has spent endless hours with his subcommittee in the study of the subject matter covered by the pending amendment and his remarks must be weighed as those of a thoroughly informed authority.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure members of the committee who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would wish to know the background and experience of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] in the field of the present discussion. I turn back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I certainly know his intentions in offering this amendment were of the highest. Certainly, the disposition of many Members of this body is to support the amendment. But let me say this: There is not a Member of this House who would knowingly seek to assist the Soviet Union. Conceivably, that is precisely what we will be doing by the adoption of this amendment. I know it is the furthest thing from the mind of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain just how it could happen, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has pointed out, insofar as peacekeeping operations are concerned.

The adoption of this amendment could effectively give to the Soviet Union a veto over actions which would be in the interest of the United States of America. Let us assume there was a conflict and let us assume that it is in the interest of the United States that the U.N. intervene in this conflict. Let us assume further that the U.S.S.R. opposes U.N. intervention for their own purposes. The U.S.S.R. as a matter of policy has made it plain that they will not participate in nor contribute to programs which are against their interests. Thus, if the U.S.S.R. were to refuse to contribute financially to this operation which, by hypothesis, is in the interest of the United States, and if the cost of this operation were greater than that which could be borne by the other nations, it would be necessary for there to be a U.S. voluntary contribution in excess of 33 percent which the gentleman from Missouri suggests.

What we would be doing, gentlemen, is letting the U.S.S.R. decide American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a soul in this body who wants to do that.

I entreat the members of the committee to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will take only a minute to point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and other members of the committee who spoke in opposition to this amendment, that the charge being leveled against this amendment to the effect that it would place a veto power in the hands of the Soviet Union is a very effective debate technique but obviously not a fact.

Mr. Chairman, unless I am mistaken, there are more than 100 other nations in addition to the United States and the U.S.S.R. who are members of the U.N. and most are able and I hope willing to contribute to these funds.

I repeat that even though this charge is effective debating technique it cannot be supported by either facts or logic.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take time for just 1 more minute to direct a question to the gentleman from New York. In the process of yielding to a number of Members I do not believe the gentleman from New York had an opportunity to tell the House whether he was for or against this amendment. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us now?

Mr. BARRY. I think it should be crystal clear that I am against the amendment.

I would like to ask the gentleman in the well if he can give me the name of any one major country in the world that could either afford with dollars or with military ability to pursue our national interests if the United Nations members were unable to pick up their share of the tab. Is there another country that could do it if we do not do it?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would advise the gentleman from New York there is not any country in the world that should pursue our national policy. They should pursue their own national policies. Our first obligation is to pursue our own national interests. If any U.N. program is in need of support from responsible nations it will receive it and you can quote the chairman of the House committee who listed yesterday that a number of Western European nations have the financial status to provide the needed response for U.N. funds.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Is it not true that we have the highest debt and the highest taxes of any nation in the world, that our national debt totals more than that of the entire world put together?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, and the gentleman speaks as a member of a committee that has much to do with the matter of increasing our national debt.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I think I can give you some good reasons why it should be adopted. I hope that some of my friends who I know are against the bill and who have been refraining from voting for any of the amendments to improve the bill will vote for this amendment.

I remember when I first became a Member of this House we were contributing 40 percent or more to the United Nations General Fund. I am convinced that had not Congress placed a limitation of 33.3 percent upon our contribution it would never have been reduced. In the past several years I have been recommending that we cut down the percentage amount of our contribution to some of these funds. The gentleman from New York mentioned the Palestine Refuge Fund, and many others will recall that I reported on a situation there when the United States was paying 90 percent of the cost of that program—we were paying that in dollars. On visiting that area I talked with the commission which was administering that program and I was astounded to find out they were using U.S. dollars to buy surplus wheat from Australia, Canada, France, and other countries, and were refraining from buying any of our wheat, due, they said, to the fact our price was too high.

I said at that time, and I am still convinced I am correct and that it is sound policy, at anytime that the United States is contributing as much as 50 percent to any program they had better take that program over, operate it in the most efficient manner it can, and get full credit for it, rather than contribute 50, 60, 70, or more percent to a program which is administered in a lot of countries where the United States does not get any credit at all for its contribution. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The peacekeeping operations of this program that serves the interest of the United States and all those programs coming under the "Special Programs" would bear the brunt of the pending amendment. If the United States has a certain program which would advance its cause or serve the cause of peace, we would be unable to participate in this program unless we could convince the other members of the U.N. to put up two-thirds of the money. If this amendment is adopted we would be precluded from undertaking this type of operation; therefore we would be precluded from serving the best interest of the United States through the apparatus of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union has many times criticized this procedure and has stated that the United States uses this device as "under the umbrella of the U.N." to serve its own interests. I feel, therefore, that this amendment while it has a worthy intent would have the effect of precluding the United States from using the mechanism of the United Nations to serve the cause of peace, and we would be required to undertake unilaterally those policies that we feel are in our best interest and therefore can best be served through the United Nations.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. To the gentleman's knowledge, does he think the United States would have gone to war unilaterally in the Congo had not the United Nations gone to war in the Congo?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not know, but I think this program is designed to stabilize the peace, not encourage war. If we adopt the Hall amendment, I think we will seriously impair the best mechanism we have for peace, the United Nations.

Mr. BARRY. I should like to assure the gentleman that on firsthand knowledge I was told by the Chief Executive of the United States that had not the United Nations taken up the cudgels in the Congo operation, the United States would have had to go in unilaterally. Certainly here is a perfect example of how a 30-percent limitation would have precluded the United Nations from taking that action and would have precluded the United Nations from going into Korea. We would have had to do these things alone instead of having the moral backing and multinational assistance that in effect made the Korean war a free world struggle against international communism.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, the author of this amendment.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are some things that should be said as a result of the various remarks that have been made, predominantly on the "con" side. I also had hoped much of the effort, much of the work, and much of the research, as per the last 3 days' insertions in the RECORD would have been read and the Members would have been knowledgeable, in addition to what was said in the short 5 minutes on the amendment.

Certainly I think the gentleman from Florida would agree with me that we knew that neither the United Nations through its various 28 different funds over and above the assessed funds, had any means of auditing those funds; nor does our State Department at the present time, by their letter of admission, have any means of checking on our contributions to those. It would seem therefore that this is a much more reasonable manner in which to limit the source of the "golden egg."

I would also say to the gentleman from Florida that we not only have contributed 100 percent to many of the World Health Organization funds, but we still contribute 100 percent to the malaria fund and the sanitary survey and water development fund that is going on at the present time.

As far as the peacekeeping operation is concerned, I think the colloquy of the last two gentlemen pretty well developed this proposition, because we did go into Lebanon unilaterally, which is very closely related to the so-called tinderbox of the world. Actually, the only veto we would be giving the Soviet by this amendment, Mr. Chairman, would be this limiting, by our own law, as to the amount we could contribute to any given U.N. situation.

As to the present situation in the Near East, the people that are refugees there are Arabs. I suggest only that Nasser, Syria, and Iraq, instead of spending millions for Russian arms, including mach 2 fighters for an attack on Israel, spend some of this money on refugees. I realize there is a dispute about the territory, and perhaps there is a question of adverse usage there involved, in that they do not want to accept them back into their own territory as refugees. But why do we have more of a responsibility to pay the cost of the Arab refugee program than we have to pay the cost of the Chinese refugee problem involving those who are coming into Hong Kong every day? How can that be part of the program when we pay 70 percent of the cost?

I should like to refer to the hearings, where the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Dr. MORGAN], had a colloquy with Mr. Cleveland of the State Department, as follows:

> Dr. MORGAN. The United States has continued to carry most of the burden of supporting the Arab refugees in Palestine for a good many years. The attitude that the State Department seems to have, is that we should just accept the "status quo" and do nothing to disturb the situation. What would happen if Congress would decide to cut this U.S. contribution to the Palestine refugees to about $10 million, and say, "Now look, we are not going to carry this burden for the rest of our lives: something has to be done."
>
> Mr. CLEVELAND. I think the people that it would stimulate would be the Arab refugees. I think it would stimulate them to start a turbulence in the Middle East which taken together with all the other things that are happening might really blow the place sky high.

I think this is a form of blackmail, as the gentleman from California said in one of his previous discussions, as long as we care for the Arab refugees, the Arabs in the Near East will not start a war.

Now as far as the question of the UNICEF program is concerned, I would like to point out again to the House, if the gentleman will yield further, that the funds for this are raised through voluntary fundraising as well as our own compulsory tax efforts. All who wish to support this worthy purpose can sit down and write a check just as they do for their own community chest. We raised billions of dollars in this country through voluntary charitable contributions by means of this route. This does much more for the giver than does charity given by compulsion. Incidentally, it is also tax deductible.

Then I would like to say further about the special project of UNESCO for the preservation of the ancient Nubian monuments in Mr. Nasser's land—the United Arab Republic—see page 1514 of hearings. In 1961 we paid 66.49 percent. A call to the Department of State just this week revealed that "our percentage for 1962 has still not been determined, because the contributions from other countries are not complete."

CONGO SITUATION

It is true, the Clay Committee did recommend an exception in the case of the Congo. But this operation is being phased out in regard to troops. In fact, Ambassador Stevenson earlier this year warned that we were only going to pay our proportionate share. Since that time, in typical fashion, we have "backtracked."

PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF ETAP AND SPECIAL FUND

Mr. Cleveland's argument before the committee was, that not all 110 nations are participating in Special Fund and ETAP. Only about 90—of which 60 are labeled "underdeveloped," and 30 are "developed." That is why he says we pay more than our 33⅓ percent. It is not a valid argument. If fewer countries are participating, the budget should be lower, but our proportionate share should be the same. Russia is one of the so-called developed countries. Yet she gives only $1 million to the Special Fund, and has been giving the same amount since 1959. We started out with $10 million and are now up to $30 million—300 percent increase.

Also, Mr. Chairman, comparisons with what Communist blocs get to what free world gets are not valid. Included in the so-called free world countries are Ghana, British Guiana, Indonesia, and numerous other neutralists who are not neutralists at all. It is incorrect to label them "free world." Also, I raise the question of Russian subscriptions in nonconvertible currencies.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we finally have the explanation for the Sphinx's inscrutable smile. It is not the sands of the Nile, but it is the fact that we are genial jackasses, as one of the other gentlemen says, without our taxpayers' money from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment passes.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his very excellent contribution toward the clarification of his amendment. It is a good amendment. I urge its adoption.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HALL and Mr. HAYS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 157, noes 168.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 18:

"CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$415,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$380,000,000', respectively.

"CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

"SEC. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$300,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '1964' and '$200,000,000', respectively.

"SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—No military assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis to any country in Africa, except for internal security requirements or for programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON OF WISCONSIN

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 11, line 2, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents you with an opportunity to take one small step toward improving the administration of this fund and greater self-discipline so badly needed in this program. I want to direct your attention to the fact that the contingency fund is not the only cooky jar in which the President has complete discretion to disburse the cookies, because the Clerk just read the preceding section relating to supporting assistance. The section on supporting assistance carries $380 million and no amendment has been offered to alter that amount.

The section on the contingency fund carries $200 million additional for a total amount of $580 million. That is solely in the hands of the President and at his discretion.

What are the terms in supporting assistance?

> On such terms and conditions as he (the President) may determine to support and promote economic and political stability.

What are the terms under the contingency fund?

> When he (the President) determines such use to be important to the national interest.

So we are actually talking about $580 million. And I suggest to you that a reduction of $50 million is badly needed to improve the administration of this act, for several reasons.

First, the amount of this authorization is unwarranted, unnecessary, and excessive.

The second reason I would submit to you is that this amount of money encourages poor planning by the administration. In the last 3 years there were 13 nations that received money out of the contingency fund. But to my surprise and yours there were 3 of the 13 nations that received money out of the contingency fund in each one of the last 3 years. There were 9 of the 13 countries that received this money from the contingency fund that received it in both years during the last 2 years.

Why did we have to give the United Arab Republic $25 million in the last 2 years out of the contingency fund? Why did we have to give the Dominican Republic $48.9 million out of the contingency fund if the planning was adequate in the State Department and by the AID officials who are handling the use of this contingency fund?

Now, Mr. Chairman, a third reason which I would like to submit for the adoption of this amendment is that the amount of money in this fund induces a snowballing-type of spending in getting rid of the money before the end of the fiscal year. Let us look at what has happened. If this is an emergency fund, why does the emergency always happen in April, May, and June of every year? Look at 1962, fiscal year 1962. In the first quarter there were only $4 million of emergencies. In the second quarter there were $36 million obligated. In the third quarter there was $82 million obligated. In the fourth quarter there was $167 million obligated.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee that the emergencies do not all occur during the last 3 months of the fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the last year, fiscal 1963. In the first quarter they obligated $31 million. But during the third quarter they obligated $41 million. In the fourth quarter they obligated $89 million. Now, in the 1962 fiscal year in the last month of the year they obligated $87.9 million, and on the last day of the fiscal year they obligated $49 million.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the committee it is high time that we took a close look at some of the factors that are bringing into disrepute the administration of foreign aid. It is high time that we tightened up on some of the obvious needs for economy and better administration of the program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first we had better look at the reasons for a contingency fund. The contingency fund is not intended to finance a planned program.

Its purpose is to meet unforeseen contingencies. No projects are planned to be financed under this fund. The contingency fund has two purposes. One of the purposes is to meet the urgent requests which may arise for which no provision has been made in any part of this act. A second purpose is to meet emergencies which cannot be foreseen or are not yet identified in sufficient detail to justify programing assistance for them.

Mr. Chairman, I will admit that I was not satisfied with the way the administration handled the contingency fund in fiscal year 1962. The members of the committee will remember that last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs criticized the handling of the contingency fund in its report.

Mr. Chairman, let us keep in focus the contingency fund now for fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964. I want to show to the members of the committee some of the improvements that have been made in the contingency fund. Last year Congress authorized $300 million in the contingency fund. The Committee on Appropriations appropriated $250 million. There was a $15-million carryover, making a total in the contingency fund for fiscal year 1963 of $265 million. Now in accordance with the committee recommendations only $148 million of contingency fund money was obligated during fiscal 1963 and spent.

One hundred and seventeen million dollars was returned to the Treasury of the United States out of the contingency fund of 1963. There was no attempt to use up all the money at the last minute.

Let us consider the contingency fund in this authorization. When the budget message came up here in January it recommended $400 million for the contingency fund. When the President's foreign aid message came up here in April it requested only $300 million for the contingency fund. The Committee on Foreign Affairs in the bill before you has cut this to $200 million.

There has to be some flexibility in this program. I cannot see where a cut of $50 million in the authorization is justified. Certainly we have to be ready to deal with unforeseen emergencies and the contingency fund ought to be more than $150 million in order to be adequate. It has never been as low as $150 million in any previous year. The executive has administered the contingency fund prudently and on June 30 returned $117 million to the Treasury.

If you provide an authorization of $200 million it is still subject to review by the Committee on Appropriations. The President ought to have a contingency fund that is adequate and which he will use only to meet emergencies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend our Speaker, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for his splendid, forthright and forceful presentation to the House of the full meaning of the foreign aid program and the crucial nature of our action here in this body.

I feel that his eloquent speech yesterday was the turning point of this debate.

He gave us his position from his heart when he told us:

> Foreign assistance to me has been the affirmative side of democracy in this great battle in this trying period of world history. I prefer to err on the side of strength. I feel that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear.

If, Mr. Chairman, I had been disposed to oppose any further extension of the foreign aid program, I certainly would have reexamined my position after our Speaker spoke to us. I find in his speech a complete affirmation of my own position.

Shortly after World War II the then Speaker of the House, our beloved JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, honored me by appointing me to the 18-member bipartisan committee which became known as the Herter committee. This committee traveled all the war-torn areas of Europe. We studied the desperate conditions on the continent. We wrote a report. And this report became the basis of the Marshall plan which, with the subsequent foreign aid programs which concern us here today, has demonstrated to the world the greatest compassion, the greatest generosity and the greatest friendship among men the world has ever known.

Later it was my privilege to travel all the islands of the Pacific, in Japan, and other areas of the Pacific war, as a member of a group appointed for this purpose by the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of what was then the Naval Affairs Committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I know something about the job that was ahead of us when we set out upon this program to rehabilitate war-torn nations.

I know now that our job is not completed. It is true that we have healed the physical wounds of war, but this foreign aid program now has turned into a gigantic undertaking to keep the free world strong, so that another holocaust does not engulf the whole of mankind.

It is true that on one or more occasions I have voted against foreign aid bills, but I did this because I wanted to emphasize that aid should not be provided to nations dominated by communism and in countries which would not cooperate with the free world in this life and death struggle with communism.

There are many reasons why we should act favorably upon this bill before us today.

It improves the former programs of aid to other peoples. It tightens up the aid operations.

The bill was presented to the House by a bipartisan vote of 24 to 7 in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Foreign aid has had the support of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. I believe that all of our Secretaries of State since the Great War, regardless of party affiliation, have supported it. Our ambassadors, who are on the watchtowers throughout the world, support this program.

It is my hope that out of this program will come a great surge in world trade. I hope that my own people down in North Carolina will be able to sell more tobacco and cotton and other things to our friends in other nations. I hope that each Member of this House will see the benefits of world trade, reflected in the well-being of industries in his own district.

For, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, ultimately, the friendship of nations, as it is with men, must thrive on exchanges—the relationship of buyers and sellers, with each nation sharing the profits and pride of production and commerce.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I reemphasize that in this disturbed, distracted, and dangerous world, we cannot go it alone.

Should we fold up and abandon the Alliance for Progress which will mean so much to the peace of the Western Hemisphere? Shall we withdraw our support for the Alliance, from the weak and underdeveloped countries of the Western World and let them become easy prey to communism?

Shall we leave South America, Central America, Asia, and Africa, and all the rest of the world to the tender mercies of communism, and draw the cloth of complacency around ourselves and try to live isolated from all the rest of the world? Remember, we tried isolation once. After World War I, we closed our eyes to the agonies of the rest of the world, and we believed that no power on earth could endanger our security or disturb the peace of our people. We learned a sad lesson and we learned it in the hard way and then we faced World War II wholly unprepared for the conflict which threatened and endangered the institutions of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, certainly in a program of this magnitude there must be some waste, but we have been assured that the expenditure of the dollars authorized by the bill before us will be safeguarded and that every dollar will be well and wisely spent in the interest of our Nation.

I stand with our Speaker in support of the foreign aid program. I agree with him that this is "the affirmative side of democracy."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 151, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II

Chapter 1—Policy

SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is hereby redesignated "POLICY" and section 501, which relates to short title, is hereby deleted.

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 504(a), which relates to authorization, strike out "the fiscal years 1962 and 1963" and "$1,700,000,000 for each such fiscal year, which sums" and substitute "fiscal year 1964" and $1,225,000,000, which", respectively.

(b) In section 510(a), which relates to special authority, strike out "1963" in the first and second sentences and substitute "1964".

(c) At the end of such chapter, add the following new section:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, line 16, strike out "$1,225,000,000" and substitute "$1,000,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful, if my friend from Ohio is here, that I may have his help on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut $225 million from the appropriation for military assistance. An analysis of expenditures and carryovers both reserved and unreserved provides ample evidence, in my opinion, that this request for military assistance can be reduced materially.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs made a token cut of $180 million on the administration's asking price of $1,405 million. My amendment would reduce the $1,225 million contained in the bill to an even $1 billion.

The time has come for a number of countries that have been receiving military aid to carry that load without assistance from the United States. It appears that as long as the downtrodden taxpayers of this country put up the cash, these countries will continue to——

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. HAYS. I just came in in time to hear the gentleman ask me to go along with him on this amendment. I will tell you what I will do. You amend your amendment and make it provide for a cut of $100 million, and I will go with you.

Mr. GROSS. For $100 million?

Mr. HAYS. We cut $180 million out of it. I agree with you that this is one place it could be cut. But $180 million plus $225 million is a pretty healthy swipe. I will quote to you what the Clay report says. It says there are countries that are maintaining military forces too small to mount an invasion and too large for defense. I think it is fair to say that one of the sacred cows in here is Formosa. But I am willing, if you will take this amendment out and make it a cut of $100 million, I will come down and try to help you get it over.

Mr. GROSS. That would not be very much of a saving, I will say to my friend, in view of some of the information I have had. The Clay Committee suggested that this go down to $1 billion.

Mr. HAYS. Over a 3-year period.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but the Clay Committee was liberal with the taxpayers' money in some of its recommendations.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman says $100 million is not very much. I am glad to know and have this establishment of the gentleman's credit, but it is a lot of money to me.

Mr. GROSS. I mean in relation to $1,225 million.

Mr. HAYS. If you want to get your amendment through, you had better buy my offer.

Mr. GROSS. Seventy-five percent of this military assistance is supposed to be going to the periphery of the Soviet bloc and we have a number of so-called allies on the periphery of the Soviet bloc that ought to be coming in and helping out. As I stated before, the Clay Committee said that spending for military assistance can be reduced to around $1 billion annually.

Secretary Rusk in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, in answer to questions posed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

> I think one can properly say it is our objective to withdraw from the military assistance field—I would suppose in the longer run totally.

The Secretary of State said that in the longer run we can withdraw from this field totally. I suppose, if pinned down, he would have said in 25 to 50 years from now when a lot of taxpayers will be broke supporting this program, but if that is the way he feels about it and the way the Clay Committee feels about it, this is a good time to start to cut down.

Last year the Passman subcommittee was asked for military assistance funds for flexible purposes, no specifications but just flexible purposes. When pinned down General Palmer, the witness, said his face was red. He denied first that he had said that money was put into the request for flexible purposes. It is military assistance funds, as I understand it, that provided an air-conditioned yacht for the Emperor of Ethiopia.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know who paid for that gold-plated bed that the wife of one of the government officials of Ghana bought in London. I do not know whether that came out of military assistance.

Take a look at Vietnam today. We are spending $1 million a day in Vietnam, much of it on military assistance and we do not know whether we have been undermined by internal revolt as of this day and this hour.

According to last year's hearings of the Passman subcommittee, $65,900,000 of military equipment, military assistance, went to Italy. There are those who will try to tell you that we long since stopped providing assistance to European countries. We gave Italy almost $66 million in military equipment—a nation which we put on its feet with some $8 billion of economic assistance, and yet only a short time ago, when the Italians held their last national election, the Communist vote increased by 1 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORSE. I will astonish the gentleman by saying that I will support the amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will not agree that the testimony offered in support of this portion of the bill was the weakest that was offered?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I do agree with the gentleman.

In India, where we are pumping in military assistance this Government was told a few days ago, that the agreement made with us to permit a Voice of America transmitter in India, would not be carried out.

In far too many countries we are continuing to pour in military equipment, and getting far too little in return.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what our committee, the Appropriations Committee, is going to do with this item. I certainly am not trying to voice the views of that committee. I do want to submit just one or two personal observations, however, upon this amendment. To me one of the most essential problems that we have to consider today is our national defense, and I regard this program as a vital part of that defense. I do not know what the testimony was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs; frankly, I have not had an opportunity to read it. But I do know that General Lemnitzer, the Supreme Allied Commander, General Taylor, and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, appeared before our committee and said, "If you feel that you must cut any funds, we would rather that you cut our regular defense funds than to cut this figure. We think this is at rock bottom."

Let me suggest just this one further thought. The thing that gives me the gravest concern about the test ban treaty is that I fear it might cause the American people to drop their guard. We cannot afford to do that at this time. If, at this particular time, when we are considering the test ban treaty we begin to cut our defense, then I fear the American people may be lulled into a false sense of security and that we might drop our guard to the point where the defense of America may be endangered.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that I have been in favor of the foreign aid program but I have been foremost in efforts to cut the program down to size and to keep it at the lowest possible figure commensurate with the need. I do feel, however, that this cut would be a very serious mistake and might jeopardize our security.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how much was in the pipeline for military assistance on July 1 of this year?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. GROSS. What was that figure?

Mr. GARY. We have it in our record. Our committee has been through all of that. The witnesses who testified before us also knew that figure and still they said that if they had to take a cut, they would rather take it in their own appropriation than in this particular appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing classified about it. The figure is $2.4 billion in the military assistance pipeline as of July 1, this year.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman knows that if you are going to supply armies you have to have a pipeline of equipment and materials on the way.

Mr. GROSS. But how much does the gentleman want them to have in new money—with a $2.4 billion carryover?

Mr. GARY. I want them to have what they think is necessary to defend America. They testified before us that they felt that every dollar of this was necessary. I am not a military expert and I am not speaking as such.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I would be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I would like to say that of this $2.3 billion in the pipeline, 70 percent is leattime for ships which take 4 to 5 years to construct and it is for aircraft which take 18 to 24 months to put into operation. There is involved a great deal of complicated electronic equipment on which there is a great leadtime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia for his statement. The Secretary of Defense in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee stated, and I quote, "That the total Defense budget in terms of new obligational authority approximated $53.5 billion. Were we to be requested to cut that budget $300 million to $400 million"—a figure which we are considering, I might say right here—"I would strongly urge that the cut be taken from those portions of the defense program other than the military assistance program. It would have first priority on the margin of dollars, in my mind."

So, Mr. Chairman, I think there is no question as to how the Secretary of Defense feels about this.

Mr. GARY. The Secretary of Defense told us the same thing. That was the statement he made. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KYL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KYL to the amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 11, line 16, strike out "$1,225,000,000" and substitute "$1,125,000,000".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time I will use only a few seconds. It is obvious from the discussion which we have had that there is considerable agreement that these funds should be cut. At least we should call attention to the necessity of efficiency in this particular phase of foreign aid spending.

Mr. Chairman, it is also obvious that there are Members on the floor who will support a moderate cut rather than the broader cut suggested by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to reduce the amount by $100 million.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to put this back in focus, the Executive requested $1,405,000,000 for military aid. The Committee on Foreign Affairs authorized $1,225,000,000, which represented a cut of $180 million.

Now, the appropriation—let me make clear that I refer to the appropriation and not the authorization, the appropriation for 1963—was $1,325,000,000. So the appropriation last year was substantially greater than that requested this year.

Mr. Chairman, the committee took into consideration the Clay report. The Clay report recommended that military assistance should be phased down over a 3-year period to $1 billion a year. We took that into consideration when we cut this amount of $180 million from the request. We did not make a meat ax cut where we are just picking a round figure of $100 million—out of the air. Last year our Review Subcommittee sent investigators to Europe and it made a detailed study of military aid to the NATO countries. Our subcommittee made a recommendation that we should phase out our military assistance to the nations of Western Europe more rapidly. They ought to be able now to carry their own load. This is the reason why we made the cut of $180 million.

Mr. Chairman, we also took into consideration what General Clay said about the Asian countries and we pointed this out in our report. We specifically justified the cut. But the sum of $180 million is a big cut. It is big enough and I feel this program cannot be cut any further.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that many of the older Members remember that here on the floor in 1961 the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], who is a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, took the floor and introduced an amendment to restore the $300 million cut to military assistance. On the floor his amendment passed. He gave some specific reasons for increasing the military aid appropriation then and those reasons are as good today as they were then. He said that conditions in Berlin, Laos, South Vietnam were bad then, as they are today. He said that we accepted the military budgets recommended then by our own Army, Navy, and Air Force experts, and our own Secretaries of Defense, whether they were Tom Gates or Bob McNamara. He pointed out that we had just appropriated $6 billion more for defense for 1962 than we had appropriated in 1961.

> We followed their advice when they asked us for money for our own Army, our own Navy, and our own Air Force, and then we do not follow the same advice they give us for military assistance for our allies, for our own mutual security.

The same thing is true today. This program has been analyzed. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has made the cut after careful study. We cannot afford any more of a cut in military assistance.

I have always supported the military assistance part of the foreign aid and opposed separation of the military part of the program from the economic part of the program.

When I go home to my district I tell them I feel the foreign assistance program is part and parcel of our defense effort. I point out that it finances our military efforts all around the world. I do not think we can cut this military assistance another dime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman referred to General Clay and his testimony before the committee. I think it might be of interest to know that General Clay sent a telegram to me, and I imagine to some others, which I would like to quote:

> I believe that the foreign aid bill now before the House represents a constructive approach to our foreign aid program and that it is deserving of strong bipartisan support. To reduce the authorization further this year, or to add restrictive amendments at this time, could hurt our position abroad. I believe that the present bill goes as far as is practicable or desirable at this time in our own interests. I would respectfully urge your support.
>
> Lucius D. Clay.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the military assistance program was not in the foreign aid bill I doubt whether you would even have a foreign aid bill. That is why the committee clings so tenaciously to the military assistance part of it.

Mr. MORGAN. The administration has been trying to separate military assistance from economic assistance for years.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Recognizing that certainly the defense of Western Europe is by indirection defense of the United States, let me ask the question: Can anyone give me figures as to what the nations of Western Europe, now in a much better position to provide funds for their own defense and their own security, are doing in the way of increasing their defense expenditures during that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman figures from memory, but in countries like Italy and most of our NATO Allies they have increased their defense budgets.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it not true they are relying on us to do a job they should be doing themselves?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I do not think that is a correct statement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment and the amendment to the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Kyl) there were—ayes 108, noes 122.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Kyl and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 146, noes 167.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 170.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and that all debate close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was going to inquire if the chairman has any idea how many amendments are pending. They are coming in here now. I think there ought to be 9 or 10. However, some of them are duplications. There are four amendments on Cuba. However, they are practically the same. There are four amendments on the Bokaro steel mill which are practically the same. There are many duplications. I would say that there are not more than nine pending amendments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on his reservation?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have inquired at the desk and it is my information that there are already up there some 17 or more amendments. I cannot see for the life of me why we ought to go into a night session tonight when we can very well be here tomorrow. As far as I am concerned we can come in at 11 o'clock and consider the amendments that are still pending. I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] that he not press that unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the gentleman, if he examines the amendments, will find there are many duplications. I do not think there are 17 pending amendments. I think if the duplications are counted there are only about 9 or 10 amendments.

However, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 12, line after line 2, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. The authorization for an appropriation contained in this Act shall not be effective until such time as—

"(a) the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; or

"(b) the budget submitted to the Congress by the President under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, reveals that the estimated receipts of the Government for the fiscal year for which such budget is submitted are in excess of the estimated expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that a balanced budget seems to be out of tune with the times. We do not hear much about a balanced budget as the goal of fiscal policy.

We have heard a lot about defense of freedom today. I happen to be in that circle of people, I hope an expanding circle, who believe that a sound dollar is our first line of defense and that we cannot possibly achieve a sound dollar if we persist in constant deficit financing.

What we are proposing to authorize here today is not really all our own money. We have the assurance a budget will be presented to us the first of the year which will be about $10 billion in the red. What we are really considering is a proposal to encumber future generations, generations that have no opportunity to be heard or to vote here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to bring a balanced budget back into style, to reassert it as a desirable goal, and to give the President of the United States a strong incentive to give it first priority.

I suspect someone will say my amendment would stop foreign aid. Of course that is not true, as there are enough dollars in the foreign aid pipeline now to continue it for some 2 years. Others may suggest this is really an insidious effort to kill the foreign aid authorization bill. That would be true only if the President of the United States fails to give a balanced budget the first priority it deserves.

My amendment would do nothing more than require that the President present us with a balanced budget the first of the year if he wants to have access to the authorization contained in the 1963 foreign aid bill.

We all talk a lot about fiscal responsibility, about wanting to have a balanced budget. Here is our chance to do something more than just give it lip service. Here is our chance to vote for an amendment which would indeed provide an incentive for the President to present us with a balanced budget. I believe that the sound dollar is our first line of defense, and this is a good chance to find out how many join with me in this belief.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for offering the amendment. In my opinion the adoption of this amendment would thrill the hearts of the taxpayers of this country and I believe the gentleman from Illinois is to be commended for offering it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out this is identically the same wording that the gentleman offered last week on the college aid bill. During the debate at that time I asked the question rather innocently was this offered on the duckpond bill? I called it the duckpond amendment and got myself into a hassle. I did not mention anyone when I referred to duckponds, but I point out the gentleman who offers it seems to pick and choose his spots. If he really wanted to be consistent he should have offered it on the $20 million bill we had up to build nests for wild ducks.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to assure the gentleman I discovered this idea only recently in a public law enacted back in 1956, I believe. I assure the gentleman I intend to offer this amendment at every opportunity from now on.

Mr. HAYS. It is a little dangerous to make commitments. I found that out this afternoon. But I am going to keep my eye on him to see if he does offer it on every authorization.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is appropriate. It is an amendment that I put on to a public works project in my own community. It did have a very fine effect and we did have a balanced budget. The project then moved ahead. The amendment did not do much more than that, but in a small way it contributed to a balanced budget. I do want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for first of all digging up this amendment and bringing it to light. It does bear on the very important subject of a balanced Federal budget. There have been speeches made today, yesterday and the day before appealing to patriotism for our own country and our concern for the people abroad. But let me assure the Members of the House the most serious problem that faces us today is our balance of payments, our domestic deficit and our own basic economy. We are not going along the lines to further a solution to these problems in this particular bill that is now before us. An adoption of this amendment, however, would help.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who proposes this amendment is opposed to communism, I am sure. This amendment, however, would prevent us from combating effectually the Communist threat unless and until we have a balanced budget.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 171.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize there is a disposition to limit debate shortly. Since I have an amendment toward the end of the bill, I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee to the contents of the amendment a little bit in advance so that they can learn about it and vote it up or down on the basis of knowledge rather than what one could say in half a minute.

My amendment would create a bipartisan study commission which would not only study the operation of the foreign aid program but would study the impediments to the investment of private capital with the objective of letting the economic development job be done by private capital and getting the Government out of the foreign economic development business eventually.

I have been voting for the foreign aid program ever since I came to this House, and I have served for the last 10 years on a committee investigating the foreign aid program. I have appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on many occasions in connection with recommendations growing out of our committee's investigation. Our committee was commonly known as the Hardy committee.

I have listened to this debate and I know it reflects the temper of the American people who are becoming concerned about this program going on and on and on and being mismanaged and never coming to an end.

There are about $4 billion a year of their funds involved. Are we being saddled with this for the rest of our existence or are we going to taper this program off and get it—at least the economic development aspects of it—into the private channels where it belongs? I suggest the creation of a study commission, and the reason I am suggesting it, is that we have wrestled with the problem here in the House and we have not had the ability to solve this problem and taper off this program as far as Government expenditures are concerned.

This Hoover-type Commission, composed of two Members of the House of either party, two members from private life appointed by the Speaker of the House, one from either party, and similarly two Members of the Senate of either party, and two individuals appointed by the Vice President from private life of either party, and four appointed by the President. This would be a 12-member Commission on the order of the Hoover Commission. With an adequate staff, it seems to me, this body could penetrate beneath the surface of some of these difficult problems and come up with some intelligent recommendations for administrative reform and legislation to bring order out of the chaos we have had in this program and make some orderly plans for its termination.

If this is not done, I predict that the temper of the American people as has been reflected in the votes on the amendments here today will finally abruptly terminate this program and it may do a great deal of harm.

I urge the support of my amendment when it comes up.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

SEC. 301. Section 601(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to encouragement of private enterprise, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "and" at the end of paragraph (3).

(b) Strike out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

(c) At the end thereof add the following new paragraphs:

"(5) utilize, wherever practicable, the services of United States private enterprise (including, but not limited to, the services of experts and consultants in technical fields such as engineering); and

"(6) take appropriate steps to discourage nationalization, expropriation, confiscation, seizure of ownership or control, of private investment and discriminatory or other actions having the effect thereof, undertaken by countries receiving assistance under this Act, which divert available resources essential to create new wealth, employment, and productivity in those countries and otherwise impair the climate for new private investment essential to the stable economic growth and development of those countries."

SEC. 302. Section 611(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by striking out "circular A-47 of the Bureau of the Budget" and substituting "the Memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWENGEL

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWENGEL: Page 13, immediately after line 7 insert the following:

"Section 303, section 611, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(e) The President shall establish such procedures as he may deem necessary to assure to the maximum extent practicable all contracts for construction outside the United States made in connection with any agreement or grant subject to subsection (a) of this section shall be made in accordance with the same standards applicable to contracts made by the Federal Government for similar construction within the United States.'"

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I have examined the gentleman's amendment. I want to know if this is any change in the basic policy that is now in the bill. Does this make the borrowing country take basic responsibility for contracting?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It does.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the United States review the bids and contracts to ascertain that they are fair and prudent and does it also require that all bid specifications are in standards, to which U.S. business could respond?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment seeks to do is to require that the administrator of the act apply so far as is practical the rules, regulations, and standards that are applied in the construction of public works and other projects in the United States where Federal funds are appropriated and spent.

This change will improve the administration of the act. It will tend to improve the confidence of American citizens in the foreign aid program and will cause in the long run to win respect from the foreign nations with whom we share a common interest.

It is in the public interest. It also serves to enhance the goals we want to achieve for freedom on the foreign front.

I hope the amendment passes and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 8:

"SEC. 303. Section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba, is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert '(1)' immediately after '(a)'.

"(b) Insert immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No funds provided under this Act shall be used to make any voluntary contribution to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the present Government of Cuba.'.

"(c) At the end thereof add the following new paragraph:

"'(2) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any government of Cuba, nor shall Cuba be entitled to receive any quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States or to receive any other benefit under any law of the United States, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.'"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 13, line 19, strike out "graph:" and insert in lieu thereof "graphs:".

Page 14, line 10, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 10 insert the following:

"(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"(A) to prevent ships under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"(i) any items of economic assistance,

"(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(iii) any equipment, materials, or commodities from the ports of Communist countries, as defined in section 620(f) of this Act, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

"(B) to prevent ships under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is practically self-explanatory but I think a few remarks probably are in order. This is what this amendment does:

1. CLOSES PRESENT GAP IN STATUTORY COVERAGE

Sections 107 (a) and (b) of the fiscal year 1963 Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act proscribe (a) any assistance to countries which permit ships of their registry to carry Battle Act commodities to Cuba, and (b) economic assistance to countries which permit ships of their registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba. Therefore countries receiving only military assistance which permit their ships to carry items of economic assistance are not reached by the present legislation.

The language of the proposed amendment would eliminate this gap and proscribe assistance to any country, ships of whose registry carry either Battle Act commodities or items of economic assistance to Cuba. Our experience since January 1, 1963, indicates that the following MAP recipient countries, would be affected by this tightened legislation if they have not taken or do not take the appropriate steps contemplated by the amendment: Great Britain, Lebanon, Italy, Norway, Denmark, West Germany, and Yugoslavia. It does not appear that Danish or West German ships will again be involved in the Cuba trade. West Germany has taken legal action.

2. COVERS ALL BLOC CARGO TO CUBA ON FREE WORLD SHIPS

In fact, this statutory language proscribes assistance to any country, ships of whose registry carry cargo of any type from bloc ports to Cuba. This is true because it is presumed that some or all of such cargo has been provided on sufficiently concessional terms to constitute items of economic assistance. Therefore phrase (c) is gratuitous since this coverage is already effected by the administration's presumption but may be appropriate politically.

3. REQUIRES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WITHIN 60 DAYS

The statutory language presently in effect speaks of countries which "permit" ships under their registry to engage in carriage covered by the statute. The new language requires countries to take appropriate steps within 60 days to prevent such carriage. This follows the hard approach of the Hickenlooper amendment (section 620(d)), by requiring affirmative action by the appropriate governments and it allows only 60 days for such action, unlike section 620(d) which permits up to 6 months.

4. IMPOSES PETROLEUM DELIVERY BURDEN ON BLOC SHIPPING CAPABILITY

There is no evidence that any free world country has furnished "Battle Act" commodities or "items of economic assistance" to Cuba. However, crude oil from bloc sources is probably an "item of economic assistance" since bloc countries are extending noncommercial credit terms to Cuba. Our experience since January 1, 1963, indicates that some free world tankers are carrying bloc crude oil to Cuba. Because of the policy and purposes of the Battle Act, crude oil has not been placed on the Battle Act list of embargoed commodities. Therefore, pursuant to section 107(a), military assistance is not prohibited where MAP recipient countries permit ships of their registry to carry bloc crude oil to Cuba.

The new statutory language would proscribe all assistance to countries which do not take appropriate steps to prevent tankers under their registry from carrying bloc crude oil. Thus, this amendment would impose the burden of crude oil delivery on Soviet bloc transport capability. At the same time the purposes of the Battle Act—to control, through international cooperation, exports of items of strategic significance to nations threatening the security of the United States—will be maintained.

5. MAKES POLICY AND LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE PERMANENT

Since the proposed statutory language would be an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, it would be a permanent legislative directive rather than a limitation contained in an annual appropriations bill.

We have taken several positive steps in the direction of isolating Cuba from the economic life of the free world. This included a total ban on transportation of U.S.-financed goods by ships that have been to Cuba; an embargo on United States trade with Cuba, which was written into law by an amendment which I offered. In addition, Congress adopted as a rider in the 1963 Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, in which we had a provision prohibiting the furnishing of military assistance to MAP recipient countries whose ships carried Battle Act commodities to Cuba and prohibiting economic assistance to countries that permitted their ships to carry items of economic assistance.

What the amendment does is close the gap that is now in the existing law. The limitation now in the law, does not proscribe economic assistance. It only affects those countries getting military assistance, and therefore, one of the major purposes of the amendment is to make it clear that we are talking about economic assistance as well.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman, how much leeway is left to the executive branch of the Government to put those provisions into effect?

Mr. FASCELL. We have a 60-day provision asking for affirmative steps to be taken by our allies in meeting the provisions of this amendment. Then, of course, there is the general provision under the Foreign Assistance Act with regard to waiver of provisions by the President. But there is no waiver in this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. No; but this amendment amends existing law which does give leeway to the Executive. The Battle Act provides, for instance, if the President deems it in the interest of the United States to do thus and so, he can apply the Battle Act or nullify it.

Mr. FASCELL. This amendment does not change that act in any way.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the thing I want to know is how much leeway do you give the President—any President—to put into effect these provisions?

Mr. FASCELL. We give him no leeway except that which now exists in law. But as far as the amendment is concerned, the amendment is clear in its legislative intent. All the amendment seeks to do is to go one step further and close the gap on shipping to Cuba which now exists in order to assist the President in carrying out this intent.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, has it not been the legislative intent and the intent of Congress, let me put it that way, that restrictive provisions be put upon Cuba and that it be isolated and yet it has not been?

Mr. FASCELL. I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that I just want to make it clear that by this legislative language there is no question of what the intent of Congress is. That is the purpose of this amendment. That is all it seeks to do.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATTIN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: On page 13, strike out line 11 through 17 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Amend paragraph (a) (1) thereof to read as follows:

"'(1) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to the Government of Cuba and no assistance under said Act shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships or aircraft under its registry, or foreign aircraft, to use its airports or to overfly its country to carry to Cuba or to export from Cuba, so long as it is governed by Castro or any other Communist regime, any military personnel, arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, or any articles, materials, or supplies, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title 1, of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"'(2) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships or aircraft under its registry, or foreign aircraft, to use its airports or to overfly its country to carry passengers or import from or export to Cuba any items so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or any other Communist regime, unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is important to the security of the United States and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination. The restrictions contained in this paragraph may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act or any other provision of law.

"'(3) As an additional means of implementing and carrying into effect the policy of paragraphs (a) (1) and (a) (2), the President is authorized to establish and maintain a total embargo upon the island of Cuba.

"'(4) No funds provided under this Act shall be used to make any voluntary contributions to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba.'"

On page 13, line 20, strike the "'(2) and insert in lieu thereof (5)'".

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be too controversial because I have a letter in my hand from Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State. Some time ago a group of our colleagues wrote a letter to the President asking him about free world shipping that was presently going into Cuba. I have the letter, which is dated August 16, and it states in part:

> After consideration at the White House, the letter signed by you and your colleagues concerning free world trade and shipping with Cuba has been sent to this department for reply. As you are aware from his many statements on the subject, your views are in accord with those of the President on the goal of isolating Cuba from the economic life of the free world.

This is one of the few times the President and I have found ourselves in agreement.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. As a matter of clarification, I would like to ask whether or not the sentence in the last paragraph of your substitute is not already contained almost in the same words in the bill pending at the present time, and I refer to page 13.

Mr. BATTIN. I will say to the gentleman that it is, and the language was submitted in the committee and accepted by the committee, by our colleague and a very interested citizen, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell]. The reason for striking out the language in my amendment was to have continuity of the numbering of the sections and for no other reason.

I will say further, Mr. Fascell's amendment does not go as far as this one, particularly the language dealing with aircraft. We find that the Cabana Airlines, along with others, are using flights as a means of moving agents in and out of this hemisphere. This is the means that the Communists are using to move people from Cuba to other countries and then into Central and South America.

There has been complete harmony on the floor today when Cuba has been discussed. Everybody wants to do something. Now we have that opportunity. The language of the amendment is about the same the House adopted last year in the appropriations act. I am sure the impression was left with the Members—it was with me—that this would do the job. The reason I wrote the letter to the President and as stated in the reply it did not do the job. About 50 percent of the ships going into Cuba today are free-world ships, the primary ones being the British fleet, the Greek, Italians and the Norwegians. It was stated in the letter I have referred to that it was not a violation of the language of the appropriation act, for these ships were going to Cuba empty and carrying Cuban exports away from the island. This, again, is the reason for the amendment so we can stop the flow in and out of Cuba. You cannot have an economic blockade when in fact the people who are the beneficiaries of our aid program are allowed to trade with the Cubans.

The amendment gives the President the opportunity, if he feels it is in the best interest of the security of the United States, to go ahead and allow ships to trade with Cuba. He can so state.

I do urge your support of the amendment. I think it is high time that we stopped free-world shipping to Cuba.

Should the amendment fail it would mean a reversal of the basic position of this House a year ago.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF FLORIDA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rogers of Florida to the amendment offered by Mr. Fascell: Immediately after "ships" each place it appears insert "or aircraft".

Amend subparagraph (iii) to read as follows:

"(iii) Any other equipment, materials, or commodities."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, for some number of months now I have imposed upon the patience of the membership of the House in order to discuss Cuba and the problems that we face. I have been very grateful to the membership for your bearing with me and those of us in Florida who are probably more concerned because Cuba is closest to us—not that all Americans are not concerned about this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in hope that if adopted, it will provide the incentive for foreign nations to cease trading with Communist Cuba.

It is evident from the figures obtained from naval intelligence and the Maritime Administration that free world shipping to Cuba has been increasing steadily over that of Russian shipping since April of this year, and that the trend in this increase became clear much earlier in the year. In view of these continual reports, I feel that all foreign aid to any country doing trade or furnishing assistance to Communist Cuba should be ended.

Some facts and figures should bear out this proposal. Since the beginning of this year numerous free world nations have allowed their flag ships to carry Russian and Soviet bloc goods to Cuba. The leaders in this shipping to Cuba have been as follows: Britain 80 trips, Greece 63 trips, Lebanon 31 trips, Norway 10 trips, and Italy 10 trips; to name just a few of the free world shippers to Communist Cuba. I find it hard to understand why these five countries mentioned specifically received in fiscal year 1962 some $222,400,000 in outright grants through our foreign aid program, and yet thwarted the best interests of the United States by continuing to ship to Cuba and prolonging Red domination of that island. Is this what the United States should expect from its allies?

The United States has long been a world leader in subsidizing the nations of the world with her benevolent helping hand. The motto of the U.S. Government has been, "We ask not what can you do for us, but rather what can we do for you?" We often seem to hand out millions of dollars in yearly grants to countries with military and economic needs, and yet have little response to our needs from these same nations. The upshot of this approach is shown in the way the free world nations have continued to trade with Communist Cuba. These countries are supposed to be our allies—why do they continue to act against the best interests of the United States and the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere? Why do they continue to keep Cuba supplied with goods that keep communism alive? Why do they who say they abhor Communist domination foster its growth by continuing shipping to Cuba? If we continue to give and give to nations who have not the same goals of freedom and willingness to act against communism in this hemisphere, then we are subsidizing those who in effect are aiding Castro and communism, which is clearly against our own foreign policy and best interests.

I feel that this amendment will effectively cause a ban on trade with Cuba by free world nations, and hopefully will give impetus to the economic collapse of that Red island, which in the long run will end Communist tyranny and restore freedom and democracy to that country. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I have gone over both of these amendments now, and I certainly feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] as amended by my amendment will do this. It says we do not want any aid to any country which will allow its ships or its airplanes to go into or from Cuba taking any equipment, any materials, or any goods.

There is no point in our giving aid to countries which are helping to build communism in this hemisphere.

Let me just give you quickly 2 or 3 facts that I think we ought to consider in adopting this amendment: January, overall world shipping this year down to 12 ships. Russian ships were 35. Look what has happened. In February allied shipping started at 19, went up to 28 in March, 37 in April, 44 in May, and 43 in June, and it is continuing. If we will adopt my amendment, reject the substitute and adopt the Fascell amendment, we will stop this, and this is what we ought to do. I hope this House will join in telling these nations, "We are not going to give you aid to help build communism in Cuba."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. May I ask the gentleman, has he had the benefit of reviewing the language of the substitute amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes; I have.

Mr. FASCELL. Am I correct in stating that under the language of the substitute there is no 60-day waiting period to get any action from any allies who might be involved?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is correct. This is not what causes me concern. This amendment provides 60 days to tell our own allies that we want them to stop shipping to Cuba and do it quickly. I do not think that is unreasonable.

Mr. FASCELL. Has the gentleman examined the language that deals with the proscription on economic assistance? Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the economic assistance program does or does not apply to ships in the language of the substitute?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It appears to me that in the language of the substitute it applies to airports, therefore it avoids in paragraph 2 the question of shipping.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. The gentleman did not look at it very closely.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, I have read it closely, especially paragraph 2.

Mr. BATTIN. I have yet to see a ship dock at an airport. This becomes a difficult thing. I do not see anything further in the gentleman's amendment that prohibits any further action of waiving the provisions of this act, talking about using a battleax, contained in the substitute, and perhaps we ought to go one step further.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the gentleman is talking about the point the gentleman from Iowa brought up. The Fascell amendment says this is to be the law. In the gentleman's amendment there is this waiver.

Mr. BATTIN. Section 614 would allow the waiver.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I disagree with the gentleman on his interpretation as between the two amendments. Further, I should like to point out that in paragraph 2, if you will read it, you will find these words:

> No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships or aircraft under its registry or foreign aircraft to use its airports or to overfly its country to carry passengers or import or export to Cuba.

The gentleman has left out "port." The gentleman has put in airports, but ships do not use airports. So the amendment is defective.

Mr. BATTIN. If the gentleman will yield, it says ships under the responsibility of that country.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is, to use its airports or overfly the country. Of course, ships do not do that, so the substitute is defective. I think the gentleman means well, I know, but I would hope you would vote for my amendment and against the substitute and then for the Fascell amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to warmly commend my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] for this amendment and my colleague [Mr. FASCELL] for the amendment which he has sought to be amended and I heartily associate myself with both gentlemen.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time hopefully to clarify perhaps the procedural aspect of the situation and also to discuss some of the statements already made with regard to the respective amendments, and the substitute amendment.

I am in favor of the Battin substitute, as a stronger measure as compared to both the Fascell amendment and the amendment to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS.] For these following reasons: This amendment was drafted in keeping with the language contained in and passed by this Committee, so far as I know, unanimously last session, as written into the appropriations bill and it was drafted on the basis of section 107 (a) and (b) of the last session of Congress, in actions relating to appropriations—but with needed strengthening amendments. That is the history of the draftsmanship of the legislation.

The amendment is stronger. It covers all aircraft, not only those registered with the air recipient country. It covers trade from as well as to Cuba by any such nations.

Now it has been said, 60 days should be given to the administration to let these other countries conform. Under last year's bill, they have had a year to conform. What we are complaining about, and why we have drafted this amendment in the form we have, and the Fascell amendment and the Rogers amendment to the amendment will not accomplish that, is to require the administration to acknowledge and carry out what the Congress intended before, but perhaps defectively stated, giving the President an out whereby the President of the United States could use his discretion—which he has done—and not enforce what I believe to be the clear intent stated by the Congress of the United States—no aid to any country that trades with Cuba. You do not need 60 days more. It has been in excess of a year since Congress spoke for an aid ban to trade-with-Cuba nations in 1962.

What does the Fascell amendment and the Rogers amendment to it do in comparison to the substitute? Well, the door is wide open for the President to do nothing; what he has done all last year, and that is little or nothing. That is what the complaint is. The Battin amendment strengthens the present law.

But the substitute provides that the President shall conform to the intent of the Congress and shall not be able to waive that announced intent pursuant to section 614. Section 614 permits the President to waive, despite what the Congress said in the appropriation bill, to waive that intent and purpose, as he sees fit to do.

The amendment proposed, the substitute by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] has the objective of preventing section 614 authority on the part of the President to, in effect, repeal what the Congress says the President should do in the first instance—that is, cut off aid to any country that trades with Cuba.

Let me say further, the question was asked with regard to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the amendment, that no funds provided under this act shall be used to make any voluntary contributions to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba.

Now this corrects a very significant technical error made, in my opinion, by the committee. If the chairman of the committee will be kind enough to look at the committee report at page 71, section 620, the chairman I am sure will see in drafting the amendment adopted in committee to the basic 1961 act that the "No funds provided under this act" relating to the United Nations, in effect, going to Cuba that the following sentence says as follows and I quote:

> As an additional means of implementing and carrying into effect the policy of the preceding sentence, the President is authorized to establish and maintain a total embargo upon all trade between the United States and Cuba.

What does that have to do with the United Nations and international organizations? What has happened is that if this substitute does not pass, from the manner in which this legislation is drafted, you are going to take the heart right out of the President's power to impose an embargo by relating it back to the United Nations instead of the trade aspects in the first sentence. This is cured by the Battin but not the Fascell amendment. So what is going to happen is that unless this substitute is adopted, the very heart of the embargo is going to be cut right out from under the President and his power to exercise it. In addition to that, the substitute does not only provide for a ban so long as the "Castro regime" is in power in Cuba—and this is important, because we do not know how long Castro will be there, but we know the Communists will probably be there a long time unless something is done about it—the Battin amendment provides not only for "Castro" but for "any Communist regime in Cuba," that the President shall have this power to cut off aid to countries doing business with Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I have earlier pointed out that on any further requests for extensions of time we would object, and I now object.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we must take steps to effect the most stringent measures against Castro's Cuba. The substitute would accomplish this purpose much more completely.

The Communist stranglehold on Cuba continues unabated. This substitute amendment will provide a nonmilitary restriction on trade with Cuba. It will also be effective in preventing the transportation of personnel into and out of Cuba.

Cuba's economic life is vitally dependent on certain major exports, and a vast number of imports. The current difficulties in the realization of its ambitious industrialization program show that the country is extremely vulnerable to any interruption of the flow of foreign trade. Whenever it has been possible to collect facts on Cuban trade, it has become abundantly clear that the Communist world is unable to supply all the basic essentials so desperately needed by Cuba.

In pre-Castro days, the United States functioned as major supplier and purchaser of Cuban needs and exports. Now that the U.S. embargo on Cuban exports and imports is in operation, and the Sino-Soviet world cannot supply Cuba's needs, many free world countries have stepped in to take a percentage of Cuban trade.

The United States has asked its free world partners to assist in enforcing the embargo, but significant cooperation on the part of the free world countries has been disappointing. There are 66 free world countries trading with Castro, and 54 of these countries are receiving some form of American foreign aid. Nations of the free world have also provided the bulk of the shipping to Cuba in recent months.

On Monday, August 19, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers], indicated that since April the free world countries have sent more ships to Cuba than have the Russians.

Shipping to Cuba

	Free world	*Russian*
January	12	35
February	19	34
March	28	32
April	37	27
May	44	38
June	43	31
July (incomplete)	28	23

In addition, Spain and Mexico are currently flying their transport aircraft into Cuba, and British Guinea is negotiating an air link with Cuba.

One of the most effective ways to stifle the Communist dictatorship in Cuba would be to eliminate trade by the nations of the free world to which we are giving our foreign aid. If we were to ask nations in the free world to stop trading and shipping to Cuba, some of their reactions might be negative. However, if we attach a few strings to our foreign aid to these countries, I believe that very rapidly we would see an almost complete cessation of trade by the free world with Cuba.

It seems inconsistent to the welfare of the United States that we should help finance and support those nations who are trading and shipping to Cuba for profit. This is a peaceful, nonmilitary, positive action, and it will be effective in curtailing communism in Cuba. I believe that this kind of positive leadership will be applauded by both nations of the Western Hemisphere and those nations throughout the world who believe that communism should be stopped.

The Communist bloc countries would, indeed, have a difficult time in providing the current volume of trade to Cuba. If the aircraft of those nations who are receiving American aid did not fly into Cuba, the flow of Communist agents to the free world would be greatly curtailed.

The substitute amendment is designed to prevent the American taxpayers' money from going to those nations who would knowingly help to preserve a Communist dictatorship which is just 90 miles from our shores.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have looked over the three amendments, and I think the Fascell amendment as perfected by the Rogers amendment will do exactly what is needed with respect to trade with Cuba. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell], as amended by the amendment offered by Mr. Rogers, is strong and will be effective. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Fascell amendment as amended be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Battin].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes had it.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Battin and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 176.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Cramer to the amendment by Mr. Fascell: Amend the Fascell amendment, as amended, by inserting immediately before the quotation marks at the end thereof the following new sentence:
>
> "The restrictions contained in this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this act or in any other provision of law."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we are getting to the crux of the real difference between the substitute and the amendment, and that is with regard to whether or not we are going to write into the law meaningful and mandatory restrictions on trading by other nations that receive our aid with Cuba or not. That is all there is to it.

This amendment, if adopted, will provide such a mandatory restriction. Without it, such mandate will not exist and the status quo will prevail.

If that is not done, of course, what you are going to end up with is exactly what we have now. That is what the problem is. You are going to end up with precisely the situation you have now, with the President in his discretion waiving the Fascell amendment. That is all he has to do, and in his discretion he can do that if he wants to do it. He waives it. The Congress is not saying to the President of the United States or the people of the United States we are going to stop sending any money aid to any country that continues to trade with Cuba. We are not saying that at all under the Fascell amendment.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question. I have not seen a copy of the Battin amendment, but as I heard it read it seems to me it did have within itself such a provision. If we were to adopt this amendment we would have a much more restrictive situation than we would have had under the Battin amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say to the gentleman that is not necessarily true, not under the present law, section 614, and the Battin amendment was drafted in exactly the same language as my amendment. We are attempting to put in the Fascell amendment the restrictions contained in the Battin amendment, the same paragraph the gentleman referred to, which added that the President shall notify the respective committees if trade is permitted to continue. The President had to take official action. The restrictions contained in this paragraph I am offering may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this act or any other provision of law. So the objective is to prevent the President from doing exactly what he has been doing under the present law that has been so ineffective.

I think the House made a mistake in not accepting the Battin amendment. It is a strong amendment, and I think it would do the job, not half a job. The Fascell-Rogers amendment if adopted does a half job. The amendment with this additional amendment I propose will put some of the teeth back into what was previously the Battin amendment by making the prohibition against aid going to countries that trade with Cuba mandatory.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. The Battin amendment contained a waiver provision, where the President had to make a positive determination in order to waive the provisions, but now if you would attach this to the Fascell amendment there would be absolutely no circumstances, not even if the President affirmatively declared it to be in the interest of the United States, in which he could waive the provisions. I think it goes too far.

Mr. CRAMER. It does exactly what has to be done if we are going to tighten up what has been going on in the past. The President under the present law and the Fascell amendment makes a determination it is all right for the United States to continue to give aid to these countries even though they continue to trade with Cuba because the Executive considers it is in the "national interest." Well, now, we might as well not pass any amendment unless my amendment is adopted to it. We passed amendments to the appropriations bill last year and these amendments were fashioned to some extent as is the Fascell amendment, but we find that the administration in effect ignored them. They said we are conforming to the law because we have this, we have section 614 that is a part of the existing law, that if the President decides it is in the national interest he may waive this prohibition or any other. So all the President did was to waive it. He said it was in the national interest and he waived it.

Over 50 percent of the shipping with Cuba today is through free world ships—50 percent of the ships continue to be free world ships. That in itself proves that the present wording, which is about the same as the Fascell wording, is not going to accomplish the objective of cutting off assistance to nations who trade and allow these subversives to go into Cuba through the use of airlines from Mexico and from Spain, and let these subversives go to Cuba and be trained to the extent that the Selden committee found and the Stennis Senate committee found, despite the resolution passed by Congress in September of last year, that these subversive activities have been gaining so fast that it is now against the best interests and the security of the United States. So if you want an amendment with teeth in it, you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to disagree with my distinguished colleague. His amendment could injure NATO and the vital security interests of the United States. In the substitute, on which we have already acted, there appeared the language, "unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is important to the security of the United States and reports such determination to the respective committees of the House." There is a similar waiver provision under existing law, and I stated in response to the inquiry from the gentleman from Iowa that I make no change in that.

When we wrote the embargo provision in this law the law also contained the waiver provisions under section 614 and yet the President imposed the embargo. The purpose of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is to strike out the application of section 614—that is what he says—notwithstanding the fact that this inflexibility would force the stopping of U.S. military aid to a stanch U.S. ally who was not able to immediately stop one of its chartered vessels from entering Cuba. Thus the gentleman's amendment is dangerous. The amendment to the amendment is not necessary, because under section 614 of the present law the President now has to make the determination for a waiver in the interest of national security.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We do not have the Battin amendment before us. We have the Rodgers-Fascell amendment before us. Let us tighten this up to where we have some meaning. Let us mean what we say and say what we mean for once.

Mr. FASCELL. I think the amendment is amply clear. I do not think it is necessary to waive the provisions of section 614 as they apply to the President of the United States in the exercise of his judgment as to what is best in the national security interests of the United States. I ask, therefore, that my colleague's amendment to my amendment be defeated and my amendment allowing us to take further strong economic action against the Communist Government of Cuba be adopted.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this happens to be a subject that interests me. I am unable to follow the subject as it has proceeded. Therefore, I should like to ask the originator of the original amendment, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], a specific question. Under the language of his amendment, if a nation chooses to trade with Cuba, can it receive aid under this bill under any circumstances?

Mr. FASCELL. Only if the President determines that it is in the national security interest. The difference is, however, that my amendment has no waiver; that waiver is contained in present law, whereas under the Battin substitute a waiver was written into the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. We are not now considering the Battin substitute?

Mr. FASCELL. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Therefore, under the gentleman's amendment as it is presently written, if the President wishes for any reason to determine that it is for the security of the United States, any nation receiving aid can trade with Cuba. Is this correct?

Mr. FASCELL. No. Only for national security interests. In any event we cannot stop any country from trading. We can only stop our aid.

The only additional remark I would make is that this is the same criterion that was proposed in the Battin substitute. There is no difference.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. Now I should like to ask this of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. In the Fascell amendment as amended by your amendment, can any nation receiving aid trade with Cuba under any circumstances?

Mr. CRAMER. Under the present law, if it is in the national interest, it can be, and that is what has happened.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Under the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, can the President make a determination that it is in the interest of the national security?

Mr. CRAMER. Under my amendment, no—under the Fascell amendment, yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. I think we are playing on words here, but it becomes important at this point because in the language of section 164 and also, I believe, in the language of the Battle Act, it refers to national interest. In the amendment I offered, it does not refer to the national interest but it refers to national security, which makes to me a substantial amount of difference.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But as I understand it, we are not dealing now with that distinction. On the one hand, if the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is accepted, the Presidential determination is not a question that matters; do I understand that that is correct?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. My amendment gives the direction to the President and states specifically that trade shall not continue with Cuba by nations that get United States freedom dollars to trade with Communists. That is what it does and it does not permit the Executive to continue to do as they have been doing all this year despite the fact that we wrote into the appropriation bill in the last session, to continue to give aid to countries trading with Cuba. It closes the loophole.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. Therefore, as I see it in voting on your amendment, it is a determination by this Congress which, in our opinion, is most in the national interest—the possibility of nations who receive our aid trading with Cuba—or the possibility of our dollars which we give in aid being used by nations to trade with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FASCELL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 162, noes 161.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair votes no.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my understanding is, after checking at the desk, there are 16 amendments, 13 of which would require individual action. In all my time here I have attempted, whether in the majority or minority, to expedite the business of the House of Representatives and I intend to continue in that fashion. But I must say that with those amendments, many of which are very important and on which Members want to speak, to undertake to consider them all tonight, when we could meet again tomorrow and in the time that would be afforded continue with a careful consideration of this very important measure, that I cannot go along and agree to that unanimous consent request; and so, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have not suggested any limitation of time, but merely that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman, I have been around here just a little while. Once you get that unanimous-consent request through, then if you see fit you can move to shut off debate on the bill and all amendments thereto; and if you have the votes to do it then, of course, you could roll over us and that would end the show.

So, Mr. Chairman, I object.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 13, line 12, strike out "first" and insert "second".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this will take just a moment. I should hope the chairman of the committee would accept this amendment because otherwise I am afraid that the whole Cuban program as it relates to the President's power to establish and maintain a total embargo is going right down the drain. The reason is, if you look on page 71 of the report you will see this sentence:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the present Government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present Government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

Following this is the President's embargo powers under present law but as amended these powers are out of place and refer to the wrong sentence in the amended version.

Now, the Committee on Foreign Affairs added a sentence to that section 620 relating to the United Nations going to Cuba. The sentence that follows the amendment sentence deals with the discretion for an embargo. So, that you cannot have an embargo at all unless the amendment is agreed to because the embargo sentence refers to the "preceding sentence" and refers to, although it has no relationship to, the presently amended U.N. sentence to which it refers.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. We have examined the gentleman's amendment. I think there is enough room in this Cuban situation for all of the Florida Representatives to get some credit. So, we will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. This has nothing to do with credit. I just wish you had accepted the other amendment too to make the trade ban on Cuba effective by cutting off all aid to nations trading with Cuba on a mandatory rather than discretionary basis.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 304. Section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to suspension of assistance, is amended as follows:
>
> (a) In clause (2), immediately after "operational conditions,", insert "or has taken other actions,".
>
> (b) Strike out "equitable and speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange" and insert in lieu thereof "speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange equivalent to the full value thereof".
>
> SEC. 305. Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing certain assistance to Communist countries, is amended by inserting immediately before the period after "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" the following: "(including its captive constituent republics)".

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for adopting the amendment to section 620(f), the purpose of which is clearly to identify the Soviet Union as a colonial power and to recognize the unremitting struggles for national independence carried on by the peoples of the captive non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union.

This is a very significant amendment.

It can have far-reaching political effects in support of peace with freedom.

There is real drama in this committee finding, as the committee report on page 32 points out, because it gives open and official announcement to the fact that our Government regards the Soviet Union for what it is—an evil prison house for many once free and independent nations.

That is what the committee means when it refers to the captive republics of the Soviet Union.

This amendment serves to undo some of the damage done to our national prestige and to our historic role in support of national independence movements caused by the ill-advised letter of Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the chairman of the Rules Committee in which the Secretary put himself on record as a defender of Russian imperialism.

The letter to which I refer was sent by Secretary Rusk in opposition to the then pending resolutions to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

It is no exaggeration to observe that much of the current suspicions which attach to our foreign policy motives, arose from the repercussions to the Rusk letter.

In that letter Secretary Rusk held that such nations as Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia were historic parts of a Russian state—the Soviet Union—and for our Government to take note of the national independence movements in those nations, would offend Russian sensitivities.

The implications of such thinking are all too obvious, particularly to scholars of international political affairs.

It is little wonder that among interested groups here at home as well as among our proven friends and allies abroad, questions arose as to what sort of deal had been made, or was in the making, with imperial Russia to work out a formal status quo which would put an official stamp of approval on the captivity of one third of the human family.

Moreover, we need look no further than the Rusk letter for a basic source of public suspicion about some sort of hidden political deal concealed behind the limited test ban treaty now before the Senate.

Policy positions announced by the Secretary of State are not expected to be arrived at without due and full consideration of all the facts and consequences involved.

It is regrettable that Secretary Rusk has not withdrawn or repudiated his letter to the Rules Committee.

Nevertheless, these circumstances serve to underscore the importance of the committee amendment to section 620(f).

I hope the Secretary will take proper note of the cogent observations on this issue contained in the committee report and that he will be guided accordingly.

There is another noteworthy feature attached to this committee amendment.

It does not cost the taxpayer 1 penny.

Moreover, it could, over the long run, lead the way to lifting the heavy burden of taxes from the backs of our people.

I say this because it is no secret that over 60 percent of the annual tax burden is attributed directly or indirectly to the threat posed to our survival and that of our allies by imperial Russia.

If the Russians were relieved of their imperial power by the process of internal political pressures leading to dismemberment of their empire, the threat to our survival would pass into history.

This is no idle hope. The signs of the times put the stamp of reality upon this prospect.

In recent weeks we have heard a great deal about the Moscow-Peiping dispute.

It is generally agreed that if this dispute is real and unhealable by Marxist magic, the Russians are in serious trouble.

Some observers even argue that the United States cannot stand on the sidelines of this dispute, that we must take sides and that imperial Russia would be easier to live with than an aggressive, expansive Red China.

This kind of loose and naive thinking is responsible for much of the trouble we find ourselves in today.

The facts are that the United States can reach no profitable or lasting agreement with either side engaged in this dispute.

Both are dedicated to burying us. They only disagree on the means to be used for the burial ceremony.

There are, nevertheless, increasing signs that the Moscow-Peiping dispute can ripen into circumstances leading to the political dismemberment of the Russian empire.

The Red Chinese have concealed their real quarrel with Moscow under heavy barrages of dialectical invective.

Stripped of all the doubletalk, what the Red Chinese are really demanding from the Russians is the status of equals in the international conspiracy and the corresponding abolition of Russian racial superiority in the affairs of international communism.

This hard and fixed discrimination within the Communist camp is even resented by non-Russian Communists in the European parts of the Russian empire.

The main difference is that the Red Chinese take added confidence from the vast population they control and are thus bolder about their demands. In the process they fan the fires of nationalism in the captive European nations.

Consequently, the imperial Russians find themselves completely surrounded by the fires of nationalism, that is, powerful human forces that regard communism to be nothing more than a clever cover operation for old-fashioned Russian imperialism.

This contest boils down, in terms of human resources, to some 90 million Russians against over 200 million captive non-Russians in the European parts of their Empire and some 500 million Chinese in the Asiatic part of their Empire.

These odds cannot be ignored, even in the nuclear age.

It is worth noting the Red Chinese have expressed contempt for fear of a nuclear war.

This contempt in the context of Red Chinese ambitions to regain their territories in the Far East annexed by the czars makes for some interesting speculation.

The Red Chinese have the Russians in a tight bind in the Far East.

In terms of sheer manpower the Red Chinese have what it takes to regain their lost territories, now a part of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialistic Republic.

If the Russians use nuclear weapons to turn back Chinese military efforts to regain those territories, the condemnation of the world will be the Russian's reward.

If the Red Chinese initiate action against imperial Russia in the Far East, this is sure to bring a favorable response from the peoples of the captive European nations who will sieze this opportunity to break their Russian colonial chains.

There are events of great international significance yet to unfold and this is surely no time to be rushing to the defense of imperial Russia.

The long-range effects of the committee amendment will, to a large extent, depend upon the exploitation given to it on a worldwide basis by the U.S. Information Agency, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberation.

I urge the able chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to take steps to make certain this is done.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BALDWIN

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: On page 15, line 2, after the period, add the following sentence:
>
> "Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended by striking out the second sentence reading: 'This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) Such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international Communism,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act'."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House may recall that 2 years ago when the foreign aid bill was taken up in the House for consideration an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] to bar aid to any Communist country. That amendment was adopted by the House.

The purpose of my amendment is simply to restore the exact original wording of the Casey amendment. The amendment that was adopted 2 years ago was greatly watered down in the Senate. Last year an amendment was again offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], exactly the same wording, but it was watered down by an amendment offered in the House that would allow a waiver under which aid could go to Communist countries.

I have voted for the foreign aid bill every year I have served in the Congress, but it seems to me the fact that aid has been given to Communist countries has done more to cause the people to have distrust in the foreign aid program than in the case of any other single feature of the program.

I have a tabulation as to the amount of aid given to Yugoslavia and Poland. The tabulation for the period from July 1945, to June 30, 1962, totals for Yugoslavia $2,396,700,000, and for Poland $522,600,000.

I am informed in this particular bill the State Department is not intending to allocate funds to Yugoslavia or Poland with the exception of certain funds for a hospital in Poland. Under the amendment adopted last year there is a specific exception in the case of hospitals. So my amendment will not change that. The provision for funds for a hospital in Poland would go for that particular purpose. But this amendment would bar any other aid under this bill to any Communist country, including Cuba, Yugoslavia, Poland, or any other Communist country.

It seems to me that we have to make a decision on principle. If we are opposed to the basic theory of communism, which is to overthrow our very way of life which our Government was set up to defend, then I do not see how, consistently with that principle, we can allow aid to be given to any communistic country under any circumstances, and the purpose of my amendment is to bar any such aid under any circumstances.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I want to thank the gentleman for complimenting me by endeavoring to restore this original language. I am still very strongly for this original language, but I must say in all fairness that since the House did adopt this amendment I have checked it, and the information furnished me by AID is that the only amount concerned in Yugoslavia since the adoption by this Congress of the amendment was around $90,000 for the purpose of closing out the program. Like the gentleman, I am a little disturbed that there is that possibility in view of the ability to make the grants. As long as they can make the grants, there is always that possibility. The amount that the gentleman spoke of, prior to this House cutting it off we were sending $415,000 a day to Yugoslavia alone. That is not peanuts.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to follow up the comments of the gentleman from Texas by stating that although the State Department has indicated they do not intend to allocate any funds to Yugoslavia and Poland, nevertheless, unless we write some restrictive provision in the bill this afternoon, they could do so. It seems to me we should indicate clearly that no funds under this bill should go to any Communist country.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Will the gentleman tell me whether this amendment will permit the sale of Public Law 480 commodities?

Mr. BALDWIN. This amendment does not cover Public Law 480 commodities.

Mrs. KELLY. Then the gentleman is willing to have surplus goods under Public Law 480 to be given or sold to Communist countries? Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. No, I am not; but my amendment is to the pending foreign aid bill, and applies to the funds in that bill. I am offering an amendment to bar allowing foreign aid to go to a Communist country. I will be glad to support any amendment offered by anyone in this House to bar aid under Public Law 480, but the funds in this bill do not fall under the Public Law 480 program.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one has endeavored to cut off aid to Communist nations any more than I have. I should like to say that Public Law 480 in no way comes under the control of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I wish it did. Then we would not have the problem involved as far as the sale of Public Law 480 commodities is concerned. It is not in this bill, although an amendment to prohibit the sale of commodities under Public Law 480 could come under this bill. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would like to include the sale of products under Public Law 480 at this time.

Mr. BALDWIN. In answer to the gentlewoman's question, this amendment is to a section of the bill dealing with the foreign aid program. Therefore, I have worded my amendment to bar aid under the foreign aid program. If any other Member of the House wants to offer an amendment barring aid under Public Law 480, I shall fully support that amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could arrive at some limitation on this debate. This amendment was debated last year fully on the floor, not 2 years ago, last year. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is that on this amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the author of this amendment, the gentleman from California, if I may have his attention, would this amendment bar the United States from giving assistance in an instance as we recently had, to the helpless and innocent victims at Skopje who were victims of an earthquake?

Mr. BALDWIN. No, this would not bar that because that was under the Public Law 480 provision.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In other words, the language of this amendment would not bar that kind of humanitarian assistance?

Mr. BALDWIN. It would not.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding because I would like to query him or the gentleman from California further as to whether, or not, this would specifically bar aid given recently to the tune of some $50 million by the Secretary of Agriculture while in that country.

Mr. BALDWIN. It would not bar that aid because that was not under the foreign aid bill.

Mr. HALL. Was that under Public Law 480?

Mr. BALDWIN. It was apparently not under the foreign aid bill.

Mr. HALL. Would it bar aid for a nuclear reactor to Yugoslavia under the technical assistance program?

Mr. BALDWIN. This amendment would bar any aid from any funds approved in the foreign aid bill. This would bar any aid from any fund under this act that we are authorizing today from going to any Communist country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to set the record straight in correcting a minor mistake here. The Casey amendment in the 1958 foreign aid bill, as I recall, was an amendment which specifically listed nations that were to be deprived of any aid; and further in looking at the amendment of the gentleman from California, I would not be satisfied with it if it qualifies the recipient as one which is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy. In the cases of Yugoslavia and Poland, the question arises as to whether the country is, in fact, controlled by the international Communist conspiracy. I would much prefer to see this amendment read, "any nation with a Communist government." Then we would not be playing with words as to whether or not the country is controlled by the so-called international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. The wording that you read is the wording that is being stricken out by this amendment. The wording you read is the wording now in the bill that is being stricken out and replaced by wording that simply bars any aid to any Communist country.

Mr. COLLIER. I understand that but I do find the reference to a Communist government.

Mr. BALDWIN. No, it amends section 620(f) which says, "Any Communist country." It is on page 73 of the committee report.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman. If that is it, I thank the gentleman. I am satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, there has from time to time during the discussion on this bill come up a very complicated situation with regard to the relationship of Public Law 480 to the foreign assistance legislation. I have tried for some time to determine what this relationship is and I have not been able to do so after months of attempts.

I would just like to point out at this point, however, to the gentleman from California, that with regard to Poland and Yugoslavia, other than military assistance primarily to Yugoslavia, a very large percentage of the aid given has been under Public Law 480, not directly under development loans or grants under the Foreign Assistance Act or the old Mutual Security Act. I agree with him that we should take every means to see to it that we do not give any more aid to a country that is directly, through its people, alined with the Communist bloc countries. It is true, of course, that both Yugoslavia and Poland are in this area, but I want him to remember that there is a difference—and it is something we very often forget—there is a difference between a government ruling over people where they have no choice and where they are a militarily occupied country. This does not indicate that the people have lost their intense desire and determination for independence. The people of Poland deserve every possible help we can give to aid them to regain their freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, there are several reasons why I oppose this amendment. First of all, I think the original author of the amendment [Mr. CASEY] has stated that the administration has demonstrated good faith in the use of the authority that presently appears. Second, the language that we have in the bill is the product of bipartisan support, and it took considerable time to work out this bipartisan language when this bill was before the House last year. Third, I think we are living in historic times where the Communist world is breaking up and to deny the flexibility that the President has to exploit these cracks is to do a serious disservice to our national interest.

Fourth, in adopting this amendment, we question the judgment of our President. We would also question the judgment of former President Eisenhower who supports the language as it presently exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. As I told the author of this amendment, I intend to support the amendment, but I also want to explain why I do not offer an amendment to restore the original words, because there has been no aid since Congress worked its will the last time. But I do want to correct the gentleman over here. Do not kid yourself that we have not been pouring money into Yugoslavia in dollars, because we have. I have a nice fat list here that I will be glad to show you if you want to see it. For 15 years, $415,000 a day, for 15 years, in Yugoslavia alone. I have an amendment coming up here a little while later which is not as controversial as this one we are now talking about which we had last year where we spent over 3 hours on this little amendment alone. However, do not kid yourself that we have not been fattening up some of our enemies.

I am going to vote for the gentleman's amendment. You can do whatever you want to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first let me give you the history of the Casey amendment that is now in the bill, which the gentleman from California is proposing to eliminate by his amendment. Last year after the Senate disagreed with the House on this provision, the President called a meeting at the White House with Members from both sides of the House in attendance. We devised this language, which is now in the law, at that time. The language that the gentleman from California is now trying to eliminate is the language that was devised by the late and beloved Congressman Francis Walter. You may remember Francis Walter took the well in defense of this language. This language specifically gives the President a right to make a determination. Are we going to trust the President or not? This language has been in the bill all this year.

There has not been any attempt by the President to give any aid to Yugoslavia or Poland under this authority. There is no money in this bill for fiscal 1964, either for Poland or for Yugoslavia. This amendment does not touch Public Law 480. If you really want to write a restrictive amendment you should amend Public Law 480 under which we are selling millions of dollars' worth of farm products to both Poland and Yugoslavia. No money under the Mutual Security Bill is going there, so we do not need this amendment to put a further restriction on the President.

Those who vote for this amendment are saying to the President of the United States, "I do not trust you."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, the bulk of the aid that the gentleman from Texas refers to was not given equally over a period of 15 years. The bulk of the aid to Poland and Yugoslavia was given during the Eisenhower administration; and I am not being political when I say that because I supported Mr. Eisenhower's right to do it. But I will tell you what this amendment will do. If this amendment passes, and there is a Hungarian type revolution in Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Yugoslavia or anyplace else and it is on a shaky basis and has a fighting chance to succeed, we would be prohibited from helping it to succeed. That would be the effect of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 150, noes 158.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 306. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

"(1) the United States,

"(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

"(j) No assistance under this Act shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is in the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this Act."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOMFIELD

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:

"(k) Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, has that section that is now sought to be amended been read by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 306 was read.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered would require additional congressional authorization for any oversea productive enterprise in which total U.S. assistance reaches $100 million or more.

Further, this amendment would remain on the books only until the enactment of next year's foreign aid bill.

There are a number of reasons why I have offered this amendment, but all of these reasons, in one way or another, hinge upon U.S. participation in the proposed Bokaro steel plant in India.

The committee spent considerable time in the hearings on this proposed plant. We questioned Mr. David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, closely on this project.

We had the benefit of the United States Steel report on the feasibility of this project.

After all the information which was given to us about this project, after all our discussions on Bokaro, I could not help coming away with one overriding observation.

That is this: What we do not know about Bokaro far outweighs what we do know.

The plain fact is that nobody knows whether Bokaro is possible, whether Bokaro is feasible, whether it can be operated economically, whether manpower can be found to run the plant once it is completed, whether adequate transportation can be provided for raw materials, if such raw materials are available in the kinds and qualities necessary for this plant.

Further, nobody knows whether or not there are private funds available in either India, in our own country, in Western Europe, to finance construction of this plant or whether the Government of India should run this plant.

I do not think that Congress, at this point, has the information available to it to make a determination of how much or what kind of contribution our Federal Government should make, if any.

Further, the Agency for International Development admits that the data is not available to it at this time to make a rational decision on the role our Federal Government should play in this project.

The United States Steel report raises some grave doubts about the availability of limestone deposits, for instance, and points out that those deposits which are known are of inferior quality.

Where the 5,400 workers would live, where the necessary technicians would come from and who they would be has not been adequately considered.

The United States Steel report points out that living conditions at the proposed Bokaro site would be very difficult for the Indians themselves, and even more difficult for any American technicians who would have to live in the vicinity.

One of the main purposes of my amendment is to forestall an agreement before the data has been obtained, before the gaps in current information are filled.

The statement has been made that there are not enough private funds available in India, the free world, and the United States to permit this plant to be built as a private enterprise project.

I have serious doubts about the validity of this statement.

Most certainly, private capital has not come forth in sufficient quantities to date to finance this project under the private sector.

The reason is quite obvious. On the basis of the data which has been supplied up until today, I most certainly would not invest a nickel in this project. I do not believe a businessman in India would do so either.

After the necessary surveys have been completed—after a close look has been taken at this project in terms of the amount of private capital available—after the geologic surveys have been completed—after a determination has been made that this plant is the best possible investment of funds to raise living standards in India, then is the time for another look at this project in terms of how it should be financed—through private capital, through a public corporation or possibly some combination of both.

While the Agency for International Development, the State Department and other Federal agencies have attempted to assure us that no commitment will be made on Bokaro during the current fiscal year, this is not enough assurance for me.

The temptation might be too great to use approval of Bokaro as a possible short-term replacement for foreign policy in the subcontinent. I most certainly would deplore the approval of this project under such circumstances, and I am sure that I would be joined by almost every Member of the House of Representatives in this.

My amendment would cover only Bokaro at this time. The reason I have proposed roughly a year's limit in the amendment is so that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will have an opportunity during the next 12 months to determine just exactly what role Congress should play in the approval and consideration of future overseas programs.

We have spent a number of months in committee in our deliberations on the total foreign aid bill. I think the committee, in general, did an excellent job.

But I think it is easy for my colleagues to recognize the fact that a great deal more study, a great deal more consideration must be given to the voice Congress should have in the approval of individual projects in which substantial amounts of U.S. dollars are involved.

It is my belief that the committee will have the time for adequate consideration of this role of Congress in these determinations under less-harried, less-hurried circumstances.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman and I worked on the amendment with reference to Indonesia at great length. This is one of the amendments I referred to earlier I would support. I think the gentleman's amendment does exactly what needs to be done.

Personally, at the moment I would be against the project, period, but at least I would be willing to grant a year to make a study and have a chance to come in and convince the committee. This amendment means they cannot proceed with this or give a dime before next year's foreign aid bill, unless the House and the Senate separately voted to let them go ahead. The committee has examined the amendment. The chairman and I have discussed it at length, and I believe—the chairman can correct me if I am wrong—I am authorized to say that we on this side accept the amendment and hope that it passes.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: On page 16, insert the following new section after line 8:

"SEC. 307. From the date of enactment of this Act through June 30, 1964, no part of any funds authorized to be made available for carrying out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available to partially or wholly finance in any country, either by loan, grant, or otherwise, participation by the United States in the acquisition, construction, or expansion of any separately identifiable project or facility proposal involving for completion an estimated aggregate limit of United States participation, as determined by the President, of $100,000,000 or more unless such project or facility proposal is authorized in specific terms either in this Act or in other legislation enacted by the Congress; and after June 30, 1964, no appropriation or other funds shall be made available for any such participation in any such project or facility proposal, otherwise authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and involving for completion an estimated aggregate limit of United States participation, as determined by the President, of $50,000,000 or more unless such project or facility proposal is authorized in specific terms by legislation enacted by the Congress.

"The provisions of this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this or any other Act."

And amend subsequent section numbers accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment I have offered may sound complicated, but it is not. There is nothing complex about it.

It provides that from the date of enactment of this act and through June 30, next year, none of the funds made available for carrying out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act shall be available to finance in whole or part, in any country, any project in which the United States is involved and which costs in the estimated aggregate $100 million or more, unless such project is specifically authorized in this act or in other legislation enacted by Congress.

After June 30, 1964, no funds shall be made available for any project or facility, involving for completion an estimated aggregate of $50 million, again as determined by the President, unless such project or facility proposal is authorized in specific terms by legislation enacted by Congress.

This amendment will not only block the spending by this Government of an estimated $1 billion on the Bokaro steel mill, but it will stop any other commitments of this kind without the specific authorization of Congress.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], is temporary in nature. I want to make this permanent. Why should not the Congress pass upon the use of our dollars to build the Bokaro steel mill in India, and they will under the terms of my amendment. But why should this same scrutiny not go to all other projects between now and next June, if there are such projects, that cost $100 million, and thereafter why should not the Congress authorize projects costing more than $50 million or more?

Why, you cannot get in your district a project costing $50,000, you cannot even get planning money for it, unless you get an authorization from the Congress. Why should we permit the bureaucrats, under the Foreign Assistance Act to launch even $50 million projects in foreign countries without the authority of Congress?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman feel we might be starting a system here or a precedent under which we would be lobbied to death by the lobbies from downtown representing the foreign governments trying to put over projects?

Mr. GROSS. Well, why should we fear lobbyists—any of them?

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a question of fear, it is a question of getting into an area in which I do not think the gentleman wants the Congress to get. When a local project is considered by the Congress, it is considered on the basis of local requirements. But when we consider one of these foreign projects, we are going to have to get into the whole field of foreign policy which is outside of the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman for just a minute or two.

Mr. McDOWELL. I will not take that long, I assure the gentleman. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I would expect that.

Mr. McDOWELL. But I do want to commend him, for he is certainly making progress. He comes from nothing to $50 million very quickly.

Mr. GROSS. What do you mean—from nothing to $50 million?

Mr. McDOWELL. I thought the gentleman was opposed to any aid.

Mr. GROSS. If it is so insignificant why are you opposed to it?

Mr. McDOWELL. I thought the gentleman was opposed to any aid whether it is 50 cents or $50 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am not authorizing any aid here. I am saying that when the bureaucratic "foreign aiders" want to start a project costing more than $50 million for some foreign dictator after next June 30, 1964, they have got to come to the Congress and justify it. What is wrong with that? You cannot get any part of that kind of money in your district or your State without coming to Congress and justifying it. And since when, I ask, has Congress been precluded from authorizing expenditures and appropriating for them even though this action may have an effect on foreign policy?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. They are going to borrow this money. This is a loan. This is not a project such as we get in this country where we get a grant. This is an actual loan and they are going to pay interest on this loan.

Mr. GROSS. Well, so what? Maybe the loan will never be repaid. Maybe for lack of proper scrutiny the project is so infeasible that it can never pay out.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is a member now on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and he has made a very valuable member of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. MORGAN. I have enjoyed working with the gentleman since the first of the year.

Mr. GROSS. And I might say this amendment is not accompanied by a State Department position paper.

Mr. MORGAN. I know it was not. But I want to say, the gentleman will admit that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has had a good many meetings since February. We have been in session 4 and 5 days a week. But if we ever get an amendment like this, it will put us in the public works business and we will be up there from 9 o'clock in the morning until 12 o'clock at night hearing the projects one by one. It will make the Committee on Foreign Affairs a public works committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman limit his request to 2 minutes and I will not object?

Mr. GROSS. Then I will make it 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Here are some of the projects that are going on: Road construction is Afghanistan, $54,200,000.

That famous fertilizer plant in Korea, $50 million.

The Vietnam highway and bridge construction, $53,900,000.

There is a long list. I do not have time to read it all. But why in the name of conscience should not the Congress of the United States pass on these projects involving hundreds of millions? I do not agree with the gentleman that it is going to impose an undue burden on the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I thought we were selected to come down here and work?

Mr. MORGAN. It certainly will put an undue burden upon the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including the gentleman in the well.

Mr. GROSS. When the foreign handout artists come in with $50 million projects, I promise you I will be on the job. I will be your little servant when they come to the committee with projects costing $50 million and $100 million. I will be delighted to work early and late to save the citizens of this country even a few of the millions now going down the drain through this global giveaway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I am in favor of the Broomfield amendment. I want to say too that Mr. BROOMFIELD worked out what I considered to be an excellent amendment on Indonesia, which I helped to write in the bill in committee. But I think we have to be reasonable about this, and I hope I can appeal to some of the gentleman's colleagues to vote for his amendment because it bars the Bokaro steel mill until the next foreign-aid bill comes up. If they come in with any proof at all, I am willing so far as I am concerned for them to submit it to the committee.

I do no think there is anything they can say that is going to get me to be for that project, but I am willing for them to submit their arguments. I think the Broomfield amendment is a reasonable amendment. I think if we live with it for a year and it works, I do not think we will have any trouble writing it in for another year. But what are you doing in this amendment? The gentleman says it is permanent, and that is right. I know Members on my left and I are going to disagree about our hopes for 1964. You hope you are going to win the Presidency. The gentlemen's amendment, if that happens, will only affect us for 6 months, but you will have to live with it, and I guarantee that your President, if you should elect one, whoever he is, will not like that kind of handcuffing. That is the substance of his amendment. I ask you to vote this down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. I will be glad to.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the Defense Department and various branches of the Service have to come before the Committee on Appropriations and before the Armed Services Legislative Committee to build even a glorified latrine?

Mr. HAYS. I have news for the gentleman. The foreign aid people have to come before the Passman subcommittee to build even an unglorified latrine; just a plain old common one.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the gentleman is quite right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend? The Chair suggests that we raise the debate level just a little.

Mr. HAYS. I am for that. So will the gentleman suggest some other kind of building, and I will go along with it.

Mr. GROSS. If there is justification for congressional approval of projects involving an outlay of $100 million in order to get at the Bokaro steel mill, if it is good to do it in that case, then why is it not justified in all other foreign aid projects costing $100 million?

Mr. HAYS. Because the gentleman is not doing it in $100 million cases. After next year he is reducing it by 100 percent down to $50 million.

Mr. GROSS. And why not?

Mr. HAYS. Because I do not think it is good business. I think that it is too restrictive. I do not think it gives enough flexibility. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has written a reasonable amendment, and I hope that the committee will support the Broomfield amendment and defeat the Gross amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will deliberately address myself to the Members on this side of the aisle, in the presumption that my words would not have much influence on that side of the aisle. Therefore, since I am addressing people who are normally friends, I am going to be very frank. I would like to say this: Boys and girls, let us get together. This is what we should do. BILL BROOMFIELD worked up a good, practical, sensible amendment. As a matter of fact, it is a perfect amendment, because no one should object to it, not even the diplomats in the Indian Government, because it is not aimed at them. All it states is the fact that next year any project that runs over $100 million must have specific congressional approval. Having done this, there is no reason in the world why we should degenerate this into a debate on an item which is $50 million less, or go off on any other tangent. If we have proposed and received the acceptance of a good, sound plan, why should we do anything else? It is late in the day. When we had the conflicting amendments and substitutes on the Cuban situation, if all the paper had been lumped together, we could have piled it on the island and it would have sunk. I do not like to see this situation degenerate into that much confusion and that much unnecessary conflict. I think the Broomfield amendment as proposed deserves the support of the entire House. It will certainly be understood downtown. It is understood and appreciated by people on both sides of the aisle, on and off the committee. Let us start moving. Let us take the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, just so that the gentleman will not feel he is not without friends on the other side and feel lonely in the well, I support the gentleman's position. I feel that the record also should be clear that the Congress is not at this time rejecting the Bokaro project. What it is doing is withholding and deferring that judgment until all the feasibility reports are in and that will be, we have been assured by the time of the consideration of the bill next year. So I compliment the gentleman from Michigan and hope that his amendment will be supported.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I direct one remark to my dear friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], with whom I never want to disagree, although in this case I must. He told us that the Broomfield amendment was imperfect because it was temporary. The gentleman knows there is not anything temporary once we in Washington set it up. So the Broomfield philosophy will be permanent.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express my very real appreciation of the work that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has done on this amendment. It happens that I have followed it very closely. I am convinced that he has brought us something that is very workable. We know there are a great many problems in the Indian situation. This does not hit that on the head but it says that we must really consult over such enormous projects as $100 million. I hope very sincerely that this Committee will vote for the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentlewoman kindly provide the House with a definition of the two words "productive enterprise"? This refers to any project dealing with a productive enterprise. What is a productive enterprise?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am afraid I can tell you more about unproductive enterprises. Most of us have dabbled in those.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, there is, I take it, no doubt of the basic U.S. interest in aiding India. It is very much in our own national interest. We are helping by far the largest of the free world nations—450 million persons; more than all of Africa and Latin America combined—and we are helping it develop under democratic institutions, at a critical time in a critical area of the world. The Indians are on the frontline of the free world confrontation with communism.

It also seems clear that there is a real need for domestic steel production in India. I understand that India badly needs more steelmaking capacity for her own domestic requirements. I am told that even if all five existing steel mills are expanded as presently planned, and if the Bokaro steel mill were built, India's economy by 1976 would still require something like 2 million tons more steel than could be produced in India.

Thus, given a genuine U.S. interest in encouraging India's economic development, and given an urgent need to expand substantially India's steelmaking capacity, it seems to me that our problem in the United States is to determine what is the right way for the United States to help meet this need.

It appears to me that a further examination of this whole problem is in order. Bokaro would be one answer to the question of how the United States can help. U.S. AID Director David Bell has told us that he has made no decision on Bokaro as yet and that he does not intend to make any decision until he has received and studied the answers to many as yet unanswered questions. He has agreed to consult with our Foreign Affairs Committee before reaching any decision and indicated that this could not in any event be before next January.

I agree with Mr. Bell that he should not make a decision until all the facts are in. I welcome his readiness to consult further with the Congress before reaching any decision. In fact, I would go further and say that the whole problem of India's steelmaking capacity and the role of U.S. assistance—not just the question of Bokaro—needs additional study.

If further study is needed both for Bokaro and for the whole problem of Indian steel-producing capacity, I think it would obviously be wrong for us to adopt an amendment which would bar any U.S. aid for Bokaro at any time. I think it would be wrong for us to do this when all the facts have not been ascertained and when studies of these problems are currently going forward. I think it would be wrong to adopt such an amendment, which would in fact prejudge the issue and amount to a decision before the circumstances on which the decision must be based are all known.

On the other hand, I see no objection to an amendment which would insure further congressional opportunity to review a proposal such as Bokaro. It is by its very size in a special situation; the Congress has a legitimate reason for paying special attention to proposals of such magnitude. I thus support the proposal to amend the aid bill by providing that development loans of over $100 million for productive enterprises be subject to specific congressional review in fiscal year 1964.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE to the amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD: At the end of the Broomfield amendment add the following:

"No funds authorized by this or any other Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, may be used directly or indirectly in connection with the Bokaro steel mill in India."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this very specific amendment, I am hoping to gain assurances that the American taxpayer will not be rushed into making what could become a disastrous investment.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that I carefully used the word "rushed" and I mean to state clearly that I am convinced, after examining all phases of the Bokaro situation that—at this stage of uncertainty—there is no clear justification for the United States entering into this agreement at this time with the Indian Government.

All during the past weeks, Mr. Chairman, I have been locked in executive session with four distinguished colleagues of my House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, a special group selected by our chairman for the express purpose of examining the Bokaro steel mill proposals. We have heard many experts, including returning U.S. Ambassador to India, John Galbraith, Gen. Lucius Clay, Norman Obbard, the executive vice president of United States Steel, representatives of the U.S. Steelworkers Union, and others.

I mention the names of these distinguished gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, only for the purpose of saying in all sincerity that they did not show sufficient cause for the immediate construction of this mill.

The comprehensive United States Steel report—which, incidentally, cost the American taxpayers $686,000—left serious doubts in my mind as to the feasibility of this project. Now I have spoken on this floor innumerable times in behalf of our foreign aid program and I am a powerful supporter of the program, when I can be convinced that the program is sound.

In no instance, Mr. Speaker, can I justify this steel mill going into a nation that has received approximately $11 billion from the United States since 1945.

The United States Steel report study—to be specific—stated that it would be 2 full years or more before a satisfactory long-term solution can be found to the basic raw material problem that exists in the Nation.

Are we going to go ahead during this fiscal year with that fact in mind?

And how about some other well-known problems, to skip over for a while the fantastic financial agreement that we would be entering into.

For example, the fact that an entire new city would have to be built, with the construction of new canals, dams, and railroad tracks.

The United States Steel report also says that it takes 3 years to train a foreman for a project such as this—and 3 to 4 years for apprentice and skilled maintenance men.

With these outstanding problems a genuine hinderance to the beginning construction of the mill, I think that it will be clear to the Members of this House that we cannot appropriate funds during this fiscal year for such a hastily conceived project.

Another factor is this—the United States has over 100,000 people unemployed who are steelworkers, at the same time that we are importing 5½ million tons of steel mainly from Japan and Belgium. No one has been able to give the assurance that there will be a significant change in steel unemployment in the United States. Production of 5½ million tons in the United States incidentally, means that 20,000 of those U.S. steelworkers who are unemployed could be working.

Before I go into the features, or I should say the drawbacks of the U.S. loan, I want to shatter the myth of those that say the Soviet-financed mill in India is justification for our going in and building this one at this time.

Their steel mill was financed by a 12-year loan from the Soviets at a 2.5-percent interest, repayable in hard currency, at a total amount of $136 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues who are suspicious of the entire U.S. foreign aid program would be down here on the floor fighting for a similar loan.

Our loan, on the other hand, would amount to almost a billion dollars, a sizable chunk of the $1.8 billion expected cost of the mill. This would be in the form of a 40-year development credit loan, with a 10-year grace period. Our interest will be three-fourths of 1 percent. Through long experience with these development credit loans, we can be certain that we will not get too much of this money back.

In other words, we will give India about a billion dollars. The Indian Government will then form a corporation to build the mill. India will lend money to the corporation at 5¾-percent interest, not overlooking the fact that for every ton of steel made in India there is a charge of $52 a ton. In toto, this means that the Indian Government will realize, over a 20-year period, out of our $1 billion alone, about $5.5 billion.

Furthermore, we will be lucky to even receive a million dollars out of the billion that we contribute.

There will also be powerful competition to sell them steel at a cheaper rate than we can sell it to India.

There is no guarantee, either, that would prevent the Indians from buying cheaper steel from the other steel-producing countries who could sell to them at a cheaper rate. That is to say, if they still have need for steel even above and beyond what Bokaro would produce.

For example, Japan could sell India a ton of steel for $102 at dockside. It would cost India $174 for a ton of steel at dockside from the United States.

We know who would get the orders.

This would not be a bonanza for the U.S. steel industry by any means. It would not, in truth, be a bonanza for anyone except the Indian Government.

It would not be fair to the American taxpayers to go ahead with this big sum of foreign aid, Mr. Speaker, when there are so many untenables.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this looks like a dangerous and serious proposition from every angle. We cannot expect to receive the support of the American people for those provisions of the foreign aid program that are so essential to the national welfare if we jump into a project such as this.

Remember that old phrase by Bulwer-Lytton, "Business dispatched is business well done, but business hurried is business ill done," and also that statement by the famous New Englander, Emerson, "Never lose your presence of mind, and never get hurried."

This is a hurried project, Mr. Speaker, and the House will do well to pass my amendment which will hold all funds for fiscal year 1964 from Bokaro. Given this extra time, and the necessary dispatch and deliberation that is so essential in our pressing times, we will be able to arrive at the sensible and practical solution to the problem.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. For which amendment is the gentleman? Is the gentleman for the Gross or the Broomfield amendment?

Mr. CONTE. My amendment is an amendment to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. I support the Broomfield amendment with my amendment specifying the Bokaro steel mill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for a brief question.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to say that I concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and to further state that I am for the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama also at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I want to compliment the chairman of our special panel that was set up to study this Bokaro steel mill. The gentleman from Alabama did an excellent job and I am sure when this report is released to the Members of Congress, the Members will see the arduous work and the time and the effort put in by the chairman and the members of that subcommittee.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman ought to lock himself up and study this some more or not. We have been studying it and we have not been locked up. The gentleman from Michigan has been studying it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] has been studying it. I do not know whether this is an attempt to get two names on the amendment or not, but the Broomfield amendment barred this for a year. That is the extent of it. As a matter of fact, the feasibility reports which we studied, offered by the United States Steel Co., say in so much plain, unmitigated English, that we are not prepared to say this project is feasible until a further study is made of the iron ore resources and the coal resources.

All of this has been studied. The Broomfield amendment proposed to do exactly this. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] made a good speech, I am glad he got to read it, but about all it did was to reiterate the fact that the Broomfield amendment is right.

The gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has been working on it a long time, and we ought to support his amendment. If there is any credit in it, I am willing to give it to him.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Since the gentleman referred to the gentleman from Michigan as having studied the subject for a long time——

Mr. HAYS. I also said you had studied it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman. As a student of the issue may I state that the Broomfield amendment does exactly what the House obviously wants to do, therefore the Conte amendment is not necessary, and I suggest that we adopt the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have somebody, I do not care whether on the right or left—perhaps my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], can answer a question. Let me read this provision in the Broomfield amendment:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100 million.

What is a productive enterprise?

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman wants a definition of the language he should have directed his question to the gentleman from New Jersey. The point here is the intention of the amendment, which is always the key. The intention of the amendment is to prohibit any participation in any development of any project where the total cost would exceed $100 million.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that the intention of this amendment is to go first to the Bokaro steel mill, and nothing else. That is because he cannot define what constitutes a productive enterprise in any other terms than the Bokaro steel mill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. "Productive enterprise," as I understand the amendment, is any enterprise which produces any usable article except hot air, and I do not mean this in any way to reflect on the distinguished gentleman from Iowa who is always succinct and to the point.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa permit me, as I hope, an old friend of his, to make the observation that he is winning a victory and he does not realize it. Once having established this precedent, once having started it, we have set the stage for future practical amendments of this type.

Mr. GROSS. But I want to apply the same scrutiny to any other number of projects costing $50 million and more—I want to apply the same rule to them.

Apparently no one wants to give me a definition of "productive enterprise," in relation to the Broomfield amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I had a similiar amendment at the desk. While I support the Broomfield amendment I think it should be more specific and get directly to the core of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment and the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts are one and the same thing. It is aimed specifically at prohibiting the assistance of this Government in financing the construction of the contemplated Bokaro Steel plant in India. It says simply that no aid shall be furnished under this act for construction of a steel plant at Bokaro, India, or elsewhere in India.

As we all know, this proposed project would, in the final analysis, entail approximately a billion dollars. This money would be raised by taxing the citizens of this country together with the institutions of private enterprise to be used to construct a mill that would be owned and operated by the Indian Government in direct competition with private enterprise. This, in my opinion, would certainly enhance the cause of world socialism and is contrary to the best interests of this Nation and its taxpayers.

Tuesday, the steelworkers, through their union representative, were asking the President for help against steel imports—imports are now pouring in at rates of 5 million tons annually representing a loss of 37,700 full-time steelworkers' jobs. Yet, these same employees are going to be taxed to build a plant in India that conceivably will produce steel to compete against our own steel producers. Private enterprise cannot compete against a socialized plant particularly when it is financed with our money. Furthermore, our tax structure and high wage scale add to the burden of production costs. These facts, coupled with the fact that the cost of production under free enterprise includes the amortization of the investment outlay to construct a plant and such cost is seldom reflected in production costs of a socialized or government-owned plant, make it practically impossible to compete favorably against such a foreign competitor using extremely cheap labor. This is a bitter pill for the steelworkers and the steel industry to swallow, particularly when they realize their own tax dollars may be used to eliminate their jobs.

It is interesting to note that AID Director, David E. Bell, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee in April of this year, that India was 1 of the 10 nations that has produced substantial economic growth and adequate progress, limiting needs for external assistance.

India already has received one of the largest slices of U.S. foreign aid without the Bokaro plant and is presently seeking a 3-year commitment from Western Powers for a military buildup estimated to entail one and one-third billion dollars in foreign exchange assistance, much of which will fall upon the United States. The well will soon run dry. It is interesting to note that while India is willing to accept our assistance with both hands, she is now reneging on an agreement to transmit Voice of America broadcasts to Southeast Asia even though we are furnishing the transmitting facilities. Obviously, India is willing to "receiveth but not giveth."

Furthermore, there are serious technical difficulties which as yet are not resolved to the satisfaction of some of us. As I understand it, United States Steel, the concern making the study as to the feasibility of the project, has indicated that insufficient consideration has been given so far to the availability of raw materials for the plant, and, further, has indicated that it would take 2 years or more to find a long-term solution. How ridiculous it would be to construct a plant that would have insufficient raw materials to serve the plant's requirements.

Mr. Chairman, to emphasize this point, I quote directly from the report of AID of March 1963:

> It became apparent to us at an early stage in our investigation that wholly insufficient consideration was being given to the raw materials aspect of the Bokaro project. This deficiency appears to be due primarily to the fact that present plans are for the three principal raw materials to be supplied by three separate government entities. No individual or group with overall steelmaking raw materials experience has been made responsible for coordinating Bokaro's raw materials program. We do not believe that any modern integrated steel project should be undertaken today in any country without such coordination of raw materials planning.

Other problems facing the feasibility of the project are inadequately trained personnel to operate the plant. Some 5,400 employees would have to be specifically trained to operate the plant. This would require additional expenditures.

Other costs involved would be for the construction of a dam and canal to Bokaro, a town would have to be constructed together with adequate power facilities. The United States Steel study stated:

> Unless transportation, power, and water facilities are available in accordance with the assumptions made in this report, the operation and economic success of a Bokaro steel plant would be seriously affected.

The facts are that adequate power, water, and transportation facilities and labor supply are not available at this time.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the report which states that a successful plant at Bokaro requires that: First, qualified personnel, Indian and American, be assured; second, supplies of important raw materials be available and brought under ownership control of Bokaro management; third, provision be made for (a) adequate rail transport, (b) adequate supplies of power and water, (c) expansion of coal mining and washing facilities, (d) adequate area highways, and (e) a townsite to support both laborers and managers.

The report further says:

> The Bokaro area has virtually no useful labor supply except in lowest categories. It is rural, remote and poorly served by transport facilities. It is unattractive to the great majority of potential Indian employees, who would come from elsewhere. "The situation is even worse as regards American employees * * * and would make it difficult to attract good expatriate personnel." Thus a nearby townsite must be built and operated, including medical, recreational, educational and shopping facilities, transport to and from the plant, and better access to the outside.

While these are compelling reasons in my judgment why the loan should not be made, the most compelling reason is our unfavorable balance-of-payments situation.

As we all well know, our balance-of-payments deficit ran considerably more than a billion dollars for the second quarter of this year—Department of Commerce figures. At this rate, our balance-of-payments deficit could reach an alltime high. I realize the administration has offered suggestions and measures to halt this outflow of our gold, and for that I commend the administration. The fact remains that the outflow has not halted and unless there is some drastic change, I fear the only solution is to devalue the dollar. We can say what we may about the balance-of-payments deficit, but we all know it is directly related to our largess. Excessive foreign aid is one of the reasons we have this unfavorable balance of payments and unless it is curtailed, the situation will become aggravated instead of alleviated.

We are already tottering on the brink of technical bankruptcy and repudiation. The stability of the dollar is threatened. The arithmetic is simple and unassailable.

Under existing Federal Reserve legislation, $12.3 billion in gold is required to support our internal currency and credit structure. An additional $500 million is required under recent legislation replacing outstanding silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes. This makes a total reserve requirement of $12.8 billion in gold. The total gold stock is now $15.6 billion, thus leaving free reserves of around $2.8 billion. But these so-called free reserves are not actually free.

Chargeable against this gold reserve is some $25.3 billion in short-term credits now in the hands of foreign governments. These short-term credits are redeemable from our gold supplies or reserves. Should foreigners continue to call our gold—as I said we lost more than $1 billion during the second quarter of this year—the demand could not be met. The structure of the free world currency is built around the dollar. If this fails, chaos results. The situation is very grave.

This project is certainly one that would adversely affect the outflow of gold and the deficit in our balance of payments. Congress could stem this outflow by restricting this unnecessary, unjustified venture.

This country simply does not have the billion dollars to put into this project.

I urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, but I wish to say to the Committee I was one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who in committee voted against the Broomfield amendment. The reason I voted against the Broomfield amendment was because it was specifically at that time directed against the Bokaro plant, and I did not want to be in a position of putting my name on a matter of such great consequence to a country that looks upon the Bokaro steel plant as a prestigious event, insofar as their future is concerned. The Russians have given them a steel mill. They are looking to us and they want assistance in this regard.

The last point I wish to make is that I now support the Broomfield amendment. I think it would be a great mistake to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa would again subject the Congress to the many, many attempts as in the past to the kind of lobbying we suffered under the Philippine bill. That should be testimony enough as to why we should vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, without regard to the question of how any Member feels with respect to the Broomfield amendment or the Gross amendment, certainly, it seems to me that on the Conte amendment the adoption of that amendment would be most unwise. I think it is unwise to pick out and name a particular country. I doubt if the situation was reversed, where legislation of this kind was pending before the legislative body of some other country, and if we were in the position of India, that we would feel pleased and happy if the United States was specifically named in this way. So without regard to the $50 million or the $100 million amendments, it seems to me that the Conte amendment, no matter what our party affiliation might be, but so far as our country is concerned, we would be directly injecting ourselves into another country and it would be offensive to that other country. As between the Gross amendment and the Broomfield amendment, we are accepting the Broomfield amendent, without reservation, not for the purpose of then voting against it but to accept the amendment that has been worked out as a very happy compromise.

I join with the chairman of the committee, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], and with other Members in urging the defeat of the Conte amendment for the specific reason I mentioned, as well as the defeat of the Gross amendment, because I think the Broomfield amendment is a fair adjustment between the membership of the committee and the leadership on both sides.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the author of the amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to comment and thank the Speaker very much for his observations, and also to point out it is very obvious no one here in the House can say whether India deserves a steel mill at the present time. The United States Steel report was inconclusive after 2 years of investigation. The AID agency made it very plain that they are not ready to make a judgment. What we are really doing is deferring the thing and giving Congress an opportunity to review it in another year. I hope we can stay with the amendment, because it is a sound approach to the problem.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here now for 3 days listening to debate on this very important bill. I think that the Members who participated have all made a very significant contribution. But it is obvious that even the members of the committee are divided on many proposals in the bill. We now have three amendments before us. We have the Broomfield amendment, the Gross amendment, and the Conte amendment; each representing different views. I think this has been a very stimulating experience we have had here in the last 3 days. But I do not think the American people are too deeply concerned as to whether or not we are going to adopt the Broomfield amendment, the Gross amendment, or the Conte amendment. I think that the average man on the street wants to know how much is all this going to cost. With this thought in mind, I think that we are somewhat in the wrong church and in the wrong pew on this debate. I shall vote for this bill. I shall support the authorization bill because it merely spells out the guidelines; the appropriation bill is yet to come. The President already has reduced the bill by $450 million. The committee has trimmed it an additional $400 million. If the Appropriations Subcommittee runs true to form, as it has during the last few years, it is reasonable to assume that there will be at least another additional $1 billion cut in the appropriation for mutual assistance in 1964. This would mean that before final action is taken on the appropriation for foreign aid next year, we in the House will have cut the expenditure by almost $2 billion.

I think many of the questions that have been debated and argued here today are going to be resolved only when we have an opportunity to vote on the appropriation measure. For that reason it is my hope that we can move along with this bill today and then get to the real issue before the American people; namely, what will it cost.

I have recently asked the people in my district whether they favor continuing military and economic assistance to our allies if we make sure that all of the waste has been eliminated. A majority said "Yes." Because the Appropriations Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has reduced previous appropriations by a billion dollars, I feel confident that if there is any waste in this bill the Appropriations Committee will take adequate steps to remove it. There are many good things in this bill. Our Nation's effort to shield South America from communism contained in this bill is worthy of our support. Our efforts to help our allies build up their economy, so they can resist communism is also worthy of our support. There are many other good provisions in this bill. But there are also some questionable projects which I am confident will be eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

Therefore, let us move along with this measure.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I see only one Member on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious to vote as anybody else and I know how I am going to vote. I would like to ask my colleague from New York who a few moments ago made a statement that we should give a steel mill to India because the Russians gave a steel mill to India. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRY. I am very glad you took the well to ask that question, because that was not my intention. I said that they, the Indians, are embarrassed that the Russians have given them a steel mill. They would like a steel mill from us. The Russian steel mill has been used as an effective propaganda weapon and the Soviets receive tremendous prestige from the steel produced from this mill. Since the Communist invasion of India's northern border, there has been a move in India away from Soviet influence toward the free world. The Bokaro steel mill has been depicted in India as the West's contribution to their steel requirements and has become a symbol of great consequence to Western prestige—whereas the feasibility reports have not justified a plant of the magnitude originally intended by some of its sponsors, the mill as finally constructed will be in keeping with the quantity and location of sufficient iron ore, coal, and limestone. I do not believe anyone in this House is now sufficiently qualified to finally determine the matter of the Bokaro plant, but I strongly oppose any amendment which singles out any one country's project for congressional approval. I do not however support the Broomfield amendment which postpones any final action during this fiscal year.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, that about sums up what we have been talking about for 3 days, in my humble opinion.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to say that we have a lot of steel mills in Pennsylvania that are not operating We might pick up one of them and send it over there.

Mr. BECKER. I was trying to get to this point for my good friends in Pennsylvania. But I wanted to say something like this. It is not my understanding that Russia ever gave India anything. It is my understanding that Russia loaned the money for a steel mill on a hard loan and that India is paying 6 or 7 percent interest on about a 10- or 12-year loan. They gave them nothing. But the gentleman is saying, to make logic, that we should give them a steel mill because Russia has loaned them the money to build a steel mill. That makes about as much sense as the bill makes.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The substitute amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:
>
> "(k) No assistance shall be provided under this Act after December 31, 1964, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1)."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this is a version of an amendment offered to the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is the third in a series of private-enterprise amendments which I have previously mentioned. The two previous ones have been adopted. I would hope that this one might also be.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to section 620 would suspend aid to any underdeveloped country which failed by December 31, 1964, to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guarantee program covering the specific risks of expropriation and inconvertibility.

When this amendment was first offered to the committee it also included a third risk, that is of war. This is no longer in the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the investment guarantee program is one designed to help the countries which sign these investment guarantee agreements. Fifty-three countries have now signed those with respect to the two matters that I have discussed; that is, expropriation and inconvertibility. If this amendment is adopted, after December 31 of next year—not this year—any country, any less-developed country, which did not have such an investment guarantee program initiated—that means started in any way whatsoever—would not be eligible for aid. When these countries sign these investment guarantees they make it much more attractive for U.S. private money to come into them. Thus this would aid their own industry and their own economy generally. That is the reason I say that this a measure which would be for the benefit of these countries which would agree to such investment guarantee program.

I fear that those countries which have not yet signed investment guarantee agreements have not done so, because they have some reason to suspect that there will be expropriation or that inconvertibility will become a reality. If they sign these agreements, if they sign even the first preliminary document looking toward an agreement, then they would qualify for aid.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to the Committee that the preliminary documents of which I hold one in my hand here, are very simple and very brief. They are not at all complex. They simply show the willingness of the country to make it possible for our Government through the Investment Guaranty Agency to assure American businesses that go in there that they will be protected against these two risks.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman explain the reason why he took out the third risk, war?

Mr. ADAIR. Because there were a great many countries which have not signed agreements relating to that risk; because I thought it was unpredictable in its effect; and because I felt that the two risks which are now covered are adequate. Hence, we would not ask these countries to guarantee against war or insurrection but we would ask that they make possible guarantees against expropriation and inconvertibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words to ask the gentleman from Indiana a few questions.

The gentleman knows the Clay Committee made a recommendation somewhat along this line?

Mr. ADAIR. I know that.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think General Clay's recommendation went as far as your amendment; is that correct?

Mr. ADAIR. I think perhaps my amendment goes a little beyond the Clay Committee's recommendation, although they were not exactly specific. They said in effect, "we do not think aid should go to any country which did not make possible the investment guarantee program."

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I remember asking General Clay some questions, also the AID Director, and I want to quote from the hearings, as follows; I said this was discussed by Mr. Bell at the hearings:

> Mr. Bell said he doubted that the Clay Committee meant the U.S. aid should be made conditional on the signing of an investment guarantee agreement.
>
> Would you indicate what you meant by the statement in your report?
>
> General CLAY. If we were in the negotiation stage with respect to obtaining such guarantee and had every reason to believe that the negotiations were proceeding normally, I don't think we should make it a condition. It might, in fact, defeat the negotiation. Where we have evidence, however, that such a negotiation is not going to succeed or has indeed been refused, then we think it is very doubtful if aid should be extended.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman I am aware of that statement and that is the reason the proposed amendment provides that if a country makes any beginning whatsoever they will qualify for aid. I think this meets the objections set forth by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the gentlemen's purpose as indicated by his amendment. He has used less developed and underdeveloped countries. I do not know why he limits it to this category of countries, and how he would suggest that the administrator could define less or underdeveloped countries.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that phrase should be "less developed." That has been defined by the Presidential document which appeared in the Federal Register on the 29th of December of last year. I shall not quote it, but the President used the phrase "less developed countries." That is the reason we used the phrase, because the definition is here.

Mr. McDOWELL. Does the gentleman still feel it should apply to this category of country?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes, I do feel it should apply. In the first place, more developed countries have no use for it. Consequently, there might be a question in my mind as to its effect upon military aid given to more developed countries. I would not want to limit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ADAIR and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 153, noes 150.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASEY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:
>
> "(k) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act for the construction or operation of any productive enterprise in any country unless the President determines that similar productive enterprises within the United States are operating at a substantial portion of their capacity and that such assistance will not result in depriving such United States enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of assistance furnished under this Act for the construction or operation of productive enterprises in all countries, including specifically the numbers of such enterprises, the types of such enterprises, and the locations of such enterprises."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I have examined his amendment, and I think already in the act under sections 201, 211, and 604 the program is required to consider the effect of the program on the U.S. economy. In section 622 we already require projects to be subject to American enterprise and 620(d) has a provision with regard to any enterprise which would compete in U.S. markets. I think there is flexibility in the gentleman's amendment. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, let us set the record straight on just how much this foreign aid program has benefited the American industry and worker.

Here is what foreign aid has done to just one plant in my district near Houston, Tex. More than 400 workers at Sheffield Steel have lost their jobs; one division of the plant is operating at 20 percent capacity, another at 50 percent. This is a direct result of the flood of cheap-made foreign steel from plants built with the American workers' tax money.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, with friends passing on benefits like this—we do not need any enemies.

The American people are asking how it has happened, and why it has happened. And I will tell you how and why: The Agency for International Development gives absolutely no consideration to our own industry before granting millions to build plants to compete against us. It is time this Congress forced AID to consider the impact upon us before using taxpayers' money to export American jobs. That is the purpose of my amendment. It is a simple amendment and to the point. It allows the Executive ample latitude. But, for the first time, it forces the foreign aid boys to consider the impact of this program on our own people.

If there be any doubt about the need for this amendment, let me state emphatically that not only does AID fail to consider the impact upon our own domestic industry—but I am convinced little, if any, thought is given to world market conditions before the handouts are passed around.

This Agency cannot tell you today how many steel plants, pulp and paper mills, chemical plants, rubber plants, aluminum plants, or petroleum facilities it has built around the world.

It took me nearly 4 months to obtain a very incomplete listing of specific foreign industries and plants financed by the American taxpayer, and I want to cite a brief paragraph from the Library of Congress expert who finally compiled it:

> The enumeration of total foreign aid to specific industries can be undertaken with only limited success * * *. The Agency itself does not compile aid figures according to industry or by name.

Well, let me tell my colleagues from the 37 States having steelmaking facilities that the tax money of your workers has been used to build or expand somewhere in the neighborhood of 179 foreign steel plants. It cost just about $2 billion.

If I seem to bear down more on the plight of the steel industry, it is because it stands alongside the American oil industry, and the American textile industry, backed against the wall by the flood of foreign imports. And I tell every Member of this House that these three industries will soon be joined by a host of others as this foreign competition we have built tries to capture our own domestic markets.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleagues will find most enlightening some brief statistics on the number of plants we have built under foreign aid: Since 1945, we have built, modernized or expanded 179 foreign steel plants. In the past 5 years, look at the aid given the following foreign industries: Pulp and paper—31 plants built or expanded. Chemical plants—24 plants built or expanded. Aluminum—13 plants built or expanded. Rubber—22 plants built or expanded. Petroleum—27 loans or grants for studies or to build plants.

Every Member of this body knows the plight of the American textile industry—of plants shut down and workers unemployed—overwhelmed by a flood of cheap-made foreign imports. I leave it to my colleagues most concerned to make a case for this particular crippled industry.

But let us examine two industries I am personally familiar with, and whose workers pump tax money in the AID horn of plenty:

The United States, in 1950, had 46 percent of the world's steel production. Now it has 25 percent. In 1950, we had 17 percent of the world's steel market—and for the past 3 years, it has been down, less than 6 percent. Today, our steel mills are operating at 55 percent of their capacity.

The dumping of foreign steel has crippled the wire and rod production in this country, and has captured some 30 percent of the domestic market. Both labor and management officials of this great industry just met with President Kennedy, begging for help to compete against foreign steel dumping in the United States.

What they should have pleaded for is a prohibition against building any more steel plants under the foreign aid program to compete against them in the world market, and here at home.

A friend at Sheffield's plant wrote that "what scares me is the influx of foreign plate which is our bread-and-butter product. For example, it is alarming to note the continuing rise of Mexican steel plates imported into the United States—from 65 tons in 1960 to 12,000 tons in 1962, and for the first 5 months of this year, the total was 21,000 tons."

Well, whose tax money do you think built the 22 Mexican steel mills under our aid program? This is a grim picture faced by one of our basic industries.

But let us look at the pulp and paper industry, and you will see what I mean about the foreign aid agency failing to consider world market conditions before building plants overseas.

The entire world produces 107 million tons of paper a year—and it consumes only 93 million tons. In Western Europe alone there is an excess capacity to produce pulp and paper that totals 3.5 million tons. Because of this, the Scandinavian paper industry has voluntarily curtailed production, and will continue to do so for another year or more. So what does AID do in the face of this? In 1961 we built or expanded paper plants in Finland, Israel, Greece, Egypt, and Communist Yugoslavia. Why?

One of my good friends is president of one of our leading paper companies. I wrote him briefly on action I intended to take, and told him of the pulp and paper mills built around the world with tax money of himself and his employees. Let me read a brief part of his letter of reply:

> I am astonished at the number of pulp and paper mills constructed overseas with U.S. dollars under the foreign aid program—each one of them to compete with and to absorb our natural markets. I knew that some had been built in this manner, financed by our tax dollars, but I am both amazed and dismayed at the number. I think what you have in mind undertaking is exemplary and urgently required.

This distinguished American executive stated emphatically that not only his own company—but the pulp and paper industry overall—has suffered from foreign competition. He points out that countries such as Finland—where we built three paper mills in the past 5 years—are diverting more of their own products to the United States because markets that Finland used to supply are now supplied by other plants we have built.

This, briefly, is the picture facing only two of our great industries as a direct result of the foreign aid program.

I do not think it necessary to point out the importance of the pulp and paper industry to my colleagues from timber-producing States—nor is the plight of our domestic steel industry lost on my friends from iron-ore- and coal-producing areas.

In summing up, let me again state that my amendment is not restrictive, it is not punitive. It merely holds this Agency's feet to the fire so that for the first time it will take into consideration the plight of our own plants and workers before it exports any more jobs abroad. I urge your support, and I submit for the enlightenment of my colleagues and their constituents the compilation on assistance furnished specific industries by the American taxpayer:

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945–63

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK CREDITS TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1945–63

	Amount authorized
Africa:	
Liberia:	
Liberia Mining Co., 1949	$4,000,000
Liberia Iron Ore Ltd., 1960	5,625,000
National Iron Ore Ltd., 1960	6,000,000
Liberian Amer-Swed Minerals, 1960	30,000,000
Asia:	
Japan:	
Fuji Iron & Steel Co., 1957	10,300,000
Yawata Iron & Steel Co., 1957	26,000,000
Toyo Kohan Co., Ltd., 1958	7,100,000
Toyo Kohan Co., Ltd., 1960	3,000,000
Japan Steel & Tube Co., 1961	6,500,000
Fuji Iron and Steel Co., 1961	15,600,000
Sumimoto Metal, Inc., 1962	8,100,000
Yawata Iron & Steel Co., 1962	26,000,000
Kawasaki Steel Corp., 1962	18,500,000
Philippines:	
American Wire & Cable Co., 1957	98,000
Ysmael Steel Mfg. Co., 1957	68,000
Jacinto Steel, Inc., 1958	58,000
Central Bank of Philippines for steel mill construction, 1961	62,300,000
Turkey:	
Vulcan Iron Works, 1946	5,341,014
Vulcan Iron Works, 1947	2,521,469
Republic of Turkey, 1950	681,563
Republic of Turkey, Karabuk Iron & Steel, 1959	15,000,000
Canada:	
Steep Rock Mines, Ltd., 1948	5,700,000
Europe:	
Austria: Oesterreichisch-Alpine, 1957	28,150,000
France:	
Union Sid du Nord, 1960	1,036,000
Union Sid du Nord, 1960	1,142,000
Union Sid du Nord, 1960	3,536,000
Union Sid du Nord, 1961	842,000
Germany: August Thyssen-Hutte, A.G., 1956	10,000,000
Italy:	
Instituto Mobiliare Italiano, 1947	9,000,000
Instituto Mobiliare Steel Mills:	
Alti Forni, 1947	3,634,000
Terni, 1947	1,350,000
Dalmine, 1947	1,300,000
Cornigliano, 1947	3,000,000
Equipment for steel mills, 1955	2,000,000
Equipment for steel mills, 1955	5,000,000
Equipment for auto and steel, 1956	10,000,000
Innocenti, S.P.A., 1956	1,500,000
Equipment for steel mill, 1958	7,000,000

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945–63—Con.

	Amount authorized
Europe—Continued	
Italy—Continued	
Blast furnace and rolling mill, 1958	$6,500,000
Itatsider steel plant, 1962	25,000,000
Spain:	
Union de Siderurgicas Asturians, S.A., 1958	6,800,000
Empresa Nacional, 1959	4,400,000
Empresa Nac Siderurgica, 1960	2,300,000
Empresa Nac Siderurgica, 1961	13,000,000
Altos Hornos Viscaya, 1961	18,000,000
Empresa Nac Siderurgica, 1962	6,600,000
Yugoslavia: Government of Yugoslavia to purchase original U.S. steel mill equipment, 1961	15,000,000
Latin America:	
Argentina:	
Soc Mixta Siderurgia, 1955	60,000,000
Acinfer, SA, 1959	700,000
Socie Indus Argentina, Tubos Acero, 1959	1,710,000
Acindar Ind. Argentina Aceros, 1960	5,645,000
Dalmino, SAFTA, 1960	1,842,000
Soc. Ind. Argentina Tubos Ac., 1960	1,675,000
Industrias Puerto San Martin, 1958	90,000
Somisa, Steel Mill Equipment, 1960	12,000,000
Acinfer Ind. Arg. Acero SA, 1960	170,500
Acinfer Ind. Fundiciones SA, 1961	105,000
Rycsa SAM Steel Shear, 1961	9,000
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1961	241,660
Dolmine SAFTA, Equipment, 1961	21,000
Acinfer Ind. Arg. Fundiciones, 1961	20,400
Tinigal SRL Equipment, 1961	5,000
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962	91,700
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962	225,900
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962	100,600
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962	127,100
Est. Metalurgicos Santa Rosa, 1962	26,200
Metalurgica Tandil, 1962	114,500
Brazil:	
Cia Sid NAC, 1950	25,000,000
Cia Metalurgica Barbara, 1952	2,185,000
Cia Siderurgica Belgo, 1955	730,440
Cia Sid NAC, 1956	35,000,000
Acos Villares AA, 1957	2,320,000
Soc Tecnica Fundicoes Gerais, 1957	2,558,000
Cia Vale Do Rio Doce SA, 1958	12,500,000
Chile:	
Corp. De Fomento Prod., 1951	58,000,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico SA, 1956	3,550,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico, 1957	16,000,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico, 1960	15,574,000
Cia de Acero del Pacifico, 1962	8,300,000
Mexico:	
Cia Fundidora de F.Y.A. Monterrey, S.A., 1945	800,000
Latin America—Continued	
Mexico—Continued	
National Financiera S.A., 1951	$5,000,000
Cia Fundidora de Fierro y Acerode Monterrey S.A., 1952	4,500,000
National Financiera S.A., 1952	3,600,000
La Consolidada S.A., 1955	662,000
Hojalata y Lamina S.A., 1955	2,055,000
Aceros de Chihuahua S.A., 1955	720,000
Cia Fundidora de Monterrey, 1956	46,500,000
National Financiera S.A., 1957	16,000,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1960	174,000
Aceros de Chihuahua S.A., 1960	550,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1960	1,479,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1960	443,850
Tubacero S.A., 1960	4,000,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961	120,000
Manufacturas Metalicas MSA, 1961	113,500
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961	290,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961	345,000
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1961	51,886
Altos Hornos de Mexico S.A., 1962	1,850,000
Peru:	
Marcona Mining Co., 1953	2,500,000
Marcona Mining Co., 1957	10,000,000
Marcona Mining Co., 1961	6,500,000
Marcona Mining Co., 1962	6,000,000
Metalurgica Pervana, 1962	1,950,000
Uruguay:	
Cinoca, S.A., 1961	65,500
Cinoca, S.A., 1961	35,000

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT LOANS FOR FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1946–63

	Amount authorized
Asia:	
India:	
Indian Iron & Steel, 1952	$31,500,000
Indian Iron & Steel, 1956	20,000,000
Tata Iron & Steel Co., 1956	75,000,000
Tata Iron & Steel, 1957	32,500,000
Indian Iron & Steel, 1961	19,500,000
Japan:	
Japan Development Bank:	
Yawata Plate Mill, 1955	5,300,000
Yawata Steel Production, 1959	20,000,000
Kawasaki Strip Mill, 1956	20,000,000
Kawasaki Steel Production, 1958	8,000,000
Kawasaki Steel Production, 1960	6,000,000
Sumitomo Steel Production, 1958	33,000,000
Sumitomo Steel Production, 1960	7,000,000
Kobe Steel Production, 1958	10,000,000
Nippon Kokan Steel Production, 1958	22,000,000
Fuji Steel Production, 1959	24,000,000
Europe:	
Belgium: Equipment for steel and power industries, 1949	16,000,000
France: Miferma, 1960	66,000,000
Luxembourg: Steel mill and railroad, 1947	12,000,000

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION LOANS TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1956–63

	Amount authorized
Asia:	
India: Republic Forge Co., 1959	$1,500,000
Pakistan: Steel Corp. of Pakistan, 1958	630,000
Latin America:	
Argentina: Acindar Industria Arg. de Aceros S.A., 1960	3,660,000
Mexico:	
Compania Findidora de Fierro y Acero Monterrey, 1963	1,126,000
Tubos de Aceros de Mexico, 1963	400,000
Venezuela: Siderurgica Venesolana SA, 1960	500,000

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1949–51

	Amount authorized
Europe:	
Austria:	
Voest, Linz, 1949	$2,887,000
Voest, Linz, 1949	8,362,000
Voest, Linz, 1950	2,169,000
Alpine Montan, 1949	4,147,000
Alpine Montan, 1949	3,346,000
Alpine Montan, 1950	4,208,000
Belgium:	
S.A. Metallurgique d'Esperance-Longdoz, Liege, 1949	2,329,000
S.A. Ongree Marihaye, Ougree, 1950	2,866,000
Phenix Works, Flammale-Haute, 1949	3,148,000
France:	
Sollac, Hayange and Ebange, 1949	56,164,000
Usinor, Denain and Montataire, 1949	11,919,000
Sidelor, Bombas, 1949	1,301,000
Ste. Anonyme des Forges, Saar, 1950	2,038,000
Acieries de Longwy. Mont, St. Martin, 1950	2,094,000
J. J. Carnaud et Forges de Basse-Indre, 1949	1,959,000
Italy:	
Finsider, 1949	32,390,000
Fiat, Turin and Aviglina, 1949	7,408,000
Acciaierie e Ferriare, Milan, 1949	1,649,000
Acciaierie e Ferriare, Milan, 1950	4,502,000
Cantieri Metallurgici Italiani, 1949	2,131,000
Sisma, Villadossola, 1949	2,538,000
Terni, Societa per L'Elettricita, Terni, 1949	1,315,000
Recaelli, Rogorado, 1950	1,067,000
Ilssa-Viola, Aosta Valley, 1949	1,569,000
Ferretubi, SPA, Milan, 1949	200,000
Netherlands: Royal Dutch Blast Furnace and Steel Co., 1949	14,935,000
Portugal: A. J. Oliveira Filhos Co., 1949	847,000
Spain: Sagunto Steel Plant, 1952	853,000
United Kingdom:	
Steel Co. of Wales, Ltd., 1949	25,373,000
Stewarts & Lloyds, Ltd., 1949	1,851,000

AID OR PREDECESSOR AGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES, 1954–62

	Amount authorized
Europe:	
Spain:	
Altos Hornos de Viscaya, 1954	$4,460,000
Empresa Blast Furnace, 1954	3,100,000

U.S. and international agencies aid to the steel industries of the world, 1945–63—Con.

Europe—Continued	*Amount authorized*
Yugoslavia: Sisak Iron Works, 1961	$8,500,000
European Coal & Steel Community: Contribution to capitalization loan, 1954	100,000,000
Far East:	
Republic of China:	
Ya Tung Tube Mill, 1955	466,000
Tang Eng Ironworks, 1957	229,000
Korea:	
Wire Rope Mfg. Co., 1956	122,000
Chain Mfg. Co., 1956	111,000
Pusan Iron Works, 1955	1,955,000
Near East and South Asia:	
India: Bokaro Steel Plant, 1962	750,000
Turkey: Eregli Steel Mill, 1959	129,600,000

FOREIGN STEEL INDUSTRIES ASSISTED FROM U.S.-OWNED FOREIGN CURRENCIES 1954–62

Europe:	*Amount authorized*
Austria:	
Steel mill, 1957, Public Law 480	$1,346,000
Steel mill and tool manufacturing, 1958, Public Law 480	846,000
Steel and malleable foundry, 1958, Public Law 480	577,000
Fabricated structural steel, 1957, Public Law 480	385,000
Yugoslavia: Niksic Iron Works, 1958, Public Law 480	5,610,000
Latin America: Brazil, Minas Gerais Steel Plant, 1961, Public Law 480	6,831,000
Asia: India, Bokaro Steel Plant, 1962, Public Law 402	91,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958–62

PULP AND PAPER PLANTS

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1958:	
Taiwan: Papermill expansion	$162,000
Iceland: Wastepaper pulp equipment	2,000
Yugoslavia: Pulp and paper manufacturing equipment	21,000
Israel: Paper plant	3,000,000
Finland: Wood pulp equipment	750,000
Argentina: Pulp and paper mill	7,600,000
Colombia: Papermill	5,700,000
Mexico: Pulp and papermill equipment	333,000
1959:	
Vietnam: Pulp plant	265,000
Yugoslavia: Processing pulp	47,000
Argentina: Pulp mill expansion	2,220,000
Philippines: Pulp and papermill machinery	5,400,000
Colombia: Pulpmill machinery	180,000
1960:	
Finland: Pulp and paperboard machinery	2,056,000
Argentina: Pulp and papermill	9,190,000
Venezuela: Papermill machinery	198,000
Tanganyika: Pulp and papermill	6,250,000
Egypt: Pulpmill	6,700,000
Yugoslavia:	
Pulp and paper products machinery	54,000
Pulp and paper mill	3,093,000
South Africa: Pulp machinery	61,000
India: Pulp and paper mill	18,500,000
Finland: newsprint machinery	5,203,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958–62—Continued

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1960:	
Israel: Pulp and paper machinery	$670,000
Greece: Pulp machinery for fiberboard	2,500,000
Argentina: Pulp and paper machinery	80,000
Colombia: Cellophane paper machinery	196,000
Panama: Paper bag machinery	17,000
1962:	
Philippines: Pulp and paper mill machinery	100,000
Egypt: Cellophane plant	3,000,000
Venezuela: Bagasse plant	1,450,000

PETROLEUM AND RELATED FACILITIES

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1958:	
India:	
Oil and Gas Commission	$41,000
Fuel Research Institute	25,000
Israel: Oil field conservation techniques	6,000
Taiwan:	
Petroleum refining	145,000
Petroleum products diversification	97,000
Bolivia: Ministry of Petroleum	83,000
Argentina: Petroleum asphalt plants	289,000
1959:	
India: Oil and Commission	12,000
Israel:	
Oil field conservation techniques	6,000
Petroleum facilities	367,000
Argentina: Petroleum asphalt plants	83,600
Spain: Petroleum production study	8,000
Panama: Petroleum regulations study	16,000
Greece: Petroleum facilities	500,000
1960:	
India: Oil and Gas Commission	42,000
Israel: Oil field conservation techniques	38,000
Panama: Petroleum laws study	1,000
Italy: Petroleum and chemical plant	2,890,000
Argentina: Petroleum asphalt plant	10,000
Pakistan: Petroleum gas treating plant	1,994,000
1961:	
India: Oil and Gas Commission	31,000
Israel: Oil field conservation techniques	6,000
Greece: Petroleum facilities	836,000
Finland: Petroleum facilities	1,750,000
Chile: Petroleum plants	34,500
1962:	
Colombia: Petroleum asphalt equipment	31,000
Greece: Petroleum facilities	570,000

CHEMICAL PLANTS

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1958:	
Taiwan:	
Caustic soda	144,000
Urea plant	1,617,000
Japan: Chemical plant expansion	2,300,000
Mexico: Chemical production	460,000
1959:	
Taiwan: Urea plant expansion	189,000
India: Phosphorous plant	21,000
Korea: Soda ash plant	5,600,000
Columbia: Chemical plant facilities	460,000
Peru: Chemical plant	700,000
1960:	
Taiwan:	
Urea plant	$1,884,000
Sulfuric acid plant	74,000
Indonesia: Nitrogenous chemical plant	33,200,000
Argentina: Phenol plant	2,000,000
Mexico: Citric acid plant	800,000
Israel: Chemical facilities	258,000
1961:	
Israel: Chemical plant	7,150,000
Mexico: Chemical plant equipment	58,000
Peru: Chemical plant equipment	508,300
Turkey: Chemical plant	2,800,000
1962:	
India: Chemical plant facilities	7,650,000
Japan: Ammonia and urea plant	800,000
Argentina: Chemical plant for synthetics	413,000
Chile: Sulfuric acid plant	95,000
Colombia: Chemical fertilizer plant	237,200

ALUMINUM PLANTS

1958: Taiwan: Aluminum plant modernization	672,000
Austria:	
Aluminum products plant	385,000
Aluminum plant	1,000,000
1959:	
Taiwan: Aluminum plant	1,350,000
Colombia: Aluminum plant facilities	400,000
1960:	
India:	
Aluminum reduction plant	13,650,000
Aluminum fabricating plant	5,000,000
Aluminum plant	2,000,000
Lebanon:	
Aluminum plant	400,000
Aluminum extrusion facilities	124,300
1961:	
Taiwan: Aluminum plant modernization	238,000
Philippines: Aluminum press	150,500
Mexico: Aluminum smelter	6,500,000

PLASTIC PLANTS

1958: Cuba: Plastic injection molders	14,000
1959:	
Argentina: Polyethylene plant	8,000,000
France: Plastic plant facilities	370,000
1960:	
Argentina: Plastic extrusion facilities	110,000
Yugoslavia: Plastics plant	23,000,000
1961:	
Argentina:	
Plastics plant equipment	9,000
Plastics products equipment	24,500
Korea: Plastics plant for fibers	3,200,000
Israel: Plastics equipment	80,000

RUBBER PLANTS

1958: Colombia: Rubber development	2,000
Peru: Rubber development	200,000
Latin America: Regional rubber development	600,000
Austria: Rubber plant equipment	769,000
1959:	
Guatemala: Rubber development	50,000
Latin America: Regional rubber development	400,000
Spain: Rubber plant	650,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958–62—Continued

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1959:	
Argentina: Rubber pneumatic plant	$3,300,000
Guatemala: Rubber plant	5,000,000
Israel: Rubber plant facilities	457,000
1960:	
Guatemala: Rubber development	156,000
Peru: Rubber development	199,000
India: Rubber plant	4,500,000
1961:	
Guatemala: Rubber development	180,000

U.S. aid to specific foreign industries, 1958–62—Continued

	Amount of aid grants and loans
1961:	
Peru: Rubber development	$20,000
Turkey: Rubber plant	4,000,000
India: Rubber plant	8,000,000
1962:	
Guatemala: Rubber development	26,000
Brazil: Synthetic rubber plant	3,400,000
Turkey: Rubber plant	3,125,000
India:	
Rubber equipment	500,000
Synthetic rubber plant	3,000,000

Hourly employment costs—American versus foreign steel industries

Country	Hourly employment costs[1]		Increase 1961 over 1952		Foreign as percent of United States	
	1952	1961	Cents	Percent	1952	1961
Luxembourg	$0.98	$1.47	$0.49	50	42	37
Belgium	.82	1.26	.44	54	35	32
France	.72	1.11	.39	54	31	28
West Germany	.69	1.37	.68	99	30	34
Italy	.64	1.04	.40	63	27	26
Netherlands	.53	1.40	.87	164	23	35
European Coal and Steel Community average	.72	1.25	.53	74	31	31
Japan	.32	.63	.31	97	14	16
United States	2.32	3.99	1.67	72	100	100

[1] Sources: 1952–60 data, Information Statistique; 1961 data, Siderurgie; 1962, No. 5 and 6, European Coal and Steel Community; Japan Iron and Steel Federation; and American Iron and Steel Institute.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. KELLY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8, insert the following:
>
> "(k) No assistance shall be furnished under section 201, 211, or 251 of this Act to the government of any country which does not agree to permit such reviews, inspections, and audits by the United States as the President may require for the purpose of ascertaining whether such assistance is being administered within the recipient country to carry out the purposes for which it was furnished."

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, relating to inspections. The amendment is very simple.

It states that no assistance shall be furnished under sections 201, 211, or 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act to any country which does not permit our Government to review and inspect the utilization of our aid. The amendment further directs the President to establish such procedures as he deems necessary to implement this proposal.

This is not an unusual requirement. We already have, in section 506(a)(3) of the act a provision which relates to the inspection of military assistance furnished on a grant basis.

My amendment would apply a similar requirement to economic development grants and loans and to the Alliance for Progress.

Many of the loan and aid agreements entered into by the Agency for International Development with foreign countries already provide for U.S. inspection and review of aid projects. This, however, is not an overall policy followed by our Government in every instance.

What I want to do is to bring some uniformity to the administration of foreign aid and to strengthen the program by making it apply across the board.

I would like to stress two things about my amendment. First, the amendment applies only to development loans, development grants, and the Alliance for Progress. It does not apply to supporting assistance, the contingency fund, and certain technical assistance projects.

And second, the amendment gives the President ample discretionary authority. It leaves it up to the President to determine what procedures are necessary to assure proper inspection—and proper utilization—of our aid. The amendment does not bind the President to any particular set of standards or requirements. It does, however, serve notice on the President, and all foreign countries receiving our aid, that the Congress expects our assistance to be checked carefully, and to be used only for the purpose for which it is given.

Mr. Chairman, the need for the adoption of this amendment was underlined in a report which I received recently from the Comptroller General of the United States. The Comptroller General said, in part—and I would like to quote:

> Although we have been able to resolve satisfactorily the difficulties we have encountered in auditing foreign aid programs, it is to be noted that recipient countries are not required, as a condition to receiving economic and technical assistance grants and loans, to permit observation and review by, or furnish information to, U.S. representatives. Enactment of such a requirement would make it clear that recipient countries are expected to grant the right of observation and review to U.S. representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Comptroller General's recommendations speak for themselves. I think this is a reasonable amendment and that it will strengthen the administration of the foreign assistance program. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. This amendment, of course, was discussed in committee. It lost in committee by a tie vote. I supported the amendment of the gentlewoman in committee. I have consulted members of the committee who opposed it before, and I see no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I fully agree and heartily support the provisions contained in subsection (i) of this section and commend the committee for including it in its bill. I particularly want to compliment the able gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], a member of the committee, for his tireless and effective work in developing this provision. And I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for his outstanding activity in the area this subsection covers.

The subsection, in substance, is a forthright, clear, declaration that we do not want any nation receiving our aid for economic development to divert its own resources for a military buildup for aggressive action against us or any other recipient of our aid and that any violator of this subsection disqualifies itself from receiving our assistance. It is more than a guideline—more than a sense of Congress. It is a mandate that we must insist be fulfilled.

There is no question in my mind—and I doubt there is any in the committee's—that this provision is immediately applicable to the United Arab Republic, one of the most vicious violators of the principles and ideals of our economic assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to ask the Chairman of the committee an extremely pertinent question. Is it the intention of the committee that this subsection apply directly to the United Arab Republic?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I think the amendment covers the United Arab Republic.

Mr. HALPERN. Is it just a question of thinking that it does, or does it actually apply?

Mr. MORGAN. It covers the United Arab Republic.

Mr. HALPERN. It is important that this be set forth clearly in the RECORD and I am pleased that the legislative history is definitely established on the subsection's objective lest there is any question whether it strikes directly at the United Arab Republic.

Nasser has flaunted our aid. He has made a mockery of the program, thereby weakening its highly purposeful and effective objectives elsewhere.

I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, to have the language in this act specifically single out the United Arab Republic to be denied any aid whatsoever. I can also see the desirable purpose, however, in spelling out in the act an ever-present vital standard for all nations for determining qualification for our aid.

That is just what this amendment does. Its language does not equivocate. Heretofore, the closest to it that we could get, is the acceptance of the principle by amendment to the act's guidelines or sense of Congress expressions.

Last year the Congress did set forth its sense in the form of clear guidelines—Keating-Halpern amendment—which, in substance, is commendably retained in section 102 of this bill. They are now complemented and strengthened by this new subsection.

In themselves, Mr. Chairman, the guidelines in the bill—although the intent is the same—obviously are not sufficient. Last year, as I mentioned, we had strong sense of Congress language. This should have been enough to cut off aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic. The language certainly applied to that country. But, what happened?

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman. We gave even more aid to Nasser and his United Arab Republic—even in the face of worse abuses by his regime than heretofore—and of his even more extreme threats to the peace—financed indirectly by the American taxpayer. How ridiculous can a situation get?

Hence, it is obvious, a sense of Congress expression, in itself, is not strong enough. We need forthright language; so there can be no question of interpretation—and I believe this provision adequately does just that. But, when enacted we must see to it, each and every one of us who are concerned with international law, morality and justice, that it is fully implemented and that aid to the United Arab Republic is cut off forthwith.

I call on the President, immediately on the enactment of this legislation, to make a clear-cut determination and to fulfill the objective of the provision.

As stated in the Committee's report and stipulated in the legislative intent just expressed on the floor of this House, it clearly applies to Nasser—and there should be no delay in applying it.

For, what nation is more in violation of this subsection than the United Arab Republic?

What nation has more avowedly declared its objective of totally annihilating a neighboring state by force?

What nation receiving our aid is spending more for arms, for missiles, for an offensive war machine than Nasser's United Arab Republic?

Nasser has ruthlessly violated international law. He has defied resolutions of the United Nations, ignored treaty obligations, and agreements with other countries including the United States. He has perpetrated intrigues and revolutions in neighboring states, threatened the total annihilation of Israel. He has proliferated the rocket race with development of offensive missiles, waged discriminatory blockades and boycotts—affecting even American citizens and American businesses; exploited American assistance by diverting his own funds, for the purchase of mammoth Soviet arms. He has expropriated the properties of Americans and others; he has extolled Castro's Cuba and Communist China.

Let me show you how Nasser—this master of subversion, intrigue, hate, and tyranny—has made a farce of our aid program; how he has exploited it; how he has perverted its purpose.

Since 1946—and including the projected program—Nasser will have received over a billion dollars of American economic assistance. Last year, alone, we gave him over $200 million. He spent that much and more in the same year in purchasing arms from the Sino-Soviet bloc. Imagine that. We put the dollars into his right pocket and he takes other money out of his left pocket to pay the Russians.

While we subsidize the United Arab Republic's domestic economy, Nasser has spent a sum reliably estimated at a figure at least $1.4 billion in the period from 1961 to 1963 for Soviet arms and other military expenditures. Just think, a billion and a half dollars for military spending from an economically underdeveloped nation.

The United Arab Republic, depending on the American taxpayer for food, has spent more of its gross national product for military requirements than the United States.

I will give you a reliable breakdown of his military expenditures in the period of 1961 to 1963 and let you determine if a so-called neutralist state, threatened by no one, needs to divert such sums from its peaceful development and human needs. We have helped pick up the tab for the following. A new Soviet arms deal, just reported, approximately $400 million: domestic missile production, $250 million; upkeep for military establishment, $600 million; military intervention in Yemen, $100 million; subversion and assassination expenses in neighboring states, $50 million. And, let me ask for what purpose an undeveloped nation needs 15 submarines, multistage rockets, and the latest Soviet jet bombers?

All this certainly leaves no question of his aggressive military buildup. Nasser's warmongering and subversion in the Middle East is the most obvious thing in the world. He even boasts about his designs in Israel.

As recently as this very month, less than 2 weeks ago, in a speech to his troops on August 12, he openly vowed the total destruction of Israel.

Direct reports from Iran, which I put in the RECORD only this Tuesday, tell how Nasser is financing agitation in that country to foment revolution against the Shah.

Nasser continues to ignore the Security Council resolution of June 11, 1963, to withdraw forces in Yemen. He has similarly defied the prior agreement of April 8, 1963, with the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. He also broke his word with the United States through misrepresentations that he would withdraw forces in exchange for our recognition of his Yemen puppet government.

This is only part of the story, Mr. Chairman. But, it is obviously sufficient to point to Nasser's unquestioned disqualification for aid under this section.

There are many other reasons that should, in themselves, suffice to cut off aid to Nasser beyond his unquestionable flagrant military aggression that this provision covers. As if this were not enough, there are other guidelines in this bill that fully cover them.

The August 1 issue of the New York Times tells of Nasser's nationalization of 500 companies including some American-owned firms.

He boastfully defies the United Nations resolution on freedom of passage for all shipping through the Suez Canal. He denies transit not only to Israeli ships but even bars and harasses American ships trading with Israel.

Cairo radio, subsidized in part by American funds spews anti-American hate and espouses the cause of Castro's Cuba and Communist China.

We partially finance the newsprint used by Egypt's government-controlled press. Yet, the very paper our dollars pay for, prints vicious attacks on the United States, calling us imperialists and exploiters.

In recent United Nations General Assembly sessions Nasser voted with the Soviet Union 37 times on key votes. But, listen to this—he voted only 4 times with the United States—4 out of 41.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is no question of interpretation here. The language is clear. Nasser's activities are clear. We can no longer remain as passive and inscrutable as the Sphinx, while Nasser sells us down the Nile. We should cut Nasser off forthwith until he can abide with international morality and the requirements of peace.

I fervently plead that this provision will be fully and immediately implemented.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. I want to say I am in full accord with his views. I think it is appropriate for me to say that this amendment to the bill was hammered out in the committee on a nonpartisan basis and that aid was given by the Republican members of the committee as well as the Democrats. So I think if there is any benefit to be obtained we all may share in it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one further word and that is that Egypt is a destructive force in the Near East, that she is trying to subvert the governments of many of the countries in the area, some of whom are our friends and some of whom are neutralist. As a result of her destructive efforts it has become necessary for her to divert so much of her cotton from the purchase of foodstuffs to the purchase of arms from Russia that we are now constrained to feed one-third of her population. In addition to her threats against Israel, Egypt has permitted Soviet technicians numbering thousands to remain in Yemen despite her agreeing not to do so. I urge the President to pay heed to the language of the bill referring to the foregoing. I am pleased at this time to join with the gentleman in his statement.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HAYS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret we reach this part of the bill so late in the evening. Nothing however can detract from the importance of that section of the committee report on page 5 entitled "Situation in the Near East." It makes excellent, clear policy which most of us can and do agree with. If the executive will follow this policy war in the Near East probably would be prevented. It would implement paragraph (I) of section 306 of this bill. I hope many of my colleagues will take the trouble to contact the Executive and express support of the committee views and the intent of the House. The wisdom of the committee, if put into practice, could activate the cause of peace for the whole world, not just the Near East or any one country. I shall personally hope to be of some help in this vital purpose.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STINSON

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STINSON: Page 16, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 8 insert the following:

"(k) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which receives weapons from any Communist country. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'Communist country' shall include, but shall not be limited to, the countries specified in subsection (f) of this section. The restriction contained in this subsection may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act."

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, the United States is currently giving foreign aid to nations which are spending part of their own meager resources for the purchases of military equipment from the Communist bloc. Such a practice has adverse effect on the national security of the United States in the following ways: In the first place, because of the balance-of-payments problems which face this country, and because of the gold outflow and monetary stability problems, items in the foreign assistance program must really be vital in order to be justified. A nation which can spend its resources on the purchases of unnecessary military equipment from Communist countries is not, in my opinion, in need of American dollars—especially when those dollars free financial resources which are then transmitted to the Soviet Union.

My second point is that this practice seems to be indirectly supporting the balance of payments of the Soviet Union. Russia has a similar problem to ours, namely, earning enough foreign exchange to support its economic and military activities in the field against its enemy. That we, their enemy, should aid the Soviets in the solution of this problem, whether directly or indirectly, is more ironical than I, for one, can tolerate.

There are even greater potential problems which continuance of this practice may bring. One of the nations which is currently purchasing armaments from Communist bloc countries is the United Arab Republic. It is estimated that from 1961 through 1964 the United Arab Republic has contracted over $300 million worth of armaments from the Soviet Union. If economic conditions in Egypt are bad enough to justify American aid, why has this tremendous amount been spent on arms which are unneeded for defense? The reason which justifies Nasser, of course, should not be the same reason which justifies American aid to him and his design for a new socialistic force in the Mideast.

Let us be frank. If the United Arab Republic and Israel go to war, only the Soviet Union will profit from the resulting misery and chaos. Therefore, it would be necessary for the United States to intervene to prevent the Soviets from realizing this advantage. In this case, how can the Congress justify, and approve of assistance to the United Arab Republic when that country is making such heavy arms purchases from the Soviet Union? In my opinion, it cannot—but the Congress can, if it prohibits aid to such a nation which purchases arms from the Communist bloc, perhaps force that nation to curtail its arms purchases.

The most glaring example of this practice is the case of Indonesia. This nation, in which the United States has spent almost $700 million to bolster its economy, has indebted itself to the Soviet Union through military purchases to the extent of well over a billion dollars. No observer pretends that these expenditures are for defense, that they are necessary to maintain Indonesia's independence against a Soviet or Red Chinese threat.

Clearly they are to support Sukarno's imperialistic adventures in southeastern Asia. If Indonesia can spend over a billion dollars to buy unnecessary military equipment, what possible justification can there be for continued U.S. economic assistance? Fortunately, the committee has seen fit to effect some curtailment against Indonesia in this year's bill.

Other situations similar to these in the Near East and Indonesia can rapidly develop if we continue on our present course.

Other nations that are purchasing armaments from Communist countries which are receiving some form of American foreign aid include; Afghanistan, Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iraq, Mali, and Morocco. If the Congress would adopt this amendment, I believe that very soon most of these nations would stop their arms purchases from the Communist countries. Naturally they are not interested in having their supply of American dollars cut off.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot believe that the American taxpayers want their hard earned tax dollars to eventually end up in Communist treasuries in payment for Communist weapons.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. This is not a simple amendment, and in the interest of time I would like to state one of the things it would do. It would immediately cut off all assistance to India, it would throw them completely at the mercy of an invasion from China. It would also immediately cut off all assistance to Laos. It would throw all of these countries and many others, a long list of them, immediately into the arms of the Communists. I am sure the gentleman is against communism, and this is aiding and abetting that area.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. What this amendment would do is very simple; it would stop these countries that I listed from buying arms from Communist countries.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, that is not true. India has built up certain credits with the Soviet Union. That is the only way they can make use of these credits. The Soviet Union has been supplying materials to the Indians to prevent a threat from the Chinese. The gentleman would not like to encourage that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If we had a regime that was switching over to our side by means of some long-term contract agreements where there would be purchases under long-term contracts, it would also cut off countries that are coming our way?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; that is the long-range effect of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems to me the gentleman points out the nature of the problem we would be taking if we would deprive ourselves of the possibility of giving aid to a country which is one of the biggest in the world. She is receiving aid up to this time, and we would be very shortsighted, so far as our own security is concerned, not to try to keep her from going into the Communist bloc. As one of the alternatives she could come back into our good graces by stopping purchases from the Soviets. The other alternative would be she would be thrown into their arms. I think it would be a great mistake to make it obligatory for us to stop providing them with assistance.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make a short observation on this particular amendment. I realize the gentleman from Washington did not intend it, but if this amendment is adopted, in my opinion it will be decidedly against the national interests of the United States.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 307. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(2) strike out "two shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretaries" and substitute "one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary".

(2) In subsection (a)(3) strike out "nine" and substitute "ten".

(3) In subsection (b) strike out "paragraphs (2) and" and substitute "paragraph".

(b) Amend section 626(b), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, as follows:

(1) Strike out the entire first sentence.

(2) In the second sentence strike out "Nor shall such service" and substitute "Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not".

(c) In section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, add the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The President may appoint any United States citizen who is not an employee of the United States Government or may assign any United States citizen who is a United States Government employee to serve as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee or any successor Committee thereto of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development upon election thereto by members of said Committee, and, in his discretion, may terminate such appointment or assignment, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such person may receive such compensation and allowances as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not to exceed those authorized for a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of said Act, as the President may determine. Such persons may also, in the President's discretion, receive any other benefits and perquisites available under this Act to chiefs of special missions or staffs outside the United States established under this section."

(d) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (k):

"(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred."

(e) Amend section 363, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In carrying out programs under this Act, the President shall take all appropriate steps to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, (1) countries receiving assistance under this Act contribute local currencies to meet the cost of contractual and other services rendered in conjunction with such programs, and (2) foreign currencies owned by the United States are utilized to meet the costs of such contractual and other services."

(f) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out "1963" and "$53,000,000" and substituting "1964" and "$54,000,000", respectively.

CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 308. Section 644(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to definition of defense services, is amended by inserting "including orientation" after "training" the first time it appears.

SEC. 309. Section 645 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to unexpended balances, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 645. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or Public Law 86–735 are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may at any time be consolidated, and, in addition, may be consolidated with appropriations made available for the same general purposes under the authority of this Act."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, there are only two pending amendments to the rest of the bill. There may be more on the Speaker's desk. I wonder if we can get unanimous consent that the rest of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how long will it take to read the rest of the bill? We have been here this long, we might as well read the rest of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana object?

Mr. HALLECK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: Page 19, after line 16, insert the following:

"SEC. 310. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 648. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, none of the funds available to carry out the provisions of this Act, shall be expended until the following question be submitted to qualified electors in a National Referendum.

" 'Shall the United States continue the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any amendments thereto, subsequent to June 30, 1964?

" 'A majority of eligible voters voting affirmatively shall be necessary before the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and any amendments thereto, shall be operative. The cost of said referendum shall be paid by proceeds from the sale of surplus property under control of the Agency for International Development.' "

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the foreign aid bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that all points of order have been waived on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all points of order are waived as to the text of the bill, as reported by the committee. Points of order are not waived as to amendments that might be offered to the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, in response to the point of order or in justification of the amendment, I think it is probably germane for I understand the people who would vote on this referendum are those who would pay the bill, that is, simply the taxpayers. I make no recommendation as to who might conduct the referendum although there are some experts, I know. I do think it is very serious when we hear talk day after day, and day after day about how everybody wants foreign aid, but nobody in my district writes to tell me so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the subject of the point of order.

Mr. DOLE. I will leave it to the discretion of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] offers an amendment to the bill which the Chair has had an opportunity to read and analyze. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill before the Committee. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago a female schoolteacher in my congressional district was dismissed by her school district for engaging in subversive activity. After an appeal to the courts the dismissal by the local school board still stood. Today this lady is in Bolivia acting as an adviser to the Bolivian Government in their educational system.

I know of no evidence which indicates that her husband is disloyal, but because he is always found where trouble is found and because of his wife and because he is my constituent, I do keep track of him. So when I heard a rumor that he was employed by the Agency for International Development, I made inquiry and received a reply which indicated that this gentleman was employed by the National Farmers Union, a contractor of AID during the latter part of 1962. He served as a member of a team which visited two or three countries in Latin America. This information was given me by Mr. Eugene Wolfe, Acting Deputy Director for Operations of AID.

In the words of my constituent here were his duties. I quote him:

> * * * working generally in the field of social and economic research connected with the Alliance for Progress.

I again quote him at a later point in his testimony.

> It would call for work in the field, particularly in the Andes Mountains where a considerable amount of organizing and agitation is going on against the Alliance for Progress. My task would be to work with Campesino groups and orient them toward our policy.

I am not attempting this afternoon to question the type of work he was doing, but I do think the House should know that the Agency for International Development is executing contracts with organizations like the National Farmers Union and that they are sending employees to South American countries for the purpose of orienting these countries toward our policies.

I might also say that I have learned upon further investigation that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, under the leadership of Mr. Clyde Ellis, received a contract and so has the Cooperative League of the United States of America. I say nothing against these groups, nor do I impugn them in any manner whatsoever, but I do point out that these organizations are registered with this House and with the Senate as lobbyists. I point out they are not offerors of hardware for sale, but they are advocates of social change. Yet we in this country have consistently advocated to the world and we proudly state that we are not seeking to impose our system or our ideas on the recipients of our foreign aid. It strikes me that for AID to award contracts to lobbying groups, which are in business for the purpose of advocating social change, we are contradicting our very foreign policy. In my opinion, this constitutes an unconscionable conflict of interest and one which I sincerely hope the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will go into in great depth during the next year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADER

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 19, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"SEC. 310. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 648. Commission on Foreign Economic Development.—(a) The Congress declares that a primary purpose of programs of foreign assistance is to raise standards of living and promote internal strength and stability in other free countries, thereby increasing their capacity to resist aggression, stimulating international trade, and contributing to the growth of free economic and political institutions. These goals can be achieved in large measure through encouraging and facilitating the investment of private capital in other free countries to develop their resources and improve their productivity. It is the purpose of this section to discover ways to stimulate the creative energies of free peoples, including the fullest use of free private enterprise, in promoting mutual security, economic vigor, and individual liberty in the free world.

" '(b) There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Development (in this section referred to as the "Commission").

" '(c) In conformity with the findings and in furtherance of the purpose declared in subsection (a), the Commission, after a complete study and investigation, shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs, policies, and administrative and other reforms, calculated to render more effective programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, including programs designed to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States, and the conduct of trade and commerce in such countries, and between such countries and other free countries, including the United States. The study and investigation by the Commission shall include a study of the operation of the programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States, with a view to determining the impact of such programs upon investment of private capital in other free countries. The Commission shall give particular attention to developing programs and policies calculated to eliminate or minimize the restrictions, hazards, and other impediments, foreign and domestic (including monopolistic and restrictive trade practices) which inhibit such investment, trade, and commerce, and to provide incentives for such investments, trade, and commerce.

" '(d) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members, as follows:

" '(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States;

" '(2) Two Members of the Senate of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Vice President; and

" '(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives of different political parties, and two persons from private life of different political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House.

" '(e) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

" '(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

" '(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

" '(h) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

" '(i) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $20,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

" '(j) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

" '(k) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

" '(l) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 203, 205, or 207 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

" '(m) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

" '(n) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

" '(o) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

" '(p) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this section; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

" '(q) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

" '(r) The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1966.' "

Mr. MEADER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment incorporates in the foreign aid authorization bill the provisions of H.R. 6679 which I introduced last June to create a Commission on Foreign Economic Development.

This bipartisan, 12-man Commission, would have the duty to study the foreign aid program and would "recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs, policies and administrative and other reforms calculated to render more effective programs of foreign assistance financed in whole or in part by the United States including programs designed to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States."

I testified in support of this proposal before the Foreign Affairs Committee, June 3, 1963. My testimony appears on pages 1421–1437 of the hearings.

My recommendation to establish a study commission on foreign aid is not a new one. I first made this recommendation April 23, 1951, and explained its purpose at some length in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 6, pages 4209–4214.

I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee during hearings on the mutual security program in the 82d Congress, 1st session, and my testimony and that of a representative of the Detroit Board of Commerce supporting my proposal appears on pages 777–835 of the hearings.

I have offered my proposal as an amendment to mutual security legislation on several occasions, the last being during the consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1961 on Thursday, August 17, 1961. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in opposing my amendment, among other things said the following:

> It is possible that the amendment has some merit, but I do not think the mutual security bill of 1961 is the place for this amendment.
>
> This amendment sets up a special commission of 14 members, as the gentleman has outlined in his presentation, some on the executive payroll and some consultants at $50 per diem. I think maybe it would be best for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to study this and, if necessary, give the gentleman from Michigan a hearing on the bill. I am sure this matter is important enough to go through the regular procedure and be referred to the committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 12, p. 16207.)

There is a significant difference between H.R. 6679 and predecessor bills I have introduced. Predecessor bills limited the commission study to identifying impediments to investment of private capital overseas for economic development and making recommendations for their elimination or diminution. H.R. 6697 broadens the study of the commission to include the entire foreign aid program.

The first reaction of members of the committee might be that another study is unnecessary in view of the recent study by the Clay Committee.

I think the answer to that question is that the Clay Committee study was excellent as far as it went, but that its 22-page report based upon a 3 months' study by distinguished citizens consisted mainly in general conclusions and opinions and fell far short of being a penetrating study of foreign aid with specific recommendations.

The commission I propose to establish might well take the Clay Committee's report as a starting point and then, with an able staff and in the 3-year period provided for the commission's existence, make a detailed examination of the foreign aid program and make specific recommendations for its reformation aimed particularly at enlisting private capital for economic development overseas with the purpose of gradually diminishing the need for American Government funds. The relatively small cost of the operation of such a commission, if it were successful, would result in vast savings not only in reduction of the burden on the American taxpayer but in improved effectiveness of the program.

To the extent we can transfer the task of economic development to private capital rather than Government grants, we not only relieve the tax burden, but at the same time, through the creation of wealth through economic development, broaden the tax base.

Only a few years ago, administration officials and certain segments of the press were strenuously advocating establishment of the foreign aid program on a long-term basis and with more flexibility, including back-door spending.

The Clay report of March 20, 1963, obviously moves in the opposite direction and contemplates a reduction and tapering off of U.S. foreign aid and a tightening up of its administration.

I find the philosophy of the Clay report largely harmonious with my own attitude toward foreign aid and wish to draw attention particularly to paragraph 5 on page 12 of the Clay report, a recommendation relating to Latin America and the Alliance for Progress, but in my opinion contains principles which are equally applicable elsewhere. I quote:

> We must continue to assume leadership with Latin Americans in stimulating the offering of incentives to the private sector which are required if Latin development goals are to be attained. Impediments to the growth of private enterprise must be identified and treated, the shallowness and harm of doctrinaire biases against responsible private enterprise exposed, new sources of credit opened to medium and small Latin American businessmen, and foreign investment encouraged in the confidence that all governments now have means to protect themselves against potential abuses. Agitation for the expropriation of foreign enterprises and for nationalization of private productive ventures is hardly conducive to the mobilization of private local and foreign capital investment and is destructive to rapid economic progress. Latin America must be encouraged to see its essential choice between totalitarian, inefficient, state-controlled economies and societies on the one hand and an economically and politically freer system on the other, realizing that a society must begin to accumulate wealth before it can provide an improved standard of living for its members. We believe the increasing acknowledgment that proper incentives to the private sector are required for dynamic growth must be accompanied by sustained U.S. and Latin American efforts and decisions at all levels of government policy and action. With such a basis, a more progressive Latin private enterprise spirit, substantial foreign investment which receives no more and no less than fair treatment, and other Alliance aid, the development of Latin America would be assured.

It is obvious from the Clay report's conclusions "impediments to the growth of private enterprise must be identified and treated" that the committee did not pretend that it itself had done that job. It is my suggestion that the best way to identify impediments to private capital investment is to establish a commission such as I recommend.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware that the aid program has been studied and studied, but my contention is that the studies have been superficial and largely repetitive. We recall the Gray report, the Rockefeller report, the Randall Commission, the Draper Committee and now the Clay Committee, and there undoubtedly have been others. Yet the problem is still with us. I believe the American Congress and the American public are growing restive under the burden of foreign aid and that the only way we will ever make any headway is through assembling the best brains we can find, both in the executive branch of the Government and private life, into a commission. With stature and independence and with an able staff, it could make a penetrating study and forthright and specific recommendations.

The difficulty with having studies made, either by officials in the executive branch or by a committee appointed by the executive branch, is that criticisms of operations of Executive agencies is likely to be inhibited.

The difficulty with having the study made by a congressional committee, and there are several which have adequate authority, is that Congress will not spend the money or take the time necessary for a penetrating study.

The Hoover Commissions on reorganization of the executive branch of the Government did have the stature, did acquire the staffs and were well worth the few millions they cost the American people. I believe that a study of foreign aid and the means of expanding the role of private capital in economic development overseas would well be worth its cost.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Does the commission, which the gentleman proposes, have sufficiently broad authority to cover such agencies as the Inter-American Bank, the proposed bank which would be set up for savings and loans and other financial institutions and programs in which the Government is interested?

Mr. MEADER. I think this commission has extremely broad study and investigative power.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman and compliment him on his idea.

Mr. MEADER. It would be composed of 12 members, 4 appointed by the President, 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House, 2 of whom would be members of the House, 1 from each party, and 2 would be appointed by the Speaker from private life, 1 from each party. Similarly the Vice President would appoint four members on the part of the Senate.

I say that this program as administered has raised many questions in the minds of the American people. I have served for 10 years on a committee that has been investigating this program. We have had a very limited staff. I think we did a lot of good. But I know we did not get below the surface and we have not established any means of bringing this program to an end.

I think we cannot live with it indefinitely, especially if it continues to be administered in such a sloppy fashion.

This commission, if it did its job properly, could make an immeasurable contribution not only to our foreign policy but to a reduction of the tax burden on the American people.

I am thinking of a commission like the Hoover Commission. We had two Hoover Commissions, for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. They hired staff; they hired task forces; they went into these subjects in some depth. You cannot do that with a committee of Congress. It will not stay with it long enough. It will not hire sufficient staff to do the penetrating job that needs to be done.

This is a move in the direction of getting this program on the right track and I hope that the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to oppose the gentleman's amendment because I know that he has given a lot of study to this, and I know he is essentially and basically sincere in wanting to do something about it. But I think he is attacking it from the wrong angle.

I was chairman for 4 years of a select committee of this House to study unnecessary Government paper work and I want to say to you that after spending 4 years in that thankless task that I did not seek, I came to the conclusion that if this American Republic ever is destroyed it will be because we will be drowned in a lot of unnecessary paper.

We have had, as the gentleman named, all of the commissions that he referred to. I shall not go through them again, except to say that he left out one, the Draper Commission. They studied this and restudied it and issued reports, the latest of which was the Clay Committee report. And what happens? Very few people read the report, and fundamentally you get back to the fact that it is the business of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee, who have to make the decisions. That is basic. That is what happens.

In fact, the gentleman's proposal itself says that there shall be two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate on this Commission. Apparently they are going to be on still other committees. And the gentleman says that we do not have time enough now and we would expect them to serve on still another committee.

I think if there is anything we can do to cure this, we are trying to do it in the Foreign Affairs Committee by setting up these staff groups to go out and make a study of this problem. We have cured a lot of this. I have been one of those who has advocated hiring more staff in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Basically it is our job and basically I think we are going to have to do it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I understand the point that the gentleman makes, but the thing that appealed to me about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is the fact that this was a commission which would cross committee lines, which was the point that I tried to bring out with my questions. Before the Banking and Currency Committee we have foreign financial relationships of our Government considered by the committee.

The same is true under other programs which come before your committee. The same is true of programs involved in taxation. A broad commission study of economic policy which I thought the gentleman's amendment was referring to and which appears to have much merit.

Mr. HAYS. What the gentleman says is true, but the gentleman has been in Congress before and the gentleman knows that no congressional committee, as jealous as they are of their prerogatives—the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Appropriations Committee—is going to let any outside commission do their work for them. This is just going to be another report which few people will read and even fewer will pay any attention to.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record. The gentleman said that the program was being administered in a sloppy manner. I think it is the impression of both sides of the Foreign Affairs Committee that the program has never been administered in a more able manner than under the distinguished leadership of David Bell, who has really identified himself and has really made this an efficient program along business lines.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with that part as far as Mr. Bell is concerned. But I think there is some justification, if I may rise to the defense of the gentleman from Michigan, when the gentleman says it has been in the past administered in a rather sloppy manner under, I might say, both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I cannot help saying to the gentleman that the conclusion to which the gentleman comes necessarily and logically leads to the conclusion that it is impossible for the Congress to do an overall examination and policy job, and I am unwilling to accept that conclusion.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think it is impossible for the Congress to do it at all. I think the Foreign Affairs Committee has taken great steps in the last 2 years to do a more capable, comprehensive job. I will say to the gentleman that what I am saying is the Congress is not going to let some outside body do its work for it. If this commission is set up and if it submits a report, as I said earlier, hardly anyone is going to read it and even fewer are going to pay any attention to it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But, this is going to be a part of the Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House ought to have the staff with which to make the study. The gentleman also sits on the Committee on House Administration and I am sure the gentleman knows that I have never been one who has been niggardly about providing funds for making committee studies, but we just will not do it. That is all. That is why we have resorted to establishing study commissions.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that we have given the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Government Operations, everything it has ever asked for, and the gentleman knows that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mills). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 401. The Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86–735, 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(a) In section 2 strike out "$500,000,000" and substitute "$700,000,000".

(b) Insert following the enacting clause "That this Act may be cited as 'the Latin American Development and Chilean Reconstruction Act' ".

SEC. 402. (a) Section 101(f) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable from the Government or agencies thereof in the respective countries."

(b) Section 105 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The President shall utilize foreign currencies received pursuant to this title in such manner as will, to the maximum extent possible, reduce any deficit in the balance of payments of the United States."

(c) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "economic development" and inserting in lieu thereof "economic and community development".

SEC. 403. (a) Section 571(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided*, That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made."

(b) Section 911(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after "on authorized home leave;" the following: "accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment, but in no case to exceed one member of his family;".

(c) Title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out section 921(d), relating to use of Government vehicles, and by inserting immediately after section 913 the following new section:

"Use of Government-owned or leased vehicles

"SEC. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78), the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available."

(d) Title X of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"PART I—EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 1081. Whenever the Secretary determines that educational facilities are not available, or that existing educational facilities are inadequate, to meet the needs of children of American citizens stationed outside the United States engaged in carrying out Government activities, he is authorized, in such manner as he deems appropriate and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to establish, operate, and maintain primary schools, and school dormitories and related educational facilities for primary and secondary schools, outside the United States, or to make grants of funds for such purposes, or otherwise provide for such educational facilities. The provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended, and of paragraphs (h) and (i) of section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State,' approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170h(h) and 170h(i)), may be utilized by the Secretary in providing assistance for educational facilities. Assistance may include, but shall not be limited to, hiring, transporting, and payment of teachers and other necessary personnel."

SEC. 404. The Act entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170f–170t), is amended by inserting immediately after section 12 the following new section:

"SEC. 13. There is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of State, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses (including those authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended) and equipment, necessary for maintenance and operation in the city of Washington and elsewhere of (1) central reproduction, editorial, data processing, audiovisual, library and administrative support services; (2) central supply services for supplies and equipment (including repairs), and (3) such other administrative services as the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. Not to exceed $150,000 in net assets shall be transferred to the fund for purposes of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of State, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law, for supplies and services at rates which will approximate the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund."

SEC. 405. The first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization", approved July 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 523), is amended to read as follows: "That not to exceed eighteen Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and annually with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) members, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area."

SEC. 406. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104(b)) is amended to read as follows: "There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs to be headed by an administrator with the title of Assistant Secretary of State and with compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.".

(2) The individual holding the position of administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State on the date of enactment of this section shall not be required to be reappointed to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs in the Department of State solely by reason of the enactment of this section.

(b) (1) Clause (2) of section 104(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104(a)) is amended by striking out "Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs".

(2) The heading of section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104) is amended by striking out "BUREAU OF SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS" and inserting in lieu thereof "BUREAU OF CONSULAR AND MIGRATION AFFAIRS".

(3) Section 101(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs".

(4) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act which appears under the center heading

"TITLE I—GENERAL"

is amended by striking out—

"Sec. 104. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State; Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"Sec. 104. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State; Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs.".

(5) All provisions of laws of the United States which refer to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs shall hereafter be deemed to refer to such Bureau by the name of the "Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs".

(c) Subsection (f) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), as so redesignated by section 109(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 535), is hereby redesignated as subsection (i).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: Page 25, strike out lines 3 through 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The individual holding the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State on the date of enactment of this section shall not hold the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs in the Department of State solely by reason of his appointment to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs before such date of enactment, but shall be required to be appointed to the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, under the terms of this section of the act a reorganization has taken place which will create a new bureau, the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs. It is provided in the bill, as now written, that the person appointed as administrator does not require reappointment but may serve without. My amendment would require the official to be appointed which would then logically assume that he would be required also to be confirmed by the Senate. I think this is a wise safeguard to see that the proper person is appointed and is confirmed to this very important office. It is designed as a protective amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that this language which he seeks to amend is exactly the language which was passed by this House last year on March 14, 1962, as a section 406 of H.R. 7885. This amendment was written by Mr. Walter and his staff and the only dissent about it on that particular occasion, it did not become law because it did not pass the other body, was because I questioned the jurisdiction of it. Mr. Walter later came to me and said, there is a question of jurisdiction and I do not know whether it could ever be decided one way or the other. But we have the language and if you put it in some bill where it is appropriate and where it is legal, we will send it up to your committee. The language was submitted identically as Mr. Walter's staff member brought it to me. I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment because it seems as though the debate has degenerated to some sort of argument about the personality of the person who now holds the job.

This does not cost another dime. It merely redesignates and puts security where it ought to be, under the administrative officer and out of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs. I would not know the present holder of that position if he walked in the door. As we say in Ohio, I would not know him from a truckload of stone. I am not interested in stone and I am not interested in personalities and I think that I agree with the gentleman it is proper that if he gets a new title at no increase in pay he be redesignated and he be reconfirmed. I think that indicates 99 percent of the objections I have heard about it, and we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 24, beginning at line 19 and running through page 26, line 14, strike out all of section 406.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my objection to this section of this bill is the fact that in this foreign aid bill we are now creating another Assistant Secretary of State. There are now 11 Assistant Secretaries of State, and this will make it No. 12. I have searched the records of the hearings of the committee, and there is not a single word in the hearings as to why this assistant should be named or why there should be a 12th Assistant Secretary of State. It is not in the hearings. There is no way that the membership of this House can find out why we should have this Assistant Secretary of State. It seems to me that on the foreign aid bill we should confine ourselves to the matters that have to do with our mutual security, if you please, but that on questions of establishing a new division of the Department of State, they should come in here for full and complete hearings and the membership should have the advantage of hearings before the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs so we would know why we are doing it and what is being done and the purpose of it.

I think the gentleman from Ohio very properly said that some questions of personality are involved in this. I admit that the gentleman's amendment that says he shall be confirmed by the Senate helps somewhat, but the Senate already confirmed this man once. I just do not know what they are going to do unless we can develop it in full and complete hearings through the Committee on Foreign Affairs so that they can give Congress the reasons why we should establish this new office. I am a little bit concerned about this amendment which was accepted, because if you read it carefully, it says:

> The individual holding the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State on the date of enactment of this section shall not hold the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs in the Department of State solely by reason of his appointment to the position of Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs before such date of enactment, but shall be required.

What does it say? It says he shall be required "to be appointed to the position." It does not take him out of office and tell him to go back to the Senate, but the language of this amendment which was accepted says, "but he shall be required to be appointed to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs."

So when you refer back to the language of this amendment, it does not do what they are trying to do, send him back for confirmation, but the language says that he shall be required to be appointed to the position of administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs. This particular office will have to do with visas and with people coming into this country.

There are many things that he will have to decide. It seems to me we ought to take a good hard look at this question of whether or not we should create this office. It should be on proper hearings and determination by that committee and not in this bill in this manner when there have never been any hearings that Members could take advantage of.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, there have been some suggestions that have come to me that the language here incorporated is the sort of thing that out in Indiana once in awhile we have had in the legislature, known as the "ripper" bill, through which the name of an organization, a State agency is changed, everybody in that agency goes out and you pick a lot of new people.

I would like to inquire of the people in charge of this bill whether such an operation is contemplated by the language contained in the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, I would like to answer as honestly and as forthrightly as I know how the question of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. There is no intent as far as I know—and I suspect we are making legislative history—to have any "ripper" bill at all. I do not think there was that intent when Mr. Walter presented this and when it passed the House without a dissenting vote.

I will tell you what my mistake is, if any. I forgot to go—and I am going to keep right on forgetting—with matters under the jurisdiction of my committee and clear them with the distinguished gentleman on the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The facts of the matter are that we did have a hearing before the subcommittee on these amendments. They were unanimously approved by the full committee. This particular amendment does nothing except change the title of the gentleman who now occupies the office. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] says he is concerned with a lot of things. That is right, he is right now. He is running the Bureau. Changing his title without raising his salary does not do anything.

And he says—and I will make some more legislative history, if I may—that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana does not do what they say it does. The legal counsel says it does. The gentleman from Indiana who is a distinguished lawyer says it does. I am just a layman and I say it does.

Let me read the law now. This is the present law.

> There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs to be headed by an administrator (with an appropriate title to be designated by the Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

That is what the law says. That is what the man is doing. That is the job he is filling. What does the new law or the proposed amendment say?

> There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular and Migration Affairs to be headed by an administrator with the title of Assistant Secretary of State and with compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

One other thing that has already been accomplished by administrative order, and I think rightly so, is to take away from this very controversial fellow, whom I do not know—apparently he is controversial with some of my friends on the other side—the jurisdiction over security in the State Department and put it under the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security who reports directly to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

You can obscure it all you want to, but these are the facts. I submit to you that when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] OK's something, I think you know him well enough to know—some of you over there may not trust me, but, as I said, he is the ranking member on my subcommittee and everything that has come out of that committee this year and the last Congress, came out unanimously. As I said, if we had an amendment, we worked it out until we had a meeting of the minds. Another member of that subcommittee is the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, and former Governor of that State. When we reported out our bill on the buildings program, that was unanimous. He had an amendment and we worked it out.

I think these people know that there is not a "ripper" bill here, there is not any intent to get one, and there is no use beclouding the issue, because it just is not there.

May I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that I am glad the gentleman asked the question. I have given the gentleman an honest answer and that is the truth to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his forthrightness. I have had concern about some people down there who have been doing a real good job for the country and all of us, and I am glad to have that assurance.

Mr. HAYS. I may say to the gentleman that to my knowledge this is not a "ripper" bill. But I am not guaranteeing in perpetuity that nobody in this department will ever be removed or transferred. I am just saying that there is no intent here to get anybody about whom I know. I do not believe that is the reason they brought it in and I do not believe that is the reason Tad Walter brought it in last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. BOW. Now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr Hays], has paid his compliments to me and I appreciate it. I shall not respond in kind. The gentleman has tried to lead this House to believe that you are not creating another Assistant Secretary of State by saying he is simply doing the work of an Assistant Secretary of State.

Let me read from your committee report:

> The effect will be to increase the number of Assistant Secretaries of State from 11 to 12.

That is in the report.

Mr. HAYS. Nobody is denying that.

Mr. BOW. You are creating another Assistant Secretary of State. I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] turn to his hearings and show us in those hearings where the gentleman took testimony to create this new division in the Department of State.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. It is not in the hearings, and I made that clear. There was a hearing before the subcommittee, but you are giving a paper argument and a phony one because we are creating an additional Assistant Secretary of State. I never said we were not. But, we are uncreating another job paying the same salary. So it is not costing a dime. Instead of calling him a director we will call him an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask one question now: Why do you want to create another Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield, let me thank my anonymous friend when he responded with "why not." I do not think I can better that answer.

Mr. GROSS. Well, why not?

Mr. HAYS. Well, the gentleman knows as well as I know that there is an awful lot of protocol around this town and the best answer I could get from Mr. Walter last year was that this was to put him on a par with his peers who had this title and were doing the same work. If the gentleman will let me reread what was said then——

Mr. GROSS. I heard the gentleman during the first reading.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to point out that the record does show that it is the creation of another Assistant Secretary of State. There is no question about this.

Mr. HAYS. Of course; that is right.

Mr. BOW. It seems to me that the gentleman's argument fails when he says that this was heard before the subcommittee. Well, of course, perhaps it was heard before the subcommittee, but are not the 435 Members of this House entitled to know from committee hearings why you created a new Assistant Secretary of State? Do we have the subcommittee hearings before us? I ask any Member of this House, have you had an opportunity to read these hearings? Have they been before you? Do any of you know what testimony was taken on which to establish this other Secretary of State? I do not think that is the way we want to legislate. I think what we are entitled to is the same procedure as was followed in these other matters that were before this committee properly on foreign aid. The record is here. But there is no record before the 435 Members of this House to determine why we should do this.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly support the gentleman's amendment, if for no other reason than I have not been sold on the explanation that it is necessary to create another Secretary of State just to be fashionable or to keep up with the Joneses.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. HAYS. I want to say that I think there has been an adequate record made right here this evening for the defeat of the amendment. We do not need any further hearings on the matter.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. Hays.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 170; noes 160.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JENSEN

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Jensen: On page 26, after line 14, insert the following new part:
>
> "PART V
>
> "In order to more directly, and thus more effectively, more efficiently, and more economically accomplish the humanitarian objectives of the United States, as set forth in the several policy provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, in aiding the underprivileged peoples of the less developed friendly countries of the world who are opposed to that theory of government known as communism and whose governments are in known opposition to that theory, and more particularly to secure the objectives designed to raise standards and conditions of living and thus enhance their health, welfare, and happiness, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, as an alternative to the several programs authorized for such purposes by this Act and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, the sum of $1,000,000,000 annually beginning with the fiscal year 1964 and continuing until the Congress determines that such objectives have been substantially accomplished or for other reasons determines such assistance no longer practicable or justifiable in the circumstances. Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended when so specified in the applicable appropriation acts.
>
> "Of the sum appropriated for any year pursuant to the authorization herein, not less than 75 per centum, including necessary administrative and distribution costs, shall be available solely for aid to such peoples in the forms of food, clothing, medicine, medical and nursing, and clinic and hospital services, as may be determined by the President. The remaining sum, including necessary administrative and distribution costs, shall be allocated in such manner as the President may determine for suitable low-cost housing for such peoples and, in countries whose economies are in major part agricultural, for supplying productive animal and poultry stock and housing and animal-drawn farm implements.
>
> "The furnishing of such assistance shall be administered by such agencies of the United States Government as the President may designate, and under his general policy direction and control, but to the maximum extent practicable such assistance in the countries concerned shall be channeled to the people, as equitably as may be, and free of cost to them, through utilization of the advice, services, and facilities of the American Red Cross, the International Red Cross, American church missionaries in the countries concerned, and other voluntary nonprofit organizations as may be designated by the President."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane as a substitute for the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Rains). It is evident from a reading of the amendment that the amendment is germane. The point of order is overruled.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to this foreign aid bill now being considered in the House is in effect a substitute for all the provisions in H.R. 7885, except the Purcell amendment which was adopted. I assure you I offer my substitute in all good faith. It speaks clearly for itself. When the foreign aid bill was first brought to the House, at the close of World War II, we were told that in 5 years, no more, the undeveloped nations would be sufficiently rehabilitated to care for themselves, hence I supported the program for the first 5 years. But not since that time.

We have up to this time appropriated and spent for this program over $100 billion to the end that we now have a Federal deficit of over $305 billion, which is considerably more than the Federal debt of all the nations of the world all put together.

Mr. Chairman, on my visits to many of the nations listed in the report on H.R. 7885, I learned firsthand by talking face to face with many needy people and others, that, when they learned we Americans were furnishing them with food, clothing, medicine, doctors, and nurses they were truly grateful, but too often they were not told of our generosity. If my substitute is made law those people will know, be greatful and friendly. It was disheartening to learn that some of those nations who accepted our military assistance reduced their defense budget by about an equal amount of our military assistance, with the thought in mind that should their country again become involved in a war, the American doughboy would again bail them out.

H.R. 7885 calls on our taxpayers to provide $4,087 million for this program. My substitute provides for $3,087 million less, which certainly should be saved. Think for a moment the good we could do for the needy people within our own shore, who number in the millions, with those billions, either in Federal aid or by reducing the President's huge budget for fiscal year 1964.

I sincerely hope my substitute bill will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. Jensen and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee divided and there were—ayes 78, noes 184.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TOLLEFSON

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Tollefson: Page 26, after line 14, insert a new section to read as follows:
>
> "No funds shall be made available under the authorization provided in this act until unexpended appropriations made available under the previous authorization provided by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, have reduced to $3,600,000,000."

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, according to the Chairman, this is the last amendment that you will have an opportunity to vote upon and I shall be just as relieved as will you.

I do not expect the Committee to approve the amendment. I offer it primarily to advance and emphasize the thought that I have had in connection with the unfavorable balance of payments and the outflow of our gold. However, it is an amendment that those who oppose foreign aid can support very easily.

It could also easily be supported by those who favor foreign aid, without abandoning their views.

Mr. Chairman, putting the amendment simply, it simply provides that there shall be no appropriations under the authorization provided by this bill until the funds in the so-called pipeline are reduced to $3.6 billion. It is a very simple amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members on both sides of the aisle who are worried about our unfavorable balance of payments and the outflow of our gold. From my point of view it is one of the most serious issues confronting us today. If we do not do something about it soon, we will not be able to carry out any foreign aid program for a very great length of time.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is an amendment that even our foreign recipient countries could support, if they had an opportunity to do so.

The amendment does not mean the abandonment of any foreign aid program at all. It simply means a stretching out of it. We are all familiar with these stretched-out programs in other instances.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are aware of the fact that this administration, as well as the previous one, has taken steps to deal with the unfavorable balance-of-payments problem. But none of these steps have been very successful. In the last quarter the rate of unfavorable balance of payments has run or did run to the tune of $5.2 billion, as I understand it. Now if we permit that kind of condition to exist for very long, then we will not for very long have any foreign aid program.

It seems to me that we ought to remember that the primary cause of our unfavorable balance of payments has been the foreign aid program itself.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman just made an unusual statement in which he stated that the foreign aid program was the cause of the unfavorable balance of payments.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Will the gentleman state his question again, please?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman says that the foreign aid program is the real cause of the unfavorable balance of payments. Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I did say that; yes, and I believe it to be so. I am not saying it is the sole cause. But I think the gentleman will agree with me that our trade balance is unfavorable.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, our foreign aid program does not make up the difference.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am not saying that it makes up the full difference.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the real culprit is our troops overseas, our tourists, and our investments overseas. The foreign aid program right now is really bringing in dollars to the United States. Foreign governments are buying with their own money $1 billion worth of arms purchases, $600 million from West Germany alone.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Let me ask the Chairman a question.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It is the Chairman's belief that the foreign aid program has not been contributing to the unfavorable balance of payments?

Mr. MORGAN. I say a small amount, only about $1 billion, while tourist expenditures abroad account for $2 billion.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I can justify it, if the gentleman wants to see the figures.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Not at this point. I do not have but about 2 minutes left and I wish to complete my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply saying if we want to deal with this unfavorable balance of payments, one way to do it is through the foreign aid program. I will grant you that a more practical way than this would be to limit the amount of expenditures per year under the foreign aid program to $2 or $2.5 billion a year. Not only would it help our favorable unbalance, but it would also have an impact on this year's budget.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, I do not expect the House is going to approve the amendment or that everyone in opposition to the foreign aid program can certainly support it. I advance the thought for your consideration in the months to come.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would be rather harmful to the foreign aid program. The basic question is the fact that you cannot divert those unfinished articles that are in the pipeline to meet new requirements which are not now anticipated. For example, such sophisticated weapons that our European allies may require cannot be diverted to provide rifles that might be needed in the Far East. If planes are on order you cannot use the obligated balance that remains in the pipeline for such purchases to be diverted for the purchase of machineguns or grenades.

That is the principal objection to the amendment and I therefore urge that it be defeated.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are now reaching the end of this debate. For all of the 13 years I have been in this Congress I have supported this program. This year I believe when it goes to a vote I am going to vote for it again with some reservations. Why? I know everybody has been wondering for 2 days why has this program been cut into so seriously. I think it gives us all pause for thought.

There are certain reasons here. I think there is the temper of the people in the country today toward this program which has been reflected in the votes that have been taken on amendments during the last 2 days.

May I say that when I came to the Congress and first considered this program we were in the midst of the Korean War. We had been thrown back at the Yalu River. At that time the program was in two parts. First, military assistance where subversion, sabotage, and armed resistance took place. The second part was to assist economically backward countries.

May I say to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, including my good friends on this side, there has been, in my opinion, a considerable slacking off by this administration in what I feel is strong opposition which would support this kind of a program. I am talking about open opposition to communism. There has been in my estimation during the past 6 months to a year many people in the Congress, including myself, who feel that this administration—and I am not trying to be partisan, I am trying to tell what I feel is the truth because I favored this program because I felt it had a value—there is a feeling there is a certain group in the White House and in the State Department whose response to communism has slackened off. I do not say it is necessarily the President himself. They are now trying to meet the issue of communism in a different way rather than by resistance. I feel that this is a feeling which we have and which has resulted in these cut amendments on the foreign aid bill which comes about as the result of that type of thinking.

If this continues during the next year I hope those in the White House and in the State Department who are of this feeling, and they are there, because I have talked to them on the outlook they have with reference to this program, there will be a slackening in the support for this program.

The whole issue of fighting communism is not such that this program can be sustained indefinitely if that is going to be the general approach which is psychologically made to the whole question of whether or not we are going to oppose communism. That is why you are finding today a very deep opposition to this bill which I have never seen before in the 13 years I have been in Congress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Could anyone have expressed himself more forcefully about communism than did the President last year in the October confrontation?

He called the bluff of the Soviet Union. The first time it was ever done and I am certain that this accounts for the new Soviet attitude.

Mr. SPRINGER. They have not opposed communism in the manner that they should have. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion. I am trying to be constructive. I do feel that is the feeling of many in the Congress as reflected by votes on both sides of the aisle.

I do hope that there will be a change in the program. May I say to the gentlemen who are handling this in the State Department that it can be demonstrated that there is a genuine use for this program in fighting communism?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Tollefson].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate on this bill, I have made every effort to support the proposal as it was reported out of committee.

There is much room for criticism of our foreign aid program, and I believe that the administrators of the program should be held to account for their shortcomings and such failures as have occurred.

I am also aware of the pockets of blight and despair which exist in this country and very considerably in my own congressional district. In every way possible, I have endeavored to support a program to help eradicate domestic blight and despair. However, we must not consider the complete solution of social problems in America as a condition precedent to our providing assistance to the world community of nations. I support help for the needy at home as well as those in foreign countries.

It is interesting to observe that many of those who aline against aid for the needy in foreign lands also aline themselves against aid for distressed Americans. They oppose acts of national charity because they contend that they are not received in gratitude. They would like to tatoo our giving on the body of every recipient. Like many givers, they want their giving carved in the marble of the cornerstone and painted on the windows. Such a gift is not a monument to charity, but a lasting memorial to avarice which is too often becoming the trademark of American benefaction.

Every man and every woman among us participates in charitable giving. Our best gifts carry no strings or accounting. Is it too much for this great and rich country to set aside 0.007 percent of its gross national product to the welfare of the less fortunate inhabitants of our world in these times? If America cannot participate in a concern for its neighbors, how then can any other nation?

I am gravely concerned with the growing crisis in the flight of gold. The situation calls for urgent modification of national policies. However, I do not believe that the termination of foreign aid is the proper solution. I am alarmed at the flight of gold but I am far more concerned with the flight of faith of those who still believe in the humanity of our democratic Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. Rains, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 493, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. BOW rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

SALUTE TO FREEDOM MARCHERS

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the impending August 28 civil rights march and rally, scheduled to occur in Washington exactly 1 week from today, compel me to speak in order that I may remind my colleagues in the House of Representatives of matters which will place that event in the proper perspective. It is not that I consider you uninformed on these matters, but only that I dare not remain silent lest some whom these words might reach should permit themselves to miss the point of the dramatic event. In view of our varied geographic, social and ethnic background, it would be all too easy to become so involved emotionally in a race-related issue that we would lose sight of substantive matters.

I have no doubt that you, my distinguished colleagues, are prepared to view the imminent civil rights march on Washington as an example of a traditional American medium of protest. I cannot conceive that anyone in this body would fail to see that this event is akin to numerous others of the same nature, except only that it occurs at a different and far more significant moment in our Nation's history. I will not believe that any Member would knowingly permit the color of the marchers' skins to so cloud his or her vision that it would be less than emphatically clear that the right of petition fully encompasses this form of articulating grievances.

I do not believe that anyone here doubts that Negroes in the United States have valid grievances against their Government; and against those private citizens who would treat them as second-class citizens. Nor is it credible that anyone here would contend, even in jest, that black Americans do not possess the same civil rights as other American citizens. I will not be convinced that anyone of my colleagues believes that anyone's rights can be possessed by another, to be patronizingly and paternalistically doled out to him as someone else sees fit to permit him to have them.

There is no question that human and civil rights are each person's possession equally; nor can there be any question as to the right to express, by public demonstration, the dissatisfaction of individuals and groups who have been denied the opportunity to exercise the rights which are theirs. The President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, fully recognizes the right of advocates of racial equality to dramatize the cause publicly. President Kennedy is also aware that the contemporary plight of Negroes is such that demonstrations are fully justified. This view has also been expressed by Vice President Lyndon Johnson and Attorney General Robert Kennedy, speaking for themselves and for the President.

The Congress and Washington have been the objects of massive protest demonstrations on numerous occasions. The earliest recorded mass demonstration against the Congress was staged while the body was located in my own city of Philadelphia, in 1783. On that occasion, several hundred Philadelphia veterans of the American Revolution demanded their long-overdue pay from a Congress which presided over an empty treasury. The local citizenry and public officials were sympathetic to the veterans and the Congress sought protection from the threatening crowd by locking itself inside its chambers. It has been said that this event strengthened the Congress' resolve to relocate in a Federal city which would be under the control of that body.

In the wake of the panic of 1893, more than 1,500 unemployed persons descended upon Washington as a "living petition" in support of legislation originating with Joseph Coxey. "Coxey's Army," as the nucleus of the marchers was called, was further supported by over a thousand jobless men, all of whom actually assembled on the Capitol grounds where many of them were arrested for "walking on the grass."

On Monday, March 3, 1913, the Washington Evening Star reported that:

> The modern crusade of votes for women this afternoon took Washington by storm.

The heading of the article referred to a "thrilling pageant" to the thousands of spectators who were "struck by the spirit and beauty of the occasion" and cheered "wildly." Following the opening sentence, quoted above, the item continued:

> Marching determinedly along Pennsylvania Avenue with bands playing martial and religious music, 5,000 earnest women passed between solidly packed masses of humanity to emphasize their demand for suffrage through a constitutional amendment, while there were being enacted on the south steps of the Treasury building allegorical dances and tableaux interpreting the dreams and ambitions of militant womanhood.

And, further:

> Reaching a climax in a giant mass meeting in Memorial Continental Hall late this afternoon, the great suffrage demonstration will pass into history as the greatest bids for public support ever made by any body of people.

And, elsewhere on the front page:

> Trying their utmost to arouse enthusiasm for their cause, the suffragists lost no opportunity to press their arguments home. At every street corner suffrage orators delivered speeches, and all along Pennsylvania Avenue more than 50 girls "newsies" were at work selling suffrage newspapers, pamphlets, and magazines.

The assembly and demonstrations of March 1913, were followed up with another mobilization and rally in July of the same year. This time, the suffragists gathered in nearby Maryland and staged a motorcade into Washington, presenting woman suffrage petitions to the Congress and to President Wilson. Later, on January 10, 1917, the women began a month-long seige of the White House, braving the cruel elements through the winter, and eventually prevailing when the Congress passed the resolution proposing the 19th amendment which became effective in 1920. The 1917 campaign was highlighted by severe police action against suffragettes who picketed the White House. Several were arrested and given "workhouse" sentences; but this served mainly to gain sympathy and support for the movement in the form of waves of protest against this sort of treatment.

Ten years later, in 1923, the first race-related mass protest occurred in Washington. The brilliant Negro Army officer, Col. Charles Young, had died and was being buried at Arlington National Cemetery. Colonel Young was then the highest ranking Negro in the Nation's armed services and had been shunted off to an obscure oversea post, by President Wilson, to avoid promoting him to the rank of general—a promotion which he had obviously earned but which he would not have received solely because he was a Negro. A reported 50,000 persons lined the streets of Washington, during the funeral, in protest against the treatment received by Colonel Young and which led to his death as a heartbroken man who had devoted his entire life to the defense of his country.

Washington Post reporter, Jean White, has written recently that:

> As the Nation's Capital, Washington draws demonstrators who want to take their causes to the top. They have used the mass rally as well as the march to effect.

So it was in 1932 and 1933 when Armed Forces veterans marched in support of bonus legislation. The 1932 effort brought nearly 20,000 veterans and their families to the banks of the Potomac from which they were forcibly driven on instructions from President Hoover. The 1933 assembly was anticlimactic since a bonus bill had already passed and compensation was to be paid a year or so later. Both demonstrations were orderly and nonviolent, except for the administration's reaction in using Armed Forces to disperse the visitors.

Since that time, virtually all large-scale marches on Washington have been associated with the Negro's struggle for equality of opportunity and treatment. In 1939, approximately 75,000 persons, white and Negro, gathered at the Lincoln Memorial for a civil rights rally that grew out of the refusal of the Daughters of the American Revolution to permit Negro contralto, Marian Anderson, to give a concert in their Constitution Hall.

The first planned Negro mobilization was initiated by Negro labor leader, A. Philip Randolph. That march on Washington movement gained such wide support and posed such as ominous wartime threat to domestic peace and unity that President Franklin Roosevelt headed the mobilization off by issuing, in 1942, his famous fair employment practices order, Executive Order 8802. The same Mr. Randolph, commonly referred to as the "dean" and "elder statesman" among contemporary Negro leaders, is serving as principal national director of the march scheduled for next week. The 1941–42 operation is the subject of a book by Myer Kesselman, entitled "The Social Politics of FEP."

In 1949, 5,000 civil rights crusaders appeared in Washington and petitioned the Congress and President Truman for passage of a strong, major civil rights law. The following year, the NAACP staged a civil rights mobilization, to which most of its local branches sent certified delegates. Again, Congress and the President were urged to produce major civil rights legislation. A prayer pilgrimage, at which Dr. Martin Luther King was a principal speaker, brought over 20,000 demonstrators to Washington in support of the then proposed Civil Rights Act of 1957. The next year, a youth march on Washington movement, also supporting civil rights for Negroes, witnessed the assembly of more than 25,000 young Negro and white marchers. This was primarily a protest against the antics of Arkansas Gov. Orville Faubus, and the slowness of President Eisenhower to act against obstruction of desegregation at Little Rock's Central High School.

These 14 major demonstrations, involving several hundred thousand Americans over the years, have all been examples of the exercise of the right of petition by masses of people as compared with the more conventional, but not necessarily less effective, media and tactics of letters and visits to Congressmen and organized pressure group representation.

Except for the suffragette movement, all of the causes which produced marches on Washington were roundly criticized prior to, during, and after the demonstrations. The women's vote movement, however, was facilitated by a divided press, a part of which supported their drive for the elective franchise and was generous with its space in reporting either objectively or favorably the various activities of the women. Coxey's Army was employed by the Republican press of the 1890's as a weapon against the Cleveland administration; while the Democratic Party papers of that time referred to the Coxeyites as "professional tramps."

The usual criticism focused on predictions of violence and lawlessness, most frequently attributable to the demonstrators. Some charges of anarchy and communism were levied against the Coxeyites and the bonus expeditionary force of the 1930's, even as the Communist "red herring" has been dragged again and again across the path of the legitimate Negro rights crusade.

More than anything else, however, it has been the failure of the Congress and the President to act positively to remove the evils which produced demonstrations which has been responsible for virtually all of the extremism which has attended these activities. The Coxeyites, in desperation for recourse to remedy, sparked unlawful seizures of private property from sympathizers who smarted at the movement's failure. Likewise, the direct action protests by contemporary civil rights advocates is, as President Kennedy has stated, a result of the Nation's responsible agencies and leaders having failed to alleviate and eliminate the evils of segregation and racial discrimination fast enough and fully enough. While deploring the necessity of having to "take to the streets" in protest against deprivation of rights, the

President nevertheless realizes that, under present conditions, that has been the only course open to Negroes and supporters of their movement for racial equality. He has reminded the Congress, including our own chamber, ladies and gentlemen, that we have done next to nothing in discharging our responsibilities to the Negroes of our Nation. He has made it clear, too, that unless we do act to pass a comprehensive and remedial civil rights law, we can expect even more local and national demonstrations of greater magnitude and with more serious threats of violence than we have yet witnessed.

The August 28 march on Washington is symbolic of the Negro's struggle for freedom which dates from the time Negro slavery was first introduced into the American Colonies, in 1619. It is indicative of the Negro's final drive to realize the full promise of democracy which has been withheld cruelly and deliberately from him over a 100-year period during which he has been teased with mere tastes of freedom. It has implications for the inevitable and ultimate realization of equality, in search of which the Negro will never again retreat or even moderate his attitude and approach.

A. Philip Randolph, principal director of the 1963 march, speaking to a group of Senators and Representatives 2 weeks ago, spoke the pure, unadulterated truth when he said that:

> There is an outcry [against racial injustice] from the longshoreman and the most educated doctor of philosophy, from the bottom of their hearts [saying] "I want to be free."

This is no hollow cry. It reflects the unrelenting determination, the complete dedication, the contagious resolve—the tenacity of the Negro people, singly and as a group, to achieve, at last, that measure of freedom and equality which the Constitution of the United States and the code of human decency dictate that they must and will attain.

But, to infer that this is only the Negro's fight is to lose sight of the larger context within which the equal rights social revolution is taking place. Does it alarm some of you, my distinguished colleagues, that I use the term "social revolution"? Are you disturbed, horrified, troubled or embarrassed by this terminology? I say this to you, it is a social revolution. The equal rights movement is effecting drastic and sudden changes in our society, yes, in our total civilization—changes which are so long overdue that the revolution for human status seems mild compared to what it might have been and what it will be if not consummated by corrective measures to that end. The inherent quality of man and the necessity of its being attained now is urgent. The cause can tolerate no further delay—cannot compromise with time or temper. The President realizes this and so do a majority of the Members of Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I appeal to you to examine your attitudes toward the August 28 march in term of the total cause of which that event is only a symbol. I urge you to take into consideration the fact that all men's civil and personal rights are of paramount importance at present; that they are not at all subject to being rationed at the will of some so-called master group. I ask you to accept the inevitable; not because it is inevitable in its accomplishment, but because it is right and no other course will protect the Negro or the Nation's future.

I leave you with the question which the late Walter White, former NAACP executive secretary, a God-fearing leader, made the title of his posthumously published survey of race relations in the United States—"How Far the Promised Land?" To that question, however, I submit the only answer that fits present circumstances. The promised land is here—now, awaiting only the complete and immediate removal, by our fellow Americans, of the racial fence which has surrounded it and kept Negroes out for over 300 years.

SHEVCHENKO CHAMPION OF LIBERTY STAMP AND THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL IN WASHINGTON

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 21, 1963, groundbreaking ceremonies will be held in the Nation's Capital for the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. The event will take place on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW. Less than a year hence, specifically on Saturday, May 30, 1964, the unveiling of the statue will occur.

All this is in accordance with Public Law 86-749, which the 86th Congress enacted in August 1960. The Department of the Interior, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, has given this historic project its complete and superlative support. In addition, both the Commission on the Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission have given their warm approval to the proposed memorial.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 174

The 86th Congress performed an invaluable service to our national interest when it legislated the act permitting all Americans to honor the works and achievements of Shevchenko. This name is a historic symbol of freedom throughout Eastern Europe. Shevchenko wrote and worked in behalf of all the captive nations in the Tsarist Russian Empire. He fought not only for the independence of his own beloved Ukraine, but also for the national freedom of all the captive non-Russian nations in that empire. The spirit of his fight lives forcefully and brightly in the hearts of all the freedom-loving peoples in Eastern Europe today, who are under the yoke of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonialists. It was little wonder that in 1960-61 Moscow and its puppets reacted vehemently and viciously against our congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress can properly crown this whole action by offering its support to the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in further honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth, which, significantly, falls in 1964 when we shall witness the unveiling of his statue. Such broad congressional support for a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp would again demonstrate to the captive nations of Eastern Europe that the United States has no intention of remaining silent about their present captivity and their future liberation and freedom. The peoples of Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland, Georgia, Hungary, Armenia, East Germany and many other captive non-Russian nations will find their hopes revived and strengthened by this indicative action.

It has been my privilege to submit House Joint Resolution 174 which provides for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp in 1964. It would be most appropriate and also telling, to have such a stamp issued on the day the statue of this Ukrainian nationalist patriot is unveiled in this Capital of the free world. The compelling reasons for this issuance are well set forth in the joint resolution.

For the benefit of my colleagues I request that the full text of House Joint Resolution 174 be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, in the event that some may not be familiar with Shevchenko, I ask that the article by Robert J. Lewis on "An Idea Oversold?" which appeared in the October 28, 1962, issue of the Sunday Star and which vividly portrays the initial reaction of unfamiliarity, be printed in the RECORD. In addition, I request that the letter of support for House Joint Resolution 174 written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky in behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America also be printed. Finally, to give the broader picture of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism and the pertinence of my proposal to the captive status of Ukraine, I ask that following the above items, the recent lecture delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University be printed in the RECORD. Titled "Problems of Russian Communism," the lecture was given at the Institute on Communism at Central Missouri State College.

The resolution, article, letter, and address follow:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 174

Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his birth.

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate, by authorizing the erection of a monument to him on public grounds in Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas the same Congress provided for a documentary biography of Shevchenko in tribute to the everlasting spirit and works of this freedom fighter of Europe; and

Whereas the unremitting condemnations and attacks by imperialist Moscow and its colonial puppets against these farseeing acts clearly prove the wisdom of the U.S. Government in properly claiming this contemporary of Lincoln as one of freedom's outstanding lights; and

Whereas in 1961 the President of the United States paid respects to the ideals and immortal teachings of this former serf, whose poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the forty-five million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence; and

Whereas the profound humanism of this champion of liberty was courageously directed against the colonial subjugation of all the non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, as well as against the suppression of the Jews and the slavery of Negroes; and

Whereas in consonance with the policy of the United States it is both proper and fitting to advance the aspirations for freedom and independence of all nations by honoring their historic advocates of human liberty, and thus forging indissoluble spiritual ties with the respective peoples; and

Whereas by all evidence the Champion of Liberty stamp series has become an important and essential vehicle of expression in the formation and strengthening of such ties; and

Whereas in 1964 friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Shevchenko's birth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is requested and authorized to issue a champion of liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, fighter for freedom in Eastern Europe. Such stamp shall be of such denomination and design and shall be issued for such period commencing in 1964 with the one hundred and fiftieth Shevchenko anniversary as the Postmaster General shall determine.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 28, 1962]

AN IDEA OVERSOLD?

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The affair of the Shevchenko statue showed, this week, that any idea can be oversold.

Until a few days ago, we had never heard the name Taras Shevchenko.

It bobbed up very quietly and—to us, at least—somewhat mysteriously. On a sheet of paper, we read:

"Taras Shevchenko statue—Commission approval of a site requested." It was on the list of matters to come before the National Capital Planning Commission last Thursday.

With the newspapers full of the news of Soviet activity in Cuba, we were a bit startled to see this item on the agenda.

A new statue to be erected to the memory of a Russian in Washington? How come? And why, at this particular time?

These, in a general way, were the kind of questions that crossed our mind.

We also got to thinking that here was just the kind of thing to turn Secretary of the Interior Udall apoplectic again. Hadn't he said Washington has too many statues already? If he didn't like the old statues of such American patriots as Dr. Benjamin Rush and William Jennings Bryan, what would he say about a new statue of Taras Shevchenko?

As it turned out, these preconceptions about both Taras Shevchenko and Mr. Udall were dead wrong.

In the first place, Mr. Shevchenko was not a Russian at all. He was a native of the Ukraine, a separate country now, within the Soviet Union in somewhat the same way that Algeria once was a part of Metropolitan France.

In the second place, Secretary Udall's own aids had chosen a site for a Shevchenko statue. It was the Secretary, himself, who was asking the planning commission to give approval so the memorial could be built.

Beyond all that, Taras Shevchenko—poet laureate of his native land—was one of the world's most notable symbols of man's desire to be free.

Ever since his death, 101 years ago, his writings have helped keep alive the desire of Ukrainians for personal liberty—and for national independence.

Just 2 years ago, Congress directed Secretary Udall to select a site for a memorial to this man who—said a joint resolution of the House and Senate—"was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land."

In deciding there should be a memorial in Washington to Shevchenko, Congress was making clear to the Ukrainian people—and to the world in general—that it was honoring a contemporary of our own Abraham Lincoln. It was demonstrating another value of statutes, too, for statues commemorate ideas as well as men.

In a congressional publication (H. Doc. No. 445, 86th Cong.) entitled "Taras Shevchenko: Europe's Freedom Fighter," there appears this statement:

"One need only to delve into the record of the anti-Communist and anti-imperialist resistance on the part of the Ukrainian nation from 1918 to the present date in order to grasp the full meaning of Shevchenko. In the incessant cold war, it is vitally important for us, in favor of our own American interests, to symbolize in every respect our friendship and spiritual affinity with the large Ukrainian nation."

At Thursday's meeting, the planning commission somehow knew less about the congressional document than about Secretary Udall's earlier opposition to statues. Members didn't seem to understand why another statue was needed now when, all along, Mr. Udall had been saying there was an overabundance of them.

So that site he chose in Rock Creek Park, just east of the P Street bridge, was not approved. Which goes to show that even opposition to statues can sometimes be carried too far. Even Mr. Udall would probably now agree to that.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., August 14, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: In behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its membership I warmly express our profoundest gratitude for your strong sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174 which provides for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. You have our complete support and backing in this extremely important cultural project.

Next month, in accordance with Public Law 86–749, ground-breaking ceremonies will take place on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW., Washington, D.C., in preparation for the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue next year. This event on September 21, 1963, will appropriately feature your splendid action in behalf of Ukraine's poet laureate and Europe's freedom fighter.

With 1964 as the occasion of the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth, we enthusiastically look forward to the issuance of the Champion of Liberty stamp in his honor at the time of the statue's unveiling. Congress in its wisdom saw fit to provide for the erection of a statue honoring this great adversary of traditional Russian imperialism. We sincerely hope the present administration will similarly honor his historic contributions to national and human freedom in Eastern Europe by arranging for the stamp issue on May 30, 1964, the unveiling date. This would, by itself, be an enormous contribution to peace and understanding between our country and the 45 million people of the Ukrainian nation, not to mention millions of others in Eastern Europe.

In deep appreciation and with warmest regards,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

PROBLEMS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

(Lecture by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University)

Every body politic has problems. This has always been; it will always be. We in the United States are beset with a full spectrum of problems, ranging from a shot to the moon to the employment of every willing and able worker. The Soviet Union has even greater problems, not only those normally associated with day-to-day existence in a developing industrial society but also—indeed more so—those created by the totalitarian goals, drives, and energies of what is commonly called Russian communism.

In a valid sense, then the problems of Russian communism, totalitarian in nature and scope, constitute an additional layer to the everyday problems engulfing those who are directly or indirectly under the influence of Moscow. Yes, there are problems of juvenile delinquency, skilled labor shortages, alcoholism, urban development and a host of other socio-economic phenomena as there are here and in numerous other countries. But to pose these as the distinctive, direct problems of Russian communism would mean to lose sight of the forest because of the trees. To be sure, in any totalitarian framework the impact of broader, overall problems is felt in the lower range of particular, day-to-day problems—creating some, sustaining others, and intensifying most. But to comprehend as best we could the total, integrated picture of the problems of Russian communism, it is necessary to distinguish between the truly totalistic problems and the particular derivative problems, with primary concentration on the former.

On this methodological note, permit me to congratulate most warmly those responsible for this Institute on Communism and also to felicitate you on your serious study of communism and all that it involves. In substance, there is no greater contribution to the continued growth, security, and enlightened leadership of our Nation than this, a forum of discussion and exchanged ideas about a phenomenon that unremittingly threatens the values and foundations of our civilization. For the survival of these values it is imperative that we come to understand the nature of this threat and the paramount problems our chief adversary seeks to resolve for our destruction.

Methodically, then, for us to view the picture of the problems of Russian communism as an integrated whole, we shall survey six selective categories, each in turn predicating a variety of interrelated problems. More, to assess the meaning of these aggregate problems both for the achievement of Moscow's goals and the realization of capable responses on our part, we shall throughout stress their operational significance in the context of traditional Russian cold war activity. A more detailed elaboration of this operational dimension will be given on my second round here.

THE IDEOLOGICO-PROPAGANDA PROBLEM

The six problem areas for our analysis are: (1) the ideologico-propaganda (2) the imperio-colonial (3) the economic area (4) the military-space field (5) the party apparatus and (6) Soviet Russian totalitarianism. Let us consider the first, the ideologico-propaganda. The strength of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda drive is admitted as being superior by most students of the subject. Moscow's tremendous feat in this all-encompassing area is the sustained impression and opinion generated in too many parts of the free world that a new way of life, a new philosophy, and new methods and operations of social order are represented by the Soviet Union and other sectors of Moscow's empire. The way of life is socialism in transition to communism; the philosophy is Marxism-Leninism with unspecified revisions now and then; and the new methods and operations are ostensibly the products of a planned economy. Our personalist way of life, our democratic philosophy, and our capitalist methods and operations stand in contradiction to these essentials of so-called Soviet society.

With his grandiloquence and constant babble Khrushchev has enlarged this ideologico-propaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of "peaceful coexistence" which, by definition, means cold war and eventual Soviet Russian takeover right down the line. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the new order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

To prevent this, we spend considerable time, capital and energy in the simple belief that we are fighting international communism or, at best, Communist imperialism. Clouding up the situation further is the notion that our adversary is "the Soviets"—mind you, councils of workers and peasants. No one will deny here that to confuse, deceive, and distract your chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally spurious ideologies of superreligious Orthodoxy and racist Pan-Slavism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

We have uncritically accepted this and inadvertently impute philosophic respectability and dignity to what is essentially not the ideology but the mythology of communism. The pendulumic swings of attitude in the United States, viewing the Russians as 4-footers at one time and then 11-footers at another, indicate both our uncertainty of knowledge and susceptibility to Moscow's manipulation of half or isolated truths. On the one hand, we deprecate Moscow's activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as mere propaganda, while, on the other hand, we complain that our story is not reaching the university students and the peoples of these areas. We have still to appreciate the central importance and significance of propaganda in the cold war. The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky and other practical psychologists have remarkably developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as a prime contender to the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the problems of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda are deep and fundamental. These have been time and time disclosed by experience and events, not theory or speculation. How often have you heard about Communist indoctrination of the youth and a captive population? Well, after 20 years of so-called indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting "Russky go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom.

Month after month, Pravda and Izvestia hammer away at the need for heavy indoctrination in the schools, in the armed services, and in the republics to overcome what is in effect hollow babbitry. On Lenin's birthday this year, B. N. Ponomaryov, the party historian and secretary of the Central Committee, delivered an address designed to justify Soviet Russian policy under Khrushchev. The basic principles of revolutionary theory, he said, "are loyalty toward Marxism-Leninism—determined struggle against any attempt to revise it; creative development of Marxism-Leninism—determined struggle against the dogmatic strangulation of the theory; indissoluble union between theory and practice, their organic unity within the scope of all party activities." In other words, like Lenin with Marx, Khrushchev can interpret Lenin as conditions warrant it.

These are only a few of the hundreds of examples proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology. Without iron, bamboo, and sugar curtains, walls, and the oppressive apparatus of totalitarian rule this existential bankruptcy would come into full bloom, the Hitlerian totalitarian and imperialist nature of so-called communism would be clear to all, this Trojan Horse of thought and weapon of deception with no basic relevancy to 19th century Marxism would become transparent even to the newly independent nations and peoples who know little about Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception chiefly because of our failure to recognize its own problems in waging this ideologico-propaganda offensive. Such development requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda—a forceful, well-planned propaganda of truth and fact—and also a grasp of the real nature of the threat stemming from Eastern Europe. Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. Worse still, the policies of USIA run counter to the task of recognizing and aggravating these problems in the U.S.S.R. For example, 5 years ago, by virtue of congressional hearings, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.[1] It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples under the heel of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism listen in the language of their Moscow captor.

The opportunities for projecting the ideologico-propaganda problems of Moscow are many. For one, we could easily show the theoretic Russian perversion of Marxism and the vacuity of so-called Communist ideology. Points on economic determinism, the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., the appeal to underdeveloped areas in the name of socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, surplus value, economic and colonial exploitation in the Soviet Union, state versus society, are only a few to establish the Russian mythology of communism. As one writer puts it, "Bolshevism evidently stems from the traditional messianic and universalist outlook of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia which fastened upon Marxism as an instrument of its own will to 'change the world'."[2] The fact is that Soviet Russian mythology is a Comtean impulse to reorganize wholesale the societies of other nations in the image of backward and barbarian Russian institutions.[3] The combination of oppressive institutions and modern technology, the latter largely the creation of the West, has produced a mythology which in every fundamental respect is Hitlerian totalitarianism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule. Make no mistake about this. This is not a matter of academic theorization and speculation. As I'll show in connection with our second area, it has been successfully tested and, indeed, more tests are in order so that this fundamental truth would be ingrained in the minds of our people and the people of the world. It is scarcely comforting to learn, alas, that we are fighting against a mythology, but it is reassuring to know that along with all the captive nations in Moscow's empire we have pierced through the mythological facade of communism to the real enemy, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. The evidence on Moscow's deep sensitivity to this penetration is more than abundant.

Our most powerful weapon against this last remaining empire in the world is the ideology, the system of ideas and truths, embodied in our own Declaration of Independence. About 10 years ago we called for a universalization of the Declaration, aimed particularly at the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.[4] The evidence of this past decade proves the soundness of this position. However, when we find Secretary of State Rusk declaring in a letter to the House Rules Committee in August 1961, that Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union," meaning, in effect, that we should not disturb Moscow's eminent domain over these captive areas, we cannot but wonder about the understanding and vision of some of our leaders, many of whom are today seeking a nonaggression pact with Moscow and a virtual sellout of the captive nations.[5] Three months later Ambassador Stevenson in a U.N. declaration talks about an "independent Ukrainian Republic," about an Armenia that "declared its independence" in 1918, about "the independent state of Georgia."[6] It is such confusion of thought that inhibits us from recognizing the problem Moscow has in shielding its backward imperio-colonialism with Marxist ideology. It is such cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains, and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known."[7]

THE IMPERIO-COLONIAL PROBLEM

Well, how about Soviet Russian imperialism? The second general area of Moscow's foremost problems is its tremendous empire. Contrary to much current wishful thinking about Red China, Albania, and Rumania, about "the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc," the Soviet Russian empire continues to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic coordination, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

---

[1] "Review of U.S. Information Agency," Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 1958, Washington, D.C., pp. 102–122.

[2] Lichtheim, George. "Marxian, An Historical and Critical Study," New York, 1961, p. 398.

[3] Dobriansky, Lev E., "Veblenism, a New Critique," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 85–86.

[4] "Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1953.

[5] "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3583.

[6] "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3568.

[7] Salvador de Madariaga, Washington Post, May 26, 1961.

Since its accidental inception in 1917, Soviet Russia has reduced to captivity one non-Russian nation after another. The history of Soviet Russian conquest began with most of the nations now held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan and others—and this process, either directly or indirectly, continues in Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and elsewhere.[8] The most significant development in all areas of the empire is the emphasis placed on the old formula "national in form, socialist in content." To attract the instinctive nationalist forces in Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and elsewhere to the global ambitions of Moscow, the Russian totalitarians are accommodating themselves to the stress of national heroes and events of the past. In this they hope to prove that the future of these captive nations rests with them rather than "the imperialist powers" of the West. Moscow exploits past and present national grievances to its own advantage, constantly telling Poles and Ukrainians, for example, about the German atrocities of the past and constantly reminding Azerbaijani and Armenians about their claims against Iran and Turkey, respectively.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the internal captives within the Soviet Union and the outer captives outside it. Feelings of Pan-Slavism, religious orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Disagreement with Red China, Rumania or Albania is more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic disintegrative tendency.

What most of us fail to see is the fact that the present Sino-Russian rift is only another chapter in the long history of Communist Parties' conflicts. In the 1920's and 1930's, it was between the Russian Communist Party and many non-Russian Communist Parties of the present Republics in the U.S.S.R.; in the 1940's and 1950's between Moscow and Tito and Gomulka; now in the 1960's between Moscow and Peiping. And in all the ideological lash was used to express national interests. There really has never been a monolith in the Soviet Russian empire, whether in the U.S.S.R. itself or beyond. Thus, for example, whether in Georgia or Azerbaijan, Ukraine or Turkestan, Khrushchev often has tried to persuade the non-Russian nationals there that they are "free and independent." And these nationals amount to over half of U.S.S.R.'s 225 million population.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even graver problems at Stalin's death, during the Hungarian revolution, but it nonetheless continued to build up its composite power.

Yet ingrained in this imperial power and strength lies the most profound problem of the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists. This fundamental problem revolves about the immense latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism, both within and outside the Soviet Union. This problem is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile murdered.[9] It is this power of patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets, junior partners, and the prime power.

Despite the unmistakable clues given by Khrushchev himself, we have yet to translate this basic problem for general American understanding. The most important and conclusive test of my observation here is Khrushchev's haunting fear of any implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U-2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Our President and others have spoken in behalf of some of the captive nations before 1959, but this produced no sensitive reaction from Moscow. It was only when Congress included all the captive nations, meaning the majority of them in the Soviet Union, that Khrushchev and his puppets exploded. And they have been erupting over this ever since because they know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

Just a few examples on this. In the Soviet Russian weekly, the New Times, a question was hard pressed last January 23, "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question." From 1957 to the present Moscow's cardinal objective has been American acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe and Asia. This is the prime motive behind Khrushchev's insistence on a nonaggression pact to smooth the way for Moscow's controlled exploitation of nationalist forces throughout Eurasia. Whether we'll assist him with this fundamental problem is the momentous question of our day.

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

Turning now to the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure, and increasingly threatening. The usual comparisons about their surpassing us in this or that are of barren meaning, a source of much economic illusion. The U.S.S.R. economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about 40 percent of our gross national product, with an industrial output of about 50 percent of ours and requiring over 20 percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by one-third and requiring 40 percent of their labor force as against 10 percent of ours, with available goods and services only 33 percent of ours and on a per capita basis only 25 percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth being experienced by them, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy. However, being a totalitarian and essentially a cold war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as $12 to $20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot "liberation" war purposes.

Problems in this unbalanced economy are many, but most fundamental are the disparities of real income and status between the new class of the ruling elite and party functionaries and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic, colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. What the average factory worker in the United States receives in 1 week—a little over $100—exceeds the average monthly wage in the U.S.S.R., about $85.

Although living standards have improved in the last 6 years, they are far below those of any modern industrial economy. The shortage of adequate housing space, not to mention facilities, remains acute; and if the present 7-year plan succeeds, the average family in a large city would have about the same living space in 1965 that its forebears had in 1917. In 1961, upon announcing the 20-year-draft plan, Khrushchev promised that by 1980 every newly married couple could expect a private apartment of its own.

Such basic maladjustments exist throughout this cold war-oriented economy—in industrial and agricultural production, transportation, communications, distribution, and economic organization. No doubt there are units in each that compare efficiently and brilliantly with the best plants we have. But unless we are wont to be deceived by Russian economic potemkinism, every sphere lacks depth and proportionality in what for years has been a capital overstrained economy. This strain showed itself in 1961 with a marked decrease in the growth rate, that in 1962 is estimated to have been less than 4 percent.

To relieve this strain, to meet consumer expectations in some degree, and yet to pursue the cold war under the cover of "peaceful coexistence" is Moscow's present objective. This forms part of the explanation for its signing the limited nuclear test-ban treaty. It also explains its accommodation of national pressures for coordination as against integration in the planning activities of Comecon.

In combination with these problems, the pressures exerted by the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. for a greater take in the economic pie represent nationalist resistance to Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. Moscow is now decrying "localism" and has launched another economic reorganization that has all the marks of Russification for the Baltic, Caucasian, and Turkestan areas. These basic problems deserve our concentrated cold war attention.

Again, to cite an example, there are today some 40 resolutions in the House Rules Committee calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.[10] One of the main objectives of this committee would be to study and make known the scope and depth of Moscow's economic colonialism in the Soviet Union. These measures seek to implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution, but so far the leadership and the administration have resisted such a step, this despite all the evidence of Moscow's troubled concern over such implementations.[11]

THE MILITARY-SPACE PROBLEMS

Contributing to the capital overstrain in the U.S.S.R. economy are the military-space problems facing Moscow. The general and specific strength of the U.S.S.R. in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching in dollar volume our total military expenditures, over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow has, as we know, made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration. In all these areas the technologic achievements are basically and almost entirely Western. They have little or nothing to do with so-called socialist economy or Communist pretension. Their further development poses, nevertheless, certain dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying the military power of the imperio-colonial tyrant.

---

[8] Dobriansky, Lev E., "History of Communist Aggression," report, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1961, pp. 14–22.

[9] George Vine, "I Killed for Russia," the Daily Mail, London, Nov. 18, 1961.

[10] "Action On The Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, pp. 15376–15378.

[11] See "Russian Colonialism And the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3518–3544.

Behind the military technocracy in the U.S.S.R., which for general economic reasons will be somewhat shortened soon, lie deep problems that no amount of nuclear blackmail or military display can hide. Before World War I the Russian czar virtually terrorized the capitals of Western Europe with the threat of the great Russian "steamroller," the vast imperial forces of the Russian Empire. Today, following in the paved traditions of Russian cold war diplomacy, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of nuclearitis as an excuse for the absence of a well defined and developed cold war policy.[12]

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent problems in the armed services of the U.S.S.R. Complete and striking military power is not just a conglomeration of new weapons. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties, and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multinational forces of the Russian Empire, whether czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. In the Russo-Japanese and the two World Wars political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations accounted for this record. About 43 percent of U.S.S.R.'s armed forces is non-Russian and despite the fact that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. calls for separate Republic war ministries, troops are carefully intermixed and dispersed.

Our capitalization of this deep-seated problem rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. Disarmament in the realistic context of the cold war is a political myth. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward toward cold war victory is by attaining to unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry. Our economy can flexibly accommodate this; the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. cannot. In space, we already enjoy an overall superiority. As in so many other respects, the Russians potemkinize their firsts and demonstrate in time their lack of depth. There is no commonsense reason why we or the free world should cooperate and share our space discoveries with the Russian totalitarians. Whether we like it or not, even space is not excludible from the Russian cold war matrix.

THE PARTY APPARATUS

Another major problem area is the party apparatus. Not unlike the Nazi Party under Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some 9 million in the party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the party consists of members with families, relatives, and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the party. And these number well over 25 million. The party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the empire and for subversive conspiracy beyond it.

However, it is not without problems that, along with others, could not be worked on. The perennial problem of succession, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Urkaine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one problem as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But it will be noted that involved in each of these major problems is the basic cross-sectional problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Can you now understand why for 4 years Khrushchev and his puppets have been violently attacking the Captive Nations Week resolution?

SOVET RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

The final and perhaps cardinal problem of Russian communism is the maintenance of its nexus between Soviet Russian expansionism and internal totalitarianism. The former continues unabated by push and accomplishment, as in the case of Cuba. And, contrary to the false notion of progressive mellowism in the U.S.S.R., the latter is kept intact. Aside from terrorism, the totalitarian reins in the U.S.S.R. are as strong as ever. There is no evidence of any democratization under Khrushchev, and allowable criticism is more administrative than institutional. As Khrushchev said in 1957, "I * * * would to goodness every Communist could fight as Stalin fought." Logically, to allow any institutional democratization, Moscow would be consigning its whole imperial structure, including the U.S.S.R., to limbo. But this logic is no reason for us to hesitate in the enlargement of this problem by actively generating pressures within the U.S.S.R. toward the civil and political freedoms of the Russian people and the national freedoms of the non-Russian nations.

In short, the permanence of the cold war and the basic fixity of Soviet Russian totalitarianism are indispensable requisites to the preservation of Moscow's imperial domain, within and beyond the U.S.S.R. A limited nuclear test ban treaty is not even a shaft of light pointing to any cessation of the cold war. In fact, as Moscow proceeds to put its house in order by solving the major problems described here and with the Sino-Russian imperialist rift deepening, we can look forward to more intense cold war efforts in the free world—this, of course, under the banner of "peaceful coexistence."

NEED FOR GENERAL LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RESERVED MINERAL RIGHTS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the sale, by the Secretary of the Interior, to the surface owners of land, certain mineral interests reserved to the United States. The particular mineral interests, which are administered by the Secretary of the Interior, were reserved to the United States when lands that had been acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the resettlement laws, and emergency relief appropriations acts of the 1930's were sold.

From time to time we have had private bills before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of this body to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell the reserved mineral interests in this circumstance to a particular owner of the surface. Three such bills have been reported favorably by our committee during this Congress, two have passed the House, and the third (S. 1154) is on the Consent Calendar.

In order to avoid a multiplicity of individual bills in this category, I have introduced a general bill. My bill would confer authority on the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the surface owner the mineral interests I have described above but only on condition that, first, there is no U.S. mineral lease outstanding; second, the conveyance is made on payment of fair market value; and third, the purchaser, in addition to the purchase price, reimburses the Government for its administrative cost in making the conveyance.

A further examination of the background will, I submit, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate the desirability of this general legislation. I have been informed that under the Bankhead Jones Farm Tenant Act there was a requirement that the United States retain a 75-percent interest in the mineral rights. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture, by regulation, required that, in a disposal of lands at resettlement projects and of land acquired pursuant to emergency relief measures, a determination be made of whether the lands have a mineral potential and, if so, to reserve all the mineral interests.

At this point we should understand that the lands involved were originally privately owned and came into Government ownership pursuant to the various assistance programs that I have referred to, that were designed to help in the stabilization of our economy during the depression of the 1930's. Having acquired the land, there was a fear that windfall benefits might accrue to purchasers from the Government if the mineral interest was not reserved to the United States.

However, in 1950, realizing that the reservation of the mineral interests in the United States impeded utilization of the lands, Congress, by the act of September 6, 1950—64 Stat. 769—established a 7-year period for the sale of mineral interests reserved or acquired by the United States or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation under programs administered by the Resettlement Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Specific provision was made for the transfer of the mineral interests for $1 in areas where "there is no active mineral development or leasing." At the end of the 7-year period the mineral interests still retained by the United States under the aforementioned programs were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior "to be administered under the mineral laws of the United States."

---

[12] E.g., text of President's news conference, the Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1962, Washington, D.C.

In hearings before the Interior Committee, we have been advised that in connection with programs of the Farmers Home Administration there were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior mineral interests in approximately 3,800 tracts and that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation transferred approximately 9,900 mineral interests for administration by the Interior Department—the Farmers Home Administration having disposed of mineral interests in approximately 5,900 tracts and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation having disposed of mineral interests in approximately 8,552 tracts.

I realize that it is speculative, but my guess is that, in the areas where there was no mineral activity, the people did not think that the mineral interests reserved by the United States presented an impediment to their title or use of the property. Now we find, in the cases that have come before our committee, the changing uses of land have made some of the farms valuable for development in other ways. As a result, the outstanding mineral reservation in the United States effectively precludes financing because a lending institution is naturally hesitant to loan money for the construction of a building that might have to give way for mineral development, even though the likelihood of such development is remote.

Another thing that we have found is that owners of the surface were not always aware of the right to purchase reserved minerals during the 1950–57 period.

It is submitted that it is fair and logical, as well as in the economic interest of the country, to encourage lands to be developed and utilized for their highest and best use. Accordingly, there is no reason for the United States to continue to hold the mineral interests in privately owned land where there are no minerals being developed.

The bill I have introduced today will permit the sale of the mineral interests to the surface owner in any case that was authorized for sale in the act of September 6, 1950, subject to the restriction that the sale would not be allowed if, in the meantime, the United States had entered into a mineral lease. Finally, Mr. Speaker, my bill protects the interest of the United States by requiring payment of full market value plus reimbursement of the Government costs.

ISRAEL ASKS U.N. TO MEET ON SYRIA

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Near East on the Israel-Syrian border at the Israel border settlement at Almagor are a matter of concern.

This morning, there are reports that the United Arab Republic has placed its armed forces on "emergency alert" and that Iraq has placed her armed forces "under Syrian command."

It is my understanding that Gen. Odd Bull, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization is in Damascus today and that in New York the Security Council is being polled as to the advisability of calling a meeting of the Security Council.

It is my hope that the United States will urge a prompt calling of the Council to ascertain the facts concerning the Syrian ambush of Israelis—fatal to two—Monday night; the subsequent exchange of fire on the border and the aerial incident of Tuesday. It would be my hope that the Council would also assess responsibility for the violation or violators of the armistice agreement involved.

Prompt action by the Security Council could be central to keeping the peace and to the prevention of the escalation of this situation into serious hostilities.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1963]

Israel Asks U.N. To Meet on Syria—Appeals to Council To Curb "Aggression" on Border

(By W. Granger Blair)

Jerusalem (Israeli Sector), August 20—Israel accused Syria of aggression today and asked the United Nations Security Council to meet in urgent session.

Syrian and Israeli forces exchanged fire throughout the afternoon in the area of Ashmura, a border farm settlement in the demilitarized zone 10 miles north of the Sea of Galilee.

The army announced that two Israeli Mirage Jet fighters had attacked and damaged one of at least six Syrian MIG–17 jets that entered Israeli airspace over the demilitarized zone on the southeast shore of the Sea of Galilee. It was the first time the Mirages, recently acquired from France, had seen combat.

The Cabinet met to consider "a grave threat to peace" in the area, Haim Yahil, director general of the Foreign Ministry, said at a news conference tonight: "We feel there is a real danger to peace if the Syrian actions do not stop."

The Government acted after two Israelis were killed yesterday by Syrian armed forces that apparently entered Israeli territory in the Jordan Valley just north of the Sea of Galilee.

The emergency Cabinet session was brief. When it ended, the Government instructed its delegation at the United Nations to request the Security Council session, citing a "grave act of aggression by Syrian armed forces."

Mr. Yahil asserted that "urgent action" by the United Nations was "absolutely essential" if a more serious situation was to be averted.

ACCEPTANCE IS CONDITIONAL

As a step to restoring peace on Israel's northern frontier with Syria, Lt. Gen. Odd Bull, head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, proposed to Israel today that the United Nations inspect the length of the Israeli-Syrian frontier to a depth of 6¼ miles on each side of the border. The object would be to ascertain if there have been military concentrations in violation of the Israeli-Syrian armistice agreement.

Israel accepted the proposal tonight on condition that simultaneous inspection take place in the Syrian zone. The Syrian reply to the proposal had not yet been received by General Bull, according to sources.

Mrs. Golda Meir, Israel's Foreign Minister, received Ambassador Vincente Gerbasi of Venezuela and Spencer Barnes, chargé d'affaires of the United States Embassy, to inform them of the situation and to ask urgent action by the United Nations.

The United States and Venezuela are members of the Security Council. Mrs. Meir will meet the diplomatic representatives of eight of the nine other countries on the Council tomorrow. The ninth is Morocco, a Moslem state without representation in Israel.

Syrians Report Battle

Damascus, Syria, August 20.—A machinegun battle lasting 2¼ hours broke out on the Syrian-Israeli border today as 15 Israeli armored vehicles opened fire on Syrian outposts, an army spokesman announced.

He said Syria had filed an urgent complaint with the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

Session Expected This Week

United Nations, N.Y., August 20.—A meeting of the Security Council is expected to be called for Thursday or Friday to act on Israel's complaint against Syria, United Nations sources said today. The possibility was seen that Syria might bring a countercharge against Israel.

The last time the Security * * * a flareup of Syrian-Israeli troubles was in March 1962, when the uneasy peace along the border erupted into an open clash, also in the Galilee area.

APPEALS HELD FUTILE

In recent years, Israel has tended to look on appeals to the Council as futile since any resolution unfriendly to the Arab States would be vetoed by the Soviet Union.

The new request to the Council was viewed here partly as a reflection of increased internal pressure on the government of Premier Levi Eshkol to deal firmly with the Syrian situation. The government apparently is also mindful of the criticism that has been directed at Israel in the past for taking reprisal measures rather than appealing to the Council.

The present appeal would serve at least to call world attention to the Syrian situation, even if more effective measures were blocked by Soviet veto.

The Council session will be the 1,057th to deal with some facet of the troubles between Israel and the Arab nations since the signing of the armistice agreements in 1949. Technically, a state of war still exists.

Backing of United States Sought

Washington, August 20.—Israel called on the United States tonight to support its request for an emergency session of the United Nations Security Council. Avraham Harman, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, made the request during a meeting with Howard R. Cottam, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs

State Department sources indicated that the United States was in favor of a Security Council meeting.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1963]

Nasser's Forces Are Put on Alert at Israel Border

Cairo, August 21.—The armed forces of the United Arab Republic were put on an emergency alert today to face "Israeli aggression against Syria," the Middle East News Agency reported tonight.

The Arab League was consulting on a "unified Arab plan" following receipt of a note on what Damascus called "Israeli aggression" from the Syrian Foreign Ministry, the agency reported.

Meanwhile, Maj. Gen. Odd Bull, Norwegian chief of staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine, arrived in Damascus from Jordan to discuss the subject of the border clashes with Syrian authorities. A United Nations spokesman said the border situation was quiet during the day.

In Amman, Jordan, Premier Sherif Hussein ben Nasser said his country always considered the armistice border between Arab countries and Israel an Arab defense line and any aggression would be considered a collective act against the Arab world.

Syria Gets Iraqi Aid

Damascus, Syria, August 21.—Iraq placed her armed forces today under Syrian command to support Syria in the armed crisis with Israel.

Reports from Baghdad said that the Iraqi Government had placed territory adjoining Syria under military emergency.

Iraq's forces in this area, west of the Euphrates River, have been put on alert to answer any call for their service from Syria.

The Syrian Premier, Salah elBitar, called in the Ambassadors of the United Nations Security Council members—including those of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France—and gave them Syria's version of the air and land battles that flared along the armistice line yesterday.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the Syrian Government also sent a telegram to the Arab League in Cairo demanding a unified Arab stand behind Syria to face "all possible eventualities" along the 70-mile demarcation line.

Syria and Iraq are parties to the Arab League Joint Defense and Economic Cooperation Treaty. The treaty says that armed aggression against one of its parties is to be considered as aggression against them all. Other members of the Arab League include the United Arab Republic, Lebanon and Yemen.

Syria called the border tension and yesterday's fighting "premeditated Israel aggression."

The United Arab Republic, despite its political feud with Syria, already has pledged support against Israel. Jordan and Saudi Arabia set aside their longstanding differences with Damascus to promise support.

The Iraqi gesture seemed to signify moral support more than military assistance. More than half of Iraq's army and a substantial part of her air force already are committed to war against rebellious Kurdish tribes in northern Iraq.

Whether Iraq could actually spare soldiers or planes to move into Syria was questionable.

The diplomatic moves came a day after Israeli and Syrian jet fighters battled over the tense truce line north of the Sea of Galilee. Ground forces also exchanged fire.

Iraqi Forces on Alert

Beirut, Lebanon, August 21.—Iraq placed her armed forces in a state of alert today with orders to be ready to move immediately to assist Syria against Israel if the need arose.

A statement by the Iraqi Revolutionary Council broadcast by the Baghdad radio said: "Israeli aggression against our sister Syria cannot be tolerated." The council, the highest authority in the country, declared that it was placing Iraqi troops at the disposal of the Syrian Revolutionary Council.

The Iraqi Defense Minister, Brig. Saleh Mahdi Anash, put all military airports west of the Euphrates River, the area bordering Syria, in a state of emergency. All aircraft at these airports were ordered to be at the runways and ready to take off immediately.

Brig. Abdel Ghani Rawi was appointed commander in chief of all Iraqi forces west of the Euphrates.

Israel Warns of Retaliation

(By W. Granger Blair)

Jerusalem, (Israel Sector), August 21.—Israel will forcefully retaliate against Syria if there is "one more serious incident" along the northern border between the two countries.

This was reported on reliable authority to be the position of the Israeli Government in the wake of Israel's charge of aggression against Syria. It followed the border killing of two Israelis, both 19 years old, in an ambush on Israel soil Monday night.

Israel has called for an urgent session of the United Nations Security Council. She is understood to want a strong and speedy condemnation of Syria on the ambush charge.

Yesterday, Israeli and Syria forces exchanged fire all afternoon in the demilitarized zone 10 miles north of the Sea of Galilee. The Israelis said their jets attacked and damaged a Syrian jet in Israel airspace.

FRONTIER IS QUIET

The Israel-Syrian frontier was quiet today, but diplomatic and political activity was intense.

Foreign Minister Golda Meir, who had seen the United States and Venezuelan diplomatic representatives yesterday, saw representatives of seven of the remaining nine member nations of the Security Council today.

The two she did not see were those of Nationalist China and Morocco. Neither of these Governments has diplomatic missions in Israel. Mrs. Meir conveyed the Israel position to the diplomats she saw.

The foreign affairs and security committee of the Knesset (Parliament) met in urgent session today to discuss the situation.

According to a Government statement, it was stressed during the committee discussion that "if the Security Council does not fulfill ts duty to take steps to stop the agression, Israel will consider it their duty to act in accordance with her right of self-defense that is reserved to every soverign state."

A list of 98 alleged instances of border harassments by Syrians between December 4 and yesterday has been prepared by the Government for the Security Council. The Israeli will also condemn the Syrian seizure July 13 of six excursionists—three Israelis and three Belgians—on the Sea of Galilee.

The Belgians have been released but protracted negotiations to obtain freedom for the Israelis have so far been unsuccessful.

ADMISSION TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include a letter from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 7, 1963, on the floor of the House of Representatives, I discussed information which had come to members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee regarding certain recommendations to change the procedures for admittance to the service academies. Yesterday I received a letter from Adam Yarmolinsky of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in which he states that he at no time has recommended that "college board exams and the other required examinations for admittance to the Academy be set aside so that special examinations could be given in order to afford preferential entrance treatment." It is now my understanding that Mr. Yarmolinsky's recommendation merely related to the establishment of special classes and special tutoring so that all groups who have been deprived of equal educational opportunities would have an opportunity to compete on an equal basis in the academies' open competitive examinations.

I appreciate very much receiving this information from Mr. Yarmolinsky and ask unanimous consent that his letter addressed to me on August 15, 1963, may appear at this point in the Record.

Office of the Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1963.
Hon. Melvin Laird,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Laird: Last Tuesday, on the floor of the House you said, "It was just 2 years ago that Adam Yarmolinsky made a recommendation to the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel that the procedures for admittance to the service academies, particularly Annapolis, be changed so that the college board exams and the other required examinations for admittance to the Academy be set aside so that special examinations could be given in order to afford preferential entrance treatment."

I can assure you that I have never made any such recommendation. I have checked the matter with Admiral Smedberg, who confirms my recollection. In fact, my position has always been that Negroes and whites should be measured by the same standards in open competition. In my own writing, I have deprecated the use of special examinations, and suggested rather that Negroes and other Americans who have been deprived of equal educational opportunities should be given additional instruction and motivation, where possible, at the secondary school level in order to prepare them to compete at the college level.

I should, appreciate it if you would correct the Record on this point.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

Adam Yarmolinsky.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE FIFTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the Speaker state what the situation is now with respect to the foreign aid bill?

The **SPEAKER**. The vote will come up on the next legislative day after the bill is engrossed.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. **FLOOD**. I yield to the gentleman.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Indiana will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the House will meet tomorrow unless unanimous consent is granted to adjourn over until a later day.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Would the Speaker permit me to say that there should be no adjournment over tomorrow?

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair had no intention in that respect.

Mr. **HALLECK**. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FLOOD**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **ALBERT**. I think the answer of the Speaker to the parliamentary inquiry was clear, but I think as a practical matter it would be in order to state that this means we expect to read the engrossed copy of the bill and vote on the foreign aid bill tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1963, many of our colleagues and I addressed this body on the importance and significance of the fifth Captive Nations Week observance which commenced on July 14 and ended on July 20. With much justification we pointed out then that this fifth observance would exceed all others in scope and depth. We stressed also the point that one of the main themes of the observance would be the establishment of a special Committee on Captive Nations in this body. As the facts show, these two points have been clearly substantiated.

ADDITIONAL GUBERNATORIAL AND MAYORAL PROCLAMATIONS

About half of the Governors of our States and over three dozen mayors of our large and major cities issued proclamations on the week. In the July 5 issue of the Record many of these proclamations appear. At this point I include the following additional proclamations of the fifth Captive Nations Week in the Record: Governors of the States of Vermont, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Arizona; Commissioners of the District of Columbia; mayors of Gary, Ind.; Scranton, Pa.; Roanoke, Va.; Portland, Oreg.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Worcester, Mass.; Honolulu, Hawaii; Harrisburg, Pa.; Miami, Fla.; and Youngstown, Ohio.

State of Vermont Proclamation, Philip H. Hoff, Governor

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a real relaxation of tensions and a genuine peace impossible; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism have resulted in the subjugation of many once-free peoples and created a vast slave empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free nations of the world; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in restoring their freedom, independence, and the enjoyment of the basic human rights; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered Nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged Nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to Soviet aggression and war, a major factor in the balance of power, and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the ominous crisis over Berlin makes it imperative that Americans of all creeds reaffirm their determination to stand by to our promises to the people of Berlin and to show that we have not forgotten our silent allies in East-Central Europe; and

Whereas the Soviet colonial rule in East-Central Europe must be condemned as more brutal, exploitative and all-pervasive the the world has ever known; and

Whereas any present or future international agreements with the Soviets are worthless if the Soviet Union refuses to honor its solemn treaties and obligations whereby she has pledged the right of self-determination to the nations now held captive by her: Now, therefore, I, Philip H. Hoff, Governor, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Vermont to join with the other States in observing this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of the oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world, and by other appropriate manifestations.

Philip H. Hoff,
Governor.

Official Statement of Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut

It is important for people who enjoy the blessings of free citizens in a free nation to focus special attention from time to time to the millions who live in oppression and fear as captive peoples in captive nations.

To that end, the week of July 14–20, 1963, will be observed throughout our Nation as Captive Nations Week.

In every captive nation, whether it is Poland, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia in Europe or China, and North Vietnam in Asia, or Cuba close to our own American shores, the need is great for assurance and encouragement from us in their efforts to regain independence and human liberty.

Let us in Connecticut, where freedom has long been ours, reaffirm during this period our steadfast support of the peoples of captive nations in whom the spark and love of liberty is still strong.

John Dempsey,
Governor.

State of New Jersey, Proclamation by Gov. Richard Hughes

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence: Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16–22, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in New Jersey.

[seal] Richard J. Hughes,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Robert J. Burkhardt,
Secretary of State.

State of Arizona Proclamation—Captive Nations Week

Whereas by joint resolution of the National Congress the third week in July of each year is to be designated by proclamation of the President as Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world;" and

Whereas Captive Nations Week provides an occasion for all Americans to show their silent allies, the freedom seeking peoples of the world, that they are not forgotten; and

Whereas many historical and cultural ties exist between the peoples of the captive nations and the people of America: Now, therefore, I, Paul J. Fannin, Governor, do hereby designate and proclaim the week of July 14 through 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in Arizona, and urge the citizens of our State to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies, demonstrating their support of the just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom.

[seal] Paul J. Fannin,
Governor.

Attest: Wesley Bolin,
Secretary of State.

A Proclamation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the chairman of the Washington Captive Nations Week Committee has requested the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate the week commencing July 14, 1963, as "Captive Nations Week," to be observed "with appropriate ceremonies and activities"; and

Whereas there is a strong belief that the observance of Captive Nations Week throughout our country and our community will serve the cause of America and the entire free world; that the keeping alive of the spirit of liberation is the West's most effective instrument in the cold war and the chief deterrent to a shooting war; and that it will, in particular, strengthen the hand of the West with respect to the ever-present critical situation facing Berlin; and

Whereas it is deemed appropriate and proper to extend to the peoples of the captive nations the support and sympathy of the people of our community for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence: Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week, and invite the people of the Nation's Capital to participate in the observance of this period by offering prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of the subjugated peoples from the godless tyranny which oppresses them.

Walter W. Tobriner,
John A. Israelson,
John B. Duncan,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

June 20, 1963.

City of Gary, Gary, Ind.—Proclamation

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these captive nations; and

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the captive nations have been deprived of their national independence and individual liberties; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet Russia have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a threat to the security of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States of America that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the captive peoples be kept alive; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to the captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the city of Gary, Ind., share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, I, John Visclosky, mayor of the city of Gary, Ind., do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the city of Gary to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of Communist-dominated peoples and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom and national independence.

JOHN VISCLOSKY,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

CITY OF SCRANTON, PA.—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas we Americans are proud that many refugees from the oppressed countries have found asylum in the United States; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to many of the captive nations peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to these people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the citizens of the city of Scranton are fully aware of, and grieve for, the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of communism: Now, therefore, I, William T. Schmidt, mayor of the city of Scranton, Pa., do hereby designate the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in the city of Scranton, Pa., and urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week.

WILLIAM T. SCHMIDT,
Mayor.

JULY 15, 1963.

ROANOKE, VA.—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas as a result of Communist aggression and subversion, there now are 2 dozen captive nations; and

Whereas nothing would delight the Communist powers more than a seeming acquiescence on our part toward the permanent captivity of these nations; and

Whereas our Nation is determined to seek the freedom of all the captive nations; and

Whereas there is a need for our people to learn more about the captive nations, and a need for popular cold war education: Now, therefore, to continue to learn and work toward the freeing of all captive nations, the Congress has designated the period of July 14–20, 1963, as the Fifth Captive Nations Week observance, and I, Murray A. Stoller, mayor of the city of Roanoke, Va., do proclaim this period as the Fifth Observance of Captive Nations Week.

Given under my hand this 27th day of June 1963.

MURRAY A. STOLLER,
Mayor.

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas in accordance with Public Law 86–90, the week of July 14–20, 1963, will be observed throughout the country as the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower have emphasized the need for our people to learn more about the 2 dozen captive nations in Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia, and Cuba; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that this period be set aside to provide all free people an occasion to show the captive peoples throughout the world that they are not forgotten and that we in the United States consider honor-bound by the wartime and postwar agreements to work ceaselessly and peacefully for the freedom of the people in these countries; and

Whereas this period also presents an occasion to evoke the tribulations of the enslaved peoples within the Soviet Union, including the Russian people themselves who are denied the right of self-determination and basic individual freedoms; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are forever linked by bonds of family and principle to all those who love freedom and justice on every continent, and

Whereas the knowledge that while men remain enslaved in any part of the world, all men are in danger and the desire for liberty and independence by the majority of the people in those submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and are the constant reminders of the need for strong vigilance by all freemen: Now, therefore, I Terry D. Schrunk, mayor of Portland, Oreg., the City of Roses, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Portland to join with all free Americans in observing this week and reaffirm their determination to work for the ultimate freedom of the oppressed and subjugated peoples throughout the world.

TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF FORT WAYNE, IND.

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these captive nations; and

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the captive nations have been deprived of their national independence and individual liberties; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet Russia have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a threat to the security of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States of America that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the captive peoples be kept alive; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to the captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, I, Paul M. Burns, mayor of the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week. I invite the people of the city of Fort Wayne to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Communist dominated peoples and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom and national independence.

PAUL M. BURNS,
City of Fort Wayne.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF WORCESTER, MASS.

Whereas the American Friends of the Captive Nations are dedicated to the peaceful liberation of captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas there are two dozen captive nations in Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., Asia, and Cuba itself; and

Whereas the Soviet Union is dedicated to the concept of captivity of peoples as evidenced by the erection and the presence of the Berlin wall; and

Whereas the United States is pledged to the ideals of freedom and the rights of self-determination of all men and all nations; and

Whereas the United States has a supreme legal and moral obligation to press for the freedom of captive nations by every diplomatic, economic and propaganda means because of its convictions in freedom: Now, therefore, I, Paul V. Mullaney, mayor of the city of Worcester, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and respectfully ask the people of the free world to combine in sincere support of independence for the new nations with the demand for the restoration of independence of the nations in captivity.

PAUL V. MULLANEY,
Mayor of the City of Worcester.

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America adopted a resolution in July 1959, providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week and that this be done annually until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas, the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, is interested in the freedom of other nations; and

Whereas Captive Nations Week again provides an occasion for all Americans to show their silent allies in Europe and in Asia that they are not forgotten: Now, therefore, I, Neal S. Blaisdell, mayor of the city and county of Honolulu, do hereby proclaim the period of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and urge the citizens of Oahu to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

NEAL S. BLAISDELL,
Mayor.

Proclamation by the Mayor of Harrisburg, Pa.

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the peoples of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities, expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now, therefore,

I, Daniel J. Barry, mayor of the city of Harrisburg, Pa., do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 14, 1963, be observed as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Harrisburg to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Daniel J. Barry,
Mayor.

City of Miami, Fla.—A Resolution

Whereas the ever-grasping, imperialistic policies of the Communist world have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of national independence in countries in Europe and Asia as well as in Latin America, resulting in a vast empire which threatens the security of the United States and all free people of the world; and

Whereas the people of these submerged and enslaved nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in the constant struggle to restore their spiritual and individual liberties; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has passed a joint resolution and President Kennedy has issued a proclamation designating the week beginning July 14 as Captive Nations Week and asked the people of this country to observe this period with appropriate ceremonies and activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commission of the City of Miami, Fla., That the week beginning July 14, 1963, be proclaimed Captive Nations Week in Miami so that the people of Miami may have an opportunity to rededicate themselves to the principles of worldwide freedom and take advantage of every chance to assure the people of these enslaved nations that we share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom, independence and national identity.

Passed and adopted this 3d day of July 1963.

——— ———,
Mayor.

Proclamation by the Mayor of Youngstown, Ohio

Whereas the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration and the maintenance of peace has become a vital need for all mankind; and

Whereas justice requires the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas the entire nation has an abiding commitment to the principle of national self-determination and human freedom: Now, therefore, I, Harry N. Svasten, mayor of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14, 1963, Captive Nations Week and urge the citizens of Youngstown to join with the people of the United States of America in observing this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and urge renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Harry N. Savasten,
Mayor.

CHIEF REASONS FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

It is evident from these proclamations and the many more that have been issued that popular American interest in the captive nations is not confined to any one section of our country or to just those Americans of East European ancestry. The deep interest in the strategic importance of all the captive nations to U.S. national security is nationwide and across the board. But what is equally revealing and impressive is the widespread national concern for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, one need not go far to understand the basis for this general popular support and the exceedingly favorable response to the proposal among our Members, including many on the Rules Committee itself. Indeed, there are now 40 identical resolutions calling for this special committee. The basis of all this support rests primarily in the reasons underlying the need of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Succinctly, these determining and justifying reasons are as follows:

First. On the issue of war and peace, the moral and political principle of national self-determination is in many respects a weapon far more potent, far more determinative, than missiles, nuclear bombs, or war-equipped space satellites. This overpowering weapon is ours, not Khrushchev's. Through its work a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would steadily expand the arsenal of this weapon for use either in the cold war or in a hot one.

Second. Both Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower have emphasized that the captive nations should be thoroughly and intensively studied for our own security. As a long, overdue response to these calls, what better means could be established than this special committee whose work would productively and profitably open up new dimensions and perspectives in our thinking about all the captive nations.

Third. In his American University address the President called for a reexamination of our views toward the Soviet Union. A special committee would help immensely in such a reexamination by its concentrated investigations into the numerous captive nations in the U.S.S.R. This would be the first time that any congressional committee has adequately explored this major field. Here, too, such an official study is long overdue, and I can assure you that the constructive work of a special committee would have far-reaching results in terms of our understanding the U.S.S.R. and legislative recommendations.

Fourth. In his 1963 Captive Nations Week Proclamation the President urged the American people "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." Again, by what better means can our people sustain such devotion than through current knowledge and analysis of developments in all the captive nations, which would be a prime task of a special committee manned by the people's own elected representatives.

Fifth. There is a hazardous gap in our official and private facilities as concerns this necessary task of investigating systematically, objectively, and continuously all of the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union. Nowhere is there any agency, public or private, performing this essential task. Piecemeal analyses of some captive nations fall desperately short of what is urgently needed for us to assess properly the opportunities we may have to cultivate the strategic value of the captive nations in the cold war, and to legislate accordingly.

Sixth. There are many in our society who would want to play down the captive nations in the illusory hope that Khrushchev would be sufficiently appeased and a detente would be arrived at. There is nothing that Khrushchev would enjoy more than this, for it would mean the virtual extinction of all hope for eventual freedom on the part of the captive peoples. The formation of a special committee would scotch the spread of such an illusion. More, it would be the first concrete implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. The fearful reaction of Moscow to this resolution will never be forgotten. Down to the very present, the Russian totalitarians, with all their missiles, satellites, and arms, have displayed an uncanny fear of the captive nations issue. The reasons for this deep fear would be a paramount object of study by a special committee, leading in turn to specific recommendations whereby we could capitalize on it in the cold war.

Seventh. House Resolution 14 and the other resolutions are realistically based on the aggregate concept of captive nations—meaning those inside the U.S.S.R. as well as those in Asia, Central Europe, and Cuba. This totalistic orientation to the problem, which has yet to be developed, will lead to findings by a special committee which would interrelate developments in the captive world and lay the basis for recommended coordinate action that can tie the interests of different captive nations in our favor.

Eighth. As advocates of freedom everywhere, we must always realize that there is another dimension of the cold war, not just between Moscow's and Peiping's totalitarian empires and the free world but also and essentially between the captive peoples and their quisling governments. This, too, would be a major object of inquiry by the special committee which, on the basis of its findings, could make recommendations providing for prudent leverages for the captive nations in their respective cold wars.

Ninth. The enormous power of propaganda has long been a virtual Moscow monopoly. The studies, facts and truths educed by a special committee would give the constant lie to the overblown Russian image, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. One of the chief areas of investigation by the special committee would be the 35 million captive Moslems in the U.S.S.R., a subject which is almost totally overlooked in this country. Aside from the favorable impact that this congressional interest would have on other sectors of the Moslem world, investigations into this area would lead to many concrete proposals pertaining to our informational and possibly propaganda media.

Tenth. A special committee would also for the first time develop and bring into focus the extensive imperiocolonial system of Moscow within the U.S.S.R. itself. This, too, is an area that has long been overlooked. The productive and really pioneering work of such a committee would not only provide the basis for new legislative proposals, but also serve our executive branch, our U.N. delegation, our representation in UNESCO and elsewhere.

Eleventh. From all this and more it should be evident that a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would have definite legislative intent and purpose. Its extensive studies and investigations, pursued in the manner of the Katyn Massacre Committee and the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression—two outstanding creations of past Congresses—would lead to conclusions that in turn would justify recommendations upon which specific legislative proposals would be founded. Activities ranging from our information programs to economic assistance with regard to the Red totalitarian empire would necessarily come within the purview of the committee's inquiries. Having as its base of inquiry the captive world as a whole, an approach that is unique in itself, the committee would furnish new insights into and critical points for fresh evaluation of our undertakings in relation to the eventual freedom of all the captive nations, covering the diplomatic, economic, cultural, religious, informational, political and many other fields. Even in the field of athletics and the Olympics, telling points can be made.

Twelfth. In reality and function, the existence of a special committee would encroach upon no standing committee. Its unusual orientation toward the captive nations in toto would permit it to dwell on phenomena which have been largely untapped by existing committees.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the chief reasons for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. These are the many reasons why observances of the Fifth Captive Nations Week across the Nation emphasized the outstanding need for such a committee. At this point in my remarks, I include the following data on these observances in the RECORD:

The July 20 Syracuse Herald-Journal editorial; the Syracuse program; the July 18 and 11 reports in the Catholic Sun; the July 28 and 29 reports in the Pittsburgh Press; the July 29 Pittsburgh Post-Gazette report; the Allegheny County program; the week's listed radio programs in the Pittsburgh papers; the July 11 Pittsburgh Catholic report; the Washington, D.C., program of the week; the Philadelphia program; the New York City festivity; the Buffalo event; and reports on the week in the July 13 Washington Evening Star, July 14 Washington Post, and those in Washington's Catholic Standard.

CITY OF SYRACUSE AND THE COUNTY OF ONONDAGA OFFICIALLY SALUTE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE, JULY 14 THROUGH 21, 1963

INVITATION TO HELP OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The Syracuse-Onondaga Citizens Committee warmly welcomes you to join in the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week from July 14 through 21. As authorized by the Congress in Public Law 86–90, each year the President of the United States issues a proclamation calling upon the American people to remember that more than a third of the world's population still lives under Communist despotism. The 22 nations enumerated in the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" of July 17, 1959, have a total of 906,532,000. This is approximately 35 percent of the population of the world. Therefore, it is fitting that we constantly manifest to such peoples in the captive nations countries that the people of Syracuse-Onondaga share with them aspirations for a speedy recovery of their life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. You, your family and friends are cordially invited to the events prepared by the citizens committee for a community tribute to our allies struggling for freedom, the gallant peoples of the captive nations' countries. This week is hereby dedicated to them.

Calendar of events, 1963

July 8: Hon. John Mulroy, county executive, proclaims Captive Nations Week in Onondaga County and issues a proclamation calling upon fellow citizens to participate in the observance of this week dedicated to the peoples of the world still struggling for their independence.

July 9: Placing of the flags of the captive nation countries for public review will continue daily in the entrance hall of the courthouse of Onondaga County at 401 Montgomery Street in Syracuse, N.Y., until July 19.

July 11: Announcing the beginning of Captive Nations Week, the mayor of the city of Syracuse, the Honorable William F. Walsh, declares July 14 through 21 as official observance week in his proclamation to fellow citizens of our city.

July 14: Syracuse churches announce that special prayers and services will be recited for the clergy and peoples held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

July 15: Throughout the week, there will be a campaign for signatures of all citizens, who support House Resolution 14 calling for the establishment of a congressional Committee on Captive Nations Affairs. Petitions requesting such action will be forwarded to Congressman HOWARD SMITH, chairman, House Rules Committee; Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, author of the resolution; and our Congressman WALTER RIEHLMAN.

July 21: LeMoyne College will host the public rally of the friends and supporters of Captive Nations Week in its auditorium at 7:30 p.m. Sunday as a climax to the official observances of events held throughout the week. Over 10 nationalities will participate in the artistic presentations, after the reading of the Presidential proclamation, the presentation of colors of the countries held in Communist slavery; and an address by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at LeMoyne College. Presentation to the rally participants of a public resolution appealing to the member states of the United Nations to openly condemn Russian imperialism and exploitation; and ask for a speedy return to the countries enslaved by Moscow of their independence and freedom of self-government.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER

The Soviets, whose spokesmen are fond of calling other people imperialists, now have an empire of no fewer than 23 captive nations. We might add Tibet to the list since its enslavement by Red China.

No fewer than 410 million people are now subject to Communist colonialism.

We know that eventually this empire will crumble as have all others amassed by force of arms. But that is poor consolation to the victims suffering oppression and unhappiness.

We of the United States are the fortunate inhabitants of a citadel of human freedom. We are proud that we are giving asylum to many refugees from oppressed countries. In point of fact, we have benefited from their presence as they are valued neighbors, loyal and industrious members of our State and Nation.

We have a weapon against communism in recognition and understanding of the plight of those captive peoples. With them we look forward to the day when their enslavement shall come to an end.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in New York State.

Given under my hand in the City of New York and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this twentieth day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

CITY OF SYRACUSE, N.Y., OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Korea, Tibet, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and many others; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the people of our country in his annual proclamation to observe fittingly Captive Nations Week because it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the people of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives a special Resolution No. 14 for establishment of a permanent congressional Committee for Captive Nations Affairs, which we wholeheartedly endorse and request its speedy enactment; and

Whereas it is fitting that we, citizens of the city of Syracuse, clearly manifest to such captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of this community share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their liberties and independence;

Now therefore, I, William F. Walsh, mayor of the city of Syracuse, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in this community, and we urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week as well as in the recognition and study of the plight of the Moscow-dominated nations. Moreover, we urge that our fellow citizens dedicate themselves to support the just aspiration of the peoples striving for liberty and independence.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Syracuse to be affixed.

WILLIAM F. WALSH,
Mayor, City of Syracuse, N.Y.

BISHOP'S OFFICE,
Syracuse, N.Y.

To the Clergy, Religious and Laity of the Diocese of Syracuse:

The week of July 14–21 has been designated by our President as Captive Nations Week. It has been so designated to make us aware of the plight of the enslaved peoples throughout the world.

While we live our God-given freedoms, we must not forget the many who have been deprived of their basic liberties. The freedom to worship God as one's conscience dictates; the freedom to select representative leaders of one's own choice; the freedom to gather together and form organizations to achieve legitimate goals; the freedom to express one's views; the freedom from unjustly inspired fears and constant threats; these and other inalienable liberties have been harshly curtailed or totally denied to millions by totalitarian governments.

As freedom blessed Americans, I urge the faithful of the diocese to join with their fellow Americans in the civic observances of the Captive Nations Week. As brothers in Christ, I urge them to offer their masses and prayers during this week for the spiritual welfare and long desired liberation of their enslaved brothers.

Devotedly yours in Christ,

WALTER A. FOERY,
Bishop of Syracuse.

SYRACUSE-ONONDAGA CITIZENS COMMITTEE LEADERS PREPARING 1963 OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

RED-HELD NATIONS FETED

Members of the Captive Nations Week Committee (CNWC) of Syracuse and Onondaga County planning for Captive Nations Week, July 14–21, were Andres Paap, Estonian Lutheran Church; Dr. Alexander Gudziak, Ukrainian Congress Committee; Arnold V. Golts, Latvian Academic Association; John K. Dungey, American Legion Post 41 and chairman of the CNWC; Stephen Obremski, Polish American Congress; Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at LeMoyne College.

MR. JOHN MULROY, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, SIGNS PROCLAMATION FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK SHOWN OVER LOCAL TV MEDIA

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAIMED THROUGHOUT ONONDAGA COUNTY

The Honorable John Mulroy, county executive, issued a declaration proclaiming July 14 through 21 as "Captive Nations Week" and authorized the official presentation of the flags of the captive nations for public review in the Onondaga County Courthouse. Girls in Ukrainian costume were Marusia Pajuk, Irka Budziak, Nadia Pylypyszyn, Marusia Proskurenko, Hania Kuprowsky and Anna Alexandrowych, Arnold V. Golts (Latvian Academic Association); Sarkis Nigolian (Armenian Community Center); Walter D. Prybyla, Jr. (Ukrainian Congress Committee); John Dungey, chairman of Syracuse-Onondaga Citizen's Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week; Henry Klimek (Polonez Male Choir); Dr. Alexander Gudziak (Ukrainian Congress Committee); Richard A. Grudzinski (second ward supervisor); Vincent Kasaitis (Lithuanian Association); and Walter Szczepanek (Syracuse Polish Community Home).

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Byelorussia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them in the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon the peoples of our great country in his annual proclamation to observe fittingly Captive Nations Week, because it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives a special Resolution No. 14 for the establishment of a permanent Congressional Committee for Captive Nations Affairs, which we wholeheartedly endorse and request its speedy enactment; and

Whereas it is fitting that we, citizens of the County of Onondaga, clearly manifest to such captive peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the peoples of this community share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their liberties and independence:

Now therefore, I, John H. Mulroy, county executive of Onondaga County, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in this community, and urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week as well as in the recognition and study of the plight of the Moscow dominated nations. Moreover, we urge that our fellow citizens dedicate themselves to support the just aspiration of the peoples striving for liberty and independence.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of Onondaga County to be affixed.

JOHN H. MULROY,
County Executive.

Date: July 8, 1963.

PROGRAM CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY, LE MOYNE COLLEGE, JULY 21

Placing of colors: American Legion, Onondaga County and captive nations colors.

Invocation: The Very Reverend Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president, Le Moyne College.

Greetings: The Very Reverend Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president, Le Moyne College.

National anthem: Bernadine Rozycko-Dubiel.

Presentation of Speaker: Stephen M. Obremski, program committee chairman.

Address: Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor, Le Moyne College.

Reading of Proclamation: E. Hawley Bendixen, attorney at law.

Introduction of dignitaries.

Presentation of resolution for adoption by assembly.

ARTISTIC PRESENTATIONS

Master of ceremonies, Dr. Mykola Bohatiuk, stage director, Arnold Golts.

1. American Legion chorus, David Kennedy, director. "Give Me Your Tired, Your Poor," Irving Berlin; and "The Creation," Willy Richter.

2. Symphonia Polish Choral Society, "My Nightingale," A. Mickiewicz; "Linden Trees Blossom," K. Wiekomirski; and "Holiday Bells," A. Chlondowski. Sydney Novak, director; Ruth Prybylski, accompanist; Tina Laskowski Sims, president.

3. Folk dances of Latvia, Latvian folk dancers.

4. Lithuanian folk songs (recorded): "My Little Duckling," mixed choir; "O Thou Forest," Women's ensemble; Alfonsas Mikulskis, director, mixed choir; and Atnonas Gimzauskas, director, women's ensemble.

5. Armenian choir, Hagop Melkonian, conductor; "My Love—Our Great Language," Mother River Araxe, Anna Markarian, soloist.

6. Hungarian folk tunes, Bella Bartok, composer; Karoly Safran, violinist, with piano accompaniment.

7. Ukrainian male chorus "Surma," Zenon Miahky, conductor, Stephen Rekulak, president; "Harvest," D. Kotko; "White Kerchief," M. Kolessa; "Marichka," S. Sobotazh; and "Our Native Land," V. Tretiak.

8. Estonian folk songs (recorded), Manivald Loite, director; "From the Northern Sun," T. Vettik; "Men, Let's Go Home," G. Ernesaks.

9. Hungarian folk dances, Istvan Babnigg, director; performed by: Olga Nagy and Zoltan Koran.

10. "Polonez" male chorus, Henry V. Stryminski, director; Henry Klimek, president; "With Smoke and Fire," K. Ujejski; also Polish folk songs.

11. Latvian Academic Association, Karlis Zvejnieks, president; "Battle Hymn of the Republic." Accordion solo by Ivars Ozolins.

Concluding remarks: John K. Dungey, committee chairman.

Benediction: Rev. John Sanborn, Syracuse Council of Churches.

"God Bless America," all.

Participating organizations: the Armenian Community Center, the Estonian Lutheran Church, the Hungarian Committee, the Latvian Academic Association, the Latvian American Society, the Polish Community Home, the Polish American Congress, the "Free China" Committee, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Conservative Council, and the American Legion Post 41.

These are captive nations: More than a third of the world's population lives under Communist despotism. The 22 captive nations, as enumerated in the Captive Nations Week resolution of July 17, 1959, have a total of 906,532,000. This is approximately 36 percent of the population of the world. These nations and their populations are:

		In thousands
Albania		1,507
Azerbaijan		3,300
Armenia		1,500
Bulgaria		7,793
Byelorussia		12,500
China (mainland)		679,232
Cossackia		9,300
Czechoslovakia		14,000
Czechs	9,000,000	
Slovaks	5,000,000	
East Germany		16,800
Estonia		1,100
Hungary		9,800
Idel-Ural		12,000
Latvia		1,900
Lithuania		3,000
North Korea		9,000
North Vietnam		13,000

	In thousands
Poland	29,000
Rumania	18,000
Tibet	1,300
Turkestan	17,000
Ukraine	44,500
Total	906,532

(Not included in the Captive Nations Week resolution are Croatia, Slovenia, and North Caucasus.)

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Honorary cochairman: Hon. William F. Walsh, mayor of Syracuse; Hon. John Mulroy, county executive of Onondaga.

Chairman, John K. Dungey; Very Rev. Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president, Le Moyne College; Sarto C. Major, sheriff, Onondaga County; Patrick J. Murphy, chief, Syracuse Police Department; Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor, Le Moyne College; Alfred Cady, Purple Heart Association; George Clow, commander, Onondaga County American Legion; Thomas Higgins, president, Merchants Bank; Garth C. Lax, chairman, Let Freedom Ring; Robert Leverton, commander, Regular Vets; Mr. and Mrs. Fred Quell, Friends; Lt. Col. H. O. Schulze, retired, U.S. Army; Dr. Henry Sliski, physician; Dr. David Kennedy, dental surgeon; Edward Whelan, Schumacher & Whelan.

CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF SYRACUSE AND ONONDAGA COUNTY

Aleksandras Andriusaitis, Istvan Babnigg, E. Hawley Bendixen, Dr. Nicholas G. Bohatiuk, Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Jan Buryn, Petrosau Dimitru, Dr. John Dosa, John K. Dungey, Arnold V. Golts, Richard A. Grudzinski, Dr. Alexander Gudziak, Bronislaw Humenny, Dr. Jacob P. Hursky, J. M. Kawecki, Ivan Konstantinoff, Dr. Michael Lohaza, Jan Morrison, Zenon Miahky, Sarkis Nigolian, Stephen M. Obremski, Andres Paap, Dr. Charles Paikert, George Petrov, Walter D. Prybyla, Jr., Rev. S. Roth, S.J., Andrejs Skoroderens, Myron Sydorowych, Harry B. Tellian, Maurice Topalian, Rev. John J. Wang, Gustav Wenczl, and Rev. Leo Wimett.

UKRAINIAN MALE CHORUS "SURMA"

SONGS AND DANCES FROM UKRAINE ARE FEATURED

The "Surma" Ukrainian Male Chorus brings to this community the music of the Ukrainian people. The chorus is directed by Zenon Miahky, 206 Merriman Avenue, Syracuse 4, N.Y. Mr. Stephen Rekulak is the president of the chorus. In the fall of 1956, it was felt that there was a need in the community for a chorus to feature the songs and dances of Ukraine and to keep alive the spirit of freedom and aspiration for independence of the Ukrainian people from Russian Communist domination.

SYMPHONIA POLISH CHORAL SOCIETY

SYMPHONIA CHORAL SOCIETY

Twenty-two years ago, there was formed in this community an all-ladies choir called the Symphonia Choral Society. Its purpose was to promote Polish music, culture and customs in our community. The director is Sidney Novak; the president is Tina Laskowski Simms.

ONONDAGA COUNTY LEGION CHORUS

Under the direction of David Kennedy, the Onondaga County Legion Chorus numbers over 30 voices and enjoys widespread popularity. This chorus is the descendant and the nucleus of a 30-year-old chorus, the old Post 41 chorus directed by Harrie W. Southwick, which has performed all over the country.

ARMENIAN CHOIR

PERPETUATING THE SONGS OF ARMENIA

The newly formed Armenian Choir has over 20 voices under the conductorship of Hagop Melkonian. Syracuse has less than 150 citizens of Armenian heritage, whose cultural and social life revolve about the Armenian Community Center, 372 West Matson Avenue. It was indeed a tremendous accomplishment for the Syracuse Armenians to form and to maintain a choir.

NEW RESOLUTION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE INTRODUCED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HELP ESTABLISH A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS AFFAIRS

If you wish to support House Resolution 14 for the formation of a congressional Committee for Captive Nations Affairs, you are encouraged to write a letter or post card expressing your approval to Congressman HOWARD SMITH, chairman, House Rules Committee; Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, author of the resolution; and our Congressman, WALTER RIEHLMAN. Address to House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C. Write immediately. Your vote counts.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Following is the text of a new resolution calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, introduced on January 9, 1963, by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania. A similar resolution (H. Res. 15) was introduced by the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican Congressman from Illinois.)

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances on the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially, inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the House, of whom not more than 6 shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which include those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful process in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Latvian Folk Dancers

Established 10 years ago by students at Syracuse University, the Latvian folk dancers promote the national traditions, dances, and customs of Latvia.

Public Law 86-90—Providing for the Designation of the Third Week of July as Captive Nations Week

(Adopted by the 86th Congress of the United States of America in July 1959.)

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a Proclamation designating the third week of July 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Forward in Freedom

The issue of our times is the issue of slavery versus freedom. Freedom can never remain at a standstill. We must either move forward or retreat. To paraphrase the Great Emancipator: The house of humanity divided against itself cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. As believers in the dynamics of freedom, we must move forward.

Support Captive Nations Week.

[From the Catholic Sun, July 18, 1963]

Program To Honor All Captive Nations

The annual captive nations program will be held at 7:30 p.m. Sunday, July 21 in the Le Moyne College auditorium.

A three-part program has been planned by the 10 organizations participating in the affair climaxing national Captive Nations Week.

The program is part of this area's salute to the 906,532,000 non-Communists behind the Iron Curtain.

Placing of the captive nations colors will open the program followed by a greeting from the Very Rev. Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., president of Le Moyne. Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at Le Moyne, will give the main address.

Readings of city, county, and Presidential proclamations on Captive Nations Week will follow.

A resolution urging support of the cause of the captive nations will be presented for adoption by the assembly.

Entertainment will be provided by the American Legion chorus, symphonia Polish choral society, Latvian folk dancers, Armenian choir, Hungarian folk singers, and Ukrainian male chorus "Surma," and Polonez male chorus.

[From the Catholic Sun, July 11, 1963]

Official

To the Clergy, Religious and Laity of the Diocese of Syracuse:

The week of July 14–21 has been designated by our President as "Captive Nations Week." It has been so designated to make us aware of the plight of the enslaved peoples throughout the world.

While we live our God-given freedoms, we must not forget the many who have been deprived of their basic liberties. The freedom to worship God as one's conscience dictates; the freedom to select representative leaders of one's own choice; the freedom to gather together and form organizations to achieve legitimate goals; the freedom to express one's views; the freedom from unjustly inspired fears and constant threats; these and other inalienable liberties have been harshly curtailed or totally denied to millions by totalitarian governments.

As freedom blessed Americans, I urge the faithful of the diocese to join with their fellow Americans in the civic observances of the Captive Nations Week. As brothers in Christ, I urge them to offer their masses and prayers during this week for the spiritual welfare and long-desired liberation of their enslaved brothers.

Devotedly yours in Christ,
WALTER A. FOERY,
Bishop of Syracuse.

President Proclaims Captive Nations Week as of July 14

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy, in proclaiming the week beginning July 14 as Captive Nations Week, has urged Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

The (July 5) proclamation asked that the American people observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. President Kennedy also said in the proclamation: "The cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration * * *. This Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom."

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal, July 20, 1963]

Captive Nations Week: Psychological Weapon

This is Captive Nations Week, a time of proclamations and observances calling attention to such areas as Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Latvia, Rumania, and Estonia—prisoners in the Iron Curtain dungeon.

The observance was first proclaimed in 1959, after Congress had authorized the President to issue "a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence have been achieved for all in the captive nations of the world."

Sympathy with such desires for the restoration of national dignity and independence, of course, is an integral part of the free world attitude. But Captive Nations Week has become itself a psychological weapon, a torch keeping lighted the fires of discontent in the trapped countries.

In this sense it is more than a sentimental gesture. It is a national declaration that these nations are, in effect, our allies behind the Iron Curtain.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 28, 1963]

Parade To Observe Captive Nations Day

A parade through Kennywood Park will open the delayed observance of Captive Nations Day at 6:45 tonight—weather permitting.

The affair originally was set for 2 weeks ago, but rain forced a postponement.

Principal speaker will be Representative **EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**, of Illinois, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and congressional delegate to the 1959 Interparliamentary Union Conference in Warsaw.

A Marine Corps color guard will participate in the parade, and representatives of nationality groups will carry portraits of religious leaders symbolic of anti-Communist resistance.

Bishop John J. Wright, of the Pittsburgh Catholic Diocese, will pay tribute to the leaders.

The observance is being arranged by the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County, headed by County Commissioner John E. McGrady.

Folk songs and dances will be performed by Hungarian, Lithuanian, Slovak, Polish and Ukrainian groups.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 29, 1963]

Aid Red Captives, Lawmaker Urges; Congressman's Plan Told at Kennywood

A Congressman from Chicago says a Special House Committee on Captive Nations should be created.

Representative **Edward J. Derwinski**, a Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said such a committee could keep the free world mindful of the Communist denial of civil rights to their captive peoples.

Mr. **Derwinski** addressed the captive nations rally last night at Kennywood Park.

"Captive Nations Week is a practical means of spotlighting the fact that the Soviet Union and its satellite puppets constitute a vast colonial empire," Mr. **Derwinski** said.

He said a strong spirit of nationalism in Communist-held countries is a continuous headache to officials in the Kremlin.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 29, 1963]

HOUSE UNIT ON CAPTIVE AREAS URGED—CONGRESSMAN TELLS RALLY OF NEED TO AID SATELLITES

A Chicago Congressman yesterday stressed need for a special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Such a committee could keep the free world mindful of Communist denial of civil rights to their captive peoples, said Congressman **Edward J. Derwinski**, Republican, of the 4th District of Illinois.

Derwinski, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, addressed the Captive Nations Day rally last night in Kennywood Park.

POINTS TO ACHILLES HEEL

In an interview earlier, he said the annual Captive Nations Week program has gathered increasing attention since it began in 1959.

"Captive Nations Week dramatizes that the captive peoples are the Achilles' heel of the Soviet Union," **Derwinski** said.

He said a strong spirit of nationalism in Communist-held countries is a continuous headache to officials in the Kremlin.

Derwinski illustrated by recalling musician Benny Goodman's 1961 visit to Tiflis, capital of the Georgian Republic, Josef Stalin's native land.

"Goodman's normal repertoire included a number of Russian folk songs. At Tiflis, the audience shouted hisses and boos and overturned chairs, demanding that Goodman play Georgian folk songs, not Russian."

RECALLS KHRUSHCHEV BLAST

Derwinski said Captive Nations Week has been a source of anger to Communist officials.

He recounted that it was a subject of debate between Nikita Khrushchev and former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon in 1959.

Derwinski himself has not escaped the lash of Iron Curtain invective. A Warsaw newspaper editorial accused him of voicing empty slogans of capitalism and branded him a "disgrace to his Polish-born grandmother."

CAPTIVE NATIONS' DAY OBSERVANCE, KENNYWOOD PARK, SUNDAY, JULY 28, 1963, 7 P.M.

Parade through park to stage, 6:45 p.m.: U.S. Marine Corps color guards and nationality groups with portraits of bishops.

Master of ceremonies: Michael Komichak.

National anthem.

Pledge of Allegiance: Former Hungarian freedom fighter.

Invocation: Most Rev. John J. Wright, D.D.

Welcome remarks and President Kennedy's proclamation: Commissioner John E. McGrady.

Introduction of Bishop Wright: Paul C. Kazimer.

Tribute to persecuted bishops: Most Rev. J. J. Wright, D.D.

Pennsylvania State Senate proclamation.

Introduction of honored guests.

Introduction of main speaker: Wence Dolegowski.

Main address: Congressman **Edward J. Derwinski**, of Illinois.

Captive Nations Day resolution.

Benediction: Rev. Paul Markowitz.

Folk songs and dances:

Hungarians: United Magyar Civic Association, Mrs. Louis B. Smith.

Lithuanians: St. Casimir's Church, Rev. Walter C. Karaveckas; statement: Rev. Alphonse Susinskas.

Slovaks: The Slovakians of St. Michael's Church, Roman Niznik; statement: Paul C. Kazimer.

Poles: Polish Women's Alliance, Mrs. Dora Aiski; statement: Wence Dolegowski.

Ukrainians: Monessen Dancers, Styn Sisters Trio; solo dancers: Yaroslava Polatajko, Michael E. Haritan; statement: Dr. Peter G. Stercho, St. Vincent's College.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 15, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

At 6 p.m.: Captive Nations Week, 1963. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky and Mr. Neil Martin, both of Georgetown University, and Congressman William Bray, of Indiana, discuss the topic: "Russian Frontiers: Moscovy to Khrushchev", WPIT, AM-FM.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 16, 1963]

HIGHLIGHTS ON RADIO

At 6 p.m.: (WPIT AM-FM) "Captive Nations Week, 1963." Dr. Howard E. Kershner, of the Christian Freedom Foundation, talks about our foreign policy with respect to communism.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 17, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

At 6 p.m.: Captive Nations Week—1963. A discussion on "Why Captive Nations Week," WPIT, AM-FM.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, July 18, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

6 p.m. (WPIT AM-FM)—Captive Nations Week, 1963. Dick Morphew, of the Citizens Council Forum, interviews Senator **Strom Thurmond**, of South Carolina, and Congressman **Armistead Selden**, of Alabama, on the Cuban situation.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, July 19, 1963]

RADIO HIGHLIGHTS

6 p.m., Captive Nations Week, 1963. Michael Komichak, secretary of the Captive Nations Committee of Allegheny County, talks about the need of establishing a special House committee. WPIT, AM-FM.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Catholic, July 11, 1963]

CIVIC PROGRAM TO SALUTE CAPTIVE PEOPLE

Captive Nations Week will begin here Sunday, July 14, with a civic program at Kennywood Park starting at 5 p.m.

It is one of many observances throughout the United States to remind Americans of the plight of European and Asian nations ruled by communism.

The third week of July was established for this purpose by a congressional resolution in 1959.

Principal speaker at the Kennywood program will be Congressman **Edward J. Derwinski**, of Illinois. The invocation will be given by Bishop Wright and the benediction by Rev. Paul Markowitz of the First Hungarian Church. Master of ceremonies will be Michael Komichak of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Nationality groups of the captive nations will parade through the park before the speaking program.

WASHINGTON CAPTIVE NATIONS
WEEK COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1963.

DEAR SIR: Captive Nations Week, July 14 through 20, is designated by Congress each year as a time for Americans of all national backgrounds and creeds to express united support for the just aspirations of people in Communist-ruled lands for freedom and self-determination.

On Sunday, July 21, starting at 2 p.m., wreath-laying ceremonies will be held in Lafayette Park and concluded by a dedication rally at the Washington Monument grounds. These acts are to remind Americans of those who left their homelands to aid our forefathers in the struggle for America's freedom and independence.

Your organization, because of its dedication to the causes of freedom, is needed to participate actively with other patriots in this solemn observance.

For your convenience we have enclosed a program schedule and a map of the dedication area. For further details and coordination, please call 296-4870. We would also appreciate an indication of the total number of persons who will attend from your group. Thank you.

Respectfully,

DONALD L. MILLER.

COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1963

PROGRAM

2 p.m., all participants meet at Lafayette Park.

2-2:10, invocation.

2:10-2:20, memorial address.

2:20-2:30, laying of wreath at Kosciuszko statute.

2:30-2:40, laying of wreath at Von Steuben statute.

2:40-3:15, group will proceed to Sylvan Theater on Washington Monument grounds. Transportation will be provided as needed.

3:15-4:15, commemorative address by Congressman **Edward Derwinski**.

Special program.

Benediction.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Participants from nationality groups are invited to bring national flags, dress in native costume, and carry any national display as appropriate.

OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14-21, 1963

President John F. Kennedy: I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, invite the people of the United States of America to observe the Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

Why Captive Nations Week?

To preserve freedom in the United States of America.

To promote freedom in the enslaved world.

To make all aware of those who lack freedom.

To give hope to those who aspire to freedom.

These are the captive nations: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Caucasus, Mainland China, Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, and White Ruthenia.

To believe that we may preserve our freedom while these nations remain enslaved is foolish and suicidal indeed. Each and every American must understand and take part in the battle to keep man a free and independent being under God. The battle is here and overseas; within our boundaries in education and material assistance; overseas in the giving of hope and eventual aid. For now, every crack in the Iron Curtain must become an echo chamber for freedom's voice.

For the past few years Moscow has reaped cold war successes because the West allowed itself to be confused, divided and deceived by Russian propaganda, basically to the effect that unless the West accepts Khrushchev's terms of "peaceful coexistence" the alternative is total destruction by atomic warfare. This, of course, is the perennial bluff and bluster of Khrushchev, his method, which unfortunately has been very effective.

The Soviet Union presents on the outside a formidable and cohesive front. However, all is not well. All persecutions, deportations, breaking up and rotation of families, brainwashing and strict censorship has been incapable of stilling the ever-present, innate desire for freedom and independence. The curtain opens now and then and the truth flashes through.

Entire nations are enslaved and suffering under the heavy yoke of Russian communism. Since 1917 this control for the minds and bodies of men has been waged by the Reds. Unbelievable slaughters in Hungary, Ukraine, Poland, China, and elsewhere have been the rule, not the exception. Their sufferings are beyond comprehension. Commonsense justice demands that we preface any request for peaceful coexistence with consideration of the plight of these captive nations.

The main hope for freedom and independence for these nations rests with us.

We must never forget what is happening and never cease efforts to work toward its eventual end.

When we turn our backs on the captive nations we decide to allow the suffering of victims today and of yet-unborn millions tomorrow.

It is for this reason we celebrate Captive Nations Week. We must remind ourselves constantly that our freedom is insecure while others are enslaved. We, individually and through our representatives, must do everything possible in the cause of freedom. To fail in this duty, we will not only condemn these people to their fate, but we will condemn ourselves to a final surrender of our freedom by default.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14–20, 1963

On the occasion of Captive Nations Week our organizations will sponsor, in New York, the following events:

1. On Sunday, July 14, at 10 am., a solemn mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral, Francis Cardinal Spellman will preside. Rev. Robert Moher will preach the sermon. National groups, with flags, are requested to assemble at 9:30 a.m. on the west side of Fifth Avenue opposite the cathedral.
2. On Sunday, July 14, at 11 a.m., a commemorative service at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, Cathedral Heights. Rev. Canon Harold Landon will conduct the service and preach.
3. On Sunday, July 14, at 12:30 p.m., at ACEN House, 769 First Avenue, across the street from the United Nations, flag-raising ceremony of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. Speakers: Representative William G. Bray from Indiana; Mr. Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
4. On Monday, July 15, at 12 noon, in front of City Hall, Captive Nations Week ceremony. Mayor Robert F. Wagner will be the principal speaker.

Each of these functions provides an appropriate occasion to manifest support of the freedom aspirations of the captive nations. In the face of prevailing trends of accommodation with the Communist regimes, such demonstrations have never been more necessary.

You are cordially invited to attend, in national garb if possible. Bring along your flags and banners. Advise your friends and relatives and exhort them to come.

> Msgr. John Balkunas, Chairman, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; Thomas J. Cuite, Member, Captive Nations Week Committee; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations; Christopher Emmet, Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Stephen J. Jarema, Chairman, American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

PROGRAM OF EVENTS—THE CITY OF BUFFALO OFFICIALLY SALUTES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14 THROUGH 21, 1963

CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Honorary Chairman: Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.

Chairman: Nestor Procyk, M.D., assistant director, West Seneca State School.

Executive assistant: John J. Sullivan, secretary to the Mayor.

Special assistants: John A. Boccio, budget division, city of Buffalo; Robert E. Casey, deputy corporation counsel, city of Buffalo; Francis X. Schwab, division of planning, city of Buffalo.

Cochairmen: Henry J. Osinski, president, Central Council of Polish Organizations; Dr. John M. Juhasz, Actio Hungarica; A. O'Neil Kline, Kiwanis Club of Buffalo.

Grand marshal: Arthur J. Vater, senior vice commander, Department of New York State, VFW.

Secretary: Dr. Stephen Gredelj, Croatian Organizations.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Herman G. Achtziger, commander, Erie County Council, VFW.

Angel Bezeff, Macedonian Patriotic Organization.

Andrew Diakun, Erie County Bar Association.

Vasil Dincev, Bulgarian National Front.

Hon. Howard E. Finney, commissioner of police.

Hon. Chester C. Gorski, president, Common Council.

Hon. Albert C. Killian, commissioner of parks.

Francis M. Kindel, past president, United Anti-Communist Action Committee.

Daniel H. Kurdziel, commander, Erie County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans.

Jerome R. Lombardo, commander Erie County Committee, American Legion.

Mychajlo Lysak, vice chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee.

Walter L. Mikulski, Americanism chairman, Erie County Council, VFW.

Felix Mindy, Polish Organizations.

Dr. Christo Mladenov, Bulgarian Organizations.

Marian Morozevych, Ukrainian Liberation Front Organizations.

Shehat Osmani, Albanian Groups.

Jacob Ozolins, Latvian Club.

Clemet Sakas, Lithuanian Club.

Jivko Shumenoff, Macedonian Organizations.

Kalev Susi, Estonian Club.

Joseph Taylor, chairman, Committee of Hungarian Churches and Societies of Greater Buffalo.

B. John Tutuska, sheriff, Erie County.

John E. Whitmer, office of the mayor, city of Buffalo.

Hon. Robert J. Zahm, commissioner of fire.

Ragib Zukic, Croatian Organizations.

MESSAGE FROM THE MAYOR

When our forefathers envisioned the founding of our great Nation they were motivated by great ideals and hoped for a peaceful world in which justice would govern the future of all nations and mankind. Their foresight, sacrifice, hard work, perseverance, and heroism brought forth a nation, which, although young, as history is measured, is second to none in the guarantees of freedom, individual liberty, and the right of family happiness. The labors of the Founding Fathers, their deep philosophy set forth in the documents of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution form a monumental asset in the annals of Western civilization.

Since the founding years, the United States has guarded these inalienable rights for our people and all others. The United States has opened her heart and gates to the teeming masses of the persecuted and unwanted of other lands granting them a chance to a dignified life as guaranteed by the laws of our land. America has always been a stanch defender of human rights making heavy sacrifices in human life to preserve in other far off lands those same rights which are the cornerstone of our great United States. Many of America's sons and daughters have made the supreme sacrifice in distant lands. Those sacrifices were made because we know that a world half free and half slave cannot survive.

Notwithstanding these great sacrifices the world again is confronted with a mortal challenge. A highly organized tyranny, void of any signs of morals and human dignity looms threateningly on the horizon. America is leading the family of nations in a total and deadly encounter with this menace. The Soviet Union this vast prison of nations, is now endangering our very existence.

The desire and fervent aspirations of the peoples in the Captive Nations for freedom and national independence provides a powerful third force in the war launched by imperial Russia. This third force is bound to our political conviction by an unbreakable bond of ideals—just as it stands as a formidable and unyielding enemy of imperial Russia. We must learn to use this powerful third force for peace, for justice among nations, and for a new world order based upon universal freedom and social righteousness.

The week of July 14 through 21, 1963, is set aside by an Act of Congress and by Presidential proclamation as Captive Nations Week. Through this weeklong observance we are reminded of the blessings which we enjoy as a free people and the commitment of our Nation, under God, to advance the frontiers of freedom until tyranny and despotism have vanished from the earth.

As mayor of Buffalo I welcome this opportunity to advance the cause of peace with justice and I urge and invite all my fellow citizens to join in the activities arranged for this annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

CHESTER KOWAL,
Mayor of Buffalo.

HIGHLIGHTS OF EVENTS

Sunday, July 14, a.m.: Religious observances and prayers in churches of the city of Buffalo.

At 1 p.m.: Marching groups and motorcade forming at Main and Tupper Streets to proceed to the City Hall.

At 2:30 p.m.: Civic opening of Captive Nations Week program at McKinley Monument in front of City Hall; presentation of colors; National Anthem; invocation by Rev. Porter W. Phillips, secretary, Council of Churches; posting of captive nations flags; welcome by Dr. Nestor Procyk, chairman; proclamation of Captive Nations Week by Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo; address by Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski, Member of Congress, 41st District of New York; vocal presentation; benediction by Msgr. Stanley A. Kulpinski, director, Diocesan Labor College.

Wednesday, July 17, 12 noon: Civic luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo, Hotel Statler Hilton, Terrace Room. Speaker: Hon. Charles J. Kersten, of Milwaukee, Wis., chairman, Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress. Topic: "Liberation of the Captive Nations—Key to Peace with Justice." Tickets $2.75 (for reservations call TL. 2-3399).

Sunday, July 21, 7:30 p.m.: Captive Nations Festival, Delaware Park at Albright-Knox Art Gallery; Buffalo Civic Orchestra under the direction of Jan Wolanek; a pageant of songs and dances of the captive nations; speaker: Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.

All events are open to the public. No admission charge will be made except for the civic luncheon on Wednesday, July 17, at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 13, 1963]

FREEING CAPTIVE NATIONS CALLED REALISTIC AIM

The liberation of the captive satellite nations remains a realistic objective, Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, said in a message read at a breakfast meeting today.

The fifth annual Washington Metropolitan area observance of Captive Nations Week began with a meeting at the Market Inn. The observance will feature special prayers and church services tomorrow, a banquet Wednesday, and a wreath-laying ceremony at the Washington Monument on July 21.

"The sad fact is that since Captive Nations Week was first proclaimed * * * the island of Cuba has gone Communist, the northern portion of Laos has been taken over, South Vietnam is again fighting for its life, a solidly pro-Soviet government has been established in China, a government under control of known Communists has been elected and still remains in power in British Guiana and a dozen countries in Latin America are in mortal jeopardy," Senator DODD said in the paper read by David Martin, his special assistant.

"I believe, now that our thermonuclear deterrent has been counterbalanced by a Soviet thermonuclear deterrent, it becomes more important than ever to sustain and encourage the resistance movement in the captive nations," Senator DODD said.

He added that the captive peoples' will to resist "remains the surest deterrent to Soviet aggression."

The captive nations (problem) should be raised at every international conference and at every United Nations session, Senator DODD said, in order that the nations will know the West has not deserted them.

Representative BARRY, Republican, of New York, said the descendants of immigrants from the captive nations "will never be reconciled to the captivity of the land of their ancestors." He warned that any quick action to release the nations would add to their burdens.

"Any outside armed intervention would undoubtedly provoke an all-out global war * * * and hence, it is unthinkable," Mr. BARRY said. "Likewise, any internal uprising * * * such as that which occurred in Hungary in 1956 * * * would undoubtedly be crushed by Soviet tanks and troops with a great amount of bloodshed and death."

America's ideal of individual liberty must continue to be "the shaft of light that breaks through the darkness of the Iron Curtain," he said.

Representative MARSH, Democrat, of Virginia, told the breakfast meeting that "Woodrow Wilson, great internationalist though he was, would not have looked with favor on current State Department suggestions that the United States move toward full diplomatic interchange with the Kadar regime which the Soviets impressed on captive Hungary."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 14, 1963]

DODD URGES UNITED STATES SUPPORT OF ANTI-REDS

The possible defection of 100 Soviet satellite military divisions was predicted by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, yesterday.

With the present nuclear stand-off between the United States and Russia, DODD said there is an increased chance for a nonnuclear war in which such a defection would be crucial.

The active encouragement by the United States of the resistance movement in Communist captive countries is necessary, according to DODD, if the chance for such a defection is to remain.

DODD's speech, read by Special Assistant David Martin at a breakfast launching Washington's Captive Nations Week observance, attacked what it called the defeatism responsible for U.S. inaction during the Hungarian revolt and the lackadaisical support of the Cuban freedom fighters at the Bays of Pigs.

He also accused the United Nations of allowing its debates on self-determinism to be dominated by discussions of Western colonialism in Africa and Asia. The U.N. should face the issue of Soviet colonialism in Europe, he said.

The breakfast meeting was also addressed by Congressmen John O. Marsh, Jr., Democrat of Virginia, and Robert R. Barry, Republican of New York, and Peter P. Lejins, president of the American Latvian Association.

The Captive Nations Week Observance, which will feature a special church service today, was established by Congress in 1959 to express support for the aspirations of captive people for freedom from Communist tyranny.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, July 12, 1963]

REPARATION SOCIETY PRAYS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

The Reparation Society of the Immaculate Heart of Mary will attend an all-night vigil at St. Ignatius Church, Baltimore, next Friday. This month's vigil has been arranged to coincide with the observance of Captive Nations Week. A chartered bus will leave Washington at 8 p.m. and return at 7 a.m. Saturday. Round trip fare is $3. For information and reservations contact Virginia Murphy, 1000 Perry Street NE. (526-9125).

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, July 5, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCES PLANNED

Captive Nations Week will be observed in the metropolitan area beginning Saturday, July 13. The week's observance will feature a breakfast, special prayers, church services, a banquet, and will conclude with a wreath-laying ceremony Sunday, July 21, at the Washington monuments of heroes of the various nations now held captive by Communists. Americans of all national backgrounds and creeds are urged to express their united support for the just aspirations of captive people from Communist tyranny. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of the faculty of Georgetown University is chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee.

EARLY ACTION ON RESOLUTIONS

Forty resolutions calling for a special committee are pending before the Rules Committee. Action on these resolutions is long overdue. Many of our Members on Rules are on record in favor of the establishment of this necessary committee. In view of the general support demonstrated for this committee, along with numerous colleagues I urge that early action be taken on this vital measure. If, as General Taylor and many others feel, there is the fear that euphoria might overtake us following the ratification of the test ban treaty, I know of no more sobering activity than a patient, well-planned, and methodic study of all the captive nations with the primary view of formulating legislation contributing to our strength and posture in the cold war.

A special committee would also be the formidable symbol of America's determination to maintain and preserve the hopes of all the captive peoples for eventual freedom and independence. It would give concrete expression to the will of countless Americans who in the Fifth Captive Nations Week observance displayed this spirited determination. As indications of this, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following comments on the week be appended to my remarks:

The July 17 New York Journal-American editorial; the July 15 New York Times report and July 13 Journal-American report; the July 15 Daily News report; an Indianapolis News editorial; the July 12 Virginia Register report; a manifesto for the week; a July 12 Catholic Standard editorial; a July 15 column in the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Times Leader; a July 27 Daily News editorial; two statements of the National Captive Nations Committee; a concise comparative statement on the captive and free worlds issued by the Washington Captive Nations Committee, and, finally, a copy of House Resolution 14.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 17, 1963]

THE CAPTIVES

This is Captive Nations Week, and in conjunction with the talks now going on in Moscow the timing could not be better.

It serves to remind us that:

1. While Premier Khrushchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation has ever accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime—that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the captivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

Further, as "Editor's Report" by W. R. Hearst, Jr., said Sunday, such a treaty would imply a parallel between the two blocs, where none actually exists. NATO is a voluntary association of free nations. "The Warsaw Pact is a dragooned clique of puppet governments whose regimented populations are kept in submission under threat of Soviet troop action."

We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 15, 1963]

Captive Nations Week Underway

The observance of Captive Nations Week began here yesterday with church services and a ceremony in United Nations Plaza.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana, told a group of 150 persons outside the headquarters of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, 769 United Nations Plaza, that free elections in the captive nations must be a condition of discussions between members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Communist bloc.

Earlier about 50 expatriates, many of them dressed in folk costumes and carrying flags, attended the 10 a.m., solemn mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral. They were received by Cardinal Spellman and they heard a statement of the cardinal read by Rev. Robert Moher, a professor of the Catholic University of America in Washington.

The observance will continue here today with a ceremony on the steps of city hall with Mayor Wagner as the main speaker. It is sponsored by the American Friends of the Captive Nations, the Conference of Americans of Central European Descent and the assembly.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, July 13, 1963]

Captive European Nations Week Opens

The observance of Captive Nations Week will officially open tomorrow with the celebration of a solemn mass at 10 a.m. in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Fifth Avenue at 50th Street.

Representatives of captive European nations will attend the mass. Preacher will be Rev. Robert Moher, C.S.C., who is assisting on the staff of the cathedral. He is former professor of moral theology at Holy Cross Seminary, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

[From the New York Daily News, July 15, 1963]

Red Captives Voting Asked

Free elections in communism's captive nations of Europe were demanded yesterday as a condition for any nonaggression-pact negotiations between NATO and the Communist bloc.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana, made the demand at a ceremony marking the start of the fifth annual Captive Nations Week. The program, outside the office of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, opposite U.N. headquarters, was attended by 150 persons.

Representative JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, Democrat-Liberal, of Queens, voiced a hope that the U.N. "will give the captive nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—the opportunity for self-determination."

Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman of the Assembly of Captive Nations, urged the U.N. to fight "flourishing Soviet colonialism" as vigorously as it has "the now almost-vanished Western-type colonialism."

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 25, 1963]

Free the Captives

Although it has been roundly condemned for "doing nothing," the State legislature has produced one positive action which should win the praise of Hoosiers of both parties.

The general assembly has passed, and Governor Welsh has signed, a concurrent resolution declaring the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" in Indiana.

The resolution commemorates the solidarity of the American people with the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union, and declares American dedication to the proposition that they shall once more be free.

As passed in the legislature, the resolve incorporates the text of a similar resolution passed in 1959 by the U.S. Congress. The wording of this latter declaration fittingly sums up the purpose of Captive Nations Week:

"These submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist and other religious freedom, and of their individual liberties;

* * * * * * *

"It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive;

* * * * * * *

"The desire for liberty and independence of the overwhelming majority of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace;

* * * * * * *

"It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

To make this fact clear, the Governor is memorialized by the legislature "to do all things necessary" in observing Captive Nations Week in Indiana, beginning this July.

This occasion was marked last year by a series of impressive ceremonies and observances, headed up by Col. Roscoe Turner and then-Mayor Charles Boswell.

We trust this year will be distinguished by similar ceremonies, and we congratulate the legislature and the Governor for putting official sanction behind so worthy a cause.

[From the West Virginia Register, July 12, 1963]

Honor Captive Nations—Public Law 86–90 Providing for the Designation of the Third Week of July as "Captive Nations Week" Adopted by the 86th Congress of the United States of America in July 1959

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the peoples of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russian have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world.

[From the West Virginia Register, July 12, 1963]

Copies of Booklet Are Available

Copies of the booklet "Flags of the Captive Nations," by Robert E. Ramsey are still available and may be purchased by writing to the author care of the West Virginia Register, Post Office Box 230, Wheeling, W. Va. Copies are priced at 25 cents each.

The booklet gives a résumé of an event that took place in Denver, Colo., in September, 1961, which honored the captive nations. It also contains a copy of Public Law 86–90, which calls for the designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week."

The law was the outgrowth of a resolution that was principally the work of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Manifesto for Captive Nations Week 1963

The undersigned organizations dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July of each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

All the captive peoples of Europe and Asia, including the bulk of the Russian and Chinese peoples themselves, have been enslaved for long years by Communist tyranny. The Soviet Union not only preserved all the colonial conquests of Czarist Russia, but expanded the empire further. Since World War II, the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe have been deprived of their national independence, in disregard of solemn treaties and agreements. Since 1921 several non-Russian nations, which became independent following the collapse of the Czarist empire, had their independence forcibly suppressed, while all other non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union have since 1919 been denied their promised right to national self-determination. All have lost their basic human freedoms—freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and what is perhaps most important of all, freedom from fear.

The captive peoples of Central and Eastern Europe have never ceased to resist actively when the opportunity presented itself, passively when necessity dictated. Even after both the United Nations and the Western Powers failed to come to the aid of the Hungarian revolution, they did not cease to hope; and their more recent disappointment at the unopposed erection of the Berlin wall has still not caused them to abandon hope. But this hope—which alone feeds the embers of resistance—depends on two major factors: The resolve with which the free world responds to Soviet threats, whether military or political, whether in Europe, Asia or Latin America; and the clarity and steadfastness with which the Western Powers—and the United States above all—commit themselves and pursue the goal of freedom for the captive nations.

Despite formal assurances that U.S. policy continues to support the aspirations of freedom of the captive peoples, there are strong indications that this policy is, in fact, evolving toward accommodation with the Communist governments. This is illustrated by the U.S. abstention on the crucial vote in the United Nations Credentials Committee on the approval of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

It is claimed by the supporters of a new approach that expanded relations with the Communist regimes will induce them to follow a course of greater independence toward Moscow and to grant some freedoms to their subjects. But this overlooks the basic fact that all improvements in the lot of the captive peoples have invariably been the result of pressures on the Communists, both from within and without. If the people of Hungary and Poland are better off than their neighbors in eastern Europe, it is because the freedom fighters of Hungary challenged the Soviet might with their bare hands—and because the Soviet Union, fearful that the revolution might spread to Poland, agreed in panic to the policy of relaxation. The gradual improvement in the lot of the Hungarians since the black repressions of 1956 and 1957 is partly due to the constant pressure exerted by the United Nations to secure compliance with its resolutions, and to the United States' hitherto steadfast refusal to recognize the legitimacy of a government forced on the Hungarian people by Soviet tanks. It is also partly a function of economic necessity; for without concessions the Communists could not secure the cooperation of the workers and technicians.

We are fearful that a policy of accommodation will have disastrous results not only for the captive peoples themselves, but for the whole free world. The resistance of the captive peoples, which has long been a powerful deterrent to Soviet aggression, might be weakened to the point where it would cease to be a factor in the calculations of the Kremlin. This would leave the Kremlin free to undertake further adventures against a West already noticeably weakened by the Communist gains in the recent Italian elections, and by dissensions in NATO. It will also challenge the credibility of American firmness not only in Europe, but in the Caribbean. It will nullify the effects of the American administration's firm stand, last fall, on the Russian missile bases in Cuba.

We call upon the U.S. Government not to embark on a course of accommodation with the Communist dictatorships. Only by leading the fight for freedom of oppressed peoples everywhere can the West assume the spiritual and diplomatic offensive in the world-wide struggle for liberty and justice. Only thus can the West effectively counter both the Soviet strategy of expansion by economic, political and military pressure, and the danger of nuclear war.

In commemorating Captive Nations Week:

We accuse the U.S.S.R. Government of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania;

We further accuse the Soviet Government of forcibly depriving the peoples within its own borders of the promised right of self-determination and of destroying the formerly free and independent states of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Byelorussia, and others;

We urge that the Hungarian question be retained on the United Nations agenda until the U.N. resolutions on Hungary have been complied with.

We urge the governments of the United States and its allies:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, their support of the right of self-determination of all peoples held in captivity by the Communist imperial system and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations.

2. To recognize that any relaxation of tensions can only follow, not precede, the realization of self-determination through free elections in these captive nations; that there can be no end to the Cold War as long as an Iron Curtain runs through Europe and half of Europe remains enslaved, and that the strict observance of the right of self-determination must be made the precondition in any security agreements.

3. To be always mindful of the proven fact that the Soviet Union and the satellite regimes desperately need as much of the Western economic strength as they can draw from trading with the West, and accordingly, to use the tremendous bargaining power their economic strength confers upon them to exact meaningful political concessions for the captive peoples and for the entire free world.

We appeal to the people of the United States of America, during Captive Nations Week, July 14–20, 1963, to manifest their awareness of the importance of their silent allies in the Soviet-subjugated lands in the world-wide conflict between the forces of liberty and Communist tyranny, and to pledge themselves to help them in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Christopher Emmet, Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations; Msgr. John Balkunas, Chairman, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; Thomas Cuite, National Captive Nations Committee; Steven J. Jarema, Chairman, American Conference for the 'Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.

[From the Catholic Standard, July 12, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

A thoughtful observance of Captive Nations Week is good insurance against captivity. Although we welcome every whiff and vestige of evidence that Russian communism is turning toward the West, we must very soberly gage both the validity of these indications and our course. The plight of the captive nations is the best example for our guidance.

People must live on facts, not promises. People must enjoy the daily benefits of freedom—not party explanations of "group freedom"—before they can say they are free. Therefore the gage of what the Reds mean about human rights, including freedom, is what they are actually doing in the captive countries.

By any standard of civilized law and usage, the captive countries well deserve their name. The very foundation of human rights is not acknowledged, that men as creatures of God possess rights granted by the Creator. The state in the captive countries assumes the rights of God and man, presuming to parcel them out according to their desires. Even the reports that governments in these states have now relaxed their controls, granting some scant exercise of rights, confirms the inadmissible premise that the state, not the individual, possesses the rights.

The Reds can easily disprove that the satellite nations are not really captives—by free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and freedom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

And until the enslaved nations are free, we shall continue to pray for them and to use all possible pressure to assure their freedom.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader, July 15, 1963]

SELLOUT OF CAPTIVE NATIONS LIKELY

This is Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed, perhaps with some embarrassment, by President Kennedy—and it comes, truly, at a strange conjunction of the stars.

On the one hand, the sponsors of the week, the insistently active National Captive Nations Committee, with Herbert Hoover as its Honorary Chairman and the fire-breathing Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University as its working head, is busy deploring our "many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later."

"Beyond all rationality," says Dr. Dobriansky, "is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a breather to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world."

While Dr. Dobriansky speaks with an iron voice, however, the administration obviously hopes that Khrushchev, with Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman waiting on his doorstep, will not take any of this "strum und drang" stuff on the part of the Captive Nations Committee too seriously.

It is not that anybody contemplates a conscious sellout of eastern European hopes in exchange for a nuclear test ban pact with the Soviets. The idea of an opening to the east, which was first explored by the Vatican, is something that is conceived in expectations of a quid for a quo.

The theory behind it all is that Soviet Russia has actually been undergoing a mutation, or a sea-change, and is ready to ease up on the Captive Nations. The "things that are God's" in Poland and Hungary, so the hopes run, will be freed from secular or political interference; the churches will be allowed to preach and practice Christianity without hindrance; and some measures of civil liberty might be expected to follow in an atmosphere that is purged of religious tensions.

When this columnist put the foregoing case for the "Opening to the East" to organizers of Captive Nations Week, however, he got a short answer: "Crumbs." He also got a prediction that the Kennedy administration, for all the hopes that Averell Harriman may carry with him to Moscow, will not dare settle for crumbs.

KHRUSHCHEV'S DEAL

Khrushchev is already on record as being willing to accept a test ban agreement that would cover nuclear explosions in the air or underwater provided the NATO nations are ready to sign a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its East European allies. But the trade of pact for pact, short of including along with it a Soviet guarantee of free elections in the East European satellites, will almost certainly never be made.

For one thing, a pact is a treaty, and all treaties to which the United States is a signatory must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate under the "advise and consent" clause of the Constitution. It is impossible to visualize two-thirds of the Senate signing away the hopes of the East European captive peoples, or granting what would amount to recognition of the long-term legitimacy of the East German Communist State.

If you don't believe that the Senate would put its collective foot down on a treaty that would consign Eastern Europe to the Soviets in perpetuity, just take a look at the list of honorary members of the National Captive Nations Committee. The list includes Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, KEATING and JAVITS, of New York, KUCHEL, of California, HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. A bipartisan list that crosses all lines, whether of party or ideology.

Moreover, there is more than idealism involved. A SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, has a Polish and Hungarian vote to worry about; a LAUSCHE, with much of his strength in Cleveland, Ohio, has all the bloods of Eastern Europe watching him. In Connecticut, Senator THOMAS DODD cannot live politically without support from people with Polish ties.

There is one way around the U.S. Senate; an exchange of "declarations" on the part of the NATO nations and the Warsaw Pact stooges would not have to run any Constitutional gauntlet, for it would not have the force of a treaty. But one cannot conceive of such a "declaration" passing muster with the West Germans or with De Gaulle.

The worries about a "sellout" this week, then, are not very real, even if Averell Harriman might be complaisant, which is extremely doubtful, anyway.

[From the New York Daily News, July 27, 1963]

SOME TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

"Now that we have banned nuclear tests," bawled N. S. Khrushchev yesterday at a Kremlin gabfest with W. Averell Harriman, "let us move forward in the direction of easing international tensions and the liquidation of the cold war."

This was just after Khrushchev and the U.S. test ban negotiator had exchanged happy hugs over Thursday's initialing of the piece of paper that may eventually outlaw some nuclear weapons tests.

Old huggy-thuggy Khrushchev led off the above-quoted remark with a typical lie. We have not "banned nuclear tests."

The proposed partial ban treaty has only been initialed. It has not been signed, and the U.S. Senate has yet to give it the once-over—preferably the thrice-over. France and Red China are refusing to take part in it, and a big Chinese Red named Kuo Mo-jo bragged only yesterday that his country will have nuclear weapons "in the not too distant future."

Yet Khrushchev is already trying to rush the Western Allies into far-ranging discussions of various pet projects of his. Chief among these is a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations. That would mean recognition of Communist East Germany, an end to any hope of German unification, and abandonment by the Western Allies of all of Khrushchev's captive nations.

The obvious move for our side is to grab the ball and suggest—with vigah—some topics of its own for discussion with the Kremlin hugger-mugger.

Why not demand that he talk about pulling his troops out of Cuba, calling off his dogs in Laos, Venezuela, Brazil, and Guatemala; holding free, secret ballot elections in all the captive nations; and giving the Western Allies free and unhindered use of ground routes between West Germany and Berlin?

Thursday's initialing of the test ban treaty does indeed offer a chance for some fruitful discussions, as Mr. Harriman says. But has our side the guts to grab that chance for its own advantage; or will it, as for years past, let the Red Hitler choose the subjects for discussion and dominate the conversation?

"LIBERATE CUBA, RESTORE FAITH IN ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS, WIN COLD WAR," 1963 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK THEME

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 9, 1963.—In a statement to all Members of the Congress, the National Captive Nations Committee announced today the theme of the 1963 Captive Nations Week: "Liberate Cuba, restore the faith in all captive nations, win the cold war." Following up the President's proclamation of the week last Friday, the committee's chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, declared, "Cuba, the latest in the roster of captive nations, can be liberated if we revive the Kersten amendment to the past mutual Security Acts and apply it thoroughly to Cuba." Originally designed for the Eurasian captive nations, the amendment provided for the formation of military-equipped Freedom Corps in the fifties.

The statement called attention to the fact that "the nationalism reflected in the party rivalries throughout the empire is the prime result of a whole decade of captive nations' opposition to Moscow's imperio-colonial rule, in Poland as well as Georgia, in Rumania as well as Ukraine, in Red China as well as Turkestan." Dr. Dobriansky, who is also a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University and the author of the Captive Nations Week resolution, emphasized:

"We are today committing many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later, but beyond all rationality is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a 'breather' to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world."

In addition to action on Cuba, the committee proposed the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in Congress, the passage of the Freedom Commission and Academy bill, and a full-scale debate in the United Nations on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, within the U.S.S.R. and without.

It also called upon Congress to put into effect the President's recent suggestion for a re-examination of our views toward the U.S.S.R. by opening up "for public discussion the captivity of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R." NCNC, which guides the annual Captive Nations Week observances, concluded on this note: "Our failure to at least start with these few proposals would justify raising the question, 'Who will be next on the long list of captive nations?' "

Referring to his telegram to the President on July 6, Dr. Dobriansky again praised the President for his early proclamation and his stress on "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty," including the majority of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself.

CAPTIVE NATIONS SPONSORS GIRD FOR FIGHT AGAINST NONAGGRESSION PACT—HONOR GERMAN ESCAPEES ON 2D ANNIVERSARY OF BERLIN WALL

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 13, 1963.—Paying tribute to over 16,000 German escapees and some 65 dead on the second anniversary of the Russian wall of shame in Berlin, the National Captive Nations Committee today urged its State and local groups to oppose any unqualified nonaggression pact with imperio-colonial Moscow.

The chairman of the committee, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, said in a statement: "This second anniversary of Moscow's infamous Berlin wall is an occasion for all Americans to honor the courage of the German escapees and those who died in their leap to freedom. We sincerely hope the President will expressively take the lead in this."

Referring to an anticipated campaign in this country for a nonaggression pact in the name of "peace," the statement called this second anniversary also "an occasion—following the most successful Captive Nations Week last month—for preparations to oppose strenuously any pact that fails to entail heavy concessions for freedom on the part of Moscow." The author of the Captive Nations Week resolution pointed out that in our negotiations we should press for these concessions on two dimensions of freedom—free elections in the captive nations of Central Europe and the constitutional right for secession by the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

"In point of cold logic," the statement read, "for us to enter into a pact with a party that in reality is in constant aggression against all these captive nations would mean a shameless acceptance of Russian aggression and the new Russian empire." The committee holds that this would be "a moral and political surrender to Moscow, which for 7 years has striven to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its empire."

The National Captive Nations Committee rejected, also, the naive notion that the limited test ban treaty is the first step toward a relaxation of tensions and the end of the cold war. "This notion," said Dobriansky, "is more the result of Moscow's psychopropaganda play on our wishful thinking than anything else." Pointing to Khrushchev's speech at the signing of the test ban treaty, he said, "We Americans should carefully read the statements coming out of Moscow to learn what peaceful coexistence means from the Russian point of view—an incessant cold war, for which we don't have an overall policy to this very day."

On the test ban treaty, which the National Captive Nations Committee regards as a terrible gamble with our national security, the statement held it to be actually the first step to a campaign for a nonaggression pact. The Captive Nations Week sponsors insist the two must be kept strictly apart, both technically and psychologically. Dobriansky stated further: "Since the illegitimate Government of East Germany has signed the treaty in Moscow, we endorse fully the idea advanced by Congressman DERWINSKI, an honorary member of the National Captive Nations Committee, to have representatives of governments in exile—Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and others—sign the test ban treaty in Washington and London."

To offset the anticipated psychological effect of the test ban treaty, as concerns Moscow's top priority item, a nonaggression pact, the committee is urging its members to intensify their efforts for the passage of the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), which calls for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. As stated by the chairman, "The creation of this committee at this time would leave no doubt in the minds of the Russian imperio-colonialists as to where the American people, represented in Congress, stand with regard to the eventual liberation of the captive nations."

CAPTIVE NATIONS CONTRASTED WITH INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY IN FREE SOCIETY

The manner and style of life in captive nations differ from that in the free society.

A man is a slave if, like a dog, he must obey the commands of his master. He may be kicked or loved, fed or starved at the master's whim. He may run or be denied any movement by his master's order.

The following statements illustrate some of the aspects of enslavement in captive nations contrasted with individual liberty in free societies where each man and woman is, or has the liberty to be his own master:

RELIGION

In captive nations	*In the free society*
In the nations enslaved by communism there cannot be concern for a spiritual mission since Communists contend that insofar as this aspect of man exists subjectively it is based on error and is on the way out. Churches may be tolerated up to a point, as in Poland, but this is purely a policy of expediency. The abnormal-normal situation is that some minimum freedom of the cult (worship) is allowed churches, reconstituted as purely private societies, as the price of obedience and cooperation with the State for propaganda and international purposes.	In a free society, dedicated to the principles of a truly human civilization, the state accepts the spiritual as a vital and valid aspect of the life of man. It encourages churches to do their proper work and even to be the conscience of the nation. The church is at liberty to fulfill her spiritual mission."—Dr. Charles Lowry, president, Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.
In the total system of communism, where the only supreme being is the state and the individual is subordinated to the system, where cultural heritage and tradition is counted back only to Karl Marx, and where political and economic philosophy supplant humanistic philosophy, Judaism and Jews experience repression and persecution. Religious practices are thwarted and religious ideals are under continual assault. For freedom of conscience, Communists would substitute lack of conscience; Communists would nationalize Jewish heritage and tradition and offer in payment only the biblical "mess of porridge."	"Judaism, which has in its centuries long history fathered Christianity and Islam, provides for its adherents a religious faith and philosophy which recognizes man's obligation to his fellow man and his subordination to the Almighty. It provides a cultural heritage and tradition as well," Roy H. Millenson, American Jewish Committee.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

Communists set up hundreds of associations in countries which they run: associations of women, of writers, of scientists and institutions for sports, cultural exchange, peace and so on. This proclaimed function of all of these is to support the Communist Party and State, educate the members into acceptance and execution of Communist orders. Their publications and statements parrot those of Communist leaders. In Communist countries these groups are instruments of state power. For example: "The art of Socialist realism is a weapon in the struggle for communism. Soviet artists fully understand the party's concern for the purity and fighting efficiency of this weapon."—Sculptor Yekaterina Belashova, secretary, Board of the U.S.S.R. Artists' Union, Moscow, April 10, 1963.	"It has been said that every situation, condition, problem, idea, thought, interest, or activity in the United States has a voluntary committee, organization, or association to deal with it. All human interests and activities are reflected by free moving groups in which all are participants, in one way or another, and which, in total, make up our American way of life.
	"The 13,000 trade and professional associations in the United States represent cooperative organizations supported by competing business units brought together by mutuality of interest to improve the general interest of the members and to solve problems together which cannot be solved through individual effort. The pervasive influence and impact of all association action account for most of what is uniquely American. The sum total of benefits to the American public resulting from the constant, pervasive, usually undramatic and unheralded association influence is incalculable,"—Glenn B. Sanberg, executive vice president, American Society of Association Executives.
All productive facilities are owned and operated by the state, there is not likely to be a counterpart of an organization of manufacturers. None of the activities permitted by such an association in the United States would be permitted.	"Our function is to promote the philosophy of economic freedom, improve relations between employers and employees, defend the rights of liberties of employers and employees, improve foreign and domestic commerce, disseminate among the people information with respect to the principles of individual liberty and the ownership of property, support national legislation in furtherance of these principles and oppose legislation in derogation thereof."—Edward Haher, vice president, National Association of Manufacturers.

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

In captive nations

The state controls, dominates and manipulates all organizations. The captive country sees no need for, and has no use for, a voluntary organization.

If, in a captive country, there is an organization by the name of chamber of commerce, it is merely a part of the government—and is set up by the government to regulate some form of industry, to police some activity of business, or to compile and publish business statistics for the government.

TRADE UNIONS

What are called "unions" in the captive nations, as in the Soviet Union itself, are agencies of the state, dedicated solely to the interests of the state. Their function is not to give workers more freedom but to control workers more effectively. To describe them as "unions" is as great an enormity as the self-description of their governments as "people's democracies."

POLITICAL PARTIES

"Marxist-Leninist parties throughout the world have before them a common ultimate aim: to mobilize all the forces for the struggle by workers and the toiling peasants to seize power for the building of socialism and communism * * * The working out of the forms and method of the struggle for socialism in every individual country is the internal affair of the working class of that country and its Communist vanguard."—Letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, March 31, 1963.

YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

"The Komsomol is a very great and active force in our society, with more than 20 million young men and girls. Some 80 million people have passed through the Komsomol's school of Communist education and have taken part in its social-political activity. What is the main thing used by the Komsomol as a guide for its activity? * * * To help youth learn communism. To learn communism means to link the theoretical theses of our party with daily practical work. Such problems as the struggle for all branches of the national economy, the struggle to raise the productivity of labor, the struggle to improve the quality of output, and the struggle to lower our production costs are problems for economics. They interest youth so profoundly and they have become so much a part of our Komsomol organization's life that without them the existence of the Komsomol simply seems to be unthinkable."—S. P. Pavlov, First Secretary, Central Committee of the Komsomol, April 18, 1963.

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

In the free society

"In America, the chamber of commerce, may be a local organization, or it may be a State, regional or national organization. Its members are business and professional men, civic leaders and business firms. It represents the business community. It voices the philosophy of free enterprise, self-reliance and individual initiative.

"The chamber of commerce is always a voluntary organization. The central purpose of the chamber of commerce is to improve conditions in general—to improve the climate in which people live, work, and carry on business. Through the chamber of commerce, its members work together on a cooperative and voluntary basis to solve economic and social problems, to create new markets and new job opportunities, to keep the country increasingly productive and strong—and to preserve our representative form of government," Arch N. Booth, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

TRADE UNIONS

"Affiliated unions of the AFL–CIO strive continuously and successfully to improve the wages, working conditions, job security, and social benefits of workers on the job, through free collective bargaining with employers. In addition, each union, by itself, and through the AFL–CIO, works ceaselessly toward the perfection of American society as a whole. Organized labor in the United State is the people's lobby, the voice of all who work for wages and salaries, a voice that is heard in the halls of government as well as at the bargaining table," George Meany, president, AFL–CIO.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Any group of individuals may form a political party, present its platforms to the voters, and campaign for election of its candidates for public office. The aim of legitimate political parties in a free society is to identify and give voice to the political views of a majority of citizens. It is through political parties that Americans express their political wants and needs.

YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Catholic Youth Organization, Christian Endeavor, the others, are organized for the purposes of encouraging self-reliance and personal growth: spiritual, physical, cultural, and social. Aspects of these programs maintain faith in God, in self, and in country. Well-rounded programs establish initiative and leadership, essential to a free society.

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while we have the undivided attention of the Members, may I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for leading a great fight for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Mr. FLOOD. I am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois. I could not have improved on that statement myself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend their remarks immediately following mine, and also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my full support for the resolution to establish a Special

House Committee on the Captive Nations. These European nations forcefully represent the tyranny which has followed the development of world communism since its inception. It is somewhat ironic that Premier Khrushchev continually uses the term "imperialist" to refer derogatorially to Western statesmen. Since World War II his nation has embarked on one of the greatest imperialistic drives of all time. Millions of Poles, Hungarians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, East Germans, Bulgarians, Albanians, Rumanians, and Czechoslovaks have been forcibly deprived of their right to national self-determination; in most instances they have lost their civil liberties as well; and in some instances, they have been deprived of their national identities.

The formation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, something which I have supported for some time, would constitute a significant declaration of firm support for those millions of trapped individuals behind the Iron Curtain who look hopefully to the West for constructive leadership toward eventual freedom and liberty. We cannot forget these people now. I strongly recommend immediate passage of this resolution.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague, Dan Flood, in directing the attention of the Members of the House to the vital need for the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Certainly, the nationwide attention that was evidenced throughout Captive Nations Week indicates strong public support and concern for and constant interest in the plight of the captive peoples, and I submit for the Record at this point, as evidence of this public interest, proclamations issued by the following Governors:

Hon. Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of the State of Indiana.

Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York.

Hon. James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio.

Hon. Jack M. Campbell, Governor of the State of New Mexico.

Hon. George D. Clyde, Governor of the State of Utah.

Proclamation for Captive Nations Week July 14–20, 1963

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed the week of July 14–20, 1963 as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas these nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and restoring to them the enjoyment of their individual liberties and freedoms; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked to them by bonds of family and in the common belief that freedom and justice must prevail throughout the world, and it is proper that we give expression of our support to the people of these nations who are striving for personal liberty and independence; Now, therefore,

I, Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of the State of Indiana, invite the citizens of Indiana to join with our sister States in observing Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Matthew E. Welsh,
Governor of Indiana.
Charles O. Hendricks,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation by State of New York

The Soviets, whose spokesmen are fond of calling other people imperialists, now have an empire of no fewer than 23 captive nations. We might add Tibet to the list since its enslavement by Red China.

No fewer than 410 million people are now subject to Communist colonialism.

We know that eventually this empire will crumble as have all others amassed by force of arms. But that is poor consolation to the victims suffering oppression and unhappiness.

We of the United States are the fortunate inhabitants of a citadel of human freedom. We are proud that we are giving asylum to many refugees from oppressed countries. In point of fact, we have benefited from their presence as they are valued neighbors, loyal and industrious members of our State and Nation.

We have a weapon against communism in recognition and understanding of the plight of those captive peoples. With them we look forward to the day when their enslavement shall come to an end.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in New York State.

Nelson A. Rockefeller,
Governor.
William J. Ronan,
Secretary to the Governor.

Proclamation by State of Ohio

Whereas the harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive:

Now, therefore, I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and urge that all citizens support this annual recognition of the plight of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe.

James A. Rhodes,
Governor.

Proclamation by State of New Mexico

Whereas the establishment of a just and enduring peace throughout the world is essential to the survival of civilization; and

Whereas the United States supports the United Nations as it works to advance the well-being of all peoples; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has resolved that October 24, the anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter, should be dedicated each year to making known the purposes, principles, and accomplishments of the United Nations.

Now, therefore, I, Jack M. Campbell, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby urge the citizens of this State to observe Thursday, October 24, 1963, as United Nations Day by means of community programs which will contribute to a better understanding of its aims, problems, and achievements.

Jack M. Campbell,
Governor.

A Proclamation by State of Utah

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations; and policies of Soviet communism have resulted in the subjugation of many once-free peoples and created a vast slave empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace:

Now therefore, I, George D. Clyde, Governor of the State of Utah, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Utah to observe this week by offering prayers for the peaceful liberation of the oppressed and subjugated people all over the world, and by other appropriate manifestations.

George D. Clyde,
Governor of Utah.

I am especially pleased to report that a record number of communities commemorated Captive Nations Week, and I submit for the Record, as part of my remarks, proclamations by the following:

Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.

Hon. Victor H. Schiro, mayor of New Orleans.

Hon. J. Bracken Lee, mayor of Salt Lake City.

Hon. George Christopher, mayor of San Francisco.

Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago.

Proclamation by City of Buffalo

Whereas our Nation was founded and built on the precept of freedom and liberty for its citizens who hailed from all parts of the world and sought on these shores a haven for a free life, free worship, and free speech; and

Whereas our Nation since its inception has continuously advocated and supported the natural aspirations of other peoples and nations toward self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas our great Nation has demonstrated time and again its readiness to defend these ideals, bringing countless sacrifices in human life as well as material values to defend these inalienable rights; and

Whereas our Nation is facing today its greatest challenge and crisis of history by an opposing ideology based on tyranny and despotism which has no equal in history, Russian Communist imperialism; and

Whereas after the brutal suppression by Russia of the once free and independent peoples of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, China, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Poland, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, East Germany, Cossackia, Cuba, Tibet, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, Rumania, Hungary, and others; and

Whereas since the enactment in 1959 of Public Law 86–90, the American people have fittingly demonstrated to victims of Russian aggression that we, the American people realize their plight and support the just aspirations of the captive nations to a free and independent life; and

Whereas the alliance of the free world with the captive nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and holds the key to peace, as the captive nations are the Achilles heel of the Russian empire and their restive masses have doubtlessly hampered and prevented many aggressive designs of imperial Russia; and

Whereas it is imperative that we Americans keep the torch of freedom burning in the hearts and minds of the peoples in the captive nations by showing our deep concern to their present plight and their future by strengthening their resolve to win human dignity, freedom, and national independence.

Now, therefore, I, Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 through 21, 1963, as Captive Nations Week and urge the people of our city to observe this week as days of rededication to the cause of liberty and the dignity of man with prayers and public ceremonies, demonstrating our moral support for the just aspirations of the peoples of all the captive nations.

CHESTER KOWAL,
Mayor of Buffalo.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Whereas universal peace and tranquillity are the goal and objective of free men in every section of the world; and

Whereas the United States derives its greatness through the democratic process, a result of harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas the Communist enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas Russian communism has adopted imperialistic and aggressive policies since 1918 which have resulted in the creation of a vast empire and presents a direct threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas because of direct or indirect aggression, Communist Russia has subjugated the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukrainia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled have lent support and endorsement to the Presidential proclamation which designates the period of July 14–20, 1963, to be observed as "Captive Nations Week"; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas this occasion provides Americans with the opportunity to recognize the fact that the Communist conspiracy has now spread its greedy tentacles and grasped one of our neighboring Republics, Cuba. All of this is a forceful reminder that the Soviet Union has become the largest colonial empire of our times:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, mayor of the city of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the period of July 14 to 20 to be Captive Nations Week, 1963, in New Orleans.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY SALT LAKE CITY CORP.

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

Whereas it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in the freedom of other nations:

Now, therefore, I, J. Bracken Lee, mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah, do hereby designate the week July 14 through 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of Salt Lake City to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Whereas in accordance with Public Law 86–90, unanimously adopted by the 86th Congress, authorizing the third week of July each year to be proclaimed "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world, the period of July 14–20, 1963, will be observed throughout the United States as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower have emphasized the need for our people to learn more about the captive nations, and this fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week again provides an occasion for all Americans to show the people of the captive nations that they are not forgotten in their hopes for achieving liberty and independence; and

Whereas the people of our Nation have many roots in the various captive countries, and it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people express their interest in the freedom of other nations:

Now, therefore, I, George Christopher, mayor of the city and county of San Francisco, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14–20, 1963, to be Captive Nations Week in San Francisco, and I do urge all citizens to join in appropriate observances thereof and to support the just aspirations of all peoples for national freedom and independence.

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION BY CITY OF CHICAGO

Whereas by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the city of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive, and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas the peoples of these Communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the city of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs;

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communications to observe the plight of the Communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at the program to be held at the band shell in Grant Park on Sunday afternoon, July 14, at 2 o'clock.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

I am very happy to note, as I have included proclamations from the various mayors, that issued by the Honorable Richard J. Daley of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, while we note the concrete accomplishments and results of Captive Nations Week, we must also realistically take stock of certain failures and questionable developments. Following this thought, I place into the RECORD at this point a letter from an unnamed citizen, commenting on Mayor Wagner's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, and an article by Columnist Fulton Lewis, Jr., analyzing the President's proclamation:

MYSTERIES AROUND CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION IN NEW YORK CITY

Thousands of New Yorkers were amazed this year to learn for the first time since 1959 that there was no official observance of Captive Nations Week at New York's City Hall. Every year—in 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962—there was an official ceremony at which the officials of the city of New York participated in these meaningful ceremonies. In the past Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York was the honorary chairman of the Captive

Nations Week Committee, and as a rule, he not only issued the captive nations proclamation, but personally delivered his address. In 1962, it is to be recalled, Mayor Wagner was in Germany during the Captive Nations Week observances, but he sent a telegram with warmest wishes for the successful celebration of this significant event. Moreover, Mayor Wagner wrote letters to President Kennedy urging him to issue an early proclamation of Captive Nations Week. Last year, as in the previous years, the New York City Hall celebration was handled skillfully by Comdr. James Farrell, director of special events, and Mr. Thomas J. Cuite, councilman of Brooklyn, two outstanding citizens of New York, who had the interest of all the captive nations at heart.

But what a difference this year?

Representatives of the captive nations organizations as usual approached city hall to start planning an impressive observance of Captive Nations Week. But all during the month before July 14, 1963—the first day of the Captive Nations Week—they were given assurance that the program would be handled by the mayor's office. Attempts to obtain details were fruitless. However, it was stated that Mayor Wagner's assistants, Messrs. Julius Edelstein and Andrew Valusek, both of whom were recently appointed as his aids by the Nationality Division of the National Democratic Committee, were planning the arrangements of the issuance of the proclamation by the mayor. They stated that Mr. Cuite would not handle the program this year.

But July 14, 1963, arrived, and there was no advance proclamation of Captive Nations Week, nor were there any preparations made for the official observance at city hall as was the case in the past 4 years. One excuse given was that the mayor had to leave for Paris to visit his sick son.

Although Mayor Wagner had returned to New York on Friday night, July 12, 1963, there was no proclamation for July 14, despite the fact that many telephone calls had been made to city hall, as well as personal interventions. Monday noon a delegation visited the mayor's office and a representative advised that no plans had as yet been scheduled for holding any ceremony. A proclamation was not ready but was being prepared. At this same time groups of people representing different captive nations were milling around asking for information about the program.

Finally, on Tuesday, July 16, 1963, the office of the mayor decided to issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation. Only a handful of representatives were notified to come to the mayor's conference room on Tuesday noon, where Deputy Mayor Edward J. Cavanagh, Jr., read the proclamation before a crowded room, many in native costumes and with national flags.

But what a proclamation.

It was an emaciated text, making reference to 10 captive nations and 120 million people only, despite the fact that the congressional resolution enumerates 22 captive nations of Europe and Asia.

There is no question that great moral and political harm was done to both Mayor Wagner and the captive nations as a whole. We know definitely that Mayor Wagner is a great friend of all the captive nations.

But it would appear that his immediate aids and assistants were trying to deviate from his record of steady support of the captive nations and to get away from the traditional observances of the Captive Nations Week altogether. Whatever it was, one thing is sure and definite as that night follows day:

New York's City Hall failed this year to uphold its tradition for having an official observance of Captive Nations Week, despite the fact that the metropolitan area of New York has hundreds of thousands of friends of the captive nations, and despite the fact that Mayor Wagner is chairman of the Nationality Division of the National Democratic Committee.

The masters of the captive nations in Moscow must certainly be overjoyed that New York City, the great cosmopolitan center and the seat of the United Nations, has played down the manifestations of its traditional loyalty and friendship to the principle of freedom and liberation of all the captive nations.

Not so long ago (January 1963), the Communist review in Moscow, the New Times, has called on Americans to discard the observances of Captive Nations Week, inasmuch as this observance was as much a "dead horse as was the Hungarian question."

There are some people on this side of the Atlantic that appear to agree with that type of thinking.

AN ANGRY GOTHAMITE.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD an editorial of July 17 from the New York Journal American; an article of July 12 from the West Virginia Register; a July 14 article from the New York Herald Tribune; an article of July 22 from the Post-Standard of Syracuse, N.Y., and a Resolution and Statement of the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia—which are positive demonstrations of the interest in the just aspirations of the captive peoples.

[From the Hazleton Standard-Speaker, May 23, 1963]

KENNEDY'S PROMISE TO CAPTIVE NATIONS FORGOTTEN

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk has been accused of gross deception in his relations with congressional leaders.

His actions strike at the very "integrity" of the executive branch, according to Senator Thomas Dodd, influential Connecticut Democrat.

Time after time, members of Congress have been assured that Rusk planned no change in U.S. policy toward the captive nations. Only last December, Dodd and four colleagues wrote Rusk asking that our U.N. delegation be instructed to "stand firm" on Hungary.

"We are deeply concerned," they wrote, "over recurring reports that the United States may be considering a change in attitude toward the Hungarian question on the U.N. agenda."

The Senators DODD, MCCARTHY, KEATING, MUNDT, and SCOTT—were assured the reports were erroneous. Then came the first shift in U.S. policy.

The United States agreed to dismiss Sir Leslie Munro of Australia as special U.N. representative on Hungary. Sir Leslie, who had performed yeoman service in his tireless efforts to win Hungarian justice, was replaced by Secretary General U Thant, a Burmese neutralist who promptly made it known the Hungarian question was dead as far as he was concerned. He then abolished the special U.N. broadcasts to Hungary, which often gave its captive people the only non-Communist news they received.

Although DODD and his colleagues did not then know it, another U.S. policy had undergone change. American envoys began to mingle socially with their Hungarian counterparts. The State Department rationale: "It served as an intelligence pipeline into the Hungarian delegation."

Soon even that pretense was dropped. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON was host to Hungarian Ambassador Karoly Csatorday at his Texas ranch. L.B.J. and his Lady Bird gave Comrade Csatorday the red carpet treatment, then rode with them and other U.N. envoys in a special parade through San Antonio.

The policy shift is now almost complete. In a paper prepared for congressional leaders, the State Department has announced that Ambassador Adlai Stevenson will no longer oppose seating the Hungarian delegation.

The reason: Kadar and company have proclaimed an amnesty for anti-Communist political prisoners. Hungarian refugees, whose contacts behind the Iron Curtain are remarkably good, call the "amnesty" a sham.

Congressional reaction has been violent. Senator DODD, one of the most eloquent foes of communism in Washington, says the shift comes close to "destroying the last hopes of the captive peoples."

Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Illinois Democrat, is incredulous:

"For anyone to suggest that the time has come for the United Nations to accept the Kadar credentials is to make a mockery of freedom, justice, and human dignity."

Note: One other statement is now worth repeating: "The godless tyranny that has fastened itself on the great nations of Eastern Europe—on Hungary, on Poland, on Czechoslovakia, on Rumania, on East Germany, on Bulgaria—can never be overthrown by an America working halftime.

"And it cannot be overthrown by empty promises at election time . . . I say the people of East Europe do not deserve to be forgotten. And I say they won't be under a Democratic Administration.

"We must make it clear to all the world that we will never accept as a final solution Soviet colonialism in East Europe. We must seek through positive action in the United Nations to hold the searchlight of world opinion on Soviet brutality."

The speaker, John Kennedy. His searchlight, apparently, has burned out.

[From the New York Journal-American, July 17, 1963]

THE CAPTIVES

This is Captive Nations Week, and in conjunction with the talks now going on in Moscow the timing could not be better.

It serves to remind us that:

1. While Premier Khrushchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation has ever accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime, that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the captivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

Further, as "Editor's Report" by W. R. Hearst, Jr., said Sunday, such a treaty would imply a parallel between the two blocs, where none actually exists. NATO is a voluntary association of free nations. "The Warsaw Pact is a dragooned clique of puppet governments whose regimented populations are kept in submission under threat of Soviet troop action."

We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger.

[From the West Virginia Register, July 12, 1963]

ELLIS ISLAND CALLED PERFECT PLACE FOR MEMORIAL

(By Robert E. Ramsey)

(The following is a brief explanation of a parade, a booklet, a drawing, and an idea.)

In 1961 I was living in Denver, Colo., and, at that time, I was a member of the American Legion. I had joined Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post No. 1 only a few months prior to September 9, the day on which the 43d National Convention of the American Legion opened in Denver.

As a member of the post's Americanism committee, headed by James P. Eakins, former post commander, I had suggested to Mr. Eakins that we form a unit honoring the captive nations that would march in the Legion parade September 11.

I believed that these nations could best be represented by their national flags and it was agreed that a place for such a unit would be found in the parade.

Although time and other factors were against us, we managed to form a unit of 13 flags of captive nations (there are 22 captive nations mentioned in Public Law 86–90). The flags were carried by men from Lowry Air Force Base, Denver. In front of them marched four legionnaires, two carrying a banner that read:

"The American Legion Salutes the Captive Nations," flanked on each side by a man carrying a U.S. flag.

In order to generate interest in what has been accomplished on behalf of the captive peoples in one isolated instance, I wrote a booklet, "Flags of the Captive Nations."

Published in April 1962, the booklet carried a brief history of the 13 captive nations which were represented in the Legion parade. It also contained Public Law 86–90 and, in the foreword, how other groups and individuals could help inform the public on the plight of these captive peoples.

The response to the booklet was overwhelming. I received letters from people all over the Nation, many of them from refugees of these same countries who were not citizens of the United States.

Al Ware, editorial artist of the Denver Catholic Register, was one person who greatly assisted me in the publication of these booklets. There were many others. Al drew a striking cover for the booklet in addition to providing the necessary artwork on the 13 flags, which appeared above their respective nations.

All this while, I thought there should be some sort of a permanent memorial to the captive nations, which would rise as a beacon of hope to the enslaved while at the same time become a constant reminder to the people of the United States that all of us should be ever aware of these nations and that we should work and pray for their liberation.

I talked this over with Mr. Ware and he drew the picture of the proposed memorial to the captive nations that appears above. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

Of course, an undertaking of this kind poses many problems and not the least of them is: Where could such a memorial be built? At first, I believed an appropriate site could be found on the campus of one of our universities or colleges.

I now think that the perfect place for such a memorial would be Ellis Island, which has been vacated since 1954. It was formerly the U.S. center where immigrants to this Nation were processed. Many of these immigrants were forced to leave their homelands because of Communist oppression and I think it is only fitting that should this memorial be realized, no better place than Ellis Island could be found on which to build it.

In the June 20, 1963, issue of the Long Island Catholic there is a picture of Ellis Island. Its layout is strikingly similar to the drawing that Mr. Ware composed for the memorial, although I know that he did not have the island in mind when he drew it.

The cutline under the newspaper picture of Ellis Island says it is "the subject of a dilemma." In other words, What is to become of it? I sincerely believe it should become the site for the memorial to the captive nations.

It has been pointed out to me that for such a suggestion to become a reality it would be necessary to have a congressional resolution introduced in the U.S. House and Senate. I hope such a resolution will be introduced and that the people of this country will support it by writing letters of approval to their Congressmen.

With God's help and the help and interest of us all, a memorial to the captive nations can be realized.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 14, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: THE WEEK K. SQUIRMS

WASHINGTON.—An annual event that infuriates Soviet Premier Khrushchev began today.

It is the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, which Congress set aside through a public law in 1959 to remind the world that 900 million people, most of them once free, are now living under communism behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

President Kennedy again proclaimed the observance in conformance with the law, but his choice of words was purposely mild so as not to complicate the overriding problem of easing East-West tensions.

When former President Eisenhower signed the first proclamation in 1959, Mr. Khrushchev reacted fiercely, charging it was "a hysterical campaign in the United States to discredit communism." He asserted angrily that "the only enslaved peoples tries."

Moscow—troubled by ideological difficulties with Red China and sensitive to the theme of this year's observance—"liberate Cuba"—is again expected to react bitterly. The Communists are well aware of the significance of the occasion and are especially irritated when branded "imperialists," "colonialists," or "aggressors," appellations normally reserved for the West.

From New York to Seattle, Miami to Honolulu, groups are gathering to hold religious services, rallies, parades, special dinners, and kindred activities which Congressmen, city and State officials and other dignitaries will attend.

While the theme is "Liberate Cuba," similar slogans will be voiced in support of the formerly free peoples of 24 Communist-dominated countries.

In Washington, a 9-day observance began Friday with a breakfast at which Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, Representative JOHN O. MARSH, Republican of Virginia, and Dr. Peter Lejins, of the Latvian Association, spoke. Formal activities will end next Sunday, with wreath-laying ceremonies at the monuments of heroes of the various captive nations.

After last year's observance, Izvestia, the official Russian Government newspaper, assailed the celebrations as being "unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-Communist slander."

The paper sneeringly asked if the more than 700,000 U.S. soldiers based in Europe were observing the week and attacked President Kennedy's proclamation as "a shallow formula of throwing the blame from a sick head to a healthy one."

The celebration is guided on a national level by the National Captive Nations Committee which lists former President Hoover as its honorary chairman and 85 Congressmen as honorary members.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, committee chairman, said that this year Taiwan, Formosan capital of Nationalist China, is undertaking a variety of activities as an expansion upon its first national observance last July. The committee also has written the Governments of Turkey, Iran, the United Arab Republic, Morocco, and others encouraging them to observe the week.

An integral part of this year's observance is aimed at winning support for a House resolution which would establish a special 10-member committee on the captive nations.

Under the measure, introduced by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, the committee would study the "captive non-Russian nations * * * (and) facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes * * * to regain national and individual freedom."

[From the Post-Standard, Syracuse, N.Y., July 22, 1963]

PROFESSOR PROPOSES PLAN FOR DEFEAT OF COMMUNISM

(By Pat McGovern)

A five-point plan to defeat communism was outlined last night by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren during his address to the captive nations rally at LeMoyne College.

The political science professor asked that the United States stop economic trade and break diplomatic relations with Communist countries and that U.S. citizens solidify friendships with people behind the Iron Curtain.

He also asked that Americans encourage Congress to establish a permanent Captive Nations Committee and that the Karsten amendment be activated.

This amendment is a $100 million a year program for the liberation of people behind the Iron Curtain.

The Citizen's Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week in Syracuse and Onondaga County sponsored the rally climaxing the week. It was attended by about 400 persons.

ALL TYRANNY PASSES

Dr. Bouscaren said "The day will come when freedom will be restored to the captive nations because all tyranny passes" as did the Nazi tyranny.

But it is the duty of all free peoples, he said, "to play an active role in aiding the erosion of tyranny."

The program's theme was "Liberate Cuba" and Dr. Bouscaren said, "since Cuba is the most exposed of the satellite nations" this is the easiest country in which to reverse the Communist situation."

SURRENDER BY INSTALLMENT

The choice, he stated, is not between coexistence or a nuclear holocaust but rather between "surrender on the installment plan" or victory over Russia by means of his five-point plan.

He also urged reestablishment of the Cuban blockade, adherence to the Organization of American States suggestion of greater isolation of Cuba, and a return to sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and hit-and-run raids on Cuba.

Those assembled at the rally voted unanimously to send a resolution to the United Nations appealing to the member states to openly condemn Russian imperialism and exploitation" and asking for a speedy return of independence and freedom of self-government to the countries enslaved by Moscow. Stephen M. Obremski, a member of the committee conducted the first part of the program.

TELEGRAMS

Telegrams and letters supporting and encouraging the Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week have been received by John K. Dungey, committee chairman, from Representative R. Walter Riehlman, Senator Kenneth A. Keating, and Dr. Michael Lohaza, a member of the Ukranian Congress Committee now traveling in the Ukraine.

Also speaking was Rev. Thomas P. Tuite, dean of men at LeMoyne College. He noted that "we the people shall never condone tyranny" and said the proclamation adopted by those assembled is "intended to bring hope to those people behind the Iron Curtain.

ART OF CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Artistic presentations were given by the American Legion Post 41 Chorus; Symphonia

Polish Choral Society; the Latvian Folk Dancers, the Armenian Chorus, the Ukranian Male Chorus "Surma," "Polonez" Male Chorus and the Latvian Academic Association.

Also Olgo Nagy and Zoltan Koran presented Hungarian folk dancers, Manivald Loite directed Estonian folk songs; Karoly Safran, violinist, rendered Hungarian folk tunes, and Lithuanian folk songs, recorded, directed by Alfonsas Mikulskis and Atnonas Gimzauskas were heard.

Master of ceremonies was Mykola Bohatink.

PARTICIPATING GROUPS

The participating organizations were the Armenian Community Center, Estonian Lutheran Church, the Hungarian Committee, the Latvian Academic Association, Latvian American Society, Polish Community Home, Polish American Congress, "Free China" Committee, Ukranian Congress Committee of America, the Conservative Council, and American Legion Post 41.

Honorary cochairmen of the observance were Mayor William F. Walsh, of Syracuse, and John P. Mulroy, Onondaga County executive.

The captive nations cited last night include Albania, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Communist China, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, Croatia, Slovenia, and North Caucasus.

Members of the Captive Nations Week Committee are Andres Paap, Dr. Alexander Gudziak, Arnold V. Goltz, Chairman Dungey, Obremski, and Dr. Bouscaren.

[From the Post-Standard, Syracuse, N.Y., July 22, 1963]

THE MORNING'S MAIL: CALLS COEXISTENCE DEFEATIST POLICY

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-STANDARD:

The policy today for defeating communism is no policy at all; it is nothing but an accommodation with this Red atheistic slavery. "Coexistence" is the name. It is defeatism, and will in the end mean the total enslavement of the world under communism.

Presently our Government is hellbent on disarmament. In three steps we will dismantle our Military Establishment and create an all-powerful peace force under the United Nations. This policy of stripping the United States of its military strength and eventually its freedom is spelled out in State Department Document No. 7277 and is being implemented today by policies that are weakening our military stature.

By virtue of a secret agreement made in 1945, the head of security for the U.N. is a Soviet citizen and who, in effect, is head of military forces of the U.N. Recently U Thant appointed another Soviet citizen to this all-powerful post, leaving an unbroken line of Soviet citizens holding this post since the beginning of the U.N.

Are we, as Americans, willing to dismantle our military and place it in the hands of our mortal enemy—the Soviet Union? The people of this country must answer this—but quick. Communism fears strength, but welcomes weakness.

We must have a win policy over communism, based on Christian-Judaic principles of truth, trust, honor, loyalty, and what is best for America. We must break off diplomatic relations with all Communist countries, thus taking away the false cloak of respectability that these nations have used all these years in promoting their brand of slavery.

Also in one sweep we will remove spy nests in this country, operating in embassies and elsewhere under diplomatic immunity. We should break off all trade and cultural relations as these are also used as an instrument of conquest.

Discontinue all economic and military aid to any so-called ally or neutral who chooses to trade with the Communist bloc. Recognize exile governments of those countries now under Communist domination and do all possible to assist in their liberation.

Hitch our foreign policy to the star of American freedom and not to the Red star of slavery.

JOHN K. DUNGEY.

RESOLUTION BY THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas there are many millions of human beings whose individual freedoms are suppressed by Communist tyranny and whose nations are held captive by the imperialistic conquests of the Soviet Union and Red China; and

Whereas these millions of human beings are brethren to the more fortunate individuals who comprise this great Nation of ours; and

Whereas the principles set forth in our Declaration of Independence, and our Bill of Rights have inspired human beings throughout the entire world to revolt against tyranny and declare their national independence: Be it

Resolved by the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia in meeting assembled this 17th day of June 1963, That on this fourth annual anniversary of Captive Nations Week, we, the District of Columbia Young Republicans, are not reconciled to the captivity of millions by Communist masters, and do extend our sentiments and invite every American concerned with the freedom of our Nation to participate with us, and rededicate themselves to the cause of individual freedom and national independence; not only during the week of July 14–20, but every week throughout the year; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Congress, and that copies be released to the various news media.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

At our monthly meeting held on June 17, the District of Columbia Young Republicans affirmed the principles of the Eisenhower administration pertaining to Captive Nations Week. The club overwhelmingly endorsed the Captive Nations Week resolution. The reasoning behind this resolution was that the Kennedy administration had sidestepped and avoided endorsing this proclamation for the past 2 years. Only as an afterthought did Kennedy proclaim Captive Nations Week. Dean Rusk has consistently discouraged the formation of a Captive Nations Committee.

We of the District of Columbia Young Republicans wish to melt some of the wax out of Kennedy's ears regarding communism. It is obvious to us that communism is the greatest threat to freedom and the greatest obstacle to the extension of freedom in the world. Communism preaches and practices the doctrine of slavery and is dedicated to the destruction of all of the values we Americans prize. It is probable that the weakness and ineptitude demonstrated by the Kennedy administration in Berlin, in permitting the construction of the hated wall, caused the Communists to move on Cuba.

We do not propose to melt the heart of Khrushchev by being cordial to him—for it will not work. Tyranny is still the suppression of individual liberties and the aggressive colonialism of the Soviets is subjugation of free people. We of the United States are continually trying to perfect our freedoms, but we do not live in serfdom as do the more than 800 million comprising the captive nations.

Our ultimate weapon is the inherent desire for freedom and self-determination for all men.

We rededicate ourselves to this cause.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FLOOD, has fought vigorously for the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, and as evidence of the growing support we are receiving from House Members, I submit a translation of an editorial from Draugas, commending the participation of the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman MADDEN, in support of this committee; also letters which were reprinted in the Harenik Weekly from our colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts, TOM O'NEIL, JR., and the gentleman from California, BERNIE SISK:

[From Draugas, Chicago, Ill., July 19, 1963]

THE CONCLUSION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND THE HOPES FOR LIBERATION

The Captive Nations Week that began on July 14 is about to end. Now we can have a fairly good idea of how it passed and how much it contributed to the liberation of captive nations.

There cannot be two opinions about its usefulness—it was high, although even more could have been accomplished. Captive Nations Week was commemorated in many larger cities. Some of the governors followed the President's lead and proclaimed Captive Nations Week. So did the mayors of several cities, and even smaller towns followed suit.

We also noted friendly statements about the captive nations in the press as well as good coverage of the Captive Nation's Week events. Some of the dailies published editorials. All this is good, and persons who have been heading the commemoration activities deserve full credit.

It is extremely important that the U.S. Congress joined in action. We noted that numerous Senators and Representatives made excellent statements on the floor during this past week, effectively spotlighting the captive nations problem. This, too, represents an important achievement.

Representative RAY MADDEN was one who spoke. Upon thanking Representative FLOOD for his leadership in commemorating Captive Nations Week during the July 15 session, Mr. MADDEN brought back the fact that Nikita Khrushchev became enraged when he learned that the U.S. Congress had voted to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. Mr. MADDEN stressed the Soviet leaders' fear that the annual commemorations of Captive Nations Week would remind the world every time that the European captive nations remain victims of Soviet military force and aggression. Speaking with Mr. MADDEN, Communist propaganda has been trying for years to convince the world that that the captive nations submitted to Soviet domination of their free will and are pleased with Soviet slavery.

Representative MADDEN is not a pessimist. He hopes that the enslaved peoples will—sooner or later—regain freedom from Soviet slavery. The Soviets themselves are already changing their attitude toward the West. This being so, Nikita Khrushchev and other tyrants begin to recognize that the captive nations will not break down, nor will they renounce their desire to become free and take over order and government in their countries.

These nations are only waiting for a propitious opportunity, possibly arising out of the quarrel between the Kremlin and Communist China. Should disagreements between these two Communist powers sharpen, they may erupt in unexpected events and furnish an opportunity for the captive nations to regain freedom. These were the thoughts Representative MADDEN expressed on the floor in the U.S. Congress.

We have stated at the outset that it was necessary to do more in order to commemorate Captive Nations Week yet on a larger scale. Representatives MADDEN, FLOOD, DERWINSKI, and others express a very sound opinion that now is no time for detente. One must strengthen spiritual collaboration with the captive nations. The United States has until now given support to their yearning for freedom; it shall continue giving even stronger support in the future.

Representative MADDEN is a member of the House Rules Committee, and he keeps urging his colleagues on the committee to endorse the resolution seeking to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. He is trying to secure the passage of the resolution during the present session.

Such a committee not only would show concern about the captive nations, but would also conduct inquiries into their plight and inform the world of the tyrannical methods by which millions of captive people are tortured behind the Iron Curtain.

Should this resolution pass, resulting in the establishment of a permanent House Committee, then the commemoration of Captive Nations Week could be conducted on a much larger scale in the future. It is our duty, therefore, to do what we can in urging our Congressmen to give unfailing support to the passage of this important resolution.

We sincerely hope that, in addition to the other positive achievements during the Captive Nations Week, a big step will be taken toward the speediest passage of the resolution establishing the House Committee on Captive Nations.

CONGRESSMEN O'NEILL, SISK PLEDGE SUPPORT IN HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

EDITOR'S NOTE: In the following letters received by the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia on June 27, Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Massachusetts, and BERNIE F. SISK, California, both members of the influential House Committee on Rules, announced their support of House Resolutions 14 and 15, establishing formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. The legislation, advanced by Congressmen FLOOD and DERWINSKI, has been held up in the Rules Committee. Both letters appeared in the July 4, 1963, issue of the Hairenik Weekly, published in Boston, Mass.

Thank you for your letter with reference to House Resolutions 14 and 15, to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

You may be assured that I shall continue to use my best efforts to secure favorable action on these measures both in the House Committee on Rules and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Thank you for your letter of June 21 with reference to House Resolutions 14 and 15, to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

You may be assured of my support of this legislation and I will do what I can to get it out of Rules Committee and to the floor for a vote.

I appreciate your comments on my Armenian Independence Day speech and I am glad you have been able to make use of it.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

BERNIE SISK,
Member of Congress.

Further evidence and necessary comment concerning the reason for the growing interest in the subject is contained in an article which appeared in the July 15 issue of the Journal American:

[From the New York Journal-American, July 15, 1963]

NOT MUCH CHANCE FOR A "SELLOUT"

(By John Chamberlain)

This is Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed, perhaps with some embarrassment, by President Kennedy—and it comes, truly, at a strange conjunction of the stars.

On the one hand, the sponsors of the week, the insistently active National Captive Nations Committee, with Herbert Hoover as its honorary chairman, and the fire-breathing Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University as its working head, is busy deploring our "many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later."

"Beyond all rationality," says Dr. Dobriansky, "is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a 'breather' to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world."

While Dr. Dobriansky speaks with an iron voice, however, the administration obviously hopes that Khrushchev, with Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman waiting on his doorstep, will not take any of this "sturm und drang" stuff on the part of the Captive Nations Committee too seriously.

It is not that anybody contemplates a conscious "sellout" of Eastern European hopes in exchange for a nuclear test ban pact with the Soviets. The idea of an "opening to the East," which was first explored by the Vatican, is something that is conceived in expectation of a quid for a quo. The theory behind it all is that Soviet Russia has actually been undergoing a mutation, or a sea-change, and is ready to ease up on the captive nations.

The "things that are God's" in Poland and Hungary, so the hopes run, will be freed from secular or political interference; the churches will be allowed to preach and practice Christianity without hindrance; and some measures of civil liberty might be expected to follow in an atmosphere purged of religious tensions.

When this columnist put the foregoing case for the "opening to the East" to organizers of Captive Nations Week, however, he got a short answer: "Crumbs." He also got a prediction that the Kennedy administration, for all the hopes that Averell Harriman may carry with him to Moscow, will not dare settle for crumbs.

Khrushchev is already on record as being willing to accept a test ban agreement that would cover nuclear explosions in the air or underwater provided the NATO nations are ready to sign a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its East European "allies." But the trade of pact for pact, short of including along with it a Soviet guarantee of free elections in the East European satellites, will almost certainly never be made.

For one thing, a pact is a treaty, and all treaties to which the United States is a signatory must be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate under the "advice and consent" clause of the Constitution. It is impossible to visualize two-thirds of the Senate signing away the hopes of the East European captive peoples, or granting what would amount to recognition of the long-term legitimacy of the East German Communist State.

If you don't believe the Senate would put its collective foot down on a treaty that would consign Eastern Europe to the Soviets in perpetuity, just take a look at the list of honorary members of the National Captive Nations Committee. The list includes Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, KEATING and JAVITS, of New York, KUCHEL, of California, HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. A bipartisan list that crosses all lines, whether of party or ideology.

Moreover, there is more than idealism involved. A Scott of Pennsylvania has a Polish and Hungarian vote to worry about; a Lausche, with much of his strength in Cleveland, Ohio, has all the bloods of Eastern Europe watching him. In Connecticut, Senator THOMAS DODD cannot live politically without support from people with Polish ties.

There is one way around the U.S. Senate; an exchange of "declarations" on the part of the NATO nations and the Warsaw Pact stooges would not have to run any constitutional gauntlet, for it would not have the force of a treaty. But one cannot conceive of such a "declaration" passing muster with the West Germans or with De Gaulle.

The worries about a "sellout" this week, then, are not very real, even if Averell Harriman might be complaisant, which is extremely doubtful, anyway.

Mr. Speaker, it is worthy to note that international attention has now been given this issue, and there are two worthwhile documents which have been directed to my attention, emphasizing the support of the Chinese Nationalist Government for the just aspirations of the captive peoples. As evidence, I submit a press release issued by the Government Information Office of the Chinese Nationalist Government, quoting a statement of President Chiang Kai-shek, and in a rally marking Captive Nations Week, we find a vigorous speech by Vice Premier Wang Yun-Wu, as worthy of our attention:

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION OFFICE OF CHINESE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT

TAIPEI.—President Chiang Kai-shek today declared the Chinese Communists must be overthrown so that captive nations can be set free and "everlasting peace" brought to the world.

The President's statement was made in a message to a city hall mass meeting in support of the U.S.-initiated Captive Nations Week.

President Chiang called attention to the conflict between the Soviet Union and Chinese Communists, and said that it is a "struggle for power" that "indicates the bankruptcy of the Communist ideology and the decline of the international Communist movement."

He said the Republic of China "must take advantage of this opportunity" to join with other free peoples in support of anti-Communist revolution on the mainland.

Text of the message, addressed to Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the mass meeting, follows:

"Since the end of World War II, the international Communists, seeking to dominate the world and enslave mankind, have successively seized Eastern European countries, the Chinese mainland, North Korea, and North Vietnam.

"Millions of people in these areas have been shut behind the Iron Curtain and subjected to Communist persecution. In order to survive and regain their freedom, many of these peoples have either staged revolts or fled at the risk of their lives.

"The U.S. Government, as a gesture of sympathy and support for enslaved peoples, initiated the Captive Nations Week movement in 1959. It has been observed annually in July.

"The movement has received strong support in various free areas and has developed into an international undertaking to support the liberation of captive peoples. Such an effort has profound meaning.

"We firmly believe that freedom cannot coexist with slavery. We must not tolerate the present world state in which half of the people are free and the other half enslaved. If we cannot destroy the Iron Curtain and help enslaved peoples regain their freedom, international communism will extend its tentacles to bring all the world under its control.

"I have said repeatedly that all the trouble in the world today has its root in Asia. The world shall have no peace unless the Communist menace in the Chinese mainland is eradicated. To deliver the suffering people behind the Iron Curtain, the Chinese Communist regime must be toppled first.

"The present Moscow-Peiping ideological dispute, which in reality is a struggle for power, is deteriorating into intensified mutual denunciation. This indicates the bankruptcy of the Communist ideology and the decline of the international Communist movement. The Chinese Communists are isolated in international relations and face agonizing internal political, economic, military, and social crises and disasters resulting from their inhuman policies.

"To cover up their failures, the Communists have aggravated the enslavement and oppression of the people and plunged them into an abyss of suffering. The people's detestation of Communist rule has grown in proportion to the worsening of this despotism. They have sought to revolt or escape. Successive revolts have erupted and refugees have streamed out of the Chinese mainland. A year ago last May a mass refugee exodus moved across the border into Hong Kong. Despite intensified controls and border patrols, refugees and defectors have continued their flights to freedom.

"We free Chinese must take advantage of this opportunity to cooperate among ourselves and unite with peace-loving peoples of the world to support the anti-Communist uprisings now raging on the mainland. We must destroy the Peiping regime in order to recover the mainland and free the people there. This will assure the deliverance of all captive nations and bring everlasting peace to the world."

The Following Is a Full Text of Speech by Vice Premier Wang Yun-Wu on July 19, 1963, at a Mass Rally Marking the Captive Nations Week

Today is the second day from the last of the Captive Nations Week, 1963. Nevertheless, there shall never be a last day for our antienslavement campaign, which we shall carry on to the day when all the captive peoples of the world shall have regained freedom, as our conscience and sense of responsibility so dictate.

The concept that men are created equal and free has not only directed the course of Western history but also been stressed in the rationalism of the Chinese philosophy. The Confucian philosophy espousing benevolence upholds the value and dignity of man. As Confucianism has been deep-rooted in Chinese culture, there has never been a strong class consciousness in China. Slavery has been nonexistent. Therefore, we can say that the Chinese have always enjoyed and loved freedom. The Western history for a long time had been marred by slavery until in the 18th century when rationalism was revived. The ancient Greek philosophy championing individual freedom had a rebirth through advocacy of the 18th century philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau. The American independence in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789 were results of men's struggle for freedom and equality. The two great revolutionary documents of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration des Droits de L'homme et du Citoyen perpetuated the watchwords "liberty" and "equality" as the rightful aspirations and aims of all men. It was then that the social class and slave systems were "put to death." We believe it is human nature to aspire individual freedom, equality, and dignity, and the philosophy espousing them has been a precious legacy of human civilization. On this point, the East and the West meet each other.

The human history, viewed from whatever angles, is a record of men's pursuit of freedom and equality, for which philosophers have dedicated their minds and martyrs their blood unconditionally. Ever since the 18th century, it has become a deep-rooted conviction in the minds of men that all men should enjoy freedom and equality. Nevertheless, this liberalism based on rationality has continuously been ravished by such fanaticism as nazism and fascism evolved from Nietzsche's supermen philosophy. The Nazis and Fascists styled themselves as the chosen people and had the ambition to become masters of the world and to enslave all the peoples whom they considered inferior to their own. However, they were mistaken and completely crushed. The Judge of history made a just verdict. Men are born with the rights for freedom and equality. None is born a master or a slave.

Nevertheless, a freak has existed in history. Alongside with people pursuing freedom and equality are always fanatics who attempt to obstruct such pursuit without heed to the lessons taught by history. As soon as the phantoms of nazism and fascism had died out, the shadows of communism swooped down upon the world. Since the end of World War II, the Communists, with Russia as headquarters, followed the Nazis and Fascists to make drastic expansion with the purpose of establishing a Communist empire. In less than one decade, some 1 billion people were shut behind the Iron Curtain. Communism is now posing a serious threat to world peace, and has left the world half free and half enslaved.

As we know, communism is founded on materialism which negates the mental and spiritual value of man and puts man on the equal footing with materials and machines. The concepts of freedom, equality and dignity of man are merely jokes in Communist dictionaries. The Communists are obsessed with dictatorship of the proletarian and world conquest. With hatred in their minds, they are determined to communize the whole world through means of either violence or smile offensive. Their aim is to build a Red empire.

The "Captive Nations Week" resolution was adopted by the U.S. Congress and the week designated by President Kennedy in 1959. The initiation of such a righteous movement further confirms the noble ideals and humanitarianism fostered by the American Independence. We shall not forget the pronouncement of the American Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The Americans, to fulfill the political philosophy conceived by their forefathers, have engaged themselves in a civil war at the risk of national disintegration and again in the First and Second World Wars at great losses of American lives and properties. The undaunted spirit of the Americans to lay down their lives readily for justice has enabled their nations to become, in less than two centuries, the spiritual leader of the world and a bastion for freedom. At the end of World War II, communism, which negates the dignity of man, sprang up to offer direct challenge and menace to the American political philosophy. As soon as the American perceived the many-pronged aggressive character of communism, they sprang to their feet in self-awareness to guard freedom and democracy. It was then that the Americans completely shook off the holdover isolationism, and assumed resolutely the responsibility to maintain world peace and order.

However, we cannot but regretfully point out that the United States has always been on the defensive, and has witnessed helplessly free territories lost to the Communists and free peoples enslaved one after the other. The American Government and people may have felt sympathy toward the captive peoples and indignation toward the Communist aggression, but they have failed to take actions. The fear for a destructive nuclear war has bred widespread defeatism in the West. Many leaders of the free world have even declared their "preference of communism to death," which spells danger. This defeatist philosophy contradicts the philosophy fostered by the American Revolution. If defeatism became accepted by the Americans, the American national foundation would be shaken, and the United States would soon capitulate to the enemy without a fight. Fortunately, most of the Americans are still champions of their revolutionary philosophy which defends freedom. Nevertheless, we must solemnly point out that it is dangerous to encourage neutralism or to believe in Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence cliche. In fact, the neutralists are nothing but selfish and virtueless politicians. Their appeasement, concession and services toward the international Communists fully demonstrate their thoughtlessness of captive peoples, their selfishness and immorality.

Though we may believe that the attempts for compromise with Soviet Russia have been driven by the rightful aspiration for peace, we must point out that such attempts have pained and disheartened the people behind the Iron Curtain, as well as discolored the glorious American history. History has taught us that sacrifice of the freedom of a part of the human race will not win freedom for the rest. Tolerance of aggression will not stop it but breed a more malevolent aggression.

We are greatly concerned and grieved by the fate of the 1 billion people kept captive behind the Iron Curtain, especially of the half billion Chinese compatriots who have suffered the most on the mainland under communism. But concern and grief alone will not help them. The antienslavement campaign is also more of a ceremony and formality than of actual help to the betterment of the world situation. What we must do is to extend our love for our compatriots and for our fellowmen to liberate them by positive means. We hope that the leaders of the free world will have the determination, similar to that of Abraham Lincoln's to emancipate the Negroes, to free the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Lincoln went to war for his antislavery beliefs, and we must also have the same courage and compassion as Lincoln's to safeguard freedom at all prices, but not to make freedom a price in itself. For the sake of freedom and antienslavement, we must not fear the Communist threats of war. "Give me liberty or give me death" is still a heartening motto which we may cling to. The Chinese proverb: "It is better to break as jade than to stay intact as a tile" also sets forth a philosophy that as men, we shall live and die for freedom and equality.

In view of the overwhelming national, international, and congressional sentiment for a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, I join Dan Flood in urging early Rules Committee consideration of House Resolution 14.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 40 identical House resolutions for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, and I feel that this body should consider this issue as soon as possible.

The need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations was suggested in the second session of the 86th Congress by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DAN FLOOD. He has been a stalwart supporter in recognizing the plight of the enslaved people behind the Communist curtains. There is a need for this Nation to continue to endorse this idea if we expect to realize a day of liberation for the world.

The 86th Congress recognized the captive nations of the world when they proclaimed a week in observance of the struggle carried on by the impoverished, enslaved people of nonallined countries who are forced to yield to the dictates of communism under the threat of force. These people are prisoners and treated as such. They have lost the right to redress; they have lost the right to appeal. Surely this is not in accord with the humanitarian rule, "All men are created equal." Equality to these unfortunates is measured by the point of bayonets which they face. They move in the direction in which it tells them to move. They must yield to its command, so their equality is slavery.

Their only hope to survive this ordeal is through the knowledge that the free nations of the world have not forgotten them. That the free world intends to hold its ground, and, through perseverance and determination, win the battle against tyranny. It is on that victory day they will see the sun shine again. As long as these people can keep their hopes alive, we, in the free world, can check the growth of communism. For the Communists cannot take any aggressive action to further their cause knowing there is an army of people behind their front lines that could disrupt their movements should they decide this course of action.

It is true that Congress has continued to observe Captive Nations Week through the past 5 years. I have been in complete support of this proclamation as I feel this declaration does lend moral support to the people imprisoned by the Communists. But the question arises, "Is it enough?" Is apathy creeping into the idea? Was enough emphasis placed on this year's proclamation of Captive Nations Week observed from July 14–20?

The press, radio, and TV gave little or no attention to this commemoration of the horrible fact that close to a billion human beings are living in prison and misery. The public demonstrations, which were numerous and well attended the first year we proclaimed Captive Nations Week, have subsided. Could it be that we have become complacent feasting on our own liberty while millions starve for these very same rights? It could very well be that Captive Nations Week might become another National Potato Week, nice to know that it is upon us once again, but, so what else is new?

I believe we need to stimulate the cause for recognizing the captive nations of the world. Through the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations we can renew hope in the enslaved peoples. We can reawaken the consciousness of the free world to the magnitude and danger of the situation. We will arouse the conscience of the indifferent. We will create the same furor to the Communists as we did in first recognizing the captive nations. They will not be able to relax. By keeping them under constant pressure we can bury them, and they not us. We will encourage the captive people to strengthen their spirits so they can break the chains that bind them. We can arrive at solutions to aid them in this cause.

It is a move in the right direction for world liberation. There is a need for this committee to concentrate its full force in resolving the plight of the enslaved, so let us delay no longer. I hope this body will consider this need and elect to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in urging adoption of the resolution to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am happy to be among the cosponsors of the resolution.

It is my sincere belief adoption of these resolutions is long overdue.

We have a particularly good opportunity to take constructive action to rekindle the hope of millions of people living behind the Iron Curtain against their will by adopting these resolutions. At a time when great changes are taking place throughout the world, it would be my hope that the United States would lead the way in reassuring the victims of international communism that we in the United States have not forgotten them.

Creation of the Special Congressional Captive Nations Committee would help draft a comprehensive program for helping the victims of communism regain their freedom.

I strongly urge adoption of these resolutions as quickly as possible.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, the thing which we have held more sacred than any other is that all just governments derive their authority from the consent of the governed. Our generation has witnessed the rights of the people disregarded, the dignity of human beings desecrated, and sufferings imposed upon the weak by the strong.

We have seen the growth of totalitarian slavery in one form or another over the years until now such imperialism encompasses the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other nations.

Mankind prays, hopes, and yearns for peace, liberty, and happiness. But it is not enough to express our sentiments in behalf of our kinsmen who have been subjugated and to forgive those who have been responsible for the oppression. If the leaders of this movement to captivate the free spirit of people are truly sincere in their efforts for peace, they must be willing to restore the fundamental rights to those from whom they have plundered.

Why a Special Committee on the Captive Nations? We must know what action is being taken to make restitution to those who have been persecuted in the past, who may be suffering in the present, and whose future cannot be written off as a debt to the next generation. We sympathize with those endeavoring to solve these monumental problems caused by those who have no real concern for anyone but themselves. That is why we in the Congress strive for the establishment of a committee to study, evaluate, analyze, and recommend solutions to this problem. It is only by such a step that we can demonstrate our faith and desire to assist in these aspirations to regain individual and national freedoms.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been criticized by our foreign friends and our own scholars for taking what they call a simplistic view of world affairs.

I would also take exception to this generalization, except when it concerns the Communist bloc.

All too often we have been disposed to consider the Soviet empire as a massive, unfissionable monolith. We have improperly stressed the unity and strength existing between Peiping and Moscow; we have attributed more cohesiveness to the Communist bloc than it deserves. We have, in general, failed to understand that forces of erosion and the diffusion of power are at work within this political system.

We have failed in particular to understand that the Communist bloc is a complex structure of competing nationalities who are responsive to deep-seated, historic traditions of nationalism. Nationalism is still a powerful force for fragmentation and change.

Because of these blindspots in our national thinking, we were taken by surprise when Tito broke with the Cominform in 1948.

In a similar way, the Polish crisis and Hungarian revolt of 1956 left us with a feeling of disbelief. And today, we have yet to assess fully the vast implications of the clear break between Moscow and Peiping. There are many centrifugal forces within the Communist bloc that generate diffusion and erosion; but there is none so powerful as that of nationalism.

Nationalism is a curse to Communists. It runs counter to all fundamental Communist dogma. The reason is simple: Communism stresses centralization, and unified, totalitarian power; nationalism is essentially a separatist force, and separation means disintegration, which in turn means diffusion of power and finally weakness.

Ever since the founding of the multinational Soviet state, the Soviet leaders have fought against the dangerous, disruptive power of what the Communists call bourgeois nationalism. In desperation they have tried to reconcile the forces of internal Soviet nationalism with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. Sometimes, they resorted to physical force and even bloodshed, as in the Ukraine and the Baltic States, in order to achieve their goals. Even today the suppression of nationalism is sometimes ruthless and harsh. In the past year, the press has carried many stories of the mounting attacks on Soviet Jewry. This, too, is a facet of the Soviet compulsion to destroy any sense of national feeling.

Within the Communist bloc the same corrosive force of nationalism is at work slowly eroding the sense of political solidarity. China and Soviet Russia are in open quarrel. Albania remains hostile and unreconciled to Moscow. The Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Rumanians, and other nationalities in Eastern Europe seek their own status within the formal structure of the Communist commonwealth. During the past year we have witnessed successful attempts by the Rumanians to insist that they structure their economy to suit their own particular national purposes. Poland still seeks to maintain a measure of independence from Moscow.

The spirit of nationalism is a powerful force, and it binds the captive peoples of Eastern Europe together in their hostility toward Moscow and its imperial overlords. We must understand that nationalism is our ally in the cold war.

Nationalism is, indeed, one of our greatest and most reliable allies; for if liberation is to come in Eastern Europe, it must come from a will existing within the people themselves, a will to assert their own national goals and aspirations, a will to join the family of free nations, a will to survive as free human beings.

It follows, therefore, that if we wish to hasten and encourage the forces of political disintegration within the Communist bloc, we must direct our attention to the task of encouraging the forces of nationalism. If we are to weaken world communism and put it on the defensive, we must maintain a constant alert for the opportunities that come to us. We must ever be listening to the pulsebeat of discord within Eastern Europe and be ready to act wisely to extract the greatest yield for freedom's sake.

We can do this best, I believe, by establishing a special committee in the House of Representatives on the captive nations. This committee could have the problems of Eastern Europe constantly under review. It could, as an arm independent from the executive department, act as a powerful source of influence throughout the free world by making known to all people the thirst for freedom that exists among the captive peoples. As an official institution within the U.S. Government, such a committee would be regarded as concrete evidence of our commitment as a nation to the freedom of captive peoples.

To adopt a resolution setting up this committee would be a genuine act of hope, for it would pledge to the captive peoples our resolve as a nation that one day freedom will be theirs. I have introduced a resolution, House Resolution 213, which would establish such a committee. I urge the Rules Committee to act on it in the immediate future.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tremendous interest in and the overwhelming justification for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Indeed, one may find it difficult to understand why we find ourselves debating the proposal rather than reaping the benefits which would undoubtedly flow from the work of such a committee.

It would appear that a formidable obstacle lies in the path of progress toward the creation of the committee, otherwise, considering the increasingly persistent demands for its establishment, it would now be an accomplished fact.

What then is the nature of the obstacle? And, having identified it, how is it to be overcome? Apparently, there is a hesitancy on the part of some, who refer in somewhat abstract terms to a concept of "historical Russia," to lend their prestige and support to House Resolution 14. This hesitancy is rather remarkable when one realizes that so afflicted are unquestioned proponents of self-determination and outspoken opponents of the new colonialism which has made captives of more than 100 million people. One recognizes immediately the paradox inherent in such thinking but, surely, will find difficulty in explaining it.

For those who are concerned lest the creation of the committee prove inconsistent with American policy toward Russia I suggest a perusal of the many public utterances of President Kennedy. The President has stated repeatedly his opposition to colonialism in general and to the brand practiced by Moscow in particular. With reference to the President and to his statements on this issue I hardly need remind anyone that authority and responsibility for foreign policy rest with the Chief Executive. May one reasonably conclude, therefore, that the proposed committee and the issues which it would probe are clearly consistent with our advocacy of self-determination, freedom, and national integrity.

Let us consider briefly the benefits which would accrue from the work of the committee. Would not our action in establishing the Committee on the Captive Nations be viewed as a reaffirmation of the basic tenets upon which our entire structure of democratic institutions rests? Further, would not such action be viewed by the oppressed millions in the captive nations as a reaffirmation of America's active role in propagating democratic ideals? Surely, these millions who have long suffered the yoke of oppression would find new hope for a life in which the individual is master of his destiny, rather than be destined to do the bidding of a master.

Finally, is there present anyone who needs to be reminded of our own colonial status at one point in our history? Our very presence in this Chamber is testimony to the tenacity of our forefathers in clinging to the hope for a life in which they would be free from the whims of a government to which they had given no consent to be governed. They envisioned what we now enjoy, a life in which the weak are not subjugated by the strong, the poor not subjugated by the rich, the few not subjugated by the many.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy approval of the proposal that there be established in the House of Representatives a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my distinguished colleagues in calling for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. During the week of July 15, 1963, I rose with the other Members of the House and paid tribute to the heroic and freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain, and I called upon this Congress to give even more meaningful recognition to their noble cause. Captive Nations Week has come and gone, and over 1 month has passed by and still no action has been taken to establish the special House committee. There was a great deal of oratory during Captive Nations Week, but unfortunately, the enthusiasm that was generated appears to have been short lived. Little has been done to establish the Special House Committee on the Captive Nations and it has not even been reported by the Rules Committee. Surely the time has come for our words to take root and the goals we advocate to come to fruition.

Four years ago I joined in sponsoring the joint resolution which established this significant annual national Captive Nations Week. In accordance with its terms, the President has annually designated the third week in July for the commemoration of the occasion. But these steps are not enough; we must move forward and take bolder, more meaningful action. We should not only reaffirm our sympathy and support of these millions of people suffering under Communist tyranny, but we should also express this support overtly, through continuing constructive activity. We should give this matter the serious recognition it deserves and nothing short of a special committee of the House would satisfactorily accomplish these ends.

There are now over 40 identical resolutions before the Rules Committee calling for this special committee. Unhappily, however, they have not yet been reported out. I therefore urge again a solid expression of support for these proposals. A Special Captive Nations Committee would make great strides toward the goal of freedom for the imprisoned people of the captive nations by undertaking a careful and precise study of their internal conditions so that definite steps could be taken to aid these peoples in their quest for freedom. We must assemble and utilize effectively all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of these countries. The enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding would give encouragement to the latent liberal elements in these oppressed countries.

The weapons of truth and fact generated under the impetus of the special committee would effectively counter and defeat Moscow's nefarious propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. Despite the recent advances recently made in ending the bitterness of the cold war, we should not come to the point where we are conciliating the Communists to such a degree that we blithely overlook the atrocities they are guilty of in Eastern Europe. Do we need any further demonstration of the Communist's intent than the infamous wall in Berlin, the war in South Vietnam, and missiles in Cuba? Now is the time for us to show the world, and especially those suffering under the yoke of totalitarianism, that we are indeed interested in world peace, but we will not forget the plight of those who have not seen the light of democracy since it was obscured by the Russians. We of the United States cannot rest with an easy conscience until all mankind is free.

Are we willing to trade the hope of a thaw in the cold war for the everlasting enslavement of millions of people? We cannot sell our birthright and heritage of freedom for all mankind for the pottage offered by the Soviets.

It is incumbent upon us as free citizens to show the world that we are sincerely and honestly interested in freedom for all the peoples of the world. We can best show the freedom-loving peoples of the world that our true intentions are for the advancement of democracy by speedily establishing the Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I urge the careful reconsideration of this proposed committee as a vital step toward the realization of the ideal to which Captive Nations Week is dedicated—the universal reign of liberty and peace under law. Let us not forget the enslaved peoples of the world; let us, instead, work for the freedom of all.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues, Congressmen DANIEL J. FLOOD and EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, in their plea for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

The Congress of the United States has taken positive recognition of America's concern for the welfare of the peoples of the captive nations by proclaiming July 14–20 as Captive Nations Week. The problem of captive nations, of 100 million people subjugated in captivity by the Communists, is a problem that goes beyond a 1-week ceremonial observance. America must demonstrate its moral and political commitment to the independence and freedom of captive nations 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. The formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is a constructive means of dealing with this vital problem on a year-round basis.

The debate on the various provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 today has made it abundantly clear that the United States is at a critical point as a leader in the great struggle for freedom. The need for a captive nations committee is greater today than ever before in our history. The free world must face squarely the fact that we must deal with the insistent expansionist aims of Communist China, the increasing oppressive and hostile activities of the Kremlin Communists, the continuing crisis in Laos and Vietnam, and the unfinished business in Latin America and in Africa. The formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is both a practical and inspirational approach in our efforts to gain self-determination for the victims of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and with the proponents of freedom everywhere in supporting the desire for freedom and liberty which continues to burn in the hearts of the peoples of the captive nations.

We, in the United States are fortunate to be living in a country founded upon principles of human dignity and representative government. There are, regrettably, those who are not so blessed. The friends and relatives of hundreds of my Pittsburgh constituents still live under the militarily supported rule of Soviet imperialism. It is a rule that denies the existence of fundamental human concepts of freedom and dignity.

Emancipation of these captive peoples is our ultimate goal. Our weapons in this effort are many: ideological, psychological, political, economic, and diplomatic—a flexibility calculated to meet every subtle change in the Communist power structure. It is imperative that, in our desire to achieve eventual liberation of these Soviet colonies, we leave no avenue of approach unexplored.

Encouraging successes in this area have already been noted but complacency is by no means indicated. The erosion of the ideological wall of solidarity, coupled with internal economic pressures, has brought about a gradual relaxation of autocracy. This, however, represents an expedient concession by the Communists rather than recognition of inherent individual rights.

It is therefore singularly appropriate that, acting through their freely elected representatives, the people of the United States continue to expose Soviet colonialism to freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and many of my colleagues who have spoken on this decision, in urging the prompt creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I hope and pray that this session will not adjourn until the special committee for which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania so long has worked has been authorized.

I venture the prediction that if the resolution creating this special committee is brought to the floor of the House, it will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

This is the time in the long struggle of the free world against the evil forces of communism that we should give strong and positive reassurance to the millions of men, women, and children in the captive nations that they are now, and shall continue to be, in the subject of our interest and our determination to strive for this liberation with no faltering in our effort.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following be permitted to revise and extend their remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]: Mr. SHORT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. KING, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, ED DERWINSKI, and others in our joint efforts to bring to the attention of our colleagues the imperative need for the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee. Now, perhaps at this time more than any other, it would be more meaningful to create such a committee in the House of Representatives.

Take the nuclear test ban treaty entered into with the Soviet Union. This could be the beginning of a more peaceful world. It could also mean we are walking in a camouflaged trap, and it would just be another instance of the Communists favorite doubledealing game—talking sweetness and light out of one side of their mouth, and on the other side, planning all manner and means of duplicity.

Russia could prove good faith in the test ban agreement by freeing these captive nations. She should be put to this test. Perhaps I am unduly suspicious of the motive of any Communist. However, it seems that experience has taught us we must be wary. Remember, the Soviet Union has broken almost every agreement since 1945. This would seem to appear that an agreement with them would be worth little more than the paper it was written on. Remember, also, the tests Mr. Khrushchev is agreeing to ban are those we can detect anyway. Remember, that immediately upon the signing of the test ban agreement, the Russians continued pressing hard for consideration of a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. Such a treaty would be a farce and only an attempt to drive a wedge between the United States and Western European countries.

I think when we weigh all the factors, we are justified in taking the risk, and the Senate should ratify the treaty. Let us not, however, be lulled into a dreamworld—thinking that we have now assured peace in the world. Let us not think that the Communists have suddenly changed their spots. To me, the Soviet Union could have assured the world of its good faith by removing troops and arms from Cuba, opening the Berlin wall, or taking steps to extend more freedom to the captive nations.

Since Mr. Khrushchev did not choose to do any of these things, I feel we must continue to ask ourselves whether or not the Soviet Union is only using this outward expression of peace to cover her efforts to expand the Communist ideology throughout the world.

An expression of the reservations we have in our minds would be such a committee as some 40 or more Members of the House are urging. Let the Communist world know we are not pawns and dupes—that we have no intention of acquiescing to the Communist empire—that we take seriously the God-given rights and privileges of all people for freedom—to govern themselves as they see fit—not to be run roughshod over by a power-hungry colonial thirsting Communist empire.

I say to each Member of the House that I would urge they seriously consider this proposed legislation of ours—proposed, I might add, on a completely bipartisan basis, and support this move for the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee, as would be provided in my House Resolution 184, and some 40 others, now pending before the Rules Committee.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to express my appreciation to my two distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], for reserving this time and arranging this bipartisan effort to focus attention on the resolutions now before the Rules Committee to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House.

One of my first official acts as a Member of Congress was to introduce House Resolution 175 calling for the establishment of such a special committee. At the time, I urged that we who legislate in an atmosphere of freedom be ever mindful that the benefits of this noble democratic practice are denied millions of the world's peoples enslaved by communism.

I also urged that we seize every possible opportunity to remind the world of the plight of the captive nations and the Soviet perfidy which has brought it about. Through the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, the forum of the United Nations, and the creation of this special House committee, we can and must assume leadership in exposing the hoax of world communism. We need to effect greater measures in all of these areas in order to assure the brave people of the captive nations that they are not forgotten, that we are working and praying for the day when they will once more walk in the sunlight of freedom.

My home community of Rochester, N.Y., derives much of its greatness from the talents, energies and unique attributes of those whose homelands or ancestral lands are now captive nations.

I speak for my constituents, therefore, in saying that we now have an opportunity to put into action our words and feelings. Let us now implement the desires we have expressed so often in the past to see constructive action taken to hasten the return of freedom and self-determination to the people of the captive nations.

The establishment of this special committee will serve as a working symbol of our fundamental conviction that the central issue of our time is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom. Assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truth and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of the captive nations can prove the validity of this conviction.

Through the creation of such a committee, the tools of truth can be put to most effective use against the deceit of communism.

Moscow has shown a profound fear of the mounting concern displayed in the free world for the captive nations. The committee I propose can advance this concern and further work to explode the myths of Soviet unity, Soviet national economic strides, and Soviet military prowess which have been foisted on the people of the captive nations.

Let us make the best use of this fear. Let us establish this committee and put some teeth in our good intentions. Let us be able to announce that we have taken positive action, that the United States intends to achieve victory in this intense psychological struggle.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to give my support to the proposed Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for their leadership in this area. They deserve the thanks of the House for their continued display of concern and energy in this matter. I am proud to be associated with them in this effort to secure approval of this proposal.

There are alarming things going on which cause much dismay among the Americans whose heritage is behind the Iron Curtain. It is a source of great concern to these people that there is discussion of the possibility that arrangements will be made which would seem to place our national policy in a position of endorsing the Communist regimes in the captive nations.

Certainly Members of the House share this concern. Many of us believe that the time is ripe, when some say that Soviet Russia is trying—for its own reasons—to establish a rapport with this country, to call the Soviet bluff. If there is any sincerity in the smiling face which the Russian bear now turns to the west, and I seriously doubt that there is, then let us in this body call the bluff.

Let us call renewed world attention to the fact that this Russian empire consists of nations which were formerly independent and autonomous, taken by armed force or subversion, in violation of treaty and solemn agreement. If the Russian colonialists want to be sincere in their so-called thaw in the cold war, as some would have us believe, then let them show their sincerity by removing their troops, commissars, secret police, and lackeys from the captive nations. Let them return millions of deported citizens, or so many of them as have survived the concentration camps where they have languished without benefit of trial, and finally let there be free elections between candidates of the people's choosing.

These things are the proper concern of this Nation. We have a long policy of recognizing governments which are freely chosen by the majority of people in any country, or even governments which we believe truly represent the majority opinion in a country. This is a noble tradition, and it is one which we should continue.

But how can we continue this fine custom and at the same time be considering full diplomatic relations with Hungary? This is reported to be under active consideration by diplomatic circles in this country. If such a thing is done, it will be done in the face of strong congressional opposition, for both this body and the other body have heard many speeches on this subject, and to my recollection not one representative of the people of this country has spoken in favor of moving one inch toward recognition of the Communist regime in Hungary.

I believe a recent Associated Press article in the Omaha World-Herald of August 9 is pertinent to this discussion and include it now:

> U.S. ACCORD FOR HUNGARY?
>
> WASHINGTON.—There is a firm belief in diplomatic circles that the United States and Communist Hungary will resume full diplomatic relations, probably by the end of this summer.
>
> The belief persists despite State Department denials.
>
> Relations between the two sank to a low point in 1956 after Russian troops crushed the Hungarian revolt.
>
> The American Minister, Edward T. Wailes, refused to present his credentials to the Russian-backed government. Since then, a chargé d'affaires has headed the U.S. Legation.
>
> About 6 months ago, in informal conversations, the United States made known it expects the Budapest regime to give tangible evidence of its willingness to end the rigid climate.
>
> The Kadar government proclaimed an amnesty for political prisoners. Last month it lifted travel restrictions that had limited the movement of American diplomats.
>
> Although Washington has not responded with an end to similar restrictions on Hungarian diplomats, there have been hints that the United States is preparing some sort of "package deal."
>
> The State Department already has said that contacts with the Kadar government were established through the U.S. Legation in Budapest, aimed at what is called normalization of relations.
>
> A crucial question is the future of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, the Hungarian Roman Catholic primate who has been living in self-imposed exile in the U.S. Legation since the uprising.
>
> Cardinal Mindszenty was not included in the amnesty.

If there is truth in this report, and I believe there is, then let it be said that the plans to move toward full diplomatic relations with this Communist regime do not have the support of the Congress, the people, or our own historic policy in determining what government we should recognize.

I believe it is important and necessary for this body to set up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I believe it is important because the millions of people in these captive nations deserve our best support. I believe it is important because such a committee would speak for the people of this country in a way which I regret to say some of our diplomatic personnel do not do.

I strongly urge the adoption of the resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I am pleased to serve with other Members of this body as a cosponsor.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FLOOD, and my colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DERWINSKI, on their stimulating efforts to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. As one of the sponsors of the resolution on behalf of the captive nations, I strongly share the concern of my colleagues for the people of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. These resolutions symbolize the will to recover freedom and solidarity of all captive nations throughout the world.

In this age of international tension when the Western nations have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world, it is only proper that we in the United States insist that the Soviet Union likewise grant freedom and independence to the people of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other captive nations. We in this country cannot be indifferent to these people whose lands have been unjustly occupied and whose prestige among the nations of the world is being denied.

Before we agree to a test ban treaty or even negotiate with Khrushchev we should first demand freedom for those people behind the Iron Curtain or at least freedom of choice.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in urging the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members have expressed to me lately their concern over an article which appeared in a recent issue of Life magazine. That article, you may recall, charged the Congress with throwing away billions of dollars on pet projects that would assure individual Congressmen the support of their constituents. Quite frankly, I am not surprised any more by this type of criticism. There seems to be a concerted effort on the part of some members of the press and some individuals to undermine the institutions of Government which have made our country the greatest in the world. To those frustrated persons—and I do not refer here to the Life reporters—I can only express pity. They do the devil's work—and Moscow's too, I am afraid, albeit unknowingly.

I would, however, like to review for a moment the Post Office Department program which was criticized in the Life article. It was this part of the article that caused Members to express their concern to me as chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee which acts originally on the Post Office Department's budget request. While my subcommittee does not appropriate funds for the construction of post offices—this is done through the General Services Administration—we do consider the Department's lease-building program which the article criticizes.

Under this program the Department leases necessary facilities instead of asking the GSA to build them. This policy is thoroughly in keeping with the American free enterprise system of private versus Government ownership. Let me say immediately that on the question of basic cost, the leasing arrangement is somewhat more expensive, as maintained in the article under discussion. Over a long period of years, it is basically cheaper to build than it is to rent, particularly if the facility can be turned over profitably when it is no longer needed.

But since 1888 the Post Office Department has had the authority to lease necessary space on a year-to-year basis and there are good reasons for such a program. In the first place, a lease naturally gives the Department more flexibility in the placement of post offices in locations where they can best provide the service called for in our Constitution.

These leases are arranged on a competitive basis. Bids are asked and an award is made. The U.S. Post Office, of course, is the largest business in the world. It does an annual business of approximately $5 billion. It should, therefore, employ the best of business methods and I would point out, in this regard, that a leasing policy is followed by most of our large commercial chainstores. They usually do not buy local sites; they lease and pay rent.

Our population is growing and moving, particularly from the cities to the suburbs, and the Post Office Department has found that many of its old offices are inadequate in terms of space or obsolete in terms of the service they must provide. The leasing arrangement has made it possible for the Department to move to a more advantageous spot without having a useless building on its hands.

In addition to the population factor, there is also a transportation factor to be considered. Many old offices are no longer adequate because they do not have the space necessary to handle the trucks and other mail vehicles used by the service today to provide speedier delivery.

Just a few weeks ago I took part in the dedication of a new branch office in my congressional district. It was necessary to move the station just a few blocks away, in the same shopping area in fact, because the old building was not large enough to handle the mail load and did not have the parking and maneuvering space to handle the mail vehicles.

The proper approach, of course, is for the Department to buy or build those facilities for which a permanent requirement exists. This applies particularly to stable downtown areas in large cities. Where the office may not be permanent, because of the shifting population or for other reasons, the leasing program offers a desirable alternative.

The Department now rents or leases nearly 25,000 facilities. More than 15,000 of them are rented on a month-to-month basis. About 9,000 facilities are occupied on a fixed-term basis, more than 90 percent of which are for terms of less than 10 years, although the article we are discussing dealt only with 30-year leases. So you do have flexibility which is so often necessary.

Moreover, the leasing program involves a taxation factor which ought to be considered in any comparison of cost, although here again the magazine article overlooked it. When a building is leased to the Federal Government, its owner, the lessor, must pay local real estate taxes on the property and income taxes. Where the building is owned by the Federal Government, of course, the property is exempt from taxation and the locality is required to provide police and fire protection and local services without compensation.

In fact, taxes and a fair return on capital investment account almost entirely for the difference in cost referred to in the Life article.

In this discussion, I hope that I have helped some of the Members understand the situation more clearly. I am sure there are abuses in the system and we are looking for them everyday. I am sure the program costs too much, and that is the main reason why this body voted a substantial cut in the Post Office budget for 1964.

But there are two sides to nearly every charge, and I feel all of the facts should be presented.

TO PROHIBIT AN AMERICAN TASS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am preparing legislation to stop the newly created market wire service of the Department of Agriculture. Unless we halt this first step toward a gigantic Government-owned news service, we may wind up with an American Tass.

My bill bars the Federal Government from owning or leasing wire services in competition with private news systems.

News wire service providing farm market news was put into operation August 1 by the Department. While it is available to any newspaper or person on request, the Secretary of Agriculture can cancel subscribers who "abuse" the service.

Unfairly competing with existing private news services, this Government news network is an ominous example of political intrusion into both freedom of the press and free enterprise.

Government-run wire services could drive existing private firms out of business. Privately owned wires cannot charge their expenses to the taxpayer. Once again the Government bites off a chunk of private enterprise.

Forced bankruptcy of AP, UPI, and other wire services from a competing Government news service would mean the end of the free press. If the Government can dominate news distribution, it can cut off and ruin newspapers and radio-TV stations which criticize the powers that be.

In 3 years in Congress, I have never had a single request that the Government get into the news business.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are no clear-cut answers to the problems facing the world and foreign aid, as we consider it today in terms of dollars and cents, is no exception.

In thinking back to what our country has done in the past as far as assistance to less fortunate countries is concerned, I do not think there is a person in the world who can justifiably criticize the United States of America. The assistance that was given the war-ravaged nations of the world at the close of World War II and since has been unparalleled. However, despite all of the aid that has been given, the prestige of the United States abroad is actually not as high as it was before foreign assistance was started.

Today we meet, as we have done for the past 19 years for the purpose of extending for 1 more year, our hand of good will to the so-called less fortunate nations of the world.

My questions to this august body are: Can we afford to spend this amount of money? Are we so rich? Is our financial condition so solvent that we can continue to spend this money abroad without affecting our already serious balance-of-payments problem? Gentlemen, the answers to these questions are quite obvious to me. I honestly do not think that as a nation we can afford to saddle our economy with this $4.5 billion burden.

For a world at the close of World War II that found two-thirds of its people hungry and lacking in industrial potential, the people of the United States responded most generously.

This expression of good will undoubtedly will go down in history as one of the most worthwhile undertakings, for mankind's sake, of this century.

Our moral obligations toward helping with the post-World War II reconstruction were met, and for this I am thankful. However, I question our ability as a nation overburdened with confiscatory tax rates and deficit spending to be in a position to continue the foreign assistance program.

Our own people deserve as much consideration, and more, as we have given the rest of the world. There are obligations in this country which we must assume if we are to continue to remain the leader of the free world.

TIME TO CLEAN HOUSE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of WILLIAM E. MILLER, chairman of the Republican National Committee. Chairman MILLER's statement is self-explanatory, and we will now await with great interest to see what Democratic National Chairman John Bailey has to say about the matter. He cannot remain silent on this issue unless he wishes to condone and approve the resolutions recently adopted by the Young Democrats of 13 Western States in Berkeley, Calif.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN WILLIAM E. MILLER

> Democratic National Chairman John Bailey owes the American people an explanation for some resolutions recently adopted by the Young Democrats of 13 Western States in Berkeley, Calif. To what extent did the "radical left" not only attend but obviously control, this convention, so that the following resolutions, among others, were adopted?
>
> 1. U.S. resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba.
> 2. A nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact nations.
> 3. U.S. withdrawal of its troops from South Vietnam.
>
> What were the motives and policies of a group seeking United States-Cuban diplomatic relations less than 10 days after Castro's kidnaping of Cuban refugees? What arguments so swayed the delegates that they supported a resolution which would seriously weaken NATO? Who convinced the Young Democrats that we should withdraw from South Vietnam and leave it open to the Communists?
>
> These resolutions should be immediately and openly disavowed by responsible Democrats. It is up to Mr. Bailey to break the embarrassed silence in his party since the issuance of the Young Democrats' resolutions.
>
> It is he who has recently been taking the opportunity to charge that the Republican Party is in danger of being taken over and controlled by the radical right. These charges are never substantiated. There is not one Republican policy statement, resolution or platform plank to be cited as proof.
>
> In contrast, Mr. Bailey remains silent when confronted with the radical left in his own party.
>
> Queries as to the large number of ADA members holding high administration positions have always gone unanswered. This organization has a basic contempt for our traditions of free enterprise and individual liberty. It is its announced aim to tailor our Constitution to fit its peculiar measurement of a socialist welfare state.
>
> The ADA would grant full diplomatic recognition to the butchers of Red China. Like the Young Democrats at Berkeley, it would knock down the legal barriers which now hinder the free play of Soviet subversion and espionage in this country.
>
> Chairman Bailey makes the broad and unsubstantiated generalization that the ultraright is taking over the Republican Party. He names no names, because there is not a single member of the Birch Society or any other ultraconservative group in a position of influence in our party structure.
>
> On the other hand, I can name names, and I will.
>
> In the President's Cabinet there is Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman of the radical left ADA. On the White House staff are ADA members Theodore Sorensen, Lawrence O'Brien, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.
>
> In the State Department are found Chester Bowles, Averell Harriman, "Soapy" Williams, and Carl Rowan.
>
> The Under Secretaries of three Government Departments are ADA men: Ivan Nestingen of Health, Education, and Welfare; Charles Murphy of Agriculture; and Henry Fowler, of the Treasury Department.
>
> Assistant Secretary of Labor George Weaver and Assistant Postmaster General Frederick Belen are on the list. Also the U.S. Solicitor General, Archibald Cox. There are others in key positions, not to mention uncounted underlings and flunkies.
>
> The Democratic side of the Senate is literally crawling with members of the Americans for Democratic Action, and the House of Representatives has a liberal quota.
>
> However, I know of not a single John Bircher or radical rightist among Republicans in the Congress, among our Republican Governors, or among our State Chairmen and members of the National Committee.
>
> I would urge Democratic leaders promptly to repudiate the resolutions adopted at the Young Democrats meeting, and then to take steps to reassure the American people by purging from high office the radical left from the Democratic Party and administration.

TEST BAN "SECRET SIDE AGREEMENT" CHARGE WITHDRAWN—"RECKLESS AND IMPROVIDENT" CHARGE HURLED FOR FAILURE TO MAKE ONE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I charged that there must be a secret side agreement with Russia as to what the published text of the partial test ban treaty actually means. This charge was based on the glib, ready, and positive statements of administration officials as to the exact meanings of various provisions of the pact. Particular reference was made to the claim it does not bar the use of nuclear weapons in war.

I stated:

> No one familiar with Russian tactics in twisting treaty terms could make such statements with assurance unless detailed interpretations had been hammered out with the Russians beforehand and put down in black and white.

My statement, reprinted at page A5249 of the daily RECORD, added:

> As a practical matter, it would be reckless and improvident to conclude a treaty with the Soviets without doing so.

On Tuesday the following exchange occurred between a newsman and the President during the latter's press conference:

> Question. The ranking House Republican expert on atomic energy says that in spite of all administration denials, he is sure that there was a side agreement at Moscow. Is there some way you can present any proof positive?
>
> Answer. No, I cannot. There is nothing I can say other than to say it is not so. The

Undersecretary of State can't say other than that it isn't so. There is nothing Governor Harriman can say than it isn't so. There is nothing the Prime Minister of England can say, who participated in it, Lord Hailsham, Lord Home, except that it isn't so. No, we can't prove it.

I accept the President's clear denial that there was any side agreement as to what the treaty's published text means. I therefore withdraw my charge that such an agreement exists. I stipulate that it does not exist.

However, under the circumstances I must reiterate and renew my charge that the failure to have made such an agreement, secret or otherwise, as to the meaning of the treaty's words is both reckless and improvident. This failure inevitably will lead to deep and serious trouble for the United States. It is a grave blunder in carrying on our foreign policy.

Time and again this failure to come to agreement at the time a treaty is made has led to trouble. It was the imprecision in World War II agreements which led to the original Berlin crisis, the long airlift, and subsequent recurring Berlin crises. Failure to define "inspection" and other terms of the Korean armistice has brought on agonizing problems. Loose wording in the nonaggression pacts between the Soviet Union and Latvia and Estonia and other states allowed the Kremlin to place its own definition on "aggression," charge that it had occurred, abrogate the treaties on the flimsy basis of the charge and invade those countries. Everyone recognizes that the failure to define the word "neutrality" in the Austrian treaty hangs like a sword of Damocles over the peace of central Europe.

Now the test ban pact, without the side agreement, presents more opportunities to the Kremlin for the same devilish mischief. It is a sloppily written document, its legal terms are ill-defined and the possibilities for varying and conflicting interpretations by the parties is vast. The language of article I, for example, was found so disturbingly imprecise on reexamination by the State Departments that it raised the question of whether, as written, the treaty did not actually outlaw the use of nuclear weapons in case of war. The ambiguity led President Kennedy to include a statement in his radio-TV speech of July 26 alleging the treaty "will not restrict" the use of nuclear weapons in time of war.

Already the Red army's official newspaper, "Red Star," has voiced complaint over this interpretation.

It is plain to see that all the Russians need say to any meaning we give the treaty's language is "nyet!" and chaos will follow.

No definition that is agreed upon as to the word "war," as it might be taken in context of the treaty, exists. None exists defining "limited war," "guerrilla action," or "police action," such as was the case of Korea. Other examples of undefined and ambiguous words and phrases pertaining to the treaty and subject to varying definitions are: "tests," "nuclear weapons," "explosion," "outer space" and "territorial waters."

This imprecision can lead to the same troubles, the same difficulties, the same losses of prestige and territory that before have arisen from the failure of our negotiators to insist upon precise and clear definitions of what are meant by the words and phrases found in such documents whenever Communists are signatories.

It is incredible, after all the dismal experiences of the past, that U.S. negotiators again have led us into this treacherous kind of semantics minefield which allows the Soviets the freedom to define what a treaty means in accordance with what is best for them, and to tear up the treaty if we fail to agree.

I repeat, it has been an inexcusably reckless and improvident act to speed us into this treaty without taking the precaution to hammer out in black and white what it means and nailing the Kremlin down to that definition.

It is to be noted that this difficulty with the treaty—the lack of a side agreement of definition—has not heretofore received any public discussion at all. I regard it as a matter of vast importance at which specific and detailed attention should be directed by the other body during its deliberations on ratification.

AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL'S LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE MOSCOW TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American Security Council in its Washington Report published a significant study of the partial test ban treaty as a legal document. The study was prepared by an eminently qualified and respected international lawyer, Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former associate professor of law at George Washington University and former Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy from 1956 until 1960. The study, which should contribute much to an understanding of this pact, is as follows:

LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE MOSCOW TEST-BAN TREATY

(By Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired)

More than half—almost 2 out of 3—U.S. Senators are lawyers.

From this prosaic circumstance rises the possibility that the Test Ban Treaty will not be ratified by the Senate.

For the Moscow Treaty, viewed as a legal instrument, is a monstrosity. Even State Department sources have observed that some of its important language is "disturbingly imprecise." Such an expression, when used by high levels in State, in describing language approved by the Under Secretary of State, amounts practically to swear words. It's a wonder the New York Times published the expression—as it did in a special Washington dispatch dated July 26. Even construed in that strong a sense, however, the use of the expression "disturbingly imprecise" to describe the legally fantastic provisions of the Moscow Treaty constitutes the understatement of the century.

The Moscow Treaty is shot through with loopholes, two-faced double-acting jokers, and triple-threat exit provisions. It is almost as great an insult to our national intelligence as it is a threat to our national security.

The United States is entering a legalistic trap. The danger is in the document. This legal instrument was drawn with superb skill in duplicity by the Soviet negotiators. The Soviet draftsmanship was accepted with incredible gullibility by the U.S. representatives. As a result, the Soviet promises in the treaty are illusory. Senate ratification will therefore give to them valid U.S. promises, which will bind us, in return for worthless Soviet promises, which will not bind them.

To evaluate the Moscow treaty as a legal monstrosity is not a matter of individual opinion, as to which reasonable persons might differ. Objective—almost mechanical—application of accepted professional legal standards will expose gross and dangerous legal defects. These legal defects could easily have been avoided before initialing by the U.S. negotiators. They subject the United States to quite unnecessary and serious risks. They so unfairly advantage the Soviets that they can undermine the power balance necessary to preserve peace and freedom.

This report will present a summary and analysis of only the five most obviously dangerous legal defects in the treaty. (Many others will be obvious to any attorney.) Each will be established by the incontrovertible proof of direct quotation from the official wording of the treaty itself. Each one will unnecessarily prejudice the interests of the United States if the Senate ratifies this particular test ban treaty.

This point reveals another reason—in addition to their capability of making their own legal analysis of the treaty and its inherent defects—why the fact that so many Senators are lawyers, may bring about the surprise upset of the unprecedented bandwagon campaign for ratification. This second reason deserves consideration before examining the specifics of the legal defects in the treaty, because it will make clear why it is the constitutional duty of each Senator—and in the interest of all Americans—to become familiar with the dangers unnecessarily thrust on the United States by this particular test ban treaty.

Our Senators, and especially those who are lawyers, understand that the issue before them is not whether they are against risking nuclear incineration of 300,000,000 people, including Americans. They know the true issue is instead, whether this Moscow test ban treaty is really "an important first step" away from nuclear incineration—or a long leap toward it.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made a forceful statement of this thesis in an article published in the New York Times on August 3. He conceded that the Senate will "ratify a test ban agreement that proves, after careful study to be in the national interest," but, he cautioned,

"Before reaching such a determination, the Senate, to fulfill its Constitutional obligations, must look at any agreement with the greatest care, to make sure that the possible gains are not overshadowed by the risks that are inevitably run."

If that majority group of Senator-lawyers does indeed look at this agreement "with the greatest care," the resulting debate will be far more sensationally historic than President Kennedy ever intended. Senator JACKSON's forthright declaration proves that the really knowledgeable Senators understand that their constitutional duty is to ask not what this treaty can do as a step toward a victory for mankind; but to ask what this treaty will do toward the defeat of the United States.

Answers are found in each of the five major defects in the Moscow treaty.

With the usual type of "joker," discovery thereof prior to the document's becoming binding, permits removing it at no cost to the injured party. With the new Soviet type, we are already trapped. If the Senate accepts the present language, the Soviets can administer a military defeat; if we try to change the clear meaning of the language, the Soviets can administer a vicious propaganda defeat. The trap is set in article I:

"1. Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

"A. In the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, or under water, including territorial waters or high seas; or"

* * * * *

"2. Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described."

This is some of the language euphemistically described by the State Department as "disturbingly imprecise." The New York Times special Washington dispatch of July 26, reports this additional understatement from its sources in State:

"Article I, for instance, raised the question of whether the treaty, as written, did not actually outlaw the use of nuclear weapons in case of war."

The first legal defect of the treaty is that by clear and unambiguous language, it does indeed "actually outlaw the use of nuclear weapons in time of war." This interpretation is shrewdly reinforced by declaration in the preamble of the "principal aim" of the parties to "eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons," and to "put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances."

On the Soviet's part, this language is in no way accidental or inadvertent. The test ban and the ban on the use of nuclear weapons were established as priority targets of the world Communist movement as a Party Congress in Moscow in 1955, when 65 national Communist Parties signed a manifesto on the subject. They have made constant efforts to get our signature on such an agreement. Now they have it. Always heretofore we had insisted that a ban against use expressly permit use "against aggression." They, of course, were never willing to allow such a deterrent to aggression.

Thus if the Senate ratifies the Moscow treaty without a reservation to an understanding imposed to get us out of the military trap, and if we intend to comply with the clear terms of the treaty, we will be in effect betraying our NATO Allies, and turning over all of Europe and Asia to the Communists. The Soviets have 174 divisions to our 16; and theirs have four times as much as ours in modern conventional weapons. Ever since the United States unilaterally disarmed at the end of World War II, only our massive nuclear first-strike capability has deterred the Soviets from overrunning first Europe, and then the world.

When State Department officials got their first shocking glimpse of the Soviet ban on use joker, they initiated frenzied action to attempt to blunt the effect of the Soviet trick. The official text of the President's test ban address to the Nation had been distributed to the press, but the President had not yet delivered it over TV and radio. State therefore abandoned its original plan of issuing a "special U.S. statement of clarification." This would have revealed Soviet duplicity and U.S. naivete to the entire country. Instead, they made a last-minute change in the President's speech, to have him say that the treaty "will not restrict their [nuclear weapons'] use in time of war."

This was not even a good try at digging us out of the legal trap. Such a unilateral statement might be admissible to explain an ambiguity in a treaty, but cannot be allowed to contradict a treaty's clear terms. Thus Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller recommended the only safe legal step to escape the ban against use. In a statement quoted by UPI on August 11, he called for attachment by the Senate of an "understanding" that the treaty does not prohibit the use of nuclear weapons to repel aggression.

The Senate is accustomed to imposing such "understandings" or "reservations" in about 18 percent of the treaties submitted. In this case, however, if the Senate does what is needed, it will expose us to the most vicious worldwide propaganda campaign the Communists can devise. We will have proved, they could claim, that we intend to unleash a hydrogen holocaust on the world; that we insist on keeping "the peoples of the world" in terrible fear of nuclear destruction; that the capitalist warmongers are revealed in their true colors—and that the peace-loving Soviet Union was willing to make this great sacrifice of giving up use of their tremendously more powerful nuclear weapons, but not so the United States.

The second legal defect in the treaty is the extension of the use-ban "joke" by the language of paragraph 2, to bind the United States not to share with our allies the weapons our mutual enemy has in such abundance. An agreement not to assist our allies in making nuclear tests would have been a reasonable supplement to our own agreement not to test in prohibited environments. Repetition of the joker phrase, however, carries the obligation much further than tests, and prohibits us from "in any way participating in" the carrying out of "any other nuclear explosion, anywhere." Furnishing weapons to be exploded would clearly come within that prohibition.

To a future U.S. administration, it might become clear that the national self-preservation of the United States depends upon sharing with our allies. Multiplication of the targets a surprise attack must hit to save the Soviet Union from retaliatory devastation, may be recognized as an essential element of deterring a surprise attack. Now, of course, we refuse to share with our friends, even on a basis which would make us, and them, and the peace of the world more secure. But now this is a matter of policy only. Senate ratification, without a "reservation" or an appended "understanding," will put us in a straitjacket of treaty obligation. On the other hand, if we try to exit the trap, we will be vulnerable to Soviet propaganda that we demand to sow worldwide the seeds of nuclear terror and destruction, and are plotting against Soviet measures to preserve the peace.

The third legal defect is also included in article I. This is not another case of the U.S. representatives approving language squarely contrary to U.S. intent. This language is merely ambiguous, but still below any reasonable standard of professional competence. The New York Times article quoted above reports its Washington source appraisal of this defect:

"Article I also contains another passage that contradicts U.S. policy and a United Nations resolution on the limits of national jurisdiction over the atmosphere and space. The world organization stated unanimously in 1961 that space was free for exploration and not subject to national appropriation.

"The test ban treaty, however, could be read as implying that the atmosphere and regions beyond its limits, including space, are places under the jurisdiction or control of nations."

This may not appear now to be an important point, but if the United States continues present policy of refusing to compete with Russia in developing capabilities for the military use of space (see the highly authoritative article in Reader's Digest for August 1963, entitled "We're Running the Wrong Race With Russia") it may become the only legal peg the Soviets require for both de jure and de facto control of space. They may shoot down our defensive early-warning satellites and block our other essential space activities. Freedom of space may soon be more important to U.S. survival than was ever our great tradition of freedom of the seas. Because we are an open society, we need space reconnaissance to help offset the military advantages of their closed society. Because we are a have-not nation as to land mass, we need the vast depth of space to offset their 9 million square miles over our 3,700,000.

The overriding legal questions of life-or-death importance to the United States are those raised by a single assertion in President Kennedy's address to the Nation on the Moscow test ban treaty:

"For this is not a unilateral moratorium, but a specific and solemn legal obligation."

Does this treaty really obligate the Soviet Union to do anything? Or to refrain from doing anything? If so, to what does it solemnly obligate Russia? And for how long? If Russia is obligated, are there any provisions to determine whether she is meeting her obligations? If it should be proved that she has violated her obligations, are there any enforcement provisions to secure compliance? Are there any penalty provisions to deter cheating in advance—or to punish it if it is detected and proved?

All of these questions strike at the heart of the two most serious legal defects in the Moscow Treaty.

The fourth and fifth legal defects are, therefore, fourth, that there are no inspection provisions, no control provisions, no penalty provisions, no enforcement provisions; and, fifth, the Soviet-demanded "escape clause" provides great advantages for the Soviets, rewards rather than retards their most probable types of test ban betrayal, and puts the United States at the greatest possible disadvantage.

The least that this Nation and its Senate should demand of the Moscow test ban treaty is more adequate safeguards against betrayal by the Soviets than existed under the first nuclear test moratorium. Trusting Khrushchev's thrice-repeated promises in that arrangement, resulted in a disaster so shocking that its magnitude is still not understood by the American people.

By his first ban-breaking series of tests, Khrushchev advanced his technology sufficiently to multiply the explosive power of his strategic weapons stockpile by 500 percent. He secured the addition of enough nuclear explosive power to destroy the United States, all of our allies, and should he desire, Red China, at the same time. It gave him the capability of building operational missiles up to 100 times more powerful than the U.S. most modern and numerous missiles, Polaris and Minuteman. By making and betraying the first test ban, Khrushchev not only stole our long existing two-to-one superiority in the technology of strategic nuclear warheads—he more than reversed it.

There are other cogent reasons why the Senator-lawyers should reject or ratify the Moscow Treaty, depending on their findings as to whether its safeguards are at least superior to those of the first moratorium.

President Kennedy himself has expressed this conviction with logic that cannot be challenged. If other nations, he said, in 1962, "thought we could permit a repetition of last summer's deception surely they would lose faith in our will and wisdom as well as our weaponry" (Newsweek, Mar. 12, 1962).

What happens when the Soviets form a low opinion of our "will and wisdom,' is demonstrated by their attempt to render us vulnerable to a surprise attack spearheaded by no-warning missiles from Cuba.

It does not take a legally trained Senator to determine by reading the text of the treaty that it provides absolutely no safeguards of any kind whatsoever. This determination immediately raises three other questions: Are any safeguards required to protect U.S. security? What type of safeguard is most vital? And can the United States take action outside of the treaty, which will make up for the fact that there are no safeguards in the treaty?

President Kennedy himself has given by far the most convincing answers to these questions. True, his most recent statements have contradicted these answers—but legally trained Senators should have little difficulty in deciding which are the more reliable of the conflicting statements. Knowledgeable Senators, like Senator JACKSON, who was quoted above, have already observed that "A test-ban must not be merchandised like cosmetics * * * Government officials are not salesmen but stewards." Here are the key statements made by Mr. Kennedy before the "hard sell" began.

In November 1961, President Kennedy denounced the Soviets prolonged preparations to betray the test ban while going through the motions of "negotiations" with us. He declared that "if they fooled us once, it is their fault, and if they fool us twice, it is our fault."

In January of 1962, he stressed specifically the danger of Soviet betrayal of a second test ban by secret preparations for surprise atmospheric tests. He declared that any future agreement would have to contain "methods of inspection and control which could protect us against a repetition of prolonged secret preparations for a sudden series of major tests."

On March 14, 1962, at his press conference, the President again stated that "We are going to make proposals in regard to inspection of preparations."

Yet the Moscow Treaty has absolutely no such inspection or control provisions as the President himself declared are necessary to protect U.S. security against Soviet "surprise" abrogation.

The likelihood of such a betrayal is now enhanced by the Moscow Treaty "escape clause". As Khrushchev himself repeatedly declared under the 1958 moratorium, the side which violated that moratorium would "cover itself with shame" and "be condemned by the people of the world." The 3-month-notice clause—which broke all U.S. treaty precedents and our tradition of the binding effect of treaties—now provides an honorable way to betray us with a surprise abrogation.

Even the U.S. Disarmament Agency has admitted that 18 months might be required to prepare a comprehensive series of tests, so 3 months is obviously too little notice for security. Also, under article 49-0 of the Soviet Constitution, the Soviet Government is authorized to abrogate any treaty, instantly and without cause.

To cover these facts, and to attempt to explain away the failure of the Treaty to include the safeguards which President Kennedy had declared to be required, a parade of administration witnesses is claiming that the U.S. will now maintain a "readiness to test."

Secretary of Defense McNamara's testimony on August 13, as reported by the Associated Press on that date, is typical:

"Surprise abrogation does not pose a serious threat to our national security * * * we have the determination to maintain a readiness to test in every environment."

McNamara and most of these witnesses also pontificate that the Soviets could make no substantial gains by one series of preplanned tests. This, of course, is just what the test ban proponents said last time, up to the point when the Soviets in a single series of tests improved their yield-to-weight ratio by a factor of 5 or more, reversed the former U.S. lead, and began to build massive supremacy into their strategic warheads.

The President has given "steward" rather than "salesman" type answers to both of these contentions. Newsweek under date of March 12, 1962, included this significant statement in the President's explanation of the U.S. "reluctant" determination to resume atmospheric testing:

"Finally, said Mr. Kennedy, the U.S. had no assurance that the Soviet Union would not set off another test series at will, providing the U.S.S.R. 'with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggression.' "

There has not been any scientific development to change the situation since that assertion by the President. Nor does anything in this Treaty preclude the Soviet Union from setting off another test series "at will". They could invoke their constitutional power of instant abrogation, or even give the 3-month notice for an "honorable" exit under their new escape clause.

THE MILITARY STRENGTH OF AMERICA

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Nation's press has become increasingly skeptical about what appears to be a steady and systematic reduction in our military strength. If these articles are true—and the testimony of many of this administration's top experts before committees and subcommittees of this body and the Senate seems to indicate that they are—we soon may find ourselves in a position of complete dependence for our continued survival in freedom upon the goodwill and peaceful intentions of a nation which has a long record of broken agreements.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, find it as difficult as I do to accept the oft-repeated theory that the Communists are "mellowing." We do not believe that their fear of nuclear holocaust has crumbled the very foundation of Marxist philosophy, namely, the victory of world socialism. I cannot believe, as do many supporters of the policies of unilateral disarmament, that the present differences between the Soviet Union and Red China are such as to drive Russia, fearful and shaking, into our outstretched arms for protection from Mao. I say this because I have been unable to find evidence that the Communist Chinese, despite their overpopulation and manpower, are either capable of or equipped to carry on a war with any of the major nuclear powers, and certainly not with the Soviet Union, on the one hand, or with the United States on the other.

Because of this incontrovertible military fact, most of us are left with a choice of two possible conclusions: First: The Sino-Soviet dispute is but a camouflage to conceal the true and long-known aims of world communism, global conquest, and to lull the West into the false belief that Russia really is not to be feared; or, second, it is, as the principals in the dispute have argued, simply a question of whether peaceful coexistence or war is the best way of burying us. In either case, the controversy is not one which should lead this administration to conclude that Nikita Khrushchev, who personally ordered the massacres in Hungary, the Ukraine, and elsewhere, is today any less of an international criminal than he was then.

Certainly, it may be said that any examination of the past would show that the so-called peaceful coexistence approach to conquest has been more successful than that of armed aggression, but nowhere in the annals of Communist expansion has this "soft line" succeeded without the threat of armed force. The Communists have accomplished their greatest territorial aggrandizement through the medium of negotiations and treaties—Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, and the rest—but behind all was the spectre of Russian armed might. The basic human fear of war and the tragedy it brings into our lives was exploited to the fullest. Perhaps the most graphic example of this technique is Cuba, where Soviet missiles were introduced and then ostensibly withdrawn as the price for the perpetuation and strengthening of a Communist base a few miles from our shores. There followed also the granting of Khrushchev's demands for removal of Jupiter missiles in Turkey and Italy, a real and potent threat to his own weapons installations.

I believe it was the great journalist, Arthur Brisbane, who once said that nothing succeeds like success, and the Cuban story is proof of this maxim. Khrushchev got what he wanted, Castro now considers himself safe in his Red sanctuary and we have been talked into cutting back on our own offensive capability.

In the editorials and articles I wish to submit for publication in the RECORD today, Mr. Speaker, the change of our foreign policy from one of strength to one of weakness can be traced. Here are the comments of writers on many of our leading newspapers criticizing the gradual abandonment of our "first strike" weapons systems, which have been so strongly opposed by the Communist world, in favor of something which is euphemistically described as a policy of "nuclear stalemate." There has not been, as far as I can determine, any corresponding slash in Communist weaponry. While our State Department insists that the historic American policy of negotiation backed by military strength is passé, that it constitutes "gunboat diplomacy," it should be obvious that it is, nevertheless, as practiced by the Communist world, the most successful policy. They are succeeding in attainement of their historic goals. We, on the other hand, continue to lose.

It is my sincere hope that every Member of this body will study and carefully consider these editorials and articles because what they describe well may lead to the abandonment of freedom. We can halt this trend by reaffirming our dedication to American principles and restoring our air, ground, and naval strength to its former invincible posture.

I am aware that some in this Nation seriously believe that the strengthening of our offensive potential will increase tensions between the East and West and thus threaten world peace. Others, I am sure, will agree with the philosophy expounded to this body 170 years ago by one of the world's greatest soldiers and statesmen, the Father of our Republic, George Washington, who said:

> There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be prepared to repel it; if we desire peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

The following articles and editorials, Mr. Speaker, accurately reflect that belief:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 5, 1963]

SOMEWHERE, A TRAP OF FATE—STEP BY STEP INTO DISASTER?

As the people have not been taken into the confidence of this administration and have no idea of the content of the many letters being exchanged with Moscow, no one is in a position to be certain of the course on which the United States seems to be proceeding.

It is like feeling around in the dark.

The search for information once again leads back to the Liberal Papers, which created such a political furor less than a year ago. They will not die. This book, representing the advance thinking of the Liberal Wing of America, contained a series of papers on foreign affairs, and one of the most important advocated a policy of "graduated reciprocation in tension reduction."

This, in ordinary language, means step-by-step reductions in arms and actions. But the key in the argument in the Liberal Papers is in the unilateral nature of these reductions as, "our unilateral acts must be perceived by an opponent (not enemy, mind you) as reducing his external threat."

We take one step; the "opponent" will take one, perhaps not as big a one as we did, but nevertheless a step. Then we take another. Gradually our "opponent" will be reassured we mean him no harm.

One of the early steps advocated by the Liberal Papers was unilateral suspension of nuclear testing.

We go back now to the controversial speech which President Kennedy made at American University. He said two vitally important things: (1) that he would unilaterally suspend testing of nuclear weapons, in the hope the Soviet Union would follow suit, and (2) that both sides in the cold war are "caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle with suspicion on one side breeding suspicion on the other, and new weapons begetting counterweapons."

The article, "Reciprocal Initiative," in the Liberal Papers, raised the point as to how can we halt, and then put into reverse, the tensions of the arms race, thereby creating an atmosphere of mutual trust, and that "each increment in military power by one side provided the stimulus for intensified efforts by the other."

The President also called on the American people to "reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union," and the Liberal Papers argue that "the Russian bogey has been grossly overdrawn."

This is not to accuse the President of having borrowed from the Liberal Papers. But the common strains of thinking suggest a Presidential adjustment to the policies so long advocated by the American left.

Since our unilateral suspension of nuclear testing presumably led to a Communist reciprocal stepdown in agreeing to sign a partial test ban treaty, will the administration soon take another unilateral step? As a matter of fact, we have been taking some for quite some time. We withdrew rockets from bases in Turkey and Italy.

In calling for a new approach to the Soviet Union, the President remarked that "history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever."

This reasoning suggests that the cold war is a dispute between nations. This could be a terrifying misreading of the world situation. The cold war struggle is not between the United States and Russia but between the free world and the Communist world, between one way of life and another.

It is not a Russian challenge to our civilization but an atheistic Communist challenge. Communism is not national, but international; it knows no borders.

History has not experienced this encounter before. It is a struggle that will determine the future of all men, not just the fate of two nations. By narrowing our view of the great struggle, we are disarming ourselves morally and spiritually—as we also may be doing militarily.

Somewhere the trap of fate will be sprung by an enemy that really understands the struggle.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 3-4, 1963]

U.S. DISARMING

The U.S. military posture is being sharply altered by the administration. Its final tailoring is a topic of paramount concern to every American, for that posture stands alone between us and a return of the Dark Ages.

The administration is acting on the belief that there is a "nuclear stalemate," a "balance of terror," and "overkill" capacity held by both East and West which make it senseless to continue, or accelerate, the strategic arms race and dangerous to possess or flourish "provocative" weapons.

Following this philosophy, America is dismantling "first-strike" weapons and placing our strategic reliance on powerful missiles—and missiles alone.

We have started unilateral disarmament in many categories.

Defense Secretary McNamara, abetted by his computers, killed the Skybolt missile which was to extend the life of the American and British bomber fleets into the 1970's. When he did so, he doomed the manned bomber.

This is made obvious by subsequent acts. The administration has almost halved the number of B-47's, has halted production of the B-52 and B-58 Hustler, and has frozen in the development stage the RS-70 bomber, an aircraft designed to fly at three times the speed of sound.

This philosophy was apparently behind the decision to remove the 60 Thor rockets from Britain and the 45 Jupiter rockets from Turkey and Italy—following the missile pullback by the Soviets in Cuba.

Signs point to a cut in the number of attack aircraft carriers. The Defense Department has refused to begin production of the Nike-Zeus antimissile weapon, which has test-killed seven missiles.

Apparently this is a "provocative" weapon, threatening the Soviet deterrent, though Mr. McNamara contends it is not as effective as he would like.

America is on record that we will be militarily "second in space." No new strategic bomber, missile or space-weapons system is now under serious development for the late 1960's, states the U.S. News & World Report magazine this week.

By abandoning these weapons the American nuclear punch must be drastically reduced by 1970 to a point where we are to rely chiefly on the Minuteman rockets and the Polaris subs.

The Globe-Democrat has fought and will continue to fight this march down the road from nuclear superiority to stalemate or worse; from the awesome variety of weapons envisioned by General Eisenhower to the all-eggs-in-the-missile-basket theory of this administration.

Our opposition is in accord with the overwhelming conviction of the military, including the chiefs of staff.

There is no proof whatever our Soviet enemy has accepted any such stalemate theory. Their test of huge terror weapons shows their scorn of any perpetual balance or equality in weapons.

It is also reliably reported they are spending as much on defensive rockets as on offensive missiles.

Time magazine this week reports that "U.S. intelligence has discovered what may be the world's first operational anti-ICBM system at a huge construction site near Leningrad."

Should we then abandon our big missiles? No weapon is obsolete merely because the enemy has the know-how to defend against it. It is obsolete only when the adversary actually possesses an operational, completely reliable defense.

We run a dangerous, foolhardy chance in declaring our bombers obsolete. The first U-2 was shot down only 3 years back. Is it practical to believe that in so brief a time the Soviets have constructed a nationwide defense against SAC bombers, far more sophisticated, far more elusive?

Of the weapons we are to rely upon after 1970, Gen. Curtis LeMay has stated, not one has been test fired with a nuclear warhead by an operational crew.

How will the vaunted hard sites of the Minuteman rockets stand up under a 100-megaton weapon which the Soviets admittedly can build? The Pentagon does not know.

We may be headed, as one critic put it, toward a "technological Pearl Harbor." There is tremendous peril in unilateral disarmament of any sort in the present world.

[From the Dallas News, Aug. 20, 1963]

U.S. DISARMAMENT—BLUEPRINT FOR SURRENDER?

(By Ken Thompson)

Politicians have a way of getting what they want, and the Kennedy administration is no exception. Its leaders know—perhaps better than any of their predecessors—that the people will swallow in small doses what they will reject in quantity.

The disarmament program of the Kennedy administration is a perfect example of how a radical scheme cannot be sold to Congress or the public in a single package, but can be put over piecemeal.

On April 18, 1962, the United States offered a draft treaty to the Soviets at Geneva. Based upon a U.N. speech by the President 7 months earlier and a State Department pamphlet entitled "Freedom From War," the proposed treaty would have eliminated the Armed Forces of this Nation over a period of 6 to 10 years and replaced them with an all-powerful United Nations "peace force."

There were so many loopholes in that proposed treaty that the Soviets could have marched their armies through them on the road to world conquest. Even if the Reds chose to abide by the principles, the best that could be expected from the outcome would have been an irredeemable loss of American sovereignty and ultimate world government under the U.N.

Millions of Americans were horrified by this radical proposal and there was never a chance that the Senate would have ratified such a treaty. Yet today—16 months after that incredible disarmament plan was laughed out of Geneva—we have traveled a long way down the road toward disarmament which was mapped by its authors. We have already taken many of the steps which they specifically outlined. If anything, we are probably well ahead of schedule on that 6- to 10-year program.

One of the primary requirements of that plan, of course, was a test ban treaty—which we have just signed with the Soviets. Many people may have forgotten that on November 27, 1961, the Soviets proposed a nearly identical treaty calling for a ban on tests in the atmosphere, under water and in space without international controls.

That proposal was flatly rejected by the United States and Britain, and was labeled in an official joint report filed by the two Governments as "an extraordinary step backwards." Today the same plan is called a giant step toward peace or a victory for mankind.

The Soviets, of course, have insisted time and again that they would never sign a test ban pact unless it were part of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. The President tells us that there is nothing hidden beneath the test ban treaty. If this is true, the Soviets have departed from a longstanding demand.

It seems possible, however, that a secret agreement leading toward total disarmament could be lurking beneath the surface. That possibility appears more plausible when you consider the whole series of other measures which have been taken in the past year in the area of arms control.

The April 1962, disarmament scheme called for a gradual reduction of nuclear arms and delivery systems. We have already abandoned the RS–70, are phasing out the B–52 and B–58 and have scrapped the Skybolt.

Production, testing, and research were to be halted under the plan. We have killed the Nike-Zeus program, downgraded the Dyna-Soar and nuclear plane projects, and discontinued development of multimegaton weapons.

Under the original disarmament scheme, production of fissionable material for military purposes was to have been stopped and outer space reserved for peaceful purposes. Just recently we offered to meet the first of these requirements and for some time now we have been boosting the NASA civilian space program at the expense of developing nuclear rockets.

A principal requirement of the disarmament scheme was to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and know-how to nonnuclear nations. This was agreed to in the treaty signed last month in Moscow.

Military bases were to have been dismantled and weapons and men stationed abroad were to have been brought home.

We have already dismantled Jupiter and Titan missile bases in Turkey, planned the withdrawal of B–47's and the elimination of IRBM's in Europe. In their place, the administration's policy is to concentrate almost exclusively on Minuteman and Polaris weapons which are limited to a primarily defensive role.

Measures were to have been taken which would reduce the chance of "accidental" war. The first step—installation of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow—has already been accomplished.

We have not yet begun severely cutting back the level of manpower, nor have we ceded compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court or begun to build up that U.N. "peace force" which would ultimately be so powerful that no nation or combination of nations could challenge its will—all specifically called for in the April 1962, disarmament draft treaty.

But after all, that scheme was to have been accomplished over a period of 6 to 10 years and the steps we have already taken have been accomplished in only 14 months.

The really frightening aspect of this story is that, of course, the April 1962, disarmament treaty was rejected at Geneva and the Russians are not bound by any treaty to take the same steps we have been taking—nor is there any indication that they are taking them.

We are disarming unilaterally—in the absence of a treaty and without the least guarantee or inspection system to assure that the enemy will follow suit.

Some 14 months ago the State Department came up with a crazy blueprint for surrender. Although it was vetoed, we are today following that blueprint as if it were the law of the land.

Unless the Kennedy administration makes a sharp turn away from the path it is following, we will be disarmed long before the original timetable has run its course.

[From the San Diego Union, August 12, 1963]

Image of United States Must Be Clear

The Communists, whether they be the Russian variety or the Chinese variety, have one overriding objective, and that is the elimination of everything we stand for as a free people.

What is our present objective?

From all indications we are being committed to an attempt to liquidate the cold war and settle for peaceful coexistence. But in the Soviet Union, the Communists proclaim that peaceful coexistence is an offensive weapon which already is paying dividends in the Red strategy of destroying the West.

How do we get ourselves in such a position?

Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, now is director of the center for strategic studies at Georgetown University. The results of the center's studies have been published by the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, in a book titled, "National Security."

In an introduction, Admiral Burke warns that the United States must take the lead in forming a strategic objective.

"People in our own Nation and those in other nations," he writes, "must have an unblurred understanding of what the United States stands for and what the United States wants to happen."

Just what do we want to see happen in the next few years?

As Admiral Burke points out, change is the essence of history.

"But the trend of future events will not change in the direction we desire unless we do something about it. Time alone will not bring a change in the methods and goals of international communism. We have within our power the capability of eroding communism, but it will not erode itself."

The United States has three choices of action: To retreat before Communist blackmail, leaving the Reds to dominate the world; to attempt to coexist; or, to take the initiative toward elimination of Communists in positions of power everywhere in the world.

Admiral Burke contends that the third alternative does not call for physical annihilation of the enemy, but rather seeks to undermine and erode his positions of power—his whole system.

The United States and all of the free world will never be safe until Communists are out of power in Russia and China.

"The United States is the most powerful nation on earth," Admiral Burke says. "Strategy involves the use of that power in its full array, economic, military, political, cultural, social, moral, spiritual, and psychological, to accomplish national objectives in the world."

A strategy that neglects any one of these is merely a holding action.

The United States, he believes, has a grave responsibility of leadership, one that it cannot avoid—but can fail.

Are we, in failing to pursue the cold war at an hour when the strength of the West can still be marshaled against the revolutionary as well as conspiratorial advance of communism, failing America and our children?

[From the Evening World-Herald, Aug. 1, 1963]

A Somber Question

One of the fixed policies of the Department of Defense under President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara is to eliminate the manned bomber; to place total reliance upon missiles for the delivery of nuclear bombs.

This newspaper has often expressed grave misgivings about this policy. We have pointed out, as have many other Americans, that:

1. Missiles have never been fired in anger in time of war.
2. No one knows whether missiles can deliver their payloads reliably on possible enemy targets, and
3. No one can say when a possible enemy may develop a completely effective defense against missiles.

In its current issue, U.S. News & World Report tells the story of this national-defense controversy in detail.

It points out that, under the Eisenhower administration, the Department of Defense had planned to have ready, by the middle 1960's a mixed bomber and missile force which would be capable of delivering nuclear bombs equal to 30 to 40 billion tons of TNT.

Under President Kennedy, this program has been cut back drastically. Present plans call for the total elimination of manned bombers, and the abandonment of all missiles except three: the Titan, the Polaris, and the Minuteman.

And the Kennedy administration proposes to build only enough of these three missiles to deliver, by the late 1960's, 2 billion tons of TNT.

Thus, in terms of capacity for delivering nuclear explosives, the Kennedy goal for the late 1960's is only about 10 percent of the Eisenhower goal for the middle 1960's.

And that isn't all. As U.S. News & World Report puts it:

"No new strategic bomber, missile, or space weapons system is now under serious development for the late 1960's."

It adds: "Worry about the future U.S. military position is being expressed on a scale not equaled in recent years."

Who are the architects of this drastically revised program for (if we may use the phrase loosely) national defense?

According to U.S. News & World Report, they are the advocates of "what many top military men consider to be a 'softheaded philosophy' about relations with Russia: The idea that the United States can lead Russia to disarmament by first partially disarming itself."

These people sometimes refer to themselves as "peace strategists." Most of them are identified with the leftwing of politics or science. They take the view that the United States must not be "provocative"; it must not be beastly to the Russians; it must set a good example.

On the other side, the side which believes that the United States, if it hopes to survive, must maintain clear military superiority over the Communist bloc, are virtually all of this country's military leaders—including the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Perhaps the most vigorous spokesman of this group is the former Omahan, the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay.

The most tragic part of this story is that the "peace strategists" apparently are controlling America's military policy, not only in 1963, but for at least the next 10 years.

New weapons cannot be produced overnight. They can be placed on the production line only after many years of research, development and strategic planning.

The Kennedy administration has abandoned planning for such proposed new weapons as the RS-70, the Skybolt, the Dynasoar, and the Nike-Zeus. As U.S. News & World Report says, it has no substitute projects "under serious development."

Thus when the manned bombers are finally phased out, the United States will be obliged to rely for its deterrent power upon missiles which were designed in the 1950's.

Where would we Americans stand if, on some dark morning a few hours hence, we should learn that Russia—or China—has devised ways to neutralize our missiles? None of the "peace strategists" has answered that somber question.

The article in U.S. News & World Report does not make pleasant reading but we strongly recommend it to our readers.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 20 1963]

Overkill Nonsense

A great deal of nonsense is being written about "overkill" by persons who have more fear than knowledge about our nuclear weapons stockpile. They seem to believe that Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy bought all of those weapons through oversight and that if some well-meaning stranger points out that we have enough arms to "kill" Russian cities many times over we can throw most of the weapons away.

The overkill argument has not impressed the congressional committees that understand military problems, nor has it impressed defense officials in two administrations who have reviewed the size of the stockpile continually. The argument has impressed persons, however, who insist on a simple—and simple-minded—solution to immensely complex and dangerous defense problems.

The fact is that we have a gigantic nuclear stockpile and a $50 billion defense budget for reasons that are logical, not whimsical. Here is the chain of logic that two administrations have followed with the support of the American people:

First, we must be ready to defend ourselves somehow. Some of the overkill criers are pacifists; this country is not.

Second, we must be able to help defend our friends and allies. Some of the critics are willing to abandon them.

Third, as long as any potential enemy has nuclear weapons, we must have them, too.

Fourth, as long as these weapons exist they can be used, deliberately or by accident, despite the obvious dangers of nuclear war and despite continued efforts to put safety locks on weapons. This is one basic assumption that the overkill crowd surely can agree with.

Fifth, the course of any nuclear war is impossible to predict. Or at least our generals don't believe they can predict it, even though some college professors in this dispute think they can.

Sixth, people are better off alive than dead. This should appeal to the humanitarian instincts of the overkill people, but it rarely seems to.

With these assumptions in mind, the Pentagon has built a military force over the years which is as flexible and bound up with safety factors as $50 billion a year can make it. It is designed to deter wars, large and small, against us and our allies. It is designed to offer our leaders a chance to steer us through a war, if, God forbid, deterrence fails, with a maximum chance of avoiding total national destruction. It would permit alternative strategies and lifesaving restraints. It includes nonnuclear weapons which can be used in preference to nuclear weapons.

The overkill argument says that since we can perform the simple nuclear-age job of killing enemy civilians with a smaller force we should throw away everything but a handful of the biggest, most horrible nuclear weapons, aim them at Russian civilians and promise to fire if our interests are violated—knowing full well that the Russians will incinerate us from border to border in return.

Our large Defense Establishment, however, does not offer a neat, make-believe solution to the problems of the cold war and nuclear age. But it does offer us a chance to survive as a free country until real solutions can be found. The establishment must be continually reviewed as weapons and world problems change, but it should not be abandoned because of a know-nothing slogan.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 17, 1963]

No Time To Lower Our Guard

The need for a versatile military striking power cannot be denied. There will be brush fires, of a military nature, for years to come. There always is the possibility of nuclear warfare.

It thus is inconceivable that any nation—particularly those which are the prime antagonists in the cold war—would attempt to specialize its weaponry system.

The United States is attempting to do this, by phasing out manned bombers and Navy units in the hope that missiles, as yet unproved, will take care of our defenses.

Adm. Claude Ricketts, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, took cognizance of this situation in his recent address here before the Institute on World Affairs.

"Our military posture must permit the Nation's leaders to employ boldly—and with confidence—political, economical, and psychological action," he said.

As he pointed out, elements of U.S. forces and weapons must be capable of surviving any type of surprise attack and then striking back at the enemy.

"We must be capable of responding quickly," said the admiral. "The warning time of a surprise attack is dwindling away. There is no way we can predict with accuracy nuclear aggression."

At the same time he noted that conventional weapons are essential in such operations as the 7th Fleet's constant vigil in the Formosa Strait. This operation, which started in 1950, has been conducted for 13 years and has prevented an invasion of Formosa, seat of the Nationalist Chinese Government, by Communist forces.

We agree with Admiral Ricketts when he said that the "single type of war" has become ineffective.

"We would be naive to present to the enemy a neat package of solutions and problems," he declared. "He must not even think he has all the answers."

Such conditions demand a versatility of weapons plus the ability to deliver them from land, sea, and air. Such an ability complicates the enemy's plans, as the admiral said.

He continued by stressing that the day of "matching weapon against weapon" is gone. The enemy must be outflanked tactically and strategically.

This Nation cannot negate the value of a single weapon. We need them all in these curious years of the cold war where anything can happen.

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 13, 1963]

President Kennedy personally induced the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with one exception, to switch from opposition to the nuclear test ban treaty to qualified support of it.

This dramatic backstage about-face by the top military leaders was brought about by the President's using both his personal prestige and great power as Commander in Chief.

At this writing Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Chief of Staff, continues opposed to the pact. He is the only member of the Joint Chiefs adhering to the position all of them originally took in a policy paper they submitted to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee last month.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman, and Gen. Earle Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff, changed their views after lengthy talks with the President. General Wheeler has some reservations, but now is supporting the President.

Adm. David McDonald, who replaced Adm. Robert Anderson as Chief of Naval Operations on August 1, is for the treaty. Admiral Anderson, new U.S. Ambassador to Portugal, joined the other Joint Chiefs in their original disapproval of the treaty.

White House insiders credit the President with winning over Generals Taylor and Wheeler by stressing two points: Their opposition would seriously damage U.S. prestige, and would react against the military services.

The President told them that while he expected their support for the pact, he had no objection to their expressing any misgivings they had in response to congressional questions—as long as they did not come out against the nuclear accord.

In the President's talks with the Joint Chiefs, he made much of the claim that a careful White House poll of the Senate had shown that well over two-thirds favor the treaty. On the ground, the President argued military opposition would only cause disunity and reduce the margin of senatorial approval.

"If by some chance the Senate should fail to ratify this treaty," the President warned, "it would be the worst blow to this country's prestige since the Russians launched their sputnik. It would be a diplomatic Pearl Harbor."

Repeatedly the President assured the Joint Chiefs that he would not let the treaty undermine the country's military strength, pointing out he was firmly against cutting the Defense Department budget.

In pounding home this argument, the President opened one night meeting with the Joint Chiefs by telling them he had conferred by phone with Representative George Mahon, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and had obtained his support to restore $1 billion of the $2 billion slashed from the military budget.

As related by the President, Mahon had agreed to increase defense funds from $47 billion to $48 billion (approximately $1 billion under the administration's original request) when the budget is considered by the Senate-House conferees. The House-passed measure is now pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The so-called escape clause in the treaty, permitting participants to withdraw 90 days after serving notice, figured prominently in the President's unavailing efforts to win over General LeMay. The President contended this provision gives the United States ample safeguards.

[From the Sunday Star, Aug. 18, 1963]

SOVIET CHIEF MAY VISIT CUBA TO BOLSTER HAND

(By John M. Hightower)

Soviet Premier Khrushchev is reported planning to visit Cuba in the fall to strengthen his position in the conflict with Red China over leadership of Communist movements throughout the world.

U.S. officials, who firmly expect Mr. Khrushchev to make the trip to Havana in the next 2 or 3 months, discount the possibility that he will attend the United Nations General Assembly session in New York, opening on September 18. But they say some new development in the China-Soviet dispute might induce him to go.

Mr. Khrushchev is going to Yugoslavia next week. Cuba may be his next big trip.

Mr. Khrushchev probably will try to serve two major purposes by calling on his Western Hemisphere comrade and recent guest, Prime Minister Fidel Castro.

One purpose would be to remind the world anew that Mr. Castro's control over Cuba makes it the first Communist country in the Western Hemisphere—a triumph for Mr. Khrushchev's general policy of peaceful coexistence, which is being regularly denounced by Communist China.

SECOND PURPOSE ASSUMED

Mr. Khrushchev's assumed second purpose, on the surface, is somewhat in conflict with his first and may, therefore, limit the amount of boasting he can engage in. For it is thought here that he would like to find some basis for easing tensions between Cuba and the United States.

Keeping Castro's economy going is costing Russia an estimated $1 million a day. If Mr. Khrushchev could begin to break down U.S. trade barriers built up around Cuba, he could hope to reduce the cost.

Secretary of State Rusk discussed the Cuban situation with Mr. Khrushchev and with Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko when he was in Russia last week. Mr. Rusk told a news conference Friday that he expressed concern about Soviet military personnel in Cuba and about attempts by Mr. Castro to interfere in the internal affairs of other Latin American countries.

Mr. Rusk would not say how the Russians responded on these points.

U.S. officials estimated that during the crisis over Soviet missiles in Cuba last October, there were 23,000 Russian military men on the island. Last April 3, President Kennedy indicated the number had been reduced to about 12,000. In June, the State Department said withdrawals were continuing.

CONTINUING REMOVAL REPORTED

Reports reaching Washington since have shown continuing Soviet troop removal, including combat troops, but at the moment administration leaders are not sure exactly how the troop total stands.

Mr. Khrushchev obviously did not give Mr. Rusk any hint that Russia would ever weaken its support for Mr. Castro or compromise its declared pledge to defend Cuba with rockets and nuclear weapons if necessary.

That policy, in fact, seems to be reinforced by Mr. Khrushchev's struggle with Red China. He can cite a Communist Cuba as evidence that the Red revolution is continuing under the banners of peaceful coexistence. Red China's leaders, on the other hand, insist on a need for widespread revolutionary violence and perhaps nuclear war.

Mr. Castro's importance to Mr. Khrushchev in this connection emerged clearly earlier this year when the Cuban flew to Moscow at the end of April and stayed in Russia until June 23. He was feted and acclaimed widely.

A May 24 communique announced that Mr. Khrushchev would go to the Caribbean island, "the first socialist state in America," but no date was mentioned.

SOFT APPROACH FORECAST

The impression in high official quarters now is that Mr. Khrushchev will avoid statements of extreme belligerence against the United States on his Cuban trip and will likely try to impress on Mr. Castro a need for restraints on his own behavior.

Despite Mr. Castro's subservience to Kremlin control at the time of his Soviet visit, U.S. officials now find evidence that he is acting contrary to the main line of Soviet world policy and must therefore be causing the Kremlin mild concern.

These officials cite Mr. Castro's raid on one of Britain's Bahama Islands Tuesday to capture fleeing refugees. They also note a July 26 speech in which Mr. Castro spoke out aggressively in favor of Communist revolutions in Latin America, specifying Guatemala and Venezuela as places most nearly ripe.

The heart of Khrushchev's long-range problem with Mr. Castro may prove in the end, however, to be Mr. Castro's loyalties in the split within the Communist bloc.

Mr. Castro has welcomed Chinese advisers in the past and has demonstrated a preference for the militant Chinese brand of aggressive revolution. Yet his economic requirements make him dependent on supplies from the Soviet Union, a field in which Communist China cannot compete.

He is committed to Soviet leadership by necessity rather than by choice, and Mr. Khrushchev may find the commitment highly unreliable if Mr. Castro finds he is able to survive without aid from Russia.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, Aug. 17, 1963]

MILITARY MIGHT IS A VIEWPOINT

WASHINGTON.—It is refreshing to see the administration standing on the rooftops and shouting boastfully about America's military might instead of moaning as the Democrats did prior to the 1960 election about how woefully weak this country had become.

To brag now is, of course, in the administration's interest. For unless the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon can convince Senators and citizens of our nuclear superiority today, then the test ban treaty will not be ratified.

And it was quite obviously in the interest of the 1960 Democrats to talk of missile gaps and American weakness. Some campaigners left the impression that President Eisenhower had deliberately neglected U.S. defenses in order to save money.

The uninformed were led to believe that the combined forces of Ecuador and Venezuela might be too much for us to handle, and such outrageous deceptions probably helped elect Mr. Kennedy.

Some argue today that the Republicans really started the missile gap talk. This is quite true. Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy privately predicted that at one future point, Russia would enjoy a 3-to-1 margin in intercontinental ballistic weapons—if it produced on an all-out basis, using all of its resources, and if we continued with our scheduled pace.

But McElroy and his successor, Thomas S. Gates, also emphasized three other points:

That they were not talking about the present, but about a point several years ahead.

That we were permitting the possible disparity because we did not wish to crank out large numbers of our first, clumsy, unprotected liquid-fueled missiles, preferring to hold off for mass production until we had the much-improved solid-fueled Minuteman and Polaris weapons.

Most important, that the interim "gap" period, which would occur only if the Russions did utilize their factories 24 hours a day, would not be dangerous because of our tremendous superiority in manned bombers.

Most of the Democrats ignored the fine print and rushed to the people with tearful reports of our perilous predicament. Weapons-happy Air Force generals and profit-seeking missilemakers stood in the wings feeding the politicians with half-facts and spurring them on.

There were a few honest men who understood all of the situation and were, nonetheless, concerned with the possible gap. But 90 percent charged off on partisan courses, ignorant of the facts or ignoring them, and running for office on a "strengthen America" ticket.

The first man in the new administration to apply the brakes was Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who told newsmen privately almost immediately after taking office that there was no existing missile gap and that there would be no "destruction" gap in the future.

It became clear to most Americans over the following months that this country was not in such dreadful shape after all. Top-level speeches proclaiming our nuclear superiority began falling like rain, especially to convince Mr. Khrushchev that he should think twice during the Berlin crisis that first summer.

A few misguided people thought that the Democrats had closed the gap by some weapons magic, but most knew that missiles become operational several years after the day you decide to order them. Our missile force today has not been rushed into being by this administration.

So now we are bragging that our nuclear force is "manifestly superior" to the Soviet Union's.

We have more than 500 long-range missiles, McNamara says, and we will have 1,700 by 1966. And the Soviets have "only a fraction as many." The actual figure of Russian ICBM's is classified, but 135 is a good round estimate.

The Senate is almost certain to ratify the treaty. But if we had been as weak in the fall of 1960 as present administration leaders said we were, we could not conceivably be strong enough this quickly to claim both relative and absolute superiority.

Some smart fellow should be able to find some kind of moral in it all.

PHIL G. GOULDING.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 19, 1963]

SOVIET CLAIMS MISSILE LIKE U.S. SKYBOLT

MOSCOW, August 18.—The Soviet Union observed aviation day today with a strong hint that Russia has successfully developed an airborne missile similar to the Skybolt scrapped by President Kennedy.

The Communist Party newspaper Pravda stressed the role of rocket-equipped supersonic aircraft that can inflict damage on an enemy "without entering the zone of its antiaircraft defense.

"The combination of modern supersonic planes with powerful rocket armaments is the main feature that defines our air force," Pravda said.

Defense Minister Rodion Malinovsky stressed Russia's readiness for air combat in an order of the day, but his message and press articles were relatively restrained.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 19, 1963]

LET REDS PROVE THEIR RELIABILITY

EDITOR, THE UNION:

The excuse given for Yalta, Potsdam and the other agreements made with the Russians which they have broken is that the United States was duped by the Russians. In the light of past events how will our elected representatives in the Senate in the future be able to use such an excuse?

The writer believes that no treaty of any sort should be approved with the criminals in the Kremlin until such time as they have proved some reliability in living up to past agreements. Let them pull out of East Germany and the other Russian slave provinces, and I suggest they give up their base in Cuba.

Russia's objective remains world domination. Khrushchev repeated it again while our representatives were bowing and scraping in Moscow concerning this test ban treaty. In the event you have any doubt that Russia is not succeeding with its plan, just take a map of the world and enter Russian expansions and dates.

We have heard brave words from the President as a candidate for the Presidency, to the released Cuban patriots in the Orange Bowl, and most recently to the people in Berlin. On the other hand the "bold and imaginative" policies of the present administration have brought abandonment of the Cuban patriots on the Bay of Pigs beachhead; acquiescence in the Russian occupation of Cuba; payment of blackmail to Castro for release of Cuban patriots, and withdrawal of our missiles from Turkey and Italy.

While Secretary Rusk was toasting Gromyko with champagne and Harriman was being embraced by Khrushchev in a bearhug, men seeking freedom from the Russian slave provinces were being murdered by the "gentle" representatives of the men in the Kremlin. How can the Senate justify acceptance of this test ban treaty?

Adm. JOHN FOSTER.

ON WHAT BASIS CAN PRESIDENT KENNEDY TRUST THE SOVIET REPRESENTATIVE, GROMYKO?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the White House has announced that President Kennedy will meet with Andrei Gromyko to discuss the easing of tensions. Remembering that this is the same Gromyko who calmly lied to the President about the presence of Russian troops in Cuba, a lie which the President himself exposed within a week, on what basis can he now be trusted?

Is it not about time President Kennedy and the advisers who seem so anxious to please the Soviet Union put the self-interest of the United States first and demand some deeds rather than more words from the Communists before entering into any new agreements? The American people should be made aware of how dangerous the President's flirtation with the Red leaders is to the security of the United States and the peace of the world. Most everyone except the President and the policymakers in the White House and State Department are concerned about our frantic efforts to make some kind of deal with Khrushchev, but the fears of the American people seem to be of no consequence to the Chief Executive as he plunges recklessly ahead in helping Khrushchev save face, finance Communist-controlled nations such as Yugoslavia, protect Red dictators such as Castro, and pushes his programs by which the United States is unilaterally disarming while the Russians increase their military strength and power in the world.

We may not have too much time left as a free nation if we do not soon demand a responsible foreign policy from the Kennedy administration.

Dr. Robert Morris, in his column "Around the World" reminds us of Gromyko's duplicity, and Communist advances which President Kennedy chooses to ignore. Dr. Morris' column follows:

WILL A NONAGGRESSION PACT BE NEXT?

(By Robert Morris)

While the Senate will be debating the test ban treaty, the diplomatic scene will be shifting toward the President's talk with Andrei Gromyko on the easing of tensions between East and West. It will be recalled that it was Gromyko who lied directly to the President on the presence of offensive missiles in Cuba last year.

What will be involved in these talks will be the Soviet demand for a nonaggression pact following the test ban treaty. We have said that we will not enter such a pact but let us see what is involved.

A nonaggression pact between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would unilaterally and formally call off the cold war as far as the United States is concerned. (It would be unilateral because the Soviets never acknowledge, as their own, Communist parties outside their borders.)

Such a pact would require all NATO countries to recognize the status quo of the Soviet conquest of the Iron Curtain countries involved. It would thus fly directly in the face of the Atlantic Charter and even the U.N. Charter which call for the self-determination of all peoples.

It would do much more. It would commit the United States and all NATO powers not to oppose communism within the Warsaw Pact countries.

The Warsaw Pact countries seem far off to many shortsighted people. But tomorrow they could very well include Castro's Cuba, Goulart's Brazil, Cheddi Jagan's Guiana, or Bosch's Dominican Republic. All the nation would have to do would be to join the pact.

Thereupon the present de facto detente with communism in the hemisphere would become de jure, at least in such countries as would join the Warsaw Pact. A new administration could not take a stand against established communism.

Castro then will have been formally and completely victorious. The Soviet conquest of Cuba, flying as it does in the face of the Monroe Doctrine and the long series of OAS treaties would be formally recognized.

That is what is involved in the Soviet demand. We are told that the United States opposes this. But we have been told other things before about these same issues, including Cuba.

The President said on September 13, 1962: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force, or the threat of force against any nation of this Hemisphere * * * then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security, or that of its allies."

Cuba is, as a matter of fact, exporting communism all over the hemisphere, with complete impunity. Communist terrorists are destroying oil installations and kidnapping people in their beds in Venezuela. The Red Cubans are constructing 200 electronically equipped "fishing" trawlers that will be plying the Caribbean, the Florida straits, the Windward Passage, carrying saboteurs and agents wherever they wish.

Last month Castro's forces invaded Anguila Key in the Bahamas and forcibly seized 19 Cuban refugees. Not only did the British do nothing to stop the seizures but U.S. forces actually stood by and overheard and watched—for hours—this invasion and kidnapping. To make the point even more shameful, according to Carlos Todd's Cuban Information Service the British subsequently arrested, on the very same key five Cuban freedom fighters who have been sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined $140.

At the beginning of last year, the American people were told that the Russians would be out of Cuba by March 15 last. All reports tell of their presence in greater number there today.

These are just some of the reasons why many people cannot be sure that the talks between the President and Foreign Minister Gromyko will not lead to a nonaggression pact.

RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, today we are devoting our energies and attentions to the problem of our foreign aid program. Each of us in this House knows full well that the results of our actions here today will have far-reaching significance, and I have no doubt that each Member of this House is approaching this problem with complete sincerity of purpose and conviction.

I do not wish to question in any way the extreme importance of these proceedings, but I do wish to remind my colleagues that in the next few days we will apparently be required to turn our attention to another problem of extreme significance, the solution of which will determine this country's economic progress. I refer to the current railroad labor dispute.

Each day lessens my once-optimistic feeling that this problem could be resolved without either a disastrous strike or the need for Congress to wrestle with the complicated problem of legislation in this field.

As of this moment—in referring to the railroad problem one can only speak of the "moment"—it appears that Congress must act to avert a railroad strike.

The alternatives before us are far from pleasant. First, we have the thorny issue of legislation which will force a solution to the dispute. There are those who feel that the President's proposals represent compulsory arbitration. This is a theory and a mode of operation that is completely antithetical to our labor-management tradition.

But compulsory arbitration, collective bargaining, nationalization, and other suggested alternatives notwithstanding, there is an overriding issue involved—the economy of this country and the public interest.

The President has spoken at length and eloquently of the disaster implicit in a nationwide rail strike. I know I need not emphasize the problem to my colleagues. I would, however, like to speak about the grave threat to my State and all of southern New England. For although Connecticut may have one of the highest per capita incomes in the country, I am indeed afraid that a prolonged railroad strike would turn southern New England into the wealthiest depressed area in the country.

Railroads have been the mainstay of transportation in southern New England for more than 100 years. But although the demand for their service is still high, the largest railroad in the area, the New Haven, has been in bankruptcy for 3 years. Under the control of the court, the trustees can continue to operate the railroad only as long as there is a good chance for reorganization. The trustees themselves have said that they can operate and reorganize without additional Federal financing—barring a natural catastrophe or a railroad strike. The Federal judge who has jurisdiction over the trusteeship himself has said that a strike would be a catastrophe for the New Haven. It is, therefore, impossible to escape the conclusion that a strike could well mean the end of the New Haven.

During the 2 years the trustees have run the railroad, some progress has been made. Operating deficits have been dramatically reduced. New methods of hauling freight have been introduced. Experiments with passenger service changes have been successful—the New Haven is, in short, doing everything possible to continue servicing New England.

Not too long ago, New England's economy was seriously affected by the emigration of the textile industry. But New England's economy has made a transition over the period since the end of World War II that is in the opinion of many virtually without parallel in economic history. Our economy is diversified and flourishing.

The New Haven railroad operates the northern half of the most heavily traveled railroad passenger route in the United States—the "megalopolitan" region that stretches between Boston and Washington. This alone is indicative of its importance.

To illustrate the importance of its freight operations to the economy of southern New England, I would like to point out that evidence offered by a spokesman for the Connecticut chapter of the Associated General Contractors indicates the following: 80 percent of lumber items for construction brought into Connecticut arrive by rail; 67 percent of steel and iron for fabricating; 75 percent of other materials for construction and 100 percent of large contractor equipment. He also estimated that construction costs would rise perhaps by as much as 15 percent if the railroad is eliminated. The vast bulk of Connecticut's newsprint arrives by rail. Connecticut farmers depend on feed grains shipped in from the West. Connecticut consumers depend on it for such necessities as milk. As the Meriden, Conn., Morning Record has editorialized, it is obvious, or should be, that Connecticut's growth would be sharply threatened if main line rail connections withered and disappeared. Again quoting the Record:

> New industries would be scared off and old ones discouraged of expansion. It is also obvious that discontinuance of rail freight service would place too heavy a burden on our highways.

One manufacturer in Connecticut has said:

> Our present freight cost is about $950,000 a year. If we lose the New Haven, this will rise by $300,000 if we use motor carriers.

The potential loss of the New Haven should not be a cause for rejoicing by its competitors—the airlines, trucks, buses, and so forth. Their fate and their future also depend on the general economic prosperity of our region. Without a railroad serving southern New England, all mode of carriage would suffer from the economic decline. The public interest absolutely demands the healthy survival of railroads.

Looking at the situation in terms of human catastrophe, in New Haven alone, 3,000 men and women depend on the New Haven for their employment. Their average income is $7,200—a strike would represent, therefore, an annual payroll loss of $21.5 million. And if the very real threat of the liquidation of the New Haven materializes because of a prolonged strike, not only would these people be unemployed, but others who depend indirectly on the railroad would suffer severe economic hardship.

I am sure that all of my colleagues realize the hardships that a strike would bring to their own districts, but I am emphasizing the crisis in southern New England because of the fact that a strike would deal the New Haven railroad a staggering blow from which it—and our economy—would have difficulty in recovering.

The railroad workers in my district are acutely sensitive to this problem. In past months, they have negotiated productively with the railroad. In brief, job cuts on train crews operating within the State was the problem at issue. Connecticut's Public Utilities Commission had approved the cuts in July of 1962; the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen had, of course, protested. Faced with the alternatives of strike or compromise, the brotherhood decided to negotiate. The resultant agreement prevented a local strike. However, even if the brotherhoods serving the New Haven were to refuse to join a nationwide strike, the railroad would still be in danger because of the fact that New England is essentially a terminal area—foodstuffs, machinery, coal, and other necessities of life are brought into New England, and a general work stoppage would imperil that service.

It is extremely frustrating to watch a situation develop that threatens your people. It is temptingly easy to scorn the conduct of both sides in this dispute. Management has told most people that the sole issue is one of featherbedding—a word that is reprehensible to all union men and women. It has not been fully explained that there are other really basic work-rule problems involved—the question of overtime pay, of payment for time held away from home for example. Even a cursory glance into this problem will show anyone that railway workers are operating under labor conditions that virtually every other industry rectified years ago. Management must assume its share of the blame for the impasse. Labor too must share some of the blame. Automation, other technical advances, changes in type of services demanded by the public—these and other problems undeniably require revision in work rules.

The opinions on the cause of this impasse are as many as those who utter them. Is it perhaps that collective bargaining as a system has broken down? Is it true that there was virtually no significant bargaining until the issuance of the report of the Rosenman Emergency Board on May 13? But since then, what negotiations there have been were futile. Mediation has not worked. Seizure has been eliminated as an "alternative." "Compulsory arbitration," as such, is a destructive precedent.

But however committed we are to the philosophy of collective bargaining, we cannot continue to overlook the fact that the railroad dispute is a problem of monumental importance—that is, it must be solved, or our Nation's economy will be strangled.

It is time to go above selfish interests; it is time for all involved to realize the consequences of their actions. It is time to stop a war of labels—"featherbedding," "railroad poverty myth," "compulsory arbitration."

I believe it is tragic that solution must come by legislation. It is a dangerous sign when Congress must act to force the settlement of a labor-management dispute. But unless there will be new developments from the negotiating parties, it will be up to us to act. And if we adopt the President's proposal—which has merit—will every other labor dispute have to be solved in the same way? Will Congress have to be the last resort in a labor dispute? Will Congress then become in effect a labor court or will it establish a labor court—another dangerous precedent.

Mr. Speaker, we will make history of a unique sort if congressional action is the only alternative to a strike. It is not the type of history that I will enjoy helping to make. And I fervently hope that congressional action can be avoided. Since this appears increasingly unlikely, I await with interest the recommendations of the Commerce Committee of the other body.

The future of southern New England is at stake—and, indeed, the economic future of the entire country. The full attention of all must be given to averting a disastrous situation. It is not too late for the parties in this dispute to come to some type of agreement that will obviate the need for congressional action. I believe that they will do themselves and their country a great disservice if they refuse to do so.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address myself to the limited test ban treaty that is before the Senate for ratification. Prior to that, however, it seems proper and pertinent to refer to remarks made by me on the floor of this House on July 11, the day the U.S. negotiating team left the United States.

The subject of my remarks at that time was the bipartisan tradition in this country and its relationship to the then upcoming test ban talks. I said:

> This administration has displayed an almost uncanny ability to appeal to the hallowed bipartisan tradition once an action in the foreign policy field has been completed. This same administration is strangely silent, however, when the negotiations or plans affecting a future action in this field are first initiated.

Mr. Speaker, the treaty has now been signed. To be ratified it needs bipartisan support. Predictably, we have seen the Senate bombarded with cries for bipartisan support. Yet, there was no offer of bipartisan participation when the negotiators went to Moscow.

Again I quote from my remarks of July 11:

> If the President and the majority party are sincerely interested in obtaining bipartisan support for a test ban agreement and for future U.S. action in other areas of foreign policy, let the administration demonstrate its good faith. Let it begin now to couple its demand for bipartisan support with equally impassioned attempts to provide bipartisan participation in the early stages or major actions.

It was my recommendation at that time a member of the minority party at least be sent along to observe, if not actually to take part in the negotiations. This request went unheeded by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, if this type of request continues to go unheeded by the administration, the minority's patience—already running thin—will perhaps run out. The result will be that the administration's future requests for bipartisan support will also go unheeded by the minority.

I bring this up at the beginning of my remarks on the limited test ban treaty because the administration has asked immediately for a great debate and ultimately for approval and ratification of the treaty. In my remarks of a month ago, I listed a number of examples similar to the test ban treaty in which support was requested but meaningful participation was denied. My statement of July 11 appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date under the heading "Piecemeal Bipartisanship Is Unworkable."

Mr. Speaker, the treaty is now being debated on its merits. Reluctantly, I will join with my colleagues in a bipartisan effort to judge the treaty solely on its merits and in the greater context within which it exists. However, this one-sided exploitation of the bipartisan tradition cannot be tolerated much longer by the minority party. Unless the administration begins sincerely to exercise the true bipartisan tradition, it, too, like many other fine traditions of the past, will be consigned to the annals of past history. Let us hope it can still be salvaged.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to a consideration of the treaty itself. The President has asked for a full public discussion of this treaty. I commend the President for encouraging this discussion and were I a Member of the Senate would not announce my support or opposition to this treaty until the current hearings are completed.

Mr. Speaker, the limited test ban treaty, we have been told, is unimportant, insignificant and, by itself, cannot adversely affect our national security. The Joint Chiefs have told the Stennis subcommittee that despite the military disadvantages in the treaty "they are not so serious as to render it unacceptable." The President and his many spokesmen constantly emphasize the many things the treaty will not do. The central theme, obviously, is to minimize, downgrade, and render unimportant any implications contained in the treaty.

To an extent, this is persuasive reasoning. The President, after all, put the major portion of the treaty into effect unilaterally last June 10 by his speech at American University. Before or after the effective date of the treaty, our resumption of atmospheric testing was solely dependent upon the actions of other nations, especially the Soviet Union.

The key question, of course, is whether the Senate should ratify the treaty. Notwithstanding the belief shared by so many that the treaty is relatively unimportant, the Senate does have a profound duty to examine the treaty in all its aspects.

This, of course, is currently being done. The treaty must be fully examined in the context within which the President and other administration spokesmen have placed it. It has been hailed as a first step. We have been told—if not in so many words, at least by strong and unmistakable implication—what the next step is expected to be.

We shall not have discharged our obligation to examine all of the ramifications of this treaty until we have examined what can reasonably be expected to follow and until we have determined whether in fact we wish to take such a followup step.

Ratification of the treaty does not commit us to accept a nonaggression pact. But it does set an immense psychological bias for such a pact.

Some Senators have indicated tentative support for ratification of the treaty. At the same time, some of these same Senators have indicated that under no circumstances could they support the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact countries.

Do these Senators undermine their own opposition to a nonaggression pact by voting for the test ban treaty?

If so, should they vote for the test ban treaty? This is a matter that each individual Senator must judge for himself. I bring this up because I have seen no concerted effort on the part of Senators, either individually or collectively, to address themselves to this very serious consideration. The Nation is preoccupied with the treaty itself. It is time to step outside of the treaty and look at the broader picture from a wider perspective.

The President of the United States has made clear repeatedly that we are hopeful that this test ban treaty, modest as it is, will form the basis for another step and another step. In his words, at a recent press conference, we seek a "genuine detente" that "covers a broad area." The President said:

> I think we should pursue, however, the next step and the next step to see if we can bring about a genuine detente. We don't have that yet.
>
> A genuine one—which covers a broad area. What we have now is the limited test ban agreement and we should recognize it as an important step but only a first step.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. We could quote Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, President Kennedy in his address to the Nation, in his recent press conference, in his message to the Senate which accompanied the transmittal of the treaty to that body, many other administration spokesmen, distinguished Members of both Houses of the Congress, and numberless editorials that appeared in the Nation's press since the treaty was initialed in Moscow. If we quoted every story, every statement, every briefing that concerned itself with favorable consideration of the test ban treaty, we would find that two major themes constantly reappear. The first is the theme of the "first step." The second is the appeal to emotion much more often than to fact.

Let us examine for a moment some of the implications contained in both of these recurring themes. Let us first look at the treaty itself, attempt to peel away some of the emotion and look only at facts.

First. In terms of U.S. commitments, the treaty is relatively unimportant. The bulk of its provisions were put into effect long before the negotiators left Washington for Moscow. Atmospheric testing was officially suspended by executive fiat on June 10 at American University by the President.

But although the treaty is relatively unimportant in one sense, there are, nevertheless, grave implications that could be at least potentially dangerous to the United States.

For ratification of the present treaty, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are said to hold a decisive influence over the outcome. On their approval, we are told, hangs the approval of a great many Senators. Last week the Joint Chiefs statement to the Stennis Armed Services subcommittee was released. It indicated qualified approval. One significant statement the Joint Chiefs made was that the treaty promised to help deter war by restraining further proliferation of nuclear weapons and by reducing world tensions. They then said, and this is the most significant part:

> These possibilities are of such importance to the United States that they offset the foreseeable technological disadvantages.

What do they mean by the "foreseeable technological disadvantages?" Disadvantages in relation to what? In relation to the state of the art in the Soviet Union?

In conclusion—

The Chiefs also wrote—

> the Joint Chiefs have reached the determination that while there are military disadvan-

> tages to the treaty they are not so serious as to render it unacceptable.

This for the first time in public officially established the fact that there are military disadvantages in this treaty. Those of us serving on the Defense Appropriations committee had realized this for some time.

Mr. Speaker, an apparently forgotten article by Richard Fryklund, of the Evening Star, should be of interest to my colleagues. It is the only public report of the positions taken by the Chiefs behind closed doors of congressional committees and within their own councils. I have asked unanimous consent that the article, dated June 12, and bearing the headline "Service Chiefs Oppose Air-Test Moratorium," be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that no denial or clarification, at least to my knowledge, has been issued by the Joint Chiefs or other responsible officials questioning the accuracy of this article. Within the past few days we have learned that the Chiefs would have probably taken an entirely different position if it were not for the fact that the treaty has already been signed.

At this point, I would like to quote one or two passages from the article. It states:

> The Chiefs of Staff of the three armed services unanimously opposed President Kennedy's moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, it was learned today.
>
> They were not consulted in advance about the President's announcement Monday pledging that the United States will refrain from further atmospheric testing as long as no other nation resumes such tests, reliable sources report.
>
> If they had been consulted, they would have told the President that they feel tests are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, since this article appeared, we have seen reports in the Nation's press to the effect that the administration has made a tremendous effort to get the Joint Chiefs at least to refrain from opposing the test-ban treaty if they could not bring themselves to support it actively. The Chiefs' very qualified support indicated that the administration has been successful.

It would behoove those Senators who feel themselves obligated to be guided solely by the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to look at this qualified support in the context of the Chiefs' earlier publically reported remarks.

Second. Many top experts believe that the Soviet Union may be ahead—as a result of their last test series—in the development of large nuclear explosives as well as in the development of an antimissile missile system. Secretary McNamara and the Joint Chiefs, in their statements to the Senate publicly confirmed the fact that the Soviets are ahead in high-yield nuclear weapons. To proceed with developments in both areas, certain tests in the atmosphere would be necessary. If the Soviets are ahead in either area—and they apparently are in at least one of them—the test ban treaty appears to preclude the possibility of our overtaking them.

Third. On the question of trusting the Soviets to live up to the treaty, one should at least go to the historical record for some indication of Soviet past performance. They have violated some 50 agreements out of some 53 they have negotiated with the West. President Kennedy, in announcing the Soviet buildup in Cuba to the Nation last October, accused Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko of having told the President a deliberate lie about the missiles then in Cuba. It was this same Gromyko who was the head of the Soviet negotiating team in Moscow last month and who initialed the treaty for the Soviet Union.

Fourth. Although many top experts believe that the Soviet Union may now be ahead of the United States in terms of large explosives, no one doubts the U.S. superiority in terms of tactical nuclear weapons. However, tactical nuclear weapons can be developed and tested underground—an area that is not prohibited by the current treaty. Thus, although the United States is prevented from attempting to catch up with the Soviet Union in terms of large explosives and antimissile missiles—if they are ahead in this area—nothing in the treaty prevents the Soviet Union from trying to close the gap in the tactical weapons area. Significantly, the Joint Chiefs, in their statement, verified this same point.

Fifth. The above-ground implementation of Project Plowshare—the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for such things as creating harbors, canals, and so forth—are apparently precluded by the treaty.

Sixth. One of the arguments used for the treaty is that it will prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. This is a simple statement to make but nothing in the treaty substantiates this statement. In fact, it could be argued that the opposite effect is more probable. If both the Soviet Union and the United States do in fact refrain from testing, other countries—notably France and Red China—might be tempted to lessen the nuclear gap that now exists between them and the major powers. This may not be a realistic goal for such countries, but it will be a tempting one, nonetheless.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the facts that a close examination of the limited test ban treaty should bring out for full public discussion. It is possible—though to my mind very doubtful—that all of these objections can be dispelled and that the treaty would emerge as in no way detrimental to the national security interests of the United States.

There are some questions, however, that the treaty leaves unanswered and that I hope the Senate will raise during the course of the hearings. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will list 10 of the more significant ones.

First. If the test ban is ratified as it undoubtedly will be and it later becomes known that the Soviets have an operational antimissile missile, how would this affect the balance of power and what action would the United States take, if any?

Second. If, as a result of the test ban, the Soviets do begin to reduce our margin of strategic superiority, what compensatory steps could the United States take which would not require other than underground testing?

Third. Could circumstances develop in which the United States felt it necessary to its national security to abrogate the treaty under terms other than those contained in the treaty? What effects would this have?

Fourth. What would happen if the Soviets violate this agreement? What if we accuse them of a violation and they deny it? Would the evidence be in all cases conclusive? Or, should we expect a lengthy debate in this country over the evidence of violation and the course of action which the United States ought to pursue?

Fifth. Does the President's statements on the inability of any nation to produce a workable AICBM system indicate that we have, in fact, abandoned this program? What evidence is there that either we or the Russians cannot develop or have not developed such systems? How do the President's statements square with those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense?

Sixth. Even if a 58-megaton bomb is considered an impractical weapon is there no effect of such a blast that could give the Soviet an advantage on the basis of their testing so far? Testimony before my committee and even some newspaper accounts have indicated that the military attaches significance to such a large weapon's capability to disrupt communications and to destroy significant targets.

Seventh. Questions have been raised as to the meaning of the term "outer space" as used in the treaty. Some terminology defines outer space as near space. What verification means have been agreed upon as acceptable evidence of deep space testing?

Eighth. The United States so far has not authorized a single space weapons program. The Soviets, on the other hand, have continually emphasized the importance of this field of weaponry. What would be the psychological effect—not to mention the military effect—if the Russians should orbit a 100-megaton space weapon sometime in the future?

Ninth. In what manner can the Executive actually assure a readiness to test that would cover a significant period of time in light of the President's own past statements about the effect on the morale of scientists who are asked to remain prepared while knowing they will probably not be allowed to test for indefinite periods of time?

Tenth. As to the treaty's so-called ability to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, how can this work? A major case made for the treaty is that it is self-policing. There is no self-policing arrangement that could prevent one nation from encouraging or participating in testing outside its own borders. Only an international inspection system that could check on the shipment of fissionable materials could guard against this in practical terms.

Mr. Speaker, these are questions and problems that relate directly to the treaty alone. All of the many pertinent questions should be raised again and again until all are answered satisfactorily, if this is possible. However, this is only one aspect of the two-pronged implications of the treaty. We are constantly reminded by the President and other spokesmen for the treaty that it should not be considered in isolation. I am now referring, of course, to the "first step" theme.

In all administration pronouncements that I have seen or heard, there appears always to be a clear-cut reference to a nonaggression pact as a possible second step.

In the communique that accompanied release of the text of the treaty, this illuminating statement immediately followed the declaration that all three signatories of the treaty regarded it as an important first step:

> The heads of the three delegations discussed the Soviet proposal relating to a pact of nonaggression between the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the participants in the Warsaw Treaty. The three Governments have agreed fully to inform their respective allies in the two organizations concerning these talks and to consult with them about continuing discussions on this question with the purpose of achieving agreement satisfactory to all participants.

It seems to be a foregone conclusion, agreed upon by the three negotiating teams with the full consent of their parent governments, that immediately after the test ban treaty is effective, a full and concerted effort will be undertaken to bring about the speedy conclusion of a nonaggression pact.

If this is the case, perhaps we should ask ourselves now, before the treaty is ratified, what a nonaggression pact with all of its ramifications will mean.

First. It could mean at least tacit approval by our Government of the existing divided Germany. It could also mean the tacit recognition of East Germany's status as a sovereign and independent power. Ultimately, it could lead as well to the neutralization of West Germany.

Second. It would signify the abandonment of those freedom-loving peoples in the captive nations, who although close to despair now, would as a result of such a pact, lose all hope of ultimate liberation.

Third. It would probably mean the suspension of USIA and Voice of America broadcasts into the satellite countries because the Soviets have long labeled such broadcasts "aggressive."

Fourth. It is possible that Cuba, after the conclusion of a nonaggression pact, would be invited to join the Warsaw Pact countries. As a result we would be formally forced to do what we have regrettably already begun—protect the existence of the Cuban regime against outside attack—by exile groups, for example.

Fifth, and this consideration applies both to the test ban treaty and to the nonaggression pact, as well as to any subsequent steps we might attempt to make. It will engender a false sense of euphoria, a misleading atmosphere of hope that the Communists are mellowing and that the world can now look to a prolonged period of stability in which tensions will continue to diminish. This is perhaps the most dangerous result the treaty can bring about. A period of genuine peace will only come about when the Communists—either on their own, or through irresistible pressure from a strong West—cease in their fanatical drive to dominate the world. This, they have not as yet done. In fact, on July 14, 1963, in the long Soviet open letter which was a reply to Chinese charges, it was stated:

> We (the Soviets) fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we are flying in the face of history, our own experience, and the demonstrable knowledge of repeated deceit and deception which have become the bywords of all Soviet actions. Everyone is for peace. But no one in a responsible position should hold this test ban treaty up as the only—or even the most likely—way to attain peace. The treaty should be recognized for what it is—a gamble. It should be seen as a step that may or may not have adverse effects on U.S. security. We must not minimize the fact that the possibility exists that it is fraught with dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I too join with the President in hoping that the whole Nation will join in this public dialog but I would caution the people of this Nation to separate fact from emotion and reality from hope in order that we may all reason well as a nation.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 12, 1963]

SERVICE CHIEFS OPPOSE AIR-TEST MORATORIUM

(By Richard Fryklund)

The chiefs of staff of the three armed services unanimously opposed President Kennedy's moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, it was learned today.

They were not consulted in advance about the President's announcement Monday pledging that the United States will refrain from further atmospheric testing as long as no other nation resumes such tests, reliable sources report.

If they had been consulted, they would have told the President that they feel tests are necessary.

NO PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The service chiefs have no plans to speak out publicly, but if asked by a congressional committee, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the Army; Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, reportedly are ready to say it is vital to American security to continue testing.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is reported to have stood with the service chiefs in past private protests against moratorium proposals, but it is not known how he would testify specifically on the Kennedy plan.

Civilian leaders in the Pentagon will be split if they are asked to testify, these informed sources said.

Defense Secretary McNamara will support a moratorium as he has in the past. But at least one and perhaps all of the service Secretaries are reported ready to oppose a moratorium.

Up until this week the position of Pentagon leaders on testing had been almost academic because the Russians had been showing no signs of signing any agreement.

THREE-NATION TALKS

On Monday, however, Mr. Kennedy announced that the United States, Britain, and Russia will hold high-level discussions in Moscow in July on a test ban, and he said that meanwhile the United States would not test in the atmosphere if other countries refrain.

His plan would permit underground, undersea, and space testing.

A similar moratorium was tried by President Eisenhower, starting in the fall of 1958. He gave up all testing, as did the Russians.

In September 1961, however, the Russians suddenly resumed testing with the biggest explosions ever set off. The United States then started a long series of tests.

Both sides are now in a testing lull.

Tests in the air give off the most radioactivity and therefore have been the particular target of persons concerned about fallout. At the same time, such tests are the most useful in the development of weapons.

The service chiefs do not want to stop them, largely because they believe there is a good chance that the Russians now know more than we do about the possible vulnerability of our ICBM's to enemy near-misses.

Military men point out that since the last moratorium was ended the Russians have set off three times the number of explosions that we have. Many of these explosions were monsters—up to 58 megatons, more than twice as large as any the United States has tested.

Aparently some of the explosions were in "wargame" situations where they were used against simulated American weapons.

These military men fear the Russians may have found weaknesses in American ICBM installations or in the communications and support networks.

American tests have pitted A-bombs against some of the components of the American ICBM underground "silos," but never against a whole silo and its supporting equipment.

It is known, however, that nuclear explosions create electromagnetic waves which under some cricumstances can disrupt electrical equipment from a considerable distance. If American ICBM's are vulnerable, the American chiefs do not want the Russians to be the only ones to know it.

SEEK "CLEAN" BOMBS

The service chiefs are also interested in perfecting "clean" weapons—that is, bombs that would not create radioactive fallout in time of war, anti-ICBM weapons and bigger weapons.

The Russians say they can orbit a 100-megaton weapon, and their tests have indicated that this may be an understatement. The chiefs do not believe these would be economical weapons, but they fear they could have great psychological effect whizzing over American and foreign cities. The chiefs want to be able to match the stunt.

All of these weapons advances would require additional testing in the atmosphere.

REDS GOT JUMP

Some of the Chiefs believe the last moratorium was disastrous to American interests. It is argued that the Russians prepared important tests during the ban and may even have tested underground in secret.

After the Russians broke the moratorium with a series of important tests, the United States had to build slowly toward major tests. Therefore, some military men say, the Russians may have been given a chance to catch up or move ahead in some weapons categories.

The basic argument for a moratorium or complete test ban is that the United States is now ahead and the ban would freeze that lead. Secretary of Defense McNamara took this position during hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee in February.

At that time, the three service Chiefs and service secretaries, under questioning by Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said continued atmospheric testing "is necessary for the security of the United States * * * under the present circumstances."

The public record of the closed-session testimony indicates they were not asked their reasons.

WILL THEY REPUDIATE?

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, I have received an invitation from Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young to attend what they describe as their "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom" which will be held on August 28, 1963, in Washington, D.C. I herewith include my reply:

AUGUST 22, 1963.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR SIRS: I have received your R.S.V.P. invitation to attend your rally on August 28. I will not be attending although I do appreciate your courtesy.

I would like to comment on several aspects of your so-called "march" and raise a question or two. I note that the man who is organizing your march is one Bayard Rustin and that A. Philip Randolph has given Rustin his "absolute confidence" in the planning of the affair. Rev. Martin Luther King is reported in the Washington Post as calling Rustin "a brilliant and most persuasive interpreter of nonviolence." It is my information that this same Bayard Rustin served 28 months in Federal prisons for failure to abide by selective service law; that he was arrested and convicted on a sex perversion charge in Los Angeles in January 1953; that he was affiliated with the Communist Party in one of its auxiliaries, the Young Communist League and as recently as 1956 attended one of the C.P.'s national conventions. Would you please let me know if you had this information when assigning Rustin to this key job? If so, why would you ask me to appear on a platform with such an individual? Will Mr. Rustin be among those welcomed by the President?

The Cleveland Plain Dealer on August 16, 1963, in a front page story reported that Eric J. Reinthaler, admitted Communist, was reservation agent for one of the Cleveland groups, CORE, which is sending Freedom March buses to your demonstration. Have you repudiated Mr. Reinthaler? Will he be among those welcomed by the President?

It is a strange double standard that you and most of the affiliated groups who are participating in your march have. If I were to appear with members of various so-called rightwing organizations who in no way are Fascist, Communist, or Communist-oriented, the AFL–CIO, CORE, COPE, ADA, your group, and others would scream to high heavens. Where is the concern over the obvious involvement in your march of people with such dubious background and political philosophy? I believe you owe an obligation to the many fine people who believe in what you are doing to exercise greater diligence in selecting your leadership and to repudiate the radical left and Communist involvement in your efforts. Many so-called liberals seem to be the first to scream about others repudiating this group or that group but the last to care about their own ranks.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Representative to Congress.

The invitation I received is as follows:

Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young, cordially request the attendance of JOHN M. ASHBROOK, at the mass assembly for jobs and freedom Wednesday, August 28, 1963, at 2 p.m. at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON
FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM.

NEW YORK CITY.
R.S.V.P.

This card will admit you to the section reserved for Members of the Congress of the United States.

I am including with these remarks the articles to which I referred from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and an editorial from the Cleveland Press on the same subject.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 16, 1963]

TWO FREEDOM MARCH BUSES BOOKED BY ADMITTED RED—REINTHALER ACTS HERE FOR CORE

(By William C. Barnard)

Eric J. Reinthaler, who has admitted Communist Party affiliations, has been identified by Cleveland police as the reservation agent for one of the Cleveland groups sending freedom march buses to a mass Negro demonstration in Washington on August 28.

Reinthaler, 39, a longtime participant in civil rights movements here, has a long record of affiliations with the Communist Party and its front organizations, police said yesterday.

In a 1958 trial Reinthaler admitted he had been a Communist up until 1954.

Members of the Cleveland department's special investigation unit said Reinthaler identified himself as the contract agent for the Cleveland chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant Negro civil rights organization, in the chartering of two Greyhound buses for the trip.

CORE has announced it will send 78 persons to Washington to participate in the Freedom March. The two CORE buses are part of a cavalcade of eight chartered buses and a private plane that will be taking more than 350 Clevelanders to the Nation's Capital for the Negro civil rights demonstration.

Civil rights leaders have said that more than 100,000 persons from scores of cities will participate in the protest.

The Cleveland delegation is being organized by a newly formed civil rights group, the United Freedom Movement (UFM). A spokesman for UFM last night denied knowledge of Reinthaler's role with CORE and said UFM's arrangements were not connected with CORE.

Following Plain Dealer efforts to reach Reinthaler and other CORE officers, a call was received from Bruce Marshal, who identified himself as vice president of Cleveland's CORE chapter. He made this statement:

"CORE has certain admission requirements which Reinthaler has met. We ask two questions of prospective members: (1) Do you believe in civil rights and equality between the races? (2) Do you believe unequivocally in nonviolence?

"Every member is asked this and we do not ask what his other affiliations are or have been."

Lt. Martin P. Cooney and Sgt. John J. Ungvary of the special investigation unit of the police department said Reinthaler made arrangements for the buses through a travel agent. At that time he left a $50 deposit.

Last Saturday Reinthaler and an official of CORE sent a telegram to the agent confirming the arrangements, the officers said. In the telegram Reinthaler listed himself as the contract agent for CORE and gave his home phone number, they said.

In 1958 Reinthaler and six other persons were convicted on charges of conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law in U.S. District Court here.

The seven were found guilty of conspiracy to file false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board. U.S. District Judge Paul C. Weick, now an appellate judge, sentenced Reinthaler to 18 months in the Federal prison at Milan, Mich., and fined him $2,500. Reinthaler served the term after losing higher court appeals.

Reinthaler was identified in the trial as an officer of a Cleveland local of the United Electrical Workers which was expelled in 1948 from the Congress of Industrial Organization, now merged into the AFL–CIO. The Taft-Hartley law requires union officers to submit affidavits stating whether they ever were Communist Party members.

In the trial, Reinthaler admitted being a member of the Communist Party at various periods from 1938 to 1954. He said he was a member of the Communist Party in Cleveland, Steubenville, and Youngstown and had been a Communist organizer in the Steubenville area.

The Reverend Charles W. Rawlings, director of the Office of Religion and Race of the Cleveland Presbytery, who is assisting in the UFM protest cavalcade, said: "We cannot stop fighting for racial justice because these causes have been exploited by organizations such as the Communist Party for their self-interest."

Clarence H. Holmes, president of the Cleveland branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and leader of UFM, said he was surprised that CORE was sending its own buses. He said all arrangements for the civil rights movement in Cleveland were to be coordinated by the UFM.

The Plain Dealer was unable to reach Reinthaler last night for comment.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 16, 1963]

REINTHALER JOINED COMMUNISTS TWICE—WAS ONLY 14 FIRST TIME

Eric J. Reinthaler, who is listed as a bus contract agent for the Cleveland branch of the Congress of Racial Equality, began his Communist affiliation at a young age.

At his Federal conspiracy trial here in 1958, Reinthaler testified he joined the Young Communist League in Youngstown in 1938 when he was 14 years old and attending Youngstown Chaney High School.

At the time he was working in the steel mills in Youngstown, he said, the Communist Party was active in the "little steel" strike. He said he stayed in the party league until 1941:

In 1943 Reinthaler went into the Army and served in France and Germany as a machine-gunner. He was wounded December 2, 1944, and was hospitalized, he related. He was discharged from the Army in 1946.

Reinthaler said he received the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Medal and European campaign ribbons for his military service.

Reinthaler said he joined the Communist Party in 1946 when he went to work for Republic Steel Corp. in Youngstown.

He told the court he remained in the Communist Party until 1954.

From 1948 until 1950, he related, he had been an organizer in the Ohio Valley section of the Communist Party with headquarters in Steubenville.

In 1949 the Daily Worker, the Communist Party organ in the United States, reported Reinthaler was among protestors in New

York on behalf of top Communist leaders on trial in the first of a series of Communist conspiracy trials.

Labor records show that Reinthaler had been a steward, an executive board member, the legislative secretary and an editorial writer for Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers Union.

Reinthaler, whose last known address was 1568 Ansel Road NE., was born in Salem, Ohio, on January 7, 1924. He moved to Youngstown in 1936 and to Steubenville in 1948.

He came to Cleveland in 1950 for treatment at Brecksville Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Reinthaler had attended Bethany College in Bethany, W. Va., and later studied at Western Reserve University. He was dismissed at WRU in 1953 for bad grades.

In 1952 he represented himself to city officials as a member of the Progressive Party when he was protesting the arrest of a friend.

In 1953 the Cleveland Council on World Affairs expelled Reinthaler after his Communist affiliations were disclosed. The Plain Dealer at that time ran news stories revealing that Reinthaler had worked his way up to membership on a policymaking group of the council.

Reinthaler served 18 months in a Federal prison for his conviction in the conspiracy trial. Six others, including Fred and Marie Reed Haug, once influential labor leaders here, were convicted of a conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board.

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 17, 1963]

Freedom March Must Keep an Eye on Reds

Disclosure that Eric Reinthaler, admittedly a former Communist, hired a couple of buses for the Negro march on Washington is something of a shock. But perhaps it shouldn't be a surprise.

It's ancient history that the Communist Party and its adherents love to infiltrate legitimate groups and purposes to twist them to Marxist ends. There was no reason to doubt the Reds would regard the August 28 freedom march as another opportunity to stir trouble and win America some bad headlines around the world.

The Nation, from President Kennedy on down, has pretty much accepted the civil rights march as a nonviolent demonstration for decent purposes.

A Communist flavor is something else again. With known Reds gathering themselves into the demonstration, danger of violent incidents becomes an even greater possibility than previously. Leaders of the march have a truly formidable job in keeping it within its controlled, peaceful plan.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate on August 27, 28, and 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF BARS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would authorize lawyers to practice before Federal agencies without special admission to agency bars. It provides for the right of persons to be represented by counsel of his choice. This right is now recognized by most of the Federal agencies, but it should be extended to all agencies. My bill would make this uniformity possible.

Several agencies in recent years have abandoned admission requirements, but these are still imposed by some agencies. I see no reason to impose admission requirements on attorneys or to interpose restraints on a citizen's right to be represented by an attorney of his choice, when an attorney has already been determined qualified to represent others in his State. The passage of this bill will do away with these cumbersome admission requirements, giving recognition to the right of persons and concerns to be represented by the counsel of their choice. This would directly benefit the client, whose legal problems in Washington could then be handled by his local attorney.

The analysis of the bill is as follows:

Section 1(a) provides that any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, commonwealth, or the District of Columbia, in which he resides or maintains an office, may represent others before any agency.

Section 1(b) imposes upon the attorney the responsibility of setting forth his qualifications and provides appropriate penalties for misrepresentation. It requires that when an attorney appears in person or puts his signature to a paper before the agency, this constitutes a representation to the agency that he is qualified and authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

Section 1(c) provides that there shall be no changes in existing statutes which permit practice before certain agencies by nonlawyers. Neither would it change an agency's existing authority to discipline persons who appear in a representative capacity before it.

Section 1(c)(iii) makes it clear that present provisions of law or agency rules are not disturbed by this legislation; that is, it would not authorize an attorney who was formerly an employee of an agency to represent others before it where such is prohibited by statute or regulation.

Section 2 of the bill is implicit in its purpose that the agency recognize and deal with the attorney who is qualified to appear in a representative capacity before it. It provides that when any participant is represented by an attorney and that fact has been made known in writing to the agency, any notice, or other written communication required or permitted to be given to or by such participant shall be given to or by such attorney. This recognition would include conferences, correspondence, and service of documents or notices. A similar recommendation was made by the recent administrative conference.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the simplification and clarification of our administrative procedures. I believe this legislation is a major step in the right direction. It would solve two paramount problems for attorneys practicing before Federal regulatory agencies: First, the admission of attorneys and, second, recognition of attorneys. There have been great discrepancies in the field of recognition. Much valuable time needed to prepare for a case has been lost by service going to the client when direct service upon an attorney would have given counsel full information.

Furthermore, when an attorney has been determined qualified to represent others in his State and to be of good character and reputation, and has been licensed by the State authority to practice in any field of the law, he is deemed qualified to handle before courts or tribunals in his State any matter which can be handled before any Federal agency. Therefore, why should admission and control of practice be duplicated at the Federal level through a maze of multiple and conflicting regulations of various agencies?

The principles of this legislation have been approved by the American Bar Association, and the text has been approved by the chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Federal Administrative Practice Act. I am confident that it will receive the support of attorneys throughout the country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill aimed at increasing the opportunity for private homeownership in Latin America.

It is my belief that private homeownership is one of the best anti-Communist weapons available to the United States, as well as one of the best methods of stimulating private enterprise in developing countries.

My bill provides for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank. Its pattern and function would be similar to our own Federal Home Loan Bank Board, by which the great savings and loan industry and institutions of this country have been built.

With local capital and local citizen management these associations have been a major help in providing financing for construction and private homeownership. This same impetus to private housing, construction, and financing will be made available under the International Home Loan Bank Board to other areas of the world.

The measure empowers the IHLB to invest in loans or advances or in shares of foreign mutual thrift and home financing institutions and foreign home loan banks, or in interests in any of the same. The Bank shall have all the powers and authority customary or appropriate to conduct an international banking organization to serve such institutions and banks.

Under the bill the International Home Loan Bank would be under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Guidance on those aspects of its operations affecting foreign policy will be given by the Department of State. The Bank's Board of Directors shall consist of 12 duly elected U.S. citizens and 2 ex officio directors, 1 to be nominated by the Secretary of the Treasury and 1 to be nominated by the Secretary of State, who shall serve as advisers to the Bank concerning matters coming within the interests of these respective departments.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, I have strongly supported the foreign aid program and particularly that portion of it which would and does assist private enterprise and private housing development in those countries striving for political and economic betterment.

Through the Agency for International Development considerable help has been given to the development of savings and lending institutions in developing countries. These institutions act as reservoirs for local savings and channel those savings into reasonably long-term mortgages at reasonable interest rates. U.S. foreign aid has already been instrumental in the creation of savings and loan associations in Argentina, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela, and of an FHA system in Guatemala, as well as in other countries around the world. Not only has the "seed" capital been provided, but technical assistance and training has been made available. This program has been invaluable in fostering the concept of savings by local citizens and the use of their savings for their own benefits.

To engender hope by practical assistance in making possible private homebuilding and private homeownership by those who previously dared not even dream of such benefits, entirely apart from the economic phases of the influx of private American capital, is assuredly a worthwhile objective. Enactment of legislation establishing an International Home Loan Bank would be a major contribution to the betterment of living conditions in Latin America and toward achievement of our foreign policy aims.

ANNUAL NATIONAL BANQUET OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored and flattered to represent the Veterans Affairs Committee of the House, its distinguished and able chairman, OLIN TEAGUE, and the Congress at the annual national banquet of the Disabled American Veterans in Miami, Fla. I will give this great dedicated and patriotic organization your best wishes and your highest esteem.

The Disabled American Veterans epitomizes the hardships and sacrifies of those men and women who fought in the air, on the seas and around the world to preserve this great Nation. They are continuing to fight in peacetime to perpetuate, for all time to come, the principles and ideals, liberties and justice for our people for which they fought on the battlefronts.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leave of absence from the House to bring this great group your best wishes; to encourage these men and women in their efforts to maintain freedom, also in their efforts both in behalf of the veterans and to maintain for the veterans fair and adequate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if a vote should come tonight on this foreign aid bill, of course I will be paired against it. I have always been opposed to the principle of foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe foreign aid is unconstitutional. Under foreign aid, we have built superhighways for the camel and the donkey. We have helped to foster dictatorships and the overthrowing of governments. We have subsidized foreign industries to compete with and undermine our own. We have drained our Treasury and gold reserves. We have placed on the American people an almost unbearable tax burden. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come to balance the budget, give the people a sound dollar, cut out all unnecessary Federal spending and then we can give the American people a badly needed tax cut.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Governors' Conference, meeting earlier this week at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., located in the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the privilege to represent, adopted a resolution urging a continuation and strengthening of the oil import program.

The resolution, the text of which is reprinted below, declared that "imports of crude oil and its derivatives and products, particularly residual oil used for fuel, constitute a constant and increasing threat to all domestic fuels industries" and urged the President "to take positive action to strengthen the oil import program so the amount of oil which can be imported will be more effectively controlled."

Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, which has long spoken out for effective import controls on oil, issued a statement commending the Governors for their action. In his statement, which will be of interest to all Members of this body who are concerned about the welfare of our domestic fuels industries, Mr. Moody said:

> It is encouraging to the Nation's coal producers, coal miners and railroads that the chief executives of our Southern States have unanimously recognized the economic damage being caused by excessive imports of both residual and crude oil, and are urging that steps be taken to hold such imports to levels that will not further injure the domestic fuels industries.

Although imports of oil, including residual, have been limited by Executive action since the spring of 1959, the permissible quota levels for residual have constantly been increased and today they are running at a rate of about 84 millions barrels per year greater than the rate established when the program began.

Total imports this year will be equal in heating value to more than 50 million tons of coal. It is not hard to see what an impact this vast amount of waste foreign fuel, dumped on the east coast utility and industrial-commercial market, is having on the economy of coal-producing areas of America. The domestic petroleum-producing States have been hard hit also by imports of both crude oil and of foreign residual.

I understand that Governors Barron of West Virginia, Combs of Kentucky, Bellmon of Oklahoma, and Connally of Texas were particularly active in presenting and supporting this important resolution, and the thanks of all those concerned with and dependent on the domestic fuels industries are due not only to them but all other members of the Southern Governors' Conference who supported it.

I earnestly urge President Kennedy and his advisers, as well as Members of Congress, to carefully consider the recommendations by the chief executives of so many of our States to which, both as producers and consumers, domestic fuels are so important.

The text of the resolution adopted at the Southern Governors' Conference follows:

OIL IMPORTS

> Whereas the maintenance and encouragement of strong domestic fuels industries are essential to the national economy and essential to the Nation's security; and
>
> Whereas imports of crude oil and its derivatives and products, particularly residual oil used for fuel, constitute a constant and increasing threat to all domestic fuels industries; and
>
> Whereas the manner in which the oil import program which was instituted in 1959 as a national security measure, has been administered raises serious doubts and uncertainties as to the future of the program; and

Whereas there was recently revealed a secret report prepared by a special Cabinet Committee which contains conclusions and recommendations which, if followed, could seriously weaken the domestic oil-producing industries; and

Whereas the President recently issued a proclamation revising the crude oil import program without notice and without public hearing, the net effect of which will be to weaken further the oil import program; and

Whereas imports of residual oil to be used for fuel in district I have increased at an alarming rate even under the oil import program; and

Whereas, a recent study of the Office of Emergency Planning recommended to the President a "meaningful relaxation" of the program as it pertains to residual fuel oil; and

Whereas, both the secret Cabinet Committee study and the report of the Office of Emergency Planning both indicate considerable support within the executive branch for phasing out of the oil import program and the opening of the American fuel market to unlimited imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Governors' Conference—

1. That the President be strongly urged to continue the oil import program as a means of strengthening the national security by avoiding an unnecessary dependence on oil from unreliable and insecure sources and preventing further deterioration of the domestic oil and coal producing industries with wide ranging economic damage to the national economy.

2. That the President be further urged to resist those officials and agencies within the administration who have indicated a desire to phase out the oil import program or to weaken it by increasing the amount of oil which can be imported.

3. That the President be requested to take positive action to strengthen the oil import program so the amount of oil which can be imported will be more effectively controlled.

4. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Congress.

AMENDMENT TO NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the economy of this Nation is still not what many of us would like it to be. It is not vibrant and moving as was predicted for it a few short years ago, and which it must be to keep this country foremost in the world picture and to provide satisfactorily for the welfare of all our citizens.

There are a number of programs initiated lately which have attempted to "get the economy moving." I am for several of them: area redevelopment, accelerated public works, manpower retraining. There are others being considered which also hold promise: tax cuts and youth employment, to name a couple.

What distresses me, Mr. Speaker, is that there are certain things that can be done by the Federal Government in some areas to contribute greatly to the local economy, to increase output, to stimulate employment, which require no new, huge programs. There are some things the Government can do that will not cost the taxpayer a single penny. As a matter of fact, there are sizable benefits that can be contributed by the Government by its simply refraining from doing anything, by its withdrawing from activities in which it is presently engaged.

Let me discuss an example of what I am talking about. The example may sound small, almost inconsequential; but I can assure you that the problem involved is monumental to the people affected and this sort of situation multiplied many times throughout the country can mount up.

In Louisiana we have several parishes—some folks who do not know call them counties—known as the Florida parishes. The name derives from the fact that this part of the State was once a part of West Florida. These parishes—St. Helena, Livingston, Tangipahoa, Washington, and St. Tammany—lie in eastern Louisiana, north of New Orleans and Lake Ponchartrain.

These parishes, like many in Louisiana lately, have had their economic ills. Their per capita income is down; their unemployment is up. As a result, they have been designated eligible for assistance under the Federal Government's accelerated public works and area redevelopment programs. While I am sure these programs will be of benefit to this area, there is something fundamental causing the sickness that has inflicted the economy of this part of the State, something which will not be cured by this massive Federal assistance, but something which can be corrected by simple Federal action.

This "something" of which I speak is the inordinately high price charged for natural gas in this area. Natural gas is one of the bulwarks of the Louisiana economy. We produce more natural gas than any other State in the Union. Then, why should any part of our State pay high prices for the commodity? It is because the Federal Government, through the Federal Power Commission, has proclaimed jurisdiction over the gas consumed in the Florida parishes and has permitted the gas company serving the area to charge ridiculously high prices for the gas.

The consumers—municipalities, businesses, and individuals alike—in these Florida parishes are presently paying one-third to one-half higher rates than their neighbors, as close as the other side of Lake Ponchartrain in New Orleans, pay. The rates are ruinous. They are causing manufacturing plants not to locate, businesses to fold, employees to be laid off, and householders to tighten up on other expenditures. The result is that the area is in the grip of an ever-deepening recession.

There is no reason why this need occur. The Louisiana Public Service Commission, the State agency which regulates utilities, has rightly claimed jurisdiction over the gas. There is no question that, if the Louisiana Public Service Commission were to exercise regulatory power over the rates of such gas, those rates would be lower. The rates are lower in nearby areas where the gas is from the same sources and where the Louisiana Public Service Commission does the regulating.

Because the State agency did claim jurisdiction over gas in the Florida parishes, the matter was taken before the Federal Power Commission for a decision. The FPC trial examiner ruled that part of the gas was shipped intrastate to the Florida parishes and therefore was not subject to the FPC jurisdiction, but was within the regulating province of the State body. However, as to the remainder of the gas, the trial examiner ruled that it was shipped into the Florida parishes from the lands off the coast of Louisiana, the Outer Continental Shelf, and that it was therefore to be considered gas in interstate commerce over which the FPC did have sole control.

I think that latter portion of the trial examiner's decision was erroneous. So did the people in my State who have taken exceptions to the decision. Those exceptions are presently before the Commission for a ruling. I think that the decision was erroneous because I do not think that gas traveling from the Outer Continental Shelf to a destination in a State, which does not travel through any other State, can be considered interstate commerce. Interstate commerce is anything that crosses into one State from another State; nowhere in the law defining interstate commerce, in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, or in the Natural Gas Act, is gas or anything else which goes into one State from off that State's shore said to be interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and not to be regulated by the State's utility commission.

However, since the trial examiner ruled the way he did and until the Commission should reverse him and rule otherwise, this gas will continue to be regulated by the FPC, the FPC will apparently continue to permit the rates being charged in the Florida parishes, and the citizens of this area will continue to suffer under these oppressive rates.

The Federal Government, as I said, could very simply remedy this situation by relinquishing its jurisdiction through the Federal Power Commission over the rates charged for gas in the area. This I urge them to do. Therefore, I am attempting to bring relief to the people of the Florida parishes by introducing a bill which will, in effect, reduce their gas rates to a reasonable level.

If the FPC continues to refuse to help our people, then I hope this bill I introduce would do this by denying to the Federal Power Commission the right to exercise jurisdiction over gas which travels only from offshore lands into one State. Such gas or any other commerce moving directly between any point on the Outer Continental Shelf would be excluded from the definition of interstate commerce. If the gas were not considered interstate commerce, the jurisdiction over it then would fall to the proper State authority. And, in the case of Louisiana, the Public Service Commission would set the rates in the Florida parishes at a much lower level, just as it has done in other areas of the State, while still insuring to the gas company reasonable profits.

We must be prepared to withdraw the Federal Government from activity where its presence is harmful to the economy, just as we so often are willing to push the Federal Government into new fields to spur the economy. If the Federal agencies are not willing to do this by their own leave, then we in Congress must take this responsibility upon ourselves. Thus, I hope we shall take favorable action rapidly on this bill and save an important area of my State from economic collapse.

INTERAMA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and Members of the House will be interested to know of the tremendous interest in my Third Congressional District, of all Dade County and the entire State of Florida in the great Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. Work is underway in filling the land for this international exposition and cultural center which is scheduled to open in 1965 and remain open for many many years.

In this connection I would like to call attention of the Members to remarks by Mr. Farrar Newberry, former president of the Woodmen of the World, given recently at a meeting of that splendid organization at Miami Beach.

I would also mention to the Members a letter from William E. Stephenson, president of the North Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The Members will also be interested, I am sure, in reading the text of editorials which were aired recently over radio station WGBS in Miami and television station WLBW-TV—Channel 10—in Miami.

These are only samples of the interest which is current in my district and throughout Florida for this great project which you will be hearing more about.

INTERAMA

The Woodmen of the World inaugurated a wide program of public service just 20 years ago, with a feeling of obligation as well as of desire. That program began with the awarding of American flags by its camps to schools, churches, libraries, scout troops, and others, and American history medals to students most proficient in that study. It came to include gifts and equipment to hospitals and schools. It honored citizens of outstanding capacity with plaques and citations.

It has placed more than 50 bronze plaques to mark historic sites and honor the Nation's great men. It has thus paid tribute to five Presidents of the United States, and such personalities as William Jennings Bryan, Uncle Joe Cannon, Stephen Foster, Buffalo Bill, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forest, and Gen. John J. Pershing. It indicated the spot where Lindbergh left in the *Spirit of St. Louis* to span the sea.

Now, most of those were tributes to people long since dead and to events of the past. All are historic.

It remains for us of this time and at this place to pay tribute to an idea—an idea not yet come to full reality—the idea of establishing a great institution on a large acreage right here in Florida which we believe destined to rank among the wonders of the world. That idea is to make practicable the American way of life and emphasize by a visible and tangible method the eternal friendship which exists between the nations of the North American continent. It is called Interama—which means "among or between" the Americas—denoting a togetherness of neighbors in purpose and activity.

Interama, when its physical plant is completed 2 or 3 years from now, will provide a spectacle unparalleled in history, and will emphasize for all time that peace, happiness, and prosperity unite the peoples and countries of this continent.

For the construction of Interama, just north of here, Miami has given 1,700 acres of land, Florida is paying for access roads to cost some $8 to $10 million, Dade County is contributing half a million for preliminary study and planning, and the Federal Government, through the Area Development Administration, has been asked for exhibits to cost $25 million and a grant of $50 million. Interama's operation is in the hands of the Inter-American Center Authority, set up by the Legislature of Florida. It includes 11 of our most able citizens, chairmaned by the very capable Dr. Irving Muskat. This authority will manage the financing of the project. A $21 million bond issue has been validated by the court, and $8 million of it, now being used for preparation of the grounds and administration, has been oversubscribed.

Here will be built, not another World's Fair, to last for a year or so, but a permanent assembly of exhibits from all countries, with special emphasis on participation by the Latin American nations.

Interama will establish four great areas: international, industrial, cultural, and festival. The combined public and private investment will exceed $500 million and it is believed that in a very few years jobs will be provided for at least 100,000 people.

And now, for a project which will mean so much to so many people—a project dedicated to progress with freedom—a project designed for the unity of the peoples of this continent—I am proud to present, on behalf of Woodmen of the World's national officers and the Sovereign Camp representing over 400,000 fine American fraternalists, this bronze testimonial of our good wishes and our belief that what this world needs most today is not guided missiles, but guided men.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

Re Washington Report, volume 2, No. 32, dated August 2, 1963, and Congressional Action, volume 7, No. 30, dated August 2, 1963, editorials on the Area Redevelopment Act.

GENTLEMEN: The board of directors of the North Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce have been following your editorials in the Washington Report and Congressional Action publications and in particular the ones above mentioned.

Generally speaking we agree, that sound business practice does not call for deficit spending, however, exceptions to the general rule must be invoked at times to accomplish the desired result.

We must admit that it is not too difficult for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to create a policy of no deficit spending as being for the good of the country as a whole. However, it must be conceded that there are areas in our vast country that are depressed, and wherein the Area Redevelopment Act would do the greatest good both directly and indirectly for the country as a whole. Dade County, Fla., is a depressed area due primarily to the influx of Cuban refugees from Communist Cuba. This problem is national in scope and not only a Dade County problem.

Permit us to bring to your attention what the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act would mean to the economy of Florida and indirectly to the southeastern part of the United States. It would create a permanent $1 billion increase in Florida's income from tourists due to Interama. (Note: Enclosed is a fact sheet on Interama.) Create jobs for Cuban refugees thereby saving millions of dollars now being expended on their subsistence program; Interama will generate 239 million more spending each year in lodging; 185 million in additional food and drink; 130 million in amusements; 93 million in groceries; 81 million in gasoline; 73 million in souvenirs and gifts; 41 million in drugs; 25 million in doctors, barbers, etc.; 17 million in utilities; and to service the additional millions of visitors who will come to Florida to visit Interama, 100,000 new permanent jobs will be generated. (Note: Enclosed is a statement by Dr. Irving E. Muskat, chairman of Interama at congressional committee hearings, Mar. 15, 1963.)

We believe that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should analyze the above facts including the enclosed Interama fact sheet and statement of Dr. Irving Muskat, so as to further evaluate the effect the Area Redevelopment Act would have on our depressed area, and other areas in the various parts of the United States at which Federal intervention and help would be more effective in solving problems, in that, local initiative would be inadequate.

With billions of dollars being allotted to foreign aid, the grants under the ARA would be picayune in comparison thereto, however, such grants would amount to capital expenditures with dividends ensuing therefrom to our citizenry.

Let us take a second and more realistic view of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Very truly yours,
NORTH MIAMI BEACH CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,
WILLIAM E. STEPHENSON,
President.
PAUL MILLER, *Secretary.*

UNEMPLOYMENT IN DADE

This is a WLBW-TV editorial.

Soon to come before the House of Representatives in Washington is a bill which will, among other things, set the criteria for depressed areas. Should this bill receive favorable consideration by the House, it would mean that Dade County would qualify for Federal funds for the construction of public projects such as sewers, streets, roads, and probably, what is most important of all, it would mean the dream of Interama would become a reality.

Funds derived because of this legislative move would be made available for the construction of Interama facilities which would, of course, in and by itself employ many thousands of people. Once Interama becomes a reality it will mean thousands of jobs year in and year out.

We urge the Florida Representatives to carefully consider the wisdom of this bill and help provide the aid that is so necessary as a result of our Cuban visitors. A similar bill was defeated in the House by a very small margin, so small in fact that had the Florida delegation voted for the bill, it would have passed.

Channel 10 believes it is vitally necessary that Dade County receive this invaluable help. We urge our lawmakers in Washington to give the bill their unqualified support.

This has been a WLBW–TV editorial. We welcome, from responsible sources, opinions other than those expressed in this editorial and will offer time for the presentation of those opinions.

EDITORIAL VOICED BY BERNARD E. NEARY, VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, WGBS, MIAMI, FLA.

Congressional action to make Dade eligible for special Federal aid, because of its intertwined problems of a high unemployment rate and the heavy influx of Cuban exiles, has taken on an encouraging momentum.

Latest move in the long and uphill struggle to bring added financial relief to this area, and further recognition of its unique problems as host to the flood of exiles, came in the U.S. House yesterday.

The House Banking and Currency Committee reported out favorably legislation extending the Area Redevelopment Act, along with an amendment tailored to fit Dade's special needs.

This amendment makes any county eligible for ARA funds, which has a substantial unemployment problem and a Cuban population of more than 50,000. Dade qualifies on both points, of course. It is, in fact, the only area in the Nation to do so.

The measure now goes to the House floor for action. It already has been approved by the Senate, which means only one hurdle remains.

WGBS views with a critical eye most efforts to lean on government for economic aid. There are exceptions to be sure, and we believe Dade's situation is one of them. Consider these facts:

Although resettlement is progressing at a good rate, nearly 100,000 Cuban refugees still remain in the area.

Unemployment in Dade, including the refugees seeking jobs, was estimated at 45,100 in June, about 10 percent of the labor force.

Dade had the highest total of unemployment compensation paid to the jobless in the State during June.

If the House approves the measure, it would make the county eligible for millions of dollars for job-creating projects and enable Interama to get off the ground.

Dade has a valid claim for added relief. It has carried the main burden of the Cuban influx, properly a matter of national concern. WGBS trusts that the House Members will share that belief and act accordingly.

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY—A CULTURED, RATIONAL, CALM, PERCEPTIVE, AND WELL-SPOKEN AMERICAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one fundamental trait of the American Presidency is that the mantle of our land's highest public office is enriched by the capacity of contracting or expanding to fit the potential stature of the wearer. The Presidency is widely held to be a symbol of the world's greatest democracy reflecting America's vigor, its effectiveness, and its potentials.

Richard Wilson's latest journalistic portrait of John Fitzgerald Kennedy reveals the strength with which other foremost American Presidents have exercised their duties and responsibilities, partly as a matter of their own character structure and inner drive and partly of the philosophy with which they have approached the office of the Presidency.

The details of Mr. Wilson's portrait are familiar to many Americans who, in the presidential election of 1960, became acquainted with John F. Kennedy's clear understanding of the Presidency as well as his strong fascination and absorption with all the facets and the numerous demands which influence the President's roles as Chief Executive, as chief legislator, as party leader, and as the Commander in Chief.

It is a portrait which, I am convinced, reveals President Kennedy's fundamental strength and feeling of human immediacy, characteristics which are essential and desirable to give the ordinary American the sense that he is not unimportant and that he has someone to speak and act for him.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include as part of my remarks the trenchant observations of Richard Wilson as to President Kennedy's personal conduct in our Nation's highest office.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 21, 1963]

PERSONAL CONDUCT IN HIGH OFFICE—PRESIDENT LAUDED FOR HIGHEST STANDARD IN BOTH PUBLIC AND FAMILY LIFE

(By Richard Wilson)

The world is much concerned, as it ought to be, with standards of human conduct. Moral, ethical and spiritual questions are sharply presented in many different ways. They arise in the private and public lives of officials here and abroad, in the revolution of religious theology and dogma, in the morality of nuclear policy, in the relationships between the races, and, most of all, in the ordinary complexities of modern life.

In this vortex of changing standards and values, when the individual finds himself troubled so much of the time, the conduct of the President of the United States provides a temporal precept and example.

President Kennedy, in his public and family life, has set the very highest standard of American conduct. One need not agree with all, or any, of his policies to recognize that in his behavior, attitude and demeanor he provides the needed example that the troubled or misguided may turn to with respect and admiration.

He is a man of intellectual attainment and with wide and varied interests not confined to public affairs but ranging into the areas of mind and spirit which define the ultimate values of life. We have seen lately his deep concern with his family, not for its advancement or preference but for its form and substance as the treasured and indispensable nucleus of a balanced life, and so little honored by the troubled and misguided.

His qualities of mind and spirit carry over into smaller but more tangible matters of style, and we see a cultivated modern man of vigorous spirit and wit and pleasing habits, manners and appearance.

The essential ingredient is, perhaps, his sense of responsibility for his own official acts, what he says, and how he behaves in his exalted office publicly and privately, partly for the effect this will have in setting a national tone of responsibility.

One would wish that such conduct were universal. Precept and example have not been so greatly honored by an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court whose divorces and remarriages, the latest to a girl 40 years his junior, have humanized the High Tribunal somewhat beyond its deserts.

Nor has the Governor of a leading State contributed to the stability of national customs by divorcing a wife of 30 years to marry a woman who herself broke up an established family with four children to marry the Governor.

These are not examples which a stable society would wish to follow. They have offended public sensibilities. They reveal instabilities of behavior which scholars have found to be historically characteristic of advanced societies on their way down, and thus out of tune with American society.

High officials must surely recognize, as President Kennedy recognizes, that the probity of their lives should at least match the level of their positions and responsibilities. As in England, there is no room for the unstable in public positions. Once such instability is condoned in prominent persons it is likely to become more general among the unprominent, where it is already general enough. The concept that a public official's private life is his own does not bear close examination in a welfare-state society wherein this official may be directly affecting the lives of others.

Mr. Kennedy's contribution to American standards of behavior is not confined to his family and personal life. His levels of taste, his manner of dress, his way of speaking and articulating his thoughts extemporaneously, as well as the breadth of his education and experience, set a high standard.

He is, in all these respects the finest the United States has to show to itself and to the world—a cultured, rational, calm, perceptive, and well-spoken American.

In other respects it may be permissible to argue with Mr. Kennedy from time to time, and with vigor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DORN (at the request of Mr. MORRISON), for today, August 22, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, on August 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6996. An act to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1145. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), relative to the estimated cost of certain facilities proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard within the authorization contained in Public Law 87-554, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1146. A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1963 of the claims paid by the Central Intelligence Agency, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, Public Law 79-601; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1147. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to certain annuity increase legislation"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 500. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6225, a bill to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 501. Resolution for consideration of S. 1007, an act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 502. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7544, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 13, pertaining to FTC advisory opinion on joint ads (Rept. No. 699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8204. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in the rates of payments to survivors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8205. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8206. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8207. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8208. A bill to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8209. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission upon its own motion to direct the interconnection of electric facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 8210. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in order to exclude from the definition of interstate commerce for the purpose of such act commerce directly between any point in a State and any point on the Outer Continental Shelf and commerce between points in the same State through such Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 8211. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8212. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to restrictions in military areas and zones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 8213. A bill to provide for the sale, by the Secretary of the Interior, to the surface owners of land of certain mineral interests reserved to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8214. A bill to prohibit departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 8215. A bill to delay the applicability of sections 1002(a)(8)(B) and 1602(a)(14)(B) of the Social Security Act under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 8216. A bill to provide equality of treatment for all families and business concerns displaced from real property by actions of the government of the District of Columbia, by authorizing the payment to such families and business concerns of the same amounts now authorized to be paid in the case of displacements from urban renewal project areas; and to provide that all families so displaced shall be given the same preference to fill vacancies in housing as is now given families displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment by subsection (b) of section 8 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (by request):

H.R. 8217. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 8218. A bill to amend section 902(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide penalties for fraudulent sales of certain air transportation by ticket agents or their representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8219. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit obsolete or excess materials under the control of the Department of Defense to be donated to 4-H Clubs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebiozen in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients, and providing for a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 662. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 663. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 499. Resolution to provide funds for the further expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8220. A bill for the relief of Hairabed G. Baghdassarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8221 A bill for the relief of Dr. Alkinoos Vourlekis and his wife, Fotini Grammenos Vourlekis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 8222. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Maurus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 8223. A bill for the relief of Janet Ruth McIsaac Austin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 503. Resolution to refer a private bill (H.R. 7151) to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

253. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. R. Hughes and others, Rusk County Conservative Club, Henderson, Tex., relative to a resolution approved August 12 by the Rusk County Conservative Club relating to the action by the President of the United States, by edict rather than by law, has ordered all military commanders in the several States where military facilities are located, to inspect areas surrounding such facilities and, if in his opinion, based on the President's intent and purpose, there is the least so-called discrimination against any Negroes, in or out of the Armed Forces, such commander must at once order such areas off limits to the Armed Forces, and that the Rusk County Conservative Club feels that such an edict is clearly illegal and violates the Constitution of the United States, and that such act and purpose be condemned as Government by armed force, and a deliberate violation of the President's oath of office for which he should be impeached and removed from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

254. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation to inject a quarter of a billion dollars more in silver coin into circulation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

255. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation to restore absolutely the three-branch system of Federal Government, as provided in the immortal Constitution of the United States, thus either abolishing certain regulatory independent agencies or transferring them to their most likely Cabinet executive department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

256. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be published as a House document a list of all the men who were next in line, at various periods of time in U.S. history, to succeed to the U.S. Presidency, but who were not elected Vice Presidents as such; to the Committee on House Administration.

257. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be published as a House document the speeches of the pro-Unionists in the secession conventions of the 11 States of the old Confederacy, 1860–61; to the Committee on House Administration.

258. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to initiate a sense-of-Congress resolution to the effect that during this cold war era the Madison Doctrine takes precedence over and before the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

259. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to emphasize music in all cultural legislation, above and beyond all the other arts, and requesting that there be erected a structure known as the American National Music Hall; to the Committee on Public Works.

260. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to provide by rule for a special secret poll of its Members to determine where political power in this Nation really is located, and the relationship of said politicial power to concentrated wealth in America, and that the results of this poll be publicly released as a House document; to the Committee on Rules.

261. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that there be adopted a rule requiring all Members of the U.S. House, during their official terms of office, not to practice any profession or occupation for a fee of monetary value, nor to hold any salaried position in any business other than that of Member of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

262. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., to investigate the overpreponderance of Ivy League (Yale, Harvard, Princeton, etc.) graduates in executive branch positions in the Federal Government paying $15,000 per annum or more; it being obvious that the Ivy League has sewed things up—they should have no greater percentage of graduates in top Federal posts than any other comparable number of college graduates; to the Committee on Rules.

263. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities appoint a Member of the House to read to the House representative selections from the U.S. House speeches of "Radical Republicans," 1863–75; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

264. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation which contemplates totally extinguishing the U.S. public debt by the year 2000 A.D. by having the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee estimate the total wealth and assessed valuation of the people of the United States of America, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Advancement by Step Increases of Certain Field Service Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain field service postal employees.

Public Law 87–793, known as the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962, established the basic principles of (a) equal pay for substantially equal work; and (b) comparability of Federal salary rates with private enterprise salary rates. However, the effective date of Public Law 87–793 as it applied to salary rates, to wit, August 12, 1962, acted as a cutoff point with respect to immediate and future pay increases.

Unfortunately, this cutoff point caused various inequitable situations to develop, affecting particularly postal employees in levels 1 through 6 whose total postal service exceeded 6 years. In some cases, junior employees were advanced further in the salary scale than employees with many more years of service. Unless these inequities are corrected expeditiously, they will be further compounded by future wage adjustments.

The bill I have introduced today proposes to correct the main inequities arising out of the enactment of Public Law 87–793 by granting postal employees in levels 1 through 6 full credit toward their salary grades for all postal service performed by them.

Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in voting a few days ago to continue our temporary national debt limit at $309 billion, has continued the trend of a decade in countenancing—in giving its blessing to—a program of deficit spending by our Federal Government. In effect, we have told this administration—as we have told it and other administrations over the past 10 years:

> Go ahead and spend money we don't have. Spend it and we will bail you out, and pass the load onto our great-great-grandchildren, as yet unborn.

Let me trace briefly this last decade in our fiscal responsibility.

In 1946, the year in which World War II—the most costly war in the history of the world—ended, the United States had a permanent debt limit of $275 billion. We lived with that limit until 1954, at which time we were forced to add a temporary debt limit of $281 billion.

In 1956, the temporary limit was reduced to $278 billion, and it was further reduced the following year to the permanent limit of $275 billion. However, in 1958, the temporary limit was raised to $280 billion—and then, in that same year, the permanent limit was raised to $283 billion and the temporary limit to $288 billion.

Just 1 short year later, the permanent limit was raised to $285 billion and the temporary limit to $295 billion. The following year, 1960, was a good year—1 of the just 3 good years in the past 10. The temporary limit was reduced to $293 billion.

However, 1960 was the last good year because, starting in 1961, we had greatly accelerated Federal spending and greatly increased deficits. In 1961, we raised the temporary limit to $298 billion. Last year we had to raise the temporary limit twice—first to $300 billion, and then to $308 billion. Just 2 months ago we voted, by an extremely narrow margin, to raise the temporary limit to $209 billion—and on our recent vote we held the line on that amount.

But make no mistake about it, the end is not in sight. We have already been informed that this fall we will be asked to again raise the temporary debt limit—possibly to as much as $320 billion.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that our present debt is some $25 billion more than the combined debts of all the other countries of the world. May I also point out that the interest on our present debt costs us more than $10 billion annually. And may I also point out that our current interest payments amount to more than the total amount it cost to run the Government as recently as 1940? True. The entire budget for 1940—just 23 years ago—was just $9.1 billion.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that we had lived with and within a permanent debt limit of $275 billion from the end of World War II until 1954. However, 1 year earlier, in 1953, an increase of $15 billion was sought. It was defeated and, to the surprise of many, the country did not go straight to the dogs. We tightened our belts and lived within our means.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we could have done the same thing this year. Had we reduced the temporary limit to $307 billion we would have served notice that the Congress—and the people it represents—do not intend to live indefinitely with a government where costs rise each year. We would have served notice that the Congress—and the people it represents—are demanding a curtailment of unnecessary Federal expenditures.

Federal spending must be curtailed if the dollar is to retain any semblance of stability. But it is we, in the Congress, who must see that it is curtailed. We cannot rely on the Executive to do it.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, about preserving our natural resources for future generations. I agree. We should not—we cannot—utilize and use up all of our natural resources, without thought to those who come later and must pay for our having used their birthright.

A strong stand on the matter this fall when it comes before the Congress again will serve notice that we intend for this Government to live within its income. Even more important such a stand will reduce the fires of inflation which are everywhere on the horizon today.

Let us reduce expenditures accordingly—and it will not be necessary to raise the debt limit come this October.

Alliance for Progress Reaching the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by a letter that was handed to President Kennedy yesterday by a Colombian gentleman from the city of Techo near Bogotá. That gentleman, Mr. Argenil Plazas, is in this country as a member of a small group of people from Alliance for Progress projects in Latin America, people whose very presence is evidence of this noble program at work.

Mr. Plazas' letter is in recognition, on the part of himself and seven other men who never owned a home before, for the role the United States played in building the housing project in which they now live—El Techo, the "Roof City." Mr. Plazas is the very same gentleman whom President Kennedy presented with the deed to the first home in this project when the President and Mrs. Kennedy visited Bogotá in November of 1961. Now Mr. Plazas and some 8,000 other families live in the new, modest but decent homes that have been built there in less than 2 years. And the letter from these seven shows how they feel:

REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA,
PILOT BLOCK,
TECHO CITY, BOGOTÁ.

To the Most Excellent President, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House,
United States:

We (the undersigned) feel moved, on this second observance of the anniversary of point 4—Alliance for Progress—the mutual aid plan for Latin America—to commemorate this significant date.

It is our fervent wish to do this because the beneficial projects of this redeeming endeavor launched by you in a spirit of humaneness are being felt in the homes of Colombia and especially in the city of Techo. This development work is being carried on here through the Home Loan Institute. At the same time, we wish to express our recognition for you, Most Excellent President Kennedy, and the U.S. institutions which have labored to provide homes and education to so many underprivileged families and who on this second anniversary wish to congratulate you.

Respectfully,
(Signatures of the seven homeowners of the Pilot Block, Techo City, including the visiting Argenil Plazas.)

I think this is dramatic evidence that, while much remains to be done, this program—the Alliance for Progress—is moving ahead, is doing so against great obstacles, and is accomplishing things every single day.

I am also pleased to quote from a superb address made by our Vice President yesterday at a special session of the Council of the Organization of American States, to observe the second anniversary of the Alliance. The Vice President cited these impressive figures on the work of the Alliance so far:

> A year ago we had relatively little to show in physical accomplishments of the Alliance. This year there is much: 8,200 classrooms, 700 well and water supply systems, 900 hospitals and health centers, 140,000 homes and 160,000 agricultural credit loans.

This is progress. But the bulk of the job remains to be done. This is why we must not be swayed from our chosen path of seeing this great program through.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent newsletter of mine pointing out the dangers involved in cutting taxes when our spending continues to mount, as well as an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News which makes some cogent comments on the same subject.

The editorial follows:

NEWSLETTER, AUGUST 20, 1963

TAXES

Last week, the Ways and Means Committee, after 6 months of hearings and deliberations, substantially approved a tax bill which, if enacted, would reduce taxes by upward of $10 billion a year when fully effective. The bill will probably be considered by the House in early September.

NEED

There is general agreement that sound economic growth requires a leveling-off of the high tax rates which were imposed under wartime conditions and which have never been significantly readjusted to meet long-term needs. Republicans, for example, have

long supported an attack on the high rate structure and were pleased when the President recognized those rates as an impediment to sustained growth.

CONDITIONS

But, a tax cut can, in the long run, be harmful—if it ignores the Government's fiscal problems and if it fails to meet the objective of a sound tax program. The bill in the Ways and Means Committee is such a bill.

OBJECTIVES

The President stated that the three major objectives of a sound tax program should be: Simplification of the tax laws, more equitable treatment of taxpayers and the creation of new jobs.

SIMPLIFICATION

Not only does the bill fail to simplify the laws; it is a step backward toward greater complexity. It adds some 300 pages of new complexities to a statute already overburdened with exceptions, exemptions, special rules and complex formulas.

EQUITY

The bill adds new inequities to the tax system. It gives an unwarranted eventual $1 billion a year subsidy to big business; it increases the double taxation of shareholders, and it increases taxes for those who itemize deductions while reducing taxes for those who do not.

JOBS

Jobs are created when people invest in new enterprises. This bill relies more on increasing consumer spending than on encouraging increased investment. The net effect may well be the creation of inflationary pressures rather than the creation of jobs.

FISCAL

More than any of these defects, however, the grave deficiency in this bill is the fact that it deliberately enacts the greatest tax cut in history when the Nation's spending is at an alltime high, and when the administration in power gives every indication of wanting more and more Federal expenditures.

SIGNIFICANCE

What this means is that the bill's tax cut will be financed by borrowing money (or creating it), not only next year but for years ahead, as far as we can look into the fiscal future. It insures deficits of the magnitude of $10 billion a year for years to come. This prospect has grave implications for the value of your dollar—both at home and abroad. It is a grave risk to take for uncertain benefits.

REQUIREMENT

What is urgently needed before we can safely cut taxes is meaningful action, not words, by the administration to get Federal spending under control, to pull back its numerous requests for new expenditures, and to give the Nation the hope that one day—in the foreseeable future—we can balance the budget.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Aug. 14, 1963]

CUT IN FEDERAL SPENDING SHOULD HAVE TOP PRIORITY TO SPARE NEXT GENERATION

While the House Ways and Means Committee is rapidly completing the long, tedious and highly complicated job of preparing a tax-cut bill that could produce substantial savings for most taxpayers, it is still very problematical that any action will be forthcoming on such a bill this year.

The reasons are obvious enough for those acquainted with the ways of Congress. To begin with, approval of a tax-cutting bill by the powerful House committee still adds up to but one short step in the long route such a bill must take through the Congress. It is an important step, to be sure, but still laying in wait for the bill is open debate on the floor of the House, a study and hearings by a Senate committee, and perhaps a long and bitter debate in the upper Chamber.

The present timetable calls for full lower House consideration of the tax-cut bill next month. Even granting that the House debate is short and winds up with House approval of the bill along the lines proposed by the Ways and Means Committee, it is not likely that any action, whatsoever, will be forthcoming in the Senate until an approved bill comes over from the House.

Then the powerful Senate Finance Committee will schedule its own hearings on the bill and they are apt to take just as long as the hearings held by the House committee. In fact, they might take longer as there are powerful economy advocates on the Senate committee who are strongly opposed to the whole idea of making substantial reductions in current tax rates without making substantial reductions in Government spending to balance the loss of revenue. Granting that this opposition can be overcome, there is still the probability that the Senate committee will change the House bill in many respects, thus enhancing the prospect of a long debate on the floor of the Senate and possible complications if and when a Senate-approved bill goes back to the lower House so differences can be resolved.

All of this precludes any interruptions of regular Senate business by a filibuster on the civil rights issue. Should there be such a filibuster, with Senate committees prohibited from holding hearings and conducting any business sessions during the filibuster, there is virtually no chance that any tax legislation will clear Congress this session.

Thus, our overburdened taxpayers would be wise to temper their enthusiasm over the prospect of getting a tax break anytime soon. It is true that the administration has put a first priority on the tax-cutting bill, but many Congressmen prefer to hold up such action until an election year and that is another factor which helps to explain why the Congress isn't going to be in any big hurry to push a bill through this year.

One of the surprising things that many Congressmen have already learned is that there are a lot of taxpayers in this country who share the belief that a tax cut should be accompanied by a sharp reduction in Federal expenditures. People who have grown accustomed over the years to tailoring their own spending to their incomes simply cannot understand how a government, which is already head over heels in debt, can improve its fiscal position by reducing its income while further increasing its spending.

Yet, this is exactly what this proposed tax-cutting bill aims to do. It will provide over $10 billion in tax relief at a time when the Federal budget is already unbalanced on the deficit side to the tune of some $7 billion. This is the same as arguing that a man who is already broke and deep in debt can go on and increase his personal spending while his income is going to be much less than he had before. Admittedly, for an individual to follow such a reckless policy would be financial folly in the extreme, yet there are those who argue that a government, which is nothing more than a collection of individuals, can do this without endangering its financial position.

We sharply disagree with this economic theory. A government, because of its vast borrowing powers, can go on spending more than it takes in for a much longer time than applies to individuals. But no government can go on indefinitely in this fashion without eventually reaping the consequences of such folly, and we are rapidly approaching the state in this country where the size of our debt, the taxes required to carry it, and our declining gold supply are certain to bring on extremely serious consequences.

Quite naturally, there are darn few taxpayers in this country who don't relish the idea of being permitted to keep more of their own money to spend on their own needs. That's what makes a tax-cutting bill so popular with Congressmen in an election year.

Yet, commonsense and plain common honesty demand that all of us look at tax-cutting proposals that aren't accompanied by balancing cuts in Government spending with a slightly jaundiced eye. This generation of Americans has already built up a staggering debt load for our children and now it is proposed we add even more to that load by giving ourselves a juicy tax cut without forcing a wasteful government to cut its spending proportionately.

From this viewpoint, that is fiscal irresponsibility of a most tragic sort and, while we recognize the need for a tax cut, we think there's an even greater need for reducing our wild Government spending at one and the same time.

SPA, Douglas Wright Celebrate Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this month, on August 31, the Southwestern Power Administration and its able and respected Administrator, Douglas G. Wright, will celebrate SPA's 20th anniversary.

I want to take this opportunity to express my personal congratulations and my appreciation to Douglas Wright and to all of the employees of Southwestern Power Administration for the 20 years of outstanding service they have rendered to the southwest area of the United States.

On August 31, 1943, the Secretary of the Interior, by secretarial order, created the Southwestern Power Administration as an agency of the Department of the Interior. The SPA was given the authority to transmit and dispose of electric energy generated at the Denison and Norfolk multiple-purpose projects in such a manner as to realize the maximum public benefit.

Since that time, the duties and responsibilities of the Southwestern Power Administration have increased many times. However, with this growth, the SPA has never lost sight of its primary mission to provide the maximum public benefit from the transmission and disposition of electric energy. Benefits to the public have certainly increased proportionately.

Now the number of hydroelectric projects whose output is marketed by SPA has increased to nine. Six States—Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Missouri, and Kansas—are the beneficiaries of the work of SPA, at the present time.

It is estimated that by 1969, the number of hydroplants in the Southwestern Power Administration area will have increased to 17, and the total installed capacity to 1,584,500 kilowatts.

SPA markets its electric energy to both public and private consumers. For example, 61 percent of SPA's electric energy goes to preference customers such as rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and defense installations. The remaining 39 percent has been marketed to privately owned utilities.

One estimate indicates that more than 95 percent of the farms within the SPA area are now served with electric power compared to only 3 percent being served in 1935.

This outstanding record of service to the Southwest is due in a large measure to the leadership, vision, and the capable administrative talent of Douglas Wright.

Mr. Wright this year celebrates his 30th year of Government service. He has a wide range of experience in the hydroelectric power field and he is certainly one of the foremost authorities in this area in our Nation.

Mr. Wright was once quoted as saying:

> In the grid of Southwestern Power Administration, public power, private power, municipalities, and rural electric cooperatives have found a common ground in which they work together.

This achievement is a great tribute to the administrative ability of Doug Wright, who has headed the agency from its beginning

The Southwest Power Administration has enjoyed a very successful first 20 years. Thanks to Douglas Wright's foresight and management and to all who have been a part of SPA, a significant contribution has been made toward insuring a bright, prosperous, and industrially expansive future throughout the Southwest.

I know I speak for thousands, who have benefited directly or indirectly, in congratulating SPA and Douglas Wright on their 20th anniversary and in wishing them continued success in the future.

The Architect of the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have been reading a good bit lately about the Architect of the Capitol. This is not surprising when considered in light of the responsibilities of the office and the recent expansion of the buildings at the Capitol. There does seem to be some misunderstanding, however, about the position of Architect, and about the Capitol itself. To set the record straight on some of these points, a brief explanation is in order.

The Architect of the Capitol is the official title given to the position created by law to oversee the Capitol Building. The title is not a job description any more than that of Secretary of State, who does not necessarily have to be a secretary. The law does not require that the Architect be an architect, and the present holder of the position happens to be an engineer. It would seem that this background better qualifies him for his duties than any other. The original design for the Capitol was not done by an architect or engineer, but by a doctor, Dr. William Thornton.

The Architect of the Capitol is appointed by the President, not the Congress, and the present Architect received his appointment from President Eisenhower.

The Architect of the Capitol has charge of the U.S. Capitol Building and its 135 acres of grounds. In addition, under the direction of the appropriate committees of the House and Senate, he is charged with the care of the three House Office Buildings, the two Senate Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court Building, the U.S. Court of Claims Building, the U.S. Botanic Garden, and the Capitol Power Plant. The latter supplies heat and air conditioning to all of the others, plus the Washington City Post Office and the Government Printing Office.

In addition to these duties, the Architect of the Capitol is charged with overseeing the planning and construction of additional buildings committed to him by the Congress from time to time. During the last few years these have included the new office buildings for the Senate and the House, and the East Extension to the Capitol.

The Architect of the Capitol also serves as a member of the Capital Police Board and the District of Columbia Zoning Commission.

The Architect of the Capitol, then, serves for the legislative and judicial branches of Government much the same function as does the General Services Administrator for the executive branch. By act of Congress in 1876 the title of Architect of the Capitol was created and permanent authority for the care of the Capitol established.

The Architect acts as administrator and overseer for the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Speaker of the House, and the Vice President. In addition, of course, his activities are further controlled by the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House.

We often hear about the high costs of construction or improvements at the Capitol. Unfortunately generalizations are often given, and the true picture of the problems never realized.

The Capitol itself, and the buildings surrounding it, must conform to the general architectual pattern long established. They must be built to endure centuries.

We need a proper perspective of the nature of the buildings and their setting on Capitol Hill. We are talking about the Capitol of the United States of America, the legislative hall of the greatest republic this earth has ever seen. The Capitol, with its additions and surroundings, serves the same Government which witnessed its beginning in 1793—but the Nation has changed. The Capitol was planned for a country with a population of some 3,929,214 people. Today it serves more than 189,712,000. The problems facing the Congress today are infinitely more complex than those at the birth of the Republic.

While the number of citizens has increased, so has the number of States, cities, counties, and also the number of Senators and Representatives. The Capitol has expanded to meet the needs of more space for committees, staff, and Members of Congress. The number of Senators has increased from 26 to 100, and the number of Representatives has increased from 65 to 435. The number of people per Member has greatly increased, since the Constitution envisioned approximately 30,000 people per Member. Today my own Sixth District of Florida comprises some 800,000 people.

All of this means more facilities, more services, more machinery, to permit the Congress to operate. It is amazing to me that we have been able to adapt the old buildings so well. Except for the new East Extension, the newest part of the Capitol is over 100 years old, and still in use. The office building where my office is located is some 60 years old.

Electricity and the telephone and many other things were not known when the Capitol was being built. Yet all of the latest equipment has been added in the old building without defacing it in any way. New buildings have been added to meet the expanded needs of the Congress, but of course have not kept pace with that need.

The Capitol is the center of Government in Washington, and every tourist and visitor going through the Capitol has every reason to be proud of their building. It is the symbol of their Nation and their Republic. They want it preserved, not as a museum, but as a living example of democracy in action.

The Architect of the Capitol is responsible for the care and the improvement of these buildings, and it is easy to blame him for the expense. But improvements are necessary for the Congress to function.

I wonder how many people visiting the building realize the responsibilities of the Architect, and the faithful devotion to the duty of preserving the Capitol and its setting exhibited by the present Architect, George Stewart.

You have only to walk through the Capitol at any time to see what kind of job he is doing. The building is clean and efficiently maintained. Improvements are constantly being made. They go on day and sometimes even at night so as not to disturb the sitting Houses of Congress. Thousands of visitors troop through the building every day, additional hundreds work within its walls, two great deliberative assemblies carry out their legislative duties, and yet the building maintains its calm and proper decor.

Economy and efficiency are just as important in the U.S. Capitol as in any other office or branch of Government. Where costs can be cut, they should be cut. If something is unnecessary, it should be eliminated. But the Capitol and its grounds should be looked upon for what they really are—a monument to our form of Government and a symbol of our past and our hopes for the future. The measure of the success of George Stewart should be in his achievements in improving the Capitol and maintaining its traditions while bringing it into the mid-twentieth century, not in the question of whether or not the Architect should be an architect. I believe he has met the challenge set down by a long line of predecessors and that the Nation has benefited from his dedicated service to us all.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Revelation 21: 7: *He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.*

O Thou who art the source of strength and courage, of light and hope in these days that are shrouded in darkness, grant that we may know the secret of victorious and joyous living as we look wistfully and anxiously toward the future.

We pray that Thou wilt deliver and lift mankind out of its atheistic and agnostic tempers of mind. Fill us with a real and radiant faith in the Lord God omnipotent who reigns as the Supreme Ruler of the universe.

Enable us by Thy grace to gain for ourselves and others the mastery over all trials and tribulations and may the spirit of our blessed Lord be the strength of our souls, His truth our shield, and His companionship our joy.

May integrity of character, fidelity to duty, and obedience to Thy will be the cardinal and crowning virtues in our lives.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what general debate we will have today?

Mr. ALBERT. The only general debate will be special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Bass
Davis, Tenn.
Dulski
Edwards
Elliott
Grant
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Keith
Keogh
McDade
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Powell
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Smith, Va.
Thompson, La.
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill, H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the engrossed copy of the bill be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 7885) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 106. Section 202(a), which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out 'and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and inserting in lieu thereof ', $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, $900,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years,'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly

Page 10, strike out lines 6 through 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'fiscal years 1963 through 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year' and insert in lieu thereof 'fiscal years 1963, 1965, and 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year, and for use beginning in the fiscal year 1964, not to exceed $450,000,000,'.

"(2) Immediately after '1963' the second time it appears therein, insert the following: 'and not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964.'."

Page 11, line 2, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

Page 11, line 16, strike out "$1,225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 188, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—222

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baring
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Perkins
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Senner
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser

Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—188

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Duncan
Edmondson
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Secrest
Sheppard
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Davis, Tenn.
Dulski
Edwards
Elliott
Grant
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Keith
Keogh
McDade
Matthews
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Roberts, Ala.
Schwengel
Shelley
Thompson, La.
Willis
Wright

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Grant for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. McDade against.

Mr. Harvey of Michigan for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Keith for, with Mr. Wright against.

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Edwards against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bass with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Nix.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Dulski.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. GROVER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, acting under the instructions of the House, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I report back to the House the bill, H.R. 7885, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 106. Section 202(a), which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out 'and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and inserting in lieu thereof, $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, $900,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years,'."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Page 10, strike out lines 6 through 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'fiscal years 1963 through 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year' and insert in lieu thereof 'fiscal years 1963, 1965, and 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year, and for use beginning in the fiscal year 1964, not to exceed $450,000,000,'.

"(2) Immediately after '1963' the second time it appears therein, insert the following: 'and not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for use beginning in fiscal year 1964.'."

Page 11, line 2, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000".

Page 11, line 16, strike out "$1,225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 186, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—224

Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—186

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morris
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush

Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Secrest
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Griffin

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Davis, Tenn.
Dulski
Edwards
Elliott
Grant
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Keith
Keogh
McDade
Matthews
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Thompson, La.
Willis
Wright

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Harvey of Michigan against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Bass for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Grant against.

Until further notice:

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Edwards with Mr. Elliott.

Mr. MINISH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to this foreign-aid bill because I believe as the Clay Committee has reported in its appraisal of our foreign-aid program that we are attempting "too much for too many."

It is impossible for any nation regardless of its wealth to continue indefinitely to support most of the countries of the world and the extent of our national debt and decreasing gold reserves present dramatic proof that our financial condition cannot support a continuation of such great foreign spending programs. In my opinion, our foreign aid should be severely restricted with assistance given to those nations willing to take a stand for democratic government and those with an ability to make proper utilization of the funds supplied them.

There has been a continuing of the absence of selectivity in the recipients of our foreign aid. We have found both economic and military assistance being given simultaneously to countries on both sides of international quarrels as well as aid going to Communist-dominated countries like Yugoslavia and Poland.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, there is a proper concern about the accumulation of unexpended balances from prior appropriations. As of June 30, 1963, we find such balances to be estimated at $6.8 billion and it is difficult to see the necessity or advisability of authorizing additional foreign aid expenditures when several such exorbitant unexpended balances now exist.

Another matter which should disturb every responsible legislator is the fact that we are being called upon to authenticate or approve long-term foreign aid commitments by the executive department when congressional approval was not sought in the initial phases of such agreements. I fail to see any logic or justification in the argument advanced that Congress is breaking faith with foreign countries when we fail to rubber stamp those Executive commitments to which we were not a party. Such agreements should have prior congressional approval before being entered into by the Executive.

Mr. Speaker, of the most serious concern not only to members of Congress but the American people is our continuation of aid to Communist governments, which is being given under the pretense of preventing a further Communist buildup or wooing them away from the Soviet's control. Actual experience reveals that neither objective has been accomplished but instead our aid to Communist-dominated countries has merely served to perpetuate its dictatorial control over the people and does not provide any measure of personal or political benefit to the people.

Certainly I am, as is every other American, desirous of giving assistance, both economic and military, to the friendly nations of the world who need such help, but I am convinced that the multibillion-dollar foreign aid program has contributed far less than its cost to our national interest and security.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that this aid program must be limited to those friendly nations which can absorb and utilize these funds effectively and should in no wise be given to Communist-dominated countries. Additionally we must withhold all aid from nations which would use our funds for territorial expansion and we must provide adequate safeguards to prevent the use of foreign aid to finance Government-owned facilities which would compete with private enterprise.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this bill I have been reminded of the story with which we are all familiar of the constituent who demanded to know: "What have you done for me lately?"

In this annual debate on the foreign aid bill it might be well to ask ourselves if we too are not guilty of a "what have you done for us lately?" attitude.

Each year the program comes up, and Members ask for a list of successes or accomplishments. The administration representatives dutifully prepare lists of successes and then the critics retort: "We know all that, but what about now?"

This sort of dialog obscures the real purposes of foreign assistance and the kind of aid program upon which we are now embarked.

The basic purpose of foreign assistance is to assist nations to achieve independence, freedom, and self-sustaining economic growth. We seek neither satellites nor domination. Our aid is aimed at encouraging independence.

Many of the nations, which have received economic assistance in the past, no longer receive aid. The record of successes has been well documented. We also know of the failures—they have been well documented, too.

The important point about this week's debate is that, in order to understand this program, we should not talk simply in terms of success and failure, good and bad, friend and enemy.

It is very easy to rise and denounce this bill; it is easy to discover mistakes; it is easy to criticize and say we are being played for suckers.

But the purpose of this debate should be to discuss the full value and ramifications of the present aid program.

Victories in the area of foreign aid are really the absence of defeat. We win if a country remains independent and does not go Communist.

We are embarked upon a long-range program of development assistance. The 1960's have been called the "decade of development."

The two words "decade" and "development"—need emphasis. We are thinking in terms of 10 years, and accomplishments should be measured over this period.

And what is involved is development, the basic development of economics, often in nations many hundreds of years behind the West.

How much foresight would we have attributed to a British investor in 1870 who put his money into the United States, as many did, and said, "I will give them 5 or 10 years to become an industrial nation"?

It might be well in viewing the progress of other nations—many of which lack the resources, the trained manpower, and the domestic tranquility of 19th century America—to remember some of our own history.

Development will take many years. The process is slow.

The remarkable fact is the speed at which many nations are emerging into the 20th century. Years are compressed into months as projects are completed, agricultural production jumps, diseases are conquered, and more trained persons contribute to their country.

The task requires patience and sacrifice on the part of the American people. But surely it is in our interest to spend—and in a majority of cases loan—less than 1 percent of our gross national product for this effort.

Certainly no nation in the history of the world has such a record for generosity. It is a record of which we can be proud.

As a result of such programs as foreign assistance, we are gaining in the struggle against totalitarianism.

I do not believe communism will win. And I do not believe in the men of little faith who say it will.

We have heard a great deal of talk about what we are doing to our grandchildren. I would certainly not want my grandchildren to grow up in a world where the richest nation—having more than half the world's wealth—ignored the needs of the two-thirds of the world who lived in poverty, disease and hunger. It might not be a very stable world. And it would be a dubious legacy for our grandchildren to pass on to succeeding generations.

Mr. Speaker, the great leaders in our history have had faith in our country—in the wisdom and generosity of our people. They have been men and women of vision.

If we are true to our great heritage, democracy will triumph, and the legacy of freedom will be passed on to succeeding generations in America and the world.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 5 years I have voted for foreign aid but with more and more misgivings. Today, I have cast my vote against foreign aid for several reasons, the first being that I can no longer justify in good conscience the giving of aid to foreign governments when we withheld aid to deserving American citizens in times of need.

I am referring specifically to disaster conditions within my own district in the wake of last year's violent coastal storm. This storm raged up the eastern seaboard and along the New Jersey coast leaving thousands of persons either homeless or faced with heavy costs of replacing and repairing severe storm damage.

In the Atlantic and Cape May County portion of my district, these damages were particularly disastrous, and a great majority of those whose homes were destroyed or severely damaged by the storm were elderly people—men and women living on small pensions or social security; men and women who in many cases had invested lifetime savings in homes for retirement years.

Now, when disaster strikes in practically any portion of the world—be it flood, famine, earthquake, or any of nature's other violent outbursts—the United States gives aid in the form of housing and dollars, or whatever else may be needed.

This is a commendable philosophy, but unfortunately our charity does not begin at home. In the aftermath of last year's storm no relief was extended to needy victims of the disaster in rebuilding or repairing their homes save for the offer of emergency small business loans at 3 percent interest to finance the rebuilding or repair of their homes battered or flooded by violent winds or tides.

There is, of course, no insurance available for flood protection. Homeowners have no choice but to obtain the emergency loans, which many will be repaying for the remainder of their lives or forsake their storm-ravaged dwellings.

By any yardstick, this was a disaster area. Up and down the Jersey coast thousands of persons suffered great hardship and staggering financial losses, yet no relief was forthcoming. The charity which our Federal Government always hands out to the less fortunate across the seas just did not apply to American citizens whose hard-earned tax dollars have supported foreign aid throughout the years.

Yes, I will admit to being bitter—and with valid reason, too. Since this disastrous storm, I have spoken with these stricken families and received letters from many others. I know firsthand their hardships and financial crises resulting from this storm, and if we cannot afford to offer a helping hand of aid to disaster-struck American citizens, I am certain we cannot afford foreign aid handouts to people of other lands, deserving though their needs may be.

Now, I am opposed to foreign aid for other reasons, too—reasons which I will briefly cite here—for I know they have been thoroughly detailed in debates over this issue during the present, as well as past, consideration of foreign aid legislation.

Since the end of World War II, foreign aid has cost the U.S. taxpayers more than $120 billion, and still has, in my opinion, failed to accomplish its intended objectives of shoring up the bonds of friendship, understanding, and cooperation between the United States and other nations of the world community.

As the Honorable OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana, distinguished veteran chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which deals directly with the annual multi-billion-dollar appropriations for foreign aid, pointed out:

> Of the aggregate amount of our aid, $100 billion, in round figures, has been given out on a unilateral basis, going into 111 foreign nations and entities, including Communist, Communist-leaning, and so-called neutralist countries alike. In addition to this, indirect aid has been extended by the United States through capital investments, exceeding $5.1 billion in five different international financial institutions, which have, in turn, disbursed assistance totaling more than $7.5 billion.
>
> But, even so, after all this money and all these years—and despite the seriously damaging drain the program is making on our economy—the trend for expanding foreign aid continues upward, rather than heading downward.
>
> This year, for example, the United States is giving economic aid to at least 73 countries and 7 entities and, fantastic though it is, military assistance to 70 countries. This program not only is uncontrolled, but it is uncontrollable; and it is imperative, in our own national interest, that it be drastically curtailed and tightly administered.

I have during this session of Congress given considerable exhaustive study to the foreign aid issue, and I find that its negative factors far outweigh its positive arguments.

Without question, foreign aid has served to undermine the dollar since we made a series of strategems—all futile—which have been tried to stem the outflow of our gold. These attempts have been unsuccessful for our foreign aid program is a one-way street. The goods and services go out, the U.S. Treasury pays the bill, and the United States receives nothing of a tangible commercial nature in return.

As Mr. PASSMAN pointed out:

> So great has been America's outpouring of wealth through foreign aid that many of the recipient nations have accumulated dollars far in excess of their needs. Consequently, they demand gold in exchange for the dollars, and in the past 10 years our gold reserves have been reduced from more than $23 billion to less than $16 billion. Over the same period, other free world countries increased their gold holdings from $13 billion to nearly $25 billion and their short-term dollar credits from less than $11 billion to $25 billion. For these dollar credits, those countries can demand gold, and if such a demand should come, the United States could not meet it.

If such a demand should be made, we would indeed be in serious trouble. We would have no recourse but to devalue the dollar with a resultant chaotic upset to the world of finance. Yet in these days of crisis the use of this extreme measure is never out of mind and is even talked about in committee hearings.

Beyond this, it is my feeling—a conviction shared at least privately by many of my colleagues—that foreign aid has made the dollar a symbol of international handouts, a substitute for initiative and effort, and an endless drain on the American taxpayer. Also, the foreign aid has constituted not only an added tax on our producers, but also a subsidy to our foreign competitors with the result that our prices have become so high that we cannot now compete successfully in world trade without the Federal Government subsidizing our exports by as much as 30 percent.

And, last, despite the mountainous foreign aid expenditures, our position in the world has not improved. Indeed, it has become increasingly precarious. Certainly, by now we have proven that dollar diplomacy will not work, that we cannot buy friendship or cooperation with dollars.

In view of these factors, I have voted against foreign aid with a clear conscience.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the 15 years I have been a Member of the House, I have voted against the annual foreign aid authorization bill, and have done so most reluctantly, because I am not against a reasonable foreign aid program, efficiently and effectively administered. Many times in the past I have voted for these authorizations, with the same kind of reluctance, hoping that I would later have the opportunity of reducing the appropriation to the level which I felt was necessary and justified. I expect to give the same careful study and consideration to the appropriation bill that I have given to the authorization bill, but in view of the information which I already have, I am prepared to vote against the appropriation if it exceeds $3 billion and I am hopeful the Appropriations Committee can assure us that even this sum is not justified and is not needed to carry out the best interests of this Nation. It is regrettable when partisan politics enter into consideration of a bill of the importance the foreign aid bill is to the security of this country, but unfortunately both parties engaged in such politics. To mention just one specific instance, I would refer to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable Durward Hall, representing the Seventh District, who offered an amendment to reduce and limit the contributions of the United States to the special programs operated by the United Nations, to not more than 33.3 percent. I have advocated such a reduction and limitation for many years, and in my remarks yesterday cited one specific instance of where we have paid as much as 90 percent of the cost of operating a program only to find that the administrators of the program were using our funds to buy commodities—wheat—which the United States had in great surplus, from other nations, giving as a reason therefor, our price was too high. For several years I have expressed the view that any time this Nation is inclined to pay more than 50 percent of the cost of any program, that we should operate the program ourselves; let the United States bear the entire cost of the program and get the full credit for any benefits therefrom. I think this is a sound policy and one which should have been adopted by the Department of State many years ago. I believe the Hall amendment, if offered by a Democrat, would have been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I do not look upon the foreign aid program as a partisan program, and I do not look upon the opposition to the program as evidenced by the vote which recommitted the bill to the committee, or the small margin by which this bill was passed as necessarily being a reflection upon the Kennedy administration. Rather, in my opinion, it is a protest against the way the program has been administered by the State Department over the past several years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations. It is not difficult to read the facts from the Record that some Democrats who vote for the program when a Democratic administration is in power, voted against it when the Republicans were in power; and that some Republicans who voted against the bill today voted for it when President Eisenhower was in power, and this despite the fact that former President Eisenhower, as well as former President Truman both advocate a continuation of the program, although I believe that both of these former executives would agree that the program should be administered in the most efficient as well as the most effective manner, and that we should profit by our mistakes of the past.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that those career bureaucrats in the Department of State, and more especially in the AID program would realize that there is great dissatisfaction in Congress over the manner in which this program has been administered, and that Congress is going to demand a more effective program, and the elimination of the great waste which has brought such discredit that Congress is fed up with many features of the program. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, when Members like myself, who can see the need for continuing the program in many areas, find it necessary to take such drastic action as voting against the entire bill in order to impress the bureaucrats that we mean business.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my feelings on the foreign aid bill pretty clear during the course of debate, as well as earlier in a special order, and in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee 2 months ago.

The Clay Committee came out with a sound report. It reflected the thinking of many of us. Each year I, among many others, have pressed for greater selectivity in the foreign aid program, decreased emphasis on the heavy amounts of military assistance, increased priority to loans instead of grants, and tighter administration.

The Foreign Affairs Committee reported out a bill that was tighter than any previous bill in the past on this subject. It reached compromises in every title of the bill. I was pleased that it accepted a proposal offered by me in testimony before the committee designed to provide greater opportunity for the private sector in the American economy to participate in and gradually take a greater share of American aid. The reported bill had the support of the ranking Republican Member, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Frances P. Bolton], and most of the more senior Members of the minority side.

I was particularly impressed with the argument stated on the floor during debate by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse]. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] has demonstrated a sharp eye for economies and the elimination of the unnecessary and the wasteful from foreign aid programs and in all other programs.

During the course of floor debate a series of other amendments were adopted by the Committee, most of which were against the wishes of the majority members that I have mentioned.

Today, a motion to recommit was offered, which makes a reduction to the extent of $160 million in the Development Loan Fund; $150 million in the Alliance for Progress; $50 million in the contingency fund; and $225 million in military assistance—a total of $585 million. The bill is reduced thereby to $3.502 billion, and it is expected that the Appropriations Committee will reduce this figure to well under $3 billion.

In the course of amendments on the floor, I supported an amendment to reduce the military assistance program by $100 million. I also supported the Broomfield amendment. But these across-the-board slashes contained in a motion to recommit strike me as beyond reasonableness.

I supported President Eisenhower each year the foreign aid bill was introduced during the Eisenhower years. The tightening process that he began has been continued, and I cannot in good conscience reverse myself in the present instance.

Foreign aid remains an important—though we hope diminishing—aspect of foreign policy. It should receive a high degree of bipartisan support. In the tradition of Vandenburg, that obligation has always been a special one for Republicans and should not be forgotten. Hence I will vote against the motion to recommit and for the bill on final passage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to require congressional approval of all proposed foreign aid projects costing $100 million or more.

The Clay Committee report, of which we have already heard much, declares that in many respects the planning and administration of our aid program has not been as effective as we and the American people whom we represent have every right to expect, considering the tremendous cost of the program.

In their excellent presentation, the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have particularized this charge and pointed out how this condition will be perpetuated in the present bill. They have also directed the attention of the House to several usurpations by the executive branch of congressional powers. I heartily concur with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], who in the discussion of the rule commended the minority for their perceptive analysis of the situation. It remains for us to act upon the suggestions made by these gentlemen by enacting this and related amendments to the bill.

The present amendment, it seems to me, is well-calculated to put a brake on the liberties which the executive branch has been taking with our function and to prevent a continuation of a particular practice which I find specially disturbing. I refer to the use of American tax dollars—the fruits of our system of private enterprise—for the purpose of encouraging State socialism in the developing economies of certain nations, particularly in Africa and Asia.

The prime example of what I am speaking about is, of course, the proposed Bokaro steel mill in India, a billion dollar operation—the tab for which is to be picked up by the American taxpayer. I say "proposed" steel mill, and I fervently hope that it is no more than that, but despite careful questioning by committee members, it did not emerge too clearly in the hearings how deeply the administration has committed us to this venture.

The Indian Embassy has been kind enough to furnish me with iron-steel production figures for the last two calendar years. In 1961, the private sector produced some 2,694,093 metric tons, and the public sector produced 1,258,802 metric tons. In 1962, the private sector produced some 2,830,323 metric tons—an increase of 144,000 metric tons over the preceding year. The public sector in 1962 produced 1,850,958 metric tons—an increase of 608,000 over the preceding year.

Thus, we see a promising privately owned steel industry being outstripped in production by a state-owned competitor. And American funds are sought to facilitate the process. The wonder of it all is, not that the Indians seek to do this, but that there are Americans who are willing to see it done.

This is precisely the kind of practices which the Clay Committee opposed, and in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee, the head of the AID indicated that he was in agreement with this judgment. But he went on to say that due to differing historical, cultural, and economic forces at work in recipient nations, it would be unwise for the United States to encourage the free enterprise system in every such nation. Certainly, one need not be a gifted observer to perceive substantial differences between the Republic of India and the United States, but I can see none and I have heard none advanced which is so insurmountable as to militate against free enterprise in India.

Here is a nation which already has a private steel industry and the United States is being asked to throttle it. An imposing array, ranging from the President of the United States down to a pair of aspiring pundits in one of the local papers, ardently support this project. The pundits, writing yesterday, seemed to feel that the dubiousness which has already been expressed by Members of Congress arises from some anti-Nehru bias which is alleged to inhere on the Hill. And they warned that if we refused to shell out for this project, India would be forced into the arms of Russia—an interesting and seldom-heard argument in foreign relations debates.

Mr. Speaker, the more I read in the press, the more firmly convinced I become that the amendment under consideration here is essential for the preservation of our national self-respect.

As I understand it, the major reasons advanced in support of our foreign aid program are two:

First, there is some sort of a moral obligation upon us in this country to share our bounty with those less fortunate. It has always been interesting for me to note that exponents of this position failed to observe that our wealth is the product of good hard work by ourselves and our forebears—no one gave it to us on a silver platter. I also note that the humanitarian impulse of the moralists seldom extends to the American taxpayer and the crushing burden of debt which is being piled on the shoulders of generations yet unborn.

Second—and somewhat more soundly, I think—it is argued that the Nation is engaged in a great struggle with the disciples of Marx who are seeking by every means at their command to extend their sway over the face of the globe. In part, this war is being waged economically: The less-fortunate peoples of the world must be helped to achieve some minimal degree of prosperity so that they will be less easy prey for the blandishments of the Marxists. And in part, it is being waged ideologically: The superiority, the vitality of our institutions must be demonstrated to these peoples. They must be afforded opportunities to see that a politically and economically free society offers more to each individual than does one which is subjected to government controls.

And so I ask, How do we advance these economic and ideological fronts by encouraging the spread of socialist institutions? I think it is clear that we do not advance either.

But, it is said, there is not sufficient private capital in India to finance this venture. And I say, and I have reason to believe that people across the Nation are saying, then let us work out an arrangement to get the capital to private developers in India. Surely this cannot be too difficult to do, and it certainly cannot be any more expensive than the present scheme. Let us, instead of spotlighting socialism, make Bokaro a showplace of private enterprise, and thus win a round on both the ideological and economic fronts.

And the first step to accomplishment of this is the adoption of the present amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the debate the other day on the Foreign Assistance Act, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] raised a question which indicated that there is some apparent confusion about the amount of our foreign assistance funds which are used for procurement in the United States. This confusion arises, I think, for the following reasons:

Expenditures under the foreign assistance program during any period of time include expenditures for which funds were committed, that is, obligated in previous years, and expenditures for which funds were obligated during the immediate year. It is obvious that changes in procurement policy primarily affect funds obligated after the changes are adopted. Therefore, there will necessarily be a considerable period of time before actual payout under the foreign assistance program will fully reflect the policies which restrict funds to expenditure in the United States.

For some time, the administration has been taking steps to increase the position of aid funds which are spent in the United States. There is no doubt that the rate of actual expenditure of aid funds in the United States has been increasing. However, since actual current expenditures reflect funds committed in previous years as well as in the current year, the percentage of procurement in the United States today is not as high as the percentage of procurement in the United States which will be spent in the future under funds now being obligated.

To make an evaluation of the effect of current foreign aid procurement policies, it is necessary to analyze its impact on current commitments to be spent in the future.

The percentage of procurement statistics demonstrate this lag between policy and effect clearly. In 1961 an estimated 50 percent of foreign assistance expenditures were made in the United States; in 1962, 63 percent; and in 1964, the estimate is 70 percent. However, the percentage of new money committed, that is obligated, which will be spent in the United States, was an estimated 81 percent in 1963 and will go up to 85 percent in 1964. The lag between commitment and expenditure is evident.

I have in my hand, and will insert in the RECORD, a copy of the latest Agency procurement policy issued on July 5 of this year. Although we can all see that prior procurement policy actions have been extremely successful in reducing the effect of foreign aid spending on our balance of payments, the goal which the President and AID have set is even greater. That target is to restrict non-U.S. spending to $500 million by fiscal year 1965.

To repeat, we must keep in mind that funds committed under old policies in prior years are being expended now. New funds now being committed of which 85 percent is for spending in the United States will not make their impact on the statistics until actually paid out.

COMMODITY PROCUREMENT SOURCE AND ORIGIN POLICY

The President has recently written to AID along with other agencies requesting a review of steps which could be taken to further relieve the burden of Government programs on the U.S. balance of payments. Specifically, the President requested an examination of what cutbacks in the aid program would be necessary to provide significant relief to the U.S. foreign deficit.

For some years it has been the target of this agency to reduce AID payments abroad to not more than 20 percent of total expenditures. It now appears that this target will be reached under fiscal year 1963 obligations. However, this agency is still making an estimated $770 million of payments offshore this year, and it is now our agreed target to reduce this amount to $500 million in fiscal year 1965.

EXISTING POLICIES

To reach this target will require a continued and concerted effort throughout the agency. Existing policies requiring the procurement of U.S. goods and services for AID-financed projects where possible must continue to be carefully and thoroughly applied. This is also true of existing policy to maximize the contributions of participating countries to the local cost of AID-financed projects and activities, including the oversea living and operational expenditures of AID technicians and contractors. Cash transfers must be reduced to the absolute minimum possible. Except for negligible amounts or as specifically waived by the Administrator, any necessary AID financing of local costs, whether on a budget support or project basis, should be introduced into the recipient country through financing of current commodity imports from eligible sources.

NEW POLICIES

As a further measure toward increasing the share of U.S.-produced goods and services in the AID program, this agency will, effective immediately, cease to finance goods of which the United States itself is a consistent net importer except under exceptional circumstances. Such consistent U.S. net imports include crude oil, petroleum fuel, tin, rubber, wool, sugar, and the additional items appearing on the attached list prepared by the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources. The list is obviously subject to revision from time to time and must take into account any adverse effects on U.S. industry. It is contemplated that an interagency committee, with possible inclusion of membership of representatives of the Departments of Commerce and Labor (with the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources and Program Coordination Staff for

AID) will be established to advise the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources on additions to or deletions from the list. The exceptional circumstances under which these items may be included in AID programs are:

1. Goods released from Government-held stocks or cases where the supplier agrees to accept an equivalent amount of goods released from Government-held stocks or strategic materials.

2. Goods acquired under barter contracts for surplus agricultural commodities under Department of Agriculture barter regulations and usual marketing criteria; or for stockpile surpluses under similar or related criteria and procedure.

3. Purchases of petroleum products subject to U.S. import quota, either in the United States, or offshore under arrangements which have the effect of treating the amount financed as an import into the United States for purposes of the U.S. import quota.

4. Cases where the regional Assistant Administrator, with the concurrence of the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, determines that essential program purposes would be sacrificed if the net import item were not financed.

The principles of competitive procurement and of AID encouragement of the incipient industrial exports of less developed countries are to be maintained to the extent possible. The policy of limited worldwide procurement of goods of which the United States is also an exporter will therefore be continued for nonproject assistance financed with development grants or supporting assistance funds. However, in issuing procurement authorizations the commodity categories should be selected with strong emphasis on those on which U.S. exporters can normally compete successfully, giving secondary consideration to administrative convenience as a criterion of selection.

It is an AID purpose that assistance should result in expanded U.S. exports and in such shifts in trade patterns in favor of the United States as do not undermine other U.S. policy purposes.

Furthermore, policy with regard to eligible commodities is modified, effective immediately, to exclude from AID financing all goods which contain components imported from excluded sources, the delivered cost of which exceeds 30 percent of the supplier's lowest f.o.b. or f.a.s. export price at point of export. Exceptions may be approved by the Assistant Administrator for Material Resources.

The pattern of commodity financing will be kept closely under review. Further revision of procurement policy may be necessary if the half-billion-dollar target is to be met.

In addition the disbursement of AID funds to international organizations is to be related to the disbursement needs of the organization. In cooperation with the Treasury, IO has already taken steps to insure this with regard to the U.N. Special Fund and UNICEF. Program coordination will work closely with the Bureau of International Organizational Affairs, State, to insure comparable arrangements as feasible in other cases. The regional administrators will consider similar arrangements with regard to contributions within their responsibility.

Finally, the Assistant Administrator for Latin America is requested to join with Treasury in securing arrangements with regard to the Social Progress Trust Fund which will reduce the drain from this source on the U.S. balance of payments. The aim of these arrangements should be substantially to confine all disbursements from the Trust Fund during fiscal year 1964 and subsequently to payment for goods and services of U.S. source.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I shall cast a "no" vote on the foreign aid bill. It is not an easy decision to make in view of worldwide commitments that have been made. However, it is my conviction that we are spending too much, in too many places; that we mistakenly believe we can buy friendship; or that we can, by gift or loan, persuade a nation to reject one political philosophy and accept ours. It just does not work that way. It is my conviction that we encourage, through our aid programs in other countries, socialism and I, for one, reject the theory of socialism. Through our aid we encourage strong dominating Federal control in other countries and certainly we do not want this for our own country.

I am opposed to building competing industry such as the Bokaro Steel Mill in India with U.S. taxpayer dollars. I am convinced that military aid to many countries is being used to police their own internal problems and that this is not our problem. I am convinced that aid should not be given to any Communist country either directly or indirectly. I am also convinced that, if we are to give aid to a country, it should be a country which is on our side. Being neutral and playing both sides against the middle is not being on our side. I also believe a nation should be politically stable before any aid is given. This we are not doing.

Mr. Speaker, our great mistake has been that we have been led astray by the early success of the Marshall plan. It was appropriate. It was timely. But the same formula cannot be applied today. The ingredients are not the same. Our own economy has changed. We are dealing with nations with no history of economic success. We are dealing with politically unstable nations and the outpouring of our dollars cannot solve their problems and it is my opinion it is only adding to ours.

EXPORTS TO THE SOVIET BLOC

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and millions of Americans have been greatly concerned about the policy of the administration on control of exports to the Soviet bloc. It has been known that certain spokesmen have espoused practically eliminating all controls on sales of goods to the Communists short of actual war materials. Many have been wondering when an out-and-out move toward this end would occur, and the speculation has been heightened since the conferences on the proposed test ban treaty.

I believe we have the answer. And that the answer is frightening and one that must be viewed with alarm.

The Department of Commerce, in conjunction with other departments of Government, has just reached a decision to allow shipment from the United States to the U.S.S.R. of highly automated mining machinery valued at an estimated $10 million. According to reports the Soviet order is for 30 of the machines which are known as "continuous miners." They are similar to but larger than equipment used to mine coal in the United States. According to these reports, the company which would manufacture these highly automated, powerful machines, at the insistence of the State Department, filled a large order for coal mining equipment for the Russians during World War II.

The Department of Commerce advises that the mining machinery will be used for the mining of potash which it states is used almost exclusively in the manufacture of potassium fertilizers. While potash is used basically for fertilizers, it also has important uses in the chemical field, including the manufacture of gunpowder, drugs, glass, detergents, dyes, textiles, and other products.

Just last year the Congress in a near unanimous action voted to strengthen the Export Control Act. A major purpose of the amendments to the act was to require the administration to place greater emphasis on economic factors in considering applications to ship goods and information to the Soviet bloc. This was done over strong objections from the State Department, who, according to the debate, "begged and pleaded" the conferees on the bill to drop the section proposing to require denial of licenses in those cases where proposed exports would make a significant contribution not only to the military but also to the economic potential of bloc nations which would prove detrimental to the security and welfare of the United States.

Is it claimed by the Commerce Department that this mining machinery would not contribute to the economic potential of the U.S.S.R.? Certainly not. In fact, the Department says in its letter to me, which I received this morning:

> In view of the size of the order and the productivity of the equipment, there was little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union.

The Department goes on to state that the decision to issue the license was because potassium fertilizer can be characterized as "peaceful goods."

What is not stated of course is the fact that potash has important chemical uses, including the manufacture of gunpowder, nor the fact that it is no trick at all for the Soviets to turn so-called peaceful goods into items of oppression and control, or into products to export or dump as part of the U.S.S.R. economic offensive.

And certainly it is generally known and understood that products and goods of all kinds which build up the economy and economic potential of a nation make that nation stronger in a military sense. It is for this very reason that the Export Control Act was amended to make it clear that prohibitions on sending goods were to be applied even though they could not be clearly characterized as contributing directly to the military potential of the U.S.S.R.

In my opinion there can be no other conclusion than that this action is directly contrary to what the Congress specifically said last year should not be done.

When reports of this license application appeared, indicating that the question was at that time pending before the Department of State, I wrote to the State Department asking whether such an application for this mining machinery was pending and expressing the opinion that if so the license application should be denied because of the significance of such export to the economic and military potential of the U.S.S.R. I should add here that though the Export Control Act is administered by the Commerce Department, the Department of State plays a highly significant role in establishing policies followed in administering the act.

I am setting forth the reply received from the State Department, indicating that my letter had been forwarded to the Department of Commerce. Set forth below also is the letter I received from the Office of Export Control of the Department of Commerce advising that my letter to the State Department had been received, and a copy of the letter received today in response to my request to the Office of Export Control to be advised as soon as a decision was made concerning the application.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 24, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPSCOMB: Thank you for your letter of July 16, concerning a report that the U.S.S.R. is interested in placing an order for automated mining machinery valued at $10 million with a firm in Pittsburgh. Certain export license applications for such machinery have been received by the Department of Commerce and are currently under consideration. I am sending your letter to Mr. F. D. Hockersmith, Director, Office of Export Control, Department of Commerce, for a report on the status of those cases since the matter falls within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Mr. Hockersmith's telephone number is code 112, extension 4293.

You will hear directly from the Department of Commerce on the matter.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE, OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1693.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: As you have been informed by the Assistant Secretary of State in his letter to you of July 24, 1963, your letter of July 16, addressed to Secretary Rusk has been referred to this office for reply. Your letter inquired as to the status of a reported pending license application concerning the proposed exportation by a Pittsburgh firm of mining machinery to the U.S.S.R.

Such an application is presently pending in the Department of Commerce. Your view that this application should be denied will be brought to the attention of Dr. Jack Behrman upon his return. I am sure that it will receive careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,
WILSON E. SWEENEY,
Acting Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE, OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1963.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: In your letter of August 15 to Mr. Sweeney of this office, you asked to be advised as soon as a decision was made with regard to the proposed exportation by a Pittsburgh firm of mining machinery to the U.S.S.R. The Department has just decided to authorize the export to which you refer. It is anticipated that the approval will be announced in the daily License List of August 21, 1963.

The machinery in question, which involves several export license applications, is for the mining of potash which is used almost exclusively in the manufacture of potassium fertilizers. While the Soviet Union is far short of its goals in the production of potassium fertilizers for its own indigenous use, nevertheless it is also an exporter of such fertilizers.

The case was one of considerable interest. In view of the size of the order and the productivity of the equipment, there was little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union. Accordingly, the question of whether such a contribution would be detrimental to the U.S. security and welfare had to be pursued. It was studied in great detail and, of course, advice was sought from other interested U.S. Government departments and from industry. Our decision to license was heavily weighted by the fact that potassium fertilizer can best be characterized as "peaceful goods." Increased use throughout the world of potassium fertilizer will undoubtedly increase food production. It is our conviction that increased food production throughout the world, thereby relieving hunger and human suffering, is consistent with and in furtherance of U.S. overall objectives.

Sincerely yours,
FORREST D. HOCKERSMITH,
Director.

I firmly believe that this license approval should be withdrawn by the Department of Commerce and hope that the Congress and the public will express themselves to the Department concerning whether or not they believe this proposed export is in the best interest of our security and welfare.

I want to add that while the license to ship $10 million worth of highly automated mining machinery to the Soviet Union is one of the most serious examples that has come to my attention, it is by no means the only example of issuance of a license which should cause concern.

In July, the Department of Commerce issued a license to ship to East Germany a quantity of precision control instruments which it was stated were for use in "air conditioning." Upon inquiring, I was advised that the instruments were to be used for temperature and humidity control on various types of ships and vessels under construction in East German shipyards. It was claimed the instruments in question were "unsophisticated controls for space heating and air conditioning, which do not meet any of the current strategic criteria," whatever that may mean. On further checking, I found the license was for a total of 380 instruments that would be used in the construction of a number of vessels that were going to the U.S.S.R. Included are a passenger ship for 750 people, a passenger ship for 300 persons, 6 fishing vessels, 7 motor freighters, and a scientific research vessel, all to go to the U.S.S.R. It has also been confirmed that the very instruments in question have applications aboard naval ships as controls for cooling electronic and other military equipment.

On August 12, the Department of Commerce granted a license authorizing shipment of technical data to the U.S.S.R. This data, the Department of Commerce states, is to be used in connection with installation and operation of oil-water separator equipment at the Gujarat refinery in India being constructed by the Indian Government in collaboration with the U.S.S.R. This refinery is part of a company in the public sector of the Indian economy, meaning it is owned by the Government.

There of course continues to be many other export licenses granted to authorize shipment of such items as petroleum drilling equipment to Yugoslavia, electronic and construction equipment to Yugoslavia, and many other items to the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries.

In addition to the significance of allowing the shipment such as the automated mining equipment to the U.S.S.R. and its meaning to a buildup of the Soviet economic potential, granting a license such as this has other far-reaching significance. If such a shipment is allowed it would set a precedent, practically opening the gates for any item which conceivably could be claimed to be of less or equal significance in building up the Soviet economy and thus their overall strength as a nation. Further attempts would undoubtedly be made to secure public acceptance and acquiescence to shipping even greater amounts and different kinds of strategic goods and information which could build up the economic and military potential of the Soviet bloc.

At that point, should that happen, our export control program would be all but meaningless, an empty shell. Though it seems clear that there are those who wish to see this become a reality, I am equally sure that far the greater majority of Americans are in complete disagreement with this goal and believe it is contrary to our security and welfare.

I have today written to the Department of Commerce urging that the Department reverse the decision to grant the license to ship the $10 million in mining machinery to the U.S.S.R.

It is also becoming increasingly clear that it is imperative that the House recreate the House Select Committee on Export Control to maintain a continuing study of all activities in this field. I introduced a resolution for this purpose at the opening of this session and urge that it be taken up and approved.

Present practices and policies followed in the administering of the Export Control Act must have immediate attention. Decisions being made on proposed exports to the Soviet bloc give appearances of being reached on the basis of political expediency and on policies which are contrary to the best interest of our welfare and security.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF AUGUST 26, 1963

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman, Monday is District Day. There are three bills, as follows:

CONTINUING RESOLUTION—APPROPRIATIONS

H.R. 7399, use of the Capitol and Keith Theaters as municipal theaters.

H.R. 7440, voluntary admission of patients to the District Training School.

H.R. 7497, annual statements of life insurance companies.

There are six printing authorization resolutions from the Committee on House Administration, as follows:

First. House Resolution 474, report on the increase in resources of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Second. House Resolution 475, report on proposed increase of $1 billion in authorized capital of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Third. House Resolution 415, U.S. defense policies in 1962.

Fourth. House Concurrent Resolution 203, "The Federal Government and Education."

Fifth. House Concurrent Resolution 212, excerpts from Library of Congress compilation on 1963-64 national debate topic of education.

Sixth. Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, excerpts from Library of Congress compilation on 1963-64 national debate topic of medicare.

House Resolution 444, authorizing $7,000 for the ad hoc Subcommittee on Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center.

For Tuesday: H.R. 7544, maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963.

This will come in under a modified open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate.

S. 1007, marketing area of Bonneville Power Administration. This carries an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 6225, providing for the rehabilitation of Guam. This carries an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

May I take this time, if the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, to advise Members that legislation involving the railroad issue may well be up next week and very probably on Wednesday. We, of course, hope that this matter can be settled by industry and labor negotiations.

I know that all Members join me in urging that this matter be disposed of by the parties so that it will not have to become the problem of the Congress in the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is, of course, made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program can be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE VARIOUS REPORTS, THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight tomorrow night to file various reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. BONNER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

U.S. ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY APPEALS FOR ACTION TO AID NEGROES

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the National Catholic Welfare Conference released a pastoral letter, drafted by Roman Catholic bishops of the United States which reads as follows:

TEXT OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS' LETTER ON RACE

Nearly 5 years ago, we, the Catholic bishops of the United States proclaimed with one voice our moral judgment on racial discrimination and segregation. This judgment of November 1958, simply reaffirmed the Catholic position already made explicit in a much earlier statement in 1943. In the present crisis, we wish to repeat those moral principles and to offer some pastoral suggestions for a Catholic approach to racial harmony.

We insist that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. * * * Discrimination based on the accidental fact of race or color, and as such injurious to human rights, regardless of personal qualities or achievements, cannot be reconciled with the truth that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity."

We reaffirm that segregation implies that people of one race are not fit to associate with another "by sole fact of race and regardless of individual qualities. * * * We cannot reconcile such a judgment with the Christian view of man's nature and rights." These principles apply to all forms of discrimination and segregation based on prejudice. In our immediate and urgent concern for the rights of Negroes, we do not overlook the disabilities visited upon other racial and national groups.

It is our strict duty in conscience to respect the basic human rights of every person. Our beloved Pontiff of blessed memory, Pope John XXIII, stated this fact in his encyclical Peace on Earth. He proclaimed that, "in human society, to one man's right there corresponds a duty in other persons: the duty, namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question." He not only condemned racial discrimination but asserted that "he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim these rights as marks of his dignity."

Respect for personal rights is not only a matter of individual moral duty; it is also a matter for civic action. Pope John stated: "The chief concern of civil authorities must * * * be to insure that these rights are acknowledged, respected, coordinated with other rights, defended and promoted, so that in this way each one may more easily carry out his duties."

We know that public authority is obliged to help correct the evils of unjust discrimination practiced against any group or class. We also recognize that every minority group in America seeking its lawful rights has the obligation of respecting the lawful rights of others. On this point, Pope John wrote: "Since men are social by nature they are meant to live with others and to work for one another's welfare. A well-ordered human society requires that men recognize and observe their mutual rights and duties. It also demands that each contribute generously to the establishment of a civic order in which rights and duties are ever more sincerely and effectively acknowledged and fulfilled."

These truths being understood, no Catholic with a good Christian conscience can fail to recognize the rights of all citizens to vote. Moreover, we must provide for all, equal opportunity for employment, full participation in our public and private educational facilities, proper housing, and adequate welfare assistance when needed.

But more than justice is involved. There is also the divine command: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Our present Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, at the beginning of his pontificate, reminds us that "Revelation teaches us to love all men, whatever their condition, for they have all been redeemed by the same Saviour; and it obliges us to offer to those who have least, the means of arriving in dignity at a more human life."

It is clear that the racial question confronts the conscience of every man, no matter what his degree of direct or indirect involvement. Indeed, the conscience of the Nation is on trial. The most crucial test of love of God is love of neighbor. In the words of the beloved apostle: "If anyone says I love God and hates his brother, he is a liar. For how can he who does not love his brother, whom he sees, love God whom he does not see?"

We can show our Christian charity by a quiet and courageous determination to make the quest for racial harmony a matter of personal involvement. We must go beyond slogans and generalizations about color, and realize that all of us are human beings, men, women, and children, all sharing the same human nature and dignity, with the same desires, hopes, and feelings. We should try to know and understand one another.

To do this we must meet and talk openly and sincerely and calmly about our natural problems and concerns. There are many ways in which such meetings can come about peacefully and naturally and fruitfully. For example those in the same type of work can readily discuss the problems caused by racial barriers. Physicians of one race can talk with those of another So can businessmen, teachers, lawyers, secretaries, farmers, clerks, and other workers. Parish and diocesan societies, political gatherings, and civic and neighborhood associations can be common meeting grounds.

Our important task is to break down the barriers that have caused such grevious misunderstandings in the past. Where barriers have existed for many decades deep misunderstandings have all too often arisen. These should be faced, not in a spirit of debate, but with a desire to open doors of understanding.

It is only by open and free exchange of ideas that we can understand the rights and obligations that prevail on both sides. Such knowledge is the prelude to action that will remove the artificial barriers of race. We must act to remove obstacles that impede the rights and opportunities of our Negro brethren. We should do our part to see that voting, jobs, housing, education, and public facilities are freely available to every American.

We can do this in our own area of work, in our neighborhood, in our community. We may act through various lay organizations of the church, as well as with civic groups of every type. In many parts of the Nation there are interracial committees representing the major religious faiths as well as the important aspects of civic life. We bless and endorse such efforts to secure interracial harmony and to implement it in everyday affairs.

But civic action will be more fruitful, and its results more lasting, if all our citizens openly and explicitly proclaim the religious basis of racial justice and love. Accordingly, we repeat simply: Love one another, for this is the law of God. Revere in every man his human dignity, for this is a gift of God.

United, as men and women of every faith and race, we can heal the ancient wounds of division. Thus our Nation will reflect its true greatness, a greatness founded on the moral principle that all men are free and equal under God.

In all these endeavors, we must remember that they labor in vain, who seek to work without Almighty God. Our daily prayer for guidance will give us that confidence and courage we need to seek racial justice and harmony in our land. Above all, it is our prayer that the love of God may infuse our thoughts and actions, so that we may revere in every man the image of the eternal God.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM IS INCREDIBLE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the situation that has been permitted to develop in Vietnam is incredible and the worst indictment yet of U.S. foreign policy and the military assistance program.

In that Asian nation, where American servicemen are being killed almost every day, allegedly to preserve its freedom from communism, Vietnamese troops and so-called combat police, trained, armed, and in fact paid through U.S. assistance programs, are engaged in ruthless religious persecution—the desecration of places of worship—the shooting of uncounted Vietnamese and the mass arrests of hundreds and perhaps thousands because of their religious beliefs.

This situation did not develop overnight. Both President Kennedy and the State Department have long been aware of the corrupt dictatorship of the Diem government, but both the President and the State Department procrastinated.

I insist this Government immediately take whatever action is necessary to restore freedom in that nation.

THE LATE ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Eric Johnston's death at age 66 is a tragic loss to the United States. He was a man of parts. He served the country with distinction in many assignments and in a variety of capacities. He was a dynamic president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for four terms and a creative businessman in his own right.

Eric was warmhearted and gay. He made friends wherever he went. Few men in public life had his ability to communicate in simple terms the things that are essential to our way of life. He was articulate in speech and affirmative in action. He was a skilled negotiator who held fast to basic principles—the values of capitalism, competition, and individual initiative—and to the fundamental strengths of American character and human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, in world affairs Eric Johnston served three Presidents and was a strong and effective supporter of meaningful foreign aid in the U.S. interest. He long was a student of Soviet affairs and served our Government in various connections therewith.

Under President Eisenhower in 1953 he was a special envoy to the Near East with the rank of Ambassador—he developed the Johnston plan for the joint use of the Jordan River Basin. In principle and on the equities it was largely agreed to. It foundered more on the political plane—than on the fairness of the plan to the several riparian nations.

It is my hope that one day all the nations in the area will see the overall merits of the Johnston plan and work to implement it—rather than expend energy in attacking it.

Finally, I would like to extend the condolences of this House and myself to Mrs. Johnston and to the family; and to say that truly America has lost one of its finest citizens and warmest advocates.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 23, 1963]

ERIC JOHNSTON DIES—AIDED THREE PRESIDENTS

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Eric A. Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, died here tonight at George Washington University Hospital. He was 66 years old.

Mr. Johnston, who had served three U.S. Presidents in various posts, had entered the hospital on June 17 after suffering a stroke. He became gradually weaker and had been in critical condition for a month.

A former president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, he had also long been a spokesman for American business. He was head of several large business concerns.

Mr. Johnston handled various Government assignments for former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. He once went to the Middle East as a special envoy for former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He lived here, where he had his headquarters. There are other headquarters of the Motion Picture Association in New York and Hollywood. Mr. Johnston administered the motion picture industry's moral code of self-censorship for 18 years.

He is survived by his widow, the former Ina Harriet Hughes, and two daughters, Mrs. William Carlin Fix and Mrs. Herbert Butler, both of Spokane, Wash.

AN EBULLIENT EXTROVERT

Eric Allen Johnston was an ebullient extrovert who started as a door-to-door salesman of vacuum cleaners and wound up as

America's most eloquent advocate of free enterprise.

At his first encounter with Mr. Johnston, President Franklin D. Roosevelt exclaimed, "My God, Eric, how did they ever elect you president of the chamber."

And Stalin, after hearing Mr. Johnston compare some fairly liberal theories of capitalism with the rigid collectivism of the Soviet Union, said with a snort of laughter, "I'm the capitalist; you're the Communist."

Mr. Johnston came to national prominence in 1942 when a mild revolt in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made him its president and the spokesman for more than 600,000 businessmen. The chamber was under the control of men who believed they were fighting a last-ditch defense of the American way of life against the socialistic New Deal.

It was not a planned palace revolution but a spontaneous boiling up of discontent that put Mr. Johnston into power. He promptly shocked the board of directors by calling at the White House. President Roosevelt was agreeably surprised by the youthful opinions of his visitor.

Traditionalists in the chamber were horrified by a Johnston admonition delivered at the annual convention:

"The new capitalism, as I see it, is shedding the last traces of its nostalgic memory of unbridled individualism. Only the willfully blind can fail to see that the old-style capitalism of a primitive, free-shooting period is gone forever. The capitalism which thrived on low wages and maximum profits for minimum turnover, which rejected collective bargaining and fought against justified public regulation of the competitive system, is a thing of the past."

MEETING WITH LABOR

Mr. Johnston shook the ultraconservatives by taking a major step toward a rapprochement with labor. He arranged White House conferences of representatives of labor and management and was influential in bringing about labor's no-strike pledge of World War II.

Labor leaders liked his liberal employment policies. In his own companies in Spokane (household and electrical appliances and construction material) Mr. Johnston had introduced a profit-sharing plan: one-quarter of the net profits, before taxes and dividends, was distributed among the workers.

"I am assuredly no Alger hero," Eric Johnston once wrote of his career. But there were similarities to the Horatio Alger rags-to-riches formula. Young Eric was brought up in what he called genteel poverty. He succeeded, he said, thanks to "the familiar American mixture of robust striving, bold risks, self-assurance, and good luck."

His ancestors fought in the Revolution and his grandfather was a successful lawyer in Washington. But his father, Bertram Allen, who ran a drugstore in the Capital, was not lucky in business. Shortly after Eric was born in Washington on December 21, 1896, the family moved West for the elder Johnstons' health, settling in Marysville, Mont., a mining village near Helena.

A year later the family moved on to Spokane, where Bertram Johnston opened a drugstore, which eventually failed. Soon afterward he died of tuberculosis. Mrs. Johnston got a job as an attendant in a physician's office and Eric sold newspapers. An uncle who was a lawyer in Seattle urged him to study law. While attending the University of Washington, the youth earned expenses by working as a longshoreman.

LIEUTENANT IN MARINES

But Eric was never to practice law. In 1917, with the Nation at war, he was one of six seniors recommended by the university president at the request of the Marine Corps, which was seeking officer material. As a second lieutenant, Mr. Johnston was a bayonet instructor at Quantico, Va., and Mare Island in San Francisco Bay. In 1918 he was detailed to the legation guard at Peiping, where he later served as an assistant naval attaché.

One day, in a native quarter of Peiping, Lieutenant Johnston was severly beaten on the head by an assailant. He suffered a skull fracture, and his recovery was impeded by sinus complications. After a year in various Naval hospitals, he was invalided out of the service.

Returning to Spokane, Mr. Johnston sold vacuum cleaners from door to door. The Alger theme now became dominant. He was so successful that in 1923 he and a friend bought a hole-in-a-wall vacuum-cleaner company and renamed it the Brown-Johnston Co. It became one of the largest distributors of household appliances in the Northwest. During the early 1930's Mr. Johnston organized the Columbia Electrical & Manufacturing Co., which became a leading manufacturer of electrical appliances in the area.

He discovered he was a born businessman. He had a particular flair for delegating responsibility, and this gave him time to plan further business deals. In 1933 he took over the bankrupt Washington Brick & Lime Co., as trustee for the creditors. Ten years later he turned the company back to its owners. It had paid off its entire indebtedness, had $150,000 in the bank and was thriving. Subsequently Mr. Johnston bought into the company and became chairman. He also became president of the Wayne-Burnaby Co., an electrical contracting concern that tackled multimillion dollar jobs.

OLD GUARD OUSTED

His connection with the chamber of commerce began in 1933, when he served on its committee on taxation. He became a director in 1934 and a vice president in 1941. The chamber was then under control of the old guard.

A revolt led by westerners stirred the chamber in 1942, and the insurgents united behind Mr. Johnston, who was elected for a 1-year term.

Apparently the old guard was quickly converted to his vigorous administration. He was reelected three times.

Tall, slim, and muscular, with pale blue eyes that kept a steely quality even when he was laughing, Mr. Johnston was hailed as "the first breath of fresh air to blow through the chamber in 20 years."

He soon became the most articulate defender of business. "I plead guilty to being a Kiwanian, sharing all the sins of extrovert good fellowship, self-improvement and community spirit which the so-called intellectuals love to lampoon," he once told an audience.

Soon the Roosevelt administration was sending him abroad as a sort of salesman for free enterprise and good neighborliness. He went to South America early in 1943 as chairman of a U.S. Commission on Inter-American Development.

GUEST OF THE RUSSIANS

In the spring of 1944 Mr. Johnston was invited to Russia as an official guest of the Soviet Union. He made a 35,000-mile tour of the Soviet Republics and was one of the first foreigners allowed to inspect the gigantic industrial development behind the Urals in Siberia.

On his return he made some uncannily accurate predictions:

"When peace is again restored, Russia and the United States will possess the greater share of the world's military and industrial power.

"The destiny of the world, in large measure, will depend upon the understanding and cooperation that will exist between Russia and the United States."

Mr. Johnston's ability as a conciliator was recognized by the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations.

He served on the advisory board of the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Committee for Economic Development, the Management-Labor Committee of the War Manpower Commission, the Committee for Drafting Federal Employees, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Committee, the advisory committee of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the advisory board of the Mutual Security Agency.

In 1945, Mr. Johnston succeeded Will H. Hays as director of the Motion Picture Association of America with headquarters in Washington. This trade organization acts as a self-regulating policymaker for the motion-picture industry.

Censorship was one of Mr. Johnston's concerns. The industry's production code often came under severe attack, and Mr. Johnston had to defend the production code authority, the industry's self-censoring body. He argued that "if our movies were half as bad as some people complain, there would be censorship laws in all States and cities."

As President Dwight D. Eisenhower's special envoy to the Middle East, Mr. Johnston devised a plan in 1955 under which Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Israel would share the waters of the Jordan River. But the Arabs rejected the plan on the ground that to participate would mean recognizing Israel.

Mr. Johnston tried to break into politics in 1940. He was Republican candidate for Senator from Washington but was defeated. He was awarded the Medal for Merit in 1947.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Aug. 23, 1963]

ERIC JOHNSTON

WASHINGTON.—Eric A. Johnson, 66, movie czar, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and a globetrotting public servant for three Presidents, died here late yesterday.

Mr. Johnston, who was president of the Motion Picture Association of America, had entered George Washington University Hospital on June 17 after suffering a stroke. He had become gradually weaker from the effects of cerebral thrombosis.

SUCCINCT

Eric Allen Johnston was once characterized as "the symbol of enlightened capitalism and progressive free enterprise."

The seeming contradiction in the modifiers was, in fact, a prime example of one of the phenomena of the middle decades of the 20th century. He was a self-made man who grasped the fact that Government and labor must play important roles in the Nation's economy, that this economy is inextricably intertwined with that of the rest of the world.

OUTSPOKEN

No firmer evidence of this could be advanced than Mr. Johnston's seeking, and obtaining an appointment with President Roosevelt in 1942 soon after he had been elected president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, youngest man ever to hold that post.

"How in the world," asked Mr. Roosevelt after a few minutes of conversation, "did they ever elect you?"

What Mr. Johnston was trying to do at that time was heal the breach between business and the administration. His success as a conciliator is attested by the fact that, though a lifelong Republican, he received important assignments by both President Roosevelt and Truman as well as President Eisenhower.

But conciliation to him had its limits. He scoffed at the substitution of "free enterprise" for "capitalism" and used the latter word persistently during a long conversation with Josef Stalin at the Kremlin in 1944. He was equally outspoken about his political affiliation, using it to good effect during that same visit to Russia.

Leaving Moscow, he went on to Novosibirsk and met Mikhail Kulagin, a Siberian Communist party chief. The latter offered him an ornate box filled with precious stones. There was the following exchange:

SHARP

Mr. Johnston: "Why, this is a fortune. I can't take this."

Mr. Kulagin (angrily): "It is from the people of Siberia. If you don't take it you will be insuling them."

Mr. Johnston: "You are a member of the Communist Party, subject to the discipline of the party?"

Mr. Kulagin: "Naturally."

Mr. Johnston: "Well, Mr. Kulagin, I am a member of the Republican Party. By its order, I am not permitted to accept your magnificent gift."

FIGHTER

The Communist leader understood at once and accepted the return of the box.

Mr. Johnston did not always see eye-to eye with his Republican brethren, however. He was a firm and highly vocal supporter of foreign aid. He not only felt that the European Common Market posed no threat to the American economy but that this country might well join it. As czar of the movie industry, he fought for a freer exchange of films between the nations arrayed on opposite sides of the Iron Curtain.

"The great challenge before the American businessman today is to find new ways to diffuse the benefits of capitalism among more people," he once said. "I am not talking about sharing the wealth. I am talking about new wealth to share."

Mr. Johnston was born in Washington, D.C., on December 21, 1896. But his father suffered from tuberculosis and the family moved first to Montana and then to Spokane, Wash., while he was still a baby. After his father died, he had to go to work at odd jobs while still in school.

"Money means a great deal to me," he said in later years "because I saw so little of it as a boy."

He worked his way through the University of Washington, graduating from there with a law degree in 1917. One of his jobs was longshoreman on the Seattle docks; another was college librarian. During summers, he worked in the wheatfields as a binder.

His graduation coincided with the U.S. entry into World War I. Commissioned in the Marines, he served until 1922 when he was discharged because of a head injury suffered in Peiping as a member of the U.S. Legation guard.

Doctors told him that he should stay out of doors as much as possible. So he returned to Spokane and got a job selling vacuum cleaners.

Adding the larger part of his commissions to money he had saved while in the Marines, he was able to buy into the company, which became one of the largest distributors of household appliances in the Northwest. He formed other companies, both manufacturing and selling, that were equally successful.

GENEROUS

Labor had a reserved liking for him because he urged liberal employment practices. In his own companies, a quarter of the net profits, before taxes and dividends, were distributed among the workers in a profit-sharing program.

His election to the presidency of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the ensuing meeting with F.D.R. set his feet on paths far removed from his immediate business interests. He served on numerous boards and committees during World War II and President Truman called upon him for similar duties when the war was over.

On September 9, 1945, he accepted the post of president of the Motion Picture Association of America and remained in that job, except for interruptions by calls from the White House, during the years that followed. MPAA is a self-regulating policymaking trade organization for the movie industry. Its membership includes most of the major producers.

Mr. Johnston said when he accepted the $100,000 to $125,000 a year position that he was "attracted to the motion picture industry because it offers unlimited opportunities to work for peace and prosperity at home and abroad."

CRYPTIC

Since at least half of the industry's gross revenue comes from foreign showings the job also offered him unlimited opportunities for globetrotting. One such trip was to the Soviet Union in 1958 where he continued his indefatigable efforts to arrange an exchange of American and Russian films.

A 5-hour talk with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev gave him a chance to compare the Red leader with Stalin whom he had seen 14 years earlier. His somewhat cryptic analysis: "Khrushchev is diametrically opposed to Stalin in everything except philosophy." He did not expand this statement.

One of the movie problems that occupied much of Mr. Johnston's time he was not abroad was that of censorship. The industry has its own production code but it is subject to recurrent criticism by church and other groups. When such criticism became extremely loud in 1955, he said "if our movies were half as bad as some people complain there would be censorship laws in all States and cities. * * * The goal of producers is to make pictures reasonably accepted by reasonable people."

DEDICATED

Among the interruptions of his work as MPAA president was a call from President Eisenhower in 1953 to go to the Middle East as the President's personal representative with the rank of ambassador. Object: To get agreement between Israel and her Arab neighbors on a plan to develop the Jordan Valley by irrigation and a power network. He made some progress at the time but nothing came of the idea.

Of medium height, Mr. Johnston always looked lean and fit. He never seemed worried, was at ease in all sorts of company. He made one venture into politics, in 1940, but was defeated as Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate from his home State.

He held 14 honorary degrees but never did get to practice law and was essentially a businessman all his life.

"America wants an America where little men can compete * * * chance to take a chance * * * a people's capitalism," he declared. "Beaten paths are for beaten men."

—RALPH CHAPMAN.

IS USDA LAWFULLY IN NEWS SERVICE BUSINESS?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, of the Committee on Agriculture, to call a public hearing to get the facts on the market news service inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Serious questions are involved.

Did the Department of Agriculture have statutory authority to get into the business of disseminating news in competition with private news distribution firms?

If so, can Government lawfully assume an expanding role in news dissemination, perhaps leading to Government domination and control of news services?

The rules under which the news service is established permit the Department to cancel subscribers without notice or reason. This will permit Government to retaliate against newspapers and radio and television stations which criticize Government programs and policies.

This looks like a foot-in-the-door for subtle but effective censorship by Government.

Here is the text of my letter to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]:

AUGUST 23, 1963.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Newspaper Publishers Association filed a petition July 22 with the Federal Communications Commission asking for suspension of the market news service inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

There is serious question whether the U.S. Government has statutory authority to enter into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies.

Deeply involved is the broad principle of a free press and the danger of censorship implicit in the Department's news service rules.

The service can be terminated by the USDA. The Department reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who "abuse" the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable.

According to the ANPA this raises the possibility of censorship in its most odious form.

As newspaper publisher myself, I am especially concerned lest this become the first step toward an expanding role of Government in controlling the distribution of news.

I believe it would be in the public interest to ask responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture to appear before the Committee on Agriculture in public hearings to get the facts.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Here is the text of a statement on this issue by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, dated July 25, 1963:

ANPA PETITIONS FCC TO SUSPEND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT MARKET NEWS SERVICE

ANPA filed a petition July 22 with the Federal Communications Commission asking for suspension of the market news service to be inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Agriculture Department.

Specifically, petition calls for suspension or rejection of the new A.T. & T. tariff which establishes the service. All contracts for the service must be between the subscriber and A.T. & T., subject to Agriculture Department approval.

ANPA petition argues there is no statutory authority permitting the U.S. Government to enter the business of collecting and disseminating news, in competition with private news agencies. ANPA also maintains that the Government would be permitted to exercise censorship "in one of its most odious forms," since the Agriculture Department could deny the service to a subscriber at any time for alleged "misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when in its sole judgment such cancellation is desirable."

Petition was also filed in this matter July 22 by P.A.M. News Corp. (Ridder newspapers).

Text of ANPA petition follows:

"The American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA), 750 Third Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., pursuant to the provisions of 1,463 of the rules, hereby petitions the Commission to suspend and set for hearing or reject seventh revised page 41 of A.T. & T. Tariff FCC No. 208, published to become effective August 1, 1963.

"In support whereof, petitioner states:

"1. The above-named page, effective August 1, 1963, was filed under A.T. & T. Transmittal No. 7576, dated July 1, 1963, which states:

"'This filing is being made in compliance with the decision and orders of the Federal Communications Commission adopted January 28, 1963, FCC 63-66 (34 FCC 217) and May 27, 1963, FCC 63-491 (34 FCC 1094) in dockets Nos. 11645 and 11646.'

"2. However, this particular tariff page was not filed to comply with any decision or order of the Commission but was filed to establish for the first time an entirely new type of service not heretofore furnished.

"3. On May 20 and July 10, 1963, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced the establishment of a New Market News Service and a copy of these two announcements are attached hereto as attachments A and B. Also, the Department of Agriculture recently issued a bulletin describing the new service more fully and a copy of this bulletin (AMS 510) entitled 'A New Market News Service' is attached as attachment C. It is this New Market News Service that the new A.T. & T. tariff page purports to establish although this fact is not disclosed in the A.T. & T. transmittal letter as should have been done under the Commission's rules (sec. 61.33).

"4. Petitioner requests that this new tariff page be suspended or rejected.

"5. This is a new venture of the U.S. Government into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies. Petitioner knows of no statutory authority by which the U.S. Department of Agriculture may expend Federal tax funds for this purpose.

"6. The highly improper nature of the new service is characterized by the following conditions imposed upon the service:

SERVICE CAN BE TERMINATED BY USDA

The new service is available to all who want it, and no application need be made to USDA to receive service. However, USDA reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who abuse the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable. (See p. 4 of attachment C.)

"7. This provision would permit U.S. Government censorship in one of its most odious forms. Any newspaper seeking to subscribe to this new service could be denied service for any reason. Any newspaper already subscribing could have its service canceled without notice or reason. Editorials written by a newspaper that the Department of Agriculture didn't like would, under the above-quoted provision be grounds for denial or cancellation of service.

"8. Thus, this news service has transcendent importance. If it is not halted now, it could lead to further ambitious attempts by this and other U.S. Government agencies to expand and enter into competition with private news agencies. An expansion of this concept would result in a government-controlled news service such as presently exists in some other countries including the Soviet Union, where the so-called news service Tass is government owned and operated.

"9. The tariff violates sections 201, 202, and 214 of the act and section 61.69(b) of the rules reading as follows:

"'(b) When tariffs or supplements are issued on less than statutory notice, under permission, decision, order or regulation of the Commission, strict compliance with all conditions named therein and all rules and regulations of the Commission not expressly waived will be required; otherwise they will be rejected.'"

Wherefore petitioner requests the Commission either to suspend or reject the tariff page referred to above.

Here is a comment on this problem as it appeared in the August 19 Journal of Commerce:

THE AMERICAN TASS

(By Eric Ridder)

What gets me—now that we're well into the 1970's and I look back ruefully at the past decade—is that it only took 5 years to kill the independent American press and that the execution was carried out with such a minimum of malice.

It really came to a head in 1965 (get the date, 1965) when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and interdepartmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?

They were, and in no time at all a large assemblage of reporters, teletype operators and other personnel was woven into a wire system slightly larger than the combined networks of the Associated Press and United Press International. There were some growing pains at first, but by 1967 it was plain that the new Federal News Service (FNS) was second to none, its coverage then extending into stock prices, business annual reports, and (seemingly for the enlightment of the Department of Justice) even into homicide and other local police matters.

The Service grew so rapidly that it was virtually inevitable that before 1967 was out a bright and highly influential young Government official should suggest, first to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Congress, that "this service is being provided with the taxpayers' money and should be made available to anyone who is willing to pay for it and will not abuse the use of it."

The proposition was promptly challenged as a move to set up "an American Tass" (a reference to the Soviet Government's news service monopoly). AP and UPI objected strenuously that it constituted an unwarranted interference with free enterprise.

But these objections got nowhere. The stage had been already been set back in the summer of 1963 when the Department of Agriculture offered a crop and market reporting service to anyone willing to pay A.T. & T. a rate for the wire service sufficient to return the company a profit. This, too, had been challenged, among others by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, for it was plain that the probable effect of this would be to put a commercial service in the same field (the PAM News Corp.) out of business. USDA had been quite unmoved by this eventuality. So was the Federal Communications Commission. When it saw that another Federal agency had been named respondent in the publishers' petition it backed off at once with the explanation that propriety of USDA's wire service to non-Government individuals was "not cognizable by the Commission."

So the point was made and carried in 1965 that if any fight were to be won on the subject, it should have been won in 1963 when the issue first came out into the open in earnest. Moreover, there had been other precedents in the field of electric power. As in the USDA case earlier, the Government then went ahead and arranged with A.T. & T. to distribute its service to anyone who would pay for it and not mishandle the news. Billings and collections would be up to A.T. & T. itself. The Government sincerely hoped that private news services would not suffer, but left the plain implication that if they did, it was their own hard luck.

A pause followed and lasted until certain newspaper and broadcasting media, struggling hard for survival, cancelled their regular news service contracts and subscribed to FNS, which offered lower rates.

The effect of this was to reduce the funds available to the private wire service. As the quality and scope of their services began to decline the whole thing began to snowball. By 1969 both AP and UPI were out of business. Though somewhat bewildered at first by the swiftness of these events, FNS found itself a monopoly.

Like BBC in England, FNS tried to be objective. It was, up to a point, but there were times (especially during elections years) when it could not quite forget which side of its bread the butter was on. Administration critics got rather short shrift. Scandals involving the administration went largely unreported because they did not quite qualify as constructive news. Some editors learned of them and reacted vigorously, but the facts came hard since few were given much encouragement to dig them out as was demonstrated on June 1, 1970, when lightning suddenly struck.

Angered by discovery of irregularities in Washington that FNS had ignored for months, a well-known newspaper serving a market of over a million readers opened an attack on administration laxity and charged FNS with silent complicity in the matter, simultaneously recalling earlier predictions that it would turn out to be "an American Tass."

The same bright young Government official (older now, and presumably more resourceful) was stung by this into recalling the half-forgotten proviso to the effect that FNS would be withdrawn from anyone "mishandling" the news. He promptly invoked it.

The next day readers of this newspaper found it shorn of all international, national and even regional news. Having only a few reporters left (FNS was by then even reporting sports and theater news) it could present only a few scraps of local gossip and was obviously not long for this world.

This lesson was not lost on the rest of the press nor on radio and TV stations. After a cautious study of the ruin to which their excontemporary's brashness had brought him, they opted for the safety of conformity.

FNS thus survived unchallenged, except by a rather worrisome unofficial system all-too familiar to dictators. Known popularly as the grapevine, this proved an inexhaustible source of the wildest rumors. It upset everybody, perhaps most of all the administration itself, but continued to spread like wildfire despite the most relentless attempts to stamp it out.

TOO TRUE TO BE GOOD

To some readers the American Tass (see above) may seem pure fantasy. In actual fact it's far from it.

The Department of Agriculture has already launched a wire service competitive with that of PAM News Corp. Its information is gathered at the taxpayer's expense then offered gratis to anyone who wants it and is willing to pay what it costs A.T. & T. to include them in its circuit and realize a small profit.

Since PAM, a commercial enterprise, must charge not only for the use of wires, operators, and tickers but for newsgathering costs that USDA charges off to the taxpayers, the result is intolerable pressure on the commercial service. Few forms of free enterprise can stand up for long under this type of competition.

How has this come about? And how was it that the Federal Communications Commission, which is usually so discriminating in specifying who should start this service or that and what the kiddies ought to be watching on TV, refused to do anything about it?

Let us get that out of the way first. When the American Newspapers Publishers' Association and PAM took the issue to FCC the Commission took one look at who wanted to offer the news service (USDA) and concluded that since it was a Federal agency the issue was "not cognizable by the Commission."

Well, I'm not going to indulge in the losing litigants time-honored right to "cuss the judge," but there are other aspects of the issue that I think you will find as disturbing as I do.

There follows pertinent paragraphs of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM News Corp. and the decision of the FCC in connection therewith. A beautiful brochure has been printed and is being used by A.T. & T. salesmen to promote this service.

A background statement issued by the Department of Agriculture says in one paragraph:

"According to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, the new system will not bring in any revenue to the Federal Government, and will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government."

And another paragraph:

"Under this plan, subscribers apply directly to the company that owns the teletype circuits, which handles all the work of contracts, billings, collections, etc., without cost or income to the Federal Government. The plan is designed to increase access to information, particularly to detailed specialized information, detail on local markets, and other information already being collected and summarized."

Two more paragraphs:

"The private common carrier that owns the teletype system leased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been obligated to protect the confidentiality of information flowing over that system, until the information was released by the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

"Therefore, it required written authorization to provide this extension of service to private subscribers. The idea was discussed of having the Agricultural Marketing Service approve each application. It was being rejected as being time-consuming and unnecessary. Instead, a catchall reservation of the right of the USDA to cancel service was included in the authorizing letter."

I wonder what a "catchall" reservation is?

A sentence in the next paragraph:

"Since it is impossible to foresee what illegal use or flagrant abuses might be made by individual subscribers, the reservation also includes the right to cancel service to individual subscribers."

I wonder who determines what "flagrant abuses" are?

Another sentence:

"In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

Isn't it nice to know that the USDA doesn't expect that it will be necessary to cancel service.

In a letter dated August 9, 1963, addressed to Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Mr. G. R. Grange, Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services says as follows:

"The PAM News Corp. relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports plus supplemental market information which it collects directly. Whether the direct connections to our leased wire circuit will adversely affect its business may depend on the value which its customers place on the supplemental information they receive from the PAM News Corp. Press associations, newspapers, radio and television stations, business firms, and all other interested persons may, if they desire, have access to the market news circuit. We have no basis for making it available to some and denying it to others, as long as there is no false or illegal use of the Federal-State market news reports."

As I remarked earlier, if you will weigh these words against the projections drawn in the American Tass, I don't think you'll find the latter overly fanciful. Perhaps you'll feel as I feel, recalling the title of one of Shaw's plays, "It Is Just Too True To Be Good."

FAILURE OF THE HOUSE TO PASS AIRTIGHT BAN ON AID TO COUNTRIES TRADING WITH CUBA, AS PROPOSED IN THE CRAMER AMENDMENT, WILL COME BACK TO HAUNT THE CONGRESS BECAUSE THE AMENDMENT PASSED LEAVES A GAPING LOOPHOLE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the misrepresented effect of the amendment banning aid to countries trading with Cuba, written into the foreign aid bill, H.R. 7885, just passed by the House, and because of the manner in which my amendment, putting teeth into this foreign aid ban was defeated by a tie vote of 162 to 162, and then only after the chairman in a seldom precedented action voted to create the teller tie, I believe it my duty to clarify the record.

The amendment as passed is a meaningless, halfhearted attempt to give the public the impression that Congress is insisting on stopping aid to countries that trade with Cuba when this is not the case on the record.

The House had an opportunity to cut off aid to countries trading with Cuba by adopting my amendment to the Fascell-Rogers amendment.

In order to put the issue in focus, I reprint hereafter the Fascell-Rogers amendment as passed and my amendment which failed by a tie vote.

The Fascell-Rogers amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 10, strike out "graph:" and insert in lieu thereof "graphs:".

Page 14, line 10, strike out the quotation marks and immediately after line 10 insert the following:

"(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"(i) any items of economic assistance,

"(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

"(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

My amendment added this sentence to the Fascell-Rogers amendment:

The restrictions contained in this section may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act or in any other provision of law.

It is obvious from a careful analysis of the action of the House in refusing my amendment and passing the watered-down aid ban amendment of Fascell-Rogers, that the House in effect did nothing that is not already accomplished under present law.

Under present law, the President has discretion to cut off or withold aid to any country if he determines it to be "in the national interest"—for whatever reason he and the State Department decide. This is inherent in the aid program. It is specifically spelled out under section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Section 614 specifically provides:

The President may authorize in each fiscal year the use of funds made available for use under this Act—when the President determines that such authorization is important to the security of the United States.

Thus, it is obvious that the President can waive the provisions of the Fascell-Rogers amendment and permit aid to go to countries when he cares to so exercise that discretion.

As a matter of fact, that is the loophole that has resulted in 50 percent of the ships going to Cuba to continue to be free world ships. The President used section 614 to get around the amendment—similar to the Fascell-Rogers amendment, passed in the fiscal 1962 foreign aid appropriations bill—to even permit Greece to ship oil to Cuba.

Thus, my amendment was to make the aid ban on countries trading with Cuba mandatory, because the experience under the 1962 ban—similar to the Fascell-Rogers ban—proved that the President and the State Department would exercise their discretion to waive that amendment under section 614 in a manner that defeated the purpose of the amendment.

My amendment would have removed the discretion contained in section 614 and thus make such a ban airtight. This is the only way to stop trading with Cuba by friendly foreign aid recipient nations.

I think the House missed its only real opportunity to cut off such trade when it failed to pass my amendment. I shall be watching with special interest the trading that continues between Cuba and foreign aid recipients in 1963 and 1964 under the watered-down Fascell-Rogers amendment, which I believe will be the final and clinching proof of my position.

WHERE ARE COMMUNISTS ON THE RUN?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the entire debate on the Foreign Assistance Act and the one major argument given time and time again was that we needed to pass this bill in order to prevent the spread of communism. The argument was substantiated even by the suggestion that we now have the Communists on the run. Had not there been so much talk on the bill which I feared might make the debate on this $4½ billion bill—a most serious matter for the taxpayers who must pay for it—a circus rather than the important consideration it is, I would have asked time during the debate to ask for some evidence to substantiate the argument.

I might ask just where are the Communists on the run?

In Cuba, with missiles in place to protect the Communist government of Castro from those who, loving freedom, want to take back the country stolen from them?

In Cuba where there is in process the building of a submarine base?

In Cuba which has been turned into a Western Hemisphere base for subversion schools and propaganda mills, munition depots and radar monitoring stations?

In Venezuela where terrorism and sabotage are on the increase?

In British Guiana where the first Communist toehold on the Latin American Continent is forming?

In Laos where Averell Harriman's troika regime is pulling the country straight down the drain for a Communist takeover?

In Korea where the "truce" is broken from time to time?

In Berlin where the wall is daily beefed up and Communist guards still shoot unarmed civilians?

On the high seas where our military forces trace the movement of freedom fighters to head them off before touching their native soil they desire to reclaim?

In Russia and East Europe where thousands of Congolese and other Africans are being trained for the next round of rebellion in Africa?

In Yemen where Soviet engineers are rolling out an airstrip on a staging point for Africa and points west?

In Africa's Golden Horn where Soviet experts are building a new port for Soviet trawlers, submarines, and warships?

In the United States where Gus Hall and his tribes infiltrate the campuses of our Nation's universities and the Communist Party announces, as top priority, its effort to increase racial turmoil and violence both North and South?

In Haiti where the pot is boiling with increased ferocity?

All this after spending nearly $110 billion in 18 years for foreign aid to fight communism.

The argument that we need the foreign aid program to combat communism would have more merit if part of the money that has been requested had not gone into the support of Communist countries which are part of the bloc against which we are waging the cold war.

It would have more merit if our present foreign policy was not one of accommodation and appeasement, for the purpose—using the President's own words—"to make the world safe for diversity," which simply means to make the world safe for communism—coexistence on an equal basis.

It would have more merit if our military policy was not one which is built on the premise that in order to keep the peace we must have a nuclear stalemate, for example, disarm ourselves down to the level of the enemy.

The argument would have more merit if we had not abandoned the Monroe Doctrine and helped dig the grave in which we buried it.

I make one other observation. The argument that we must be humanitarian and thus continue this multibillion-dollar gift business, lacks respect for the will of the people as to how their money for aid should be spent.

In the hearing before the subcommittee a representative of a large church body—I will not mention either his name or the name of the denomination in whose behalf he allegedly appeared since I am sure he did not appear for this lobby purpose as a result of the direct vote of the members of its respective denomination—testified upon questioning that the giving of his denomination for foreign aid—foreign mission—averaged out to $1.50 per member per year. This is what people voluntarily gave. This bill represented a request for foreign aid amounting to $100 for every family of four—not a voluntary but a mandatory gift which they would be forced to give because the Government would tax them for it. Can we justify forcing our citizens to participate in a giving for foreign aid purposes and this to the tune of $25 a year for every member of the family, large or small?

ONE-MILLIONTH CARLOAD OF LETTUCE SHIPPED FROM SALINAS VALLEY, CALIF.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this week the Salinas Valley shipped its millionth carload—railroad carload—of head lettuce. This is a lot of lettuce. It means a lot of things to many people. It is only one of many fresh fruit and vegetable crops grown in, and shipped from the Salinas Valley. It has helped to provide a bountiful sustenance for many persons throughout the United States—most of the produce is shipped to the Eastern States. It has provided many good jobs for many thousands of persons of all skill levels, callings, trades, and professions throughout the United States. It has contributed more to the raising of the standard of living of as many people as any other industry.

The obligation of helping to feed the United States, and much of the world, will continue. We are proud of our record. We are anxious to discharge our obligation even better.

Needless to say the abrupt discontinuance of the bracero method for providing the necessary supplemental labor to harvest crops will cause chaos and disruption to this small but important and productive industry.

I share the following newspaper article from the Salinas Californian with my colleagues primarily to acquaint them with the importance of this industry to the residents of every congressional district in the United States.

MILESTONE IN LETTUCE IS REACHED

The one-millionth carload of lettuce rolled out of the Salinas Valley this morning, bedecked with bunting and loaded with produce representing some 400 Salinas Valley growers.

Each of the lettuce cartons is carefully wrapped in foil, and bound for New York where it will be sold in a special auction, with the proceeds going to the American Red Cross.

The iceberg lettuce was donated by members of the Growers Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California, which represents growers in the Monterey-Santa Cruz-San Benito County areas.

The millionth car was launched on its way by Charles Paul, director of the California Department of Agriculture; members of the California State Legislature, and other dignitaries, including Pamela Gamble, last year's Miss California.

IMPORTANT MILESTONE

At the brief but historic ceremony, the shipment of the millionth car was hailed as an important milestone by J. J. Crosetti, president of the Grower-Shipper Association.

Crosetti said: "The Salinas Valley today typifies the important role which all of California's agricultural areas play in the lives of every man, woman, and child in the United States."

He added that, "from California's comparatively limited valleys and foothills, containing less than 3 percent of the Nation's farms, our State's growers provide over 42 percent of the Nation's fruits and nuts; 43 percent of the Nation's vegetables and over 25 percent of the entire Nation's supply of food."

FIRST SHIPMENT RECALLED

Today's 1,000,000th carload in the ultramodern PFE mechanical reefer was a far cry from the first shipment of iced lettuce which left the Salinas Valley in 1921. A shipment which ended in disaster when the car ran out of ice before it reached its destination.

The very chore of icing that first car gave birth to an anecdote still going around Salinas. It is said the growers' order for

10 cakes of ice was doubted by the owner of the local iceplant. He thought the order must have meant 10 pounds, and insisted upon seeing the car before delivering the ice.

Within a few years, however, there were no doubts about the demands on ice production. Before the advent of mechanical vacuum coolers, Salinas made and used more ice than the city of New York.

NEW RECORD SET

By 1937, the district shipped 26,000 cars to set a new record for shipments from one district in one season. By the early fifties, these shipments had grown to 40,000 cars a year.

Although the area is a major producer of other vegetables, having shipped to date over 150,000 cars of mixed vegetables with no less than 50 different varieties in a single car, lettuce is still king. And though today, shipments from Salinas must share the market with many new growing areas, the Salad Bowl of the World still accounts for 40 percent of the Nation's lettuce with about 85 percent of its shipments going out of State.

Jack Bias, executive vice president of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association, summarized it all very nicely as he watched the millionth carload move out of the railroad yards on its way to New York.

"That carload represents more than the 999,999 cars which have preceded it," he said. "It represents the economy of this area, the economy of California's millions of jobs and the major source of food for even more millions of Americans. It symbolizes something that all of us should be very proud to be a part of. For it represents California agriculture which * * * even in this world of rockets and space technology * * * is still our No. 1 industry."

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a major struggle has developed on the question of once again extending Public Law 78, which permits Mexican nationals to enter this country to perform agricultural labor on a seasonal basis.

Long before coming here, I felt that the bracero program was wrong—the moral concept was wrong, and the impact it had on American agricultural workers was wrong.

My efforts against extension of the bracero law began with the hearings on H.R. 2009, a bill that this House defeated on May 29 by a vote of 154 to 178. Shortly thereafter, the Senate was given S. 1703, a bill exactly like H.R. 2009, except that it provided for a 1-year extension of Public Law 78. This month, that bill passed the Senate, but only after it had been amended so that domestic workers are guaranteed the same conditions as Mexican nationals. The House will get S. 1703, but without that amendment. I hope that this House will again defeat extension of Public Law 78, despite the heavy lobbying effort now being exerted in its behalf. For this law is a shameful piece of legislation, a blight on our conscience—it is a disgrace which we have once rejected, and are now called upon to reject again. Let us confirm our judgment that no good can come from a law which is unjust.

TO SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it has been an amazing thing to watch the complete smear and distortion job which has been done by liberal news media on the Young Republican National Convention which was held in San Francisco, June 25–28, 1963. It is of course to be expected because there are bad tidings at home for the pseudoliberal element in contemporary politics. Harbingers of change are evident everywhere and the liberals just cannot get used to it, whether they be liberals in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. In truth, it is amazing to see how similar the tactics are for those who profess to be Republicans and their liberal counterparts in the other party. You can read what Governor Rockefeller, the ADA, the official Democratic newspaper, Drew Pearson, former Young Republican Chairman Len Nadasdy, and the AFL–CIO are saying without changing the copy. It carries the same tune all of the way through.

Charges have been hurled which need to be answered. The record should be set straight. To be fair, it must be admitted that the non-Republican liberal community has received grist for their propaganda mills through the irresponsible statements of GOP spokesmen who should know better such as the Governor of New York and former Chairman Nadasdy. It has been alleged that radicals took over the Young Republican movement. The tactics of these unknown radicals have been depicted as roughshod, totalitarian, Birch inspired and controlled, fantastic—well, just about every extreme adjective which can be imagined. Pleas of unity have scattered to the winds. This buttresses the opinions I have had for many years. As long as the minority liberal faction in the Republican Party can either run things or have disproportionate voice, unity is fine. If the overwhelming conservative majority ever appears to exert its rightful voice and looks like it might have its say, unity goes to the winds and the liberal element attacks its own with all of the passion of the opposition party.

Chairman Donald "Buz" Lukens, our new YR National Chairman, has been singled out for particular attack. Of course, he was not supposed to win and it did create a traumatic experience for those who were preparing to toast the supposed winner. Chairman Nadasdy, in fact, told reporters he was "in a state of shock." In Nadasdy's case, it can't be said that his shock moved him to make unfortunate utterances on the spur of the moment which he would now regret. In his particular case, he had been using the old scare technique line even before the convention so his regrettable and untrue charges in the postconvention period were out of the same cloth. Newspaper reports from his native State of Minnesota carried his "grave" warnings about the dangers ahead at San Francisco. He told reporters that he feared a takeover by the forces of the far right in San Francisco. In the same tar brush style of his apparent mentor, Governor Rockefeller, he of course never bothered to define what he meant by radical right, name the people who presented the supposed threat or responsibly state the case.

Parroting this line in advance of the San Francisco convention was a little known Kiplinger-like newsletter published by Bundy Clarke, former Young Republican leader in the District of Columbia. Clarke was ousted from power by "Buz" Lukens before the latter's election as Young Republican head which might account for some of his flavoring of his reports. Loosely called Political Intelligence, the Clarke publication has sought to label the conservative group in Young Republican national politics as the "syndicate" and the Nadasdy faction as the "gangbusters." This "good guys" and "bad guys" technique is a shallow perversion of the truth, too blatant to receive serious consideration.

An interesting side note is the fact that Nadasdy should receive one of his greatest accolades from a very liberal Representative from his own State, DONOLD M. FRASER, the man who beat our great Walter Judd. In the July 9 daily RECORD on pages A4269–A4270, Representative FRASER stated:

> Mr. Nadasdy's comparison of these tactics with those pursued by the Communists is valid * * *. It is unfortunate that Senator GOLDWATER should appear to be the beneficiary of the activity of these extremists. * * * I wish to commend Mr. Nadasdy for his expressed determination to alert the people to the dangers of the Birch Society and the radical right.

I have included this entire article in the appendix to these remarks. The article appeared in the July 7, 1963, Minneapolis Tribune and is "politics by epithet" at its very worst. Read some of the vague insinuations which Nadasdy made:

> But, he said, Lukens' supporters used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful.

* * * * *

> At the center of the confusion were members of the John Birch Society and the radical right, Nadasdy said.

* * * * *

> During the coming year, I want to try to alert the people, and especially the Republicans, as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right, which is to subvert the Republican Party and to seize control, rather than just nominate a presidential candidate.

I have been in politics for a long time. I do not recall anyone making smears as bad as these. Nadasdy owes the Republican Party one of two things: First, an apology, or, second, documentation and evidence which can support his charge. The latter he cannot do. Consider the absurdity of his further allegation from the Minneapolis Tribune article:

> John Birchers at the Young Republican convention were mostly from California,

Illinois, and Iowa, with a scattering from other States, Nadasdy said.

He of course is throwing the words "John Birch" around as something synonymous with evil. While I personally believe that the John Birch Society has been distorted out of proportion and does not pose a threat—especially when considered in the light of the ADA and other leftwing organizations which are a true threat and have a position of power in the Kennedy administration—a threat to either the country or the Republican Party, this is not the point here. He is using the charge as a scare word and smear and must therefore be considered in that light.

This is not only a reprehensible charge—it is, I am sure, an unfounded lie. To smear the Young Republicans from these great States is an injustice the likes of which is unknown in the annals of Young Republican history. I personally know most of the Iowa and Illinois Young Republican delegates in particular, and I find it hard to believe that a person could be so irresponsible as to brand them with such accusations. Can he name one—just one—John Birch member from any of these States? I doubt it. There were well over 1,000 delegates there, I would guess, and the impression is given that the Birchers and the radical right controlled things so he should be able to name scores of them if it were an honest statement. I doubt if it were an honest answer.

It was my pleasure to attend the Young Republican National Convention. This made the sixth biennial convention which I have attended. The convention was indeed a rollicking affair. There was pandemonium, there was plenty of enthusiasm and at times it was noisy and boisterous. What is new about this? Observation: Anyone who would say the shouting was one-sided or from an imaginary radical right is not telling you the truth. Both sides had their share of levity, dilatory tactics, groans and shouts of protest—all the things that go into this American institution we call a political convention. I saw delegates shouting, for example, who were properly at a microphone trying to get attention of the Chair to change their votes or make a point of order. They were repeatedly overlooked by the Chair. I saw the Chair act most irresponsibly in several instances. On one occasion, the convention seemed to be getting out of hand and he issued an order that guests be ejected from the room despite the fact that the guest section was serene by comparison. I saw the huge New York delegation in its little ploy to gain time at the end of the ballot when all appeared to be lost. They asked for a poll of the delegation which took at least 5 minutes and didn't change a vote—nobody expected it to. I saw pandemonium break loose, and properly so, when after the first ballot results were announced, Chairman Nadasdy erroneously proclaimed that Chuck McDevitt had been elected chairman when constitutionally he had not. Is not that the type of thing that might just encourage a few people to shout et cetera? I saw the tumult as the Young Republican favorite, Barry Goldwater, addressed an admiring throng. I saw a lot of things but one thing I did not see—these stealthy, dangerous, and diabolical people Nadasday and Rockefeller have alluded to who supposedly are trying to ruin our great party, these radical rightists and John Birchers who are posing such a threat. Where were they, Mr. Nadasdy and Mr. Rockefeller? Are you honest or responsible enough to tell us?

As is typical at Young Republican conventions, it is impossible to say that conservatives defeated liberals. Just about everybody there was a conservative. Chuck McDevitt, a capable and honorable Young Republican from Idaho, had good conservative credentials. While his major support came from the more liberal wing of the Republican Party such as New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey delegations, he had such conservatives behind him as the majority of the Texas delegation. Try to find liberals among the Young Republicans in Texas if you want a real job. Personalities, likes and dislikes, regional coalitions, old feuds, and so forth, had as much to do with the results as anything. It is true that the winner had endorsed Senator Goldwater for the Presidency but this was not decisive in my opinion. Many delegates with whom I spoke were convinced that both candidates would be for Goldwater and the loser, Chuck McDevitt, was not against the Senator despite his basic New York support. One thing is certain, he would not have been caught dead being openly for Nelson Rockefeller. This would have been the kiss of death and he knew it.

Two other distinguished Congressmen were present and they, too, have expressed amazement over the Drew Pearson-Rockefeller-Nadasdy charges. I include their statements at this point:

Statement of Congressman William E. Brock, of Tennessee

It was my pleasure to attend the recent Young Republican National Federation convention in San Francisco as a guest and participant in the official program.

Unfortunately, several big city newspapers, the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education, certain journalists, and some self-seeking politicians have condemned the Young Republicans. These dedicated young Americans have been accused of being "fogies," coming from the "radical right lunatic fringe," being guilty of using "Fascist tactics" and acting "just like the Communists."

Unlike most of those who have seen fit to criticize the convention, I was there. So was my distinguished colleague and past national chairman of the Young Republicans, John Ashbrook. We feel it is time to set the record straight on some of these inaccurate statements.

The fact of the matter is that the whole tone of the convention was conservative. Apologists for the present administration can find little contentment in viewing the deliberations of such a conservative body, and they have resorted to smearing the whole 600,000-member federation.

In San Francisco young people were taking a keen interest in practical politics. No longer are today's youth apathetic about affairs of state; no longer are they satisfied to let others do their thinking for them. They desperately want to participate in the body politic. This is healthy. And being part of today's political process, they are training to be leaders of tomorrow. This is wholesome. Too often the outcome of political conventions is decided in the backrooms by party bosses. In San Francisco the elections were decided on the floor of the convention. This, too, is good.

True, emotions ran high. Pressures and counterpressures were delivered with gusto. One could sense the excitement and enthusiasm of the event just by entering the convention hall and viewing the banners, badges, and balloons. The battle was hard-fought, but men with wounded pride, muckrakers and ambitious politicans do the country a disservice, I believe, by trying to dampen the interest of young people in politics.

As for the Young Republicans, I predict they will be leading the great phalanx of united Republicans, armed with principle on their side, marching toward victory at the polls next year. For myself, I'm proud to be a member of the Young GOP.

Statement of Congressman Ed Foreman of Texas

I was pleased to have been invited to appear on the program and speak before the Young Republican Convention held at San Francisco during June. The enthusiasm, the determination and dedication exhibited by these fine young people was an encouraging ray of optimism. Young folks from all over America were gathered to express their concern over our national, and in fact international, deplorable and disgusting state of affairs.

True, as with all young political groups, the meeting was lively indeed, but definitely not dangerous, radical or uncontrollable as has been indicated by some of the lesser informed. My own State of Texas delegation was a typical group—all responsible, sound conservatives—they split down the middle on their vote for the Young Republican presidential candidates. We need more young people in America today, like those who met in San Francisco, who are willing to devote a part of their efforts and energies to helping extend the cause of freedom and blunt the spearhead of socialism and communism.

Then, too, note carefully the observations of other Young Republicans who also are offended at the smear technique being used against them. They were there. These are their comments:

August 16, 1963.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller,
State of New York, Executive Chamber, Albany, N.Y.

Dear Governor Rockefeller: Having been a delegate to the recent National Convention of the Young Republican Federation, I was very interested in your July 14, 1963, observations relating to that convention, particularly where you noted:

"But every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed, and operating through the tactics of ruthless roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism."

Be assured that, as an objective observer of this convention, I quite agree. The extremist group spent over twice as much money at the convention; were extremely well organized (electing four of the top five officers of the federation); were involved in such irresponsible activities as cutting the opposition's private telephone lines, and in attempting to obtain passage of divisive resolutions relating to unimportant aspects of our party's national organization.

I am delighted by your concern, since the group I described was financed and organized by the New York delegation. I trust your expressed concern will result in a housecleaning in the New York Federation of Young Republicans.

Very truly yours,

Willard D. Dover.

Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

[From the Oregonian, July 6, 1963]

Statement of Robert D. Bell, Chairman, Young Republican Federation of Oregon

To the **Editor**:

The attack by Rowland Evans, New York Herald Tribune correspondent, on the National Young Republican Federation convention this past week was unwarranted. Evans, typical of the individual who believes all views other than his own to be extreme, put together a real "mish-mash" of facts when he attempted to review the events that occurred at the convention in San Francisco.

Evans would have the people believe that the key issue of the Young Republican convention was one of the "moderates" versus the "extremists" and which philosophy was going to prevail. Actually the issue was justice versus injustice. Thank God that men of principle stood and made themselves heard and counted regardless of philosophy in order that justice could prevail.

The ruthless parliamentary tactics used by outgoing Chairman of the National Federation Leonard Nadasdy will be long remembered by this writer. This man used his position of power while chairing the convention to rule again and again in favor of his 1961 campaign manager, Charles McDevitt from Boise, Idaho. On the first ballot, he even declared McDevitt elected and then had to rescind this ruling because his candidate did not have a majority of the total delegates present.

The Oregon delegation went to the convention uncommitted, determined to do what was best for the Republican Party and the State we represented. As moderate Republicans, it did not take us long to see through the shoddy veil of deceit that the then national chairman was trying to draw over the eyes of the delegates present.

Many of the so-called conservative States such as Texas, Georgia, Wyoming, Arkansas, and Colorado voted consistently with New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and other liberal Eastern States.

On the other hand, the majority of the delegates from the supposedly liberal States of Michigan, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin were lined up behind the new national chairman, Donald E. Lukens, of Washington, D.C.

When reviewed in this light, Columnist Evans' conclusion that this was a battle between the moderates and extremists certainly does not hold water. According to Evans, outgoing Chairman Nadasdy, in trying to bring order to the proceedings, muttered to himself, "This is incredible." Observing from the floor Chairman Nadasdy's entire handling of the convention, I concur, this was incredible. Incredible that an officer of a highly respected national organization would indulge in such shenanigans.

Incredible that the tone of the convention was set by the fact that the Nadasdy organization hired private police to be present and also insisted upon reinforcements in the form of members of the San Francisco police. This was a vain attempt to intimidate the delegates. Such extremely unusual action was incongruous with the high calibre of individuals who represented their States as delegates which included Congressmen, judges, State legislators, attorneys, etc.

Strangely enough, the police were absent at the precise moment that the national YR secretary, Carolyn Manchester from Portland, Maine, needed them to protect her from the irrational outburst of Chairman Nadasdy. In an effort to stop her from announcing the official vote, which elected Lukens the winner and defeated the chairman's candidate, McDevitt, she was violently shoved away from the microphone by Nadasdy before she could announce the results.

This type of delaying tactic brought out into the open the unethical conduct that was already a key controversy of the convention. I, for one, with many other young Americans, do not believe chivalry is dead. This action on the part of the national chairman clarified the real issue at stake.

The charge that the rightest-controlled California delegation set the tune of the convention was again ridiculous. Robert Gaston, chairman of California YR's in his race for the national chairmanship, remained in only on the first ballot and received a total of nine votes outside of his own State. If this indicates support of a so-called extremist California group from over 1,400 delegates and alternates, I fail to see it.

Do not mistake what this means. No one of clear conscience will say that politics is all good, but let every man of sound principle say a silent prayer of thanks that there are still men who can't be bought, threatened, or cajoled into giving up these principles we all hold to be true.

Robert D. Bell,
Chairman, Young Republican Federation of Oregon.

Statement by Jack A. Quilico, Chairman, the Montana Young Republicans

The remarks of Leonard Nadasdy, former national chairman of the Young Republicans, as inserted in the Congressional Record, volume 109, No. 103, for Tuesday, July 9, 1963, represent an enlightening account of the recent Young Republican National Convention held in San Francisco. Reading Mr. Nadasdy's account, I am at somewhat of a loss as to just what convention he was attending. I was at the convention and sat in the sessions that were chaired by Mr. Nadasdy. I must candidly admit that that was an unusual experience indeed, to sit there and watch the parliamentary maneuvering that Mr. Nadasdy engaged in in his vain attempt to hand the election to his former campaign manager of the position of national chairman.

Mr. Nadasdy states: "The whole thing has been very disillusioning for me." This is probably the only undistorted thing that Mr. Nadasdy stated in the entire interview. Disillusioning was the fact, that control was firmly wrested from the machine that Mr. Nadasdy had built to perpetuate the liberal philosophy that he and his followers zealously sought to instill with another regime of the same order.

It adds to the dwindling stature of Mr. Nadasdy when he states: "Lukens supporters used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful." Now that is saying quite a bit and as is usual lately in such outbursts from hurt and scared liberals, they make a shotgun blast of charges and care less who gets hit. To set the record straight in this regard, the Montana delegates, of which I was chairman, take great exception when being accused of using Communist techniques to gain their ends. Quite frankly, Mr. Nadasdy takes a lot upon himself when he goes around accusing sovereign States who were at the convention of using such tactics. This in the light of the most ungentlemanly act that I have ever seen and which Mr. Nadasdy himself took in the most unprincipled action of using physical action, which resembled a slap at Miss Carolyn Manchester who was trying to read the tally of States' votes which she was required to do as national secretary. Mr. Nadasdy states: "Their purpose was to completely ensnarl the convention and confuse everyone. All this accomplished by screaming and hollering." After the incident with Miss Manchester, which left her near hysteria, there was indeed screaming and hollering as there are still quite a few men who do not take kindly to having women treated in the manner that Miss Manchester received from Mr. Nadasdy.

As to ensnarling the convention and causing confusion, Mr. Nadasdy might well look back upon his own sad chairmanship and reflect upon the use and misuse of regularly established procedure which he employed only to one end, the defeat of the conservative candidate. It was sad indeed to see any pretense of fairplay disappear completely when the vote got close in the national chairmanship race.

What is also regrettable is the fact that this national was the first time that many Young Republicans had ever been to a national and the impression left with them is still disbelief at the dictatorial and autocratic use in the manner that the Chair under Mr. Nadasdy was used. And should there be disbelief in this, there were several U.S. Congressmen who were in attendance and can substantiate the statements made here.

As to causing dissention and disunity among the Republican ranks, Mr. Nadasdy would do well to contemplate his own utterances which certainly do nothing to bring unity into play, and in fact play that dangerous game of the opposition to wit: "If you don't play the game my way, then you can't play."

This, Mr. Nadasdy, is a bad game to play and is also a bunch of sour grapes on your part. The Republican Party has always been proud of the fact that within their party framework they could include many points of view, which is not the case with the opposition. It would seem very narrow on your part to try and exclude those with conservative leanings and in fact to go to the point that you would stop at nothing to prevent them having a voice in the say of their party which by the way belongs to them just as much as it belongs to you.

You do dishonor to the Young Republican organization when you falsely preach that "Birchism" and "radicalism" was an issue at the national convention. It was no more an issue than the fact that Lincoln was the founder of the Republican Party. To falsely label the great conservative element which exists in the Republican Party as extremists is to merely be a dupe of the opposition and sow the seeds for a Republican defeat at the polls come next November. There is no taint to believe in conservatism and I proudly stand up and ask to be counted as a conservative. And it is quite probable that only within the conservative movement will the Republicans be able to counter in November and retire what has made a mockery of our domestic front, made shambles of our foreign policy, and so lowered the prestige of the United States abroad that the present administration is unlikely to have a poll taken knowing full well the results of such a poll.

It would do well for you, Mr. Nadasdy, to take your talents and apply them in the direction that any nominal Republican should do; namely, working for the Republican victory in 1964 and letting all citizens know and hear the promise-all give-nothing New Frontier.

Indeed, the State chairman of Nadasdy's own Minnesota felt constrained to set the record straight when he got home and read the distorted reports of the proceedings at San Francisco. He told reporters that, in his judgment, there was no takeover by the far right. In fact, he dismissed calmly the Nadasdy charges. I insert an article on his interview at this point:

[From St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press, July 7, 1963]

Young Republican Takeover—Nadasdy Disputed

(By Gene Newhall)

The Young Republican National Federation convention's election as chairman of a Goldwater-for-President backer did not signify takeover of the Young Republicans

> by the far right, Martin Kellogg, 448 Woodlawn Avenue, Minnesota Young Republican chairman, said Saturday.
>
> He took more lightly than did Leonard Nadasdy, Wayzata, outgoing national Young Republican chairman, the aggressive tactics of Young Republican delegates identified with the arch-conservative John Birch Society.
>
> Nadasdy came back fuming to Minnesota from the San Francisco convention, which wound up after an all-night final session a week ago. He got off a letter to WILLIAM MILLER, senior Republican Party national chairman, warning that the Birchite tactics might disrupt the GOP presidential nominating convention a year from now in San Francisco.
>
> Kellogg, who also attended with Minnesota's 15 delegates and 8 alternates, had been to one previous Young Republican national convention. He felt at the San Francisco session "a strong battle going on, with a strong conservative force, but no takeover of the organization."
>
> Besides electing Donald (Buz) Lukens, Washington, D.C., a United Nations foe and Goldwater backer whom Nadasdy opposed, the convention elected to other offices people whom Nadasdy supported, Kellogg pointed out.
>
> The national chairman of the drive to draft Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, for President voted for Lukens' opponent in the tightly drawn Young Republicans election, Kellogg added.
>
> He noted, as had Nadasdy, that some delegations to the national Young Republicans convention are appointed by their State chairmen, not elected.
>
> And the "unit rule," by which some State delegations failed to allow individual members to vote their personal choices if those differed from the majority of the delegation, "was a significant factor," Kellogg thought.
>
> The shift to the full California delegation to Lukens was crucial in his victory by a two-vote margin on the second ballot over Charles McDevitt, Boise, Idaho, State legislator, who on the first ballot had been two votes short of election as national chairman. The Californians abandoned their own third-place candidate to push Lukens from second to first place.
>
> It was a "long, rancorous" convention, Kellogg conceded, so tied up in parliamentary procedure that it never got to resolutions.
>
> Kellogg noted one particularly positive element in the distracted convention: It awarded the Minnesota Young Republican League the prize for "the outstanding State organization," recognizing especially the Minnesota Young Republican League campaign to help elect a conservative majority in the State house and senate.

A great deal of noise has been made concerning the California Young Republicans. It is alleged that they are radically oriented if not Birch inspired. Let me say from my own observations and firsthand opportunity to chat with many of them that they indeed are determined, philosophically intent Young Republicans. Extremists? Of course not. Many of them had never been to a convention before and were frankly astounded at the wheeling and dealing that almost naturally transpires at meetings such as the one in San Francisco. That they were somewhat intransigent in their views could not be denied but since when is there anything wrong with that? I personally respected their high-principled stance though at times I did think they should have been a little more realistic. Anyone who would paint them as radical or a threat to the party is way off base, in my judgment.

A final point on California. Those who lost are particularly critical of this State. They forget one thing: When the chips were down and the heat was on they were trying harder than anyone else to get California's votes. Ask them about the offers they made to California to secure their big bloc of votes. When they didn't get them, they suddenly found grave consequences to the fact that California Young Republicans supported Buz Lukens. Had they received the California votes, everything would have been all right, I suppose.

ROLE OF ROCKEFELLER

I find particularly appalling and reprehensible the attempt of Governor Rockefeller to smear the good name of the Young Republicans in the United States. It certainly would be safe to say of the San Francisco convention that he was not a popular favorite, indeed he was barely considered as a serious contender insofar as I could judge the temper of the delegates. This hardly gives him any justification, however, for besmirching their good name. Governor Rockefeller has evidenced a tendency that I have long felt was a tenet of the so-called liberal wing of the Republican Party. By his vicious and at the same time vague attack on Republican conservatives he is saying, in effect, "it will be me or someone like me or no one." In truth, it appears that he would sooner see the incumbent reelected than support Senator GOLDWATER or any conservative. According to the New York Times, the Governor has supposedly received a secret report on the convention from New York Young Republicans. I am sure they could not have given him the information on which he based his smear attack.

In particular, his tactics are quite transparent. When he appeared to be ahead in the presidential race, his first plea was for unity. With his star on the wane—and let me say that I never have believed he was ahead except in the imagination of the Madison Avenue artists—he now attacks in a rule or ruin fashion. A close examination of his July 14, 1963, statement is necessary to determine the nature of his charges.

He starts out with the self-serving declaration that he has "been working to put the party in a position to face the challenge of the 1964 election as a strong and united fighting force." Maybe he has—but then he thought he was in front. He proceeded to state:

> In making this effort toward unity for principle, it was my deep conviction that the activities of the radical right, while deeply disturbing in many ways, would represent an inconsequential influence on the Republican Party.

Here he displays the age-old strategy which he repeats throughout his strange prouncement—create a straw man, make it a "threat," "subversive," "dangerous," "irresponsible" and so forth, then get out your sword, mount your charger and go forward to give the dragon battle. Do not forget the press releases at each skirmish. Just whom or what group is he talking about? He is not honest or forthright enough to name them. Judged by his vitriolic scatter gun attack, it could well mean anyone in the Republican Party to the right of Governor Rockefeller and that would be about 80 to 90 percent of us.

In referring to the Young Republican National convention in San Francisco, he magnanimously says that "no one could fail to be deeply disturbed by the proceedings" because, he relates:

> Every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed and operating through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism.

This unfounded lie is made even more blatant by his vicious attack in which he alleges:

> The leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe—every bit as dangerous to American principles and American institutions as the radical left—who successfully engineered this disgraceful subversion of a great and responsible auxiliary of the Republican Party are the same people who are now moving to subvert the Republican Party itself.

In this big lie technique, Governor Rockefeller has shown himself to be completely out of touch with reality. I would frankly like to know who "the leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe are who had anything—I repeat, anything—to do with the YRNF convention let alone "dominate" it? Can he name them? Of course, not. He lacks the moral and philosophical honesty to define his terms, name these supposed bogeymen who do not exist and, in the end, he will not retract this big lie in the hopes that if it is repeated enough times there will be those unsuspecting Republicans who will take it for the truth. With this set of credentials it is absolutely fantastic that he should later state that "political success cannot be divorced from political morality."

Any party should be big enough to encompass diverse thought and a variety of people. It is possible for anyone to say he is a Democrat or Republican and he is accepted as such. However, when a person in leadership position manifests such irresponsibility it is our duty as party members to point out that such a person has traveled into a never-never land where day is night and right is left. The most significant thing about the plight of Nelson Rockefeller is that few responsible Republicans are willing to come to his defense. He has so obliterated any vestige of responsibility that he stands virtually alone. To his credit, Senator GOLDWATER has refused to be drawn into debating such baseless charges. As an active young Republican, still within age limits, I share the resentment of others like myself who know these charges are not true and know of the damage that they will ultimately do. It is regrettable that our organization should be attacked so wrongfully and only because I am sure that Governor Rockefeller will not be honest enough to retract his misstatements do I add any further fuel to this controversy which is the dying legacy of a blighted aspirant for the Presidency.

As wrong as Governor Rockefeller has been on his appraisal of the Young Republicans and their San Francisco convention, he has been right on one thing. His charges have been picked up by the propaganda mills of the left who are using it to attack the Republican Party. I am including the Drew Pearson article of July 19, 1963 in the appendix to these remarks. His innuendoes and smears are legion, most of which were prompted by the Nadasdy-Rockefeller sour grapes. The Democrat, official newspaper of the Democratic National Committee, had a field day in its July 22, 1963 edition in which it reprinted with marked emphasis the Minneapolis Tribune article which headlines "Mob Rule Tactics Cited—YGOP Convention Shocked Exleader." The New York Times could report, as if it were objective and honest, in its July 31, 1963 paper:

> In some parts of the West, the John Birch Society has created intraparty problems for the Republicans that are draining energies that might otherwise be directed toward lining up support for different candidates. In Idaho, for example, Charles McDevitt, a young Idaho lawyer, was scheduled to become president of the Young Republican Federation at the group's convention held in June. But he was beaten out by Donald Lukens, a rightwinger. "Many of the young Republicans are disillusioned and a lot of the older ones are sobered by what happened," said an observer in Boise.

Take the unfounded charge and sooner or later you have it converted into a fact. This technique often works. Even Life magazine picked up the charge and treated it as a fact, which it is not. In its July 26, 1963, issue, this magazine carried an editorial "Time To Hear From GOLDWATER" in which it further compounded the big lie into a factual observation. Life said:

> Rockefeller was especially disturbed by the success of extremists in turning the Young Republican convention in San Francisco into a virtual Goldwater-for-President rally. He charged that they operated "through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism."

Note again the statement "Rockefeller was especially disturbed by the success of extremists." You start with an unfounded charge and soon it is factual. Rockefeller gave no evidence of extremism in San Francisco, no names were given but soon you have reports that these unknown people were "successful." Neat little tactic, is it not?

CONCLUSION

On the encouraging side: Most people have not fallen for this line. There are enough voices who speak in calm, deliberate terms to present the facts. Governor Rockefeller's unfounded charges, regardless of how often repeated, will not improve his stock or damage the reputation of Senator GOLDWATER. The Young Republicans will survive, too, and go on to even more effective political action. It is a shame, however, that in the process that they should be smeared and so much ammunition should be given to the opposition.

If the news media were looking for some real extremism, they could have found some in another political meeting in the West. On August 18, Young Democrats from 13 Western States met at Berkeley, Calif., and adopted resolutions. Among them were statements:

> That the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba;
>
> That a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations;
>
> That the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam;
>
> That the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished; and
>
> That the McCarran Internal Security Act be repealed.

Yes, there is extremism all around us. As a Republican I am proud that it is almost exclusively found on the left and not on the right.

I include with these remarks an article by Stan Evans which appeared in National Review, a report by a Young Americans for Freedom—YAF—publication, the statement of Governor Rockefeller and the articles referred to before. This, then, is the record. Let us set it straight.

[From the National Review, Aug. 13, 1963]

GOLDWATER, ROCKEFELLER, AND THE YOUNG REPUBLICANS

(By M. Stanton Evans)

The Young Republicans of America, meeting at Boston's Hotel Statler in June 1951, chose Herbert Warburton of Delaware as their national chairman. Because Warburton represented what was to develop as the "Eisenhower wing" of the party, and because his opponent was strongly backed by elements close to the late Senator Robert Taft, the result was prophetic of what was to happen a year later in the senior party.

In 1959, when there was again some question as to who would be the next GOP nominee, a similar clash occurred. Ned Cushing of Kansas, a strong backer of Richard Nixon, was elected Young Republican chairman. The delegation from New York, trailing the tattered banner of Nelson Rockefeller, stood forlornly on the outside looking in. Once more the Young Republican convention prefigured that of the senior party; Rockefeller's weakness among the Young Republicans was, by year's end, equally apparent among their elders.

It has since become something of an axiom among GOP professionals that the Young Republican convention immediately prior to a presidential showdown is a good indicator of party sentiment. It was thus no surprise that this year's Young GOP conclave, held in San Francisco, June 25–28, should have attracted the interest of the press and of party regulars. In the normal course of things, their soundings would have been recorded and issued as a Republican summer book on presidential possibilities. But for a number of reasons, this year's convention achieved a notoriety surpassing any of its predecessors. It became, not simply an index to more important happenings in the GOP at large, but a major news event in its own right.

As usual, the convention feaured a miniature version of the maneuvering underway in the senior party. The alinement of forces behind one of the candidates included BARRY GOLDWATER's Arizona and a constellation of the more conservative States; behind the other, Rockefeller's New York and the more liberal States. There were of course some areas of overlap, with a handful of conservatives backing the second candidate, and certain "moderates" backing the first. But in the main the lines were drawn clearly enough, according to previous custom. There were, however, aspects of the convention setting it apart from those of years past:

1. The winning candidate, Donald E. (Buz) Lukens, 32, of Washington, D.C., openly endorsed Senator GOLDWATER for the Presidency. While such allegiances have hitherto been deduced from the nature of a candidate's backing, and were equally plain in this instance, it is unusual for a Young Republican chairman to put such preferences on record. In accordance with the Young GOP constitution, Lukens added that he would administer the affairs of his new office impartially, supporting all officially selected Republican candidates for office.

2. Lukens' opponent, Charles R. McDevitt, 31, of Boise, Idaho, labored to establish his own conservatism. Although backed by liberal delegations from New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, etc., McDevitt seemed well to the right of his supporters. As one newsman noted (with evident distaste), McDevitt proposed at a press conference "that the Government turn the veterans hospitals back to the States as one step in an economy plan that would permit the abolition of the income tax." Such was the public mien of the candidate backed by Rockefeller's delegation from New York—a seeming paradox which suggests the all-pervading conservatism of the Young Republicans.

3. Even had there been no contest for chairman, the drift of the convention would have been unmistakable. The New York Times observed: "The only Republican Presidential possibility with any following visible here is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. And that following overwhelms like a herd of buffalo. Only his badges are sold and only support of him is talked of in the lobby of the Sheraton-Palace Hotel." The Young Republicans turned out in record numbers to hear GOLDWATER at his June 27 appearance in San Francisco. A Presidential preference poll among the delegates showed a margin of eight to one, GOLDWATER over Rockefeller. A "Statement of Principles" adopted by the Young Republicans, modeled on a GOLDWATER suggestion to the 1960 senior convention, was strongly conservative, and the delegates handily defeated New York-led efforts to liberalize it.

THAT SUPREME BETRAYAL

These items in and of themselves add up to an event of newsworthy dimensions. But their cumulative effect led to yet another dedevelopment of still greater import, escalating what had been a set-to among junior politicians into a full-fledged casus belli of national politics. On Sunday, July 14, Governor Rockefeller, having had 2 weeks to reflect upon matters, issued a cry of distress. The conservative triumph, he charged, was an act of disgraceful subversion. In a world which needs love and understanding, he added tenderly, the victors of San Francisco offered only hate and distrust. They were, come to think of it, members of the radical right lunatic fringe—extremists enmeshed in cynical expediency. They were, in short, guilty of that supreme betrayal—nonsupport of Nelson Rockefeller.

To this noble effusion, Rockefeller added a charge of foul play. "Every objective observer in San Francisco," he said, "has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well-financed, and operating through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism."

To a reporter who was on the scene, Rockefeller's angry words suggest that the Governor must have had some other convention in mind. Certainly nothing he said resembles what innumerable eyewitnesses report as having taken place at the Sheraton-Palace. Some of the charges could hardly be serious; the accusation that the conservatives were "well financed," for example, need not—considering the source—be accorded sober examination. The charge of "ruthless, roughshod intimidation" is undoubtedly intended for serious reception, but the evidence to support it is equally scarce. One searches Rockefeller's statement for documentation, but no specifics are given.

Perhaps the Governor took the word of the outgoing Young Republican chairman, Leonard Nadasdy, of Minnesota. Nadasdy, professing himself in a state of shock, devised a postconvention analysis similar to Nelson Rockefeller's. In an interview with the St. Paul Pioneer-Press, Nadasdy denounced the backers of Lukens, saying "they were using the exact same techniques as the Communists." In the Minneapolis Tribune, he added that "this radical element is just like the Communists. They drive the good people away." Nadasdy's allegations were repeated in a column by Drew Pearson, not usually considered a confidant of Republicans, who changed the accusation of Communist tactics to Fascist.

SMEAR TACTICS

Many press accounts of the convention describe Nadasdy and other anti-Lukens elements as moderates. Somehow it is difficult to reconcile the concept of moderation with statements such as Nadasdy's or Rockefeller's. Smearing one's opposition as lunatic, totalitarian, just like the Communists, practitioners of subversion and hate, etc., is not the hallmark of the moderate man. Nor is it the kind of rhetoric we are accustomed to associate with objective discourse. It is instead precisely the sort of thing we expect from those who have been thwarted in partisan objectives, and who have no compunction about blackguarding opponents in the angry aftermath.

Rockefeller's wounded self-interest is too obvious a component of his remarks to need much elaboration. Nadasdy, portrayed by Pearson as an impartial observer, had a stake in the convention less apparent to the casual reader but equally real. Far from being a detached official voicing Olympian horror at mortal vulgarity, he was a bitter-end supporter of the defeated candidate, McDevitt. McDevitt had been Nadasdy's campaign manager in the 1961 Young Republican convention in Minneapolis. For the past 2 years, he served as Nadasdy's chief appointee on the executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation. Prior to this year's contest, Nadasdy gave it as his opinion that McDevitt would be the winner. Presiding over the convention, he did everything within his power to prove his clairvoyance, and insure McDevitt's election. This fact was obvious to anyone at the press table but was unreported in several dispatches pulsating with horror over a rightist terror.

Many reports of the convention, for example, quote Nadasdy's plaint that the screaming and hollering of the delegates was like a nightmare. What is not mentioned is why there was screaming and hollering—namely, the tactics Nadasdy employed throughout the convention to carry it for the liberal faction. As early as Wednesday, June 26, in the contest for national college chairman of the Young Republicans, there was a foretaste of the McDevitt-Lukens wrangle. Nadasdy had plunged into the campaign of liberal-backed candidate Ward White, of Cornell Law School, against conservative Jerry Dickson (immediate past president of the University of Kansas student body) by attempting to control the makeup of the college credentials committee. Officials of the campus group rebelled, with the result that conflicting credentials reports were placed before the assembled college delegates; on two divisions as to which credentials would be accepted, the conservatives won. At that point, certain of defeat, the liberal faction walked out, holding a rump meeting at which Nadasdy presided until a temporary chairman could be chosen.

THE CREDENTIALS GAMBIT

Nadasdy's role in the college election was but a mild augury of his behavior during the convention proper. Peter G. Kohler, chairman of the Wisconsin delegation to the convention, says Nadasdy's strategy became apparent when the report of the credentials committee was presented to the convention. "Nadasdy violated protocol and departed from the published convention program," Kohler says, "by presenting the report of the credentials committee prior to adopting the rules of the convention. The purpose of this maneuver lay in the fact that there were contested credentials, and it was hoped these credentials could be jammed through the convention while the floor was relatively empty. Further, should these credentials have been challenged, no rules had been adopted giving procedure under which to operate. This would give the Chair, and the general counsels, a free hand in manipulating any contest. By catching the opposition unaware, the credentials were passed without contest and the session adjourned."

On the following day, Thursday, June 27, the credentials gambit assumed major importance. A dispute arose as to who should be allowed to vote in the New Jersey caucus. According to an agreement reached by the New Jersey State Young Republicans organization April 19, both delegates and alternates were to vote in caucus at San Francisco to determine the sentiment of the delegation. When it developed this arrangement would produce a conservative majority, the agreement was rescinded—without, according to the conservative argument, correct recourse to parliamentary procedure. The question was therefore brought to the floor of the convention, where Nadasdy ruled the liberal delegates whose status was being challenged could cast New Jersey's vote on the matter. It was not, he said, a question of credentials (the credentials having been eased through the preceding day), and therefore the contested delegation could vote on its own seating. He then declared his ruling "unappealable." That determined the fate of the New Jersey conservatives, and sealed up the delegation for McDevitt. The question of whether the liberal delegates could cast New Jersey's vote was thus decided—by letting the liberal delegates cast New Jersey's vote. New Jersey National Committeeman Richard Plechner, a leader of the conservative forces, says: "The Chair was upheld by 10 votes, including the 21 unit votes of New Jersey in favor of the Chair. It is one of the few instances in our political history that a delegation to any convention could reserve the right to vote on its own seating."

It was this parliamentary novelty, accompanied by much switching off of microphones and playing of the National Anthem, which first aroused conservative ire and led to angry protest on the floor. In the Pearson-Nadasdy account, however, the episode emerges as a pat case of Nadasdy attempting to hold off a horde of maniacs obstructing the "orderly" conduct of the convention. Peter Kohler says: "I assume that when Nadasdy says he desires an 'orderly conducted convention' he means a convention where he rules supreme and he wins."

With New Jersey secure for the liberal forces, the key issue of the convention became the unit rule: Whether unit votes—allowing the majority of a delegation to vote a State's entire delegate strength—could be imposed by a single vote of the delegation, or whether they had to be mandated in advance by the State organization. According to the rules of the Young Republican Convention, the practice of the State group is binding, and unit votes are valid only as they conform to such practice. Attempting to garner additional votes for McDevitt during Friday's balloting, Nadasdy decreed that unit rules were binding even when there was no home-State authorization for them. Massachusetts Chairman Richard Mastrangelo, siding with the Rockefeller forces, attempted the unheard-of procedure of imposing a unit rule between rollcalls. Nadasdy ruled it permissible.

LIBERAL STEAMROLLER

When Lukens backers attempted to protest these rulings, they were refused recognition. When they approached the microphones to speak on an issue, they were sometimes physically prevented from doing so. In cases where they succeeded in breaking through the cordons of "moderates," the mikes, centrally controlled by Nadasdy, were switched off. Thus universally thwarted, the conservatives not unnaturally denounced the rulings of the chair, shouted to make themselves heard, accused Nadasdy of trying to railroad the convention, etc. The alternative would have been to lie down and let the Nadasdy-New York-McDevitt machine roll over them. The cause and effect relationship of liberal steamroller to conservative anger was obvious to anyone who sat through the balloting; no visiting journalist could have missed what was going on, since one of the most hotly contested microphones was directly in front of the press table. Yet horror stories about the convention make no reference to Nadasdy's tactics.

Contrary to the Rockefeller-Nadasdy assertion, protest from the floor was not the work of "rightwing extremists." Robert D. Bell, chairman of the Oregon Young Republicans (the Oregon GOP is headed by middle-of-the-road Gov. Mark Hatfield) gives the following synopsis of Nadasdy's conduct:

> The ruthless parliamentary tactics used by outgoing chairman of the national federation, Leonard Nadasdy, will long be remembered by this writer. This man used his position of power while chairing the convention to rule again and again in favor of his 1961 campaign manager, Charles McDevitt from Boise, Idaho. On the first ballot, he even declared McDevitt elected and then had to rescind this ruling because his candidate did not have a majority of the total delegates present. (Reportedly) Nadasdy, in trying to bring order to the proceedings, muttered to himself, "this is incredible." Observing from the floor Chairman Nadasdy's entire handling of the convention, I concur, this was incredible. Incredible that an officer of a highly respected national organization would indulge in such shenanigans. Incredible that the tone of the convention was set by the fact that the Nadasdy organization hired private police to be present and also insisted upon reinforcements in the form of members of the San Francisco police. This was a vain attempt to intimidate the delegates.

With the convention machinery arrayed against them, the Lukens forces found communications a particularly difficult problem. The difficulty was intensified on the eve of the final balloting, when Lukens headquarters personnel found their phone lines had been cut. (New Jersey conservatives had similarly found their headquarters room broken into and the wires on their mimeograph equipment severed.) On the floor of the convention, the job of coordinating strategy among pro-Lukens delegations assumed Herculean proportions. Large groups of liberal delegates, sergeants-at-arms, and private police (dubbed "rent-a-cops" by conservatives) stepped in at one time or another to prevent Lukens workers from moving about the floor. In contrast, says Young Republicans leader Al Deckard of Indiana, McDevitt supporters had complete freedom of movement. "At times," Deckard asserts, "there seemed to be as many McDevitt supporters from outside our State sitting with our delegation as there were people from Indiana. They were completely commingled with our delegates. Lukens workers, on the other hand, time and time again were singled out and forced to leave the floor. The sergeants-at-arms were definitely partial to the McDevitt forces, and they were about the only people who could gain access to a microphone without using force. The machinery of the convention was completely one sided."

It would be possible, if space allowed, to quote scores of similar complaints. One midwestern delegate says he was approached by a Nadasdy subaltern accompanied by two policemen and three sergeants at arms and asked "whether I would leave the floor quietly." He adds that only by seeking out his State chairman, who was able to produce on the spot written proof of the challenged delegate's legal status on the floor, was he allowed to remain. "In the absence of this proof," he says, "I would have been ejected from the floor." In a scene enacted directly in front of the press table, Massachusetts National Committeeman Michael Robbins was physically restrained by a group of liberals trying to keep him from getting to a microphone. Richard Plechner of New Jersey says that when he approached the Chair to question a point of procedure, after having been refused recognition a half-dozen times, he received a similar reception. Groups of New York delegates roamed the floor in search of Lukens backers suitable for election. Says Peter Kohler: "The only violence I saw close to the Wisconsin delegation was caused by New York delegates, a couple of whom threw some knees or punches in their assignments to 'cover' the opposition and to block the floor organization and movements of the leaders of the opposition." Another midwesterner adds: "Two or three sergeants at arms (appointed by the Nadasdy-controlled convention machinery) continually followed Lukens' floor manager, prior to and during the balloting for chairman, endeavoring to make him leave the aisles and convention floor. It was pointed out to them that the floor manager for McDevitt and Art Richardson (a New York Young Republican leader) were effectively conducting the floor communications for McDevitt and they were being given complete freedom of movement."

As these remarks indicate, a frequent theme of the delegates is the key role played by the partisans of Governor Rockefeller. "The dictatorial tactics," says Michael Robbins, "were all on the Rockefeller side." Indiana Delegate Don Cope adds that "the New York people were allowed to go anywhere they wanted, but Lukens supporters were harassed by sergeants-at-arms whenever they stepped into the aisles. New York delegates surrounded the microphones, trying to keep conservatives from reaching them." Joseph T. Murphy of the Massachusetts delegation gives a virtually identical summary of the New York delegation's performance:

"Mr. Rockefeller said he was deeply disturbed by the 'ruthless, roughshod intimidation and tactics of totalitarianism' at the convention. What was not stated, of course, was that these tactics were utilized primarily by the 41-member New York delegation working in conjunction with the outgoing chairman to prevent the election of a pro-Goldwater chairman. Gangs of New Yorkers surrounded the floor microphones to prevent by physical means legitimate delegates from speaking. These tactics so incensed the delegates that they refused on numerous occasions to allow the chairman to proceed until he sent the New York delegation to its seats and ultimately caused sufficient resentment among uncommitted delegates to swing the election to the preconvention underdog."

The recurring mention of New York's performance makes the Rockefeller pique understandable; clearly, New York prestige and influence had been engaged in behalf of McDevitt's candidacy, and the loss was a painful setback in both categories. From the foregoing, it would appear that if the Governor is truly concerned about improving Young Republican manners, he might have a fatherly talk with some of his own proteges.

TRAGI-COMIC EFFORTS

The end of the first rollcall, despite all these exertions, found McDevitt short of a majority. California Chairman Robert Gaston, who had run as a favorite son candidate, demanded recognition to change his State's vote to Lukens. Nadasdy refused to recognize Gaston, instead announcing McDevitt had been elected. Pandemonium ensued. At last admitting his mistake, Nadasdy proceeded immediately to a second rollcall, still without recognizing California. This time the balloting ended with Lukens in possession of a clear majority. But Nadasdy, who had announced the results of the first ballot with lightning speed, would not give the totals. The ballot was dragged out interminably as State after State was called on for possible changes in its vote (the identical privilege denied to California on the preceding go-round), and as New York staged a tragi-comic polling and repolling of its delegation which changed nothing. During the stall, McDevitt supporters scoured the room for additional votes. After some of this byplay had gone on to no effect except to produce new votes for Lukens, Young Republican Secretary Carolyn Manchester tried to read the tally. Oregon Chairman Bell gives this account of what happened at that point:

"Strangely enough, the police were absent at the precise moment that the national secretary, Carolyn Manchester, from Portland, Maine, needed them to protect her from the irrational outburst of Chairman Nadasdy, in an effort to stop her from announcing the official vote which elected Lukens the winner and defeated the chairman's candidate, McDevitt. She was violently shoved away from the microphone by Nadasdy before she could read the results."

Deckard of Indiana says Nadasdy wrenched Miss Manchester's hand away from the microphone and covered it to prevent her words from being audible. Here, indeed, was the crowning act of "moderation." It was not until several minutes later, after further delay of the game, that Miss Manchester was able to complete her duties as secretary, and declare that Lukens had been elected. The liberals and the Rockefeller forces had tried just about everything, and it wasn't enough. There was obviously nothing to do with the people they had failed to intimidate but smear them as "lunatics."

One ironic aspect of the voting, which is also a good measure of who was in fact using ruthless tactics at the convention: On the second rollcall, a number of votes cast for McDevitt the first time around switched to Lukens. One would imagine that, had the Lukens forces been using Communist or Facist methods, their iniquities would have lost them some votes. Instead, it was Nadasdy's behavior which alienated people formerly on his side. Significantly, the vote changes came from States like Michigan, Rhode Island, and Maine—hardly hotbeds of rightwing extremism. These were not proconservative votes, but simply votes in favor of elementary fairplay. They were lost to McDevitt because of the performance of his patron in the chair.

In sum, it was obvious to anyone on the scene that there was no intimidation being practiced by conservatives; the iron boot was on the other foot. In fact, with the convention machinery so completely in their hands, it is amazing the Nadasdy-New York-McDevitt forces lost. They had come into power only 2 years before; their organization should have been young, resilient, capable of maintaining its dominant position. And they certainly were not hesitant to make use of the advantages they possessed. But in the decisive hour their strategy sagged and fell apart. Obviously, there was something more happening in San Francisco than the collision of two political organizations. The truth is that the groundswell of conservatism, reflected in the overwhelming preference of the delegates for Senator GOLDWATER, was simply not to be contained by the techniques of machine politics.

YAF REPORT

The following is a special article published in Washington Report one of the many publications of Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., the Nation's leading conservative youth political action organization. A large number of the delegates at the San Francisco convention were members of YAF.

The report follows:

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM SPECIAL REPORT—"A VICTORY FOR CONSERVATISM"

As everyone knows by now the National Young Republican Convention held in San Francisco in late June produced the election of Donald "Buz" Lukens of Washington, D.C., as national chairman of the Young Republicans.

From the outset it was clear that this was a conservative Young Republican convention. Both candidates for national chairman, Lukens and McDevitt, worked diligently to establish that each was the most conservative. Lukens, 32-year-old minority clerk of the House Committee on Rules, and Charles McDevitt, 31-year-old State legislator from Boise, Idaho, took stands which were almost identical, and strongly conservative. The only difference between the candidates was in their backing. With some exceptions Lukens got the strong Goldwater States and McDevitt got the Rockefeller States, lead by the New York delegation. While McDevitt took the traditional stand of refusing to endorse any prospective candidate for the Presidency in 1964, Lukens was not so formal. Addressing the New Jersey caucus early in the week he came out solidly for GOLDWATER, though he pledged that if elected chairman he would not use his office to favor any candidate.

WE WANT BARRY

The highpoint of the Young Republican convention was the speech given by Senator GOLDWATER on the evening of June 27. Speaking before more than 3,000 Young Republicans at Longshoreman's Hall (home base of Harry Bridges) the Arizona Senator let go with all guns at the failures of the Kennedy clan. He was repeatedly interrupted with thunderous applause and almost mobbed by enthusiastic supporters after his speech. This Young Republican demonstration of support for GOLDWATER bore out the results of various polls conducted during the convention which showed that GOLDWATER was favored for the nomination by more than 80 percent of the Young Republican delegates.

THE CHAIR RULES

With the convention votes closely divided and all possible pressure being applied by outgoing Young Republican National Chairman Len Nadasdy, of Minnesota, it looked as if McDevitt would win. National Young Americans for Freedom Chairman Bob Bauman had previously looked into McDevitt's background and was assured by reliable sources that McDevitt was a sound conservative, even though his Rockefeller-Eastern backing made him suspect politically. In a brief talk with McDevitt, Bauman discovered that the would-be Young Republican chairman was not for GOLDWATER ("I am not for GOLDWATER or anyone else"). Despite contrary indications McDevitt denied that he was against Young Americans for Freedom but he stated emphatically he would not accept a YAF endorsement in his race for chairman. (Lukens has been a member of YAF since early 1962.)

If any one factor served to make up the minds of undecided delegates it was blatantly partial manner in which Young Republican National Chairman Len Nadasdy presided over the convention sessions. Elected Young Republican national chairman in 1961 at the Minneapolis convention (McDevitt was his campaign manager) Nadasdy billed himself as a "moderate" Nixon man. Few people thought he was capable of the hard nosed parliamentary dictatorship he attempted at San Francisco. Beginning with a dispute over the rules governing the New Jersey delegation and ending with the false announcement that McDevitt had been elected after the first ballot for chairman, Nadasdy left behind him a trail of ridiculous rulings and crass partiality which shocked delegates and observers.

At every turn Nadasdy ignored pro-Lukens delegates who sought recognition from the floor and he would not allow their microphones to be turned one. When the McDevitt strategy demanded it, or when Lukens sentiment seemed to be growing on the floor, Nadasdy ordered music played on a booming electric organ which served to drown any protests against his high-handed conduct. (The organist who so willlingly drowned out the voices of duly elected Young Republican delegates was I. Lee Potter, of Virginia.) At one point Nadasdy allowed such a parliamentary farce to develop that the vice chairman of the California delegation formally apologized to the convention for the rulings being given by the Nadasdy-appointed parliamentarian, Harry Keaton, also a Californian.

DELEGATES SHOUTED "RAILROAD RAILROAD"

The final abuse of the convention came when Nadasdy announced that McDevitt had been elected at the end of the first rollcall, when in fact he was two votes short of a majority. This power play backfired and the resultant protest from the delegates caused Nadasdy to back down and allow a second ballot, but only after much stalling during which McDevitt backers vainly searched for needed votes.

Unable to be recognized by the chairman at any other time, many State chairmen took the opportunity when announcing their State votes tc also denounce the chair for its conduct. When the second rollcall was over Lukens had been elected with a vote of 318 to 305 for McDevitt. One of the decisive boosts for "Buz" was the heavy hand of Nadasdy.

LAUGHING MATTER

One of the comic relief sidelights of the convention was the presence of legmen for Advance, the leftist GOP publication. Few could ignore the ubiquitous presence of sad-faced Bruce Chapman, perennial Harvard boy and Advance publisher, dismayed at what he saw and not sure what was to be done about it. In a feeble attempt at saving a few Young Republican souls from conservatism an Advance table was set up in the Palace Hotel lobby where a few liberal hearties tried to sell their little magazine. In short order the table and the boys disappeared and were not heard from again. Chapman distinguished himself, however, by getting laughed out of a New Jersey Young Republican caucus which was being filmed by CBS news. His offense? Several of the New Jersey delegates recognized him.

TRADITIONAL REPUBLICANS

Despite the hatchet job done on the Young Republican Convention by the liberal press, aided by the cry of extremism raised by ex-chairman Nadasdy and Governor Rockefeller, the truth is that there were no "rightwing extremists" at San Francisco. There were indeed hundreds of young conservatives, many of them members of Young Americans for Freedom and readers of National Review and Human Events. But these are young people who have risen in Young Republican ranks during the past 2 years as part of the very real "wave of conservatism" and certainly not by any sinister design. Their views are the traditional views held by all responsible conservatives in the GOP. These young conservatives are not extremists, unless the principles of the Constitution are extreme. They are sick of the present liberal administration in Washington and just as sick of some "Republicans" who are no better than a diluted version of the New Frontiersman.

EXTREMISTS ON THE LEFT

The most disgusting result of the Young Republican Convention has been the smear job done on the new national chairman, Buz Lukens, conservative Republicans in general, and even against Senator GOLDWATER himself. Ex-Young Republican Chairman Nadasdy lead the parade of those making statements bearing little relation to what really happened at San Francisco. In an interview with the Minneapolis Tribune (which was later quoted as an authority by Nelson Rockefeller) Nadasdy wailed that he was in "a state of shock" over what had happened. He said that the Lukens supporters "used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and furor." All this he blamed on "the radical right."

NADASDY ATTACKS GOLDWATER

Warming to the attack, Nadasdy then went after Senator GOLDWATER. Claiming that he had appealed to the Senator to "restore order" at the convention by calming down the delegates with his speech, Nadasdy alleged that GOLDWATER had betrayed him; "He apparently forgot what he said to me." All he did was to pour gasoline on the flames." This wholly untrue charge was immediately picked up by Drew Pearson and used in his nationally syndicated column to discredit Senator GOLDWATER. Liberal Democrat Congressman DON FRAZIER (who defeated Walter Judd in 1962) found Nadasdy's remarks so tasteful to him that he had them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to see. The national chairman of the Young Democrats, Allan Howe, echoed Nadasdy almost word for word.

THE LARGER GOAL

Whenever a liberal Republican beats out a conservative he immediately calls for "unity." What we are now seeing on a national scale is the reverse side of that coin. A Goldwater victory in the Young Republicans and other signs of growing conservative strength has produced a suicidal desire on the part of the liberal GOP to destroy the party if they cannot rule it. The Republican Party is greater than this clamoring clack and will succeed in spite of them.

Young Republican Chairman Buz Lukens told the Nation that his election was a clear victory for conservatism. With every ounce of effort and determination we can muster in this fight, Young Americans for Freedom will work to allow BARRY, GOLDWATER to make that same statement—on election night, 1964.

Fascist Tactics at GOP Convention

(By Drew Pearson)

NEW YORK.—Behind the tough statement issued by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller against Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and his right wing crusade were some alarming reports regarding Fascist tactics used by Goldwaterites at the recent Young Republicans' convention in San Francisco.

At that convention mob rule broke out, right-wingers tried to seize the gavel of the moderate president, and police had to be called in to restore order when playing the national anthem failed to keep the Goldwaterites standing at attention so they would not rush the rostrum.

The Senator himself, addressing the convention, did nothing to calm the radical right or disassociate himself from the John Birchites behind the Fascist tactics.

"I had told him about the rioting that occurred earlier in the day and asked for his aid in calming the situation," Leonard Nadasdy, retiring president of the Young Republicans told this column. "He promised to try to calm the crowd. But the only mention he made of the situation was to comment about the great spirit of the delegates. It was like pouring gasoline on the flames."

Nadasdy has been president of the Young Republicans for 2 years. The organization has a membership of around half a million and traditionally follows a policy of steering clear of intraparty battles. When Nadasdy tried to continue that policy, rightwing Republicans shouted: "Go back to Russia."

He was trying at that time to enforce a provision in the Young Republicans' constitution that State delegates only may vote in the election of officers, not the alternates. The GOLDWATER backers and the radical right wanted alternatives included under a unit rule provision in order to elect David Lukens, the GOLDWATER candidate.

When Nadasdy ruled this out of order, pandemonium broke loose.

"Several members of the California delegation tried to rush the rostrum in order to take the gavel away," Nadasdy told this column, "but fortunately members of the Pennsylvania and New York delegations, located in front of the rostrum, held them off.

"There were fist fights on the floor," he said. "I've never seen such violence at a political affair. Their goal was to completely confuse everybody. There was screaming and hollering. It was like a nightmare."

Opposing Lukens for the Young GOP presidency was Charles McDevitt of Boise, Idaho, who followed the traditional policy of taking no stand for Goldwater, Rockefeller, Romney, or any other candidate.

Lukens was from Washington, D.C., had been carefully picked by the Goldwater crowd, and campaigned on a John Birch platform, though he states he is not a member. He is for the abolition of the income tax, favors U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations, wants to subjugate the U.S. Supreme Court by adopting a higher court of State justices.

"After observing his first platform," said retiring President Nadasdy, "he seemed to be saying exactly what the Birchites wanted him to say."

Two Republican Congressmen came to San Francisco to help the radical right and the Goldwaterites, Nadasdy said—W. E. (BILL) BROCK, the Chattanooga candy manufacturer who was elected with John Birch support; and JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio. "They spent a great deal of time working behind the scenes to elect the Goldwater candidate," Nadasdy said, "even though it is an accepted fact that regular party members stay out of our elections."

"I want to alert the Republicans as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right; namely, to subvert the Republican Party and seize control," said the retiring president. "The radical right is just like the Communists. They drive good people away."

Word of these rightwing tactics which got back to Governor Rockefeller was one of the reasons he issued his warning blast against Senator GOLDWATER and his operations.

Young GOP Convention Shocked Ex-Leader

(Extension of remarks of Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 9, 1963)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting interview was published in the Minneapolis

Tribune of July 7. Leonard Nadasdy, former national chairman of the Young Republican Federation, reported on the recent Young Republican Convention in San Francisco.

The tactics of those identified by Mr. Nadasdy as "members of the John Birch Society and the radical right" have no place in a responsible political party, either in the junior or senior division. According to the article, these members showed intolerance for the views of others and contempt for the democratic procedures essential to a responsible political organization.

Mr. Nadasdy's comparison of these tactics with those pursued by the Communists is valid. In Minnesota many years ago we experienced these same tactics from a group in our own political party, that time from the left, and successfully defeated them.

It is unfortunate that Senator Goldwater should appear to be the beneficiary of the activity of these extremists. They offer nothing constructive on the American scene, and are evidently embracing the tactics of those whom they profess to oppose.

Complacency will not suffice to meet the threat posed by these extremists. I wish to commend Mr. Nadasdy for his expressed determination to alert the people to the dangers of the Birch Society and the radical right.

The interview follows:

"MOB RULE TACTICS CITED—YOUNG GOP CONVENTION SHOCKED EX-LEADER

"(By Mercer Cross)

"Leonard Nadasdy said Saturday he is 'still in a state of shock' because of the Young Republican National Federation convention in San Francisco, Calif.

"'The whole thing has been very disillusioning for me,' said the immediate past president of the 500,000-member federation.

"Narrowly elected to succeed Nadasdy for the next 2 years was Donald Lukens, 32, Washington, D.C., who campaigned as a supporter of Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, for President.

"Defeated was Charles McDevitt, 30, Boise, Idaho, who took no stand on a GOP presidential candidate. McDevitt had the unanimous support of the 15-member Minnesota delegation.

"McDevitt had the edge going into the Young GOP convention, said Nadasdy, 32, a General Mills public relations man who lives in Plymouth.

"But, he said, Lukens' supporters 'used the old Communist technique of causing a lot of dissension and a lot of furor, at which they were eminently successful.'

"Their purpose, said Nadasdy, 'was to completely ensnarl the convention and confuse everyone. All this was accomplished by screaming and hollering.'

"At the center of the confusion were members of the John Birch Society and the radical right, Nadasdy said.

"Two years ago the Minnesotan was elected chairman as a member of the Young Republicans' moderate faction. As convention chairman this year, he said:

"Rightwing delegates shouted at him to 'go back to Russia.'

"'They made a couple of rushes at the podium to take the gavel away from me.

"'There were fist fights on the floor.'

"At one point the national anthem had to be played to make the delegates sit down, and police were summoned to keep order.

"Radicals distributed scurrilous printed matter attacking Nadasdy.

"McDevitt's hotel room was broken into and campaign literature, two typewriters, and some briefcases were stolen.

"'I've never seen such violence at a Young Republican affair,' said Nadasdy. 'It was like a nightmare to be there.'

"Goldwater appeared at a rally the first night of the convention.

"Nadasdy said he appealed to the Senator to help restore order. Goldwater said he would try to calm down the delegates and would say he supported no candidate for Young GOP chairman, Nadasdy reported.

"'He apparently forgot what he said to me,' said Nadasdy. 'All this did was to pour gasoline on the flames.'

"The Minnesotan made this prediction concerning Goldwater:

"'Unless the Senator starts getting some sane, conservative people around him, he's going to have a very difficult time getting the nomination and being elected.'

"Nadasdy said he has set out on this personal mission:

"'During the coming year I want to try to alert the people, and especially the Republicans, as to the real objective of the John Birch Society and the radical right, which is to subvert the Republican Party and to seize control, rather than just nominate a presidential candidate.'

"Particularly in Minnesota, where Birchers are scarce, said Nadasdy, 'It really worries me. I'm just afraid people aren't going to see the danger. I think we're complacent.'

"The radicals are 'not reasonable,' he said. 'They know what they're doing. They know where they're going. They're extremely dangerous. They're after power for power's sake.'

"And the significance to the senior party?

"'The significance,' said Nadasdy, 'is a word of warning that the national convention in San Francisco next year is going to be one of the toughest ones the party's ever had.'

"'Far-righters spent much time and money to elect their man to lead the Young Republicans,' said Nadasdy, 'and they'll spend 10 times as much to take over the senior party.

"'It's a question whether the party's going to allow mob rule or whether they're going to see an orderly conducted convention.'

"As for Lukens, the new Young Republican chairman. 'He is not a Bircher, but he certainly began to say everything they wanted him to say,' said Nadasdy.

"Lukens campaigned for abolition of the Federal income tax, U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations and a 'court of the union' higher than the U.S. Supreme Court.

"'I'm very concerned about what's going to happen to the organization,' said Nadasdy. 'Only time will tell. I just want to see if Lukens can stand up to the people who elected him.'

"John Birchers at the Young Republican convention were mostly from California, Illinois, and Iowa, with a scattering from other States, Nadasdy said.

"'These people are a minority. They don't even represent one-fourth of the people in our party,' he added."

Statement by Governor Rockefeller, July 14, 1963

Over the past months, many leaders of the Republican Party, myself included, have been working to put the party in a position to face the challenge of the 1964 election as a strong and united fighting force.

A minority party must be united for principle to provide the effective opposition and constructive alternatives that our country sorely needs. It must be united for principle and reach beyond its own boundaries to win. It must be united for principle to command broad support.

The paralysis of government that we are witnessing today in Washington stems from the fact that the Democraic Party is not united for principle, but in effect is two parties of opportunism proceeding in opposite directions.

In making this effort toward unity for principle, it was my conviction that the activities of the radical right, while deeply disturbing in many ways, would represent an inconsequential influence on the Republican Party.

It was my conviction that despite differences in emphasis among the party's responsible elements, there was an overwhelming consensus within the party on the fundamental articles of Republican faith.

In broadest terms, these articles of faith are:

1. Unswerving dedication to the preservation of our own freedom and the extension of freedom throughout the world through a firm, resolute, and positive foreign policy.
2. Equality of opportunity for a better life for all Americans regardless of economic status, geographic location, race, creed, color, or national origin.
3. Faith in our Federal system of government as the best assurance of freedom and equal opportunity and as the only hope of keeping democratic government close to the people and responsive to their will.
4. Faith in the private enterprise system as the dynamic, creative base for social progress in a free society and of freedom of individual initiative without which men cannot be really free or equal.
5. Faith in the fundamental importance of fiscal integrity in government as the indispensable political base for economic growth and the vitally needed expansion of job opportunities.
6. Faith in our heritage of freedom of speech and of information and in the right and need of the people to know all the facts on the issues confronting them as essential to the preservation of a free society.

While as a party and as a people, we have been keenly aware of the grave threat to these principles posed by international communism, I have now come to the conclusion that many of us have been taking too lightly the growing danger to these very same principles through subversion from the radical right.

I am now convinced that, unless the vast majority of Republicans who subscribe to these principles, are aroused from present inaction—whether this inaction stems from complacency, from fear or from a fantastically shortsighted opportunism—the Republican Party is in real danger of subversion by a radical, well-financed and highly disciplined minority.

For it has now become crystal clear that the vociferous and well-drilled extremist elements boring within the party utterly reject these fundamental principles of our heritage. They are, in fact, embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform and its candidates on their own terms—terms that are wholly alien to the sound and honest conservatism that has firmly based the Republican Party in the best of a century's traditions, wholly alien to the sound and honest Republican liberalism that has kept the party abreast of human needs in a changing world, wholly alien to the broad middle course that accommodates the mainstream of Republican principle.

This cannot be allowed to happen. The continuing commitment of the Republican Party to its historic principles, including its fundamental dedication to equality of opportunity for all men, cannot and must not be betrayed. No temptation of political gain through cynical expediency can be permitted to becloud our commitment to principle and purpose.

No one could fail to be deeply disturbed by the proceedings at the recent Young Republican National Convention in San Francisco. I am completely confident that the overwhelming majority of Young Republicans of this country respond today, as they always have, to the idealism of the party's tradition. I am confident that they want it to continue to be a positive and responsible party serving the best interests of all the people.

But every objective observer at San Francisco has reported that the proceedings there were dominated by extremist groups, carefully organized, well financed and operating through the tactics of ruthless, roughshod intimidation. These are the tactics of totalitarianism.

Unfortunately, this cannot be brushed off as irresponsibility. For youth is responsible. The leaders of the Birchers and others of the radical right lunatic fringe—every bit as dangerous to American principles and American institutions as the radical left—who successfully engineered this disgraceful subversion of a great and responsible auxiliary of the Republican Party are the same people who are now moving to subvert the Republican Party itself. They claim initial success and predict ultimate victory for their efforts.

These people have no program for the Republican Party or the American people except distrust, disunity and the ultimate destruction of the confidence of the people in themselves. They are purveyors of hate and distrust in a time when, as never before, the need of the world is for love and understanding.

They have no concern with and offer no solution for the problems of chronic unemployment, of education and training, of housing, of racial injustice and strife, of all the other problems which must have answers if our democratic ideals are to be translated into loving reality.

And in the political sphere, they offer something equally sinister.

Completely incredible as it is to me, it is now being seriously proposed to the Republican Party that as a strategy for victory in 1964, that it write off the Negro and other minority groups, it deliberately write off the great industrial States of the North (representing nearly 50 percent of the country's population), that it write off the big cities, and that it direct its appeal primarily to the electoral votes of the South, plus the West and a scattering of other States.

The transparent purpose behind this plan is to erect political power on the outlawed and immoral base of segregation and to transform the Republican Party from a national party of all the people to a sectional party for some of the people.

No such plan ever has, or ever will succeed. It cannot stand the light of day. It will be rejected out of hand by the Republican Party. It will be rejected by the Nation. It will be rejected by the South.

The South has long pointed out that the racial problem is not a sectional problem, but a national problem. I know that there is southern leadership that wants to participate in a national solution.

A program based on racism or sectionalism would in and of itself not only defeat the Republican Party in 1964, but would destroy it altogether.

The Republican Party is the party of Lincoln. It was founded to make men free and equal in opportunity. It is the party of all men, the only truly national party in America. For that party to turn its back on its heritage and its birthright would be an act of political immorality rarely equaled in human history.

No cloak of so-called States rights can conceal the real purpose behind this strategy. The political rights of States are clear within the Federal system and their realization depends importantly upon the exercise of States responsibilities within that system. But a century ago, a great war decided for all time that in the area of human dignity, States rights must forever yield to the rights of the individual. And so in this area, the invocation of States rights can only be regarded as a pretext.

For the Republican Party, political success cannot be divorced from political morality and the fact is that the party's dedication to the equality of all men is still, and must more than ever before, be its guide to leadership and to victory.

Far from abandoning this dedication, the whole burden of the distinguished 1961 report by Chairman Bliss, of Ohio, was that both the party's greatest challenge and its brightest opportunity lay in its willingness to deal with the great urban problems confronting our Nation, and the people of the cities, especially the minority groups.

The path to victory is not in running away from the people of this country. The path to victory is in seeking out the people in the areas where they live, in accepting the responsibilities of leadership in the solution of their problems and demonstrating to them, as the Republican Party has in many areas, that in it is to be found the will, the sincerity, the competence, and the drive to make this a better land for all its people.

The issue that confronts the Republican Party today is the gravest in its history.

I have no doubt whatever that responsibility, moderation, and sound progress continue to be the spiritual allegiance of the overwhelming majority of the Republicans of this country.

But a complacent majority, or a fearful one, or a majority misled to betrayal of its principles in pursuit of political fantasies will be as surely subverted by militant extremism as such majorities always have been throughout all history.

No Republican can stand by idly in the face of this threat. No Republican can stand aloof from issue that it presents. One must be either for or against these forces. The time for temporizing is over.

Some in the party have already spoken out against this threat. This is a responsibility for all of us. I for one will do everything in my power, working with others to counter the influence of these forces and to defeat their purposes.

For the future of this great Nation lies not in the unprincipled extremism of the radical right any more than it lies in the unprincipled opportunism that has captured the Democratic Party.

It lies in the fiscally responsible, humanely principled mainstream of American thought and leadership that the party of Abraham Lincoln, of Theodore Roosevelt, of Robert Taft has always represented and will continue to represent.

It is said that in the next presidential election, the voters should be given a choice.

I agree.

There must be an alternative to a faltering administration that has suffered a Communist military base to be established 90 miles off our shores—the most visible symbol, but by no means the only one of a general deterioration in our national security and our posture of leadership before the world.

There must be an alternative to an administration that is floundering in its fiscal management, that has been unable to settle on a program, let alone effect a solution, for our stagnant economy and our millions of unemployed.

There must be an alternative for an administration that by inaction has plunged our country into the most soul-searing racial strife of our history.

There must be an alternative. But, in the sound instincts of the American people, that alternative will never be found in a party of extremism, a party of sectionalism, a party of racism, a party that disclaims responsibility for most of the population before it even starts its campaign for their support.

Such an alternative is not a choice but a mockery.

The choice that must be provided to the American people is to be found only in a party of responsible Republicanism, truly faithful to its Lincolnian heritage, truly national in scope, concerned with the opportunity and well-being of every individual citizen and thus commanding the confidence of the country as a whole. Last but not least, it must be responsibly and constructively concerned with the strengthening of this country's leadership of the free world.

The choice as to whether such a party shall be presented to the electorate is a choice for all Republicans. In the days between now and the Republican Convention, where the final decision will be made, that choice and these issues must be submitted to them. I have no doubt as to the outcome. And I have no doubt that out of this process will come the kind of moral strength, the strength of principle, that is needed to win and that is needed to govern.

The Republican Party stands today at the crossroads of its destiny. Its destiny is to save the Nation by first saving itself.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 19, 1963]

POLITICS BY EPITHET

We see that the political commentators are interpreting Governor Rockefeller's long political statement this week as a broadside against Senator GOLDWATER and those who support him for the Republican nomination.

Governor Rockefeller has lent some support for this interpretation, for although in castigating the radical right he mentioned no names, he did remark at a later press conference that he feared Senator GOLDWATER might be captured by his own followers, whatever that means.

Even so, we are reluctant to believe the Governor meant to make a personal attack on the Senator. If so, the statement doesn't speak very well for the Governor and it isn't going to do his party much good.

Not that there was anything exceptional in the general political sentiments Mr. Rockefeller expressed. In listing his articles of faith he said he was dedicated to freedom, equality of opportunity, the Federal system of government, the free enterprise system, the importance of fiscal integrity, and to our heritage of free speech.

We would hardly expect anyone to quarrel with these sentiments. They are also Senator GOLDWATER's, and in the Democratic Party they could be embraced equally by Senator BYRD and President Kennedy. In fact, in Governor Rockefeller's stated philosophy there is very little to distinguish his politics from those of the President.

But this was not all the Governor said. He then went on to cry that these principles are in danger from a "highly disciplined minority" who are out to subvert the Republican Party are who are so strong they constitute a present danger to the Republic as well. The implication is that these powerful people do not believe in freedom, equality of opportunity or any of those other things Mr. Rockefeller listed among his articles of faith.

Moreover, the Governor sees them as no trivial conspirators. "They are embarked on a determined and ruthless effort to take over the party, its platform and its candidates." Already these people—he calls them the "lunatic fringe"—have supposedly subverted the Young Republicans.

Now we have no doubt that the country has its lunatic fringes at both ends of the political spectrum. But the Governor is not just making a commentary; he is making an indictment loaded with words like conspiracy, subversion, and racism.

This is surely a serious indictment, and just as surely calls for a bill of particulars as to what these subversive ideas are, what national leaders are espousing them, and how it happens that this minority is in a position to subvert against its will one of our two great political parties.

No such bill of particulars is forthcoming. Other than showing enthusiasm for Senator GOLDWATER, what did the Young Republicans advocate that is subversive? Which of Mr. Rockefeller's six articles of faith do these plotters plot against? Who are these oh-so-powerful conspirators? You are left to guess.

Personally we find it difficult to believe that Governor Rockefeller really intended his statement to sound the way it seems to. For unfortunately it sounds too much like one of those demagogic speeches of familiar memory in which the orator cries that "they" are organized to take over the country and subvert our freedoms. In such speeches the "they" are never specified. "They" are simply left to hang over the landscape, brooding, ominous, and frightening.

This is always a shoddy way to carry on the public debate. For what divides this country is not its articles of faith; there is universal dedication to the preservation of our own freedom and heritage. The difference is over how best to preserve them. Those who rally to Senator GOLDWATER, just as those who rally to Governor Rockefeller, have their reasons and it is no service to the public discussion to conduct it by epithet.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TALCOTT, for 1 week on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for Friday, August 23, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY), for 45 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SECREST and to include a report of the Projects Committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABELE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1148. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 10, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Ill., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted July 18, 1957, and August 20, 1957 (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

1149. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1150. A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid under section 2672 by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1151. A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 2732(f) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1152. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 12, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Des Moines River at Ottumwa, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee of conference. S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 700). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7497. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7399. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7440. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6260. A bill for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu; with amendment (Rept. No. 703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8224. A bill to provide for the sale, by the Secretary of the Interior, to the surface owners of land of certain mineral interests reserved to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8225. A bill to provide for the sale of the undisposed of lots in the townsite of Pocatello, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 8227. A bill to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 772), providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 8228. A bill designating the corn tassel the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 8229. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to access to and exit from certain portions of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 8230. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 8231. A bill to close ports of the United States to certain vessels while engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 8232. A bill to amend title I, "Tariff Schedules of the United States, of the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962," to correct certain inequities in the classification and duty provided for certain aluminum products, television picture tubes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 8233. A bill regulating the purchase of electric power by the Department of Defense and its agencies and prescribing procedures therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 8234. A bill to supplement the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution with a National Transportation Museum in order to make a complete history of transportation available for the benefit of the people of the United States, and to provide space for a National Visitor and Student Center in order to assist the 7 million people who visit the Nation's Capital each year; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 665. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroads and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Point Reyes National Seashore, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 8235. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 8236. A bill for the relief of Felippo and Giuseppa Raccuglia and minor children, Antonio and Tommaso Raccuglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8237. A bill for the relief of Dr. Keun Ho Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 8238. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8239. A bill for the relief of S. S. Rolfe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Friday, August 23, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in this searching moment we would that the bewildering voices of the world about us and the clamor of wordy arguments be hushed. In the solemn sense of Thy presence, our arrogance is rebuked and our pride of opinion is mocked, as we confess that, at best, we but grope in the darkness; that our knowledge is partial, and our judgments fallible.

We would yield ourselves to Thee as we are, with all our failure, our ignorance, and our self-will, and yet with all the climbing aspirations of our better natures.

Break down the narrow barriers of our minds that shut us out from fellowship and understanding with any of Thy children. Teach us to value beauty of heart or strength of brain in any strand of our common humanity, that we may become workers together with Thee in binding the races of mankind into the perfect unity that will belt the earth with good will when Thy radiant kingdom comes.

In the name of Christ Jesus, our Lord, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Metcalf, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 20, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 20, 1963:

S. 874. An act to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint.

On August 22, 1963:

S. 1032. An act to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended.

REPORT ON FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 18th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period January 1 through June 30, 1963.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *August 21, 1963.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 401(a), Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Chelf, of Kentucky, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Hays, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Denton, Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, Mr. Arends, Mr. Westland, Mr. Lindsay, and Mr. Chamberlain, members of the U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6996) to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Teague of Texas, Mr. Karth, Mr. Hechler, Mr. Martin of Massachusetts, and Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Jolan Berczeller;

H.R. 1742. An act for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H.R. 1759. An act for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton;

H.R. 1874. An act for the relief of Eugene Ahrends;

H.R. 2228. An act for the relief of the estate of Rafaello Busoni;

H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;

H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;

H.R. 2925. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;

H.R. 2928. An act for the relief of Maria Caviris;

H.R. 5583. An act for the relief of Brig. Gen. Fred C. Gray;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension funds as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; and

H.R. 7491. An act for the relief of William L. Berryman.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.;

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Beg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas;

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carte Gallitto;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;

H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith;

H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski;

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;

H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Giazikis;

H.R. 6996. An act to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7824. An act to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Jolan Berczeller;

H.R. 1742. An act for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H.R. 1759. An act for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton;

H.R. 1874. An act for the relief of Eugene Ahrends;

H.R. 2228. An act for the relief of the estate of Rafaello Busoni;

H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;

H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;

H.R. 2925. An act for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased;

H.R. 2928. An act for the relief of Maria Caviris;

H.R. 5583. An act for the relief of Brigadier General Fred C. Gray;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.; and

H.R. 7491. An act for the relief of William L. Berryman.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

George L. Mehren, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Phillip M. Griebel, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard;

David Statler Black, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission; and

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, heretofore the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has objected to the holding of any committee meetings when the Senate is in session. However, I discussed this matter with him a moment ago, in the Committee on the Judiciary, and this request does have his consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency authorized the Subcommittee on Stabilization to conduct hearings outside Washington, D.C., on the so-called Douglas truth-in-lending bill. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has scheduled hearings for today in Pittsburgh and tomorrow in Louisville. I ask unanimous consent that that subcommittee may continue with its hearings while the Senate is in session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the request refer to today?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF RAIL DISPUTE BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps this is as good a time as any to ask the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], whether it is proposed that, if the rail dispute bill is forthcoming from the Commerce Committee, it be made the order of business?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. My distinguished colleague, the majority leader, has so informed me that if the bill is forthcoming from the Commerce Committee, and is filed during the adjournment of the Senate, it will be the order of business; and it is hoped that it can be considered on Monday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF A RAILROAD AT LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER, FLORIDA

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a railroad at the Launch Operations Center, Fla.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Army National Guard Construction Program

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Army National Guard construction authorization program, for the year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 24 of Federal Reserve Act, To Liberalize Conditions of Certain Loans by National Banks

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 371), to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Activities Under Merchant Ship Sales Act

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarter ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Development of a Commercial Supersonic Transport

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Supersonic Transport Development, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a request for proposals for the development of a commercial supersonic transport (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Need for More Effective Management Action in Veterans' Administration Pharmacies

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for more effective management action to reduce costs by filling private physicians' prescriptions in Veterans' Administration pharmacies, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Unnecessary Depot Handling and Transportation Costs by General Services Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecesary depot handling and transportation costs of supply items, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Proposed Amendment of Concession Contract at Statue of Liberty National Monument

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with Evelyn Hill, Inc., Statue of Liberty National Monument (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Central Intelligence Agency

A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, during fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Claims Under Military Personnel Claims Act

A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims under the Military Personnel Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an acompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of the Air Force

A letter from the Acting Administrative Assistant, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Petitions for First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions according the beneficiaries first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Alteration, Reconstruction, or Relocation of Certain Highway and Railroad Bridges by Tennessee Valley Authority

A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 772) providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Ann Slusher, of Tulsa, Okla., favoring the enactment of the President's civil rights legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H.R. 4638. An act to promote the orderly transfer of the Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President (Rept. No. 448).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 277. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year (Rept. No. 450).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1936. A bill authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906 (Rept. No. 451);

H.R. 1135. An act to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock (Rept. No. 453);

H.R. 2671. An act authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va. (Rept. No. 455);

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill. (Rept. No. 454); and

H.R. 7594. An act to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir (Rept. No. 456).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1756. A bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act (Rept. No. 452).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation (Rept. No. 457).

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937, TO ENCOURAGE THE REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 449)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that supplemental views may be filed by midnight Monday, August 26, and that the report be printed, together with the supplemental views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, together with the supplemental views.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we worked long and hard on this dairy bill. The committee voted to report it by the resounding vote of 11 to 4.

The bill will reduce the cost of the farm programs. I believe that over the years the bill will reduce that cost significantly, and also will increase dairy farm income. In my opinion, the bill will have the strong support of dairy farmers throughout the country; in fact, I think we can show that the dairy farmers approve and support the bill. I am convinced that dairy farmers in every State will favor it.

I hope the Senate will consider the bill in the very near future.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. No. 458)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report and minority views will be printed, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILROAD AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 459)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with individual views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report and supplemental views will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2068. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2069. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Carrara Vasile;

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Nina Maria Carmela Fiore;

S. 2072. A bill for the relief of Olinda Di Carlo; and

S. 2073. A bill for the relief of Roza Feuer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. Sparkman, and Mr. Gore):

S. 2074. A bill to amend the Act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 772) providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2075. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the United States Government are free from undue prejudice and preference; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2076. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve Banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2077. A bill to regulate in the District of Columbia rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds, and for certain forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR BURDICK

Mr. METCALF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 187) assigning Mr. Burdick to the Committee on the Judiciary, and excusing him from service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Metcalf, which appears under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. METCALF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 188) assigning Mr. Proxmire to the Committee on Appropriations, and excusing him from service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Metcalf, which appears under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR METCALF

Mr. METCALF submitted a resolution (S. Res. 189) assigning Mr. Metcalf to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and excusing him from service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Metcalf, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE AMBASSADOR AND THE PROBLEM OF COORDINATION"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 190); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate Document the committee print of the Committee on Government Operations, of the Eighty-eighth Congress entitled "The Ambassador and the Problem of Coordination" (a study submitted by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations); and that there be printed six thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PEARSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 191) to authorize certain studies by the Committee on Small Business, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Pearson, which appears under a separate heading.)

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSE TAX

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have discussed with management and employees in the affected industries of hotels, restaurants, and nightclubs the problems created by that portion of last year's tax bill relating to the disallowance of certain entertainment expenses. I am convinced that the measure which was enacted last year is a self-defeating one as far as bringing in revenue to the U.S. Treasury is concerned. The law, which has depressed many businesses and, in fact, ruined some, will cause fewer rather than more taxes to be collected.

In an effort to bring some order out of the chaos created by last year's entertainment expense statute, the industries which have been vitally affected have proposed a bill which I now introduce in the Senate. I believe this bill would go a long way toward creating a stability in the industries dependent upon the spending of money by businessmen for entertainment and certain travel purposes, while, at the same time, the measure would provide the necessary protection against abuses that have existed in this area. I plan to offer this bill as an amendment in the Senate Finance Committee to the omnibus tax bill when it is sent to that committee from the House of Representatives.

I now send to the desk the bill, and an explanation of it, and ask that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week through the close of business on Friday, August 30, so that anyone wishing to cosponsor it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana, and the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2068) to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanation presented by Mr. Long of Louisiana is as follows:

Explanation of Proposed Amendment to Section 274, Internal Revenue Code

The proposed amendment would repeal the limitation of existing law (sec. 274 (b) and (c)) on deductibility of expenses for gifts and combination business and travel, and would establish more reasonable and understandable rules for limiting deductibility of expenses, and for the substantiation thereof, as more fully explained below.

Proposed paragraph (a)(1) would establish two standards for determining the deductibility of expenses for entertainment, amusement or recreation, both of which would have to be met (in addition to the ordinary and necessary requirement) before any such amounts would be deductible:

1. The expenditure, in addition to being an ordinary and necessary business expense, would have to be reasonably designed to further the taxpayer's trade or business. This would not only establish the standard of reasonableness, which is a criterion for other business-expense deductions (such as salaries and wages) but would also require that the expenditure, under all the circumstances of the case, be of such amount and nature as might be expected to further the taxpayer's trade or business. This would rule out expenditures which were lavish and extravagant in amount as well as those which bear only a vague relationship to business purposes.

2. the expenditure could not be for the primary purpose of satisfying the personal, family, or living expenses of the taxpayer or his representative, nor of the recipient of the entertainment, amusement or recreation. This is the element of entertainment expenses to which most of Treasury's objections have been levied. Under the proposed amendment, even though an expenditure were ordinary and necessary and might even be designed to further the taxpayer's trade or business, if it were primarily for satisfying the personal, family, or living expenses of the taxpayer or his representative, or of the recipient of the entertainment, it would not be deductible. And, as is the case of all deductions from gross income, the burden would be on the taxpayer to establish that the expenditure was not for the primary purpose of satisfying such personal, family, or living expenses.

Paragraph (a) (2) would establish similar standards for deductibility of expenses of maintaining or operating an entertainment facility. Maintenance and operating expenses of these facilities are the type of expenditures at which present law is directed, and not unrelated uses, such as a business meal at a country club. The troublesome "primary use" standard of existing law would be eliminated, and a taxpayer would be permitted to deduct expenses to the extent they meet the standards.

Proposed subsection (b) would establish more equitable and more flexible rules for substantiation of travel and entertainment expenses. Precise specifications of elements of recordkeeping would be eliminated from the statute and left to regulations, thus affording more reasonable flexibility in prescribing the nature of records or evidence required in particular circumstances. In the case of reimbursed expenses of an employee, the substantiation requirement would be met if the employee is required to account, and does so account, to his employer. Regulations could, of course, as indeed they did before enactment of section 274, specify what would be deemed an adequate accounting to an employer.

The proposed amendment would render unnecessary the nine exceptions to the disallowance rules, and with them, of course, the uncertainty and confusion surrounding these exceptions. The proposed amendment would abandon the "directly related to" and the "associated with" standards of existing law, concerning which there is abject and total confusion.

TURN PUBLIC SEARCHLIGHT ON CAMPAIGN SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require fuller and more prompt reporting of campaign spending in Federal elections.

American politics has rushed headlong into an era of big campaign spending. Multimillion dollar presidential campaigns and hundred thousand dollar senatorial campaigns are a sure 1964 affliction.

Every candidate for Federal office who faces a contest and has a chance to win next year must have these huge sums spent in his behalf. The immense expense of modern communication media makes this certain.

Laws regulating campaign spending in Federal elections, however, are still back in the preradio days. They are pitifully inadequate for the expensive marvels of a television era.

They are based on the outmoded idea that campaigning is conducted mostly on courthouse steps with speeches before several thousand enthralled listeners, and that the only cost is for the oats and hay for the candidate's horse that brought him into town.

In 1964 those most interested in the elections, including many with a special antipublic interest, will, as in the past, contribute most of the huge sums that will help determine who wins.

Let us make no mistake about it: In every close election, big money is likely to play a decisive part in determining the winner.

My bill does not restrict, impede, or limit contributions. It does throw the cleansing searchlight of public scrutiny on campaign money. It will make it possible for the first time for the voter to know and know before he votes just what interest groups are contributing how much to each candidate.

In general, my bill follows the recommendations made by Professor Alexander Heard in his excellent study of campaign spending for President Kennedy.

Among the bill's new provisions are two proposals not offered in previous similar legislation: The first would cut off all campaign contributions 5 days before the election takes place.

The second would require committees or individuals receiving contributions exceeding $100 to report the name, address and occupation of contributors within 24 hours after receipt of the contribution.

Reports would be open to public inspection. Provision is made in the bill for criminal penalties upon its violation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2069) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, an anomalous situation exists today in our transportation system whereby the sovereign government is free to achieve what the law itself prohibits its citizens from doing. I refer specifically to section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which authorizes the Federal Government to negotiate freight rates with carriers free of all controls and restraints applicable to private shippers. It simultaneously denies the right of any person to obtain redress from these rates. Today I introduce a bill to amend this statute as a means of eliminating the inequities created through the application of one set of rules for the Government and another for private shippers.

Section 22 has come down to us from 1887 with a bilateral association with the land-grant railroads. It is in no way connected nor was it ever intended to be connected with our defense program. It was included in the original act to regulate commerce for a very simple reason: To allow non-land-grant railroads to compete for Government traffic through equalization agreements with land-grant railroads without violating any other sections of the act.

Repeal of the free or reduced rate provisions of section 22 would not stop Government shipping agencies from receiving waivers from the ICC where matters of national security are concerned. The fact remains that the ability of the Government to move its troops and goods in times of national emergency does not hinge upon the existence of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. President, why in 1945, when the last of the land-grant acts were repealed removing any further obligation on the part of carriers to haul Government cargo at reduced rates, section 22 was not repealed also. When the Congress of that year relieved the railroads of their obligation to haul both military and nonmilitary traffic at low rates it should have logically repealed section 22 at the same time. In view of the fact that section 22 was allowed to remain intact, we can only assume that the import of this statute with its impending consequences was not recognized at the time.

Since 1945, the use of section 22 to secure reduced rates on Government freight has grown to astronomical proportions and the consequences have been correspondingly serious. The misuse of section 22 since 1945 has fostered discrimination in private industry which would not be tolerated by the ICC in cases involving commercial shippers. It has encouraged an arbitrary imposition of unequal rates and charges in many cases for substantially the same service. It has allowed concerns to completely bypass the equalizing influence of the ICC thereby offering low freight rates to Government purchasers of transportation, simultaneously with the levying of higher rates on private shippers.

Historically the purpose of most transportation regulation has been to prevent discrimination as created by section 22 which results in uneconomic consequences, detrimental to the sound financial structure of carriers and commercial health of industry. This free-for-all battle for Government cargo has caused rate wars and unwarranted competition which have been wasteful and ruinous to carriers, shippers and to the public. It is a fact that certain carriers dissipate their revenues to disastrously low levels in the race to secure Government traffic. They are completely undeterred by the Interstate Commerce Act and the Commission, and can, if they wish, haul millions of tons of Federal cargo not only at rates below commercial charges but free of all charge regardless of the destructive impact upon the public interest.

My proposal to amend section 22 does not suggest there should be the slightest modification of our Government's sovereign right to economical and expeditious freight service in times of war and peace. On the contrary, I want to maintain our total transportation costs at the barest minimum possible. Also, I have and remain in full accord with our national transportation policy as expressed to the Congress by the President:

> To maintain a transportation system which assures the availability of fast, safe, and economical transportation service without waste or discrimination.

The bill I introduce does not propose to abolish section 22 but rather it provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have the authority to remove any section 22 rate tendered to the Government which subjects any person or locality to unjust discrimination, undue or unreasonable prejudice, or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever. It would also provide that any agency or department of the Government which intends to use a section 22 rate negotiated with a carrier must file its intention with the ICC 15 days previous to the rate's acceptance. This will eliminate the unique and unfair element section 22 ratemaking which allows a supplier to establish his transportation cost factors without his competitors knowing of the freight rates involved. This type of secrecy in freight rate negotiations on Government traffic precludes equal competitive opportunities to bid for the same business. Current regulation requires that carriers file their section 22 rates with the Commission. However, from a practical standpoint the rate is entirely secret as it need not be filed until it is used and even then it may be retroactive.

The basic purpose of transportation legislation and the expressed intent of Congress are therefore being bypassed by the constantly expanding use of section 22. Indicative of the growing concern that encourages me to seek to correct this condition is the thoughtful expression of the distinguished mayor of the city of Detroit, the Honorable Jerome P. Cavanagh. His letter to me of August 6 is clear in its expression and responsible in its suggestion, characteristic of Mayor Cavanagh and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2075) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the U.S. Government are free from undue prejudice and preference, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

CITY OF DETROIT,
August 6, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: Under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, there is a provision for exemption the Federal Government from Government regulation on the shipment of its goods. As a result of this provision, the port of Detroit has not been able to realize its full potential with respect to the shipment of defense goods.

Representative THOMAS ASHLEY has introduced H.R. 4298 which establishes a procedure to assure that no rate will be quoted on shipment of goods which results in unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage to any particular locality, port, port district, gateway region district or territory.

I know you have been very interested in this particular problem and I would appreciate it if you would consider introducing similar legislation in the Senate. The legislation merely establishes a fair and equitable procedure to avoid discrimination in the shipment of Government goods while at the same time it permits affected localities to challenge unfair rates. There is a provision which protects the national security.

I am enclosing remarks by Representative ASHLEY when the House bill was introduced on February 27, 1963.

Very truly yours,
JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

EXTENSION OF CREDIT TO MEMBER BANKS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, AND OTHERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I send the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill introduced by request of the Federal Reserve Board to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD letter addressed to me, of August 21, from Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve System, requesting the introduction of the bill, together with an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2076) to amend the Federal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1963.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Board of Governors recommends the introduction and enactment of legislation that would, in effect, substitute for the present technical and restrictive requirements of the Federal Reserve Act relating to the eligibility of paper for discount or as security for advances by the Federal Reserve banks, a new provision broadly authorizing the Reserve Banks to make advances to their member banks on any security satisfactory to the Reserve banks, subject to limitations, restrictions, and regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors. A draft of a bill that would accomplish this objective is enclosed.

The original Federal Reserve Act authorized the Reserve banks to discount only certain types of paper arising out of actual commercial or agricultural transactions, subject to specified maturity limitation. The concept underlying this limited authority was that the liquidity of commercial banks could be assured only if the loans made by them were short-term and self-liquidating in character. Related to this concept was the assumption that the pledging of such discounted paper by the Reserve banks as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes would serve as the basis for an elastic currency; it was expected that the volume of currency would expand and contract directly in response to the varying credit needs of the economy, as reflected by the volume of short-term borrowing by commercial and agricultural enterprises.

The principle that Federal Reserve credit should be extended only on the basis of short-term, self-liquidating paper was departed from as early as 1916, during the First World War, when the law was amended to authorize the Reserve banks to make 15-day advances to member banks, not only on the security of eligible paper but also on the security of direct obligations of the United States. A more significant departure occurred in 1932, when Congress authorized the Reserve banks to make advances to member banks in exceptional and unusual circumstances on any security satisfactory to the Reserve banks, although at a penalty rate of interest. This authority, at first temporary, was made permanent in 1935, and it is no longer limited to exceptional and unusual circumstances, although such advances continue to carry a penalty rate of interest.

The concept that limitation of discounts to short-term, self-liquidating paper would serve automatically to regulate the volume of Federal Reserve notes in circulation has also been breached by amendments to the law and has been refuted by experience. In 1932, Congress authorized the issuance of Federal Reserve notes on the security of Government obligations in addition to eligible paper and gold. This authority was originally of a temporary nature, but it was made permanent in 1945. The volume of Federal Reserve notes today fluctuates with the changing demands of the economy without regard to the nature of the paper offered as collateral for Federal Reserve credit or pledged as security for Federal Reserve notes.

Each of these legislative changes took place during a period of economic stress that served to make clear the inadequacy of the original framework for Federal Reserve credit extension. The credit needs of American businessmen, farmers, and consumers were evolving in many ways that could not be adequately handled by the old instrument of short-term, commercial-type paper; and the rapid growth of both private and governmental economic activity generated credit requirements far in excess of those that could be supported by the relatively small volume of eligible paper.

Despite changes in the character of paper held by commercial banks and the repeated and necessary departures from the original concept that discounts should be based only on short-term, self-liquidating paper, the law continues to impose unduly restrictive requirements as to the nature and maturity of the paper that may be discounted by the Reserve banks or offered as security for advances by the Reserve banks.

For many years, it has been generally recognized that the concept of an elastic currency based on short-term, self-liquidating paper is no longer in consonance with banking practice and the needs of the economy. It has long been apparent that the narrow requirements of the law regarding eligible paper serve no useful purpose and that it would be preferable to place emphasis on the soundness of the paper offered as security for advances and the appropriateness of the purposes for which member banks borrow. The 1-year paper of many bank customers that is not now eligible for discount may be as satisfactory collateral as the 90-day notes of other customers. Moreover, the nature of the collateral provides no assurance that the borrowing bank will use the proceeds for an appropriate purpose.

As long as member banks hold a large enough volume of Government securities, they need not, of course, be particularly concerned as to the eligibility for discount with the Reserve banks of customers' paper held by them. Since World War II, however, there has been a sharp net decline in the aggregate holdings of Government securities by member banks. If any substantial increase in economic activity should cause banks to reduce their holdings of Government securities in order to meet increased credit demands, many banks would be obliged to tender other kinds of collateral if they should seek to obtain Federal Reserve credit.

If such a situation should develop, the Reserve banks could accept technically ineligible paper as collateral for advances to their member banks only under section 10 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act at a rate of interest one-half of 1 percent above the regular discount rate. However, the necessity for distinguishing between eligible and ineligible paper would give rise to cumbersome administrative procedures that are not warranted by the exigencies of current banking conditions. In order to avoid these problems, it would clearly be preferable to move in advance and to revise and update the law so as to eliminate the existing restrictions with respect to eligible paper.

The Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve banks believe that such a revision of the law would be desirable so that the Reserve banks will always be in a position to perform promptly and efficiently one of their principal responsibilities—the extension of appropriate credit assistance to member banks to enable the latter to meet the legitimate credit needs of the economy.

Accordingly, the Board urges that legislation of the kind here proposed be given favorable consideration by your committee and by the Congress. In addition to the draft bill, there are enclosed a section-by-section explanation of the bill and a document showing the changes that would be made by the bill in provisions of present law.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED BILL REGARDING ADVANCES BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

In general, the first section of this bill would confer upon the Federal Reserve banks broad authority to make advances on any satisfactory security; and the remaining sections of the bill are largely of a conforming nature.

Section 1: A new section 13A would be inserted in the Federal Reserve Act. It would authorize any Federal Reserve bank to make advances to any of its member banks on the note of the member bank secured to the satisfaction of the Reserve bank, subject to such limitations, restrictions, and regulations as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe. In making such advances, the Reserve bank would be required to give due regard to the "maintenance of sound credit conditions and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture" and to keep itself informed as to the character and amount of the loans and investments of its member banks, with a view to determining whether undue or inappropriate use is being made of bank credit for speculative purposes or for purposes inconsistent with the maintenance of sound credit conditions. These requirements are substantially the same as those now prescribed by the eighth paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act.

In addition to advances to member banks, the Reserve banks would be authorized to make advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations on the security of obligations of the United States, an authority similar to that now contained in the last paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, although the new authority, like that with respect to advances to member banks, would not specify any maturity limitation. As under present law, the authority to make advances to corporations would cover advances to nonmember banks.

Section 2: Because they would be superseded or rendered obsolete by the authority conferred by the new section 13A, the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act hereafter described would be repealed.

Section 10(a) of the act (12 U.S.C. 347a), enacted in 1932, authorizes advances to groups of five or more member banks. This authority has never been utilized and would be unnecessary in the light of the new authority.

Section 10(b) (12 U.S.C. 347b), containing authority for advances to member banks on any satisfactory security but at a one-half-of-1-percent penalty interest rate, would likewise be rendered unnecessary by the new legislation.

Section 11(b) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248 (b)), authorizing the Board of Governors to permit or require a Federal Reserve bank to rediscount the discounted paper of other Reserve banks, has not been used since 1933 and is of no practical importance today.

The 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 10th, and 13th paragraphs of section 13 of the act (12 U.S.C. 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 361, and 347c, respectively), contain the basic provisions of present law regarding discounts and advances by the Federal Reserve banks. These provisions limit eligible paper to paper "issued or drawn for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes, or the proceeds of which have been used, or are to be used, for such purposes"; provide emergency authority (never used) for the discounting of eligible paper for individuals, partnerships, and corporations; authorize the discounting of sight drafts in certain limited circumstances; authorize the discounting of bankers' acceptances and "dollar exchange" acceptances of the kinds described in paragraphs 7 and 12 of section 13; limit the amount of paper of one obligor that may be discounted for a member bank; authorize advances (as distinguished from discounts) to member banks secured by Government obligations or eligible paper; provide for the regulation of discounts by the Board; authorize advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations on the security of Government obligations; authorize the discounting of agricultural paper, paper held by Federal intermediate credit banks, and paper of cooperative marketing associations; and provide that certain types of real estate loans by national banks shall be regarded as commercial paper for discount purposes. All of these provisions would either be superseded or covered by the new section 13A added by section 1 of the present bill.

Section 3: The eighth paragraph of section 4 of the act (12 U.S.C. 301) presently requires each Federal Reserve bank to consider the maintenance of sound credit conditions and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture in extending credit to member banks, and to keep itself informed regarding undue uses of bank credit for speculative purposes; and the Board of Governors is authorized to suspend any member bank from access to Federal Reserve credit for any such undue use of bank credit. These provisions would be retained in substance in the new section 13A. Accordingly, the similar provisions of section 4 would be repealed, so that the eighth paragraph of that section would provide only—as it does now—that the board of directors of each Federal Reserve bank shall administer its affairs "fairly and impartially and without discrimination in favor of or against any member bank or banks."

Section 4: The 13th paragraph of section 9 of the act (12 U.S.C. 330) would be amended to repeal the proviso limiting the amount of paper of one obligor that may be discounted for any member bank. This limitation, like the similar limitation in section 9 of the act, appears unnecessary in view of the fact that most State laws limit the amount of loans that may be made to one borrower by State banks, in terms similar to those applicable to national banks under section 5200 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 5: The last sentence of section 11(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248(c)), regarding the addition to the discount rate of any tax paid by the Reserve banks on deficiencies in their reserves against Federal Reserve notes, would be modified to refer to the interest rate charged on advances under the new section 13A.

Section 6: The language of the last sentence of section 11(m) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248(m)), regarding suspension of rediscount privileges for certain increases in loans secured by stock or bond collateral, would be conformed to refer to suspension of use of the credit facilities of the Federal Reserve banks.

Section 7: The provision of section 12 of the act (12 U.S.C. 262), authorizing the Federal Advisory Council to make recommendations in regard to discount rates and rediscount business, would be changed to refer to advances under the new section 13A and interest rates on such advances.

Section 8: The first paragraph of section 14 of the act (12 U.S.C. 353) would be amended to eliminate a reference to paper eligible for rediscount and, at the same time, to omit a reference to regulation of Federal Reserve bank open market operations by the Board of Governors, a function that has been subject to regulation since 1935 by the Federal Open Market Committee.

Section 9: A conforming change would be made in section 14(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 356) to eliminate a reference to paper arising out of commercial transactions, as hereinbefore defined.

Section 10: Section 14(d) of the act (12 U.S.C. 357), relating to the fixing of discount rates, would be amended to refer to interest rates under the new section 13A. At the same time, this provision would be broadened to authorize the fixing of different rates, not only for different classes of paper, but also according to such other basis or bases as may be deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of this provision. The amended provision would also include separate authority as to rates on advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations under subsection (c) of the new section 13A.

Section 11: The provision of section 16 of the act (12 U.S.C. 412) authorizing the use of paper acquired under section 13 as security for Federal Reserve notes would be modified to refer to notes of member banks or others acquired under the provisions of [the new] section 13A of this act.

Section 12: The provision of section 19 of the act (12 U.S.C. 463), prohibiting member banks from acting as agents for nonmember banks in obtaining Federal Reserve discounts, without the Board's permission, would be conformed to refer to advances instead of discounts.

Section 13: A provision of section 23A of the act, relating to security for loans to affiliates of member banks, would be conformed to eliminate a reference to drafts eligible for rediscount.

Section 14: A provision of the act of July 21, 1932 (12 U.S.C. 1148), authorizing agricultural credit corporations to rediscount eligible paper with the Federal Reserve banks, would be repealed.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE RATES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this is the model bill proposed by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie over until a week from today for such additional cosponsors as may wish to join.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 2077) to regulate in the District of Columbia rates for all forms of casualty insurance, including fidelity, surety, and guaranty bonds, and for certain forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 187), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is relieved from service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, also on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 188), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is relieved from service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, also on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 189), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is relieved from service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, many persons in different parts of our country were displaced from Yugoslavia as a part of, and as an aftermath of, World War II. In that operation, they lost their property. Subsequently, they came to this country and became citizens of the United States.

The United States concluded with the Yugoslav Government, an agreement whereby the Yugoslav claims settlement commission for the handling of specific claims was created. But it appears that it has taken the position, and our representatives also have taken the position, that since these persons were not citizens of the United States, no valid claim could have been preferred. Now they have become U.S. citizens; but they were dispossessed of their property.

This situation comes to mind in connection with the Foreign Assistance Act, which is Senate bill 1276, under which I am fairly sure that certain benefits—whether in the form of loans or in the form of grants—might be made available to Yugoslavia. It is a singular thing that out of the tax moneys of the people of this country, including those of the various claimants whose claims have been unsatisfied, we would propose such payments—not urge the Yugoslav Government to do something about these claims, but mandate them and, in fact, provide that there shall be no assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, unless and until the President determines that such Government has made an acceptable arrangement for the payment of claims arising out of the nationalization or other taking by such Government of property of persons who are now citizens of the United States, on the date of the enactment of this act.

In any case, such persons were not citizens of the United States on the date of the nationalization or taking of such nationalization or other taking occurred subsequent to July 19, 1948.

Mr. President, I have a more extended memorandum to submit in connection with this matter. In addition, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to Senate bill 1276, to be called up when that bill comes to the floor for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

BACKGROUND OF YUGOSLAV CLAIMS

All claims arising from the nationalization or other taking of property owned by American citizens in Yugoslavia between September 1, 1939, and July 19, 1948, are considered to have been fully settled by the payment made to the United States under the Pecuniary Claims Settlement Agreement between the United States and Yugoslavia of July 19, 1948. These nationals with valid claims to compensation for the loss of property during the cited period were obliged to file claims with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission before the termination of the program on December 31, 1954.

The State Department reports that while it is sympathetic toward those unfortunate individuals who were not American citizens at the time their losses occurred, the United States, in accordance with the well-established principle of international law and practices, espouses private claims against another nation only where the claimant was a national of the United States at the time the claim arose. The Yugoslav Claims Settlement Agreement excludes from the settlement of claims individual nationals of the United States who did not possess such nationality at the time of the nationalization of their property.

Article 3 of the agreement provides that such claims are subject to compensation by the Yugoslav Government, either by direct negotiations between that Government and the respective claimants, or under compensation procedures prescribed by Yugoslav law. It is clear from this provision that there is no obligation on the part of the Yugoslav Government toward the United States with respect to so-called article 3 claimants. Similarly, there is no obligation on the part of the United States toward such claimants. The matter of payment of these claims is for settlement between the claimants and the Yugoslav Government.

The United States has not disinterested itself in the fate of such claimants, and it has urged the Yugoslav Government on different occasions to preserve the rights of claimants who were not American citizens at the time their losses occurred. The United States cannot do more than urge.

In May 1962 the State Department announced that the United States and Yugoslavia have agreed to begin negotiations with a view to settling claims of American citizens against Yugoslavia for the taking by Yugoslavia of their property under the nationalization law of December 1958, and other measures of the Yugoslav Government. The claims to be included in the negotiations are those which have arisen since July 19, 1948, the date of the last settlement between the two Governments.

When the amendments to the War Claims Act were before the Senate in the fall of 1962, a provision was included to include claimants who were not citizens of the United States at the time of their losses. This was eliminated in conference.

The Senate receded, "with the understanding that in the event there remains a balance in the war claims fund after the payment in full of claims provided for under the bill, consideration would be given to legislation providing for payment to these categories of persons. The committee of the conference recommended that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission should proceed to make an estimate of the amount of claims that would be involved." (H. Rept. 2513, 87th Cong.)

WHY SHOULD THE U.S. AID PROGRAM BE PAYING DUTY ON THE PRODUCTS OF ITS LOANS AND GRANTS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate referral, an amendment to S. 1276, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

My amendment is simple. It is designed to correct what I consider an abuse which has occurred in some of the countries receiving foreign economic assistance grants and loans. In some of the countries, articles purchased in this country with U.S. dollars loaned or granted to those countries under our AID program, are subject to customs or other import duties when imported from the United States into those countries. In effect, those countries are diverting a portion of our aid dollars away from their economic development and into paying for the general operating expenses of the governments of those countries.

In effect, this is hidden partial underwriting of the budgets of those countries in a manner determined by them and not by the United States. If we are giving development grants or loans to a particular nation, every dollar of that grant or loan should be applied to the particular project aided. We should not permit a single dollar of it to be diverted, in this indirect manner, to any other uses decided upon by the government aided.

In order to give my colleagues an opportunity to join with me in this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record, and lie at the desk until the close of business August 30, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 302. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(1) No loan or grant shall be made under any provision of this Act to any country, or to any recipient therein, unless such country shall have agreed to exempt from all customs duties or other import taxes levied by such country any articles procured in the United States or any of its territories with the proceeds of such loan or grant, including any amounts thereof loaned by the original recipient to borrowers within such country'."

NO U.S. AID FOR GOVERNMENTS THAT WAGE OR WOULD WAGE AGGRESSIVE WAR

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 1276, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

This too is a simple amendment. The amendment would cut off foreign economic assistance to any nation which is arming itself for aggression against any nation which we also are aiding.

We find in the Middle East an extremely explosive situation. Egypt is engaged in an arms race seeking to make itself militarily capable of carrying on an aggressive war with its neighbors. In fact, at this very moment, more than 28,000 Egyptian troops are fighting in Yemen, and have been kept there despite promises to the United States to remove them. While the United States under its aid program is pouring millions of dollars into Egypt to build up its economy and relieve its people's poverty the Egyptian Government is squandering millions in an aggressive war in another country. Yet we continue to give Egypt foreign economic assistance, thus freeing Egypt's normal resources for diversion into arms bartered from Communist nations.

But the situation is worse than this.

Because Egypt is arming itself, its neighbors against which it has openly made threats must divert much needed revenues from their economic development into arms. We are aiding Jordan with many millions. We have aided Israel substantially to assist in its economic development. Israel and Jordan would need far less if they were not forced by Egypt's arming of itself to do likewise.

The amendment which I am offering was adopted in the other body yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be printed at this point in my remarks and lie on the desk until the close of business on August 30, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18 insert the following new section:

"Sec. 302. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

" '(1) the United States,

" '(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

" '(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act'."

TRANSFER OF EXECUTIVE POWER OF PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JACKSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF AGING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2000) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration of Aging."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RAILROAD DISPUTE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] be added to the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102 submitted by the junior Senator from California [Mr. Engle].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of August 8, 1963:

S. 2031. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to urban conservation and development, the provision and improvement of housing, the availability of mortgage credit, and for other purposes: Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Ribicoff.

Authority of August 15, 1963:

S. 2053. A bill to provide for the acquisition of rights-of-way for canals and ditches: Mr. Burdick, Mr. Engle, and Mr. McGee.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 15, 1963, the names of Mr. Inouye and Mr. Keating were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submitted on August 15, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—S. 810 AND S. 811

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I announce that on September 17, 18, and 19, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on S. 810, a bill entitled "Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1963," and S. 811, a bill entitled "Home Mortgage Corporation Act." The hearings will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. each day.

All persons wishing to testify should contact Mr. Carl A. S. Coan, staff director of the subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

TIGHTER REIN ON FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an article appearing in the Evening Star of August 21 gives rise to the hope that President Kennedy, at long last, may be taking a second look at some of his economic advisers' theories that getting the economy moving is predicated upon continued deficit spending.

Staff writer Garnett Horner notes that the President, in a letter to Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, has promised a tighter rein on Federal spending in striving toward the long-range goal of a balanced budget. It is too bad that the President made the promise contingent upon approval of his tax-cutting program. He should have called for spending cuts first. But at best this is a long-overdue awakening by this administration to the peril of persistent deficit spending.

Every taxpayer welcomes the words of the President as set out in the sixth paragraph of this article:

> Tax reduction must also be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need.

In a letter to President Kennedy last March 19, six members of the Joint Economic Committee recommended this same step. I would like to quote from that letter:

> We should not, however, pin all of our hopes for ending our chronic deficits on the possibility of rapidly rising tax revenues. It is clear that hard thought must be given to the other side of the ledger—to controlling rapidly increasing Federal expenditures. We do not suggest an across-the-board cut in Federal spending. In view of the Nation's domestic needs and international and security commitments, such an approach would be self-defeating. What we should seek, however, is a reform of Federal expenditure policy so as to effect important savings without impairing the national interest or retarding economic growth. Indeed, thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures can increase our national security and stimulate our economic growth. In view of these considerations, we believe that Federal expenditure policy requires thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination. Support for the principle of tighter control and more effective use of Federal expenditures is virtually unanimous; support for specific suggestions for achieving it is more difficult to attain. The difficulty of the task, however, should not deter us from making the attempt.

It is heartening that our Nation's leaders finally may have recognized this need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Kennedy Vows To Trim Spending After Tax Cut," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 21, 1963]

KENNEDY VOWS TO TRIM SPENDING AFTER TAX CUT

(By Garnett D. Horner)

President Kennedy today promised a "tighter rein" on Federal spending in striving toward the long-range goal of a balanced budget after Congress approves his tax-cutting program.

The President warmly indorsed the two-step tax reduction and revision program voted by the House Ways and Means Committee in a letter to Chairman Mills, and he emphasized that "it is most important now that the bill be enacted this year as rapidly as possible."

He wrote Mr. Mills after telling his press conference late yesterday that the Nation's economy is "good" now, running slightly better than his experts estimated in January, but that the tax bill should be passed this year "if we are going to see 1964 another good year."

LISTS FIVE INTENTIONS

Seeking to reassure some Members of Congress who have called for cutting Government spending if taxes are reduced, the President outlined five "intentions" in his letter to Mr. Mills:

1. "Our long-range goal remains a balanced budget in a balanced full-employment economy. It is clear that this goal cannot be achieved without a substantial tax reduction and the greater national income it will produce."

2. Tax reduction must also "be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need."

SMALLER DEFICIT SEEN

3. As the tax cut becomes fully effective "and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased tax revenues will be applied toward a reduction in the transitional deficits which accompany the initial cut in tax rates."

4. Assuming a loss of revenue of $5 billion more in fiscal year 1965 than in fiscal 1964 under the tax-cutting program, the President said he expected his fiscal 1965 budget to call for a deficit of less than the $9.2 billion forecast for fiscal 1964.

5. Any increase in the Federal debt resulting from transitional deficits "will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product, and thus the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced."

Mr. Kennedy said the program voted by the House committee "will provide much needed jobs for our economy, increase our rate of economic growth, promote balance in our international payments and benefit the individual and corporate taxpayer."

CALLS ON BUSINESSMEN

In urging rapid passage, he said businessmen whose investment plans are keyed to this program should be certain that both steps will become fully effective by January 1, 1965. The committee-approved bill calls for tax cuts in two steps, the larger in 1964.

The President emphasized that the "surest way" to get away from budget deficits is quick passage of the tax reduction program because it will result in greater tax revenues to the Government as a result of increased national income spurred by tax reductions.

The President also wrote Chairman Mills that he sees "no reason for placing any conditions or contingencies on the effectiveness of the second phase of the tax-reduction program."

THANKS CHAIRMAN

On the other hand, he said, any delay or contingent feature would substantially reduce effectiveness of the legislation in stimulating the economy, and this could lead to less revenue than expected.

He promised continued efforts to "improve governmental efficiency, promote economy, and prune expenditures."

The President said increases in the number of Government civilian workers are being held below the increases in workload. He noted that civilian expenditures for the 1963 fiscal year ended June 30 were reduced nearly $2 billion below January estimates, and cuts in the fiscal 1964 budget have been recommended by him since it was submitted in January.

Expressing his appreciation to Chairman Mills and all other members of the House Ways and Means Committee "for your long and constructive labors in formulating a new tax bill," Mr. Kennedy said, "I hope that you will find as strong bipartisan support for this tax reduction program on the House floor as you did in the Ways and Means Committee."

EXPRESSES CONFIDENCE

At his press conference, the President said he could not see why Congress could not stay in session long enough to pass both the tax and civil rights bills.

He also asserted confidently that America's balance-of-payments problem—arising from more dollars going abroad than are coming in—will be conquered "by one means or another."

When asked how the economy is going, Mr. Kennedy replied: "I would say good."

He added that Federal Reserve Board statistical comparison, using the 1957–59 base as 100, has risen to 127 now from 119 in January.

A reporter had asked the President about talk on Capitol Hill that it might be a good idea to postpone action on both the tax and the civil-rights bills until the next session starting in January.

The President remarked that if the tax bill were started all over again in January, it might be May or June or July of next year before it got to a vote, and asked: "What would happen to the economy in the meanwhile?"

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Payments Deficit at $5 Billion High," Eileen Shanahan, published in the New York Times on August 20, 1963, and an article entitled "Floating the Dollar," by the distinguished columnist Harry J. Taylor, datelined London, and published in the Fort Dodge Messenger on August 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 20, 1963]

Payments Deficit at $5 Billion High

(By Eileen Shanahan)

Washington, August 19.—The U.S. balance-of-payments deficit reached an annual rate of $5,200 million in the second quarter of this year.

The deficit surpassed, by a thin margin, the previous records for a single quarter, set in the final quarters of 1961 and 1962.

Administration concern over the worsening balance-of-payments picture was made known by President Kennedy in a special message to Congress a month ago. The second-quarter figure, however, was far larger than he or any other official had indicated.

The increase in the deficit in the second quarter amounted to an annual rate of $2 billion. Almost the entire increase was traceable to increased flows into foreign hands of American capital of all types, both short-term and long-term.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES

The balance of payments measures the difference between what Americans, including the Government, spend, lend, and invest abroad and what they take in from all foreign sources. The United States has run a deficit in its international balance of payments every year since 1957.

The second quarter figures for the balance of payments made public today by the Department of Commerce are preliminary estimates and contain little detail. They do not reveal the precise nature of the outflow.

It is not possible, for example, on the basis of the preliminary figures, to distinguish between American capital that went into foreign securities and that which represented so-called direct investment in the assets of companies operating overseas, either American or foreign-owned.

Nor was it possible to identify bank loans as a separate component of private capital outflow.

The key item in President Kennedy's new program for dealing with the balance-of-payments deficit is a tax ranging up to 15 percent on American purchases of long-term foreign securities from foreigners. It is designed to discourage such securities purchases and would not affect either direct investments or bank lending to foreigners.

Even the sketchy preliminary figures revealed clearly that increased purchases of foreign securities by Americans had contributed importantly to the increase in the deficit in the second quarter.

Statistics on newly issued foreign securities, which were available, showed that $500 million of these had been sold to Americans in the second quarter. Nearly $1 billion worth was sold in the first half of the year. The first-half volume was "not much less than for the year 1962 as a whole," the Commerce Department said in releasing the figures, and was "almost double the amounts purchased in each of the years 1960 and 1961."

The House Ways and Means Committee will begin hearings tomorrow on the President's proposed foreign securities tax. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon will be the lead-off witness.

There were indications that the Commerce Department had been asked to rush the preliminary figures so that Mr. Dillon might discuss them and use the big jump in the deficit in the second quarter as an argument against congressional delay in approving the tax.

The one bright spot in the balance-of-payments report for the second quarter was the trend in U.S. foreign trade.

The balance of trade—the amount by which exports exceeded imports—rose by an annual rate of $1,200 million in the second quarter.

The Commerce Department noted, however, that the dock strike of January had kept both exports and imports at lower than normal levels in the first quarter, and that this factor accounted for part of the improvement. Eliminating the effects of the dock strike from the figure would have reduced the second quarter improvement in the trade surplus to around $400 million, the Department indicated.

Another negative factor in the second quarter balance of payments was the rise in Government grants and loans for foreign countries.

The second quarter balance-of-payments deficit exceeded the records established in the final quarters of 1961 and 1962 by only about $100 million. In both of those quarters, freakish factors were thought to be at work, among them movements in bank funds that are peculiar to the final quarter of the year and the effects of special Canadian financial problems in both years.

The actual annual U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, for an entire year, reached a peak of $3,800 million in 1960. It then declined to $2,400 million in 1961, and to $2,200 million in 1962.

A major portion of the improvement was, however, attributable to special arrangements the United States made with European governments—to make advance repayments on certain loans, to purchase equipment for their armed forces in this country and to buy some specially issued U.S. securities. These payments, which were recorded as income to the United States in the balance-of-payments figures, reduced the reported deficit.

In today's announcement of the second quarter balance-of-payments figures, the Commerce Department computed all back figures and the present ones as though no such special payments had occurred.

The change added $100 million to the reported second-quarter deficit, putting it at an annual rate of $5,300 million. But it also made the deficits of earlier years look larger, and therefore, the deterioration this year look less severe.

On the basis that the Government has now apparently decided to use, the 1960 deficit remains at $3,900 million, but the 1961 deficit becomes $3 billion and the 1962 deficit is $3,600 million.

The deficit in the first quarter of this year, on the new basis that excludes special payments, becomes $3,600 million instead of the $3,200 million reported earlier.

Floating the Dollar

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In contrast to his statements last week at home, President Kennedy gave the impression abroad on his recent trip that the United States is seeking an escape from balance-of-payments disciplines by pumping air into Western European currencies and floating the dollar off with them. The effect was, and remains, lethal.

This dodge away from discipline would take the form of a supranational credit-creating institution to ease the financing of the red-ink deficits in the U.S. balance of payments.

Competent European listeners like West German Economic Minister Erhard, who will succeed Chancellor Adenauer, were reportedly appalled. Moreover, President De Gaulle promptly received every detail about Mr. Kennedy's trial balloon.

Mr. Kennedy acknowledges that all free world currencies are anchored to the dollar. His current and past statements express all-out defense of the free convertibility of gold and the dollar as the cornerstones not only of U.S. monetary policy but of the entire international financial system.

Mr. Kennedy repeatedly pledges they will remain so. But Fort Knox is gone with the wind now and Mr. Kennedy knows that Chancellor Adenauer and President De Gaulle between them control such a large call on our depleted gold that they could make his pledge meaningless any moment they chose.

Far from doing this, both have cooperated in supporting the dollar for their own nations' benefit and that of the free world as well as of the United States.

But if President Kennedy is going to keep up his overspending and thus force himself to fly the dollar off into the wild blue yonder they realize that the sooner they protect their central banks by calling for gold the better.

In the financial world news spreads at the speed of sound. His trial balloon traveled that fast over here. Nothing could be calculated to put a worse strain on international confidence in the dollar. The result is premonitory; it helps to create or intensify the very consequences it fears.

Informed European officials know time is running out on Mr. Kennedy for any possible orderly correction of the payments deficit and the discipline necessary for a balanced U.S. budget.

They view the present outlook in the light of his statements of the past. They know his several claims of improvement in the payments deficits comparing 1962 to 1960, were merely what the British here call "cooking the books."

In truth, the "improvement" was chiefly through unsustainable short-term gains such as extraordinary (requested) prepayments to Washington by foreign governments totaling $700 million—$250 million foreign exchange earnings through special U.S. Treasury borrowings in foreign currencies and $470 million advance payments by West Germany and others over here for military equipment.

Also, exclusive of Government-financed exports, our trade surplus fell from $2.8 billion in 1960 to $2 billion last year and net private long-term capital outflow climbed from $2.1 billion to $2.5 billion. The "improvement" simply wasn't an improvement, as claimed, nor is the present description of the deterioration the full story.

Responsible men over here pay attention to the facts. They remain properly unimpressed by last week's change in the discount rate so long as budgetary fundamentals remain undisciplined.

As part of this approach, they see the New Frontiersmen still trying to bless their own "planned deficits." That's the kind of talk you'd expect from a banana republic, not the No. 1 nation in the world.

For Adenauer knows the importance of sound finance. He also knows the President's chief economic adviser, Walter W. Heller, is utterly discredited in Europe.

West Germany's remarkable recovery dates entirely from the Erhard currency reform (1948) that established a sound German mark. As Internal Finance Adviser to the U.S. Military Government in Germany in 1948 Heller opposed this. He pushed his Heller plan of "planned deficits" which President Kennedy has adopted for the United States today: completely repudiated by Adenauer and Erhard alike a full 15 years ago.

President de Gaulle also sees the importance of sound finance. It revitalized France.

Responsible European leaders cannot be expected to believe Mr. Kennedy is effectively grappling with America's crisis until he fires Dr. Heller and turns away from the Balkan-like economics such advisers represent.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, those articles point up the importance of doing something about our continuing deficit spending. They indicate to me that we are in danger of continued aggravation of our balance-of-payments deficit if we do not do something about it.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROBLEM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Columnist Roscoe Drummond, writing in the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette on August 6, calls attention to a situation of very alarming proportions. It involves probably the most respected agency in the U.S. Government—the Federal Bureau of Investigation—and its relationship to one of the most serious issues of today, the civil rights problem. Mr. Drummond expresses concern, which I feel we all should share, over extremists' attacks on the role of the FBI in dealing with civil rights violations. We cannot afford to involve this agency in the middle of this controversy. And Mr. Drummond rightfully points out that it is imperative that all of us must understand the FBI's assigned responsibilities in the area of civil rights and the limits of its jurisdiction. He underscores that the FBI is not—repeat "not"—an enforcement agency but strictly an investigative agency. I believe this article should be read by everyone who has any desire to correctly assess past and coming events.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "FBI Rights Role Limited," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Aug. 6, 1963]

Critics Demand More Action: FBI Rights Role Limited

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—Unless the role and record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in dealing with civil rights violations are widely understood, it is going to be unfairly caught in the middle of a hurtful controversy.

Already extremists on both sides are inaccurately accusing the FBI either of willfully encroaching upon the sovereignty of State and local agencies or of willfully neglecting to do its duty under civil rights legislation.

This kind of ill-considered, uninformed criticism of the FBI will not do anybody any good. It can only do harm.

It has already brought a strong rebuke from Director J. Edgar Hoover who, in the course of an article in the August issue of the Yale Political magazine, has written:

"There are highly vocal pressure groups who feel that the FBI should be obligated to step in wherever, in their opinion, a breakdown in law enforcement has occurred. When we have declined to exceed our jurisdiction in response to these demands, extremists among these elements have gone so far as to accuse the FBI of racism.

LIMITED SCOPE

"Persons such as these are no less bigoted in their thinking than those who parade around in white sheets demanding that the FBI 'stop prying into State and local affairs' and counseling witnesses to civil rights violations, 'don't tell FBI agents anything.'"

These words deserve to be pondered—and heeded.

The first necessity is to understand the FBI's assigned responsibilities in the area of civil rights and the limits of its jurisdiction.

Its responsibilities are defined in the acts of Congress including the civil rights laws of 1957 and 1960. It has been given authority to investigate these eight categories of rights violations:

1. Involuntary servitude and slavery.
2. Any infringement on the right to vote for a candidate for Federal office.
3. Conspiracies to deprive any citizen of the free exercise of any right secured to him by the Constitution or Federal law.
4. The deprivation by persons acting under the color of law of any such rights.
5. Willful obstruction of any Federal court order—such as an order requiring a public school to desegregate.
6. Interstate flight to avoid prosecution for firing or bombing private, religious, or educational institutions, or to avoid testimony.

PROPERTY DAMAGE

7. Interstate transportation of any explosive with knowledge that it will be used for the foregoing purpose
8. Use of any instrument of communication or commerce to threaten to damage private or public buildings.

These assigned duties give the FBI a wide responsibility in the area of civil rights which it has and will carry out without apology to anybody. But it needs to be understood that the FBI is not a national police force; it is a Federal police force concerned only with Federal law.

It is not an enforcement agency; it is strictly an investigative agency. It cannot and should not exceed its jurisdiction.

When no violation of Federal law has taken place, it cannot step in merely because there has been a breakdown of State or local law enforcement.

Civil rights cases are handled by special agents of the FBI who have completed advanced training courses which specifically qualify them to conduct such investigations.

In recent years the FBI has taken the initiative to provide civil rights training to law-enforcement agencies in all parts of the country; a total of 553 special civil rights schools were conducted for police officials.

From my observation, the FBI deserves the confidence of every responsible civil rights advocate.

BEEF AND VEAL IMPORTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, today one of the greatest concerns to agriculture is the greatly increased importation of beef and veal which has more than doubled in the last 2 years.

The Livestock Feeder magazine has exercised real leadership in calling attention to this problem, and in trying to obtain action by the administration to alleviate it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter, dated April 3, 1963, to the Honorable Christian A. Herter; a reprint of an editorial in the April 1963, issue of the Livestock Feeder magazine; a letter to Mr. Irwin Hedges, agricultural trade specialist, Executive Office of the President, dated July 23, 1963; a news bulletin released August 8, 1963, by the National Livestock Feeders Association; a copy of a letter dated August 14, 1963, to the Honorable Christian A. Herter from the National Livestock Feeders Association; and a letter of August 19, 1963, addressed to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, by the National Livestock Feeders Association.

There being no objection, the letters and other documents were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Livestock
Feeders Association,
Omaha, Nebr., April 3, 1963.

To the Honorable Christian A. Herter, special representative for trade negotiations.

Re imports of meat and meat products and, U.S. policy in foreign trade negotiations.

GENERAL TRADE NEGOTIATION POLICY

The National Livestock Feeders Association is gravely concerned with the general policy which has guided U.S. trade negotiations, and particularly, with the apparent employment of trade agreements as an international relations tool. This apparent use, in our opinion, has lead to an utter disregard for the health and well-being of domestic industries and has divorced such agreements from a sound basis in economics. Governmental officials who participate in trade negotiations do, in effect, represent American business.

At the same time, the attitude of this association with respect to foreign trade is not one of isolationism. It is recognized that a volume of imports at some level between the extremes of complete prohibition and almost unrestricted entry (current situation on most meat) can be absorbed without measurable injury to the basic U.S. industry.

The creation of the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 resulted from a realization on the part of Congress of the necessity to separate the diplomatic functions of the State Department from foreign trade negotiations and agreements. This action was in harmony with the policy of the National Livestock Feeders Association and was encouraging to the association.

At the last annual business meeting, held on February 8, 1963, association officials were instructed by the membership to reemphasize efforts to stress the following in trade negotiations:

(1) Equalization of tariff structures between the United States and other countries;

(2) Encouragement of U.S. exports;

(3) Stimulation of economic growth and improvement of the business climate in the United States;

(4) Trade agreements which are truly reciprocal;

(5) Agreements based on economics, rather than using negotiations as a foreign relations tool; and

(6) Rule out negotiating on the basis of percentage increases or decreases in rates in cases where there is wide variation in existing rates.

CURRENT SITUATION WITH RESPECT TO LIVESTOCK AND MEAT

Prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products by a significant amount. However, in the past 5 years the relationship has changed and the value of exports has been considerably lower than the value of imports. According to figures obtained from reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service, the dollar volume of exports of livestock and meat products by the United States in 1962 amounted to approximately $320 million; whereas our imports amounted to $670 million, plus around $209 million of wool, making total imports of approximately $879 million. In other words, in 1962 the United States imported 2¾ times the dollar volume of her exports. This reversal in export-import balance has come about in the very short period of 5 years.

The swing from a net exporter to a net importer has come about primarily from the very significant increase in the importation of manufacturing (boneless) beef, veal and mutton. It was in 1948 that the import duties on these products were reduced 50 percent: Beef and veal (fresh, chilled or frozen), 6 cents per pound, to 3 cents per pound.

Mutton (fresh, chilled or frozen), 5 cents per pound, to 2½ cents per pound.

The figures in tables A and B show the very rapid buildup in the imports of boneless beef, veal and mutton and of the fresh or frozen products as a whole.

TABLE A[1].—*Imports of boneless beef and veal (product weight basis)*

[In millions of pounds]

	Average
1951–55	18.2
1958	255.9
1959	469.2
1960	383.9
1961	527.5
1962	741.5

1961 as a percentage of 1951–55, 2,898 percent.

1962 as a percentage of 1951–55, 4,074 percent.

[1] Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

Imports of fresh or frozen beef and veal[1] *(product weight basis)*

[In millions of pounds]

	Average
1951–55	59.9
1958	358.2
1959	524.5
1960	413.8
1961	569.2
1962	863.3

1961 as a percentage of 1951–55, 950 percent.

1962 as a percentage of 1951–55, 1,441 percent.

[1] Includes boneless beef and veal.

Percent in 1962 from:	Percent
Australia	51.5
New Zealand	24.7
Ireland	8.2
Mexico	6.5
Canada	2.2
Other countries	6.9
Total	100.0

TABLE B[1].—*Imports of mutton, fresh or frozen*[2] *(product weight basis)*

[In millions of pounds]

	Average
1951–55	0.7
1958	17.2
1959	47.3
1960	37.3
1961	44.9
1962	65.0

1961 as a percent of 1951–55, 6,414 percent.
1962 as a percent of 1951–55, 9,286 percent.

Percent in 1962 from:	Percent
Australia	97.9
New Zealand	1.3
Other countries	.8
Total	100.0

[1] Source: U.S. FAS reports.

[2] Practically all of the mutton imported from 1958 on was in form of boneless product according to FAS reports.

The story of substantial increases in imports during 1962 is told in the following quotation from the February 18, 1963, issue of Foreign Agriculture (weekly magazine of the Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA):

"Imports of almost all major categories of livestock and meat products rose sharply during 1962.

"One of the most notable increases was in the imports of beef and veal, which rose 41 percent above the previous year to 971 million pounds and set a new record. Most of this meat was boneless beef from Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. Imports of mutton, mostly boneless, at 65 million pounds were nearly double the 1961 total."

It is often contended that imports of boneless product do not exert pressure on "block" (sold fresh) beef and veal, since this type of meat is used in the manufacture of processed products only. The fallacy of this argument is evident when two important facts are considered:

(1) Processed products constitute very real competition in the sale of fresh beef and veal. The availability of large quantities of imported manufacturing (boneless) beef and veal has resulted in a continuously larger proportion of processed products being offered consumers, in comparison to the volume of fresh cuts which come principally from carcasses grading USDA Good and Choice.

(2) Boning beef comes principaly from old bulls and cows and from low grade steers and heifers. Without the very large volume of imports, there would be a substantial downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher grades for use as boneless beef. This provides price and supply movement stimuli to the fresh beef market.

The substantial increases in imports of all beef and veal from the countries of Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland are of particular significance, as seen in table C.

TABLE C.—*Imports of all beef and veal, product weight basis*

[In millions of pounds]

	Australia	New Zealand	Ireland
Average, 1951–55	1.4	13.0	7.2
1958	16.9	182.0	23.7
1959	223.9	160.9	42.0
1960	144.7	130.7	43.6
1961	232.2	154.3	61.1
1962	444.7	213.6	70.7
1962 as a percent of 1951–55	31,764.0	1,643.0	982.0

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

In the March 11, 1963, issue of Foreign Agriculture, the Foreign Agricultural Service stated: "Australian meat exports in 1962 set a new record with 831 million pounds. * * * approximately 60 percent of the exports were shipped to the United States.

"The United States received 70 percent of Australia's record shipments of beef, 48 percent of the mutton, 10.5 percent of the lamb."

The National Livestock Feeders Association submits that there is overwhelming justification in demanding action to curtail the phenomenal buildup in meat imports into the United States. Sharply lower price levels in the slaughter cattle market strongly indicate that imports have reached a volume which is definitely injurious to the domestic producer. Under the prevailing prices, many producers are losing from $35 to $50 per animal sold.

Imports of beef and veal are now approaching the 10-percent level of domestic production. In our opinion, a 5-percent level can be injurious to domestic producers; surely, a 10-percent level is depressing to the degree of being detrimental to the stability of the U.S. market. We have conferred with officials of the Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, on this subject.

The relationship between U.S. production and U.S. imports over the past 10 years is shown in tables D and E.

TABLE D.—*U.S. production and imports of all beef and veal, carcass weight basis, last 10 years*

Year	U.S. production (million pounds)	U.S. imports, carcass weight equivalent (million pounds)	U.S. imports as a percent of U.S. production
1953	13,953	271	1.9
1954	14,610	232	1.5
1955	15,147	229	1.5
1956	16,094	211	1.3
1957	15,728	395	2.5
1958	14,516	909	6.3
1959	14,588	1,063	7.2
1960	15,835	775	4.9
1961	16,341	1,037	6.3
1962	16,297	1,454	8.9

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

TABLE E.—*U.S. production and imports of mutton, last 10 years*

Year	U.S. production (million pounds)	U.S. imports[1] (million pounds)	U.S. imports as a percent of U.S. production
1953	73	1.3	1.8
1954	74	.3	.4
1955	76	.9	1.2
1956	74	.6	.8
1957	71	1.7	2.4
1958	69	17.2	24.9
1959	74	47.3	63.9
1960	77	37.3	48.4
1961	84	44.9	53.4
1962	81	65.0	80.2

[1] Excludes canned product.

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

In addition to the substantial volume of meat imports, the timing of the buildup likewise is detrimental to domestic producers. As indicated in tables D and E, imports are generally on the upswing at the same time domestic production is being increased. A satisfactory price level in the United States for livestock provides stimulus for both the importer and the domestic producer to start the buildup of the supply cycle and supplies from both sources tend to peak together, bringing injurious pressure on U.S. market prices.

IDEAL ANSWER TO IMPORT PROBLEM

In view of the coincidental increase of U.S. production and imports into this country, a system of flexible duties and import quotas tied inversely to domestic production would constitute an ideal method of handling meat imports. Such a system would provide for a measure of protection for U.S. growers and feeders and yet allow for trade with other countries.

ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE AVENUES OF PROCEDURE FOR IMPORT RELIEF

The National Livestock Feeders Association has studied and appraised the various avenues of procedure through which attempts may be made to bring relief from the injurious pressures of imports of beef, veal, and mutton.

Petition to the Tariff Commission: Petitioning the Tariff Commission for an investigation is both time consuming and expensive. Our observation has been that the rules of procedure followed by the Commission, particularly those pertaining to hearings which are an important part of any investigation, do not allow a just opportunity for domestic businessmen, associations, or individuals to present their case in a climate to which American citizens and taxpayers are entitled. Foreign nations who are exporting to the United States, as well as the importers, are permitted to appear before the Tariff Commission and even to cross-examine witnesses in what then amounts to an international court case with the injured domestic industry having to defend its position against the forces of the foreign nation or nations involved, the importers, and perhaps the U.S. Government.

Furthermore, the requirement to prove injury under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is an insurmountable obstacle to Agriculture. It is impossible to obtain thousands of financial statements from individual producers in support of the injury claim and, also, it is an impossible task with general farm units to separate out the particular enterprise involved, in the production of the specific product(s) or commodity(s) in question.

Appeal to the Office of Emergency Planning: Filing an appeal to the Office of Emergency Planning under the National Security amendment would present the same sort of obstacle in proving injury as would the Tariff Commission petition.

Special legislation: Legislation has already been introduced in this session of the Congress covering the importation of cattle, beef and veal, and sheep, lambs, mutton, and lamb. However, this association hesitates to encourage legislation in those areas until all administrative avenues have been thoroughly explored. Commodity legislation should be used, perhaps, as a last resort only, since it would tend to erode an existing law.

Since trade negotiations and tariff adjustments are ultimately the responsibility of the President, except under special commodity legislation, and since other avenues would in our instance present serious obstacles, the National Livestock Feeders Association has elected to submit its case directly to the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. Effort on the part of the President to develop agreements with countries concerned to establish voluntary quotas themselves is a sound method of procedure, in the opinion of association officials. In the case of Australia, for example, we know the people there who are engaged in the livestock and meat industry, and in fact, the Australian Government itself, are very sensitive to the attitude of American growers and feeders with respect to the imports of Australian meat and livestock products. We think it would be highly possible for the President to be successful in prevailing upon both Australia and New Zealand to set voluntary quotas for themselves on imports of livestock, meat and meat products into the United States.

The officers and directors of the National Livestock Feeders Association hereby respectfully request that inquiries be made into this and any other negotiation avenue which is deemed to be effective in helping to solve the problem of sharply mounting imports of meats and the impact of this development on domestic livestock producers and feeders.

In the interest of providing a ready reference on trade barriers confronting the United States in exporting livestock and meat products, a brief summary of those by country follows.

FOREIGN TRADE BARRIERS

The following is a brief summary of the trade barriers which the United States faces in the exportation of livestock, meat, and meat products to other countries. (Source: FAS publication, "Prospects for Foreign Trade in Livestock and Meat," January 1963.)

Argentina: Prohibits imports of sheep and cattle from the United States.

Australia: Prohibits imports of sheep and cattle from the United States; also prohibits imports of U.S. hog and pork products.

Austria: The United States is excluded from most tenders issued by Austria for meat and meat products.

Barbados: Prohibits imports of pork from the United States.

Belgium: Prohibits imports of unsterilized pork products from the United States, and controls imports of a large number of meat items under import licensing procedures.

Brazil: The premiums which have to be paid plus tariff duties make the cost of U.S. products prohibitive.

British Guiana: Restricts entry of fresh pork products and import of tallow and lard; bacon and ham restricted by import permits.

Canada: On June 25, 1962, Canada levied special import taxes on most livestock and meat products; these were abolished on November 15.

Chile: High import taxes discourage entry of U.S. products.

Colombia: Bars entry of most livestock and meat products, and those not restricted are subject to high duties and to license requirements.

Denmark: Prohibits entry of pork and pork products from the United States.

Egypt: Obtains large share of imports of meat products through bilateral trade agreements.

Finland: Controls the entry of most meat products by variable import fees.

France: Restricts the import of most meats from the United States, primarily to maintain livestock prices to French farmers.

West Germany: Limited entry of variety meats and fatback from the United States; lard, inedible tallows and greases and cattle hides not restricted.

Guatemala: High import tariffs restrict entry of meat; for example, hams are subject to 45.5 cents per pound plus 30 percent of the import value.

Haiti: Restricts meat imports by use of a luxury foodstuffs tax.

Honduras: High import duties limit volume of U.S. meat products; for example, cured pork at 45 cents per pound.

India: Prohibits import of most livestock products.

Ireland: Generally restricts entry of all livestock and meat products by requiring import licenses; lard subject to an import tax of $11.76 per hundredweight.

Italy: Close control on imports of meats through a licensing system; quotas established for various types of meats, with amounts allowed to come in being determined in part by the level of domestic livestock and meat prices.

Jamaica: Requires specific licenses.

Luxembourg: Restricts entry of several livestock and meat products important to the United States.

Mexico: Entry of U.S. livestock and meat products restricted by several trade barriers (import permits, high duties).

New Zealand: Prohibits imports of most meats and other packinghouse products.

Norway: Prohibits import of most meat products.

Panama: Imports of lard limited by quotas; duty on U.S. lard is 100 percent ad valorem.

Peru: Has increased its import duty on lard and tallow.

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: Requires import licenses, and imports are confined to such products as tallow, sausage casings, mutton and some canned meat.

Spain: All meat imports are purchased by the Government's National Supply Commission, which controls the amounts received and their origin.

Sweden: Regulates imports of meat and meat products by licenses and import tariffs; tariffs are flexible and are raised to reduce imports when domestic prices are low.

United Kingdom: Technically approves entry of pork originating in 44 States; most U.S. canned meats are banned by dollar restrictions; no restrictions on imports of frozen carcasses and variety meats.

Venezuela: In December 1962, this country suspended imports of pork to permit hog prices to rise.

Yugoslavia: Has a flexible control system which adjusts imports and exports according to domestic situation and price conditions.

European Economic Community

Several significant developments regarding EEC meat policy occurred during 1962.

Beef and beef variety meats: Entry will require import certificates which can effectively limit trade. Frozen beef variety meats have been bound in GATT at 20 percent. Presently, rates are below this figure in most countries and the gradual increase in duties will be a limiting factor.

Pork and pork variety meats: Subject to a complex levy and gate price system. Frozen pork variety meats have been bound in GATT at 20 percent. Present tariffs from most countries are below this figure and gradual increase in duties will be a limiting factor.

Lard: Subject to complex import levy and gate price system. The extent of these levies is not known; however, any increases will undoubtedly limit U.S. exports.

Tallow and greases: Tariff for this commodity has been bound at 2 percent ad valorem. EEC beef policy requires import certificates for tallow. Inedible hog grease has been bound in GATT at 3 percent.

Hides and skins: Duty has been bound at zero and no restrictive features are expected.

Sausage casings: Not expected to be materially affected by current EEC policy.

Mohair: EEC countries do not levy import duties on raw mohair.

Respectfully submitted for the officers and directors of the National Livestock Feeders Association.

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

THE WHOLE STORY ON IMPORTS

(Reprint of an editorial as it appeared (revised) in the April 1963 issue of the Livestock Feeder magazine, the official publication of the National Livestock Feeders Association)

More than a slight disservice was rendered the cattle feeding and growing industries early this month when the Department of Agriculture released its special report on the cattle situation, and stated, "While the volume of imports (of beef) does have an influence on the grades and classes of cattle slaughtered primarily for processing beef, it is not an important factor affecting the price of our high-quality beef and hence the prices of fed cattle." The release accompanying the report said, "Imports of beef have sometimes been cited as a cause of the price break for fed steers and heifers. The report finds no evidence that this is true."

These statements are misleading and obviously are the result of incomplete analysis of the situation. It would appear that the Department is attempting to coverup for deficiencies on the part of the Federal Government in foreign trade negotiations. Others have committed similar errors of conclusion.

Before refuting these statements and conclusions, let's review the figures and trends on imports of beef and veal, the relationship to domestic production and other pertinent information. We are not talking about imports of pork in this case at all because the volume is of less significance. We are, though, talking about boneless beef and veal, fresh, chilled or frozen, of manufacturing and processing quality.

From 1953 and including 1957, imports of all beef and veal, carcass weight equivalent, ranged from 211 to 395 million pounds per year, or from 1.3 to 2.5 percent of our domestic production of these same items. All of this data is taken from the U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service reports.

In 1958, imports of beef and veal jumped to 909 million pounds equivalent to 6.3 percent of domestic production. In the years following, the volume and percentage went like this: 1959—1,063 million pounds, 7.2 percent of domestic production; 1960—775 million pounds, 4.9 percent of domestic production; and 1961—1,037 million pounds, 6.3 percent of domestic production.

Imports in 1962 set an alltime record of 1,454 million pounds of beef and veal, amounting to 8.9 percent of a domestic production figure of 16,297 million pounds, only slightly below the record production in 1961.

At the same time, it is noteworthy to examine the trend of imports on beef and veal from the three major countries exporting to the United States. The figures are set out in the table below:

Imports of beef and veal from 3 countries, product weight basis

[In millions of pounds]

	Australia	New Zealand	Ireland
Average, 1951-55	1.4	13.0	7.2
1958	16.9	182.0	23.7
1959	223.9	160.9	42.0
1960	144.7	130.7	43.6
1961	232.2	154.3	61.1
1962	444.7	213.6	70.7
1962 as a percent of 1951-55	31,764.0	1,643.0	982.0

Some have said, yes, but we also export considerable in volume of livestock and meat products. The truth of the matter is that prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products. In the past 5 years, however, the relationship has changed and the value of U.S. exports has been considerably below the value of imports. In 1962 the dollar value of U.S. exports of all livestock and meat products came to about $320 million, whereas our imports amounted to approximately $670 million, plus about $209 million of wool, making the total import value of approximately $879 million.

With the facts and figures before us, let's move to the argument that since imports of beef and veal are largely manufacturing products, they have little or no effect on the price level of the better quality fresh beef produced in the United States and the prices of fed cattle.

This large volume of imported beef and veal does supplement domestic production of lower grade processing beef—cows, bulls, steers and heifers—creating a much larger quantity of such items as luncheon meats, sandwich meats, wieners, sausages, and hamburgers, and also making it possible to offer these products through retail outlets at lower prices.

Disregarded by the Department of Agriculture is the fact that the source of manufacturing beef from domestic production is not confined solely to nonfed animals. Also, with a more moderate volume of imports, there would be more downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from domestic carcasses of other grades. Processors are not going to use these domestic cuts, however, if they can obtain imported beef at more attractive figures.

Hence, it must be recognized that this supplementation of domestic manufacturing beef goes beyond the area of cow beef and to some degree, at least, is supplementing our domestic production of the higher grades.

Then there is the matter of competition. It has been argued that the products from manufacturing beef do not exert any pressure on the price level of fresh beef offered to consumers. At the same time, though, those making such a statement readily admit that other meat products—pork, broilers, etc.—are competitive with fresh beef. It is absolutely fallacious to contend that products manufactured from beef, usually offered in the same counter and in close proximity, are not competitive with the better quality of beef produced domestically.

The contention that a lower volume of manufactured products is apt to drive consumers away from the meat counter and cause them to use substitute products is absolutely without foundation. Yet these are some of the arguments that are being inaccurately used to justify a continued high level of imports.

Domestic production of beef and veal, in terms of consumption, came to about 90 pounds per capita in 1962. With imports of beef and veal at 8.9 percent of domestic production, it means that 8 pounds of additional product per person are offered in our domestic market from foreign sources. It is a foregone conclusion that if we were to suddenly increase domestic production to the extent of 8 pounds per capita, we would have serious repercussions in our market, almost regardless of the type of beef involved in the increase. We fail to see what special set of circumstances makes our domestic market immune from the same impact of 3 pounds of foreign beef per person.

There are some other factors in this import controversy that have not been brought out. First of all, there are reliable reports of a larger volume of better quality beef cuts, suitable for sale as fresh beef, coming into the United States from Australia and New Zealand. Beyond this, we understand advance commitments on imports of boneless beef have been made at least through midyear.

Then, there is the change in the attitude of the foreign exporters of this beef to the United States. Previously, they were not interested in overloading the U.S. market and indicated, at least, some measure of restraint in order to protect the privilege being enjoyed.

That attitude has changed and it now appears as though exporters are intent on getting as big a slice of the American market as they can obtain with less and less regard for the position of the U.S. producer and taxpayer. It may very well be that the past policy of the United States in international trade negotiations has encouraged these countries to the point where they no longer have any fear of either quotas or higher tariffs on imports of the United States.

This is the story on the import situation. No one wants to cut them off entirely. Trade with foreign countries is a recognized necessity. However, the supply of beef on the domestic market, including beef from foreign sources, is still the important price-determining factor. The industry is entitled to a better deal than it is getting now.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., July 23, 1963.

Mr. IRWIN HEDGES,
Agricultural Trade Specialist, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEDGES: Thank you very much for your letter reporting the results of the GATT meat conference in Geneva. Naturally, we are disappointed that no proposal was made by any other country which would lend encouragement for improving the position of the United States. On the other hand, the results which you reported in your letter are about what we had expected would be forthcoming. After all, why should the other countries of the world want to change the status quo as far as meat and meat products are concerned? They now enjoy almost unrestricted entry into the United States, while at the same time maintaining effective trade barriers against the importation of U.S. meat and meat products into their countries.

As to the emphasis by the U.S. delegation of the untenable position in which the United States would be placed if other major meat importers adopted more restrictive practices, we submit that it is not a case of adopting more restrictive practices; very effective restrictions are now in force.

The EEC countries in past years have provided an important market for U.S. meat and meat products. We are concerned with trying to maintain a practical degree of nonrestrictive entry into these countries; however, we are also concerned with the very rapid buildup of U.S. imports from countries such as Australia and New Zealand. The Geneva meeting provides further evidence of the validity of our statement to Mr. Herter; namely, that it is necessary for the United States to take the initiative in proposing agreements with those countries who are now exporting large volumes of meat and meat products to this country. The countries with which we are the most concerned when it comes to imports are not members of the EEC, and thus, we see no reason to wait until the EEC decides to move before initiating negotiations with these countries. Accessibility to this market should surely be sufficient trading stock on our part.

We fail to understand why the United States should continue to sit back and wait for some other country or countries to make the first move, rather than taking the initiative in the area of international trade on meat and meat products. It does not seem reasonable to us to expect the domestic industry to wait indefinitely, or even until early 1964, for some constructive move to be made toward solving the import problem. Five years have already elapsed since the beginning of the very rapid buildup in import volume of meat and meat products.

In our original conversation with Mr. Herter, we suggested to him that his office proceed to negotiate with the importing countries to seek an agreement for voluntary import quotas. Both Australia and New Zealand are very sensitive to the attitude of U.S. growers and feeders and our contacts would lead us to believe that such agreements are possible.

Instead of allowing the European Economic Community to continue to set the timetable and develop the pattern for negotiations, the National Livestock Feeders Association firmly suggests that the time has come to implement section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in view of the action of the Community on the importation of agricultural commodities.

Yours sincerely,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION NEWS BULLETIN

OMAHA, NEBR., August 5.—"Imports of foreign meat into the United States continue to mount at a rapid clip," Don F. Magdanz, executive secretary-treasurer of the National Livestock Feeders Association, said in a statement made today from the national office of the association.

"Imports of meat in the first 5 months of 1963 are significantly above the tonnage for the same period of 1962, the year in which an alltime record was set," Magdanz added. "The rising imports of beef and veal presents one of the most prominent threats to the livestock industry," Magdanz continued.

"The increase in imports of beef and veal for the January–May period this year amounted to over 32 million pounds or a 12-percent increase over 1962. Fresh and frozen beef and veal, the products which saw a phenomenal increase in 1962, accounted for 55 percent of the import tonnage for the first 5 months and made up almost 70 percent of the increase over a year ago.

"Australia is the leading exporter to this country of fresh beef and veal. During the 5-month period this country exported over 142 million pounds to the United States, which constituted 45 percent of the fresh beef and veal imports. Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, and Ireland accounted for 92 percent of the imports in the form of fresh beef and veal during the 5 months. Notable was the substantial increase in tonnage received from Mexico, over 31 million pounds, this country replacing Ireland as the third largest exporter of this type of meat product to the United States.

"Of significance also," continued Magdanz, "was the very large increase in imports of cured, canned, and cooked beef for the first 5-month period. The percentage increase over 1962 was a whopping 26 percent. Argentina led all other countries in this category, accounting for 70 percent of this type of beef offered for importation into the United States."

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., August 14, 1963.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office of the President, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: We were particularly pleased to read your recent announcement in the press that the United States will take retaliatory measures against imports from countries in the European Economic Community for increased duties placed on American poultry by members of the Common Market. While this move to withdraw tariff concessions the United States has made on exports from countries in the Community may not directly affect the livestock feeding industry, nevertheless we look upon the development with considerable gratification because we feel it is a step in the direction that should be taken in foreign trade negotiations.

You will recall that this declaration of policy by your office follows very closely the recommendations contained in our discussion last March, as well as the recommendations made in our subsequent memorandum and in the resolutions adopted by this association. It is a step that may easily be extended now in defense of other domestic agricultural industries, and we hope it serves as a precedent for negotiations with those countries outside the European Economic Community who are responsible for the excessive U.S. imports of certain meat and meat products.

Under the circumstances now, we feel it is an even greater probability that countries such as Australia and New Zealand would be willing to give serious consideration to the acceptance of some flexible schedule of voluntary quotas on the meat products they are sending to the United States. The people in these countries are fully apprised of the impact their products are having on our domestic market and the strong attitudes against the volume of imports on the part of domestic producers and feeders.

The importation of meat and meat products for the first 5 months of 1963 is cause for even greater alarm. The fact that we have sustained an increase in imports of beef and veal for the January to May period this year amounting to over 42 million pounds, or 14 percent as compared to the same period in 1962, represents an increasing threat to the health of the domestic livestock industry. We are also aware of the fact that the increase in imports of all meat and meat products amounted to over 47 million pounds, or 11 percent of last year's volume during the same period. At the same time, imports of fresh and frozen beef and veal were over 295 million pounds in the first 5 months of 1963, an increase of 12 percent over the 263 million pounds received in the same 5-month period of 1962.

We are grossly disturbed over the unrealistic conclusions which have recently been released by the Department of Agriculture claiming that imports of manufacturing beef and veal have very little if any impact on the domestic market for the fresh product. To support this conclusion they point to the fact that beef imports last year rose 59 percent from June to August, during which time choice steer prices rose from $24.25 per hundredweight in June to $28.19 per hundredweight in August. The Department also added that when fed cattle prices started to drop last December and January, imports had dropped to 62 percent of the August import rate. Knowing something about proper statistical analysis, we submit that conclusions supported by arguments of this kind amount to a gross violation of responsible research procedure, and in fact, border on propaganda. The conclusions of the Department would be accurate only under conditions where all other factors affecting price were held constant. It is a matter of common knowledge that such was not the case during the period referred to by the Department. Furthermore, the drop in imports in December and January came about in part, at least, as a result of the dock strike, and the record shows they rose phenomenally again in February.

We are complimentary to you for the announcement which has been made and we hope this initial move on the part of the United States will lead quickly to further activities in the areas where livestock producers and feeders are most concerned. If we can be helpful to you further we will be happy to respond.

Respectfully yours,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., August 6, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: This association was grossly disturbed again when the Department of Agriculture released a statement on August 5 which obviously attempts to excuse and minimize the effect of large-volume imports of beef on our domestic market. The statement is the second of its kind this year and we would like you to know that in our opinion a great disservice is being rendered the American people by information of this sort from their own Government.

The particular statements contained in the release to which we refer are the following: "The bulk of imported beef is for processing and does not have an important impact on the fed cattle market." After maintaining that imports exert their prime influence on prices of cull cows and bulls and the volume of imports has mainly filled the gap resulting from decreased domestic cow slaughter, the release continues: "Beef imports last year rose 59 percent from June to August. In spite of this, choice steer prices rose from $25.25 in June to $28.19 in August. When feeder cattle prices started to drop last December and January imports had dropped to 62 percent of the August import rate. Thus, the sharp rise in imports had no significant impact on fed cattle prices."

Knowing something about proper research methods and analytical procedure, we submit to you that conclusions of this kind have no basis in fact. To conclude that imports had no significant impact on fed cattle prices because steer prices rose while the rate of imports was increasing is a discredit to the scientific integrity of the Department. Such a comparison can be made only when all other factors affecting price remain constant, and the people in your Department are fully aware of the fact that during the period in question domestic pricing factors were far from constant.

While it should not be necessary, we do feel the need of explaining how these large volumes of imports of manufacturing beef and veal do affect our entire market structure. This large volume of imported beef and veal does supplement domestic production of processing beef, thereby creating a much larger quantity of such items as luncheon meats, sandwich meats, wieners, sausages, and hamburger to compete with fresh products. Furthermore, under conditions of low volume of domestic manufacturing beef there would be downward substitution of some cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher quality thereby providing stimulus to the fed market.

It is absolutely fallacious to contend that products manufactured from beef, and offered in the same counter as cuts of fresh beef, are not competitive with the better quality fresh beef produced domestically. It would be just as erroneous to argue there is no competition between beef and pork, or between other food items, because they happen to be of somewhat different character.

Another point that your Department has failed to consider is the fact,there is always some timelag between the date frozen beef products reach this country and the time these same products appear in manufactured form in our retail meat counters. The number of days or weeks involved in the manufacturing process varies considerably, of course, but we do not have a situation similar to that in movement of fresh beef where the items must be sold within a short period of time to avoid deterioration or even spoilage.

We are fully aware the Department of Agriculture has no jurisdiction or authority to reduce the imports of manufacturing beef and veal. We do believe it has the responsibility, however, to accurately analyze the situation according to accepted research procedure, and we submit to you that this responsibility has not been assumed in the case of imports of beef and veal. We hope you will find it possible to reconsider the statements that have been made by your Department and so inform the livestock industry as well as the American public.

Respectfully yours,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

TRIBUTE TO ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the passing of Eric Johnston, the State of Washington and the country has lost one of its most outstanding public-spirited citizens. He stood in the great tradition of the businessmen like Bernard Baruch who have contributed so much to our country and the world in national and international affairs. As an adviser to Presidents, he made invaluable contributions in the tumultuous years since the beginning of World War II. In recent years he has done much to bring the North Atlantic Community close together through his work as a member of President Kennedy's Citizens Commission for NATO.

I had the privilege of knowing Mr. Johnston for over 20 years. In that association, I came to have nothing but admiration and respect for his intelligence, vigor, and dedication to the public good. To his family, his wife Ina and his two daughters, I want to extend my most sincere condolences.

COEXISTENCE: COANNIHILATION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Communist leaders of Red China are violently denouncing the limited test ban treaty now before the Senate for ratification. Likewise, members of the radical rightwing fringe—the John Birch Society and others—are denouncing it. Daily I receive many letters on the subject. Some I recognize as coming from the same authors of letters which were written to me some months ago having as their subject, "Impeach Earl Warren," and denouncing that great and loyal American. Others come from the same radical rightwing fringe, members of the John Birch Society and sympathizers in Ohio who have written to me continuously on the theme of "Take the United Nations out of the United States and the United States out of the United Nations." Now they are on the same side as Red China in demanding that the limited test ban treaty be rejected.

Some extreme rightwingers and ex-generals and admirals are against coexistence. So also are the Chinese Communists. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has very aptly stated, coexistence is defined as existing together.

Do the generals and ex-generals who oppose the limited test ban treaty, claiming that there cannot be coexistence with the Soviet Union, believe that the Russians will merely cease to exist?

The alternative to coexistence is coannihilation. Together we have the power to destroy millions of human beings. It has been estimated that if the Soviet Union were to launch a sneak attack against us and if we were to retaliate, in a matter of hours perhaps as many as 300 million Europeans, Russians, and Americans would be killed. In 10 years, if China, with a population of 700 million, becomes a nuclear power, then what?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. May I have unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Obviously, we should take this short step toward peace by ratifying the limited nuclear test ban treaty. This treaty is an objective which two administrations, representing both political parties, have patiently sought in spite of repeated discouragements, and notwithstanding opposition and criticism at home. It will not usher in the millenium. It will not end the cold war. It will not totally disarm the Soviet Union. It will not end the threat of Communist aggression. It will not bring about at once total and complete disarmament. But it will be a step toward ending one area of armament competition. It may pave the way for progress in other areas. For 17 years mankind has lived in the shadow of fear. This treaty might—just might—replace terror with confidence and despair with hope.

Mr. President, the makers of our Constitution wisely provided that civil authority must always be supreme over military authority in this country. Walter Lippmann, one of the great journalists of our time, in a fine article published in the Washington Post, entitled "Experts and the Treaty," expressed his opinion that in reading what some of the military leaders have to say about the test ban treaty we must not forget that the fundamental issue is not one on which a military man as such has any special competence. He points out that the genuine experts in this field are scientists who have worked in nuclear physics and related fields.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERTS AND THE TREATY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In reading what the military chieftains have to say about the test ban treaty, we must not forget that the fundamental issue is not military. It is not one on which a military man as such has any special competence. The fundamental issue is one of scientific method, whether continued testing in the atmosphere will produce significant, perhaps decisive, military advantages either for the Soviet Union or the United States.

The opinions of General Power and General LeMay on the probable results of future tests in the atmosphere are not one bit more expert than the opinion of Secretary McNamara. They are all laymen in this field, and their opinions are at best like the opinion of a judge when he has listened to the testimony and the arguments of both sides. The genuine experts in this field are scientific men who have worked experimentally in nuclear physics and in the related fields of chemistry and biology.

The crucial controversy is over the probable value of more atmospheric testing. On the one hand, there are those who, like Dr. Teller, believe that if unlimited atmospheric testing is allowed, the United States will forge way ahead of the Soviet Union and will achieve the absolute weapon, an antimissile defense, which will disarm the nuclear forces of the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, there is an array of eminent scientists who say that the more the two powers test, the more they will make the same discoveries and unlock the same secrets. The belief in a unique breakthrough is a romantic form of self-deception. Dr. Teller's promise that American scientists will be able to do what the Soviet scientists will not be able to do is not a scientific judgment. It is a reckless pseudopatriotic gamble on the inherent superiority of American over Russian scientists.

In the Soviet Union there are, of course, the counterparts of Dr. Teller and the Air Force generals. These Russians would also be willing to bet on the superiority of their scientists, and they too would like to try for the decisive breakthrough to an absolute weapon.

The great value of the treaty is that it takes out of the race of armaments—which will of course, continue—most of the feverish gamble for supremacy which unlimited testing invites. The experiments are to be limited by the treaty to the laboratories and to holes in the ground. This will not preclude the discovery of the secret of the absolute weapon if there is a secret that is possible to discover. But limiting the experiments will remove the hysteria, the violence, and the poison from the competitive search for absolute supremacy.

NEEDED EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, next Monday morning schools in South Dakota and across the Nation will begin opening their doors to another term of classes. As they do, I want to call attention to the fact and to emphasize the emergency which now exists in some 4,000 school districts across this land of ours with the termination of the temporary provisions Public Laws 815 and 874 the impacted areas legislation, which died nearly 2 months ago on June 30.

As a consequence of the unconscionable delay of which this Congress has been guilty in dealing with these two important pieces of legislation, I suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should provide signs to be placed above the doors of these 4,000 schools next Monday morning, to read, "Our capacity to serve young Americans has been curtailed by political paralysis in Washington."

Mr. President, this legislation has been on the books and in operation since 1950. Never before have the schools been denied this rightful assistance by the Federal Government. Since 1950 a total of $1,426 million has been appropriated under Public Law 874 and $1,087 million has been appropriated for construction of school facilities under Public Law 815. I cite these figures to show how extensive these programs have become, how vital they are for our educational system, how closely they have become intertwined with the opportunity for young Americans to get an education, and how important they are with schools now going back into operation with a large portion of this legislation terminated.

Despite this, the unjustifiable and disillusioning inaction is continuing on both sides of the Congress. From all over the country this has created a mighty clamor, as suddenly school officials have been confronted by the ugly fact that they will be compelled to open their doors without the financial resources which Uncle Sam rightfully owes them because of the school population burden which Uncle Sam has imposed upon them by creating impacted areas in their communities.

School administrators, school boards, principals of schools, and taxpayers are saying, "We now need to know what kind of facilities we can finance for this school year which is about to begin." Virtually every State in this Republic is affected, because of the farflung operations of our military, because of the involvement of our large Indian population in our Western States, and because of mighty construction projects which the Federal Government is undertaking in sparsely settled areas of the country.

Federal expenditures for national security and domestic projects are still at record levels because of the unsettled international situation. The cold war is still on, Mr. President. We are still preparing our defenses against a possible catastrophic attack from communism.

Along with many other Senators and Members of the House, I have always considered Federal assistance given by this legislation to be a rightful responsibility of the Federal Government to those communities which experience a significant increase in school enrollments because of Federal activity, or which lose substantial funds because of land purchased by the Government. My own State of South Dakota has received a sizable amount of funds, and these funds have been vital to the communities as they have helped to maintain high educational standards and quality programs, even with the increased demands upon the school districts. Because South Dakota is a small State, with many sparsely settled areas, the impact of a large Federal installation—whether it be to establish a missile base or to build a tremendous dam across the Missouri River—places upon the local school authorities problems of a magnitude which would simply cause them to throw up their hands and close up shop, except for the aid provided by these funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Failure to provide this necessary Federal assistance would mean not only a loss of education to the children of the families who go there to do the work, but it would mean also a problem to the families who live there indigenously, whose children will also be compelled to lose an educational opportunity because of this great influx of new students brought in by Federal activity, for which the Federal Government today is shirking shamefully its rightful responsibility.

I call upon the White House, and I call upon the leadership of both Houses of the Congress to correct this injustice now, because the schools are opening. We are no longer confronted with a theory; we are confronted with a condition.

Consequently, it is imperative that these programs under the impacted area legislation should be extended now so that the school districts depending on this aid, now beginning their classes, once again will have the opportunity to provide the necessary school services.

After all, one is of school age only once in his life and if we fail these youngsters now there is no way in which we can pass compensatory legislation 3, 4, or 5 years from now to take care of children whose school years have been interrupted and injured because of our failure to act promptly now. We must give these school authorities the assurance of continued assistance in their difficult task. We must give them this assurance at a time when it will be of value to them.

I am a former smalltown school superintendent myself. I can testify from personal experience the extreme necessity of knowing what funds can be counted on for operating our impacted school systems. It is difficult enough to recruit the faculty members required for the opening of the school year starting early in the summer months. Even now this Congress has delayed action on this so long that many schools may end up with the money but no available talent to employ because of the uncertainty which has hovered over their entire operating budget. To delay further will be to do an injury to the schoolchildren just as surely as though the money were not available.

I am seriously concerned that the Federal aid to education measure which encompasses this legislation is now before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Hearings started in April and were concluded in June, and the measure still pends before the committee, surrounded by mothballs. In the House, the general aid to education bill has been broken down and some of its features have been passed by the House. But H.R. 7156, which would extend the impacted areas legislation and which was reported out of the Labor and Education Committee, has been bogged down in the burial grounds called the Rules Committee since early in July.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate, I appeal to the White House, I appeal to the leadership of both bodies, to take immediate action on the extension of this vital matter. I appeal to other Senators and to our colleagues in the House who come from the affected areas to speak up for these young Americans who otherwise are going to be denied educational opportunity simply because of the failure of the Federal Government to make good on its obligations. I dislike to think that a Congress, which started out so brightly with promises by the White House for Federal aid to education, is going to deny to them the traditional and established types of aid which they have always received under previous administrations since 1950.

A CONSTRUCTIVE THOUGHT IN THE CURRENT RACIAL ISSUE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in view of the coming debate on civil rights legislation, it is pertinent and refreshing that in Alaska the problems that are agitating the 48 older States exist to only a very limited degree. It is my hope that with Alaska's record of racial tolerance and the enactment some years ago by the Territorial legislature of antidiscriminatory legislation, even that very limited degree will disappear. In this connection, the forthright and enlightened position taken by the secretary of one of our Alaska labor unions, in declining to fill out a questionnaire issued by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, is worthy of note and, in my view, his reasons therefor are entitled to commendation.

Apparently his reasoning and action were sufficiently impressive to obtain a front page display in the Washington Post, followed by an Associated Press story from Washington carrying the story to the entire Nation.

Peter Lannen's pithy comments are notable and worthy of widespread consideration; and I ask unanimous consent that the story by Frank C. Porter from the August 20 Washington Post and the Associated Press story as printed in the New York Times of August 21 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1963]

AN ALASKA UNION BARS RACIAL DATA

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Declaring that a man's race is "none of our business," a Carpenters Union local in Alaska says it is unable to fill out a questionnaire listing how many members it has from certain minority groups.

"We were unable to completely fill out the form on an honest basis, as we are not anthropologists," said Pete Lannen, financial secretary of local 1281, of Anchorage.

"We do not know when a member becomes or ceases to be a Negro, an Indian, an oriental, a member of a minority group or any of the other designations in the form," Mr. Lannen said.

For example, he said, the treasurer of the local, to the best of his knowledge, is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish, and "has perhaps a little Swedish blood."

"Another of our officers is roughly in the same category," Mr. Lannen said. "We do not desire to dissect the poor devils and put part of them in each one of these columns."

AGENCY SOUGHT DATA

The questionnaire was issued by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, headed by Vice President JOHNSON, as part of a campaign against racial discrimination. The form asks local unions around the country to list numbers of their members who are American Indians, Negroes, orientals, Puerto Ricans, and Spanish Americans.

In a section of the form headed "Remarks," Mr. Lannen wrote that Carpenters Local 1281 had no interest in an individual's ethnic background, his religion or his political beliefs. He said he guessed that the local reflected almost all the major racial strains. He continued:

"We have many members who apparently have Negroid blood. In fact, some of the experts state that there is only 1 person in 1 million in the world today that does not have Negroid blood.

"We have a number of Alaskan aboriginals with Eskimo and Indian blood mixed with Russian, Scandinavian, Chinese and other so-called races whose sexual urges resulted in crossbreeding.

"We have one member from Cuba who speaks Spanish, looks like a Norwegian and drinks like a Irishman. We have several members newly arrived from European countries with names God could not pronounce and whose ethnical origin is unknown to us.

"Fortunately we are a long way from Governors Wallace and Barnett, and a man's race is none of our business. To quote Mark Twain: 'We do not allow 1 part of a man to outvote the other 15 parts,' as they do in the Deep South."

Mr. Lannen apparently referred to Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama and Gov. Ross R. Barnett of Mississippi.

REFUSAL BY WOODWORKERS

The position of the carpenters' local in Alaska recalled a similar reaction recently by the International Woodworkers of America. A. F. Hartung, president of the Woodworkers' Union, wrote the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity that the questionnaire tended to establish minority groups rather than to eliminate discrimination against them.

Mr. Hartung refused to forward the questionnaire to local union affiliates. He said it would be "an insult to the leadership of our local unions."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1963]

RACE MIXTURES DEFY UNION IDENTIFICATION

(By Frank C. Porter)

Protesting that "we are not anthropologists," an Alaskan local of the Carpenters' Union says its membership is too ethnically jumbled to permit a racial breakdown.

For example, the local told the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity its treasurer is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish and "has perhaps a little Swedish blood."

A Cuban member "speaks Spanish, looks like a Norwegian and drinks like an Irishman."

As part of its antidiscrimination campaign, the President's Committee sent a questionnaire to labor unions throughout the Nation asking the number of American Indians, Negroes, orientals, Puerto Ricans, and Spanish Americans enrolled in each local.

Under "Remarks," Pete Lannen, financial secretary of carpenters local 1281 of Anchorage, replied:

"We were unable to completely fill out the form on an honest basis, as we are not anthropologists and we do not know when a member becomes or ceases to be a Negro, an Indian, an oriental, a member of a minority group or any of the other designations in the form.

"For example, the treasurer of this local union, to the best of his knowledge is part Negro, part Indian, part Jewish, part Irish and has perhaps a little Swedish blood. Another of our officers is roughly in the same category. We do not desire to dissect the poor devils and put part of them in each one of these columns.

"We have many members who apparently have Negroid blood. In fact, some of the experts state that there is only 1 person in 1 million in the world today that does not have Negroid blood. We have a number of Alaskan aboriginals with Eskimo and Indian blood mixed with Russian, Scandinavian, Chinese, and other so-called races whose sexual urges resulted in crossbreeding. We also have a number of members who came from the Hawaiian Islands. It appears that their ancestors were both promiscuous and prolific * * *

"Fortunately we are a long way from Governors Wallace and Barnett and a man's race is none of our business. To quote Mark Twain, 'We do not allow 1 part of a man to outvote the other 15 parts,' as they do in the Deep South."

Less good-humored was the reply of A. F. Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America. He told the committee he refused to forward the questionnaire to his locals because it would be an insult to them. "We take everybody into our union unless it can be proved he is a Communist, Fascist or Nazi," he said.

SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the present outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East. Now, as in the past, it is evident that the States of the Arab world are seeking to distract attention from their own domestic problems by concerted harassment of Israel. The latest direct Syrian-Israeli clashes provide continuing proof—if proof is needed—that the problems of the Middle East are not solved. In fact, they have not even eased with the passing of time.

Israel's latest charges of aggression by Syria go back to last December. Since then, it is charged there have been 98 shooting incidents which have very much the appearance of deliberate provocation against Israel.

Mr. President, in the past Israel has understandably been reluctant to press its charges against Arab nations in the U.N. The Israelis realize full well that the Arab States outnumber them in voting power. Even more significant, they recognize that, regardless of the merits of the issues, the Soviet Union and Communist bloc will back Arab charges, however exaggerated, in the continuing Communist effort to woo Arab support and infiltrate the Middle East.

What is less understandable, however, Mr. President, is the position that the United States has all too frequently taken when similar incidents have been protested to the Security Council in the past. Our Government, most regrettably, instead of standing up for the facts and judging the issues with an understanding of Israel's vulnerable and insecure position in the area, has tended to go along with Arab and Soviet initiatives. In some cases, the United States has even gone along with direct condemnations of what the Arabs describe as "Israeli aggression." In other cases, the United States has joined in watered-down resolutions that place the blame equally on both sides even though the facts indicate that the provocation was from Arab States. In no case have we contributed forceful leadership and tried to put the full weight of U.S. prestige on the side of a reasonable solution.

Mr. President, the discussions before the Security Council are—and will be viewed throughout the Middle East as—a significant test case. Israel for the first time in a number of years has brought Arab activities to the attention of the United Nations instead of considering direct retaliation. If the Security Council temporizes, if the Security Council postpones action, if the Security Council merely passes a watered-down resolution that seeks to blame both sides equally for belligerent Arab activity, then we can blame ourselves if more trouble comes. Any weakness or shilly-shallying in the U.N. on this issue will only be an invitation to the Arab States to continue their provocation.

Mr. President, the United States has a fine opportunity to assume a role of leadership in these circumstances and to make clear that we will not tolerate continued Arab harassment and provocation along the borders of Israel. Nasser has already threatened to bring his troops now in Yemen to contribute to the tensions along the Israel border.

Mr. President, the United States must take a strong stand now and make it clear that the United States will not tolerate a continuation of this belligerence. Now is the time, in the course of the present meeting and debate, to make our views clearly known and our leadership decisively felt.

CALIFORNIAN TRAVELS FASTER ON WHEELS THAN ANY MAN BEFORE HIM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the extraordinary feat of a young Californian, Craig Breedlove.

On August 5, Craig Breedlove whipped across Bonneville Salt Flats in Utah in his wingless jet car and averaged 407.45 miles an hour. This is faster than any man had ever traveled on wheels before. It broke the land speed record of 394.196 miles per hour held by England's John Cobb—a record that daredevils for 16 years had been trying to crack.

Craig Breedlove got the racing bug at the age of 12. Until he was old enough to enter acceleration events he worked at the mechanical end of the sport. At 16 he set seven records in the highly competitive southern California drag circuit.

Three years ago he began to think seriously about breaking the land speed record. He gave up his job as an aircraft stress tester and devoted full time to his dream. He gathered together a voluntary group of assistants. And he got invaluable help from the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and the Shell Oil Co., sponsors of the record attempt.

Shell Oil made a special blend of turbine fuel to help the J–47 engine generate its 4,250 pounds of thrust. Goodyear made the 4-foot-tall tires and tested them up to 600 miles per hour. It also designed, tested, and fitted the precision-machined wheels and brakes.

Craig Breedlove is an exceptional young man. His car "Spirit of America" is well named. It reflects his own special spirit—and the kind of will and tenacity of purpose needed for the job.

An interesting story on his triumph was published in the August 16 issue of Time. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DREAM OF SPEED

Across Utah's Bonneville salt flats whipped the piercing whine of a J–47 jet engine. Technicians huddled around their electric timers. "Here he comes," somebody shouted. A strange object that looked like a wingless jet airplane flashed into sight, roared past and disappeared, leaving waves of refracted light dancing in the brilliant desert dawn. Strapped in his cramped cockpit, Craig Breedlove, 26, pressed a button that released two colored parachutes, and the Spirit of America skidded to a halt. "All I know," he said, "is that I was moving fast." The timers told how fast: in two runs through Bonneville's measured mile, Breedlove had averaged 407.45 miles per hour—faster than any man had ever traveled on wheels before.

AT WHAT PRICE?

Breaking the world land speed record has been Craig Breedlove's obsession ever since he was a car-struck 12-year-old in Los Angeles and talked his parents into letting him buy an aged and battered Ford—"not to drive, just to work on." That was in 1949, 2 years after London Fur Broker John Cobb set a new land speed record, gunning his twin-engined, 2,500-horsepower Railton Mobil Special up to 394.196 miles per hour. Over the years, dozens of daredevils have tried to track Cobb's mark, and few sporting pursuits have been so costly to participants in terms of money and life. The turbine-powered Bluebird of Britain's Donald Campbell is, so far, a $5 million flop. Three years ago, Utah's Athol Graham was killed when his homemade car lost a wheel at better than 300 miles per hour. Last year California's Glenn Leasher drove his jet-powered Infinity past the timers at more than 400 miles per hour, but moments later an explosion scattered car and driver over a square mile of Bonneville salt.

Breedlove paid for his dream too. Instead of going to college, he took a variety of odd jobs (welder, fireman, sports car salesman) that allowed him free time to build fast cars and race them. His first wife divorced him. In 1959 he set to work on Spirit in earnest. Before he was through, he quit his job, exhausted his unemployment compensation, was scrimping by on the earnings of his second wife, a waitress in a drive-in (and a car buff like himself). "Four years," he said last week. "Four years of seven days a week, eighteen hours a day—no movies, no going out to dinner, no TV, nothing but work."

A well-to-do Mormon bishop bought Breedlove an airplane jet engine. Designers helped him with problems of aerodynamics. He drew up a brochure, built a tiny-scale model of his car, went in search of sponsors. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. donated the special tires he needed, and Shell Oil Co. agreed to pick up the rest of the bill. "He's a remarkable salesman," said one Shell executive. Shell's contribution came to about $150,000.

IN WHAT BOOK?

The painstakingly handcrafted vehicle that carried Breedlove to his record was a bizarre contraption with three wheels and a tail fin jutting 10 feet high. The thing was 35 feet long and 11 feet wide, weighed 3 tons. Its single front wheel could be steered only half a degree in either direction. To keep the car from taking off at high speeds, the cigar-shaped body was designed so that terrific air pressure on the nose would hold it down ("negative lift," engineers call it). A small fin under the nose helped carve a path through the "air wake"—so strong at high speeds that it might otherwise rip the car apart.

At week's end record-book custodians were arguing over what book Breedlove's record belonged in. The Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile said no, Spirit is not an automobile, because it has only three wheels and none of them is driven directly by the engine. The Fédération Internationale Motocycliste said of course Spirit is not an automobile—it is a motorcycle and, hélas, a motorcycle that can beat any automobile. Breedlove only shrugged. He was finally going to take a vacation. "If someone breaks my records," he said, "I'll be right back." In the meantime, if Spirit of America was only history's fastest tricycle, that was all right with him. It was undeniably, he knew, the fastest something or other.

X–15 DOES IT AGAIN

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, yesterday another altitude record toppled to the airplane which has been called the most successful research aircraft ever built—the rocket-powered X–15.

NASA's chief test pilot, Joseph A. Walker, held the X–15 to 351,000 feet or 66.5 miles. He used the aircraft's speed brakes as he arced upward to prevent excessive velocity. For about 3 minutes Walker was in a near weightless condition.

The purpose of the flight was to obtain data on stability and control in the extreme ranges of flight, especially in reentry from high altitude with the ventral fin removed.

This flight also carried for the first time an altitude predictor as a pilot aid to avoid overshooting the desired altitude. Fast readings were provided by computer and an ultraviolet photometer. Last July 19, Walker unexpectedly reached a new altitude record of 347,800 feet when his rocket engine burned for 85 seconds—2 seconds longer than planned. Yesterday Walker kept the engine burning full throttle for 85.5 seconds and shut down at 167,000 feet. Momentum carried him the rest of the way up. From the time the X–15 was dropped from under the wing of a B–52 over Mud Lake, Calif., until its steel skids touched down on the hard clay of Rogers Dry Lake, the flight lasted just 10 minutes. The plane weighed 33,000 pounds at launch and 15,000 pounds at landing, consuming 9 tons of liquid oxygen and ammonia during powered flight.

Yesterday's flight may not be the highest the X–15 will make. But NASA's engineers say they consider 360,000 feet to be about the optimum altitude for the plane in its present configuration. However, it is worth noting that this airplane already is flying at the edges of space. This was Walker's fourth flight above 50 miles, the altitude that qualifies a military pilot for astronaut wings.

More importantly, the X–15 has climbed more than 100,000 feet above the altitude for which it originally was designed. And in 91 flights during a successful 11-year program, the X–15 has expanded its role from an experimental high-speed aircraft to that of a carrier of scientific experiments into space. The X–15's contributions to aeronautics and space research have been many. The reaction jets used to control the X–15 have been adapted to the space capsules used in Projects Mercury and Dyna-Soar. Valuable information has been gained about aerodynamic heating, new control systems, better instrument displays, and in many other areas.

Mr. President, the X–15 project has its home at NASA's Edwards Flight Research Center in the southern California desert so uniquely fitted for high-speed and high-altitude flight operations.

Most of the 375 persons who took part in yesterday's high-altitude flight, although assembled from all over the United States, now make their homes in California. The X–15 aircraft is built by North American Aviation at its El Segundo, Calif., factory.

As a Californian, but most especially as one who is interested in the continued progress of aviation and flight research, I am pleased to call the attention of the Senate to this latest successful entry in the X–15's flight log.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, August 21 is a big day for Hawaii for it is the fourth anniversary of Hawaiian statehood. It is a day of joyous celebration but also a day of sober reflection on the responsibilities we have assumed in the sisterhood of States.

On the previous two anniversaries of Hawaiian statehood, I emphasized the economic as well as the political and social progress that we had made since the advent of statehood. I am happy to report that Hawaii continues to show a healthy growth and each year attains new heights.

On this our fourth anniversary, I should like to reflect a while on the role of Hawaii in the space age.

Throughout our half-century fight for statehood, we repeatedly stressed that the geographical separation of Hawaii from the rest of the United States would not be an obstacle, but indeed could be an advantage. During the past few years, I feel that we have been proven correct to a degree beyond that which we ourselves had envisioned.

Hawaii, which is not only the westernmost State but the southernmost State as well, is located near the center of the vast Pacific Ocean. Primarily because of this favorable geographical location, Hawaii has made and will continue to make valuable contributions in our national effort to push the new frontiers of science in this space age. Let me cite a few examples:

First. At Kokee, on our beautiful garden isle of Kauai, Hawaii is proud to have a satellite tracking station which played a significant role during the recent historical space flights by Astronauts John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, and Gordon Cooper. It was a particularly momentous event and signal honor for Hawaii to be the first State to welcome the returning Major Cooper, who was so dramatically picked up in the Pacific waters near our islands.

Second. The strategic location of our islands in the geographic center of the vast Pacific missile range has opened up new scientific horizons for the Hawaiian people. New emphasis is being placed on science and engineering in our institutions. In coordination with such companies as Hawaiian Telephone, Hawaiian Electric, Kaiser Industries, and Kentron, the island government is exploring the possibility of establishment of a research and development center which will exploit the advantages of Hawaii's geography and natural resources.

Third. The Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense has awarded a $4,350,000 contract to the University of Michigan to build and operate a midrange ballistic missile observatory on Mount Haleakala on the island of Maui in the State of Hawaii. This observatory, which will be equipped with three 48-inch telescopes, will be located on land leased from the University of Hawaii and, when not being used for ballistic missile observation purposes, will be available to other institutions for astrophysical and astronomical experiments.

Fourth. The University of Hawaii on its own is making significant progress in the field of geophysics. The current multinational tsunami—tidal wave—study should prove of value to many nations.

Fifth. Early this year, Pearl Harbor was made the home port for Polaris nuclear submarines in the Pacific basin.

On this fourth anniversary of Hawaiian statehood I am, therefore, proud that our new State has enthusiastically adjusted to the space age. We must, however, remind ourselves that the space age is not confined to technical advancements. Good human relationships are even more important in this era of greater speed and awesome power. We have always felt that the people of Hawaii could contribute much, especially in helping to bridge the gap between the East and West—between peoples of different color and creeds.

The granting of statehood to the people of Hawaii, the majority of whom are of Asiatic descent, I am sure gave a new dimension to American democracy in the eyes of the world. We are proud of Hawaii's wonderful climate and natural beauties, but as a State we are infinitely prouder of our long history of harmonious race relations. We do not claim to have found all the answers to solve racial conflicts, nor are we self-righteous about our own good record. In the coming struggles over civil rights in this country, however, I do say that our newest State stands eager to share its proudest commodity—the spirit of "aloha." The spirit of aloha stands for friendship and good will.

On this occasion of our fourth statehood anniversary, I am privileged on behalf of the 50th State, to extend to you our warmest and heartfelt aloha.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the executive committee of the Kansas Republican State Committee meeting in Wichita, Kans., on August 10 adopted a resolution in regard to proposed civil rights legislation.

The Republican Party in Kansas has always been cognizant of insuring the equality of our citizens in our State, and under Republican leadership, has for many decades enacted legislation that would prevent discrimination against any of our citizens because of race, color, or creed.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY KANSAS REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 10, 1963

Whereas the Republican Party is and always has been the party of human freedom and equal justice; and

Whereas the State of Kansas has been a leader in the enactment of excellent legislation pertaining to civil rights; and

Whereas the legislation now pending in the Congress of the United States is similar to legislation introduced by the Republican administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Kansas Republican State Committee, That the congressional delegation for the State of Kansas be urged to support and work for the enactment of sound and constructive civil rights legislation.

DANGER IN THE ARCTIC AS RADIOACTIVITY MOUNTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a grave and potentially dangerous situation exists in the Arctic regions of our Nation. American citizens of Eskimo and Indian stock who live in inland Alaska today rely upon caribou meat as their principal food stock. There is reason to believe that the caribou are becoming increasingly contaminated with strontium 90 and cesium 137. This contamination cannot be of good effect and may well be of harm to these people and to their descendants.

The time is approaching, Mr. President, when the Senate and the Nation must give real attention to the perils caused by the radioactive refuse of atomic testing. Practical action is needed and the Federal Government dare not duck its responsibility.

The above words, Mr. President, I addressed to the Senate on April 4 of this year. I said then the time was approaching when action will be needed. The time is now here.

On June 3 of this year I repeated my warning: I have received reports that lead me to believe that levels in the coming months and years will rise a good deal higher than figures now available indicate, even without further tests. A responsible official of the Public Health Service has informed me that it is reasonable to expect that in some instances individuals in the American Arctic will begin receiving exposures well into range III in the near future. I would wish that a study of countermeasures to protect the Eskimo citizen were also underway. It is not. I would wish a policy decision had been made as to when and how countermeasures would be applied in the Arctic. It has not.

Yesterday, in testimony received by the Subcommittee on Research Development and Radiation of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, my predictions were borne out. Mr. H. M. Parker, manager of the AEC's Hanford Laboratories, testified that Alaska Eskimos are now receiving doses of contamination exceeding the generally accepted permissible levels as established by the Government in the radiation production guides. I ask unanimous consent that a story by Frank Carey in this morning's Washington Post may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH RADIATION DOSES FOUND IN ESKIMOS

(By Frank Carey)

Evidence was reported yesterday that Alaskan Eskimos have absorbed radiation doses exceeding at least average permissible limits—from eating reindeer and caribou meat containing unusually high concentrations of bomb-test fallout.

Another report from Atomic Energy Commission officials said Alaska has experienced "somewhat higher" fallout than any other State—primarily because it's the first region hit by the early fallout from Russian nuclear tests in polar latitudes.

H. M. Parker, manager of the AEC's Hanford Laboratories at Richland, Wash., who told of the Eskimo radiation findings, stressed that he did not believe the Eskimos are in any danger.

But he added, in testifying at fallout hearings being held by the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee:

"This is not to say that in the long term it (would) not be dangerous * * * and if I were a resident there, I'd begin to look around to see how reasonable it would be to substitute some other kind of food (for reindeer and caribou)."

Meanwhile, it was learned that the Public Health Service and the AEC, at the urging of Senator E. L. Bartlett, Democrat, of Alaska, are planning a much more extensive study of the situation.

The joint study will include an intensive analysis of radioactivity in the air and water in those Alaskan areas where the Eskimos and Indians live—and the caribou roam. It will also embrace intensive studies of the radioactive content of the reindeer and caribou meat, which is used extensively in the native diet.

Parker said the Eskimo studies were made with the help of a unique, transportable radiation counter developed by Hanford engineers.

Before using this device, to examine 700 natives from 7 villages, the researchers using other measuring techniques found fallout levels in many native plants and animals "higher than those in other States of the Union."

Unusual concentrations of cesium 137 were observed in flesh of caribou and reindeer," Parker said.

In the Eskimo studies, the highest average adult "body burden" of cesium 137 in 1962 was 450 nanocuries of radiation, and the maximum was 790.

Parker said this compares with proposed permissible limits of 300 on the average for a group, and 1,000 maximum for an individual, with respect to people in the general population. The maximum permissible limit for workers in atomic plants is much higher—30,000 nanocuries.

(A nanocurie represents a billionth of a curie of radiation.)

Mr. BARTLETT. It is true, Mr. President, that more extensive body count measurements are being taken across the Arctic. As a direct result of the concern expressed by many Alaskans as well as myself, a proposal has been worked out by the Public Health Service and the Atomic Energy Commission to establish, for the first time, a sensible Arctic-wide study of the extent of the contamination hazard to the fauna and flora. This research, to be undertaken by the Arctic Health Research Center, would be the first competent and comprehensive American approach to the problem. I need hardly say that it is months and years overdue. I regret to say that, overdue as it is, the proposal has not as yet received final approval from the Government agencies concerned. I request, I demand, that it be soon approved and that work get soon underway.

Horror stories like the one which I have just placed in the Record do no one good. The Public Health Service has a responsibility to the Eskimos, a responsibility it cannot shirk.

AN IMPORTANT MESSAGE FOR ALASKA NATIVES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, early in June, the chiefs of the Athabascan Indian communities which border the Tanana and Yukon Rivers of Alaska, met to confer on the many problems facing their people today. They invited several Government officials to speak to them on specific subjects and among these was Robert L. Bennett, Alaska area director, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Since assuming his duties in Alaska, Mr. Bennett has made real progress in dealing with problems of the Alaska native people. He does not sit in his office in Juneau but gets out in the bush and meets community leaders, he requests and uses their ideas before initiating new programs or projects.

Mr. Bennett's remarks to the Tanana chiefs I feel exemplify the caliber of his thinking and quality of the counsel which he is capable of giving. I feel his message to the chiefs that education is the key to the solution of their problems of unemployment, the decline of the availability of game and fish for subsistence, and their rapidly expanding population, is an important one. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Robert L. Bennett, Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Tanana Chiefs' Conference, June 5–7, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Bishop Gordon, Reverend Fathers, leaders, and gentlemen, I enjoy being here very much, to hear what the delegates have to say, to hear the recommendations of the various committees, and to hear what your friends and guests have had to say.

I think the reason why you are here, and why you have the problems you do, is because changes are taking place among you. Some of these changes are changes which are brought about by your own desires, your own needs—some of these changes are the result of external or outside forces.

The first one, I believe, which came about, and which probably resulted in your first meeting, is the statehood bill which gives the right to the State of Alaska to select certain lands, subject to the rights of the native people which so far have not been defined by the Congress. There is under consideration at this time in the Department of Interior a proposed bill which the Secretary of the Interior will submit to the two committees of Congress, Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. There these bills will be studied by the staffs on these two committees and will be introduced with whatever changes may be made by the chairmen of these two committees.

After these bills are introduced, we will get copies from the committees or from your congressional delegation or our Washington office, so that each village in Alaska will have a copy of the bills as introduced. The bills as introduced in the Senate and in the House probably will both be the same. You will then have an opportunity to study these bills. You may then want to hold some special meetings among you to get together on what your views and attitudes on these bills are going to be.

Before Congress takes any action the committees will, of course, hold public hearings and I believe one of your recommendations is that some of these hearings be held in Alaska so that more of the delegates have the opportunity to speak either for or against these bills or to recommend changes in them. When the bills are finally made into law you still may not be satisfied with your rights as Congress defines them and you could consider legal action. This, of course, would take some time. I believe, however, there are things which you can do and should do now.

I believe that the State of Alaska, through its director of lands, Mr. Roscoe Bell, is very interested in working out local plans for the use of land around native villages. Regardless of how the legislation comes out and regardless of any subsequent later court decisions affecting your rights, it is always good business to plan. I would suggest, therefore, that you take advantage of the opportunity you now have to plan with the State division of lands on how land around your villages is to be used.

It is evident from what I heard here, the hunting and trapping pressure is getting pretty terrific on some of the lands, some of the villages are resorting to using more land for gardens as a means of having food of a kind necessary to feed you and your families, and some areas may be developed for other purposes which will bring in income to the villages. You can sit down now with the State director of division of lands and do this kind of planning without harming your basic rights to the land. In other words, by sitting down and planning with the State you are not jeopardizing your rights, because you can plan on the condition that you are still reserving every right you feel you may have to the land as may be eventually established by Congress or established in the courts.

I feel that each village should have a committee—a planning committee—for this purpose so that you can call upon Mr. Bell and others you feel can be of help to you to develop these kinds of plans. Some of you are concerned that you're killing or trapping too much, and as a result in time there won't be any. So, I think that you are now in a situation where you will have to develop your own local plans on how you are going to use this land which is around you. I am sure Mr. Bell and people in the State division of lands want to and would be willing to accept requests from you to come out and plan, and as I said before, you can do this without jeopardizing your rights, whatever they may eventually be determined to be either by Congress or by the courts.

Now in connection with another outside factor which is causing tremendous change in the villages, both below and above the site, is the Rampart Dam. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has requested that the Corps of Engineers make available money for a social and economic study of the villages which will be affected, a survey of the lands and the property claimed by the native people which will be affected, and prospects that the native people will have for economic development during the construction of the dam and after it is constructed. In negotiating with the Corps of Engineers other construction projects of this kind, involving Indian reservations in the lower 48, we have been able to obtain from the projects: First, money to pay for the property that is lost plus the right to take the property. In other words, if you have a house which is going to be lost you get paid for the house and then you can also take the house. It's paid for and it is still yours to take. Second, for relocating and reestablishing villages; third, payment for the rights you are losing to hunt, fish, and trap in particular areas—these are called your intangible rights which have been mentioned before; fourth, the cost of moving graves and shrines and relocating things of this kind; fifth, funds for a new community, and a better one, involving water systems, power, and streets—funds for helping the villages get started in a new area. In other words, when you go into a new area, whether it is an area in which you hunt, trap, or set up businesses, you will need funds to get started and funds for economic development.

These are all precedents which have already been established by Congress in settlement with the native people where they have lost lands in other areas because of the projects such as the Rampart Dam. We have already served notice—the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the Corps of Engineers—that these are the things that we are going to insist be provided for the native people and communities which will be affected by the Rampart Dam, if it is built. As Colonel Sawyer mentioned yesterday, the decision as to whether or not it is going to be built has not been made, but since they are doing advance planning we are letting them know what our views are also at this time in relation to Rampart Dam settlements and the native people.

I was very happy to hear the recommendation of the Rampart Dam committee relative to training, because we felt also the native people had these needs and these two additional requirements are being insisted upon by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. One is for training for jobs in the preconstruction and construction of the dam and in operation of any facilities which may be permanent facilities, like the powerplant—and, second, local resident priority in employment.

These are some of the things which the Bureau is recommending in relation to the Rampart Dam project at this planning stage. Now here again I believe that the villages which will be affected should appoint a negotiating committee, or a committee that can work with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in constant negotiation and discussion with the Corps of Engineers relating to the Rampart Dam. If it is not constructed, well and good, and you are not affected. If it is constructed then you have put in several years of negotiations and planning with the Corps of Engineers, you have made your wants known soon enough, and they are specific enough so that when money is provided for construction of the dam, a part of the project cost will be included to meet all the needs and the claims of the people.

I think that the villages should, as soon as possible, appoint a negotiating committee so that we in the Bureau have someone we can work with. We hope the University of Alaska will help us also in making some of these studies so they will need a group representing the villages that they can work with and in time we develop in dollars and cents exactly what the village needs will be.

Most of the States in the lower 48, that have substantial Indian populations, have developed and created through the legislature commissions on indian affairs. You may wish to consider suggesting to your own legislature that they develop a commission on native affairs. This could be made up of a group of men representing the State government appointed by the Governor, and an equal number of delegates from the native population, who would meet—hopefully at the expense of the State—monthly, or every 2 months or 3 months, to discuss some of the mutual problems of the native people which you are bringing up here. I'm afraid that some of the recommendations that you bring up have no organization behind it to take action.

Now, if such a commission on native affairs was created by the State legislature, then this would be the organization to which all of your needs and your recommendations would be presented. They could meet and study your problems and make recommendations to the State for additional legislation, for changes in legislation or regulations, and whatever is decided that would be in your best interest and in the interest of the State and the country as a whole. So, I believe that this is something that you might consider.

I think the best thing that has happened to the native people in the past year is approximately 118 native boys and girls graduating from the 12th grade at Mount Edgecumbe and 3 graduating from the University of Alaska. Now, when we are talking about the problems of the native people, unless you, as leaders, insist that your young people be trained, they are going to be sitting here 20 years later and talking about the same problems you are talking about today.

Now you talk about game, and game can be lost—you talk about trapping, and the prices are gone—and the population pressure, particularly in the lower Kuskokwin, is getting to the point where even if they allow you to kill and take everything they wanted, the game and fish aren't there any more like they used to be. But there is one thing that can't be lost to you and that is the education and training which your young people receive. Now, if we could have three times as many graduating from high school and many, many more graduating from college, then the next generation of the Athabaskan people won't be sitting here talking about the kind of problems you are talking about.

To me, this is the only way that you can meet the changes which are affecting you people—affecting you not only from the outside factors but also from your own desires, and your own needs. You need to have cash now to get the things that you want, to get the things that your family wants, and the things that you need, and the hunting economy and a fishing economy is at a point of no return. I mean your children and grandchildren are not going to be able to live as they want on a fishing and hunting economy. So, whether or not you are able to change the seasons on the moose or kill more moose, and sell fish and do these things you are talking about, it would help only for a very short while because with the population increases of the native people, this isn't going to be the job you want.

I hope that in the future meetings you will begin to put your thinking out further because the only way the native people are going to be able to meet what is facing them in the future is through the kind of education and training that you insist your young people have and that you insist that your young people attend and participate in.

This is not a problem or something which is peculiar to the Athabaskan people. These are problems which are being faced by people all over, even the coal miners of Pennsylvania—they can't sell their coal any more—they are having to be trained to do something else. The people in different countries who have not been trained to do anything are now having to be trained to do some of these jobs. This is the reason why many of the new governments in Africa and these places aren't working because they don't have the trained people.

The requirements for many, many jobs are going to increase—they're never going to go back to the old days. It is true there may be people amongst you who can operate machines without a high school education, but it's also true that many of these agencies for reasons of safety and many other factors, are making high school education a requirement for a job. And these standards will never go back or be lowered.

Now, the whole situation is what can you do to prepare yourself and your children to be able to meet these standards and not ask everything to stop so that you can take part, because it won't stop. It's going to go on and it will leave you further and further behind unless you, as leaders, begin to face up to what is really ahead of you.

What is really facing you isn't a lack of enough moose, and a lack of enough fish and ducks and so forth—what is really facing you is the fact changes which are taking place all around you. Unless you prepare yourself through the education and training of your young people, they are going to be in the same position you are 20 years from now—and they will be sitting here right where you are, wondering why they are so far behind and why they are having such a difficult time.

The many Federal and State agencies, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, are here to help you. There is no reason why any high school graduate—native high school graduate in the State of Alaska—should not be in college today because of lack of money. The one thing we can get money from Congress for is for college training of native students. Now, I know that the non-Indian people of Alaska would like to have that kind of assurance. They would like to have that kind of assurance, that when their young people graduated from high school they know they would get through college. They don't have that, but you do. And this is the thing that you need so you, the native people, are able to face the realities ahead, to be able to face what the future is going to be holding for your young people.

Now, this doesn't mean that I am against your having further opportunities, such as the changes in the hunting seasons and these things that you are asking for. But if you had all that you are asking for, including the land, and if that were all given to you today that would not help you meet what the future is bringing to you and you wouldn't live any different tomorrow than you're living today.

It may be true that as a legal right you are entitled to the land. That's well and good. But don't put all your faith in it because that's not going to provide you with the answer. The answer is going to come from how much you insist that your young people go to school and take advantage of the education and training opportunities they have, and how you yourselves will take advantage of the education and training and help you can get through adult education, through the participation and planning with the State agencies, through the negotiation and planning that we will help you with in connection with the Rampart Dam.

You are not facing this kind of battle alone. A lot of people all over the world are facing these kinds of problems. And I hope that when you go home you will think about this, and I hope that in future meetings you will get down to some real serious thinking in terms of what you feel and what ways you feel you and your younger people can be helped, and maybe you will want to know and to get a real understanding of the things you are going to be facing in the future.

In connection with the negotiations on the Rampart Dam, I know that you will especially need the help of the Bureau. Now, we have lawyers but we are in the Government. The Corps of Engineers has lawyers and they are in the Government, too. It isn't always best to have our lawyers represent you because they are in the Government. You may need some outside legal help and you may want some outside legal help but in order for that attorney whom you may have represent you or to have legal standing before the Corps of Engineers or the Government agency he must have a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior. So if you, in discussing how you are going to present your case to the Corps of Engineers for the things you want, if you feel you need legal help, and I think by all means you should have legal help, then the attorney you select that you will pay money to must have an approved contract, approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This is a requirement of law. I just wanted to mention that.

I again want to say I am very happy to be here. We stand ready to help you; we stand ready to educate your children and to train your children; we stand ready to bring community education into your village; to help you meet the future which you will have to meet, which you will have to face, and which owning the land and killing more game and changing the season will not meet for you. I hope that in future discussions we can go into this more in detail and, as I said, with the oportunities you have and the opportunities the young people have I think you have a good opportunity to meet the challenges.

As I said before, I think the greatest thing that can happen to you—and has happened—has been the native young people who have graduated from high schools and graduated from the universities, and the more that are graduated from high schools and the universities, the closer you are going to come to solving your problems.

THE EDUCATION OF BLIND YOUTH IN PAKISTAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Dr. Isabelle Grant, a participant in the U.S.-sponsored educational and cultural exchange program, has written me from Lahore, West Pakistan, outlining her experiences during the past year preparing programs to aid the blind children of that country. Dr. Grant, herself blind, is a pioneer in the field of education for blind youth.

I believe the many Members of Congress, as well as the American public, who have supported the educational and cultural exchange program will be interested to learn of Dr. Grant's work which she describes as "living with a purpose."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from her letter and an article from the Pakistan Times summarizing a report on the education of blind youth in Pakistan be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAHORE, WEST PAKISTAN,
March 18, 1963.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: As a Fulbright grantee, I would like very much to share with you some of my experiences this year. I trust that you will not think it impertinence on my part thus taking your time.

My mission here was to see what I could do regarding a very vital problem, the education of the hundreds of thousands of blind children in this country whose lot, by the traditional cultural and religious pattern, consigns them to mendicancy. If indeed some of the families with blind children do not require their blind children to make the family living for them by begging, these better families do not admit to having blind children in the family and hide the children even from the closest relatives of the family. My experience here has been intensely interesting and stimulating and challenging, but at the same time discouraging and difficult. Yet all of these epithets do not begin to describe the 9 months I have been steadily working here. I might describe it as living with a purpose.

In order to teach their blind children, or any children for that matter, they need teachers. With my limited use of Urdu, in spite of hours of work on that language, I felt I could not approach the children directly. The native teacher with her vernacular, and her local teacher training, such as it was, was the teacher best fitted to teach blind children, I concluded. So I approached the department of education in West Pakistan and was privileged to set up a seminar for the preparation of teachers who would go out into the field, into the primary schools, and set up small groups of blind children in day classes. The publication I compiled and published just last week tells the rest of the story. It is called "Education of Blind Youth in Pakistan, a Seminar Report." I hope your schedule will allow you time to scan through some of the articles written by participants, showing better than I could describe it their awakening to a new and entirely undeveloped area of their educational program.

The Pakistan Times, probably the most widely read daily, for it goes to Karachi, Peshawar, and Dacca in the East Wing, was informed about the publication and a reporter came to interview me. I am enclosing the newspaper copy of his report.

The job has little more than begun. It may take years to do; but at least a beginning is being made now. The stumbling blocks have been many. They are part and parcel of this developing process in the so-called emergent countries. You will quite understand how complicated the problem became when, in January of this year, I was told that the education of handicapped children, scant as the program is, was to be taken out of the Department of Education and transferred to the Department of Social Welfare. The transfer was made, but no action whatsoever was taken. However, last week through the newspapers I learned that the Department of Social Welfare has been itself transferred to the Department of the Basic Democracies. I am at a loss to know where I stand trying to get a program of the education of blind children off the ground, but I shall keep on trying, and something may break one of these days. In the meantime, I am interviewing directors, inspectors, and headmasters, and anybody I feel will help in opening up this opportunity for education to these otherwise hopeless and helpless children.

I would like to close with my most sincere thanks for the opportunity which you have made possible for me, to have this year of living with a purpose.

Respectfully yours,

ISABELLE GRANT.

[From the Pakistan Times]

A NEW CHAPTER IN EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

On Friday, the 11-week seminar on the Education of Blind Youth came to a close in Lahore and with that Pakistan turned a new chapter in this woefully neglected field of education. It would yet be time before the fruits are gathered but the seed has been sown and both the soil and climate have been galvanized thanks to the aging but incredibly energetic Dr. Isabelle Grant, herself blind and a pioneer in the field of education for blind youth.

The statistics about the seminar look modest to the point of being negligible. But they mislead; they do not tell the whole story, anyway. Some 34 men and women from 23 different cities of East and West Pakistan have been trained to teach the blind and, also, to train teachers like themselves. For a country with many more than 500,000 blind people, a third of them in school-going age groups, but scattered all over this large country, 34 trained teachers would be less than a drop in the ocean. But, surely, they are infinitely better than none. These 34 go back to their respective towns to start the good work they have been trained for and they have dedicated themselves to.

What lends the seminar and its results a truly historic significance is that from now onwards we shall have an altogether new and admittedly sensible attitude toward our blind. Thanks again to Dr. Grant, we have come to learn and believe that blindness is not a curse; it is a challenge—to the sighted. One physical handicap—for blindness is no more than just that—need be no deterrent to learning. Therefore with properly trained teachers on the staff of the ordinary schools for the sighted children, blind children would be entering them like the rest of their brothers and sisters. All told, there are only 200 blind children going to some sort of school in Pakistan today; 200 out of nearly 100,000. This works out like this, nearly 38 percent of the sighted children in Pakistan go to school, only 1 percent of the blind. This picture should soon begin to change for the better as a result of what had been happening during the last 11 weeks in a Lahore school under the guidance and inspiration of Dr. Grant.

The basic idea behind the new philosophy of education for the blind is that "handicapped though they be, they form a vast reservoir of potential assets for the Nation * * * they should be rescued from their present hopeless and helpless status as objects of pity and charity and given a chance to be contributors instead of being consumers, an asset instead of being a liability to the society." Pakistan cannot afford to have another generation of blind beggars. The end of the Seminar is, in fact, the beginning of this new and soul-stirring crusade.

But it is only a beginning and a modest beginning, too. The task cannot be accomplished by trained teachers alone, even if there be a million-strong army of them. In Dr. Grant's words, the sighted must be cured of their blindness towards the blind. They must be persuaded, if necessary taught, to realize that the blind are just like any one of themselves; that they do not need charity but the normal facilities to be educated and made into normal and useful citizens like any other children. A painful aspect of the new efforts to send the blind and sighted children to school together is that the sighted children have yet to get used to their blind fellows in the class. The sighted children imbibe a self-conscious attitude towards the blind from the society in which they are brought up. The responsibility for setting right this emotional disequilibrium between the sighted and the blind would naturally lie on parents and teachers.

There are many hurdles in the way still. There are no statistics about blind population in the country. The Burki recommendations require collection of these when the census is taken. Then there is the problem of braille books. Very few are as yet produced in the country. A braille press is taking shape at Karachi. But it would take some time before adequate number of braille books are available. The society as a whole has to be educated on this subject. The deep-rooted fatalistic belief that blindness is a curse and there is nothing one could do about it has to be eradicated. Unfortunate parents of blind children have to be taught that their child has every chance, or just about as good a chance, of making good in life as any other child provided he is afforded the same opportunities and facilities.

The first, and admittedly the hardest step, has been taken; a beginning has been made. A vast deal remains still to be done but it can be done, and quickly, too, if the new path now cut is pursued with diligence and devotion. All must play their part for experts and the teachers they have trained alone would not be able to achieve the object if society as a whole fails to wake up to its obligations to the blind child.

GEORGIA JAYCEES OPPOSE FORCE LEGISLATION AND MOB RULE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce, one of the most outstanding Jaycee organizations in the United States, on August 11 adopted a resolution in opposition to the administration's so-called civil rights legislation, specifically, H.R. 7152 and S. 1731.

Describing the proposals as both an unnecessary and an unwarranted infringement upon individual liberties and private property rights, the Georgia Jaycees urged that these bills in their entirety be defeated. The problems this legislation would purport to solve can best be met at the local levels of government by individual citizens and businessmen, their statement said.

Mr. President, I urge all Members of the Senate to carefully consider this resolution and the views expressed therein, and at this point I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States, certain proposed legislation commonly referred to as the civil rights bills; and

Whereas this legislation (H.R. 7152 and Senate bill S. 1731), contains certain provisions which are contrary, not only to the basic junior chamber of commerce beliefs favoring free enterprise, but to the inalienable rights of all citizens of the United States as guaranteed by the Constitution to engage in free enterprise; and

Whereas title 2 of the aforesaid legislation, now commonly known as the public accommodations section, does clearly deny rights to the majority of the citizens of the United States; and.

Whereas we believe that title 2 of said legislation, the public accommodations title, would, if passed, deny the fundamental principle of free enterprise and would impair the rights of private owners of businesses and would generally curtail freedom and handicap commerce; and

Whereas we believe that businessmen should, in our free country, be able to operate under a free enterprise system and do business with those with whom they choose; and

Whereas we, the members of the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce, feel that any social injustices which might exist can be, and are now being, solved by voluntary action without either force by mob rule or force of government control; and

Whereas that although we believe in the right of all qualified individuals to vote and have for years strongly urged all qualified voters to exercise their privilege to vote, and we do believe that the qualifications of voters should be fairly determined and administered, we feel the right and duty to set such qualifications is vested in the various States; and

Whereas we have confidence in the ability of the free American citizens to voluntarily solve any inequities found to exist in our social order without force from either mob or government; and

Whereas political rights enjoyed by freedom-loving Americans include the right to hire people of their choice without advice from a government study commission; and

Whereas other provisions of this legislation also call for the substitution of action of the Federal Government for the rights of the citizens; and

Whereas the States, localities and individuals should and can handle the problems sought to be remedied by this legislation; and

Whereas we believe the people of the United States should sue and be sued as individuals if they feel their rights infringed and that neither the Federal Government nor the Attorney General should be allowed to take away the rights of individual citizens to enforce their own rights through our courts of justice; and

Whereas there are sufficient laws now in existence and just and favorable courts to administer these laws so as to make further rules, regulations, and laws on civil rights, not only unnecessary, but an infringement on the political rights of the majority; and

Whereas the answers to problems existing in the social field lies in individual human action, not in hastily passed statutes enacted under force and duress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce does hereby go on record as favoring voluntary action where deserved and needed to give all citizens rights guaranteed to citizens, but as being opposed to H.R. 7152 (Senate bill S. 1731) in its entirety and urge that every legal step be taken to defeat this ill-conceived legislation and that copies of this resolution be sent to all members of the Georgia delegation in Congress with the request that it be entered in the Congressional Record and the minutes of the appropriate committees.

Robert A. Sloan,
President,
Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

Hal Kunkel,
Executive Vice President,
Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

ACQUISITION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in an editorial of August 15, the Baxley, Ga., News-Banner suggests that if the Congress enacts the public accommodations section of the administration's so-called civil rights bill, then there should be provisions made for making reparations to the businessmen who are forced to turn their businesses over to Government control.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Time for Reparations

While reparations are generally thought of as payments made by a defeated nation for property destroyed by the loser, it seems to us that congressional provision should be made for reparations to property owners whose businesses have already been wiped out or are certain to be as a result of racial demonstrations, riots and other illegalities condoned by the Kennedy administration.

Already by Executive order, before any additional civil rights legislation has come before Congress for a vote, the Armed Forces have been given authority to declare off limits any business or community discriminating against members of the Armed Forces. Executive orders against discrimination are coming from other branches of the Federal Government to State agencies expending Federal funds.

It has been the News-Banner's belief that Georgia has been making steady progress in resolving its racial issues in the use of tax-supported public facilities. However, the invasion of private establishments catering exclusively to certain groups has already resulted in many property owners having to close or liquidate their properties at heavy losses.

As the News-Banner has stated before, restaurants, motels, hotels and similar establishments stand to lose their investments either as a result of uncontrolled demonstrations driving away their regular patrons, or from the loss of regular patrons if their establishments are integrated.

Under the free enterprise system existing long before this country was founded, it has been until now an unquestioned right for an individual to deal with whom he chose. Therefore, if the Congress of the United States insists on passing the public accommodations section of the President's civil rights bill, then the Congress should provide in it for the compensation of innocent persons who may well lose all their life's earnings as a result of such legislation. Such compensation is provided for in the public acquisition of property for urban renewal and other programs conceived to be in the general public interest. An extension of that principle of the acquisition of property only by due process of law should be extended to include the loss of property by such a fundamental change in the laws governing property rights.

To the President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States we respectfully address this proposal.

PENNSYLVANIA'S WELFARE PROGRAM AN EXAMPLE TO THE NATION UNDER THE CONSTRUCTIVE LEADERSHIP OF THE SCRANTON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an exciting new welfare approach in my home State of Pennsylvania has been approved by an enlightened and knowledgeable 1963 general assembly.

It is being advanced with encouraging administrative help from our Gov. William W. Scranton, and Secretary of Public Welfare Arlin M. Adams. Secretary Adams has accomplished much for Pennsylvania citizens and has brought the welfare department to the highest place among the States, in the opinion of many observers.

I want to share the public welfare record of the 1963 Pennsylvania Legislature with you, because I think some of the programs it approved will become model legislation for other States.

When the new administration appraised public welfare on taking office in Harrisburg last January it realized immediately that these problems could not be solved with money alone. More would have to be done to rehabilitate persons dependent on public aid. Hospital stays of the medically indigent would have to be shortened whenever medically possible, and reimbursement methods improved. Idle hands would have to be retrained to do new work in a changing industrial world.

Only bold, new steps would break the "cycle of dependency" threatening to make public aid a way of life for some persons. Pennsylvania's legislature took those steps by authorizing a modern hospital purchase of care system; liberalizing medical care to the aged; requiring able-bodied aid recipients to work on public projects, and improving family and child welfare services.

To supplement his landmark legislative program to combat the social ills of our time, Governor Scranton by executive action created the Governor's Council for Human Services and named Public Welfare Secretary Adams as chairman.

The council, as the Governor pointed out in establishing it, is "of a pioneer nature within the Nation." Its members consist of the heads of State departments dealing with humanitarian services to people. It has the mission of providing better health and welfare services without wasting tax dollars.

The first project of the council, aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation, is a 5-year study of the school dropout problem. This will start in the Centennial School District in Bucks County in September.

The Pennsylvania General Assembly, in addition to tackling the problems of public assistance by authorizing 25 percent more caseworkers to emphasize social rehabilitation of those on public aid, adopted major improvements in many other public welfare activities, including enactment of:

More realistic medical aid for the aged—MAA—under the Kerr-Mills Act by expanding asset and income limitations so that Pennsylvania's eligibility requirements are the most liberal in the United States; authorizing post-hospital nursing home care to shorten hospital stays; ease relative responsibility; abolish repayment claims against estates; and permit prequalification of medically indigent 65 and over—H. 56, 57, 58.

Modern hospital aid on the basis of purchase of care for the first time since Benjamin Franklin in the 1750's instituted hospital grants-in-aid. This system of general hospital aid for all medically indigent persons was placed on a "purchase of care" basis, on a descending formula of percentage of cost to encourage maximum hospital utilization. Previously the State subsidy system limited a grant-in-aid to nonsectarian hospitals—S. 772.

Legislation authorizing the department of public welfare to contract with nonprofit corporations such as Blue Cross for the cooperative administration of assistance to the medically needy. This is another landmark in social welfare. It means that the aged will not have to deplete their savings when hospitalized—H.R. 1750.

Child welfare legislation that will enable Pennsylvania to assure adequate uniform child welfare service throughout the State. It changes the entire base of financial and administrative relationships for a more effective partnership between the State and its 67 counties in providing suitable child welfare services for every Pennsylvania child. This bill gives the State department of public welfare authority to administer such services directly if counties do not have satisfactory programs by January 1, 1968—H.R. 1720.

Legislation for the protection of children from inhuman treatment, by requiring physicians and pharmacists to report to the authorities all cases of injured children that come to their attention, the so-called battered child. This legislation was designed to stop shocking attacks by adults on children in their care, many of which are unreported at present—S. 96.

Pennsylvanians can be proud that while much of the Nation continues to debate the merits of various kinds of medicare programs, we have moved ahead to meet our responsibilities in the best way possible under existing Federal legislation.

The practice of demanding repayment of medical aid from the estates of our senior citizens is now eliminated.

This program increases the allowable limits on both assets and annual income of an aged couple from $2,400 to $3,840. For one aged individual allowable assets and annual income are upped from $1,500 to $2,400. These are the most liberal terms in this country.

Persons with assets and income exceeding these amounts may receive partial benefits, depending on the size of their bills. Their home, household furnishings, and car and $500 in insurance are exempted in computing assets.

Another valuable feature of this program authorizes the department of public welfare to prequalify aged persons for medical care. This means they do not have to undergo questioning during the stress of an illness.

In an effort to shorten hospital stays, the legislation provides for up to 60 days of care in nursing homes for elderly patients after they leave the hospital.

The responsibility of relatives of medically indigent persons may be reasonably regulated by the department of public welfare, within the framework of public funds available.

Under the new State aid to hospitals, purchase of care system eligibility will be determined by the department of public welfare's public assistance staff. Uniform regulations using present MAA eligibility—$1,500 and $2,400—will be applied.

Persons under 65 who are needy or medically needy will be eligible.

Sectarian hospitals can take part in the new program because payment for care has been held not to be a contribution toward the maintenance of the purveying organization. These hospitals did not qualify under the previous State aid grants system.

Whereas the highest rate paid the hospitals was $10 a day under the State aid system, rates more nearly approaching actual costs can be paid under the purchase of care system.

Sixty days of nursing home care in a 12-month period will also be provided.

The public child welfare program—H.R. 1720—gives the department of public welfare authority to administer child welfare services in any county that fails to have a satisfactory program.

Before the department assumes operation of child welfare services in a county, the county will be given ample opportunity, including a hearing, to conform with the requirements of an adequate child welfare program.

The costs of a county child welfare service program if administered by the department of public welfare will be divided between the county and State in the same proportion as if the program was administered by the county.

The bill also provides a procedure for the grants to be paid in quarterly installments to replace the present reimbursement procedure.

This new grant procedure will expedite subsidy payments to counties by eliminating detailed audits prior to payment and substituting adjustments to later grants for any overpayments that may occur.

Where charged with responsibility for affirmative action, as in many States, progressive social legislation at a State level under Republican Governors has resulted. This excellent record of constructive legislation achieved in Pennsylvania in the Scranton administration since January 15, 1963, is compelling evidence of what the Republican Party can accomplish where it has the voter's mandate as the majority party. Indeed, I would suggest to you that Republican State administrations not only implement aggressive social legislation, but in many respects promote programs along these lines far in advance of, and more imaginative and effective than the program of the opposition.

The Republican Party, as the party of the "constructive alternate" to spending for its own sake, is proving its point and winning public approval wherever Republican Governors are given legislative backing.

FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. SCOTT. It is hard to put into words one's feelings about Tad Walter. Tad lived a fascinating life, excelling in all he undertook and constantly impressing his colleagues with perception, wisdom, patience, and hard work.

He was the recipient of many academic honors, defender of his country in two World Wars, and an outstanding legislator for many, many years. He had the respect of his fellow Congressmen on both sides of the aisle.

I consider myself fortunate to have been able to have called him colleague.

DRAFTING OF NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Drafting Test Ban Treaty Job for Former Memphian," written by Charles Edmundson, and published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of August 10, 1963, being a tribute to Adrian Sanford Fisher, of the State Department.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFTING TEST BAN TREATY JOB FOR FORMER MEMPHIAN

(By Charles Edmundson)

Next to Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, the American most responsible for writing the new international treaty to halt nuclear testing in the atmosphere was a former Memphian, 49-year-old Adrian Sanford Fisher.

Mr. Fisher, son of the late U.S. Representative Hubert F. Fisher, spent 10 hard days in Spiridonovka Palace in Moscow as a member of the three-man drafting committee which hammered the treaty in shape.

His coworkers on the drafting job were Britisher Charles Darwin (a lineal descendant of the great British naturalist) and Semyon Tsarapkin, a top level Russian diplomat.

Now back at his State Department desk in Washington, Mr. Fisher is helping work out the strategy of getting the history making treaty ratified by the Senate.

One of the first things Mr. Fisher did after returning to Washington with Mr. Harriman was to telephone his mother, Mrs. Hubert F. Fisher, Sr., of 198 South McLean.

In Washington yesterday, Mr. Fisher described his drafting sessions with Mr. Darwin and Mr. Tsarapkin as a "no-nonsense type of discussion, not hostile, not friendly, but businesslike."

Matters were made easier because all three draftsmen speak fluent English.

"Once or twice Tsarapkin actually picked me up on the meaning of an English word," Mr. Fisher recalled. "Once I said, 'We have three alternatives.' Tsarapkin corrected me at once. 'Not three alternatives,' he said. 'There can be only two alternatives to a question. What you mean is three choices.' "

Mr. Fisher's committee met each morning to argue out draft versions of the treaty. Each afternoon this committee presented its draft to a meeting of the full delegation.

"The conferences in World War II were so short," Mr. Harriman has been quoted as saying, "that sometimes the hastily accepted language simply concealed the differences—papered over the cracks, that is. Perhaps that's one reason those agreements failed to stick. But this time the language we finally agreed upon preserved the understanding of both sides."

In nearly 2 weeks in Moscow Mr. Fisher took one afternoon off. He went with Mr. Harriman to see the men's events in the American-Russian track meet, which the American men won by a narrow margin.

"Mr. Khrushchev was there," Mr. Fisher says. "He seemed not only popular with the Russian people but acted like a man who thought this was important."

Mr. Fisher was a Phi Beta Kappa at Princeton, where he was a member of the football squad, winning a coveted gold football.

He took his law degree at Harvard in 1937. He was law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis and then to Justice Felix Frankfurter, under whom he had studied at Harvard. (An uncle, the late Edward Terry Sanford of Knoxville, had served on the Supreme Court.)

He has been in Government ever since except for a few years as a member of one of Washington's most prestigious law firms, Covington & Burling.

His full title now is Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. His title at the Moscow Conference was deputy to Mr. Harriman.

Mr. Fisher visited Memphis last October, when his mother was ill.

"I hope to get back there this fall," he says, "to visit my mother and my brother (Hubert F. Fisher, Jr., executive vice president of Cook & Co., Inc.)."

Meanwhile Mrs. Fisher is checking on her son through news pictures.

"Wrinkles are showing up in these photographs," she says. "I think he's working too hard."

RECLAMATION'S CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN PROSPERITY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the August 16 issue of Life magazine features an article which is supposed to be an exposé of what is termed the "pork barrel outrage." The article, an outrage in its own right, sheds buckets of indignant tears over Federal appropriations for various sound domestic programs. It tries to persuade its readers that when Congress invests money in public works projects for the benefit of our national economy, what is really going on is a wholesale raid on the taxpayers' wallets.

The article represents the combined efforts of four reporters, one photographer, one cartoonist, and I cannot say how many editorial geniuses, one of whom writes that the reporters spent 2 months of travel and research digging out facts. You would think that an informative, enlightened contribution to public knowledge might have resulted from all that effort, but such is not the case. Since these are presumably intelligent men, who must be capable of assembling and interpreting facts in order to get and hold positions as writers and editors, there is only one conclusion I can reach: Life's editors must have started out with an armchair decision that Federal investment in public works programs—particularly in the field of water resource development—was a shameful waste of public money; and then they must have ordered their reporters to seek out any facts whatever that would appear to support their preconceived thesis. Such methods are a far cry from responsible journalism.

I will take no more time berating Life's editors for this shoddy piece of journalism. I will put my faith in the intelligence of the American reading public. When the truth is placed before the people, they will have no difficulty in separating fact from fancy, truth from bias.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which is responsible for bringing life-giving water to the western half of the United States, is singled out for attack by Life. The article mentions no more than three of Reclamation's water conservation projects as examples of what it pretends is a needless drain on the Federal Treasury and a shameful bilking of the poor helpless taxpayers, but the implication is clear that many more "fat slices of pork" in the reclamation program could be cited if only there was a little more space. Such statements and implications cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. The truth is that the Bureau of Reclamation has been the chief architect in the development of the West; it pays for itself in hard dollars; and its monetary value in direct and indirect benefits to the West—and to the East and all other sections of the country as well—is many times the original Federal investment. I want the record to show this.

I was born and reared in Montana, one of the 17 arid Western States which could not possibly have achieved their present levels of growth and prosperity without the vital programs of reclamation. I have lived in and around reclamation areas all my life; I have watched dry, worthless sagebrush land that could hardly support a jackrabbit converted by the magic of irrigation water into prosperous farms and farming communities supporting thousands of prosperous people. And these people pay for their projects. Also they buy materials and equipment and all manner of consumer goods from factories and businesses in every State in the Union. And do not forget, they pay taxes into the Federal Treasury in addition to just paying back the cost of developing the water that permits them to earn their livelihoods. Reclamation is good business. I have seen it work all my life, and I know what I am talking about.

MONTANA RECLAMATION

Let me give you some statistics about reclamation in Montana. Reclamation has developed facilities in my State that now irrigate 267,558 acres of farmland. In 1962, crops grown on these lands were worth $14 million. That is $52 worth of crops for each of these irrigated acres. Without irrigation much of this land would have been producing nothing at all; it would have lain idle—a wasted resource of no value whatever to Montana or the Nation. Or else it would have been dry-farmed for wheat and other surplus crops. A point that easterners should keep in mind is that irrigation agriculture is not a significant contributor to our crop surplus problem; instead irrigation offers farmers the opportunity to diversify their crops and grow such things as sugarbeets, vegetables, fruits, and other specialty crops in high demand in the produce markets.

The cumulative value of crops grown on reclamation farms in Montana through 1962 totals $313.6 million. The total cost of construction and rehabilitation and betterment programs in Montana to date has been $250 million. There is one measure of how reclamation pays for itself.

Let us look at the payout picture on a few of reclamation's Montana projects. The Frenchtown project—not far from my hometown, incidentally—was built at a cost of $282,000. The water users have contracted to pay back to the Treasury $297,000—yes, $297,000—more than the original cost of the project works. So far, they have repaid $102,000, and they keep building up that sum every year. Meanwhile, the businesses and communities in the surrounding area grow and prosper as a result of the stabilized economy fostered by irrigation agriculture.

Stabilized agriculture made possible by irrigation, sets a chain reaction in motion. When a farmer knows his water supply for next year, and the year after, is assured, he has a good idea what kind of a crop year he can expect, and how much income he will have. He can purchase the machinery and equipment he will need, service and related industries in the area can expand their inventories to meet the predictable needs of the farmers, and the economic benefits are felt not only in the immediate trade area, but also across the State and the entire Nation. Had Life magazine been interested in giving a true evaluation of the worth of the reclamation program, they would have done well to hire the services of an agricultural economist. He could have given them an insight into the economic facts of life very quickly.

Let us get back to examples of direct payout for Montana reclamation projects. Water users on the Huntley project, in the south-central part of the State, have contracted to pay back $1,788,000 for water storage facilities and an irrigation distribution system built for them at an original cost of $1,884,000. So far they have paid back $1,217,000 of this—nearly three-quarters of the total.

On the lower Yellowstone project—in the eastern part of Montana, with a portion of it spreading over into western North Dakota—water users have contracted to pay back $3,828,000 for facilities built at an original cost of $3,589,000. So far, $3,070,000 has already been returned to the Treasury, more than three-quarters.

Incidentally, I am quoting repayment figures compiled at the end of fiscal year 1962. I do not happen to have later figures on payout in front of me now, but you may be sure that in each case the water users have paid back more than the sums I am quoting.

On the Minidoka project in my neighboring States of Idaho and Wyoming, there are repayment contracts in force totaling $34,466,000. The total project cost of $37 million includes Minidoka power facilities amounting to $3,125,017, of which $2,773,000 has been repaid.

An offshoot of the Minidoka project, the North Side pumping unit, celebrated its 10th anniversary just a few days ago. It was developed following World War II and gave many war veterans a valuable homesteading opportunity. Last year the 72,154 acres of irrigated unit lands contributed crops having a gross farm value of $10,309,270 to the national economy. Most of the acreage was in forage crops, vegetables, sugarbeets, and seed crops—which do not contribute to any crop surpluses. On the Minidoka project as a whole, crops produced in 1962 had a gross value of $114,740,464.

Let us move down to Arizona and the Salt River project, the grandaddy of the reclamation program, built in the first years of this century when reclamation was established by Congress to bring water to the great empty West.

The original $16.5 million cost of Salt River's irrigation and power facilities has been completely paid out. The Salt River Valley water users have been running their own project since 1917, and have built four more storage dams, additional power facilities, and at least two-thirds of the present distribution system. Through 1962, the cumulative value of crops grown on Salt River project lands had reached the enormous total of $1,935,812,042. But this is by no means the most significant aspect of the Salt River story. The project is located in and around Phoenix, as you know—the fastest growing metropolitan area in the entire United States. When reclamation first built the Salt River project, Phoenix was a dusty desert town of 12,000 people. Today, the Phoenix metropolitan area supports a population of more than 700,000 people. And what has made this fantastic growth possible? Just water. Water originally developed by reclamation, first to make the desert green with crops, then later—in ever-increasing volumes—to supply the domestic and industrial needs of the city and its surrounding towns.

The Phoenix story illustrates the magnitude of reclamation's role in the development of the West, totally above and beyond its original purpose of irrigation. Last year reclamation projects supplied 474 billion gallons of water for the municipal and industrial use of over 10 million people. Let me point out to you a fact about population growth that may have escaped general attention. Everyone seems to be concerned about the rate of growth of our eastern seaboard. We hear talk about a "megalopolis"—one solid city—reaching from Portland, Maine, to Richmond, Va. But fast as the population may be growing in the Eastern United States, the population of the West is growing twice as fast. In the East, we have twice as many people as we had at the turn of the century—in the West, four times as many. This is not an alarming statistic. This is fine, exactly as it should be. There is still plenty of wide open space in the West. It is logical for our excess numbers to migrate out to where there is room for growth. They are doing it in greater and greater numbers, and they are opening new businesses, new jobs, new opportunities for the young. The West is becoming an increasingly greater factor in the economic prosperity of the Nation, where once it was a hostile, empty waste, totally dependent on the resources of the East. The difference is written in one word: water. And the water development program of the Bureau of Reclamation has been the greatest single factor in Western development and prosperity.

That is just one more yardstick for measuring the vast indirect benefits that reclamation has brought to the Nation.

To get back to the payout picture let me just run quickly through a few more projects in other States to demonstrate how reclamation pays for itself all over the West.

The Yuma project in southwestern Arizona—another of Reclamation's earliest undertakings. Built at an original construction cost of $5.5 million, it has been entirely paid out by the water users.

The Baker project, Oregon: total to be repaid by contract, $225,000; repaid as of June 30, 1962, $147,000.

Boise project, Idaho: repayment contracts, $30,339,000; repaid, $15,398,000.

Carlsbad, N. Mex.: to be repaid by contract $3,747,000; repaid, $2,175,000.

Fruitgrowers, Colorado: contract, $198,000; repaid, $91,000.

Humboldt, Nev.: contract, $1,334,000; repaid, $660,000.

Strawberry Valley, Colo.: contract, $3,349,000; repaid, $3,044,000.

Orland, Calif.: contract, $3,291,000; repaid, $1,919,000.

North Platte, Nebr.: contract, $26,207,000; repaid, $17,319,000.

And so it goes, for projects large and small all over the West. They have either paid for themselves, or they are doing so.

Life magazine, for obvious reasons, fails to mention such projects. In fact, the article does not mention one single completed, functioning project in its imaginary chamber of horrors. The three it singles out are either still under construction, or only authorized—projects which have not yet had the chance to prove their worth.

Attacks of this sort are an old, old story. A time-honored saying has it that it is not fair to attack dead men, when they cannot stand up to defend themselves. The same applies to newborn babies. They cannot defend themselves either.

There are many people still around who remember the debates when Reclamation's great Boulder Canyon project came up for authorization. It was called a gigantic boondoggle, by its uncomprehending critics, a harebrained scheme to rob the taxpayers; the water and power to be developed there were not needed and never would be needed; the project could not possibly pay for itself—and so on.

But what has happened? The total cost of project facilities—including the giant Hoover Dam and powerplant—was $172 million. By June 30, 1962, $110 million had been paid back. Twenty-five million dollars of this was principal, $85 million interest. The entire principal will be paid out by 1989, and by then the interest paid back will total $143.5 million. So the project will pay back nearly twice its cost—and the revenues thereafter will go to develop other water supplies so badly needed in the Southwestern United States.

I want to mention just one other reclamation project that has been so vital to western development: the Colorado-Big Thompson project. To pay for the irrigation facilities on the Big T, there are repayment contracts in force totaling $29 million. To date $3 million has been repaid, and the total will be paid out within 50 years of the time of project development. Commercial power investment in the Big T is $60.5 million. Ten and three-fourths million dollars of the principal has been repaid, plus $15.25 million in interest. The total will be paid back on schedule—within 50 years—in addition to $32.5 million in interest.

But the real story of the Colorado-Big Thompson is told in terms of drought and the value of crops saved. This lifesaving project has been worth $126 million to northeastern Colorado. During the drought years of 1954, 1955, and 1956, Big T facilities brought vital water to some $41 million worth of crops each year. There is another drought in the area this year—a bad one. Bad, that is, to those farms outside the area served by the Big T. I have an article here from the Denver Post of August 4 under the headline "Drought Nullified in Northern Colorado by Big Thompson Water." It tells us that the experts agree that without the Big T this year "losses from lack of water would be catastrophic in one of the richest and most diversified farm areas of the West."

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Drought Nullified in Northern Colorado by Big Thompson Water

(By Bert Hanna)

With thousands of acres of Colorado land scorched by drought, the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project is proving a lifesaver to a vast agricultural area of northern Colorado.

Without this complex of reservoirs, canals and tunnel diversion from the western to the eastern slope, experts agree that losses from lack of water would be catastrophic in one of the richest and most diversified farm areas of the West.

The "Big Tom" is taxed to its limit this year to supplement streams that have dwindled to trickles and to supply water needed for a profitable harvest.

The region 7 office of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation points to this project as the prime example of agricultural stabilization in the West.

They also cite it as justification for the planned future water resources development of the South Platte River involving the downstream Narrows Dam and upstream Two Forks Reservoir—a project that would conserve thousands of acre-feet of water for Colorado use.

It is estimated that last year Big Thompson project water increased by more than $22 million the value of crops grown in the 720,000-acre area under the Northern Colorado Water Conservation District.

This year, that figure is expected to be significantly higher and to represent the difference between virtual crop failure for many farmers and normal production.

The actual 1963 deliveries of project water so far have amounted to nearly 150,000 acre-feet of water. The project spreads over a tier of counties, including Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, Summit, Washington, and Weld.

Normally, deliveries from the system would be about 200,000 acre-feet annually. But because of the drought, the maximum allotment was declared at the beginning of the irrigation season—or 310,000 acre-feet.

It is estimated that at least 300,000 acre-feet will be delivered this season—a record.

Last year, the take from the Big Thompson was 283,000 acre-feet, but much of this water went into private storage of small irrigation companies.

This year, that storage is being consumed along with direct deliveries. The estimated 160,000 acre-feet of storage water used, plus the direct diversion, would be the equivalent of direct stream use. Thus the project is supplying about half the water needed to mature crops. Normally, the project water utilization is 28 percent of need.

The Reclamation Bureau points up an experiment conducted under Bureau auspices on water use and value by a farmer near Eaton, Colo., to determine how much additional production is obtained from an acre-foot of project water.

It was found that in the past year, the benefits in this case ranged all the way from $17 per acre-foot on such crops as oats to around $79 for potatoes. For diversified production on this farm, it was estimated that the value in terms of additional crop production was about $60 per acre-foot.

However, this was a controlled experiment, it was pointed out, and the average throughout the district was scaled down to about 60 percent of this farmer's result.

H. P. (Pat) Dugan, Denver regional director for the Reclamation Bureau and George R. Highley, Big Thompson project manager, say that each year since completion of the full facility in 1955, the increased gross value of crop production due to project water has amounted to more than the original repayment contract.

The total value of crops harvested in the irrigated area totaled $78,602,244 in 1962, or an average of $109.17 per irrigated acre.

Bureau officials also stress the importance of crop diversification which is brought about by supplemental irrigation. Delivery of project water was made to farms on which 35 different crops were grown.

Irrigated sugarbeets continue to be the most valuable cash crop and corn ensilage the most valuable feed crop. Sugarbeets harvested from 114,094 acres accounted for $26,856,107 of the total gross crop value in 1962. Other valuable crops include cucumbers, onions, and dry beans.

Livestock feeding on a large commercialized scale is a vital industry, consuming much of the agricultural feed products. The beef, poultry and dairy products sold or processed add much to the area's economy.

Thus, reclamation officials assert that projects such as the "Big Tom" do not contribute materially to the Nation's crop surplus because they permit a diversified agricultural economy to meet national needs.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I point out the virtues and the solid financial value of the Colorado-Big Thompson project to the western economy because Life has seen fit to attack the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, authorized by Congress last year. Fryingpan-Arkansas is, in its essentials, a sister project to Colorado-Big Thompson. It will divert water through the Continental Divide—just as the Big T does—to irrigate the fertile plains of southeastern Colorado. And it holds every promise of being just as valuable to the economy of the southeastern part of that State as the Big T has been to the northeastern part. It too will pay for itself, just as the Big T is doing; and it will pay off in direct and indirect benefits to the National economy in sums many times over the original investment.

Life states that Fryingpan-Arkansas will make Colorado water "that now flows west flow east and $170 million will flow out of U.S. taxpayers' pockets." I believe that no further words are necessary to demonstrate the irresponsibility of that statement, nor of the other charges set forth in Life's unworthy efforts to link "pork barrel" with the water resource developments of the Bureau of Reclamation.

ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE HARLAN AT AMERICAN BAR CENTER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, August 13, Mr. Justice John Marshall Harlan gave the dedicatory address of the William Clarke Mason Wing and the American Bar Foundation William Nelson Cromwell Library of the Bar Center in Chicago, Ill., as part of the activities of the annual convention of the American Bar Association.

Mr. Justice Harlan's speech is a magnificent reminder of the nature of our constitutional system of government and the demands made upon those who would preserve this system, the keystone of our liberties. Particularly at this time, when both national and international unrest might cause lesser men to agree to, or to seek, easy solutions which would destroy our entire constitutional fabric, we should be especially grateful for Mr. Justice Harlan's reminder.

As Members of the Congress, it is incumbent upon us to review thoroughly the constitutional basis for every legislative proposal. As we attend to our task of legislating, I feel it would be helpful to pause and reflect upon the wisdom of the remarks of Mr. Justice Harlan. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of John M. Harlan, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, at the American Bar Center, August 13, 1963

A role similar to that in which I find myself this afternoon has twice before been filled by members of our Court. In 1953 Mr. Justice Jackson spoke at the laying of the cornerstone of the American Bar Center. He was followed in 1954 by the present Chief Justice of the United States who dedicated the original buildings of the center. Today I have the honor of addressing you on the occasion marking the addition of two fine new facilities to this important part of the American Bar Association's establishment. In the 10-year interval this notable enterprise has come to fruition in a rapid and impressive manner, so that what is now said about its significance need no longer be confined to the promise of the future but should also embrace the present.

Few who know the American scene would, I think, dispute the generalization that the Constitution of the United States has proved to be the great instrument of government it has largely because it was the product of men who in a revolutionary era were able to preserve a sense of moderation and proportion. They were content to strike the balance between orderly government and individual liberty in terms of broad outlines, leaving the framework to be filled in by future generations. Their farsighted handiwork has proved fully equal to meeting the needs of the Nation in periods of domestic tranquillity, unrest, and strife as well as in times of international peace and war, and under it the country has attained a position of preeminence in world affairs.

We are again in an era of international unrest and domestic uncertainty. Our system of government is being challenged from abroad and readjustments of one kind or another are facing us at home. Only the fainthearted could doubt our ability to cope with both. Yet it would be shortsighted not to recognize that times like these are bound to produce temptations and pressures to depart from or temporize with traditional constitutional precepts or even to shortcut the processes of change which the Constitution establishes. Is it not the special responsibility of lawyers, whether on or off the bench, to see to it that such things do not happen?

One of the current notions that holds subtle capacity for serious mischief is a view of the judicial function that seems increasingly coming into vogue. This is that all deficiencies in our society which have failed of correction by other means should find a cure in the courts. The principal theme of these remarks will be to challenge the validity of that thesis from the three principal standpoints that are most frequently heard in its support. These are: Doubt whether the federal system is any longer adequate to meet the needs of modern American society; impatience with the slowness of political solutions generally; and an urge for quick and uncompromising panaceas for things that call for reform. I venture to say at the outset that this cosmic view of the place of the judiciary is not only inconsistent with the principles of American democratic society but ultimately threatens the integrity of the judicial system itself.

Our Federal system, though born of the necessity of achieving union, has proved to be a bulwark of freedom as well. We are accustomed to speak of the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment as the principal guarantees of personal liberty. Yet it would surely be shallow not to recognize that the structure of our political system accounts no less for the free society we have. Indeed, it was upon the structure of government that the founders primarily focused in writing the Constitution. Out of bitter experience they were suspicious of every form of all-powerful central authority and they sought to assure that such a government would never exist in this country by structuring the Federal Establishment so as to diffuse power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The diffusion of power between Federal and State authority serves the same ends, and takes on added significance as the size of the Federal bureaucracy continues to grow.

Federalism as we know it in this country does not, however, have to find justification only in terms of history or of its significance as an instrument of freedom. What other political system could have afforded so much scope to the varied interests and aspirations of a dynamic people representing such divergencies of ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and at the same time unified them into a Nation blessed with material and spiritual resources unparalleled in history?

A Federal system is of course difficult to operate, demanding political genius of the highest order. It requires accommodations being made that may often seem irksome or inefficient. But out of that very necessity usually comes pragmatic solutions of more lasting value than those emanating from the pens of the best of theoretical planners. Unless we are prepared to consider the diversified development of the United States as having run its course and to envisage the future of the country largely as that of a welfare society we will do well to keep what has been called "the delicate balance of Federal-State relations" in good working order. The association took a notable step in this direction yesterday when it rejected with an unequivocal voice a proposal which in the name of preserving our Federal system would actually destroy it.

Apart from what they regard as the shortcomings of the Federal system some well-meaning people apparently believe that the judicial rather than the political process is more likely to breed better solutions of pressing or thorny problems. This is a compliment to the judiciary but untrue to democratic principle. That point of view is some times difficult for judges to resist for it carries ostensibly authentic judicial hallmarks—the function of statutory construction and the power of judicial review. If the Congress or a State legislature has passed an inadequate statute why should it not be revised by judicial construction? If the statute is one that is manifestly unwise, harsh, or out of date, why should it not be abrogated by the exercise of the power of judicial review? It is said that there can be nothing wrong with the courts so acting because whatever they may do can always be undone by legislative enactment or constitutional amendment.

The objections to such alluring but deceptive plausibilities are more deep seated than might appear at first blush. For in the end what would eventuate would be a substantial transfer of legislative power to the courts. A function more ill suited to judges can hardly be imagined, situated as they are, and should be, aloof from the political arena and beholden to no one for their conscientious conduct. Such a course would also denigrate the legislative process, since it would tend to relieve legislators from having to account to the electorate. The outcome would inevitably be a lessening, on the one hand, of judicial independence and, on the other, of legislative responsibility, thus polluting the bloodstream of our system of government. We should be on guard against any such deliberate or unwitting folly.

The late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, once observed that "one of the greatest statements that was ever made by anybody was: 'Just a minute.'" He was referring to the catalytic effect of time as a factor in the legislative process. The same factor is important in the judicial process. A judicial decision which is founded simply on the impulse that "something should be done" or which looks no further than to the "justice" or "injustice" of a particular case is not likely to have lasting influence. Surely Mr. Justice Holmes, a man of unsurpassed judicial sensitivity, was not being untrue to that quality when he wrote to a friend: "I have said to my brethren many times that I hate justice, which means that I know if a man begins to talk about that, for one reason or another he is shirking thinking in legal terms." Our scheme of ordered liberty is based, like the common law, on enlightened and uniformly applied legal principle, not on ad hoc notions of what is right or wrong in a particular case. The stability and flexibility that our constitutional system at once possesses is largely due to our having carried over into constitutional adjudication the common-law approach to legal development.

Woodrow Wilson in an academic address dealing with the function of colleges in the training of men for the "Nation's Service" epitomized that approach in these eloquent words: "But not all change is progress, not all growth is the manifestation of life. Let one part of the body be in haste to outgrow the rest and you have malignant disease, the threat of death. The growth that is a manifestation of life is equable, draws its springs gently out of the old fountains of strength, builds upon old tissue, covets the old airs that have blown upon it time out of mind in the past. Colleges ought surely to be the best nurseries of such life, the best schools of the progress which conserves. Unschooled men have only their habits to remind them of the past, only their desires and their instinctive judgments of what is right to guide them into the future; the college should serve the State as its organ of recollection, its seat of vital memory. It should give the country men who know the probabilities of failure and success, who can separate the tendencies which are permanent from the tendencies which are of the moment merely, who can distinguish promises from threats, knowing the life men have lived, the hopes they have tested and the principles they have proved."

How do the thoughts which I have so generally, and doubtless inadequately, expressed fit the occasion we are observing today? May I put to you in summary fashion, even at the risk of seeming guilty of oversimplification, several ways in which I believe that these fast-moving times especially call for leadership on the part of lawyers and particularly by the American Bar Association which speaks the national voice of the profession.

First it seems to me that every public-spirited lawyer should keep himself abreast of current constitutional trends. Since as Chief Justice Hughes once said, "The Constitution is what the judges say it is," you will not consider it brash of me to suggest that the bar generally should have more than a newspaper, radio, or television acquaintance with the important constitutional decisions of the day. While this may be regarded by many lawyers as having little relevance to their practice, such an awareness is quite essential if the profession is to play its full part in the shaping of things to come. The Nation and the courts themselves should not lack the informed best thought of the bar in the current swift pace of constitutional litigation.

Second, constructive criticism of judicial decisions, as with other aspects of the work of the courts, is a good thing for the judiciary and for healthy development of the law. Only a warped judicial outlook could think otherwise. But it is surely equally true that ill-informed or intemperate criticism of the doings of the courts only serves to breed misunderstandings and ultimately disrespect for law. Is it claiming too much to say that the judiciary is entitled to count on the bar sternly setting its face against that sort of irresponsibility from any quarter?

Third, much of the useful criticism of judicial decisions, whether from the standpoint of substance or professional quality, now comes from the law schools. I believe it would be of great value were their output to be supplemented on an organized basis by bar critiques bringing to bear the points of view of active practitioners on important cases.

Fourth, there have been few periods when the public has shown as much interest in the work of the courts as at the present time. This makes it important that the news coverage of the courts should be done without sensationalism, and that the accounts of their decisions should be as accurate as possible. With notable exceptions, it is fair to say that the quality of legal news-reporting is generally not as good as it should be. I believe it would be a worthwhile project for this association to explore with some of the principal news media ways and means of improving the situation.

In conclusion, the leadership of the bar at the community level is becoming more and more a thing of importance in connection with many of the burning issues of the period. The readjustments that some of such issues call for will never be satisfactorily accomplished by the excesses of pressure groups on whichever side of the matter they may be. Their solution requires objectivity, understanding, patience, willingness to reckon with the just demands of history, and, above all, insistence upon steadfastness to the orderly processes of our system. The bar has a peculiar reponsibility for furnishing these qualities in great measure. I have no doubt that by serving the bar as its "organ of recollection," its "seat of vital memory," the American Bar Center can play a large part in enabling this association to fulfill that responsibility and in keeping our institutions on even keel.

Thank you for this opportunity of addressing you.

ALAN H. NEWCOMB'S REPLY TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the wisest commentators upon the passing scene is Alan H. Newcomb, the public affairs director of station WBT—WBTV, Charlotte, N.C. On August 21, 1963, Mr. Newcomb broadcast his reply to a communication received by him from the Department of Justice. This broadcast demolished in a most effective and lucid manner the arguments upon which the Attorney General relies in his effort to find a constitutional basis in the interstate commerce clause for the so-called public accommodations provisions of the administration's civil rights bill. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Newcomb's broadcast entitled "The Attorney General's Reply" be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection a copy of such broadcast was ordered printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPLY

We have received a communication from the Department of Justice questioning our position taken in a previous editorial on the use of the interstate commerce clause as a means of forcing integration in public accommodations business.

After a careful study of the Attorney General's legal memorandum, and with all due respect for his position, we find it impossible to modify the opinion that we previously expressed.

Let us emphasize again that this station is not opposed to full civil rights for Negroes. On the contrary, we favor it. Our argument was that the use of the interstate commerce clause as a weapon to force compliance in matters not affecting interstate commerce would set a precedent dangerous to all American liberties.

The issue seems to be this: does segregation in public accommodations have an effect on interstate commerce justifying the use of the clause to protect trade across State lines?

We still believe it does not.

The Attorney General uses several illustrations to prove his point. He says that a segregated restaurant will not serve as many customers as an integrated restaurant and will therefore not buy as much out-of-State food; hence to that extent segregation interferes with the movement of interstate commerce.

We doubt that he can establish that thesis. In the first place, it is not at all certain that a restaurant will have more customers after integration than before. In the second place, all those people must eat, whether in an integrated or a segregated restaurant, or at home. The same amount of food will be consumed in any case, and interstate commerce will not be affected.

As another illustration the Attorney General cites the report that in six southern States that practice segregation, new construction contracts for the first quarter of 1961 were 11 percent below those of the first quarter of 1960, though the national average was up two-tenths of 1 percent. Therefore fewer building materials moved in interstate commerce, and segregation was to blame.

That is only a post hoc argument, because no connection has been shown between segregation and the drop in building contracts for that quarter. And why did he go back to a particular 3-month period in 1961 to get his figures. What about the other three quarters of 1961?—or all four quarters of any year?

We submit, therefore, that the Attorney General has not made a case for invoking the interstate commerce clause as a means of forcing private business to integrate.

We hold to our opinion that this use of the clause makes it a dangerous weapon which in unscrupulous hands could undermine the very civil liberties that the proposed bill is intended to safeguard.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on August 15, I complimented my freshman colleague in the House, M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, of Kentucky, for his efforts to bring to the attention of that body and the country what appeared to him to be the unwise use of taxpayers funds. As I pointed out at that time, some of his revelations of Government spending appeared almost fantastic and I checked them with the Comptroller General, who verified the gentleman's statements in all instances except one.

Subsequently, there has been brought to my attention a page 1 article in the August 19 issue of the Louisville Times in reference to my insertion in the RECORD of the Comptroller General's letter to me. This article is a biased presentation of only a part of the facts. It appears to be an effort to discredit the gentleman from Kentucky when in truth and in fact he should be applauded for his efforts on behalf of his constituents and on behalf of all taxpayers of this country.

The Louisville Times article omits that the Comptroller General indicates that we are being charged $57,000 to cancel the inexcusable contract for the purchase of the 1,000 TV sets for a country with no electricity. While the Louisville Times tries to explain the necessity of the other expenditures, I think a more correct statement would be that the Comptroller General verified the charges of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. President, if this news article had appeared on the editorial page, there could be no complaint; but for this story to be represented as factual news reporting is a disservice to the gentleman from Kentucky and to his constituents who might read the article.

Mr. President, I want to commend any Member of either body, regardless of political affiliation, who is endeavoring to promote fiscal sanity and fiscal soundness. I, therefore, hope the gentleman from Kentucky will continue his exposures of wasteful spending.

NOT ALL EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS ARE ALIKE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Honorable Richard Barrett Lowe, of Alexandria, Va., is a distinguished citizen of my home State. He served as superintendent of schools in three South Dakota cities before becoming president of Sioux Falls College. He is author of two books about his home State and was president of the South Dakota Education Association.

On active duty during World War II and the Korean war he also directed the school and college relations program for the U.S. Navy Recruiting Service and left the Navy as a commander U.S. Navy Reserve. Later he served with honor and distinction as Governor of American Samoa followed by a term as Governor of Guam.

As a student of history, government, and international relations, Governor Lowe's position paper on "Putting the Lunatic Fringes on the Far Right and the Far Left Into Perspective" should prove useful material for Senators and Congressmen to have in mind as they discuss the pertinent issues of our time. I request permission to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUTTING THE LUNATIC FRINGES OF THE FAR RIGHT AND FAR LEFT INTO PERSPECTIVE

(By Richard Barrett Lowe)

During the depression years before World War II there was a comparable balance between the far rightists and the far leftists in the United States. The lunatic fringe on the right mainly were Fascist agitators who got inspiration from the philosophies of Hitler and Mussolini, while the leftists were Communist inspired.

History dealt a blow to the Fascist agitators in the United States. With Russia as an ally in World War II the prestige of the leftists was enhanced, while the rightists were almost totally submerged. In the meantime the leftists somehow were able to give the public impression that they were intellectuals while the rightists became labeled as "squares." The leftists, duped by Communist propaganda, became apologists for Soviet chicanery, treatybreaking and satellite oppression. They supported the movement to decolonialize all non-self-governing people who sought freedom, self-determination and independence outside the satellite bloc, but never were they heard to cry out against Soviet and Chinese oppression behind the Communist curtains, nor to object to the infiltration of underdeveloped nations to bring about the communistic controls of the police state.

Since World War II the United States, within the framework of the United Nations, has supported the concept of self-determination which has resulted in the complete independence of 43 new nations in the free world. Independence for the Filipino people, planned prior to World War II was an initial unilateral step forward by the United States.

During this same period the Soviet Union has been swallowing up whole nations behind the Iron Curtain in violation of agreements and without allowing for a free vote of the people concerned. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and to some extent Yugoslavia—all have been made Soviet satellites, where the people have no opportunity for freedom, self-determination, or independence, to say nothing of freedom for education. A similar fate in Asia has overtaken North Korea, North Vietnam, Manchuria, Sakhalin, the Kuril Islands, and Tibet. Laos is fighting for its life because the Soviet Union has not upheld its agreements. The hammer and sickle, under police state controls, dominates the people of Cuba, and menaces the governments and people of the Western Hemisphere. Even now the Communists are attacking our relationships with Puerto Rico. Hundreds of thousands of refugees have managed to escape from behind the Communist curtains, while hundreds of millions of others have had no choice but to exist under the tyranny of Communist dictatorship.

For 18 years the United States, the United Nations, and the Soviets have supported the principle of self-determination for all people outside the Communist bloc, but the Communists, while agitating continually for the freedom of others, have given no opportunity for self-determination to the imprisoned people of their own satellites and have, in fact, extended their system of tyranny whenever and wherever they could. The Hungarian Revolution is a case in point, and it may be asked how long Castro would last if the Soviets removed themselves and their police state system from Cuba.

Even in the discussions regarding the nuclear test ban treaty the Soviets made it clear that their willingness to sign did not in any way change their long range objective to communize the world. With over one-third of the world's population under Communist domination, and the rest under continuous pressure it behooves the United States and the free world to look after their knitting. It seems obvious that the radicals in the lunatic fringe on the left, with all the power of the Communist propaganda machine behind them, are a real menace to our national security and well-being, as well as to the rest of the free world.

Millions of words have been spoken and written about Communist infiltration, subversive activities and dangers to the American way of life. Among these millions of words is the House Committee on Un-American Activities "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" (revised December 1961) which lists 871 organizations. Of these about 94 percent are Communist or Communist front (left wing) organizations; 2½ percent are Fascist, mostly prewar German or Italian; another 2½ percent are totalitarian mostly prewar Japanese; and 1 percent believe in violence to deprive citizens of their constitutional rights. The German and Japanese inspired organizations have mostly disappeared. This guide also lists 122 publications cited as Communist or Communist front by Federal authorities and 25 listed by State or territorial investigating committees.

The last available Attorney General's consolidated list of subversive organizations names 287 groups of which over 81.5 percent are Communist or Communist front. Most of the Fascist or totalitarian organizations (15.3 percent) under German, Japanese, or Italian inspiration have disappeared, leaving perhaps less than 10 percent which either believe in fascism, totalitarianism, or extremism in general. This does not include the new extreme rightists which so far have not been publicly classified as subversive.

While the above percentages may not show the true picture it must be recognized that the total substance of the radical leftwing movement in this country is appalling. Little wonder that they grasp the opportunity to promote the attack on the new radical rightist movement—it transfers the spotlight from them to another reprehensible movement, new and small as it may be, compared to the pernicious long-term activities of the radical leftists. Currently their guns are mostly leveled at the John Birchites, all of whose supporters are not lunatic fringe rightists any more than all of the supporters of the Americans for Democratic Action are lunatic fringe leftists.

While many liberal politicians have found the rightist movement to be a made-to-order issue, interestingly enough, two of the most potent attacks on the extreme rightists came from speeches in the U.S. Senate by Milton R. Young, Republican, of North Dakota[1] and Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican, of California.[2] One odd example of the hate techniques of the extreme rightists is an attack on Senator Barry Goldwater because of his Jewish ancestry despite the fact that he was born a Christian and has always been one. This smacks of KKK'ism, but is of domestic rather than of international significance. The Ku Klux Klan, while talking about 100 percent Americanism, is chiefly interested in maintaining white supremacy in violation of the legal and constitutional rights of the colored people. The KKK's seem to spend the rest of their time ranting about Catholics and Jews. The activities of this fringe on the right, it seems, may be compared with the agitationist leftwing fringe which is using the civil rights issue to further the Communist cause.

THE "AGITATIONISTS"

In the civil rights issue the American people seem to be divided into three main groups—the segregationists, the moderates, and the integrationists. The segregationists of course, and many of the moderates and sincere integrationists find themselves on the defensive because of the radical left wing of the integrationists; the agitationists. The agitationists should be differentiated from most demonstrationists; although they are part of that movement—the radical part.

Because it is morally right the integrationist movement can be supported so long as it stays within reasonable bounds, but the agitationists who agitate for the sake of agitation are a menace to the American system of law, order, and domestic tranquillity, and jeopardize the cause for which they agitate.

The agitationists of today may be compared with the radical wing of the Abolitionist Movement prior to the Civil War which because of its uncompromising temper helped prevent any other solution to the differences between the North and South than that of civil war.

The radical left wing agitationist movement of today may well prevent a satisfactory solution to the integrationist crusade because it tends to harden moderate men against a justifiable cause. Even if Congress passes a satisfactory civil rights bill much will remain to be done within the hearts and minds of the American people, white and colored alike.

In all likelihood the radical left wing of agitationists will not be satisfied with the passage of a good civil rights law, but will continue their covert promotion of overt violence, for immediate total organic acceptance within the entire social, political, and economic structure of the Nation regardless of the necessary period of adjustment to the legislation.

Communist propaganda is aimed at causing internal dissension, conflict and disaffection among all people outside the Communist satellite bloc. Within the bloc no opposition is tolerated. It is obvious that the worldwide Communist propaganda machine has in the American civil rights issue an ideal subject for continued agitation—and only those who are blind to the objectives of the Communists are likely to reach any other conclusion. This is not to say that all American agitationists are Communists.

The moderate colored leadership of the country is confronted with a tremendous problem—they must find some way to control the situation or the agitationists will continue to render great disservice to their cause. They must recognize that anyone who supports the agitationists is either too weak to stand up to them, agrees with them, or is one of them.

After all, in round numbers 90 percent of the American people are white and 99 percent plus of all the citizens, white and colored alike, are loyal Americans, but the 1 percent minus on the radical left, with Communist propaganda behind them, can create an inordinate amount of trouble for our country both domestically and internationally.

In the main the extreme rightists cannot be separated from the international picture any more than can the extreme leftists. The rightists are opposed to teaching about international understanding under the misguided concept that such teaching will undermine American patriotism. They are against foreign aid, the World Court, the United Nations and all its family of related agencies. Their basic philosophy is covered in the slogan—"Get the United States out of the U.N. and get the U.N. out of the United States."

One reason that educators currently seem to be more upset by the activities of this group than they appear to be with the leftists is because the new rightists attack at the local level, while the leftist activities are further removed and have become old hat. The rightists censor textbooks, visual aids, library books and the statements or supposed attitudes of teachers, thus putting local school systems, teachers and librarians on the defensive. Deluded as they are, most of these agitators think of themselves as patriotic Americans defending their national heritage against enemies from without. Unfortunately the lunatic fringe on the right succeeds, occasionally as does the lunatic fringe on the left, in obtaining support from good American citizens who are victimized by their fanatic propaganda.

For over three decades the extreme leftists have attempted to infiltrate their insidious propaganda into the schools in many devious ways. The fact that they have had some success probably is partly responsible for the present rash of rightist activities. In any event, the recent rightist attacks on the schools have become of sufficient importance to justify an organized attempt to cope with the "vigilantes, censors and critics" comparable to the organized attempts to cope with the Communists and Communist front activities which have been active so long.

Perhaps the best article related to the problem of putting the lunatic fringes of the far right and the far left into perspective is one by Alan F. Westin in Harper's magazine, April 1962, entitled "The Deadly Parallels; Radical Right and Radical Left." Mr. Westin points out "how the new breed of extremists are using the same tactics once tried by the radical left, and why the business community should be especially wary of such infiltration."

CONCLUSION

Without minimizing in any way the stupidity of the lunatic fringe on the right it should be noted that since World War II no rightist has been guilty of defecting, spying, aiding, or abetting any foreign power. It is the lunatic fringe on the left which has produced such enemies and traitors to our country in the international field. Yet it must be understood that both fringes, if either could be allowed to prevail, would lead America down the road to dictatorship. Fascism and communism converge at the point of totalitarianism. At that point, when the individual has lost his freedom, it makes little difference whether he is governed by a Fascist or a Communist police state. Americans must be alert to the dangers of "isms" foreign to our way of life no matter how they pose—whether under the swastika of the fascists or the hammer and sickle of the Communists.

A final point should be considered in attempting to put the lunatic fringes into perspective; patriotic Americans should not condemn the lunatic fringe on the right without simultaneously condemning the lunatic fringe on the left. Those who attack one and remain silent about the other appear to be guilty of being biased, dishonest, or stupid: Biased, because they see only good in one and evil in the other; Dishonest, because they do not want both sides to be disavowed; Stupid, because they have been duped by one side or the other. "A plague on both their houses."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I feel Governor Lowe's thoroughly objective and analytical presentation deserves the careful study and consideration of America's opinion makers and prominent public figures. These days we are hearing altogether too much demagogic nonsense about the alleged perils to our freedoms represented by groups of citizens with whom we may happen to disagree. I submit, Mr. President, the right of dissent is as much of an American right as the right to speak freely or the right to consent. It is about time somebody in this country develops some criteria and standards by which to measure and evaluate the perils to our future, if any, involved in the fact that there are groups among us who articulately and violently disagree with prevailing public policy or even with prevailing public opinions and attitudes. It is simply an exercise in forensic fakery and an effort to deceive when prominent individuals attempt to balloon up into serious implications a group of dissenters who dare to be different—call them crackpots if you must—whose criticisms may jar our individual sensibilities but whose capacity to change the course of human history or to direct our country's destiny is obviously a nonexistent factor.

---

[1] "The John Birch Society," Congressional Record, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 8, 1961.

[2] "The Fright Peddlers," Congressional Record, 88th Cong., 1st sess., May 2, 1963.

Two recent examples of what I consider baseless charges of this nature come quickly to my mind. The first was of course the regretful headline seeking attempt by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, to conjure up a nonexistent danger to America growing out of some actions by a Young Republican Convention of which he disapproves. I, also, disapprove of some of those actions and statements but to conclude that excesses of this type demonstrate a deterioration in the good sense of young Americans and comprise a danger to our freedoms is simply to demonstrate that those who make such assumptions have grown prematurely old and have lost personal touch with the fine citizens of our younger generation who as they grow older will moderate their statements, temper their actions, and become a stimulating and thoroughly patriotic influence in our body politic.

Likewise when men like Governor Rockefeller attempt to convince hardheaded Americans that mature citizens who join up with a John Birch Society or a flamboyant pro-American or anti-this-or-that organization compromise a movement likely to take over and make over the United States, he rendered a disservice to our country by leading people in other lands and of other nations to really believe this country has ceased to be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I come happily from a State virtually devoid of hate groups or extremists of any type. I am not aware, for example, of the existence of a single John Birch Society chapter or club in my entire State. I, like most Americans, disagree with many of the methods and objectives of that organization but I also recognize the American right of people with whom I disagree to organize and to express their attitudes just so long as they employ no subversive forces to overthrow our Government and just so long as they are devoid of any foreign controls or connections which make them servants of a foreign cause or creed.

The other recent example of how excitable men may seek to build into unrealistic and imaginary proportions actions of which most good Americans disapprove grows out of the rather astonishing resolutions adopted at a recent Young Democratic Convention meeting in California. Naturally I am disturbed and saddened when the Young Democrat Clubs of America in convention assembled resolve to, first, resume diplomatic relations with Cuba; second, to propose a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact nations; third, to withdraw U.S. support of South Vietnam; fourth, to recognize Communist Red China; fifth, to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and similar proposals which follow so faithfully and fully the Communist line mouthed by all American Communists and directed from international Communist headquarters in Moscow, Russia. I would hope that President Kennedy would repudiate these resolutions and denounce them as not representative of the great political party which he heads. I would also hope such repudiations and denunciations might come from other prominent Democrats in and out of public office. But whether such public scolding takes place or not will disclose primarily the profiles of courage applicable to these party leaders and whether it is forthcoming or not I am convinced these young Democrats will not control our national policies and that given 5 to 10 years of more maturity they, too, will become responsible and reliable members of our body politic.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me express the hope that in future statements by important people who feel compelled to dwell upon such comparatively insignificant developments on our domestic scene as flamboyant and excessive declarations of position by groups or organizations of our fellow citizens instead of making penetrating and intelligent observations and recommendations about public policies designed the better to serve America at home and abroad, such leaders will at least pay sufficient recognition to the good sense of most Americans to do two things:

First, devote themselves with equal vigor to the groups operating both at the extreme right and the extreme left of our political and economic spectrum dedicating to each end of the spectrum the attention and criticism it deserves on the basis of the importance and the success experiences demonstrated by each, and second, give Americans the demonstrable truth in making comparisons between the two extremes which will recognize the difference between those who would influence an election or promote a public policy by constitutional means and those who associate themselves with the causes and the creeds of those favoring the destruction of our way of life by force and violence. There is a real and growing difference, Mr. President, between groups operating on the American scene as indigenous dissenters and extremists and those operating on the American scene to promote the objectives and the policies of communism. It is the height of absurdity and the zenith of intellectual dishonesty even to suggest that the forces at opposite ends of the spectrum are equally dangerous and should be viewed and exposed with equal alarm.

Mr. President, there are many valid reasons for not comparing the voices of the far right to the voices of the far left as though they were of equal significance or equal danger. So far as I know, for example, no rightwing group in this country is financed or directed by an alien power; unfortunately, as every alert American knows, this cannot be said of a host of front organizations and crypto-Communist organizations at the extreme left.

Only the Communists and their dupes or followers have the force of an atomic bomb located on alien soil with the objective of burying America. Only the far left in the areas that it is influenced or infiltrated by Communists has as its patron saint a country guilty of the bloodiest, the boldest, and the biggest aggressive acts of human history. If some of our American spokesmen fail to recognize this basic difference or seek to obscure it for partisan advantage they can emphatically be advised of the basic differences involved between these groups at the far right and the far left by talking with the first Cuban refugee they meet. Only the groups associated with the Communist elements in our midst, Mr. President, take any satisfaction in having a Communist dictator like Castro 90 miles from Miami, Fla.

I hope, therefore, that Governor Lowe's presentation paper may help induce us all to recognize the realities involved and to devote less time to fighting political windmills and more time to helping all Americans to decide what policies and programs are best suited to maintain the strength, the freedom and the future of our great Republic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the unfinished business automatically comes before the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into. It is Senate bill 1153.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended:

(1) by striking out the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(2) by striking out the subsection heading "Airport Classifications" and all of subsection (b).

SEC. 2. Section 3(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1102(b)) is amended:

(1) by striking out the phrase "War and Navy Departments" wherever it appears in the subsection heading and text and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Defense".

(2) by striking out "such Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department".

Sec. 3. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended by striking out "1962", "1963", and "1964" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "1965", "1966", and "1967".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 10(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved project under this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs."

(b) Section 10(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended by striking out "(1), and the maximum United States share under subsection (a)(2),".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out the parentheses and all words within the parentheses and inserting ", not to exceed 75 per centum,".

Sec. 5. Section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1110) is amended:

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as (5) through (9), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) Appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including landing and take-off of aircraft."

(2) by striking out "(5)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)".

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I propound a unanimous-consent agreement, that the proceedings today on the pending legislation extend through the third reading; that on Monday next, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] be permitted to offer his amendment; and that 10 minutes be allowed for debate on each side on that amendment, even though we will have had the third reading of the bill. I also ask that rule XII, requiring a quorum call before fixing the time for a vote on passage of a bill, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to clear up one point. I have a minor amendment that probably will not take more than 5 minutes altogether. I wish to be sure that I will have an opportunity to offer it. If the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] is not available today, I should like to have an opportunity to offer that amendment also on Monday. Does the acting majority leader know whether the Senator from Oklahoma will be available today for the purpose of acting on my minor amendment?

Mr. METCALF. I am quite sure that the Senator from Oklahoma will be present.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he intends to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the amendment I shall offer on Monday; yes.

Mr. GRUENING. I mean on today's amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On today's amendment I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be present on Monday morning, but I should like to make an inquiry. As I understand, there will be morning business on Monday, following which the Senate will take up the pending bill; and the Senator is suggesting that debate be limited to 10 minutes to a side. Is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. Yes; 10 minutes to a side.

Mr. KEATING. Can the Senator from Wisconsin advise the Senate what the nature of his amendment is?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My amendment is very simple. It reduces the airport grant program by one-third—from $225 million to $150 million.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. It is anticipated that there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That after the third reading of the bill (S. 1153), to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which shall be reached today, further consideration of the measure shall be postponed until the conclusion of morning business on Monday, August 26, 1963, at which time, notwithstanding the third reading of the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], to reduce the cost of the program by one-third.

Ordered further, That debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover [Mr. Proxmire] and the majority leader, or someone designated by him, to be followed by a vote on final passage of the bill.

Mr. METCALF subsequently said:

Mr. President, I wish to supplement the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered by providing that after the pending bill has been read the third time, further proceedings on the bill be postponed until Monday, and that at that time the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] will be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] may proceed to make some remarks on another subject, and that I may speak briefly on it also, and that the time we consume be not charged to either side on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that the time that I consume and that the Senator from New York will consume will not be charged to either side. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 10 days ago I introduced a new proposal, S. 2038, to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology—COST—which would provide for the Congress an independent, responsible, readily available means of obtaining scientific assistance.

In the years since the war, we have seen a fantastic spiralling growth of Federal spending for scientific research and development.

Congress has got to control the great and, in some cases, extravagant spending that is going on in this field and has got to do it in a responsible manner.

The Office of Science and Technology which I suggest, would provide, for a few thousand dollars, a way of obtaining the independent scientific advice which is so badly needed if responsible opposition is to ride herd on these programs costing ever more and more, billions and billions of dollars.

As it is now, we are just stumbling in the dark.

The proposal to establish COST has received in the last few days a remarkable amount of comment and attention.

I am pleased to say that as of last night, 12 of my colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this proposal. The support which they have shown illustrates the concern of all Senators of both parties with the growing and troubled ties between the Government and the sciences and guarantees that the Congress will, in due time, come to grips with the problems which these ties create.

The cosponsors are: The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young].

Because some Senators are out of town, I have been asked to leave this proposal on the desk for 5 days longer, until Wednesday, August 28. I ask unanimous consent that S. 2038 be allowed to lie on the desk until Wednesday next.

This proposal to create a Science and Technology Office for the Congress is receiving attention in the House as well as the Senate. Congressman Sibal, of Connecticut, has been in the forefront of these efforts. His bill, H.R. 6866, proposes to create a similar office to assist the Congress. Congressman Widnall, of New Jersey, has introduced a bill identical to S. 2038. It is H.R. 8066. It is important and significant that these two Congressmen are able and distinguished members of the Republican Party. The

COST proposal is not a partisan one: It is nonpartisan. It is not a Senate proposal; it is a congressional proposal. It does not narrow or lessen the authority of any committee, it does not upset the balance between the Houses: It provides, on a purely advisory basis, information and direction independent of the special pleaders and the already committed, for the use of every Member and every committee.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles commenting on these proposals may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The first is an editorial from the eminently respected Science magazine, of June 28, 1963, the second from the National Observer, of August 5, 1963, the third from the Fairbanks News-Miner, of August 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Science, June 28, 1963]

DEVIL'S ADVOCATES

Increasingly the future shape of science is being determined by legislative actions taken by men who can be expected to have only a superficial knowledge of the technical facts embodied in their decisions. The Government provides about two-thirds of the support for the Nation's efforts in science and technology, and the fraction has been growing.

On the surface it would seem that more money for science is a good thing. Indeed, I have heard some scientists say that it would be almost impossible to provide too much support. However, the realities today are that in many areas of science and technology the crucial bottleneck is brains, not money. For instance, top-quality physicists are in short supply, and this deficiency is likely to continue. When Congress votes to expand activity in a field requiring first-rate physicists, it simultaneously makes the negative decision to remove them from other important endeavors.

It has been pointed out that the educational background of Members of Congress is heavily weighted toward the legal profession, with little representation from science. The remedy usually proposed is that more scientists should get into politics. On the surface this suggestion is attractive. One obvious difficulty is the time it would take for any considerable group to be elected. A second problem is that, in becoming politicians, the erstwhile scientists would in general lose their professional acuity. Moreover, there is no certainty that a man trained in science would bring as much wisdom to Congress as one trained in the law. Some of the most narrowminded, uncompromising, chauvinistic individuals in this world are scientists. Many research workers are deeply convinced that their narrow area of inquiry is the only one worth pursuing. I recently sat on a panel which cheerfully toyed with the desirability of channeling the total gross national product into a single area of scientific endeavor. A man representative of such a body of opinion would be a dangerous nuisance on the congressional scene.

The Government does not suffer from a quantitative lack of scientific information. Rather, the difficulty is that most of the advice comes from special pleaders. The executive branch has good counsel from the Bureau of the Budget and Jerome Wiesner's office, but the Congress has no independent impartial source of advice. Since the legislative branch cannot evaluate technical proposals, the temptation arises to employ phony arguments in advocating major projects. In scientific circles there is a tendency to be more concerned with the glamorous, salable aspects of a proposal than with intrinsic merit.

It seems well to consider other ways of improving the scientific judgments of Congress. To make good decisions it is not necessary to digest all the facts. It is necessary to be well advised. One of the more promising methods would be to make available to Congress a special group of scientific counselors. These would supplement existing staff and would not be permanent Government employees. They could be nominated by such a body as the National Academy of Sciences on request of Congress. They might serve for short, intensive periods while retaining their professional connections. They would be expected to act as devil's advocates (the Washington Star recently made a similar suggestion), with a duty to insure that the public interest was well protected. If such a system could be properly implemented, a substantial improvement in the quality of science legislation might ensue.

[From the National Observer, Aug. 5, 1963]

SCIENCE PUZZLES: WHEN TECHNOLOGY BAFFLES CONGRESS IT'S TIME TO CALL FOR THE EXPERTS

Growing achievements in science breed a growing uneasiness among laymen. Between the far-off lure of space travel and the dubious prospect of manipulated heredity, the man in the street is hard put to understand developments that may vitally affect his future.

Congress is in the same boat, and additionally it has the job of sitting in judgment on the huge sums of Government money—an estimated $14.7 billion last fiscal year—that make the dizzy pace of scientific and technological progress possible.

Complained Alaska's Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT last week: "We have water research bills, fish research bills, mineral development research bills, urban psychological study programs, supersonic airplane bills, satellite communication bills, air pollution, water pollution, environmental hazard bills, cancer, heart disease and mental health bills, retardation and epilepsy programs, moose conservation and forestry research bills. Who is to tell the Congress what is redundant, what is necessary, what is duplication, and what is vital?"

THE WHITE HOUSE PATTERN

The Democratic Senator expressed a mounting fear that decisions that could shape the future of our Nation are being made by anonymous experts and not by elected officials. His idea for a solution: Congress should hire its own experts. It should set up a Congressional Office of Science and Technology (COST) to advise Congress on scientific questions. The unit would be molded on the White House Office of Science and Technology, established last year to give the President a firmer hand in U.S. scientific decisions.

Senator BARTLETT presented figures showing this "incredible" growth in Federal research and development appropriations: Fiscal 1960–61, $9.6 billion; 1961–62, $11.2 billion; 1962–63, $14.7 billion; 1963–64 (requested) $17.4 billion. In the 1963–64 request, $7.6 billion is for space activities.

DISTURBING BUT TRUE

"Neither man nor party," said the Alaskan, "will be able to halt or reverse the trend. * * * It is disturbing but true that at the present time the Congress does not understand science, and it is also true that science does not understand Congress. Communication between the two must be improved and the Congress must inform itself—for its own protection and that of the people—on the activities of the sciences.

"Increasingly, policy decisions made on programs and funds for science and technology affect in their full relevancy not only the security of the country, but the liberty and privacy of every human being everywhere. If democracy and representative government are to prevail in this Nation, it is necessary that the Congress understand the importance of these decisions and that it have a role in the making of them. At the present time Congress does not appreciate the importance of scientific decisions, and as a result they are made, not in the halls of Congress, but elsewhere, not by elected representatives, but by unknown administrative officials.

"In this world of cataclysm, change, and of almost impossible complexity, representative democracy is put to severe test. How is a popularly elected government to control its own activities? How are elected officials to direct development of something they cannot understand with implications they do not comprehend?"

[From the Fairbanks News-Miner, Aug. 14, 1963]

CONGRESS NEEDS CONSULTANTS

Congress is beginning to worry about how to deal with a boom in Government-sponsored scientific research, and a bill by Senator E. L. BARTLETT that would give the Congress a small staff of professional consultants is a step in the right direction.

"It is disturbing but true," the Alaska Senator declared, "that at the present time the Congress does not understand science and it is also true that science does not understand Congress."

During the 1963 fiscal year, Congress was called upon to appropriate at least $14.7 billion for scientific and technological research, a 31-percent increase over the previous year. An additional $2.7 billion has been recommended by the President for fiscal 1964.

BARTLETT's measure would keep the scientific advisers totally separate from the executive branch. The congressional Office of Science and Technology, as he would term it, would enable the legislators to assign priorities. There would be less chance for hoodwinking.

BARTLETT noted that the representatives must consider water research bills, fish research bills, mineral development research bills, urban psychological study programs, supersonic airplane bills, satellite communication bills, air pollution, water pollution, environmental hazard bills, cancer, heart disease and mental health bills, retardation and epilepsy programs, moose conservation and forestry research bills.

The Senator and his colleagues might well ask: "Who is to tell the Congress what is redundant, what is unnecessary, what is duplication, and what is vital?"

BARTLETT, who has been openly critical of the administration's failure to take a clear stand on radioactive fallout protection guides, has cited four examples of scientific decisions "of grave implication," which he said were inadequately understood by the public or the majority in Congress when they were made.

These were (1) the apparent discarding of radiation protection guides in the measurement of fallout; (2) the high-level test of an atomic weapon which altered the Van Allen belt and disrupted radio signals; (3) the placing of millions of copper needles into space; and (4) the proposed construction of a harbor in Alaska by atomic explosion.

In voicing this concern, Senator BARTLETT does not stand alone. Last month the House Rules Committee passed a resolution seeking to create a select committee to make a "complete, full, and thorough investigation into the Federal Government's $14.7 billion research effort." But in the Senate, the need for professional advice is even greater. The 435 Members of the House of Representatives have more time to delve into special projects than do their counterparts in the Senate, who number only 100.

We agree with the Alaska Senator's conclusion, that if the Congress does not insist upon participating in these vital decisions, they will be made by lower echelon administrative officials and scientists. If Congress does not arm itself with an independent pool of scientific wisdom, great powers will pass on to those who make the decisions, "leaving but the mantle and circumstance for the Congress."

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Section 1. There is established in the legislative branch of the Government the Congressional Office of Science and Technology, which shall include an Office of Science and Technology of the Senate and an Office of Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, each of which shall be supervised by a Director.

Sec. 2. (a) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology of the Senate shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology of the House of Representatives shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Each Director shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of the office. No person while serving as Director may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(b) The gross annual compensation of each Director shall be $———.

Sec. 3. (a) Subject to the approval of the officer by whom he was appointed, each Director shall employ and fix the compensation of assistant directors and employees, and shall purchase furniture, equipment, books, stationery, and other supplies, as may be required by his office for the performance of its duties.

(b) No person may be appointed to or serve in any position in either office until the person has been determined to be qualified to have access to any information classified in the interest of national security as matter which may not be publicly disclosed. Upon written request made by the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall (1) cause to be conducted an investigation as the Director deems required to determine whether any person considered for service in, or serving in, the Office of Science and Technology of the Senate or of the House of Representatives is qualified to have access to such information, and (2) transmit to the requesting congressional officer a full and complete report of the investigation.

Sec. 4. (a) It is the duty of the Office of Science and Technology of each House of the Congress—

(1) upon request, to advise and assist any Member or committee of that House with respect to matters relating to science and technology;

(2) to make studies concerning matters relating to science and technology as may be directed by that House or any committee thereof:

(3) to maintain a register of scientific and technological consultants who have indicated a willingness to advise and assist committees and Members of that House; and

(4) to transmit to committees of that House reports concerning significant scientific or technological developments which pertain to matters subject to the jurisdiction of such committees.

(b) The Office of Science and Technology of each House to the greatest practicable extent shall furnish to any joint committee of the Congress upon its request information and assistance as the joint committee may require with respect to matters relating to science and technology.

(c) The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall determine the priority to be given by the Office of Science and Technology of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, to directions and requests authorized by this section.

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act. One-half of all appropriations of the Congressional Office of Science and Technology shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk until Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend my colleague for the very constructive proposal which he has asked me to cosponsor and which I have been very happy to cosponsor.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is one of the 12 cosponsors.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his initiative in this matter.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] in cosponsoring legislation to establish in the legislative branch of the Government a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. Because the Government is today involved in many programs that concern scientific and technical issues, the Members of the Congress are often required to make decisions on complex technical points where they obviously cannot be great experts. Most of the testimony heard by congressional committees with respect to scientific efforts and programs is limited to Government officials or advisers who naturally want the largest possible sum for their agency. Many are eager to pursue their pet projects, more concerned to get ahead, than to eliminate needless costs. What the Congress needs—and I have often made this point—is something like a devil's advocate or perhaps it should be called a taxpayer's advocate—a group of experts whose job it should be to analyze scientific programs and requests for Government spending with a view to determining where Government cuts can be made and what programs are not worthwhile.

Senator Bartlett's proposal to establish scientific advisers to the Congress would go part of the way to meet this need. I would like to suggest that it go a little bit further.

Instead of being modeled on the Office of Legislative Counsel, I would have it modeled more along the lines of the General Accounting Office, with the authority to undertake independent studies of scientific programs throughout the executive branch of the Government. I would also suggest that instead of merely consulting on a staff basis with the members of committees involved in scientific programs and expenditures, such a group would be expressly required to present testimony of its own evaluating and criticizing the requests of the executive branch. We have more chances than we frequently want to hear from Government officials who all want more money, but we seldom have any chance at all to hear enlightened well-informed experts arguing against specific parts of the program or suggesting changes. This is a necessary part of intelligent decisionmaking, and certainly should be carefully considered by the members of the Rules Committee.

The Constitution provides for due process of law in any court where life, limb, and property are concerned. We need something like that in the spending process, especially where technical scientific programs are involved. The taxpayers' pocketbook deserves a fair trial, and due process in spending needs people equally sharp and equally competent technically to argue on both sides regarding the funds Congress appropriates.

The establishment of a congressional office not merely to study and consult privately with Members of Congress, but also to present open testimony and even argument against executive agency requests in scientific programs, would be extremely beneficial for Congress and for the country.

Mr. President, this suggestion was first brought to my attention during hearings before the Senate Space Committee when one of the distinguished scientists, who was offering just this type of informed scientific advice, urged the Congress to consider a similar proposal. These hearings by the Space Committee in which distinguished scientists were called on to testify freely were extremely useful to the committee and I believe also enlightening to the country. I would like to see a continuation of this kind of advice to the country not only on general scientific questions, but also on specific programs and specific items in appropriation bills and other bills as they are brought before the Senate from time to time. Therefore, I commend the Senator from Alaska for bringing this proposal to our attention. I am happy to joint with him. I hope that he will give serious consideration to the proposal which I have made for a broadening of the duties of such an office, to permit it to be of even greater help to Congress in dealing with the scientific advances and problems which, over the years as we face the future, look as if they would become more complex and multiplied many times over.

I commend the Senator from Alaska for his initiative. I thank him for yielding.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am most pleased to have the Senator from New York as a cosponsor of the bill. His suggestions are provocative. I am sure they will be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration when hearings are held on the bill. I expect and hope that many more ideas will be advanced. I hope that hearings may be held within the reasonably near future.

The situation as I see it is exactly as described by the Senator from New York. We live in a world of science and technology. Ten years ago Congress appropriated approximately $3.4 billion for scientific purposes of all kinds throughout the whole range of Government. Last year the appropriation amounted to more than $14 billion. There is every indication that instead of leveling off or decreasing, the amount will likely increase.

As Senators know, there is no person or no group in Congress to whom we can turn for such information. We are not scientists. We must seek our scientific knowledge from others. We must discover where those others may be who can give us the kind of unprejudiced information that we really ought to have. I do not for a moment suggest that if the bill becomes law it will make scientists of any Members of this body; but it will afford us, conveniently at hand, a base of scientific knowledge derived from specialists in the field.

My bill was deliberately designed to establish a relatively small office to be directly under the control of Congress—small so that it would not cost too much money. It is not necessary to establish an extravagant office. We do not believe that will be necessary in order to provide highly useful and even essential information to Members of the Senate and the House.

I should mention that Representative SIBAL, of Connecticut, introduced a similar proposal in the House even before I introduced S. 2038. We have met to discuss the subject. I do not believe there will be any difficulty in reconciling our views with those of Representative SIBAL. In the House, Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, with whom the Senator from New York and I served in the House, has introduced in the House a companion measure to S. 2038. I hope we may make progress and that the bill will soon become law. I thank the Senator from New York for his contributions to the discussion.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

EXTENSION OF 4 YEARS OF INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of four years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, which was signed in the city of Dallas, Texas, the 16th day of February 1935 by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and at the same time and place was signed by the representatives, as a recommendation for approval to the Governors and Legislatures of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and which prior to August 27, 1935, was presented to and approved by the Legislatures and Governors of the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, and which so approved by the six States last above-named was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter was consented to by the Congress in Public Resolution Numbered 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935, for a period of two years, and thereafter was extended by the representatives of the compacting States and consented to by the Congress for successive periods, without interruption, the last extension being for the period from September 1, 1959, to September 1, 1963, consented to by Congress by Public Law Numbered 143, Eighty-sixth Congress, approved August 7, 1959. The agreement to extend and renew said compact for a period of four years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, duly executed by representatives of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming, has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and reads as follows:

"AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"WHEREAS, on the 16th day of February, 1935, in the City of Dallas, Texas, there was executed 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS' which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

" 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

" '*Article I*

" 'This agreement may become effective within any compacting state at any time as prescribed by that state, and shall become effective within those states ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing state may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

" '*Article II*

" 'The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

" '*Article III*

" 'Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if the laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

" '(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

" '(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

" '(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

" '(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

" '(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

" '(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

" 'The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any state.

" '*Article IV*

" 'Each state bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

" '*Article V*

" 'It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

" '*Article VI*

" 'Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION, the duty of which said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

" 'The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several states within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said states, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

" 'No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

" '*Article VII*

" 'No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

" '*Article VIII*

" 'This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon sixty (60) days notice, withdraw herefrom.

" 'The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory states.

"'This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in Article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.'

"WHEREAS the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1963; and,

"WHEREAS it is desired to renew and extend the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967:

"Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the Compact entitled 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS' executed in the City of Dallas, Texas, on the 16th day of February, 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby is, extended for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1963, its present date of expiration, to September 1, 1967. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in Article I of the original Compact.

"The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing state may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"EXECUTED by the several undersigned states, at their several state capitols, through their proper officials on the dates as shown, as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State Legislatures.

"THE STATE OF ALABAMA
"By JOHN PATTERSON, Governor.
"Dated: 9-4-62
"Attest: 'BETTY' FRINK
"(SEAL) *"Secretary of State*

"THE STATE OF ALASKA
"By WILLIAM A. EAGAN, Governor
"Dated 9-21-62
"Attest: HUGH J. WADE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ARIZONA
"By PAUL J. FANNIN, Governor
"Dated: 11-1-61
"Attest: WESLEY BOLIN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ARKANSAS
"By ORVALE E. FAUBUS, Governor
"Dated: 8-15-62
"Attest: NANCY J. HALL
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF COLORADO
"By STEVE MCNICHOLS, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: GEORGE J. BAKER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF FLORIDA
"By FARRIS BRYANT, Governor
"Dated: 5-28-62
"Attest: TOM ADAMS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
"By OTTO KERNER, Governor
"Dated: 12-12-61
"Attest: CHARLES F. CARPENTIER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF INDIANA
"By MATTHEW E. WELSH, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: CHARLES O. HENDRICKS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF KANSAS
"By JOHN ANDERSON, Jr., Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: PAUL R. SHANAHAN
"Secretary of State
"LEONE M. POWERS
"Assistant Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF KENTUCKY
"By BERT COMBS, Governor
"Dated: 11-30-61
"Attest: HENRY H. CARTER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF LOUISANA
"By JIMMIE H. DAVIS, Governor
"Dated: 6-12-62
"Attest: WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MARYLAND
"By J. MILLARD TAWES, Governor
"Dated: 11-20-62
"Attest: LLOYD L. SIMPKINS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MICHIGAN
"By JOHN B. SWAINSON, Governor
"Dated: 7-6-62
"Attest: JAMES M. HARE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
"By ROSS R. BARNETT, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: HEBER LADNER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF MONTANA
"By DONALD G. NUTTER, Governor
"Dated: 1-18-62
"Attest: FRANK MURRAY
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEBRASKA
"By FRANK B. MORRISON, Governor
"Dated: 1-24-62
"Attest: FRANK MARSH
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEVADA
"By GRANT SAWYER, Governor
"Dated: 4-25-62
"Attest: JOHN KOONTZ
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
"By E. L. MECHEM, Governor
"Dated: 10-23-61
"Attest: BETTY FIORINA
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NEW YORK
"By NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, Governor
"Dated: 9-22-62
"Attest: CAROLINE K. SIMON
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
"By WILLIAM L. GUY, Governor
"Dated: 3-2-62
"Attest: BEN MEIER
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF OHIO
"By MICHAEL V. DI SALLE, Governor
"Dated: 10-9-62
"Attest: TED W. BROWN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
"By J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, Governor
"Dated: 10-20-61
"Attest: WILLIAM N. CHRISTIAN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA
"By DAVID L. LAWRENCE, Governor
"Dated: 2-6-62
"Attest: E. JAMES TRIMARCHI, Jr.
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
"By ARCHIE GUBBARD, Governor
"Dated: 3-26-62
"Attest: ESSIE WIEDENMAN
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
"By BUFORD ELLINGTON, Governor
"Dated: 9-10-62
"Attest: JOE C. CARR
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF TEXAS
"By PRICE DANIEL, Governor
"Dated: 10-16-61
"Attest: P. FRANK LAKE
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF UTAH
"By GEORGE D. CLYDE, Governor
"Dated:
"Attest: LAMONT F. TORONTO
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
"By ALBERT D. ROSELLINI, Governor
"Dated: 10-25-62
"Attest: VICTOR A. MEYERS
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA
"By W. W. BARRON, Governor
"Dated: 10-10-62
"Attest: JOE F. BURDETT
"Secretary of State
"(SEAL)

"THE STATE OF WYOMING
"By JACK R. GAGE, Governor
"Dated: 10-3-62
"Attest: ROBERT OUTSEN
"Deputy Secretary of State
"(SEAL)".

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall continue to make an annual report to Congress, as provided in section 2 of Public Law 185, Eighty-fourth Congress, for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas as to whether or not the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact have been consistent with the purposes as set out in article V of such compact.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on August 19 the House amended Senate Joint Resolution 33 by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof the language of House Joint Resolution 220 as reported by its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In all substantive respects, Senate Joint Resolution 33 and House Joint Resolution 220 are identical. The sole difference is a slight change in the wording of section

3, which sets forth an amendment reserving to the Congress the right to alter, amend or repeal the first section of the legislation granting consent. The language adopted by the Senate Committee is identical to that in previous statutes approving and extending the compact. However, the Parliamentarian tells me the House language will accomplish the purpose and will do no harm.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I support Senate bill 1153, to extend for an additional 3 years the Federal program of providing matching grants for the construction of airport facilities.

Before touching on the details of the bill, I want to make a few general comments on the role of aviation in America today.

We hear much about new supersonic transports, the aircraft of the future which can whisk passengers across the continent or across the oceans at 2,000 miles per hour. We also hear much about the controversies over transatlantic air fares, and even about what carriers are going to fly from New York to Miami.

Without in any way minimizing the importance of these matters, I think it is crucial that we recognize that the revolution which air transportation is bringing to our Nation is not confined to the major cities and not restricted to the long-distance traveler. The heart of America—the hundreds of cities which cannot be called major air traffic centers—are also caught up in the advance of air transportation.

One of the principal avenues of growth, not only for the air transport industry but for commerce generally, lies in short-haul transportation and communication between smaller cities, or between the smaller city and its closest metropolitan neighbor.

The demands for short-distance air transportation are on the increase, not only because of the modern insistence on speed and convenience, but also because one alternative method of transportation, the passenger train, is phasing out of the picture in many areas of this country if, in fact, it has not already disappeared entirely in some.

The future reliance of many millions of our citizens for intercity transportation will inevitably be on air transportation, as it already is to a marked degree.

The hearings of our Aviation Subcommittee, last week and this week, on air service in New England dramatically highlighted this situation and provide firsthand evidence, from the grassroots of America, of the importance of air transportation to a major area of the Nation.

Adequate airport facilities are a basic first requirement for adequate and safe air transportation service; and the pending bill is part of the continuing effort of the Federal Government to carry out its share of the responsibility in this field. And let me say at this point that I do not regard Federal airport grants as gifts to a particular city, but rather as a proper and necessary effort to promote the commerce and the welfare of the entire Nation. The adequate airport benefits the traveler from afar, just as much as it benefits the community in which it is located.

The safety of air travel has always been a major concern to our committee; and the emphasis on safety aspects which have been written into this legislation in recent years is continued by the pending bill. But the safety of airports and air facilities has another side which is also important, though often overlooked. That is reliability and dependability. Witnesses in our hearings on air service in New England again and again stressed the need for dependability of air transportation schedules in marginal weather, as well as in good weather, as a key factor in air transportation. The Federal Airport Act plays a major role in this respect, because of the emphasis it places on the installation and establishment of facilities which contribute directly to safety, reliability, and dependability. Such things as in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and high intensity runway lighting all fall within this category, and can be installed with the aid of funds provided in this bill.

In my own State of New Hampshire, there is pressing need for improved facilities. We are seeking an instrument landing system for Manchester, and eventually hope for another at the Lebanon Regional Airport; flight service stations at Keene and Manchester and, when traffic warrants, at Laconia, and Berlin; a weather bureau forecasting facility for the State. These and other facilities are sorely needed. While some of the navigational aids are provided directly through the Federal Aviation Agency, many communities in New Hampshire and all other States rely on the aid to airports program to provide the assistance which enables them more fully to participate in commerce.

Passage of the bill, therefore, would be one more step in the direction of better, safer, and more dependable air transportation, for small cities, as well as for great cities. The bill is not designed just to build longer and longer runways for bigger and bigger airplanes; to the contrary it is designed to make air service safe, attractive, and dependable in all cities which have a reasonable chance of utilizing such service.

These general considerations impel me to support this bill, and nothing in the details of the legislation weakens my support.

The bill continues, for another 3 years, the $75 million a year program. The committee heard from a number of witnesses who requested a larger program, but I believe this amount has provided a realistic and effective program over the past several years and will be adequate in the immediate future, at least. To my mind, it strikes a reasonable balance between the desire of many for more money and the fears of others, which I largely share, that we simply cannot afford more when the Federal budget is close to an all-time high.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I compliment the Senator from New Hampshire for his statement on this bill. Vermont and New Hampshire have a common cause. In this instance, Vermont makes very liberal use of two of the airports, those at Keene and Lebanon, which are just across the river from us. I believe some 40 percent of Lebanon business generates on the west side of the river.

That leads me to say that one cannot always tell, by looking at a few populous centers, where the wealth and strength of this country originate.

We have our main highway system, and we have our byroads and access roads. Statistically, access roads do not pay for their upkeep. The main highway system would not exist except for the many access roads that empty into them; and I think the same is true of airports. Of late, there has been a tendency for airlines to neglect the business of the more sparsely settled rural areas; yet those are areas where it is possible to build up more business, and thereby expand the economy and prosperity of the country as a whole.

I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is performing a valuable service. We know that business can be built up in some of these areas if an effort is made to do it. In the case of the Mohawk Lines, I believe the part of Mohawk which services Vermont is not subsidized, so I understand. Mohawk Lines have built up their business there, and that would be true of any other airline that sees fit to serve northern New England. The potential business is there, but there must be adequate service and—more important than all else—it must be sustained service. When passengers plan to return by air to wherever they came from, they want to know that the planes will be running the next week or the next day—weather permitting. So sustained service is very important.

We have had demonstrated to us how easy it is for an airline to discourage service at certain points which it finds inconvenient to serve. Both Vermont and New Hampshire have suffered in that respect.

I have seen at the Barre-Montpelier airport, in Vermont, passengers who have driven there all the way from Berlin, N.H., about 80 miles away. That situation has existed there ever since service was suspended at the Berlin airport.

That is the nearest place to which they could drive from the Berlin area and the area to the north of it, yet we know that certain interests would like to see even the Barre-Montpelier Airport discontinued. So once more I join with the Senator from New Hampshire in his remarks and state that I think he is doing the whole rural area a great service.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his observations. In his characteristic brief, direct, and succinct manner he has put his finger exactly on the point that I was seeking to emphasize in relation to the problem that confronts his State, my State, our neighboring State of Maine, and other so-called marginal areas in this country. As the Senator from Vermont has so well stated, it has been demonstrated that when an airline chooses really to develop a rural area and encourage travel by being dependable, reliable, informing the public, and giving the people good service, it is surprising how many passengers the airlines find will travel that route.

There is an old saying about a certain railroad in this country that it hated passengers—meaning that the railroad would like to curtail its short haul passenger service and encourage only the long haul service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself 3 more minutes. The same situation has been distressingly true sometimes in air service. On behalf of myself and the Senator's distinguished colleague from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], who serves with me on the Committee on Commerce, I should like to say that we are thoroughly alert to the situation that confronts our 3 northern New England States. We shall have some suggestions which we shall desire to discuss among the two Senators from Maine [Mrs. Smith and Mr. Muskie], the two Senators from Vermont [Mr. Aiken and Mr. Prouty], and the two Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton and Mr. McIntyre] concerning that problem in the near future. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from New Hampshire for the help he has given us in past years and this year in putting together an effective Federal Aid to Airports Act, and also the continuing interest he has shown in the vast needs of the entire New England area for improved airports and airline service. He is the Senator who sparked the investigation and study resulting from the discontinuance of the Northeast Airline run to Florida in an effort to determine what type of air service we would be able to obtain for that great industrial area. The Senator was the one who, along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and other New England Senators, afforded leadership in requesting committee hearings on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the hearings it was brought out effectively that safety features are badly needed at New England airports for more reliable public air services that can go through New England weather, as well as consolidation of regional airports when we can get them. If I remember correctly, there is not a single instrument-landing system available north of Boston. Is that correct?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. While the bill does not include a provision for an instrument-landing system, it includes provision for runway lighting, glide angle approaches, and many other features. I hope that the Federal Aviation Agency will give immediate and satisfactory consideration to the things for which the Senator has been working for so many years in the committee, including the installation of landing aids to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his observations. I wish also to thank him for his kindness, his willingness, and his patience in holding long hearings day after day concerning New England's problems in connection with the discontinuance of the Northeast Airlines' route to Florida. I am sure that every New England Senator, including the distinguished present occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and his distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are grateful to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation. I thank him also for his work on the bill now before the Senate. It is a good bill. The subcommittee has unanimously reported it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

THE BOKARO (INDIA) STEEL PLANT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the subject of the Bokaro steel plant, which the U.S. Government is contemplating financing up to about $950 million through the foreign aid program. The AID of our Government hired the United States Steel Corp. to make a study of the steel industry in India. We paid to the United States Steel Corp. the sum of $686,344 to make the study. The study consists of two volumes, both of which are available for inspection. Since the time the study was completed, a synopsis of the study was prepared by an economic expert of the steel industry. I should like to discuss that synopsis because it contains information of the most vital consequence.

We should have in mind that we contemplate putting up $950 million to establish a steel plant costing $1.5 billion, which would compete with private industry in India. If the plant were constructed, it would be governmentally operated, and in a governmental operation, it would compete with existing steel plants in that country.

In volume 1 of the study, there is set forth an analysis of the capacity and the present use of the six main sources of steel production in India. I should like to point out the status of the capacity and the present utilization of the capacity:

First is the Tata Steel Works, having a rated capacity of 2 million tons, which is not now being realized due to raw-material-supply difficulties. Second is the Indian Iron and Steel Co., with a capacity of 1 million tons, which is operating at that level.

No. 3 is Hindustan Steel, Ltd., Rourkela, with a rated capacity of 1 million tons, which is not operating at full capacity.

No. 4 is Hindustan Steel, Ltd., Bhilai, with a rated capacity of 1 million tons, operating at the capacity of its productive ability.

No. 5 is Hindustan Steel, Ltd., Durgapur, with a 1-million ton capacity, also operating below that level.

Thus, three of the main plants in India are operating below their maximum production capacity. India, however, wishes to build a $1.5 billion plant. It would be the largest venture at a single time into steel plant building in India.

India wishes to do this so as to operate on a governmental basis to compete with private industry, as I have heretofore stated.

If the five plants now existing are not operating at their full capacity, why should we put up American taxpayers' money in the sum of $950 million to establish another plant? I cannot see the wisdom of that design. I think it is wrong, and that it ought not to be done.

This synopsis was prepared by experts of the steel industry of the United States. In volume II the synopsis shows that—

> Eighty percent of India's steel capacity is located within 135 miles of the Tata works.

Which is the private steel plant.

> Bokaro is contemplated for this same area. Over and above the problem of limited trained personnel which are at present inadequate even for existing steel plants, there are four major additional problems—

I am quoting from the synopsis—

> transportation, power, water, and raw materials. Raw materials, as indicated above, are already plaguing the Tata works and the problem should be allowed an additional 2 years to be solved.
>
> 2. One of the most difficult problems is poor and remotely located limestone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 3 minutes more?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I continue to read from the report. There is also a problem with respect to ore:

> Ore seems to be adequate except that alumina runs almost 5 percent.

That is not my statement. That is the statement made by the economic experts of the steel industry in the United States.

Coal is rather poor with ash averaging 16 to 18 percent, after washing and sulphur running 0.5 to 0.7 percent. Coking coal reserves are 1¼ billion tons and weekly coking coal reserves are 3.5 billion tons.

With respect to manpower, Bokaro is in an agricultural area with no large nearby cities and no industrial know-how except coal mining. It is a poor location for Indians to move to and live and even worse for Americans. The estimated manpower needed for step 1 including administrative, technical, etc., is slightly over 8,000 people. It is assumed that Bokaro would involve a 10-year management contract with qualified Americans.

The estimated costs of the Bokaro steel plant, step 1 through step 3, are as follows:

The total is, in the three steps, $1,382 million.

This analysis of the impediments is not mine. It was made by experts of the U.S. steel industry. The analysis points out that economically it is not advisable at this time to build the plant. Therefore, I express my vigorous opposition to the proposal that we should make a $950 million loan.

Finally, if we should make the loan, the money would go to the Indian Government to establish a socialized steel plant. Money earned in our free enterprise system in the United States would be loaned to establish a governmentally owned steel plant to compete with the privately operated steel plants of India. I cannot see the logic of such a course.

We have no right to tell foreign nations what type of economy they will adopt, but we have a right to say, "If you wish to borrow our money you cannot have it if you are going to establish an economic system which is against our philosophy and is constantly attempting to break down the free enterprise system of the United States."

I thank the Senator for granting me the time. I ask unanimous consent that the complete study may be printed in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read it, because it is of extreme importance.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES TAKEN FROM THE FEASIBILITY STUDY ON PROPOSED BOKARO STEEL PLANT IN INDIA, PREPARED BY UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.

VOLUME I

1. Population of India at mid-1962 was approximately 450 million. It is expected that 100 million will be added in the next decade.

2. With respect to the possibility of steel exports in the future, the report says the following at page 30: "Although steel exports will depend to a large extent on the relative cost of producing steel in India compared with that in other countries, and particularly on the pricing policy that is worked out for steel exports, there is no reason why India should not be able eventually to compete in at least segments of the world steel trade."

India has been having a series of 5-year plans, of which the third is in progress and due to end the end of March 1966. The fourth plan will cover the ensuing 5 years. The report does not anticipate much in the way of exports during either of these periods.

3. The following table indicates, in thousands of metric tons, production, imports, apparent consumption, and indirect imports (i.e., steel contents in things imported) in India for the years 1952 and 1961.

	Production	Imports	Apparent consumption	Indirect imports
1952	1,142	154	1,296	475
1961	2,901	1,038	3,939	1,050

In 1960, consumption of steel in India was divided among the following general categories:

	Percent
Railway	10.9
Structural	11.8
Bars and bar shapes	40.0
Flat rolled	31.5
Other	5.8

Consumption, including indirect imports, grew at the rate of approximately 12 percent per year for the years 1952 through 1961.

4. The report is largely predicated on the following estimated steel demands for India for the periods noted:

Estimated demand per year

[In thousands of metric tons]

Period:	
1965–66	6,916
1970–71	11,235
1975–76	17,000
1980	24,000

The foregoing tonnages are tons of finished steel products. The 24 million tons for 1980 are considered to require approximately 32 million tons of ingots. The 1970–71 demand assumes a rate of growth over the previous 5 years of 10 percent per year. The 1975–76 presumed demand assumes a rate of growth of approximately 8½ percent per year over the previous 5 years. The first two estimated demands are predicated on the overall Indian expansion plans for those periods, i.e., the third and fourth plans, and discount the estimates of Indian economists by 20 percent. In other words, demands used in the report are 80 percent of those predicted in the third and fourth Indian plans.

5. Following below are the existing steel plants in India, their current rated capacity, and their estimated effective capacity to produce finished products, in the years ahead, based upon estimated realization of the expansion plans.

A. Tata (Jamshedpur) has a rated capacity of 2 million metric tons which is not being realized at present due to raw material supply difficulties. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]

Year:	
1963	1,730
1966	1,920
1971	2,620
1976	2,620

B. Indian Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (Burnpur) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons and is operating at that level. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]

Year:	
1963	1,190
1966	1,190
1971	1,690
1976	1,690

C. Hindustan Steel, Ltd.-Rourkela (built by West Germany) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons but is operating below that. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]

Year:	
1963	630
1966	1,050
1971	2,040
1976	2,040

D. Hindustan Steel, Ltd.—Bhilai (built by Russia) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons and is operating at that level. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]

Year:	
1963	790
1966	1,420
1971	2,020
1976	3,230

E. Hindustan Steel, Ltd.—Durgapur (built by Great Britain) has a current rated capacity of 1 million metric tons and is operating below that level. Its effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]

Year:	
1963	630
1966	840
1971	1,360
1976	2,780

F. Other (over 100 small plants rerolling rails, semifinished, etc.). Their effective capacity to produce finished products is estimated as follows for future years:

[In thousands of metric tons]

Year:	
1963	930
1966	1,113
1971	1,535
1976	1,635

6. The following table indicates the estimated steel to be provided by the foregoing plants in India, expanded as it is anticipated they will be expanded in the future:

[Thousand metric tons]

Year	Finished products	Total steel mill products	Total ingots
1966	5,678	6,476	7,350
1971	8,794	9,969	11,290
1976	11,185	12,460	14,390

7. The following table indicates the anticipated demand as shown in paragraph No. 4 above related to the anticipated supply and the apparent deficit.

[Thousand metric tons]

Year	Demand	Supply	Deficit
1966	6,916	5,595	1,321
1971	11,235	8,684	2,551
1976	17,000	11,075	5,925

The anticipated supply figures do not exactly match those in paragraph No. 6 and I was unable to find the reason for the discrepancy. However, they are quite close.

8. The Bokaro steel plant is planned in three stages or steps, with the following number of blast furnaces and the anticipated iron production, steel ingot production and finished steel production:

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Number of blast furnaces	2	3	4
Anticipated iron production [1]	1,251	2,193	3,529
Anticipated steel ingot production [1]	1,400	2,500	4,000
Anticipated finished steel production [1]	1,040	1,800	2,900

[1] Thousand metric tons.

It is anticipated that steps 1, 2, and 3 would be completed respectively by about 1966, 1971, and 1976. On this basis, the steel deficits in those years would be as follows:

Year	Deficit before Bokaro	Contribution of Bokaro	Deficit after Bokaro
1966	1,427	1,040	387
1971	2,348	1,800	548
1976	4,910	2,910	2,000

9. The products anticipated for Bokaro are hot rolled sheets and strip, cold rolled sheets and strip, galvanized sheets, and plates.

10. The facilities contemplated are a coke plant, blast furnaces, a Universal slabbing mill of 4 million tons capacity, and 80-inch hot strip mill of 3,500,000 tons capacity, tandem mills, and a 140-inch sheared plate mill. Anticipated annual sales from these facilities, in dollars, are as follows:

After step 1	$157,198,000
After step 2	272,711,000
After step 3	445,877,000

VOLUME II

Volume II points out some of the problems involved in Bokaro and the anticipated capital cost.

1. Eighty percent of India's steel capacity is located within 135 miles of the Tata works at Jamshedpur. Bokaro is contemplated for this same area. Over and above the problem of limited trained personnel which are at present inadequate even for existing steel plants, there are four major additional problems: Transportation, power, water and raw materials. Raw materials, as indicated above, are already plaguing the Tata works and the problem should be allowed an additional 2 years to be solved.

2. One of the most difficult problems is poor and remotely located limestone. Consideration is even being given to fine grinding and flotation to improve its quality. Ore seems to be adequate except that alumina runs almost 5 percent. Coal is rather poor with ash averaging 16 to 18 percent, after washing and sulfur running 0.5 and 0.7 percent. Coking coal reserves are 1¼ billion tons and weakly coking coal reserves are 3.5 billion tons.

3. With respect to manpower, Bokaro is in an agricultural area with no large nearby cities and no industrial know-how except coal mining. It is a poor location for Indians to move to and live and even worse for Americans. The estimated manpower needed for step 1 including administrative, technical, etc., is slightly over 8,000 people. It is assumed that Bokaro would involve a 10-year management contract with qualified Americans.

4. The estimated costs of the Bokaro steel plant, step 1 through step 3, are as follows, in thousands of dollars:

	Dollars	Rupee cost stated in dollars	Total dollars
Step 1	512,588	314,653	827,241
Step 2	162,367	75,488	237,855
Step 3	216,597	100,346	316,943
Total	891,552	490,487	1,382,039

It is estimated that step 1 will cost roughly $125 million more than it would in the United States.

5. The anticipated spending schedule is as follows (in thousands of dollars):

1963	3,925
1964	100,491
1965	298,602
1966	280,953
1967	118,988
1968	24,282

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes from the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 6 minutes.

PROPOSED LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it seems to me that our Defense Establishment has been speaking with two voices in discussing the proposed limited nuclear test ban treaty. The statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as released by the Preparedness Subcommittee, was frank enough to admit that there are "military disadvantages to the treaty." On balance, however, the statement says they "are not so serious as to render it unacceptable." Their conclusion explains that this is so because of the important political gains which might be achieved.

The Secretary of Defense, however, takes a more optimistic view. His testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee concludes with this statement, that "the values of the treaty are substantial even if we consider only the military area."

The Secretary's view is based upon the main theme of his testimony: That the United States possesses "tens of thousands" of nuclear warheads, and that this numerical preponderance over the Soviets will be maintained even under such a treaty as that now proposed.

I am well aware that in other portions of the two items of testimony there are catch phrases and qualifications which attempt to make them perfectly compatible. The job of the Senate is to make absolutely sure that, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the civilian optimism and the military reservations do not conceal any significant disagreements as to the impact upon this Nation's security of the test ban proposal.

And I would like to cite here one area in which such a disagreement might well be possible. I refer to the difference between the Secretary's assurances regarding our tens of thousands of warheads and the foreseeable future in which delivery vehicles for those warheads may significantly be diminished in number and quality in comparison to the delivery systems of the Soviet.

No number of warheads can truly be reassuring if we do not have adequate means of delivering them. No treaty regarding nuclear tests can be reassuring if our defenses become inventory items in a warehouse. No talk of preparedness to test under the treaty can be reassuring if we lack equal preparedness regarding the delivery systems which turn warheads from mere statistics into a true shield of freedom.

Let us, in considering this treaty, then discover if the military disadvantages mentioned by the Joint Chiefs have anything to do with such areas as these:

What percentage of our present nuclear striking force depends upon the Strategic Air Command's force of manned bombers? The percentage, I am sure, is high. I may say that the Secretary himself estimates it to be about 75 percent. Therefore, what is the future of that striking force as we cut back on our manned bomber system? If it is to be replaced by new systems, can the replacement be made, in full security, without any of the tests banned by the proposed treaty? Do the civilians and the military men speak with a single voice on this?

How has the withdrawal of our Thor and Jupiter missiles affected our delivery capabilities? Do the civilians and the military speak with a single voice on that? Are further withdrawals possible under the treaty and its subsequent steps? How would that affect our security?

What impact upon the relative strength of Soviet and American nuclear delivery systems can be anticipated as a result of Russia's admitted superiority in high-yield weapons and our admitted disadvantages in developing comparable ones under the treaty? Could our numerical superiority in warheads be overcome by qualitative advances on Russia's part?

The treaty proposal speaks of not testing nuclear weapons in space. There is nothing in it to inhibit the Soviets or ourselves from testing space delivery systems, however. On our side, by contrast, we have as a stated policy of the Defense Department the fact that we will not orbit weapons of mass destruction. Will the treaty freeze that policy while heating up Russian advances toward usable space delivery systems?

What is our delivery position overall? The B-47 and B-52 programs are being phased out. Three Titan missile squadrons, previously programed, have been cut out. Our Polaris program remains the same 41-boat program as during the previous administration. Skybolt, a highly-sophisticated attempt to preserve the utility of our manned bomber force into the 1970's, has been cancelled—and with it much of the delivery capability of our British allies. Our orbiting space platform program, which would be a step, at least, toward preventing a space weapons gap has dropped, and dropped in priority in America, while similar programs are advancing in the Soviet .

My point simply is this: The assurance that this treaty has no adverse military impact is so far backed by imposing statistics of numbers of warheads. My question is whether these assurances will hold as strongly if we direct our questioning toward delivery systems. Is it not enough to talk of our strength in numbers alone. Nor is it enough to speak of readiness to test. It is the readiness to strike, the real readiness to defend ourselves, that counts. What steps to assure that readiness have to be guaranteed under such a treaty as the one we are considering?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 more seconds.

If there is any doubt about our ability to deliver our weapons in the years ahead, this treaty will not ease those doubts but merely turn them into more grave dangers. The time to thrash this out is now, before we commit the security of this Nation to any proposal which may be anything less than completely thought through.

THE RAILROAD WORK RULES DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. President, if the news ticker account on the proposed legislation for settling the railroad dispute which allegedly came out of the Commerce Committee this morning is correct, I cannot think of a greater legislative mistake we could make. If the ticker account is correct—and I understand it is—the Commerce Committee recommends a proposal for compulsory arbitration; and let us stop "kidding" ourselves about it. I will never vote for a full-fledged compulsory arbitration bill for the settlement of a labor dispute in America as long as I serve in the Senate.

When that bill reaches the floor of the Senate I shall move to substitute the President's proposal for the settlement of the railroad dispute. The President's proposal is far superior to the committee's proposal. I do not care what semantics the Commerce Committee uses—a proposal which sets up a 7-man board for a settlement of the dispute, binding upon the parties by law, is compulsory arbitration. Oh, I understand that it is said, "What about the senior Senator from Oregon's proposal in support of the President's proposal? Is not that compulsory arbitration?" And the answer is "No."

I have discussed that subject before in the Senate and I shall again during the forthcoming debate. The President's proposal is to turn this problem over for temporary determinations for a 2-year period to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The ICC was created by law to exercise jurisdiction over the railroads in this country. The Congress itself, upon the recommendation of the railroad brotherhoods and the carriers, in the past has assigned the jurisdiction of the so-called Washington agreement to the ICC. Under the Washington agreement, the Interstate Commerce Commission is given the determination of job security problems in cases of mergers. Under the Interstate Commerce Commission, the parties remain free, by the President's proposal, to continue collective bargaining on the issues in dispute during the 2-year period, but after the 2-year period the problem will be before us de novo. All of the appeal procedures and procedural legal rights available under the Interstate Commerce Act will be available to the parties under the President's proposal.

I am at a complete loss to understand why the railroad brotherhood chiefs seem to have lost their commonsense. Some of us have been pleading with them for weeks to take to their membership a proposal of voluntary arbitration for settlement of the dispute. The senior Senator from Oregon believes that if the railroad brotherhood members were given the facts about the railroad dispute, the rank and file of the brotherhood membership would vote overwhelmingly for voluntary arbitration of this dispute.

Such a precedent of compulsory arbitration established in the bill reported to be coming from the Commerce Committee in this case cannot be established without our finding it on our doorstep in the future in case after case. It will rise to plague the Congress. It is just as bad as the proposal pending before the Senate, introduced by a group of Senators, to establish a watchdog committee over collective bargaining in the railroad industry. In the first place, Congress is not qualified so to function. We are dealing with a field of American life in which a group of politicians is not qualified to function as watchdogs of collective bargaining—for the same reason that there should not be turned over to the courts the determination of the economic problems of labor relations.

I say to the brotherhoods, "Come to your senses. You have no right to try to settle the economic issues which are involved in this issue on the picket line, for they are not subject to settlement on the picket line." A settlement calls for a careful analysis of the facts. It calls for a careful analysis of the problems that are going to arise in respect to automation. Congress will have to enact legislation in the field of automation and job disjointures in an attempt to seek to determine to what extent the public, the chief beneficiary of automation, the principal beneficiary of technical advance and progress, should pay for the loss of jobs that thousands upon thousands of workers are suffering week by week as a result of the rapid advance in technology.

Mr. President, it is not fair to expect employers to pick up the total cost of automation in the form of paying for the loss of jobs. There is an area where some contribution should be made by employers, and industrial statesmen among employers recognize it. It has been recognized in various collective bargaining agreements that are being adopted these days. It is found in the steel industry. It is found in the west coast longshore industry. It is found in the rubber industry.

These collective bargaining agreements, on the other hand, are not capable of covering the issue as to how much the public should pay. Labor cannot expect, either, not to pay some share of the cost of job losses due to automation. Here is the area of legislation that will have to be dealt with in the next few years, in my judgment. The President recognized it in his proposal, and suggested and recommended the creation of a Presidential National Council on Automation, to do two things; first, to find out what the facts are in regard to automation and the resulting cost of it, and, second, to recommend what legislation needs to be passed in the public interest to cover the problem.

A few weeks ago, on the floor of the Senate I said that the problem is somewhat similar to the problem that confronted Congress in the period from 1900 to 1920, the so-called era of progressive labor legislation, dealing with such issues as the Adamson 8-hour law, minimum wages, safety legislation, and a long list of legislative objectives dealing with the problem of protecting the legitimate rights of labor and of industry in the field of employer-labor relations.

The mere fact that a critical labor dispute is facing us is no justification for coming forward with a proposal that amounts to compulsory arbitration for the settlement of disputes. We cannot reconcile compulsory arbitration with economic freedom. I am at a loss to understand how any employer or any labor leader in America could propose or agree to compulsory arbitration for the settlement of industrial disputes.

That is, in effect, turning the economy of the country, segment by segment involved in disputes, over to a third party for a determination of the wages and working conditions. It would also lead to a determination of prices and managerial rights for employers.

I shall fight to the last roll call against this proposal of the Commerce Committee. I may go down whipped again, which is no new experience for the senior Senator from Oregon, but the principles that I shall defend will rise time and time again to plague the Senate if it adopts this unwise proposal for compulsory arbitration.

CONDITIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, two articles on American policy in South Vietnam. The first is an article entitled "War Against Reds Dominated News," written by Homer Bigart and published in the New York Times of August 22, 1963; the second is an article entitled "The Swamps of Saigon," written by Robert Karr McCabe, Newsweek's correspondent in Southeast Asia, which appeared in the New Leader of August 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these articles tell a very sad story of American foreign policy. It is a policy that has failed, and has cost us billions of dollars in the meantime, and the loss of precious American lives. The sooner the United States ceases its support of the Diem Government, the better off we shall be.

Newspaper accounts coming from that area in recent hours indicate that there have been some changes in the Government in South Vietnam, but the accounts of such changes are not very reassuring. It appears that the changes consist of changing from the dictatorship of Diem to a dictatorship of the military.

We keep Diem afloat with huge sums of foreign aid; and although that aid is touted as a means of containing communism without use of American forces, we are using American forces, too, in South Vietnam. Diem, is our responsibility, and the world knows it. If we were to cut the string, he would sink. So long as we do not, we must accept all the opprobrium that goes with his noxious regime. He is our responsibility because we assumed it. We assumed it wrongfully. In my judgment, the position that we should have taken from the very beginning was that we would cooperate with other free nations in the defense of freedom in South Vietnam, but that we would not assume full responsibility for the protection of freedom in South Vietnam.

Time and time again on the floor of the Senate I have raised the question, and I raise it again, and I shall continue to raise it until our policy in South Vietnam is changed: Where are the other free nations in respect to helping in the protection of freedom in South Vietnam? Why is it America's responsibility alone? Where are Australia, New Zealand, and Canada? Where is England or France or West Germany? Where are the rest of our alleged allies?

The American people are entitled to a full exposure of all the facts, involving our present and past relationships with Diem.

I have opposed unilateral U.S. intervention in South Vietnam from the beginning. I have insisted that we should not give aid there unless the other free nations of the world were willing—and they were not—to help us in South Vietnam, with their financial aid and their blood. I have always urged that we stay out of South Vietnam if going in means for the most part that the United States will carry the full load. I urge now that we get out, unless our alleged allies in NATO and elsewhere in the world are willing to do their fair share—and that includes France and Great Britain.

I again refer to the two articles which I have asked to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. First I refer briefly to the article by Homer Bigart, published in the New York Times. In the article he discusses how we got into South Vietnam in the first place, and points out the conflict that developed between the U.S. Ambassador and CIA. It is difficult to speak on the floor of the Senate on what the CIA policy really was, because Senators cannot find out. However it is the responsibility of Congress to find out. For several years Congress has refused to return foreign policy to the American people. For several years Congress has refused to pass the necessary legislation that places an effective check upon CIA. Congress has permitted CIA to continue to exercise what appears, in fact, to amount to a police power in a democracy. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I cannot tell the Senate—nor can any other member of the committee—what the facts are about the CIA policy in South Vietnam or anywhere else in the world.

I say to the American people: "You are long overdue in making your demands crystal clear to Republican and Democratic administrations that you want an end to the growing trend toward sanctioning a continuation of what amounts to police procedures in a democracy."

There is no justification for giving any agency of Government—CIA or any other—unchecked power. That is exactly what we have given to CIA.

But listen to what Mr. Bigart says about the conflict that arose originally in South Vietnam:

> The chief CIA agent, Col. Edward G. Lansdale, threw his support behind Ngo Dinh Diem, opposing the U.S. Ambassador, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who recommended that the United States withhold support from the Saigon government. Allen W. Dulles, then Director General of the Intelligence Agency, persuaded his brother, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, that Colonel Lansdale was right.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been very unhappy, within the sphere of my knowledge of facts concerning certain incidents, relative to the influence the CIA has exercised throughout the world in the determination of American foreign policy, particularly including instances in Latin America. I know nothing about the so-called Lansdale-Dulles difference of opinion other than what is stated in this article. However, I now call upon the Secretary of State, from the floor of the U.S. Senate, to give me a memorandum setting forth the history, from the very beginning of our relationships with South Vietnam, of steps that were taken that resulted in our becoming involved in South Vietnam. I particularly call upon the Secretary of State to advise me in that memorandum why we are following what amounts, for the most part, to a unilateral course of action in South Vietnam.

I say to the Secretary now: "Do not give me a memorandum containing references to so-called token help that is being offered by some countries, for I am not interested in form, only in substance." I want to know from the Secretary of State how we got into the plight we are in; why we have a commitment to support a tyrant in South Vietnam. I am satisfied that had it not been for the United States buttressing Vietnam, the anti-Communist forces in South Vietnam would have thrown Diem out in 90 days, a long time in the past.

I remember an occasion when I conducted a cross-examination in the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning anti-Diem groups exiled in Paris, France. I cross-examined witnesses in behalf of the administration, and they made clear that those exiles are anti-Communist. They are also anti-Diem.

What one must be on guard against when he makes a speech such as the senior Senator from Oregon is making today are the smear artists in the country, who seek to give the impression that because one does not support a tyrant in South Vietnam, he must be in favor of supporting the Communists. Quite to the contrary. We have been building up Communist power in South Vietnam by supporting a dictatorial tyrant in that country. In fact, too frequently in American foreign policy we have played into the hands of the Communists by supporting wrong regimes in various parts of the world. I have no doubt that we have made that great mistake in South Vietnam.

The time has come for the Secretary of State to prepare for the senior Senator from Oregon a thorough, detailed memorandum—and every Member of the Senate is entitled to it—containing a detailed account of the history of our participation in the internal affairs of South Vietnam. If we do not put an end to the mistaken policy that we are following in that country, we will hear from the American people in no uncertain terms—and should—for there is a restlessness developing at the grassroots of America in respect to foreign policy.

If my other duties of the day permit, I may later today, when the pending business has been laid aside, discuss foreign aid. The restlessness of the American people applies to foreign aid.

Mr. President, all I can do is make the record. I intend to continue to make the record, issue by issue, and then let the people of the United States, at the only place that, apparently, politicians understand, namely, the voting booths, make clear to Congress in 1964 what they think of the failure of Congress to save the American people the huge sums of money that Congress owes it to them to save in connection with the foreign aid bill this year.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

WAR AGAINST REDS DOMINATED NEWS—ANTI-COMMUNIST OPPOSITION TO REGIME WAS PLAYED DOWN BY WASHINGTON

(By Homer Bigart)

One day last June a 73-year-old Buddhist monk sat down in the middle of a Saigon street. Thousands watched in shock as his fellow monks poured gasoline over him and he calmly touched a match to his saffron-colored robes.

His suicide jolted millions, including top officials of the U.S. Government, into realizing that a strange new crisis confronted South Vietnam.

Ordinary crises involving intrigue, money, and revolution have been commonplace under the authoritarian rule of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Since 1959 the regime, with massive support from the United States, has been involved in a nasty, frustrating war with Vietcong guerrillas. While there is no doubt that the Vietcong is Communist led, the regime has made bitter enemies among non-Communists, also.

BOMBING PLAYED DOWN

The U.S. Government has tended to play down the non-Communist opposition to the Ngo Dinh Diem regime. Thus, when two Vietnamese Air Force officers bombed the Presidential Palace on February 27, 1962, narrowly missing the ruling family, Washington echoed Saigon's contention that the incident was "isolated" and of passing consequence.

Those on the scene who felt that the bombing was a manifestation of deep-seated unrest were shushed and called defeatists.

Americans in Saigon assumed that the President and his family, if they lost power, would be overthrown by a military junta. They presumed that any new rulers would be those generals who had worked closely and amicably with the American military advisers.

Few Americans bothered to worry about the possibility of a religious revolution. They were aware, of course, that while the President and his family were Roman Catholics, 70 percent of the population and an even higher percentage of the army were non-Catholic.

BUDDHISTS SEEMED DOCILE

Yet the Buddhists seemed docile, appeased by the fact that the vice president, gentle Nguyen Ngoc Tho, was a practicing Buddhist.

The first intimation of trouble came May 8, when Government forces opened fire on a Buddhist procession in Hue, killing nine marchers. The Buddhists were demonstrating against an attempt by the regime to ban the flying of their five-colored patchwork flags.

Hue (pronounced Way) is the seat of Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, a brother of the President, and of Ngo Dinh Can, another brother, who runs the northern provinces.

In a country where public protests are forbidden and the press is tightly muzzled, the Hue demonstration was a clear portent of impending crisis.

The Government refused to accept responsibility for the shooting down of peaceful demonstrators. Despite eyewitness reports and photographs, the Government insisted that a Communist guerrilla had thrown a grenade into the crowd.

PROTEST QUICKLY SWELLS

The Hue incident quickly grew into a full-scale popular protest. President Ngo Dinh Diem made a concession; the ban on Buddhist flags was rescinded.

The concession came too late. Buddhist leaders brought up other grievances.

Contending they had been treated as second-class citizens, the Buddhists demanded the right to buy and hold real estate as freely as did the churches of the Christian minority.

They demanded the conviction of the soldiers who had fired into the Hue procession and indemnity for the victims' families.

They demanded the right to meet freely without special police licenses.

This last demand sounded especially sinister to Ngo Dinh Nhu, a brother and chief political adviser of the President. He and his wife, Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu, who has expressed amused contempt at the world's concern over what she called the "Buddhist barbecue," believe the regime cannot tolerate free expression while fighting the Communists.

REGIME WARNED BY UNITED STATES

By mid-June reports from South Vietnam were sufficiently alarming to oblige Washington to caution the Saigon Government. The U.S. Embassy was instructed to tell President Ngo Dinh Diem "in the bluntest terms" that Buddhists disaffection could be disastrous.

The Kennedy administration seemed to be losing faith in the effectiveness of quiet pressure. This pressure had never really dented the secretive and suspicious atmosphere of the palace.

The Ngo family, despite the presence in the country of a dozen American generals and 12,000 advisers of lesser rank, continued to run the war pretty much as it pleased.

The conduct of the war was clearly threatened by the religious strife. The United States had sunk billions of dollars into the preservation of South Vietnam from Communist rule. The investment might go down the drain unless the regime came to terms quickly with the Buddhists.

In June the United States told President Ngo Binh Diem that it would publicly condemn the treatment of Buddhists unless he moved quickly to redress their grievances.

The regime reacted coldly. Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu charged that the U.S. Embassy had threatened and blackmailed her in an attempt to "shut me up."

Her husband, always suspicious of an American plot to overthrow the regime, summoned 30 of the nation's military leaders and upbraided them for having failed to take adequate precautions against a coup d'etat.

SUICIDES DEEPEN CRISIS

Meanwhile, the crisis deepened. Four more Buddhist monks and a nun killed themselves. The Government suffered military setbacks.

Yesterday the regime reacted by raiding Buddhist temples and jailing more than 100 monks. The President declared martial law.

Washington issued its threatened denunciation, calling the anti-Buddhist measures "repressive action" and contending that the action was "a direct violation by the Vietnamese Government of assurances that it was pursuing a policy of reconciliation with the Buddhists."

For nearly 2 years Washington has not acted, although the Saigon regime was becoming increasingly unpopular and increasingly incapable of arousing the war-weary population to greater efforts.

Washington discouraged criticism that the Saigon Government was repressive and that American aid had been wasted and mismanaged.

"Why do not reporters give President Diem the benefit of the doubt?" Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., used to ask American correspondents.

REGIME APPEASED

The Ambassador's desire to maintain good relations with the Ngo Dinh Diem regime sometimes led to extreme appeasement. Embassy personnel were ordered to stop dancing, even in the privacy of their homes, when the Government cracked down on night life and decreed that modern dancing was "immoral."

Mr. Nolting has now ended his tour of duty in South Vietnam and is being replaced by Henry Cabot Lodge.

The involvement of the United States in the affairs of the Saigon regime did not begin with the Ambassador's surrender on square dancing.

Relations have seemed inextricable since 1954 when Ngo Dinh Diem rose to power in South Vietnam with an important assist from the Central Intelligence Agency.

The Agency was right, in the opinion of most observers, in seeing in Ngo Dinh Diem the only clear prospect of a strong anti-Communist leadership.

OTHER CANDIDATES RULED OUT

There were other candidates for power in Saigon when, after the defeat of the French in the Indochina war, Vietnam was partitioned, the Communists taking over North Vietnam and South Vietnam relying on American support. But the other candidates were either tarred as French collaborators or were palpably corrupt.

The chief CIA agent, Col. Edward G. Lansdale, threw his support behind Ngo Dinh Diem, opposing the U.S. Ambassador, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who recommended that the United States withhold support from the Saigon Government. Allen W. Dulles, then Director General of the Intelligence Agency, persuaded his brother, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, that Colonel Lansdale was right.

President Ngo Dinh Diem may be credited with having saved South Vietnam for communism. But Washington is wondering whether a strict policy of supporting him in maintaining an increasingly repressive regime may not alienate all the Buddhists of southeast Asia.

The dilemma is that the United States considers South Vietnam militarily important. It controls the mouth of the Mekong River, the main artery of southeast Asia. The country's loss would jeopardize the remaining free nations of southeast Asia.

THE SWAMPS OF SAIGON

(By Robert Karr McCabe)

SAIGON.—"Vietnam," said the frazzled American, "might be a nice little country if it weren't for the Vietnamese." His despair was not entirely unjustified, and he was not speaking strictly of the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. During the several years of his residence here, he has seen the political situation crumble almost daily. Vietnam's problem today is greater than simply ridding itself of the Diems.

To the journalists who have haunted Saigon since early May, one of the single most disturbing factors in the situation is the reluctance—or the inability—of the Vietnamese to take matters into their own hands. "You Americans must help us," the chorus goes, "Diem is too powerful for us alone." This has long been the cry of the weak, disorganized politicians of the opposition. It now has been taken up by the military dissidents * * * and by the Buddhists as well.

Late in June, for instance, one of the Buddhist Big Five explained the pagoda position to me. "The Government of South Vietnam was created, and is supported, by the American Government," he said, gesturing emphatically. After pausing to readjust the hem of his robe, he continued: "If the Vietnamese Government betrays the agreements it has made with us, the U.S. Government will be held responsible. Americans, by putting Diem in power, assumed a responsibility to the Vietnamese people. If Diem is allowed to betray his pledges, the United States will be accused of abandoning the Vietnamese."

Then he shrugged. "This problem can only be solved by the United States, because Diem will do nothing. Diem is a puppet of Washington just as Ho Chi Minh is controlled by the Chinese and the Russians."

He rejected a suggestion that Vietnamese themselves might be able to oust Diem. "The President has American-armed troops to back him," he said. "There are thousands of secret policemen around every pagoda. How can we do anything alone?"

The bonze has a point: There is no doubt that a large-scale popular uprising would face tremendous difficulties. But there is equally little room for enthusiasm over the chances of an American-engineered coup surviving, Washington's continuing support for Diem, in the face of every political reality in the book, has sullied the American image in Vietnam. ("Kennedy is Catholic," a Saigon intellectual notes. "So is Diem. The connection is obvious.") And any government pushed into office by would-be American Machiavellis would run headlong into exactly the problems faced by the current tenants.

Much of the responsibility for the reluctance of Vietnamese to take matters into their own hands must be borne by retiring Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting, Jr. It is obvious he arrived in Saigon with instructions to get along with Diem, but it seems equally clear that he has exceeded his orders. Though Nolting is a career Foreign Service officer, and thus by definition a diplomat, he has not had much success of a diplomatic nature. His incredibly maladroit comment on the Buddhist problem last month sums up his work in Vietnam: "The trouble with this damn thing, if I may speak frankly, is that everybody focuses on a tiny aspect of it. I myself, I say this frankly after almost 2½ years, have never seen any evidence of religious persecution." Mr. Nolting just wasn't looking.

Neither were other American officials. Until mid-June, as a matter of policy, most American diplomats in Saigon were getting their information on the Buddhist movement from just two sources: Vietnamese government functionaries and American journalists. No attempt was made to contact sect leaders: "The Buddhists have a pretty fair publicity organization," a high-ranking U.S. official told me in mid-June. "We get copies of all their pronouncements." After the Reverend Thich Quang Duc immolated himself, the American Embassy finally began to take the Buddhists seriously, and the flow of information has improved markedly.

But the damage had been done, both in Saigon and in Washington. Vietnamese outside the government no longer seem to trust Americans. And Washington's official policy has evidently been frozen on the basis of the rosy reports sent back to the State Department under the Nolting tenure. One of the least exclusive groups in American officialdom is the Corner-Turners Club: "We have turned the corner in Vietnam," said Admiral X, General Y and Secretary Z today. And tomorrow, might we turn another one?

Adding to the mood of despair in Saigon is the unpleasant fact that the Kennedy administration has come up with no fresh ideas on Vietnam. The delay in the arrival of new Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge may well be because Washington still has not made up its mind on an alternative policy. Meanwhile, in Saigon, embassy officials are leaderless. Most drift along, expressing mild unhappiness about the uproar and parroting the old "Sink-Along-With-Diem" line: "Maybe he's not the greatest guy in the world," one told me cautiously, "but he's all we've got." (In this context, a comment by an American diplomat in Seoul is illuminating. Asked his opinion, he said, "That's phony. There's always an alternative.")

Among the viable alternatives to Diem today are at least one high-ranking soldier, a well-known intellectual and perhaps one or two politicians. None can be named for fear of Diem's instant retaliation, but many sources in Vietnam seem to believe there are alternatives. There is little hope that the several groups of Vietnamese exiles will produce acceptable candidates; most are tarred either by collaboration with the French or the Hanoi regime.

The Buddhists themselves, however admirable their struggle may seem, offer no real prospects. Buddhist spokesmen vow their movement remains nonpolitical, though there are signs the younger bonzes have more than sutras on their minds. After 8 weeks interviewing various members of the hierarchy, however, the most lasting impression is one combining equal parts of pettiness and slyness. Buddhist spokesmen have lied outright to the press (as is all too usual elsewhere in Vietnam), and in typical Asian style suspect all news reporters on the scene of being either in the pay of the CIA or the brothers Ngo.

There seems little question that the Buddhist movement was in fact nonpolitical in its origins. For the past several hundred years, Vietnamese Buddhism has been in a state of decline: Academics say that even today its doctrinal purity is suspect. In the early 1930's, when the General Buddhist Association of Vietnam (GBAV) was founded, vague attempts were made to restore the importance of the area's Buddhism. Little came of these efforts until the early 1950's, after the International Congress of Buddhists in Colombo, Ceylon.

Since that time, though Buddhists did increase their efforts to work together, the split between the Mahayana and Hinayana groups has remained a troublesome point. The former dominates the GBAV; its base is in Hue, where all the trouble began last May 8. The differences seem to rest more on personality than on theory, however, and in any case are not understood by 99 percent of Vietnam's lay Buddhists. In essence, Hinayana is an earlier and simpler school, which stresses individual salvation. (Saigon Buddhists, by the way, prefer the term Theravada to Hinayana.) Mahayana is much more "religious" to Western eyes. It stresses compassion—helping others to reach Nirvana as well as one's self. Cynics might say this caused the present clear political involvement.

In theory, Buddhist leaders profess to remain religious types rather than politicians. At Saigon's Xa Loi Pagoda, bonze after bonze will solemnly swear that "all we want is acceptance of our five demands."

These five demands are:

1. Withdrawal of the Government ban on display of the Buddhist flag.

2. Special status for Buddhism parallel to that accorded Catholicism.

3. Cessation of arrests and terror directed against Buddhists.

4. Freedom to preach and pratcice Buddhism for both bonze and laymen.

5. Compensation for families of those killed and wounded in the Hue riots, as well as punishment of the officials responsible.

(Diem has relented on the flag ban, ordered commissions to investigate points 2 and 5, and stated that points 3 and 4 are met by provision of the Constitution. In practice, of course, the latter is simply not true.)

Until these five demands are completely met, the Buddhists will continue their protests. Asked if traditional Buddhist nonviolence has not been a bit besmirched by such raucous incidents as self-immolation and riots, they disagree vigorously. "Self-sacrifice has been practiced in the past to protest religious injustice," a priest declared. "And the riots are all the fault of the government police."

On this last point, there seems room for doubt. Certainly the Buddhists have provided an enormous amount of provocation. And the Saigon government, by coping with the problem in a somewhat reasonable manner, might well have been able to score at least a few propaganda points, if not totally smooth things over. One of the first things a reporter learns about Vietnam, however, is that events do not proceed in a sensible fashion.

In this case, blame must be laid squarely at the dainty little feet of aging—but still attractive—Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, who seems to find someone new to hate every year. In this year of our Lord 1963, President Diem's sister-in-law has zeroed in on the Buddhists. They are, she said 2 weeks ago, "so-called holy men who have never considered the interests of the nation."

The Times of Vietnam, generally accepted as Mme. Nhu's mouthpiece, has maintained a steady flow of insinuation that the Buddhists are influenced by Vietcong agents: "When a Communist in the cloth of a bonze is arrested, is it discrimination against Buddhists or is it protection of public security against subversion?" asked a recent editorial. After stating that "Vietnam for over 2,000 years a land of multiple religions, is an example of true religious peaceful coexistence," the editorial warned that "such loosely structured organizations as the Buddhist clergy are especially vulnerable to (Communist) exploitation. It would be well to keep this salient fact in mind in judging the present problem."

Mme. Nhu's intrasigence, in fact, seems to be creating troubles within the once-monolithic Ngo family. It is widely felt in Saigon that President Diem is somewhat more flexible on the Buddhist issue than the Nhus or Archbishop Ngo Dimh Thuc, and that the otherwise unexplained minor waverings in the Government's line are due to this situation. If recent events are any criteria, however, the Nhu line has won out.

Even the most determinedly optimistic Americans in Saigon see little hope for genuine victory in Vietnam under present conditions. The effects of the strategic hamlet program, beneficial at first and bearing promise of better things, have been totally nullified by the anti-Buddhist campaign. (It should be noted that these hamlets are not concentration camps, certain U.S. liberals' opinions to the contrary. Diem already has plenty of prison camps.)

Local military successes, however impressive the casualty reports, are meaningless in a broader context. The war in Vietnam is, and has always been, a struggle for popular allegiance. Diem et famille have now forfeited whatever claim they had on mass esteem. And the younger Vietnamese, following the pattern laid down in postwar China, are forsaking the republic for either the Vietcong or the furtive opposition parties. The Diem regime is growing older, more rigid, more fearful of change. The Buddhists, through their antiregime activities, have provided a channel for protest on a truly national scale. But no one, not even the Buddhists themselves, knows where this channel leads.

PROPOSED NEW CLASSIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL SUBJECT TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is agreeable to my being yielded 7 minutes, without his losing the floor, and that this time shall not be taken from the time allotted to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is necessary for the Senator to obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, who has the floor at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control at present; but without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor has proposed to establish a new classification of executive, administrative, and professional personnel in businesses subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. This reclassification, to become effective September 3, 1963, will have severe repercussions on the small business of this country. This action will interfere with business management's ability to use its personnel most effectively. It will increase the cost of business operations unjustifiably and it will adversely affect the already increasing cost of living. The resolution I introduce today is intended to call for a congressional review of this action by the Secretary of Labor and to urge that he postpone the effective date pending the completion of this review.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Secretary of Labor has congressional authority to determine who qualifies as a bona fide executive, administrator, or professional employee and is, therefore, not eligible to receive overtime pay.

To be ineligible for overtime pay, an employee must meet two basic requirements under existing regulations. First, he must fit the act's description of the duties and functions of an executive, administrator, or professional employee. Second, he must earn in excess of a specified amount. If both conditions are met, the individual is considered a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional employee and, as such, is not eligible for overtime pay. This, of course, is applicable only to personnel in establishments coming under the jurisdiction of the act.

The Secretary of Labor has recently announced that one of the criteria will be altered on September 3. Specifically the salary level shall be raised.

A number of adverse repercussions to this decision arise. In situations where an employee has hitherto been considered a bona fide executive, after September 3, he must receive overtime pay for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week. This, in turn, increases the weekly salary of the employee and increases the cost to the employer without rendering him any increase in effort or productivity.

If, as a result of the decision, an employer is compelled, out of economic necessity, to return an individual to an hourly pay scale, the results may have further detrimental effects. Pension, retirement, or insurance plans are in many cases, geared to the manner of payment, the employee classification, and the salary level. Consequently, the operation and intent of these programs may be disorganized or totally interrupted by a change in employee classification. In addition, if an employee is compelled to return to an hourly wage basis, the morale of the individual in question and his job efficiency may be greatly damaged.

Equally critical is the extension of Federal interference into the management of business. It is one thing for the Federal Government to deal with minimum wages. It is quite another to manipulate the classification of employees in such a way as to restrict the ability of management to effectively classify, assign, utilize, and compensate its personnel.

In issuing his decision, the Secretary of Labor noted that alternatives to present criteria had been suggested in testimony, but he consistently rejected each alternative.

In arriving at his decision, the Secretary stated that he was persuaded by the division's experience, and by the results of relevant surveys, that a salary increase was appropriate. The survey indicated that the following percentages of establishments would be affected by the proposed salary increase: for executives, 13 percent of establishments; for administrators, 4 percent; for professional employees, 12 percent.

However, with respect to the number of employees concerned, the percentage is larger. Eighteen percent of the executive employees would thereafter become eligible for overtime pay, 11 percent of the administrators; and 29 percent of the professional employees.

No survey was conducted to determine the average hourly workweek for executive, administrative, or professional employees. If the number of overtime hours which an employer would be expected to meet under the new criteria established in the decision is unknown, the financial impact on the businesses in question cannot be properly estimated. Furthermore, the geographical variations of salary levels have apparently not been taken into consideration, and due emphasis was not given to the fact that there is a wide variety of conditions which exist. For example, the South and the nonmetropolitan areas were classified in the same manner as large industrial metropolitan centers. From all indications, no attempt was made to determine, or to give consideration, to the probable financial cost of the decision.

Consequently, in view of the apparent lack of consideration given to the consequences of this decision, I urge the Select Committee on Small Businesses to request the Secretary of Labor to delay the enactment of his decision until the committee can conduct an investigation to determine: First, the economic cost to businesses affected; second, the consequences resulting from a reorientation of classification and its further repercussions on pension plans, insurance programs, employee morale and efficiency; and third, to establish if the techniques used and material relied upon were both sound and adequate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield the Senator from Kansas 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this rise—which in 1959 was $55 and $75 for various classifications, and later was raised to $80 and $95 for the various classifications—is not of so much concern to me as it is to the Secretary of Labor, in reaching his decision about the new classification without regard to the institutions in the area which might be affected, without regard to the impact upon the small businesses throughout the country, particularly in the Midwest, and further, without any consideration of the repercussions that may take place in the various pension funds and insurance plans and benefits for the employees.

Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the resolution referred to, and ask that it be received and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 191) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the Select Committee on Small Business established by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation with respect to the proposed promulgation by the Secretary of Labor of revised regulations relating to the coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 of executive, administrative, and professional employees, for the purpose of ascertaining (1) the validity of the classifications of employees provided by such revised regulations and, particularly, the impact thereof on small business, (2) the propriety of techniques and methods used by the Department of Labor in ascertaining factual data forming the basis for such classifications, and (3) such other matters relating to such revised regulations as the Committee may deem necessary.

(b) The Committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

(c) The Committee is authorized to request the Secretary of Labor to postpone the effective date of the proposed revisions referred to in subsection (a) for such reasonable time as may be necessary to enable the Committee to complete its investigation.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation has been the Federal aid to airports program, which authorizes Federal matching funds for airport development in the amount of $75 million a year. This successful program will expire on June 30, 1964.

S. 1153, as unanimously reported by the Commerce Committee, would extend this program for an additional 3 years. The bill would make only two changes in the existing law. First, it adds a new provision requiring as a condition precedent to any grant that the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including enactment of zoning laws, has been or will be made to restrict use of land adjacent to airports in order to make it compatible with the operation of the airport.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. I am particularly interested in this provision because obviously we have had problems with growth around airports all over the country. In the bill it is provided that the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable efforts, including the enactment of zoning laws, have been made.

Mr. MONRONEY. An effort must be made to secure such an enactment, if the State law would permit regional zoning or zoning by county or zoning by State. We recognize that there is a patchwork of 50 different State laws, with varying zoning requirements. Most of them are limited to municipalities. Therefore, zoning is impossible for an airport which lies outside the limits of a municipality. In such cases the Administrator often will work with the airport authorities to encourage the purchase of additional land. Unless it lies in the path of the safety zone, the Administrator does not participate in that transaction. The purpose is to protect the airport itself against constant encroachments by the construction of schools, churches, nurseries, or housing developments close to the end of the jet runways—and then those concerned wonder why the properties decline in value because of the noise and the danger.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does this provision also apply to the funds for the general aviation airports?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; $7 million is included.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do the zoning laws still apply?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; although that is not so important. This provision merely amounts to advice to the airport authorities that in their own way they should do what they can to protect their investment in the airports. The airport land is perhaps the largest block of land in the community or in the county; and whatever they can do locally to protect this investment will eventually diminish the Federal Government's investment.

So we ask the Administrator to show in his reports that everything possible has been done.

Mr. DOMINICK. This is an extremely valuable provision, and I am glad to see it included in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know that the Senator from Colorado, as a pilot, understands how many airports can be ruined by the construction of high-rise apartments, smokestacks, and similar buildings which encroach on the flight patterns.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his question.

Second, the bill incorporates certain technical amendments to eliminate references in the act to airports according to classification by size to conform the law to administrative practice.

I should like to summarize briefly some of the significant and desirable features of the existing Federal Airport Act. Under the act, Federal participation is limited to items directly related to safety; items such as public parking lots, restaurants, and passenger terminal facilities are ineligible for any of the matching funds provided for in the bill.

A special fund of $7 million a year is provided for the development of general aviation airports and to relieve congestion at high-density airports.

Whenever congestion is relieved at high-density airports and at busy air terminals, overcrowding of airspace by private planes is eliminated. The private planes will use the general aviation airports, where they will have more compatible atmosphere and better service areas than they could possibly have at high-density metropolitan airports.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield on that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to make clear, so far as the RECORD is concerned, that it is my understanding that, although we are trying to place special emphasis on general aviation airports, there is no intent by the committee, and no provision of the bill so states, that commercial airports shall not be available for general aviation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Oh, no. We set aside the $7 million to give the small plane operators an opportunity to have an atmosphere compatible with the speed and design of their planes. They can still land at the busiest airports of the country if their planes are equipped to communicate with the radio towers and otherwise to comply with the airport regulations.

We felt it was better to provide an alternate place at which he could land and still permit him to have access to the metropolitan airport if he wishes it, than to say, "You cannot land at the metropolitan airport." There may not be any other place for him to be served.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Funds allocated to any State under the area-population formula which are not obligated within 2 fiscal years revert to the discretionary fund.

This is a program which was continued in spite of the FAA recommendation that the funds should revert in 1 year. We retained the 2-year provision because we felt that many municipalities—particularly smaller communities—could not provide for their financing or make the necessary arrangements for the construction of the airport within the 1-year period. Therefore, reversion of funds from the State quota would leave them in an uncertain status in determining whether the cost of the airport could be financed by up to 50 percent of Federal matching funds.

As a condition precedent to receipt of Federal aid, airport authorities are required to make provision for the installation of specified landing aids, such as in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and high-intensity runway lighting. Federal funds for these aids may be increased to 75 percent of the cost.

A special fund of $1,500,000 is provided for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands because of their insular status and unique reliance on air transportation. Of this amount $600,000 is allocated to Hawaii, $600,000 to Puerto Rico, and $300,000 to the Virgin Islands.

Since a part of a State's quota is based on land quotas, it would be obviously unfair to base the quotas for such areas on the amount of land, because the water area that surrounds them in their vicinity would not be given any weight in the area allocation formula.

Except for special set-aside allocations, 75 percent of the remaining authorization, or $49,875,000, is allocated to the States on the basis of their area and population, and 25 percent, or $16,625,000, is placed in a special discretionary fund to be used in any State at the discretion of the Administrator.

The act requires the Administrator to prepare a national airport plan specifying projects considered necessary to insure a system of public airports adequate to meet the needs of the various segments of aviation.

All of these significant and desirable features of the existing law would be extended by S. 1153.

Specifically, the bill would authorize to be obligated by grant agreements during fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967 a total amount of $225 million, or $75 million a year for each of the fiscal years. Under the existing area population formula, $49,875,000 a year would go to the States, $1,500,000 a year special set-aside to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, $7 million a year for development of general aviation airports to relieve congestion at high-density airports, and $16,625,000 a year for use in any State at the discretion of the Administrator.

The discretionary fund would be increased by the addition of the State quotas which would not be used for the 2-year period. It would supplement the $16,625,000 that we provide each year mandatorily to be used at the discretion of the FAA Administrator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a detailed breakdown of the allocation to the various States of Federal aid under this program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal-aid airport program—State apportionment of $75,000,000 authorization (75 percent State apportionment and 25 percent discretionary)

Alabama	$806,890
Alaska	3,994,844
Arizona	950,979
Arkansas	607,329
California	3,258,755
Colorado	948,502
Connecticut	390,289
Delaware	78,332
District of Columbia	106,705
Florida	1,096,112
Georgia	946,607
Hawaii	131,618
Idaho	657,532
Illinois	1,793,445
Indiana	895,215
Iowa	763,932
Kansas	859,060
Kentucky	695,524
Louisiana	787,763
Maine	366,734
Maryland	514,350
Massachusetts	778,275
Michigan	1,742,125
Minnesota	1,057,902
Mississippi	629,166
Missouri	1,071,649
Montana	1,088,320
Nebraska	718,232
Nevada	786,796
New Hampshire	147,285
New Jersey	899,232
New Mexico	954,576
New York	2,698,477
North Carolina	989,872
North Dakota	565,565
Ohio	1,651,795
Oklahoma	796,355
Oregon	901,766
Pennsylvania	1,885,489
Rhode Island	127,824
South Carolina	542,163
South Dakota	615,385
Tennessee	781,577
Texas	3,139,146
Utah	697,789
Vermont	119,165
Virginia	837,737
Washington	873,882
West Virginia	442,155
Wisconsin	997,096
Wyoming	707,687
Puerto Rico	975,000
Virgin Islands	525,000
U.S. totals	49,875,000
Insular areas:	
Hawaii	600,000
Puerto Rico	600,000
Virgin Islands	300,000
Total	1,500,000
Discretionary funds:	
General aviation	7,000,000
Regular discretionary (25 percent)	16,625,000
Grand total	75,000,000

Mr. MONRONEY. Since the inception of this program in fiscal year 1947, total expenditures have amounted to $550,609,855. Total net project funds available amounted to $741,723,839. Total grant agreements amounted to $695,171,206. As of July 1, 1963, the total amount of unobligated carryover funds is estimated to be $46,552,633.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing the net project funds available for obligation, grant agreements and cash expenditures by fiscal years from 1947 through 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Past Federal expenditures under the program

	Net project funds available	Grant agreements	Net project funds available	Grant agreements	Total net project funds available	Total grant agreements	Total cash expenditures
1947	$42,750,000	$3,041,906			$42,750,000	$3,041,906	
1948	30,662,500	25,490,758			30,662,500	25,490,758	$5,148,889
1949	36,817,172	49,908,900			36,817,172	49,908,900	30,390,990
1950	36,500,000	44,049,461			36,500,000	44,049,461	33,182,519
1951	21,200,000	39,703,042			21,200,000	39,703,042	30,388,415
1952	15,850,000	19,538,231			15,850,000	19,538,231	32,808,068
1953	9,710,029	11,007,077			9,710,029	11,007,077	26,990,836
1954		−855,556				−855,556	17,481,945
1955	20,750,000	19,698,475			20,750,000	19,698,475	8,353,021
1956	20,571,525	8,588,383	$42,500,000	$9,205,897	63,071,525	17,794,280	16,515,871
1957		7,649,910	63,000,000	37,491,306	63,000,000	45,141,216	20,649,031
1958	[1] −587,387	6,403,252	63,000,000	63,922,493	62,412,013	70,325,745	42,870,387
1959			63,000,000	72,956,360	63,000,000	72,956,360	56,577,626
1960			63,000,000	82,202,876	63,000,000	82,202,876	57,113,356
1961			63,000,000	73,783,676	63,000,000	73,783,676	64,215,753
1962			75,000,000	46,381,321	75,000,000	46,381,321	56,920,716
1963			75,000,000	[2] 75,003,438	75,000,000	[2] 75,003,438	[2] 51,002,432
Total	234,223,839	234,223,839	507,500,000	460,947,367	741,723,839	695,171,206	550,609,855
Total grant agreements					695,171,206		
Available for obligation July 1, 1963					[2] 46,552,633		

[1] Unused appropriation which reverted to Treasury.

[2] Estimated.

Mr. MONRONEY. On August 18, 1963, the Administrator announced that for fiscal year 1964 the allocation for construction and improvement of 452 civil airports under the program would be $75,911,216.

Mr. President, the committee is convinced, and unanimously agrees that $75 million a year is fully justified and represents the minimum amount necessary to make the program effective. During recent years eligible project requests have been nearly double the current level of authorizations.

In other words, we have had requests for at least $150 million a year of Federal funds and have had only $75 million maximum to match those requests.

In fiscal year 1962 the eligible project requests totaled $149,782,420; in fiscal year 1963, $140,114,334; and for fiscal year 1964, requests amounting to over $150 million were received by the FAA. The level of authorization is definitely below the estimate of required development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point summaries of the estimated required airport development for each of the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1967.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of estimated required airport development by cost item by State

FISCAL YEAR 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Alabama	600	380	1,901	6	0	80	107	3,074	0	5	49	19	0	100	0	173	3,247
Alaska	24	3,206	2,446	228	290	250	21	6,465	0	575	0	0	0	0	12	587	7,052
Arizona	0	287	2,981	169	0	58	70	3,565	0	73	922	138	0	36	50	1,219	4,784
Arkansas	50	54	289	5	0	0	22	420	69	47	314	34	0	0	16	48	900
California	204	4,347	3,516	390	125	2,859	2,541	13,982	1,330	631	2,804	658	100	349	93	5,965	19,947
Colorado	0	48	706	107	0	890	9	1,760	2	70	330	17	0	30	33	482	2,242
Connecticut	0	268	476	54	0	60	7	865	60	166	463	247	0	40	97	1,073	1,938
Delaware	0	0	142	30	0	0	8	180	0	180	142	0	0	0	0	322	502
Florida	1	725	2,927	232	0	50	569	4,504	0	7	258	113	0	0	11	389	4,893
Georgia	7,550	220	470	112	80	50	8	8,490	53	180	392	80	0	20	14	739	9,229
Hawaii	0	447	790	179	0	600	50	2,066	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	40	2,106
Idaho	20	5	740	140	0	125	112	1,142	16	0	466	15	0	30	38	565	1,707
Illinois	1,030	822	2,599	227	240	0	15	4,933	3,797	4,697	2,303	177	0	75	120	11,169	16,102
Indiana	0	55	585	43	200	0	0	883	360	210	438	36	0	0	61	1,105	1,988
Iowa	4	35	938	30	0	0	19	1,026	51	31	851	70	0	0	25	1,028	2,054
Kansas	8	2	380	11	0	0	0	401	0	45	1,256	105	0	30	0	1,436	1,837
Kentucky	0	640	1,221	128	1,050	0	81	3,120	315	352	80	0	0	0	100	847	3,967
Louisiana	10	326	1,426	59	0	0	10	1,831	0	1,162	2,098	106	0	80	49	3,495	5,326
Maine	2	189	298	34	0	0	95	618	40	260	292	127	0	0	25	744	1,362
Maryland	250	2,560	6,457	193	0	2,000	14	11,474	523	880	846	0	0	0	40	2,289	13,763
Massachusetts	0	2,102	1,393	182	0	0	70	3,747	0	457	1,557	444	0	0	57	2,515	6,262
Michigan	113	262	973	114	0	90	10	1,562	820	75	170	50	0	50	5	1,170	2,732
Minnesota	1	147	543	74	0	845	93	1,703	179	140	348	72	0	10	36	785	2,488
Mississippi	0	1,344	775	18	0	30	35	2,202	0	42	210	0	0	0	0	252	2,454
Missouri	0	20	2,399	14	0	135	0	2,568	325	139	1,266	81	0	0	0	1,811	4,379
Montana	0	0	739	99	0	100	32	970	1	10	634	42	0	60	10	757	1,727
Nebraska	22	30	184	85	0	215	97	633	134	97	408	30	0	70	42	781	1,414
Nevada	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	20	0	5	16	53	0	0	6	80	100
New Hampshire	7	177	188	29	0	125	13	539	46	236	316	58	0	0	59	715	1,254
New Jersey	0	210	1,390	0	0	0	350	1,950	0	174	854	44	0	0	20	1,092	3,042
New Mexico	0	100	471	109	0	66	3	749	16	48	312	62	0	14	52	504	1,253
New York	45	10,121	2,388	268	0	200	4,215	17,237	0	274	1,451	66	0	0	281	2,072	19,309
North Carolina	41	335	1,780	200	0	125	42	2,523	257	310	152	57	0	0	32	808	3,331
North Dakota	0	23	201	12	0	0	0	236	40	106	117	0	0	0	10	273	509
Ohio	210	775	2,664	113	0	500	530	4,792	1,102	534	1,219	71	0	0	202	3,128	7,920
Oklahoma	0	20	125	0	240	0	0	385	89	131	870	177	0	0	125	1,392	1,777
Oregon	4	12	254	182	0	0	2	454	0	7	268	42	100	0	12	429	883
Pennsylvania	1,015	8,605	3,175	265	300	0	100	13,460	1,390	3,635	2,084	485	0	150	30	7,774	21,234
Rhode Island	0	35	242	50	0	200	8	535	0	22	44	56	0	0	6	128	663
South Carolina	0	235	500	80	85	830	222	1,952	98	94	0	0	0	0	15	207	2,159
South Dakota	8	24	535	16	90	0	15	688	54	56	57	0	0	0	25	192	880
Tennessee	0	0	220	58	0	2,220	0	2,498	138	268	497	81	0	0	30	1,014	3,512
Texas	0	224	3,139	163	200	3,050	44	6,820	925	454	1,609	64	0	0	473	3,525	10,345
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	32	0	0	0	34	34
Vermont	25	59	61	13	0	0	1	159	20	93	328	46	0	0	23	510	669
Virginia	80	115	1,230	161	0	0	70	1,656	100	843	1,449	120	0	0	163	2,675	4,331

Summary of estimated required airport development by cost item by State—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Washington	1,300	50	502	100	0	858	96	2,906	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	300	3,206
West Virginia	0	1,450	1,335	169	0	0	0	2,954	150	139	353	0	0	0	12	654	3,608
Wisconsin	188	438	1,518	127	150	220	70	2,711	246	93	314	0	0	0	2	655	3,366
Wyoming	9	16	98	60	0	0	12	195	29	47	41	15	0	0	33	165	360
U.S. total	12,821	41,545	60,310	5,158	3,050	16,831	9,888	149,603	12,777	18,100	31,548	4,210	200	1,164	2,545	70,544	220,147
Puerto Rico	0	7,000	2,770	175	0	0	0	9,945	15	0	25	5	0	0	0	45	9,990
Virgin Islands	0	655	290	28	0	0	0	973	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	973
Territory total	0	7,655	3,060	203	0	0	0	10,918	15	0	25	5	0	0	0	45	10,963
Grand total	12,821	49,200	63,370	5,361	3,050	16,831	9,888	160,521	12,792	18,100	31,573	4,215	200	1,164	2,545	70,589	231,110

Source: Federal Aviation Agency.

FISCAL YEAR 1965

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Alabama	0	452	370	135	200	170	40	1,367	0	3	8	0	0	0	4	15	1,382
Alaska	12	2,902	710	120	225	210	31	4,210	210	248	0	30	0	0	28	516	4,726
Arizona	0	158	1,603	80	120	480	243	2,684	1	57	688	87	0	8	21	862	3,546
Arkansas	25	38	210	90	120	0	24	507	6	16	91	34	0	0	8	155	662
California	82	1,766	9,276	358	285	6,530	2,577	20,874	50	216	1,241	443	225	921	244	3,340	24,214
Colorado	0	237	67	18	0	80	0	402	242	14	351	46	0	30	0	683	1,085
Connecticut	0	280	380	53	0	50	14	777	0	90	173	56	0	265	77	661	1,438
Delaware	0	6	32	0	0	0	0	38	0	0	431	0	0	0	0	431	469
District of Columbia	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Florida	30	146	871	164	0	0	17	1,228	0	0	168	60	0	0	2	230	1,458
Georgia	50	5,050	890	12	0	0	15	6,017	90	215	222	6	0	0	12	545	6,562
Hawaii	0	0	0	95	0	1,695	0	1,790	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,790
Idaho	0	46	917	57	0	75	75	1,170	5	1	139	78	0	40	8	271	1,441
Illinois	0	35	205	306	0	125	11	682	1,028	544	1,665	117	0	0	185	3,539	4,221
Indiana	0	152	830	43	0	30	0	1,055	465	298	883	113	0	20	32	1,181	2,866
Iowa	0	0	360	21	0	0	0	381	32	25	774	33	0	0	8	872	1,253
Kansas	0	20	0	0	0	55	0	75	6	34	632	103	0	0	4	779	854
Kentucky	110	895	1,360	141	0	0	435	2,941	45	65	0	0	0	0	8	118	3,059
Louisiana	0	659	698	19	0	0	6	1,382	0	12	38	0	0	0	0	50	1,432
Maine	0	141	356	32	0	80	0	609	10	50	79	71	0	0	15	225	834
Maryland	0	800	2,764	202	0	0	0	3,766	0	737	827	46	0	0	33	1,643	5,409
Massachusetts	30	1,532	704	346	0	190	116	2,918	0	56	446	594	76	560	137	1,869	4,787
Michigan	127	152	605	62	0	45	10	1,001	20	555	171	120	0	15	5	886	1,887
Minnesota	172	203	701	58	0	480	9	1,623	211	205	431	2	0	0	37	886	2,509
Mississippi	0	104	2,090	63	0	0	0	2,257	0	0	69	23	0	0	1	93	2,350
Missouri	42	776	57	8	0	250	10	1,143	154	68	1,235	127	0	0	21	1,605	2,748
Montana	10	103	1,408	138	0	0	108	1,767	0	0	72	10	0	50	10	142	1,909
Nebraska	0	130	829	21	0	0	0	980	14	54	318	9	0	0	0	395	1,375
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	50	15	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
New Hampshire	4	315	254	38	0	100	19	730	5	94	209	45	0	0	2	355	1,085
New Jersey	0	15	260	101	0	1,630	0	2,006	0	95	262	211	0	0	89	657	2,663
New Mexico	13	111	314	60	0	30	14	542	0	88	205	70	0	12	4	379	921
New York	410	4,696	3,714	242	0	365	982	10,409	0	110	479	174	200	110	20	1,093	11,502
North Carolina	90	132	1,245	48	0	0	38	1,553	499	678	465	98	0	0	64	1,804	3,357
North Dakota	0	1	158	53	0	0	0	212	19	45	90	0	0	0	5	159	371
Ohio	980	830	1,600	134	0	0	30	3,574	727	430	649	10	0	0	120	1,936	5,510
Oklahoma	0	1,381	3,124	105	0	0	20	4,630	30	90	640	5	0	0	29	794	5,424
Oregon	16	0	0	44	0	16	0	76	0	1	110	0	0	0	7	118	194
Pennsylvania	250	3,620	1,590	160	150	1,320	1,490	8,580	275	4,340	2,079	562	0	0	80	7,336	15,916
Rhode Island	0	12	16	0	250	60	12	350	30	0	30	5	0	90	10	165	515
South Carolina	0	150	440	0	0	345	310	1,245	45	125	138	18	0	0	27	353	1,598
South Dakota	0	21	925	35	0	130	0	1,111	51	52	82	22	0	0	18	225	1,336
Tennessee	0	0	250	0	0	0	0	250	233	135	298	60	0	75	9	810	1,060
Texas	20	127	1,079	60	0	150	32	1,468	233	200	778	15	150	0	56	1,432	2,900
Utah	0	37	136	6	0	34	0	213	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	28	241
Vermont	0	47	14	0	0	80	32	173	45	216	68	29	0	0	37	395	568
Virginia	0	20	790	188	160	0	0	1,158	220	332	324	173	150	0	138	1,337	2,495
Washington	0	0	0	0	600	460	0	1,060	0	0	37	52	0	0	6	95	1,155
West Virginia	0	37	981	44	0	0	45	1,107	0	284	175	53	0	0	36	548	1,655
Wisconsin	115	341	581	35	0	80	25	1,177	215	107	448	2	0	0	0	772	1,949
Wyoming	5	13	216	102	0	0	7	343	2	18	148	0	0	0	3	171	514
U.S. total	2,593	28,689	45,980	4,097	2,110	15,395	6,812	105,676	5,218	11,003	18,866	3,840	801	2,196	1,660	43,584	149,260
Puerto Rico	0	1,025	200	10	0	750	25	2,010	0	0	0	15	0	50	0	65	2,075
Virgin Islands	0	0	50	6	0	0	0	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Territories total	0	1,025	250	16	0	750	25	2,066	0	0	0	15	0	50	0	65	2,131
Grand total	2,593	29,714	46,230	4,113	2,110	16,145	6,837	107,742	5,218	11,003	18,866	3,855	801	2,246	1,660	43,649	151,391

Source: Federal Aviation Agency.

Summary of estimated required airport development by cost item by State—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1966

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Air carrier airports								General aviation airports								Grand total air carrier and general aviation
	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	Land acquisition	Site preparation	Paving	Lighting	Control tower	Public use facilities	Miscellaneous	Total	
Alabama	0	125	1,925	43	235	160	17	2,505	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,505
Alaska	50	4,240	2,307	175	150	240	32	6,194	0	786	0	0	0	0	10	796	6,990
Arizona	0	30	93	63	200	1,370	6	1,762	6	20	100	50	0	132	76	384	2,146
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	145	1,172	202	0	0	49	1,611	1,611
California	40,600	156	1,040	426	400	900	767	44,289	1,750	50	753	255	1,052	523	97	4,480	48,769
Colorado	60	5	289	20	0	0	116	490	0	29	533	101	0	0	14	677	1,167
Connecticut	0	0	0	116	70	60	20	266	0	30	40	71	0	470	16	627	893
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	60	0	60	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	66	126
District of Columbia	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Florida	0	17	797	44	1,600	3,315	384	6,157	0	0	65	34	0	0	0	99	6,256
Georgia	0	0	2,890	180	0	50	30	3,150	51	155	399	47	0	0	8	660	3,810
Hawaii	0	1,728	1,774	155	0	0	0	3,657	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,657
Idaho	0	0	443	198	260	140	25	1,066	0	1	17	18	0	115	4	155	1,221
Illinois	0	67	200	55	0	75	0	397	23	627	2,377	214	0	0	71	3,312	3,709
Indiana	0	165	285	36	0	0	0	486	40	59	293	210	0	0	0	602	1,088
Iowa	0	0	220	32	0	0	0	252	0	24	308	158	0	202	0	692	944
Kansas	0	8	397	66	0	15	0	486	34	26	561	259	0	25	14	919	1,405
Kentucky	923	4,200	3,440	245	600	130	107	9,645	323	554	159	0	0	0	148	1,184	10,829
Louisiana	0	671	2,625	138	0	40	16	3,490	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,490
Maine	0	152	290	39	0	140	0	621	45	106	114	34	0	150	25	474	1,095
Maryland	85	0	800	0	200	1,000	0	2,085	0	0	76	172	0	0	10	258	2,343
Massachusetts	0	130	398	32	0	265	14	839	0	46	145	11	0	840	178	1,220	2,059
Michigan	0	30	60	0	0	40	0	130	255	80	255	70	0	25	13	698	828
Minnesota	173	0	670	63	0	0	10	916	227	177	140	84	0	0	66	694	1,610
Mississippi	0	235	1,011	20	0	0	0	1,266	2	12	14	0	0	0	3	31	1,297
Missouri	0	164	1,242	38	0	1,135	0	2,579	0	8	896	195	0	135	0	1,234	3,813
Montana	0	10	200	271	0	720	45	1,246	0	1	16	105	0	45	0	167	1,413
Nebraska	126	428	2,071	46	0	312	8	2,991	0	0	829	52	0	60	4	945	3,936
Nevada	0	190	202	25	20	50	0	487	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487
New Hampshire	0	95	265	24	0	130	10	524	6	20	146	24	0	20	6	222	746
New Jersey	0	0	198	124	170	1,590	72	2,154	0	0	520	209	0	30	359	1,118	3,272
New Mexico	0	121	1,740	137	0	225	40	2,263	0	32	220	60	0	85	12	409	2,672
New York	100	496	2,665	421	0	164	601	4,447	0	1	181	239	0	35	20	476	4,923
North Carolina	244	69	429	40	0	0	37	819	89	430	175	82	0	0	39	815	1,634
North Dakota	48	34	299	63	0	0	0	444	69	150	204	0	0	0	21	444	888
Ohio	100	1,970	5,480	248	0	150	200	8,148	530	428	796	66	0	100	72	1,992	10,140
Oklahoma	0	499	912	64	80	0	13	1,568	94	68	649	440	0	0	35	1,436	3,004
Oregon	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	150	0	16	16	51
Pennsylvania	370	4,910	1,895	135	0	400	875	8,585	0	675	3,070	670	0	0	0	4,415	13,000
Rhode Island	0	8	74	96	0	0	40	218	0	20	20	2	0	90	0	132	350
South Carolina	0	75	0	25	0	0	300	400	15	180	53	28	0	0	18	294	694
South Dakota	0	18	913	48	90	300	0	1,369	20	29	29	13	0	45	13	149	1,518
Tennessee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	500	85	0	39	16	726	726
Texas	25	195	1,194	54	100	40	5	1,613	892	454	2,156	29	0	0	179	3,710	5,323
Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	2	0	0	0	69	69
Vermont	0	0	54	4	0	0	2	60	0	51	430	39	0	0	1	521	581
Virginia	40	0	450	50	0	140	0	680	0	169	493	210	150	0	55	1,077	1,757
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	100	25	125	0	0	0	18	0	0	5	23	148
West Virginia	0	0	33	100	0	180	40	353	0	84	430	111	0	0	0	625	978
Wisconsin	0	371	1,821	70	0	100	0	2,362	253	125	376	0	0	0	0	754	3,116
Wyoming	0	5	53	120	0	0	4	182	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	15	197
U.S. total	42,944	21,617	43,144	4,384	4,175	13,736	3,861	133,861	4,767	5,964	19,766	4,735	1,352	3,166	1,673	41,423	175,284
Puerto Rico	0	1,200	700	100	0	1,200	0	3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Territories, total	0	1,200	700	100	0	1,200	0	3,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200
Grand total	42,944	22,817	43,844	4,484	4,175	14,936	3,861	137,061	4,767	5,964	19,766	4,735	1,352	3,166	1,673	41,423	178,485

Source: Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is pertinent to note that the estimated requirements for fiscal year 1964 are $231,110,000; as mentioned previously, the program announced for this year is $75,911,216. By adding the matching local funds the total amount for airport development in fiscal year 1964 is roughly $151,822,432, or $79,287,568 short of the required needs.

All witnesses who appeared before the committee supported the $75 million authorization as the minimum amount necessary. Many expressed the view that the amount should be increased to $100 million annually and extended for a 5-year period. A number of the members of the committee agree that this amount could be justified. However, in view of past strong opposition to such an increase on the part of the House and because of the many other pressing demands on the Federal budget, it would not be practical this year, to press for a higher authorization. With these considerations in mind, the committee determined it best to extend the act for 3 years rather than 5, and thus avoid freezing the program at the $75 million level over too prolonged a period. This will enable the committee to review the program again 2 years hence. It is possible that circumstances may have changed by that time, which will make the realization of an increased level of authorization more practical.

The committee in 1961 reluctantly agreed to a House amendment changing the method of funding from contract or advance obligation authority to a system of annual appropriations. The committee was apprehensive that the past chaotic history of the appropriations system, with its attendant uncertainties, might repeat itself and render the airport program ineffective. The committee is pleased that its fears have not, thus far, come to pass.

It is not enough to authorize advance funding if authorizations are not obligated to be expended by means of advance appropriations. The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses have wisely recognized this need, and have maintained 2-year forward funding at the fully authorized level. Two years is the minimum leadtime essential to the realization of an orderly and effective program. The committee is confident that this need will continue to be recognized.

A review of the statistics clearly shows the spectacular growth of air commerce and the immense contribution this industry makes to the national economy.

The aircraft manufacturing industry ranks second only to the motor vehicle and equipment industry in terms of number of people employed, the total of which exceeds 650,000. This does not include the many people employed by industries indirectly associated with aviation; for example, aviation fuel consumed by domestic aircraft exceeded 3 billion gallons in 1962. The domestic trunk airlines alone realized revenues of $2,250,-

281,000 in 1962 while expending $2,174,137,000. Domestic air carrier revenue passengers are expected to increase from 59.9 million at the outset of this year to 85 million by 1970. For the same years in terms of passenger-miles the figures are 33 and 51 billion. Particularly impressive is the growth of the 13 local service carriers which carried 18.2 percent more passengers, flew 19.6 percent more passenger-miles, and carried 14.3 percent more mail, 24.9 percent more express, and 31.4 percent more freight in 1962 than they did in 1961. They flew 7,650,000 revenue passengers, a total of 1.6 billion passenger-miles. Mail ton-miles amounted to 3.8 million in 1962, while express ton-miles were 3.8 million and freight ton-miles were 7.2 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Aircargo continues to set new records and 1962 was no exception. Total traffic carried by the airlines exceeded 1.3 billion ton-miles in 1962 for an increase of nearly 20 percent over the preceding year. It is estimated that total cargo traffic should at least double by 1970. Airfreight showed a 22.5-percent increase this year with total ton-miles amounting to 898.1 million. Air express amounting to over 70 million ton-miles showed a 14.3-percent increase over the preceding year. Airmail recorded a 12.7-percent increase with a total of 251.4 million ton-miles. First-class mail achieved a 16.4-percent increase over 1961 with the total for 1962 amounting to 88.6 million ton-miles.

This is the mail carried on a "space available" basis in the air, but carried at the regular surface cost. It is a wide open field for greater utilization of aircraft without additional cost to the Post Office Department, and also for furnishing a use for unused capacity which is now going to waste.

General aviation last year, with over 80,000 aircraft, flew approximately 3 times as many hours and twice as many miles as the domestic certificated airlines. Today, the general aviation fleet represents 85 percent of all U.S. aircraft. By 1970, their number should total well over 100,000. General aviation use is rapidly expanding for pleasure flying, business travel, air taxi service, and in agricultural and industrial applications. Operations increased from 12,129,000 in 1957 to 17,367,000 in 1962 at 270 airports controlled by FAA control towers. In terms of hours flown, general aviation flying is expected to increase from slightly over 13 million to well over 18 million by 1970. During the decade ending 1961, estimated hours flown rose from 8,186,000 to 12,800,000, while estimated plane miles flown increased from 972,055,000 to 1,695 million.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I realize that the question I am about to pose does not relate specifically to the portion of the Senator's speech I have interrupted. Nevertheless, I regard the Senator to be such an authority on the subject of aviation that I wish to express to him a concern I have felt, and to solicit his views.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall certainly appreciate any comment by my distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, since he has always been a great friend of aviation and forward looking in meeting the needs in the air as well as meeting the needs for transportation on the ground.

Mr. GORE. I have been concerned that the aviation industry might be rushing pellmell, uneconomically, and unnecessarily into jet transportation. To illustrate my point, I find it quicker to take an Electra from Nashville, Tenn., to National Airport and then an automobile to the U.S. Capitol, than to take a jet from the same airport to Dulles Airport and then an automobile to the Capitol. In other words, I can travel by Electra from the airport in Nashville to reach my office in the Capitol quicker than I can by taking a jet, yet the jet transportation requires great expense, great investment, and I fear—if not immediately, ultimately—great Government subsidy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Oklahoma that he has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I inquire of the Presiding Officer how the remaining time stands?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-three minutes remain to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Oklahoma whatever time he needs.

Mr. MONRONEY. The jets essentially are the long-legged aircraft, which must fly longer distances to make up for the trend in airport locations generally being moved farther from the centers of cities. There is a great need for modern turboprop aircraft for shorter distances. In fitting the jet aircraft into the economic pattern, probably we shall move again to propellor-driven aircraft or lighter, lower powered jets, whose noise level will permit landings at airports closer in.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Electra will fly from Nashville to Washington, D.C., in approximately an hour and a half. The jet might reduce that time by 20 minutes. Is jet transportation justified strictly from the standpoint of time saving?

Mr. MONRONEY. It depends upon the distance. American Airlines has recaptured much of the market between Washington, D.C., and Chicago by abandoning jet service from Friendship to O'Hare, and by originating its Electra flights to Washington National. Many friends of mine fly by jet from California to Chicago, and transfer to Electras or Viscounts at Chicago and fly to Washington National, rather than to the outlying airport, which they could do in the jets.

It depends upon the distance, largely, whether a jet is a great economy in time.

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to say anything critical of American Airlines or of any other particular airline, but I have noticed another trend. Local service is being diminished. Knoxville, Tenn., is now served by only one American flight east and one American flight west in a 24-hour period. I would rather have more frequent service by standard equipment than less frequent service by superjets.

Mr. MONRONEY. One of the things which we must continue to watch is the abandonment of cities such as Knoxville or other good revenue towns as the equipment grows larger and the major trunk lines desire to make longer flights. There is no question that they can make more money from the longer flights with fewer stops. This is one of the reasons why they are abandoning service to intermediate size cities. It will be a danger, eventually, to service in many areas, which may have to be picked up by feeder lines or local service airlines on a subsidy basis.

Mr. GORE. I have one further point, if the Senator will permit me to proceed momentarily, though I realize his time is short. The development of which he speaks will leave the intermediate cities to be more or less hitchhiking stops.

The flights seem no longer to be scheduled from Nashville, Tenn., to New York or Washington for the convenience of passengers in Nashville, but, rather, as a convenient stopover for passengers from California to New York.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. Of course, most California-New York traffic is moving nonstop, or at least with only one stop. To get adequate revenue loads in the older days, they had to make perhaps 10 stops.

Mr. GORE. If that practice continues, what about interim cities like Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Nashville, Little Rock?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is a grave danger that the trunklines have become such supertrunklines that they do not provide adequate service for intermediate cities.

Mr. GORE. What can Congress do?

Mr. MONRONEY. Congress can, through hearings and by policy expressions, ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to require justification of how well these major lines have served intermediate points, and whether they should be rewarded in the future with long-distance transcontinental routes. I think service to each community is the yardstick by which airlines should be measured.

Mr. GORE. I do not think that yardstick is being used. For example, American had a flight out of Nashville at 6 or 6:30 in the morning for years. The patronage was good, the service convenient. People would leave Nashville early in the morning and arrive in Washington early. I could be at my office by 9 or

9:30. Now I can get no flight out of Nashville except at 2 a.m. on which I can arrive in Washington no earlier than 2:30 or 3 in the afternoon. Such service does not measure the needs of the community by the yardstick which the Senator mentioned.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. Service has diminished to such communities, and will continue to diminish unless the FAA and the CAB take this problem into cognizance.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will not need that much time.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that this trouble will continue unless Congress or the Federal aviation agencies take some action. This disturbs me. What assurance can the Senator give me that the Federal Aviation Agency will do something about it?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be a matter to be taken into consideration in granting extensions of additional route miles, which are often sought by major trunkline air carriers. The Senator can do, as I presume all Senators do—insist to the airline that greater service be available to the State that the Senator represents.

It is a plain fact that, if it is left strictly to economics rather than public service, the airlines will make more money serving long flights. The greater the distance, the more money there is in carrying passengers to distant points. The shorter range flights are the least profitable.

I do not understand why the airlines do not recognize that from Nashville to Washington, for example, the plane always is filled with passengers when it leaves there at 6 or 7 o'clock. There is never a seat when the plane leaves Nashville. I do not know why they do not recognize that such a flight provides a good revenue source.

I have been urging a modern replacement for the old DC-3 that would be fast and tailored to serve the communities the Senator is talking about with the frequency of service they need. That is what we are really talking about. While we can build the massive, long-legged jets and the supersonic planes that fly at three times the speed of sound, we have not yet found a replacement for the old DC-3, which today is still the standard plane for the carriage of traffic on schedules that fly to the medium sized towns.

Mr. GORE. I can reach only one conclusion, from the remarks made by the Senator from Oklahoma, namely that the CAB has not been adequately caring for the public interest.

Mr. MONRONEY. It has not paid attention to that part of the public interest represented by the towns of the size of which the Senator from Tennessee speaks.

Mr. GORE. Are there not more Nashvilles, Tulsas, and Louisvilles than there are Los Angeleses and New Yorks?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are many more. When times become hard and they are looking for revenue, the airlines will rediscover them. I have been urging that they rediscover them with frequency of service on shorter haul flights with a redesigned plane. The fault lies not only with the airlines, but with the aircraft manufacturers, who have failed to give the airlines the type of equipment we need. There is not a short range aircraft today being built in this country that the airlines can use. The DC-9 has been designed, but is not in production. The other planes are for longer hauls, generally a minimum range of 1,500 miles. They are so long legged that to stop with a 707 or a DC-8 on a short haul is totally and completely uneconomic.

Mr. GORE. I conclude by urging the distinguished chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee to haul the CAB before his committee, in public hearing, and demand of them why it has not performed the duty which Congress has vested in it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator speaks very wisely in this field. I will certainly take time to call their attention to it, and, as time permits, try to have hearings on the question. This is a real problem. I am afraid the trunklines will abandon service in towns of a size smaller than Nashville, and turn them over to the feeder lines, which will then be paid a subsidy for service to towns which the trunk lines should serve as a part of their service for being permitted to serve larger cities. This is the real poblem.

Mr. GORE. I promise not to take any further time of the Senator——

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the Senator's questions. They are stimulating and important.

Mr. GORE. The end result of the trouble which the Senator has described, and for the end of which he offers little hope, is poor service for the vast majority of the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. On a population basis.

Mr. GORE. It takes longer to get from Tulsa to Washington than from Los Angeles to Washington.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And at much greater expense to the taxpayers.

Mr. MONRONEY. In many parts of the country it is easier to fly backward for 300 or 400 miles. In other words, in order to go east, it is quicker to fly west from Phoenix to Los Angeles and then east to Oklahoma City, than to try to get to Oklahoma City directly from Phoenix. This is a question of scheduling that is a source of irritation to the committee. We deplore the fact that the major airlines have not tried to keep up with the public interest in this regard.

To return to my statement, arguments have been made in the past that our airport needs are static; that these needs will soon be met, that the program can be reduced drastically each year as these static needs are met. The argument is specious, and ignores, as well as denies, the march of progress. Air traffic is exploding, speed is doubling, the general aviation fleet is increasing rapidly each year, technological advances are continually made which should be incorporated into our airport system. Mr. President, you can no more squeeze the air traffic of today into the airports of the thirties than one can expect to squeeze the traffic of the seventies into today's existing airports. This was dramatically called to the attention of the Senate Aviation Committee this very week during the hearings on New England air service. It was quite apparent that one of the major reasons for inadequate service in New England was the lack of adequate airports. I am sure that the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire would agree with me that the system is not only less than adequate, it is deplorable. This bill will continue to provide at least the minimum amount of funds necessary to improve our airports.

In this connection it should be noted that just in the past year the FAA criteria for our airports in smaller communities have been revised. In the past the criteria called for such sophisticated designs and plans and such rigid and expensive minimum requirements that many of our communities were not able to avail themselves of the benefits of the program because of prohibitive costs and unnecessary requirements. This recent development will enable hundreds of our smaller communities to qualify for assistance, properly related to their needs. The plans have been simplified and the costs cut in half. We can expect a rapid rise in the number of applications from these communities and in the amount of funds which will be needed.

Our airports are also vital and indispensable to our national defense. In World War II over 429 civil airports were made available to the Military Establishment. They are continually available to the military in times of national emergency and in peacetime as well. For example, itinerant military aircraft operations at airports with FAA control towers in 1961 amounted to 1,766,488.

Since the beginning of the program and continuously throughout its history, the primary emphasis has been on safety. This emphasis was of paramount importance in the amendments passed in 1961. It is a recognition that the single most important factor in insuring air safety is the maintenance of an adequate airport system. The need to maintain and improve our airports is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that more than two-thirds of all aircraft accidents occur either at or within 5 miles of the airport.

The act stresses and contributes to safety by imposing conditions which must be met before Federal funds can be granted. The Administrator must prepare a national airport plan specifying the projects considered necessary to insure an airport system adequate to meet aviation needs. Airports not included in the plan are not eligible for Federal assistance. Airport sponsors must operate and maintain the airport and all facilities in a safe condition. FAA approval of a master plan is required before Federal funds may be expended.

Design, engineering, and construction must be approved in advance of allocation and must further be inspected and approved during the course of construction. This system of Federal oversight over the use of millions of tax dollars—Federal, State, and local—has unquestionably contributed greatly to the unparalleled safety record of aviation in this country.

The only new provision contained in the bill will also contribute to safety, as well as help to alleviate the noise problem around our airports. This provision would require as a condition precedent to the making of a grant that the Administrator satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including enactment of zoning laws, has been or will be made to restrict the use of land adjacent to airports to make it compatible with the operation of the airport. The noise problem cannot be ignored or dismissed, especially in view of the advent of supersonic jets. The problems of approach, landing, and takeoff noise and sonic boom overpressure which are inherent in the development and use of such jets require careful study and analysis. The new provision would enable the Administrator to encourage and assist the local communities in their efforts to achieve effective zoning and land use and in preparing for the era of the supersonic transport.

The noise problem must be met head-on. Every available means of alleviating noise must be employed. The single most important means which can be effected now is to insure adequate zoning. The proposed amendment will encourage such zoning where reasonable and practicable. However, the Federal Government can only encourage and assist. The primary responsibility and initiative rests with local governments and the Federal Government can only cooperate. Therefore, the Administrator, in interpreting this provision, must take into consideration all relevant factors including those involving economic, social, safety, and multiple-jurisdiction considerations. The prime consideration should be what makes economic sense, not what may be technically feasible or within the realm of reality. In administering this provision, the Administrator should broadly interpret the word "reasonable."

In regard to this new provision, as well as the remarks in the committee report of tailoring aircraft to fit existing airports, the goal is to improve our existing airports, build new airports, and promote safety—not price our airports out of existence.

Mr. President, Congress has always recognized the need for and supported every measure designed to improve our national transportation system—by water, rail, highway, and air. I close with the observation that until all our communities, both large and small, are accessible by air, as well as by other means of transportation, we have not achieved a national transportation system designed to fulfill the needs of the future.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to yield, if I have some time. I have practically consumed all my time.

Mr. KEATING. I need only 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has briefly discussed one of the committee amendments to this bill which is of great concern to me. I am referring to the proposed amendment to the basic Federal Airport Act which would require, as a condition precedent to any airport grant, that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency satisfy himself that appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to airports so as to make it compatible with the operation of the airport.

Mr. President, a provision such as this has been long overdue. The aircraft noise problem and related nuisances are becoming more serious from day to day in the metropolitan areas of our country where large airports are located. As I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is aware, I have been very conscious of the devastating effect of aircraft noise in and around airports located in New York, not only in New York City but elsewhere in the State such as the Buffalo-Niagara Falls area. Now I recognize that there is no single means of tackling the problem which will solve it. Only a many-sided approach will reach longrun solutions. One certain avenue of progress lies in basic research and development into noise suppressant devices on jet engines, and I have sponsored appropriate legislation for Federal participation in such a program, which I hope will be reached for consideration by the Commerce Committee as early as possible. But in the meantime, we should not overlook, and I am gratified that the committee has not overlooked, another important and sensible approach which has now been taken in the amendment to this bill; namely, that compatible land use of adjacent land areas around airports be achieved to the extent feasible.

It is altogether true that surrounding areas of many airports are already developed to such an extent that corrective zoning is impossible. Certainly this holds true for the most part at many New York airports. However, the lack of foresight in the past to take protective action when it was feasible as a practical matter provides a lesson for what can now be accomplished at this late date with respect to new airport improvements and new airport sites in areas which remain relatively underdeveloped. Compatible land use arrangements, where legally and practically enforcible by zoning or otherwise, are a most reasonable tool to strike at aircraft noise hazards before, not after, they take their toll in human health and discomfort and in the depreciation of substantial public and private investments in and around airports.

As the committee has recognized, its amendment provides no airtight safeguard against future noise nuisance. Moreover, there are always drawbacks in delegating to an administrative agency authority and power which are unconfined by precise criteria for their exercise. Nonetheless, I have read with great care the assurances of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency which have been given the Aviation Subcommittee, and I take heart that it is his intention to work jointly with airport sponsors to influence and persuade zoning authorities and private developers to coordinate action which will protect area residents from the regrettable nuisances of airport operations.

Of course, such action must make economic sense and take into account all the relevant legal and social factors, including, most importantly, the safety of aircraft operations in and out of the airports.

Therefore, Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman and members of the Committee on Commerce for the wisdom and foresight which they have exerted in including this significant amendment in the bill now before us. It is not a panacea for the jet noise problem. Nor is it a cure-all for aircraft noise nuisances generally. But it is a giant step forward in the right direction, it will be very helpful, in my judgment, and it has my full support.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which would add a section to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. The Federal Airport Act is amended further by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ACCESS TO RECORDS

"SEC. 21. (a) Each recipient of grants under this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the plan or program in connection with which such grants are given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost or the plan or program supplied by other sources and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers and records of the recipient that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on page 188 of the hearings on the bill there is printed a letter from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, which makes a specific request of the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I will read one or two paragraphs from that letter written by the Comptroller General. He says:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of March 27, 1963, acknowledged March 28, requests

> our comments on S. 1153, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.
>
> The changes in the Federal Airport Act as proposed by S. 1153 concern matters of policy which we feel are primarily for the Congress to determine. Consequently we have no comments to offer regarding the merits of the bill.
>
> We should like to point out, however, that although the Federal Aviation Agency has provided by regulation that recipients of grants maintain records and grant access to such records to designated representatives of the Federal Aviation Agency for audit and examination, no provision is made in the regulation nor in legislation applicable to grant programs authorized by the Federal Airport Act for access to grantees' records by representatives of the General Accounting Office. We believe that provision for such access should be made.

The proposed amendment follows at the bottom of the letter, and my amendment adopts the proposed amendment, which would give audit authority to the Administrator and the Comptroller General and place an additional section, a short two-paragraph section, at the end of the bill. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether he will accept it.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is being done to a general degree through the Federal Aviation Agency; and whenever any doublechecking or auditing is necessary beyond its capacity, it is done by the Comptroller General. However, since the Comptroller General, in answer to our request for comment, suggested that he would like this authority, I believe it would be an extra safeguard to put the language in the bill.

Under it the Comptroller General would have the right on his own motion to make a study of any situation in which a study might be required. Therefore I am happy to accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that no time is left in support of the bill, and only 15 minutes in opposition. I have an amendment with respect to which there is a unanimous-consent agreement to have it called up on Monday, with 10 minutes of debate on each side. I should like to discuss the amendment for a half hour this afternoon. I have discussed this arrangement with the Senator in charge of the bill. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 minutes in which to discuss my amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, if there is objection, it would be permissible to have the third reading of the bill now.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to have a vote on an amendment which he intended to offer on Monday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, the unanimous-consent agreement allows for a third reading, with the exception that this amendment would be considered by the Senate on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin can offer and have 1 hour on his amendment, as I understand the unanimous-consent agreement as it is printed and placed on our desks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be preferable that the amendment not be offered until Monday, because a third reading can be had now, and the Senate would be in a better parliamentary situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not understand how the third reading can be had today, and the Senator's amendment can be considered once the third reading has been had.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The unanimous-consent agreement provides that the amendment may be offered after third reading in this particular situation. That arrangement was agreed to earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Chair state what the ruling was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks that the clerk read the agreement previously entered into today.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

> *Ordered*, That after the third reading of the bill (S. 1153), to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, which shall be reached today, further consideration of the measure shall be postponed until the conclusion of morning business on Monday, August 26, 1963, at which time, notwithstanding the third reading of the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], to reduce the cost of the program by one-third.
>
> *Ordered further*, That debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the majority leader, or someone designated by him, to be followed by a vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is an order that has been adopted by the Senate, not a parliamentary ruling.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Unfortunately, no member of the committee was in the Chamber when the unanimous-consent request was made. I do not recall ever accepting after third reading, and by a unanimous-consent agreement, an amendment which may then be placed in the bill. I think this is causing some degree of jeopardy to the usual clarity of the Senate rules. I do not raise this question as a point of order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, because of the limited time that is expected to be taken on the amendment on Monday, be allowed 30 minutes to discuss his amendment, and that the opposition to the amendment also be allowed 30 minutes in which to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes to a side?

Mr. MONRONEY. Thirty minutes to a side on the amendment the Senator from Wisconsin will offer after the third reading. He would be allowed to discuss his amendment now in the time I am asking for under unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that if the bill is read the third time today, there will be no further control of the time; the Senator from Wisconsin may discuss his amendment without a limitation of time.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a new parliamentary procedure to me. It may be familiar to the Parliamentarian. I want the Senator from Wisconsin to have an opportunity to discuss his amendment by whatever means it can be done under the unanimous-consent arrangement. That would allow the Senate to have the third reading of the bill, if the Senator wishes. Then I hope he might obtain the floor to discuss the amendment that will not be voted on until Monday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In view of the fact that only 15 minutes remain of the time on the bill, it seems to me that the only way I could be safeguarded—any Senator could object—would be to offer an amendment, discuss it for 30 minutes, and then withdraw it. I do not say that I will do that, but I shall offer the amendment.

Therefore, I move to strike lines 10 and 11 on page 10 of the bill. On my amendment, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for a parliamentary inquiry without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask the Chair whether a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered that the Committee on Commerce may file a report on a bill up to midnight tonight?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An agreement has been entered for the filing of a report and of supplemental views.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

PROXMIRE AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment. It would reduce by one-third the sums authorized in the bill. The bill provides for $75 million a year, and $225 million over a period of 3 years, in Federal matching grants—50-50 grants—to the 50 States. My amendment would reduce the $75 million to $50 million a year, or $150 million over a period of 3 years.

I offer the amendment because, in my judgment, it is the only way that we can, on a fair and sensible basis, reduce the program. If the bill passes, the Committee on Appropriations is pretty much honorbound to vote the entire authorization. It has done so in the past; I am almost certain it would do so again. Therefore, there will be no real opportunity to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill to reduce this subsidy program.

Also, I feel strongly that if we are to hold domestic spending at its present level, it will be necessary not only to resist some new programs, but also to cut back some of the old programs. Otherwise, if we keep domestic spending level as President Kennedy suggested we shall be in the static position where we shall have no new programs at all, which I think we all agree would be wrong. Some old programs should be improved and increased. Some certainly should be reduced if we are to have any genuine efficiency in Government, and any real dynamism.

Of all the Federal subsidy programs in existence, it seems to me that this one is the least justified. It is a subsidy program for business—profitmaking business; a business that has been doing, in many areas, very well, indeed; and it is not based on any kind of need for such a program. In fact, as the committee report itself indicates, on page 16, the size of the business has become substantial. Let me read from the committee's report:

GROWTH OF AIR COMMERCE AND ITS IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

> Few industries have experienced more spectacular growth or have contributed more importantly to the national economy. The aircraft manufacturing industry ranks second only to the motor vehicle and equipment industry in terms of number of people employed, the total of which exceeds 650,000. This does not include the many people employed by industries indirectly associated with aviation, e.g., aviation fuel consumed by domestic aircraft exceeded 3 billion gallons in 1962. The domestic trunk airlines alone realized revenues of $2,250,281,000 in 1962 while expending $2,174,137,000. Domestic air carrier revenue passengers are expected to increase from 59.9 million at the outset of this year to 85 million by 1970. For the same years in terms of passenger-miles the figures are 33 billion and 51 billion. Particularly impressive is the growth of the 13 local service carriers which carried 18.2 percent more passengers, flew 19.6 percent more passenger-miles and carried 14.3 percent more mail, 24.9 percent more express, and 31.4 percent more freight in 1962 than they did in 1961. They flew 7,650,000 revenue passengers, a total of 1.6 billion passenger-miles. Mail ton-miles amounted to 3.8 million in 1962, while express ton-miles were 3.8 million and freight ton-miles were 7.2 million.
>
> Air cargo continues to set new records and 1962 was no exception. Total traffic carried by the airlines exceeded 1.3 billion ton-miles in 1962 for an increase of nearly 20 percent over the preceding year. It is estimated that total cargo traffic should at least double by 1970. Airfreight showed a 22.5 percent increase this year with total ton-miles amounting to 898.1 million. Air express amounting to over 70 million ton-miles showed a 14.3 percent increase over the preceding year. Airmail recorded a 12.7-percent increase with a total of 251.4 million ton-miles. First-class mail achieved a 16.4-percent increase over 1961 with the total for 1962 amounting to 88.6 million ton-miles.
>
> General aviation last year, with over 80,000 aircraft, flew approximately three times as many hours and twice as many miles as the domestic certificated airlines. Today, the general aviation fleet represents 85 percent of all U.S. aircraft.

WHY BIGGEST SUBSIDIES FOR AVIATION?

Why should this industry be subsidized in the gigantic, overwhelming way that it is? The overwhelming majority of Americans never fly, have never flown, and never will. It is true, a large part of the population flies, but those who do are among the more affluent in our society. It is true that some of them have modest planes; but, to quote the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who was the leader in the passage of the bill 2 years ago—in 1961—and is today, in talking about some of the modest cost of the planes that are flown:

> Our Oklahoma farmers fly Piper Cubs or Tri-Pacers or Cessna 170's and similar planes. They fly planes that sell from between $5,000 and $20,000.

Five thousand dollars and twenty thousand dollars are modest prices for airplanes, but they are far beyond the means of the overwhelming majority of the American people, who cannot afford to pay such amounts. This occupation involves many people; and it is a fine, healthy, and pleasant occupation, and undoubtedly contributes to the pleasure of many Americans. But I cannot understand why the Federal Government should provide so large a subsidy. I am not opposed to all subsidy for it, but I do oppose a subsidy of this kind and of these dimensions.

This subsidy is increasing in two ways— first, in the rate of spending Federal funds for aviation.

SOARING SIZE OF SUBSIDY

The budget in brief, page 60 shows, under the heading "Commerce and Transportation—Aviation," that when I entered the Senate in 1957, this amount was $219 million; but today the estimate is $885 million—or more than 4 times as much, and it is now approaching $1 billion.

In the other transportation areas in which there are subsidies—highways and so forth—we try to apply a user tax which enables the users to contribute a substantial part of the cost. That applies to aviation; but the fact is because of the use of jet fuel, the tax revenues from aviation gasoline have been declining. A report which I received an hour or so ago from the Treasury shows that this year about $16 million is expected; but only last year Congress cut the tax on airline tickets from 10 percent to 5 percent—with the result that we can anticipate revenues amounting to, at best, approximately $100 million from the tax on air transportation.

This means that whereas we are spending nearly $1 billion in this area, we are receiving only about $120 million.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin recognizes, of course, that passenger taxes were removed from all forms of transportation except aviation, does he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that. In the other big mode of transportation, the automobile, the gasoline tax is the big passenger tax, and that has not been removed. It is a very heavy tax, and it accounts for almost all of the cost of Federal highways.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is supposed to do so. Federal participation in the highway program, instead of being on a 50–50 basis, is 90 percent; 10 percent is State.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But whether by the States or by the Federal Government, the users pay the cost.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is problematic. The Senator can go beyond that if he wants to. I do not believe that is true in many States. Furthermore, one who uses the Federal-State highway system uses what generally is a publicly built facility, with 90 percent coming from the Federal Government and 10 percent from the States, and he pays absolutely no tax for his transportation unless there happens to be a State tax—not a Federal tax—on his ticket. An airline user will be paying a 5 percent tax, which last year was 10 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So far as the tax is concerned, it is a matter of indifference to many people whether it is a State tax or a Federal tax. The fact is that the user of a highway pays for it, either through the gasoline tax or through the tax on automotive equipment. He pays for the entire cost of the highway—although some might dispute that, and might insist that he pays for, say, 95 percent; whereas the user of aviation—a much more affluent person, by and large—pays for about 10 or 12 percent of the cost of his subsidy.

Mr. MONRONEY. Farmers or small-businessmen have little use for aircraft as a means of pleasure—although it is a pleasure to fly; but many contractors and builders—persons, including farmers, whose operations require travel for great distances—find aviation a necessary transportation facility for their type of work.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is a wonderful way to travel.

Mr. MONRONEY. Business aircraft are necessary.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why subsidize them to this overwhelming extent?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin is talking about a $75 million program, a 50–50 matching program, for a transportation facility which today carries more passengers than all the railroads in intercity transportation and all the bus lines in intercity transportation; yet he is objecting to a $75 million authorization which has been held level by Congress for the past 3 years, in spite of the ever-increasing volume of air traffic.

The authorization has been $75 million for all these years, and certainly I feel that we are watching the program very closely. We require close matching for it; and in Wisconsin the actual matching has been with almost identical amounts. Over the past 5 years, 43 cities in Wisconsin have benefited to the extent of $5,631,100; and also included in this figure, because of the use of discretionary funds by Wisconsin, was

$1,400,000—which brings the total for that State to almost identically the amount which would be allowed per annum under this bill. Wisconsin has exceeded its State allocation by 23 percent over the past 5 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to yield more time to the Senator from Oklahoma, but my time is limited.

I should like to mention one or two things. The Senator from Oklahoma stated that the program has leveled at $75 million for 6 years. The fact is that the committee report shows on page 7, that the funds made available in 1959 were $63 million; 1960, $63 million; in 1961, $63 million; in 1962, $75 million; and in 1963, $75 million. So only in the last 2 years have we reached the $75 million figure. This amount has been increasing. I was not talking about aid to airports. I was talking about the overwhelming amount of aid received by the FAA, which has ballooned into an agency which now is operating with approximately $900 million—an increase of four times over the amount with which it operated in 1957.

HUGE INCREASE IN FAA SPENDING PER AIRCRAFT, PILOT AND MILE

Furthermore, if we relate the amount we are pouring into the aviation subsidy with the job that Agency has to do, you can see how this Agency has ballooned. For example, since 1951 the number of aircraft has increased from 88,545 to 111,580, but the FAA costs per aircraft increased from $1,510 to $4,375. In other words, the subsidy is costing us three times as much on a per aircraft basis and if we could bring it up to date, the case would be even more devastating.

Second, in 1951 the certificated pilots numbered 580,574. In 1960, they numbered 783,232. But the FAA cost per pilot has increased from $230 to $624—or nearly triple.

Take number of miles traveled. This is a good index of how much it costs to keep track of the efficiency of the operation and how much is being expended on a comparable basis: In 1951, 1½ million miles in U.S. civil aviation; in 1960, 2.8 million miles; the FAA cost per mile, in 1951, 8½ percent; in 1960, 16.8 percent—or double.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX 6

Air traffic system load factors, U.S. civil aircraft

Year	Number of aircraft	FAA cost per aircraft
1951	88, 545	$1, 510
1952	89, 313	1, 397
1953	91, 102	1, 368
1954	92, 067	1, 272
1955	85, 320	1, 270
1956	87, 531	1, 560
1957	93, 189	2, 283
1958	98, 893	3, 310
1959	105, 309	4, 250
1960	111, 580	4, 375

APPENDIX 7

Certificated pilots

Year	Number of pilots	FAA cost per pilot
1951	580, 574	$230
1952	581, 218	214
1953	585, 974	212
1954	613, 695	186
1955	643, 201	168
1956	669, 079	204
1957	702, 519	304
1958	731, 078	448
1959	758, 368	592
1960	783, 232	624

APPENDIX 8

Plane-miles in U.S. civil aviation

Year	Number of miles	FAA cost per mile
	Thousands	*Cents*
1951	1, 576, 975	8. 5
1952	1, 642, 775	7. 6
1953	1, 780, 240	7. 0
1954	1, 877, 949	6. 1
1955	2, 078, 788	5. 2
1956	2, 308, 055	5. 9
1957	2, 516, 012	8. 5
1958	2, 628, 652	12. 4
1959	2, 800, 353	16. 0
1960	2, 895, 540	16. 8

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that if I could bring the tables up to date—for I do not have the final record here—they would show, in each case, that in the last 3 or 4 years the pace of spending has accelerated very rapidly—far more rapidly, I am sure, than in virtually any other agency of the Government, with the possible exception of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Wisconsin was in the Chamber, I believe, and listened to the colloquy between the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma and myself. I have been reflecting upon the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MONRONEY]. It seems to me that he seemed to be saying that the trend which has prevailed for the past 2 years is likely to continue, and that the end of the trend would result in poorer service for the vast majority of cities in the interior of the United States, and yet at greater subsidy cost to the taxpayers.

Did the Senator reach such a conclusion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin, too.

Mr. GORE. Does that not disturb the Senator?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed; very much.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have any proposal to check that trend of greater cost to the taxpayer and poorer service to many of the people? The end result of the trend is that a few trunk airlines with coast-to-coast nonstop flights will be vastly prosperous, but the majority of the people in the interior part of the country will have poor service and at greater subsidies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. He has brought out an excellent point. The Senator from Oklahoma has given the best possible answer, and that is that he will hold hearings on the question. He will call the FAA and put them on the spot. He will ask them specific questions, and ask them what remedies they propose to improve the situation.

As I understand, this particular program is devoted primarily to airport construction, and it would not be part of the other FAA responsibilities that are presently related to the question which the Senator from Tennessee so constructively raised a little earlier.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I admire the tenacity with which the Senator from Wisconsin pursues a possible cut in the cost of the Federal aid to airports program. His reasoning in this instance, I believe, is unreliable. The colloquy between the astute Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is not based on what I feel are the facts. Rather than to lessen the degree of service to the smaller communities of the United States, the reverse is true. Of the approximately 577 communities that are now served by scheduled transport airlines daily, 344 are served by what are called local service airlines. This type of service has been stepped up during the past few years to that number of communities and is a clear indication that, rather than lesser service to the smaller communities, there is in fact increased service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may respond

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield once more. Since I am speaking under limited time, it will be difficult for the Senator from Wisconsin to yield much longer. I will yield once more to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps feeder lines are flying more mileage at greater subsidy. But I cite to the Senator the fact that American Air Lines used to have regular flights into the Tri Cities Airport in Tennessee, east and west. They have completely abandoned the airport. There are no flights at all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There are more flights now by Piedmont Air Lines than there were by Piedmont and American.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made one of my points. Nashville, Tenn., was served far more adequately by American Air Lines a short time ago than it is now. There is a tendency, which is confirmed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for the trunklines to have flights coast to coast, with fewer stops at intermediate cities, and leave to the feeder lines which have slower and more inefficient service at the bare subsidy cost to serve the vastly greater part of the country. I do not think that trend is in the public interest.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield once more to the Senator from West Virginia.

Then I shall have to stop yielding because my time has almost expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator in charge of the proposed legislation [Mr. MONRONEY] has approached the subject in a constructive manner. General aviation has continued to grow. While only 2,000 aircraft are flying on the scheduled systems, 22,000 military aircraft are using these airports of the United States. But more than 85,000 aircraft are owned by individuals and companies. This latter development is in general aviation. So when it is said that the Federal Government is continuing an airport construction program for the benefit of the so-called major airlines of the country, the statement is not true. Aviation has spread its benefits, and the figures so indicate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have again met one of the hazards that a Senator encounters when time is limited. I should like very much to yield further, but I shall not be able to do so. I understand that I have but 2 minutes remaining. I have only gone one-third of the way through my presentation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 11, line 7, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMINICK in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 7, it is proposed to strike the word "normal."

EISENHOWER RECOMMENDED KILL PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the history of the program has not been one of moving along on a stable level. The program has built up greatly in recent years. Furthermore, it has been a very controversial and questionable program over the years. When President Eisenhower's administration came in in 1953, the President had such reservations about that particular program that in 1954 no money was made available for it.

In 1960, after 8 years of experience, and on the basis of the best findings of his experts, President Eisenhower recommended that the country should withdraw in an orderly way from the program. He proposed an appropriation of $50 million, then $45 million, and then $35 million over the 3 succeeding fiscal years. It should be recognized that the program is controversial. Many outstanding people, including the former President of the United States, disapprove of the size of the program. Some disapprove of having the program at all. All I am saying is that it ought to be reduced. The program has grown substantially and rapidly over the past few years. I should like to state to the Senate the extent of that growth on the basis of the total net project funds available:

RAPID EXPANSION SUBSIDY

In 1952, $15 million was available.

In 1953—10 years ago—$9 million was available.

In 1954, no money was available.

In 1955, $20 million was available.

In 1956, $63 million was available, and $63 million was available over the succeeding 4 or 5 years. Then in 1962, $75 million was made available. So the program has been expanding. It should be closely examined.

AMENDMENT PERMITS ORDERED REDUCTION

If the amendment should be adopted it would not mean a disorderly withdrawal from the program. As the committee report on page 7 points out, there is a substantial amount of money—$46 million—in unobligated carryover funds. That amount is available to phase out the program in an orderly and careful way. Furthermore, as the total of the grant agreements and the total cash expenditures on page 7 of the report show, the program has been fairly erratic. For example, in 1962 only $46 million was made available. There is no way in which more than $64 million could be spent. The point the Senator is trying to stress is that the program could be cut down by a third without a drastic, radical, and unfortunate effect on the construction of airports in our country.

The Senator from Oklahoma is a great Senator. He is a friend of mine. He is an outstanding and able man. Senators all recognize that. He is thoroughly honorable, and he conducts hearings on the basis of getting the facts.

LOBBYISTS DOMINATE HEARING

Anyone who examines the record of the hearings will see exactly the reason for that tragically expensive tendency in the Federal Government to increase the size of programs and to spend more and more. Who appeared before the Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Aviation, to testify? Let me go through the list of witnesses:

Joseph P. Adams, executive director and general counsel, Association of Local Transport Airlines.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd, chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Thomas Burnard, executive vice president, Airport Operators Council.

Edward Cockerham, executive director, Air Traffic Control Association.

John O. Colonna, vice president, Municipal and Airport Division, American Road Builders' Association; director, Department of Aviation, city of Baltimore, Md.

Robert E. Commerce, president, Air Line Dispatchers Association.

And many other witnesses from the industry who of course predictably want Uncle Sam's money spent on the industry and the more the better.

Of course, Mr. Halaby, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, appeared.

The two Senators from Hawaii [Mr. FONG and Mr. INOUYE] appeared in behalf of their State and made excellent presentations.

With the exception of the two Senators from Hawaii, who appeared with respect to their particular problems, virtually every single one of the witnesses who submitted a statement or appeared in person to give testimony was a person with a vested interest in having the program increased or expanded, either because of being a part of the industry or because of representing a county or a city which desires more money, or part of the Federal bureaucracy which would be enhanced.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] made the interesting suggestion an hour or so ago of having a taxpayer's advocate. There is a need for a taxpayer's advocate in this kind of program. The people who want the money appear and make excellent, persuasive arguments.

POLITICAL PRESSURE ON SENATORS FOR SUBSIDY

Furthermore, the difficulty is that Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are put in the position either of favoring these programs or of having difficulty with the folks at home. When a Member of Congress announces an airport, there is a feeling on the part of some people that the Member of Congress has donated the airport from his own pocket. It is a nice thing to do. The communities are grateful.

Virtually every community in Wisconsin of any large size is eager to get an airport or to have an airport improved. That is true of every State. We are all subject to this temptation. We have an obvious personal political reason to support this program. If we are honest with ourselves we will admit it.

The only way we can get any reduction in this program is to cut the money to be spent on the program. In this case I propose a one-third cut and to have the allocation distributed equally among the States.

The argument will be made, I am sure —it has already been made eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma—that this issue involves the matter of safety; that we must provide safety for those who fly in the air, both pilots and passengers.

Elsewhere in the budget there are large amounts of funds requested—which I am sure will be granted—for air safety.

THIS BILL SMALL PART OF TOTAL

For example, not in this bill but elsewhere in the budget for air traffic control the figure we are asked is $35 million. That is $35 million of Federal money with no matching.

For airport traffic control towers, aside and apart from this bill, $47 million, no State matching.

For flight service stations, $11.5 million, all Federal money.

For air navigation facilities, $44.6 million, no State matching.

For aircraft inspection and research, $12.2 million, strictly from Uncle Sam.

For research, test and evaluation, $15 million, all Federal.

For research and development on air traffic control and navigation, $41 million, all from Uncle Sam.

For aviation weather, $4.3 million, all Federal.

For aircraft safety, $5.9 million, all Federal.

For airports, $1.2 million, all Federal.

For aviation medicine, $2 million, all Federal.

For national capital airports, $12 million, all Federal money.

For traffic management for the FAA, $210 million, all Federal.

And all this is a direct contribution to the operation of airports. The Senator from Oklahoma said that the local people put up 50 percent. The local people put up 50 percent of the money for construction of airports, and 100 percent for terminal facilities; but with respect to the really significant safety factors, the local people put up nothing. The Federal Government provides traffic management and facilities and maintenance to the tune of $222 million. For administration of flight standards, the figure is $88 million. And so it goes.

All these items add up to an exceedingly expensive Federal program with which the taxpayers are burdened; ninety percent of the people who pay the cost, can get no benefit because they do not fly. The overwhelming majority of the people do not fly, and never will fly.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR $75 MILLION FUND

Furthermore, we should recognize that while this is an able committee report, as is every report handled by the Senator from Oklahoma, there has been no reconciliation with respect to the so-called need for Federal grants of $75 million, as set forth on page 8 of the report.

It is argued that the total eligible projects in 1962 were $149 million, in 1963 were $140 million, and in 1964 were more than $150 million. This would mean that $75 million would be needed to provide the 50 percent which the Federal Government should provide. However, when we refer to the tables which are used as the basis for compiling these needs, pages 10 through 13 of the report, we find total figures which are substantially larger, adding up to a grand total of about $231 million for fiscal year 1964. But there is no reconciliation anywhere in the report to show how the figure of $149 or $150 million was arrived at.

It is true that the public-use facilities can be thrown out of the grand total. One or two other relatively minor items listed can be thrown out. It is also true, I am sure, on the basis of past experience, that some States cannot provide the matching funds necessary to meet the Federal requirement, so that the facilities which are needed can be built. Some States will have more funds available than the 50 percent they need.

So on both scores it would seem that the figure could be substantially reduced, but there is no way of telling precisely how the amount—which is crucial in the bill, and the real cornerstone for demanding $75 million instead of $60 million or $50 million—has been arrived at.

LESS SUBSIDY NEEDED NOW

On the basis of past experience and on the basis of plain commonsense it would seem that less should be needed now for our airports, for very obvious, realistic, technical reasons.

The Engineering News Record reported in 1960 that 87½ percent of the total allocated under the Federal Airport Act construction program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, was for land acquisition and construction of runways, taxiways, and aprons.

I see in a document prepared by the committee the statement that 69 percent is all that is to be used for this purpose in this program. In view of the fact that a great deal less on a percentage basis is needed now for the principal purposes, it would seem to be possible to reduce the amount needed.

As I pointed out, in 1960 there were appropriations of $63 million, substantially less than now being asked, although the need for runways, taxiways, and aprons was substantially higher then than it is at the present time.

This would seem to argue that we do not need more money in this program, but can get along with a great deal less.

I wish to make one further point before I summarize.

MORE SUBSIDY FOR PLANT OWNERS

I understand that the FAA has eased technical requirements to qualify for the Federal grant. This will mean that more communities with airports will be able to get Federal money. I am told it will take about half as much in terms of local funds in order to get Federal money. What will that mean? That will mean that the table which is in the report now, which shows a $231 million overall gross need, could be increased by perhaps 20 or 30 percent, for the next couple of years. That would mean that people would come to Uncle Sam and say, "We need more money."

I predict, if the bill passes in its present form—and I suspect that it will—Congress will be called upon in the future for $100 million or $120 million to take care of small communities which want airports for the communities.

I understand this will be true because the FAA is to permit shortened runways. Control towers will not be required with the same stringency, at least. The kinds of sophisticated navigational aids which were previously required are not to be required in the future for airports.

All this suggests that these airports would be quite a bit less useful for national defense purposes. Certainly there is no safety advantage here. It also suggests a very expensive Federal future from many States, in which small towns with 5,000 or 6,000 people, located reasonably near to a large city, will say, "We want an airport."

The mayor wants it. The bankers want it. The leading citizens want the airport. Of course they want it. We cannot criticize them for wanting it. If I were in their place, I, too, would want the airport. How can Congress say "No" under the circumstances? We can point out that now they qualify. We can point out that they can drive 10 or 15 miles and use the airport there. But I am sure this particular change in regulations will mean that we shall be requested to appropriate millions of dollars more in the future than we have in the past.

Furthermore, it is evident that although 25 percent of the funds are for general airports in fiscal 1964, in 1965 and 1966, under these regulations, the funds for general airports are going to increase very sharply.

It seems to me that funds for the general airports are the least justifiable of all. There is no justification on the basis of national defense, because they are too small and are not susceptible to use by any kind of military aircraft.

The funds are not justified because of use by the general public, because general airports are not used by the general public. They are used by people who own, operate, or rent their own planes, planes which cost, at the very least, $5,000 or $7,000. To own a plane one must have a substantial amount of money. Those people are to be commended. They are engaged in a fine endeavor. But why in the world should the Federal Government subsidize them any more than the Federal Government should subsidize motherhood? Motherhood is fine, and so is babyhood. I suppose we could appropriate large amounts of money to subsidize beautiful babies, but it would be extremely expensive and ridiculous. It is just as expensive, and even more ridiculous to have a program to subsidize general aviation, which is engaged in by people in our society who can afford to pay their own way. If it is going to cost them 10 to 20 percent more, that is too bad, but it seems to me that if we are to have free enterprise and be free of Government domination, we should at least insist that people pay their own way so far as possible.

SUMMARY

To summarize, in the first place, any subsidy of this kind, amounting to more than $1 billion a year—and that is only a part of it—should be able to demonstrate a great need. We should insist on a justification for every dollar of that kind of subsidy.

Also, it should be clear that if people are benefiting under this kind of subsidy, there should be a demonstration that they do not have the ability to pay. This is not only Robin Hood in reverse; this is a Cadillac subsidy. It provides a subsidy to people who own planes costing, at the very least, $5,000 or $10,000.

President Eisenhower, after 8 years of experience, called upon Congress to phase out this program, to eliminate it entirely.

Witnesses who appeared before the committee on this program were overwhelmingly people who had a special, vested interest in obtaining the subsidy. Although I favor reducing the program, I recognize that the Senator in charge of the bill, who is championing the bill, is an extremely able man. He is a great friend of aviation. He has rendered fine service. Nothing I say should in any way be considered as critical of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, over the years as aviation has grown in size, importance, and complexity, general aviation has assumed greater significance. For example, many people do not realize that our total aviation system in America includes 2,000 active air carrier aircraft that serve America's great network of commercial aviation. There are 22,000 military aircraft dedicated to the day and night defense of our Nation. But the largest and fastest growing segment of aviation is the general aviation classification which aggregates over 84,000 aircraft.

General aviation includes business, agricultural, recreational, and instructional type flying. According to the Project Horizon Report written at the request of President Kennedy by a nationally recognized team of experts for Federal Aviation Agency Administrator N. E. Halaby, general aviation is forecast to grow to over 105,000 aircraft by the year 1970.

It is appropriate to note, too, that the scheduled airlines in the United States established new gains both in service and traffic in 1962. Flying a billion plane-miles, an increase of 4.1 percent over 1961, they offered a record of 82.6 billion seat-miles, an increase of 15 percent.

The number of passengers totaled 62½ million, an increase of 7 percent over 1961. Passenger-miles added up to 43.8 billion, a gain of 9.9 percent.

This is the 25th year since the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It has since been amended and titled the Federal Aviation Act. In a recent speech in the Senate, I declared that in this 25th anniversary year of the basic aviation act, it is well that there be a reaffirmation of congressional interest in securing and strengthening scheduled air services to the smaller as well as the larger cities of the Nation.

The action of the Congress of the United States in establishing, through the Civil Aeronautics Board, a group of airlines dedicated to serving small and intermediate size municipalities and their trading areas, has proved to be a productive investment.

These carriers, known as local service airlines, provide direct and daily flights to 577 communities in this country. Three hundred and forty-four of these urban and suburban sections of small and intermediate size are dependent solely on the local service operators for their scheduled air transportation.

With these services supplementing the larger trunk airline systems, there are few points in the Nation more than a day's travel away from any part of the country.

Air transportation is therefore meeting the growing needs cited in the act, namely, those of "commerce of the United States, of the postal services, and of the national defense."

The importance of the local service airline to the economic and social development of our intermediate and smaller communities is generally recognized.

In West Virginia, three of the local service airlines—Lake Central, Allegheny, and Piedmont—serve all 10 of the State's airports where there is scheduled carrier service. Eight of these airports and scores of communities are solely dependent on these local service carriers for air transportation. And through the facilities and schedules offered by these local airlines, numerous West Virginia industries not in air trunkline cities, are accessible to the commerce of the Nation. Also, they are in better national defense status and more advantageously benefit from the movement of the mails and cargo by air. Likewise, the markets of other States are more readily available to West Virginia.

It is vital, both from the standpoint of our State and the country, that local air services be continued and further developed, even as we strive to keep the major airlines healthy and the whole aviation industry of the United States in step with technological and commercial progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article which I wrote for the magazine Air Purchasing and Traffic, issue of May–June 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Airlines New Frontier—Aircargo

(Note.—Senator Jennings Randolph, U.S. Senator, West Virginia, was one of the sponsors of the Civil Aeronautics Act, when he was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives (1933–47). He was the author of legislation providing a nationwide survey of our airport requirements, which preceded the passage of the Federal Aid Airport Act, of which he was an active proponent. The Civilian Pilot Training Act was advocated by Representative Randolph. The National Air Museum Act was authored by the West Virginian when he was in the House. He was also coauthor of National Aviation Day. He was the "father" of the airmail pickup system.)

(By Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia)

One of the most striking aspects of today's airfreight business is the flurry of statistics that are available at the drop of an airbill.

Aircargo adherents—and I'm one—will tell you that—

It has increased by volume 50 times since 1946.

The airlines provide freight service to some 7,000 points in the United States—plus 150 major world capitals.

There are 200 long range piston powered planes now doing all cargo work. They are joined by nearly 600 turbine powered combination aircraft. And in fact, all of the scheduled airlines' 1,800 plus aircraft, from giant jets to helicopters, carry cargo.

And the first all cargo jet freighters are ready to take to the U.S. and world airways.

But these are merely statistics and don't really dramatize the breakthrough that has been occurring in the aircargo field.

My firsthand experience with the airline business has always proven to me that whatever aircargo says it will do in the next year or so, it does, and one better. For instance, while last year passenger business was increasing less than 10 percent, airfreight grew at a clip of 23 percent over 1961—almost double the growth rate of the previous year.

Although it's true that airfreight today is only a small portion of total intercity freight movement—less than 1 percent—the important fact is that it is growing and growing. In fact, it is probably one of the fastest growing businesses in the country. Here are some comparisons: * * * airfreight has increased almost 50 times while mushrooming industries such as nylon fabrics and frozen fruit juices have increased only 13 percent each.

In 1946, the real beginning of airfreight, the scheduled airlines operated 15 million ton-miles. Last year, the figure was up to 900 million, and it may top the 1 billion mark for the year 1963.

There are many reasons for this dramatic development. The increasing swings of the commerce pendulum are only part of the reason. Also, planes are bigger now. They are faster, they go more places. And, the airlines just know more about the whole, new, and exciting airfreight business.

And, perhaps more importantly, rates are coming down to the level where they promise a real breakthrough, since they are becoming very competitive with surface transportation in a growing list of commodities.

Airfreight rates had been, for a number of years, generally pegged at 22 cents per ton-mile. The air salesmen have had to compete with surface salesmen who could offer rates that were 10 to 50 percent lower. Only in recent years have the carriers begun to lower rates with CAB approval, and now some commodities are only 10 to 15 cents per ton-mile.

But aircargo is an overall word and airfreight is just one aspect. There is parcel post, and express, and, of course, there is airmail.

YEAR 1962 VERSUS 1961

Express is a big item in the overall aircargo business. In fact, in recent years, it has achieved a phenomenal forward surge. One major reason, besides the faster jet planes and the greater capacity and schedule flexibility, is the agreement signed between the scheduled airlines and the REA Express that provides real incentives for each.

It created a complete 50–50 partnership and it has also meant that in the last few years air express has really come into its own. And as a further boost to the business, REA Express on July 1, 1961, achieved greater independence in operating its express business. Based on contractual agreements reached in 1959 with its railroad owners, REA could now, for the first time, benefit from the disciplines and incentives of a profit-and-loss accounting system.

Other important freedoms REA gained from the new agreement were freedom of routing traffic the best way to do the best job for the public at the lowest cost, and freedom of pricing * * * the right to price express services on a realistic, marketplace basis, as long as the rates are compensatory.

REA Express has come a long way since 1959, and together with its air express arm has a very promising future. The successful formula at REA, I believe, has been good service at the lowest possible prices.

Here are some figures to illustrate the point:

Year	Shipments	Revenue	Ton-miles
1959	5,404,721	$48,000,000	57,471,531
1960	5,410,696	50,100,000	60,008,520
1961	6,683,501	42,000,000	62,133,213
1962	7,426,328	58,400,000	70,726,947

A net gain of over 10 million revenue ton miles in just the past 2 years.

An increase in annual individual shipments of over 2 million in those same 2 years.

TO 7,000 POINTS

As noted earlier, the airlines provide scheduled freight service to some 7,000 U.S. points and to important locations everywhere in the world. The high volume of domestic destinations served is made further possible by Air Cargo, Inc., an industry corporation whose job is to provide a nationwide pickup and delivery service (and, recently, air/truck).

The integrated and swift nature of air freight service is a major factor in today's distribution revolution. Distribution accounts for more than half of the total cost of goods and commodities sold, according to a Twentieth Century Fund study. In fact, the distribution cost of goods and commodities has been referred to as "the last frontier of industrial inefficiency and waste."

Distribution involves much more than the price tag on transportation alone. It includes money spent for marketing, sales, advertising, warehousing, insurance, materials handling, taxes, packaging, capital investment and inventories.

Through the use of air freight, it is impossible to reduce these multiple costs on many articles. Thus, even though air freight may result in a higher out-of-pocket transportation bill to the shipper, it can reduce the related costs by a great amount, thereby yielding the shipper a net saving. These savings improve the efficiency of the overall distribution system. In addition, they release funds for other purposes. Whether such funds go into increased research, improved production facilities, or some other area, the consumer ultimately benefits.

To help implement the distribution revolution, the scheduled airlines have developed improved materials handling systems and equipment. Modern air freight terminals have been and are being built at a number of airports. Mechanized loading systems are being developed. Progress and refinements are being made in containerization. Swift and efficient systems are commonplace for the loading and unloading of shipments carried on jets now in service.

As far as being useful to business and industry—and the public—the benefits of air freight are very much here today. The company, that is fighting the cost spiral, stands to profit by examining the distribution complex and its relationship to transportation by air.

The word "frontier" suggests the future—a goal yet to be attained. But, in many ways, air shipping has already reached the frontier; and, in some ways, it has already set foot in the "promised land" of transportation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield time to myself in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

I appreciate the kind things the Senator has said about the chairman of the subcommittee. I reciprocate by stating my affection for the Senator and also my regret that I must disagree with his position.

One of the reasons why we have been prepared to continue at an increasing level appropriations for our Federal airport system was the very point the Senator made—that President Eisenhower had no desire to continue any airport system. During the year 1954 no Federal funds were available for the then expanding aviation activities. We were just coming out of World War II with the DC-6's, and the DC-7's were just coming into being. Yet only about $9 million or $15 million in matching funds was available for a most inadequate program.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma had a part in trying to correct that situation, and it was corrected. Now we have an orderly program designed to advance aviation.

If the Senator from Wisconsin does not think aviation is worth advancing, by providing funds for operation of aviation on the basis of a subsidy that is matched 50-50 by the using communities—and generally the local communities have bonded and taxed themselves, because they felt that such facilities were necessary to enable them to keep pace with an America that is moving forward—I feel he is following a very pennywise and pound foolish position.

The Senator has talked a good deal about the very wealthy private aircraft pilots or owners. I see no sense in trying to arouse class prejudice. Most of the men I know who fly do not have much money. They buy secondhand planes, perhaps $5,000 Piper Pacers that are handed down from one owner to another, and they get the plane for $1,000 or $2,000. So a great number of the general aviation planes that use the fields of America are modest indeed, and they are used very largely for the transaction of business. One of the largest fleets of aircraft, bigger by far than the commercial lines, is that used by men who are in small business and who are operating a taxi service, which is a rapidly growing and important part of aviation. They are truly small businessmen, and are absolutely at the mercy of our airport system, and one which should not be limited to O'Hare in Chicago, or Lambert Field in St. Louis, or Idlewild in New York. They are dependent on a nationwide airport system.

There are only 31 airports in the entire United States where air carrier operations exceed the operations of general aviation. Of these 31, general aviation operations account for almost one-half, 44 percent, of those operations. So we have a mixture.

The general rule of thumb is that, in spite of the fact that Government and military planes—Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force planes—pay no landing fees, fully 50 percent of the landing operations on major airports are by military aircraft. Today, in the dispersal of our fighting aircraft, if the tensions of possible atomic attack continue, as they existed during Cuba, the use of these commercial fields for dispersal of military aircraft is of great advantage, so that they all cannot be hit or destroyed on our military bases.

The Senator referred to the chart on page 7. Reference was made to the fact that the amount of unobligated funds on July 1, 1963, was $46,522,000. The information before the committee was that $15 million of that amount is in State apportionments. That amount is tied up because the State of Wisconsin or the State of Oklahoma, for example, may claim its pro rata share of those funds.

Of that amount $28.9 million is programed. There has been notification given to the communities that this amount of money is available to them. It takes 50 percent local money to match any Federal funds, and we want to be sure that the States have the money and that it is programed. So all but $3 million of the amount which the Senator said will be available has been accounted for. We might be able to scrape up more money by breaking faith with the communities that have spent money in plans and designs anticipating this money for long-awaited airports.

The amount that we would have actually available would be approximately $3 million.

The American aviation industry is an important industry. Unfortunately, the large sums that are earned by the industry are earned by the industry in California, where it is largely centered. It accounts for a very large export item. However, the sum that is earned in California does not come to the State of Wisconsin or to the State of Oklahoma; nor do the income taxes from Oklahoma or from Wisconsin help to apply against salaries where this money is earned. There are very few airline crews or jobs located in many of the States. Oklahoma has one facility, so we are a little more fortunate than most, from the standpoint of repair and maintenance. However, most of the States earn very little, if anything, from the airlines that fly into their airports and fly beyond. As prosperous as the airlines may be, only the Federal income tax reaches the salaries paid by them and that does not make it possible for all the beautiful figures on air transportation to be reached by the local tax system. I refer to the air transportation as related to the interstate systems.

This is one reason why I say some Federal matching money is needed. The 50-50 basis is the proper share. It is far more proper and appropriate than the 90-percent-10-percent formula which is used on our super throughways, which are spotting the city of Washington and many other places today. The heavy burden is placed on the Federal Government, the 10-percent burden is placed on the local community which will largely use these facilities.

I may point out that of all the forms of transportation which are interstate, aviation is the leader, because most airplane flights, particularly those on airlines, terminate in States other than those in which they originate. A tax system applicable to the commerce that is represented in the interstate system will have to be a part of the Federal tax system, both with respect to the income tax, by which our airlines pay a substantial portion, and the gasoline tax, which, as the Senator has stated, is down to $16 million; but the gross intake from the transportation tax, the ticket tax—and this is the only form of transportation that carries a 5 percent ticket tax—of $105 million is coming from the aviation transportation industry.

I congratulate the Senator on his appointment to the Committee on Appropriations, where his talents will be greatly appreciated. I am sure he realizes that we are not talking about the same item when we talk about air safety and the necessity of air traffic control, and all the many other factors that have gone into the expansion of aviation, when we discuss a $75 million airport bill. We are responsible for $75 million of expenditures on the airports. As I previously stated, about two-thirds of aviation accidents take place either on the airport or within 5 miles of the airport; therefore, a safe airport is the greatest contribution that can be made, both for airline safety and for general aviation safety. It is not fair for the Senator to charge the airports with the funding necessary to scan airways with radar or to protect our airports with weather information, and to collect in a network the latest information on weather ahead, or with all the many other necessary items, including accident investigation and servicing and inspection of aircraft. All those items are examined by the Appropriations Committee in connection with the Independent Offices appropriation bill. It will be before the Senate one of these days. The committee is only halfway through with its consideration. These things are taken up item by item. However, it is not fair to charge the safety features of air traffic control and other matters to the airport bill, any more than it is fair to charge all the highway patrols and police and ambulance and other services on the U.S. Interstate Highways System against a $40 billion construction program for our Interstate Highway System.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin was pointing out that the Federal Government pays all of the $35 million cost of air traffic control centers, and all $47 million of the cost of airport traffic control towers, and so forth. I thought I made it clear that this was not a part of the $75 million bill, but that it was a separate item. The Federal Government makes this total contribution itself, in addition to the 50 percent matching on airport construction.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; but the Senator asked why we should ask for $75 million, when we are spending $800 million for air traffic control. This is a program that I believe is absolutely necessary. America wants to move ahead, and we must move ahead. Aviation is here to stay. It cannot succeed unless we have adequate landing fields and unless we have places for the planes to get into safely. The CAB is surveying the State of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, in the North Central Area Investigation case, to see if the local service can be extended into more towns, to bring into the area of better service not only metropolitan areas such as Milwaukee, but also the Ashlands, the Green Bays, the Oshkoshes, and all the other points.

It is necessary to enlarge runways and to "beef up" the taxiways. The expansion of runways costs money. I wonder where the Senator thinks we would be in the jet age if we had not had $63 million and $75 million a year for the past few years to have the airport runways lengthened.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There was a time when it was necessary to spend a great deal of money, upon the advent of the jet aircraft, to lengthen the runways. This was the justification for setting up the program for $63 million. While all this will never be completed, most of the work has been done. It has tapered off, and the statistics show it. Less is now going into runways and less into aprons. How can we justify such an overwhelming subsidy to the aviation industry? We do not subsidize automobiles or banking or groceries or skiing or baseball. This is amusement and business. Why should there be such an overwhelming subsidy to aviation, not only for safety, which I strongly favor, but also for construction, which should be a community affair or a business affair or an amusement enterprise?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are about 4,700 privately owned airports out of 8,025 airports in the country. Only 728 of such airports are so-called air carrier airports. I know of no airport in the United States, excepting those that have large operations and are vast air traffic centers, that are able to carry their own weight by the landing fees charged for the aircraft that use them, whether it be the commercial planes or the private planes. They are all charged for landing.

Yet all of them generally ran in the red. Few, if any, airports are making money. If we expect to have service, just as the Senator from Wisconsin expects to have service from Milwaukee to Chicago, it is necessary to have airports that can take care of the dozens of flights a day and the shuttles that fly back and forth constantly. At the time terminals were built, there was Federal participation. We have eliminated all of that assistance to the point where Federal aid now is limited only to those items which contribute to safety. There are no Federal funds for restaurants, bars, lunchrooms, or even hangars. We do provide funds for the aprons and runways, and the sheds where fire equipment and snowplows are housed; but we do not contribute, as we once did, to the plush aircraft terminals that were built in the earlier days.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator knows perfectly well, first, that we are greatly expanding and increasing the amount of Federal dollars going into aviation. The budget figures indicate $219 million in 1957 and $585 million in 1964. Furthermore, the FAA has now loosened the regulations so that in the future the airport program will be bigger, because in the future it will take only half as much money for an airport to qualify. The runways may be shorter; less safety equipment is required. This program may be reduced in some ways, but it is expanding in ways that cost money; and the arithmetic of dollars spent proves irrefutably how rapidly it is expanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin talks about the total cost only. Many things are being done in aviation today. The Senator knows we are talking about Federal airports. In 1952, we started with $63 million. We have expanded only to $75 million. We have carefully husbanded funds because of the increased cost of buying the same type of materials today. This has accounted for the large dollar increase, one which we do not want to have slide forward. But we do not want to see a worse airport system than we had in 1955.

The aviation industry will continue to grow. The airspace is becoming more crowded all the time. Vast sums of money are required to keep aviation safe. The jet age has required new flight levels. Whereas planes once operated at 19,000 feet, they now operate at 50,000 feet. Complete radar surveillance and expensive equipment are required to keep air traffic separated. Military aviation is now required to fly according to the same safety rules as civilian aviation, and under air traffic control.

I am glad the government has decided to try to make the multi-billion dollar aviation industry safer. It is a record of which we can be proud.

We should not mix in some of the costs of safety features and the air traffic control system. We are trying to provide, with $75 million of matching funds, a national airport system.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is a part of the same basic program. Former President Eisenhower not only criticized the program, but proposed to abolish it. It seems to me it makes sense to point out that in 1951 the FAA cost per aircraft was $1,500; by 1960 it was $4,300; while today it is probably $6,000.

These statistics have been arrived at carefully, on the basis of facts. It may be pointed out that planes fly at 50,000 feet instead of 30,000. The jet age has created new problems; but it seems to me that the expensive program that is proposed will require a great deal of justification, which we cannot find in the hearings or the committee reports.

Mr. MONRONEY. We were not holding hearings on that budget in the Committee on Commerce. The Senator from Wisconsin will be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which will hold hearings on the Federal Aviation Agency's budget. The Committee on Commerce held hearings on the Federal aid to airports program; it had nothing whatever to do with control stations or with the air traffic control system. I do not believe those operations can be charged to the airport program.

During the war, we neglected completely the development of airports, to the extent that they were becoming worse and worse. They had not been equipped with radar—either air traffic control radar or weather radar. That is why for years, after 1951, we were seeking to spend more money to try to make up for the lag that had taken place in that period. The Senator from Wisconsin was not in this body when this situation was explained. That was the reason why the Civil Aeronautics Administration was succeeded by the Federal Aviation Agency. Congress determined to provide modern equipment and to improve the air traffic control system.

We cannot go back to 1951. If we tried to do that today, so many airplanes would be falling around the country that it would not be possible to count them, because planes are flying faster and at greater heights. The problems of air traffic control at the terminals have grown immensely, as is shown by figures submitted earlier.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the fact remains that this particular program has skyrocketed. The budget figures show that the average was around $20 million in 1947, $21 million in 1951, $15 million in 1952, $9 million in 1953, and none in 1954. Now it has jumped up to $75 million. It is true that the amount has been at a fairly high level ever since 1956; but it has climbed very sharply in the past decade.

This airport construction program—this bill—is one phase of aid to aviation which, it seems to me, can be reduced without seriously affecting safety.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is talking about the time when we had no airport program, and is comparing it with a time when we had a satisfactory airport program, although about one-half is accounted for by the matching funds that would be available from local communities.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COTTON. I welcome the endeavors of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for economy in Government. Some of us who have been struggling through the years on this subject are happy to have his enthusiasm, zest, dedication, and devotion to the noble cause of economy.

I am also happy to learn that the Senator from Wisconsin has been assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, where he will have an opportunity to exercise his talents in that direction and to help do the things that we feel it is necessary to do.

But my mind goes back over a few years. As a member of the Subcommittee on Air Transportation of the Committee on Commerce, I remember standing on the floor of the Senate, for 2 or 3 years in succession, fighting against the use of Federal subsidies for the portions of airports that had to do with—I remember and others will remember the phrase so well—keeping passengers dry; in other words, providing them with waiting rooms.

One thing that cannot be stopped, is the ever-growing number of airports. There are sections of the country—and mine is one of them—that are starving because of a lack of air transportation. There is no possibility of comparing this program with grants-in-aid to other forms of transportation. The Federal Government subsidizes the motor vehicle industry by the building of immense highways. Perhaps we should provide more aid for the railroads.

However, there is no Member of the Senate who flies—and I daresay that nearly the entire membership flies constantly—who has not been in a plane and seen the weather changing, seen the clouds gathering, looked out into nothing but fog and "soup," and wondered how many more planes were flying near us.

Imagine what would happen if suddenly out of the fog came another plane and a collision occurred. We know what would happen. The Governor of our State would be naming another Senator.

There is not one of us who has not realized that transportation in the air assumes proportions that no other form of transportation has ever assumed.

We need to safeguard those who are flying—including the families with small children who use planes. We need more good airports, so that if a plane goes off course and needs to make an emergency landing, there will be as much safety as possible—especially in the more remote sections of the country.

I regret to say that in New Hampshire there are not the air safety devices that are needed. We are now struggling to obtain them—among them being an instrument landing system at one of our airports, a weather station which can warn and predict, and other safety equipment. I regret that payment of the cost of some of this equipment cannot be authorized by this measure. But, Mr. President, when we consider the airports which today dot the country, and into which planes are flying; when we consider the traffic; and when we consider the number of Americans who at this very moment, while we discuss this matter, are in planes, it is obvious that $75 million to aid in safeguarding the lives of the American public who travel by plane is a mere pittance, when compared with some of the expenditures Congress authorizes.

The amount authorized in this airport bill has not been increased. We have continued it at the same figure, and every year we have been narrowing it down to the things which are essential to safety—not luxuries. The people of my section are dependent on air service. We have no passenger service, to speak of, on the railroads. We are almost completely dependent, for our small industries, our resorts, and for the life of the State, on air travel. It is the lifeblood of the industries of this country, and we need it.

A certain rich man endowed one airport in our State, and it has the first modern airport building we have had. It was built by community money and by endowment. The endowment came from a wealthy citizen who had an incurable disease, and wanted to put some of his money where it would help and where it would remain a benefit to his community; and he put it into a terminal at Manchester, N.H., which ever will stand as a credit and a monument to him.

So the money is being raised. We are not leaning on the Federal Government. I doubt that many Members of the Senate have raised their voices more frequently than I have against needless expenditures. But in joining the Senator from Oklahoma in the committee in voting to report this bill to the Senate, I had as clear a conscience as any Senator could possibly have.

The CAB reports periodically to our committee the details of air accidents. Unfortunately, they still occur, and always will to some extent, because air service cannot be made perfect. But when I think of those in the past 2 or 3 years, and think of the reports we have received on them and the reasons for them, and think of the changes made under pressure to control and channel the air traffic, it is clear, Mr. President, that this authorization bill will result in good economy. It provides for human safety and for the saving of lives.

I second everything the chairman of the subcommittee has said.

Although I sincerely admire the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin along these lines, in this particular instance I hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

The Senator from New Hampshire is a fine, able Senator, and an outstanding advocate of economy. However, the fact is that 90 percent of the money authorized by this bill will be spent, according to the summary and breakdown of the Federal aid airport program—for land for runways, taxiways, and aprons.

The FAA has eased the technical requirements, so that the runways can be shortened. Will that result in greater safety? Of course not. Furthermore, control towers will not in the future be required to function with the same stringency. Will that produce greater safety? No, far less safety. Sophisticated navigational aids will not be required as before to qualify for Federal aid. More and more and more of this money under these policies will be used for airports without such equipment. I do not say it is necessarily wrong to build these airports. It is fine to build them. But can one justify a 50-percent Federal gift for them on the basis of saying this is the only way we can obtain safety in air traffic? That simply does not make sense.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that what he is talking about is the small airport program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are trying to obtain more of the small airports, not built to metropolitan airport standards, as regards the thickness of the runways or the length of the runways. The Senator certainly would not expect us to enlarge the program for the airport for a very small town beyond the requirements of the traffic which will use it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course not.

What I am saying is that we seem determined to spend more money on this program in the future. The authorization is $75 million now. I think we should cut down on the authorization and cut down on the appropriation. I think we should spend less money, and should not apply it to the general airports. They are marvelous; they serve a fine purpose; but they do not properly relate to the national needs or the national defense or safety.

Mr. MONRONEY. What the Senator from Wisconsin is criticizing is the fact that we are trying to get more value for the man who operates a plane out of a small-town airport, and therefore less is going into the small airport than would have been required by the former FAA regulations. This is what has happened. We have been pushing them to get reasonably priced airports. So I think the FAA should be congratulated, instead of being condemned, for trying to limit the cost of these airports.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Once a number of airports are constructed around a city, I know I shall be pressured even more by mayors and bankers and other fine people who want an airport in their small town and want the Federal Government to help pay for it. But if they had to drive 10 or 20 miles to reach a town with a larger airport with longer runways and with greater safety features, from a safety standpoint that would be even better. This is why I maintain that although there may be justification for building more general-noncommercial airports, they cannot be justified on the basis of safety or national defense if those who use them will not pay for them in full. If the users cannot afford to pay for them, they should not be built. Why make the Federal taxpayer the victim who has to pick up the tab for amusement or business?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks on the Proxmire amendment a table showing a comparison between the funds provided in the committee bill and the funds which would be provided under the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison table

State	Committee bill	Proxmire proposal (⅔)	Difference
Alabama	$806, 890	$540, 620	$266, 270
Alaska	3, 994, 844	2, 676, 545	1, 318, 299
Arizona	950, 979	637, 176	313, 803
Arkansas	607, 329	406, 910	200, 419
California	3, 258, 755	2, 183, 366	1, 075, 389
Colorado	948, 502	639, 496	309, 006
Connecticut	390, 289	261, 494	128, 795
Delaware	78, 332	52, 482	25, 850
District of Columbia	106, 705	71, 492	35, 213
Florida	1, 096, 112	734, 395	361, 717
Georgia	946, 607	634, 227	312, 380
Hawaii	131, 618	88, 184	43, 434
Idaho	657, 532	440, 546	216, 986
Illinois	1, 793, 445	1, 201, 608	591, 837
Indiana	895, 215	599, 794	295, 421
Iowa	763, 932	511, 834	252, 098
Kansas	859, 060	575, 570	283, 490
Kentucky	695, 524	466, 001	229, 523
Louisiana	787, 763	527, 801	259, 962
Maine	366, 734	245, 712	121, 022
Maryland	514, 350	344, 615	169, 735
Massachusetts	778, 275	521, 444	256, 831
Michigan	1, 742, 125	1, 167, 224	574, 901
Minnesota	1, 057, 902	708, 794	349, 108
Mississippi	629, 166	421, 541	207, 625
Missouri	1, 071, 649	718, 005	353, 644
Montana	1, 088, 320	729, 174	359, 146
Nebraska	718, 232	481, 215	237, 017
Nevada	786, 796	527, 153	259, 643
New Hampshire	147, 285	102, 691	44, 594
New Jersey	899, 232	602, 485	296, 747
New Mexico	954, 576	638, 566	316, 010
New York	2, 698, 477	1, 808, 120	890, 357
North Carolina	989, 872	663, 114	326, 758
North Dakota	565, 565	378, 929	186, 636
Ohio	1, 651, 795	1, 106, 703	545, 092
Oklahoma	796, 355	533, 558	262, 797
Oregon	900, 766	604, 183	297, 583
Pennsylvania	1, 885, 489	1, 263, 278	622, 211
Rhode Island	127, 824	85, 642	42, 182
South Carolina	542, 163	363, 249	178, 914
South Dakota	615, 385	412, 308	203, 077
Tennessee	781, 577	523, 657	275, 920
Texas	3, 139, 146	2, 103, 228	1, 035, 918
Utah	697, 789	467, 519	230, 270
Vermont	119, 165	79, 841	39, 324
Virginia	837, 737	559, 084	278, 653
Washington	873, 882	585, 501	288, 381
West Virginia	$422, 155	$282, 843	$139, 312
Wisconsin	997, 096	668, 054	329, 042
Wyoming	707, 687	474, 150	233, 537
Puerto Rico	975, 000	653, 250	321, 750
Virgin Islands	525, 000	351, 750	173, 250
U.S. total	49, 875, 000	33, 416, 250	16, 458, 750
Insular areas:			
Hawaii	600, 000	400, 000	200, 000
Puerto Rico	600, 000	400, 000	200, 000
Virgin Islands	300, 000	200, 000	100, 000
Total	1, 500, 000	1, 000, 000	500, 000
Discretionary funds:			
General aviation	7, 000, 000	4, 670, 000	2, 330, 000
Regular discretionary (25 percent)	16, 625, 000	10, 138, 750	6, 486, 250
Grand total	75, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	25, 000, 000

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that the amendment I am withdrawing is an amendment which would merely eliminate the word "normal" in one line of the bill. It is not the principal amendment which I intend to offer on Monday. For parliamentary reasons, it seemed better to offer the amendment on Monday.

I withdraw the amendment relating to the word "normal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, so that I may understand the situation correctly. The bill has been read the third time——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Wisconsin first asked that he might make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to make sure that he understands the parliamentary situation correctly. Earlier today the Senate arrived at a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill would be considered on Monday, and that, even though third reading of the bill had already been had, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would be considered at that time, with 20 minutes on the amendment, 10 minutes on a side before the Senate votes on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator understands the parliamentary situation correctly. The Senate will dispense with further consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. FONG obtained the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION POLICIES

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, our Declaration of Independence proclaims that all men are created equal. But in many areas of American life we have not practiced this principal tenet of our democracy.

America's agonizing reappraisal of her racial policies and practices is manifest in our Birminghams and Cambridges, our New Yorks and Chicagos, in the demonstrations and disturbances stirring many communities across the Nation.

In America's brief 180 years of life, we have made tremendous progress toward that ideal of equality and undoubtedly we shall attain it.

But we still have a distance to go. At home we are now attempting to revise our laws and practices to wipe out the last vestiges of racial discrimination against our own citizens.

As we reappraise the relationship of citizen to citizen, is it not also good for us to reexamine this same relationship of man's equality to man with other peoples of the world?

For as we move to erase racial discrimination against our own citizens, we should also move to erase racial barriers against citizens of other lands in our immigration policies and laws, which are replete with racially discriminatory provisions.

This is an issue of fundamental national policy, because the racial restrictions inherent in our present immigration laws disparage our democratic heritage. They directly contradict the spirit and principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our traditional standards of fairness and justice.

Racial immigration restrictions began in 1875 and reached their peak in 1924. Public sentiment in 1924 was summarized by Senator David A. Reed, who said:

> I think most of us are reconciled to the idea of discrimination. I think the American people want us to discriminate; and I don't think discrimination in itself is unfair. We have got to discriminate. The only question that I think worries the committee is [which method] is the more plausible method of attaining that discrimination. Practically all of us are agreed that [racial discrimination] is an end that should be attained.

However, since 1924, we have made tremendous progress toward removing racial restrictions in our immigration policies and practices. An outstanding milestone was the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. It was a far-reaching step forward in the relaxation of the racial curbs in our immigration statutes. It wiped out total exclusion against Japan and other Asian nations and for the first time allowed many nations a long-denied quota of immigrants.

Progressive as that 1952 law was, today it is very obsolete. More than 10 years have now passed since its enactment. Since then, our Nation and the world have witnessed revolutionary changes in almost every phase of life. Many areas emerged from colonial status to full nationhood. Many nations have changed their form of government. There is greater clamor for freedom, liberty, and justice, and, worldwide, peoples are on the march seeking equality. Economic interdependence has shaken traditional economic, social and political patterns.

At home, we have wiped out racial barriers in our armed forces, in interstate transportation, in our institutions of higher learning, and in many areas of our economy. We are making significant progress in desegregating our public schools, housing, business, and public accommodations, and protecting the voting rights of all citizens. It is imperative that we, as a Nation, recognize this great upheaval in our Nation and throughout the world for equal status.

Repeatedly America has been accused that it has been unfair in its immigration laws. We have erected racial barriers that deny equal dignity and respect to more than one-half of the world's population. These racial barriers are bad for America. They hurt America's image as the leader of the free world.

For example, do Senators know that under present American immigration quotas for Asia and the Pacific areas more than 50 percent of the people who populate our newest State could be almost totally excluded from the United States?

That Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000, has a larger quota than all Asia, with a population of nearly 1½ billion?

That the quota for tiny Switzerland is greater than the quotas for the entire African Continent?

That Rumania—a Communist nation—has a quota of 289, which is small enough, but this is nearly a third more than our quota for non-Communist India and the non-Communist Philippines combined?

Do Senators know that the immigration quotas of nearly every nation in the Asia-Pacific area are so small that Japan's waiting list stretches all the way to 1989 or beyond; the quota for Chinese persons is for all practical purposes exhausted in perpetuity, according to State Department officials, because immigrants already admitted into the United States have been charged against it; the quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 20 other Pacific dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011; the Philippines quota is 89 years behind, and only the quotas of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, and Nepal are open, since these are countries which generally have not sought immigration beyond their borders?

The 1960 platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties recognized the need to eliminate the racial features of the law.

The relevant excerpts of the Republican plank on immigration read as follows:

> Republican conscience and Republican policy require that the annual number of immigrants we accept be at least doubled; obsolete immigration laws be amended by abandoning the outdated 1920 census data as a base and substituting the 1960 census; and the guidelines of our immigration policy be based upon judgment of the individual merit of each application for admission and citizenship.

The Democratic platform in relevant part states:

> We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policy to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst.
>
> The national-origins quota system limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this Nation. It is inconsistent wth our belief in the rights of man.
>
> The revision of immigration and nationality laws we seek will implement our belief that enlightened immigration, naturalization, and refugee policies and humane administration of them are important aspects of our foreign policy.

We shall have to act with greater resolve to implement these pledges with legislation.

I am very pleased to see the junior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. HART] in the Chamber at this time. He is one of the greatest advocates of revision of our immigration laws. The junior Senator from Michigan is the author of an immigration bill, S. 747, which has won the endorsement of every community organization which is interested in immigration. This bill has been cosponsored by a bipartisan group of 37 Senators.

The distinguished and able junior Senator from Michigan has been in the forefront of the battle to end racial discrimination in our immigration laws and policies. The bill which the Senator has introduced seeks a comprehensive reform of our immigration laws. The Senator from Michigan has worked zealously and untiringly toward such reforms. He has a reputation for deep sincerity, fairness, justice, and fair dealing, and his efforts to tell the Nation about unfair and discriminatory immigration laws have been unflagging. He is without a doubt one of the Nation's leading experts in the field of immigration. I am most delighted and pleased that he is in the Chamber this afternoon, and I am most happy to help him in the enactment of a sound and fair immigration law.

Mr. HART Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HART. It should be no surprise that I ask for this opportunity, first, to thank the Senator from Hawaii for some very kind remarks; and, second, to say that in the brief time I have been a Member of the Senate the most moving speech I have heard on this floor was one—it was not long—delivered by the senior Senator from Hawaii late in an evening. It was one of those times—which are too few, unfortunately—when the Senate was performing in the fashion that kindly historians of the Senate describe.

I cannot express adequately to the Senator my appreciation for his kind comments about me. With the Senator from Hawaii, I hope that the day will soon come when we as a people may remove from the basic approach to our immigration policy a bar which has no justification in logic or tradition in this country. When that day arrives the Senator from Hawaii will be the first to be saluted by the rest of us.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished and able junior Senator from Michigan for his kind and laudatory remarks. I hope our joint efforts and the efforts of other Senators in this Chamber will be sufficient to cause enactment of a very comprehensive and fine immigration bill.

THE ORIENTAL EXCLUSION ACTS

The racial strictures of the present immigration laws have their genesis in the 19th century, when more than 19 million immigrants arrived in this country. The first restrictive law passed by Congress was the act of March 3, 1875, which empowered consular officials to investigate Chinese and Japanese immigrant labor contracts for evidences of any lewd or immoral purposes. It established penalties for U.S. citizens who transported subjects of China or Japan without free consent for a term of service and rendered such contracts void. Immigration officers were required to inspect all vessels and certify their compliance.

Because of the tremendous influx of Chinese immigrants—200,000 from 1850 to 1880—following the discovery of gold in California, Congress enacted the first of the Chinese Exclusion Acts in 1882. The act suspended immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States for 10 years, although Chinese already in the country on November 17, 1880, were allowed to leave and reenter.

Two years later, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was tightened even further. Not only was the period of suspension of Chinese immigration extended another 10 years in the act of 1884, the stricture was made applicable to all Chinese, wherever their birth or whatever their national allegiance.

While the Chinese Exclusion Act of March 12, 1888, allowed entry of Chinese officials, teachers, students, merchants, and travelers for pleasure or curiosity, legislation of October 1, 1888, took away from Chinese laborers the right of reentry into the United States, unless they had reentered before the date of the act.

These exclusion laws were extended again in 1892, and in 1902; in 1904 they were extended without limitation.

Partly because immigrants continue to pour into the United States—some 14½ million between 1900 and 1920—and partly because of a sharp rise in Japanese immigration during that period, there arose in Congress insistent demands for Japanese restriction. The Japanese Government protested vigorously. President Theodore Roosevelt, who was not in sympathy with Japanese restriction, pressed for passage of an act allowing Japanese to become naturalized citizens. Nevertheless, Congress in 1907 passed an immigration act authorizing the President to negotiate international agreements regulating immigration. As required by the law, President Roosevelt signed a gentlemen's agreement with Japan in 1907, limiting the volume of Japanese immigration to the United States.

Then, based on the 1907 law, the President later that year issued a proclamation excluding from the United States, Japanese or Korean laborers, skilled or unskilled, who have received passports to go to Mexico, Canada, or Hawaii and come therefrom.

Seventeen years later, the House Committee on Immigration, reporting on the quota law of 1924, pointed out that the real intent of the gentlemen's agreement was to restrict Japanese immigration and thus check any further growth of U.S. Japanese population, which was considered unassimilable and ineligible for citizenship.

Under the gentlemen's agreement, between 1907 and 1924 over 53,000 Japanese immigrants were brought to Hawaii to work on the pineapple and sugar plantations. Total immigration of Japanese to Hawaii up to that time was 180,000.

With passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, all Japanese immigrants as well as other persons of Oriental descent were barred. In desperate need of cheap labor, Hawaiian planters turned to the Philippines, until 1946 an American possession, as an alternative source of labor supply. Between 1910 and 1932, over 100,000 Filipinos arrived in Hawaii. This represented the last large wave of Oriental migration to the United States.

Opposition to free immigration gained momentum during World War I and, on February 5, 1917, Congress passed the progenitor of our present immigration law, codifying all previous exclusionary acts and going the rest of the way in laying the basis for our present Asia-Pacific Triangle: it declared inadmissible all natives of China, India, Burma, Siam, the Malay States; the eastern part of Russia; part of Arabia and Persia; Afghanistan; most of the Polynesian islands; and the East Indies. Instead of calling it a triangle, the act labeled the area a barred zone.

Seven years later, Congress passed the 1924 Immigration Act, which not only continued exclusion of the barred zone peoples but also brought to an end the gentlemen's agreement, thereby excluding Japanese immigration to the United States.

This exclusionary law of 1924 elicited vehement protests, especially from the Japanese Government, and many have said that this was one of the circumstances that brought on World War II.

Mike M. Masaoka, national legislative director of the Japanese American Citizens League, testified in the 1951 Joint Hearings on the Immigration Act as follows:

> To the Oriental, Congress divided the world into two parts in 1924 when it approved an immigration law prohibiting the entry of Asiatics into this country for permanent residence. In effect, Congress informed the peoples of Europe, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere that they were considered "superior," "desirable," welcome to immigrate to the United States, while condemning the peoples of Asia and the Pacific islands as "inferior," "unfit," "undesirable," "not good enough."

Included in this act was the concept of the national origins system in America immigration policy, which was first proposed for legislative enactment by Congressman John Jacob Rogers as an amendment to the immigration bill then being considered by the House. Mr. Rogers, defining the system, made the following statement on the floor of the House:

> We should * * * proportion our admission of immigrants, not to the numbers of racial or national representatives composing the alien colonies or foreign groups now in the country but to the quantities of the various racial and national elements which have passed the refining test of the melting pot and have become amalgamated in the structure of the American Nation (65 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 6226).

Mr. President, you will remember that Senator Reed made the very same observation, which I quoted you earlier.

The national origins system, according to Oscar Handlin, "ranked all the nations of the earth according to the order of precedence and assigned the largest number of admissions to those that were presumed to be closest in racial heritage to the original settlers of the United States." Its avowed purpose was concerned not with the immigrant's individual worth, but with his place of birth.

Our policies since the passage of the 1924 law to the present time have not been basically altered. While Chinese exclusion was repealed in 1943, and Filipinos and natives of India were declared admissible and eligible for naturalization in 1946, natives of the Asia-Pacific triangle area continued to be singled out under present immigration policies as deserving of very meager consideration for entry.

RACIAL STRICTURES OF THE 1952 IMMIGRATION ACT

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, testifying before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization shortly after the passage of the 1952 act, advised the Commission that:

> The lifting of the bar of exclusion caused deep gratification in Asia when the [1952] act was passed, but the racial discrimination apparent in the triangle provision can be expected to keep alive some feelings of resentment. * * * The combination of very small quotas for Asia and the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions still furnish ground for Asian suspicion of U.S. motives.

While the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 did eliminate the last of the absolute bars against the admission of persons from the Asiatic barred zone and permitted their naturalization, special provisions were written into the law to carefully hold the total number of immigrants coming from the barred zone to an infinitely small fraction of total allowable annual immigration: 2,390 of 154,887, or 1.53 percent. The 154,887 figure is, according to the law, one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1920 population.

In our present immigration laws, we may count at least eight racially discriminatory provisions.

First. In 1924 the national origins system was conceived and annual quotas were allotted only to white nations. Polynesians, orientals, and Negroes were totally excluded. In the 1952 provision, the national origins system was continued for white nations, while oriental and Polynesian countries and the newly emerging nations of Africa were given minimal quotas of about 100 each.

Because nonwhite nations were excluded from the system, annual quota calculations were based only on the white population in the United States in 1920. As an example of how this annual quota was allocated to white nations, based on the 1920 census, there were about 39 million persons who derive their ancestry from the United Kingdom; one-sixth of 1 percent of 39 million is equal to about 66,000 persons, which is, then, the annual British quota.

One reason advanced during the debates over the 1952 act for excluding the African Negroes from the national origins computation was that the geographical origins of American Negroes could not be determined. This assumption was sharply challenged, however, by State Department geographers, who were able substantially to pinpoint their origins by tracing the original African railroad routes and the port of embarkation from which the Africans were transshipped to the United States.

While the natives of Africa were not enclosed in a triangle, there do exist special provisions, discussed below, that are designed to prevent Negro immigration to the United States—even from areas in the Western Hemisphere.

Second. Under the 1952 act only 1.53 percent of the total annual immigration quotas was attached to the Asia Pacific triangle, where more than one-half of the world's population live. In addition, involved regulations based on race have been issued by the administering agencies to carry out the requirements of the complicated triangle provisions.

The Asia-Pacific triangle, created by the 1952 law, comprises that area bounded by the meridians 60° east and 165° west longitude and by the parallel 25° south latitude. When traced on a map, the area actually appears as a triangle embracing all the Far East, southeast Asia, and all Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand—almost all of Polynesia and small portions of Micronesia and Melanesia.

The 21 quota areas of the Asia-Pacific triangle, largely independent nations, are as follows: Asia-Pacific—which I will explain later—Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Chinese persons—which I will explain later—India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaya, Nauru, Nepal, New Guinea, Pacific Islands—trust territories—Pakistan, Philippine Islands, Thailand, Vietnam, and Western Samoa—newly created.

Also included in the triangle are the following subquota areas, largely colonies and dependencies: Christmas Island, Cocos—Keeling—Island, and the territory of Papua, Australian dependencies; New Caledonia and the New Hebrides, French dependencies; the British Solomons, Brunei, Fiji, Gilbert, and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Maldive Islands, North Borneo, Sarawak, Singapore, and Tonga, all British dependencies; the Ryukyus, presently under American administration; the Cook Islands, a New Zealand dependency; Macao and Portuguese Timor, dependencies of Portugal.

Both the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the State Department administer the 1952 law.

By issuing special regulations on the triangle, for example, the State Department sought to delineate the races indigenous to the area within the triangle as well as those not indigenous. Those considered indigenous were the Dyaks of North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei; the Melanesians of the Fijis, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Solomon Islands, and Nauru; the Micronesians of the Carolines, Marshalls, Marianas, Guam, and Gilbert Islands; the Negritos of Netherlands, New Guinea, Papua and New Guinea; the Parsees of India, the Pathans of Afghanistan and Pakistan; and the Sindi of Pakistan.

According to the same regulations, the Turkic race is not considered to be indigenous, while the Polynesian race in itself—including the Maoris—is not regarded as being either indigenous or not indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle. This depends entirely on the place of birth, the regulations explain:

> A Polynesian born in Papua, which lies wholly within the Asia-Pacific triangle, is chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota, but an alien of Polynesian ancestry born in French Oceania [which is outside the triangle] is chargeable to the subquota for French settlements in Oceania within the immigration quota established for France.

This regulation illustrates how involved and complex our present immigration policies really are.

Since all quota areas, except for Japan with a quota of 185 and that for Chinese persons of 105, are limited to the minimum quota of 100 guaranteed by the act, the total allowable annual immigration from the Asia-Pacific triangle is only 2,390—only 1.53 percent of the total yearly immigration to the United States of 154,887.

But that figure of 2,390 was only recently established.

Until September 26, 1961, when Congress passed Public Law 87–301, the Asia-Pacific triangle had been limited to a ceiling quota of 2,000. Had there been any more than 20 quota areas in the triangle, any newly established quota would have reduced the quota of other nations and dependencies proportionately. Section 9 of Public Law 87–301 repealed this inequitable ceiling.

Still, the fact that more than one-half of the world's population live in the triangle area does not square with an annual allotment of only 2,390 immigrants. The effect of these provisions is to permit the great majority of quota immigrants—over 81 percent—to come from northern and western Europe, and to allow more than 98 percent from Europe.

The unfairness of this system is nowhere more evident than in the fact previously stated that, for example, Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000, has a larger quota than all Asia; that we take more people from Switzerland than we do from the entire African Continent; that Rumania, a captive nation of the Iron Curtain, has a quota of 289, which is small enough, but is nearly a third more than our quota for India and the Philippines combined.

Because of the very small quotas assigned the triangle nations, according to the quota report of the State Department dated February 1963, the quotas of nearly every area within the triangle are heavily oversubscribed. For example, short of an extraordinary act of Congress, or the passage of immigration reforms, the nonpreference quota for Chinese persons is so heavily mortgaged into the future—by immigrants already admitted into the United States—that State Department officials say that for all practical purposes, it has already been exhausted in perpetuity. Japan's quota is filled up at least until the year 1989; the quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 20 other dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011; the Philippines quota is 89 years behind. Only the quotas of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, and Nepal are open—since these are countries which generally have not sought immigration beyond their borders.

Third. While place of birth determines the quota under which a white person would fall, race, or ancestry is determinative for Polynesian and oriental persons.

Normally, each nation's quota may be used only by persons born there. Present or past residence or citizenship is irrelevant. A person born in Italy, for example, will be eligible for only the Italian quota, even if he has become an English citizen and has worked and lived in England for many years.

But the 1952 Immigration Act's provisos spell out special, rather complicated stipulations applicable to oriental persons wherever born. Orientals born outside of Asia are rendered ineligible for the quota of their birthplace. Instead, anyone deriving as much as half his ancestry from persons who were born in or whose race is indigenous to the Asiatic area is eligible only for one of the tiny Asiatic quotas. If the country of his oriental ancestors can be determined, he is eligible for only its quota. For example, a person born in London to an English father and an Indian mother would have to wait his turn under India's annual quota of 100, even if he had lived all his life in London; under present oversubscribed quota conditions, he would have to wait for at least 138 years.

Yet, if a person's ancestry cannot be traced, or is traceable to more than one quota area, he is eligible for only the special quota of 100 allotted to "Asia Pacific," a quota created for such people, and to cover the 20 colonies and dependencies—called subquota areas by the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952—in the triangle area. For example, a person born, say, in Brazil of a Korean mother and a Japanese father wishing to enter the United States would be assigned to the so-called Asia Pacific quota; an immigrant born in Germany of a Malayan father and a German mother is charged to the Asia Pacific quota.

Fourth. Section 202(b)(1) of the act established a special Asia Pacific quota of 100 to which thousands of oriental and Polynesian peoples living all over the world and in over 20 dependencies in the triangle area must be assigned.

The Asia Pacific quota is, geographically speaking, a general quota, not tied down to any specific area.

Who, then, must be assigned to the quota of 100 persons?

Not immigrants born within a separate quota area situate wholly within the triangle, for such persons must be charged to the quota of the separate quota area in which he was born. For example, a Japanese born in Japan must come under the Japanese quota.

Not immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry is attributable by one-half to an ethnic group indigenous to not more than one separate quota area in the triangle, since these persons would fall under the quota of that quota area. For example, an Indonesian born in Germany of an Indonesian mother and a German father would be attributed to the Indonesian quota.

Persons chargeable to the Asia-Pacific quota fall into three categories:

(1) Immigrants whose ancestry is 50 percent or more Asian, except Chinese, and who were born in a colony or other dependent area located in the triangle, are allocated to the Asia-Pacific quota. They are specifically excepted from the provisions of section 202(c)(1), which allows persons born in colonial areas to draw from the quota of the governing nation to the extent of 100 persons. This provision is available only to white persons born in those dependencies. For instance, Tonga, an archipelago of 150 islands in the south-central Pacific and a British protectorate, may not have a separate quota for Tongans or Asians born in the Tongas. Its subquota of 100, taken from the British quota, is available only to white persons born there. Only by a determination of the Secretary of State that it is an independent country may Tonga have its own quota. As the law presently stands, Tongans and Asians born in Tonga must share the Asia-Pacific quota of 100 with 19 other subquota areas and an indeterminate number of persons born outside the triangle.

The Ryukyus, however, provide a rather complex problem in this regard. Those islands are now assigned to the Asia-

Pacific quota by administrative determination of the State Department and are under U.S. administration and jurisdiction assigned by the United Nations Trusteeship Council. While Japan now has residual sovereignty, should the United States relinquish its administrative rights and full sovereignty revert to Japan, would the Ryukyus still fall under the Asia-Pacific quota, or would it be assigned to that of Japan? Presumably, if they are deemed a colony of dependency, the Ryukyus would remain under the Asia-Pacific quota. But if they are considered wholly a part of the sovereign nation of Japan, of course, they would be a part of that quota area.

(2) Immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry is one-half attributable to a people indigenous to one or more colonies or other dependent area located in the triangle must be charged to the Asia-Pacific quota. For example, a person born in Spain who is one-half Spanish and one-half Tongan must be charged to the Asia-Pacific quota.

(3) Immigrants born outside the triangle whose ancestry may be traced to peoples indigenous to two or more separate quota areas in the triangle, except Chinese persons, must be attributed to the Asia-Pacific quota. That is, a person born in France who is one-half Filipino and one-half Japanese would be charged to the Asia-Pacific quota.

Fifth. There are two quotas for China—100 for the few white persons born in China and only 105 for the millions of Chinese persons, wherever born. One quota, designated the China quota, is reserved for persons born in Manchuria, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang, Tibet, Taiwan, and the area of the Chinese mainland bounded by the 1938 boundaries. A second quota of 105 was established for Chinese persons.

The reason for this lies in the history of the exclusion of Chinese from American shores. Prior to the repeal of Chinese exclusion in 1943, since Chinese persons were ineligible for entry into the United States, the quota for China was used for white persons born on the China mainland. The 1952 immigration law specifically provided in section 201(a) that: "the quota existing for Chinese persons prior to the date of enactment of this Act shall be continued." Thus, the practice of allotting the China quota to whites was continued and necessitated the creation of a second quota—for Chinese persons.

To assign a quota of 100 to the few thousand, at most, white persons born in China and only 5 more quota numbers to the entire Chinese world population speaks loudly as to the extremes our law has gone in discriminating against a people.

To the quota of Chinese persons were allocated all persons with as much as one-half Chinese blood, wherever born. This would be true, according to the State Department, even if the Chinese person were born in a subquota area located in the Asia-Pacific triangle. It matters not one whit whether his family had lived in the United Kingdom, Brazil, or in Tonga for generations; if he is one-half Chinese, he is mandatorily allocated to the Chinese persons quota.

Sixth. Although present immigration law grants nonquota status to persons born in the Western Hemisphere, this is greatly diminished by two racial provisions:

(1) The special restrictions on orientals apply with equal measure to orientals born in hemispheric nations. For example, a native of Canada born of a Japanese mother and a Canadian father is not a nonquota immigrant, although he is a native of an independent country located in the Western Hemisphere. He must be charged to the quota for Japan.

(2) Nonquota status is denied persons born in colonies of the Western Hemisphere. The immigration law provides that each colony or other dependent area is limited to a quota of 100 a year to be taken from its parent country's quota. As several witnesses to the 1951 joint hearings pointed out, plainly, this provision is aimed squarely against the Negroes of Jamaica, Trinidad, other West Indian and Latin American areas, who make up most of the immigrants from those areas. These immigrants formerly could take advantage of the consistently unfilled quotas of their mother countries. This was true particularly of the British quota, which had been utilized more by West Indians than by other British subjects. The Immigration Act of 1952 has effectively restricted such immigration.

Seventh. Our present law clearly discriminates, not only against Orientals and Negroes, but also against persons of Eastern European, Middle Eastern, and Mediterranean origins. The combined quotas for Greece, Turkey, and Spain, for example, come to 783, which is roughly one-third of the quota we allot to Norway.

Moreover, oversubscription plagues the quotas of nations from these areas as it does nations and dependencies in the triangle. Italy's quota is subscribed for some 47 years; Yugoslavia's for 35 years; Iran's for 86 years; Israel's for 157 years; Lebanon's for 31 years. Were it not for the fact that, by special legislation in 1957, Congress forgave the mortgages charged against nations from which immigrants entered the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, Latvian and Greek quotas, for example, would have been mortgaged until the years 2274 and 2014, respectively.

Eighth. Under the 1952 act, an Asian family of mixed blood may be separated in migration if the wife is accountable to an oversubscribed quota, although her husband is chargeable to an open quota. On the other hand, a non-Asian wife accountable to an oversubscribed quota may be given the quota of her immigrant husband, if he is fortunate enough to have access to an open quota.

SENATE BILLS 747 AND 1932

Two bills are now pending before the Senate which would basically change American immigration policies. I have cosponsored them both.

The two measures would eliminate the national origins quota system, the Asia-Pacific triangle, and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present immigration laws.

Senate bill 1932, the administration's proposal, would establish a series of priorities for admission: First, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons related to individuals already in the country; and, third, to all other immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, with no one nation receiving less than 200 or more than 10 percent of previously established quotas.

Existing national quotas would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually until the allotments were wiped out in 5 years. These quota numbers would go into a reserve pool for redistribution under the system of priorities I mentioned earlier.

The power to redistribute quota numbers lies entirely in the hands of the President, with the advice and help of a new seven-man Immigration Board. An extraordinarily wide latitude of discretionary power is thus lodged in the hands of a single person.

Senate bill 747, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], which a bipartisan group of 37 Senators have sponsored, and of which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, are the primary cosponsors, proposes to eliminate all of these discriminatory policies from American immigration law. This bill is a comprehensive revision of our immigration laws.

It revises the present national origins quota system by providing a two-part formula based on population ratios and patterns of actual immigration to the United States during the past 15 years. It would authorize a total of 250,000 quota visas annually, of which 50,000 are to be made available to refugees and escapees without regard to quota areas. The remaining 200,000 quota visas are to be allocated to countries in the following way: First, 80,000 quota visas are to be divided among countries in proportion to the size of their population to world population, but no one country is to get more than 3,000 under this category; and, second, 120,000 quota visas are to be allocated to countries based in the same proportion as their immigration to the United States over the past 15 years bears to the total of all immigration to the United States for the same period.

No quota area shall get less than it got under the old law, except that the maximum is 25,000, and the minimum 200. Quotas are allocated to applicants either by country of birth or by country of citizenship, provided he has been domiciled for 10 years or more in the place of citizenship. All unused quota numbers at the end of the year are pooled and divided among quota areas having a backlog of applicants waiting for immigrant visas. No quota area shall get from this pool a number of visas greater than its regular annual quota and no more than 100,000 numbers may be used from the pool in any one year.

Quotas under the bill will be revised every 5 years, based on latest data. Within the quotas, 60 percent are available to "blood relatives of a citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the third degree of consanguinity, their spouses, and children." The remaining 40 percent is available to other qualified immigrants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comparative table which shows the figures for recent immigration levels and the quotas proposed under Senate bill 747, for the principal countries contributing to recent immigration, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Comparative table of recent immigration levels; and quotas proposed under S. 747, principal countries contributing to recent immigration*

	Present quota	Average immigration, 1951–60	Proposed quotas
EUROPE			
Austria	1,405	2,968	2,595
Belgium	1,297	1,292	1,710
Czechoslovakia	2,859	2,880	3,357
Denmark	1,175	1,370	1,293
Finland	566	668	792
France	3,069	3,802	6,172
Germany	25,814	34,545	25,000
Greece	308	4,844	3,458
Hungary	865	6,455	4,556
Ireland	17,756	6,455	17,756
Italy	5,666	18,700	15,648
Latvia	235	1,913	2,292
Lithuania	384	1,186	1,841
Netherlands	3,136	4,719	3,902
Norway	2,364	2,467	2,364
Poland	6,488	12,798	13,848
Portugal	438	2,043	1,892
Rumania	289	1,743	2,441
Spain	250	1,072	2,614
Sweden	3,295	1,886	3,295
Switzerland	1,698	1,719	1,698
Turkey	225	684	2,367
United Kingdom	65,361	20,887	25,000
U.S.S.R	2,697	4,650	6,487
Yugoslavia	942	5,866	5,295
ASIA			
China	205	3,274	5,335
India	100	314	3,233
Indonesia	100	1,012	3,789
Iran	100	291	1,586
Iraq	100	190	458
Israel	100	935	810
Japan	185	4,467	5,378
Jordan	100	511	507
Korea	100	702	2,616
Lebanon	100	337	365
Philippines	100	1,809	2,913
AFRICA			
Morocco	100	216	694
Tunisia	100	137	259
Union of South Africa	100	232	1,243
United Arab Republic	100	618	1,670
OCEANIA			
Australia	100	500	1,344
New Zealand	100	189	397

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, persons born in the Western Hemisphere remain nonquota. Also, nonquota status is expanded to include the parents of a U.S. citizen and persons with special skills, including spouse and children.

The bill automatically eliminates the Asia Pacific triangle and all its concomitant provisions.

Thus, all nations of Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East, southern and eastern Europe, and Africa are treated according to the same standards as other nations. All complex and special arrangements to limit or render virtually nil immigration from those areas are eradicated.

The enactment of this bill would be a signal contribution in obtaining a long overdue revision of our immigration laws.

Although I feel that both S. 747 and S. 1932 are meritorious and deserve the most careful examination, I feel that S. 747 is preferable, for two reasons.

First, S. 747 would allot each nation a definite quota, figured according to a formula and revised and updated every 5 years. This quota cannot be reduced unless all other quotas are readjusted under the same formula.

Second, S. 747 does not provide for as much administrative discretion, so that there is less room for the law to be administered in a discriminatory way.

Mr. President, opposition to revising our statutes are based on two arguments: First, the fear that the admission of more immigrants to the country would exhaust our economic resources and add to our already serious employment problems; and, second, the fear that too many persons of Oriental background would be admitted into the country, upsetting traditional patterns of American life. Reasonable analysis of both arguments, however, shows them to be quite unfounded.

Let us analyze each of these in turn.

IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

First, let us look at the impact of immigration on our economy. We have not introduced S. 747 without thoughtful and thorough consideration of our economic situation and the hard facts about our complex technologically-oriented economy. It is our belief that the immigration program proposed by our bill would enhance our economic growth, help stimulate our economy, and generate new employment opportunities. The best data unquestionably supports this assertion.

Based on statistics and facts supplied by the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, and the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations, both of the U.S. Department of Labor; the Bureau of the Census, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department, six points stand out with respect to the impact of immigration on our economy.

First, under S. 747, total annual immigration to the United States is limited to 250,000, plus perhaps 100,000 nonquota admissions a year, totaling about 350,000, a figure which is only slightly higher than the number we actually have been admitting over the past 10 to 15 years. See tables 6, 6A–6E, 7, and 7A, Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Report, 1962, pages 23–36. See also Population Bulletin, November 1962, page 137. This somewhat startling situation can be accounted for by the fact that Congress, recognizing the inadequacy of our present immigration laws, has repeatedly passed special short-term immigration and refugee legislation—the cumulative effect of which has so modified our immigration practice that the act of 1952 no longer represents our immigration quota policy.

Of the 1½ million quota immigrants authorized during the fifties, only a million actually entered the United States. But 1½ million nonquota immigrants were admitted during the same period. In short, out of a total immigration of 2½ million, 3 out of 5 persons were admitted outside the quota provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Congress, through special laws enacted every year since 1952, and through thousands of private immigration bills, has drastically revised the pattern of immigration envisioned by the act of 1952. Nations with very small quotas have been among the most substantial contributors to recent immigration. Italian immigration, for example, has been three times greater than its quota allotment. Japanese immigration has been over 20 times greater. Immigration from Greece and China has been 16 times the very small number permitted by their quotas. (See table I.)

The second noteworthy fact is that immigration has been a sharply declining factor in the increase of U.S. population. In the last 30 years immigration has accounted for an average of 5.1 percent of our population increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table II, showing the components of U.S. population growth from 1870 to 1960.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Components of U.S. population growth, 1870–1960*

[In thousands]

Period	Population			Natural increase		Net immigration	
	Beginning of period	End of period	Increment	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1870–80	39,818	50,156	10,337	8,063	78.0	2,274	22.0
1880–90	50,156	62,948	12,794	8,302	64.9	4,490	35.1
1890–1900	62,948	75,995	13,047	10,516	80.6	2,531	19.4
1900–10	75,995	91,972	15,978	10,689	66.9	5,289	33.1
1910–20	91,972	105,711	13,738	10,537	76.7	3,201	23.3
1920–30	105,711	122,775	17,064	13,974	81.9	3,089	18.1
1930–40	122,775	131,669	8,894	8,787	98.8	1,067	1.2
1940–50 [1]	131,669	150,697	19,028	18,153	95.4	875	4.6
1950–60 [2]	151,326	179,323	27,997	25,337	90.5	2,660	9.5

[1] Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.
[2] Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Population Bulletin, November 1962.

(At this point Mr. THURMOND took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. FONG. Table II shows how immigration has been a declining proportion in the growth of our population.

In earlier decades, immigration ranged between 18 and 35 percent of our population growth. But in the 30 years since 1930, the comparable rates were 1.2 percent between 1930 and 1940, 4.6 percent between 1940 and 1950, and 9.5 percent between 1950 and 1960—an average of 5 percent over the 30-year span.

This data is taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's population bulletin of November 1962.

From table II figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 1 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Third, the number of immigrant workers entering the United States in any single year during the postwar period represented a very small fraction of the total work force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table III, showing immigrants with occupations as a percent of employed labor force for the years 1957 and 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—*Immigrants with occupations as a percent of employed labor force, selected year*

Occupational group	1961			1957		
	Labor force [1] (thousands)	Immigrants [2]	Immigrants as percent of occupation	Labor force [1] (thousands)	Immigrants [2]	Immigrants as percent of occupation
Total with occupation	66,796	123,688	0.19	65,016	152,986	0.24
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7,705	21,455	.28	6,468	24,489	.38
Farmers and farm managers	2,711	3,002	.11	3,329	3,506	.11
Managers, officials, and proprieters, except farm	7,119	5,363	.08	6,703	6,127	.09
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	14,300	25,198	.18	13,280	25,897	.20
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	8,623	17,679	.21	8,664	26,976	.31
Operatives and kindred workers	11,762	13,288	.11	12,530	19,362	.15
Private household workers	2,317	8,811	.38	2,098	11,457	.55
Service workers, except private household	6,323	8,399	.13	5,534	8,761	.16
Farm laborers and foremen	2,459	4,799	.20	2,730	4,585	.17
Laborers, except farm and mine	3,477	15,694	.45	3,680	21,826	.59

[1] Labor force figures are monthly averages for 1961 and quarterly averages for 1957.

[2] Data are for fiscal years.

Source: Labor force data—1961, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings"; 1957, U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Annual Report on the Labor Force." Immigration data: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. FONG. Table III shows that in 1961, for example, our total labor force was about 66.7 million, including 123,688 immigrants—so that immigrants were less than one-fifth of 1 percent of our labor force. In that year this proportion did not exceed one-half of 1 percent in any occupational category ranging from the professional and technical workers to clerical, operatives, and unskilled laborers.

This data comes from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

From table III figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 2 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Between 1947 and 1962, our labor force expanded by about 13 million persons, while the total number of immigrants was only 3.8 million. But not all of these immigrants could or did enter our labor force. About 20 percent were housewives, 20 percent were children under 14 years old, and 7 percent were students.

Thus, in any single year, only about 50 percent of the immigrants who came to this country could have entered our labor force—for instance, in 1962 about 142,000 of the 284,000 immigrants, or less than a quarter of 1 percent of our employed labor force, could have entered our labor force.

Although their numbers are small, these immigrants have made important contributions to our economy and society. Before they arrived, they had been fully trained and possessed talents and skills urgently needed in our economy. One of our most serious occupational shortages has been a lack of engineers. During the last 10 years, some 31,000 immigrant engineers entered the United States, which was only 5.6 percent of all domestic graduates in engineering and science.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table IV, showing the relationship between totals of immigrant scientists and engineers and domestic graduates in engineering and science, by fiscal year 1951 to 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Relationship between totals of immigrant scientists and engineers and domestic graduates in engineering and science, by fiscal years, 1951–61*

Group	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
1. Immigrant scientists and engineers	1,561	3,204	2,718	3,200	2,862	3,790	5,823	5,190	5,081	4,326	3,922
2. Domestic graduates in engineering and science [1]	93,793	72,646	60,834	57,883	57,066	62,534	71,594	79,677	86,474	89,443	[2] 93,000
Percentage of group 1 to group 2	1.7	4.4	4.5	5.5	5.0	6.1	8.1	6.5	5.9	4.8	4.2

[1] Includes earned bachelor's degrees in the natural sciences and engineering. Social sciences are excluded.

[2] Estimated.

Source: "Scientific Manpower From Abroad," by National Science Foundation, 1962.

Mr. FONG. Table IV shows that, for example in 1960, 4,326 immigrant scientists and engineers entered the United States compared with 89,443 domestic graduates in those fields or a percentage of 4.8.

In 1961, 3,922 immigrant scientists and engineers entered the United States compared with 93,000 domestic graduates in those fields, or a percentage 4.2.

This data is taken from the publication "Scientific Manpower from Abroad," by the National Science Foundation, 1962.

From table IV figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 3 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

We are all aware that there is a great need for engineers and scientists, and that we are able to employ many, many more. This sharply accelerated demand for engineers, paralleling steeply increased demands for scientific and technical personnel, is attributed to increases in research activities, defense spending, and a speed-up in industrial technological advances. These trends are expected to continue—see Manpower Research Bulletin, August 10, 1962; "Scientific Manpower from Abroad," National Science Foundation, 1962; "Current Labor Market Conditions in Engineering, Scientific and Technical Occupations," Department of Labor, August 1962.

The range of our unemployment in the last 10 years has been between 4 and 5 million jobless persons, who comprised 5.5 to 6 percent of the labor force according to Labor Department figures—see manpower report, March 1963, pages 33–38.

However, high unemployment rates in this country are not to be found among professional and technical workers, where it was less than 2 percent in 1962. Highest unemployment was concentrated in the relatively unskilled groups—the nonfarm laborers, operatives, and service workers—which had rates well in excess of the 1962 total—see table 5 below.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table V, showing unemployment rates of the unemployed, by major occupation groups, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE V.—*Unemployment rates of the unemployed, by major occupation group: Annual averages, 1947–62, persons 14 years of age and over*

Major occupation group	Unemployment rate															
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
Total	5.6	6.7	5.6	5.5	6.8	4.3	3.8	4.0	5.0	2.5	2.7	3.0	5.0	5.5	3.4	3.6
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.6	.9	1.0	1.5	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.9
Farmers and farm managers	.3	.4	.3	.3	.6	.3	.4	.4	.4	.2	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.0	.8	.9	1.2	.9	.7	1.0	1.6	1.5	1.0	1.2
Clerical and kindred workers	3.9	4.6	3.8	3.7	4.4	2.8	2.4	2.6	3.1	1.7	1.8	2.1	3.4	3.8	2.3	2.9
Sales workers	4.1	4.7	3.7	3.7	4.0	2.6	2.7	2.4	3.7	2.1	2.5	2.8	4.0	3.5	3.4	2.6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	5.1	6.3	5.3	5.3	6.8	3.8	3.2	4.0	4.9	2.6	2.4	2.6	5.6	5.9	2.9	3.8
Operatives and kindred workers	7.5	9.6	8.0	7.6	10.9	6.3	5.4	5.7	7.6	3.2	3.9	4.3	6.8	8.0	4.1	5.1
Private household workers	4.9	5.9	4.9	4.8	5.2	3.7	4.2	4.1	5.0	2.5	3.2	3.8	5.6	5.2	3.2	3.4
Service workers, except private household	6.4	7.4	6.0	6.4	7.4	5.1	4.8	5.8	5.2	3.6	3.7	4.3	6.8	6.1	4.8	4.7
Farm laborers and foremen	4.3	5.7	5.2	5.1	6.2	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.2	2.5	2.3	2.1	5.0	3.9	2.3	2.7
Laborers, except farm and mine	12.4	14.5	12.5	12.4	14.9	9.4	8.2	10.2	10.7	6.1	5.7	5.6	11.7	12.9	7.5	7.5

Source: President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for the very careful and well thought-out analysis of the immigration bills before us which he is now presenting. The Senator represents a State in which there are relatively few civil rights problems because of that wonderful spirit of aloha which permeates not only his State but also the actions of our colleagues from Hawaii in this body. He is doing a particularly outstanding job in refuting the argument with which we who favor a change in our immigration laws are so frequently confronted; namely, that increased immigration will increase unemployment in our country.

I think the Senator in his presentation is demolishing that argument. It is a fact, based on our most recent experience, that immigration to the United States for permanent residence has increased employment opportunities for our people rather than diminished them. I shall cite only one example.

In my home city of Rochester, N.Y., a lot of men's clothing is made. Rochester is a clothing center. For many years, skilled cutters have been very hard to find. They could not be obtained in this country. Finally, about 100 skilled cutters were obtained from Italy. I was told by executives of the firms involved that for each one brought in, jobs were made for 10 or 12 other people. This was because there was a bottleneck in the factories. They could not produce what they wished to produce because of the shortage of skilled workers at a crucial stage of production. So in this case each person brought in made work for 10 or 12 native Americans.

The Senator has obviously studied this problem carefully. He is a cosponsor, with me, of S. 747. We have also both considered S. 1932, more recently introduced.

I wish all Senators could hear the outstanding and careful analysis the Senator is presenting. I hope that all those interested in the problem will read the Record tomorrow to educate themselves, as indeed I shall be educated by the remarks of my colleague the Senator from Hawaii today.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from the State of New York for his kind remarks. I also wish to thank him for alluding to the aloha spirit of my State. It is a fine spirit. We are trying to export that spirit of aloha, of brotherhood, of amity, and of concord. I hope that eventually all America will have the aloha spirit.

The Senator is correct in saying that when skilled people are brought to the United States as immigrants additional jobs are created for our own people. We are indeed in very short supply of all the professional, technical, and kindred personnel, particularly in all scientific categories—chemists, physicists, nurses, and physicians. Actually, we are inveigling other countries, by enticing the intelligentsia to our country. We should view it as an asset to America, rather than a detriment to our country. It is in that light I am presenting my argument today.

The distinguished Senator from New York also has been in the forefront of those seeking to solve the Nation's immigration problems. He has worked hard to reform our immigration laws. He has presented arguments for the reform of the laws many times on the floor of the Senate. I know that the Senator from New York and other Members of the Senate, working with me, will be able to work out something acceptable to all our citizens and the people of the world.

Mr. KEATING. I sincerely hope so, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table V shows that higher unemployment rates continued to be found among blue-collar workers and among the less skilled, in 1962. While the total unemployment rate was 5.6 percent of the work force, unemployed unskilled nonfarm laborers to those employed in that group was 12.4 percent; blue-collar operatives, 7.5 percent; and service workers, 6.4 percent. The unemployment rate for professional and technical occupations was only 1.7 percent.

The source of this data is the 1963 President's Manpower Report.

From table V figures I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 4 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Since only an extremely small number of immigrants who are unskilled workers are admitted annually, immigration has only a minimal effect, if at all, on unemployment.

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, it has been increasingly clear that labor has been displaced largely by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity.

It has been estimated that about 1.8 million jobs are affected each year by technological change, and that approximately 18 million jobs will be affected in the decade 1960–70—see population bulletin, November 1962, page 144.

Output per man-hour in private industry since 1947 has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in man-hours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947—see table VI. See also the Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 67–72.

I ask unanimous consent that table VI, showing "Indexes of Output Per Man-Hour and Related Data: Annual Averages, 1947–62" may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record.

TABLE VI.—*Indexes of output per man-hour and related data:* [1] *Annual averages, 1947–62*

[1957–50=100]

Output, employment, and man-hours	1962 [2]	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
OUTPUT PER MAN-HOUR																
Total private	113.4	108.9	105.3	103.3	99.6	97.2	93.9	93.8	89.7	88.2	84.7	82.9	80.9	75.5	73.4	70.9
Agriculture	121.8	117.9	109.3	102.8	103.0	94.2	88.3	86.4	83.4	77.8	69.9	64.0	64.7	56.8	59.6	50.2
Nonagricultural industries	112.1	107.9	104.8	103.1	99.4	97.5	94.9	95.3	91.4	90.0	87.6	86.5	85.1	80.8	77.9	76.3
Manufacturing	114.9	110.7	106.1	103.7	98.9	97.2	97.1	96.0	89.8	90.6	86.4	85.2	83.7	78.5	76.8	74.8
Nonmanufacturing	110.6	106.8	104.2	102.7	99.7	97.6	93.4	94.6	92.0	89.0	87.8	86.8	85.6	82.0	78.2	76.8
HOURS PER UNIT OF OUTPUT																
Total private	88.2	91.8	94.9	96.8	100.4	102.9	106.5	106.6	111.5	113.4	118.0	120.6	123.7	132.5	136.2	141.1
Agriculture	82.1	84.8	91.5	97.3	97.1	106.2	113.2	115.7	119.9	128.6	143.1	156.3	154.5	175.9	167.9	199.3
Nonagricultural industries	89.2	92.6	95.4	97.0	100.6	102.5	105.4	105.0	109.5	111.1	114.1	115.5	117.5	123.8	128.4	131.0
Manufacturing	87.0	90.3	94.2	96.5	101.1	102.9	103.0	104.1	111.4	110.4	115.7	117.4	119.4	127.4	130.2	133.8
Nonmanufacturing	90.4	93.7	96.0	97.4	100.3	102.4	107.0	105.8	108.7	112.3	113.9	115.2	116.8	122.0	127.9	130.2
OUTPUT																
Total private	114.4	108.6	106.9	104.1	97.0	98.9	97.0	95.0	87.2	88.6	84.4	82.0	77.3	70.8	71.2	68.4
Agriculture	107.2	106.2	104.8	100.0	100.5	99.0	100.5	102.9	97.6	93.7	90.4	87.0	92.8	88.0	92.8	81.2
Nonagricultural industries	114.9	108.8	107.0	104.3	96.8	98.9	96.8	94.5	86.6	88.3	84.1	81.7	76.4	69.8	70.0	67.7
Manufacturing	117.3	108.6	107.1	105.0	94.2	100.7	102.1	99.5	88.1	97.3	88.4	85.7	78.3	67.6	72.6	71.1
Nonmanufacturing	113.6	108.9	107.0	103.9	98.1	98.0	94.1	92.0	85.8	83.7	81.9	79.6	75.5	71.0	68.7	65.9
EMPLOYMENT																
Total private	101.7	100.8	101.9	100.7	97.9	101.3	101.5	98.9	95.2	97.6	96.2	95.2	91.9	90.2	92.1	91.0
Agriculture	87.9	91.2	95.6	97.6	97.9	104.5	110.5	113.2	109.6	110.8	120.5	125.3	133.5	142.1	140.4	145.0
Nonagricultural industries	103.2	101.8	102.6	101.1	97.9	101.0	100.5	97.4	93.7	96.2	93.6	92.0	87.5	84.7	87.0	85.2
Manufacturing	101.0	98.1	101.1	100.3	96.2	103.5	103.9	101.8	98.4	105.8	100.4	99.0	92.0	87.2	94.0	93.8
Nonmanufacturing	104.2	103.4	103.2	101.4	98.7	99.9	99.0	95.5	91.6	91.9	90.6	89.0	85.5	83.6	83.9	81.4
MAN-HOURS																
Total private	100.9	99.7	101.5	100.8	97.4	101.8	103.3	101.3	97.2	100.5	99.6	98.9	95.6	93.8	97.0	96.5
Agriculture	88.0	90.1	95.9	97.3	97.6	105.1	113.8	119.1	117.0	120.5	129.4	136.0	143.4	154.8	155.8	161.8
Nonagricultural industries	102.5	100.8	102.1	101.2	97.4	101.4	102.0	99.2	94.8	98.1	96.0	94.4	89.8	86.4	89.9	88.7
Manufacturing	102.1	98.1	100.9	101.3	95.2	103.6	105.2	103.6	98.1	107.4	102.3	100.6	93.5	86.1	94.5	95.1
Nonmanufacturing	102.7	102.0	102.7	101.2	98.4	100.4	100.7	97.3	93.3	94.0	93.3	91.7	88.2	86.6	87.9	85.8

[1] Output refers to gross national product in 1954 dollars; man-hour estimates are based primarily on establishment data.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: The President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table VI shows the close, positive relationship between productivity increases and expanding output; as output per man-hour showed impressive gains, output—as measured by gross private product in 1947 dollars—rose at about the same impressive rates. At the same time, while output rose by about 59 percent, employment rose only by 11 percent. Total man-hours worked rose by even less—only about 3 percent.

So that well over 80 percent of the increase in aggregate output from 1947 onward can be explained by increases in output per man-hour.

This data comes from the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Form table VI figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 5 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet, 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 percent—will lack high school diplomas—see Manpower Research Bulletin, March 1963, pages 9–10. There is no doubt that one of the major causes of unemployment is the rapid technological changes in our economy.

Unemployment, then, does not always mean that there is a job shortage. It may also indicate a shortage of persons who have the kinds of skills, knowledge and abilities required by the economy. Labor economists in the United States are discovering that it is possible for large numbers of unemployed to exist, even while innumerable job openings go unfilled. To quote from the Labor Department's 1963 Manpower Report:

> Despite the large supply of unused manpower, serious shortages exist in essential occupations * * *. Jobs remain unfilled because they require different skills from those possessed by the unemployed. Moreover—

The report continues—

> existing market mechanisms and educational programs have not overcome the imbalance of requirements and resources.

Shortages of qualified workers are particularly acute in the scientific, engineering, teaching, technical, health, and other professional fields—see the President's Manpower Report, March 1963, pages 30–32; and, as the Manpower Report points out, these ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. To meet these shortages, extensive education and training are required; retraining and reeducation of our existing manpower resources cannot be accomplished except over a prolonged period of time.

Where, then, are these highly trained and skilled workers to come from? One important source has been immigration. These immigrants, according to Labor Department officials, have not increased the number of persons on our unemployment rolls, because they possessed the skills and training our economy required. Even if it were possible immediately to retrain and reeducate 150,000 or 200,000 unemployed persons—a relatively small proportion—to give them skills needed by the economy, there can be no doubt that the economy would be significantly stimulated. Precisely the same thing may be said about the entry of skilled and highly trained immigrants into the economy. Of all immigrant workers arriving since 1947, about one of every three reported a professional, technical, or skilled occupation. Approximately half of the 3½ million immigrants who entered the United States between 1947 and 1961 were reported as having occupational attachments—see table VII—the remainder were primarily housewives, young, and retired persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables VII and VIII be received and made a part of the RECORD. Table VII shows the number and percentage

distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947–61 and for selected years. Table VIII shows the number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952–61.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE VII.—*Number and percent distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947–61 and for selected years*

[Fiscal years]

Occupational groups	Total, 1947 through 1961		1961		1954		1947	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total admitted	3,542,189	100.0	271,344	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation	1,671,003	47.2	123,688	45.6	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation	[1] 1,871,186	52.8	135,704	50.0	[1] 112,067	53.8	[1] 81,709	55.5
No occupation reported	(1)	----------	11,952	4.4	(1)	----------	(1)	----------
With occupation [2]	[1] 1,671,003	100.0	123,688	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	263,018	15.7	21,455	17.3	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers	87,083	5.2	3,002	2.4	3,846	4.0	3,462	5.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	83,346	5.0	5,363	4.3	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	283,432	17.0	25,198	20.4	16,018	16.7	13,961	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	268,555	16.1	17,679	14.3	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers	238,141	14.3	13,288	10.8	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers	129,643	7.8	8,811	7.1	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household	95,851	5.7	8,399	6.8	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen	53,792	3.2	4,799	3.9	1,622	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine	168,142	10.1	15,694	12.7	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

[1] "No occupation" includes "No occupation reported" group.

[2] Includes immigrants age 14 years and over.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE VIII.—*Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952–61* [1]

[Fiscal years]

Occupation	Total, 1952–61	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952
Biological scientists	420	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23	34	27
Chemists	4,899	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383	276	401
Dentists	1,271	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116	103	198
Engineers	30,373	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391	2,059	2,381
Geologists and geophysicists	474	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34	31	30
Mathematicians	243	24	31	29	32	35	17	18	14	22	21
Nurses	28,235	3,449	3,828	3,620	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502	1,796	1,866
Physicians and surgeons	14,340	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040	845	1,210
Physicists	1,096	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74	73	58
College professors and instructors	3,147	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184	252	317
Teachers, not specified	19,278	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	655	1,549	1,356	1,227	1,828
Technicians	12,217	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804	602	889
Machinists	9,025	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488	583	737
Toolmakers, diemakers and setters	7,250	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760	675	506
Pattern and model makers, except paper	501	26	34	25	63	123	118	60	32	13	7

[1] The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the list of currently critical occupations as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1961: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice. 1952 through 1958: Data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. FONG. Between 1953 and 1961, over 166,000 immigrants entering this country possessed skills in such critical job areas as physics, nursing, medicine, teaching, engineering, and other kindred fields. These are occupations declared to be in short supply by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the Labor Department, occupations which are used by the Selective Service in determining deferments in the national interest. Some 12,680 immigrant physicians and surgeons, and about 25,376 nurses helped alleviate the shortage of trained persons in the critical medical field in the 1952–61 period; about 4,448 chemists, 4,036 natural scientists, and 19,894 technicians—vitally needed workers who support scientists and engineers—were admitted in that same period.

I ask unanimous consent to submit and have printed in the RECORD table IX, showing the selected professional, technical and kindred workers admitted to the United States, 1959–61, and total, January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE IX.—*Selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States, 1959–61, and total Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961*

	1961		1960		1959		Jan. 1, 1953, to June 30, 1961	
	Total	Percent of PTK's [1]	Total	Percent of PTK's [1]	Total	Percent of PTK's [1]	Total	Percent of PTK's [1]
Total	21,453	100.0	21,940	100.0	23,287	100.0	166,413	100.0
Engineers	2,868	13.4	3,338	15.2	3,936	16.9	27,142	16.3
Natural scientists	376	1.7	401	1.8	428	1.8	4,036	2.4
Physicists	151	.7	162	.7	155	.7	----------	----------
Mathematicians	24	.1	31	.1	29	.1	----------	----------
Other natural scientists	201	.9	208	1.0	244	1.0	----------	----------
Chemists	551	2.6	504	2.3	645	2.8	4,448	2.7
Physicians and surgeons	1,683	7.8	1,574	7.2	1,630	7.0	12,680	7.6
Dentists	119	.6	110	.5	99	.4	----------	----------
Nurses	3,449	16.1	3,828	17.4	3,620	15.5	25,376	15.2
College professors and instructors	500	2.3	367	1.7	340	1.5	1,921	1.2
Teachers (not specified)	2,688	12.5	2,532	11.6	2,670	11.5	17,998	10.8
Technicians [2]	2,138	10.0	2,350	10.7	2,740	11.8	[3] 19,894	12.0
Other professional, technical, and kindred workers	7,085	33.0	6,936	31.6	7,179	30.8	52,918	31.8

[1] Professional, technical, and kindred workers.

[2] Includes draftsmen.

[3] Includes designers, draftsmen, radio operators, surveyors, medical and dental technicians, testing technicians, and technicians not specified.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. FONG. It is important to note here that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has increased significantly in the past decade—see tables VII and VIII. For instance, there were 20 percent more engineers entering in 1961 than in 1952, and 84 percent more technicians. It should be noted further that special legislation was passed during the 87th Congress to permit nonquota admission of several thousand highly trained and skilled immigrants.

Virtually every study projecting the occupational structure of our economy in the decade of the sixties shows a shift of employment toward occupations requiring high levels of skill, training, and education. While unskilled jobs are not expected to expand at all in terms of absolute numbers, professional and technical positions will be the fastest growing occupations. This simply reflects the continuation of scientific and technological advances and of trends which were becoming increasingly evident as early as 1947.

I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD table X which shows employed persons by major occupation group, annual averages, 1947–62.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE X.—*Employed persons by major occupation group; Annual averages, 1947–62, persons 14 years of age and over*

Major occupation group and sex	Number (in thousands)															
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948	1947
BOTH SEXES																
Total employed	67,846	66,796	66,681	65,581	63,966	65,016	64,928	62,997	61,160	61,778	60,989	60,854	59,648	58,489	59,307	57,843
White-collar workers	29,901	29,124	28,726	27,798	27,056	26,451	25,597	24,585	23,891	23,614	23,070	22,413	22,373	21,636	21,400	20,185
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	8,040	7,705	7,475	7,143	6,961	6,468	6,096	5,792	5,588	5,448	5,092	4,788	4,490	4,028	3,977	3,795
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	7,408	7,119	7,067	6,935	6,785	6,703	6,552	6,450	6,201	6,396	6,182	6,220	6,429	6,433	6,344	5,795
Clerical and kindred workers	10,107	9,861	9,783	9,326	9,137	9,152	8,838	8,367	8,168	7,991	8,122	7,655	7,632	7,438	7,438	7,200
Sales workers	4,346	4,439	4,401	4,394	4,173	4,128	4,111	3,976	3,934	3,779	3,674	3,750	3,822	3,737	3,641	3,395
Blue-collar workers	24,278	23,862	24,211	24,162	23,510	24,874	25,179	24,771	24,167	24,991	24,802	25,009	23,336	22,770	23,988	23,554
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	8,678	8,623	8,560	8,561	8,469	8,664	8,693	8,328	8,311	8,558	8,742	8,434	7,670	7,625	8,119	7,754
Operatives and kindred workers	12,041	11,762	11,986	11,858	11,441	12,520	12,816	12,762	12,253	12,747	12,352	12,623	12,146	11,780	12,396	12,274
Laborers, except farm and mine	3,559	3,477	3,665	3,743	3,600	3,680	3,670	3,681	3,603	3,656	3,707	3,952	3,520	3,365	3,573	3,526
Service workers	8,802	8,64	8,349	8,040	7,809	7,632	7,609	7,106	6,755	6,949	6,488	6,533	6,535	6,266	6,040	5,987
Private household workers	2,341	2,317	2,216	2,197	2,204	2,098	2,124	1,946	1,760	1,850	1,805	1,869	1,883	1,757	1,754	1,731
Service workers, except private household	6,461	6,323	6,133	5,843	5,605	5,534	5,485	5,160	4,995	5,099	4,683	4,664	4,652	4,509	4,286	4,256
Farmworkers	4,866	5,170	5,395	5,582	5,591	6,059	6,544	6,537	6,348	6,224	6,632	6,900	7,408	7,819	7,881	8,120
Farmers and farm managers	2,595	2,771	2,780	3,019	3,083	3,329	3,655	3,739	3,853	3,842	3,963	4,025	4,393	4,703	4,668	4,995
Farm laborers and foremen	2,271	2,459	2,615	2,563	2,508	2,730	2,889	2,798	2,495	2,382	2,669	2,875	3,015	3,116	3,213	3,125
	Percent distribution															
Total employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-collar workers	44.1	43.6	43.1	42.4	42.3	40.6	39.4	39.0	39.0	38.2	37.7	36.8	37.5	37.0	36.1	34.9
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	11.9	11.5	11.2	10.9	10.9	9.9	9.4	9.2	9.1	8.8	8.3	7.9	7.5	6.9	6.7	6.6
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	10.9	10.7	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.3	10.1	10.2	10.1	10.4	10.1	10.2	10.8	11.0	10.7	10.0
Clerical and kindred workers	14.9	14.8	14.7	14.2	14.3	14.1	13.6	13.3	13.4	12.9	13.3	12.6	12.8	12.7	12.5	12.4
Sales workers	6.4	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.5	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.4	6.1	6.0	6.2	6.4	6.4	6.1	5.9
Blue-collar workers	35.8	35.7	36.3	36.9	36.7	38.3	38.8	39.2	39.5	40.4	40.7	41.1	39.1	38.9	40.4	40.7
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	12.8	12.9	12.8	13.1	13.2	13.3	13.4	13.2	13.6	13.9	14.3	13.9	12.9	13.0	13.7	13.4
Operatives and kindred workers	17.7	17.6	18.0	18.1	17.9	19.3	19.7	20.2	20.0	20.6	20.3	20.7	20.3	20.1	20.9	21.2
Laborers, except farm and mine	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.8	5.9	5.9	6.1	6.5	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.1
Service workers	13.0	12.9	12.5	12.2	12.2	11.7	11.7	11.3	11.1	11.3	10.7	10.8	11.0	10.7	10.2	10.4
Private household workers	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0
Service workers, except private household	9.5	9.5	9.2	8.9	8.8	8.5	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.3	7.7	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.2	7.4
Farmworkers	7.2	7.8	8.1	8.5	8.7	9.3	10.1	10.5	10.4	10.1	10.9	11.3	12.5	13.3	13.3	14.0
Farmers and farm managers	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.6	4.8	5.1	5.6	6.0	6.3	6.2	6.5	6.6	7.4	8.0	7.9	8.6
Farm laborers and foremen	3.3	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.7	5.1	5.3	5.4	5.4

EMPLOYMENT, BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1960–75

Major occupational group	Actual, 1960		Projected, 1970		Projected, 1975		Percent change		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1960–70	1970–75	1960–75
	Millions		*Millions*		*Million.*				
Total	66.7	100.0	80.5	100.0	87.6	100.0	21	9	31
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7.5	11.2	10.7	13.3	12.4	14.2	43	16	65
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	7.1	10.6	8.6	10.7	9.4	10.7	21	9	32
Clerical and kindred workers	9.8	14.7	12.8	15.9	14.2	16.2	31	11	45
Sales workers	4.4	6.6	5.4	6.7	5.9	6.7	23	9	34
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	8.6	12.8	10.3	12.8	11.2	12.8	20	9	30
Operatives and kindred workers	12.0	18.0	13.6	16.9	14.2	16.3	13	4	18
Service workers	8.3	12.5	11.1	13.8	12.5	14.3	34	13	51
Laborers, except farm and mine	3.7	5.5	3.7	4.6	3.7	4.3	----------	----------	----------
Farmers, farm managers, laborers, and foremen	5.4	8.1	4.2	5.3	3.[illegible]	4.5	−22	−7	−28

NOTE: Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Monthly Labor Review, March 1963; President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Table IX, which I have already introduced, shows selected professional, technical, and kindred workers admitted to the United States from 1959 to 1961 and the total number of such workers admitted between January 1, 1953, and June 30, 1961.

The total admitted in that 8-year period was 166,413, of which 21,455 were admitted in 1961, 21,940 in 1960, and 23,287 in 1959.

Table IX relates directly to table X, which shows employment by type of occupation between 1947 and 1962, and the percent change in employment projected to 1970.

Table X shows that the demand for professional, technical, and other skilled workers is expected to continue to rise in the future. But unskilled occupation groups are not expected to grow at all; in fact, they may decline.

These materials are drawn from the Monthly Labor Review, March 1963, and the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

From the figures in tables IX and X, I have prepared two charts which I refer to as charts 6 and 7, showing graphically what I have just introduced.

The large unfilled need for personnel in the professional, technical and other skilled occupations are expected to continue into the foreseeable future. This fact was underscored particularly in the President's 1963 Manpower Report. Immigration will therefore continue to be our best source of supply of highly trained people.

The fourth point is tied to the third—the fact that many American economists and social scientists are beginning to recognize the tremendous economic value of educated people. They see that much of the wealth attributable to resources and capital equipment really has its roots in education.

For example, a person born in 1956 who subsequently completes high school would earn a lifetime income of $253,631, computed on the basis of the average income of male high school graduates in 1956. A substantial increase in lifetime income corresponds with each additional year of schooling completed, so that, for instance, on a basis of 1958 data a college graduate could expect to earn about $435,000 during his lifetime, compared with $258,000 for the high school graduate.

Mr. President, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD table XI, which shows estimated lifetime income for males, by years of school completed, selected years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XI.—*Estimated lifetime income for males, by years of school completed, selected years*

Years of school completed	Income from age 18 to death				Income from age 25 to 64			
	1939	1949	1956	1958	1939	1949	1956	1958
Elementary:								
Total	(1)	$113,330	$154,593	$154,114	$37,172	$91,932	$127,047	$127,286
Less than 8 years	(1)	98,222	132,736	129,764	(1)	79,654	108,310	106,449
8 years	(1)	132,683	180,857	181,695	(1)	106,889	148,033	149,687
High school:								
1 to 3 years	(1)	152,068	205,277	211,193	53,011	121,943	169,501	175,779
4 years	(1)	185,279	253,631	257,557	67,383	148,649	208,322	215,487
College:								
1 to 3 years	(1)	209,282	291,581	315,504	73,655	173,166	243,611	269,105
4 years or more	(1)	296,377	405,698	435,242	104,608	241,427	340,131	366,990

[1] Not available.

Source: Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 1961.

Mr. FONG. To cite one set of figures from table XI, in 1958 a person with elementary school education can expect to earn $154,114 from age 18 to death, and $127,286 from 25 to 64; with a college education, $435,242 from 18 to death, and $366,990 from 25 to 64.

Data is taken from the Occupational Outlook Quarterly, 1961.

From the figures in table XI, I have prepared a chart which I have referred to as chart 8 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Since most higher-paying jobs require a high degree of training and education, it is not surprising that persons having more education are employed in better jobs. As of March 1962, the median years of schooling for professional and technical workers was 16.2, as compared to 12.5 for clerical employees, and 8.5 to 10.1 for unskilled persons. (See table XII.)

Mr. President, I submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD table XII, which shows median years of school completed by employed persons 18 years old and over, by major occupation group and sex, 1952–62.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XII.—*Median years of school completed by employed persons 18 years old and over, by major occupation group and sex, 1952–62*

Major occupation groups	Both sexes				Male				Female			
	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962
All occupation groups	10.8	11.7	12.0	12.1	10.4	11.2	11.7	12.1	12.0	12.1	12.2	12.3
Professional and managerial workers	12.9	13.2	13.5	13.9	12.8	12.9	13.2	13.5	14.0	14.4	14.0	14.7
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	16+	16+	16.2	16.2	16+	16+	16.4	16.4	16+	16+	15.9	16.1
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	12.2	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.2	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.2	12.3	12.2	12.4
Farmers and farm managers, laborers, and foremen	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.4	8.4	8.6	8.7	8.0	(1)	8.7	8.9
Farmers and farm managers	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.5	(2)	(1)	(1)
Farm laborers and foremen	7.5	8.2	8.3	8.5	7.2	7.4	7.7	8.3	7.9	8.7	(1)	(1)
Clerical and sales workers	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.6	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.5
Clerical and kindred workers	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Sales workers	12.3	12.4	12.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.6	12.7	12.0	12.0	12.2	12.1
Craftsmen, operatives, and laborers, except farm and mine	9.2	9.7	10.0	10.4	9.1	9.7	10.1	10.4	9.4	(1)	9.8	10.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	10.1	10.5	11.0	11.2	10.1	10.5	11.0	11.2	11.5	11.3	11.2	9.2
Operatives and kindred workers	9.1	9.5	9.9	10.1	9.0	9.6	10.0	10.2	9.3	9.3	9.7	9.9
Laborers, except farm and mine	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.9	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.9	8.5	(2)	(2)	10.0
Service workers, including private household	8.8	9.0	9.7	10.2	(1)	(1)	(1)	10.3	8.8	9.0	9.5	10.2
Private household workers	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.7
Other service workers	9.2	9.6	10.3	10.8	8.8	9.0	10.1	(2)	9.7	10.2	10.5	11.1

[1] Not available.

[2] Median not shown where base is less than 150,000 in 1957 or less than 100,000 in other years.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. FONG. Table XII shows that workers with more education are employed in better jobs.

In March 1962, the highest paid workers were professional, technical, and kindred personnel, who completed a median level of 14.7 years of schooling, while unskilled workers, with a median level of 8.7 years of schooling, were the lowest paid.

Data were drawn from the Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics.

From the figures in table XII, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 9 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

While the proportion of workers with less than 5 years of schooling fell during the past decade from 7.3 to 4.6 percent of the labor force, this 4.6 percent represents 3.1 million workers who are considered "functional illiterates" by the Government. See "Manpower Report," March 1963, pages 12–13. By contrast, less than 1 percent of the immigrants to the United States are illiterate.

Although the rate of unemployment is high among all young people, it is far higher for youngsters who dropped out of school before graduating. For example, 27 percent of the dropouts in 1961 were unemployed, as compared with 18 percent of the high school graduates. The high dropout rate in previous years is expected to continue into the 1970's, so that at least 7.5 million or 30 percent of all young people entering the labor force in this decade will lack a high school education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XIII showing employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts, by year of graduation or dropout, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October of 1959–61, be received and made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XIII.—*Employment status of June high school graduates not enrolled in college and of school dropouts, by year of graduation or dropout, sex, and color, and by marital status of women, October 1959–61*

[Thousands of persons 16 to 24 years of age]

Sex and color, and marital status	June high school graduates							School dropouts						
	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force	Civilian noninstitutional population	Civilian labor force					Not in labor force
		Total		Employed	Unemployed				Total		Employed	Unemployed		
		Number	Percent of population		Number	Percent of civilian labor force			Number	Percent of population		Number	Percent of civilian labor force	
	1959													
Total [1]	790	634	80.2	549	85	13.5	156	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Male	304	279	91.7	239	40	14.3	25	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Female	486	355	73.0	310	45	12.8	131	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Single	418	331	79.2	291	40	12.1	88	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Married and other marital status [3]	68	24	(4)	19	5	(4)	43	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
	1960 [5]													
Total	921	706	76.7	599	107	15.2	215	344	214	62.2	175	39	18.2	130
Male	348	308	88.5	262	46	14.9	40	165	126	76.4	102	24	19.0	39
Female	573	398	69.5	337	61	15.3	175	179	88	49.2	73	15	(4)	91
Single	473	359	75.9	308	51	14.2	114	110	71	64.5	60	11	(4)	39
Married and other marital status [3]	100	39	39.0	29	10	(4)	61	69	17	(4)	13	4	(4)	52
White	848	653	77.0	568	85	13.0	195	273	163	59.7	133	30	18.4	110
Nonwhite	73	53	(4)	31	22	(4)	20	71	51	(4)	42	9	(4)	20
	1961													
Total	916	730	79.7	599	131	17.9	186	354	239	67.5	175	64	26.8	115
Male	345	297	86.1	242	55	18.5	48	179	150	83.8	108	42	28.0	29
Female	571	433	75.8	357	76	17.6	138	175	89	50.9	67	22	(4)	86
Single	482	392	81.3	326	66	16.8	90	119	75	63.0	55	20	(4)	44
Married and other marital status [3]	89	41	(4)	31	10	(4)	48	56	14	(4)	12	2	(4)	42
White	814	651	80.0	545	106	16.3	163	283	189	66.8	134	55	29.1	94
Nonwhite	102	79	77.4	54	25	(4)	23	71	50	(4)	41	9	(4)	21

[1] Data not available by color.

[2] Not available.

[3] Other marital status includes widowed and divorced persons, and married persons with spouse absent.

[4] Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.

[5] Data include Alaska and Hawaii beginning with 1960 and are therefore not strictly comparable with data for 1959.

Source: President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XIII shows that dropouts have significantly higher rates of unemployment than high school graduates.

While the unemployment rate for high school graduates in 1961 was a high 17.9 percent, the comparable rate for youths who had dropped out of school was a very high 26.8 percent.

Data was taken from the President's 1963 Manpower Report.

From the figures in table XIII, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 10 showing graphically what I have introduced. It also contains a chart showing school grades of youths leaving before high school graduation.

In addition to the monetary value of an education, the underlying philosophy of the Peace Corps well illustrates the point: the United States sends skilled, professional and technically proficient persons to developing nations whose economic and cultural levels may thereby be lifted and improved. The great success of this Peace Corps idea abroad may be said to operate with equal success in the reverse—that skilled technicians and knowledgeable persons from other countries can and have helped improve the American economic and cultural levels.

There is no doubt that every educated immigrant admitted into the country adds immeasurably to our economic and social wealth. The training of professional and technical workers is a costly undertaking and represents a substantial national economic investment.

It has been estimated that it costs $35,000 to raise a child and send him through college. If this estimate is correct, then the immigrant scientists and engineers who came here since 1952 represented an investment in human capital of approximately $1.25 billion. Together with other highly trained and educated immigrants, the United States has received about $3.5 billion in human capital since 1952 because of immigration.

Thus, because a large number of immigrants to this country are fully trained when they arrive, the United States, as the receiving country, benefits greatly from the education and training acquired in the nation of the immigrants origin. Not only do they bring with them a wide diversity of knowledge, education, and training which is badly needed throughout our economy, but they also bring with them a willingness to work.

The fifth point regarding the impact of immigration on the economy is that, particularly during the coming decade, immigrants can help us make up for a shortage of people in the central age ranges, from 25 through 44. We are indeed in critically short supply of workers in this age bracket, because during the depression years of the 1930's the number of children born in the United States fell off sharply. The 1930 babies are now in the 25-to-44 age bracket, a group which normally supplies many of the skilled workers, technicians, and middle management personnel and a group relied on heavily by employers. In 1960 only about 26 percent of the U.S. population was in that age range—considered by economists the prime years of a person's working life.

Census Bureau figures show that an increasingly high proportion of immigrants admitted to the United States in recent years has been in the 25-to-44 age range.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, table XIV shows that a large proportion of immigrants, both male and female, in that period were in the 25-to-44 age bracket—about 1 million of about 2.5 million.

Source of this data is the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

From the figures in table XIV, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart II showing graphically what I have just introduced.

Mr. President, Labor Department projections for the 1960's, shown in the following table, indicate how significantly immigration could contribute to alleviate the worker shortage in the central age range:

Estimated changes in the number of workers in each age group from 1960 to 1970, with and without immigration

[In millions]

	With immigration	Without immigration
Total, all ages	12.6	11.1
Under 25	6.2	5.9
25 to 34	1.6	1.1
35 to 44	−.3	−.7
45 and over	5.1	4.8

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XIV entitled "Immigrants Admitted, by Sex and Age: Years Ended June 30, 1953–1962," be received and made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XIV.—*Immigrants admitted, by sex and age, years ended June 30, 1953–62*

Sex and age	1953–62	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Number admitted	2,599,349	170,434	208,177	237,790	321,625	326,867	253,265	260,686	265,398	271,344	283,763
Males	1,185,440	73,073	95,594	112,032	156,410	155,201	109,121	114,367	116,687	121,380	131,575
Under 5 years	117,489	7,226	8,708	9,587	14,087	15,766	11,976	11,511	12,299	13,203	13,126
5 to 9 years	95,053	6,273	7,769	8,783	12,419	13,452	9,488	8,960	8,570	9,604	9,735
10 to 14 years	75,817	4,345	5,513	6,730	9,323	9,898	7,694	7,975	7,731	8,295	8,313
15 years	13,805	732	870	1,303	1,847	1,764	1,304	1,363	1,493	1,446	1,683
16 to 17 years	33,321	1,761	2,211	3,104	4,581	4,247	3,190	3,237	3,565	3,537	3,888
18 to 19 years	45,839	2,103	2,890	4,226	6,204	5,953	4,294	4,739	4,879	5,171	5,380
20 to 24 years	154,531	7,777	10,341	13,986	20,537	20,114	13,782	15,999	15,836	16,618	19,541
25 to 29 years	184,987	11,922	15,447	17,625	23,783	23,986	17,493	17,306	17,788	18,349	21,288
30 to 34 years	144,130	9,661	13,543	14,950	19,883	19,637	12,841	12,487	12,919	13,063	15,146
35 to 39 years	98,270	6,788	8,456	9,106	12,581	12,652	8,840	9,199	9,969	9,802	10,877
40 to 44 years	72,124	5,141	6,950	8,492	11,311	9,745	5,836	5,721	5,827	6,247	6,854
45 to 49 years	56,076	3,587	4,975	6,128	8,523	7,166	4,545	5,346	5,369	5,326	5,111
50 to 54 years	37,831	2,404	3,560	3,703	5,306	4,561	3,076	3,784	3,762	3,865	3,810
55 to 59 years	24,389	1,511	2,046	2,065	3,035	2,917	2,050	2,752	2,646	2,652	2,715
60 to 64 years	14,508	830	1,107	1,100	1,433	1,579	1,268	1,772	1,801	1,756	1,862
65 to 69 years	8,897	508	636	587	813	892	737	1,168	1,187	1,218	1,151
70 to 74 years	4,600	277	309	289	407	445	390	579	592	732	580
75 to 79 years	2,295	118	159	143	209	214	176	317	294	322	343
80 years and over	1,235	99	86	109	99	130	105	129	146	168	164
Not reported	243	10	18	16	29	83	36	23	14	6	8
Females	1,413,909	97,361	112,583	125,758	165,215	171,666	144,144	146,319	148,711	149,964	152,188
Under 5 years	112,371	7,162	8,188	9,065	13,661	14,950	11,172	11,005	11,799	13,001	12,368
5 to 9 years	92,591	6,107	7,429	8,342	11,958	13,102	9,239	8,800	8,953	9,320	9,341
10 to 14 years	74,742	4,331	5,639	6,684	9,173	9,326	7,753	7,811	7,655	8,139	8,231
15 years	14,571	840	989	1,335	1,961	1,882	1,498	1,401	1,395	1,536	1,734
16 to 17 years	44,997	2,878	3,189	4,187	5,440	5,421	4,709	4,621	4,690	4,915	4,947
18 to 19 years	86,695	4,950	6,263	8,060	9,704	9,386	9,091	9,465	9,968	9,825	9,983
20 to 24 years	282,251	18,996	22,126	24,466	30,897	31,244	29,253	30,119	31,838	31,366	31,946
25 to 29 years	213,844	16,317	18,730	19,921	24,852	26,050	22,181	21,384	21,755	21,209	21,445
30 to 34 years	144,848	10,323	12,230	13,299	17,571	18,827	14,698	14,585	14,829	14,211	14,275
35 to 39 years	93,150	6,783	7,224	7,756	10,364	11,418	9,376	10,073	9,989	10,071	10,096
40 to 44 years	69,074	5,460	6,131	6,823	9,062	8,984	6,656	6,431	6,232	6,497	6,798
45 to 49 years	57,592	4,162	4,821	5,303	7,158	6,883	5,703	6,071	5,941	5,756	5,794
50 to 54 years	45,016	3,437	3,722	3,977	5,043	5,114	4,397	4,949	4,633	4,746	4,998
55 to 59 years	33,156	2,386	2,487	2,710	3,606	3,831	3,405	3,737	3,610	3,499	3,885
60 to 64 years	21,881	1,422	1,538	1,669	2,161	2,355	2,253	2,729	2,515	2,484	2,755
65 to 69 years	13,395	890	894	1,053	1,260	1,409	1,303	1,599	1,565	1,649	1,773
70 to 74 years	7,527	500	502	610	703	761	818	872	767	997	997
75 to 79 years	3,886	273	293	315	384	404	406	414	386	512	499
80 years and over	2,031	137	164	164	227	233	181	220	175	226	304
Not reported	291	7	24	19	30	86	82	33	16	5	19

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table XV entitled "Changes in Total Labor Force, by Age and Sex, 1950–75," be received and made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XV.—*Changes in total labor force, by age and sex, 1950–75*

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and sex	Actual		Projected		Change, 1950–60		Change, 1960–70		Change, 1970–75	
	1950	1960 [1]	1970	1975	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Both sexes:										
14 years and over	64,749	73,081	85,703	93,031	8,332	12.9	12,622	17.3	7,328	8.6
14 to 24 years	13,331	13,697	19,861	21,787	366	2.7	6,164	45.0	1,926	9.7
25 to 44 years	29,263	31,878	33,235	37,023	2,615	8.9	1,357	4.3	3,788	11.4
25 to 34 years	15,145	15,099	16,709	20,806	−46	−.3	1,610	10.7	4,097	24.5
35 to 44 years	14,118	16,779	16,526	16,217	2,661	18.8	−253	−1.5	−309	−1.9
45 years and over	22,156	27,506	32,607	34,221	5,350	24.1	5,101	18.5	1,614	4.9
45 to 64 years	19,119	24,127	29,128	30,510	5,008	26.2	5,001	20.7	1,382	4.7
65 years and over	3,037	3,379	3,479	3,711	342	11.3	100	3.0	232	6.7
Male:										
14 years and over	46,069	49,563	56,295	60,916	3,494	7.6	6,732	13.6	4,621	8.2
14 to 24 years	8,668	8,731	12,594	13,782	63	.7	3,863	44.2	1,188	9.4
25 to 44 years	20,996	22,394	23,003	25,671	1,398	6.7	609	2.7	2,668	11.6
25 to 34 years	11,044	10,940	11,990	14,916	−104	−.9	1,050	9.6	2,926	24.4
35 to 44 years	9,952	11,454	11,013	10,755	1,502	15.1	−441	−3.9	−258	−2.3
45 years and over	16,405	18,438	20,698	21,463	2,033	12.4	2,260	12.3	765	3.7
45 to 64 years	13,952	16,013	18,414	19,083	2,061	14.8	2,401	15.0	669	3.6
65 years and over	2,453	2,425	2,284	2,380	−28	−1.1	−141	−5.8	96	4.2
Female:										
14 years and over	18,680	23,518	29,408	32,115	4,838	25.9	5,890	25.0	2,707	9.2
14 to 24 years	4,663	4,966	7,267	8,005	303	6.5	2,301	46.3	738	10.2
25 to 44 years	8,267	9,484	10,232	11,352	1,217	14.7	748	7.9	1,120	10.9
25 to 34 years	4,101	4,159	4,719	5,890	58	1.4	560	13.5	1,171	24.8
35 to 44 years	4,166	5,325	5,513	5,462	1,159	27.8	188	3.5	−51	−.9
45 years and over	5,751	9,068	11,909	12,758	3,317	57.7	2,841	31.3	849	7.1
45 to 64 years	5,167	8,114	10,714	11,427	2,947	57.0	2,600	32.0	713	6.7
65 years and over	584	954	1,195	1,331	370	63.4	241	25.3	136	11.4

[1] Alaska and Hawaii are included beginning with 1960. The 1960 estimates for the labor force differ slightly from those derived from the monthly labor force survey because they were adjusted to be consistent with the revised 1960 population estimates published by the Bureau of the Census in Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 241.

NOTE.—Individual items may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: President's 1963 Manpower Report.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, figures drawn from table XV show that the shortage of workers in the critical 25-to-44 age bracket is expected to continue to 1970.

From these figures, I have prepared a chart which I refer to as chart 12 showing graphically what I have just introduced.

There would be 700,000 fewer workers in the 35-to-44 age group in 1970 than in 1960 if there were no immigration. But with immigration continuing at present levels, this key age group would be only 300,000 fewer by 1970.

The sixth point about the economic implications of immigration is that, by and large, adjustments in the timing of admissions of immigrants with different skills to U.S. employment levels and needs may perhaps best be handled administratively. When we are in short supply of medical technicians, for example, at a particular time and have an adequate supply of machinists, then we should adjust our immigration priorities to admit more medical technicians and temporarily suspend admission of machinists. Australia and Canada, nations which have embarked on ambitious programs of immigration, so administer their immigration, and with remarkable success.

J. L. Marion of the Canadian Immigration Office said:

> I should emphasize that immigration is for Canada an economically stimulating factor and hence we feel that some immigration is desirable even in periods of economic recession although at such times extra care must be taken to insure that the migrants are well qualified and will not enter into competition with unemployed Canadian workers.

Figures provided by the Canadian Labour Congress show that when immigration was high in relation to the labor force, unemployment was low; on the other hand, when immigration was low in relation to the labor force, unemployment was high.

Exclusions based on economic as well as social factors, administered flexibly and pragmatically, are justified. But to arbitrarily exclude skilled or gifted persons needed in this Nation merely because he is a Polynesian, a Negro, or an oriental, or because the country of his birth has a small quota—our experience under the 1952 Immigration Act has been precisely this—is to effectuate undemocratic as well as economically wasteful policies.

As the New York Times editorialized on July 25, 1963, "each immigrant's worth is best judged by personal qualities and skills, not by group stereotypes."

One of our oldest and most emotional arguments against changing our immigration laws is the fear that an increase in the number of Asian immigrants would upset the historical and cultural patterns of American life. An objective examination of the facts dispels this fear as groundless.

According to the 1960 census, the population of the United States included 464,332 persons of Japanese ancestry, twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population, 237,292 persons of Chinese ancestry, thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent; 176,310 persons of Filipino ancestry, nine one-hundredths of 1 percent; and 218,089 in a category designated "All others," including persons of Korean, Indian of the Far East, Polynesian, Indonesian, and other nonwhite ancestries except Negroes and American Indians, about twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population.

There were, then, in the United States in 1960 only 1,093,023 persons of oriental and Polynesian extraction, or sixty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent of a total of 180 million people—an extraordinarily small minority—not even 1 percent of our total population; in other words, a little more than one-half of 1 percent of our population. And as envisaged under our proposed immigration bill, the total allotment for nations of Asia and the Pacific would be 26,990, or only 10.8 percent of the total immigration annually—surely a small enough proportion, since the Asia Pacific area contains over half of the world's population.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT AND A SOURCE OF STRENGTH

Contributions of our American citizens of Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Polynesian ancestry, and others whose antecedents are native to the triangle area in the building of our country have been significant. They have achieved distinction in nearly every field of endeavor: artistic, scientific, political, socioeconomic, religious, military, financial, industrial, and otherwise.

Once thought to be unassimilable, today they are as much a part as any other ethnic group in the mainstream of American life. They have contributed economically and culturally to our Nation and are great assets in the American body politic. In addition, they serve well as bridges of understanding between our people and the peoples of Asia and the Pacific, for in sharing common ethnic origins, they are able to reach much better the peoples of the triangle area with their messages of good will, democratic freedom and individual dignity.

A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Historically, the United States is an immigrant country. The world came to regard us as a haven where freedom was to be found. Since the first settling of this land, over 40 million people have migrated to America. There is no part of our society which has not been refined by the contributions of "aliens" who have come to make their home in the United States. This is the essence of our Union. It is its strength. The unequalled economic prosperity and vigorous culture of the Nation is due to the ingenuity, resourcefulness, hard labor and ideals of people of several score of nationalities—but all American.

Oscar Handlin writes:

> Our remarkable national development testifies to the wisdom of our early and continuing belief in immigration. Our growth as a nation has been achieved, in large measure, through the genius and industry of immigrants of every race and from every quarter of the world. The story of their pursuit of happiness is the saga of America. Their brains and their brawn helped to settle our land, to advance our agriculture, to build our industries, to develop our commerce, to produce new inventions, and, in general, to make us the leading nation that we now are.

In 1959, President Eisenhower said in a message to Congress:

> The strength of this Nation may be measured in many ways—military might, industrial productivity, scientific contributions, its system of justice, its freedom from autocracy, the fertility of its land and the prowess of its people. Yet, no analytical study can so dramatically demonstrate its position in the world as the simple truth that here, more than any other place, hundreds of thousands of people each year seek to enter and establish their homes and raise their children.
>
> To the extent possible, without dislocating the lives of those already living here, this flow of immigration to this country must be encouraged. These persons who seek entry to this country seek more than a share in our material prosperity. The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts. Their real concern is with their children, and as a result those who have struggled for the right of American citizenship have, in countless ways, shown a deep appreciation of its responsibilities. The names of those who make important contributions in * * * almost every other field of endeavor indicate that there has been no period in which the immigrants to this country have not richly rewarded it for its liberality in receiving them.

To understand the message of these paragraphs, we need only point to the 15 U.S. Nobel Prize winners in physics and chemistry who were immigrants to this country; we need only to think of a few immigrants—Noguchi, a poor Japanese peasant who became one of the world's greatest scientists in the United States; Japanese artist Yasuo Kumiyoshi; Lin Yu Tang, Chinese philosopher and author; Dr. Chen Ning Yang and Dr. Tsung Dao Lee, who jointly won the Nobel Prize for Physics while engaged in research in the Princeton Institute of Advanced Studies; D. S. Saund, an Indian who was elected Congressman from California; Jiddu Krishnamurti, Hindu poet and philosopher; Wernher von Braun and the entire team of scientists whom Dr. von Braun brought with him from Germany to work for the U.S. Government at the Redstone Arsenal; England's Samuel Gompers of the labor movement; the German physicist, Albert Einstein; Ireland's Father Flanagan, founder of Boys' Town; the great Spanish philosopher, George Santayana; Hungary's journalist Joseph Pulitzer; Austrian-born Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter; Polish pianist Artur Rubinstein; the brilliant Italian atomic physicist Enrico Fermi; the great maestro of the Philadelphia Orchestra, Hungarian Eugene Ormandy—to name a few who have made notable contributions in American culture and thought. See, for example, "Scientific Manpower, From Abroad," National Science Foundation, 1962.

As a nation of immigrants, we have developed a racially heterogeneous society in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American dream a reality.

We live in brotherhood; we believe in it, for we know it has real prospect for success nationally and internationally, and it has the force of logic.

Believing in this ideal and constantly working to achieve it, we cannot but write from our books the discriminatory quota provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which give offense to many peoples of the world.

During my tour of the Far East and southeast Asia, I was asked many questions about our immigration policies. I was pressed again and again to explain the small quotas we allot inhabitants of those nations. These people feel greatly the sting of discriminatory treatment.

America's role of leadership in the free world is one of great sensitivity, and our position is hardly enhanced by an immigration policy which implies that some nationalities and some ethnic groups are less desirable members of the American family.

Many countries of Asia and the Pacific have traditionally sought more than a token of immigration to the United States. These are the countries that will play a large and vital role in determining the future course of world events. Their friendship is crucial to all those who are fighting to preserve freedom.

The problem of immigration is no longer merely a domestic issue; on the contrary, it has great international significance.

While Secretary of State in 1956, John Foster Dulles said:

> My primary concern as Secretary of State is that whatever overall quota is adopted by the Congress be apportioned equitably. Our quota restrictions should not discriminate among persons merely on the basis of their national origin, nor should the restrictions discriminate unfairly against any of the friendly nations which have an interest in common with us in the defense of the free world. The present system of determining quotas is offensive on both counts.

America's struggle with totalitarianism is a struggle to vindicate democracy's belief in the individual worth of human beings, as opposed to the totalitarian concept that individuals have no identity except as components in the political and economic structure of society.

The racial incongruities of our present basic immigration law should be deeply troubling to the national conscience.

Until the many provisions of our immigration laws which discriminate against certain national and ethnic groups are eliminated, our laws needlessly impede our struggle for global peace.

Our forebears, coming to America from all corners of the world, have worked together to transform a vast continent of wilderness and desert into a powerful bastion of freedom and opportunity.

Mr. President, our Nation is the great pilot demonstration of the most influential principles and ideals in history. Our tenets of equality irrespective of race, creed, or color have inspired freedom-loving people eveywhere to look to America as a beacon in their struggle to win freedom and independence. Our opportunity is to live up to these ideals.

Since 1924 we have come a long way in our immigration laws. Let us go the final mile in writing a fair and just law. We will then be demonstrating to the whole world that we practice what we preach, and that all men are equal under law.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the statement by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Hawaii, is a valuable contribution to the current discussions of immigration policy. This is not the first time the Senator has spoken so responsibly to the conscience of the Senate on immigration matters. But certainly it is one of his most eloquent and vigorous statements. I commend him for it, and thank him particularly for his unflinching support of legislation I introduced earlier in this session.

I was struck especially, Mr. President, by the Senator's definitive discussion of the discriminatory clauses of our basic immigration statute, and the irrational pattern of the national origins quota system. An immigration policy with different standards of admissibility for different racial and ethnic groups, a policy with unjust strictures against family unification, in short, a policy with built-in bias, should have no place on our statute books. It is contrary to our credo of democracy. It tarnishes our claimed position of world leadership.

We need a new formula for the admission of immigrants—one based on equality and fairplay, and applied without exception to the people of all nations. It is one reason I introduced reform legislation earlier this year, which, as the Senator from Hawaii points out, is widely supported in Congress and throughout the country.

Mr. President, as Senators know, the strictures and bias of our current basic statute have necessitated many special enactments in the last 10 years. The argument is made these special measures have brought refinement to our immigration policy. But have they really? I think not. For these efforts stop short of the point where a stable and permanent policy comes into question.

A brushfire approach to immigration matters does not satisfy the requirements of a useful immigration policy. The foreign policy aspect is a case in point. Despite the special enactments of the past decade, our immigration policy, a basic expression of America abroad, is still defined by the discriminatory contents of the Act of 1952.

The act is widely and unfavorably known; the exception which temporarily modify it beyond recognition and make it contemporarily workable are not. We thus suffer needless stigma, and furnish grist for the propaganda mills of Moscow and Peiping—to the detriment of this country and the ideals we cherish. Without question, our basic immigration law is at variance with the foreign policy we pursue in accordance with these ideals. The situation generates skepticism relative to America's practice of democracy.

There is no yardstick with which to measure the impact of our immigration policy upon our foreign relations and the reputation of America abroad. But it would not seem outlandish to suggest that in the long run this impact may well equal that of our economic aid programs.

Mr. President, the Senator's comments on the economic impact of immigration are most useful and valuable. He lays the facts on the line in great detail. I hope his statement is widely read and appreciated by Members of Congress and citizens in all parts of the country. The legislation already mentioned has economic value. The best data available substantiates this fact. The Senator from Hawaii points it out clearly, as others of us have attempted on other occasions.

Certainly we must attack the problem of unemployment and underemployment in this Nation. This is a high priority in President Kennedy's program. The solution lies—in part at least—in training the unskilled, in removing racial bars to equal employment opportunities, and in expanding the economy through sound tax reform and fiscal policies designed to stimulate economic growth. Selective immigration, on a new basis, can assist this growth.

It serves no useful purpose to make immigration the scapegoat for the problem of unemployment. Such reasoning only generates confusion, perpetuates our problems, creates a false issue, gives cause for doubt among our friends, and ammunition to our enemies on the claimed vitality of our democratic society.

What is being said here today reminds me of President Kennedy's words at Yale University over a year ago. They have a real relevance, Mr. President, to the current discussions on immigration policy.

> Mythology distracts us everywhere—

He said.

> We must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new difficult essential confrontation with reality.

And he is right. The presence of racial, ethnic, social, economic, and political myths—in any segment of public policy—can only stifle America's growth and keep us from broad areas of potential achievement, including that of a just and practical immigration policy.

There are morally sound and practical reasons to overhaul our basic immigration statute. The Senator from Hawaii has ably discussed some of these reasons today. And, again, I thank the Senator for his forthright discussion.

The situation lays upon the Congress and the President a responsibility to make every effort to effect reform legislation. It is part of the total effort for the security of freedom.

SEIZURE OF AMERICAN FISHING VESSELS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am a Californian and I am very much interested in hemispheric solidarity. I am a supporter of the Alliance for Progress program, and I have supported that program under the Eisenhower administration and under the Kennedy administration.

I bring some facts to the attention of the Senate which I consider deeply disturbing.

On Monday, August 19, 1963, U.S.-flag tuna vessels *Ruthie B.* and *Intrepid* were fishing approximately 38 miles off the northern coast of Peru. The *Ruthie B.* was accosted, boarded, and forced to deliver a crewmember to a Peruvian naval vessel identified as "No. 69." In addition, the patrol vessel seized possession of the ship's documents. With the crewmember as a hostage and with the ship's documents of the tuna vessel, the captain of the Peruvian patrol vessel ordered the *Ruthie B.* to follow him into a Peruvian port. Prior to this maneuver, the Peruvian patrol vessel fired across the bow of the *Intrepid.* I am also reliably informed that the patrol vessel was ordered to seize the U.S. tuna vessels *Nautilus, Lexington,* and *Hornet.* This is even confirmed by accounts in Lima newspapers. The incidents are but a few of many that have occurred in the past year. You will recall the seizures on the high seas of the tuna vessels *Western King* and *Chicken of the Sea* by Peruvian authorities in November 1962. The owners of the vessels were fined $15,000 by the Peruvian Government. The seizures also involved a shooting episode. It is my understanding that an official report on this incident was prepared by a U.S. naval attaché and members of the State Department.

In May of this year, an Ecuadoran gunboat seized two vessels, the *Ranger* and the *White Star.* This seizure was dramatized by the fact that some 20 other tuna boats fishing in the area escorted the seized vessels as they were taken into the Ecuadoran port. Despite this demonstration of solidarity and despite protests from the Department of State, these two vessels were fined over $20,000 before they were released.

Again, even while these events were taking place in Ecuador, the same Peruvian gunboat "No. 69," boarded the vessels *Freedom* and *Ruthie B.* This continuing harassment of our fleet has the fishermen who operate these vessels greatly worried that sooner or later there will be some loss of life or a boat sunk by some trigger-happy Peruvian or Ecuadoran sailor.

Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress is a two-way street. I raise my voice in the Senate this afternoon, and ask our friends in Peru and Ecuador and in all of South America to bring to a halt the harassment of decent American fellow citizens, whose vessels are engaged in tuna fishing on the high seas in this hemisphere. I intend to raise my voice again on this subject. Within a few weeks the Senate will have before it the mutual security bill. At that time I intend to go into the matter further, because the American people do not want their fellow citizens harassed by gunboats of friendly allies.

I asked the State Department in writing a number of weeks ago to bring this matter before the Organization of American States. I regret to say that the State Department declined to do so. I urge that that action be taken again. More particularly, let the Government demonstrate that we will not allow our fellow Americans to be kicked around.

ON CANCER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last May 1, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] spoke here about the specter of cancer which continues to menace the lives of millions of people in this free, progressive, and otherwise healthy land of ours.

Citing the need for an overall, well-coordinated and integrated plan to combat this dread disease, Senator KEATING also introduced Senate Resolution 133, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should call a White House Conference on Cancer to meet that need, harnessing all scientific and medical talent and knowledge in this field, as well as all resources available from private and governmental sectors.

I do not attempt to match our colleague's eloquent plea. Rather, I would merely complement what he has said by inviting the Senate's attention to an article entitled "One, Quite Small, Statistic" from the pages of the Cancer News.

The article contains the story of a young American boy who fell victim to cancer, as told by his mother. It is deeply touching, and I believe it will evoke among my colleagues a feeling of sympathy and compassion and a sense of urgency in the need for action.

Let us all remember that the U.S. Senate itself, within the last decade, lost two of its able, dedicated, and competent Members, the late Robert A. Taft and the late Richard Neuberger, both of whom were victims of cancer. Let us bear the memory of this loss in mind as we contemplate the case of this unnamed American boy who, had he lived, might have looked forward to a long and happy and constructive life.

I ask that the article "One, Quite Small, Statistic" be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE, QUITE SMALL, STATISTIC

(Condensed From Cancer News)

(NOTE.—A mother who wishes to remain anonymous opens her heart, so that others may open theirs during this month's cancer drive: "I do not want the sympathy of friends," she has said. "The little children need it so much more.")

Once we were a family of four. We had two fine boys and the usual assortment of bills, problems, love, and happiness. I felt strongly, however, that there was one more child flitting around heaven just waiting to come to us. He was ours, only we didn't have him yet.

Getting him wasn't easy. Seven years of doctors, prayers, disappointments, and two miscarriages went by before we finally gave away the clothes that I had saved for him.

Then the miracle—I was pregnant again. When a little boy was born, I could find no name that meant direct gift from God, so I settled for the good name of Mark, and within me I knew him as something very special.

He was, too. This child, as he grew, awakened our family. As so often happens with a later child, he reopened our eyes and hearts to rich new depths of love and happiness. Our older boys quickly fell into the role of young fathers—learning lessons of patience, understanding, and a joyful tolerance of this young upstart who gleefully managed to keep us a bit off balance most of the time.

His first nickname was Sir Sprout, quickly followed by Sad Sack, Geronimo, then finally by Little Chum, which he loved. Whenever he awoke from a nap, some member of the family would sound tornado alert, for life was seldom peaceful as Mark learned to cope with the world. He did quite well, too. Once, when he was 2, as I picked him off the top of our upright piano, I thought, "Little boy—owner of the world." His was a will and spirit so intense and vital I hoped the world could never tame it, for to us it was as refreshing and free as a cool breeze.

Many times during those first years I looked at him—button nose, smiling mouth, quick blue eyes, blond hair—and I thought, "I'll remember you always, just like this."

He loved roly-poly bugs, puppies, hotdogs, puzzles and, most of all, trains. When he was 4 he decided to become a train driver, so he could give free rides to all little children.

Then one day, shortly before he was 5, he became ill. We were told that he had leukemia—blood cancer—and was going to die. That afternoon my husband assembled the tricycle we had hidden away for Christmas, and together we watched him happily ride it for a short while before we left for the hospital.

After 3 weeks of needles, pain, transfusions, and pills, we were able to bring him home. Then began the endless blood tests and the deadly game of trying to keep this child alive, with the one hope that a cure would be found in time.

Looking into the bright, confident eyes of a beloved child with the certain knowledge we had, listening to the pain of treatments which could not cure, watching this beautiful creation of God's slowly die—this was unbearable. But he died for a whole year, and no help came.

Our great love for this child protected him from nothing. When he cried, "Mama, help me." I could not. As his body swelled, I gave him love instead of healing medicine. As he went blind, I told him stories to ease the pain. Through the last days, as parts of his body became forever cold, I covered them with blankets. As he hemorrhaged and was racked by convulsions, I said good-by for a while. After he was dead, I closed his eyes.

So we are four again. We know once again that there is a child in heaven who is part of us. But we were fortunate enough to know him. Mark's light will shine through the rest of our lives.

Yesterday, as I shopped, I noticed on the store counter the familiar container labeled "Give to cancer." One dime lay on the bottom, and it somehow made the container seem more empty than if there had been none. I longed to reach the hearts of the people who passed it by and help them understand.

If this can help you know that your money can someday give to other children, perhaps to yours, what we were unable to give to our little boy, then Mark's light may also shine on them.—The mother of one, quite small, statistic.

CIVIL RIGHTS: A VOICE FOR RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is tragic indeed to note that 187 years after our country's independence, some of our fellow citizens are not able to participate in our way of life solely because of the color of their skin or their country of origin. All Americans who view this problem with a conscience and with a sense of humanity must realize that the patience of some of our fellow Americans has been sorely tried. Yet, if this quest for equality of opportunity and attainment of the privileges granted to all our citizens by our Republic and its Constitution is to be successful, I urge all our citizens to let the rule of reason predominate rather than the rule of force. I recognize the constitutional right of petition. My views on civil rights are those of a lifetime. I urge those who are going to exercise their constitutional right of peaceful assembly to proceed with meticulous care. It would, indeed, be a tragedy if progress which has beer so long in the making were to be damaged by the actions of a few.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has appropriately commented on this matter as follows earlier this week:

> The march to Washington, therefore, is an American cause. And its method also is thoroughly American. The Constitution safeguards the right of the people to assemble peaceably and to petition Congress for redress of grievances. The march to Washington will be a basic exercise of these fundamental rights. The freedom to demonstrate in this fashion is undeniable.
>
> With freedom, however, come its responsibilities. The civil rights movement has a tremendous responsibility both to itself and to the people of Washington and to the Congress to maintain peace and order here on August 28. Any incident or outbreak of violence connected with the demonstration could do grave damage to the civil rights cause. It would furnish a spurious but convenient pretext to the enemies of civil rights to delay or scuttle the pending legislation. It could also mean a setback for the techniques of nonviolent action which up to now have had great success in winning valued concessions to Negro rights in many parts of the country without active Government intervention.

I seek equal treatment under law for all Americans—no matter from what nation they came, no matter the color of their skin, no matter their economic condition, or religious practices.

I was particularly impressed with the comments recently made in the Senate by one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. Here is a Senator whose votes on civil rights legislation, I feel sure, will be precisely the same as those cast by myself and by many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have fought for years for legislation to assure the equality of opportunity under law for all our people.

Both Senator RIBICOFF and Senator KEATING, incidentally, made a real contribution to this great debate earlier this week when they offered a joint amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Act which would bar discrimination under Federal grant-in-aid programs. I have been glad to join with them as a coauthor of this amendment.

Senator RIBICOFF's recent remarks reiterated the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln who said in his Cooper Union address over a century and 3 years ago:

> Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

The junior Senator from Connecticut is a Democrat. The junior Senator from New York and I are Republicans. As Americans, we have not only coauthored the President's civil rights legislation now before Congress, but authored what we regard as additional and needed measures in this controversial area as well. In taking this position, we have not acted in the belief that law alone will right the wrongs of long generations. In taking this position, we have not acted in the belief that a solution promulgated in Washington will alone remedy the acts of discrimination which take place in North as well as South, in the East and West. Indeed, such discrimination must be eradicated wherever it occurs in communities throughout our land—not only against members of the Negro race, but also the Indian, who was the "first American," those of Mexican descent, of Japanese descent, indeed, all of our great heterogeneous population of 180 million.

The Senator from Connecticut has called in this Chamber for responsibility by both "white and Negro, citizen and legislator." He has recognized that while "discrimination in hiring can and must be ended" that "there must also be trained Negroes to apply for jobs." He correctly stated that it is equally indefensible to give one a job because of his race—whatever his race may be—as it is to deny him one because of it.

Mr. President, a perceptive observer of the Washington scene and student of the Senate, Mr. William S. White, has called attention to Senator RIBICOFF's excellent address in his syndicated column which was carried several weeks ago in the Los Angeles Times. Mr. White noted in part:

> For Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, has made a contribution of memorable decency and commonsense to what should be a high national dialog of self-restraint and responsibility. This national problem needs not the screams of demagogs but the sober consideration of self-controlled men honestly in search of fair and sensible solutions.

Months ago, I joined with several of my colleagues in the Republican Party in introducing the most forward-looking proposals now before the Senate having to do with the equality of opportunity in the fields of voting, education, housing, public accommodations, employment, and the administration of justice. The administration recently recommended proposals in some of these areas.

Now is the time for sound legislative progress to be made by Members in both parties acting simply as decent Americans. Let us also remember that the question of human and civil rights is not merely one of law. It is a question of morality and of conscience. To build a better America, in which all our people can actively participate, will require great exertions by each of us. This effort cannot take place in Washington alone. It must take place in every community in our land. The times require not bullheadedness or softheadedness. The times require levelheadedness and good will.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 7 and August 15, 1963, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD various editorials and other documents expressing concern about and criticism of the proposed Moscow test ban treaty. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks the following materials on this subject:

An editorial from the Dallas Morning News dated August 21, 1963, entitled "Look Who's Talking."

A front-page editorial from the Manchester Union Leader, of Manchester, N.H., dated August 21, 1963, entitled "The Death Trap."

An article by Mr. Holmes Alexander, as printed in the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., entitled "Taking a Backward Look on United States-Russian Relations." It is dated August 21, 1963.

A broadcast editorial, dated August 20, 1963, over Station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C.

A recent editorial from the Indianapolis Star entitled "What's Behind the Treaty?"

An editorial from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., of August 20, 1963, entitled "The Test Ban Tragedy."

A recent article, by Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, published in the Miami Herald, entitled "Peril Is in Believing All Is Sweetness."

A recent article by David Lawrence, published in the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., on August 19, 1963, entitled "Strange Pleas Being Lodged for Test Ban."

An article by David Lawrence, published in the Evening Star on August 20, 1963, entitled "Too Late for Senate To Advise: Chamber Believed Given No Chance for Constitutional Role on Treaty."

Research Institute Recommendations, dated August 9, 1963.

Manion Forum weekly broadcast, dated August 11, 1963, by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, entitled "The Risks Involved in the Test Ban Treaty."

An advertisement, by Robert B. Dresser, published in the Providence Journal of Providence, R.I., on August 16, 1963, entitled "The Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Should Not Be Ratified."

An editorial, by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., dated August 15, 1963, entitled "Communists Bringing Gifts."

An article by George Todt, published in the Los Angeles Evening Herald-Examiner of recent date entitled "A Chilling Document."

An article, by Bill Pugh, published in the Oakland Tribune on August 20, 1963, entitled "Knowland Would Vote Against Pact: Ex-Senator Warns Soviets Break Treaties."

An article, by David Lawrence, published in the Sumter Daily Item on August 20, 1963, in Sumter, S.C., entitled "Top Brass Afraid To Incur Disfavor on Nuclear Pact?"

An article, by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, published in the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., on August 20, 1963, entitled "Don't Trust Them—GRUENING."

An article, by Constantine Brown, published in the State, of Columbia, S.C., on August 17, 1963, entitled "Nonaggression Pact To Be Second Step: Test Ban Regarded as Meaningless."

My weekly newsletter, dated August 26, 1963, entitled "The $64 Question."

An article, by Eric Sevareid, published in the Evening Star of August 22, 1963, entitled "NATO, After Treaty Is OK'd: Lulling Our Alliance-Strengthening Effort Believed Soviet Goal in A-Accord."

An editorial, from the Evening Star of August 22, 1963, entitled "Test Ban Critics."

An article, written by Clarence E. Manion, published in the Newberry Sun of Newberry, S.C., on August 22, 1963, entitled "Test Ban Fatal to U.S. Interests."

An editorial, from the Aiken Standard and Review of Aiken, S.C., dated August 21, 1963, entitled "Seduction?"

An editorial, from the Indianapolis News of August 19, 1963, entitled "It All Fits."

There being no objection, the editorials, articles, and other documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 21, 1963]

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

A national citizens committee has been formed to support the nuclear test ban treaty. This newspaper has just received a mailing put out for that committee by a New York public relations firm. Along with a summary of arguments in support of the treaty, the mailing contained a long list of prominent citizens who have endorsed the test ban agreement and are urging the U.S. Senate to do the same.

These citizens committees—formed on both sides of every major issue—are usually much alike. Many of the names crop up time after time, and probably not many people pay a lot of attention of them. Particularly interesting about this one is the nature of the subject on which its members are offering their advice and the experience—or lack of it—in that particular field.

The test ban treaty is essentially a complicated military subject. Its success or failure of ratification will have primary effect on our national security. Though every citizen—whatever his competence in these matters—certainly has a perfect right to express his opinions, the weight of those opinions most certainly should be judged upon competence.

This particular citizens committee lists 166 sponsors. Broken down by professions, the list includes 37 ministers and religious leaders, 39 professors and educators, 20 writers and novelists, 15 business leaders, 10 playwrights and producers, 9 artists, 8 composers and conductors, 7 architects, 7 government officials, 5 poets, and 9 persons of miscellaneous background.

The list includes such well-known names as: Steve Allen, Fannie Hurst, James Jones, Elia Kazan, Dr. Martin Luther King, Archibald MacLeish, Arthur Miller, Walter Reuther, Dore Schary, Irwin Shaw, John Steinbeck, Mark Van Doren, and Roy Wilkins.

On the entire list of 166 names there is not one person known as a military leader of military authority. That's amazing, considering the nature of the subject. We're always interested in hearing what Arthur Miller, Steve Allen, or John Steinbeck has to say on any number of other issues. But on the subject of a nuclear test ban treaty, we'd rather listen to the experts—and we hope the Senate will do the same.

One of those experts, SAC Chief Gen. Thomas S. Power, has flatly opposed the treaty as "a great mistake" in testimony before the Senate. Power added that ratification of the treaty "is not in the best interest of the United States."

Several days ago, Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," took a similar view. He said the treaty could cost us our nuclear superiority over the Russians.

Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff have now endorsed the treaty, they were obviously reluctant and there is something a little bit fishy about the endorsement. A short time ago the Joint Chiefs were unanimous in their opposition to this kind of treaty. What changed their minds?

Perhaps the testimony of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, is a clue. LeMay said that if the treaty were still in the proposed stage he would recommend against it.

As a matter of fact, he did. LeMay still says there are net disadvantages to the treaty from a military standpoint, but that these may now be offset by advantages in the political field.

Just what this political field encompasses is not clear. Is it strictly the politics of international diplomacy, or does domestic politics enter in? Some months ago, the Kennedy administration and its allies in Congress raised a fuss about Pentagon generals engaged in politics—and they weren't talking about just domestic politics.

The famous Fulbright memo and followup orders by Secretary McNamara in effect told military leaders they could be seen but not heard, except on strictly military matters. All that now seems to have been changed.

[From the Manchester (N.J.) Union Times, Aug. 21, 1963]

THE DEATH TRAP

Read and shiver at the article by the famed Washington columnist, Holmes Alexander, which starts on this page today (see headline, "Better Look This Treaty in Mouth"). Learn that one U.S. Senator was so carried away by the possible nuclear test ban that he wanted to cut our arms budget $5 billion a year. Five other Senators joined him in slobbering over the illusion of peace. They fled in panic from reality.

If this is not enough to frighten any American who wants to see his children grow up in freedom and his Nation remain out of the slave pit of communism, let him consider the double-page advertisement carried last week in the New York Times and, presumably, other large metropolitan newspapers in support of the nuclear test ban. It was signed by 45 of what the advertisement describes as successful businessmen and industrial leaders who, according to the ad, were not given to wishful thinking.

Of course these businessmen have not been trained in the field of atomic or hydrogen bombs or in military strategy but, nevertheless, because they are successful in business, they would presume to know all the answers in regard to the Nation's foreign policy.

In contrast, Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb and an expert on nuclear matters, told the U.S. Senate last week that it would be most dangerous for the United States to agree to the proposed test ban treaty.

Dr. Teller has no job to protect, as have the chiefs of the armed services and the chief of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is not running for the U.S. Senate nor is he trying to help the Democratic Party build up a phony appearance of being the father of universal peace, and thus gain votes.

From Germany, Constantine Brown, the long-experienced foreign correspondent, reports that knowledgeable European observers, with an understanding of history, see a complete similarity between the proposed Moscow treaty and the one signed by the fatheaded and futile British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, with Hitler a quarter of a century ago.

Those of us who remember, shudder when recalling the silly Chamberlain standing at the airport in London, shaking his umbrella in one hand and holding the treaty in the other and saying: "Peace in our time." We remember all the American boys and the boys and families of every nation who perished during "peace in our time."

Writing from another part of Europe, Henry J. Taylor, columnist and former U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, reports the same apprehension on the part of realistic Europeans, who see the United States being sucked into a phony peace trap which, in reality, is a death trap.

Unfortunately, the average citizen in this country, busy at his job and taking care of his or her family, is indifferent, believing that our leaders in Washington know best. They should but, unfortunately, they don't.

The British leaders at Munich didn't know best, as the Britishers who subsequently died under a rain of Nazi bombs—many of them right in their own beds—found out.

U.S. leaders and British leaders didn't know best at Yalta or Teheran, as the enslaved millions of Eastern Europe now know, as every morning they awaken to another grim, endless round of futile toil as slaves of the Soviet Union.

In the end it will be average American citizens, all of us, who will pay for the present administration walking into the deathtrap of a test ban with the Russians.

This test ban will allow the Russians to continue testing in the field where they are weakest. It will prevent the United States from conducting atmospheric tests where we are weakest. It will prevent the United States from developing an adequate defensive missile which could protect us from the horror of hydrogen and atomic bombs being dropped on our homes.

Since it is we who will suffer in the end, it is up to us to make our representatives in Washington know how we feel in this matter. The average U.S. citizen understands that the Russians are playing to win and that any agreement they enter into in the meanwhile is merely a misleading tactic on the road to ultimate victory for the Russians.

Since we will suffer, let us speak out now. Write or wire your Senators who will be voting on whether or not the United States should ratify the test ban treaty. Tell them how you feel about the treaty. Tell them you don't want to be led into a deathtrap.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Aug. 21, 1963]

TAKING A BACKWARD LOOK ON UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, a senior and essential Republican in the nuclear test ban treaty debate, has in his possession volume 78, part 1, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a 29-year-old document of historic pertinance to the latest can-we-trust-Russian debate.

Back in 1933 President Roosevelt used his Executive authority to recognize Soviet Russia. The Congress had nothing to do with this decision, but in January 1934, after Roosevelt nominated William Christian Bullit to be Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., the Senate assumed the same advise-and-consent responsibility that it now has in the nuclear treaty.

The late Senator Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, did just what HICKENLOOPER has now done. Both these Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee demanded to see the correspondence between the President and Russian negotiators. Roosevelt did submit the letters in question. President Kennedy at this writing has not complied. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, now in HICKENLOOPER's possession (and read by me), contains the Roosevelt-Litvinoff correspondence which was the subject of debate in January 1934, during the 2d session of the 73d Congress. Only three Senators—HARRY BYRD, HAYDEN, and RUSSELL—have careers that span the three turbulent decades.

Vandenberg told the Senate that, while not certain he'd have voted for recognition, he felt constrained to agree that we should send an Ambassador—now that the correspondence was before the Senate.

"But," he added, "I should have declined to proceed in the absence of these all-controlling documents."

We shall see in a moment why Vandenberg believed, as HICKENLOOPER does today, such documents to be "all-controlling" in the Senate's decision to ratify the President's action. But first, let's note that Vandenberg was acting from vigilance, not from fear, in this early dealing with Soviet Russia.

"I want to make it perfectly plain," said Vandenberg, "that I am not in the slightest degree fearful of any raid by communism on America * * * But fear does not need to precede vigilance. I have been raised on the theory that vigilance is the price of liberty. Therefore, it has seemed to me that complete, effective and conclusive defense against the infiltration in America by subversive propaganda was a prerequisite to any relationships of an official nature with Moscow."

Vandenberg, a little too overconfident of his country in one respect, said he agreed with Stalin that communism could not be exported to America, yet he insisted that the Senate see for itself what pledges were given. The key pledges were contained in a letter dated Washington, November 16, 1933, from People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Maxim Litvinoff to F.D.R. It reads in its substantial part:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relationship between our two governments, it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

"1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life * * * in its own way and to refrain from interference in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States.

"2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons * * * from any act, overt or covert, liable in any way whatever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, and security of the whole or any part of the United States.

"3. Not to permit the formation or residence * * * of any organization or group * * * which * * * makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of the United States; not to form, subsidize, support, or permit * * * groups having the aim of armed struggles against the United States.

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence * * * of any organization * * * which has as an aim the overthrow or * * * the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the United States."

Such was the Soviet Union's solemn vow of live-and-let-live. It was given to the President, the Senate, and the American people at a time when we had relatively little experience in Communist trustworthiness.

But today, after nearly 30 years of Russian perfidy, the Senate has the same question before it: What good is any diplomatic arrangement with Red Russia?

[From WOKE Radio, Charleston, S.C., Aug. 20, 1963]

WOKE EDITORIAL

Regardless of whether we Americans like it or not, the U.S. Senate is going to ratify the treaty and the citizens of the United States are going to get a test ban treaty, not on the merits of such a treaty, but strictly on the power of the Kennedy administration to enforce its will on the national news media, the U.S. Congress and the witnesses appearing before congressional committees.

Even before the two members of the nongovernmental Council on Foreign Relations, Presidential appointee W. Averell Harriman and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, left for Moscow to try and "sell" the test ban treaty idea to the one that it favored, the national news media was stating that it would be ratified by the U.S. Senate. This before the treaty was even initialed or signed in Moscow. Since the actual signing of the test ban treaty, certain members of the U.S. Congress have been keeping up their barrage of victory statements, some saying that the Senate vote would be 80 to 20 in favor of the ratification. All of these gauged, evidently to sell grassroots America on the idea that this test ban treaty will avert nuclear war. The horrors of such a calamity have been overplayed in order to convince the American people that a test ban treaty is the only way to combat communism and our deadly enemy and to discourage grassroots America from sending a vocal barrage of its own in the form of letters, wires, and phone calls.

We recall that on August 13 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara reversed his earlier testimony, before South Carolina's own Senator STROM THURMOND, that the Russians have developed an antimissile system. In support of the administration's drive for a test ban treaty, McNamara told the Senate that the Communists had not developed an antimissile missile. The Defense Secretary was placed in a quandary when that great American patriot, Senator THURMOND, reminded him of his earlier testimony. So there you have a directed contradiction of what Defense Secretary had told the Armed Services Committee earlier. Anything goes, just as long as the test ban treaty is ratified by the U.S. Senate. But, the Secretary of Defense is not the only person who has reversed his testimony or conviction since the power of the administration has been turned loose on the national news media, the U.S. Congress and governmental witnesses appearing before various congressional committees. The Joint Chiefs of Staff reversed their earlier testimony that they oppose the test ban treaty. One of our military leaders said that he would have stood in opposition to the test ban treaty if he had been given the opportunity before the actual signing. One military leader has come out solidly against the treaty but others, reluctantly, have endorsed the test ban treaty, with some reservations. Yes, the power of the administration has been brought to bear on the participants in the ratification of the treaty, not on the merits of the test ban treaty, but on the power of the administration to enforce its will on those participating in the hearings.

In the Scott and Allen report of August 14, commenting on the reversal of the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, these two newsmen pointed up that "This dramatic, backstage, about-face by the top military leaders was brought about by the President's using both his personal prestige and great power as Commander in Chief. (The President told the Joint Chiefs) 'If by some chance the Senate would fail to ratify this treaty it would be the worst blow to this country's prestige since the Russians launched their Sputnik.' Repeatedly the President assured the Joint Chiefs that he would not let the treaty undermine the country's military strength."

The apparent result of the President's insistent assurance that the test-ban treaty would not be detrimental to the security of our country is the reversal of the earlier testimony by the top military leaders of our Nation. This is just another in a long list of decisions that the President and his circle of civilian "whiz kids" advisers have made, without consulting qualified people in the Government. Rather than seeking their advice before such decisions are made, the administration goes ahead and makes the commitments and then depends on its power of pursuasion.

This power of enforcing its will on the national news media, the U.S. Congress and the witnesses appearing before congressional investigative committees will give the people of our beloved United States a test-ban treaty, unless they have the will to resist the will of the administration and instruct the Members of the U.S. Senate to refuse to ratify the treaty so that we might complete nuclear tests in the atmosphere, perfect our antimissile missile and provide the necessary protection of our cities and citizens from the Russian-launched missiles.

[From the Indianapolis Star]

WHAT'S BEHIND THE TREATY?

One of the questions that will be asked when the Senate begins debating the nuclear test ban treaty is whether there are secret agreements made under the table on which the treaty was negotiated. If so, what are they?

There is an unsubstantiated report that 40 or more notes passed back and forth between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev during the negotiations. W. Averell Harriman, the chief U.S. negotiator, has said that he did not see such notes and doesn't know what was in them, if they existed.

That statement makes even more pertinent the question of whether the notes really did course back and forth. Is it possible that the treaty was negotiated by a U.S. representative who was being kept in the dark about views being exchanged directly by the two heads of state?

The question of secret agreements—and intentions—behind the treaty takes on one concrete aspect in the proposal for disposition of nuclear material which has now been advanced by the United States in the 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva. Proposed is an immediate agreement that the United States and the Soviet Union will stop making fissionable material and will transfer large amounts of stockpiled material to peaceful uses.

The proposal itself is not new; it was advanced several months ago. But there has been a most interesting change. When first offered, the proposal was that each of the two nations transfer 50,000 kilograms of fissionable material to peaceful uses. The offer now put forward is that the United States would transfer 60,000 kilograms and the Soviet Union 40,000 kilos. The figures were changed, it was said, to meet any Soviet objection that the United States has more fissionable material than Russia.

But there has never been any published Soviet reply to the proposal—not even an acknowledgment. What, then, leads U.S. officials to conclude that Russia may have such an objection? The obvious inference is that this matter has been discussed secretly.

There is still no open response from the Soviets. Doubtless they're waiting for the figures to get better.

Recollection of the test ban inspection business at this point brings a chill to the spine. The United States started out with a declaration that it would make no test ban agreement without inspection, and with a requirement for inspection of effective scope. The Soviets played a cat-and-mouse game while the U.S. requirement was whittled down and down, in a persistent effort to meet Soviet objections. At length the U.S. demand got down to an amount of inspection which would be farcical, and there finally emerged a treaty which does not mention inspection.

Will the same thing happen on the matter of stopping production and disposing of nuclear material?

The test ban treaty is declared to be the prelude to more agreements. That in itself is a most compelling reason to ask a great many questions about it. Just where do the negotiators plan to go from here?

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 20, 1963]

THE TEST BAN TRAGEDY

While Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that administration pressure was not exerted to obtain his compliance with test ban proposals, the heads of the Armed Forces display no enthusiasm for the Moscow pact.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, NSAF, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified that he would like to see the United States develop a super bomb similar to those which the Russians have exploded. Adm. David McDonald, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, warned Congress that a large-yield Soviet bomb "quite likely" would knock out communications for the Polaris submarine missile system.

General LeMay also stated that all the service chiefs believe in the necessity of adequate safeguards if the treaty is approved. He stated they could not have approved the test ban agreement unless "adequate safeguards" were contained in it to preserve U.S. readiness to resume testing. He added that as yet "no one has said that these safeguards will be carried out."

Asked who will insist on the safeguards, he said that he depended on Congress to take the necessary action.

The heads of the armed services are in a quandary. If they completely oppose the President, they will be questioning the judgment of their Commander in Chief. Personally, they will be in an intolerable spot. Furthermore, opposition to the test ban could lead the administration to take retaliatory action against a branch of the service if its chief declined to go along with the White House.

The Navy, for instance, is fighting to save its aircraft carriers. Mr. McNamara's "whiz kid" advisers want to put away these vital ships in mothballs. The Kennedy administration is quite capable of denying the Navy ships or funds in order to make the admirals understand who is the boss. This is a serious charge but the administration's ruthlessness is notorious.

The tragedy is that the Joint Chiefs are being asked to make judgments about the enemy's intentions instead of his capabilities. It is the capabilities that the Senate should consider. A guessing game about Communist intentions could be fatal to the United States.

This is not the first time that the leaders of the Armed Forces have been forced to go along with an administration in power in accepting limitations on U.S. readiness. President Eisenhower overrode military objections when he ordered a temporary test ban in 1958.

If we look back to the 1920's, we find a similar situation. The administration of President Warren G. Harding entered into naval agreements that deprived the United States of needed seapower. It also agreed to demilitarization of certain islands in the Pacific. Mr. Harding's advisers assumed that they could trust the Japanese not to fortify their islands. What happened is that the Japanese secretly built fortifications while the United States lived up to its side of the agreement. As a result, thousands of U.S. marines lost their lives in World War II, trying to seize islands the Japanese had fortified.

With the Moscow test ban agreement, the United States is making the same mistake. We are reminded of a statement of George Santayana, the philosopher, who said that nations which don't learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat the errors of the past. No one knows on what nuclear battlefields Americans will have to pay the ultimate price for today's folly.

[From the Miami Herald]

Peril Is in Believing All Is Sweetness

(By Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall)

As the U.S. Senate prepares to do its duty by the test ban treaty, it can sympathize with the pleading of the quack who was hailed before the court for selling earthquake pills.

Said the judge, sternly: "You know that your pills will not stop earthquakes."

Replied the defendant: "Can you tell me anything that will do any better?"

That the Senate will ratify the treaty is becoming pikestaff plain. Hardly less so is the fact that much of the opposition to it is worry about the wrong things.

The pact in itself does not endanger any vital interest of the United States. A simple reprieve from nuclear tests in the atmosphere contains real jeopardy for no one.

On the other hand, the agreement between the powers to proceed with the experiment doesn't usher in the millennial dawn. It's only a slight gesture in the right direction, the equivalent of quarreling neighbors agreeing to sheath one picket in a spite fence.

Let the Russian band strike up, "Love Walked In," at the signing, if the Kremlin must have its little joke. When Americans whistle the same tune, when headlines spread rumors of bigger treaties to come, when average citizens dream that the test ban presages the greatest embrace since Adam and Eve were booted from the garden, it's time to say: "Hold your hats, boys, here we go again."

Amid trial, we as a people love to believe that there must be an easy way out. Moreover, national leadership tends to encourage that illusion because it's the popular line and overglorifying achievement is one way to win votes.

But as Reinhold Neibuhr once said: "If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

The realists are Khrushchev, Mao, and the men around them. They do not change course because of any paper signed by Dean Rusk. They merely tack off momentarily in different directions. But they're headed for the same port.

Since shortly before Mr. Harriman flew to Moscow, in our press and on our platforms, there had been an upsurge of wishful speculation about how and why the quarrel with Red China is softening the Soviet view of America and the free world. Most of it leads to the happy conclusion that we may be relieved of tension as the Communist threat to the West sputters out, which is pure pollyannaism.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON put it this way a few days ago in a Seattle speech: "Khrushchev and Mao are not quarreling about whether to bury us. They are quarreling about how. The Moscow-Peiping dispute is for the highest stakes. The leadership of world communism is at issue. So are the fates of men who regard themselves as the locomotives of history. Mao and Khrushchev each desperately desires to prove that his policy for liquidating the West is best. The consequence for us may well be a period of rising danger."

In Khrushchev we are coping with as adroit and resourceful a political leader as the century has known. But whether he is building a Berlin wall or hugging Mr. Harriman, he is the same crocodile with gentle smiling jaws.

I read history eye to eye with "SCOOP" JACKSON. International peace and security derive not from a balance of power but from a certain imbalance favorable to those who really believe in peace. As in war itself, our success depends upon our margins. No expansionist power like the Soviets will ever be satisfied with this condition. They will keep on trying to alter it.

Exactly for this reason, we must stay satisfied with it. But we won't if we now start looking for syrupy options.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Aug. 19, 1963]

Strange Pleas Being Lodged for Test Ban

(By David Lawrence)

More puzzling than any of the words themselves in the pending treaty limiting nuclear tests are the strange arguments being made urging its ratification.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, who represent the military judgment on which the security of the country is customarily based, say frankly that they have had their doubts but that, on the whole, they now think the disadvantages in ratifying the treaty are outweighed by the advantages. They insist, however, that the United States not only carry on a vigorous program of underground testing but that it stay ready on short notice to resume atmospheric testing if the Soviets abrogate the treaty.

PRESSURE ON MILITARY LEADERS

All this is difficult for the average person to understand, and many Members of Congress have wondered whether political pressure has been applied to persuade the Joint Chiefs to support the treaty. In fact, in a Senate committee hearing last week, the question was asked if the Joint Chiefs responded to "pressure." This was emphatically denied. But the mere raising of the question indicates that in the back of the minds of some Senators is a feeling that the high military officers do not dare to incur disfavor. Indeed, recently a Chief of Naval Operations was not reappointed and, while it was denied that he was punished for expressing his views before Congress on a controversial issue, the idea prevails that he did disagree with the administration and paid the penalty.

The campaign to get the treaty ratified is typical of what happens when a political issue is involved, but it is not characteristic of the kind of discussion that usually takes place when purely military matters are being considered. It is doubtful whether any high military men would venture openly to question the wisdom of ratifying the nuclear test treaty.

SCIENTISTS ON OPPOSITE SIDES

Another puzzling development is the attitude of the nuclear scientists. While a large number favor ratification, it is significant that Dr. Edward Teller, often referred to as the "father of the hydrogen bomb," is vehement in his opposition. Efforts are being made by the administration to pooh-pooh his objections as of secondary importance, but his testimony—just published—has served to increase the doubts prevalent on Capitol Hill:

Dr. Teller says that testing in the atmosphere is important in order to catch up with the techniques in which the Soviets are ahead of the United States. He says that nuclear explosions in the air are the key to developing missile defenses. If the Soviets feel they are at an advantage, they can threaten attack and gain political concessions by such a threat. They could invade small countries at will, knowing they would not be risking war with the United States. So, Dr. Teller insists, tests in the atmosphere and in outer space are absolutely essential to America's future safety.

WHY DID MOSCOW REVERSE SELF?

There is considerable speculation as to why the Moscow Government reversed its previous decisions and suddenly decided to go ahead with a plan it had earlier rejected. It is suggested that the Soviet experts may be planning someday to mount a mock attack by, say, 500 missiles high over Russia and counter the attack with a display of their antimissile defense system. Dr. Teller thinks they might even invite American experts to watch the test. If the test happened to fail, the Russians would have lost only the treaty, but he thinks that, if the scheme worked, they would then be able to say: "Now you see we have an excellent defense and can absorb any attack you can send against us. There is the proof. Now please do this and that, etc."

On this point alone—inhibiting U.S. development of a missile defense—Dr. Teller feels the treaty is dangerous to the United States.

A TEST OF SOVIET HONESTY

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his testimony before a Senate Committee this week, said:

"And probably more important than purely military implications, the treaty should provide us with an opportunity to test the sincerity of Soviet protestations about their desire to explore more sweeping arrangements for preserving the peace. It provides us with this opportunity at a minimum risk.

"I do not pretend that this or any other agreement between great contending powers can be risk free. This one is not."

But the Secretary feels that America possesses the power of a devastating retaliatory attack that could destroy Russia. America can rely on that potential power, however, only as long as the Soviets do not develop a system whereby missiles from the United States or its bases on land or underwater are intercepted and nuclear materials are disintegrated in flight. That's the true worry of the scientists who disagree about approving any treaty while it halts testing in the atmosphere.

WEEKS OF DEBATE ARE PROBABLE

As for fears of "fallout," testimony has been given that these claims have been exaggerated and that the radioactive substances which drop from the air after nuclear tests have not been anywhere near the maximum limits at which the nuclear "fallout" becomes dangerous to mankind.

So the whole issue is far from clear, and probably many weeks of debate in the Senate will ensue before final action is taken.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 20, 1963]

Too Late for Senate To Advise—Chamber Believed Given No Chance for Constitutional Role on Treaty

(By David Lawrence)

The Constitution says the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties."

There is no evidence that the text of the limited nuclear test ban treaty signed in Moscow recently was ever submitted in advance to the Senate so that it could tender its "advice" before the document was signed.

There is no evidence, either, that the text was shown to all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before it was "initialed" and then signed at Moscow. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of the U.S. Air Force, told a Senate committee yesterday that "I think I would have been against" the treaty if it had not already been signed. He added that "the fact that it has been signed had an effect on me, yes," because "there might be some political disadvantage if we don't ratify it."

This frank observation indicates clearly that, once the signature of the executive branch of the Government has been affixed to a treaty, there is really no opportunity to render "advice." The Senate, for instance, can only ratify or reject. There is no chance to amend or modify the terms except by a new negotiation, which, of course, is difficult and often impractical.

So Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, Republican, was right in his speech last Friday night at the University of Wisconsin when he characterized the support of the Joint Chiefs for the nuclear treaty as a political evaluation. He said:

"And what they (the Joint Chiefs of Staff) have to say, and have said, must be weighed independent of the political decision which guided the formal statement of the Joint Chiefs. Why do I say that a political decision guided that statement? Aren't the Joint Chiefs supposed to be free of political pressure? I submit, in answer, the summation of their own report. It flatly says: 'There are military disadvantages to the treaty.' But they conclude by saying that 'the risks inherent in this treaty can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences.'

"The mention of risks, I say, is a conscientious military evaluation. The decision that the risks are acceptable is not. It is an echo of a State Department evaluation and not of one that necessarily sounds very deeply the real evaluations of our professional military men."

The official statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says pointedly that the risks inherent in the treaty can be accepted "if adequate safeguards are established." Now the debate has begun as to what the "safeguards" are and where the responsibility for providing them is to be placed. General LeMay testified that no one has said as yet what safeguards would be provided. Two Senate committees have asked that the administration provide a "bill of particulars."

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, also asked the Chiefs of the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps whether they would have approved the treaty "in the absence of these safeguards," and each replied that he would not have done so. In answer to a question from Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, Republican, General LeMay said that "if you automatically cut off the political factors, there are net disadvantages from a military standpoint," to the United States.

While the Joint Chiefs are reported to have been kept informed in a general way from time to time about the course of the test ban negotiations, General LeMay testified that he was surprised at the administration's speed in hastening the final agreement toward the end. As for voicing objections, General LeMay declared that, once the pact was "initialed" or about to be, he doubted very much "that any of us would have gone to the President at that stage of the game."

Secretary of State Rusk, at a news conference last Friday, was asked whether there was not "an unresolved difference in this Government" on the treaty, and he replied:

"I am not sure that I would call such a difference unresolved. After all, the executive branch is headed by the President of the United States."

This is tantamount to saying that, despite the military expertness of the members of the Joint Chiefs in their respective fields, they can be and are overruled by the President and by his civilian advisers who can place political experimentalism in international affairs above the necessary safeguards against nuclear advances by an adversary state.

The Senate is today presented with a "take it or leave" it proposition. The upper House of Congress, which is a joint partner with the President in treatymaking wasn't afforded an opportunity to give its "advice" before the treaty was signed. Now the treaty will have to be ratified, or else the Senate will be placed in the position of taking full responsibility for the consequences in the field of diplomacy. If, on the other hand, Russia chooses to "cheat or abrogate"—as General LeMay says might happen—it will be too late to argue about "political factors" or "net military disadvantages" of a treaty which may have put the United States behind in the nuclear arms race.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE RECOMMENDATIONS

U.S. Reds aren't waiting for the long J.F.K.-K. negotiations that lie ahead. They already know how they'll use the test ban and the "detente"—not for real peace but for more struggle.

We're taking the unusual step of quoting U.S. Communist boss Gus Hall. Reason: His words in the party newspaper, the Worker, represent the Kremlin's official instructions to U.S. Communists.

It's worth reading the following statements carefully—behind the turgid Communist jargon is a description of the Reds' three-part strategy—"popular fronts" with the peace groups, "peaceful coexistence" and intensified war on "U.S. imperialism":

"The test ban agreement is the result of the struggle of the peace and ban-the-bomb forces of all lands, including our own." (Note: The Worker is giving great prominence to peace group spokesmen, and quoting them at considerable length.)

"The concept of peaceful coexistence has enriched Marxism because it has added new and additional avenues, possibilities and tactics for the class struggle. It has not nullified the class struggle but has refreshed and raised its policies and tactics to correspond with * * * the new reality.

"Because the policies of peaceful coexistence are the most effective and telling in the struggle against imperialism, and because U.S. imperialism is the citadel of world imperialism, therefore the center of resistance to those realistic anti-imperialist policies is here. To spread the falsehood that the Soviet Union, the bastion of world anti-imperialism, places the anti-imperialist struggle as secondary is to do the bidding of U.S. imperialism. The facts of history completely destroy this falsehood."

Remember this is the "Khrushchev International" speaking, not the "Mao Tse-tung International"—the "peaceful" wing of world communism, not its "violent" one. Hall's statements show clearly what K. had in mind when he said that agreements with the West do not imply any letdown in the ideological war.

Of course, this does not mean that the peace organizations, mothers' and women's groups, etc., are Communist. That, in fact, would spoil the whole "popular front" idea. But it does mean that Moscow thinks they can be used to help drive wedges between the U.S. people and its leaders. You'll see this pattern in Europe, Japan, other spots where Red takeover isn't feasible at this time.

[From Manion Forum, Aug. 11, 1963]

THE RISKS INVOLVED IN THE TEST BAN TREATY

(Remarks by Hon. CRAIG HOSMER, Member of Congress for California)

Dean MANION. If you did not hear Adm. Chester Ward's startling speech over this network last week, then by all means send for a copy of it now. Admiral Ward is one of the world's great authorities on nuclear war strategy. He believes that if the Senate ratifies the test ban treaty with the Kremlin it will be the end of our country.

With me here this week is another top authority on nuclear weapons development. In my judgment, nobody in Washington knows more about this critical subject than Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of California. At present he is a leading member of the Joint House-Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, where he pursues an interest which began at Los Alamos, N. Mex., in 1948, when he was attorney for the Atomic Energy Commission.

My friends, we are all getting a lot of fancy managed news about this pending treaty from its proponents in Washington, but what Admiral Ward told you last week and what Congressman HOSMER will tell you now is the unvarnished truth. Listen carefully, therefore, and make use of what you hear.

Congressman HOSMER, it is a great pleasure to have you back at this microphone.

Mr. HOSMER. Thank you, Dean Manion. It is a privilege to return to the Manion Forum.

The White House, State Department Disarmament Agency and news media are telling us of the partial test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow and of its alleged advantages. Much has been said about the risks supposedly reduced or eliminated by the arrangement, but little or nothing has been said about the new risks it creates.

Unless these are understood, thoroughly assessed and balanced against the claimed advantages, it is impossible to say whether the Moscow arrangement is in the national interest of the United States, whether it is detrimental to these interests, or whether the entire affair has been a meaningless exercise in futility.

That there are risks in the partial test ban treaty, we can be sure. Unless Mr. Khrushchev is a madman, and he is not, he sees advantages for the Soviet Union and communism in it. He sees them as substantial advantages, worthy of his time and effort. He sees the treaty as advancing the Communist goal of world domination, not retarding it.

Another reason for a hard look at the risks to the free world inherent in the partial test ban treaty, is to dispel the feeling of euphoria it is sure to create. People will tend to regard it as evidencing an easy solvability of East-West relationships. Pressures will mount for concessions all along the line to achieve a detente with communism.

First, a nonaggression declaration, next a summit conference, then concessions here, there, at many points which, when taken together, will add up not to a solution of East-West relations, but to the tragic shift of strategic superiority to Communist hands.

Misconceptions already prevalent concerning the Sino-Soviet dispute amply illustrate the pitfalls of miscalculating Communist intentions. Wishful thinkers view the highly publicized Moscow-Peiping dispute as a fundamental split in Communist ranks. This is not the case. Realistically, it concerns in no way whether America and the West shall be buried. Only in dispute are the subsidiary questions of: How, and When?

The military consequences of the partial test ban treaty bear directly on these questions.

U.S. progress in high yield, 30- to 100-megaton weapons, will be paralyzed at a time when the Soviets already have achieved this capability. The United States gives up entirely its opportunity to cope by high-yield warheads with the Soviets' massive program of hardening their offensive intercontinental ballistic missile bases.

Our consequent inability to mete out destruction to Soviet military installations with more powerful warheads will decrease the credibility of our deterrent force in direct ratio to increases in Soviet base hardening. It is equivalent to cutting back our SAC air squadrons, our ICBM bases, and our Polaris submarine patrols.

As Soviet bases harden progressively, we will be left threatening only empty launching pads and indestructible fortifications. This cannot be expected to deter the Soviets from initiating nuclear war. Our only alternative under these conditions would be to threaten Soviet cities, which hardly squares with the administration's "no city" targets doctrine.

Additionally, the partial test ban will either greatly slow down or paralyze completely American progress in antimissile defense. This at a time when, according to Khrushchev, the Soviets have "solved the problem of antimissile defense." It is to be noted that past Soviet claims like this in the nuclear field have been accurate.

Their claim to having achieved the H-bomb is a notable example. When made, many in the United States scoffed. Nonetheless, it turned out to be quite accurate. The massive construction program now going on at Leningrad's missile defense sites lends credence to the estimates that the Soviets have what they claim regarding ICBM defense missiles and are installing them.

Antimissile defense capability in the hands of the Soviet Union is another way of saying our deterrent against Soviet surprise attack has weakened. It, too, is the equivalent of cutting back our SAC air squadrons, ICBM bases, and Polaris fleet. For if the warheads carried by these delivery systems can be intercepted and destroyed by Soviet defenses, they will not dissuade those in the Kremlin who are arguing for the explosive removal of the United States as the roadblock to Communist world domination.

TREATY MAY PRECLUDE OUR DEVELOPMENT OF ANTIMISSILE MISSILE

Conversely, the absence of American antimissile capability permits a Soviet first-strike, surprise attack to get through, destroy our deterrent forces before they are put in operation, and thus further reduce U.S. power to deter Soviet button pushers with a credible threat to impose unacceptable, retaliatory damage upon their country.

This situation cannot be remedied except by improvement of our antimissile capabilities. This cannot be done well, it cannot be done readily, perhaps it cannot be done at all without atmospheric testing.

Moreover, the partial test ban treaty will introduce a completely new hazard and risk to America of "surprise abrogation." This is the situation where, under the cover of the treaty, Russian nuclear weapons scientists might be put to work intensively in many clandestine laboratories behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain.

All test preparations would be made in strictest secrecy, then the Soviet Government suddenly would announce itself no longer bound by the treaty and promptly initiate an extensive series of tests.

During all this period of secret preparation, which might last for years, U.S. laboratory work would deteriorate in quality and quantity; and our capabilities for atmospheric testing would dissipate. The net effect would give the Soviets a quantum jump ahead in nuclear capabilities which might well gain them decisive nuclear superiority.

Under such conditions, America could expect at the worst a "nuclear Pearl Harbor" and at best a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

As an alternative to surprise abrogation, the Kremlin simply might direct its nuclear laboratories to concentrate exclusively on underground development of highly efficient tactical nuclear weapons. This, in secret, could include even the dreaded neutron bomb.

In any event, we do know that the Soviet Union spends 3½ times the amount spent by the United States on basic military research. This indicates an aim at developing "full spectrum" Soviet military superiority in approximately a decade. This fits well either with a "surprise abrogation" timetable or with the tactical neutron weapon development timetable.

Unless one is to be wholly and totally naive, he cannot say that any Russian ruble released from nuclear research by the partial test ban treaty will be reallocated to consumer goods production. This "refrigerator" argument simply fails to square with any past action ever taken by Communist leaders.

Put another way, we can be absolutely certain that any financial savings the Soviet Union makes by the test ban treaty will be utilized to improve its military strength relative to the United States, not to better the standard of living of its people.

We can also be certain that the relative weakening of American military might will encourage Communist leaders to intensify efforts in the cold war areas of conflict between East and West. It could even lead to easier decisions by Communist leaders to engage in limited conventional warfare.

This simply because the fearful capacity of American military strength cautions Communist leaders now against risking lesser types of conflict which might escalate into a full scale nuclear war. Weakening America's strength only makes it easier for Communists to be more adventurous in choosing actions which can escalate into nuclear warfare.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF TREATY COULD SHATTER OUR ALLIANCES

There are political consequences of the partial test ban treaty as well as military ones. Heretofore, the U.S. policy against dissemination of nuclear weapons to numerous countries has been a matter of national discretion.

The partial test ban treaty will commit us indefinite to that policy, even though future events may dictate we change it; and because of the treaty, now we will not be able to do so without abrogating it and involving ourselves in deep international complications.

With respect to our NATO allies, this freeze comes at a time when the U.S. policy against dissemination is seriously weakening the alliance. As the partial test ban treaty results in sapping our deterrent capabilities, Europeans will become less and less inclined to follow our lead. The estrangement will deepen. European defenses will weaken, and the dissolution of NATO well could follow. This, for years, has been one of Premier Khrushchev's priority objectives.

With respect to the situation in the Far East, our options in meeting the threat of emerging nuclear capabilities on the part of Red China will be seriously restricted. It will be impossible to work closely with Japan and other Far Eastern allies in creating a nuclear deterrent. The full burden of handling the Red Chinese will fall on the United States, at the very time our overall military capabilities are seriously weakened because of the treaty.

This weakening is certain to accelerate, rather than decelerate efforts of other countries to obtain their own independent national nuclear deterrent capabilities. Even if we choose to weaken ourselves, they will not. Proliferation will occur under other country's terms, not under terms which the United States might impose to make the consequences of proliferation less risky.

Dean Manion, I strongly recommend that your listeners who feel these military and political disadvantages to the United States from a partial test ban treaty outweigh the advantages claimed for it, write their U.S. Senators and urge them to vote against ratifying President Kennedy's test ban treaty.

Dean Manion. Thank you, Congressman **Craig Hosmer**, of California, for this good advice.

My friends, the Senators are getting plenty of pressure from the White House to vote for this treaty. But, after all, the Senators do not represent the White House: they represent you. They are your Senators—so tell them what you want and tell them now.

[The Providence (R.I.) Journal, Aug. 16, 1963]

THE LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY SHOULD NOT BE RATIFIED—MEANING OF "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

(By Robert B. Dresser)

The nuclear test ban treaty has been signed by the three original parties, the United States, Great Britain and Russia. The signing took place in Moscow and was witnessed by a group of U.S. Senators.

Khrushchev has expressed his delight at the signing and it has been acclaimed by our administration as a major step toward peace and toward general and complete disarmament.

CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TREATY

The preamble to the treaty itself so declares in the following language:

The three governments, the original parties to the treaty, proclaim "as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons."

Article IV of the treaty is well worth noting. It provides as follows:

"Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty 3 months in advance."

This extraordinary provision gives to each party to the treaty the right to withdraw at any time. It makes one wonder why it is regarded as so important that the treaty be signed if any party to it can withdraw at will, a right which Russia certainly will exercise if and when it suits her convenience.

RATIFICATION BY SENATE NECESSARY

It now remains to secure the ratification of the treaty by the Senate. The administration is doing everything in its power to bring this about as quickly as possible. A veritable barrage of propaganda has emanated from Washington to convince the public of the great importance of signing the treaty.

QUERIES

Does anyone really believe that the treaty constitutes a step toward peace?

Does anyone really believe that our disarming would not lead either to our destruction or our domination by Russia?

Don't the American people know by this time what Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" means?

MEANING OF "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

Statement by J. Edgar Hoover

Let me quote from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's book, "A Study of Communism," published in 1962 (p. 181):

"The overall intensification of subversive and intelligence activities against the United States reveals the underlying treachery and deceit in Khrushchev's pious statements about 'peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation.' Communists never entertain any ideas of a permanent reconciliation with non-Communists. This was cogently stated during 1962 by Mikhail Suslov, a secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when he said:

" 'Peaceful coexistence in the ideological sphere, any reconciliation, even a temporary compromise with the bourgeois ideology both in the internal and external spheres are impossible. This is impossible without betraying the interests of communism. This would mean the ideological disarmament of the Communists, the disarmament of the international working class movement.' "

(NOTE.—In Communist jargon, "bourgeois" means "non-Communist," "working class" means "a Communist Party," or the world Communist Parties collectively.)

THE 1961 REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE

In May 1961 the American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives issued a report entitled "Peaceful Coexistence, a Blueprint for Disruption."

I quote from the report the following:

"What are the immediate objectives of the Communists? How do they propose to achieve them?

"The Communists themselves have answered and reaffirmed their stand on these questions in two recent documents, reproduced at the end of this report. The first is the Communist Manifesto of 1960, which is entitled 'Statement by 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties' adopted unanimously in Moscow on December 5, 1960, at a meeting of Communist parties. The January 1961 issue of Political Affairs—theoretical magazine of the Communists in the United States—published this manifesto, calling it a 'historic document.' The second document is the report on this statement by Nikita Khrushchev, delivered at a top-level Russian Communist meeting on January 6, 1961.

"The free world once ignored the plans of Hitler as revealed clearly in Mein Kampf until it was too late to prevent World War II. We face a greater danger now. We must not ignore what the Communists now say and long have said they are going to do.

"As a hymn of hate against America, the 81-party statement has no equal. It is also a pronouncement of the current party line to Communists and their followers in all countries.

"The party line is a program of strategy and tactics that may change from time to time to meet changing circumstances. It may disguise, conceal, or restate the basic doctrines of world communism. However, the fundamental ideology called 'Marxism-Leninism' is a program for world domination and control by the Communists. It always remains constant. This is evident in the statement from repeated declarations of adherence to such ideology. Khrushchev said:

" 'If anyone thinks we shall forget about Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is mistaken. This will happen when shrimps learn to whistle.'

"Marxism-Leninism is a program of dictatorship and revolution. It teaches that the conquest of the world by communism is historically inevitable.

"What do the Communists mean by 'peaceful coexistence?' The statement answers that question:

" 'Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle. * * * The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries. Peaceful coexistence * * * does not mean conciliation of the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas.'

"The meaning of 'peaceful coexistence' is thus made clear to Communists throughout the world, though the phrase is intended to convey the opposite meaning to the people in the free world. The statement says:

" 'In the opinion of Communists the tasks which must be accomplished * * * are to stop the arms race, ban nuclear weapons, their tests and production, dismantle foreign war bases and withdraw foreign troops from other countries, disband military blocs, conclude a peace treaty with (East) Germany, turn West Berlin into a demilitarized (East German) free city, thwart the designs of the West German revanchists, and prevent the revival of Japanese militarism.'

"Our people must understand that in party jargon 'peace' means 'universal Communism,' and 'peaceful coexistence,' means 'intensification of the struggle * * * of all the Communist Parties * * * for the triumph of socialist ideas.' When this is understood, we will not be misled into Communist 'peace' movements, 'anti-imperialist' maneuvers, 'antiwar' organizations, and campaigns against our national security.

"Widespread knowledge of the Communists' tactics, strategy, and objectives is essential to national survival."

STATEMENT OF DMITRI MANUILSKI

In 1931, Dmitri Manuilski, a Soviet official and at one time the presiding officer of the United Nations Security Council, stated to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

KHRUSHCHEV'S REAL OBJECTIVE UNCHANGED

In spite of his pleasant smiles and cordial handshake the Butcher of Budapest has but one objective, world conquest, and if our Government leads us into the boobytrap set by this treaty, those responsible for so doing will deserve the bitterest condemnation of the American people.

CERTAIN REFLECTIONS

The slightest reflection leads a person to wonder what purpose this treaty serves.

Consider the facts.

Russia is arming for the purpose of conquering the world, including the United States, and not for self-defense.

The United States is arming for the purpose of defending itself against Russia and not for the purpose of attacking her.

Russia knows this.

Russia openly declares her adherence to her objective of world conquest.

In spite of this we are planning to disarm.

Does this make sense?

It inevitably means our eventual destruction or submission to Russian domination.

ANOTHER COURSE

There is another course that would avoid this dilemma.

Let us maintain a nuclear striking power so superior to that of Russia that she would never dare to attack us.

Let us sever diplomatic relations with this outlaw of civilization and deport its many agents who are stealing our military secrets and stirring up strife and discord among our people.

Let us drive the Communists out of Cuba, 90 miles from our own shore, and restore the control of that island to its unhappy people, thereby notifying the world that the Monroe Doctrine is not a dead letter.

Let us stop giving aid to the governments of Communist countries, and instead let us help the people of Communist countries to throw off the Russian yoke, which they so much desire to do. Let us not repeat our tragic desertion of the Hungarian patriots.

How else can we hope to win?

[From the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Charlotte, N.C., Aug. 15, 1963]

Communists Bringing Gifts

The Red Chinese delegates have had their Moscow debates on doctrine with the Soviets, and returned to Peking after what appeared on the surface to be a final disagreement between the two largest Communist countries.

From their capitals they are hurling insults back and forth by radio and the printed word, each accusing the other of unpardonable heresies.

This performance has inspired some incurable optimists in the West to proclaim that the Communist world is now split once and for all, and that we can take advantage of the division. One group says we should rush in and help China with massive foreign aid and build up the country as a counterbalance to the Soviet Union.

Another says Russia, being much smaller than China, must look westward for compensating strength, and as a result the United States and the Soviet Union may find themselves allies after years of enmity.

But there are still others who advise caution. Representative Dorn of South Carolina believes the whole show was phony and that the so-called split is intended merely to throw the West off guard so that a test ban treaty favorable to the Soviet Union can be established.

John Noble, who spent years in a Soviet prison camp and has written two books about it, agrees with Mr. Dorn that the split is a fake, stage-managed to confuse the West.

For our own part, we think there is fact behind both opinions. If you read the thousands of words printed in Soviet and Chinese papers and broadcast by Radios Moscow and Peking, and compare them with some of Lenin's writings, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that there is a deep rift between the two on Communist doctrine and dialectics.

But this is our red light for Western statesmen: whatever the ideological disagreements between the Soviets and the Chinese, both are still Communists. As such they are deadly enemies of the West, because they have solemnly sworn to destroy us.

In 1948 when a similar split developed between Stalin and Tito, some wishful thinkers in the West thought by building up Tito we would have an ally within the Socialist camp. Tito took our money—more than $2 billion of it—and then voted with the Soviet Union and against the United States on every major issue that came up between them in the United Nations.

Just last May he was still taking our money—millions of it—at the very moment he was having a love feast with Khrushchev on his state visit to the Soviet Union, at the end of which Tito proclaimed his unbreakable allegiance to Russia.

As a word of warning to Western statesmen, therefore, we would paraphrase Virgil's admonition about the Greeks:

We fear the Communists, even when bringing gifts.

[From the Los Angeles Herald Examiner]

A Chilling Document

(By George Todt)

"A diplomat's words must have no relation to action. Words are one thing, action is another. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water."—JOSEF STALIN, "Complete works," volume 2, page 277.

I hold in my hand now a copy of the "Korean Underground Report of July 9, 1963," which, according to Mr. Kilsoo Haan, was submitted to President John F. Kennedy. It is a chilling document. Let's examine it.

What J.F.K. did with his original copy, I cannot say. Perhaps he agreed, or disagreed, as the case might be. Likely he saw it—but may have decided to sit on it. A Presidential prerogative. Who knows?

In my case, I think this information ought to be shared with my readers. It is not classified. So why not? Read it and see what you think.

According to the Korean patriot and ace underground intelligence agent, Kilsoo Haan, the following are some important facts to be noted:

About a week before three power nuclear test ban talks began in Moscow last month, the Korean Underground Report of July 9 disclosed a preview of what was purportedly Soviet Russia's price—the conditions for an East-West rapprochement.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The report also revealed the alternative: War between the United States and U.S.S.R., possibly in this decade.

On May 1, 1963, six Russian military officers from the Soviet Union were visiting in Pyng-Yang, capital of North Korea. They revealed to six North Korean officers of equal rank these five conditions for "peaceful coexistence" between the United States and U.S.S.R.

1. The United States must withdraw completely all its military forces and nuclear weapons from Europe and Asia.

2. The United States should be the first capitalist power to recognize the East German People's Government.

3. The United States must sign the nonaggression agreements with the Socialist commonwealth nations.

4. The United States must abandon the Monroe Doctrine policy and allow the Latin American countries the right of self-determination to choose the kind of government they prefer.

5. As a sign of good faith, the United States must initiate an unrestricted trade agreement negotiation with Red China and North Korea—not later than 1965.

ARROGANT REDS

If we American "Capitalists" do not accept these proposals of the arrogant Reds, then what is our alternative? The ready answer is—war.

Of course, the Communists have already decided in advance that we are responsible for any conflict between us. As they see it:

"The determination of war in the sixties will rest on the United States and not on the Soviet Union."

Here are nine reasons why the Soviets say we two world titans may have to fight:

1. The possibility of the United States initiating a preventive war on the U.S.S.R. in the sixties is real.

2. The ruling class and the warmongers in the United States believe American security will depend on the destruction of the U.S.S.R. before 1970.

3. The warmongers are working fanatically for a monolithic control of NATO and rearmament of Germany with nuclear arms and weapons.

4. Therefore the Soviet Union is necessarily committed to war against the Republic of the United States.

5. The first military strike must be against the United States and not the NATO countries in Europe, nor American allies in Asia.

6. The Soviet Union does not intend to be caught unprepared. Hence, the preparation for nuclear war in the sixties must be given top priority.

7. To insure an early victory, the Socialist camp civil defense troops must—swiftly and jointly—occupy all the strategic cities and areas of America.

8. The Soviet war plan calls for two or more advance bases close to the United States—in addition to Red Cuba—in order to deploy civil defense troops prior to the first strike.

9. Also, the Soviet war plan calls for specialized Negro liberation civil defense units. These specialized units can and will (according to the Soviets) play a very important role to insure the Soviet camp an early victory. On this note, the report ends.

K.'S CROWBAR

According to Kilsoo Haan, Premier Khrushchev launched his peace offensive on the eve of the nuclear test ban talks, which began in Moscow on July 15, 1963. He saw in the limited nuclear test ban agreement something of a "diplomatic crowbar" to gain his first objective.

And this is nothing less than the conditions for peaceful coexistence, as revealed in the Korean report of July 9, 1963 (above).

Mr. K. put on another dramatic performance, as usual, and was a huge success from the Soviet point of view. He got his crowbar.

There should no longer be any doubt that we are facing a master chessman on the world stage today. Can we cope with him? Who on our side can give him a serious run for his money? Where is our David to stop this modern Goliath?

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Aug. 20, 1963]

KNOWLAND WOULD VOTE AGAINST PACT—EX-SENATOR WARNS SOVIETS BREAK TREATIES

(By Bill Pugh)

"I am opposed to the nuclear test ban treaty," William F. Knowland said in an exclusive interview. "I would vote against it if I were in the Senate today."

The former Republican Senate leader, now assistant publisher and editor of the Oakland Tribune, gave his opinions on many national and international problems.

"Soviet Russia has never kept its treaty obligations," Knowland said. "Look at what happened to treaties the Soviets made with Hungary, Romania, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, the Republic of China, and Bulgaria. And the Russians violated the United Nations Charter during the Korean war and again during the Hungarian revolt."

BORROW SITE

"Though there are some ideological differences between Moscow and Peiping, what is to prevent the Russians from 'borrowing' a test site inside China?

"Since Red China is not a signatory to the test ban treaty, the Russians could smile and say: 'There's nothing we can do to control our Chinese friends.' "

If this happened and the United States were forced to resume testing, the former Senator said we would stand condemned before world opinion for breaking the ban while the Russians reaped a major propaganda victory.

"To ratify such an agreement," he said, "I would insist on a foolproof system of inspection. At Geneva we started by asking for over a hundred inspections and without getting anything in return we have agreed to no inspections."

VICTORY BY REDS

The 55-year-old publisher said he thought a test ban treaty would lead the West into a nonaggression pact with the Russians and that this would be a major victory for the Communists.

"A nonaggression pact with the Reds would be a death blow to the hopes of freedom to the peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. This is exactly what the Communists want.

"The main disagreement between the Chinese and Russians is on means and not objectives," he declared. "The Russians are conducting what I call Operation Nibble. They will settle—for the time being—for half of this country and part of that one. But the Red Chinese, who are newer at this game and probably have less to lose, favor more violent methods.

"We have abrogated the Monroe Doctrine by allowing a Soviet base 90 miles from our shores. Unless we reinstate this vital policy, how can we complain when the Communists establish another base 300 or 600 miles away?"

KIND WORDS

Knowland had some kind words for the United Nations where he once sat as a delegate for the United States. He considers the U.N. to be a valuable forum where the free world can make its voice heard.

But he also had some criticism for American actions at the U.N., especially during the Korean war and the Hungarian revolt.

"In our anxiety to avoid an adverse vote at the United Nations," Knowland said, "we have at times taken positions that were against the best interests of the United States and the free world.

"In Korea we were prevented from crossing the Yalu to destroy the Chinese bases on the excuse that we might provoke the Chinese. Since we were then being provoked by the Chinese with everything they had, it is hard to see what more they could have done.

"I thought then and still think we should have fought to win the Korean war. And I feel that if we had won in Korea, we would not have many of the problems that now face us in Asia.

"The United States also should not agree to the formation of coalition governments, such as in Laos.

"In every country where we recognized a coalition government—Czechoslovakia, for example—the Communists went through the motions of representative government only long enough to gain control of the police and communications media. Then," Knowland said, "they disposed of their opposition by prison, execution, or exile."

During the Hungarian uprising, the former Senator said he thought the United States should have taken direct action to support the constitutional government headed by Premier Imre Nagy instead of leaving the United Nations to merely pass resolutions which were ignored by the Soviet Union.

CURTAIL AID

Foreign aid should be curtailed, Knowland declared, and on a rapidly diminishing basis.

"I supported and voted for the Marshall plan. But I didn't think—and I don't think anyone else did—that this was going to be a part of our national budget permanently.

"All foreign aid should not be abruptly terminated. But the United States should take a closer look at the aid program and do some substantial pruning—now.

"The Government should encourage private businesses to participate in foreign aid. Some businesses," Knowland said, "have done this. But they got into the field late and have not done as much as they should.

"Some of the original beneficiaries of the Marshall plan are now capable of assuming more of their share in this field and relieving us of part of this vast financial burden.

"We cannot afford to continue the foreign aid program indefinitely and should not be expected to."

"IFFY" QUESTION

Asked about his personal political plans, the Republican stalwart smiled and said he would have to borrow a quote from President Franklin D. Roosevelt: "That's an 'iffy' question."

"I have no plans for running for office," he stated. "I will not make a Sherman statement because I don't know what the situation will be in the future."

He noted that his many years in public service—both houses of the California State Legislature, service in the Army for 3 years, and 13½ years in the U.S. Senate—has caused lengthy absences from the Oakland Tribune, the Knowland family newspaper.

Knowland denied that he was the spokesman in California for Arizona's Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

"After all," Knowland said, "Senator GOLDWATER has said he is running only for the Senate and has not said he would seek the Republican presidential nomination. And the convention is in July 1964, and not next month.

SUPPORT CANDIDATE

"I will support the presidential candidate selected by the convention, regardless of who it may be."

Knowland indicated that hé was friendly with both GOLDWATER and New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller. When asked which he would support for the GOP nomination, he said:

"That's another iffy question. But if both GOLDWATER and Rockefeller do enter the California primary, I would support Senator GOLDWATER."

FAR BROADER

On the question of civil rights, Knowland said:

"Civil rights are far more broad than racial rights alone.

"These include the right to walk our streets day or night without danger to life, limb, or property, the right to own, manage, and dispose of property, the right to associate with friends of one's own choice, the right to have gainful employment and to stay or leave the job based upon one's own choice and judgment. These are also civil rights entitled to the protection of Federal, State, and local authorities.

"Whenever a mob can deny these rights, regardless of the composition of those who would take over the streets from their use by peaceful citizens and from the duly constituted civil authorities, we have a breakdown of constitutional government.

RESPONSIBILITIES

"It is too bad that those who have led the fight for one segment of civil rights have not equally stressed civil obligations and civil responsibilities.

"Every American citizen has the right to register and vote according to the qualifications for voting established by each of our 50 States and to do this without having discriminating standards applied to the individual applicant or voter because of race, creed, sex or color.

"Every American citizen has a right to patronize or withhold his purchasing power according to the choice he and his family make in the marketplaces of the Nation.

"By his political action and economic participation an opportunity is given to every citizen to have 'his say' in influencing events now and over the future years.

PATIENT PEOPLE

"But he has no right to ride roughshod over the constitutional rights of the rest of our citizens. No pressure group minority can impose by unconstitutional means its views upon the majority of our people without their consent. Changes can only be made through the constitutional process of amendment.

"The American people are a just people, they are a patient people, they are an understanding people and they are a law abiding people.

"But if pushed too far (as King George III, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler and Tojo learned to their sorrow) they are capable of taking the necessary political or military steps to remove the dangers to their constitutional form of government. The ballot box can and will serve the majority as well as the minority."

[From the Sumter (S.C.) Item, Aug. 20, 1963]

TOP BRASS AFRAID TO INCUR DISFAVOR ON NUCLEAR PACT?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—More puzzling than any of the words themselves in the pending treaty limiting nuclear tests are the strange arguments being made urging its ratification.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, who represent the military judgment on which the security of the country is customarily based, say frankly that they have had their doubts but that, on the whole, they now think the disadvantages in ratifying the treaty are outweighed by the advantages. They insist, however, that the United States not only carry on a vigorous program of underground testing but that it stay ready on short notice to resume atmospheric testing if the Soviets abrogate the treaty.

All this is difficult for the average person to understand, and many Members of Congress have wondered whether political pressure has been applied to persuade the Joint Chiefs to support the treaty. In fact, in a Senate committee hearing this week, the question was asked if the Joint Chiefs responded to pressure. This was emphatically denied.

But the mere raising of the question indicates that in the back of the minds of some Senators is a feeling that the high military officers do not dare to incur disfavor. Indeed, recently a Chief of Naval Operations was not reappointed and, while it was denied that he was punished for expressing his views before Congress on a controversial issue, the idea prevails that he did disagree with the administration and paid the penalty.

The campaign to get the treaty ratified is typical of what happens when a political issue is involved, but it is not characteristic of the kind of discussion that usually takes place when purely military matters are being considered. It is doubtful whether any high military man would venture openly to question the wisdom of ratifying the nuclear test treaty.

Another puzzling development is the attitude of the nuclear scientists. While a large number favor ratification, it is significant that Dr. Edward Teller, often referred to as the "father of the hydrogen bomb," is vehement in his opposition. Efforts are being made by the administration to pooh-pooh his objections as of secondary importance, but his testimony—just published—has served to increase the doubts prevalent on Capitol Hill.

Dr. Teller says that testing in the atmosphere is important in order to catch up with the techniques in which the Soviets are ahead of the United States. He says that nuclear explosions in the air are the key to developing missile defenses. If the Soviets feel they are at an advantage, they can threaten attack and gain political concessions by such a threat. They could invade small countries at will, knowing they would not be risking war with the United States. So, Dr. Teller insists, tests in the atmosphere and in outer space are absolutely essential to America's future safety.

There is considerable speculation as to why the Moscow government reversed its previous decisions and suddenly decided to go ahead with a plan it had earlier rejected. It is suggested that the Soviet experts may be planning someday to mount a mock attack by, say, 500 missiles high over Russia and counter the attack with a display of their antimissile defense system.

Dr. Teller thinks they might even invite American experts to watch the test. If the test happened to fail, the Russians would have lost only the treaty, but he thinks that, if the scheme worked they would then be able to say: "Now, you see we have an excellent defense and can absorb any attack you can send against us. There is the proof. Now please do this and that, etc."

On this point alone—inhibiting U.S. development of a missile defense—Dr. Teller feels the treaty is dangerous to the United States.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his testimony before a Senate committee this week, said:

"And probably more important than purely military implications, the treaty should provide us with an opportunity to test the sincerity of Soviet protestations about their desire to explore more sweeping arrangements for preserving the peace. It provides us with this opportunity at a minimum risk.

"I do not pretend that this or any other agreement between great contending powers can be risk free. This one is not."

But the Secretary feels that America possesses the power of a devastating retaliatory attack that could destroy Russia. America can rely on that potential power, however, only as long as the Soviets do not develop a system whereby missiles from the United States or its bases on land or underwater are intercepted and nuclear materials are disintegrated in flight. That's the true worry of the scientists who disagree about approving any treaty while it halts testing in the atmosphere.

As for fears of fallout, testimony has been given that these claims have been exaggerated and that the radioactive substances which drop from the air after nuclear tests have not been anywhere near the maximum limits at which the nuclear fallout becomes dangerous to mankind.

So the whole issue is far from clear, and probably many weeks of debate in the Senate will ensue before final action is taken.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Aug. 20, 1963]

"DON'T TRUST THEM"—GRUENING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Much to President Kennedy's pained surprise, the nuclear test ban treaty is being sharply challenged by an unexpected critic.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, veteran liberal, is bluntly questioning the reliability of the pact in view of Russia's long and voluminous record of broken and violated agreements.

Specifically pinpointing this caustic accusation, GRUENING is cited the Soviet's persistent illegal invasion of U.S. fishing waters.

These violations are occurring off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. They are particularly numerous and flagrant in Alaskan waters. GRUENING, Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, and other congressional and State authorities have repeatedly appealed to the White House and State Department for help, but to little avail.

A few formal complaints have been made to Moscow—comparable to a tap on the wrist—and that's about all.

With the submission of the nuclear test ban treaty to the Senate for ratification, GRUENING is using Russia's persistent fishing violations to question whether the Kremlin can be trusted to abide by the pact.

In a telegram to the President reporting further fishing infringements, GRUENING hotly declared:

"I find it difficult to see how we can be asked to approve a treaty which implies friendly relations with Russia when the Russians are continually violating international law and other treaties respecting our waters."

GRUENING also demanded that vigorous measures be taken against Soviet violators, as follows:

"When the Russians were pulling up Alaskan crab traps, I urged you to send a couple of destroyers to prevent this continued violation of our waters. It is not enough to report these incidents and make diplomatic protests. These violators should be arrested and brought to trial, and this cannot be done with the inadequate naval and Coast Guard equipment now available. The Russian fishing boats are actually faster than any Coast Guard or naval vessels now in Alaskan waters."

Representatives CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, and PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, also are denouncing the Soviet's numerous fishing violations and contending they cast grave doubts on signing agreements with the Reds.

"Since the beginning of the Communist regime in Russia," said HOSMER, "a calculated course of insincere negotiations has been pursued wherever and whenever it forwards the goal of world domination. In its 44-year history, the Soviet has signed over 2,000 agreements with non-Communist governments. It is safe to say that those remaining unbroken by the Kremlin are only those which expediency has not yet dictated to breach.

"Recently the American Bar Association's Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives had this to say: 'During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjon, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words. All this talk led to 52 major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them.'"

Representative ROGERS, testifying before the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee, detailed numerous instances of Soviet vessels violating U.S. territorial waters along the Florida coast.

"What are the operations of these Russian trawlers?" said ROGERS. "Writing in the Navy publication 'Proceedings,' Comdr. Bernard Kassel states that the trawler fleet is used for purposes ranging from commercial fishing to outright espionage. * * * Whatever the purposes these Soviet vessels have in this hemisphere, it is not in our national interest to allow them to continue their operations as they have."

TREATY FALLOUT

A large number of the letters coming to the White House in favor of the nuclear test ban treaty are being sparked by a new lobbying organization whose members include the curious combination of Norman Thomas, perennial Socialist candidate for President, James Wadsworth, New York Republican and former U.N. ambassador, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, noted baby expert. In an appeal sent to more than 75,000 throughout the country, the organization is urging, "Write three letters or telegrams as follows: To President Kennedy and to both your Senators." Recipients of this appeal also are being asked to get their "friends and neighbors" to do the same. * * * One of the censored deletions in the testimony of Dr. Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb, was his statement that there is no clearcut knowledge the Russians are not prepared to perform extensive underground nuclear testing. The noted scientist warned that to believe the Russians are incapable of doing that would be highly dangerous. He also pointed out underground tests can be conducted in Russia in an inconspicuous manner. There was no explanation why the Kennedy administration blue-penciled this Teller statement. He said nothing the Russians don't know, and there is utterly no reason the American people shouldn't know it. No military secrets of any kind are in these remarks. * * * Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, Iowa, senior Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, doesn't think much of President Kennedy's writing style—which his admirers highly acclaim. While questioning Secretary Dean Rusk, at the hearings on the test ban treaty, HICKENLOOPER noted that the President's message to the pact contained more "don'ts" than "do's." Said HICKENLOOPER, "I wish I could find as many does it do's as I can find don't it do's."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Aug. 17, 1963]

NONAGGRESSION PACT TO BE SECOND STEP—TEST BAN REGARDED AS MEANINGLESS

(By Constantine Brown)

BONN.—Discussion of the "second step" has quickly followed the signing of the test ban treaty in Moscow. This step is the old Rapacki plan of a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact nations which the Kremlin has been touting for years.

When the proposal was first made by Poland's Foreign Minister Rapacki, it was rejected by the United States and her Western allies as phony.

High ranking Germans do not know whether to admire the diplomatic skill and the patience of the Soviets or to wonder at the gullibility of the policymakers in Washington and London.

It is pointed out here that the atomic test ban means very little, if anything, as a means to world peace. Not too long ago there was a 10-month moratorium by gentleman's agreement on nuclear testing except for underground tests. Then, without a by-your-leave, Russia exploded its most powerful 50-megaton-plus bomb.

The gentleman's agreement has now been made formal and is called the first step in a general and complete disarmament.

Thus Mr. Khrushchev, by merely signing what may turn out to be a meaningless test ban, is about to achieve the main diplomatic objective: a phony nonaggression agreement in which his East German puppet will be allowed to participate formally as a member of the Warsaw bloc and by which it will obtain informal recognition by the United States and Britain.

The explanation from Washington that the United States and Britain need not give their formal assent to East Germany signing and thereby do not recognize the Soviet-occupied part of Germany as a legitimate state, does not go down too well in West Germany. The argument that the partition of Germany is a fact and it might as well be realized is not relished by the Germans.

Their reasoning behind this is that so long as the goal is a freely united Germany—no matter if the goal continues for 50 years or more, the Germans on both sides of the Iron Curtain will have hope. And no government of West Germany wants to take that hope from the people.

It is feared that both the Moscow treaty and the nonaggression Rapacki plan will remove that hope from all Germany if East Germany becomes a party to any East-West agreements.

The chancellor-designate, Ludwig Erhard, who will take over from Adenauer in October, is more inclined toward the policies of Washington and London than those of Paris. He and Foreign Secretary Schroeder are known for their strong leanings toward the Anglo-Saxon bloc.

But even Adenauer and Erhard have misgivings about future proceedings because of German public opinion which already is alarmed over any deal which may make permanent the partition of Germany.

There is nothing the Germans would like more than to reduce their military establishment. There is nothing the German industrialists would like so much as to do business with Russia today. Peace in our time means as much to the Germans at is does to Americans and British. They have had a bellyful of war—not only was their nation devastated and partitioned by the victors, but Hitler brought them the deepest humiliation.

All the same, there is an intense feeling of uneasiness and concern not only in this political capital of the Bundesrepublik but throughout the country over the inescapable prospect that the Rapacki plan is the basis of the negotiations between Washington and London and Moscow.

And this, they fear, will lead to the permanent dismemberment of the German peoples who live "one portion free and one portion slave" as the result of the Yalta agreement—a repeat performance for Mr. Harriman who drew up the Yalta draft with Molotov in 1945.

THE $64 QUESTION

(Weekly Newsletter by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, Aug. 22, 1963)

Testimony on the Moscow test ban treaty, both in public and secret sessions, reveals that there is one awesome question on which the whole issue precariously hangs. The question: Do we dare risk the entire national security of the United States on the validity of our official intelligence estimates?

All of the intelligence experts admit freely that our intelligence is poorest on what is happening in the Soviet Union and in Red China. By comparison, Cuba is an open book. Our official intelligence estimates do not have a history that exactly inspires confidence. Consider the record.

When the Soviets came up with the atomic bomb, it was a complete surprise to the United States. Official estimates took the position that the Soviets could not master the atomic bomb before the mid-1950's, but they tested on August 19, 1949.

In the fall of 1949, just after the Soviets detonated an atomic bomb, the United States was considering whether to develop a thermonuclear weapon. The official intelligence estimate, even after being fooled by the Soviets on the atomic bomb a few weeks earlier, said the Soviets could not develop the thermonuclear weapon until the late 1950's. All the scientists, except one, agreed with the estimate, and opposed U.S. construction of a thermonuclear bomb. The one exception was Dr. Edward Teller, who, in October 1949, urged that if the United States did not hurry with the development of the H-bomb, the Soviets would get one first. Fortunately, President Truman decided against the official estimate and with Dr. Teller's lone scientific opinion. The estimate was wrong; Dr. Teller was right. We exploded a thermonuclear bomb on October 31, 1952; the Soviets followed on August 12, 1953, with a hydrogen bomb explosion.

When the Communists invaded South Korea in June 1950, the United States was caught off guard. Official intelligence estimates took the position that it wouldn't happen. On the basis of those estimates, U.S. military forces had been withdrawn from the area, making the attack possible.

When the Soviets launched Sputink I in October 1957, the United States was caught by complete surprise. Official intelligence estimates had let us down again.

Along in 1958, official intelligence estimates said the Soviets had a multitude of ballistic missiles, and thus was born the "missile gap." It was such a scare that it became a major issue in the 1960 presidential election. It then turned out that the whole estimate was phony; the estimates were wrong, and the "missile gap" was a fraud.

On September 19, 1962, an official intelligence estimate was issued which took the position that there were no Soviet missiles in Cuba, and that the Soviets would not put any missiles in Cuba. This one got disproved in a hurry. Now it is admitted that missiles were in Cuba when the estimate was written.

The official estimates now admit that the Soviets are ahead of us in some fields of nuclear technology. They also admit that we don't have much hard information on which to base our estimates. In the areas of technology where we have the most information, official estimates admit the Soviets are ahead; in areas of technology where we have the least information, official estimates assume that the United States is ahead.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, who knows something about our intelligence methods in this field, has little confidence in our intelligence estimates. He stated that if the treaty were not already signed, he would recommend, don't sign it.

Gen. Thomas Power, who commands the Strategic Air Command, and is even closer to the problem, says the estimates are wrong, and that it's far too dangerous to sign the treaty. The Soviets might well have a clear superiority in technology now. Gen. Bernard Schriver, who commands our missile development, says he can't do his job properly if the treaty is ratified.

Dr. Teller, who has the best experience in the nuclear field, and who has a history of making correct judgments, says the intelligence estimates are wrong.

What is the difference? If the treaty is ratified, and any significant part of the estimates is wrong again, the United States is finished. Russia will have us hands down in the nuclear field, and the only choice that would be left to us then is surrender or be wiped out.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 22, 1963]

NATO, AFTER TREATY IS OK'D—LULLING OUR ALLIANCE-STRENGTHENING EFFORT BELIEVED SOVIET GOAL IN A-ACCORD

(By Eric Sevareid)

The extreme rightwing in American politics is not likely to prevail in the debate over the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia, in spite of the respectable doubts of such open-minded men as Senator JACKSON, in spite of the clear truth that the treaty by no means implies the end of the worldwide contest with aggressive communism. The long reach of history is accomplished by such short, often unpremeditated steps; and this seems to be one of those times when it is better to move than to stand, however impossible it may be to identify the next move after that. What we are engaged in with Russia is a game of poker, not chess.

Before this current argument is over, the United States will have again demonstrated to the world that if there is any basic flaw in the American world stance it is a leaning toward trust rather than distrust, a deep seated predilection toward lowering our guard, not toward rigidity and ingrained hostility, in spite of the clamorous, guilt ridden claims of all those groups which arrogate to themselves the desire for and the label of peace.

No, if from here on we are led into policy errors by reason of domestic pressures, it will not be the pressure of the overly suspicious rightwing minorities but the pressures of the leftwing minorities who persistently equate American with Communist responsibility for the dangerous condition of the world—those groups which would have us detach from Vietnam because its Government happens to be nasty in rightwing fashion and which would have us draw closer to Cuba because its nasty regime happens to be leftwing. Brutality, itself, does not bother these groups; they are concerned only with the words of the torturer's chant as he wields the whip.

One can hope. One can hope, for example, that the tenor and outcome of this debate on the test treaty will demonstrate to these groups and their counterparts in Europe that, while the "military industrial power structure" of which General Eisenhower warned is, indeed, worth worrying about, it is not determining the foreign and defense policies of this country. The President and the Secretary of Defense are doing that, as much, if not more, than ever.

One can hope that the tranquilizing effect of the treaty agreement will not put the efforts to reorganize and strengthen NATO, already half paralyzed, into a coma. It is entirely permissible to believe that this prospect was one of Premier Khrushchev's various purposes in welcoming the agreement.

One can hope, also, that behind Mr. Khrushchev's corollary desire to isolate the nuclear ambitions of the Chinese, there is not something far more immediate and frightening than a doctrinal disagreement about the worth, in Communist terms, of risking big war. With no hard evidence to support it, the nagging thought persists that the Chinese may have been pushing, not merely for doctrinal support from Moscow, but for support of Chinese plans for immediate, overt aggressions, whether against Vietnam or South Korea or Formosa or India. It may not be merely the Chinese ideologs who left Moscow in disgust last month; it may be also representatives of the Chinese General Staff.

It is a scary notion. Whether or not aggressions do come on such a dire and drastic scale, what we cannot realistically hope for is an end to small-scale Communist aggressions in the Far East or an end to Communist-created alarms and excursions in Latin America, which could easily snowball. The coexistence Mr. Khrushchev has in mind is an intensely competitive coexistence, both political and economic. There is no reason, whatsoever, to think that he, any more than the dogmatic Chinese, has revised his declaration that "socialism is working for history," which is a program of action, as distinguished from the old Marxist slogan that "history is working for socialism," which was an intellectual abstraction.

It is generally and historically true that tyrannies do pass away in time, that doctrines are always diluted by realities, that any church militant tends to become, with prosperity, the established church. And it is also true that these processes, like all social processes, move through their cycle at a faster rate than they did before the modern revolution in communications. But the worst mistake we could make would be to assume, on the evidence of the test ban treaty, that these processes have come to completion, even with the Russians. With the Chinese, of course, the processes have scarcely begun.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 22, 1963]

TEST BAN CRITICS

From the public's point of view, bewildering is the only word which describes the clashing expert testimony on the nuclear test ban. Bewildering—and disturbing.

The testimony of the opponents, though it tends to shake confidence, has not altered our belief that, all things considered, the treaty should be ratified. The preponderance of the testimony still is on the side of ratification, and the benefits still seem to outweigh the risks.

All of this, however, does not get us around the fact that only a a tightly closed mind could remain indifferent to the views expressed by such as Dr. Teller, General Power, General Schriever and now Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., head of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. The adverse testimony of these men cannot be answered by allusions to bushy eyebrows, theatrical tones, vested military interests, etc. There is no doubt in our mind that these critics are just as sincere and just as devoted to the interests of the United States as are the treaty advocates. And, generally at least, they have access to essentially the same information. How is it possible, then, for Defense Secretary McNamara to say that this treaty serves the best interests of America, while Dr. Teller tells the Senators that if they ratify the treaty they will be "giving away the future safety of this country?" How can Mr. McNamara say that we are not behind the Russians in our knowledge of antimissile missiles, while Dr. Teller insists that the Russians are far ahead in this area?

One explanation may be that this conflicting testimony, as far as the published accounts go, is opinion testimony. Specific information and facts which support the opinions have not been made public. Perhaps these things have been spelled out for the benefit of the Senators, who must make the final judgment on the treaty. Certainly, we hope so. And we also hope that all the information and facts, consistent with true security, will be made available to the people. Otherwise, the public mind will be bedeviled for years to come by doubts as to whether we have traded our security for a possibly vain political hope. Perhaps these doubts can never be entirely removed. But they should be assuaged to the extent that this is possible.

[From the Aiken (S.C.) Standard and Review, Aug. 21, 1963]

SEDUCTION?

The unanimous opposition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the test ban treaty, hitherto reported as set forth in a secret paper signed by all members, appears to have evaporated—but, like the mushroom cloud, not without some fallout.

In a full day of testimony before the combined Senate Foreign Relations, Senate Armed Services and Joint Atomic Energy Committees, Defense Secretary McNamara declared U.S. military might to be "manifestly superior to the Soviet Union's," said he expected U.S. nuclear superiority to continue and gave his "unequivocal support" to the treaty.

Next day, following their boss, the Joint Chiefs echoed their support of the treaty, if not quite so unequivocally. As their spokesman, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, JCS Chairman, reported to a closed session of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee that our ranking military commanders now find the test ban "compatible" with military security in spite of "disadvantages and risks."

"The risks inherent in this treaty," the Joint Chiefs statement concluded, "can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences."

Under questioning, General Taylor assured the subcommittee that his arm had not been twisted. It was not immediately known whether Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay—on record as opposing any ban on testing in space, in the atmosphere, underwater or underground—has an arm in a sling. Adm. George W. Anderson, then Chief of Naval Operations, who agreed with him, has since walked the plank.

Irrespective of administration pressure, however, the overriding concern expressed by the Joint Chiefs for stabilization of international relations, a peaceful environment, and resolution of our differences suggests that they should be working for Mr. Rusk rather than Mr. McNamara. Their proper concern is with those disadvantages and risks. And it would be a sad state of affairs if our top commanders have been caught in the psychological trap that Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations and JSC member, regards as the treaty's greatest danger.

"We could easily be seduced," he told a group of Congressmen, "into thinking a scrap of paper is a great step toward peace, permitting us to relax our weapons research, resort once again to wishful thinking, and so, once again, betray ourselves."

[From the Newberry (S.C.) Sun, Aug. 22, 1963]

Test Ban Fatal to U.S. Interests

(By Clarence E. Manion)

By the time this column is read, the U.S. Senate will probably have ratified the latest nuclear test ban treaty, in spite of our past experience with the Communists and their treaties and in spite of the statements about treaties which the Communist leaders have frequently made. Remember—they say treaties are like piecrusts—made to be broken.

At least 5 months before the Soviets broke the last test ban treaty, it was predicted that they would do exactly that, just as it was predicted more than a year in advance that the Russians were converting Cuba into an offensive base. No one paid too much attention to either of these predictions until they came true.

Both of these disasters could have been averted if our leadership had been willing to face the proven facts of Communist duplicity and malevolence.

Now, we are again refusing to face the facts in connection with the new test ban treaty. Because we want to believe the Soviets are sincere, we are proceeding as though we know they are. Ratification of the treaty will freeze the United States in second place to Russia in the technology of strategic nuclear weapons. Our strike capability will be reduced rapidly compared with the Soviet's mushrooming superweapon strength, and it will take the Soviets about a year and a half to put us in a position of being unable to retaliate against the military power of the Russians' superweapons of annihilation. This could mean the end of our country.

Managed news out of Washington confused the American people into forgetting what Khrushchev did in atmosphere cheating, and what our own President said then about protecting us from another such fraud. In November 1961 Mr. Kennedy said: "If they fooled us once, it is their fault; but if they fool us twice, it is our fault." We are now giving them another chance.

Some Senators will doubtless feel that the necessity for adequate safeguards against major cheating by the Soviets can be obviated by the United States maintaining a "readiness to test." But the President himself has said that this is not possible. On that subject, the President said in 1962 that for us to maintain such a readiness to test "is not merely difficult or inconvenient; we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

If we could be sure that the test ban agreement contains inspection provisions which the President says are essential to protect against secret prolonged preparations for sudden massive atmospheric tests; or that it contains enforcement provisions, or penalties for cheating, to prevent the Soviets from betraying the second test ban exactly the same way that they betrayed the first one, then we might take some comfort from the signing of this treaty and its ratification.

We should, however, remember that the Soviets first ban-breaking tests enabled them to multiply their nuclear explosive efficiency many times over their previous efficiency, while our own superiority was at a standstill. During the period of the previous test ban treaty, the Soviets were obviously working furiously to get ready for the powerful weapons testing that occurred when they broke the treaty by exploding their big bombs in the air. During that same period, our own testing was stopped according to the treaty and we had nothing in process of manufacture that would be any defense to these superweapons developed by the Soviets while the test ban was in operation.

There is not much that any one of us can do about the new test ban treaty, except to keep constantly in our minds the results of the last one.

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 19, 1963]

It All Fits

The gaudily publicized "split" between Red China and the Soviet Union has occupied students of world communism for many months.

Ordinarily, such public quarreling is counter to intelligent strategy. Allies seek to present a common front to the enemy, to project an impression of maximum strength. Yet the Communist world seems intent on doing exactly the opposite. Why?

It is obvious the Communists never embark on any large venture without some clear object in mind. They clearly would not publicize their disagreements if they did not think something was to be gained by letting the rest of the world in on the dispute. Precisely for that reason, Westerners who see the "split" as a great plus for our side would be well advised to proceed slowly.

The "why" of the split has begun to become more apparent in recent weeks, with the advent of the nuclear test ban treaty. The Soviet Union is a signatory, but Red China is not. It is assumed Peking will not join in the agreement because it is so much more "belligerent" than Moscow—supposedly the major reason for the "split."

The projection of Sino-Soviet differences into the area of nuclear testing suggests a number of reasons for the copious publicity the Reds have given to their own "problems." If the free world accepts at face value the argument that Khrushchev is more conciliatory than Mao, then the idea of the Kremlin actually abiding by such a treaty seems less unreasonable.

Even more importantly, the "split" allows Moscow to disclaim responsibility for Peking's actions—including atomic tests. Since Red China is not a signatory, nuclear activity inside its boundaries will not be construed as a violation of the treaty. If the "split" is less real than Moscow has made it seem, the Soviets could test in China and blame the whole thing on Mao and company. The recent buildup about Red China's supposed readiness to launch its own nuclear program implausible on the face of it, would dovetail nicely with such a venture in deception.

Thus Khrushchev, thanks to the vast publicity he has built up around the "split," could have the best of both worlds: He could continue to advance Moscow's nuclear program while American testing stopped; and his own "reasonableness," compared to the irreconcilables in Peking, would commend him even more warmly to the West as a man of peace. Indeed, the more he stepped up the "Chinese" tests, the more lovable he would appear by way of contrast. As a cold war stratagem, it would be near perfection.

Whether this is happening or not, no one can say. In the world of Communist deception few things are certain. The problem is that, given the nature of the Communists, we have no way of being certain it is not happening. We have gullibly accepted (a) the existence of the "split," (b) Red China's alleged nuclear capability, and (c) the idea that Khrushchev in fact wants peace. Combined with the nuclear test ban treaty, those three items provide Moscow a perfect opportunity of burying the West for good.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 20, 1963, Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, the distinguished director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, appeared as a witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and testified on the proposed ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty. It is my understanding that Dr. Strausz-Hupé was unable to come before the committee until late in the afternoon, and, therefore, did not have an opportunity to present his complete statement to the committee, but had to insert most of it into the record of the hearings. Because of this, Dr. Strausz-Hupés remarks received very little public and senatorial attention; so I feel that it would be appropriate to have his remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Strausz-Hupé raised some very valid questions about the treaty and proposed some specific Senate reservations to the treaty "should the Senate finally determine that the treaty, in the present international strategic context, poses no unacceptable risks to American security."

I am confident that anyone who studies the testimony on the entire subject of test ban effects on our national security, as that testimony was submitted to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, will find it very difficult to conclude that the risks posed by this treaty to our national security are acceptable.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Strausz-Hupé's testimony on the Moscow test ban treaty be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Nuclear Test Ban Agreement

(A statement submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, by Robert Strausz-Hupé, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., August 20, 1963)

Mr. Chairman and Senators, I have favored the signing of an appropriate three-environment treaty since it was first proposed by the West in August, 1957. My exceptions to the treaty concluded on July 25, 1963, in Moscow, stem from considerations other than its generally stated purposes which for some time have been met in the absence of any treaty. My exceptions concern the following aspects of the Moscow treaty.

First, the symbolic place which the treaty holds on the agenda of U.S./U.S.S.R. issues.

Second, the implications of the treaty for U.S. security.

Third, the motivations which may have led the Soviet Union to sign the treaty.

Fourth, the effect of the treaty on our allies.

Fifth, the range of "next steps" that might be taken.

1. A SYMBOLIC ACT

The President of the United States has stated eloquently why he has sought the nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union and Great Britain. Last Monday, the Secretary of State told this committee: "We have no basis yet for assuming a fundamental change in Soviet objectives. We are still engaged in a contest between free choice and coercion."

The treaty formalizes a condition that has obtained for many months. The treaty does not bear upon the substantive issues which divide the United States and the U.S.S.R. Thus the conclusion of the treaty signifies a symbolic act which endows an existing condition with moral-legal sanction. In diplomatic history, symbolic acts of this kind which precede an understanding on concrete issues, have been proven empty of positive beneficial consequences. It would have been better diplomacy to seek agreement on such concrete issues as, for example, Berlin, Cuba and Laos, and to cap the concrete achievement with a symbolic act.

The claims staked out for the treaty by its makers appear, in view of the treaty's modest substantive content, exorbitant. The judgments of history are exceedingly slow in the making. It seems unduly hasty to seek to anticipate a verdict which history cannot give before several decades have gone by. The immoderate statements intended to dispel doubt about speedy ratification of the treaty have created an atmosphere which does not favor the prudent and sober deliberation on the provisions of the treaty.

2. SECURITY IMPLICATIONS

Last week, Secretary of Defense McNamara presented a picture of American strategic superiority and argued that the treaty will enable the United States to retain indefinitely its margin of nuclear superiority. We are told, too, that the Soviets still seek to prevail over the West, if possible—and I find this quite easy to believe. Apparently, the Soviet leaders, by subscribing to the treaty, are voluntarily relegating themselves to a position of prolonged inferiority in respect to strategic nuclear capabilities. This is difficult for me to believe. In fact, it is hard to conceive of any responsible government actually accepting a second-place position vis-a-vis its major political adversary. Such an attitude is especially out of keeping with the character of the Soviet leaders as we have come to know them over the years.

I do not claim any military or technical expertise, but I have read the arguments pro and con, official and unofficial. It would appear that the Soviet leaders do not find our stressing of our military superiority uncomfortable; in fact, the Soviet press claims the same advantage for the Soviet Union.

Different military considerations than those thus far emphasized, might have influenced the Soviet decision to conclude the treaty. The Soviets may have concluded that the continuation of atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons will not increase the security of the Soviet Union of its selective military advantage over the United States. The treaty, for example, would preserve Soviet superiority in very large weapons which Soviet military experts consider important.

The Soviet leaders, rightly or wrongly, believe air and missile defense to be crucially important and are making a determined and expensive effort to forge ahead in this area. Furthermore, they do not believe that "defense is provocative," but consider it an essential element in a rational military posture. Nor do the Soviet leaders continuously labor the technical difficulties of missile defense.

These considerations suggest one possible motive for the Soviets' decision to enter, at this time, the same kind of partial test ban agreement which they have rejected in the past. That is the motive of employing the test ban as a means of reducing the strategic superiority which the United States undoubtedly now possesses in numbers and kinds of offensive forces, by building on the existing Soviet knowledge to insure destruction of our missiles in the atmosphere.

It is improbable that the Soviets, who have shown themselves to be proficient strategists, have decided to concede military superiority to the West and thus to withdraw from the contest for world power. I hope, therefore, that the Senate of the United States will probe carefully the possibilities which inhere in this treaty of a "flanking maneuver" by Soviet planners of military technology. After all, deception has long been an element of Soviet operational doctrine. Unfortunately, we have no way of determining how the Soviets really view the projected strategic balance.

3. SOVIET MOTIVATIONS

The Soviet leaders have stressed the political benefits of the treaty. The dominant themes of Moscow broadcasts over the past several weeks have been:

(1) Contamination can be ended.

(2) The treaty is but a first step, not the end of the arms race.

(3) The treaty conforms to the vital interests of the peoples of the world.

(4) The treaty shows that cooperation can be achieved; the policy of peaceful coexistence, therefore, has been shown to be right.

(5) The treaty leads to solution of other issues, lessens tensions, and reduces dangers of nuclear war.

(6) The treaty is the result of the persistent socialist struggle for peace, by various means as, for example, the peace movements.

(7) Nuclear proliferation in terms of number of states is dangerous. (The theme, incidentally, has been mentioned, only once, and then in negative reply to the Chinese).

(8) The treaty is opposed by American "madmen" (Senators Goldwater and Thurmond, and former Vice President Nixon); militarist West Germans; extremist French; and incorrect Chinese.

Only one reference was made to economic difficulties of all nations. But contrary to views expressed abroad, the Soviet Union emphatically denied that it was led to signing this treaty because of internal economic pressures.

Insofar as proliferation of nuclear weapons is concerned, I am satisfied that this subject played a distinctly minor role in Moscow's deliberations. For one thing, neither France nor China represents a military threat to the Soviet Union. For another, the Soviets do not believe that any treaty can restrain a government determined to develop its own nuclear power. For their part, the Soviets intend to retain monopoly control over nuclear weapons within the Communist bloc and, therefore, will do nothing to help the Chinese to acquire an independent nuclear force. However, they have not taken drastic measures such as the abrogation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty, in order to prevent the Chinese from acquiring nuclear power.

Because of the obvious Soviet lack of concern with the alleged military consequences of the treaty, we should examine it, first and foremost, as a part of the Soviet political strategy. Outside the immediate security requirements, the present purpose of Soviet nuclear power is to impress the world that the destruction of the United States is within Soviet means: Soviet control over a well-developed nuclear arsenal prevents the West from launching an all-out war, and, by putting fear in the hearts of the "imperialists", Soviet nuclear power paralyzes the Western responses to Communist encroachments.

As the July 13 reply of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Chinese Communist Party indicates the difference between Peiping and Moscow is really minor:

"It is the task of the working class and the Communist parties to make maximum use of the now available opportunities for the peaceful road of a Socialist revolution, not connected with a civil war, and to be at the same time ready for the nonpeaceful method, for the armed suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie."

The Chinese contend that the West; i.e., the United States, is already paralyzed by this fear and advocate a more aggressive strategy. The Soviets are not sure whether the United States is as yet psychologically incapable of using nuclear weapons anywhere. At any rate, they want to play their game more prudently. While exploiting American fears of nuclear war, they keep in front of us an alternative of peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes thereby attempting to soften the American will to resist. Moreover, the Soviets have never renounced general nuclear war as an instrument of Communist policy.

The Western role in this whole episode may have been limited in advance by Soviet decisions. In fact, the first step would never have been taken if it were conditioned upon substantive matters to which the Soviet Union has never agreed and would not now agree.

4. EFFECT ON ALLIES

According to published reports emanating from domestic and foreign sources, several of the principal allies of the United States have taken umbrage at being informed on the details of the treaty negotiations, either late or not at all. There can be no doubt that several of our most important allies have subscribed only reluctantly to the treaty and look upon it and the consequences to which it might give rise, with scarcely concealed misgivings. It is difficult to reconcile the manner in which the treaty was negotiated and concluded with the concept of partnership which, in other forums, the United States propounds vis-a-vis its Atlantic allies. It is too early to determine now the degree to which the treaty might weaken the sense of urgency animating the NATO alliance.

It is no secret that U.S. relations with France are not quite what they have been for many years—and what they ought to be in view of that country's crucial position in Europe. While we may not now be in a position to improve them—although that should be one of our long range objectives—the ratification of the treaty in opposition to the policy of the French Government may aggravate an already dangerous split.

The treaty should be subject to careful scrutiny in respect to our relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. The problems faced by the German Government are unique. Germany is the only country in Europe still divided, 18 years after the end of the war, the only country whose former capital still remains an isolated island in an area under Soviet occupation, and the only country specifically prohibited—by international treaty voluntarily acceded to—from manufacturing, possessing or testing nuclear weapons in any form whatsoever. One of the tenets of her policy has been a refusal to recognize the puppet government of the Soviet zone as a "German government." While we may aver that the signature of the Ulbricht government does in no way constitute a de jure or de facto recognition, we must take cognizance of German objections, as well as of the imponderables of the German situation, fraught with problems of internal politics, as well as those of her realtions with other members of the Atlantic Community.

The danger exists that a relaxation in East-West tensions might result in a weakening of the NATO alliance.

5. OTHER IMPLICATIONS OF THE TREATY

There is one particular clause in the treaty which stirs disquieting doubts in my mind, and that is article IV, which pertains to the right of withdrawal. The definition in article IV of "extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty * * * that have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country" is so broad as to permit any signatory to withdraw from the treaty at almost any moment it chooses. While this may seem to give equal rights to the United States and to the Soviet Union, such a symmetry exists largely on paper. There is no problem posed if the Soviets would openly violate the treaty. But a situation in which the United States may find it necessary, in the interests of its own security, to resume testing first, is another matter. Even if the executive branch of our Government came to the decision that the treaty ought to be abrogated in the interest of national security, it is quite likely that a powerful and vociferous campaign of protest would be instantly organized against abrogation of the treaty. It would enlist the support of many influential and well-meaning citizens. Our greater respect for international law would deter us from withdrawing from the treaty except under major provocation or for other valid and compelling reasons.

I have spelled out the reasons for my concern in an annex to this statement.

Inspection, the most crucial question in the long years of fruitless dialogue on arms control between the West and the Soviet Union, has been effectively sidestepped in this treaty. The crux of the problem has been Soviet unwillingness to allow the West free access to territory inside the Iron Curtain.

To many in the West, the chief villain in the disarmament debates has been the obstinate American insistence on inspection. If it were not for this American fetish, they argue, all nuclear bombs would be banned and we would have a world of peace and harmony. To be sure, one may argue that international inspection is not necessary to detect testing in the atmosphere, outer space or under water. Nevertheless, the treaty should not be allowed to provide a pattern for all future arms control agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. The reasons why I am concerned about this possible precedent are also found in the annex to my statement.

6. THE NEXT STEPS

The Moscow Treaty has been called a "first step" toward other agreements which might usher in an era of peace and good feeling. In his television address of July 26, President Kennedy maintained that the test ban treaty did not mean the end of the cold war. Nevertheless, the President called the treaty "an important first step; a step toward peace; a step toward reason; a step away from war." President Kennedy listed some of the proposals for the reduction of international tensions which might follow the signing of the treaty: safeguards against surprise attack, safeguards against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and measures to guard against radioactive fallout.

The Moscow Treaty cannot be divorced from other negotiations, reported to be taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, at first, insisted upon a package, namely the test ban and a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw pact group. According to semiofficial statements, the United States feels restrained in negotiating such a pact by the scruples of some of its allies. In the absence of any official statements denouncing the Soviet proposal as pointless as well as redundant, the American public and world opinion might infer that the U.S. Government is indeed giving serious consideration to the conclusion of such a pact.

This proposal, together with a proposal for the unification of Germany on the basis of direct negotiations between the Bundesrepublik and the German People's Republic and the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Central Europe was first advanced in a note by Foreign Minister Gromyko on May 25, 1959. The proposal was then indignantly rejected by the Western allies. Its resuscitation in what appears to be the familiar Soviet piecemeal method must give rise to deep concern. The very consideration of such a pact by the United States can be taken as an admission that the United States bears a burden equal to that of the Soviet Union of responsibility for the cold war. Since it was the Soviet Union which, according to innumerable official U.S. statements, has engaged in aggressive acts and the United States has abided by the spirit of the United Nations Charter, the United States' acceptance of the Soviet proposal would mark the abandonment of a long held position. Of course, were such a proposal submitted to the United States upon completion of the Soviet withdrawal from Eastern Europe and the liquidation of the Soviet military position in Cuba, the basis of a meaningful pact might be laid. Thus far, the Soviet record does not encourage the expectation that the Soviets will relinquish their conquests, or for that matter abide by a nonaggression pact. Within the last 25 years, the Soviet Union has concluded several nonaggression pacts and broken them. Although our press contains much news of and hints at a loosening of the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe, Soviet military power still dominates all East European satellites, and each satellite is ruled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders. Thus the association of the treaty with a nonaggression pact raises questions that are even more important than those raised by the treaty itself.

Of particular significance is the last paragraph of the agreed communique, announcing the proposed treaty at the Moscow meeting, which speaks of "other measures, directed at a relaxation of tension." The desirability of such a goal in dealing with an opponent who seeks world domination and frequently speaks of "burying" us is questionable.

Both Secretary McNamara and General Taylor warned about the dangers of Western euphoria that will inevitably follow the treaty. One effect of the treaty will be to raise popular expectations concerning the East-West struggle. A groundswell of hope may induce Western Governments to offer further concessions to the Soviets. Such pressure undoubtedly influenced the British Government to sign the treaty. The treaty's preamble pledges the signers to seek "general and complete disarmament," a utopian concept, the implications of which have never been spelled out.

This treaty will mean many things to different people. To many Europeans it will appear as a manifestation of the sincerity of the Soviet Union to establish an effective and equitable arms control arrangement; many will see in it a gradual abandonment by the Soviets of the core of the Communist political ideology: a deterministic world design. Prime Minister Macmillan, for example, described Russia as "moving away" from communism.

Lenin urged Communists to utilize those circles of the bourgeoisie which gravitate toward pacifism. Khrushchev, in his notable speech of January 6, 1961, restated the value of using pacifists in the West to bring pressure to bear on their Governments and to undermine the force opposed to Communist expansion.

While it may be true that many people in the world will welcome the ratification of the treaty, it is not sure that they will credit the United States with motives which reflect credit upon its fortitude under international pressures. That American negotiators traveled to Moscow and subsequently followed the Soviet Premier to his vacation retreat in the Crimea is likely to be taken by many people as a concession. In the eyes of that large segment of the world opinion which does not see us as we see ourselves, the overeagerness with which the treaty has been sought, do not jibe with the image of a great power supremely confident in the righteousness of its case against a notorious aggressor. Soviet propaganda appears to credit Soviet firmness and the rightness of Soviet policy for the Moscow Treaty. It should be recalled that at the Belgrade Conference of Neutrals (Sept. 1–6, 1961) the participants refused to condemn the Soviet Union for having broken the test moratorium. Some refrained from censuring the Soviets because they feared retaliation. It is not difficult to persuade a large segment of neutral world opinion that we, too, acted from fear rather than more elevated considerations. Perhaps, the Soviet 60-megaton bomb has already played its role in softening up Western elites.

There is a widespread concern, particularly in the United States, that any refusal to sign the treaty will incur the wrath of "world opinion". We must not allow ourselves to be swayed by unfounded assumptions concerning its importance. The Soviets consistently disregard it when it runs counter to their interests.

One of the greatest dangers arising from the treaty, therefore, is the psychological atmosphere which it has generated; the notion that we are now somewhat moving, step by step, into a new period of detente. But as far as we can see ahead we are going to be under the pressure of revolutionary forces, be it Russian communsim trying to extend its empire wherever that is possible, be it Chinese communism attempting to build up its own empire wherever conditions permit, be it revolutionary nationalists of various stripes lashing out against the West and their neighbors in other corners of our world.

The failures of our policy in the past have been due to our ever-renewed desire to relax after every great effort, to our hankering after a so-called condition of "normalcy" and "business as usual", to our inability to accept the necessity for vigilance and preparedness over a whole historical period. We are locked in a competitive struggle of long duration and our full acceptance of this prospect is a precondition for our ability to wage it.

SUMMATION

The treaty, as it now stands, may produce the benefits sought by the administration. At best, it is a symbolic act which may ultimately lead to settlement of other cold war problems. I would have preferred it, had the settlement of specific political issues preceded this treaty. That decision, however, rested with others. I would hope that the Senate will state its own interpretation of those articles of the treaty which impinge directly on the vital security interests of the United States.

Should the Senate finally determine that the treaty, in the present international strategic context, poses no unacceptable risks to American security, I recommend ratification with the following stipulations:

First. The Senate should require routine quarterly reports on observance of the treaty on the part of all signatories; on Soviet weapons developments; and on the state of American preparedness to resume nuclear tests. Moreover, the Senate should demand the immediate reporting of any evidence indicating either a violation of the treaty or other "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty."

Second. The Senate should stipulate that ratification of the treaty implies neither American diplomatic recognition of the German Democratic Republic, nor of any claims by the German Democratic Republic to juridical or diplomatic rights under the terms of the treaty.

Third. The Senate shall not look favorably upon any "second step" arms-control agreement which does not embody, in some practicable form, the principle of adequate, and not merely token, international inspection.

(4) The Senate should express its sense as follows: The 90-day waiting period, stipulated in article IV, refers to the formal abrogation of the treaty, but does not prejudice the right of the United States to resume testing in the three environments as soon as possible once it has determined that "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty" have placed the supreme interests of the Nation in jeopardy.

(5) The Senate should express its sense as follows: article I does not affect the use of nuclear weapons in war.

(6) The Senate should express its sense as follows: Article I, section 2, does not mean that the United States is forfeiting the option of transferring nuclear weapons, under proper controls, to its allies.

If the Senate does not accept in essence the foregoing stipulations, I must conclude that ratification of the treaty would be damaging the security of the United States.

ANNEX TO STATEMENT BY DR. ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ

Operational and other implications of the treaty

The clause in article IV, which pertains to the right of withdrawal, is not, in itself, objectionable. Given the fact that the treaty is founded upon the principle of national sovereignty and contains no provisions at all for effective international control, each signatory rightly reserves to itself the right of withdrawal. Each party polices the agreement to its own satisfaction. Each gathers its own intelligence and makes its own judgments concerning security. Each is free to withdraw, without a breach of international law, "if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

My misgivings arise out of the last sentence in article IV, which says that the withdrawing party "shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the treaty 3 months in advance." Secretary Rusk furnished one helpful clarification of this sentence in his testimony before this Committee last Monday when he said: "If the Soviet Union were to test in violation of the treaty, the fundamental obligation that is the consideration for our adherence would disappear. In that case the United States could, if it chose, consider itself released from its reciprocal obligation and could resume testing without delay." The Secretary's clarification eliminates one difficulty. But another serious difficulty remains. The situation in which the United States may find it necessary, in the interests of its own security, to resume testing first, is more difficult.

Perhaps I can best explain the reason for my concern by constructing a hypothesis which is not at all farfetched. Let us suppose that after the treaty goes into effect, the Soviets start producing AICBM's in substantial quantities, deploying them around their cities (as they are already reported to have done in the case of Leningrad), and training crews in their use. At first, American policymakers, relying upon the current estimate of our overwhelming strategic superiority, would probably deprecate Soviet efforts in the antimissile field. I would not be at all surprised if the Soviets themselves should play down the importance of the AICBM, or keep a discreet silence, until after they have made some real headway. But after 2 or 3 years, American defense experts might begin to exhibit a certain amount of concern over the possibility that the Soviets were substantially reducing the American margin of superiority. I am ready to concede that my scenario may leave something to be desired. It does not, for example, take into account other arms control agreements which may be concluded subsequently to this treaty, and which might affect the size of nuclear stockpiles or the number of missiles or the total deliverable megatonnage to be retained by each side. To be sure, in the new international climate which may be ushered in by the treaty, no one can predict with certainty what the relative military positions of the Soviets and ourselves might be 3 years from now. But that is not my point. I simply wish to suggest that there is a conceivable set of circumstances in which our Executive branch may become sufficiently worried as to conclude that the United States, in prudence, must speed up its own antimissile program by conducting tests in one of the three environments. Under this hypothesis, the Soviets have not been testing in violation of the treaty terms. They have placed the supreme interests of our country in jeopardy by exploiting fully the findings obtained from pretreaty tests. Perhaps those who drafted the treaty had some such contingency in mind when they formulated the phrase, "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty." If the United States should determine that Soviet weapons development, based presumably on the results of pretreaty tests, posed risks to the security of our Nation, I submit that this would constitute an extraordinary event related to the subject matter of the treaty, and that it would, under the wording of article IV, justify an act of withdrawal by the United States, regardless of the fact that the Soviets had not violated the treaty. But once the United States has made an authoritative determination that the supreme national interest has been placed in jeopardy, a question arises as to why 3 months should elapse before tests would be resumed. It seems to me that where national security interests are at stake, the time lapse between the decision and the testing should be limited solely by the state of our technological preparations. If, as we have been assured, the Government expects to sustain a readiness for immediate resumption, then it should resume testing as quickly as possible.

We must recognize frankly that a mandatory delay of 3 months contains a built-in political disadvantage for a democratic society such as the United States. During this period we would probably experience an acrimonious debate between those whose primary concern was preventing an exacerbation of international tensions as a result of U.S. test resumption and those whose primary concern was preserving an adequate security posture for the United States. This would be especially true in those situations—more probable than improbable—in which there would be conflicting reports about whether a violation by the Soviets had actually occurred, or whether other Soviet weapons developments posed a threat to American security. There would be endless arguments over the kind of evidence possessed by Western intelligence sources, the seriousness of the violation or other technological development, and its significance for the international strategic balance. Under these ambiguous circumstances, extremist groups all over the world would have ample opportunity to organize a massive protest against the scheduled resumption of testing by the United States, and the opponents of resumption would issue warnings that we must not outrage world public opinion by canceling the agreement. If we do ratify the test ban treaty, we should not penalize ourselves by inviting controversy after the appropriate authorities have already decided that the supreme interest of the United States has been placed in jeopardy. There should be vigorous and free debate before that determination is made; but once made, this country should not be inhibited from moving as swiftly as possible to remedy whatever deficiencies may appear in its defenses. There is little doubt in my mind that if the Soviets should ever decide to resume testing, and to bear the opprobrium of withdrawing from the treaty publicly, they will do what they did in the late summer of 1961—make the announcement on one day and test the next.

Another serious implication of the treaty is the precedent which it sets for future arms control or disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. This agreement is quite different from the one which our diplomats tried so hard to obtain at Geneva. In the Geneva talks, the central issue was international inspection, and on this issue the Soviets and the United States were not able to reach any final agreement. Hence there is no way of knowing whether the Soviets today are any closer to accepting the principle of international inspection in practice than they were 17 years ago, when they turned down the Baruch plan. Not long ago, it was argued that the chief utility of the projected test ban consisted in the fact that it would establish an invaluable precedent for future disarmament agreements, for it would involve the acceptance by Soviet leaders of international inspectors on their soil. Presumably, in adhering to a test ban, the Soviets would be setting aside their traditional phobia of international inspectors as "espionage agents." They would be abandoning their traditional insistence upon the preservation of an excessive national sovereign exclusivism. They would be accepting, even though in modest form, the principle which the United States has insisted upon for 17 years as the basis of any arms agreement, viz, international control and inspection. American analysts have always argued that it would be much safer for the United States to conclude armaments agreements with the Soviets if the latter could be induced gradually to give up their neurotic secrecy complex and to begin opening up their closed society. We were anxious, therefore, to use the test ban agreement to establish a certain kind of precedent. But now, we have signed a test ban agreement which may establish exactly the opposite kind of precedent. Ignoring the question as to whether the absence of an inspection feature in the treaty poses any direct security problems to the United States, we should ask what it signifies for future arms agreements. We cannot fully blame the Soviets: We ourselves proposed a nationally inspected ban on atmospheric tests in April 1959, and a nationally inspected three-environment ban just 1 year ago. But even if the Soviets had accepted either of those proposals, the Senate would have been obliged to examine the significance of a shift from the principle of international inspection to the principle of national policing. We should try to understand what such a shift may portend for the "next steps." I have no way of knowing what those administration officials who have been shaping our national arms control policy within the last 2 years may now be contemplating as logical "next steps," or what proposals may have been exchanged in the post-Cuban correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, or what possibilities may have been explored by East and West in the recent Moscow talks. But you will recall that President John F. Kennedy last November 3, after Khrushchev's pledge to remove Soviet missiles from Cuba, announced that the United States would insist on international ground inspection in Cuba. However, as you know, when we were confronted by Premier Castro's refusal to allow international inspection of the wtihdrawal of Soviet missiles, the United States dropped its demand. Now we have departed from international inspection in the test ban treaty, except for a ritual mention of the principle in the preamble. Who is to say whether the "next step" might involve nuclear disengagement in Central Europe without effective international inspection and control. It would be a serious lapse from a previously held, and strongly held position, if the United States were to lose interest, for all practical purposes, in international inspection and control as an essential condition of disarmament.

COMMUNIST CONNECTIONS AND INFLUENCES IN THE CURRENT NEGRO DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 2 and 7 I placed in the Record a series of articles showing Communist connections and influences in the current Negro demonstrations, riots, and agitational efforts. On August 13, I placed in the Record police reports and other articles dealing with immorality and Communist deception and duplicity in using Negro movements and demonstrations. Today I wish to present to the Senate other tactics used by the Communists to incite and exploit racial tensions—treachery and terrorism.

The activities of Carl Braden and his wife, Anne Braden, fit the master plan of communism to use the Negroes to bring about strife and bloodshed in the United States. The Honorable Dale Alford, of Arkansas, summarized in the Congressional Record, volume 105, part 2, page 2546, the Bradens' activities with these comments:

> Traveling about the South today, distributing the doctrine of totalitarian government, is a husband-wife team by name of Carl and Anne Braden. Carl Braden is free to roam the Nation, these days, because of a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court that Federal statutes against sedition have preempted State sedition laws. Braden is now a field secretary for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, which was formed after the SCHW was revealed as a Communist front. As a Communist boss in Louisville, Ky., Carl Braden was indicted on charges of sedition in Jefferson Circuit Court, State of Kentucky. He was convicted in December 1954, subsequently sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment and fined $5,000. Evidence at the trial, with the prosecution conducted by State's Attorney Scott Hamilton, showed that Braden purchased a home in a suburban Louisville community occupied exclusively by white families and then, transferred ownership to a Negro named Wade. It was further shown at the trial that the home was dynamited on June 27, 1954, and the grand jury determined, after visiting the scene of the crime, that the dynamiting was "an inside job" perpetrated to create an incident. The prosecution maintained that Braden was the "common denominator" of the explosion. Shortly after this home purchasing and bombing incident, Carl Braden received a letter from a comrade who signed his name as "Al," otherwise unidentified in the trial record. The letter stated that the latest project of the Bradens—the Wade home acquisition—constituted a "breach in the wall" of what Comrade Al referred to as "the real estate trust." Al told Carl and Anne their project "left us breathless."

These comments of Mr. Alford are as valid today as in 1959, as the Bradens have appeared in the Negro demonstrations in Danville, Va., as late as last month.

At this point, Mr. President, to show sworn testimony of Carl Braden's Communist Party membership, I shall now read testimony taken in the Jefferson Circuit Court at Louisville, Ky., and used in evidence at his sedition trial in 1954.

Question. I hand you what purports to be a transcript of some testimony taken in the Jefferson Circuit Court, the Criminal Branch of the Second Division, of Kentucky, at Louisville, of December 11, 1954, in a case entitled *Commonwealth of Kentucky* v. *Carl Braden*, and ask you if that is one of the documents you received?

Answer. It is.

Question. Does that transcript contain any sworn testimony concerning Carl Braden and affiliation with the Communist Party of the United States?

Answer. It does.

Question. Who is the witness who testifies in that regard in that case?

Answer. The witness is known as Alberta Ahern.

Question. Turn to page 2276 of that transcript of testimony and read what that witness swore under oath in regard to Mr. Braden.

Question. Will you please state your name to the court?

Answer. Mrs. Alberta Ahern.

Question. And where do you live, Mrs. Ahern?

Answer. 2311 Payne Street.

Question. And what is your occupation?

Answer. Seamstress.

Question. Mrs. Ahern, I will ask you if you have been employed in an undercover capacity for the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Answer. I have.

Question. I will ask you, please whether or not the defendant, Carl Braden, got you into the Communist Party?

Then there was an objection, and—

The Court. No, that is leading. Objection sustained.

Very well, Your Honor.

Question. Now, you are a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. That's right.

Question. I will ask you if, of your own knowledge, the defendant, Carl Braden, is a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. Mr. Braden is a member of the Communist Party.

Question. Now, Mrs. Ahern, I will ask you whether or not you were a member of the same group or the same cell of the Communist Party in Louisville, Ky., with the defendant, Carl Braden?

Answer. I was.

Question. I will ask you, please, whether or not on July 9 of this year, 1954, you attended a meeting of the Communist Party here in Louisville? If you did, where was that meeting held?

Answer. I attended a Communist Party meeting at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Braden, 4403 Virginia Avenue, Louisville, Ky.

Question. By Mr. Hawes. Turn, Mr. Strickland, to page 2280 of that transcript of testimony and read what this witness swore under oath further in regard to Mr. Braden. I will ask you if on June 3, 1954, you attended as a member of the Communist Party a called meeting of your cell or group? Did you attend a meeting on June 3, 1954?

Answer. I did.

Question. Where was that meeting held?

Answer. It was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Braden.

Question. And who were present, please?

Answer. Mr. I. O. Ford, Mr. Carl Braden, and myself.

Now I wish to present to the Senate a résumé of the grand jury investigation on the facts concerning the explosion which occurred at 12:30 a.m., June 27, 1954, at the home of Andrew Wade IV, at Rone Court, near Louisville, Ky. This record is one of the best and most clear-cut examples of crimes committed by Communists interested in causing racial strife between Negroes and whites. It reveals the activities of highly trained saboteurs, trained to expertly detonate explosives by use of a battery, portable-type radio. This was the act of a professional by the name of Vernon Baun, who in the record shows as having served in Spain during the Spanish civil war. He was cited for contempt when he refused to answer whether he had been, or was a Communist.

I ask unanimous consent to have this grand jury report printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Résumé of Grand Jury Investigation

(The following is an outline of the facts concerning the grand jury investigation into the explosion which occurred at 12:30 a.m., June 27, 1954, at the home of Andrew Wade IV, at Rone Court, near Louisville, Ky.)

During the late winter or early spring (approximately the first part of March, 1954), Andrew Wade IV and his wife, entered into an agreement with Carl Braden and his wife, Anne, to purchase a house in what might be referred to as a predominantly white residential neighborhood of Louisville, or vicinity. The Wades are young colored people, approximately 30 years of age and the parents of two children, one being about 2 years old, and the other 2 months old. The Bradens are white people, probably in their early forties. Both Braden and his wife formerly were employed by the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, but several years ago Mrs. Braden gave up her employment and Braden severed his relationship with the paper for a period of time, but subsequently was reemployed.

Apparently the Bradens and Wades endeavored to buy one or more houses, but for some reason were unable to complete the transactions. Finally, however, during the month of May 1954, the Bradens represented to a real estate dealer, Mr. Hudson, who was the representative of a Mr. Rone, and also to Mr. Rone that they, the Bradens, desired to purchase a house which recently had been constructed by Mr. Rone. They stated that they desired to move into the house and went so far as to discuss with the real estate agent the possibility of listing their home on Virginia Avenue, in Louisville, with him for sale or rental, knowing all the while that they intended to convey the house to the Wades immediately. The house was, in fact, conveyed to the Wades a short time after it was transferred to the Bradens and, before moving into the house, and before any acts or threats of violence whatsoever had occurred, the Bradens and the Wades, or someone interested in them, sought a police escort to accompany them while they moved. Because there had been neither threats nor violence and, in fact, apparently no one but the Wades and Bradens knew that the Wades intended to move into the house at that time, police protection was denied them. They thereupon moved into the residence, and the investigation has disclosed that at least 18 firearms, made up of high powered rifles, shotguns, and pistols, were taken into the house for the alleged purpose of defending it.

Shortly after the Wades moved into the residence, a cross was burned in an adjoining field, and the identity of three young white men was established as being the persons who burned it. Thereafter a rock was thrown through a window of the Wade house, and rifle shots were fired into the front door. The identity of the persons responsible for the shooting has not been established, although some people seem to believe that this was done to create trouble, rather than as an effort to frighten the Wades into moving from the neighborhood. The three young men involved in the cross burning readily admitted that they did this, and stated that it was somewhat of a prank and done on the spur of the moment. One or two of the three involved in this incident live in the immediate neighborhood.

Immediately after the first act of violence occurred, the Jefferson County Police furnished police protection all around the clock, keeping a man at the scene at all times. In addition, the occupants of the house likewise had persons, both white and colored, to stay on the premises to guard the residence. A committee, made up of both white and colored people, was formed for the alleged purpose of stimulating interest in the protection of the Wades and their right to live wherever they desired. It developed that many of these persons had a reputation of being Communist sympathizers or active Communists.

This committee sought to obtain the support of the NAACP, and we have been informed that this organization would not participate in the movement.

One of the persons who was active in the group was one Vernon Bown, whose true name is Vernon Baun. He also has used the name of Vernon Brown. He has resided in Kentucky only approximately a year and a half, and from the investigation, has lived for comparatively short times in other parts of the United States, among them, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, and New York. This man was in the merchant marine during the war, and also served in Spain during the civil war in that country. Bown, a white man, volunteered to act as a guard at the Wade residence. He gave up his living quarters and moved into the house. Either shortly before, or shortly after moving into the Wade home, Bown purchased and took there, a battery, portable-type radio. After the explosion, which occurred at exactly 12:30 a.m., this radio was found beneath the house and the speaker was missing. We have been informed that dynamite can be discharged by using a radio such as this, and the electronic authorities say that the fact that the speaker is missing is significant, that apparently being a possible source of current to set off the explosive.

Bown refused to testify before the grand jury in response to whether or not he is, or had been, a Communist, whether or not he ever had been beneath the house, and whether or not he ever had taken a radio underneath the house. His refusal to answer was based on the fifth amendment, and section 11 of the Kentucky Constitution, on the ground that his answers might be self-incriminating. Bown was indicted for contempt of court when he refused to answer certain other questions after the Court had instructed him to answer.

Our investigation disclosed that Bown had not known the Wades before moving into the premises. He had been, and after the explosion again was living with one I. O. Ford, who moved to Louisville from Paducah within the past year or two. When the officers went to his residence to execute the bench warrant for his arrest, they saw certain communistic literature in the living room, and upon making a further search, found what might be referred to as a huge quantity of communistic literature, letters, and records, which indicated that both Bown and Ford were Communists.

Among the papers found was a letter, a photostatic copy of which, marked "Exhibit I" is attached hereto, from a person in California to Ford, calling his attention to the fact that the residence of a colored family in or about Los Angeles had been damaged by explosives, and further pointing out that it had caused a great deal of trouble in that community.

Exhibit II is a photostatic copy of an undated letter, which, by reference to certain facts contained therein, is believed to have been written on July 5, 1954. In this letter Ford is congratulated for the work he is doing in Louisville. We believe this pertains to the explosion at the Wade residence on June 27, 1954.

Exhibits III and IV consist of a newspaper clipping of an explosion which occurred at a grocery owned by a colored man in eastern Kentucky, and a typewritten letter, signed "G," and mailed from Lexington, Ky., to Braden, in Louisville. Written in longhand beside the clipping is a notation concerning the disturbance this caused and, in parentheses, it is stated that the writer of the letter was 20 miles away when the explosion occurred.

In addition to Bown, the Bradens, and Ford, at least two other persons whom we believe to be Communists, were active on the Wade committee. They both came to Louisville from Indianapolis some time ago after the loyalty of either one or both was questioned in that city. Both Miss Gilbert and Miss Spiker were called before the grand jury and at first refused to be sworn and were sent to jail for contempt of court. After spending approximately 3 hours in jail, Louise Gilbert sent word to the court by her attorney, Grover Sales, of Louisville, that she would be sworn and thereupon purged herself of the contempt charge. After being sworn, she refused to testify concerning her Communist connections on the ground that it might incriminate her. Miss Spiker spent a day and night in jail and finally sent word to the court that she, too, would be sworn and, after being sworn, she, too, refused to answer such questions on the ground that the answers might incriminate her.

Due to certain references in letters concerning Ford, particularly praising him for work that he has done on the picket line, and considering the fact that he moved to Louisville from Paducah comparatively recently, we are wondering if he might not have had some connection with all of the labor trouble that has existed at the atomic energy project at Paducah.

The grand jury and the officials conducting the investigation were dismayed at certain statements made by a radio and television commentator on the stations connected with the Louisville Times and Courier-Journal. Copies of two scripts are attached hereto, marked for identification, exhibit V and exhibit VI.

We also were dismayed at the editorial policy of these two papers, both of which are owned by the same individual, and are the only newspapers of general circulation in this community. Two editorials, marked exhibit VII and exhibit VIII, regarding the Wade case are attached hereto. Also attached, and identified as exhibit IX, is another editorial which pertains to a bill introduced by the attorney general at the last session of the legislature for the control of subversive organizations in this State. We do not charge anyone connected with the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times as knowingly encouraging or condoning the activities of Communists and Communist sympathizers but, as stated, all concerned were dismayed at the stand taken by these papers and their satellite radio and television stations.

The executive committee of the Louisville Bar Association adopted a resolution commending the grand jury for its work and, in substance, criticized the editorial position above referred to.

At the outset of the investigation, it was made clear to all concerned that there were at least two possible motives for the commission of this crime, one being that the white residents of the neighborhood were endeavoring to cause these Negroes to move, and the other that it was committed by persons interested in causing racial strife in and about Louisville. This community has not, in many, many years, had any trouble to speak of between the white and Negro people living here.

It also has been significant that the conflicts between the statements of various witnesses only occurred between those who might be suspected of causing the trouble for the purpose of effecting racial difficulties and was noticeably absent among the other witnesses.

The grand jury called before it 53 individual witnesses, and some of these were recalled. The grand jury called, among other witnesses, those who were interested in the Wades' behalf, and every name which was submitted by the Wades, even though these people could give no reason as to why they should have been called as witnesses. In many of these instances, the Wades alleged that various individuals they demanded the grand jury call, had been seen riding past their house with "an evil look." Actually, when these witnesses testified, they knew nothing whatsoever concerning the matter, and were not even residents of the neighborhood. The only people asked concerning Communist connections were those whom we had reason to believe were so connected, or were Communist sympathizers, and they, without exception had prepared statements ready to hand to newspaper reporters and, on each occasion, wanted to make speeches in open court. The law in Kentucky provides that grand jury proceedings shall be held in secret, and the only publicity given in this matter was brought on those who were publicized by their own actions.

Among the facts which caused the grand jury to investigate the possibility of Communist involvement are the following: The house was under guard as above stated; the radio with the missing speaker was found underneath the house; there was no outside fuse; the explosion was located under the house near a wall which was on the opposite side of the only means of entrance. These items, together with Bown's refusal to state whether or not he had been under the house—and we might say that it can be established that he had been—and his failure to state whether or not he ever had taken a radio under the house, would seem to cause a reasonable person to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that Bown set off the explosion. It also is significant that the occupants of the house were on the outside porch, on the opposite side from where the explosion occurred; and had taken their 2-year-old child to stay with its grandparents that night. The reason given for this was so the child could go to Sunday school the next morning.

Based upon the evidence developed from this investigation, the grand jury indicted Vernon Bown for blowing up the house and also for advocating and teaching sedition and criminal syndicalism. The grand jury also indicted Larue Spiker, Louise Gilbert, I. O. Ford, Carl Braden, and Anne Braden for advocating sedition.

Large quantities of Communist material were found at the residence of the Bradens and the residences of Ford and Bown. Some was found at the home of Larue Spiker and Louise Gilbert.

The following are only a few samples of the material found:

1. "Exhibit of Bacteriological War Crimes Committed by the Government of the United States of America." This was printed in Peiping, China, by the Chinese People's Committee for World Peace.
2. "How To Be a Good Communist."
3. "Thirteen Communists Speak to the Court."
4. "Constitution of the U.S.S.R."
5. Soviet Literature, a monthly magazine printed in Moscow.

There were other articles of the same nature, too numerous to mention.

Exhibit X, attached, is a photostatic copy of a letter apparently written by a man in Lexington, Ky., to I. O. Ford relating to the situation in the coal fields in the Eastern United States. It will be noted that in this letter the writer admits that they are Communists, Marxists, etc., and points out that the miners are fertile subjects for exploitation by the Communists.

Exhibit VI, also attached, is a photostat of a letter dated October 1, 1954, signed "KL," and written on two sides of the page, and photostated in that way, addressed to I. O.

Ford. The envelope was postmarked "Los Angeles, Calif." and the letter expresses concern about the communistic material being found in Ford's home and refers to Ford having been on the picket line and also performing other duties.

It is the opinion of the grand jury and the officials that this presents a very serious situation and, in conformity with the recommendations of the Jefferson County Grand Jury of September 1954, a copy of this statement, the attached exhibits, and the grand jury report is being forwarded to those who are interested in such matters. We believe that this matter should be pursued by the Federal authorities, since it does relate to national security, and apparently concerns persons in other parts of the country.

Respectfully submitted.

A. SCOTT HAMILTON,
Commonwealth's Attorney,
30th Judicial District of Kentucky.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Carl Braden, except for action by the U.S. Supreme Court, would today be in jail where he belongs instead of being field secretary for the Southern Conference Educational Fund, associated with Rev. Martin Luther King, and causing racial strife and agitation throughout the South. The Kentucky telephone directory lists the Southern Conference Education Fund, Inc., at 4403 Virginia Avenue, Louisville, Ky., telephone number SPring 4–3331. The same directory lists the same address and same telephone number for Carl Braden.

The present activities of Carl and Ann Braden are clearly outlined in the following news articles and columns: "Commies Recruiting Members in Hinds?" Jackson Daily News, September 1, 1962; "Southern Conference Educational Fund, led by Shuttlesworth, called Red Trent," the Danville Register, July 11, 1963; "White Women Exhorters Are Known Left Wingers," the Danville Register, July 17, 1963; "Moses Admits He is Carl Braden's Friend," Jackson Clarion Ledger; two columns by Jack Lotto, "U.S. Commies Seek Freedom for Buddies" which appeared in the Houston Chronical and "Dixie Drive by Pro-Reds," Los Angeles Herald Examiner.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have these news items printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Sept. 1, 1962]

COMMIES RECRUITING MEMBERS IN HINDS? APPLICATION FORM AT WORKSHOP CITED

(By James M. Ward)

REGISTRATION BLANK: ADULT EDUCATION WORKSHOPS CONDUCTED BY THE MISSISSIPPI ADULT EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Name________________________________
Age________________________________
Street address_________________________
City_______________________________
State______________________________
Telephone___________________________

I. If you are a student:

1. What school are you attending?________
____

2. What is your classification?

Freshman ____ sophomore ____ junior ____ senior____

* * * * *

16. Do your political views differ basically from those of your parents? Yes ____. No ____.

Do they approve of your working in programs for the greater equality of the races? Yes ____. No ____.

Do they or have they participated in such programs themselves? Yes ____. No ____.

17. Do you think that the Negro has a better life in Mississippi —— or in Africa ——?

18. If you had the opportunity to move to Africa, would you be willing to do so? Yes ____. No ____.

19. Do you think that a transition to the Communist system of government would better or worsen the lot of the Negro in Mississippi? Better ____. Worsen ____.

20. Do you think that the need to improve the lot of the poor white is greater than ____, equal to ____, or less than ____ the need to improve the lot of the poor Negro in the South?

SEMINAR REGISTRATION FORM

The Jackson Daily News has intercepted an inflammatory registration form to be completed by Negroes attending "workshops" and "seminars" that are conducted under the sponsorship of Carl Braden, an identified Communist who recently visited Mississippi to drum up support for voter registration and integration activity. The Braden meetings are being held at Mount Beulah Christian College near Edwards, Tougaloo Christian College, and other points throughout the State. Special attention is called to question No. 19.

At a "voter registration" workshop held at Mount Beulah Christian Institute near Edwards under the sponsorship of Carl Braden, an identified Communist and field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, an inflammatory registration blank was passed out for prospective participants.

A source qualified in such activity said the questionnaire has all the earmarks of a snare for Communist Party membership.

Soliciting various personal background data on candidates for the workshop, the registration blank also asks for information on the participant's desire to engage in voter registration work and agitation for integration in schools, churches, and private facilities.

The explosive portions come near the end of the long form with such questions as:

"Do your political views differ basically from those of your parents. Do they approve of your working in programs for the greater equality of the races?

"Do you think that the Negro has a better life in Mississippi—or in Africa—?

"If you had the opportunity to move to Africa, would you be willing to do so?

"Do you think that a transition to the Communist system of government would better or worsen the lot of the Negro in Mississippi?"

WHAT IT MEANS

An authority on subversion said the latter question was highly interesting. After giving a group of Negroes a heated lecture on how they are being mistreated they would tend to answer they favored a transition to the Communist system. If they did answer in that manner, they were then considered ripe prospects for recruitment into the party. If they signed "yes" and later changed their mind, their original answer could be used as blackmail to make them conform to party discipline and the victim could be used as a dupe.

The questionnaire was used at Mount Beulah in connection with an adult education workshop conducted by the Mississippi Adult Education Committee.

A confidential report by Carl Braden published in full in yesterday's Jackson Daily News revealed Braden instrumental in setting up the workshop and Braden reported that he and Bob Moses, 27-year-old Negro native of New York who has been active in integration attempts in Mississippi within the past 2 years, recruited participants, signing up some 50 to 75 people.

Moses was arrested in Indianola yesterday on a charge of passing out handbills without a permit. Police said he went to jail and made no effort to post the $50 cash bond necessary to be released.

Braden has revealed that he will return to Mississippi in the near future to set up a special workshop at Mount Beulah to plan means of getting the maximum amount of national publicity on "violence and police brutality" in Mississippi.

In connection with his plan, Braden said: "The continued (police) beatings have caused the leadership people in the State to see the great need for a constant stream of reports going out across the country."

Braden's deep interest in voter registration, integration of schools, churches, and private places is not new. Upon release from a Federal prison last February he has resumed a busy schedule of agitation in the South.

Much of the planning for his current crusade was made at a conference on "The Deep South: Ways and Means to Integration" at Birmingham last April 13–14.

The conference was sponsored by the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, Student Non-Violent Co-Ordinating Committee and the Southern Conference Education Fund, Inc.

Participants on the program included Bishop Edgar A. Love, president, Southern Conference Education Fund, Baltimore; Aubrey W. Williams, president emeritus, who made a financial reward to the Reverend F. L. Shuttlesworth, president, Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights and agitation leader in Alabama; Miles Horton, director of the Highlander Center at Monteagle, Tenn., an institution that was closed by the State of Tennessee upon exposure of its pro-Communist training work.

Braden's chief role at the Birmingham rally was to explain his plan for "getting better and fuller coverage in the news media."

Listed on the printed program was the Reverend Murray Cox, Gulfport minister and chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Reverend Cox, like Braden, has an intensive dislike for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He recently was a cosigner of an ad in the New York Times urging abolition of the committee.

Reverend Cox did not attend the meeting due to "a conflict" but he said he gave his name to be used as a participant.

Highlander Folk School, shut down by Tennessee as a public nuisance, is out of business and its property is being auctioned.

With Braden's intensive interest in Mount Beulah near Edwards and Tougaloo College, is the successor to Highlander Folk School to be established at one or both institutions?

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, July 11, 1963]

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE EDUCATIONAL FUND, LED BY SHUTTLESWORTH, CALLED RED FRONT

The man who substituted for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as the speaker at a rally here last week to protest segregation has been identified as head of a big pro-Communist front, according to a Cincinnati newspaper.

In an article published Sunday, June 9, in the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth was identified as the new president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund.

According to the article, both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have described the SCEF as an organization set up to promote communism throughout the South.

This has been confirmed, according to City Manager T. E. Temple, who received a copy of the article.

The same news item notes that new additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund include the Reverend James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla., and father of Bob Zellner, a young white man who has been active in the demonstration movement here. Young Zellner is among 13 who have been indicted for inciting racial violence as a result of the demonstrations.

The article also points out that the field secretary for the SCEF is Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky., who was among the speakers at a rally here March 26 when King was the featured speaker.

King reportedly is expected here today. He was to be the speaker at a rally July 3 but was replaced by Shuttlesworth after canceling out the previous night.

Shuttlesworth vowed at the time he would return here "and march" but local leaders say he will not be among the group accompanying King here today.

According to the Cincinnati newspaper, Shuttlesworth is pastor of a church in the Ohio city. However, he has become better known as a leader in the Birmingham, Ala., integration movement. He was identified here as national secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which King heads, and president of the Alabama Christian Movement.

Asked for comment by the Enquirer, Shuttlesworth said: "To a segregationist, integration means communism. I can think of nothing more un-American than the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

Following is the text of the Cincinnati Enquirer article (written by Jack Lotto):

"One of the top leaders of the integration movement in the South has been named head of a big pro-Communist front.

"He is the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth (965 Dana Avenue), pastor of the Revelation Baptist Church, 1556 John Street.

"The post he was elected to is president of the 'Southern Conference Educational Fund,' with headquarters in New Orleans, and active in 17 Southern States.

"Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have described the SCEF as an organization set up to 'promote communism' throughout the South.

"This group has a long history of activity in the South. It originally was known as the 'Southern Conference for Human Welfare.' One of its founders was a veteran Communist, the late Louis E. Burnham.

"When the SCHW was cited as a Communist front in 1947 by the House committee, it ostensibly went out of business.

"It quickly reopened at the same New Orleans address, under the new name and with the same telephone number.

"According to the Senate subcommittee, the Southern Conference Educational Fund was 'operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes' of its predecessor.

"Said the House report on the SCHW:

"'It seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. Its professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"The field secretary for the SCEF, and editor of its publications, 'The Southern Patriot,' is Carl Braden of Louisville, Ky. Braden, identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, recently finished serving a 1-year prison term for contempt of Congress.

"New additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund included the Reverend James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla. He is the father of Bob Zellner, the 'freedom-walker' active in the 'Student Non-Violence Committee' and now serving a jail term in Alabama.

"Another board member is Mrs. Diane Bevel of Cleveland, Miss., active in Nashville student demonstrations, and currently working in Alabama and Mississippi.

"She is jailed in Gadsden, Ala., for taking part with Zellner in a prointegration march, following in the steps of William Moore, the postman shot and killed during a one-man protest march.

"Communists and pro-Communists are moving into the South to provoke friction between whites and Negroes. On the scene is James E. Jackson, a member of the four-man secretariat of the U.S. Communist party.

"Jackson, who is propaganda boss in the United States for the Reds, is also the party's secretary for southern and Negro affairs—a polite term for chief racial troublemaker.

"This Moscow-trained Negro has been in the forefront of Communist organizational and agitational work in the South for years.

"In 1959, he went to Russia as representative of the U.S. Communist party at the 21st World Congress of Communist Parties. There, he hailed the Soviet Union and denounced the United States."

Following is the statement given the Enquirer by Shuttlesworth:

"I do not intend to become involved in verbal gymnastics with those, who for years, have prided themselves and made themselves famous for slandering the character of others without proof and for making a mockery of the democratic process which says a man is innocent until proven guilty.

"I have the highest regard for this organization (SCEF), for the work it has done since I have been a member of the board, and I have seen nothing on the part of any persons, with whom I have been associated, to give any substantiation to these charges.

"Generally, the House committees are governed by southerners who will label any organization subversive or communistic that seeks to further the American aims of integration, justice, and fairplay.

"To a segregationist, integration means communism. I can think of nothing more un-American than the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

[The Danville (Va.) Register, July 17, 1963]

WHITE WOMEN EXHORTERS ARE KNOWN LEFTWINGERS

Anne Braden addressed Danville Negroes last night at St. Pauls AME Church. Two weeks ago, Dorothy Day spoke to them at High Street Baptist Church.

Both women have numerous leftwing connections.

Mrs. Braden, for instance, is the wife of Carl Braden, a man who has been identified as a Communist and who has served a prison sentence for contempt of Congress.

A woman who did undercover work for the FBI testified in court both Mrs. Braden and her husband were members of a Communist cell.

Mrs. Braden, a 1943 graduate of Stratford College was described by her husband as editor of the Southern Patriot when the latter accompanied Martin Luther King to Danville in March.

The Southern Patriot is published in Atlanta. It formerly was an organ of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, an organization which went out of existence after the House Un-American Activities Committee described it as a Communist front.

Carl Braden was associated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Now he is field secretary of the Southern Conference Education Fund, which has been described in Congress "as an organization set up to 'promote communism' throughout the State." When the SCEF was founded, it had the same address and telephone number formerly used by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

The Washington Star of December 12, 1954, carried an Associated Press dispatch telling about Carl Braden's trial. It read in part as follows:

"LOUISVILLE, KY., December 11.—Newspaperman Carl Braden was branded a Communist today by a surprise rebuttal witness testifying at his sedition trial.

"Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, 44, a Louisville seamstress, said she had been doing undercover work for the FBI in a Communist cell of which both Braden and his wife, Anne, were members.

"Braden testified earlier in the week he was not a Communist and had never been one."

"Dorothy Day, editor of the "Catholic Worker," is a woman who frequently lends her name to leftwing causes.

For instance, she was one of the signers of a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson when the cases of the latter two were before the Supreme Court on appeal in February 1961. Wilkinson is head of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and has been identified as a Communist.

Miss Day is sponsor of an organization known as Friends of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and was present at a reception for the Flynn woman on March 29 at the Belmont Plaza Hotel in New York City. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn is chairman of the Communist Party of the United States.

According to the Communist Party organ Daily Worker on May 12, 1963, Miss Day praised "the Alderson Story," a biography of Elizabeth G. Flynn.

The Brooklyn Tablet on October 20, 1962, carried an article in which it was stated Miss Day had made a trip to Cuba and attacked American policy toward Cuba.

In the June 18, 1963, issue of the weekly magazine National Review, a book review of Garry Wills described her in this manner:

"Dorothy Day goes among the poor to prove things about poverty and anarchy that the poor would be the last to believe in—as she went to Cuba last year to help the Cubans by pointing out to them how Castro resembles Christ."

Priscilla L. Buckley, managing editor of National Review, yesterday called Miss Day politically very naive and a far-left passivist who, in her peace-promotion efforts, will do such things as refuse to take shelter during civil defense test alerts.

She described the Catholic Worker, which Miss Day edits and publishes as a tiny little mimeographed sheet that is totally lay and is neither sponsored nor connected with the Catholic Church. The Catholic Worker, she said follows fairly closely to the Communist line on peace.

Shortly after the execution of the Red spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the Catholic Worker carried an article written by Miss Day entitled "Meditation on the Death of the Rosenbergs."

This article said, in part: "They were children of that race in which Mary and Jesus and Joseph, the Holy Family, belonged. In their humanity, they more closely resembled Jesus than we do who are not Jews. Let us have no part with the vindictive state and let us pray for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg."

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger]

MOSES ADMITS HE IS CARL BRADEN'S FRIEND

GREENVILLE.—Voter registration worker Robert Moses of New York testified Thursday he was a friend of Carl Braden and had seen him recently at a workshop sponsored by the Southern Conference Education Fund.

Moses' testimony came during a hearing before Federal District Judge Claude Clayton on a Justice Department suit seeking release of 45 Negroes arrested during a march at Itta Bena last month.

A. H. Bell, attorney for the Leflore County Board of Supervisors, questioned Moses about his connections with Braden and the SCEF, which a House Un-American Activities Subcommittee cited as a Communist-front group. Braden refused to answer questions about whether he was a Communist.

Moses testified he was not a Communist.

Asked about Braden, a Louisville, Ky., man, the 28-year-old Moses said, "I consider him a friend." He also said he had seen Braden recently at a SCEF workshop at Atlanta.

The hearing was expected to continue several days.

Defending the county were Bell and Assistant State Attorney General Guy Rogers. Representing the Justice Department were special Assistant Attorney General John Doar and Attorney John Martin.

Moses, a New York City Negro, said he was in Mississippi "Because I'm interested in helping my people in Harlem. If Mississippi Negroes can defeat with their votes the men in Congress who block and defeat worthwhile legislation, then all Negroes will benefit."

He also said he came "to help alleviate injustice" and said he felt Mississippi voting laws were unjust.

Moses, a field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, was questioned about food distributed to needy Negroes by SNCC in Leflore County this spring.

Asked if SNCC required recipients to seek registration as voters, Moses said:

"We required that a minimum requirement because there was a shortage of food and we didn't have enough to go around. But there were cases of great individual need when we gave the food without requiring that * * *."

Asked if SNCC workers had credit cards for use in telephoning the Justice Department, Moses said they did not and:

"We usually pay for the calls ourselves. When there is a matter that the Justice Department is particularly interested in, we sometimes call collect."

He said "SNCC workers were paid expenses, room and board, and $10 a week when we have the money."

Also testifying were workers Willie Baxter, 19-year-old Itta Bena woman, and Willie H. Magee, 22, also from Itta Bena. They were among the 27 Leflore County prisoners called to testify.

The woman said a tear gas bomb was thrown into an Itta Bena church June 18 while a voter meeting was in progress.

Magee testified the group decided after that to go looking for police protection. He said at one point they found an officer 2 blocks from the church, so returned to continue the meeting.

But, he said, "the church was full of gas and we came out again. The officer we saw, I don't know who he was, was gone, so we decided to go looking for protection, walking two by two."

He said another group of Negroes began throwing bottles and bricks at them and the arrests followed. Officers testified the original group did the throwing.

Magee said he had never been intimidated by Leflore officials because of his activities and the offcials had not interfered with his meetings.

Asked if the group had been refused police protection, he said, "I don't know."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, 1962]

U.S. Commies Seek Freedom for Buddies

(By Jack Lotto)

Pro-Communists and their supporters are doing their Christmas shopping early this year.

They have asked President Kennedy to play Santa Claus and free two identified Communists jailed for contempt of Congress.

Red sympathizers and/or dupes are working also to get the general public behind their petitions for Executive clemency.

In effect, the groups trying to open prison doors for Frank Wilkinson of Los Angeles and Carl Braden of Louisville, Ky., want the President to slap the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Freeing the defiant pair could be interpreted as a sign of Presidential disapproval of the committee.

Wilkinson is the coordinator of the intensive nationwide pro-Red effort to destroy or utterly discredit the important House group.

He and Braden, active in the South, were jailed for 1 year for refusing to answer any committee questions, including whether they were party members.

The U.S. Supreme Court upheld their convictions. They began serving their terms May 1.

At least four groups are distributing signature petitions for clemency. They are the New York Council to Abolish the House Un-American Activities, the Los Angeles Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights and the Southern Educational Fund, headquartered in New Orleans.

A few days ago, two delegations turned over petitions collected so far to President Kennedy's special counsel.

One delegation was headed by Prof. Otto Nathan of New York. Nathan, executor of the late Albert Einstein estate, has refused to affirm or deny Communist Party membership in congressional appearances.

Braden is field secretary of the Southern Conference Education Fund, cited officially as a national Communist front by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Identified under oath as a Red, Braden also was active in the drive to abolish the House committee.

The biggest Red front leading the operation to kill the House subversion-probing committee is the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

ECLC Chairman Harvey O'Connor, of Little Compton, R.I., is soon starting a coast-to-coast tour to drum up public support for his pals and collect funds.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner]

Dixie Drive by Pro-Reds

(Editor's Note.—To help its readers keep on guard against propaganda, the Herald-Examiner brings you this authoritative weekly roundup.)

(By Jack Lotto)

One of the top leaders' of the integration movement in the South has been named head of a pro-Communist front.

He is the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, of Birmingham, Ala.

The post he was elected to is president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, headquartered in New Orleans, and active in 17 Southern States.

LONG HISTORY

Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have described the SCEF as an organization set up to promote communism throughout the South.

This group has a long history of activity in the South. It originally was known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. One of its founders was a veteran Communist, the late Louis E. Burnham.

When the SCHW was cited as a Communist front in 1947 by the House committee, it ostensibly went out of business.

It quickly reopened at the same New Orleans address, under the new name and with the same telephone number.

According to the Senate subcommittee, the Southern Conference Education Fund was "operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes" of its predecessor.

Said the House report on the SCHW—"(It) seeks to attract Southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. Its professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The field secretary for the SCEF, and editor of its publication, The Southern Patriot, is Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky. Braden, identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, recently finished serving a 1-year prison term for contempt of Congress.

OTHERS

New additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund included the Rev. James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla. He is the father of "Freedom Walker" Bob Zellner, active in the "student nonviolence committee," and now serving a jail term in Alabama.

Another board member is Mrs. Diane Bevel, of Cleveland, Miss., active in Nashville student demonstrations, and currently working in Alabama and Mississippi.

She was jailed in Gadsen, Ala., for taking part with Zellner in a prointegration march, following in the steps of postman William Moore, who was shot and killed during a one-man protest march.

Communists and pro-Communists are moving into the South to provoke friction between whites and Negroes. On the scene is James E. Jackson, a member of the four-man ruling secretariat of the U.S. Communist Party.

MOSCOW-TRAINED

Jackson, who is propaganda boss in the United States for the Reds, is also the party's secretary for Southern and Negro affairs.

This Moscow-trained Negro has been in the forefront of Communist organizational and agitational work in the South for many years.

In 1959, he went to Russia as the representative of the U.S. Communist Party at the 21st World Congress of Communist Parties. There, he hailed the Soviet Union and denounced the United States.

[From The Worker, Dec. 3, 1960]

Rally To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee—To Urge Christmas Clemency for Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden—To Pay Tribute to First Amendment Defendants Who Have for Years Fought in the Courts Against HUAC and Similar Committees

Speakers: Prof. Fowler Harper, Yale Law School, civil liberties; James Higgins, assistant editor, York, Pa., Gazette & Daily Advocate; Ring Lardner, Jr., Academy Award Winner screenwriter; Ernst Mazey, Detroit Trade Union Official; Pete Seeger, folklorist and singer, first amendment defendant; Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, Birmingham, Ala., integration leader; Gore Vidal, playwrite, author, "The Best Man"; Mrs. Frank Wilkinson, wife of HUAC abolition leader.

Place: Wednesday, December 6, 8 p.m. sharp, Manhattan Center, 34th Street and 8th Avenue. Contribution 99 cents.

Auspices: New York Council to Abolish HUAC, 150 W 34th Street, New York, Staten Island. Dr. Otto Nathan, chairman; Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, honorary chairman; Rev. Lee H. Ball, treasurer and Youth To Abolish HUAC; Mrs. Sandra Rosenblum, chairman. Telephone PE 6-3228.

Contribute to New York Council To Abolish HUAC, 150 West 34th Street, New York 1, N.Y.

I enclose $---- for ---- tickets at 99 cents each December 6 rally.

Name ----------------------------------

Address --------------------------------

Make checks payable to Rev. Lee H. Ball, treasurer.

Mr. THURMOND. Having placed in the Record certain information on Mr. Braden and his connections with the Negro demonstration movements, I call to the attention of my colleagues another example of a direct connection of a supposed former Communist with the proposed August 28 march on Washington as exposed in the Plain Dealer of Cleveland, Ohio, on August 16, 1963. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article entitled "Two Freedom March Buses Booked by Admitted Red: Reinthaler Acts Here for CORE" be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Two Freedom March Buses Booked by Admitted Red—Reinthaler Acts Here for CORE

(By William C. Barnard)

Eric J. Reinthaler, who has admitted Communist Party affiliations, has been identified by Cleveland police as the reservation agent for one of the Cleveland groups sending freedom march buses to a mass Negro demonstration in Washington on August 28.

Reinthaler, 39, a longtime participant in civil rights movements here, has a long record of affiliations with the Communist Party and its front organizations, police said yesterday.

In a 1958 trial Reinthaler admitted he had been a Communist up until 1954.

Members of the Cleveland department's special investigation unit said Reinthaler identified himself as the contract agent for the Cleveland chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), a militant Negro civil rights organization, in the chartering of two Greyhound buses for the trip.

CORE has announced it will send 78 persons to Washington to participate in the freedom march. The 2 CORE buses are part of a cavalcade of 8 chartered buses and a private plane that will be taking more than 350 Clevelanders to the Nation's Capital for the Negro civil rights demonstration.

Civil rights leaders have said that more than 100,000 persons from scores of cities will participate in the protest.

The Cleveland delegation is being organized by a newly formed civil rights group, the United Freedom Movement (UFM). A spokesman for UFM last night denied knowledge of Reinthaler's role with CORE and said UFM's arrangements were not connected with CORE.

Following Plain Dealer efforts to reach Reinthaler and other CORE officers, a call was received from Bruce Warshal, who identified himself as vice president of Cleveland's CORE chapter. He made this statement:

"CORE has certain admission requirements which Reinthaler has met. We ask two questions of prospective members: (1) Do you believe in civil rights and equality between the races? (2) Do you believe unequivocally in nonviolence?

"Every member is asked this and we do not ask what his other affiliations are or have been."

Lt. Martin P. Cooney and Sgt. John J. Ungvary of the special investigation unit of the police department said Reinthaler made arrangements for the buses through a travel agent. At that time he left a $50 deposit.

Last Saturday Reinthaler and an official of CORE sent a telegram to the agent confirming the arrangements, the officers said. In the telegram Reinthaler listed himself as the contract agent for CORE and gave his home phone number, they said.

In 1958 Reinthaler and six other persons were convicted on charges of conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law in U.S. district court here.

The seven were found guilty of conspiracy to file false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board. U.S. District Judge Paul C. Weick, now an appellate judge, sentenced Reinthaler to 18 months in the Federal prison at Milan, Mich., and fined him $2,500. Reinthaler served the term after losing higher court appeals.

Reinthaler was identified in the trial as an officer of a Cleveland local of the United Electrical Workers which was expelled in 1948 from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, now merged into the AFL-CIO. The Taft-Hartley law requires union officers to submit affidavits stating whether they ever were Communist Party members.

In the trial, Reinthaler admitted being a member of the Communist Party at various periods from 1938 to 1954. He said he was a member of the Communist Party in Cleveland, Steubenville and Youngstown and had been a Communist organizer in the Steubenville area.

The Reverend Charles W. Rawlings, director of the Office of Religion and Race of the Cleveland Presbytery, who is assisting in the UFM protest cavalcade, said: "We cannot stop fighting for racial justice because these causes have been exploited by organizations such as the Communist Party for their self-interest."

Clarence H. Holmes, president of the Cleveland branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and leader of UFM, said he was surprised that CORE was sending its own buses. He said all arrangements for the civil rights movement in Cleveland were to be coordinated by the UFM.

The Plain Dealer was unable to reach Reinthaler last night for comment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks additional articles from the Plain Dealer as follow:

"Reinthaler Joined Communists Twice; Was Only 14 First Time," on August 16, 1963.

"UFM Brass Denies Link to Reinthaler," on August 16, 1963.

"CORE Weighs No Policy Change," on August 17, 1963.

Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these articles an excerpt from hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on legislation to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and dated February 26, 1958.

There being no objection, the articles and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UFM Brass Denies Link to Reinthaler

Leaders of the United Freedom Movement, which is sending 363 Clevelanders to Washington for the August 28 March for Freedom demonstration, yesterday denied any ties with Eric J. Reinthaler who has arranged for two buses to take part.

"Our six buses are completely separate from the two being sent by the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)," explained Mrs. Carriebell Cook, general chairman for the UFM Washington project.

Mrs. Cook was called by the Plain Dealer following disclosure by Cleveland police that Reinthaler, who has admitted Communist ties in the past, figured in the CORE bus arrangements.

"The first I knew that CORE was sending buses was when I read it in the newspapers," said Mrs. Cook, who is employed at city hall as director of manpower retraining for the city.

"I never even heard of Eric J. Reinthaler," she said. "We are screening out all who would violate the spirit of this march. The purpose is peaceful throughout. Only responsible citizens sincerely interested in civil rights will ride on our buses."

When asked whether he knew of Reinthaler's Communist background, Arthur Evans, Jr., chairman of the arrangements for CORE's Freedom March activity, said: "I don't think it's my responsibility to tell you that."

Later Evans said: "I know him as a member of the local chapter of CORE. What other organizations he had belonged to was no concern of mine."

Mrs. Cook has been busy taking reservations from individuals for the UFM buses at the Cleveland office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 9293 Cedar Avenue SE. She said reservations for the CORE buses would not be accepted there.

Both CORE and NAACP are part of the United Freedom Movement, a federation of more than 30 organizations active in the civil rights field. It was formed several months ago under leadership of the NAACP to gain Negro rights in housing, education, and employment.

Nationally, CORE and the NAACP have been feuding. The NAACP's traditional approach to obtain Negro rights has been through the courts. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 ruling out segregated schools crowned these efforts by the NAACP. CORE on the other hand, uses direct action such as sitins.

The maverick CORE buses, two in number, are priced at $12.50 per seat. The UFM buses will leave Cleveland at 7 p.m. August 27 from the Karamu House parking lot 2355 East 89th Street. The CORE buses leave at midnight from the Church of the Covenant (Presbyterian), 11205 Euclid Avenue.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 16, 1963]

Reinthaler Joined Communists Twice; Was Only 14 First Time

Eric J. Reinthaler, who is listed as a bus contract agent for the Cleveland branch of the Congress Of Racial Equality, began his Communist affiliation at a young age.

At his Federal conspiracy trial here in 1958, Reinthaler testified he joined the Young Communist League in Youngstown in 1938 when he was 14 years old and attending Youngstown Chaney High School.

At the time he was working in the steel mills in Youngstown, he said, the Communist Party was active in the Little Steel Strike. He said he stayed in the party league until 1941.

In 1943 Reinthaler went into the Army and served in France and Germany as a machine gunner. He was wounded December 12, 1944, and was hospitalized, he related. He was discharged from the Army in 1946.

Reinthaler said he received the Purple Heart, the Good Conduct Metal and European campaign ribbons for his military service.

Reinthaler said he joined the Communist Party in 1946 when he went to work for Republic Steel Corp. in Youngstown.

He told the court he remained in the Communist Party until 1954.

From 1948 until 1950, he related, he had been an organizer in the Ohio Valley Section of the Communist Party with headquarters in Steubenville.

In 1949 the Daily Worker, the Communist party organ in the United States, reported Reinthaler was among protestors in New York on behalf of top Communist leaders on trial in the first of a series of Communist conspiracy trials.

Labor records show that Reinthaler had been a steward, an executive board member, the legislative secretary and an editorial writer for Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers Union.

Reinthaler, whose last known address was 1568 Ansel Road NE., was born in Salem, Oreg., on January 7, 1924. He moved to Youngstown in 1936 and to Steubenville in 1948.

He came to Cleveland in 1950 for treatment at Brecksville Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Reinthaler had attended Bethany College in Bethany, W. Va., and later studied at Western Reserve University. He was dismissed at WRU in 1953 for bad grades.

In 1952 he represented himself to city officials as a member of the Progressive Party when he was protesting the arrest of a friend.

In 1953 the Cleveland Council on World Affairs expelled Reinthaler after his Communist affiliations were disclosed. The Plain Dealer at that time ran news stories revealing that Reinthaler had worked his way up to membership on a policymaking group of the council.

Reinthaler served 18 months in a Federal prison for his conviction in the conspiracy trial. Six others, including Fred and Marie Reed Haug, once influential labor leaders here, were convicted of a conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board.

CORE WEIGHS NO POLICY CHANGE

(By William C. Barnard)

No change in the membership policy of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) is contemplated, a spokesman for the organization said yesterday following disclosure Eric J. Reinthaler is an active member.

Reinthaler, 38, of 1568 Ansel Road NE., was convicted in 1958 of a Communist conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board.

Reinthaler was identified by police as the reservation agent for two buses chartered by CORE to take interested Clevelanders to Washington on August 28 to participate in the Washington freedom march.

Bruce S. Warshal, vice president of the Cleveland chapter of CORE, said his group had nothing to hide and confirmed that Reinthaler is on the CORE bus committee.

"His past is known and he freely admits it. Eric has met all the requirements of our organization and is a sincere member," Warshal said.

Warshal said he knew Reinthaler was not a Communist at present because of his actions. He said Reinthaler was a dedicated worker for civil rights. "We cannot ask any more of him as a member," Warshal said.

The only requirements for membership in CORE, Warshal said, are that the applicant believe in civil rights and in nonviolent action. He said Reinthaler subscribed to these policies.

Warshal criticized the Plain Dealer for publishing the story.

"It was gutter-type journalism by a third-rate newspaper," he said.

"The story was a smear on the entire civil rights movement," Warshal protested.

He would not comment, however, on whether Reinthaler's membership in CORE was detrimental to the civil rights movement.

In the 1958 conspiracy trial, Reinthaler admitted being a member of the Communist Party at various times from 1938 to 1954. He served 14 months of an 18-month sentence. Police said his participation in Communist activities was extensive.

Anton Krchmarek, who identifies himself as spokesman for the Communist Party of Ohio, issued a statement to the Plain Dealer yesterday. Commenting on the Reinthaler case, he said:

"The position of the Communists * * * is no secret. Why then did the Cleveland Police Department at this time choose to publicize actions of individuals in supporting the historic freedom march to Washington? Clearly, it can be only for one purpose—an effort to disrupt the freedom march by use of the old Red-baiting tactics.

"In doing so the Cleveland Police Department is lending itself as a cat's paw to the racists, the Birchites, and reactionaries who are seeking to block human progress."

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON LIMITATION OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT

FEBRUARY 26, 1958

Mr. FORBES. On January 6, 1958, 8 persons were brought to trial in Federal court in Cleveland, Ohio, on "charges of conspiracy to file false non-Communist union officer affidavits (form 1081) with the National Labor Relations Board" under a provision of the Taft-Hartley law. According to a Department of Justice release dated January 23, 1957, the indictment alleged these individuals "were aware that statements and representations * * * made in the affidavits" denying membership in the "Communist Party, were false." The indictment accused the defendants of conspiring "to fake resignations from the Communist Party and conceal the plot by using aliases, secret codes, and other deceptions." (See the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Jan. 24, 1957, p. A-30.)

(The additional incidents referred to follow:)

"Two of the defendants, Marie Reed Haug and her husband, Fred Haug, are also charged with having signed false non-Communist affidavits in a previous indictment. The other six defendants who allegedly conspired with the Haugs to willfully violate the Taft-Hartley law provision were Edward Joseph Chaka, Hyman Lumer, Sam Reed, Andrew Remes, Eric Jerome Reinthaler, and James S. West. This case was the first of its kind in which prosecution was instituted by the Department of Justice. The indictment charged a direct relationship between alleged subversives in the labor field and national leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Listed in the indictment as coconspirators but not as defendants were the following eight known Communist officials: Joe Brandt, Martin Chancey, Gus Hall, Frank Hashmall, Anthony Krchmarek, Steve Nelson, Sidney Stein, and John Williamson. Since their January 1957 indictments, the defendants have been supported by two newly created defense organizations in the Midwest. According to recent letterheads, Mrs. Betty Chaka is secretary of the Committee for Taft-Hartley Defendants, room 202, 2014 East 105th Street, Cleveland 6, Ohio, and Rev. Harold H. Hester and Harry J. Canter are affiliated with the Provisional Committee To Aid Victims of Taft-Hartley, room 402, 189 West Madison Street, Chicago 2, Ill." (See National Guardian, Dec. 23, 1957, p. 3.)

"As chairman of the Provisional Committee To Aid Victims of Taft-Hartley, Canter is a veteran of the Communist movement in the United States. In 1930, he was a Communist candidate for Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. During that period, he served 1 year in a Massachusetts jail for carrying a banner 'in Boston's Sacco and Vanzetti demonstration, denouncing the Governor Fuller as the murderer of these two workers * * *'. Canter was listed as an instructor at the Communist Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago, Ill., during its 1943 fall session." (See Special Committee on Un-American Activities, appendix IX, 1944, p. 292. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, Investigation of Communist Propaganda, pt. 5, vol. 4, 1930, p. 757; and HUAC, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, 1957, p. 5.)

"In 1956, Canter was secretary of the James Keller Defense Commission, of room 325, 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill. This organization was apparently a defense front for James A. Keller, who had been 'ordered deported in 1953 on charges of past membership in the Communist Party.' A 1955 indictment against Keller was dismissed last year when the Supreme Court ruled in the case of *United States of America* v. *George I. Witovich* that 'an alien awaiting deportation was not compelled to answer questions about Communist activities.' According to the June 23, 1957 issue of the Worker, Sunday edition of the recently defunct Communist Daily Worker, Canter wrote a congratulatory letter to this paper's editor." (See Daily Worker, May 17, 1957, p. 3, and Firing Line, July 1, 1957, pp. 6 and 7.)

"The Provisional Committee To Aid Victims of Taft-Hartley is currently using the office facilities of the Chicago Joint Defense Committee To Defeat the Smith Act. Formerly known as the Claude Lightfoot Defense Committee, the Chicago Joint Defense Committee's October 1957 letterhead reflects their following officers: Leon Katzen, chairman; John T. Bernard, vice chairman; Geraldine Lightfoot, projects director; and Richard Criley, publicity and research. Katzen, Bernard, and Criley were identified as members of the Communist Party before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1952. Both Katzen and Criley have been listed as Communist leaders. Like Canter, Geraldine Lightfoot and Katzen are former instructors of the aforementioned Abraham Lincoln School." (See HUAC, annual report, 1952, pp. 29 and 31, and HUAC. Testimony of Walter S. Steele Regarding Communists Activities in the United States, 1947, p. 52.)

Mr. THURMOND. These articles report that an active participant in the march on Washington is Eric J. Reinthaler, who twice joined the Communist Party and who was convicted and was sentenced to serve 18 months beginning in 1958 for conspiring to "fake resignations from the Communist Party and concealed the plot by using aliases, secret codes and other deceptions" in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Plain Dealer articles report that Mr. Reinthaler was convicted in 1958 of "a Communist conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley law by filing false noncommunist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board." They also show that leaders of the CORE chapter in Cleveland have confirmed that Mr. Reinthaler is a member in good standing and that the only requirements for membership in CORE, according to Mr. Bruce S. Warshal, vice president of the Cleveland chapter, is that the applicant believe in civil rights and nonviolent action.

Mr. President, it is incomprehensible that any organization in this country would have such a lax policy for accepting membership and particularly in permitting leadership such as has evidently been given to Mr. Reinthaler with his authority to arrange for transportation of CORE members to Washington for the march on the Nation's Capitol. This appears to be in line, however, with the stand that Mr. A. Philip Randolph, chairman of the march on Washington committee, has taken with regard to his vice chairman, Mr. Bayard Rustin, whose unsavory record as a former member of the Young Communist League and who has been convicted as a sex pervert and for refusing to serve in the Armed Forces of this country, was laid bare on the Senate floor by me on August 13. Mr. Randolph and other spokesmen for his committee continue to insist that Mr. Rustin will be Mr. March on Washington despite his ludicrous record. Evidently, Mr. President, many ministers, rabbis, priests, and others will march under his command on August 28 because even with the revelation of this information none of these religious leaders indorsing the march has backed off.

Mr. President, as further evidence of the tie-in between communism and the Negro demonstrations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article from the September 1963 issue of the Christian Herald entitled "Road to Riot: George S. Schuyler Presents One Negro Viewpoint." The author of this article, Mr. President, is the associate editor of the Negro newspaper, the Pittsburgh Courier.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Road to Riot—George S. Schuyler Presents One Negro Viewpoint

Considering the recklessness of the agitators currently leading Negroes, it need surprise no one if we see in America a bloody massacre similar to that which disgraced South Africa at Sharpeville in 1960, when police fired into a crowd, killing 89 demonstrators.

That the Negro demonstrations in America are spontaneous and unrehearsed is a major imposture of the times. Far from being a grassroots flareup of indignant innocents panting for drastic reforms, they are a part of a carefully concocted program generaled by experts in mobism.

It would be a grave error to overlook the real grievances of the Negro, as it would also be to ignore the great advances made in his status since World War II. When the present generation was born, prominent Negroes had already perfected the techniques of exploiting discontent, and there was plenty to be discontented about.

Save in a few northern and eastern communities, racial discrimination, segregation, and exclusion were rife, lynching was still going on although declining, all transportation into and out of the South was rigidly segregated, there were separate racial schools everywhere in the South and in many parts of the North and West, and of course there were no general hotels and restaurants that would serve Negroes, nor any filling stations whose facilities they could use.

Department stores were reluctant, or refused, to permit Negroes to try on garments: the service was studiedly rude so that bourgeois colored women either sent their maids to shop for them or waited until they could go to New York or Chicago. Theaters and movie houses relegated Negroes to balconies or galleries, if they admitted them at all, and the Nation's Capital was the worst offender. Everywhere Negroes were bulldozed or beaten by the police.

Civil service, even outside the South, was largely a white preserve. Housing was an acute problem whenever the Negro wished to move from his racial district, even more so than it is today. The columns of Negro newspapers have been filled for years with accounts of colored homes bombed, burned, or defaced, because their owners had the effrontery to move into a white district. Even if a Negro wished to operate a business, he could do so only in his own neighborhood, rarely downtown because of the virtual impossibility of getting a lease.

Publicly owned recreational facilities such as swimming pools, golf courses, tennis courts, and zoos were barred to Negroes or a special time set aside for them.

At the same time Negro illiteracy was being wiped out rapidly, tens of thousands of Negro students were matriculating in colleges and universities the country over, great athletes were bringing honor to the United States in Olympic games and to the alma maters at home, black boxers were dominating the field, a million young Negroes in uniform had been segregated and discriminated against at home and abroad.

It would have tried the patience of Job, and the Negro is not made of the stuff that will take treatment like this lying down. He was and always has been—contrary to some unlettered opinion—ready to fight. The question was how, where, and when.

During the same period, through the efforts of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Urban League, the large church denominations, and labor unions, the lot of the Negro was being gradually improved. Through the years the NAACP had won a score or more cases before the U.S. Supreme Court which broke the color bar in tax-supported colleges, killed the white primary, ended the Jim Crow car and bus in interstate travel, compelled the equalization of school moneys and teachers' salaries, forced open tax-supported recreational facilities, outlawed residential covenants excluding Negroes. Finally, with the Supreme Court decision of 1954–55 desegregating schools, it did not seem far to the promised land of full equality.

The Army, Navy, Air Force and Coast Guard had been integrated by President Truman. Washington's racial barriers had been cast down by President Eisenhower. A score of States had fair employment practices laws, and because of this, significant advances had been made in jobs and in union membership.

The rigid Jim Crow barrier in organized religion was slowly being lifted in token fashion. Some big corporations were at last seeking out Negro graduates even before graduation. In a half hundred cities the Urban League was getting an increasing share of Community Chest funds for Negroes and making significant openings in employment. In the theater, on the concert stage, in art and literature, the postwar period was the golden age for Negroes.

Quite likely the rapidity of these successive reforms stimulated rising expectations and increased the appetite for more. There was a growing impatience with moderate advances and gradualistic approaches. The erstwhile nostrum of politics nowhere brought the advertised utopia, although it did bring some Negroes political preferment and minor reforms. Negroes became keenly aware, more so than ever, of the vast gulf separating them from their white neighbors in wages, job opportunities and social restrictions. A cause of vast bitterness was the persistent circumvention of court rulings on desegregation of public schools, and the dead end confronting the ambitious young Negro throughout the South who sought anything better than menial work in his community.

Where at first the Negro demands were far from extreme and the agitation was locally generated and controlled, it was not long before the direction of the campaign against Jim Crowism was seized by professionals from afar, versed in mass pressure techniques and in creating hysteria. From mild demands which local authorities might have granted, there were soon strident shouts for immediate revolutionary changes which officials could not meet because the majority of whites would not tolerate them. The evidence from Albany, Ga., Jackson, Miss., Birmingham, Ala., indicates that it was outside agitators, the trained men from Nashville, Atlanta, New Orleans and New York, who kept the fires burning.

The NAACP was caught flatfooted by the well-trained corpsmen of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Students Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee, many of them schooled in special techniques at secret sessions subsidized by certain white individuals sharing the philosophy of mass pressure. The NAACP is now stressing immediacy as strongly as the less responsible groups. Like them it has refused to let up pressure anywhere along the line, although it is being hurt by the bite of other groups into the civil rights dollar while it has to pay the fines and go the bail of youngsters arrested for sitting-in, swimming in, kneeling-in and other challenges to local law and order.

Now the Negro cries for revolutionary changes are rising more loudly. Demands are being made that leaders know cannot be fulfilled, but they have a tiger by the tail and dare not let go for fear of being labeled "Uncle Tom" and deserted by the more hysterical. There are many who seem to welcome the strife that must inevitably come when the patience of law enforcement officers runs out. They daily warn that demonstrations will continue unless all their demands are met. They say literally or in effect that "the white man is scared." They have seen him run out of Asia and Africa; have noted that Washington rushed to recognize Castro, laid out the red carpet for Lumumba and Adoula, supported Nasser and Nkrumah; and they figure whites will surrender here without a real struggle, if they keep on challenging them. They perhaps rightly observe that the West has gone soft due to unprecedented luxury and high wages. They fail to distinguish the difference between globally oriented Washington politicians, international-minded big-city officials, and persons in the hinterland; or the undisciplined neurotic and vainglorious white youth in congested urban centers.

Examination of the cast of characters reveals that it consists of a hierarchy of professional agitators schooled in sit-in tactics that were imported by American labor unions in 1937, after a successful trial by the French Confederation of Labor the year before. These sit-in strikes were revelatory and effective, and were not lost upon Negroes seeking solutions to the color bar and its attendant evils. There was also ample though not encouraging precedent in the Coxey's Army march of 1894 and the pathetic Bonus Marchers of 1932, as well as the jobless demonstrations engineered by the Communists of that period.

One of the most respected leaders today is A. Philip Randolph, president of the International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car

Porters, a longtime advocate of mass pressure and founder of the march on Washington movement. It was this threat to march a band of 10,000 Negroes into Washington that pressured President F. D. Roosevelt into issuing his Fair Employment Practices Executive Order 8802, 3 days after the Nazis attacked their erstwhile Moscow allies. Ever since then, Randolph has been in the forefront of Negro leadership. Today's marches on city halls and executive mansions, culminating in the proposed march of 100,000 Negroes on the Nation's capital to speed passage of a sweeping civil rights law, is an indication of the effectiveness of these ideas now re-echoed by younger men. Other Negro leaders who now wholeheartedly support this program in the name of non-violent civil disobedience, had sat on their hands in 1941—when it was first proposed by Randolph—content to confer and draw up resolutions.

A year later the Congress of Racial Equality was founded by James Farmer, a pacifist, which brought to perfection the tactic of sit-ins in public places excluding Negroes from service. For years CORE restricted its activities largely to nonsouthern areas, enlisting an interracial corps of intrepid individuals willing to brave clubbings and arrests to break down the color bar. CORE took the lead in testing supposedly integrated buses and trains in Dixie, and later waiting rooms and lunch counters in bus and railroad stations.

There were other organizations set up in the period after World War I which concentrated on Negro agitation. One of the earliest was the African Blood Brotherhood headed by a "voluntary" Negro, Cyril Briggs in the twenties in Harlem; the American Negro Labor Congress of 1925, headed by Lovett Fort-Whiteman, who soon took off for the Soviet promised land and remained. This was followed by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights of 1930. Others included the Communist-dominated Federal writers' and theater projects; the very profitable Scottsboro case which the astute colored Communist leader, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., snatched from the NAACP, thus keeping the Reds' larder filled for years; the International Labor Defense, an arm of the Third International, which was able to penetrate Negro churches and organizations by parading a succession of Scottsboro "mothers" all over the country, taking up collections and delivering incendiary speeches. Other directly Red-inspired or at least pink-tinted organizations were the Sharecroppers Union; the Negro Labor Councils; the Negro Labor Victory Committee; and the Civil Rights Congress.

They all had their part in training adherents and agitators.

Most influential of the efforts to mold Negro opinion favorable to a Soviet America was the National Negro Congress. Ostensibly formed by Howard University professors, the plan for it actually originated in the New York County Committee of the Communist Party and was carried to Howard by Manning Johnson and another Communist. According to Johnson, who was a member, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, was later elected to the National Committee of the Communist Party. The president from 1936 to 1940 was A. Philip Randolph. He resigned, saying, "I quit the congress because it is not truly a Negro congress." Out of some 1,200 or more delegates, over 300 were white, and obviously of Communist persuasion.

The first Negro president of Howard University, Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, now a member of the Washington, D.C., Board of Education, was publicly identified with Communist doctrines by Judge James A. Cobb, of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, testifying before the House Committee Against Un-American Activities.

Another witness, the very respected Dr. Kelly Miller, for 45 years a faculty member, testified about a conference held at Howard on May 18, 19, and 20, 1935, presided over by President Johnson. Miller said that he was astonished to hear the fiery speeches by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, Professors Emmet Dorsey and Abram Harris, James Ford (quadrennial vice presidential candidate of the Communist Party), and Eric Waldron, correspondent of the Communist Daily Worker and surprised that President Johnson sat through it all without comment and apparently with approval. (HUAC, vol. 3, p. 2148, Oct.–Nov. 1938.)

Lawrence A. Oxley, an official of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, attended every session of this conference and found it "distinctly communistic in character. * * * There seemed to be but three ways out for the Negro. (1) The answer of the Socialist Party; (2) the answer of the Communist Party; (3) the answer of the American Labor Party."

"During the course of the last session, May 20," said Mr. Oxley, "I heard Mr. Ford and Mr. Dorsey advocate the overthrow of the American Government, if necessary, to secure the objectives of the program sponsored by the conference" (p. 2149 HUAC, vol. 3, November 1938).

It is illuminating to read what was outlined at the secret Communist Party convention in Bridgeman, Mich., on August 22, 1922, attended by subversives and unkindly raided by the Michigan constabulary who carted off two barrels of documentary proof. The blueprint for Negroes reads: "In order that the Negro may be reached with education and propaganda and that he may be organized for activity, the following methods are recommended:

"1. Nuclei shall be established in all existing Negro organizations, such as fraternal, religious, and labor organizations, cooperatives, tenant farmers' leagues, etc.

"2. Colored organizers and speakers shall be sent among Negroes to inform them and win their confidence.

"3. Newspapers and publications shall be established or, when this is not feasible, news service shall be established by friendly cooperation with colored newspapers of liberal tenets.

"4. Friendship of liberal-minded Negro ministers shall be sought as these men are at the present time the leaders of the Negro masses and many of them are earnest but lack scientific knowledge.

"5. Conferences on the economic conditions shall be held from time to time with these ministers, educators and other liberal elements, and through their influence the party shall aim to secure a more favorable hearing before the Negro masses.

"6. By means of its membership the party shall penetrate the existing forums, literary societies, lyceums, schools, colleges, teachers' institutes, etc., of the colored people, and establish forums of its own for the enlightenment of the Negro population.

"Where other forms of activity are impossible or impracticable, as in certain southern districts, cooperatives may be formed."

This prescient program of 40 years ago has been followed to the letter. Thousands of Negro students, professors and preachers are prepared to lead and support extremist strategy. With opportunities for leadership sparse, Negro intellectuals were easily beguiled with honorary positions in front organizations, chairmanship at dinners and meetings, and grosser forms of interracial persuasion at which the Communist conspiracy is adept. Many did not even know where their guidance was coming from and indignantly denied any Red membership or connection—as if that made any difference so long as they served the Communist purpose. A fancier of old Communist-front letterheads and the columns of Red newspapers will find enough names of prominent Negro leaders to fill a book; many of these people are the intellectual authors of the present disturbances.

When Jacques Duclos, the French Communist leader, with one stroke of the pen, in 1946 snatched the Communist Party U.S.A. away from 20th century Americanism, which it had opportunistically adopted while American arms were making the world safe for the Soviet Union, the party fell upon evil days. Security agencies were smiting the comrades hip and thigh. The revival of Self-Determination-for-the-Black-Belt, the ousting of nine Red unions from the CIO, the Peekskill riot, the presentation to the United Nations by the NAACP's Dr. DuBois and Walter White of a charge of American genocide against Negroes, even the triumphant Communist Peace Conference at New York's Waldorf-Astoria (endorsed by the first Negro president of Fisk University, Dr. Charles S. Johnson) could not rescue the above-ground party from the doldrums. It was then that a new Red policy on Negroes was adopted. It meant abandonment of front organizations and concentration on boring from within existing Negro groups.

In July 1931, when Robert Minor, a veteran Communist boss, quoted approvingly an editorial "No Menacing Red" in the powerful Negro weekly, Afro-American, it was almost alone among the 150 colored weeklies in its position. Twenty years later this was a popular view in editorial offices, and one big newspaper had as many as four fellow-traveling columnists.

The Afro editorial said in part: "The Reds are going our way. Like ourselves they represent a feared and hated cause. They are the first white group since Emancipation to advocate race, social equality and intermarriage for those who wish it. In fact there is more real Christianity among white Communists than in the white YMCA, the white Christian Endeavor Societies or the white so-called Christian churches. The Reds are no menace to Negroes. In fact, it is comforting to find groups of such people as Communists in this color-mad world."

Interestingly this newspaper had no comment when in the midfifties the Communists set up a Jim Crow school in Harlem because of racial tension and discrimination at its Jefferson School in Greenwich Village.

The People's Voice, a Negro weekly of large Harlem circulation founded by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, was soon dubbed the "Uptown Daily Worker" because of its news and editorial content and fiery volumns by Paul Robeson and Lena Horne, which left no doubt of its ideological kinship with the Afro-American. On the Pacific coast, the widely circulated California Eagle was equally a mouthpiece for Red ideas.

These are among the influences that shaped the thinking of the current crop of agitators.

Irresponsible demagoguery on both sides will lead someday, somewhere, to a bloody conflict which could spread as rapidly and as far as the demonstrations have, and the outcome of which will have to be martial law and eventual dictatorship. As Bernard Shaw has observed: "Bravery is sometimes a form of stupidity," and some may cynically agree with the Communists that "You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs," but the risk is an American Sharpeville. While this may satisfy those who favor Red revolution, it is scarcely guaranteed to advance the cause of the Negro. Even Gandhi discovered that nonviolence frequently leads to violence because few leaders can control hysterical followers, and bedeviled police armed with shotguns and rifles may not always withstand showers of rocks and bottles with calm and fortitude.

It is a most alarming development when leaders of a people shout, "No compromise." "No moderation." Since the Negro wishes to remain in America, embittered violences on both sides will not bring any real integration or guarantee our national security nor insure our survival as a democracy which has brought the greatest freedom and highest living standards in all history to its citizens, black and white.

Mr. THURMOND. I expect to have additional information to present to the Senate on the question of whether there are Communist connections and influences in the Negro demonstrations and agitational efforts. I have stated, and I state here again today that I am certain that many persons involved in these demonstrations are sincerely seeking to serve some end other than advancing the cause of communism. I am convinced, however, that there are also some who are sincerely carrying out the orders and aims of the Communist Party U.S.A. So I renew here today my request that this entire matter be looked into without further delay by the Congress.

In concluding my statement, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record my weekly newsletter for August 19, 1963.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who Is Working for the Kremlin

(By U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond)

The Congressional Records of August 2, 7, and 13, and the Senate Commerce Committee hearings on S. 1732, are filled with information from public sources which prove that there is Communist influence in and penetration of the current Negro demonstrations and agitational efforts in this country. Unfortunately, all requests for investigations of these demonstrations, which have caused violence and bloodshed across this country, have fallen on deaf ears and closed minds. The only antidote suggested to solve all this—as if anything could, including complete surrender by the Congress to all demands of the rioters—is passage of the President's power-laden and unconstitutional civil rights program.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has emphasized to the Congress and also to the public in his books, "Masters of Deceit" and "A Study of Communism" that a primary objective of the Communists in this country is to foment and exploit racial strife and disorders. Indeed, the key propaganda terms used by the Communist Party U.S.A. are the words "equality" and "peace."

Testimony by a former Communist before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1957 corroborates Mr. Hoover's point about the Red goal in the United States of America. Frank S. Meyer told the subcommittee: "The major drive * * * to penetrate the movement of the Negro people * * * has nothing to do with any interest in the aims and desires of the Negro people, but is a realization by the Communist Party that that movement can be used as the most important and strongest cutting edge against the constitutional structure of the United States, by trying to develop a removal of division of power guarantees in the Senate, and secondarily, by the fact that they believe * * * that at this time in a prosperous country this is the only place in which serious trouble can possibly be stirred up, in which there are serious possibilities of developing what they call mass struggles of building up extraconstitutional and extralegal actions, and so on."

Here is a quote from Mr. Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit": "The party's sole interest, as most American Negroes know, is to hoodwink the Negro, exploit him, and use him as a tool to build a Communist America."

Later he told the House Appropriations Committee on March 3, 1961: "The sit-in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its ends."

The evidence in the hearings and the Congressional Record shows that the man most generally credited with inciting and organizing the riots, Dr. Martin Luther King, has had top assistants with questionable backgrounds. One of these, Bayard Rustin, has admitted being a former member of the Young Communist League and having served jail sentences for sex perversion, lewdness, and refusing to serve in our Armed Forces. He has also been arrested on numerous occasions. Now he is Mr. March on Washington, serving as vice chairman of the August 28 march on Washington. How can ministers, rabbis, and priests march to Lincoln Memorial on August 28 under such leadership?

Dr. King has been a lecturer at the Highlander Folk School with admitted Communist and pro-Communist characters. This school has been closed by the State of Tennessee and cited as subversive by the attorney general of Georgia. There is much more public evidence in the Record and even more to be obtained by a penetrating investigation into the current riots.

There is no question but that many persons participating in these disturbances are sincerely seeking to obtain some end other than advancing the cause of communism. However, there are also some who are sincerely carrying out the orders and aims of the Communist Party, U.S.A. A recent article by the National Editorial Association says Gus Hall, head of the CPUSA, has issued secret orders for Reds to infiltrate the demonstrations, especially the march on Washington.

Columnist Holmes Alexander has made the point that "if it's true, as seems evident, that the Communists are trying to exploit the civil rights issue, the best way to spoil their game is to expose them." The Washington Evening Star has also stated that "all concerned—both white and colored—have a right to know just who is working for the Kremlin in this matter."

With these comments, I concur completely, as do many others who are likewise not satisfied with the efforts to sweep this vital question under the rug with passage of more unconstitutional civil rights legislation and addition of more dictatorial police powers for the Attorney General.

Mr. THURMOND. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks a news dispatch which was printed in the Los Angeles Times of Los Angeles, Calif., on August 14, 1963. This article, which is entitled "Senator Raps March Organizer as Ex-Red—Target of Thurmond Attack Admits Being Former Communist, Jailed Draft Evader" written by Mr. Andrew J. Glass, of the New York Herald Tribune staff, contains a report of my remarks on the Senate floor on August 13 about Mr. Bayard Rustin. It also has an interview with Mr. Rustin on the charges I made, and it is interesting to note that he affirms the principal charges I made, refusing to comment on one which is a matter of public record, and denies only one point I made.

Mr. Rustin specifically denies that he ever traveled to the Soviet Union as was reported in my speech, but he does admit that he was one of the organizers of the 1958 pacifist march to which he referred "and would have been proud to have joined them in Red Square." I wish to point out to the Senate that my point about Mr. Rustin having visited the Soviet Union in conjunction with this parade came from an Associated Press news dispatch from New York which quoted Mr. Rustin to this effect. However, regardless of the accuracy of the AP report on this point, I think Mr. Rustin's reply to this charge makes a distinction without too much of a difference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Raps March Organizer as Ex-Red—Target of Thurmond Attack Admits Being Former Communist, Jailed Draft Evader

(By Andrew J. Glass)

Washington.—Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, charged Tuesday that the chief organizer of the August 28 civil rights march on Washington is a former Communist who spent 28 months in jail during World War II for refusing to register for the draft.

The South Carolina Democrat inserted what he said was the police record of Bayard Rustin, the 53-year-old deputy director of the march, into the Congressional Record. The file, he said, includes a 1953 conviction for sex perversion and a subsequent arrest for vagrancy and lewdness.

CITES DISSATISFACTION

"Many people across the country," the southerner told the Senate, "are not satisfied with the Attorney General's efforts to whitewash the question of Communist influence or involvement in these Negro demonstrations which have been turning into race riots in various cities in this country."

(Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy informed the Senate Commerce Committee last month that the Justice Department had "no evidence" that the Negro equality drive was inspired by Moscow.)

Rustin, who runs the march headquarters from the community center of Harlem's Friendship Baptist Church, confirmed both his wartime prison term and his former Communist membership.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR

"As a Quaker and a pacifist," he told the Herald Tribune News Service, "I was opposed to all participation. I notified the draft board 2 years before I was arrested that I could not support the military effort in any way."

While a student at City College of New York in 1936, Rustin said, "I joined the Young Communist League because at that time, I thought they were deeply concerned with social justice." He said he "broke completely" with the YCL in June 1941, after the Nazi attack on Russia. At the time, the league accepted racial segregation in the Armed Forces and "their true intentions became crystal clear."

RUSSIAN TRIP DENIED

"In 1958," Senator Thurmond further alleged, "(Rustin) saw fit to travel to the Soviet Union and meet with the butchers of the Hungarian freedom fighters to participate in a Communist propaganda show called 'Non-Violent Action Committee Against Nuclear Weapons.'"

Rustin termed this "an absolute lie." He said he had never been to the Soviet Union, although he was one of the organizers of the 1958 pacifist march and "would have been proud to have joined them in Red Square."

Rustin declined to comment on the morals charges which allegedly were lodged against him in Pasadena, Calif., and involved two other men.

A spokesman for the march said all comments on the affair must come from A. Philip Randolph, director of the rally. Randolph was at an AFL–CIO summit meeting at Unity House, Pa., and could not be reached.

RUSTIN BACKGROUND

The spokesman, however, recalled that the ministers backing the march had spoken of "redemption." He also noted that the conviction was 10 years old.

"They cannot get Randolph, they cannot get King, they cannot get Wilkins—so they go after Rustin," the spokesman said.

Rustin was secretary to Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference from 1956 to 1960. Wilkins is executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peaple.

Arrested more than 25 times in the South for his role in the civil rights fight, Rustin said he once spent 30 days on a North Carolina chain gang. Along with Randolph, he came here last week to brief 60 legislators on the coming mass demonstration.

Asked recently whether he wanted Rustin to resign, Randolph replied: "Why, Heavens, no. He is Mr. March himself."

Mr. THURMOND. I think it would also be appropriate at this point, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Columbia Record on August 20, 1963, entitled "Red Influence on Capital March." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED INFLUENCE ON CAPITOL MARCH

Administration spokesmen looked up and declared innocently that they saw no Communist cloud hanging over the August 28 March on Washington. They couldn't see it for the rubescent smog.

Senator THURMOND took the Senate floor to call attention to the pink haze in the atmosphere. He cited public documents for proof.

The vice chairman of the committee in charge of the Nation's biggest civil rights demonstration is Bayard Rustin, who has a long record of Communist and leftwing associations, although he declined to join the Communist Party.

He was incarcerated 28 months in Federal prisons during World War II for failure to abide by the selective service law. More than a conscientious objector, he refused to do patriotic Government work or to stand a physical examination.

Rustin admits that he was a member of the Young Communist League and attended a Communist Party convention, as an observer. He participated in a Communist propaganda show in Moscow. He is a friend of Communist Dictator Nkrumah, of Ghana. He has been actively associated with organizations that have been officially designated as Communist fronts.

One of his boasts is that he has been jailed more than 20 times for civil rights activities. He has police records in California, New York, and North Carolina. He pleaded guilty to a charge of sex perversion and has been convicted for vagrancy and lewdness.

This unsavory record was called to the attention of A. Philip Randolph, of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, chairman of the march on Washington committee. Asked if he wanted Rustin to resign, he replied, "Heavens, no. He's Mr. March himself."

Granting that it is true that Rustin is "Mr. March on Washington," even the most ardent and colorblind integrationists should be able to see the red aura of influence that is pervading the Washington protest scene. If their eyes and ears do not inform them, at least their nostrils should.

ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate now has before it for consideration one of the most crucial and vital issues of our time. I refer to the nuclear test ban treaty before the Senate on the question of ratification.

On any issue before the Congress, but particularly on this vital issue affecting the military security of our Nation, it is absolutely necessary that the testimony presented to the Congress be candid, forthright, and unequivocal. Some of the testimony on the test ban treaty, in my opinion, fails to meet the standard which should be enforced. Unfortunately, since the subject is both technical and subject to security restrictions, it is most difficult for the Senate to enforce the forthrightness which it could otherwise require. As a result, there is an ever-present danger that both the Senate and the public may be misled by some of the testimony, particularly the public testimony, and the generalizations contained therein.

Official witnesses from the executive branch, as is to be expected, have sought to make the strongest possible case for ratification of the treaty. We can and do expect the officials of the administration to make the strongest arguments in support of their conclusions that the treaty is in the best interest of the United States. The facts upon which those conclusions are based, however, should not be subject to bias in presentation. It is against the facts themselves, upon which the Senate must weigh the conclusions of the executive branch and, thereby, the merits or demerits of the treaty.

I am particularly disturbed by the testimony of the Secretary of Defense on August 13 before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Let me say at this point that while I disagree completely with many of his conclusions, it is not with his statement of conclusions that I take issue now; rather it is with the manner in which the facts were presented. The presentation of factual matters was unbalanced to the extent that it was misleading. The testimony of the Secretary of Defense was lengthy, and I will make no attempt to point out all of the instances of unbalance. I will illustrate my point with one particular aspect of his testimony—that pertaining to the antiballistic-missile field—in some detail; and then briefly call attention to several other rather glaring instances.

Historically, the U.S. position in support of a prohibition of nuclear testing has been based, whether publicly acknowledged or not, on the premise that a cessation of nuclear testing would have a strong tendency to preserve an existing U.S. superiority in nuclear power. This is a worthy motive, but one which is based on a fundamental premise that the United States does, in fact, have such a superiority to protect. Probably the most fundamental question to be answered by the Senate on the issue of ratification of the proposed treaty, therefore, is whether the United States does now have a superiority in nuclear power.

In approaching the estimate of whether the United States or the Soviet Union has a superiority, the question initially resolves itself into two related, but distant, aspects—technology and arsenal, or knowledge and weapons. And in each field of nuclear power, strategic and tactical, offensive and defensive, this distinction exists. It is possible that the two elements—technological superiority and arsenal superiority—do not coincide. One side may have the greater quantity and quality of weapons in a particular field, while the other may have a superiority in technology, although lapse of time will usually insure that at some point the superiority of knowledge and weapons will coincide. Productive capacity, or the lack of it, on one side, could prevent the coincidence of the two, of course.

When the question of superiority, or "who's ahead," in a particular field comes up, therefore, it must necessarily relate, unless specifically limited, to both the questions of technology and weaponry. The field of antiballistic missiles is no exception. Superiority in the field of ABM's involves really two questions, knowledge and weapons.

The Secretary of Defense testified on the subject of antiballistic missiles, and in order that there may be no question of quoting him out of context, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the Secretary's prepared statement dealing with antiballistic missiles, and the closely related subject of penetrability of U.S. ballistic missiles, be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. The Secretary, after describing in general terms the nature of the problems in any anti-ballistic-missile system, stated: "The last of these two items, resistance to blackout effect and warhead technology depend on nuclear testing." The Secretary then pointed out that the United States has the capability, without further testing, to weaponize ABM warheads. He did not specifically mention the Soviet capability in this regard.

On the question of resistance to blackout effect, the Secretary stated:

> As for the blackout problem—and these observations, incidentally, apply to communications blackout as well as to ABM radar blackout—Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable although obtained in different ways.
>
> Each side has had about the same number of high altitude tests, and over yield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable though not identical. By theoretical analysis of presently available data, we believe we can adequately predict effects over the range of yields and altitudes in which we are most interested. We will be able to design around the remaining uncertainties.

Mr. President, it is in the field of resistance to blackout effect that the most serious problem of technology arises.

This falls generally into the field of weapons effects. On this question, the Secretary of Defense stated:

> As for the blackout problem—and these observations, incidentally, apply to communications blackout as well as to ABM radar blackout—Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable although obtained in different ways.

That, Mr. President, is a most deceptive statement.

Testimony in classified session has spelled out the particular tests in detail which have been conducted by both sides. This testimony cannot be discussed in public. Two statements which have been released to the public belie the Secretary's assertion, however.

The statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, delivered by General Taylor, included this statement on weapons effects:

> It is indicated that the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the high-yield (tens of megatons) technology, in weapons effects knowledge derived from high-yield nuclear explosions.

Thus, the Joint Chiefs of Staff assert categorically and without equivocation that the Soviets are ahead in weapons effects technology in the high yields.

Dr. Edward Teller put it even more emphatically, and I quote from his publicly released statement:

> There is one field of particularly great importance where we have reason to believe that the Russians have acquired a decisive lead. This is the investigation of the effects of nuclear weapons.

The Secretary's most carefully worded statement that "each side has had about the same number of high-altitude tests, and overyield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable though not identical," is grossly deceptive. In testing for weapons effects, it is the type of tests and the purpose of tests, together with the type and sophistication of instrumentation used, and not just the number, yield, range, and altitude which make the difference. The implication of the Secretary's statement is that there exists a parity in technology between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on weapons effects. Such an implication is not supported by any of the scientific testimony on the record, and, Mr. President, there is considerable scientific testimony on the record.

The Secretary's testimony is even more misleading when considered from the standpoint of weaponry, as contrasted to technology. The Secretary stated:

> The best present judgment is that our design efforts are comparable in magnitude and success with those of the Soviets. Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have in the near future will probably not be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than the Nike-Zeus system. It should be noted that the United States decided not to deploy the Nike-Zeus because its effectiveness was inadequate.

Mr. President, our "design efforts" are undoubtedly, as the Secretary stated, comparable in magnitude and success with those of the Soviets. This does not go to the questions of weaponry superiority, or arsenal superiority, however; and it does not cover the field of ABM blackout technology, for the Soviets have probably not yet converted their knowledge into design, having only finished their testing in late 1962.

The Secretary went on to state:

> Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have in the near future will probably not be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than the Nike-Zeus system.

Mr. President, the Secretary did not say at this point that the Soviets did not have a system deployed now, nor did he say that they had not begun deploying such a system. He implied, however, that both countries are still in the design stage.

Subsequently, in answer to a question I asked, the Secretary of Defense stated:

> I would like the record to be clear. I have not stated the Soviets had a deployed antiballistic missile system.

The Secretary's denial covered his previous testimony in the Foreign Relations Committee, and also, by context, his testimony earlier this year before the Armed Services Committee in the posture hearings. The latter hearings, insofar as this subject is concerned, are classified. I can say, however, that I was perturbed, at the very least, by the Secretary's denial.

On August 14, the day following the Secretary's testimony, an article appeared in the Evening Star over the byline of Richard Fryklund, which revealed what may have been a technical basis for the Secretary's denial. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. Fryklund described the testimony as follows:

> Senator THURMOND contended that Mr. McNamara had said in closed testimony earlier this year that the Russians have an anti-ICBM system. The Senator also said—as did his allies—that nuclear tests in the atmosphere are needed by the United States for the development of such a weapon.
>
> Mr. McNamara denied saying that the Russians have an anti-missile-missile system, and disputed the idea that the treaty would hinder development of such a system by this country.

Mr. Fryklund then proceeded to explain that the difference was in semantics. He wrote:

> The dispute stems primarily from differing estimates of technical uncertainties and propaganda.
>
> In referring to Russian development of an anti-ICBM, Senator THURMOND was talking about the Leningrad missiles. So was Mr. McNamara in denying that the Soviets have developed an anti-missile-missile system.
>
> The Evening Star reported in mid-March that American intelligence had spotted the sites around Leningrad and thought they probably were for an antimissile missile similar to the Nike-Zeus, which this country dropped last year.
>
> There is nothing to indicate the Russians have a system, however. In military parlance, a weapons system is a vast complex which includes the weapons themselves and the bases, troops, communications, training schools, supplies, etc., that are necessary to fight with the weapons.

If this is, indeed, what the Secretary meant, he should have said so. The impression he gave was that the Soviets have not deployed an anti-ballistic-missile system at all, and this in turn would leave the impression that the United States and the U.S.S.R. are in the same boat, since the United States has not even begun component production of a system.

As Mr. Fryklund's article states, the Evening Star, in an article by Mr. Fryklund himself, reported in mid-March that the Soviets had anti-ballistic-missile sites around Leningrad. Even by Mr. Fryklund's definition, however, what is deployed around Leningrad is an ABM system. If a weapons complex had to be deployed at every conceivable defense site to constitute a system, then obviously, it could always be argued that there was no system in being in the absence of absolute saturation. This is a lot of nonsense. The intelligence reports of the Defense Department, itself, refer to the ABM system deployed around Leningrad. It is about time that the leaked stories to the newspapers were cleared up on this whole matter of the Leningrad complex. We have not been able to get accurate and full information in the hearings on this matter, but here are the facts:

The Soviets are believed to be deploying an anti-MRBM/IRBM system around Leningrad. Current intelligence indicates that the initial operational capability of this system at Leningrad could be achieved in 1963. This system is believed to have attained effectiveness against ballistic missiles fired from 300 to 1,000 nautical miles. The system will probably be effective against unsophisticated IRBM's, but we cannot define the degree of effectiveness at this time.

During 1963–64, the Soviets could begin deployment of a transportable AM–1 system to their army fronts. This system should provide an effective defense against MRBM's such as the Pershing and Redstone and IRBM's such as the Thor, Jupiter, and Polaris.

The system being deployed at Leningrad is probably the basis for the continued development of a transportable AMM system for use in the defense of field force rear areas and strategic areas of secondary importance. The follow-on development could result in a system which could be deployed in 1963–64.

The AM–1 system possibly could, under certain favorable conditions, engage an ICBM reentry vehicle. There are 30 launchers per AM–1 system and 5 AM–1 missiles can be launched simultaneously and/or controlled at one time by one system against from one to five different targets.

From this it is quite obvious that from the standpoint of ABM weaponry, the Soviets are ahead. We do not have the first missile, launcher, or radar in production, much less on site. Significantly, there is a minimum period of 4 years between beginning of production and beginning deployment.

At another point, the Secretary stated:

> Multimegaton weapons development tests would have to be conducted more than 20 million miles from the earth * * * if they

> were to have a good chance of escaping detection by a ground-base system such as could be installed rapidly with the cooperation of Western and possibly some neutral nations.

This is a gross misstatement as to distances. Senators should compare classified testimony. The most likely tests in outer space which we could expect the Soviets to conduct clandestinely would be weapons proof tests, not weapons development tests, and the instrumentation and expense involved would be considerably less and one or two shots would be adequate for the purpose. A series of such tests such as would probably be necessary for weapons development tests would be unnecessary for proof tests of weapons which had been designed on the basis of existing knowledge.

At another point, the Secretary of Defense stated:

> Over the U.S.S.R. or Communist China, only very low-yield tests with quite limited objectives, could have a good chance of escaping discovery. These tests could not produce significant advantages.

Mr. President, with a very low-yield test in the atmosphere, the Soviets could test resistance of an ABM system to blackout effects. Since such a test must be conducted in the environment in which the system would be operated, very low-yield atmospheric tests by the Soviets would, for this purpose, give them a very distinct and significant advantage.

In discussing the ban on underwater tests, the Secretary of Defense stated:

> A violator might like to perform a nuclear test to determine overall vulnerability of submarines and surface vessels with their associated electronic gear. Such a test would almost certainly be detected.

Mr. President, underwater tests conducted by the Soviets in inland Lake Baikal would give almost precisely the same type of seismic signals as would underground tests, which are permitted under the treaty. Even if the signals were detected, we would have no information on which to base a case for abrogation; for we would be quite helpless to prove that the signals which were detected did not result from underground tests. Indeed, if the tests were at a relatively low yield, we probably would not detect them at all; for if we could detect such low-yield underground tests, a comprehensive, rather than a partial, test ban agreement would be feasible in the eyes of the administration.

But for the limitation of security classification on the testimony and evidence which has been received in executive sessions, many, many more discrepancies in Mr. McNamara's presentation could be brought to the public's attention.

The statement of the Secretary was eloquently presented and was masterfully conjured to create a predetermined impression in the minds of Senators and the public. I sincerely hope that Senators will not accept Secretary McNamara's statement at face value, but will analyze it in detail, and compare it with the factual presentations received in the executive hearings. The Senate must not permit itself to be "conned" on such a vital matter.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPT OF TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MCNAMARA BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 13, 1963

Now, turning to the antiballistic missile. This is the third special area relating to the military balance which has concerned some people, the antiballistic missile known as the "ABM."

My remarks on this subject will have a close relation to those on the next subject—penetrability by U.S. ballistic missiles. Interception and penetration are opposite sides of the same coin.

An ABM system consists of several types of radars, the interceptor missile and the very complex computing equipment at a ground station to control the radars and to direct the interceptor missile. The various radars serve to detect incoming objects in space, to distinguish the incoming warhead from other objects in nearby space, to track the incoming warhead, and to track and control the interceptor missile, which is targeted on the incoming warhead by the computing equipment.

In designing an antiballistic-missile system, the major factors are reaction speed, missile performance, traffic handling capacity for decoy discrimination, resistance to blackout effects, and warhead technology.

The last two of these items, resistance to blackout effect and warhead technology depend on nuclear testing.

With respect to warhead technology, the United States now has the capability, without further testing, to weaponize a variety of possible ABM warheads, including those within the yield range desired by the designers of what is known as our Nike-X system.

These or larger warheads can be improved even further by underground testing under the treaty. The ABM system which we are now designing will provide us with a high confidence of achieving a low miss distance, a short distance between intercepting missile and the incoming warhead.

At such miss distances, the ABM warhead designs which we now have or can develop through underground testing will provide a high probability of killing Soviet warheads even if they incorporate advanced technology far beyond what now exists.

As for the blackout problem—and these observations, incidentally, apply to communications blackout as well as to ABM radar blackout—Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable although obtained in different ways.

Each side has had about the same number of high-altitude tests, and overyield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable, though not identical. By theoretical analysis of presently available data, we believe we can adequately predict effects over the range of yields and altitudes in which we are most interested. We will be able to design around the remaining uncertainties.

The best present judgment is that our design efforts are comparable in magnitude and success with those of the Soviets. Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have in the near future will probably not be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than the Nike-Zeus system.

It should be noted that the United States decided not to deploy the Nike-Zeus because its effectiveness was inadequate.

One important point stands out in connection with the antiballistic missile: The ABM problem is dominated by factors unrelated to the treaty—by reaction speed, missile performance; that is, the rate of acceleration of the intercepted missile, traffic handling capacity, and capacity for decoy discrimination. A fuller understanding of the blackout phenomenon—which would result from tests prohibited by the treaty—might at most permit some reduction in the number of ABM radars required per ABM site.

Thus, with or without a test ban, we could proceed with the development of an ABM system.

Next, the penetration capability of our missiles. This is the final special area relating to the military balance which I wish to discuss, that of the capability of U.S. weapons to penetrate any enemy defenses. They have, and will continue to have, that capability.

Penetration of an enemy antiballistic missile system depends on the capability to destroy, disrupt, or saturate the system. Current penetration philosophy concentrates on saturation, and is dominated by problems of decoy design and salvo techniques, as well as of nuclear technology.

The problems of nuclear technology here relate to the vulnerability of the ballistic missile warhead to kill by blast or by radiation. The latter vulnerability, as to radiation, can be tested underground, but the former cannot be fully tested underground.

We have not, and we believe that the Soviet Union has not, explored by full-scale, high-altitude tests the vulnerability of reentry vehicles to blast.

Atmospheric testing would enable us to confirm the enhanced resistance of new, hard warhead designs to blast. Without the confirmation which dynamic tests of reentry vehicles would provide, we will have to rely on extensive extrapolations and, therefore, there will be greater uncertainties than would otherwise exist.

But, regardless of the design of any Soviet ABM system, in view of the warhead improvements we can make under the treaty, of the massive U.S. force available to saturate their defenses, and of the array of penetration aids which are being developed and will continue to be developed and improved, by underground testing where necessary, the United States will continue to have the capability, and most importantly, the Soviets will know that we will continue to have the capability—to penetrate and to devastate the Soviet Union if a retaliatory blow is required.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 14, 1963]

THE TREATY FOES' ARGUMENT

(By Richard Fryklund)

Opponents of the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia apparently are seizing on the lack of an effective U.S. anti-ICBM weapon as the major reason the treaty should not be ratified.

This argument became clear yesterday during Secretary of Defense McNamara's testimony on the treaty at a Foreign Relations Committee hearing.

Democratic Senators STENNIS, of Mississippi, THURMOND, of South Carolina, and LAUSCHE, of Ohio, clashed with Mr. McNamara over the development of this weapon.

Senator THURMOND contended that Mr. McNamara had said in closed testimony earlier this year that the Russians have an anti-ICBM system. The Senator also said—as did his allies—that nuclear tests in the atmosphere are needed by the United States for the development of such a weapon.

Later, Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, told the Senate it must make sure the test ban treaty is not opening a possible fatal gap in our defenses by foreclosing this country's development of an effective anti-ICBM.

M'NAMARA'S STAND

Mr. McNamara denied saying that the Russians have an anti-missile-missile system, and disputed the idea that the treaty would hinder development of such a system by this country.

He stressed in his statement that a system that could destroy incoming missiles is very complex and made up of many elements, of which a nuclear warhead is only one.

Mr. McNamara contended repeatedly under direct questioning that further atmospheric tests were not necessary to develop an antimissile missile.

He added, however, that therein is no certainty that either Russia or the United States will be able to perfect such a system.

Senator GOLDWATER, in his speech, challenged President Kennedy's comment at a news conference earlier this month that "the problem of developing a defense against a missile is beyond us and beyond the Soviet's technology."

Senator GOLDWATER said the Nike-Zeus, although called a primitive defense against missiles, still is a defense and is a step toward greater defense. He added that missile defenses around Leningrad also are steps toward greater defense against missiles.

ESTIMATES DIFFER

The dispute stems primarily from differing estimates of technical uncertainties and propaganda.

In referring to Russian development of an anti-ICBM, Senator THURMOND was talking about the Leningrad missiles. So was Mr. McNamara in denying that the Soviets have developed an anti-missile-missile system.

The Washington Star reported in mid-March that American intelligence had spotted the sites around Leningrad and thought they probably were for an antimissile missile similar to the Nike-Zeus, which this country dropped last year.

There is nothing to indicate the Russians have a system, however. In military parlance, a weapons system is a vast complex which includes the weapons themselves and the bases, troops, communications, training schools, supplies, etc., that are necessary to fight with the weapons.

Even if all of these things did exist in Russia, the Red anti-ICBM probably could not intercept American long-range missiles.

Intelligence estimates say that when completed, the Russian system will not be able to overcome the penetration aids which now go with American missiles.

It was this inability to cope with anticipated Russian decoys, salvos and jamming that caused Mr. McNamara to drop the American Nike-Zeus.

The Army is now developing a system called the Nike-X which would be able to beat Russian penetration aids.

HEARS COLD WAR BALLYHOO

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has disagreed with Mr. McNamara on an anti-ICBM, but his concern has been over possible "great ballyhoo" about a reported Russian weapon.

General Taylor sees the limitations of Zeus, but he told a House Armed Services Appropriations subcommittee this year that "some day there will be a great ballyhoo that the Soviets have an antiballistic missile and we do not. The claim may be largely sham and propaganda, but we face that possibility of a cold war defeat."

The ballyhoo has started, but Mr. McNamara believes it would cost $14 billion for a Zeus to counter it.

Military experts agree that continued testing in the atmosphere—banned under the treaty—is not needed to develop a Zeus. But there is disagreement brought out by Senator THURMOND yesterday about the need for testing the Nike-X.

WEAPON UNCERTAINTY

Nothing here is black or white. All experts agree that there is always some uncertainty that any nuclear warhead will go off as scheduled and do the damage it was designed for.

This uncertainty is compounded in the case of the Nike-X because that weapon must not only blow up the incoming warhead, but "neutralize" it by spraying it with so many free neutrons that its explosive chain reaction cannot start.

The science advisers to the Joint Chiefs disagree about the amount of uncertainty in the case of Nike-X. It seems clear that a majority of the Chiefs, including General Taylor, believe the uncertainty is small enough to live with, however.

Senator THURMOND reflects the views of other military men and some scientists who believe the uncertainty must be reduced by atmospheric testing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, August 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 23, 1963:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Amis, Thomas W.
Barris, Victor E.
Bartlett, Stephen C.
Baumgardner, Carroll G.
Behm, John R.
Bibles, Jerry D.
Bowen, Dennis R.
Brenan, Richard P.
Brigham, Don A.
Buck, Leslie E.
Civelli, Joseph R.
Clark, Dan W.
Cline, John T.
Collins, Michael E.
Common, Anthony T.
Cumpston, George W.
Curtis, Bill B.
Dubinsky, Ronald L.
Frost, Robert E.
Gallup, Bryan A.
Getz, Alan C.
Glass, Richard H.
Goforth, Robert K.
Grossfuss, George H.
Hageman, Richard A.
Hagener, Robert L.
Hofheinz, Walter H.
Jensen, Duane S.
Kessler, Robert G.
Leonhardt, George T., Jr.
Martell, David W.
McGeehan, Stanley M., Jr.
Meskan, Donald J.
Moyer, Lawrence R.
Mullen, William F.
Owens, Jack C.
Prosch, Thomas J.
Reynolds, James C.
Robinson, Larry W.
Rooke, John A.
Saeger, Herbert F.
Sagebiel, Walter C.
Scheuren, William J.
Smidt, John D.
Ulm, Richard H.
Underwood, James L.
Waterfield, Robert G.
Waters, Kenneth D.
Westmiller, Paul B.
Williamson, John C.
Wolson, Abraham W.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Baker, Richard W.
Barbes, Alden H., Jr.
Bartlett, Jack, Jr.
Bergan, Darrel T.
Brindell, William F.
Brown, James B.
Burrows, William J.
Calvert, John D.
Campbell, Donald B.
Cason, Billy A.
Coady, Eric J.
Connell, Carey B., Jr.
Cooper, John R.
Crane, William B.
Daniels, Robert L.
Davidson, Jerry
Defries, Christian F., Jr.
Durham, Thomas R.
Dyer, Wallace N., Jr.
Eisenson, Henry L.
England, Gary L.
Everett, William E.
Fallon, Timothy J.
Faulkner, James P.
Fetterly, Roger A.
Gilmartin, Martin T.
Hansen, Dawson P.
Harvill, William B.
Healy, David Y.
Heinzereing, Conrad W.
Hendricks, Dick D.
Hines, Oscar J.
Hobbs, Claude C.
Ilzhoefer, Robert E.
Jacobs, Richard E.
Janss, Peter F.
Judkins, Cliff J. III
Kalas, Warren D.
Kanaley, Thomas F., Jr.
Kelley, William R.
Kilianski, Joseph R.
Kinser, George A.
Klingele, Terence G.
Koch, Neil D.
Lacroix, Carroll M.
Lecy, Henry E.
Lewis, Thomas E.
Loveless, Graden E.
Maddocks, Maynard W.
Mathews, Robert A., Jr.
Mattia, Henry L.
Maxwell, Harold J.
McMenamin, John J., Jr.
Meredith, Martin W.
Miller, Clifford S.
Moffett, Donald L.
Mueller, Gerard H.
Munson, Rolfe L.
Murley, Thomas E.
Nevins, William J., Jr.
Olson, Glenn A.
Osborn, William F.
Owens, Terry D.
Paydo, Michael A.
Peterson, Bruce R.
Pollard, Stephen F.
Pyle, Harold F., Jr.
Quadrini, Frank J., Jr.
Randall, Jesse T.
Ranta, Roger J.
Rauscher, Thomas J.
Reid, Lawrence E.
Reves, Samuel S.
Richter, Charles J.
Sales, Joseph R.
Schlagel, Gordon R.
Shaw, "H" "J"
Sherman, Wayne F.
Sherwin, Robert S.
Shields, John M.
Sites, David T.
Snedeker, Munson R.
Strickland, James D., Jr.
Summe, Robert C.
Tanzman, Arnold
Therriault, Anton E.
Thomson, Richard T., Jr.
Tierney, Michael W.
Tristany, John P.
Usher, Rockeley E.
Vacca, Donald U.
Vanes, John M.
Wallace, Daniel T.
Walsworth, William A.
Wardlaw, Robert W., Jr.
Wasko, Michael J.
Watkins, Thomas L.
Wiegand, Robert W.
Williams, Gary W.
Wood, Charles H.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Akin, Robert M.
Allen, James S.
Banks, Andrew B., Jr.
Baranowski, Joseph T.
Bertram, Barry J.
Brenan, Michael H.
Brown, George W.
Brown, John M., Jr.
Buckley, James E.
Bullard, Clyde A., Jr.
Carroll, Michael M.
Childress, Clyde "O", Jr.
Decastro, Howard L.
Dejong, Gerald
Dickey, Clarence D.
Eikenbery, Tod A.
Garland, John D.
Gibson, Thomas M.
Graham, Gordon L.
Gram, Ivar R.
Griffin, James R.
Hadley, Allen C.
Halliday, Bartholomew G. III
Holland, Kenneth D.
Hull, Longstreet M.
Kaljian, Dan
Knight, John B.
Korman, Robert C.
Krueger, Peter A.
Kruse, Philip R.
Madigan, Edward F.
Marshall, James H.
Martin, John S.
May, James E., Jr.
Mills, Harry R.
Moffett, James H.
Morris, John D.
Newsom, Bobby J.
Nicholson, Robert G.
Nunn, Albert N.
Palatini, Anthony
Pearce, William M.
Pinson, Raymond G.
Rea, John M.
Ripley, Michael J.
Rummel, William H.
Salem, Donald L.
Sandvoss, Bert E. G.
Scholl, Robert B., Jr.
Stockburger, Arthur L.
Thrash, Ronald J.
Underhill, Lonnie S.
Walters, Francis M., Jr.
Yatsko, Anthony A.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W–3

Acuff, Burnis R.
Allen, Howard W.
Altizer, Robert B.
Altomare, Gasper R.
Alves, Frank
Ambrose, Timothy J.
Andress, Samuel E.
Arnott, Joseph R.
Baier, Kenneth C.
Beckner, Charles C.
Begg, Robert W.
Belles, Harry J.
Bishop, Herbert H.
Bloomfield, Albert B.
Bocko, Peter P.
Bohline, John C.
Bonenberger, Norman G.
Booth, Franklin H.
Brasher, Willie R.
Bredding, James R.
Briley, George L.
Brown, Raymond W.
Broyles, Kermit E.
Brumbaugh, France W.
Burger, Elmer S.
Carroll, William O.
Cash, John C.
Cavanaugh, Charles H.
Chapman, Homer L.

Christensen, Jack C.
Christie, Harold D.
Clark, Harlan D.
Clements, William R.
Colter, Lessie H.
Cook, Charles B.
Corbin, "E J"
Corman, William C.
Cottrell, Billy R.
Cree, Donald
Crouss, Herman F.
Cullinan, John F.
Daniel, Charles L.
Day, Gordon H., Jr.
Debaecke, Ivan J.
Dodge, James H., Jr.
Donnelly, Frederick J.
Dracoules, Harry L.
Dredger, Robert F.
Duenwald, Vernon D.
Eells, Burton B.
Elkins, Harvey W.
Emond, Francis L.
Engle, Clarence W.
Engler, Donald A.
Epoch, Wilbert M.
Estes, Martin C.
Farnham, Charles R., Jr.
Fazer, Vernon T.
Feeney, James F.
Fore, Ralph W.
Forgey, Augustine H.
Forsen, George U.
Foster, Albert W., Jr.
Fousie, Howard M.
Gardner, John F.
Gentry, Gerald H.
Giblin, Walter L.
Gibson, William E.
Gilbert, Edgar L., Jr.
Glace, James H.
Goodwin, Ballard E.
Gordon, Robert C.
Graham, Philip J.
Griffin, Robert A.
Gruester, Sidney L.
Haffey, John E.
Hamryszak, Peter J.
Hansen, Donald A.
Hayes, Charles R.
Heeney, Joseph F.
Higgins, Dean S.
Hill, James W.
Hoff, Robert T.
Hollowell, Joseph M.
Holmes, Theron C.
Howell, Abbie R.
Huddleston, Howard E.
Hughes, Raymond W.
Johnson, Byron W.
Johnson, Harley, Jr.
Joyner, Edward C.
Kelly, Francis H.
Key, Thomas F., Jr.
Knutson, Robert G.
Kopchinsky, Edward A.
Lamb, James H.
Lane, Robert T.
Lofgren, Earl W.
Loftus, Joseph F.
Long, Henry A.. Jr.
Lowe, Kenneth A.
Lydon, John F.
Madewell, John A.
Malloy, Lloyd L., Jr.
Mankin, Robert N.
Mann, Robert H.
Mansell, John T., Jr.
Mariniak, George W.
Marlino, Lena M.
Martin, Vincent E.
Mathiasen, Vernon A.
Mathison, Elmer L.
May, Willie C., Jr.
Mayer, Edward J.
McCarron, John H.
McCay, George E.
McClure, Lester G.
McCracken, James M.
McKelvey, Allen O.
McNaught, Ray A.
Miller, William V.
Milligan, John C.
Mitchell, Harold H.
Morissette, Lucian G.
Murray, Eugene C.
Newton, Thomas A.
Noonan, Robert J.
Pace, William J.
Parrett, Vanita F.
Petersen, Hans P.
Pick, Robert J.
Pierson, Harmon L.
Pittman, Ora L.
Pitts, Jewel C.
Porter, Newell H.
Prince, Louis F.
Prisk, Lloyd E.
Pryor, Walter T.
Racette, Arthur H.
Rambo, Jack Wesley
Ramsey, James M.
Redden, Dennis J.
Revolinsky, Walter R.
Rewucki, Henry
Rhoades, Richard C., Jr.
Rice, Harold B.
Riggar, Jack W.
Romenski, Edward W.
Rooney, Philip J.
Rowland, George H., Jr.
Rutkofske, John A.
Sanchez, Rogelio, Jr.
Scanlan, Philip T.
Schlais, Alvin E.
Schwerdtfeger, William K.
Sekerak, Francis A.
Shealy, Harold O.
Sheets, Robert T.
Sheldon, Robert E., Jr.
Shontz, Michael
Simmons, Albert F.
Sloat, Lewis D.
Smith, Clark L.
Smith, William R.
Smolski, Stephen
Spisak, Frank
Steffen, John V.
Stenstrom, Joseph F.
Still, Stephen R., Jr.
Stone, Thurman R.
Stromstedt, Dale R.
Stubbs, James E.
Sudol, Elvina J.
Sullivan, John V.
Summers, Clarence E.
Talton, Lewis E.
Taylor, Earl P.
Taylor, Jodie V.
Tenney, Leo C.
Thompson, Homer C.
Travis, John R.
Treanor, Peter F.
Unkle, Osborne L.
Upton, "L R"
Walsh, William K.
Webb, Howard J., Jr.
Welch, Calvin K.
Wheeling, James T.
Williams, James V. P.
Williams, Joseph H.
Willis, Donald W.
Wilson, Charles E.
Windham, Joe C.
Witkoski, Cheslaw
Wooten, Robert W.
Yackle, Milton R.
Yates, Wallace G.
Zacharias, Clarence J.
Zelechoski, Stanley F.
Zimmerman, Paul W.
Zwer, Don O.

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Abney, Walter R.
Aemmer, Donald A.
Allen, Charles N.
Anderson, Dale K.
Axtell, Clair F., Jr.
Balasan, Robert
Baron, Theodore J.
Barry, Harry L.
Barry, Timothy A.
Barton, Robert J.
Bickel, Charles W.
Blevins, William C.
Blood, Hiawatha E.
Boland, Charles L., Jr.
Booth, Robert C.
Bordelon, Buford T.
Bracken, Christopher
Bracy, Lloyd E.
Bradley, Robert E.
Brahin, Sidney A.
Brooks, Samuel N.
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Denton C.
Brown, Edward C., Jr.
Brown, Leo E.
Bryson, Allen C.
Buck, Billy
Burdett, Lesta D.
Burdette, Claude N.
Burns, Lawrence C., Sr.
Calfee, Julian E.
Cantrell, Warren P.
Carney, James J.
Carr, Franklin P.
Carrozza, Salvatore
Chapin, Junior R.
Childers, Sanford L.
Cobb, Arthur E.
Cook, Harry C.
Crawford, Jack
Cribbs, Dossey C.
Crim, Marvin E.
Crowell, James L.
Cseselka, John
Dall, George O.
Dauenhauer, Eldon G.
Dauteuil, Pierre P.
Davis, Alan B.
Davis, Robert E.
Deal, Franklin D.
Dehnbostel, John H.
Dinga, John A.
Dixon, Robert E., Jr.
Doyle, Alfred L.
Doyle, Roger V.
Drell, Warren J.
Dressel, Howard B.
Dudley, Melvin L.
Duhaime, Arthur R.
Eades, Earl W.
Edalgo, Tyson
Fazio, Michael
Fetterman, Melvin W.
Fitzhugh, Herman H., Jr.
Flynn, James L.
Fowler, Bion, Jr.
Frazee, Wilton J.
Freel, James H.
Friend, Donald E.
Frye, Ward W.
Frye, Warren A.
Gardner, Wayne R.
Gay, George L.
Golbski, Edward J.
Gordy, Granville E.
Gore, Charles A., Jr.
Gould, Alexander
Granlee, Gayle L.
Guzy, Edward M.
Hall, James A.
Hammond, Robert R., Jr.
Harris, Walter B.
Harrison, Fred, Jr.
Harter, Richard S.
Hartley, Clair C.
Hayes, Layton A.
Heckendorf, Leonard H.
Henke, Walter L.
Hill, Eugene L.
Hintz, Loyd G.
Hoffsetz, Robert F.
Holley, Bernard M.
Howell, Albert W.
Hudgins, Luther M.
Hudson, James H.
Hull, William T.
Hunter, Vincent M.
Ivery, Edward S.
Johnson, Joseph H.
Jones, William S.
Jorgensen, Herbert R.
Kanevel, Jack R.
Klein, Marcus G.
Kummer, Arthur J.
Lathen, Sylvester H.
Lenon, Horace G.
Leroy, John D., Jr.
Lewis, Eugene I.
Lewis, Francis M.
Lipe, James C.
Livingston, Lyle W.
Lovelace, Darrell M.
Lunt, Alfred G.
Mable, Earl D.
Macnaughton, John R.
Marion, George L.
Martin, Melvin L.
Matson, Francis M.
Mazza, Robert J.
Matthews, Carl W.
McCaffrey, John W.
McConnell, Howard E.
McDonald, Edwin W. J.
McFall, Henry R.
McGuire, Shely W.
Mcinnis, Edwin L., Jr.
Miller, Daniel J.
Mintz, Kermit T.
Moore, Orange J., Jr.
Moorehead, Harold L.
Morris, Benjamin F.
Morrison, William M.
Morrissey, Robert M.
Mount, Marvin A.
Myers, Russel E.
Nash, Kenneth P.
Nelson, Carl A.
Newill, Lawrence E.
Nickel, Steve J.
Nobel Lowell I.
Osterman, Joseph F.
Page, Jack W.
Palmer, Charles E.
Palmer, Roger A.
Parks, Joe
Perdue, Samuel K.
Peverada, Caesar L.
Pickerill, Henry S.
Powner, Walter J., Jr.
Ragan, Lionel B.
Ramage, Rudel E.
Redding, Victor L.
Raddoch, Donald W.
Renshaw, William M.
Resch, Raymond R.
Richcreek, Edmund V.
Rosenkoetter, Russell E.
Sawyer, Robert S.
Scheppmann, Leroy E.
Schmidt, John J.
Shaw, Garland R.
Shea, Richard H.
Shirley, Raymond R.
Sims, Curtis H.
Skoldberg, George W.
Slater, Charles
Smith, Coleman D., Jr
Smith, Gerald F.
Smith, Henry J.
Smith, Lester L.
Smith, Paul F.
Smith, Sidney P.
Southard, Conward B.
Speer, Charles D.
Steele, Burton, A.
Taylor, Rex C.
Tenney, Charles A., Jr
Thomas, Harry A.
Thompson, Robert A.
Tucker, Lester B.
Tully, Harold J.
Tworek, Flavius S.
Unger, George W., Jr.
Vaughan, Troyce D.
Vodopich, Frank
Walker, Jack H.
Warwick, Charles A., Jr.
Watkinson, Harry M.
Webster, William W.
West, William O.
Wickham, Jack E.
Williams, Thomas W.
Willig, Faye L.
Wright, Gerald W.
Wright, Virgil W.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W-3

Anagnostou, Angelo
Baldasari, Nilo J.
Rowman, Glenn P.
Butler, Creighton F.
Campbell, William H.
Canfield, Glenn R.
Donovan, Peter B.
Faini, Orlando R.
Gay, William C.
Goldberg, Sol
Hutchison, Frank
McGroarty, Edward J.
Mitchell, Leonard T.
Nagle, Richard R.
Neyer, Arthur E.
Shrum, Wayne A.
White, Charles R.
Whitt, William F.
Wright, Scott E.

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Adcock, Cecil A.
Albert, Cyril H.
Anderson, Kenneth E.
Asseier, August H.
Bacon, Everett R.
Baldwin, Joseph C.
Barksdale, Leon K.
Book, Mac
Brad, Carl
Brinson, Marion H.
Brooks, Loyn R.
Burdyshaw, Loyd R.
Case, Alexander
Christensen, Knud H.
Crawford, Gordon H.
Crosthwaite, Frederick N.
Cunningham, Albert L.
Danaher, John S.
Dersham, George E.
Dickenson, Waldo E.
Dmoch, John
Dorton, Charles C.
Drechsler, Max K., Jr.
Ettling, Sheldon
Evans, Joseph L.
Falconer, Leroy D.
Farmer, Eddie L.
Farmer, Paul E.
Garrison, Randolph J.
Grunwald, Otto A., Jr.
Hamilton, Donald L.
Hammock, James C.
Harrell, Dexter E.
Hart, Robert N.
Hayes, William R.
Holden, James B.
Howard, John R.
Ischar, Dowglas
Jones, Harold E.
Kalberg, Kenneth O.
Knutson, Orton L.
Lalley, James M.
Lankford, John R.
Lasley, Claude H.
Lazenby, James H.
Lewis, Don E., Jr.
Ludwig, Russell L.
Malik, Joseph, Jr.
Maroney, Frank J.
Maurer, Richard H.
Moon, William N.
Morrow, Paul E.
Oulie, Keith N.
Padget, Bernard B.
Palmer, Robert W.
Parker, Guy J.
Radcliff, George T.
Riposa, Guiseppe
Rivers, Lee D.
Robinson, James W.
Schardin, Roy K., Jr.
Shannon, Mark L.
Shick, Clifford D.
Smith, Thurlow S.
Snoey, Jakob
Stark, George R.
Svenningsen, Arne R.
Vanauken, Merrill J.
Wicks, Clifford C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jerms, Robert L.
Schlegel, Kurt A.

Mary A. Curtis for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line of the U.S. Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Ayre, Donald
Barry, Richard D.
Benson, Peter H.
Broglio, John D.
Condit, Norman E.
Dooley, John J.
Johns, James E.
Partlow, Joseph A.
Stevens, Stanley L.
Young, Robert B.

SUPPLY CORPS

Goodman, David R.
Jaap, Joseph D.
Kee, William D., Jr.
Myers, Cecil E., Jr.
Paskawitz, Selwyn S.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Moran, John P.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy, serving in a higher grade, for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W–3

Hixson, James T.
Schiavone, Anthony J.

To be chief warrant officers, W–4

Clarke, Wiot L.
Corday, Earl F.
Mayle, Arthur E.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W–3

Benson, Louis R.
Brugler, Louis W.
Caporicci, Joseph A.
Carden, James C.
Cox, James T.
Elworth, Raymond F.
Evans, Richard L., Jr.
Ewing, John E., Jr.
Fergerstrom, Gilbert C.
Franck, Delbert E.
Jackson, Lewis L., Jr.
Jones, Robert W.
Kayton, Kenneth B.
Koerner, John G.
Leamons, John B.
McNiff, Eugene E.
Stauffer, Donald W.
Taylor, William K.
Thompson, Perry T., Jr.
Toomey, Robert B.
Triplett, Franklin I., Jr.
Ungemach, Seibert A.
Warp, Arthur J.
Welch, Stanley C.
Wright, Edwin A.

To be chief warrant officers, W–4

Carpenter, James
Carter, Richard W.
Moye, Edwin B.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

David W. Harned
Joseph A. Masterbone
Thomas H. Oswald
Allen R. Ruth

Charles M. Maskell, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

John F. Lynch III (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Jerome M. Kopel (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

John H. Leonard (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jerome H. Davis
James M. Fitts, Jr.
Thomas N. Markham
Alan C. Newburger
Emil E. Pollard

Robert M. Hoffman (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Bennie Krupa, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a chief warrant officer, W–4, in the Navy, for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

Marvin A. Ennis, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W–3, in the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 23, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commanders

Pentii A. Stark
Merlyn E. Natto
Alfred C. Holmes

To be lieutenants

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Charles K. Paul
Dee E. Kimbell

To be ensigns

James H. Allred
Gordon E. Mills
Paul W. Larsen
Michael Gemperle
Leland L. Reinke
Christian Andreasen
Robert T. Coffin
Henry L. Pittock III
Ronald W. Elonen
John B. Jones
Thomas E. Ryder
Edgar N. Vail

To be captain

Glenn W. Moore

To be lieutenant commander

Kelly E. Taggart

To be lieutenants

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick

To be ensign

Danford A. Moore

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Monroney Delivers Oologah Dedication Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last month on July 20, members of Oklahoma's congressional delegation, leading business and political figures in Oklahoma, and hundreds of Oklahoma citizens joined together in dedicating the Oologah Dam and Reservoir.

This was a memorable event in Oklahoma and it culminated the hopes and dreams of many who have followed the progress of the Oologah project for a quarter of a century since it was first authorized in 1938.

The Oologah Dam and Reservoir is the first major unit to be completed on the Arkansas-Verdigris River navigation project.

One of the highlights at the Oologah dedication ceremonies was the speech delivered by Oklahoma's able senior Senator, the Honorable MIKE MONRONEY. Senator MONRONEY has been a champion of water conservation and development throughout his illustrious career in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

Senator MONRONEY's remarks point out in graphic terms the benefits to be derived from the Arkansas River development program and the necessity of continuing to develop and conserve our water resources. The complete text of his remarks follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY AT THE DEDICATION OF OOLOGAH DAM, JULY 20, 1963

Today we dedicate the first of three great projects that make possible the first manmade navigation channel in Oklahoma.

Mark Twain once said that the Army Engineers had started out to make the Mississippi over again—a task which he claimed was exceeded only by the original job. We are in the same posture as we envision the massive job undertaken on the unruly Arkansas.

But here we are—at a dedication service for the Oologah Dam and Reservoir, which was first authorized 25 years ago. Next year we will dedicate the Eufaula project (dam to be completed June 1964), which will control the Canadian River system, and the Keystone project (dam to be completed December 1964), which will control the upper Arkansas and all its major tributaries above the confluence of the Verdigris, which is controlled by this great project.

Oologah, Eufaula, and Keystone—three great mountains of earth, rock, steel, and concrete erected across three unruly rivers. These had to be completed before we could direct our attention to the construction of the navigation canal.

The tons and tons of silt carried by the Canadian, the Arkansas, and the Verdigris had to be trapped—the torrents of flood waters had to be impounded—before we could begin the locks and dams, the revetments, and the channel straightening which will form our waterway to the sea.

The Corps of Engineers has adopted a unique way of putting all the pieces together in the right way at the right time. They call it the "Critical Path Method." This system is one devised by the armed services for programing construction of complex missile base systems. It was also used successfully in the Navy's Polaris program. I am told that by following the recommendations of the "mechanical brain" the construction schedule can be maintained with the reliable assurance of navigation to Pine Bluff in 1968, to Fort Smith in 1969, and to Catoosa in 1970, provided, of course, that Congress furnishes the money. I assure you that it is the objective of the Oklahoma delegation to see to that.

The Arkansas project is expected to exceed the benefits of the already developed Tennessee, which is used as the "showcase" of America to foreign visitors interested in

the field of conservation, and where private investment in job-creating industries along what was once a useless, dangerous river has already surpassed the total public investment required to control its waters.

We have no reason to believe that our Arkansas will not develop as profitably as the great Ohio, which is returning $11 on each $1 invested. The former chief of Engineers, Emerson Itschner, said at Tulsa that we had all the resources that made the industrial complex of the Ohio grow at the rate of $1 billion per year, plus a great abundance of fuel resources and bauxite. Who here wishes to dispute the chief?

The Columbia River development is returning $5 to $1, the lower Mississippi $6 to $1, and the lower Colorado almost $3 to $1. Where else can we invest to secure such a handsome return? I favor economy in Government. I favor, when possible a balanced budget. But I also favor accelerating the investments that we as a Government make in our soil and water programs.

Each project we create is the equivalent of a new industry. It creates jobs, which means payrolls. It creates new opportunity for industries and for recreation. Each visitor to this project will spend an average of $3 per day. He will create a demand for capital investments of $10 to supply him with goods and services.

Our good friend and colleague Senator FULBRIGHT, testifying before the Appropriations Committee, pointed out that since 1900 the United States had spent $21.5 billion on Army Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, and Tennessee Valley programs. He pointed out that this is less than one-third of the amount budgeted for defense purposes for the coming year. The Corps of Engineers has advised us that this project will create in excess of $1 billion in new business each year for Oklahoma and Arkansas, and the direct benefits from its operation will amount to $64.5 million a year, which is $6 million more in annual benefits than is required to amortize the project in 50 years.

We are running out of time. We need to realize that our demands for conservation are growing much more rapidly than our development program.

The Russians are determined to overtake the United States in hydroelectric power and water development by 1975.

Congressional committees that have visited Russia report the Russians consider their mighty river systems their greatest inexhaustible resource. They are sparing no effort and no expense to have the greatest harnessed and utilized river system in the world (spending $2 to our $1).

The priority of river development is hydroelectric power, navigation, irrigation, flood control, fish, wildlife, and recreation, water supply.

The U.S.S.R. is catching up with the United States in electric power production, the basic field in which supremacy counts heavily in peaceful and economic competition or in event of war (10 percent of river investment going into power).

Although the United States is still far ahead, with 142 million installed kilowatts at the beginning of 1959, compared with 53 million in the U.S.S.R., the Russians could overtake us in 1975—in 12 years—unless we speed up or they slow down.

The U.S.S.R. allocates almost four-fifths of its power to industry. The United States uses a far smaller share of its power in goods-producing industry. This means that the U.S.S.R. could surpass the United States in the amount of power allocated to industry in 1973—in 10 years.

The U.S.S.R., vigorously pursuing its oft-stated goal of overtaking the United States in economic production, has undertaken literally hundreds of new starts on water developments within the past 5 years.

Ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in bringing you the following greetings from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 13, 1963.

The completion of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir is an event of considerable satisfaction to me. Its relief of the misery and loss from floods, its needed water supply, and its enhancement of recreational and wild life opportunities will be important contributions to a better life for the people in the area. As a key reservoir in the multiple-purpose plan for development of the water resources of the Arkansas River Basin, it signals a major milestone in bringing to the people Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas the benefit of an invaluable waterway connection to the Mississippi. This occasion is also a tribute to the late Senator Kerr and to those Members of Congress who are participating today in the dedication exercises.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Report of National Projects Committee to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the national projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 50th National—"Golden Anniversary"—Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, June 4–7, 1963.

The permanent national projects committee of the congress consists of an oustanding expert on water resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while serving here on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public works program and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

I was honored to be asked to serve as chairman of this important committee, having previously served as its chairman for a number of years during my former service in the Congress of the United States. At that time I also had the honor of serving as a national vice president of the congress, and presently I am serving as its regional director for the lower Great Lakes region.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session are as follows:

Projects committee: Representative ROBERT T. SECREST of Senecaville, Ohio, chairman.

New England division: William S. Wise, executive secretary, Flood and Water Policy Commission, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

North Atlantic division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, U.S. Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.

South Atlantic division: Col. George W. Gillette, U.S. Army (retired), chairman, Wilmington Port and Waterway Development Commission, Wilmington, N.C.

Southwestern division: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central division: Al. Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn., vice chairman.

Missouri River division: John B. Quinn, executive director, Missouri Valley Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Herbert G. West, executive vice president, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific division: Col. Thomas J. Weed, U.S. Army (retired), vice president, National Defense Transportation Association, Washington, D.C.

Western Inter-Mountain Region: Harold H. Christy, second national vice president, National Reclamation Association, Pueblo, Colo.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

JUNE 7, 1963.

Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your projects committee met on June 5, 1963, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 62 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 22 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $247,068,000. Fourteen proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 26 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to permit completion of these surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this congress.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

On October 23, 1962, President Kennedy signed the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act. This act authorized the Corps of Engineers to construct, modify, or otherwise participate in the provision of 199 flood control, navigation, water conservation, and other water resources projects, having an estimated Federal cost of $2,260,218,300.

This includes 79 navigation projects at an estimated Federal cost of $378,498,800; 12 beach erosion control projects at an estimated Federal cost of $19,875,000; and 108 flood control (including multiple-purpose) projects at an estimated Federal cost of $1,861,844,500.

The new law also authorizes amendment of existing beach erosion control laws to provide for Federal payment of 50 percent of the cost of works for the protection of non-Federal publicly owned or publicly used, shores and up to 70 percent of the cost of protection of State and other publicly owned shore parks and conservation areas which meet certain criteria. Previously, it was 33⅓ percent in both cases. Authority is provided to construct small shore protection projects not specifically authorized by the Congress with the Federal share of the cost limited to $400,000, and the law authorizes shore protection investigations at Federal expense in lieu of the present basis under which local interests participate equally in study costs.

In addition, the new law increases the Chief of Engineers' small flood control project authority from $400,000 to $1 million for a single project. The limitation on the overall amount which may be used for this program in any one fiscal year was increased from $10 to $25 million.

Other items of interest in the bill include amendment of the flood control emergency law to provide for repair and restoration of Federal hurricane and shore protection works, and authority for the Chief of Engineers to develop recreational opportunities at all Army water resource projects (previously limited to reservoir projects).

The new omnibus act also authorizes 18 surveys for flood control and allied purposes and 8 surveys in the interest of navigation.

It will be recalled that the Senate version of the 1962 Authorization Act included increases in monetary authorization for 10 river basin plans. However, when the bill went to conference, these increases, along with several projects on which the House committee had not held hearings, were deleted from the bill. The managers on the part of the House made the commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings on those projects as soon as practicable after the next Congress convened.

As a result of the hearings during April 1963, a bill, H.R. 6016, authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, was reported by the House Public Works Committee on May 15, 1963. The bill provides increases in monetary authorization for 10 river basin plans, totaling $684 million. It is understood that monetary authorizations for certain river basins have become so deficient that funds which might be made available cannot be used in the fiscal year 1964. Your projects committee recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to take early action on this bill.

Your projects committee feels it is fitting at this time, the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, to cite the accomplishments in the field of water resources.

The Corps of Engineers civil works program statistics, as of June 30, 1962, are as follows:

Navigation

Number of improved harbors (commercial)	500
Improved Federal waterways in commercial use (miles)	19, 100
Commerce during calendar year 1962 (billion tons)	1. 1

Active navigation projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed	2, 289	$1, 972, 400, 000
Under construction	110	2, 639, 200, 000
Balance	130	1, 611, 400, 000
Total	2, 529	6, 223, 000, 000

Flood control

Number of reservoirs in operation	195
Number of local protection projects in operation	536
Flood-control storage in reservoirs in operation (acre-feet)	65, 800, 000
Flood damages prevented during fiscal year 1962	$662, 637, 000
Cumulative flood damages prevented to date	$11, 295, 187, 000

Active flood control projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed	484	$1, 604, 100, 000
Under construction	168	2, 993, 100, 000
Balance	259	2, 297, 600, 000
Total	911	6, 894, 800, 000

Multiple-purpose projects producing hydroelectric power

Number of reservoirs in operation for hydroelectric power	36
Installed capacity of projects producing power (kilowatts)	7, 531, 400
Generating capacity installed during fiscal year 1962 (kilowatts)	657, 000
Generating capacity under construction (kilowatts)	4, 030, 000
Ultimate capacity of projects completed and under construction (kilowatts)	15, 677, 400

Active multiple-purpose projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed	29	$1, 678, 600, 000
Under construction	30	3, 741, 900, 000
Balance	17	1, 480, 000, 000
Total	76	6, 900, 500, 000

NOTE.—Net hydroelectric power generation during fiscal year 1962: 29,924,100,000 kilowatt-hours.

IRRIGATION

Irrigation storage was provided by 16 reservoirs, having 796,000 acre-feet exclusively for irrigation, and 4,043,000 acre-feet jointly for that and other purposes, making a total of 4,839,000.

LOW-FLOW REGULATION

There were 35 reservoirs in operation which provided low-flow regulation.

WATER SUPPLY

There were 20 reservoirs in operation which provided approximately 1,500,000 acre-feet of water supply storage for 64 cities, towns, and rural areas.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

The total estimated Federal cost of the 92 authorized projects, involving partial reimbursement for construction by local interests, is $44,400,000, of which $8,800,000 has been appropriated to date for 48 of these projects, leaving a balance of $35,600,000 to complete.

RECREATION

Outdoor recreational facilities for public use have been provided at more than 300 projects, at a Federal cost of $27,500,000 and a local cost of about $56 million. During calendar year 1962, there were 127 million visits to these facilities.

It is to be noted that great progress has been made in water resource development, but much remains to be done. The problems in water resource and land use developments are ever increasing in an expanding Nation such as ours. The committee is gratified to note that not only is increasing attention being given to the need for comprehensive planning for water resources development but even more important, numerous recent actions are designed to facilitate true comprehensive planning in the water resource field. These actions include section 207 of the 1962 Flood Control Act in the interest of public parks and recreational facilities at water resource development projects; also Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, 2d session, prepared under the direction of the President's Water Resources Council, has been issued setting forth policies, standards, and procedures in the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for use and development of water and related land resources.

The studies and recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has provided the primary stimulus for the currently increasing emphasis on comprehensive basin planning. The requirements placed upon our water and related land resources are many and varied. They must serve domestic, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other human activities. Senate Document No. 97 states that "The basic objective in the formulation of plans is to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land resources to meet all foreseeable short- and long-term needs." That document also established the scope of multiple-purpose planning; the needs and possibilities for all significant resource uses and purposes of development. As of June 1962 comprehensive basin planning had reached the stage where the areal extent was considered as an entire river basin or major tributary thereof. As a result of the need for such planning Congress has authorized many comprehensive river basin investigations. The budget for fiscal year 1963 included funds for completion of three comprehensive basin studies, continuation of two and initiation of 19 other studies. The fiscal year 1964 budget request includes funds for initiation of 4 and continuation of 21 comprehensive basin studies.

In closing, your committee desires to direct the attention of the Congress to the urgent need for initiating and completing authorized water resource projects and investigations. It is hoped that the committees of Congress will see fit to include in the annual public works appropriations bills for the various Federal agencies concerned with water resource developments, funds necessary to carry out their assigned responsibilities in this highly important field during the next fiscal year.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT T. SECREST,
Chairman.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each calendar year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application.)

DIVISION I—ENDORSED

Endorsed. This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
867-R	Kawainui Swamp	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1008-R4	Calcasieu River salt water barrier	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1096-R5	Port San Luis deep draft and small craft harbor development	California	South Pacific.
1102-R	Trinity River and tributaries	Texas	Southwest.
1193A-R2	Savannah Harbor	Georgia	South Atlantic.
1235-R	Campti-Clarence flood control	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1239-R	Green Bay Harbor, deepening of entrance and river channels	Wisconsin	North Central.
1254-R	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	Tennessee	Ohio River.
1266	Hyder Wing Dam	Alaska	North Pacific.
1267	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach and vicinity	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1268	Savery-Pot Hook, reclamation	Colorado and Wyoming	South Pacific.
1269	Bostwick Park, reclamation	Colorado	Do.
1270	Fruitland Mesa, reclamation	do	Do.
1275	Fremont flood control, Sandusky River	Ohio	North Central.
1276	Salt Creek Reservoir	do	Ohio River.
1277	Crab Creek	do	Do.
1280	Laurel River Reservoir	Kentucky	Do.
1281	Cordell Hull Dam	Tennessee	Do.
1285	Key West Harbor modifications, Key West Bight	Florida	South Atlantic.
1286	Key West Harbor, Garrison Bight	do	Do.
1287	Great Lakes harbors study, interim report on Saginaw River	Michigan	North Carolina.
1296	Elkhorn Basin flood control and irrigation project	Nebraska	Missouri River.

DIVISION II

Meritorious

Meritorious. This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
1092-R3	Passaic River Basin	New Jersey	North Atlantic.
1126-R4	Norfolk Harbor and channel to Newport News	Virginia	Do.
1157-R3	Waikiki Beach improvement	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1165-R	Trenton Channel extension (All American Channel)	Michigan	North Central.
1168-R3	Haleiwa Beach erosion project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1170-R3	Harbors for light-draft vessels, coast of Hawaiian Islands	do	Do.
1213-R2	Northeast (Cape Fear) River above Hilton Bridge	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1220-R2	Cape Fear River above Wilmington	do	Do.
1234-R	Salem Church Reservoir	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1256-R	Norfolk & Western Ry. bridge	do	Do.
1271	Animas-LaPlata, Reclamation	Colorado and New Mexico	South Pacific.
1272	Waterloo flood protection project	Iowa	North Central.
1279	Devils Jumps Reservoir	Kentucky and Tennessee	Ohio River.
1295	Central Arizona project	Arizona and New Mexico	South Pacific.

DIVISION III

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested. This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
776-R	Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Key West	Florida	South Atlantic.
797-R	Perdido Pass	Alabama	Do.
1069-R	Knik Arm Causeway Dam	Alaska	North Pacific.
1138-R2	Mississinewa River channel improvement	Indiana	Ohio River.
1158-R3	Iao Stream	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1162-R3	Kihei District	do	Do.
1163-R2	Palolo and Manoa Streams	do	Do.
1169-R3	Honolulu Harbor, deepening and widening of harbor and survey for a harbor at Barbers Point.	do	Do.
1172-R3	Port Allen Harbor modification	do	Do.
1174-R3	Explosive handling facilities within Hawaii harbors	do	Do.
1219-R2	Kahoma Stream	do	Do.
1251-R	Hanalei River flood control	do	Do.
1257-R	Thimble Shoal Channel, Norfolk Harbor, and channel to Newport News	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1273	Kuliouou Stream	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1274	Potomac River channel improvement project	Virginia and Maryland	North Atlantic.
1278	Heppner Dam and Reservoir	Oregon	North Pacific.
1282	Pupukea-Paumalu flood control	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1283	Kapaakea flood control	do	Do.
1284	Kawela Gulch flood control	do	Do.
1288	Kawaihae Harbor modifications	do	Do.
1289	Hocking River survey	Ohio	Ohio River.
1290	Champlain Waterway	New Jersey, New York, Vermont and Canada.	North Atlantic.
1291	Lafayette River, tributary or estuary of Hampton Roads	Virginia	Do.
1292	Cliff Walk	Rhode Island	Northeast.
1293	Touchet division, Walla Walla project	Washington	North Pacific.
1294	Susquehanna River watershed, comprehensive development	New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.	North Atlantic.

Statement Commemorating the First National Bank of Gallipolis, Ohio, on Its 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the 100th anniversary of a bank whose constant goal has been dedication and service, the First National Bank of Gallipolis, Ohio.

On September 11 ceremonies commemorating a century of service by this bank to both the citizens of Gallipolis and the Ohio Valley will be observed in Gallipolis.

From its very inception in 1863 the bank under the guidance and through the administration of capable and dedicated men and women has served its customers in the highest tradition of banking. It has grown from a small rural institution to a landmark of the Ohio Valley. It is a landmark not because of unusual financial prowess in the banking world, but because of dependability, integrity, and an awareness of how it could meet the financial needs of its customers and the community. In this space-age world we sometimes have a tendency to forget some of our smaller, but enduring and dedicated business firms and institutions. We overlook institutions that serve the many needs of our smaller communities and outlying areas—better than our larger and better known banks that sometimes tend to be insufficiently aware of the needs of smaller cities.

But, it is difficult to overlook a bank that has accepted the challenge of adversity and overcome it to grow in the finest American tradition. Nor can one overlook a man who has dedicated over 50 of his 82 years to the banking world. Mr. Joe Moch is in his golden year as its president. Thus not only do we have a banking institution of note in Gallipolis, but one of the grand old gentlemen of banking.

A half century ago when Mr. Moch became president of the bank deposits totaled just over $200,000, but since have reached new heights of over $5 million. This in itself is a tribute to his devotion, service, and obviously untiring leadership. Many other statistics could be cited, such as the growth of the bank's surplus from $31,000 in 1913 to $600,000 in 1963 but statistics could never tell the story of the First National Bank nor of its president, Mr. Moch.

There are many First National Banks in this country. But few, if any, are as worthy of the name of First National Bank as is this First National Bank of Gallipolis. It has the distinction of being one of the very first banks to be chartered under the National Banking Act of 1863. For 100 years it has been faithful to the trust that was accorded to it by the granting of this charter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I consider it entirely fitting for the Congress of the United States to salute the Fist National Bank of Gallipolis on its centenary and to extend our heartiest congratulations to its distinguished president, Mr. Joe Moch, who has guided its destinies for exactly half of its first hundred years. We are confident that the First National Bank will continue to contribute to its community and to the Nation in the same spirit of dedication and service that have characterized its first century.

Mexican Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, all Mexican citizens, Americans of Mexican descent, and citizens of the United States whose lives have been touched by the Spanish-Mexican cultural influence, will celebrate the 153d anniversary of Mexican Independence Day.

Mexico was the first of Spain's New World colonies to rise up in a war for independence, and the cost of this independence was high in numbers of patriots and expended treasure. But the commodity sought—freedom and sovereignty—was, and remains, priceless. There are few nations in the world which can match Mexico's boundless pride and reverence for its historic struggle for freedom.

In 1810 Mexico was in a ferment of revolutionary ideas and plans for independence. Among the Mexican leaders of this movement was a simple parish priest, Father Miguel Hidalgo, who administered to the Indians and peasants of Dolores. In September of that year, upon learning that the Spanish Government had learned of a plot that he was involved in, Father Hidalgo boldly chose to strike before the government rounded up the revolutionaries. On Sunday morning, September 16, 1810, he rang the church bells to summon the simple people of his parish—the church and churchyard were soon crowded with humble peasants and Indians. Hidalgo spoke to them from the pulpit:

> My children, this day comes to us a new dispensation. Are you ready to receive it? Will you be free? Will you make the effort to recover from the hated Spaniards the lands stolen from your forefathers 300 years ago?

As the crowd roared its approval, Hidalgo cried out what became known as the grito de Dolores, the battle cry of the Mexican War of Independence:

> Long live our Lady of Guadelupe, down with bad government, death to the Spaniards.

Although Hidalgo's army of Indians did not gain complete Mexican independence—for Hidalgo himself was tricked, captured, and shot—the grito de Dolores electrified and rallied Mexican patriots to the long task of earning their freedom. Thus, this day, September 16, like our Fourth of July, is celebrated as the day of the declaration of independence.

Mr. Speaker, we Californians, of course, have particularly close ties with the history and culture of Spain and Mexico, for we have been deeply affected by the gentle arts and customs which our heritage has bequeathed us from Mexico. There are many Mexican-Americans residing in California—over 30,000 in the San Francisco Bay area alone—and we join with them wholeheartedly in their celebration of this day of independence.

From the people of the United States comes the warmest and most affectionate good wishes to the people of Mexico on this, their national day of independence. You are, of all our good neighbors in Latin America, our closest and best neighbors.

Pork?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, unrefuted in the recent speechmaking on the floor of the House in which Members rebutted the smear-like tactics of Life magazine in its issue of August 16 on the subject of so-called pork was that portion of the story pertaining to the U.S. Employment Service under the heading of "The Steaming Pork Casserole—Tasty Items in the Dish." After speaking of the scope and cost of the U.S. Employment Service, the article says:

> Here is where the pork gets mixed into the dish. To attract professional people, some State agencies build elaborate offices with free parking lots in downtown districts. * * * Last year only 40 percent of the people USES placed were unemployed.

Judging from the reaction to this article of Mr. Gil Johnson, Commissioner of Labor of Alaska, who is also head of the Alaska State Employment Service, the subject statement about the employment service is far afield indeed, as evidenced by the telegram which I have received from him, as follows:

> Following wire sent to editor of Life magazine: "I must take exception to your statement in August 16 issue that only 40 percent of the people placed by the U.S. Employment Service were unemployed. Alaska State employment is affiliated with Public Employment Service. Our records show that of the nearly 10,000 persons placed in jobs during the 12-month period ending July 30, 1963, 87 percent were unemployed. Unfortunately your writers apparently ignored the job-finding services provided by the employment service network to the physically handicapped and unemployed veterans. The job-counseling service given applicants and the activities of the service in combating automation and obsolescence of skills through

retraining programs. You have apparently been misled by the current campaign being conducted across the Nation by the fee-charging employment agencies. I would appreciate it if you would give your readers a complete report on the activities of the U.S. Employment Service."

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I say that although Life magazine went far out of its way to broaden its attack to include worthwhile programs based upon public policy and the general welfare, it said nothing about the highly preferential and deficit-producing second-class mail rate under which it mails its magazine each week to its subscribers. Honest reporting should include a fair evaluation and balanced presentation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John W. Wright, Bethesda Baptist Church, Jersey City, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we desire with reverence to approach Thy throne.

We draw near with confidence, relying on the worthiness of Christ, through whom alone we look for pardon and acceptance.

We adore Thee in Thy wise and righteous government. The word of Thine authority is right; and all Thy works are done in truth.

Today and for all times, we beseech Thy guidance and help; look Thou upon us with compassion. Help this Nation, Thy people, to recall to memory the richness of Thy blessings promised, if only Thy name is honored and obedience to Thee is practiced.

May we all now, the people of this great and blessed Nation, begin to meet the conditions that will enable Thee to fulfill Thy promises.

Bring us to the knowledge that right living exalteth a nation and that in Thy will can genuine peace and joy be had.

Help us, O God, to be living examples of the same.

With so much strife and bitterness within the Nation among Thy people, some are free and some are not; in Thy omnipotence touch the hearts of men that a closer relationship among the races abound, that true freedom and lasting liberty are had and felt by all.

"What makes a nation truly great,
Not the strength of arms, nor men of states;
Nor vast domains by conquerors won
Who know not the rising or the setting of the sun.
Not sophisticated schools nor learned clans;
Nor laws that bind the will of man,
For these have proved in ages past like fatal dreams that could not last."

Help all men of this Nation to know no barriers of creed or race, that our love may be like Thine—a love that sees all men as Thy children and our brothers.

O God, who knoweth the secret of every heart, bless, we pray Thee, the leaders of this Nation.

Strengthen the courage of the Representatives in Congress assembled—men of sincerity and of good report desiring to do that which is right and acceptable to Thee. Make Thy righteousness clear to them, O Lord, that by them the Nation is guided into a finer way of life.

Forgive the errors they have made and grant to them the courage to admit mistakes.

Save our leaders, O God; let no personal ambition blind them from that which is right—give to them, if Thou wilt, commonsense and a selflessness that shall make them credits to the Nation.

Holy Father, in this hour, we would pray for the President of these United States, that he too will have the spiritual courage and grace with which to shoulder his obligations.

Be Thou near unto him we pray, filling him with the spirit of God that shall make him fearless to seek, to know, to do the right.

May in his perspective, he has been tried and never denied and is willing to be tried again.

Crown his family with heavenly benedictions and guard their hearts and thoughts always in Thy will.

Strengthen and empower his advisers that they too may know the truth and that their ideals and procedure square with Thy criteria, that by their example and influence all the people will be taught to praise Thee, O God.

Finally, let the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength, and our redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 23, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the French Congo was overthrown last week by a howling mob in the streets of its capital city. Reports from Saigon, South Vietnam, hourly bring incredible tales of mob violence and demonstrations. This friendly government on which we are spending a million dollars a day is in grave danger of being overthrown by mobs.

The march on Washington this week will set a dangerous precedent. It is reminiscent of the Mussolini Fascist blackshirt march on Rome in 1922. It is reminiscent of the Socialist Hitler's government-sponsored rallies in Nuremberg.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been submitted a written threat by George Lincoln Rockwell, commander of the American Nazi Party, to parade and counterdemonstrate. His organization has demanded permission to parade and hold a rally at the Washington Monument. I am reliably informed that 40 additional organizations have also asked for permission to counterdemonstrate.

While this Federal Government-sponsored demonstration on the 28th may be "peaceful" under the watchful eye of thousands of Federal troops, Secret Service, National Guardsmen, and police, it is a bad precedent and could lead to a takeover of the Federal Government by future mobs. The Federal Government has created a Frankenstein monster. The might of the Federal Government is being mobilized to insure a "politically successful" demonstration. Political expediency in this case calls for the utmost caution to insure order. The very fact that the Federal Government is going to such extensive and expensive preparations to guarantee a "peaceful march" indicates the stark potential danger of such demonstrations in the Nation's Capital. After this precedent, the next march on Washington may bring a million demonstrators carrying concealed weapons.

The Constitution guarantees peaceful assembly and the right of petition. However, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the history of our Nation that the Federal Government itself has encouraged a "march on Washington."

The law against mass demonstrations in the Capitol Building and on the grounds should be extended by the Congress to cover the entire District of Columbia to protect the seat of Government of our Republic.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MARKET NEWS SERVICE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, today I have requested the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, of the Committee on Agriculture, to call a public hearing to get the facts on the market news service inaugurated August 1 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Serious questions are involved.

Did the Department of Agriculture have statutory authority to get into the business of disseminating news in competition with private news distribution firms?

If so, can Government lawfully assume an expanding role in news dissemination, perhaps leading to Government domination and control of news services?

The rules under which the news service is established permit the Department to cancel subscribers without notice or reason. This will permit Government to retaliate against newspapers and radio and television stations which criticize Government programs and policies.

This looks like a foot-in-the-door for subtle but effective censorship by Government.

In this day and age of managed news, freedom of expression means more than it ever did and this privilege and right will have to be guarded zealously if we are to continue to live under it.

PREFERENCE LAW ABROGATED

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a copy of a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one day during this week S. 1007 will be on the House floor for consideration. This is the most dangerous and far-reaching bill that will be considered this year.

It is dangerous because it completely abrogates the public body preference law which has been on the statute books since 1906 and during that entire time has never been violated in any substantial degree.

The 1906 power preference law simply says that since these dams and generating facilities are constructed by all the taxpayers of the Nation the first preference for use of such power generated shall go to public bodies.

This bill gives equal preference to all users of power, in the area designated in the bill, regardless of their status either at present or in the future and it provides that no power go outside of this designated area for any purpose so long as any use or purpose can be made of it within that area.

This bill established a regional preference law and is the first step in the complete annulment of the public body preference law which has served the cause of the REA's so successfully down through the years. It is the thing that has made cheap power available to the REA cooperatives without which these cooperatives could not continue to bring power to their farm customers at reasonable prices.

I have today called upon Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of NRECA, and Al Hauffe, president of NRECA, demanding that they take action even at this late date to block passage of this bill which can only mean ultimate destruction to the historical preference law and great financial disruption to the REA cooperatives of the Nation.

The telegram I have sent to these officials is as follows:

> The establishment of a regional preference, as opposed to the present law of granting preference to public bodies, which is embodied in S. 1007 will be on the House floor this week. This bill is the first step toward further regional and river basin preference laws and the ultimate complete liquidation of the public body preference law which has done so much to make REA feasible. I was shocked and surprised to find that you and Al Hauffe, president of NRECA, had failed to appear and testify against this bill abrogating the existing preference law. If you are no longer willing to fight and defend the REA cooperative from the ravages of high priced power, if you are no longer willing to carry on the fight to protect and preserve the existing preference law, then you should resign and permit the REA cooperatives across the Nation, acting through NRECA or some other organization which will protect their interests, to employ someone who will represent them. You can still take effective action. As an REA cooperative member, I call upon you and demand that you wire every Member of Congress expressing your unqualified opposition to the passage of this regional preference bill and mobilize your member co-ops to do likewise.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 103

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 103, Eighty-eighth Congress, with respect to the establishment of a Science Information Data Processing Center incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor specially created to make such investigation, not to exceed $7,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

> Page 1, following line 8, and preceding line 9, insert the following: "Within the continental limits of the United States".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is no committee of Congress that can handle this investigation? I ask if there must be a new committee set up with staff, whatever it amounts to? Of course, it will not be a large staff with an appropriation of $7,000, but is there no committee in Congress that can handle it?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This will come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but is not the Committee on Education and Labor properly staffed to take care of an investigation like that?

Mr. FRIEDEL. A special ad hoc subcommittee will handle this investigation and they will need a secretary. It is a very modest budget.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Three thousand dollars for a secretary; and travel for witnesses, $3,000; and reporting services, $1,000. They have been working on the investigation and cannot continue without proper staff.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is convinced the committee cannot operate without this additional staff?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am saying the full committee cannot give up a member of its staff to the ad hoc subcommittee.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Will the proposed activities of this subcommittee have anything to do with retrieval of information which is gathered by the Federal Government? It seems to me I read that there was a dual purpose of this resolution. I know that the resolution relates to the establishment of a data-processing center, but does it also have something to do with the retrieval of information and research data that the Federal Government compiles?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Our committee is convinced it was not retrieval. At first our committee thought it would be a conflict of interest with the Committee on Government Operations, but we are convinced it is not, that it is something new.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, although not a member of this subcommittee, I know extensive hearings on this subject have been held over the last several months. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee where the funds have come from to operate this subcommittee thus far.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I understand the subcommittee had some hearings, but additional hearings are necessary. They want to pursue the subject further and everybody on the committee will benefit if this resolution is adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. We have had extensive hearings on this subject already. I would like to inquire what further hearings are planned at this time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. If the gentleman will ask the chairman of the subcommittee, he may get that information. I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of this subcommittee, answer that question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Nebraska quite properly pointed out that we have had extensive hearings on this subject. These hearings have been conducted primarily through the efforts of my own staff, carrying out committee assignments in addition to its own duties dealing with my office. I might say, my staff has worked many a night on its own time and with no extra compensation to get this very important work out. We have not had any assistance, simply because the main committee does not have the personnel. The volume of requests for information on the work of the committee has become so great that we do need somebody to handle this heavy volume of work. I have discussed this with the minority members of our committee and we are all agreed that this modest sum will enable us to help resolve the problem that has been created because of the tremendous interest in the work that this committee is doing by retaining a full-time clerk for the committee. This committee's work has been received very well all over the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inquire as to what the plans are for additional hearings, for which the gentleman says they need this $7,000.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman can see in the resolution that up to $3,000 could be used for travel of witnesses. I am not certain we will need that much but we do intend to have considerable hearings. The next phase of the hearings on this subject will be with people who can describe latest methods for making better use of research information. The gentleman will note one thing, I hope. This committee is studying legislation which is an amendment to the National Defense Education Act which in 1958 established the Office of Science and Information Services. The amendment before my subcommittee amends the NDEA to permit the OSIS to establish an informal research data processing and information reference center to coordinate the collection and distribution of research information.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. The gentleman states that this money is to be used to pay the expenses of witnesses who are coming to Washington or wherever hearings are held. In reading the resolution it does not state that. It says that these funds are to be used for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by Members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the subcommittee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The budget for this has been submitted. There is $3,000 for secretarial services; travel and witness fees, $3,000; and for reporting and telephone, telegraph and supplies, $1,000, which makes up the $7,000.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this ad hoc subcommittee which we are discussing here today was appointed by the gentleman from New York, Congressman Adam C. Powell, chairman of the full House Committee on Education and Labor, in order to ascertain whether the National Defense Education Act should be amended to permit the Office of Science Information Service to establish a national research data processing and information retrieval center.

The Office of Science Information Service was established in 1958 after Congress adopted enabling legislation as part of the National Defense Education Act in order to help close the scientific information gap which, it was believed at the time, placed the United States behind the Soviet Union in technological development. Many of you will recall that the National Defense Education Act was approved by Congress shortly after the Soviet Union plunged its first sputnik into space.

Public Law 85-864 established the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Title IX, section 901, titled "Functions of the service," reads as follows:

> The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such service, shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision of, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information, and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

There has been considerable discussion about the effectiveness of the Office of Science Information Service. I have read the annual report of this very important agency, and it is my hope that as the hearings proceed, we will learn more about the functions of this agency.

On January 17 of this year I introduced H.R. 1946, which calls for the establishment within the structure of the Office of Science Information Service of a national research data processing and information retrieval center. This proposal is designed to help eliminate costly duplication of research and provide a centrally coordinated effort for the dissemination of scientific and technical information.

The tremendous amount of written material pouring from over 100,000 technical journals is but one of many sources which makes it physically impossible for scientists to keep current in their field. This results in wasteful duplication of research estimated to be up to 50 percent of our current $15 billion effort in research and development.

The House Committee on Education and Labor has a particular interest in how the resources of the many universities and other institutions of higher learning are utilizing their scientific facilities for their contributions toward this Nation's technological progress.

The members of this committee are generously giving of their time in order to ascertain whether the spirit of the National Defense Education Act, which established the Office of Science Information Service, is indeed being fully carried out or whether this important agency needs additional legislation to make its work even more effective.

I am convinced that the work of this subcommittee can make a most significant contribution toward a better understanding of the problem which confronts America in mid-20th century.

The members of this subcommittee who, despite assignments on other important committees, have agreed to undertake this very important study are, on my right, the Honorable John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana, who, in addition to many other outstanding educational achievements, holds a degree of doctor of philosophy from Oxford University; and the Honorable Hugh L. Carey, Democrat, from New York, eminent member of the bar, a Member of Congress who has shown intense interest in the technological capabilities of this Nation's institutions of higher learning. On my left we have the Honorable Alphonzo Bell, Republican, of California, who brings to this subcommittee the rich knowledge and experience he gains every day as a member of the very important House Committee on Science and Astronautics; and on his left, the Honorable Paul Findley, Republican, of Illinois, a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Illinois College who has shown an intense interest in research retrieval.

This subcommittee is also fortunate to have as technical advisers two gentlemen who have outstanding records in data retrieval: Mr. Allan Kiron, head of advanced research in the Office of Research and Development in the U.S. Patent Office, and Dr. Karl F. Heumann, Director of the Office of Documentation, National Academy of Sciences.

The subcommittee is also most grateful to Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences, who has agreed to assemble a panel of outstanding scientists and scholars who will serve as an advisory task force to this subcommittee.

As you can see, while the five members of this committee, including myself as chairman, are extremely interested in this entire subject of data processing and information retrieval, we have surrounded ourselves with professional men who are highly respected in the American scientific community to guide us along the way in this very complicated field.

This subcommittee plans to have witnesses from various Government agencies, private industry, scientific societies, universities, and other interested parties who will testify on the efforts being undertaken to meet the challenge of data processing and information retrieval.

It is my firm conviction that before this decade is over, data processing and information retrieval will be one of the biggest industries in America and the world. The tremendous technological explosion which is sweeping the world makes it imperative that this civilization develop more efficient ways of grasping the full meaning of man's intellectual discoveries.

I am fully convinced that just as this Nation spent the forties in nuclear development and the fifties in space exploration, the generation of the sixties will see the advent of a tremendous emphasis on data processing and information retrieval.

I dare predict that before this decade is over, a vast part of both the Federal budget and expenditures in the private sector of American industry will be spent on storing and retrieving this tremendous amount of scientific data that scientists and engineers throughout the world are producing.

Since the beginning of recorded history, man's capability to accumulate and retrieve information has paced his progress. Today we are witnessing a grave threat to this progress.

This threat has been eloquently described by the eminent neurologist, Dr. Grey-Walter, as follows:

> During the last two generations the rate of accumulation of knowledge has been so colossally accelerated that not even the most noble and most tranquil brain can now store and consider even a thousandth part of it. Humanity is in a critical state compared with which the constitution of the dinosaur and the community of the Tower of Babel were triumphant.
>
> The root of this evil is that facts accumulate at a far higher rate than does the understanding of them. Rational thought depends literally on ratio, on the proportions and relations between things. As facts are collected, the number of possible relations between them increases at an enormous rate.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, the great American scientist, characterized the urgency of the problem with the following grim note:

> Science may become bogged down in its own products, inhibited like a colony of bacteria by its own exudations.

The staggering statistics amply testify to this pejorative state of affairs.

During the last 33 years, there has been a 10-fold increase in the number of scientists and engineers; from 50,000 in 1930 to over a half million today. Indeed, one authority estimates that the number of scientists now living is greater than the number of all scientists who ever lived before.

The prodigious output flowing from this ocean of creative activity is overwhelming. Over 130,000 research and development projects per year are of government origin, representing two-thirds of the $15 billion our country now spends on research.

We have over 120,000 technical journals in the world. Our Patent Office has over 7 million patents in its files. There are over 500 specialized science information services.

Indeed we have reached a stage in the accumulation of knowledge where manual searching for information is quickly becoming an impossible and extremely costly task.

For example, we now have bibliographies of bibliographies. The last issue of the "World Bibliography of Bibliographies" contains more than 100,000 separately collated volumes of bibliographies.

And yet it is painfully apparent that the human capacity to absorb knowledge is almost minuscule in comparison with the fantastic amount of information available.

For example, the average person reading 12 hours a day, for 50 years, can at most read about 16,000 to 18,000 technical books in his lifetime. We have about 30 million books in the world today.

The enormous gap in our capacity to store and retrieve information and at the same time meet the demands and responsibilities in our society has created the most costly and wasteful drain on our resources, which is without parallel in the entire history of mankind.

The appalling figures speak for themselves. One major U.S. company spent over $250,000 and 5 years of research in an attempt to solve an electronic switching problem important to military communications. The team of topnotch mathematicians doing the research found the solution. However, they also discovered the solution was available in a manuscript 6 months before the research program started.

A cloud seeding experiment has recently been made at a cost of $3 million. Shortly after the completion of the experiment, it was discovered that the same experiment was performed at an earlier date, costing only $256,000.

In one of our ballistic-missile programs, a special valve was needed to solve a tricky fluid handling problem. After several months of research, the solution was realized. In addition, it was discovered the information on this valve existed before research was started. In the meantime, missile firings were held up for several months.

Recently the General Accounting Office reported two Government agencies were working on the same type of missile for over a year before the duplication was discovered. The cost of duplication involving NASA's Atlas Agena B and the Air Force Atlas Vega was $18 million.

A leading manufacturing firm paid over $8 million for the invention of one of its products before it realized someone else had developed the same product.

One Air Force project for storing and retrieving research reports rediscovered 3,000 reports worth $36 million.

In fact, the situation of retrieving information has reached such an abysmal state of affairs that industries find it more economical to duplicate research projects costing less than $100,000 rather than spend the time and effort in finding out if in fact the desired information is available in the literature.

This catalog of waste is by no means exhaustive. It is, however, sufficiently dramatic to make us responsive to meet the greatest challenge of our time, a challenge fraught with power to either suffocate our progress or ennoble the aspirations and welfare of mankind.

Indeed, the harnessing of power from scientific knowledge through data processing and information retrieval will surely surpass the rich rewards derived from harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Another challenge with which we must concern ourselves is the Soviet Union. Reports of past and recent activities in the Soviet Union indicate a concerted government effort toward the solution of problems in data processing and information retrieval.

Probably the best known institute in Russia devoted to data processing and information retrieval is Viniti, located in Moscow. It is by no means the only one. However, it is the biggest, most centralized institute in the Soviet Union. Viniti employs thousands of scientists and abstractors, processing mountains of information which becomes available wherever it is needed.

There has been a great deal of speculation as to the important role Viniti may have played in advancing the Soviet space effort. The American Air Force Journal, as early as 1957, wrote this about Viniti:

> No one will ever know how many billions of rubles and how many tens of thousands of man-years of valuable scientific research time this system has saved Russia.

The following facts reported recently in the Soviet literature may offer some hint:

In 1 year a plant in Maslenikov saved $1,400,000.

An industrial complex in Leningrad saved $27 million; in Gorkiy, $25 million; in Udmurtskiy, $14 million.

All this saving was achieved as a result of information provided from Viniti.

The Russians seem to be so efficient that Dr. Finley Carter, director of the Stanford Research Institute, was prompted to state:

> In order to better know what American scientists are doing, one must read Soviet journals of abstracts.

John Gunther, the well known American reporter, writes:

> Russian abstracting services are so complete and so well developed that it has come to the point where American scientists learn about new accomplishments by Americans in their field from Russian abstract journals.

The importance of centralizing information has been attested to as one of the key factors in the success the Soviets have had so far. As pointed out by Dr. Michailov, director of the Institute of Scientific Information of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences:

> Nine years of operational service of the Institute of Scientific Information under U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences justify completely the establishment of a centralized documentation agency, since it is only within a centralized documentation service that the world's overall output of scientific publications can be processed and knowledge scattered through various sources can be cumulated and synthesized. Besides, the centralized system of information provides a fair base for effective mechanization and automation development.

The above is supported by Prof. Boris M. Tareev, also from Viniti who states:

> Experience gained from information work in the U.S.S.R. and in other countries indicates that the complex and important task of providing complete, i.e., "total" information on all recent scientific and technical developments throughout the world can be accomplished by a central scientific information institute which has at its disposal many highly qualified specialists, suitable technical equipment, and sufficient funds for acquisition of current literature from many different countries. The Institute of Scientific Information is such a center in Russia.

In my bill, H.R. 1946, introduced January 17, 1963, I proposed the establishment of the National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center to ameliorate some of the abysmal shortcomings and dangers to which facts and figures above bear witness. For it is readily apparent that the lack of a central organ, amidst hundreds of abstracting devices and countless specializing information services, lacking efficiency and control over duplication of research projects costing billions of dollars is a deadly danger to the survival of our country.

The timing and need for the center which I have proposed have never been more urgent and necessary. The responsibilities of our Government to our citizens and the scientific community must be met at once with energy, dedication, and leadership worthy of our heritage.

The cries for help from our scientists are desperate and justly demanding. The distinguished vice president of Tulane University, Dr. F. R. Cagle, only a few months ago succinctly captured today's mood of our scientists by saying:

> I speak as a scientist complainant; as a biologist frustrated by the difficulties of obtaining articles essential to my research; as a bewildered administrator participating in decisionmaking; as a frightened observer of the literature problems of my biologist colleagues; as an angry critic of our Government for failing to have concern about technical information programs.

It is therefore of little surprise that my proposal has received such gratifying response and support.

The distinguished soldier-scientist, former Chief of Research and Development in the Department of the Army, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, recently pointed out:

> I believe you of industry, our academic allies, and the agencies of Government need to get together and back what I think is needed here—let's call it STATIC—a Scientific and Technological Information Center—a national clearinghouse for the most complete and comprehensive acquisition, translation, and exchange of information that we can get from all segments of our Nation and from the rest of the free world.

A Washington University editorial writes:

> Above all, in this country we need a central agency to coordinate the overall information effort; winnow the total production; and pick up the loose ends like foreign publications, research bulletins, graduate theses, Government reports and papers delivered at conferences. Organizing and operating such an institution would be an effort no bigger than others we have made, no more ponderous than others the Government has shouldered and carried home. It would deserve to be called investment rather than extravagance.

One of the most distinguished foreign critics on information retrieval, whose expert advice and services have been solicited by various Government agencies for many years, including the National Science Foundation, whose record of objective scientific analysis is unassailable, Professor of Mathematical Logic and Linguistics Y. Bar-Hillel, has recently stated:

> There could, for instance, hardly be any doubt that the establishment of an institution corresponding to the Russian All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technological Information could greatly improve the existing situation in the information field in the United States and could most probably be an overall improvement.

Needless to say, there are many others who voice similar views. Clearly, the establishment of a National Center is the most urgent need and merits the highest consideration and priority.

The benefits to be derived from the establishment of a National Center are too numerous and too obvious to need further elaboration here. However, there is one outstanding bonus which can be had. It is less obvious and, therefore, I shall detail some of the hidden rich rewards awaiting the realization of a National Center.

We are all too familiar with the current shortages of scientists, the costly expense involved in obtaining a technical education and the difficulty of attracting students to pursue degrees in science. And, yet notwithstanding these obstacles, the establishment of a National Center could double the number of scientists by cutting wasteful duplication and mountainous literature searches which consume as much as 70 percent of our scientists' time.

Never before in history have we faced such a titanic challenge. The hour is fast approaching when we must act or be left behind, adrift in a fog of technological confusion. The rewards in accepting this great challenge are boundless. The decision is ours.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, over the years the House of Representatives has made many significant contributions to economic and efficient operation of our Government. It is worthy to note that the House has not overlooked its own activities in this endeavor and has provided that the necessary funds made available to our various House committees shall not be used in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House. It could be said that this limitation diminishes the independence of our House committees. Nevertheless, without question, this limitation is entirely justifiable and necessary for the economic and efficient management of our legislative responsibilities.

House Resolution 444 would authorize the House Labor Committee to expend funds in an investigation and study as to the need and desirability of Congress authorizing the establishment of a Science Information Data Processing Center. An important factor in maintaining centralized coordination of House expenditures on studies and investigations is whether such a study would in any way overlap or duplicate Government operations committee deliberations on H.R. 5171. As you will recall, this latter measure was approved by the House on July 18, 1963. Earlier this month I had the pleasure of appearing before the House Administration Committee, at which time I outlined the basic distinction in the centralized program of equipment acquisition and utilization as provided in H.R. 5171 as contrasted to the substantive utilization of such equipment as would be the subject of the study authorized under House Resolution 444.

H.R. 5171, within the context of ADP acquisition and utilization, constitutes an endeavor which is comparable to the efforts of the House Administration Committee in achieving coordination among other House committees relating to investigations and studies. H.R. 5171 would achieve a centralized coordination among Federal agencies relating to the use of ADP equipment. According to authoritative studies of the Comptroller General, this is essential to economic and efficient acquisition and utilization of this costly automatic data processing equipment, and will save the taxpayers over $100 million a year. Under this centralized, coordinated approach, the Administrator of General Services would provide equipment to meet the individual requirements of the various Federal user agencies. However, the various individual agencies would establish their own requirements for such equipment and would use the equipment for whatever purposes they selected in carrying out their independent managerial responsibilities. The Administrator of General Services would act essentially as a supplier and a coordinator. Furthermore, before he furnishes any equipment to any user agency, Congress would have had to authorize the expenditure for the purpose intended and provide adequate funds in the user agency's appropriation to cover the cost of utilizing the equipment for the fiscal year involved.

On the other hand, it would appear that House Resolution 444 would authorize the House Labor Committee to expend funds in an investigation and study as to the need or desirability of Congress authorizing the establishment of a science information data processing center. Thus, the direct aim of this resolution would appear to relate to the substantive use of ADP equipment—to the desirability of Congress authorizing some executive agency to assume the function of collecting scientific data using ADP equipment. Under H.R. 5171, the Administrator of General Services could not establish such a center unless Congress authorized a user agency or agencies to carry out this function and provided the funds for this purpose.

Accordingly, there would not appear to be any conflict between this study and H.R. 5171, assuming, of course, that the study did not involve the acquisition and supply of any ADP equipment which would be necessary for the establishment of the center. Apparently this study would relate solely to the need for a science processing center rather than the means by which the center would be established and the equipment acquired. On this basis, I see no conflict between the proposed investigation and study and this important legislation which has already been acted upon by the House of Representatives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, inaccessibility to available technical information renders today's scientists virtually unable, within reasonable time limitations, to effectively recapture existing knowledge. Some 120,000 different technical journals periodically published the world over in scores of different languages, approximately 30 million books, untold millions of scientific papers and theses, and more than 500 specialized science information services highlight the magnitude of the information retrieval problem.

Today, as never before, scientific and technical information accumulates in mountainous proportions, spurred ever higher by new breakthroughs, and the increasing demands of a space age world.

Generating this mass storehouse of information is the largest scientific community the world has ever known. Over a short 33 years, the number of scientists and engineers has increased tenfold; from 50,000 in 1930 to over half a million today. Each individual in this massive human equation adds his own insight, and within short order the scope of available information becomes astronomical.

How to make rational order out of this wide-ranging chaos, how to obtain maximum useful information from millions of diverse sources is one of the most pressing problems facing the scientific community today.

The alarming fact is that scientific advancement is being impaired today because of a failure to implement an effective collection and retrieval system. Such techniques appear to be within the range of modern day automatic data processing systems. Describing such a system remains the crux of the problem.

The newly established ad hoc Subcommittee on Research Data and Processing and Information Retrieval Center was created solely and for the express purpose of determining criteria for describing an efficient data collection and dissemination system. Legislative study of the problem should be encouraged. It should be encouraged for a number of compelling reasons.

HUGE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS PROVIDE SELF-JUSTIFICATION

Scientific research projects of the Federal Government cost $14.5 billion in fiscal 1963. This is a 33 percent increase in 2 years. The upward trend is certain to continue. With so deep a commitment, the need to correlate all programs become self-evident. Efficient automated techniques to collect and retrieve available knowledge are imperative.

EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS THROUGH ADP TECHNIQUES WOULD CURB DUPLICATION

At current annual rates, the Federal Government is involved in over 130,000 research and development projects. Avoiding duplication is near impossible under present methods. A Department of Defense survey of certain scientific contractors in 1958 estimated that 30 to 85 percent of the work was wasted because of duplication. Example after example involving losses of millions can be cited where a scientist worked years on a project only to discover that his conclusion was published months before his work even began. This we cannot afford.

PRODUCTIVITY INCREASES REALIZED THROUGH ADP TECHNIQUES ARE VITAL TO MAXIMIZE TIME EXPENDED BY SCIENTISTS ON PURE RESEARCH

Much concern has been recently expressed over scientific and technical personnel shortages. Yet, current estimates speculate that as much as 70 percent of a scientist's time is consumed in reference and literature searching. Modern America faced by scientific personnel shortages cannot afford such wasted effort.

ADP SYSTEM TECHNIQUES ARE REQUIRED TO COMPETE EFFECTIVELY WITH COLD WAR ADVERSARIES

Effectiveness of an information storage and retrieval system has been proven by our cold war competitor. Moscow's largest data processing and information retrieval center, Viniti, has reputedly been responsible for substantially advancing time schedules on many space age projects. Indications are that this system is more advanced than any system the United States now maintains. According to recent reports, several United States companies approached the Russian information center, Viniti, and offered to pay $3 million a year for a translation of Viniti's abstracting services. The Soviet challenge must be met.

AMERICA'S ADP SYSTEM TECHNIQUES ARE CRUCIAL TO MAINTAINING WORLD WIDE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE

Keeping competitively astride in today's fast-paced world requires rapid dissemination of new information. Yesterday, new ideas were assimilated into the education stream and over a period of a generation or so became the fountainhead of new business and industrial techniques. Today it is questionable whether this lag can be tolerated without sacrificing precious competitive advantage.

Avoiding duplication, making efficient use of scientific personnel, paring back the drudge of mechanical library search, maintaining competitive position in world markets, and keeping pace with cold war adversaries; that is the brief recap of reasons for encouraging legislative review of automatic data processing collection and retrieval techniques.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NASA AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. MILLER of California submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE SPECIAL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND TO THE CONGRESS ON INCREASE IN RESOURCES OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 474 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the May 1963 Special Report to the President and to the Congress on Increase in the Resources of the Inter-American Development Bank, by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF THE MAY 1963 SPECIAL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND TO THE CONGRESS ON PROPOSED INCREASE OF $1 BILLION IN AUTHORIZED CAPITAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 475 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the May 1963 Special Report to the President and to the Congress on the Proposed Increase of $1,000,000,000 in Authorized Capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE STUDY ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 203, with amendments, and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor ten thousand additional copies of the study entitled, "The Federal Government and Education", prepared by that committee during the current session; and that there be printed one hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies, of which one hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and fifty-one thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why 171,000 copies? What representation was made to the committee which would justify 171,000 copies of this?

Mr. HAYS. Well, the representation was made by quite a few Members who said they had heavy demands for this document and that they could not obtain them from the committee because the committee had said that they had demands for all they had expected to get. So we made available some limited number of these on the basis of 250 to each Member and 500 to each Senator.

Mr. GROSS. I note there are to be 10,000 additional copies for the committee itself and then 161,250 additional copies, of which 109,750 shall be for the use of the House and 51,500 for the use of the Senate, making a total of 171,000 copies.

How many of these have been printed up prior to this time?

Mr. HAYS. Three thousand, as a committee print.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps there is a huge demand for them, but I cannot recall ever having a request for one of these publications.

Mr. HAYS. All on which we had to go was the number of people who said they did, and there was a heavy demand and that there would also be an increasingly heavy demand when they found out they were available to some Members.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 2, following the word "printed" insert "as a House Document, and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document and additional copies of the study entitled 'The Federal Government and Education'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING OF EXCERPTS RELATING TO THE 1963-64 NATIONAL COLLEGE DEBATE TOPIC

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 212 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document selected excerpts relating to the 1963-1964 national college debate topic, "That the Federal Government should guarantee an opportunity for higher education to all qualified high school graduates", compiled by the Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that there be printed sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies of such document, of which five thousand one hundred and fifty shall be for the use of the Senate and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF MATERIAL RELATING TO U.S. DEFENSE POLICIES IN 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the document entitled "United States Defense Policies in 1962" by Charles H. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert "That the document entitled 'A compilation of material relating to United States Defense Policies in 1962' by Charles N. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended to read as follows: "Resolution authorizing the printing of a compilation of material relating to United States defense policies in 1962."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, recently the Federal Food and Drug Administration has issued a proposed ban on the prescription of certain drugs containing antibiotics.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this proposal and to include extraneous correspondence and information on this matter, immediately following the consideration of these bills to which my colleague from Ohio is referring.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, recently published stories in various newspapers reported the proposal by the Food and Drug Administration to ban a number of prescription cold-cure drugs containing antibiotics. Notice of this proposed ban was published recently in the Federal Register and such a ban could become effective after a 30-day waiting period. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that if such a rule and regulation is formally adopted by the Food and Drug Administration no physician may give his patients a prescription which includes designated antibiotics with other drugs in the treatment of the so-called common cold.

Any such procedure, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is an unwise and unwarranted preemption of the best judgment and freedom of individual physicians to prescribe what is best in accordance with scientific knowledge and ability, for the good health of their patients. It also appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that such an action can easily be considered as one more step to socialize the practice of medicine by having a Federal agency determine what combination of otherwise approved drugs can be used by private physicians in the treatment of their patients.

Mr. Speaker, it may seem somewhat farfetched at first glance, but is this another effort to reduce people to numbers instead of being persons? Are we now to have prescriptions approved and designated as numbered prescriptions for the treatment of ailments which are also numbered? Will the function of the physician, who already has his prescription authority number, be now required to look up the number of an ailment, match the number of the prescription he may be permitted to use and then prescribe such numbered prescription combination for an individual who has already become a number and who may go to a number designated pharmacy to have the prescription filled? Are we as a nation becoming so number conscious that we are losing our traits of human individuality? This, Mr. Speaker, might be an interesting line of thought to pursue but I do not want to get lost in a numbers game.

Mr. Speaker, upon seeing the news stories about the possibility of such a ban by the Food and Drug Administration, I telephoned Commissioner George Larrick to discuss it with him. As the result of our conversation, Commissioner Larrick wrote to me and attached some pertinent information by way of additional information.

In order to enable my colleagues to answer any inquiries they may receive, under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit copies of our exchange of correspondence and the information furnished by Commissioner Larrick to be included herewith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1963.

MR. GEORGE P. LARRICK,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your letter of August 23 and the information you enclosed in response to my recent telephone conversation with you relative to the proposed ban on the prescription of cold-cure drugs containing antibiotics.

Obviously, I am not trained in any of the sciences included in the various professions of the healing arts. Yet I have had a long and deep personal interest in these matters and I am very grateful for the opportunity I have had to participate in the hearings, committee consideration, and debate on H.R. 11581 which, you will recall, was approved in the House of Representatives on September 27, 1962.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that the practice of the healing arts is not an exact science. Many individuals respond and react differently to medication and other treatments. Therefore, there is no substitute for the well-trained physician who, because of his scientific knowledge, skills, ability, and experience, plus his own knowledge of his individual patients is the only competent judge as to the medication and treatment to be prescribed in a given illness. I am certain no well-qualified physician would ever prescribe a drug or a combination of drugs for his individual patients unless he was personally convinced his prescription would be in the best interest of the health and well-being of his patients.

The intentions of my colleagues on the committee and my own intentions in urging approval of the 1962 amendments to the Food and Drug Act were fully set forth in the committee report and the debate in the House which is recorded on pages 21049 to 21100 inclusive of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 15. My own remarks appear on pages 21055, 21056, and 21057. I am sure that if you and your staff will carefully restudy all of the RECORD you will have no difficulty in determining the intention of the Congress.

Therefore, it seems to me that any effort on the part of the Food and Drug Administration, even with the help of a panel of outside medical expert authorities, to ban the use of some drugs or combination of drugs all previously approved by the FDA on the grounds that such remedies do not have value in the treatment of a given ailment is going far beyond the expressed intention of the Congress. Such an action, it appears to me, serves only to tie the professional hands of individual physicians and thus prevent them from using their own best professional judgment. One can easily infer that such a determination by the FDA is but one more step toward the socialization of medicine by requiring the physician to go by the book instead of permitting him to use his own best professional judgment.

It would seem to me that a far better plan for the FDA to adopt, if your own experts and the panel of outside experts are fully convinced as to the scientific soundness of their decisions, would be to make all their scientifically developed findings available to each and every physician. Thus each physician would then be enabled to exercise his own best judgment in complete confidence and in accordance with our long-established principles of freedom of choice.

The responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration to determine the purity, strength, and safety of each drug and combination of drugs along with the conditions under which they are manufactured is fully recognized and endorsed. The determination as to the efficacy of the drug as claimed by the manufacturer is also a recognized responsibility of the FDA. The efficacy of a drug, however, when combined with others in a prescription by a physician could easily be quite different, I should think, and this judgment, it seems to me, can best be left in the hands of the physician himself because he knows his patient as an individual.

The purpose of all of us and each of us is to improve the health of everyone including those yet unborn and you may be assured I shall continue my every effort to assist you and your staff in this entirely worthy objective. We in the United States must maintain and continue our worldwide recognized leadership in the good health, happiness, and welfare of each and every citizen. I am glad to join you and your associates in this effort in every proper manner I can.

Enclosed is a photostatic copy of a story in the August 19 Dayton Daily News on the subject of your proposed ban and is the news item I mentioned to you.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Representative to Congress,
Third District, Ohio.

[From the Daily News, Aug. 19, 1963]

PURPOSE QUESTIONED: COLD CURE BAN AMAZES DOCTORS

(By Mary Ellen Lynch)

Dayton physicians and druggists today expressed surprise over the Food and Drug Administration's proposed ban on more than 50 cold cure prescription drugs.

The proposed order, announced by the FDA Saturday, would affect prescriptions which include antibiotics in conjunction with analgesics, antihistamines, decongestants and caffeine. But it would not affect popular cold remedies sold without prescription.

An FDA spokesman said the move came after a team of medical scientists found that antibiotics have no effect on the common cold.

"That's not news," Dr. H. H. Williams, city health commissioner said. "We've known that for years. But secondary bacterial infections often develop along with colds and antibiotics can be effective in treating these.

"I don't see why the FDA would try and limit this to prescription drugs when people can buy any kind of patent medicine they want to. What they seem to be doing is limiting prescription drugs ordered by doctors who know as much or more than the FDA and letting patent medicine people sell anything they want to."

"It's not clear what the Government's driving at," commented Lee Eiler, Sr., Dayton drug firm executive and president of the American College of Apothecaries.

"If the order were the other way around, affecting nonprescription drugs, it might make some sense. The claim of some of these over-the-counter remedies are ridiculous."

Eiler said that some nonprescription cold remedies contain small amounts of antibiotics. He added that the prescription drugs the FDA is aiming at are rarely ordered by physicians anyway.

"They account for a very small percentage of the prescriptions written," Eiler said. He added that he hopes to get some clarification on the proposed order.

Dr. W. J. Lewis, a general practitioner, agrees with Eiler.

"I seldom prescribe that sort of thing anyway," he said, "and I don't see the purpose of the Government order. Every doctor knows that antibiotics should not be used indiscriminately. But it should be left to the discretion of the physician."

Dr. Lewis said that when a secondary infection indicates the need for an antibiotic he prescribes it separately. This could still be done if the Government order goes into effect.

"Overall it would make very little difference," the doctor said. "I doubt if the public will be aware of any change."

Dr. Robert E. Zipf called the FDA proposal "incongruous."

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1963.

Hon. PAUL F. SCHENCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: In accordance with your telephone request of August 21, we are glad to outline the basis for recent actions which will have an effect on certain drugs containing antibiotics.

We followed the advice of outstanding medical experts in the development of our policies on these drugs. A committee selected from specialists named by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council to advise us has submitted a report which serves as the basis of a recent proposal about certain antibiotic-containing drugs.

Dr. Harry Dowling, University of Illinois School of Medicine, and chairman of the council on drugs of the American Medical Association, was chairman of our advisory committee. Other members were: Dr. Paul Beeson, Yale University School of Medicine; Dr. Maxwell Finland, Harvard University School of Medicine; Dr. William Jordan, University of Virginia School of Medicine; Dr. Edwin Dennis Kilbourne, Cornell University School of Medicine; Dr. Carl Schmidt, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Copies of the report of the committee and of our proposed changes in the antibiotic regulations to meet the recommendations of the medical experts (from the Federal Register of Aug. 17, 1963) are enclosed.

Also on July 23, 1963, we published in the Federal Register a statement of policy about certification of antibiotic drugs. This explains how the provisions of the Kefauver-Harris drug amendments affect a large group of antibiotic drugs which were brought under the certification procedures by the new law. Copy of this policy statement is enclosed (sec. 146.31 of the antibiotic regulations).

These actions with regard to antibiotics relate to preparations that are sold with and without prescription and are based on the specific provisions of the Kefauver-Harris drug amendments and upon the best advice available from experts in the field of antibiotic therapy.

We have found medical experts quite willing to assist us in our activities with regard to drugs. In case you have not seen it, you may be interested in the enclosed release from the American Medical Association dated June 24, 1963, announcing the Second National Congress on Medical Quackery which will be held in late October under the joint sponsorship of the American Medical Association and the Food and Drug Administration. The first conference held 2 years ago has led to more effective action by all agencies interested in curbing quackery. We anticipate that the forthcoming one will further strengthen programs designed to curb medical quackery.

With best regards,

GEO. P. LARRICK,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1963.

Following the June 6, 1962, meeting of the group of consultants to consider the prophylatic use of antimicrobial agents, the chairman, Dr. Harry F. Dowling, forwarded the following discussion and conclusion under date of September 25, 1962:

"1. In general it was concluded that to permit a claim for the prophylactic use of an antimicrobial agent to be made definitive evidence for the usefulness of that specific agent should be required, wherever possible, in the specific disease against which it is to be used. It was conceded, however, that collateral data may be sufficient to warrant support of a claim for prophylactic use when it is not medically feasible to obtain more definite proof.

"The panel suggested that a general statement could be made to the effect that there are situations in which susceptible individuals in a closed environment have been exposed to a specific infecting agent and where specific prophylaxis with a relatively safe, known effective antimicrobial may be employed. The examples cited were institutions, camps, and occasionally private home environment.

"2. The panel next considered the areas of recognized prophylatic use of individual antibiotics. It was agreed that the summary developed by the Bureau of Medicine presented a good picture of the present status of such uses.

"In prevention of streptococcus infections in patients who have had rheumatic fever—penicillin and erythromycin were recognized as useful for this purpose. It was concluded that sulfonamides could also be included provided a statement was included that restraint strains may develop. Tetracyclines and sulfonamides were considered to be less effective than penicillin or erythromycin in the prophylaxis and particularly in the treatment of streptococcal infections.

"Prophylaxis of tuberculosis—acceptable where there is a high exposure of susceptible individuals of any age and in infants and young children with positive tuberculin tests.

"Contacts of patients with meningococcal infections merit sulfonamide prophylaxis and sulfadiazine is the drug of choice. It was noted that there have been no field trials to support the recommendation of other sulfonamides.

"The panel recognized that there was some evidence to permit the use of antibacterial agents for the prevention of shigellosis under certain conditions. Sulfadiazine and tetracycline have proved useful, but epidemics have occurred caused by strains resistant to these agents. In prophylaxis of venereal infections penicillin was recognized as acceptable in the prevention of gonorrhea provided it is given in close relationship to the time of exposure. The question of antibiotic prophylaxis of syphilis was discussed but no definitive recommendations were made either to accept or deny this as a proper indication. Patients with significant chronic pulmonary disease may be candidates for long- or short-term suppressive or preventive therapy with the tetracyclines. Prophylaxis of infection in certain patients with chronic illnesses such as fibrocystic disease of the pancreas and hypogammaglobulinemia was considered acceptable.

"The panel added that it was considered acceptable to use antimicrobials to prevent infection following a single instrumentation of the urinary tract (for example, catheterization). Tetracyclines and sulfonamides were considered acceptable but chloramphenicol, nitrofurantain, and mandelamine should not be recommended. Prophylactic use of antimicrobials during use of indwelling catheters is of no demonstrable value.

"Use of penicillin in connection with dental extraction, oral surgery, or tonsillectomy in patients with rheumatic or congenital heart defects to prevent bacterial endocarditis in accord with the American Heart Association recommendations is considered acceptable although its value is unproven.

"3. The use of antimicrobial therapy in treating the common cold was next considered.

"It was concluded that there is no acceptable evidence that any antimicrobial agent is of any value in the treatment of the common cold or of any viral infection. Infections due to certain large viruses are expected.

"Antimicrobial agents are of no value in preventing bacterial complications in patients with common colds who are otherwise healthy and therefore should not be used. They may have value in patients with underlying chronic pulmonary disease.

"The problem of the combination products containing antimicrobial agents with analgesics, antihistamines, and possibly decongestants was discussed. The question of whether the antimicrobial agent prevents complicating infections had been answered as well as the fact that the antimicrobial had no effect on the cold itself. The symptomatic relief provided by the other ingredients was questioned, but even if these were effective, in no instance was there justification for any such product to contain an antimicrobial agent.

"When prophylactic therapy of respiratory infection is justified, the antimicrobial agent that may be used must be one that is relatively free of inherent toxicity. This would preclude the use of chloramphenicol, triacetyloleandomycin, and/or sulfonamide products.

"The group generally did not favor fixed combination products containing antimicrobials. It was stated that there may be a risk, although admittedly difficult to prove, of the potential effect on bacterial ecology of the indiscriminate administration of small prophylactic doses of antibiotics; namely, that drug resistant organisms may appear and perhaps even organisms of changed virulence.

"4. Consideration was given to combinations of antimicrobials with an antifungal agent to suppress monilial overgrowth. Essentially, it was considered acceptable to permit a statement to the effect that the combination of antimicrobial agents with antifungal agents for prophylactic purposes may effect a diminution in the fungal population, but this is of no proven therapeutic value against fungal infections.

"5. OTC—Antibiotic throat lozenges. This matter was briefly discussed. The panel was willing to make a statement to the effect that they knew of no evidence that antibiotics topically in lozenges would prevent or cure upper respiratory infections. They added that they considered labeling misleading if it states or implies that the antibiotic or chemotherapeutic is useful in preventing or treating infection unless data are available to prove it. They added that data pointing to the toxicity or hazard resulting from the use of such lozenges would be extremely difficult to develop.

"6. Antibiotic ointments and sprays offered to prevent infection of minor cuts, scratches, and abrasions. The panel was asked if they wished to comment on such prophylactic use. They made no recommendation, feeling this should be considered by a different panel including experts in the field of dermatology and allergy."

Following receipt of this report, the Food and Drug Administration prepared a draft of a proposal and submitted this to each member of the committee. Suggested changes in the draft were made and the formal proposal was published in the Federal Register of August 17, 1963.

[From the Federal Register, Aug. 17, 1963]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

[21 CFR parts 141a–148e, 146, 146a–146e]

ANTIBIOTICS IN COMBINATION WITH ANALGESIC SUBSTANCES, ANTIHISTAMINICS, AND CAFFEINE—NOTICE OF PROPOSALS TO DELETE FROM THE LIST OF ORAL DRUGS ACCEPTABLE FOR CERTIFICATION

Based on clinical data submitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs by an interested manufacturer, the antibiotic regulations were amended October 25, 1952, to provide for the optional use of analgesic substances, antihistaminics, and caffeine as ingredients of penicillin tablets for the relief of symptoms and prevention of complications of the common cold and other acute upper respiratory infections. Later, these same ingredients were permitted for use in other oral dosage forms of penicillin and in certain oral dosage forms of chlortetracycline and its derivatives, when intended for these same conditions.

Since the issuance of the aforementioned regulations, questions have been raised by well-qualified medical experts concerning the efficacy of use of such drugs for these purposes. For this reason, and because the Commissioner had before him requests from a manufacturer that the antibiotic regulations be amended to provide for the certification of a tablet and a sirup consisting of tetracycline hydrochloride and antihistamines, analgesic substances, and a decongestant, the Commissioner concluded that these drugs should be reevaluated in the light of present medical knowledge. He requested that the President of the National Academy of Sciences nominate a group of medical experts to assist him in the development of a sound medical policy as it relates to the use of these specific drugs and to the use of antibiotics in general for the prophylaxis or prevention of bacterial infections. The Academy agreed to the Commissioner's request and, from a list of names submitted, a panel was formed consisting of the following: Dr. Harry Dowling, University of Illinois School of Medicine, chairman; Dr. Paul Beeson, Yale University School of Medicine; Dr. Maxwell Finland, Harvard University School of Medicine; Dr. William Jordan, University of Virginia School of Medicine; Dr. Edwin Dennis Kilbourne, Cornell University School of Medicine; Dr. Carl Schmidt, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

The panel met with representatives of the Bureau of Medicine and the Division of Antibiotics of the Food and Drug Administration to study and discuss the problems involved. Subsequently, the Commissioner received from the chairman the panel's unanimously approved report. A number of the conclusions and suggestions made in the report will require no changes in the antibiotic regulations, since they deal only with labeling. Before putting into effect those made concerning antibiotics in combination with drugs such as antihistaminics, analgesic substances, decongestants, and caffeine, however, changes will be required in the existing regulations. The effect of these changes would be to delete such drugs from the list of those acceptable for certification. With respect to these drugs, it was the conclusion of the Panel that:

1. There is no acceptable evidence that any antimicrobial agent is of any value in the treatment of the common cold or any other upper respiratory viral infection.

2. Antimicrobial agents are of no value in preventing bacterial complications in patients with common colds who are otherwise healthy, and therefore should not be used. They may have some value in patients with underlying chronic pulmonary disease. When prophylactic therapy of respiratory infection is justified, the antimicrobial agent that may be used must be one that is relatively free of inherent toxicity. This would preclude the use of chloramphenicol, triacetyloleandomycin, and/or sulfonamide products.

3. The antibiotic in a drug which includes analgesics, antihistaminics, and possibly decongestants would have no effect on the cold itself and there is insufficient clinical evidence to show that it would be of value in the prevention of complicating infections of a cold. The symptomatic relief that may be provided by the other ingredients of such a preparation is no justification for any such product to contain an antimicrobial agent.

In the light of the unanimous opinion of the advisory panel, the Commissioner proposes, pursuant to section 507 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 507, 59 stat. 463 as amended; 21 U.S.C. 357) and under the authority delegated to him by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (25 F.R. 8625):

1. To amend the antibiotic regulations wherever necessary by deleting from the list of systemic oral drugs acceptable for certification those that contain an antibiotic in combination with an analgesic substance or a decongestant or an antihistaminic or caffeine.

2. To deny the request that the antibiotic regulations be amended to provide for the certification of tablets and of syrups of tetracycline hydrochloride, analgesic substances, an antihistaminic, and a decongestant.

3. To initiate proceedings under the provisions of section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or regulatory actions as needed to remove from the market combinations intended for systemic use of any antimicrobial agent with analgesics, antihistaminics, decongestants, or caffeine.

All interested persons are invited to present views and comments, in writing, regarding these proposals. Such comments should be submitted preferably in quintuplicate, to the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, room 5440, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington 25, D.C., within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Dated: August 12, 1963.

Geo. P. Larrick,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

[From the Federal Register July 23, 1963]

Section 146.31, Certification of Antibiotic Containing Drugs; Statement of Policy

(a) Prior to the enactment of the 1962 amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the only antibiotic drugs required to be submitted to the Food and Drug Administration for certification were those containing penicillin, streptomycin, chlortetracycline, chloramphenicol, or bacitracin, or any derivative of one of these antibiotics. Scientific proof of safety and efficacy was required. In the case of a drug containing any other antibiotic, it was necessary, unless the drug was then considered to be generally recognized as safe, that the applicant submit proof of safety under the new-drug provisions of the act. Furthermore, prior to enactment of the 1962 amendments, a number of these drugs had been declared no longer new drugs, since they had become generally recognized as being safe for their intended uses. As a result, there are now on the market antibiotic-containing drugs with labeling claims that, in the opinion of the Administration, are not supported by available medical data. This is particularly true for drugs such as troches, nose drops, mouth washes, and deodorants intended for use by the laity.

(b) Antibiotic drugs not subject to certification prior to May 1, 1963, therefore fall into two categories:

(1) Drugs for which, prior to their being marketed, the manufacturers applied for and obtained effective new-drug applications under the provisions of section 505 of the act.

(2) Drugs not cleared through the new-drug procedures prior to their being marketed.

(c) Under the provisions of the 1962 amendments, drugs described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section are exempt from an affirmative finding of efficacy for the conditions covered by the prior approval of the new-drug application, and the initial regulations listing them for certification for such conditions may not be withdrawn for lack of proof of efficacy until October 9, 1964. The deferred effective date as to efficacy does not apply to the drugs described in paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(1) The Food and Drug Administration is now drafting regulations to provide for the certification of the drugs in paragraph (b)(1) of this section. Samples will be accepted from any manufacturer or repacker of a drug described in such regulations with a view to certification if the drug meets the requirements of the regulations or, pending the effective date of such regulations, with a view to release as provided in section 507(a) of the act. Thus, each manufacturer or repacker of a drug described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section need not hold an effective new-drug application for the drug in order to qualify for certification, but all such drugs will be certified only with the claims for those conditions for which the drugs were found to be safe under the new-drug procedures. If a regulation providing for the certification of a drug in paragraph (b)(1) has not been revoked before October 9, 1964, it will be revoked after that date unless the Commissioner of Food and Drugs has received substantial evidence to support the claims of effectiveness.

(2) The Commissioner does not intend to issue regulations to provide for the certification of any drug covered by paragraph (b)(2) of this section until he has received substantial evidence to support such regulations. A drug in this group, even though marketed before October 10, 1962, may not now be marketed until an appropriate regulation has issued and the drug has been certified or the drug has been released as provided in section 507(a) of the act. To permit orderly transition to the certification requirements, the Commissioner will continue to accept samples of a drug in this group with a view to release of batches as provided in section 507(a) of the act, provided the manufacturer submits to the Food and Drug Administration within 45 days of publication of this statement in the Federal Register, evidence to support the claims for such drugs.

[From the American Medical Association, June 24, 1963]

Chicago.—The Second National Congress on Medical Quackery will be held October 25–26 in Washington, D.C., Sheraton-Park Hotel, it was announced today.

The Congress will be sponsored jointly by the American Medical Association and the Food and Drug Administration. The First National Congress on Medical Quackery was held in October, 1961, with the same sponsors.

Objectives of the Second National Congress will be to bring together again all major American groups concerned with efforts to safeguard the public against useless cures, mechanical gadgets, food fads, and other quack devices and worthless treatment, said the FDA and the AMA in a joint announcement.

Extending the work of the First National Congress, the meeting next fall will seek to determine why the public is vulnerable to quackery and to determine what is needed in health education to help the public protect themselves against health charlatans.

The first of the three half-day sessions will encompass progress reports from organizations concerned with quackery. The second session will center on preventive aspects, particularly seeking the answer to the question of why people are such ready targets for quacks. The final half-day will center on the responsibilities of the communications media in protecting the public.

"The First National Congress in 1961 generated widespread interest in the need for education of the public against quackery," the statement said. "This interest is being translated into action at a State and community level. Quackery conferences have been held in Connecticut, Wisconsin, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Missouri, and more are planned soon in other States.

"Enforcement campaigns of governmental agencies have been stepped up, radio and television networks have produced a number of documentary programs on quackery, many newspapers have published major feature articles on the subject, there have been more than 100 major national magazine articles published—all as an aftermath of the First National Congress.

"In one major area of food quackery—house-to-house peddling of vitamin food supplements—sales have been substantially reduced by strict enforcement action and public education.

"The Second National Congress on Medical Quackery will be another phase of the continuing campaign.

"Both official and voluntary agencies, such as the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, the Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Trade Commission and the Post Office Department, as well as State departments of public health, have cracked down hard for many years on the medical quacks, and progress in this area is constant.

"But the quacks—put down in one area—keep showing up somewhere else with a new gadget or product, and there can be no let up in the campaign against them. The Second National Congress on Medical Quackery will once again focus the full light of publicity and public opinion on quackery."

AUTHORIZING PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SELECTED EXCERPTS ON THE 1963–64 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE SUBJECT OF MEDICARE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document selected excerpts on the 1963–1964 national high school debate proposition: "What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Medical Care to the Citizens of the United States", compiled by the Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that there be printed twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred shall be for the use of the Senate and fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five" and insert "fifty-one thousand three hundred and thirty".

Lines 10 and 11, strike out "ten thousand three hundred" and insert "twenty thousand six hundred".

Lines 11 and 12, strike out "fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty-five" and insert "thirty thousand seven hundred and thirty".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended to read as follows: "Authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress relating to the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4330) to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 17 to 25, and on page 5 lines 1 to 24, and on page 6 lines 1 to 13.

Page 6, line 14, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)".

Page 6, line 19, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)".

Page 7, line 3, strike out "(8)" and insert "(7)".

Page 8, line 17, strike out "(9)" and insert "(8)".

Page 10, line 25, strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)".

Page 11, line 11, strike out "$1" and insert "such fee as they may, from time to time, determine to be reasonable."

Page 11, line 13, strike out "(11)" and insert "(10)".

Page 13, line 11, strike out "(12)" and insert "(11)".

Page 13, line 17, strike out "(13)" and insert "(12)".

Page 14, line 10, strike out "(14)" and insert "(13)".

Page 15, line 1, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. This Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Huddleston] to call up several bills from his subcommittee.

USE OF CAPITOL AND KEITH'S THEATERS AS MUNICIPAL THEATERS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7399) to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall prepare and present to the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before February 15, 1964, feasible plans for the use as a municipal theater, as a semimunicipal theater, or for municipal purposes, and for the acquisition therefor (by purchase, gift, condemnation, lease, or otherwise), of that portion of the National Press Club Building which is located at 1326 F Street Northwest, District of Columbia, and which is now known as Loew's Capitol Theater, and that portion of the Albee Building which is located at 619 Fifteenth Street Northwest, District of Columbia, and which is now known as Keith's Theater. Such plans shall include detailed proposals for the operation of such property for such purposes. Such plans shall also include detailed methods for financing the acquisition and operation of such property for such purposes, including but not confined to (1) tax reduction, (2) appropriated funds of the District of Columbia, (3) private and foundation gifts and donations, and (4) combinations of such financing methods.

(b) In order to provide the time needed by the Senate and the House of Representatives to consider adequately the detailed plans provided for in subsection (a), no permit shall be issued by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the demolition of the Capitol Theater or the Keith's Theater, or for the conversion of such property to uses other than theater uses, until the expiration of 60 days after the date of filing of the plans provided for in subsection (a).

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than February 15, 1964, a feasible plan for the acquisition of Loew's Capitol Theater and Keith's Theater by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters. It is further stipulated that no permit shall be granted for the destruction of those theaters or for their conversion to other uses, until 60 days after the date on which the above-mentioned plan is submitted to the 88th Congress.

The motivation for this bill is the report that these two privately owned theaters are scheduled for conversion into use for business offices.

Keith's Theater, located in the Albee Building at 619 15th Street NW., has a seating capacity of 1,600 and is reputed to be one of the most beautiful and acoustically perfect theaters in the world. Loew's Capitol Theater is in the National Press Building, at 1326 F Street NW., and is the largest theater in the city, with a seating capacity of 3,600 persons. We are informed that Loew's Capitol is the only theater in Washington with stage facilities large enough to accommodate the presentation of the larger types of ballet and grand opera productions.

A joint resolution identical to this bill, House Joint Resolution 865, passed the House of Representatives on September 24, 1962, but failed of action in the Senate. At a public hearing held last year in connection with House Joint Resolution 865, spokesmen for a number of local organizations devoted to the performing arts, including the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, the Washington Ballet Guild, the Hayes Concert Bureau, and the Washington Civic Opera and Washington Civic Symphony, testified as to the need for the continuance of these two theaters as irreplaceable centers for live theatrical exhibits.

We were informed that the performing arts, such as ballet, grand opera, and theater, are more lively today than ever before, and that throughout the United States enthusiasm, activity, and patronage are on the increase. Under these circumstances, it would certainly be a most serious setback to this movement if the principal showcase of the Nation, a city now acclaimed in many circles as the capital of the world were unable to accommodate major musical, dance, and opera companies, including some which come from abroad as official visitors in implementation of international agreements undertaken by our Government. Any step reasonably calculated to assist in averting such an unfortunate development will certainly constitute a significant contribution to the cultural life of this city and of the Nation.

In recent years, some 15 to 18 live shows which could have been accommodated on no other stage in the District of Columbia have been presented each year at the Capitol Theater, and it has been planned to increase this number in the future. These presentations have included such internationally acclaimed performers as the Gala Royal Danish Ballet and the Bolshoi Ballet.

The Cultural Center which is now in the planning stage for the District of Columbia will not offer a solution to the problem posed by the threatened loss of the Capitol and Keith's Theaters. In the first place, the most optimistic timetable calls for the completion of this center in 1966; and also, plans for the center include provision for a theater which will seat only 1,200 persons.

A Citizens' Committee To Save the Capitol Theater, composed of prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, attempted to negotiate a lease with the owners of the Capitol Theater, without success.

Also, within the past 2 months, a group of investors submitted a very substantial offer, reported to be some $8 million, for the purchase of the building in which the Capitol Theater is located, for the purpose of leasing the theater to keep a "much needed entertainment and cultural center for our Nation's Capital." Despite this offer, however, the National Press Club Corp., which owns both the building and the theater, has proceeded with plans to convert the building into offices. This plan necessitated an application to the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment for a zoning variance, because the offices would create a greater density than now exists inside the building. On June 26, 1963, it was announced that the Zoning Board had granted this variance, and apparently the corporation intends to proceed with its plan.

It thus appears that citizens' efforts to accomplish the continued operation of these theaters are doomed to failure, and that the only feasible solution must involve the District of Columbia government, as proposed in this legislation.

Public hearing on H.R. 7399 and H.R. 7390, identical bills, was held on July 26, 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has angrily castigated a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives for cutting the annual multibillion-dollar authorization for the so-called foreign aid program.

He describes these Members of Congress as "thoughtless" and "irresponsible."

I note that one of the Members of the House who voted for the motion cutting $585 million from the authorization was the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, a Democrat [Mr. MILLS], whose committee bears a heavy responsibility in Congress in matters of fiscal concern to the entire Nation.

Members of the House may disagree with the gentleman from Arkansas on certain issues, but I doubt that a single Member, Democrat or Republican, will agree with the President that he is "thoughtless" and "irresponsible."

On August 17, 1951, when he was a Member of the House, Mr. Kennedy stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> I say it is impossible for us to think of raising the standard of living of all the low-standard countries of the world.

Later in the same year, November 19, 1951, he is quoted in the Boston Globe as saying:

> The vision of a bottle of milk for every Hottentot is a nice one, but it is far beyond our reach. There is just not enough money in the world to relieve the poverty of all the millions of this world who may be threatened by communism.

Says the President in his castigation of the majority of the House after the vote on last Friday:

> I recall during 8 years in the Senate from 1953 to 1960 consistently supporting the requests which General Eisenhower made as President of the United States.

Let us look at some of his record.

In 1959, the seventh month and the seventh day, on two votes to cut military aid by $500 million and $300 million, Mr. Kennedy was not voting.

The seventh month and the second day, on a motion to cut the Development Loan Fund from $2 billion for 2 years to $700 million for 1 year, Mr. Kennedy was not voting.

The fourth month, the 30th day, 1959, on a $100 million cut in the Development Loan Fund, Mr. Kennedy was not voting.

In 1960, the sixth month and the second day, on approval of U.S. gifts to the International Development Association, Mr. Kennedy was not voting.

The fifth month and the second day, 1960, on 13 separate votes on the Mutual Security Act, including passage of the act, Mr. Kennedy was not voting.

Now let us look at another side of this coin.

In 1953, the seventh month and the first day, to cut mutual security funds by $300 million, Mr. Kennedy voted "yea."

The eighth month, the third day of 1954—to cut the military security authorization by $500 million—Mr. Kennedy voted "yea."

The 7th month, the 22d day of 1955, to restore a $420 million House cut in military aid—to restore the cut—Mr. Kennedy voted "nay."

The 7th month, the 22d day of 1955—to add $50 million to the funds for Asian economic development—Mr. Kennedy voted "nay."

The 6th month, the 14th day of 1957—to cut military security defense support funds by $90 million—Mr. Kennedy voted "yea."

The sixth month, the sixth day of 1958—to cut military aid funds by $200 million—Mr. Kennedy again voted "yea."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what President Kennedy does not understand or does not want to understand is that the American people are fed up with the global handout program. They are fed up with a foreign policy dependent upon blank check spending; a foreign policy that will not contain communism as in the case of Cuba and a foreign policy that yields all too often to foreign blackmail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7399, a bill to save the Capitol and Keith's Theaters in the Nation's Capital and which is identical with my own bill H.R. 7390.

This legislation, let me say at the outset, will not conflict with the National Cultural Center; in fact it should strengthen the drive for funds on its behalf. The reason for this should be obvious, even to the most partisan proponent of the National Cultural Center, because, if we permit the destruction of the Capitol and Keith's Theaters—two of the finest theaters in the United States today—we will not be able to really justify asking people all over the Nation to contribute to building other cultural facilities in Washington.

Several theaters which were part of Washington's cultural life from 1900 to the 1920's have already been destroyed here in Washington: The Shubert and Columbia Theaters were torn down for parking facilities. The Academy Theater was destroyed for the same reason. Poli's Theater across from the Treasury was torn down and grass was planted on that site. The Washington Civic Auditorium, in which opera was presented in the 1920's, and which, indeed, occupies one of the finest sites in Washington, near Constitution Hall, the Department of the Interior, and the new Civil Service Building, is being torn down to straighten a small road. The Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square, with its deep connections in American culture, is being destroyed at the whim of the President only a couple of years after he introduced legislation in the Senate to save it as a civic theater. There was and is no valid reason for the destruction of any of these theaters. Certainly, the Congress must not support the destruction of Washington's great theaters while, at the same time, endorsing a drive to build a National Cultural Center in Washington.

Washington needs the National Cultural Center, if it is to discharge its great and necessary role as the leader of the free world. I voted for the National Cultural Center on August 22, 1958, when the legislation was first before the House, and I voted for the extension of the life of the National Cultural Center when this matter was before the House earlier this month, on August 5.

The National Cultural Center is required by law to be truly national, and to provide stages for the best of classical and contemporary art from this and other countries.

At the same time, Washington needs the Capitol and the Keith's Theaters to fill in until the National Cultural Center is built. It also needs help to preserve these two great theaters for its own groups in the performing arts, so they may one day excel, as, say, New York's groups excel.

At a hearing held by the House District Committee last September spokesmen for a number of outstanding organizations in the Nation's Capital concerned with the arts endorsed legislation which I had sponsored and which was identical with H.R. 7399. These organizations included the National Symphony Orchestra; the American Federation of Musicians AFL–CIO, Local 161; the Washington Opera Society; the Washington Civic Opera Association; the

Washington Ballet Guild; the Washington Civic Symphony Orchestra; and the Hayes Concert Bureau.

M. Robert Rogers, the brilliant manager of the National Symphony Orchestra, has suggested that the precedent for civic intervention in the proposed destruction of the Capitol and Keith's Theaters was demonstrated a year or two ago in New York City where Carnegie Hall was saved from destruction by the joint efforts of citizens and leading public officials. Among those active in that great civic effort were: Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Mayor Robert Wagner, and for the arts, Isaac Stern and a host of distinguished American artists.

Today, we have the unique, once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to pass legislation which will preserve for ourselves and for succeeding generations two great theaters which have long been a central part of the cultural life of the Nation's Capital. It has been conservatively estimated that it would cost as much as $10 million to $15 million today to assemble the land and build theaters equal to the Capitol and Keith's theaters.

I would like to suggest that culture and art do not spring into being simply because a $30 million price tag is placed on them, or because they have been given lipservice in high places in this administration.

This House must, and should, concern itself with benefiting the people who live in, and those who visit, the Nation's Capital by preserving those cultural assets which we already possess, and which are easily accessible, by means of public transportation, to everyone.

More than 7 million people visit the Nation's Capital each year. They come in large numbers from your State and congressional district, and from mine, yet there are literally very few places available for their entertainment after dark.

There is, of course, the National Theater, which, it has been publicly announced, is to be razed for an office building. Even if it is not razed—and it should not be destroyed, for it is one of our Nation's greatest theaters—it is far from adequate to handle all of the tourists who would want to go to the theater, if it were ably publicized—as New York City's theaters are.

There are some other places which merit the attention of tourists, particularly the university theaters, and Arena Stage, all of which are away from the center of the city, and are not well known to tourists, nor is an adequate attempt being made to tell tourists about them.

If these two theaters, the Capitol and the Keith's, disappear, there will be only these three alternatives for most tourists to choose from: First, stay in their hotel rooms and look at television; second, go to the movies; and third, go to the strip-and-clip joints.

The Nation's Capital must mean more than strip-and-clip joints to the millions of people of all ages, especially the young and impressionable teenagers, who visit this great city each year.

If these are the only alternatives open to most of our constituents, who spend over $1 million a day here, then they might as well stay home and look at television, or go to the movies at their own motion picture houses.

The National Cultural Center has announced that it will bring a number of theater companies from some 15 of the Nation's leading universities to the Nation's Capital next year. Plans now call for the presentation in a tent of such companies from the several States. Imagine, the richest Nation in the world so poor in cultural facilities that our young people cannot perform in a real theater. This kind of planning has been forced upon our cultural leaders because the Congress and the President have not moved decisively to preserve the Capitol and Keith's theaters.

In conclusion, I would say again that the passage of H.R. 7399 will strengthen the drive for the National Cultural Center because, if this measure is not enacted into law, it is going to become increasingly difficult to persuade people from all over the Nation to contribute to the National Cultural Center at the very time that two great theaters, the Capitol, and the Keith's—where President Wilson attended plays when he was in the White House—are being destroyed to provide office space in a city where office buildings are springing up like mushrooms after a storm, making such destruction wholly unnecessary, and purely speculative in nature.

I include as part of my remarks letters exchanged between the president of the National Press Club, Bryson B. Rash, and myself which will be of particular interest to the Members of this House, and the text of House Report No. 702 which accompanied H.R. 7399.

In the letter to me, the full text of which is included as part of my remarks, you will, I am sure, be pleased to note that Bryson B. Rash says on behalf of the National Press Club, which owns 77 percent of the stock of the National Press Building, that:

> May I assure you that before any irretrievable steps are taken for the conversion of the Capitol Theater, the board of governors of the National Press Club and the board of directors of the building corporation will carefully study all proposals respecting the theater. We would do this, not only from a sense of responsibility to Washington, but to the stockholders of the corporation whose interests are paramount.

I shall continue to look forward to this promised meeting.

The letters and text of House Report No. 702 follow:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1963.

Mr. Bryson B. Rash,
President, National Press Club,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Rash: Your letter of July 24 was received the following day, and I was pleased to note in that letter, and I quote: "May I assure you that before any irretrievable steps are taken for the conversion of the Capitol Theater the board of governors of the National Press Club and the board of directors of the Building Corp. will carefully study all proposals respecting the theater. We would do this, not only from a sense of responsibility to Washington, but to the stockholders of the corporation whose interests are paramount.

* * * * *

"Since I received your letter we have had but one meeting of the board of governors of the Press Club and because of the summer vacations so many are away from the city it has been difficult to arrange any sort of meeting, either with the governors or the directors of the Press Building Corp., hence, we have not been in touch with you for such a conference as you suggest. However, we will be in touch with you prior to any final action on the theater."

You can readily imagine my astonishment when I read in the Washington Daily News of August 12 that a $3.2 million contract was signed last week for the destruction of the theater and the remodeling of the Press Building. This is now being followed by stories that antique dealers are swarming through the Capitol Theater and that furnishings will be sold.

The press carried a story immediately after receipt of your letter, on July 27, to be exact, that a subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia had passed a bill similar to mine addressed to saving the Capitol Theater. Further favorable action should be taken by the full Committee on the District of Columbia within a few days. I would also like to call your attention to the fact that the House unanimously passed a similar bill in the last session of the Congress, a bill which failed to be acted upon by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia only because of controversy over another bill which Senator Morse claimed had priority.

I have noted that the conference mentioned in your letter would take place, and that the officers of the National Press Club would be in touch with me prior to any final action on the Capitol Theater. I have been working with other Members for some time and have found considerable support for favorable action on my bill. I hope that the action taken regarding the National Press Building recently is not irretrievable. This action has been disheartening because of the difficulties of the National Cultural Center in raising funds. Completion of that ambitious project can hardly be looked forward to in the near future.

I hope I may hear further from you in respect to this letter.

Sincerely yours,
William B. Widnall,
Member of Congress.

National Press Club,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1963.

Hon. William B. Widnall,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Widnall: I am sorry I have not answered your letter before this time. We are quite aware of the concern and the deep interest you have in the arts and are appreciative of the fact that you have spent so much time and effort to make Washington equal to other cities in this field. May I assure you that before any irretrievable steps are taken for the conversion of the Capitol Theater the board of governors of the National Press Club and the board of directors of the Building Corp., will carefully study all proposals respecting the theater. We would do this, not only from a sense of responsibility to Washington, but to the stockholders of the corporation whose interest are paramount.

Personally, I feel that the people of the Washington metropolitan area are fortunate to have Members of Congress such as yourself and Representative John Kyl interested in the cultural arts and willing to make their performance economically feasible. May I inquire of the status at the present time, of your bill and the general reaction to it on Capitol Hill? This is of great interest to us.

Since I received your letter we have had but one meeting of the board of governors of the Press Club and because of the summer vacations so many are away from the city it has been difficult to arrange any sort of meeting, either with the governors or the directors of the Press Building Corp., hence, we have not been in touch with you for such a conference as you suggest. However, we will be in touch with you prior to any final action on the theater.

Sincerely yours,

BRYSON B. RASH,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1963.

Mr. BRYSON RASH,
President, National Press Club, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RASH: Along with many other people, I happen to be deeply interested in the arts and in making the Nation's Capital a center equal to other cities, of equal size here and abroad, in the arts.

I have felt that the Capitol Theater's preservation for cultural purposes was absolutely essential. As a result I have introduced legislation for this purpose, and have been advised both by Mr. Albert Adams and Mr. Morris that my legislation met with their approval.

Before the Capitol Theater is irretrievably lost to this great city I think the National Press Club's directors, including its members on the board of the National Press Club Corp., should meet and study the alternative proposals which have been made, such as mine, to keep this theater available for all of the people.

I happen to disagree completely with Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner's approach to the matter of the Capitol Theater, for it is really not a matter of choice between schools and welfare and the arts.

Actually, the city of Washington under Commissioner Tobriner is engaged in a great roadbuilding program, as it is in many other things. The city is quite capable of affording the things which it wants, and perhaps Commissioner Tobriner doesn't want the arts as much as he wants inner loops, and urban renewal programs in which the Federal Government bears most of the cost, if not all of it. At the present time, the city of Washington spends about $25,000 for the arts annually, and this compares with Baltimore's $500,000 and the equal or larger sums spent by Detroit, Newark, San Francisco, Philadelphia, New York and other cities.

There must be some way of saving the Capitol Theater, and I would appreciate the opportunity of presenting my own plan to the officers of the National Press Club and the National Press Club Corp. If you would arrange such a meeting I am sure the results would be significant and, even if the theater could not be saved, the community would be assured that the members of the National Press Club, which controls 77 percent of the stock of the corporation, had cared enough to try and save it.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress.

REPORT NO. 702: USE OF CAPITOL AND KEITH'S THEATERS AS MUNICIPAL THEATERS

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7399) to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than February 15, 1964, a feasible plan for the acquisition of Loew's Capitol Theater and Keith's Theater by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters. It is further stipulated that no permit shall be granted for the destruction of those theaters or for their conversion to other uses, until 60 days after the date on which the above-mentioned plan is submitted to the 88th Congress.

The motivation for this bill is the report that these two privately owned theaters are scheduled for conversion into use for business offices.

Keith's Theater, located in the Albee Building at 619 15th Street NW., has a seating capacity of 1,600 and is reputed to be one of the most beautiful and acoustically perfect theaters in the world. Loew's Capitol Theater is in the National Press Building, at 1326 F Street NW., and is the largest theater in the city, with a seating capacity of 3,600 persons. We are informed that Loew's Capitol is the only theater in Washington with stage facilities large enough to accommodate the presentation of the larger types of ballet and grand opera productions.

A joint resolution identical to this bill, House Joint Resolution 865, passed the House of Representatives on September 24, 1962, but failed of action in the Senate. At a public hearing held last year in connection with House Joint Resolution 865, spokesmen for a number of local organizations devoted to the performing arts, including the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, the Washington Ballet Guild, the Hayes Concert Bureau, and the Washington Civic Opera and Washington Civic Symphony, testified as to the need for the continuance of these two theaters as irreplaceable centers for live theatrical exhibits.

We were informed that the performing arts, such as ballet, grand opera, and theater, are more lively today than ever before, and that throughout the United States enthusiasm, activity, and patronage are on the increase. Under these circumstances, it would certainly be a most serious setback to this movement if the principal showcase of the Nation, a city now acclaimed in many circles as the capital of the world were unable to accommodate major musical, dance, and opera companies, including some which come from abroad as official visitors in implementation of international agreements undertaken by our Government. Any step reasonably calculated to assist in averting such an unfortunate development will certainly constitute a significant contribution to the cultural life of this city and of the Nation.

In recent years, some 15 to 18 live shows which could have been accommodated on no other stage in the District of Columbia have been presented each year at the Capitol Theater, and it has been planned to increase this number in the future. These presentations have included such internationally acclaimed performers as the Gala Royal Danish Ballet and the Bolshoi Ballet.

The Cultural Center which is now in the planning stage for the District of Columbia will not offer a solution to the problem posed by the threatened loss of the Capitol and Keith's theaters. In the first place, the most optimistic timetable calls for the completion of this Center in 1966; and also, plans for the Center include provision for a theater which will seat only 1,200 persons.

A Citizens' Committee To Save the Capitol Theater, composed of prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, attempted to negotiate a lease with the owners of the Capitol Theater, without success.

Also, within the past 2 months, a group of investors submitted a very substantial offer, reported to be some $8 million, for the purchase of the building in which the Capitol Theater is located, for the purpose of leasing the theater to keep a much-needed entertainment and cultural center for our Nation's Capital. Despite this offer, however, the National Press Club Corp., which owns both the building and the theater, has proceeded with plans to convert the building into offices. This plan necessitated an application to the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment for a zoning variance, because the offices would create a greater density than now exists inside the building. On June 26, 1963, it was announced that the Zoning Board had granted this variance, and apparently the corporation intends to proceed with its plan.

It thus appears that citizens' efforts to accomplish the continued operation of these theaters are doomed to failure, and that the only feasible solution must involve the District of Columbia government, as proposed in this legislation.

Public hearing on H.R. 7399 and H.R. 7390, identical bills, was held on July 26, 1963.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may insert their remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately prior to the passage of the bill, H.R. 7399.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VOLUNTARY ADMISSION OF PATIENTS TO DISTRICT TRAINING SCHOOL

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7440) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That an Act entitled "An Act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1135), as amended (sec. 32-601 et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended as follows:

(1) Whenever the terms "District Training School", "Board of Public Welfare", "said board", "feeble minded", and "inmate" occur in such Act approved March 3, 1925, they shall be stricken, and the terms "Forest Haven", "Department of Public Welfare", "said department", "mentally retarded", and "patient", respectively, inserted in lieu thereof.

(2) Section 2 is amended to read as follows: "The words 'mentally retarded persons' in this Act shall be construed to mean any person afflicted with mental defectiveness from birth or from an early age, so pronounced that he is incapable of managing himself and his affairs, and who requires supervision, control, and care for his own welfare, or for the welfare of others, or for the welfare of the community, and is not

insane nor of unsound mind to such an extent as to require his commitment to a hospital for the mentally ill."

(3) The first sentence of section 14 is amended by inserting after "If the order for admission is as a public patient" the words "or if the patient is admitted under the provisions of section 30 of this Act".

(4) The first sentence of section 15 is amended by inserting after the words "If the order for admission is as a public patient" the words "or if the patient is admitted under the provisions of section 30 of this Act".

(5) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 30. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act and in addition to the preceding sections, the Director of Public Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may admit to Forest Haven as a patient any adult who has been a resident of the District of Columbia for one year next preceding the date of application or any child under the age of twenty-one (1) who is certified by the Director of Public Health to be mentally retarded and in need of care at Forest Haven, and at least one of whose parents or legal guardian has been a resident of the said District for one year next preceding the date of application; (2) who, either by himself, his parents, his spouse, or his legal guardian makes written application for admission to Forest Haven; and (3) who does not express, either to the Director of Public Health or Public Welfare, his objection to being so admitted.

"(b) Any person admitted to Forest Haven pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be released therefrom not more than five days after receipt by the Superintendent of Forest Haven of a written request for release: *Provided*, That if within such five-day period a petition concerning such person, as provided by section 7, shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, such person shall be detained until a final judgment is entered by the court upon said petition.

"(c) The Director may discharge any patient of Forest Haven admitted pursuant to authority contained in this section if the Director is satisfied that such discharge will not adversely affect the welfare or interests of the mentally retarded person, the community, or others.

"(d) (1) If the Director finds that any person with respect to whom an application for admission to Forest Haven has been made, as provided in this section, or any parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian of such person, is able to pay all or any part of the cost of maintenance and care of such person, the Director shall not admit such person unless a contract for payment, satisfactory to the Director, be executed by such person, parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian.

"(2) The Director is authorized to enter into any agreement he deems necessary with any applicant to become a patient in Forest Haven, or with his parent, spouse, adult child, or legal guardian, for payment to the District of Columbia of all or part of the cost of such maintenance and care. Upon default of payment provided by any contract entered into under this section, the Director is authorized to discharge any patient of Forest Haven and, in addition, he may utilize the procedures provided for in sections 14 and 15 of this Act to secure payment.

"(e) The Director, with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be performed by the Board of Commissioners or may be delegated by said Board in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out line 8, page 1, through line 5, page 2, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"Wherever the terms 'the District Training School', 'Board of Public Welfare', 'said board', 'feeble-minded', 'inmate', 'inmates', and 'an inmate' occur in such Act approved March 3, 1925, they shall be stricken, and the terms 'Forest Haven', 'Department of Public Welfare', 'said Department', 'mentally retarded', 'patient', 'patients', and 'a patient', respectively, inserted in lieu thereof."

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to urge the enactment of the bill now before this body, H.R. 7440, which would "amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District Training School, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1925, as amended."

Mr. Speaker, this bill, which I introduced at the request of the executive of the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners and which was thoroughly considered and favorably reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia would accomplish, in part, the following: First, it would authorize the voluntary admission of patients to the District Training School; and, second, would authorize the District of Columbia Director of Public Welfare to require financial arrangements with the District on behalf of such patients, as a prerequisite for such voluntary admission, when the patients or their relatives are financially able to pay for all or a part of the expenses involved.

The District Training School is an institution operated by the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare at Laurel, Md., for mentally retarded persons of all ages, where such persons are given such education and training as their mental abilities will permit.

At present, admission to the District Training School can be accomplished only by a court order, the issuance of which must be preceded by a petition to the court and a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, it is the opinion of all those concerned that families could well be spared the emotional ordeal involved in bringing their mentally retarded relatives before the court, and that the court itself could more profitably use its time for other purposes. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the petitions in the great majority of these cases are uncontested.

This bill would provide, in addition to the present system of admission to the Training School by court order, for voluntary admission in cases where the District of Columbia Director of Public Welfare first determines that the applicant is in fact eligible for admission. A patient voluntarily admitted in this manner would have the privilege of petitioning for his own release, and would be discharged 5 days after filing his petition with the Superintendent of the Training School, unless during this period the Director of Public Welfare files a petition in District Court to detain the patient for court hearing on his case. In that event he would be retained until such time as the court has disposed of the case.

Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction that this liberalization of the procedure for admission to the District Training School, and the provision for requiring payment of such part of the expense as the patient or his family can afford to pay, will be a step forward in the more effective and efficient operation of this service to the residents of the District of Columbia.

I would further point out that this bill provides for the modernizing of terminology heretofore used in this field. In this instance, the description "feeble-minded" is changed to "mentally retarded." This change is recommended because in such delicate matters that confront the families of mentally retarded children the use of archaic language does not serve any practical purpose. Further, the bill would, in my opinion, do the following:

First. It would avoid the emotional ordeal by parent and child now made necessary by court appearance.

Second. It would save the time of the court, court personnel, medical witnesses, the Office of the Corporation Counsel and the institutional staff.

Third. It would expedite admission of the applicant into the institution by providing for direct admission without court procedure.

Fourth. It would facilitate discharge in appropriate cases by avoiding court procedures if and when the patient recovers sufficiently to be returned to the community.

Fifth. It would result in substantial savings to the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no opposition from any quarter to this bill; on the contrary, support was concerted and forceful from all parties concerned—legal, humanitarian, and medical. I urge its adoption.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to accomplish the following:

First. To authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District Training School.

Second. To require that a prerequisite to such voluntary admissions be a financial arrangement with the District of Columbia on behalf of such patients when they or their relatives are financially able to pay for all or a part of the expenses involved.

Third. Delete certain archaic terminology in the present law and substitute modern terminology in its place.

The District Training School is an institution at Laurel, Md., operated by the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare for mentally retarded citizens of the District, where such persons are not only cared for but are given such education and training as their mental capacities will permit.

Under present law, admission to the District Training School can be accomplished only by court order, the issuance of which must be preceded by a petition to the court and a hearing. It is the opinion of this committee that families could well be spared the emotional ordeal involved in bringing their mentally retarded relatives before the court, and that the time of the court could more profitably be used for other purposes. In this connection, we are informed that these petitions are nearly always uncontested.

H.R. 7440 would provide, in addition to this present system of admission to the District Training School by court order, for voluntary admission in cases where the District of Columbia Director of Public Health determines that the applicant is eligible for admission, and where the patient expresses no objection to being admitted.

A patient voluntarily admitted would have the privilege of petitioning for his own release, and would be discharged 5 days after filing his petition with the Superintendent of the Training School, unless during this period the Director of Public Welfare petitions the district court to detain the patient for court hearing. In this event, the patient would be retained until the court has disposed of the case.

This bill provides further that where the term "District Training School" occurs in the present law, the more commonly used title "Forest Haven" shall be substituted. Similarly, the more humane term, "mentally retarded," would replace "feeble-minded," and the word "patient" would be inserted in lieu of "inmate." This committee feels that these changes in terminology would serve to a degree to spare the feelings of the families of these retarded persons and thus lighten the burden upon them.

At a public hearing conducted on July 26, 1963, the Administrator of the District of Columbia Children's Center, of which the District Training School is a part, testified that the Department uses a scale similar to the public assistance scale in determining what amount the families of patients admitted to the training school should be required to pay. Such payment is then stipulated in the court order authorizing the admission. However, changes in the families' financial circumstances frequently occur during the patients' period of residence at the training school, which may make them able to pay substantially more than was originally stipulated, or unable to pay as much. In either case, present law requires the Department of Public Welfare to go back into court for any change in the original agreement. The Department is very much in favor of the provision in H.R. 7440 which would authorize them to handle the financial arrangements with the families directly, as this would facilitate frequent review and adjustment of charges when altered circumstances indicate a need for such changes.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners requested this legislation, and approval has been expressed also by the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health. No opposition to its enactment has been expressed.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill presently under consideration, H.R. 7440, would amend the District of Columbia law which provides for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, the District of Columbia Training School. This bill is of such convincing need that I urge immediate enactment.

H.R. 7440 contains that rare balance of humanizing the law coupled with the practical aspect of economic savings to the public.

The Committee on the District of Columbia most thoroughly reviewed this bill and has acted favorably. The committee heard experts from the legal, welfare, and medical fields testify in concerted, convincing support of the bill. There was no opposition whatever.

Historically, the District of Columbia government maintains at Laurel, Md., the District Training School for the care of the mentally retarded of all ages. Under present law, only a court order following a formal court hearing can commit a patient even though the vast majority of cases are voluntary and uncontested. Court procedure is also mandatory to allow the authorities to release a patient. This rigid, expensive, embarrassing, and time-consuming formal procedure would be liberalized by the bill under consideration.

This bill, H.R. 7440, in general would: First, provide for the voluntary admission of patients at the Training School and would dispense with the court procedure in connection with such voluntary admission; second, provide that financial arrangements in connection with such voluntary commitment be arranged between the District government and the relatives of the patient or with the patient himself; and, third, would strike from the code archaic terminology in favor of more up-to-date modern usage of a less onerous, depressing, humiliating, or embarrassing nature. For instance, this bill would strike the words "feeble-minded" and substitute the words "mentally retarded."

At present, families with so-called feeble-minded members have to go through the most embarrassing formal procedure of bringing their retarded kin before the court in order to obtain legal commitment to the training school. Sometimes these patients are brought before the court in baskets or stretchers. Not only is the entire formal proceeding distressing to the family but their personal emotional pain is not helped by the peering eyes of the curious and the downright morbid. The whole proceeding is so traumatic that only one judge will consent to hear these cases. Bear in mind that over 90 percent of these commitment cases are uncontested.

Under this bill, if enacted, a formal court proceeding leading up to voluntary admission would be suspended; and in lieu thereof, a mutual accord would be reached between the family or patient and the committing agency—the District of Columbia Department of Welfare. A financial agreement for support of the patient could then be worked out depending on the family's or patient's ability to pay. The bill further provides for the automatic release of any voluntarily admitted patient unless the District court decides otherwise. In no way would the right to a court hearing be interfered with should there be any objection from any party connected with a proposed commitment.

In the words of the District Commissioners the bill: first, would avoid the emotional ordeal by parent and child now made necessary by court appearance; second, would save the time of the court, court personnel, medical witnesses, the Office of the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, and the institution staff; third, would expedite admission of the applicant into the institution by providing for direct admission without court procedure; fourth, would facilitate discharge in appropriate cases by avoiding court procedures if and when the patient recovers sufficiently to be returned to the community; and, finally, fifth, would result in substantial savings to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to insert their remarks in the body of the Record on this bill, immediately prior to its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL STATEMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7497) to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8, chapter II of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1132, ch. 672; sec. 35–407, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is hereby amended by striking the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof, the following: "If any such company shall fail to file the annual statement herein required, the Superintendent may thereupon revoke its certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia. The Superintendent shall also have power to require that at least once in the month of March in each year a summary of such annual statement shall be published by the company in a daily newspaper published in the District."

Sec. 2. Section 11 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1132, ch. 672; sec. 35–410, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is hereby amended by inserting at the conclusion of the first paragraph thereof the following sentence: "*Provided, however,* That

this section shall not be deemed to prevent an alien company from furnishing to its policyholders in the District of Columbia its annual report to policyholders of its domicile."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act so as to afford to life insurance companies doing business in the District of Columbia the same measure of relief from certain troublesome provisions in present law as already has been extended to fire and casualty insurance companies.

Specifically, these areas of difficulty pertain to the penalties involved in the requirement of annual statements of life insurance companies to be filed with the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance and published in a local daily newspaper, and to certain restrictions regarding the content of the annual reports of alien life insurance companies to their District of Columbia stockholders. The details of these problems are as follows:

Annual statements: Current law—section 35-103, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—requires that each life insurance company doing business in the District shall publish annually in March in a daily newspaper a summary of its annual statement, "and any such company or association failing to comply with the provisions aforesaid shall have its license to do business in the District revoked." Almost every year, the harshness of this inflexible penalty has created problems for one or more companies which through inadvertence or mistake have failed to make timely publication.

Relief from this provision would be provided by section 1 of this bill which authorizes the Superintendent to exercise his discretion in connection with the publication requirement. The relief here sought for life insurance companies is already applicable to other kinds of insurance companies. In fact, the precise language of this new provision is carried over from the law now applicable to fire, casualty, and marine insurance companies—section 35-1311, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition.

Also, present law—section 35-407, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—provides that all life insurance companies doing business in the District must file a financial statement annually before March 1 with the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance, and the same mandatory revocation of license is imposed in the event of failure to do so. This bill would change this requirement so as to make it discretionary with the Superintendent of Insurance whether a company should have its certificate of authority revoked for failure to file its annual statement on time, rather than mandatory as under existing law. We are informed that precedent for this change also exists in the Fire Insurance Act. Furthermore, there is an ambiguity in present law regarding life insurance companies in this respect, because of a provision in the Revenue Act of 1937—section 47-1805, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—which states as follows:

> If any such [insurance] company shall fail to file the annual statement herein required, the Superintendent of Insurance may thereupon revoke its license or certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia.

This apparent conflict in present law would be relieved, of course, by this provision of H.R. 7497.

Annual reports, alien companies: Current law—section 35-410, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—prohibits alien companies from referring in their District advertisements to assets other than those held in the United States. This provision precludes a Canadian company, for example, from sending to its policyholders in the District a copy of its annual report which is sent to its policyholders elsewhere, since the annual report will reflect the company's total assets.

The provisions of section 2 of this bill would grant relief from this provision to the extent of allowing such a company to mail its annual report to its policyholders in the District.

This legislation was requested jointly by the Life Insurance Association of America and the American Life Convention. These two organizations have an aggregate membership of 311 life insurance companies in the United States and Canada which have in force approximately 95 percent of the legal reserve life insurance written in the United States. A spokesman for these organizations informed this committee that as far as they can learn, the above-cited provisions which now exist in the District of Columbia with respect to life insurance companies do not exist in any other State.

At a public hearing held on July 26, 1963, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners stated that they have no objection to the enactment of this bill, which has the approval of the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance. No opposition was expressed.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill presently under consideration, H.R. 7497, would amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia relating to annual statements. The proposed amendments, the committee found, are equitable, in the public interest, and I too urge immediate enactment.

Under present law, life insurance companies doing business in the District of Columbia are burdened by archaic burdensome provisions in the code—relief from which have already been extended to fire and casualty insurance companies.

The purpose of this bill would be to afford similar relief to the life insurance companies. This relief would in no way endanger the necessary protection to the policyholders or the public interest and is supported by the District of Columbia authorities.

Presently, it is mandatory for life insurance companies to publish their annual statements in a daily newspaper during the month of March. Failure to publish on time incurs the mandatory revocation of the license to do business. Each year life insurance companies—because of unavoidable delay, inadvertence, or simple oversight fail to strictly comply with this publishing requirement—and so the harsh revocation penalty is the cause of many problems both to the industry and to the District government. This bill would instead authorize the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance to exercise his discretion concerning publication—thus allowing a necessary flexibility.

Another stringent requirement of present law provides that life-insurance companies must file a financial statement annually before March 1 with the District of Columbia superintendent of insurance. The same mandatory revocation of license is imposed for failure to do so on time. Again, this bill provides the superintendent of insurance with discretionary authority concerning revocation.

Present law also prohibits alien—that is, Canadian—life insurance companies from informing its District policyholders of assets not held in the United States. The effect of this requirement could be to mislead the policyholder, inasmuch as the incomplete statement does not accurately reflect the company's total assets. Relief from this provision of present law would be afforded by H.R. 7497 to the extent of allowing such alien company to mail its full annual statement to its policyholders in the District of Columbia.

To conclude, H.R. 7497 has the effect of giving the same equitable treatment to District of Columbia life insurance companies that is currently afforded District fire and casualty insurance companies. The Committee on the District of Columbia after hearing the various authorities in this field and assured of the continued protection to the public, recommends favorable consideration by this body.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the able.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD prior to the passage of this bill, H.R. 7497.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 665.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MILTON S. HERSHEY FOUNDATION WILL BUILD $50 MILLION MEDICAL CENTER IN DERRY TOWNSHIP, PA.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KUNKEL**. Mr. Speaker, an atomic bomb fell on Derry Township, Harrisburg, Hummelstown, Hershey, and the 16th Congressional District of Pennsylvania last Friday, August 23. Only this was a most beneficent, munificent, and glorious one. If all atomic explosions were only like this, there would be no need to worry about test ban treaties. While the direct impact is in the central Pennsylvania area, the helpful and healing effect of the fallout from this explosion will extend over the State of Pennsylvania, the Nation and the world. The ultimate blessings to mankind are not calculable. They stagger the imagination.

I refer to the announcement of the transfer of $50 million from the Hershey Trust Co. to the M. S. Hershey Foundation to create and maintain an area medical school located in Derry Township. This was approved last Friday by Dauphin County Orphans Court Judge Lee S. Swope, after thorough review and approval by Attorney General Walter Alessandroni, acting for the public interest.

The nine men responsible for the project are the members of the Boards of Directors of the Hershey Trust Co., the Milton S. Hershey School and the M. S. Hershey Foundation. They are: Samuel F. Hinkle, Arthur R. Whiteman, James E. Bobb, Theodore R. Banks, Harold S. Mohler, Kenneth V. Hatt, Joseph S. Gumpher, William E. Schiller, and John O. Hershey. I am sorry that my good friend John Sollenberger's recent retirement prevented him from participating in something which he had done so much to make possible.

Samuel F. Hinkle is president of the Hershey Chocolate Corp. and vice president of the Hershey Trust Co. James E. Bobb is board chairman of the school and of the foundation.

Arthur R. Whiteman is president of the Hershey Trust Co., as well as president of Hershey Estates and the Hershey National Bank. Mr. Whiteman entered as a student at the Milton Hershey School at the age of 4. It was just 50 years ago to the day—1913—when the announcement of the surprise project was made. Two other members of the board of directors, Joseph S. Gumpher, secretary-treasurer of the Trust Co., and Kenneth V. Hatt, comptroller of Hershey Estates, are graduates of the Milton Hershey School.

Twenty million dollars of the gift will be used for building construction. The other $30 million will be an endowment, the income from which will be used to run the school.

Pennsylvania State University will operate the center. Penn State has no graduate medical school at this time, but the college will make available to the center its research facilities in the physical and biological sciences.

Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of Penn State, said that the school will grant not only a doctor of medicine degree but, also, doctorates in philosophy and science in the medical arts. Dr. Walker has hinted that further facilities for graduate education in the sciences may later be placed in the Harrisburg area. "The opening of the medical school will," he said, "enhance and give higher priority to a Penn State Graduate Center in Harrisburg." He added that possibly a technical school and some undergraduate courses in engineering will be added as time goes on and the project develops more fully.

Milton S. Hershey must feel tremendously happy when he looks down from above at the way in which the Hershey affairs have been managed by those who succeeded him. Not only has the chocolate company grown and grown, but it has increased enormously in value under the able management and great foresight of his successors, particularly including Mr. Hinkle, the present president. Even more important—the board has undoubtedly carried out in a truly majestic manner purposes along the lines which Mr. Hershey's life work and personal actions had shown he desired—ones which would have fulfilled his ambitions, hopes and aspirations.

Having had only 4 years of schooling himself, Mr. Hershey was tremendously interested in education for young people. He loved Derry Township and Dauphin County where he was born and where the Hershey plant and its many other enterprises are concentrated.

I had the privilege of knowing Mr. Hershey well prior to his death in 1945. He was a fine man and a great humanitarian. He was quiet and unassuming. He wanted to help others and not to glorify himself. I am sure nothing would have pleased him more than to know that his successors had carried on so perfectly in the Hershey tradition and that boys from the Milton Hershey School, which he had founded and on which his care and energies had been lavished, were part of the team who did this. The Hershey enterprises are a team organization. Space and time will not permit me to mention all those who have played a role in this development.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES: A STRANGE SYSTEM OF REWARDS

Mr. **KING** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CLEVELAND**. Mr. Speaker, the CAB seems to have worked out a strange system to suitably reward airline companies for their service to the public and their success in a competitive market. Northeast Airlines was recently awarded one of these prizes in recognition of their record on the New York-Florida route.

Seven years ago, Northeast was given temporary certification—an unheard of kind of licensing. This created countless problems as Northeast expanded to meet the needs of their new market. Credit was hard to get. Leases, plant improvements, aircraft procurement and major expenditures cost more and came under onerous terms and conditions because with a temporary license, Northeast just could not prove that they would be in business over the full payout period.

They encountered personnel problems, for they could offer very little assurance of job security; they were fair game for other airlines who pirated their top employees with offers of permanent positions. The temporary certificate was an open invitation to their competitors to hit Northeast as hard as possible to prevent its being made permanent.

But Northeast struggled, Mr. Speaker, and made it, despite this handicap and the burden of the unprofitable New England routes. Their entry into the competition raised the service of all three on the route. Northeast worked until they increased their share to cover 60 percent on the Boston to Philadelphia, Washington and Florida traffic and made a profit on the run.

Meanwhile, Eastern, one of the two other lines on the route, was fighting to prevent the addition of competition for the market. They leased airplanes from other carriers at a loss in order to flood the market. They instituted shuttle flights as a loss leader, and the loss was staggering. But Eastern was willing to pay the price for they were reasonably sure of their gain—the demise of Northeast. They issued public warnings and advised agents not to sell Northeast because issued tickets might not be honored. CAB's General Counsel and the Department of Justice characterized this as action designed to bring about the demise of competition.

So when it came time for CAB to evaluate the situation and dole out reward and punishment, having considered Northeast's finally successful struggle against the overwhelming odds of temporary authority, cutthroat competition, and unprofitable New England service, the Board rewarded Northeast by stripping them of 83.86 percent of their business—the only profitable part.

On the basis of this judgment, it is clear what will happen if Northeast can continue to operate at all on only 16.14 percent of its market—and profitless shorthaul routes at that. Northeast will work with equal diligence to increase and improve its service in New England. And, if they do a good enough job, in 7 years the CAB may again reward them by deciding that they are giving Mohawk and Allegheny too much competition and cut off their Boston-New York routes.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of regulation is that? If Government agencies, have such unlimited power to make or break a business on such flimsy reasoning, how can investors or management have any confidence in the future of any firm? For superhuman efforts, good business, healthy competitive practices, service to the public, and success run the risk of the reward Northeast was granted—the loss of 83.86 percent of their busines by Government decree.

BACK TO SCHOOL WEEK IN CHICAGO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the latest fad in the United States, which is growing by leaps and bounds, is to set aside a week of our calendar year in observance of some product, industry, or event. Its purpose is to call the public's attention to the occasion, and can be considered to be one of the basic principles of advertising. Some of the designated weeks, whether they be national or local proclamations, have been known to raise a chuckle, and yet, some serve an important purpose, in that attention is drawn to a specific cause, which should be the concern of the public. So the principle of this idea has merit and produces results.

This week is a most important week in Chicago. Mayor Richard J. Daley has designated August 25 to September 1 as the "Back to School Week in Chicago." Its purpose is to make a concerted effort to get those youngsters, who are planning to drop out of school, to change their minds and remain in class. It is the product of an idea put forth by spirited, responsible citizens, most worthy in its conception.

This "back to school" crusade will start today. Its target will be the city's grammar and high school students who may be considering to drop out of school because they feel it is an unnecessary waste of time and they can make their place in society much faster by starting to work at an early age.

In those areas where the school dropout problem is most serious, 24 attendance officers of the Chicago public school system will conduct a house-to-house campaign distributing pamphlets and other information to the parents and youngsters alike, stressing the importance of regular school attendance. Legal requirements of school attendance, as well as benefits to the child, will be stressed in this door-to-door canvass. The students and parents will receive a leaflet titled "Lets Talk About School." This publication points out the advantages of education and why it is necessary to attend school. Six reasons are listed and they are as follows:

First. By 1970 the number of eligible workers will increase by 13½ million.

Second. The biggest increase in jobs will occur in occupations requiring the most education and training.

Third. There will be no increase in the percentage of jobs for unskilled workers.

Fourth. The worker with least education has the most difficult time getting and holding a job.

Fifth. More and more jobs require at least a high school diploma.

Sixth. In general those with more education earn more money.

The pamphlet also points out that students who graduate from an elementary school can expect to earn $52,000 more in their lifetimes than those who do not graduate from an elementary school. A high school graduate can expect to earn $76,000 more than an elementary school graduate, and a college graduate can anticipate earning $177,000 more than a high school graduate. They say that money talks, so it could very well be that the staggering figures mentioned will be the shock treatment needed to induce students that schooling is not to be taken lightly, but seriously.

In addition to the personal door-to-door contacts, a counseling and school placement program will be held tomorrow and Wednesday in certain district elementary schools. High school students just entering their secondary level of learning will be oriented on Wednesday and Thursday, while transfer students will also be tested for placement at the proper grade level. In summing up this program it can best be described as a study in humanity designed for the welfare of the young who will one day have to face life and all its realities in an era of rapid advancement, both scientifically and industrially. To keep pace, education will be the wheels on which they must travel.

What has been the reaction to this Back-to-School Week in Chicago? In my district, the West and Northwest Side weekly newspaper publications have given it front page coverage. The daily papers are editorializing its importance. The radio and TV media are calling it to the attention of their listeners. To Chicagoans this is a most important week worthy of support. We hope to greatly reduce the projected figure of 20,000 high school students that will drop out of school next term.

We, in Congress, are aware of the serious school dropout problem facing this Nation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has alerted us to the number of youngsters who will not finish high school. These figures are most alarming and have great cause for concern. I know we hope to remedy this situation with certain legislation now pending; however, I feel that the community itself must lend its individual support to resolve the problem.

The citizens of Chicago have taken a giant step in this direction. This Back-to-School Week is a worthwhile project which deserves the attention of this Congress, and it is for this reason that I address this body. Maybe it will foster a similar movement in other communities. It should certainly bring results for there is no better way to reach an individual, especially the young, than through personal attention. I am confident the program will be a success and we, in Chicago, will reduce the number of school dropouts. I commend those associated with the program and our great Mayor Richard J. Daley for taking this action.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1914) entitled "An act to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America," and the bill (S. 1942) entitled "An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America" together with all accompanying papers.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON THE MUTUAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr Curtis] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy issued a statement Friday concerning the action of the House of Representatives in cutting the mutual security authorization bill from $4.1 figure to a $3.6 figure. In this statement he said:

> It is simply a short-sighted, irresponsible and dangerously partisan action.

The press reported him as being angry. He was not angry, he was calculating.

The President made this statement with knowledge that the House Appropriations Committee has almost finished its work on the appropriation bill which would put the figure at around $3 billion. His attention is really riveted on this figure, not the $3.6 figure which he will be happy to get.

If there is shortsighted, irresponsible partisan activity going on I think it lies at the executive rather than the congressional level. The 1963 figure for this program was $3.9 billion, not $4.9 billion. The $1 billion increase from $3.9 to $4.9 came solely from President Kennedy's budget for 1964. It is quite apparent that this was a bargaining figure by the executive on the assumption that the Congress was going to cut whatever was the initial figure. A Kennedy cut is one which ends up with a figure greater than that of the year before. It is done by doubling the increase sought and then cutting back on the increase.

President Kennedy's first shock came, I believe, when his handpicked committee, the Clay Committee, to review the foreign aid program recommended a cut of $500 million in the present levels of expenditures of $3.9, not an increase of $1 billion as the President asked for in his 1964 budget request.

It was astonishing how limited was the reporting to the public of the Clay Committee report. The Clay Committee did not just recommend a cut of $500 million from present levels. This was only the first of three cuts. The Committee recommended cuts to be applied over a period of 3 years to eventually get the foreign aid program down to what the Committee deemed was an efficient and manageable size to a figure which by interpolation must lie closer to $2 billion than $3 billion.

The Kennedy's administration immediately went into action to counteract the Clay Committee report. Its first line of attack was to squelch any reference to the 3 year cutting proposals. The second line of attack was to throw confusion on the meaning of the first-year cut of $500 million by suggesting that it related to the $4.9 new request figure and not to the $3.9 figure of fiscal 1963.

To implement this public relations gambit the President with great fanfare sent a message to Congress "voluntarily" cutting back his $4.9 billion request to $4.5, carefully creating the inference that he was thereby following the advice of the Clay Committee in that he was cutting $400 million from the program. Actually, as anyone not fooled by the gambit knows, he was still asking for a $600 increase—$4.5 from the $3.9 billion of the previous year.

When the House Foreign Affairs Committee reduced the $4.5 billion request to $4.1 billion the press dutifully reported that the foreign aid program has been cut another $400 million, instead of reporting what the truth was, that the foreign aid program was now being increased only $200 million above 1963 levels.

The House by cutting back to $3.6 has only followed part way the Clay Committee recommendation for a first-year cut of $500 million. The Clay Committee suggested a first-year cut from $3.9 billion to $3.4 billion.

I trust that the House Appropriations Committee in its judgment will bring the cut to about $2.9 billion, which is below the Clay Committee recommendation for the first year. A cut to $2.9 does include part of the cut the Clay Committee felt should be made in the second year. The scheduling of the total cut is a matter of details in planning, not a matter of policy. The Clay Committee as a matter of policy stated that the program should be reduced to around $2 billion. As a matter of planning they suggested a cutback in three stages. I believe the House Appropriations Committee has considerably more information and experience with the details of planning than was available to the Clay Committee, which by request was concerned primarily with policy and incidentally with planning. Furthermore, the balance-of-payments problem has become considerably more acute than it was at the first part of the year when the President presented his budget and since the time the Clay Committee prepared the report it issued. In light of this worsening of the balance-of-payments problem I think proper policy requires an acceleration of the cutback of the foreign aid program to the optimum level recommended by the Clay Committee. Probably we should get to the $2 billion level in 2 years rather than in the 3 years originally proposed.

At any rate this is an area for honest debate and there is no cause for the President to accuse those who feel this way and who would debate the point, of being "shortsighted, irresponsible or dangerously partisan." I do not regard the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, as being either shortsighted or irresponsible in any area in the years during which I have worked and so often disagreed with him. I am certain he voted to cut the figure as he did because he feels somewhat as I feel that we must move more rapidly in getting our foreign aid program down to a figure that will make the program more efficient and more effective and that will minimize the impact it causes in our balance-of-payments problems.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the gentleman from Missouri, after listening to the President's press conference on Friday, one could come to no other conclusion than that every Republican Member of this House of Representatives must possess two votes instead of one. The President showed a complete lack of knowledge of how policy is made by the minority party here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the administration, time and time again, has displayed an almost uncanny ability to appeal to the hallowed bipartisan tradition once an action in the foreign policy field has been completed.

Mr. Speaker, this same administration is strangely silent, however, when negotiations or plans affecting a future action in the field of foreign policy are first initiated.

We in the minority party take pride in the House Republican policy committee. We have regional representation on the House Republican policy committee. Each Member of the minority side of the House of Representatives is given an opportunity to set party policy in a democratic fashion, spelled with a small "d," through this committee.

Mr. Speaker, we pride ourselves in that this operation gives each Member of the minority an opportunity to make his voice heard in establishing party policy.

It is of interest to point out that the chairman of the Republican policy committee, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], has at no time during this session of Congress been asked to consult with the President of the United States. Surprising as it may seem, the chairman of the House Republican policy committee has been completely ignored by the President with respect to any action in the area of foreign policy. One would believe, after listening to the press conference of the President on Friday, that there were all sorts of consultation between the minority and the majority and between the administration. Bipartisanship as practiced by this administration on a piecemeal basis is unworkable. Former Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, made it very clear that bipartisanship will only succeed by mutual trust and prior consultation before decisions are made.

Policy on the minority side of the House of Representatives is not made by the minority leader or the minority whip. It is made by the Republican policy committee with each of the areas of the country represented and with three at-large Representatives. This committee meets on a weekly basis but can meet oftener on call of Chairman BYRNES. The President of the United States has failed on every occasion in this session of the Congress when the national security might be involved to consult or advise the chairman of the policy committee.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his very pertinent observations. Incidentally, as a member of the policy committee myself, I can affirm what the gentleman has said.

I have taken the floor on many occasions in recent months to try to point out what I thought was one of the most serious problems that has ever faced this country—our balance-of-payments problem. I have tried to do it in a scholarly fashion as best I am able without any indication of partisanship. I have never maintained this problem was peculiar to this administration at all; in fact, the problem developed under the Eisenhower administration. I think we can move forward and conduct debate on policy without these intemperate remarks.

Certainly, if the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman MILLS, engaged in "dangerously partisan action" it would be because of his loyalty to the Democratic Party which is beyond question not to the Republican Party. I must confess at times in the heat of an issue I have felt that the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman MILLS, did allow his loyalty to the Democratic Party and its present leader, John Kennedy, to somewhat interfere with his judgment. But I think we need loyal partisans and a little less of this "all things to all people and there is no difference between parties" concept which seems to be becoming part of the American political scene today.

This issue involved in balance of payments and the levels of expenditure in foreign aid is no Republican-Democrat partisan issue unless President Kennedy wishes to make it so. The same problem existed under President Eisenhower. He took almost the same approach in dealing with the Congress that President Kennedy is taking, including, I regret to say, lecturing and castigating the Congress when it did not grant to a "t" his request.

I maintained the same position under President Eisenhower that I am trying to maintain under President Kennedy. If anything, some of my speeches during the Eisenhower administration were a bit rougher in their description of the inefficiencies, the lack of clearly spelled out policies in our foreign aid programs and of the failure of the executive department to do its homework and debate the issue forthrightly.

The difference under the Kennedy administration is this: What some of us saw on the horizon as a beginning of a storm cloud during the last few years of the Eisenhower administration has now developed to the point where only the unobserving person fails to see the thunderheads and the flashing of lightning in the distance. The rumble of thunder is even heard by those who are not particularly observing in watching the development of this raging and destructive storm.

I would observe that the Kennedy administration has resorted to rather extreme and questionable methods to divert the public and congressional attention from the relationship of foreign aid to the balance-of-payments problem.

The President has lent his high office to this diversion of public attention. This storm is now almost upon us. The administration no longer seeks to argue its seriousness. In his message to Congress on April 3, 1963, the President said:

> A few years ago, more than half of U.S. economic aid funds were spent abroad, contributing to the drain on our dollars and gold.
>
> Of our current commitments over 80 percent will be spent in the United States, contributing to the growth of our economy and employment opportunities.

This is one of the bases for public statements, editorial references, and news articles making the point that foreign aid really does not have much to do with our balance-of-payments problem because 80 percent of these funds are being spent in the United States.

Of course, a careful reading and a full understanding of the President's statement does not justify such assertions. The failure of the President himself or responsible executive officials to correct these erroneous assertions which he knows are based upon his carefully worded text raises a serious question of whether the ambiguity was intentional. This failure to clarify must be considered in context with additional statements by other administrative spokesmen which build upon this ambiguity and make further erroneous deductions. Any fair person is led to the point of asking, Was the President's statement and the statements of administrative spokesmen designed to becloud this issue?

The facts are that in 1962, the latest year for which we have been supplied real rather than estimated figures by the administration, the amount spent in the United States of foreign aid funds was 50 percent. The figure for 1963 is an estimated figure and it is 63 percent. The figure for fiscal 1964, which of course is also an estimate, is 70 percent.

The point is that the moneys spent and to be spent in 1963 and in 1964 and in some degree further into the future have been under contracts let in previous years. Contracts being let today, for which money will be spent in the future, according to the administration, have a target of 80 percent to be spent in the United States. It would be some time before a goal of 80 percent of expenditures, now contracting, would be made in 1 year in the United States.

Now reread the President's statement of April 3 and ask yourself the frightening question, Was this ambiguity designed to deceive the Congress and the public about the impact of the foreign aid program on our precarious balance-of-payments situation?

Furthermore, the figures themselves are open to serious question. I have sought to find, unsuccessfully, the working papers which establish these ratios of expenditures in the United States and expenditures abroad. If working papers exist they have not been made available to anyone that I know. It is an extremely difficult technical statistical problem to come up with anything more than a guesstimate on the point of what is spent in the United States and what is spent abroad. The assumptions that must be made to come up with even a guesstimate are bound to be the subject of considerable debate even among the technicians. For these reasons the working papers and the assumptions upon which they are based become exceedingly important if we are to have even a reasonable understanding of just what portion of the Federal aid money might be spent in the United States and what might be spent abroad.

Furthermore, the import of this data relates to what impact our foreign aid program has on the balance-of-payments problem. Even if the figures given, 50 percent in 1962, an estimated 63 percent in 1963 and a 70 percent in 1964, were sustainable they must be related to our balance-of-trade figures which are the primary bright spot in our balance-of-payments picture. We cannot count our pluses of exports over our imports twice. This we do if we seek to eliminate 80 percent of foreign aid expenditures as an item in our negative balance of payments. If we cancel out foreign aid we must then subtract approximately 80 percent of the sum from the export side or plus side of our ledger. However, this is only the beginning of the exercise if we are really to study the impact of our foreign aid program on our balance-of-payments situation. We must look into the important point of what governmental foreign aid programs may do in pushing out private export programs which would be a real plus in our balance-of-payments picture.

However, it is really not necessary to go into the full development of the balance-of-payments problems to establish the point that our foreign aid program along with our military expenditures abroad have the greatest negative impact on our balance-of-payments problem of any programs. The more responsible spokesmen for the Kennedy administration have stated this to be so on many occasions.

This is not the end of the mischief created, however, by playing fast and loose with the issue of foreign aid and balance of payments. I sought to point up during the debate on the foreign aid bill that if the administration statement was sustainable that 80 percent of foreign aid funds were now or in the immediate future to be spent in the United States, we have then gone against the very theory of foreign aid. There may be some justification—in my judgment very little because of the sacrifices to efficiency, low cost, and sound procurement procedures—in applying the buy-American theory to our military expenditures abroad. However, there can be no sensible justification for applying this principle to the foreign aid program. The foreign aid program is designed to build the economies of the undeveloped nations abroad, not to build directly the economy of the United States. The theory is, and I adhere to this theory, that as we build the economies of other nations abroad we in the long run build our own economy. We need all right, correct governmental policies, to build our own economy, but we cannot do this, nor should we do this, through the foreign aid program.

Now the Kennedy administration by its own statements has been applying the buy-American theory to the contracts it is entering into for the future expenditures of foreign aid. One issue then is, is this consistent with the economic, social, and political theory of our foreign aid program? I say it is not. I further state that the President had and has no authority from the Congress to so administer the foreign aid program even if he felt this radical change in policy was in the best interests of the United States. Furthermore, to make any foreign aid program sensible we must bring together all of our Federal programs directed toward foreign aid objectives. While we debate over hundreds of millions of dollars in the Mutual Security Act, billions of additional dollars are being spent in many instances for the identical objectives in the Public Law 480 programs now given in typical New Frontier style a fancy and inaccurate label, "food for peace."

I have supported the original concept of foreign aid. I still do. I think it is important to the welfare of the United States that we have a well designed foreign aid program in policy, in planning, and in administration. I am willing to debate the issue forthrightly. Let the President and his clique who control the public relations media join this debate forthrightly. I do not ask for equal time. I ask only one-tenth of the time given to those who are on the opposite side on this issue.

Finally, I request that those who in the past personalized the issue of demagoguery in public affairs, thereby indulging in the worst form of demagoguery, by dubbing it "McCarthyism," lay off the impugning unpatriotic motives, or of ignorance, or of lacking in humanitarianism to those with whom you are in disagreement and debate the issues.

I recognize the same school of political and economic thinking which used the ploy of McCarthyism to distract our attention from the issues of Communist subversion to be behind this present distortion of the issues involved in the debate over foreign aid and balance of payments. This same school is engaged in trying to persuade the American people to abandon their Puritan ethics and to follow the will-o'-the-wisp of deficit financing to find the pot of gold. President Kennedy has permitted this political and economic school to direct his domestic and foreign policies. To combat the theories and the programs of this school is not dangerously partisan action on the part of either Democrats or Republicans. I would regard it as dangerously partisan if either Democrats or Republicans who believed as I do in the Puritan ethic failed to join this combat because of party loyalty or because of the desire to win the acclaim of those who today control the national public relation media and the acclaim of the powerful segment of our academicians who seem to control the awarding of accolades for scholarship of name professorships and of favorable book reviews or for a desire to be President.

Just as in economics, I have sought to expose by debate those who have claimed for themselves the mantle of Lord Keynes, so I believe it is necessary to begin the exposure in the field of political science again by debate, of the imbalanced and degrading theories of Niccolo Machiavelli which the same neo-Keynesians have espoused and seek to use and to develop. To pinpoint this debate I would refer to the writings of Dr. David Bicknell Truman, professor of government at Columbia University, who is the author of the textbooks being used widely in teaching political science throughout the country. Dr. Truman is the high priest of the school of the neo-Machiavellis with which the neo-Keynesians have joined forces. Financed by the Federal Treasury and wealthy foundations and enjoying the blessing of great personal talents in cerebration, this is a formidable foe.

I think pursuit of truth is more formidable.

TEXT OF KENNEDY BLAST AT HOUSE FOR AID CUT

The action of the House today in drastically cutting the mutual security authorization bill is unprecedented, unwarranted, and unwise.

This cut will critically affect our strength at a time when the forces of freedom are moving around the world.

The most disturbing aspect of today's House action is that for the first time since the end of World War II, this program experienced a shocking and thoughtless partisan attack by the Republican leadership on a program which both parties have consistently supported as being vital to our national security.

EARLIER BACKING RECALLED

I recall during 8 years in the Senate from 1953 to 1960 consistently supporting the requests which General Eisenhower made as President of the United States.

This program has been opposed by some Members of both parties in the past but today was the first time that the leadership of one party led the attack upon it.

This year's authorization bill was carefully trimmed before it went to the Hill and was examined by General Clay and others. It was one of the lowest ever presented to the Congress. Despite all of this, the House of Representatives has made the sharpest cut it has ever made in a foreign authorization bill.

This action cannot be explained by any change in the world situation or by the requirements of our national security or as an economy measure. It is simply a shortsighted, irresponsible and dangerously partisan action.

If today's vote stands, no development loans could be made in Iran, Greece, Thailand or other countries on the rim of the Communist empire except to fulfill existing commitments.

SHIELD WEAKENED

Under the terms of this bill, hopeful social and economic progress in Latin America will be stalled and our shield against Communist aggression in this hemisphere will be weakened. It will mean that the Soviet Union will be giving almost as much assistance to the small island of Cuba as the United States is to the whole of Latin America. This is no way to defeat communism in this hemisphere.

A $225 million cut in military aid will jeopardize the effectiveness of allied forces on the border of the Sino-Soviet bloc which now receives over 70 percent of our military assistance. Obviously, the foreign aid authorization voted by the House today is unsatisfactory. It represents not only a partisan attack on the foreign policy of this Government but a repudiation of the foreign policy which this country has pursued since the end of the Second World War.

APPEAL FOR SUPPORT

In the key vote on foreign assistance today, only 9 percent of the Republican Members of the House supported this program which has hitherto commanded bipartisan support, and I reiterate again, time and again this program had bipartisan support in the years of the fifties. The danger is just as great today. I see no reason why the program and its bipartisan support should be destroyed.

I urge, therefore, that members of both parties in the Senate restore the full amount of this request and that the conference will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to reconsider its ill-advised actions of today.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the close of World War II a great American statesman, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, in another body, became the author of a policy which was designed to leave partisan politics at the shoreline. The record of the Democratic Party in the Congress since that time, under three administrations, will convince anyone who reviews it that the overwhelming majority of the Members on this side of the aisle have maintained that bipartisan policy.

For 8 years during the administration of President Eisenhower the majority of both parties supported the foreign policy of the President. Something like 80 percent of the Members on this side of the aisle voted against deep cuts in foreign aid proposals recommended by President Eisenhower. How can Republican Members of this House who supported excessive cuts to the tune of 91 percent of its total membership, now deny the charge that it is they who have abandoned bipartisanship in foreign policy? How can they say in this era when there are tensions behind the Iron Curtain—how can they say at this critical period in history when this country should be united in supporting the President of the United States in his efforts constructively to approach the problems of the world—that we should no longer heed the voice of the President of the United States, whose voice is the only voice that can speak for our country on matters of foreign policy?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Ninety-one percent of the Members on the other side of the aisle voted to cut appropriations below the recommendations of a bipartisan committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think this speaks for itself. I hope this is no precedent. I hope this does not mean that just because we now have a Democratic President Republican Members in overwhelming majorities can no longer give him the same cooperation in the area of foreign policy that they gave to President Eisenhower and that Democratic Members of the House gave to President Eisenhower. I do not believe that President Kennedy did not mean what he said when he was critical of a $585 million cut in foreign aid. I am sure that there was no deception in the President's statement. I am sure that when he said the cut was too deep he had reference not only to the authorization bill but also to the final appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. No, I will not yield yet. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I wanted to find out if the gentleman was present when I made my presentation.

Mr. ALBERT. I was present when the gentleman made his first statement.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, what is the purpose of attacking the motives of Members of Congress?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not attacking their motives.

Mr. CURTIS. The President was.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman attacked the motives of the President of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. The President deliberately attacked the motives of those who disagreed with him and not their arguments and not the facts, and the gentleman did not——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman did not decline to yield. I think we were engaging in a colloquy that I thought was fruitful.

The SPEAKER. That is a question of fact.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I must say I heard the gentleman when he made the statement. I do not think I misunderstood him. Of course, listening to debate sometimes a person can be mistaken as to what was intended. Certainly I have the highest regard for the gentleman. I know that the gentleman is a distinguished, constructive Member of the House and I would never question his motives. Nor do I think that the President of the United States was questioning the motives of anyone. But I think the President of the United States, who is the leader of his country in matters of foreign policy, had every right to be concerned about the future of our bipartisan foreign policy when 91 percent of the Members on the other side of the aisle voted to inflict serious cuts in the foreign aid program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to address the House for 5 minutes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of the majority leader in which he traced the history of bipartisan foreign policy to the time of the senior Senator from Michigan, the Honorable Arthur Vandenberg. I think in this discussion it might be well to point out that there were certain guidelines set out by Senator Vandenberg as far as maintaining bipartisanship in foreign affairs. The most important of those guidelines provided for consultation, consultation with the majority and with the minority alike, before decisions are made.

Mr. Speaker, during the time this administration has been in office we have often had an appeal to the bipartisanship tradition but we have not had the consultation with the minority party which is absolutely necessary in developing bipartisanship in foreign policy.

I would like to point to several examples:

In Cuba, prior to last October's confrontation, all attempts by the minority to call for a blockade or a quarantine or any other action, were subjected to a massive administration-inspired barrage of "warmongering" charges. No minority proposal—and there have been many—has been afforded serious consideration by the present directors of our destiny. Yet, when the President finally was forced to act because of the intolerable threat posed by the Russian missiles, there was a loud call for bipartisanship. At that time, election was only a few short weeks away. Also at that time, many of us in the minority felt the President's action was too little and too late. Nevertheless, in the spirit of the bipartisan tradition, the minority party rallied to the support of the President's action.

This one-sided tolerance on the part of the minority, Mr. Speaker, will not last forever. This hollowed tradition we hear so much about is a two-way street. And it is about time we started traveling in two directions on that street.

Consider the Lao disaster. That unfortunate country has been written off by the administration. When Laos finally goes completely, all of southeast Asia will most probably follow as a matter of course.

At the time of the Geneva accords on Laos, I addressed an urgent letter to the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. It was answered by the principal architect of the disastrous Lao accords, Averell Harriman. The exchange of correspondence between Mr. Harriman and myself on the subject of the Geneva accords on the neutrality of Laos appears on pages 6376 to 6379 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this year.

For all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, the grave misgivings expressed in my correspondence and the equally grave misgivings expressed by large numbers of my colleagues in the Congress were ignored. The usual answer a member of the minority hears when he expresses misgivings about foreign policy actions is that we must unite behind the President in a spirit of bipartisanship.

This commitment to a piecemeal bipartisanship on the part of the present administration is unworkable. The minority party cannot fulfill its obligations to the 48 percent of the American electorate it represents by conceding to the Executive the right to exercise a discriminatory, selective bipartisanship whenever it is deemed necessary or desirable.

The minority party's good will and docile tolerance of such practices is not inexhaustible, Mr. Speaker. A display of good will and good faith is necessary on both sides of a cooperative relationship. Such a display has been sorely lacking in recent years.

Was the minority consulted, for example, prior to the decision to withdraw our Thor and Jupiter missiles from Italy and Turkey? The minority was not.

Was the minority consulted prior to our decision to scrap Skybolt or to establish a multinational nuclear force? The minority was not.

Was the advice or concurrence of the minority sought before the United States decided passively to accept the recognition of the Kadar regime's credentials by the United Nations? It was not.

Was the advice or concurrence of the minority sought before President Kennedy announced at American University on June 10 a test moratorium on atmospheric testing? Predictably, no.

Was the minority informed of the administration's plans to hold high level talks in Moscow for the purpose of negotiating a test ban? Was the minority invited to participate in these talks? Was the minority extended the courtesy of sending an observer to these talks? In every case, the answer is no. In too many other cases as well, the answer would also be no.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] is trying to show that bipartisanship has gone down the drain because of the amendments that were adopted to the foreign-aid bill last week. I had hoped that he had been here earlier when I pointed out that we on the minority side establish our policy through a Republican policy committee in which all areas of this country are represented. We are the minority party in the Congress and hope the President did not convince the majority leader that every Republican Member of this House has two votes.

The chairman of this policy committee in the House of Representatives is the Honorable JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am sure he stands ready to consult with the President at any time that the national security of this country is involved. But at no time in the last year has the President of the United States sought to inform the chairman of the policy committee on the minority side of this House of any overriding national security considerations.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to first say that I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I think the import of my statement was not that bipartisanship had gone down the drain. But when 91 percent of the Republicans voted together to cut the foreign-aid bill, the President should be concerned lest it might go down the drain. I say that was the import of my statement.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the President of the United States should be concerned that it might go down the drain and I hope he does become concerned over the fact that bipartisanship as far as foreign policy is concerned can go down the drain by following his present course of action.

It is time, I think, that he begin now to respond to a demand for bipartisanship in the true Vandenberg tradition and that that be by consultation and consultation with the group that sets Republican policy on this side of the aisle, the Republican policy committee.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the President of the United States has never availed himself once to set forth his views as far as national security matters are concerned to the chairman of the Republican policy committee. The policy committee on our side of the aisle sets policy as far as this side of the aisle is concerned and I am sure its leader can give the President helpful advice and counsel.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. I think the gentleman is in an anomalous position here when you state a conclusion. Please correct me if I am wrong. The gentleman states that a group of Republicans, duly authorized to meet and set public policy and that that be the policy of the party, the policy of the minority on that side of the aisle which is determined through a policy committee.

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. I would be glad to explain in detail how the policy committee operates as far as the minority side is concerned.

Mr. LIBONATI. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman included in his direct remarks the fact that the minority whip and the minority leader had nothing to do with determining the policy.

Mr. LAIRD. They have a perfect right to express their views, as members of the policy committee.

Mr. LIBONATI. As individuals?

Mr. LAIRD. As individuals.

Mr. LIBONATI. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman said every Member had a right to do that.

Mr. LAIRD. Through the policy committee and their elected representatives on the policy committee on the minority side.

Mr. LIBONATI. Then, whatever action the Republican Party, the minority, takes is the result of the determinations of that policy committee; is that right?

Mr. LAIRD. Well, now, not altogether. There are some times when, of course, the Republican policy committee does not take a specific position on a particular piece of legislation. But, certainly, the chairman of our policy committee is the No. 1 man as far as Republican policy pronouncements are concerned here in the House of Representatives. He operated under the control and direction of his policy committee. Each individual minority member is, of course, always free to follow the dictates of his own conscience.

Mr. LIBONATI. If the gentleman will yield further, then when 91 percent react favorably, as in the foreign aid cut, the findings and determinations of the policy committee of the minority, is really the determination of the majority of the minority as to policy, in that matter was it not?

Mr. LAIRD. That certainly is correct. All the gentleman has to do is look at the Republican Joint House-Senate Committee statement of last year on Republican policy and principle. This statement sets forth in some detail our position as far as the foreign aid program was concerned and our position and concern for the balance-of-payments crisis which faces this Nation. I believe that our overall policy statement as contained in that particular declaration of last year, adopted unanimously by House and Senate Republicans, is clear and forthright.

Mr. LIBONATI. I thank the gentleman.

FOREIGN POLICY BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] if he believes that, had the President consulted with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] on the merits of the administration's proposal for continued military and foreign economic assistance to our allies, the vote might have been different than the 91 percent Republicans who voted to curtail this program?

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Certainly on the basis of the information which was available to the minority party and to our policy committee at this time I would say there would be no change as far as the majority of the Members on this side of the aisle are concerned. However, if there was some overriding national security consideration which the President alluded to in his statement but did not spell out in his statement, then I think it is his responsibility to invite the minority if we truly wish to go forward with a bipartisan foreign policy. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois recognizes that bipartisanship is a two-way street.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I respect the gentleman's frankness in replying that it really would not have made any difference. Of course it would not have made any difference. The fact of the matter is during 3 days of debate on this bill on amendment after amendment offered by the minority side, the amendments were unanimously supported with the exception of 4, 5 or 6, or perhaps by 10 Republican Members. I think the distinguished majority leader has certainly raised a good point, one that we ought to seriously consider, not as Democrats or Republicans, but rather as responsible Members of this body.

Foreign policy must be handled in a bipartisan basis if it is to succeed. We have made great progress under the previous administration because we approached foreign policy on a bispartisan basis. We are making great progress under this administration for the same reason. We have shored up many of our programs in this great struggle for survival of freedom by both administrations because we knew how to set partisan political considerations aside in our struggle against international communism. We have called the bluff on Khrushchev when 3 years ago he told our President that he was going to set a deadline for the allies to get out of Berlin. We stood resolute as Americans, not as Republicans or Democrats; we stood together as Americans in our determination to maintain our position in Berlin. And we won—not as Democrats or Republicans—but as Americans. Mr. Khrushchev had to alter his timetable on Berlin; he has had to alter his timetable in Vietnam; he has had to alter his timetable in the Congo; he has had to alter his timetable in Laos and he was compelled to alter his timetable in Cuba by withdrawing his missiles. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Khrushchev had to alter his timetable because both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have showed him we Americans know how to stand together when our Nation's security is at stake.

We have been making progress and we shall continue making progress by showing all that when it comes to freedom; the dignity of man; we stand together as Americans united against the concepts of communism.

That is what our distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] had in mind when he said the time has come to work together in order to win this battle.

I have only one concern, and that is that perhaps some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have lost faith in this principle of a bipartisan approach to meeting the challenge of communism. I think the entire United States, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans, has proved to the world that our way is the best way; that it offers mankind its greatest degree of hope for survival. This is the great promise for mankind, and I believe working together as Americans we can continue this great victory. I say we are going to prove Mr. Khrushchev wrong in his boast that our grandchildren will live under communism. I say if we continue as Americans with faith in our democratic system and belief in our free institutions, Mr. Khrushchev's grandchildren will grow up under freedom.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I hope this discussion which we have had today is noticed by the executive branch of our Government. I hope that the executive branch will begin now to couple equally impassioned attempts to provide bipartisan consultation in the early stages of action as far as foreign policy is concerned. The record is replete with examples of how this has not been the case during the last 2-year period. It is my hope that if we wish to carry forward on the traditions that were outlined earlier by the gentleman from Oklahoma in his reference to Senator Vandenberg we also will follow forward on the conditions which were set forth by Senator Vandenberg in this particular area. I remind the gentleman from Illinois once again that in order to have true bipartisanship there must be a give and take on the part of both major parties.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman. However, while I am grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin for his candor in admitting to this House that it is Republican policy to oppose this program, I think the record should be clear that if indeed it is Republican policy to fight these measures, then further consultation with the chairman of the Republican policy committee would most probably be fruitless. The gentleman himself said the decision to curtail this program of collective security was arrived at by the entire Republican policy committee.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire. I am sorry the gentleman from Illinois did not yield while he had the floor. I am anxious to point out in the colloquy regarding what might have occurred if the President had consulted with the minority side of the aisle, particularly through their duly elected representative, the chairman of the policy committee. It is a two-way street. Possibly the President might have been somewhat influenced by our point of view in respect to the seriousness of the balance-of-payments problem and the foreign aid program's bearing upon it, also our deep concern at continued deficit financing, which this administration has espoused as perfectly proper from their point of view as a fiscal and economic policy, with which many of us disagree. This business of consultation I hope goes both ways. Indeed, maybe the President might have persuaded us. On the other hand, we are always hopeful, feeling deeply as we do on these things, that we might be able to persuade him.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to praise the distinguished gentleman and scholar from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] for his forthright and excellent speech which has prompted this whole discussion. One can only hope that the President and the press will read it thoughtfully.

Since I have been here in the House I have been impressed many times by Mr. Curtis' thoughtful and perceptive observations on important issues. Many times the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] has taken the time to speak forth on specific issues of importance such as balance of payments and fiscal matters. He has notified the other side of the aisle that he was going to take time, and he has notified them as to what he was going to discuss and has invited honest debate. I have yet to see him get a real debate on the issues that he presents so forthrightly. I am impressed by this because I keep reading in the "free press" of America that there is not enough public debate in this country and not enough in the U.S. House of Representatives. I want to say for the record that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] has frequently asked for debate, giving the other side of the aisle ample forward notice of his intentions. He makes his remarks, Mr. Speaker, but they are not met. One can only conclude that the other side of the aisle is either afraid to join in debate or has not gotten the facts to do so. It seems to me this country needs more hardheaded debate of issues and less hotheaded and intemperate name calling.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Respecting the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri commenting on the failure of the President to consult with the Members on his side of the aisle on foreign aid before the vote in the House, in view of the vote of his colleagues is it not possible that the only difference would have been if the President had done that, he would have received the bad news just a little earlier?

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman did not follow what I was saying. I was saying in consultation it might go the other way. Because we hope the President has kept an open mind as I hope we have. We have differences of opinion and possibly from that meeting maybe he would influence our side to some degree. I am still hopeful we might influence him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if I might ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], whether it is not a fact that the President did, indeed, consult with former President Eisenhower on this program; that he did, indeed, organize a bipartisan committee of businessmen, the Clay Committee, to study the whole program and make recommendations. As a matter of fact it was on the basis of the Clay Committee recommendations that the President reduced his program by $450 million. The gentleman makes it appear, if I understand him correctly and I think I do understand him correctly, that there was no effort made whatsoever by the President to continue the bipartisan approach to this problem of foreign aid. It would appear to me Mr. Kennedy has made a very strong effort for bipartisan consideration of the problem. Am I incorrect in that statement?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. The point of this is that the castigation by the President in his remarks on Friday were directed against Republicans in the Congress, duly elected Members of the House, and not President Eisenhower. The consultation with President Eisenhower was later. I said in my remarks, if the gentleman listened when I first took the floor, I pointed out the Clay Committee report was not adequately reported by the press or by the President as to what was said. One of the things the Clay Committee report suggested was not just a cut for 1 year, but over a period of 3 years to get this program down to size. I think the actions we took on the floor of the House on Friday were more in accord with the findings of the Clay Committee report than the President's statement. I added there has been one new development since the Clay report and that is a worsening of the balance of payments not a betterment. This requires a more drastic cutback over a shorter period of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

SILVER; THE VANISHING METAL

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White] may address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, just 3 months ago the House passed a measure, which I strenuously opposed in committee and on the floor. This measure, now Public Law 88-36, was the repeal of the Silver Purchasing Act. I am sure that the Members recall my reasons for opposing this ill-advised legislation and that I predicted they would wish to have the opportunity to reverse their vote in the very near future. I predicted that as soon as the market price of silver reached the present monetary value, there would be a rush to deplete our monetary stocks. Frankly, I thought it would be a year before I would have to make this speech, but the combination of bad judgment within the Treasury Department and avarice of the silver fabricators and speculators has accelerated the withdrawal of silver certificates to such an extent that I believe it is necessary to issue a warning to the Congress regarding the monetary policy now propounded within the Treasury and further aberrations planned for the future.

Despite the assurance by the Secretary of the Treasury and the admonition contained in both the House and Senate reports on H.R. 5389 that the rate of withdrawal of silver certificates would be gradual and would not exceed $105 million per year, there are now $40 million less silver certificates outstanding than when the law was passed just over 2 months ago. Even if we were to allow for seasonal fluctuations and all the other excuses given to us for this decrease in outstanding certificates, the rate of withdrawal is more than twice that directed and promised. I suppose further allowances could be made on the basis of the above excuses, if we wished to be broadminded to the point of stupidity. However, it seems that this extreme haste to eliminate our only currency with 100 percent metallic backing will have further help by the Treasury Department. On July 22, the Secretary of the Treasury signed an instruction that silver bullion will be exchanged for any funds presented to the Federal Reserve Banks or U.S. Assay Offices in New York and San Francisco. You do not even need to present silver certificates, just other funds of equivalent monetary value. You may be sure that the already inordinately rapid rate of withdrawal will be speeded up considerably by this order.

Already, silver futures prices are above the monetary value of $1.2929 per ounce. It will soon be profitable for silver users to turn in their hoarded silver certificates and other funds and obtain silver bullion in exchange.

We were told that H.R. 5389 was an urgent piece of legislation because we need silver for coinage. The offering of the Treasury to sell our silver bullion, makes the Congress seem rather naive. Why should the silver fabricators have been so interested in a measure that was sold to us as monetary legislation? It was not for coinage that they desired the retirement of silver certificates, but to obtain an advantageous governmentally controlled ceiling on the market price of silver.

The horrible alternative presented to the Congress if H.R. 5389 were not passed was the issuance of token coinage. Our traditionally sound and solid silver coins would be replaced with inferior substitutes of no intrinsic value. I believe the possibility for this situation was not eliminated by enactment of the bill, particularly in view of the advertised offer of the Treasury Department to sell silver bullion to anyone presenting currency for it. This prodigal attitude toward our silver stocks will, no doubt, produce another urgent plea from the Treasury. This next plea will be for legislation to debase our coins. It will be urgent because there will not be any silver left to mint due to the silver sales, at a subsidized price, to speculators and makers of silver products.

At this time, I do not wish to go into the reasons why we cannot afford to issue token coinage. However, I will refute one of the arguments that will be pressed by the proponents of cupro-nickel coins. They will argue that the United States can make a handsome profit on the silver it purchased at an average price of 71 cents per ounce and will be able to sell for $1.38 per ounce. Some will be ridiculous enough to propose this as one of the major ways to solve our balance-of-payments deficit. The profit argument melts when you consider the fact that the profit has already been made on this silver. At least a book profit was made by the minting of the coins at $1.38 per ounce monetary value. To sell our almost diminished supply of silver at this price to those who would make spoons and wires from it is no profit at all.

Those advisers who would have lightweight coins of no real value are the same who would remove the gold backing of our currency. One of these recently applied adjectives of irrational and antirational to have a 25-percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes. At least ostensibly concerned about the outflow of gold from this country, this recommendation was thrown in as a cleanup measure. However, I am concerned that our monetary policymakers are too anxious to create fiat currency. If the issuance of paper money is controlled only by the conclusions of men propounding a variety of untried economic theories and the decisions of officials, who have so recently disregarded the wishes of Congress in regard to silver, I doubt that we will ever see an improvement in our gold flow. Although I believe the lesson so recently learned with regard to silver was costly, it may perhaps alert us to the need for closer examination of legislation dealing with monetary matters. Let us be warned that not only are the theories questionable, but the motives and assurances given us by advocates of debt-based currency and coin are likewise of dubious value.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Idaho on making these remarks. I was very happy, as the gentleman may recall, during the debate on the Silver Act to join with him in the warnings which he so well brought to our attention here today and the consequences of which have come about. At the time I felt that the action was ill-advised and would result in this kind of deflation of the dollar and the cutting out of some of the precious metals behind the paper currency that we have. I join the gentleman in his remarks and commend him.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial in the Delaware State News of August 21, 1963, entitled "Tax-Exempt Foundations Compete With Private Enterprise," by the gentleman from Delaware, the Honorable HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.:

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., of Delaware, Representative at Large)

In his editorial of August 8, 1963, Mr. Jack Smyth, publisher of the Delaware State News, expressed concern that the Farmers Home Administration extends loans to farmers in competition with private lending institutions. Mr. Smyth has touched on a longstanding controversy. However, when rural residents are denied private commercial credit, the Congress has so far found it in the public interest to authorize loans to assist them.

Competition with private enterprise, however, does have one major aspect which has so far escaped the public spotlight. On December 31, 1962, the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives released a report regarding the impact of tax-exempt and charitable trusts on our national economy. The report probed into numerous foundation controlled activities which are in direct competition with taxpaying businessmen and corporations.

Although the select committee initially studied 534 foundations, the Internal Revenue Service reported 45,124 foundations as tax exempt at the close of 1960 as contrasted with 12,295 at the end of 1952. The 534 tax-exempt foundations examined had assets of $10 billion at the end of 1960; their aggregate untaxed receipts amounted to almost $7 billion from 1951 through 1960; 111 of these 534 foundations owned 10 percent or more of at least 1 class of stock in 1 or more of 263 different corporations on December 31, 1960. The stockownership held by those 111 foundations ranged from 10 to 100 percent of the capital common voting stock of many well-known profitmaking businesses, including the Atlantic City Racetrack.

The 135-page report covers details of concern to all taxpayers. It deals with the abuses, and the disregard, on the part of many foundations of the accounting of tax-exempt income, assets, and disbursements as required by law. The chairman of the Select Committee, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, rated these financial statements "among the poorest he had ever seen." One foundation filed a report which listed no securities, although it actually held securities valued at nearly $50 million. Another foundation had been operating on a tax-exempt basis since 1926, yet no application was filed for tax exemption until mid-1960. Still another foundation had total receipts of $24.7 million, including capital gains of $12.9 million for the years 1950 through 1960, yet it did not file a capital gain schedule showing details of assets sold during those years.

The report revealed numerous conflicts between foundation activities and the public service concept on which the tax exemption is granted. Foundation funds and assets have been used to carry on proxy fights and to supply capital to donors and associates whenever needed at extremely low interest rates, thus cutting out private lenders entirely.

Several sections of the report pointed to the wholly unfair and widespread competitive advantages which accrue to tax-exempt foundations. Independent and taxpaying research and testing laboratories, for example, alleged that their foundation-backed competitors operate multimillion dollar commercial businesses at a profit. The American Council of Independent Laboratories charged that seven tax-exempt research and testing organizations did over $100 million in business during 1959.

Independent service station operators, small independent retailers, and real estate investors are discovering that their businesses are not immune to foundation-backed competition. Three foundations purchased gasoline service stations and commercial buildings and leased them back to several huge corporations which initially owned and sold these properties. Such sale and leaseback arrangements are the equivalent of providing instant capital to companies which accelerate their own growth in competition with independent service station operators and small retailers. This practice relieves beneficiary foundation-controlled enterprises from turning to the commercial money lenders for their capital. How can private business possibly compete with these privileged foundations which use funds and tax-deductible contributions earmarked for charity as venture and operating capital?

According to the report, the Ford Foundation loaned millions of dollars at preferential interest rates to railroads, airlines, boat manufacturers, oil companies, cosmetic makers, real estate dealers, foreign corporations, and other commercial enterprises. Thus, Ford Foundation, one among many family-vested and controlled trusts, is engaged in the moneylending business in direct competition with commercial banks and other taxpaying suppliers of credit. The report points to other foundations which loaned money to their creators and their subsidiary trusts, traded stock and property with them, speculated in the stock markets, paid for insurance policies on the lives of their donors, financed recreational and lending programs for contributors' employees, and engaged in many other activities whose relevance to charity and social welfare is remote indeed.

"In my view," said Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, "this is a dangerous situation with its boundless temptations and opportunities. I do not agree with the cheerful philosophy that the situation will right itself. The law must properly safeguard the community against possible abuses of the tax exemption privilege by the 'owners' of foundations or their successors."

I share Chairman PATMAN's deep concern in this matter. Special privileges flowing from inadequate laws, inadequate regulations, and lax administration pose a serious threat to our free enterprise economy and to our American system of government.

In closing, may I commend you, Mr. Smyth, for opening your interesting editorial page to guest editorials written by citizens of the First State. As far as I can determine, it is a privilege rarely extended by the press in the United States and one which other daily newspapers in Delaware might well emulate.

ROY WILKINS AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a story appeared recently in the Shreveport Times, disclosing that integrationist Roy Wilkins had told the Attorney General that Federal presence and action was badly needed in Shreveport.

I do not know why I am amazed at anything this man has to say, but I am. While innocent people are being shot down on their own property in nearby Maryland, Wilkins issues no call for Federal troops. He does not ask for Federal troops to quell the pitched battles that are fought almost around the clock in New York City. He asked for no intervention of Federal forces to aid Chicago police while they maintain what amounts to a constant war-like patrol to insure some semblance of an uneasy truce. Police estimate that 1,000 persons were involved in two recent disturbances, 47 of whom were arrested.

While these street riots are taking place all over the Nation; while law breaking is encouraged and, even, urged by authorities in Washington, agitator Wilkins calls for Federal troops to be sent to a peaceful city like Shreveport.

I am struck, too, by the improved relations Wilkins has been able to establish with the Office of the Attorney General. Previous Attorneys General took notice of him only when they were citing him for membership in various Communist-front organizations and gatherings. His stock has taken a sharp rise since Robert Kennedy took over that office.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1963, deals in detail with Wilkins' various Communist-front citations, in an insertion made by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative GATHINGS. It makes illuminating reading, particularly when you consider that Representative GATHINGS' insertion took 30 pages of very small type to list all the Communist-front citations of various leaders of the integration movement. These 30 pages, I might add, are in sharp contrast to the President's recent statement that he knew of no Communists in the integration movement.

Representative GATHINGS' insertion concerning racist agitator Wilkins and the story in the Shreveport Times are included below. The comparison is startling, indeed, and must cause us all to wonder how much of this agitation is Communist inspired.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1961

The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself. The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Judicial Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled "What is the IJA?" and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Judicial Association as "a Communist front and an offshot of the International Labor Defense" (report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report dated Sept. 17, 1950, p. 12).

A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of Mar. 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a "Communist-front organization" (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as "completely under the control of Communists" (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7686; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7684; and press releases on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936, (p. 1), entitled "1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes," he stated: "The greatest significance undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party," Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. "It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect of the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth." This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

NAACP Official Wants Federal Action in City

NEW YORK.—Integration leader Roy Wilkins has told Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy that Federal presence and action are badly needed in Shreveport, La., it was revealed Wednesday.

Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), sent a telegram to Kennedy requesting an immediate investigation by the Justice Department of violation of civil rights of Negroes in Shreveport.

The Negro leader charged that the Reverend Harry Blake, NAACP branch president, was arrested following an incident that occurred when he was out of the city.

RELEASED ON BOND

Blake was jailed Monday and released Tuesday on bonds totaling $1,500—$500 on a charge of contributing to the delinquency of a minor and $1,000 as an appearance bond pending a peace bond hearing.

Sixteen Negroes were arrested after racial incidents at three Shreveport stores Friday and Saturday.

He also said that a warrant has been issued for Charles Evers, NAACP field secretary for Mississippi, because he addressed a meeting in Shreveport.

"Reverend Blake alleged that he was warned by city officials some months ago that he would be held responsible for any demonstrations regardless of whether or not he participated," Wilkins said.

"It is obvious that Shreveport authorities are seeking by intimidation and police state action directed against leaders to prevent Negroes of that city from the exercise of constitutional rights of peaceful assembly. Federal presence and action are badly needed," Wilkins charged.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LANDRUM, for 45 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. KING of New York), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. WELTNER), for 30 minutes, on August 27, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. WELTNER.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KING of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following member (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 23, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora;

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Beg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas;

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carta Gallitto;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic;

H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith;

H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski;

H.R. 5834. For the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;

H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Giazikis;

H.R. 6996. An act to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7824. An act to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1153. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1154. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 84), to increase the limit on the maximum liability of a single borrower to a national bank"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1155. A letter from the Under Secretary, for the Secretary of Commerce, relative to providing war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public for the period as of June 30, 1963, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1156. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the positions which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had established as of June 30, 1963, pursuant to the authority provided in 72 Stat. 426, 429, and is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 206(b) of the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 785, 791); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1157. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 5, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on the Great Lakes Harbors study—Interim report on the Alpena Harbor, Mich., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 444. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 103; with amendment (Rept. No. 705). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee of conference. H.R. 7500. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 706). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 474. Resolution to print as a House document the May 1963 Special Report to the President and to the Congress on Increase in the Resources of the Inter-American Development Bank, by the National Advisory Council International Monetary and Financial Problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 707). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 475. Resolution to print as a House document the May 1963 Special Report to the President and to the Congress on the Proposed Increase of $1 Billion in Authorized Capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems; without amendment (Rept. No. 708). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 203. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"; with amendment (Rept. No. 709). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 212. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of selected excerpts relating to the 1963–64 national college debate topic, compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, as a House document, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 710). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 415. Resolution authorizing the printing of the U.S. Defense Policies in 1962 as a House document; with amendment (Rept. No. 711). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963–64 national high school debate subject of medicare; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 665. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8240. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 8241. A bill to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government and in the municipal government of the District of Columbia should be granted administrative leave on Wednesday, August 28, 1963, in connection with the civil rights activities in Washington, D.C., on such day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 8242. A bill for the relief of Fotios Nicolpoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8243. A bill for the relief of Escott B. Belisle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 8244. A bill for the relief of Swifftrain Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

◆

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. William Sydnor, rector, Christ Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Holy God, Lord of the hearts of men and Lord of the forces of history, by Thine outstretched hand guide, we beseech Thee, the work of these, Thy servants, in the Senate of the United States. Take from them any taint of arrogance, greed, or selfishness, and fill them with the spirit of dedicated service, so that their work may reflect the kindness and compassion, righteousness and justice in which Thou doth delight. In Thy mercy do Thou direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors upon the best and surest foundations that there may be justice and peace at home and that through obedience to Thy law, Thy people may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. If it be Thy will, O God, hear our prayer and grant our petitions, we pray in the name of Jesus Christ, our Savior. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 23, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of J. Ellison Deer, to be postmaster at Ulmers, S.C., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George L. Mehren, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David Statler Black, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1968.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. **ANDERSON**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 46. A bill to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable (Rept. No. 460); and

S. 48. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act (Rept. No. 461).

By Mr. **CHURCH**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1868. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training (Rept. No. 462);

H.R. 5883. An act to correct a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 463); and

H.R. 6710. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyo., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 464).

By Mr. **BIBLE**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 465); and

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes (Rept. No. 466).

By Mr. **BURDICK**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress in respect to the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest (Rept. No. 467).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **MAGNUSON**:

S. 2078. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. **JAVITS** (for himself and Mr. Keating):

S. 2079. A bill to provide for the striking of three different medals in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and Statue of Liberty National Monument American Museum of Immigration in New York City, N.Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **HILL**:

S. 2080. A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. **BEALL**:

S. 2081. A bill to amend section 511(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to equalize the retired pay of certain officers of the armed services retired prior to October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. **HOLLAND**:

S. 2082. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla., for administration as a part of said park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. **HUMPHREY**:

S. 2083. A bill for the relief of Dr. Floriano P. Brion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BREWSTER**:

S. 2084. A bill for the relief of Peitrina Del Frate; and

S. 2085. A bill for the relief of William Maurer Trayfors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2086. A bill to amend sections 220, 221, and 233 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **LONG** of Missouri:

S. 2087. A bill for the relief of Dr. Delfina M. Ibalio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **CLARK**:

S. 2088. A bill for the relief of Tomos Ishikawa Westley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **BREWSTER**:

S. 2089. A bill to establish the St. Mary's City National Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

MEDALS IN COMMEMORATION OF THREE NEW YORK CITY NATIONAL HISTORIC SHRINES

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the striking of a liberty series of three medals in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and the Statue of Liberty National Monument American Museum of Immigration.

All three of these great historic landmarks, located in the downtown Manhattan area of New York City, have been recognized as national historic shrines, and are presently being reconstructed by the National Park Service. New York City, my home city, will be celebrating the 300th anniversary of its founding in 1664. The issuance of these medals is designed to coincide with the 300th birthday anniversary of the city and with the New York World's Fair, which is also scheduled to open in April 1964; and it is hoped it will also coincide with the completion of the pending construction of the shrines. The object is, of course, to have the shrines open and ready for the millions of visitors who will be coming to New York for the fair. Proceeds of the sale of the medals would be used to defray part of the expenses of reconstructing and maintaining the shrines.

Under the terms of the bill, the sale of the medals will be supervised by the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board, which was created by act of Congress in 1955. The board has initiated this program of commemorative medals, has suggested the designs, and has conferred with officials in the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Mint.

The bill calls for a series of three correlated commemorative medals. The face of all three would be identical in design, presenting the Statue of Liberty National Monument as "Liberty Enlightening the World," which was the theme of the French sculptor, Auguste Bartholdi. The reverse of each of the medals would differ as follows: The first would depict Federal Hall as the first capitol building, where Gen. George Washington was inaugurated as first President of the United States, the first congressional sessions were held during 1789–90, and our departments of Government, including the Treasury Department, were first organized. The second would depict Castle Clinton as the last of a series of forts which, from the time of the Dutch settlement in 1624, guarded lower Manhattan, and was headquarters of Gen. Winfield Scott during the War of 1812, the 150th anniversary of which is now being observed. The third would depict the American Museum of Immigration now being constructed so as to complete the base of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, which will tell the story of the making of the United States by those who have come to our shores from all over the world.

The bill calls for a total issue of no more than 765,000 medals, to be issued over a period of 10 years. It is expected that they will be sold at the New York World's Fair in 1964–65, and at the three national historic shrine sites, and thereafter, through various other outlets for the benefit of the continuing operation and maintenance of the shrines.

Completion of the shrines has been estimated by the National Park Service to cost approximately $5.2 million. Of this sum, Congress has authorized $2.6 million, or one-half of the cost, leaving an equal amount to be raised by the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board and cooperating groups. As of August 1, 1963, the Board reported, through Rear Adm. John J. Bergen, chairman of its national fund-raising committee, that it must still obtain subscriptions of approximately $1.5 million to meet its quota. I believe enactment of this bill will be of material aid to achieving completion of these great historic landmarks by the target dates during the New York World's Fair. I hope action will be taken promptly enough so that this may be accomplished.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2079) to provide for the striking of three different medals in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and Statue of Liberty National Monument, American Museum of Immigration in New York City, N.Y., introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and

Mr. Keating), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 220, 221, AND 233 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 220, 221, and 233 of the National Housing Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the background and justification for the proposed legislation be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2086) to amend sections 220, 221, and 233 of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. Brewster, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. Brewster is as follows:

Background and Justification for Proposed Legislation

This bill is intended to correct an omission from the National Housing Act of 1961.

In the event of default under FHA insured mortgages, the act provides for payment to the mortgagee, in debentures, of the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus any accrued interest. To make these certain sections of the act more acceptable to investors, Congress provided that the Commissioner might pay "in cash or debentures."

Due to minor drafting error that was not discovered until after passage of the 1961 Housing Act, interest from the date of default cannot be paid if the claim is settled in cash. The result is that investors are disinclined to accept cash settlements and the congressional intent in providing for same has been thwarted.

It is generally agreed that it was not the intent of Congress to prevent the FHA from paying such interest and that mortgagees are entitled to it whether settling in cash or for debentures.

This legislation is proposed to correct what is properly classified as a technical error. Its passage will accomplish the intent of Congress when it passed the National Housing Act of 1961.

ST. MARYS CITY NATIONAL MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the St. Marys City National Memorial Commission.

Mr. President, this bill proposes to preserve the sacred site of St. Marys City, Md., for the American people, and perpetuate the ideals of peace, liberty, equality, and brotherhood which guided its founders.

In urging favorable action on this bill, I shall refer only to three items, each of which in itself constitutes a good and sufficient reason for its passage.

The men and women who crossed the Atlantic Ocean on the *Ark* and *Dove* and founded St. Marys City, the first English settlement in Maryland, came under the protection of the King of England who had granted a patent to Lord Baltimore to establish a colony in what became known as Maryland. They were well armed and capable of taking the land from its Indian owners by force. But they did not choose to do so. They shunned violence. They recognized the right of the Indians to their land, and offered to purchase it from them. Their decision to acquire the land by purchase rather than by force of arms was a repudiation of the whole colonial theory.

Besides renouncing colonialism, the founder of St. Marys City also condemned religious bigotry and recognized the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

At a time when religious fanaticism was at its height, when Protestants and Catholics persecuted each other and Puritans made war on both, the early Maryland settlers, composed of both Protestants and Catholics, agreed among themselves to live and work together in peace and harmony, without regard to creed.

In 1649, 15 years after the founding of this unique colony, its legislative assembly passed a law which officially guaranteed freedom of religion to all in Maryland. This law was the first of its kind in the Western Hemisphere, and the forerunner of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

St. Marys City enjoyed another distinction, the enviable distinction of being the home of Margaret Brent. She was the first woman attorney in this country. As attorney for Lord Baltimore, she was entrusted with the management of his affairs in the colony, which included the maintenance of an army, and thus became recognized as the first lady of Maryland.

Margaret Brent was also the first suffragette. At a time when it was universally accepted that woman's place was in the kitchen, when government and politics were the exclusive sphere of men, when only men were considered fit or capable of making laws, Margaret Brent appeared before the Maryland Assembly and demanded a place in it and a voice in making laws and decisions for the colony. This demand, made more than two centuries before the National Woman Suffrage Association was organized by Susan B. Anthony, was the start of the woman's movement.

The light that once shone so brightly at St. Marys City has for generations been buried under a bushel. Few people outside the State of Maryland know about the treaty of the first Maryland colonists with the Indians. Few people outside of Maryland have ever heard of the Toleration Act of 1649 or of Margaret Brent.

St. Marys City itself is hardly known outside the State of Maryland. Indeed, it does not exist anymore as a city or even as a town.

Today, St. Marys City is buried deep in the ground under cornfields and scrub brush. There are no visible remains of the once proud city in which religious tolerance was born.

This bill is designed to rescue it from oblivion and preserve it for posterity as an important part of the great American heritage.

Those who chose the site of St. Marys City made a most fortunate choice. Located on the banks of the St. Marys River, and commanding a sweeping view of this stream as well as the Potomac River and parts of Virginia, the spot has few equals in beauty. Its acquisition and preservation for the enjoyment and edification of the American people is urgently recommended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2089) to establish the St. Marys City National Memorial Commission, introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 14, 1963, the names of Mr. Inouye and Mr. Randolph were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2046) to establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President, introduced by Mr. Miller on August 14, 1963.

COMMENDATION OF NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently in the Congress and elsewhere there has been considerable discussion as to the relative efficiency of naval yards and private yards. Unfortunately, in this discussion, the Navy yards do not always get the consideration and understanding of their real function necessary to a fair evaluation of their role in the national defense.

The Navy shipyards are ready to serve our Nation under all conditions, at a moment's notice. They are ready to accept all work, no matter what the difficulties or unusual circumstances. They are topflight insurance that sudden major defense efforts will be satisfactorily met and rigorous schedules will be upheld. They contain a large segment of skilled white-collar and blue-collar employees who are intimately acquainted with naval ships, are ready to meet whatever demands are imposed upon them, and have a deep and patriotic loyalty to the long-term needs of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. President, a proper balance in public and private shipyards is certainly essential to the well-being of our Nation. I would be the last to suggest that private shipyards be abolished so that Navy yards could do all the work, but equally I would fight to the last breath any effort to abolish Navy yards so that private shipyards could do all the work. Certainly, maximum endeavors of public and private yards should be directed cooperatively toward strengthening our defense efforts. Navy yards are keenly aware of the need to produce the maximum for the taxpayer and for our national defense while keeping costs to a minimum.

Mr. President, I recently visited the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn which, for 160 years, has had a reputation for being the "can do" yard. I was deeply impressed by the sense of devotion, the skill, and the industry of the workers there.

I am glad to note, Mr. President, that my high opinion of the naval shipyard is also shared by Navy commanders and others who have gone out of their way to praise the work done at the naval shipyard. The National Association of Naval Technical Supervisors has called to my attention the commendation sent recently to the commandant of the Navy yard from the commanding officers of the U.S.S. *Raleigh* and the U.S.S. *Vancouver*, two LPD's, recently completed at the New York Naval Shipyard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these wires be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From: Commanding officer, U.S.S. *Raleigh* (LPD–1).
To: Commander, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Subject: Assistance by New York Naval Shipyard; appreciation of.

1. During the 6 months since this ship was accepted for restricted service certain difficulties have occurred in connection with machinery or equipment installed in the *Raleigh*. In many cases the problems involved highly complicated equipment of new design not previously tested on board ship. In some instances the difficulties encountered were of major importance affecting the immediate operational commitments of the ship and in other cases were minor in nature or involved only the need for technical advice. Regardless of the magnitude of the difficulties experienced New York Naval Shipyard's response to requests for assistance have been prompt and positive in every instance.

2. It is obvious that those in leadership positions at New York Naval Shipyard have a sincere desire to make the construction of the *Raleigh* complete and in every way satisfactory for full service. The assistance rendered on numerous occasions since January, both in the form of material and technical assistance by shipyard personnel, has been greatly appreciated.

3. During the same period New York Naval Shipyard liaison with the *Raleigh* in preparing for the post shakedown availability has been thorough with evident assurance that every possible effort is being made to make the most efficient use of the short 6-week availability assigned.

4. As the *Raleigh* prepared for her first extended deployment with the fleet, the commanding officer extends sincere thanks and appreciation to the commander, New York Naval Shipyard, and to all the members of his staff for the continued, effective, and willing assistance rendered.

A. W. WHITNEY.

From: U.S.S. *Vancouver* (LPD–2).
To: Naval Shipyard, New York.

On occasion of departure desire to express sincerest appreciation to New York Naval Shipyard and all associated with construction and fitting out of the *Vancouver* for the outstanding job, splendid spirit of cooperation, and unstinting support which characterized the efforts of all concerned. You have turned out a fine ship, ready to do a job. We leave with a high regard for the ability of the "can do" yard to deliver a product of which both you and the operating forces can be proud. I am confident that the results of your efforts will be apparent in the operation of the ship for many years to come. We terminate our relationship with regret, tempered only by enthusiasm at the long-awaited opportunity to continue the job you have so well begun by developing the ship's potential with the amphibious forces of the fleet. We will take with us nothing but the finest memories of the New York Naval Shipyard and all its people. Well done, best wishes, and warm regards.

ANTIRELIGION IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, persecution of religious groups in the Soviet Union is not one whit abated. Over the years the Communists have waged ruthless war against all manifestations of faith in the Almighty.

Jewish groups have suffered most, both under czars and under the Communists. Most recently they have been made the scapegoats for the economic failures of communism.

But all religious persons, of whatever faith, have felt the heavy hand of Communist tyranny. The most recent actions of the Soviet Government illustrate beyond doubt that, although nuclear testing in the atmosphere is over, although the cold war may be in for a slight thaw, the war against religion in Communist lands goes on.

The Soviets have altered the U.S.S.R.'s pension system to block payments to workers employed by churches or religious agencies. Only cleaners and watchmen, apparently, are excluded from this act, and that on the grounds that the property is state property and must be maintained.

Under the ruling, secretaries, typists, translators, deans, and persons similarly employed will lose pension rights.

Mr. President, this is one more example of the continuing hostility of the Soviets toward all aspects of religion. It should serve warning of the continuing need for world attention to Soviet actions, and to Soviet tyranny, not only around the world, but also within the Soviet Union.

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—INCORPORATION OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bills, S. 1914 to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and S. 1942 to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, were passed on August 20.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall object unless there is an explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, and particularly the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the two bills in question came from a subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and from the Judiciary Committee. They were approved and advanced by unanimous vote of the subcommittee and the full committee. One would confer a Federal charter upon the National Catholic War Veterans and the other a charter upon the National Jewish War Veterans. There has been some objection from certain quarters, and it is upon the basis of that request that the majority leader is entering a motion to reconsider those bills. At the moment I have no objection, because discussion can take place at some subsequent time when the motion is called up.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be happy to yield in a moment after a brief explanation. The purpose of the motion is to accommodate a Senator who did not happen to be present at the time, and who had privately expressed the hope that the bills could be debated. I assure Senators that if the motion is agreed to, there is no intention on the part of the leadership to delay consideration of those measures. Though they would not be called up today, they would be within the immediate future.

Mr. KEATING. That was the question that I wished to put to the majority leader. As the author of one of the bills, I naturally have a deep interest. I have been working on those measures for years. Can the Senator state with any more particularity the date when they might be called up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. My guess would be some time shortly after Labor Day.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a cosponsor of the bill which would provide a charter for the Jewish War Veterans. With my colleague, I feel I can say that if any Senator wishes to discuss these charters, which are of such character that one would wish to feel that the heart of the Congress is in them, I think that such consideration can be thoroughly justified on the record. The organizations in question have served our Nation's interest magnificently.

I join my colleague in asking for an early hearing. Many people have been led to believe that the bills have passed the Senate. I would not object to the right of any Senator to discuss the measures if he could not be present at the time the measures were considered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has the assurance that that will be done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] have expressed completely my point of view. These are two sound bills, but I would not want to foreclose full discussion of them upon reconsideration as a courtesy to any Senator who was absent when they were brought before the Senate previously. They will stand on their own merits. The only real question before the Senate is a question of timing for reconsideration. The majority leader has given his assurance that they will be brought up shortly after Labor Day. I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If only to round out the record, I wish to say that the bills were reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the minority leader. There was no objection. There was no indication to me that they should be held on the calendar. My calendar indicated that they had approval. So the request came subsequent to that time from another Senator. But I am glad to oblige and to join with the majority leader in the motion. When the measures are called up, there can then be discussion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was no opposition to the bills at the time they were discussed on the floor of the Senate. A goodly number of Senators were in attendance at the time.

Mr. President, has the motion been agreed to?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator has a right to enter the motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return the papers on the bill S. 1914 to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and on the bill S. 1942, to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank Senators for their courtesy and understanding.

SAFEGUARDS RECOMMENDED BY THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF TO REDUCE THE RISKS AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, has released the unclassified portions of the reply by the Department of Defense to the committee's request for a statement regarding implementation of the safeguards recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reduce the risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty.

The Senator from Georgia had transmitted to the Secretary of Defense the text of a motion which I made and which was unanimously adopted by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on August 14 and by the full Committee on Armed Services on August 15.

The part of the reply made public consists of letters from the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The classified part of the reply has been delivered to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

We thought all Members of the Senate would wish to be informed on this matter in connection with their consideration of the test ban treaty. On behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I ask unanimous consent to have printed the public part of the reply in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the portions of the reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1963.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter responds to your letter of August 15 transmitting the motion adopted by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on August 14 asking for information on the four safeguards that will be maintained by the administration in order to avoid injury to our national security in connection with the test ban treaty.

As the chairman of the subcommittee recognized in his colloquy with General Taylor on August 14 when the motion was under discussion, the matters referred to in the motion not only transcend the responsibilities of the JCS but also transcend the responsibility of the Department of Defense. For that reason, this reply has been prepared after obtaining advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and after consultation with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

When the motion was under discussion in the August 14 hearing of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, it was recognized that the response, dealing with the four subjects, would have to be primarily in terms of the "criteria" or "standards" which are guiding the executive branch. I am glad to bring together here in one document the extensive assurances which have been given on the four subjects by the President and by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Furthermore, we have included here, or in a separate classified annex where appropriate, specific detail and explanation in an effort to be as fully responsive as time and circumstances permit.

Safeguard (a): "The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs designed to add to our knowledge and improve our weapons in all areas of significance to our military posture for the future."

On this subject, the President, in his message of August 8, 1963, transmitting the treaty to the Senate, said, "The United States has more experience in underground testing than any other nation; and we intend to use this capacity to maintain the adequacy of our arsenal. Our atomic laboratories will maintain an active development program, including underground testing, and we will be ready to resume testing in the atmosphere if necessary. Continued research on developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be possible through underground testing." Later in the same message, the President referred to "our determination to maintain our own arsenal through underground tests." In his press conference last Tuesday, the President described the program of the last 2 years and added, "We are going to continue to carry on, as I've said, a vigorous series of tests."

Secretary McNamara and Dr. Seaborg, in their testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 13 and 14, reiterated these points and elaborated on them. General Taylor, in his testimony on August 15 before the same committee, testified that the President's position on this matter had been effectively communicated.

The underground test program will expand over that currently programed for fiscal year 1964. Details of the program are set forth in the separate, classified annex.

The Government will apply the following criteria, or standards, in the area of underground testing:

The underground test program will be comprehensive. Therefore, it will be revised to include as many as feasible of the objectives of the tests which we would otherwise do under conditions of unrestricted testing.

The underground test program will be vigorous. It will proceed at a pace that will exploit to the fullest the capabilities of existing AEC and Department of Defense weapons laboratories. If these capabilities are proved to be inadequate to meet established requirements, they will be expanded.

The underground test program will be a continuing program designed to insure the highest practicable rate of progress in nuclear technology.

The standards established governing the type and magnitude of tests to be conducted will not be more restrictive than the spirit of the treaty limitations.

Safeguard (b): "The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends."

There are three major facilities in which programs in theoretical and experimental nuclear warhead design technology are currently conducted and seven major Department of Defense laboratories engaged in nuclear weapons effects research. The AEC facilities operating under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission are:

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, N. Mex.

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.

Sandia Laboratory, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

The major Department of Defense laboratories are:

Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratory, Bedford, Mass.

Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex.

Armed Force Radiobiological Research Institute, Bethesda, Md.

Ballistics Research Laboratory, Aberdeen, Md.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.

Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory, San Francisco, Calif.

Nuclear Defense Laboratory, Edgewood, Md.

Efforts to "attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources" to the program of these laboratories depend primarily on their authorized programs and their equipment and facilities.

The AEC laboratories have been conducting programs of research in chemistry, physics, metallurgy, computer technology, and biological sciences, in addition to their major efforts in the design and development of nuclear weapons. They are also conducting development and exploration in applied nuclear physics such as reactors, controlled thermonuclear reactions, peaceful uses of nuclear explosives, nuclear propelled rockets, and the development of a nuclear ramjet.

The Department of Defense laboratories have been conducting programs of basic research in the nuclear weapons effects areas which have military applications. In addition to making effects measurement during nuclear test series, research includes studies of airblast effects on ground equipment and aerospace systems, initial nuclear radiation measurements, shielding effects, protective structures, biomedical effects, underwater effects, electromagnetic effects, and integrated effects and phenomena.

To support all of these studies extensive simulation techniques and computer facilities are used.

These activities are expected to be more than sufficient to provide the necessary stimulus and challenge to attract and retain first-rate scientific talent.

The next most important requirement after the quality of the research program necessary to maintain laboratory vitality is the physical plant with which the scientists must work. A continuous program of upgrading equipment and facilities has been underway at these laboratories since their inception, and this program is planned to continue. The approximate capital investment at each of the laboratories at the end of fiscal year 1963 was: Los Alamos, $226 million; LRL-Livermore, $118 million; and Sandia, $122 million. The approximate capital investment in support of the weapons effects program of the seven major Department of Defense weapons effects laboratories is $153 million.

Some important facilities are now under construction at the laboratories or are awaiting fiscal year 1964 appropriations. If additional facilities should be needed at these installations in order to carry out the vigorous and imaginative testing program which we have discussed, funds for such facilities will be requested.

In addition to program and facilities development, the laboratories have aggressive personnel development activities including provision for inservice training, sabbatical leave, and outside educational opportunities at affiliated universities.

The President, Secretary McNamara, and Dr. Seaborg have all expressed the firm commitment of the administration to maintaining the quality and the vitality of our weapons laboratories.

The President in his press conference last Tuesday referred specifically to the safeguard "that we should keep our laboratories activated and vital." He said, "I've already met with Dr. Foster and Dr. Bradbury; we have talked with others. We are going to do that."

Our standards in this area will be as follows:

Adequate AEC and Department of Defense budgets, modern facilities and positive personnel policies will be maintained and augmented as necessary in order to attract and retain competent scientists in nuclear and related fields.

Broad and forward-looking research programs will be carried on which will attract and retain able and imaginative personnel capable of insuring the highest practicable rate of progress that can be attained in all avenues of potential value to our offensive and defensive posture.

Safeguard (c): "The maintenance of the facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere should they be deemed essential to our national security or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union."

The following steps are illustrative of what has been done and what is being done in this important area:

Improvement of test support facilities, including preparation and maintenance of off-continent support bases and test sites, is now underway. Approximately $55 million is now committed by AEC and Department of Defense for fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964 for improvements to Johnston Island to provide a partial overseas test capability.

To provide an airborne nuclear test capability, suitable for most weapons proof and development tests, the following needs are being satisfied: Diagnostic aircraft (being accomplished by AEC and Department of Defense); instrumented device or weapon drop aircraft (being accomplished by AEC and Department of Defense); sampler and other support aircraft available from the Air Force on short notice (being accomplished by Department of Defense); suitable operating bases on Johnston Island for surveillance, weather, sampler, and sampler return aircraft (joint AEC/DOD construction underway), and in the Hawaiian area.

For a high altitude nuclear weapons effects test capability the following steps are being taken: An overseas base at Johnston Island with adequate area and suitable facilities to support the tests, such as rocket launch pads, assembly areas, etc. (joint AEC/DOD construction underway); instrumented ships and aircraft available on short notice from the Navy and Air Force.

Further, the AEC and Department of Defense test organization—the Nevada operations office and the Defense Atomic Support Agency, including a nuclear joint task force—will be maintained at strength. This task force will be somewhat larger than the standby unit currently maintained.

It is planned that the regular continuing laboratory programs will include development of those devices which may at some time require atmospheric testing; that the laboratories will be encouraged to carry their ideas and studies to the point where final device construction can be achieved in a time comparable to the time necessary to implement an actual atmospheric test should such tests be authorized; and that development of instruments needed for support of an atmospheric test program will be continued by the laboratories.

The President has assured the Nation that a high state of readiness to test will be maintained. In his television address on July 26, he announced: "Secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible, and, thus, our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must." And in his message transmitting the treaty to the Senate he stated, "We will be ready to resume testing in the atmosphere if necessary." He amplified the point in his press conference last Tuesday, stating, "Already we have begun to prepare Johnston Island for that unhappy eventuality, if it should occur. We are dredging the harbor, we are building some piers; there are * * * two dredges already out there, so I can assure you that we are going ahead very rapidly in that area."

The position was supported by Secretary McNamara before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 13. Dr. Seaborg's remarks on August 14 were to the same effect.

On being asked how long after a treaty violation it would take the United States to begin testing, the Secretary of Defense gave the following reaction times as the objectives to be attained: Proof tests within 2 months from the decision to test, development tests within 3 months from the decision to test, and effects tests within 6 months from the decision to test. He explained that such an effects-tests readiness posture—the most difficult one to maintain—could be achieved by about a year from now.

With regard to logistics and finances, Secretary McNamara emphasized that it was important to keep up and expand the facilities on Johnston Island. He reminded that "we can provide a standby capability by utilization of the approximately $200 million in funds that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department have requested for fiscal 1964 for test purposes, and by possible supplements to those funds for further standby facilities."

The programs are designed to meet the following criteria with respect to the maintenance of a readiness-to-test posture:

The readiness-to-test program will be establishment on a Government-wide basis in support of a plan common to all participating agencies. The required resources and facilities will be maintained in a state of readiness, or earmarked, so that plans can be implemented within the reaction times established.

Reaction times for resumption of testing in the prohibited environments will be established and maintained within the constraints of military requirements and reasonable costs. Reaction times will vary for the broad categories of testing. As an immediate objective, we should be able to conduct proof tests of weapons in stockpile in about 2 months; operational systems tests in about 2 to 3 months; weapons development tests in about 3 months; and, weapons effects tests in about 6 months.

There will be provision for periodic updating of our test-program plan and for checking our readiness to test.

Safeguard (d): "The improvement of our capability, within feasible and practical limits, to monitor the terms of the treaty, to detect violations, and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements."

The United States now has substantial capabilities to detect, identify, and to some extent diagnose nuclear tests. These capabilities exist in the resources of our conventional intelligence community and in the resources of the Atomic Energy Detection System (AEDS).

The role played by the intelligence community was discussed with the Senate Foreign Relation Committee on August 16 and with the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on May 22 by Mr. McCone, Director of Central Intelligence. The intelligence community, under the direction of the U.S. Intelligence Board has increased its activities and will continue to increase its activities to cope with the new conditions under the treaty.

Secretary McNamara, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 13, stated that "Our examination concluded that the Soviet Union could obtain no major results by testing in the atmosphere and deep space or underwater without incurring high risk of detection and identification." He pointed out that "the only advantages of illegal testing in the three prohibited environments would be either to develop weapons with yields in the multimegaton range (since designs for weapons with yields of up to 10 MT or more can be checked by lower yield tests underground) or to determine the weapons effects of explosions which cannot be carried out at all, or not so well, underground. There will probably be no cost advantage to illegal testing in the prohibited environments because keeping the tests secret will add to the expense and difficulty of the experiments." In answer to a question about the future, Secretary McNamara referred to augmentations of the detection and identification system which have already been approved and to further augmentations which are under consideration—expanding upon the statement of the President in his message of August 8 transmitting the treaty to the Senate: "There is further assurance against clandestine testing in our ability to develop and deploy additional means of detection."

Dr. Seaborg, in his summary before the same committee on August 14, said that "systems to detect possible violation of the treaty will be maintained and continually improved."

The administration—as indicated in the detailed testimony of Defense and ACDA officials before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on May 9 and 15—has under consideration proposals by which our present AEDS resources can be augmented to enhance our capabilities. The proposals now being reviewed are summarized in the separate, classified annex.

The standards for the program and plans are these:

The current capability of the United States to detect and identify nuclear tests conducted by the Sino-Soviet bloc will be improved to a degree which is both feasible and remunerative. (Specific proposals for this purpose are currently under consideration.)

A vigorous research and development program will be pursued in order to improve equipments and techniques for nuclear test detection and identification.

Conventional intelligence sources will continue to complement the scientific intelligence techniques.

In conclusion, the following additional important factors must be borne in mind in connection with the concern about clandestine tests: First, the possibility of Soviet clandestine tests is lessened by the fact that they can test legally underground. Second, although there can be no guarantee that we will be able to identify all possible violations of the treaty, the Soviets cannot guarantee that we will not identify such violations. Put another way, the Soviets will never be sure of the threshold for successful evasion of our expanding and improving detection system. And third, as the President stated in his message to the Senate of August 8, we are determined to maintain our own arsenal through underground testing and our readiness to resume atmospheric testing if the actions of others so require.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I trust you will agree, that the major decisions of policy have already been made and that Executive action under these decisions is already going forward. I am assured—and I can assure you—that if further decisions and actions are needed, the President will take them.

Since the matters discussed above were also raised during the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the test ban treaty, a copy of this letter is being furnished also to the chairman of that committee. In addition, since the contents of this letter are pertinent to an earlier inquiry from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, a copy is being furnished to the chairman of that committee as well.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL GILPATRIC.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1963.
The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to the request of your committee transmitted to the Secretary of Defense on August 15, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have developed criteria for testing the adequacy of plans and programs in support of the treaty safeguards included in their statement on the limited test ban treaty made to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. These criteria, attached hereto, are necessarily general in language since additional study will be required to determine specific standards and programs for underground testing, for the stimulation of nuclear laboratory activities, for the standby preparations for nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and for the improvement of our capability to detect clandestine testing.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended the inclusion of this statement of criteria in the letter of the Deputy Secretary of Defense dated August 23, which has been transmitted to you in further response to the request of August 15 mentioned above. They consider that the actions described in Deputy Secretary Gilpatric's letter meet the requirements as presently foreseen for implementing the safeguards proposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reduce the risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty.

We appreciate this opportunity to amplify for your committee our views on this important issue.

Sincerely yours,

MAXWELL D. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

CRITERIA TO INSURE FULFILLMENT OF THE SAFEGUARDS PROPOSED BY THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF WITH REGARD TO THE LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Listed below are the four safeguards and the recommended criteria which should be employed in subsequent examination of programs designed to insure that each of the safeguards is fulfilled.

A. "The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs designed to add to our knowledge and improve our weapons in all areas of significance to our military posture for the future."

1. CRITERIA

(a) The underground test program should be comprehensive. Therefore, it should be revised to include as many as feasible of the objectives of the tests which we would otherwise do under conditions of unrestricted testing.

(b) The underground test program should be vigorous. It should proceed at a pace that will exploit to the fullest the capabilities of existing AEC and DOD weapons laboratories. If these capabilities are proved to be inadequate to meet established requirements, they should be expanded.

(c) The underground test program should be a continuing program designed to insure the highest practicable rate of progress in nuclear technology.

(d) The standards established governing the type and magnitude of tests to be conducted should not be more restrictive than the spirit of the treaty limitations.

B. "The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends."

1. CRITERIA

(a) Adequate Atomic Energy Commission and Department of Defense budgets, modern facilities, and positive personnel policies should be maintained and augmented as necessary in order to attract and retain competent scientists in nuclear and related fields.

(b) Broad and forward-looking research programs should be carried on which will attract and retain able and imaginative personnel capable of insuring the highest practicable rate of progress that can be attained in all avenues of potential value to our offensive and defensive posture.

C. "The maintenance of the facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere should they be deemed essential to our national security or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union."

1. CRITERIA

(a) The readiness-to-test program should be established on a Government-wide basis in support of a plan common to all participating agencies. The required resources and facilities should be maintained in a state of readiness, or earmarked, so that plans can be implemented within the reaction times established.

(b) Reaction times for resumption of testing in the prohibited environments must be established and maintained within the constraints of military requirements and reasonable costs. Reaction times will vary for the broad categories of testing. As an immediate objective, we should be able to conduct proof tests of weapons in stockpile in about 2 months; operational systems tests in about 2 to 3 months; weapon developments tests in about 3 months; and weapon effect tests in about 6 months.

(c) There must be provision for periodic updating of our test program plan and for checking our readiness to test.

D. "The improvement of our capability, within feasible and practical limits, to monitor the terms of the treaty, to detect violations, and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements."

1. CRITERIA

(a) The current capability of the United States to detect and identify nuclear tests conducted by the Sino-Soviet bloc must be improved to the extent it is both feasible and remunerative. (Specific proposals for this purpose are currently under consideration.)

(b) A vigorous research and development program must be pursued in order to improve equipments and techniques for nuclear test detection and identification.

(c) Conventional intelligence sources must continue to complement the scientific intelligence techniques.

ROY ROBERTS ON THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there is no more highly respected newspaperman in this country than Roy A. Roberts.

In his typically thoughtful manner, after extensive analyses, Mr. Roberts presented his views yesterday in a signed editorial in the Kansas City Star.

I commend this thought-provoking editorial to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Aug. 25, 1963]

SMALL STRIDE TOWARD PEACE: SOME REFLECTIONS ON THAT VITAL TEST BAN TREATY

(By Roy A. Roberts)

With most of the evidence now in, the Star is more convinced than ever that the nuclear test-ban treaty serves the national interest and the cause of world peace.

As we see it, the case for approval by the Senate is almost overpowering. Giving full weight to all the objections that have been raised, we think that the treaty should be ratified. More than that, we think that it will be. Nor do we favor such action simply as a token gesture toward a better working relationship with the Soviet Union. The treaty, limited as it is as a measure of progress toward world peace, is a vital contribution to the history of this atomic age.

I have waited until all the pros and cons have been stated, in the Senate hearings and elsewhere, before reviewing in detail this issue so important to all of us. Now my observations—and they are mostly personal—seem in order. They are not, let me state, observations based on the knowledge of an expert in this complicated field. They stem, rather, from a close perusal of the testimony on Capitol Hill, from the personal experience of history, and from deep convictions on man's fears and hopes.

In Washington, I covered the developing story of the League of Nations, of the probably ill-advised but dramatic disarmament after World War I, of the United Nations. Particularly, I recall that first world naval disarmament conference. There were paeans of joy on the start of a new day. I saw this Nation throw away naval supremacy by sinking its new cruisers. And in a few years, I saw some of the parties who sat at the table cheating, notably Japan. I mention this to allay any thought that I am starry-eyed over agreements and pacts.

Indeed, I have seen treaties come and treaties go, and I have learned not to get overly excited about any of them. With a piece of paper, signed by a few nations or many, man's hopes may soar, foolishly, and fruitlessly. I caution now against such a reaction to the nuclear test ban. But in commonsense realism there is a certainty that this agreement is, in its limited way, a step toward the goal of a better world.

Soon, the roll will be called and the Senators will be asked to give their "advice and consent." Remember, it takes the votes of only a third of the lawmakers to block a treaty. Remember, too, that there are some intense nationalists in the Senate. They have strong views and will stick to them. But with the preponderance of opinion favoring U.S. acceptance of the treaty, the size of the favorable vote might be a surprise.

Certainly there will not be the "great debate" that seemed likely when the treaty was first offered to the world. The material for such a debate simply isn't there, nor is the situation on Capitol Hill particularly favorable for a bitter, to-the-finish fight. Almost overshadowing the nuclear pact is the highly emotional and very difficult civil rights problem. It's a reasonable guess that the big debate, if there is one, will be on civil rights, not on atomic testing. Congress does not usually stage a real two-ring show in any one session.

Let's start our own debate by analyzing the situation at the moment. There has been an almost unprecedented rush of the nations to proclaim their adherence to the treaty. More than 60 so far, including even West Germany. The Bonn government was reluctant in the beginning, but not because of any provisions of the treaty. Rather, West Germany was uneasy over the standing that the agreement might give to East Germany in world affairs.

On the other hand, only five nations have refused to accept the treaty. The free world holdout is the France of Charles de Gaulle, who refuses to play ball until his nation is a member of the nuclear club. In the Communist world, Red China and its three satellites—North Korea, North Vietnam and little Albania—have said no, flatly.

That's the size of the opposition among the nations.

Can you imagine, then, that the United States would turn its back on this first real, if small, step toward the disarmament that the world longs for? Of course you can't. Should it do so, it would be disavowing the acts of the President. It would be flouting world opinion. It would be teaming up, on the one hand, with Red China, and on the other, with the sometimes difficult partner, France. It wouldn't make sense, would it? And it would mean virtual abdication of world leadership by the United States.

I do not think for the moment that such an action is likely. This Nation must protect itself, no matter what the cost in world leadership. National security comes first at all times. But the discussion of the treaty to date has shown a consensus even among the military people: A consensus that this pact is calculated to serve the Nation's interest. It is a step that can be taken safely.

Now some of the military men and some of the scientists have expressed varying degrees of doubt and disapproval. The Nation needs their opinions and they should be heard. But I know the military mind. It is the job of these men to be on the alert constantly. They cannot always see national policy as a whole, with all its implications. Their advice, valuable as it may be from the military point of view, may not always be the best possible advice. It need not always be followed.

It is of the utmost significance, however, that the chiefs of staff have voiced their approval of the proposed treaty, provided that certain safeguards are guaranteed. It is an important statement of professional thought.

Among the safeguards, the military insists on continued underground testing, working always toward the development of the antimissile missile. There is an insistence that the United States remain always ready to resume atmospheric testing should the treaty be violated. And that the Government should continue nuclear research. These are policies of sound commonsense. They would guarantee that the United States would always keep its guard up. In view of past experience with the Kremlin, an administration that ignored these policies would be utterly irresponsible.

But if these are policies of commonsense—and they are—it is also commonsense to move, however slowly, toward the longed-for safeguard against the nuclear holocaust. The test ban treaty, I am firmly convinced, is a start in that direction.

Frankly, I believe that most of the fears of the military are based on the uneasy feeling that once this step has been taken, the American public itself might let down its guard and lose interest in cold-war security. It is natural that they should feel thus. To sign a treaty that would have such an effect would be foolhardy. But I am confident that the people—and their Government—would not be complacent. For deep in our national thinking is an instinctive distrust of Communists and communism.

Indeed, this distrust itself has been used as an argument against the treaty. Wisely, most Americans subscribe to the principle that you can't trust the Kremlin. It is a valid principle and it cannot be ignored.

But if the free world takes the negative position that because of this distrust, you just have to sit tight and do nothing, then this old globe has reached a sorry state indeed. Everyone longs for peace and it will never be attained by an adamant refusal to deal with the Reds.

Consider the burden of cold war in terms of defense costs. They are terrific in this country and that money could be used in so many ways. Other nations—including the U.S.S.R.—also feel the weight of the crushing load. The Kremlin is sweating beneath it, as is Washington. I do not believe, however, that the high cost of cold war is the chief catalyst of world opinion so heavily in favor of the test ban treaty. Above all other considerations, there is in the mind of modern man the fear of nuclear destruction, the fear of the deadly fallout that could leave its mark on generations to come.

True, the United States has made every effort to "clean up" its nuclear explosions so that atmospheric testing would create a minimum of pollution. The huge megaton blasts of the Russians, however, were not similarly cleansed. They turned loose in the clouds the potential danger of contaminated milk and food. Strontium 90 has become a dread phrase around the globe, and there has been and continues to be a deep uneasiness over the effect on those unborn.

Here and elsewhere there has been a burning desire to end this threat. For that reason, I suggest that this treaty, submitted to a popular vote, would receive an overwhelming endorsement wherever free expression exists. It is a fact to be recognized and a fact that is likely to have a big effect on the Senators who must make so historic a decision.

Actually, the sharpest doubts on the treaty have been raised not by the military, but by the brilliant if extremist Dr. Edward Teller, who would never approve any pact with Russia. To a degree, I suppose, Teller's testimony before the Senate committee expressed in its extreme this basic distrust of Nikita Khrushchev and the fretful feeling that he is taking us in again.

Americans have reason to share this feeling. It is natural that they should ask themselves why we should trust Khrushchev. After all, scarcely more than a year ago, he was attempting to slip powerful nuclear missiles into Cuba in a plot that was designed to blackmail the United States into treaty agreements on the Kremlin's terms.

Of course Khrushchev put forward the treaty because he regards it in the best interests of his country. For so many years, he spurned such an agreement. The fact that he has accepted it now does not mean that the Kremlin will not, suddenly, change directions once again. But that would be tomorrow; and today, there is this opportunity to progress however slightly toward world sanity. It is an opportunity to be seized, but always with our guard up.

But why, we may properly ask, did the Kremlin alter course, almost overnight? Everyone is guessing on the Red motive and no one knows, really, but Khrushchev. For what it's worth, here's my two-bits' worth, an opinion based in large part on the knowledge I gained during my trip to the Orient last spring. It is my guess—and it's only a guess—that the boss of the Kremlin had three major motives:

At this time he is probably more concerned over the power struggle for control of world communism than he is with the cold war itself.

The cost of nuclear development, staggering for us, is undoubtedly even more staggering in the eyes of the Kremlin's budget makers. For all its progress, the Soviet Union badly needs those billions of rubles for its own industrial and economic development.

A third likely motive is, in a sense, a paradox. If Russia needs more economic development, it has also taken tremendous strides as a nation. Because of its progress, it has so much more to lose in a war of nuclear destruction. By contrast, Red China has little to lose except its masses of expendable people. I don't think for a minute that Peiping wants nuclear war with the United States. But it would be perfectly willing to see this Nation and the Soviet Union destroy each other. Nikita Khrushchev, I suspect, is thoroughly aware of this fact.

Two or three other impressions gained on my trip to the Orient are worth repeating, in view of recent world developments:

It is apparent, in the Far East, how very real was the split between Peiping and Moscow. And that the rift in the Red world would widen even further. It has. We are witnessing a struggle between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung to determine the ultimate boss of world communism. Unquestionably the reality of this struggle was a factor in Mr. K.'s thinking on a test ban treaty.

I learned, too, that it was difficult to determine where communism left off and racism began in the Orient. Red China makes a fetish of communism, to be sure; but the rising tide of color is a dominant factor in Peiping's policy. Communist China has set up shop as the leader of the "antiwhite" world. It has pointedly placed Russia in the camp of the whites.

For years, Soviet propaganda rehearsed the old line of the haves versus the have-nots. In the Orient, poverty is a way of life, and in Red China the backward millions have been placed in the ranks of the have-nots by their own propagandists—the have-nots as opposed to the haves of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

I heard expressed so often the opinion that, if the world could get by the next decade or so without nuclear war, Red China, with its fervent racism, would be a greater threat than is Red Russia today.

By examining—guessing at—Khrushchev's motives, I do not suggest that he will be easier to deal with in the future. Berlin and divided Germany are still stumbling blocks to a genuine accommodation. There are others. But in light of the test ban treaty, it is reasonable to suggest that other limited steps may be possible. At least, every opportunity for accord ought to be explored, provided always that we do not let down our guard for one single second.

But, some argue, this first step might conceivably lead to others that some day would put the United States in bed with communism. They will not, if we scrutinize each step carefully, if we maintain our attitude of watchful distrust.

This does not mean, however, that the United States should condemn every possible step in advance. But each time we deal with the Russians, there must be a constant eye on our own national interest. Approval of the test ban treaty, by the public, by the Senate, or by this newspaper, does not bind anyone to approval of anything else that may be proposed. The United States will not be clobbered if it is constantly wary of the Russians, especially when they come bearing treaties. In the case of the test ban agreement, we have been wary, and properly so.

Let us then recognize this agreement as only a small start. And proceed cautiously and calmly, meeting each issue as it arises, subjecting it to the test of the national interest and of world peace.

Another question is asked: What will the United States get out of this treaty? To answer it, begin with the firm conviction that the American people are sincerely dedicated to the cause of peace. Perhaps there is too wide an assumption that it will come overnight. It won't. But even in the mad rush of our daily lives, there is, I suggest, a constant awareness of the nuclear danger. To reduce this fear, the slightest bit would, if nothing else, add to our national peace of mind. Any reduction in the wide fear of nuclear fallout would, in itself, justify this treaty.

Certainly there will not be a great reduction—if there is any—in military spending. Let's not fool ourselves about that. For it must be repeated again and again: This is but a start. But ever-so-important a start. In a sense, this treaty will slow the nuclear race that has been growing more dangerous every year in spite of the talks. Even a breather will work to the advantage of the United States.

We can go farther. Remember the phony issue of the missile gap in the last presidential campaign? Today, the situate in respect to nuclear power is amazing. The present administration and the Chiefs of Staff agree that we have more nuclear might than does Russia. We can destroy the Soviet Union even though, in the process, this Nation would suffer greatly. There is no missile gap now.

But the apprehension in the continuing nuclear race was over the breakthroughs that might come, eventually. The apprehension has been extended to opposition to the treaty, and its possibly binding effect, should such breakthroughs come.

If Red China, for example, should come up with the nuclear bomb, what would we do? We could get out of the treaty within 3 months, should national security so dictate.

On this subject, I learned on my trip to the Orient that most observers believe Communist China might come up with a nuclear explosion any time from 6 months to a year hence. But it would be years before Peiping would have the hardware to deliver nuclear death. Even France, with its high level of industrialization, has been 5 or 6 years in producing the nuclear bomb that it may shortly possess. So don't panic when Red China sets off its first blast. In the Orient, there is a general belief that the real danger from that source still is years in the future.

Such a breakthrough by Red China, when and if it should come, would change the picture drastically. It might be, then, in the national interest of the United States to pull out of the treaty. Similarly, Nikita Khrushchev might find it to the advantage of his nation to withdraw. But the commonsense of the situation does not suggest that we should sit back and wait for such a contingency to arise. Better now to do what can be done.

Another possible breakthrough could change the present balance of power with tremendous consequences. I refer to the development, by one side or the other, of the antimissile missile. The United States will continue to seek this weapon, and it should. We do not believe the Soviet Union possesses it at present. But unquestionably it, too, is pursuing such research. It must be assumed that the Russians will continue their quest.

Treaty or no treaty, however, we live in a dangerous world. It will remain dangerous through this generation, perhaps longer. Some calculated risk must be taken. It is the only sensible approach if progress toward world peace is ever to be made. Negativism will never move man toward the goal of peace that seems so elusive.

Indeed, peace is to be attained only through hard work and by taking the calculated risk. This test ban treaty is the child of work and the parent of some risk. It has been formulated, I am convinced, with careful consideration of the national interest and with due attention to the essential safeguards.

It will not bring peace to the world; it may bring the world just a bit closer to peace. And that is a goal which man must constantly seek in the fearful age of the atom.

TRADING WITH CUBA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Post appears an article entitled "Japan No. 1 Non-Red 1962 Trader With Cuba," by Lewis Gulick.

Two years ago I pointed out that unless the United States was willing to cut off trade with Cuba entirely ourselves, it would be rather difficult for us to request other nations to do so. After an undue delay, trade was stopped except, as I understand, in the case of a few items such as medicines and other essentials in that highly selected category. As a result, for 1962 United States trade with Cuba went down to $7.2 million. But I do think it well to point out that unless it goes down to practically zero, we will not be in a very good position to ask other nations of the world to cease and desist from all trade with Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD with a view to informing readers of the RECORD of the volume of trade by other non-Red nations during the years 1961–62 with Communist Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN NO. 1 NON-RED 1962 TRADER WITH CUBA

(By Lewis Gulick)

Figures compiled by U.S. authorities showed yesterday that Japan succeeded the United States as the largest non-Communist trader with Cuba in 1962.

At the same time, total non-Communist commerce with Cuba—except from Asia—dropped sharply to a fraction of pre-Castro levels. The United States has been pressing a campaign to isolate the Havana regime.

The information was compiled from State Department, Commerce Department, U.N., and intelligence sources, and includes some educated estimates. It covers Cuban trade with 26 non-Communist countries in the period from 1959—the year Fidel Castro came to power—through 1962.

The figures list Japan's trade with Cuba last year at $46.4 million, up from $36.1 million in 1961. The bulk of this was Japanese purchases of Cuban sugar.

The United States, still the No. 1 trader with its Caribbean neighbor in 1961 with $48.8 million, dropped to 11th place on the list, with $7.2 million, in 1962. Much of the $7.2 million was in U.S. purchases of Cuban tobacco which have since been shut off.

Total non-Communist trade with Cuba was $1.3 billion in 1959, $892 million in 1960, $355 million in 1961, down to an estimated $230 million last year, and still declining.

United States-Canadian trade with Cuba during this 4-year period plummeted from $908 million to $20 million, while Latin American commerce dropped from $86 million to $14 million and West European from $228 million to $85 million. Only with the Asian area was there an increase, from $74 million in 1959 to an estimated $111 million in 1962.

By comparison, Cuba's trade with the Communist bloc, originally negligible, is now estimated to have climbed to more than $1 billion a year, including large chunks of military equipment.

U.S. sources said Japan has been approached a number of times about curtailing her Cuban trade. The Tokyo government, it was reported, took the position that Japan must buy sugar somewhere, and that in this time of world sugar scarcity—purchases of non-Cuban sugar would hurt consumers—including Americans—by raising already high sugar prices even higher.

The Japanese were said to be cooperating in their sales of various manufactured goods to Cuba by not allowing shipment of strategic items, and Japanese shipping has generally stayed away from Cuban ports in line with U.S. policy, it was stated.

Following is a listing of 26 non-Communist countries engaged in trade with Cuba, with amounts in millions of dollars:

	1961	1962
Japan	36.1	46.4
Morocco	9.7	28.0
Britain	28.2	27.2
Egypt	20.1	22.8
Canada	35.1	12.8
Netherlands	15.2	11.7
West Germany	13.8	11.5
Chile	15.7	10.4
Spain	13.6	9.9
Tunisia	2.1	8.5
United States	48.8	7.2
Greece	3.4	6.7
Sweden	1.9	4.6
Finland	.7	4.5
France	6.0	4.1
Syria	5.2	3.6
Switzerland	3.9	3.6
Norway	2.5	2.8
India	15.7	2.6
Belgium-Luxembourg	4.9	2.4
Yugoslavia	6.7	2.3
Ceylon	8.1	1.9
Uruguay	.8	1.8
Italy	4.4	1.7
Brazil	.3	1.4
Mexico	3.7	.8

AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION RECOMMENDS BUDGET CUT FOR FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association is a remarkable organization. It is obviously organized to work for the best interests of the owners and pilots of America's aircraft all over the country. Despite this, it has come to the Congress with a proposal to cut the budget of the Federal Aviation Agency by nearly $300 million, or 36 percent.

This is not merely an act of publicity. It is very carefully developed and documented. The costs have been carefully and thoroughly analyzed, item by item.

This is such a remarkable—almost revolutionary—proposal by an interest group, that the budget of the agency benefiting them should be cut sharply, that I ask unanimous consent to have the study printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AOPA Proposes 36-Percent Slash in FAA Budget Request

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association has recommended to Congress that deep cuts, amounting to about 36 percent, be made in the $810,100,000 budget estimate for the Federal Aviation Agency for fiscal year 1964.

In a detailed analysis of the FAA estimate for the next fiscal year, the 93,000-member AOPA pointed to areas where a total of $293,638,000 could be pared from the fiscal year 1964 program without reducing the effectiveness of the Agency or imperiling air safety. Copies of the association's 40-page document were sent to Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Independent Offices, and to U.S. Representative Albert Thomas, head of the House of Representatives comparable committee.

Cuts proposed by AOPA in FAA's fiscal year 1964 program would still leave the Agency with $585,224,000 to spend. This would roll back the budget figure to about $20 million more than the fiscal year 1959 appropriation of approximately $565 million. In the event the full FAA request of $810,100,000 should be granted by the Congress, the Agency would have a spending capacity for fiscal year 1964 of $878,862,000, the difference coming from carryover unobligated funds from previous fiscal year appropriations.

Appropriations for FAA and its predecessor, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, have grown steadily each year since fiscal year 1955, when $131,441,000 was appropriated. The big jumps, however, started with fiscal year 1959 when FAA was allowed $565 million in new obligational authority.

"We have watched while all manner of devices have been used to justify ever larger appropriations, some valid, some fallacious," the AOPA statement says. "We have watched even larger sums of money justified to improve safety while the general aviation safety record has remained almost constant for 6 years and the air carrier rate, due to numbers too small for valid statistical purposes, has fluctuated in an inconclusive manner. We have watched even larger sums justified to improve the air traffic system, only to experience little in real improvement. We have watched the Agency justify larger appropriations for inspection and surveillance while it neglected to take advantage of its opportunities for delegation of many of its responsibilities to qualified industry representatives. We have watched the building of a totally unnecessary medical empire and medical research program in the absence of any evidence that medical standards are deficient or that the accident record could be markedly improved by tightening those standards or changing the personnel by whom candidates for medical certificates are examined.

"In short we have had the unpleasant experience of watching a lean and hungry agency that served essential needs metamorphose into a fat and sated agency attempting to serve a host of nonessential desires and achieve impractical goals," the AOPA document says.

AOPA pointed out that it was handicapped in making its study by the absence of detailed FAA justification for its budget request. The association had to rely upon sketchy information contained in budget information available to the public, the knowledge of its staff of the Agency and its functions and records of past hearings held by congressional committees upon the Agency's request for funds.

In its statement sent to Congress, AOPA explained that the majority of its membership of 93,000 were nonprofessional pilots and belonged to the association for the services it could give them, rather than for trade or labor purposes; that its members owned and flew half of the active civil aircraft in the United States, and that 26 percent of the active civil pilots in the United States are AOPA members.

Attached is the AOPA document submitted to Congress. Little of FAA's present level of activity or personnel would be affected by the proposed cuts contained in it.

Care must be used in interpreting the dollar amounts used in the accompanying document. The format is geared to the Government-style budget request submitted to the Congress and may be misleading to those not familiar with the form of appropriations requests. For example, the cutback indicated for "Flight service stations," on page ii of the AOPA summary from $11,500,000 to zero does not indicate a recommendation for discontinuance of such facilities. Instead, it applies only to the FAA request for some $11 million in additional equipment over and above that which they now have. Dollar amounts indicated under "Facilities and equipment," and all other categories except "Operations" relate to additional equipment and material programs. In other words, these amounts are now spending money to be used for further expansion of the FAA's programs, and are additional to the increases requested for personnel and administrative funds under "Operations."

Generally speaking, permanent employees of the FAA are included under the various "Operations" categories. Here again, the figures must be examined carefully. The FAA request in every case represents an increase over their present authorized staffing. The AOPA recommendation does not necessarily mean dropping existing employees. Rather it represents elimination of expansion during the next fiscal year and possibly the nonfilling of vacancies to start the Agency on the road to a lean and more economical basis. As an example, the AOPA recommendation for $170 million for air traffic management may be compared with the 1962 level of $168 million and the fiscal year 1963 level of $186 million, representing only a $16 million cutback from the 1963 figure.

Other categories similarly must be viewed with care and understanding. Under "Research and development," AOPA recommended a figure of $30 million for air traffic control and navigation research contracts and work. This is not a reduction of an existing activity but is new money which would be added to the some $270 million that has been poured into this program in the last 6 years. AOPA's recommendation for no funds for the FAA to use in aviation weather research is based on a firm conviction that such activity should be conducted by the Weather Bureau. FAA's role in determining aviation weather requirements and the transmission of weather to pilots, needs implementation rather than research.

SUMMARY OF AOPA RECOMMENDATIONS ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AND THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY FISCAL YEAR 1964

SUMMARY

We have recommended a small increase in the CAB's Bureau of Safety staff to help improve our knowledge of why accidents happen and what profitable measures we can take to improve general aviation safety.

We have recommended selective cuts in the FAA budget request in conformance with our necessarily limited knowledge of the Agency's detailed justifications. These cuts amount to $293,638,000 or approximately 36 percent of the FAA's request.

We do not make this latter recommendation lightly. Rather, we believe our perspective as practicing airmen gives us a comprehensive view of aeronautics and its relative importance in the national scheme. As citizens, taxpayers, and airmen we have tried to do equal justice to the national weal and the special interest we represent, whose future is an inseparable and component part of that public interest.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

AOPA recommendation: CAB's request for an increase of funds should be granted at least to the extent of providing $180,000, which is accompanied by an instruction to the Board to revoke Public Notice No. 13 immediately and to assume the full load of its statutory duty to investigate all accidents.

Federal Aviation Agency

Operations:	
Traffic management:	
FAA request	$210, 359, 000
AOPA recommendation	170, 000, 000
Facilities maintenance:	
FAA request	222, 962, 000
AOPA recommendation	180, 000, 000
Administration of flight standards program:	
FAA request	88, 865, 000
AOPA recommendation	20, 000, 000
Administration of medical standards:	
FAA request	4, 002, 000
AOPA recommendation	1, 000, 000
Research direction:	
FAA request	10, 955, 000
AOPA recommendation	1, 000, 000
Administration of airports program:	
FAA request	8, 507, 000
AOPA recommendation	4, 000, 000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Air traffic control centers:	
FAA request:	
Long-range radar	18, 400, 000
Automation equipment	2, 200, 000
Other center facilities	14, 700, 000
Total	35, 300, 000
AOPA recommendation	16, 000, 000
Airport traffic control towers:	
FAA request:	
Terminal area radar	23, 000, 000
Other tower facilities	24, 000, 000
Total	47, 000, 000
AOPA recommendation	15, 000, 000
Flight service stations:	
FAA request:	
Domestic	7, 900, 000
International	3, 600, 000
Total	11, 500, 000
AOPA recommendation	0

Federal Aviation Agency—Continued

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—continued

Operations:	
Air navigation facilities:	
FAA request:	
VORTAC	$31, 300, 000
Low/medium frequency facilities	900, 000
Instrument landing systems	5, 300, 000
Approach light systems	6, 700, 000
Intermediate fields	400, 000
Total	44, 600, 000
AOPA recommendation	30, 000, 000
Aircraft and related equipment:	
FAA request:	
Facility flight inspection	$3, 916, 000
Training	6, 131, 000
Research support	1, 590, 000
Logistic and administrative	575, 000
Total	12, 212, 000
AOPA recommendation	6, 000, 000
Research, test, and evaluation facilities:	
FAA request:	
Buildings, construction, and improvement	10, 390, 000
Equipment	1, 910, 000
Prototype equipment	2, 700, 000
Total	15, 000, 000
AOPA recommendation	5, 000, 000
Housing, utilities and miscellaneous facilities:	
FAA request	5, 000, 000
AOPA recommendation	4, 000, 000

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Air traffic control and navigation:	
FAA request	41, 629, 000
AOPA recommendation	30, 000, 000
Aviation weather:	
FAA request	4, 285, 000
AOPA recommendation	----------
Aircraft safety:	
FAA request	5, 900, 000
AOPA recommendation	----------
Airports:	
FAA request	1, 182, 000
AOPA recommendation	----------
Aviation medicine:	
FAA request	2, 004, 000
AOPA recommendation	----------

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORT

FAA request:	
Contract liquidation	20, 000, 000
Grants for construction	75, 000, 000
Total	95, 000, 000
AOPA recommendation	95, 000, 000

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS

FAA request:	
Operations and maintenance	8, 000, 000
Construction	4, 600, 000
Total	12, 600, 000
AOPA recommendation:	
Operations and maintenance	6, 827, 000
Construction	1, 397, 000
Total	8, 224, 000

This comments on budget requests by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency.

AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association is an organization which provides services to more than 92,000 members located in every State in the Union.

Purpose: It was formed 23 years ago to promote, protect, and represent the interest of its members; to further the art, science and industry of aeronautics and the pursuit of flying; to promote the economy, safety and popularity of flight in aircraft and the use of aircraft by members. To accomplish these purposes we seek as specific objectives maximum freedom of the airspace for all users consistent with safety, improved aviation safety, an expanded airport system, an expanded system of air navigation aids, production of improved aircraft, reduction of frustrations in aircraft ownership and use, facilitation of international travel by private aircraft and wider public support of general aviation requirements.

Concern: Our members have indicated a growing concern with (a) the character and dimension of Federal Aviation Agency activity and (b) the continued failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board to properly fulfill its accident investigation and related responsibilities. As a consequence, we are submitting this statement on behalf of our membership. It contains AOPA's recommendations for amendments to the budget requests made by the Agencies named above, and our reasons for those recommendations. We request that this statement be printed in the record of your hearings on independent offices appropriations, 1964.

We believe that it will be helpful to the committee in evaluating these recommendations to provide some background concerning the composition and method of policy formulation of our association.

AOPA staff: To serve the more than 92,000 AOPA members who fly for business and recreational purposes, we have assembled a full-time staff of 78 people. Our professional staff is composed of specialists who are acknowledged experts in their respective fields. We cover virtually every field of significant interest to the owner or pilot of a noncommercial aircraft. Many of these fields are also of interest to commercial operators.

Membership: Half of the active general aviation aircraft in the United States are owned and operated by our members. More than 26 percent of the active pilots are our members; 66 percent of our members hold private certificates, 25 percent hold commercial certificates, 2 percent hold airline transport ratings, 8 percent hold student certificates and the balance are pilots in military service. AOPA is not a professional or trade association. The majority of our members are nonprofessional pilots and therefore do not join for the usual professional or commercial reasons, characteristic of unions or business trade associations. AOPA is a service organization.

Method of policy formulation: Your committee members will recognize the inherent problem in policy formulation in an organization with so large a membership. It is not unlike your own problems in representing your constituents on specific issues. Like you, we pay very close attention to the nature, character, substance and volume of our mail from our members. AOPA policy is formulated, in the light of member comment, by the professional staff members, who combine their extensive knowledge, background and understanding of aviation problems. Our rapid growth in 24 years from zero to 92,000 members, is practical testimony to the success of this method and the accuracy with which our staff reflects member desires—for we are completely dependent upon member dues voluntarily paid.

Handicap: Your committee is aware that, due to the ground rules imposed, we are not acquainted with the detailed budget requests and justifications therefor. As a consequence, we must base our recommendations upon the meager details presented in the President's published budget in combination with our knowledge of Agency programs, past and present. You may wish to question the basis upon which we have arrived at our recommendations for budget amendments. We can only plead that in the absence of knowledge of the detailed justifications presented by the agencies, we can only exercise our best judgment as to precisely how much and where to cut.

Regard for officials: Let us also say at the outset that we entertain the highest regard for the principal officials responsible for these two agencies. Mr. Boyd and his fellow members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, are exemplary public officials. Mr. Halaby of the Federal Aviation Agency is without doubt one of the best Administrators yet to head either CAA or FAA. Our differences with these gentlemen are limited to the scope and direction of their Agencies' programs.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

AOPA's present interest in Board activities centers upon the Bureau of Safety program and we are limiting our comments accordingly.

AOPA recommendation: CAB's request for an increase of funds should be granted at least to the extent of providing $180,000, which is accompanied by an instruction to the Board to revoke Public Notice No. 13 immediately and to assume the full load of its statutory duty to investigate all accidents.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958, like the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 before it, specifically directs the Civil Aeronautics Board to investigate all accidents. The Board has not shouldered this responsibility since it issued Public Notice No. 13 almost 10 years ago. The Board does not investigate nonfatal accidents involving light aircraft; i.e., under 12,500 pounds gross weight.

The Board's failure to assume its full role in safety matters has produced these results:

(a) The Federal Aviation Agency must bear a burden which properly belongs to the Board.

(b) The check on Federal Aviation Agency operations provided by an independent accident investigation program is incomplete.

(c) The Board is and has been unable to provide accurate up-to-date accident statistics in the depth and variety needed by both industry and Government to assess properly the utility of past, existing or proposed safety programs relating to general aviation.

The total number of accidents each year not investigated by the Board is in the order of 4,500. One additional investigator in each of the 10 field offices, if assigned to this task, would produce an average workload of approximately 2 investigations per man per day. In our judgment such a workload is reasonable. Most of these investigations are relatively simple, since the crew is alive to tell what happened and the damage is generally minor in character.

We also believe that the Washington office needs five additional people to augment the Bureau of Safety staff devoted to safety analysis, data processing, statistics and safety studies.

The total cost for payroll and expenses for 15 people for the program outlined above would not exceed $180,000. This amount is slightly more than one-quarter of the budget increase requested by the Board. We ask the committee to allow at least this much increase and to earmark its use for the purposes we have outlined.

The graph in figure 1 of the appendix (and which is based upon CAB reported data) shows the trend of numbers of accidents which constitute the basic workload of the Board's Bureau of Safety. It does not indicate that the number of accidents is increasing significantly despite the steady increase in the volume of aviation operations over the past several years. In our judgment there is no valid basis for any expectation that the Bureau's basic workload is likely to increase substantially in the immediate future. Therefore increased staffing does not appear warranted on this basis.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

We approach the task of commenting upon the FAA budget request with considerable reluctance and some apprehension. Reluctance, because we remember so vividly those times just a few years back when it was so difficult to get adequate sums of money appropriated for aviation purposes. We observe that much good has been accomplished with the funds that have been supplied. We have noted the tendency to oscillate between supplying too little and supplying too much. Furthermore, we know that some will think it odd that we, the representatives of a sizable aviation interest, should do anything to reduce the funds appropriated for aviation purposes, however questionably used. We are apprehensive that many will misunderstand our motives and some will even believe that we have sold aviation down the river.

Let us explain our position as clearly as we know how. We still believe in aviation. We still believe that the benefits aviation provides our society far outweigh any penalties it may impose. We still believe that travel through the skies with the widest possible freedom will bring undreamed of advantages to our world. We still believe that sizable sums of money can be spent profitably for aviation purposes in the public interest. And we still believe that a total absence of regulation would lead to chaos in the air.

At the same time, we also represent members who pay somewhat more than average taxes. We have watched since 1950 the FAA appropriaitons for its basic functions of operations, facilities, equipment, research and development grow at the average rate of 15 percent per year. We have watched the safety record continue its prior improvement through the first half of the decade of the fifties and then level out so that since that time no significant change is apparent. During this same period from 1950 on, the number of civil aircraft has increased at the rate of 3 percent per year, the number of airmen at 3½ percent per year and the number of plane miles in civil aviation at 7 percent per year. In the fifties the cost of basic FAA functions grew from $1,510 to $4,375 per civil aircraft registration, from $230 to $624 per pilot and from 8c to 17c per aircraft mile. We have watched the number of controllers quadruple from 4,000 to 17,000 in the last 10 years, and the FAA now employs one man for every two active civil aircraft. The appendix, attached hereto, provides further detail in tabular form on most of these items.

We have watched the FAA personnel and payroll take larger slices of the Federal budget. The FAA now accounts for 3.2 percent of the personnel and 4.3 percent of the money in the nondefense Federal payroll. If we include defense, the FAA accounts for 1.8 percent of the personnel and 2.4 percent of the total Federal payroll. Who says that aviation has not made its mark? While the average Federal employee draws about $524 per month in pay, the average FAA employee draws about $760 per month; an average difference amounting to over $2,800 per year. We have also noted the proposal in the fiscal year 1964 budget for 35 special grades at salaries of $20,000 plus for each; 6 GS–18's at $20,000; 27 GS–17's at $18,000–$20,000; 76 GS–16's at $16,000–$18,000; 655 GS–15's at $14,000–$17,000; and 1,944 GS–14's at $12,000 or more. No wonder people are leaving the aviation industry in droves to seek employment in Federal aviation.

We have watched the cadre of competent, trained personnel become so diluted by the explosive expansion of the Agency that many key positions are now staffed by persons deficient in technical knowledge and operational experience of the subjects they must administer. This reached a high point when an individual who was not a certificated pilot was appointed and served as Director of Flight Standards. The very essence of this job is the regulation of pilots and aircraft operations.

We have watched while all manner of devices have been used to justify ever larger appropriations, some valid, some fallacious.

We have watched larger sums of money justified to improve safety while the general aviation safety record has remained almost constant for 6 years and the air carrier rate, due to numbers too small for valid statistical purposes, has fluctuated in an inconclusive manner.

We have watched even larger sums justified to improve the air traffic system, only to experience little in real improvement. The Agency apparently has not yet recognized that we simply cannot afford the astronomical cost of a complete positive control system. Yet we note that the Administrator last year assured the House subcommittee in its hearings that total positive control—with a couple of minor exceptions—was his objective. He has been careful not to say this where general aviation people can hear.

We have watched the Agency justify larger appropriations for inspection and surveillance while it neglected to take advantage of its opportunities for delegation of many of its responsibilities to qualified industry representatives. Thus industry flight examiners have declined from several thousand to a few hundred.

We have watched while Federal safety regulation of civil aviation has moved more and more from a protective character—which prohibits malpractice—towards a coercive character—which demands conformance with procedures, practices, and limitations decided upon administratively.

We have watched the building of a totally unnecessary medical empire and medical research program in the absence of any evidence that medical standards are deficient or that the accident record could be markedly improved by tightening those standards or changing the personnel by whom candidates for medical certificates are examined.

In short, we have had the unpleasant experience of watching a lean and hungry Agency that served essential needs metamorphose into a fat and sated Agency attempting to serve a host of nonessential desires and achieve impractical goals. Regrettably, the Agency has had a lot of help from a shortsighted industry in this metamorphosis. Operators have asked for services they wanted—but not badly enough to pay for if that was the only way to get them. Professional pilots have requested better facilities to make their relatively easy job even easier and to eliminate the need to exercise the skill and judgment for which they are paid. Air carrier interests have gotten many of their demands for improvements to airports and the air traffic system provided for by the public purse but have resisted vigorously and successfully all efforts to extend the tax on aviation fuel.

While the Agency and some segments of the industry have sought expansion of what we view as nonessential services, absolute safety, and total reliability, one administration after another has requested direct user charges to help offset the soaring cost of these pursuits. Each year, the Congress has yielded a little more to these requests.

We had thought that, as taxpayers generally and gasoline taxpayers specifically, we were paying our user charge for the air traffic system, just as by the same means we pay for our use of the public streets and highways. We still think this is true and that the same principles which apply to highway use ought to apply to air traffic system use. Both systems are essential parts of that national transportation system which is the indispensable means by which we bind the economy together and make it operate. We do not think that use of a part of this system conveys measurable special benefits to the direct user in contradistinction to those which accrue to the indirect user. Thus, in our view, the time has arrived when we must make our thoughts known to the Appropriations Committees regarding the Government's role in financing aviation activities.

We believe the only valid excuse for governmental activity in any field is that such activity is in the public interest. Being in the public interest, it should be supported by the general fund of the Public Treasury. Conversely, the Government should avoid providing services not in the public interest. The provision of services which merit user charges is not a proper function of government; it is instead the proper function of private enterprise.

In consideration of these things, we believe it is essential for us to review critically the aviation services provided by the Government, determine which in our view are essential to the public interest, and advise you accordingly. We further believe that such an appraisal must be based upon the safety-risk as reflected by the long-term accident record and an efficiency index in terms of cost per aircraft unit traveled.

Operations

Traffic management:

FAA request	$210,359,000
AOPA recommendation	170,000,000

This would be a cutback to a level of activity between 1962 and 1963.

Much of the service provided is unnecessary. Operators file IFR flight plans for flights in VFR conditions. The airlines have done this habitually since 1957 and their accident rate shows no significant benefit. We understand the military are expanding this practice in connection with administrative flights. By this practice, an unnecessary load is placed on the air traffic control system so that now the system is busier in good weather than in bad—when its service is essential.

The practice of filing IFR in VFR conditions should be severely limited to marginal weather situations or abolished altogether.

During House appropriations hearings in 1962, this exchange occurred:

"Chairman THOMAS. Does it add up to this: That you are working toward and hope to eventually control every plane from the minute it takes off in the continental United States until it sets down, using all the equipment that is necessary? Is that the ultimate control in safety? Is that what you are working toward?

"Mr. HALABY. That is almost exactly right, Mr. Chairman. There are a few categories of flight that we do not need to control and I hope would never try to control—the duster, dusting a field; the rancher, going back and forth from his ranch to a small country airport. On the other hand, the rancher who wanted to come into Phoenix in the midst of air carrier and military traffic would have to enter the system and subject himself to control."

Presumably, the pilot simply cannot be trusted to know or do anything right. He must be told what to do and when, from start to finish of the flight. How then, we wonder, did we manage to build the world's greatest aviation activity on a system which depended primarily on pilots?

If present ATC system costs are remotely representative of the magnitude of cost we face under a concept of total positive control, then aviation appropriations could eventually rival those for national defense. The FAA is already the eighth largest executive office in Government—only Defense, Post Office, Veterans' Administration, Agriculture, Treasury, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior are larger. No other regulatory body of any other transportation mode is remotely as large though other modes use more vehicles and move more tonnage. The traffic control function the FAA is presently straining to cope with is generated by a small proportion of the total aircraft operating mostly from less than 300 tower-controlled airports out of over 7,800 airports in regular use. A recent survey by our association shows that only about 3 percent of the general aviation hours flown is under IFR rules. If we must have 7,000 more towers at over $440,000 each for installation plus operating and maintenance costs thereafter, and the system capacity to handle 30 times the present general aviation load in flying time and 5 times the load in units to bring this positive control concept to fruit, then in our estimation the persons responsible for this concept do not know the temper of the American taxpayer or the user who will have to pay for it. If our present system represents an investment of $1 billion as the Administrator has claimed, then this positive control system is likely to cost us a capital investment of $28 billion if we can have it, for that little. This is an amount exceeding one-fourth the total national budget. Anyone who doubts this can inquire as to why our present system with its limited capacity costs so much, for our estimate is only a simple straight line projection.

Nor is positive control as presently conceived a guarantee that no accident will occur. All of the elements of positive control were present when the New York midair collision occurred. They were also present when the Springfield holding pattern incident occurred. Batteries of radar scopes; all the radio one could ask for; trained controllers; complete elimination of VFR traffic; all the elements of positive control were present—and they failed. No system is error proof.

We are willing to support the establishment of positive control above 24,000 feet provided VFR operations above this level are available under reasonable conditions to the average aircraft. General aviation already has many aircraft capable of operating in this airspace. We also suspect the military will still require allowance of some VFR operations above this altitude.

The Congress should note that those people in industry who plead for more air traffic control by the Federal Government and get it are in effect transferring many of their liabilities to the Government. This is no small relief, as we shall show hereafter in dealing with tort claims. At the same time these same people have demonstrated a remarkable reluctance to be assessed for the cost of the controls they demand or the liabilities the air traffic control system relieves them of.

One of the connotations of positive control in air traffic is the provision of an all-area-radar environment. As nearly as we can ascertain, the cost of long-range radars has been averaging about $2,500,000. The 58 of these installed so far has enabled positive control above 24,000 except for a portion of the mountainous areas in the West. This aspect of the system so far represents an investment of approximately $145 million. Again, it becomes apparent that the cost of a system which will provide control capability down to the ground is fantastic and beyond our means, if we intend to devote any substantial funds to other essential public efforts.

The growth of the various factors which generate workload, aside from paperwork and the effects of Parkinson's Law, has been at a lesser rate than the growth of FAA expenditures. During the period 1950 to 1962, the average annual growth in number of airmen has been 3.5 percent; in number of aircraft, 3 percent; in number of plane miles, 7 percent; in number of instrument approaches, 10 percent; in number of contracts, 14 percent; in number of aircraft operations, 4.7 percent. During this same period the average annual growth in CAA–FAA expenditures, omitting airport aid, National Capital airports, and supersonic transports, has been 15 percent. And the number of controllers has quadrupled.

One of the primary excuses for this absurd expansion has been that high speed makes visual separation by pilots impractical and that therefore positive control from the ground is essential to avoid midair collision. If this were really true, and it worked, then pilots and operators should be demanding aircraft without windows so that they could not possibly see outside and would have to depend on the air traffic control system for separation. They aren't. As previously stated, this positive control system, with all the controls, all the fancy radar, all the expensive multichanneled radios, and complete instrument conditions so the pilots could not see, failed to assure separation in the case of the United-TWA accident over New York. As a matter of fact, the collision problem has not yet been solved in a slow speed, two-dimensional environment where the vehicles can even stop dead still or back up: they still collide. The maritime interests still have a substantial number of ship collisions despite good rules of the road, radar, noise devices, and a constant watch. Stern realism on this matter must consider the strong probability that there is no practical way to eliminate the occurrence of people, boats, autos, or aircraft bumping into each other—if that is, we would do anything but devote attention to avoiding each other. If we live, we must accept reasonable risks. Considering all the foregoing, we believe that the midair collision experience is low. In the period 1938–60, the CAB reports the occurrence of 410 such accidents or an average of 18 per year. Only 32 of these involved air carrier aircraft or an average of 1.4 per year. "The highest possible degree of safety" does not mean perfection—unless we've lost our perspective on the nature and limitations of man.

Yet another facet of the air traffic control problem is reflected by the alarming increase in the tort claims against the United States for alleged failures to properly execute the control function the Agency seeks to extend. If nothing else does, this should signal a warning to the Agency to go slow in assuming more responsibility for control. At the end of 1962 there were over 300 claims exceeding $120 million pending against the Government as a result of aviation accidents, according to the Department of Justice. Two hundred and eighty-three of these cases involved the Air Traffic Service. By comparison, there were only 82 such claims on July 1, 1961.

The FAA has also entered into cartographic design and the accumulation of aeronautical data, two functions formerly performed satisfactorily enough for the purpose to be served. While aeronautical charts were not as up to date as they should be—they still aren't. The critical factor is not whether data is accumulated or charts are redesigned—these can be done and were being done when practical by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The critical factor lay in the inadequacy of funds for Coast and Geodetic Survey to produce up-to-date charts. This deficiency still remains and so long as it remains—most of the FAA Flight Data Center functions are pointless so far as the majority of pilots are concerned. The Flight Data Center has also engaged in the development of a pointless set of standards for aeronautical charts. This took manpower for a completely unnecessary exercise to remedy a potential deficiency which had never caused any significant trouble. Empire building such as represented by the Flight Data Center should be halted and pruned back to practical levels.

In yet another fashion, the Air Traffic Service, through its flight service stations, has jeopardized the pilot-to-forecaster communications service experiment currently under research and development supervision. We note that FAA has programed no funds for the continuation of this experiment or for systemwide implementation in the fiscal year 1964 budget. Yet no new program in recent years has generated such acceptance or gone so directly to the heart of the major safety problem in flight operations: coping with the weather. We understand there is some possibility that the Weather Bureau may assume this program next year and we hope it will, but we cannot overlook the jeopardy placed on this program by attempts to subrogate it to serve flight service station desires.

In view of all the foregoing, we believe traffic management expenditures should be gradually reduced to the 1957 level over a period of 3 years.

Facilities maintenance:	
FAA request	$222,962,000
AOPA recommendation	180,000,000

Our reasoning with respect to traffic management is also valid for facilities maintenance. The character of our recommended cut is the same; i.e., to return over a 3-year period to a 1957 level of expenditure.

It needs to be recognized that much of the growth in facilities maintenance has been a result of acquisition of complex electronic equipment. This equipment was supposed to practically eliminate air traffic safety problems and inefficiencies in use of the airspace. As a practical result it has produced an exchange of one set of disadvantages for another equally disagreeable set of disadvantages.

Administration of flight standards program:	
FAA request	$88,865,000
AOPA recommendation	20,000,000

Rather than expanding its reliance upon competent industry agents to execute more and more of its regulatory functions, the FAA has generally reduced the number permitted to act in its behalf. The first recommendation of Project Horizon—an effort the Administrator has commented upon with substantial satisfaction—regarding general aviation was that "the FAA should expand the designee system under which many activities formerly performed by FAA personnel can be done by qualified and certified nongovernmental agencies." We think that if the Agency will pursue a vigorous program to expand designation in all possible areas of its flight standards program, it will be practical to reduce expenditures by the degree recommended. The comparable program in 1958 was supported with $18,792,359. Much of the work load the Agency now supports was self-created by eliminating designations, neglecting to make designations in already established categories, and by failing to explore the possibilities for designation in new categories such as type certification.

Nor has the Agency shown any inclination to delegate responsibilities to well-established and identifiable operators such as the airlines and then to evaluate their performance on the basis of their safety record, though this is one of the few areas in which we have complete and dependable statistics. Use of objective standards for evaluation would bring order to industry and Agency efforts as well as offer reassurance to the public and help to minimize the hysteria which blossoms into life following each isolated accident. Use of objective standards would aid greatly in simplifying the FAA's task and reducing its budget requirements.

Much of the rest of the Agency's workload in flight standards has been created by devoting effort to marginal programs which picked at insignificant deficiencies in safety standards or industry performance. Rulemaking efforts in the areas of crop dusting and air taxi operations are just two examples.

No small part of the Agency's problem in arriving at a proper perspective—and we claim it hasn't gained it yet—with respect to aviation regulations, lies in its self-generated compulsion to try to provide, as nearly as it can, complete security and surveillance of the industry. No doubt some of this compulsion is defensive to forestall or prepare for criticism and alleged failure to do its duty properly. Some is honest worry. And some is pure empire building. In any case, the Agency's interest is all-pervasive. Virtually no detail is too small or insignificant for its attention and concern. You cannot change a tire or replace a spark plug but the Agency is concerned with who did it, when, and how.

Administration of medical standards:	
FAA request	$4,002,000
AOPA recommendation	1,000,000

The medical standards program has expanded beyond all reasonable bounds. The safety record has never shown evidence that medical standards were deficient or that any improvement in them would cause a significant improvement in the safety record. Despite this lack of justification, the Agency has embarked upon extensive research programs, reduction of those authorized to give medical examinations, and educational programs in civil aeromedicine.

Actually, some years ago while the CAB still possessed safety rulemaking authority, they were considering the advisability of eliminating any medical certificate requirements for private pilots. We find considerable merit in such a proposal. The task of piloting the average general aviation airplane is not so arduous or critical as to require much in the way of physical capacity. Women and children do it. So do elderly men. Actually, piloting is less demanding of unwavering attention than driving a car—and so far as we know only one State requires a physical examination to drive a car—although practically all make simple tests for vision. In short, the medical standards should be relaxed rather than tightened.

Until 1959 any licensed physician, without special FAA designation, was authorized to give private pilot physical examinations. The FAA canceled this privilege and now only designated physicians are so authorized. Where formerly tens of thousands of family physicians could give these examinations, which are no more complicated than those one takes for a life insurance policy, now only about 5,000 can do so. (The Civil Air Surgeon will probably respond that insurance companies designate their examiners but this is not comparable for two reasons: (1) the insurance company is a private body and not a public agency, and (2) the insurance company bears the cost of the examination which is not the case with the FAA.) The price of the examination to the applicant has doubled and sometimes tripled. We must admit a slight justice in this increase, but only because the FAA now floods the designated medical examiner with a stream of pointless aeromedical educational material which he is supposed to read. Much of this material involves accident reports which contain no information at all of a medical character. The designated medical examiner is also urged and enticed to attend aeromedical seminars held at various locations about the country. These affairs are organized and the programs presented by the FAA for the most part. They, and the Air Surgeon's entire program, seem to be pursued on the basis that even though no significant evidence points to a serious medical problem in civil aviation which justifies expenditure of tax funds, if we look hard enough and long enough we ought to be able to find something that will. (We might call this Goddard's law, in honor of the FAA's first Civil Air Surgeon who first implemented this program.) Now that the FAA's medical program has grown from a minor infection to a catastrophic epidemic—still without proving its point—we think it is time to administer the penicillin and get the swelling back down to size. His former privileges should be returned to the family physician.

Another reason for this program was that family physicians were not executing the FAA's examination forms completely. However, we still find in the bulletins going to designated medical examiners, countless exhortations to fill out the forms completely and carefully. Three years after the program was adopted the FAA was admonishing its medical examiners that 53 percent of the reports submitted were not filled out properly and required further correspondence to put them in proper order. Apparently the new program has not solved this problem or even—as far as we can learn—reduced it by any large fraction.

Oddly enough, the vast majority of general aviation flying occurs in the same airspace it has for the last 50 years. According to a survey by our association of operations in 1961, 96 percent of general aviation flying occurs at or below 10,000 feet. Human beings habitually live at higher altitudes than this in many mountainous locations. We venture to say that military and other research has already discovered most of what needs to be known about working, resting, living, and flying between sea level and 10,000 feet. Further expenditure of public funds for medical research projects under FAA aegis is unwarranted and this program should be eliminated at once. Whatever knowledge or effort is still required in this area—and even up to 40,000 feet—can be accomplished by military medical research facilities or through the National Institutes of Health.

Certainly, there is not and never has been any justification for the establishment of the Civil Aeromedical Research Institute. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is a laudable and worthwhile endeavor but such a pursuit is not appropriate to a service agency of the character of the FAA whose only justification for the expenditure of funds in this field is safety. Since elimination of all aeromedical factors in accidents would not affect the record in any significant degree, we can only classify research in this area as the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. We think this program should be scrapped at once.

Research direction:

FAA request	$10,955,000
AOPA recommendation	1,000,000

Some years ago we looked with favor upon the great expansion of funds for research and development in aviation. We think we have now learned once again that great sums of money do not guarantee success or accomplishments. We had hoped for programs which would enlarge freedom of use of the airspace for all. Instead, we have been treated to one theory after another and successive programs which have nibbled away a part of what freedom we had and promises to take still more until in the end each aircraft will be goosestepping its way about in a totally controlled environment that serves the needs of the system beautifully but forgets that the objective was the service of the desires of the people. The "system" has become the Agency's objective, rather than the means to our true objective of serving people's desires.

The research and development program has fallen into the hands of technicians who are so entranced with the technical possibilities within the state of the science that they have lost or cannot see the implications for the taxpayer and the system participant. The consequence is that readily available improvements are passed over while attention is devoted to ideas and projects of such sophistication that neither the taxpayer can afford them, nor the pilot cope with them, nor the Agency integrate them into a workable aviation system.

Apparently, the FAA, not having a profit objective in the research it does, has found it impossible to find the talent or the will to make the hard, economically sound research decisions which are so necessary for the productive use of available funds. We think the time has come to reappraise the research and development effort with a focus upon the constraints that surround any research and development effort in current times. Almost invariably, agencies that have tried to make a giant step in research expenditures have wasted money and obtained disappointing results. Highly qualified manpower for research and development work is severely limited. Industry has found that $5 to $15 of new capital is required to exploit a dollar's worth of new product research, with the result that the investment cost quite often can easily exceed the financial resources available to exploit the products of research. There is considerable evidence suggesting that returns from increased research expenditures are shrinking. In fine, the research administrator must consider many factors besides technical feasibility before undertaking a proposed research project. We think the rate of return has not been great enough in relation to the cost of development, the probability of success and the benefits which success would make possible. The Government has other and better alternatives for the investment of its money.

The National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center (NAFEC) has investigated a host of items but only one or two have found their way into operational use. It appears that NAFEC does not serve a useful purpose of worthwhile magnitude and should be eliminated. Any essential portion that cannot be disposed of can be transferred and combined with the Aeronautical Center at Oklahoma City. Investigations can be executed by contract with private industry. Changes in programs of this character will permit practical reduction of research direction to an administrative staff only. The amount we recommend is sufficient for this purpose.

Above all, research direction requires leadership sensitive to the untapped capabilities of the existing aviation system. A little exploration with practical, rather than theoretical users of the system will reveal practical opportunities for improving system capability and capacity—provided we are willing to demand a little self-reliance on the part of system participants. We can also profit by remembering the techniques tried and proven in less sophisticated times and consider how they might be adopted to current needs rather than ignored completely.

Administration of airports program:

FAA request	$8,507,000
AOPA recommendation	4,000,000

We find much to commend in the Federal airport aid program and the FAA's administration of it. We also find much which merits criticism.

The Agency has been long on meaningless plans and short on meaningful promotion. It has produced a paper plan for a national airport system based mainly upon requests of interested parties. It has neglected to establish a rationale for airport facilities which reflects the needs of the various communities in terms of location, population, area, growth rate, and economic character. As a consequence some communities have wound up with "white elephant" airports while others do not have enough and still others have been discouraged from even attempting to develop an airport facility to meet their actual and current needs. On the other hand, the Agency has generally been most reluctant to promote airports, to educate nonaviation officials and citizens of the benefits an airport provides, or to state realistic requirements for airport projects. Fortunately, Mr. Halaby, with the assistance of his new Airport Director, Cole Morrow, has made some corrections in this area but much remains to be done.

Again, we think the Agency has neglected its opportunities to make fuller use of State and local aeronautical agencies to help it administer its program and accomplish its objectives. State aviation departments in particular could be most helpful in this respect and could bear much of the administrative load. We see no valid reason why State aviation departments should not perform with respect to airports in the same manner that State highway departments perform with respect to Federal highways.

A reduction of the size we recommend becomes practical if the FAA pays better attention to national planning concepts, establishes realistic airport standards for eligibility and relies upon State agencies for project planning, programing, and supervision.

The Agency rates "A" for its performance in responding to the need to eliminate monopolies on public airports and for holding sponsors to their agreements whenever a complaint is received.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

A basic cause for FAA expansion has been the proliferation of expensive and impractical ideas and gadgets to control aircraft traffic. Radar was touted as the savior of the air traffic control system—instead because of unrealistic demands on its capabilities, it is bidding to become its albatross. Expensive to build and install, radar is even more expensive to maintain. It has severe limitations as to the number of aircraft which can be controlled by it and it requires a fantastic amount of coordination between controllers using it. All of these failings build manpower requirements without comparable increases in traffic capacity.

As shown by the tables in the appendix—we have spent in the last 13 years over $865 million and the proposed budget will make it $1 billion—for facilities and equipment. The annual amounts have fluctuated erratically from a low of $5 million in 1955 to 1961's high of $164.6 million. While Congress is often blamed for failure to appropriate sufficient funds for air traffic system purposes, we suspect that no small portion of the cause lies in the Agency's inability to resolve upon a coherent plan for an air traffic system that focused on meeting user needs rather than devising technical concepts for control. This situation has produced violent differences of opinion both inside the Agency and out, with the result that it has been difficult to unify and bring to bear broad industry support for the Agency's program—let alone its budget. This problem is still unsolved. The Agency apparently finds it difficult to swallow the concept—which had worked well for many years—of an air traffic system which is largely permissive in character and places primary responsibility in the pilot rather than in the controller.

The Agency's use of unnecessarily detailed specifications contributes in a major way to the rising cost of facilities and equipment. These often spell out in the most minute and comprehensive way exactly how an item is to be designed, composed, constructed, and tested. Little if anything is left to the contractor's imagination or ingenuity. As a consequence innovation is at a minimum and standardization is often carried to ridiculous extremes. Often too, the standards imposed exceed the real need, thereby building excessive quality into a product and increasing its cost unnecessarily. We think that the Agency should specify the end result it wants and leave the production of that result to the contractor. Proper penalty clauses, rigidly enforced, are all the protection the Agency needs or should require.

The Aviation Facilities Service now numbers over 15,000 people. Each appropriation for more—and more complex—equipment sends this staffing load higher. Worse yet, it is but the precursor of even greater staffing requirements for the Air Traffic Service which must eventually operate the facilities provided.

It appears less than prudent, in view of these previous failures and contradictions, uncertainties, and foreseeable consequences, to continue high levels of funding for facilities and equipment.

Air traffic control centers:

FAA request:	
Long-range radar	$18,400,000
Automation equipment	2,200,000
Other center facilities	14,700,000
Total	35,300,000
AOPA recommendation	16,000,000

We think a moratorium should be placed on the radar installation program until either the deficiencies inherent in present radar control operations are corrected or eliminated or it is determined that this is not economically feasible and the program is modified.

We also think that funds for building centers should be limited to those necessary to build one new center if required for consolidation. Relocations of centers for purposes other than consolidation should be held in abeyance until traffic system philosophy is resolved.

Airport traffic control towers:

FAA request:	
Terminal area radar	$23,000,000
Other tower facilities	24,000,000
Total	47,000,000
AOPA recommendation	15,000,000

Again, we think a moratorium on radar installations is indicated pending resolution of the very major difficulties attending the use of these facilities. We have been unable to locate any cost-benefit studies on these units and question seriously whether the benefit achieved is worth the cost. The Atlanta terminal radar service area experiment in positive control—or separation—has increased rather than diminished this doubt.

While the Agency has adopted a striking new standard plan and design for control towers, we see no reason why this calls for relocation of existing towers. These relocations cost about $375,000 each and in most cases are entirely pointless. This year, for instance, eight towers are being relocated. We have been at four of these locations in recent weeks and have failed to find valid justification for these expensive shifts in terms of ability to survey the airport. While some of these tower structures are old, in most cases we think they could be remodeled at much less expense than relocation involves. The other excuse commonly provided—to make room for more electronic gear—is again based primarily on radar requirements which we recommend be held in abeyance for reasons outlined heretofore.

There is also reason to question the establishment of towers at airports with marginal volumes of traffic. It is apparent that either the criteria established and used by the FAA to determine where towers shall be installed or maintained is too loose or too low, or it is being ignored and claims of traffic volume are not being audited on a realistic basis. We strongly doubt the public interest in bearing the cost of tower operation at airports with less than 10 airline schedules daily and a daylight volume of less than 10 general aviation and military aircraft operations per hour. We also question whether tower service throughout the night is warranted at any but the busier airports where a reasonable volume of traffic is maintained throughout the night.

Flight service stations:	
FAA request:	
Domestic	$7,900,000
International	3,600,000
Total	11,500,000
AOPA recommendation	----------

The role of the flight service station has altered drastically in the last few years. As air traffic control centers have assumed the greater portion of responsibility by providing for direct pilot-controller communications, the station's part in IFR operations has correspondingly declined. To offset this decline the FAA has had its flight service stations promote and provide more services for general aviation pilots who do not normally participate in the IFR traffic control system. Thus we have seen the number of VFR flight plans filed soar to new heights from 257,000 in 1954 to 1,731,000 in 1962, almost a sevenfold increase in 8 years. A flight-following service provides up-to-date—though not always accurate—weather information on an automatic basis that not even the pilot on IFR enjoys. And stations periodically produce individual bulletins for distribution to pilots in their area explaining the services they have to offer and inviting the pilot to use them.

In a more coercive vein, the FAA adopted a rule requiring pilots, within 5 miles of a station to use its facilities if the aircraft was equipped to do so. Thus, much of the recent increase in the activity of flight service stations results from an administrative fiat to make work rather than a demand from pilots for more service. And much of the increase over the years results from pure promotion.

So far as the industry is concerned, the future role of the flight service station in the air traffic system is at hazard. Many of its services are desirable but not essential. And many who use those services would not do so if required to pay for them on a service fee basis. Indeed, some doubt even exists within the Agency as to the merit of continuing these establishments. In view of these things, we think a moratorium on flight service station investment is in order until their future role is determined. A rigorous examination of the services they provide and an objective appraisal of other available alternatives may very well reveal other simpler and more economic methods of obtaining the desired objectives.

Air navigation facilities:	
FAA request:	
VORTAC	$31,300,000
Low/medium frequency facilities	900,000
Instrument landing systems	5,300,000
Approach light systems	6,700,000
Intermediate fields	400,000
Total	44,600,000
AOPA recommendation	30,000,000

We find less fault with this portion of the "Facilities and equipment" request than any other, and, appropriately, our recommended cut is less drastic. We do think that the VORTAC program warrants a sizable reduction. We now have 400 VOR's, 302 VORTAC's, 53 TVOR's and 22 VOR/DME's in service. Already the problem of frequency spacing and interference is plaguing us. Further expansion will make it immeasurably worse. Moreover, quite often stations are being established at unnecessary locations simply because rapid implementation of distance measuring equipment and procedures has not proceeded according to original plan.

In fact, the entire DME program has been thrown into question by the Agency's fascination with the positive control concepts generated by the utopian dream of an all-radar environment with radar beacon transponders in all aircraft. We recommend that funds adequate to add distance measuring capability only to VOR's be allowed for those stations in the master plan for the ultimate system but that other VOR's be maintained in the status quo.

There no longer seem to be any sound argument for spending an average of $237,900 to convert VOR's to VORTAC's merely to add the TACAN azimuth capability in view of the military's declining requirement. We recommend its elimination.

We approve of the request for instrument landing systems. However, we maintain that each airport having a valid need for such a system should get it before airports already equipped are granted second systems. Development of more airports capable of accommodating instrument traffic will serve the public need better than doubling, tripling, and quadrupling these scarce facilities in a few high density traffic areas. Safety is better served if our instrument approach capabilities are scattered liberally around the country than if they are concentrated on a few busy hub airports. The airport at the other end must be approachable too—and it isn't always a high density location.

Intermediate fields, like so many of the best things in the early program, have suffered an eclipse. Airports being our basic need and problem, this program should receive all that is asked. We only regret that the FAA did not deign to ask for more. These fields are useful and have saved many lives. In comparison with many of our more sophisticated programs for enhancing air safety, these fields can claim sizable honors for economy, utility, and efficiency. We presume that their only fault is their simplicity.

Aircraft and related equipment:	
FAA request:	
Facility flight inspection	$3,916,000
Training	6,131,000
Research support	1,590,000
Logistic and administrative	575,000
Total	12,212,000
AOPA recommendation	6,000,000

We note the Agency owns or has the use of about 130 aircraft on which it secures a relatively low utilization. Several things strike us adversely about this situation.

We have been shown the esoteric equipment installed in the new, large, range-riding aircraft and been appropriately impressed. We were given to understand that with all these multiple receivers, computers and what-not that these aircraft could simultaneously check several facilities at once and that hereafter only a handful of these aircraft would be required. Apparently, this is not what the Agency has told the committee. We merely ask, "What are the facts?" It would appear that either we have too many aircraft for checking facilities or that we don't need the expensive investment in sophisticated aircraft and checking equipment.

With respect to training aircraft, we disagree with the Agency that its inspectors need the high level of piloting skill claimed in order to do a satisfactory job of checking pilot competence. It is not the inspector's job to teach but to test and evaluate. To do this he seldom needs to handle the controls and when he does—his technical skill is not at issue. What he does need to know is what to watch for. Therefore we think that much of the inspector training can be done in groups, with a small amount of time in the aircraft, some in simulators and some just studying pilot manuals and reviewing visual training aids. A recent announcement indicates that a roving team will give general aviation safety agents training in light twins at the agent's home station. We approve. This should be much more economical and still do what essentially needs to be accomplished. We think the Agency would do well to rent large aircraft from the airlines or others rather than buying such aircraft to provide the limited amount of training that is required.

We see no more validity to the idea that the FAA should own a stable of aircraft to train inspectors than the city of New York should own the Empire State Building and a host of others on which to train building, health, and elevator inspectors. The Agency would probably do much better to contract for a training service with the manufacturer of the aircraft concerned.

We recognize the difficulties attending the use of aircraft for research purposes. However, we doubt if the Agency is using to the fullest extent possible the use of appropriate or comparable Defense Department aircraft on bailment. We see no valid reason for the FAA buying aircraft for research purposes.

With respect to administrative aircraft, let us first state that we have no more objection to the Agency's owning and using aircraft for this purpose than we do for autos and trucks. However, while we accept the idea that rank has its privileges, even to the extent of a limousine and a Jetstar for the Administrator, we take a dim view of providing the aircraft equivalent of Biarritz Cadillac convertibles to those of lesser rank. The recent acquisition of eight Queen Airs at $229,000 per copy is just a little too rich for our taxpaying blood. Particularly when the same investment would have provided anywhere from 50 to 150 light single engine airplanes, depending upon whether you bought the aviation equivalent of Buicks or Fords. At least, with aircraft of the caliber of Cessna 172's, Piper Comanches, and Beech Bonanzas, more of the administrative and policy personnel who need to travel could make use of this modern transportation device and keep apprised of what the average aircraft owner or pilot must cope with.

Research, test, and evaluation facilities:	
FAA request:	
Buildings, construction, and improvement	$10,390,000
Equipment	1,910,000
Prototype equipment	2,700,000
Total	15,000,000
AOPA recommendation	5,000,000

Previously, in commenting on research direction, we voiced our reluctant disapproval of the NAFEC operation and recommended its elimination. Therefore, we think no money should be made available for permanent construction at NAFEC. Instead, the programs now in progress should be brought to an orderly close. The $5 million we recommend should be sufficient to terminate this ill-starred venture in Government-operated research. The failure of this venture only demonstrates again that independent scientific judgment is hard to come by in a complex dominated by a strong interest in Agency self-preservation and expansion.

Housing, utilities, and miscellaneous facilities:	
FAA request	$5,000,000
AOPA recommendation	4,000,000

In the absence of details on the nature of the items in this request we can only venture the suspicion that if the amount was arrived at as in other requests, our recommendation is overly generous. Four million dollars is a lot of miscellaneous.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Previously, we outlined our misgivings and objections with respect to general aspects of the FAA's research and development program in commenting upon research administration. In the last 14 years over $297 million has been appropriated for research and development, almost $272 million or 92 percent of it in the last 6 years. This latter-day massive approach has produced microscopic results of something less than earth-shaking significance for the improvement and promotion of aviation.

Air traffic control and navigation:	
FAA request	$41,629,000
AOPA recommendation	30,000,000

One example of fruitless effort is the data processing central program. The FAA spent over $52 million on data processing central research and development before it concluded it was pouring money into a rat hole. Over $32 million was spent on this project with just one company. Nothing tangible, even in the way of components, has found its way from this project into the air traffic control system. We are informed that some pieces are being used as research tools on other projects but it appears that this salvage has not been entirely economical.

In another instance of much lesser magnitude but still representative of the Agency's disregard for available knowledge, $75,000 was spent with an unknown company to develop a low-cost 360-channel radio using a single-crystal technique before the Agency elected to cancel the project. Knowledgeable people of two well-known companies inform us that the technique was well known and not worth pursuing. The Agency got off cheap. It could have cost $1 million.

Honest mistakes, errors of judgment, we can understand and accept. What we find difficult to accept in the reseach and development program is the low rate of productivity so far as usable tools for the air traffic system are concerned. The items now going into the system, daylight radar scopes, peripheral communications and similar items, were all produced by research antedating the explosion in research and development efforts. Even the visual glide slope is but a minor modification of an item developed by the British.

Research and development projects have investigated a wide range of items, often without much respect to current practice or previous knowledge. Pictorial displays, an old subject at the Indianapolis Technical Development Center, were investigated again, and again the Agency decided they were only a nice supplement to the air traffic system—practically a foregone conclusion since any other finding would adversely affect the building of a positive control empire. Extension sums were devoted to three-dimensional radar until the Beacon task force questioned the outlook for success. Perhaps we are impressed as much as anything with the untold amounts of money and numberless projects dealing with research on research models, methods and techniques. We cannot but wonder at this situation which not only confesses ignorance of how to solve the problem but also confuses the distinction between the proper Agency mission of applied research with the improper one of basic research in research and development concept and methodology.

Aviation weather:	
FAA request	$4,285,000
AOPA recommendation	----------

We assert that weather is the major causal factor in accidents. We do need more dependable weather information and better dissemination. However, we disagree with the Agency that aviation weather research is a proper function for it to assume or maintain. This activity should remain in its entirety, with the Weather Bureau, the FAA should confine itself to stating its requirements for weather service to the Weather Bureau.

Moreover, the research and development reports that we have seen in the last year on weather problems would make a stack almost 5 feet tall. Most of what needs to be known about aviation weather requirements is already known: we need to be able to operate regardless of weather; we need more accurate current reports and forecasts; we need broader dissemination; we need better weather education for pilots; and we need simpler, faster means of displaying and conveying weather information. The research, for practical purposes, is done. What we need is implementation.

Aircraft safety:	
FAA request	$5,900,000
AOPA recommendation	----------

This is another field in which the Agency has failed to make use of its available powers and resources to implement needed safety improvements. Yet it continues to search for knowledge on the subject. We fail to see any virtue or public purpose to be gained by continuing this situation.

Standards of cockpit visibility have been needed for years. The Agency has the power to set them—on either an advisory or mandatory basis. It has failed to do so—though it has not hesitated to set mandatory standards for many other items of much less importance. Standard placement and design of critical controls has likewise been needed.

Again FAA has failed to act.

Instead the Agency has devoted large sums of money to arresting hooks for jet transports, runway barriers and similar projects of very limited application. We think projects of this character properly lie in the province of the aircraft manufacturer concerned who should begin to assume some responsibility for designing aircraft which will fit our present airports.

We also suspect that all that can profitably be learned about aircraft fire, crash worthiness, and similar subjects has been learned. Again, what we need is to do something about the knowledge we have already gained.

Project Little Guy is another instance where the Agency has attempted the giant leap forward—with mighty questionable prospects of success at some indeterminate date in the future—and ignored "the art of the possible" now. We, too, like horseraces and long shots but hardly feel that funds for such ventures should come from the public purse.

Airports:	
FAA request	$1,182,000
AOPA recommendation	----------

We think the airport is inherently a safe place. The concrete or asphalt runway or the hangar building does not cause the accident. Adequate standards for design, construction, and equipment are already developed and available for use. Many are enforced through requirements arising from the Federal Airport Aid Act. Again, we do not need more research: we need more airports built using the presently available knowledge.

Aviation medicine:	
FAA request	$2,004,000
AOPA recommendation	----------

In previous comments on administration of medical standards, we stated our almost complete disapproval of the FAA medical program. Those remarks are applicable to this request also. We add to them this one example of the ridiculous extremity to which the medical program has gone: 1962's first scientific report from the FAA Civil Aeromedical Research Institute was "An Analysis of Sitting Areas and Pressures of Man." It cost $1,400 and 300 man-hours. Three CARI scientists measured 104 sitting males on a special machine and discovered that the average man's posterior covers 179.4 square inches and exerts a pressure of 0.92 pounds per square inch. What a perspective on aviation safety.

Grants in aid for airports

FAA requests:	
Contract liquidation	$20,000,000
Grants for construction	75,000,000
Total	95,000,000
AOPA recommendation	95,000,000

In the history of the treatment of aviation by our Government, the Federal airport aid program is one of the brighter jewels. Over the years, whether in the development of landing areas program, the intermediate field program, the Alaskan airport program or the current grants-in-aid program, the need for airport development has been recognized. In practical effect, this recognition has not always enjoyed a strong emphasis but it has been fairly consistent.

The most critical factor limiting aviation progress is the continuing loss of existing airports. Each year about 200 are plowed under for shopping centers, housing developments and similar nonaeronautical purposes. Their loss is particularly deplorable because they already possess the desirable features the community needs in an airport: convenient locations, low investment cost, and a neighborhood accommodated to its existence and operation. Since over half of the Nation's public-use airports are in private hands, we think no better use could be made of airport aid funds than to assist local public bodies to convert these privately owned airports to public ownership, wherever the private owner can be persuaded to release it, or at least the public use portions of it, such as the landing, ramp and terminal areas.

There are countless opportunities to use aid funds wisely and in such a manner that they make a new and perceptible addition to air commerce and the national economy. Thus we think that such funds as are available should be allocated to the establishment of new airports, before applications for additional improvements on existing airports are considered. The second priority objective should be to mesh new airports into the air commerce system.

Since a constant guard must be maintained to avoid waste, judgment must be used in following our principle of favoring new airport construction. A $1.7 million project for a new airport near Grand Canyon, Ariz., is an example. An airport, of adequate dimensions and readily expandable, now exists on Forest Service land within 4 miles of the proposed project. We think in this case, the public interest is better served by making improvements to the existing airport than by constructing a new one. The special use permit by which the existing airport is in private hands, can be modified or revoked if necessary. We also agree that the existing airport needs improvement but this can be accomplished at much less cost than that of building a new "Dulles on the South Rim."

The Agency also needs to adopt a consistent and reasonable philosophy concerning the appropriateness of airport facilities. We think the airport should be scaled to the size, location, economic character and growth history of the community it serves. If a $10,000 grass strip is all that is needed, the Agency representatives should not encourage construction of an air carrier type airport. The present Administrator has made some welcome changes in Agency policy in this respect, but this policy is not yet always adhered to in the field.

National Capital airports

FAA request:	
Operations and maintenance	$8,000,000
Construction	4,600,000
Total	12,600,000
AOPA recommendation:	
Operations and maintenance	6,827,000
Construction	1,397,000
Total	8,224,000

Our recommendation would reduce the "Operations and maintenance request by $1,173,000 and leave $2 million for the industrial-commercial area. Other items in this request we leave unchanged largely because we have no basis for commenting on them. Our cut is recommended on the basis that until traffic increases substantially there is little need for further improvement in the operation of the industrial-commercial area at Dulles.

With respect to "Construction," we recommend that no funds be allowed for Dulles and that those for Washington National be limited to $1,397,000. Again Dulles should develop some traffic before further construction is done. The available funds should be channeled into Washington National.

We note that it has taken 12 years, the period from 1950 to 1962, for air traffic at Washington National Airport to double from 156,420 total operations per year to 302,330. Complete data is not available to us but it appears that it has taken only 6 years, from 1957 to 1962, for Federal employment to operate and maintain this airport to double from approximately 200 employees to 400. We do not think this rapid expansion in employment is warranted by workload if growth in operations is what generates that workload. And we think it does.

General aviation had no requirement and stated none for Dulles International Airport—though it will use that vast wasteland to connect with air carrier flights. The design, location, layout, construction and appointments are more responsive to the assumed demands of national prestige and jet airline operations than to the requirements of general aviation people.

Air traffic at Dulles is presently at an annual rate equivalent to that of Sioux City, Iowa, and Battle Creek, Mich. Total operations are in the order of approximately 5,000 per month, but less than half are regularly scheduled operations of airlines carrying fare-paying passengers. There is a large volume of training flights—which makes Dulles about the most expensive training field we've come up with yet.

Now, the FAA wants about 874 employees to make these 2 airports go in fiscal year 1964. That would give Dulles as many as National with only a fraction of the traffic and workload. Nor can we logically anticipate a repetition here of the kind of shift Chicago experienced from Midway to O'Hare. National is at least convenient, which Midway never was. The National Capital airports seems on its way to becoming overstaffed.

Much comment regarding the recovery of investment and operating costs at these airports has been made by the Administrator. We merely point out that these airports were constructed in the public interest and that presumably that interest is served by having people use them.

In many respects, many of the features embodied in the National Capital airports have been established to serve the requirements of governmental prestige. In our judgment, this precludes, or ought to, treatment as a businesslike enterprise on a corporate basis. In large part, these airports embody monumental characteristics, appropriate perhaps to the seat of government, but established to serve political or diplomatic purposes rather than transportation purposes. The facilities, particularly at Dulles International Airport, greatly exceed the real needs of the air transportation market in the Washington metropolitan area. No community of a comparable size or similar market potential that we know of has established such monumental airport facilities or invested comparable public funds for this purpose. Furthermore, we see no good reason why these airports should be treated differently than the city streets of Washington where no direct assessment of a user charge is made. On the other hand, if user charges are to be assessed at these airports, then in all equity we think it only proper that they be formulated on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Facilities established to meet air carrier needs should not be reflected in fees charged to general aviation users and vice versa.

2. Facilities established to meet the needs of large aircraft should not be reflected in fees charged to users of small aircraft and vice versa.

3. Facilities established to meet the special needs of jet, helicopter, V/STOL or any other special aircraft, should not be reflected in fees charged to users of piston, fixed-wing aircraft, and vice versa.

4. Facilities established to meet the special needs of cargo operations should not be reflected in fees charged to noncargo operators and vice versa.

5. Facilities established for purposes of governmental prestige, statecraft, or meeting military requirements should not be reflected in fees charged to civilian or nongovernmental users.

SUMMARY

We have recommended a small increase in the CAB's Bureau of Safety staff to help improve our knowledge of why accidents happen and what profitable measures we can take to improve general aviation safety.

We have recommended selective cuts in the FAA budget request in conformance with our necessarily limited knowledge of the Agency's detailed justifications. These cuts amount to $293,638,000 or approximately 36 percent of the FAA's request.

We do not make this latter recommendation lightly. Rather, we believe our perspective as practicing airmen gives us a comprehensive view of aeronautics and its relative importance in the national scheme. As citizens, taxpayers, and airmen we have tried to do equal justice to the national weal and the special interest we represent, whose future is an inseparable and component part of that public interest.

APPENDIX

The following table shows the safety record in terms of actual numbers and in rates per million aircraft miles.

U.S. civil aviation safety record

Year	Accidents		Fatalities	Accidents per million plane miles	Fatalities per million plane miles
	Total	Fatal			
1951	3,933	466	1,075	2.50	0.68
1952	3,762	415	938	2.20	.57
1953	3,325	407	949	1.90	.53
1954	3,475	403	726	1.85	.39
1955	3,437	402	848	1.65	.41
1956	3.579	365	843	1.55	.36
1957	4,314	442	900	1.70	.36
1958	4,689	414	893	1.80	.34
1959	4,680	467	1,161	1.67	.41
1960	4,638	453	1,328	1.60	.46
1961	4,710	437	1,071	1.68	.38
1962, preliminary	4,724	436	1,197	1.63	.41

It would be natural to jump to the conclusion that with the rapid increase in population and participation in recreational activities, the number of accidents would increase in proportion. Not so. The total numbers of accidental public deaths has remained about the same year after year (public does include work or traffic):

Accidental public deaths by year

Year	Water	Boats	Guns	Flying	Falls	Railway	Other	Total
1948	5,250	950	1,150	1,450	3,500	1,700	2,000	16,000
1949	4,450	1,100	1,350	1,200	2,800	1,450	2,650	15,000
1950	3,750	1,100	1,150	1,050	2,750	1,450	3,750	15,000
1951	4,150	1,200	1,300	1,350	2,850	1,450	3,700	16,000
1952	4,450	1,050	1,200	1,350	2,900	1,200	3,850	16,000
1953	4,550	1,250	1,100	1,300	3,100	1,150	4,050	16,500
1954	4,300	1,150	1,050	1,300	3,150	950	3,600	15,500
1955	4,300	1,100	950	1,300	3,200	950	3,700	15,500
1956	4,100	1,150	1,000	1,200	3,700	900	3,950	16,000
1957	4,400	1,200	1,100	1,100	4,000	900	4,800	17,500
1958	4,300	1,250	1,000	1,150	3,600	800	4,400	16,500
1959	4,200	1,200	1,050	1,050	3,700	750	4,550	16,500
1960	4,300	1,150	1,050	1,050	3,500	700	4,750	16,500
1961	4,400	1,100	1,050	1,000	3,500	650	4,800	16,500

Source: National Safety Council.

The following tables show the growth in number of aircraft, pilots, and air traffic in terms of plane miles; they also show the Federal expenditures from the previous table in terms of these workload generating factors.

Air traffic system load factors, U.S. civil aircraft

Year	Number of aircraft	FAA cost per aircraft
1951	88, 545	$1, 510
1952	89, 313	1, 397
1953	91, 102	1, 368
1954	92, 067	1, 272
1955	85, 320	1, 270
1956	87, 531	1, 560
1957	93, 189	2, 283
1958	98, 893	3, 310
1959	105, 309	4, 250
1960	111, 580	4, 375

Certificated pilots

Year	Number of pilots	FAA cost per pilot
1951	580, 574	$230
1952	581, 218	214
1953	585, 974	212
1954	613, 695	186
1955	643, 201	168
1956	669, 079	204
1957	702, 519	304
1958	731, 078	448
1959	758, 368	592
1960	783, 232	624

Plane miles in U.S. civil aviation

Year	Number of miles	FAA cost per mile
	Thousands	*Cents*
1951	1, 576, 975	8. 5
1952	1, 642, 775	7. 6
1953	1, 780, 240	7. 0
1954	1, 877, 949	6. 1
1955	2, 078, 788	5. 2
1956	2, 308, 055	5. 9
1957	2, 516, 012	8. 5
1958	2, 628, 652	12. 4
1959	2, 800, 353	16. 0
1960	2, 895, 540	16. 8

Summary of civil flying, 1940–61

[As of Dec. 31 or for year ending Dec. 31. Includes Alaska and Hawaii, except as noted. General aviation flying excludes civil flying performed by public carriers—scheduled, supplemental, contract, or intrastate. See also "Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1957," series Q 376–383 and Q 394–397]

Item	1940	1950	1955	1958	1959	1960	1961
Miles of Federal airways [1]	32, 100	70, 253	148, 979	182, 575	176, 934	178, 924	135, 447
Equipped with low-medium frequency radio aids	32, 100	70, 253	67, 770	57, 705	47, 302	36, 879	14, 543
Equipped with very high frequency radio aids			81, 209	124, 870	129, 632	142, 045	120, 904
Total civil aircraft [1] [2]	17, 928	92, 809	85, 320	98, 893	105, 309	111, 580	(3)
Active aircraft	(3)	60, 921	60, 432	69, 718	70, 747	78, 760	(3)
Hours flown (general aviation) [4] thousands	3, 200	9, 650	9, 500	11, 700	12, 000	12, 203	(3)
Business [5] do	314	2, 750	4, 300	5, 300	5, 700	5, 300	(3)
Commercial [6] do	387	1, 500	1, 950	2, 200	2, 300	2, 200	(3)
Instructional do	1, 529	3, 000	1, 275	2, 000	2, 000	1, 700	(3)
Pleasure do	970	2, 300	1, 975	2, 200	2, 400	2, 950	(3)
Other do		100				53	(3)
Miles flown (general aviation) [4] do	264, 000	1, 061, 500	1, 216, 000	1, 544, 000	1, 649, 000	1, 645, 000	(3)
Business [5] do	25, 910	339, 700	627, 800	787, 000	855, 000	811, 000	(3)
Commercial [6] do	31, 961	180, 500	245, 700	278, 000	291, 000	281, 000	(3)
Instructional do	126, 264	286, 600	120, 650	216, 000	216, 000	184, 000	(3)
Pleasure do	79, 865	244, 100	221, 850	263, 000	287, 000	362, 000	(3)
Other do		10, 600				7, 000	(3)
Fuel consumed (general aviation): [4]							
Gasoline thousand gallons	22, 400	131, 200	190, 000	227, 000	249, 000	268, 160	(3)
Oil do	660	2, 916	3, 450	3, 700	4, 060	4, 325	(3)
Certificated airplane pilots	69, 829	(3)	643, 201	731, 078	758, 368	783, 232	(3)
Airline transport	1, 431	(3)	13, 700	18, 303	19, 364	20, 985	(3)
Commercial	18, 791	(3)	211, 142	245, 541	255, 377	262, 437	(3)
Private	49, 607	(3)	418, 359	467, 234	483, 627	499, 810	(3)
Other certificated airmen:							
Glider pilots	138	(3)	3, 659	4, 271	4, 592	4, 974	(3)
Mechanics	11, 177	(3)	91, 001	107, 072	113, 520	115, 688	(3)
Parachute riggers	444	(3)	2, 859	2, 543	2, 835	2, 936	(3)
Ground instructors	1, 948	(3)	27, 080	28, 306	30, 179	29, 421	(3)
Aids to air navigation (Federal airways): [1]							
Radio range stations	292	749	768	885	983	1, 030	1, 042
Low-medium frequency	290	378	344	329	322	305	282
Very high frequency	2	371	424	556	661	725	760
Nondirectional radio beacons	48	141	175	191	191	190	176
Airport towers		172	100	128	139	153	184
Airways centers	11	31	31	32	33	35	36
Combined station-towers			75	84	83	75	70
Flight service stations	365	451	364	345	332	335	338
Instrument landing systems	1	96	157	171	174	191	195
Airports in operation [7]	2, 331	6, 403	6, 839	[1] 6, 018	6, 426	6, 881	7, 715
General			2, 713	[1] 2, 932	2, 949	3, 026	3, 274
Limited and restricted			4, 126	[1] 3, 086	3, 477	3, 855	4, 441
Lighted airports	776	1, 670	1, 247	[1] 1, 809	1, 943	2, 133	2, 200
Aircraft accidents (general aviation) [8]	3, 471	4, 505	3, 343	4, 264	4, 576	4, 540	4, 650
Aircraft destroyed	433	1, 527	798	780	1, 178	(3)	(3)
Substantial damage	2, 505	2, 947	2, 509	3, 462	3, 369	(3)	(3)
Minor and no damage	533	31	36	22	29	(3)	(3)
Degree of injury to persons in aircraft accidents (general aviation):							
Fatal	359	781	619	688	823	835	794
Severe	327	546	347	308	449	(3)	(3)
Minor and no injury	4, 744	6, 263	4, 974	6, 661	3, 304	(3)	(3)

[1] United States (including Alaska and Hawaii) and outlying areas.

[2] Includes gliders.

[3] Not available.

[4] Beginning 1960, includes Alaska and Hawaii.

[5] Corporation and individual business transportation, not for hire.

[6] Passenger and cargo transportation for hire, aerial application (crop dusting, spraying, seeding, etc.), patrol, survey, and other miscellaneous work use.

[7] Existing airports and airfields recorded with FAA. "Limited" includes seaplane bases and heliports.

[8] Detail shown is number of accidents. 1960 and 1961 figures are preliminary.

Source: Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board. Published in "FAA Statistical Handbook of Aviation."

LET US MOVE INTO THE SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY—THE 12-MILE LIMIT IS NEEDED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on the 28th of June I introduced S. 1816, a bill which would, under certain circumstances, extend the territorial waters of the United States to 12 miles for fishing purposes. Joining as cosponsor of the measure was the able junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

In the weeks which have passed there has been no lessening of need for S. 1816.

Russian fishing boats are in Atlantic waters, North Pacific waters, and elsewhere. And they are not on pleasure cruises.

As a result our sea harvest is lessened. In western Alaska, in the Bristol Bay area, Alaska salmon fishermen this year found very few fish in their nets. The catch was less than one-fifth that expected. This is not to say that a 12-mile territorial water would revive the salmon run—although I wish it could. But a modern territorial water will give the fishermen of this Nation one of the tools they urgently need.

The reasons for modernizing our existing territorial waters limitation have been summarized well in an editorial entitled "Outmoded Law of the Sea," which first appeared in the New York Times and was reprinted in the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News on July 27, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTMODED LAW OF THE SEA

In an age in which the nations of this world reach for the stars and seek to formulate laws for outer space. they are still, ironically enough, at odds over an ancient law much closer to them; the law of the freedom of the seas, involving the extent of their territorial waters.

This latter issue has been raised anew by Canada's decision to extend its exclusive coastal fishing area to a 12-mile limit and also by Ecuador's recent seizure of American fishing boats off its coast. The same issue has caused many hot disputes before this, including a miniature war between Britain and Iceland.

The old 3-mile "cannon shot" limit no longer meets the requirements of national defense, nor, in the case of countries largely dependent on fishing, the requirements of the national economy. More than 40 nations have already extended both their territorial and their reserved fishing waters. Some Latin-American countries even claim a 200-mile limit for the latter. The United States still clings to the anachronistic 3-mile limit.

However, the United States did join Canada at the abortive Geneva conference on the law of the sea in 1960 in a proposal to extend sovereign territorial waters to a 6-mile limit and exclusive national fishing rights to another adjacent 6-mile zone, making 12 in all. There is thus no dispute between the two countries over principle. A complication may arise because Canada proposes to measure its 12-mile fishing zone on a straight-baseline principle from one outer headland to another instead of following coastal contours. This method would reserve for exclusive Canadian use enormous waters off both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts in which the United States, France and other nations have treaty or traditional fishing rights. But as Prime Minister Pearson promises to take such rights into account, it should not be too difficult to find an accommodation.

The reason for such measures, reiterated by Mr. Pearson, is the growing depletion of coastal fishing resources by industrialized fishing fleets, in which Russia and Japan are pre-eminent. But Mr. Pearson also mentioned "other problems," presumably referring to the constant presence of Russian spy trawlers off the American coasts. The United States might well take advantage of the impending negotiations with Canada to follow the Canadian example.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senate colleagues who are interested in the grave problem of the balance of payments. I wish to state that Thursday, after the morning hour, and as soon as I can be recognized, I shall undertake to lay out what I consider to be the basic problems involved, the solutions which I recommend, and the areas in which I think the administration has been slow to come to grips with the problem.

Many Senators are interested. This is one of the most critical problems before us. I take this opportunity to give notice in this connection to all Senators who may be interested in discussing the matter on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from New York for his announcement with respect to the discussion he will conduct Thursday. I look forward to it. No other Senator is better able to discuss this problem. It is a matter which is most urgent and most important and should be called to the attention of the Nation. The Senator from New York is performing a fine service.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin. We have done this once before, but nothing much happened except that the balance-of-payments deficit climbed at the rate of almost $2 billion.

The Senator from Wisconsin is eminently well qualified to make a major contribution in the consideration of what should be done. I hope he will join me Thursday.

I ask unanimous consent, by way of signalizing that this is not merely our opinion, to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Battle of the Dollar," from the New York Times of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF THE DOLLAR

The battle of the dollar has taken a sharp turn for the worse. The second-quarter figures show that the deficit in the nation's balance of payments climbed to an annual rate of over $5 billion, and even though there is a good deal of imprecision in balance-of-payments accounting, the deficit is clearly deepening at a disturbing rate. The result is bound to be fresh fear about the strength of the dollar and the administration's determination to defend it.

The odd part is that this occurs when basic economic trends seem to be moving in our favor. The U.S. economy is still the strongest in the free world. Our gold reserves remain formidable. Our growth rate, though still much too low, is now improving. And we are demonstrating a greater ability to hold down prices, which may well lead to a reversal of the present outflow of dollars and gold.

The administration, however, has been slow to come to grips with the problem of the deficit. It has tended to overestimate the impact of the series of measures it devised to reduce the deficit. It has fumbled its tax package, which if it had been enacted by now would have bettered our competitive position and increased to opportunities for profitable investment.

If the administration is to make progress in reducing the deficit, it should concentrate on getting Congress to take action on its revised tax bill. This is the single most important step toward strengthening the dollar, for it would spur domestic growth and release monetary policy to deal with the international position of the dollar. Our basic reliance must continue to be on domestic expansion plus strengthened bonds of international monetary cooperation to insure that the dollar will be safe against speculative attack.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon wishes to make a brief announcement as to the procedural position he will take during the oncoming debate over proposed legislation in connection with the railroad dispute.

The senior Senator from Oregon will agree to no time limitation. I will agree to no unanimous-consent agreements whatsoever during the course of that debate. I am perfectly willing to have the Senate stay in session continually for a discussion of this matter. The issues which are raised by what I consider to be the unsound and unfortunate bill recommended by the Commerce Committee of the Senate will raise problems to plague this country and American free labor and American free employers for years to come, unless we take the time necessary for a thorough examination of the proposals—and I hope revision of the proposals—before passage of the bill.

Therefore, if there is any intention on the part of the leadership to speed the bill through without adequate debate, I serve notice now that they will not succeed in that parliamentary tactic.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER REFUTES AND REJECTS ATTEMPT OF CHINESE COMMUNISTS TO ASSOCIATE THEMSELVES WITH CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the entire Nation has been favorably impressed by the rebuff which Roy Wilkins gave last week to the attempt of the Chinese Communists to associate themselves with the August 28 civil rights march. When a group calling itself the Chinese Peoples Committee for World Peace sent the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People a cablegram of support and encouragement for the march, combined with a malicious propaganda attack on President Kennedy and the Congress, Mr. Wilkins, the NAACP executive secretary, did not hesitate to strongly reject any acceptance of such support and to refute emphatically the charges made against this country. He showed up the hollowness of the Communists' statement by asking when the Chinese Government would permit a rally of protest to the living conditions in their totalitarian state.

Mr. Wilkins' reply to the Chinese Communists—like his life of dedicated effort on behalf of civil rights within the framework of the American tradition and Constitution—demonstrates beyond any doubt the firmly American nature of the civil rights movement.

I ask unanimous consent that the following documents and articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: A Washington Post editorial of August 26, titled "Thanks, but No Thanks"; a New York Times article of August 23 by M. S. Handler; and the texts of the Peiping group cablegram and Mr. Wilkins' reply.

There being no objection, the editorial and other items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 26 1963]

THANKS, BUT NO THANKS

From Peiping—from something called the Chinese Peoples Committee for World Peace—has come a cable to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People offering support and felicitation for this week's civil rights demonstration and denouncing the Kennedy administration for its "ruthless persecution of Negroes," its policy of racial discrimination and its imperialist aggression throughout the world. Fortunately, the cable was addressed to just the right fellow, Roy Wilkins, the NAACP's executive secretary.

Mr. Wilkins is thoroughly familiar with the old Communist tactic of trying to claim credit for the support of good causes by joining and vociferously extolling them at the 11th hour. There are indications that the American Communist Party, such as it is, is trying to grab the coattails of the civil rights movement, and no one should be surprised if it should claim credit for having invented the march on Washington; but very few Americans are likely to be bamboozled by it.

Mr. Wilkins said some things in responding to the Chinese Communists which were well worth saying and which should help to put the March in proper perspective for the whole world. He reminded his "well-wishers" that the demonstration planned for the Capital on Wednesday "is in support of the civil rights legislation proposed by President Kennedy" and "in opposition to racial practices now in effect in some parts of our country which are contrary to the National Government policy of nondiscrimination." And then he wound up with a haymaker: "We await the opportunity to send our felicitations to Chinese citizens gathered in a huge demonstration in your nation's capital to protest living conditions under your government and welcomed there by your heads of state."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 23, 1963]

PEIPING REBUFFED ON RIGHTS MARCH—WILKINS REPLIES TO CABLE BY DEFENDING U.S. POLICIES

(By M. S. Handler)

A Chinese Communist attempt to identify the Peiping regime with the August 28 march on Washington has been firmly rejected by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The Chinese cabled their support and felicitations for the civil rights demonstration as part of a struggle "against American imperialist policy of racial discrimination and oppression."

A Peiping cable dated August 13 from the Chinese Peoples Committee for World Peace accused President Kennedy and his administration of being "chief culprit for the ruthless persecution of Negroes, champion of racial discrimination and main source of policy of national oppression and aggression throughout the world."

REFUTES ACCUSATIONS

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the association, replied Wednesday. He acknowledged receipt of Peiping's good wishes and then refuted each accusation against President Kennedy, the administration and Congress.

Mr. Wilkins identified the President, Government officials, and many legislators with the civil rights movement, praised them for the rights bill pending in Congress and for the support of the march on Washington.

In conclusion, Mr. Wilkins said: "We await the opportunity to send our felicitations to Chinese citizens gathered in a huge demonstration in your nation's capital to protest living conditions under your government and welcomed there by your heads of state."

PEIPING CHARGES IMPERIALISM

The Peiping cable said that the Negro civil rights struggle "has dealt telling blow to U.S. imperialist policy of racial discrimination and rendered powerful support and encouragement to peoples fighting against imperialism headed by United States."

It also said: "Since inauguration of Kennedy administration, shocking crimes of brutal suppression against American Negroes have been constantly increasing. This thoroughly unmasks hollowness of so-called democracy and freedom in United States, and explodes Kennedy's lies about 'eliminating vestiges of racial discrimination'."

It also declared: "Facts prove Kennedy administration which represents big monopoly group in the United States is chief culprit for ruthless persecution of Negroes, champion of racial discrimination and main source of policy of national oppression and aggression throughout world."

WILKINS REBUTTAL

Mr. Wilkins said in his reply: "The gathering of white and Negro American citizens on that date, August 28, has been welcomed by President Kennedy in a public press statement and by many Government leaders and legislators of both major political parties, some of whom will participate.

"The demonstration is in support of the civil rights legislation proposed by President Kennedy. It is in opposition to racial practices now in effect in some parts of our country which are contrary to the National Government policy of nondiscrimination."

Mr. Wilkins told the Red Chinese that the march "will call upon Congress to enact the corrective legislation as proposed by President Kennedy to match the court decisions and Executive orders and procedures of the two branches of our Federal Government."

With reference to Peiping's foreign policy, Mr. Wilkins said: "We join you in your wish for peace, but believe there can be no genuine peace without freedom for the individual within all nations and the cessation of aggression, including physical military invasion, by nations themselves."

CABLEGRAM SENT TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE FROM PEIPING RALLY

AUGUST 13, 1963.

PEIPING.—Over 10,000 people representing various Chinese peoples organizations and democratic political parties and people of all circles in Peiping held solemn rally today voice resolute support to American Negro people in their struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights and strongly condemn U.S.A. imperialists for their crimes of racial discrimination.

Struggle waged by over 19 million American Negroes is entirely just which enjoys sympathy and support of Chinese people and decent people world over. Since last April, Negro people in the United States have unfolded vigorous nationwide struggle on scale unknown before, which was dealt a telling blow to U.S.A. imperialist policy of racial discrimination and rendered powerful support and encouragement to peoples fighting against imperialism headed by the United States. Chinese people sincerely admire their American Negro brothers for their dauntless and indomitable spirit in struggle and most resolutely support their just demands.

American Negroes have long been subjected to oppression and enslavement. They have been deprived of elementary human rights and thrown in depth of miseries. Since inauguration of Kennedy administration shocking crimes of brutal suppression against American Negroes have been constantly increasing. This thoroughly unmasks hollowness of so-called democracy and freedom in the United States of America and explodes Kennedy's lies about "eliminating vestiges of racial discrimination" and "protecting civil rights of Negroes" at same time it convincingly demonstrates so-called sympathy aid progress and peace peddled by Kennedy among oppressed nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are nothing but out-and-out deception. Facts prove Kennedy administration which represents big monopoly group in the United States of America is chief culprit for ruthless persecution of Negroes, champion of racial discrimination, and main source of policy of national oppression and aggression throughout the world.

American Negroes are not alone in their struggle. Their struggle is closely linked with struggles of American people and people of whole world against imperialism headed by the United States of America and they are inspiring and supporting each other are sure our Negro brothers and sisters in the United States of America as long as they close ranks and persevere in struggle will triumph no matter how arduous the struggle and how tortuous the path may be. American Negro people and oppressed nations and peoples throughout world surely will achieve thorough emancipation.

Rally of people of all circles in Peiping supporting American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination.

NAACP CABLEGRAM REPLY TO PEIPING RALLY

AUGUST 21, 1963.

CHINESE PEOPLES COMMITTEE FOR WORLD PEACE,
Peiping, China:

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People acknowledges your good wishes on the August 28 demonstration to be held in Washington, our National Capital. The gathering of white and Negro American citizens on that date has been welcomed by President Kennedy in a public press statement and by many Government leaders and legislators of both major political parties, some of whom will participate. The demonstration is in support of the civil rights legislation proposed to the Congress by President Kennedy. It is in opposition to racial practices now in effect in some parts of our country which are contrary to the National Government policy of nondiscrimination. The August 28 demonstration will make known the dissatisfaction of American citizens of both races over local and regional discrimination in employment, housing, education, voting, and public accommodation. It will call upon Congress to enact corrective legislation as proposed by President Kennedy to match the court decisions and Executive orders and procedures of the other two branches of our Federal Government.

We join you in your wish for peace but believe there can be no genuine peace without freedom for the individual within all nations and the cessation of aggression including physical military invasion by nations themselves. We await the opportunity to send our felicitations to Chinese citizens gathered in a huge demonstration in your nation's capital to protest living conditions under your government and welcomed there by your heads of state.

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary.

GREEK HERITAGE MAGAZINE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the people of the United States and of the entire Western World owe an inestimable debt to the people of a small ancient country on the Mediterranean. We are indebted to the Greeks for the basic ideas and forms of Western man—for conceptions of art and architecture and the fundamental value of the individual personality. We may thank Greece also for the many fine sons and daughters she has sent us and for mixing her cultural richness with our own.

This month Mr. Christopher G. Janus, of Chicago, has announced his plans to publish an American quarterly of Greek culture. The publication will be called Greek Heritage and will bring to American readers the great ideas of the writers, artists, and leaders of the Hellenic world, ancient and modern. Some of the authors who will appear in the first few richly illustrated issues of Greek Heritage are Andre Malraux, Nikos Kazantzakis, Lawrence Durrell, and George Santayana. I believe that Greek Heritage will bring home to many Americans the treasures of Greek life. I, therefore, want to wish the best of luck to this important new publication.

FEDERAL INSURANCE FOR RISING WATERS DAMAGES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, following Hurricane Carla in September 1961 a great deal of attention was given in a number of agencies of the Government to the question of Federal insurance to protect against the risk of loss from rising water. Such Federal insurance was urged because there is no such insurance available in the field of private insurance. Such Federal insurance has been urged for years, after the great Connecticut River floods of nearly a decade ago, after the Cameron Parish, La., hurricane disaster, and after Hurricane Carla on the Texas gulf coast in September of 1961. The first attempt at a legislative solution to this problem, the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, has never been implemented.

Mr. President, last week in Texas, citizens asked why nothing had been done in this field, after the bright prospects of 1961. The need for such insurance is ever present; we should not wait for another disastrous hurricane to inspire us to take further action to provide some form of insurance protection against loss from rising waters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject at a Freeport, Brazoria County, reception honoring the past presidents of the operating engineers, on August 24, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RISING WATER INSURANCE

After I visited Freeport, Galveston, Texas City, Port Arthur, Port O'Conner, Port Lavaca, Victoria, Corpus Christi, and other Texas coastal cities and towns in September of 1961, in the wake of Hurricane Carla, while the water was still standing up to the eaves of homes, I pledged that I would work for rising water insurance, to insure the homes, property and belongings of the people of the United States against losses from damages from rising waters alone.

Such insurance is not now available in the United States.

More than half of the people of the United States now live in river valleys and coastal areas where such insurance is vitally needed to spread the losses in case of a disaster. Such insurance would be practicable, feasible, and would be good business for the insurers.

Property insurance is timid and backward in comparison with life and accident insurance. With a widespread coverage, the risk would be no greater than for certain other types of insurance now in force.

Hail insurance is a case in point. Until the Federal Government offered a guaranteed plan in the 1930's, hail insurance on field crops was not purchasable in the United States. After a few years' experience with Federal hail insurance, the private insurance companies seized the initiative and now eagerly and profitably sell hail insurance.

If the existing Lehman-Kennedy rising water insurance law of 1956, were implemented now, we could begin to issue this insurance now. It is my belief that timid private insurance companies would begin writing this rising water property insurance within 2 years, if the Federal Government would only break the ice and start it off.

We need the spirit now of beginning something new in insurance, that the Government showed with hail insurance under Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930's.

This rising water insurance would be one of the greatest boons to the river valleys, and the gulf, Atlantic and Pacific coastal areas, in the history of the country. It would give security to the individual homeowner who is unable, under the present system, to carry his own rising water insurance. Development of the gulf coast would be stimulated with its great petrochemical and industrial installations and potential. Development of all our river valleys and coastal areas would be stimulated.

We are building at Port Arthur, Nederland, Port Neches, Freeport, Texas City, Galveston, and other Texas cities, better seawalls and hurricane protection. This better protection makes rising water insurance even more feasible.

Over 90 percent of all new construction in America is financed by loans. Rising water insurance would help stimulate that construction in all river valleys and in all coastal areas.

If rising water insurance is not to be written by the Federal Government, then reinsurance should be written by the Federal Government on insurance written by private companies.

Protection by dispersal of risk is the essence of insurance. It exists to protect loss of ships in storms at sea, against loss by fire, explosion, wind, or hail. It would be even simpler to protect against the risk of loss by rising waters.

I have worked on this for nearly 2 years, but if it takes 2, 3, 4 or more years I intend to keep on until this insurance is available. This is reasonable and just. I will not quit.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, yesterday the magazine section of the New York Times contained an illuminating and perceptive article about the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

It was a fitting tribute to a man who by any standard ranks as one of the outstanding legislators of this generation. I know of no Senator who surpasses Hubert Humphrey in keenness of mind, breadth of interest, abundance of energy, generosity of spirit, and deep dedication to the well-being of his fellow men.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HUBERT HUMPHREY COMES ON STRONG—THE MINNESOTAN, A POWER IN THE SENATE DESPITE HIS RELATIVE YOUTH, HAS PUT HIS MARK ON MAJOR NATIONAL ISSUES AND IS LIKELY TO DO SO INCREASINGLY IN THE YEARS AHEAD

(By Samuel Shaffer)

WASHINGTON.—The name of Hubert Horatio Humphrey must figure in any list of the dozen most powerful and influential men in the U.S. Congress. Both in domestic and foreign policy, key issues confronting the 88th Congress bear the mark of the irrepressible, garrulous, and indefatigable senior Senator from Minnesota. In fact, some of the major legislative proposals advanced by the Kennedy administration were fathered by him.

For at least half of his 15 years in the Senate, he has been accepted as a member of the "inner club," the small group of men whose words and deeds not only clearly affect public policy but shape the laws that finally emerge. Its members fall into two groups: (1) Those whose power is relatively stable (or, because of age or obdurate refusal to bend with the winds of change, is on the wane), and (2) those whose power is increasing because of relative youth and political adaptability.

At 52, Hubert Humphrey is one of the very few who clearly belongs in the second category. He is already a power; he is also a "comer." With one brief exception—the late spring and early summer months of 1960 when he lost his bid for the presidential nomination—Humphrey has been a "comer" all his life.

Humphrey's position at the center of Senate power is unique. Others possess power because they are chairmen of major committees or because they occupy posts in the leadership hierarchy. Though high in seniority in such major committees as Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Government Operations, Humphrey is chairman of none. He is the Senate majority whip, but this position, officially labeled "assistant majority leader," is traditionally as remote from the majority leadership in the actual appurtenances of power as the Vice Presidency is from the Presidency.

Humphrey's power is personal. He has risen—and continues to rise—through the force of a vibrant personality, phenomenal energy, hard work, intelligence, and a buoyant and expressive love of life, politics, and people.

But Hubert Humphrey does not just want to "be somebody." He wants to do something in almost every area of national interest. Major items now before Congress reflect this drive. Most of them were developed initially through direct or indirect Humphrey efforts. They are:

The nuclear test ban treaty: No man in Congress deserves a greater share of the credit for the Moscow agreement and likely Senate ratification. For 7 years Humphrey worked, persistently and relentlessly, for a practical and realistic effort by the United States toward such a ban. To this end he set up and headed the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee and gathered the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Through some of those years, he faced almost total congressional or administration indifference, outright opposition or (equally frustrating to HUMPHREY) the lofty supporting platitudes of pacifists.

A resolution proposed last May by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, calling for a ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere, the fringes of outer space and under water, caught fire when HUMPHREY cosponsored it. When 34 Senators of both parties quickly lined up in support, it was interpreted in Moscow as well as in Washington as heartening assurance such a treaty would have a chance of Senate ratification.

Civil rights legislation: HUMPHREY's influence and leadership in the field are unquestioned. In the Democratic convention in Philadelphia in 1948, HUMPHREY first came to national attention by sparking a party revolt on civil rights. After hearing his brief but powerful plea, the convention rejected a mild plank backed by President Truman and adopted HUMPHREY's stronger substitute. This unexpected victory by the brash young mayor of Minneapolis and freshly nominated Democratic candidate for the Senate resulted in a walkout of Southern delegations and led to the Dixiecrat revolt against Truman's reelection.

Before President Kennedy submitted his civil rights program to Congress last June, HUMPHREY succeeded in White House parleys in persuading him to toughen a number of the provisions, including the one banning discrimination in public accommodations. "Mr. President," HUMPHREY told him, "no labor union ever walked into a bargaining session with management by first yielding on half of its demands."

Aid to education: The most realistic appraisal indicates congressional approval this year of a program expanding the National Defense Education Act and a program of loans and grants for higher education. HUMPHREY was the author of the original NDEA and through the years has been a principal sponsor of legislation authorizing financial aid to colleges and universities.

Youth Employment Opportunities Act: This high-priority Kennedy program—which has passed the Senate but awaits an uncertain fate in the House—would establish a Youth Conservation Corps of boys and young men to work in the Nation's forests and parks, and for municipal agencies. It is almost pure HUMPHREY. He has been pushing the bill for 5 years.

Medicare: HUMPHREY's very first bill after he came to the Senate in January 1949, proposed hospital care for the aged under social security. He introduced this in each succeeding Congress. In 1958, he asked Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, to become the principal sponsor, figuring that an influential member of the Senate Finance Committee might be able to give the bill the momentum the controversial legislation needed. Today it is a major, if still far from realized, program of the Kennedy administration.

Two of the very limited number of Kennedy innovations translated into reality during this administration were in large measure conceived and pushed through Congress by HUMPHREY. On June 15, 1960—several months before Presidential-aspirant Kennedy advanced the idea—HUMPHREY introduced a bill to establish the Peace Corps. Its creation in 1961 was a major achievement of the young administration. The Disarmament Agency, which Congress authorized in the fall of that year, was proposed by HUMPHREY in a bill he introduced on February 4, 1960, in the last year of the Eisenhower administration.

HUMPHREY's success in guiding the Government's course of action in such diverse areas derives not alone from his leadership in substantive matters. It grows out of the varied roles he plays as a Senator and from his relationship with the man who trounced him in the Presidential preference primaries to become the Chief Executive.

HUMPHREY is, before anything else, a representative of the State of Minnesota in the Senate. The day after his election, he starts running for reelection 6 years later. He and his office give highest priority to the requests and needs of constituents. He is capable of keeping other Senators, Cabinet Members, and influential Washington correspondents waiting while he visits with contingents of Girl Scouts from Hibbing or Gold Star Mothers from Albert Lea, Minn.

HUMPHREY's habit of keeping the home fences in good repair makes it possible for him to be the kind of Senator he is. Vice President JOHNSON doesn't have to tell HUMPHREY, as he tells newcomers to the Senate, "You can't be a statesman unless you can be reelected." HUMPHREY can be a statesman because he knows he can be reelected.

HUMPHREY's brand of statesmanship has become a rarity in the Senate. In this age of specialization, most legislators are specialists. Some try to understand the implications of atomic energy; some are experts on foreign affairs, money and banking, taxes, industrial relations or agricultural economy. Outside their areas of expertise, they are content to accept the party line or to serve a regional interest. Not so HUMPHREY. He tries to fulfill a commitment to himself to suggest solutions for all the major national and international problems.

"I have no patience," he says, "with politicians who raise issues but don't try to offer solutions. Any man in public life has a duty to suggest solutions to problems affecting the national interest."

The diversity of HUMPHREY's concerns was illustrated one afternoon in July, when he discoursed, in this order, upon: the need to sustain wheat prices by the enactment of new legislation ("I say to the administration, as one of its supporters, that we cannot content ourselves with doing nothing"); the need for a nuclear test ban treaty ("It is my personal conviction—a conviction reached after the most detailed study over a period of years—that such a treaty is in the national interest of the United States and is in the interest of a more just and peaceful society"); the need for a decent auditorium in Washington ("The acoustical properties of the Washington Coliseum are about as good as one would expect in talking down a salt mine" while in Constitution Hall "the whole orchestra can be absorbed and one can never hear a note"); the deplorable fact that travelers arriving at Dulles International Airport must spend a quarter on a long-distance call to telephone anyone in Washington, which the federally financed airport was built to serve; and, finally, the sad failure of the Washington Senators to win more ball games.

It is for the very range of his interests that HUMPHREY is sometimes criticized by his associates, even those who like him best. They complain that he spreads himself "too thin," that he wastes some of his recognized talents by dilettantism; that he is too glib and too sure of himself. They are sometimes amused by his frenetic activities, sometimes irritated by them.

Discussing the test ban treaty, one of HUMPHREY's colleagues ascribed his own skepticism about the pact to the Minnesota Senator's enthusiasm for it. "HUBERT personifies the kind of easy optimism which we, as a nation living in dangerous times, can't afford," said this Senator. "It is fine to be buoyant and to hope for the best, as he always does, but sometimes it isn't realistic."

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, in a recent forum, predicted a realinement of the major parties and gave HUMPHREY as an example of the kind of extreme liberal who couldn't forever remain in the same party with conservatives. It was odd that RUSSELL should single out HUMPHREY rather than JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, or WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, or some other exponent of the liberal faith, with whom he has more head-on collisions. The explanation doubtless is that HUMPHREY is a more persistent and effective champion of civil rights than anyone else and that RUSSELL, as leader of the Southern anticivil-rights contingent, therefore finds him most objectionable.

HUMPHREY dislikes his designation as "whip." It implies a harsh form of party discipline which he considers ineffective in dealing with 66 proud, strong-minded men. He isn't constitutionally organized to political threats and intimidation of the kind LYNDON JOHNSON resorted to on occasion when he was majority leader. HUMPHREY will bend another Senator's ear for 4 hours if given the chance, but he doesn't try to twist the victim's arm to win a vote.

His is the psychologist's approach. He makes it his business to know the background of every Senator, his ideological predilections, his political situation, the pressures he is under. A Democrat reluctant to support a Democratic measure will get a sales talk something like this:

"Look, Bill, we really need your vote on this one. I know you're not sure. But the President wants this program, the Secretary supports it, it's popular with the people and it is necessary for the Nation. If there's some clause you don't like, tell me about it. Maybe we can make an adjustment." All this said with a warm smile, an earnest appealing expression, and friendly hand placed gently on the other Senator's shoulder.

HUMPHREY doesn't look upon himself as a "lieutenant" of the President. He thinks of himself as the President's "ally" in the Senate. And the President has no more trusted ally on Capitol Hill.

The Humphrey-Kennedy relationship goes far beyond the normal alliance of two leaders of the same party at opposite ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. They battled each other, sometimes bitterly, in 1960. But they also shared the same yearnings and routes over the snow-covered farmlands of Wisconsin and the green hills of West Virginia. When it was over, each man forgot the conflicts and remembered the shared experience. They emerged from these trials with a greater political respect for one another and a warmer friendship.

The two rely on each other in different ways. HUMPHREY has access to the White House whenever he wants it, for anything from arranging a picture of a constituent with the President to relaying a complaint or a request from another Senator—and for backing for his own crusades and programs.

The President relies on HUMPHREY for his political judgment, his almost instinctive grasp of the realities of Congress (marred occasionally by his ebullient optimism, which tends to negate caution), his forcefulness in fighting administration battles, and his expert knowledge of such specialized areas as disarmament, civil rights, agriculture and Soviet strategy.

HUMPHREY brings something else to this relationship which is rare and precious to a President. HUMPHREY and Kennedy are so comfortable in each other's company that they can kid one another. Thus, the dreadful isolation imposed by the Presidency is pierced. For example, last March HUMPHREY was called to the phone by the President. "HUBERT," the President said without preamble, "what are you going to say tomorrow night in your Gridiron Club speech?"

"Well, I almost hesitate to tell you, Mr. President," HUMPHREY replied. "I'm writing the speech now and I am thinking of putting in a paragraph ribbing Nelson Rockefeller that will read something like this: 'Gentlemen, the American people would never tolerate a President who might appoint his brother, Winthrop, to head the Peace Corps; his brother, Laurance, to a Cabinet position, and let his brother, David, run for the Senate. This Nation would not permit a dynasty."

The President roared with laughter at this sally at the Kennedy family. "That's a good line, HUBERT," he said, "go right ahead and use it."

When the President returned from his most recent trip abroad, brimming with stories about his reception in Ireland, HUMPHREY told him: "Mr. President, while you were off seeing your relatives in Ireland, I was back home in Minnesota. The Chippewa Indians made me a chief. I am now Chief Leading Feather. And what's more, Mr. President, they all have votes."

For all his seeming self-confidence and outward assurance, HUMPHREY is a modest man who still seems amazed at his progress from clerking in his late father's drugstore in Huron, S. Dak., to a position of eminence in the Senate, the Nation, and the world. He likes to poke fun at himself, such as telling people in his wife's presence: "I married Muriel for her money. She had managed to save up $600 during the depression years."

The HUMPHREY of 1963 has one major difference from the man who was first elected to the Senate in November 1948. He is not the brash, rigid liberal he once was. In the intervening 15 years, he has grown, and matured. He has lost none of his fervor for the New Deal, the Fair Deal, or the New Frontier, but he now looks upon politics as the art of the possible. He does not subscribe to the political doctrine that renders so many of his fellow liberals impotent as truly effective Senators, that to compromise is somehow to betray a principle.

"If I believe in something," he says, "I will fight for it with all I have. But I do not demand all or nothing. I would rather get something than nothing * * *. Professional liberals want the fiery debate. They glory in defeat. The hardest job for a politician today is to have the courage to be a moderate. It's easy to take an extreme position."

This was why HUMPHREY could not stand with the liberal faction in the Senate which conducted the bitter and futile filibuster against the administration's communications satellite bill. In the cloakrooms, the liberals complained about betrayal—but not for long. Without HUMPHREY, the liberal contingent would be fragmented and impotent.

Today, Senator HUMPHREY's influence in national and international affairs seems bound to increase. This passage of time will certainly place him in a powerful committee chairmanship and could elevate him to the majority leadership.

Will he try for the Presidency again in 1968? HUMPHREY isn't looking that far ahead. He is having too good a time, enjoying the present moment. A television interviewer a year ago asked him whether he would ever run again for the Presidency. HUMPHREY paused and replied: "I have no such plans—but I have no plans to say I would not."

More recently, an aid popped the same question to him while the two were walking (at top speed, as usual) down a Senate corridor. HUMPHREY stopped at the elevator, dug his fists deeply into his trouser pockets and thought hard. After a moment he replied: "Well, I'm still young."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, we have been exposed to a number of speeches, messages and letters on the question of civil-rights legislation and the urgent need for its enactment. Most of the communications have been extremely well-articulated. However, I wish to present to this distinguished body a letter recently received from the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, which I think is an exceptionally well written argument.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 15, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The deepening moral crisis in all dimensions of our common life due to the exclusion of Negroes and other minority persons from full participation has erupted into a full-scale social revolution. This is a crucial hour for the U.S. Congress, as for all other institutions in our land.

The time for deploring, for placing blame, for temporizing, for seeking credit, has passed. If every segment of our national life does not now assume its full responsibility for ending the discrimination and segregation affecting American citizens of color, we may find that history has left us in its dust.

Recently, the major religious bodies have gone beyond pronouncements. They have allocated proportionately large sums of money and appointed special commissions with staff and budget to bring their own institutional practices in line with their public utterances. They have recognized that only a massive assault on segregation and discrimination within their own inner structure is equal to the urgent demands of God and the events of the times.

As we seek to correct our own failures, we appeal to the legislative branch of our government in these extraordinary circumstances to accept its crucial role in rectifying the injustices of three centuries.

We do not claim to be political statesmen. But we do believe the American people are politically sophisticated enough to recognize the temptation of both political parties to try to derive political advantage from the civil rights struggle. While this temptation is understandable as normal to the noble art of politics, it is obvious that our situation is not normal. It has changed drastically. There is no time for "politics as usual."

Neither party can pass effective civil rights legislation by itself. Therefore neither should attempt to claim credit if the effort is successful. But elements in either party can effectively block a major step in the solution of our Nation's most vital domestic problem. If meaningful and effective civil rights legislation is not enacted by this session of Congress in time to permit it to go on and deal with other vital issues, or if systematic efforts to make one party look good and the other bad are indulged in, irreparable damage will be done.

In times of overriding national crisis in the past both our legislative and executive branches of government have been able to put country above party. The moral dimensions of our present crisis are sharp and clear and the consequences of failure are unmistakable. We have confidence that the vast majority of our legislators can rise to the demands of the present occasion.

The hour for greatness is upon the Congress of the United States, as it is upon all of us. We pray that you will do everything in your power to enable the Congress to be equal to that hour, and to enact promptly a program of civil rights that is both effectual and enforceable.

Yours sincerely,
EUGENE CARSON BLAKE,
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly.
THEOPHILUS M. TAYLOR,
Secretary of the General Council.
JOHN COVENTRY SMITH,
General Secretary, Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations.
KENNETH G. NEIGH,
General Secretary, Board of National Missions.
WILLIAM A. MORRISON,
General Secretary, Board of Christian Education.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the issue of Tuesday, August 13, 1963, the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard published a beautiful tribute to the late Estes Kefauver under the editorial heading "The U.S. Senate Loses a Giant." I ask unanimous consent that this beautiful editorial may be printed in the RECORD. It is an editorial which in my judgment pays a most deserved tribute to a great senatorial giant.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. SENATE LOSES A GIANT

In the death of Estes Kefauver last weekend, the U.S. Senate lost one of its outstanding Members. He more than held his own in the Senate, a body which, on the average, is as able as any political body on earth. Mr. Kefauver was conscientious, dogged, friendly, keenly intelligent. And he never cheapened himself by playing to prejudice and hate the way many Southern Senators, to their discredit, have done.

In the Senate he was best known for his investigations into crime, drug prices, boxing scandals, and collusion in pricing electrical equipment. He was less well known for his championship of the international point of view and for his work in civil rights legislation. He was a champion of civil rights before such a thing was the fad. In 1954 he was one of the few Senators from his region who refused to attack the Supreme Court's decision on school desegregation.

Twice, he tried to be President. With a refreshing candor, while other candidates were playing coy and hoping to be drafted, Mr. Kefauver went after the nomination. "I'd very much like to be President," he said upon a number of occasions. In 1952 he entered 14 State primaries and won in 10 of them, including Oregon's, which he carried 5 to 1.

He campaigned intensively in Oregon in both 1952 and 1956. In 1952, on a fast tour through the Willamette Valley, an observer with a wristwatch noted that he signed two autographs and shook 23 hands in 60 seconds. His 1956 visit to Springfield was marked by his leading a bagpipe band, using a broom for a baton.

The combination of fate, circumstance and politics kept him out of the White House. For all that the voters in States with preferential primaries liked him, his fellow politicians felt less kindly toward him. Southern Democrats regarded him as too liberal on the race issue. Northern pols wanted to get even with him for exposing the tie-ins between Tammany Hall and organized crime. In 1952 he lost the nomination to Stevenson. Again in 1956 Stevenson got the nomination, with Kefauver settling for the vice presidential spot. But those weren't Democratic years. No Democrat could have beaten Eisenhower.

Unfortunately, many Americans never really saw behind the coonskin cap image that the Senator affected in an effort to seem like folks. He was folks, in a way. Genuinely friendly and easy, he did like people. But he was no hillbilly. When he talked, a person heard Yale Law School as much as he heard the hills of Tennessee. The hillbilly image, which he sought to build up, really didn't fit him very well. One wonders what would have been his political fate if he had played it straight, admitting that he was really as much of an egghead as Stevenson.

Another side to the man, not generally appreciated, was his interest in Congress, as such. He served in it for 24 years—9 in the House, 15 in the Senate. Early in his congressional career he was the co-author of an important little book, "20th Century Congress." That book was a major influence in the congressional reforms of the 1940's.

Unloved as he was among many Democratic politicians, he had the respect of his fellow Senators. He played the game according to the rules, kept his word, and demonstrated that he was always a man to be reckoned with, and always a gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the little people of America lost their foremost Washington lobbyist last month when Estes Kefauver died.

The voice of the organized interests comes through clear and strong to Congress. The collective voice of the little people of the Nation is muffled and diffused. Representing them can be a lonely, frustrating task.

That was the role Estes Kefauver undertook, tirelessly and valiantly. And the little people knew and understood that he was their advocate. The people of my State of North Dakota certainly did, because I witnessed their warm response to the man.

In the truest sense, Estes Kefauver was a U.S. Senator. His constituency was not confined to Tennessee. It included the entire Nation.

Estes Kefauver always was concerned about the underdog. As a southern Senator, it required no small amount of courage for him to support civil rights legislation.

He bothered to worry about the consumer—about his drug bills and his utility bills. In this latter endeavor he had a strong ally in my illustrious predecessor from North Dakota, Senator William Langer. Together they waged the successful battle to kill the Dixon-Yates contract, which would have undercut the public power yardstick in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Estes Kefauver took on organized crime. And he was unrelenting in his campaign against the evils of economic concentration and monopoly.

I am proud to have been a member of the small band of Senators Estes Kefauver led last summer in the battle against turning over the communications satellite system to a private corporation.

He went down fighting on this issue, for he was struck by his fatal heart attack on the Senate floor while seeking an amendment to the NASA authorization bill to require reimbursement to taxpayers for research and development which will benefit the private communications satellite corporation.

On the communications satellite question, Estes Kefauver was on the losing side, but I have every confidence that the wisdom and rightness of his position will be fully appreciated in the years to come.

As the stalwart champion of the little people, Estes Kafauver sustained many disappointments and defeats, but having waged the good fight, he accepted them with grace.

The likes of Estes Kefauver will not be seen in the U.S. Senate for a long time. He was a man of heroic dimensions, and it was a privilege to have served in the Senate with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article which appeared in the New York Times, August 12, 1963, entitled "The Observer," included in my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVER

WASHINGTON, August 11.—He was an egghead masquerading as a yokel and what he wanted was the Presidency. For 6 years, with little more than a coonskin cap and the stamina of a drayhorse, he kept the most skillful politicians of the Democratic Party in a nightmare.

Up and down the American folkways he plodded with his huge right hand dangling limp before him, ready for deposit in the claw of anyone who crossed his path. He would hand them the hand and look through them and murmur, "Ah'm Estes Kefauver and Ah'm runnin' for President. Will you he'p me?"

From Harry Truman in the White House down through the bull-roast-and-clambake crowd, the party professionals despised him. He was a maverick.

END OF A MAVERICK

"Always running for President," his colleagues in the Senate said with an inflection that meant, "he doesn't belong." The Southerners viewed him as a traitor to the cause, a Southerner seduced by ambition into espousal of civil rights and other un-Southern flapdoodle. His TV investigation of the mobs, which had publicized certain ugly facts about the relationship of dirty money and urban politics, had won him the lasting hatred of the big-machine politicians.

Campaigning across the country on a chain of outstretched hands, Kefauver found the opposition of the professionals a boon of sorts. He could say with Liberace, "Nobody loves me but the people." And so, it seemed, the people did. But conventions are purely professional institutions and both times—in 1952 and 1956—the professionals had their revenge.

In 1956 he managed to win the sop of the Vice Presidential nomination, and the professionals assigned him to the obscurity of campaigning in the deep-corn country.

The campaign was a model of disorganization. He fell hours behind schedule, kept audiences waiting until midnight until finally, out of the storm, groggy with fatigue, that distant dreamy look on his face, he would stumble into the hall to be greeted by his dismayed local agent.

"What kind of audience you got here?" he would ask as he moved in his stately stiff walk down the aisle, giving them the hand-flapping motion that passed for a wave. "Indians," his adviser told him one night. "What's their problem?" Kefauver asked. "Damn it, man. They're Indians. Isn't that enough?"

EGGHEAD IN COONSKIN

The irony of Kefauver was that the coonskin cap, by which the country at large knew him, was a fraud. It implied a log cabin rustic bred to the cracker barrel circle, but it concealed one of the authentic eggheads of American politics. Behind the homespun facade was an upper-middle-class family background, a university education, a law degree from Yale, marriage to a moneyed Scottish beauty, and a quality of introspection so deep that he was most enigmatic to those who knew him best.

In the Dixon-Yates affair he was a match for the canniest minds of Wall Street in the intricacies of high finance. In private conversation he was given to a mordant, ironic humor far deadlier to the politician than Adlai Stevenson's good-humored wit, which was said to have offended the voters.

None of this showed on the public facade. To the country he remained the mountaineer in coonskin, exuding the smell of the old hills. Subconsciously or by design, he exploited the Lincolnesque in his figure and towered among his "little people" as a symbol of all those virtues associated in the national memory with log-cabin roots.

"Will you help me?" went the pitch. "I grew up in a little, small town, and I have the same ambitions, the same aspirations that most of you have."

INNATELY THE BACKWOODSMAN

And yet, if the facade was all wrong, there was a germ of essential truth in the coonskin, for he had the backwoodsman's innate distrust of big business and the "interests" and an admirable zest for stepping on rich fat toes.

Those who trailed him on his quest for the Presidency will remember him for a time to come, standing on the old-fashioned bandstands in courthouse squares murmuring, "You'll help me, won't you?" And, "If you can't give me your votes, remember me at least in your prayers."

RUSSELL BAKER.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS BUILDING AMERICANISM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, 2 years ago this fall it was my privilege to participate in a Senate study mission to South America. The trip was made at about the time the Alliance for Progress was being established, and we had an opportunity to test attitudes and conditions generally.

We found an explosive situation, with no doubt that the type of assistance the Alliance would provide is urgently needed. The obstacles faced were formidable—both Castroism and anti-Americanism running more deeply than we would have liked, and with incredible poverty and ignorance providing a fertile field for both. Skepticism that the Alliance could be made to work was being steadily spread by the oligarchists, the privileged rich who want no social change.

The study mission made a number of specific recommendations as to what had to be done if the Alliance—"the most exciting new idea to come to South America in a century" was to have any chance of success, and we found agreement on them in the State Department. It was our unanimous opinion that America had no choice but to pursue the Alliance.

I was delighted, therefore, when our distinguished Utah newspaper, the Deseret News, summed up the first 2 years of the Alliance with a hard-hitting editorial whose thesis is "Don't Give Up on Latin America." The editorial discusses many of the titanic problems the study mission found, and the initial failures in meeting them. It treats both frankly and without pulling punches. But the conclusion on the Alliance's second anniversary is that "all has not been failure. There is still sound reason for moving ahead."

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful editorial from the Deseret News of Saturday, August 17, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would also like to include a second editorial from this same important newspaper which suggests a fresh approach to building Americanism. The editorial is entitled "How About a Pro-U.S. Seminar?" It points out that fighting communism with the same techniques used to build it up is not enough—that we need to adopt a positive approach on what's right with America, and what we stand for. I ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD, also.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two Years of the Alliance: Don't Give Up on Latin America

Two years after the signing of the Charter of Punta del Este, it has become almost a national sport to castigate the lack of progress of the Alliance for Progress. Even President Kennedy recently admitted he was "depressed" about the program. "In some ways," he said, "the road seems longer than it was when the journey started."

Progess has been discouraging. Political and economic and social upheavals do continue to wrack Latin America. U.S. redtape and bureaucracy do tend to smother the program. Latin Americans themselves do seem to devote too little effort and thought in their own behalf.

But while all this is true, we suggest there is a brighter side that should be understood if our continuing policy toward Latin America is to be intelligent.

Despite all the grumbling, the Alliance has directly benefited 37 million Latin Americans—1 out of 6—these past 2 years.

Through its loans, 140,000 houses have been built, 160,000 farms improved, 1,500 community water systems installed—and these loans are being repaid.

Yes, one may say, but political and economic conditions are so unstable there. It's so hard for anyone, in government or private industry, to plan any kind of continuing program.

It's true. The difficulty of attracting private capital is one of Latin America's most serious problems. Expropriations of private businesses in Brazil and elsewhere have scared off many potential investors and scared out some present ones. Critics point out that 1962 saw a net loss of $23.8 million in private U.S. investment in Latin America.

But even this grim figure needs some interpretation. In Venezuela alone, where the Government has decided to do its own oil prospecting in the future, investors pulled out $182.5 million and put in nothing—not because of expropriations but simply because they plan to do their oil exploring elsewhere.

Take Venezuela out of the picture, and U.S. investors put in $159 million more than they took out of Latin America.

Latin America is not moving forward as fast as it could and should. But it is far from stagnating. Its annual growth rate of around 4 percent the past 4 years is still better than ours. Its manufacturing industry is moving ahead well; steel production went from less than 2 million to more than 5 million tons the past decade. Production of private automobiles has grown by nearly 50 percent in the past 5 years.

But it's never safe to generalize about Latin America. Real understanding can only come by looking at individual countries.

So take Venezuela, for example. Despite the pullout of U.S. capital, Venezuela's economy grew by 6 percent in 1962—and its oil production was up 9½ percent. "At the outset of 1963 prospects are more favorable than at any time since 1958," the U.S. Commerce Department reported.

Colombia had serious devaluation problems and a dollar drain in 1962. Even so, it made surprising economic progress, particularly in more than doubling its exports of diversified commodities.

Ecuador is one of Latin America's weakest sisters, but even its growth rate moved up last year from 1 to 2.5 percent.

Peru went through a political crisis with a military coup in 1962, and is still experiencing serious labor troubles. But its exchange reserves went from $82.4 million to $106.6 million during the year, its exports rose 9 percent, and its currency held steady—a remarkable achievement these days.

Even Chile, where inflation and austerity measures supposedly have hamstrung the economy, industrial metals production grew by 52 percent last year.

Brazil is a puzzle. Its economic and political crises would topple most nations of the world. But still it goes on—producing 44 percent more passenger cars, for example, than the previous year and nearly doubling its wheat production.

Argentina is the bleakest spot, with its distressing problems of unemployment, labor tensions, bankruptcy, and virtual civil war. But even there, exports grew over the preceding year. Settlement of the nations' political problems could touch off a real boom in the economy.

We do not wish to be Pollyannish about Latin America's problems. There is vast room for improvement, particularly in the area of spreading the benefits of reform and economic growth throughout the whole population.

But on this second anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, we ought at least to understand that all has not been failure. There is still sound reason for moving ahead.

How About a Pro-U.S. Seminar?

Some of the anticommunism seminars that have cropped up around the country in recent years have been anything but a service to America because of the methods they advocated for fighting communism.

Too many of them advocated "fighting fire with fire," using precisely the same techniques the Communists use—only against them. That this could easily destroy the very freedoms we are fighting to protect didn't seem to bother some of these people.

Judging from the Freedom Academy held this week at Camp Williams under sponsorship of the Utah National Guard, this particular seminar is doing a good job of avoiding that tendency.

The featured speaker was William C. Sullivan of Washington, D.C., Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He said some things that need to be said at anticommunism seminars.

Specifically, he cautioned against using extremes in fighting communism. "Instead," he urged, "fight the causes of communism—ignorance, poverty, disease, social injustice, political corruption, educational inadequacies, religious inadequacies, and psychological maladjustments."

In other words, in fighting communism it's not enough merely to be against something. More important is what we're for. And what we're for, mainly, is a free and united America—not one riven by a hunt for scapegoats that sows mutual distrust, destroys mutual confidence, and makes it difficult to recognize our real problems and to tackle them intelligently and constructively.

In short, what this country needs is not so much anticommunism as it is pro-Americanism. With the help of men like Mr. Sullivan, we could be on our way to getting it.

AN APPEAL TO REASON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, Hon. Fred Gray, a former assistant attorney general of Virginia, who won national fame as a constitutional lawyer in his arguments before the Supreme Court in school segregation cases, and who now is a member of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, made a notable speech at the University of Virginia. The occasion was a seminar of some 400 young bankers from Virginia and Maryland who were attending a week's course of study sponsored by the bankers association of the two sister States, and in cooperation with the undergraduate school of commerce at the university.

The university department of commerce prepares students, of course, for postgraduate work in the University School of Business Administration, inaugurated some years ago by my good friend and former colleague in the U.S. House of Representatives, Colgate W. Darden, Jr., who served with great distinction as a Governor of Virginia during World War II and then for 15 years as President of our State university. Virginia's School of Business Administration has not yet achieved the national reputation of its older schools of liberal arts, law, and medicine, but I can recommend it highly to fond parents who hope their offspring will preserve their patrimony. In other words, the School of Business Administration at the University of Virginia, teaches the fundamental Jeffersonian principle that property rights cannot be severed from other rights and are, of necessity, an integral part of the famous Jeffersonian phrase "pursuit of happiness."

Unlike the French Revolution, our Revolution, to the commencement of which Jefferson contributed the immortal Declaration of Independence, was in no sense a social revolution. In the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson enumerated our major grievances which could be summarized in one short sentence—the rights of English citizens. Those rights which included life, liberty and the possession and enjoyment of private property stem from the Magna Carta which in 1215 declared:

> No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or anywise destroyed; nor shall we go upon him, nor send upon him, but by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

The same principle was reasserted by the Petition of Right which the English Parliament sent to Charles I in 1628, which said:

> No man should be put out of his land or tenements, nor taken, nor imprisoned, nor disinherited, nor put to death without being brought to answer by due process of law.

The father of our party, who asked to be remembered by the fact that he was the author of the Declaration of

Independence, the author of Virginia's Statute for Religious Liberty, and the founder of the University of Virginia, was a large property owner, and the home that he built for his young and lovely bride now preserved by a patriotic foundation, is still a model of architectural beauty and of facilities for gracious living. On many occasions, Jefferson referred to his interest in the protection of property rights but the following brief quotations will be sufficient, I hope, to dispel the misguided opinion of some do-gooders who claim that if Jefferson were alive he would warmly embrace the Kennedy omnibus civil rights bill, a bill which the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said on the floor of the Senate on August 20 "is the most expansive blueprint for governmental tyranny which has ever been conceived in the mind of any man on the North American Continent." Jefferson, a great advocate of personal freedom, Jefferson, the great political philosopher, who said that the least governed are the best governed, Jefferson, the personification of the doctrine of States rights said:

> In defense of our persons and properties under actual violation, we took up arms.

In the same declaration on taking up arms, he said:

> The political institutions of America, its various soils and climates opened a certain resource to the unfortunate and to the enterprising of every country, and insured to them the acquisition of free possession of property.

In a letter to James Maury, Jefferson wrote:

> The first foundations of the social compact would be broken up were we definitely to refuse to its members the protection of their persons and property while in their lawful pursuits.

Still later, he wrote this to a friend, Charles Yancey:

> The functionaries of every government have propensities to command at will the liberty and property of their constituents. There is no safe deposit for these but with the people themselves; nor can they be safe with them without information.

It was in defense of those fundamental Jeffersonian principles that my friend, Fred Gray of the Richmond, Va., Bar addressed the young bankers in Charlottesville in a speech entitled "An Appeal to Reason." The keynote of that speech is to be found in this sentence:

> When the history of the year 1963 has been written and reviewed dispassionately it may well be discovered that in this year the fate of the American dream was sealed.

That is a prelude to his splendid discussion of what is involved in the President's omnibus civil rights bill.

In the course of that discussion, Mr. Gray states that some will argue that title VI of the omnibus bill does not cover such items as GI insurance, individual social security benefits, veterans benefits, farm subsidies, Federal deposit insurance, and similar programs. On the contrary, Senator ERVIN, one of the best constitutional lawyers of the Senate, categorically stated that title VI covered everything referred to above by Mr. Gray and was so all embracive that it would be difficult to find any activity which was not in some way affected. The section specifically enumerates "any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guarantee or otherwise." That language, of course, includes farm subsidies and all insurance programs such as FHA and FDIC.

Then Senator ERVIN added that in utter disregard of the Jeffersonian principle of the rights of States and of the people thereof specifically reserved in the 10th amendment:

> It is obvious that the provisions of the first sentence of section 601 of title VI do not stop with the transfer of the lawmaking power from Congress to the President. They also make the President the accuser, the judge and the jury, and the executioner. In so doing, they attempt to vest in the President the judicial power to condemn and punish in violation of article III, section 1 of the Constitution.
>
> Regardless of the name by which it may be called, any government is a tyranny when the rights and responsibilities of its citizens are dependent upon the will of one public official.
>
> While the first sentence of section 601 of title VI is silent on the matter, we can easily infer the steps the administration will take if the bill is enacted. The administration will divert every program or activity of the Federal Government from its primary purpose to compel the American people to conform to its notions in respect to racial relations. This assertion finds ample proof in the orders relating to employment and housing issued by the President and the orders relating to so-called places of public accommodations issued by the Secretary of Defense without congressional authorization. Under the orders of the Secretary of Defense, the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are in the process of converting the military and naval commanders of our country into political arms of the executive department and of putting the Armed Forces at economic warfare with the civilian population to compel civilians to operate their commercial enterprises in conformity with the Presidential will.

Mr. President, I not only endorse the sentiments concerning the civil rights bill expressed on the Senate floor last week by Senator ERVIN, but I likewise endorse the sentiments concerning that bill expressed last week at the University of Virginia by Hon. Fred Gray in which he appeals to Congress and the American people to preserve the only true source of freedom—constitutional limitations on government. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gray's speech entitled: "An Appeal to Reason" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO REASON

It is unquestionably true that the tremendous, even unbelievable, scientific achievements of the past two decades have conditioned the mind of man for change. Today, many have developed an attitude that whatever is as old as yesterday, must certainly be obsolete. We are ready for change. We are even eager for change and in many instances, we are apparently ready for change for the sake of change itself and not for any virtue which the change offers us.

I am convinced that the tremendous progress which has been made in the fields of technology has had a tremendous effect upon the attitudes of people. There is a restlessness; an impatience; even to the extent of affecting our governments. Legislatures leap to new and untried methods and disregard the tried and the true. Courts seek to do by revolution that which should be done by evolution. It is the belief of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government that these are dangerous practices—that freedom remains modern and that the dangers to freedom remain unchanged. It is for that reason that we were created and seek in these revolutionary times to hold fast to the basic concepts of the American Republic and to alert the American public to the dangers which we feel are inherent in some of the policies which are being pursued today. We believe that the ancient slogan—"the price of liberty is eternal vigilance"—is neither outmoded nor outworn.

The Virginia Commission was established as of July 1, 1958, by a unanimous vote of the Virginia General Assembly. It consists of 15 members who serve without compensation for 4-year terms. The Governor of the Commonwealth is an ex officio member. Four of the members of the commission come from the House of Delegates of Virginia, three from the State senate and the others are appointed by the Governor. Our duties are chiefly educational. The act which created the commission charges it with the duty of assembling and making available to interested persons factual material intended to clarify and expound the proper relationship between the State and the Federal governments. We have published a number of booklets and pamphlets to call attention to the line that supposedly divides the powers reserved to the States and the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Central Government. We also are instructed by law, as best we can, to call to the attention of Congress the doctrine of the limited Central Government with the thought in mind that the rights of the States and the individuals should be preserved. In an attempt to carry out these duties, the commission is now engaged in a number of educational and promotional activities. It came to our attention that some of the textbooks which were being used in our public schools were setting forth glaringly inaccurate facts about the American Constitution and we are, therefore, assisting the State department of education in the development of an expanded course in American Constitutional Government, which is now a required subject of all students at the 12th-grade level in our public schools. Because we are convinced of the merits of our form of government, because we have no fear of the comparison, and because we know that the young people of America should become aware of the threat offered by communism to the free institutions that this country affords them, we have undertaken the preparation of supplementary teaching materials which are intended to instruct high school students in the true nature and aims of the Communist system.

We have undertaken a comprehensive study of Federal grants and aid. It is our belief that the ever-accelerating growth of the Federal Government springs largely from this source. We feel that it is important that we know exactly how these programs operate, how they effect the finances of the various States of the Union and the political subdivisions and how the people of America have come to depend upon Federal grants. Our findings have really primary application to the public administration in Virginia, but they also provide a valuable case study for every State and every locality.

We have a mailing list of some 28,000 persons across this Nation. To them we have sent a series of publications dealing with the structure of American constitutional government. These individual publications will be bound in a volume known as "We, the States." This, we hope, will be ready for distribution sometime this year. We have undertaken a number of research programs at the request of Members of Congress on matters that involve constitutional government in which they feel that they are in need of assistance.

In addition to these specific projects, the commission undertakes through its members to carry to colleges, civic or patriotic groups, or any interested organization the message we are seeking to spread. To this end we welcome speaking engagements before such organizations. And, incidentally, we are never happier than when an invitation comes from a group which we expect to be hostile. We are seeking converts not applause.

One of the questions that has most frequently been asked is whether or not the Virginia commission is concerned with segregation in public schools or anywhere else, for that matter. The answer to that question is that we are not concerned with the social aspects of segregation. We are concerned with court decisions, such as *Brown v. The Board of Education*, which was the school segregation case, when we believe that those decisions have the effect of amending the Federal Constitution. Our concern arises out of the precedents which are established and which can be used in other fields as well as in the field of segregation.

Let me mention some of the areas of constitutional concern which we feel. In a case of which you may never have heard—a case entitled "Mapp v. State of Ohio"—the question arose as to whether, in a State court, evidence which has been obtained by means of illegal search and seizure can be used in the prosecution of one charged with a crime. Now, this is a question which could be debated from a moral standpoint. Many people think that it is unfair to use evidence that has been illegally obtained in order to prosecute. The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia had the question before it a number of years ago and in a very well-reasoned opinion, the court concluded that the proper thing to do in such case is to use the evidence if it is relevant and material. If it tends to prove that the defendant is guilty or innocent, then it matters not how it was obtained, the court is entitled to use it in reaching the truth. Our court pointed out that what should be done in such cases is to punish the offending police officer as by prosecution for unlawful entry or by departmental discipline or by civil suit for trespass. But the court reasoned that we should not throw away evidence which is useful in determining the guilt or innocence of the accused.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Mapp case concluded that the Federal Constitution now precludes the use of such evidence in a State proceeding. You may agree with the moral result, but it is indeed difficult for me to understand the constitutional basis of the decision. Originally, the Federal courts had a rule, just a rule of court, which precluded the use of such evidence in a Federal court. Several States had a similar rule. They felt it was unfair and improper to use evidence which was obtained by unlawful search in a prosecution and so they excluded such evidence. The majority of States followed the view of the Virginia court and admitted the evidence. Through a series of decisions, the Federal court converted its rule into a constitutional right in Federal trials and brought itself to the point that all that was left in this field was the right of the State to either admit such evidence or reject it as it saw fit. In the Mapp case, in a shocking disregard for the proper amendatory processes, the court actually engaged in a nose count of the various States and determined that most of the States have now adopted the Federal rule and, therefore, the time has come for it to become a part of the Constitution and they hold that it does become a part of the Constitution. Gentlemen, this is a dangerous way in which to amend our Constitution. Let me read a short paragraph from the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan:

"I regret that I find so unwise in principle and so inexpedient in policy a decision motivated by the high purpose of increasing respect for constitutional rights. But in the last analysis I think this Court can increase respect for the Constitution only if it rigidly respects the limitations which the Constitution places upon it, and respects as well the principles inherent in its own processes. In the present case I think we exceed both, and that our voice becomes only a voice of power, not of reason."

All of you, I am certain, are familiar with the Tennessee Reapportionment case. In that decision, the Supreme Court of the United States overturning a long, long line of prior decisions determined that it is within the power of the Federal courts to strike down the apportionment of a State legislature determined by the elected representatives of the people and to substitute for that an apportionment determined by a Federal district court. Again, many people see a moral question. The case arose in Tennessee and that State had not been reapportioned for 60 years. There were apparent discrepancies and inequities. The question, however, is not whether Tennessee was right or wrong in its reapportioning. The question is, How did a Federal district court acquire the power to act in this field? Where, under our constitutional system, a system which clearly defines the powers reserved to the States and the powers vested in the Federal Government, does a Federal court derive such jurisdiction? What provision of the Constitution authorizes the Federal Government to intrude into this vital area of truly State concern?

The answer comes, as it now comes in an increasing number of cases, "If there is a wrong, the Federal Government has the right to correct that wrong." This concept is totally foreign to initial concept of our Nation.

I hope that you will not misunderstand. The Virginia Commission takes no position on whether illegally obtained evidence should be admissible or inadmissible in a prosecution, but we do take the position that there is nothing in the Federal Constitution which authorizes a Federal court to make that determination for the State. The Virginia Commission takes no position with respect to whether the apportionment of a particular State legislature has been accomplished in an equitable manner or in an inequitable manner, but we do take the position that it is improper and dangerous to establish the principle that a Federal court has jurisdiction to make that determination. For while today the opinion of the Federal court as to what is an equitable distribution of the legislative seats in a particular State may meet with the approval of you or with the people in that State, tomorrow's court may hold a vastly different view and we may find ourselves made subjects of Federal gerrymandering to accomplish purposes entirely foreign to those which the proponents of redistricting are now seeking. The Virginia Commission deeply feels that we must carefully examine the precedents which we are establishing. If these precedents can be used as tools against freedom tomorrow, then they are poor tools to be placed in the hands of the Federal Government even though they may be for seemingly virtuous purposes today.

The courts are not the sole offenders. I should like to turn your attention briefly to the pending civil rights legislation. The bill which is pending in the Congress of the United States is worthy of the attention of every American citizen, be he white or colored. It is worthy of your prayerful consideration, your intelligent consideration, and your active opposition or support, as the case may be. In my opinion, this bill constitutes the greatest menace to the freedom of the American people that currently exists. I intend to be speaking in kindness rather than in criticism of the administration in Washington when I say I cannot believe that they fully appreciate the tremendous power over the lives of the American people that they are asking the Congress to give them by the provisions of this act.

In my opinion we are engaged in a last-ditch fight for the preservation of our republican form of government and for the free enterprise system which has made our Nation great. When the history of the year 1963 has been written and reviewed dispassionately it may well be discovered that in this year the fate of the American dream was sealed. I think that no one can successfully dispute the fact that never ever in the history of the human race has a people had a better opportunity to perfect a system for mass government. If we miss this opportunity, if the American dream becomes a nightmare, if the light of freedom flickers and dies—if we fail our posterity—liberty, as we have known it, may perish from the earth, and unless the people of this Nation, Negro and white, Republican and Democrat, rich and poor, awaken to the true nature of the struggle that is now being waged, we may indeed miss the opportunity.

I do not appeal to your passion, I care not for your views on segregation or integration, I am not concerned with your politics, and my appeal is as much to the Negro as to white race. * * * I appeal only to reason. I ask you to look at the lessons of history and ask yourself, am I safe from tyranny?

The Negro says he is struggling for his total freedom. No one can criticize a man for seeking freedom. But I say to the Negro race, "If it is indeed freedom which you seek, you should not believe that yours is the first such struggle in the history of the world." White men have struggled for centuries to achieve their freedom. And against whom did we struggle? We struggled against government. When we struggled to be free, we struggled against a czar, an emperor, a king—give him whatever title you will—but it was the power of a too powerful government which we were seeking to escape. And after centuries of struggle a new concept was born. It was a concept predicated on the individual dignity of a human being, a concept that there are certain rights that a man possesses because he is a man, certain rights that neither the courts, the Congress, nor the Crown can take from him. Much later, we came to refer to them as certain "inalienable rights." Long after the birth of the concept of a written guarantee of these rights was wrung from the British Crown by our English forebears. Magna Carta. A promise of liberty. When the English colonists came to America they brought with them a fierce love for those rights. It was to preserve those rights that our forefathers pledged to one another "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" and entered upon a struggle that even the most optimistic among them is certain to have realized carried with it the very real prospect of death as a traitor. It was the determination never again to surrender to government their individual rights that carried them through the horror and suffering of Valley Forge to the glory of Yorktown.

These same people drafted and ratified the Constitution of the United States. They were people who had more than a passing acquaintance with tyranny. They knew him well * * * they had faced his sharp steel in battle * * * they had starved under his blockade * * * their comrades in arms had died under his power. Tyranny was no friend to them and when they instituted our form of government they did so with one thought uppermost in their minds, "We, the people" are to control the Government, the Government is to be "of the people, by the people, and for the people." They placed every safeguard around their liberty that they could conceive. They rigidly limited the power of the Central Government. They preserved to the States and to the people of the States all the powers except those conferred by the Constitution on the Federal Government.

Today the struggle lies forgotten, the fears are regarded as outmoded, the safeguards are thrown aside. Under a cry of freedom, well-meaning people forget the lessons of history, forget that unlimited power inevitably leads to oppression, and seek by the process of empowering the central government, to obtain what they would call liberty. And I say to them the very tools which you forge today in the name of freedom can as easily be used tomorrow to enslave us all. No tyrant could ask better weapons than those which you now create. The very people who most need unalterable constitutional rights applaud, indeed demand, a process by which constitutional rights are made subject to interpretation and change. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, the rights which we have considered inviolate now fall within the orbit of judicial change. The Constitution, the harness by which Federal power is held in check, is cast aside and we, all of us, must pray that power thus loosed will never fall into the hands of a zealot. And still you may ask what is it, that the President's civil rights bill does, that so endangers our liberty? And I would reply that it establishes a sufficient precedent as to the power of the Federal Government to support almost any legislation which can be conceived.

The civil rights bill consists of seven titles. The first title deals with voting rights. I think that no reasonable person will seek to condone any practice by which an American citizen who is qualified by age, intelligence, and education is denied the right to vote because of race. But ample protections are afforded by present law. This bill establishes a sixth-grade education as the line at which a person is presumed to be literate for voting purposes and confers vast powers on the Attorney General of the United States to protect the rights to vote and to register Negroes through the use of referees. This portion of the bill has been previously debated last year; it is clearly unnecessary, and in the hands of one seeking to use the polls as a springboard to power, it could be exceedingly dangerous.

Title II deals with public accommodations. We have made an honest effort to determine what is and what is not covered by the bill. I say to you that without stretching the language nearly so much as certain phrases in the Constitution have been stretched in recent years this bill covers practically every phase of human endeavor. These so-called public accommodations are businesses which you and I formerly considered private business. I am convinced that the term public accommodations was artfully selected for the purpose of tying this subject as closely as possible, in the minds of the people, to a familiar field in which the proprietor has no right to discriminate—the public service company or public utility. The phone company and the power company have no right to refuse to serve because they are granted a franchise by the State—a monopoly in the field—they must serve all comers. But this bill would impose that obligation on practically every business establishment, perhaps even every professional man, in the country. Again, I do not desire to argue the moral issues. Whether the owner of the corner soda fountain should refuse service to a person because of his race is not the subject matter of my concern. My concern arises out of the question—"where did the Federal Government derive the power to deny to the owner that privilege—right or wrong?" It has always been my notion that in America if I owned a piece of property, I had considerable rights in that property, and that one of those rights was to say who could and who could not come upon it.

Where in the Federal Constitution is there a provision that the Federal Government can deny me that use of my property? The Attorney General of the United States had this bill drafted as falling under both the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution and the 14th amendment. It was very cleverly done. The commerce clause is incredibly brief to contain all of the power that has been attributed to it even before this monstrous proposal. It simply provides that Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." The Attorney General, of course, recognizes that there is nothing in this clause which deals at all with discrimination based upon race, so he dips into the 14th amendment for restrictions against actions by States based on racial discrimination and seeks to use the commerce clause as constitutional authority for the Congress to forbid the racial discrimination prohibited by the 14th amendment. But the civil rights bill is directed not only at the States but at individuals. Even the Attorney General recognizes that the 14th amendment speaks only to States. In his statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee Mr. Robert Kennedy admitted that there are grave constitutional questions about this portion of the bill under the 14th amendment, but according to him it is clearly within the power of Congress under the commerce clause. Thus, whether Mr. Jones, owner and operator of a corner soda fountain, sells or refuses to sell a "Coke" to Mr. Smith, private citizen, becomes a matter that is within the regulatory power of Congress under the simple clause "regulate commerce among the several States." Do you think that is what the Founding Fathers had in mind? I say to you that this is a field in which the Negro cannot validly say he is seeking freedom. He has complete freedom—we all do. The proprietor has a right to select his own customers if they will offer themselves as customers—and the consumers have the right to select whichever establishment they choose that will serve them. If the proprietor is dissatisfied he can change his policies or close shop and if the consumer is dissatisfied he can open his own establishment and serve whomsoever he chooses. Freedom is not being sought here. What is being sought here is governmental control—control in a vast field where freedom now exists. But that is not all—for if it is determined that every small business establishment in America falls under the commerce clause—then the full regulatory power of Congress is brought to bear. The whole trackless maze of Federal regulations which frustrate businessmen truly engaged in interstate commerce, fall upon the smallest merchant and the power of the Federal Government over our very livelihood becomes supreme.

Title III authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to institute school desegregation suits. Again an unnecessary provision. We have passed the eye of this hurricane and moved into calmer waters. Desegregation is proceeding in more and more communities—if the pace is not fast enough to suit all, at least many marvel at the lack of disorder and violence that has attended the integration of school after school. The present proposal would throw aside orderly procedure and substitute the modern mania for rapid change—why seek to navigate the hurricane again? But title III goes beyond this widely publicized provision. It would authorize a Federal Commissioner of Education to initiate programs to deal with problems arising from racial imbalance in public schools. What this means is that instead of following the rule which we have been told is the law—that is, that assignments to school must be made without regard to race—we will now deliberately shift students on the basis of race to secure balanced racial composition of classes. This is racism in the raw.

Title IV establishes a Community Relations Service. This is merely a normal example of Federal bureaucracy in the growing stage—no real constitutional principles are involved—only increased spending and waste.

Title V would extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission—no one expects a Federal agency to die—but not only will the Commission live, but the President would give it general rulemaking power to carry out the purposes of the act creating it. In other words, the Commission could write laws in one of the most critical areas of American life.

Title VI permits the cutoff of Federal financial assistance to any activity in which racial discrimination occurs. Can you possibly conceive the power attendant upon such a provision? Millions, tens of millions, of American homes have been financed through loans involving financial assistance from Washington. The Commission of Civil Rights has reported that "the Federal Government has been without question the major force in the expansion of the housing and home finance industries." Financial institutions with assets in excess of $890 billion would fall under the power of Federal personnel—a power that could be twisted easily from its intended purposes to the imposition of political and sociological views upon the victims. I am totally incapable of comprehending the vast scope of this power grant. It would perhaps be easier to find what is not affected. It serves no purpose to argue that such items as GI insurance, individual social-security benefits, veterans' benefits, farm subsidies, Federal Deposit Insurance, and the like are not covered—recent years have taught us that the Federal Government finds means to control our lives—even our prayers—with no covering language. Given the sweep of this bill, no one can predict where they will go.

Title VII at first reading merely creates a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. But if you read carefully you will find a provision just as sweeping as that in title VI. The President is authorized to confer on the Commission whatever powers he sees fit. And this they call liberty. This provision would authorize the Fair Employment Practice Committee in such shape and size as any President desires. Unless one is fully familiar with the extent of the role of the Federal Government in the life of America today he cannot comprehend the extent that the President would be empowered to order our lives.

And I return to my theme. I need not debate with you the rights or wrongs of the practices which exist and which cause some people to believe the Civil Rights bill to be desirable. I ask that we consider the overriding factor. Each of us is free because we have inherited a controlled government. We have no guarantee of continued liberty except devotion to the cause of liberty. If we, group by group, seek to attain our own individual aims through the process of pouring power into government, it must inevitably come to pass that government will enslave us all. Uncontrolled power leads inevitably to tyranny. If our American system is imperfect, if injustices and inequities exist, we are a fair minded people and in time corrections will come. Man may be able to circle the globe in an hour today—but it still requires time to move his mind from long existing customs.

But if some among us, by failing to recognize the ultimate source of our total freedom, destroy our heritage—the heritage of constitutional limitations on government—then they will have won the battle and lost the war.

This is the long, hot summer. In the past Americans have given their physical lives to preserve our liberty. This summer, American political leaders are being called upon to risk their political lives for the same cause. There are those who will see the truth and respond. There are others, blinded by a passionate desire to attain the ends regardless of the means, who will not heed the danger of passing the point of no return—no return from Federal power. Finally, there are those who will see but who will lack the courage to make the individual sacrifice which may be required. Of them I would say in the words of the Great Teacher: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

SCHOOL DROPOUTS—A REFLECTION OF THE PARTIAL FAILURE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY—EFFORTS ARE MADE TO STIMULATE YOUTH TO COMPLETE EDUCATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in recent months, public attention has become increasingly concentrated on the problems of American youth who fail to complete high school. In no small degree this is the result of concern focused on this area by congressional inquiries.

It has been my privilege to have been actively associated with two of these investigations, both of which have been conducted by subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The extensive hearings of the Subcommittee on Education, which have been directed by the penetrating intelligence of our chairman, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], will comprise seven volumes when printed. Though the subcommittee hearings have explored the entire range of educational problems in America today, much attention was devoted specifically to the question of school dropouts and the related issues of juvenile delinquency and youth unemployment.

Collateral but independent hearings have been held by the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment. This subcommittee, under the scholarly chairmanship of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has for many months been engaged in a broad-scale study of the long-term problems of manpower and employment in the United States. At many times during the past months, these two independently conducted inquiries have necessarily touched on common issues, because we cannot realistically cope with manpower and employment problems without a consideration of the education and training of our labor force, nor can we talk meaningfully about education without reference to the social and economic context within which it functions.

As an active participant in the work of both subcommittees, I have been increasingly impressed by the closely woven fabric of American society. The faulty threads in the pattern of education have weakened the entire cloth. Juvenile delinquency and the high rate of youth unemployment appear as rents in this fabric, due in large part to the inadequate educational preparation of our young people.

It was with a consciousness of these problems and a growing sense of their urgency that I was prompted earlier this month to write to the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia, and suggest that he use the powers of his office to launch a statewide effort to bring the potential dropout teenagers back to school this fall. I ask that this letter be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR
> AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
> *August 16, 1963.*
>
> Hon. W. W. BARRON,
> *Governor of West Virginia, The Capitol Building, Charleston, W. Va.*
>
> DEAR GOVERNOR BARRON: As you are aware, during the past several months the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I serve, has been engaged in a broad-scale study of manpower and employment problems in the United States.
>
> More recently, our subcommittee has been conducting hearings on the extension until 1967 of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. During the past week especially, we have received voluminous testimony regarding problems of youth unemployment, school dropouts, and the related rise in juvenile delinquency.
>
> The conditions in West Virginia were dramatically portrayed during the hearing this morning, August 16, in the testimony of members of the board and the executive director of the Charleston Youth Community, Inc. It was stated that "of the children entering the first grade in West Virginia in 1948, only 41 percent graduated in 1960—59 percent dropped out along the way."
>
> Admittedly, many of those represented in the 59 percent belonged to families who moved away from West Virginia. But, as you know, there remains an alarmingly large dropout figure in our State.
>
> I am writing to suggest that you use your position of leadership to launch a maximum statewide effort during the next 3 weeks, especially among our high school population, to bring our students back to school. Such an effort would, of course, require more than the resources of the office of Governor, but it occurs to me that if you take the initiative in such a program, coordinating with the State school superintendent, the county school superintendents, the principals of high and junior high schools, and public and private civic and welfare agencies, many young people might be saved from joining the swelling ranks of the unschooled and unemployed.
>
> I hope that you might find this recommendation of practical value. With personal and official regards.
>
> Very truly,
>
> JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the problem is not unique to West Virginia. As President Kennedy stated in his message to the Congress on January 29, 1963:

> Nearly 40 percent of our youths are dropping out before graduating from high school; only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school.

This is the record of the recent past and immediate present.

Projections for the future are only slightly less foreboding. Estimates of the U.S. Department of Labor indicate that between 1960 and 1970, some 26 million youth will enter the labor force. Of these 7.5 million, or 29.1 percent, will not have completed high school. At the same time, our need for unskilled workers will not increase, and the need for farmworkers will drop by approximately 20 percent.

This is not a problem of some remote future. It has reached critical proportions already and it will remain unabated in the immediate years ahead. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Education, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz stated, and I quote:

> During the 1963–65 period, about 7.5 million new young workers will be looking for work * * * the group which will cause us the most concern will be the 5½ million non-college-bound new young workers. * * * About 3½ million of these young men and women will have a high school education and approximately another 2 million youngsters will not have completed their high school education.

An enlightened society cannot condone the tragic individual and social waste resulting from this failure to educate our youth. The extent of such waste is reflected in innumerable surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and other governmental agencies. One of the more recent ones indicated that the unemployment rate among young people who failed to complete their secondary schooling in 1961 was 28 percent, or nearly 3 out of every 10.

This waste is not solely in terms of production lost as a result of unemployment. Nor is it only in terms of the failure to realize the individual potential for human growth. There is an additional positive waste in the efforts society must expend to maintain the unemployed and in the resources we devote to the rehabilitation of unemployed and unschooled young people who fall into patterns of delinquency.

It is no mere coincidence that an extremely high proportion of juvenile delinquents is drawn from the ranks of the unemployed and ill-educated. The peak age for juvenile delinquency comes at the critical time when young people are making the transition from school to work. With inadequate schooling and increasingly less employment opportunities, an ever larger number of our young people are seeking an outlet for their frustrations in lawlessness. Thus, it has been estimated that about 95 percent of 17-year-old delinquents are not attending school, while 85 percent of the 16-year-olds, and 50 percent of the 15-year-old delinquents are not in classes.

The relation between school dropouts, unemployment, and juvenile delinquency was starkly portrayed by Dr. James B. Conant in reporting on the findings of the National Committee on Children and Youth. In reporting on one metropolitan community, he stated:

> In a slum area of 125,000 people, mostly Negro, a sampling of the youth population shows that roughly 70 percent of the boys and girls between ages 16 and 21 are out of school and unemployed. When one stops to consider that the total population in this district is equal to that of a good-size independent city, the magnitude of the problem

is appalling and the challenge to our society is clear.

In another community studied by Dr. Conant's committee it was reported that a "total of 59 percent of the male youth between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed." Most of these individuals were school dropouts, though the unemployment rate in that particular community, even for high school graduates was a staggering 48 percent.

The tragic waste of school dropouts, however, is intensified by the realization that many of those who leave school do so not because they are intellectually incapable of continuing, but for financial or family reasons, or because they see no realistic goal being fulfilled. According to a study of seven cities, the Bureau of Labor Statistics determined that over half of the high school dropouts—54 percent—were of at least average intelligence. This, Mr. President, indicates an alarming shortcoming, not only in our educational system, but in our entire social structure itself.

It is encouraging to note the activity now taking place in the District of Columbia—in large measure under the stimulus of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy—which is devoted to bringing the dropouts and potential dropouts back to school this fall.

Similar efforts are being conducted in some 63 cities throughout the country, following the urging of President Kennedy when he met with educators at the White House in June. The program is being coordinated by Commissioner Francis J. Keppel, of the Office of Education, and is receiving the cooperation of the Labor Department and welfare administrators. In addition, President Kennedy earlier this month allocated $250,000 from his emergency fund to the cities so that they might bring their school counselors back early in order to call on parents and students.

These are all commendable efforts, and doubtless, many students will be salvaged. But the underlying problems of inadequate education, unrealistic curriculums, high unemployment and juvenile delinquency will not be solved by exhortations addressed to our young people.

The Congress has already enacted such legislation as the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act which partially treat some phases of these problems. But much more remains to be done.

The Senate has passed the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, and we are awaiting action in the other body. S. 1716, which I introduced and which has been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will further strengthen the Manpower Development and Training Act. If the Senate moves favorably on the measure, as I am hopeful it will, our retraining program will continue to progress toward eliminating some of the ravages of chronic unemployment.

In addition, however, the Congress must face its responsibility to American youth and to American society by acting on the President's comprehensive National Educational Improvement Act of 1963. There is no more critical legislation on our agenda this year, and we will not have kept faith with the American youth of today and tomorrow if we fail to act favorably on this measure.

The philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, eloquently and truthfully stated the problem when he wrote:

> The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in the August 30 issue of Life magazine is one that I think all Members of the Congress should read. We have come a long way scientifically in our short history as a nation, but at no time in that period have we adequately set out to explore what the oceans of the world can do for us and the peoples of the world.

It makes sense to me that the ocean, which is the ultimate depository of all of our minerals, must be a source of wealth whose size defies the imagination. It must be true that if the ocean is the final depository of the plant life of our country, there must be a source of food in the ocean sufficient to defy hunger any place. The oceans came with the cooling of the earth so there must be untapped mysteries contained in their waters, the answers to which could prolong life, sustain life, and make life better for all the peoples of the world.

I believe that Life's position that the needed money should go into oceanography is a sound one and, frankly, one that makes more sense to me than by chasing after the illusionary moon.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two Billion Three Hundred Million Dollars Should Go Into the Ocean

Why has the administration announced a new program to spend $2.3 billion during the next 10 years on oceanographic research?

Why does the administration want to parcel out this sum among the U.S. Navy and 14 agencies—with 56 percent of it allocated for the kind of basic research once defined as finding out what questions to ask?

Why should the U.S. Congress and the U.S. public tolerate, let alone support, such a vaguely defined, long-range and perhaps open ended exercise in Federal spending?

The answers lie in the very character of American geography. Even as the United States thrusts into space it does so from a continent that is in fact a large island enveloped by massive oceans. Whoever knows most about those oceans holds the advantage in the struggle for command of the seas, holds the lead in reaching for the fabulous unknown resources of the ocean floor. "Because we're such a big island the public doesn't realize this," says one of the United States most famous oceanographers, Roger Revelle of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, Calif. "We have to show the flag in oceanography all over the world."

The administration's new program, which Congress and the public should endorse, means coming to grips with oceans of ignorance just as vital as the far reaches of space.

In fiscal 1964 the United States is spending just $156 million on searching and probing the seas that cover 71 percent of the earth's surface, provide the rain, decide the climate, swirl in currents that help make a nation in Britain and a wilderness in Labrador at equivalent latitude. In the same fiscal year the United States is spending $4 billion in space. But the new administration oceanographic campaign, without prejudice to the space effort, will launch the kind of research fleet—cruisers, floating laboratories, submarines capable of exploration 18,000 feet below, a new bathyscaphe for 36,000 feet below—that can perform the critical mission. Some reasons for coming to grips with the oceans:

Defense: The United States least vulnerable strategic weapon is the Polaris-bearing nuclear submarine, 41 of which have been programed to date. Polaris sweeps enemy coastlines, invulnerable because it is undetectable. But the U.S. Navy's own antisubmarine warfare planning against the U.S.S.R.'s 450 or so submarines aims to make all submarines just as detectable and just as vulnerable as surface craft. "There isn't an ocean in the world big enough to lose the sound of a pistol fired at the right depth," said Columbus O'Donnell Iselin II of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on Cape Cod, and already the Navy has batteries of hydrophones installed on the edges of the Continental Shelves and midocean islands to locate submarines hundreds of miles away. It is essential to protect Polaris through the shifting states of the art of sea war by exploring jetstream currents submarines can ride and thermal layers and sea-floor mountains they can hide behind, also by mapping navigational landmarks in the deep. As of now only 3 percent of the ocean floor is mapped.

Food: By 1980 the United States will need perhaps as much as an added 3 billion pounds of seafood to maintain its protein diet. The needs of undeveloped nations run much higher. But the U.S. fishermen have been humbled by Russians, Japanese, and Peruvians and the proud old Yankee fishing banks off Cape Cod sometimes look like a Soviet lake. The Russians are even boasting about new floating fish factories in which automation navigates the vessel, searches out the fish, hauls in the catch, freezes it, and packages it for the long journey home. In this situation the administration wants to increase the U.S. present annual catch of 3½ million tons by 1972—among other processes, by cultivating undersea fish farms along the Continental Shelf.

Mining: The fabulous success of the U.S. offshore oil industry points the way to establishment of an underwater mining industry within 5 to 10 years. Most realistic projects are the mining of placer deposits of precious metals in shallow waters offshore, diamonds off South Africa, gold off Alaska, etc. Fifteen thousand feet beneath the Pacific near the Tuamotu Islands manganese nodules and other minerals litter the sea floor at a potential value of $1.5 million per square mile. In the administration's 10-year plan the Bureau of Mines even talks about sending an underwater "Lewis and Clark expedition" to find more metals resources. But this type of program has a deep-blue-yonder tone that bewilders inland Congressmen.

The U.S. oceanographers, a glamorous lot aboard their weatherbeaten survey ships, are going after all these prizes with unusual intramural advantages. By and large they are satisfied with the current administration budgets and they are not inaugurating the program with shouts and intrigues for "more." They also seem fairly satisfied with their loose, almost casual grouping under the Interagency Committee on Oceanography (ICO) of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. There seems remarkably little duplication and interagency bickering and there is no demand for an oceanography czar assigned to determine priorities, wipe out confusion, obliterate red tape McNamara-style. The $2.3 billion, if approved, will therefore be parceled out amicably among the Navy (36 percent), the National Science Foundation (22 percent), the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (15 percent), the Coast and Geodetic Survey (12 percent) and 11 other agencies ranging from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Public Health Service.

"The day a Russian Polaris-type submarine surfaces off New York City and waves its red flag, you bet we'd have a crash program," the Navy's oceanographers add, just in case. The Navy gets unfailingly agitated about oceanography when the Russians turn five ships loose to research the Gulf stream off the U.S. coast, which they did last summer. And the Navy is never more effective than when storming ahead on such quiet oceanographic projects as mapping the bottom of the Gulf of Siam, which it is doing right now. But the administration's program sets the Nation on course into its new oceanic age in an orderly manner that will probably render a crash program unnecessary.

What the oceanographers do want is more attention—from Congress, from the public, from places far from the sea—as they set forth on the new venture. They are getting some. Already more than 5 million skindivers are questing. Already family-type submarines are on the market. Hundreds of thousands or more Americans remember the Link trainer, that instrument of torture in which they were flung about blindly while learning to fly in what now seems like the age before last. Where was Link last week—Edwin A. Link, the inventor, that is? Now 59 years old, he was busy on the oceanography ship *Sea Diver* in Chesapeake Bay putting mice through pressure tests equivalent to pressures found at 2,000 feet below as a prelude to indoctrinating humans. The quest for knowledge changes environments, but its spirit remains the same.

FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the current debate on foreign aid an attempt must be made to maintain a historically accurate record.

The following facts are submitted for the information of the public.

Friday evening, August 23, referring to the action of the House of Representatives in cutting foreign aid authorization, President John F. Kennedy stated:

> I recall during 8 years in the Senate, from 1953 to 1960, consistently supporting the requests which General Eisenhower made as President of the United States (the New York Times, Aug. 24, p. 6).

Fact: On July 29, 1953, then Senator John F. Kennedy voted to cut the Mutual Security Appropriation Act by $50 million—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 8, page 10335.

Fact: On August 3, 1954, then Senator Kennedy voted with the majority to pass the Long amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The effect of Senator Kennedy's vote was to cut the foreign aid authorization by half a billion dollars—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 10, page 13039.

Fact: Not 1 year later, on July 22, 1955, then Senator Kennedy voted against restoring the $420 million cut from the mutual security appropriations by the House of Representatives—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11273.

Fact: Again, on June 14, 1957, then Senator Kennedy voted for the amendment reducing mutual security act appropriations for fiscal year 1958 by $90 million—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 7, page 9112.

Fact: Remaining consistent, then Senator Kennedy on June 6, 1958, voted to pass the Ellender amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1958. The effect of Senator Kennedy's vote was to cut the foreign military assistance authorization by $200 million—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 8, page 10433.

Fact: President Kennedy's voting record in the Senate followed the pattern which he established for himself while in the House of Representatives. On August 17, 1951, then Representative Kennedy rose to the floor of the House to make a plea for his amendment to cut the foreign aid program by $35 million. At that time he said:

> I cannot believe that we are going to spend this money merely to set an example to these countries, some of which are ruled by an oligarchy, which they might follow in the future themselves. I believe in military assistance to this area and that it is a good thing, but I do not think that we can afford in this country to raise the standard of living of all the people all over the globe who might be subject to the lure of communism because of a low standard of living. * * *
>
> I say it is impossible for us to think of raising the standard of living of all the low-standard countries of the world. I believe the funds provided in section 203 can well be cut by the amount in my amendment. The cuts can be applied proportionately to the programs affected.
>
> Therefore, I ask that the House accept the cut from $175 to $140 million.

In view of the President's severe castigation of the Republican Party and his flat statement as to his historic position on foreign aid, it is desirable to present the facts and let them speak for themselves.

CAPITOL HILL SEMINAR

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues in the Senate of a most interesting educational program which has been successfully conducted these past 2 years for congressional staff members.

This program, the Capitol Hill seminar, has been developed and conducted by the American Foundation for Continuing Education, a not-for-profit educational foundation which, since its inception in 1947, has been devoted to supporting and extending the liberal education of adults wherever it is appropriate in American life. The main office of the American foundation is located at 19 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

What I find most interesting about the Capitol Hill seminar is that this program has evolved out of the expressed needs and interests of members of the congressional staff and is, in a very real sense, their program.

In the fall and winter of 1961–62, the American foundation held a series of exploratory discussions with congressional staff personnel. In these interviews, congressional staffers stated their concern that their busy daily schedule and heavy workload afforded them little opportunity to examine in depth and breadth many of the major, national public policy issues which they too often viewed only in the most pragmatic, partisan, operational terms. As they put it, it was difficult to see the forest for the trees.

Out of this expression of need, the American foundation evolved the idea of developing a study-discussion seminar program which would critically examine pressing social, political, and economic issues which had implications and roots far beyond their immediate currency. This examination, it was felt, should be geared to a continuing exploration of the basic values, premises and goals of American democracy. Several congressional staff members advised the foundation on the selection of topics which such a seminar might cover and offered to organize a bipartisan group of 12 legislative and administrative assistants drawn from both Senate and House offices. Because of this strong, initial interest, the American foundation agreed in turn to develop a series of readings and conduct a test program.

In the spring of 1962, the Capitol Hill seminar was launched. Its inception marked, I believe, a new and important phase of the increasing efforts by various educational organizations to develop a variety of programs which seek to assist in refining the level of professional competence of members of the congressional staff. Because it was in the nature of an experimental program, testing new approaches, the first group held a year ago, received little general attention at the time. Two-hour seminars were held each Friday evening and Saturday morning for 6 weeks, under the leadership of American foundation senior staff members.

I am happy to report to my colleagues that this initial pilot seminar was well received by the congressional staff members who participated. Their oral and written comments to the American foundation, at the termination of that first program, convinced the foundation that important educational needs had been uncovered. The conclusion, supported by the evidence of the pilot program, was that a carefully expanded program would be warranted the following year.

A three-volume set of readings, "Readings for Capitol Hill," was designed, edited, and printed by the American foundation. The program was expanded to fourteen 2-hour seminar sessions. And I am pleased to say here that, commencing this past March, 31 hard-working members of the professional staff on the Hill joined the "Capitol Hill seminar" program. One group has been meeting on Tuesday evenings, a second on Wednesday evenings, in a conference room made available by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

What is most important to note, I believe, is that the Capitol Hill seminar program has developed out of an educational need defined by our staffers themselves. Those who have participated have expressed their concern to develop a more sophisticated sense of the whole picture, to draw back from the immediate pressures of their work and explore the larger philosophic dimensions of the questions and issues with which they are daily concerned in a pragmatic way. Thus, the Capitol Hill seminar, as developed by the American foundation in answer to this need, has attempted to encourage the participants to develop:

First. Deeper understanding of the values, premises, and goals of American democracy.

Second. Increased understanding of current issues and their interrelationships.

Third. Deeper understanding of philosophic questions underlying public policy issues.

Fourth. Greater understanding of their own values, of the implications and assumptions of their own positions.

These are not, I think, easy objectives to achieve. The congressional staff members who have participated come from various regions of the country, from both urban and rural areas, from a variety of backgrounds and experience. Moreover, they are deeply involved in the practical and partisan work of their offices, both Democratic and Republican.

The American foundation, which is a nonpartisan educational organization, has nevertheless attempted to offer a program of discussion and analysis of issues which often, in the public debates of our country, elicit highly partisan responses. The method which the American foundation employes to achieve the objectives utilize the study-and-discussion approach. The foundation has developed for the seminar a series of readings which represent a variety of different and often conflicting interpretations of crucial issues. Each session averages 40 pages of material selected to provide a balanced range of analysis and opinion drawn from the writings or speeches of persons of knowledge and concern: social scientists, experts from many fields, statesmen, politicians, philosophers, both past and present.

The foundation does not attempt to develop a consensus of opinion among the participants. Quite to the contrary, the sessions often produce fundamental disagreement among the staffers who participate. But it is a reasoned disagreement, forming part of a continuing dialog. The position taken by any one participant is subject to the careful scrutiny of the others, so that all are forced to analyze the problems and develop their own thinking on the basis of the soundest and most rigorous argument of which they are capable.

In this second year of the program, the 14 seminar sessions consisted of the following topics:

First. "National Goals and Purposes."

Second. "Freedom and Equality: Social and Educational Aspects."

Third. "Excellence and Mass Democracy."

Fourth. "Urbanization: Problems and Prospects."

Fifth. "Work, Abundance, and Leisure."

Sixth. "American Economic Growth: Why and How?"

Seventh. "Who Shall Govern?—I: Political Leadership, Public Opinion, and Public Interest."

Eighth. "Who Shall Govern?—II: Political Parties and Private Governments."

Ninth. "Who Shall Govern?—III: The Executive, Congress, and the Right To Know."

Tenth. "America and the World—I: Goals of Foreign Policy."

Eleventh. "America and the World—II: Aid to the Emerging Nations."

Twelfth. "America and the World—III: Arms or Disarmament?"

Thirteenth. "Science and Society—I."

Fourteenth. "Science and Society—II."

Mr. President, it occurs to me that the objectives of the Capitol Hill seminar program for professional staff members are highly relevant to the continued development of the professional character and status of their work on the Hill. I believe we should congratulate the staff members of our various offices who have taken the time and effort, with their extremely full schedules, to participate in this program.

The American Foundation for Continuing Education is to be applauded and encouraged in this work of providing our congressional staff, through this seminar, with the opportunity to develop and refine their understanding about, and judgment of these major questions, issues, problems of this day and age.

The Old Dominion Foundation, in helping to underwrite the costs of the second year of this program, has contributed importantly to an educational activity which I hope may be continued and expanded in future years.

In addition to 27 staff members from the House side, 16 staff members of Senate offices have to date participated in the Capitol Hill seminar. I should like to take this opportunity to list their names and offer them an expression of our support and encouragement for their interest in expending this time and effort in their continuing education.

Minor Barnes with Senator Jack Miller's office.

Miss Sally Bloom with Senator Roman Hruska's office.

Charles E. Bosley with Senator Clair Engle's office.

Bruce Feld with Senator Harrison A. Williams' office.

James A. Flood with Senator J. Caleb Boggs' office.

Ralph E. Group with Senator Warren G. Magnuson's office.

Thomas L. Hayes with Senator Winston L. Prouty's office.

William F. Hildenbrand with Senator J. Caleb Boggs' office.

George Mitchell with Senator Edmund S. Muskie's office.

Donald E. Nicoll with Senator Edmund S. Muskie's office.

Joe E. Nusbaum with Senator Gaylord Nelson's office.

Colgate S. Prentice, formerly with Senator John Sherman Cooper's office.

Allen E. Pritchard, Jr., with Senator James B. Pearson's office.

Eiler C. Ravenhold with Senator Hubert H. Humphrey's office.

Edwin N. Winge with Senator Patrick V. McNamara's office.

Olon Zagar with Senator Roman Hruska's office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time necessary for the call of the roll being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which will be stated by the clerk.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 10, beginning with line 5, to strike out all through line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 3. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "1962", "1963", and "1964" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "1965", "1966", and "1967";

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking out "$199,500,000" and "$66,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "$133,000,000" and "$44,333,333";

(3) in paragraph (2) by striking out "$4,500,000" and "$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "$3,000,000" and "$1,000,000"; and

(4) in paragraph (3) by striking out "$21,000,000" and "$7,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "$14,000,000" and "$4,666,666".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment, which is pending.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The unanimous consent fixed the time for debate on this amendment at 10 minutes to a side. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then the rollcall will take place 20 minutes from now. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment cuts one-third of the authorization for the airport grant appropriations. It cuts the amount from $75 million to $50 million a year, or from $225 million to $150 million a year over a period of 3 years.

If Congress should practice economy in any program, it seems to me it should practice economy in this one.

President Eisenhower, after 8 years experience with this program, recommended in 1960 that the airport grant program be abolished entirely. I am not asking for that. I am merely asking for a one-third cut.

Aviation is the most heavily subsidized industry in America. Seven short years ago, in 1956, the big subsidy agency for aviation, the FAA received $220 million. Today it is $885 million, a massive fourfold increase. It is true that there are more aircraft and more pilots and more miles traveled. Even in terms of miles traveled, the subsidy has doubled. In terms of aircraft, it has tripled. In terms of pilots, it has tripled.

Furthermore, in my judgment, this part of the program is less keyed to safety than any other.

Aside from the grant program, the Federal Government contributes this kind of money to the aviation industry.

For air traffic control, $35 million, all Federal money, with no local matching funds.

For research and development on air traffic control, another $41 million, all Federal money, with no matching local funds.

For air navigation facilities, another $44 million, all Federal money, no matching funds.

Air traffic control towers, all paid for by the Federal Government, no local matching funds, $47 million.

Administration of flight standards, $88 million of Federal money.

Traffic management, $208 million, all Federal, no local funds.

Facilities and maintenance for the FAA, $222 million, without any local matching funds whatever.

This particular airport grant subsidy is the least justified at all, because only one out of seven Americans ever flies or uses the airlines. Only a tiny proportion of the American people use those facilities regularly. Even a smaller proportion of the American people operate and fly their own planes.

The people who fly their own planes are fine people. They deserve credit. This is a fine industry. But there is no reason on earth why they need such heavy subsidies. These are among the people most able to pay in our society.

If we are to practice economy anywhere, this is the place. It is not like giving aid to the blind or the unemployed or the distressed. These are people who are able to take care of themselves. If we are to pay out the Federal taxpayers' money it should be based on the ability of people to pay.

Fifty million dollars a year is ample annual Federal assistance for this program. Back in the early 1950's this program varied from zero to $20 million. It skyrocketed in 1956, particularly to provide additional runways needed to take care of jet airplanes. It went up to $63 million a year. Two years ago it rose to $75 million. The committee proposes that it be continued at that high level.

The fact that the needs are not nearly as great as the committee report would suggest is shown by analysis of the tables on pages 10 to 15 of the committee report. They show, according to the airport development plan made by the FAA itself, that the total needed in Federal and State money for fiscal 1964 is only $231 million, and that includes $20 million of ineligible needs, for a gross eligible potential of $211 million.

Half of that is not, as stated in the committee report, $150 million. Half of that is $105.5 million.

Furthermore, the total needed, according to the committee report, page 13, for 1965, State, local, and Federal, is only $151 million. With $19 million ineligible the potential State, local, and Federal eligible is only $132 million. Half of that for the Federal matching portion is only $66 million even if every single program project is granted. Yet we authorize $75 million.

Furthermore, page 15, committee report, in 1966 we shall have a most unusual situation, because the table shows that $178 million is the overall State, local, Federal need for airport development. But of the $42 million called for under land acquisition, $40 million is in one State, California. The State allocations, however, show that California will receive only about $3,258,000 of that amount.

If we recognize that and cut the total for 1966 down by $38 million and another $18 million for ineligible categories the total potential eligible for monetary grants is $122 million. Half of that or the full Federal share is $61 million, even if that single last project is fully funded. Yet we authorize $75 million.

Furthermore, the only way the FAA can show even this need is by reducing safety requirements. The FAA is no longer requiring the same length runway or control towers requirements or the same requirement for navigation aids. FAA has reduced all these requirements. So the local communities can provide only half the money that used to be needed and still Uncle Sugar will match the grants.

This new FAA policy will mean a proliferation of smaller, less safe airports. Anyone who has had political experience as Senator or Representative knows what this will do. It will mean that more and more the small towns which are 10 or 15 or 30 miles distant from a bigger town will seek to have their own airport built. The mayor will ask for it. The bankers, the chamber of commerce, will ask for it. Pressure will be brought on Representatives and Senators to have the airports built. This means that they will be built with Federal money; and the safety factor will be reduced, instead of improved.

These airports contribute nothing to the national defense or to air safety. If they are to be built, why should not the local communities pay for them?

There is one further feature to which I should like to refer before I temporarily yield the floor. The great increase in the airport program will not be in the air carrier airports but in the general airports, those used by sportsmen and businessmen with their own planes. There is no reason why the Federal Government should subsidize general airports, because they are used by people who can afford to pay for them.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, like the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I wish to be on record as being opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I have been in aviation for a long time, from the business end and as a private pilot, and I know at first hand the need that exists, particularly in the West and in the Middle West and in the mountain areas. Federal assistance is needed. The airports need facilities in order to improve the safety and operation characteristics of the airports.

I do not know whether the Senator from Wisconsin has ever been in such a situation, but as a pilot, flying in bad weather, not knowing whether I would be able to reach the airport for which I had originally set out, it has always been a comfort to me as the pilot, and I am sure to other pilots, as well, and to all those in the airplane with him, to know that there is within reach an airport where it is possible to let down, and that that airport is equipped with adequate safety facilities.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. It is difficult in the time remaining to me to meet the objections raised by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. He spoke about the general airport system used by people who own their individual aircraft, people like farmers, salesmen, business people, and managers. The Senator believes it to be a sin for the Federal Government to put up 50 percent of the cost of airports in the smaller communities. Most of us understand, of course, that privately owned automobiles, to a large extent, cost in the neighborhood of the amount for which a small, used aircraft can be bought, and that those automobiles use the 90-percent subsidized Interstate Highway System and the 50-percent subsidized highways of the U.S. highway system, and that that formula has been a part of the law since about 1920.

We have encouraged such construction. Likewise, we have tried to have the small towns build smaller airports for the type of aircraft that those airports are designed to serve.

We do not have a fund to spend $3 million on the kind of airport that is being asked by the city of Appleton in the State of Wisconsin, but we do have a fund to try to build airports to serve the type of aircraft that will be flown on and off such runways as we have in mind.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have very little time available. I hope the Senator will be brief.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I am a strong supporter of the position the Senator from Oklahoma has taken. I know he has traveled in my own State and over much of the southwestern part of the United States. I ask him if it is not a fact from his experience that most of the common carrier transportation is now by way of airplane, and that it is absolutely essential that such transportation be afforded to people to get around, whether it be by private or commercial plane?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. It should be remembered that air transportation now carries more people than are carried by the combined passenger services of the railroads and the interstate buslines.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, since the Senator is being interrupted?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the ranking minority member of our committee.

Mr. COTTON. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for what he is saying. The record shows that the bill has come to the Senate by the unanimous action of the Commerce Committee, with every Democrat and every Republican on the committee agreeing to it.

I remind Senators that we have been trying more and more to limit the use of these funds exclusively to safety features, and deny aid to luxury items such as the construction of waiting rooms. The bill is primarily intended for those areas of the country where the need is great and where the people are ready to make sacrifices to get these funds. My own State of New Hampshire would lose $44,000 if the Senator's amendment were adopted. We are confronted with the fact that we have practically no railroad passenger services, and we are desperate. This bill would promote safety, and it is essential. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership in this field. I stand with him 100 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The Senator from Wisconsin alleges that the total amount of work to be done is $150 million. He will see, if he will read the record and examine the statistics in the record that the $150 million is the amount that the municipalities and States are ready to invest. Therefore the actual amount that is needed, instead of being $150 million, comprising $75 million of Federal money and $75 million of local funds, is actually $300 million. We have been able to match only half of it.

The Senator's amendment not only would reduce the Federal funds by $25 million, but also would cut out at least $25 million of additional funds from municipalities and States by way of matching funds. This is the share of the cost of the system, and it meets the formula that has been used for every other type of Government aid, with the exception that in some instances it is greater than that.

If the Proxmire amendment were to be adopted, it would mean drastic cuts. New York State would lose $890,357. Pennsylvania would lose $622,000 Also the FAA discretionary fund would be reduced by $8,816,000. That is money that is used to help fill in the gaps in our national airport system.

Mr. President, the proposed fund, if it were included in the military budget, would go unnoticed. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin qoted the figures for research and development of new aircraft, and apparently he would relate them to the cost of the airport system. This is a separate item and a separate fund. It represents $75 million of the Government's matching money, so necessary if we are to have an interstate transportation system. The other goes to air safety.

Mr. President, we can no more relate that cost to the cost of air safety than we can relate the cost of operating highway patrols or communications services on the highways to the cost of the highways.

So it seems to me that these funds are vital not only to the civilian use of the airports, but also to the use of the military. Without a system of civilian airports having competence for jet capacity, providing a capability to assist in military defense, this country would be far less strong in the air. Thirty-eight percent of the funds for all operations, if the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to check the air traffic control and other parts of the FAA operational budget, is spent by the FAA for military flights. The ratio of the military, National Guard, Reserve Air Force program and itinerant Air Force operations use to general use of air-carrier airports is about 50–50.

The timing of this cut would be most disastrous, if it should occur, because the country is in the second expansion of the jet age, which is bringing in medium-range jet aircraft to replace the "Connies," Convairs, and DC–6's.

The enlargement of taxiways, runways, and aprons will have to be made by many cities that have not yet received jet service but will soon be able to get it. Because of the large increase in the number of jet flights, many metroplitan air terminals will require additional jet runways when the single jet runways are unable to accommodate the traffic that wishes to use the airport.

The amount of these funds has not been elevated greatly throughout the years there has been an airport program. The amount has remained the same since 1961. In the 5 years prior to 1961, there was $63 million a year of matching money. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin would reduce the amount proposed by one-third, following a period when we had completely neglected our airport system.

In 1 year, no money was appropriated. Why does the Senator from Wisconsin not go back to that year, if he feels that $50 million is so good? He seeks to trim the amount to $50 million at a time when the construction of airports is costing much more per square yard of runway.

The figures show that the cost estimates on which the 1961 projection was made are 70 percent below the cost of the actual work that was done in 1962. The increase is necessary because the criteria have had to be advanced for the construction of jet airports, just as it has been possible to lower the criteria for DC–3's to the point where we do not overbuild in small communities.

The materials cost has advanced, as every Member of the Senate knows. It has been necessary to construct wider taxiways, heavier aprons, and longer runways. These facilities cost more money. I do not think any of us wants to turn back the clock on the most efficient type of transportation.

The Senator from Wisconsin cites the great increase in the cost per plane mile of the FAA. While this point is not at issue, he is quoting figures for the operation of the DC–3, a slower plane, capable of carrying fewer passengers. But when we apply the total cost to the statistics for the air carrier passenger miles flown, these miles run into the billions.

Since 1951, there has been an increase from 13.1 billion revenue passenger miles to 43.8 billion revenue passenger miles in 1962. The Senator from Wisconsin will find that if he figures the cost on a passenger mile basis, which is the way the statistics are kept, the cost per passenger mile in 1951 was 1.7 cents, while in 1962, it was 1.6 cents.

True, during one period, when the installation of radar had been neglected for several years, and there were many mid-air collisions, and when the air traffic control system was an invitation to sudden death because of a reduction of funds applied to it by the Department of Commerce, which was then in charge, the cost was much lower. But I do not want to go back to those days. I do not want to have any other Senator go back to them, because all of us use air service, as do other Americans. I want to make air transportation as safe as possible; and the best way to make it safe is to build adequate runways and adequate airports, clear of obstructions. Two-thirds of the accidents that occur in aviation, including deaths that occur from such accidents, are caused in the region of airports.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

First, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma said that the Federal Government provides 90 percent of the funds for highway construction—for the automobile user. But this amount is paid for by the automobile user himself in the automobile user or gasoline tax. The Senator knows that. The Senator knows that the tax on gasoline—Federal and State—pays for virtually the whole cost of the highways.

What about the tax on aviation fuel? It has declined sharply because jet fuel is not taxed. The passenger travel tax has been reduced by one-half, from 10 percent to 5 percent. The result is that although the aviation industry is subsidized to the tune of $900 million a year, only about $100 million a year is raised from taxes generated in the industry itself, in contrast to the automobile industry, where the taxes fully provide for the cost of highways.

Second, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Oklahoma continually stress safety. The fact is that safety has little to do with this particular bill. The safety factors of the FAA are handled in separate legislation, as I have emphasized, and as the Senator from Oklahoma, I am sure, fully understands. Congress appropriates an additional $800 million for various kinds of safety research, administration of safety standards, and so forth.

The Senator from Oklahoma said that if I had read the committee report, I would have seen that $300 million was provided for overall needs, and that the Federal Government would put up only half of the $150 million, which would be used to meet the Federal Government's matching requirement.

On pages 11, 13, and 15 of the Senator's own committee report the record shows that eligible project requests total—Federal and State—will be such that in 1964 the Federal share will be $105 million, in 1965 only $66 million, and in 1966, $62 million. And this is the total positive need if every single dollar of requested money is granted.

Obviously to grant all requests would be a highly inefficient way to operate any Federal program.

The Senator from Oklahoma calls attention to the statistics of passenger miles; but on the basis of the number of pilots, the number of aircraft miles flown, and the basis of the actual number of aircraft in operation, the aviation industry has been subsidized far more heavily year after year, so that now the rate is double or triple what it was 10 years ago.

The Senator from Oklahoma was precisely correct when he said that we Senators use the airlines. Senators do use the airlines. We have a strong personal self-interest in seeing to it that the bill passes; but I point out—and the fact is uncontested—that more than 4 out of 5 Americans never fly, and only 1 out of 20 uses the airlines regularly. But we who do fly can afford to pay a little more for the service and thus help to reduce the subsidy.

Furthermore, we are working ourselves into a political trap. So long as the money is available, small local communities will be asking for more of it with which to build airports to serve them, because they want such airports for prestige purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes yielded to himself by the Senator from Wisconsin have expired. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield one minute to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if the bill is not limited to safety at the airports?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. No passenger facilities are included. The bill relates to funds for runways, taxiways, aprons, and other types of installations that will contribute to air safety.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin should be adopted, it would put the program on a 50-50 basis?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; it has always been on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know, but I mean on a discretionary basis with respect to funds?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. The Senator from Wisconsin proposes to take one-third of the $75 million out of the bill. Over a 3-year period, this would amount to a $75 million reduction. That would reduce the amount of funds that have been going into airport construction at a low Federal matching rate, the $75 million contributed by the Federal Government being matched by $75 million contributed by local communities. The Senator's amendment would reduce the amount to $50 million. Obviously, that will cause a reduction in what the communities contribute, and there will be $150 million less for the construction of airports during the 3-year period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee report is a unanimous one?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. If the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin could see some of the desperate methods resorted to in the smaller communities in my State to raise money to match these funds, I think he would be quite sure that this aid will not lead to the construction of airports where they are not needed. Only when they are needed desperately are these funds raised in the small communities.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. The record will show that we are trying to meet the desperate needs of the small communities. In the large cities, such as Milwaukee and Madison, in Wisconsin, and Oklahoma City and Tulsa, in my State of Oklahoma, and in large cities in other States, the need has largely been met. Yet the proposed cut would deny the funds needed by the small communities for feeder airlines and for general aviation airports. Under the amendment, they would have no hope of obtaining such funds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This bill is subject to a subsequent appropriation, in any event, is it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. This one is the authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the fact is that the Appropriations Committee will fully fund this amount, as it has in the past—as all of us know. Once this commitment is made, we can expect all of this amount to be appropriated and spent. Furthermore, about 85 percent of this money is to be spent on land acquisition, site preparation, and paving. It will have nothing to do with safety.

Mr. President, we should let the free market determine in this transportation business, whenever possible, what facility people will use. When a Federal subsidy is overwhelming in amount, and is concentrated so heavily on one form of transportation, we do not permit the free market forces to determine an efficient economic result.

Furthermore, if we are to have any economy in Government, we certainly should vote to have it here.

We can save $75 million by adopting this amendment; and I hope it will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, is it possible to have a quorum call before the yeas and nays are taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk procedeed to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 144 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Ervin
Hickenlooper
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Mundt
Nelson
Proxmire
Robertson
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—64

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Dominick
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Bayh
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Kennedy
McClellan
McGovern
Neuberger
Pastore
Russell
Stennis
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any time remaining on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time remains.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may have one minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against this measure. This subsidy program ought to be phased out.

Recommendations were made for its phasing out 5 years ago, but the program goes on interminably, and I think wrongly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1153) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended:

(1) by striking out the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(2) by striking out the subsection heading "Airport Classifications" and all of subsection (b).

SEC. 2. Section 3(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1102(b)) is amended:

(1) by striking out the phrase "War and Navy Departments" wherever it appears in the subsection heading and text and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Defense".

(2) by striking out "such Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department".

SEC. 3. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended by striking out "1962", "1963", and "1964" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof, respectively, "1965", "1966", and "1967".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 10(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved project under this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs."

(b) Section 10(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended by striking out "(1), and the maximum United States share under subsection (a)(2),".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out the parentheses and all words within the parentheses and inserting ", not to exceed 75 per centum,".

SEC. 5. Section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1110) is amended:

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as (5) through (9), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) Appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including landing and take-off of aircraft."

(2) by striking out "(5)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)".

SEC. 6. The Federal Airport Act is amended further by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ACCESS TO RECORDS

"SEC. 21. (a) Each recipient of grants under this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the plan or program in connection with which such grants are given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the plan or program supplied by other sources and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers and records of the recipient that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader about the program for this afternoon. I presume that Senate Joint Resolution 102, relating to the railroad work rules dispute, will be laid before the Senate, but it is my understanding that both the majority and the minority have set conferences for 2 o'clock today. I wonder if the majority leader could indicate whether he proposes to move to recess the Senate at that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished minority leader is correct.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 435, Senate Joint Resolution 102, which is to be laid before the Senate and made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana to proceed to consider the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102), which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change except by agreement, or pursuant to an arbitration award as hereinafter provided, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an arbitration board to consist of seven members. The representatives of the carrier and organization parties to the aforesaid dispute are hereby directed, respectively, within five days after the enactment hereof each to name two persons to serve as members of such arbitration board. The four members thus chosen shall select three additional members. The seven members shall then elect a chairman. If the members chosen by the parties shall fail to name one or more of the additional three members within ten days, such additional members shall be named by the President. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the three arbitrators not named by the parties at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Promptly upon the completion of the naming of the arbitration board the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the board and to the parties to the dispute copies of his statement to the parties of August 2, 1963, and the papers therewith submitted to the parties, together with memorandums and such other data as the board may request setting forth the matters with respect to which the parties were in tentative agreement and the extent of disagreement with respect to matters on which the parties were not in tentative agreement. The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, incorporating in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, resolving the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of those portions of the carriers' notice of November 2, 1959, identified as "Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power" and "Consist of Road and Yard Crews" and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as "Minimum Safe Crew Consists" and implementing proposals pertaining thereto.

SEC. 4. To the extent not inconsistent with this joint resolution the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, the board's award shall be made and filed as provided in said sections and shall be subject to section 9 of said Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby designated as the court in which the award is to be filed, and the arbitration board shall report to the National Mediation Board in the same manner as arbitration boards functioning pursuant to the Railway Labor Act. The award shall continue in force for such period as the arbitration board shall determine in its award, but not to exceed two years from the date the award takes effect, unless the parties agree otherwise.

SEC. 5. The arbitration board shall begin its hearings thirty days after the enactment of this joint resolution or on such earlier date as the parties to the dispute and the board may agree upon and shall make and file its award not later than ninety days after the enactment of this joint resolution: *Provided, however*, That said award shall not become effective until all other issues in the dispute arising from the aforesaid notices have been disposed of as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 6. (a) The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, not to be disposed of by arbitration under section 3 of this joint resolution and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such issues by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed toward promoting such agreement.

(b) If any of the issues referred to in paragraph (a) have not been resolved by collective bargaining within thirty days after the award is filed in accordance with section 5 of this joint resolution, the National Mediation Board shall certify to the arbitration board the status of the issues then in dispute, and the arbitration board shall make a decision resolving these issues. The arbitration shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this joint resolution. The arbitration board shall make and file its award on these issues not later than sixty days after such issues have been certified by the National Mediation Board.

SEC. 7. The obligations imposed by this joint resolution, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall expire when all disputes covered thereby are disposed of by the arbitration herein provided or by agreement of the parties as provided in section 6(a) hereof.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 3 P.M. TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], has an introductory statement, which will require approximately one-half hour.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington the Senate take a recess until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator tell us whether he expects to try to conclude consideration of the joint resolution tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. There is not the chance of the proverbial icicle in "you know where."

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION ENDORSES YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have learned that the American Municipal Association meeting in Houston, Tex., has approved a special resolution supporting the Youth Employment Act, the National Service Corps Act, the proposed extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961, and the proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act to broaden the training opportunities available to young people.

This is indeed good news. The American Municipal Association, representing over 13,000 municipalities, is able to speak with a practical appreciation for the many difficult problems confronting our young people in these rapidly changing times. Although many opponents of these measures take special pains to allege that such legislation destroys local autonomy, or puts the local municipality at the mercy of a Federal bureaucracy, it is heartening to note that the municipalities themselves do not share these fears. They see an urgent need for these programs and they have spoken out in their behalf.

I commend the American Municipal Association and its newly elected president, Mayor John F. Collins, of Boston, Mass., for its vote of confidence in behalf of America's young people as symbolized by this resolution. Congress has made some progress on each measure noted in the resolution but, as yet, none have been sent to the White House for President Kennedy's signature. I do not believe that the 1st session of the 88th Congress can consider it has finished its work until each of these items is enacted into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this special resolution approved by the American Municipal Association be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the future of our Nation rests in great measure upon the character and development of our youth; and

Whereas our increasing population is leaving a vast, destructive wake of delinquency, drifters and dropouts among our youth; and

Whereas existing agencies and institutions, although doing a yeoman job in helping our youth learn to meet their obligations and potential, are badly understaffed and sorely in need of volunteer help; and

Whereas the problems of youth unemployment, education, and delinquency cannot be conquered unless a concerted nationwide effort is made to strike at the roots of these problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association lends its full support to those agencies and organizations today working toward the elimination of causes robbing our youth of their greatest freedom—the freedom to live in self-respect; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Municipal Association supports the following programs designed to aid existing agencies and organizations in carrying out their work with America's youth:

1. The Youth Employment Act, including the Youth Conservation Corps and the Home Town Youth Corps;
2. The National Service Corps Act;
3. Extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961; and
4. Proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act aimed at increasing the share of existing Federal training money for youth programs.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article in the morning press relating to the achievements of the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELINQUENCY UNIT REPORTS PROGRESS MADE IN 10 CITIES

(By William Rice)

The President's 2-year-old Committee on Juvenile Delinquency issued a four-page report last week aimed at buttressing its case for a 3-year extension of the 1961 Juvenile Delinquency Control Act.

The report, which tells how Federal funds are being used to start and plan anti-juvenile-delinquency projects was the administration's answer to congressional charges that the program was developing grandiose plans instead of helping children on the streets.

Though the act is not due to expire until June 30, 1964, administration efforts to get it extended met opposition in the House Education and Labor Committee as early as last April.

It came under fire from Representative ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Democrat, of Connecticut, among others, who charged a "presentable case" could not be made for continuation, since only one action project had been started with Federal funds, in New York City.

More recently Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze went before a Senate subcommittee to counter charges of waste and argue that the projects undertaken had not had time to produce results. The Senate group appeared more sympathetic than the House Committee, but neither side of Congress has reported the extension to the floor.

Sixteen cities have received money under the act. It authorized the appropriation of $10 million a year for 3 years. Celebrezze said the $12 million spent so far would be mostly wasted if Congress curtailed the program.

The report cited the following:

WASHINGTON

About 1,000 summer jobs, usually given to middle-class youths, were intentionally given to Negro youths from poor families who were counseled on the job by roving leaders.

Ten returning Peace Corps teachers will teach in Cardozo High School in the fall to see if their informal personal techniques can work in American slums.

NEW YORK CITY

In a homework helper program more than 300 bright high school students from slum schools are being paid $1 an hour to tutor failing elementary students.

Fifteen lower East Side women are being paid to act as troubleshooters with families in the area in an attempt to discover if they can help the needy in ways social workers cannot.

In Harlem 27 volunteers are working in a domestic peace corps.

ST. LOUIS

A military service preparation program offers tutoring to help prospective enlistees pass military entrance tests so they can benefit from service training.

HOUSTON

A program for Negro dropouts, taught by skilled Negro adults, is being organized to train Negro boys to fill existing jobs.

CHICAGO

A "group home" is proposed for boys paroled from institutions who have no home to return to.

LOS ANGELES

With the help of Hollywood performers, a loft studio will be established to give training and encouragement to talented youths from low-income families. The studio will also serve as a neighborhood center for entertainment programs.

Special outpost service centers will centralize problem solving agencies on a neighborhood level, making them more accessible within a large city.

MINNEAPOLIS

A "postschool counselor" program is proposed to help youths who have dropped out of school or have not gone to college by steering them to remedial education and job training programs.

NEW HAVEN

A special half day summer school program, offering informal personal instruction but no grades or credits, attracted 2,000 students.

Six schools in slum areas, instead of closing at 4 p.m., will become community centers, offering recreation, adult education, social services and places for meetings. (David Hackett, executive director of the committee, said—"The importance of this experiment cannot be overstated. It attempts to break down the wall between slum residents and slum schools.")

CHARLESTON, W. VA.

In a program similar to gang workers, the Teenage Corner, a social worker was assigned to help youths in a specific area, advising them, starting recreation programs and helping them find jobs.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

A corps of teachers reconducted a communications skills program stressing remedial reading for 60 slum children who have fallen behind in school.

DETROIT

Community Action for Detroit Youth has a job placement and training program for 17-to-20-year-olds. and will contact more than 1,000 business firms in the target area to find jobs for qualified high school graduates who haven't found work.

BOSTON

After a successful trial in a middle-class school, an experimental reading program will be introduced in six target area junior high schools. Special reading teachers will assist in each classroom so that reading becomes part of every subject and the entire school program is reading oriented.

Guidance counselors will be in selected junior high schools for the first time.

LANE COUNTY, OREG.

Community leaders, dropouts, delinquents and teachers have been cooperating in an effort to find the causes of rural delinquency and how it differs from big city delinquency.

PHILADELPHIA

Four preschool programs will begin in September using male teachers to offset the predominantly female-centered families the target area children come from. Other cities are also working on preschool programs.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON "THE VACANT STORES"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, small business friends in the Philadelphia area have brought to my attention an extremely perceptive editorial which recently appeared in the West Oak Lane Beacon and Montgomery County Beacon Journal. The editorial, titled "The Vacant Stores," speaks eloquently of the community loss involved in the closing of an independent hardware store, a neighborhood pharmacy, or other small retailer.

We are all greatly indebted to the editor and publisher of this fine, small newspaper for reminding us of our personal interest in preserving our hometown merchants. In these days of international and domestic crises and tensions, we could easily forget the serious economic plight of the Nation's independent retailers. But, I am sure that so long as the editorial voice of the Beacon Journal and like-minded newspapers remains loud and clear, the American people and the Congress will take all necessary steps to keep our community merchants strong and numerous.

It is the concern that many Members of Congress feel over the increasingly large number of vacant stores throughout the country that has prompted their support for the quality stabilization bill pending in both Houses.

While there has been a considerable attack on the bill, I have not found anyone who has proposed a better alternative with respect to the difficult situation confronting the independent retailer merchant in America, who is the victim today of high interest rates, of monopolistic competitions, and of discounters. Until some of the editors of the large newspapers and some of the governmental officials can point out a better alternative than the quality stabilization bill, I think they would be well advised to be a little more moderate in their condemnation.

I am keenly interested in the survival of our private enterprise economy. Mere pleasant-sounding words about the value of an independent free enterprise economy are not adequate. There must be some kind of remedial action, some kind of legislative protection. One of the purposes of the quality stabilization bill is that legislative protection.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "The Vacant Stores," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VACANT STORES

Is the American consumer buying himself into a dead end corner that may deny him needed and sometimes vital services. We recently had an experience that opened our eyes to this possibility.

We are not very apt in the multitude of do-it-yourself jobs that are becoming increasingly essential for successful suburban life. By good fortune we became acquainted with a local hardware store, where two salesmen always seemed to have unlimited time to discuss our trouble, find the right gadget for us, explain its use and application. Somewhere in this store they always had just what we needed. And it never seemed to make a difference in the time, help, and patience extended, even if the total sale were 25 cents. Our conscience was relieved when we found that our annual purchases, sometimes in big units, came to quite a respectable figure.

Recently, in need of help for a minor repair, we sought our friends and advisers in this hardware store. To our dismay it was dead and empty. Search and inquiry soon showed that there were now no hardware stores in this prosperous community of 15,000 people. Ten years ago there had been three.

Instead, we have nearby a Sears, Roebuck store, with a large and glittering hardware department, all in open display; a big Korvette with a bustling hardware department, and a big new discount store apparently determined to outshine the other two. Unhappily, none of the salespeople in these stores had time for our problem, nor did they seem to want to understand it, although a little later a neighbor with amused tolerance fixed the trouble in a few minutes and assured us it was routine. Since then we have discovered that the product we want is not to be found in these stores unless it is something everyone else wants and something that can be picked up and taken to the cash register without fuss and bother. Gone forever, apparently, are those warm and friendly stores that always seemed to have those odd items you might want occasionally, and the staff people willing to take the time to explain them to you.

Perhaps if it had not been for this experience, we would not have noticed the boasting of another neighbor who had discovered that he could save as much as $4 a month by taking his prescriptions away from the local pharmacy we each go to and giving them to a nearby chain discount operation. The many little things that this local druggist has done for us, in a perfectly businesslike way, have earned some claim for gratitude. For instance, when he is very busy, he seems to know who needs help and service fast and who can wait a little. We have a feeling that we are not numbers, dates, and obscure medical words to him, but human beings, many of us troubled. We feel security in that he or an assistant are always to be found in the store from 9 a.m. until midnight and that a bell ring or a phone call will always find one of them.

Our neighbors who have taken their normal drug business to the discounter, in an emergency or when in need of special help, can, of course, still run back to the neighborhood druggist. The trouble is, can they be sure the druggist will be there?

SENATOR FONG'S ELOQUENT ADDRESS ON AMERICAN IMMIGRATION POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, regrettably I was not on the floor Friday afternoon when the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] delivered his eloquent and richly documented address on the need to amend the Nation's immigration statutes. But from my study of the speech in the RECORD, I wish to commend my good friend from Hawaii for his forthright and intelligent statement. It surely ranks as one of the most thoroughly researched and factual addresses delivered on this subject in many years.

We are fortunate that a man of the vision and understanding of the Senator from Hawaii has brought this immigration matter to our attention.

I am proud to cosponsor both S. 747 and S. 1932, the two principal bills pertaining to a thorough revision of the immigration and naturalization laws. I realize that the Judiciary Committee has a difficult task in determining the precise nature of the final product that should be brought to the Senate floor. But I join with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] in urging prompt consideration of both bills and hoping for an overwhelming vote in favor of updated, just, and humane procedures relating to immigration.

The President of the United States has sent us his message on this subject, and has proposed legislation which has been introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. The recommended changes are long overdue; our Nation is that much poorer for tolerating such archaic and unjust immigration policies in recent years.

Once again, I compliment the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] for his statesmanlike contribution to the Senate's consideration of American immigration policies.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished and able Senator from Minnesota for his kind remarks. He has been in the forefront of those who desire to enact a fair, just, and impartial immigration law. The efforts of the Senator from Minnesota in this regard have been sustained, eloquent, and persistent. I am happy to associate myself with the Senator. I hope our efforts will result in bringing forth a just and fair law, which will be a credit to our Nation and to our sense of fair play and justice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Hawaii. He is deserving of more commendation than I could give to him. His voice in regard to social justice and humane legislation is much needed and greatly appreciated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I join both Senators in expressing appreciation of the fact that immigration legislation should be discussed on both sides of the aisle. Our immigration policy has been quite harmful in regard to international affairs, and very unjust at home. There are dozens of private bills on the calendar which show how unjust it has been.

I have heard the Senator from Hawaii speak on this subject previously, with great eloquence. I know the country is grateful to him for his remarks.

I hope that we may take some resolution now, that we shall not any longer submit to the "hold-ups" at the point of a gun for an insignificant immigration amendment, with regard to the admittance of a few hundred people, in order to keep us away from the idea of doing something basic about immigration policy.

I hope the President's message will signal that we shall no longer submit to that kind of blackmail. That is what I call it. I hope that we can face the issue of the immigration laws, rather than take stop-gap measures. Since we are usually told if we do not take them the bill will be pulled off the calendar, which would hurt a few hundred people or 1,500 people, we submit. At least, that is what we have done.

I hope this will steel our determination against that procedure. I join with the Senators from Minnesota and Hawaii in this dedication. I congratulate them both for their fine positions on this subject.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield, of course.

Mr. FONG. I also want to thank my colleague the Senator from New York for his fine words, and congratulate him for his very constructive work in trying to reform our immigation laws. My distinguished colleague from the State of New York has worked very diligently on this matter. He has been most active in the movement to reform these unfair laws. I know, since 36 Senators have joined this effort, that we will have an excellent chance to enact a fair and just law for our Nation.

I am pleased and proud to join the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York, together with the other Senators who have cosponsored both bills, in working to amend the law.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times—and I am sure similar articles appeared in other newspapers—there was a special article entitled "Cut in Latin Fund Alarms U.S. Aids—Alliance for Progress Held Imperiled by House Action."

I recognize the rules of comity that exist between the two Houses of Congress. I rise today, as I did in my home State yesterday, to protest as sharply and as sincerely as I can the unwise, unprecedented, unfortunate, and irresponsible action of drastically cutting the foreign aid authorization bill last week.

We have invested billions of dollars in foreign aid, and we are beginning to invest a substantial amount of human resources, as well as material resources, in Latin America. We are late in Latin America. It may even be that we are too late. Nevertheless, we are making a determined effort to try to help those good people in Latin America who love freedom and who believe in democratic institutions to survive and grow and develop their countries. But, Mr. President, if the cut that was voted in the House of Representatives were to be sustained by the Senate, for all practical purposes we would eliminate and wash out every investment we have made in Latin America.

In country after country our Nation, from public and private sources, with public and private funds, has a large investment already in Latin America and in Central American areas. Yet the cut that was made in the past week will take off not what is known as fat, but, as the Secretary of State so wisely put it, will cut into the bone, muscle, and sinew of our foreign aid program.

I know foreign aid is not a popular subject, but everything that is difficult ceases to be popular. If Congress were interested only in tying itself to a popularity contest, it would have no reason for being here. We are supposed to be able to make tough decisions. We are supposed to be able to do what is right.

The foreign aid program was considered by a carefully selected Committee headed by General Clay. As a result of that committee's action, the President reduced the foreign aid request by $400 million. Then a further reduction was made in the foreign aid program authorization by the appropriate committee in the other body. This threatened additional $565 million reduction, which cuts into the loan funds, repayable in dollars; cuts into Alliance for Progress funds; and cuts into the technical assistance fund; and for all practical purposes maims and wounds the foreign-aid program.

It is easy for people to make loud talk about Castro and communism. In the Congress of the United States are some of the most militant anti-Castroists and anti-Communists to be found anywhere in the world. They want to bring about all kinds of action, including even aggressive military action, including blockades which are hazardous, expensive, and dangerous. But when it comes to putting up the money for a program that may very well mean life or death for a country like Peru, which today needs radical, social, and economic changes, they want to cut, and cut deeply.

The article in this morning's New York Times tells the story when it points out that in country after country this work will have to be abandoned. The start that was made will have to be stopped. The promise that was given at Punta del Este will have to be forgotten or reneged on.

Mr. President, I want to put myself on record right now, and I am not afraid of the political consequences here or at home. I believe the President's request for the foreign aid program, as modified, as finally sent to us, the second time around, with the Clay Committee's recommendations, is a minimum, and it ought to be authorized by the Senate.

I intend to do all I can in the Foreign Relations Committee, once the nuclear test ban hearings are over, to see that the full amounts are granted. If the Senate does less than that it will jeopardize everything we have worked for these many years in these highly critical and important operations.

Of course, foreign aid works slowly in Latin America. Of course, it works slowly in Asia and Africa. Those are not industrial countries. They are not all highly sophisticated countries. They are in some cases countries frequently termed as backward and underdeveloped. They need development, and our help to become developed.

At the very time the Communist bloc finds itself in some difficulty, we aid and abet it by weakening our position. At the very time Castroism has suffered a serious setback, we give it an incentive to move into Latin America.

I feel that unless we reverse the action that has been taken, we shall, for all practical purposes, have given Castro a passkey to every country in Latin America. I believe that we shall have forfeited our right to world leadership.

I call upon the Senate to act in a bipartisan manner in what should be a bipartisan matter. Since I came to Congress, we gave President Truman full support in his foreign aid program, on a bipartisan basis. We gave President Eisenhower full support on a bipartisan basis. Time after time I stood on the floor and fought for President Eisenhower's foreign aid program. Yet I have witnessed this past week a bitter partisan attack on foreign aid, which was aided and abetted by some Democrats.

I hope we will have the good sense and judgment in this body to restore the record of the Congress, namely, that our foreign policy was above partisanship, and that foreign aid was dealt with as a matter of national necessity and security.

Foreign aid is as much a part of our national security as is the Military Establishment of the United States. To think of it as anything less than that is to show a lack of understanding of the situation that prevails in the world today.

The American people can and should expect the Senate to act responsibly on this issue and to help restore bipartisanship to critical areas of foreign affairs.

For the first time since World War II Republican leaders have played party politics on an issue of foreign policy and national security.

It is time for the men in Congress who talk a hard and tough line about Castro and communism in Latin America to back up their words with deeds. Right now it would appear that some Members of Congress have adopted a new motto: "Speak loudly and carry a little stick."

The action of the House, unless reversed, could give Castro a passkey to every gate and house in Latin America.

The Alliance for Progress is beginning to show constructive results. But it will be stalled and then defeated if the House's 25-percent cut in the economic development authorization for Latin America stands.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is saying words of the most historic importance to our Nation and the Senate. As the Senator from Minnesota serves on the Foreign Relations Committee, and as the Foreign Relations Committee is going to deal with this question, I should like to add, if I may, three points:

First, I wish to associate myself with the Senator's conviction that foreign aid is the offensive of the United States against communism, and that we tend to destroy that offensive unless we take a more constructive view than, in my opinion, the other body has in acting on the authorization for foreign aid. So I join the Senator in any efforts to correct what has been done.

But I would be less than honest if I did not say to the Senator that I read certain lessons in this action. The Senator from Minnesota has given gifted leadership in this field in the Foreign Relations Committee. So I hope the Senate will pay strict attention to this aspect of the problem. I feel there is unhappiness over the fact that the private enterprise system has not been adequately introduced within the processes of foreign aid and that really major actions have not been taken on that score. I believe it can be done, and I believe, quite honestly, that not enough enterprise has been shown in AID, or by previous administrations, for that matter, in order to do that.

To take an example out of the air, as it were—but it is a proper example—there is serious concern about the fact that private enterprise is not encouraged, but discouraged from involvement in hundreds of countries to which we are giving foreign aid, and it is made known that the Government would rather do it itself.

There is a deep feeling in many quarters that the World Bank would be an excellent agent for the foreign-aid funds of the United States, in putting together the foreign aid funds with consortia of private enterprise. There are probably dozens of other ways, but I commend to the Senator the amendments—and I have some myself—which are before the Appropriations Committee to introduce private enterprise more effectively into this program.

There is great unhappiness at the idea of seeking to introduce social reforms into Latin America under the cover of the Alliance for Progress. I thoroughly agree with such social reforms, but the question is whether it will work, or whether we will get social reforms faster if economic aid under the Alliance for Progress is operated as an economic matter, in a businesslike way, first producing greater economic strength, and whether we should not lay social reforms aside for the moment. However, be that as it may, we know that most people will choose the path of social reform once they get some economic security and economic well-being.

There was an excellent article on this subject published in the New York Times Sunday magazine of yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent, with the Senate's permission, to have it appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1963]

ANOTHER VIEW OF THE LATIN AMERICAN PROBLEM

(By John Paton Davies, Jr.)

LIMA, PERU.—A lot of effort and money has gone into the attempt to make a better life for the people of Latin America. Yet there is a general feeling that little progress is being made, even that ground is being lost.

The U.S. Government furnished about a billion dollars last year to the fight against poverty, ignorance, and disease in the good neighborhood. The Congress is now being asked for nearly as much again. In addition, there is our human contribution: more than 1,400 scientists, teachers, technicians, and other specialists in the aid programs throughout Latin America, and 1,300 more in the Peace Corps.

Nor have the Latin Americans been idle, as some critics imply. From the Rio Grande to Tierra del Fuego, governments, private organizations, and individuals are working in their own fashion to develop their countries.

Still, with all that has been and is being done, the poor remain piteously poor, and ignorant, and diseased—and multiplying. And the rich—most of them are still rich. The gap between the poor and the rich is the most publicized characteristic of the Latin American scene. Although such disparities exist in other parts of the world, it is the Latin American gap which arouses our greatest indignation. Someone must be the villain of the piece. Who but the rich, the oligarchs?

This excited generalization is more misleading than enlightening. What are we talking about?

The rich, assumably, are that 5 percent of the Latin American population which, we are told, accounts for some 30 percent of the area's consumption. The aggregate consumption being low, this ratio is theatric rather than genuinely dramatic. For in that 5 percent are not only the relatively few millionaires with great haciendas, yachts, and polo ponies, but also many more who are what we would consider well off rather than very wealthy.

Implying that the rich are an oligarchy is to misrepresent the power structure of Latin America. No country in the area is governed exclusively by a few wealthy men or families. Ecuador and Guatemala, for example, currently have governments of the few. But the few are military men, not plutocrats. The truth is that power in Latin America is usually shared in fluctuating combinations among the very rich, the military, politically inclined professional men, and a growing number of variegated Marxists from all classes.

Still, it is argued, the rich are an obstacle to progress. There is that tiny minority among them, living lavishly, almost like foreigners on the fringe of their own countries, parasites on their national economies, stashing away their ill-gotten, feudal extortions in Swiss banks and, when not cavorting on the beach at Copacabana, jet-setting to the fanciest spas of the old world.

There are indeed some who live more or less in this colorful fashion, trying to keep up with their kind elsewhere. But it is correct that they are a tiny minority. And they are not as important in the total scene as they are popularly represented. Latin America's fate does not lie in their manicured hands.

Most of the rich are very much a part of their countries. They are the most productive part. They live well, some luxuriously. But so did the men who laid the groundwork of American economic strength: the Astors, the Goulds, the Armours, the Carnegies, the Harrimans, and the Rockefellers.

The rich pay their labor the wages of the country, which are low, but steadily rising. Whether it be growing crops or mining or manufacturing, they are in business with the incentive of profit. Many export their products to compete in the world market against commodity producers on other continents, also paying low, or lower wages. Or they must compete against subsidized production—for example, against American export cotton with its 8½-cents-per-pound subsidy.

These Latin employers can recognize that raising all wages voluntarily would be, theoretically, enlightened self-interest. But unless productivity also rises, which they have good reason to doubt, wage increases might well price their exports out of the market, with disastrous consequences to themselves and their workers. They therefore tend, like businessmen elsewhere, to make across-the-board wage raises only when unions or the government cause them to do so.

Being the product of traditional Latin civilization, most of the wealthy live by the Latin conception of civic and business ethics, which differs from the Anglo-Saxon—as from the Hindu, the Japanese or the Arab. In their relations with individuals and the government, they are more personal than the Anglo-Saxons. Matters are more likely to be arranged and compromised rather than enacted and enforced.

This does not contribute to administrative efficiency in the Harvard Business School or Bureau of the Budget sense. But it is the way things are done. And the torrent of foreign advice to straighten themselves out is received with more patience and tolerance than one could imagine being mustered by the National Association of Manufacturers, were it subjected to moralistic nagging by European Socialists, insisting that free enterprise does not meet America's need to move ahead on social reform.

The rich are accused of being "not overly enthusiastic about * * * domestic investment" and of putting money away in American and European banks for a rainy day. So far as this is true, it is because in most of Latin America it looks politically stormy—from showers of redistributed wealth to cloudbursts of revolutionary confiscation. And everything that the Latins hear from north of the Rio Grande heightens this apprehension. They would not be prudent custodians of their children's futures if they did not tuck away something abroad for all of them.

That there are so many children (for the rich generally share with the poor a wealth of babies) means that the assets of the prosperous are automatically being redistributed among its progeny. As almost none of the fortunes are really all that grand by American standards, even the very rich are in a process of spreading their wealth thinner.

The hope of Latin America should lie with those privileged men who were sent by discerning fathers (as they are now sending their own sons) to MIT, to the London School of Economics or to Oklahoma State. These are the ones who would seem best equipped to make a workable synthesis of the three worlds which they know: the traditional Latin-American, the computerized, socially tranquilized Yankee, and the uncomputed, untranquil Latin America now aborning. These men have made a contribution far out of proportion to their numbers. But there are not enough of them. And it is asking a bit too much to expect them to transform a society in a hurry.

So it is perhaps not wrong to say that they who should be the architects of the Latin future may not be so—excepting as they forget or abandon many of their inclinations toward and lessons in rationality and efficiency. For a society out of balance and maladjusted, in a near-revolutionary situation, reason is usually a faint, fading voice. In such a body politic, the spleen and the fist often take over from the brain.

What are the evidences of maladjustment in Latin America?

The population of the area is some 200 million, with the world's highest growth rate: nearly 3 percent per year. This projects to 600 million by the end of the century.

Because Latin America has ample space, even this extreme rate of human multiplication would be supportable were economic development keeping pace. But the annual economic growth rate per capita, as calculated by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, is 1 percent. To foster economic growth, according to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, it should be at least 2½ percent.

Half of the population, says the Commission, has an average annual income of $120 and accounts for only 20 percent of consumption. And in exports, vital to earning foreign exchange, Latin America advanced during the period 1953–60 a mere 13 percent in contrast to a world increase of 56 percent.

Nearly two-thirds of the Western Hemisphere is, then, an area of lagging growth—in everything but more mouths to feed. There is a lag in capital formation, a reported flight of domestic capital and a decline in American investments. With the fall of commodity prices on the world market, the Latin Americans earn less for what they produce. And with the rise in cost of manufactured goods, they pay more for the farm tractors, mine compressors, and other machinery to produce the commodities they need to earn their way in the world.

None of these countries are highly industrialized. Nor can they industrialize rapidly. They do not have enough capital and, even though others were to supply it, neither do they have sufficient trained manpower to do the job speedily.

How has it been proposed to deal with this staggering problem? There are, basically, two approaches to moving a society from underdeveloped to developed. One is the old-fashioned do-it-yourself process. This is the tougher of the two. For the other is to do it with foreign aid.

England was the forerunner of self-help development. Through the innovation of the Industrial Revolution, it progressed to the most advanced and powerful position of the 19th century.

The Japanese, following the same prescription, transformed themselves in about one generation from archaic feudalism, from being the subject of sentimental opera and the butt of Gilbert and Sullivan spoofs, to the status of world power.

The Russians also did it, essentially on their own. They operated on the basis of ideological superstitions and were, therefore, spectacularly inefficient. Nevertheless, they were able to make the grade, with a slowly rising standard of living, because of their unusually rich endowment of natural resources.

In the transition of these three to developed societies, there were certain conditions in common. There was a ruling group which, notwithstanding internal differences, instinctively or by disciplined plan, forced the development of the country and the creation of wealth. Of the wealth created, a trickle was tapped off into good living by the small elite which managed the process. The mainstream was reinvested in economic expansion and arms. The wealth was not shared with the general population. On the contrary, the poor not only remained impoverished, but capital formation was in part extracted from the needy.

Because this was a painful process for the majority, repressions and controls were necessary. The peasantry and the factory workers were held down to a subsistence level, at least in the early stage of development. This tough solution can now be attempted only by dictatorships. Modern free societies will not countenance the sacrifice of two or three generations to forced national development.

So, for a democratic Latin America, the harshly proven course is unacceptable. A new, indulgent formula is needed to move a society from underdeveloped to developed. The Alliance for Progress is represented as that modern formula.

Its charter portrays a broad offensive on a sweeping front: Capital formation, production, education, public health, housing—plus social justice, democratic processes, land reform, tax reform and a rising standard of living. The commitment is to change more than the structure of Latin society; it is to change also its ethics. This is to be progress free of exploitations, the birth without pain of affluent, upright, democratic societies. The timetable set is 10 years from 1962.

Obviously, such a transformation could not be wrought on a do-it-yourself basis. Foreign help is thus an integral part of the program.

It was reckoned at Punta del Este that the Latin countries themselves would in a decade have to generate $80 billion. Foreign sources, governmental and private (both primarily American), were to contribute $20 billion.

The feeling of urgency about the Alianza and dedication to reform of the Latin social structure originated essentially in Washington. They grew out of acute anxiety over the spread of Castroism. We felt that we had to force through democratic evolution before the Fidelistas took over by revolution.

Social reform and economic development were supposed to proceed in tandem in the Alianza. The general impression in Latin America, however, is that social reform takes precedence, a reversal of the historic order.

The Kennedy administration's resolve to push reform is unexceptionable in moral intent. But it is politically naive and inoperable. The determination to make over the Latin American social structure has aroused suspicion, when not hostility, without attracting in the area a strong alignment of supporters. The two most powerful elements—the rich and the military—suspect that the Alianza is a Yankee maneuver to diminish their influence. In this they are not far wrong.

As for an upsurge of popular support, Dr. Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia and an ardent supporter of the Alianza, summed it up in June. "The truth is that one cannot see anywhere in Latin America the spirit of enthusiasm that should precede and go along with such a formidable adventure."

The administration, apparently, had not thought through the implications of its policy. If one advocates a crash program to upset an established social order, resistance should be anticipated. And if the undertaking is serious, then one should be willing and prepared to follow through to overcome the resistance when encountered. But this, on belated second thought, our Government seems unwilling to do. And quite rightly so. For to try to force through the reforms would reduce our relations with the rest of the hemisphere to a shambles, without attaining the ends sought.

What can be done about our faltering policy of a better life for the people of Latin America?

First, to be able to work effectively, quietly de-emphasize social reform. We only get ourselves into trouble by trying to make Latin America a little bit pregnant with revolution. Our Government is in no position to denounce the flight of Latin capital and the reluctance of American investors to enter the area when the administration urges drastic changes in the social system, with unforeseeable results.

"Ah," it will be countered, "but to back away from social reform will deepen anti-American feeling throughout Latin America and give the Communists valuable ammunition for their propaganda." As it happens, pushing social reform has created precious little pro-American feeling, certainly not nearly enough to offset the irritation and resentment it has generated. And as for Communist propaganda, it is not likely to be any more persuasive when distorting a program limited to economic development which creates jobs than when distorting a reformist one involving even greater gringo intervention in internal Latin affairs. In any event, fear of what the Communists might say should not be a limitless inhibition on the formulation of sensible American policy.

The problem of social reform as a criterion for aid may be eased by a proposed inter-American committee to allocate aid according to the receiving country's efforts toward self-help. Whether this body will be established and, if it is, how successful it will be remains to be seen.

Second, Washington should stop feuding with the Latin military. Our attempts to chastise juntas are selfdefeating, as has been embarrassingly demonstrated. They are also economically unsettling. The slack cliché that a military dictatorship necessarily produces a Castro-type successor is contradicted by events since the Cuban revolution. In fact, the Latin American country most threatened by internal communism is one of the most democratic and most progressive, with the highest gross national product and a near model in compliance with the Alianza program—Venezuela.

We have to adjust ourselves to the reality of continuing political influence by the military in Latin America. Beyond this, we should recognize that in the convulsive transition through which the area is passing, the situation can degenerate piecemeal into chaos. In the face of such extremities, the armed forces are the ultimate hope for maintaining order, without which even a semblance of economic development is not possible.

Furthermore, we would do well to appreciate that the military has a passionate tradition of patriotism and has recently developed a feeling for civic contribution: public works, and teaching conscripts the three R's and trade skills. All of this can go sour, for the Communists are working to infiltrate the armed forces. We only contribute to that and make the military actively anti-American by lecturing it on its proper role in society and cracking down on juntas that seize power.

Third, our primary emphasis had best be on aiding economic development. This means, essentially, helping to create and increase productivity and thus wealth and jobs, wherever we can, and are wanted.

Many democratic Latin American governments have legislated generous social security and fringe benefits for labor; as examples, 1 month's paid vacation per year and early retirement on full pay. This is indeed progressive, leaving the Alianza really little more progress to register on this front. Yet nearly all of the governments have neglected the importance of increasing productivity, essential to the welfare of both the individual worker and the state.

So our main role in Latin America is the traditional aid function that we have been performing for years. It is demonstrating how two stalks can be made to grow where one grew and how skills and machines can produce more.

It is also fostering, with modesty and tact, education in management and in labor organization. American unionists are now trying to offset the powerful Communist influence in Latin labor and to help the workers to understand the importance to themselves of advancing productivity. This is a practical step in the right direction. As for development loans, they had best be phased over to international banks and their affiliates.

Fourth, we should do everything that we can to make it possible for the Latin Americans to earn their own way in international trade. When we can help remove a block on the road to their making a respectable living, we do something solidly constructive. That is why something like the recent international agreement on coffee prices is so important. One such compact is worth millions of dollars in aid. For Latin America's greatest hope is perhaps, an improvement in its position in the international commodity market. If this does not happen, our whole aid program may well prove to be futile.

Finally, we shall have to be uncommonly patient. For Latin America is in for a long time of trouble, the end of which cannot be foretold. At best, the gap between the rich and the poor will remain wide at the close of the decade of progress. There will be disorder and violence, demagoguery and subversion. But there will also be constructive advance, and statesmanship.

The main thing for us to remember is that there are humbling limitations on what we can do to help in so turbulent and alien a situation.

Mr. JAVITS. I have made two constructive suggestions. The Foreign Relations Committee must come to the Senate for a restoration of the funds, and it must also give the Senate a reason for restoring the funds. These are two directions to which I invite the Senator's attention, in an effort to give the Senate not only the response as to what should be restored, but also a reason for restoring the funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join wholeheartedly with the Senator, as I have in the past, last year and in the years before, in the encouragement of greater cooperation on the part of our aid administration and our Alliance for Progress programs, and in the encouragement of private enterprise as a vital and absolutely essential part of this total effort that we are making. It is impossible to program work without harnessing and bringing into the program the vast contribution and the human resources and the material resources that come from our private enterprise economy.

I am proud to be associated with the Senator from New York in such an endeavor. We have been working on this subject for months. We have produced some results, but we need the cooperation of governmental sources.

The Senator's point is well taken, and it is well made, that not only will we need to restore the funds, but we will need policy guidelines along the lines to which the Senator made reference, in terms of correlation and integration of private enterprise activities into the Alliance for Progress.

So far as social reforms are concerned, this has been a very difficult problem. There has been considerable debate and discussion as to whether we ought to proceed forthwith with the economic basis, without regard to social reforms, or whether we should have an admixture. I believe that a certain pragmatic approach needs to be applied. In countries where reforms are being made or ought to be made, where there is a need for them, a greater amount of programing should be had, and greater attention paid to them. In other countries, where reforms are slow, it should not mean that we must stop economic progress; nor does it mean that we must punish people. Rather, what we ought to do is view the situation as it comes up. The

Congress should very carefully scrutinize what is going on in each country.

These are policy matters, and I believe they deserve most careful and mature attention. However, all the policy in the world is meaningless if plasma of the economic bloodstream is cut off or reduced. I do not care how much policy we have, how much programing we have; if we do not have economic resources to put that policy and programing into effect, it will fail.

We have made plenty of mistakes in our foreign aid program. We are dealing with people in faraway places. We are confronted with a difficult situation. We must work in countries where we are carrying on the programs of cooperation with officials of the public and private sectors of those countries. We are frequently hampered by laws, practices, and traditions in certain countries.

However, we have demonstrated some results in countries, for example, like Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela. Improvements are beginning to show because of the Alliance for Progress.

This program is only 2 years old. We cannot remedy 200 years of abuse and 200 years of mismanagement and 200 years of exploitation in 2 years. It took us one year to establish the organization. It took us at least a year to design the organization. Now, after a little more than two years, starting in 1961, we are told by some to get ready to cut back the program, because, it is said, it does not work well enough. I thought Congress was critical of former President Eisenhower, and of President Kennedy also, because the program did not go far enough in advance.

I heard arguments made only 3 years ago to the effect that we had to plan for at least 5 years in advance, that we ought to make commitments for 5 years. Have Senators forgotten that former President Eisenhower recommended to Congress that there be a 5-year commitment under the development loan program? Have Senators forgotten that President Kennedy joined in the same recommendation?

There was no partisanship in that program. It has been said repeatedly that if a business institution were operated on a 1-year basis, as Congress had insisted that this program be operated, it would automatically go bankrupt.

We have tried to make some plans during this administration and during the previous administration, at Punta del Este and at Bogotá, whereby we laid down a program for and an economic and political revival in Latin America. It was a far-reaching program. The problems are staggering. The need is paramount. We said that we would work in cooperation with our neighbors and partners in Latin America for at least 10 years into the future. We pointed out we would make a substantial contribution, but that 90 percent of the effort and 90 percent of the resources would have to come from Latin America. The 10 percent that we would put into the Alliance for Progress in the form of loans or technical assistance or grants is the difference between success and failure. Any man who has operated a business knows that the difference between solvency and insolvency may be only a matter of 2 percent in the profit margin, or 5 percent in sales.

We are faced with exactly the same situation under the foreign aid program. If we reduce it drastically, as has been suggested, then for all practical purposes we kill it. I say that if we want to protect the American taxpayer, and if that is the only interest we have, without regard to the future of America in the years to come, then we might consider cutting out the whole program. I say that because what we would be doing then would be to spend a little more than $3 billion. If the policy that has been advocated in the other body is followed, the $3 billion will be wasted. The difference between success and failure may very well be in the amount that was cut. I am not going to take a lackadaisical attitude. I wish to say that I am as much in favor of effective foreign aid as I am for an effective defense program. I do not believe we can spend money to defend the security of this Nation without an effective foreign aid program. An effective foreign aid program requires financial commitment, not financial finagling; not playing reckless games, with respect to the financing of the particular projects to which we have given our honor—our sacred honor—and our good faith.

I ask every Member of Congress to remember the commitments we have made to our friends in this hemisphere and elsewhere. When they do, I think we will come to our senses in the Senate and act like a responsible body, people worthy of the mantle of leadership.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the business pending before the Senate is Senate Joint Resolution 102, which was reported by the Committee on Commerce on Friday, the report having been made to the Senate before midnight of last Friday. The joint resolution concerns a matter which has been in the minds of many Members of Congress, the public, and the executive branch of the Government for some time.

At the outset, I should like to say that once in a while a suggestion has been made in the press and elsewhere that perhaps the committees involved, in both the Senate and the House, might have tackled this problem prior to last week. The subject was under consideration most of last week by the Senate Committee on Commerce.

I think it would be only fair to say, on behalf of the members of the committee, and perhaps every Member of Congress, both Senate and House, that there was a tendency to hold off, as it were, in deciding what to do about this problem, knowing full well the situation involved, in the hope that the parties concerned in the so-called railroad dispute would come to an agreement.

I think it also well to have the RECORD show that during all of last week and the week before, members of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, our counterpart, were in constant touch with the parties, by way of private conferences, telephone calls, and meetings. On last Wednesday, the Senate Committee on Commerce had a meeting with both parties, the meeting lasting 5 hours. Perhaps we were father to the thought, because we reluctantly proceeded by legislative process into this type of dispute, but for a time it appeared as though there might be some hope that the parties would come to an agreement with respect to their particular difficulty. We were highly conscious of the deadline set by management, which will be 12:01 a.m. Thursday, August 29—this week. But we also know that there is nothing particularly sacred about that exact date; that if it appears that progress will be made, either legislatively or among the disputants themselves, or in both ways, of course the deadline could be postponed for a matter of days or for a time, so that we might achieve what I am sure everyone wishes to achieve—a settlement.

In beginning the discussion of the joint resolution today, I direct attention to some of its technical aspects. I shall probably go into more detail than I usually do in discussing legislative proposals, because this is a highly complex subject, which requires that the record be made perfectly clear.

The joint resolution relates to a work rules dispute of long duration between the five organizations of operating railroad employees and some 170 of the Nation's principal railroads.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to forestall, by a method equitable to both parties, a nationwide strike in opposition to certain work rules which the carriers propose to impose at 12:01 a.m. Thursday, August 29.

Such a development would disrupt drastically the Nation's interstate and foreign commerce, paralyze the economy, throw millions of nonparticipants involuntarily out of work, impair the national defense, and have adverse and probably disastrous effects on the public health.

The reporting of the joint resolution, I admit candidly, is an unusual action, compelled by unusual circumstances. It is an action that I hope will never have to be repeated, an action warranted only by the nature of the emergency which today confronts us—and confronts the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

RECESS UNTIL 3 O'CLOCK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 3 o'clock; and that at that time the distinguished Senator from Washington, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, once again be allowed to resume the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, following the recess, I shall resume this review of the facts as the committee sees them. I hope many Senators will listen to it, because a number of them have asked me this morning about some points. I feel certain that the explanation will clear up any uncertainties which Senators may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate now stands in recess until 3 o'clock, at which time the Chair will recognize the Senator from Washington.

(At 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 3 o'clock p.m. today.)

At 3 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair).

FURTHER RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4330) to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he proposes to keep the Senate in session late tonight, and whether there is a likelihood of any votes today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The session will run fairly late. Whether or not there will be any votes remains to be seen.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I started to make a statement regarding the joint resolution before the Senate, and then the Senate was required to recess for a period of time. It took a little longer than was expected, so I did not get very far in my statement. For the benefit of Senators who were not present, I shall begin again. It will add only about 2 minutes to the general statement.

Mr. President, this joint resolution relates to a work rules dispute of long duration between five organizations of operating railroad employees and some 170 of the Nation's principal railroads.

The purpose of the resolution—in the public interest—is to forestall, by a method we hope will be equitable to both parties, a nationwide strike in opposition to certain work rules which the carriers propose to impose at 12:01 a.m., Thursday.

Such a development would disrupt drastically the Nation's interstate and foreign commerce, paralyze the economy, throw millions of nonparticipants involuntarily out of work, impair the national defense and have adverse and possibly disastrous effects on the public health.

Submission of this joint resolution, I admit candidly, is an unusual action, an unusual action compelled by unusual circumstances.

It is an action that I hope and pray will never have to be repeated, an action warranted only by the nature of the emergency which today confronts us—and confronts the Nation.

The fact is that we are up against the gun in an hour of crisis.

The reason why we are against the gun—or two guns if we prefer—is that the adversary parties in this dispute for nearly 4 years have been adamant and virtually unyielding in their demands or in their resistance to the demands of the opposing party.

I do not say this in criticism of either party because each has been motivated by conviction.

Congress, and the public generally, is caught in the crossfire.

Although during the hearings before the Committee on Commerce each party was disposed to blame its adversary for the failure to reach a settlement, neither I nor the committee propose to weigh the merits or demerits of these contentions.

It is not the history of this dispute, however lengthy and involved, which confronts us.

What does confront us is the present reality that no settlement at this hour has been reached.

The Nation cannot afford the potential effects of the existing impasse and its threatened aftermath.

This threatened aftermath is what has compelled the committee to recommend passage of the joint resolution, although some amendments I understand will be proposed not to the basic concepts of the joint resolution but to certain procedures therein involved.

This joint resolution is before the Senate because the committee recognizes and is keenly aware of the potential impact of a nationwide railway strike, and for no other reason.

Such a strike would hurt the Nation, hurt railway management whose new work rules the operating unions have declared unacceptable, and hurt the operating employees who are using a historic economic weapon—a work stoppage—to resist these work rules.

I think I should stress right now that the resolution before the Senate does not resolve the issues in this dispute. It does not affirm or reject any of the work rules or proposed work rules in dispute.

Neither, for that matter, would a strike resolve the issues. Should there be a strike it is still a fact that at some time, some place, the opposing parties would have to sit down together and negotiate a settlement.

The Committees on Commerce of the House and Senate cannot do that. Congress cannot do that. The resolution before the Senate would not do that. It is not the function of committees of Congress or of the Congress itself to resolve disputes between management and labor.

And, I may add, it never should be.

What the resolution does is set up a method by which the issues in this dispute may be resolved by representatives of the two adversary parties plus three public representatives whom the parties themselves may, if they wish to do so, choose.

Ultimately, in the event of a strike, the competing parties would have to get together anyway for their own economic survival. The effect of this joint resolution is to expedite the process.

The joint resolution also would do this:

It would prevent the imposition on August 29 by the railroads which are members of the three major railway conferences of certain work rules which the operating unions consider are intolerable.

It would prevent the operating employees of these railroads, in self-defense or in retaliation of these work rules, from conducting a work stoppage.

It protects the public interest from precipitate action by either of the adversary parties in the dispute, both of whom affect and are affected by the public interest and who, for that reason, have been vested with certain privileges by the Congress.

These are facts which I believe may well be considered in connection with this resolution. The railroads, as stated by the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, in a recent decision bearing directly on this work rules dispute, enjoy a regulated monopoly in their field.

This has been the tenor of nearly all decisions in the courts. The Railway Brotherhoods, as do other labor organizations, enjoy an immunity from the restrictions of the antitrust laws.

This joint resolution in no way impairs these entitlements.

There are other things that the joint resolution does not do.

It does not in any way interfere with the general right of Labor, either collectively or individually, to walk off the job or strike.

As a matter of fact, there is a railway strike in progress now, and it has been in progress for the past 7 months. It is not a nationwide shutdown. It does not involve a nationwide promulgation of work rules repulsive or objectionable to operating railway employees on whom they would be imposed throughout the Nation.

Distressing as this strike may be in the area served by this railroad, it does not constitute yet a major threat to commerce, or to the public safety, or to the national economy and welfare.

The joint resolution before the Senate has no application to other organizations of railway employees—19 in number according to the hearing record—who are not parties to this work rules dispute and who are commonly referred to as the nonoperating unions. Nor does it apply to management relations with these employees, who number approximately 500,000.

In the event of a strike or work stoppage these 500,000 nonoperating employees as well as the 200,000 operating employees would be off the job. For the 500,000 this unemployment would be involuntary.

The joint resolution does not apply to the thousands of other unions throughout the Nation—local, national, or international—nor to the multiplicity of industries and enterprises who employ their members. If they have differences they must resolve them on their own through collective bargaining procedures; procedures which have also been available to railway management and the railway operating unions on this particular matter for the past 3½ years.

In other words, Mr. President, this is a one-shot operation, forced upon the Congress and its committees by a singular and extraordinary circumstance, and involving parties unique in management-labor relations and in their relation to the welfare of the Nation as attested by special legislation enacted by Congress in the past in their behalf, such as the railroad 8-hour law and Railway Labor Act.

In other words, Congress has acted in this field on other occasions. The resolution does not and will not set a precedent because no exact parallel circumstance with exact parallel impact on the Nation should arise—that is a case on all fours with this.

This I wish to make crystal clear to both management and labor.

Neither I nor the committee can conceive of any future dispute between management and labor which might involve the consideration of the committee or any other committee of the Congress—that is, not in the same set of circumstances.

The Congress and the administration has established agencies, boards, and commissions to assist in mediation of such disputes. I emphasized the word "assist" because none as yet has the power to resolve them.

The Commerce Committee has not mediated this dispute, nor has it undertaken to do so. What it has done is to encourage or urge the adversary parties to mediate their differences among themselves.

The pending resolution does not mediate, it simply proposes a medium, the machinery, by which the differences between the adversary parties may be resolved and largely by themselves.

I concede that the action which the committee has taken may not be popular with either railroad labor or railroad management. This should not be the primary concern of the committee; all factors should be taken into consideration.

Each of these parties may have preferred that the committee take a position favorable to its particular interest, or that in the absence of such a position the committee would have referred the matter to a governmental body presumed favorable, or not favorable, as the case may be, to that particular interest.

The committee did neither.

The action which the committee did take was solely in the public interest, and not in the interest of either adversary party.

This should be ample warning, in my opinion, to any party in a labor dispute, that it cannot advance its cause by seeking to give it to Congress.

We are not in the business of resolving controversies between management and labor, and we are not going into this business—if we can help it.

The mediation of labor-management disputes is completely foreign to responsibilities or functions of Congress under our American system, and should remain so.

The action that the Committee on Commerce has taken in this instance—and it is not mediation—was not taken in the interest of either adversary party, but in the interest of a third and involuntary party of interest—the general public.

The committee considers this third interest—the public interest, or it might also be called the national interest—paramount to the interests of either of the adversary parties in this dispute.

It was because of the public interest—not the interest of management or labor—that the railroad 8-hour law was enacted, that the Railway Labor Act was enacted, that the National Labor Relations Act was enacted, and that many other acts have been enacted which may on their face have appeared to have conferred gains on distinctive segments of the labor force or, on the other hand, on industry.

That was not the purpose of these enactments. The primary and dominating purpose that these laws were enacted was the conviction of Congress that they would be beneficial to the general public and enhance the national interest.

The pending resolution, therefore, is submitted on this basis.

Should anyone mistakenly assume the contrary, the committee will continue to act, as it has acted in the past, in what it considers the public interest.

True, much of the legislation which is referred to our committee has to do with transportation—surface, water, air transportation.

The committee has had long experience in the transportation field. It has a long record of legislation designed to assist the various modes of transportation, including rail transportation.

Much of this legislation, it will be agreed, has been of great assistance to transportation, with ancillary benefits, both to management and labor.

But this legislation has not been enacted in the interest of transportation management, or transportation labor, or the transportation industry as a whole.

They have been enacted in the interest of the whole people, in that of the Nation, and because the health of the transportation industry and its management and labor is important to the economic and social health of the entire Nation.

Now we are confronted with the threat that this health might be impaired by forces within the industry itself, a threat that to this committee and to all of us is intolerable.

The public interest is and must be paramount to the interest of either of the adversary parties in labor-management disputes while at the same time the public interest demands that the rights of these parties to peacefully adjust their differences be preserved.

Laws providing methods for such peaceable adjustments are on the statute books.

None of these acts, however, have availed to avert a showdown on this pending work rules dispute, which has now dragged along for almost 4 years.

Efforts of Presidential commissions during two administrations, and of boards, committees, and other instrumentalities of the executive branch which have or have had a direct responsibility of seeking to mediate differences between the two adverse parties, have not averted this showdown.

Efforts of the five operating organizations to prevent, by appeal to the courts, imposition to them of the distasteful work rules by management, have been unsuccessful.

Efforts by the Committee on Commerce throughout the time Senate Joint Resolution 102 has been before it, to encourage the adversary parties to resolve their differences through free negotiations and collective bargaining, have been equally abortive.

I suggest at this point that many members of the committee, sometimes as individuals, sometimes as a group, sometimes collectively, in the past few days and the past few weeks, both before and after the hearings, and during the course of these negotiations, have been in constant touch, almost day and night, with the parties involved—not necessarily meeting as a group, but, in some cases, with their attorneys and counsel, with members of other unions involved in railroad transportation, with management and their attorneys, with the Secretary of Labor, with members of the Labor Department, with the administration, and with everyone else involved, including the public, in the hope that we might be able to be helpful in seeing this dispute settled. But all those efforts have been of no avail.

So we have come now to a situation which one witness at the hearings described as "an irresistible force meeting an immovable object."

Only Congress, it appears, has the power to correct this impasse, and to move the parties in conflict toward a fair and faithful settlement of their differences.

Every effort has been made by the Committee on Commerce to achieve this result without reporting the pending resolution to the Senate.

There was no dragging in the Senate committee on this matter. There was, I must confess, an overriding reluctance for Congress to enter into this dispute, and there was sometimes a too optimistic remaining hope that something would happen and we would not be required to act.

Prior to that the administration had made every effort to avoid having to resort to an 11th-hour legislative proposal.

This proposal, in the form of a draft joint resolution, was submitted to the Congress on July 22 and referred to the Commerce Committee.

At that time notices had been given by the conferences of the carriers that on July 29, or 7 days thereafter, they would impose certain work rules on the brotherhoods and unions which would be affected, and the latter had made public their determination that if this were done they would immediately embark on a general and nationwide work stoppage.

That means that the brotherhoods had served such notice.

Senator PASTORE, as acting chairman of the committee during my absence due to illness, immediately scheduled hearings for July 23, and for every day thereafter except the following Sunday, until and including August 1.

Because other matters had been scheduled before it—very important and sensitive matters—the Senator from Rhode Island and the committee had to work on this subject. They did not complain, and I am not suggesting this as a matter of complaint, but they had to work on this subject, because it came to them at this time. I mention this fact to show how the committee immediately reacted to the necessities of the situation in view of the work the committee was confronted with. Many times hearings were held at night, sometimes as late as midnight, and many times committee members were in telephone communication and in meetings with the parties involved, in the hope that something would happen.

Many of these hearings were by necessity held at night, and the committee put in 14 to 17 hours each day in their endeavors to have the adversary parties resolve their differences, to receive their testimony, and to attend to their other duties, including consideration of other important legislation pending before our committee.

It was through the energetic work of this committee and its counterpart in the House, I may add, that the deadline for imposition of the proposed new work rules was postponed for 30 days or until the 29th of this month.

That is at 12:01 a.m. on Wednesday night. I do not know whether at the time it was considered that Wednesday would also be a busy day around the Capitol. The date could have been made the 30th or 31st of July. I do not know whether the present situation was taken into consideration. However, they did agree to postpone the date which they had themselves at first set.

Mr. President, I cannot praise too highly the brilliant and expeditious manner in which my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] conducted these involved and strenuous hearings.

And I would be remiss also, if I did not, with great pride, commend every member of the committee, irrespective of his party affiliation, for his earnest attention to the problem and for his searching but objective questioning of witnesses during the long and arduous hours of testimony.

I see in the Chamber the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the ranking minority member of the committee. I must say I do not know of any time during all the conferences and debates, all the meetings, and all the hearings, when there was not the best cooperation on both sides of the committee. The problem of partisanship, on the question of meeting the objective before us, did not exist.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The record should be made clear at this point with respect to what the chairman has said. I notice from the report which has been filed by the committee that additional views have been added. The views are expressed by eight members of the committee, which is one less than a majority of the committee. Anyone reading the report might be somewhat misled as to what transpired at the meeting. I believe the record ought to be made abundantly clear in that respect. It involves some of us who have been rather conscientious in trying to arrive at a solution to this very knotty problem.

It has not been an easy area within which to labor. I remind Senators that all parties who have appeared before our committee should be congratulated and commended for their frankness and honesty of purpose. We face an issue which involves the livelihood of a great number of people. When a man is told that his job will be done away with, it is not easy to reconcile such a situation in one's mind. We must consider the delicacy and sensitivity of the situation.

In the other hand, we must realize that the carriers have their problems. In some instances their economics are not exactly as they would like them to be. If they feel that certain jobs are unnecessary, they have a perfect right to say so and to see what can be done about elimination of those jobs.

Therefore, no matter how we look at the situation, we were faced by a very sensitive area within which to operate, and our work was not easy.

However, we had the fullest cooperation from all sides, and had fine cooperation from all members of the committee on both sides.

However, the question that I should like to direct to the distinguished chairman of the committee is this: Is it not a fact that the measure before the Senate, in its present form, with subsection (b) of section 6, and section 5, as written in the joint resolution, was unanimously reported by all members of the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; as I remember, the committee was working very late, and all of us were looking at the clock, on Friday. The committee was in complete agreement that the joint resolution should be reported.

A certain question was raised by one or two members of the committee, to this effect: "We want to get the joint resolution on its way. We agree with its objectives. However, we want to know whether this will bind us not to present some other views on some of the very sensitive problems." That is what the Senator from Rhode Island has referred to.

I said, "That is always the prerogative of the members of a committee."

However, the overriding objective of the committee was to get busy on this subject.

The only real objection in committee was what the Senator from Rhode Island pointed out. In committee we placed ourselves in a position similar to that in which the parties to the dispute find themselves, by developing a difference of opinion as to some of the procedures that were involved. The Senator from Rhode Island is absolutely correct. I pointed out that it was the prerogative of any member of the committee to express other views. We did not attempt, as is normally the situation, to write the report of the committee and have it read by the members so that committee members could write minority views, which could be read, with the possibility of certain changes. Every member of the committee has that prerogative. Over the weekend certain members decided that they had different views on one point which we were discussing. However, I do not believe that any member of the commitee was in disagreement as to the necessity of approaching this subject with a committee resolution, with the prospect that on the Senate floor certain other views would be expressed, and perhaps amendments would be offered.

Mr. PASTORE. I want the record to be clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. PASTORE. I believe it is a fair response. Is it not a fact that additional views were written after the committee had adjourned?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. PASTORE. And that all members of the committee were not shown the additional views before they were sent to the printer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, I wish it to be clearly understood that no one should reach the conclusion, by reading the eight names on the last page, that if there had been one more who had agreed to the additional views the proposed legislation now before us would have been defeated. That is not the case. I wish the record to be clear that, so far as the joint resolution is concerned, a vote was taken by all members of the committee, and everyone voted to report the joint resolution to the Senate, regardless of what they did after the committee adjourned. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. With the exception that before the vote was taken—no record vote was taken—members asked if they would be able to submit additional views. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. Afterwards, they got after them. Some members of the committee were not presesnt, and some of them had left proxies, but I did not believe I should vote two proxies that I had, because I did not know whether the Senators who had left the proxies with me knew what had transpired.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, but I repeat my question. The record must be clear. Certain peoples are going around the halls of the Capitol saying that if one more member of that committee had joined in the additional views, the pending proposed legislation would have been defeated. That is not the case. The joint resolution was reported unanimously by every member of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With that one exception.

Mr. PASTORE. That members would be permitted to write additional views.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. But no Senator who wrote additional views voted against reporting the joint resolution as written.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The necessity for doing so is, I think, obvious to every Senator.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I am sure the chairman would not want to let stand in the Record his own inadvertent words just as they were spoken. The chairman said, "Of course, it is true that after the committee adjourned, they got after them." I wonder who got after whom. Will the chairman explain that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I said that, I did not mean it. What I meant was that the members of the committee decided they would report this proposal. I did not discuss it. We were necessarily rushed. But I did not mean that anyone "got after them." I think the views they have been expressing have been expressed by these particular Senators time and time again in the hearings, in the committee, and elsewhere. I mentioned it, and I think the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] did also. I hope no one will go around the halls impugning the motives of the Senator from Rhode Island. No one has more integrity than he has, as I am sure the Senate as a whole would agree.

I, too, wish to say something about the Secretary of Labor. During the hearings and after they had been concluded, up to the past weekend, the committee, including the chairman and the ranking members of both parties, in close and sympathetic cooperation with the Secretary of Labor, did everything in their power to encourage the representatives of railway management and labor to resolve their differences. Foremost in this effort was the Secretary of Labor, Hon. W. Willard Wirtz.

During the course of the hearings, Secretary Wirtz arranged many meetings, many of them after the Senate hearings had concluded late at night, between the two groups of negotiators.

Such meetings continued after the hearings had been concluded, and frequently continued, on his part, with members of the committee not present, until the wee morning hours. I know that to be so, because at the conclusion of such meetings, following my return to Washington, the good Secretary would call me, sometimes at midnight, sometimes later, to report such progress as might apparently have been made, or the lack of progress on the frequent occasions when there was none. Many times we received calls stating the progress, if any; or telling us what might be done; or who else could be reached; in the hope that this problem could be settled.

I doubt whether at any time in the history of the Nation any man has endured such long and strenuous toil in attempting to bring about a settlement of a management-labor dispute, and with such dedication and enduring patience as that demonstrated by Secretary Wirtz. Few of us would have had the endurance to stand up under such an extended and frustrating ordeal—and "frustrating" is the proper term. Sometimes the indications were that headway was being made; at other times the reverse was true. Meanwhile, the committee, Congress, and the Nation are aware of the deadline which confronts the Nation if the parties to the dispute carry out their intentions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that during the course of the negotiations the majority leader on at least five, possibly six, occasions held meetings in his office, meetings which were attended by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who for much of the time was acting chairman of the committee, and with other interested Senators; and that at those times various proposals were advanced seeking to bring about an accommodation of the parties, seeking to bring about an equitable settlement of the dispute, and thereby avoid the necessity of legislation? Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only is that a correct statement; but the majority leader also held conferences and worked with the Secretary of Labor. I am sure the majority leader talked with the parties to the dispute themselves. Most of the members of the committee have done so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I must state for the record that I tried to keep the meetings unpublicized and private, away from the press, the television, and the representatives of both sides to the dispute, because they were not in attendance at those meetings. It was a problem with which the Congress was confronted, and to which a solution had to be found, if the parties themselves did not agree to some sort of settlement.

So far as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, he never missed a meeting; he was always on the lookout for a possible settlement. He worked long hours and tried to do the best he could.

Speaking of the unanimous vote by which the joint resolution was reported from committee, if my memory serves me correctly, the Senator from Rhode Island, after the vote on the joint resolution, left the city and did not know about the so-called 9-to-8 division until he returned this morning.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not like the connotation "left the city." I went home. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. I stand corrected.

Mr. PASTORE. But I say to the Senator from Montana that one thing the Senator from Rhode Island did not do was to get on his knees and beg both sides to resolve their differences through the process of collective bargaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us face the fact: These were the issues that were pending as of November 2, 1959. Many issues have arisen since then, and many more will arise in the future.

The carriers will have to live with the brotherhoods. I am saying this because they are decorating our galleries today. The brotherhoods will have to live with the carriers. Sooner or later they will begin to look in one another's eyes. The sooner they begin to look in one another's eyes, the sooner they will begin to bring about a better understanding between themselves, the better off Congress will be, the better off the country will be, and the better off management and labor will be in the operation of the railroads; because this is the beginning of nothing. This proposal will merely resolve questions which up to this time have been insoluble—and I can understand why: because they are intricate, complex, and involve the bread and butter of workers.

But let no one make a mistake: The ultimate answer to this problem is collective bargaining. The sooner the parties themselves come to an understanding, the better off everyone will be.

This is the only speech I shall make on the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before I yield, I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that he does not go quite far enough. This is the first time, in a major way, that we have been confronted with a situation such as this, relating to what we like to term general automation. It is the same kind of dispute that involved the airlines, in a minor way, with the flight engineers. It is the same kind of dispute as will evolve from many problems on the water front and many problems in all other forms of transportation. This is what makes the present problem so difficult, as the Senator from Rhode Island points out. I am seeking to recite for the record the chronological facts, not to get into other matters. It is a difficult responsibility for anyone who represents a labor group to go back to his people and say, not that he negotiated with respect to normal labor matters, as to which there are historic procedures, but with respect to something to which that sort of procedure no longer applies. What is happening now is comparatively new. A labor negotiator does not want to go back to his people and say, "I negotiated so that 10,000 or 15,000 of you will lose your jobs." This is something new; I feel certain it will occur over and over again in the transportation industry in the next 4 or 5 years.

I heartily agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. I would go further in this field.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It should be brought out now that the Senate has before it a joint resolution. At the meetings which were called by the majority leader, in addition to the presence of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the distinguished acting chairman of the committee [Mr. PASTORE], during the absence of the Senator from Washington, another Senator was in constant attendance—the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who, in my opinion, has one of the best minds in the country in matters involving labor and who has, over the years, made many sound contributions to the betterment of labor in this country. I wish to say to all of them that even though the plan I suggested did not meet with their approval, because of conditions over which they had no control, and although the plan which we thought had met with approval on Wednesday or Thursday of last week did not come to fruition, nevertheless we did try—and I am not saying this defensively—to arrive at an equitable area wherein agreement could be reached.

When the distinguished chairman of the committee used the word "automation," he put his finger on the biggest difficulty which the rail industry and other segments of the economy face today.

Let me point out, for the record, that the day after the President sent us his message and his proposal on the rail dispute, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] introduced a joint resolution seeking to bring about a congressional study to cope with the problem of automation, to the end that, insofar as possible, in advance rather than at the end, as seems to be the case at the present time, I believe that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joined the Senator from Oregon in the introduction of that joint resolution at that time. I think the record should be made clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Oregon, who knows a great deal about labor procedures, has done a miraculous job and a dedicated job in some of these labor problems; and I am sure we all agree that the basis of this difficulty is a problem that is going to plague our economy. It is the problem of labor-management relations. In my own opinion—although of course it always is easy to look back and be a Monday-morning quarterback—one of the faults of management in this case has been, rightly or wrongly—I do not know the reasons; they may be justifiable—that management has let this problem drag on for many years, whereas probably at the time when the first diesel engine began to run on the railroads, management should have started then to do something about the future.

This is a serious problem. The Senator from Oregon has pointed it out many times. Let me say I think we have been far behind in thinking about it; we should have been thinking about it a long time ago.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. At this time, I wish to make two points. Later, I shall speak at length.

First, let me say that the management of the railway industry has been raising these issues for years, in one emergency board after another, and has been trying to get some understanding reached by bargaining. So I wish to file that caveat quickly, because it does not follow that there has been a failure to engage in collective bargaining. There has been a great deal of collective bargaining in this industry, and it has not been a one-way street at all.

Second, I wish to announce that soon I shall make an attempt to have the Senate reject the committee's proposal, which I think unsound. In doing so, I shall follow two procedures. First, I shall, in due course of time, offer the President's proposal, as modified by an amendment calling for the appointment of a seven-man board—two from the carriers; two from the brotherhoods; and three to be appointed by the President, in case the parties cannot agree on the three arbitrators, or any number of the three; and the amendment will provide that the board is to function for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and is to submit its recommendations to the Interstate Commerce Commission, for acceptance or modification and promulgation. That will keep the handling of the case clearly within the Interstate Commerce Commission, to which the Congress has on various occasions by legislation assigned specific duties, not the least of which has been the Washington agreement which has given the Interstate Commerce Commission considerable jurisdiction over job security.

If we fail in that—although I do not think we shall—I shall offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute which will not provide for any compulsory arbitration whatsoever.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oregon has told many Members of the Senate involved in this case that that was his intention; and I think it is well that now he has told all Senators of it.

Mr. President, I should like to finish these introductory remarks. They are not very long. I merely wish to state the facts for the record in chronological order, so the record will show clearly many of the procedures involved and what the joint resolution will or will not do.

Mr. President, at times there were indications that some headway was being made; at other times that the reverse was true. Meanwhile, the committee, the Congress, and the Nation have been approaching another deadline which, if the parties to this dispute carry out their intentions, will be disastrous to the Nation.

The proportions of this disaster have been estimated by the Department of Commerce and other departments of the Government in a report prepared at the request of the committee.

I shall not burden the RECORD with the complete report entitled "Impact of a Nationwide Railroad Shutdown"; but I shall take the liberty of citing some of the repercussions which the threatened strike would have on the Nation and on its citizens. This is why we talk so much—and rightly so—about the public interest.

A work stoppage on our Nation's railroads would directly affect not only the 200,000 members of the five operating brotherhoods, but also the 500,000 nonoperating railway employees. Rapidly, as transportation services for producers who use the rails would cease, these producing industries would be forced to close, lay off, or curtail employment.

The Department of Commerce estimates that a rail strike of 1 month's duration would find 6½ million citizens out of work, in addition to the 700,000 now employed by the railroads.

Agricultural producers would be among the first to suffer. I remind all who live out West that this is the beginning of the harvesting of the crops and the movement of the crops—particularly in the great producing grain areas. The absence of refrigerator cars, or "reefers," would compel a loss of fruit and vegetable crops, as well as a loss of other perishables, including meat and fish. Some packing plants, we are told, would be forced immediately to shut down.

Grains and sugarbeets, being harvested now, could not be moved. Heavy industrial products would cease to move. Our ports, dependent largely on rail connections for both exports and imports, would suffer drastically.

Coal mines, virtually completely dependent on rail haul, would be forced almost immediately to shut down, thus aggravating the unemployment in areas already depressed. Metal mining would be similarly disrupted.

The movement of chemicals and liquid fuels which move by tank car would be terminated abruptly.

Lumber and steel are largely transported by rail; and not only would a strike drastically affect our steel and lumber mills, but construction would be directly or indirectly affected.

A work stoppage on our railroads would immediately burden local communities, rural areas, cities, counties, States, and regions with a multiplicity of problems.

The Department of Commerce estimates that not more than one-eighth of the goods which normally move by rail could be diverted to truck lines or barges, for the reason that many of these services are now operating almost to capacity—carrying, as they do, many of our products.

The Defense Department estimates that 30 percent of the traffic normally routed via railroad could not be diverted to trucks, barges, or aircraft, because of the nature of the products involved.

The Health Department reports that in most cities only medical supplies in inventory are maintained to supply their needs for 30 to 60 days, and also predicts health hazards from the deterioration of perishable foods in transit—although I must say, in all fairness, that both sides have intimated that the problem of medical supplies and other matters such as necessary food supplies, would be worked out.

The scarcity of products will inevitably force up prices, of course, and at a time when more than 15 percent of our work force will be unemployed; and this would create the highest percentage of unemployment since the prewar depression years.

If there is a strike, the public is going to be hurt badly; the railroads are going to be hurt; the unions affected by this dispute are going to be hurt.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz told the committee that "we, the public, are going to get hurt worse by a strike or stoppage than either of the parties are," but added that he thought either of the parties could stand a strike longer than the public.

The committee, in seeking a solution, did not accept the administration proposal that the issues in controversy be referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The members agreed with the representatives of the Brotherhoods that the ICC was not the appropriate agency to seek to bring about a settlement, and the same objection, in my opinion, would apply to referring this dispute to any other existing agency in the executive branch.

The members of the committee also generally agreed that there should not be established a precedent of referring such a dispute to a Government agency. Other disputes might follow.

The committee likewise rejected suggestions by witnesses that Congress itself, through its standing committees or a joint committee, undertake to resolve this issue.

Congressional committees are not equipped to make such determinations, nor are they prepared to embrace such unprecedented functions as weighing the merits or demerits of labor-management disputes. Nowhere in the Constitution does Congress have such power nor any power to settle private differences between individual private groups and industries.

The responsibility of Congress is again—and I am reiterating—the public interest.

In the public interest, it is true, Congress has set up agencies and commissions, not to regulate wages, hours or working conditions, but to assist labor and management to resolve their differences wherever such differences may exist.

What the Committee on Commerce has done in this present crisis is to propose the establishment of an arbitration board to consist of seven persons. It would be set up similar to the plan mentioned by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Each of the adversary parties in this dispute, the carriers and the labor organizations, would designate two persons to serve as members of this arbitration board. The four members so chosen would then designate three additional members. This could be done by agreement among themselves on who the three additional members of the board would be. Should the members chosen by the adversary parties fail to name one or more of the three additional members within 10 days, then the vacancies among the additional members could be designated by the President.

Mr. President, I submit that the procedure will be eminently fair to both parties and will afford to these parties opportunity to resolve the differences among themselves, or among themselves and arbiters of their own free choice.

Pending action by the arbitration board, or settlement of the dispute and its issues by the adversary parties through collective bargaining, whichever may come earlier, the changes proposed by the railroads on November 22, 1959, and those proposed by the railroads on September 7, 1960, shall not be put into effect, nor shall there be any strikes or lockouts arising from the dispute over these rules proposals.

Differences involve what is commonly known as the main issues. There are what are called other, or side issues, about which the Senate will hear a great deal during the course of the debate in regard to that proposal. But the two main issues are the ones about which I have been talking. Those are the ones proposed by the railroads on November 22, 1959, and those proposed by the brotherhoods on September 7, 1960.

None of those rules should be put into effect until the parties, through collective bargaining or through the board, whichever may come earlier, have reached a conclusion.

This is not a victory or defeat for either labor or management.

It is, in effect, an armistice in the public interest during which the differences between management and labor can be settled at the conference table.

The board would have authority to arbitrate two of the nine issues in dispute—the two issues being what we have agreed to are main issues—that of train crew consist and that relating to employment of firemen-helpers.

Hearings on these two issues would commence before the board within 30 days; a final determination would be reached within 90 days following enactment of the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to finish the subject on which I am now talking and then I shall yield. I am really relating these points as the committee bill was discussed.

An award based on this determination would not become effective, however, before the remaining seven, and lesser, issues have been disposed of.

Senators will find great differences of opinion to procedure which I hope can be resolved without too much difficulty.

The adversary parties may resolve these by collective bargaining which, the resolution states, shall be resumed immediately and with the National Mediation Board and Secretary of Labor rendering their assistance.

If these lesser issues are not resolved through collective bargaining within 30 days following the Board's determination on the two major issues, then the National Mediation Board will certify the status to the arbitration board which will have 60 days to make a determination with regard to these issues also.

That involves the basic proposal in what is known in the debate as section 6(b). That was an amendment adopted by the majority of the committee to a proposal submitted by the chairman which did not have that portion of the procedure. In other words, it left the collective bargaining on the so-called other issues with an open end for the purpose of collective bargaining, but the arbitration would go to the two main issues.

Mr. President, without attempting to be technical this is the gist of the resolution.

The committee feels that it is a reasonable and practicable solution that avails itself in this 11th hour of a singular and critical situation threatening an economic breakdown, disruption of industry, and wholesale involuntary unemployment.

There is a difference of opinion as to these procedures that can be resolved by the Senate, after due debate, either by a vote or by members of the committee arriving at some other solution. Several suggestions have been made. Several ways to approach the question have been proposed. That was one of the stumbling blocks between management and the brotherhoods in the dispute. What has been added is the fact that this morning the House committee unanimously reported out a bill which also deals with this particular question. The House bill proposes another type of procedure, but deals with the same question, as to when the effective date of the award on the two main issues shall take effect and how the so-called side issues or the other issues should be resolved by collective bargaining, or within a certain period of time by collective bargaining, and then remanding that issue to a board for some form of arbitration.

The resolution affects no other labor-organization and no other industry, but only one industry and its employees, both of whom bear a special relation to the national welfare, which has been pointed out time and time again in regard to other measures which have been directed to the railroad industry.

I need not mention to the Congress, despite some differences as to procedure, effective dates of certain awards on these question. That point will be debated, I am sure, and discussed quite freely and thoroughly.

There is the question of expeditious action by the Senate. The House has now started to do what the Senate committee did last Friday. The House committee reported a bill. I understand that, as soon as possible, the Rules Committee will be asked for a rule on the bill. The House leadership has agreed to see what measure the Senate passes and, I presume, hopes that it may be able to accept the Senate measure. The House committee used the Senate committee bill. The committee did so not because it was in favor of the committee bill in all respects. The members of the committee were for the main objective, but used the bill as a basis for action this morning.

Senators cannot complain too much, I presume, about the Senate taking the final action. The House might reach the point where it might be ready to accept the joint resolution, or have a quick conference of not too long a duration to resolve any minor differences that may occur between the two Houses of Congress. I hope such differences would be minor. Senators will recall that the last time such action was necessary—when the then President seized the railroads and sent to the Congress a bill supplementing the seizure—the House acted first, and while the bill was on the way from the House to the Senate, the railroad dispute was settled that afternoon.

So the Senate did not have to act upon that measure. The House did. I suppose the House has every justification for saying to us, "Now it is your turn." So we could not complain about that too much.

Mr. President, there is much more that I could say about this subject, but I do not wish to take more time. I shall point out one other feature of the bill.

The words "compulsive arbitration" have been used in stories, discussions, and conversations quite frequently in this regard, and in regard to other matters pertaining to labor disputes. Congress as a whole, and I think the public as a whole, and even management and labor, are reluctant to get into any phase of what could be described as "compulsive arbitration."

In this particular case there are two main issues. I hope the Senate will differentiate in that regard. On the two main issues there would be binding arbitration, or compulsive arbitration, or whatever anyone wished to call it. The fancy term is that we are to submit it to a board for a binding decision. But a binding decision would be compulsive upon the parties involved.

There is a difference in this case, and I think it should be noted. That is, in the joint resolution we are suggesting—we are all in agreement on this, and there is no problem—that the two main issues, of train "crew consist" and the employment of "firemen (helpers)," we feel both parties had voluntarily agreed to arbitrate, in the same manner as we would provide. They had disagreed on them. They are quite far apart as to procedures involved in so doing.

So in the joint resolution we would proceed legislatively, not necessarily to see if we could force the procedures, but if we could legislate a procedure whereby there would be a final, binding conclusion. That is somewhat different from a labor-management dispute in which perhaps the parties have not sat down across the table to start collective bargaining.

The parties may have discussed the other issues, but they have not agreed to arbitrate and to have the arbitration binding. We are talking about the two main issues on which there has been agreement in this respect. The brotherhoods sent a letter to the Secretary of Labor. I do not think that it requires any classification. I am sure I can put it in the Record. The managements have published statements. I do not have anything in writing from them in this respect. I do not think anybody else has anything I could put into the Record, but it was generally understood by everyone that management agreed voluntarily to arbitrate these two issues.

The gist of the joint resolution on that point is that we suggest a method of arriving at that binding decision by an arbitration board.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The other issues have been called secondary. They are important, and I do not particularly like the term "secondary." They are issues which have not been touched by a voluntary agreement to arbitrate. They are issues on which, so far as I can determine, the parties have not started collective bargaining.

The parties have said on many occasions that the other issues are issues standing alone, and that if they were alone without the two main issues they could probably be resolved quickly. That is the general consensus of opinion.

When a binding decision is made with respect to the two major issues, I suspect there is some legitimacy or justification to the argument that if the decision comes first, whoever does not like the decision—and somebody is not going to like it—will have the opportunity to drag heels on the other issues. I am a little more optimistic on that point than some other Senators who serve on the committee, because the parties have intimated time and time again that the other issues probably could be resolved. Those are ordinary and normal issues involving wages and other things. I will give them to the Senate. They are issues which involve things which have been discussed time and time again in collective bargaining. The parties can come to some conclusion on them.

So the committee has reported a measure to cover that point.

Another point in the committee which was the subject of a great deal of consideration and some different opinions, was to this effect: "All right, that is done. Now when will the arbitration award, if it is made, take effect?"

That was one of the disputes between the parties. Management wanted the award—whatever award was made, if there was an award by a board or the ICC or whoever took it up—to be definite. They wanted a statement to say, "It shall take effect within 30 days, or 60 days," or some stated period of time, "regardless of the progress or lack of progress on the other issues."

As I understand the other position, it was that the award should be held up; that the award could be announced and made, but that the effective date be held up pending the resolution of the other issues.

This has been a cause of some disagreement. The majority of the committee, as I have pointed out, said, "Go ahead and bargain collectively on the other issues. Have the board meet on the two main issues. If they make an award prior to an agreement on the other issues, that award will not take effect until the other issues can be resolved. But if, after a certain period of time after the award has been announced, the other issues are not resolved, they in turn will be submitted to a board and will go through the same process."

So there would be a day certain when all the issues finally would be nailed down.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have only a few more remarks and I shall be through. I have nearly concluded my general statement.

I shall be glad to yield, but first I wish to put into the Record, following my remarks, two editorials; one from the Washington Post of August 24 and one from the New York Times of the same date.

To be more specific and to go into more detail on the effect of a strike on the Nation's economy, a fine, objective analysis was made in a short article published in Business Week of the same week, August 24.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I promised the Senator from New York that I would yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington ask unanimous consent that the editorials and article may be printed in the Record?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1963]

CONSTRUCTIVE SOLUTION

The Senate Commerce Committee has responded in constructive fashion to the impending railroad emergency. With the change in work rules and a resulting strike set for next Thursday, the committee had been lamentably tardy in coming forward with a solution. But if the Senate and House act with dispatch, it is still possible to avoid a national railway tieup that would inflict severe economic damage upon the country without removing the need for an arbitrated settlement.

The committee's bill would keep the railroads in operation and set up a board to arbitrate the unsettled issues. President Kennedy had recommended that this difficult arbitral task be assigned to the Interstate Commerce Commission. A special board will have the advantage of not involving an established Government agency and of making the procedure somewhat more acceptable to the railway brotherhoods. Both the unions and the carriers would be represented on the seven-man board, with two members each, and together these representatives would have an opportunity to select the three public members if agreement among them could be reached. This reasonable concession would in no way sacrifice the public interest in seeing that a settlement is effected without a prolonged strike.

At first the board would tackle only the two main issues in the dispute—the employment of firemen on diesel locomotives and the size of traincrews. During the 60 days allowed the board to make its decision, the carriers and union would continue to negotiate on the other issues. If no agreement could be reached within 30 days after the arbitration ruling, the secondary issues would also go to the board. But the parties could still avoid compulsory arbitration by agreeing among themselves at any time before the deadlines for the board's action.

In our opinion, this is about as fair a device as could be applied by legislation. We hope that both Houses of Congress will accept it without quibbling or protracted argument. No doubt a strike lasting a few days would be less costly than a bad law to compel a settlement. But the solution offered by the Commerce Committee appears to be sound and to be further recommended by the fact that it is the mildest remedy which could be relied upon to be effective.

What Congress does will become a precedent of great importance in the settlement of future disputes in which the public interest in continued service overrides the right to strike. For this reason it is highly desirable to keep the remedial measure simple, fair, and effective. It is also essential for Congress to demonstrate that it can act with dispatch when a clear-cut issue so vitally affecting the public interest is laid before it.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1963]

Right Way on the Railroads

The bill approved by the Senate Commerce Committee for binding arbitration of the railroad featherbedding dispute represents the soundest approach now open for protecting the public against the crippling damage of a nationwide rail strike. It is vastly superior to the hodge-podge measure originally proposed by the administration for referring the controversy to the Interstate Commerce Commission—a measure that would have established a much more hurtful precedent without really settling anything.

It is, of course, a tragedy for collective bargaining that 4 years of negotiation, mediation and fact-finding in this vital industry should have culminated in the need for a legislated solution. The primary responsibility for this unhappy outcome must rest with the railroad unions, which spurned all the constructive peace proposals put forward by two Presidential commissions and by Secretary of Labor Wirtz.

When at long last they accepted the principle of arbitration as the only sane method left for ending a dispute, their negativism had made impossible of solution at the bargaining table, the conditions they attached to their acceptance ruled out any real possibility of an accord. All labor will now pay for their subbornness by a general weakening of public confidence in collective bargaining. So will the whole process of free decisionmaking in our society.

Secretary Wirtz, who worked indefatigably to prevent the present impasse, is deserving of national appreciation. The legislation that will go before the Senate Monday is, in substance, an embodiment of the formula he got both sides to accept in principle last week. As such, it represents far less an exercise of governmental coercion than would have been the case had he given up when the President sent his original bill to Capitol Hill a month ago.

The important thing now is for Congress to act before next Thursday's strike deadline. Even better would be a last-minute recognition by the rail unions of the desirability of entering into an arbitration commitment without waiting for Congress to put a gun to their head.

[From Business Week, Aug. 24, 1963]

Can Trains Be Kept Running?—Administration Believes a Tieup of a Few Weeks or More Could Bring On a Recession

Intense pressures on railroads and operating unions at midweek apparently had brought them closer to a settlement of their work rules dispute—but not yet close enough to end anxieties about a possible tieup of rail service next week.

Carriers and unions yielded to administration and public insistence by agreeing to submit two critical issues to arbitration: firemen's jobs and the makeup of train crews. The railroads had been willing from the start to arbitrate, but on broader terms; the unions had rejected arbitration in any form.

Under a plan proposed by Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, other rules and money issues would be settled through continued bargaining.

IFS, ANDS, AND BUTS

The unions' acceptance of arbitration was hedged about with ifs, ands, and buts. The biggest involved the timing of arbitration—whether it would be before or after settlements on other issues. With a week to go before an August 29 deadline, the parties appeared in no hurry to work out technical details such as this; each wanted the best possible basis for arbitration.

SPREADING EFFECTS

The dangers of a strike, even a short one, are sobering everyone. Its repercussions could throw the country into a fourth postwar recession and multiply unemployment troubles.

There would be a pinch from the start. Coal mines that rely on railroad pickup at the mineshaft would close down right away. Cities that depend on chlorine shipments for water purification might be in health trouble. Refrigerated carloads of fresh fruit and meat would be ruined. Many animals would be held back from the slaughterhouses and harvests of grains and sugarbeets would not be shipped. Commuters would be jammed onto highways or stranded at home in the suburbs.

If a strike dragged on for weeks, a month, or longer, the economic shock could knock the country right off the tracks of its current upswing. Two Government studies—by the Commerce Department and the Council of Economic Advisers—paint a bleak picture of a prolonged strike.

Ripple effects from transportation bottlenecks would be most serious, the Government says, and would hit industries like this:

After 1 week—autos, construction, chemicals.

After 2 weeks—periodicals.

After 3 weeks—noncellulose fibers, boiler products, large transformers, motors, generators.

After 1 month—machinery products, mattresses, and bedding.

POSSIBLE COST

John P. Lewis, of CEA, told the Senate Commerce Committee last month that the economy would suffer a minimum net loss of $25 billion in gross national product (at an annual rate) if a strike lasted 30 days. Unemployment, he said, would swell to 6.5 million. Price rises would hamper U.S. exports in a competitive world market.

Government economists say a tieup would probably generate a violent inventory cycle that would end in recession early next year.

PREPAREDNESS

Businessmen seem to consider a strike unlikely, since few have prepared for one (Business Week, July 20, 1963, p. 26). But the Government is taking no chances. The Commerce Department's Office of Emergency Transportation has worked out guidelines for shippers—just in case.

As the Commerce staff sees it, only 10 or 15 percent of today's rail freight traffic could be diverted to trucks and barges by the end of a month-long strike. In any shorter time, even less freight could be switched to available carriers. OET has worked up a list of priority cargoes ranging from defense items to newspapers.

Local post offices have been warned that all classes of mail would be moved by truck up to 150 miles and that no mail, except first-class airmail, would be moved farther than that.

In industry, OET says traffic managers would have to use self-discipline and judgment. They would become quasi-officials, authorized to determine the priority of shipments in cooperation with such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Meanwhile, ICC and CAB would approve added service by alternative carriers as rapidly as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like for the Senator to answer a couple of procedural questions first, and then we can get to the question of compulsory arbitration, to which the Senator referred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I could not hear the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Perhaps I should make an observation on the compulsory arbitration first.

The Senator does tell us quite frankly, does he not, that there is an element of compulsory arbitration involved? The joint resolution is "a little bit pregnant" with compulsory arbitration?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think any decision which would become binding on a person, which by its nature could be enforced by the courts, surely would have some odor of compulsion.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator whether under those circumstances, in respect to the views which have been expressed, the so-called additional views, that "a delicate course has to be steered between two unthinkables—strike and seizure, on the one hand, and the unacceptable—compulsory arbitration, on the other," the Senator is telling us he could not steer that course as delicately as the additional views set forth.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will answer this way: If the Senator from New York, or any other Senator, or anyone else, has an alternative that would steer a course other than what the committee has reported to the Senate, with some differences that could be resolved, we shall be very glad to accept it.

Mr. JAVITS. As the Senator knows, I have stood for the seizure principle for a long time. I will offer that principle with respect to this joint resolution because I believe it is the only way we shall be sure to be able to operate the railroads.

That statement leads me to this question: If the measure stands as it is, under compulsory arbitration, it would be a complete settlement. If, on the other hand, as we all seem to know, although it has not been stated yet, an effort is made to substitute the House proposal which has been referred to, these problems may very well be back on our doorstep in January. Two issues would have been decided: The work rules would have been put into effect for the firemen and crew consist, and one of the secondary disputes may be blown up into a major issue, by reason of the fact that people are unable to agree, and then we would be faced with the precise situation we now face, and the course we shall have to follow will be that of compulsory arbitration or some other course. But it is bound to come back to us unless the so-called secondary issues are settled by compulsory arbitration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I beg the Senator's pardon. My attention was diverted momentarily when first one Senator, and then another, spoke to me.

Let us consider the last matter that the Senator has suggested—that he is going to offer an amendment to allow the President to seize the railroads.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree that this is the traditional remedy which would enable the Nation to operate. It does not involve any new concept. I think we all ought to understand that the present proposal is a new concept. Even the Railway Labor Act does not provide for compulsory arbitration. As it stands today, the arbitration has to be voluntary. I do not want to debate this particular point with the Senator, but I will state to him that my only experience is that if we are going to apply a remedy, we should apply a remedy which is, first, traditional, and, second, a sure remedy. Seizure is both a traditional remedy and a sure remedy. That is why I feel this is the only way in which we can be sure that the railroads will operate.

That brings me to the second point I made when the Senator was occupied momentarily and did not hear me: Even if the views prevail which all of us seem to feel are moving around us and will undoubtedly be offered—that is, the House version of the measure—if we should adopt them, if the dispute could not be settled by collective bargaining on the so-called secondary issues, this problem would be back with us in January.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not necessarily.

Mr. JAVITS. We have not been shown anything so far to give us any other feeling.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said before that perhaps the Senator from Washington is a little too optimistic, but I cannot buy the proposition that because an award will be made on the two major issues, one or both parties will say, "We are not going to sit down and collectively bargain" issues that they have collectively bargained over and over again over the years.

I refer to issues which, so far as I know, the parties have not sat down around the table and tried to settle. They are issues which, either in so many words or by impression, we have been led to believe are issues which they probably could resolve.

It is true that these issues were taken up by the President's Emergency Board and discussed, but the parties have not discussed them. I would like to give the collective bargaining process a chance. Members of the committee who felt that way thought that opportunity should be given to them. There is some merit to that argument. There is a period of time involved.

With respect to the question of seizure, I naturally oppose it. The railroads were seized by President Truman. In our history, I think the railroads have been seized twice.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The War Powers Act gave the President the authority to do so in all kinds of matters. I think it would establish a precedent if the President were allowed to seize the railroads, although the railroads are in a unique position. However, the same principle would apply to the trucklines, the airlines, and other forms of transportation that had become a vital part of our transportation system.

In the reams of testimony taken there are at least opinions to the effect that seizure would probably be a step in the direction of Government ownership, because if there were seizure and the status quo continued for a long period of time, pretty soon it would be said, "The railroads are operating all right. Let us keep it that way."

We have the only private enterprise railroad system in the world. Every other railroad in the world is operated, controlled, or subsidized by a government. The only country that comes anywhere near having the same kind of system with respect to railroads has two railroads, one of which is owned by the government, and one-third of the stock of the other railroad is owned by it. That is the closest any other government comes to having a system of railroads such as we have.

We do not want to take a step toward Government ownership or operation over such a long period of time that perhaps everyone would say, "The railroads are doing fine. They are operating satisfactorily. Why touch them?" That is one of the problems posed by this dispute.

I must be frank. I have not examined the law on this question. I do not know whether the President, under his normal authority, could declare a national emergency and seize the railroads. Under the War Powers Act he had such authority. I believe the War Powers Act was repealed about a year and a half or 2 years ago.

Mr. JAVITS. While the Government has seized the railroads and there has been Government operation, we have not had compulsory arbitration, which may lead to the same thing and a great deal of confusion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. President Truman seized the railroads, but the seizure lasted only during the time when a piece of paper was transmitted from the other House to this House.

Mr. JAVITS. That was authorized during the war, but there has not been compulsory arbitration, which may so interpose a Government agency into the process as to be tantamount to Government operation. I will argue that point tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps tonight.

Mr. JAVITS. Perhaps tonight.

Turning to page 9, line 20 of the bill, the phrase appears:

> Resolving the matters on which the parties were not in agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. JAVITS. Page 9, line 20 of the joint resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is section 3?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. The language reads:

> Resolving the matters on which the parties were not in agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is just what it says.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. I am coming to something. It seems to me essential that the report be made crystal clear—because I do not think the language of the statute is clear—that that does not include the power to resolve the so-called secondary issues, because, as I read the language, there is no imposition whatever on a board of arbiters to resolve matters which are not in disagreement, but it can resolve anything that represents a dispute between the parties, including the secondary issues, and leave nothing for collective bargaining unless they would stay their hand.

So, at the very least, if the language is not to be changed, the chairman of the committee ought to state that it does not mean precisely what it says.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will read further, on line 23, the language reads:

> Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of those portions of the carriers' notice on November 2, 1959, identified as "Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power" and "Consist of Road and Yard Crews" and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as "Minimum Safe Crew Consist" and implementing proposal pertaining thereto.

It is limited to the two issues. At least we tried to limit it to the two issues.

Mr. JAVITS. Under the familiar rule of construction, the court will try to give effect to every part of the law. Therefore, the court can say "yes" to that part, without violating the terms of the act. All I say that in the interest of tightening up the legislation I hope that point will be considered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me state the intent. Insofar as we have gone, the arbitration group or board is limited to the discussion in the first instance.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first round.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the first round, what we identify as the two main subjects.

Mr. JAVITS. Correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They include the issue of the fireman—helpers—and the road crew. We do not intend to go any further in the first instance.

Mr. JAVITS. That is very helpful.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know how better we can state it. These two documents shape up the issue.

Mr. JAVITS. The second point is this: I notice that on page 8, lines 17, 18, and 19, the representatives of the carriers and organization parties are directed to appoint arbitrators. Will the Senator state for us again the legislative intent, which I understand to be—and if I am in error, I hope the Senator will correct me—that if the parties fail or refuse to appoint arbitrators, it is contemplated, under section 7, that the Attorney General may go into court and obtain a mandatory injunction directing the parties to appoint arbitrators, under the jurisdiction of the court. We may encounter the situation where many of the carriers, or quite a number of them, and the five brotherhoods will not be able to agree on arbitrators.

Then what happens? The legislative intent should be clearly spelled out. A direction which has no implementation except its power to go into court would seem to be sterile. What did the committee intend to be the compulsion which would make the representatives of the carriers and the representatives of the unions carry out the directions of the committee to appoint arbitrators?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee did not believe that any compulsion was needed to get the representatives of the carriers to appoint two people, or that the labor group would need any compulsion to appoint two people. I believe on Saturday it was mentioned as a possibility that they would not make the appointment. If they did not do it after a certain period of time, the President could make the appointment. That could probably be done by simple amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That could happen.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for narrowing the issues on the question involved in the dispute; namely, that it comes down to the question of preserving to the maximum the principle of collective bargaining, and under the alternatives proposed until now there is an open question, and sometimes a very serious question, as to whether rather fatal erosions on the principle of collective bargaining have not been made.

Therefore, it seems to some of us that in the committee-reported joint resolution, as it comes to us, whereas there was a voluntary agreement for arbitrators on the two primary issues, as publicly declared in the press and by the President, this in itself gives ground for agreed-upon arbitration on these two issues.

However, it seems unwise, in view of the possible precedent that we do anything that will promote a procedure of arbitration of the secondary issues. In order to clarify the committee proposal toward achieving that end, and for keeping the base for whatever compulsion there may be in as small an area as possible, I would propose an amendment to the committee amendment, which would include a section 6(b) very much along the lines of the proposal in the House. I believe it would be amenable to clean up the language of the proposed amendment, and try to make it as consistent as possible with the House action. I wonder whether the chairman would permit me to offer it as an amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute at this time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; the Senator may send it to the desk. I yield for that purpose, that he may do so.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary point of inquiry.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is submitting his amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I understood that he wanted the chairman to accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The chairman does not accept the amendment. He has no authority to accept the amendment. The Senator is merely submitting the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. It is an amendment that is being offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer his amendment at this time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. He is asking that it be considered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is submitting an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is offering it, and the clerk will report it.

Mr. MORSE. And make it the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does it require unanimous consent to do that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, beginning with the word "all" on line 1, strike out all through line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "60 days after the filing of the award."

On page 11, line 4, strike out "(a)".

On page 11, strike out lines 14 through 24.

On page 12, beginning with the word "when" on line 4, strike out all through line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "150 days after the date of its enactment, except that it shall remain in effect with respect to the last sentence of section 4 for the period prescribed in that sentence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not want the amendment to be acted on tonight. The Senator only proposed the amendment for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the Senator's request?

Mr. McGEE. My request is that it be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Let us have the procedure made clear.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Let us get the procedure straight. The proposal is to offer an amendment for adoption; then we will start our speeches against the bill. But we are not going to act on any amendment tonight.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no intention of acting on any amendment tonight.

Mr. MORSE. There is. The Chair has ruled that the amendment is before the Senate for action now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we are going to debate it at length.

Mr. MORSE. I will say we are.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] merely offered an amendment to the joint resolution. His amendment is the pending business. Other amendments may be offered. They can be discussed and debated. It is not the intention, as I understand, to vote on any proposal tonight.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming is the amendment that brings the question we have been discussing for some time in committee for a discussion on the subject on which there was a difference of opinion. That is all there is to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming is the pending question, and it is debatable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is debatable.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, before making a few general observations upon the joint resolution before the Senate, I should like to say, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce, that I feel certain the entire committee is appreciative of the able way in which its chairman [Mr. MAGNUSON] has presented the issues to the Senate this afternoon, and of the manner in which he conducted the deliberations of the committee on his return from his unfortunate illness.

I should like to say also, as the ranking minority member of the committee, that my admiration is unbounded for the dedicated, devoted, fair, and able manner in which the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], during the illness and absence of our chairman, handled and conducted the hearings on the very vexing and perplexing problem which confronted the Senate and its Committee on Commerce when the President submitted and recommended his legislation.

As has been said, the committee hearings have been long. They have been wearisome. They have considered many details with which they are unfamiliar. At least, I can speak for myself; and perhaps other Members of Congress are in similar situation. Even though we have served in Congress for many years, we are not experts on labor law or on labor negotiations. Of necessity, we are dealing with subjects and issues, many of which were unfamiliar to us. There was a long and difficult task. I am proud of the record the committee made for its attendance through the long evenings during which hearings were held.

This is perhaps as grave a domestic problem as has ever confronted Congress. We read in the press and hear on the floor and in committee many statements about compulsory arbitration, free collective bargaining, the interests of the brotherhoods, the interests of the carriers, and the interests of the public. Vital principles are involved in the question we shall attempt to settle in the Senate in the coming hours.

Let me say now—and I do so without any desire to be critical, but the situation is serious and grave enough so that there is no sense in mincing our language—that I regret that when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] just offered his amendment, we were hastily assured that it would not be voted on tonight, but that it would be debated at great length. I regret that we have been informed, at least informally, that the Senate will debate this general problem tonight and not get down to real voting on the various amendments and substitutes that will be presented—and I already know of many that will be—until tomorrow.

Of course Congress should never be forced into hasty and ill-considered action. However, it would be well for us to remind ourselves that this controversy did not begin yesterday; and it was not last week that we had notice that we had a duty to perform and some issues to meet. We knew that the time was growing short. For more than 4½ years this controversy has been developing as a result of the automation and mechanization of the railroads. All of us can appreciate the problems of the parties to the controversy.

It is impossible for those who represent the brotherhoods to go back to their members with any great fruits of victory, because it is inevitable that jobs that are rendered needless and unnecessary because of automation and mechanization must go. Any other course is not consistent with the efficiency, competitive ability, and powers of this country and its free enterprise system.

Nevertheless, it has been their duty—and no one can blame those who represent the workers—to use every means at their command—and they have used every means at their command, as we have been informed through the long hours of the hearings—to defer and hold off the inevitable result that is bound to occur, although the manner in which it is to apply has already been suggested and essentially agreed to; namely, that it shall be applied by attrition so that it will not result in employees of any standing whatsoever being thrown out jobless in the cold.

By the same token, the carriers have persistently, actively, with energy, and with skill, represented the interests of the railroad system of the country, about which I have heard so much said in the Senate and seen so many crocodile tears shed. The railroad system of the United States is the artery which connects the various parts of the country. It is essential to the welfare of the Nation in peace as well as in war.

So President Eisenhower appointed a commission which took voluminous testimony, listened to all sides, considered the problem for a long period of time, and presented its solution and judgment, which were accepted by the carriers.

President Kennedy then caused the problem to be referred to Emergency Board No. 154. Again the problem was considered, and again certain conclusions were drawn, although they were not identical with the Commission's, and did not cover all the ground covered by the Commission.

Again, they were accepted by the carriers. I am not reproaching the brotherhoods for their attitude because they had much to lose; they had their duty to perform to their members who needed their jobs.

Then the matter was carried to the Supreme Court, and the decision was handed down.

Now I am not rehearsing this, simply to make a speech. This is in no way critical of the chairman or the other members of the committee, for whom I have the greatest respect and whom I honor from long years of service with them. Someone said a few minutes ago—I do not remember who it was—why had management waited so long?

Well, what has the Government done?

When this thing came to a head, and the carriers had been authorized by the highest Court in the land to put into effect their rules, and had been sustained in maintaining that they had the right—and, indeed, they had the duty to their stockholders to do so—the President of the United States very wisely and very justifiably concerned himself with this emergency.

Let us remember that this is only the third time in history that it has become necessary for the President of the United States to send to Congress recommendations to exert arbitrary, naked power in dealing with the railroad industry. We can add one other instance; namely, when the President attempted to wield such power against the steel industry, and it was thrown out by the Court. But the present President very naturally—and Senators should not misunderstand me; I do not reproach him for it; I honor him for it—waited until the last minute, hoping that the parties could be brought together and that the Secretary of Labor, the National Mediation Board, and all those in Government who are charged with the duty of trying to negotiate settlements would be successful in settling this dispute, so that the President would not have to ask us to resort to some form of compulsory arbitration or to invoke seizure, rather than to face a devastating national railroad strike.

So he tried and tried, waited and hoped, and tried and waited and hoped, until finally all hope of agreement was exhausted.

Some of us, because of our positions on the committees, were permitted to sit down at the White House with the leadership and hear what the President had to say before he made his recommendations and sent his bill to Congress. Of course, one does not quote or attempt to quote the President of the United States, because he might be misquoted; and that is something we must avoid. But let me say, in the stereotyped form we use, that it was my impression, from what the President said, that he had waited until the last minute, that he had requested the carriers to withhold the posting of their rules, and they had done so—if I remember correctly—more than once, and that he felt that he could no longer honorably ask them for another stay of execution—if one wants to phrase the matter that way.

My understanding is that he did not say that the Congress could not do so, or that the committee could not do so; I understand—although I am not quoting the President—that he said he could not honorably do so. Then, after we learned of the feelings of the President—again, I believe I understood them correctly, and I am not quoting him—he said he did not wish to resort to seizure, because seizure would solve nothing. He said he did not wish to invoke any form of compulsory arbitration, because it would set a grave and dangerous precedent, which would result in a kind of naked power on the part of the Government which might eventually, if allowed to grow, put an end to certain economic rights and human rights in this country.

So he was adopting what he felt was a middle course, which was neither seizure nor compulsory arbitration. I must say—not at all in a partisan sense, but frankly—that I could not then follow his reasoning, and I cannot do so now—any more than I have been able to follow the reasoning of many other distinguished men, who I am sure, have spoken with sincerity about certain proposed steps, and then have tried to tell us that they do not amount to compulsory arbitration.

But, Mr. President, I can boil the proposal down to its bones: If Congress is to pass a measure that will amount to anything, it must require either seizure or some form of compulsory arbitration. It may be mild; it may be temporary; or it may even be sugar coated; but it must contain the seeds of either compulsory arbitration or seizure, or else it will not be effective.

The only other course—if we wish to be absolutely sure, simon-pure, holy, and certain that the bill we pass does not contain the seeds of compulsion; and that includes seizure, because there is no more vicious form of compulsion than seizure—is to let nature take its course and leave the solution of this problem to collective bargaining, let the work rules be posted, and let the strike take place, disastrous and calamitous though it would be—and it may be that that is necessary, Mr. President, in order to preserve the rights of all people in the future. I will not say that it is not.

So the proposal came to the Senate and to the House, and it was referred to our committee. We had less than a week to go. Here is where I believe each member of the committee should reproach himself. I do not reproach the chairman. He was ill and in the hospital in his home State. I do not reproach the acting chairman, because he very naturally wanted to hold off, if possible, until the chairman returned. After all, we were guilty of doing exactly and precisely the thing the President did; let us face it. I am not impugning the motives of Senators; but there was a great deal of hoping against hope that we would not have to stand on the floor of the Senate—as we stand tonight, and as we shall stand tomorrow—and have to vote "yea" or "nay" on a proposal that is repugnant to us, and on which we cannot win, no matter which way we vote.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. On the point the Senator from New Hampshire has just made, I should like the record to be abundantly clear that the delay, if we may characterize it as delay, was deliberate, because, as I have said, it was our hope that this problem would be resolved by the process of collective bargaining, and I exhorted both parties to make contact with each other. I urged the Secretary of Labor to call them in and talk to them separately and together—which, of course, he did, as all of us know.

All of us thought—in fact, until a few days ago we were very hopeful of it—that the chances were that there would be a meeting of the minds. But then that fell through. However, I do not apologize for our procedure. I am perfectly willing to admit on the floor of the Senate, this afternoon, that we did proceed with all expedition to hold committee hearings. Some nights we held them from 7 p.m. until midnight, because we also had the civil rights program before our committee, and we did not want to do anything to forestall consideration of civil rights.

After the hearings were concluded, I invited representatives of the brotherhoods to come to my office. I did so publicly. I urged upon them to reconsider all the proposals that had been made, and particularly the one made by the Secretary of Labor. I did not tell them what to do. I did not ask them to do anything except to reconsider and review their position in the hope that the issues could be resolved through the process of collective bargaining. I regret very much that that did not happen. But the fact that my distinguished colleague was sick, and we did want him to come back, did not mean that we used that as an excuse. We were merely stalling, if anyone wishes to use the expression, in the hope that the parties would resolve the issues. It is regrettable that it did not happen. But I admit that I did so deliberately.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, there is not one single word which the Senator from Rhode Island has said with which I would not agree 100 percent. If he had happened to hear me a little sooner, he would have heard me say that if we have waited too long, we should all face our responsibility for it. The motives of the Senator from Rhode Island are exactly what he said they were. The President of the United States had the same motives. In each case they were absolutely praiseworthy. Their hope was that the issues would be settled.

But the fact remains—and this is the only thing I will say that could be construed as criticism—we waited, I fear, a little bit too long. I am frank to say that it seems to me that toward the end of the period, only an extreme optimist—only a person who believed in Santa Claus—could really hope that the controversy would be settled on the eve of the joint resolution coming to the Senate.

Now the joint resolution has come before the Senate. According to my watch, it is roughly 10 minutes past 6 on Monday. Roughly 54 hours from the moment that I am standing here now the deadline will be reached. The carriers will post their notices. The strike will follow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I had intended to make this comment later in a short speech, but I do not know how it could be more apropos than at the present moment, if the Senator will permit the observation.

The Congress is now engaged in a legislative process dealing with this issue.

I say most respectfully, but with the deepest conviction, that I can think of no greater disservice that the carriers and the brotherhoods could perform to our system of government than to follow a course of action on either side that would bring about a strike while the Congress is in the midst of the legislative process on the issues themselves. I mean it when I say that if the carriers go forward with posting working rules on Thursday, and the brotherhoods go forward with a strike following the posting of those rules, in my judgment, both sides will be guilty of a gross unpatriotic act. It is not a case of the parties being taken advantage of by the Congress, for everyone knows that we are in the midst of a determination of the issues. Everyone knows that some legislation will be passed. But in the interest of maintaining a sound system of government by law, such legislation ought to be passed in an atmosphere within which reason, and not hysteria or political pressure, prevails.

I sincerely hope that both sides to the dispute will make immediately clear to the American people, who have the right to receive such a message from them, that while the Congress is passing judgment upon how to settle the issues legislatively, and as long as the Congress pursues that course without interruption, there will be no posting of rules and there will be no strike. If the Congress became guilty of dilatory action and sought to lay the matter aside, that would be a different thing. But I feel that if either side to the dispute follows a precipitate course of action now, resulting in a stoppage of the rolling of the wheels of the railroads, they ought to be condemned by the American people as unpatriotic citizens.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the pungent and forceful remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I always admire his ability to express himself clearly, forcefully, and powerfully. Many times I agree with him, and always I respect his viewpoint. But I desire respectfully to say that I disagree with him on what he just said—and I disagree with him radically—that we should condemn the carriers and the brotherhoods as unpatriotic in carrying through what is their constitutional right, as decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and what they themselves have continued to defer at the request of the President, and again at the request of the acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I do not believe that any American citizen should be reproached because somewhere along the line he chooses to exercise the rights guaranteed to him by the Constitution.

While we are informing the American people, as the distinguished and eloquent Senator from Oregon has so well said, rather than informing the American people that the carriers are horrible if they assert their rights, after postponing them several times, we had better inform the American people that their representatives in Congress are not entirely blameless.

I could not agree more with the Senator from Oregon that legislation as important, weighty, and grave as the proposed legislation should not be considered hastily. It should not be ill-considered. It should be thought out with the most careful workmanship that can be applied to it.

But the situation into which we have allowed ourselves to get is ready-made for a blocking by any Senator who is not satisfied and who feels strongly. I shall not use the horrible word I have heard somewhere, which refers to some action in Congress. But the word "filibuster" is ready-made.

Already I have spent too much time on generalities. If a certain interpretation is written into the joint resolution—and it may well be offered—I am ready to stand at my desk and read every single word of all the deliberations of the President's Railroad Commission and everything else that I can find which is pertinent to the subject. So I am not throwing rocks at anyone else for doing what I would do if a certain amendment were ever written into the joint resolution. I know that my friend from Oregon has never argued at length or indulged in any filibuster——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am the only liberal who admits that he filibusters.

Mr. COTTON. As my friend knows, I was speaking facetiously.

I know that the Senator entertains some very deep convictions on this subject. I honor him for it. As would be said in some other circles than the Senate, "Five will get you ten that if certain things should go into the joint resolution, the Senator from Oregon would stand and fight until the last hour goes by for the posting of these notices."

So here we are, with 54 hours. Generally speaking, any Senator who wishes to block action by Congress, if he feels sincerely it would be dangerous action, is in a beautifully advantageous position to do so.

I was present when the Committee on Commerce asked for 30 days, and the carriers gave them 30 days. The 30 days will be up at 1 minute past 12 o'clock Thursday morning.

So far as I am concerned, I feel exactly as I understood the President felt. The President said, "I cannot ask them for any more time. You may." I do not think we are in a position to ask for more time, since we have let this matter go until the last minute.

I felt compelled to say these things because in justice I thought they should be said. I wish to mention two or three other aspects of the joint resolution.

Of course, we considered the proposal recommended by the President. We considered the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission as the agency to arbitrate and to settle either some or all of the issues involved in this controversy. That was most repugnant to the brotherhoods. "Repugnant" is a mild word. I listened to the testimony and I talked with them. They seemed to be honestly and earnestly in terror of having the ICC made the arbitrator. They all agreed with Roy E. Davidson, the grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who said in his testimony that the ICC was "about the last arbitrator to whom we would think of submitting our dispute." We could be frank and say that they almost pleaded with the committee not to give them the ICC to arbitrate. So we agreed to that. I think the decision was almost unanimous, if not unanimous.

I am beginning to be somewhat wary about what I say about the committee agreeing, because those things change, and I cannot keep up with them.

I shall talk about the great Committee on Commerce with the same respect, and shall observe the same protocol I do with respect to the President. I will not quote, but I will say that it was my understanding that we decided among ourselves that whatever we did we were not going to force the brotherhoods to accept the ICC as the final arbitrator.

So we began to discuss some other tribunal.

I will state frankly what I believed. I am sure that at least some of my colleagues were in accord with me. I will state what I advocated.

I advocated that we pass the President's proposal, taking out the Interstate Commerce Commission and putting in a commission appointed by the President of the United States. I felt that that would be the fairest way, if we were to resolve the questions, and if we were to be compelled to do so by compulsory arbitration. That is what we were doing. Let there be no mistake about that. Let us not be hypocritical about it. When the time came when we really got down to brass tacks on the joint resolution, that was and is, involved.

Being a loyal member of the minority, I do not know what happened on the majority side. I am not invited, of course, to all the conferences of the leadership and the chairman of the committee and the Secretary of Labor and the representatives from the White House. Quite properly, the administration in power and the administration's majority in the Congress determine policy. That is as it should be. I am not offended because I did not have the advantage of knowing all that went on behind closed doors, or what was said or done.

But I do know that there is one thing a minority Senator cannot be stopped from doing. He can attend his committee meetings. He can attend its executive sessions.

What I have to say to my colleagues in the Senate bears on what I have had to say about the responsibility of the Congress in waiting too long. If people do not like it, that is too bad, but there was an element of hoping that we would not have to make this decision, that we would not have to walk up to the trough and take a drink.

I know that the committee never got down to business to consider a measure to report to the Senate until last Friday morning. And a measure was reported at noon on Friday.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Was the measure reported by the committee one which was unanimously adopted by the entire Commerce Committee?

Mr. COTTON. I say to my friend, do not say those dirty words. There were some who apparently did not believe in it. There were no votes against it; let us say that.

Mr. SIMPSON. I refer to the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, who said this afternoon that there was a unanimous agreement of the committee; and, as an afterthought—that is my word, not his—subsequently there occurred the afterthought, and some Senators joined in another report which is now appended to the original report of the Commerce Committee.

Can the Senator give us any information about that?

Mr. COTTON. I say, bless your heart, my dear friend. There is not a Republican on that list, and much as I esteem them and as I hope they esteem me, not one of those Senators ever comes to me for advice, so I cannot tell the Senator what motives inspired them, with whom they talked, or what caused them to write that kind of report.

I am not criticizing; I do not know about the situation.

All I know is that we sat in the committee and voted, and there was not a single vote against reporting the joint resolution.

In justice, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] had expressed himself as much in doubt, and he reserved the right—and said other Senators might wish to do the same—to file supplementary views.

I am not criticizing those Senators. I am merely trying to recount what happened and how fast it happened.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the Senator believe that if the amendment recently offered by my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] were to be adopted by the Senate, it would prevent the railroad carriers from putting the rules into effect, and put us back where we were?

Mr. COTTON. I will come to that question in a moment in my discussion. It is a very pertinent question, and I thank the Senator for asking it.

There was not a single concrete, definite draft presented to the Committee on Commerce until it met at the call of the Chair at 9:30 a.m. Friday morning. If I remember correctly, the committee did not come to order until nearly 10 o'clock. Two or 2¼ hours later out from the committee came the joint resolution.

Some Senator should "pop up" at this point and say, "What is the Senator complaining about? He voted for it." I did.

It should be noted, however, that there were certain imperfections of workmanship in the measure. When I say "imperfections of workmanship," I am making the understatement of the year.

It was the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire, when Senators began to talk about having labor represented by two members of the Board and the railroads represented by two members of the Board, that the President should name all members of the Board, but that he name two members from a list submitted to him by the brotherhoods and name two other members from a list submitted to him by the carriers.

There are five brotherhoods involved in this dispute. Many railroads are involved. After all, in a sense, this is the responsibility of the President of the United States. He has recommended a course to the Congress, but he made the official decision that the time had come for the Government to step in and do something about this situation. I think it would be well if he had an opportunity to name the Commission. If several persons were suggested by the labor unions he might have some selection to make among those to be nominated. The same thing is true with respect to the carriers, and then the President could name three more members, representing the public, one of whom should be chairman.

That is what I wanted written into the joint resolution. I do not know where the joint resolution came from, or who drafted it, or how hastily it was done, but I do know that it directs five labor unions to name two men. I do not know much about the internal workings of labor unions, but I can see how there might be some dispute among them. I do not own any railroad stock, and so I do not know much about railroads, but the measure directs the railroads to name two, and there are many railroads involved. I can conceive that there could be disagreement among them.

We are under the stern direction of writing legislation which is just as airtight as we are capable of writing, and that cannot be done between 10 o'clock in the morning and 12 o'clock noon.

There are some further changes, which I would mention. There is a little partisanship in what I am about to say, and I think it is justifiable: I become a little sick about the overawed and overpowered Republicans, year by year, day after day, being abused and kicked around, so that when something sticks out like a sore thumb, we do not say anything about it. I am going to say something about it. I do not know who wrote the draft that came to us, but, Mr. President, do you know what was in it?

It provided that the railroads should name two members of the Board, the brotherhoods two, the other three to be selected by whom? The President? Oh, no. By the National Mediation Board.

I do not want to be political, but this is a political country. I respect my President, and I have spoken highly of him in this speech, and I am going to speak highly of him again. I have the greatest respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I have so much respect for them that they sometimes scare me. Some of them are so very powerful, so very adroit, but they were never more adroit than when they wrote those words into the joint resolution. They did not want this to be the President's baby. They did not want this to be the Democrats' baby. They wanted the National Mediation Board, which never was created for such a function, to name those three members. Then the White House would be pure as the driven snow. Nobody ever could rise and say to the President of the United States, "You had something to do with creating a Board which could, mercilessly and powerfully, engage in compulsory arbitration." Oh, no, it could be said, the Congress passed the act. They did not even pass the act the President recommended. They took on their shoulders the responsibility, and probably most of the responsibility was on the shoulders of the Republican minority, whose members comprise only one-half the number of the majority. But the Congress wrote it. And who appointed those who administered this arbitrary power? The National Mediation Board, not the President.

Of course, that is ridiculous. This crisis is far too grave, this hour is far too solemn, to have any board making decisions that affect many thousands of working men and their jobs, and that affects the financial stability of the railroads of the United States—any board that does not have the dignity and the prestige and the influence and the power that is given to a Board by being appointed and named by the President of these United States.

So that provision was changed. I think it was the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] who took up the cudgels on that issue, and the provision was changed without any great amount of disagreement.

Then the Senator from New Hampshire suggested that we ought not to throw away all the guidelines in the proposal that came from the President. It will be remembered that in the measure that came to us from the President, in section 3, on page 4, it was provided that the Commission—as it was called in that proposal; the Board, in this measure, "shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed rule upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carriers and the employees affected."

It may be said that those are rather trite sentiments, but I feel they ought to be given due consideration. They do constitute guidelines.

In connection with the measure that was reported, it was said that such a provision was unnecessary, since it is only window dressing. Some Senators said, "Let it go without it." Now I am informed that there is a grave question; that there was at one time an award handed down by an arbitration board some years ago that was thrown out by the courts because that board had no guidelines and no criteria drawn for it. I do not know that that is so, but I have been informed that it is so, and that the staff of the committee is preparing an amendment on that point.

Another respect in which the measure needs an amendment is that there is no time named within which the President shall name the three members of the Board. I do not mean that President Kennedy or any other President would be purposely dilatory, but if we are writing airtight legislation, there should be a time limitation. I expect an amendment to be offered to take care of these apparently technical defects—at least they are defects in my book.

I want to say a word about what is at stake in the matter of the so-called secondary issues.

If section 6(b) is a bad section—and the House apparently thinks it is, and my friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] apparently thinks it is, and so do other Senators—I will take the primary responsibility for it, because I offered it in the committee. I can be held responsible for anything that has my name attached to it.

The rough draft that was brought in Friday morning about 10 o'clock for our consideration provided that the Board of seven would act on the two main issues, as they are referred to, of the firemen—helpers—and the crew consist, and that they should have 30 days to start to act, and 60 days to render their award and then nothing would happen. The award would not take effect, because it was stipulated that the parties should proceed at once, on the passage of the proposed legislation, with collective bargaining on the so-called secondary issues, many of which are rather important. Therefore, it was stipulated in the draft which was put before us that the award of the Arbitration Board would not take effect until the parties, the railroads, and the unions, had negotiated and agreed on all the so-called secondary issues.

In all the years that I have been kicking around the House and the Senate I have never seen anything like that. There is another nice little piece of smooth craftsmanship. I would use the word "craftsmanship," and I would use the adjective "crafty" to describe the craftsmanship.

I wish that some of the distinguished Senators from the South were in their seats now. I wish the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] were sitting in his accustomed place. I cannot help think what would happen if the Senate passed a civil rights bill, for which many of our friends are working so hard, but passed only half of it, and then said that the southerners should start bargaining with the NAACP, and that what we had passed would not take effect until they had agreed. How long does anyone suppose it would take?

What would the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] say if he won his primary, became the nominee of his party, and then won the election and became a duly certified and elected Senator from the State of Wyoming, only to be told that a bill had been passed providing that he could not come to the Senate and take his oath of office and assume his seat in the Senate until he had entered into some kind of amicable agreement with his defeated opponent? What would he think of that?

It is easy to say that the so-called secondary issues are not very important; that they could be decided easily enough. Perhaps they can be decided easily. They have not been decided so far, but perhaps they can be.

Senators can be assured that when the board of arbitration renders its decision, someone will not like it.

It could be the carriers, or the unions, or both. Someone will find something distasteful in it. Does anyone think they are going to sit down and come to a conclusion when they know that those decisions cannot take effect? Of course not.

I am only a country lawyer, but in my opinion this provision is unconstitutional, in that it is taking property without due process of law. We can go all through these 4½ years of seeking to settle this controversy by collective bargaining, but we must consider what will happen when Congress exercises arbitrary power and passes an act which says to the railways of the Nation: "You must keep all the employees that you now believe are unnecessary and needless; in addition, you must continue to hire new employees as fast as the old ones die or leave their work until you have agreed with the brotherhoods on the so-called secondary issues."

It would be equally unjust if we were to say to the brotherhoods, "You must come to a conclusion before you can have any of the benefits that would accrue to you by the decision of the Board." If the Board renders a decision that gives liberal severance pay, or a decision which states that no man will lose his job, and that the only changes will be by attrition—and that has already been conceded to the employees in the two major issues—and if it hands down a liberal decision protecting seniority rights of those who were removed from their jobs and had to seek other jobs, they too should not be deprived until they knuckled down and agreed with the carriers.

If there was ever an arbitrary, dangerous, unjust, and completely fantastic provision written into an act, it is that one.

I offered the amendment which is now called section 6(b), that after the Board of Arbitration had rendered its decision on the two major issues, 30 days would ensue for continuing bargaining. Parties would have been bargaining all the time while this was being done. After 30 days, these issues would go to the arbitration board, which would decide them in 60 days. Therefore the whole dispute would be resolved in 180 days, plus such time as might be taken for the legitimate appeals to the courts. That right of appeal is preserved in the joint resolution by reference to the Railway Labor Act. I offered the amendment. It was adopted.

It was my understanding at the time that some members of the committee opposed the amendment and wanted the provision left in; in other words, they wanted to hold up the decision of the arbitration board until the parties had agreed on the secondary issues.

I have read the additional views of my distinguished friends, who prepared them, as is their right, after the deliberations of the committee had been concluded, and after the joint resolution had been reported and we had gone home with a sigh of relief.

When I returned, I found staring me in the face the additional views.

I read from the additional views:

> We concur with the committee in reporting legislation, but we cannot agree with or support that provision of the reported measure which would refer the secondary issues to arbitration. In the present crisis a delicate course has to be steered between two unthinkables—strike and seizure, on the one hand, and the unacceptable—compulsory arbitration, on the other. Free collective bargaining, as an institution responsible for many of this country's remarkable achievements in economic stability and productive capacity, must survive without a precedent that would substitute legislation for negotiation.
>
> It is our judgment, then, that only those issues on which the parties themselves had neared agreement on the need for arbitration should be referred by legislation to an arbitration board. On this basis the fundamental issues in the dispute, "fireman (helper)" and "crew consist," are appropriate for submission to such an arbitration panel. But the secondary issues have never been to our knowledge a subject of collective bargaining; in fact, ample evidence in the hearing record indicates (as did the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy) that these could be resolved once the primary problems had been disposed of. Therefore, we would leave these secondary issues for settlement between the parties without the inhibiting threat of arbitration at a time certain.

Mr. President, the point is that those views are good views. The first paragraph is an absolutely correct statement. I would endorse every word of it. On the whole, the second paragraph is a good paragraph. But do Senators notice one thing about it? What happened to all the contention? What happened to the rough draft? What happened to the idea that the award of the arbitration board would not take effect until the railroads agreed upon the secondary issues? That provision went somewhere. It is not mentioned. It is not referred to. It is ignored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think that the interesting time postponement feature might get us over the election?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the matter of going through all the procedure of arbitration and having the award made and then having it not take effect until this agreement has gone out the window disturbs me.

I have great confidence in my colleagues. I would trust them with almost anything I have. I would trust them with my pocketbook. I would trust them with my wife. I would trust them with almost anything. But the way this question has wobbled around, I wonder whether we shall hear about it again.

I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment which was thrust upon us with such great haste a few minutes ago by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], although it is not intended to have the Senate take any action on it until tomorrow. The deadline will be reached day after tomorrow. I assume, or I gather from what he said, that essentially it is the House version; and the House version leaves the secondary issues to be negotiated. It provides that arbitration on the two issues shall take effect 60 days after award is handed down.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming is the House version, that is one thing; if it contains essential differences—and I have not had an opportunity to read it yet—that is something else. But I serve notice that if there is even a hint or a suggestion or an amendment offered to include this hypocritical, delusive expedient of creating a great arbitration board, having it make an award, and then not having the award take effect, I will assist the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] to the extent of my ability to prolong the debate until the strike has taken place, is settled, is over, and the rails on the railroads have worn out. That sort of action is absolutely unjust and incompatible with ordinary justice or decent legislation.

I do not want to vote for compulsory arbitration. I am sure I shall not vote for seizure. I am as reluctant as any other Member of the Senate to allow a devastating railroad strike to paralyze the country. I repeat that we are not blameless.

But I say again, as I said earlier, that we shall either take this particular animal by the horns and do something about it, or we shall not. It appears to me as though we are not going to do so.

I should like to know what the President thinks about the joint resolution, or what he wants. I hope that sometime before the week after next the majority leadership or my good chairman, or someone else, will take the rest of us into confidence, because this is a grave situation. The President dropped the problem into the lap of Congress. I should like to know how he feels about the joint resolution the committee has produced and where he stands. So far as I can do so consistently with my own convictions, I want to consider the President's views and follow them.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] said he has one amendment in the nature of a substitute which he intends to offer, and which is really the President's proposal. A moment or two later, he said that if that proposal failed, he would offer another amendment, and it would not provide for compulsory arbitration. The inference is—and the Senator from Oregon is a man who uses words with great exactitude—that there is a little compulsory arbitration in the President's proposal. If so, I am horrified. I have been told over and over again in the hearings and have even been told by representatives of the carriers that there was no compulsory arbitration in the President's proposal.

From this moment on, let us not deceive ourselves. There is compulsory arbitration in seizure. That is the most compulsive action that could be taken. It is one of the most dangerous procedures and would settle nothing. It would only prolong the agony of the undecided questions that are haunting and vexing the workers and the carriers.

It is said that the joint resolution reported to the Senate provides for compulsory arbitration. Even though I voted to report the joint resolution, I will not say it does not provide for compulsory arbitration. There is compulsory arbitration in the President's proposal and in the committee's bill.

I feel perfectly free to speak out and support the committee's joint resolution. This problem has been boiling around in me. I religiously attended all the hearings through all this long month. What pains me the most is to hear a Senator assure the minority leader—and the minority leader received the statement with great equanimity—that there will be no voting tonight. Mr. President, when is the Senate to start voting? We cannot settle this question with hot air. If we crawl to the carriers and ask them to grant another reprieve because the Senate and House have not been able to consider the problem with due deliberation and make up their minds, I hope the carriers will spurn us.

We have a duty to perform. We cannot perform it by adjourning and going home now. We should stay here, consider the proposals before us, and start voting, because the time is short. Unless someone has obtained information which

I do not have—for we lowly Republicans cannot know what is going on behind the scenes—and unless Senators can be certain that no action will be taken the day after tomorrow, I think tonight is the time for the Senate to be on the job. I do not want the majority leader to rise at about 4 o'clock, 5 o'clock, or 6 o'clock tomorrow, with perhaps only 24 hours to go before the deadline, and request unanimous consent that 5 minutes be allowed each side. Mr. President, I will tell you who will make one objection: It will be made by me. I shall also be watching for some of the neat, little devices similar to those which came to us so suddenly and then evaporated so completely between the time when we met and the time when the so-called additional views were written.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Hampshire knows that I have already notified the Senate that there will be a second objection.

Mr. COTTON. Then there is no need for me to object, because I have never known the Senator from Oregon to weaken, once he has made such a statement. I am glad that is true. But I still wish we would get busy with our work on this problem, because the challenge is very grave, and we are not meeting it.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I suspect that the Senator from Wyoming submitted his amendment in order that all of us could read it this evening. I have looked at it just now. The leadership has proposed—for several reasons of its own—that we do not vote on it tonight. I am willing to have us vote now, or at midnight, or at 2 o'clock in the morning. Several Senators have said they are going to speak on this joint resolution. If so, we cannot vote on it tonight. That is not the fault of the Senator from New Hampshire, nor is it the fault of the Senator from Washington. It is part of the Senate procedure. So I do not think we would save any time, on both sides, by trying to get a vote tonight or in the next 2 or 3 hours. Instead, I believe we can make faster progress in the morning.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am not suggesting that we rush to the final vote. But we have various amendments to vote on. I do not see anything in the world to prevent the Senator from New York from submitting his seizure amendment and having it voted on. The amendment of the Senator from Wyoming would, in general, conform to the provisions of the House joint resolution. I do not think it is going to take all night for me or for any other Member to read that; and the sooner we vote on it and then act on the other amendments, the nearer we shall be to the final vote on the joint resolution. We are faced with a deadline; all Senators know that. If we keep Senators' feet to the fire and begin to vote on the amendments, we shall have a better chance to discharge our responsibilities.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Washington for what he has done. I know that neither he nor any other Senator is at all responsible for the delay. I know no one had anything to do with it—except someone nebulous and far away in some pink cloud. But whether we wait to hear from all Senators or whether we wait to hear from the President or whether we wait to hear from the carriers or whether we wait to hear from the brotherhoods or whether we wait for Christmas and Santa Claus—whatever it is—I wish all Senators good luck.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is very good to hear from the Senator from New Hampshire. I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding.

During the delivery of Mr. COTTON's speech,

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the director of the joint resolution, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] whether—and he is the director of it—whether there is a likelihood of a vote tonight?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am the caretaker of the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will amend my statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is my understanding that there will be no votes tonight. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] submitted an amendment to lie on the desk. It is the pending business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desires to make some remarks on the subject and probably present some further amendments or substitutes. When he has finished, it is proposed to have the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until 12 o'clock noon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Until 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. COTTON. I shall be finished within 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The wish of the majority leader is to have the Senate adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall let the record speak for itself—as it will, when it is read tomorrow—as to the descriptions I have given previously of the amendment I am about to submit. I believe the record will show that I said, it is free of compulsory arbitration. I believe the record will show that I said in effect, that the amendment is based upon voluntary arbitration, and that the only possible relationship between it and any of the other measures before the Senate is to be found in the Commerce Committee's joint resolution. The Commerce Committee's joint resolution would result in compulsory arbitration. Tomorrow, at some length, I shall distinguish between the President's proposal and the Commerce Committee's joint resolution.

Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that I think it is well that the Senate is not voting tonight. It is important that the Senate do a little reflecting tonight. There were two party conferences this afternoon; the Democrats had a meeting, and the Republicans had a meeting. I do not know what went on in the Republican meeting, but I do know what went on in the Democratic meeting; and I am satisfied that some Senators are going to take a long, second look at the Commerce Committee's joint resolution before they vote on it, because—for reasons which I shall set forth in some detail tomorrow—the committee's joint resolution proposes, in my judgment, some very unwise legislation.

One more comment, before I discuss my two amendments: I have great respect for the patriotism of the representatives of the carriers and for the patriotism of the representatives of the brotherhoods. But they are party litigants, and are involved in a controversy which we can say has tried men's souls, not for months, but since 1959. So I think it fair to say that to a certain extent many of them have just about reached the limit of their patience. I could not disagree with the Senator from New Hampshire more than I disagree with his comments about the suggestion I made—namely, that while we are in the midst of the legislative process, both the carriers and the brotherhoods have a clear, patriotic duty to postpone "pulling the plug," so to speak, or to postpone engaging in a course of action of posting the work rules and calling a strike while the legislative process is at work in good faith.

We cannot maintain a system of government by law, Mr. President, if all the groups involved in any matter being considered by the legislative process does not pay respect to our system of government by law. So I believe it is in the best interest of both parties to this dispute—so long as Congress acts in good faith and continues to give consideration to this legislative problem during the rest of this week or the first part of next week, if necessary—that there simply be an announcement on their part—it will not call for an understanding with the Congress or with the President or with anyone else—that so long as Congress proceeds to consider this matter legislatively, there will not be any posting of the work rules or any calling of a strike.

I cannot speak for the carriers, but I can speak of my impression of their position. My impression of the position of the carriers is that the American public will learn that they never had any intention of posting any work rules this week, if Congress was in the process of considering this issue on its merits.

Of course, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] pointed out, the carriers are in a position in which they have a legal right to post their working rules. They carried that issue to the Supreme Court. The Court sustained their right, and I agree with the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

If they did not have that right, I do not know what rights of management are left in this country. Many times in recent weeks I have spoken on that issue. I have made many unhappy. But I now incorporate by reference every word that the senior Senator from Oregon has spoken from the floor of the Senate on this case. I stand by every word, including my criticisms of the brotherhoods In my judgment, the leaders of the brotherhoods have performed a great disservice to the rank-and-file members of the brotherhoods in the way they have handled this case. In my judgment, they will discover that the rank-and-file members of the brotherhoods, once they come to learn the facts about the handling of this case, will, by a substantial majority, share the point of view of the senior Senator from Oregon. There is no justification in the field of labor relations for the way in which the chiefs of the brotherhoods have bungled this case. They have permitted the carriers to be placed in a position in which the carriers have been willing to go along with every procedural suggestion and recommendation that has been made by every official board appointed by our Government, beginning with the Rifkind Board under the Eisenhower administration, down through the Rosenman Board.

I am not interested in the semantics of the chiefs of the brotherhoods. The undeniable fact is that the strategy of the brotherhoods has been the strategy of maintaining the status quo. The brotherhoods have had a great deal to say about collective bargaining, the presence or the absence of which existed in this case. But collective bargaining does not exist if the position of one party in essence is the position of the status quo—take it or leave it—or making token suggestions in regard to how many men whose services, it is alleged, they might be willing to dispense with as not needed.

We do not know what the merits are on the substantive issues, because the fact is that in handling of this case for the most part to date, the various commissions and individuals who have handled it have dealt primarily with procedural matters. Some of us said weeks ago that that was the main feature of the Rosenman Commission report.

I do not know whether a better commission to make recommendations on the substantive issues could be found. It is pretty well known in the Senate that at one stage of our conferences at the White House level, bipartisan in nature, with Senators on the other side of the aisle sitting with Senators from this side of the aisle, with the President, the Secretary of Labor, and others, it was suggested by the senior Senator from Oregon that if another commission were to be appointed or considered, the thing to do would be to reconvene the Rosenman Commission with instructions to proceed with the necessary hearings to particularize its recommendations on the substantive issues. I wish that had been done, for that was in the voluntary stage. There was nothing binding about that. I would like to have had the American people—for after all, it will be the American public who will be the final arbitrator in this case—have a particularized report on the substantive issues from the Rosenman Commission. But it was finally decided to appoint a special group from the President's Management-Labor Council. But the report of that group was again limited pretty much to a relating of the steps that had been taken in the case and a description of what the issues were about, but again no particularization by way of recommendations for a settlement of the substantive issues. It is the substantive issues that are giving us all the trouble.

I know enough about collective bargaining to know when there is a will to bargain and when the will is nonexistent. Although an attempt has been made to paint the carriers as having a coloring of being against collective bargaining, I am satisfied that the facts of the case do not bear it out. This afternoon I heard in conference talk to the effect that there had been no collective bargaining on the so-called secondary issues. Of course, there is no such thing as a secondary issue in this case. Every one of the issues that has been described as a secondary issue is a major issue and represents an issue over which firemen will strike unless there is a fair and equitable settlement of the dispute over that issue. So I am not one who will take the position in the debate that is starting on this historic case of saying that the carriers have not bargained but the brotherhoods have always been willing to bargain—or vice versa, for that matter. But I am satisfied that at least at this moment we are merely wasting our breath if we talk about procedures to be put in a joint resolution that will produce collective bargaining on the part of these parties. In my judgment, we have about as much prospect of obtaining collective bargaining of the type we are talking about in support of the joint resolution as I have of flapping my arms and thereby flying to the moon. These parties are in irreconcilable conflict over the substantive issues involved in this dispute. They know what they ought to do. They do not need me to tell them. They know they should never have permitted this case to get into the situation in which it is tonight. They know that labor leaders cannot justify letting this case get into that situation.

Before the Rosenman Commission the brotherhoods argued, "We need more mediation." I do not know how much more mediation could have been carried on in this case. It has been mediated in one form or another since 1959. The President offered the best channel and vehicle for mediation that could possibly have been offered. The President offered Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg to arbitrate the case. So the brotherhoods seized upon the word "arbitrate." They built it up into a great propaganda balloon. But they pricked it themselves and it burst upon them. I told a group of them when they came to my office that it was not my fault. Later I made the same statement on the floor of the Senate. I said, "You parked your brains outside the White House the day you walked in and refused to accept the President's proposal to have Mr. Justice Goldberg arbitrate the case."

Every member representing the brotherhoods knows the record of Mr. Justice Goldberg. He has no peer in the field of American arbitration and mediation. His procedure is known. As I told some of them, "You know that about 90 percent of the proceedings which would have been conducted by the Justice would have been mediation, an attempt on the part of the Justice to get the parties together on a mediation settlement, which is a last step collective bargaining procedure prior to arbitration."

When one moves into arbitration, one moves into a judicial process, if it is really arbitration, and the only thing that controls is the evidence and the application of the preponderance of the evidence rule to the record made by the parties.

I do not know what the brotherhoods fear in respect to the proposal made by the President or in respect to the proposals some of us have tried to get them to see that they ought to adopt in recent weeks, for voluntary arbitration submitted by themselves.

From the standpoint of public reaction, the brotherhoods have created the impression in the minds of millions of Americans that they are afraid of their case on the merits. Are they? The answer is to prove the case on the merits. The President gave them the opportunity to prove their case on the merits, and they ran away from it.

We got closer to the deadline, and the President then called to the White House one afternoon a bipartisan group. There in the Cabinet room he had explained to us—and he made it perfectly clear that the explanation constituted his proposal—what has become known as Senate Joint Resolution 102. That was the first time that any congressional Member present at the Cabinet room conference, so far as I know, ever heard of Senate Joint Resolution 102.

It was not until this afternoon in the Democratic conference that I heard that the senior Senator from Oregon is apparently being charged by some of the spokesmen for the brotherhoods as being the father of Senate Joint Resolution 102.

As I said to my colleagues this afternoon, I have long since stopped being concerned about rumors about me, for I know my record. I had nothing to do with Senate Joint Resolution 102.

But let the record be perfectly clear that I support Senate Joint Resolution 102 with the Morse amendment, which I shall offer before I have closed this speech. And if the brotherhoods do not like it, that will be too bad, because I have never in my public life followed a course of action contrary to what I believe to be consistent with the facts in order to satisfy any economic or political pressure group.

I say to the brotherhoods, "You had better look at your hole card, for your best interest is still to offer to the carriers and to the President of the United States a voluntary arbitration agreement proposal and to get on with the job of proving your case."

I know enough about the substantive issues in this case to satisfy me that a good many of the fears of the brotherhoods are completely unwarranted so far as the longtime best interests of their memberships are concerned.

If we take a look at the record, we will have a better understanding of why I made the statement I made, for the President has included in his message on Senate Joint Resolution 102 his proposal for the creation of a National Presidential Council on Automation, to be charged with the responsibility of presenting to the American people a factual study on automation, with proposals for whatever legislation may be necessary to protect the legitimate rights of workers who are going to suffer disjunctures and losses as a result of automation.

The senior Senator from Oregon has been pleading this cause for months on the floor of the Senate. The senior Senator from Oregon has said in past speeches that this Congress is in almost the same position as the Congresses were from 1900 to 1920, when they passed one piece of progressive legislation in the field of labor relations after another to protect the legitimate rights of workers in this country: the Adamson law, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, regulation of railroads, safety legislation, legislation protecting the rights of women. I could go on giving the full list, ending up with the Wagner Act in the early 1930's.

We have a similar responsibility now. The legislation will be different in design, but its basic purpose will be the same—to protect the legitimate interests of labor and of management as a result of the new era into which we have entered, the era of automation.

I have said before, and I repeat tonight—it is pertinent to the subject matter we are considering, because we cannot separate this problem of automation from the problems of the railways—we cannot expect and we have no right to expect the employers to pick up the check for all the losses to labor suffered through automation, and we cannot expect labor to pick up the check and to assume all the losses suffered as the result of automation; for, after all, it is the average citizen, Mr. John Q. Public, who is the chief beneficiary of progress through automation.

What is the formula? Who will know until the President's commission gets through with its job? Who knows in what form and to what extent we need legislation whereby the public will assume a fair and proportionate cost of the loss suffered by human beings as the result of job disjunctures caused by automation?

All I can say to the brotherhoods is "Raise your sights. Look at a new horizon. Do not constantly turn back to agreements that were negotiated in the past."

They keep telling us about the agreements that have been negotiated for 35, 45, or 50 years. That is what is wrong with some of them. Some of them go back to the time when steam engines were steamed up with cordwood and cheap coal. Then we got into the coal era. Then we got into the era of diesels and electricity. The time has passed some of the guarantees of collective bargaining agreements of 40 and 50 years ago.

It does not follow that, because an existing practice has 50 years of whiskers on it, it should not be shaved. It does not follow, either, that the families that will be the sufferers of an arbitrary, unfair, discriminatory policy that may—and I underline the word "may"—be adopted by the carriers in connection with any working rule change should not receive the attention of a fair umpire and a subsequent review, if necessary, by the Senate of the United States.

These brotherhoods, apparently, are men of little faith. Let us assume the most absurd hypothetical situation in regard to this problem that I can mention. Let us assume that a voluntary arbitration board handed down a decision that was obviously unfair, prejudiced, biased, and slanted against the legitimate rights of the brotherhoods. Do they think the Congress would sit by and not take what legislative steps were necessary to see to it that justice was done this group of workers?

They apparently do not believe in our system of checks and balances, or do not understand how it works.

Mr. President, I am not worried about the possibility of an unfair arbitration award, but I am worried about making it compulsory, and that is why I cannot support the measure as reported by the committee.

The President offered a program that would channel the solution of this problem through the Interstate Commerce Commission, which happens to be our agency. We created it. It is our child.

I repudiate, I disassociate myself, from any point of view or argument offered on the floor of the Senate that, because the brotherhoods do not have confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission, therefore, we ought to surrender to the attitude of the brotherhoods in respect of the Commission. If we have that kind of Interstate Commerce Commission, if the facts bear out that prejudice, then we had better change it. If that is the kind of Interstate Commerce Commission we have, then it is the responsibility of Congress for permitting that kind of Commission to come into existence. But it is not that kind of Commission.

Take a look at the jurisdiction the Congress of the United States has given the Interstate Commerce Commission by law. It has given the Commission jurisdiction over so many subject matters that are inseparably intertwined in the fabric of brotherhood-carrier labor relations.

Consider the Washington agreement. Where did that come from? It came from the brotherhoods and the carriers. It was the brotherhoods and the carriers that wanted it indelibly written into the law, and we wrote it into section 5(2) (f) of the Interstate Commerce Act. But it is said that the President's proposal is not as broad as that. Of course, it is not, but the principle is the same, and the principle of the Washington agreement, written into section 5(2) (f) gives, by law, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, jurisdiction over job security in connection with mergers. We have given that Commission jurisdiction over safety.

For that matter, as I pointed out in the Democratic conference this afternoon, every time the Interstate Commerce Commission considers petitions in regard to rates, it has to take into account the cost of operating the railroads. Taking into account the cost of operating the railroads calls for an analysis of the items that create the cost, because there is an obligation to return a fair rate, supposedly. If there is a working rule bewhiskered and out of date, which ought to be collectively bargained into a new rule, the Commission has to evaluate it in the determination of the rate structure.

Mr. President, before we get through this debate we shall have to put into the Record typical examples of Interstate Commerce Commission decisions that cannot be separated from the Commission's consideration of the working policies that exist on the carriers.

The President also used as the vehicle for the settlement of this dispute an existing agency of Government, and that is a very important point—not a new arbitration board, not an independent, ad hoc temporary group, but an agency whose members and staff have probably forgotten more about the railroad industry than any ad hoc board could possibly learn in a year. That was the commonsense approach of the President of the United States to the situation.

Furthermore, let us take a look at the great differences between the handling of railroad labor over the decades and the handling of the rest of American labor. Railroad labor has time and time again been set aside, handled differently. Railroad labor has its own Railway Mediation Board. It has its own Railway Labor Act. It has its own Adjustment Board. Railroad labor has had separate and different treatment legislatively for a long time. A good many of railroad labor's problems affecting jobs have been channeled through the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore, I think it was most appropriate and proper for the President to use the Interstate Commerce Commission as the channel for the administration of a settlement of this dispute.

The President was not happy about it. He was not happy that he had to make any recommendation, for he pleaded time and time again with the brotherhoods to agree to a peaceful settlement of this dispute which did not require legislative action. They kept turning him down. What else could the President do?

The President has a responsibility to the public interest, and it is not a cliche of the senior Senator from Oregon when he points out once again that there is no labor interest, there is no employer interest in this country, that can ever be justified being placed above the public interest. And all the rights of labor and all the rights of management must be accommodated to the public interest.

I remember the dock controversy of January of this year, when the issue was raised by the head spokesman for the union that he resented reflections upon the patriotism of the union. I made very clear that my board was not reflecting upon the patriotism of the union or of the shipowners.

I had no doubt about their patriotism. I said, "I wish to make it very clear to this committee that I have no doubt about the patriotism of this union, for I am satisfied that if we reached a point where a contest were drawn between the industry and the Government, every member of the union would want the Government to win."

That is applicable to the instant case, too. I have been pleading with the representatives of the parties to this case not to let it get to the point where the contest is drawn between the Government of the United States and this industry. But they are fast approaching that point. If they let it go to that point, let me serve notice on the brotherhoods tonight: The Government will win.

The American people will insist on it. The Government will win. It will win among the membership of the brotherhoods themselves, as well as the rest of American labor, and the general public. They will have no one to blame but themselves for letting the case get into the present situation.

I wish to point out that over the years railroad labor has been handled for the most part separately and distinctly from the rest of American labor. It has been the beneficiary of all the legislation that I have previously referred to. Therefore, I believe that it was particularly appropriate that the President should continue to handle the problems separately and channel his procedure through the Interstate Commerce Commission.

What does the joint resolution do? It creates what is going to be referred to in public discussions as a general arbitration board. It will be said, "But, Mr. Senator, it refers to an ad hoc situation, to a railroad case."

That is true; it does. However, this is the precedent. This is the first case, this is the bellwether that takes a major dispute and sets up a general arbitration board to handle the issues assigned to that board.

Mr. President, wait until the workers of this country at the local union level fully apprehend the significance of that precedent. Let no one quote to me what was quoted to me this afternoon by some national labor leaders who are not members of the brotherhood. I respect their judgment, but I am perfectly satisfied that the rank and file workers of the country will not follow any labor leadership which seeks to give approval to the appointment of a general compulsory arbitration board to handle this case or any other case.

I know something about the alinements and the deals and the temper of the partnerships in organizations among labor leaders. In this respect they are no different from any other group, including employer groups. Of course, there is a tendency to come to each other's support in an hour of crisis. What all the labor leaders of this country, everyone of them, ought to be doing in this hour is getting together and working out an honorable voluntary solution to the problem procedurally, if they cannot do it substantively.

That is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon on this subject, as far as my views as to the justification of the President's course of action are concerned, and of the importance of our now following the proposed procedure.

Mr. President, I do not care what legislation we pass; some great values will be lost by both labor and employers in this country. I know there are reactionary forces in America that are delighted by the stalemate which has developed in this case. They see a breakthrough, for they have been urging for years the establishment of compulsory arbitration, not only in so-called national emergency disputes, but also in any dispute of any considerable significance.

I was interested this afternoon in hearing Senators try to argue that this is not going to be considered a precedent. Their saying it is not a precedent is not going to stop it from becoming a precedent. If we create this incident, we have created a precedent. We will face some serious labor troubles ahead in the months to come. The country will be faced by a trucking dispute, in my judgment, within 6 to 9 months. There will be a very serious shipping dispute all along the east coast and through the gulf.

I do not care where we look at the American economy, as far as labor-employer relations are concerned, there are serious disputes ahead. I believe that we ought to protect economic freedom in this country. We will lose economic freedom on both sides with compulsory arbitration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator agree with me also that we not only lose it by having this matter get into Congress, but we also lose it by the very fact that it is permitted to come to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about that. I have pleaded that it not come to Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a precedent in itself.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I have pleaded to keep it from coming to Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know what the Senator has done on the question of voluntary arbitration. However, it is a precedent any way we look at it.

Mr. MORSE. One of the reasons why it has come to Congress is that in times past we created a precedent. We created a precedent in the Railroad Case in 1947. We created a precedent in the steel case. There is a whole series of precedents. I do not want to add a new type of precedent.

I spoke a few minutes ago about the President channeling this matter through the Interstate Commerce Commission. I will go into that at some length tomorrow. However, I wish the RECORD to show a reference to it tonight. Let us not forget that the Interstate Commerce Commission is subject to the Administrative Procedure Act. There exists a whole set of procedures and reviews and appeals. All that is lost under a separate, ad hoc arbitration board, which is provided in the pending measure.

The existence of that procedure, may I say to the brotherhoods and the carriers, is one of the greatest guarantees they have for fair treatment in the handling of the case on the substantive issue through the President's procedure.

I should like to make one more point which comes back to me and that I wished to mention before. I will fill it in rapidly before I turn to my two amendments. The parties to the dispute ought to recognize also that they cannot drag this out along any such time schedule as has been discussed in the debate this afternoon.

Some of us were making various time calculations in respect to the several proposals that are being made which would lead to a final settlement of the dispute. It is perfectly evident that we would get up to March 1964. One Senator, even, said good-naturedly, "Can't we have an amendment offered that would take us up to December 1964?" I say that facetiously, as he did. But this case must be settled now, within the reasonably immediate future.

Actually, if we examine the voluminous record that has been made by the various boards, commissions, and individuals that have been involved in the case, I do not know what more could be said. That brings to mind an experience I had in 1941, when, for 6 long weeks, we held public hearings in Kimball Hall, in Chicago, Ill., during the great railway dispute of 1941, hearings which involved all the issues, involved the whole agreement. There was nothing the parties could think of that was not involved in that dispute. Six weeks of public hearings were held. We handed down our recommendations as an emergency board. Everyone knew that we functioned as arbitrators. I conducted the hearings which were held by us as an arbitration board. We applied the rules of evidence to the testimony and the exhibits that were offered. We decided the case by applying the preponderance-of-evidence rule to the record made before us.

The brotherhoods were persuaded by others, including a prominent senatorial politician, not to accept the award. So we were asked by the President to conduct rehearings. The rehearings were held in the caucus room of the House. At the close of the first day's hearings, counsel for the brotherhoods came to us in Chambers and said: "We know we haven't got a case. We know that you are going to reaffirm your previous decision. But what we would like to do is to see if we cannot have the dispute settled by mediation."

I said, "That is not for this board to decide. It is not for the President to decide. It is for the parties to decide. But we have gone forward with the rehearing, and we are going to announce our decision on the basis of the alleged new evidence that you offered in the case." The record will show that we issued a second opinion, reaffirming our first. The parties had no new evidence. Everything had been said in the case that could possibly have been said.

The case now before us has received voluminous attention, but its merits ought to be presented to a third-party umpire now, preferably one appointed by the parties themselves. That is up to them. But one thing is perfectly clear: The parties have let the situation come to this state of fact, and unless they are willing, of their own accord, to propose a voluntary arbitration procedure, there is no other course of action than to have the Government make a final determination of the case, including the so-called secondary but vitally important issues. I am not interested in any proposal that will prolong and procrastinate and permit engagement in dilatory tactics that will result in the so-called secondary issues not being settled for months to come.

Of course, I would welcome the parties sitting down and bargaining collectively for an agreement with regard to these issues as well as the others; but they cannot be made to do so. However, one thing can be done: The case can be settled legislatively, if the parties force Congress to settle it legislatively. So the issue before us is: What is the best vehicle for legislative settlement? I offer two, tonight, as alternatives to the committee's proposal.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing and to have lie on the table my first amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I recognize the fact that there will not be time for the committee to consider my proposal; nevertheless, it should go through the procedure I have just suggested. If it is printed and lies at the desk, then tomorrow or the next day, or whenever the Senate gets to it, I shall move to substitute it for the committee's bill. I shall outline the amendment very quickly.

The amendment proposes to substitute the President's proposal for the committee's proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 102. It amends the committee's resolution by providing for the appointment of a seven-man special board, two from the carriers, two from the brotherhoods, and three from the public, to be appointed by the President if the parties themselves are unable to agree upon the membership of the three. If the parties agree on one, that will be fine; if they agree upon two, that will be fine; if they agree on three, so much the better. But any number they cannot agree upon, the President shall appoint.

It shall be a special board advisory to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The board shall report its reommendations to the Interstate Commerce Commission. It shall have the authority of review, acceptance, or modification.

My proposal will include secondary issues. There will be a time lapse between the so-called primary issues and the secondary issues that will provide for a collective bargaining period, if the parties wish to engage in collective bargaining. But my proposal will end the case—primary and secondary issues—within what I consider to be a reasonable period of time. I think it is a preferable proposal.

The President submitted his proposal in good faith. He submitted it in a bipartisan conference. I do not mean to imply that everyone who attended the conference agreed. But I do mean to state that a goodly number of Senators attended that conference and agreed to the approach proposed by the President, namely, through the Interstate Commerce Commission; and I do not intend to walk out on my President. If I thought upon reflection that his proposal was a bad one, I would change my mind. But I thought, after I listened to it, that it was a fair and reasonable proposal, and I think so tonight. That is why I have offered my proposal with the modification I have added to it, for my modification shows that I am willing to change my mind if I think a proposal of the President can be improved.

I shall discuss my proposal at some length tomorrow, but I wanted to have it appear in the Record with this brief statement, so that it could be printed and be made available to the Senate and to the parties.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk a second amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I shall offer if the amendment in the nature of a substitute that I have just sent to the desk should be rejected. I doubt very much whether it will be rejected, because I think the public should know that in recent hours a good many Senators who thought they favored the committee's joint resolution are now expressing serious reservations in regard to it, and are expressing favorable consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute that I have just submitted. They have urged that I submit it tonight, so that they may have copies of it tomorrow.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be received out of order, for appropriate reference and for printing, another amendment, which I may offer as a substitute for the joint resolution before this historic debate ends.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Does the Senator from Oregon wish the amendment referred, or ordered printed and to lie on the table?

Mr. **MORSE**. I said "for appropriate reference." I recognize that there are not great possibilities that the committee will have time to hold a meeting to consider it, although we cannot tell, and we do not know what may happen before this debate is over. It may very well be that the committee may decide to call a special meeting to consider the various amendments which will be offered, and to make a subsequent report to the Senate. It is appropriate for it to do so, if it wishes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ANALYSIS OF THE WORK RULES DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I wish to read a very brief explanation of the second substitute amendment which I have just now submitted.

PURPOSE

The object of this amendment in the nature of a substitute is to provide for a system which will encourage the parties to adhere to collective bargaining procedures in the settlement of the issues involved in the work rules dispute and at the same time to protect the economy from the paralyzing effect of a total railroad strike. It accomplishes this objective by, first, providing for an effective mediatory and conciliatory system to handle the basic issues and, second, authorizing the President to take all necessary steps to maintain essential rail transportation during a strike. It has twin objectives to develop procedures to assist the parties in finally resolving the issues and, at the same time, to give the President the means by which he can safeguard the public interest in the event of a strike. It is based upon the proposition that during a rail strike, the national interest may be best served by requiring the continued operation of only that part of the rail system which is necessary to move essential commodities.

The general plan of the amendment is based upon a concept of limiting the area of economic conflict to that part of the economy which cannot be said to involve the national health and safety. This concept may be analogous to the political theories of total war and limited war. Total war threatens the security and health of the entire world. A strike shutting down the entire rail system or, in other words, a total economic war, threatens the security of the country. Just as we must limit wars in order to preserve our world civilization, the amendment would limit the rail strike, to protect the health and security of the country.

Partial operation of the rail system during a strike emergency provides the necessary balance between the right of labor to bargain and the obligation of the Government to protect the public interest from the devastating effects of a total strike. The plan of developing legislation to provide for partial operation of the transportation services in the situation now confronting the country is not new. It was recommended in the report of an independent study group designated by the Committee for Economic Development in December of 1961. The study group consisted of such eminent scholars and labor experts as Clark Kerr, George W. Taylor, David L. Cole and John T. Dunlop. Its recommendations parallel the basic ideas expressed in the Morse amendment.

MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

The amendment requires the maintenance of the status quo until all issues are resolved through collective bargaining, or are made the subject of recommendations by a special railroad work rules disputes board.

FACT FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE WORK RULES DISPUTES BOARD

First. The President will appoint a board consisting of seven members—two drawn from management, and two drawn from labor, with a chairman and two additional public members selected by the President.

Second. The Board will first consider the basic issue involving engine crew and train crew. The remaining issues must be negotiated by the parties.

Third. The Board will issue its decision and recommendations on the two basic issues within 90 days.

Fourth. The remaining issues are to be resolved by the parties in collective bargaining. However, the National Mediation Board may refer any of the remaining issues to the Work Rules Disputes Board for determination upon request of any party if it finds that the party making the request has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach agreement on such issue in collective bargaining.

TERMINATION OF THE STATUTORY STATUS QUO PERIOD

The parties are free to take such action as they may determine to be in their own interests whenever all issues in the dispute have either been resolved through collective bargaining or have been made the subject of the Work Rules Disputes Board's decision and recommendation.

PARTIAL OPERATION OF THE RAIL SYSTEM IN THE EVENT OF A STRIKE

First. If the carrier should reject the recommendations of the Board and should put into effect work rules of a different nature, the unions may strike. In this event, the President is authorized to seize such part of the railroad system as may be necessary to maintain essential services in the public interest. The facilities which have not been seized will remain subject to the strike.

Second. If the carrier should put into effect the recommendations of the Board, the unions may strike in protest thereof. In this event, the President is authorized to enjoin that part of the strike which interferes with the maintenance of essential rail transport.

Third. In determining what part of the rail system must be maintained in order to provide essential services, the President must give due consideration to the availability of other means of transport for the shipment of essential commodities.

COMPENSATION IN THE EVENT OF SEIZURE

In the case of seizure, the amendment provides that just compensation shall be made for the operation of the railroads, giving due consideration to the fact that the United States took possession of the rail system when its operations had been interrupted by a strike.

STRIKE RISKS

The amendment provides that the Work Rules Disputes Board, in its recommendations, may provide that employees who strike in protest of the recommendation may be denied any part of the job protection provisions contained in its decision.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I shall discuss the amendments at some length, item by item, if it becomes necessary to call them up.

I close, Mr. President, by calling attention to the fact that a great labor policy question confronts the Senate and the House of Representatives. We are so close to it that I wonder whether we fully appreciate what is involved. We are so close to it that I wonder whether we are in somewhat the same position that our predecessors in the Senate were in during the period 1919 to 1920, to which I have previously alluded. If we read the debates published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we find that then there were those who wanted to follow a course of action so reactionary in nature and so inconsistent with economic freedom that, for the time being, they stood in the way of the enactment of needed, progressive legislation.

Mr. President, I would fail to maintain my record of some 25 or 30 years of service in the field of labor relations if I did not run the risk of unpopularity here and elsewhere by taking the time to warn the parties to this dispute, the Members of Congress, and the public generally of the potential dangers to the preservation of our system of economic freedom by the establishment of a precedent involving the creation of what amounts to a general compulsory arbitration board.

We cannot maintain economic freedom in America without having free trade unions and free employers. We cannot have free trade unions and free employers if we start subjecting them to the dictates of a compulsory arbitration board, for under a system of compulsory arbitration there is no end to the power over management and to the power over labor that will be developed. Now is the time to stop it.

Let me say to the parties to this dispute that they have an obligation to make their contributions to citizen statesmanship. If they really want the economic freedom which our system makes available to them, they should quickly offer to resolve their differences and to eliminate the need for this debate in the Senate and for our further consideration of such legislation, by promptly developing their own program for a voluntary arbitration settlement of all the issues in this dispute.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has made a serious contribution to a solution of the issue. If we listened, I believe that a great number of us would not be in disagreement with a great deal of what the Senator from Oregon has said. If Senators will read the RECORD, they will see that tonight the Senator from Oregon has narrowed the differences that might exist on the question, which will probably lead us to the possibility tomorrow of a quick solution of the issues, if we do not have too many amendments to consider.

The Senator from Oregon has two amendments. I think there will be not more than two or three other amendments offered, which can be handled very quickly. In that respect the Senator from Oregon has narrowed the issues before the Senate. We all have the same objective that he has. He has contributed a great deal to the debate.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 6118. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities; (Rept. No. 468).

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

An additional bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 2090. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR MUSCATINE, IOWA, AND DRURY, ILL.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2090) to amend the act of July 26, 1956, to authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., introduced by Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois," approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669; Public Law 811, Eighty-fourth

Congress), as amended by the Act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59; Public Law 87-441), is amended by inserting immediately after section 14, the following new section:

"SEC. 15. The commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois, subject to the provisions of this Act; except that the authority granted by this subsection shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this subsection."

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILROAD AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MILLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Joint Resolution 102, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. TOWER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Joint Resolution 102, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Joint Resolution 102, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 26, 1963:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter E. Craig, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona, vice Arthur M. Davis, deceased.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Dan H. Fenn, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1969, vice William E. Dowling.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Philip H. Burris, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John R. Barrow, of Maryland.
Delmar R. Carlson, of the District of Columbia.
William D. Toomey, of North Dakota.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Howland Bancroft, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Roland A. J. Berardo, of Rhode Island.
Hugh W. Burrows, of Michigan.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Gordon R. Beyer, of Maryland.
Richard H. Howarth, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service Officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Philip J. Adler, of the District of Columbia.
Richard C. Barkley, of Michigan.
Natale H. Bellocchi, of New York.
John D. Blacken, of Virginia.
A. Donald Bramante, of New York.
John R. Countryman, of New York.
Miss Marie R. de Gunzburg, of New York.
William K. Mackey, of the District of Columbia.
David Dysart Morse, of Illinois.
Andrew J. Pierre, of New York.
Martin Prochnik, of Colorado.
Peter Solmssen, of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Mary M. Johnson, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service Officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

David L. Aaron, of California.
Kenneth P. Allen, of Texas.
Morris J. Amitay, of New York.
John P. Becker, of California.
Alan D. Berlind, of Virginia.
F. James Bingley, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Werner W. Brandt, of New York.
Philip E. Burnham, Jr., of New Hampshire.
James A. Carney, Jr., of Virginia.
James H. Cheatham, of Tennessee.
Richard A. Christensen, of Wisconsin.
John R. Davis, of New York.
Miss Patricia A. Dawson, of New York.
Peter Jon de Vos, of the District of Columbia.
Dale Alan Diefenbach, of Ohio.
Charles F. Dunbar, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
William A. Feldt, of Wisconsin.
Patrick E. FitzGerald, of Montana.
Ronald D. Flack, of Minnesota.
Jerry A. Fowler, of California.
Ralph P. Gallagher, Jr., of New Jersey.
Carmen L. Gentile, of Massachusetts.
Stephen R. Gibson, of California.
Robert F. Gillin, of Pennsylvania.
Frank Ralph Golino, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Coleman Gratsch, of Michigan.
David W. Guthrie, of Ohio.
Miss Ruth M. Held, of New York.
M. Charles Hill, of New Jersey.
Miss Elinor V. Hohman, of Illinois.
George R. Hoover, of California.
Alden H. Irons, of Massachusetts.
Philip K. Johnson, Jr., of Ohio.
Don Roland Kienzle, of Massachusetts.
Walter C. Lenahan, of Oregon.
Winston Lord, of New York.
James M. Lucas, of California.
Stephen R. Lyne, of Vermont.
John Linden Martin, of Oregon.
David P. Matthews, of Virginia.
Robert Allan Mautino, of California.
John T. McCarthy, of New York.
Carroll R. McKibbin, of Iowa.
Robert Wesley Miller, of California.
Miss Carole A. Millikan, of Indiana.
Miss Marilyn H. Moninger, of Illinois.
Lewis Roy Murray, Jr., of Tennessee.
Robert P. Myers, Jr., of California.
David G. Newton, of Massachusetts.
Thomas M. T. Niles, of Kentucky.
Ernest D. Oates, of California.
Arthur M. Odum, of Texas.
Carl Pearl, of California.
Charles R. Pogue, of Indiana.
Fernando E. Rondon, of California.
Ronald F. Rosner, of Louisiana.
Ernest C. Ruehle, of Missouri.
Cornelius D. Scully III, of Virginia.
David Segal, of Connecticut.
John W. Sewell, of New York.
Miss Edith Smith, of Illinois.
Gerald E. Snyder, of Ohio.
Joel S. Spiro, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Steinmetz, of California.
William Morgan Stewart, of Maryland.
Carl Taylor, of Vermont.
Joel D. Ticknor, of New York.
Frank Tumminia, of New York.
James F. Twaddell, of Rhode Island.
Gary L. Vyne, of Arizona.
Lannon Walker, of the District of Columbia
William J. Waller, of California.
Martin A. Wenick, of New Jersey.
J. William Wenrich, of Michigan.
Frank G. Wisner II, of Maryland.
Miss Joanna W. Witzel, of California.
William R. Womack, of Arkansas.
Ronald R. Young, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

George E. Brown, of Texas.
Warren Clark, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Raymond H. Collins, of Missouri.
Stephen P. Dawkins, of New Jersey.
William S. Diedrich, of New York.
Kenneth Allen Hartung, of New York.
Peter B. Johnson, of California.
James J. Johnston, of Arkansas.
Miss Susan M. Klingaman, of New York.
Miss Claretta L. Krueger, of Illinois.
James S. Landberg, of Washington.
Charles T. Magee, of the District of Columbia.
Arnold E. Ogren, of California.
Alfred L. Padula, Jr., of New York.
Thomas R. Shaver, of Illinois.
Dudley G. Sipprelle, of California.
Lawrence R. Tharp, of Michigan.
Andrew G. Thoms, Jr., of New Jersey.
Erwin W. von den Steinen, of California.
Donald R. Woodward, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Janet M. Ansorge, of Wisconsin.
John P. Banning, Jr., of New York.
William A. Bell, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
William J. Boudreau, of Massachusetts.
Walter M. Cadette, of New York.
Lawrence E. Christmas, of Texas.
Carl B. Cunningham, of California.
E. Bliss Eldridge, of New York.
Guy Feliz Erb, of California.
Arthur M. Giese, of Mississippi.
Marvin Groeneweg, of Iowa.
Miss Jean Marianne Haeske, of Washington.

Brian S. Kirkpatrick, of California.
Vernard A. Lanphier, of Utah.
Warren A. Lavorel, of California.
James B. MacRae, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Thomas G. Martin, of Alabama.
Michael A. G. Michaud, of California.
Charles T. Owens, of California.
Vernon D. Penner, Jr., of New York.
Miss Charlotte W. Peters, of Indiana.
Joseph A. Presel, of Rhode Island.
Thomas W. Simons, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Thomas W. Sonandres, of Michigan.
Gilbert J. Sperling, of Pennsylvania.
James H. Taylor, of California.
Patrick N. Theros, of the District of Columbia.
John N. Thomas, of California.
Miss Susan L. Travis, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph H. Weiss, of California.
Leonard F. Willems, of Wyoming.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

William H. Dunbar, of the District of Columbia.
Philip F. Gould, of the District of Columbia.
Edward S. Grainger, of Connecticut.
Geoffrey Groff-Smith, of Michigan.
George C. Jenkins, of California.
Edward J. Joyce, of Virginia.
John R. Kochevar, of Wyoming.
Ernest Mayerfeld, of New York.
Charles J. Orr, of Texas.
Robert T. Shaw, of Arizona.
Howell S. Teeple, of Texas.
Clinton Thaxton, of Kentucky.
Otto H. Wagner, of Michigan.
William G. Wilcox, of Ohio.

Martin J. Bergin, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Anthony Chapell, of Connecticut.
Thomas I. Dowling, Jr., of Indiana.
William C. Horn, of Washington.
Grant H. Ichikawa, of Virginia.
Arthur D. Lofkowitz, of New York.
William R. Lenderking, Jr., of Connecticut.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Keith E. Adamson, of Kansas.
Dean J. Almy, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Max J. Arnold, of Virginia.
Robert A. Bauer, of California.
Robert W. Berg, of Texas.
Philip Birnbaum, of New Jersey.
John W. Dayton, of Virginia.
William K. Harvey, of Maryland.
John H. Hoskins, of the District of Columbia.
Harold Kaplan, of New Jersey.
Henry W. Koski, of Ohio.
Harry K. Lennon, of Virginia.
William P. MacLean, of Wisconsin.
John D. McGrail, of Massachusetts.
Gilbert F. McGreevy, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
John R. O'Brien, of the District of Columbia.
Horace L. Rhorer, Jr., of Georgia.
Charles A. Shields, of Connecticut.
George T. Walsh, of Massachusetts.
Charles G. Williamson, of Florida.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 26, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

George L. Mehren, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

U.S. COAST GUARD

To be lieutenant commander

Phillip M. Griebel

To be lieutenants

Dan S. Meginley
Warren K. Wordsworth
James L. Webb
Robert A. Rich
Edward L. Murnane
Carl "J" Angus

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Richard H. Hicks
Danny M. Brown
Robert T. Morhard
Lafayette J. Harbison
Donald H. Ramsden

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

David Statler Black, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert M. White, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate August 26, 1963:

The nomination sent to the Senate on May 2, 1963, of J. Ellison Deer to be postmaster at Ulmers, in the State of South Carolina.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Jordan Enterprises Weekly Newspapers Receives Coveted Quill Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, my constituent, DuPree Jordan, Jr., publisher of Jordan enterprises weekly newspapers, visited this city, where he had the opportunity to observe the Congress, to meet with leaders of both Houses, and to discuss issues with top-level leaders of the administration.

The result of his visit was a special section included in his newspapers, the North DeKalb Record, the Weekly Star, and the Tri-County Graphic, entitled "A Week in Washington, D.C."

This excellent feature was widely distributed to Members of Congress. From comments I have received, I know that my colleagues share with me a deep appreciation for the fair and objective manner in which Mr. Jordan compiled his most interesting observations. I am, therefore, pleased to advise my colleagues that Mr. Jordan's perspective has not gone unnoticed by his fellow journalists. The Atlanta Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity, recently conferred upon Jordan Enterprises its coveted Quill Award, for outstanding contribution to journalism. I congratulate Mr. Jordan on this signal honor.

Rogers Commends Automobile Companies for Installing Seat Belts in New 1964 Models

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that five leading automobile manufacturers have decided to install seat belts as standard equipment in the front seats of their new models. It is commendable that the manufacturers have the responsibility and foresight to see the added safety that can be given to drivers and riders in automobiles by the use of seat belts, and that they have taken the initiative by installing these seat belts in their future models.

In the past 5 years, 192,081 persons have died in auto accidents, and on an average that is some 38,500 lives per year. In 1962 alone, 41,000 lost their lives in traffic accidents, and this year we seem to be continuing the upward trend toward a new record of human self-destruction.

I feel that a ready solution to this problem of automobile fatalities due to accidents can be lessened considerably if the automobile owner will use these seat belts provided for them in these new model cars. Having the seat belts is only the first step to safe motoring, the other and most important step is the use of these belts.

I am sure that the whole Congress joins with me in commending these automobile companies for their efforts towards automobile safety.

Caverns of Sonora: A Veritable Symphony in Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, only recently there was opened to public view, near Sonora, Tex., one of the world's most fabulous natural spectacles. I am referring to the Caverns of Sonora, which has been described as "Nature's art gallery." It is believed by many experts that these caverns are more spectacular in many respects than any underground discovery that has yet taken place in America.

Indeed, a visit to the caverns by Bill Stephenson, past president of the National Speleological Society, prompted him to say: "It's the most beautiful known in the world."

An estimated 60 million years of slow uninterrupted growth has gone into the formation of the caverns, where nature has fashioned scenes of beauty ranging from the dinosaurs to miniature patterns of frothy lace.

The formations found there are translucent and phosphorescent and range in color from pure white through shades of gray, faint greens and blues, pale rose and bright oranges to deep browns. So profuse are these formations that in portions of the cave, walls, ceiling and floors are completely covered.

Exploration of the caverns began in 1955. Already many miles of passages have been explored, and an undeterminded number of passages are yet to be explored. Cave experts from all over the United States and several foreign countries have made trips through the caverns, and all describe it as the most beautiful known in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of exploring these caverns. They are located in the district I represent. I felt it appropriate to call attention to this discovery, and to urge everyone who possibly can to visit the caves. It is an experience one can never forget.

No. 1, Maryland: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, I have brought to the attention of Congress the scores of nations throughout the world that have utilized Government-operated lotteries not only as a compromise with the gambling problem but as a revenue-raising device as well.

I have shown how 77 foreign countries have recognized and accepted the human urge to gamble as a normal, instinctive trait which should be regulated and controlled by the Government for the people's benefit.

Mr. Speaker, today, and in the coming weeks, I intend to discuss the vast gambling activities here in the United States which have grown into a $50 billion a year business. I also intend to discuss the panorama of gambling and crime in America—in different States, cities, and towns.

Because of our stubborn refusal to open our eyes to the bold print of commonsense, we have turned this country into a gamblers' paradise. We have, thanks to the hypocrites and bluenoses, helped the underworld crime syndicates to fatten themselves from gambling revenues.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Members of the Maryland congressional delegation are aware of the illegal gambling that goes on in that State?

While part of the gambling is strictly legal, most of it is illegal. Maryland ranked fifth in the Nation, last year, in parimutuel turnover. More than $160 million was wagered at Maryland tracks in 1962 which brought into the coffers of the State treasury over $9 million.

However, according to the McClellan Committee on Gambling and Organized Crime, off-track betting far exceeds legal betting on the horses. Maryland's share of the estimated national off-track yearly turnover is $860 million and this figure only represents less than half of the total illicit gambling in that State. Therefore, the extent of gambling in Maryland may well approach the sum of $2 billion a year—all but a small part of it being illegal.

Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that gambling syndicates skim about 10 percent of the take—this would amount to a haul of $200 million in Maryland. These moneys constitute the treasury of the underworld. So long as gambling is illegal and clandestine, the crime syndicates will wax fat. Of course, not all of this profit stays in criminal hands. The biggest expense faced by the syndicates involves the corruption of the process of government.

I do not know whether the Maryland congressional delegation realizes it but their State is heavily subsidizing the forces of organized crime with each moment that gambling is chastised rather than controlled by officialdom.

Society, Mr. Speaker, is the greatest victim of the failure and refusal to regulate and control gambling through the most obvious means—a Government-run Federal lottery. We know that the crime syndicates have a good cause to oppose a national lottery but, it seems to me, those reasons which are good cause for their opposition are also good causes for our action.

Young Democrats and the Radical Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the national president of the Young Democrats, Allen T. Howe, has repudiated the actions of the Western States Young Democratic Conference held recently in Berkeley, Calif.

There can be no doubt that resolutions urging the resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba; the signing of a nonaggression pact with the Eastern European slave states; and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Far East are clearly following the Kremlin line and are repugnant to all responsible members of the Democratic Party.

It is right that the conference should be condemned, and the so-called Young Democrats participating in it exposed.

However, I cannot agree with Mr. Howe when he calls the conference "an isolated instance." Those resolutions are typical of many that have been spewed forth in recent years at meetings of the California Young Democrats.

It seems clear to those that study the situation that there has been a determined attempt by radicals of the far left to gain control of the Young Democratic movement in the Western States. It will not do for Mr. Howe to simply point his finger at the Young Republicans. The outrageous happenings within the California Young Republicans and the violence and rightwing fanaticism displayed at their meetings does not provide us with an excuse for extremism within our own party.

Mr. Howe says, "The Young Democrats allow—even welcome—dissent." For my part, I think this is commendable. Our party is neither totalitarian in origin nor monolithic in structure. However, there is something to be said for party responsibility and political maturity as well. Both these two qualities have been conspicuously absent in the proceedings of the Young Democrats in the Western States.

Resolutions calling for unilateral disarmament by the United States have been introduced time and time again at meetings of Young Democrats in California. Sometimes these resolutions have been brazenly worded, at other times their true meaning has been slightly veiled. On a number of occasions resolutions of this type have been passed at regional and State meetings.

Anyone reading the convention platforms and resolutions of the California Young Democrats can only assume that the organization is firmly in the grasp of a highly vocal group of emotional radicals, peace-at-any-pricers, and other assorted lunatic leftists.

It is a disgrace that the honorable name of the Democratic Party should be associated with such resolutions and policy positions. I know that there have been many sincere members of the Young Democrats battling against this tide of radicalism, but they have been left to stand alone. Little, if any, interest or aid has been forthcoming from the national leadership.

I suggest to Mr. Howe that he refrain from pointing the finger of scorn at the Young Republicans until such time as his own house is in order. The old expression—people in glass houses should not throw stones—is entirely appropriate in this case.

It may be of further interest to Mr. Howe to know that radicalism is not confined to those parts of his organization located in the Western States. The District of Columbia Young Democrats could stand his close inspection. Recently that group passed a resolution calling for the District of Columbia to be placed under control of the United Nations. If this is meant as a joke it is in pathetically poor taste, and if it is meant to be serious I shudder to think what else they may advocate.

Mr. Howe is proud of the liberty displayed by his organization. I think that his organization has confused liberty with license. I think they also confuse political freedom with anarchy. I suggest that Mr. Howe and the National Committee of the Democratic Party launch a full-scale inquiry into the activities of the Young Democrats, and attempt to bring order into this ever-present chaos. If this organization is to have the privilege of using the name of our party—they must prove they have the necessary maturity to earn it.

Herb Clark, of the Tipton, Iowa, Conservative, Wins Best Editorial Award at Annual Meeting of the National Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of calling attention to the fact that Mr. Herb Clark, of the Tipton, Iowa, conservative, had been granted the Best Editorial Award by the National Editorial Association for his editorial, "We Honor a Dream," a tribute to former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, written the day of the dedication of the Herbert Hoover Library in West Branch, Iowa.

This is the second editorial citation received by the Tipton Conservative in the last 2 years. In 1962, Herb Clark was awarded a citation for "editorial page excellence," the highest editorial writing award given to weekly papers in Iowa.

In addition, he has twice been honored by the National Editorial Association for news stories. In 1953 while news editor of the Marengo Pioneer Republican, he received a third-place award for the story of the Marengo bank fire. In 1960 a story about the "Bennett Bank Robbery" also received a third-place award in newswriting.

These awards are in addition to State honors to the Tipton Conservative for general excellence, use of photographs, typographical excellence and highest honors in the coverage.

We are proud of Herb Clark for his constant deduction to highest journalistic principles which is reflected in the honors which have come to him and the papers for which he has written.

He is an Iowan by birth and training. He was born in Tama, Iowa, May 19, 1918. He attended the University of Iowa and received a bachelor of arts degree in journalism in 1940. Since his graduation he has done graduate work at the State University of Iowa and the University of Washington.

Herb Clark started his career in journalism while he was still in college. He was a sports writer for the Iowa City Press Citizen during his undergraduate days. After graduation he went to work for the Tama (Iowa) News Herald. He then became part owner and publisher of the Toledo (Iowa) Chronicle and served in this capacity from 1948 to 1952. In 1953 and 1954 he was news editor for the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer Republican. In 1954 he became a stockholder in and the editor for the Tipton (Iowa) Conservative, at which paper he is still winning honors.

He has some teaching experience on his side. He taught English and journalism during the 1947–48 school year at the Burlington (Iowa) High School and during the school year 1952–53, he was an instructor in the school of journalism at the State University of Iowa.

Typical of the leaders of his generation he has a fine military record. He enlisted January 7, 1941 and served overseas for 3 years in the European Theater of Operations with the 9th Infantry Division and the 7th Corps. He was separated from the service with the rank of captain. He is now a lieutenant colonel assigned to Army Intelligence and Security. He just completed 2 weeks of active duty at summer camp at Camp McCoy, Wis., attending Reserve command and general staff school.

Herb Clark is married and has five children. He married the former Ruth Hinkhouse. Their children are Arthur, 13; Krista, 11; Brian, 9; Stuart, 7 and Maeve, 6. Mrs. Clark still finds time to teach at the Bennett (Iowa) School.

The citizens of Cedar County, Iowa, will continue to be exposed to faithful reporting and thoughtful editorial opinion as long as we have people in the editor's chair with the background, training and sincere dedication which Herb Clark brings to his weekly task of turning out a highly readable, interesting and factual newspaper, the Tipton Conservative. And Herb Clark will continue to receive citations for the excellence of his work as long as the people who judge these efforts look for originality, clarity of thought and purity of prose.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 24, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District of Texas)

TAX ON FOREIGN SECURITIES

H.R. 8000 would impose a tax on U.S. citizens' future purchases of outstanding and new foreign securities. The tax would range from 2.75 percent for 3-year maturity to 15 percent if over 26½ years. The administration seeks to correct the present imbalance of payments, whereby American dollars are flowing out of the United States and American dollars can be redeemed by foreigners in our gold. We now have only $15.5 billion left of which $11.5 billion, approximately, undergirds the value of our currency. The world holds $24 billion callable in our gold. The imbalance continues and so the administration, seeking to take action, proposes the so-called "Tax Equalization Act of 1963," H.R. 8000; arguments against which have been almost universal, include: (1) Private investment abroad improves our balance of payment, because interest, dividends, and capital return to United States; (2) H.R. 8000 will, on the contrary, worsen our balance of payment; (3) the new tax is a discriminatory protective tariff; (4) H.R. 8000 does not treat the basic causes of our imbalance of payments, which are: (a) Our heavy military expenditures abroad, (b) foreign aid, averaging $8½ billion per year, (c) interest rates in the United States which, when lower than in other nations fail to keep our capital at home. Artificially-low Government influenced rates augment this problem. (d) Government intervention which shackles our industrial productiveness through restrictive regulation and burdensome taxation.

What we need to do is to free-up our industries' competitive position in the world by removal of Government bureaucracy and taxation, rather than this New Frontier tax and control on the free flow of money. It is my hope that we do this, accompanied necessarily by reduced Federal spending, a balanced budget replacing deficit spending, and lower taxes. However, if we follow the administration's suggestion, we will destroy confidence in the dollar, devalue our money, drastically hurt U.S. industry and world money markets impose additional controls on U.S. capital flow, retire as the world banker, and see the world capital market center shift from New York to overseas. These spell financial ruin for the United States. The President and his inadequate advisors must not be permitted to sabotage U.S. present and future financial fortunes.

FOREIGN AID

(Excerpts from Alger remarks in the House of Representatives during debate on foreign aid.)

"Foreign aid must be substantially changed and drastically cut. Since World War II we have given away over $100 billion to approximately 110 countries. There is $6.8 billion in the economic and military assistance pipeline, that is unexpended money, earmarked for foreign aid. Now we are being asked to authorize $4.1 billion more to 95 countries. Are American taxpayers considered to be a bottomless barrel of money? How easy it is to give away someone else's money, is the way it seems. Indeed, we do not have the money to give away. We are borrowing money, borrowing from future generations of children and grandchildren to give it away. How fiscally foolish, how reckless, how careless, how immoral we are.

"Our national debt is $305 billion and skyrocketing up. Our gold reserves are dwindling. And here we are, being asked to give away some more. Our debt, our taxes are the highest in the world. Yet, we must borrow more and either tax or inflate our currency more.

"All evidence and information garnered from our past giveaways now tells us that we have failed to accomplish our objectives. The Communists, of the international conspiracy, are firmly entrenched 90 miles from our land. The Monroe Doctrine is discarded. We have not only failed to prevent the spread of communism, we have been subsidizing it. Our foreign aid to Communist satellites has been transshipped to help the Communists in Cuba, in Laos, in Vietnam, and elsewhere. The United Nations has aided in this effort. We have footed the bill. Now it is British

Guiana the Communists are preparing for takeover. There are other areas, too. Our foreign aid has not only failed to stop the spread of communism, it has accelerated it. The shotgun techniques of scattering money promiscuously in grants, soft loans, Public Law 480, and gifts of every sort have helped the Communist enemy spread the teachings of socialism, educationally aided the unfriendly neutrals, and alienated our friends. We bewilder everyone.

"You cannot buy friendship but we give the appearance of trying. We pledge no strings attached, and as a result, unfriendly neutrals and enemies benefit. We talk moral and spiritual virtue, and practice materialism. We declare our belief in do-it-yourself and self-determination and then expect foreign nations to act, to develop, to want to be, like us. Then we waste goods, we duplicate orders, we plan the wrong projects, and generally discredit careful planning and sensible goals until it is no wonder foreign nations think we are fiscally irresponsible. Couple with this free and easy careless giveaway the liberals belief in easy money and you can readily understand what has brought us to crisis in our balance of payments.

We are told by Secretary Dillon and foreign aid exponents that giving our dollars away does not affect the balance of payments. What nonsense. Even the material bought in the United States with some of this money does not obscure this fact. The 42,500 employees in Federal aid are too many. We should cut back the personnel. We should streamline the administration. All money expended must be carefully scrutinized yearly by Congress, no back-door spending. No money should go to Yugoslavia, Poland, or any other Communist country nor to the U.N. for transshipment to a Communist country. In this connection we should not even trade with Communists and build up their economies. Otherwise, "Trade not aid," while a forgotten slogan should be remembered and practiced. Section 231 of the 1963 Trade Expansion Act must be observed, not violated, by this administration. Even the Clay Committee report stresses too much has been spent on too many. Strong as we may be, we cannot throw our money around. Nor should we invest without our own interests at heart. I suspect that members of this administration in the White House would devalue our money before cutting foreign aid or big Federal deficit spending. This fact must be faced and the American people must choose either fiscal responsibility, the balanced budget or the "spend ourselves into bankruptcy" so confidently expected by Khrushchev and the Communists.

"The rest of the world must help bear the financial burden of foreign aid. United States great contribution can and must be, the demonstration of capitalism; of free enterprise at work. We should export our business know-how in American business moneymaking activities—not loans and grants, unless the cause of capitalism can be advanced. Free enterprise, a free money market, new American factories at home and abroad, that hire employees and help the local economies, standards of living and governments, through taxes on profits—these are our legitimate forms of foreign aid. By precept and example we demonstrate capitalism at work. Others can follow our examples and we help them as we benefit simultaneously from profits on our industry. Competition is the key, "Trade, Not Aid" the slogan, inventiveness and initiative the origin, and capital the fuel."

NOTE.—The illogic of our aid can be seen in the many amendments which failed; example, an amendment to deny our aid to those aiding Cuba failed (by a tie vote 162–162). The bill passed the House 224 to 186. ALGER against. Five hundred eighty-five million dollars was cut off the bill.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art behind earth's darkest clouds and in them, in all our journey across this isthmus of mortality Thou art to us a shelter from the stormy blast and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

Undisturbed in our peace and poise by the shattering events which fling their angry fury across our world, we would maintain an inner sanctuary inviolate and still as we claim Thy promise, "I will keep that man in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Me."

And so, amid all the distractions of our complex modern life, in which we are called to play our part, keep our hearts childlike and trustful, free from corroding cynicism, so that the gates of wonder, closed to the merely clever and conceited, may swing open on the hinges of humility. Thus, may even stern duty turn to delight and statutes turn to songs, as in a victorious faith in the final enthronement of righteousness and truth, we confidently commit ourselves and our cause unto Thee, in whose will is our peace and our strength.

In the dear Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 26, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Willis Moore Hawkins, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963–64 national high school debate subject of medicare, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7399. An act to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes;

H.R. 7440. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended; and

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document and additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"; and

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of selected excerpts relating to the 1963–64 national college debate topic, compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, as a House document, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 7399. An act to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes;

H.R. 7440. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended; and

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements, and for other purposes.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions of the House were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. CON. RES. 203

Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document and additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document, and for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor ten thousand additional copies of the study entitled, "The Federal Government and Education", prepared by that committee during the current session; and that there be printed one hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies, of which one hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and fifty-one thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

H. CON. RES. 212

Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of selected excerpts relating to the 1963–64 national college debate topic, compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, as a House document, and for other purposes

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document selected excerpts relating to the 1963–1964 national college debate topic, "That the Federal Government should guarantee an opportunity for higher education to all qualified high school graduates", compiled by the Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and that there be printed sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-five additional copies of such document, of which five thousand one hundred and fifty shall be for the use of the Senate and ten thousand nine hundred and seventy-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the President of the Senate recognizes the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I advise the Senate that the Governor of Tennessee, Hon. Frank J. Clement, on August 20, 1963, appointed Hon. HERBERT S. WALTERS, a Senator from Tennessee, to represent the State in the Senate until the vacancy created therein caused by the death of our beloved colleague Estes Kefauver is filled by election as provided by law.

I send to the desk the certificate of appointment and ask that it be read.

The certificate of appointment was read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Tennessee, I, Frank G. Clement, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint the Honorable HERBERT S. WALTERS, a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of the Honorable Estes Kefauver, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness his excellency our Governor Frank G. Clement, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville this 20th day of August in the year of our Lord 1963.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

——— ———,
Secretary of State.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator designate is present, and I ask that he may be permitted to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. WALTERS, escorted by Mr. GORE, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President and was subscribed by him.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my capacity as a Senator from the State of Montana, and as the majority leader of the Senate, I wish to call to the attention of this body a statement which I am about to make.

Mr. President, there is now before the Senate a bill which will provide a means for settling the railroad-labor dispute. The Senate will stay with this measure until it is disposed of one way or another. It is my hope that the decision will be reached within a short time. There is every reason to believe that the House will act with similar alacrity.

In these circumstances, the national responsibilities of both carriers and unions are clear and it is incumbent upon both to accept them. Pending completion of action by the Senate and Congress, I expect that the carriers will not put into effect the changes in work rules which are scheduled for 12:01 a.m. Thursday and which will precipitate a strike. The Senate and the Congress will legislate as fairly and as promptly as possible. But the Senate will not legislate under pressure. Therefore, I think I speak for the entire membership of the Senate when I call upon both sides to face their responsibilities to the public and to the Nation to abstain from any unilateral change in the status quo of the dispute pending final decision by the Senate and the Congress. The right of the parties to reach voluntary settlement of the dispute at any time, of course, remains unchanged.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I add to what the distinguished majority leader has said that the clock and the calendar can become such instrumentalities of pressure that I believe the record of legislation passed under that kind of pressure is too often faulty. This, after all, is designated as a deliberative body, and it must deliberate within a time period which affords a real opportunity for deliberation. I hope, therefore, that the admonition of the majority leader will be taken to heart.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1175. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 469).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1582. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project (Rept. No. 470); and

H.R. 3306. An act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission (Rept. No. 471).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 912. A bill approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement (Rept. No. 472).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. George D. Synon and Capt. John B. Oren, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2091. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 2092. A bill declaring the Grand (Neosho) River above the town of Fort Gibson, Muskogee County, Okla., to be not navigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2093. A bill for the relief of Sui-To Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2094. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Gettings' estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2095. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to eliminate the Federal occupational and transfer taxes on certain firearms which are chiefly collectors' items; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2096. A bill to repeal paragraph (2) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATOR WALTERS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 192) assigning Mr. WALTERS to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

REPEAL OF PARAGRAPH (2) OF SECTION 203(j) OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 on behalf of the representatives of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. The association is made up of representatives of each State who are authorized by State law to locate Federal surplus property and distribute it to certain users under a donation program authorized by Federal statute.

Representatives of the State and local surplus property offices cooperate with and maintain a daily working relationship with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and military posts and stations. Through their cooperative efforts, a substantial amount of surplus property is donated to schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, clinics and local civil defense organizations each year.

The first part of this bill would amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. It would relieve the Secretary of Defense from the responsibility of determining what surplus property under his control is usable and needed by educational activities of special interest to the armed services. Such determinations would be transferred to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and administered by the Office of Education, as is done for other schools and educational institutions. The first section of the bill would also permit military schools which were heretofore eligible to receive surplus property to continue to receive such property.

The second section of the bill would clarify the purpose and intention of section 201(c) of the act so that certain types of property would be made available for donation to health or educational institutions before being sold or traded in for new equipment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2096) to repeal paragraph (2) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PERSONS TO FISH IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], be added as cosponsor of S. 1988, a bill introduced by me which would prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"OK MIKE"

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today a new slogan of success has been added to the language. Press, radio, and television reports from the heroic rescue operation that saved the lives of the two trapped miners in Sheppton, Pa., have echoed with the single phrase, "OK Mike." As the huge drilling rig worked delicately to widen the escape tunnel down the entire 308 feet to where the men were trapped, those in charge of the operation repeatedly called out to the burly ex-marine handling the drill: "OK Mike." As the New York Times reported, the phrase became almost a litany.

I know all Americans are proud of the great effort that was made by all who took part in this rescue. We in Connecticut are especially proud because "OK Mike" refers to a talented resident of our State, Mike Rank, of Bethel, Conn.

A skilled drill operator who works for the Gill Drilling Co., of North Branford, Conn., Mike Rank was in the Pennsylvania coal region servicing equipment his company distributes when the disaster occurred. Together with the head of the company, Irwin Gill, of Stony Creek, Conn., they went to the scene to offer help.

Mike Rank was asked to handle a large share of the drilling and readily accepted the challenge. Yesterday, as the drilling reached the critical stage where the tunnel was to be completed, Mike Rank sat for hours at the controls of the drill, handling the huge machinery. With the drill turning as slowly as a longplaying record, the 39-year-old drilling specialist kept at his job until success was achieved.

I am proud to salute a skilled worker from Connecticut. From now on if someone asks me how things are going, the answer will no longer be "AOK," it will be "OK Mike."

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been asked to enter an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Objection is heard.

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow the District of Columbia will play host to the long-heralded march on Washington for jobs and freedom. On Sunday the leaders of this massive and historic assembly issued a statement that should be read by every Member of Congress. I should like to quote several significant paragraphs from the statement:

> The Washington march of August 28 is more than just a demonstration.
>
> It was conceived as an outpouring of deep feeling of millions of white and colored American citizens that the time has come for the Government of the United States of America, particularly the Congress of that Government, to grant and guarantee complete equality in citizenship to the Negro minority of our populations.
>
> As such, the Washington march is a living petition—in the flesh—of the scores of thousands of citizens of both races who will be present from all parts of our country.
>
> It will be orderly, but not subservient. It will be proud, but not arrogant. It will be nonviolent, but not timid. It will be unified in purposes and behavior, not splintered into groups and individual competitors. It will be outspoken, but not raucous.
>
> It will have the dignity befitting a demonstration in behalf of the human rights of 20 millions of people, with the eye and the judgment of the world focused upon Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963.

Mr. President, this is a courageous and historic statement by the leaders of a truly unprecedented event in the history of race relations in this country. The statement calls for strict self-discipline among the marchers so that all public disorders will be avoided. It clearly sets forth the ideal and objectives of this massive outpouring of spiritual, physical, and material resources. It describes an operation which is, in essence, at the very heart and soul of the democratic process.

It is time the Nation came to realize and understand the precise nature of this demonstration. I have talked with many persons preparing to travel thousands of miles to participate in this great national witness in behalf of human freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is no sense of threat or intimidation among these people. They are not traveling to Washington to disrupt the established legislative procedures followed by the Congress in considering the civil rights legislation. But they are coming to express their deep convictions that the President's legislation should be enacted promptly.

They are coming to exercise their constitutional rights of petition, assembly, and speech in a fashion wholly within the American traditions of liberty. In fact, they are conducting themselves in a manner quite reminiscent of the spirit which must have motivated and inspired the Founding Fathers of this Nation.

These people—both white and Negro—are coming to Washington out of a deep personal sense of commitment to the struggle for civil rights that is underway in this land. They are coming because they share the belief that second-class citizenship must be banished without delay. They are coming to Washington because their consciences will permit them no other course.

I suppose that tomorrow's demonstration will be largely composed of people who have never before demonstrated for or against anything. There will be housewives, manual laborers, doctors, lawyers, the unemployed, churchmen, stage and screen personalities, Government workers, blue-collar workers, and white-collar workers. I have spoken with these people and their enthusiasm and expectancy for this demonstration is remarkable—and contagious. These are not troublemakers or rabble rousers; these are responsible and concerned American citizens who are determined to speak out in favor of full freedom and equality for their fellow citizens. That is why they are coming to Washington.

In a world in which the people of so many areas are denied the opportunity of freedom of petition, in a world in which tyranny seems to rule so many people, what a blessed and wonderful experience it is to know that in the United States of America the voice of the people can and will be heard in a democratic meeting.

Of course, there are certain risks in bringing so many thousands of people together to support a matter that is charged with emotion and feeling. But there are few things in this world that are worth accomplishing which do not also entail a certain degree of risk. I am convinced and confident that the marchers themselves will not initiate any public disorder. Should certain agitators attempt to subvert the objectives of the demonstration, I am confident that the District police will enforce the law and maintain order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Regardless of the risk, I support this demonstration because it serves as a unique vehicle whereby thousands of Americans can express their deep personal convictions that the time for equal justice is now. This is a totally voluntary outpouring of the human spirit in behalf of freedom and liberty, an outpouring that has not been seen in this country for many generations. As such, I believe the feelings of the marchers will be transmitted across this land to all Americans and across the seas to people everywhere.

When this demonstration has been concluded, we will have evidence in abundance that the lamp of liberty still burns on these shores. We will learn again the age-old lesson of liberty that America first learned nearly 200 years ago and has been teaching the rest of mankind ever since.

As one Senator from Minnesota, I rise to welcome the many thousands of Americans who will come to Washington tomorrow. I intend to participate fully in their activities. I am confident that their effort will be successful and that the entire Nation will be reached by the dedication and enthusiasm which the demonstrators bring with them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement released by the leaders of the 10 national organizations sponsoring the march on Washington for jobs and freedom be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the statement of welcome issued by the District Commissioners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON MARCH

Leaders of the 10 national organizations sponsoring the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom yesterday issued the following public statement:

"The Washington march of August 28 is more than just a demonstration.

"It was conceived as an outpouring of deep feeling of millions of white and colored American citizens that the time has come for the Government of the United States of America, and particularly the Congress of that Government, to grant and guarantee complete equality in citizenship to the Negro minority of our populations.

"As such, the Washington march is a living petition—in the flesh—of the scores of thousands of citizens of both races who will be present from all parts of our country.

"It will be orderly, but not subservient. It will be proud, but not arrogant. It will be nonviolent, but not timid. It will be unified in purposes and behavior, not splintered into groups and individual competitors. It will be outspoken, but not raucous.

"It will have the dignity befitting a demonstration in behalf of the human rights of 20 million people, with the eye and the judgment of the world focused upon Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963.

"In a neighborhood dispute, there may be stunts, rough words and even hot insults; but when a whole people speaks to its government, the dialog and the action must be on a level reflecting the worth of that people and the responsibility of that government.

"We, the undersigned, who see the Washington march as wrapping up the dreams, hopes, ambitions, tears and prayers of millions who have lived for this day, call upon the members, followers, and well-wishers of our several organizations to make the march a disciplined and purposeful demonstration.

"We call upon them all, black and white, to resist provocation to disorder and to violence.

"We ask them to remember that evil persons are determined to smear this march and to discredit the cause of equality by deliberate efforts to stir disorder.

"We call for self-discipline, so that no one in our own ranks, however enthusiastic, shall be the spark for disorder.

"We call for resistance to the efforts of those who, while not enemies of the march as such, might seek to use it to advance causes not dedicated primarily to civil rights or to the welfare of our country.

"We ask each and everyone in attendance in Washington or in spiritual attendance back home, to place the cause above all else.

"Do not permit a few irresponsibles to hang a new problem around our necks as we return home. Let's do what we came to do—place the national human rights problem squarely on the doorstep of the National Congress and of the Federal Government.

"Let's win at Washington."

The statement was signed by Mathew Ahmann, executive director of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, vice chairman of the Commission on Race Relations of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America; James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality; Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; Rabbi Joachim Prinz, chairman of the American Jewish Congress; A. Philip Randolph, president of the Negro American Labor Council; Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL–CIO, and chairman, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League.

COMMISSIONERS' STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS ASSEMBLY

Next Wednesday's civil rights assembly will draw the world's attention to Washington.

Many thousands of participants are expected. Steps are being taken by the city, in cooperation with the groups' leadership, to provide for the health and safety of our visitors, while maintaining, as far as possible, normal city activities.

Washingtonians who are accustomed to groups bringing their causes to the Nation's Capital, know that the forthcoming gathering is in the American tradition of orderly appeal for the redress of grievances. The right to assemble peaceably is an essential part of that tradition.

We have confidence that the energy, resourcefulness, and ingenuity of the city and its people will be exerted to welcome the many visitors and to extend to them full courtesy and hospitality.

Officials of the gathering have given the city excellent cooperation in completing necessary arrangements. We are confident that these joint preparations will produce an event in which the city and the Nation can have both pride and satisfaction.

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
JOHN B. DUNCAN,
C. M. DUKE,
Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the authorities in the District of Columbia for the excellent manner in which they have cooperated with those responsible for the organization of this march on Washington. It is a tribute to their understanding and dedication to public duty.

MEETING OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTER GROMYKO

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there appears an article by Carroll Kilpatrick entitled "J.F.K. Agrees to a Meeting With Gromyko." This article points out that the date when the President and Mr. Gromyko last met was October 18, 1962, when Mr. Gromyko assured the President that Soviet assistance to Cuba was entirely defensive.

Since that date we have learned how false Mr. Gromyko's statement to the President was. To put it more bluntly, we know that Mr. Gromyko lied to the face of the President of the United States.

I am quite disappointed to note that, in the face of a lie on which the future security of this Nation could have rested, the President is still going to open his office to Mr. Gromyko. I wonder what would be the case if our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, had told a bald-faced lie in Mr. Khrushchev's office. I wonder to what extent Mr. Khrushchev would have extended an invitation for a meeting, which has apparently been done in this case.

I would hope that such a meeting could be held off indefinitely or at least until such time as Mr. Gromyko purged himself of his reputation for lying to the President of the United States.

I suggest that one of the first steps that might be taken would be for Mr. Gromyko to persuade Mr. Khrushchev to follow up and fulfill Mr. Khrushchev's commitment to the United States that there would be on-site inspection in Cuba, under the auspices of the United Nations; and, further, that Mr. Gromyko persuade Mr. Khrushchev to carry out his commitment to remove Soviet troops from Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

J.F.K. Agrees to a Meeting With Gromyko

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Kennedy yesterday agreed to meet Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko this fall to discuss future steps to ease East-West tensions.

The talks are to take place while Gromyko is in this country for the United Nations General Assembly, which begins September 17. Gromyko conferred with the President while here for the 1961 and 1962 General Assembly meetings.

Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin made the announcement following a 50-minute meeting with Mr. Kennedy, and the White House confirmed the statement without setting a specific time and place for the talks.

Dobrynin said he delivered to the President a letter from Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev expressing satisfaction over signing of the nuclear test-ban treaty.

The letter was not made public, but Khrushchev told the President, Dobrynin said, that he had been pleased to see Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the senatorial delegation that went to Moscow for the treaty signing August 5.

Dobrynin said he discussed with the President steps that could be taken in the future "to develop relations and ease tensions."

Asked if Khrushchev might attend the U.N. meetings the Ambassador replied cryptically that he was not prepared to answer the question.

Acting White House Press Secretary Andrew T. Hatcher indicated, however, that this was not expected, and informants said the subject of a visit was not raised in Khrushchev's letter.

Dobrynin recently returned from an extended visit in Moscow.

Rusk's talks with Khrushchev brought forth no specific plans for new ways to ease tensions as a followup to the test-ban agreement.

The possibility of a nonaggression treaty and the proposal to station inspectors on the territory of each side to reduce the dangers of a surprise attack were among the subjects discussed.

But Rusk and the President have indicated that some time may elapse before detailed negotiations begin.

Rusk is expected to have preliminary discussions with Gromyko in New York before he meets the President.

When the latter two meet it will be the first time since October 18, 1962, when Gromyko assured the President that Soviet assistance to Cuba was entirely defensive.

At that time, the President already knew that Soviet missiles had been put in place in Cuba, but he did not tell Gromyko he had such information.

Four days later, when Mr. Kennedy announced to the world that Soviet missiles had been discovered in Cuba, he referred to Gromyko's assurances and said the information was "false."

A year earlier, on October 6, 1961, the President and Gromyko met at the White House at the height of the Berlin crisis. Although Gromyko called the meeting "useful," Rusk said it was "interesting, but that is all you can say about it."

Both the 1961 and the 1962 meetings lasted more than 2 hours.

FOREIGN AID—NONANSWERS TO NONCRITICS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal appears a lead editorial, entitled "Non-Answers to Non-Critics," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nonanswers to Noncritics

It is a traditional political ploy to answer criticisms that are not being made instead of ones that are. Now, as the foreign-aid debate moves from the House to eventual Senate consideration, it is instructive to observe this exercise in action.

President Kennedy gave a good demonstration of the device the other day. "No party or group," he said, "should call for a dynamic foreign policy and then seek to cripple (the aid) program." That is what he thinks the House cuts, if sustained, would do.

At his press conference Mr. Kennedy speculated on just what the program's critics, of whom there are more than ever in Congress this year, would like to see stopped. "Should we scrap the Alliance for Progress, which is our best answer to the threat of communism in this hemisphere? Should we deny help to India, the largest free power in Asia, as she seeks to strengthen herself against Communist China?" And so on.

Well, it isn't quite like that. Some may think the Alliance, to take that example, should be scrapped because it is a failure. But the real point is that it is ill conceived and needs drastic change.

The bulk of Alliance aid goes to Latin political regimes, with all the implicit corruption, rather than to help the poverty-mired masses. It stresses socialist planning and State enterprise instead of the incentive economy that might make going concerns of some of these countries. The real answer to the real criticism is a reshaped policy and program.

Similarly, few critics of aid to India object to military help intended to strengthen the nation against the threat of renewed attack by Red China. The criticism is of the nature and results of the economic aid to India, which is a wholly different kettle of fish.

This aid supports and entrenches socialism, with all the stultifying economic effects of centralized controls and excessive bureaucracy. In the opinion of a good many experts in and out of India, the best hope of progress lies in moving much further in the direction of an enterprise economy, putting much less emphasis on planning and state-run heavy industry.

Yet the U.S. Government not only fails to use the lever of its tremendous economic aid to move that way; it complacently accepts Indian socialism and now seriously considers giving it a big new boost in the form of help for a costly Government steel mill. We don't see why any official should be surprised at criticism on such valid grounds.

Nor are we aware of many demands for a dynamic foreign policy, whatever that might mean. People probably prefer a sense of confidence in the judgment behind foreign policy to any displays of dynamics. In any case, the connection between aid and the crucial aspects of policy is more tenuous than the administration professes to believe.

Cuba received aid but was not saved from communism by it. And when the Cuban crunches came—the Bay of Pigs disaster, the Soviet missile stashing—U.S. aid or the lack of it simply had nothing to do with issues of the most fateful kind. It is equally irrelevant in the significant question of whether we are entering a period of improved relations with Russia.

In sum, what most critics of foreign aid are saying is not that it should be summarily scrapped, but that it is confused, overblown, oversold, and too often geared to purposes not in the national interest. It may seem smart to discuss nonexistent criticisms instead, but that old political gambit is no answer to serious questions.

BRIDLED BRITAIN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal appears an article entitled "Bridled Britain," which sets forth measures to retard the gold drain used by Great Britain, which could be a lesson to the United States. The article is written by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr. I feel it is a timely article and merits the attention of those who are concerned with our problems of balance of payments and outflow of gold from the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bridled Britain: Its Measures To Retard Gold Drain Hold Lesson for United States

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Last month's increase of the Federal Reserve discount rate to 3½ percent from 3 percent, in one respect, was not unusual. The Federal Reserve Board has boosted the interest it charges member banks no less than 13 times in the last 9 years.

But in another sense the latest increase was most extraordinary. For the first time in the post-World War II era, the Fed raised its rate for reasons not tied to happenings in the domestic economy.

The rate boost, as Fed officials readily concede, was aimed at easing the United States worrisome international balance-of-payments deficit and the resulting gold drain. It is impossible to ascertain whether the payments deficit will continue to worsen—it jumped sharply in the second quarter—and necessitate further Federal action.

If additional measures are required, however, a hint of what may lie ahead can be gleaned from a review of the balance-of-payments woes that have recently plagued the United Kingdom. Though Britain's experience is not strictly applicable to the United States, it indicates that a balance-of-payments problem can be licked with stern action, but at some cost.

Discount rate increases, of course, tend to push up short-term interest charges, generally, and curb capital outflows to countries offering more attractive returns to investors. An international payments deficit, such as America's, occurs when a country spends more abroad than it takes in from foreigners. The U.S. gold drain is linked to its balance-of-payments problem because dollars accumulating abroad may be used to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury.

The Fed's previous postwar rate boosts were designed chiefly to prevent too-rapid inflation in the domestic economy, by increasing borrowing costs. And they were modest, seldom pushing the rate higher than the 3-percent level.

THE 1957 EXPERIENCE

Not so in postwar Britain. Without exception, recent increases of the U.K. bank rate (comparable to the Fed's discount rate) have been initiated to improve the island's shaky international balance of payments.

Take, for instance, the sterling crisis of 1957. Because of a persistent payments deficit, Britain's gold and dollar reserves, used to settle foreign debts, and shriveled by September 1957 to $1,850 million, down about 20 percent from the level at the year's start. To halt the decline, U.K. authorities on September 19 of that year boosted Britain's bank rate two full points to 7 percent—twice the current Fed rate.

Other restrictions were also imposed, including a freeze on Government spending and more stringent borrowing regulations for banks. The measures were aimed at sharply curbing inflation that was spurring import demand and pricing some British-made goods out of foreign markets.

The impact of these moves on Britain's foreign reserves was dramatic. By September 1958, the country's gold and dollar holdings were at $3,120 million, nearly 70 percent above the crisis level of a year earlier and higher, in fact, than at any time in 7 years.

But this is not the full story of the 1957 crisis. Britain's industrial output, which had been climbing steadily for 5 years, began to slide soon after the restraints were imposed. It fell from 119 percent of the 1953 base in late 1957 to 113 percent in mid-1958. Employment, at 106 percent in late 1957, skidded to 104 percent in a few months and didn't regain 1957 levels until the end of 1959. By that time, with U.K. exchange reserves again strong, the bank rate was back down to 4 percent.

British monetary authorities were unable, however, to leave the bank rate at the 4-percent level for long. Britain's reserves began tumbling again in late 1959, and on January 21, 1960, the bank rate was raised to 5 percent. When the pressure on reserves persisted, the authorities, in a series of steps were forced finally in July 1961 to bring the rate back up to the 7-percent mark.

In addition, brakes were applied to consumer buying, so as to free more production for export markets and trim import demand. Downpayments, normally at the discretion of lenders, were fixed at not less than 20 percent on installment purchases of such consumer goods as autos, TV and radio sets and major home appliances. Also, a 2-year repayment limit was slapped on a wide range of products bought on credit.

KEEPING OFF INFLATION

When the credit controls were imposed in April 1960, Chancellor of the Exchequer Derick Heathcoat Amory told the House of Commons that the measures were to keep off inflation and thereby give Britain a more healthy external position.

As before, the effect of the restraints on United Kingdom reserve was swift. In July 1961, when the bank rate again hit 7 percent, Britain's holdings of gold and convertible currencies stood at $2,452,800,000, the lowest total in 3½ years. A short 4 months later, reserves amounted to $3,556 million, a 45-percent rebound from July's low point.

But industrial production, at a record in mid-1961, began a 6-month decline and did not return to 1961's high level until mid-1962. By then, with reserves rebuilt, the bank rate was down to 4½ percent. Employment, also at a peak in mid-1961, similarly dropped for several months and did not turn up again until the second quarter of 1962.

Recently, British reserves have held at relatively high levels. In a burst of optimism, United Kingdom officials have vowed to steer an expansionary course in the months ahead. How long this may be possible, however, is open to question. Britain's living costs have pushed markedly higher in recent months. And just last week it was reported that the nation's trade gap widened to $216 million in July, up sharply from $98 million in June. The July gap constituted the United Kingdom's largest excess of imports over exports in any month since August 1962.

The list of economic restraints Britain has used in the postwar period to bolster its exchange reserves is long. Besides bank rate adjustments and other actions already noted, tactics employed at one time or another include pay freezes for workers, steep purchase taxes geared to crimp domestic sales of many goods and, to reduce the drain on United Kingdom treasury funds, higher charges for such Government services as postage.

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE

The impress of Britain's balance-of-payments woes on its economic growth is suggested by matching United Kingdom performance against those of other industrial powers. In a recent review of various Western economies, the Bank for International Settlements stated that Britain's economic growth rate has been unsatisfactory. The BIS concluded that "if the persistent balance-of-payments obstacle to expansion could be overcome, a better record could be achieved in the present decade."

The following table dramatizes Britain's lagging expansion. The percentages express, by country, the average annual increase of gross national product (the value of goods and services produced) for 1950–60. Distortions caused by inflation have been adjusted for.

	Percent GNP gain
West Germany	7. 5
Italy	5. 8
Netherlands	4. 7
France	4. 6
Switzerland	4. 3
Canada	3. 7
Sweden	3. 5
Belgium	3. 1
United States	3. 0
United Kingdom	2. 6

The United Kingdom growth rate, the table shows, has been slower than in any other major Western country. And BIS studies reveal British expansion in some recent years has been well below the 2.6 percent average.

There is, of course, another side to the coin. The restrictive measures have doubtless enabled the pound to weather repeated devaluation threats. The record also shows that Britons have suffered less inflation in recent years than most West Europeans. The United Kingdom cost-of-living index has risen only about 10 percent since 1958, far less than the corresponding increases in such lands as France and Italy, where living costs have spurted some 25 percent since 1958. It's no coincidence, parenthetically, that the United Kingdom money supply (demand deposits plus currency in circulation) has increased less, recently, than that of any other West European nation.

GREAT DISSIMILARITIES

To be sure, there are great dissimilarities between the British and American economies. Britain's was hit especially hard by World War II and has been strained in the postwar years by the disintegration of the colonial empire. Moreover, as an island, Britain relies heavily on imported goods. United Kingdom imports traditionally exceed exports, and this places constant pressure on the country's balance of payments.

Thus far, the U.S. action to curb its payments deficit can hardly be likened to the drastic restraints that have been resorted to in Britain. Some U.S. officials even contend last month's half-point discount rate boost won't hamper continued business growth.

Still, the British experience appears noteworthy, as the gold drain persists and the payments deficit swells. It is an experience that America, with a naturally favorable trade balance and a highly modern industrial plant that wasn't ravaged by the war, would presumably strive to avoid as the decade once labeled the "soaring sixties" unfolds.

COLUMBIA DAILY SPECTATOR ENDORSES MARCH AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the editors of the Columbia Daily Spectator recently issued a special editorial endorsing the march to Washington scheduled for tomorrow and the civil rights legislation now before Congress. The editorial was unanimously approved by the seven members of the newspaper's editorial board despite the fact that the newspaper is on vacation for the summer.

The editorial explains that the editors of the Columbia Daily Spectator traditionally maintain a discreet silence on public issues during summer vacations. The march was considered an event of such importance, however, that the editors, in a tradition-breaking step, decided to publish the editorial to make known their support of the march.

Mr. President, there is something inspiring in this example of the deep concern which these intelligent young people have expressed in the problem of civil rights. I hope that Congress, following the example of the Columbia Daily Spectator editors, will put an end to its own foot dragging on this subject and come to grips with this important moral and constitutional issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the editors of the Columbia Daily Spectator be printed following my remarks in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The March and the Congress

The editors of the Columbia Spectator traditionally maintain a discreet silence on public issues while their newspaper is on vacation for the summer. We have decided to break that tradition. This week's march on Washington for jobs and freedom is an event of such importance that we must make known our support.

It climaxes a struggle for civil rights that has shocked a Nation out of indifference. It can now prod a Congress out of its accustomed lethargy.

Congress, by nature and custom, is the most conservative of the three branches of Government. It takes extraordinary conditions to bring about a major piece of legislation. Such conditions are present. We know of no more important legislation than the civil rights bill. We know of no more compelling circumstances than those of the American Negro. We know of no more dramatic demonstration of the yearning for equality than this week's march.

That yearning has been felt since this Nation was founded, but the civil rights struggle has remained largely dormant in the National Legislature for a century. The battle is now reborn. The program before Congress covers a wide range—from voting rights to public accommodations to continuing the Commission on Civil Rights. It could stand improvement, and may get it. But the important matter is passing the bill without serious compromise of its intent.

A satisfactory program will not be approved, however, unless many Congressmen who still walk the line of indecision are impelled to step to the President's side. To say that the demonstrations in Birmingham and elsewhere have made the march superfluous is to advocate passivity when significant victory is almost won.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR UNITED STATES-CANADIAN TRADE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago I called to the attention of the Under Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury the need for continued pressure, in negotiations with the Canadian Government, to secure a greater degree of reciprocity in United States-Canadian trade relations. I was—and am—particularly concerned over the tendency of our Government to show too much deference and consideration to the economic problems of other nations. Specifically, there can be no doubt that the Canadian tariff of 7½ percent on U.S. bread, as compared with no U.S. tariff on Canadian bread, creates an unequal and in many ways unfair relationship.

The bakery industry and bakery employees in the United States, especially in States bordering on Canada, are facing great economic hardships. Sales of U.S. bread are dropping; sales of Canadian bread are mounting; and bakery employees throughout the affected areas are losing their jobs and facing hardship and destitution.

I see primarily two alternatives. Either the United States raises its tariff on bread to 7½ percent in order to equalize the situation, or we persuade the Canadians to lower their tariff on bread. Neither of these courses can be followed unless the Federal Government takes an active interest and shows a genuine concern in this probelm.

Mr. President, I am glad to note that the reply which I have received from Secretary of the Treasury Dillon does offer some hope of Government activity on behalf of the bakery industry and bakery workers. He informs me that further efforts will be made to reduce or eliminate this duty during the forthcoming round of trade negotiations. He also indicates that the continuing question of United States-Canadian economic relations will be discussed in a joint meeting in Washington September 21 and 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. I sincerely hope that every effort will be made at that time to make the Canadian Government aware of the problems that have arisen with regard to bread tariffs—and also with regard to the very low level of Canadian tourist expenditures permitted on a duty-free basis in the United States. Although I regret very much that both of these problems were not discussed in the last round of economic talks with the Canadians and were not at that point given an urgent priority, I am hopeful that considerably more attention will be devoted to both these points in future talks with the Canadians.

Mr. President, it is a matter of some interest to me that I have received letters from Canadian citizens supporting my position on these two points and expressing sincere regrets at the restrictions placed by the Canadian Government upon its citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD the text of a letter I have just received from the Secretary of the Treasury discussing this situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1963.

HON. KENNETH KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: Your letter of July 24 mentions two aspects of U.S. economic relations with Canada that are naturally of concern to some of our citizens along the border, and I can certainly appreciate your interest in the bread tariff and the Canadian duty-free allowance.

On the bread import duty, you probably are aware that the current rate represents some progress on this issue. Through negotiation, the Canadian tariff was lowered from 15 percent for bulk and 20 percent for packaged products to its current 7½ percent level effective July 1, 1962. Both the State and the Commerce Departments have indicated their intention to make further efforts to reduce or eliminate the duty during the forthcoming Kennedy round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The primary purpose of the curtailment in the duty-free goods allowance, as formalized in the recent Canadian budget, is to reduce foreign expenditures by Canadian residents. For some years the Canadians have had a deficit on goods and services accounts with the United States of around $1 billion annually. They feel that the only way they can reduce their dependence on U.S. capital inflow is to reduce this payments deficits on goods and services. Nevertheless, I understand that the State Department, which has the primary responsibility for bilateral negotiation on such matters, expects to raise this issue in the context of overall economic relations when the Cabinet level Joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs meets in Washington September 20–21, 1963.

You have inquired whether these issues were considered in the recent discussions with Canadian officials with respect to the treatment of Canadian securities under the proposed interest equalization tax. There are several reasons why it was not practicable to include in these financial discussions other aspects of our economic relations with Canada, including the two specific questions that you have raised.

The conversations that were held with Canadian officials on July 20–21 centered on financial problems that had arisen following the President's announcement of the interest equalization tax. There was a very limited amount of time available to reach decisions before the opening of the financial markets on July 22. A grave disruption of the Canadian capital market and a sizable decline in Canadian foreign exchange reserves had already occurred. There was a deep and urgent concern on the part of Canadian officials that they would be faced with a new foreign exchange crisis unless the market could be given assurance that the capital inflow would be forthcoming to offset their current account deficit. Without a solution to their problem, it was feared that measures would have to be adopted by Canada that would have entailed a marked restriction of trade with the United States and would have had a depressing effect on both the economies.

In order to avoid these consequences, it was agreed that the Treasury would recommend the exemption of new Canadian securities from the tax. In return, the Canadian authorities gave us assurance that it would not be the desire or intention of the Canadian Government to increase its foreign exchange reserves through borrowings in the United States, and that Canada would take whatever steps may be necessary to limit Canadian flotations on the U.S. market to the level needed to avoid a fall in Canadian reserves—something like the normal level maintained in the 1950's. Thus the Canadians have accepted limitations on their exemption, and the balance-of-payments gains which we expected from the adoption of the tax measure will be attained.

I cite these facts surrounding the financial negotiations of July 20–21 to indicate (1) their urgency, (2) their success in avoiding a serious threat to the economic and trade relations of the two countries, and (3) the restraint accepted by the Canadians on their future borrowings. I do not believe that it would have been productive to attempt to raise other specific economic questions under the circumstances attending these discussions, since such specific negotiations are normally time consuming, require commodity experts, and rapidly extend to cover many individual items that are likely to be raised by both sides.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

FATE OF THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the year 1939, Hitler and Stalin signed a secret treaty leaving the Baltic States entirely in the sphere of Russian influence. The fate of these small sovereign states was sealed without their consideration. On June of 1940, the Soviet Union cruelly and forcefully occupied the Baltic States. One year later mass deportations of their citizens to Siberia began.

This year, as in the past, Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians of Greater New York assembled to commemorate the tragic event. A resolution was adopted demonstrating vividly that these people have not forsaken hope of one day restoring freedom and independence to the Baltic States and all other captive peoples. These persons, now loyal citizens and patriotic residents of the United States, have not and cannot forget the inhuman deeds of the Soviet Union, and neither can we. In this regard I ask unanimous consent to enter the resolution of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians of Greater New York into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS OF GREATER NEW YORK

Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians of Greater New York, citizens and residents of the United States of America, assembled on this 16th day of June 1963 at the Carnegie Endowment International Center in New York, to commemorate the 23d anniversary of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States and the 22d anniversary of the first inhuman mass deportations of their citizens to Siberia in June 1941;

Recalling the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States, perpetrated in violation of all Soviet solemn agreements to respect the Baltic peoples, their independence and freedom and the crimes of genocide committed by Soviet Russia in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

Noting, that the occupation, of the Baltic States has taken on forms of colonialism and the captive Baltic peoples have been surrendered to slavery and subservience; and

Considering that the right of self-determination has been granted to former colonies of Western Europe, both in Asia, in Africa; and that

Contrary to this global movement, the Soviet Union is continuing its colonial subjugation of East Central Europe, particularly of the three Baltic States; and

Pointing out that the United Nations, an international body dedicated to world peace and understanding, has appointed a Special Committee of 24 to study and recommend action for abolishment of colonialism; and

Noting that this Committee of 24 has dealt only with the so-called Western colonies in Africa and Asia and while apparently not adverse to considering the Soviet colonialism, has failed to include in its agenda the issue of colonialism in the Baltic States; and

Taking notice, that Members of the U.S. House of Representatives continue their efforts for establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations;

Resolve:

1. To renew their solemn protest against the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations and the transformation of the once free and prosperous Baltic States into Soviet colonies;

2. To request the governments of the free world and especially that of the United States, to undertake all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination to the Baltic nations; and

3. To request the American delegation to urge the Commitee of 24 of the United Nations to consider as an immediate item for its agenda, the abolishment of Soviet colonialism in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and that the United Nations call for and supervise free elections in these countries; and

4. To urge the Committee on Rules of the Congress of the United States for quick action in passing House Resolution 14, for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; and

5. To renew the dedication of the Baltic nations to the struggle for freedom and independence with all other captive peoples until victory.

Dated, New York, N.Y., June 16, 1963.

STEPHEN BREDES, Jr.,
President.
VINCENTA LESKAITIS,
Secretary.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the sugar industry is as dynamic and vital an industry as we have in this country. Since the elimination of Cuban cane sugar supplies, the growth of domestic sugarbeet producers has filled the void and provided a valuable contribution to our total economy. We in Colorado are particularly proud of our sugarbeet industry where we have headquartered such fine companies as the Great Western Sugar Co., American Crystal Sugar Co., Holly Sugar Co., and the National Sugar Manufacturing Co., where as a State we produce the second largest tonnage of sugar in the country.

The importance of the beet sugar industry in this country has been recognized by the Congress in the National Sugar Act as amended in 1962. The dependency of food companies upon the sugar industry as a supplier of a raw material vitally necessary for their continuing production, is another example of this industry's significance.

In a paper published in the Financial Analysts Journal of July–August 1963, Mr. Dennis O'Rourke, president and chief executive officer of Holly Sugar Co., has performed a valuable service to us all by discussing with great clarity and detail "The Sugar Situation, 1963."

Mr. O'Rourke is a fine lawyer, a very valuable community leader, and is recognized as one of the best-versed students of the sugar industry, highly qualified through almost 20 years of experience to write on this important topic. As president of Holly Sugar Co., he follows the great leadership of Mr. Merrill Shoup, known to so many of us in Congress as a statesman in the sugar industry.

Because this article shows clearly the sugar situation in the country and the development under the 1962 Sugar Act, I request unanimous consent to have Mr. O'Rourke's article included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGAR SITUATION, 1963

(By Dennis O'Rourke)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dennis O'Rourke, president and chief executive officer of Holly Sugar Corp., joined the corporation in 1945 as general counsel. For several years prior to joining Holly, Mr. O'Rourke served as an attorney in the Office of the Solicitor (now Office of the General Counsel), U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. In 1953, he was elected vice president and general counsel of Holly Sugar Corp., and in 1956 a member of the board of directors. In 1963, Mr. O'Rourke was elected to his present position. A native of Nebraska, Mr. O'Rourke was graduated from Nebraska State Teachers College and received the degree juris doctor, with distinction, from George Washington University Law School.)

Three years ago, in July 1960, with the loss of Cuban supplies, the domestic beet sugar producing area became the largest single sugar supplying area for the U.S. market. The national Sugar Act, as amended in 1962, fully recognizes this primacy by granting the beet sugar industry the largest quota of any supplying area, by awarding it the largest right to share in market growth, and by giving very special encouragement to the building of new beet sugar factories.

During the present year, Americans will consume almost 20 billion pounds of sugar. Next year, the growing national population will require an estimated additional 250 to 300 million pounds of sugar to meet its needs.

Stated in other terms, U.S. consumption averages about 100 pounds of sugar per person annually, a rate which has varied little for many years. As the U.S. population increases, so does total demand for sugar.

The consumer takes this sweetest of all of nature's foods in a variety of forms—spooned from the family sugar bowl, or in soft drinks and candy, ice cream and bakery goods, canned fruits, jams, jellies, pickles and TV dinners, sauces and pasteurized cheeses, chewing gum, and a multitude of other food items commonly found in the retail stores of America.

Normally, the consumer also takes his sugar for granted. Although it is a commodity with great universal appeal, and even strategic importance, it has been in such ample supply and at such reasonable prices in the United States that the average American has given little, if any, thought to the whys and wherefores of national and international sugar commerce.

The beet sugar industry of the United States is nearing its 100th anniversary. Its successful bow onto the American scene occurred in 1870 when the first commercially successful processing plant went into operation at Alvarado, Calif., on a site now occupied by a big, modern processing plant owned and operated by Holly Sugar Corp., one of the Nation's major sugar producers.

At the time the beet sugar industry was a fledgling in this country, it already was well established in Europe, where it continues today to be the dominant and much esteemed source of sugar for the European housewives and chefs.

NAPOLEON ISSUES SUGAR DECREE

The stimulus for commercial sugarbeet and beet sugar production came from Napoleon Bonaparte, who found his warring nation cut off from sugar supplies which usually flowed in from the West Indies. The French Emperor was told about the work which German and other scientists had done with the sugarbeet and its potential as a source of home-grown sugar; whereupon he issued a decree which launched planting of beets and construction of processing factories throughout France.

After the industry was successfully transplanted to the United States and the first plant had demonstrated the economic practicability of beet sugar production, the industry spread rapidly in western and mid-Western States. The greatest early development occurred at and soon following the turn of the last century.

Today, sugarbeets are grown on thousands of farms in 22 States stretching from Ohio and Michigan westward through the Rocky Mountain States to the Pacific coast. During 1962, there were a total of 59 operating beet sugar factories in 14 States.

All of this constitutes by far the Nation's largest domestic sugar-producing area. At current levels of consumption, more than one-fourth of all the sugar consumed in this country will come from this industry in a variety of forms—bulk granulated sugar in large shipments for the industrial users, or in liquid form, and full lines of grocery items for selection of the housewife.

This sugar, which the beet provides, is the same sugar that is found in commerce all around the world. Technically, it is sucrose. Just as pure gold can be extracted from various ores, so pure sugar (sucrose) can be extracted from various plants. In either case, the fully refined product is the pure substance—gold is gold and sugar is sugar—no matter what the source.

Pure sucrose can be taken from palm trees, maple trees, sorghum, watermelons and many other plants, just as it is taken from sugarbeets and sugarcane. After exhaustive tests, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has declared that "by no chemical test can the pure crystallized sugar from these different sources be distinguished."

The two chief sources of sugar are, of course, sugarbeets and sugarcane. Beets account for about 45 percent and cane for about 55 percent of total world production of sugar.

The beet sugar industry has become deeply rooted in the agricultural-industrial economy of vast sections of the Nation because of its many and widespread benefits. The sugarbeet itself provides needed cash income to the farmers who produce it, and on a contract basis which virtually guarantees a substantial annual return to the grower, barring natural disasters which might affect his crop.

On this score, the beet is comparatively attractive too. It is an extremely hardy plant which can sustain a pummeling from nature and still survive to "make a crop." It provides as byproducts pulp of the root from which the sugar has been extracted and molasses, which are combined to make a valuable livestock feed. In addition, the leafy beet top is an excellent feed. Inevitably, establishment of the beet sugar industry has stimulated livestock feeding in areas where the byproducts become available. The molasses beet pulp is also shipped to feeders at points distant from the production area.

A STAPLE CROP IN OUR ECONOMY

Stability has been a keynote of the beet sugar enterprise, stability for the economy of the community in which the industry operates. By its very nature, the industry encourages diversification of farm production programs, it adds industry to rural areas; and returns from the crop have been dependable and substantial.

The record of our company in large degree typifies how the total industry has grown in the United States. Starting in 1905 as a one-factory company serving a small group of farmers in southeastern Colorado, we have grown steadily in all respects.

Today we operate 10 factories in 4 States—at Delta, Colo.; Torrington and Worland, Wyo.; Hardin and Sidney, Mont.; and Brawley, Santa Ana, Alvarado, Tracy, and Hamilton City, Calif.

Construction of our new plant at Hereford, Tex., is tangible evidence of trends which have been developing in the sugar world during several recent years. New emphasis has been placed upon greater self-sufficiency in sugar in this Nation, especially since Castro cast Cuba into the Communist orbit.

Prior to the Red takeover in Cuba, that island nation had been the biggest single supplier in the U.S. market, providing annually approximately one-third of the Nation's requirements and holding vast quantities of sugar in reserves, upon which the United States could draw quickly when other supplies were not available for any reason. Loss of the "Cuban sugar bowl," within a few miles and quick delivery time of our shores, has had significant effects upon our national sugar situation. The sugar formerly imported from a single source—Cuba—now is drawn from more than a score of countries, many of them at considerable distance from American ports.

Sugar supplies and markets long have been of deep concern to nations throughout the world, most of which have developed their own programs affecting sugar production and trade. National and international controls are the rule, rather than the exception. In some instances, the government programs are designed to encourage production. Some have as a basis objective assuring consumers adequate supplies. Generally, importing nations seek to assure continuity of supply. Exporting nations seek to assure markets for their production.

Since 1934, the United States has had in operation a sugar program designed to encourage the production of a substantial part of our sugar requirements within the United States. The stated objectives of this program have been: (1) to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; and (2) to promote the export trade of the United States.

SIXTY PERCENT SUPPLIED DOMESTICALLY

Through a system of marketing quotas, the program gears supply to demand. Today, approximately 60 percent of the Nation's total requirements is supplied by domestic producers (the 22-State beet-producing area, plus the cane-producing areas of Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands), while the remaining 40 percent is imported from foreign countries.

The quotas specified in the Sugar Act—which is the embodiment of the U.S. sugar program—are based upon a national consumption level of 9,700,000 tons, which was approximately the annual rate of U.S. sugar consumption at the time the Sugar Act was last amended in July 1962. The basic quotas are shown in table I below.

In recent years, annual U.S. consumption has been increasing at the rate of about 160,000 tons. Above the 9,700,000-ton level, this annual growth is divided 65 percent to the beet producers in 22 States and the mainland cane producers in Louisiana and Florida—and 35 percent to foreign countries. Of such 65 percent, the beet-producing area receives 75 percent and Louisiana and Florida 25 percent. This means that, at current levels of annual consumption growth, about 75,000 tons are added to the beet area's annual quota and 25,000 tons to the mainland cane quota. The remainder is assigned to foreign suppliers.

In the expectation that Cuba might once again return to the circle of friendly American nations, the Congress made provision in 1962 for a basic Cuban quota of 1,484,121 tons. But since July 1960, by Presidential order under the statute, no Cuban sugar has been imported into the United States; and under provisions of the 1962 Sugar Act, Cuba's basic quota is now being supplied under a so-called global quota arrangement, which means that it may be filled by friendly foreign countries with certain provisions for special consideration for Western Hemisphere nations and nations which buy our surplus agricultural commodities.

TABLE I.—*Basic annual quotas, domestic and foreign areas, at approximate level of 9,700,000 short tons, raw value, U.S. consumption estimate*

	Short tons, raw value
DOMESTIC AREAS	
Beet sugar	2,650,000
Mainland cane sugar	895,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000
Total domestic	5,810,000
FOREIGN AREAS	
Philippines	1,050,000
Dominican Republic	319,804
Peru	189,804
Mexico	189,804
Brazil	180,186
British West Indies	90,234
Australia	39,884
Republic of China	35,075
French West Indies	29,984
Colombia	29,984
Nicaragua	24,892
Costa Rica	24,892
Ecuador	24,892
India	20,084
Haiti	20,084
Guatemala	20,084
South Africa	20,084
Argentina	20,000
Panama	14,992
El Salvador	10,183
Paraguay	9,900
British Honduras	9,900
Fiji Islands	9,900
Netherlands	9,900
Canada	631
United Kingdom	516
Hong Kong	3
Ireland	10,000
Belgium	182
Total foreign	2,405,878
Cuba, basic quota now supplied by other foreign nations as global quota	1,484,121

The sugar program also contains provisions for meeting deficits. That is, when any area or country is unable to fill its quota, there is machinery for reassigning the unfilled portion of the quota to another supplier and thus avoid a shortage in total supply.

To gear domestic marketing and production to the quotas, the Secretary of Agriculture has effective controls for use as required. When it appears necessary for orderly marketing or related purposes, the Secretary may impose marketing allotments on the individual sugar companies placing a limit on the amount of sugar each company is permitted to market during the year. In order to prevent overproduction of sugar crops, the Secretary of Agriculture may also establish acreage allotments for domestic sugarbeet or sugarcane farmers. The acreage allotments for sugar crops are called "proportionate shares," since they allocate to each farmer his proportionate share of the total acreage required to produce the quota for the area. No beet sugar marketing restrictions have been in effect since May of 1962 and no beet acreage controls have been imposed since 1960.

CONDITIONS OF U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM

The U.S. sugar program includes a unique tax-and-payment system which has proven to be an effective means of securing compliance with certain conditions specified in the Sugar Act. The act authorizes payments to farmers conditioned upon their not employing child labor; upon their payment of certain minimum wages, prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture after public hearings, to the people who work in sugar fields; and upon their compliance with acreage allotments. Sugar farmers comprise the only segment of the American agricultural industry singled out for Government-prescribed minimum wages. Average wages actually paid in American sugarbeet fields are usually above the required minimum and are close to the minimum wages set by law for workers in nonfarm industries.

The sugarbeet farmer pays part of a processing tax of about one-half cent a pound which is collected from the sugar processor, and the Treasury also collects an import tax of the same amount on foreign sugars entering the United States. If the U.S. farmer complies with the conditions above referred to, he receives a payment which ranges from eight-tenths to three-tenths of a cent per pound on the sugar his crop produces, with the higher payment rate going to the smaller farmer. To date, since the sugar program has been in operation, tax collections have far exceeded payments made, so that there has been a net gain to the Treasury of more than $450 million.

Among the more significant changes made in the Sugar Act in 1962 was the addition of those provisions designed specifically to encourage expansion of the domestic beet sugar industry, again in recognition of the wisdom of making the Nation better able to have adequate supplies in times of crisis or other unusual developments.

Briefly, the new provisions established annual acreage reserves to be committed in the years 1962 through 1965 to new areas to be served by new processing facilities. The law states, in effect, that acreage sufficient to produce 65,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar shall be reserved each year for commitment to new producing areas which show themselves qualified to expand the industry. Specific criteria, dealing with ability to produce sugarbeets, to finance construction of a factory, and farmer need and desire to grow the crop, were incorporated in the law to guide the Secretary of Agriculture in committing acreages to new areas.

The law also provides that the acreage available shall accumulate during years it is not used, except that not more than that acreage sufficient to produce 100,000 tons of sugar shall be committed in 1966, the last year during which the current act is in force.

In total, then, the law provides for a reserve for new factories aggregating some 260,000 short tons, raw value, of beet sugar in the years 1962–65. Thus far, the Department of Agriculture has committed 230,000 tons of this reserve, but actual increases in beet sugar production are likely to be materially larger because the new factories being built will produce more than the reserve awarded to them, and, in addition, several older factories are being expanded.

Holly Sugar Corp. was the first beet sugar company in the Nation to file application, jointly with farmers in portions of Texas and New Mexico, for assignment of an acreage reserve as provided by the amended law. In due course, the application was approved, and the construction of Holly's new $20 million factory at Hereford, Tex., was begun in April 1963.

MINIMUM ACREAGE ASSURED

The law, in effect, assures that there shall be a minimum acreage available, even should acreage limitations be invoked. Without such assurance, it would theoretically have been possible for anyone to erect a factory and suddenly find insufficient acreage available to support its operation.

In a period dating back only to World War II days, the complexion of sugar consumption in the United States has changed materially. Prior to World War II, about 65 percent of all the sugar consumed in the United States was used in the household directly from consumer-size packages. During the war period, as housewives more and more went into gainful employment, the so-called "convenience foods" made spectacular development, and more of these are coming onto the market almost every day even now. Today, as a result of the Nation's changed cooking and eating habits, about two-thirds of all the sugar consumed reaches the ultimate consumer via the industrial food plant. The housewife carries home only about one-third of her family's annual sugar requirements in a consumer-size package. Thus, within the span of a very few years, the percentages have been reversed.

NO SUGAR—OUT OF BUSINESS

The implications are significant. Sugar now ranks as a major raw material upon which food companies rely. Without sugar, they are, as stated not long ago by a Government official, "out of business."

Secondly, the change has greatly altered marketing methods. Demand for bulk shipments of sugar, in dry or liquid form, means that the supplier, including, of course, the beet sugar processor, must be equipped to serve this kind of trade. It has meant construction of huge bulk storage bins for sugar at the processors' plants. Holly Sugar, for example, has included bin storage for 600,000 hundredweights of sugar at its new Hereford, Tex., plant, and has constructed bins at other factories to store vast quantities of bulk granulated sugar. Some of this is shipped in bulk rail carloads or truckloads. Some is packaged, as needed, to serve the retail trade. It has also meant the building of liquefying facilities and liquid storage tanks.

Transportation of bulk sugar shipments has required development of special rail and truck equipment for both dry bulk and liquid sugar. There has been rapid development of specially designed systems for inplant handling of sugar by industrial users. Many of the systems currently in use by sugar users have been devised and installed with the technical assistance of sugar suppliers.

Liquid sugars are blended to the purchaser's precise specifications in many instances. Quality standards have become among the highest in the food field. A whole new technology has been developed so that the sugar industry may keep pace with changing times and changing habits.

As mentioned earlier, the average American sugar consumer has tended to take all of this for granted. Sugar has been plentiful and cheap. Recently, however, sugar has been thrust from the commodity reports and grocery advertisements to the front pages of the world's newspapers, because prices rose quickly to levels which the United States, accustomed to not only a low but a very stable price, had not seen for many years.

Consumers began to ask one principal question: "Why?"

The answer was not simple because, despite its normal "bread-and-butter" category, sugar is a complex subject. To answer the question required a thoughtful answer.

One of the Nation's most respected firms in the field of sugar economics and brokerage, B. W. Dyer & Co., of New York, stated recently:

"Informed observers agree that today's high sugar prices are primarily the result of substantially changed supply-demand factors throughout the world.

"Reduced supply—the statistics of reduced world sugar supply have already received widespread publicity. Freezes, droughts, unattractive prices, and political upheavals have all contributed. Another recent example is Oswaldo Dorticos, current president of the once great sugar bowl of the world—Cuba—who officially admitted, via radio from Havana on May 11 and Cienfuegos on May 13, that Cuba would produce only about 2.9 million metric tons of sugar this year. However, other reports indicate 3.2 to 3.5 million tons. This compares to about 4.8 million tons reported last year, and about 6.8 the year before."

The Dyer & Co. statement emphasized that part of the higher U.S. prices at the time the statement was issued resulted from accelerated demand, described thus: "While actual consumption is relatively stable, effective demand at any one time can vary greatly. Today's sugar prices are the result of abnormally increased effective demand, as well as reduced supply. Naturally, if buyers are panicked and try to buy a year's supply in 1 month, instead of the normal 30 to 60 days' supply, the price must rise. Sellers generally are too conservative to meet such accelerated demand at normal prices because of uncertainties of production and distribution outside of their control."

Commenting on the same subject in a speech delivered on May 22, 1963, Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Policy Staff, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, observed:

"World sugar production has fallen. Serious declines in Europe and Cuba have been offset only partially by production increases elsewhere. World production in the crop year beginning October 1, 1960, reached the record level of 60 million tons. Last year it fell to 56 million tons. Current year reports from Cuba and elsewhere make it apparent that world production this year will be less than 56 million tons."

Continuing, Mr. Myers spoke of world consumption:

"The trend of world consumption has been sharply upward. In 1961–62 world consumption apparently amounted to around 58 million tons compared with world production of 56 million tons. Accordingly, world stocks were reduced 2 million tons. World consumption this year will depend upon the extent to which world sugar stocks will be depleted.

"The developments outlined above have changed the world sugar situation from one of growing surpluses to one of shortage. Through the crop year 1960–61 world stocks were increasing. In 1961–62 world stocks were reduced but the reduction was not felt. Starting last fall the world sugar market began to reflect relief from the past surpluses.

"The late recognition of the change from surplus to a tight supply situation may account for a large part of the violence of recent market reaction."

Relative to the change in the world sugar situation, Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy testified before the Senate Committee on Finance on May 29, 1963. After reviewing the situation thoroughly, Secretary Murphy concluded with this statement:

ADVANTAGES OF THE QUOTA SYSTEM

"Finally, let me say that all of us should be grateful for our Sugar Act and the assurance it makes possible for sugar supplies at this time. It should be abundantly clear that U.S. sugar supplies today would be infinitely more precarious if we had not had the protection of this law and the quota system over the past 30 years. For without this system, our domestic sugar industry might not have survived the disastrously low world prices of 1960–62. U.S. farmers today are producing and the U.S. processing industry is manufacturing 6 million tons of sugar that constitute nearly 60 percent of our sugar supplies. The protection that the Sugar Act has afforded over the years has maintained a healthy and growing domestic sugar industry which is indispensable in such a period of world shortage."

With world sugar consumption exceeding production in 1962 and 1963, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has, of course, removed all restrictions on domestic production, and it has also taken other steps calculated to obtain increased domestic production. Among these are its announcements this spring that beet plantings would not be restricted for the 1964 and 1965 crops.

Generally, among the producing segments of the domestic sugar industry, it is the hope that sugar prices in the U.S. market may achieve somewhat more favorable levels than obtained generally prior to 1963. Sugar prices had not kept pace with rising costs, including wages, as have the prices of all foods. For example, during the quarter-century period between 1934 and 1958, sugar prices rose one-fourth less than the average prices of all foods, and only one-third as much as per capita disposable income.

Great efficiency gains in production methods employed by sugarbeet growers and beet sugar processors have enabled both to withstand the growing pressures of mounting costs against a very stable return. The beet sugar industry as a whole, from farm through factory, has devoted itself to well devised programs of research which have tended to increase productivity per acre and to decrease labor requirements and which have produced new techniques in processing and distribution.

SCIENTISTS ALTER BEET SEED CHARACTER

The sugarbeet of today, thanks to scientific breakthroughs in plant breeding, bears little, if any, resemblance to varieties produced earlier in this century. It is more resistant to its natural enemies, such as diseases and various pests, and its yields are greater.

The scientists have even changed the character of the beet seed so that the monogerm in widespread commercial use in this country today is more adaptable to mechanical farming methods than was the old multigerm variety. The monogerm seed produces a single seedling plant, whereas the multigerm sent up clusters of plants which were difficult to thin as field populations were reduced to obtain optimum production.

All the harvesting of today's U.S. sugarbeet crop is done by machine, and much of the thinning, cultivating, and weed control is accomplished by mechanical and other means employing new techniques developed through research.

In terms of man-hours required to produce a ton of sugar, the U.S. beet sugar industry is very close to the top of the list among the most efficient sugar producers in the world.

In terms of purchasing power, sugar has been cheaper in the United States than anywhere else on earth, and, even at the somewhat higher prices which have recently prevailed, the U.S. price is among the lowest, a benefit of principal importance to the consumer.

The beet sugar industry is now busily engaged in answering the challenge presented to it by the new Sugar Act and by the present sugar situation. Three large new factories are scheduled for completion in each of the years 1963, 1964, and 1965, with other new ones planned, and the capacities of several existing factories are being increased. This large program of expansion will give further important assurance to sugar consumers of the United States of adequate sugar supplies at reasonable prices.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago, after a long conference, members of the conference committee of the House and Senate agreed on a compromise to permit the Export-Import Bank to continue in business by extending its charter for 5 years. However, the conferees were unable to agree on giving the Bank extra borrowing authority, because of a vital difference in principle between the two groups of conferees as to what additional borrowing authority should be given. The Senate was adamant for continuing Treasury borrowing, as hitherto. The House was equally firm on changing the system, which had been in effect for more than 30 years, to require appropriations financing.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial commenting on this subject, entitled "Reopening the Eximbank," which appeared in the New York Times of August 25 of this year, may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Reopening the Eximbank

The Export-Import Bank, which has played a vital role in financing international trade, will be able to open its doors again as a result of the far from satisfactory compromise between the Senate and the House. Its charter lapsed last June 30, when the House refused to approve a proposal to increase its lending power by $2 billion unless it had the specific approval of Congress. There was no dispute over the amount itself, but the House sought to put a stop to the Eximbank's traditional back-door method of borrowing from the Treasury.

This adamant refusal to authorize additional Treasury borrowing suspended the activities of the Eximbank when the United States could least afford a setback to our export trade. The conflict is still unresolved, for though the agreement calls for renewing the charter, the request for the additional $2 billion has been dropped.

The Eximbank can get along without more funds for the time being. But it cannot contribute to the objective of expanding trade if its access to funds is arbitrarily curtailed. The notion voiced in the House that there is something underhanded in its back-door borrowings from the Treasury is nonsense. The Eximbank, which has been doing just that for almost 30 years, has an enviable record for stimulating trade through its guarantees of private credit.

If the bank is to do a thorough job now that it is back in operation, it will be needing new funds. Its old authorization to borrow should be restored, in the country's interest.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call attention to the following statement contained in the editorial:

> The notion voiced in the House that there is something underhanded in its back-door borrowings from the Treasury is nonsense.

I make these comments particularly because some doubts have been expressed on the floor by a senior Member of the Senate as to the validity of the position which the Senate conferees unanimously took. In my opinion the editorial answers that contention conclusively.

THE WORLD'S EXPANDING POPULATION PROBLEMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on August 15 I had occasion to address an empty Senate Chamber at some length on the subject of "The Time Has Come To Speak Out on the Problem of Population Control."

I intend from time to time to call the attention of my colleagues to further developments in this area, because I believe very strongly that the time has come to sweep this problem out from under the rug and discuss it intelligently and frankly and freely in the Senate, as it is discussed everywhere else in the world. There is no reason for the continuation of an inhibition to discuss in the Senate one of the most critical problems facing us merely because we have always behaved thus in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that an interesting article entitled "Catholic Theologians Say Faiths Agree on Population Problems," published in the New York Times and written by Peter Kihss, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
Aug. 27, 1963]

Catholic Theologian Says Faiths Agree on Population Problems

(By Peter Kihss)

In an article appearing simultaneously in two major Catholic and Protestant magazines, a University of Notre Dame theologian contends that Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are in substantial agreement on principles that could help to solve the world's expanding population problem.

This area of agreement, the Reverend John A. O'Brien says, "embodies the two critical elements to make it work: The prudent regulation of births and the clear consciousness of the responsibility they entail, which is but another name for family planning."

Father O'Brien, cochairman of the Commission on Religious Organizations for the National Conference of Christians and Jews since 1952, buttresses his thesis with quotations from 11 Catholic prelates and scholars, among others, in his article in the weeklies Ave Maria and Christian Century.

In Chicago, the Christian Century reported yesterday that Father O'Brien had suggested the joint publication, but had also requested an accompanying statement that the article reflected his personal thinking. He added that six leading Catholic theologians had checked and approved it. He said that he assumed full responsibility for any statement that may be open to possible misunderstanding.

"There can be no doubt that the Roman Catholic church is taking the wraps off the issue of birth control," the Protestant weekly said in an editorial comment. "Confronted with the fact of an increasingly overcrowded globe and the attendant problems of mounting hunger and misery, liberal Roman Catholics, both clerical and lay, are promoting research projects to perfect a church-approved method of limiting families."

Ave Maria, which is printing the article in its August 24 issue, is published at South Bend, Ind., by the Congregation of the Holy Cross.

Father O'Brien sees "well-founded hope for the cooperative action so desperately needed to solve this problem on both the national and international levels." Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, he contends, "can work together, with each group following its conscience, to achieve the same important goal."

"Contrary to widespread belief," he says, "the Catholic Church does not forbid birth regulation. For any serious cause a married couple is exempt from the normal obligation of parenthood for a long time and even for the whole duration of married life."

CHURCH POSITION NOTED

He notes the church's approval of the rhythm method, and stresses that "the church teaches that the primary end of marriage is not merely procreation but also the education of offspring." Hence, he says, it calls for "responsible parenthood."

The Catholic authorities quoted by Father O'Brien include the Reverend William J. Gibbons, professor of sociology at Fordham University; Dr. Robert Odenwald, former professor of psychiatry at Catholic University; Msgr. John A. Goodwine, theological censor for the New York Archdiocese; Dom Gregory Stevens, professor of moral theology at Catholic University; the Reverend Charles

J. Corcoran, former professor of theology at Holy Cross College in Washington; Dr. John J. Kane, professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame, and the Reverend John L. Thomas, sociologist of St. Louis University.

From abroad, Father O'Brien quoted Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens, Archbishop of Malines in Belgium; the Reverend Stanislas de Lestapis, professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris and Vatican representative at the 1954 United Nations World Population Conference in Rome; the Reverend Clement Mertens, demographer, of St. Albert College in Louvain, Belgium, and Bishop William M. Bekkers, of 's-Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands.

Mr. CLARK. I invite attention to the fact that the article, which is commented on, is written by the Reverend John A. O'Brien, who is assigned to the University of Notre Dame. It has appeared not only in a well-known Catholic publication, but also in a well-known Protestant publication.

It points out that there is much in common between these views on the population problem of Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, and urges further cooperation in the interest of solving the population problem, which, in my opinion, is one of the most critical subjects facing our country and the world today.

THE RAILWAY DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the majority leader for the request he made of the parties to the railway dispute that they forgo any economic action until Congress finishes its legislative process, in which it is now engaged in respect to passing legislation dealing with the controversy.

I associate myself with the majority leader's remarks and repeat that I believe it is the clear public duty and obligation of the carriers and the brotherhoods to withhold any economic action in the dispute until the due processes of the legislative process have run their course.

While I am addressing the Senate on this subject, I wish to take up a report which has come to me to the effect that in certain radio broadcasts and news articles this morning it has been stated that the senior Senator from Oregon proposes to filibuster the issue. That is nonsense. I never had any such intention. The senior Senator from Oregon served notice yesterday that he will not agree to a unanimous-consent proposal to limit debate. I shall not consent to any such unanimous-consent agreement.

I know of no issue before the American people which demands more careful deliberation than the issue before us now.

The final action that we take on this issue may determine the course of action for our handling labor relations problems for many years to come.

The senior Senator from Oregon proposes to offer a substitute when he obtains the floor today. I have no intention of speaking more than a maximum of 30 minutes on that substitute. Later, if it becomes necessary—although I hope it will not be necessary—I shall offer a second substitute, on which my speech, which is in manuscript form, can be delivered within the course of 2 hours, and I believe within a shorter time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Oregon on every point he has made. First, the railroads have every reason to understand that Congress means business, and that therefore the legislation in process should be accommodated. Second, like my friend from Oregon, I have no design to engage in extended debate. I can complete my part of the discussion in an hour in connection with what I shall offer with respect to the joint resolution.

Third, and most importantly, this is an historic and critically important issue, which, though it must be dealt with in a short time, must nonetheless be dealt with carefully, based upon the experience which resides in the Senate.

I wish to identify myself with every point made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I always feel strengthened when I have the Senator's support.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I reciprocate the feeling.

AIRLIFT OF POLIO VACCINE TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to report to the Senate on a most interesting and gratifying conference from which I have just returned. It concerns the shipment of a million and a half doses of oral polio vaccine, which was airlifted today by Pan American Airways to the Dominican Republic, to meet the threat of a grave polio epidemic in that country.

We have had a report from Dr. Tom D. Y. Clin of the U.S. Public Health Service, who heads a team of polio experts in the Dominican Republic, which indicates that this effort comes not too soon, as indicated by the development of additional cases of paralytic polio in that country in recent days.

The reason that this effort to meet the polio crisis in the Dominican Republic is so significant is that it represents an exciting demonstration of cooperation between private enterprise and government, both the U.S. Government and the Government of the Dominican Republic.

This is an illustration of what can be done when we set our hands to an undertaking outside the normal channels of government operations. This effort began when the wife of the President of the Dominican Republic, Mrs. Bosch, was in Washington and had lunch with me. At that time she told me about the threat of polio in her country, which, as we know, is recovering from 30 years of dictatorship under Trujillo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the country, because it was straining itself in so many other directions, including the payment of its debts, could not meet the bill for the polio crisis in time.

I told Mrs. Bosch that I would see what could be done. With the assistance of two distinguished New Yorkers, Nicholas Biddle and Peter Cusick, who traveled to and from the Dominican Republic and saw many persons who might support the project and give backing when needed, we finally arranged for the vaccine to be contributed by Lederle Laboratories, division of American Cyanamid Co., of Pearl River, N.Y., under the leadership of the distinguished New Yorker, Mr. Wilbur G. Malcolm, who is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Cyanamid.

Transportation was contributed by Pan American Airways. The International Rescue Committee, a famous agency in this field, handled the management of the operation.

Finally, as late as yesterday, when a shortage of paper cups developed in the Dominican Republic, we obtained from the Lily Tulip Cup Corp., of New York, through the generosity of Mr. Walter Bergman, chairman of the board, 1 million 1-ounce paper cups, which are used in administering the vaccine.

The full cooperation of AID, under the direction of David Bell, AID Administrator, was thrown into the breach through its representatives here and in the Dominican Republic.

The U.S. Public Health Service sent a team to work with the Ministry of Health of the Dominican Republic and with the Pan American Health Organization. Mass immunization will begin shortly.

Mr. President, this was an extraordinary demonstration of how Americans can act with celerity and dispatch, and without necessarily invoking the full powers of government. It shows how private enterprise and private philanthropy can act at every level in order to perform a great humanitarian act.

I offer my congratulations to the entities I have named. I am deeply gratified to be able to report this activity to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a document on this effort:

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Polio Vaccine Airlifted to the Dominican Republic

A cargo of 1,500,000 doses of oral polio vaccine will be airlifted to the Dominican Republic today (Tuesday, August 27) to meet the threat of a grave polio epidemic in that country.

The international effort, which involves donations by U.S. firms and assistance by private and Government agencies, was arranged by Senator Jacob K. Javits. He announced that the American Cyanamid Co. donated the polio vaccine, which will provide immunization for 750,000 children in the Dominican Republic. Pan-American Airways offered to fly the vaccine to Santo Domingo, and the Lily-Tulip Cup Corp. is donating paper cups needed in administering the vaccine.

Senator Javits said that also cooperating in the effort are the International Rescue Committee, the Agency for International Development (AID), the U.S. Public Health Service, the Ministry of Health of the Dominican Republic, and the Pan-American Health Organization.

The delegation on hand at the Pan-American Terminal, Idlewild Airport, on Tuesday morning, August 27, 1963, to see the vaccine off, includes:

Senator JAVITS; the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic, Enriquillo del Rosario; Dr. Herald R. Cox, of American Cyanamid Co.; and Edwin J. Wesley of the International Rescue Committee.

The project was first undertaken last June when Senator JAVITS invited Mrs. Juan Bosch, wife of the President of the Dominican Republic, to lunch with him in the Senate dining room. The Senator had met Mrs. Bosch at her husband's inauguration, and she was in Washington on a social visit. Mrs. Bosch informed Senator JAVITS of her fears of a polio epidemic in her country, and requested his aid. She said her country lacked the financial means at the moment to devote to the polio crisis.

Senator JAVITS sent two representatives, Nicholas Biddle and Peter Cusick, to Santo Domingo to discuss the matter with President Bosch, who designated Sancha Volman, executive secretary of CIDES, a private Dominican foundation, to represent him in working out the effort. Senator JAVITS also enlisted the help of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), who sent two polio experts of the U.S. Public Health Service to Santo Domingo to survey the situation.

The Public Health Service team confirmed that there was a possibility that the incidence of paralytic polio could rise to epidemic proportions similar to those experienced in the Dominican Republic in 1959. The team recommended mass immunization as promptly as possible. Last weekend, the Public Health Service reported the situation was growing more serious with 114 cases of paralytic polio in Santo Domingo alone.

Senator JAVITS contacted American Cyanamid Co., and Wilbur G. Malcolm, chairman of the board and chief executive officer, agreed to help. Mr. Malcolm offered to donate 1,500,000 doses of monovalent vaccines (type 1 and type 2) from the Lederle Laboratories Division of American Cyanamid in Pearl River, N.Y. Pan-American informed the Dominican Government that it was prepared to airlift the vaccine, which must be under constant refrigeration.

AID secured a team of three polio experts from the U.S. Public Health Service, headed by Dr. Tom D. Y. Chin, who flew to Santo Domingo last Friday to prepare for the mass immunization program.

On Monday, August 26, Dr. Chin reported that all the necessary preparations were made for the mass immunization program. He reported that immunization centers will be set up throughout the Dominican Republic where children will come to receive the vaccine beginning this weekend. The Dominican Ministry of Health and the Pan-American Health Organization will assist in the administering of the vaccine.

Dr. Chin also reported one final problem—a shortage of 1-ounce paper cups, used in administering the vaccine. Senator JAVITS contacted Walter Bergman, chairman of the board of the Lily-Tulip Cup Corp., of New York, who offered to donate 1 million paper cups to meet that problem.

THE LATE ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Eric Johnston, a distinguished American and a dear friend of mine, who passed away at a relatively young age.

Mr. Johnston was president of the Motion Picture Association of America and a former president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. He was honored by President Eisenhower, President Truman, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt, all of whom gave him assignments. He was honored by the great of our Nation at the memorial rites held for him yesterday.

We may truly say that Eric Johnston was a dear friend, a golden soul, a luminous personality, and a servant of the people of the United States. The work which he accomplished earns our deeply felt "Well done!"

I offer my condolences to the members of his family, who have every reason to feel the greatest honor in the life which was led by Eric Johnston.

PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we have heard so much expert testimony regarding the proposed limited nuclear test ban treaty—and so much conflicting testimony at that—that I wonder if it might be permissible to apply some commonsense to the situation. I have heard many of my colleagues express their sense of confusion concerning the uncommon amount of disagreement. I wonder if some down-to-earth areas of agreement might not appear if we look closely at the record.

The most important such area seems to be that political hopes are the major reason advanced for minimizing technical reservations regarding the treaty. All of the doubts we have heard expressed have, ultimately, been shunted aside by mention of overriding political gains hoped to be made under the treaty. There are, to be sure, sharp pros and cons on every one of the technical reservations—but running like a thread through the arguments in favor of the treaty is the final argument based upon the political gains we hope will be possible. This is particularly true when it comes to the timing of the treaty. It is described as possible at this particular time because the Soviet needs or wants such a treaty at this particular time. And we read into that desire or need an optimistic hope that this is but the first step toward an ever more reasonable and rational relationship with the Soviets.

And here is where I wonder if we might not apply our commonsense. We do not need the Soviet attitude toward this treaty alone as a test of their intentions or a test of their mood.

The main tests of Soviet intention, in fact, are far removed from the conference table. They are out in the real world of real events.

Do the words regarding the test ban treaty sound louder than Soviet actions in Laos, in Cuba, along the Berlin wall, at their newly built jet airstrip in Yemen?

Commonsense always has told us that actions speak louder than words. What about now, as we consider the words of this proposed test ban which the Soviets say they want in the interests of relieving tension? Is it tension they want to relieve, or just pressures on their own aggressive plans?

In Laos, just a few days ago, the British virtually threw up their hands over hope that the Soviets would fulfill their part of the efforts to stabilize the situation there. Day by day the situation there deteriorates toward a Communist takeover of the country. And this is the area that the administration often has called the litmus paper test of Soviet intentions. What does the litmus paper show? It shows aggression and duplicity, and no change whatsoever in Communist goals of subversion and conquest.

If they want this treaty, if they are interested in steps toward the easing of tension, could we not talk here and now about some proof in Laos? And if we get no such proof, should we still look on this test ban proposal as any sort of concession at all toward peace?

If the Soviets want this treaty, and if they are interested in steps toward easing tension, should we not talk here and now about some proof in Cuba? There are Soviet troops in Cuba whose removal would speak louder than conference table words. There is Communist agitation throughout Latin America whose cessation would speak louder than words in terms of real steps toward an easing of tension.

The Soviets speak with the voice of a dove when it comes to the proposed test ban treaty—which they want. They speak with the voice of violence and with the clang of bayonets when it comes to their other actions in the world. Is this not the time to test their words, to make demands upon them?

Do the words of this test ban proposal mean anything when they echo from the Berlin wall? We want to take a step toward ending the cold war but we cannot step across the barbed wire in Berlin. They want this treaty. We want that wall to come down. Is this not exactly the time to ask that the Soviets show some of the sort of good faith that we are prepared to show?

Let the wall come down and the negotiation over this treaty might make some commonsense. Let the wall remain up, let new bodies be piled at its base, and the proposed test ban treaty is a mockery of peace in a world of violence.

Our leaders say that we are prepared to accept the risks of the treaty in exchange for the possibilities of the treaty. In commonsense terms, surely, that is a concession. What concessions are the Soviets making? Are they foregoing the test of advanced, high-yield weapons? Not at all. They have tested such weapons. We are making that concession. We have not tested them. Why then should we not expect and demand that the Soviets do make some concessions—concessions toward a demonstration of the sort of relieved tension they talk about?

The opportunity is there. They risk no cataclysmic upheavals. They risk only peaceful possibilities of resolving tensions if they fulfill their so-far broken promises in Laos, if they remove their troops from Cuba, if they call off the subversion of Latin America, if they knock down the wall in Berlin, if they withdraw from the support of chaos in the Middle East.

If they want this treaty and if we are to want it also, this is the time to talk of real deeds and to reject mere talk.

I, for one, feel that the decision we make on the proposed test ban treaty must fully take into account such Soviet actions as I have described. Millions of Americans, millions of freemen everywhere, must depend upon the leadership of this Nation to assure that negotiations with the Soviets are based upon reality and not simply upon fancies. People everywhere have come forward eagerly in response to this treaty proposal because they hope that it will have real meaning. They cannot demand more of the Soviets. They are in no position to do so. We can. This, the mightiest Nation on earth, must make those demands. No one else can.

We stand at one of those rare moments when communism seeks a favor of us. We must not let this moment go by default. We must press freedom's demands, now, for all men. If we can get no favorable response, then the treaty is just a scrap of paper, anyway. But let us try, and withhold our approval of the treaty until we have tried, to get from the Soviets—here and now—demonstrations of their real intentions. Let Laos, Cuba, and Berlin be the testing ground. Let actions there be the measure of action on the treaty. Or let us forget the talk we hear of new Soviet reasonableness and a thaw in the cold war. The test ban proposal is no thaw. It is a Soviet initiative. I ask that America show an initiative of its own; no more, no less.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the recent immigration legislation introduced in the Senate, of which I am privileged to be a cosponsor, represents the most practical and human approach to this problem in many years. In its recognition of practical and of human needs, the legislation is good for our country. In its abolition of the national origins quota system, the legislation recognizes the fundamental principle that all Americans are equal in dignity, no matter from what nationality or national stock they come.

This legislation and the President's message have been greeted with extremely widespread support in my home State of Massachusetts, which knows as well as any the long-range benefits of immigration. Every argument against enlarged immigration that is being made today was made in Massachusetts 40 and 50 years ago. Yet our Commonwealth has become great because the Irish, the Italians, the Poles, the Greeks, the Portuguese, and so many other nationality groups were allowed to immigrate. In building a better life for themselves, they built a better society for all.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials and articles in favor of the bill from the Boston Herald and the Boston Globe be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, July 25, 1963]

Immigration Realities

President Kennedy's proposal to replace one set of immigration restrictions with another is so firmly rooted in national needs, international realities and historical precedent as to deserve congressional support.

The President would substitute manpower and family considerations for selection by race and national origin. Far from being an idealistic move toward an impossible open door policy, the President's special message is consistent with previous measures restricting the flow of immigrants.

The first restrictions were imposed in 1882 when Congress excluded paupers, criminals and other undesirables. In addition, low-wage Chinese laborers were barred, primarily for economic rather than racial reasons. A few years later, foreign contract labor, regardless of race or national origin, was shut out—again essentially an economic reaction.

There followed the period of the great flood of immigrants which reached its annual peak in 1907 when 1,285,349 persons entered this country from foreign shores. The wave of newcomers primarily hailed initially from northern Europe and later from southern and eastern Europe.

During the latter two decades of the last century, at the same time racial segregation laws were passed in many States, virtually all Asian immigrants were excluded.

After World War I, a quota system, still in effect, was instituted. It was based on the composition of the nation's population according to the 1920 census, and thus reflects a bias in favor of those northern European countries that sent more immigrants earlier.

The quotas were imposed because there was a widespread belief, still prevalent, that the Nation couldn't assimilate unrestricted immigration. The quotas were based on national origin because second, third and fourth generation "native" Americans feared they would be swamped by dangerously dissimilar newcomers.

Mr. Kennedy would eliminate both racial discrimination and national origin quotas while retaining significant and probably essential restrictions on the kind and number of annual immigrants.

First priority would be given those with useful skills. To a nation with a surplus of unskilled and semiskilled labor and a shortage of highly skilled manpower, this is desirable, for it would mean more engineers, doctors, nurses, teachers, technicians, and scientists.

Second priority would go to persons whose immigration would reunite a family, to the children or parents of persons already here. While the national quotas of countries like Britain, Ireland, Sweden and Germany now go unfilled, many relatives of American citizens are forced to wait for years in countries like Italy and Greece before being allowed to enter.

The President has offered reasonable and desirable criteria by which to select a limited number of newcomers annually. They should be made the foundation of the Nation's immigration policy, replacing arbitrary, prejudicial and outmoded means of selection.

[From the Boston Herald, July 28, 1963]

Immigration Quotas Questioned

> "Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses
> yearning to breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of
> your teeming shore * * *
> Send these, the homeless,
> tempest-tossed to me!
> I lift my lamp
> beside the golden door."

The words engraved on the Statue of Liberty became involved in practical economics nearly a century ago and the golden door was left only slightly ajar for the "huddled masses."

During the past week President Kennedy asked the Congress to fling it wide again. He suggested that the quota system be abolished completely within the next 5 years. Under his plan the quotas set up in 1924 would be reduced 20 percent in each of the next 5 years until they disappear.

Under this plan the United States would eliminate a widely criticized quota system which has sharply limited immigration from southern Europe and southeast Asia. The country most affected would be Italy. It is estimated that immigration from that country would rise from the present 5,500 quota to more than 16,000 a year in each of the 5 years after the enactment of the Kennedy proposal.

It was also pointed out that a number of nations in Europe, notably Ireland and the United Kingdom have not filled their quotas in the past years. Many areas have huge backlogs of people wanting to come to the United States and other countries leave their quotas unfilled.

[From the Boston Globe, July 25, 1963]

Abolish the Quotas

Like his two predecessors, President Kennedy wants to abolish immigration quotas, based on national origins, in proportion to those of American citizens in 1920. The President would also remove restrictions on Asian immigration.

The quota system would be eliminated gradually over a 5-year period. In its place would be established a total annual immigration of 165,000, with first come first served, except for two priorities. The highest of these would go to those with skills of special value to this country, doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists. Then would come persons whose admission would unite a family.

The President's message is too late for action by Congress this year, but it should be pressed at the 1964 session, for the pernicious national origins principle discriminates against south Europe, especially Italy. This country cannot afford to keep on its books at this time legislation showing any kind of bias.

VIEWS OF ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE ON PROPOSED TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. THURMOND. Adm. Arleigh Burke, who for the 6 years preceding 1961 was Chief of Naval Operations and who now heads the Center for Strategic Studies for Georgetown University, testified today before the Preparedness Subcommittee. Admiral Burke, in answer to questions, stated categorically that he did not think that the proposed test ban treaty was in the best interest of the national security of the United States. He further stated that the proposed safeguards as outlined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff would still not make it advisable to ratify this treaty and that if he were a Senator he would not vote for ratification. His statement to the committee on the proposed nuclear test ban treaty was comprehensive, objective, and most refreshing for its candor. It is difficult to imagine a more knowledgeable and thorough treatment of the subject on an unclassified basis than that given by Admiral Burke. It merits a careful study of every Senator and, indeed, every citizen. I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Burke's prepared statement be printed in the body of the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Admiral Arleigh Burke, USN (Retired) on Proposed Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the invitation to express my views on the proposed treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water before this distinguished committee.

As many witnesses who have appeared before you have stressed, this is a most important treaty and it may mark a turning point, one way or another, in the course of the history of the United States. All people in the United States urgently desire a secure peace. We do not covet the territory of any nation. We do not want to control any foreign peoples. We do not want a world of tension with war constantly hanging over our heads. We want a peaceful world, a world in which we can live our daily lives without interference and with good will for everybody on earth.

But we also want freedom and liberty. We want to continue to build our social order, our way of life, our system of Government. We have become a great and powerful Nation, and we have demonstrated many times that we stand for justice under law. We have also repeatedly demonstrated our compassion for our fellow man of other nations.

Every American wants international tension relieved without increasing the danger to the United States. Because we wish for peace so fervently, we all yearn for any agreement, any situation, that might cause a more peaceful world. It is most difficult, in this state of mind to examine meticulously proposals which are intended to fulfill our urgent hopes. Yet, regardless of our great desire to acclaim moves for peace, proposals in the name of peace do not always lead to peace. Such proposals may seem to lessen tension for a while, but in the process may increase the danger to our country, and, ultimately, may lead to war. The prelude to World War II is ample evidence of what emotional and unrealistic actions can produce.

A persuasive statement has been made that the United States now enjoys technological superiority over the Soviet Union, and will, through its participation in the proposed test ban treaty maintain that superiority. Hence there does not now exist, according to this argument, parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, nor will parity ensue in the foreseeable future. Superiority, clearly now in our hands, certainly will not pass to those of the Soviets, this argument holds.

As Secretary McNamara pointed out in his statement: "If testing continued indefinitely without limit as to test environment or size of yield, the most likely ultimate result would be technical parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. * * * (The) prolongation of our technological superiority will be a principal direct military effect of the treaty on the future military balance."

On this basis, it would appear that the treaty will insure our continued superiority for the foreseeable future. But on the other hand, it will also insure Soviet inferiority for the same period. Hence, the Soviets appear by this argument to be willing to freeze themselves in a postion of inferiority vis-a-vis the United States. This kind of inferiority, in this day and age, will leave the nation which accepts it almost inevitably in a position of permanent stategic inferiority.

If the Soviets have in fact resigned themselves to such a position of strategic inferiority, then it would appear that they have renounced their goal of world conquest and the destruction of our system of life. But, as Secretary of State Rusk pointed out in his statement to the Foreign Relations Committee, "We have no basis yet for assuming a fundamental change in Soviet objectives."

In addition, the statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff emphatically points out that: "We must not for a moment forget that militant communism remains committed to the destruction of our society."

What benefit, then, accrues to the Soviet Union by affixing its signature to this document? Are we to believe that the very same regime which threatened the peace of the world by attempting to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba just 10 months ago, and which at the very moment it was carrying out preparationss for this treacherous scheme, instructed its Foreign Minister to lie to the President of the United States about its intentions in Cuba, now has resigned itself to a second place position in the divided world of 1963? And can we place any measure of trust in this regime which, time after time, has proved by its actions that it would use any means, however base, to achieve its stated objectives? Can we enter into an agreement with a measure of confidence similar to that which we accord to allies who join in similar compacts with us? It's hard to believe that Communists would agree to a document which, if faithfully adhered to by both parties, would guarantee the long-range inferiority of Communist strength and the concomitant failure to achieve long-standing goals.

It is interesting to note that on August 5, the day on which the treaty was signed in Moscow, the official Tass statement included this passage: "Does conclusion of a treaty banning the tests alter the present balance of power? No, it does not. The Soviet Government would never have agreed to the conclusion of such a treaty if it placed us in an unequal position, if it gave unilateral advantage to the other side. All this does not require special proof."

As just mentioned, it is claimed that a principle advantage of the treaty is that it will prolong our technological superiority over the Soviet Union. This superiority has been claimed so often that I fear it has become automatically accepted as being fact. What is not generally realized is that this statement is not founded on hard evidence, but rather is the result of speculation.

This speculation is based on the assumptions that the Soviet nuclear technology is, at best, no better than ours, and that their designs are based on the same military considerations as ours. That this degree of similarity should exist is an extremely unlikely situation, and, in my judgment, we do not possess the yardstick which would allow a meaningful assessment to be made of "who's ahead of whom" at this stage of the game.

It is of interest to note that the Soviets claim to be ahead of us in nuclear weapons technology. Whereas this claim need not be accepted necessarily, neither is it possible to reject it unequivocally.

The premise that this treaty will serve to protect our superiority is not valid if we do not now in actual fact enjoy such superiority. Furthermore, the most unlikely ultimate result, with or without a treaty, will be technical parity.

The most likely situation is one of asymmetry in technical achievement, and the magnitude of this asymmetry will be a function of the degree of effort and motivation which both sides apply to their nuclear programs. An example of how rapidly we can lose ground is the apathetic situation which existed during the 1958–61 moratorium. How much ground was lost during this period is debatable, but the amount was considerable. I don't know whether the Soviets, in the last 2 years, conducted more tests than did we, or whether the average yields of their tests were greater than ours, or whether the scientific data they acquired were better or greater than those we obtained, but from newspaper information, I would suspect that their test programs were more vigorous than ours.

Although the United States did its best to keep ready for testing during the past moratorium, it took a long time to commence testing. That was only a moratorium; it will be much more difficult to stay ready with a treaty in existence, and it is doubtful if a high degree of readiness can be sustained under the conditions which will pertain in a few years. It should be emphasized that our attitude toward preparations will in turn be a direct measure of our potential progress, and thus a strong determinant of who will emerge ahead of whom.

New weapons of all types used to be exhaustively proof tested as a matter of principle and of commonsense practice. In today's nuclear environment there is even more reason to know what our weapons systems will do, but with this treaty we will not have that knowledge. This is a dangerous departure, especially in the light of the great complexity of so many of our current weapon systems.

It is realized that this treaty would also prohibit the Soviets from proof testing many, but by no means all, of their weapons. However, it is altogether possible that we may enter into this treaty with a proof testing asymmetry in favor of the Soviets, who apparently have been far more mundane than we in checking out their nuclear systems.

It is difficult to be specific on reservations on the matter of proof testing, because it is not possible to assess the reliability or unreliability of some of our key weapon systems without such tests. But as we advance into the missile and space age, the ability of the military commander to assess the performance of his systems will surely become increasingly hampered by a lack of such tests. This lack is bound to have an effect on the confidence he holds in these systems, and on the assurance he can provide his commander in chief, who may have to bank heavily on such assurances in time of possible future crisis.

Although the military commander would desire most to see his weapons tested as fully and realistically as possible, there is much that can be learned through tests in the atmosphere, at yield levels which are below the threshold of the monitoring systems. A diverging asymmetry in operational capability may result from such tests being conducted by the Soviets in undetected violation of the treaty. To be sure, we do not know the Soviets will do this in violation of the treaty, but neither do we know they won't. What we will know is whether or not we have detected and identified an illegal nuclear explosion. What we will not know is whether or not the Soviets have been able to explode nuclear devices illegally without our knowing it.

It is argued that the risks of the treaty are far smaller than those inherent in further testing. The treaty, hence, will slow, or signal the end of, the arms race. At minimum, it is claimed that it will slow it down.

This could be true—but whether it turns out to be true is dependent upon what the Soviets do—and what the United States does. Heretofore, as demonstrated by the recent Soviet tests which followed their violation of the moratorium, they did everything they could to overcome the advantages the United States had accumulated.

It has been admitted that they have gained considerably from their test, and certainly they can be expected to incorporate those gains into their weapons systems.

Should the treaty go into effect, I don't see how the arms race will be slowed down appreciably, even if both sides abide by the provisions of the treaty, if the safeguards stipulated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others are met. We then will be testing underground aggressively; we will keep our laboratories at a high pitch; we will be ready to test in the atmosphere promptly; we will monitor the terms of the treaty if we can, and we will keep current knowledge of what the Sino-Soviet bloc is doing in the nuclear field. If we meet these safeguards, the Soviets will know it, and surely they will do their best along the same lines. In addition it is probable that certain areas of clandestine tests can be exploited to a considerable degree by the Soviets. The point of real importance is not how much the arms race is slowed down, but how much the relative technological progress of the United States and the Soviet Union are affected. Past actions of the Soviets suggest that they will do all in their power to improve their weapons systems.

Many have testified that the risks involved in possible cheating are relatively minor compared to those of unrestricted testing. The judgment on this factor is by no means clear, and I would like to advance one of the concerns which I hold.

One important area of potential misinterpretation of the treaty has not been discussed to date. The problem was raised in connection with an article which was called to my attention. The article, "Soviet Attitudes and Practices Concerning Maritime Waters," was written by Mr. William Harben, a Foreign Service officer of the Department of State. The treaty, while applicable to nuclear explosions "underwater, including territorial waters or high seas," does not make specific mention of "internal waters." The explanation of what that may come to mean is complex and hard to follow, but it is for these very reasons that the point needs to be thoroughly analyzed, for someday it will most likely be used to our disadvantage.

Tests in internal waters, under the present wording of the treaty, and under at least one interpretation of international law, would be regarded as underground tests and, therefore, permissible if radioactive debris is not deposited outside national boundaries. Otherwise, the treaty would need provisions for inspection to detect against inland underwater testing. And if testing underwater in an inland lake is permissible, in what other waters might it also be permissible?

Three important considerations must be mentioned: First, underwater testing per se is not illicit; such tests would be possible for all parties under this treaty. However, because of oceanographical advantages and certain other technical circumstance which I will discuss shortly, such tests would be feasible for the Soviet Union and perhaps a few other states, but not for the United States; the second point is that not all underwater tests can be detected; the Soviet Union could conduct, under this treaty, nuclear test explosions in such a manner, and in such areas, that our existing underwater test detection capabilities would be of questionable utility; third, clandestine underwater nuclear tests would appear to be worth the risk if they hold promises of scoring technical advantages. Underwater testing, even in the very low kiloton range, could lead to improvement in the design of Soviet submarines and to the possible development of effective means of destroying, or countering, our Polaris submarines.

Your attention is invited to article I, paragraph 1A of the treaty. It describes, as one of the prohibited environments, "underwater, including territorial waters or high seas." When one compares that language with the language of the draft treaty which the United States tabled at Geneva in August 1962, and upon which the present treaty is said to be based, one will note that it read: "in territorial or high seas."

During 1958 and 1960, historic and productive conferences on the law of the sea were held at Geneva. These conferences resulted in agreement upon four valuable conventions, two of which are controlling here. The convention on the high seas has received the required 22 ratifications, including those of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and it is now in effect. Article 1 of that convention provides "The term 'high seas' means all parts of the sea that are not included in the territorial sea or in the internal waters of a state."

Neither in that article or elsewhere does this convention mention "territorial waters." In fact, its only reference other than to the three categories of waters listed is to the "contiguous zone." But that is not a fourth category of waters because, as clearly spelled out in the next convention I shall mention, the contiguous zone comprises a certain portion of the high seas contiguous to the territorial sea.

The Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, also ratified by both the United States and the U.S.S.R., lacks only one additional ratification before becoming effective. It is a certainty that it will become effective. Article 1.1 of this convention defines the territorial seas as follows: "The sovereignty of a state extends, beyond its land territory and its internal waters, to a belt of sea adjacent to its coast, described as the territorial sea."

We have a meaning for "territorial waters," but it is doubtful that the Soviets would entertain the same meaning. In fact, a representative sampling of the writings of international lawyers would give evidence to the fact that they either refrain from using the term or disagree to its meaning when they do use it. We would probably agree with the definition that territorial waters are those included within a definite maritime zone or belt adjacent to a State's territory. The Soviets would also use this definition if it were clearly suitable to their purposes, regardless of their present intentions.

But since the term is ambiguous, any party is free to adopt his own definition. There obviously cannot be, in the present case, a mutually agreed definition of the term "territorial waters," since we have been assured that this treaty constitutes the entire agreement.

The Conventions which I have mentioned deal with three categories of waters: High seas, territorial seas, and internal waters. The latter are defined in article 5 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone as follows: "Waters on the landward side of the baseline of the territorial sea form part of the internal waters of the State."

In everyday language, internal waters customarily include inland lakes, rivers, harbor waters enclosed by the outermost harbor installations, and certain historic bays. These are bays long regarded by other nations as the exclusive property of a particular nation. United States examples are Chesapeake and Delaware Bays.

The U.S.S.R. has turned the "historic bay" practice to its own unilateral purposes. It has assumed the right to designate "new" historic bays never so regarded by other nations and without consulting other nations. Consequently, as shown on the map attached, most of the Soviet coastline is bounded by what they describe as "historic bays" or "historic seas" of vast extent which are treated by them as internal waters. Moving clockwise around the Soviet Union these bays and seas are as follows: Sea of Azov, White Sea, Kara Sea, Laptev Sea, East Siberian Sea, Chukotsk Sea, Sea of Okhotsk, and Peter the Great Bay.

It is clear that if the treaty prohibited underwater nuclear tests in the "territorial or high seas," as proposed in our 1962 draft treaty, it would, by excluding internal waters from the prohibition, permit underwater nuclear tests in such waters. And under the Soviet view of internal waters, testing would be legal in all of the seas and bays depicted by the shaded areas on this map. The only restriction would be that radioactive debris must not be present outside her territorial limit. In this instance that limit would be, again in the Soviet view, a line 12 miles beyond the outer boundary of the "historic sea," since the U.S.S.R.-claimed 12-mile territorial sea would naturally lie immediately beyond the historic sea or bay. These shaded areas, in our view of the law of the sea, are properly high seas open to reasonable use by all nations.

I suspect that the ambiguous term "territorial waters" was used deliberately so it can have two meanings: to us it means the same as "territorial seas," that is, the 3-mile belt of sea around our coasts; to the Soviets it means all waters they claim as being within their sovereign territorial boundaries, and therefore includes historic seas plus a 12-mile outer belt of territorial sea. If our view is the true meaning, then underwater tests may be said to be prohibited everywhere except in inland lakes, and tests in them are to be regarded as underground tests. However, if the Soviet interpretation is correct, then they can test in all of their "internal waters," which are high seas to everyone but the Soviets. If the term has a twofold meaning, where is it spelled out? It isn't—and I doubt if it could have been spelled out without jeopardizing the chances for Soviet acceptance of this treaty. Neither the United States nor any other free world nation valuing, as we do, the maximum freedom of the seas, could accept, or lend any semblance of dignity to, the Soviet claims that these vast expanses of open oceans belong exclusively to the Soviet Union.

Therefore, if we ratify this treaty, we should express the reservation that any underwater nuclear test conducted in the Sea of Azov, the White Sea, the Kara Sea, the Laptev Sea, the East Siberian Sea, the Chuktosk Sea, or the Sea of Okhotsk will be a violation of this treaty for the reason that we regard those bodies of water as high seas.

Of course, even with such a reservation, there would remain at least two significant, and thus far unanswered problems: First, are our existing underwater test detection facilities capable of assuring us with requisite confidence that no clandestine testing is taking place in such areas as the Sea of Okhotsk or the Kara Sea? I mention those two areas advisedly. The Sea of Okhotsk is approximately 590,000 square miles in area. The largest warning area declared by the United States in the Pacific Ocean for our test purposes there was many thousands of square miles smaller, and it had a large fallout "safety factor" included. Now look at the Kara Sea. The Soviet 50-megaton device was exploded in the vicinity of Novaya Zemyla, the island bordering the Kara Sea on the northwest. With prevailing winds blowing eastward, it would not seem likely that radioactive debris from a low-yield underwater nuclear explosion in the Kara Sea would carry beyond what the Soviets may claim as the national boundaries of the Soviet Union. Consequently, the Soviets could undertake underwater nuclear testing upon an "initial" and a "fallback" basis. The test could be tried clandestinely with the thought that it would not be detected. The absence of U.S. naval vessels on these Russian seas is some assurance for them that they might succeed. If detected by other means, and we objected, they could claim that tests are permitted in internal waters, are in the same category as underground tests, and therefore need not be announced. The arguments would be interesting, interminable, and perhaps indecisive.

Second, underwater testing in internal waters will be permitted. The United States would not find this feasible. Our largest such body of water, the Chesapeake Bay, is but 20 miles wide at its widest part. Would the U.S.S.R.? If they have developed a "clean" weapon, they might find such tests feasible. This is quite a risk we may take.

I will not go into other military areas which might be affected by cheating, but there is one general observation that I wish to make about the adequacy of the treaty to prevent such occurrences.

The determination of radioactive debris from nuclear explosions has been developed to a high degree by the United States, but it has been developed in an era in which the development of fission weapons was of prime concern.

One of the most dramatic potentials for future nuclear weaponry lies in the exploitation of fusion weapons, which produce but a very small fraction of the radioactivity associated with fission weapons. Without radioactive debris, it is doubtful if a positive determination of a nuclear explosion will be made even though other means may indicate that some sort of an explosion may have taken place. Under the circumstances, the temptation to cheat by a regime which sees nothing wrong in cheating is twofold: There are important gains to be made, and they can be made clandestinely with much less risks of abrogation by the United States.

It is important to recognize that the future of ground warfare would be affected critically by the development of fusion weapons.

The statement of the JCS says that: "If the Soviets are to catch up with the United States in the low-yield field, particularly in numbers, they will be subjected to a major additional expenditure of national resources which are already under heavy strain."

First, this statement may be true—and again it may not, because it assumes that the Soviets will not make any major breakthrough in nuclear technology which will permit them to achieve substantial reductions in cost. It does not take into account the possibility that they may develop pure-fusion weapons whose nuclear costs are far below those of current fission weapons.

Should the Soviets develop the pure-fusion weapon, there would be no strain of a "major additional expenditure of national resources." In fact, if this occurred without a parallel development on our part, the Soviets could surpass our production rate and our stockpile of low-yield weapons.

Second, the judgment that Soviet national resources are already under heavy strain does not mean that still greater stress could not be put upon them. Since the early days of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, the Soviets repeatedly have put their national resources under great strain. Only in recent years has that strain appeared to diminish, and only recently have consumer goods increased relative to more constant military expenditures. But it is known that, when the Soviets made the decision to move quickly ahead in the space race, they thought little of scrapping their vaunted plan in order to allocate additional resources to that field. The scrapping of their plan and the burdening of their resources did not interfere with Soviet determination to secure supremacy in space research and exploration. That the Soviet population would suffer through further strictures on the consumer sector of the economy was not a major concern to the Soviet leadership; and the fact that even greater sacrifices would have to be borne did not deter them from their path of enforced deprivation.

Another example is that of Cuba: After the United States became convinced officially that Castro was indeed a Communist, and that he was moving into the Communist orbit, there arose rapidly a theory to the effect that "Khrushchev would soon find Cuba too expensive." It was even suggested that nothing at all be done to upset "stability of leadership" in Cuba in order to make Cuba too great a drain upon the Soviet economy. It is clear now that that theory was false. Cuba has not proved too expensive for Khrushchev and the Soviet economy. While Cuba may constitute a real financial liability to the Soviet Union, and while Soviet expenditures in Cuba rather than in Red China may have widened the differences between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, we know that Khrushchev is prepared to pay the price. There are, then, certain political and psychological advantages which cost a great deal in terms of resources, and upon which a nation accustomed to doing business at a profit looks with a dubious eye, but for which the dictator and totalitarian is willing to pay the price.

Cost alone should not be the standard measurement for our attempting to explain what is and what is not in the best interest of an enemy nation. The use of criteria which normally we would apply in attempting to clarify a given course of action for the United States will be of little value when applied to the motives or desires of a totalitarian adversary. Far too often the Communists have defied reason and logic to pursue seemingly impossible objectives; and far too often we have made false assesments of their ability or willingness to pursue those "impossible objectives."

Shortly before the official discovery of missile sites in Cuba, it was thought that the Soviets would not take such an enormous risk. Policy was made on that assumption, and when it was discovered that they were fully prepared to take that "enormous risk," an alternative plan for action was not available to us. Hence, we had to improvise hastily a series of actions with no certainty whatsoever that our objectives would be met.

Many persons, and among these most notably Members of the Senate, have been concerned about the potential limitations which this treaty places upon the use of nuclear weapons. Article I, paragraph 1, states that each of the parties "undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control."

This language, some have pointed out, is substantially stronger than it need be to ban nuclear weapons testing. One interpretation of the treaty could be that the United States, for example, is prohibited from using nuclear weapons to come to the aid of a nation subjected to a massive conventional attack by the Communists.

If, for example, Red China suddenly attacks one of her neighbors, as she periodically seems to be in the mood to do, and if that free world nation is about to be rapidly overrun and appeals to the United States to assist her, would the United States be permitted to employ nuclear weapons in an attempt to halt the advancing enemy force?

Assurances have been given by previous witnesses that the treaty does not prohibit the United States from implementing nuclear weapons in time of war. Secretary Rusk said, "This treaty does not affect the use of nuclear weapons in war." And the President, in his transmittal message to the Senate said that it does not "outlaw the use of nuclear weapons." But the language of the treaty clearly does specify that "other" nuclear explosions may not be caused.

What is of concern to me here is that the United States may find itself involved in unfavorable conventional military actions which, while suitable for the application of our nuclear weapons, would have to be fought without their benefit because of interpretation of the treaty at that time, even though we interpret it now as not being so restrictive.

Then, too, there is some difficulty with regard to the definition of "war." Would "war" include an action of the kind in which we engaged in Korea? Or, for that matter, what about South Vietnam right now? Would it include the defense of our access to routes to Berlin, or the defense of the city itself?

There is an apparent misunderstanding concerning the extent to which the text of the treaty represents the entire agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. In his message to the Senate, the President said that "This treaty is the whole agreement. U.S. negotiators in Moscow were instructed not to make this agreement conditioned upon any other understanding; and they made none. The treaty speaks for itself."

And Secretary Rusk has pointed out that, "The treaty before you is a self-contained document, and it embodies the whole of the agreement * * * there are no side arrangements, understandings, or conditions of any kind."

But with specific reference to the question of the treaty prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, some question arises in connection with the absence of an explicit clarification of this point.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor stated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been concerned that the treaty might rule out the use of nuclear weapons in time of war, but that the Joint Chiefs, visiting in a body with the Secretary of State, were given complete assurance that there is a clearcut understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States that the test ban does not apply to conditions of war.

Such an understanding properly belongs either in the body of the treaty or in an appendix. Under normal diplomatic procedure, terms and conditions subject to clarification or various interpretations are amplified either in the treaty itself or in a supporting document. It is important that the language employed in any treaty be subject to only one interpretation. Failure to assure uniformity of interpretation by all the parties in a treaty such as this could have serious consequences. And, when dealing with the Soviet Union, one does well to be as explicit as language permits, for the Soviets have in the past demonstrated great consistency in interpreting agreements to suit their purposes even when the perfectly clear language does not permit that interpretation. Furthermore, there is the distinct possibility that the other signatories to the treaty, most of whom have expressed an abhorrence of nuclear weapons, may interpret the treaty to outlaw tactical nuclear weapons, and may seriously inhibit our resolve to use such weapons when we need to use them.

Such understandings cannot safely be left to stand as self-explanatory. They should be subject to the same searching scrutiny to which the formal document is subject, thereby insuring that the signatories and all others directly concerned, including the populations of the free world, have a clear understanding of what is involved. Too often we have learned the hard way that imprecision is not a relevant part of international relations. The initial establishment of the Berlin corridors is a good example.

In a treaty of such stupendous importance to our national security as is this present treaty, only the highest attainable degree of precision will suffice.

It is of utmost importance that we assess as fully as possible the motives which the Soviet Union has in signing this document. There is, to be sure, no single and simple reason which can explain Soviet motivations, but analysts have attempted to delineate some of the principal ones.

High on the list of possible considerations is that the Soviets are genuinely interested in a detente with the West in general, and with the United States in particular. Elaborations on this theme advance as justification such reasons as: (1) the Sino-Soviet "split"; (2) the need for freeing resources for consumer needs; (3) the gradual emergence of Realpolitik on the part of the Soviets; (4) the realization that it is impossible to catch the United States in a straight arms race; and (5) the need for a breathing space in which to recoup strength. I should like to analyze each of these in greater detail.

(1) The Sino-Soviet "split": To refuse to acknowledge that there exist significant differences between the Soviets and the Chinese would be to ignore the realities of international politics. Differences on a range of matters do indeed exist within the Communist movement, and many of these differences impinge upon what was heretofore referred to as the "monolithic unity" of the Communist camp. Most of the differences can be boiled down to a basic question: How should the further prosecution of the Communist revolution proceed?

It is rather widely assumed that the Chinese advocate continuous active warfare, brute violence, as the means for advancing the cause of the revolution, while the Soviets now are convinced that the quickest and surest way to attain communism's ultimate goal of world domination is through peaceful coexistence with emphasis on subversion, political machinations, and economic warfare rather than on military aggression. This is a vast oversimplification which lends itself most dramatically to a spectacular presentation of the facts by the mass media of communication. A basic truth is too frequently overlooked: The Soviets and the Chinese have one important goal which both hold sacred and irrevocable, and that goal consists in the destruction of our system of life.

We must use the term "destruction" advisedly, for it is precisely on the interpretation of this term where we go astray. Both the Soviet and Chinese Communists wish to eliminate our system of life, and in that sense they seek to destroy us. Either would prefer to accomplish the elimination of our way of life without open war. Either would renounce openly the use of violence to achieve that goal if it were assured that adequate progress could be made by less costly means.

To the Red Chinese, however, it is more realistic to use available military strength to force the behavior of the West into patterns acceptable to the Communist world. The Chinese are not convinced of Western determination to defend the free world. They are realistic enough to realize, however, that the Chinese are hoplessly inferior in strength to the free world. Hence their main task is to convince the Soviets that a much harsher line of action will bring dividends to the Communist cause through Western capitulation to Communist demands. Barring success in this effort, they feel that the preferred course of action to goad their partners in the general cause is to accuse them of selling out the best interests of the movement to the enemy, "American monopoly imperialism." Should they still be unable to convince their principal ally through these tactics, the Chinese Communists may attempt to "wrest control" of the international movement from the Soviets.

It is extremely difficult to judge with any degree of accuracy the set of intrabloc tactics which are being applied by either partner at any one time. However, it would appear that the Chinese have seriously considered the third method, that of attempting to secure the allegiance of the other Communist parties throughout the world. It should be noted, however, that they have failed rather miserably if they have attempted this, for most of the parties—indeed, the overwhelming majority—side with the "international vanguard," the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Soviets, on the other hand, have found that a more conciliatory posture toward the West is much more likely to bring success in their ultimate goal than is a belligerent posture. It may well be that at least one hard fact has been realized in the Kremlin: that the United States, for the time being at least, continues to resist open aggression even at the risk of war. It is apparently clear to the Soviets that, should war now be eventuated by a series of provocative military aggressions on their part, they would suffer levels of damage completely unacceptable to them. It is also possible, however, that this estimate of acceptable damage may change or even now be changing; but the present consensus is that the Soviet losses would be too great to compensate for any gain whatsoever.

The policy of peaceful coexistence, which the Soviet Union professes to practice, is much more complex than appears to the average observer. The doctrine of peaceful coexistence, a major arguing point in the Sino-Soviet "split," means not a simple "you live there, we live here" argument; it is, rather, a complex and sophisticated doctrine of aggression and advance, and by no means constitutes a state even approaching genuine peace. "Peaceful coexistence" has been defined time and time again by Khrushchev and his subordinates, but we either ignore that definition or dismiss it as a meaningless facade. The Soviets refer to it as the doctrine based on the principles of Lenin, and they are correct: it does indeed reflect a major strategic concept of Leninism.

Khrushchev, in his well-known speech of January 6, 1961, said that: "Life itself bears out the correctness of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence. * * * Our party considers the policy of peaceful coexistence, which has been handed down to us by Lenin, to be the general line of our foreign policy. Peaceful coexistence is the high road of international relations between Socialist and capitalist countries * * * the policy of peaceful coexistence * * * is a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena."

It is imperative that we note Khrushchev's emphasis on an intense struggle. Peaceful coexistence, as defined by Khrushchev, appears to be not peaceful at all by his own definition. Rather, it consists in a continuation of the battle against our system of government and our way of life, but with means short of international violence. This does not mean that war has been discarded as an instrument of achieving victory. War may have lost first place in the array of techniques employed to gain victory, but it is by no means excluded as a possible course of action. As long as methods short of war are capable of rendering progress, it makes little sense to the Communists to advocate the shorter, but costlier, route of war—at least, not with the present relative military strength.

The crux of the issue between the Chinese and the Soviets concerns the utility of war. In short, the Soviets are capable of appreciating the damage which nuclear weapons can inflict, and hence deemphasize it as a means to an end at the present time. The Chinese, on the other hand, may have not yet assessed the dangers from the same point of view, and hence follow a more reckless policy, believing that: (a) The West will not retaliate against conventional Chinese attacks with nuclear weapons; and (b) the Soviet nuclear umbrella, although not expressly designed for the purpose, affords a significant measure of protection for aggressive Chinese actions.

We in the West may have magnified this dispute out of proportion, and may have made hasty judgments concerning what the Sino-Soviet "split" portends for the future of U.S. foreign policy. At one extreme, some commentators have gone so fas as to predict that the Soviet desire for detente with the West stems from the realization that the United States and the Soviet Union will have to join forces to "contain" Red China. To assume that the Sino-Soviet "split" is irreparable and that it is therefore in our interest to make common cause with the Soviet Union would not only be premature, but imprudent and even dangerous. A few years ago Khrushchev and Tito were at each other's throats—but now give the appearance of being the best of friends. The same sort of thing can happen, and may very well happen, between Khrushchev and Mao. The Sino-Soviet "split" is not now final, and even if it should occur at both party and state levels, it would be unwise to say that it is incapable of repair. But most importantly, to make policy on the basis that the Soviet Union now seeks to enter the family of nations traditionally known as the "Western World" and give up her often reiterated basic objective of destroying our way of life would be to commit what may well prove to be a fatal error.

(2) The need to free resources for consumer needs: It is true that when one compares the Soviet economy of the early days of the Bolshevik state with the economy of today, one notes profound differences. It is also true that, especially in the past few years, the consumer sector of the Soviet economy has received much more emphasis than ever before. In addition, it would not be unfair to estimate that, if possible, the Soviet leadership would like to make life as tolerable as possible for the average Soviet citizen. Unquestionably, possession of the "better things in life" creates a desire for additional acquisitions of a similar kind, and the Soviet people should prove to be no exception in this respect.

It is doubtful, however, that there is pressure upon the leadership to divert resources currently earmarked for weapons to consumer sectors of the economy. The theory that pressure is being exerted upon the Communist hierarchy to stress consumer goods in distinction to military hardware has, nevertheless, become popular. In the first place, we have no means of determining the character or extent of pressure in a totalitarian state. Since there are no institutional guarantees of the kind which free, democratic, and constitutional governments must necessarily provide, we are at a loss to estimate the kinds of opposition which a given Communist hierarchy faces. The media of communication, under firm control of the government, admit only that criticism which can remain under control. The arts, long an expression of fundamental social and political desires, can be and are controlled by a government bureaucracy.

But even if we were able to determine character and extent of pressure to divert resources to the consumer sectors of the economy, it would be unlikely that any funds released through a temporary relaxation of international tensions would flow to those sectors. On the other hand, given the history of Soviet practice in this respect, it would be much more realistic to expect those funds to be allocated not for increased consumer goods, but for increased basic research and economic growth which will enhance their capability in the field of weapons development.

On previous occasions the Soviets have sought release from international tensions in order to be able to solidify and increment their warmaking or defense capabilities. The temporary return to limited capitalism under the new economic policy of the 1920's, for example, allowed for the buildup of the young state's military machine. Again in 1939, the decision to enter into a nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany was, among other things, an excuse to augment funds for armed strength. Whenever in the past additional funds were made available through various means, little, if any, of these funds were allocated to the production of automobiles or refrigerators.

In this connection, it may be that the Soviets intend to devote more funds to internal subversion in Latin America, southeast Asia and other vulnerable areas. The Soviets have made considerable headway, for example, in Brazil and Laos, but may not have had sufficient funds to take over those areas if the governments of those countries were overthrown and Communist governments installed.

Therefore, while it would be more comforting to believe that releasing the burdens upon the Soviet economy would result in increased "peaceful spending" for consumer goods, the history of the Soviets indicates we would be well advised to consider the possibility that a transitory detente would bring greater military expenditures on their part.

Of great concern in this connection is the recent theory that both the United States and the Soviet Union have renounced the search for the "absolute weapon." There is no assurance that either nation has decided to renounce its search for new and advanced weapons; if there is such an agreement, it has not been made public, and if there is no such agreement, it would be well to have a declaration to that effect.

The "ultimate", or "absolute" weapon is in itself a contradiction. Just as a scientist cannot accept the proposition that new elements will never be discovered, and just as the mathematician can recognize no limit upon arithmetical progressions, so the developer of weapons would not admit that new and dramatic breakthroughs can be ruled out in this field. Because weapons of even greater destructive power than those which we now possess can be discovered, it does not mean that they will be "ultimate" or "absolute" weapons. That the discovery or development of such weapons may be difficult or in the distant future is something quite different from stating that it is impossible. One commentator said recently that "the absolute weapon is, if not impossible, then certainly most improbable. It is in a class with a machine for perpetual motion or an elixir for perpetual youth." It would not be rash to estimate that scientists would almost unanimously disagree with such a statement, especially when it is contrasted with the history of the development of science and technology in the 20th century. The scientist, Lord Rutherford, once made the statement that science now knew all the fundamental facts of nature, and that only minor refinements of scientific understanding remained to be accomplished. There have been similar statements many times in history. Apparently we will continue to make them.

It will take much more than conjecture to substantiate the thesis that the Soviet consumer will be the first to gain from a reallocation of Soviet resources.

(3) The gradual emergence of Realpolitik on the part of the Soviets: It is often alleged that, since change is the essence of history, aggression will ultimately be moderated with the passage of time. History has wrought great changes in social systems, creeds, and ideologies, and undoubtedly will continue to impinge upon the long-range goals of men and nations. It may well be that the passage of time will bring to Communist leaders everywhere the realization that the irrational goals of international communism are unattainable and hence unworkable. But by the same token, history has demonstrated that tyranny can persist with a singleness of purpose over long periods of time. It has been demonstrated that aggressors, acting in direct contradiction to the forces of justice and logic, have conquered and ruled peoples whose only desire was to live in harmony and peace.

One thing is clear: never in the history of the world has it been more difficult to dislodge a despot. The modern tyrant has at his disposal the spectrum of technology, and with a small group of followers equipped with the latest weapons, can control vast numbers of people.

Today it is customary, when referring to Communist ideology, to point to the vast discrepancies between the theory of Karl Marx and that of Stalin or Khrushchev. It is said that were Marx able to learn what had happened to his doctrine, he would "turn over in his grave." I do not think that such a statement is justified. Certainly, great changes have been made in the original doctrine of communism, but in its essentials it has remained unchanged for over 100 years. Karl Marx was as much an enemy of freedom as is Nikita Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung.

The opening which the Soviets seek in the West today, the detente which they profess very much to want, is alleged by some to stem from a basic realization that communism is unattainable. At the very least, it is said that within the very recent past, Communist policies and objectives have undergone radical changes.

But if the objective of the Soviet Union in introducing missiles into Cuba in October 1962 was to place the United States at the former's mercy through nuclear blackmail, is it fair to assume that merely because that venture was but half successful the entire strategic vision of communism has undergone by an about-face?

Many view the present treaty as the first sign of dawn on the horizon of genuine peace. To be sure, genuine peace is our strongest desire, and toward that goal we must work with unflagging efforts. But it is equally necessary to take into consideration the reactions of the adversary to this treaty. For example, on August 1, midway between the initialing and signing of the treaty, a Radio Moscow commentator had this to say concerning changes in Soviet policy:

"The argument that some newspapers and politicians are harping on more and more persistently is that Soviet policy is undergoing some changes. And some people even go so far as to make the ridiculous assertion that the Soviet Union has openly renounced Lenin's doctrine, and has actually stated that war is impermissible as an instrument of policy. Facts do not back up this absurd contention.

"The initialing of the treaty to ban nuclear tests in the three elements is therefore a direct result of the fight waged by the Soviet Union for many years, and it is certainly not a result of any change in Soviet policy, or departure from Lenin's principles."

Hence, it would appear to even the casual observer of Soviet reaction to the current state of affairs that the Soviets themselves view the test-ban treaty as a victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence. The interpretation of peaceful coexistence, as I have stressed, is crucial.

The current treaty can be considered a victory for both sides only if the objectives of both sides are compatible. The President has stressed that it involved compromise by neither side, and hence, we are bound by a most solemn obligation to assess its impact within the overall framework of detente.

It seems to me to be a mistake to impute the recent atmosphere to a change in Soviet policies. It does not appear that Soviet policies have undergone a fundamental change, nor does it appear that they themselves consider recent events a reflection of change in strategy or tactics.

(4) The realization that it is impossible to catch up with the United States in a straight arms race: Over the years, the Communist economy has shown a remarkable aptitude for promoting inefficiency and waste. Yet, despite great shortcomings, this cumbersome apparatus has managed to yield progress in many fields, especially in research and development. They have shown they can make rapid advances in developing a system when they lay maximum effort and emphasis on that system. In the fields of rockets and missiles, an early determination to allocate manpower and money in order to develop a military capability has paid dividends. And, despite the enormous drain which backward techniques constitute, the Soviets have managed either to keep abreast of us or to overtake us in certain military and scientific fields. Nonetheless, the rigors of the arms race under these obvious handicaps have brought the Soviets to the conclusion that even in an allout arms race, under the present circumstances there is little chance of keeping apace with the production capability of the United States. They have not been able to meet the production ability of the United States which Khrushchev acknowledges with the threat to us and exhortation to the Soviets that they some day will do just this.

If the Soviets have come to this hard calculation, they may well be in search of detente with the West in order to be able to withdraw temporarily from the burdens of production competition.

This withdrawal may be interpreted in two ways: (a) the Soviets will use the advantages of a detente in order to shore up weak spots at home; or (b) they will now concentrate not on matching the United States in terms of present types of armaments, but upon leapfrogging the United States by pouring all available resources into advanced and futuristic weapons. Hence, having assured themselves that the United States will not attack, and banking upon a slackening of the U.S. effort in arms production and basic weapons research, the Soviets would be afforded a period of relative quiet in which they could channel their efforts in one or a very few directions with the hope, or even the expectation, that they could come up with a startling technological breakthrough while we would not be making similar efforts.

Which interpretation we choose depends largely upon the efficacy and industriousness of our intelligence community. It is vitally necessary that we know what Soviet laboratories are working on in the field of weapons development, and which systems have priority at any given moment and these are most difficult to determine now and may be even more difficult in the future.

(5) The need for a breathing space in which to recoup strength: The foreign policy of the Soviet Union has followed a consistent pattern of expansion against and encroachment upon neighboring territories. The expansionism of that policy does not, of course, mean that the Soviets are interested only in moving slowly outward to absorb contingucus territories. Rather, the Soviet Union has on many occasions attempted to hurdle the immediate defenses of the free world by attempting to penetrate to our "sanctuary" areas. Guatemala in 1954 is a case in which that policy failed. Cuba is an example of its success. And today, on a worldwide basis, the Communists search for inroads of vulnerability to exploit and turn to their own purposes.

It seems to many that Communist policy, while primarily expansionist, is also cyclical. Periods of aggression are followed by periods of relaxed tensions while gains are consolidated or weaknesses are repaired. In recent years we have, at the hands of Khrushchev, experienced several undulating currents of alternate tension and relaxation. We know that this is due to the Communist seizure of initiative in the creation of unrest and disorder.

But Communist dynamism, when met with a firm resolve and steady determination, and when confronted with an array of power, pauses. Almost immediately, new ways are sought to continue forward momentum by avoiding the major obstacle. If met at every juncture with unrelenting and meaningful opposition, Communist policy has been altered and the forward momentum has been halted.

Each time this momentum has been halted, a relaxation of tensions has followed. There have been overtures for peace, with special emphasis upon "peaceful coexistence." This period, known to Communists as the "peredyshka," or breathing space, has afforded a measure of respite for the purpose of regrouping forces and reexamining strategy and tactics.

Today I believe we are entering a period of relaxation of tension. Khrushchev, troubled by events at home and within the Communist camp, and apparently having failed in his attempt to keep missiles in Cuba last fall, sees the need to exercise the tactical prerogative of the breathing space. He does not, I am sure, view the breathing space as anything more than a transistory period to be discarded as soon as it is feasible to begin the forward pressure once again.

There is no evidence that Khrushchev has finally decided to work for a stable, just, and lasting peace. The lessons of recent history demonstrate the persistence of communism in its pursuit of goals which are diametrically opposite to ours.

The question at issue is one of weighing relative risks. Each individual makes his assessment on the basis of personal philosophy, past experience and current knowledge. This accounts for the wide differences of opinion on such issues between men of equal competence and dedication.

Based on the past actions of the Communists when they make a sudden aboutface, as they have done in the case of this treaty the provisions of which they have rejected on several previous occasions, it would seem that they wish to seek some advantage over the United States.

They never have been generous. They always have acted solely in their own interests to reach their own goal of domination. Thus we should go slowly in the direction they urge, look carefully at what the treaty will or could do to our national security, and deduce as much as we can of the Communist motives.

They may indeed be the relatively harmless motives and intents which we hear so readily advanced today on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Indeed, the Soviets may even want a treaty to impress the Red Chinese with the effectiveness of the Soviet course of action. Perhaps suddenly they have come to fear nuclear holocaust and the spread of nuclear weapons enough to convince themselves that a treaty to stop most nuclear testing is what they need to avoid such developments. Perhaps our many offers of peace and friendship have convinced them that the United States is not a threat to them after all, and that we want only to coexist with them, each in his separate way.

On the other hand, there are other possible motives. They could hope to spread euphoria, complacency, relaxation and wishful thinking within the United States and the other stronger free powers as well as the rest of the free world. They could seek to weaken U.S. nuclear weapon research and development capabilities by undermining the morale of our weapon laboratories, thus hoping to increase their obvious lead in multimegaton nuclear weapons and missile engines, or extend these leads in other nuclear weapon areas. Perhaps they tell the truth, as they do when it occasionally suits their purpose, in claiming to have achieved effective defenses against all missiles launched against them, and hope to block any equivalent developments in the West. Or perhaps they intend to put multimegaton nuclear weapons into orbit and deny to the West a capability to defend against them or to shoot them down.

We do not know with absolute certainty their capabilities and can only conjecture. However, based upon our experience to date and upon announced Communist objectives it would seem that one or several of the last conjectures is the more probable reason for their sudden reversal to accept this treaty.

If this is true, then the crucial question is: Can the Soviet indeed achieve such goals by means of this treaty? Maybe they can, in important respects.

Previous witnesses have listed many safeguards as being necessary for this treaty to be acceptable in order for the military risks in this treaty to be brought to a passable level. One of the safeguards is that our nuclear laboratories must be operated at a high rate of efficiency. To keep nuclear laboratories at a high peak of efficiency is not so easy under the circumstances of this treaty, and there is great danger that we will not be able to do it.

The nuclear scientists who are now in our laboratories and who have been with the nuclear program for some time know why it is so very important for them to continue enthusiastically on nuclear weaponry. Many of these scientists will stay in their present jobs, but laboratories need a constant influx of enthusiastic, brilliant young men to retain the competence of the laboratories. It will be difficult to attract this very much needed type of young scientist to develop the new competence and expertise if there is doubt in their minds about the future of their laboratories or the future of their own work. This reluctance to accept positions in nuclear laboratories will be aggravated if there is a general feeling among our scientists that research on nuclear weaponry is not enthusiastically supported not only by the U.S. Government, but also by the scientific fraternity. It is most difficult, for example, to keep an organization at a high peak of efficiency, ready to act, such as the organization which would be required to be ready to resume atmospheric testing promptly over long periods of time of inaction. We had this difficulty in our laboratories after World War II, and we had similar difficulties to a lesser extent during the test moratorium. There will not, of course, be a sudden decrease in laboratory effectiveness—it probably will slowly deteriorate.

Unfortunately, if our research and development capability in the nuclear sciences does decline, we will be unable to resume atmospheric testing instantly when the occasion arises. In addition, we may not have proper new weapons to test. Extrapolation can go only so far without test. There can be small improvements based on nonverified data, but it is not usual to be able to make large improvements.

It has been said that where the treaty prohibits testing crucial elements of our major weapon systems we can compensate effectively by more careful design and greater numbers, or perhaps by testing underground. Specifically, it is said that the many existing unknowns with regard to the vulnerability of our hardened strategic missile sites and the vulnerability of reentry bodies to neutron flux can be so compensated.

No amount of careful design or conservatism can substitute effectively for the actual testing of complete weapon systems. Unanticipated defects or failures invariably come to light with testing. There is no substitute. While testing extensively will not eliminate all possible failures, it is essential to eliminate major flaws, and the issues are crucial to our national safety.

An automobile design is based upon many years of experience. Even so, the manufacturers spend vast sums on extensive testing of each new model. And still mistakes get into production. How many other mistakes would get through without extensive testing?

Although it is true that many factors, other than the development of the warhead and the determination of weapons' effects must be improved to develop an ABM system, an ABM cannot be made effective without these two elements either. Warhead design and knowledge cannot remain static either, and these elements are not unimportant.

If the Soviets have the knowledge to develop effective missile defenses, then a great preponderance in numbers on our side will not be enough someday. Antimissile defense is crucial. We cannot afford to deemphasize its development, short of real knowledge that the threat no longer exists.

CONCLUSIONS

Secretary Rusk, in testimony to the Senate, stated: "The most important thing about the treaty is, therefore, what it may symbolize and what new paths it may open."

It is crucial that we understand just what this treaty may symbolize. If it is not a realistic symbol of our hopes to curb the arms race, in a manner which is consistent with our national security, then we would justifiably have grave doubts as to the wisdom and the desirability of new paths which may appear to be open as a result of the treaty.

If the treaty goes into effect, and assuming that the Soviets have not already achieved enough knowledge for them to develop a wholly new system of nuclear weapons, and if the safeguards which have been stated to the Congress are fully carried out, then, for the near future, our relative nuclear capability will not have been reduced to any appreciable degree. In fact, if the assurance that we will carry out an expanded and vigorous underground test program is realized, then our nuclear test activities will actually be increased; for, in reference to Senator JACKSON's recent speech, such a program would not be subject to the restrictions which have been placed upon our past rate of testing.

Therefore, at best, since our test policy must be based upon Soviet actions which do not justify trust in the Soviet motives and intentions, a properly safeguarded treaty will probably not result in a significant slowing down, on our part, of attempts to develop new nuclear weapons for some years to come. Nobody knows what actions the Soviets may elect to take, should the treaty go into effect; but, considering the manner in which they exploited the past test moratorium, it is highly unlikely that their efforts will diminish.

Should we fail to maintain the safeguards which have been stated as being necessary to keep our scientific and military programs at an adequate level, then a dangerous situation can develop. If the Soviet programs did not also suffer similar degradations, then a serious asymmetry in the relative nuclear capabilities could exist.

However, in this respect it will be most difficult for us to determine what progress the Soviets might be making under these conditions, since the types of information which we have gathered from past atmospheric tests would no longer be available. Under these circumstances it would seem that the treaty may serve to heighten, rather than reduce, tensions and suspicions, for a growing uncertainty would develop as to how much progress the Soviets were making.

In addition to these broad factors of doubt and concern, there is the problem of risks engendered by clandestine tests which the Soviets may conduct. For reasons such as I have brought out in my statement, I am not convinced that these risks are necessarily small. We may enter into this treaty without an existing capability to monitor space and underwater tests and with but a limited ability to monitor atmospheric tests. Every effort should be made to increase our monitoring and detection capability by all means possible.

With respect to clandestine testing at low-yield levels, which can be conducted in the atmosphere or underwater, the rationale of such tests seems to be predicated, to a considerable degree, on the premise that the value of nuclear tests is related to the size of the yield. The low-yield area of nuclear effects testing offers considerable gains. On the matter of clandestine tests I do not concur in the opinion that such tests will not have a significant effect upon the military balance.

What is lacking, from the present treaty is an element which the Soviet Union has consistently refused to provide over the entire course of our disarmament negotiations with them. I refer specifically to an absence of truly meaningful enforceability, namely, inspection.

Without a system of inspections which makes it possible to enforce realistically the sincerity of stated intentions, a test ban treaty cannot lead to the results which are claimed for it. The current treaty is, in essence, a self-contradictory document. The discussions about the treaty imply a mutual sincerity of purpose and yet demand that we take proper safeguards to protect against a lack of sincerity.

If we are to have a limited treaty which has some real meaning, then both sides must have knowledge of what is happening, and that means we must have some limited inspection. The effectiveness of the treaty is significantly weakened since there is no definite level of inspection incorporated into the treaty.

I recognize that the current status of the treaty, with so many nations having already subscribed to it and the hopeful attitude which has been thereby stimulated worldwide, is a factor which cannot be ignored when ratification is being considered by the Senate. The decision on this treaty would be much easier were this factor not involved. If requirements of national security required this factor to be overridden, the consequences would not improve our worldwide image.

President Eisenhower advanced his open skies proposal to the Soviet Union. It was a sober, reasoned, and searching probe of Soviet intentions. It was summarily rejected and its rejection spelled out clearly that the Soviets would not permit verification by both sides of what each side was actually doing.

If the current intentions of the Soviets are different from those of a decade ago, or different from those reflected in Cuba last fall, the reintroduction of a limited version of the open skies proposal may be in order in conjunction with the limited test ban treaty. President Kennedy suggested that we incorporate such measures into our treaty negotiations, after the Soviets broke the moratorium in 1961, and it would be beneficial to put his suggestion into practice before we commit ourselves to such a vital course of action.

If there is a sincerity of purpose in the Soviet view on this test ban treaty, then verification which can enforce such sincerity is in order. We know of many of the Soviet testing sites which support their atmospheric tests, and they certainly know all of ours. If the treaty were to have real meaning, these facilities should be dismantled. Our country would gladly live up to such a bargain, but would the Soviets? They should, and it is along such lines, in a treaty which contained the inspection elements to check on such action, that I would concur.

It looks as if this treaty will be ratified in the near future. I have grave misgivings as to whether this will be a step toward peace or a step toward decreasing the security of the United States. Many witnesses have listed reservations and safeguards which, if fully implemented, will reduce the danger to the United States. All of these are important and if I may be permitted to make one recommendation it would be for the Senate not only to assure itself that these reservations and safeguards are carefully, clearly, and distinctly spelled out, but also that the safeguards are fully implemented and continue to be implemented throughout the life of this treaty.

Finally, the history of the Soviet Union is replete with broken treaties, lies, and perfidy even when dealing with other Communist regimes. They have never been trustworthy, even as Allies, and no confidence, no trust, no faith can be placed in their word or in their treaties.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS ON THE COUNTY LEVEL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a heartening article by Mitchell Gordon, which appeared in the August 26, 1963 edition of the Wall Street Journal. In this article, entitled "Counties' Comeback," Mr. Gordon examines various recent developments on the county level of government and concludes that the counties are not as outmoded as many authorities have led us to believe.

The increase in county expenditures and employees and the increasing tendency of counties to assume new and important functions point to a revitalization. In addition, the fact that two-thirds of the standard metropolitan statistical areas, as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Census, fall within the confines of a single county, provides those in these areas who are attempting to cope with area-wide problems arising from urbanization with a ready-made unit of government through which to operate.

Our Federal system rests on the proposition that each level of government must assume its proper share of governmental responsibilities. In this respect, these signs of strength among our county governments should be most reassuring to all of us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 26, 1963]

COUNTIES' COMEBACK—LOCAL UNITS EXPERIENCE A REVIVAL UNEXPECTED BY POLITICAL SCIENTISTS

(By Mitchell Gordon)

For years Milwaukee area motorists have fought through thickening traffic to reach the city, with no freeways to help them. The city and 19 neighboring municipalities agreed some should be built. But they disagreed on routes and quarreled over who should raise how much of the tax money that would be needed.

Then residents realized they had a central political authority: Milwaukee County, which takes in the whole area. So now a county expressway commission has scheduled for 1972 completion a $375 million areawide freeway system financed by the county property tax.

The situation typifies a growing paradox in U.S. local politics. Like Milwaukee, many areas today are troubled by urban sprawl—that is, the spread of metropolitan areas over a complex of cities and suburbs with common problems but divided political jurisdictions. And like Milwaukee many areas are tackling this ultramodern problem, not by creating the new form of government some political scientists urge, but by revitalizing an ancient institution—county government, which began in England before the reign of King Canute (1017–35).

OBSOLETE TO INDISPENSABLE

This trend surprises some of the political scientists. "As recently as 5 years ago we were referring to counties as 'those obsolete units of government,'" recalls L. Laszlo Ecker-Racz, Assistant Director of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, an agency created by Congress to promote closer coordination of Federal, State, and local governments. The sleepy air in many county courthouses in those not-too-distant days lent weight to such views. Until recently counties for the most part confined their activities to such things as running certain types of courts and building roads in areas outside the limits of any municipality.

Now, however, there's a growing realization that two-thirds of the "standard metropolitan areas" defined by the U.S. Census Bureau lie within single-county boundaries. In many of these areas, county officials say, the county is the only unit of government with the broad tax base and unused debt authority needed to organize areawide services.

More important, says Bernard Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials, in most of these areas "there's just no other level of local government with the geographic jurisdiction to cope with metropolitan problems, especially the costly human ones like health and welfare."

TRASH, AIR POLLUTION AND HOSPITALS

So some metropolitan counties are setting out to provide services their cities have failed to institute. New York's Erie County won authority from the last session of the state legislature to carry away the area's trash and is organizing four refuse disposal districts to do so. Earlier it received the legislature's blessing to coordinate sewage treatment in the area by setting up sewage agencies encompassing all its municipalities. Erie's 1.2 million citizens populate Buffalo, two other cities and 25 towns.

Milwaukee County, besides building freeways, has set up the first air pollution control department in its area. Since air pollution control usually is effective only on an areawide basis, it also is a county function in Los Angeles and several other areas.

Other counties are taking over services established by their big cities and extending their benefits to all metropolitan area residents. In Ohio Cuyahoga County recently took over the Cleveland City Hospital and changed its name to Metropolitan General Hospital. Welfare cases throughout the county now are eligible for the care in the hospital, previously restricted to residents of Cleveland or other cities that had special arrangements with the hospital.

Cities now have begun to speed this trend by voluntarily—indeed eagerly—turning over some expensive jobs to their counties. Detroit currently is cutting Wayne County in on administration of its health department; a new county health chief is to be hired who also will head the city health department, with 55 percent of his salary paid by the city and 45 percent by the county. Columbia, S.C., already has given Richland County its airport. And Las Vegas has dropped its civil defense into Clark County's lap.

COUNTY SWALLOWS CITY

In Tennessee, this movement now is being carried to an extreme. Voters of the city of Nashville and surrounding Davidson County in June 1962 decided to do away with the city government altogether and turn its functions over to a renamed Nashville-Davidson County. Now similar charters are being readied for submission to voters in three other counties: Shelby, which includes

Memphis; Hamilton, which takes in Chattanooga; and Knox, which encompasses Knoxville.

It's not certain that any of these charters will be approved. Shelby and Knox Counties have each taken one previous defeat on city-county consolidation efforts, and the proposal to consolidate Nashville and Davidson County was voted down once before winning approval last year. It apparently carried the second time only because Nashville's efforts to annex neighboring areas frightened suburbanites into thinking that unless the county swallowed the city the city would swallow them.

But even without city-county consolidations, the new functions counties are assuming already have made them one of the fastest-growing forms of government in the country. Last October U.S. counties employed 764,000 persons full time, up 54 percent from 498,000 10 years earlier; in the same period city payrolls grew only 27 percent from 1,175,000 to nearly 1,496,000. County expenditures exceeded $7.4 billion at last count in fiscal 1961, an increase of 76 percent in 7 years, and many authorities think the climb has only started.

To finance these expenditures, county governments are pushing their hands deeper into the taxpayers' wallets to fumble along with city, State, and Federal fingers already there. In the past, counties usually have raised their revenue exclusively from property taxes. But now many are looking for new sources of funds to pay for their expanding activities.

Businessmen and professional people in Virginia, who pay State license taxes, may soon be hit for a second license tax by their counties; the League of Virginia Counties has asked for the necessary authority and a gubernatorial commission is studying the request. A few years ago Virginia counties won the right to impose auto license fees, so Virginia cars now carry two license tags: The usual State plate and a two-inch metal strip the county tacks on top of it. Marylanders, who already pay State sales and income taxes, would be slapped with county sales and income taxes too under a recommendation of a commission appointed by Governor Tawes. The Governor is expected to endorse the idea before the next session of the legislature.

States are playing a key role in the growth of county governments. Though Virginia colonists established the first American counties before there were any States, counties today legally are creatures of their States. They have only what taxing and other powers the States give them.

However some States, recognizing the growing importance of county government, have adopted "home rule" legislation allowing counties to do anything not specifically forbidden by their charters. California passed the first such law in 1911 and similar statutes are now in the books in 14 States; 6, including Michigan and Minnesota, have adopted these laws since 1958. The National Association of County Officials calculates in addition that 44 States currently have some kind of legislation in the works to give counties added powers.

RURAL STIRRINGS, TOO

Whether aided by such laws, or inspired by the example of their metropolitan brethren, even some small-town and rural counties are taking on new jobs these days. In Louisiana, street widths in some unincorporated segments of St. Mary Parish, which corresponds to a county elsewhere, have been fixed by newly created planning boards at 60 feet; before there were no minimums and some streets were only 30 feet wide. "Street widths were no problem when the area was rural but we began to get choked up as the (housing) subdivisions came in," says Peter J. Guarisco, 1 of 16 "police jurors" who run the 50,000-population parish.

In North Carolina, rural dwellers now enjoy added fire protection from stations and apparatus purchased for them by county governments. Rural fire departments there, which still must rely on volunteer help for their manpower, previously were dependent on voluntary contributions for stations and equipment, too.

Not all counties are being showered with added duties, though. About half the Nation's 3,000-odd counties lost population in the decade to 1960. And populous Connecticut in 1960 took over most functions from its counties, leaving only a sheriff's office in each. Rhode Island, however, is the only State with no county government at all.

There are some other forces working against expansion of county governments. Though counties are taking over many functions from cities, some of the larger counties now are beginning to resist efforts by their cities to saddle them with additional, expensive, and politically unrewarding jobs.

WHO WANTS A JAIL?

Los Angeles County for years has been resisting efforts by the city of Los Angeles to get the county to take over operation of the city jails. And Cuyahoga County now is saying no thanks to an attempt by Cleveland to give it the city zoo.

In some States, annexation laws permit cities to push out their boundaries to take in neighboring territory, and some cities have been coordinating their metropolitan areas that way, with no help from the county. Mr. Hillenbrand of the National Association of County Officials mentions Houston, Phoenix, and Oklahoma City as examples.

And some metropolitan areas are so big they defy coordination by county government. New York is an extreme example; the city itself encompasses five counties and the surrounding metropolitan area not only sprawls over many more counties but crosses the Connecticut and New Jersey State lines.

However, in some areas counties are now banding together to tackle problems too big for any one to solve. A four-county water commission in upstate New York is at work on areawide efforts in the fields of water pollution control, water supply for irrigation and for remote industrial areas, flood control and recreation. And San Francisco's recently authorized billion-dollar transit system is being financed by three counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, and the city-county of San Francisco itself.

FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a thought-provoking article appeared in the March 30, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover. Entitled "The Decline of the Individual," Admiral Rickover expounds the historic thesis that individual autonomy is the bedrock of American democracy. He goes on to assert that in recent years the freedom and dignity of the individual have diminished thereby making our whole society less free.

Our threats to individual freedom are cited by the author. Among these are the fact that the concept of individual responsibility has been replaced by the theory that man is shaped not by himself but by his socioeconomic environment.

Admiral Rickover is, himself, an excellent example of the creative individual. Professionally, he is responsible for the pioneering of the nuclear submarine. Yet he is also a recognized expert on educational theory. Here he demonstrates his deep concern for the bases of democratic society. If we had more men like Admiral Rickover the problems about which he writes would not be so pressing.

I believe that this article will provide food for thought for all who read it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECLINE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover)

In recent years a sense of uneasiness has crept upon the American people. We have lost some of our exuberance, some of our faith in ourselves. Many of us are disturbed by the loss of good things we cherish as peculiarly American and by the intrusion of distasteful things we never expected would invade our way of life. These changes have been many and various, but they all have a common root: They stem from factors which have conspired to diminish the freedom and dignity of the individual.

These human values are essential in a democracy; anything that threatens them makes our whole society a little less free, our Nation a little less strong. The basic tenet of democracy is respect for the equal moral worth of all human beings and the equal freedom of all men to shape their lives as they see fit, provided only that they harm no one and violate no law. Only the self-determining, independent citizen can make a success of self-government.

Yet these same values can be neither created nor preserved without continuous effort, and that effort must come from the people—or rather from the individual citizen. Self-government will not produce a good society unless enough citizens feel an identification with the fate of the Nation. Repeating patriotic clichés is not enough.

Even were it conceivable that we might prefer things to freedom—perhaps self-indulgence or social irresponsibility or political apathy—the peril in which our country finds itself today forbids such folly. In its struggle with communism, democracy cannot afford to forgo a single one of the advantages inherent in a free society: the mutual trust that flourishes in freedom, the release of human initiative and energy, the pragmatism and tolerance that prevent enslavement to dogmatic ideology—these are what give democracy flexibility and strength.

Our Nation was launched with a system of government containing numerous safeguards to protect individual liberties. Careful reading of the Declaration of Independence shows that our society pivots on the free citizen. Observe the order of precedence: First there is the statement that all men are born equally endowed with "unalienable rights," and some of these are listed; then the Declaration notes that governments "are instituted among men" to "secure" these rights, and finally it is stated that Government derives its "just powers" from the governed. Clearly the Founding Fathers wanted to make certain that Americans never would be ruled by anyone who had not received their express mandate.

Over the years, however, and especially since the coming of the industrial and later the scientific revolution, radical changes have occurred in our way of life, some of them inimical to the free individual in whom our society is grounded.

The first major threat to individual freedom lies in the replacement of what sociologists call the Protestant ethic, which prevailed in this country until the turn of the century, by a new so-called Freudian ethic. Put in simple terms, the Protestant and Freudian ethics stand for two opposite concepts of man. The first sees him shaping his own destiny, being governed by standards he sets himself and by his own conscience, therefore responsible for his own acts. It is the spiritual foundation of democracy. The second sees man ruled by unconscious drives and external pressures, hence not really responsible for his acts. His life is shaped not by himself but by his socioeconomic environment; if he becomes a failure or a criminal, not he but society is to blame.

American egalitarianism reinforces this caricature of Freud's concepts. Mediocrity excuses itself as the normal and healthy state of mankind. The uncommon man who excels thus becomes a sort of unnatural freak. Conformity to the environment in which one happens to find oneself becomes the safe and approved aim. That this shrivels individual autonomy is a fact not always immediately perceived.

The process starts with the "progressive" school and the permissive home. Emphasis is placed on self-expression rather than on self-discipline; or group adjustment rather than on development of the individual's innate capacities; on gaining popularity with the "peer" group rather than on becoming an independent, self-determining adult human being. The educationists' avowed intent to use the school for leveling out human differences strikes me as an assault on the child's basic humanity. Unlike animals who are equipped only for the one kind of life proper to their species—peer group, if you like—man is infinitely diverse in talents and interests. The higher the cultural level, the greater this diversity; passive adjustment to a group belongs to a more primitive age of man.

Group conditioning in the school makes itself felt in adult life. Increasingly, Americans seek comfort and security through belonging to a particular segment of society. People huddle together in communities populated exclusively by members of some one segment and pattern their personal behavior on group standards. What is particularly disturbing is the resentment that tends to be generated in these closed groups against anyone who thinks independently and who must therefore at times differ from approved "group thought."

All new ideas begin in a nonconforming mind that questions some tenet of the "conventional wisdom." All improvements originate in a critical mind that mistrusts the "image" projected by some powerful organism. The innovator of ideas and the social critic are essential to a free society; they are what make the society free.

In a democracy there is need for "critics by profession"—commentators, columnists, etc., whose "beat" is the whole of the social scene—but there is also need of "lay critics" who look upon discovery and publication of truth as part of their civil responsibility. The critic who makes himself an expert on some particular subject, so that he may offer the people information not otherwise available, ought surely to be able to count the people on his side. But, all too often, habits of conformity and mistrust of iconoclasts lead the public to take a neutral position, as if they were judging a proceeding in a court of law.

It is a sad comment on the decline of individualism in America that the critic has no friend at court. He is tagged "controversial," the worst that can happen to anyone in a conformist society.

The "controversial" tag makes him, by definition, a "flawed" personality, not group-adjusted, one-sided, ill-informed, frustrated, and motivated by ill will. Epithets may therefore be thrown at him with impunity; he may be misquoted and misrepresented, and what he says may be contemptuously dismissed as requiring no refutation whatever.

A second major threat to individual freedom comes from the impact of technology. The utilization of science for practical purposes has such enormous potential for the good or evil of man and society that our attitude toward it requires careful rethinking. We have here a complex problem that calls for a higher order of intelligence than has so far been applied. Up to now we have left technological matters almost entirely to the management of practical men. I submit, however, that the practical approach to a new scientific discovery is short-range and private; it is concerned with ways to put a discovery to use in the most economical and efficient manner. The scholarly approach is long-range and public; it looks to the effects which the use of a new discovery may have on people in general, on the Nation, perhaps on the world, and it considers the future as well as the present.

As an engineer I have a healthy respect for the categorical imperatives of nature, imperatives constantly being disregarded for the sake of short-range benefits. I feel strongly that technology must not be raised to the status of an end in itself, but must always remain a means to an end, the end being the welfare of human beings and of the Nation as a whole. In determining whether a given technology conforms to this objective, we need the help of both practical and scholarly experts. But the final decision must rest with the American people.

It disturbs me that we allow ourselves to be pressured by purveyors of technology into permitting so-called technical progress to alter our lives without attempting to control this development—almost as if technology were an irrepressible force of nature to which we must meekly submit. If we but paused to reflect before acting, we should note that much which is hailed as progress contributes little or nothing to human happiness. Everything new is not eo ipso good and everything old inferior.

Technology does not automatically render obsolete the principles we found good in the past; they belong to a different order of things. Technology is not concerned with them. Principles have to do with the way we marshal our inner resources, discipline our actions and respond to the promptings of our conscience; with the ordering of our personal lives and of our relations with fellow citizens, both in private and in public life. They apply to human beings.

Technology, on the other hand, deals with material things. Technology can enlarge our powers of mind and body. With it we can improve health, produce material abundance, leisure and comfort, circle the earth with instant communications, etc. But technology does not dictate either the manner in which we put it to use or the specific benefits which we want to derive from using it.

I suggest we reject the notion that man is no longer master of his own and of his society's destiny. Let us put man back in the center of the stage and do some hard thinking about the kind of life that technology is currently creating for us. Only now, for example, are we beginning to realize that careless use of dangerous pesticides and weed killers may poison soil, vegetation, animals and humans. And it took the tragic case of the European thalidomide babies to dramatize the fatal consequences that may result from the hasty use of inadequately tested drugs.

A third threat to individual freedom has been the tremendous increase in the country's population, with all the attendant changes that this has brought. From 1800 to 1850 our population almost quintupled; from 1850 to 1900 is tripled; from 1900 to 1950 it doubled. Natural increase had as much to do with this growth as immigration. Since World War II the growth rate has accelerated so much that when the time comes to celebrate our bicentenary each citizen will have only about 1 percent of the voting power which individual Americans had in our first national election. A healthy infant born on that day can expect within his lifetime to see our population soar close to the billion mark—unless, of course, we ponder the consequences to the quality of American life and reverse the trend.

Space of itself bestows freedom and dignity; it gives man elbowroom and a chance to find peace and quiet and privacy. When men are scarce each individual becomes important. Today 7 out of 10 Americans live in crowded cities, suburbs, and other urban areas, and the country as a whole is more populous per square mile than was Europe at the time of our revolution. It is hard to find quiet and privacy and a spot of unspoiled nature within reach of home. Manmade ugliness presses on the human spirit, and there is no place for our children to play in safety.

As long as a wilderness had to be subdued there was work in abundance, work of a kind that ordinary men with willing hearts and hands could do, vitally needed work that bestowed dignity on the workman. We were a country of independent farmers, artisans, and merchants in those days. Now 9 out of 10 Americans work for others, many for giant organizations where they have little opportunity to feel individually important. Today, moreover, our society is plagued with endemic unemployment, a condition under which it is difficult to hold fast to a sense of human worth. The loss falls most heavily on those—and, alas, there are all too many—who lack the skill and education for which there is demand in a complex modern society. In the past, America offered unique opportunities for social advancement to average men with average competence; today this is less and less true. America once offered steady employment even to men of below-average ability, but job opportunities for them have contracted drastically. Ours is still a land of opportunity, but increasingly so only for the highly skilled and educated.

With the disappearance of preindustrial, rural America we lost a way of life that was congenial to individual freedom and democracy. Life was simple. Ordinary men could understand the world they lived in; they could manage their affairs without much trouble; they could reach independent decisions on public issues that concerned them as citizens of a democracy. The individual is diminished when he cannot comprehend the problems besetting his nation. I myself think that if we had a first-rate school system, stressing basic education in the liberal arts, many more Americans than now would understand and express their views on public issues.

Serious as is the loss of these natural advantages, however, it need not be fatal to individual freedom or to preservation of a free society. Many of the most civilized modern European countries never had these advantages, yet they were able to evolve out of feudalism and capitalist monarchy into democratic nations where individual freedom is at least as well protected as here—and in some cases better protected. What we need is a new perspective; a recognition that we must now take positive action to create "artificially" the climate in which the autonomous individual and the free society can prosper.

A fourth major threat to individual freedom is the rise of giant organizations which interpose themselves between the citizen and his government. When the Nation was founded we did not even have political parties, and there were only seven commercial corporations in all the colonies. We had no labor unions, no vocational or professional associations, no special-interest groups or huge government bureaucracies. The citizen faced his government directly—whether local, State, or Federal. With his fellow citizens he shared control over his government on a basis of complete equality.

Today the citizen's wishes may be thwarted if they conflict with the interests of powerful organizations able to bring their immense resources to bear on government. Many organizations, such as labor unions and even women's clubs, have been successful in preventing governmental action they consider harmful to their interests, or in obtaining special government benefits and privileges not vouchsafed ordinary citizens. When society is dominated by powerful organizations the autonomy of the individual is diminished.

Of course, the right to associate with others for the purpose of engaging in joint enterprises is itself an important part of individual freedom. In a huge, populous, technically advanced country such as ours both private and public organizations are indispensable. Enormous good flows from them. Many organizations, furthermore, are exclusively concerned with serving their members and do not seek to influence anyone; others are small and therefore a threat to no one; not a few are big and powerful but exemplary in behavior and performance. These do not concern us here. What does concern us is the threat to individual freedom posed by huge power complexes which dominate our lives but over which we are not able to exercise control. Among these are both public and private organizations.

Large Government bureaucracies are as indispensable to modern society as are large private organizations. Many government tasks have to be entrusted to special agencies set up for this purpose. Yet, although they are a part of government, the citizen's influence on them is not as effective as it is on the elected branches of government; nor are the men who run these bureaucracies as accessible to citizens who have legitimate business with them as are elected government officials.

Many large nongovernmental organizations also tend to misuse their power in relations with the public and the government, as when they seek to hold up necessary legislation favored by the electorate or win special favors as a result of past political support—or through the threat of future retaliation at the polls. In some cases, moreover, these organizations develop an autocratic structure which diminishes the freedom and dignity of employees or members, either by needlessly circumscribing their working—and occasionally even their private—lives, or by failing to be responsive to their best interests. Often those "faults of bigness," as one might call them, are not essential to the purposes of the organization or even relevant to their specific tasks. Once we recognize what makes large organization a danger to freedom, we can deal with the problem without interfering with their lawful pursuits. In fact, protection of individual freedoms will benefit any honest organization, since it releases private initiative, one of the great powers for good inherent in a free society.

Organizations act through men. In our country they act through a special category of career men, called managers or administrators. The 18th-century French statesman Mirabeau once remarked that "to administer is to rule." One might expand this to say that administration is a type of authoritarian rule with no constituency and no direct popular mandate. As such it is an anomaly in a democratic society.

In nearly all our large organizations administration stands apart and above production. The men who do the real work of the organization are placed below the administrators who rule them. Administrators may or may not have competence in the organization's special field of work; often they do. Unhappily they often do not. Take education: Clearly the teachers do all the productive work, but it is not they who manage the vast educational enterprise in this country. Teachers are bossed by administrators who quite frequently have not been trained in teaching but only in management of housekeeping, personnel, and public-relations chores.

The larger an organization, the more powerful are the managers or administrators. Their source of power comes from being in charge of housekeeping matters, hence of the purse and so in turn of personnel assignment and promotion. As with all rulers, the larger the realm, the more important and better paid are its administrators. This makes them empire builders. It also accounts for a tendency to authoritarianism. Orders flow downward freely, but suggestions rarely rise upward in the hierarchy. This is probably more true of public than of private organizations.

Nevertheless the individual who must work in a large organization, whether private or public, meets conditions of inequality not found elsewhere in our democratic society. Nor is this inequality necessarily a result of unequal human qualities; it comes because one party has behind him the power of the organization and uses it to prevail over the other. This reminds one uncomfortably of the special rights and privileges which once were enjoyed by men for no other reason than membership in a higher estate—as when society was divided into the nobility, the clergy and the third estate.

There is yet another way in which large organizations tend to diminish the freedom of the individual. The Founding Fathers sought to secure the "unalienable rights" of man by associating the citizen with the business of governing; that is, by making the consent of the people indispensable to the functioning of government. In order to exercise his public functions a citizen must be free to make up his own mind on any public issue, to speak out and to solicit the approval of his fellow citizens; in other words, to be active politically.

Freedom in private life is important, for the citizen needs what Socrates called "a private station" when he engages in public activities. More than invasions of privacy, intolerable in a free society, are therefore involved when organizations presume to meddle in their employees' personal lives. Can a man who must submit to organizational regimentation be a fully effective democratic citizen? Will he feel free to engage in active politics if there is doubt in his mind whether the organization he works for, or the union or association to which he belongs, approves?

Many people have been concerned over the danger of our becoming a state dominated by pressure groups. It has been proposed that the people be given a special department to look after their interests. This misreads the problem. The Government in all its branches is already set up specifically to look after the people's interests and for no other reason. What we must do, I submit, is find ways to curb the illegitimate powers of large organizations, both public and private. Government bureaucracies should be made more responsive to the wishes of the voters; this means bringing them under closer control of our elective bodies. Nongovernmental organizations—labor unions, professional associations, special-interest groups, even business corporations—ought to be held more strictly to the specific mandate of their charters, as well as to "public policy."

We have allowed the freedom of the individual to shrink while permitting the freedom of the organization to expand to the point where it overshadows human liberties. But this Nation was founded for people, not for organizations. We need to remind ourselves that organizations—like technology—are not ends in themselves but means to an end. This end is a good society—a strong nation—human beings who in equal measure are assured the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

I have no simple solutions to offer. There are no simple solutions for any of the problems which urgently require our attention today. We can approach these problems from many different angles. I approach them from the point of view that individual freedom must be preserved.

Fortunately, there are now signs that give one hope we have passed the nadir and are slowly ascending toward the more rugged individualism that was so marked a characteristic of earlier Americans. The shock that sputnik administered to our self-esteem has led us to throw ourselves into an earnest search for flaws in our way of life. I am convinced that once the American people have been shown at what points individual freedom has been weakened they will speedily reinforce these points.

We will be able to do this all the better if we can overcome a general tendency to think of ourselves as unique. A good deal of not wholly disinterested propaganda comes our way seeking to convince us that all the good things of the life we associate with American democracy are uniquely ours. There was a time when life in this country differed greatly from life in other Western nations. For more than 100 years we were the model of the free society. But ideas have been moving back and forth across the Atlantic, leaving deposits on both shores. Democracy as a form of government has long since become the Western—not solely the American—way of life. It is well, also, to remember that its roots go back 2,500 years to Greece and that in evolving the concept of the equal worth of all men every Western nation has played a part.

The greatest glory of Western civilization is that it alone, on its own, came to accept the idea that man as man, individual man, regardless of his particular attributes or possessions, is "the measure of all things" (Protagoras). Since the political corollary of this idea is democratic government, it is not surprising that democracy, too, is a uniquely Western invention.

There is, to be sure, a so-called "Eastern" concept of democracy: pure Marxist double-talk, of course. It defines democracy as government of the people, on behalf of the people, and in the interest of the people.

In areas of the world where the individual has never been held in high esteem, where he derives his status and rights from membership in some group—family, tribe, church, etc.—this parody of Lincoln's famous words is sometimes actually taken as a species of democracy. In a negative way, this illustrates the point I wish to make crystal clear: Respect for individual freedom, for the autonomous individual, is the foundation of a free society. As soon as you think in terms of "groups," the foundation begins to erode.

Today the true democracies all face similar problems. All are seeking to solve them through the democratic process, and each can learn something from the others without being untrue to itself. There is, I believe, an irresistible trend toward changing government from the "night watchman" to the "service agency" type. Americans could learn something from the way this transition is being made in the most successful of European democracies. Their reasons have been practical, not ideological. What they have recognized and accepted is that modern life is now so complex, so dependent on careful dovetailing of innumerable human activities, that the individual is in greater need than ever of protection by the law against being harmed by his fellow citizens. There can be no valid objection in principle against making necessary changes. The Declaration of Independence states that "it is the right of the people" to alter the powers of Government in such a way "as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

A friendly though critical visitor to our country once remarked that "there is nothing wrong with America that Americans cannot set right." We can, if we will, strengthen the autonomous individual in our free society. In so doing we will make our Nation not only stronger but also a better place to live.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a truly excellent article about Senator Hubert Humphrey appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times. Congressional correspondent Sam Shaffer has written a fine description of one of the hardest working and most productive men in Washington. I think that he and the New York Times should be congratulated for this tribute to the Senate whip.

I was so impressed with the article that I had hoped to have it printed in the Congressional Record. Senator Ribicoff, however, already had that honor. I would like, therefore, to associate myself with the comments he made at the time he introduced it into the Record. Like Senator Ribicoff, I believe that Senator Humphrey is a great Senator and enthusiastic Member of the Senate leadership. We are fortunate that he and Senate Majority Leader Mansfield are teamed up so effectively. We would have to travel far to find two such experienced men dedicated to the work they do so well here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF PORTION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives the bill (S. 1139) to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the Act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with "*Provided further*, That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds:".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment, which is of a minor technical nature.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate Joint Resolution 102.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Senate is now embroiled in the railroad controversy which has caused 4 years of turmoil. No one in Government has wanted to become involved, because this is an area which should be reserved for collective bargaining. But, now time has run out—Congress must give some assistance if we are to protect this country from a national railroad strike which could bring economic chaos.

The carriers and unions have been unable after almost 4 continuous years of negotiations, to resolve these differences. Presidential study groups have recommended actions to the President and no action was taken. Finally, the 11th hour came and the President asked for a delay so that the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy could review and report to him on facts and issues to be sent to Congress. Then Congress asked for another 30 days delay to act on the legislative proposals.

Never have I seen responsibility ignored so patently. After the President refused to act and threw the "hot potato" to Congress, Congress refused to discuss the matter until 3 days before the deadline. I believe Congress must act if we are to protect the public interest which is threatened by the possibility of a strike.

Why has Congress shirked this responsibility?

One reason may be the political maneuvering that has been evidenced in an attempt to win political favor by some Members of this body.

This Nation is faced with a serious railroad crisis. To meet this challenge we must proceed with objectivity and statesmanship. It requires more than cheap politics and political maneuvering.

The Commerce Committee finally sat down to draft a legislative solution to the heretofore insoluble problem. The committee with objectivity and realism drafted what is now called Senate Joint Resolution 102. This resolution was reported out without a dissenting vote. As unpalatable as this type of legislation is, it does offer a solution. Seventeen Senators on this committee felt that it was a good piece of legislation and voted to report it.

After the Commerce Committee meeting, eight of the members, six of whom are up for reelection in 1964, chose to offer an amendment which would strike section 6b and thus destroy the effect of the resolution.

Mr. President, this Nation is confronted with a crisis with which this Senate must deal. We do not have the time nor can we afford to play pure politics with this matter.

This legislation would resolve all the issues in this dispute. It is essential that they all be resolved. The legislation does not pose a threat to free collective bargaining but rather protects the public interest from the threatened railroad strike. Senate Joint Resolution 102 as reported will save this country from a strike which would bring irreparable economic damage.

Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star printed an editorial last evening, August 26, which discusses the "unthinkable" position taken by the eight Democratic Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point this editorial, entitled "Why Unthinkable."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Unthinkable?

A group of eight Democratic Senators, who must live in a kind of never-never world, say it is unthinkable that all the issues in the railroad dispute should be submitted by law to binding arbitration. But they do not say why it is unthinkable—only that "free collective bargaining * * * must survive without a precedent that would substitute legislation for negotiation."

This, in our opinion, is nonsense. It is not only thinkable but essential that any legislation enacted by Congress should cover all of the issues in this dispute.

It is not legislation which, in this instance, poses the threat to free collective bargaining. The threat, to the extent that there is a threat, stems directly from the readiness of the railroad unions to trample on the public interest rather than accept any process, including voluntary arbitration, which would settle a dispute which the parties have not been able to settle through collective bargaining. Unquestionably, it is desirable that labor-management disputes should be settled through collective bargaining or some other voluntary procedure. But when, because of wrongheadedness, this cannot be done, it surely does not follow that either labor or management has a right to put the public through the wringer. Yet this is precisely what would happen if the rail unions, having rejected rational methods of settling the dispute, should now be permitted to strike to prevent changes in the work rules.

The eight Senators say they are willing to enforce arbitration of the two main issues, the need for firemen and the size of train crews, but would leave other issues to bargaining. Fortunately, however, these eight are a minority of the Senate Commerce Committee. The majority holds that if legislation has to be adopted it should cover all issues or, otherwise, this could prove to be no settlement at all. We think the majority is right. In the light of the 4-year history of this dispute, why enforce settlement of two issues and leave the others until another strike becomes imminent? To do this would really be unthinkable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, for the past month, representatives from the United Nations have been meeting in Geneva to discuss the forthcoming International Conference on Trade and Development. The importance of this Conference, which now is scheduled for March 23 to June 15, 1964—12 weeks—is almost impossible to overestimate. The Conference will be held in Geneva. At a time when the flow of trade has become of vital interest to the economic health of the free world, it is essential that the United States play a determinant role in this Conference. We must have not only strong policies, but also strong men with firm convictions who, during the important negotiations to be held next year, will fight to protect the economic interests of this Nation.

Authority to hold the conference was given last December by the General Assembly of the United Nations, with the support of the United States. For many years the impetus for a world trade conference has come from the Soviet Union, and it has been the policy of this Nation to resist such a conference on the grounds that the Communist nations would use it as a propaganda vehicle to press for expanded East-West trade. The United States, however, reversed its previous position last December and agreed to go along with the conference. The reason for this change was not Soviet pressure, but mounting demands by the underdeveloped nations of the world for improving the conditions of trade on which their economic development depends. Sensitive to the needs of these emerging nations, the U.S. decided to support the trade conference. At the same time, we defeated Soviet demands to include nonmembers of the United Nations such as Communist China and East Germany, and also prevented them from gaining their major objective, which was a discussion of the conditions of East-West trade.

As the conference now stands, it will center on the problem of trade and development as it concerns the emerging nations. It is not hard to understand why these nations should desire to improve their trade position. They must finance their economic development largely from their earnings in foreign trade. They earn approximately three times as much foreign currency through trade as they receive through all forms of economic assistance. Yet during the 8-year period 1954–61 the value of their exports increased only 19 percent—barely enough to keep up with their population increase—while the industrial countries increased their export earnings by 50 percent. While the prices of raw materials have remained constant or have even dropped, the prices of manufactured goods have risen steadily—which is to say that the developing nations earn less on their exports and pay more for their imports. What is happening is that the industrial nations of the West are getting richer and the underdeveloped nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America are in many cases getting poorer in relation to them—even though their living standard may be slowly rising.

Obviously this is a situation which the Communists are the first to take advantage of, and this is why we must be on our guard to prevent them from turning the trade conference into an attack on Western trade policies. We must not let the Soviet Union take the position of defender of the interests of the underdeveloped nations. On the contrary, it is we in the West who are sympathetic to the legitimate needs of the emerging nations and who have been seeking with great effort a way of helping them in their trade and development problems. The desire for economic development by the emerging nations is not just a Russian propaganda theme, but a real fact of life in the real world. It is because of this compelling need for economic development that the underdeveloped nations have urged that this conference be held. It is the Soviet Union which is hitching itself onto their bandwagon, not the reverse. These nations have wisely refused to allow the Russians to plead their cause for them. They resisted the Soviet move to focus the conference on the trade problems of disarmament, which would have been an obvious propaganda theme. They also refused to allow the problem of East-West trade to be placed on the agenda, despite Russian pleading. This is going to be a conference on the development problems of the emerging nations—one which is of real concern to the United States.

The Soviet Union, to be sure, will attempt to turn the conference into a propaganda exercise. Stymied in their move to focus the conference on the expansion of East-West trade, they will no doubt try to shift it in that direction once the conference is convened. But there is no reason for the underdeveloped nations to support such a distortion of the conference, and I am certain that our delegates will keep the discussion focused on the legitimate problems of trade expansion for the underdeveloped nations. The Russians will no doubt also use the conference as a springboard for a full-scale attack on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—the free world trade organization which now includes 50 nations, including 7 Asian and 14 African States. Since the Soviet Union and most of the Communist nations have been excluded from GATT, they have tried to discredit it in the eyes of the underdeveloped world as a device to enrich the capitalist nations. While the emerging states have not fallen for the Communist argument, the Russians have gained some support for their contention that GATT is not a truly international organization since many members of the United Nations are denied membership and yet are affected by its decisions.

With this argument they will try to destroy GATT and replace it with another trade organization in which they would be able to participate.

In order to ward off such Communist assaults on the free world trade organization, it is important that the United States be represented by the highest caliber delegates, men who will be sensitive both to the needs of the American business community and to the political implications of the economic problems of development. Whether the head of the American delegation is a businessman or a Government official is less important than that he and his staff be fully cognizant of the importance of these negotiations and to the attacks which the Soviet Union is likely to make upon GATT and western trade policies. As we prepare for this conference to be held early in 1964, I urge that we put all our efforts into assuring that it concentrate on the problems of trade expansion and development for the emerging states, and that we not allow it to become a vehicle for Communist propaganda. This will require great skill on the part of our negotiators and great vigilance in protecting our interests.

Mr. President, it is essential that we keep close tab on who our representatives will be. The Russians will attempt to exploit that meeting. It will attempt to break up GATT and weave itself into an expanded trade with the free West. That we must prevent, because the continued life of our economy and the growth of the underdeveloped nations are inextricably tied together in the maintenance of a free world.

This meeting is looked upon with tremendous importance by Red Russia. We should do no less.

Again I stress that we should watch whom we send to that conference. We should make certain that they subscribe to our philosophy of economics. We should make certain that they are not lukewarm with respect to our philosophy and ardent in the support of socializing the nations of the world.

What the result of the conference will be in my judgment will depend upon the economic philosophy of the men our Government and the United Nations put in charge of the meeting. If that is stacked in favor of Red Russia, it will be a dire and black day for our country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 667) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1914. An act to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; and

S. 1942. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4330) to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 667) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] to the committee amendment.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I temporarily withdraw my amendment, which is the pending question, in order that the Senate may consider a substitute proposal by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. I serve notice that if the substitute is defeated, I shall immediately reoffer my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 182 intended to be proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That changes in work rules involving the manning of train or engine crews, and the protection of the interests of employees affected thereby, which changes come within the area of those proposed by any carrier in the notices of November 2, 1959, or by any labor organization in the notices of September 7, 1960, shall become effective upon application to and approval or modification by the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and pursuant to general or special rules of procedure prescribed pursuant to the provisions of section 17 (except paragraph (2) and the last sentence of paragraph (5)) of that Act, such rules to be operative only as interim rules and until the current controversy regarding such rules is resolved by the parties through continued collective bargaining; and no provision in this joint resolution shall be construed as limiting the right and responsibility of the carriers and organizations to reach agreement regarding such rules. An application may be filed under this section only by or on behalf of a carrier or labor organization which was a party to either of the notices referred to in this section.

Sec. 2. (a) There shall be established, to assist the Commission in the exercise of its functions under this joint resolution, a Special Board which shall consist of seven members appointed by the President, three to be appointed as public members, two to be appointed upon the nomination of the carriers, and two to be appointed upon the nomination of the labor organizations.

(b) An application filed under section 1 shall be referred, upon receipt, to the Special Board for consideration, and for report and recommendation to the Commission within ninety days after receipt of such application.

(c) The Special Board may consider as evidence before it the evidence introduced before the Presidential Railroad Commission, created by Executive Order 10891, of November 1, 1960, and before Emergency Board 154, created by Executive Order 11101, of April 3, 1963, and shall not be required to receive evidence cumulative thereto.

Sec. 3. In considering an application referred to it, the Special Board shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed rule upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and the employees affected, giving due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154, and, to the extent practicable, the Special Board shall give due consideration to the extent to which the areas of disagreement between the parties have been narrowed in bargaining and mediation following the Emergency Board report. As a condition of its recommendation of approval of any interim rule under section 1, the Special Board shall recommend a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected as provided in section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and shall give due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154 relating to the retention of job rights by senior employees, relocation expenses and earnings protection to less senior employees transferred to other jobs by the employing carrier, preferential hiring rights, displacement allowances, supplemental severance allowances, and retraining allowances. To the extent that provision for such displacement allowances, supplemental severance allowances, retraining allowances, and retraining may be available to an employee under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 or other Federal statutes, the carrier will be relieved of this obligation.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall act upon the recommendation of the Special Board within thirty days from the receipt of such recommendation, and shall approve, give modified approval to, or disapprove the application involved, consistent with the Special Board's recommendation, unless it is determined by the Commission that such recommendation is contrary to the provisions of this joint resolution, or has been arrived at by procedures inconsistent with those set out herein.

(b) Upon such approval or modified approval an interim rule consistent therewith shall be put into effect, upon such notice as the Commission may prescribe, and shall remain operative until the parties reach agreement regarding the matter involved, or, if no agreement is reached, for two years following the date the interim rule goes into effect, notwithstanding the expiration of this joint resolution. Where any stay of the Commission's order is imposed by a court after an interim rule has gone into effect, pending final determination by the court, the period of such stay shall not be counted in determining the two-year period during which such interim rule shall remain operative.

(c) The arrangements required by the Commission for the protection of affected employees shall continue in effect for the period prescribed by the Commission, notwithstanding the expiration of such interim rule, if the effect upon the employee continues beyond such expiration.

Sec. 5. No change in rules coming within the area of the notices referred to in section 1 of this joint resolution may be made except by agreement or by the procedures prescribed herein. Any change in rules prohibited by this section, and any strike or lockout to effectuate a prohibited change, and any strike, lockout, or other action to prevent or interfere with a change made by such an agreement or by such procedures shall be subject to section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Sec. 6. The parties shall proceed immediately to bargain collectively, with the assistance of the National Mediation Board, concerning any unresolved issues regarding any proposals which were included in the notices of November 2, 1959, or September 7, 1960, but which do not involve the manning of train or engine crews and the protection of the interests of employees affected thereby. If agreement has not been reached within sixty days following the effective date of this joint resolution, any party may submit its proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If the Commission determines (1) that the party submitting such proposal has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach a settlement of such issues through collective bargaining, and (2) that it is unlikely that any agreement with respect to such issue or issues or with respect to voluntary procedures for the disposition of such issue or issues will result from further efforts to bargain collectively, the Commission shall refer the proposal to the Special Board for disposition in the same manner as in the case of applications filed under section 1. The provisions of section 5 of this joint resolution shall be applicable to matters covered by such proposals.

Sec. 7. (a) The provisions of the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," (29 U.S.C. 101–115) shall not be applicable to an action under section 5 or 6 of this Act. In any such action, service of the complaint and summons shall be made on the parties to the controversy by delivery thereof to an officer or to any other agent of said parties authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process. The delivery of the summons and complaint may be made by certified mail. The orders, writs, and process of a district court issued in any such action shall run, be served, and be returnable anywhere in the United States.

(b) Each action to suspend, enjoin, annul, or set aside in whole or in part any order issued by the Commission under this joint resolution shall be brought only in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sec. 8. This joint resolution shall expire two years from the date it becomes effective: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States under sections 5 and 6 shall continue, and section 7(a) of this joint resolution shall remain in effect for so long as any interim rule under section 4 or order issued under section 6 continues to be operative. Prior to such expiration, the President shall report on its operation to the Congress and make such further recommendations, if any, as he deems appropriate, including his recommendation, as to whether this joint resolution should be extended. In addition, the Interstate Commerce Commission may, from time to time, submit interim reports to the President on its actions pursuant to this joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED NATIONS ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to the annual report which has just been issued by the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant. Mr. Thant has been able to announce that the U.N.'s role in attending to problems in the hotspots of the world—the Congo, Cuba, the Near East—has brightened the international outlook and strengthened the United Nations. He reports that the U.N. has weathered a crisis of confidence during the past year and is a stronger organization today than a year ago. This is due in great part to the U.N.'s success in bringing at least tentative peace and order out of chaos in the Congo.

I believe that the assessment of U Thant is correct—the U.N. is today a more effective instrument for promoting international harmony than at any time since the death of Dag Hammarskjold. Much of the credit for the vigor of the U.N. today is due to the tireless efforts of U Thant who has followed the example of Hammarskjold in giving the U.N. bold and dedicated leadership as Secretary General. He has not been content to be an administrator, but has used his position to undertake new initiatives, to assert the leadership of the U.N. in solving key international problems and in fulfilling the U.N. peacekeeping role.

The Secretary General is not alone in recognizing the key role which the U.N. must play in alleviating international tensions and in promoting justice and harmony in the world.

The American people, in one public opinion poll after another, have demonstrated their great confidence in the United Nations and their dedication to the United Nations. Leaders of many countries, both in public and private life, have stated again and again their support of and allegiance to the Charter of the United Nations and the activities of that important international organization.

Undoubtedly the most significant endorsement during the past year of the U.N. and the work it is doing came from the late Pope John XXIII in his encyclical "Pacem in Terris." In this encyclical the Pope both endorsed the U.N. and supported an enlargement of its powers and responsibilities in international affairs. He stated:

> In our time, the universal common good poses problems of worldwide scope. They can only be resolved by a public authority whose power, organization, and means of action also have worldwide scope and which can take action throughout the whole world. It is thus the moral order itself which requires the organization of a public authority of universal jurisdiction.
>
> It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable rights. This is all the more to be hoped for since all human beings, as they take an ever more active part in the public life of their own political communities, are showing an increasing interest in the affairs of all peoples, and are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of a world community.

Pope John went beyond this and left no room for doubts about his intentions as far as the U.N. is concerned. In May of this year he sent Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens of Belgium as his personal representative to interpret the encyclical, in an address in New York before the U.S. Committee for the United Nations. I ask that this remarkable address by Cardinal Suenens, delivered to an American audience, be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in July of this year Pope John's successor Pope Paul VI, in receiving Secretary General U Thant at the Vatican, repeated his successor's endorsement of the U.N. and of its vitally important role in promoting peace and social justice. Addressing U Thant, Pope Paul stated:

> We renew the expression of our esteem and our hopes for the fundamental program of the United Nations, especially in regard to the elimination of war, elevation of the peoples in process of development and of those in need of defense and promotion, the lawful freedom of individuals and social bodies and the safeguarding of the rights and dignity of the human person.
>
> The convergence of so many peoples, so many races, so many states in a single organization, intended to avert the evils of war and to favor the good things of peace, is a fact which the Holy See considers as corresponding to its concept of humanity, and included within the area of its spiritual mission in the world.

Taken together these strong endorsements by two Popes represent a great tribute not only to the organization but to the man who heads it today, Mr. U Thant. Mr. Thant deserves our praise and our support for his active leadership, his patience and tenacity, and his determination to make the U.N. an even more effective force for harmony and justice in the world.

While I have quoted from the late Pope John and the present Pope Paul, those two great spiritual leaders do not stand alone in their dedication to and respect of the United Nations and its activities. The National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States has given strong endorsement for the Protestant community. The respective organizations of the Jewish community have strongly supported and endorsed the activities of the United Nations. The various synods of the Lutheran Church have strongly supported the activities and role of the United Nations in promoting peace and social justice in the world. Congress would be well advised to take into consideration at all times the great respect with which the United Nations is held by so many people, not only in our own country, but throughout the world.

I conclude by again congratulating Secretary General U Thant.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, together with an editorial from the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1963]

UNITED NATIONS REPORT

It is fortunate that the annual report prepared by the Secretary General of the United Nations does not require the approval of the membership. It might never see the light of day. In his report just issued, Secretary General U Thant expresses some independent views that are worth noting.

Mr. Thant dwells on the achievements of the United Nations in what can be called its peacekeeping function. He claims a little too much when he attributes to the United Nations some of the credit for settling the Cuban crisis. In the big crisis spots of the world—Cuba, Berlin, Laos—the United Nations can do little beyond perhaps helping one or both of the contestants to save face. But in the grade B trouble areas the United Nations has proved its value. In the Congo, the Middle East, New Guinea, Kashmir, and Yemen, it has stood its ground. In some cases, it prevented what might have become another confrontation of the great powers. In some it paved the way to what may turn out to be stable solutions. The United States, when it has to enter a situation, does not usually manage to keep peace on so slim a budget.

The United Nations can look back on a year not only of external but also of internal successes. The organization has survived its change in command, the Secretary General having been elected for a full term. The Russians have made no headway with their troika proposal. The entry of numerous new nations has not swamped the General Assembly, as at times had to be feared. The Secretary General has asserted considerable freedom of action. While all members must view this freedom as something of a risk, nothing else can give hope of effective action. It is a tribute to Mr. Thant that the members have been willing to accord it to him.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1963]

UNITED NATIONS TODAY

A modicum of optimism and confidence, welcome these days, is found in the annual report of Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations. He believes the international outlook brighter and the U.N. stronger.

One can look at Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America and see any number of threatened crises, of course. And the next report Mr. Thant writes in the summer of 1964 is hardly likely to describe a year of calm. For this is one of the most agitated and revolutionary periods in history and it is going to take a long time to work itself out.

The Secretary General may exaggerate the role that the United Nations played in the Cuban missile crisis last October. That was settled by President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, but it is true that the existence of the United Nations and the willingness of Mr. Thant to intervene were helpful. The year's chief accomplishment was to bring about the restoration of law and order in the Congo. The U.N. also deserves credit for solution of the West New Guinea dispute, and it is now playing a vital role in helping to solve the Malayan and Yemeni problems.

The value of the United Nations, in short, continues to be manifest. But the financial situation, as Mr. Thant says, "remains serious owing to the continued failure of a number of member states to pay their assessed contributions to the United Nations Emergency Force and United Nations operations in the Congo." The two chief culprits are the Soviet Union and France. As a result the United Nations will have to operate "under a serious financial deficit." This is a problem that must be tackled before the end of the year.

The competence of U Thant has inspired worldwide confidence in his work as Secretary General. He deserves congratulations for the relatively favorable situation in which the United Nations finds itself today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article from the New York Times of yesterday, August 26, on U Thant's report on activities of the U.N. for the last year, along with a profile sketch.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Introduction to U Thant's Report on Activities of U.N. for the Last Year

I

The year under review has been marked by a number of developments which on the whole may be said to have brightened the international outlook and strengthened the United Nations as a result.

The Cuban crisis, which erupted rather suddenly in October 1962, provided the United Nations with the opportunity to help avert what appeared to be impending disaster. A large number of member states not directly involved in the crisis consulted with me on the need for action to ward off a confrontation of the two major nuclear powers which seemed inevitable and I was encouraged to take the initiative in making certain proposals which had the immediate effect of tending to ease the situation.

As a result of the high sense of responsibility and statesmanship demonstrated by the leaders of the powers directly concerned, as well as the assistance which the United Nations was able to give, the danger of a major conflagration was averted. The United Nations also provided, both through the Security Council and the Secretariat, an opportunity for dialogs among the interested parties. By the end of the month, the situation had ceased to present the aspects of an imminent crisis, and by the end of the year had reached a point where it ceased to give rise to anxiety.

The turn of the year also marked a sudden change for the better in the Congo. As a result, the terms of the United Nations mandate in the Congo, as far as the military force is concerned, have now largely been fulfilled. External military interference in the Congo has ceased, the territorial integrity of the country has been secured, and law and order have generally been restored and are being maintained, although the situation in one or two areas still gives some cause for concern.

There were, however, moments of anxiety in December 1962 and January 1963 when it appeared that major acts of sabotage—some already committed and many more threatened—by the secessionist regime in Katanga might disrupt the economic life, not only of Katanga, but also of the Republic of the Congo itself. Fortunately, good sense prevailed in the end and the most serious of the threatened acts of sabotage did not take place. In the subsequent months there has been a steady improvement in the Congo situation, which is reviewed in greater detail below.

SUCCESS IN NEW GUINEA

The year also saw the successful conclusion of the operation of the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority in West New Guinea (West Irian) and the first occasion for the exercise by the United Nations of executive authority, however temporary, over a vast region. Thanks to the cooperation of the two governments primarily involved, the United Nations team was able on May 1, 1963, to hand over the administration of the territory to the Republic of Indonesia, as envisaged in the agreement between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands on Aug. 15, 1962.

Towards the end of the year under review the United Nations has had to assume new responsibilities. The Yemen operation is now in full swing and is discussed in greater detail below. At the request of the Governments of Malaya, Indonesia and the Philippines and with the concurrence of the United Kingdom, I have sent a team of United Nations officials to Sarawak and North Borneo to carry out certain tasks as envisaged by the three governments.

Both the Yemen operation and the Malaysia mission have their special difficulties and problems, but they are continued evidence of the usefulness of the world body in reducing tension and facilitating a peaceful solution of issues which might otherwise lead to strained relations among the interested governments for a protracted period.

The year is closing on an optimistic note on account of the signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. This has given the whole world a feeling of hope and I trust that the year to come will justify the current mood of optimism.

There has been much constructive work in the various fields of activity which are briefly mentioned in the succeeding sections of this introduction, and described in the annual report. In the field of outer space there has been some progress, though no spectacular results have been achieved. Some progress has also been made in the process of decolonization, although a few chronic problems remain to be solved. The United Nations Conference on Science and Technology was a milestone in the development decade, and preparations are now under way for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Both the expanded program of technical assistance and the special fund are continuing and stepping up their fruitful activities.

However, the financial problem posed mainly by the cost of certain peacekeeping operations remains unsolved; and although the proposals I have in mind for winding up the military phase of the Congo operation may, if accepted, reduce the impact of the problem to some extent, the financial issue is a priority item, the solution of which is the primary responsibility of member governments, if the organization is to continue to be effective in the cause of peace and of constructive effort for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

II

The achievement of disarmament continues to be the most important problem of our time. After many years of persistent but fruitless effort, two events took place recently, in the context of the disarmament negotiations, which I believe are of major significance—the signing in Geneva on June 20, 1963, of the memorandum of understanding establishing a direct communications link between Moscow and Washington, and the signing in Moscow on August 5, 1963, of the treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

In the field of disarmament, as elsewhere, certain preconditions have to be met before substantial progress can be registered. The agreements recently concluded do constitute important first steps, and help to meet these preconditions.

Many countries, and in particular the nonalined countries, both in the General Assembly and in the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, insisted that in the absence of a test ban treaty no real progress could be envisaged in other fields of disarmament, and that the cessation of tests should therefore receive the highest priority. The signature of the treaty is a recognition by the major nuclear powers of the validity of this approach.

The test ban treaty, although limited to three environments and marginal to the central problem of disarmament, is an important objective in itself. It will directly serve the humanitarian aim of ending the danger of ever-increasing radioactive fallout resulting from nuclear explosions. But it will also help restrict the spread of nuclear weapons and impose limitations on the development of new weapons of mass destruction, and thus be a factor in slowing down the arms race. This treaty could also point the way to the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty including a ban on underground tests.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF PACT

Equally if not more important are the political implications of the test ban treaty. If this treaty is followed by agreement on other measures aimed at lessening international tension and establishing confidence among states, it may be the beginning of a new era of better understanding between nations, and create a more favorable international climate that would facilitate progress toward general and complete disarmament and the goal of stable international peace and security, which remains the primary purpose of the United Nations. It would seem, therefore, all the more urgent that the partial test ban treaty now concluded by the main parties be made universal by the accession of all states.

I believe that the opportunity so eagerly awaited by mankind will not be missed because of considerations of national interest, and that the enduring cause of world peace will prevail over short-range political considerations. I am strengthened in this belief by the improved relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, which have come about in spite of the difficulties of these two great world powers in reconciling new developments and requirements in the fields of defense with their diverse interests and those of their respective allies.

The process of negotiating disarmament measures through the long years of mistrust about the intentions of the "other side" has been a formidable and sometimes baffling task. The usefulness and timeliness of the work of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament has been amply proved in the short span of its existence. The Committee provides an effective forum for harmonizing the responsibilities of the great powers with the interests of other countries and thus of humanity as a whole. In conditions of reduced international tension and of improved political climate, the role of the Committee may become more significant than heretofore.

It will require the collective effort and wisdom of all members of the international community to insure that the momentum generated by the recent agreements is maintained until the goal of global security and freedom from fear of war is reached.

III

In the course of the year, the development of cooperation in outer space exploration and use continued in an encouraging manner, especially in the scientific and technical field.

The Scientific and Technological Subcommittee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, at its second session held in Geneva in May 1963, agreed upon a series of new and revised recommendations concerning the exchange of information, encouragement of international programs, education and training, potentially harmful effects of special experiments and the organization of international sounding rocket facilities. The meeting of the subcommittee provided once more the occasion for the scientists of the two leading space powers to continue their private talks on cooperative space programs.

The World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunication Union and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization continued to participate actively in the field of peaceful exploration and use of outer space.

No agreement was reached on legal problems relating to outer space, but a valuable exchange of views took place in the Committee and its legal subcommittee.

The discussion revealed areas of agreement as well as disagreement, and also indicated that on some questions there were encouraging indications of rapprochement. It must be borne in mind that the principal legal problems relate to issues of military security, and that in some respects it is difficult to separate the legal questions of peaceful use from problems of disarmament. Yet the effort should continue to be made to formulate more concrete principles of law and procedures that will foster the peaceful use of outer space. This is a task that cannot be left to the slow processes of customary law, but needs to be pursued vigorously by the United Nations bodies in view of the rapid development of space technology and the accelerated rate of space launchings.

IV

During 1963, United Nations activities in the economic and social field have been conducted with constant reference to the United Nations development decade. The United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas (UNCSAT) has already been described as a milestone in the decade, and the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should be another of no less importance.

The spirit of the decade has enlivened the discussions in the Economic and Social Council and in its subsidiary organs; it has inspired many resolutions and it will no doubt stimulate the work required for their implementation; it has sharpened the sense of purpose within the United Nations family, and is spurring their efforts toward a greater concentration of resources on tasks of recognized priority; and it is fostering a closer cooperation among all the organizations and agencies concerned.

The milestones already passed or in sight in the drive to move forward are, however, not enough. We have embarked on a long journey, and on the road ahead we also need guideposts which could indicate to us how to match resources and requirements.

When the time comes, in a year or so, to assess the progress made, to project current developments into the second half of the decade, to identify and remedy shortcomings and imbalances, it would certainly be most useful if achievements and advances could be seen against a background of well-defined objectives, at least for those sectors and areas of activity in which intentions can be translated into programs of action. The more projects undertaken, at the national level or through international cooperation in any given field, can be related to each other in a framework designed to produce a combined and cumulative effect over the period, the greater will be the chances of sustaining and justifying the hopes that the proclamation of the decade has aroused.

The expanded program of technical assistance, which was initiated at a time when the highly developed nations were becoming more conscious of the vital importance of extending technical help to those which were less fortunate, was a prelude to the development decade, in which it is now playing a very leading part.

The improved financial situation of the program has been one encouraging sign; for the period 1963–64, it has become possible to plan for the first time on the basis of an income of slightly over $100 million for the 2 years together. The increased resources have made it possible to meet, fairly satisfactorily, the rapidly increasing demands arising from the emergence of many independent countries in Africa, although these resources are not enough to allow for badly needed expansion in other regions.

However, there is still no assurance that contributions will continue to increase at the rate which is necessary for the continued progress of a growing program. Speaking generally, there is no doubt that the efficiency of the program has been steadily improving. It seems clear that this is partly due to more careful selection of projects by governments, which, in turn, can be partly accounted for by the spreading practice of national economic planning.

The Special Fund, for its part, has continued to fulfill the General Assembly's intention that it be "a constructive advance to United Nations assistance to the less developed countries." The pace of its operations accelerated during the period under review. New priority development projects approved for its assistance extended both the scope and the geographic distribution of the Fund's activity. The total program approved to date amounts to 327 major projects in 120 developing countries and territories. Toward the program's cost of $672 million, the Special Fund is contributing 42 percent, and the developing countries the remainder.

These accomplishments reflect not only sound criteria on the part of governments and wise management principles on the part of the Special Fund. They are also the result of effective contributions by the United Nations and its related organizations which serve as Executing Agencies for the Special Fund. There is, however, one major disappointment which must be voiced: governmental pledges to enable the Fund to finance new projects in 1963 were some 25 percent below the $100 million target. It is therefore to be hoped that all participating governments will help the Fund to obtain the $100 million it urgently requires in 1964.

The scale of this major program in the United Nations Development Decade must be raised somewhat more closely to the needs of the low-income countries, more closely to their capacity to absorb its assistance and more closely to the ability of the Special Fund and the Executing Agencies to help meet those needs. The need for more multilateral development assistance is very real. The time for meeting that need is rapidly growing shorter, because the processes of development are inevitably protracted—training is a vast, long and difficult as well as essential task, social and economic transformations are not easily prepared nor speedily accomplished, and investment on the scale required to achieve the aims of the Development Decade will not be forthcoming unless preinvestment work is completed in time.

The sums required and which can be effectively used, both for preinvestment and investment, are not nearly so large as many imagine. The resources required from the industrialized countries are within their capacities to provide; there are perhaps only one or two among them which are as yet devoting even one-half of the proposed 1 percent of their steadily increasing national income for development in the developing countries. However, many of the political leaders of the industrialized countries are aware of the growing danger to their prosperity and world peace represented by the widening gap between their affluent and dynamic economies and the nearly static situation in so many of the developing countries, where progress is slow and inadequate in relation to population increase.

V

The operations of the United Nations involving the use of military personnel are varied in character and objectives. The truce observation missions in the Middle East and Kashmir and the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East have continued to perform their essential peacekeeping duties without notable incidents. Three other more recent operations, the United Nations in the Congo (ONUC), the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority in West Irian, and the United Nations Yemen Observation Mission, have attracted considerable attention.

The United Nations commitment in the Congo has now lasted for more than 3 years. In that time it has proved an exceptionally heavy burden on the resources of the organization and of its members, and there have been times when it seemed that hopes of positive results were not very bright.

In 1963, however, the situation has improved very considerably and, as I mentioned earlier, the United Nations mandate in the Congo, especially in its military aspects, has been largely fulfilled. While good reasons have been put forward for the continuation of the United Nations military commitment in the Congo, I sincerely believe that the time has come when, for various reasons, it is necessary to envisage the early withdrawal and winding up of the United Nations Force in the Congo. It can no doubt be argued that some useful tasks could still be performed by the force, but I am of the opinion that the time has now come when the Congolese Government should assume full responsibility throughout the Congo for the maintenance of law and order.

I believe that in the past 3 years the Government and people of the Congo have begun to develop the means by which they can assume this responsibility. The retraining of the police and the army is, of course, a vital factor in this development, and as this progresses, there will be a parallel increase in the ability of the Congolese authorities to maintain law and order throughout the republic.

Originally, it was envisaged that the greater part of the assistance to be rendered to the Government of the Congo by the

United Nations would be in the field of technical assistance, or what is now called civilian operations. Here, despite the great difficulties of the last 3 years, the United Nations has, with the help of the specialized agencies, played an indispensable role in the Congo in providing experts for the maintenance of the essential services of the country, while at the same time providing training facilities designed to make it possible for the Congolese themselves to assume these responsibilities quickly.

It is extremely important that this part of the United Nations effort should not suddenly be allowed to lapse for financial reasons. If it proved necessary suddenly to pull out these essential experts and close down the program of training in various fields, the Government and people of the Congo would suffer a severe setback, and much of the effort of the United Nations in the past 3 years would have gone to waste.

I therefore hope that governments will continue to support the civilian operations in the Congo by contributions to the Congo Fund, until such time as it can become a normal technical assistance program under the usual auspices.

As in many countries, the future in the Congo is unpredictable and many difficulties and problems certainly lie ahead. I believe that the United Nations operation in that country, allowing for all its shortcomings and despite the violent criticism which has been leveled against it at various times and from various quarters, has provided a bridge from the desperate situation which existed in July 1960, to a solid basis from which the Government and peoples of the Congo can now progress toward a prosperous and peaceful future.

If this belief is justified, it will mean, quite apart from the benefits that accrue to the Congo, that a great and novel experiment in international cooperation has proved its worth in a very difficult situation. For that success, great credit is due to all concerned, and in particular to the governments which have so generously provided assistance in many forms. Much is still required, but it is perhaps a measure of what has been achieved that we are now able to envisage a great reduction in the scope and cost of this operation.

VI

Owing to the loyal cooperation of the Governments of the Republic of Indonesia and of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Nations operation in West New Guinea (West Irian) did not encounter any major difficulties and was successfully concluded on May 1, 1963, with the transfer of the administration of the territory from the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (UNTEA) to the Republic of Indonesia.

The United Nations military observer team, the small international staff under the United Nations Administrator and the security force were guided solely by the provisions of the agreement of August 15, 1962, which the General Assembly took note of in its resolution 1752 (XVII). After the cease-fire arrangements had been successfully implemented, the main responsibility of the international administration from October 1962 on was to insure that there was no disruption in the public services and economic life on account of the departure of the Netherlands administration, and also to prepare the population for the important political changes which were taking place.

Whatever may have been usefully accomplished during this brief period of 7 months the United Nations Temporary Executive Authority owes its success to the unfailing assistance from the government parties to the agreement (which also shared the expenses of the operation), the devotion of all those from many different nationalities who served with UNTEA, and the calm and friendly attitude of the population.

On March 13, 1963, I was in a position to announce the decision of the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands to resume normal relations and to exchange diplomatic representatives. This was a happy outcome of the solution of the question of West New Guinea (West Irian). The United Nations stands ready to assist the Government of Indonesia in the implementation of the remaining part of the agreement relating to the act of free choice by the inhabitants of the territory and to help the same Government in the economic development of West Irian through a voluntary fund open to contributions from member states of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

VII

In the course of 1962, I received communications from Thailand and Cambodia concerning difficulties which have arisen between them. At the same time the two Governments expressed a desire to find a solution to their dispute through one of the procedures enumerated in article 33 of the charter concerning peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, and they requested me to appoint a personal representative for this purpose. On October 19, 1962, I informed the members of the Security Council of my affirmative response to the above request, and my appointment of a personal representative.

According to the terms of reference, my personal representative is at the disposal of the parties to assist in solving all problems that have arisen or may arise between them, and the Governments of Cambodia and Thailand have both agreed to share equally all the costs involved. The two Governments also requested me, at the end of 1962, to extend the term of my personal representative for a period of 1 year, beginning January 1, 1963.

From October 26, 1962, my personal representative has remained in the area in continuous contact with the Governments and high officials of both countries. A number of investigations have been made at the requests of one or the other party, and certain suggestions advanced for their consideration on appropriate steps that could lead to improved relations between them. As long as the two Governments consider that my personal representative can help them in dealing with a delicate and often tense situation, I am willing to continue to provide such services, whose value and efficiency will depend very much on the good will of the two Governments and their sincere desire to normalize their relations.

VIII

The United Nations Yemen Observation Mission was established, after the Security Council had adopted its resolution of June 11, 1963, to facilitate the implementation of the disengagement agreement by the parties concerned in Yemen. The operation is agreed upon and financed by the parties themselves, and its success will depend upon the good faith of the two parties in carrying out the agreement.

In the conditions prevailing in Yemen, the implementation of the disengagement agreement is not an easy matter for either side, and it is as yet too early to make a judgment on the effectiveness of the mission in assisting in bringing about the actual disengagement. It is to be hoped, however, that the efforts of this mission in very difficult conditions, combined with the efforts of the parties themselves, will bring about the disengagement and the restoration of peace in Yemen, which is the desire of all concerned.

It will be clear from the preceding sections on the Congo, West Irian and Yemen that many member states have made available to the United Nations military personnel for various very constructive tasks of peacekeeping. I have accordingly designated as my military adviser a senior military officer who was formerly the military adviser for the Congo operation. He and the small but expert military staff working under him in my office have played a truly valuable role in the support and functioning of the operations I have just mentioned.

IX

One of the major developments of recent years has been the attainment of independence by a large number of countries and peoples formerly under colonial rule, whose right to freedom and equality is written into the charter. Without intending to minimize the efforts of the peoples themselves in securing their freedom and of the contribution of the respective administering powers, it may be said that the organization, through its various organs, has made an important contribution towards this welcome development.

The significance of this historic and dynamic process to the international community and to the future course of world events can be gaged from the transformation of the United Nations itself, as a result of the increase in its membership from the original 51 to the present 111 members. The widening of the membership has also brought the organization nearer to its goal of universality.

In this connection, it is relevant to recall the year 1960 when, at its 15th session, the General Assembly admitted 17 newly independent countries—16 of them from Africa—to membership in the United Nations, bringing the then total membership to 100. By that time there was overwhelming recognition of the need for bringing about, by peaceful means and in an orderly manner, the inevitable transformation of the remaining colonial areas from dependence to independence as speedily as possible.

This, coupled with the belief of the member states that the emancipation of all dependent peoples would remove one of the major obstacles to the maintenance of peace, led to the adoption by the General Assembly on December 14, 1962, by resolution 1514 (XV), of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

The importance of this question to the organization is evident from the amount of attention devoted to it by the General Assembly. The progress of implementation of the declaration was extensively discussed in general terms, and also in relation to individual territories, by the General Assembly at its 16th and 17th sessions as well as by the Special Committee which the General Assembly established for that purpose. It is a matter for satisfaction that progress toward independence is being made in a number of the territories which the Special Committee has examined this year; and mention may be made in this connection of Kenya, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Zanzibar.

With regard to Portuguese territories and South-West Africa, the member states responsible for their administration have refused to cooperate with the United Nations or to implement its resolutions. In the case of Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom has continued to maintain its constitutional position concerning that territory, but has cooperated with the Special Committee in its study of this question and has discussed the matter with a Subcommittee of the Special Committee in London.

The question of the territories under Portuguese administration has lately been the subject of discussion in the Security

Council on the initiative of the African member states. In its resolution of July 31, 1963, the Security Council has requested me to insure the implementations of the provisions of that resolution, to furnish such assistance as I may deem necessary and to report to the Security Council by October 31, 1963. The resolutions of the General Assembly on South-West Africa (1805 (XVII)) and Southern Rhodesia (1760 (VII)) had already entrusted to me certain functions in relation to these territories.

X

The situation in the Republic of South Africa continued to be a source of increasing concern during the period under review. The question of the racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa has been before the United Nations, in one form or another, ever since 1946. Successive resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, expressing their serious concern at the racial policies of the South African Government, which not only are not in conformity with its obligations and responsibilities under the charter but are also a source of international friction, have been ignored by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

The Security Council has again been seized of this matter recently, and the participation in the meetings of the Council of several foreign ministers of independent African States reflects the urgency and seriousness of the problem. I sincerely hope that, in response to the repeated recommendations and decisions of the United Nations organs, the Government of the Republic of South Africa will abandon its policies of apartheid and also implement measures aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equal rights and fundamental freedoms for all the people of South Africa.

XI

In the course of the year under review, the financial situation of the organization has remained serious, owing to the continued failure of a number of member states to pay their assessed contributions to the costs of the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Operation in the Congo. Thus, at June 30, 1963, arrears for UNEF totaled $27.3 million and for ONUC $72 million; at the same date the United Nations was operating under deficit of some $114 million.

The drain on available resources was increased by the fact that for the period July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963, the General Assembly authorized expenditures for UNEF and ONUC up to a certain maximum, without appropriating the amount involved. The proceeds of the bond issue during this period compensated in some measure but fell considerably short of covering total expenses during the 12 months involved as well as the accumulated arrears in contributions dating back to 1957 in the case of UNEF and to 1960 in the case of ONUC.

In a report to the General Assembly at its special session in May–June 1963, at which it considered the financial position of the organization, it was indicated that, if all existing factors continued to operate, the deficit might reach a total of $140 million at December 31, 1963, and that cash resources would have been reduced to a dangerously low level.

ALLEVIATION FORESEEN

Certain actions taken by the General Assembly at its special session may be expected to alleviate the situation to some extent. Thus, for the period July 1, 1963, to December 31, 1963, an amount of $9.5 million was appropriated for UNEF and $33 million for ONUC, to be financed by a combination of assessed and voluntary contributions. By a resolution on arrears in assessed contributions for these two operations, the door was opened to more flexible arrangements, within the letter and spirit of the charter, for bringing payments up to date, including the possibility of payment by installment. The authorized period during which United Nations bonds might be sold was extended from December 31, 1962, to December 31, 1963. Moreover, as plans for the systematic reduction and eventual termination of the military component of ONUC proceed, the main financial burden giving rise to present difficulties will gradually be lifted.

These are bald figures which have to be faced; and while it is to be hoped that the prospects for improvement referred to above will yield some favorable results, the fact remains that the organization is likely, for some time to come, to operate under a serious financial deficit and a cash position causing constant concern.

I trust that member states will not fail to bear in mind the vital nature of this problem, which if allowed to persist without adequate and timely measures for its solution, must inevitably impair the effectiveness of the organization and jeopardize its very existence. To the same end, the further endeavors to evolve a statisfactory method of financing future peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditure deserve the attention and support of all concerned.

XII

Toward the end of May 1963, a historic meeting took place in Addis Ababa—the meeting of the heads of 32 independent African states. It was a matter of deep regret to me that, although I had been invited to be present at this meeting by the head of state of the host Government, it was not possible for me, for personal reasons, to attend the conference. Besides adopting a number of important resolutions on various questions of general interest, as well as problems of special interest to Africa, the conference also approved a charter and decided to establish an Organization of African Unity.

I was deeply impressed by the statesmanship shown by the African leaders at this conference and the reasonable and moderate tone of the resolutions which they approved. In regard to the Organization of African Unity, it is of course well known that regional organizations are not precluded under the charter of the United Nations, provided that "their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations." The charter of the Organization of African Unity specifically states that one of its purposes shall be "to promote international cooperation, having due regard to the charter of the United States Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." I was also impressed by the recognition by the leaders of the independent African States of the basic fact of their interdependence not only amongst themselves but as members of the international community.

I said in the introduction to the annual report a year ago that the organization was facing a so-called "crisis of confidence," which was due to the emergence of so many independent states in Asia and Africa and the consequent change in the original balance of forces within the United Nations. Today, a year later, I feel I can say, without being charged with undue optimism, that this "crisis" has largely disappeared. I see on the other hand increasing recognition of the usefulness of the United Nations not only among statesmen but also among ordinary citizens.

I believe that today there is a better awareness of the United Nations, both on the part of those who support it, and of those who criticize it—mainly because of an inadequate understanding of the limitations under which we work; and oftentimes the United Nations is taken to task merely because it mirrors the complex problems and the shortcomings of the world. However, the public pronouncements of leaders in every walk of life and the statements made recently by both spiritual and temporal heads show that much hope is placed in the United Nations as an instrument for the promotion of better understanding and an enduring peace.

UNIVERSITY LAUDED

One element in the strength of the United Nations is the progress toward universality that the organization has made so steadily during recent years. I believe that this progress should be maintained and encouraged, and should not be reversed, even when situations arise involving deep emotions and strong convictions.

I also believe that there should be room in the United Nations for member governments with widely differing political, economic and social systems. It is only by providing and maintaining a common meeting-ground for all peace-loving states which accept, and are willing and able to carry out the charter obligations, that the organization can fulfill one of the basic purposes of the charter: "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations."

Recent developments which have already been reviewed at some length in this introduction support an encouraging view of the future. These developments have been taken in certain quarters, perhaps with somewhat more optimism than is justified, as ushering in a new era.

The General Assembly has already recommended several measures, which could now be followed up as a result of the improved political climate following the signature of the partial test ban treaty; and I referred to most of them in a statement I made on that occasion. There are no doubt other steps which have not, so far, been discussed by the General Assembly which could also usefully be taken. In this regard, the next 12 months may prove to be an interesting and perhaps even a fruitful period.

There is much discussion nowadays on ways and means to improve the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations and its effectiveness as a dynamic instrument for safeguarding international peace and security. I welcome such discussion because it reflects an appreciation of what the organization has already been able to achieve, sometimes under great handicaps. It is, no doubt, true that very often the problems that are left at the door of the United Nations are the difficult ones. This is as it should be; and in view of this circumstance, the United Nations cannot be expected to find without exception a satisfactory solution to every problem.

At the same time, looking ahead, it is reasonable to assume that, as the organization succeeds in solving one difficult problem after another, and resolving differences between member governments, it is gaining in strength and effectiveness almost imperceptibly. It is my earnest hope that this process will provide us with an ever-widening field of useful service in the cause of peace.

SOFT-SPOKEN NEUTRALIST: U THANT

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 25.—U Thant, of Burma, who as Secretary General issued a yearly report today on the activities of the United Nations, emerged into international prominence in the fall of 1961 after the death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of Sweden. Mr. Thant became the leading candidate for Secretary General when both the United States and Soviet Union found him acceptable. At the time Burma's chief representative to the United Nations, Mr. Thant was described as the only man acceptable to all members of the organization, a tribute to his standing as a neutral.

Although he is a man who believes in maintaining his "emotional equilibrium" at all times, Mr. Thant concedes that his sudden propulsion toward the focal point of world diplomacy produced a brief bit of personal excitement.

"It seems incredible," he observes calmly. "Of course, there was a moment of emotional excitement. But I have been trained in the Buddhist tradition of concentration and meditation to seek a certain detachment."

Like many of his countrymen, he has only one name. The "U" is a title of respect that has no exact English equivalent.

On the recommendation of the Security Council, the General Assembly elected him Acting Secretary General on November 3, 1961. A year later he was unanimously elected Secretary General, thwarting a Soviet campaign to establish a three-man directorate as the executive head of the United Nations. At the time Burma's chief representative to the United Nations, Mr. Thant was described as the only man acceptable to all members of the United Nations. His present term will end in 1966.

Mr. Thant's election ended a major crisis precipitated by the Soviet proposal to establish a politically divided directorate in place of the Secretary General's office. His performance and popularity within the organization persuaded the Soviet Government to abandon its proposal, at least for the present.

Since his election, Mr. Thant has used his persuasive talents to alleviate several crises, including the dramatic confrontations over Cuba and the Congo.

A CRISIS WEATHERED

In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the organization, Mr. Thant said the United Nations had weathered a "crisis of confidence" in the past year.

The 54-year-old diplomat is a pragmatic neutralist who strives for mediation and conciliation through quiet diplomacy. His basic goal is to produce a better understanding between East and West while narrowing the great gulf between rich and poor.

Mr. Thant is a scholarly, soft-spoken, modest man who looks as though he might be a high school teacher, which he was for many years in Burma.

As Secretary General, Mr. Thant is playing an extremely complex role in a period of constant crisis. The functions of the Secretary General are not clearly defined, leaving the scope and significance of the position largely to the man who fills it.

His key role is to interpret and execute policy decisions, which the General Assembly and the Security Council frequently phrase in general terms, because divergent views tend to preclude agreements in the United Nations on clear-cut policies. This often gives the Secretary General considerable leeway to act.

Born in the Burmese town of Pantanaw, near Rangoon, on January 22, 1909, he was the son of a prosperous rice miller. He was educated at the National High School in Pantanaw and at University College in Rangoon. At the age of 20 he won a nationwide translation competition.

URGED TO ENTER POLITICS

He went on to become a teacher, educator, and writer before entering politics after World War II at the urging of U Nu, who became Premier.

Mr. Thant served as an adviser and assistant to the Premier. He also filled several public-service posts before becoming Burma's chief representative to the United Nations in 1957. He was Vice President of the General Assembly's session in 1959.

The Secretary General is an imperturbable citizen of the world. He is impeccably dressed in a dark conservative suit during working hours. In his fashionable Manhattan apartment he wears the long Burmese kilt called a longyi.

His daughter, who did graduate work in sociology at Hunter College, was married in New York in a Buddhist ceremony in 1960. His only son, who also studied at Hunter, was killed in a motor accident in Burma.

Mr. Thant suffered the personal tragedy of his son's death in quiet dignity and then resumed his efforts to prevent international tragedies.

The consensus at the United Nations seems to be that he is carrying out "the most impossible job in the world" with the independence and impartiality required of a man who must stand between East and West.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release of the full address made by His Holiness Pope Paul VI when he received United Nations Secretary General U Thant in private audience on July 11.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF POPE'S TALK TO U THANT

The organization of the United Nations of which you are the renowned and efficient Secretary General is a historical reality of too great importance to leave us indifferent to this meeting with you, which is, on the contrary, a source of lively emotion.

This is because, Mr. Secretary General of the United Nations, the Holy See, which you are visiting today in our humble person, holds a very high conception of that international organization. It considers it to be the fruit of a civilization to which the Catholic religion, with its driving center in the Holy See, gave the vital principles. It considers it an instrument of brotherhood between nations, which the Holy See has always desired and promoted, and hence a brotherhood intended to favor progress and peace among men. It considers the United Nations as the steadily developing and improving form of the balanced and unified life of all humanity in its historical and earthly order.

The universality proper to the Catholic Church, with its pulsing heart here in Rome, seems in a way to be reflected from the spiritual sphere into the temporal sphere of the United Nations. The ideologies of those who belong to the United Nations are certainly multiple and diverse, and the Catholic Church regards them with due attention; but the convergence of so many races and so many states in a single organization, concerned with avoiding evils of war and favoring the good things of peace, is a fact which the Holy See considers as corresponding to its concept of humanity, and included within the area of its spiritual mission in the world.

In recent years the voice of the Popes, our predecessors, was among the first to augur the formation of a body such as that of which you, Mr. U Thant, guide the activities. In his own time, Pope Benedict XV desired it; its fundamental criteria were traced with happy foresight by Pope Pius XII in his Christmas message of 1939 and in the message of September 1944; then its importance was underlined, and its increasingly perfect functioning was encouraged by Pope John XXIII in his last encyclical letter, "Pacem in Terris," the text of which, bearing the autograph signature of the pontiff, was consigned to you, Mr. Secretary, by Cardinal Suenens.

We, therefore, derive consolation from your visit and we avail ourself of the occasion to renew the expression of our esteem and of our hopes for the fundamental program of the United Nations, especially in regard to elimination of war, the assistance of developing peoples, and of those in need of defense and promotion, the lawful liberties of individuals and social groups, and the safeguarding of the rights and dignity of the human person.

To these sentiments, then we add our good wishes for true prosperity of the great organization of the United Nations, and for the happy success of its activities to which, sir, you are so nobly dedicated. We pray Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, to grant and fulfill these our good wishes.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Catholic Reporter, May 24, 1963]

THE MESSAGE OF THE ENCYCLICAL—CARDINAL SUENENS SPEAKS TO THE U.N.

(NOTE.—Presented here is the complete text of the most authoritative interpretation of Pope John's encyclical, "Peace on Earth," yet produced. It was delivered last week by Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens, archbishop of Malines-Brussels, in the Converse room of the United Nations General Assembly Building before the annual meeting of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations. Cardinal Suenens spoke as the personal envoy of Pope John, who had been invited by the Committee to send a delegate to address the meeting. Besides serving as Primate of Belgium and head of one of the world's most populous dioceses, Cardinal Suenens is an influential thinker and has played an important role in deliberations of the Second Vatican Council. His books include two recently published in the United States: "The Nun in the World" and "Love and Control." Among the 400 persons present for Cardinal Suenens' address were U Thant, U.N. Secretary General; Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.; Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States; and Auxiliary Bishop James H. Griffiths of New York, Vatican observer at the United Nations.)

In response to the invitation of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations, Pope John XXIII has done me the honor of entrusting to me the duty of explaining to you, at the headquarters of the United Nations, the meaning and import of the encyclical "Peace on Earth."

I accepted this assignment with great pleasure, since it gave me the opportunity of acquainting the men of today with the mind and heart of the one who has sent me.

The papal document of which I shall speak is unprecedented in history.

It is addressed not only to the 500 million members of the church whose beloved shepherd is the successor of St. Peter, but it is framed as an "open letter to the whole world," as a dialog with all men of good will.

It has been greeted with unanimous acclaim by the press of the whole world, and has aroused responsive echoes among all the nations of the earth.

It speaks in a language that is simple, direct and man-to-man.

It was born of a great trust in God and at the same time of a trust in man, in that which is best in him.

One writer has compared it with Beethoven's "Ninth Symphony" and has called it the symphony of peace.

A fundamental theme, four movements and a finale. The theme which recurs, like a leitmotif, nine times, and which is especially developed in the third part of the encyclical, is in these words:

"Peace among all peoples requires truth as its foundation, justice as its rule, love as its driving force, liberty as its atmosphere."

This theme underlies each of the four sections that correspond to the four movements of the symphony and that fix the major laws which govern it: Peace in the harmony of individuals with each other, peace in the harmony between individuals and their political communities, peace in the harmony between political communities, peace in the harmony between individuals and political groups on the one hand and the whole community of men on the other.

I should like to focus with you on certain central ideas which are like peaks in a range of mountains that form the summitline which dominates the surroundings and keeps them in proportion.

This focusing on the essentials is made easier by the fact that the Pope has gone straight to the heart of the matter without detours or circumlocutions but simply with an outburst of his heart.

The Holy Father recently said to me, "There are people who like to make simple things complicated. I like to make complicated things simple."

The encyclical is a striking illustration of those words.

It is simple, but it has a simplicity which is the exact opposite of facile simplification. It does not ignore the complexities of the problems that have to be met or the antagonisms that have to be reconciled. It does not ignore the burden of history. But over and above those things that divide us, it focuses on those that unite us.

A statesman once said:

"I think that there exists among men—more often than we think—a common denominator. It is like a blackboard. You write a whole lot of big complicated fractions that seem irreconcilable and you know that by various arithmetical operations, by various successive eliminations, you can finally reach their common denominator, which is a very simple title figure that you never could have foreseen from the thickets."

That is what the encyclical "Peace on Earth" is. It is the discovery of the common denominator among men of good will.

Once that is understood, it remains only for us to make—not an analysis, for it is too abundant—but only a rapid examination.

It seems to me that in the encyclical we can discern a fourfold appeal:

An appeal for respect for the individual.

An appeal for collaboration among nations.

An appeal for the creation of a supranational power.

An appeal for collaboration among men despite their ideological differences.

Let us examine each of these, one by one.

I. APPEAL FOR RESPECT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

At the start of this mountain range there stands, like a Mont Blanc dominating the terrain, the basic affirmation of the inviolable and inalienable rights of each individual human being.

Any dialog among men is impossible unless both sides accept a hierarchy of values or at least a first principle which governs everything. That principle, the encyclical tells us, is the recognition of the dignity and rights of the individual.

At the start the Pope forms the dialog with delegates of the United Nations who here promulgated, on December 10, 1948, the universal declaration of the rights of man.

That declaration solemnly recognizes for all men without exception their individual dignity. It affirms for every individual his rights to seek freely for truth, to follow the rules of morality, to practice the duties of justice, to demand living conditions that conform to human dignity.

Those inalienable and sacred rights, the Pope reaffirms, sets forth in detail, and defines.

Those rights, he declares, are valid and necessary in all latitudes and longitudes, without regard to place, or to racial, political, ideological, or religious differences.

Respect for those rights is at the foundation of every social structure.

A well-known author (Antoine de St. Exupery) put this thought very well when he said:

"If respect for man is established in the hearts of men, men will succeed by establishing in return a social, political and economic system that will enshrine that respect."

But if the respect due to the individual is the starting point for every civilization, it is to the individual that we must return to begin the movement of opening up to others which, step by step, will bring about the peace of the world.

This opening up to others, far from contradicting the true personality of man, is an integrating factor. A person who turns inward, who turns away from society weakens, stifles and ultimately denies himself. The relationship to others is located as of right in the heart of the true personality and assists its development.

It is therefore in the souls of each one of us that at the outset the peace of the world is cast.

It is from there that it must spread out, in concentric circles, to the limits of the universe.

It is from there that it must extend, more and more, like waves which carry images and which need successive relay stations to go around the world.

International peace begins in the souls of each one of us. Its boundary line is not marked by this or that river or ocean or mountain range. It coincides, at the start, with the frontiers of our hearts.

Peace must begin at this first level, if we wish to erect, stone by stone, the vast and complex edifice of peace among nations.

Peace begins at home. Charity begins at home—according to the saying that you know so well—but I hasten to add: Charity must not remain at home. Peace begins in the bosom of each family and spreads from there to the street, to the neighborhood, to the city, to the nation, to the world. Each gesture of peace, each little peace, each small-scale decision, helps the big-scale decisions that carry into effect peace among nations. General peace depends upon peace in these particular situations, these humble and modest efforts at pacification which are being accomplished, without fanfare in all social classes and at all levels.

The father who settles a family dispute and brings his household together, the office-worker who settles a quarrel and changes the atmosphere of his surroundings, the employer and the union leader who make an effort to understand each other and overcome the antagonisms between their particular interests, the history professor who lights up the past with serene objectivity—all these, and I could go on indefinitely—bring their own precious contributions to the building of peace.

If we are not to lose all reality, we must never neglect any work of peace that is within our reach.

II. APPEAL FOR COLLABORATION AMONG NATIONS

But individuals are not isolated. They are parts of political communities.

"These political communities," the encyclical tells us, "must harmonize their relations according to truth and justice, in the spirit of active solidarity and in liberty."

Truth requires us to recognize "the natural equality of all political communities in dignity and human nobility."

Truth requires us to treat every people with serene objectivity.

Truth requires us to eliminate all news-disseminating procedures that do unjust harm to the reputation of any people.

Justice in turn implies recognition "of mutual rights and the fulfillment of their corresponding duties."

Justice requires that "when political communities advance opposing interests, the conflicts may be settled neither by force of arms nor by fraud or deceit, but by mutual understanding, by an objective appraisal of the facts and by an equitable compromise."

The sense of solidarity requires that peoples do not close themselves off in narrow compartments and that they place in common their individual riches, at all levels, and they enter into broad mutual interchanges.

The sense of liberty finally demands abstention from intrusion into the internal affairs of other peoples and the encouraging in others of the development of the sense of responsibility and of initiative.

Such, briefly, are the rules of the road which lead to peace, rules which must be respected in the relations between the various political communities.

This fundamental principle of necessary collaboration between peoples collides, as you know, with this drama of our century which is called the armaments race.

If we want the nations to build together the peace of the world, we must as soon as possible free the way and escape from this impasse.

Thus, the solemn warning on disarmament that the Pope addresses to the world:

"On the other hand, it is with deep sorrow that we note the enormous stocks of armaments that have been and still are being made in more economically developed countries, with a vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources. And so it happens that, while the people of these countries are loaded with heavy burdens, other countries as a result are deprived of the collaboration they need in order to make economic and social progress.

"The production of arms is allegedly justified on the grounds that in present-day conditions peace cannot be preserved without an equal balance of armaments. And so, if one country increases its armaments, others feel the need to do the same; and if one country is equipped with nuclear weapons, other countries must produce their own, equally destructive.

"Consequently, people live in constant fear lest the storm that every moment threatens should break upon them with dreadful violence. And with good reason, for the arms of war are ready at hand. Even though it is difficult to believe that anyone would deliberately take the responsibility for the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring in its train, it cannot be denied that the conflagration may be set off by some uncontrollable and unexpected chance. And one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on the earth.

"Justice, then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease. That the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned, the banning of atom weapons and finally disarmament brought about by common agreement and accomplished by effective controls."

This is an appeal for reconciliation, for a dialog between peoples. Confidence cannot be born overnight; but between blind confidence and systematic distrust, there is room for a measured and progressive trust. A journey of a thousand leagues, according to an oriental proverb, begins with a single step.

The sovereign pontiff invites the peoples to progress toward trust, toward an opening to others not only personal but collective. But if the path is long and arduous it merits being followed. This effort is "both demanded by reason, supremely desirable and of the greatest usefulness."

The peoples do not have a choice: Either they choose the armaments race with, as the end of this rivalry, the permanent risk of collective nuclear suicide; or they select the progressive trust which alone can engender the trust necessary to the stability of the peace.

But this is yet only the elimination of an obstacle. A true collaboration between peoples demands a positive converging effort.

If the nightmare of the armaments race disappears from the horizon almost unlimited possibilities of fruitful collaboration will present themselves. We can then begin to solve, by indispensable and urgent collaboration, according to the scale of our needs, the principal social problem of our time.

This problem, as we all know, is that of the developing countries.

No man of good will can accept the fact that two-thirds of the world—2 million of every 3 million men—do not attain the level of normal human development that technology places at the disposition of privileged peoples. No one can accept coldly the fact that two men out of every three live in an undernourished state. No one can accept such a flagrant inequality of the distribution of the fruits of the earth. Civilization is not worthy of its name if it resigns itself to this collective social sin.

This disproportion, this disequilibrium, hangs with all its weight on the peace of the world, but, even if this were not the case, no one could accept passively this situation of collective social injustice, the most flagrant of our century.

It is necessary to break, at any price, the vicious circle which results in men being poor throughout the greater part of the world because they produce too little and produce too little because they are too poor to produce more.

It is necessary to attack the evil at its roots and bring all our powers to bear so that every individual and every people can attain the level of human diginity, the "level of hope" in a better future. Time is short.

"In a world which counts an additional man every second, one has not the right to be an hour behind. Misery does not wait.

"Two out of every three men suffer from endemic or acute hunger. Every year, of 60 million deaths, hunger and its consequences cause 30 to 40 million, that is to say as much as the last war, in five years, with all its resources and destruction.

"It is necessary that this 'unmerited misery' of peoples cease. Another reason that the swords, of which the Prophet Isaiah spoke, become plowshares."

The hour has come for a vast collective movement of aid and of effective solidarity at the scale of our needs.

But in order that this aid may be valid and accepted, the encyclical asserts an essential condition: "that this indispensable aid be given with full respect for the liberty of the developing peoples."

It does not suffice to wish good for someone. It is necessary to wish it with him, with respect for his own personality, with the fundamental concern of aiding him to become himself and to reveal himself to himself and to the world. The necessary aid ought to be granted always in the framework of these words of the French philosopher, Louis Lavelle:

"The greatest good that we can do to others is not to transmit our riches to them, but to discover theirs."

The Pope expressed this same concern with these words:

"Let us underline it with emphasis, the aid brought to these peoples cannot be accompanied by any fetters on their independence. They must besides feel themselves principally responsible for their economic and social progress."

These words echo the invitation formulated already in another encyclical, "Mater et" Magistra. This document, devoted to economic and social problems, completes the thought of "Pacem in Terris" in these words:

"Economically developed States must take the greatest care so that in coming to aid the developing countries they do not seek their own political advantage in a spirit of domination.

"If that is going to happen it will be necessary to declare firmly that it is not to establish a colonialism of a new type, masked, without a doubt, but no less dominating than that which numerous political communities have recently left. This would damage international relations and create a danger for the peace of the world.

"It is indispensable therefore and justice requires that this technical and financial aid be transmitted in the most sincere political disinterestedness. It must have the objective of placing the communities in the path of economic development and at the same time of realizing by their own efforts their economic and social progress."

In order to act effectively, with regard to the extent of the problem to be resolved and its complexity, men must believe with a strong conviction that the solution is realizable and that it is within reach of their efforts.

At the time of the U.S. War of Secession, Admiral Dupont laboriously explained to Admiral Farragut one day why he could not bring his warships into the port of Charleston.

Farragut, after having heard him out, said: "Dupont, there is one more reason."

"What, then?"

"You did not believe that you could do it."

In order to achieve the progress of the developing countries we must believe that this work does not exceed our combined forces. Where there is a will, there is a way.

The Sovereign Pontiff asks men of good will to believe in the possibilities of succeeding in this most extensive work which is worthy of man and of most noble aspirations.

III. APPEAL FOR THE CREATION OF A SUPERNATURAL POWER

In order to be effective and real this collaboration among peoples requires at the highest level, a coordinating organ. This is why His Holiness John XXIII concluded his exhortation for collaboration by all with an appeal for a better organization of the public powers charged with assuring the universal common good.

The extent of these problems to be resolved is, of itself, an invitation to constitute a public authority of worldwide scope, it being always understood that the principle of "subsidiarity" must control the relations of this world authority with the governments of states and that the latter retain, within their own sphere, the exercise of their responsibilities.

In our time (the Pope writes), the universal common good poses problems of worldwide scope. They can only be resolved by a public authority whose power, organization, and means of action also have worldwide scope and which can take action throughout the whole world. It is thus the moral order itself which requires the organization of a public authority of universal jurisdiction.

And the Pope continues:

"This organization of a general character, whose authority extends throughout the world, and which possesses effective means for the promotion of the universal good, must be established by unanimous agreement and not imposed by force. The reason for this is that the authority in question ought to be able to perform its functions effectively; but it is also necessary that it be impartial toward all, absolutely independent of partisan spirit and attentive to the needs of the universal common good. If this supranational or world power was installed by force by the most powerful nations, one might fear that it would serve particular interests or that it would take the side of this or that nation that would compromise the value and the effectiveness of its action. Despite inequalities that economic development and armament introduce among political communities, they are always very sensitive in respect of legal equality and of moral dignity. This is the very valid reason why national communities would only accept with repugnance power which would be imposed on them by force, or which would be organized without their participation or which they would not have joined freely."

And the Pope concludes with this wish:

"It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable rights. This is all the more to be hoped for since all human beings, as they take an ever more active part in the public life of their own political communities, are showing an increasing interest in the affairs of all peoples, and are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of a world community."

IV. AN APPEAL FOR COLLABORATION AMONG MEN DESPITE THEIR IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

The encyclical contains a fourth appeal: for collaboration among men in the economic, social, and political domains despite ideologies which place them in opposition:

"However, one must never confuse error and the person who errs. It must be borne in mind, furthermore, that neither can false philosophical teachings regarding the nature, origin, and destiny of the universe and of man, be identified with historical ends, not even when those movements have originated from those teachings and have drawn and still draw inspiration therefrom. Because the teachings, once they are drawn up and defined, remain always the same, while the movements, working on historical situations in constant evolution, cannot but be influenced by these latter and cannot avoid, therefore, being subject to changes, even of a profound nature."

That is to say that it is not necessary to identify the flesh-and-bones men with whom we come in contact according to the abstract logic of the ideologies that they profess.

Every Christian knows that the Christianity which inspires him is worth more than the practical translation which he gives it due to weakness and egoism in his daily life. He must know that the opposite is also true; it happens that one may join and cooperate in social efforts emanating from those whose principles, for one reason or another, one cannot accept.

His Holiness John XXIII, at the conclusion of his letter, invites us to go forward to the discovery of men beyond the ideologies which oppose them to one another. And what is true for men is true for peoples.

Neither can the latter be identified with the political systems in which they exist.

A limitless field of discoveries opens there before us. Today people are not more ignorant, but they do not know themselves further.

A quarter of an hour passed in some airport shows to what degree men of five continents come together and are seized by the same rhythm of life.

But this encounter is not yet a meeting.

People are elbow to elbow but each is lost in the anonymous crowd; no one has given his name nor shown his true visage.

We are still far from the grouping together of people, farther yet from a real communion and from human friendship.

Men pass, side by side, as hurried and distracted travelers without exchanging a word, nor a fraternal handshake nor a smile.

We do not seek to know what constitutes the profound soul of each people. We do not know the hidden treasures of culture and of noble traditions which could become, in the interchange, a common good for humanity and an enrichment for all.

A first revolution will be made if men learn simply to speak to each other and not only to co-exist side by side.

Our century has discovered interplanetary space, but it has hardly explored the space which separates men from each other.

Our century has thrown gigantic bridges over rivers, but it does not yet know how to build bridges from people to people and to join the two sides.

Our century has discovered nuclear energy, but it has yet to discover the creative energy of peace and of concord which embodies a simple act of love and of mutual understanding.

It is for qualified and wise statesmen, the encyclical tells us, to determine the stages, the means and the extent of reconciliation among peoples but it is for each of us, starting now, to create the atmosphere therefor.

The least effort of justice and of equity, of objectivity and of understanding in public relations, opens the way toward this revolution to which humanity aspires and which looks toward the introduction and the stabilization of peace among men.

In addressing to you, as a supreme testament, this charter on peace, His Holiness John XXIII has only one ambition and one desire: to render the earth a better place in which mankind may live.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on the 25th of June, 1963, the Senate and House passed and sent to the President a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the months of July and August since most of the appropriation bills had not been enacted into law.

The House of Representatives today has passed an amendment to that continuing resolution, extending it until October 31, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 667.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (H.J. Res. 667), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 667) was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 667) was passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 29, 1963 (Public Law 88-55), is hereby amended by striking out "August 31, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 31, 1963".

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on my amendment No. 82, which I understand is the pending amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102. I express my sincere thanks to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the committee, for arranging a parliamentary situation whereby the Senate will proceed to the consideration of this amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

I offer the amendment as the administration's amendment. The amendment was prepared by the administration. It is a sound amendment, in my judgment. I shall briefly outline it.

The amendment retains the procedure set forth in the President's original recommendation to the Congress, the original Senate Joint Resolution 102, with this major modification, which was first proposed by the Secretary of Labor in a conference in the majority leader's office several days ago, prior to the final action of the Senate Commerce Committee, as representing the administration's proposal: It proposes that a seven-man board, two from the carriers, two from the brotherhoods, and three public members, the public members to be selected necessarily by the President, proceed to arbitrate the dispute, under the auspices of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They would make their award recommendations to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would have authority to modify the award if it saw fit, and then promulgate the award.

Speaking only for myself, I say to the carriers and to my colleagues in the Senate that, in my judgment, the possibilities and probabilities of any modification of an award of a fair board of arbitration are most remote.

This proposal of the Secretary of Labor, as he submitted it in the majority leader's office the other day, follows a procedure that prevailed during World War II, under the jurisdiction of the National War Labor Board. The National War Labor Board had ultimate jurisdiction, but there was a series of regional War Labor Boards, and special commissions. For example, there was the West Coast Lumber Commission, which had jurisdiction over all disputes in the lumber industry in the Western States. There was a special commission known as the Shipbuilding Stabilization Commission. Other commissions involved other industries.

I served as chairman of the Appeals Division of the National War Labor Board, which had jurisdiction of appeals, acting on behalf of the Board, although there was a procedure permitting a case to be sent to the full Board if necessary. But that did not become necessary. There was a right to take appeals from any decisions of special commissions or regional boards.

Our policy was to sustain the decisions of the special commissions, except on one score: If a special commission should hand down a decision that violated the National Wage Policy, it knew that it would be reversed on that point. It never became necessary to reverse them, because the boards maintained contact with the national Board and determined the question of fact as to what the national wage policy was with respect to a given area. At no time was it necessary to reverse a special commission.

I cite that fact in support of the opinion I have just expressed that, in my judgment, the probability of the Interstate Commerce Commission's modifying a decision of a fair arbitration board is most remote. But I am willing to come to grips with the essence of the argument of those who are in opposition to this part of the measure I am offering. Should this authority be given the Interstate Commerce Commission? My answer is, "Yes, by all means." I know that I am dealing with a phase of the law that is pregnant with legal abstractions.

These legal abstractions are vital to the preservation of our rights in the whole field of American jurisprudence. Let me say to American labor, particularly railroad labor, that in this instance they are vital to the best interests of railroad labor.

It has been argued that the railroad brotherhoods do not have confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is a rather sad commentary. It certainly would be no justification for Members of Congress to refuse to give to an existing legal agency of Government jurisdiction which falls clearly within the sphere and the province of its authority. It is our agency. It is our instrumentality. Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commission. I do not want to assume that Members of Congress would wish to confess to incompetency on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and not have done anything about it over recent years.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate who make that argument: "What proposals have you made for modifying the Interstate Commerce Commission if you think in an hour of crisis it is not the Government agency that can carry out such legislative function as we seek to delegate to it in my proposal?"

I deny the premise, because in my judgment the Interstate Commerce Commission is qualified and competent to carry out the duties that are sought to be imposed upon it in my proposal.

I said last night, and I repeat briefly here, that we have assigned to the Interstate Commerce Commission by law a great many duties in the field of labor relations, although they have not been so called. Sections 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act turns over to the Commission administration of the Washington agreement. The Washington agreement came out of the house of the brotherhoods as well as of the carriers. It was the result of a negotiated understanding which the parties reached. We gave to the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction to administer it in the case of all mergers that deal with job security, and the present dispute is primarily a problem of job security.

I do not buy the argument that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have the competency or experience which qualifies it to deal with the review power which is provided for in the substitute amendment now under discussion.

That is not the only jurisdiction which the Interstate Commerce Commission has over jobs and working rules. When we are dealing with the Interstate Commerce Commission we are dealing with an agency of Government—and I do not believe this is subject to dispute—that knows more about railroad problems than any other group within the Government. We have given them the jurisdiction to supervise and regulate the railroads of the country, and have done so for years by legislative fiat.

I am one politician who is not going to give heed to the propaganda of the brotherhoods, that because they do not want the dispute to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission, Congress should not place it with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Who is in control of this Government, the brotherhoods, or Congress, acting on behalf of all the people?

If we have set up a commission in behalf of all the people which is not competent to regulate the railroads and pass upon the issues of job security involved in connection with working rules which affect the operation of the railroads, we had better get busy and do something about the Interstate Commerce Commission. I will not vote to keep this dispute from the Interstate Commerce Commission merely because some brotherhood politicians do not want it placed in the Interstate Commerce Commission. They ought to be brought under the canopy of a system of Government by law. We have in our system of Government by law an existing agency to which we have entrusted jurisdiction over railroad operations.

Every time the Interstate Commerce Commission must deal with a litigious matter, or an adversary matter, in regard to a continuance or discontinuance of a railroad train or a railroad line, working rules are bound up in that controversy, and jobs are bound up in it, and the interests of families of those who are connected with the railroad are bound up in it.

For years the Interstate Commerce Commission has been given jurisdiction by Congress to pass on that subject matter.

I could cite the authority that the Interstate Commerce Commission has over safety matters. Do Senators believe that jobs are not involved in that field? Do Senators believe that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not passing in those cases upon job security, upon the bread and butter of hundreds and perhaps even thousands of workers in the railroad industry? Of course it is.

We should come to grips with this problem. Let us not assume, a most extreme hypothetical situation. Aside from the appeal procedure, to which I shall refer in a moment, and remaining in the political arena for the moment, suppose that the Interstate Commerce Commission should hand down an unfair decision. Do Senators believe that we would sit on our haunches?

The Commission is our agent. It is our baby. We gave it birth. We have clothed it with its jurisdiction.

I say to the members of the brotherhoods that they have no right at this time to suppose that Congress would sit idly by—if all the fears that they have voiced in their lobbying activities of recent days on the Hill should prove to have any justification in fact—and permit an injustice to be done to the railroad workers. We would not, any more than we would sit by and permit an injustice to be done to the stockholders of the railroads. They, too, are parties to the dispute.

As I have listened to some of the discussions in the cloakrooms and elsewhere, I have come to the conclusion that apparently some people believe that there is only one party to the dispute; namely, the railroad brotherhoods. There are two others, and one of them is more important than two of the three. They are the carriers and there is the public. The public interest must come first. I say most respectfully that Congress, in this historic debate, should direct its attention to what is in the best interest of the public. The substitute which I am offering this afternoon is in the best interest of the public and fair to the party litigants. It would set up a seven-man arbitration board. That is what the committee measure would do. It is a tripartite board. We may finally decide upon a presidential appointment, if necessary, to arbitrate the dispute, now that the parties have put Congress in the position where it must pass some legislation. That would call for arbitration. What kind of arbitration? Senators should remember that if this dispute is kept within the framework of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we make available to the parties all the procedures of review and appeal, and all the procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act. If we put it in the hands of an independent, ad hoc arbitration board, those procedures will not be available to the parties. I am at a loss to understand why the brotherhoods have not recognized that important procedural difference between my proposal and that of the committee.

My amendment speaks for itself. However, because questions have been raised in respect to how all the issues in dispute will be handled, I wish to read section 6 of my amendment, beginning on page 5, line 18. I am talking about the so-called secondary issues. The two main issues go directly to arbitration, and this is the way the so-called secondary issues are included, although I know of no real secondary issues in the case, for every issue involves the bread and butter of thousands of workers. Every issue is of vital concern to the railroad families of the country. In my judgment, every issue, unless equitably handled, could lead to a strike. So my proposal handles this problem as follows, beginning on page 5, line 18:

> SEC. 6. The parties shall proceed immediately to bargain collectively, with the assistance of the National Mediation Board, concerning any unresolved issues regarding any proposals which were included in the notices of November 2, 1959, or September 7, 1960, but which do not involve the manning of train or engine crews and the protection of the interests of the employees affected thereby. If agreement has not been reached within sixty days following the effective date of this joint resolution, any party may submit its proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If the Commission determines (1) that the party submitting such proposal has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach a settlement of such issues through collective bargaining, and (2) that it is unlikely that any agreement with respect to such issue or issues or with respect to voluntary procedures for the disposition of such issue or issues will result from further efforts to bargain collectively, the Commission shall refer the proposal to the Special Board—

That is the special arbitration board provided for in the amendment—

> for disposition in the same manner as in the case of applications filed under section 1. The provisions of section 5 of this joint resolution shall be applicable to matters covered by such proposals.
>
> SEC. 7. (a) The provisions of the Act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," (29 U.S.C. 101–115) shall not be applicable to an action under sections 5 or 6 of this Act. In any such action, service of the complaint and summons shall be made on the parties to the controversy by delivery thereof to an officer or to any other agent of said parties authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process.

Mr. President, I close with this final argument: Unless there are vital reasons for not following the original proposal of the President of the United States, I plead with Senators to support the hand of the President, for, in my judgment, he recommended to Congress a procedure that is fair. It has been greatly improved by the Wirtz amendment. The amendment provides for the tripartite board that the Committee on Commerce provides, a board which would function under the auspices of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The proposal would provide for a fair settlement of the dispute. It continues to avoid my major objection to the committee's proposal of an ad hoc, general, compulsory arbitration board that might very well set an unfortunate precedent that could be brought to bear upon many labor disputes in the future, involving workers outside the railway industry.

I repeat what I said last night: Congress has always, as a matter of course, tended to treat railway labor differently, legislatively, than the rest of labor. Thus, we have the National Mediation Board, the Washington agreement, the boards that are established to handle the retirement funds of the railroad brotherhoods, the Chicago board that considers grievances that arise with respect to the expenditures of funds. There is a set of separate legislation for railway labor, including the Interstate Commerce Act and the Railway Labor Act of 1926.

The proposal offered by the administration keeps the procedure within the framework of existing legislation that is applicable to railroad labor.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 145 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Anderson
Clark
Goldwater
Gruening
Javits
Kennedy
Mansfield
McClellan
Metcalf
Morse
Nelson
Randolph
Simpson
Smathers
Young, Ohio

NAYS—75

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—10

Bayh
Carlson
Eastland
Engle
Hartke
Neuberger
Stennis
Walters
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Morse's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Morse amendment to the committee amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in relation to the last vote. A crowded reception has been underway on behalf of my distinguished junior colleague, Hon. Herbert S. Walters. When someone notified him that a vote was being taken, he tore himself away from his friends to come to the Senate Chamber, arriving as the rollcall was completed. He desired me to state that if he had been one-half minute earlier, he would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure that it will be of great interest to Senators that a representative of the Committee on Commerce conferred with Dr. Roy L. Sexton of the Doctors Hospital regarding our distinguished colleague and great friend, Senator Clair Engle, who has been ill. The doctor announced to us this morning that the Senator from California is in excellent condition and he expects to send him home in a week or 10 days. Indications are that the operation has been successful.

[Applause.]

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I call up the so-called McGee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 11, beginning with the word "all" on line 1, it is proposed to strike out all through line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "60 days after the filing of the award."

On page 11, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "(a)".

On page 11, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 through 24.

On page 12, beginning with the word "when" on line 4, it is proposed to strike out all through line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one hundred and fifty days after the date of its enactment, except that it shall remain in effect with respect to the last sentence of section 4 for the period prescribed in that sentence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington ask to have the amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do, temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the ranking minority member of our committee, and other Senators have had discussions on the McGee amendments and section 6(b) of the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102, the so-called Cotton amendment. All of us have discussed this subject at considerable length today. We have reached the point where there is very little difference on the question.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], along with certain staff members, are in the process of working out an amendment to be added to the McGee amendments, but in order to keep the Senate working on this matter, I have asked that the McGee amendments be considered by the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] expect to present some modifications to the McGee amendments, which will probably be agreeable to all concerned, which will allow us to move on. The Senators who have been working on the problem are doing their best, and they will be in the Chamber in a few minutes. They did not know that the McGee amendments would be considered at this juncture.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] is quite familiar with the basic objectives of both the Cotton amendment, section 6(b) of the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102, and the so-called McGee amendments, joined in by other Senators. I think it would be well for Senators to listen to the Senator from Rhode Island for a few moments, and thereby save time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, with the exception of that part of the McGee amendments which is now being worked on by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], I shall explain the substance of the McGee amendments.

Senators have heard a great deal of discussion as to what is involved in the issues in controversy between the two parties; namely, the carriers and the brotherhoods. Senators have heard of the firemen issue. The firemen issue has to do with employment of firemen now being engaged on diesel locomotives, for jobs which the carriers have considered to be unnecessary and obsolete. There are 32,500 so-called firemen. That is considered a primary issue.

The next primary issue is the crew consist issue. This has to do with the making up of the crews.

In addition there are the so-called secondary issues. They are secondary only by comparison to the primary issues. Insofar as importance is concerned, they certainly are important issues. Secondary issues include the following:

First, interdivisional runs. That means that the runs can be extended beyond the divisions that are now recognized, or that some of the jobs could be constricted.

Second, combination of road and yard service.

Third, manning of self-propelled machines.

Fourth, wage structure and fringe benefits.

Fifth, employment security.

Sixth, training.

As the joint resolution was reported by the committee, it would require that within 30 days a tripartite board of arbitration be set up, to consist of two members chosen by the workers, two members chosen by the carriers, and three to be agreed upon. In the event there was no agreement, then the President of the United States would choose the three public members. In short, the arbitration board was to consist of seven individuals.

The Board would consider and arbitrate the so-called primary issues, which relate to the firemen and the crew consist, and would decide them within a period of 60 days.

After an award was filed with the district court of the District of Columbia, under the committee amendment, if the parties had not between themselves, through the process of collective bargaining, resolved the so-called secondary issues, after the expiration of 30 days, such issues would be referred to the same Board of arbitration, which then would consider the so-called secondary issues for a period of 60 days; and then the whole package would be complete. In the meantime, the award with respect to the two primary issues would not become effective until all issues had been resolved.

Some members of the committee felt, because of the allegations made by the brotherhoods, that there had never been any collective bargaining, so to speak, with respect to the so-called secondary issues. Apparently those issues had been discussed informally and generally, but had never been on the table for purposes of collective bargaining. Inasmuch as that was the case, certain members of the committee felt that it would be injudicious at this time to subject to compulsory arbitration issues which had never been discussed in collective bargaining. For that reason it was felt that the arbitration should be confined solely and strictly to the two primary issues—the firemen issue and the crew consist issue—and that the secondary issues should go completely to collective bargaining.

The only question which arose was: Inasmuch as, under section 5, the award on the two primary issues would not become effective until such time as the secondary issues had been resolved, if subsection (b) of section 6, which had to do with those issues, were deleted, then there would be an open end. The argument was made that unless the award on the two primary issues were settled, the parties could go on ad infinitum, without ever resolving the secondary issues so that the primary issues could become effective; and we would be in no better position at the end than we were at the beginning.

Because of that fact, the House committee reported to the House a measure which did not include the secondary issues for purposes of arbitration. It left those to collective bargaining. But the House committee did "button up" section 5 by making the award on the two primary issues effective after a period of 60 days from the time of the filing of the award with the District Court of the District of Columbia.

That is what the McGee amendments would do. The McGee amendments follow the House committee measure. They would delete from the arbitration the so-called secondary issues, leaving those up to the parties for consideration. They would put a time limit for the effective date on the award for the primary issues, by making the award effective after 60 days, no matter what the parties had done about the secondary issues.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under the McGee amendments, would the strike scheduled for Thursday morning be prevented?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. That language is contained in the joint resolution. The McGee amendments have nothing to do with that language. The joint resolution itself would prohibit the carriers from posting their new rules and also would prevent a strike or a work stoppage during the effective period of the award.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would happen to the secondary issues in the event the parties could not agree in collective bargaining?

Mr. PASTORE. The secondary issues would not be resolved. The situation would not be any different than it has been, but the brotherhoods could not strike until the award on the primary issues was put in effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. If there were no agreement, would the Board arbitrate the issues under the McGee amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. It is the feeling of the members of the committee that the two primary issues are the stumbling blocks; and that once those are disposed of, the parties will enter into collective bargaining. There is no guarantee. But, fundamentally, I want Senators to consider that what we are doing this afternoon is apparently unprecedented, for this reason: For years management and labor have historically and traditionally been opposed to compulsory arbitration. This measure is a deviation from that philosophy. Today, because of the calamitous situation, or, as the President said, the catastrophic situation, which would arise in the event of a strike, we are deviating from tradition. There is no question about it. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon has said, this is the first time in a long time that the Congress of the United States has undertaken to legislate on compulsory arbitration.

In order to soften that blow, in order to solve the problem once and for all, since we are acting because of the unusualness of the situation, we are bending over backward to leave to collective bargaining certain issues which have never been discussed in good faith under the procedures of collective bargaining. In other words, this is what I would call an hermaphroditic situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Senator from Rhode Island and the McGee amendment, should the secondary issues not be resolved through collective bargaining, the board would have no jurisdiction. The question would have to be resubmitted to the Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. The question would not have to be resubmitted to the Congress. There are two important issues——

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. PASTORE. The award will be coming into effect. There will be that pressure. I have answered the question. It is true that we are in a state of suspended animation in the event the parties do not agree by collective bargaining; but, after all, neither party can do much about posting rules or going on strike until the award on the two major issues has gone into effect and I believe the McGee amendment will extend the period by 30 days.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the report by the committee, is it not true that should the secondary issues not be agreed upon through collective bargaining, the board would have jurisdiction to arbitrate those issues?

Mr. PASTORE. That is absolutely correct. That is what the committee had in mind when it reported the measure. This is a compromise.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the McGee amendments would strike out that provision.

Mr. PASTORE. The McGee amendments would strike that provision out. The Senator is correct. It agrees with the House version.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question about the McGee amendment. On page 12 of the measure, it is provided that the expiration date of this resolution is going to be 150 days after the date of enactment. I am wondering where that would leave the parties if this measure should expire after 150 days with respect to two things: First of all, with respect to the two primary issues which the arbitration board will settle; and, secondly, with respect to the secondary issues which, under the McGee amendment would still be left to negotiation.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may interrupt the Senator from Iowa, he will remember I was very particular when I explained the joint resolution. I did not go into that question because it is being considered. Before we become confused, let us wait until Senators who are working on it return to the Chamber.

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry. I did not hear the Senator's explanation.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not go into that question because Senators are working on the problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They will return soon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator from Florida correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say that, under the committee resolution as reported, machinery was provided for settlement of all issues, suspending to a date considerably later than the decision of the two principal issues the date by which the secondary issues must be resolved? Am I correct?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. With reference to the administration bill, is the Senator from Florida also correctly informed that the administration measure likewise provided machinery whereby the two major issues would be first decided and the secondary issues would be finally decided either by collective bargaining, or, if that failed, under the machinery provided for in the measure?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Why is the able chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearing now proposing a measure which departs from both those approaches and provides no terminal facilities for the secondary issues?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island is not proposing this amendment. I wish to make that abundantly clear. I do not think there is a great deal of difference between the two proposals. This amendment was discussed in the committee at the time subsection (b) of section 6 came before the committee for consideration, and subsection (b) was unanimously adopted by the committee. The minority or additional views developed sometime after the meeting.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am explaining this amendment on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. As matters now stand, the Senator from Rhode Island will support the amendment.

The issue is clear. If Senators desire all the secondary issues to go to arbitration in the event they are not resolved within 30 days after the award is filed on the primary issues, they should vote against the McGee amendment and support the committee amendment. On the other hand, if Senators feel they prefer the McGee amendment, they should support it.

The issue is clear. It is not a question of why or why not. If Senators are for the McGee amendment, they should vote "yea." If they are for the committee amendment, they should vote "nay" on the McGee amendment. The issue is as simple as that. Do not ask me why certain Members of the Senate want it one way or the other. I have been here 13 years and I have never been able to figure that out.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. While the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has not solved the enigma to which he has referred, I think he has helped some of us figure it out by his very clear explanation of the McGee amendments.

With the indulgence of the Senate, because not only is the joint resolution unusual, but the situation is unusual, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Wyoming have gotten their conference together, and they have a suggestion to make, at least to modify the McGee amendments in the respect I spoke about when I brought them up.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I will address myself to two questions:

First. Preserving the maximum of collective bargaining, and

Second. Narrowing the area of compulsion to the smallest possible base.

In contrast to the President's bill which, in my judgment, would set a precedent for throwing other major labor disputes into the laps of Federal boards, the pending proposal of the Committee would narrow the precedent to a one-time-only proposition. Should the proposal have gone to the ICC, it would have set a precedent for a future airlines dispute going to the CAB; a steamship dispute going to the Maritime Board; and a communications dispute going to the FCC.

A further serious limitation of the ICC approach is contained in the fact that none of the appointees was ever consciously selected because of his experience or training in labor-management negotiations. These Boards were created to regulate, not to arbitrate.

A third reason for opposing the ICC approach is that the Commission in itself creates a psychological block among the brotherhoods. Rightly or wrongly, they feel it is prejudiced in favor of the carriers.

The basis for arbitration of the two primary issues—firemen-helper and crew consist—stems from the August 15 public declaration by both sides that they voluntarily would submit these two questions to arbitration. The committee, therefore, proceeded within that context to set up procedures for implementing those voluntary intentions.

Whether those intentions on either side were sincere or merely arrived at for publicity purposes would seem to matter not at all. The fact of the declarations gives to this dispute a special character all its own; a character which makes this instance in labor-management history readily identifiable and thus less subject to the establishment of precedents for future disputes. This becomes one of the most powerful recommendations for the committee bill. It clearly makes it a one-time thing.

In addition, my amendment to the bill, which would remove the secondary issues from the compulsory features of the two primary questions, further limits the scope of the pending settlement. There is no reason to force the secondary issues into the same formula of quasi-compulsion as is proposed for the two primary issues. At no time have the secondary issues been bona fide subjects of collective bargaining. Both sides, in fact, have contended that, once the two big questions were agreed upon, the minor ones would fall into place.

It is a weak case which contends that, once the two major issues are settled, the minor questions then become major and will not be settled. This is presumptuous and prejudges the intents of either or both sides. The litigants' protestations of a willingness to settle secondary issues once the primary ones are disposed of need to be "called." They have to be given a chance in the interest of preserving the deep principles of collective bargaining to run their course. Should they subsequently fail on those questions, appropriate action can only legitimately be taken at that time. For the Congress, in its present frustration or impatience to attempt to throw the secondary questions into the same hopper with the primary ones would be to do violence to the format of the pending proposal. For it should be recalled the pending proposal was advanced in the wake of the public declaration of both sides voluntarily to arbitrate the two primary questions. At no time did they make reference to the secondary issues.

At the very most, therefore, the secondary questions should be approved independently of the primary ones in the instance of this particular legislation. That there are those who would seek to arbitrate these lesser questions by force is understandable. It would be convenient and might conceivably save another crisis some time in the future.

But the consequences should give us pause, namely, that it would seriously weaken the basic principle of collective bargaining which admittedly has not been fully utilized in their case.

I should like now to address myself to the question my able colleague the Senator from Rhode Island raised in terms of why there is concern about bringing the secondary issues into the problem that do not apply to the primary issues. The concern is that, in both the testimony and conversations in the committee, there was a tentative public understanding on the part of the litigants in this case on the 15th of August to proceed voluntarily, through their own agreement, to arbitration of the two primary issues; and on that basis we tried to draft a procedure for resolving the primary issues. At no time were the secondary issues involved in whatever was said on the 15th of August or in conversations that followed in the wake of it.

The chairman of the committee will verify the tone and nature of those conversations. Therefore, it seemed to many of us that it would be unwise and even wrong to drag into the formula that had been our approach in the primary issues, the secondary issues at stake likewise in this question. That is the reason for the separation.

In the proposal as it is being modified we would eliminate section 6(b) and make the secondary issues subject to collective bargaining throughout the interval of the procedure and the announcement of the award, plus 60 days beyond. That is a total of 150 days during which there would be restraint in the imposition of the rules by the railroads, or the alternative on the part of the brotherhoods, the strike.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe that point should be cleared up.

In the event the secondary issues are not resolved, it has been asked, could the brotherhoods strike? They could strike 150 days after enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. McGEE. After 150 days.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. The record should be clear.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Wyoming is explaining the amendment.

Mr. McGEE. The point of the proposal as it now stands is that at the expiration of 150 days, on the secondary issues, the rules can be posted and strikes can be resorted to. There is a rather strong indication that the secondary issues, which then would become primary in the minds of some, would hardly justify resorting to the extremes that would be resorted to with respect to the two primary issues. There is every reason to believe that adjustments would be made. In the meantime, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire also discussed the matter of the 150-day interval. I believe he wishes to explain that point. I therefore yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. I will take three sentences to recapitulate what I said in my remarks last evening. Section 6(b), which would be stricken from the pending measure by the amendments of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] was a section which I offered in Committee. My principal purpose in offering it, however, was to avoid a situation which confronted the committee but which is not before the Senate now, a situation involving the prospect that the award, after it was made, should not take effect until the parties came to an agreement on the secondary issues. I felt then, and I still feel, that that would completely vitiate the joint resolution.

So far as I know, there is no disposition—on anyone's part to adopt that position now.

Now we come to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming, which would make the Senate joint resolution similar to the House joint resolution. The two principal issues would be resolved by the board of arbitration, and the so-called secondary issues would continue to be subject to collective bargaining for 150 days following the enactment of the joint resolution. That means that for 150 days, and 150 days only, as I understand, both the carriers and the brotherhoods would be restrained from either posting rules or striking. The law would hold them in that situation.

So far as the secondary issues are concerned, of course, the situation might be brought back into the lap of the President and of the Congress. To that extent, frankly, I do not like it. However, let us not discuss that point now. What I have been discussing with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is the 150-day period. It seemed to me that we might well find ourselves in a situation in which, at the end of 150 days, the award of the arbitration board would take effect. At the same time, the act would expire. There would be no further restraint on the parties from taking such action as they saw fit, including a strike.

Furthermore, at the end of 150 days, the award might not take effect, because there might be pending an appeal to the court. There might be some other reason why the award on the issue of the "firemen (helpers)" and "consist of road and yard crews" would not be in effect and before the key issues could be gotten out of the way, the others would be back before us.

It was my suggestion that the act should not expire until the award was actually in effect and operating. However, we found that could lead to complications. It was not entirely satisfactory to my friend from Wyoming.

In view of the fact that both of us have been going to school for a month, learning how to arbitrate, and learning how to mediate and conciliate, it was our joint suggestion—my suggestion, which I believe he will accept—that the 150 days should be amended to read 180 days from the enactment of the act, so that there would be a 30-day leeway. In other words, when the award was handed down and filed, it could not take effect for 60 days. It would then take effect, but 30 days more would elapse before the act would expire, so that the parties could attempt to bargain and come to a conclusion on the secondary issues before the expiration of the joint resolution.

I ask my friend the Senator from Wyoming if that is his conception of our understanding.

Mr. McGEE. That is my understanding. I thank my friend from New Hampshire for his cooperation on this question. I ask that that portion of my amendments be modified from 150 days to 180 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to say to my colleagues in the Senate that that is a fair compromise. The way it was first reported, it was open end so far as the award under section 5 was concerned. That award could not become effective until all the issues had been resolved.

By excluding subsection (b) of section 6, whereby we leave the secondary issues to collective bargaining, we are, in effect, amending section 5 by making the award effective after 60 days.

While the parties were bargaining, the carriers would have the benefit of eliminating jobs under the award. I believe that 180 days is a reasonable time. What we are saying is that the parties would have the same rights under the Railway Labor Act after the 180-day period.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, were the secondary issues incorporated in the notices that were filed by the carriers in November 1959, and the response of the brotherhood of September 1960?

Mr. McGEE. The secondary issues were incorporated in the notices; yes.

Mr. MORTON. That was my opinion, but some Senators have asked the question: Does not the whole secondary subject start de novo through section 6 of the Railway Labor Act? That would not be the case, would it?

Mr. McGEE. I am advised by counsel that that would not be the case.

Mr. MORTON. That is my understanding, but I thought the point ought to be clarified.

As one who supported the so-called Cotton amendment for the same reasons that the senior Senator from New Hampshire has expressed, I am, however, satisfied with the proposition that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] has developed. I have complete confidence that this problem will not be back in the lap of the Senate. I say that for the practical reason that both sides have indicated that the secondary issues can be resolved. I take their statement in good faith.

If either side throws it back into the lap of the Senate—I do not care which side—I think they can probably expect some rough legislation from Congress. I do not think they are going to do it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Senators have spoken to me and expressed the understanding that under the joint resolution recommended by the committee, the decision on primary issues arrived at by arbitration would not go into effect until the secondary issues were agreed upon. I put this question to both the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]: Is it not true that by the end of 6 months, under the committee joint resolution, all issues would be finally decided—both primary issues and secondary issues? The decision on primary issues would not go into effect, however, at any time prior to 6 months, unless the secondary issues had been agreed upon?

Mr. PASTORE. Or sooner.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Or sooner; that is correct. So under the committee amendment, the primary and secondary issues mandatorily would come to an end either by arbitration or by agreement at the end of 6 months?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. McGEE. Under the original committee proposal. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So any understanding that the secondary issues, while being negotiated, could interminably hold up the effective date of the arbitration award is in error?

Mr. PASTORE. It is not in error at all; not beyond 180 days.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I said permanently.

Mr. PASTORE. It makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator did not understand my statement. My statement is that it is the understanding of some Senators that the primary issues, although arbitrated, would permanently remain ineffective unless there were an agreement or an award on secondary issues.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. After listening to much of the discussion, I believe the solution reached by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] is, as the Senator from Rhode Island said, the fairest way to meet this unusual problem. I say this for two reasons. First, there is no evidence that on the three so-called secondary issues either management or the brotherhoods have had a chance to sit down and bargain collectively. I think they should be allowed, in the normal way, to resolve those questions or issues, which are greatly different from the main issues.

Second, like the Senator from Kentucky, I am taking on faith the statement I have heard on all sides that there is no reason why the parties to the dispute cannot solve these problems in the normal way of collective bargaining. There are always problems, but they can be solved by collective bargaining. So I take such statements on faith. Some persons do not agree with that view.

However, I join the Senator from Kentucky in the view that the parties cannot expect the same kind of treatment from Congress if they do not bargain collectively in good faith. The issues that are before the Senate now can be resolved quickly in come cases. The two main issues are the knotty ones; and I can understand the problem involved in them.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think it ought to be made clear for the record that irrespective of what may happen to the secondary issues before the expiration of the 6-month period, or the period of 180 days, the arbitration award with respect to the primary issues will be settled and out of the way.

Mr. McGEE. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under the McGee amendments.

Mr. McGEE. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to add also, in order that Senators may understand the situation before they adopt the amendment, that we have rather carefully explored all possibilities; that is, it was the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the expiration time of the act should be at the end of all legal procedures. The act would expire when the award on the two primary issues actually was in effect.

But upon further discussion, we felt that the legislation would be difficult enough, and the Senate is having trouble enough with it, without leaving any dates uncertain. So we agreed that 180 days—that is, 30 days after the award takes effect and allowing 30 days for any other court procedure, including appeals, would be the most we could plan to clear the way to deal with this problem.

I am not quite so optimistic or confident about the problem not coming back again as is either the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] or the chairman of the committee [Mr. Magnuson]. Perhaps I have grown cynical in my old age; I certainly have in the past month. I can see how it would be perfectly possible for the problem to come back to the lap of Congress. I do not think we should deceive ourselves.

I feel certain that neither of those Senators meant that Congress would indulge in punitive legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not say that.

Mr. COTTON. Then I withdraw my statement. Some Senator said it. It may not have been said by either of the Senators whose names I have just mentioned, but I heard the word used.

I wish to make it crystal clear on the floor of the Senate that if these questions come back to us, we must meet them. So far as I am concerned, the word "punitive" or the thought "punitive" will never enter into my mind in dealing either with the carriers or with the brotherhoods.

I believe this proposal is a good compromise. I appreciate the courtesy, forbearance, and understanding of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. I know that the proposal will not meet with the approval of all Senators on his side of the aisle. His concessions may not meet with the approval of all Senators on this side of the aisle. But I think the proposal offers a good solution.

We are faced with a nationwide railroad strike. It is up to us to act, and this seems to me to be a good, clean-cut compromise.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not true that in a few more hours the Senate and House of Representatives will have to get together on a final measure, and that the President will have to sign it by a given deadline? In consideration of that fact, is it not true that if the Senate adopts the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming, the measure will be brought into much closer conformity with the proposal recommended by the House committee, and thus make much more likely the possibility of avoiding a conference that could be of great consequence in preventing Congress from meeting the deadline?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Idaho is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the amendments of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] have been modified?

Mr. McGEE. They have been modified to provide for 180 days.

Mr. MILLER. I agree to the change to 180 days. It ties in very closely with the date of March 1, 1964, set forth in my amendment numbered 177.

I had an informal discussion with the Senator from Wyoming earlier this afternoon about the possibility of modifying his amendments further by allowing section 6(b) to remain, but including an entirely new section. If that were done, line 4 of the Senator's amendment, which strikes out paragraph (a) and line 5, would be deleted and there would be inserted in lieu thereof this language:

> If any of the issues referred to in paragraph (A) have not been resolved by collective bargaining within sixty days after the award is filed in accordance with section 5 of this resolution, the President shall cer-

tify to the Congress the status of the issues in dispute.

The point is that I believe this modification fits in with the rationale of 180 days. The rationale is that we wish to have a little breathing space, after 150 days, in which to determine what, if anything, we should do. Under my proposed modification of the Senator's amendment, after 150 days the President would certify to Congress the status of the issues—somewhat in line with the proposal we have already considered. We would then have 30 days in which to consider the status of those issues and make up our minds about what action, if any, was necessary by Congress.

I hope the Senator from Wyoming will react favorably to my proposed modification of his amendment.

Mr. McGEE. I have read the Senator's proposal very carefully and have given it some thought. I am reluctant to add it to my amendment, for this reason: We now have a formula agreed upon; it is clean cut, and will get the President and Congress out of the stalemate by means of the process of collective bargaining. Personally I would be reluctant to agree to a change which would inject the President or any group back into the controversy at that stage. It is true we may have it back in our laps when the waiting period has ended, and then we may have a new set of primary issues. But by that time, let the course of good judgment and good sense prevail. So at this stage I prefer not to accept the proposed modification.

Mr. MILLER. What objection is there to having the President certify to Congress, 30 days before the bottom falls out all over again, what the status of the issues is? I cannot see how that could possibly hurt anything. I think it would be helpful. I am not trying to disturb the formula which now has been agreed upon. I am trying to make it effective. What will it profit us to wait another 30 days to decide what we are going to do? What will be gained by making the change to 180 days, if we have not had some action by the executive branch to indicate the status of the other issues? I think we should have it.

As the amendment now stands, after 180 days, the President would submit the issues to us. My modification would have him do that with 150 days. I submit to the Senator from Wyoming that this is a good modification, and that it will make even more effective what we are trying to do. I do not believe the President will be unaware of what is taking place. In fact, I imagine that the National Mediation Board will enter into the situation, and that is what gave me the idea for this modification. As section 6(b) now reads, we would have the National Mediation Board certify certain situations. This means, to me, that the National Mediation Board will be in this picture, whether we like it or not; and that if nothing takes place after 150 days, the President can then certify to Congress the status of the other issues, so Congress will know how far it may have to go, and will have 30 days in which to legislate wisely.

Mr. McGEE. Again, I must say to the Senator from Iowa that I cannot accept his suggestion. I do not think it applies or fills any critical gap. As a matter of fact, I am sure the President will know what progress is being made, as will the country at large; and, in any case, the people will let Congress know their feelings.

The controversy will then have to be treated as an entirely new and separate labor dispute.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming this question: After 150 days, what will happen?

Mr. McGEE. We shall have to wait for the full period of time. Until we see what happens in any kind of management-labor relationship, no one knows what issues have or have not been considered at any point along the line. We cannot forecast that at the present time.

Mr. MILLER. After 180 days and after the bottom falls out, unless these issues are negotiated or unless Congress takes some action, what will happen?

Mr. McGEE. Under the procedure the groups have agreed to, the only procedure is for someone to file new rules; and with the threat of a strike confronting us at that time, Congress then would have to determine what the procedure would be. But this amendment is designed to make it clean cut, and not to protract the situation in any way.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, after the 180 days the Railway Labor Act will take over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. And all of the procedures which thus far had been gone through with respect to the two primary issues would then have to be gone through with respect to the secondary issues?

Mr. McGEE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, some time ago I promised to yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. I now yield to him.

Mr. SIMPSON. I had just one question, which now becomes repetitive. I understand that the McGee amendment is merely a stopgap, and would prolong for 180 days the agony of the strike threat—so that we would have to go all through this controversy once more 180 days from now. Is that correct?

Mr. McGEE. That is not correct. My proposal is to try to nail down the two primary issues. That is the issue which is at stake at the present time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am referring to the secondary issues.

Mr. McGEE. The secondary issues are not now under consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON. But in the end that would become the subject of a strike.

Mr. McGEE. Those issues will be open to collective bargaining between now and the expiration of the 180 days.

Mr. SIMPSON. But then they will become the subject of a strike.

Mr. McGEE. Then they will become subject to the normal operations under the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. SIMPSON. So we would be no better off then.

Mr. McGEE. We would be two primary issues better off—which would make a great deal of difference, under the contentions in this dispute. Both parties have agreed that once we resolve the two primary ones, the chances of resolving the secondary ones will be much improved. I think we have to give that procedure an opportunity to run its course.

Mr. SIMPSON. But it is conjectural.

Mr. McGEE. I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take the floor in my own right.

Mr. McGEE. Then I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The energetic Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] has submitted what is termed the compromise amendment. I am cognizant of his earnest efforts to effectuate a satisfactory solution. There is also the original committee amendment, as reported by the effective chairman [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Do both of these proposals place the rail carriers in the same position as to the implementation of the new work rules?

Mr. McGEE. Neither one will change that in any respect. They stand together on it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oregon wishes to have the floor in his own right. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the McGee amendments. I will do so because I know that 4 years have passed in which this issue has been kicked back and forth, without any final decision being made. I believe we must create a situation that will bring to an end this dispute between the railroads and the labor unions. The only way to do it is by the enactment of a law providing that at the end of a specific time—and that is 6 months—this issue will be closed. The McGee amendments would require arbitration of the two main issues and leave to collective bargaining all other issues.

If the McGee amendments are adopted, I predict that the issue will be back in our laps next year. Under the joint resolution as reported by the committee, all issues would be finally decided by arbitration or agreement in 6 months.

Those who have political fears about the consequences of the joint resolution recommended by the committee will sweat more next July than they are sweating now, if we do not finally wrap up the package and put it to rest.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I agree completely with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, with one addition: I think too little has been said in this whole debate about the justifiable expectations of the general public in this matter. I think the general public, after having waited 4 years during which all this argument has been pending, and there is no question that all of these issues were discussed as far back as 1960, as brought out by the question of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]—after 4 years of indecision and uncertainty, deserves greater consideration than this. It will be a retreat from its responsibility for the Senate, after having received a forthright recommendation from the President for bringing an end to all of this controversy, and after having received from its committee a similar forthright recommendation for the ending of all of it, to weakly march in reverse, and to say, "No, we are going to end only a part of it, and leave hanging over the general public, for 180 additional days of anxious anticipation, the expectation of a general railroad strike at that time."

Mr. President, I do not think that is a fair thing to do to the general public of our Nation. If the Senate takes that action, and the House approves it, Congress will be justifiably subject to criticism of the gravest sort from the general public, which expects us to deal forthrightly and honestly with the question before us and not merely to solve part of it, leaving for 180 days of suspense the sword of Damocles hanging over the head of the Nation.

I shall not support the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have been glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I wish to supplement what the Senator from Florida has said. I call attention to one fact which has been overlooked. Yesterday the Senator from Oregon stressed the same point. I point out that in the excellent opinion poll of the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J., with their vast research facilities, it was shown that more than 60 percent of the people in the country consulted were for compulsory arbitration rather than a strike which could cripple our country, as the President of the United States has so capably pointed out. Against compulsory arbitration were only 20 percent.

I point out also that even union members themselves, who are logically concerned about compulsory arbitration, favor compulsory arbitration in this case by a vote of 54 percent to 30 percent.

In the western country from which I come, 62 percent of the people are for compulsory arbitration rather than a strike, as opposed to 20 percent of the people in that area who are against arbitration instead of a strike. I thank the Senator from Florida for his observations, and I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only reason the joint resolution is before the Senate is the public interest. Anyone who says that we have not talked about it is not stating the fact. The public interest is the overriding consideration that has put the joint resolution before the Senate and started the machinery in motion. Yesterday the Senator from Washington spent a half hour talking about that interest. The report sets it out clearly. Otherwise we would permit the parties to the dispute to wait until doomsday. The public interest, of course, is overriding. Anyone who would suggest that we are not thinking of the public interest does not know why the joint resolution is before the Senate. Of course we are thinking about the public interest. That is the only reason we are telling the two groups involved that they must do something about the dispute. The public interest overrides every other consideration. Otherwise the committee would not have had anything to do with the joint resolution. The public interest is the main consideration. Surely we have to talk about the details as they affect the parties. But any implication that the Senate Committee on Commerce or the House Committee on Commerce or the Congress of the United States has forgotten the public interest is not correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I support the pending amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], because it is about the only proposal respecting the joint resolution which would preserve the principle of collective bargaining. I am perfectly aware of the fact that because the carriers and the unions have not been able to arrive at any agreement through the process of collective bargaining on the two main issues involved, and as the President of the United States has declared, and the committee has unanimously found, that because of health, defense, and the demands of our economy, railroad transportation must be maintained, we are placed in the position of providing compulsory arbitration upon those two issues. But according to the distinguished committee chairman and the record, other issues have not been the subject of collective bargaining, or at least in a definitive sense. Even if collective bargaining fails as to these questions—some involving wages—and they come back to the Congress next year—and perhaps they will come back—the principle and right of collective bargaining ought to be preserved as to those issues which have not been considered. This the McGee amendment would secure.

I do not like compulsory arbitration. Certainly it would be wrong to apply compulsory arbitration to prospective disputes as section 6(b) will do, if it is not deleted by the pending amendment.

I was in the Senate when the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted and voted for it. It does not apply to matters subject to the Railway Labor Act. But I remember that in the long and controversial debate, Senator Robert Taft stood again and again for the principle of free collective bargaining with as few restrictions as possible.

The railroad unions have a right to strike, but in practice it is becoming a theoretical right. For if the consequences of a strike are as dire as has been detailed by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, and the committee's report, we must consider that under similar circumstances in the future the Congress would be called again to act to prevent a strike. In all fairness, the railway unions, denied the right to strike, and faced with compulsory arbitration, should be allowed the right to bargain collectively upon issues where bargaining has not broken down.

This amendment of the joint resolution would be the only provision in the joint resolution which would preserve and encourage collective bargaining. It is in the interests of both the railroads and the unions. I place my support for the amendment on this positive ground.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from Washington said a few moments ago about our observance of the overriding interest of the general public. Yesterday or the day before I congratulated him upon the fact that his committee had recognized that interest and had reported a joint resolution under the machinery of which all these various arguments would be settled, a strike averted, and the anxiety of the public terminated, as against having to undergo what would be the most serious hurt to our economy that we could possibly sustain. At the same time, I have paid the same sort of compliment to the administration because it faced the problem forthrightly.

I only regret that the desire to serve the public interest is somehow dimmed in the eyes of some of those who have been handling the joint resolution because now they are about to retreat from a position which did offer machinery which would solve all of these controversies, and instead leave the public in a position in which it must anticipate the possibility of a strike in the near future, not more than 6 months off. That possibility is made almost a probability by the words of the Senator from Kentucky and others, who made it very clear that they expected the issue to be back in the lap of the President and in the laps of the Congress at the end of that time.

I do not believe that is a strong way to measure up to our responsibility toward this problem. I hope that the Senate will not choose the weak way to fail to measure up to it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment. I have the highest regard for the Senator from Florida and of his concern for the public interest. We all share this concern. It may express itself in various ways. It may be manifest to various Senators in different forms.

I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], because I recall with lively apprehension the fact that not many years ago the thing said about a man named Mussolini was that he made the trains run on time, and this was stated as great justification for him. He did that, and he ended freedom at the same time.

In this country we have successfully avoided doing that sort of thing, and have managed to make the difficult system of democracy work without compulsion except under most extreme circumstances.

I think the committee measure, as amended by the agreed upon amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, comes about as close to perfection as is possible in an imperfect world.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon yields to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I should like to ask the sponsors of the pending compromise amendments a question. I am not clear in my mind as to how they define the secondary issues. I do not know whether the so-called primary issues and secondary issues are separate and distinct and present different problems which can be dealt with in a different manner, or whether they are so interrelated as to be a part of one problem. If they are the latter, probably all should be dealt with at once.

I should like to hear from the sponsors of the amendments in this regard.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me, the designation is not a designation by the committee. The designation was a common usage designation applied in the trade, as the issues came to a head.

These two issues were regarded to be the toughest ones, those on which there was the widest range of disagreement and on which they were the farthest from settlement—the firemen issue and the crew consist issue. All others were referred to as secondary issues. Both sides repeatedly said, "Once we can resolve the two big ones, the chances of the others falling into place will be much improved."

That was the reason for the language.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator regard them to be separate and distinct problems or issues, or are they part of one entire problem?

Mr. McGEE. They are olives in the bottle; and these two happen to be sticking in the neck of the bottle.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, it is not possible for the parties to the dispute to accept the arbitration if they are unable to agree on the so-called secondary issues?

Mr. McGEE. The secondary issues really have not been considered for arbitration or for discussion at the present time. The exchanges have occurred in regard to the primary issues. The "primary" and "secondary" words are used as a means of identification, to avoid confusion on the issues.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may clarify this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. If the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will look at section 3 of the joint resolution, he will find that section 3 identifies the issues which are being treated as primary issues, and section 6 refers to all other issues.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that.

Mr. PASTORE. All the issues were contained in the notices. Section 3, beginning on page 9, explains that. The language is:

> Those portions of the carriers' notice of November 2, 1959.

The notice contained all the issues that the carriers were interested in.

Then there were "notices of September 7, 1960," which were further notices. I think those were submitted by the brotherhoods.

Together, they constitute all the issues before the parties.

It is stated, on line 2 of page 10:

> "Use of firemen (helpers) on other than steam power" and "consist of road and yard crews"

That is spelled out.

When we look at section 6, we find the language:

> The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, not to be disposed of by arbitration under section 3.

That is the identification.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the language, but my question relates to the practical sense of it. Are those issues not tied together?

Mr. PASTORE. In a practical sense, at the beginning they were, but now we are separating them, because the parties, in the process of collective bargaining which has been taking place in the past 4 years have been separating these issues.

Mr. CURTIS. If the McGee-Cotton approach should be adopted, it would provide for a 6 months' moratorium against a strike. Could a strike not be called on the secondary issues at the end of that time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. A strike could be called at any time. A strike could be called tomorrow on some other issue.

Mr. CURTIS. I had understood that the proposed legislation was before Congress in order to save the public from a strike.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are starting to pull out ghosts.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield further, I believe I can allay some of the apprehension on the part of my friend from Nebraska.

We must realize that the carriers have felt for a long time that they are employing and paying too many firemen.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That has been the big stumbling block. The carriers feel they have been harassed into paying for more crewmen than they have needed. That is their position. Whether it is right or wrong is apart from the question.

Those are the two big issues. The parties recognize them as such. Of course, there are other important issues.

There has been a feeling right along that if they could get over the hump on the firemen issue and on the crew consist issue the other issues would take care of themselves in regular order.

The point is made that there is no guarantee. Of course there is not. However, we must consider the fact that, on behalf of the carriers, there will be an award on the two primary issues which will be effective.

Then the question comes from the brotherhoods, "You have satisfied them. How about us? What leverage have we in order to obtain action on our claims?"

If we should provide for no rights for the brotherhoods, we would not be exerting the influence upon the carriers on the secondary issues that we would be exerting upon the brotherhoods on the primary issues.

So what is being suggested? We are leaving the question open. If the parties cannot agree for 180 days, the brotherhoods will have the rights they now have under the Railway Labor Act, and that includes the right to strike.

If we should eliminate the right to strike, we might as well throw the whole process of collective bargaining out the window. We must accord labor some rights. That is what we are doing.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not objecting to the right to strike. I am merely asking a question. Is the distinguished Senator assuming that the award of the arbitrators will be unfair and unjust to the union?

Mr. PASTORE. They could do nothing about it. They would have to take it after 60 days.

Mr. CURTIS. Both parties would.

Mr. PASTORE. Both parties.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. My question did not relate to denying the right to strike. My question related to the extent to which the primary and secondary issues were in reality one. I recognize that a distinction is made in the joint resolution.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. They are related in every sense, but we are proceeding in a piecemeal way. We admit that. We are subjecting this dispute to arbitration because, in principle, the parties in their discussions have more or less agreed to voluntary arbitration; while this proposal would be compulsory arbitration. The parties have more or less agreed to arbitration of the two primary issues. We would permit such procedure under this measure, although it would be compulsory.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. We are now saying, insofar as the other issues are concerned, "Because you have not had a reasonable opportunity to resolve the issues by collective bargaining only, because you were too concerned about the two primary issues, we will leave that door open, to give you an opportunity to arrive at an adjustment."

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that. I will try to state my question in another way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before the Senator states his question, I wish to say that I thought the Senator was asking about what would happen without passage of the joint resolution. Of course, a strike could not occur if the joint resolution were passed.

Mr. PASTORE. We all know that.

Mr. CURTIS. My question is this: Are the so-called secondary issues, issues that would exist, and be separate and apart from the primary issues, or are they in some way related to them?

Mr. PASTORE. No. I think they would exist, anyway, because even the carriers are interested in some of the secondary issues. For instance, consider the interdivisional assignment. The carriers want to go over certain division lines in order to amalgamate and constrict crews. Fringe benefits and wages are involved. The unions are interested in these issues. So both sides are interested. But the primary interest of the carriers is in the two primary issues that are being set up for compulsory arbitration. Let us not deceive ourselves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I will not take much time of the Senate——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington without losing the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to make another announcement that will help in expediting the measure. I have received information that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has ordered the bill reported from the committee. We have discussed that measure. We know what it does. The House Rules Committee issued a rule to bring up the bill tomorrow. The debate will be limited, under the House rules, to 2 hours. Under the rule, also, if it wishes to do so, the House will be able to take the Senate measure without the necessity of a conference.

I think that situation helps to clear up the question of expediting this measure. I hope the Senate can reach the stage of completing action on it soon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I agree that the Senate should complete action on the measure today. I think it is a real tribute to the Senator from Oregon. We have already pledged ourselves——

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will yield, I am grateful not only to the Senator from Oregon, but to the Senator from New York and all the other Senators who have interested themselves in this subject.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

I shall support the amendments because I think they are constructive, notwithstanding the fact that for a long time I have felt that the remedy of seizure is preferable to the remedy of compulsory arbitration. This is the first time that Congress has legislated compulsory arbitration. Therefore, it is not meaningful only to railroad labor; it is meaningful to all labor.

I am delighted that the Senator, with his usual perspicacity, understood that this means something to the cause of freedom and the cause of labor generally, so that, as we are venturing into a very seriously dangerous field in terms of American freedom, at least we can try to do it with the minimum impact, since we have not given this matter the thought and the investigation it should have had, and since, in all frankness, the Congress is caught flatfooted on the issue, when all other remedies have not worked, and we are placed in an emergency.

It is often said, "The President should go to Congress." The President has come to Congress, and Congress is not ready.

So Congress is going to do what it can to minimize "fuzzing" over the issue, so it will not be a landmark of historical precedent. If that is what the Senate wants, if it wants an ad hoc solution of a trying situation, I think the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], with the assistance of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], have a minimum impact. They will at least minimize the impact with respect to being a landmark decision. But they will not settle the need for dealing with national policy and legislation.

What do we do when we run into a situation of this kind? There is no remedy on our statute books. This is the weakness of the Taft-Hartley law and the Railway Labor Act.

I shall support the amendments because they make the best of a bad situation, within the context of what the committee has projected. I reserve the right to offer to the Senate a definitive remedy, so that the Senate may have an opportunity to work its will on a definitive remedy of this issue.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for two sentences?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Washington—and I appreciate their courtesy—referred to the amendments as the McGee-Cotton amendments. I want the Record to show that they are not the McGee-Cotton amendments. They are the McGee amendments. The Cotton amendment is section 6(b) of this measure, and it is being stricken out.

All the Senator from New Hampshire did was sit down and bargain in good faith to change the figure from 150 to 180. If the Senator from New Hampshire had a week to do it, he would fight that long to keep in the bill section 6(b), in an attempt to take care of it in one package. But we do not have a week in which to consider the question, and the Senate must operate the way other men of good faith and sense must. We have to make sufficient concessions so we can get some kind of action taken. For that reason, I am yielding in supporting the amendments, but I do not want to be charged with authoring them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I wish to dissociate myself from the views expressed by three of my warm friends on the other side of the aisle; namely, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], for, as I shall endeavor to show, they have argued on the basis of false assumptions with respect to these amendments.

In my judgment, the joint resolution was an unsound measure when it came from the committee. Now, with the proposed amendments, it can be described as confusion worse confounded.

I have come to the conclusion, as I have listened to what I consider to be interesting rationalization for justifying what is an unsound course of action on the part of many of my colleagues, that they have been proceeding on the assumption that there is only one party to be considered; namely, the brotherhoods, for I have heard very little about the rights of the carriers and the stockholders.

Let me say to my colleagues in the Senate that when we start dealing with a labor dispute and we are in the middle—and the Senate is in the middle today—we have a clear obligation to keep in mind that we should consider three parties to the dispute—the employers, the labor groups, and the public.

Let us take a look at what is being done to the carriers. Since 1959 they have had the legal right to post their rules. The Supreme Court has so held. Quite an argument could be made for the proposition that they had a duty to post their rules in protection of their stockholders. They have made clear, time and time again, through their governing boards, that they have been willing to suspend that right as the Government, time and time again, has asked them to suspend it. Now the Senate proposes to have them suspend it for 6 months.

I suppose some of the proponents will come forth with a bill—they ought to do it, in all fairness—to make up to the stockholders the losses due to the Senate's course of action. What kind of fairness is involved in the idea that we would seriously pass a measure which would guarantee to the unions that they can keep resisting—and they have given every indication that that is going to be their course of action—and which would guarantee a continued loss to the stockholders of the carriers? They should offer a bill to pick up the losses that the stockholders will suffer for every day the Senate forces the brotherhoods to have the benefit of an arbitration award that is handed down, whatever it is.

Then let us take a look at the arbitration board. How would any Senator like to serve on it? How would he like to be appointed to an arbitration board with the restrictions that the Senate is imposing on it? It is an insult to the intelligence of any fair-minded arbitrator. It will be difficult to find anyone trained in this field to serve on that kind of board, with the kind of restrictions upon the judicial processes of the arbitrators that will be imbedded in the joint resolution that the Senate will pass. It can hand down an award, but it will not have effect. It can hand down an award, but of course, it cannot be put into effect for—I am not quite sure of the mathematics now. This has gone into higher mathematics, and I do not know what the final mathematical figure is as to how long they are going to postpone the application of the arbitrators' judicial award on the merits.

What a fine way to treat the judicial processes of an arbitration board, by appointing a board and then telling it, "Of course, your decision cannot be effective until some other maneuverings go on."

Let me talk about a few assumptions that have been accepted as facts in this dispute. A great deal of semantics has been indulged in.

Statements have been made to the effect that so far no collective bargaining on the secondary issues has taken place. I categorically deny it. Those who say that there has not been any collective bargaining, I ask to define collective bargaining. I say to them, "What do you mean by collective bargaining?"

Nevertheless, in the debate on the floor, in speech after speech, the categorical statement has been made that there has been no collective bargaining. Have Senators who say that read the Rifkin report? Have they read the Rosenman report? Have they read statements by the Secretary of Labor?

I say to Senators that the secondary issues have been kicked around since 1959, and the parties to this dispute knew exactly their relative and respective positions on such issues.

I say that the fact is they have reached a point of stalemate. Are we going to say, let them be in stalemate for another 180 days?

What nonsense. What a pollution of the stream of the judicial process of arbitration in this country. I would not think of voting for the pending measure on the basis of the procedures that have been written into it.

There has been another false assumption, and that is that the parties have agreed to arbitrate on the major issues. More semantics. The committee report bases part of its recommendations on that allegation. Have Senators read the offer of the brotherhoods on arbitration? The moment they say they arbitrate they proceed to take back their statement by attaching to the so-called offer conditions and restrictions which amount to no arbitration. Whom do they think they are kidding? They have succeeded in kidding some Senators and getting by with it. They are not kidding me, because I know what they are up to. I told some of them just that. The carriers have acted in good faith on every procedural request ever since the dispute started. The brotherhoods have dragged their heels. They have refused to go along, because they wanted the status quo, and whatever offers they made were nothing but token offers.

Senators will be closer to election in March than they are now. Now is the time to stand up to the political pressure of the brotherhoods which, in my opinion, could not, even if they so desired, deliver the votes of their memberships.

Let no Senator assume for a moment that we are through with the discussion of this case on the floor of the Senate. This case, and the record of every Senator in the case, will be discussed in local brotherhood halls across the country.

I received a call this morning from Oregon from a brotherhood man. It was 5 o'clock out there when he called me.

He had been listening to the radio and listening to news reports in regard to the speech I made on the floor of the Senate last night, which to him added up to my refusal to follow the brotherhoods because of their failure in leadership for many months, and because of the great disservice that they have performed for the rank and file of the railroad workers of this country, by the adamant position they have held and their refusal to cooperate with their Government, and their refusal to adopt every proposal that the Government had made for a peaceful solution of the problem so that it would never get to the floor of the Senate.

The chiefs of the five operating brotherhoods must take the full responsibility in the history of the American labor movement for being responsible for the adoption of the first compulsory arbitration law in the history of Congress.

The rank and file of the American labor movement will understand the disservice of these political chiefs—and that is the best description I can give them.

Mr. President, I have seen lobbies, but I have never seen the kind of political lobby in operation that I have seen in recent days in the precincts of Congress on the part of the railroad brotherhoods. There is not a Senator who can talk on a record of service to railroad labor any more than can the senior Senator from Oregon. I have been with the brotherhoods when they have been right on the facts, and I have been against them when they have been wrong. They are dead wrong in the way they have handled this case. They are dead wrong in the support they are giving to the pending measure.

We all know what they are looking to. They want to be able to say to the membership, "We did not agree to compulsory arbitration. It was imposed upon us by Congress."

However, we know that behind the scenes that is what they want. I want none of it.

Mr. President, these are not secondary issues. These are major issues. Six months from now we will be that much closer to the election in 1964, and they can be the cause of great unrest in the railway industry.

If any Senator believes that they are not going to be back, he is mistaken. They will have even more political power that close to the election than they have now. Now is the time to settle every issue involved in this case. If they want to continue with their professions that they have been bargaining collectively, it will not take them long to offer whatever they want to offer for a compromise in collective bargaining.

I am sure no Senator believes that collective bargaining will go on while the arbitration is in progress. I will give the Senate some of their alibis. They will say they are sorry they cannot engage in collective bargaining because one man is tied up in this case or someone else is tied up in another case, or a group is tied up.

These men have been heel draggers with regard to this case.

Mr. President, we have problems. We ought to be giving attention to the real problems in the railway industry. We have an obligation to see to it that fair treatment and fair consideration are given to each and every railroad worker who will suffer a job disjointure as a result of the technical technological age in which we now live.

For weeks, I have been trying to get the Senate to see that we ought to be on with the job of passing legislation in the field of automation. The President gave it to us in his bill, and the Senate has just finished turning it down. He proposed an automation council. He proposed that the council should proceed to study the effect of automation upon the economy and that it should then recommend legislation to do justice to all people in the country who are thrown out of jobs as a result of automation.

The continuation of men in employment cannot be justified if the facts show that they are not needed in such employment. That brings me back to my point as to the other party to the dispute, namely, the carriers.

What we would be buying by these amendments would be a 6 months' delay in the final determination. Even then, we would not have it. It would be back in the cauldron of American politics, pretty close to the heat of a campaign. But the campaign would heat the cauldron. If a measure can be passed under those circumstances, I do not know what will be done with the so-called secondary issues when there is a threat of a strike, based upon the warning of the carriers that they intend to post their work rules, rules which they have a right to post.

These amendments should be defeated. We ought to completely rewrite section 6(b) to provide that when the arbitration board hands down its decision on the two main issues, it will be final on those two issues. It will be the decision, and it will go into effect at once.

Do not insult the arbitration board by including in the bill a provision that so encumbers the arbitration terms of reference that although the board will have completed its work, its award will become effective in futuro. Have the major issues settled finally before the board hears the case and renders its judgment. That will give time for the parties to deliberate and determine whether they can reach the agreement that the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from New York are so concerned about. If they have not reached agreement before then, my prediction is that they will not reach it.

Therefore, there ought to be a provision in the joint resolution with respect to whether we give the right of compulsory arbitration, which God forbid.

As soon as the Senate can dispose of this group of amendments, some technical amendments, and an amendment which the Senator from New York wishes to offer, I shall be ready to proceed with my amendment, in the full knowledge that it will be snowed under, but also with the firm knowledge that the record I shall make this afternoon in behalf of voluntary arbitration will rise to become eventually the adopted principle in the handling of national emergency disputes in this country.

I shall oppose the pending amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the vote about to be taken a vote on the so-called McGee amendments, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As modified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As modified in the conference between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. A vote "yea" will be a vote for the amendments; a vote "nay" will be a vote against the amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on these amendments, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendments ordered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 146 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Clark
Ellender
Goldwater
Gruening
Holland
Lausche
Mechem
Morse
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—8

Carlson
Eastland
Engle
Hartke
Neuberger
Walters
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. McGee's modified amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the McGee amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a technical amendment to the committee amendment. It has been worked out by the staff of the committee, and I believe it will be approved by the chairman of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of this amendment to the committee amendment be dispensed with, in order to give me an opportunity to explain it. Then it can be read, if any Senator desires to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, these are four technical amendments. I know the chairman of the committee is fully aware of them, and I believe he has indicated his approval of them.

The first amendment clarifies the appointment of members of the Arbitration Board, requiring the President within 10 days to name members representing the parties, if the parties fail to do so within 5 days.

The second amendment makes section 3 clear; under this amendment it is clear that the initial arbitration provided by that section is confined to the two key issues of firemen and crew consist. This is the clear implication of the present language of the joint resolution; but the committee feels that it would be better to write that implication into specific language.

The third one would add specific standards to guide the arbitration board. Originally the committee felt that such standards were unnecessary, but has since learned that some arbitration awards in the past have been overturned in the courts because of the lack of such standards. The amendment would incorporate the standards which were originally in the President's Senate Joint Resolution 102, as follows:

> In making any award under this joint resolution, the arbitration board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to their public and upon the interests of the carriers and the employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation.

The fourth amendment would add the customary separability clause that if any part of the act should be found to be unconstitutional, it shall not affect the remainder of the act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, these were technical amendments which were unanimously agreed upon by the Committee on Commerce. They would perfect the joint resolution along the lines of the objectives of the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire are excellent and needed. They would provide in the joint resolution the guidelines that were contained in the President's proposed joint resolution. Without such guidelines, there would be danger that the joint resolution would be invalid because of failure to give adequate legislative direction to those who would arbitrate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to as follows:

> On page 9, line 1, after the period insert the following: "If either party fails to name a member or members to the arbitration board within the five days provided, the President shall name such member or members in lieu of such party and shall also name the additional three members necessary to constitute a board of seven members, all within ten days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."

On page 9, line 3, strike out "three".

On page 9, beginning with line 17, strike out all through line 6 on page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, as to what disposition shall be made of those portions of the carriers' notices of November 2, 1959, identified as 'Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power' and 'Consist of Road and Yard Crews' and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as 'Minimum Safe Crew Consist' and implementing proposals pertaining thereto. The arbitration board shall incorporate in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, shall resolve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of the aforesaid issues covered by the decision of the board of arbitration."

At the end of the joint resolution insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution and the application of such provision to other parties or in other circumstances not held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] proposes an amendment which would add certain language at the end of the joint resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution add the following:

"The President is authorized to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of any carrier which is a party to the dispute concerning changes in work rules currently existing between the carriers represented by the Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees and certain of their employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America, labor organizations, for the appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of the equipment and facilities of such carrier and to use and operate such equipment and facilities in the interest of the United States, and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety or the health or safety of any substantial section of the country it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver and to make such other orders as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That (1) at any time before directing the special receiver to take possession of such equipment and facilities, the court may direct the parties to the dispute to make every effort to agree to resume such part of the operations of such equipment and facilities as in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the national health or safety, and upon such resumption of operations may postpone the taking of possession by the special receiver so long as such operations continue; (2) such equipment and facilities shall be operated by the special receiver only to the extent which in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the national health and safety of the United States, or of any substantial section of the territory or material portion of the population thereof; (3) the possession and operation of such equipment and facilities shall not render inapplicable any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards, and the special receiver while operating such equipment and facilities shall comply with such laws as if they were privately operated; (4) the wages, hours, conditions, and other terms of employment effective at the time of taking possession by the special receiver shall be maintained without change, provided that the court may direct the special receiver to make effective in whole or in part any recommendations heretofore made by the board appointed under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act with respect to the operation of equipment and facilities which are being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation; (5) during the period of such possession by the special receiver and thereafter, the parties shall be encouraged to continue efforts to settle the dispute, and the special receiver shall have no authority to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with respect to rates of pay, rules, or working conditions; and the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions which have been made effective pursuant to the recommendation of said board appointed under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act shall remain in effect for a period of ninety days after the possession or operation of such equipment and facilities has been returned by the special receiver to the owner, unless in the meantime the parties concerned have entered into a collective bargaining agreement with respect to rates of pay, rules or working conditions, it being understood that in such negotiations between the parties concerned, involving proposals theretofore contained in any prior notices served pursuant to section 6 of the Railway Labor Act which resulted in the dispute, the parties shall be deemed to have complied with and have exhausted the procedures of the Act; (6) such equipment and facilities shall be returned to the carrier as soon as practicable, but in no event later than thirty days after the restoration of such labor relations between such carrier and its employees that the possession or operation thereof by the special receiver is no longer necessary to insure the operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the national health and safety or the health and safety of any substantial section of the country; (7) such equipment and facilities shall be operated by the special receiver for the account of the carrier: *Provided further,* That the carrier shall have the right to elect, by written notice filed with the court within ten days of such taking of possession, to waive all claims to the proceeds of such operation and to receive in lieu thereof just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the period of such possession and operation by the special receiver, to be paid by the United States as follows: (A) The President shall ascertain the amount of just, fair, and reasonable compensation to be paid as rental for the appropriation and temporary use of such equipment and facilities while in the possession of or operated by the special receiver in the interest of the United States, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder, and taking into account the existence of the labor dispute which interrupted or threatened to interrupt the operation of such equipment and facilities and the effect of such interruption or threatened interruption upon the value to the carrier of the use of such facilities; (B) if the amount so ascertained is not acceptable to the carrier, as just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property taken hereunder and as full and complete compensation therefor, the carrier shall be paid 75 per centum of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided for by sections 1357 and 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code to recover such further sums as when added to the amount so paid shall constitute just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property so taken. In the event such notice of election is filed with the court, the special receiver shall pay over to the United States the proceeds of the operations of such equipment and facilities while in his possession."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe I can explain the amendment in fairly short order and obtain the judgment of the Senate upon it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Eventually I shall offer an amendment. While many Senators are present in the Chamber, I should like to ask now for a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment before Senators go to dinner.

Mr. JAVITS. Before the Senator does so, I should like to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment at this time, even though the amendment has not yet been offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my amendment proposes a provision for procedure for seizure in the event of a national emergency strike, or the threat of a national emergency work stoppage.

The amendment proposes to apply the remedy to the railroad situation. Instead of making a generic law, the amendment would apply it to the particular situation now before the Senate. I would be less than frank with Senators if I did not state that I have brought up the subject because I believe we ought to begin—and I think this is the process of beginning—to deal with the fundamental question of policy which is involved when we are up against this kind of situation. When all other remedies of law have failed—the Railway Labor Act or the Taft-Hartley Act—what do we do? Shall we approach the question in an ad hoc way, so that the President must come to the Congress for a remedy, which is then not a whole remedy, but a partial remedy, which involves us in basic and deep decisions of policy which may prove to be offensive to the whole of American public life, to the processes of collective bargaining, and to the future of American labor-management relations, or shall we thoughtfully endeavor to prepare a policy for such eventualities?

Having seen that such an eventuality can happen—and this is what has happened now—if we are to be responsible in Government we ought to prepare a policy. The number of votes I may garner on the amendment is not the main point. The main point is to bring the country and the Congress face to face with grim realities. The grim realities demand a decision of policy, and for the following reason:

Debate has gone off pretty much on the basis of what is or is not necessary to accommodate the views and the problems of employers and employees in a particular business; that is, the railroad industry. Vital and critical it certainly is, but it is still a particular business.

But what has not yet been adequately and fully considered, and what the amendment challenges, is the responsibility to the Nation in terms of the operation of the Nation. The fundamental and final question relating to the responsibility of government is, Will the Nation continue to operate, come what may? A nation which cannot operate come what may is not a nation fully able to meet its responsibilities, strong and vital in its destiny. It is for this very reason that the Lenins, the Stalins, and our worst enemies in terms of freedom have predicted that we will fall like a ripe apple, because we are unable or unwilling to arm ourselves with the power and authority necessary to our own survival.

If I make no other argument today—and I consider this a step perhaps in a long process—I hope Senators may at least think about that one.

It is predicted that our Nation will fall like a ripe apple, and that it will not be necessary to push us over by force or by any other means. We will go out of business because of our inability to provide for our own survival. The amendment is an effort to enable us to provide for our own survival.

Nothing has been shown which assures us that the railroads will operate. The plan which is before us and which will probably be passed, is based on the hope that people will respond to reason, the call of the Congress, the demands of the court, and that somehow or other there will be enough agreement to keep the railroads going for at least 6 months. Some predict—and I assume that was the basis for the opposition to the last amendment—that 6 months later the problem will be back again. The question is whether the Nation has any right to have in its armory anything less than the power to protect itself. So far, there is nothing before us except the amendment. Perhaps the ideas of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will give us an opportunity to consider the question again a little later in the evening. But there is nothing before us except the amendment which will assure us that the railroads can operate and that our Nation will not be at the mercy of either management or labor.

Let us analyze the joint resolution. There would be compulsory arbitration on two issues. There are many other issues involved. It is freely predicted that if some people did not like what may happen on those two main issues, the other issues could be blown up into major issues. If that should occur, we would be in the same position. We shall have to decide the knotty problem, "Shall we demand arbitration?"

That is big contingency No. 1.

What is big contingency No. 2?

It will be required that five brotherhoods agree on arbitrators. It will be required that five brotherhoods comply with the court orders, even with mandatory injunctions directing them what to do in a given situation. It is true that one trade union was fined $1 million. Nonetheless, the union did not obey, but it was fined. One of the trade unions conceivably might decide to do the same in this instance.

The process would require agreement of a host of carriers on this problem. One or more carriers may decide that this is an unconstitutional approach, like the NRA. There are many analogies between what we are trying to do and what the Government tried to do under the NRA. The Schechter case still remains the law. Somebody might say, "We will take this up in the courts. We will put up a big fight, to see if this provision will hold water or not."

For those reasons, and for probably a dozen others that I have not been able to develop in my own thinking, this will be by no means a sure shot. This proposal would by no means end the danger of a railroad strike.

There is only one way to end the danger, and that is to give the Nation the power to operate come what may. Only one remedy will do that, and that is the remedy of seizure.

The approach of compulsory arbitration between management and labor, imposed by the Congress, is what we lawyers call sui generis, some very fancy words meaning that it has not been done before.

Mr. President, we have seized before. We have not only seized, but we have relinquished seized roads. We have never imposed compulsory arbitration.

We know that seizure is a process over which we have some control in terms of national discipline. We have done that and gotten by with it without government ownership. We do not know what may be the results of compulsory arbitration. We do not know how many disputes may be brought to the Congress in the future. We do not know what effect this action may have in every bargaining chamber in the country involving key industries, whether they be utilities, railroads, airlines, or defense industries.

So, on the basis of choosing a remedy which has been tried, with respect to which we have experience, which we know has been sustained as to constitutionality, this joint resolution is the wrong approach.

One can design a process of seizure. I have tried to design the process in the amendment so as to take out the romance completely for both management and labor.

There have been no hearings on this proposal. That is not my fault. That is because of the fact that Congress has been unwilling to face the issue of what to do when everything else fails.

We are facing the issue now. In that respect it is probably good for our country at long last that we come face to face with reality. Indeed, we faced it in connection with the possible steel strike. It was then that I developed this particular approach, with the aid and comfort and support of my distinguished friend and colleague the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]—who does not necessarily have to vote for this amendment, but whose opinion and views I value so greatly, because they supported and backed mine. We put in a bill of this character at the time of the threatened steel strike.

In the absence of hearings and attrition and development, which we owe to a subject of this kind—which we have never given to it; not on the Taft-Hartley law and not since—I have tried to devise techniques to take the romance out for both management and labor.

What are those techniques?

First. The seizure would be under orders of the court, with a receiver in control, so that there would be a large body of law as well as the rules of the Federal courts by which to go, as well as the traditional obligations of receiverships.

Second. I have based this upon a carrier-by-carrier situation, so that a different receiver might be appointed for one carrier or for a series of carriers in what is called a system under the Railway Labor Act.

Third. I would give the court the authority to make decisions with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions for those who engaged in work on the railroads during the time the Government was in possession of them. That again would be in the normal tradition of receivership. In this case, for example, even the rules which have been recommended by Presidential commissions could be applied, but only while the Government was operating, and not thereafter.

So, really, there would not be the kind of compulsion there would be under the joint resolution, which is likely to pass, because under the joint resolution, if a man should quit he would give up his seniority rights and everything else. It is true that the Railway Labor Act, which would apply to the measure which is about to pass, would preserve his right to quit. There is an express section to that effect. But it would not preserve his seniority rights or other rights that may have accrued to him by working for a given railroad for a given time.

If a man should quit while the Government was in possession of the railroad, he would give nothing up, because the Government would not be his employer. Therefore, that is a real compulsion built into the measure before us, without my amendment.

Another item of importance is that this amendment would allow the United States to operate the road for its own account. That is the greatest point of all.

This approach would use the power of eminent domain in order to pay a fair compensation for the use of a road. That would take the romance out of it completely for management. Management would not have possession of the roads. Management would get a fair rental for them, but would not have the opportunity to develop them, which is what management wants to do.

It seems to me that is a built-in scheme which will put the Government into a position to assure itself of operation. This is the prime necessity, in my view, overriding every other consideration which is inherent in the debate today.

This amendment would take the romance out of the dispute so far as management and workers are concerned. If collective bargaining is to continue, and a restoration is to be made, to the management of each carrier when there is no longer a danger of a strike, this would put a real premium upon agreement between management and labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I concur thoroughly with the desire of the Senator from New York to take the romance out of these disputes which are damaging to the national economy and the national security.

However, I notice that the substitute which the Senator is offering is considerably different from the bill which the Senator and I introduced, to authorize the seizure of railroads or steel mills or other things in times of crises, when the national security is threatened. I notice that the substitute would apply specifically to the present dispute and to the railroads and unions which are engaged in that dispute. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. Let me explain to the Senator my reason for that.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator does not have to explain it to me. I understand.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to do so. I have been so honored by the fact that the Senator from Vermont has joined me in this effort, that I wish to explain it, if I may.

In good conscience I had to answer the question as to whether a measure as broad in its implications as this should, under these circumstances, be offered as general law—which is what I had originally contemplated when I introduced the bill with the Senator from Vermont—or whether it should be confined to this one dispute. I felt, in good conscience, that it ought to be confined to this dispute, because of the fact that, through no fault of mine, it has not gone through the process of hearings and attrition. So I came to the conclusion that, if there is to be a precedent, it ought to be a precedent in this dispute in regard to compulsory arbitration.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator means that it would be a limited precedent.

Mr. JAVITS. A limited precedent, rather than a broad general law using this measure as the vehicle.

I point out to the Senator and to the Senate that though the printed amendment is listed as a substitute, the amendment as I have offered it would be an addition to the joint resolution.

In short, I am proposing to leave the joint resolution as it is, as it has been voted so far, but also to give to the President the residual power to keep the country operating, come what may. Come what may at the end of a 6 months' period, or come what may in the interim, if the compulsory arbitration should fall on its face, or come what may in the future, the President would be given an additional power—the power to keep the country operating.

That is what this amendment is all about. If I do not get that point across to the Senate, I have not made my point at all.

I feel that in a situation of this character the President should have the ultimate final power to keep the country in business, come what may, whoever falls down on the job, whatever events occur, whatever accidents occur. In the final analysis, the President can keep the country operating. That is the ultimate point which I think, in all good conscience and responsibility, must be added to the bill.

I add an interesting fact for my fellow Republicans. This is not a new idea with me. This is the idea of the late Senator Robert Taft. In connection with the original National Labor Relations Act of 1949, in the minority views which were filed in the Senate on May 4, 1949, Senator Taft, for himself, Senator Smith, and Senator Donnell, proposed precisely what I am proposing to the Senate today. He proposed, too, that if there were to be a complete scheme of labor-management relations, there should be a seizure provision.

I should like to read to the Senate the seizure provision that Senator Taft wrote. It is a clear and unequivocal argument for what I am advocating today. It represented at that time section 304(a) of the bill, and it provided as follows:

> After issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 301 the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lockout or the continuing thereof or for authority for the President to take immediate possession and through such agency or department of the United States as he may designate to operate such industry, or both—

That is, injunction or seizure—

> and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lockout—
>
> (i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and
>
> (ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lockout, or the continuing thereof or to authorize the President to take immediate possession and through such agency or department of the United States as he may designate to operate such industry, or both, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

I have read the language of Senator Taft as to what he conceived to be the required labor-management policy of the United States.

Before I sum up, I would like to make one further observation. I have said many times that I am proud of the designation "liberal," although in the Republican Party we generally like to think of ourselves as progressive rather than liberal. It is always an idea on the part of those who would debate with us, or take different viewpoints, that we are merely moralists.

This is perhaps the best illustration of how wrong is the opinion, because if the Congress wants to be really realistic, if the Congress really wants to rise above groups of economic or social interest, if the Congress really wants to address itself to fundamental problems, which alone give us the right to be in the labor-management situation, and which should address itself to this question, our responsibility is to keep America operating; and we know that a strike on the railroads could immobilize the Nation. Therefore, it is our fundamental duty, whatever we do about the dispute, in the hope that it will be settled, by action of the arbiters, by action of the courts, or by collective bargaining, to provide for what may happen if nothing else works. This is our duty. If nothing else works, we should make provision for that contingency.

Do we come back to the Congress and say, "It has failed. Give me another remedy"? Or does the President, as he does with respect to defense and national emergency, have the power to do what is necessary for the country?

In this case, he does not have the power unless we give it to him. That is precisely what the Supreme Court decided when it threw out the efforts of President Truman to seize. The Court decided the President does not have that right unless Congress gives it to him. President Truman thought he might have that right under a national emergency, as he was advised in good faith, by the Attorney General, that he did have. But he did not, and the Supreme Court said so.

So this is a real vacuum in American public life, and it is a real vacuum in terms of the internal operations of the country. Whether or not we fill the vacuum today, I know we will have to fill it one day.

It is my purpose, in offering this amendment, which I have thought about a good deal, to give Congress the opportunity to begin to face its responsibility.

Just a word of summary on the presentation of this amendment and why I believe it is sound.

First. Let us remember that it is governmental intervention in either case. It is governmental intervention in arbitration; it is governmental intervention if we use the remedy of seizure.

Let us remember that our genial and delightful friends on the Commerce Committee who, in their additional views, said they wanted to steer between two unthinkables, strike and seizure, on the one hand, and the unacceptable, compulsory arbitration, on the other, have not steered at all. They have frankly, and quite properly, admitted on the floor of the Senate that they have adopted the other hand, which is completely unaccepable, compulsory arbitration; and that is what is incorporated in this measure.

I would rather adopt the unthinkable, if the unthinkable gives the President the power to survive this difficulty, over what members of the committee rather euphemistically called the unacceptable. In other words, the unthinkable may become acceptable, but the unacceptable can hardly ever be acceptable. That is what is being argued for in this measure—the unacceptable, namely, compulsory arbitration.

That is the first point. We are intervening as a Government, no matter what we do.

Second. We have a duty to the Nation to see that the railroads operate at least to the extent required by the public health and safety. There is no other way to assure that that duty will be discharged except by giving the President the ultimate remedy.

Third. The pending measure lacks the ultimate remedy of finality. If we are to deal effectively with this dispute, we should deal with it in a final way. The measure before us lacks finality. The amendment which I have proposed gives it finality. In any case, the Nation cannot be frustrated. The President can always act, and act decisively.

Fourth. It is not unfair to the workers. It gives the courts jurisdiction; and a man can quit if he does not like the situation, without the penalties involved in the pending measure, under which he would have to work under compulsion. Therefore, there is no compulsion for him to worry about. There is no compulsion to work under the seizure provision. He is protected by rights of appeal, in addition.

So far as management is concerned, my amendment makes it very clear that the Government has the right to survive, to protect itself; and that railroads, like any other piece of property, are subject to eminent domain where the public interest requires it. It is well known that we have exercised that power.

Fifth. It does not freeze the status quo, by making it very unromantic for management and labor. It gives opportunity for collective bargaining under the pressure of having an unfavorable situation for both. So it does not freeze the status quo.

Sixth. It does not lead to Government ownership. In fact, there seem to be greater reasons for Government ownership in the path we seem to be in a mood to follow, because it is untried and will affect every collective bargaining contract in the country, whereas seizure has been tried and has not represented Government ownership, but has represented a situation in which the properties were turned back to their private owners when the reasons for seizure had been dispelled.

For all these reasons, and as a matter of high responsibility in terms of the public policy of the Nation, I have offered the amendment as an addition to the joint resolution. I deeply feel that the Senate would be well advised to adopt it in discharging its ultimate responsibility, which is the responsibility of continuing the functions of the Nation, come what may.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would like to discuss at some length the proposal of the Senator from New York, but time is really of the essence.

In regard to the amendment and the general purposes of the amendment, the committee discussed at some length the problem of seizure, in all its aspects, and in the face of all the precedents and with regard to all the angles involved, and unanimously decided that it would not write a section on seizure into the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from New York. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 88, as follows:

[No. 147 Leg.]

YEAS—3

Aiken
Javits
Kuchel

NAYS—88

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Carlson
Eastland
Engle
Hartke
Hayden
Neuberger
Walters
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Javits' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Although I was listening, there was considerable conversation in the well of the Senate and I could not hear the result of the rollcall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was 88 to 3.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] is hereby assigned to serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was considered and agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the amendment which I have sent to the desk be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

> On page 10, line 6, after the period, add a new sentence as follows: "As a condition of its approval of any decision involving, directly or indirectly, the reduction of existing manning requirements or practices the arbitration board shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interest of the railroad employees affected as provided in section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and with due consideration

to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154 relating to the retention of job rights by senior employees, relocation expenses and earnings protection to less senior employees; to other jobs by the employing carrier, preferential hiring rights, displacement allowances, supplemental severance allowances, and retraining allowances."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is not my intention to press the amendment to a vote. Under the Interstate Commerce Act, when mergers, abandonments, or discontinuances take place in the railroad industry and result in the loss of jobs, certain equitable procedures are made mandatory.

The same procedures were applied to the Mass Transit Act. This amendment provides that section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act is to apply in this situation. I discussed this proposal informally with other Senators; and it is felt that probably without question the arbitration board would recognize the precedents, in the event of a loss of manpower and a loss of jobs as a result of the arbitration award. I think I voice the consensus of Senators when I say it is our feeling that this amendment to the committee amendment is unnecessary in this situation. Therefore, I shall withdraw it, after a question or two of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I appreciate the objective of the Senator from New Jersey. If I were to write out or spell out what any board or collective bargaining group would take up in these particular cases in regard to working rights, I would use this language. But it seems to me we have to rely upon the board or the parties involved in the collective bargaining feature to discuss these matters; and I am sure both parties have this in mind. Part of this debate has not been directed—and deliberately so—to what might happen to certain jobs under certain conditions. But I think it has been fairly well established, through both public discussions and private discussions, that certain things mentioned here probably would constitute criteria in connection with the act itself, and would form a good starting point. Both parties, so far as I know, are thinking both of attrition, in cases in which they might have to let some workers go, and—if they had to lose their jobs, due to attrition—of severance pay. We have already discussed that subject. Both sides have also mentioned seniority—to which the Senator from New Jersey has referred—preferential hiring rights, and similar matters. It seems to me that in order to do equity and justice in these particular cases, no group could ignore what is in the act itself, as a starting point.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. I am very grateful that the chairman of the committee feels that way, because we know that rail employment has been dropping at an alarming rate over the last decade, either with or without so-called featherbedding—from 1.4 million rail employees in 1947 to approximately 700,000 at the present time. This presents very great human problems that cannot be ignored.

If the railroads were a growing, thriving and expanding industry, it would not be too difficult to work out adjustments in the face of technological change.

But when employment in this industry is going steadily downhill, it is no easy thing to talk about eliminating tens of thousands of jobs, when these people have absolutely no opportunity to find employment in other facets of the industry.

We need to see if some sound solutions can be found to the underlying economic problems of the rail industry—solutions which would provide greater employment opportunities.

The $500 million urban transit bill that passed the Senate earlier this year is an example of the kind of program that would fill a real need, and will expand employment opportunities in the rail commuter facets of the industry's operations.

I am grateful for this interpretation by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I shall withdraw my amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. I am sure that both the brotherhoods and management are more than conscious of the fact that in dealing with these issues, we are dealing with most important human problems, two of them perhaps involved in some of the side issues—not with some of the ordinary problems of labor, such as wages, working conditions, pension rights, and other matters which in the past have been the subjects of labor disputes or labor conferences. They fully realize that the loss of a job is a human problem. It is a somewhat new problem. I suppose this is the first time automation has hit a whole nationwide industry in a major way—as happened when the work rules that were posted by the industry 3 or 4½ years ago. The brotherhoods realize that, and I am sure management realizes it just as much as those who operate the railroads do.

This is a most difficult problem, and it will confront our economy for the next 5 or 10 years. The question of what to do for a man who loses his job is more difficult to answer than the question of what to do when a group of workers say, "We want 10 cents more an hour," and then are offered an increase of only 8 cents.

I believe both parties to this dispute fully realize that problem and are very conscious of the particular situation the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] so ably brings up in connection with his amendment.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment to the committee amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the committee amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 178 to the committee amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment to the committee amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the third and fourth "Whereas" clauses at the beginning of the joint resolution, and to substitute therefor the following:

> Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures should be provided for security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers if all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

And to add a new section 1 as follows:

> This Act shall become effective upon a finding by the President that all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute, and that as a consequence thereof transportation services essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, are not available or are imminently threatened.

And to renumber the remaining sections.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, this amendment does two things: First, it strikes out two of the "whereas" clauses in the joint resolution.

One of these reads as follows:

> Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute;

The second "whereas" clause reads as follows:

> Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to secure the continuity of transportation services by such carriers;

These two "whereas" clauses would be replaced by the following:

> Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures should be provided for security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers if—

I direct particular attention to the word "if"—

> all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Iowa will suspend. The amendment the Senator from Iowa proposes to the committee amendment is, in part, an amendment to the preamble, which is not in order until the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. **MILLER**. But, Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that another part of my amendment would add a new section to the committee amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. That is correct; and that part is in order at this time. The remainder is not in order until the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. **MILLER**. I thank the Chair.

To continue, Mr. President, as I said, the first part of this amendment—for I shall have to discuss the first part in order that the amendment may be understood—would strike out two of the "whereas" clauses, which actually state that all procedures have been exhausted. My "whereas" clause uses the words "if all procedures have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute." If that change is made, the joint resolution will still state that no solution has yet been reached, and still will recite why it is necessary to take action, but only if certain situations exist.

The key part of my amendment is to add to the committee amendment a new section, as follows:

> This act shall become effective upon a finding by the President that all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted—

And so forth.

The purpose of the amendment is to make the operative fact not the action of Congress in passing the joint resolution and the signature of the President, but the declaration or finding of the President of the United States that all the conditions we have set forth have been met, and therefore there is a national emergency, or that one is imminent. I suggest that that is the proper way to handle the proposed legislation. Though probably unlikely, it is possible that if the joint resolution should pass the Senate today, tomorrow another attempt might be made to get the two parties together. There could be an agreement by the carriers to withhold putting into effect the work rules for another week, 2 weeks, or 3 weeks. There could be another round of negotiations. Indeed, there could be a negotiated settlement. That is a possibility. We ought to leave that possibility open.

I do not believe it is good legislation for the Congress, unless there has been a final declaration by the President in a certain factual situation, to put the joint resolution into effect. That is the purpose of the amendment.

I invite attention to the fact that while I recognize that the President considers the situation to be grievous, he has not yet quite said that all of the facts recited in the "whereas" clauses have been met. The most that I can find that he has said is set forth on page 5 of the committee report, which refers to the President's message back in July, in which he said:

> In the absence either of an agreement, postponement, or reversal of position on the part of the parties, or of enactment of some contrary measure on the part of the Congress, July 29 will almost certainly witness the start of a general rail strike.

The President went on to paint a dark and dismal picture of what would happen as a result of a railroad strike. We know that the July 29 date was postponed until 1 minute after midnight on August 29. The most that we have from the President is that almost certainly there will be a railroad strike, but he has not yet said that there is a national emergency or that one is imminent. We ought to have such a finding by the Chief Executive before this particular measure goes into effect. That is the purpose of my amendment. It is offered because I understand from people far more experienced in this type of proposed legislation than I that that is the usual way such legislation is worded. I would welcome any comments from Senators, particularly from the able chairman, the senior Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will not be adopted. Without quoting any member of the committee in detail, as shown in the report, the committee was of the opinion that the President had found such a condition as the Senator from Iowa has suggested when the President sent his message to Congress with the proposed joint resolution.

The joint resolution provides what the Senator has stated:

> Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand, that is merely a draft of the joint resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the joint resolution that the President recommended.

Mr. MILLER. It is merely a draft of the joint resolution. In his message did the President say that a national emergency exists or is imminent?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If one would read the President's message he would come to that conclusion. I do not know where in the message the President made the statement in those words.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the attention of the Senator from Washington to page 5 of the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the President's message to the Congress. He mentioned the joint resolution—the kind of legislation he proposed—and the legislative setting. On page 3 he spoke about the effects of a prolonged nationwide rail strike, which surely would establish an emergency.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I have lost him. He has referred to page 3.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I referred to the President's message to the Congress on this subject.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I do not have the same document that the Senator from Washington has.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the President's message to Congress.

Mr. MILLER. I see. I did not have that. I was reading the committee report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the President's message to Congress. From a reading of the message, I do not know what other conclusion one could come to than exactly what the Senator from Iowa has suggested.

Mr. MILLER. I believe the important part of the President's message to which the Senator referred is the part that I quoted from the chairman's committee report, which states:

> In his message the President concluded that the Nation faced the following prospects:
>
> In the absence either of an agreement, postponement, or reversal of position on the part of the parties, or of enactment of some contrary measure on the part of the Congress, July 29 will almost certainly witness the start of a general rail strike.

That is exactly my point. It is almost, but not quite, a declaration which I believe ought to be the operative event to put such drastic legislation as we will enact this afternoon or this evening into effect. I would hope that the Senator from Washington would recognize that legislation of this character ordinarily has as its operative moment a declaration by the Chief Executive rather than a mere statement by Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would be somewhat at a loss to put in stronger language what is suggested by the Senator from Iowa than the President put in his message to Congress. I do not know how he could make it any stronger than what he has said. There are several pages of the language. The conclusion is that the language which provides that "Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement" is a part of the joint resolution and the message. I do not know how we could pin it down better than he has done.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has suggested that the proposed joint resolution is actually a part of the President's message. He has quoted from the proposed joint resolution, which recites that "Whereas all procedures have been exhausted." The proposed joint resolution came to the Senate some time in July, as I understand. The Committee has spent a great deal of time on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the attention of the committee chairman to the fact that during all the intervening time until about 48 hours ago serious efforts were made on the part of the President, the Secretary of Labor, and the National Mediation Board to get the parties together. So the recital in the proposed legislation back in July that all procedures had been exhausted obviously was not the fact. The fact was that procedures were continuing to be utilized. I am not quite satisfied yet that they have been completely exhausted. The parties are not meeting now, and there is little prospect that they will. But I suggest that if the Senate passes a joint resolution like the one before the Senate, it could possibly result in a couple of telephone calls which might hold off the necessity for imposing binding arbitration, even though the joint resolution has now been narrowed down to two issues. I suggest that it would be proper for us to explore the possibility of delaying that eventful moment as long as we possibly can.

Furthermore, I point out that what I have suggested is the approach which is used in respect to proposed labor legislation. The operative moment is a declaration by the Chief Executive.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's amendment would require something further to be done. It would call upon the President of the United States to make some kind of statement after the joint resolution had passed the Congress or before the joint resolution took effect or when he signed the joint resolution.

Mr. MILLER. Indeed, it would.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I presume the President will make a statement when he signs the joint resolution.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know whether he will or not. If the situation has not improved, the President can sign the joint resolution and immediately make the declaration which will become the operative moment or operative fact for the joint resolution, but he may not have to do that. I suggest to the chairman that there would be a pretty serious situation if the joint resolution were not amended, the President signs it, and about the same time that he signs it we should receive information that management has agreed not to put the rules into effect and the union not to strike.

Therefore, labor is not going to strike, and will have another "go at it" rather than look forward to the time when the compulsory arbitration would take effect. It would be too late then. We would have missed a last opportunity to avoid the imposition of something I am quite sure none of us would like to see imposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think it would be too late at all. I hope that will happen. Then the joint resolution would not be operative.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator mean the President would not sign the joint resolution?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. Even if the President signed the joint resolution, if the parties said the next day, "We agree," the joint resolution would not be operative. There would be nothing to it. I hope that will happen. I have been pleading for that to happen for weeks.

Mr. MILLER. Is the chairman of the committee suggesting that if the parties should agree to negotiate further, after the President had signed the joint resolution, it would not go into effect, and the arbitration board would not be appointed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under the joint resolution the parties could agree with respect to certain issues, and they would be settled.

Mr. MILLER. That is not the point. The point is that, if they merely agreed to negotiate further, the wheels would be set in motion for the appointment of the arbitration board. The arbitration board would start its hearings. The mere agreement to negotiate further would not stop the machinery from going into effect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. There would have to be a settlement.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There would have to be an agreement on some of the issues involved.

Mr. MILLER. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the President has made his position as clear as anyone could make it, in as strong language as anyone could use. I do not see any necessity for him to reiterate what he said before.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the position of the Senator in charge of the joint resolution that the President has, for all practical purposes, declared that all procedures under the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in the settlement of the dispute; and that, as a consequence thereof, transportation services essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, are not available or are imminently threatened? Is it the Senator's position that the President has made such a declaration?

Mr. MAGNUSON. He said so on July 22 and Congress is going to say so tonight.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that Congress is going to say so, if Congress passes the joint resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At least, the Senate is going to say so.

Mr. MILLER. The Senate is going to say so, without this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not follow the Senator from Iowa. Does the Senator want the President to make a statement now about this issue? I do not follow what the Senator wishes to have done.

Mr. MILLER. The point is that I do not think any Member of the Congress ought to want to have this provision go into effect until the President of the United States has made a finding that all procedures under the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and that the national health and defense are imminently threatened or that transportation services essential thereto have stopped or are not available.

Mr. MAGNUSON. When does the Senator want to have him do that?

Mr. MILLER. After the joint resolution has been passed with my amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us pass the joint resolution and then we can talk about that.

Mr. MILLER. The point is that the Presiding Officer has already ruled that this part of my amendment is proper to be considered now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to belabor this point, but I think the President has said what the Senator from Iowa is talking about. The President did not say it yesterday or the day before, but he said it on July 22. I suppose, if he were asked to do so, he would say it again.

Mr. MILLER. My point is that the President did not say it. All he said was that if we did not do something on July 29 it was almost certain that there would be a strike. But the President did not say that there was one, or that the national defense was threatened imminently. That is the point. I do not think it is for the Congress to say that this is the situation. I think it is for Congress to say that under certain conditions something will take place, and then let the executive branch of the Government make the finding that the conditions have been met. That is exactly the way most of this type of legislation has been handled.

I do not wish to press this further, but I would like to have some assurance from the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to have some assurance from the Senator from Washington, if his position is to oppose the amendment, that so far as the Senator is concerned and so far as his committee is concerned the President has, for all practical purposes, declared that all the procedures under the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and that the transportation services essential to the national interest are not available or are imminently threatened.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot give the Senator from Iowa any assurance of that. I do not know what the President said yesterday, or the day before, or last week, or what the President will say tomorrow. All I know is that the President sent a very strong message to the Congress stating the case. The Secretary of Labor has repeated these things over and over. That is the basis on which the committee acted. I think it is unnecessary to have the President of the United States say any more about this matter.

Mr. MILLER. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He may wish to do so. I suppose he will say something when the joint resolution is signed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second part of the Miller amendment to the committee amendment, beginning on line 3. I presume that is what the Senator from Iowa would like to have a vote on.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I could not hear the statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second part of the Miller amendment to the committee amendment, beginning with line 3.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

The second part of the Miller amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not ask that it be read. I ask unanimous consent that the reading may be dispensed with and that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Strike out all of Senate Joint Resolution 102, as reported, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (44 Stat. 577; 45 U.S.C. secs. 151–164 and 181–188), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, as follows:

" 'Twelfth. (a) It shall be unlawful for the purposes of this section only, for employees in concert, or for any labor organization or representative of employees or their officers or agents, to engage in conduct which has as an object or effect, requiring a carrier—

" '(A) to employ or agree to employ any person or persons in excess of the number of employees reasonably needed by such carrier to perform actual services; or

"'(B) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value in lieu of employing, or on account of a failure to employ any person or persons in connection with the conduct of the business of a carrier, in excess of the number of employees reasonably needed by such carrier to perform actual services; or

"'(C) to pay or agree to pay more than once for services performed; or

"'(D) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services which are reasonably needed by a carrier in connection with the conduct of the business of such carrier but which are not performed or not to be performed; or

"'(E) to pay or give or agree to pay or give any money or other thing of value for services not reasonably needed in connection with the conduct of the business of a carrier; or

"'(F) to pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction for the privilege of, or on account of, producing, preparing, manufacturing, selling, renting, operating, using, or maintaining any article, machine, equipment, or materials or rendering any service; or to accede to or impose any restriction upon the production, preparation, manufacture, sale, purchase, rental, operation, use, maintenance of the same, or upon the rendering of any service, if such restriction has as an object thereof, preventing or limiting the use or utilization of such article, machine, equipment, materials, or service.

"'(b) Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any violation of subsection (a) of this paragraph may bring a civil action in a district court of the United States for such remedy or relief (including damages and injunctions) as may be appropriate. Whenever a judgment for damages is granted against a labor organization, collection of such judgment shall be limited to the assets owned or controlled by such labor organization, and such judgment shall not be enforceable against any individual member. Any such action against a labor organization or representative shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the district where the alleged violation occurred, or where the principal office of such labor organization or representative is located.

"'(c) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (28 U.S.C. 381), to restrain violations of this paragraph, without regard to the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 17, 29 U.S.C. 52), and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101–115).'"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for the edification of my colleagues, I shall not press for a vote on this substitute amendment. I merely wish to establish the position that I think it is a wiser approach than the one the President suggested or the one the committee has reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the joint resolution reported by the Committee on Commerce is designed to solve effectively the extremely serious problem facing the Nation in the railroad industry. My substitute consists of the bill, S. 1925, which I introduced on July 22, 1963, and which, if enacted, would have the effect of prohibiting all types of featherbedding practices in enterprises subject to the Railway Labor Act, to wit, the railroad and air transport industries.

My amendment would bring the railroads into line with the fundamental principles of our national policy against featherbedding as established in the Taft-Hartley and Lea Acts. Very few people today appear to realize that the prohibitions against featherbedding are incorporated into Federal law for all industries except railroading and air transport.

I believe it is in the public interest that this omission in the law be rectified immediately. I find it rather strange that, in all the discussion attendant on the present dispute over work rules which would eliminate featherbedding, so little attention has been paid to the immunity, under the law, which the railway unions, almost uniquely, enjoy in this respect.

We certainly have heard about all the other possible approaches to the problem, including suggestions for compulsory arbitration, which I regard with considerable apprehension because it would interfere with free collective bargaining and the right of workers to strike.

In this regard I find myself in complete accord with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who, during the time I have known him and all of his life in labor law, has been opposed to compulsory arbitration. I agree with the Senator that this procedure would mark the end of free collective bargaining in this country, even though what we might do in this instance might be considered only as a precedent. Precedents are very dangerous things, Mr. President. We have embarked on several of them in this body since I became a Member. In every instance we have come to regret the precedent which was established.

Free collective bargaining is a necessity if we are to continue to have labor unions and continue to have a free enterprise system.

I am also apprehensive about this approach because I believe that eventually it must affect the right to strike. The only weapon that a worker has is the right to strike. We can impose certain restrictions on that right, where it interferes with health, safety, and the national interest, and I think that would be a justifiable avenue for the Congress to operate in, but to embark on compulsory arbitration, whether it is outright, such as the proposal of the committee, or whether it is subtle, such as the proposal of the President, is a bad step.

The substitute reported by the Commerce Committee, like the original resolution recommended by the President, imposes compulsory arbitration on the parties to this dispute, and sets a precedent which will haunt us for years to come.

Mr. President, just as the Lea Act in 1946 was fashioned to meet the featherbedding problems of the broadcasting industry, my amendment is designed specifically to deal with the problem of featherbedding in the enterprises subject to the Railway Labor Act. In brief, my proposal would permit an employer in these industries to bring a civil suit for damages and injunctions against labor unions seeking to compel him to accept featherbedding practices. The forbidden practices would include among others, requiring payments for work not reasonably needed, for work not performed at all, or for employing more employees than are reasonably necessary to perform required work.

I feel that any person or group of persons who constitute a company or a corporation, and who are willing to invest their money in property, certainly have the right, as entrepreneurs, to be the judge of how many employees they need and to be the judge of whether or not the work those employees are performing is satisfactory or needed at all.

Mr. President, what have we done? I think it is understandable if we will study the history of the Taft-Hartley Act and the Railway Labor Act. We are excluding two industries in the United States from the prohibition placed against every other industry in the United States. It was done to facilitate the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, but this does not mean, in my opinion, that we should allow the language to be absent from the Railway Labor Act for all years to come.

It is true that this legislation, or whatever legislation is passed by Congress, will probably have an effect in settling this strike, but, just as we failed to do in all other cases of labor problems since I came to this body, we fail to recognize the disease. The disease is a simple one. It is the undue grant of power placed in two groups of workers representing labor—not two unions, because there are many unions in this field.

I call upon my colleagues to judge, in good conscience, whether it is proper and decent, under American standards, to allow two parts of our society to enjoy privileges that the rest of our society does not enjoy.

Mr. President, the standard to be used in determining whether these prohibitions have been violated is the standard of reasonableness, one of the most widely used concepts in our entire system of law. The validity of this standard was sustained by Justice Hugo Black, speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court, in a decision a number of years ago applying the Lea Act to featherbedding practices in the broadcasting industry.

Mr. President, in introducing my bill, S. 1925, on July 22, 1963, I submitted an analysis of it which was printed in the RECORD for that day.

Instead of prolonging the debate at this late hour, I ask unanimous consent that the analysis of the joint resolution, which appears at page 13080 of the RECORD of July 22, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF GOLDWATER BILL TO PROHIBIT FEATHERBEDDING IN THE RAILROAD AND AIR-TRANSPORT INDUSTRIES

The bill is designed to extend the existing Federal statutory prohibition against featherbedding to the only industries whose activities affect interstate commerce which are not presently subject to such a prohibition. The bill therefore takes the form of an amendment to the Railway Labor Act and is therefore applicable to featherbedding practices in the railroad and air-transport industries only.

Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act contains 11 paragraphs setting forth, among other things, the duties and obligations of carriers by rail and air in their collective bargaining relationships with their employees, and with the labor organizations which represent their employees for the purposes of collective bargaining. It also sets forth the rights of employees with respect to their labor union activities.

This bill would add a 12th paragraph to section 2 making it unlawful for labor unions or employees acting concertedly, to engage in any conduct which had the object, in whole or in part, or would have an effect of requiring a carrier by rail or air to do any of the following:

1. Employ or agree to employ more employees than are reasonably needed to perform actual services.

2. Pay or give, or agree to pay or give, money or anything of value, in order to escape being required to employ more employees than are reasonably needed to perform actual services.

3. Pay or agree to pay more than once for needed services actually performed.

4. Pay or agree to pay for services which are reasonably needed but which are not actually performed or which it is agreed are not to be performed.

5. Pay or agree to pay for services which are not reasonably needed in the conduct of the carrier's business.

6. Pay or agree to pay any tax or exaction in order to be permitted to produce or manufacture any article or render any service.

7. Agree to impose a restriction on the production or manufacture of any article or the rendering of any service, if the purpose of the restriction is to prevent or limit the use of such article or the rendering of such service.

By way of remedy, the bill permits anyone whose business or property is injured by any of these forbidden featherbedding practices to bring a civil suit in a Federal district court for appropriate relief, including damages and injunctions, with the limitation that any judgment for damages is collectible only from the union or representative and not from any individual union member. The suit must be brought in the district where the alleged violation occurred or where the union or representative has its principal office.

The limitations on the granting of injunctions by Federal courts in labor disputes are specifically made inapplicable to suits instituted under the provisions of the proposed legislation. (These inapplicable limitations are contained in sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act, and in the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.) However, in any proceeding in which injunctive relief is sought, the provisions (relating to notice to the opposite party) which are to be found in section 17 of the Clayton Act are specifically made applicable.

The basic functions of the court in a suit brought under the provisions of this bill are threefold:

1. To determine if the facts are substantially as alleged by the complainant.

2. To determine if these facts constitute a violation of the bill's prohibitions, with the court deciding whether the demands of the union or the position of the employer better meets the standard of "reasonableness" in those provisions where such a standard is specifically provided.

3. To determine, where a violation has been found, the appropriate relief or remedy in accordance with established principles of law and equity.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I indicated at the outset, I have no intention of calling for a vote on the proposal. I wish the committee had considered it, because I think sometime in the future we must face the problem that exists, and not try to wish ourselves away from it in order to keep friends in some labor organizations. Eventually the labor movement itself will recognize the unfairness of this provision and probably call upon us to take appropriate action, which I am suggesting, but which I will not press for.

In fact, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want the RECORD to note that this amendment is in the nature of a substitute. I think it is a bill which the Senator from Arizona has introduced as a separate measure. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. As I recall, I introduced the bill the same day the President's bill came to Congress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And it has been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This is the first time I realized that. I remember a colloquy that night on the floor, in which I asked the majority leader which committee would receive the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it properly belongs in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senator is a member of that committee, and he can press for consideration of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Washington realizes now that the whole subject would better have been before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would have been easier on the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suggest that in the future, when labor matters come before this body, they be referred to that committee—not that I belittle the efforts of the Senator from Washington, but the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare engages in this work day after day and year after year. I know it is foreign to the Committee on Commerce. But I congratulate the Senator for working so assiduously on the measure. The joint resolution which has been brought out of that committee has the possibility of preventing a strike, but not of ending the trouble. The real trouble is in labor-management relations. We are going to be constantly plagued by the threat of strike, and the precedent which may be established here——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Particularly in the field of automation, which this is all about.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I could not agree more, but the problem of automation has been with us for 300 years. We are prolonging the problem by allowing people to stay on the job who would be better off in other jobs, if there were an opportunity to have them trained for other work. I think the proposals of the railroads are adequate. We must face this issue some day.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator elucidate on the statement that the Taft-Hartley Act now prohibits featherbedding, and that the only two groups that are immune from the act are the railroad and air carrier employees?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. As I understand, although I was not in this body at the time, when the Taft-Hartley bill came from the other side of the Capitol, it contained a prohibition against featherbedding in all industry. So the railroads, and by virtue of being carriers, the airlines, were exempted from the act, under the argument that the Taft-Hartley Act did not apply to the Railway Act. Therefore, by that omission, the Railway Act permits featherbedding in those two industries.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator able to tell us when the Taft-Hartley bill was passed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In 1947. I refer to section 8 of the Taft-Hartley Act, "Unfair labor practices," section 8(b):

> It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

And then going over to page 7—

> to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value * * * for services which are not performed or not to be performed.

That is the Taft-Hartley language.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Taft-Hartley Act contain the language exempting railroads because they have normally come under a separate governmental control?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. The Taft-Hartley Act does not apply.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or to airlines.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It does not apply to the railroads or the airlines.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Arizona has presented a bill which would make applicable to all industries, without preference being given to any, the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, prohibiting the payment of any money for nonrendered services, if I may put it that way.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The language is "for services that are not performed or not to be performed."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether there are any other proposed amendments to be offered, which the chairman is not aware of?

Mr. McNAMARA. I have one, to which I should like to make reference in the RECORD. I will not call it up, however.

I have cast my votes on this legislation most reluctantly.

I am aware of the serious effect of a nationwide railroad strike. At the same time, I am aware of the serious precedent we are adopting.

Despite all the debate conducted to assure ourselves that this is not a precedent—that this is not compulsory arbitration—I think most of us must feel deep in our consciences that this is exactly what we are doing.

I sincerely hope that the railroad unions and the carriers are fully aware of these serious implications inherent in this measure.

On both of them I urge the most serious reflection and exercise of responsibility in carrying out the remainder of the negotiating program which we have begun with this legislation.

For either of them to fail now in reaching swift agreement on what we have called the secondary issues would invite disaster. This would mean that the Congress again would be compelled to act—and that action, I say frankly, would be much faster in view of the precedent we are setting today.

I do not feel that the railroad industry as a whole—including employees and management—can take any satisfaction in our action today.

This resolution is a precedent that, if repeated, threatens the very existence of the railroads as a free segment of the American free enterprise economy.

An industry such as the railroads whose charges to the public are regulated by the Federal Government, whose service to the public is regulated by the Federal Government, whose retirement program is regulated by the Federal Government, whose safety regulations are regulated by the Federal Government, whose consolidations, mergers, and abandonments are regulated by the Federal Government, has little left to lose.

It would not be much of a step for this industry to also lose to the Federal Government the determination of personnel and labor relations policies.

Therefore, I hope that both parties will take the responsibilities assigned them in completing negotiations with the utmost seriousness—and give Congress no further cause to intervene.

I had prepared an amendment which would have made this responsibility more obvious.

I would have striken that last line of section 5—which now sets a period of 60 days for the arbitration award to become binding.

The award would have become binding immediately on issuance—so that the parties could get on with settling the so-called secondary issues through collective bargaining.

Further, I would have stricken section 6(b)—that section which would have required arbitration of the secondary issues—had settlement not been reached freely. I am happy to see that the McGee amendment—which we have adopted—strikes this section.

And finally—my amendment would have permitted the resolution to expire at the conclusion of the collective bargaining—rather than setting an abitrary and unnecessary 180-day period—as does the McGee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 181.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change except by agreement, or pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored. The provisions of this section shall remain in effect only until each of the issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, has (1) been settled by agreement of the parties, or (2) has been included in a decision of the Board appointed under section 2.

"SEC. 2. The President shall, at the earliest possible date, appoint a Special Railroad Work Rules Dispute Board, hereinafter referred to as the 'Board,' to be composed of (1) two members selected from among persons recommended by representatives of the carriers which are parties to the aforesaid dispute, (2) two members selected from among persons recommended by representatives of the labor organizations which are parties to such dispute, and (3) a chairman and two other members selected at large. In the event that the representatives of a party fail to submit such recommendations to the President within ten days after being requested to do so by the President, the President shall proceed to make the appointments without such recommendations. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 3. Promptly upon the completion of the naming of the Board the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the Board and to the parties to the dispute copies of his statement to the parties of August 2, 1963, and the papers therewith submitted to the parties, together with memorandums and such other data as the Board may request setting forth the matters with respect to which the parties were in tentative agreement and the extent of disagreement with respect to matters on which the parties were not in tentative agreement. The Board shall make a decision containing its recommendations for the settlement, on an interim basis for a period not to exceed two years, of the issues raised by those portions of the carriers' notice of November 2, 1959, identified as 'Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power' and 'Consist of Road and Yard Crews' and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as 'Minimum Safe Crew Consist' and implementing proposals pertaining thereto. In making its decision, the Board shall incorporate any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, and shall give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement.

"SEC. 4. The Board shall begin its hearings thirty days after the enactment of this joint resolution or on such earlier date as the parties to the dispute and the Board may agree upon and shall make and announce its decision not later than ninety days after the enactment of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 5. (a) The parties to the dispute arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, not to be included in the decision of the Board under section 3 of this joint resolution and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such issues by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed toward promoting such agreement.

"(b) If any of the issues referred to in paragraph (a) have not been resolved by collective bargaining within sixty days after the Board's decision is announced in accordance with section 4 of this joint resolution, either party may apply to the National Mediation Board for certification of such issue or issues to the Board. If the National Mediation Board determines (1) that the party making such application has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach a settlement of such issues through collective bargaining, and (2) that it is unlikely that any agreement with respect to such issue or issues or with respect to voluntary procedures for the disposition of such issue or issues will result from further efforts to bargain collectively, the National Mediation Board shall certify to the Board the status of the issues then in dispute, and the Board shall make a decision containing its recommendations with respect to the settlement of these issues. The Board shall make and announce its decision with respect to these issues not later than sixty days after such issues have been certified by the National Mediation Board.

"SEC. 6. In the consideration of any issue under this joint resolution involving, directly or indirectly, the reduction of existing manning requirements or practices—

"(1) the Board shall consult with, and request the recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to the safety aspects of such proposed reduction; and

"(2) the Board shall include in its decision a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected as provided in section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and shall give due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and Emergency Board 154 relating to the retention of job rights by senior employees, relocation expenses and earnings protection to less senior employees transferred to other jobs by the employing carrier, preferential hiring rights, displacement allowances, supplemental severance allowances, and retraining allowances: *Provided, however,* That the Board may include in its decision a direction that all or any part of such job protection arrangements and job rights and benefits should be denied to any employee engaged in a strike against a carrier because such carrier has placed into effect any of the recommendations contained in the decision of the Board.

"SEC. 7. (a) In the event that prior to the expiration of two years following the date on which the first section of this Act ceases to be effective—

"(1) the carrier does not put into effect all recommendations of the Board and a strike is called against such carrier because of a dispute involving any of the issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, and

"(2) the President determines, after consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers and the Interstate Commerce Commission, that the interruption of the operation, or any part thereof, of any carrier, caused by such strike, if permitted to continue, will deprive the Nation or any substantial part thereof of transportation services essential to health or safety, the President is authorized to take possession of and operate such part of the facilities of such carrier as may be necessary to maintain such services, giving due consideration to the availability of other forms of transportation services.

"(b) In the event that the President takes possession of and operates any facilities of a carrier under subsection (a), he shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of such facilities. In any such case the operation of such carrier shall be carried out to the fullest extent practicable through the existing management thereof.

"(c) During the period in which possession of any carrier has been taken by the United States under this section, the carrier or its duly designated representatives of the employees of such carrier shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining in a good faith effort to settle the issues in the dispute between them. During the period in which the United States shall have taken possession of any carrier, the National Mediation Board shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such carrier shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the carrier or with the labor organization for a collective bargaining contract or to alert the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry or plant prior to the dispute, except as may be consistent with the recommendations of the Board or as may be authorized by the President.

"(d) Any carrier or properties of which possession has been taken under this section shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees of such carrier settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such carrier by the United States is no longer necessary.

"(e) Beginning not later than thirty days after issuance of an order taking possession of a carrier, the United States shall impound and hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the carrier. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the carrier, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took or continued possession of such carrier when its operation had been interrupted by a stoppage of work or operations or that a stoppage of work or operations was imminent; to the fact that the United States would have returned such carrier to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such stoppage of work or operations; and to the value the use of such carrier would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation: *Provided*, That any increase in wages or other compensation or any increase resulting from a change in the method of computing wages or other compensation which is agreed to retroactively for the period of Government operation or any portion of that period shall be deemed costs or expenses for such period.

"(f)(1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this section to the owner of any carrier of which possession is taken. The members of such compensation board shall be compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 2.

"(2) Upon appointing such compensation board, the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding, unless within thirty days after the issuance of said award, a party moves to have the said award set aside or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"SEC. 8. In the event that, prior to the expiration of two years following the date on which the first section of this joint resolution ceases to be effective—

"(1) a strike is called by any labor organization against a carrier because of the placing into effect by such carrier of any recommendation contained in a decision of the Board, and

"(2) the President, after consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers and the Interstate Commerce Commission and after giving due consideration to the availability of other forms of transportation services, determines that the interruption of the operation, or any part thereof, of any carrier caused by such strike, if permitted to continue, will deprive the Nation or any substantial part thereof of transportation services essential to health or safety, the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court, having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such strike or such part of the strike thereof as might otherwise interrupt the maintenance of such services, and if the court finds that the President has reasonable cause to believe that such interruptions if permitted to continue, will deprive the Nation, or any substantial part thereof, of transportation services essential to health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such strike, or such part thereof as may be necessary to prevent interruption of such essential transportation services, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.

"In granting such injunction or relief, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101-115). Such injunction or order shall be dissolved (1) upon settlement of the dispute, (2) such interruption no longer deprives the Nation or any substantial part thereof of transportation services essential to health or safety, or (3) the expiration of the two-year period hereinabove referred to.

"SEC. 9. The President shall take such steps as may be necessary to encourage the making of such pooling or other arrangements between any carrier or carriers the employees of which are restrained from engaging in a strike under an injunction granted under section 8 and any carrier or carriers whose employees are not covered by any such injunction, as may be necessary to assist such carrier or carriers in absorbing the impact of any strike by employees not so covered."

THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTE IN THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY—SHUTDOWN OF NATIONAL RAILROAD SYSTEM WOULD BE DISASTROUS TO THE NATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the labor dispute in the railroad industry involves not two, but three parties. We are apt to think of this issue in terms of the Nation's railroads and the railroad brotherhoods which represent the railroad employees. However, there is a third party, and in my opinion, that is the most important party—the American public. To the carriers and the brotherhoods I say today, there are considerations that rise above individual or group selfish economic interests; namely, the good of our country and the public interest.

I have pointed this out to the brotherhoods in the past weeks, as I have pleaded with them not to make the mistaken judgment of attempting to settle on the picket lines a set of issues which are not susceptible of being settled on the picket lines, unless they want to defend going back to jungle law in economic disputes. We ought to settle this dispute by the application of rules of reason, by taking the economic evidence involved in connection with this substantive issue and in connection with the jobs that are involved in the dispute. A good many substantive work rules are involved.

If there ever was a case, in my work in the field of labor relations, that calls for settlement, first around the collective bargaining table, and then around the voluntary arbitration table, this is it.

If some equitable agreement is not reached between the carriers and the railroad brotherhoods, with the help of congressional legislation if necessary, we are still confronted with the fact that the Nation cannot tolerate a general shutdown of our most vital artery of national commerce. This artery carries the life blood of our Nation. It must remain open.

We in the Congress serve here with the primary responsibility of representing the public interest of all the people of the Nation. Whenever any economic segment of that citizenry follows a course of action which may develop a fact situation in which its course of action sacrifices the general public interest, then it will become the responsibility of the Congress to proceed to protect the public interest for the right to strike is not an absolute right, and never has been. Most rights we have must be exercised in connection with their relationship to other rights. It is very easy for us to say we have a right to do such and such. We may have the right, it is true, but it may not be used in a manner which will destroy other rights with which it must be reconciled.

Mr. President, in connection with these great national disputes which involve so directly the national welfare, including the health, safety, and security of the country, I say most respectfully to labor, as I have said so many times in the past: Never forget that the greatest value of the right to strike is to be found in the threat to strike. All too often, when labor goes beyond the threat to strike and pulls the plug, so to speak, it loses the strike, because in most national emergency disputes which involve the health and safety and welfare of the Nation, public interest must come first.

Labor ought to recognize that the public interest will always be placed first.

That is why the Senator from Oregon has urged in recent weeks that the parties agree to voluntary arbitration of the issues in this dispute on which they could not reach agreement.

Having mentioned the procedure of voluntary arbitration, I wish to pay my respects and my compliments to a great industrial statesman within the field of railroad labor. He is the head of one of the so-called nonoperating unions. I refer to the incomparable George Harrison, who has demonstrated time and time again that he recognizes the point the senior Senator from Oregon has made. It is very interesting to note that in recent weeks Mr. Harrison entered into an arbitration agreement in regard to one part of the transportation industry in the country, and I commend him for it. It is with great regret that I note that the chiefs of the five operating brotherhoods did not exercise the same degree of industrial statesmanship.

The President of the United States has alluded clearly to the unthinkable results of a nationwide stoppage of our railroad systems. In his message of July 22, 1963, he told the Congress:

> In the event a strike occurs it will bring widespread and growing distress.
>
> Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment—including coal and other mining which is dependent on rails leading directly to the mine, steel mills that ship by rail, certain chemical plants which load liquids directly into tank cars, and synthetic fiber mills dependent on chemicals which for safety reasons can be carried only in rail tank cars—all of these and others would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the west coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear in New York City and other major population centers. Mail services would be disrupted. The delay, cost, and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversion.
>
> The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.
>
> As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components—including those engaged in the production of automobiles, metal products, lumber, paper, glass, and others—the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic. Construction projects dependent on heavy materials—exports and waterway shipping dependent on rail connections—community water supplies dependent on chlorine which also moves only by rail—slaughterhouses and stockyards, iron ore, rubber and machinery, magazine publishers, and transformer manufacturers—all would be hard hit by a strike. The August grain harvest would present a particularly acute problem.
>
> The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the 30th day of a general rail strike, some 6 million nonrailroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15 percent mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of gross national product would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst postwar recession.
>
> At the same time, shortages and bottlenecks would increase prices—not only for fruits and vegetables, but for many industrial materials and finished products as well—thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive posture in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or congressional action on the 30th day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold.

The parties to this dispute knew that. The President did not tell the parties anything they did not know when he recited to the American people what the economic effects of the strike would be. Yet the record of the case is clear. Time and time again, the carriers agreed to cooperate with the Government in the adoption of peaceful procedures for the determination of the issues on the merits; and the brotherhoods adamantly, time and time again, refused. Who put the public interest first? Not the brotherhoods. I am sorry to find it necessary to say these things on the floor of the Senate.

I propose to put the blame where it belongs—right on the backs of the chiefs of the brotherhoods involved in this dispute. They have made a sad and sorry record of noncooperation with the Government in the attempt to seek voluntary, peaceful procedures for the settlement of this dispute.

A stoppage of general railroad service would be particularly disastrous to the small business segment of our economy. Thousands of such firms would close in bankruptcy after a few days. Their losses would be reflected many times over in related and dependent areas of the national economy. We cannot afford so great a sacrifice. We cannot afford it because I believe reasonable men, with their minds uppermost on the general public interest, can resolve the railroad dispute.

LEADERS OF THE RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS' SERIOUS MISTAKE—REJECTION OF VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

If there was ever a labor-management dispute that called for a solution through the procedures of voluntary arbitration, it is the railroad dispute with which we are now confronted.

President Kennedy deserves the highest praise for having offered the voluntary arbitration procedures to the parties and the carriers are to be commended for having agreed to accept this procedure under the specific plan offered by the President.

The President offered to the parties the services of one of the most able and highly respected labor arbitrators in our Nation—Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg. Mr. Justice Goldberg is recognized as one of the greatest leaders of our generation in the field of labor relations. His record is one of impartiality. He has brought his great judicial temperament to every labor dispute he has ever mediated or arbitrated.

Mr. Justice Goldberg was willing to devote his time this summer to an arbitration of the railway labor controversy dispute. Both sides to the dispute should have wasted no time in accepting the President's suggestion. The proposal was for voluntary arbitration. I believe that management and the railroad brotherhoods also had a patriotic obligation—I use the term "patriotic" advisedly—to retain voluntary arbitration in the field of labor relations as a tool, a vehicle, and a procedure for the settlement of labor disputes.

It is perfectly clear, as one studies the issues involved in this dispute, that the American public has come to the conclusion that there should be an equitable settlement of this dispute without a costly strike.

I need yield to no one as a friend of the legitimate rights of management and of the legitimate rights of labor. I say to the railroad brotherhoods, "In my judgment you had a clear responsibility, owed to your membership, owed to the families of your membership, and owed to the American public, to accept the principle of voluntary arbitration and to accept as the arbitrator a truly great man recommended by the President who, in my judgment, has no peer in the field of labor arbitration."

Mr. President, everyone in the dispute knows that a shutdown of the railroads would finally end with a settlement on just about the same terms as would be awarded by such an impartial judicial arbitration award, based upon all the evidence, as Mr. Justice Goldberg would have handed down.

Why the leaders of the railroad brotherhoods rejected the voluntary arbitration services of Mr. Justice Goldberg, I shall never understand. They lost a golden opportunity for a fair and equitable ruling. They know that Justice Goldberg is without a parallel as a mediator of labor disputes. With his great ability in this field he would have mediated—and successfully—the majority of the issues in dispute. His arbitration functions would have been called for on only a small number of issues. Above all, he would have placed his reputation as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court at stake. This would have assured absolute fairness and justice on any decision he might have rendered by way of arbitration.

But all this is "water over the dam," so to speak. The leadership of the brotherhoods rejected the President's voluntary arbitration offer, and thereby lost a great opportunity.

In the 11th hour of the negotiations the brotherhood finally agreed tentatively to proposals by Secretary Wirtz to arbitrate two basic issues involving the engine crew and the train crew. Unfortunately, it was too late. The brotherhood and railroads could not get together on the terms of the arbitration and the matter was thrown back to Congress.

But with respect to the offer of arbitration on the part of the brotherhoods, in my judgment, it does not meet the test of a good-faith offer, because the brotherhoods so entwined their offers with restrictions and reservations, as I said earlier in the debate today, that in one breath they offered arbitration, and in another breath they effectively took arbitration away. The terms, conditions, and restrictions they sought to impose killed their offer at the very time they submitted it.

It now remains for the Congress to exercise its jurisdiction toward a fair solution of the dispute.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 102—THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

On July 22, in implementation of a plan for settlement of the railroad dispute, as offered by the President, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate joined in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 102.

The objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 102 as introduced, were explained by the President in this language:

> Ineffective measures which would not halt an injurious nationwide rail strike have been rejected as inconsistent with the public interest.
>
> Punitive antilabor measures which would destroy railway labor's rights to collective bargaining and reasonable job security have been rejected as harmful to the Nation and insensitive to the very real issues posed by the proposed work rule changes.
>
> Seizure of the railroads has been rejected as unjustified in the circumstances of this case, as creating complex legal and financial problems for the Government, and has merely postponed the day of reckoning on more efficient work rules and their acceptance by the brotherhoods.
>
> Compulsory arbitration of this dispute by a special or congressional panel has been rejected as inconsistent with the principle that solutions reached through free collective bargaining should always be permitted and preferred.
>
> Indefinite extension of the status quo for one or both parties has been rejected as an evasion of a serious public, as well as labor-management, issue that must be squarely faced.
>
> Our objective instead was to find a solution which—
>
> (1) Is sufficiently familiar to the Congress, in terms of the procedures and principles involved, to facilitate its prompt enactment;
>
> (2) Encourages the parties to achieve their own solutions through collective bargaining;
>
> (3) Confronts the parties, on issues where voluntary agreement is not possible, with methods and standards of solution which are comparable to those both sides have previously experienced and found acceptable;
>
> (4) Recognizes both the public interest in promoting railroad efficiency and preventing a disastrous strike and the public's concern for those adversely affected by a settlement; and
>
> (5) Provides for an interim remedy while awaiting the results of further bargaining by the parties.
>
> RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION
>
> As noted above, the railroad 8-hour law of 1916 provides a precedent for congressional intervention of this type; and the Interstate Commerce Act provides a pattern to which both Congress and the parties are accustomed. Recognizing that both railroad mergers and their effect on railroad employment are deeply affected with the public interest, section 5 of that act wisely supplements the results of private decisionmaking and collective bargaining in this area with the quasi-judicial regulatory powers of the independent Interstate Commerce Commission. Proposed mergers must be passed upon by the Commission after due regard to their effect on public service and safety, the rights of employees, and other considerations. In its order of approval the Commission includes specific terms and conditions to protect the job security of the employees involved. The carriers and brotherhoods remain free to supersede these employee security provisions with their own collective bargaining agreement. The value which railroad and other unions attribute to this section was reflected in their urging that comparable provisions be included in this year's mass transportation bill; and there are such provisions in this bill as it passed the Senate and as it was reported in the House.

Mr. President, I digress from reading the President's message to say that I have a sense of humor when I am confronted with a little irony; and perhaps in this instance it is best explained as a paradox, for early this year representatives of the railroad brotherhoods and representatives of the mass transit workers came to me and urged me to help write into the mass transportation bill what amounts to the Washington amendment. It became known as the Morse amendment. I fought hard for that amendment, against what many Senators said were insurmountable odds. We had a meeting of the Democratic conference; and there it was perfectly clear that at that time the Morse amendment was not favored. But as Senators came to understand the fairness and the soundness of the position taken by the railroad brotherhoods and the mass transit workers, my amendment was adopted by the Senate by a good-sized majority, and it is now pending in the House; and the President adopted, as part of his program for the handling of this dispute, the principle of the very amendment that the brotherhoods and the mass transit workers earlier this year urged be added to the mass transportation bill. That is a bit ironical, and also is a bit humorous, Mr. President, when we consider the position the brotherhoods have taken in opposition to the President's proposal.

I read further from the President's message:

> There is no reason why these principles and procedures, if they are applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad mergers and mass transit modernization, are not equally applicable to the employment security problems raised by railroad modernization and mechanization. An expert body should pass on these proposed rule changes in the light of public service and safety; and it should also make provision to prevent the employees from bearing the full cost of technical or economic progress, so long as priority is given to agreements privately reached by the parties themselves.
>
> I recommend, therefore, that—for a 2-year period during which both the parties and the public can better inform themselves on this problem and alternative approaches—interim work rules changes proposed by either party to which both parties cannot agree should be submitted for approval, disapproval, or modification to the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the procedures and provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Commission being directed to use to advantage the word of the two previous panels which received the evidence on these matters.

To digress again, Mr. President, let me say it was the brotherhoods who strongly endorsed the inclusion of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act in the first instance.

I read further from the President's message:

> At its discretion the Commission may also appoint a special advisory panel to assist it in the discharge of its functions. The Commission shall judge the effect of each proposed rule on the adequacy and safety of transportation service to the public and on the interests of both parties; and it shall, with the advice of the Secretary of Labor, require fair and equitable arrangements to protect the interests of the affected employees, giving proper weight to the protection provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act and those recommended by the Presidential Commission and Emergency Board reports. Emerging from the recommendations of these boards was the principle that, while many jobs would not be filled following the death, retirement, or voluntary transfer of the present occupants, every present employee with a significant attachment to the railroad industry would retain the right to his present employment or to comparable railroad employment at comparable pay. Provisions would also be made for rehiring priority, relocation expenses, displacement allowances, education and retraining grants, supplemental severance and retirement benefits, and other features. In short, no one would be thrown out in the street; and, while the railroads gradually modernize their operations, there would be little, if any, loss to individual employees.
>
> Unlike compulsory arbitration, this method would preserve and prefer collective bargaining and give precedence to its solutions. But any strike or lockout designed to impose a rules change which has not been approved by the Commission or the parties, or to oppose one which has been approved, would be subject to the remedies of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act.
>
> This procedure is most appropriate to the disposition of those rule changes involving the manning of train or engine crews—the "automation" issues, in a sense. It would build on the progress made to date in defining and refining those issues through the various panel studies and subsequent bargaining efforts.
>
> While the disposal of those issues should be sufficient to remove the barriers to a peaceful solution of all other issues by collective bargaining between the parties, many of them are closely interrelated to the work rules changes—and I recommend that the same joint resolution of the Congress provide that either party may submit such issues to the Commission to be settled by procedures deemed appropriate by the Commission.
>
> I stress the fact that, unlike compulsory arbitration, these procedures would provide only interim changes and only for those situations and for such length of time as the parties are unable to agree to collective bargaining.

Mr. President, I think the message the President of the United States sent to Congress on July 22, accompanying his proposal, was a sound one. I still think so today. Not one syllable uttered by any Senator during this debate has, in my judgment, to the slightest degree called for a qualification of the President's statement.

A few days ago, after considerable discussion with a group of Senators in the office of the majority leader—and the meeting was attended by spokesmen from the White House and by the Secretary of Labor—it was suggested by the Secretary of Labor that there be added to the President's proposal an amendment which would provide for a seven-man board, on the basis of the organization and procedures which I presented to the Senate earlier today.

That amendment was sent to me by the administration yesterday. I offered it to the Senate today. I am proud that I offered it, and I am proud that I voted for it. I am satisfied that in due course of time there will be general recognition of the fact that that is the joint resolution that ought to have been passed by the Congress.

The legislative problem which the administration faced in drafting Senate Joint Resolution 102 was to provide a procedure which would preserve collective bargaining but which at the same time would provide the assurance that there would be a resolution of the dispute through voluntary action of the parties without resort to a work stoppage.

Senate Joint Resolution 102 as originally introduced in the Senate, attempted to do this by identifying the engine crew and train crew issues as matters which are closely comparable to railroad mergers, amalgamations and coordinations, as well as mass transit modernization, with respect to their impact upon employment security. It was pointed out that not only are job security problems identical in these regulated areas, but that the proposed rule changes with respect to the manning of the engine and train involve matters generally subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission with specialized knowledge of the railroad industry, including factors such as public service and safety which are so intimately involved in the current dispute. These were the considerations which prompted the administration to develop an ad hoc procedure designed to remove the case which had been blocking the channels of bargaining.

The second key to the administration proposal was to develop a system within the ICC framework for the development of interim rules governing the engine and train crew issues for the time being.

It is in the light of these interim rules that Senate Joint Resolution 102 would encourage and stimulate the parties to continue to bargain in order to develop final solutions of these and of all other remaining issues.

This is what the Secretary of Labor meant when he stated that the procedures contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 102 did not constitute compulsory arbitration, but, on the contrary, were designed to preserve collective bargaining within the limitation established by the background of these long overdrawn negotiations.

Thus, section 1 of the original Senate Joint Resolution 102 provides that changes in the work rules involving the manning of train or engine crews shall become effective only upon application to and approval on modification by the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act. It appears to be the intention in this section, read in the light of the scheme of the resolution and of the legislative background, that these rules will provide a basis for the manning of the trains for the interim period only.

Stated conversely, the resolution does not authorize the Commission to approve rules which are dispositive of the entire manning issue for the indefinite future. The emphasis is on interim work rule procedures to be effective only until such time as the parties reach agreement regarding the entire matter or 2 years following the date the interim rule goes into effect, whichever occurs sooner.

Section 3 of the original Senate Joint Resolution 102 emphasizes that the Commission in acting upon application to approve the proposed work rule changes within the limitations already developed, shall take into account considerations of safety and public interest and shall give due consideration to the recommendations of the Presidential Emergency Board and to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement developed in the negotiations following the Emergency Board report.

No matter what the Commission does in this connection, it is required to provide fair and equitable job security arrangements provided by section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act—the so-called Washington agreement procedures—protecting the jobs of employees and providing for the insurance against any worsening of the position of employees in consequence of the interim rule change.

Secretary Wirtz suggested that the decisions of the Commission would be subject to review in the same manner as are the orders of the Commission under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The parties are enjoined to bargain collectively with respect to the unresolved issues covered by the notices, other than the manning issues governed by section 1. However, if the parties fail to agree on any such issue within 60 days following the effective date of Senate Joint Resolution 102, either party may submit the proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission for disposition by special procedures adopted by the Commission after consultation with the parties, including, but not limited, such procedures as were recommended by the Emergency Board.

Thus, the resolution is designed to avoid compulsory arbitration as the term is generally understood and to provide in its place for the development of some interim basis for creating an atmosphere conducive to collective bargaining without the crisis pressures which have been built up as of this time. This is accomplished by the device of the so-called interim procedures.

WASHINGTON AGREEMENT SUPPORTED IN PAST BY BROTHERHOODS

Mr. President, basic in the procedures and principles adopted by the President in the suggested proposal for legislative action is the Washington job protection agreement in the Mass Transportation Act. Those of us who have been consulting with the administration in regard to the railroad dispute crisis were not parties to the drafting of Senate Joint Resolution 102. It was presented to us for consultation after the officers of the executive branch of the Government had prepared it and believed that it warranted favorable consideration. We talked about its pros and cons. Many suggestions were considered. Finally the administration decided that it ought to be considered in the form which it sent to Congress. The record should be made clear that under those circumstances we said we would support the resolution. Neither the consultants nor those who drafted the proposal—and although I cannot speak for him, I can express the opinion that it also applies to the President of the United States himself—took the position that under no circumstances should Senate Joint Resolution 102 be modified by amendment or by substitution unless a better program could be proposed, first, to protect the public interest; and, second, to protect the legitimate interests of the carriers and the brotherhoods.

The Senate Commerce Committee considered the President's proposal as originally introduced under Senate Joint Resolution 102. What did the Commerce Committee produce?

A compulsory arbitration resolution, under the substitute Senate Joint Resolution 102, which was reported to the Senate on August 23.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION—A DISSERVICE TO EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

I have said time and again that I will not vote for any legislation providing the perennial bromide of compulsory arbitration as the means for settling the railroad dispute. Regrettably, the joint resolution reported by the Senate Commerce Committee offers precisely that kind of remedy.

Each time throughout recent history that the statutory procedures fail to settle a dispute involving the national economy, at some point someone reaches into the cabinet for the timeworn proposal of compulsory settlement as the basis for curing the headache. Some have called compulsory arbitration an excessively harsh remedy, but it is more than that. Let us not delude ourselves. It is a form of economic capital punishment. As a practical matter, it means that there will be no more collective bargaining where it prevails. Some may prefer decapitation as a cure for this headache, but I urge more realistic measures which are designed to maintain a true balance between the rights of labor to engage in collective bargaining and to strike and the rights of the public to be safeguarded against paralyzing and destructive consequences of a total strike affecting the national health and safety.

The committee measure favors decapitation of collective bargaining, and it is with sadness and regret that I must at this point part company with my distinguished friends who have joined in reporting out a measure of this kind.

The significance of compulsory arbitration as a form of economic capital punishment is well understood by the administration, by the railroad brotherhoods, by the carriers, by the house of labor and by all of the professional members of the labor-management relations community. Indeed, it was only a few weeks ago, as I mentioned earlier, that the President of the United States in his special message to the Congress on the railroad dispute told us that the administration had given careful consideration to the various kinds of legislation which Congress might enact to solve the present railroad situation and had specifically rejected compulsory arbitration as inconsistent with the principles of free collective bargaining.

The report of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy issued in May of 1962 emphasized its rejection of "the idea that there should be any legal requirement that disputes should be resolved through compulsory arbitration." This has been the consistent position of all of the Secretaries of Labor, including Secretary Wirtz, and represents the honest and sound judgment of those who are most familiar with the process of collective bargaining and settlement of emergency disputes.

Since I will be referring rather extensively in the next few minutes to the work of the Committee for Economic Development and the special panel appointed by the committee to make a study group report on national labor policy, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a list of the members of the independent study group, because I do not know how there could have been brought together a better qualified group of recognized authorities on the subject of labor economics, labor law, mediation, and arbitration than this group.

It consists of the following:

Dr. Clark Kerr, chairman of the group, president of the University of California and one of the distinguished mediators and arbitrators in our country.

Douglas V. Brown, professor of industrial management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

David L. Cole, practicing attorney and arbitrator, Paterson, N.J.; one of the most able men we had on the staff of the National War Labor Board during the war.

John T. Dunlop, professor of economics, Harvard University. When the members of the board and the staff of the National War Labor Board get together for a reunion now, we refer to men such as Dr. Dunlop as graduates of the War Labor Board. He was one of our distinguished staff members.

William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University.

Albert Rees, professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Robert M. Solow, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Philip Taft, professor of economics, Brown University.

George W. Taylor, professor of labor relations, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Taylor was vice chairman of the War Labor Board. He has settled, as an arbitrator in the past 20 years, many of the major labor disputes of this country.

Members of the staff were:

George P. Schultz, director of the staff, professor of industrial relations, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago.

Abraham Siegel, associate director, associate professor of industrial relations, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

David Burke, staff associate, University of Chicago.

The report they have prepared is a classic. It should be required reading, not only in undergraduate courses, but also in graduate seminars which deal with the subject of labor relations.

I extend my congratulations to the Committee for Economic Development for the great contribution it has made to knowledge in this field through the appointment of this independent study group and the report which has been filed. I particularly congratulate Donald K. David, chairman of the board, Committee for Economic Development.

I ask unanimous consent that the foreword which he wrote for this report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The research project which terminates with the publication of this study was, in the words of the Committee for Economic Development Trustees' resolution of authorization "a carefully, extensively and soberly considered step." For the trustees, and their committees recommending the study, were fully aware that they were "approaching one of the most explosive policy areas in this country."

But, characteristically, Committee for Economic Development authorized and arranged the financing of this independent study because its trustees were convinced that national policy toward labor organizations was a subject urgently in need of impartial inquiry. And the trustees launched the project conscious of the fact that Committee for Economic Development would once again "live dangerously in pursuit of the national interest." Their decision to proceed followed discussion of the project at two meetings of the executive committee, the first in November 1958, and at a meeting of the program committee before it was approved by the research and policy committee for referral to the board of trustees in January 1959.

In order to assure a detached environment for the study group's work, the trustees wisely called for no public announcement of the group's composition and the nature of its task. The group was thus able to work over a period of about a year and a half, meeting occasionally at sessions lasting a full week, without "fanfare, the excitement of expectations, or the diversion of advance public debate."

I believe that the results of the study, to be found in the following pages, will prove ample justification for the decision of CED's trustees—and for their precautions. Also, readers will note that the group stayed strictly within the scope of their assignment as defined by the resolution of the trustees, adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

"The study is to evaluate policies in terms of their effects upon the general public interest, rather than in terms of effects upon the interests of any particular sector of the society. The study is to deal with policies toward 'labor organizations' as distinct from 'labor'—i.e., such matters as full employment policy, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, etc. National policy is understood to cover Federal, State, and local government policies, but to exclude matters that are primarily within the purview of management and labor, such as personnel policies, except insofar as these internal matters condition, or are conditioned by, public policy."

As also prescribed by the trustees, publication of this report by CED "does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the recommendations therein by the Committee for Economic Development, the research and policy committee, the research advisory board, the research staff, or any board or committee or any officer of the Committee for Economic Development."

In the spirit of objectivity with which CED authorized this study, it even sought its financing from outside philanthropic sources, and I wish here to thank those who joined in this effort to assure the independence of the study group. I wish also to offer my personal congratulations to members of the study group for adhering studiously to their mandate, and for the diligence and dedication they brought to their task.

Mr. MORSE. In the foreword Chairman David had this to say about the work of the independent study group:

> I believe that the results of the study, to be found in the following pages, will prove ample justification for the decision of CED's trustees—and for their precautions. Also, readers will note that the group stayed strictly within the scope of their assignment as defined by the resolution of the trustees, adopted by unanimous vote as follows:
>
> "The study is to evaluate policies in terms of their effects upon the general public interest, rather than in terms of effects upon the interests of any particular sector of the society. The study is to deal with policies toward 'labor organizations' as distinct from 'labor'; i.e., such matters as full employment policy, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, etc. National policy is understood to cover Federal, State, and local government policies, but to exclude matters that are primarily within the purview of management and labor, such as personnel policies, except insofar as these internal matters condition, or are conditioned by, public policy."

The independent study group appointed by the Committee on Economic Development in its report of December 1961 warned against the use of "meat ax solutions, such as compulsory arbitration, which are offered as one-shot and one-blow solutions to any problem which appears to be too difficult for other solutions." The report of the Livernash Committee to Secretary of Labor Mitchell in January 1961 on collective bargaining in basic steel makes precisely the same point. It tells us that—

> The fundamental handicap of compulsory arbitration is that it operates without either standards or consent. In the absence of participation in determining their own economic future, the parties will demand to know the basis for the decision. Unfortunately, there are few, if any, generally accepted standards which both labor and management will accept in setting wages and working conditions. In the area of wages alone there are over a half-dozen criteria that can be and have been used in determining rates and most of these are very general and controversial in application. The great advantage of free collective bargaining is that the economic decisions involved in a settlement are self-justifying, at least so far as the parties are concerned. Compulsory arbitration lacks this essential element.

The report warns that experience with compulsory arbitration in a number of the American States and in Australia and New Zealand establishes that compulsory arbitration has always corroded free collective bargaining.

The fact is that compulsory arbitration is repugnant to our entire tradition of economic freedom in America. Not only is it repugnant, but it does not work. Years ago we were told by my old friend, Will Davis, who served as Chairman of the National War Labor Board and later Director of Economic Stabilization during World War II days, that—

> The determination of a controversy between free citizens by the edict of Government is not a peaceful thing, and it is not a settlement. It is an enforced termination of warfare, and it settles nothing.

On this subject, I speak from experience. I have spent many years in the area of collective bargaining and arbitration, and I have served in all kinds of the most difficult disputes, which appeared at the time to be hopelessly deadlocked and hopelessly entangled. I have seen these before the war, during the war, and in the long period since. A review of my record will show that my judgment on this issue has never varied. In 1941, in an article appearing in the March issue of the "Commonwealth Review," published by the University of Oregon, I wrote about the growing agitation of that period for legislation to provide compulsory arbitration. I said then, and I say now, that compulsory arbitration is opposed generally by both unions and employers—and rightly so. A realistic approach to labor problems forces the conclusion that the most powerful argument against compulsory arbitration is that it obviously will not work. I said then, as I say now, that any employer group conscious of its own self-interest must recognize that the application of compulsory arbitration to their disputes is bound to threaten their managerial rights. I said, further, that compulsory arbitration will always be opposed by labor because labor recognizes that compulsory arbitration places in the hands of the arbitrator the power to determine the very existence of the union itself.

Compulsory arbitration, no matter how plausible it may be made to sound in any case such as the one before the Congress today, does, in fact, place in the hands of the arbitrator the power to destroy the employer or the union.

The railroad brotherhoods have always been opposed to the use of compulsory arbitration. They have told me this time and again. They have fought over the past 4 years to avoid the very thing that is threatening them today. If any of them have finally yielded to the terms laid down by the Commerce Committee in its reported bill, or in a modified form with 6(b) out of the bill, it is only because they feel that there are no other courses left open to them. They must feel that they have been driven to the very edge of the cliff and that they must either surrender or perish.

An analysis of the record in this case demonstrates all of the evils which compulsory arbitration would bring upon this industry. No assurances that its effects can be stopped here can satisfy me. The policy of this bill, if it becomes law, will be spread throughout all of labor relations and will mark a great turning point in the history of collective bargaining in the United States. In reviewing this history, one must underscore the point that the carriers have for a number of years been steadily and persistently following the policy of attempting to get a compulsory arbitration bill before the Congress. And their long and patient efforts have now been marked by success.

The threat of compulsory arbitration has been ever present in the negotiations relative to this dispute. This factor, alone, perhaps more than any other, has chilled the bargaining to a degree where resolution of the issues has become, as a practical matter, impossible.

The Rosenman report and the President's report to the Congress each has emphasized in various ways the inadequacy of the bargaining which has taken place. We have been told in these reports that progress throughout the past few years has been small and that only in the most recent period following the Rosenman report has there been any encouraging signs that the parties might warm up to their task of developing a basis for an agreement.

The brotherhoods have been understandably hesitant to develop positions in bargaining because of their fear that any offer they might make would eventually become the standard for the compulsory arbitration which was constantly casting its shadow over the parties. Perhaps if at some point the brotherhoods had offered to compromise a figure on the reduction in the size of the engine crew or of the train crew and if their effort had aborted, they must have felt that their figure would have become the floor in the deliberations of the panel on compulsory arbitration to achieve an enforced resolution of the issue. I cannot believe otherwise.

Let me digress here to say that when I arbitrate a case, the offers of the parties in collective bargaining are not admissible in evidence. Why should they be? In collective bargaining the parties are trying to arrive at a conscionable compromise, and make give-and-take adjustments. They may make an offer on issue "X" in the hope that they will get from the other side a better offer on issue "Y." It is the view of the senior Senator from Oregon that when the parties enter into arbitration, in effect, they are in court.

I have always been proud of the fact that time and again lawyers trying their cases before me in my arbitration courtroom expressed appreciation of the fact that judicial procedures and the rules of evidence were followed to a reasonable degree. So I have always ruled that the bargaining which took place in the collective bargaining room has no place in the arbitration courtroom.

Yet I know there are many employers and many negotiators for labor who fear arbitration because they fear they may not get such a ruling, and they fear that some offer they made might rise to plague them in the arbitration courtroom.

I have been trying to find some basis for explanation of the adamancy so characteristic of the brotherhoods' handling of their side of this case. I express this view not knowing whether it is borne out by the facts or not, but I assume it may have had some bearing. It does not justify their adamancy.

The threat of compulsory arbitration had a very real and pernicious effect on the bargaining in this case. It has been charged that the carriers lacked genuine enthusiasm for developing a basis for a negotiation because they hoped and apparently knew that a deadlock would mean the end of collective bargaining in railroading. But as I have studied the record of the case that has been made available to me, I do not find that that charge against the carriers stands up.

If we demonstrate to the parties now that there will be no compulsory arbitration, and we tell the carriers that they can put aside their plans and hopes of the past 2 years, and we tell the unions that they can put aside their fears, I think we can all safely assume that the parties will begin to bargain in earnest for the first time. The resolution pending before the Senate carries with it all of the vices and the evils which I and which all other commentaries on compulsory arbitration proposals have identified throughout the past three decades. The arbitration board contemplated by the resolution will not only resolve in binding and final arbitration the issues relating to the firemen-helpers and crew consist issues, but it will also resolve all of the other issues in the dispute.

I must qualify that statement now in view of the amendment that was adopted this afternoon. I am still not sure that I know what all the effects of the amendment will be, and I am inclined to think that the authors of it do not, either. But it would appear, from the confused explanations given about the amendment this afternoon, that there is no assurance now, as the joint resolution has gone this far through the Senate, that there will be a final determination of all the issues. If not, it is not worth passing. Unless there is to be a procedure that will result in the determination of the issues, we are postponing the so-called evil day, and we shall have the headache back with us in 6 months.

Section 6(b) of the joint resolution, which has been changed in the resolution since I dictated this speech, provides that if the parties fail to resolve any of the other issues within the short time of 30 days after the issuance of the manning issues, the National Mediation Board shall certify to the arbitration board the remaining issues. We all know that all the carriers have to do under such a provision is to drag their feet for a few days and the entire matter will be very easily dumped into the compulsory arbitration procedures. This is bald, unadulterated compulsory arbitration of one of the most critical disputes affecting the entire labor relations structure of the railroad industry.

On the basis of the modification of subsection 6(b), which was adopted on the floor of the Senate, all the brotherhoods will have to do is to drag their feet after there has been a decision on the two main issues. Eventually the whole problem will be dumped back on the floor of the Senate. That is why I believe it is incomprehensible that the Senate should adopt any such legislation.

If this measure passes, it most assuredly will become a precedent for the settlement of any other issue in any future negotiation, and it will mean an end to the long history of collective bargaining in this great industry.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL

The railroad brotherhoods have objected strenuously to President Kennedy's proposal for the use of the good offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission in reaching a settlement of the railroad dispute. Possibly at the root of this is the fact that they fear a lack of impartiality on the part of the I.C.C. membership. I do not share this fear.

I think the brotherhoods are unduly alarmed and unjustifiably disturbed about the consideration the case would receive if the President's proposal were to be enacted.

In my opinion the Interstate Commerce Commission would be bound by the evidence. I have a great deal of difficulty in accepting the contention of the brotherhoods that they would have no chance of getting a so-called square deal from the Interstate Commerce Commission because the representatives of the workers in the industry themselves negotiated the Washington agreement. The Washington agreement is carried out under section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which places the determination of job security issues that are involved in connection with mergers and dislocations in industry within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Therefore, I think the President of the United States was quite logical and quite fair when he suggested in his recommendation that the agency of the Government that has jurisdiction over the railroads should be the agency to hand down, not final determinations, but interim determinations, covering a 2-year period, until the parties to the dispute themselves work out modifications and agreements in respect thereto.

To show his fairness, the President, through his Secretary of Labor, had a modification of the original proposal introduced in the Senate last night by the senior Senator from Oregon and presented in argument today. That modification calls for the appointment of a seven-man tripartite board which would do the arbitrating and would submit its arbitration recommendation to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which would either promulgate it or modify it prior to promulgation.

I will not spend more time on this point now; but, as I said earlier in the debate, there is practically no possibility of a decision of an arbitration board being modified by the Interstate Commerce Commission unless an arbitration board should go hog wild and render an arbitration decision which obviously could not be squared with the evidence.

So as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the presumption is in favor of the President's proposal. Anyone who seeks to modify that proposal has the burden of proof to show that his modification would better protect the public interest than the draft of the President's proposal which was introduced in the Congress.

I say most respectfully, that in my judgment the Commerce Committee did not sustain its burden of proof. It did not overcome, in its committee report or in any arguments or speeches made by its members on the floor of the Senate during the course of the debate, this presumption in the President's proposal.

I am confident that that point of view would likewise be shared by the President, in that if anyone could show that the public interest would be better protected by a modification of the President's proposal, he would be the first to favor such a modification.

On August 14, in discussing the railroad dispute in the Senate, I referred to a letter addressed to me by a number of Oregon constituents. The very sincere views they expressed prompted me to offer the suggestion that a panel of seven, two from the carriers, two from the brotherhoods, and three from the public, might be appointed to consider the issues on their merits and weigh the evidence supporting the contentions of the two sides to the dispute. I know of no more rational way of handling it.

Because of the situation that has developed, I feel that the Senate should have the opportunity to consider another proposal as a step toward an equitable solution of this vexing problem.

The problem is and always has been to develop a statutory procedure which would achieve a balance between the policy of the Federal Government which recognizes the precious hard-won right of employees to organize and to strike and the policy of protecting the national interest from the destructive effects of a national strike endangering the public health and safety.

The basic idea implicit in my substitute is not new. It has in one sense or another been debated and explored by those elements in the labor-management community who are concerned with problems of national emergency strikes. In fact the basic idea was advocated by the eminent counsel to the United Steelworkers of America in the litigation in 1959 in the basic dispute of that period. The name of that counsel is well known to all of us. He later became a most distinguished and successful Secretary of Labor and is now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I refer, of course, to Mr. Justice Goldberg, who in 1959 was the counsel to the Steelworkers in the litigation culminating in the United Steelworkers against United States, reported in 361 U.S. 39. The main thrust of Mr. Goldberg's argument in that case was that the public interest in maintaining national safety and security could be served by enjoining only that part of the steel strike which interfered with the national defense production. It was his contention that partial operation of the steel industry would amply satisfy all of the essential steel requirements involved in maintaining national health and safety. The Supreme Court did not disagree with this conclusion. However, it sustained the position of the Government in that case, holding that the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act authorized the issuance of a broad injunction enjoining the entire steel industry.

In a study on the basic steel industry completed in early January 1961 for former Secretary of Labor Mitchell, the point is made that partial operation of the steel industry might well take care of the essential needs of the country.

In its report on the national labor policy by a study group designated by the Committee for Economic Development, to which I have referred, it was noted that "partial operation of a struck industry or facility may be all that is necessary to protect the public interest in continued availability of the goods or services involved." It was stated by the group consisting of some of the most eminent scholars and specialists in the labor field, whose names I mentioned previously, that partial operation offers hope in many industries, including the transportation industry, "of protecting the public interest while allowing private pressures on parties to bring about a voluntary settlement." This group stressed that "the President is entitled to have this possibility explicitly recognized" in any law dealing generally with the subject of emergency strikes.

Of course, what we have here is a need for a special, ad hoc legislative remedy to fit the situation confronting the United States because of the hopeless deadlock in the railroad negotiations. We do not need a general law at this point such as this group had in mind. What we need is a special procedure to fit this single case. The bill which I have developed will do this. It is based upon the concept that the public interest must be protected from the consequences of a total strike by providing for a plan to maintain essential rail services during the strike. At the same time it respects the principles of free collective bargaining by encouraging the parties to settle the dispute voluntary procedures and by preserving the right of the employees to strike. However, because of the competing interests of the national community, the strike must necessarily be related to that part of the rail system which is not required to be maintained in the interests of the national health and safety.

The analogy is, of course, to the difference between a total atomic war and a limited war. Just as a total war would be destructive of our entire civilization, a total strike would imperil and threaten our national health and security. To avoid the total consequences of this kind of total action, we have developed a concept of limited war in order to isolate international disputes to a point at which they will not endanger the security of the world. Similarly, in my amendment, we would isolate the economic war between labor and management, if it should break out, in such a way that the national health would be protected.

The amendment thus requires the President to develop a plan by which the area of allowable economic conflict can be clearly marked out and separated from the area in which continued rail service is required in the public interest.

It would authorize the President to appoint a Special Railroad Work Rules

Disputes Board composed of seven members. Three of the members will be selected by the President from a panel designated by the carriers, and three of the members will be selected from a panel designated by the brotherhoods. The seventh man shall be the Chairman, who shall be appointed by the President directly.

I am perfectly willing to modify my proposal so as to provide for two members to be designated by the carriers, two by the brotherhoods, and three to represent the public. What is important is to have a tripartite Board. I shall not press the matter of detail, for I have no illusions about what will happen to this amendment in a few minutes. The overwhelming majority of Senators will vote against it, because the die has been cast. They are for compulsory arbitration. They are for setting the saddest, sorriest precedent in the history of labor-management relations in the history of this Republic and of Congress.

But it is important, in carrying out one's trust in the Senate, to make the record for future reference. So I offer the amendment and make this explanation of it and engage in these comments today for future reference.

I am satisfied that the leaders of labor and of management will come back for the very procedures that I suggest today, after they have suffered the sad experiences that will be imposed upon them by what I consider—and I express my own opinion—the surrender by Congress to the powerful pressure that has resulted in the passage of a measure that never should have been passed.

Congress should have told those pressure groups: "We are going to put the public interest first."

But the public interest is not put first by the passage of the kind of legislation that is being proposed here today.

The Work Rules Disputes Board will have the responsibility of issuing a decision with recommendations on the two basic issues involved in this case. I refer, of course, to the issue involving the engine crew and the train crew.

The recommendations issued by the Board will, however, not be binding on the parties. Either may accept it, or either may reject it. Upon the request of any party who has demonstrated that he has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach a settlement of any of the issues covered by the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, the National Mediation Board may refer any such issue to the Disputes Board for decision and recommendation in the manner already described.

During this entire period in which these issues are either made the subject of decision and recommendation of the Board or are otherwise settled by the parties, the status quo is maintained. The carriers may not make changes in their work rules, nor may the unions strike.

Once the issues have been settled in the manner described or have been included in the decision by the Board, the parties will then be free to take whatever action they desire. The carriers and the unions may accept the recommendations and conclude the matter. The carriers may put the recommendations into effect, and the union may strike in protest thereof.

The carrier may put some other rule into effect and the union may strike to enforce the recommendations.

All of these courses are open.

However, if the carriers should put into effect some rule other than those recommended, a strike by the union will result in a seizure of that part of the rail system which is necessary to maintain national defense and safety. On the other hand, if the union should strike in protest of the carriers' putting these recommendations into effect, the President may direct the Attorney General to enjoin that part of the strike which interferes with the national health and safety.

In either case, the essential national transportation will be maintained giving due consideration to all other available means of transport, and at the same time the parties will be able to resort to economic force in support of their own positions.

Under this system we avoid the vice of compulsory arbitration. However, we develop effective recommendations which the parties may follow. The parties nonetheless are free to follow other courses, but if they do so, the President has full authority to take action to maintain essential transportation either by seizure or by injunction.

Mr. President, I have offered my amendment and urge its serious consideration by the Senate because I believe it offers a sensible and practical procedure for the solution of this most difficult case.

Mr. President, last night I read to the Senate a section-by-section analysis of the amendment I have offered. I shall not take the time to repeat the reading of that analysis. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed again at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE WORK RULES DISPUTES SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE

I. PURPOSE

The object of this bill is to provide for a system which will encourage the parties to adhere to collective bargaining procedures in the settlement of the issues involved in the work rules dispute and at the same time to protect the economy from the paralyzing effect of a total railroad strike. It accomplishes this objective by (1) providing for an effective mediatory and conciliatory system to handle the basic issues and (2) authorizing the President to take all necessary steps to maintain essential rail transportation during a strike. It has twin objectives to develop procedures to assist the parties in finally resolving the issues and, at the same time, to give the President the means by which he can safeguard the public interest in the event of a strike. It is based upon the proposition that during a rail strike, the national interest may be best served by requiring the continued operation of only that part of the rail system which is necessary to move essential commodities.

The general plan of the bill is based upon a concept of limiting the area of economic conflict to that part of the economy which cannot be said to involve the national health and safety. This concept may be analogized to the political theories of total war and limited war. Total war threatens the security and health of the entire world. A strike shutting down the entire rail system or in other words a total economic war, threatens the security of the country. Just as we must limit wars in order to preserve our world civilization, the bill would limit the rail strike to protect the health and security of the country.

Partial operation of the rail system during a strike emergency provides the necessary balance between the right of labor to bargain and the obligation of the Government to protect the public interest from the devastating effects of a total strike. The plan of developing legislation to provide for partial operation of the transportation services in the situation now confronting the country is not new. It was recommended in the report of an independent study group designated by the Committee for Economic Development in December of 1961. The study group consisted of such eminent scholars and labor experts as Clark Kerr, George W. Taylor, David L. Cole, and John T. Dunlop. Its recommendations parallel the basic ideas expressed in the Morse bill.

II. MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

The bill requires the maintenance of the status quo until all issues are resolved through collective bargaining or are made the subject of recommendations by a special railroad Work Rules Disputes Board.

III. FACTFINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE WORK RULES DISPUTES BOARD

A. The President will appoint a Board consisting of seven members (three drawn from management and three drawn from labor with a Chairman designated by the President).

B. The Board will first consider the basic issue involving engine crew and train crew. The remaining issues must be negotiated by the parties.

C. The Board will issue its decision and recommendations on the two basic issues within 90 days.

D. The remaining issues are to be resolved by the parties in collective bargaining. However, the National Mediation Board may refer any of the remaining issues to the Work Rules Disputes Board for determination upon request of any party if it finds that the party making the request has exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach agreement on such issue in collective bargaining.

IV. TERMINATION OF THE STATUTORY STATUS QUO PERIOD

The parties are free to take such action as they may determine to be in their own interests whenever all issues in the dispute have either been resolved through collective bargaining or have been made the subject of the Work Rules Disputes Board's decision and recommendation.

V. PARTIAL OPERATION OF THE RAIL SYSTEM IN THE EVENT OF A STRIKE

A. If the carrier should reject the recommendations of the Board and should put into effect work rules of a different nature, the unions may strike. In this event, the President is authorized to seize such part of the railroad system as may be necessary to maintain essential services in the public interest. The facilities which have not been seized will remain subject to the strike.

B. If the carrier should put into effect the recommendations of the Board, the unions may strike in protest thereof. In this event, the President is authorized to enjoin that part of the strike which interferes with the maintenance of essential rail transport.

C. In determining what part of the rail system must be maintained in order to provide essential services, the President must give due consideration to the availability of other means of transport for the shipment of essential commodities.

VI. COMPENSATION IN THE EVENT OF SEIZURE

In the case of seizure the bill provides that just compensation shall be made for the operation of the railroads, giving due consideration to the fact that the United States took possession of the rail system when its operations had been interrupted by a strike.

VII. STRIKE RISKS

The bill provides that the Work Rules Disputes Board, in its recommendations, may provide that employees who strike in protest of the recommendation may be denied any part of the job protection provisions contained in its decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close with this final statement about what I believe is really involved in the crisis that has been created by this case. We in this country must make up our minds whether we shall preserve economic freedom by preserving the precious right to bargain collectively; the precious right on the part of management to resort to economic force by way of a lockout, if it wants to follow that course of action; the precious right of workers to band together and refuse to offer their services in concert and engage in a strike.

Many persons like to dismiss these abstract rights. But I would have Congress and the people of the country reflect on the kind of country we would have if those rights were lost to free employers and to free workers.

It may be said, "Oh, you are whistling while walking by a graveyard. There is no danger of that. Stop deluding yourself."

But there are people in other countries and in other civilizations who took the same position, the position that they could not lose their freedom. But it happened.

There are many ugly dangers in this country today that are attacking our freedoms from many angles. There are in this country extremists who want to invest in the police of the country, including the police of the District of Columbia, police-state powers that would destroy the basic rights of freedom. They want to take away the protection of the Supreme Court in such fact situations as the Mallory case. Another group of extremists seeks to vest more and more unchecked power in the American military.

I have heard it said—and I repeat today, and it is apropos the subject matter of the protection of freedom which is so basically involved in this proposed legislation—"Be on guard, for it can happen in the United States that a military power can become so strong that free institutions and constitutional procedures become endangered."

Mr. President, those of us who have been battling on the floor of the Senate for the past few years against the unchecked power of the CIA are really fighting to preserve for the people the precious principle of our system of checks and balances, for in a democracy there is no room for unchecked power by any agency of government or any group within our citizenry.

Some may ask, "What does this have to do with this joint resolution?" The answer is, "Everything"—as Senators will realize if they reflect upon the major premise of my argument. I am arguing against the unchecked exercise of compulsory power on economic freedom. If the wall of protection which Americans have enjoyed all these years in the field of management-labor relations is broken through by a compulsory-arbitration hammer drive such as this joint resolution can, in my judgment, properly be said to constitute, we shall start to tear down the wall of economic freedom for management and labor which has been built up to protect them from the exercise of arbitrary power by the Government—in this instance, by a compulsory arbitration board representing the Government.

Mr. President, the preservation of these abstract principles of government will determine whether Americans remain free. When we read history, we find that the first step taken by police states is destruction of the economic freedom of the workers and managers; and usually they do it with unchecked military power.

So, Mr. President, as a constitutional liberal, I offer this amendment to the committee amendment. I known it has been argued that this is a rather complex amendment. Of course it is. But freedom is complex, too; and freedom is worth whatever price we have to pay to protect it. I will not vote today for such a precedent, even though an attempt is made to limit it to this case, for it cannot be limited to this case. Although Senator after Senator has gone through the verbal form of trying to assure himself that the proposal now confronting us will not establish a precedent, no Senator can assure himself or anyone else that it will not establish a precedent. Of course it will establish a precedent, Mr. President—and an exceedingly dangerous one. Who knows where it will lead? It should not be established, because it never should be followed. But precedents are followed; that is one of the ugly things about bad precedents.

So I conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by saying that I care not whether I am the only Senator who will vote against this joint resolution or whether I am the only one who will vote for this amendment to the committee amendment. I will stand on the record I am making today for future reference in support of the preservation of economic freedom for management and labor, and in opposition to a precedent of compulsory arbitration set by this very unwise and shocking joint resolution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I recognize the absolute sincerity of the Senator from Oregon, and I would subscribe to the argument he made if I were able to forget and disregard what has happened in this dispute since November 1, 1960.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment contemplates mediation by a Presidential board of seven members, but with no power to render any ultimate judgment which would bring the dispute to an end. The only difference between what has been proposed by the Senator from Oregon and the various avenues which have been traveled in attempting to settle this dispute is to be found in the inclusion in his amendment of a provision which would give the President of the United States a right to seize the railroads in the event no ultimate agreement or settlement was reached.

I have mentioned the history of the dispute. I wish to enumerate what has been done, by way of mediation, recommendation, conciliation, and other attempted means to bring these parties to a settlement.

On November 1, 1960, President Eisenhower appointed what was known as the Presidential Railroad Commission. It was composed of 15 members—5 from labor, 5 from management, and 5 from the general public. The Commission was instructed to make a study and, as a consequence of the study, to submit recommendations for settlement of the dispute. It had no authority to arbitrate. All it could do was make recommendations.

It is very interesting to consider the various subjects which were assigned to that 15-member group.

Subject No. 1 dealt with the manning of railroad cars and trains. The Commission made its study, covering 96 days and countless pages of testimony. The public members personally observed what was being done in the railroad systems.

On the subject of manpower in the railroad industry, the Presidential Commission made its recommendations.

The second subject which it was to investigate was the use of firemen helpers. The Commission made its study, and made its recommendations.

The next study was of the training of engine-service employees. Specific recommendations on that subject were made.

Then came the study of the consist of crews and of what personnel a train crew should consist of. Under that consist of crews study were the subjects of road and yard crews, manning of motor cars and self-propelled machines—which are used in doing repair work—and, finally, crew-consist laws and regulations. On each of those subjects, recommendations were made.

Then there came part III, which dealt with the question of how technological changes shall be dealt with, especially from the standpoint of those displacing employees. The 15-member Commission made its recommendations on that subject.

The Commission also took up the item of compensation—the questions of what shall be the wage structure components and the earnings, what shall be the fringe benefits and holiday pay rules, what shall be the difference between pay for nightwork and pay for daywork, what shall be the compensation for the time spent away from home on each of these jobs. Again the Commission made its recommendations on each of these.

With respect to each of those items recommendations were made. I have before me the final report and a dissenting report that was filed, which did not bring the dispute to an end.

Judge Simon F. Rifkind was Chairman of the Committee. He made his report to President Kennedy on February 26, 1962.

When President Kennedy found that he could not get the dispute settled by negotiation, he appointed what is known as the Executive Board in pursuance of the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. That Board made its recommendations. Those recommendations did not effect a settlement.

Then Secretary of Labor Wirtz stepped in and tried to negotiate. He got nowhere.

Then the President recommended that Justice Goldberg act as arbitrator. That proposal was rejected.

Four years have passed during which there have been discussions, efforts at conciliation, and negotiations. The Nation is on the threshold of a strike scheduled to take place tomorrow night if the work rules are put into effect.

I have not agreed with the brother of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. KENNEDY] on many instances. But in the present instance his sympathies were with the railroad unions. He realized that negotiation would bring no results. President Kennedy deliberated in solitude on the dispute and concluded contrary to what I would like to see occur. He said:

> For the benefit of the people of the country, I must recommend arbitration in the present dispute.

His whole history, including his promotion of the Kennedy-Ives bill and the Kennedy-Ervin bill, indicated his sympathy and friendship for labor leaders. But on the question we are now considering he said:

> We must part. My principal obligation is to the people of the country and I cannot afford to have a strike.

Thus he recommended arbitration.

The substitute amendment of the Senator from Oregon proposes that the same process be followed, and that we go down the same road without an end, to reach what might be called a voluntary settlement of the issues. In 4 years such a settlement has not been reached, and it will not be reached in the future under the situation which now prevails.

The Senator from Oregon claims that the proposal is an autocratic process. It is contrary to all the principles of freedom of our Nation.

A proposal for the Government to seize and take charge of the railroads is, in my opinion, the most autocratic and oppressive course that could be followed. If the Government could take by seizure the railroads, it could seize the steel industry, the automobile industry, and every other industry in the country. Freedom would be dependent on the whims and caprices of the President. Such a course was never contemplated by the writers of the Constitution. It was never contemplated by those men who with sweat and effort wrote our document of liberties for the people of the United States.

We cannot afford to have a strike. We cannot afford to have this dispute continue for another 3 or 4 years. It must be settled. The way to settle it is through the modified joint resolution now before the Senate. It would insure negotiation of the secondary issues and compulsory arbitration on the main issues. That is the end of the road. It is the only method by which the dispute can be brought to an end.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, I wish to say that I am sorry he has not read my substitute amendment, for so many of his comments are completely irrelevant to the contents of the substitute amendment. I do not know where the Senator from Ohio got the idea that when national health, safety, and security are involved the Government does not have authority to seize. Time and time again the Federal Government has seized when the national health, safety, and security have been involved. It is not proposed in the substitute amendment of the Senator from Orgeon that all the railroad systems be seized, but specifically, as I spelled out in great detail, that the Government seize only a part with respect to which there is a violation on the part of the carriers of the recommendations, and when their course of action endangers health and safety. We would enjoin the unions on that part of the system where an unwise strike would endanger health and safety. It is that simple. I put it in the record, and I stand on the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Oregon. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business. I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 91, as follows:

[No. 148 Leg.]

YEAS—2

Javits
Morse

NAYS—91

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Carlson
Eastland
Engle
Hartke
Neuberger
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. MORSE's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the joint resolution—and I think the yeas and nays have been ordered—I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by my distinguished friend, the minority leader, it is anticipated that the next order of business will be Calendar No. 427, Senate bill 1936, a bill to authorize the State of Rhode Island, or its instrumentality, to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island will be present tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted, because I do not anticipate there will be any absence from this body tomorrow, and I expect a full attendance to consider the interests of Rhode Island as well as other parts of the country, because a number of bills, some of which may be controversial, will be brought up tomorrow. In addition at some time during the session of the Senate the conference report on the space authorization bill will be taken up.

Depending on events, it is also anticipated that, at the conclusion of business tomorrow, if need be, the Senate will go over until Thursday; but, if things work out as we hope they will, it will go over until Friday, in which case, barring unforeseen events, there will be an "in and out" session on Friday, and the Senate will go over until Tuesday, at which time at least a 95 percent attendance will be expected in the Senate, to pick up where it left off.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader. A good many of the bills on the calendar are of great dimensions and of world-shaking proportions, and I admonish my colleagues, for that reason, that when the calendar is reached, they should be present and participate in the legislative discussion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the event the House should adopt an amendment, even a technical amendment, to the measure passed by the Senate, would that not require the Senate to reconsider the joint resolution and perhaps have a hurried conference?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a possibility, but, under the rules of the House, it can act with speed and dispatch. Perhaps it will do so tomorrow, in view of the deadline which we face. But the Senate will be in session, to take care of situations as they arise.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if that should happen, a conference could be held during the session tomorrow.

AUTHORIZATION TO CORRECT CLERICAL ERRORS IN SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 102

Mr. President, before the vote, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to correct any clerical errors in the engrossment of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has been previously announced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 149 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Morse
Tower

NOT VOTING—8

Carlson
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Hartke
Neuberger
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) was passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change except by agreement, or pursuant to an arbitration award as hereinafter provided, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an arbitration board to consist of seven members. The representatives of the carrier and organization parties to the aforesaid dispute are hereby directed, respectively, within five days after the enactment hereof each to name two persons to serve as members of such arbitration board. The four members thus chosen shall select three additional members. The seven members shall then elect a chairman. If the members chosen by the parties shall fail to name one or more of the additional three members within ten days, such additional members shall be named by the President. If either party fails to name a member or members to the arbitration board within the five days provided, the President shall name such member or members in lieu of such party and shall also name the additional three members necessary to constitute a board of seven members, all within ten days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the arbitrators not named by the parties at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Promptly upon the completion of the naming of the arbitration board the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the board and to the parties to the dispute copies of his statement to the parties of August 2, 1963, and the papers therewith submitted to the parties, together with memorandums and such other data as the board may request setting forth the matters with respect to which the parties were in tentative agreement and the extent of disagreement with respect to matters on which the parties were not in tentative agreement. The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, as to what disposition shall be made of those portions of the carriers' notices of November 2, 1959, identified as "Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power" and "Consist of Road and Yard Crews" and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as "Minimum Safe Crew Consist" and implementing proposals pertaining thereto. The arbitration board shall incorporate in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties are in agreement, shall resolve the matters on which the parties are not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties are in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of the aforesaid issues covered by the decision of the board of arbitration.

SEC. 4. To the extent not inconsistent with this joint resolution the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, the board's award shall be made and filed as provided in said sections and shall be subject to section 9 of said Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby designated as the court in which the award is to be filed, and the arbitration board shall report to the National Mediation Board in the same manner as arbitration boards functioning pursuant to the Railway Labor Act. The award shall continue in force for such period as the arbitration board shall determine in its award, but not to exceed two years from the date the award takes effect, unless the parties agree otherwise.

SEC. 5. The arbitration board shall begin its hearings thirty days after the enactment of this joint resolution or on such earlier date as the parties to the dispute and the board may agree upon and shall make and file its award not later than ninety days after the enactment of this joint resolution: *Provided, however,* That said award shall not become effective until sixty days after the filing of the award.

SEC. 6. The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, not to be disposed of by arbitration under section 3 of this joint resolution and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such issues by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed toward promoting such agreement.

SEC. 7. (a) In making any award under this joint resolution the arbitration board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation.

(b) The obligations imposed by this joint resolution, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall expire one hundred and eighty days after the date of its enactment, except that it shall remain in effect with respect to the last sentence of section 4 for the period prescribed in that sentence.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution and the application of such provision to other parties or in other circumstances not held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to consider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the preamble, as amended.

The preamble was amended, so as to read:

Whereas the labor dispute between the carriers represented by the Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees and certain of their employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America, labor organizations, threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; and

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers; and

Whereas it is desirable to achieve the above objectives in a manner which preserves and prefers solutions reached through collective bargaining; and

Whereas, on August 2, 1963, the Secretary of Labor submitted to the carrier and organization representatives certain suggestions as a basis of negotiation for disposition of the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues in the dispute and thereupon through such negotiations tentative agreement was reached with respect to portions of such suggestions; and

Whereas, on August 16, 1963, the carrier parties to the dispute accepted and the organization parties to the dispute accepted with certain reservations the Secretary of Labor's suggestion that the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues be resolved by binding arbitration but the said parties have been unable to agree upon the terms and procedures of an arbitration agreement: Therefore be it

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 102 be printed as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay testimony to the minority members of the Commerce Committee, particularly the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], who have been so diligent and assiduous in the development of the joint resolution and in bringing it to final passage. I believe they deserve a special encomium on my part. I can salute the majority members of the committee, as well, for a job well done in very difficult and trying circumstances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the distinguished minority leader, not only in what he had to say about the minority members of the Commerce Committee for contributing to the passage of the joint resolution, but also in paying tribute to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who was at times the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] who each contributed so much to working out the difficult problems connected with this bill.

I also pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who, despite the fact that he raised questions which perhaps raised the hackles of some, nevertheless performed a public service, as always, in bringing questions of great difficulty and importance before the Senate for its consideration.

I am not by any means completely satisfied with the joint resolution as passed. However, sometimes we must do the best we can under the circumstances, in the interest of comity, and in the interest of meeting a deadline. That was the situation in this case.

I am sure that no Senator who voted for the joint resolution was absolutely satisfied in his own mind that it was the best answer to the problems which this difficult situation brought to our attention, but it was the best that we could do under the circumstances. We hope that tomorrow, as we anticipate, the House will act expeditiously, that the Congress will meet the deadline, and that at 12:01 a.m. on Thursday next, instead of the posting of work rules and a strike, the trains will be running and the employees of the railroads will be performing their jobs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have two points which I should like to make to the Senator. First, the Senator spoke of automation and the Presidential Commission on Automation. Together with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I have introduced a joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 105. Because the President's plan went down the drain, it does not mean that the question of what to do about automation should similarly go down the drain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I share that hope most sincerely, because, as has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from New York and other Senators, it is the key to the difficulties which confront us with respect to such legislation as we have just considered and which will confront industry more and more in the days ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. I have discussed the subject with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He heads the subcommittee which could give this problem a hearing. I am pleased to inform the majority leader that the Senator from Oregon has assured me that he will give the bill an early hearing, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to consider the question. I am sure—and this is my reason for mentioning it now—that it will have the cooperation of the majority leader in respect to trying to have some action taken upon the possibility of creating a Presidential commission, as requested by the President, even at this session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York may be assured of my support, for whatever it is worth. I am delighted to know that he and the Senator from Oregon are combining their talents to carry out the recommendation made by the President last month.

Mr. JAVITS. Having in mind what the majority leader has said about the joint resolution and his own unhappiness with it, let me state why I finally voted for it. Perhaps it might be of some interest to him and to other Senators.

It was a troublesome question for me. I feared very much to undertake a course of compulsory arbitration. But the problem of keeping the country operating dictated strongly to me the need for the residual power of seizure in the President. Also, in thinking the problem through, I felt that the only choice which was offered in order to keep the country running was the joint resolution. Notwithstanding my own desires, I felt I could not, in good conscience, indulge the luxury of standing out and saying, "No," as a matter of principle, when I knew this was the only way left, all other routes having been exhausted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from New York. While there are few measures that satisfy any of us completely, the joint resolution raises many questions, so far as labor and possible legislation in the future are concerned.

I would hope that labor would take this to heart.

As the Senator from New York says, in effect, all we can do is to "Call them as we see them" and "Let the cards fall where they may."

MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, AND REPAIR OF BRIDGE ACROSS MOUNT HOPE BAY, R.I.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 427, S. 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island, or its instrumentality, to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report is agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE AWARD OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on June 13, 1963, I directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, calling attention to what I consider to be a great danger in the present policy of allowing all notifications of the awarding of defense contracts to be released through Congressional offices.

In that letter I suggested that the Defense Department not only should stop its present practice of using officers as messenger boys to deliver these advance notices to Members of Congress but also should make its own releases to the press.

On June 26 I received a reply to my letter, in which the Secretary agreed that he would stop using military officers as messenger boys; however, in the letter he indicates that the Department is going to continue the practice of letting Members of Congress get advance notices and thereby claim credit for obtaining these contracts for their individual States.

I am glad that the Secretary has stopped the practice of using military officers as messenger boys; however, I regret very much that he did not completely correct this situation but that he insists upon continuing to allow favored Members of Congress to obtain credit for something with which they should have had no connection.

For a Member of Congress to intercede in the awarding of a Government contract or for the Defense Department to award a contract to a company or to a certain State on the basis of the influence of the Members of Congress would be wrong, and unless this policy is corrected it could open an era of the greatest influence peddling which we have ever witnessed.

The Secretary's reply was released at that time, but recently I have received many requests for additional copies, and accordingly I am today incorporating both his response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with my original letter, in which I raised this question.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that my letter of June 13, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, along with his reply, dated June 26, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you in connection with a serious problem which concerns both your Department and Congress; and that is the policy under which the Defense Department permits Members of Congress to make the first announcement of all defense contracts that are being awarded to companies in their respective States. I appreciate that this policy did not originate with your administration, although it is becoming evident that the policy is now being implemented to a far greater extent than ever before. Unless this political farce is checked, however, I am afraid it will develop into the greatest era of influence peddling we have ever seen.

My concern over this situation is the misunderstanding which is rapidly developing on the part of many contractors and the American people in general that the way to get a Government contract is to see their Members of Congress. Defense contractors in some States are now being openly told that the easiest way to get Government contracts is to elect as their Representatives in Congress men who have the closest ties or relationships with the administration. Allegedly Government contracts will be obtained for their States on the basis of the influence of the Member of Congress rather than on the contractors' ability to underbid their competitors.

One dangerous aspect of this policy is the tendency of National or State political organizations to capitalize on the influence their candidates will have in Washington as an excuse to collect larger political contributions from these defense contractors. Of course, the inevitable result would be for these contributions to be added to the cost of the next Government contract, and again the taxpayers will pay.

We both fully recognize that when Members of Congress use their political influence to obtain Government contracts for their States or for their favored constituents it is wrong. Likewise, should your Department award a contract to a particular contractor solely on the basis that an influential Member of Congress from his State had interceded, rather than on the basis that the company was the lowest responsible bidder that, too, would be highly improper if not actually illegal.

At the present time high-ranking officers are being detailed as messenger boys to hand deliver advanced notices of these contracts to members of the congressional delegations. In my opinion it is an insult to these officers, most of whom earned their ranks on the battlefield in the service of their country, to now delegate them to the status of messenger boys.

A glaring example of just how far this policy is getting out of hand was called to my attention some time ago. In that particular case a sizable contract was being awarded in a State where both U.S. Senators and the Congressman of the affected district were all very friendly with the administration, and apparently the Defense Department wanted to be sure not to show partiality. Therefore, three high-ranking officers were dispatched to the Capitol with a notification for each of the three members. To make sure that there was no partiality shown, the officers even synchronized their watches and by prearranged plan entered the offices of their designated congressional member on the exact minute.

All of these precautions and the utilization of the services of these three officers were being taken to allow some Members of Congress to claim credit for something with which they had nothing to do; in fact, in this instance not one of them even knew that the company in question was bidding on the contract. And had it been true that some Member of the delegation had been interceding or using his influence to get this contract for his State it would have been improper.

Actually, under this system the laziest Member of the congressional delegation is the one who will be able to get out the first announcement of the contract to the constituents of his State. This is true because that Member of Congress who neglects his committee work, neglects his duties on the House or Senate floor, and just sits back in his office with his feet propped on his desk will always be on hand to take the message and thereby be able to relay it back home before the working members of the delegation return to their offices. To make matters even worse the telephone calls to relay these messages back to the State papers and radios are ofttimes charged as official business, which means that the taxpayers are paying for this political farce.

But in addition to creating a false impression as to how contracts are awarded and burdening the taxpayers with unnecessary costs, there is another bad result that can develop from the continuation of this farce in that it would make it possible for the administration in power to use this "advance notice method" as an inducement, bribe, or club to keep a Member of Congress in line and to make him take orders from the White House as to how he should vote on certain legislative requests under the threat that the advance notice could be withheld from his office should he refuse to cooperate.

I am sure that we are both in complete agreement that Government contracts should always be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder and that under no circumstances should they ever be awarded to any State or any congressional district on the basis of political intervention or on the basis of how that State voted in the general election.

This problem is being called to your attention in the hope that you too recognize the serious danger of allowing this policy to continue, and in the hope that you will establish a new policy wherein the Defense Department itself will in the future make direct to the press its own announcements of the awarding of all defense contracts.

In calling this to your attention I again emphasize that I am not placing all the responsibility for the present policy upon you or upon any other administration. Like Topsy, the policy started and has been allowed to grow, and I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent mink coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic.

Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous.

In order that you may get not only my opinion on this problem but the reaction of the other Members of Congress as well, I am writing this as an open letter, and next week I will place it in the Congressional Record for all to read.

I shall await your reply with interest.

Yours sincerely,

John J. Williams.

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, June 26, 1963.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,

Dear Senator Williams: This is in response to your letter to me of June 13, 1963, concerning contract awards.

I fully agree with you that no contract should be awarded, nor indeed any other policy or decision made by the Department of Defense, on a political basis or in a partisan manner. This is the policy I have followed since I became Secretary of Defense and will continue to follow as long as I am here.

The same policy applies to the announcement by the Department of Defense of contract awards. These announcements are made by the Military Department concerned to all interested Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation, about 1 hour before the news is released to the press. As you indicate in your letter, this practice of advance notification is one of long standing and pre-dates my tenure in office. It was instituted because of complaints from Members of Congress that simultaneous news media and congressional notification put Members in the embarrassing position of having to deal with press and constituent inquiries about matters on which they were not adequately informed. In fact, what was in form a simultaneous notification often became an advance notification for the press, because the news went on the wires before the Member or his office could process and evaluate the information provided.

I am sure you are aware that one of the traditional complaints of Congress vis-a-vis the executive branch is that Congress is not kept adequately informed. And so our policy has been to provide Members of Congress, as a matter of courtesy and to the extent feasible, with relevant information about our activities, whether that information be favorable (e.g., contract awards), or unfavorable (e.g., base closures, reductions in force, etc.) from a particular individual's point of view. Barring some further indication that the Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice, I am disposed to continue it, although we would of course be quite happy to honor the request of any Member who wishes not to be notified in advance.

I quite agree with you that anouncements should not be delivered by military officers. To the extent that they have been, this practice will be stopped.

Sincerely,

Robert S. McNamara.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I next ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal of July 12, 1963, entitled "The Brass-Hatted Messengers."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

The Brass-Hatted Messengers

Whatever else may be said of it, the practice of allowing Congressmen to announce defense contract awards in their areas is being employed with increasing frequency. And a story related by Senator Williams of Delaware, suggests the Pentagon now has the process well organized.

The way the Senator tells it, a sizable defense contract had just been awarded in an area where both U.S. Senators and the district's Representatives were "all very friendly with the administration." Therefore, "three high-ranking officers were dispatched to the Capitol with a notification for each of the Members. To make sure that no partiality was shown, the officers even synchronized their watches."

As Mr. Williams says, the three legislators thus could take credit back home for being helpful to their constituents. Without the brass-hatted messengers, this would have been difficult. The fact is, you see, that none of the three had even known that the lucky company was bidding for the award.

JOB TRAINING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the need for job training geared to jobs available is being increasingly emphasized in this country.

In my own State of Delaware the Sussex County Vocational-Technical Center, at Georgetown, is being expanded to provide more programs of adult education, education which leads to employment.

The September issue of Farm Journal magazine carries an article about another such school in New Jersey—the Salem County Vocational-Technical Institute, at Penns Grove. This is an up-to-date trade school intent on equipping students with skills useful in today's fast-changing job market. The article warns parents they may be deluding themselves into thinking the vocational training their children are receiving in high school is equally in tune with the times, when actually their children are learning skills which industry is not going to buy.

Training for jobs—for high school students and for adults—vital to our country's economic and social well-being. I ask unanimous consent that this timely article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

School That Just About Guarantees a Job

Suppose you'd taken over your dad's farm, farmed for 10 years—then suddenly realized you weren't making enough money to support a family of four kids—what could you do?

Walter Newkirk, a solid, ruddy-faced vegetable grower from Elmer, N.J., was in just that fix—and he went back to school.

He had taken a winter job as a carpenter, but couldn't get much of any work. That's when he heard about the Salem County Vocational-Technical Institute at Penns Grove, N.J., and that's where he went, to study electronics.

He got a man to help farm while he was in school, but did chores when he got home at night. He wanted to keep on farming in case the school didn't pan out.

Mornings he took technical English and report writing, math, physics—background for his afternoon electronics lab. He visited nearby industries to see in action the jobs he might hold, then wrote reports of his trips for English class. He took a drafting course to learn to draw the equipment he used in the lab.

Walt had no trouble finding a job. In the 5 years the school has been running, there have always been more job offers than students to fill them.

Today, Walt has a good job with a big electronics firm nearby, and is making steady progress. It's no wonder that he and his boss are big boosters of the school. Walt still operates the farm, with the help of his brother Joe, a student at the school.

Like most rural areas, Salem County had many young people who needed jobs but needed something more than an ordinary high school education to qualify.

What skills did the community need? There weren't enough nurses, for one thing. Local industry was desperate for glassblowers. The electronics field was wide open.

So 5 years ago, the county vocational-technical school opened its doors, starting with practical nursing, then adding electronics, mechanical drafting and design, tool and die technology and scientific glassblowing.

Boys (and girls too) with glassblowing skills—after some field experience—can make as much as $4 an hour, even start their own businesses.

Mike Fisher, a Hancocks Bridge farm boy who took the course, now works full time in a nearby Vineland glass factory. So does Jim Rishel, another farm boy. Today Jim has a job in Vineland making $3 an hour, helps out on the farm.

The school plans to add at least one course a year, is considering a medical secretary course for girls. It also has a large night school to give "booster courses" to people already on the job.

The Salem students come mostly from three surrounding counties, but from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and as far away as Michigan. Next year, if quotas can be worked out, there'll even be a girl from Japan. All must have finished the high school, and for electronics, they must have had extensive science and math courses. There are no discipline problems. Boys like what they're doing.

Industry is behind the school too. The local Du Pont company was so enthusiastic that they donated their million-dollar country club for a school building and campus. A local glass factory provides the glass tubing for lab sessions. Advisory committees from local industries and labor unions work with the instructors of each course.

Every instructor has had at least 8 years of successful experience in his trade, plus a college degree and special training in how to teach vocational education. They get top salaries, too, the equal of what they could get as craftsmen in industry—and considerably more than the average teacher. The school director, H. C. Donaghay, and his board realize that without top talent, the school could fizzle.

Funds come from local, State, and National Governments. The students themselves pay $150 tuition a year ($450 for out-of-country residents.) The Salem folks expect to increase their enrollment to 170 day students next year, and over 500 in night school.

Other trade schools are springing up over the State—and over the country. New Jersey now has 13 county vocational programs similar to the Salem project; and the number in the United States is growing.

The trend is toward post high school instruction. Real training for jobs that exist requires a mature, well-prepared student. Besides, everyone needs a good high school course.

For information about a good vocational school nearest you, write to your State director of vocational education.

Or find out what your community needs—and talk up the idea of starting your own vocational school. Write the National Vocational Education Association, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., for help. There still aren't nearly enough really good trade schools.

Dell James.

TRIBUTE TO DUKE KAHANAMOKU AND THE DUKE KAHANAMOKU FOUNDATION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a beloved son of Hawaii, one who has won world renown as an Olympic swimming champion and as Hawaii's ambassador of good will, was honored by his friends in Honolulu on the eve of his 73d birthday anniversary, last Saturday night.

To millions of people throughout the world, the name Duke Paoa Kahanamoku is synonymous with Hawaii. As Olympic swimming champion, sheriff of Honolulu, Hawaii's official greeter, and a Hollywood movie actor, Duke Kahanamoku has been the islands' ambassador of good will for more than half a century.

Duke Kahanamoku was born in Honolulu August 24, 1890, of ancestry traceable to Hawaiian nobility. He was named Duke—which is not a title—after his father.

He plunged himself and Hawaii into news headlines in 1912 when he captured the 100-meter free-style title at the Olympics, in Stockholm, with a mark of 63.4 seconds. In 1920, he rewon the 100-meter title at the games in Antwerp, bettering his own mark with a time of 61.4 seconds.

He participated in the Olympics for the last time in 1932, at Los Angeles, as a member of the U.S. water polo team.

Duke Kahanamoku acted in a number of movies in Hollywood over a period of 8 years from 1925. He was elected sheriff of the city and county of Honolulu in 1934, and was reelected continuously through 1959, when the office was abolished under the new city charter. During those years, he was Hawaii's unofficial ambassador of good will, presenting himself to visitors as a heroic figure of Hawaiian aristocracy.

In 1960, he toured Asia as one of three "Aloha Ambassadors" from Hawaii; and the next year he visited Scandinavia with an 11-member delegation. He was made official greeter of Hawaii in 1962.

This beloved son of Hawaii has inspired the creation of an institution to help young men and young women of this State achieve their desired goals in life. In recognition of his outstanding qualities and in celebration of the 50th anniversary of his first triumph as Olympic swimming champion in 1912, friends banded to honor Duke Kahanamoku by forming, in his name, a foundation dedicated to Hawaii's youth.

The aims of the Duke Kahanamoku Foundation are to furnish assistance to qualified young people of the State of Hawaii in their preparation for careers; to set up ideals for young people to emulate in the tradition of Duke Kahanamoku; to seek out and encourage potential future leaders who will enrich the civic, community, and cultural life of Hawaii, and thus to perpetuate a heritage of greatness handed down to Hawaii's people by men of Duke Kahanamoku's caliber.

I am pleased to make this tribute to an outstanding citizen of Hawaii. I join his host of friends in wishing him and his charming and gracious wife, Nadine, many, many years of happiness. And I extend my congratulations to the Duke Kahanamoku Foundation for its efforts to help others to bring honor to Hawaii as Duke has done in his distinguished life.

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have expressed their gratitude and commendation to the membership of the Committee on Commerce for the excellent work that was achieved by the passage of the joint resolution upon which the Senate has just acted. The Nation may very well be spared a costly and serious strike because of this legislation.

Tomorrow the House of Representatives will act, I am confident, and may well agree to the provisions which have been so carefully worked out by the authors of the measure on which the Senate has acted and the amendments that were offered to it.

I wish particularly to commend the chairman of the committee [Mr. Magnuson] who I know, from having worked alongside him, has performed a remarkable service in steering the proposed legislation to a successful conclusion.

I join the majority leader in commending and expressing thanks to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who for many weeks conducted the hearings and brought together the members of the railroad brotherhoods and the officers of the railroad carriers to discuss the legislative proposals that were advanced and to encourage collective bargaining.

Also, we are indebted, as has been stated, to the ranking minority Member, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], who has been exceedingly helpful.

I also wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], a member of the Committee on Commerce, who, throughout all the deliberations, discussions, hearings, and debate in the Senate, has been of great help and performed a splendid service in the offering of his amendment, and the discussion of his amendment, and in his activity in support of the joint resolution.

The majority leader expressed appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. I join him in that expression of commendation and appreciation. The senior Senator from Oregon not only presents a brilliant argument and is an expert man in the field of labor-management relations; he is also one of the outstanding experts in labor-management law. More important, in this instance he has tried, during the weeks of this dispute between the carriers and the brotherhoods, to bring about collective bargaining, and to narrow the areas of disagreement. He has worked tirelessly to find an honorable and equitable solution.

Yes; the Senator from Oregon has been a helpful and constructive force. It might well be said that without his cooperation the Senate could not have completed action on the joint resolution tonight. Therefore, I wish to express this personal note of appreciation to him.

Finally, the President and his Secretary of Labor have been most helpful. The President sent to us the proposal which was the subject of hearings. While that proposal as such was not enacted, its objectives and purposes were agreed to, and the proposed solution that the President advanced was finally accepted; namely, that a legally constituted body should be brought into play to settle the major disputes in the areas of primary concern.

I know that the President had no pride of authorship in the proposed legislation. What he wanted was to protect the well-being of the Nation. The President wrestled with this problem for many months. He had the constant advice and counsel of the distinguished Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. The President and the Secretary of Labor did not in any way attempt to force a solution upon Congress by saying, "This is the President's program; therefore, we ask the loyal members of the Democratic Party and those of the minority party to support him."

What he asked for, above all, was a solution of the difficulties. This is a mark of statesmanship and leadership, because it could well have been, today, that had the President insisted on every word of his proposal, there might have been a bitter, long debate, and the Senate might not have finished its work. We are indebted to the President and to Secretary Wirtz for their guidance, leadership, and patience. I wish to particularly commend the Secretary of Labor for his effective, dedicated efforts.

I know, because of personal conversations with members of the White House staff, with the Secretary of Labor, and with the President himself, that what was wanted, above all, was a fair, judicious, equitable solution of the difficulties facing the American public in this long dispute—a dispute that has lasted almost 5 years. I am of the opinion that the President will be pleased with the work of the Senate today—pleased in the sense that it provides a solution of the problem.

Of course, none of us is fully happy with our handiwork in this legislative process. There are many areas which we wish we could have improved. I believe some parts of this measure could have been improved. However, the important point when confronted by such a deadline is to face up to the very tough situation involved and to provide a legislative remedy which is fair to the Nation, to railroad carriers, and to the railroad workers. I think we have found that solution in Senate Joint Resolution 102—the measure the Senate has just acted upon.

THE PROBLEM OF DUMPING DISCUSSED AT WHITE HOUSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week President Kennedy met with Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United

States Steel Corp., and David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, to discuss the growing problem of dumping of steel products by foreign manufacturers on the American domestic market. This was a significant meeting, because it again disclosed the serious nature of the situation that is developing, due to the dumping of foreign surplus merchandise.

Following the meeting with President Kennedy, Mr. Blough stated the nature of the dumping problem, as follows:

> It is the common practice of most foreign steel producers to stabilize their rates of operation by selling their excess output in export markets. Since the United States affords by far the largest potential market for such excess production, they have sought business in this country by under-pricing American producers by whatever amount is necessary to obtain the customer's order.

In his statement, Mr. McDonald said:

> The United Steelworkers of America believes in free trade under fair conditions. We are certain that, under such conditions, our steel industry can compete effectively with foreign steel companies under the labor contract standards we strive to maintain. But dumping is another matter which is of grave import to the United Steelworkers of America. If foreign producers are unloading excessive tonnage on the American market at prices unjustifiably below those set for their own domestic, or other foreign consumers, then, the statutory prohibition against such alleged activities should and must be invoked.

These statements suggest that both labor and management leaders in one of the Nation's basic industries view with growing alarm the problem of dumping. I doubt whether anyone familiar with the complicated and involved procedures surrounding the Antidumping Act of 1921 can discover any self-evident panaceas in this area of international trade. The concept of dumping itself is a matter of dispute among knowledgeable persons in this field. The task of determining when a foreign company is actually dumping merchandise on the American market is a most delicate and difficult assignment that rests with the Treasury Department. The subsequent step of determining the extent of injury to domestic manufacturers is an equally delicate responsibility of the Tariff Commission.

Despite the delicate and controversial nature of the problem—and I am fully aware of that—it is one which the responsible officials in the executive branch can no longer ignore or wish away. For the past several years I have become increasingly disturbed by the apparent lack of official concern about the growing problem of dumping. It has been my general observation that the preservation of the status quo in the handling of dumping complaints has been the objective, rather than the initiation of a searching reevaluation of present practices, to determine their adequacy in light of existing patterns of international trade.

The Senator from Minnesota and many other Members of Congress have made certain proposals in regard to amending the Antidumping Act. It is my impression that officials in the Treasury Department are not particularly sympathetic to these proposals, despite the great reluctance on their part to offer any constructive alternatives. I believe the time has passed for just preserving the status quo.

The problem of dumping has been encountered in many other product areas, including bicycles, cement, rayon, sheet glass, and wire rods. This is not a problem that will disappear of its own accord. I hope the meeting with President Kennedy served to demonstrate the serious dimensions of the problem. I further hope that both Congress and the executive branch will begin to take constructive steps to reach a solution that is not protectionist, but does provide for sound and equitable antidumping procedures that will foster international trade conducted in a responsible fashion.

I do not claim this will be an easy or a self-evident task. But I do feel that it is becoming a task which we cannot afford to postpone much longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements released by Mr. McDonald and Mr. Blough, following their meeting with President Kennedy, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT DAVID J. MCDONALD, OF THE UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

For more than a year, I have repeatedly expressed concern over persistent reports that dumping by foreign producers has been a serious contributory factor in the recent rise in steel imports.

Today, I reiterated that concern in our conversation with the President.

The United Steelworkers of America believes in free trade under fair conditions. We are certain that, under such conditions, our steel industry can compete effectively with foreign steel companies under the labor contract standards we strive to maintain.

But dumping is another matter which is of grave import to the United Steelworkers of America. If foreign producers are unloading excessive tonnage on the American market at prices unjustifiably below those set for their own domestic, or other foreign consumers, then, the statutory prohibition against such alleged activities should and must be invoked.

No American steelworker should be confronted with the prospect of unemployment because of unfair trade practices by foreign producers.

The steel companies which have filed a complaint on such alleged practices have taken the proper course. We believe that investigation of dumping is appropriate and should be carried out promptly and vigorously by all Government agencies concerned.

If such investigation determines that the antidumping act be amended further, we believe this course should be taken.

We offer our full cooperation both to the Government and to the American steel industry toward that end.

THE STEEL DUMPING PROBLEM

Imports of all steel products were 3,300,000 tons in 1961, 4,300,000 tons in 1962 and have now reached the rate of 5 million tons per year and are continuing to increase at a disturbing rate. The greatest recent increases have occurred in the imports of tin plate, hot-rolled sheets, cold-rolled sheets, and galvanized sheets and the American steel industry is seriously threatened with the loss of important domestic markets in these vital product lines. This means a serious curtailment of employment opportunities in this country.

In terms of unemployment, imports of 4,300,000 tons of steel products in 1962 represented the loss of an estimated 70 million man-hours of work. This is the equivalent of approximately 37,700 jobs for steelworkers alone and represents a loss in income and benefits to American workmen of at least $291 million.

The dumping of foreign steel also has a significant bearing on the balance-of-payments problem in that the total dollar volume of steel imports for the year 1963 is estimated at $618 million.

Competition with foreign steel producers in our markets and theirs on equal terms is an essential part of international free trade, but American steel producers must have the opportunity to compete under conditions which are fair to everyone. Under present conditions created by the pricing practices of our foreign competitors in dumping their products in the United States, it is increasingly difficult for us to compete successfully with them.

On most finished steel products, the published prices of the Common Market, British and Japanese steel producers in their domestic sales are about the same as our own domestic prices. However, the prices quoted on their exports to the United States are much lower than our domestic prices and are continuing to decline as the foreign producers expand their capacity and seek to increase their exports to this country.

It is the common practice of most foreign steel producers to stabilize their rates of operation by selling their excess output in export markets. Since the United States affords by far the largest potential market for such excess production, they have sought business in this country by underpricing American producers by whatever amount is necessary to obtain the customer's order.

While we were reluctant to file complaints under the Antidumping Act, the critical nature of the dumping problem finally caused us to take action against the dumping of standard pipe as a means of bringing this problem to the attention of our Government. Our experience in the pipe case and the experience of other American steel companies in the wire rod case have now caused great concern, because the practices of Treasury tend to nullify rather than to enforce the act.

We concur in the view that dumping is difficult to prove under the present Antidumping Act, but we are confident that the present act can provide a measure of relief if both Treasury and the Tariff Commission make a genuine effort to put a stop to the dumping of foreign steel in our markets.

UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the balance-of-payments deficit is a disturbing problem—one fraught with seriousness which few understand. It is not an issue which will or can disappear overnight.

The deficit is now running at an annual rate of $5.2 billion, and our gold supply has shrunk to well below $15.7 billion, the lowest since 1939.

Steps have been taken to deal with these problems. I believe that some of these steps are long overdue. But there are some who would have us go further; they propose that the United States devalue its dollar—a solution whereby the United States could reap a so-called profit by doubling its gold reserves. But this step is one which contains the specters of problems which few may realize.

Columnist Sylvia Porter has begun exploring this question in a series of articles which began yesterday—August 26—in the Washington Evening Star. It is a series well worth reading, for it explains in layman's language the balance-of-payments and dollar-devaluation problems. One thing Miss Porter overlooks, Mr. President, is in the article in today's Washington Evening Star, where the question is asked, "How could devaluation be achieved?" The answer given is: "It could be done only by an act of Congress."

Mr. President, I grant that this is the only official way in which devaluation of the dollar could occur; but I suggest that Miss Porter has overlooked the fact that we could have what is known as devaluation in fact. This would occur if the holders of dollars overseas sought to convert them into gold, and if we did not have the amount of gold needed in order to meet their demands. On several occasions, I have pointed out that the difference between our present gold reserves, of some $15.7 billion, and the $12.5 billion needed to back up our own currency, is less than one-quarter of the total claims or potential short-term claims that foreign creditors have; that if only one-quarter of those foreign creditors demanded gold instead of dollars in repayment of our debts against them, we would be in a very serious condition.

The reason why we would be in a very serious condition is that if we did not have the gold to deliver in response to their claims against us, our dollar would actually go down in the world market, and then we would have what is known as devaluation in fact.

But aside from this oversight on the part of Miss Porter—which I hope she will correct in a later article—I think the series is well worth reading. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the first two articles in this series. They are entitled "Dollar Devaluing—Vigilance Needed," and "Dollar Devaluing—An Explanation."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 26, 1963]

DOLLAR DEVALUING—VIGILANCE NEEDED

(By Sylvia Porter)

"I hope and pray the time won't come when we would have to devalue the dollar," Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin told the House Banking Committee recently. He was being pressed to discuss what might happen if we in the United States do not stop spending more abroad than we are earning abroad and do not drastically curb the resultant drain on our gold reserves. "It would not be the end of the world, but it would take years to recover and would cause slowing down of world trade and our trade."

This threat of "devaluation of the dollar" lies at the heart of the battle we are now waging to slash the deficit in our balance of payments. Thus, it's time an effort was made to explain in simple language the bafflegab of devaluation.

Because we have been running in the red in our financial accounts with other nations year after year, our foreign creditors have built up more than $20 billion of dollar claims, much of which they can convert into our gold any time they wish.

Because we are banker to the world and the dollar is the pivot around which all other currencies revolve, we stand ready to sell gold out of our reserves to qualified foreign owners of dollars at the price of $35 an ounce which Congress set almost 30 years ago.

Because qualified foreign governments and their central banks owning dollar claims against us have asked for $9 billion in gold since 1948 and have drained $395 million out of our hoard just so far this year, our gold supply has shriveled to well under $16 billion, lowest since 1939.

Because the deficit in the balance of payments has soared this year in the face of administration assurances that we were drying up the red ink, worry about our dollar's integrity has been mounting.

Thus, the fight to control the outflow of dollars and gold from the United States has become urgent.

The Federal Reserve System is increasing short-term interest rates in the United States so that foreign creditors will be willing to keep their dollars invested here in comparatively attractive U.S. securities. Also to hold dollars in the United States, the Central Bank has authorized U.S. banks to pay as much as 4 percent to big depositors on certain short-term funds. The White House is pushing a controversial "penalty" tax designed to discourage American investors from buying foreign securities and adding to the flow of dollars into foreign hands. These are the three latest moves made in the battle.

In addition, the administration is vigorously promoting our export trade to earn more dollars abroad. A campaign is on to increase tourism in the United States to narrow the gap between what American tourists spend abroad and what foreign tourists spend here. Increasing amounts of our foreign aid are being tied to purchases of U.S. goods by those getting the funds. Another goal is major reductions in our net defense spending abroad and in other types of oversea spending. Most significant are the elaborate defenses we have created in cooperation with foreign central banks against currency speculators and the extent to which we are using the defenses.

The arsenal to defend the dollar is impressive and there are still more weapons in it, but, nevertheless, the 1963 deficit in our balance of payments has ballooned. And as our payments problem hits the front pages of the Nation day after day, talk about "devaluation" as the ultimate solution is spreading.

We are not going to devalue the dollar in the foreseeable future. Last month, President Kennedy repeated his pledge of 1960, again of 1961 and again of 1962 in these words:

"This Nation will maintain the dollar as good as gold, freely interchangeable with gold at $35 an ounce, the foundationstone of the free world's trade and payments system." There's no qualifying phrase here.

Yet, despite the repeated pledges, millions of Americans are asking: What is devaluation? How could it be done? Why does anyone favor devaluation? Tomorrow's column will deal with these questions.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 27, 1963]

DOLLAR DEVALUING—AN EXPLANATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Devaluation of the dollar would be as shattering a blow to U.S. power, prestige and health and to the well-being of every American as a takeover of the United States by the Russians," a leading currency expert said in an off-the-record talk recently. "It would mean instantaneous disaster for the foreigners who own $20 billion of dollar claims today and it would lead to a complete breakdown of our entire international financial system."

In less dramatic words, President Kennedy, Treasury Secretary Dillon, Reserve Board Chairman Martin—to name just a few—have said the same thing on the record. There is no possibility that we will devalue the dollar in the foreseeable future.

Nevertheless, fears about devaluation are spreading as we continue to spend far more abroad than we earn abroad, as the deficit in our balance of payments remains dangerously high, as foreign claims against our gold reserve mount, as our gold supply shrinks. Here's an attempt to understand the devaluation problem.

Question. What is devaluation of the dollar?

Answer. The dictionary definition of devaluation is "to diminish the value of something." In the case of the dollar, if we devalued, we would diminish its value in terms of gold and also in terms of other currencies—assuming other nations did not immediately copy us and devalue their moneys to precisely the same degree as we did the dollar.

We would devalue by raising the price at which the U.S. Government stands ready to buy from or sell gold to any qualified foreign government or bank or international organization.

The price of gold today is $35 an ounce and it has been frozen there since we last devalued in 1934. Say we raised this price from $35 to $70 an ounce. The gold value of the U.S. dollar would be 1/70th of an ounce instead of 1/35th. The dollar would have been devalued by half.

Question. How could devaluation be achieved?

Answer. It could be done only by an act of Congress. Under the Bretton Woods Agreement Acts of 1945, the President cannot even propose devaluation unless Congress first gives him the authority to do so, and even a rumor of this request would plunge the free world into monetary chaos. Also we would have to obtain the approval of the International Monetary Fund, to which we and most nations of the West belong, for all member countries have pledged not to make any major change in the value of their currencies without the IMF's OK.

Despite a belief to the contrary, the dollar could not be devalued by any "stroke of the pen" deal.

Question. Why does anyone favor dollar devaluation?

Answer. Because our foreign creditors have such enormous dollar claims against our gold reserve and our hoard has been shrinking, the proposed "solution" is that we write up the value of gold so we will have a "profit"—and so will all other countries owning gold—the basic precious metal that backs paper currencies today.

If we raised the price of gold from $35 to $70, our $15.6 billion gold reserve would be worth $31.2 billion. We would have doubled the amount with which to settle claims against us. At $70 an ounce, our gold would be a much less attractive buy to foreigners.

Because our dollar's value in other currencies would be cut in half, the cost of our goods to foreigners would be cut in half too. Theoretically, our exports would be twice as attractive, and theoretically this would boost our sales abroad. At the same time, the value of a dollar to a foreigner would be cut in half and the cost of goods we import would be doubled. Theoretically, imports would be much less attractive and we would be less eager to buy imported goods. For instance, a German car costing $2,000 or 8,000 marks would cost $4,000 for the same 8,000 marks.

All this assumes other countries would sit by and let us devalue our dollar by ourselves and not follow suit.

They could not sit by and let us do this—which is why a unilateral devaluation by the United States is unthinkable.

Why do other countries devalue? How would devaluation affect prices here, change the dollar? These answers tomorrow.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

An additional bill and joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2097. A bill to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. Humphrey (for himself, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Miller, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Allott, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

LABELING OF PACKAGED POTATOES BY STATE OF ORIGIN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment of a problem of increasing seriousness facing the potato growers of the State of Idaho.

For years, Idaho has been known for the size and quality of a type of potato that has been developed there—the famous Idaho russet potato, so often featured on the menus of the Nation's finest restaurants. Through the intensive work of the State's potato producers, the terms "Idaho" and "russet" have become synonymous in the minds of many American housewives.

Today Idaho producers are increasingly threatened by three developments:

First, a growing number of other States are now producing russet potatoes, and are marketing them with this designation. While certainly nobody could argue that the term "russet" can be reserved for the use of any one State, it is a fact that this term, in many instances, has become synonymous with the term "Idaho," so that large quantities of non-Idaho russets can be marketed inferentially as Idaho potatoes.

Second, while a present provision of the Perishable Agricultural Commodity Act prohibits misrepresentation of the country, region or State of packaged potatoes, many potatoes grown in Idaho, but packaged and sold elsewhere, are marked only with the location of the packaging or sales concern. In many such cases, these concerns are located in different regions of the country.

Third, and most serious, the fame and quality of the Idaho potato has led to the spreading practice of using the word "Idaho" as a term of variety, rather than a designation of origin. In this sense, the term "Idaho potato" is likened to the term "Irish potato"; but unlike the latter instance, an Idaho potato is thought by the retail buyer to be a product of the potato fields of Idaho, when this is often not the case at all.

This, then, is the three-way problem confronting Idaho potato growers. Even where there is no violation of existing law, there is unfair use of a reputation justly earned by Idaho potato producers for their product. The common thread connecting the three parts of this problem is that of misrepresentation by inference. In the words of one producer:

> Idaho is competing against a ghost package of unknown origin of the same variety, sold by inference as its own product.

At the present time, it is reliably estimated that, while 40,000 carloads of potatoes are shipped yearly from the State, a total of 80,000 are being sold as "Idaho potatoes." Misrepresentation by inference is occurring in most terminal markets of the United States. The solution is not to seek particular rights for one group of growers; rather, it is to insure uniform and fair practices for the protection of all growers.

To this end, I am today introducing a bill to require the labeling of all packaged potatoes by State of origin. Processed potatoes are exempted, as are small retailers who receive their potatoes directly from the grower. This bill is identical to the one introduced by my colleague, the Honorable Ralph Harding, in the House of Representatives.

If the bill were enacted, the American housewife could readily identify the origin of the potatoes she purchased. She could choose those potatoes—from whatever State—that most appealed to her, whether from the standpoint of tested quality or price. Every potato-growing State, for one reason or another, has reason to take pride in its product; each, accordingly, could benefit from the assurance that its potatoes, and no others, will be easily identifiable by their State of origin.

Mr. President, the laws of this country should protect against misrepresentation by inference as well as misrepresentation by fact. Both lead to the same consequences. Plain fairness to producer and consumer alike is the best reason for enacting this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2097) to require that Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce be labeled as to State of origin, introduced by Mr. Church, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State or territory or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof or between points within the same State or territory or the District of Columbia, but through any point outside thereof, or which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects such commerce.

(b) The term "potatoes" means whole potatoes of any variety included in the species solanum tuberosum in fresh form generally considered as perishable vegetables, including potatoes which have been washed, graded, packed, or otherwise prepared for sale as a perishable product, but not including potatoes which have been so processed by cooking, freezing, drying, canning, or in some other manner as to change them from their natural state into a prepared food.

(c) The term "container" means any bag, crate, carton, or container of any type or size including bulk display cases or bins.

(d) The term "to pack" means to place into containers for the purpose of sale, shipment, or display.

(e) The term "dealer" means any person engaged in the business of buying or selling whole fresh potatoes in wholesale or jobbing quantities in commerce and includes—

(1) any jobber, distributor, or wholesaler,

(2) any retailer—

(A) in any calendar year immediately succeeding a year in which such retailer's purchases of potatoes exceeded, in the aggregate, the amount of $10,000, or

(B) in any calendar year in which such retailer's purchases of potatoes may reasonably be expected to exceed, in the aggregate, the amount of $15,000;

(3) any grower—

(A) in any calendar year immediately following a year in which such grower's sales of potatoes (whether or not grown by such grower) exceeded, in the aggregate, the amount of $10,000, or

(B) in any calendar year in which such grower's sales of potatoes (whether or not grown by such grower) may reasonably be expected to exceed, in the aggregate, the amount of $15,000.

(f) The term "broker" means any person engaged in the business of negotiating sales and purchases of any whole fresh potatoes in interstate or foreign commerce for or on behalf of the vendor or purchaser or both.

(g) The term "State of origin" means the State in which the potatoes are grown.

(h) The term "to mark" means to brand, mark, label or stencil the container in such a position as to be readily legible in a color to contrast with the container and in lettering equally prominent with any other lettering on the container.

Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful in, or in connection with any transaction in interstate or foreign commerce, for any person acting as a dealer or broker to pack, sell, ship, or consign or offer for sale any lot of fresh potatoes unless the container in which they are packed is marked with the State of origin and, unless such potatoes are being offered for sale on the premises of the packer or repacker, the name and place of business of the packer or repacker.

Sec. 3. It shall be unlawful for any dealer or broker to pack, sell, ship, consign, or offer for sale fresh potatoes in a container marked with more than one State of origin.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 5. Any person who violates any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation issued under authority of this Act shall be fined not less than $100 or more than $1,000 for each such violation.

SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Dirksen, McClellan, Nelson, Long of Missouri, Randolph, Bayh, Hartke, Miller, Douglas, Dominick, Allott, Holland, and Williams of New Jersey, I introduced, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the first week in March of each year to be "Save Your Vision Week."

As far back as 1927, the proposal of a "Save Your Vision Week" came into existence. Since then, the Governors of all of our States and the mayors of countless municipalities, both large and small, have issued proclamations calling upon their constituents to observe "Save Your Vision Week" during the first week in March. This year more than 1,200 radio stations and 300 television stations broadcast messages about "Save Your Vision Week."

Vision, like life itself, is God-given. Therefore, we are often inclined to take it for granted, with the result that the time may come when it will be too late to safeguard this most precious gift. Even though one's neglect may not result in blindness, if it impairs the visual efficiency, not only is that individual a loser, but it may result in loss of another's life or injury in an aviation, highway, hunting or industrial accident.

For example, recent research indicates that most hunting accidents are caused by hunters with inadequate vision. The Minnesota Safety Commission, studying 93 hunters involved in accidents, found that 77 percent had vision problems. Those in accidents had deficient visual acuity, color recognition, muscular balance or depth perception. And nearly all were unaware of shortcomings. Vision standards in the tests were set by optometrists, physicians, and safety authorities, and 52 percent of a cross section of licensed hunters met all requirements compared to only 23 percent of hunters with accidents. Other statistics show 350 hunters killed, 2,000 injured annually in the United States.

Color plays an important part in reducing the number of hunting casualties.

Recent tests conducted by the National Rifle Association in cooperation with several State optometric societies indicate that traditional hunting red is one of the most dangerous colors in apparel for hunters because it is not quickly distinguished by either colorblind hunters or those with normal vision. These tests revealed that yellow is by far the safest color. Similar tests in Massachusetts during 1959 found fluorescent blaze orange was best. Hunters are best advised to be sure the color they wear contrasts sharply with foliage and terrain.

Hunters are often unaware of vision deficiencies because vision deteriorates somewhat unnoticeably with age. Eyes or glasses that are OK one year may not be adequate the next. Major requirements of hunting vision are: Acuity, field of vision, and color vision.

Ninety percent of all driving decisions are based on sight. There are more than 10 million highway accidents each year. "I didn't see" is most common excuse for automobile accidents. One out of six drivers has vision handicap of which he is unaware. In many States motorists are permitted to renew their licenses year after year regardless of sight deterioration. More families have been bereaved by highway casualties than by war. Three out of four traffic deaths are on rural highways where fatalities are increasing while those in cities are declining. Two-thirds of all traffic deaths occur at night, although one-third of driving is done at that time. Fatigue is recognized as a major cause of accidents: Inefficient vision is a major cause of fatigue. Fatal accidents at intersections tend to occur on side of driver's less efficient eye. This was found in 30 out of 33 cases in a California study.

More than 80 percent of all school tasks are based on vision. Four out of 10 grade school children in the United States are visually handicapped for adequate school achievement—at least 12 million children. Millions of children repeat one or more year's work due to inadequate vision. About 18 percent of all children with vision problems are not detected through school vision tests. According to a study made at the University of Chicago, one out of two children failing reading needs vision care.

We are all distressed to read in the public press the statistics pertaining to dropouts in our schools with resulting juvenile delinquency. There is no question but that many of these young people who fail in their studies become dropouts and delinquents because of faulty vision. Time was if a pupil could read a Snellen chart at 20 feet, he or she was rated as having 20/20 vision, which to most people means perfect vision. Some pupils are 20 feet from the blackboard, but most of what they read and all of what they write is done at 20 inches or less. Unless they are given a thorough professional eye examination, their visual deficiencies may not be detected. It is important, not only that their visual handicaps be known, but also as far as possible that they be corrected.

The American Optometric Association recently held its 66th Annual Congress in Minneapolis, Minn. It so happened that one of nature's most interesting phenomena, the solar eclipse, occurred during the time of this meeting. Of all natural phenomena, the solar eclipse is the most detrimental to human vision if observed unprotected. All media of public communication carried information furnished by the association warning the public about the danger and describing the proper means of viewing a solar eclipse.

In past years the association has helped to stimulate interest throughout the Nation in support of Save Your Vision Week. Since this week has been proclaimed by the States and by many local governments, I believe it is appropriate for Congress to authorize a national proclamation by the President of the United States.

I hope the health care professions and all other agencies and individuals concerned with programs for the improvement of vision will fully implement this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the joint resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be held at the desk for 1 week, so that other interested Senators may, if they so desire, become cosponsors of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 113) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week," introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas vision is of the utmost importance to every individual and to the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas many Governors and mayors have, over the past 36 years, issued proclamations calling upon their citizens to give special attention to vision care during the first week in March of each year; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has supported significant research to protect man's priceless gift of vision; and

Whereas the U.S. Post Office Department has authorized the use of special cancellation stamps during that week and the preceding week for the purpose of reminding our citizens that their vision demands constant care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week," and inviting the Governors and mayors of State and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations. The President is further requested to consider including in such proclamation an invitation calling upon the press, radio, television, and other communications media, the health care professions, and all other agencies and individuals concerned with programs for the improvement of vision, to unite during such week in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of vision to their own welfare and that of our country, and to urge their support of programs to improve and protect the vision of Americans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 27, 1963:

Department of the Army

Willis Moore Hawkins, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Finn J. Larsen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 13: 10: *Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, grant that daily we may have a larger share in building a social order in which Thou shalt be worshiped more worthily and reverently and mankind shall be served more effectually and helpfully.

May all the members of the human family seek to cultivate a more obedient relationship to Thee and a more fraternal relationship to one another and thus find the secret of peace and joy.

We pray that the legislation which is being proposed and passed in this Chamber by the Congress may be for Thy glory and enable all the citizens of our beloved country to find the happier and more hopeful way of life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1153. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CANNON. Mr Speaker, under previous order of the House which was entered on the 22d of August 1963, I call up House Joint Resolution 667 and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 29, 1963 (Public Law 88-55), is hereby amended by striking out "August 31, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 31, 1963".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual continuing resolution making interim provision for operating the departments and agencies until the regular bills are passed.

I have been discussing it with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of the committee, and the gentleman approves of the resolution as written. The only change in the resolution from the one adopted 2 months ago, covering July and August, is that it extends the date of effectiveness to October 31. It is precisely the same resolution, precisely the same verbiage, and extends for 2 more months the authority of the various departments of Government to continue to expend money in order to meet their obligations until the regular bills are finally processed.

Mr. Speaker, five major appropriation bills remain to be reported to the House, the foreign aid bill, the independent offices bill, the military construction bill, and the public works bill. Of course, the final bill which we always expect is the supplemental appropriation bill, the amount of which will probably depend very largely upon what happens on the pending authorization bills for new programs and projects.

Four bills have been sent to the President and approved. Four are in the Senate. Two are ready for conference. The 4 regular 1964 bills now pending in the Committee on Appropriations involve budget requests of, roughly, $26 billion. The requests yet to come from the President for the closing supplemental bill would, of course, be in addition.

I include the following tabulation of the bills in detail:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Aug. 27, 1963

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	[1] $508, 172, 000	Feb. 26	$508, 172, 000		Feb. 27	$508, 172, 000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1, 641, 507, 106	Apr. 5	988, 756, 506	−$652, 750, 600	Apr. 10	1, 438, 691, 506	−$202, 815, 600	+$449, 935, 000
	Public works acceleration	(500, 000, 000)		( )	(−500, 000, 000)		(450, 000, 000)	(−50, 000, 000)	(+450, 000, 000)
	All other	(1, 141, 507, 106)		(988, 756, 506)	(−152, 750, 600)		(988, 691, 506)	(−152, 815, 600)	(−65, 000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2, 149, 679, 106		1, 496, 928, 506	−652, 750, 600		1, 946, 863, 506	−202, 815, 600	+449, 935, 000
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998, 009, 000	Mar. 28	929, 690, 200	−68, 318, 800	Apr. 2	922, 625, 200	−75, 383, 800	−7, 065, 000
	Loan authorization	(13, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)	
	Contract authority	(17, 500, 000)			(−17, 500, 000)			(−17, 500, 000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6, 146, 842, 000	Apr. 1	5, 997, 026, 000	−149, 816, 000	Apr. 4	5, 997, 026, 000	−149, 816, 000	
H.R. 5888	Labor-HEW	5, 759, 489, 000	Apr. 25	5, 449, 988, 000	−309, 501, 000	Apr. 30	5, 449, 981, 000	−309, 508, 000	−7, 000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	5, 368, 755, 000	June 3	5, 979, 457, 000	−389, 298, 000	June 6	5, 979, 457, 000	−389, 298, 000	
	Loan authorizations	(855, 000, 000)		(855, 000, 000)			(855, 000, 000)		
H.R. 6868	Legislative	[2] 148, 580, 245	June 6	[2] 140, 038, 919	−8, 541, 326	June 11	[2] 140, 038, 919	−8, 541, 326	
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	2, 159, 891, 900	June 14	1, 851, 269, 900	−308, 622, 000	June 18	1, 851, 269, 900	−308, 622, 000	
H.R. 7179	Defense	49, 014, 237, 000	June 21	47, 092, 209, 000	−1, 922, 028, 000	June 26	47, 082, 009, 000	−1, 932, 228, 000	−10, 200, 000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289, 581, 800)	July 8	(284, 286, 800)	(−5, 295, 000)	July 11	(284, 286, 800)	(−5, 295, 000)	
	Federal payment	34, 868, 000		32, 868, 000	−2, 000, 000		32, 868, 000	−2, 000, 000	
	Loan authorizations	(8, 000, 000)		(8, 000, 000)			(8, 000, 000)		
	Total, 1964 appropriations	70, 630, 672, 145		67, 472, 547, 019	−3, 158, 125, 126		67, 455, 275, 019	−3, 175, 397, 126	−17, 272, 000
	Total, all appropriations	72, 780, 351, 251		68, 969, 475, 525	−3, 810, 875, 726		69, 402, 138, 525	−3, 378, 212, 726	+432, 663, 000
	Total, loan authorizations	(876, 000, 000)		(869, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)		(869, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)	
	Total, contract authority	(17, 500, 000)			(−17, 500, 000)			(−17, 500, 000)	

---

[1] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[2] Excludes Senate items.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Aug. 27, 1963—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill No.	Title	Senate						
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—	
							Budget estimates	House action
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS							
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	$508, 172, 000	Feb. 28	$508, 172, 000	Mar. 4	$508, 172, 000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1, 652, 300, 456	Apr. 24	1, 486, 096, 841	May 1	1, 488, 683, 841	−$163, 616, 615	+$49, 992, 335
	Public works acceleration	(500, 000, 000)		(450, 000, 000)		(450, 000, 000)	(−50, 000, 000)	
	All other	(1, 152, 300, 456)		(1, 036, 096, 841)		(1, 038, 683, 841)	(−113, 616, 615)	(+49, 992, 335)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2, 160, 472, 456		1, 994, 268, 841		1, 996, 855, 841	−163, 616, 615	+49, 992, 335
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS							
H.R. 5279	Interior	998, 009, 000	May 22	979, 093, 400	May 28	979, 693, 400	−18, 315, 600	+57, 068, 200
	Loan authorization	(13, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)	
	Contract authority	(17, 500, 000)					(−17, 500, 000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6, 146, 842, 000	May 3	6, 074, 216, 250	May 8	6, 069, 466, 250	−77, 375, 750	+72, 440, 250
H.R. 5888	Labor-HEW	5, 759, 489, 000	Aug. 1	5, 494, 627, 250	Aug. 7	5, 495, 827, 250	−263, 661, 750	+45, 846, 250
H.R. 6754	Agriculture							
	Loan authorizations							
H.R. 6868	Legislative	182, 218, 450	June 25	168, 273, 069	June 26	168, 273, 069	−13, 945, 381	+28, 234, 150
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary							
H.R. 7179	Defense							
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia							
	Federal payment							
	Loan authorizations							
	Total, 1964 appropriations	13, 086, 558, 450		12, 716, 209, 969		12, 713, 259, 969	−373, 298, 481	+203, 588, 850
	Total, all appropriations	15, 247, 030, 906		14, 710, 478, 810		14, 710, 115, 810	−536, 915, 086	+253, 581, 185
	Total, loan authorizations	(13, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)		(6, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)	
	Total, contract authority	(17, 500, 000)					(−15, 500, 000)	

Bill No.	Title	Final action			Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
		Date approved	Amount as approved	Public Law No.	
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS				
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	Mar. 6	$508, 172, 000	88–1	
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	May 17	1, 467, 430, 491	88–25	−$184, 669, 965
	Public works acceleration		(450, 000, 000)		(−50, 000, 000)
	All other		(1, 017, 430, 491)		(−134, 689, 965)
	Total, 1963 supplementals		1, 975, 602, 491		−184, 869, 965
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS				
H.R. 5279	Interior	July 26	952, 456, 500	88–79	−45, 552, 500
	Loan authorization		(6, 000, 000)		(−7, 000, 000)
	Contract authority				(−17, 500, 000)
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office	June 13	6, 045, 466, 000	88–39	−101, 376, 000
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW				
H.R. 6754	Agriculture				
	Loan authorizations				
H.R. 6868	Legislative				
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary				
H.R. 7179	Defense				
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia				
	Federal payment				
	Loan authorizations				
	Total, 1964 appropriations		6, 997, 922, 500		−146, 928, 500
	Total, all appropriations		8, 973, 524, 991		−331, 798, 465
	Total, loan authorizations		(6, 000, 000)		(−7, 000, 000)
	Total, contract authority				(−17, 500, 000)

Source: Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has said other than that this is the usual continuing resolution that we have passed on many occasions, and I hope it will not be necessary to pass another continuing resolution extending beyond October 31.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask, under these continuing resolutions it means we are maintaining the expenditure levels of 1963 or lower, is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, that is correct. It has to be the lower of two figures: The 1963 rate or the budget estimate—whichever is lower.

Mr. CURTIS. One other question: It is my understanding that some of them have not been doing that.

Mr. CANNON. They are, of course, supposed to do that. The resolution so provides.

Mr. CURTIS. I thought so, but it has been my understanding that some of the agencies were seeking to expand their operations and actually are employing people beyond the 1963 levels, and that these expenditures are going up. Can that be done, and, if so, the only way they would be met is by later passing supplemental appropriations, am I correct?

Mr. JENSEN. If there is any agency of government that is expanding their personnel at this time, certainly the committee will know about that, and we will penalize them according to their crime.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Supplementing that statement, whatever the departments spend under these resolutions is ultimately lodged as a charge against—an advance against—the annual appropriation carried in the regular bill. And these annual amounts are determined primarily without regard to the interium expenditures under these continuing resolutions.

Further on the matter of the reductions below the President's budget requests for appropriations as shown in the table which I have included, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that while we have been reducing the amounts requested, the asking price, we have been allowing increases above last year. And last year we spent more than we collected. We went beyond our national revenues. We did the same thing the year before. And the year before that. We have done the same thing in 7 of the 10 years since the Korean war ended. In those ten years, the budget went in the red by $34,564,000,000. And we have done this despite the fact we were not at war and despite the fact we have enjoyed record national Treasury revenues—more than we have ever before taken into the Treasury.

The trouble is, in time of peace and record national revenues we use the wrong figures, the wrong criteria, the wrong measurement in arriving at the appropriations. Of course in wartime we spend whatever is necessary to survival regardless of cost and regardless of how much we have to borrow to do it. But we ought not to do that in peacetime years of record national revenues. It is incredible, it is unbelievable that we refuse, repeatedly, to live within our income—to pay as we go along or do without until we are willing to pay our way. And when we live beyond our revenues we of course have to hike the debt to get the money—from future generations not here to call us to account. No serious thought of making some beginning on a systematic, methodical, yearly reduction of the debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, the only sensible, the only sane way to write the budgets and the appropriations is to begin with the revenues, the annual income of the Treasury as the ceiling. And the first priority, before any appropriation, is to set aside at least 2 percent of income for paying on the recordbreaking national debt which today amounts to over $6,400 for every family of four in the land, a debt on which annual interest alone accrues, day and night, every minute the clock ticks, at the rate of $19,000 a minute. A recent compilation shows that if we set about to pay off a debt of $300,000,000,000 by the year 2100, or 137 years from now, and for simplicity assume one payment of interest and principal a year at 3 percent, we would pay $9,154,923,649.00 each year but the total outlay—look at this figure—would be $1,263,379,463,562.00. A trillion and a quarter.

Every family has to exercise some self-restraint in the family budget or be called to account. If they keep borrowing beyond the family income, they are headed for trouble. The local bank will not lend any more money to a family if they are not in the habit of paying something on account. And so inevitably it is with governments. We simply cannot afford to keep on and on, appropriating and spending beyond what we take in without ultimate debasement of our once peerless dollar—a dollar which today is worth only 44 cents. And if we need any further evidence of the precariousness of the situation, look at the rate at which foreign bankers have been cashing in dollars and demanding gold—to the point where we have to do something about it, and stop "hoping" the budget will someday balance itself.

The only certain way to get the budget in balance is to stop spending more and more money we do not have for things we could get along without.

Stop hacking at the branches and start hacking at the roots. Start a systematic payment schedule on the debt and cut appropirations and spending to stay within what is left over. We could do that and still meet every national security need and every other essential requirement. It is the nondefense programs that have unbalanced the budget these last 10 years as we have so often and so conclusively documented.

Mr. Speaker, if the executive and the Congress would collaborate in a continuing program to this end, we would reinforce and enhance the stability of the dollar, lay the groundwork for stopping the decline in its buying power, stabilize the cost of living, and halt the erosion of bonds, savings accounts and pensions.

That we adopt such a program and keep to it is an urgent and imperative national necessity.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—1 MONTH OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 1 MONTH OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. Speaker, in conformity with previous practice, and under leave granted, I include for the information of Members, a tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures in the first month of fiscal 1964 with pertinent comparisons.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the normal pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; and receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are usually lower than in the January–June second half.

Budget revenues were officially estimated by the President at $86,900,000,000 in last January's budget for the current fiscal year 1964, which, if realized, would exceed fiscal 1963 revenues by $543,000,000. That is the last official budget estimate, although recent statements indicate some official expectation that revenues may exceed that figure. In any event, in July, the first month of the fiscal year and a low collection month, actual budget revenues amounted to $3,547,000,000, slightly below the $3,566,000,000 for July of last year.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the President's budget last January at $98,802,000,000 which, if held to, would represent an increase of $6,212,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 budget expenditure. On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of $8,233,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in July amounted to $7,863,000,000, which in turn compares with $7,252,000,000 spent in July of last year; national defense was up $290,000,000 over a year ago, and all other items—nondefense—were $321,000,000 higher.

As in past budgets, the original January budget expenditure—disbursements—estimate of $98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represented a composite of, first, estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964 from appropriations made in prior years—$42,353,000,000, or approximately 43 percent, and, therefore, not directly affected by current congressional action on the 1964 appropriation bills; second, $1,202,000,000 estimated first-year expenditure in fiscal 1964 associated with proposals for new legislation; third, roughly $11,781,000,000 estimated to be expended from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and, therefore, not required to be voted on in the current session; fourth, thus leaving only about $43,466,000,000 of the total $98,802,000,000 original spending estimate for 1964 subject to direct action in the appropriation bills of the current session.

In his letter of August 19 to the Committee on Ways and Means on the new committee tax bill, the President did not supply the details but did say that the Secretary of the Treasury had made a new deficit projection of $9,200,000,000 for fiscal 1964—presumably in lieu of the President's original forecast of a $11,902,000,000 deficit. No details were given as to the mix of revisions—increased revenues, reduced expenditures, et cetera—accounting for this $2,700,000,000 downward adjustment in the original deficit expectation for fiscal 1964.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Both the state of the Union and budget messages emphasized that the expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so constructed that the total proposed administrative budget expenditure for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest was slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as then forecast—for such programs. The original net budget estimate for fiscal 1964 for such programs was $29,066,000,000. In the meantime, actual expenditures in fiscal 1963 for comparable purposes did not go as high as forecast in last January's budget, with the result that the $29,066,000,000 stands as an increase of $1,747,000,000 over fiscal 1963 rather than being below that year. And in the first month—July—of fiscal 1964, expenditures were $2,463,000,000—or about $127,000,000 above the corresponding expenditure in July of last year.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit is $11,900,000,000 originally projected, the $9,200,000,000 mentioned by the President on August 19, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years. And the President advises that the next budget, for fiscal 1965, will also be in the red. And no assurance is at hand that the fiscal 1966 budget will be balanced. We have not had a balanced budget since fiscal 1960. In summary here are the official administrative budget results of the last 3 years:

	Deficits—	
	From July 1, 1961 to date	For 3 fiscal years 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961)	$6,378,000,000	$6,378,000,000
Fiscal 1963	6,233,000,000	6,233,000,000
Fiscal 1964 (1 month to July 31, 1963)	4,316,000,000	
Fiscal 1964 (estimate mentioned in President's Aug. 19 letter)		9,200,000,000
Total, as above	16,927,000,000	21,811,000,000

And in total, budget expenditures in the fiscal 1963 just recently closed compares with certain earlier years as follows:

	Budget spending, fiscal 1963, over—	
	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1954
National defense	+$5,249,000,000	+$5,757,000,000
Other than national defense	+5,826,000,000	+10,296,000,000
Total	+11,075,000,000	+25,053,000,000

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 1 month of budget operations in the current fiscal year 1964 the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at $305,481,910,810.88, and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

Federal public debt—Direct and guaranteed

	Fiscal 1954	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at July 31, 1963)
1. The debt at end of period (in billions)	271.3	289.2	298.6	306.5	305.5
2. Amount per capita (in dollars)	1,670	1,575	1,600	1,619	1,612
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars)	6,680	6,300	6,400	6,476	6,448

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget) 1 month of fiscal 1964 versus 1 month of fiscal 1963 and comparison with full-year estimate

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 1 month (to July 31)			Tentative budget estimates for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual for all of fiscal 1963		
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Budget estimates for 1964 [1]	Actual, 1963	Estimate, 1964, over actual, 1963
1. Budget receipts (net)	$3,547	$3,566	−$19	$86,900	$86,357	+$543
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	4,237	3,947	+290	55,433	52,743	+2,690
(b) Other than national defense	3,626	3,305	+321	43,369	39,847	+3,522
Total expenditures, net	7,863	7,252	+611	98,802	92,590	+6,212
3. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−), line 1 minus line 2	−4,316	−3,686	−630	−11,902	−6,233	[2] −5,669
4. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,237	3,947	+290	4,619	4,395	+224
(b) Other than national defense	3,626	3,305	+321	3,614	3,320	+294
Total monthly average	7,863	7,252	+611	8,233	7,715	+518
5. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized by the budget message of January 1963:						
(a) National defense (per budget classification)	4,237	3,947	+290	55,433	52,743	+2,690
(b) Space	270	135	+135	4,200	2,552	+1,648
(c) Interest	893	834	+59	10,103	9,976	+127
(d) All other expenditures	2,463	2,336	+127	29,066	27,319	+1,747
Total budget expenditures, net	7,863	7,252	+611	98,802	92,590	+6,212

[1] As shown in budget, Jan. 17, 1963, which, among many assumptions and contingencies, reflected an estimated net revenue loss in fiscal 1964 of $2,700,000,000 from President's tax reduction and reform proposals. But President's letter of Aug. 19 to Committee on Ways and Means indicates current expectation of a fiscal 1964 deficit of $9,000,000,000 rather than the $11,902,000,000 in January budget (no details in letter).

[2] That is to say, the January budget projected a deficit $5,669,000,000 higher than the deficit actually experienced in fiscal 1963.

Sources: Monthly Treasury statement for July 31, 1963; budget for 1964; and monthly Treasury statement (preliminary) for June 30, 1963.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. **HÉBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 8042.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. **BONNER**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill—S. 1194—to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 700)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
ALTON LENNON,
MILTON W. GLENN,
GEO. A. GOODLING,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. L. BARTLETT,
PHILIP A. HART,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report: The action of the conference would result in no change in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
ALTON LENNON,
MILTON W. GLENN,
GEO. A. GOODLING,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AERIAL SURVEILLANCE OF CUBA

Mr. **SELDEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month news reports—including the syndicated column of Mr. Robert S. Allen and Mr. Paul Scott—indicated that U.S. aerial surveillance of Cuba had been banned by a Presidential order.

Disturbed by these rumors, I made a query to the Department of State, and have been assured that Cuban reconnaissance flights are continuing.

I am including in my remarks a copy of a letter from Mr. David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, stating U.S. policy in this connection:

> OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
> *Washington, D.C., August 22, 1963.*
> Hon. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. SELDEN: Your recent query to Mr. Sterling Cottrell, of the Department of State, concerning the August 6 article by Messrs. Allen and Scott entitled "Reconnaissance Flights Banned," has been referred to the Department of Defense for reply.
>
> The article's main theme is the allegation that a Presidential ban has been placed on surveillance flights over Cuba. This allegation is not true, and I can assure you that aerial surveillance of Cuba has not been interrupted.
>
> I hope this information will be of assistance to you and if I can be of further service please do not hesitate to call on me.
>
> Sincerely,
> DAVID E. MCGIFFERT,
> *Assistant to the Secretary,*
> *Legislative Affairs.*

FOREIGN AID

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the AID Agency on June 30, 1963, had available to meet all prior year commitments an amount in excess of $7 billion, and this does not take into account the amount available under other statutes for which foreign aid is given.

If the Congress never appropriates another dollar for foreign aid, we will not default on a single legal commitment to any other Nation. On June 30, 1963, the AID Agency had to its credit from prior years' appropriations sufficient funds to meet every legal commitment made prior to June 30, 1963.

The people downtown have hollered wolf too often. Under the previous administration we had worked the annual appropriation down to less than $2,800 million annually. Then the program got out from under control. Now look at what an uncontrollable mess the foreign aid program is in. Wait until the Committee on Appropriations brings out the money bill. We will present facts that will curl your eyebrows—facts that will prompt those downtown to think things through in the future before making charges that cannot be supported with facts.

TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have given most earnest and serious consideration to whether it would not be desirable for the other body to require as a reservation to the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty that Russia show good faith by withdrawing her soldiers from the island of Cuba. I have concluded that the importance of the ratification of this treaty is such that the imposition of such a reservation should not be required. But while we are hopeful for the improvement of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in the future, it should certainly be the policy of this administration not to negotiate further with the Soviet Union after the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty until Russia does withdraw her troops from the island of Cuba and we should be prepared to give assurance to Russia that if she does make such withdrawal, we will not permit China or any other nation to replace those troops with her own, and I propose to introduce a resolution to that effect in the House today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 502, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the material and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments affecting title V of the Social Security Act and to the text of the proposed new title XVII contained in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

Abernethy
Adair
Ashley
Avery
Bass
Bray
Brock
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Goodling
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Hardy
Holifield
Jones, Ala.
King, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pelly
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
Roudebush
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Whitten
Williams
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 385 Members have answer to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RETURN OF S. 1914 AND S. 1942 TO SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate:

> *Ordered,* That the Secretary of the Senate request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1914) entitled "An act to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America" and the bill (S. 1942) entitled "An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America" together with all accompanying papers.

The request was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 502 provides for consideration of H.R. 7544, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combatting mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes. The resolution provides a modified open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of general debate. No amendments shall be in order except amendments affecting title V of the Social Security Act and to the text of the proposed new title XVII contained in H.R. 7544.

The bill, H.R. 7544, is designed to assist in preventing and combating mental retardation. The bill would help to accomplish these objectives by first, expanding the existing programs of maternal and child health services and crippled children's services; second, authorizing grants for maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation; third, authorizing grants or contracts for research projects related to the maternal and child health or crippled children's services programs that show promise of advancing these programs; and, fourth, authorizing onetime grants to States to encourage planning and other activities that promote State and community efforts to combat mental retardation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 502.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman why we should have a closed rule on a bill like this? I understand, of course, that it comes from the Committee on Ways and Means and that most matters coming from the Committee on Ways and Means dealing with tax matters necessarily should have a closed rule, but on a bill of this kind I ask my good chairman, Why should we have a closed rule?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may answer the gentleman from California?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I am delighted to inform my friend from California that this is not a closed rule.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I must have misunderstood my friend from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. This is a modified open rule subject to amendment on title V. That is the only section. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 7544. The reasons for the closed rule, which, as I am told, is known as a modified closed rule, have already been explained. I think that is the only serious question on the rule. The bill itself is a bill that has certainly great appeal to everyone who has studied this question and who realizes the very serious nature of retardation in children. The President in his message to the Congress gave us some very grim figures, and I think it is well to bear these figures in mind. I quote from the message of the President:

> It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as muscular distrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded; they require constant care or supervision.

The State and local communities spend $300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded and another $250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services.

This bill will, of course, bring the sum up to considerably more. As a matter of fact, it will be very close in time to $1 billion. The only objection I can see to this is that there have been rumors, and they are perhaps well founded rumors, that this bill was hastily considered; that enough time was not given to it. I note in the separate views of our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, that he says:

> This bill calls for the authorization of the extension and increase of two existing programs over a 7-year period costing $570 or $285 million each, an increase of $220 million. The 1962 per annum level of $50 million ($25 million per annum for each) is increased to $100 million. These two programs increase about 50 percent over the 7 years, 1954 to 1961.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a long program. This takes in a very broad gage, because it is for 7 years, which always strikes me as a little bit unusual in the House of Representatives.

The proposals in this bill would call for an increase of 150 percent in the 7 years to 1968 with continued increases of around 25 percent for the years 1969 and 1970.

Certainly something in this field should be done. Certainly we know that this Congress and the American people are sympathetic to such a program and that they also feel it will advance science. Mr. Speaker, if we could ever find a way of curing or abolishing in any way whatsoever mental retardation, and I do not mean to be humorous in this matter, it would be a Godsend not only for our country but for the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. I think this is a very fine bill that the Committee on Ways and Means has brought out for consideration. There is one additional dimension to the problem of mental illness that I trust will be brought to the attention of the country and of the Ways and Means Committee. There is a tremendous financial obligation on parents of mentally retarded children. If those parents had an opportunity to set aside money every year for the purpose of future care of the mentally retarded children after the parents have passed on I believe it would benefit the whole society.

I trust the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the committee itself as well as the Congress will consider the possibility of such tax exemptions for parents of mentally retarded children, some time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Ways and Means Committee has done a fine job in bringing out this bill in line with the recommendations of the President's panel on mental illness and mental retardation.

I would like to call the attention of the House to another aspect of this problem which goes beyond the legislation we are considering today. This problem concerns the heavy financial burden placed on the parents of mentally retarded children. Whether a child is cared for with parental love in the home, or placed in a public or private institution, there are mounting expenditures and many drains on the pocketbook. Frequently, when a mentally retarded child requires constant care, someone must watch over him at all times. This removes the possibility of the mother or older sister from getting outside employment to help alleviate the additional financial burden.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned in the total tax picture with the taxes which are placed on the parents of mentally retarded children. Most families readily accept their obligation to their children, and few would even think of asking that their obligation to a retarded child be entirely assumed by the State or Federal Government. Yet what I am suggesting is that some form of tax relief be considered for the parents of mentally retarded children.

It is difficult and heartrending for a parent to be forced to placed a child in a public institution. But even this course is a difficult one financially because most States do not charge for the institutional care of the permanently handicapped, but most States do charge for institutional care of the mentally retarded. I would like to quote from a statement of the National Association of Retarded Children:

> It is bitter irony to tax parents for the unavoidable misfortune of having a retarded child. We must wonder if it is consistent with American social philosophy to require that parents of mentally retarded children pay taxes to support public education facilities which exclude their children, when there is a price tag on their attempts to obtain equal benefits for their children in public institutions.

What happens to a mentally retarded child once he grows up and his parents are no longer around to support or help him? Must he become a ward of the State? Why would not it be possible to enable parents to set aside a little money every year to provide for the future care of their mentally retarded children after the parents are gone? If tax exemptions were provided, it might be possible financially for parents to do this. The least we could do would be to double the $600 exemption for dependents.

I have talked with many people who are deeply concerned with this problem. All without an exception urge that more must be done to take part of the financial burden off the parents who are valiantly struggling to fulfill their parental obligations.

Last year, the State of Louisiana amended its State income tax law to allow an additional personal exemption of $1,000 for the taxpayer who is mentally retarded or for a dependent who is mentally retarded. I believe that Louisiana deserves our congratulations for this forward-looking step.

I trust that others will discuss this issue, and that before too long Congress will come to grips with this problem in a constructive way. Let us begin as soon as possible to do our best to help the parents of the mentally retarded.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the Record an excellent editorial which appeared in the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser January 26, 1963:

TAX RELIEF FOR PARENTS OF RETARDED MUCH NEEDED

Congressman Ken Hechler, of Huntington, in discussing President Kennedy's tax proposals recently, touched upon a problem worthy of consideration by Congress as it drafts new tax legislation.

The fourth district Representative said he believes there should be some form of tax exemptions for parents "with the heavy financial burden of sending children to college," and that parents of mentally retarded children also should receive tax relief. He added that he is planning to introduce bills in the House which would provide such exemptions.

The problems of parents attempting to finance college educations for their children are well known and indisputable. Higher education is a "must" for both the individual and the Nation.

Less publicized is the staggering financial problem for parents of mentally retarded children. Here there's no question of finding the money for a college education. It involves even more—finding a way to provide the child with a life of dignity and physical comfort in a world in which he is not equipped to compete. It is an almost overwhelming problem for the parents.

The airing of mental retardation is a relatively new thing. In earlier days, the mentally retarded in many cases were able, in our predominantly rural society, to eke out an existence for themselves. But times have changed and it now requires a quick mind and competitive spirit to maintain a place in society. It also requires the ability to earn a great deal of money.

This the mentally retarded child is not equipped to do.

The parents of such a child have three basic choices: (1) Place him in a public institution; (2) place him in a private institution; or (3) keep him at home. The first choice is heart rending. The others are extremely costly. Most parents simply cannot afford them.

Anybody who has visited a ward for the mentally retarded in a public institution in West Virginia immediately realizes that it is not a life of reasonable comfort or dignity. It is a last resort.

Private institutions provide a much better choice. But the cost is prohibitive for most.

The third choice, keeping the child at home, also is expensive. In addition to the cost of special medical care, there are the problems of constant supervision and providing education suitable to the child's abilities. The latter may involve moving to a city which provides special classes. This also removes the prospect of the child's mother going to work to supplement the family income. The retarded child is usually a lovable child—and requires more love and care than the normal child. His mother's constant presence helps to ease him over the many frustrations which beset him every day. A babysitter isn't adequate.

There's still another question facing the parent. What of the future?

Many of the retarded can be expected to outlive their parents. Thus the protective shield is removed, and they are left alone to struggle for survival. This means the public institution or menial, poor-paying jobs. It's a bleak prospect.

The parents' best hope is to set aside some money to help the retarded individual after his father and mother have died. If there is enough, it can finance a life in a private institution. Or it can be used to augment the retarded person's meager income.

One possible action the Federal Government can take to help answer this problem is to double the income tax deduction for retarded children who are kept at home or in private institutions. Instead of the present $600 deduction, it would be $1,200. The extra money can be used for the present needs of the child and can give the parents a chance to set aside some for his future.

The Federal Government already has taken one step locally in helping the retarded through a 3-year demonstration grant from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to help finance Cabell County's pioneering sheltered workshop. In this program, retardates over the age of 16 are trained in various manual skills and provided therapy classes and physical training.

The workshop is an admirable effort toward alleviating a herculean problem, but more can be done. Representative Hechler's proposal is another way of helping to make life better for children who have started out with three strikes against them.

It isn't too much to ask.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that I oppose a rule. However, I feel that it is necessary in this instance to oppose this rule, as I did before the Committee on Rules. The reason is that this program, although designed by its label and its subject matter for the solution of a real social problem and one in which we are all concerned—and I might say I have over a period of years had a particular interest in it—because we are in a position, in my judgment, where the Committee on Ways and Means cannot fully advise the House as to the extent of this particular legislation and what its impact will be. I should like to refer to my views on pages 18 and 19 of the committee report. I think I will start by reading the next to the last paragraph:

> I think it is important to call the Congress attention to the fact that the Ways and Means Committee, although enjoying a fine professional staff, knowledgeable in the Internal Revenue Code, has not one single person on the staff who is an expert in the field of welfare matters covered in the Social Security Act. It is imperative that we staff our committees professionally if we are to make intelligent recommendations to the House in regard to legislation.

As you all know, the Committee on Ways and Means has been particularly busy this year; and I want to commend our chairman for the work that we have been doing, but not in this area; it has been on the tax bill, debt management, et cetera. We held no public hearings on this bill. We did not have the time to do it. All that was considered was a statement asking those who are interested to write in on it. We have been completely—I do not want to use the words "at the mercy," but we have been completely dependent, which is, I think, a better expression, upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for what little we know about this bill.

We are talking about two programs that would be increased at the rate of 150 percent in contrast to a previous rate of 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read again from my minority views:

> Regretfully it is the lack of adequate study and consideration by congressional committees of proposals for new programs and expanding old ones—

There are two expanding old ones here and one new one—

> which appeal in their labels to our humanitarian instincts that cause real damage to be done in solving the very problems they proclaim by their labels they seek to solve.

I would say to my colleagues, I know this is only for the record, that there is nothing going to be done about what I have to say here. But let me tell you the reason we have these imbalances in our budgets. It is because of this kind of procedure, coming in here with bills that have great labels appealing to our heartstrings—and indeed they do—and a lot of good can be done and should be done in this area.

But if we are going to do the proper job for the program itself and pay attention to this overriding problem we have of our finances, which if we do not get on top of this deficit it is likely to wreck this entire country, we have got to do the homework necessary on these programs.

Mr. Speaker, what I am doing is attempting to make a little bit of record in trying to call this to the attention of the Members of the House.

Further quoting from my minority views, there is the following:

> At the same time these unstudied programs have created the burgeoning bureaucracies and deadening deficits in the Federal budget which are eroding the economic strength of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read the next paragraph and then I will have finished:

> The limitations of programs that involve research and expansion in the health and scientific fields are today not limited by dollars but rather by lack of skilled manpower. The grants of Federal funds have been so unstudied and so wastefully excessive that the efficient allocation of scientific and technological manpower has been disrupted. This is resulting in serious damage even in the areas of overallocation where the program is designed to move forward. It has been estimated that seven-eighths of the Nation's scientific and technical personnel is now under the direction of Federal programs. For example, the National Institutes of Health have found it impossible to spend the moneys that the Congress has voted them. Obviously in trying to spend the amounts of money they have, they have moved forward with programs that have not been well conceived, efficiently designed, and effectively operated.

Mr. Speaker, my recommendation to the House in my report is that this matter be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means. I am in no position I might say to advise the House on what kind of amendments might be good in this bill, because we do not have the information. However, I think it should be recommitted for further study by our committee and I might say forthwith reported back to the House as to what we think is an adequate measure in this area.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. St. Onge].

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. My bill, H.R. 7486, is similar to that of the chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills].

The proposals contained in this legislation are based on President Kennedy's message to Congress several months ago in which he requested that programs be set up on mental retardation and the care of crippled children. The amendments provided in this bill will make it possible for the Federal Government to assist States and communities in combating mental retardation, help crippled children, and expand programs dealing with maternal and child health care.

Fact sheets and other material prepared by the Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, show that there are estimated to be 5.4 million persons in the United States today who are mentally retarded in varying degrees. We are also informed by the same source that 126,000 mentally retarded children are born every year in this country, and of these, it is believed by experts in this field, about 110,000 can in time acquire limited skills and pursue an independent community living if they are given assistance and proper training.

The bill under consideration would provide matching grants to States and communities in expanding and improving these health services in several ways: in planning comprehensive action to combat mental retardation; in expanding maternal and child-health services to reduce infant mortality, especially in the low-income areas; in increasing services for crippled children, including medical, hospital and home-care services; and in research in these fields.

The cost of all these services to help the mentally retarded and the crippled, as well as the programs for maternal and child-health care, is not excessive when we consider the human lives involved and its importance to so many thousands of our citizens who will directly benefit from these services.

I consider this a very worthy piece of legislation, and for this reason I was very happy to cosponsor the bill several months ago and to support it today. The country has long felt the need for legislation to deal with this problem. I urge all my colleagues to support the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS BY RAILROAD AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 505, Rept. No. 714), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 665) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

That after the passage of House Joint Resolution 665, it shall then be in order to call from the Speaker's table and consider in the House the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7544, with Mr. Edmondson in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that earlier this year there was submitted to the Congress programs to combat and prevent mental retardation through an expansion of certain existing programs under social security and the authorization of certain new programs and through the construction of facilities as a part of an overall program.

The two parts were forwarded to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. The Committee on Ways and Means has reported the part referred to it in H.R. 7544 to the House by a vote of 23 to 2, as I recall, with one of the members who voted on the majority side reserving his rights with respect to floor action.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today can be very briefly described insofar as its purpose and content are concerned. The bill amends certain programs which are now contained in title V of the Social Security Act by authorizing some increases in the ceiling of those programs and, in addition, under these two parts of title V authorizing an additional program of maternal and infant care to prevent mental retardation and to provide very limited authorization for research and planning projects in mental retardation.

Mr. Chairman, as you will recall, title 5 is one of the 16 titles of the Social Security Act. That title is broken down into three parts. No. 1 has to do with maternal and child health services. Part 2 has to do with the crippled children's services. Part 3 has to do with the child welfare services.

The first two, namely, the maternal and child health services and the crippled children's services, are dealt with in H.R. 7544. The other part of title 5 was dealt with by the Congress in the program that we passed last year entitled the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

What do we do to these two programs in this bill? Over a period between now and 1970 we provide for an increase in the authorization of the two programs to the same level that we provided last year for the child welfare services, the third part of title 5.

These are matching programs and the amount of State and local money which is expended on them greatly exceeds the amount of Federal money. For example, in fiscal 1962, less than $25 million in Federal funds was made available for the maternal and child health program while over $70 million in State and local funds were put into that program. A similar situation exists with reference to the crippled children's program.

As Members of the House will further recall, in the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, provision was made for gradually increasing the ceiling on the child welfare authorizations from the then-existing $25 million per year over the succeeding 5 years so that by 1969 that authorization will amount to $50 million per year. The bill which is now before you would authorize similar increases in the ceilings for the maternal and child health services program and for the crippled children's services program in the following manner—the $25 million authorized for each of these programs would be increased to $30 million for fiscal 1964, $35 million for fiscal 1965, $40 million for fiscal 1966 and 1967, $45 million for fiscal 1968 and 1969, and $50 million for fiscal 1970 and subsequent years. It should be understood, of course, that these are ceilings and that appropriate requests have to be presented before money is made available.

These grant-in-aid programs have become a very important factor in the prevention of disease in infancy and childhood and promoting health of mothers and children and in providing medical, surgical, and hospital care for crippled children. The programs are administered by the States. The Federal funds, as I have indicated, are allocated strictly on a matching basis, and there is a great deal more State and local money involved in these programs than there is Federal money.

These programs have been a significant factor in the reduction of infant and maternal mortality in all areas of the country, but particularly in the rural areas. However, progress in maintaining these basic preventive health services has been seriously affected by the fact that we have an increasing child population which has put a strain on the existing agencies and which requires an increase in the available services, if they are to keep pace with the increasing population. The provisions of this bill will make possible an orderly growth of the maternal and child health program, an increase in the volume of services and a new program for the prevention of mental retardation.

Mr. Chairman, the new program which is authorized under this legislation is a 5-year program of grants to the public health agencies for projects to provide necessary health care for expectant mothers who have, or are likely to have, conditions associated with child bearing that increase hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants who, because of low income or other reasons beyond their control, will not receive such care. The State and local health agencies administer this program and determine those who meet the qualifications. The authorizations which would be provided for this program would be $5 million for fiscal year 1964 and gradually increasing to $30 million for fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968. As I have indicated, grants for these mental retardation projects are on a matching basis.

Mr. Chairman, the other two purposes of this bill can be summarized quite briefly. First, the bill would authorize research projects under the auspices of the Children's Bureau relating to maternal health services and crippled children's services. These would be the projects that show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement of these programs. These research projects are intended to be applied research and are not intended to overlap research sponsored by other agencies of Government.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the Committee on Ways and Means was particularly concerned that there would be no overlapping or duplication with respect to these matters and I call your attention to the language contained on page 7 of the committee report, beginning in the middle of the page, setting forth clearly and unequivocally the intent of the committee with respect to this. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this bill will involve no overlapping of programs authorized to be conducted by other agencies of Government because the Committee on Ways and Means took occasion to go into that matter very carefully.

Finally, the bill authorizes a one-time limited grant-in-aid to encourage planning to combat mental retardation at the community and State level.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated at the outset of my remarks, the legislation which is covered in this bill now before you is one part of an overall program which has been recommended. This part does not involve authorizations for any construction projects but rather expands certain existing programs of services to crippled children and for maternal and child health. The bill which has been reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is the bill which involves construction projects. There is no construction money in the bill now before you. Nor is there any overlapping or duplication as between this bill and the bill which has been reported by the other committee. Throughout the consideration of this legislation members of the Committee on Ways and Means have sought to assure themselves that there will be no overlapping or duplication in the research provided under this bill and that there will be no overlapping or duplication as to the services authorized as compared to the programs which are handled by other committees. What is involved here, basically, is simply an expansion of existing title V programs under the Social Security Act and a limited authorization for a temporary period of time for a new type of mental retardation program. Otherwise, the research which is involved is applied research, and the planning grants are one-time grants simply to encourage the State and local communities to plan ahead to prevent mental retardation where possible.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware that mental retardation ranges as a major health, social, and economic problem. The cost to our people in heartbreak and in money is staggering. We are advised by the medical experts that a great number of mentally retarded individuals may suffer unnecessarily, since mental retardation can be prevented and programs can be devised so as to make useful and productive citizens out of many of these unfortunate individuals.

It has been said, Mr. Chairman, by one of the members of our committee that the committee did not receive sufficient information which would justify this action on the part of the committee. It is true that the committee did not have hearings on this bill as it normally does. Following the same procedure that the committee followed a year or so ago in connection with the Customs Classification Act, as chairman of the committee I released an announcement requesting all who might be interested, the public generally, to write us setting forth any comments or recommendations they might have on the legislation. We did receive responses from a great number of people, set forth in a pamphlet that we caused to be published entitled "Comment by Interested Individuals and Organizations on H.R. 3386." That was the initial bill which I introduced earlier in the year, the forerunner of H.R. 7544, which is before this committee today.

Out of all of those letters we received one letter from one lady, opposed to the bill. She was not opposed to the idea of doing something about mental retardation but contended that it was not necessary for the Federal Government to enter into this field, that private charities could take care of the job.

If one will look again on pages 12 and 13 of this pamphlet, it will be observed that this basic idea was approved by practically every national organization dealing in the field of health and medicine, by a great number of nonmedical national organizations, and by a great number of State agencies engaged in this field. There were some amendments suggested in some instances and many of them have been adopted by the committee. It was decided, therefore, by the committee that it was not necessary in the light of this widespread support and apparent lack of opposition that the committee hold hearings.

We did discuss the bill at length in executive session of the committee. It was not rushed. Everybody was given the opportunity of discussing his own point of view, asking questions and seeking information about the bill.

A question has been raised by the gentleman from Missouri to the effect that we do not have any justification for increasing the ceilings of the Maternal and Child Health Services and the Crippled Children's Services programs. We have as much justification today, Mr. Chairman, for increasing the ceiling on these two programs as we had last year in increasing the ceiling on the child welfare services. I do not remember in the course of the debate on the bill then before the House that any question was raised by anyone as to the advisability of increasing this ceiling on the authorization for child welfare services over this period of several years.

Now we do have evidence—I have evidence, Mr. Chairman, that I want to submit to the House—that I believe is sufficient for all of us without any reservation to support the increases in these authorizations that are involved in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for us to be reminded of the rising child population in the United States to understand that services which are rendered to children would of necessity have to, from time to time, be increased as the population of children increases.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have to be reminded either of the fact that medical costs, and in particular hospital costs, are rising in the United States, as another reason why services involving medical costs would have to be increased from time to time, if such services are to be continued to be rendered in the same effective manner.

But there is, Mr. Chairman, an even more impressive reason, in my opinion, for increasing these ceilings today than the two just mentioned. I am very, very proud of the progress that has been made in the United States over the past 12 years in reducing infant mortality in the United States by the medical science that exists here in America. We have reduced that mortality rate in that period of time by approximately 13 percent. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, however, that our own record of reducing infant mortality here in the United States, as impressive as it is, has not kept pace with that of some other nations of the world—in the free world incidentally.

In 1950, the United States stood sixth among the nations of the world in the percentage of infant mortality. In 1962, the United States stood 11th among the nations of the world. In spite of the fact that we had progressed to the extent of a 13 percent improvement ourselves, some other nations apparently had done more in those 12 years than we have done to reduce infant mortality. Which indicates, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of existing programs at the local level, sponsored by the State and local governments; at the Federal level, sponsored by the Federal Government; by private charities in our cities and in our communities and in our States, there is still a great deal of additional progress that needs to be made in this particular area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another reason in my opinion for justifying the increase in these ceilings—small, yes, compared to the total but it is my recollection that the Committee on Appropriations last year set aside within the existing ceilings within funds made available in the appropriation bill last year a million dollars for mental retardation clinics within our States. I assume that the Committee on Appropriations, having decided to do this, would certainly feel that this program should perhaps enjoy a higher percentage in the future of funds authorized under these various programs in title V for mental retardation in clinics.

I believe, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that there is ample evidence before us to justify the increase in these amounts.

I want to say a word briefly, Mr. Chairman, about whether there are $265 million of additional increase in these programs over a 5-year period or not. If one wants to look solely at the mathematics of the proposition, the answer is yes. When you increase over a 5-year period the authorization of each of programs for maternal and child health services and crippled children's services from $25 million upward to a total of $50 million for each in 1970, we can say mathematically that we have caused a situation wherein costs of Government may rise. The same is true for the new programs. But let us remember, Mr. Chairman, what we are seeking to do in these programs. For every child in the United States that we can restore to a normal useful life; for every child that we can enable to take his place in society that would not otherwise do so; for every dollar of cost involved in that action, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the monetary reward, if we want to look at that alone, might not be 10-fold or 100-fold in the contribution that that child may later make as a result of some actions taken here. This would not take into account the life time costs of maintaining such a person as a mentally or physically handicapped person.

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not view increased expenditure in this area as a waste, or as a loss, or as being contrary to the public interest. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. For here, if this purpose is carried out, what is sought and what is intended, we will, as a people, through the expenditure of these amounts, reap even greater economic reward in the generations that are helped and the generations that will come after us.

Those are the two programs, Mr. Chairman, about which it is said that we do not have sufficient information today to justify legislation. There are other parts of this bill, Mr. Chairman, that have to do more particularly with the establishment of programs to combat or to prevent mental retardation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his explanation of this program and the committee for the consideration of it. The gentleman mentioned the two parts of the program included in the President's message, one part of it going to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the course of the hearings and the consideration of our committee the question of duplication and overlap developed. I have been before the Committee on Rules this morning, and the same question has arisen. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any duplication so far as he knows and the committee knows in the program that is included in this bill and the program which is included in the bill which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported and is now seeking a rule on.

Mr. MILLS. Let me start with that question as I discuss parts of this bill which relate specifically to the matter of mental retardation by answering the gentleman with as much assurance as I have ever been able to give in answer to any question that there is no duplication between the bill that the gentleman's committee reported and the bill that the Ways and Means Committee has reported to the House which is presently before this committee.

The gentleman's bill has to do with matters within the jurisdiction of his committee. The bill from the Committee on Ways and Means has to do with matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In our bill on mental retardation we are providing for authorization for appropriations to be used in applied science; and, incidentally, there was concern in our committee over a possible overlapping between this and the science programs that are carried on by the National Institutes of Health which are basic in nature. The committee has been very pointed in its report in saying that we are not only assured, but we do not anticipate there will be, and certainly we are not going to countenance, any duplication even in that research.

We are providing for a one-shot grant to the States of moneys to enable them to set up plans and promote in their own way programs of combating and preventing mental retardation within the States.

The gentleman's bill, as I understand it, initially as he introduced it, had to do with authorizing the appropriation of funds to be made available to States for construction of facilities.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Schools, things of that sort, for the mentally retarded. Also the bill as it was introduced would have provided moneys, as I understand, in the form of grants to States to help staff those institutions that were developed.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman's bill do either of those things?

Mr. MILLS. The bill has nothing to do whatsoever with staffing. It has nothing whatsoever to do with construction of facilities. There was some question raised by some Members of the use in the report of the word "project." The word "project" is referred to in the bill and in the gentleman's report. I guess the word "project" may have many meanings and uses. I have not checked to see what all the meanings are. But in this bill here, where we are talking about a project in one instance we mean a demonstration project, a service-type operation. It has nothing to do with wood or brick or mortar, anything of that sort.

Mr. HARRIS. It has nothing to do with the physical property, facilities?

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

Mr. HARRIS. What does the gentleman's committee mean in the report on page 4 where it says:

> Under the program special diagnostic clinics for mentally retarded children have been developed.

What does that mean?

Mr. MILLS. It does not mean what some might imply, if the gentleman is raising the question about construction of clinics—it has nothing to do with the construction of them.

Mr. HARRIS. That was the question raised by members of our own committee, that there is overlapping and duplication, and I want to make it perfectly clear in this RECORD that there is no duplication.

Mr. MILLS. There is positively no duplication. When we use the word "clinic" we talk in terms of the services of a doctor to a group of these children who come to see him from hour to hour. In that sense that is a clinic. But we are not talking about the construction of a clinic by the stretch of the imagination of anyone. A clinic in the sense of our bill certainly means what we say it means here and I daresay any doctor on the floor of the House will understand what I am talking about when I refer to it in perhaps this most "unmedical" approach.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Certainly there is no attempt on the part of the Children's Bureau in the Social Security Administration or the Public Health Service to duplicate any of the services or research provided in these two programs. They have given assurances to all of the legislative committees that there is no intention to allow any duplication to occur.

However, the language is broad enough so if it were not properly policed by the

Committee on Appropriations and not properly watched by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, duplication could result.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to comment briefly and then I shall continue to yield to the gentleman. The gentleman is right in his statement, but I do not want us to overlook the fact that we are not leaving it just to the Committee on Appropriations and the Bureau downtown—the supervision—to see whether or not there is duplication. Whenever the members of our committee are told there will not be any duplication in this field, it will also be our committee's responsibility to see that that promise is carried out. We will not just rely upon the Committee on Appropriations—as effective as it is—and wash our hands of it.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman from Arkansas will yield further, I would hope that sometime in the not too distant future we could bring all the services affecting children under one agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The last Congress created a new institute within the structure of the National Institutes of Health dealing with the problems of child behavior, health, and care. The Public Health Service and the Social Security Administration through the Children's Bureau are very much in this same program. The eventual solution quite possibly will be to elevate the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to a position where it will have overall responsibility for the overall children's health and welfare programs. At the present time we have many agencies going their separate ways. The only coordination that does exist is when the Congress or the Secretary himself steps in. I might add that this happens very seldom.

The National Institutes of Health at the present time has justified their appropriation request for the new children's institute on the basis that it will only approve basic research work. But we find as we go down this list of grants and contracts that there are many applied research grants which have been already approved for funding by NIH.

I hope that they will curtail their activities in the applied research area and let the Children's Bureau through their program go forward in the applied research area as far as mental retardation is concerned. The funds presently programed by NIH should be transferred to the Children's Bureau.

I would like to point out one further thing, if the gentleman will yield. In the administration's appropriation request this year for the National Institutes of Health a very unusual request was made. Fortunately the House rejected it in the appropriation for the Department of HEW for fiscal 1964. The request was for $12 million in new program money for the National Institute of Mental Health to make grants to mental health hospital operating costs in each of our 50 States. There was no authorization ever granted by the gentleman's committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, or by the committee of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to get into a program to pay for personnel or operating costs in mental hospitals throughout the United States. However, here the National Institute of Mental Health came in with a program to provide, to start with, at least $100,000 for a mental hospital program in every State of the Union to help pay operating costs in mental hospitals. This type of program never has been authorized by the Congress. The administration is using the broad general grant authority of the basic authorizing act for National Institute of Mental Health. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] through his committee is presently looking into the misuse of this authority by NIH.

The administration should not use that broad general grant of authority at the National Institute of Mental Health to contribute to operating costs in these hospitals without getting proper authorization from the Committee on Ways and Means or by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is important that the legislative committee look into the broad use of existing authority by the executive branch of the Government to cover new programs never discussed with the legislative committees. This new program was never set forth in any prior legislative hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman and the members of his Ways and Means Committee for the fine work performed on the legislation before us this afternoon.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his contribution. What the gentleman refers to, however, is an existing situation, of course, and not in the bill before us.

I want to thank the gentleman publicly, as well as the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], for providing me time to discuss the pending bill before it ever left our committee to determine whether or not from the viewpoint of the Appropriations Subcommittee there should be certain amendments adopted.

As a result of these conversations, particularly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], the committee will offer two or three amendments which I think improve the bill. I want the membership to know that in spite of the fact the committee has not had hearings and in spite of the fact one of the members of our committee feels we do not know enough about the subject to legislate, we have done something here I do not recall ever having been done before in the development of legislation. We have gone to the source of more knowledge than perhaps we possess, I must admit, the Appropriations Committee members of the House, to get their advice and their assistance.

Mr. HARRIS. The question has been raised in our own committee and before the Committee on Rules, and I wanted to make it abundantly clear in this Record the bill that is being discussed here, if and when a rule is cleared and the other bill comes before the House, there is no duplication whatever, that this is a program to amend the Social Security Act which makes grants to the State for one purpose.

Mr. MILLS. For services.

Mr. HARRIS. For services, and the program we have before our committee is a program involving research construction on mental retardation, and there will not be any duplication.

Mr. MILLS. The social security aspect has nothing to do with that aspect of the program.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Under section 1703, titled "Applications," it is stated:

> In order to be eligible for a grant under section 1702 a State must submit an application therefor which designates or establishes a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out the purposes of this title.

For the purpose of clarification I would like to know what the chairman thinks or what he believes is the interpretation of the phrase "a single State agency for carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. MILLS. Let us go back so the Record will be clear as to what we mean. The gentleman is referring to a provision in title 17 of the bill. Title 17 provides grants for a "one-shot" operation, 1 year, of $2.2 million for all States and territories to develop plans or to use the language in the bill: "leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation."

We give them this amount of money supplemented by other money as required on page 8 of the bill to develop a plan to combat mental retardation. It has nothing to do with the operation of such a plan. It has to do strictly with the development of a plan. With respect to your specific question, "what do we mean by a single State agency?" may I say that a single State agency could be a regular State agency, it could be an interdepartmental committee, commission or council assigned the responsibility by the State legislature or by the Governor to carry out the planning envisaged in the bill H.R. 7544.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman. Just one other question to amplify the explanation of the chairman: May I therefore interpret the statement of the chairman to mean that when he speaks of "interdepartmental in nature" it shall include the fields of education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, health, and institutional programs that represent the consumers of such services?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. It is up to the State as long as it works it out in a plan which can be done on some interdepartmental or agency approach such as I have outlined, but the gentleman from New York recalls quite vividly that the Committee on Ways and Means is a very strong believer in leaving such things to the discretion and decision of the States.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas a clarifying question, and then based on that make an observation? First let me say I agree with the definition of the word "services" but in the interest of semantics, and further in answer to the other gentleman's remarks, I would say that this bill is prophylactic and the other is security.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know about that. Would the gentleman reverse that description?

Mr. HALL. I would say that your bill is prophylactic and the one of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is more security.

Mr. MILLS. As long as the distinguished gentleman is in support of the legislation I do not care how he describes it.

Mr. HALL. In the last part of the gentleman's opening statement he stated that we have made remarkable gains in maternal care and child welfare. There is no question about that. The percentage of deaths has dropped remarkably, and perhaps due to some of our participation worldwide they have dropped in other places. But if we can keep hands off the maternal process, it does better by nature alone than otherwise.

Further, the bill says that through 1970 and subsequent years we are going to use certain funds, I believe $50 million a year, and this is well worth it in the gentleman's opinion. I respect his opinion, but is there any lack of annual appropriation process for these funds? Could it be interpreted in any wise as backdoor spending?

Mr. MILLS. Not at all. Every dollar in this bill has to be appropriated by the Congress before it becomes available for any of the uses authorized in this bill.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

The second phase of my question is, It would seem impossible, since this is all on the basis of projected terms, the common terms we use of population explosion, and so forth, through 1970 to indicate the need for steadily increasing amounts, because that would almost admit to the fact that we do not expect in the research we are endowing with grants to make the breakthrough we need. So why not go over this each year, after we have more expertise in these matters that affect childbirth and mental retardation, because it seems likely to permit endless increases? Would the chairman comment on that?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. I guess somebody could make an argument that you could go further than we have. There are some people in this field who are so sincerely interested in vigorous action in the field that they would think that these amounts herein contained should be increased. If the gentleman will bear with me, the record in the past shows that the Congress has not taken the determining lead at all in stating the amounts that are to be spent.

The States have historically exceeded the Federal Government's contributions to the States in these fields. For instance, where the Federal Government makes available less than $25 million for maternal and child welfare services, the States just do not spend a little less than $25 million, but they are spending $70 million in the last year that I have a record of—$70 million compared to less than $25 million.

The question here is one always, I think, whether or not we go forward with our amounts of money faster than they can be appropriately utilized and faster than there are people available to render these services within the States. We waste money when there are not enough people available within the States to render these services. But, if we have the skilled people available within the States and the States are willing to carry forward with their responsibility of putting up their part, the moneys are not wasted but they are going to be spent appropriately and properly upon the people for whom these programs are intended. I can assure the gentleman and we have, in turn, been assured that there is no lack of available people within the United States qualified to perform these services. The medical profession comes into this in many important ways, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Would the gentleman not say that the medical profession itself had first started this research and investigation along with the local communities before the Federal Government became involved?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes, certainly—long before the Government got into it. That is what I was saying earlier, the Federal Government did not set the trend in this. The States have put up more money all along than the Federal Government has. But our interest, I think, should always be to keep a ceiling on our contribution in such relationship to existing needs within the States as to justify the amount being made available by the Federal Government when the States are qualified and can properly use the money.

Mr. HALL. Does the chairman agree with my hasty calculations, which may not be too dependable, that if we divide $2,200,000 additional funds by 50, it is only $44,000 additional dollars per State not counting the territories?

Mr. MILLS. I have not gone into that detail, but I am sure the gentleman's figures are correct. I think it is about $40,000. The point of the gentleman's figures emphasizes, I believe, the fact that we have not gone excessively high in this field, for certainly these services within the States are susceptible of that degree of enlargement that the gentleman's figures indicate.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman yield for one final question?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman suggested that there are going to be some committee amendments; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, they are printed in the bill, I believe; are they not?

Mr. HALL. Will they involve such questions as, referring to page 6, further definition of "necessary health care"—or "likely to have diseases"—that the mother or child is likely to have?

Mr. MILLS. To what lines is the gentleman referring?

Mr. HALL. Lines 3 and 4.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. HALL. In other words, would they involve more complete definition and scope of maternal and child welfare than this bill involves?

Mr. MILLS. These really are terms that can better be interpreted by people in the medical profession than by me. I had understood that they were terms that can be interpreted. Now there is an amendment to this particular section that the gentleman refers to, but it is to strike out certain language in lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert the new language as printed in the bill in italics on lines 9, 10, 11, and 12 which language came to us from some members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his work on this bill. I think it is a very needed field. But one of the things that I was a little concerned about, which has already been referred to, is this. In our bill that was sent out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we provided for eight research centers for the mentally retarded. I notice in your report, the report calls attention to the fact that under these programs special diagnostic clinics for retarded children have been developed.

Mr. MILLS. They have been developed, but we are not developing them in our bill under any circumstances. My friend from Missouri and I discussed a moment ago what a clinic means in this sense. They have been developed within that meaning. I do not know but that maybe State and local funds have developed actual buildings for carrying out this purpose, but that is not what we are talking about. We are talking about the situation wherein services are rendered by the medical profession to a number of people who have come to a clinic.

Mr. NELSEN. We want to be very sure, I am sure you will agree, that there should not be duplication in the spending of our dollars.

Mr. MILLS. I am just as anxious to avoid that as the gentleman, and I can assure the gentleman that our committee and its chairman have been positively assured, as has been the chairman of your committee, that there is in no way duplication between these two bills, and that it would violate the jurisdiction of the departments of the Government if there were, for the reason that social security in title V is only concerned with the rendering of a service by a State agency whereas the Public Health Service, to which the gentleman's programs are directed, may make grants available to States and localities for any number of purposes, or for the construction of buildings, and things of that sort.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I do not believe there is any duplication.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the widespread interest that exists in this program and the purposes that are sought to be accomplished, I trust that the House will see fit to go along with the Committee on Ways and Means and send this on to the other body. I thank you.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, of course I do not intend to debate this bill very long, because my main point is that we do not have adequate information on which to debate it. There are fine intentions, and I happen to share these fine intentions. I might say that I think my record in my own community as well as in the Congress will bear out my deep concern about these matters and particularly the matters in this bill. I think there is actually something we could and should be doing in this field of mental retardation. The chairman of the committee has correctly pointed out that we do have a little booklet called "Comments by Interested Individuals and Organizations" on this legislation, which came in as a result of the Ways and Means Committee asking people to supply information. However, as we all know here, these are the statements of people who are, of course, concerned with this legislation for some particular reason. Our job here is to look over these lobby groups' ideas, and I mean lobby in the fine sense of the word, because these are essentially fine organizations, but the congressional committee is set up for the purpose of going behind their fine intentions and being certain that they have thought through these programs carefully, and this your committee has not done. In fact, as I pointed out, about the only work we can point to on the committee that has been done has been done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who largely wrote the report that the committee submitted to you, and I suggest they probably went around collecting these various statements. However, just read or flip through these statements that appear in here, and you will find out what they are. They are in favor of the general objectives of the bill, which I am, too. Hardly any of them show a knowledge of what is in the bill, let alone supply the committee with information about the bill. I want to refer to two specific letters that are a little more than just that. On page 13 of this document we will find a statement in respect to these replies received by the House Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 3386. One person is listed under the heading "against" and then one under the heading "partial approval" and then the balance under "approval." Incidentally, in these listed under "approval," when you read some of the statements, they turn out to be approvals but they are really partial approvals.

On page 29 we see under "approval" the statement of the American Medical Association. But the AMA concludes its remarks by saying:

> For the reason referred to and with the reservations noted the American Medical Association supports H.R. 3386.

And the reservations noted are in some detail so this is really partial approval. I want to call attention to the letter following right after that of the AMA, from the American Psychiatric Association. They say that:

> The aims—

"The aims" notice. There is no quarrel about these aims. We are all for these aims.

> The aims of H.R. 3386 are consistent with these views.

That is, their views over a period of years.

> Prenatal care, maternal and infant care are important aspects of prevention of disability.
>
> The American Psychiatric Association supports the intent of the amendments to the Social Security Act to provide increased funds for maternal and child health services to specifically develop programs in the field of mental retardation.

Here is what I want to call attention to.

> While none of the funds are specifically earmarked for retardation, it is the hope that the Government will so channel the funds that they will, in fact, benefit the retarded and will also prove beneficial in the general mental health field.

I would like to have interrogated the witness on that by saying, "What do you mean, you hope? Where is it you feel we have not tied it down?"

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote further:

> We are somewhat distressed with the fragmentation of concern into various governmental units. It would be our hope that planning in the field of mental retardation might be under medical auspices at all times and might be combined with planning in the general mental health field.

We have already seen examples and we know these examples of proliferation alluded to in these suggestions. The problems of children are proliferated among the various governmental agencies. These are examples of the areas that I should have liked to see our committee go further in depth in studying this.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from my separate views:

VIII. SEPARATE VIEWS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

> The objective of H.R. 7544 is to establish or augment programs concerned with mental retardation and crippled children. I support any effectively developed program that would prevent the occurrence of or alleviate the hardship of problems arising from these maladies. It is my view that inadequate study has been made of this legislation so that it is not known that the provisions of this bill will be effective in achieving the stated objective.
>
> This bill calls for the authorization of the extension and increase of two existing programs over a 7-year period costing $570 million or $285 million each, an increase of $220 million. The 1962 per annum level of $50 million ($25 million per annum for each) is increased to $100 million. These two programs increase about 50 percent over the 7 years, 1954–61. The proposals in this bill would call for an increase of 150 percent in the 7 years to 1968 with continued increases of around 25 percent for the years 1969 and 1970.
>
> This committee made no study itself nor reviewed any study, if one exists, of whether these programs could be intelligently and usefully expanded at such a rapid rate.
>
> The majority views in the committee report state: "Continuing increases in the child population and in the cost of medical care, together with wide variations among States in maternal and infant mortality, indicate the need for increased Federal support of these programs."
>
> The committee heard no evidence and had no discussion whatsoever on these points and, therefore, is not in position to advise the House whether the premise is true or false and whether the Federal Government must assume whatever increased burden there may be. The point was not even broached in the committee executive sessions.
>
> The committee report states: "Continuing growth of the child population increases in the cost of hospital care and advances in medical technology which are of benefit to handicapped children are indicative of the need for increased Federal support of these programs."
>
> The committee heard no evidence and had no discussion whatsoever on these points and accordingly is not in a position to advise the House of their accuracy or inaccuracy. There was no discussion of whether the Federal Government vis-a-vis other governmental authorities was required to increase support.
>
> The bill also calls for two new 5-year programs authorizing the expenditure of $110 million and $40 million for additional research specifically directed to the prevention and combating of mental retardation. The justification for these new programs was discussed by the committee and testimony was adduced to establish and support their justification. It is this program which, if successful, will cut down the incidence of mental retardation prenatally and among infants. This success will more than pay for itself in the lowering of the governmental costs connected with the care of retarded children. These programs I can favor and recommend to the House.
>
> Therefore if the new 5-year programs are successful the needs in the crippled children and child health program will be diminished not increased. The new 5-year programs provide the increase necessary in the maternal health service to strike at the high incidence of the number of births of retarded children. However, the bill also provides for a redundant increase to the extent that the increase is directed toward the mental retardation problem.
>
> Regretfully it is the lack of adequate study and consideration by congressional committees of proposals for new programs and expanding old ones which appeal in their labels to our humanitarian instincts that cause real damage to be done in solving the very problems they proclaim by their labels they seek to solve. At the same time these unstudied programs have created the burgeoning bureaucracies and deadening deficits in the Federal budget which are eroding the economic strength of our Nation.
>
> The limitations of programs that involve research and expansion in the health and scientific fields is today not limited by dollars but rather by lack of skilled manpower. The grants of Federal funds have been so unstudied and so wastefully excessive that the efficient allocation of scientific and technological manpower has been disrupted. This is resulting in serious damage even in the areas of overallocation where the program is designed to move forward. It has been estimated that seven-eighths of the Nation's scientific and technical personnel is now under the direction of Federal programs. For example, the National Institutes of Health have found it impossible to spend the moneys that the Congress has voted them. Obviously in trying to spend the amounts of

> money they have, they have moved forward with programs that have not been well conceived, efficiently designed, and effectively operated.
>
> I think it is important to call the Congress' attention to the fact that the Ways and Means Committee, although enjoying a fine professional staff, knowledgeable in the Internal Revenue Code, has not one single person on the staff who is an expert in the field of the welfare matters covered in the Social Security Act. It is imperative that we staff our committees professionally if we are to make intelligent recommendations to the House in regard to legislation.
>
> For these reasons, I think this bill should be recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee and immediate professional study be devoted to the subject matter of this bill.

That is all I have been directing attention to. Here the Congress has before it something that is an authorization going on beyond 7 years and I think maybe if we had taken the time to go into this we would be in the position of saying to the House, Yes, we have looked into this and we think this is tied down. We have helped the program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, by the way, for what he said he did do. I know, because I was part of this business of checking with our knowledgeable people on the Appropriations Committee. We have gained some beneficial suggestions as the result of that. But the kind of information I point out is lacking is the information that I think our committees increasingly must be able to provide the House if it is going to act with intelligence on these matters of major legislation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I rose earlier to ask my friend from Missouri to yield because I wanted to thank him for being so helpful to us in the development of this legislation in the committee. I do not know of anybody during the consideration of the bill in the committee who manifested more interest and more concern about this problem of doing something about mental retardation than my friend from Missouri. I do thank him for that.

Mr. CURTIS. I know the gentleman is not just being kind.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman, I am sure, does not resent my thanking him for helping us.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not. I appreciate his kind remarks. I think I should add one other thing, that when we were considering this bill we were directing attention primarily to one program, which is the new program on mental retardation. I was all ready—and this is in my minority views—to support that new program, because I thought, although we could have had more information, we did get into sufficient depth with that particular program to properly advise the House on it. It was not until the committee report was prepared that I realized that in addition we were extending two other programs with considerable more amounts of money for periods of 7 to 10 years, increasing the rate of expenditure by 150 percent over the period in contrast to an increase of 50 percent in the preceding 7 years.

Then, I will say to my chairman that is when I really got concerned and said, How can I come to my colleagues in the House with this unstudied when I have argued so often that other committees should be doing their homework before they bring bills to the floor? I could not assure my colleagues on these questions of whether these are well tied-down programs. I just could not do that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to cover principally one aspect of this bill. I do not want it swept under the rug. I suspect that many of my colleagues would be concerned about it, as indeed am I.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes of the bill are outlined on page 2 of the report, which concern I share. I of course find reason for differing, and I do, with how much of these legitimate objectives are the authority of the Federal Government. But there men can differ in viewpoint.

But I do, Mr. Chairman, want to call to my colleagues' attention something that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] and I tried our best to state, very briefly. On page 20 of the report—and I cannot say it better, I would like to read that:

> Specifically, we disapprove the stimulus given by Federal policies through HEW, of illegitimate births which in turn result in a higher percentage of births of mentally retarded children. Staff members of HEW admitted that poorer prenatal care for unmarried mothers resulted in more births of mentally retarded children. The Federal Government, through aid to dependent children and welfare programs, is encouraging more illegitimate births.

I know that is not the intent of the bill. Of course, there is no Member of the House who would agree that that is our objective. Yet if I had any doubts about this they were certainly substantiated by a pamphlet which I have recently read, and I would like to hold it up as I am now doing for the record so at least I can point out that I tried to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. This pamphlet is called "Unmarried Parents: A Guide for the Development of Services in Public Welfare."

Mr. Chairman, I think all Members as parents as well as Members representing constituents, other parents, would be interested in this because of the various things that appear here that actually represent something of a departure, I think, from our system of society. See what you think.

As a matter of fact, it points out on page 39 this point which I have made about the actual subsidy of mothers of illegitimate children. Obviously, we want to help people who have a problem, we do not want to hurt them. Unfortunately, therein lies the incentive to ask for more help from Uncle Sam. So, we find on page 39 that a majority of the mothers that were surveyed in at least one survey of 520 living in the New York area, a majority were 25 years of age or older and already had at least one child born out of wedlock.

My point, gentlemen, is that having had one illegitimate child and the mother receiving a subsidy, we help that unwed mother go ahead and have another child illegitimately. Apparently, this is not too widespread. Let us hope so. I am not saying it is. But neither do I think we mean to encourage the birth of more mentally retarded children through illegitimate birth because of poor prenatal care, which is clearly established.

Then let us look at page 7. This is of a delicate nature, but I must point this out because if I did not you might not know about it. This pamphlet points out "a real change in social mores." After outlining how younger people live—increased freedom, lessened supervision, movies, and automobiles—and I quote:

> All these practices would seem to imply an acceptance in our society of freedom in sex relations outside of marriage.

I submit to the members of the committee that this is not so, there has not been a real change in social mores, but this pamphlet is put out as though to stimulate in many ways this problem almost as though it were perfectly all right with reference to additional illegitimate children. I think the encouragement and subsidy of illegitimacy is ill-advised and improper use of the taxpayers' money.

I should like to refer to page 20 of the report. Look at a list of the specific encouragements given in this pamphlet to parents of illegitimate children, the relieving of the father from any criminal law application whatsoever, solicitation to tell people of additional Federal aid, making it easy for them to gloss over the whole thing in order actually to stimulate additional illegitimate children. At my conclusion, I shall insert this list. I hope I have said enough to encourage some Members to look into it so that later on we can go into this matter.

I want to show once more for whatever my colleagues may find of help in this, what I consider to be the breakdown of the liberals' philosophy as shown in this pamphlet.

What is that philosophy? First, that our people have a need or needs. In this case it is need of preventing or helping mentally retarded children, and the need of direct help to mothers who have illegitimate children.

Second, the United States has resources to meet those needs. The third point automatically follows to the liberals therefore, that the Federal Government must use the resources to solve the people's need. It automatically follows that government must do it. I say no at this point.

We have private organizations, we have our churches. This may not be the place to develop that, but I want it to appear in the RECORD that I, at least, mentioned we have our religious convictions and church programs, the private and religious organizations to help in this program.

Now as to the question of cost. We are talking about $265 million more in the way of deficit financing. Again, we are borrowing to spend. Our chairman has said the majority of contribution comes from the States and localities. Yet in the bill we are setting a limit of 75 percent in Sections 4 and 5, that 75 percent of the tab will be picked up by the Federal Government.

I know we intend to stimulate the activity through the local level if we can, once again we burden social security. This will further imbalance the social security program. Let me say again, if you close out the social security program today, taking into account the contract the Federal Government has with those who are presently covered by the program, the program is out of balance approximately $300 billion, and we are going to add to it today. I think that, too, is wrong.

Now I want to include as part of my remarks the separate views from the report:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF HON. BRUCE ALGER AND HON. JAMES UTT

There are inherent dangers and improper practices encouraged by this bill which should not go unnoticed. These include: (1) increased Federal aid and control, (2) failure to face up once again to "who pays" this bill, and further, (3) actuarial imbalance and endangerment of the social security program. Implicit in these criticisms of the bill is our lack of confidence in these: The expenditures of more Federal money as the answer to the problem; the too large percentage of Federal participation, 75 percent in section 4 and 100 percent in section 5; the Federal aid to religious groups, an encroachment we disapprove.

However, despite the importance of the basic disagreements which are matters of continuing concern to us we are most concerned over Federal programs augmenting the problems we would solve. Specifically, we disapprove the stimulus given by Federal policies through HEW, of illegitimate births which in turn result in a higher percentage of births of mentally retarded children. Staff members of HEW admitted that poorer prenatal care for unmarried mothers resulted in more births of mentally retarded children. The Federal Government, through aid to dependent children and welfare programs, is encouraging more illegitimate births.

The subtle change of emphasis underlying this program and this Federal emphasis may be seen in the pamphlet entitled "Unmarried Parents—A Guide for the Development of Services in Public Welfare." Here we see the development of welfare rather than its reduction, and a shift of emphasis toward encouraging illegitimacy. The following policies are recommended in this HEW publication:

1. Set up procedures to find new cases.
2. Make welfare assistance easier.
3. Abolish residency requirement nationwide.
4. Set up social welfare lobbies to get new welfare legislation.
5. Eliminate all roadblocks to certifying new cases.
6. Adulterers are to be known as "new partners."
7. Nowhere is religious theory used or mentioned.
8. The taxpayers' interest in saving money is "moralistic."
9. Forcing adulterers to marry is wrong.
10. Need alone shall be the sole qualification for relief; (need, not poverty). Need means—income minus expense.
11. Every citizen has a right to welfare.
12. Do not require a male adulterer to assist if he does not want to, or if it will disrupt his life.
13. Eliminate illegitimate paternity as a criminal offense.
14. Treat each client carefully in order that he or she will recommend others for welfare.

We do not believe these Federal policies and this shift of emphasis to be right. We do not believe Government should encourage illegitimacy nor subsidize it. Since such Federal encouragement results in a larger percentage of births of mentally retarded children we believe this bill does not go to the heart of the problem, but skirts it. Further, in view of HEW emphasis, the problem is being enlarged. Such statements, as on page 7 of the pamphlet, modern living practices "seem to imply an acceptance in our society of freedom in sex relations outside of marriage" are inaccurate and misleading.

We would stress private and local solutions to the problem of helping mothers and children.

JAMES B. UTT.
BRUCE ALGER.

Finally, for those who would look over the HEW pamphlet, it is Bureau of Public Assistance Report No. 45, Children's Bureau publication No. 390—1961.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should set the RECORD straight on a few points. First, many of us when we talk about social security think in terms of the old age and survivors' insurance program, which is a program funded through a special tax on employees, employers, and the self employed. That is the fund the gentleman from Texas was referring to in his closing remarks.

The program we are now considering has nothing to do with that part of the social security program. This program is paid for out of appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury. What we do here today will not affect the social security trust funds.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I can let no opportunity pass, where social security is mentioned, without putting in my other plug. I thank the gentleman for the correction.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This program may cause an imbalance in the general funds of the Treasury because it is general funds that are used. However, it will not cause an imbalance in the old age and survivors' insurance system.

Second, it must be made clear that this legislation does not in any way approve the philosophies expressed in the pamphlet put out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If it did approve those philosophies, I assure the gentleman I would not be here supporting the legislation. I think the gentleman from Texas is sound in pointing out to the House some of the things that are done down in that department with the use of public funds, but this bill does not approve nor does it advance those philosophies as expressed in the pamphlet.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield, I would simply say at this point that good men can disagree.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. To the extent that this legislation does deal with the problem that arises from illegitimacy, I think we have to recognize it. We know that many of the cases of mental retardation arise from improper prenatal care. As the evidence we had before us has shown, in the area of illegitimacy there is a tendency to avoid the proper prenatal care.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, what we are concerned about here is the child. The yet unborn child may have the potential of being born mentally retarded or becoming mentally retarded. It is not the child's fault that it is born out of wedlock.

I think there are two basic objectives involved in this legislation—objectives which I support. Those objectives are to minimize and to prevent the burden of mental retardation which is placed not only on the individual child and on the family, but also on the States and local communities—and possibly even eventually on the Federal Government. To the extent that we can by research, by knowledge, by experimentation, and by giving proper care, prevent or minimize the impact of retardation, we have not only helped to relieve a most serious distress but, it seems to me, we have made an economic gain in that we have made possible a situation where a person who might otherwise be a burden on society becomes a person who can assume and lead a useful life; and from that we all benefit. That is the basic purpose of the legislation. To the extent it is successful, it should eventually reduce the cost of general governmental care for these people.

I do not think anybody suggests that this bill is going to be a cure-all for mental retardation, that we will not have any, that there will no longer be problems. We will always have it, I suppose, to some degree. But to the extent we can minimize it by this action, in my judgment, we have made a real step forward.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman has made a statement that is worthwhile. I should like to lend what professional background and experience I have had toward this end. There are some great breakthroughs that are being made in the field of prevention of mental retardation. They are primarily in the field of immunology, in the field of comparative anatomy, and in the field of nutrition, dietetics, and so forth.

Along with the statement made by the chairman of the full committee a while ago, as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], the ranking minority member, we are not doing this alone in America, albeit we are choking our people sometimes with research funds because of "earmarking," or specifying to which objectives this research will be directed. It is for this reason that in one of our multilateral programs, namely the World Health Organization, 11 other countries have taken precedence over us in national welfare and stopping mental retardation among the yet to be born. Because much great and effective work has been done in the fields of immunology against diseases during pregnancy while the yet to be born baby is in utero; and in the fields of comparative anatomy, and particularly in the subcontinent of India in the field of nutrition and its effect on mental retardation, we look forward to less deformity of babies and less mental incompetency.

I do want to say as great as this is, and I want to compliment the members of the committee for putting this on the basis of a "designated State agency," and I wish they would specify it in their amendment even more to make it the various State health departments, or the professions who have done so much of this in the past because they, and they alone, know that many of these mentally incompetents—or if you prefer to use the term "retarded"—have not been once or twice or thrice but many times surveyed; and their lack of development of actual brain tissue is well known and well cataloged. We do reach a point sometimes where those who are already born as contra-disposed to those whom we are trying to prophylactically benefit here, as yet unborn, have had enough surveys and enough money and enough research.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much for his splendid contribution to the discussion of this very serious problem.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying I think great progress can be made in this area, and for this reason I support the bill.

I would like to make one further comment and that is with reference to the increase provided in this bill for the programs for maternal and child health services and crippled children services.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that what the committee is attempting to do here is to bring these two programs in line with the child welfare program. You will recall that we changed the authorization levels for the child welfare program legislation passed by the 87th Congress. Why we did not also at that time consider these other two programs is because the bill in its entirety related primarily to the child welfare program. We have in the past considered these three programs pretty much on the same level. What the bill before you does is to bring the two programs that we have not acted on, namely, maternal and child health services and crippled children services up to the level that we had previously established for the child welfare services. I do not think we are establishing any precedent that we would regret. We are really being consistent with what we have already done. We want to continue all three programs as set forth under title V of the Social Security Act.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their own remarks on the pending bill at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is to be commended for his usual clear and concise description of another piece of important legislation presented by him.

H.R. 7544 deserves the overwhelming support of this body, and I am sure that its appeal is so great and its purposes so commendable that its victory is assured.

Expansion of existing programs of health services in maternal and crippled children cases through further authorization of grants for maternity care to prevent mental retardation, establishing by grants such research projects as will advance such programs, and grants of assistance so that States will be encouraged toward planning and other activities that will alert community efforts to combat mental retardation will be accomplished by this bill.

On February 5, 1963, we are reminded that President Kennedy called attention to the fact that "mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social and economic problem."

As he stated, private voluntary associations have valiantly tried to cope with the problem until lately States, such as my State of Illinois, have moved forward in this field through community services, special hospitalization, treatment, education and rehabilitation programs.

We from Illinois take pride in the progress made in the last 3 years by our Governor Kerner whose promises to devote much of his attention to the mental health problems have been made good.

The cost for the 5-year period 1964 through 1968 totaling $265 million is a sound investment in our Nation's health and future.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I know of no legislative proposal with greater appeal to the impulses of good hearts than that encompassed in H.R. 7544. In voting for its passage, I shall have the sense that I am meeting my responsibility as the Representative from the Second District of Illinois as all my constituents would desire.

As President Kennedy said in his message of February 5, 1963, our children are our most precious asset, and mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level but it hits more often—and harder—at the underprivileged and the poor.

When human life and health are the stake, and the conditions that doom so many of our children to hopeless misery are preventable with good medical care, it is the concern of all the American people.

The bill we are now considering, and which I hope will be passed by a near unanimous vote, follows the recommendations of a panel of distinguished experts appointed by President Kennedy. It constitutes an overall program to prevent and combat mental retardation in the United States, to expand existing maternal, child care, and crippled children services and to provide for appropriate research projects.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation of the noblest character. I am happy to give it my full support.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, mental retardation continues as a major problem to this Nation, socially and economically. While only 4 percent of the mentally retarded are confined to institutions, their care costs relatives and communities some $300 million annually. Additional amounts are required for the construction of facilities for custodial and educational purposes. These costs amount to an additional $1 billion per year or more. We know, Mr. Speaker, that about 3 percent of the population of this Nation are persons having significant difficulties in adapting adequately to their environment. Based on this figure of 3 percent, approximately 126,000 children born each year will be classified as mentally retarded. Of this group, 110,000 will suffer mild retardation which can with special training and assistance be reduced, enabling them to acquire limited job skills and achieve a certain independence in the community. The remaining children in the group, classified as mentally retarded, will range from severe retardation to moderate retardation, for which additional services are required.

I recited these facts in a speech before this House on March 19, in which I reviewed the scope of Federal activity in this important work. I recite them again to emphasize the obvious need in this area and to stress the importance of affirmative congressional action on the bill now pending before us.

I look at the enactment of this bill as a first step toward a complete program in this field. I fully realize that Federal arrival in this work cannot replace the efforts of those in the local community which have long occupied the field. Rather, it is a recognition of this effort and a desire to aid in this work that now prompts this Federal effort. This program goes to the cost of planning to determine what action is needed to combat mental retardation and will result in activities leading to comprehensive State aid community action. This is Federal-State cooperation at its best and the effective use of means available to solve a distressing problem.

I particularly note, Mr. Speaker, that this bill increases the $25 million authorized for the crippled children's program to $30 million for 1964 and substantial increases until 1970. Under this bill, the Children's Bureau will concentrate on research directed toward the evaluation of programs and improving the development, management, and effectiveness of the maternal and child health and crippled children's services program. This program of basic research will increase activity in a field where it has proven effective and is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced legislation dealing with this subject and I have used as a basis the clear way of progress already made in an area once considered hopeless. I am indebted to groups such as the Guild for Exceptional Children and others in my own district, especially in the Bay Ridge area, who have led the way in this field. Their suggestions have been invaluable to me. Their experience in this field makes them the persons to whom we must look for aid in legislating and their tireless work inspires all who are concerned with an effective solution.

Mr. Chairman, I know every Member of this distinguished body is concerned with the problem of mental retardation and is desirous of doing everything possible to solve what the President has correctly called "a national problem." Each Member knows that any delay on our part will result in increased suffering among what I have often called "our greatest asset"—the Nation's young and their dedicated and loving parents.

I call for the passage of this bill to plan further study of this problem, discover its scope and move toward its solution.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, mental illness and retardation, once spoken about in whispers only, has become a subject of public discussion and, more important, of public action. In legislation on mental health can be read the story of our growing comprehension of what makes possible a "sound mind in a healthy body."

Mr. Chairman, I talk from long experience in this field. As a Senator in the New York State Legislature, I sponsored considerable legislation to reorganize and modernize the State's mental health program. One of my proposals established the New York State Mental Health Commission to stimulate vast programs of research and to encourage and assist local efforts to combat mental illness. Another authorized a bond issue of $3,500,000 to expand the State's mental health program.

As a Member of Congress, I consistently have sponsored efforts to expand and render more effective State and National mental health programs. I am privileged to have cosponsored the legislation before us, aimed at preventing one of the causes of mental retardation—inadequate prenatal care. Our passage of this bill will demonstrate once again that Congress is alert and responsive to advances in scientific knowledge about the causes of mental illness. But, we cannot forget that this measure attacks a narrow aspect of the mental health problem. For this reason, I have sponsored and strongly urge passage of two other bills, far broader in their scope—H.R. 3947, to assist States in combating mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded, and H.R. 3948, to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community health centers.

Looking back, over the legislative record on mental health, I am impressed by the immense change in attitude toward the Government's responsibility for enabling the mentally ill and retarded to perform useful social tasks and to realize themselves fully as individuals. No more do lunatics and imbeciles comprise the major focus of our mental health laws. No more do we offer all mentally ill and retarded persons one road only—incarceration which makes them complete social outcasts. With our recognition of varying degrees of mental illness and retardation, we encourage part time and flexible treatment that does not prevent the afflicted person from performing a role that simultaneously allows him to contribute to the social welfare and to build up his self esteem. Even when we commit an individual to a mental hospital, we look forward to releasing him some day.

Now, we have reached a point where we can enact prevention as well as remedial mental health legislation. The bill under consideration today reflects this progress.

Mental health experts have found that children born of mothers who receive inadequate prenatal care are likely to develop some form of mental illness. As might be expected, there exists a close correlation between inadequate prenatal care and the mother's lack of funds to buy necessary medical aid. President Kennedy's report to Congress of February 5 revealed widespread extent of medical indigence among pregnant women. I quote:

> An estimated 35 percent of the mothers in cities over 100,000 population are medically indigent. In 138 large cities of the country an estimated 455,000 women each year lack resources to pay for adequate health care during pregnancy and following care in hospitals. Between 20 and 60 percent of the mothers receiving care in public hospitals in some large cities receive inadequate or no prenatal care—and mental retardation is more prevalent in these areas.

H.R. 7544 is one response to this situation and I am proud to associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] in cosponsoring my bill being H.R. 8240. Its main effect is to make grants available to States and communities for developing prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation. It also authorizes grants to aid the States in establishing comprehensive programs that deal with other aspects of the mental health problem.

But, why should the Federal Government get involved at all? Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but admiration for the efforts of local and State governments to promote mental health, but statistics like these on medical indigence among pregnant women reveal that State and local efforts have fallen short of achieving the noble aims inspiring them.

Federal Government must pick up its share of the burden. This does not require Federal authorities to carry the whole load. To the contrary, Federal participation should stimulate local and State projects that otherwise would remain on the drawing board for lack of adequate financial resources.

H.R. 8240 is consistent with State and local initiative in the mental health field. Under its terms, a State or local community must finance at least 25 percent of a project and take the initiative by drawing up the program to suit the particular needs of the area for which it is intended.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this House votes overwhelmingly for H.R. 8240.

Today we smile at the superstitions and narrow-mindedness of our parents and grandparents who thought mental illness and retardation beyond human help. Future generations will laugh at, or rather pity us, if Federal, State, and local governments fail to pool their resources to maximize mental health in accordance with the latest scientific discoveries.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, in support of this legislation. I filed a companion bill to H.R. 7544 which is exactly the same in content as the legislation now before us. This legislation is for the purpose of preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation.

President John F. Kennedy recorded the need for such a program and in 1962 a panel of distinguished experts made extensive studies of these problems. The passage of this bill will carry out in part a number of the recommendations urgently needed which were discovered by the President's panel.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, mental retardation in children is one of the growing, frightening and terrible characteristics of our American society.

Associated as it frequently is with hereditary and crippling diseases over which modern research and medical science have developed all too little preventive or curative solutions, the need for a vigorous, comprehensive attack on these problems is immediate and mandatory.

It is high time that the Congress should move to promote coordinated local, State, and National efforts to seek effective prevention, alleviation and cure, wherever these are possible, by the application of research and development, care and treatment, and full marshaling of our resources against these afflictions which plague the human race, generation after generation, and cause untold loss, misery, and suffering to multitudes of unfortunate human beings.

This bill is not a waste of public funds. To the contrary, it will authorize moderate sums by the Federal Government in support of efforts of the several States to fight mental retardation, study its causes, help its victims, their mothers, and their families, and ultimately, we hope, to rid our Nation and the world of terrible afflictions which impose such heavy burdens upon our fellow human beings and threaten the present and future strength and vitality of the human race itself.

I vigorously support this bill and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7544 and I commend the great Ways and Means Committee for bringing before us a measure that so well follows the recommendations of President Kennedy in his message of February 5, 1963, on the subject of mental illness and mental retardation.

The President stated that mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem, and that the care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and care, have been too long neglected.

I am happy that the Ways and Means Committee has responded to the urging of the President for quick action in this vitally important area, and I seek for this bill the support of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, it cannot be a source of pride to our Nation that more than 5 million children and adults are the victims of mental retardation. This statistic is all the more tragic because it could be prevented. Our knowledge of the causes of mental retardation is imperfect, but medical science has already told us that many, many instances of retardation could be prevented by adequate medical care for the expectant mother and the newborn infant.

The bill that is before us to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation is a long overdue extension of our present programs of maternal and child health services and crippled children's services and would provide public health agencies with funds for the care of expectant mothers with conditions which increase the hazards of retardation. The research and planning projects contemplated by the bill will increase our knowledge of the causes and cures for mental retardation and go far toward reducing the tragic cost in human talent and human happiness which the present rate of mental retardation represents. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7544.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before the House this afternoon. No bill before the present session of Congress appeals more to our humanitarian sympathies or to our approval of intelligent social action than this measure designed to improve the mental health of Americans. Across our Nation millions of our citizens are afflicted with mental illness or mental retardation. These afflictions, by their very nature, are more difficult to diagnose, expensive to treat, and cause more suffering in the families concerned than any other category of illness. Some 17 million Americans suffer from some degree of mental illness.

The bill before us calls for a new approach to our national responsibility in the field of mental health. It seeks to stimulate State, local, and private action to use the breakthroughs already achieved in the diagnosis and treatment of mental disabilities. It calls for Federal grants for the construction of community health centers for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of the mentally ill and for research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded.

Perhaps the most important part of this measure, Mr. Chairman, is title II which would provide grants, after the Hill-Burton pattern, for the construction of community mental health centers. This title would authorize the appropriation of $115 million during the 2-year period beginning July 1, 1965, to be allocated among the States for constructing public and other nonprofit community mental health centers. I say that this is the most important provision of the bill because problems of mentally disturbed people are community problems—regardless of which unit of government or administrative official has immediate responsibility.

As matters stand, State mental hospitals continue to be hard pressed to cope with increasing admissions—up a whopping 27 percent between 1955 and 1960. However, there is some good news: since 1956 there has been a small but steady decline in the patient population of mental hospitals. A drop of 1 percent is not startling, Mr. Chairman, but it shows progress can be made.

A patient admitted to a mental hospital today can expect to leave eventually, thanks to new drugs and more effective psychiatric methods. The days are coming to an end when patients must spend a lifetime confined in a hospital, hidden from public view and conscience.

But mental health authorities agree that the outlook of shorter hospital stays, more discharges faces a major obstacle—the extreme difficulty a released patient faces in trying to find his way back into a normal life. Experts charge that too many are dumped into the nothingness of a community that makes no effort to help them. Dr. Robert Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, says the readmission rate is a serious problem.

> It has become evident—

He says—

> that adequate community facilities are necessary if patients are to return home and remain home.

Last year Dr. Felix summed up the community's role:

> An individual becomes mentally ill when he can no longer adapt to the community and to those around him. Wherever or whatever his treatment may be, he still has to readapt to the community or his recovery will never be complete. The community can and must be a healing agent, just as it is sometimes a disruptive agent. It has the ultimate responsibility to take care of its own.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report points to the magnitude of the problem of mental illness. That mental illness is our Nation's most serious health problem can be seen by the fact that the direct cost of caring for the mentally ill, mostly in State mental institutions, is about $2 billion annually, that half of our hospital beds are occupied by mental patients and that at various times in their lives about 1 in 10 persons is so severely mentally ill as to need—but not often obtain—professional help.

There is a growing public concern for action against this most serious national health problem. The concern of the public stems from the lack of adequate facilities and the absence of coordinated programs of services for the mentally retarded. These deficiencies maximize the impact of mental retardation on the individual, his family and our country. If day care facilities and related community services were available it would be possible to eliminate the need for placing many of the mentally retarded in residential institutions.

Mr. Chairman, this is another landmark measure and its most ambitious effort is the community mental health center. By helping establish mental health centers right in the communities of our land, this legislation will mark the new era in the treatment of this disease. These community mental health centers would offer to the mentally ill or to those in danger of becoming mentally ill a wide range of services, including inpatient and outpatient care, followup care, and rehabilitative services. They would provide consultative services to schools, courts, public, and private welfare agencies and to individuals concerned with the problems of mental health. According to Dr. Felix, these centers "represent a dream, which if translated into reality on a large scale across the United States, will so radically change the picture of patient care and treatment that the patterns we know today can be traced only in our children's history books."

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues will join me in accepting this clear responsibility for Federal support of a new mental health program and I respectfully urge prompt passage of this measure.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, even a most cursory examination of the objectives of this bill before us, H.R. 7544, would be sufficient, in my humble opinion, to inspire unanimous approval by the membership of this body.

In simple summary these objectives are:

First. To expand the existing programs of maternal and child health services and crippled children's services.

Second. To authorize grants for maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation.

Third. To authorize grants or contracts for research projects related to the maternal and child health, or crippled children's services programs that show promise of advancing these programs.

Fourth. To authorize one-time grants to States to encourage planning and other activities that promote State and community efforts to combat mental retardation.

Fundamentally this bill would authorize a new title XVII of the Social Security

Act, "grants for planning comprehensive action to combat mental retardation."

Mental retardation has been a major national problem for many years. There are approximately 5.4 million mentally retarded persons in our population. About 126,000 mentally retarded children are born each year. The costs of mental retardation are high in terms of dollars and incalculable in human suffering. Surely any reasonable expenditure to bring about significant reductions in these tremendous burdens to families in particular, and our society in general, are wholly and amply justified not only from an economic standpoint but even more in observation of the basic principle of civilized concern for fellow human beings and more especially our children.

In the midst of today's difficult and challenging legislative problems that try the minds and souls of our people and our legislators here is a refreshing and wholesome cause that surely unites the conscience, the sympathy and the action of us all.

In approving this measure of assistance to the less fortunate of our children today, and to help to reduce such affliction in the children of tomorrow, let us hope that our unanimous action may light the way for greater understanding and indulgent cooperation toward early patriotic resolution of legislative challenges that still confront us.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my support to the bill, H.R. 7544, now before the House for consideration. Its objectives of preventing and combating mental retardation have my complete approval.

The statistics concerning mental retardation are grim indeed. They offer convincing evidence of its major proportions as a national health, social, and economic problem. Most distressing of all is that mental retardation strikes children, our precious asset.

In the United States today, an estimated 3 percent of the population—between 5 and 6 million children and adults—are the victims of mental retardation. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision, and more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions.

Another indication of the serious size of mental retardation incidence is a comparison with other debilitating afflictions. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as polio.

With the proper reaction, we can be encouraged by the fact that a significant proportion of mental retardation results from conditions which are preventable with good medical care. Accordingly, a major key to the prevention of mental retardation is the expansion of care for expectant mothers and their infants. While mental retardation strikes without regard for class, creed, or economic level, it hits more often and harder at the underprivileged and the poor. Adequate prenatal care for those who would not otherwise receive it because of low income thus becomes that much more important.

My support of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is not alone based on the benefits which it would produce in a program to prevent and combat mental retardation. I also urge its passage for the expansion it provides in maternal and child health services that will benefit children with all types of handicapping conditions that are susceptible to medical treatment.

I also wish to express my belief that the bill embodies a sound approach to the role the Federal Government can and should play in supporting State and local programs designed to meet these national health problems. The grants which this legislation would authorize for work in the fields of maternal and child health, crippled children, and mental retardation are limited as to how much of the total cost of a given project they can constitute. This fact added to past experience of the salutary effect Federal funds have on exciting State and local expenditures is cause for optimism.

In fiscal year 1962, Federal funds for two of the programs affected by this legislation, maternal and child health services and crippled children's services, amounted to $49 million. The combined State and local funding for the same programs was $124 million. This same favorable ratio has obtained since the inception of these programs.

The direct attack on mental retardation provided by this bill is worthy of note. There is to be authorized a 5-year program of grants to assure necessary health care to prospective mothers for whom childbirth is a hazard and for various reasons would not receive this help otherwise. Additionally, the bill provides for a one-time grant of $2.2 million to assist States in developing plans for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation. This planning would be significant in stepping up public awareness of this unmet health need and coordinating the activities of the various agencies equipped to meet it.

Mr. Chairman, unlike many other causes of human suffering which continue to pose such a riddle to the most eminent medical minds of the world, there is available—we have at hand—medical knowledge that can prevent or lessen a significant proportion of the cases of mental retardation that occur. That preventive service must be intensified and offered on the widest possible basis.

I shall vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do likewise.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7544. This measure has the unqualified support of the State of California. Together with other legislation soon to come to the House floor, its passage would increase our opportunities for significant progress in fields of health and mental retardation. California has already moved to increase such community programs. The pending bill will support and expand our progress in this field.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, it gives me deep satisfaction to speak to you today in support of H.R. 7544, a bill whose passage will mark the culmination of many of our efforts in behalf of the mentally retarded. While it is true that this bill embodies only a part of the total legislation currently being considered by Congress—and supported by me—to advance the mental health of this country, its provisions are of special significance.

Mr. Chairman, I have in fact considered these provisions of such critical importance that I myself earlier in this session introduced an identical bill to this one before you now, which was introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

My colleagues here in this House well know my measure of concern for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded, and my consistent support of legislation to advance the attack on these afflictions.

I look back only 8 years to the bleak days when the problem of the mentally retarded was first brought forcibly to my attention—a time when there were no Federal funds allocated for programs to conquer mental retardation. I am proud to have had the opportunity as a Member of this House—and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare—to support steadily increased appropriations since that time.

Progress, as the result of these actions, has been gratifying but the program in being is too modest in scope and too small in size when viewed in relation to the magnitude of the medical problem.

The time has now come when this House has an opportunity such as it has not had before: to take steps toward a program of sufficiently large dimensions, and of a very practical nature, that it promises a breakthrough in the critical health fields of mental retardation.

As you well know, I have given strong support, and will continue to do so, to legislation designed to strike at the root of mental disability. I shall reserve further comments about related problems in mental health for another occasion calling your attention here to the provisions in H.R. 7544 which specifically relate to the problems of the mentally retarded.

The foundation of the legislation before us today was carefully laid in the deliberations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation which studied and surveyed all aspects of this health problem and made recommendations on needs.

My longstanding conviction of the importance of preventive action was substantiated by the committee—and culminated eventually in this, and my identical—bill.

For this bill, H.R. 7544, known as the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments Act of 1963, is primarily designed to alleviate causes of mental retardation.

Those of us who have faced this dreadful scourge and know the emotional and economic toll it takes of families and communities, know how important prevention before the fact can be.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this occasion to refocus the attention of this House upon the dimensions of the problem of mental retardation as reported by the President in his special message to Congress earlier this year. It is a major national health, social, and economic problem. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care and supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in custodial institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults—an estimated 3 percent of the population.

Time and time again our dedicated scientists and professional workers have found these relationships functioning in our society: where people are impoverished, there is poor health; where there is poor health, mental illness and mental retardation are prevalent. Where families are weak, community ties tenuous, educational and employment opportunities lacking, there you will find the mentally retarded clustered. Among expectant mothers who do not receive adequate prenatal care—a disproportionate number of whom reside in city tenements and rural slums—premature births occur two to three times as frequently as they do among women who receive adequate prenatal care; further, among premature infants, the incidence of birth defects and mental retardation is high. In city tenements and rural slums, the intellectual blight that characterizes these neighborhoods is associated with the higher incidence of mental retardation found among school children coming from these neighborhoods.

A major provision of the bill is a program of grants for planning comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation. The need for thoughtful, coordinated planning of programs of a magnitude needed to truly deal with this problem is self-evident. This legislation will make it possible for States to develop public awareness of the problem and of the need for combating it, and to plan and coordinate State and local activities relating to prevention, treatment, or amelioration.

I regard this provision as essential to the success of our program.

Second, the bill proposes an increase in the grants to State health agencies, long authorized under the Social Security Act, for promoting the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from severe economic stress.

Third, the bill increases the amounts authorized for annual appropriations to State crippled children's agencies for services in locating crippled children and for providing medical, surgical, corrective and other services and care, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and aftercare for children who are crippled or suffering conditions leading to crippling.

Further, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a new 5-year program of grants to provide necessary health care to prospective mothers living under conditions which increase the hazards to the health of mothers of their babies, including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants.

It has become increasingly clear that the prevalence of mental retardation is higher in those population groups where maternity care is not adequate. There are increasing numbers of women, especially in low-income families in our larger cities, who are receiving inadequate care during pregnancy. The rate of premature births is higher among these groups, and the rate of mental retardation substantially higher among premature infants than among those who are full term. Complications of pregnancy are more frequent among women with low income than in the rest of the population. For these, it is critically important that good maternity care be provided during the prenatal period, labor, and delivery.

Under the provisions of the bill, State health agencies would be enabled to provide comprehensive maternity care to selected high-risk patients and to greatly improve the quality of care for these mothers and babies in hospitals equipped and staffed to provide proper services.

In view of the statistical evidence available indicating the high incidence of mental retardation among premature infants, I am convinced that this program will strike at an important root of mental retardation.

A fifth provision of H.R. 7544 which merits emphasis deals with research projects relating to maternal and child health services and crippled childrens' services. It extends authority to the Childrens Bureau to make grants and to jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, and organizations engaged in research for the development of research related to mental retardation. The major force of this provision is to determine how with effectiveness and economy, present medical knowledge can be brought to bear directly on the problem where it exists to the greatest extent.

Mr. Chairman, as the President has stated:

> If this Nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower, we must as a nation seek to bestow the full benefits of our society upon those who suffer from mental retardation.

For far too long too many have felt that mental retardation was a hopeless, incurable affliction. As a result of the persistence of this belief, this Nation has never launched a full scale attack on the problems of mental retardation.

The time has come when we not only are in a position to do so, the time has come when we must do so.

If we are to decrease the incidence of mental retardation, we must act now to strike at its roots through making available adequate services for those who otherwise would not have them.

If we are to bestow the benefits of our society on those already retarded, they must receive special services in the community that will foster the development of each individual's maximum capacity.

If, as is apparent, providing adequate medical care to expectant mothers and their infants prevents mental retardation, then adequate medical care must be made available to each mother and to each child.

If the mentally retarded need special educational opportunities, then we must make special efforts to provide them.

If as we know, many of the mentally ill will require long services and a sheltering environment for an indefinite period, we must see that these are available.

If, as we know, research holds the answer to many of the enigmas of mental retardation, we must push forward also on this front.

Mr. Chairman, time does not stand still for the mentally retarded while those who control his destiny quibble about what proportion of his total needs they are going to provide. The passage of time will only make more desperate the needs of the retarded that are not being met today. For it is now that the infant's mother needs care. It is now that premature births must be prevented. It is now that crippled children should be assisted so that they can look forward to developing to the full extent of their capacities. It is now that research grants relating to maternal and child welfare must be initiated.

For a long time I have known that the needs of the mentally retarded were great and complex. All of them will not be met by this bill. I shall wholeheartedly support such other bills as are currently under consideration that will provide ways of meeting other needs in this field, needs which I have consistently brought to the attention of this House. But this is a good bill and I wholeheartedly urge your approval of it. It is a major step forward.

What I have said up until this time relates to the general importance of problems of mental retardation to our citizens and the need to aid in their solution by programs sponsored by the Federal Government, particular attention being given to the prevention of this dire condition. My comments would be incomplete were I not also to say something about the organization which is charged with the responsibility of the conduct of this program. For decades the Childrens Bureau, through its programs of maternal and child health have done much to minimize maternal illness and infant mortality and have performed these services with funds that were generally inadequate. The statistics on maternal and child health reflect the effectiveness of this program. Against such a rich background of experience and accomplishment, I have little doubt but that the development of programs under this new legislation will do for mental retardation in a truly productive manner what the other programs have so effectively done in maternal and child health.

Finally, I would emphasize that in the development of their programs, we will expect the Childrens Bureau to undertake bold planning with the view that financing of the activity by the Congress will have its primary justification in the net benefit to be obtained rather than from a narrow and shortsighted sense of false economy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to rise in support of this very important legislation to help our Nation strengthen our efforts to deal with mental health problems.

I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and his entire committee for bringing this very important legislation before us today.

We, in Illinois, are particularly concerned with this problem because, under the leadership of our very distinguished Governor, Otto Kerner, we have engaged in a tremendously inspiring program to upgrade the entire State effort in dealing with the problem of mental health.

Every statistic available on this subject shows that much can be done to reduce the ravages of mental illness.

Governor Kerner has faced this statewide challenge with a boldness and determination seldom manifested by a State executive. The Governor has quite properly pointed out that the establishment of facilities to deal with the problem of mental health is not only the very essence of a humane society mindful of its obligations to its less fortunate neighbors, but is also just plain, good, sound administration.

Millions of dollars can be saved the taxpayers with an adequate mental health program which has as its aim preventive medicine rather than obsolete custodial care.

This has been Governor Kerner's greatest emphasis and I am happy to say that the people of Illinois are supporting Governor Kerner in his effort. He has brought to Illinois a boldness in purpose unequaled in the State's history to deal with this serious problem.

The legislation before us will help Illinois and the other States improve their activity in this field.

This legislation is worthy of support because it demonstrates how the Federal Government, working with the State governments, can get to the root of one of our Nation's most serious domestic problems. I consider it a privilege to be able to support this legislation today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7544, the bill to combat human misery.

As it was pointed out to the Congress by the President in his message of February 5, the care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure have been too long neglected.

In the United States, 5.4 million persons—an estimated 3 percent of our population—are handicapped by mental retardation. If the present trend continues, this means that 3 out of every 100 Americans born from here on in will be mentally retarded. What a dreadful thought this is, especially in view of the known fact that mental retardation strikes without regard for race, creed, or economic level. Any one of our very own children or grandchildren may be numbered among that 3 percent. And if we happened to be poor and underprivileged, or uneducated, the frequency and severity of the cases can be expected to be greater.

Fortunately, studies have shown that a significant proportion of mental retardation results from conditions which are preventable with good medical care. It is this major key of prevention of mental retardation that H.R. 7544 seeks to provide, among other things, by an expansion of our existing programs for the care of expectant mothers and their infants, who would not otherwise receive it, for lack of means or other reasons.

The costs of mental retardation are high both in terms of dollars and human suffering. It is estimated that more than $1 billion are spent annually for institutional care, facilities construction, and special family care. Of even higher and immeasurable cost is the human misery that visits upon the family whose member happens to be born mentally retarded.

Significant reductions in these burdens among members of our own citizenry certainly justify increased expenditures designed not only to reduce but also to prevent mental retardation as a social and economic problem.

I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 7544.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments affecting title V of the Social Security Act and to the text of the proposed new title XVII contained in the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it be open to amendment pursuant to the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963."

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State $70,000 and such part of the remainder of such one-half as he finds that the number of live births in such State bore to the total number of live births in the United States in the latest calendar year for which he has statistics."

(c)(1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to section 501."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years".

(b) So much of subsection (a) of section 512 of such Act as ends with "$12,500,000 to the States" is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated pursuant to section 511 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State $70,000 and shall allot the remainder of such one-half to the States".

(c)(1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 512 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made pursuant to subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 511."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half" respectively.

PROJECT GRANTS

SEC. 4. Part 4 of title V of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART 4—GRANTS FOR SPECIAL MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECTS AND RESEARCH PROJECTS

"Special project grants for maternity and infant care

"SEC. 531. (a) In order to help reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $30,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years, for grants to assist in meeting the cost of projects as provided in this section.

"(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the State health agency of any State and, with the consent of such agency in the case of a project in which such agency is unable or unwilling to participate, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State, to pay not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of any project for the provision of all necessary health care to prospective mothers (including, after childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants) who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants (including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants) and who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from low income families or for other reasons.

"(c) Payment of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"Research projects relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services

"SEC. 532. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such sums, not exceeding $8,000,000 for any fiscal year, as the Congress may determine to enable the Secretary to make grants to or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, and public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations engaged in research or in maternal and child health or crippled children's programs, and contracts with public or private agencies and organizations, and with individuals, engaged in research or in such programs, for research projects relating to maternal and child health services or crippled children's services which show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement thereof.

"(b) Payments of grants or under contracts or cooperative arrangements under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursements, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

Mental retardation planning

SEC. 5. The Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVII—GRANTS FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE ACTION TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 1701. For the purpose of assisting the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) to plan for and take other steps leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,200,000.

"Grants to States

"SEC. 1702. The sums appropriated pursuant to section 1701 shall be available for grants to States by the Secretary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year. Any such grant to a State, which shall not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the planning and related activities involved, may be used by it to determine what action is needed to combat mental retardation in the State and the resources available for this purpose, to develop public awareness of the mental retardation problem and of the need for combating it, to coordinate State and local activities relating to the various aspects of mental retardation and its prevention, treatment, or amelioration, and to plan other activities leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

"Applications

"SEC. 1703. In order to be eligible for a grant under section 1702, a State must submit an application therefor which—

"(1) designates or establishes a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(2) indicates the manner in which provision will be made to assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, including services in the fields of education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, health, and the law, and services provided through community programs for and institutions for the mentally retarded;

"(3) sets forth its plans for expenditure of such grant, which plans provide reasonable assurance of carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(4) provides for submission of a final report of the activities of the State agency in carrying out the purposes of this title, and for submission of such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the State under this title.

"Payments

"SEC. 1704. Payment of grants under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

Meaning of "Secretary"

SEC. 6. As used in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment. Page 5, line 19, after "cost" insert "(exclusive of general agency overhead)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 1, strike out "all".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 6 through 8, strike out "and who" and all that follows down through the period and insert the following: "and whom the State or local health agency determines will not receive necessary health care because they are from low-income families or for other reasons beyond their control."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 25, insert "nonprofit" before "private agencies".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 25, through page 7, line 1, strike out ", and with individuals,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 1, insert a quotation mark before "GRANTS".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 502, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill just passed may, if they desire to do so, include extraneous material and tables in connection with their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MARKETING AREA, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 501 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]; and, pending that, myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, on the so-called Northwest preference bill. I know of no particular controversy on the rule although there is discussion and controversy on the bill itself; and therefore I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] my colleague on the Committee on Rules, has explained this rule very well. It provides for the consideration of the bill, S. 1007, with 2 hours of general debate. It is an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us would establish the rules under which surplus power could be sold outside the Pacific Northwest by Bonneville Power Administration. The sale of such power would meet two growing needs. The first of which is a financial need.

By this I mean that some $20 million worth of surplus power could be sold by Bonneville. This power is not being sold today. It is power which, if sold, could alleviate the problem Bonneville faces in respect to its deficits. The system has been operating at a deficit for several years, although Bonneville's repayments are ahead of schedule. But, Bonneville at some future date could fall behind on its repayment schedule if it does not find ways to prevent its deficits. Of course, this could be done by raising customer rates. I believe, however, the sale of surplus power under terms of S. 1007 is a more appropriate method—a more businesslike method.

Also, it is a method that would help conserve one of our major resources, the water of the Columbia River. By this, I mean that we could use this water more efficiently. Today, water is literally flowing over the dams of the Columbia in the sense that surplus power cannot be sold. This bill would help correct this situation by assuring the orderly disposal of surplus power during the peak season.

Mr. Speaker, the other body here on Capitol Hill has passed S. 1007. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of this House has held extensive hearings on the measure and has recommended enactment of the bill, with an amendment presented by the gentleman from Washington State [Mr. Westland]. The amendment was approved by the committee as a part of section 8 of the bill which we are to consider in just a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the Department of the Interior did not specify in the testimony and budget request for Federal interties whether the lines would be constructed as direct-current or alternating-current lines.

The Department of the Interior failed to say what route the lines would take. It did not evaluate the effect the wheeling of such power might have on reclamation projects which the lines would cross. Also, the Department could not point specifically to any particular customer which had agreed to buy this power, if made available.

Mr. Speaker, the Westland amendment, which incidentally was adopted in the committee by a heavy majority, recognizes these uncertainties and clarifies the situation by requiring specific congressional authorization before Federal lines can be constructed. There is precedent, both for the bill as a whole, and for the amendment. After all, the Tennessee Valley Authority has similar authorization in respect to its customers. This Congress and this House itself voted for that.

Mr. Speaker, as to section 8 of this bill, let me say that a similar amendment was adopted in regard to the Missouri River Basin. The committee in that case believed that such a procedure was necessary to provide the Congress with proper surveillance and control over future development of the Missouri River Basin by the Department of Interior.

It seems to me, and I believe to the majority of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that similar surveillance and control over the development of Bonneville power is in order.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to point out that the amendment has bipartisan support. As I mentioned a moment ago, support by a heavy majority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The vote in the committee, as I understand it, in favor of the adoption of the so-called Westland amendment was 23 to 9.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this bill, when it comes before the House, will be given every consideration and the amendment—that is, the Westland amendment—when it comes before the House as a part of the bill as reported by the committee, I certainly hope that if any motion is made to strike out the Westland amendment or if any amendment is offered to do so, that that sort of amendment will be defeated or such motion will be defeated. I feel very strongly that in order to obtain the support required for the passage of this bill this amendment must be a part of it.

Many of us who have some question in our minds as to the waste of some of these public power projects—and I think as representatives of the taxpaying public that has helped pay for this great Bonneville project and helping pay for it now out of the tax dollars from our part of the country, those of us who have this feeling have a right to insist upon every proper possible protection for the people's investment to be thrown around and about this whole adventure so as to make certain that the best use, the best possible use, the most remunerative use of this power that is generated not only by our waters but with our tax dollars, be made effective.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as near as I can ascertain the so-called preference provisions of the reclamation law have been on the statute books for almost 60 years, since 1906, to be exact. As I understand it these preference laws require that any power generated in a Federal facility—and the Bonneville Power Administration facility certainly qualifies—that power be given on a preferential basis to public agencies for the benefit of all the people.

When the Bonneville Power Administration was first brought into being, its service area, due to limitations of electrical transmission, which then existed, was confined to its immediate service area. But now because of advancements in technology an "economic transmission distance" includes points as far south as southern California. So for all practical purposes, and legally speaking, southern California preference agencies have the right today under the preference laws established since 1906 to a permanent claim on Bonneville Power.

That is what this bill is all about. The facts are simple. The Bonneville Power Administration has some surplus power, Bonneville is currently operating in the red, and if it does not get into the black very soon Bonneville is going to have to raise its rates. California can use this surplus power and if Bonneville sells power to preference customers in California, the Northwest preference customers and the nonpreference customers might not get it back if they should need it in the future. So the Northwest wants to do business in California while it is profitable to do so, but it also wants to keep some strings tied to the power and to pull it back, whenever anybody in the Northwest, preference or nonpreference customer, privately owned or publicly owned utility companies, want to get that power back.

This is like a common law marriage. It seeks all the benefits with none of the responsibilities. It is something like a zoom lens. A zoom lens allows one to photograph a wide field, and suddenly by touching a button, confine that field to a much smaller area. Here the Pacific Northwest is asking the Congress to look at the entire transmission area, including southern California, so they can get themselves out of the red. Then conveniently some day they hope they can touch that button and zoom on down and take the area which they have asked to help them out of consideration and only consider their own immediate Pacific Northwest area.

Mr. Speaker, there are federally financed projects paid for by all the people like the San Luis project in California. It will have a tremendous appetite for power and under the law it has a preferential right to this power. Yet if this bill passes it will be possible for a privately owned paper company or a privately owned utility in the Pacific Northwest to say "We need this power," and they could take it away from the San Luis project.

A few years ago this Congress authorized $115 million for the Stanford linear electron accelerator at Stanford University. This will be a project built with Federal money and operated at Federal expense. It will use tremendous amounts of power. If power is committed to the Stanford linear electron accelerator and the Northwest decides later on it needs it, it can take that away and give it to a private consumer.

The same is true of the Ames Laboratory of NASA with its tremendous wind tunnels and its high appetite for power. They get but a small portion of their power from the Central Valley project today. If they should get more Federal power because of this tie-in to the Pacific Northwest, we could demand that this Federal agency give up its power to a private utility in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a principle which has been on the books since 1906, and which everyone has pointed to as the justification for public power, should not be done away on a selective basis simply because one portion of the United States wants to build a fence around itself and reserve the right to conveniently press the zoom lens, and ask you to look at a large area today and later on, when it suits their convenience, to look at just part of the same area. A principle is good or bad for the whole country and should not be applied as if it were part of a patchwork quilt.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 1007, with Mr. Hechler in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of S. 1007 is to establish the area within which the Bonneville Power Administration is authorized to market its firm power and energy. At the same time it would permit Bonneville to market surplus power and energy outside this established area under certain conditions. The established marketing area, which is designated in the act as the Pacific Northwest, includes the entire States of Oregon and Washington, that portion of Montana west of the Continental Divide, and those portions of Idaho, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming within the Columbia River drainage basin which the Secretary of the Interior determines to be in the marketing area. The area in question is generally that area which has been served by Bonneville in the past, as modified by the order of the Secretary of the Interior dated May 21, 1963, extending the marketing area to include the upper Snake River drainage area.

The enactment of this legislation would provide the means for attaining the tremendous benefits that would flow from interconnecting the Bonneville power system and the Pacific Southwest power systems without disrupting the economy of the Northwest. Electric power or energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest could not be exported out of the Pacific Northwest unless it was surplus to the present and future needs of the customers within the Pacific Northwest, both preference and nonpreference. However, with the approval of the legislation now before us, great quantities of energy that are presently wasted because the energy is not needed in the Northwest could be exported to the Southwest and marketed for the benefit of both regions.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill as a conservation measure. It is almost criminal that we are wasting each year to the Pacific Ocean over the spillways of the great powerplants in the Northwest about 11 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy which could be used in the Southwest to meet peakloads in that area and conserve fuel which would otherwise be used for steam electric generation. This spillage is equivalent to about 20 million barrels of oil annually. The energy wasted last year amounted to about 35 percent of all the electric energy used on all the farms in the United States. In addition to conserving fuel, offpeak steam generation in the Pacific Southwest could be used to firm up hydroelectric capacity in the Pacific Northwest, and the diversity of loads between the two areas would permit large savings in steamplant investments in both regions. Thus, there would be large monetary savings as well as conservation of resources.

The Bonneville power system came into being in the late 1930's as a means of conserving and putting to use the tremendous water resources of the Pacific Northwest. Some areas of our Nation have coal, other areas have oil, and so forth. In the Northwest the greatest energy resource known of at this time is waterpower.

Federal power development in the Northwest started during a period when we were in an economic depression and private interests were not interested or able to develop these great resources. As the clouds of World War II gathered, construction in the Northwest was accelerated and when war came construction was placed on a crash basis. The great contribution which Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects made to our war effort is now a matter of historical record.

After the war hydroelectric power development expanded rapidly—both Federal and non-Federal. The aluminum and electroprocess industries which started during the war expanded also. Today, there are 20 Federal multipurpose projects existing or under construction with a combined capacity of over 8 million kilowatts, for which Bonneville Power Administration is the designated marketing agent.

It seems appropriate to me that this great power system, which was brought into being to permit the Northwest to put to use its water resources, be allowed to make maximum use of the available conservation values.

The second reason I support this bill is that it will go a long way toward putting the Bonneville power system back on a sound financial basis. The Bonneville power system has been operating at a deficit during the last several years, even though repayment of the system is still ahead of schedule due to a surplus that was built up during early years of operation. It has been estimated that an interconnection between the Bonneville system and the Pacific Southwest would provide an additional $12 to $15 million annually from the marketing of surplus Northwest power and energy alone. While it still may be necessary to raise Bonneville power rates in the near future, this additional revenue would permit a substantially smaller increase and thereby continue the availability of low-cost power to the entire Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, in my opinion, that this legislation has been referred to as the Northwest regional preference bill or as a bill which gives customers in the Northwest an overlying preference which supersedes the preference provisions of existing law. I do not regard this bill as inconsistent with the principle of preference and priority accorded by Federal power laws to public bodies and cooperatives. These preference provisions, of course, serve as the cornerstone of Federal power policy. They are spelled out in at least 13 acts of Congress beginning with the Reclamation Act of April 16, 1906. This legislation continues to recognize the principle of preference for public bodies and cooperatives in the established marketing area.

It seems to me that a carefully defined service area is essential to good management of any utility system. Only by reference to a specific marketing area can load growth be accurately forecast and the installation of facilities to meet the load growth be properly planned. This is particularly true as we enter an era where technological advances in electric energy transmission make it possible to economically transmit energy over long distances. It just does not make sense to export energy from the Pacific Northwest to California for marketing when it is needed and can be marketed in the Northwest. To do so could disrupt the entire economy of the Northwest which has been built upon the availability of a plentiful supply of electric power and energy. The desirability of having a defined service area does not lessen, however, the need for interconnecting systems in order to take advantage of benefits flowing from diversity of loads, exchanges of energy, increases in firm capacities, et cetera.

The Bonneville Project Act was passed in 1937 when economic transmission distance was in the neighborhood of 200 to 300 miles. There is presently no statutory geographical limitation on the marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration. The only limit under the authorizing act is that of economic transmission distance. It is therefore apparent that this problem has arisen primarily because of technological advances in the field of electric energy transmission. While the Bonneville Power Administration presently has the authority to market energy and power anywhere within economic transmission distance, Bonneville has firm energy available only for the Pacific Northwest. The energy available for marketing outside the Pacific Northwest is dump or nonfirm energy. Of necessity it must be subject to being cut off on short notice. Due to the technological advances I mentioned this nonfirm energy can be marketed in the Southwest if some means can be found to export only the energy and power that is surplus to the needs of the Northwest. This act provides the means for doing this. Preference customers outside the Pacific Northwest have no access to Bonneville power at the present time because the transmission facilities to make this energy available do not exist. Should the transmission facilities be constructed without some statutory definition of the marketing area, preference agencies outside the Pacific Northwest could demand, under existing law, power that is needed in the Pacific Northwest to meet the power needs of nonpreference utilities and industrial customers.

While the objective of this legislation is to clear the way for an interconnection between the Bonneville power system and the power systems of the Southwest, the matter of authorization for construction of such an interconnection is not a part of this bill. The question of who is to construct the transmission lines interconnecting these two areas is a matter presently under consideration and study by the Secretary of the Interior and should not be permitted to delay enactment of this bill. In my opinion, this legislation is needed regardless of who constructs the transmission lines.

I mentioned earlier the order of the Secretary of the Interior dated May 21, 1963, extending the Bonneville marketing area to the upper Snake drainage area which includes all of southern Idaho and small adjoining areas in Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada. This results in the integration of the upper Snake Federal hydroelectric projects with those in the rest of the Columbia River Basin. The Secretary took this action under authority in the Bonneville authorizing act which I have already discussed. The action is based upon a finding of feasibility which sets out in detail the advantages and justification for this extension. Southern Idaho is geographically a part of the Columbia River Basin and logically should be included in the Federal power system for the basin. I mention this because this action has been taken since consideration of this legislation was initiated, and it firms up the area defined in this act as the "Pacific Northwest"—the marketing area for the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is meritorious legislation and I hope it will be approved by the House.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this bill we are considering, S. 1007, the so-called Northwest regional preference bill, raises almost as many serious and far-reaching questions as it is supposedly designed to answer. The only thing which makes it almost palatable is the amendment approved 23 to 9 by our committee which requires subsequent congressional authorization before funds can be expended for construction of Federal transmission lines outside the Pacific Northwest area to carry out the provisions of this bill. Without this amendment which was offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland], the bill would be most undesirable and, in fact, would establish a dangerous precedent.

Because of time limitations, I will not attempt to document the various shortcomings of the bill; because, in my opinion, this was done in the separate views in House Report No. 590 signed by myself and six other members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Let me merely reiterate the nine things the bill would do.

First. The bill would remove some objections to Federal transmission lines connecting the Pacific Northwest with the Pacific Southwest.

Second. The bill would abrogate the existing preference laws, first enacted in 1906, governing the sale of Federal electric power at least insofar as they would apply to such power produced in the Pacific Northwest and sold outside of that area.

Third. The bill does not follow the principle of TVA legislation prescribing boundaries.

Fourth. The bill would lure industries from other areas.

Fifth. The tax dollars used to pay for Federal Northwest projects containing power came from all Americans.

Sixth. Regional preference would impede the free flow of power from areas where it can be produced most economically to those areas where it might be needed most.

Seventh. Customers outside the Pacific Northwest would have to incur the financial burden of building high-cost steam powerplants to meet their increasing needs for power.

Eighth. This legislation would be a precedent for extending regional preference to other areas.

Ninth. This legislation is not the effective way to protect the Pacific Northwest.

There is also a serious question, at least indirectly raised by this legislation, relative to the recent announcement by the Secretary of the Interior that the Bonneville Power Administration will take over the power marketing responsibilities from the Bureau of Reclamation in southern Idaho. I have been discussing this problem almost daily in the Congressional Record and I will have much more to say about it on the floor in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the only redeeming feature of S. 1007 is the Westland amendment. With it Congress will still have the opportunity to decide basic issues of national power policy. Without the Westland amendment this bill would be very dangerous and contrary to the public interest and should not be enacted. If the proponents of this bill are anxious for its final enactment into law, they should be put on notice that the Westland amendment must be preserved intact through all the subsequent legislative steps. If this is not done, I, for one, will do my utmost to defeat the final version of the bill.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our committee, my dear friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Wayne Aspinall, has described the purposes of S. 1007 and his reasons for supporting the legislation. His remarks, as usual, are thorough and unbiased. Wayne is the sort of fellow who can support, or oppose, legislation based on the facts of the case and regardless of prejudice. I can assure the House that, as a member of his committee for the past 11 years, I am happy to have his support for this bill.

This bill would define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville power administration and give customers located within the area priority to power produced by Federal projects, both public and private, over customers outside. It also would permit the sale of surplus power—surplus power being the power for which there is no demand at any price—to customers outside of the Pacific Northwest, both public and private, who are ready, willing and able to buy. The question is—should the people who have paid the bills for these Federal dams for 30 years now risk being deprived of their source of power?

These purchasers are anxious to buy the surplus power and have already submitted proposed contracts. If these contracts are consummated, and I hope they will be, it can mean a return to the Federal Treasury of $20 million annually, $20 million that is being wasted every year.

Why is this so?

Because of the unique situation that exists relative to electrical energy requirements of the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest.

You see in the Northwest our greatest demand for power occurs in the winter, but in the Southwest the greatest demand is in the summer. We have a surplus to sell during the summer months and we have ready buyers, as I said, to the tune of $20 million annually.

Someone might ask: "Then, why has not this surplus power been sold before?" The simple answer is that up until now it has not been feasible or economical to transmit power beyond 300 to 400 miles at the most. But with the advent of a new transmission technique, by extra-high-voltage lines from 500,000 to 750,000 volts, it is now possible to transmit this power economically for distances of 1,500 to 2,000 miles. I might add that this technique was developed by our good friends, the Swedes.

So, it is now possible to transmit power from the Columbia River to Los Angeles—and to do it economically—and Los Angeles is ready to buy, as well as other areas of California.

Some may ask: "Is not this setting a precedent in delineating a marketing area and giving a preference to those customers located within that area?" My answer would be "No."

Congress, in 1959, by legislative action, set the boundaries of the TVA, and, in effect, said to TVA, you cannot sell power to anyone outside that area. It is a fact that no power produced by TVA can be sold even to a preference customer outside that area.

We do not want such restrictive legislation. We want to be able to sell our surplus power outside the Bonneville marketing area—surplus power that is created by falling water, that you could not stop if you wanted to, water that is being wasted annually and worth $20 million a year. This $20 million would be collected by BPA and, in turn, be paid into the Federal Treasury in repayment of the moneys loaned to build the dams. You may hear talk about subsidized power, but the fact is that Bonneville is repaying these loans with interest.

But basically, what we are talking about here in this bill is the delineation of the primary marketing area of Bonneville and the assurance of a supply of power to the users in that area. I believe this legislation is fair and equitable, in the best interest of the conservation of our resources, and should have the approval of the House.

In the bill before you is an amendment which I offered in committee and which was accepted by a vote of 23 to 9. Since there has been some controversy over this so-called Westland amendment, let me tell you what it does.

In essence it provides that before any Federal transmission lines can be built outside the Pacific Northwest, the Secretary of the Interior must get congressional authorization. That is all it does. It does not prevent the construction of transmission lines by the Federal Government, either inside or outside the marketing area. But in view of the fact that the cost of such a line would be somewhere between $150 and $300 million, we—the committee—thought that the Secretary should be required to come before the authorizing committee and justify his requests.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman Aspinall, briefly discussed the purpose of S. 1007 and explained how it would permit the Pacific Northwest to make the fullest use of its water resources without jeopardizing its economy. The gentleman from Colorado, Chairman Aspinall, also explained how important and necessary it is for all power systems, including Federal systems, to have a specific service area within which it can plan its service and operations. I would like to elaborate to some extent on additional matters involved in this legislation.

The principal energy resource of the Northwest is water power and this has been put to use for the generation of electricity. There has been developed in the Northwest the Nation's greatest hydroelectric generating system. The bulk of the generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest are owned and operated by 16 different organizations—Federal, municipal, and private. The region is almost totally dependent on hydroelectricity for its electric supply. In order to make the best and most efficient use of resources and obtain the maximum firm power capability, the hydro system for the entire area must be fully coordinated, both electrically and hydraulically.

All the power facilities of the Northwest—both Federal and non-Federal—are coordinated through the Northwest power pool and operated as a single system. The entire system is operated in such a way as to get the greatest amount of firm energy out of all of the plants—just as if they were operated by a single ownership.

Power production depends on stream flow and stream flow varies from season to season and from year to year. Without the great dams in the Columbia Basin, the flows would vary in a ratio as high as 30 to 1. Even with the dams, the Columbia River and its tributaries are not fully controlled. The firm power and energy from the entire system is limited to the amounts that can be produced during low water years. When stream flows are higher, the system can produce a great deal of power that is not dependable, and is surplus to the needs in the Northwest.

Today the Pacific Northwest is able to meet its firm electric power needs from hydro sources. By the mid-1970's, and perhaps even sooner, the Pacific Northwest will have to import electric energy or turn to steam-electric generation. In the meantime, there is a need for this legislation.

Having established, in section 1, the service area or marketing area for the Bonneville Power Administration, the legislation provides for the sale of Pacific Northwest surplus power under certain conditions outside the specified area, particularly in the Pacific Southwest where it can be used for steam displacement with a saving to the power consumers. In addition, the legislation provides for sale in the Pacific Southwest and in other regions outside the established Bonneville marketing area, of surplus hydro peaking capacity of the Pacific Northwest. The legislation also provides for transmission north of energy available in the Southwest, principally in California, to firm up a portion of the hydro energy in the Northwest, thereby making optimum use of California thermal plants and increasing firm power capacity of Northwest utilities.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 135]

Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Auchincloss
Avery
Barry
Bray
Brock
Celler
Curtis
Diggs
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Goodling
Grant
Healey
Hébert
Jones, Ala.
King, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roudebush
Saylor
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Talcott
Thornberry
Trimble
Udall
Van Pelt
Watts
Wharton
Whitten
Williams
Winstead

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Hechler, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill S. 1007, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 379 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers] had 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, lastly, the legislation provides for taking advantage of the seasonal diversity of loads between the two regions. The Northwest has a winter peak and the Southwest generally has a summer peak, each of which is expected to become increasingly larger. By seasonal exchange of power between the two regions, investment in plant can be reduced with resulting economies to the electric power and energy users in both regions. The legislation sets out in detail the rules and criteria under which the Bonneville Power Administration may supply power and energy outside the established area and enter into additional contracts relative to the sale and exchange of power and energy.

Of course, these benefits cannot be realized without an interconnection between the Bonneville power system and the power systems of the Pacific Southwest. The enactment of this legislation would facilitate the construction of transmission lines to interconnect these two areas. However, this legislation does not directly involve the matter of who constructs this intertie. I believe that this legislation is necessary whether the intertie be Federal or non-Federal, or part each. It is a prerequisite for any intertie.

I do not know of any major electric interconnection between systems or regions anywhere in the United States, either public or private, that has been built for the purpose of exporting firm energy which is needed within the marketing area of the constructing agencies or utilities. Interconnections have been built to take advantage of diversity of peak loads. The Bonneville Power Administration does not have and will not have the electric capacity for supplying firm power and energy outside the Pacific Northwest.

Any attempt to do so would adversely affect the entire economy of the Northwest which is based upon the availability of large quantities of low-cost electric energy.

The Federal Government has invested over $500 million in transmission facilities in the Pacific Northwest. These facilities were designed and constructed to meet the needs in that area in the most economic and feasible manner possible. Should the operation of the Bonneville power system be changed to require general service to customers outside the Pacific Northwest, much of the existing transmission system and the huge investment therein would be unnecessary and useless.

Mr. Chairman, there are several additional reasons why it is necessary that the Northwest be given protection against the loss of firm power and energy needed in that area.

The possibility of an interconnection between the Bonneville power system and the Pacific Southwest has developed only recently and is due principally to advances in long-distance transmission technology. This has raised unprecedented problems. The mutually beneficial interchange of surpluses and diversity of loads could result in demands for previously committed blocks of power on which large investments have already been based and on which substantial employment and business activity already depend.

The industries of the Pacific Northwest have been built on the basis of the availability of electric energy from Federal plants. Bonneville customers alone have invested more than $350 million and employ more than 15,000 persons. These plants and jobs are directly dependent upon a continuing supply of electric energy. If the Federal power generated in the Pacific Northwest is diverted to other regions, many of these industries would be seriously affected.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation is fully justified and I hope it will be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other point. The primary reason and probably the main reason for this legislation is the fact that man has through technological advances made it possible to wheel electric energy much further than he ever supposed he would be able to in the first instance. Had we known this at the time of the Bonneville Power bill, at the time of the TVA authorization, and at the time of the bills that provided for other power developments in this country, those acts would have contained the language in this measure that is before us today.

The reason they did not is because it was not considered a problem at the time. They felt that the marketing area was fixed by the ability to wheel the power; therefore, there would be no reason to confine this to any certain area.

This bill actually does one major thing. It protects free enterprise in the Northwest region of this country. It does this because it creates preference customers out of private enterprise and free enterprise industry that has been built up in that area and prevents the power from Bonneville from being siphoned off by public groups in other sections of the country and permitting private enterprise in the Northwest to be injured.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is of utmost importance to the continued progress and expansion of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation in general. Various sections of our Nation have some special advantages bestowed on them by nature. Texas and Oklahoma, for example, have their oil and gas fields. Pennsylvania and Kentucky have their coal fields. The Ohio Valley has deposits of coal and iron ore, and low-cost water transportation.

Similarly, the Pacific Northwest has as one of its basic resources the falling waters of the Columbia River system. These tumbling waters have been harnessed by mighty dams and the energy has been diverted through generators to produce electrical energy.

As a result, certain industries have expanded and the general economy has been bettered, enabling the people of the Northwest to purchase more Detroit-built cars, Pittsburgh steel, Boston shoes, and Atlanta textiles. Through the years, many dams, private and public, have been constructed at various points along the Columbia River system and yet, there is no foreseeable surplus of firm power in the Northwest area. True, due to seasonal fluctuation of our river flow and power loads, there will be temporary periods when more power can be generated than is needed. And this generated power must be put to good use, or as the alternative, the falling waters which do the generating will be allowed to flow wasted into the Pacific Ocean.

Years ago, when the original Bonneville Power Act was passed, no limitation on the marketing area was established except that governed by economic transmission distance. A radius of 400 miles or less seemed to control the limits of power sales at that time. However, with the advance of technology in the transmission field, the definition of marketing area today is much broader. And here is where the problem arises.

To those of us who would strenuously object to the nationalization of the Nation's power systems, we have the thought that without a specific marketing area for the Bonneville Power Administration, it is now not only possible but probable that such a Federal system would be extended throughout the Western States.

This legislation would assist in preventing such nationalization and would deter such broadening of the Federal power system by specifically defining the marketing area. This legislation would also insure that the original intent of the Bonneville Power Administration—that is, to handle the wholesale of federally generated power from Pacific Northwest multiple-purpose dams in the Pacific Northwest—would be continued.

Now, as regards the needed ground rules for the exchange of surplus power between regions: since hydroelectric power is the sole energy resource of the Pacific Northwest, we must maintain our rights to it for the protection of our economy. It is not a question of being selfish. It is a question of maintaining for a region of our Nation that essential resource which will permit further growth in the region economy and thus the continued improvement in our Nation's economy. Without this legislation, we have no alternative but the unthinkable drift to fighting for and condoning waste. With this legislation, we can fight for resource conservation. And this brings the last point.

By this legislation you will encourage the construction of available hydroelectric and steamplants in the Pacific Northwest ahead of their need in such areas. This means that these projects can be built before escalation in construction costs will make them less feasible. This will be good for our Nation. It will help the other regions of our Nation.

This bill, by establishing a primary marketing area, will make a limited modification of the application of the preference provisions as between that primary marketing area and other areas. Public agency customers within the Pacific Northwest will continue to have preference over private utilities and industries within the Northwest, and public customers outside the Northwest will continue to have preference over private customers in their own region; public customers outside the Northwest, however, would not have preference over private customers in the Northwest.

That is the inevitable effect—in fact, a major purpose—of any determination of a primary marketing area. No power agency can plan its operations and construction schedules unless it has a definite service area, the power needs of which it can ascertain.

Bonneville Power Administration obviously could not meet the loads of all the preference customers within economic transmission distance of the Federal Columbia River plants. It does not have that much power available, and there isn't that much undeveloped hydro in the Pacific Northwest.

There is nothing new in the proposal for a primary marketing area. There are a number of instances in which Congress has established area limitations which have affected the application of the preference clause. The one most pertinent here is the restriction on the marketing area for the TVA. Despite any alleged differences between TVA and BPA and despite the labored attempts in the minority report to distinguish the action of Congress with respect to the TVA marketing area and the action of Congress sought by this bill, the fact remains that a public agency outside the TVA marketing area cannot obtain power from TVA at the expense of an industry within the TVA marketing area.

The amount of power affected by the congressional limitation on TVA's marketing area, indicated by TVA's sales to industries within its marketing area, is more than 10 billion kilowatt-hours, approximately 18 percent of its total sales—1962 TVA Annual Report, appendix B, table 3, page A35.

The minority report asserts:

> The suspension of preference would apply to more than one-half of all the hydroelectric power produced by the United States in the entire country because more than one-half of the Nation's Federal power is generated in the Pacific Northwest.

This is exaggeration. About 43½ percent of the installed capacity at Federal hydroelectric projects is within the Pacific Northwest, and preference customers now take about half of that. Only 28½ percent of the installed capacity of all Federal projects, hydro, and nonhydro, is within the Pacific Northwest.

In one form or another the concept of area preference has been a part of Federal power policy for nearly 35 years. The Boulder Canyon Project Act grants a preference to Arizona, California, and Nevada. The Hungry Horse Dam Act grants a preference to the State of Montana. The Priest Rapids Project Act requires that the Federal Power Commission, licensee of the project, must offer a reasonable portion of the capacity and energy of the project for sale within the economic market area in neighboring States. The Niagara Power Project Act requires that any FPC licensee must make a portion of the power available within reasonable economic transmission distance in neighboring States. The River and Harbor Act of 1958 provides that the States in which future Corps of Engineers' dams in the Missouri Basin are located shall have preference to a portion of the power.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of the First Congressional District of Washington State I strongly support Federal legislation to guarantee electrical power users in the Pacific Northwest first call on energy generated in their own marketing regions. Electricity is distributed in my district in part by a private power company and in part by a city-owned municipal light and power system. Both of these non-Federal systems have generating facilities of their own but depend on the Bonneville Power Administration for peak and surplus needs. Since the Federal Government has preempted the major hydroelectric sites for multipurpose projects, it only seems fair that regional distributors should be given protective legislation to give them a priority if sales of surplus Bonneville power is provided to distant areas beyond our own marketing region. Otherwise under existing Federal law, the Bonneville Power Administration would be compelled to give preference to public agencies and cooperatives outside our marketing area. We do not object to sharing our power but certainly we do not want to have Pacific Northwest power users discriminated against because they deal with a private investor-owned distributor as against a user hundreds of miles away because of such a distributor being publicly owned.

This legislation is to allow, under modern technology, the transmission of surplus Bonneville power to areas outside the Pacific Northwest. Without a priority, such as this legislation provides, if a transmission line was built our northwest nonpublic investor-owned Bonneville customers could lose their source of buying firm Federal power to nonregional preference customers.

Mr. Chairman, my own Seattle Chamber of Commerce supports this legislation and so testified before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Also many other chambers of commerce in the State of Washington have endorsed it as have the Washington State Federation of Labor and many labor organizations. Likewise all private and public power groups support this bill as do all large industrial users and the State grange.

The Bonneville Power Administration is currently $20 million ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to the Treasury for the cost of its operations and for repaying the cost of the Federal Government in its power facilities.

If Bonneville can dispose of its surplus of secondary power and peaking capacity Bonneville rates will be cheaper. Therefore, the people of the Pacific Northwest desire to see this wasted power transmitted outside our region. It will avoid waste and give other Americans a share of the direct benefits of river development in the Northwest. But if this is done we must have the protection afforded by this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, Nevada, as my colleagues know, is called the one sound State. Well, the committee-approved amendment requiring congressional authorization of any Federal transmission lines constructed to market power pursuant to the provisions of S. 1007 should be called the one sound amendment.

This amendment assures that the Congress will have a chance to consider specifically the need, or lack of need, for any such Federal facilities. It provides as follows:

> SEC. 8. No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this Act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by the Congress.

This opportunity to analyze and approve any contemplated Federal project will enable us to carry out our responsibility to all Americans to assure that their best interests are being looked out for in Congress.

It is not sound, in my view, to say as many of the opponents to this amendment state that this amendment is unnecessary as we have our restraint in the appropriation process. Such an argument ignores the time-honored and time-tested authorization process.

Bonneville's authorization statute was passed by this body over 25 years ago, long before myself or many, indeed most, of the present Members of Congress were in office. To say that a lot of water has gone over the dam in that period is being quite, quite serious.

Technologies have been improved, Federal investments of vast proportions have been made in other regions and still others are contemplated.

What will be the effect of constructing lines to market power pursuant to S. 1007? We are told that great benefits will accrue. But what about the unanswered questions? Questions that were far beyond the purview of Congress in 1937 and which are, as yet, presently unanswered. For instance, where will a Federal line go? We do not know. Some say Hoover Dam, others Los Angeles, others Tracy, Calif.—still others say Phoenix, Ariz. The line location twists and turns seeking supporters like a thirsty vine seeking water. Will it pass through California or Nevada? No one seems to know.

Who will the line serve? Again, no clear answer.

What will be the effect on existing and proposed Federal and local water projects in California, Arizona, and other Western States? No one knows; or if they do, they are keeping it to themselves. Clearly no responsible official would advocate a Federal project that would have an adverse effect on such projects as the Central Valley or central Arizona projects, but the fact is, the potential effect has not been measured.

It is not the Appropriations Committee which should bear the burden of studying and answering these questions. They have enough to do trying to resolve the sticky questions attributable to projects which have met the strict testing of our various authorization committees. Moreover, to eliminate the authorization process on a project potentially involving many millions of dollars is to distort the legislative processes of this body.

Clearly the authorization of lines such as those now envisaged has never been studied. In 1937 Congressmen talked in terms of electric lines running only a few hundred miles. For example, Senator Bone advised his colleagues in the Senate that Bonneville would service Oregon and Washington alone—Senate hearings on S. 2092, June 29, 1937, page 7.

During the House's consideration of this year's Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD described one of the provisions of that bill as follows:

> The ultimate effect of this legislation will be to strengthen political and fiscal responsibility in this important scientific program. The result should be beneficial to the Congress, the taxpayers, and the Nation.

He was describing an amendment requiring prior congressional authorization for all AEC appropriations.

It is this same sort of authorization procedure that is contemplated by the committee-adopted section 8—the so-called Westland amendment.

The effect of this amendment to S. 1007 will be exactly the same as with the

AEC bill. It will give Congress—not some office downtown—control over multimillion-dollar Federal projects. Such control will, of its very nature, be beneficial to the taxpayers and the Nation.

We should not duck our responsibility to the American people. This amendment gives us the chance to squarely meet that responsibility at a time when there are several takers lined up for every Federal dollar.

Proponents of reclamation projects are forever praising them as investments in America's future. Well, let us not endanger these investments in a blind, headlong tumble that could result from Federal construction of the facilities that may be involved if this bill is passed without the Westland amendment.

Let us retain this one sound amendment that was adopted overwhelmingly by Democrats and Republicans alike in the House Interior Committee.

In my statement before the Interior Committee, I said:

> Less than 5 percent of Nevada is within the drainage area there, and actually that section is all mountainous, sloping into Idaho. Our mountains run in that direction, toward the State of Idaho.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The boundaries were drawn arbitrarily. It is very easy to run the same powerlines into Nevada if you can run them all the way to Los Angeles, a distance of 1,500 miles.
>
> We have no power in Nevada all the way down to Tonopah, which would be about the 38th parallel. We do have Boulder Dam power in the very southern tip, but we do not have it in the northern tip.

The bill as reported by the committee does not include Nevada in the Northwest priority area. The bill raises some other grave questions on national power policy and preference. Nevertheless, I support this legislation and will continue to do so—but only as long as the provision requiring congressional approval of these Federal power facilities is retained.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for what I consider to be one of the finest statements on a most complicated matter I have heard in many days. I also want to commend the chairman of the full committee. I think they have done an excellent job in bringing us this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would be no more of a precedent to extending geographical preference to other areas than would the many similar instances in which Congress has already done just that. Colleagues have cited these instances.

Particularly, this legislation would not be a precedent for other areas whose economy, energy base and pattern of utility ownership may be different. It is aimed at problems which are unique to the Pacific Northwest. This region does not have proven resources of oil and gas, and its proven coal resources are limited. About 96 percent of its firm energy capability is hydro, and 62 percent of the hydro is federally generated. Most of its steamplants are small, old, high cost and inefficient. No other area in the United States is so heavily dependent upon hydropower. With the exception of the Tennessee Valley, no other region has such a high percentage of federally-owned generation. As a result, no other area would be so greatly affected by any problem or policy relating to its hydroelectric generation. No other region would be so acutely affected by a change in the ground rules for the disposition of Federal power.

One of the most important of the unique factors is that the Federal system in the Pacific Northwest generates more power than the preference customers in the region utilize. In other regions, there is not enough Federal hydro power to serve the loads to Federal customers, and the Federal power has to be rationed. They have no surplus to be exported to preference customers in other regions. In the Pacific Northwest, only 42 percent of the Federal generation is sold to preference customers and another 10 percent is sold to Federal agencies. Almost one-half of the Federal generation is sold to private utilities and industries, and they are heavily dependent upon it.

Industrial customers of the Bonneville Power Administration have invested more than $350 million in their plants. Replacement cost today would be double that amount. They are heavy power-consuming industries which have purchased annually from 31 to 62 percent of the energy sold by the Federal system. They employ 15,000 Pacific Northwest citizens directly and provide employment for another 30,000 indirectly.

The Pacific Northwest has no competitive-cost alternative to its hydroelectric power. If Federal power generated in the Pacific Northwest is diverted to other regions, many of these industries would have to shut down or severely curtail their operations, with the most serious economic consequences to the region directly and to the Nation indirectly.

Furthermore, the Federal Government has invested more than $500 million in the transmission facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration. These facilities were designed and constructed to meet loads in the Pacific Northwest in the most efficient and economical manner possible. If the operation of the Columbia River power system should be changed to meeting loads of only preference agencies in the western half of the United States, much of the existing transmission system and the huge investment in it would be unnecessary and useless.

The primary marketing area for BPA defined in this bill is a natural one, tied together by nature, history, and economics. By way of contrast, compare the attempts last year in the Senate debate on similar legislation to have geographical preference extend to other parts of the country. Instead of proposing a natural geographical and economic marketing area that made sense, the proposal was to establish each State as a marketing area and to give it preference to power generated at Federal projects located therein. This would have created a purely arbitrary marketing area—one that had no relation to geography, economics, hydrology or power system operations. The Senate, after full debate, quite properly rejected it by a vote of 53 to 33.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1007 is necessary legislation to define a sensible primary marketing area for the Bonneville Power Administration and to establish ground rules for the sale and exchange of Pacific Northwest surplus secondary energy and peaking capacity outside the region.

Every integrated electric utility must have a well-defined marketing area in order to meet the requirements of its customers and plan intelligently to meet future load growth. The primary marketing area established for BPA by this bill makes both economic and engineering sense. It is an area three times the size of the marketing area established by Congress for the TVA, yet it is one BPA can serve efficiently.

As a practical matter, BPA does not have sufficient power resources, either existing or potential, to serve the firm power needs of a larger area. On the other hand, the BPA system does have a surplus of secondary power and peaking capacity which has been going to waste. This legislation will permit and, in fact, facilitate the sale outside the primary marketing area of these kinds of surplus. It will put an end to waste. It is a true conservation measure.

Unfortunately, the committee has adopted an amendment which will make it more difficult for the Bonneville Power Administration to dispose of surplus power under terms which are most beneficial to electric consumers and the U.S. Treasury. This is the amendment proposed by my able colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. It would forbid Federal construction of any intertie lines outside the BPA primary marketing area to interconnect with BPA lines unless hereafter specifically authorized by the Congress.

The practical effect of this amendment, in its present form, would be to take away from the Secretary of the Interior an authorization which the Congress granted when it passed the Bonneville Project Act—an authorization which has been used wisely and without abuse.

It has been congressional policy for many years to provide for the construction of transmission lines to market power from Federal multipurpose projects. Congress has controlled such construction through its Appropriations Committees, and this is where such control should remain. The Appropriations Committees, in this very session, are considering the Department of the Interior's proposal for one all-Federal direct-current line and one part-Federal and part-private alternating-current line between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest, and weighing this proposal against the several non-Federal offers to build all or parts of the necessary line or lines. Retention of this amendment would preclude the Appropriations Committees from completing their consideration of this matter at this session and delay further consideration of Federal lines for 1 and, possibly, 2 years.

Such a delay could result in the additional waste of millions of dollars worth of power for lack of transmission facilities. The Secretary of the Interior would be hamstrung in his ability to work out satisfactory alternative arrangements for the marketing of surplus Northwest power over non-Federal transmission lines. As the Secretary of Interior has told the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, without Federal appropriations for the line or lines for bargaining purposes, it will be most difficult and likely impossible to obtain the most favorable terms from private utilities for carrying Federal kilowatts. What kind of an agreement could the Secretary negotiate?

Lacking any immediate or realistic alternative, he would have either to accept terms and conditions dictated by the private utilities, or continue to waste the power now spilling over Northwest dams.

Congress should at least insure the Secretary has sufficient bargaining power to protect the taxpayer-ratepayer investment in the Bonneville system, and the consumers of the Pacific Southwest who, ultimately, must pay the transmission charges for Northwest power.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, in the hearings before the House Interior Committee this year and last year I opposed the regional preference bill as contrary to the best interests of our people. It would result in a major distortion of the preference position of the Federal installations and water projects in my State. It also could create a dangerous precedent.

Although I still do not approve of this measure, the bill that was reported out of the House committee has one saving grace—the Westland amendment.

This amendment preserves the prerogative of Congress over items of great significance. The significance is pointed up by a review of some of the underlying reasons for this amendment which appears as section 8 of the bill.

> SEC. 8. No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this Act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by the Congress.

In my school days I learned that electricity was both positive and negative, but unless this Congress acts wisely we may well find ourselves saddled with a Federal transmission line scheme from which there seems to flow nothing but the negative.

I refer to the adamant determination on the part of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administration to spend Federal funds to build, somewhere and somehow, an extra-high-voltage powerline from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest. Yet the Secretary and the Bonneville Administration have not decided what route this line—or lines—would follow. They are uncertain of the cost. They have not decided on the terminus. They have no customers. They can offer no assurance that the transmission line would be dependable. And they have not even demonstrated a need.

This, I submit, is the blankest of all blank checks.

It is small wonder, then, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs overwhelmingly approved the amendment of the gentleman from Washington, Representative WESTLAND. This amendment merely spells out the right—and the constitutional responsibility—of Congress to pass on major expenditures of the taxpayers' money. The same approval must be secured by other departments of Government. This is a sound legislative test of proposed expenditures, a test to which the Department of the Interior should not be exempt.

Let us not be beguiled by any arguments that this amendment is unnecessary. The eminent junior Senator from Washington, in reporting favorably on the Senate's regional preference bill, declared—and I quote: "The bill contains no authorization for the construction of Federal lines between these regions. Existing statutes provided such authority."

Whether or not this is so, let us set forth here and now our firm intent to see that the economic development of the West is not fried to a crisp on an electric power grid tailored to federalistic doctrine instead of on honest-to-goodness need.

There are seven non-Federal offers to build all or part of a transmission line. Some of these possibly would do it better than the Federal proposal, and do it without adding an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers. For instance, the offer of California's four major power companies not only holds promise of a more satisfactory job but it would also create tax revenues instead of draining off tax wealth. Moreover, these utilities have offered to equitably share the benefits from Bonneville power with the State of California and other public agencies which can make use of surplus Federal energy.

There is no assurance that the proposed all-Federal direct current powerline, or lines, would be dependable. Direct current is not yet a proved method of carrying power long distances except under certain unusual circumstances. Repeated efforts to use direct current transmission have been restricted by its inherent shortcomings. Even the vaunted 294-mile Volgograd-Donbass direct current line in Russia, designed to operate at 800 kilovolts, is reportedly being operated at only a quarter of this designed capacity because of troubles with converter equipment.

If this half-a-loaf Federal direct current line should be built, there are as yet no customers for the large blocks of this vagrant Bonneville power which would be offered on a "when, as and if" basis in a limited area. It would be "Saturday, Sunday, and holiday" power, power that would be imprisoned in direct current lines as it bypassed rich and populated areas of California to be dumped in big lumps in Los Angeles—a concentrated target area where there is no present market unserved. It would be dumped there with no regard to local problems, local desires or local reclamation and water projects.

Congress must unequivocally reserve its right to investigate what State or States would be involved in a line whose route has not yet been determined, whose terminal is shifted according to the exigencies of the day and whose actual distance has never been measured nor its real cost computed.

So long as a reasonable business proposition exists as an alternative to this Federal power transmission project, this Congress must not be stampeded into ignoring it. So long as we are the elected representatives of the American taxpayers, we hold a position of trust that cannot be delegated to appointed officials in Government bureaus. So long as the Westland amendment is a part of this legislation, Congress can fulfill that trust. Congress should not pass this bill without this amendment.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation strikes me as a businesslike approach to a business problem. How can we best dispose of a surplus commodity for which the demand is greater than the supply? How can we do this without hurting the present customers?

No utility system in America, public or private, would dispose of firm power outside its service area if that power were needed to take care of its own loads within its own service area. As has been pointed out on the floor today, the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of California made clear in questioning before the Senate Appropriations Committee that his firm would not take power away from its own customers in order to serve customers outside its own territory.

One of the ground rules established by this legislation for the sale of surplus power outside the Northwest provides for withdrawal clauses when the power is no longer surplus to the needs of the area where it is generated. These withdrawal clauses are standard in all contracts between utility systems for the sale or exchange of power.

In the contract between the four private utilities which form the California Power Pool, provision is made for interrupting various types of service on notice of not to exceed 24 hours in one case, 7 days in another, and 45 days in still another. The principal type of intercompany sales, interruption can be without any notice.

In the contract between Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and Pacific Power & Light Co. for the sale of surplus power by P.P. & L. to P.G. & E. there is provision for deliveries only when P.P. & L. can supply and when P.G. & E. can beneficially dispose of surplus energy. Deliveries can be interrupted at any time, the only obligation being to give as much advance notice as possible.

These are but examples of the general utility practice of interconnecting two or more systems so that each may dispose of its surplus power to the advantage of both the supplying and receiving systems.

On the other hand, this bill does not impede technological progress. It will permit every transfer and exchange of power for which utility systems are interconnected. It will do so without endangering the power supply of customers in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to recite a little history relating to the Bonneville Power Administration's activities.

I favor the Westland amendment. I want that understood. It must be said that the Bonneville Power Administration overbuilt their hydroelectric producing plants to the end that they now have over 4 million-plus kilowatt hours of power which they cannot market. The power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration are so low, being only about 2 mills per kilowatt hour, that private utilities cannot justify the building of thermoproducing plants which would firm up the Bonneville nonfirm power which the hydroelectric plants produce.

Hydroelectric power, of course, is nondependable power, nonfirm power, so to speak. In order to make it dependable power it must be firmed up with thermopower, steam-produced power.

The Bonneville Power Administration refuse to raise their power rates sufficiently to keep their books in the black, to the end that they have lost over the past several years about $15 million annually. However, it must be said that they are current in their repayments to date.

A number of years ago the Oregon and California private utilities offered to buy all the surplus power that Bonneville was producing and pay a reasonable rate for it. But they were refused. The 1964 fiscal year budget request $25 million to start construction of a power line running from the John Day Dam to Tracy, Calif., at an estimated total cost of $160 million, of course, all of the American taxpayers are asked to loan that amount to the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation to build this proposed high voltage line which would have been unnecessary had the Bonneville Power Administration accepted the proposition that was made them by the California and Oregon private electric companies years ago. My colleagues, we have here again the situation of the camel getting his nose under the tent. Of course, the Westland amendment requires that the tie line be authorized, not only this one but similar proposed lines nationwide. But this is a forerunner for the spending $160 million and make no mistake about that.

As I said before I shall support the Westland amendment as good and necessary safeguard, but I shall not put myself in a position to OK the expenditure of $160 million for the building of the proposed tie line, then I am opposed to the passage of this bill, since the private tax paying utilities are ready, able, and willing to construct all the transmission lines necessary to deliver Bonneville power to preferred customers and others at reasonable rates to the power users in all the States listed to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1007 which is identical to bills introduced by myself, H.R. 994; by the gentleman from Washington, Congressman WESTLAND, H.R. 1160; by the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman ULLMAN, H.R. 4071, and by the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman WHITE, H.R. 4485.

I would like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman ASPINALL, and the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman ROGERS, for their patient and fair conduct of long and full hearings, both this year and last, that covered every phase of this legislation. Both these gentlemen have today explained to you the major purposes of the bill. What I have to say is supplemental.

This legislation is supported by Governors Hatfield, of Oregon, Rosellini, of Washington, and Smylie, of Idaho. It has the support of public and private power, business, and labor.

Its main purpose, as explained by previous speakers, is to establish for the Bonneville Power Administration an orderly marketing area that makes economic and engineering sense. The Bonneville Project Act, as written in 1937, directs Bonneville to market power anywhere within economic transmission distance. Until recently that was 200 to 300 miles; technology has increased that distance to 1,500 to 2,000 miles. Even if it were otherwise desirable for Bonneville to market power over such a large area, as a practical matter the Bonneville system does not have the power resources, existing or potential, to supply preference customers on such a grand scale. If it attempted to do so, Bonneville would be sold out of firm power within 3 years and preference customers relying on Bonneville within and without the Pacific Northwest would have to be rationed.

To take power away from nonpreference customers in the Northwest to serve preference customers outside the region would create economic chaos in the Northwest, for this region is uniquely dependent upon hydroelectric power, and some 62 percent of the hydroelectric power is generated at Federal plants. Long-established industries with many millions of dollars of plant investment and many thousands of employees, and with one of their major objectives competition in a tough world market, would have to shut down if their supply of electric power disappeared. The region has no other comparable cost sources of energy. It has no proven reserves of oil or gas, and its proven supplies of coal are limited.

It was for this reason that the Pacific Northwest turned to hydro development in the first place. Need I remind my colleagues how fortunate we were, as a Nation, to have the great Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams ready to put power on the line just as we entered World War II. These great projects provided the power base for industry which supplied our troops with materiel, and it is no exaggeration to say that the existence of these projects in the Northwest helped us win World War II and may even have shortened that war.

While it has no surplus of firm power, the Bonneville system has a substantial surplus of secondary power—produced when streamflows are good—and a surplus of peaking capacity. Last year, alone, some $33 million worth of power—secondary and short-term firm—was wasted in the form of water over the region's spillways. As a matter of conservation, as a matter of ending waste, this surplus power should be sold where it can be used. This the bill before us permits, and, in fact, facilitates. It defines the primary marketing area for BPA and then establishes sound and sensible ground rules for the sale and exchange outside that area of surplus secondary power and peaking capacity, and for exchanges of power to take advantage of seasonal diversity in load patterns between the Northwest and other regions.

May I point out also that this legislation is consistent with sound business practices of all utility systems, public and private? Any utility seeks to market its surplus instead of wasting it. By the same token, no utility sells power outside its service area which it requires to meet the needs of customers inside that service area.

The importance of a clearly defined marketing area was underscored by Mr. Robert Gerdes, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., America's biggest utility, in his testimony this year before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He was asked if his company would sell firm power outside its present service area if to do so would take power away from any customers in P.G. & E. territory. He replied:

> No, it would be inconsistent with our obligation as a public utility.

I cannot conclude my remarks without noting my exception to the committee amendment sponsored by my friend and colleague from Washington, Mr. WESTLAND. The amendment would require specific congressional authorization for any Federal lines proposed to be built outside BPA's marketing area to interconnect with BPA lines.

This is a deauthorizing amendment, taking away from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administration authority already existing to construct such lines as are necessary for BPA to do its power marketing job. Actually, the amendment is irrelevant to this bill, which has nothing to do with who builds any intertie facilities between the Pacific Northwest and other regions. This bill establishes ground rules for the sale and exchange of surplus secondary power and peaking capacity; it is not a public works measure, but the amendment attempts to make it such. If the Congress wishes to consider deauthorizing legislation to take away from the Bonneville Power Administration authority to construct lines which the Congress has previously granted, such legislation properly should come from the Committee on Public Works. This is the committee which considered the Bonneville Project Act when it was amended in 1945.

In addition to this basic objection to the Westland amendment, there are many other serious objections. First is that it would remove from consideration by the Congress at this session a specific budget request for an all-Federal direct-current line from the Columbia River to the Los Angeles-Hoover Dam area. The merits of this line have been fully presented not only to the Appropriations Committees, but also to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This Congress is in the process of completely reviewing the merits of the requested appropriations.

On the other hand, if the Westland amendment were adopted in its present form, the Department of the Interior would be faced with two alternatives: First, either accept such terms as the private utilities or other non-Federal entities may choose to offer for the transmission or purchase of federally generated power; or second, delay 1 or probably 2 years, during which about $30 million worth of power is being wasted each year, to seek a specific authorization followed by another budget request for a Federal line.

The possibility of this delay inevitably weakens the bargaining position of the Department entrusted by Congress to protect the public interest in these matters. Concurrently, it strengthens the monopoly position of two of the largest privately owned utilities in the world.

The situation is not the same as prompted the House to pass H.R. 6016, dealing with the authorization of new units in the Missouri Basin. H.R. 6016 does not apply to regional interconnections tieing Federal plants in other basins with Federal Missouri River hydro plants.

The most businesslike way in which to consider the economics of specific lines is the appropriations process. Each year Bonneville must present to the appropriations committees a budget for every penny of operating and construction funds it proposes to spend in the next fiscal year. Consideration of budget requests for new lines, including regional interties, can best be given as part of the consideration of Bonneville's entire fiscal and operating problems. This power of the purse strings assures Congress of continuing control over the building of Federal transmission lines.

In conclusion, may I remind my colleagues of the statement by President Kennedy, August 20, 1962, on the occasion of Bonneville's 25th anniversary. At that time he said:

> When you help build a region, you help build your Nation. The economic growth of the Pacific Northwest has created a bigger market for Detroit cars and Pittsburgh steel and Boston shoes and Atlanta textiles. The list is almost without end, and proves again that the economic vitality of one region affects the economic vitality of all other regions.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I also want to compliment the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee for the very diligent job they have done in seeing that hearings have been held on this bill and in preparing it for presentation to the House. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], concerning the overbuilding of dams on the Columbia River, that this is not like building a steamplant where it is possible to overbuild, but I think it was pointed out in earlier remarks here that the Columbia River is a river that runs at times at high flood stage and at low ebb at other times. It is impossible to impound all of the water no matter how many dams you build on the Columbia River. I take exception to the gentleman from Iowa saying that this is overbuilt, because it has not been done in this area.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman certainly does not mean to say that Bonneville did not overbuild in hydroelectric plants when the facts are that they have 4 million more kilowatts of power now than they can market?

Mr. WHITE. I would say they had not overbuilt for firm power.

When the Bonneville Project Act was written in 1937, economic transmission distance was only 200 or 300 miles. Today technological advances have increased economic transmission distance 1,000 to 2,000 miles, a distance that includes almost all of the area west of the Mississippi River.

Obviously the opposition to S. 1007 do not really want BPA to undertake to serve such a vast area. So far, the Secretary of the Interior has not exercised his full statutory authority to extend BPA's marketing area to the limits of existing law. If he did so, it is a fair guess that opponents to S. 1007 would object loud and strong. In fact, the Secretary's recent order extending BPA's marketing area to include Southern Idaho, which is well within the primary marketing area established by this bill—and which was a logical, legal, and welcome decision by the Secretary—has aroused the ire of certain opponents to S. 1007. Those who are opposed to the extension of BPA's marketing area to southern Idaho should support S. 1007, not oppose it, for without it the BPA marketing area by secretarial order could be extended as far as Los Angeles and Chicago.

The opposition's argument that S. 1007 should be opposed because it allegedly weakens the "preference clause" for public agencies and cooperatives must be made with tongue-in-cheek. The ranking signator of the minority report has made no bones about his opposition to all preference for public agencies or cooperatives in the marketing of Federal power. He believes in the bus bar sale of federally generated power to the highest bidder. The minority report, itself, urges as its main argument against S. 1007 that it might "remove some objections to Federal transmission lines connecting the Pacific Northwest with the Pacific Southwest. Yet the one all-Federal line proposed in the President's budget is intended to serve the needs of the preference customers of California, southern Nevada and Arizona. It is strange, indeed, to oppose S. 1007 under the banner of the preference clause, and simultaneously oppose it for the contradictory reason that it might enable BPA to deliver surplus power to preference customers in California.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I support wholeheartedly S. 1007, guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region. At the present time there is no geographical limitation on the marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration—the only limitation is that of economic transmission distance. In 1937, when the Bonneville Project Act was passed economic transmission distance was in the neighborhood of 200 to 300 miles. Today, however, with the tremendous technological advances made in the field of electric energy transmission electric power and energy can be transmitted over long distances. The Federal Government has invested over $500 million in transmission facilities in the Pacific Northwest. These facilities were designed and constructed to meet the needs in that area in the most economical and feasible manner possible. If the operation of the Bonneville power system should be changed to require service to customers outside the Pacific Northwest much of the existing transmission system and the huge investment in the area could become unnecessary and useless. Moreover, industrial consumers of the Bonneville Power Administration have invested more than $350 million in their plants. If Federal power generated in the Pacific Northwest is diverted to other regions, without regard to the needs of the Pacific Northwest, many of these industries would be seriously affected. The Pacific Northwest could not tolerate the risk, without some statutory definition of the marketing area of Pacific Northwest energy, of having preference agencies outside the Pacific Northwest demand power under existing law that is needed in the Pacific Northwest.

Under this legislation the Pacific Southwest could purchase surplus Bonneville power for which there is no need in the Pacific Northwest and this is good economy and desirable but there must be a safeguard that Bonneville power needed in the Pacific Northwest will not be transmitted outside the Pacific Northwest. It is only a matter of commonsense and good business practice that surplus Bonneville power not be wasted, but at the same time it would be extremely poor business, and disastrous to the Pacific Northwest, if needed power in the area should be transmitted elsewhere. S. 1007 is both meritorious and vitally needed legislation. I have and shall continue to give it my vigorous and wholehearted support.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, S. 1007 is a good bill. In fact, it is a very good bill, that is if you live in the States of Washington and Oregon, or in the Columbia River drainage area of Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming, or with a friendly Secretary of Interior if you happen to live anywhere in the State of Idaho.

What this bill does is to freeze the power output of the entire Columbia River Basin for the benefit of public and private industry in that basin at a sale price of 2¼ mills, and then to permit the sale of surplus power anywhere in the United States on the basis of 2¼ mills for firm power and dump power at a cheaper rate.

I said it was a good bill if a person happened to live in that fortunate area where the taxpayers of the Nation have spent millions and millions of dollars in the construction of hydroelectric dams and where that taxpayer is now going to not only see his tax money drained into that area, but will also see industry drained into that area because, if this bill passes, it provides a regional preference for all electric power, giving private industry in that area the same preference that public bodies have anywhere else in the United States, and it gives it to them at this subsidized rate of 2¼ mills.

The draining of industrial development from the balance of the United States into the Pacific Northwest could be overlooked, but the thing that cannot be overlooked insofar as the balance of the Nation is concerned is that this is the first great step in the complete destruction of the preference power privilege which has been the bulwark upon which foundation the great REA industry in America has been built. This is the Hiroshima of REA in America. This is the first slice that cuts the heart out of the existing preference laws, which preference laws have governed the sale of Federal electric power since first enacted in 1906.

I say it cuts the heart out of the preference clause because now every area and every river basin in the United States will be asking for the same privilege and the same rights and the same regional preference as is given in this law to the Pacific Northwest.

Even this, Mr. Chairman, could be tolerated if it were not for the fact that this preference privilege, which has been considered almost sacred down through the years, has been betrayed by those who profess to be its greatest friends, and by the organizations which most benefit through this preference law.

It was the Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, assisted by his Assistant Secretary of Interior Kenneth Holum, who dreamed up this dastardly area preference.

Not one hand was raised nor one stone was turned by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to prevent its passage. Where was Al Hauffe, president of NRECA, when hearings were being held on this violation of the preference law? Where was Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of NRECA, during all the time the hearings were being held in both the Senate and the House? Could it be that they were so busy fanning the flames of hatred against the nasty private power companies that they did not have time to know what was going on?

When hearings were being held in the House, I called on Al Hauffe, president of NRECA, to do what he and his association could do to block this abortive abrogation of the existing preference laws which will ultimately mean the complete abandonment of public preference in the United States. I discovered to my amazement that there are a number of REA cooperatives in Washington, Oregon, and the other States of the Columbia Basin, who threatened to withdraw their membership in NRECA if any action was taken which would prevent them from getting this regional power preference. Mr. Hauffe and Mr. Ellis apparently felt that they could not afford to lose these dues-paying members, and it would be cheaper in the long run to sacrifice the power preference protection of the rest of the cooperatives in the Nation, rather than to lose a few hundred dollars in membership fees each year.

Is that all the REA movement means to these officials of NRECA? Is that all they are interested in is dues-paying members so they can publish their monthly magazine and attend meetings all over the Nation at the expense of the local REA cooperative?

I call on the REA cooperatives all across the Nation to demand an accounting from these officials to find out why they stood idly by while the preference law is being violated. As an REA member and cooperative user, I demand that the associations across the Nation find out why Clyde Ellis and Al Hauffe refused to protect the REA's across the Nation from this abrogation of the preference rights, and I suggest that their resignation be demanded.

It cannot be said that this is a minor matter, so far as the preference right is concerned because, as was brought out in the hearings, the suspension of preference in the Pacific Northwest, covered by this bill, will apply to more than half of all the hydroelectric power produced by the United States in the entire country because more than one-half of the Nation's Federal power is generated in the Pacific Northwest. True, there have been some minor exceptions to the preference principle in the past, but by comparison, this exemption would make insignificant the other exceptions that have been made for a few individual projects.

In this legislation, Congress is asked to protect any and all who may now, or ever be, situated in this sanctuary in the Pacific Northwest whether such users are public or private so long as they are located within this power sanctuary.

This is the reason I oppose this bill. This is the reason I challenge the officials of NRECA. This is the reason I ask the member REA cooperatives across the Nation to demand the resignation of their officials who would deliberately stand by and watch the REA preference being washed down the drain rather than sacrifice a few paltry dollars in the form of dues from members who may be located in the sanctuary of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill and I am not equivocating about being opposed to it. In my opinion, if somebody had taken the Ten Commandments and written them out upside down and backwards, it just about would amount to this bill. I say that after a long, serious, hard study of it. The reason why we have the bill before us has been explained. They have this new transmission line technology which allows the transmission of electricity over greater distances than before. To the people up in the Pacific Northwest this simply means somebody else is now going to have a shot at their cheap Government power. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] explained to you, the chamber of commerce and almost everybody else in the Pacific Northwest is for this legislation. Of course. They are not going to go out and shoot Santa Claus. They are going to try to build a wall around the Pacific Northwest and keep other people from coming in and getting this power out.

So, in essence, in the beginning of this battle, when it started out a couple of legislative years ago, the forces of greed were fighting the forces of greed. The public power people outside of the Pacific Northwest were screaming against this legislation and the people in the Pacific Northwest were screaming for it. Under those circumstances, of course, public power forces were in considerable disarray and it was necessary for the people down in the Interior Department, who are interested in having all power of the Nation controlled from Washington, to do something to put them back together so that they can get a united front to get more appropriations out of this Congress for more public power generating facilities and for more public power transmission facilities. They did a pretty slick job of it here. They accomplished the maneuver by promising the people of the Pacific Northwest this bill, denying regional power preference to all others, then placating the nonpreferred they will get theirs in the form of new Federal generating plants and transmission lines financed out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Will the gentleman inform me, if this bill were not to become law, what is the reason why an intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest could not be built and the benefits which have been explained made available?

Mr. HOSMER. I will tell the gentleman the exact reason; because private power facilities would have to construct it in order to insulate the Pacific Northwest against preference customers outside the area. The Department of the Interior does not want private people to build these lines because, if they do, the private people are going to get a leg in the national power grid that is coming up and the bureaucrats in Washington will not be able to control it so easily. That is why we have this legislation before us.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, let us see how this scheme works. People in the Pacific Northwest say they want to have all the Bonneville power they can get, at one basic prime rate that has been in effect since 1939—since 1939—without one increase in power rates. In order to do that, they have put the gimmick in section 1 of this bill. Section 1 of this bill contains a bunch of definitions and if you are persistent enough you can get all the way through them. And this is what you find out. You find out that by law this Congress is defining Bonneville firm power as any power that anybody in the Pacific Northwest at any time, for the next 1,000 years, if it lasts that long, wants. The bill goes further to say something else—namely, anything else is dump power. It could be power as firm as the rock of Gibralter—but the law says it is dump power. Only that can be exported, and in exporting it, it must be sold at dump rates.

Mr. Chairman, they tell you that we are going to pick up $10 to $12 million annually for the Federal Government through this magnificent piece of legislation. Let me tell you this, if it were not for this piece of legislation, if we got them to do what they ought to do there, firm up the power the way it ought to be firmed up, we would be getting $100 million a year for the Federal Government. When you are voting "Yes" on this bill you are voting to keep that money out of the Federal Treasury; you are voting a legislative fiction as to what firm power and what dump power is. You are voting against all sanity in utility economics when you vote for this bill. That is the reason I make no bones about being against it.

The purpose of the bill, namely, keeping the mouths of the people of the Pacific Northwest, up to the Treasury, sucking out cheap kilowatts, could have been accomplished in other ways. The Federal Power Commissioners in the report on the bill quarreled with this legislation. They do not like it. They said that without all these inane consequences it involves, we could have given these people what they want merely by giving the Bonneville Administrator the power administratively to define some reasonable kind of a marketing area. Instead of that we have before us a gimmick that takes care of the cheap power users in the Pacific Northwest at the expense of everybody else, keeps everybody else from ever getting a shot at this power they help pay for since it is paid for by all the people of the United States. You give any industry, for all future time, that wants to go out to the Pacific Northwest and put in a big, costly, power-consuming plant—private industry, mind you now, say another paper company—the guarantee of access to this cheap public power over and above some public power user who happens to be just outside the borders of the Pacific Northwest.

You gentlemen who live in the Southern part of the country and who have your paper mills just realize that somebody is going to go out to the Pacific Northwest and take advantage of this cheap power that is legislated into law by Congress to make paper. Then that company is going to go, say, to Chicago and bid on a paper contract cheaper than your plant in the South can bid. It will get the contract. Your people are not going to get it because Congress today passed this bill.

We started out many, many years ago with this preference business—and perhaps then it was a good thing. Perhaps preference to public power bodies and cheap public power when the Pacific Northwest was in its swaddling clothes and you had to chop down a few trees to get from one small community to another, was good. Maybe it helped build up what is now a very modern, a very progressive part of the country. But let me tell you such a sure-win gimmick of decades ago may be the sure-lose gimmick in modern America, which interferes with, impedes and makes more costly the economic progress of this country. It is going to make necessary—because it defies modern day economics—untold billions of dollars of investment in added generating facilities so the American people can have the power they need as consumption of power increases. Confining these kilowatts up in the Pacific Northwest prevents proper pooling of power, which in turn imposes requirements for construction of facilities not otherwise needed. It is uneconomic in other ways, too. Oh, we can have some tie lines and we can transfer some dump power that can be cut off on a few days' notice. But we cannot now with this piece of legislation ever have a power pool for all the Pacific States and throw all of the generating facilities of all of these States of the West together, both hydro and through thermal and achieve the efficiencies permitted by modern technology. As the decade of the sixties progresses into the decade of the seventies and then on into the decade of the eighties—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, as we go into these periods ahead where the power requirements of this country double, my friends, double every decade, we are going to have this and probably other similar legislative obstructions based on this as a precedent, in the road of developing the power that the United States of America needs for its economy and, if you will, needs for its race for survival in a hostile world. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is in my opinion only one redeeming feature of this entire piece of legislation and that is the feature that was introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. I mentioned this national power grid that will surely come into being, even though it may, to an extent, be Balkanized by legislation such as this. I mentioned the desire and the greed of Federal bureaucrats to be the ones that build this grid, or at least control it, and become the force that hereby control the combined power resources of the Nation. They want to get their greedy hands on the Nation's kilowatts and in that way exercise a dictatorial control over the entire economy of the country. I have mentioned those.

Now, the present Secretary of the Interior wants to be able to get away with building a national power grid, these very costly transmission lines, to lace together the Nation without coming to the authorizing committees of Congress to do so. He just wants to be able to go down and some afternoon at a crowded Appropriations Committee hearing and get $100 million, $200 million, or $500 million, or whatever amount of millions of dollars he needs for this purpose. He does not want to stand the careful scrutiny of an authorizing committee to determine whether or not his lines are those lines that are going to be best for the country. The Westland amendment prevents this and we should retain it at all costs.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the inconsistency of the Department of the Interior on this subject is truly amazing. The Secretary wants to come only to the Appropriations Committee, get money, and build a vast tieline between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, to be followed by another, vaster, second tieline on the basis that these interconnect generation centers and load centers.

At one and the same time he also is planning to come to Congress with a multibillion-dollar program of dual-purpose atomic reactors for the production of both power and fresh water. The thing about these dual-purpose reactors is this: Although they may be needed, although they may be good, although they may be the finest way there is to satisfy requirements for both water and power—although I do not necessarily admit it—these dual-purpose reactors are going to have to be confined to certain locations in this country. The amount of polluted material that will come out of these plants, the polluted water, means you cannot put them inland; you have to put them on a seacoast somewhere where you can get rid of this polluted water. These dual-purpose reactors are planned at 5 million kilowatts capacity. They will be restricted in their location. They have to be near a salt water source and an ocean to dump pollutants in. They will entirely relocate the centers of power production in this country to new and different locations. Yet the Secretary of the Interior in his plans has not even mentioned this feature. He might ask Congress to build these expensive interties, up to a quarter billion dollars at a crack, in areas where within a decade the power consumption and power production centers would be so drastically altered that these lines would no longer serve a purpose. This could come about long before the lines were ever paid for by the power users.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to be able to beat this bill. In my opinion it is in all respects a bad bill. I have six amendments I am going to offer to this bill, and I do not expect them to be adopted because many will think they are too radical. One of them, for instance, would require that 10 percent be added on to these Bonneville rates and the money to be used to help the Treasury reduce the national debt. That is really a radical idea nowadays. These people who have not had a boost in their power bills since 1939 are not going to take kindly to asking them to pay 10 percent more even though others, since 1939 have accepted very much greater increases. That would be just too old frontierish to contemplate. I do not expect them to be adopted, but I hope offering them will at least prick the consciences of some.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, it is actually refreshing to hear the discussion of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] of this problem because for the first time this afternoon we get into a debate and have some conflicting opinions presented. It reminds me of the two farmhands who were working in the watermelon patch. One of them went to get a drink of water. The other one observed him stopping and talking to the boss. He asked him what his conversation with the boss was; what they were arguing about. The first fellow says, "The boss told me watermelons sure grow good in a sandy soil. I said 'They sure do,' and we just argued about that," he said.

That is what this debate has been—an argument over nothing—until the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] brought in his conflicting remarks. He started off by referring to the Ten Commandments and implying that the proponents had incorporated them into this bill. This reminds me of the soldier who heard the sermon in chapel on the Ten Commandments. He was rather shocked with the minister's comments on the subject of adultery and coveting your neighbor's maid servants and the other eight commandments. When he was outside he was heard to remark that at least he had not set up any graven images.

We have set up no graven images in this bill. All we have done in the process of preparing and presenting this bill to the Congress of the United States is precisely what the private utility companies in this Nation do.

They take a look at the demands and the needs of the area that they are to serve, and having once taken care of those needs, they look at the surplus power which they are able to produce, because every hydroelectric project, every steam project, indeed, from time to time will have the capacity to produce power which is not firm and they arrange to sell or exchange that surplus with a neighboring utility. Firm power is that power which can be guaranteed every minute of every day of every year. This power we are talking about selling here is power that cannot be guaranteed for a specific year.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. Just a moment and then I will answer the gentleman's question, because I think I know what his question is. The water available in the low-water year, which I think in this case was 1934, for all practical purposes this surplus power is firm in almost every instance. This bill likewise, of course, permits the sale as surplus power in California, or elsewhere outside the Pacific Northwest, of that power which cannot be consumed in the Northwest. To that extent there may be some power which is defined as firm power that can be sold outside the Northwest as surplus, but it is power for which there is no immediate need in the Northwest.

What we are talking about here, as the able chairmen of the committee and of the subcommittee have pointed out, is conservation. It is an absolute and unjustifiable waste to permit this power to cascade down the Columbia River into the Pacific Ocean and no use be made of it whatsoever, when that same water can be transformed into kilowatts and transmitted to California, where they have steam generation, where they already have the steam plants in existence to firm up this power and satisfy their needs.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] says the Pacific Northwest ought to construct steam plants to firm up their power, and we will do that some time, but it is an absolute waste to construct them in the Pacific Northwest when they exist in the Pacific Southwest and can be utilized on that basis.

Again I say to you that this is nothing more than what every private utility does. The private utilities in the Northwest have these interchange agreements with Bonneville right now. When the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] suggests the Federal Government is trying to keep the private power people from getting a leg into the national grid, this is not so, because they already have a leg into the power grid in the Northwest. They are completely integrated, private and public both.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman was speaking of the year 1936 or 1937, in which there were 5 months with an average situation where there was dump power. Will the gentleman admit to me that this power, even in an adverse water year, is transmitted to California, and it is dump power as far as the Northwest is concerned, when it becomes firmed up by the steam power in California, as far as the Pacific coast is concerned it becomes firm power?

Mr. DUNCAN. I knew what the gentleman's question was going to be when he stood up. But this surplus can be shipped out of the Northwest and there can be use for that because it is firmed up. What is wrong with this? It is desirable. It can be economically used by the people of California. This is not a bill just for the benefit of the Northwest. This sets up ground rules under which a natural resource in our area can be made available to the people of California. We want to sell it. They need it. Why should not this be done?

You say, "Why should you have the first call on it?" This is precisely what every private utility does. It is more economical to consume this power close to the source of production. This is where the power ought to be used first. While Mr. HOSMER will say Bonneville does not have a utility responsibility, and technically he is correct, it is also true that from a practical standpoint it has an analogous responsibility and the economy of the Pacific Northwest has grown up around this Bonneville Administration.

It has grown up around the power that has been made available. What will happen if you do not have these ground rules? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] suggested, if they had accepted the provisions of the private power proposal sometime ago, this bill would not be before us. But it would, because we are not talking here about who is going to construct an intertie. We are not talking here about who is going to construct some atomic powerplant sometime in the future. All we are talking about is this power and we are just setting up ground rules under which we can sell it and give some reasonable protection to the people of the Northwest. Yes, to the private utilities themselves and to the private industrial consumers. There is nothing insidious about the fact that we are selling power that can be interrupted or called back because there are reciprocal provisions here for an exchange of power from California, and California will enjoy these same privileges as they send power to the Northwest. This is as it should be.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. In the debate previously reference was made to the position of the Federal Power Commission. Is it not true that all five members of the Federal Power Commission support the objectives of this bill and the only point on which they differ was that four of them suggested certain administrative protection and one suggested another line, but that they are all in favor of this bill so far as the objective of the legislation is concerned? Is it not true that this legislation is supported by all the members of the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. DUNCAN. The chairman is absolutely right. What this really does is to permit the tying together of two great productive sections of this country—the Northwest and the Southwest and maximum utilization of steam generation that they have in California and hydroelectric generation that we have in the Northwest. There is no real philosophical public-private fight on that issue. That is all this bill is intended to do, as it was introduced. I happen to be one who believes there is room in this country for both the public power we have and the private power we have. As a result, you receive brickbats from both sides. But that fight is not involved here. It is to a certain extent in the Westland amendment, which I think is unwise, but I am going to support the bill even with it in here. The only philosophical question you have involved is that we have modified the preference clause. The preference clause gives public power, municipalities, and the PUD's the prior right to this power produced at Bonneville. We are modifying this. At the present time every public agency in the Northwest has a right to a preference over any private agency. But in my State, 85 percent of the power is supplied by private utilities now buying power from Bonneville and depending on it. There have been some industries that have grown up in the Northwest and some of them are buying power from Bonneville and have depended on that. As the law stands now, any public agency—take the city of Los Angeles, for example, which has a tremendous capacity to consume electricity—if they constructed a line to Bonneville and said, We want power—what would the result be? With their tremendous capacity and with that preference, they ultimately would be able to displace the power presently being utilized by the private utilities in the Northwest and by the industries in the Northwest. And then they would require the Northwest preferential customers to share on a pro rata basis. The result would be such a fragmentation of the available power that it would do no one any good. What we do is merely to preserve inviolate the rights of the presently existing power of the private people and the public people in the Northwest to have a prior call and to ship out the power that is not needed.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I would just like to say insofar as the gentleman is speaking of the power generated in southern California, it is limited to that number of kilowatts for which anybody has any use in the Pacific Northwest. If you could put all these kilowatts in one big pool, we would have enough for everybody, but that would involve a slight rise in rates for the Pacific Northwest. If the gentleman would want to have the benefit extended to everybody in the Western United States, I would hope he would accept the series of amendments that I will offer later to this bill that would accomplish that purpose.

Mr. DUNCAN. I welcome you inviting me to accept some of your positions on this question of public power because you have objected vociferously to the protection of the Pacific Northwest. I would like to say at this time, I am perfectly willing to accept the provisions of the bill which you have introduced, the Bridge Canyon bill, which as I recall gives to the public agencies in the three States of Arizona, California, your own State, and Nevada a preference to the power generated by that project to the exclusion of customers' preference or nonpreference outside of those States. I say to the Members that is the only thing we are trying to do here.

Mr. HOSMER. I want to say to the gentleman I do not expect that bill to pass.

Mr. DUNCAN. But the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has at least tacitly accepted the main point of this bill. He has tacitly accepted it by including the same provision in the Glen Canyon bill to which he has affixed his name and which is in here with him as a sponsor. If it is sound for Glen Canyon, it is likewise sound for the Northwest bill.

I urge the Members to vote for this bill.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee, this legislation is necessary whether the proposed transmission lines be Federal, non-Federal, or a combination thereof.

A private utility line used exclusively by the utility to serve customers on its own distribution system would create no preference rights in California. But the mere physical existence of that line would pose a problem to the Pacific Northwest unless legislation such as S. 1007 were enacted first.

If the private utility agreed to wheel power for a California public agency, the latter would have access to the Bonneville system and could assert its preference rights to power, not only surplus secondary, but firm power as well. Any protection for the Pacific Northwest in this arrangement would depend upon the whim of the private utility owning the line—would it or would it not wheel for a public agency in California?

There is an even more serious possibility. A California public agency could condemn the line, or it could condemn the right to use a portion of the capacity of the line, which would be a much less expensive procedure. In either event, it would have access to the BPA system and could assert its preference.

Still another possibility could result from the stated intent of the California utilities to share the benefits of Pacific Northwest surplus power equitably with the public agencies of California which are in a position to utilize that power advantageously. The public agencies could assert a preference based on their rights as third-party beneficiaries to the contract between the Bonneville Power Administration and the California private utilities. A court could well look through the form of the transaction to its substance, and hold that it was in reality a direct sale by BPA to the California public agencies with the power being wheeled by the California private utilities.

This is why this legislation is necessary regardless of whether the intertie facilities be Federal, non-Federal, or partly each. Any intertie facility, regardless of ownership, creates essentially the same problem. That is why many of us who are opposed to all Federal construction of the coming intertie between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest fully support this legislation. We do not want to expose the Pacific Northwest to the economic chaos that would result if preference agencies outside the region were to take power away from the industries in the Northwest which have made large investments in reliance upon it.

May I say further that while the Secretary of the Interior and I disagree over whether the Federal Government should build the entire Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie facilities, we do see eye to eye on the fact that this legislation is needed, no matter who builds the facilities. At several points in the House hearings on S. 1007 he was asked about the relationship of this bill to Federal construction, and he made clear repeatedly that the special circumstances relating to power supply in the Northwest requires that legislation of this type be enacted whether the lines be Federal, non-Federal, or partly each.

It is enabling legislation only in the sense that it will enable the Pacific Northwest to dispose of—over either public or private lines—large quantities of power now going to waste without endangering the region's own firm power resources; and that it will enable public and private utilities in the Pacific Southwest to share the Northwest's surplus without serious damage to the economy of the Northwest.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill would limit the area in which the Bonneville Power Administration could sell its firm power, and would establish rules under which it could dispose of its surplus power to customers outside that area.

As the report states, a carefully defined service area is essential to good management of any utility system. Private power systems are based on this premise. So should Federal power systems.

Many of the opponents of this bill do not oppose its objectives. They differ from the proponents chiefly over the manner in which the objectives should be achieved. An illustration may be found in one of the supplemental or additional views contained in the report on the bill.

The minority report quotes Mr. Joseph Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, as recommending that the Bonneville Power Administration define its own marketing area under existing law. The chief difference between Mr. Swidler and sponsors and proponents of this legislation is that Mr. Swidler believes that BPA should establish its own marketing area, while we believe the Congress should do so. Even the minority report concurs that "if the marketing area is to be extended, Congress itself should do this."

While Mr. Swidler is, in principle, against regional preferences, he recognizes the special circumstances involved in this bill and the impossibility of Bonneville attempting to serve loads in a distant area at the expense of customers in the Pacific Northwest. In his 1962 testimony he stated:

> I am far from saying that I think it would make sense for Bonneville to have a market area that was scattered all over the West, and I am far from saying that from a national point of view it would necessarily make sense that industrial loads established on the basis of the attraction of low-cost power should be under imminent hazard of having that power interrupted.
>
> I think that there would be much to say for looking at this question as one of establishing a compact, workable, businesslike marketing area, but this would not be governed by questions of State lines, but, rather, by economic and business considerations.
>
> You might well arrive, Senator, at an area that would not be very much different from the Northwest area defined in the bill; I do not know.
>
> Certainly you can see that if Bonneville has to take responsibility for the power requirements of municipalities located many hundreds of miles from its headquarters, many hundreds of miles from its source of supply, that it would have a very difficult operating problem.
>
> I say this, Senator, on the basis of long experience with TVA. (Senate hearings on S. 3153, 87th Cong., 2 sess., p. 43.)

In the report of the FPC on the pending bill, Mr. Swidler further stated, in part:

> The Federal Power Commission fully recognizes the problems which have led to the introduction of this legislation and shares in the desire for their early resolution. We are thus aware of the dangers both to the existing and potential users of power in the Pacific Northwest and to the Federal marketing system itself, if by the process of extending transmission lines into new areas * * * the Bonneville system becomes liable for the continuance of firm service to the preference customers in the new region. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the real and mutual benefits of interconnecting the power grids of the two Pacific areas can only be achieved if it is not secured at the expense of the ability of the Bonneville system to continue to give primary attention to its present service area.
>
> Our difficulties with the present proposal lie not with its objectives but with the means by which they would be accomplished.

As I said at the outset, the difference between Mr. Swidler and those of us who support this bill is that he would have BPA do administratively what we believe Congress should do legislatively. If Congress fails to act affirmatively, we will be inviting action by administrative fiat.

I urge the House to approve the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is important not only to Oregon and the Northwest but to the Western States. The bill guarantees electric consumers of the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at the Federal plants in that region. The original bill, S. 1007, passed the Senate last July. The House bill now before us amends the Senate bill to require prior authorization by Congress before the proposed interconnecting transmission lines can be constructed. I think the Westland amendment added in the House Interior Committee by a narrow margin is an unfortunate one. If given the opportunity, I would vote against this amendment. However, I believe passage of the legislation is so urgent and immediate that the bill should be approved so that we can work with the Senate on a reasonable compromise.

The job is to provide a sounder and more prosperous economy in the Pacific Northwest and California.

Hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest is generated at installations along the Columbia River.

The Bonneville Power Administration, Mr. Chairman, last year enjoyed a deserved 25th anniversary. BPA, serving an area of 220,000 square miles and more than 5 million persons, markets nearly 60 percent of all power generated in Oregon, Washington, northern Idaho and Montana, west of the Continental Divide. Private and public power agencies both purchase this power.

Bonneville Power is undeniably credited with supplying the energy power for a remarkable economic development in the Pacific Northwest since its establishment. BPA's birth inaugurated the industrial development of the Pacific Northwest from primarily a farming-lumbering-mining-fishing economy. Bonneville's low-cost energy power now serves 14 electro-process industries with 18 industrial plants representing a gross investment of nearly $400 million.

Firms among these industries account for almost one-third of the aluminum ingot production in the United States. These industries pay to State and local government taxes in the amount of $5 to $7 million yearly.

Low-cost BPA power, distributed through public and private agencies, has led to electrification of more than 99 percent of the farms in the Pacific Northwest.

As one section of the country is strengthened economically, the entire country is strengthened.

In dedicating the Oahe Dam in South Dakota last year, President Kennedy declared that:

> If public and private interests veto each other's progress, or if one region refuses to permit another to share in its abundance—then we shall be entering a decade of challenge and crises with an inexcusable vulnerable attitude of waste.

Last year, Bonneville "dump" power was valued at $33 million.

Now what would happen if a hydroelectric power intertie is constructed, linking the Pacific Northwest and California, and the bill before us does not pass?

Well, under present law, if a public utility in the Pacific Southwest has access to Pacific Northwest power—as it would over an intertie—it could demand and receive power generated in the Northwest ahead of the private utilities and industries of the Pacific Northwest. Thus an intertie, without regional preference, poses a hazard.

In step with such population growth statistics as I have just cited, the long-range power needs of the Pacific Northwest must be protected. The energy base of the Northwest is hydroelectric power; many industries, some defense industries, are dependent on the continuation of low-cost power supply.

May I repeat, a prosperous Northwest economy means prosperity to the West and to the Nation in these days of an indisputably interdependent national economy.

Bonneville, with a plant investment of more than $500 million with an annual payroll of about $16 million for its 2,300 employees, stand today at another crossroad of development.

In the next 25 years, the Pacific Northwest population will nearly double from its present figure of 5.5 million persons. This means that perhaps as many as 3.6 million manufacturing and service industry jobs will have to be provided.

The Bonneville administration should be afforded the legislative latitude to widen its markets and sell its surplus "dump" power. Based on its past and present accomplishments and its potential, Bonneville, under the very effective and forward-looking leadership of its Administrator, Charles F. Luce, deserves the support of Congress and the American people.

In brief, the continuation of low-cost power is dependent upon BPA's being able to sell its surplus "dump" power that accrues during certain months of the year. It cannot sell it unless it has access to markets through such developments as an intertie to California. In so doing, the Pacific Northwest private and public customers should have protection so that they will be assured of a reliable share within the total power allocation of Bonneville.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I had not proposed to say anything on this bill until after listening to the debates. I do not think anybody has really told you what is in this bill. Let us get down to the brass tacks of what is involved in this particular bill. In the first place, you are attempting to bail out the Bonneville Power people who are now losing at the rate of $18 million a year. This is one, supposedly, of the fine projects out there that are going to pay off all of the money they get from the Federal Treasury. Yet it is losing at the rate of $18 million a year. Now, what do they propose to do here? They propose to change the rules right in the middle of the game and increase the marketing area of the Bonneville Power people. What is it going to cost us? Do not kid yourself, do not be misled; this bill would not be a good bill at all unless the Westland amendment were in there that gives us a little bit of protection. I tried to find out in committee what the cost of these interties would be, if built. Secretary Udall, after twisting and turning and saying that the Interior Committee that was authorizing this bill did not need to have him explain how much it was going to cost, that he would explain how much this was going to cost when he got before the Appropriations Committee, started off with $24 million. That is all he is asking you now, but he admitted that what he proposed to build, asking for $24 million, would cost $90 million.

Mr. Luce, director of the Bonneville power project, finally admitted that what they proposed to do, if they went through with this, would cost $183 million.

That is all there is here. You are either prepared to spend this money—and I do not know, I am just hoping that the amendment that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] has put in here, will give some private enterprise out there an opportunity to get in on this boondoggling scheme, because that is what it is.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, the only good thing about this sorry situation is to be found in the amendment added in the House Interior Committee that will require the Secretary of the Interior to get congressional authorization before he can construct any lines to market power sold under the terms of S. 1007.

This is the amendment—new section 8—that was presented by Congressman WESTLAND. It is a good amendment. It makes sense. It retains in the hands of Congress, not some bureaucratic empire builders, control over the Federal power program. It provides that presently unanswered questions be resolved before the Federal Government can seek to expend many millions of dollars. It does not prohibit anything; it just requires a little proof before the Government is allowed to build electric lines to unknown places, at unknown costs, to serve unknown customers, with unknown effects on existing and proposed reclamation projects in the West.

Although I oppose this bill even with the amendment, I am frank to admit that it is this provision which may be its saving grace. Without the Westland amendment the bill would not only distort the preference laws, it would also be an abrogation of congressional responsibility and would be absolutely unacceptable.

Why do opponents of the Westland amendment insist that this project—the Bonneville-California intertie—bypass congressional approval? Why do they demand that Congress abdicate its constitutional authority? Why do they seek so desperately to rationalize a reason for such action?

The Westland amendment provides for nothing more drastic than congressional review and approval before millions—literally hundreds of millions—of dollars of public money are spent on a project of which we so far know next to nothing. What is so intolerable about that? Is it intolerable for the Congress, and especially this House, to perform its function of authorizing public works?

Just how devious is this plan, that it cannot stand the light of scrutiny by this Congress? I submit that the very clamor against this amendment is the strongest argument in its favor. The amendment's opponents apparently realize that this Federal power proposal will not stand close scrutiny. There are so many loose ends, so many unanswered questions about the project at this time that to approve this bill without the Westland amendment would be a grave failure of our responsibility to the people.

There is ample precedent for this amendment. The amendment commends itself so strongly to my sense of what is reasonable that I would favor it, precedent or no—but there is precedent. Much of it is recent. In June this House passed three bills, and in July another, all containing provisions similar in principle to that of the Westland amendment—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11196. Bills referred to in the text as embodying the same principle are H.R. 7139, atomic energy authorization bill, passed by the House July 8, 1963; H.R. 79, Coast Guard facilities bill, June 21; H.R. 6016, Missouri basin authorization bill, June 24; H.R. 4347, veterans' hospital bill, June 19.

Similarly, just last week we adopted the Broomfield amendment to the foreign aid bill requiring congressional authorization for expenditures exceeding $100 million. This same test is applicable in the present case where the contemplated transmission lines will cost well in excess of that figure. So much for the precedent.

Now, it seems clear to me that no individual or private firm responsible for spending a large sum of money—to buy a home, say, or a business—would be anything but pleased at having a second chance to go over the details before being committed to the expenditure. Yet here we find men saying of an infinitely more expensive proposal, and an extremely vague one, that it needs no second look. Indeed, they do not want anyone to get a clear first look. This is insupportable. We must have the second look that the Westland amendment will provide. In this case, in fact, so little information has been supplied that it would hardly be a second look, but almost a first. All the more necessity for the amendment. We shall fail in our responsibility to the public if we fail to adopt it. We shall allow the Secretary of the Interior to usurp the constitutional function of this Congress, if we fail to adopt it.

Interestingly, and most inconsistently, in endorsing another piece of legislation, the Secretary of the Interior has recently commenced to shed great crocodile tears about the possible adverse effect on the central Arizona project of the existing licensing power of the Federal Power Commission. In a letter of July 1, 1963, endorsing S. 502, a bill "to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam," the Secretary recommends enactment. The effect of such enactment would be to deprive the Federal Power Commission of its power to license projects in the area, while the Interior Department justifies to Congress a project of its own.

The Secretary considers S. 502 good legislation. He states that "it is essential that Congress not be deprived of full freedom of action when it considers basic issues of Lower Colorado River Basin water development." Well, who is anti now?

I shall not pass on the merits or lack of merits of S. 502. However, I wholeheartedly agree with the principle propounded by the Secretary—namely, that Congress should retain its full freedom of action in such matters.

This principle—that Congress should retain its full freedom of action is the basis for the Westland amendment. It is sound. I commend the Secretary for recognizing the principle; it is too bad that he fails to recognize its application in this case. Perhaps the difference lies in the fact that in one instance he may gain some power (S. 502), while in the other he contends he would lose some power.

I do not believe our decision should turn on an approach that appears to be based on the old principle of "whose ox is being gored." Rather, I believe we should look out for the people of this land—and that means exercising a close scrutiny over the construction of multimillion-dollar facilities. The Westland amendment gives us a chance to exercise this scrutiny without being anti anything—except perhaps a little overambitiousness on the part of the Interior Department.

So, if this bill is to be passed by the House, let us be sure to retain the Westland amendment.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, this regional preference bill before us today is typical of much of the legislation we have had to deal with in the last couple of years. It is what you might call schizophrenic legislation. It is not really what it seems to be. It appears to be intended to do one thing when in reality it will do another thing. Fortunately, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs saw through this subterfuge and adopted an amendment that went straight to the heart of the deception that would otherwise have been perpetrated on the American public. I refer to the Westland amendment which requires that:

> No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by Congress.

Without this amendment this bill would be completely unacceptable. Consider its contradictions.

It is said to be in the public interest but it would geographically circumscribe that so-called public interest to one section of the country so that in reality it becomes a special interest bill.

It is advocated as being to the economic advantage of the Nation yet it opens the door for hundreds of millions of dollars of spending of the most questionable kind.

While it is held up as the best answer for solving the financial problems of an operation that cost the country $17 million in 1962 and has cost us a total of $60 million over the last 5 years, it completely ignores the true cause of this economic failure which is refusal to charge a price for electricity that covers all the costs of providing that service.

If the bill is not what its supporters claim it is, what then is it? Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Stewart Udall, gives us the answer. On March 29 he issued a press release in which he said:

> The proposed legislation is considered a key element in pending plans to build a Federal high-voltage intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest.

Other supporters of the bill have said much the same thing. Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to describe the bill another way. I would describe it as a high flier in high voltage with an ante of as much as $350 million to find out if we are holding any cards. Now the Westland amendment recognizes this and it puts some insurance into the game to the extent that it says in effect, let us take a good look at our cards before we put up this ante which could run to $350 million.

Last week this body debated the foreign aid authorization bill and we trimmed $585 million from that measure. What we did in that case very closely parallels what the Westland amendment proposes to do in this regional preference bill. My colleagues will recall that we adopted an amendment with respect to the Bokaro steel plant in India. That amendment would require specific authorization for oversea productive enterprises in which total U.S. assistance reaches $100 million or more. In short, this Congress was after the same kind of insurance which is now proposed for the regional preference bill. The amendment merely proposed that if we are going to shove a big stack of Uncle Sam's chips into the pot, let us at least be in the position where we can look at our cards first, so that we know what we are betting on. The Congress has adopted the same policy this year in respect to other authorizations for appropriations.

The author of the amendment made a remark that is most applicable to the present legislation. He said, "What we do not know about Bokaro far outweighs what we do know."

This is equally true of the multimillion-dollar transmission line Mr. Udall's Department would like to build in the Pacific Northwest. What we do not know about it far outweighs what we do know.

What do we know about this proposed Federal transmission line? We know it will be big and we know that it will cost the Nation plenty. We know that it is a first step and that is about all we do know. We do not know where that second step will take us.

We do not know whether the Federal Government really has to build this line. There are several alternative offers to do the job, all of which would avoid the spending of a possible $350 million.

We do not know, assuming the Federal Government builds the line, exactly what route it will take, whether it will pass through one State or several States.

We do not know where the southern terminus of the line will be, whether it will be Los Angeles, Hoover Dam, or Phoenix.

We do not know what market is proposed to be served by such a line. The logical market is Los Angeles but Los Angeles has said it will buy its power from other sources. The Secretary of Interior has advised the committee that as yet he has not made a decision as to the most feasible and economical plan for interconnecting the two areas.

We do not even know if the line, as talked about by the Department of Interior, will work. The Department says it wants a direct current line. But at the proposed 750 kilovolts capacity and approximately 800-mile length, the line will be strictly experimental because nowhere else in the world has such an overhead line been operated successfully to provide needed experience. A high-capacity direct current overhead line built by the Russians is giving them trouble. The only other operational direct current lines are of lesser capacity and justified largely because of their application to the specialized field of underwater transmission.

We do not know what effect an outage on a direct current line will have on the alternating current systems of the utilities to which it will be connected.

We do not know what the cost of transmission over a direct current line will be because we have no experience. According to report No. 16 of the Federal Power Commission's National Power Survey, such transmission costs at the distance contemplated here could run to as much as 3 mills a kilowatt-hour, and as most of my colleagues are aware, that will be more than the present price of Bonneville power.

With all these things we do not know, it must be obvious that we cannot possibly know whether this line, if federally built, will be economically feasible. Surely, it is reasonable to propose, as the Westland amendment proposes, that we be in a position to look at our cards before we place a bet.

Mr. Chairman, I say again that this bill is quite unacceptable without the Westland amendment. It would give the Department of Interior carte blanche to play around with millions of dollars of taxpayers' money and we in Congress who are charged with the responsibility of making sure that these funds are spent wisely would not have the faintest idea of what we would be gambling our constituents' money on. All that the Westland amendment proposes is to give us the opportunity to take another look at this transmission line to be sure it is economically justified and to get all the facts before we make the plunge. It may prove to be a good investment for the Nation but on the basis of the present record how can anyone possibly be sure?

If this proposed line is going to be as good as its supporters claim, then surely they should be willing to prove it with some solid facts to the committees of Congress. The possible cost to the country is far too great to take the casual and haphazard approach that will be forced on us if we approve this legislation without the Westland amendment.

In supporting this Westland amendment I do so knowing that it is the only thing that makes this legislation acceptable, and I do so knowing that I need not be ashamed to face my constituents and tell them that I fought to give Congress the right to take a good hard look before committing the Nation to a possibly needless and wasteful expenditure of $350 million. I hope this House in its wisdom will retain the Westland amendment.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of replying to the comments of the gentleman from Florida indicating that the Bonneville Power Administration is in the hole, is losing $18 million. It is true that Bonneville for the past 5 years has been running in the red, but it is equally true that the Bonneville Power Administration is current in its payments to the Federal Government for the loans that have been made. It is equally true that had these transmission lines been in effect, which we hope this legislation will authorize, that deficit would not have occurred and Bonneville Power Administration would have been in the black for all of those years.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my friend from Washington on his statement which I know to be a correct statement. I wish to say this, that basically I want to compliment the committee on its bill. I am generally for it. Of course, I have some very strong reservations on the amendment. I will say that it is my understanding that a credit of some $80 million has been accumulated by Bonneville and that figure, due to this constant running in the red for the past several years is now down to something like $20 million.

Although we would like to buy power in California, and I think this will tend to help us, at the same time we are helping the Pacific Northwest. So, I think it works favorably to both of us. I would hope that it would not be indicated as being simply a one-way street.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to propound a few questions.

I have listened carefully to the debate. I am convinced that this bill will work to the substantial advantage of the Pacific Northwest. If I were representing a district in the Pacific Northwest, I would be in here fighting vigorously for this bill. But since I do not come from the Pacific Northwest but come from another section of the country which helped put up the money to build this power potential, I would like for some member of the committee to explain to me the justification for reserving this power to the Pacific Northwest and not permitting power users in other sections of the United States to derive some of the benefits of this cheap power. I am asking this question in good faith and would like some answers which would indicate why I should vote for a bill that is so preferential in its treatment to one section of the country.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman's reputation in the 11 years that he has been in Congress has always been one of watching the national purse. The gentleman has served on the Committee on Appropriations all these years and I have observed the gentleman's work in trying to bring more income into the Federal Treasury in order to try to have a balanced budget.

In the first instance the gentleman has heard other speakers here and myself state that if this legislation is passed and an intertie built, which we hope it will be, that it will bring into the Treasury approximately $20 million a year. For that reason, I believe the gentleman from North Carolina, even though he may not be directly affected or his State may not be directly benefited from this measure, would support the legislation.

Second, this legislation, if passed, will assist neighboring States in obtaining power and in obtaining this surplus power which now is being wasted into the Pacific Ocean from the Columbia River. I think based upon the fact that this is a conservation measure, the gentleman can support the leigslation.

Third, while the people from the good State of North Carolina chipped in some money to help build these dams, starting with Grand Coulee, yet they are being paid back for those funds and they are being paid back with interest, I might add.

I think for those reasons the gentleman from North Carolina can find it in his heart to support this legislation.

Mr. JONAS. I thank my friend from Washington for his explanation.

I would like to make it clear that I do not anticipate that the power users of North Carolina will ever have an opportunity to use any of this power. I am interested in the Pacific Northwest and wish it well, but I am equally interested in the growth and development of sections of our country not included in the Pacific Northwest as defined in this legislation. I want to be sure that I am being fair to adjacent areas before I vote for this bill. Therefore, I am seeking answers to these questions. I notice that the surplus power available for sale outside the Pacific Northwest is to be delivered only on a provisional basis and with it clearly understood that the people contracting for it will have to be in a position to release it when required to fill the needs of customers in the preferred area. I would like some further explanation as to why the people of the Pacific Northwest should have any preferred claim for this power, as against people who live adjacent thereto.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think I would be less than candid if I said any section of the country in which a dam is constructed does not feel quite naturally some proprietary interest in the power which comes from that dam. But, basically, the answer to the gentleman's question is this: There is nothing insidious nor sneaky about the fact that this power will be sold on a callback basis. This is perfectly understood by California and if California sends power back to the Northwest it is likewise on a callback basis because there is a reciprocal provision contained herein.

When this power is sold as surplus power it means the purchaser has the right to say, "no, we do not want any power for this particular period," and they do not have to pay for it. They do not have to buy it when there is a sufficiency of power in the Northwest. It is sold back to the Northwest under the same type of provision.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman from Oregon permit me to ask this question—and I am trying to satisfy myself. I understand the proprietary interest argument. But why should you deny power to sections of States east of the Continental Divide? Why is the area defined in the bill as the "Pacific Northwest" entitled to all of it?

Mr. DUNCAN. It is a question of the capacity of the Columbia River Basin to produce power, and to the extent we are able to produce power to serve everyone with this capacity, that is done under the bill. There is nothing in the bill that says that this power has to go to California. It is in terms of export out of the Northwest. We are trying to make this power available to other sections of the country under reasonable rules. That is all we are trying to do. Basically the same rules are applied when any private company enters into an agreement for sale outside its area.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. On this so-called reciprocity: The power that might come from the Pacific Northwest is power that is surplus capacity, in the sense that the new thermo plants have been put in and all of the local use of that is not taken up, in the sense that the exported power from the Pacific Northwest is power that comes out of facilities that are already paid for or already in the process of being built by the Federal Government, something entirely different. That power can be interrupted by the Pacific Northwest from leaving its borders merely by the Pacific Northwest having another use for it. If somebody comes in at any time in the future and wants to put in more light bulbs or a plant, they automatically chop it off from what I would regard to be more worthy purchasers outside the area, at least, in a legalistic sense. Purchasers are now being defined in the bill as having a preference, and they are public bodies and private plants, and the Northwest is going to pull it back. It depends on what they want to use it for. There is no quota, it is use. They can get more and more as time goes on.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If you begin with the premise when you are producing hydroelectric power you are producing it from the flow of water, if that water goes on down to the ocean it is lost. You have facilities on the Columbia River to produce this power. The sale of that power is going to be necessary to pay out the Bonneville program. Why not make it available to other people in the United States? This bill does one thing: It says all those people in private enterprise, and the gentleman from North Carolina is one of its stanchest advocates, people who invest their money in the Northwest, if this power is exported out of the Northwest we will see that your needs are taken care of first, because you have invested your money there. Otherwise let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina if that power that went out of the Northwest to public preference customers in California, Nevada or any place else, could not be recovered for the free enterprise people in the Northwest, it would be lost forever because they are covered by the original preference clause.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I very seldom enter into debate on these very complicated power bills, but I am forced to in this case because some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle have taken my name in vain.

At the bottom of page 38 of the committee report and at the top of page 39 they used an argument I made on section 107 of the atomic energy bill to substantiate a position in support of the Westland amendment. I want to make it very plain I am going to support the bill the committee has brought out. If I get a chance I will vote against the Westland amendment.

I want to explain to those within the sound of my voice that the argument that I made on section 107 of the atomic energy authorization bill was for an entirely different purpose than the objective of the Westland amendment. The argument that I made was to establish authorization power in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy over the major section of the bill on which the Atomic Energy Committee did not have the power of authorization. The Westland amendment is for an entirely different purpose. The Westland amendment is to take away from the Secretary of the Interior power which he now has to outline a marketing area. So the argument that I have used for one purpose cannot be twisted by my friends over on the Republican side of the aisle to support a position which is expedient for them to use to buttress their present position. I want those that read this RECORD to know that I am supporting the bill and that I am against the Westland amendment, and that the very clever use of an argument I made for one purpose to sustain a position of theirs to support the Westland amendment is a very clever bit of byplay. I understand that. I am not angry. I understand the strategy involved in using it. Nevertheless, I want the people on my side of the aisle to know where I stand on this bill.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of this bill conflicts with my long-standing position against the preference clause. I am deeply concerned over this proposed creation of a special preference within a preference.

From my reading of the Interior Committee's report on this measure, it seems abundantly clear that enactment of this bill would be just a first step toward construction of major interties between the Northwest and California. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have watched with mounting apprehension the mushrooming of Federal spending. Particularly, I am increasingly disturbed at the tendency toward loose interpretation of spending authority. It has been gratifying, however, to see the House this year take several actions to insist on specific authorization as a preliminary to appropriation. The Interior Committee report on S. 1007, the bill now before us, lucidly presents these actions as they affect the Missouri River Basin project, the Coast Guard, and AEC.

I find myself in complete agreement with the 14 members of the House Interior Committee who regard the Westland amendment as the only redeeming feature of this bill. Without this retention of policy control in the hands of the Congress, the bill would be totally objectionable. I urge the House to keep the Westland amendment in the bill if it is to be passed, and to stanchly insist on its retention in conference with the Senate.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise at this point to express my opposition to the bill under consideration, S. 1007, specifically because of an unauthorized amendment included by the committee. This amendment originally proposed in the committee by my colleague, Representative JACK WESTLAND, of Washington, provides that:

> No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this Act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by the Congress.

My opposition to the amendment is based on the following grounds:

First. The amendment is not germane to the subject matter of S. 1007. This bill is designed to define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration and to establish ground rules for transfers of power between that marketing area and other regions. Such standards are considered a prerequisite to operation of any intertie—Federal or non-Federal. S. 1007 as referred to the committee did not address itself to the questions of who, why, when, where, and how an intertie might be built, but simply sought to insure that an intertie would receive the fullest practical use with proper protection for all parties—no matter who actually constructed the facility. This type of working agreement, frequently handled on a contractual basis, is an essential part of all major electrical interconnections—public or private—between systems or regions throughout the United States. Creation of the arrangement proposed in S. 1007 as introduced in no way prejudiced the case for Federal or non-Federal ownership of an intertie. As submitted by its sponsors, S. 1007 was completely neutral on this subject.

Second. No hearings were held on the amendment. In fact, the amendment was not considered in the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which had responsibility for reviewing the legislation and reporting it to the full committee, but was offered only after the completion of subcommittee action. No testimony was taken and no reports from interested Federal agencies were received. Thus, the committee did not have the benefit of information from witnesses either inside or outside the Federal Government as to what the impact of the amendment would be, and action was taken in a vacuum with respect to the detailed views of interested parties. There was no opportunity to consider adequately the questions raised by the amendment.

Third. S. 1007 as introduced is not a proposal without controversy, as is indicated by the minority views. The amendment introduces a nonrelevant element which blurs the issues and prohibits a clearcut congressional decision on the merits of the original bill. If a proposal such as the amendment is to be considered by Congress, it should be the subject of separate legislation with a decision made only after full hearings with adequate notice.

Fourth. The amendment constitutes a deauthorization act. Ample authority for construction of transmission facilities required to effectively, efficiently and fairly market and interchange power produced at Federal dams in the Northwest has been granted previously by Congress. In fact, a prime reason for the existence of S. 1007 is recognition of existing law which not only authorizes but directs the Bonneville Power Administration to perform this function. Section 2(b) of the Bonneville Act provides:

> In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups, the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide, construct, operate, maintain and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project to existing and potential markets, and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed.

There are no statutory geographical limitations on the exercise of this authority; the only restriction is that of economic transmission distance. It is precisely for this reason that legislation to define the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area was introduced in the 87th Congress and again in the current Congress.

Other statutes under which the Secretary markets power from projects in both the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest, including but not limited to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, provide additional and alternative authority for the construction of the lines. The Flood Control Act provision expressly authorizes the construction of transmission lines for marketing power generated at projects. The Reclamation Project Act provision impliedly authorizes such construction as a necessary requirement for marketing power.

Statutes relating to particular projects provide further authority. For example, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1937 reauthorizing the Central Valley project, with particular reference to transmission lines, is authority for the construction of an interconnecting line between the Pacific Northwest and the San Francisco Bay area via California's Central Valley, if at some time in the future the transmission should be necessary to the project. At the present time the project output is already under contract. Similarly the act of 1935 reauthorizing Parker Dam on the Colorado River provides additional authority for the construction of an intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Los Angeles region via the Nevada route, if such transmission should become necessary to that project. That same act of 1935 also reauthorizes Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River. The proposed transmission lines by either route are therefore also authorized under that act as "incidental works necessary" to that project.

It should also be noted that section 14 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 authorizes the Secretary to enter into contracts for exchange of power if in his judgment such exchange is "necessary and in the interests of the United States and the project." It follows that the Secretary would be authorized to construct the transmission facilities necessary to effect such an exchange.

While the Bonneville Project Act speaks in terms of authorizations to the Administrator, it also provides that all functions vested in the Administrator may be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior. In addition, Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950 transferred the functions of the Administrator to the Secretary. It further authorized the Secretary to permit any agency in the Department of the Interior to carry them out. For example, he could designate either the Bonneville Power Administration or the Bureau of Reclamation as the agency to construct, operate, and maintain the entire line, or he could divide the function by having the Bonneville Power Administration construct, operate, and maintain that portion of the line north of the Oregon-California border and the Bureau of Reclamation that portion south of the California border.

Congress has already given express recognition of the existence of legislative authorization for a Federal intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest. Last year Congress appropriated for the fiscal year 1963 $300,000 for preliminary engineering, reconnaissance surveys, economic analysis and negotiations with public and private utilities interested in a coordinated plan for power interchange between the two regions.

The amendment represents nullification of existing laws which now provide full authority in the Secretary of the Interior to construct such lines. If existing law is to be changed, it should be in accordance with normal legislative procedures instead of through the device of tacking on an amendment to S. 1007.

Fifth. Despite the existence of legislative authorization, no Federal intertie can be built without further congressional approval—even without the amendment. Congress will have full opportunity to consider the merits of such a transmission line. The administration has submitted to Congress a budget request of $25.5 million for implementation of an interconnection plan in cooperation with private power companies, State and local public agencies and rural electric cooperatives. Justification for this proposal has been presented to the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The entire matter will be open to extensive floor debate and possible amendment when the public works appropriation bill is presented in the House of Representatives and the Senate. No Federal intertie of any kind can be built without the express endorsement of needed funds by Congress.

Sixth. The amendment is discriminatory against States outside but adjoining those of the Northwest. It requires specific authorization only for lines outside the Northwest, leaving intact existing authorizations in that area. If the principle embodied in the amendment is good, consistency requires that it be applied throughout the entire affected area. Why should California, Nevada, and part of Montana be singled out for special treatment?

Seventh. The amendment is prejudicial to Federal construction of an intertie but favors non-Federal development. While the amendment prohibits construction of Federal lines outside the Northwest for the purpose of selling surplus energy and capacity of interchanging power, no restriction is placed on the Administration regarding arrangements with non-Federal parties who might seek to build such an interconnection. Yet such an agreement could represent a substantial financial commitment on the part of the Federal Government and might not necessarily be in the best interests of the taxpayers or the ratepayers. Congress has not yet had a chance to consider the merits of either current Federal or non-Federal proposals. Although testimony has been taken by the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations from various witnesses proposing non-Federal alternatives, the findings have not yet been reported to the Congress. The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held lengthy hearings on S. 1007 but not on proposals to construct an intertie. If it is proposed to legislate on the subject of an intertie in S. 1007, it should be done in an even-handed fashion.

The result of passage of the amendment will be to assist the California Power Pool. Since the amendment would preclude timely construction by the Federal Government, and reportedly no entity other than California Power Pool proposes lines terminating in its service area, public agencies would be forced to accept the California Power Pool's offer to buy Northwest surplus and to resell it to public agencies, thus preserving full control by the California Power Pool. In effect, the amendment constitutes special legislation for the aid and comfort of the California Power Pool.

There is no doubt that control rests in the hands of the entity which owns the transmission lines. Ralph M. Davis, president of Puget Sound Power & Light Co., in commenting on the proposed Northwest-Southwest intertie, is quoted in the June 14, 1963 edition of the Wall Street Journal as follows:

> Whoever controls transmission lines these days controls the works.

Mr. Davis was preeminently right. The "works" in this case would be the multimillion dollar Bonneville Power Administration power system.

8. The bargaining position of the Secretary of the Interior in attempting to obtain the best possible arrangement in terms of cost and conditions for any non-Federal intertie is severely weakened by the amendment. Without the ability to hold out the possibility of Federal construction as a credible alternative, the Secretary is left at the mercy of non-Federal parties who seek to own and operate the facility themselves. The amendment diminishes the leverage of the Secretary by placing an unnecessary and undesirable hurdle in the way of a Federal intertie. No matter who ultimately builds the interconnection, it is highly beneficial to the public that the Government be able to drive a hard bargain.

The situation with respect to the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie is analogous to that which faced Congress in connection with transmission lines for the Colorado River storage project. Private power companies offered to construct needed facilities and transmit power on a fee basis to customers for power generated by Federal dams. Congress established certain criteria against which the offers were to be judged. In its report on the project authorization bill, for instance, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs instructed that project power be marketed through the facilities of electric utilities operating in the area "provided, of course, that the power preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected." However, the bill approved by Congress specifically authorized construction of Federal transmission lines.

Bureau of Reclamation personnel analyzed the companies' offer. They found that the proposal could not meet the Congressional criteria. On January 17, 1961, Fred A. Seaton, then Secretary of the Interior in the Eisenhower administration, approved recommendations calling for construction of an all-Federal transmission system. The matter was the subject of prolonged congressional debate in 1961. The Congress concluded that funds for the all-Federal system should be appropriated and the plan implemented "unless the Secretary of the Interior finds it practicable and in the national interest to enter into wheeling agreements with private power interests."

By making these funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation, Congress permitted the Department of the Interior to negotiate with the private utilities from a position of strength. As a result, the original proposals of these companies were voided and a net saving of nearly $500 million during the payout period was gained for ratepayers and water users. In addition, the utilities substantially reduced their "rockbottom" proposals, allowing a further saving of $77 million. An extra dividend which resulted from the action of Congress was creation of a strong Federal tie linking northern Colorado and Phoenix, Ariz., which made possible development of a major steam plant in the coalfields of Colorado with part of its output to be delivered by replacement in Arizona; because of the decreased investment in transmission lines, savings in line losses, and new wheeling revenues, another saving in excess of $200 million was made possible.

Without the requested congressional appropriation, none of these benefits could have been realized.

Based on a finding by a Department of the Interior task force that an extra-high voltage electrical interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and Southwest was technically and economically feasible, the administration, in its proposed budget for the fiscal year 1964, recommended funds for Federal construction of an intertie.

Charles F. Luce, administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, in testimony to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, outlined numerous proposals for non-Federal construction, the principal offers coming from the California Power Pool—including Pacific Gas & Electric, International Utilities, and the Northwest Intertie, Inc.

In testimony before the Appropriations Committees Secretary of the Interior

Udall called for approval of funds in accordance with the President's budget. He further testified that he needs the appropriation if he is to be placed in an effective bargaining position with those who propose non-Federal interties.

The amendment will preclude appropriation of funds requested by the President for a Northwest-Southwest intertie, thus tying the hands of the Secretary of the Interior in dealing with non-Federal entities. If the amendment becomes law, the Secretary will be forced to accept an offer of one of the non-Federal entities. The amendment would preclude timely construction of a Federal line or an appropriation of funds for its construction. Many months would be required to follow the routine requirements for special authorization. Without a Federal line, or the practical possibility that one will be constructed, the chances of finding a satisfactory transmission service to move surplus Northwest power are greatly diminished. As a result, the Northwest surplus power may never be sold and the energy may continue to be wasted.

Ninth. The amendment represents a major alteration of congressional procedure in handling Federal transmission lines. General legislation has established the pattern that transmission facilities adequate to market Federal power are authorized with Federal projects, subject to certain specified limitations. If this method is to be drastically changed, with special authorization required for individual lines, then Congress should consider the matter on its merits as a single piece of legislation—not as an amendment to another bill on another topic—with full hearings and complete exploration of the issues involved. Present practices permit orderly disposition of transmission problems with full congressional review. Congress should take a hard look before making a change.

Tenth. Effect of the amendment cannot be considered in a void. What impact will the amendment have on efforts to integrate Federal projects for maximum efficiency and the greatest return on the taxpayers' dollar? How will it affect the treaty with Canada for cooperative development of the upper Columbia River? Will it enhance creation of private "transmission tollgates" which will boost power costs to consumers? These questions have not been answered. Change in basic statutes should not be made pending consideration of these matters.

An intertie between the Northwest and Southwest should be a common carrier, available to private and public parties without discrimination. It should not be an instrument of monopoly in transfers of electrical energy between the two regions. The Government should be assured a fair share of capacity. Facilities should be planned to insure the most economical and efficient arrangements. Congress should not approve the amendment and place a hurdle in the way of a Federal intertie, pending assurance that such standards can be achieved in some other fashion.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill, for the most part, is reasonable enough in that it would give the Pacific Northwest first call on Government power generated in that area before any could be transmitted to California or other States. However, the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, Hon. JACK WESTLAND, would go far beyond the basic principle enunciated in this bill. The amendment would do away with the existing authority for the Department of the Interior to build a Federal transmission line from Bonneville into California. It would allow the Bonneville Power Administration to build a Federal line only to the Oregon-California border unless specifically authorized by Congress.

This, in my opinion and the opinion of many others, would leave California at the mercy of private utilities who have banded together in a so-called power pool for this purpose.

The Westland amendment would impede efforts to integrate existing Federal systems. It would drastically weaken the Government's negotiating position respecting possible non-Federal intertie proposals. It would jeopardize chances for approval of the Canadian treaty providing for sale of Canadian power to the United States. It would mean higher costs for Northwest and Southwest consumers but lower returns for the U.S. Treasury.

The bill in its present form embodies the grossest sort of discrimination in that it permits the continued right to build a line with public funds for the ultimate and total benefit of a private utility, but it forecloses that same right to a publicly owned utility.

The Westland amendment, in short, must have exceeded the fondest hopes of the special interest lobbyists representing the privately owned electric utilities.

The concept of transferring public power from surplus areas such as Bonneville to areas of need such as California will be sacrificed unless this amendment is removed in conference. If this amendment remains in the bill, the private utilities would sit at the power tollgate, making every ratepayer in California subordinate to private utility rates. California needs public power for her public agencies. California needs public power to reduce the cost of irrigation water. She needs public power as a yardstick to hold the line on rates charged by private utilities. She needs all this in the best interest of every person who uses electricity and water in California.

Unless a substantive change is made in this section of the bill in conference, I shall be forced in all conscience to vote against it when it returns to the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) "Pacific Northwest" means (1) the region consisting of the States of Oregon and Washington, the State of Montana west of the Continental Divide, and such portions of the States of Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming within the Columbia drainage basin and of the State of Idaho as the Secretary may determine to be within the marketing area of the Federal Columbia River power system, and (2) any contiguous areas, not in excess of seventy-five airline miles from said region, which are a part of the service area of a distribution cooperative which has (i) no generating facilities, and (ii) a distribution system from which it serves both within and without said region.

(c) "Surplus energy" means electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest which would otherwise be wasted because of the lack of a market therefor in the Pacific Northwest at any established rate.

(d) "Surplus peaking capacity" means electric peaking capacity at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest for which there is no demand in the Pacific Northwest at any established rate.

(e) "Non-Federal utility" means any utility not owned or controlled by the United States, including any entity (1) which such a utility owns or controls, in whole or in part, or is controlled by, (2) which is controlled by those controlling such utility, or (3) of which such utility is a member.

(f) "Energy requirements of any Pacific Northwest customer" means the full requirements for electric energy of (1) any purchaser from the United States for direct consumption in the Pacific Northwest, and (2) any non-Federal utility in that region in excess of (i) the hydroelectric energy available for its own use from its generating plants in the Pacific Northwest, and (ii) any additional energy available for use in the Pacific Northwest which, under a then existing contract, the utility (A) can obtain at no higher incremental cost than the rate charged by the United States, or (B) is required to accept.

(g) Terms not defined herein shall, unless the context requires otherwise, have the meaning given them in the March 1949 Glossary of Important Power and Rate Terms prepared under the supervision of the Federal Power Commission.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the sale, delivery, and exchange of electric energy generated at, and peaking capacity of, Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest for use outside the Pacific Northwest shall be limited to surplus energy and surplus peaking capacity. At least thirty days prior to the execution of any contract for the sale, delivery, or exchange of surplus energy or surplus peaking capacity for use outside the Pacific Northwest, the Secretary shall give the then customers of the Bonneville Power Administration written notice that negotiations for such a contract are pending, and thereafter, at any customer's request, make available for its inspection current drafts of the proposed contract.

SEC. 3. (a) Any contract for the sale or exchange of surplus energy for use outside the Pacific Northwest, or as replacement, directly or indirectly, within the Pacific Northwest for hydroelectric energy delivered for use outside that region by a non-Federal utility, shall provide that the Secretary, after giving the purchaser notice not in excess of seven days, will not deliver electric energy under such contract whenever it can reasonably be foreseen that such delivery would impair his ability to meet, either at or after the time of such delivery, the energy requirements of any Pacific Northwest customer. The purchaser shall obligate himself not to take delivery of or use any such energy to supply any load under such conditions that discontinuance of deliveries from the Pacific Northwest in seven days would cause undue hardship to the purchaser or in his territory, and, further, the purchaser shall acknowledge full responsibility if any such hardship occurs. Deliveries by a non-Federal utility from its generating plants in the Pacific Northwest for use on its own distribution system in an area outside but contiguous to the Pacific Northwest (not including any extension of its outside service area by merger or acquisition after the effective date of this Act) shall not be deemed deliveries by such utility for use outside the Pacific Northwest.

(b) Electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest which can be conserved, for which there is no immediate demand in the Pacific Northwest at any established rate, but for which the Secretary determines there may be a demand in meeting the future requirements of the Pacific Northwest, may be delivered for use outside that region only on a provisional basis under contracts providing that if the Secretary determines at a subsequent time that, by virtue of prior deliveries under such contract, the Secretary is or will be unable to meet the energy requirements of any Pacific Northwest customer, the purchaser will return the full amount of energy delivered to him, or such portion or portions thereof as may be required, at such time or times as may be specified by the Secretary, except that the Secretary shall not require return during the purchaser's daily peak periods. The Secretary shall require the return of the energy provisionally delivered hereunder, to such extent and at such times, as may be necessary to meet demands at any established rate for use within the Pacific Northwest.

(c) Any contract for the disposition of surplus peaking capacity shall provide that (1) the Secretary may terminate the contract upon notice not in excess of forty-eight months, and (2) the purchaser shall advance or return the energy necessary to supply the peaking capacity, except that the Secretary shall not require such advance or return during the purchaser's daily peak periods. The Secretary may contract for the sale of such energy to the purchaser, in lieu of its return, under the conditions prescribed in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The Secretary, in making any determination of the energy requirements of any Pacific Northwest customer which is a non-Federal utility having hydroelectric generating facilities, shall exclude any amounts of hydroelectric energy generated in the Pacific Northwest and disposed of outside the Pacific Northwest by the utility which, through reasonable measures, could have been conserved or otherwise kept available for the utility's own needs in the Pacific Northwest. The Secretary may sell the utility as a replacement therefor only what would otherwise be surplus energy.

SEC. 4. Any contract of the Secretary for the sale or exchange of electric energy generated at, or peaking capacity of, Federal hydroelectric plants in marketing areas outside the Pacific Northwest for use within the Pacific Northwest shall be subject to limitations and conditions corresponding to those provided in sections 2 and 3 for any contract for the sale or exchange of hydroelectric energy or peaking capacity generated within the Pacific Northwest for use outside the Pacific Northwest.

SEC. 5. Without regard to the limitations specified in sections 2 and 3 of this Act, the Secretary may enter into contracts for the exchange with areas other than the Pacific Northwest of (1) surplus energy during the Pacific Northwest storage refill period, (2) any hydroelectric energy during the Pacific Northwest storage refill period which will be returned to the Pacific Northwest in equal amounts during the same Pacific Northwest refill period or the succeeding storage drawdown period, (3) any hydroelectric energy which will be returned to the Pacific Northwest in equal amounts during the same Pacific Northwest storage drawdown period, (4) hydroelectric peaking capacity, or (5) surplus peaking capacity for energy. All benefits from such exchanges, including resulting increases of firm power, shall be shared equitably by the areas involved, having regard to the second energy and other contributions made by each.

SEC. 6. Any capacity in Federal transmission lines connecting, either by themselves or with non-Federal lines, a generating plant in the Pacific Northwest or Canada with the other area or with any other area outside the Pacific Northwest, which is not required for the transmission of Federal energy or the energy described in section 8, shall be made available as a carrier for transmission of other electric energy between such areas. The transmission of other electric energy shall be at equitable rates determined by the Secretary, but such rates shall be subject to equitable adjustment at appropriate intervals not less frequently than once in every five years as agreed to by the parties. No contract for the transmission of non-Federal energy on a firm basis shall be affected by any increase, subsequent to the execution of such contract, in the requirements for transmission of Federal energy, the energy described in section 8, or other electric energy.

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall offer to amend, without imposing any other requirement as a condition to such amendment, all existing contracts for the sale or exchange of electric power generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest to include, and shall include in all new contracts, provisions giving the purchaser priority on electric power generated at such plants in conformity with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act shall not be applicable to (1) the Canyon Ferry project and (2), except as provided in section 6, downstream power benefits to which Canada is entitled under the treaty between Canada and the United States relating to the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin, signed at Washington, January 17, 1961, nor to energy or capacity disposed of to Canada in any exchange pursuant to paragraph 1 or 2 of article VIII thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify the geographical preference of power users in the State of Montana which is established by the Hungry Horse Dam Act (Act of June 4, 1944, 58 Stat. 270), as amended.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 9, strike out "seven days" and insert "sixty days".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 17, strike out "seven days" and insert "sixty days".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 1, strike out "forty-eight months" and insert "sixty months".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 19, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this Act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by the Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 24, strike out "SEC. 8" and insert "SEC. 9".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 7, line 24, strike out "section 8" and insert "section 9".

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a correction of the numbers. When we inserted section 8 reference was made to section 8 in the bill, but that was not changed with reference to section 9 when the numbers were changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 8, line 9, strike out "section 8" and insert "section 9".

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for the same purpose, to correct the reference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BATTIN

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTIN: Page 1, line 7, after "Montana", strike out "west of the Continental Divide".

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to compliment the chairman of the committee for the work that has been done on this bill. Certainly, the debate here this afternoon has been most interesting. The gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Rogers, has been in my district in Montana and in my hometown. We were glad to have him, and I am sure he thought, as I did, when he was in that area that he was in the Pacific Northwest. Yet, I find by definition in the bill before the House the area east of the Continental Divide in Montana has been specifically excluded in the language and in the definition of what would be the Pacific Northwest as far as the preferential power provisions are concerned in the Bonneville marketing area. Perhaps, it would be all right if in the rest of the definition, areas just within the Columbia River drainage were included in the definition itself. But it becomes very hard for me to envision in my own mind that the State of Nevada is within the Columbia River drainage.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. It so happens it is, and there is a small portion of the State of Utah that is within the Columbia River Basin. It is only these small areas that the Secretary has included within this new enlargement of the marketing area.

Mr. BATTIN. I would say to the gentleman from Colorado that the language on page 2 goes beyond that in the description where it says, "any contiguous areas, not in excess of 75 airline miles from said region, which are a part of the service area of a distribution cooperative" and so forth would be exempt from this definition.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I reply that the gentleman is correct. It takes care of just a few local operations where areas are being served and are contiguous to this and which is within the marketing area.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman. Now we go to the next step, which is that in Montana the Continental Divide separates the Columbia River and the Missouri River Basins. Yet we find areas in the Missouri River Basin on the eastern side of the divide, actually in the shadow of Fort Peck Dam and who are preference customers that are not supplied with adequate electric energy. How is this going to apply to the Bonneville system?

Mr. ASPINALL. As far as the legislation before us is concerned, of course, it permits the sale of the surplus and the nonfirm energy elsewhere, supposedly, in the Southwest. My friend also will be advised that as far as Hungry Horse Dam is concerned, it applies to users within the State of Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. I know it is in the bill, at least.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right. And also by the original statute.

Mr. BATTIN. Right.

Mr. ASPINALL. So rather than enlarge this area from what the marketing area now is, and what is contemplated under this legislation, we have just not accepted any enlargement of the area where you can sell Northwest power so far in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee—and I do not know what this committee will do.

Mr. BATTIN. Just to clear up the situation, most of the debate this afternoon has been with reference to California and the sale of surplus or dump power from the Bonneville area into the marketing area of southern California. Of course, this is outside the Bonneville area. Why, then, would any area of the country be excluded?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would say to my friend, power can go anywhere. It could go east and southeast and could go south as far as this legislation is concerned. It depends entirely on the lines that transmit power and the market that might be available.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the chairman of the committee, and I would say in support of my amendment that it is very difficult for me to understand how a State can be divided. It gives one part of the State an advantage over the other. It creates unfair competition between two areas of the same State. The bill is grossly unfair in this respect.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would merely call attention, in addition to the remarks made by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], to the fact that I think it has been recognized for a long time that even in a private enterprise or a public interprise the power marketing area must be defined so that you can project your thinking into the future and make it possible to meet the needs that you can project into the future. Otherwise you have no way in the world of operating a market area or a power facility on a businesslike basis. It is not a question of a mountain, insofar as Montana is concerned, but it is primarily a question of a river basin. The outlines of this power-marketing area were fixed with the river basin, with the several isolated situations pointed out by the chairman which are included in the bill in order to have a workable situation. It is not practical, really, to go across the Rocky Mountains at that particular point.

The Hungry Horse Act provides the power preference in the State of Montana, and this bill also recognizes that provision. If you want to extend the power-marketing area outside of this river basin, then you might as well extend it on to Florida or Texas or any place else, because you are getting completely out of the river basin. I think it would be a bad precedent, because we will have to lay the predicate of fixing these basin areas in the future insofar as the power marketing area is concerned primarily because you can now wheel electricity from the west coast to the east coast, which you would not do before.

I sincerely hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Is not the very purpose of this measure a sort of precedent for the protection of local people any place in the United States in the preservation and use of their own resources?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. TVA has the same thing, I will say to the gentleman from Washington, and unless you do adopt some policies of this kind you are going to get into a situation in this country, due to this technological advance in the ability to wheel electric energy, where you are going to have one group of people feeding the cow in one part of the country and people in another part of the country milking the cow. It is not going to be fair to several areas, like the Columbia Basin, or the Missouri Basin and other areas in this country.

I have the highest respect for the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Battin], and I know that he is trying to serve his people well, and is doing a wonderful job. But I sincerely hope that this amendment will not be adopted because I think it would set a bad precedent that some of the people who have spoken here have been against before.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Battin].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hosmer: Page 2, line 8: Commencing with line 8, page 2, strike out all through line 11, page 8, and insert the following:

"(c) 'Firm energy' means firm electric energy equal to 110 per centum of the amount generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest and under contract for sale at the date of enactment of this Act.

"(d) 'Regional Peaking Capacity' means electric peaking capacity at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest equal to 110 per centum of the amount under contract for sale at the date of enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 2. After the enactment of this Act no firm energy and no regional peaking capacity shall be exported from the Pacific Northwest."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of six amendments that are all very simple; I promise you I will not take but a minute on any one of them. This one merely takes the terms of this bill and, instead of applying it to all the power in the future, says that the Pacific Northwest is going to have only the monopoly they now have on all of the power that they are now using and an extra 10 percent. We give them that and all the rest of it is up for grabs for anybody that can put lines in to get it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this type of amendment would also be very bad for the reasons I stated with respect to the amendment of the gentleman from Montana.

The gentleman from California has insisted on several occasions that he is against an intertie for public power. Yet by this amendment he is opening the door for all future power to be produced by Bonneville by capacities that they now have over 110 percent of the present capacity to be made available so that everyone will try to make a national grid out of this public power.

It does not seem consistent, to me. It will, of course, leave the Northwest handcuffed so far as future development of that area is concerned and I think that any area of this country ought to be allowed to use the energy sources that God put in that area to develop that area. I think that this bill does that and protects the Northwest. I do not think these amendments at this time can do anything except cripple the Northwest.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUBSER

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 9 after line 11 insert a new section as follows:

"If the Secretary enters into a contract under this Act for the sale or exchange of electric power generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest which is to be used by any Federal, State, or other Public Agency for pumping in the operation of a Reclamation, Water Conservation, or Irrigation project, then this Act shall not thereafter be applicable to such power used for such purpose."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, briefly and simply stated, the purpose of my amendment is to require that whenever in the future the Secretary shall enter into a contract with a public agency for project pumping in irrigation and reclamation projects that they will not be subject to this act and cannot be reclaimed by the area of origin. My amendment would not affect present allocations and commitments to furnish power.

Mr. Chairman, it is my honest opinion that this will not hurt the objectives of this bill. I personally hold no objection to expanding the marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration. I have no objection to a tie line. I think a tie line of some kind is in the public interest and that we must have it for the benefit of both the Northwest and the Southwest part of the United States.

My objection has been that we enlarge the marketing area for the purposes of selling so-called dump power. But we do not do a clean job of enlarging that area because we retain a provincial interpretation of the preference laws and confine the benefits of the preference laws to an area smaller than the marketing area.

Admittedly, this is dump power and we are creating another market area for dump power. It is not firm power. But let us remember that to the purchaser who buys this dump power and combines it with a steam generating capacity, it becomes firm power. So we who are interested in project pumping for federally financed reclamation projects are properly thinking of firm power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in considering this amendment I ask the members of the committee to go back to the spirit behind reclamation law. Dual-purpose hydroelectric projects started when we wanted to impound water for the purpose of controlling floods and also reclaiming land through irrigation. It was obvious that the sensible thing to do when we impounded this water was to let it turn a turbine as it fell to create a dual-purpose project and use power revenues to assist in repaying the cost of the reclamation project. This is the spirit of reclamation law.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that my amendment applies only for the future. The Secretary has complete records on power surpluses on a month-to-month basis for the Pacific Northwest. Because he has such records he obviously is not going to enter into a contract for project pumping any place outside the present service area, unless the figures show that the present commitments for firm power in the Bonneville service area will not be infringed upon. So, this is a matter of whether or not the Secretary shall enter into such an agreement. If he does not enter into an agreement, my amendment does not apply. But this does say that for the future—not for the present or the past but for the future—that the preference law which has always applied will prevail as it pertains to project pumping and that for the future this category of preference customers will be placed ahead of the nonpreference customer who is not in the Northwest today but may come there in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of the committee to preserve the spirit of reclamation law. It will not hurt a single soul who is presently in business in the Northwest.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I grant that the gentleman's amendment is offered in all good faith. I understand once a contract is entered into between the Bonneville Power Administration and a pumping project, then this legislation if enacted would no longer apply to that contract; is that true?

Mr. GUBSER. Yes. This is for the future, and it merely retains the preference provisions of the present law. It merely retains the spirit of the reclamation law which was, after all, the motivating force for all these projects all over the country.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am wondering if the gentleman realizes the ultimate result of his amendment? As I understand it the Bonneville Power Administration sees a great growth in pumping projects in years ahead.

Mr. GUBSER. The only project authorized in California at the present time which would require project pumping power is the San Luis project which will consume 180,000 kilowatts. You will note that there are many months in the year that the Bonneville Power Administration has surpluses of over 3 million kilowatts.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Relying only upon the comments of the Bonneville Power Administration that there will be an increase in pumping projects in California, what would happen if a pumping project in the gentleman's district obtained a contract from the BPA for surplus power, that would be a permanent contract. Then other pumping projects came up in the gentleman's area, what would he do with respect to their requirements, or a contract for surplus power?

Mr. GUBSER. It would be a simple matter of first come first served. New commitments would not be considered unless the Secretary entered into a contract with new purchasers.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Then the gentleman would be asking for preferential treatment.

Mr. GUBSER. There would be a preference, which would be established at the outset in accordance with the law and one that is not established with new rules when we are half way through the ball game.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this will not hurt the objectives of this bill. It retains the spirit of the reclamation law, and I urge a favorable vote on my amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fine work the gentleman from California has done in reference to these water and power matters. He is to be complimented. But he comes forward with an amendment which, if he will study it, he will realize that the Secretary of the Interior could not enter into a contract with regard to it anyway, because this bill deals with secondary power only. When you follow out the amendment offered by the gentleman from California you will make firm power out of secondary power. The Secretary of the Interior has no authority through the Bonneville group to enter into any such contract as that. For that reason the amendment has no place in the bill and should be defeated.

Assuming it could be done by the Secretary of the Interior, it ought to be defeated for another reason. That is because it is taking out one type of preference customer under your general preference customer law, and making an additional preference customer out of him as far as pumping is concerned, and discriminating against your groups that are preference customers. For that reason the amendment should be defeated, and I ask the committee to defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: Page 9, after section 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. This Act applies only with respect to present customers of the Federal Government in the Pacific Northwest and to present Federal plants in the Pacific Northwest; no section of this Act shall be applicable to the sale or delivery or exchange of power from future Federal facilities; and, provided, further, that no section of this Act shall be deemed to create or guarantee any priority for future customers of the Federal Government in the Pacific Northwest."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this brings up the problem of when, if ever, does the Congress of the United States start to think about terminating this whole business of preference.

It does so by saying that the privileges and the priorities established by this bill will apply only to those who now are receiving the benefit of presently existing Federal facilities in the Pacific Northwest. This is a matter that we are going to have to look into in a very broad sense, but the amendment applies specifically to this particular bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] for the contribution he has made on this bill. I am sure if he will study his amendment he will find he is putting a stopgap on the entire northwest area by this type of amendment and forbidding them ever to grow or expand in the future. I am sure he would not want to do that. As a matter of fact, it defeats the whole purpose of the bill. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 9, after section 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, on and after 10 years from the date of enactment hereof, all electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest shall be marketed without regard to preference and no contract theretofore entered into for the sale of said electric energy shall be valid after that date insofar as any provisions therein respecting preference are concerned."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this strikes directly at the historic question of preference. It would eliminate preference in the purchase of power from public utilities 10 years after the passage of this act insofar as the Pacific Northwest is concerned. If it were made a part of this bill I would anticipate that other legislation would be introduced eliminating the preference insofar as all other publicly generated power is concerned. All of the Members of this body who have preference customers in their districts, who want to continue to buy public power at rates less than it costs to produce, should certainly vote against my amendment. The others I think should logically vote for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from California again on his ability to protect his section and of course the rest of the United States. This amendment would simply do away with the preference clause insofar as the Northwest is concerned, the power that is generated up there, and just put an open season on that power for every other section of the United States that could get a powerline in there. So you might just as well read off the Pacific Northwest by this amendment. I ask that you defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 9, following section 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Neither the Secretary of the Interior nor the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as a condition of granting rights-of-way over public lands for the construction of non-Federal transmission lines connecting any generating plants in the Pacific Northwest or Canada with any other area outside the Pacific Northwest, shall require either that any excess capacity of said lines be made available to the Federal government or that said lines conform with Federal power marketing policy."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order so that I may explain the amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this brings directly to the attention of the Members this matter of the Secretary of the Interior requiring, wherever a line goes across Federal land—and it could be in the New England States or any other part of the country, because we have plenty of Federal land all over—that private transmission facilities be made available for his purposes of establishing a national grid.

This question, whether it is decided yes or no today, should be brought up and decided by the Congress in its broad sense in the very near future. We are always told these things are not in order in connection with a specific piece of legislation. However, we cannot get a piece of general legislation heard and brought out for a decision.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in regard to this amendment, it goes into a matter that is actually entirely foreign to the matters treated in this legislation.

This legislation has to do with creating a power marketing area in the Northwest. The only thing in the world it has to do with regard to building an intertie or going across public lands is a provision in the Westland amendment which provides that the Federal Government cannot build a line. It does not say you can build, but it says you cannot build a line unless you come back to the Congress and get specific authority to do that. It has no place in this bill. It will do nothing in the world but hurt the bill, as it is, and I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: Page 9, after section 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, during and after fiscal year 1965 the Secretary shall add ten per centum to the rates otherwise determined for all sales of electric energy marketed by the Bonneville Power Administration. The added revenue so received from the marketing of electric energy by the Bonneville Power Administration shall be applied to the reduction of the United States national debt."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, again I bring up something that the Congress is going to have to face up to and that is this mounting national debt and how to get some revenue to pay it. We have billions of dollars of Federal money invested in power lines and in power generating facilities throughout the country. I think it is up to us to take a responsible look at every possibility for adding a small sum to the charges made to the users of this power, since it comes and has been coming at cost for a long time, and to applying that revenue toward the solution of a problem which nags every single responsible citizen of the country whether he serves in public office or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would impose a penalty on the Northwest, and I am sure the gentleman from California would not want to penalize the Northwest. It would also be a discrimination against all of the projects of this kind within the United States. The fixing of rates for power is a very complex and technical thing. What we need to do by this legislation is to make is possible to create a market to sell electrical energy that can be reduced and which is wasted if it is not reduced, to provide the money to pay off this Bonneville project and then at that time pay on the public debt in the same way and in the regular order that moneys will be contributed from all other projects.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Let me assure the gentleman that if this amendment is passed with respect to Bonneville, I would introduce legislation applying it to all other public power marketing agencies. And I am sure if it is passed with respect to this project, it would pass with respect to all projects. I think it should be adopted.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will say this to the gentleman from California, that when he introduces such legislation to all other projects, I think that would be the proper time to include Bonneville but not at this time.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Would it not be more sensible, rather than to approach this on a piecemeal basis, to go back to the basic reclamation law and pass an amendment to it and get the whole thing over with?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will introduce a bill of that kind, we will be glad to consider it in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, the last amendment I have to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hosmer: Page 9, after section 8, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, on and after the date of enactment hereof, except for unexpired contractual commitments then in force, no electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in the Pacific Northwest shall be marketed at less than value computed in accordance with methods prescribed by the Federal Power Commission for the computation of power value."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, here we have the last of those most serious questions that we as a responsible legislative body should consider with respect to federally owned electric kilowatts that are marketed to consumers throughout the Nation, that is, what is the fair price at which they should be sold.

As the gentleman from Texas indicated a moment ago, the fixing of rates for electricity is a difficult matter. This amendment would provide that the most expert body in the country be given the job of fixing those rates; namely, the Federal Power Commission, which has the applicable formulas for determining the value of power. The amendment says Bonneville power shall not be marketed at less than value. Again I would say with respect to this particular principle, if applied to the Bonneville power project, as I believe it properly should be, that legislation could easily be enacted to apply it to all other Federal marketing bodies. I certainly recommend most highly that it be done.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I just want to say this: The fixing of power rates, of course, is a complex and highly technical thing which must be governed by the circumstances surrounding a situation in the particular areas affected. I am sure the gentleman from California is a man who is against centralized government, and this amendment would do nothing in the world but help to centralize the power in one of the bureaus downtown, the Federal Power Commission. There are a lot of people today who are complaining that that bureau, the Federal Power Commission, has entirely too much power today, and I certainly think this House will not add any more to that without studying this problem very carefully.

Mr. HOSMER. The locality is one of the criteria used by the Federal Power Commission in this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Hechler, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 501, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

COST OF DEMONSTRATION TO THE TAXPAYER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would create a select committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate the cost to the American taxpayer of the mass demonstration here on the 28th. The American people are entitled to know how much of their money is being expended by the Federal Government to sponsor this political rally.

The resolution I have introduced would make it possible for this Congress to find out how much each department and agency of the Federal Government is spending to make this demonstration peaceful and successful. We are entitled to know how much is being spent by the District of Columbia. The committee created by this resolution would not only determine the facts but would make recommendations on how to cope with future demonstrations, protect our Capital City, and guard our national security.

Mr. Speaker, the elaborate, fantastic, and feverish preparations by the Federal Government to receive the mass demonstrators are unbelievable. It is my understanding that troops have been in training for weeks. Policemen, plainclothesmen, detectives, firemen, and National Guardsmen are everywhere with many thousands more on the alert. Details are working overtime preparing first aid tents. Water fountains are being connected to fire hydrants. I have participated in many military campaigns. The detailed planning downtown today is reminiscent of the most elaborate military preparations. All of this apparently is considered necessary by the high command to insure a peaceful demonstration.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Federal Government going to do to entertain the 40 or more other organizations who have threatened to demonstrate and counterdemonstrate? Is the Federal Government and the District of Columbia going to be guilty of discrimination when it comes to other demonstrators? Or, is this particular demonstration the favored one? Could it possibly be that this demonstration controls the most bloc voters?

I hope this resolution will pass this House so the American people will have the truth:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the actual cost to the Federal Government of the demonstrations to occur in the District of Columbia on August 28, 1963, including, but not limited to, the actual cost of such demonstrations to the government of the District of Columbia.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATION

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are many ways to frustrate the constitutional right of free citizens to seek redress of their grievances. In a state where police or military juntas rule, the right of movement is restricted. Restricted, too, is the right to seek redress of grievances.

I was shocked to learn from some constituents that some of them experienced frustration in attempting to come to Washington and participate in the march for jobs and freedom on August 28.

Instead of being blocked by police or a military junta, they were being blocked by bus companies and other transportation media who, on one pretext or another, claimed either to have no buses available or, in the cases that have also come to my attention, bus rates that began at one figure soon started to climb once it became known that hundreds of thousands wanted to use them.

These transportation systems must not be permitted to frustrate the August 28 march to Washington. If thousands of my constituents cannot leave New York City at their free will to come to Washington, D.C., then those responsible have erected a Berlin-type wall that must be smashed now.

I have called on the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a sweeping investigation of all bus companies, tour companies, and travel brokers who have had anything to do with this march. When a poor church in my district, on the Lower East Side, has to pay $320 for an un-airconditioned bus while the going rate filed with the ICC by another company for identical equipment is approximately $250, then something is not only wrong, it is rotten.

When a group from downtown CORE is made to pay a high fee; when the Lower East Side Civil Rights Committee, an ad hoc group composed of the most respected religious, fraternal, and civic groups is promised 20 buses, and is then given 9, "1 more certain and possibly an 11th," I must confess that I am shocked at this type of vehicular black market.

The ICC must step in now—even as the hour for the march approaches. There is no reason why neighboring States cannot pitch in and help even on temporary ICC permits. I think the ICC should pay particular attention to those bus companies who have hiked rates from $250 to $320 and from $279 to $410 per bus as the demand grows.

The major bus companies are always before us pleading for special subsidies. When they stand in the way of American citizens seeking to petition Congress then I have no sympathy for their plight and I have nothing but contempt for their business practices.

I hope it will prove unnecessary for me to go any further than suggest that the bus companies in question voluntarily adjust their prices to come within the tariffs filed by them with the ICC.

AUGUST 28 CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, August 28, will be recorded as a historic day. In the tradition of American democracy citizens of this Nation over 100,000 strong will come to the Nation's Capital to petition peacefully their Government for jobs and freedom.

I want to extend to those who come to Washington my own personal welcome and support and participation in this demonstration. The march is part of the civil rights revolution which is sweeping our land, a revolution which is dedicated to fulfilling the aims of our first revolution—liberty and justice for all. This revolution is being fought nonviolently with courage and dignity and dedication. Tomorrow's march will reflect those qualities. The leaders of the march are to be commended, in my opinion, for their sense of responsibility and for their dedication.

In yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a statement issued by the leaders of the 10 groups sponsoring this march. This statement outlines the reasons for the march and makes an eloquent appeal for restraint and dignity during proceedings tomorrow. I include that statement at this point in the RECORD along with the names and organizational affiliations of the 10 signers.

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON MARCH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The statement was signed by: Mathew Ahmann, executive director of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, vice chairman of the Commission on Race Relations of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America; James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality; the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; Rabbi Joachim Prinz, chairman of the American Jewish Congress; A. Philip Randolph, president of the Negro American Labor Council; Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL–CIO, and chairman, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League.)

(Leaders of the 10 national organizations sponsoring the march on Washington for jobs and freedom yesterday issued the following public statement:)

The Washington march of August 28 is more than just a demonstration.

It was conceived as an outpouring of deep feeling of millions of white and colored American citizens that the time has come for the Government of the United States of America, and particularly the Congress of that Government, to grant and guarantee complete equality in citizenship to the Negro minority of our populations.

As such, the Washington march is a living petition—in the flesh—of the scores of thousands of citizens of both races who will be present from all parts of our country.

It will be orderly, but not subservient. It will be proud, but not arrogant. It will be nonviolent, but not timid. It will be unified in purposes and behavior, but not splintered into groups and individual competitors. It will be outspoken, but not raucous.

It will have the dignity befitting a demonstration in behalf of the human rights of 20 million people, with the eye and the judgment of the world focused upon Washington, D.C. on August 28, 1963.

In a neighborhood dispute, there may be stunts, rough words and even hot insults; but when a whole people speaks to its Government, the dialog and the action must be on a level reflecting the worth of that people and the responsibility of that Government.

We, the undersigned, who see the Washington march as wrapping up the dreams, hopes, ambitions, tears, and prayers of millions who have lived for this day, call upon the members, followers, and well-wishers of our several organizations to make the march a disciplined and purposeful demonstration.

We call upon them all, black and white, to resist provocation to disorder and to violence.

We ask them to remember that evil persons are determined to smear this march and to discredit the cause of equality by deliberate efforts to stir disorder.

We call for self-discipline, so that no one in our own ranks, however enthusiastic, shall be the spark for disorder.

We call for resistance to the efforts of those who, while not enemies of the march as such, might seek to use it to advance causes not dedicated primarily to civil rights or to the welfare of our country.

We ask each and every one in attendance in Washington or in spiritual attendance back home, to place the cause above all else.

Do not permit a few irresponsibles to hang a new problem around our necks as we return home. Let's do what we came to do—place the national human rights problem squarely on the doorstep of the National Congress and of the Federal Government.

Let's win at Washington.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the text of a bill I introduced today along with a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 8246, a bill to divest the National Labor Relations Board of its judicial functions. This bill requires that in the future all unfair labor practice cases be tried before U.S. district courts throughout the country.

The National Labor Relations Board would, in the future under this bill, be limited to handling representation matters. This would include the conduct of employee elections. But this agency would no longer investigate, prosecute, or adjudicate unfair labor practice cases as it does today.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 8246 is a measure of far-reaching significance. Its significance lies not alone in what I believe to be its constructive approach to handling unfair labor practice cases. An even deeper significance lies in the contribution it will make to preserving the cherished high standards of American jurisprudence. Its purpose is to restore to all litigants in labor cases—plaintiffs and defendants alike—their right to equal justice under law.

Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1963, in discussing before the House the trend of recent Labor Board decisions, I said that I planned to introduce legislation to remove from the Board its jurisdiction over unfair labor practice cases. H.R. 8246 is the bill I had in mind. And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that the text of the bill, along with a section-by-section analysis, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

In the June 18 comments to which I just referred, my respected colleague from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] joined with me in reviewing an extensive series of NLRB decisions which have circumvented and distorted the intent of Congress as expressed in the Landrum-Griffin Act. More than a year earlier, on April 10, 1962, we made a similar presentation to the House. On these two occasions, we presented a documented account of what I believe to be the Labor Board's studied and deliberate effort to achieve administrative repeal of the Landrum-Griffin Act—repeal by a series of decisions which not only torture the language of the statute, but which also ignore the clearly expressed will of Congress.

I should emphasize here, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 8246 does not touch upon the reporting and disclosure provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, the so-called financial provisions of that law. Those provisions are the responsibility of the Department of Labor. The comments previously made on the floor of the House by my colleague from Michigan and myself were directed—and H.R. 8246 is directed—at the National Labor Relations Board, and more particularly at the manner in which the NLRB has handled its responsibilities dealing with unfair labor practice cases. Members of the House will recall that the NLRB is charged under Landrum-Griffin, as it was under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley law, with deciding whether, on a particular set of facts, an unfair labor practice has been committed.

The House may be assured, Mr. Speaker, that my decision to introduce H.R. 8246 was not arrived at overnight. It has been my privilege to serve on the Education and Labor Committee of the House for more than 10 years. My studies through those years have confirmed grave doubts about the capacity of the NLRB to discharge its duties with fairness and impartiality. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the very bill I have introduced today was approved by the Education and Labor Committee as long ago as 1954. Complaints of bias in the NLRB's handling of unfair labor practice cases are, therefore, far from new. They have been made and documented repeatedly through nearly all the years of the Board's existence. Almost from its inception with the Wagner Act in 1935, this Board has been under public and congressional fire for failure to perform its duties in an even-handed impartial manner.

After 12 years' experience with the Board under the Wagner Act, a long-suffering public saw Congress in 1947 pass the Taft-Hartley law—not alone to redress a basic statutory imbalance, but also to undo the damage wrought by biased Board decisions. It soon became clear, however, that the Labor Board would not follow the mandate of the Taft-Hartley law, and would not respect the intent which Congress clearly expressed in passing that law. So-called NLRB loopholes became the rule, and the very abuses grew which Congress had ordered stopped. Then, after another 12 years, a long-suffering public once again saw Congress act, this time in 1959 with passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act. Yet here we stand today, Mr. Speaker, less than 4 years later—with this Board's refusal to follow the will of Congress even more pronounced since passage of Landrum-Griffin than it was before. Once again, abuses grow and flourish which Congress clearly banned. It is apparent that major changes must be made—and soon—if we are ever to have equal justice under law in the trial and adjudication of unfair labor practice cases.

I will not burden the House with a full recital now, Mr. Speaker, of all the decisions which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and I reviewed in our discussions of April 10, 1962, and June 18, 1963. Suffice it to say that Labor Board rulings in those and other cases have distorted the letter and the spirit of the law, and have operated to legalize again many of the most flagrant abuses which Congress, through the Landrum-Griffin Act, sought to eliminate. Most damaging to public confidence in the NLRB, and most hostile to the will of Congress, have been those decisions which have permitted secondary boycotting, which have literally encouraged blackmail picketing, which have trampled upon the constitutional and statutory guarantees of free speech, and which have impaired the right of those who risk their capital to make the economic decisions necessary to proper management of their businesses.

The following, however, will serve to illustrate the absurdity of the Board decisions to which I refer—and demonstrate too the violence which those decisions have inflicted on the statute itself and on the intent of Congress.

One of the most important provisions in Landrum-Griffin was its ban on secondary boycotts. The Taft-Hartley law, of course, sought to ban all such boycotts, but a series of ingenious NLRB decisions quickly created loopholes which all but nullified those provisions of Taft-Hartley. Accordingly, in Landrum-Griffin, Congress carefully restored and reinforced the boycott ban.

For example, Taft-Hartley said it was unlawful for a union to induce or encourage "employees of any employer" to commit a boycott. Over the years, however, the Board carved out a loophole which permitted boycotts by farm laborers, railway employees, supervisors, et cetera. To close this loophole, Congress in Landrum-Griffin rewrote the language so that it banned boycotts by "any individual employed by any person." Undaunted by this directive, however, the NLRB quickly managed to decide that in some instances an "individual" is not really an "individual" at all. See Carolina Lumber, 130 NLRB No. 148, 1961; and Operating Engineers Local 324, 131 NLRB No. 36, 1961. In an equally absurd holding, the Board permitted a boycott by deciding that a radio station literally produces the automobiles which are advertised in its commercials—Electrical Workers Local 662, 133 NLRB No. 165, 1961. Also, that a seller who distributes candy and tobacco is actually the producer of those items—Teamsters Local 537 and Lohman, 132 NLRB No. 67, 1961. In another case—local 83, Teamsters Union, 133 NLRB No. 116—the Board found no boycott violation where a union agent threatened a secondary employer—even though the Landrum-Griffin Act specifically forbade threats against employers.

Landrum-Griffin also banned blackmail picketing. However, that indefensible practice has now gained NLRB approval through a series of fantastic decisions. For example, picketing was permitted to force an employer to recognize one union while another union was already certified by the NLRB—Calumet Contractors, 133 NLRB No. 57, 1961. Then in the case of C. A. Blinne—135 NLRB No. 121—the Board literally invited the union to circumvent the ban on blackmail picketing when it said the picketing would be protected if the union filed an unfair labor practice charge—even though it knew the charge to be groundless when it was filed.

These and other cases, which have been discussed at length in prior presentations to Congress, reflect beyond question a pattern of administrative repeal. These cases are merely illustrative. There are many, many more in the same vein. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the House at this juncture, nor the necessary space in the RECORD to set forth in full the extent to which these decisions have set in motion the process of administrative repeal. Suffice it to say here that the NLRB seems to single out for special attention those provisions in the law where the greatest measure of damage will flow from the absurd decisions referred to here.

To illustrate further, in the area of free speech, the Board has been especially ingenious in its efforts to prevent employees from hearing and weighing the views of their employer during a union organizing campaign. In the Harrison-Cherry Lane case—140 NLRB No. 11, 1962—the union lost the election and then filed objections because the employer had shown his employees a movie film which depicted scenes of union violence. The Board found there was no misrepresentation, no coercion, no threats involved in the film. However, it nevertheless ordered the election set aside. It concluded that the use of this motion picture was a "new and somewhat different" type of electioneering, and that it therefore interfered with the election.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned when I spoke to the House on June 18, 1963, the law protects the right of free speech, whether exercised in written, printed, graphic, or visual form. Obviously motion pictures were not unknown to Congress when the free-speech provision was written into the Taft-Hartley law in 1947. Nevertheless, today the NLRB says that the use of motion pictures constitutes a new and somewhat different type of electioneering. And to show that it plays no favorites in restricting the means by which the right of free speech is exercised, the Board ruled in the Oak Manufacturing Company case (141 NLRB No. 121), that an employer interfered with the election when he wrote letters to his employees during an organizing campaign citing the benefits they were already enjoying without a union.

Again, Mr. Speaker, merely to illustrate another area where the NLRB has undertaken a freewheeling operation which has no sanction under law—I should like to refer briefly to a series of decisions which have far-reaching implications for our free competitive enterprise system. I refer to decisions in which the Board has heavily encroached on management's right to manage. As I told the House last June 18, Mr. Speaker, this line of decision holds that a business enterprise must bargain, not alone on wages, hours, and working conditions as the statute specifies, but on a variety of major economic business judgments as well.

These decisions begin with the second Fibreboard case (138 NLRB No. 67, 1962), and include a variety of others, among them the Renton News case (136 NLRB No. 55, 1962) and the American Manufacturing case (139 NLRB No. 57, 1962), to which I referred in the presentation before the House on June 18, 1963.

The net effect of all these cases, Mr. Speaker, is that the NLRB has once more charted for itself a course far afield from the law. Through these cases, the Labor Board says, in effect, that management may no longer make its own decisions on the efficiency, competitiveness, or even the very survival of its business. Management may no longer make its own decision on the location of facilities, on the future prospects of the business; in fact, it may no longer decide for itself whether it will stay in business or whether it will go out of business.

Mr. Speaker, this eye opening NLRB doctrine about management prerogatives is but the latest in a long line of extrastatutory powers this Board has arrogated to itself.

It is obvious that corrective action cannot longer be postponed. Month by month, year by year, the NLRB itself—by its own decisions—has systematically put Congress on notice that it is futile to entertain further any hope of a reasonable course in future Board decisions. No longer can there be serious question about the need for the legislation which I have introduced today. As I told the House on June 18, 1963, the 25-year record of performance by the NLRB in the discharge of its judicial role truly represents one of the most lamentable episodes in the history of American jurisprudence.

I have heard some people say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not worry too much about NLRB decisions—because they can be appealed to the courts. Yes, they can be appealed. However, to those who say this, I would simply point out that the worth of their suggestion is refuted by the quarter-century history of this agency's relationships with the courts. The courts invariably defer to the so-called expertise of the Board as the fact-finding agency. Because the Board's trial examiners conduct the hearings and see the witnesses, the courts have been most reluctant to upset the Board's findings. In this connection it should also be remembered that when an NLRB decision is appealed to the courts, it does not mean a new unbiased trial. It is limited to an appellate review of the written record made before the Board. The miscarriage of justice which has attended so many Board proceedings, is therefore initiated—indeed it is often assured—at the level of the Board's employees, for as already pointed out it is the Board's trial examiners who conduct the hearings at which these records are made.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, few cases are appealed. Also, the history of the NLRB shows that it has rarely changed to a reasonable course simply because courts of appeal rebuffed it on particular cases.

The corrective, Mr. Speaker, must, therefore, be applied at the trial level. This is the corrective provided by H.R. 8246.

Before we proceed to an analysis of H.R. 8246, Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that practically all of the Board's excesses through the years, all of its absurd decisions, have reflected one central misconception of its own role. Early in its existence, Mr. Speaker, this agency somehow conceived the notion that Congress had given it a policymaking function. In this view, the NLRB is 100 percent wrong.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of H.R. 8246 were approved by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1954. In his statement covering the committee's activities at that time, the chairman of the committee had some pointed comments to make about the NLRB's self-appointed policy role. The chairman's remarks are as appropriate now as they were then, and I should like to quote from them in part here. He said:

> The Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley law spell out in definite terms the conduct which constitutes unfair labor practices. The functions of the Board under both statutes have been investigation and factfinding—to determine whether certain acts were committed, and whether such acts, if proved, violated the law. Thus, its real job has been to determine the guilt or innocence of individuals under these statutes. In neither law did Congress delegate any discretion to determine what the country's labor policy ought to be. It gave the Board no authority to decide what should be the relations among unions, employers, and employees. It is this lack of authority in policy matters which sets this Board apart.
>
> Other Federal agencies are not so restricted. * * * The Securities and Exchange Commission regulates the conduct of stock exchanges. * * * The Federal Power Commission sets standards for construction of power lines. * * * The Federal Trade Commission decides what type of advertising and other trade practices can be permitted in the public interest.
>
> Each of these agencies necessarily has a broad grant of policymaking authority from Congress. The NLRB has none. * * * It is firmly limited by statute to a judicial finding on whether specific acts violate the well-defined terms of the law (p. 3, committee print, Report of the Committee on Education and Labor, pursuant to H. Res. 115, 83d Cong., 2d sess., on matters relating to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947).

Mr. Speaker, the observations which I have quoted are as valid today as they were when made by the chairman of our committee nearly 10 years ago. At that time, Mr. Speaker, we had analyzed over 15 years of what the chairman called in his statement "the unhappy history of NLRB's experts." Now, in 1963, we have added almost another decade, which—measured in terms of NLRB's studied distortions of congressional intent—represents a period of years even more distressing than those first 15.

Unfair labor practice cases are private law suits—nothing more. On this point I should like to quote again from the statement filed by the chairman of our committee in the 83d Congress. After citing the fact that in unfair labor practice cases the NLRB is limited to a judicial finding, the chairman said:

> This is precisely the function which our courts perform. It is the very function for which courts were established. It is one which they alone should exercise. It should never have been placed elsewhere.

I agreed with those observations when they were made in the 83d Congress, Mr. Speaker. I subscribe to them with added emphasis now. H.R. 8246 will, as the chairman said in 1954:

> Restrict the administrative agency to an administrative job, and restore a purely judicial function to the courts.

I recall that in 1954, Mr. Speaker, some apologists for the NLRB said the committee's proposal would impose a hardship on the courts. I disagreed then, and I disagree now. Statistics on the number of unfair labor practice charges filed over a given period of time are far from a true indicator of the judicial workload contemplated by H.R. 8246. It is a fact of labor-management life that unfair practice charges are basically requests for investigation. It is also a fact of life that many such charges are filed by employers and unions for bargaining or maneuvering advantage. Only a small percentage of all charges filed ever reach the hearing stage. Approximately 40 percent of all charges are withdrawn, about 30 percent are dismissed, and about another 20 percent are settled. We can readily see, then, how it is that less than 10 percent of these charges reach the trial stage. In fact, over the past 3 years 36,968 unfair labor practice charges were filed, an average of 12,323 per year. During this same period a total of 2,221 hearings were held by NLRB examiners. This is an average of 740 trials per year—see 27th Annual Report of the NLRB, 1962, pages 6–14.

In the event that approximately the same number would go to trial in the courts under H.R. 8246, this means we are talking about an average of fewer than 10 added trials each year in each one of our 86 U.S. district courts.

I realize, of course, that these trials, though widely distributed geographically, would not fall evenly in every judicial district. Some courts, particularly those serving heavily industrialized areas, would draw a greater percentage. And on that point, Mr. Speaker, might I express the hope that Congress will never deny any litigant his proper access to our courts simply because existing facilities in a given district might seem to be overtaxed. For such a problem, should it arise in any district, Mr. Speaker, the obvious answer is either the reassignment of some judges now serving elsewhere, or legislation to authorize additional judgeships.

Several additional factors should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, when the House assesses the workload contemplated for the courts under H.R. 8246. I have already mentioned that over the past 3 years an average of only 740 hearings were held each year by NLRB trial examiners. Under H.R. 8246, with the parties no longer able to use the NLRB for the same maneuvering and bargaining advantages that they have in the past, an even greater number of charges may be settled or dismissed before they reach the hearing stage in the future. Further, H.R. 8246 makes the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally applicable to these trials. It also provides for hearings before special masters at the discretion of the court. These provisions, along with a specific provision for nonjury trials, will all materially lessen the impact of any additional caseload on our courts. And, as I have already pointed out Mr. Speaker, if experience should show that any judicial district is overburdened, the answer will then lie in the appointment of additional judges or the reassignment of some now serving in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to emphasize here that H.R. 8246 would in no way prejudice any case pending before the Board at the time of its enactment. Nor would it prejudice any enforcement proceeding pending in court at the time of enactment. It would preserve the full rights of all litigants at all stages.

And I should like to emphasize one further point. With the NLRB restricted under H.R. 8246 to purely administrative duties, complaining parties would in the future make their own investigations, furnish their own facts, and present their own cases for trial. On that, Mr. Speaker, the bill carries a very significant proviso. I realize—as did the Committee on Education and Labor when it approved this same measure in 1954—that at times some litigants, particularly individual employees, may be unable to afford the costs of handling their own cases. This certainly will not be true of the average employer nor of the average union, but it might well be the case where an individual employee files a charge against his employer or against a union. In such a situation, H.R. 8246 provides the alternative right for a complaining party either to present his own case in court or to have his local U.S. attorney present it for him without cost.

H.R. 8246 makes no attempt to rewrite the unfair labor practice sections of the law. It is directed only at the manner in which unfair labor practice cases will be adjudicated. However, that entails a number of significant procedural changes. In the interest of clarity and a full understanding, I want to outline these procedural changes here.

Under present law, orders of the NLRB are not self-enforcing. If they are not complied with, the Board must petition the U.S. Court of Appeals for enforcement. With cases tried in district courts, court orders would, of course, be automatically self-enforcing, with the regular appellate procedure available to all litigants.

Under present law, temporary restraining orders are issued by the court only on the petition of the General Counsel for the Board. With cases tried in Federal courts, judges would have their regular power to grant appropriate temporary relief pending final disposition of any case. Such injunctive relief could of course be sought by any litigant—union, employee, or employer. However, as in the amendment adopted in the Committee on Education and Labor during the 83d Congress—before any temporary restraining orders could be issued, additional procedural safeguards are provided in H.R. 8246. These are patterned after the Norris-La Guardia Act, and require first, that the complaint must be under oath; second, that a public hearing be held, at which testimony would be taken to support the petition, with the opportunity afforded both to cross-examine and present opposing testimony; and third, that to support any temporary restraining order, the court must find (a) that the unfair practice has been committed and will be continued unless restrained; (b) that substantial and irreparable injury would follow; (c) that greater injury would flow from denying relief than from granting it; and (d) that there is no adequate remedy at law.

Further, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8246 would forbid all ex parte injunctions. It prohibits any restraining order unless there is notice and an opportunity to be heard.

Another significant procedural change in H.R. 8246 relates to jurisdictional disputes. The law now makes a jurisdictional strike or boycott an unfair labor practice. H.R. 8246 does not change that. However, existing law now empowers the NLRB to hear and decide jurisdictional disputes, unless the parties themselves reach a settlement within 10 days after a charge is filed. H.R. 8246 does not carry that assignment over to the courts. The job of determining who should do a particular piece of work is essentially an administrative job—not a function properly to be assigned to our courts. The regular certification procedures of the Board may at times assist in determining who should do what work, but obviously the courts should not be asked to decide that question. However, under H.R. 8246 the unfair labor practice charge growing out of any jurisdictional strike or boycott is made subject to the same redress in court as are all other unfair labor practices under H.R. 8246.

Summing up, Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that I realize the legislation proposed by H.R. 8246 is of deep and far-reaching significance. The House may be assured that my decision to introduce it was not, as I said earlier, arrived at overnight. I ask that it be promptly and earnestly considered by the Congress, for clearly its enactment would serve the best interests of employees, of unions, of employers and of the general public.

Congress has been patient, tolerant, and helpful to the NLRB for more than 25 years. All to no avail, however, because the NLRB by its own decisions has demonstrated that it respects neither the letter of the law nor the intent of Congress.

I have reluctantly concluded therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of congressional and public patience, in terms of the national interest, the NLRB has passed the point of no return. Its own history and its own decisions demonstrate its lack of fitness for any judicial role.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, for this reason and for the other reasons which I have already outlined, I shall press for early enactment of the legislation I have offered today.

H.R. 8246

A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for trial of unfair labor practice cases in the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(d) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby repealed. This section shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. Section 4(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the General Counsel of the Board" in the first sentence; by striking out ", examiners," in the second sentence; and by striking out the fourth and sixth sentences.

Sec. 3. Section 8(b)(5) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(5) to require of employees covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a)(3) the payment, as a condition precedent to becoming a member of such organization, of a fee in an amount which is excessive or discriminatory under the circumstances, considering, among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organizations in the particular industry, and the wages currently paid to the employees affected;".

SEC. 4. Section 9(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 10(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of section 10 in effect at the time the order was issued".

SEC. 5. Section 9(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Whenever the validity of a certification of a bargaining representative by the Board under this section is in issue in a proceeding before a court under section 10, the clerk of the court shall notify the Board of that fact. Within fifteen days after the date such notice is received the Board shall file such certification, together with the record on which it was based, with the court."

SEC. 6. Section 10 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PREVENTION OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

"SEC. 10. (a) The district courts of the United States, the district court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone shall have jurisdiction, as provided in this section, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in section 8) affecting commerce.

"(b) Any person aggrieved by any such unfair labor practice may, within six months after the date on which such unfair labor practice occurred, either (1) file and prosecute a complaint in any court specified in subsection (a) having jurisdiction of the parties, or (2) file a charge of such unfair labor practice with the United States attorney for the appropriate district and request him to file and prosecute such a complaint. Whenever a person aggrieved by an unfair labor practice is prevented by reason of service in the Armed Forces from filing a charge or complaint he may do so within six months after the date of his discharge.

"(c) Whenever a charge is filed with a United States attorney under this section, he shall promptly notify the person against whom such charge is made. Within a reasonable time thereafter, he shall file a complaint with the appropriate court and prosecute such complaint, in the name of and on behalf of the person who filed the charge, unless he determines that the charge is frivolous, or otherwise without basis in law or fact, in which case he shall promptly notify the parties of such determination. After receiving such notice, the charging party may file and prosecute a complaint under subsection (b) on his own initiative; and the period beginning with the date on which he filed the charge with the United States attorney, and ending with the date on which he received such notice, shall not be counted in determining whether the six-month period specified in subsection (b) has expired. The United States attorney shall give priority to charges of unfair labor practices within the meaning of paragraph (4) (B) or (C) of section 8(b) over all other unfair labor practice charges filed with him.

"(d) Proceeding under this section shall be tried by the court without a jury. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply in each such proceeding, except as otherwise provided in this section. In any case in which the pleadings present issues of fact, the court may appoint a master and the order of reference may require the master to submit with his report a recommended order. The master shall be compensated by the United States at a rate to be fixed by the court, and shall be reimbursed by the United States for necessary expenses incurred in performing his duties under this section. Any court before which a proceeding is brought under this section shall advance such proceeding on the docket and expedite its disposition.

"(e) The court may grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems appropriate pending final disposition of any proceeding under this section, but only after publicly hearing testimony of witnesses (with opportunity for cross-examination) in support of the allegations of a complaint made under oath, and testimony in opposition thereto, if offered; and only after findings of fact by the court to the effect—

"(1) that one or more acts constituting an unfair labor practice have been committed and will be continued unless restrained;

"(2) that substantial and irreparable injury to the complainant will follow;

"(3) that as to each item of relief granted greater injury will be inflicted by the denial of relief than will be inflicted by the granting of relief; and

"(4) that complainant has no adequate remedy at law.

The Act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes' shall not apply to any proceeding under this section, except that section 10 of such Act, providing for expeditious review of temporary injunctions, shall apply with respect to any temporary relief or restraining order issued under this section.

"(f) If the court finds that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any unfair labor practice as charged in the complaint, the court shall enjoin such person from engaging in such unfair labor practice, and shall order such person to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay (but not including the payment of damages in any other form), as may be necessary to enforce compliance with the provisions of this Act which such person is found to have violated. Where an order directs reinstatement of an employee, back pay shall be required of the employer, or the labor organization, or both, in such proportion as the court shall assess responsibility for the discrimination suffered by him. No order of the court shall require the reinstatement of any individual as an employee who has been suspended or discharged, or the payment to him of any back pay, if such individual was suspended or discharged for cause. In determining whether a violation of section 8(a)(1) or section 8(a)(2) has occurred, the same rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether the labor organization affected is affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope.

"(g) For the purposes of this section courts shall be deemed to have jurisdiction of a labor organization (1) in the district in which such organization maintains its principal office, (2) in any district in which its officers or agents are engaged in promoting or protecting the interests of employee members, or (3) in any district in which the unfair labor practice is alleged to have occurred. The service of legal process upon such officer or agent shall constitute service upon the labor organization and make such organization a party to the suit."

SEC. 7. Section 11 of such Act is amended by striking out "and section 10" in the matter preceding paragraph (1); by striking out "or proceeded against" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and by striking out "Complaints, orders," in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "Orders".

SEC. 8. Section 14(c) of such Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. (a) Any proceeding under section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act which is pending before the National Labor Relations Board on the date of enactment of this Act shall be continued by the Board if the hearing provided for in subsection (b) of such section, as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act, has been completed, and if, within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act the person aggrieved by the unfair labor practice in question requests the Board to continue the proceeding. Upon request of any such person, the appropriate United States attorney shall appear and represent such person in proceedings under this subsection before the Board and the courts. The Board shall act in such proceeding, and its action may be enforced or reviewed by the courts, in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted, except that—

(1) the person requesting continuation of the proceeding or the appropriate United States attorney, shall be substituted for the General Counsel in proceedings before the Board;

(2) any enforcement proceeding under section 10(e) shall be instituted by the party seeking enforcement of the Board's order, or the appropriate United States attorney, and thereupon the Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceedings;

(3) the Board shall not appear in any proceeding under section 10(e) or 10(f); and

(4) if the court orders additional evidence to be taken in any proceeding under section 10(e) or 10(f), it shall be taken before a master designated by the court; the master shall be compensated by the United States at a rate to be fixed by the court, and shall be reimbursed by the United States for necessary expenses incurred in performing such duties.

(b) Where the Board has issued an order under section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act before the date of enactment of this Act, a proceeding in court for the enforcement or review of such order may be instituted after such date in the same manner and with the same effect as though this Act had not been enacted, except that the provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) of this section shall apply to such proceedings.

(c) Any proceeding under section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act which is pending in any court on the date of enactment of this Act shall be continued as if this Act had not been enacted, except that after the effective date of section 1 an attorney employed by the Board and designated by the Board for the purposes shall be substituted for the General Counsel.

(d) Where a charge of an unfair labor practice is pending before the National Labor Relations Board on the date of enactment of this Act, and the hearing provided for in section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act, has not been completed, and the time limit provided for in section 10(b) of such Act, as amended by this Act for filing a charge or complaint based on the same acts has expired, a charge or complaint may nevertheless be filed under such section at any time within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: This section repeals subsection (d) of the National Labor Relations Act (hereinafter referred to as the "act"), which will have the effect of abolishing the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Inasmuch as the basic purpose of the bill is to provide for trial of unfair labor practice cases in the courts, there will no longer be any need for a statutory office of General Counsel. This amendment will become effective 30 days after the enactment of the bill.

Section 2: This section amends section 4(a) of the act, relating to employees of the Board, to delete references therein to the General Counsel, to examiners, and to attorneys who represent the Board before the courts. Since, under the bill, the Board will no longer engage in the adjudication of unfair labor practice cases, no trial examiners will be needed and there will be no Board orders to be enforced in the courts.

Section 3: This section amends section 8(b)(5) of the act, relating to excessive union dues and fees, to delete the reference to findings of the Board. As indicated above, under the bill the Board will make no findings in connection with unfair labor practice cases.

Section 4: This section amends section 9(c)(2) of the act to make a technical conforming change with respect to procedures in representation cases.

Section 5: This section amends section 9(d) of the act to require the Board to file with the appropriate court a certification of a bargaining representative, together with the record upon which certification was based, in cases where the validity of such certification is in issue.

Section 6: This section inserts, in lieu of section 10 of the act, a new section 10 which contains the basic provisions as to the new procedure for preventing unfair labor practices.

Subsection (a) of the new section 10 invests the district courts of the United States with jurisdiction to prevent persons from engaging in unfair labor practices.

Under subsections (b) and (c) any person who believes himself aggrieved by an unfair labor practice will have two courses of action open to him.

First he may himself file and prosecute a complaint in any Federal court having jurisdiction of the parties; or, second, he may elect to file a charge of such unfair labor practice with the U.S. attorney for the appropriate district and request him to file and prosecute such a claim. The person aggrieved has 6 months from the date on which the unfair labor practice occurred to file the complaint or charge, but service in the Armed Forces will not be considered in computing such 6-month period.

If the person aggrieved elects to file a charge with the U.S. attorney, the U.S. attorney will promptly notify the person against whom the charge was made, and must, within a reasonable time thereafter, file a complaint with the appropriate court and prosecute such complaint in the name of and on behalf of the person who filed the charge. The U.S. attorney is relieved of this obligation only if he determines that the charge is frivolous, or otherwise without basis in law or fact, but in such a case he is required to promptly notify the parties of his determination. Where the U.S. attorney declines to file a complaint when requested to do so, the charging party may himself file and prosecute a complaint on his own initiative, as described above, and the period during which the matter was under consideration by the U.S. attorney will not be counted in determining whether the 6-month period referred to above has expired.

The U.S. attorney is directed to give priority to charges of unfair labor practices within the meaning of paragraphs (4) (B) or (C) of section 8(b) of the act.

Subsection (d) of the new section provides for a court trial, without a jury, in which the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will apply. It is provided, however, that in any case in which the pleadings present issue of fact, the court may appoint a master and in the order of reference may require the master to submit with his report a recommended order. The courts are directed to expedite proceedings for trial of unfair labor practice cases.

Subsection (e) of the new section authorizes the court to grant temporary relief or restraining orders pending final disposition of proceedings under the section. However, such temporary relief or restraining order may be granted only after the court has heard the testimony of witnesses, and only after the court has found that an unfair labor practice has been committed and will be continued unless restrained, that substantial and irreparable injury to the complainant will follow, that as to each item of relief granted greater injury will be inflicted by the denial of relief than by the granting of relief, and that the complainant has no adequate remedy at law. The provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act will not apply to prohibit the granting of such temporary relief or restraining order.

Subsection (f) of the new section provides that if the court determines that a person has engaged in or is engaging in any unfair labor practice as charged, it will enjoin such unfair labor practice and will order such affirmative action, including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as may be necessary to enforce compliance with the provisions of the act such person has been found to have violated. No other damages may be required. Where the court orders reinstatement of employees, back pay will be required of the employer or the labor organization, or both, in such proportions as the court shall assess responsibility for the discrimination suffered by the employees. The court may not order the reinstatement of an individual or payment of back wages to him if he was suspended or discharged for cause. In determining whether a violation of section 8(a)(2) has occurred the same rules of decision will be applied by the courts irrespective of whether the labor organization affected is affiliated with a national or international labor organization.

Subsection (g) of the new section gives jurisdiction over labor organizations to U.S. district courts of the district in which it maintains its principal office, of any district in which its officers or agents are engaged in union activities, and of any district in which an unfair labor practice is alleged to have occurred.

Section 7: This section makes certain technical and conforming changes in section 11 of the act.

Section 8: This section repeals subsection (c) of section 14 of the act. This subsection at present permits the Board to decline to assert jurisdiction over certain labor disputes where the effect of the dispute on commerce is not sufficient substantially to warrant exercise of its jurisdiction. It also permits States to assume jurisdiction over labor disputes over which the Board has declined to assert jurisdiction. The continuation of such authority in the Board would be inappropriate in light of the transfer to the Federal courts of all jurisdiction over unfair labor practice cases.

Section 9: This section specifies the manner in which unfair labor practice cases which are pending before the National Labor Relations Board or the courts on the date of enactment of this act will be disposed of.

THE AUGUST 28 DEMONSTRATION

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by the pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 25, I had the privilege of attending church services at the Fourth Presbyterian Church in Washington. At this service Pastor Richard C. Halverson presented a very thought provoking and well reasoned statement concerning the August 28 civil-rights demonstration. I ask unanimous consent Mr. Speaker, that the statement of Dr. Halverson appear at this point in the RECORD:

A STATEMENT CONCERNING THE AUGUST 28 DEMONSTRATION

(By Richard C. Halverson, Pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C.)

Next Wednesday an unprecedented event will take place in our Nation's Capital. It is predicted that 100,000 or more persons will march on Washington to demonstrate for civil rights.

Although I can appreciate the rationale of this demonstration—that its purpose is to dramatize the just cause of the American Negro as well as all minority groups, I am not persuaded that this is the proper way, nor the most effective way to accomplish that purpose.

The atmosphere of the growing agitation is such that those who are involved in the demonstration will be inclined to intimidate those who are not. The tendency will be to identify those who do not participate as opposed to civil rights for the Negro; therefore there are two facts which demand recognition.

1. Many who believe in full and equal citizenship for Negroes will neither participate in the demonstration nor give it their moral support.

2. Some will involve themselves in the demonstration, not because they are particularly interested in Negro rights or any other rights, but because they will exploit this or any other righteous cause for their own evil ends.

Whether or not a person participates in or supports the August 28 demonstration is not a valid criterion as to his convictions about minority rights or the merits of the Negro's cause. Intimidation by those who advocate the demonstration is unworthy of the purpose for which the demonstration will be held and if anything it will hinder that purpose.

I am personally convinced of the righteousness of the Negro cause. Discrimination, as practiced against the Negro is immoral—it is neither Christian nor American. I believe in the right of Negroes and all minority groups to all the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship which I demand for myself.

There are those who are opposed to the demonstration which is to be held next Wednesday; nevertheless, it is our Christian obligation to respect the right of those who participate to do so—to honor their motivation as we expect them to honor ours who do not participate—and to pray that God will so overrule this memorable day in national affairs that no violence or unworthy incident will mar the demonstration or militate against the faithful and worthy intentions of the cause itself and those who participate.

Let us pray.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has expired.

TEST BAN TREATY A GAMBLE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when witnesses are being heard over in the other body on the nuclear test ban treaty, I think it ought to be pointed out that article IV of the treaty gives all signatories a right to withdraw if "extraordinary events have jeopardized their supreme interests." The treaty stipulates that 3 months' advance notice must be given before a nation can withdraw and resume testing. This provision supersedes our Constitution and becomes the law of the land so far as the United States is concerned. However, this provision does not hold true insofar as the Soviets are concerned for the following reasons: The whole of article IV is in direct conflict with article 49-0 of the Soviet Constitution, which entitles the Soviets to abrogate any treaty instantly, with or without cause.

Accordingly, the Soviet Government, acting in secret session of the Presidium may under article 49-0 denounce the treaty. Such action would operate instantaneously to relieve the Soviet Government from its obligation to deliver 3 months' advance notice or any notice at all.

There is no provision in Soviet law which provides for the Soviet Constitution to be overridden by the provisions of any treaty. Under these circumstances the Soviets could keep secret from all other parties its renunciation of the treaty until such time as it appeared most advantageous to suddenly reveal their action making their abrogation instantaneous.

In view of the Soviet's record of having abrogated 62 out of 64 formal treaties during their brief history, plus their methods of breaking less formal agreements without notice and in view of the above-described loophole, there is room for considerable doubt and speculation as to what the Soviet's motives are in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I would surely have to agree with the editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star under date of Saturday, August 24, entitled "Test Ban Treaty a Gamble," and I include it, under unanimous consent, in my remarks at this point:

TEST BAN TREATY A GAMBLE

> Now, after the original propaganda blasts for the nuclear test ban have had their effect and the opponents (muted though they have been) have also at last been heard from we have a clearer picture of how unclear the whole deal is.
>
> What it amounts to is that a number of ranking scientists think we have a nuclear lead on the Russians and that a test ban deal will preserve that lead.
>
> A number of other ranking scientists in this specialized field, including the greatest of them all, think, however, that the Russians have made a breakthrough in a critical area of missile defense and now want to prevent us continuing research in that field and catching up.
>
> Military experts are equally divided and along similar lines.
>
> The President has chosen to take the view of those who think the test ban is a good idea, but even at best he has publicly recognized the possibility of a doublecross and has discussed measures we are taking to nullify any.
>
> That, unhappily, is mostly political talk arising from pure political necessity. There has never been a serious disagreement among the experts themselves about one thing, and this includes President Kennedy's top advisers in this field. That is the simple fact that we are a long, long way from the "detection equipment" he speaks of so blithely. It isn't even in the works. And that is also the fact that maintaining active laboratories readying tests we are pledged not to make (just in case the Russians cheat) won't work.
>
> Going programs will always have priorities on the best brains and best equipment over a banned program that seems to be going nowhere, and top scientists will want to work in the programs that are moving ahead, not those standing still.
>
> It just isn't possible to maintain a high level of readiness to test under the conditions of a test ban, and we can be surprised by a disadvantage as great as a year and a half once again, just as we were the last time.
>
> Hence, it is clear that basically we are gambling and we are guessing.
>
> This step is not being taken on the basis of any sure knowledge or "hard" facts, but on the basis of guesswork in which the guessers do not agree.
>
> That is a big gamble with this Nation's life.
>
> The President thinks it is worth it, because he has a great fear, expressed more than once, that we are all going to be blown up anyway if we go on indefinitely with the cold war.
>
> He thinks the risk of trusting the Russians is less than the risk of not trusting them.
>
> At the moment, it doesn't seem like we have any place else to go.
>
> But, certainly, we go with grave misgivings, and very little of these high hopes that all will become sweetness and light between us and an organization of Communists with a history of betrayal, mass murder, and total ruthlessness behind them as an organization, and as individuals.
>
> We are doing business with proven liars, crooks, and murderers, and it cannot be anything but a hazardous business.
>
> It's hard to figure which is safer, agreeing or disagreeing with such people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that the combined forces attempting to jam this treaty down our throats have done a tremendous amount of propagandizing behind the scenes by every possible means and by every kind of pressure available. Otherwise, why would some 50 "have-not" nations rush blindly up to sign on the dotted line before the ink was hardly dry on the proposed treaty? These "have-not" countries did not even pretend to have deliberated upon the question. For what purpose? Obviously, to put each of our Senators in a hot seat where they would have to knuckle under and say "uncle" or be subject to the smear of every left-wing media.

GRANTING OF EXPORT LICENSES TO AUTHORIZE SHIPMENT TO U.S.S.R. OF HIGHLY AUTOMATED MINING MACHINERY

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House of Representatives last Friday, August 23, I discussed a decision by the Department of Commerce to grant export licenses to authorize shipment to the U.S.S.R. of highly automated mining machinery valued at an estimated $10 million intended for use in mining potash by the U.S.S.R.

The Department itself admitted that because of the size of this order and the productivity of this type of equipment there was little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union. The decision to issue the licenses was based on the reasoning that potassium fertilizer, a major product of potash, can be characterized as "peaceful goods."

I firmly believe that granting these licenses is completely contrary to our security and welfare and against the express direction of the Congress last year in strengthening the Export Control Act to make the prohibitions against shipments to Soviet bloc countries specifically apply in the case where exports could help build the economic potential of Soviet bloc countries.

Chairman Khrushchev himself on August 24, 1963, provided insight once again into how "peaceful" Soviet intentions are. In his current trip to Yugoslavia he boasted that the U.S.S.R. is making significant strides toward reaching American production levels, but urged the Yugoslav people to work harder to win against the West. According to news reports on August 24, he told reporters:

> I say we will beat you, and beat you with better organized production. We will not bury you with a shovel, but the working class will bury you.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in a statement dated August 21, 1963, commenting on his recent trip to the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc nations told of the agricultural goals of Khrushchev and the significance of state planning. Secretary Freeman said:

> This means that if Chairman Khrushchev carries out his determination—as he indicated to me he would—to sizably increase his capital inputs in agriculture, there will be an increase in production, particularly grain and row crops. The Chairman indicated he would give strong emphasis during the next 5 years to mixed feed, fertilizer and chemical production. It is apparent that he is shifting agricultural priorities from the new lands, where the Russians have placed substantial amounts of virgin land into grain production in recent years, to more intensive cultivation of historic cropland.

Secretary Freeman also said Khrushchev told him his goal is to surpass the United States as No. 1 agriculture producer. Freeman's closing comment was:

> Finally, the clear evidence of increased attention to the agricultural sector in the countries we visited is a sign and a trend we should welcome and encourage. Investments in raising the standard of living are investments in the peaceful capabilities of these nations.

Certainly the Communist campaign to build up their economic capacity and potential with which Khrushchev hopes to "bury" us will be given a major boost if we help them out through selling automated equipment such as the potash mining machinery in question.

For a good indicator of one of the things the Soviets can and will likely attempt to do with the increased potash production if they obtain this machinery, let us look at the situation concerning sales of potassium fertilizer to Japan. During the year July 1 through June of 1958–59, the United States shipped 242,000 short tons of potash to Japan. That amount represented 35 percent of the market. For the same year the U.S.S.R. share of the market was 17 percent. During the intervening years the U.S. share of the market rose to some 40 percent of the market but is now back down to 38 percent. In the meantime, the U.S.S.R. share of the Japanese market has risen steadily until today it takes up 32 percent of the market. This has occurred, mind you, during the time when the U.S.S.R. has been far short of its production quota for potash for its own use.

How has the U.S.S.R. increased its share of the market? All the U.S.S.R. has to do is cut its prices. During the years 1961–62 the price for potassium fertilizer exported to Japan from the United States ranged from $43.70 to $44.70 per metric ton. The U.S.S.R. price ranged from $39.00 to $39.30 per metric ton.

Since U.S.S.R. industry is state regulated, it can simply set aside an amount of potash products for export purposes and set its price anywhere it pleases to undercut markets. This is the well-known dumping of goods procedure, at which the Soviets are so adept if they see advantage in it to the U.S.S.R.. There does not seem to be any question but that we would be helping the U.S.S.R. to further its trade offensive schemes by allowing shipment of this mining machinery to the U.S.S.R.

Soviet efforts to purchase the mining machinery follows along the same familiar pattern we have seen in the past. The Soviets do not want to buy consumer goods for the people. They want to buy factories, technologies, advanced precision equipment, and so forth to build up their economy and thus make the U.S.S.R. a stronger nation economically and militarily.

Its economic offensive against the West is an important part of the Communist campaign to extend its influence and I believe it is dangerous and shortsighted policy to help the Soviets through selling them equipment to help realize their goal.

Listed below are the export license approvals for the mining equipment authorized to be shipped to the U.S.S.R. contained in the Department of Commerce list for August 21, 1963.

Combination potash cutting loading machines and parts, $757,500; conveying equipment and parts, $517,362; mine shuttle cars, $192,000; roller and ball bearings, $3,603; air and gas cleaning and purification machines, $17,912; rubber hose and tubing, $1,562; rubber hose and tubing, $2,336; conveyor and elevator belts and belting, $70,720; percussion rock drill bits, $14,188; conveying equipment parts, $7,715; mining cable, insulated, $8,800; mine shuttle car parts, $21,339; specialized mining equipment parts, $82,345; conveying equipment parts, $16,972; tires and tubes, $4,425; rubber hose and tubing, $3,401; mining cable insulated, $39,459; combination potash cutting loading machines, $4,485,000; conveying equipment, $2,925,000; specialized mining equipment parts, $3,655; combination potash cutting loading machines, $266,343; electric motors, $20,729; electric motors, $14,003; electric motors, $50,400.

I am also setting forth my letter of August 23, 1963, to the Secretary of Commerce, urging that the decision to issue these licenses be reversed. The letter follows:

AUGUST 23, 1963.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been advised by Mr. Forrest D. Hockersmith, Director of the Office of Export Control, Bureau of International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, in a letter dated August 21, 1963, that a decision has been made to grant licenses authorizing exportation to the U.S.S.R. of certain mining machinery.

It is stated in the letter that the machinery in question, which I understand is highly automated equipment valued at $10 million, is intended for use in the mining of potash by the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Hockersmith advises that because of the size of the order and the productivity of the equipment, there is little doubt that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union. I am in complete agreement with that view.

I believe that because of the fact that shipment of this equipment would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the U.S.S.R., the issuance of such licenses is completely contrary to the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, and hereby respectfully request that the decision to allow shipment of this machinery to the U.S.S.R. be reversed.

Sincerely,

GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

It is my hope that Members of Congress and the public will join in the request urging that these licenses be canceled.

NEWSPAPER LEADERSHIP IN CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's newspapers are filled with articles dealing with the current civil rights crisis. Reporters and their editors are effectively chronicling what surely will be the major domestic news story of the year.

Beyond the news accounts of the events which characterize this civil rights crisis, there are an increasing number of editorials being published which state opinions on how best to achieve a solution to the problem of second-class citizenship. These editorial expressions contain much moral suasion. Their impact cannot be overstated.

I was particularly impressed with an editorial I read in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat and Chronicle of Sunday, August 25. This daily newspaper which serves my home community and so many of my constituents has issued a forceful challenge to its readers concerning the problems faced by Negroes in the North.

The editorial points out with clarity four specific areas in need of community understanding and attention: jobs, housing, schools, and government representation. For the interest of my colleagues who may wish to alert their own communities to this suggested plan of action, I take pleasure in sharing this editorial with them:

HERE'S WHAT WE IN ROCHESTER CAN DO ABOUT INTEGRATION

Can the average white citizen do anything to help his community solve the racial problem?

He can do a great deal, even as an individual.

But he can do a great deal more as part of a concerted force behind sensible projects forming part of a citywide, areawide program.

This summer editors and reporters of the Gannett Newspapers have been searching for workable, down-to-earth projects. Starting today these will be presented in The Democrat and Chronicle in a continuing series of articles, reports and editorials under the general title of "The Road to Integration." Similar material will appear in the Rochester Times-Union.

The road to integration is a rocky one. It stretches far into the future, perhaps beyond what most of us will live to travel. There are, it seems, no quick, easy, overall answers to the many complex issues. Nor is this something which can be left to Washington. It must be solved by each community. Rochester's warm heart and sturdy independence make this a challenge which we should welcome.

By now every realistic American knows that the racial problem will not be solved by passing some more laws. Negroes in the North long have just about every legal right possible to nail down.

Instead, the problem revolves around three basic needs:

1. Negroes need jobs.
2. They want better homes.
3. They want a good education for their children.

This is the vicious circle that has kept the Negroes in spiritual and economic bondage a full century after the Emancipation Proclamation.

A man with a good, steady job has self-respect. He is a taxpayer instead of being a burden on taxpayers. He can move out of the slums—with the support of the law and the good will of the community. Once he gets out of the slums the problem of the segregated school will begin to solve itself.

Rochester has had ample warning of what has come to pass. Carefully documented surveys by both newspapers and studies by many dedicated civic leaders forecast today's problems long before they became acute.

To be specific, just what must Rochester do?

Let's forget about the stratospheric, unrealistic dreams of the idealists—just as we would reject utterly the ugly racism of the white South. Here's what we think can be done:

JOBS

As employers or as fellow workers we can, and should, go out of our way to welcome Negroes to the ranks of the employed. We can make them feel at home, part of the team, and give them special coaching.

Every Negro who gets a good job—and makes good at it—helps to break down barriers and to encourage other Negroes. Remember when Jackie Robinson was the only Negro playing major league baseball?

Setting quotas and favoring Negro applicants are nothing more than discrimination in reverse. But it won't do for us to sit back and wait for "fully qualified" Negroes to show up. We must encourage them to apply, rather than leaving that up to the NAACP.

HOUSING

Rochester always has been allergic to public housing. Many people believe that the building of Hanover Houses, for example, encouraged Negroes to move here when the city had no jobs for them.

Nevertheless, we think that Rochesterians should support such public housing as makes sense, in connection with slum clearance—but preferably encourage the use of existing buildings where possible, because this makes for a more normal neighborhood. Herding hundreds of poor people into one building or a complex of starkly functional structures, is just another form of segregation. It deprives a neighborhood of any natural leadership or variety.

Instead of permitting the slums to sink into jungle conditions, real "ghettos" where even the police fear to tread, we should:

1. Insist that the city enforce the sanitary and safety codes governing multiple dwellings, tearing down any building which a landlord refuses to keep up to the mark.
2. Patrol the area to control crime and juvenile delinquency, no matter how much it costs.
3. Encourage neighborhood groups that are trying to clean up their blocks and to teach rural immigrants how to live in town and indoors.

SCHOOLS

Negro children must have first-rate school buildings, adequate equipment and, above all, good teachers. If anything, they should have unusually well-qualified teachers and special courses to help those who came here poorly prepared.

The very few Rochester schools which have become predominantly Negro because of changes in the neighborhood do not fit into the pattern which has caused protests in other cities. Our board of education appears to be proceeding with properly deliberate speed to correct imbalance.

Breaking up the traditional neighborhood school pattern will be unpalatable to most white families. It may drive more of them to the suburbs. But our children will live in a biracial America, and any sensible program which brings whites and Negroes together at the formative age will benefit both races. We do not favor a so-called crash program.

Some people think there is no hope for adult Negroes who lack either education or jobs; that we must concentrate on training the younger generation. However, a Chicago program to educate adults on relief has been so successful that New York State will adopt the idea next month, starting at Niagara Falls. We should have a similar project here, along with more vocational training programs.

REPRESENTATION

The Negroes have the votes. They are beginning to use them. They can elect members of the Board of Supervisors and, eventually, a councilman.

Meanwhile, there should be studied effort to seek out some of the scores of fine, moderate, little-known Negro citizens and ask them to serve on appointive boards. They also should be considered for posts on some of the boards of our numerous semipublic institutions and agencies.

All of these things add up to a beginning of true representation. Add responsibility. They may be a million light years away from actual integration, but they are the foundation stones of equality. And, in all good conscience, America cannot afford to offer less.

Meanwhile, read what is being tried in other cities and let's hope that Rochester, as in so many other ways, can set a good example.

INTRODUCTION OF ANTITRUST BILLS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference three bills as the first installment of a legislative program designed to keep the antitrust laws abreast of our changing times.

I believe our antitrust laws are generally adequate and appropriate for their important public purpose—the protection of fair competition in free markets. No thoroughgoing overhaul is intended or needed.

Recent experience and continuing study, however, have convinced me of the need to revise and reform the antitrust laws in certain respects.

These three bills have been carefully framed as approaches to current problems which continue to impede the fair and effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. Let me explain each bill briefly.

My first bill would amend section 5 of the Clayton Act—15 United States Code, section 16—to correct certain illogical anomalies as to the effect in private antitrust actions of a judgment finding a violation of the antitrust laws in a suit brought by the Government.

The bill would also resolve a conflict among the decisions of the district courts by making it clear that a criminal antitrust conviction entered on a plea of guilty is not a "consent judgment," and hence it would be prima facie evidence of a violation of the antitrust laws in a subsequent private civil action.

Finally, this bill would remove a longstanding obstacle to a private party seeking redress for his injuries resulting from antitrust violations by providing that a criminal conviction entered on a plea of nolo contendere over the objection of the Government is not a "consent judgment." Such a judgment would thus become available as prima facie evidence to private victims of antitrust violations.

Second, I am introducing a bill to bring up to date the antitrust immunity statute—15 United States Code section 32—to require a witness to plead his constitutional privilege before obtaining immunity with respect to the evidence he furnishes. Almost every modern immunity statute contains this requirement, and its absence from the antitrust immunity statute, enacted in 1903, leaves pitfalls and uncertainties for the Department of Justice, the courts, and perhaps even for the committees of the Congress, who may find to their surprise that they have unwittingly given an antitrust violator an "immunity bath."

Third, I am reintroducing a bill to provide fair, uniform tax treatment in cases of divestiture under the antitrust laws. It is in the interest of the Government and defendants alike, to say nothing of the public interest in antitrust enforcement, to avoid imposing a tax penalty for compliance with the antitrust laws.

Hence my bill would provide for nonrecognition of capital gain where, to comply with an antitrust divestiture decree, a corporation sells or exchanges stock or assets, or passes through stock of another enterprise to its stockholders as was done in the Dupont-General Motors case.

In conclusion, I ask that a more detailed explanation of these three bills be included in the Record immediately following these remarks.

I. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 5 OF CLAYTON ACT

I am today introducing a bill to amend section 5 of the Clayton Act. As chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee and of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have viewed with mounting concern a number of illogical and unjust anomalies whereby defendants, found guilty of antitrust violations in suits brought by the Government, can force the private victims of their unlawful conduct to relitigate their guilt all over again, contrary to the plain purpose of section 5.

A. THE PURPOSE AND PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE CLAYTON ACT

The Clayton Act, among other things, seeks to enlist the aid of private parties in the enforcement of the antitrust laws. It gives them a right of action to restrain antitrust violations and to recover treble damages for their injuries resulting from such violations.

Consistent with this purpose, section 5 is designed to help private victims of antitrust violations to obtain redress by lessening their required proof and litigation expenses in the usually complex, time-consuming and expensive area of antitrust litigation.

To that end, section 5(a) provides that a final judgment or decree, in a civil or criminal antitrust case brought by the Government, to the effect that a given defendant has violated the antitrust laws shall be prima facie evidence in a later civil antitrust suit by a private plaintiff against that same defendant.

In addition, by tolling the statute of limitations while a Government antitrust case is pending, section 5(b) permits a private party to await the outcome before bringing suit so as to frame his pleading with the benefit of both the Government's evidence and any final decision which may be rendered finding the defendant guilty of antitrust violations.

B. NATURE OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The bill I now propose would amend section 5 to remove four anomalous restrictions on the right of private parties to use a final judgment finding that a given defendant has violated the antitrust laws.

First, section 5 as presently worded limits the use of such a judgment by a private party to an action or proceeding "brought" by him. This language apparently does not apply to suits for a declaratory judgment.[1] More important, it does not appear to give such a judgment prima facie effect in proving defenses (or perhaps even in establishing a counterclaim) in a suit brought by the antitrust violator against his victim. Thus, if a company had been held to have abused its patents to create a monopoly under the antitrust laws, it could still sue for infringement of those patents during the very period when they were being so abused, and the defendant might nevertheless be unable to use the prior judgment as prima facie evidence of his defense of illegality, estoppel and unclean hands.[2]

---

[1] *Volk* v. *Paramount Pictures*, 91 F. Supp. 902 (D. Minn., 1950).

My bill would make it clear that such a judgment may be so used.

Second, when the Clayton Act was amended in 1955 to authorize the United States to recover its damages sustained as a result of violations of the antitrust laws, section 5, curiously, was amended so as to exclude such judgments for damages from the provisions both of section 5(a) making them prima facie evidence, and of section 5(b) tolling the statute of limitations while a suit by the Government was pending.

It is utterly illogical that a suit by, or a judgment for, the Government should be available to a private party when the Government seeks equitable or injunctive relief but not when the Government sues for damages alone, or when it sues for both but gets a judgment for damages only.

This anomaly could lead to absurd results. For example, if the Government sues for both damages and injunctive relief, but recovers only damages, is the plaintiff who has waited barred by the statute of limitations, whereas he would be free to sue if the Government had obtained an injunction but no damages? Such a whimsical result can only have been inadvertent, and I can find no explanation for it in the legislative history.

My bill, therefore, would give the same effect to a suit by, or a judgment for, the Government whether it sues for damages or for injunctive relief. Where the effect of the judgment is concerned, it is the fact of a violation as evidenced by the judgment or decree which is important—not the details of the decree or the amount of damages.

With respect to the statute of limitations, it should make no difference, so far as the private victims of antitrust violations are concerned, whether the Government seeks an injunction to end the violation or damages which it has sustained as a result of the violation.

Third, in the wake of the notorious electrical equipment price-fixing cases, some 1,850 private damage suits have been brought against the defendants as a result of their convictions entered upon pleas of guilty.

Astonishingly, in these of all cases, the Federal district courts are evenly split, 3 to 3, on the question whether a conviction entered on a plea of guilty is a "consent judgment," within the meaning of section 5(a).[3] Unless ultimately reversed on appeal, three of these district court decisions mean that the convictions of these flagrant antitrust violators cannot be used as prima facie evidence against them, despite their express admission of guilt, in the many private treble-damage cases pending in the fifth, seventh, and ninth circuits.

Hitherto, it was generally supposed that a conviction entered on a plea of guilty in a criminal antitrust case could be used against the defendant in later litigation. Thus in *Sacramento Municipal Utility District* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, 62 CCH Trade Cases, Par. 70,552, the Court stated:

"Title 15 U.S.C. section 16 (section 5 of the Clayton Act), by its terms, does not apply to 'consent decrees,' but a plea of guilty cannot be construed as being a consent decree, any more than a crime can be consented to. A conviction of violation of the Sherman Act establishes 'prima facie all matters of fact and law necessarily decided by the conviction and the verdict on which it was based' (*Emich Motors Corp.* v. *General Motors Corp.*, 1950–51 Trade Cases, par. 62,778, 340 U.S. 588,569), and no logical distinction appears herein between a plea of guilty and a conviction after trial."

This general belief that a plea of guilty would be prima facie evidence in treble damage litigation explains the popularity of nolo contendere pleas among antitrust defendants. As Judge Weinfeld observed in *United States* v. *Standard Ultramarine & Color Co.*, 137 F. 167 (S.D.N.Y., 1955):

"The use of the nolo plea came into extended use in antitrust suits partly because of the uncertainty that a guilty plea would in fact gain for the defendant the benefit of the exception under section 5."

To lump together convictions on pleas of guilty with pleas of nolo contendere "would also in effect erase the well established distinction between pleas of nolo and guilty." (*Atlantic City Electric Co.* v. *General Electric Co.*, 1962 CCH Trade Cases, par. 70,406).

This familiar distinction was reaffirmed in *Hudson* v. *United States*, 272 U.S. 451,455, where the Supreme Court stated that it is "a rule of law that has never been questioned, that the implied confession, as contrasted to the express confession, does not estop the defendant to plead and prove his innocence in a civil action."

In *Atlantic City Electric Co.* v. *General Electric Co.*, supra, Judge Feinberg in holding that a plea of guilty is not a consent judgment within the meaning of section 5(a), pointed out that a contrary result would frustrate the purpose of section 5.

"Plaintiffs observe that section 5(a) and its proviso give expression to two policies—encouraging capitulations in Government prosecutions and easing the burden of treble-damage litigants who sue defendants previously found to have violated the antitrust laws. Accepting defendants' position, say plaintiffs, tips the balance between these two policies wholly in favor of encouraging surrender, leaving private litigants not much better off than they were before section 5 was enacted."

This bill would effectuate the purpose of section 5 by removing all doubt on this score. It is bad enough to let defendants convicted of a mammoth price fixing conspiracy evade civil responsibility for their crimes by "copping a plea" of nolo contendere. It would be monstrous if they could do so where they have solemnly admitted their guilt in a criminal conspiracy so widespread as to result in 1,850 civil damage suits.

Furthermore, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have been concerned, as has Chief Justice Warren, over the impact of these 1,850 treble-damage suits on the orderly administration of justice in our Federal courts. Calendar congestion will be compounded a thousand-fold if the guilt of these corporate defendants must be relitigated at full-scale trials by their many private victims without even the benefit of the Government's grand jury evidence against these defendants.

If a conviction on a plea of guilty does not constitute prima facie evidence, the private victims of antitrust violations, to obtain redress, must relitigate the defendants' guilty at length all over again. To do this they must first uncover in protracted discovery proceedings, as best they can, the evidence which the Government has already laid before the indicting grand jury in camera. To countenance such a result would make a mockery of section 5; it would work untold hardships and delay, and it would reduce the administration of justice in these 1,850 important cases to the "level of a game of blindman's bluff." *Simmons* v. *United States*, 348 U.S. 397, 405.

Fourth, like many other students of the antitrust laws, I have long been concerned with the familiar pattern of conduct of antitrust defendants who loudly protest their innocence when prosecuted by the Government and publicly predict their eventual vindication in court. When the early hue and cry has abated, however, they quietly come into court and "cop a plea" of nolo contendere—meaning "we do not choose to fight"—precisely in order to escape civil accountability for their public wrongs.

As I have already noted, the distinction between pleas of guilty and nolo contendere is well established. Pleas of nolo contendere, like consent decrees, are important to effective antitrust enforcement, since they encourage compliance without the delay and expense of complex litigation.

But when pleas of nolo contendere are accepted over the objections of the Government, and when antitrust offenders are accorded "an unqualified right"—without regard to the rights of their victims—"to avoid the 'prima facie evidence' sanction by capitulation"[4]—then I submit the purpose of section 5 is being frustrated.

It is one thing to provide, as section 5 does, that a defendant shall not be penalized if he capitulates to the Government and agrees to comply with the antitrust laws in the future by a consent decree. It is quite another matter, I submit, where the offense is so flagrant that the Government objects to a plea of nolo contendere, to allow a criminal defendant to "cop a plea" and thereby deprive his victims both of the Government's grand jury evidence and of any assistance in securing redress other than a mere admission against interest.

Where a plea of nolo contendere is accepted over the Government's objections, flagrant offenders are getting off virtually scot-free of any civil responsibility to their victims. Yet it has become commonplace for the courts to override the Government's objections and accept nolo pleas.

Chief Judge Kirkpatrick of the U.S. district court in Philadelphia has shared my puzzlement at this anomaly in our law. In *City of Philadelphia* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, 1961 CCH Trade Cases, p. 70, 143, Judge Kirkpatrick observed:

"I never could myself quite grasp the logic of this distinction between nolo contendere and guilty and why the one is permissible in evidence in a civil suit and the other is not. * * * I think the weight of authority really compels me to strike those allegations, although if I were entirely free and it was a new question, I might feel otherwise about it."

Accordingly, my bill would remove this anomaly by making admissible as prima facie evidence a judgment of conviction under the antitrust laws, whether on a plea of guilty or on a plea of nolo contendere, where the plea of nolo contendere has been accepted by the court over the objections of the Government.

I believe that the enactment of my bill would go far to fulfill the true purpose of section 5 of the Clayton Act. Furthermore, such legislation would improve both the prompt administration of justice in the Federal courts and the fair, effective administration of the antitrust laws.

---

[2] Ibid, 91 F. Supp. at p. 905.

[3] Holding that a conviction on a guilty plea is not a "consent judgment," and therefore can be used against the defendant are *Atlantic City Electric Co.* v. *General Electric Co.*, 207 F. Supp. 620, 1962 CCH Trade Cases, Par. 70, 406 (S.D.N.Y.); *Sacramento Municipal Utility District* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, 1962 CCH Trade Cases, Par. 70, 552 (N.D. Calif.); *Simco Sales Service of Pennsylvania, Inc.* v. *Air Reduction Co., Inc.*, 1963 CCH Trade Cases, Par. 70, 638 (E.D. Pa.).

Contra are *Commonwealth Edison Co.* v. *Allis Chalmer Mfg. Co.*, 1962 CCH Trade Cases, Par. 70, 514 (N.D. Ill.); *Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles* v. *Allis Chalmers Mfg. Co.*, 1963 CCH Trade Cases, Par. 70, 656 (S.D. Calif.); and *City of San Antonio* v. *General Electric Co.* (unreported) Civil No. 1238 (W.D. Texas, Nov. 27, 1962).

[4] *United States* v. *Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co.*, 1962 OCH Trade Cases, par. 70,282.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731, 15 U.S.C. 16), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5(a). A final judgment or decree heretofore or hereafter rendered in any civil or criminal proceeding brought by or on behalf of the United States under the antitrust laws to the effect that defendant has violated said laws shall be prima facie evidence against such defendant in any action or proceeding in which such laws are involved as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estoppel as between the parties thereto: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken: *Provided, further,* That the term 'consent judgments' as used herein shall not include judgments of conviction based upon a plea of guilty or upon a plea of nolo contendere which has been accepted over the objection of the United States.

"(b) Whenever any civil or criminal proceeding is instituted by the United States under any of the antitrust laws, the running of the statute of limitations in respect of every private right of action arising under said laws and based in whole or in part on any matter complained of in said proceeding shall be suspended during the pendency thereof and for one year thereafter: *Provided, however,* That whenever the running of the statute of limitations in respect of a cause of action arising under section 4 is suspended hereunder, any action to enforce such cause of action shall be forever barred unless commenced either within the period of suspension or within four years after the cause of action accrued."

II. Amendment of Antitrust Immunity Statute To Require a Plea of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination Before Immunity Is Conferred

I am also introducing a bill to amend the antitrust immunity statute to require a witness to plead his privilege against self-incrimination before receiving immunity from prosecution on account of evidence he has given in a proceeding under the antitrust laws. (Act of Feb. 25, 1903, 32 Stat. 904, 15 U.S.C. 32.)

Under the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution, a person cannot be compelled to be a witness against himself. Nevertheless, incriminating testimony may be required, if the witness is granted immunity from prosecution for transaction about which he testifies. *Brown* v. *Walker,* 161 U.S. 591 (1896). The antitrust immunity statute, enacted in 1903 affords such immunity in proceedings under the antitrust laws.

This statute does not expressly require a witness to first claim his fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination in order to gain immunity. Because of the absence of such an express requirement, the Supreme Court held in *United States* v. *Monia,* 317 U.S. 424 (1943) that immunity from a Sherman Act prosecution had been acquired by a witness who had not pleaded the privilege before a grand jury inquiring into an alleged price-fixing conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act.

Accordingly, as stated by Judge Youngdahl in *United States* v. *Niarchos,* 125 F. Supp. 214, 225, note 17 (D.D.C., 1954):

"Unless the statute requires it, the witness need not assert the immunity privilege at the time of his testimony."

The result in the Monia case was severely criticized by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion. (317 U.S. 431) in *United States* v. *Niarchos,* 125 F. Supp. 214, 225, n. 17 (D.D.C. 1954) and *United States* v. *Onassis,* 125 F. Supp. 190 (D.D.C. 1954), Judge Youngdahl stressed the difficulties and uncertainties which result when a witness is not required to claim his privilege before obtaining immunity.

In the first place, it is the witness, not the prosecutor, who has knowledge of the facts. If the witness is not required to claim his privilege, the prosecutor may ask an innocuous question only to find by an unexpected answer that he has unwittingly given the witness an "immunity bath." (See 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12943, daily ed. July 28, 1961) Second, where the privilege is not claimed, it is not clear whether the witness is testifying voluntarily or whether his self-incriminating testimony is given only in expectation of and in exchange for the immunity. It is only in the latter case that immunity need or should be granted. (See Frankfurter, J., dissenting in *United States* v. *Monia*). Finally, where the claim of privilege is required, the court can readily determine whether, and to what extent, the witness is entitled to immunity. (Youngdahl, J. in *United States* v. *Niarchos,* 125 F. Supp. 214, 225 (D.D.C., 1954).

For these reasons, 14 of the 17 modern Federal immunity statutes enacted since 1933, confer immunity only after the witness has pleaded his privilege. (See for example, sec. 21 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. 78u(d). A list of such statutes showing whether or not a plea of the privilege is required appears at 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12943, July 28, 1961.) And Judge Youngdahl, after careful study in the Onassis and Niarchos cases, concluded that the "statutory requirement (for the claim of privilege at the time the testimony is given) is much preferable." (125 F. Supp. 225, n. 17.)

Judge Youngdahl added:

"For one thing (the statutory requirement) makes it clear that immunity is given only for testimony that is incriminating and would not otherwise be volunteered. Also it removes the necessity for determining the nature of the grand jury proceeding at this late date. When the privilege is asserted at the time of the testimony, the nature of the proceeding for purposes of the witness' immunity is determined by its acceptance or rejection."

I have long felt, therefore, that the antitrust immunity statute should be brought up to date so as to require a plea of the privilege before the witness receives immunity.

My concern on this score is the greater since the recent decision in *United States* v. *H. P. Hood* (CCH Trade Cases 1963, par. 70,728 (D. Mass., Mar. 27, 1963)). There the court decided that a witness who testified before the Small Business Committee of this House thereby became immune from prosecution. The court held, for the first time, that a congressional committee hearing was a proceeding within the meaning of the antitrust immunity statute, so that incriminating testimony given in response to subpena and under oath to this House renders the witness immune without so much as a plea of the privilege.

Untold mischief can readily be foreseen if the Supreme Court should uphold this startling departure in the Hood case—60 years after the antitrust immunity statute was enacted—from what I dare say was the well-nigh universal belief that witnesses in congressional hearings do not receive immunity except under the specific statute, 18 United States Code section 3486, which is limited to inquiries in the areas of national security and defense. One legal publication has already noted (31 U.S. Law Week 1153):

"Henceforth, corporation officers are likely to respond with alacrity to subpenas requiring appearance and testimony before congressional committees investigating possible antitrust violations."

I am sure many Members will join me in the desire to be forewarned, at least, by a plea of the privilege in order that we may consider whether the incriminating evidence a witness could give is worth the immunity which would be conferred.

Even if the Hood decision is reversed by the Supreme Court, however, the need to update the antitrust immunity statute still remains. In keeping with my continuing interest in the fair, effective enforcement of the antitrust laws, therefore, I am introducing this bill to amend the antitrust immunity statute so as to require a witness to plead his privilege against self-incrimination before receiving immunity. The text is as follows:

That the paragraph which begins "That for the enforcement", under the center heading "Department of Justice" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and four, and for other purposes", approved February 25, 1903 (32 Stat. 904; 15 U.S.C. 32), is amended by striking out "under said Acts" in the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "under the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate commerce', approved February 4, 1887, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto", and by inserting immediately before the colon preceding the last proviso thereof the following: ": *Provided further,* That no person shall be prosecuted or be subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, in any proceeding, suit or prosecution under the antitrust laws (as defined in the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914 (15 U.S.C. 12))."

III. A Bill To Provide Fair, Uniform Tax Treatment in Cases of Divestiture Under the Antitrust Laws

I have long been concerned over the tax penalties sometimes visited on antitrust defendants as a result of compliance with the antitrust laws. Our present tax laws often impose serious liabilities for the transfer of property pursuant to antitrust judgments or decrees.

In my view, there should be no tax penalty for compliance with the antitrust laws. Moreover, many an antitrust defendant may be willing to enter into an appropriate consent decree so long as compliance will not result in extra tax liability.

For that reason, in the last Congress I introduced H.R. 11873 to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide fair, uniform tax treatment for corporations subject to decrees of divestiture pursuant to the requirements of the antitrust laws, as well as their stockholders.

I repeat today what I said then:

"Such legislation, in my opinion, would fill a longstanding need. There should be no need to resort to Congress for special legislative relief where—as in the DuPont-General Motors case—millions of stockholders would otherwise have been suddenly confronted with heavy tax liabilities which they had done nothing to create, or where—as in the Hilton Hotels case—a corporation is forced to divest itself of one of its enterprises to comply with the requirements of the antitrust laws. Furthermore, one wonders whether undue tax hardships may have been visited on others less numerous or less vocal as a result of other divestiture decrees. Moreover, I understand that the formidable tax consequences have often proved a major stumbling block to appropriate consent decrees in antitrust cases."

I am reintroducing the same bill today in the hope that it will receive favorable consideration during this Congress. My bill is designed to permit a corporation to pass through to its stockholders, without subjecting them to untoward tax liability, securities of a corporation of which it has acquired control in violation of the antitrust laws.

This would make generally applicable the tax relief which was enacted during the last Congress for the special benefit of DuPont stockholders to avoid thrusting upon them an enormous capital gains tax liability as a result of the final decree in the DuPont-General Motors case. The removal of such capital gains tax penalties upon stockholders who have done nothing themselves to violate the antitrust laws may well provide a relatively painless way to achieve compliance with the antitrust laws and thus encourage appropriate consent decrees.

My bill would also permit a corporation to defer capital gains tax liability where it exchanges stock or assets of one enterprise for another different enterprise in order to comply with the antitrust laws. I believe that this too would provide a painless way for many corporations to comply voluntarily with the antitrust laws in many cases where heavy tax liabilities now encourage long and expensive litigation with the Department of Justice.

I note with interest that the Committee on Ways and Means has already reported favorably H.R. 2826 which is designed to achieve such a relief from tax liability, although the particular terms of H.R. 2826 raise serious questions from the point of view of antitrust enforcement. The bill H.R. 2826 was considered under suspension of rules and the required two-third vote was not achieved in the House. It is presently pending on the Union Calendar.

I hope, therefore, that while the whole subject of tax reform is before the Congress, my bill will receive thorough consideration in the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means and in this House. The text is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1111(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions of antitrust order) is amended by striking out all that follows "to which the United States is a party" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(b) Section 1111(e) of such Code (relating to definition of divested stock) is amended by striking out "an intentional violation" in the matter following paragraph 2(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "a willful violation".

SEC. 2. (a) Part IX of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to distributions pursuant to orders enforcing antitrust laws) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1112. DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY TO EFFECTUATE ANTITRUST POLICIES

"(a) NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If property or stock is sold or exchanged as the result of a judgment, decree, or other order (or the threat of imminence thereof while the proceeding is pending) of a court or of a commission or board authorized to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), such sale or exchange shall, if the taxpayer so elects, be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033. In the case of a sale or exchange which is treated as an involuntary conversion under the preceding sentence, the requirements of section 1033 dealing with investment in property shall be satisfied if the taxpayer during the period within which the property must be replaced under section 1033(a)(3)(B) purchases other property for use in a trade or business or other stock and such investment is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in the preceding sentence.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any sale or exchange which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax.

"(c) REQUIREMENT OF CERTIFICATION.—For purposes of this section the purchase of other property shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033 unless—

"(1) the Attorney General of the United States, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

"(2) the commission or board, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board,

certifies that such purchase is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a), is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act, and is not inconsistent with the Clayton Act.

"(d) NONRECOGNITION OF CERTAIN GAIN.—The part of the gain (if any) on a sale or exchange described in subsection (a) to which section 1033 is not applied shall nevertheless not be recognized, if the taxpayer so elects, to the extent that it is applied to reduce the basis for determining gain or loss on a sale or exchange of property which is of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation under section 167 and which remains in the hands of the taxpayer immediately after the sale or exchange or is acquired in the same taxable year. The manner and amount of such reduction shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 1112. Disposition of property to effectuate antitrust policies."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960, irrespective of the time of the sale or exchange involved.

FREEDOM MARCH

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the so-called freedom march, I think it is commendable of the Washington Post to print one small, well-hidden story giving the true side of the story of this sorry event.

For several months now, the Post and other newspapers of their leftist ilk, have harangued their readers with thousands upon thousands of words in squirming adulation of the race-mixing agitators who will descend on the Capital tomorrow. These demonstrators, wrapped in a loving, tax-supported cocoon of Federal chaperones, are led by a former Communist leaguer and convicted sex pervert, Bayard Rustin. It appears that his perversions are not limited to sex alone. His principal claim to fame, heretofore, was that he chose to hide behind the red skirt of cowardice during World War II and refused to defend this country when it was locked in mortal combat with the Nazi enemy. For this dishonorable act, this neuter served 28 months in prison while men and women fought, bled, and died for this Nation.

What monumental gall that this man now lead a march of thousands on the Nation's Capital; a drone who has forever relinquished his right to be called a man.

What tragedy that men of the cloth have been persuaded to side with him in their misguided zeal.

But there are some who, with clear accuracy, are not deceived by the federally inspired, federally led, federally financed march that will take place here tomorrow.

Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, U.S. Army, retired, knows the truth and he has spoken it in a story in this morning's Post headlined, "Sit-Ins Called One of the Great Frauds of the Century by Negro Ex-Major."

Donald Warden, chairman of the Afro-American Association, knows the truth, too, and he has spoken it in a story which appeared last week in the Shreveport Journal. His statement: "His People Need Race Pride" cuts to the heart of the matter.

I commend both these stories to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Shreveport Journal]

NEGRO LAWYER SAYS HIS PEOPLE NEED RACE PRIDE

OAKLAND, CALIF.—The American Negro will not get far in his battle for equal rights unless he acquires racial pride, the chairman of the Afro-American Association said today.

"What the Negro needs is the same pride that helped the Chinese, Jews, and Irish to overcome prejudice," Donald Warden told United Press International.

Warden urged his followers to "throw away your bleaching creams, throw away your hair straightener, quit dropping out of school, quit flunking out—and get off welfare.

"If you won't accept the challenge to improve yourself, then admit that you are inferior," he said.

CRITICAL OF NAACP

The 27-year-old attorney also was critical of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and similar civil rights groups. He called the NAACP a "middle-class organization" which leaves the Negro without a sense of purpose.

He charged that during the Birmingham demonstrations "over $2 million was wasted—and only three Negroes got jobs out of it."

"It may cost a million dollars to desegregate a lunch counter—and if successful, this will create maybe a dozen jobs," he says. "The Negro would be smarter to spend that million on a factory which might employ 1,000 Negroes."

This philosophy and Warden's criticism of "moderate" civil rights has resulted in strong criticism by some Negro leaders.

Terry Francois, former head of the San Francisco chapter of the NAACP, has blasted the young attorney as "a modern Uncle Tom who should be tarred and feathered."

STRESSES EDUCATION

Warden stressed the need for the majority of Negroes to improve their lot through education and self-respect—a void which he said the NAACP and CORE have neglected.

Warden said his group has 3,000 members in California and branches of the group are planned for New York and Chicago.

Warden maintained that the American Negro lacks racial pride because he has not been taught the history of his race. He pointed out that "blacks go to school to learn about whites."

To counter this, the Afro-American Association conducts classes to teach Negro history—and such things as how to buy a car and how to avoid being victimized through credit and similar basics.

"I know I've been called Uncle Tom, and I know I've been accused of telling white people what they want to hear," Warden said. "But I say, let the masses decide."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1963]

Sit-Ins Called One of Great Frauds of Century by Negro Ex-Major

Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, U.S.A. (retired), who was commandant of cadets at Fort Valley State College in Georgia until June, thinks sit-ins are "one of the greatest frauds perpetrated upon the American people within the past century."

Before leaving the school post he held for 6 years, Major Robinson, a Negro, commended his students for not participating in civil rights demonstrations.

He said in an interview that what is needed is more respect for constitutional authorities—regardless of the positions they may hold—more self-improvement, more service to country, more sharing in full citizenship by obeying laws and less criticism of other racial groups.

Major Robinson said human nature is such that "certain ones will go ahead, even if the schoolhouse was a log cabin, while others may be assigned to the best schools and the best environment and still either drop out or fail to measure up to accepted standards."

He said he had spent his first 19 years on a farm in Florida and had entered school at the age of 20. Yet, he noted, he had gone on to receive a B.S. degree from Springfield College in Massachusetts and had studied in six other colleges. He was a chaplain in the Army for 6 years and a psychologist for the Veterans' Administration for 4 years.

"Those who devote their time and energy in sponsoring activities that create disturbances in the various parts of the country," he said, "have ignored entirely the basic needs of the minority group with which they identify themselves."

DALLAS NEGRO STUDENTS ACT IN THE TRUE AMERICAN WAY

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again I take pride in pointing to the initiative and self-assurance of the people of Dallas County, the district which honors me by sending me to be its representative in Congress.

While other areas of the country rush to feed at the public trough in the matter of getting Federal funds to discourage high school dropouts, Dallas along with Houston, has said, "No thanks, we will take care of the problem ourselves." These Texans still believe in the American tradition of self-help and in neighbor encouraging neighbor. Theirs is the spirit that built America and theirs is the spirit that will save it.

Encouraging young people to stay in school will not be accomplished through pretty speeches from Washington, nor by spending Federal funds. It will be accomplished through the exercise of parental responsibility and through the efforts of the local community.

What makes the Dallas story in this area even more significant and worthy of praise is the report of the efforts by the students themselves in encouraging their fellows to stay in school. A story in last Saturday's Dallas Morning News details the efforts of Negro youths spark the campaign. This is the kind of effort that will bring opportunity in America, people doing for themselves, people wanting to get ahead, people willing to learn and to work for reward. I want to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate the Negro students of Dallas and to call to the attention of my colleagues their worthy effort.

As a part of these remarks, I include two news stories from the Dallas Morning News. The first, "Dallas, Houston Reject Aid To Curb Dropouts," and the second, "Students Plan Campaign Against School Dropouts," then I invite other Americans to join with the people of Dallas in bringing back the best American traditions:

Dallas, Houston Reject Aid To Curb Dropouts

(By Dennis Hoover)

Dallas and Houston have both said, "No, thanks" to President Kennedy's offer of special funds to persuade young people to return to school this fall.

Records of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) showed Friday that 62 communities in 23 States and the District of Columbia are utilizing the money to help curb dropouts.

A total of $250,000 was made available August 1 from the Presidential emergency fund. In most cases, cities are using their allocations to pay school counselors to work during August, contacting likely dropouts and their parents, HEW said.

Dallas was offered $5,000, Houston $6,000. The amounts refused by both cities have been reallocated to cities that elected to institute late summer dropout projects, HEW noted.

Cities with projects underway utilizing the special funds range in size from New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles to Detroit, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Cincinnati, San Diego, Seattle, Cleveland, St. Louis, Denver, Miami, Atlanta, New Orleans, San Antonio, Memphis, and La Grange, Ga.

In making the special fund available, President Kennedy termed the rising number of school dropouts "a serious national problem."

"The end of this summer of 1963," he said, "will be an especially critical time for 400,000 young Americans who, according to the experience of earlier years, will not return to school when the summer is ended."

Dallas high school dropout rate is over 50 percent for Negroes and 22 percent for white pupils. This roughly tracks the national predicament, in which about one-third of youths are failing to complete high school.

The National Education Association has asked every teacher in America voluntarily to be responsible for one child coming back to school this fall.

In another special back-to-school program, families receiving federally aided support for dependent children are being encouraged by caseworkers to keep their youths in school wherever possible. As needed, the parents are being guided to specific assistance or services to carry out plans for their children's schooling. This may include clothing or school fees.

Students Plan Campaign Against School Dropouts

(By Harry McCormick)

An intensive campaign urging Dallas high school students to return to school will be kicked off by Negro youths Saturday in shopping centers all over the city.

The youngsters are members of church classes, YMCA and YWCA groups, and Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, who, with the aid of a few white students, are working under the direction of Mrs. Juanita Craft.

Mrs. Craft, who is active in many Negro youth activities, is supervising the work of making 10,000 bumper stickers and placards which the students will pass out Saturday and in the week before Dallas public schools open.

A final rally is scheduled at picnic grounds and in city parks on Labor Day.

"This is not a program aimed at Negroes alone," Mrs. Craft said, "I am told that 40 percent of all high school students drop out before graduation."

The principal cause of the dropouts is economic, she said.

"There is a family in West Dallas with four children of high school age," she said. "The school closest to them is James Madison High School—and it is 8 or 9 miles away. Daily carfare and lunch money for the four are more than the family can afford."

There are other reasons, too, for dropouts, Mrs. Craft said.

"A boy asked me not long ago why he should go to college. He was a porter and said he worked alongside a graduate of Prairie View College. Both of them were drawing the same amount of wages."

Hardship, lack of family guidance, and lack of motivation are other causes for dropouts, she said.

Mrs. Craft was one of four Dallas women who attended a July 9 meeting in Washington of women representing various organizations over the Nation. President Kennedy, addressing them during the meeting, deplored the national rise in high school dropouts, and urged the Nation's youth to continue their education.

On her return to Dallas, Mrs. Craft organized the campaign which is beginning Saturday.

"We look upon this as a civic obligation to all of Dallas," she said.

A MANDATORY CUTOFF OF FUNDS WHERE DISCRIMINATION IS PRACTICED

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, appeared before a committee of the other body, and presented a suggestion for an amended version of title VI of the President's civil rights proposal. As the bill originally was written, Federal funds could be denied programs which were operated in a discriminatory manner, but the discretion was left to the executive.

In my statement in support of civil rights legislation to the House Judiciary Committee on August 12, I suggested a reexamination of the title VI discretionary authority language which left too much to the political imagination. I consider the new proposal from the Justice Department, with its provision for judicial review and its statement of policy affirmatively against the denial or use of funds on discriminatory grounds to be a decided improvement which I hope will be adopted by the Congress.

I know of few American taxpayers who would not agree that when Americans of all races pay taxes for a program, they should have equal access to the benefits provided by the program. In the past I have supported amendments to specific legislation dealing with separate programs. This has been true whether I voted for the program itself, as in the case of vocational education, or against the manner in which a good idea had been poorly carried out, as in the case of the area redevelopment authorization before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

When this has been attempted on a program by program basis, the Republicans have constantly been accused of supporting it simply to kill the bill. I think it is time to put that political myth to rest. Acceptance or rejection of the new suggestion for a mandatory provision with flexible operation and judicial review—new only in the sense that this is the first time the administration has accepted a proposal endorsed on both sides of the aisle, will indicate whether there is a confirmation of past voting patterns or not. It will be interesting to note the position of some of those who have shouted the loudest against the so-called kill-the-bill tactics, who in the past have never indicated a position on the substance of these amendments.

A copy of the new language for title VI follows:

Title VI—Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs

Sec. 601. Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of any other law, it is the policy of the United States that no person shall, on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Sec. 602. Each Federal department and agency which is empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, shall take action to effectuate the foregoing policy. Such action may be taken by or pursuant to rule, regulation, or order of general applicability and shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken. Compliance with any requirement adopted pursuant to this section may be effected by suit under section 603 of this title, by the termination of assistance, or by any other means authorized by law: *Provided, however,* That no such action shall be taken until the department or agency concerned has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with the requirement and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means.

Sec. 603. Any requirement adopted pursuant to section 602, whether by rule, regulation, order, agreement, or otherwise, shall be enforceable in the district courts of the United States by means of a civil action or other proper proceeding, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order, bought by or on behalf of the United States or any agency or officer thereof expressly authorized to bring suits by Act of Congress.

Sec. 604. Any department or agency action taken pursuant to section 602 shall be subject to such judicial review as may otherwise be provided by law for similar action taken by such department or agency on other grounds. In the case of action, not otherwise subject to judicial review, terminating financial assistance by reason of failure to comply with any requirement imposed pursuant to section 602, any person aggrieved (including any State or political subdivision thereof and any agency of either) may obtain judicial review of such action in accordance with section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

BIPARTISANSHIP—SHORT MEMORIES ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was discussion here concerning bipartisanship in foreign policy. The talk was triggered by President Kennedy's intemperate and petulant outburst last Friday afternoon, after this House, which is after all controlled by the Democratic Party—257 to 177—worked its will on the Foreign Assistance Act.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] called to our attention the President's own voting record which apparently had escaped the Chief Executive's memory. Mr. Kennedy's voting record as a Senator shows six votes in favor of substantial cuts in foreign aid and five other occasions when he failed to vote at all on foreign aid cuts. I wonder if he considers his own votes as "thoughtless" and irresponsible as he now calls ours.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] reminded us that bipartisanship is a two-way street and that the leaders of the Republican policy committee have not been consulted by President Kennedy, or informed of his intentions in foreign affairs.

Asking once again, and I am afraid in vain, for honest discussion of the issue, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] urged those who are in opposition to join the debate forthrightly, without denouncing us as unpatriotic, ignorant, and inhuman simply because we disagree with them.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out yesterday, it seems to me that this country needs more hardheaded debate and less hotheaded and intemperate name calling. Within the framework of a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs, I think it is the responsibility of the Members of the U.S. Congress to express their views. We unite, of course, in times of crisis, and we are always united in our devotion to the United States and to the wise conduct of its foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican policy committee of the Senate, whose chairman is Senator Hickenlooper, and whose staff director is David S. Teeple, prepared last February 21, a synopsis of some Democratic criticism of the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy. I am presenting these criticisms here bebecause, in the view of the President's remarks last Friday, I think they are pertinent:

Democrat Criticism of Eisenhower Administration's Foreign Policy

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, chairman; David S. Teeple, staff director, February 21, 1963)

Advisory council of the Democratic National Committee, May 5, 1957: "The Eisenhower-Dulles administration of our foreign affairs has substituted improvisations for policy, appeasement for leadership, posturing for deeds, and advertising slogans for information."

Senator John F. Kennedy, "On Bipartisanship in Foreign Policy" (speech), Grand Rapids, Mich., October 14, 1960: "* * * Let me make it clear that I regard bipartisanship as putting the interest of our country first. And I can assure you that in this campaign when we discuss the foreign and domestic opportunities and responsibilities which are facing our country, we do so from the best interest not of our party but of our country, which is the obligation of all of us." ("The Speeches of Senator John F. Kennedy, Presidential Campaign, 1960," pp. 588–589.)

John F. Kennedy, New York, October 20, 1960: "* * * Under Republican leadership our prestige has fallen so low that our Latin American allies are no longer willing to follow our leadership in the fight against communism in this hemisphere."

Democratic advisory council, October 19, 1957 (reported by New York Times, October 20): "The administration has brought to a low point the confidence of our allies in the integrity and responsibility of its conduct."

Gov. Raymond Gary (Oklahoma), Democratic Midwest Conference, October 17, 1957 (reported by New York Times, October 18): "I am of the opinion that President Eisenhower, through lack of aggressive leadership, has permitted our defense program to stalemate to a considerable extent."

Adlai Stevenson, Chicago, October 30, 1958 (reported by Washington Post, October 31): "* * * a void left by the failure of White House leadership is being filled by Congress."

Harry Truman; convention of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers; St. Louis, Mo.; October 1, 1956: [The Republicans] "* * * have broken their campaign and platform promises. With the help of their Madison Avenue advertisers they have deceived the people. * * * They have allowed our national defense to lag. They have alienated our friends and allies abroad. They have endangered our national security."

Harry Truman, National Farmers Union Convention, Denver, Colo., March 19, 1958: "This Republican administration, through blundering, mismanagement and refusal to face the facts, has led our country into a position of great international peril."

Lyndon Johnson, March 8, 1959 (reported by Washington Post, March 9): "Shall Berlin be remembered as the deathbed of democracy or as the graveyard of aggression?"

"We can no longer sit by and see our strength—military, moral, or economic—decimated by delay, defeat, or retreat."

"The United States can no longer take a passive role. * * * We cannot wait for May in Berlin."

John F. Kennedy, August 14, 1958 (reported by Washington Post, August 15): "Our missile lag is but another symptom of our national complacency, our willingness to confuse the facts as they were with what we hoped they would be to appeal at the same time to those who wanted a quick solution and those who wanted a less burdensome one."

John F. Kennedy, Connecticut Democratic Convention, June 27, 1958 (reported in Washington Star, June 28): "The decline in our prestige in that area, the increase in Soviet influence, the acerbation of all its ancient rivalries, the instability of unpopular governments—all of these have passed beyond the point where the United States is in control."

John F. Kennedy, testimonial dinner for former Senator Lehman, New York, November 23, 1958 (reported by Manchester Union Leader, November 24): "None of us, I am sure, would use the term 'wicked' to describe the conduct of our foreign policy today or those who bear that responsibility. But the gulf between words and deeds is perhaps nowhere greater than in this area of applying ethics to international affairs.

"I do not say that ours is an immoral policy using unethical tactics to strive for improper goals. But I do say that we have all too often failed to recognize the great moral issues that shape and shake our world today more than either the Communists or the atomic revolutions."

John F. Kennedy, Congressional Record, volume 106, part 3, page 3804: "* * * it is deplorable that the situation deteriorated to this point, where it became a matter for debate. In matters of this kind, the only wise and safe course is to leave a margin so large as to preclude any doubt or debate."

John F. Kennedy, Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 12523: "* * * the real issue * * * is the lack of long-range preparation, the lack of policy planning, the lack of a coherent and purposeful national strategy backed by strength."

* * * * *

"Our conferees have consistently gone to the international bargaining table ill staffed, ill prepared, and ill advised * * * strong direction from the top has often faltered because the President was not kept fully informed."

Senator Ernest Gruening (Alaska), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 12527: "I believe that much opposition to foreign aid stems from the poor way it has been administered and the lack of true consultation and cooperation with the Congress. It has been too much of an executive proposition, without collaboration with the legislative branch of Government that really has the constitutional authority to provide the funds for that purpose."

Senator Frank Church (Idaho), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 12527: "* * * how can the American people possibly conclude that those who have been most closely associated, during the past 8 years, with what has become a growing debacle, could be best fitted to direct American affairs in the coming 4 years?"

Senator Albert Gore (Tennessee), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 12529: "Eight years ago we had not embarked upon haphazard and dangerous personalized summitry; the world had not witnessed the worst diplomatic debacle which human experience affords; the credibility of the United States of America had not been held up to scorn by a whole series of official falsehoods; we had not fallen behind in the exploration of space * * *; the Soviet Union had not outstripped the United States for a period of years in economic growth."

Senator Ernest Gruening (Alaska), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 12530: "* * * under this administration [Republican] there is a wide disparity between word and deed."

Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 10, page 12535: "* * * I have reason to believe that we have all too often been more concerned with some commercial interests in the Middle Eastern area than we have been concerned with sound international principles of law, of decency, and of justice."

Senator J. W. Fulbright (Arkansas), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 11, page 14734: "Mr. President, I believe the prestige of our country among nations has reached a new low, and I believe that before we can begin to regain our position in the world, we must admit our errors and examine the causes thereof; then carefully plan and execute a program for the restoration of that power and influence."

Senator J. W. Fulbright (Arkansas), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 11, page 14736: "If we can disabuse ourselves of the habit of self-delusion, of viewing defeats as victories and of advertising blunders as strokes of genius, there are some things we can learn from these sad events. One is the need for better coordination and much firmer direction of all governmental activities affecting foreign relations. If this is not to come from the White House, it should come from the State Department."

Senator J. W. Fulbright (Arkansas), Congressional Record, volume 106, part 8, page 10767: "Everyone knows what happened is a great tragedy for the entire world. Who is to blame, and so forth, is a subject of legitimate inquiry."

John F. Kennedy, Congressional Record, volume 103, part 8, page 10781: "* * * earlier U.S. consideration of this and similar problems [were characterized by] tepid encouragement and moralizations to both sides, cautious neutrality on all real issues, and a restatement of our obvious dependence upon our European friends, our obvious dedication nevertheless to the principles of self-determination, and our obvious desire not to become involved. We have deceived ourselves into believing that we have thus pleased both sides and displeased no one with this head-in-the-sand policy—when, in truth, we have earned the suspicion of all."

John F. Kennedy, Congressional Record, volume 103, part 4, page 4276: "The announcement from Bermuda that the United States will join the military committee of the Baghdad Pact adds another curious twist to the Nation's zigzag path through the Middle East.

* * * * *

"Whom do we hope to deceive by pretending to the pact members that we are full participants and pretending to the Arab States that we are not full participants after all?

"Fuller American participation in the Baghdad Pact might, of course, make sense were it an integral part of a comprehensive policy for the Middle East—a policy which * * * attacked all of the major problems of the Middle East with consistency and foresight, instead of rushing, in helter-skelter fashion, from one crisis to another, alarming our friends, antagonizing those whom we want to be our friends, and thoroughly confusing the American people in the process."

Senator J. W. Fulbright (Arkansas), Congressional Record, volume 104, part 9, page 11844: "Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I cannot help being impressed by a recurrent phenomenon in the conduct of the most important affairs of the Nation. I may add that I cannot help being deeply disturbed by it.

* * * * *

"The phenomenon is what might be termed a periodic urge to inertia in the national leadership. It manifests itself in the approach of the administration to the most complex and difficult problems that beset the Nation, particularly those of foreign policy and defense. Periodically, the administration is inspired, frightened, or otherwise prodded into looking at these problems. It takes them out, examines them, makes a few statements, puts them back into the bureaucratic drawers and forgets about them.

"The administration's behavior in these matters reminds me of a schoolboy who dreams great dreams of achievement. He announces his high purpose and resolve to the world. He piles his desk high with books and diligently sets about to bring the dreams to fulfillment. A half hour later, however, the sounds of gunfire on the TV or the shouts of play outside his window become irresistible. He is off. The dreams of achievement are remembered vaguely and the high purpose and resolve are shrugged off for another day.

"What is understandable and harmless in a child is incomprehensible and perilous in the Government of the United States.

* * * * *

"All is indeed back to normal, insofar as a constructive foreign policy is concerned, insofar as positive action for peace is concerned. The administration sags in apathy. It is a dangerous apathy, compounded of a leadership that is at once aimless and feeble, and a bureaucracy so fearful of change that it clings desperately to the ancient pillars of policy even as they rot away under the pressure of irresistible international developments. Aid programs as usual, cold war as usual, defense strategy as usual, foreign policies on Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere as usual—that is what is offered. All the while scientific changes, economic changes, and political changes accumulate at home and abroad to render these policies as they are presently pursued increasingly unreliable as guardians of the Nation and international peace.

* * * * *

"What, in short, supports in the minds of these men this apathy, this dangerous apathy, that passes for policy?

"The men who lead us know—they must know; indeed, they have said so many times—that the power to destroy civilization in quick and overwhelming military blows exists in the world today. They know that others, as well as ourselves, have this power. They know that the world skirts the brink of disaster; indeed, some have even boasted on occasion of carrying it to that point. Knowing this, how can they behave as though nothing has changed in the world in the past decade, even in the past 5 years? How can they behave as though the time for action, for constructive action, is interminable?"

AMENDMENT TO ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that is designed to stem the serious and damaging importation of firearms into this country.

In introducing an amendment to the Antidumping Act, I join with my two colleagues from Massachusetts who serve in the other body, Mr. Saltonstall and Mr. Kennedy, as well as the two Senators from Connecticut, Mr. Dodd and Mr. RIBICOFF, who have introduced the exact same measure.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, provides that the foreign market value of imported firearms and ammunition which have been disposed of as surplus by a foreign government shall, for the purpose of such act, be not less than the construed value of the merchandise.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 4,000 American employees in the American sporting arms plants who depend upon the continuing strength of this industry for their livelihood.

Contrasting to this small but important segment of our economy, there has been an importation of 1,300,000 surplus military rifles imported into the United States since 1956.

The average import price of foreign surplus military rifles is under $4 a rifle.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that 43 percent of the U.S. sporting centerfire-rifle market was captured by foreign market rifle imports in, to note one year, 1962.

I am hopeful that, with House passage of this amendment, the industry will be able to strengthen its resources, and continue to provide the kind of excellent service which it has always provided to the American people.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY RESULTS: COMMUNIST DOMINATION OR WAR—ADOPTS NEW U.S. POLICY OF PEACEFUL COLLABORATION AND NONRESISTANCE TO COMMUNISM—DISARMS U.S. NUCLEAR POWER AND THUS DESTROYS TOTAL U.S. MILITARY POWER—LEAVES COMMUNIST POLITICAL POWER AND WEAPONS AND MILITARY POWER INTACT AND UNOPPOSED—CREATES NEW WORLD PUBLIC FORUM FOR COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the nuclear test ban treaty.

My statement before the committee follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. PILLION, MEMBER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 1963, RE THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, my name is JOHN R. PILLION, a Member of the House of Representatives. I would like to identify and present my associates: Mr. Donald L. Miller, and Mr. Russell A. Rourke.

TREATY LEADS TO SUBJUGATION, NOT PEACE

Mr. Chairman, the eventualities and the complexities of this nuclear test ban treaty place a sobering and heavy responsibility upon the distinguished Members of the Senate.

This treaty is not a simple, single agreement to limit nuclear testing; it will not lead to world peace but to a Russian-Communist world subjugation.

This treaty would mark a major and irreversible turning point in world history.

TREATY INCREASES PROBABILITY OF WAR—TREATY CAN BE TRANSFORMED INTO INSTRUMENT FOR FREEDOM

Gentlemen, this treaty could reduce the possibility of nuclear war, but only if, we accept a continuing series of surrenders leading to our subjugation by Communist forces.

But if, at any time before we are completely disarmed, this Nation becomes determined to survive as a free people, this treaty would increase the possibility, even the probability of war.

This treaty has much in common with the agreements of Munich, Yalta, and Potsdam. It would commit this Nation to a series of events which would upset the total world balance of power to the advantage of the Communists and to the disadvantage of the United States.

This committee has a unique opportunity to recast this Moscow Treaty into a noble U.S. declaration of purpose, of courage, of action.

This treaty can be transformed into an instrument to genuinely reduce world tensions, to assure a mutual survival for all peoples, to take the first step toward a true peace founded upon spiritual, political and economic freedoms.

TREATY COMMITS UNITED STATES TO NEGOTIATE SOVIET AGENDA

Mr. Chairman, the official communiques and pronouncements relating to this treaty have pledged the United States to negotiate an agenda of both political and military subjects.

The preamble to this treaty commits this Nation to a policy of general and complete disarmament.

Our Government has been bogged down by an examination of the technical, scientific, and military aspects of nuclear weapons testing. The United States suffers from the misconception that disarmament is a military decision.

Khrushchev has no such delusions. He seeks to disarm the United States by political negotiations to achieve his political objectives, not ours.

Premier Khrushchev has repeatedly stated his conditions for our survival. He summarized his conditions as an agenda for disarmament negotiations pursuant to the preamble of this treaty.

His speech in Moscow on July 19, 1963, listed this agenda:

1. A nonaggression pact between the NATO nations, including the United States, and the Warsaw pact nations, headed by the Soviet.
2. The freezing and reduction of national military budgets.
3. The establishment of exchange control posts to check military movements.
4. The establishment of Soviet military inspection troops in West Germany with United States counterpart troops in East Germany.
5. General and complete disarmament.
6. Liquidation of the German question. (This means the detachment of West Berlin from West Germany, and the detachment of West Germany from our North Atlantic Military Alliance.)

Premier Khrushchev then stated that world war is not necessary to greatly accelerate his world revolutionary process.

The United States has not challenged this agenda. In fact, discussions on parts of Khrushchev's agenda are now taking place and tentative agreements have been reached even before the Senate has had a chance to vote on this treaty.

The acceptance by the United States of this Soviet agenda for negotiation can only lead to a complete disintegration of the political, economic, and military alliances between the United States and its European allies.

COMMUNIST PURPOSE TO DESTROY UNITED STATES NUCLEAR POWER

This Nation's Army, Navy, and Air Force are built around the maximum utilization of nuclear firepower. Without nuclear weapons, our total defense system would become a hollow shell.

A mutual disarmament of nuclear power would immediately give to the Soviet a clear superiority of manpower, firepower, and conventional military might.

Khrushchev does not need to rely upon nuclear power to defend the Soviet because the Soviet is not threatened and cannot be threatened by conventional military power.

Nor, does Khrushchev rely upon or need nuclear power for the attainment of either his political or military objectives.

Mutual destruction of nuclear power by the Soviet Union and the United States will destroy the only deterrent this Nation has against Communist aggression and leave the Russian-led international Communist forces intact, unchallenged and unopposed.

The Russian Communists' motive for the destruction of United States nuclear power is made clear by the following extract from Radio Moscow, July 24, 1963: "The Socialist camp grows, the revolutionary atmosphere becomes hotter, the class warfare in the Western countries worsens; this inspires the imperialist camp to use war to stop the development of socialist countries."

This means that Khrushchev is afraid that, as the Communist political and paramilitary conquests drive the United States into a desperate choice of surrender or nuclear war, the United States might panic and launch a nuclear war to prevent total Communist subjugation.

TREATY WILL INTENSIFY, NOT REDUCE, WORLD TENSIONS—SOVIET-COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL POWER SYSTEM

This Nation is proceeding under the false hope that this treaty is a first step to reducing world tensions, and that peaceful conditions in the world will increase as nuclear and military forces are abolished.

This is a mirage of peace.

This treaty completely ignores the basic forces that are creating world tensions, threatening us with war, and imperiling our freedom.

It is impossible to reduce tensions, to avoid war, to ensure our freedom until and unless we identify and correctly diagnose their causes.

Gentlemen, I invite your attention to these charts. They outline the dual and interlocking power system of the International Communist forces.

The right side of the large chart contains an organizational chart of the power system of the Government of the Soviet Union, and its satellite and associate governments in the Communist bloc.

The political, military, and economic weapons systems of these governments are listed on the small chart to your right. These are the official, overt, legal weapons systems.

On the left side of the large chart, you see an organizational outline of the power system of the Communist parties of the world. The Communist Party system is led, coordinated, subsidized, and directed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Their weapons are listed on the small chart to your left. These are the unofficial, covert, secret, political, and paramilitary forces.

These are the forces that are creating class warfare, political strikes, guerrilla warfare, and civil war.

These forces are wholly unaffected by the treaty or by the Soviet agenda for disarmament.

The International Communist Party is, in fact, a world superstate. Every Communist government is subordinate to its Communist Party, and every Communist Party is subordinate to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Gentlemen, the undisclosed principal and the real party in interest to this treaty signed by the Soviet Union Government is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist parties of the Communist controlled nations, the International Communist apparatus are not signators to the treaty nor are they bound by its provisions.

It is self-evident that world tensions, class warfare, political aggressions, threats to the world are deliberate, directed, and coordinated efforts of the whole Communist apparatus.

This treaty, in no way, obligates or commits the Communist parties around the world to either cease or reduce their activities which create the tensions, threats, and danger that we seek to eliminate.

Khrushchev does not depend upon Soviet military power to win his war. He is leading a worldwide insurrection. His army is the Communist Party organization with its 42,500,000 trained members and more than 100 million indoctrinated and dedicated civil activists.

AMENDMENTS TO PREAMBLE AND TO ARTICLE I

Gentlemen, I respectfully submit for your consideration—one amendment to the preamble, four amendments to article I, and two alternative amendments to article II.

These proposed amendments are attached, and made a part of this statement.

Gentlemen, my proposed amendments to the preamble and to article I would obligate the parties to this treaty to negotiate a complete and total disarmament, including both military and paramilitary and political weapons.

The Communist governments would undertake to discontinue the worldwide insurrection being carried on by their citizens.

AMENDING PROCEDURE (ARTICLE II) ENDANGERS NORMAL TREATY PROCESS

Mr. Chairman, article II of this treaty is an incredibly dangerous provision. It alone constitutes more than sufficient cause for an outright rejection of the whole treaty.

Article II purports to establish a procedure for amending this treaty.

In simple language, it creates a deceiving instrumentality for the generation of propaganda and agitation.

An examination of article II discloses the following:

Any and all signator nations may propose unlimited numbers of amendments to this treaty. These must be circulated to every signator nation.

The subject matter, scope, and relevance of the proposed amendments are completely unrestricted.

This procedure could compel the United States and the free world to consider, negotiate, and defend unknown numbers of proposed amendments on any conceivable subject, no matter how malicious or spurious.

This article creates a new mechanism through which the Soviet Union and the world Communist apparatus can exploit any issue for the purpose of confusing, confounding, and weakening the free world.

This article permits the convocation of a conference upon the call of one-third of the signators to this treaty. The Soviet Union can muster at will one-third of the nations of the world in support of its policies. Thus, by article II of this treaty, the Soviet Union is provided with its own new world forum for propaganda, agitation, and the manipulation of world opinion.

This article makes possible the establishment of a parallel organization controlled by the Russian Communist Party that will compete with, contradict, and tend to eventually destroy the United Nations.

DELETE ALL OF ARTICLE II

Mr. Chairman, the language of article II is so broad, so unpredictable in its eventual consequences that it must be deleted from this treaty.

The deletion of the whole of article II will not, in any way, affect the carrying out of the purpose of this treaty.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE II, IF NOT DELETED (REQUIRES APPROVAL OF ORIGINAL PARTIES BEFORE AND NOT AFTER CIRCULATION AND CONVENING OF CONFERENCE)

Mr. Chairman, if, in the event that article II is not stricken from this treaty, then I respectfully recommend an amendment which is attached to this statement. This amendment would give the original parties to the agreement—the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom of Great Britain—the opportunity to approve and ratify an amendment before and not after a worldwide discussion has been initiated by the circulation of the amendment, and before worldwide publicity is generated by the convening of a world conference.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, this treaty as it stands will:

1. Reverse U.S. policies of opposition to the Soviet-Communist forces.
2. Commit the United States to a peaceful collaboration with the Soviet-Communist forces.
3. Commit the United States to abandon nuclear and military superiority as a deterrent to Soviet-Communist aggressions.
4. Leave the Russian-directed international Communist forces intact, unchallenged and unrestricted.
5. Enable the international Communist organization to accelerate and intensify political and paramilitary conquests.
6. Create a new mechanism and a new world public forum for intensified propaganda against the United States.

The acceptance of the content of this treaty as it stands can only result in an American loss or Soviet victory in the Communist total war.

Gentlemen, the seven amendments that I have proposed would transform this defeating Moscow Treaty into a meaningful and courageous U.S. instrument for the attainment of both freedom and peace.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Proposed amendments to the preamble to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

Amendment No. 1

At the end of the preamble, immediately preceding the phrase "have agreed as follows", add the word "and".

At the end of the preamble, immediately following the word "and", add a new clause as follows:

"Proclaiming as a further principal joint aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete nonmilitary disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to direct and indirect political aggressions and eliminate the incentive to the creation in other nations of civil, paramilitary and military strife and revolution, and

"Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of the use of propaganda, agitation, financial and military aid which promote hate and hostility of any class, race, religion, nation, or people against others."

Proposed amendments to article I of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

Amendment No. 1

Add the following new section to be numbered "3":

"Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to refrain from and discontinue, and to prevent its citizens from engaging in illegal activities that interfere with or intervene in the internal affairs of other nations including political, mass communications, educational, economic, labor, or social affairs," and/or—

Amendment No. 2

Add the following new section to be numbered "4":

"Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to refrain from and to prevent its citizens from causing, encouraging, aiding, abetting, subsidizing or participating in or carrying out by word or deed revolutionary, subversive or hate fomenting activities in other countries, aimed at establishing any particular monolithic, totalitarian world, social, economic or political systems," and/or—

Amendment No. 3

Add the following new section to be numbered "5":

"Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to refrain from and to prevent its citizens from attempting or encouraging interference or intervention in the internal political affairs of any other nation, leaving the peoples of each nation free to choose their own social, economic and political systems by free and secret elections," and/or—

Amendment No. 4

Add the following new section to be numbered "6":

"Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to refrain from and to prevent its citizens from encouraging, aiding, abetting, subsidizing or participating in insurrections, revolutions, aggressions, subversions, threats, or breaches of the peace against peoples of other nations."

Proposed amendments to article II of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

Amendment No. 1

Delete all of article II, and appropriately renumber all following articles, or—

Amendment No. 2

In article II, section 1, after the word "Governments", in the second sentence, insert a "period", and strike out the remainder of the sentence.

Insert a third sentence to read as follows: "In the event that the Original Parties unanimously sign, approve and ratify the proposed amendment, complying with all procedures required for a new treaty, then the Depository Governments shall circulate it to all parties to this treaty."

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, congressional delay seems to typify this session of Congress, but it is difficult to understand how the leadership can sit back and ignore the critical situation confronting the 4,000 school districts in this Nation located in federally impacted areas which will be opening their doors next week, not knowing whether the provisions of Public Laws 874 and 815 will be extended.

These schools are going to open, but they cannot stay open without these funds. Extension of these laws means the difference between staying open and closing, and as you know, these laws expired last June 30. Neither the House nor the Senate has acted to extend them.

These schools have to open because they have to take care of these students, both those who normally reside there and those brought in as the result of some Federal installation. These funds, which have been paid since the laws were enacted in 1950, are really payment in lieu of taxes and a direct obligation of the Federal Government.

Congress has an obligation to these school districts, their administrators, and their pupils to act immediately to extend Public Laws 874 and 815. Let us meet it.

BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be called upon to extend the bracero program for 1 year, despite the fact that we have already defeated a 2-year extension. A powerful lobbying effort is underway in order to reverse our decision.

It is said that American agriculture will be gravely damaged if we refuse to extend Public Law 78. Yet only 2 percent of our farmers use braceros, and 98 percent of them do not. Our farming industry did well without the program before, and there is every indication that it would do all right without braceros now.

The bracero program is special interest legislation; it is shameful legislation. Mr. Speaker, we must reaffirm our stand that Public Law 78 should expire on December 31.

A RESOLUTION TO IMPLEMENT THE SECOND SECTION OF THE 14TH AMENDMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to create a committee of the House to implement the second section of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. The committee would be composed of 11 members to be appointed by the Speaker, no more than 7 of whom shall be members of the majority party.

As we all know the 2d section of the 14th amendment states that Representatives shall be apportioned among the States by counting the whole number of persons in each State except "when the right to vote in any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crimes, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

This provision has been modified, of course, by the 19th amendment which gave the right to vote to women. Other than that it stands.

My resolution will implement it by authorizing the committee created to determine the number of persons in the several States whose right to vote in any election covered by the amendment has been abridged and upon the basis of those findings to determine the number of Representatives to the House to which each State shall be entitled.

The resolution further directs the committee to utilize the services of the Civil Rights Commission and the Bureau of the Census in obtaining its findings and in making its determinations. The resolution directs the committee to certify its findings to the House by March 1, 1964. If, 60 days after the submission of their findings, the House has not expressly disapproved it, the findings shall then take effect as a determination by the House of the number of Representatives for each State who qualify, in accordance with the 14th amendment, for membership in the House in the 89th Congress.

If we are to broaden democracy and include all of our eligible citizens in the democratic process the provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment should be implemented. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SALARY INCREASES

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of H.R. 7814, to increase Federal Civil Service Employee salaries:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 7814

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in behalf of H.R. 7814, which proposes a Federal salary increase to be effective on January 1, 1964. This legislation is urgently needed in spite of the fact that the second phase of the salary increase provided in the Salary Reform Act of last year will become effective on that date.

Last year's legislation was the first Federal pay legislation which specifically embraced the principle of comparability; that is, that Federal salaries should be comparable to salaries received in private enterprise for jobs having similar duties and responsibilities. The act provides that the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall make annual surveys of the rates of compensation for similar positions in the Federal Government and in private industry. Congress is then to use these statistics as a guide to keeping Government salaries in line with nongovernmental salaries.

The second step of last year's pay raise, which will take effect January 1, unless superseded by new legislation, is a step in the right direction, but was necessarily written without the benefit of the first of the BLS surveys. We now have an opportunity of correcting that situation. The results of this first survey were published in March of this year. It is only fair that we now revise the salary schedule in the light of the BLS findings, and bring Government salaries into line with the principle of comparability which we so warmly espoused in last year's legislation. This is the time to assure Federal employees that we are indeed concerned with their financial welfare, and will live up to the standards which we set less than a year ago.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty facing us in considering a revision of the second phase of the salary increases provided for by last year's act is the timelag between the BLS statistics and the actual implementation of the new rates. The spirit of the comparability principle and natural considerations of equity require that the lapse of time be held to the minimum possible. This is the reason for the introduction of the bills we are considering today.

By our actions in this first year's test we can demonstrate that the Government has sincerely committed itself to the twin proposition of fair treatment of its employees and adequate compensation for recruitment and retention purposes.

The BLS statistics were collected during the period 1961–62. These statistics show that private enterprise salary rates increased in 1961–62, and there is no reason to believe that they have not continued to increase since that time.

The cost of living has also continued to rise. If Federal employees are to continue to make ends meet without undue difficulty, we must use our knowledge of present and future economic conditions to correct what could become an intolerable situation.

We have the finest civil service in the world, and we must make it clear that we intend to keep it that way. The necessity of competing with private industry for the best talent available should act as a stimulus to keep Government rates of compensation at a desirable level. Public service provides many intangible rewards to the dedicated employee, but it is highly unfair to ask that the Federal employee be satisfied with less than his counterpart in private enterprise—he can't raise his family on intangibles.

It is a fact that quality in this world, in any field, does not come cheaply. Private enterprise has long recognized this, and the Federal Government, in its legislation of last year, is just beginning to put this into practice.

The Federal Establishment has an urgent need for more and better qualified applicants for its multitude of jobs. The new and continuing challenges of the decades to come will provide an outlet for the talents of many thousands of workers. Never before has a National Government been faced with such an array of possible courses of action in so many fields of human endeavor.

Our action on these proposed salary increases is vitally important to the future. If we do not act now, thus reaffirming our confidence in our Federal employees, we may well find ourselves without the needed competent personnel in the days ahead.

President Kennedy described last year's Salary Reform Act as "the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years."

I do not agree with his evaluation—I believe that this year's pay legislation is the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years. This is the crucial year—are we merely going to give lipservice to the principles set forth in last year's act, or are we going to establish now, once and for all, a Federal salary policy which is in line with the 20th century?

The administration has also sent us a bill to adjust the salary schedules which are presently to take effect on the first of next year. The administration bill proposes increases which range from 2 percent to about 20 percent, and average slightly more than 3 percent. Because of the time difference, however, I am in favor of the more liberal H.R. 7814, which amends the President's plan to give employees in the low grades an additional 6 percent, which I feel is fully justified since private salaries have, as mentioned previously, continued to rise since the BLS surveys.

H.R. 7814 does not propose to raise the salaries of the top grades as much as the administration's bill does. The reason for this is because, in accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a study of Federal executive pay has just been completed. It is, of course, highly desirable, in the interests of equity and the solution of pressing problems in professional and administrative staffing, to achieve full comparability rates for all grades as soon as possible. As soon as the results of this report, prepared by a high-level citizens committee headed by Clarence Randall, can be evaluated, a further revision of executive salaries will be proposed.

Another piece of legislation being considered by the committee at this time is H.R. 4800. I strongly favor incorporating its provisions into the overall pay legislation which we have been discussing.

This bill proposes to correct defects of last year's legislation with regard to certain postal service employees. It provides that employees in the first six grades of the postal field service who satisfactorily complete a specified period of service at one step would automatically move up to the next step within the grade. The passage of this legislation would be of great value to these employees, and I strongly favor its passage.

I urge the committee to give favorable consideration to these proposals, whose passage would assure Federal employees of our continued support for their fine work and loyalty.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962, ITS RECORD TO DATE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have discussed the subject of imports and textiles. Today I think is a very significant day on which to consider this particular problem in the economic life of our country. I say that today is significant because this is the day when an announcement was made of an arrangement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan with reference to textiles.

Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of a release from the State Department just an hour or so ago. While I have not had an opportunity to thoroughly study it, I feel that it is of such importance that it should be made a part of the RECORD on this day.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make this release by the Department of State a part of my remarks at this point, as well as the data attached to the release.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE BILATERAL TEXTILE ARRANGEMENT

The Governments of the United States and Japan today announced the conclusion of a bilateral arrangement covering trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States for the period 1963 through 1965. The purpose of this arrangement is to provide for the orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States. The notes effecting the arrangement, which was negotiated under article 4 of the Geneva Long-Term Arrangements Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles of February 9, 1962, were exchanged today by Ambassador Ryuji Takeuchi and Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs G. Griffith Johnson. Representatives of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor participated in the negotiations with the Embassy of Japan and with other representatives of the Japanese Government. Principal features of the bilateral arrangement are as follows:

1. For calendar year 1963 the level of Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States, as listed in annex A to the arrangement, is 287.5 million square yards equivalent. Within this aggregate limit, limits or ceilings are also provided for particular categories and groups of textiles.
2. The overall limit, and the limits or ceilings on groups and categories, will be increased by 3 percent for calendar year 1964, and these levels will be increased by 5 percent for calendar year 1965.
3. The two Governments will exchange such statistical data on cotton textiles as are required for the effective implementation of the arrangement. A set of conversion factors is specified in annex C of the arrangement to express various categories of cotton textiles in terms of a square yard equivalent.
4. The two Governments agree on procedures that would be applied in the event that an excessive concentration of Japanese exports of any particular product of cotton textiles, for which no limit or ceiling is specified, or of end items made from a particular type of fabric, should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. market.
5. The two Governments also agree on procedures which would be applied in the event that questions should arise concerning certain items not included in annex A of the arrangement.
6. The two Governments also agree to consult on any problem that may arise during the term of the arrangement.

Except as otherwise provided by the arrangement, the terms and provisions of the long-term arrangements will continue to be applicable to the trade between Japan and the United States in cotton textiles.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 27, 1963.
His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your note of today's date and the bilateral arrangement attached thereto concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States which reads as follows:

"EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the recent discussions held in Washington by the representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and to confirm on behalf of the Government of Japan, the understandings reached between the two Governments that, pursuant to the provisions of article 4 of the Long-Term Arrangements Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as 'the long-term arrangements'), permitting 'mutually acceptable arrangements on other terms not inconsistent with the basic objectives of this arrangement,' and with a view to providing for orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, the bilateral arrangement attached hereto will be applied by the two Governments for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, subject to the provisions thereof.

"I have further the honor to request you to be good enough to confirm the foregoing understandings on behalf of the Government of the United States.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration."

I have further the honor to confirm the foregoing understandings on behalf of the Government of the United States of America.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

FOR THE SECRETARY OF STATE:
Washington.

WASHINGTON, *August 27, 1963.*
His Excellency, DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the recent discussions held in Washington by the representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and to confirm, on behalf of the Government of Japan, the understandings reached between the two Governments that, pursuant to the provisions of article 4 of the Long-Term Arrangements Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as "the long-term arrangements"), permitting "mutually acceptable arrangements on other terms not inconsistent with the basic objectives of this arrangement," and with a view to providing orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, the bilateral arrangement attached hereto will be applied by the two Governments for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, subject to the provisions thereof.

I have further the honor to request you to be good enough to confirm the foregoing understandings on behalf of the Government of the United States.

I avail myself to this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONCERNING TRADE IN COTTON TEXTILES BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

Pursuant to the provisions of article 4 of the long-term arrangements, permitting "mutually acceptable arrangements on other terms not inconsistent with the basic objectives of this arrangement," the following arrangement will be applied by the two Governments for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, subject to the provisions herein.

1. The purpose of this arrangement is to provide for orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States. To achieve this purpose:

a. The U.S. Government shall cooperate with the Japanese Government in promoting orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and

b. The Japanese Government will maintain, for the period of 3 years beginning January 1, 1963, an annual aggregate limit for exports of cotton textiles to the United States, and annual limits for major groups and annual limits or ceilings for certain products within those groups, subject to the provisions of this arrangement.

2. The annual aggregate limit for 1963 shall be 287.5 million square yards. This limit shall be subdivided into four major groups as follows:

	Million square yards
Group I, cotton cloth	125.5
Group II, made up goods, usually included in U.S. cotton broad woven goods production	41.0
Group III, apparel	111.0
Group IV, miscellaneous cotton textiles	10.0
Total	287.5

Within these major groups, annual limits or ceilings for specific products are set forth in annex A. Within the annual aggregate limit, the limits for groups I, II, III, and IV may be exceeded by not more than 5 percent, provided that this provision for "flexibility" shall permit an increase only in the "other" categories referred to in each group in annex A.

Each group set forth above shall be deemed to contain the following categories which are defined in annex B:

Group I, categories 5 through 27.

Group II, categories 28 through 36, and part of category 64.

Group III, categories 39 through 62, and part of category 63.

Group IV, categories 1 through 4, 37, 38, and part of categories 63 and 64.

3. The aggregate limit for 1964 shall be increased by 3 percent over the limit for 1963. The aggregate limit for 1965 shall be increased by 5 percent over the limit for 1964. These increases for 1964 and 1965 shall be applied to each limit for the groups and to each limit or ceiling within the groups.

4. Wherever it is necessary for the purposes of this arrangement to convert units other than square yards (e.g., dozens, pieces, pounds, etc.) into square yard equivalents, the conversion into equivalent square yards shall be at the rates specified in annex C.

5. a. The two Governments undertake to consult whenever there is any question arising from the implementation of this arrangement.

b. If instances of excessive concentration of Japanese exports in any products within the scope of this arrangement, except those included in categories for which limits or ceilings are specified in annex A, or if instances of excessive concentration of Japanese exports of end products made from a particular type of fabric should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. domestic market, the United States Government may request in writing consultations with the Japanese Government to determine an appropriate course of action. Such a request shall be accompanied by a detailed, factual statement of the reasons and justification for the request, including relevant data on imports from third countries. During the course of such consultations, the Japanese Government will maintain exports in the products in question on a quarterly basis at annual levels not in excess of 105 percent of the exports of such products during the first 12 months of the 15-month period prior to the month in which consultations are requested or at annual levels not in excess of 90 percent of the exports of such products during the 12 months prior to the month in which consultations are requested, whichever is higher.

c. The provisions in subparagraph b above should only be resorted to sparingly. In the event that the Japanese Government considers that the substance of annex A would be seriously affected due to the consultations in subparagraph b, the Japanese Government may request that the consultations include a discussion of possible modifications of annex A.

6. The two Governments recognize that the successful implementation of this arrangement depends in large part upon mutual cooperation on statistical questions. Accordingly, each government agrees to supply promptly any available statistical data requested by the other government. In particular, the United States Government shall supply the Japanese Government with data on monthly imports of cotton textiles from Japan as well as from third countries, and the Japanese Government shall supply the United States Government with data on monthly exports of cotton textiles to the United States.

7. As regards products in any category under specific limits or ceilings specified in this arrangement, the U.S. Government shall keep under review the effect of this arrangement with a view to orderly development of trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States, and shall furnish the Japanese Government once a year with available statistics and other relevant data on imports, production and consumption of such products such as would clarify the impact of imports on the industry concerned.

8. If the Japanese Government considers that as a result of limits and ceilings specified in this arrangement Japan is being placed in an inequitable position vis-a-vis a third country, the Japanese Government may request consultations with the U.S. Government with a view to taking appropriate remedial action such as a reasonable modification of this arrangement.

9. The two Governments understand that the terms and conditions of the long-term arrangements shall be applicable to trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States except as provided in this arrangement. The U.S. Government agrees that insofar as the exports from Japan of the products falling within the scope of annex A of this arrangement are conducted within the framework thereof the U.S. Government shall not invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements with respect to such products.

10. a. This arrangement shall continue in force through December 31, 1965, provided that either Government may terminate this arrangement prior thereto effective at the beginning of a calendar year by giving 60 days' written notice to the other Government.

b. Each Government may at any time propose modification of this arrangement. The other Government shall give sympathetic consideration to such proposal.

ANNEX A

1. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 125.5 million square yards for Group I—"cotton cloth":

	Thousand square yards
(1) Ginghams (categories 5 and 6)	46,200
(2) Velveteens (category 7)	2,750
(3) Typewriter ribbon cloth (category 17)	987
(4) All other fabrics (categories 8 through 16 and 18 through 27)	75,563

b. Within the specific limit for "ginghams, combed" (category 6) shall not exceed 75 percent of the above specific limit.

c. Within "all other fabrics," the following specific ceilings shall not be exceeded:

	Thousand square yards
(1) Sheeting (categories 9 and 10)	30,000
(2) Poplin and broadcloth (categories 15 and 16)	30,000
(3) Print cloth, shirting type, 80 x 80 type, carded yarn (category 18)	20,000
(4) Other shirting (categories 19, 20 and 21)	32,000
(5) Twill and sateen (categories 22 and 23)	39,000
(6) Yarn-dyed fabrics, n.e.s. (categories 24 and 25 and part of category 32)	29,000
(7) Duck (part of categories 26 and 27)	1,750

d. Any shortfall below the limits specified in (1), (2), and (3) of paragraph 1a may be transferred to (4)—"all other fabrics."

e. Within "all other fabrics" total exports of fabrics made from combed warp and filling shall not exceed 34.65 million square yards.

f. Within "yard-dyed fabrics," total exports of handkerchief cloth shall not exceed 2.25 million square yards.

2. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 41 million yards for group II—"Made-up goods, usually included in U.S. cotton broad woven goods production":

	Unit	Number
1. Pillowcases, plain (categories 28 and 29).	1,000	5,400.0
2. Dish towels (category 30)	1,000	7,200.0
3. Handkerchiefs, except for dedicated handkerchief cloth (part of category 32).	1,000 dozen	1,260.0
4. Table damask and manufactures (category 33).	1,000 pounds.	3,100.0
5. Sheets (categories 34 and 35)	1,000	2,940.0
6. All other made-up goods (categories 31, 36, and part of category 64 as specified in par. 5, below).	1,000 square yards equivalent.	2,494.0

b. Any shortfall below the limits specified in (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) of paragraph 2a may be transferred to (6)—"all other madeup goods."

3. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 111 million square yards for group III—"apparel":

	Unit	Number
1. Gloves and mittens (category 39).	1,000 dozen	472.5
2. T-shirts, knit (categories 41 and 42).	do	535.0
3. Knit shirts, except in T and sweatshirts (category 43).	do	809.0
4. Men's and boys' dress shirts, not knit (category 45).	do	382.0
5. Sport shirts, whether or not in sets, not knit (category 46).	do	717.5
6. Raincoats, ¾ length or over (category 48).	do	60.0
7. All other coats (category 49)	do	120.0
8. Trousers, slacks, and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit (categories 50 and 51).	do	1,500.0
9. Blouses, whether or not in sets (category 52).	do	1,775.0
10. Dresses, not knit (category 53).	do	45.0
11. Playsuits, sun suits, wash suits, rompers, creepers, etc. (category 54).	do	180.0
12. Nightwear and pajamas (category 60).	do	120.0
13. All other apparel (categories 40, 44, 47, 55 through 59, and 61, 62, and part of category 63 as specified in par. 5, below).	1,000 square yards equivalent	1,428.0

b. Any shortfall below the limits specified in (1) through (12) of paragraph 3a may be transferred to (13)—"all other apparel".

c. Within the specific limit of 1.5 million dozen for "trousers, slacks and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit", the following specific ceilings shall not be exceeded:

	Unit	Number
1. Men's and boys' (category 50)	1,000 dozen	500.0
2. Women's, misses', and children's (category 51).	do	1,162.5

d. The aggregate volume of exports of the following apparel items manufactured of corduroy, where the chief weight of the item is corduroy, shall be limited to 21.35 million square yards equivalent based upon the conversion factors for the items in question which appear in annex C.

Category No.:	*Description*
46	Sport shirts.
48	Raincoats.
49	All other coats.
50–51	Trousers.
54	Playsuits.

4. a. The following specific limits shall apply within the total annual limit of 10 million square yards for Group IV—"Miscellaneous cotton textiles":

	Unit	Number
1. Zipper tapes, not elsewhere specified (U.S. "schedule A"), No. 3230 273.	1,000 pounds	810
2. Other (categories 1 through 4, 37, 38, and parts of categories 63 and 64 as specified in par. 5, below).	1,000 square yards equivalent.	6,274

b. Any shortfall below the limit specified in (1) in paragraph 4a may be transferred to (2)—"Other".

5. With regard to categories 63 and 64 referred to in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 above, the following items or products as identified by present U.S. "Schedule A" numbers or parts thereof shall be included:

Category 63 (to be included in group III except as noted otherwise):

3113 000[1]
3113 362
3113 365
3113 958[1]
3113 962[1]
3113 965
3113 969
3113 970
3113 971
3113 972
3113 973
3113 974
3113 975
3113 995
3114 001
3114 155
3114 165
3114 175
3114 180
3114 225
3114 235
3114 240
3114 245
3114 255
3114 715[1]
3115 720[1]
3114 895
3114 900
3114 905
3114 925
3114 950
3114 955

Part of:

3113 997[3]
3113 998[3]
3114 260[3]
3114 960[3]
3114 965[3]

I.E.: Pullovers, aprons, altar cassocks, beach wear sets, swim wear, baseball uniforms, sleeping bags for infants, halters, men's and boys' coveralls and overalls, diaper sets, scarves, dress shields,[1] sash belts,[1] apparel with bib, bibs,[1] belts for apparel,[1] and shoulder straps for brassieres.[1]

Category 64 (to be included in group IV except as noted otherwise) (excluding in sets):

3030 000
3030 100
3081 510
3081 530
3081 600
3081 710[2]
3081 730[2]
3081 812[2]

See footnotes at end of table.

3081 815[2]
3081 818
3081 852[2]
3081 855[2]
3081 858
3081 912[2]
3081 915[2]
3081 918[2]
3083 500[2]
3083 700[2]
3083 900[2]
3084 112[2]
3084 400[2]
3086 600[2]
3086 730
3118 200[2]
3124 200[2]
3134 200[2]
3144 200[2]
3154 200[2]
3158 020[2]
3158 120[2]
3159 020[2]
3159 120[2]
3163 001
3163 002
3163 003
3163 004
3163 005
3163 006
3163 580[2]
3163 600[2]
3163 690[2]
3166 000
3166 200
3166 300
3166 692
3166 695
3168 001
3168 002
3168 003
3168 004
3168 005
3168 006
3168 007
3168 008
3168 009
3168 010
3200 012[2]
3200 015[2]
3200 400[2]
3220 130[2]
3220 202[2]
3220 205[2]
3220 207[2]
3220 212[2]
3220 862
3220 865
3220 868
3224 000
3224 050
3224 100
3224 150
3224 200
3224 300
3224 500
3230 240
3230 273
3230 350
3230 401
3230 410
3230 431
3230 500[2]
3230 682[2]
3230 685[2]
3230 688[2]
3903 300
3969 010
3230 232
3230 235
3230 278
9439 950

[1] These items or products shall be included in group IV.

[2] These items shall be included in group II.

[3] The two Governments shall consult as to whether or not any product other than the 17 products enumerated below the footnoted items may be classified as an addition to these items. Such consultations shall not cover shoe uppers, Japan items, belts (other than sash belts and belts for apparel), suspenders and braces.

ANNEX B

Definition of cotton textile categories—list of categories and unit

1. Cotton yarn, singles, carded, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.

2. Cotton yarn, plied, carded, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.

3. Cotton yarn, singles, combed, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.

4. Cotton yarn, plied, combed, not ornamented, etc.: pounds.

5. Ginghams, carded yarn: square yards.

6. Ginghams, combed yarn: square yards.

7. Velveteens: square yards.

8. Corduroy: square yards.

9. Sheeting, carded yarn: square yards.

10. Sheeting, combed yarn: square yards.

11. Lawns, carded yarn: square yards.

12. Lawns, combed yarn: square yards.

13. Voiles, carded yarn: square yards.

14. Voiles, combed yarn: square yards.

15. Poplin and broadcloth, carded yarn: square yards.

16. Poplin and broadcloth, combed yarn: square yards.

17. Typewriter ribbon cloth: square yards.

18. Print cloth, shirting type, 80x80 type, carded yarn: square yards.

19. Print cloth, shirting type, other than 80x80 type, carded yarn: square yards.

20. Shirting, carded yarn: square yards.

21. Shirting, combed yarn: square yards.

22. Twill and sateen, carded yarn: square yards.

23. Twill and sateen, combed yarn: square yards.

24. Yarn-dyed fabrics, n.e.s., carded yarn: square yards.

25. Yarn-dyed fabrics, n.e.s., combed yarn: square yards.

26. Fabrics, n.e.s., carded yarn: square yards

27. Fabrics, n.e.s., combed yarn: square yards.

28. Pillowcases, plain, carded yarn: numbers.

29. Pillowcases, plain, combed yarn: numbers.

30. Dish towels: numbers.

31. Towels, other than dish towels: numbers.

32. Handkerchiefs: dozen.

33. Table damasks and manufactures: pounds.

34. Sheets, carded yarn: numbers.

35. Sheets, combed yarn: numbers.

36. Bedspreads, including quilts: numbers.

37. Braided and woven elastics: pounds.

38. Fishing nets: pounds.

39. Gloves and mittens: dozen.

40. Hose and half hose: dozen pairs.

41. Men's and boys' all white tee shirts, knit or crocheted: dozen.

42. Other tee shirts: dozen.

43. Knitshirts, other than tee shirts and sweatshirts (including infants): dozen.

44. Sweaters and cardigans: dozen.

45. Men's and boys' shirts, dress, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

46. Men's and boys' shirts, sport, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

47. Men's and boys' shirts, work, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

48. Raincoats, three-quarter length or over: dozen.

49. All other coats: dozen.

50. Men's and boys' trousers, slacks and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

51. Women's, misses' and children's trousers, slacks and shorts, outer, whether or not in sets, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

52. Blouses, whether or not in sets: dozen.

53. Women's, misses', children's and infants' dresses (including nurses' and other uniform dresses), not knit or crocheted: dozen.

54. Playsuits, sunsuits, washsuits, creepers, rompers, etc. (except blouses and shorts; blouses and trousers; or blouses, shorts, and skirt sets): dozen.

55. Dressing gowns, including bathrobes and beachrobes, lounging gowns, dusters and housecoats, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

56. Men's and boys' undershirts (not tee shirts): dozen.

57. Men's and boys' briefs and undershorts: dozen.

58. Drawers, shorts and briefs (except men's and boys' briefs), knit or crocheted: dozen.

59. All other underwear, not knit or crocheted: dozen.

60. Nightwear and pajamas: dozen.

61. Brassieres and other body supporting garments: dozen.

62. Other knitted or crocheted clothing: units or pounds.

63. Other clothing, not knit or crocheted: units or pounds.

64. All other cotton textile items: units or pounds.

ANNEX C

Conversion factors

Category No.	Unit	Conversion factor
1	Pound	4.6
2	do	4.6
3	do	4.6
4	do	4.6
28	Number	1.084
29	do	1.084
30	do	.348
31	do	.348
32	Dozen	1.66
33	Pound	3.17
34	Number	6.2
35	do	6.2
36	do	6.9

Conversion factors—Continued

Category No.	Unit	Conversion factor
37	Pound	4.6
38	do	4.6
39	Dozen	3.527
40	do	4.6
41	do	7.234
42	do	7.234
43	do	7.234
44	do	36.8
45	do	22.186
46	do	24.457
47	do	22.186
48	do	50.0
49	do	32.5
50	do	17.797
51	do	17.797
52	do	14.53
53	do	45.3
54	do	25.0
55	do	51.0
56	do	9.2
57	do	11.25
58	do	5.0
59	do	16.0
60	do	51.96
61	do	4.75
62	Pound	4.6
63	do	4.6
64[1]	do	4.6

[1] Floor coverings shall be measured by actual square yardages.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1963.
His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan,
Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States affected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state the understandings of my Government that if any problem arises regarding the classification in the implementation of the arrangement, the two Governments shall consult each other with a view to finding an appropriate solution. Particularly, when questions arise whether certain products fall within the scope of annex A, the two Governments shall study such questions taking into account, inter alia, such international standards as B.T.N. and S.I.T.C.

In view of the fact that category definitions may be affected as a result of possible future changes in the U.S. "schedule A," I hereby wish to state further our understandings that such changes shall be promptly notified to the Japanese Government, and that consultations shall be held to make such adjustments in the arrangement as may become necessary as a result of the changes.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,
For the Secretary of State:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *August 27, 1963.*
Hon. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state the understandings of my Government that if any problem arises regarding the classification in the implementation of the arrangement, the two Governments shall consult each other with a view to finding an appropriate solution. Particularly, when questions arise whether certain products fall within the scope of annex A, the two Governments shall study such questions, taking into account, inter alia, such international standards as B.T.N. and S.I.T.C.

"In view of the fact that category definitions may be affected as a result of possible future changes in the U.S. schedule A, I hereby wish to state further our understandings that such changes shall be promptly notified to the Japanese Government, and that consultations shall be held to make such adjustments in the arrangement as may become necessary as a result of the changes.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

I wish to confirm on behalf of my Government the understandings set forth in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1963.
His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan,
Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: On the occasion of the exchange of notes with the arrangement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected thereby, I wish to state that there are certain items not included in annex A of the arrangement but which are classified as cotton textiles by the U.S. Government. A list of these items, identified by the U.S. schedule A numbers, is attached to this letter. It is the understanding of the United States Government that the Japanese Government does not consider some of the products within the first 22 items to be cotton textiles and does not consider any of the last 7 items to be cotton textiles.

Nevertheless, in the event imports from Japan in any of the items or products enumerated in the attached list should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. domestic market, the United States Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government for the purpose of finding an appropriate course of action.

The consultations shall be conducted in the manner provided in paragraph 5 of the arrangement if the item or product in question is considerered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government, or in any other manner agreeable to both Governments if the item or product in question is not considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government. The Japanese Government shall promptly notify the United States Government whether or not it considers the item or product in question to be a cotton textile.

While the U.S. Government agrees and prefers to seek a mutually satisfactory solution through the means mentioned above, it reserves its right, if such a settlement cannot be reached expeditiously, to invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements regarding international trade in cotton textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962, concerning the items or products enumerated in the attached list.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,
For the Secretary of State:

ATTACHMENT

(1)	2061	400
(2)	3224	800
(3)	3224	900
(4)	3226	110
(5)	3226	300
(6)	3230	238
(7)	3230	275
(8)	3230	277
(9)	3230	352
(10)	3230	451
(11)	3230	712
(12)	3970	010
(13)	3971	010
(14)	3971	020
(15)	3971	110
(16)	3971	210
(17)	3971	430
(18)	3113	997[1]
(19)	3113	998[1]
(20)	3114	260[1]
(21)	3114	960[1]
(22)	3114	965[1]
(23)	2061	000
(24)	2067	610
(25)	2067	710
(26)	3224	700
(27)	3230	461
(28)	3230	670
(29)	9439	950

(in sets only)

See footnote at end of table.

[1] Part of these items include, i.e., shoe uppers, belts (other than sash belts and belts for apparel), suspenders and braces.

WASHINGTON, *August 27, 1963.*
Hon. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963 which reads as follows:

"On the occasion of the exchange of notes with the arrangement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected thereby, I wish to state that there are certain items not included in annex A of the arrangement, but which are classified as 'cotton textiles' by the U.S. Government. A list of these items, identified by the U.S. 'schedule A' numbers, is attached to this letter. It is the understanding of the U.S. Government that the Japanese Government does not consider some of the products within the first 22 items to be cotton textiles and does not consider any of the last 7 items to be cotton textiles.

"Nevertheless, in the event imports from Japan in any of the items or products enumerated in the attached list should cause or threaten to cause disruption of the U.S. domestic market, the U.S. Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government for the purpose of finding an appropriate course of action.

"The consultations shall be conducted in the manner provided in paragraph 5 of the arrangement if the item or product in question is considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government, or in any other manner agreeable to both Governments if the item or product in question is not considered a cotton textile by the Japanese Government. The Japanese Government shall promptly notify the U.S. Government whether or not it considers the item or product in question to be a cotton textile.

"While the U.S. Government agrees and prefers to seek a mutually satisfactory solution through the means mentioned above, it reserves its right, if such a settlement cannot be reached expeditiously, to invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements regarding international trade in cotton textiles, done at Geneva on February 9, 1962, concerning the items or products enumerated in the attached list.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

With regard to the above-stated understandings of the U.S. Government, I wish to confirm, on behalf of my Government, that these are also the understandings of the Government of Japan with the following reservation.

In the event the U.S. Government exercises its right to invoke article 3 of the long-term arrangements, the Japanese Government may exercise its rights as an exporting country in accordance with the various relevant provisions of the long-term arrangements, including the right to bring questions of interpretation or application of the long-term arrangements to the GATT Cotton Textiles Committee in accordance with article 8 of the long-term arrangements.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

WASHINGTON, *August 27, 1963.*

Hon. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state our understanding that the exports of uniquely Japanese products called Japan items shall not be included in annex A of the arrangement. The attachment to this letter provides for the definition of "Japan items" and enumerates those products which have been and are likely to be exported to the United States as "Japan items." Additional items may be added to the above attachment through agreement after consultations as may become necessary in the future.

It is further understood that the exports of "Japan items" shall be made with certification by the Japanese Government. In the event that the United States Government finds that any particular products imported from Japan as "Japan items" should not be properly classified as such, the United States Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government with a view to finding the appropriate classification of the products in question within annex A of the arrangement.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,

—— ——.

ATTACHMENT

1. DEFINITION OF "JAPAN ITEMS"

"Japan items" to be kept outside annex A of the said arrangement are the items which are uniquely Japanese products. Whether a particular product should be considered as "Japan items" or not will be determined on the basis of the following criterion.

Designed for the use in the traditional Japanese way of life, wearing kimono, living in "Tatami" rooms, decorating for traditional Japanese ceremonies or festivals, playing Japanese sports, etc. In other words, not in use in the regular western way of life except for hobbies or special likings.

2. LIST OF "JAPAN ITEMS"

The names of the items which have been and are likely to be exported as "Japan items" are as follows:

(a) *Cloth*

Kimono: Traditional Japanese style dress.

Yukata: A type of kimono, summer-wear made of Yukata-Ji (plain-woven light fabrics printed in simple colors).

Juban: Underwear for kimono, fundamentally same style as kimono.

Haori: Overcoat for kimono, usually less than three-fourth length.

Wafukukoto: Raincoat or duster coat to be worn over kimono, basically same style as kimono, different from haori in not being open in front and longer than three-fourth length.

Happi: Workers' overcoat, similar style with haori but not dressy.

Judogi: Kimono-style sports wear for judo, usually accompanied by slim and three-fourth length trousers and by belts.

Kendogi: Kimona-style sports wear for kendo, usually accompanied by Hak ma (men's skirts, full length). Different from judogi in being lighter, tighter and half-sleeves.

Kappogi: Apron to be worn over kimono with broad sleeves, chest and shoulders covered.

Momohiki: Carpenters' or Rikishamen's trousers, often coveralls to be worn in combination with happi. Different from western style trousers in being extremely light and small in lower ends, usually black in color. Combination sets of happi and monohiki are often traded as "carpenter apparel".

Sashiko: Quilted coat which is almost like happi, typically used by firemen.

(b) *Clothing accessories*

Obi: (1) Wide thick belts for kimono, usually a few inches wide or more. (2) wide, thin belts for men's kimono or Yukata, both longer than Western style belts by a few times; and (3) judo belts, narrow but approximately twice as wide and longer than western style belts, no buckles.

Obishime: Woven decorative belt to be used on top of the obi (1) above.

Tabi: Socks to be worn when one wears "kimono" made of woven fabrics, tightly in the form of foot, having a separate division for the big toe. Reaches just above the ankle and is fastened at the back by means of an overlap having metal hook tabs.

Koshihimo: Narrow, soft belt to be used between obi and kimono, or kimono and juban.

Erisugata: A length of stiff cotton cloth to be sewn inside "eri" collar to give a form or shape.

Sodeguchi: Extra broad sleeves which are based on the short sleeves of juban.

Homaekake: Men's working apron, thick and heavy. Big in size, usually simple in color.

(c) *Household goods*

Futon: Japanese style bedding, mattress and thick, large blankets. Mattress different from western style in the stuffing much softer and the covering cloth lighter. Blankets are as thick as an inch or more, also with soft stuffing.

Futon-Cover: Cover for "futon." Different from sheets as it covers the stuffing directly, also different in sizes as it is made to contain voluminous stuffing, usually printed or dyed.

Zabuton: Cushion to sit on in Japanese "tatami" rooms. Approximately a yard square, a few inches thick with soft stuffing.

Furoshiki: Wrapping cloth of about 1½-yard square. Different from scarf in the thickness of the fabric.

Koinobori: Artificial carp to fly on top of a long pole on the occasion of "Boys' Festival" in the Japanese custom.

Noren: Shop curtain to hang at the entrance of shops, short, with vertical cuts in several parts.

Tenugui: Oblong towel, woven, usually with Japanese decorative design.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan, Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to annex A of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to state our understanding that the exports of uniquely Japanese products called 'Japan items' shall not be included in annex A of the arrangement. The attachment to this letter provides for the definition of 'Japan items' and enumerates those products which have been and are likely to be exported to the United States as 'Japan items.' Additional items may be added to the above attachment through agreement after consultations as may become necessary in the future.

"It is further understood that the exports of 'Japan items' shall be made with certification by the Japanese Government. In the event that the U.S. Government finds that any particular products imported from Japan as 'Japan items' should not be properly classified as such, the U.S. Government may request consultations with the Japanese Government with a view of finding the appropriate classification of the products in question within annex A of the arrangement.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

I wish to confirm on behalf of my Government the understanding set forth in your letter.

Sincerely yours,
For the Secretary of State.

—— ——.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 27, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan,
Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: With reference to paragraph 5b of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to inform you of the views and intentions of the U.S. Government:

The U.S. Government recognizes that exports of the end products containing fabrics potentially falling under the so-called concentration clause are themselves subject to limits established in annex A of the arrangement. It further recognizes that changing demands in the U.S. market may, from time to time, lead to changes in the types of fabric appearing in imports into the United States. Considering these and other circumstances, the U.S. Government does not intend to invoke paragraph 5b on any type of fabric except in the case of a sharp and substantial increase from present levels in imports from Japan of that fabric in the form of end items. It is to be understood that a sharp and substantial increase would be considered to apply only in those cases where present levels of imports from Japan of the fabric concerned in the form of end items already are in substantial volume in relation to total consumption in the United States.

In any event, the U.S. Government would give the Japanese Government advance notice prior to any invocation of the clause under discussion.

I should be grateful if you would acknowledge on behalf of your Government the receipt of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

—— ——.

(For the Secretary of State)

WASHINGTON, *August 27, 1963.*

Hon. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I acknowledge, on behalf of my Government, receipt of your letter of August 27, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to paragraph 5b of the arrangement between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America concerning trade in cotton textiles between Japan and the United States effected by the exchange of notes today, I wish to inform you of the views and intentions of the U.S. Government:

"The U.S. Government recognizes that exports of the end products containing fabrics potentially falling under the so-called concentration clause are themselves subject to limits established in annex A of the arrangement. It further recognizes that changing demands in the U.S. market may, from time to time, lead to changes in the types of fabric appearing in imports into the United States. Considering these and other circumstances, the U.S. Government does not intend to invoke paragraph 5b on any type of fabric except in the case of a sharp and substantial increase from present levels in imports from Japan of that fabric in the form of end items. It is to be understood that a sharp and substantial increase would be considered to apply only in those cases where present levels of imports from Japan of the fabric concerned in the form of end items already are in substantial volume in relation to total consumption in the United States.

"In any event, the U.S. Goverment would give the Japanese Government advance notice prior to any invocation of the clause under discussion.

"I should be grateful if you would acknowledge on behalf of your Government the receipt of this letter.

"Sincerely yours,

"——— ———."

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the foregoing release and I can say without hesitancy that perhaps there has been no more important bit of news for the people whom I represent than the news contained in this release regarding the arrangement. I wish we could say that a solution has been found to the textile problem. But we cannot find it in any arrangement or agreement that may be made with just one country.

In 1962 when we were considering the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 I was one of those who voted against the legislation. At that time I had serious concern as to the correctness of my vote. Today I have no concern about it whatever. I am convinced that the vote I cast was correct and in the best interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, when the trade expansion bill was before Congress last year, one of the prime arguments in its support was based on the adjustment assistance provisions contained in the bill.

These provisions represented a recognition of the damage that might be inflicted on domestic industry as a consequense of the sharp tariff reductions provided for by other sections of the bill. In other words, it was acknowledged that the proposed tariff-slashing program was frankly designed to open our industries to destructive import competition. Such a course was regarded as a necessary undertaking to bolster our international diplomatic policy. This was an unabashed admission that American industry was to serve, at the expense of possible lethal injury, the ends of diplomacy as interpreted by the State Department and the Presidency.

As compensation for such a program of sacrifice, the bill made provision for various kinds of assistance to companies and workers that could satisfy the Tariff Commission and the President that they had been injured as a result in major part of increased imports caused in turn in major part by a tariff reduction.

This compensation was to be in the form of technical, financial, and tax assistance, so far as firms are concerned, and in the form of special payments to workers for retraining, relocation, and so forth, so far as assistance to workers is concerned.

By following such a course, industries could be reorientated in point of production to get out of the way of competitive imports and vacate the ground to them. Imports would have the right of way as emissaries of economic goodwill from other countries. We would not in the least contest their progress. We would automatically recognize the right of imports to capture our market from our own industries on the very simple proposition that our industries convict themselves of inefficiency by their inability to compete. We have thus announced our willingness to vacate one industrial premise after another in deference to the ability of other countries to lay down goods in this country at prices below the level necessary to keep our industries alive.

While the trade expansion bill was put forward as a friendly gesture to industry and labor that would be victimized, albeit reluctantly, by the trade program, the language providing for the balm was so stringently drawn that in the 10 months since the Trade Act was passed not one cent of compensation has been awarded for technical, financial, or tax assistance to firms or for retraining, relocating, and otherwise supporting the victimized workers.

To date no less than 11 cases have been processed by the Tariff Commission under the provisions of the new Trade Act. All 11 have been rejected by the Commission by unanimous vote. Five of the cases were brought by industries, four by the workers in individual companies, and two by individual manufacturing firms.

This is the record under the Trade Expansion Act. This is the record made under the language of the bill as insisted on by the State Department.

At the present time the Commission has no new cases before it under the new act. Its docket is empty.

So far as the much-touted adjustment assistance provisions of the law is concerned, it is a dead letter.

The escape clause is dead. It was buried by the new trade bill. Yet the facts are that industries are being hurt as a result of past tariff reductions and face a yet more inhospitable outlook in the future when further cuts are to be made.

I was convinced when the trade bill was before this body that the escape clause would be severely crippled, but I did not believe that it would be completely disemboweled. The record speaks for itself. It would be no cause of surprise if the Tariff Commission's docket should remain empty in this field. Apparently no case can be made under the wording of the new statute.

Why should any industry, firm, or group of workers apply for relief under the record made to date?

The law should be changed radically to make it responsive to the needs of our industries and their workers.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to join my distinguished colleague in the remarks he is making today and commend him, as I have done so often for his continuing fight in behalf of the texile workers of this Nation. I think all of us who have served with him here can testify to the fact that he has been unrelenting in his demand that we retain the textile industry in a healthy economic condition.

I was unable to read the Japanese-American agreement thoroughly because of insufficient time, but I just happened to think, in keeping with the gentleman's remarks, how many American jobs were given away or sold down the river in this trade agreement which has just been signed. I wonder whether or not this Government is asking those people in the textile plants all over this country if they can find any justification in giving away or selling away or bartering away American jobs. If I were dependent on the textile industry for my livelihood and if that had been my life work, and if I were over 40 years old and knew I could not be rehabilitated very easily, for it is not done anymore, certainly I would feel that my country was not looking after my best interests.

I want to join the gentleman and commend him and say to him, as his friend, his neighbor, and his colleague here in the Congress, that I salute his efforts on this occasion.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman. I say to him as I have said so many times that not only do I appreciate the interest which he has shown and the energy he has exerted in this area but I am sure that the people of my congressional district as well as the people of his own district appreciate his devotion to the cause of preserving the jobs of American people.

I, like the gentleman, have not had an opportunity to analyze thoroughly this Japanese-American arrangement, but I am familiar with some of the basic facts about which the gentleman has been concerned and I would like to mention those briefly at this point.

The U.S. imports of cotton textiles and apparel currently are running at an annual rate of 1.2 billion equivalent square yards. This rate is in excess of the 1.11 billion square yards which entered the country between October 1, 1961, and September 30, 1962. I would point out that this was a period in which imports from free-world countries other than Japan were to be restrained under the provisions of the international cotton textile trade arrangement. The arrangement was an outgrowth of the seven-point program of assistance to the domestic textile industry enunciated by President Kennedy on May 2, 1961. Its objective was to prevent cotton textile and apparel imports from exceeding the fiscal 1961 level of 812 million square yards. But in spite of that arrangement, the import increase was measured at about 37 percent. Meanwhile under U.S. Government cotton price policy, American mills are required to pay about one-third more for U.S. cotton than foreign mills pay for any cotton, including American grown cotton. This situation provides foreign mills with a cotton cost advantage which enables foreign made products to displace U.S. goods in markets both here and abroad.

This briefly is one part of the problem that confronts the American people who earn their living in the textile plants.

A few days ago in reading one of the leading textile publications, the Southern Textile News, I saw this little paragraph which I think is relevant to the discussion in which we are now engaged. It says:

> The average wage in the textile industry in the United States as of last December was $1.69 per hour. Meanwhile the average textile wage in Japan was 16 cents an hour, in Italy it was 27 cents, France 51 cents, Germany 46 cents, England 68 cents.
>
> See why the United States textile industry is in trouble?

The gentleman from South Carolina and I take little pride in the knowledge that this industry average in America is not in keeping with the industry average generally. The textile industry is, unfortunately, one of the lower paying industries. The people we represent in North Carolina and South Carolina in the textile area are buying automobiles made by $3.50 an hour labor on earnings of $1.69 an hour on the average. This is not the sort of condition we want our people to have to contend with. But, yet, with the type of wage structure that we find in these other countries, as pointed out in the paragraph I just read, it seems inescapable that we will not be able to have the type of wages for our people that we all want them to have unless something is done to halt this great growth in the import trade in the textile field.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The thought occurs to me in the light of the gentleman's remarks that the American textile worker is a consumer of American goods. But the competing textile worker in Japan, Italy, and France does not buy American goods; he is not a consumer; he is not an American taxpayer; he has sent no sons or daughters to war for this country; he has done nothing to improve the lot of the American citizen of yesterday, today, or tomorrow. They have made, so far as I can determine, no sacrifice for this great country as have the textile people and their kindred throughout the generations I have known. It is a sad commentary to me that in the process of trade we have abandoned and neglected, and the Government has, you might say, snubbed its nose at these people. They are consumers, and as the gentleman very well points out, if we did not have to compete with these imports, we could pay these people more. They would have more dollars to spend as consumers. They would be occupying a greater and more important place in our economy and in the market places of the country generally.

That is what you and I want for them and what everybody should want for the American citizen. Give him as much consumer power as possible because it is that consumer power that makes the wheels go round.

Mr. WHITENER. I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina has read with the same degree of interest that I read a report on imports of man-made fibers, fabrics, and manufactures which was recently—in fact, on August 6, 1963—prepared by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. The information contained there is quite shocking, or should be, to all Americans. This, to state it briefly, shows that imports of broad woven fabrics in June 1963, were 28 percent above the same month in 1962, and 101 percent above the corresponding month in 1961. Then when we get to man-made fiber fabrics in square yards, the total imports of man-made fiber products were up 14 percent in May 1963, from what they were in May 1962, and showed a 103-percent rise for the same month, that is, the month of May, over 1961. These statistics are so interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I ask unanimous consent to make them a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The statistics referred to are as follows:

Imports of man-made fibers, fabrics and manufactures [1]

[Broadwoven fabrics, in the piece (in square yards)]

	June	January-June
1961	3,627,212	17,376,229
1962	5,707,326	32,463,991
1963	7,284,469	36,367,440

[1] Imports of broadwoven fabrics in June were 28 percent above the same month a year ago and 101 percent above the corresponding month of 1961. January-June figures were 12 and 109 percent above the same period for 1962 and 1961, respectively.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Total imports of man-made fiber fabrics and manufactures (in square yards) [1]

	May	January-May
1961	6,834,625	41,273,752
1962	12,173,865	68,651,758
1963	[2] 13,853,109	70,478,024

[1] Total imports of man-made fibers products were up 14 percent from May 1962, and showed a 103-percent rise from the same month of 1961. January-May figures were 3 percent and 71 percent above the same period for 1962 and 1961, respectively.

[2] Conversion factor for May: 4.6378 yards.

Sources: Bureau of the Census and Department of Agriculture.

Principal U.S. imports of man-made fibers and manufactures

Item	Unit	1963	
		June	January-June
Yarns:			
Filament yarns, having not more than 20 turns/inch:			
Singles:			
Weighing 150 denier or more:			
Cellulosic	Pound	29,859	458,328
Noncellulosic	do	5,951	70,381
Weighing less than 150 denier:			
Cellulosic	do	65,004	228,220
Noncellulosic	do	231,809	2,127,192
Plied:			
Weighing 150 denier or more	do	2,171	11,455
Weighing less than 150 denier	do	299	971
Spun yarn:			
Singles	do	57,586	183,929
Plied	do	34,955	206,632
Fabric, woven, in the piece, total	Square yard	7,284,469	36,367,440
Grey, not jacquard, total	do	2,060,336	11,269,076
Acetate	do	152,693	1,028,748
Rayon, all filaments	do	171,446	2,003,229
Other rayon	do	195,896	1,230,872
Polyamide	do	1,226,252	4,267,228
Polyester	do	257,684	2,409,339
Other fabrics	do	56,365	329,660
Finished, not jacquard, total	do	4,422,030	21,964,165
Acetate	do	89,641	204,006
Rayon, all filaments	do	2,100,689	12,268,872
Rayon gingham	do	271,800	1,583,160
Other rayon	do	1,396,496	5,528,417
Polyamide	do	9,485	209,950
Polyester	do	420,546	1,806,595
Other fabrics	do	133,373	363,165

Principal U.S. imports of man-made fibers and manufactures—Continued

Item	Unit	1963	
		June	January-June
Grey, jacquard figured, total	Square yard	30,277	250,354
Acetate	do	20,034	116,043
Rayon, all filaments	do	2,873	6,478
Other rayon	do	7,370	29,936
Polyamide	do	0	37,098
Polyester	do	0	60,131
Other fabrics	do	0	668
Finished, jacquard figured, total	do	771,826	2,883,845
Acetate	do	105,363	324,626
Rayon, all filaments	do	66,713	343,906
Other rayon	do	349,050	1,405,969
Polyamide	do	99,847	174,060
Polyester	do	120,293	459,950
Other fabrics	do	30,560	175,334
Pile:			
Pile fabrics	do	61,800	279,724
Pile ribbons	Pound	9,653	98,845
Pile articles	do	4,333	21,060
Fabric, knit, in the piece, total	do	26,409	107,867
Acetate	do	128	1,793
Rayon	do	5,742	19,384
Acrylic	do	0	0
Polyamide	do	20,025	77,334
Polyester	do	0	0
Other	do	514	9,356
Wearing apparel, knit:			
Underwear	do	192	1,658
Sweaters	Dozen	13,022	36,172
Wearing apparel, not knit:			
Blouses	do	5,890	15,618
Dressing gowns	do	718	5,200
Nightwear	do	171	4,411
Dress shirts	do	4,114	33,265
Sport shirts	do	2,150	19,338
Trousers, slacks	do	4,185	23,126
Other	Pound	39,398	360,198
Wearing apparel, not knit, ornamented:			
Blouses	Dozen	620	8,248
Blouse sets	do	1	1
Dressing gowns	do	1,001	7,565
Nightwear	do	1,833	6,867
Dress shirts	do	7	307
Work shirts	do	0	0
Sport shirts	do	2,340	17,816
Suits	Number	11,952	47,206
Coats	do	332	9,691
Trousers, slacks, etc	do	135,338	1,111,995
Underwear	Dozen	1,161	6,284
Other	Pound	47,048	603,403
Miscellaneous:			
Tubings, cords, and tassels	do	11,003	47,712
Woven labels	do	30,514	194,603
Gill nets or netting	do	14,004	84,023
Nets for fishing	do	6,325	47,909
Tire fabric	do	568	11,443
Other	do	48,932	388,575

Source: Compiled by ATMI from Bureau of the Census data.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I might inform the gentleman that in the process of these negotiations a certain textile manufacturing company in my district found that it, along with certain others of the textile industry, were targets for Japanese imports. The Japanese were going to wipe out this industry. We took the necessary steps, and with the assistance of some new friends in the State Department, whom I shall name in a speech later and thank, we began to negotiate. While we were negotiating and before this agreement could be signed, the Japanese put on the oceans directly to America a shipload of textile production in order to try to sneak in, just like they did at Pearl Harbor, to sneak into this trade thing. They have done it. They will not keep good faith. They will use every trick in the trade to beat the United States. They have done it time and time again and have tricked us and will trick us again tomorrow. That is the reason why it is so important that our people realize what we are dealing with.

I thank the gentleman for talking about imports, because the American people have been led to believe that because of this trade bill and other things imports have been cut down to a certain level, but they have not been. Rather, they have been increased.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman mentioned the increase in imports and also mentioned a subject which I think appeals to all of us when he refers to the fact that many of our people who are today suffering from this import deluge are men who served their country on the battlefields, in the ships at sea, and in the air.

The balance of trade in textile manufactures has been deteriorating since 1947. At that time our exports exceeded imports by $1.1 billion. In 1962 imports exceeded exports by $546 million, which contributed significantly to the Nation's $2.2 billion deficit in the balance of payments. Currently the U.S. deficit in the balance of payments is predicted for this year to reach $3 billion. The problems created by imports of textiles and apparel continue to be acute and will remain so unless and until the import-control programs are evolved by the Government for textiles of all fibers.

It seems to me that there are two steps that must be taken by our Government in the interest of our own economy and our own people. First, the Congress should pass cotton legislation so that American mills may buy American cotton at the same price at which it is made available for export and thus eliminate the cotton cost advantage given to foreign mills using American cotton, which imposes an unfair burden on the American textile and apparel industry.

And secondly, somewhat related to what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] said, there should be a finding, as requested of the Office of Emergency Planning, that the textile industry is vital to the national security. The OEP should act immediately on the information which was given it about 2 years ago and make an official finding that textile imports impair or threaten to impair the national security either from an economic or military preparedness standpoint.

If this was done the President would then have the necessary statutory authority to impose restraints on imports of all textiles regardless of fiber and avoid a further impairment of the national security position of our country.

I think these two things should be done by the Congress and by the executive department if we are to have justice and equity for our own American people who work in the textile plants.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for this splendid presentation of one of the major problems in America. I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that every seat in this Chamber is not filled with legislators. I am sure if they were here, to hear the speech and the words that my friend from North Carolina has uttered it would certainly impress and would encourage them, as he and I are encouraged to try to do something in this area before it is too late. So I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina for again bringing to the attention of the House this important matter. I would like to impose upon his time for a few minutes to call attention of the House and of you, Mr. Speaker, to a letter which I recently received from one of my constituents, who is the head of a textile enterprise in my State and in my district, and which is the world's largest producer of cotton corduroy. This is what this friend and constituent wrote me:

> I must reluctantly and regretfully advise you that your district is in considerable jeopardy as far as the economy of Haw River and Hillsboro is concerned and, to a lesser degree, Greensboro.
>
> You may recall that I wrote you some weeks ago in connection with corduroy, which is produced in a greater volume in your district than in any other Congressman's area in the United States. I was in Washington about 3 months ago talking with Mr. Trezise and Mr. Blumenthal of the State Department. To refresh your memory, I enclose a copy of my letter of May 23 and also a clipping from our trade paper, the Daily News Record, of Wednesday, August 7. I presume there is nothing that you can do. This corduroy situation is an outrage. You are either going to have to give us our cotton at world prices, or else protect our market, and it is going to have to be done pretty fast, or you are not going to have a textile industry left. I am pointing to you because we can't get any relief from the hired hands in the executive branches. Unless our Congress puts the brakes on its crowd in the State Department and in the Agriculture Department it is going to ruin what little is still left of cotton textiles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that letter is written to me by a man who knows what he is talking about, by a man who has been raised in the textile industry, who is there on the job every day watching the withering and wilting away as a result of inaction here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, he also forwarded to me a statement from the Daily News Record and I would like to quote a portion of it. It says:

> American corduroy producers have watched corduroy apparel imports spurt from 15.6 million yards in 1960 to 32 million last year. They express shock that this Government should permit imports of such quantities when they have had to curtail production of pinwale corduroys by 25 percent in the past year. About 95 percent of the corduroy imports are pinwales.
>
> They also point out that Japan is not only shipping huge quantities of corduroy apparel to the United States, but also sending corduroy fabrics to other Far Eastern points where they are made up into apparel and shipped to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, those are quotations from an article that appeared in the Daily News Record of August 7, 1963.

On August 14th the Daily News Record, a trade paper of the textile industry, also had this to say:

> Ceilings on corduroy apparel: The final quota figure is reported to be either 21,250,000 or 21,200,000 square yards. This is a compromise between the earlier Japanese proposal for 23 million yards and the last American proposal for 20,400,000 yards.
>
> The United States demanded item-by-item ceilings on corduroy sports shirts, raincoats, other coats, men's trousers, women's trousers, playsuits, and dressing gowns, but this was later dropped and the single common ceiling for corduroy agreed upon.
>
> The United States also dropped dressing gowns from the list. The new ceiling is about 700,000 yards more than the actual imports into the United States in 1962.

Mr. WHITENER. I believe the gentleman said that is an article from the Daily News Record?

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITENER. I would say to the gentleman that the corduroy situation is one which is grave in nature. I am sure, however, that the gentleman would agree with me that there are many other textile commodities which are riding on the same train and which are having a pretty rough roadbed on which to ride.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Oh yes, indeed. I was just preparing to say that while I was pointing out the situation in the area of textiles I certainly would not want the gentleman to misconstrue my remarks as limiting my interest to the area of corduroy. My interest, as the gentleman knows, is for the entire industry.

Mr. WHITENER. This thing which the gentleman mentions cuts across the board, from sales yarn to every type of fabric, and even the finished apparel.

In recent years—the last 2 or 3 years in particular—there has been a great influx of sales yarn into this country from Spain, Portugal, and many other countries from which our people had never expetced to have any competition. The same is true of many of these synthetic fibers. I can remember when I first came to Congress most of us felt that even though the foreigners were taking our cotton textile market in great measure, we still had the synthetic or manmade fiber field pretty much to ourselves. Today that is not true. One of the big problems confronting the manmade fiber segment of the textile industry is the import of these products.

I would say to the gentleman that as we go along here, I am certainly not trying to fight a year-old battle again.

I think we are going to have to see a more realistic attitude on the part of the Tariff Commission toward the application of the plain provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 if we are to have the type of relief which the Congress envisioned for the people of this country who were injured by reason of imports. I think it is abundantly clear also that we must have relief from the price differential or cost differential now existing in the purchase of American grown cotton for our domestic textile industry. I believe we might agree that a favorable decision by the Office of the Emergency Planning finding as a fact that this flow of imports is impairing our national security situation is absolutely essential.

Those things do not seem to be propositions that any person interested in the advancement of the economy of the United States could argue about. Yet, unfortunately, it seems that certainly some of those people we hear from in the State Department as we get their briefings seem to have a greater interest in promoting jobs for foreigners than they do for our own people.

I know that the hour is late and many Members and the staff of the House are anxious to get to their homes and their families, and I certainly have no desire to keep them longer.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes, briefly, although I realize that it is difficult to be brief when discussing a problem that is so important to the area which the gentleman and I represent. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I would like to say I agree 100 percent with the gentleman's statement. There are two matters that ought to be given special attention in securing relief for the American textile industry. The two-price cotton inequity should be eliminated, and this petition before the OEP should be approved. Those are two very important and vital matters which must be resolved if we are going to have adequate protection for the jobs of our textile employees.

Mr. WHITENER. Let me say to the gentleman that I am particularly appreciative of his participation. It was only a few minutes before I commenced making this statement that I mentioned to him I was going to do it. I appreciate his willingness to participate on short notice. Also may I say to the gentleman and our colleagues I regret that my presentation is not more complete. There are many other things that could be said, but unfortunately I did not have the time to reduce my remarks to writing and was compelled to speak extemporaneously.

I feel we should deal with this subject more fully on a more favorable occasion from the standpoint of available time. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] that I will look forward to doing that. I hope that he and others will join with me in this effort on behalf of one of the great industries of America, the textile industry, composed of the finest people to be found anywhere—those who earn their livelihood in the textile industry.

MINE DISASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, much will be said, more will be written, but unless this Congress passes H.R. 23, the Small Mine Safety Act, nothing will be done about conditions that caused the recent mine disaster in Pennsylvania's hard coal regions. In less than 2 weeks millions of persons have learned that experience in Schuylkill County, in a town called Sheppton.

There is no recompense for the fear, the anguish, the suffering, and the physical and mental torture of this past 2 weeks to the miners, their families, officials, and citizens of this community.

Yes, even those amongst us who have never given the production of coal a second thought have had a rude awakening. We find at this late date outmoded, dangerous, and disgraceful mining conditions simply because we value the dollar too much, we are politically expedient, or we just do not care about human life, somebody else's—of course.

We are all happy about the two men who were rescued and join in the continuing vigilance with the family of the third man who has, so far, been unable to give a clue to his condition. It could just as easy have been all 3, or 30, or 300 trapped men under similar mining conditions.

The contributions and efforts of all the persons who gave their time, their energy, their resources—both in men and material—in know-how, and in encouragement will go down in the history of the region to be added to the great wealth of folklore and stories of the deeds of the early miners in a region that has seen better days economically.

The untiring efforts of the volunteers, public officials, and the United Mine Workers, the Pagnotti Coal Co., the Correale Coal Co., and others too numerous to mention were directly responsible for the rescue of the helplessly trapped men.

At this very moment amidst the joy of rescue of Fellin and Throne and the terrible weight of not knowing the fate of the third man, there is a burning undercurrent of unrest.

Perhaps some of it stems from the conditions that have forced almost 1,000 mines to be opened by unemployed, desperate men living in an economic void for more than a generation. Perhaps it comes from rumors and public charges that the State mine officials, officially denied, had decided to close the area; leave the men entombed for 30 or more days and then start the grim job of recovering the bodies.

Stories are told, although officially denied, of the attorney general's reported actions in seeking permits to seal off the mine before ascertaining the fate of the men known to be some 300 feet below the choked up entrance.

This shows more than anything else how perseverance and faith with the help of those who knew the mining business, literally moved mountains to save the lives of men given up for dead by cold, calculating, relentless machine age statistical Government agencies.

One wonders whether or not in our blind and ofttimes fruitless drive for more efficiency, more progress, more security, we are not losing sight of the very essence of life itself, faith, fellowship, and a regard for others in both good times as well as the bad times.

One shudders to think of such a possibility, but the facts appear to be there and from what I have been told by some of the residents of the area, the unselfish, human interest of the miners from the UMW played a major role in this drama enacted by live actors on the continuously moving screen where men and women lived and live in the constant fear of mine disasters seeking out a meager living in an industry long ago forgotten by the National Government in its scheme of planned prosperity.

One wonders sometimes when voting for cotton, wheat, tobacco, and peanut subsidies, why the men in the devastated coal fields have had no helping hand from the benevolent Government on the banks of the Potomac.

When we are called upon to vote for the $371 million extra subsidy for the cotton textile mill owners, let us give a few minutes of pause and ponder the fate of Dave Fellin, Henry Throne, and Louis Bove in their unsubsidized, frightful hole in the ground, grubbing out a living, not fattening up their corporate profits.

On August 31, the Scranton Times carried the following story with the views of Dave Fellin, a giant amongst men of courage, on the occupation of digging coal in what Louis E. Evans, former legislator, secretary of mines of Pennsylvania and official of the UMW, calls the deathtraps of the coal regions.

David Fellin would gladly give up his hole in the ground for a job at $1 an hour on the surface of the earth. Just think of it, $1 an hour and no takers of his offer or the offer of thousands of so-called independent miners, many of whom worked—in the days not so long past—in the outlawed bootleg operations that practically wiped out law and order in the ownership and operation of mines in the anthracite region.

The story follows, it tells a heartbreak story common to many ghost towns in the anthracite and not too far removed from the plight of the soft coal miners:

LEAVE MINING? FELLIN WOULD FOR $1 AN HOUR

> SHEPPTON.—If and when the three trapped miners are freed from their chambers 340 feet deep in the earth, will they continue to work in the mines?
>
> David Fellin's wife asked him this same question after he was trapped once before in a less serious mine cave-in.
>
> His reply:
>
> "If you can find me a job outside for a dollar an hour, I'll take it. You don't think I like this, do you?"
>
> Jobs, at a dollar an hour or 10 cents an hour, are hard to come by in the Hazelton-Sheppton-Pattersonville area. So the men of the region do what comes naturally—they mine, sometimes in independent operations where the latest machinery and safety devices are not available.
>
> Cave-ins, injuries and possibly death are accepted matter-of-factly by the men and their families, with something like the unruffled attitude of participants in hazardous sports.
>
> This accounts for the lack of outward emotion on the part of the relatives here as they await word of the trapped trio.
>
> Their emotions, however, have been nettled by what they consider the slowness in moving to the "borehole" solution to the rescue of the miners.
>
> Secretary of Mines H. Beecher Charmbury took note of the criticism in his news conference yesterday. "We have been criticized for our early proposal of refill," he said. "What we intended to do was fill in the caved out area until it stabilized and then start working through the slope toward the men."
>
> The "refill" plan he talked about was planned last week. It was widely misinterpreted as a plan to seal off the mine and abandon the men as lost.
>
> The secretary did not discuss why the State's attorney general had sent an aide to try and get releases from the relatives prior to starting the refill plan. The releases would have eliminated any responsibility on the part of the Commonwealth for the miners' fate.
>
> Nor did the secretary's statement go into the question of why the rescue officials waited so long—from Tuesday to Saturday—before acceding to demands by relatives and the United Mine Workers of America, which did not have jurisdiction in the mine but expressed concern for the welfare of the trio, before starting to drill the boreholes.
>
> The fate of the trio below the earth is expected to be determined within the next 48 to 72 hours.
>
> The resulting joy or sorrow will ultimately be washed away by the necessity of eking out a daily living. Joy and sorrow appear to be shortlived in this Schuylkill County township.
>
> But the beneath-the-surface anger over delay in starting the borehole operations may burn in the hearts of the townspeople for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, nothing I say can make any real difference or give any help in this disaster, but what Congress does with H.R. 23, the small mine safety bill can make a great difference in the future operations of this dangerous and at best, difficult means of earning a living.

I repeat here a statement in the Herald Tribune attributed to former secretary of mines, Lewis E. Evans:

MINES CALLED TRAPS

> HAZLETON.—"These places are deathtraps," said Lewis E. Evans, former Pennsylvania State Secretary of Mines, as he pointed angrily at the dark opening in the coal mine in which the ordeal of three entombed men entered its 9th day.
>
> "There are 700 to 800 of these small mines around here with no second opening for escape," Evans, who is now a special representative of the United Mine Workers, said above the roar of the two drilling machines that are digging with agonizing slowness toward the men trapped below the surface.
>
> Ralph Ditzler, Pennsylvania State mine inspector, disagreed with Evans that the mine was "a deathtrap." He said he had inspected it recently and found it in good

condition. Federal and State inspectors can examine small unregulated mines and make recommendations for improvement, but they have no enforcement powers over them.

"But I agree," said Ditzler, "that the mine should have had a second exit in case of need."

He added that one of the mineowner's projects at the time of the disaster was to tunnel through to a neighboring unworked mine 700 feet away. The tunnel, which would have taken a couple of months to accomplish, according to Ditzler, would have given the mine the desired two exits.

The mine falls in a legal no man's land, according to Evans. It is too small to be regulated by Federal laws. A mine must employ 15 or more men underground to fall under Federal regulation. And it is too small even for State regulation. No anthracite mine employing less than five men underground at one time is subject to State regulation.

The mine was dug 16 years ago in this desolate anthracite country.

It had been virtually abandoned, owing to the depressed state of the anthracite market, until David Fellin and his partner, Eugene Gibbons, took it over recently and began to work it. They extracted the first anthracite from it just last month.

Can we continue to allow unguarded these deathtraps all over the mining regions of this Nation? Many tragedies have taken place in the past decade in these small mines, simply because the Congress of the United States saw fit to resist the pleas of the voice of the mineworkers, the UMW, and listened instead to the voice of the profit-seeking mineowner.

There is nothing wrong with profit, but all the profit in the world cannot buy back one life sacrificed needlessly.

We know that Congress must compromise many times in order to get controversial legislation passed. We know this, we understand this; however, most of the citizens who are not well versed in the legislative procedure cannot understand this.

The attached statement from Sheppton, scene of this latest mine disaster, clearly points its finger at the Congress for failure to act on mine safety legislation.

Last year this legislation died in the Rules Committee, and that veteran legislator from West Virginia tried valiantly to pass it on the floor, but was thwarted by a single objector.

All objectors can well ponder the consequences of his action.

There is every reason to believe that this disaster could and probably would have been averted by the application of Federal mine safety rules. At least we know this, there would have been a second out.

The story from the Scranton Times of August 21, 1963, follows:

Congress To Blame?—Mine Safety Laws Lacking, Evans Says

Sheppton.—Former State Secretary of Mines Lewis E. Evans, now a representative of the United Mine Workers, today bitterly criticized Congress for failure to pass legislation which, he said, would have prevented such mine tragedies as the cave-in near here.

Mr. Evans issued the following statement to newsmen at the site of rescue efforts to save three men, trapped for 8 days in an independent mine operation cave-in:

"I sometimes wonder how long and how many lives must needlessly be lost or placed in jeopardy, as is the case here, before the Congress of the United States takes heed and enacts the necessary and humane legislation that would prevent this slaughter in the coal mining industry—a killing cycle that has been permitted to go on and on for too many years.

"Officials of the United Mine Workers of America have been going before Congress pleading for such relief—but these pleas have fallen on deaf ears over the decades. And here is another concrete example to justify action by the Congress.

"I might reiterate an earlier statement I made here on the scene that a man who loses his life in a 14-man mine is just as dead as a man who loses his life in a 15-man mine—and that's the line of demarcation.

"As you are well aware, under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, a 15-man mine comes under provisions of the statute which authorizes Federal inspectors to shut down a hazardous mining operation, while those employing 14 or less do not come under the law.

"President W. A. (Tony) Boyle of our organization, as recently as August 8, told Congress that there is no logic under the law that should give coal operators employing 14 or less men the legal right to kill mineworkers.

"I want to conclude by saying that this mishap is another glaring example to point up the need for the enactment of the type of legislation that would obviate the unnecessary killing of mineworkers in this country."

As I close this discussion I do so with a fervent prayer that Miner Bova will be saved to join his grief stricken family and friends.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am sure everybody in this Congress was as relieved and thankful as I to hear the good news that two of the three trapped miners at Sheppton, Pa., were brought to the surface this morning and are in good condition.

The entire Nation has followed the drama of the rescue operations at Sheppton. We have all been impressed by the courage and cheerfulness of Henry Throne and David Fellin and by the dedication of the rescue workers. Now that this part of the rescue operation is successfully completed, I want to commend all of the unselfish people who have given so much time, hard work, and money in the effort to save the three coal miners.

Louis Bova, the third trapped miner, is still underground and it is my understanding that the rescue workers will make a valiant attempt to reach him. His fate is uncertain, but I hope and pray that he, too, will be successfully recovered.

Peter Bova, the oldest brother of the miner still underground, said recently that his brother was down there because he had to make a living for himself. That was the only thing left.

These are tragic words, Mr. Speaker, that sum up much of the misery, danger, and hard times that have fallen on the hard coal areas which I represent in the Congress. Louis Bova, Henry Throne, and David Fellin were trapped underground in unsafe mines attempting to make a living the only way that was open to them.

Rather than go on relief, these men risked their lives in hazardous work in an area where more than 10 percent of those needing jobs cannot find them. I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Dan Flood, who represents Luzerne County just across the line from Schuylkill County where the mine is located in my congressional district, in pointing out:

> The tragic thing about all this is that until these men have a chance at other jobs, they will go into these dog holes and risk their lives day after day.

Until Congress passes adequate programs to stimulate employment and productivity, not only in the coal areas I represent, but throughout the Nation, we can expect more tragedies and accidents like the one at Sheppton. With the proper programs and action by the Federal and State Governments, these risks would not be necessary.

I supported the Manpower Training Act and the area redevelopment program, which have been of great assistance in providing jobs in the Sixth Congressional District and the Nation. But much more needs to be done. Increased funds for job training and for job-creating area redevelopment programs are necessary so that all able bodied men who desire employment may find it.

Much more must be done to prevent future accidents such as that at Sheppton. Tremendous effort and large sums of money have been spent to rescue the trapped miners. If even a small part of this sum had been spent on mine safety programs, on closing down unsafe mine holes in coal areas, accidents like this would not have happened. But we must remember that a successful mine-safety program must go hand in hand with measures to produce needed employment in coal areas.

Together with an expanded program of mine safety to prevent accidents there is a great need to combat the increasing pollution of lakes and streams and cut down on the huge, annual fish and wildlife kill caused by mine water drainage. Clean water is becoming more and more of a precious commodity, not only in areas where coal mining operations pollute surrounding streams but throughout the country where industrial waste is discharged negligently into the air and water. Extension and expansion of the Water Pollution Control Act is needed for these purposes.

The accident at Sheppton underscores, in the most human of terms, the responsibilities which face this Congress and the Federal Government. The States alone cannot provide the necessary assistance to increase employment and satisfy the human needs that exist in the depressed areas throughout our country. Only by continued, responsible and cooperative action by both State and Federal Governments can we assure the wives and families of men like Louis Bova, Henry Throne, and David

Fellin that their husbands, sons, and fathers will not have to risk their lives daily in order to earn their livelihood.

Through the efforts of Members of Congress and others, the Federal Government has given substantial help to the rescue operation. Agencies involved include the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Marine Corps, the Federal Bureau of Mines, and the Atomic Energy Commission. I commend these agencies and officials and the various State officials who have spent so much time and effort to save the three men. To all the rescue workers and volunteers who labored selflessly to remove Throne and Fellin and who are even now attempting to rescue Bova must go a special word of thanks and commendation.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of many public statements concerning the Republican position on the foreign aid authorization bill, I would like to call attention to analysis of this matter by the syndicated columnist, David Lawrence.

The analysis by Mr. Lawrence follows:

PRESIDENT HELD TO BLAME FOR AID BILL DEBACLE

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has made serious mistakes in tactics while trying to get the foreign-aid bill through Congress. He now has compounded his error by seeking to put the blame on the Republican leadership for the cut in foreign aid voted by the House of Representatives. Some of his words, given to a hastily assembled news conference, are open to dispute on factual grounds. He said:

"The most disturbing aspect of today's House action is that, for the first time since the end of the World War II, this program experienced a shocking and thoughtless partisan attack by the Republican leadership on a program which both parties have consistently supported as being vital to our national security."

Those lines give the impression that the Republican leaders voted against the whole foreign-aid program. They did not do so. The 4 Republican leaders in the House, together with 48 other Republican Members, actually joined with 172 Democrats the same day to approve the foreign-aid bill and send it to the Senate. Without those 52 Republican votes, even the reduced foreign-aid authorization would have failed. This wasn't noted in the President's blast at the Republicans.

Later on in the same statement, the President supplemented his attack on the Republican leadership with a criticism of the Republican Members of the House as a whole. He said:

"In the key vote on foreign assistance today, only 9 percent of the Republican Members of the House supported this program which has hitherto commanded bipartisan support, and I reiterate again, time and again, this program had bipartisan support in the years of the fifties. The danger is just as great today. I see no reason why the program and its bipartisan support should be destroyed."

But Mr. Kennedy forgot that, as a Member of the House and then of the Senate in the 1950's, he, too, voted for cuts in the foreign aid programs proposed by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

Is it true, moreover, that bipartisan support and the program itself are really in danger today of being destroyed? The bill on final passage in the House called for $3.5 billion. This still is a large sum, and the President himself had done some cutting from his original request for $4.9 billion. He revised the figure down to $4.5 billion when a commision he had appointed advised that the amount could be cut. Later, further cuts were made by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, bringing the total down to $4.1 billion.

Was a cut of less than 15 percent of that sum—which occurred in what the President calls a key vote—the same thing as destroying the whole foreign-aid program? If the Republicans were guilty of partisanship when they voted with a bloc of 66 Democrats to reduce the amount from $4.1 to $3.5 billion, how shall the 66 members of the President's own party be classified? Are they, too, to be called partisan? If those 66 Democrats, which included the Democratic chairmen of three committees of the House—the Ways and Means, the Appropriations and Rules, respectively—are added to the 172 Democrats who already favored the amount that the Foreign Affairs Committee recommended, this could have provided a sufficient majority to pass the measure in the form the White House desired. Aren't these three committee chairmen Democratic leaders?

So it is hardly logical to issue an intemperate statement attacking the Republicans and their leaders when there were enough Democrats and their leaders in the House who didn't follow the President but who could have assured passage of the bill he wanted.

As for the handling of the Republicans, the President has blundered. Either he has been too busy to watch the situation carefully himself, or he has been badly advised. For one thing, he has never invited the Republican leaders to conferences at the White House on the foreign aid program. President Eisenhower used to invite the Democratic leaders for breakfast regularly to talk things over.

Also, it happens that foreign aid is unpopular today in the country generally and has been for some time. The appropriations in recent years have been passed with difficulty, too, because in reality the American people have grown tired of what, in some instances, is regarded as international blackmail and extortion.

But apart from the troubles that the foreign aid program runs into—especially with so many interests at home pressing for bigger appropriations out of an already unbalanced budget—it is important for a President of the United States to steer a careful course himself in congressional affairs if he expects bipartisan support.

In this connection, the comment of Representative Glenn Cunningham, Republican, of Nebraska, becomes pertinent. He called attention to the fact that former Representative Walter Judd, Republican, of Minnesota, was for years the most articulate and persuasive spokesman for foreign aid in the House and had won over to his side many of his fellow Republicans. Mr. Glenn added:

"Then last year, Kennedy went up and purged him. On the very day we were debating the foreign aid bill, and Judd was there arguing for it, Kennedy was in his district speaking against him. Judd wasn't here today, either. That was the nub of Kennedy's defeat."

The President's trouble is that sometimes he himself is too partisan—or, to put it another way, he isn't nonpartisan enough.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, instead of leveling criticism at the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, the President would do well to direct his attention to correcting the defects in the foreign aid program. Such an effort would not only produce savings in the program but it would also allay some of the current opposition to it.

I include at this point an editorial from today's Wall Street Journal.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1963]

NONANSWERS TO NONCRITICS

It is a traditional political ploy to answer criticisms that are not being made instead of ones that are. Now, as the foreign-aid debate moves from the House to eventual Senate consideration, it is instructive to observe this exercise in action.

President Kennedy gave a good demonstration of the device the other day. "No party or group," he said, "should call for a dynamic foreign policy and then seek to cripple (the aid) program." That is what he thinks the House cuts, if sustained, would do.

At his press conference, Mr. Kennedy speculated on just what the program's critics, of whom there are more than ever in Congress this year, would like to see stopped. "Should we scrap the Alliance for Progress, which is our best answer to the threat of communism in this hemisphere? Should we deny help to India, the largest free power in Asia, as she seeks to strengthen herself against Communist China?" And so on.

Well, it isn't quite like that. Some may think the Alliance, to take that example, should be scrapped because it is a failure. But the real point is that it is ill conceived and needs drastic change.

The bulk of Alliance aid goes to Latin political regimes, with all the implicit corruption, rather than to help the poverty-mired masses. It stresses socialist planning and state enterprise instead of the incentive economy that might make going concerns of some of these countries. The real answer to the real criticism is a reshaped policy and program.

Similarly, few critics of aid to India object to military help intended to strengthen the nation against the threat of renewed attack by Red China. The criticism is of the nature and results of the economic aid to India, which is a wholly different kettle of fish.

This aid supports and entrenches socialism, with all the stultifying economic effects of centralized controls and excessive bureaucracy. In the opinion of a good many experts in and out of India, the best hope of progress lies in moving much farther in the direction of an enterprise economy, putting much less emphasis on planning and state-run heavy industry.

Yet the U.S. Government not only fails to use the lever of its tremendous economic aid to move that way. It complacently accepts Indian socialism and now seriously considers giving it a big new boost in the form of help for a costly government steel mill. We don't see why any official should be surprised at criticism on such valid grounds.

Nor are we aware of many demands for a dynamic foreign policy, whatever that might mean. People probably prefer a sense of confidence in the judgment behind foreign policy to any displays of dynamics. In any case, the connection between aid and the crucial aspects of policy is more tenuous than the administration professes to believe.

Cuba received aid but was not saved from communism by it. And when the Cuban crunches came—the Bay of Pigs disaster, the Soviet missile-stashing—U.S. aid or the lack of it simply had nothing to do with issues of the most fateful kind. It is equally irrelevant in the significant question of whether we are entering a period of improved relations with Russia.

In sum, what most critics of foreign aid are saying is not that it should be summarily scrapped, but that it is confused, overblown, oversold and too often geared to purposes not in the national interest. It may seem smart to discuss nonexistent criticisms instead, but that old political gambit is no answer to serious questions.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that certain of my good friends on the other side of the aisle found occasion to call to the attention of the House last week some of the resolutions passed by the Western States Conference of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, and in doing so they demonstrated a rather strong element of partisanship, using terms such as "extreme" and "fanatical," "leftwing" and "radical left," I feel that I should provide the House with a more objective summary of these resolutions.

I am sure that we all understand that the somewhat exaggerated statements of my Republican colleagues were triggered, not so much by the four or five resolutions which they attacked specifically, but more by one which they did not mention, which included the statement:

> We deplore the capture of the National Young Republicans by the extreme rightwing of the political spectrum.

It is quite understandable that this should raise the hackles of some of my Republican friends, but it should not necessarily lead to the complete degeneration of the political dialog to childish cries of "I am not" and "You're one too."

The Western States Conference of Young Democratic Clubs of America, meeting in San Francisco August 16–18, 1963, passed a total of 32 resolutions during that weekend.

In general, these resolutions strongly supported programs aimed at achieving peace in the world, a prosperous economy in the United States and freedom for all our citizens, goals which are difficult to disagree with. Methods suggested for reaching these goals included a national conference on peace, freedom and jobs, major tax cuts, increased public works, enactment of the test ban treaty, protection of the right to vote, congressional reform, a Domestic Peace Corps, a nonaggression pact between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, support of the U.N. and similar measures, all of which I believe are within the realm of respectable discussion.

A surprisingly large number of resolutions were devoted to problems of conservation, water resources and Indian rights, again a proper concern of Western Democrats. This group of resolutions included one supporting the Colorado River decision of the Supreme Court, support for a Federal power intertie between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest, one in support of the water rights of the Pima Indians, and one endorsing the Canyonlands National Park.

I think all of us are aware that the tremendous pressures toward political conformity in this country render suspect almost any discussion of foreign affairs and our relations with the Communist bloc once the discussion rises above the level of patriotic cliches.

Such has been the case with the test ban treaty until recently, and is still the case with regard to Berlin, Communist China, Cuba, Vietnam, and many other troubled areas which should require our best analytical thinking and major political innovation.

The Western States Conference of the Young Democratic Clubs of America is to be commended, in my opinion, for daring to voice some new approaches which they consider worthy of exploration in these problem areas. I do not share all of their views; the National Young Democrats do not share all of their views; and the Democratic Party as a whole does not share all of their views. But certainly these views deserve more than condemnation as being beyond the pale of respectability.

These views also deserve accurate reporting which they have not received in the comments made heretofore. For example, last Tuesday it was stated—page 15441 of the Congressional Record—that a resolution was adopted "that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam." The actual resolution read:

> That the Western States Conference YDCA urges President Kennedy to make renewed efforts to encourage Diem to make meaningful social, economic, and political reforms, posing as a possibility the withdrawal of American forces if these reforms are not begun.

This is, of course, official U.S. policy with regard to Vietnam, and in the last few days the possibility of withdrawal of American forces has increased considerably above what it was when this resolution was adopted.

Needless to say, the impact of the criticism made of these resolutions on this floor would be considerably greater if it were confined to factual rather than imaginary basis.

Two resolutions opposed to the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the McCarran Internal Security Act were adopted. I could list a very large number of quite respectable and strongly anti-Communist organizations which share this viewpoint, but I hardly think it necessary to do so here. Obviously, this view may be unpopular with many Members of Congress, but this does not put it outside the boundaries of political discussion, any more than proposals to impeach Chief Justice Warren or drastically modify the powers of the Supreme Court. This latter position, incidentally, cherished by the far right, was rejected in one of the resolutions adopted by the Young Democrats.

I think it well, also, to point out that the United States, although rejecting a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw pact nations as a condition precedent to the nuclear test ban treaty, is at least exploring this possibility as a further step toward peace exactly as suggested in one of the criticized resolutions.

Resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba, the last resolution specifically mentioned in last week's criticism, enjoys about as much support as recognizing the U.S.S.R. did in the late twenties or recognizing Communist China has for the past several years. We did recognize the U.S.S.R. and we probably will recognize Communist China and Cuba when we reach the conclusion that the national interest warrants it. That may be sooner than most of us on this floor think. The resolution in question suggested the desirability of recognizing Cuba as a means of minimizing Soviet influence in the Western Hemisphere and lessening Cuban dependence on the Soviet bloc—both quite laudable aims—and specifically stated that this action "does not mean approval of the existing Government."

Because I believe most Members of this House are quite capable of judging for themselves as to the reasonableness of political resolutions, I am including herewith the full text of those criticized, together with a selection of other resolutions adopted.

I would like to commend the Western State Conference of the Young Democratic Clubs of America for the concern they have shown for the problems their Nation is facing. I think that they have shown a great deal more appreciation of the needs of the world today, including the need for world peace, the protection of individual liberties, and the improvement of our economic climate, than their counterparts in the other political party.

The text of selected resolutions is as follows:

National Conference on Peace, Freedom, and Jobs

Whereas there is a need for liberal forces to organize themselves in behalf of peace, civil rights, and employment and to discuss in a broad forum a program for political action in these areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges the Democratic Party to conduct a national conference on peace, freedom, and jobs to be held concurrently with and in the same city as the Democratic National Convention. This conference would bring together representatives of peace organizations, civil rights organizations, and labor unions to discuss and give publicity to the need for congressional reform and its relevance to the issues in which they are interested.

Federal Tax Cut and Economic Growth

Whereas a substantial and growing number of our unskilled and semiskilled workers are unemployed due to automation; and

Whereas our existing plant is automated to such a degree that production could be substantially increased to supply additional demand without employing additional workers in significant numbers; and

Whereas the proposed $10 billion tax cut will not alone provide the new opportunities for profitable investment or for employment of the unskilled and the semiskilled which we must have if the economy is to expand and unemployment is to be reduced; and

Whereas there is a critical unmet need for public facilities, such as roads, schools, rapid transit, parks, and hospitals, at the local, State, and Federal levels; and

Whereas the majority of the unemployed who fit in the described categories mentioned above are in our minority groups: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges President Kennedy and the Congress to combine the proposed tax cut with major new programs of investment in public facilities at the local, State, and Federal levels, specifically providing for long-range construction and public works programs involving employment for the unskilled and semiskilled labor in significant quantity; and be it further

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA supports the President's Manpower Retraining Act and other programs to provide for the training of future workers so that their employment opportunities will not be lessened by the effects of automation.

South Vietnam

Whereas the existence of the reactionary, authoritarian and corrupt regime of Ngo Dinh Diem is hampering the political, social, and economic development of this country and is making easier the task of Communist penetration and takeover: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges President Kennedy to make renewed efforts to encourage Diem to make meaningful social, economic, and political reforms, posing as a possibility the withdrawal of American forces if these reforms are not begun.

Test Ban Treaty

Whereas testing of nuclear weapons constitutes a grave health danger to the present world population as well as endangering future generations; and

Whereas both sides now have more than enough nuclear weapons to destroy each other; and

Whereas continued testing of nuclear weapons accelerates the arms race and increases the possibility of accidental war; and

Whereas the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have concluded a workable treaty banning testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA go on record in support of this treaty and urge its swift passage by the U.S. Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That we applaud the constructive and creative negotiations carried on by U.S. Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Voter Registration in the South

Whereas the right to vote, the most fundamental right by a citizen in a democratic society, is being consistently denied to a large segment of the Negro population in five Southern States; and

Whereas the method frequently used to deny the right to vote is to make difficult, dangerous, and impossible the task of voter registrations; and

Whereas the student nonviolent coordinating committee has undertaken the crucial task of registration of Negro voters in the South: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges the Democratic National Committee to back up the courageous SNCC workers by conducting a large scale, massive drive in five Southern States with the avowed purpose of getting all citizens to register and vote.

March in Washington, August 28

Whereas the Western States Conference YDCA supports the efforts of minority groups to obtain equal living standards and equal treatment in public places of business; and

Whereas the summer of 1963 is a crucial period in the fight for racial justice; and

Whereas the march on Washington will focus public attention on the civil rights issue: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA fully supports the August 28 march in Washington and urges all YDCA Clubs to support this.

Railroad Strike

Whereas the national interest is best served when both employer and employee can agree on work rules and wages; and

Whereas in the past collective bargaining has successfully settled labor-management disputes in national industries; and

Whereas Government-enforced compulsory arbitration is an infringement on labor's right to strike; and

Whereas Secretary of Labor Wirtz reports that the threat of Government action in the railroad dispute has eliminated serious negotiation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges Congress to reject all proposals involving compulsory arbitration by the Interstate Commerce Commission or any other agency of Government.

Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (Walter-McCarran Act)

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, commonly known as the Walter-McCarran Act, has in practice proven itself to be discriminatory and unfair, and prejudicial to the interests and standing of our country among the peoples of the world; and

Whereas this law has resulted in the baseless harassment and persecution, the imprisonment and, sometimes, deportation of thousands of noncitizen residents of our country, guilty of no crime under our other laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we support President Kennedy's call for rewriting of our nationality and immigration legislation to conform to our best liberal and democratic traditions; and be it further

Resolved, That as an immediate measure, the present law be amended to provide a statute of limitations of 5 years, after which noncitizens can no longer be threatened with deportation procedures, and foreign-born citizens can no longer be threatened with procedures to revoke their citizenship; such noncitizens or foreign-born citizens, after said 5-year period, shall be subject only to the laws and penalties generally applicable to all citizens and residents of our country.

Adjournment in Memory of Estes Kefauver

Whereas the people of the United States and, more particularly, the citizens of Tennessee have lost a great friend and Senator in the person of Estes Kefauver; and

Whereas there are too few public officials as dedicated to the public interest as the late Senator Kefauver: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA adjourn in memory of the late Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee.

Cuba

Whereas, the interests of world peace can best be served by negotiation between nations; and

Whereas the crisis last October in Cuba might well have been avoided if there had been contact between the Cuban Government and the United States prior to the establishment of Russian missiles in that country; and

Whereas it is desirable to minimize Soviet influence in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas this could best be brought about by lessening of Cuban dependence on the Soviet bloc; and

Whereas we have diplomatic relations with a great many Communist and Socialist nations; and

Whereas diplomatic recognition does not mean approval of the existing government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urge the U.S. Government to resume diplomatic relations with the Cuban Government and reestablish trade relations with that country.

Repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act

Whereas the McCarran Internal Security Act changes the criteria for conviction for subversion from a person's actions to a person's thoughts; and

Whereas the act is a bill of attainder in spirit if not in fact, and time a violation of the constitutional powers of Congress; and

Whereas the act provides for concentration camps in national emergency to which any American citizen can be sent by administrative order of the Federal Government, with court remedies only after extension and expensive procedures; and

Whereas all of the above provisions of the act are contrary to rights of Americans as provided in the Bill of Rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA call for the repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act.

Nonaggression Pact

Whereas the continent of Europe is divided into two armed camps, NATO and the nations of the Warsaw Pact; and

Whereas the true road to world peace can only be attained through mutual trust of nations of different philosophies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges the signing of a nonaggression pact between the NATO countries and the nations of the Warsaw Pact as another step on the road to a lasting world peace.

Constitutional Amendments Pertaining to U.S. Supreme Court

Whereas so-called States rights; i.e., segregationists and other reactionary forces have introduced into State legislatures various constitutional amendments to weaken the power of the Supreme Court; and

Whereas the sole purpose of these amendments would be to weaken the civil rights movement, the labor movement, and civil liberties; and

Whereas the adoption of these amendments would have disastrous effects upon the social and economic progress of our Nation; and

Whereas 16 State legislatures have already approved these amendments: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA opposes all of these constitutional amendments, or any amendments that weaken the U.S. Supreme Court.

Abolition of Oil Depletion Allowance

Whereas a broader tax base is desirable for economic development; and

Whereas oil companies have been given a tax windfall for years in the form of an oil depletion allowance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA calls for the abolition of the current oil depletion allowance.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM—PUBLIC LAW NO. 78

Whereas the Congress of the United States has finally taken their courageous stand opposing the importation of alien workers (Public Law 78); and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has given excellent reasons for this stand, to wit:

(1) Economic discrimination against the farmworkers of the United States.

(2) The downgrading of farmworkers wages for the workers of the United States.

(3) Economic hardship caused by the bracero program on the family size farmer in the United States.

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA wholeheartedly commend the Congress of the United States on the aforementioned courageous stand; and be it further

Resolved, That the conference unalterably opposes all attempts of the Congress of the United States to reactivate the bracero program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ, Democrat of Texas, who has led the fight against the further extension of the bracero program.

ABOLITION OF HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas freedom of speech and association are guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee for 25 years has dared to investigate into the political beliefs of U.S. citizens; and

Whereas the abridgment of liberty of one person is a threat to the liberties of all persons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA urges the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Whereas the struggle for full social, political, and economic equality for minority groups is the most important test facing our country today; and

Whereas it is the test by which the nations throughout the world will judge the workings of democracy; and

Whereas throughout the United States there is widespread discrimination against minority races: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA favors the following steps by Congress to bring about the full equality of opportunity for all citizens:

(1) Enactment of national FEPC.

(2) Enactment of a public accommodations statute.

(3) Use of Federal registration of voters in the South to insure all U.S. citizens the right to vote.

(4) Revocation of any Federal license of the licensee practicing racial discrimination.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Whereas the rights and traditions of civil liberties have consistently proven to be a source of sinew and vitality for this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA condemns those institutions and organizations which, under the guise of national security, patriotism, or any other virtue, would limit the civil liberties guaranteed under the Constitution. Specifically, we condemn the John Birch Society, Americans for Constitutional Action, the Christian Crusade, and the Harding College Program, and other organizations on the radical right; and be it further

Resolved, That we deplore the capture of the National Young Republicans by the extreme rightwing of the political spectrum.

HEARINGS BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON LEGISLATION TO INCREASE FREEDOMS OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TO BEGIN SEPTEMBER 4. FOUR BILLS TO LIBERALIZE THE RESTRICTIONS ON INVESTMENTS BY NATIONAL BANKS ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION. INTRODUCTION TODAY OF H.R. 8245, TO MAKE CERTAIN CHANGES IN THE RESTRICTIONS ON INVESTMENTS BY FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 8245, a bill which would make a variety of changes in the restrictions now imposed on the investments of Federal savings and loan associations and also remove certain restrictions on investments in these associations. The administration has recommend four bills, I believe at the behest of Comptroller of the Currency Saxon, which would increase investment freedoms of the national banks. Since these bills have been requested by the administration, I feel, of course, that the Committee on Banking and Currency to which the bills have been referred should give full consideration to the administration's requests.

The hearings on these bills are to begin on September 4. When these hearings were first announced on August 11 of this year, I announced at the same time that I was inviting other segments of the financial community to make whatever suggestions they may have in mind for legislation to liberalize limitations and restrictions on the kinds and amounts of assets and activities in which they may invest.

H.R. 8245 has been designed to carry out suggestions received from the United States Savings and Loan League and the National League of Insured Savings Associations. This is what each section of the bill would do:

H.R. 8245 TO BROADEN THE INVESTMENT POWERS OF FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

SECTION 1

Would permit Federal associations to have a restricted type savings account of the type used for Keogh-Smathers self-employed persons retirement funds. (But it would take other legislation amending the Revenue Code to fully implement this.)

SECTION 2

Would broaden statutory investment power of Federal savings and loan associations as follows:

1. Permit purchase of State and municipal securities (now only U.S. securities are permitted);
2. Permit the making of loans up to 5 percent of assets on household furnishings and equipment;
3. Increase property improvement loan ceilings from $3,500 to $5,000;
4. Permit up to 5 percent of assets in loans on mobile houses;
5. Permit up to 5 percent of assets in college education loans;
6. Clarify associations' right to loan on leaseholds.

SECTION 3

Permit Federal associations to act as trustees for pension funds, primarily self-employed pension funds.

SECTION 4

Qualify accounts in all FSLIC institutions as depositories for public funds under the control of the United States or officers of the United States.

SECTION 5

Would permit savings and loans to form accounting service corporations comparable to those authorized last year for commercial banks.

SECTION 6

Would authorize small business investment companies to invest idle funds in insured savings and loans.

PURPOSES OF THE BILLS TO LIBERALIZE NATIONAL BANK INVESTMENT POWERS

I might discuss now briefly and give exact references to the four bills recommended by the administration for liberalizing the investment powers of the national banks. These are as follows:

H.R. 5845 TO ASSIST CITIES AND STATES BY AMENDING SECTION 5136 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED, WITH RESPECT TO THE AUTHORITY OF NATIONAL BANKS TO UNDERWRITE AND DEAL IN SECURITIES ISSUED BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would, in effect, repeal provisions of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 and make it possible for national banks to deal in and underwrite revenue bonds of the State and local political subdivisions. It would permit national banks and consequently State member banks to deal in and underwrite up to their 10 percent limitations obligations issued by a State or political subdivision or agency of a State or political subdivision, except obligations payable solely from the proceeds of special benefit assessments. The bill would also provide that the limitations and restrictions contained in 12 United States Code 24 would not apply to obligations of local public housing agencies with respect to which States are obliged to lend amounts sufficient to pay their principal and interest on the same basis as obligations of local public housing agencies with respect to which the Public Housing Administration is obliged to lend amounts sufficient to pay their principal and interest.

H.R. 7878 TO AMEND SECTION 24 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT (12 UNITED STATES CODE 371) RELATING TO CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON REAL ESTATE LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS

This bill would make it possible for national banks to make loans on real estate having terms up to 30 years instead of the present maximum of 20 years; and it would also permit the national banks to lend on real estate in amounts up to 80 percent of the appraised value of the real estate instead of the present maximum of 70 percent.

H.R. 8230, TO AMEND SECTION 24 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT (12 USC 371) TO LIBERALIZE THE CONDITIONS OF LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS ON FOREST TRACTS

Present law permits national banks to make loans on forest tracts up to 40 percent of the value of the economically marketable timber for a term of 2 years or, if the loan is amortized, for a term of 10 years. The bill would permit loans of up to 40 percent of the marketable value of the timber for a term of 5 years or, if the loan is amortized, up to 75 percent of the value and for a term of up to 20 years. Under the bill, the amount of the permissible loan would be based on the appraised fair market value of the growing timberland and improvements thereon.

H.R. 8247 TO AMEND SECTION 5200 OF THE REVISED STATUTES AS AMENDED (12 U.S.C. 84), TO INCREASE THE LIMIT ON THE MAXIMUM LIABILITY OF A SINGLE BORROWER TO A NATIONAL BANK

OTHER BILLS TO COME

I anticipate that there may be still further suggestions from responsible associations of Federal credit unions and also from such associations as mutual savings banks and perhaps also from still other financial institutions. If such suggestions are received by the committee, bills will be introduced and appropriate witnesses will be invited to testify during the course of the committee's hearings to begin on September 4.

Further, I anticipate that these hearings will continue for perhaps 2 weeks or longer. They will begin on Wednesday, September 4, and run through the remainder of the next week, which week begins on Monday, September 9. However, it will not be possible for the committee to have hearings during the week beginning Monday, September 16. In all probability, however, we will have hearings on this matter, after a week's interruption, beginning again on Monday, September 23.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Langen (at the request of Mr. King of New York), for 30 minutes, on Friday, August 30.

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Kornegay), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McLoskey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. King of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Westland.

Mr. Burkhalter and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kornegay) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. Healey.

Mr. Dulski.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1153. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1158. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of radar altimeters; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1159. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management, Bureau of Indian Affairs," for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 505. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 665, joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8200. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8245. A bill to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 8246. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for trial of unfair labor practice cases in the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 8247. A bill to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 84), to increase the limit on the maximum liability of a single borrower to a national bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 8248. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the return to the stockpile of materials withdrawn but not used for defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8249. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the return to the stockpile of materials withdrawn but not used for defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8250. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 8251. A bill to amend section 612, title 38, United States Code, to authorize dental services and treatment in cases where discharges were corrected by competent authority from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8252. A bill to amend the act of February 25, 1903, to provide that witnesses must claim the privilege against self-incrimination before testifying with respect to certain transactions in any proceeding under the antitrust laws in order to obtain immunity from prosecution thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8253. A bill to amend section 5 of the Clayton Act to strengthen the enforcement of the antitrust laws by private suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide uniform tax treatment in cases of divestiture pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 8255. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 8256. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, in order to provide that the foreign market value of imported firearms and ammunition which have been disposed of as surplus by a foreign government shall, for the purposes of such act, be not less than the constructed value of the merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 8257. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8258. A bill to repeal sections 132(a) and (b) and 409(a) of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8259. A bill declaring the Grand (Neosho) River above the town of Fort Gibson, Muskogee County, Okla., to be not navigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8260. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8261. A bill to provide for appointment of temporary employees to career positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 8262. A bill to provide a program for an "Operation Bootstrap" for the American Indian in order to improve conditions among Indians on reservations and in other communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove limitations on deductions for exploration expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 8264. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 8265. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 8266. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8267. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 8268. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to prevent double taxation in the case of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to the United States and subsequently reprocessed in the manufacturer's bonded factory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 8269. A bill to prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8270. A bill to prohibit departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 8271. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 8272. A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to provide that such building shall be designated the "President James Madison Memorial Library", and to provide that additional facilities for the Library of Congress shall be built in squares 637 and 691 in the District of Columbia in order to render unnecessary the construction (at a cost of $39 million) of a special memorial to President James Madison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 8273. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program, to establish Federal requirements with respect to the weekly benefit amount and limit the tax credits available to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to establish a Federal requirement prohibiting States from denying compensation to workers undergoing training and deny tax credits to employers in a State which does not meet such requirement, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment taxes, to establish a Federal unemployment adjustment and equalization account in the unemployment trust fund, to change the annual certification date under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, to provide for a Special Advisory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8274. A bill to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 8275. A bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 668. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.J. Res. 669. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 670. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 504. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Res. 506. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study with respect to the Gesell report; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 507. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the cost to the Federal Government of certain demonstrations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 508. Resolution creating a committee to investigate, make findings, and determine the representation in the House to which each State shall be qualified; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 509. Resolution to provide that no future negotiations with the Soviet Union be entered into until the Soviet Union first withdraws all troops from Cuba; and that upon such withdrawal the United States will not allow China nor any government other than Cuba to establish or maintain military forces in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 8276. A bill for the relief of Adel Gafar Nafrawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 8277. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cacciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 8278. A bill for the relief of Ankin Messikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 8279. A bill for the relief of Cosmos C. Caridimos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8281. A bill for the relief of Anica Samardzia Vavan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 8282. A bill for the relief of Theodore S. Zoupanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8283. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juliet Hananian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Pietro Ardizzone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8285. A bill for the relief of Capt. George F. England, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 8286. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leslie B. Shanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 8287. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Malka Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8288. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giuseppe Ciancimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nuclear Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the test ban treaty currently is being discussed here in Washington, D.C., and across the land. During the past couple of weeks, I have had many letters from constituents concerning this issue. Because of their interest in the matter, I have made the nuclear test ban the subject of my August newsletter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include my newsletter, as well as the paragraphs entitled "As I See It" in the RECORD:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

The test ban treaty has been signed, and probably will be ratified by the Senate in a month or so. Whether or not this "first step" is in the best interests of our country remains to be seen. However, it wouldn't hurt to ask a few why and wherefores.

Why did Khrushchev suddenly agree to a treaty which he had refused in the Eisenhower administration and again until recently during the Kennedy administration?

Was it because of his serious problems with the Red Chinese? Did he need a detente with the West? We have been told repeatedly that the break between Moscow and Peiping is real and that a full struggle for power exists between Mao and Khrushchev. Will the signing of this treaty pose him before much of the world as "the man of peace"?

Or is he in trouble politically in Russia itself and needed to demonstrate his ability to call the tune with the West? There have been indications that all is not quiet and peaceful in Russia and that Khrushchev is having personal political problems.

Did he sign this treaty because of military considerations? It is generally conceded that the weakest part of Russia's nuclear arsenal lies in its lack of tactical nuclear weapons and that these weapons can be developed through underground testing, which the treaty permits. On the other hand, our knowledge of large weapons effects is limited and that knowledge can only be implemented by tests conducted in space. If these assumptions are true, then it is quite possible that the Soviets can obtain a weapons superiority by continued underground testing.

Perhaps it was because of the tremendous costs of the arms race and the strained Soviet economy. We have been told by Secretary of Defense McNamara that the signing of this treaty will not reduce our defense budget of $50 odd billion, so we will not gain from a dollars-and-cents point of view.

Then we ask, Why did we agree to this treaty? Was it because it "eased tensions?"

President Kennedy, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Rusk have all said that this treaty does not lessen the threat of nuclear war, it will not prevent the addition of new weapons to the stockpile, it will not reduce in any way the present stockpile. There is certainly no guarantee that Mr. K won't make a move in some other direction. Remember this, it was on July 14, 1963, that the Soviets stated in an open letter:

"We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism, but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

I would write a great deal more on this subject, but space won't permit. Let me conclude by asking: Is Mr. K a man of peace? If he is, he could demonstrate it by withdrawing Red Army troops and equipment from Cuba. What do you think?

Sincerely,

JACK WESTLAND,
U.S. Congressman.

AS I SEE IT
(By Helen Westland)

Recently I listened to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the floor of the Senate, discussing the nuclear test ban treaty. Senator GOLDWATER was asking questions in the field where he thinks there is some doubt. Senator HUMPHREY was trying to reassure the people of the United States that there is little, if any field of doubt. Down in the basement of the Senate, and simultaneously on the House side, ceremonies were going on announcing civil defense supplies were, for the first time, being unloaded and placed in shelters on Capitol Hill. This struck me as a field of doubt, in the broad picture. I would like to know if the Russians are laying in civil defense supplies as they sign a treaty with the United States, supposedly to release tensions on the possible nuclear war front.

Meanwhile, "Anyone for quilting?" In the extracurricular activity department, I am now involved in being chairman of a political quilt. In every national campaign, projects of this nature come to light. You might call them attention catchers. I am collecting signatures of Congressmen and Senators which in turn will be embroidered on an 88th Congress quilt. This is literally "history in the making," and it is lots of fun.

Runaway Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I revise and extend my remarks in connection with further proof of the desirability, in some definite way, of letting the American public know where the motion pictures they are asked to support by their patronage are actually filmed. Those of us from southern California know only too well what the runaway film production has done to the tempo of the motion picture industry in Hollywood; it has brought it to practically a standstill.

We are all aware of the many inroads that have been made into the motion picture presentation of films that are not truly fitted for younger viewers to attend. These films openly project scenes and scripts that deal in sensationalism and have as their main theme murder, adultery, and all around promiscuous behavior. Quoting from the August 22, 1963, issue of the Hollywood Reporter it has the following to state:

> Approximately 95 percent of the motion pictures given a class C (condemned) rating by the National Legion of Decency are foreign productions, according to a breakdown of the legion's latest tabulation of film classifications. In the cumulative list of pictures in active release, totaling 407, there are 63 condemned films, of which 59 are foreign made.

The biggest category in the Legion's list is the top-rating class A–I, films "Morally unobjectionable for general patronage," with a total of 91 films under this heading and the big majority of them American. Two other categories—class A–II, "Morally unobjectionable for adults and adolescents," and class A–III, "Morally unobjectionable for adults"—list 86 and 76 films, respectively. There are 32 class A–IV, "Morally unobjectionable for adults, with reservations," and 59 films in class B, "Morally objectionable in part for all," with the latter category also heavily foreign.

Due to this overwhelming report that shows the desirability of American-made films I feel it is most important that Congressman KING's H.R. 7670 and my companion H.R. 7672 be enacted in this Congress to let the American motion picture viewing public know where the pictures they are asked to patronize are actually filmed. A fact that is hidden from them in today's exhibition of motion pictures.

Democrats or Republicans, Maybe?—Conservatives, Definitely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED FOREMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it may be difficult to determine whether west Texans are Democrats or Republicans, but it is not hard to see that they are definitely conservative in their thinking. Recently, with the help of hundreds of volunteer citizens, I mailed out approximately 100,000 questionnaires to the folks of west Texas inviting them to advise me of their feelings concerning some of the major issues facing the Congress. Also, most of the newspapers published my questionnaire, and several clubs reproduced and distributed it. I fully realized that the simplicity of the questions hardly befitted the complexity of the issues, and therefore, I invited the people, if they wished, to attach a letter setting forth their reasoning on any of their answers and discussing any other issues not mentioned in the questionnaire.

The response was tremendous; 21,651 questionnaires were returned and over

5,000 of them had additional comments and suggestions attached. The answers pointed up the people's vital concern and dissatisfaction with our national situation and their overwhelming desire for responsible, conservative government. The questions submitted, and the answers returned, are as follows:

Questions	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe that taxes should be cut without a cut in Federal spending?	6.3	93.7
2. Do you believe deficit financing is good for our national economy?	4.4	95.6
3. Do you favor the proposal to provide Federal aid for urban mass transportation?	6.0	94.0
4. Do you favor the proposals to give Federal aid to education at all grade levels?	13.0	87.0
5. Do you favor the administration's Federal aid for medicare proposal?	12.3	87.7
6. Are you satisfied with the way the administration is handling the problem of Cuba?	9.2	90.8
7. Do you believe there should be large reductions in our foreign aid expenditures?	91.1	8.9
8. Do you favor continued Federal control and regulations of agriculture?	11.3	88.7
9. Should the Guadalupe Peak area be removed as a source of State tax income and made a national park?	24.6	75.4
10. Should the Federal Government be responsible for removing the salt cedars along the Pecos River?	8.8	91.2

Of the 100 people answering, "Yes," to a final question, "Do you own property along the Pecos River?" 74 opposed Federal Government eradication of the salt cedar bushes, even though it was on their own land, and 26 favored the Federal aid program.

It is a pleasure, indeed, for a conservative Republican to have an opportunity of representing this kind of folks in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Free Enterprise Can Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. McLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session I warned the Congress that the Department of the Interior, under the guidance of Secretary Udall, planned to create a Government monopoly in setting up long-distance transmission powerlines.

In my opinion this dreamy socialistic scheme of Secretary Udall's is just another example of the spreading of pork barrel projects by the Federal Government under the fallacious argument that private enterprise cannot do the job.

It is a peculiar commentary on our way of life that we are now reaching the place where the Federal Government is fearful of having private industry compete against it. Are the socialistic planners afraid to have private industry prove it can do a better job at a lower cost to the consumer than can the Federal Government?

I am very pleased to learn that a group of locally controlled power companies in the Midwest are willing to meet the challenge.

Last week, in company with a number of other Congressmen and Senators, it was my privilege to attend a dinner meeting at which time we were briefed on the plans and purposes of a new organization of power suppliers in the North Central States who have joined together to coordinate the planning, construction, and operation of the power supply facilities in their area.

To me this is a proper approach to the problem. It is a worthy objective when investor-owned companies, cooperatives, and public power districts are willing to pool their respective talents and investments to work in complete harmony with each other. It is a most important step in the right direction when these three groups combine their resources in bringing to consumers the greatest possible electric service at the lowest possible cost.

To my way of thinking this is the proper approach to protect the American taxpayer against subsidized Federal projects. My congratulations to this joint effort to prove the free enterprise system is both feasible and workable. I wish every success to the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners.

Criteria for Economic Assistance for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Buffalo, N.Y., is an active group which has aided many civic endeavors and expressed a genuine interest in the affairs of local and national government. On occasion it has conducted seminars or studies on topics pertaining to community interests, as well as national interests.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following criteria for economic assistance for underdeveloped countries, recommended by the National League of Women Voters and endorsed by the Buffalo league:

First. Stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries.

Second. Efforts to reduce and ultimately eliminate our aid by enabling nations to stand on their own feet as rapidly as possible.

Third. Securing increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of aid to developing countries.

Fourth. Development programs should be long-term because development programs cannot be solved overnight.

Fifth. The programs should be adequately financed so that they have a real chance of success.

Sixth. The programs should be "effectively" administered so that our tax money will get full value.

Syria's Harassment of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the foreign aid bill, we heard a most interesting analysis of America's present position in the Near East. It was prepared by the Department of State. I quote from it:

> The United States has become the most influential outside power in the Near East, now able to exert a more useful although still limited degree of influence on a wide variety of issues important to the free world than at any time heretofore.

Now this is a very reassuring statement. It is meant to placate the worriers among us and quiet the critics among us. It is meant to soothe those of us who protest when our allies in Israel and other Arab States are threatened by aggressive neighbors.

For instance, defenders of continued massive aid to Egypt will say that by exercising influence over Nasser's economy, we exercise control over his ambitions.

It will be claimed that American wheat—millions of tons of it—cushions the diplomatic channels between our Embassy in Cairo and the Egyptian Government. It will be contended that our aid was a major factor in bringing Egyptian troops home from the long and bloody little war in Yemen.

Well, I contend that our aid contributed to Nasser's ability to stay in that war for so long. It has indirectly helped him to amass an arsenal of more and more sophisticated weapons, by freeing part of his economy for the purchase of Russian arms. Just last month, we saw a day-long parade of that arsenal through the streets of Cairo. The crowds cheered; the bands played; the Migs thundered overhead. The Egyptians took that parade very seriously; I do not see why we should not.

And let us take a closer look at that triumphant return of Nasser's troops from Yemen. Thousands of Egyptian soldiers, having fought long and hard against Royalist guerrillas, sail into Alexandria. Does their leader promise them rest, peace, security? No. With one hand he signs the nuclear test ban treaty and with the other, he directs his battle-weary army to the cherished goal of—and I quote—"liberating Palestine." And to me, that means annihilating Israel.

I was glad to see that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its report on the foreign aid bill, was not too much soothed by the State Department's confidence. The committee stated:

> Consideration should be given to the withholding of economic assistance from those countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparations for their execution, and to entering into security guarantees with those nations that would be willing to make appropriate commitments for promoting peace and stability in the area.

If Nasser's speech to his Yemen veterans is not just another myth manufactured by Cairo radio, then I define Egypt as a nation which has "persisted in policies of belligerence."

At this very moment, the Security Council is deliberating Israel's complaint that her borders have been repeatedly violated by Syrian soldiers and aircraft since last December. Two of Israel's young pioneers have been killed at their work.

Why does this Syria choose this moment to inflame her borders with Israel? Because she is in trouble with Arab public opinion. She is under attack by Cairo's propaganda machine, one of the most destructive weapons in the Near East. Syria, like other Arab nations, has come to believe that she can use the Israel conflict to cover her sins at home and to protect herself from Arab enmity, without fear of action by Israel's Western allies.

We should keep in mind that Baathist Syria is quite different from the Syria we have known in recent years. It used to be the case that rebellious soldiers and opposing politicians were exiled to pleasant diplomatic posts abroad. Now, they are shot.

In Morocco, dissident voices are being systematically choked by the Government. Many of these voices are directed by Cairo. They attempt to subvert, infiltrate, undermine. They have their counterparts throughout the Near East—in Jordan, where they exploit the Palestinians; in Iran, where some months ago they exploited a national religious observance to instigate bloody riots.

Nasser does not limit totalitarianism to Egypt. He encourages it in other countries by forcing governments to protect themselves against Nasser with Nasser's own methods.

Algeria's leader—and I use the singular, Mr. Speaker, because now Ben Bella stands alone—shrouds his purge of old revolutionary friends by blaming Israel for a plot against his regime. He too feels free to beat the whipping-boy of the Arab East. As his imitation of Nasser grows more and more unmistakable, this recipient of enormous American aid declares his "policy of belligerence" toward Israel.

I have heard reports recently that France will turn over some atomic testing facilities to Algeria, who will in turn lend them to Egypt. Egypt does not plan to test firecrackers, Mr. Speaker. Nasser plans to do exactly what he says he will do—liberate Palestine—and unless we stop him, he may give it a try and thus catapult the entire world into a disastrous conflict.

Supposedly, we seek to acquire influence in these countries in order to protect the interests of democracy and freedom, and to resist the pressures of the Soviet bloc. I have some doubts about this definition when applied to American Near East policy. It seems to me that the influence we have must be very meager—if it does nothing more than protect blossoming dictatorships from Soviet influence.

I will tell you where I think we have influence. We have influence in Israel. In Israel, men are free to petition their Government, to argue with it as we do in this country. Israel's citizens have the protection of their courts and their laws. What they need now is the protection against Arab aggression which could be afforded by security guarantees from the United States and her Western allies.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two resolutions on this matter. One calls upon our United Nations delegation to introduce and support a movement calling for direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. The other urges that we undertake a collective defense agreement with Israel. These are the ways to convince Arab leaders that threats of war against Israel must stop, that border harrassment must stop, that war in fact is out of the question.

These are the ways to use our hard-won influence. And if we don't use it, we might as well not brag about it. Because we might as well not have it.

Exchange of Correspondence With Secretary Dillon Commenting Upon Interest Equalization Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on July 23 I wrote to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon commenting upon the administration's so-called interest equalization tax on U.S. purchases of foreign securities. On July 24 I inserted a copy of my letter to the Secretary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have now received a response from Secretary Dillon, dated August 6, 1963, and, under unanimous consent, I insert a copy of his reply in the RECORD at this time, along with a copy of my letter to him.

The Ways and Means Committee is now holding hearings upon the administration's proposal, and it is my hope that the record of these hearings will shed further light on the many points of disagreement now existing on the soundness of the principle behind the tax proposal as well as on its balance-of-payments effects.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing in regard to the administration's plan to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by stemming foreign security sales in the United States through an interest equalization tax. It is claimed that such a tax would, in effect, increase by approximately 1 percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country and would thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad.

The significant nature of this proposal was demonstrated by the unsettling reaction which its announcement caused in major financial centers around the world. Because of the serious effects that it might have on domestic and international money markets and because it is a clear departure from U.S. policy of maintaining freedom of capital movements, the benefits to be derived from such a program must be carefully weighed against the costs. It seems clear that the costs of such a program, particularly when employed by a key currency country, would be so onerous as not to justify the meager balance-of-payments savings which might be expected to result from it.

In his July 18 balance-of-payments message to the Congress, the President said that the balance-of-payments savings which would result from an interest equalization tax combined with the increase in short-term interest rates should over the next 18 months equal or probably exceed $900 million. As you pointed out in your testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on July 8, a reasonable increase in short-term interest rates would be likely to improve our annual balance of payments by $500 million or more. Over an 18-month period, therefore, we might expect an improvement arising from the increase in the discount rate of about $750 million. It would follow that the balance-of-payments savings over 18 months which the administration believes would flow from the foreign security tax program would be in the area of $150 million—or $100 million on an annual basis. I would appreciate knowing if my understanding is correct.

Furthermore, I presume that this estimate was arrived at prior to the exemption of new Canadian issues, which the administration reportedly has granted. Since new Canadian issues for the past 3 years have comprised an average of 33 percent of American purchases of all new issues of foreign securities plus all transactions in outstanding foreign securities, it appears that exempting them would very largely wipe out the balance-of-payments savings which the administration has estimated. What is the administration's estimate of the total balance-of-payments savings which would be realized by the program on an annual basis if Canadian new issues are totally exempted?

If new Canadian issues and issues of the less developed countries are exempted, as is apparently planned, my estimates indicate that the total amount which might be affected by the tax would have been only $189 million in 1960, $478 million in 1961, $379 million in 1962 and $131 million in the first quarter of 1963. Admittedly, one cannot predict the size of future outflows of this nature solely on the basis of past experience. It does appear to me, however, that the magnitudes covered by the tax would be so small as not to warrant taking such a potentially harmful and unsettling step.

Aside from the fact that the balance-of-payments savings which might be realized would be relatively insignificant compared to the size of the overall deficit, there is a possibility that there will be offsets to such savings. First, some exports of U.S. capital goods which are financed from foreign borrowings in the U.S. market probably would be reduced. Second, there is a likelihood that some foreign investment in the United States, which the President seeks to attract, would be discouraged by the fear that further restrictions might be imposed on the use of the dollar. Has the Treasury Department made any estimate of the size of these possible offsets to balance-of-payments savings arising from the proposed tax?

In addition, the tax proposal is inconsistent with the administration's objective, which was clearly spelled out in the President's message, of selling more U.S. securities abroad. The erection of an artifical wall to foreign flotations in this country can only serve to negate any beneficial effects which might flow from the administration's efforts to sell more U.S. securities overseas. Has the Treasury estimated the size of this offset?

Furthermore, there is considerable doubt about whether a 1-percent increase in long-term interest rates would discourage much foreign borrowing in the U.S. market. For example, an article by Prof. Peter B. Kenen in the June 1963 issue of Lloyd's Bank Review points out that the costs to the borrower of floating new issues is considerably higher in other financial centers than in the United States. Even after a 1-percent increase in effective interest rates, the U.S. market would still remain considerably more attractive than nearly every other major financial center. Furthermore, as you yourself have pointed out, there are numerous important influences other than interest rates which attract borrowers to the New York market and which would remain largely unaffected by the tax.

If my conclusions are correct, the tax plan at the rates proposed is likely to have no appreciable effect on the balance of payments. If the tax were to be passed by Congress, however, I fear that once its ineffectiveness became apparent the administration would insist that the approach was right but that the rates were not high enough and needed to be increased.

I do not wish to leave you with the impression that my comment on the effectiveness of the proposal implies any agreement with the principle behind it. Instead of erecting barriers to private capital movements, the administration should grapple with the basic cause of the outflow of funds. This outflow results from an unfavorable investment climate in this country arising from a weakness in business confidence based upon the continuing profits squeeze, chronic Federal budget deficits and the slow but steady erosion of the value of the dollar. Confidence and the healthier investment climate which accompanies it will not be restored until the administration imposes discipline upon itself in the conduct of its fiscal affairs.

In sum, Mr. Secretary, aside from rejecting the principle underlying the administration's proposal, I have the distinct impression that the gains which might be realized from it are likely to be so small as not to justify the heavy costs involved. Because of my deep concern over our payments problem and my desire to seek solutions consistent with the U.S. role as world banker, I should appreciate hearing any comments you may have on my understanding of this proposal.

With very best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1963.
Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Your letter dated July 23 raises a number of very interesting points with regard to the potential benefit for our balance of payments of the proposed interest equalization tax. I shall deal with these points in the order in which they appear in your letter. Let me emphasize at the outset, however, that we do not regard this tax as "a clear departure from U.S. policy of maintaining freedom of capital movements." The tax will exert its impact on the market by raising the costs to foreign borrowers. It will neither arbitrarily shut off foreign security sales by other advanced countries in our markets nor make them subject to Government screening or direct control.

Paragraph 3 of your letter involves a misinterpretation of the estimated balance-of-payments improvement which the President referred to in the penultimate paragraph of his July 18 message to the Congress. The "approximately $2 billion" estimated gain is the decline in the rate of payments of Government expenditures abroad and of short- and long-term capital outflows over the next 18 months. Sometime within that period we expect Government expenditures abroad to fall to and continue at a level which, on an annual basis, will be $900 million lower than the 1962 level. As much, or more, of a decline in the rate of outflow of short- and long-term portfolio capital, considered together, is expected to result from the rise in short-term interest rates and the effects of the interest equalization tax. The balance-of-payments savings from declines in the rate of Government expenditures, and short- and long-term portfolio capital outflows will obviously be larger the sooner the lower levels for these payments are reached within the 18-month period.

It is our belief that the amount of new foreign security issues sold to U.S. residents will return in the next 18 months to the average level of the years 1959, 1960, and 1961—something just under $600 million—as compared with $1.1 billion last year and an annual rate of about $1.8 billion in the first half of this year. The balance-of-payments saving from the interest equalization tax, when it is fully effective, would therefore amount to some $500 million annually from the 1962 level. Measured from the level indicated by the recent upward trend in new foreign security issues, the savings resulting from the tax would appear substantially larger. I think you will agree that a continuation of that trend would have been serious.

Our estimate of the potential decline in portfolio capital outflow attributable to the IET is not affected by the exemption for Canada. Canadian authorities have assured us that they would not borrow in the United States to increase their reserves or to relend the proceeds of their borrowing to other borrowers who are not exempt from the IET; also that we could expect a decline in the recent level of Canadian borrowing here.

In view of these considerations, we agreed that a properly safeguarded exemption for new Canadian issues would be consistent with their domestic goals. If we should find operating satisfactorily, we would reconsider that the exemption given to Canada is not the situation in light of the facts at that time. An interdepartmental committee will carefully analyze overall developments on a continuing basis and call attention to such measures as may become appropriate.

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of your letter, you give estimates of the total amount of transactions which might have been affected by the proposed tax in recent years in the assumption that new Canadian issues and issues of the less developed countries are exempt. While it is correct that new Canadian issues would be exempt from the tax under our proposal, it does not follow that the volume of new Canadian issues in the U.S. market would, therefore, remain unaffected. As indicated above, we have assurance from the Canadian authorities that we can expect a decline in recent levels of Canadian borrowing in the United States. We are thus achieving our objective in the case of Canada by a somewhat different procedure than application of the tax to new Canadian issues. I would also point out that the tax applies to purchases by Americans from foreigners of outstanding foreign securities of developed countries.

You mention the possibility of some offsets to the balance-of-payments savings resulting from the proposed tax. For example, you suggest that some exports of U.S. capital goods which are financed from foreign borrowings in the U.S. market probably would be reduced. In this connection I want to make several points. All financing up to 3 years would be exempt from the tax. Commercial bank lending in the ordinary course of business would be exempt from the tax. In general, we expect to ask for an exemption which will relieve from the tax any financing arising out of the export of U.S. goods. Direct U.S. investment abroad would be exempt from the tax (assuming that acquisition of securities is not made for the purpose of resale in the United States). Securities issued or guaranteed by the governments of less developed countries would be exempt from the tax as would securities issued by a corporation which meets the definition of a "less developed country corporation" in section 955(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

You also mention a likelihood that some foreign investment in the United States would be discouraged by the fear that further restrictions might be imposed on the use of the dollar. The proposed tax is not a restriction on the use of the dollar, and we do not believe that it will be so interpreted by foreigners. What could have generated concern about the dollar on the part of foreigners is a continuation of or increase in the recent large outflow of private portfolio capital abroad and its impact on our balance of payments. New foreign issues sold to U.S. residents jumped sharply from $523 million in 1961 to $1.1 billion last year, and to an estimated $1.8 billion annual rate in the first half of this year. The reaction of official financial circles in Western Europe is that we have taken a step beneficial to our balance of payments, and that the program which the President announced on July 18, including the IET, will increase rather than reduce confidence in the dollar.

I cannot agree with you that the tax "can only serve to negate any beneficial effects which might flow from the administration's efforts to sell more U.S. securities overseas." Failure to react to the excessive outflow of portfolio investment, with its adverse impact on our balance of payments, would have been far more damaging to foreign confidence than any of the consequences you attribute to the proposed tax. The amount of foreign investment in U.S. private securities was less than $150 million last year. Any possible indirect effect which you fear the tax may have in reducing the inflow of foreign capital would seem to me negligible compared to the effect of the tax in discouraging the outflow of U.S. capital into foreign securities.

You question whether a 1 percent increase in the effective borrowing rate, as a result of the tax, would discourage much foreign borrowing in the U.S. market in view of the fact that costs of borrowing in some financial centers may still be considerably higher than in the United States and that other factors besides the level of rates attract borrowers to the U.S. market. As I indicated on page 2, we believe that the level of foreign portfolio borrowing here will return to the approximate level of the period 1959-61, but it is not possible to be precise in such an estimate. You should note that the tax will deter not only sales of new security issues of advanced countries but also sales of their outstanding issues to American investors who will now have to pay the tax.

With regard to setting the tax at a level that would increase the effective cost of foreign borrowing here by 1 percent, that increase seemed about right in the sense that it seemed large enough to reduce U.S. private capital outflow without preventing foreign borrowing in our market for the more pressing needs or disrupting rate structures abroad.

With regard to your concluding remarks on our balance-of-payments problem, I believe that the President's program, including the emphasis on maintaining price stability as business activity accelerates and on achieving more productive investment through tax reduction, is fully consistent with our common objectives of maintaining a sound dollar at home and abroad without the imposition of controls or other forms of regimentation.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

All Hail to Southwestern Power Administration's 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, all Americans can today proudly celebrate the 20th anniversary of creation of the Southwestern Power Administration by the Secretary of the Interior on August 31, 1943. SPA was conceived to market power and energy from the Norfork Dam in Arkansas and Denison Dam in Texas, both built by the Army Engineers, and the Grand River Dam—Pensacola, Okla.—projects, and to market additional power and energy from later projects. After World War II, Grand River Dam was returned to control of the State of Oklahoma.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 spelled out the general purposes of SPA, as follows: "who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

Shortly after this law was passed this section 5 was inscribed on the head of a straight pin and carried around the Senate by a page boy to show the Senators—Douglas G. Wright, "The Southwestern Power Administration; Past, Present, Future," speech at New Orleans, La., January 21, 1960.

In spite of violent propaganda in the early days to the contrary, and its later spectacular history of growth, the Southwestern Power Administration has not tried to build a monopolistic, grasping power empire which would duplicate facilities already in operation. Instead, its policy, from the beginning, has been to use existing equipment, and build new facilities where practicable, and where needed, particularly in the rural areas. One of its most important objectives has been to promote tie-ins or coordination with, and use of, facilities of private companies and cooperatives. Proof of this is that, in 1950, SPA requested Congress to cut its appropriation by $6 million because the need was eliminated by a contract with two Oklahoma utility companies to supply power.

The SPA program has not been one of grant or of subsidy. It has marketed ample, dependable, low-cost power, recovering the annual cost of the Government's power operations, and repaying the investment costs to the Treasury, plus interest.

Revenue from its projects has ranged from $8,510 in fiscal year 1944, to $17,600,000 in fiscal year 1963.

By 1950, the SPA had cut the average wholesale power rates in half in its operating area, from 1.03 cents per kilowatt-hour in Texas and 1.16 cents in Oklahoma in 1941, to 5.6 and 5.8 mills, respectively, 9 years later. Today SPA's power is 20th from the lowest in the United States, and 9 of the 10 companies with lowest rates in the country are associated with SPA.

SPA's growth and present goodwill among private companies and cooperatives have not been easy to build. These assets have been nurtured and fought for by its Administrator from the start, Douglas G. Wright, and other employees. In the early days, private utilities were strongly opposed to public power and, naturally, to SPA. For example, one company extensively exhibited a model to show that successful incorporation of flood control, and generation of power in the same dam or reservoir was impossible. However, in 1952 the president of that company publicly asked support for the immediate beginning of a multiple-purpose dam in the company's home State. In the same year the president of another utility company which had previously fought SPA told Mr. Wright that:

> If I appear before the congressional Committees on Appropriations for fiscal year 1953, it will be to support your entire program.—"A History of SPA," by U.S. Southwestern Power Administration, Tulsa, Okla., 1952.

The Southwestern Power Administration now buys, markets, and exchanges electric power and energy in a drought-ridden area in six States, in Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. The uncertainty of rainfall and vagaries of waterflow in these areas made apparent to SPA from the beginning the necessity and importance of coordination or tie-in of transmission and power facilities among SPA, private companies and cooperatives. In that way deficiencies from drought in one area could be made up by power brought over other systems' lines from normal storage or rainfall areas, and from fuel-powered electricity plants. It also provides an alternative source of power when local equipment fails or blows up, such as happened at Jonesboro, Ark. The local powerline's interconnection with SPA, however, restored the community power service until repairs could be made. SPA now has about $30 million invested in about 1,100 miles of transmission facilities, and SPA has the use of other interconnected facilities worth over $2 billion. Of the approximately $350 million worth of dams in its expected payout future schedules, about $250 million will be allocated to power development.

SPA's installed capacity of hydroelectric power now is over 791,000 kilowatts. Over half—52 percent—of its power sales go to REA cooperatives, about 20 percent goes to the aluminum industry in Arkansas, about 8½ percent goes to municipalities and 2.7 percent goes to Federal agencies. In 1961 the Southwestern Power Administration bought 127 million kilowatt-hours of power from private power companies and it sold 125 million kilowatt-hours to them.

Mr. Douglas G. Wright, who has been administrator of Southwestern Power Administration from its beginning, is a strong advocate of building up and using pumped storage power. This helps increase peak power availability, and it supplies a reactive which works at night to enable high-voltage transmission grid lines to benefit and work from power unused at night that might otherwise be lost.

The great achievements of the Southwestern Power Administration in working with private power companies, municipalities and cooperatives are those of enlightened diplomacy and statesmanship. Together these forces and the SPA have brought ample, dependable, low-cost power for thousands of families, businesses, and individual consumers in parts of six States.

This 20th anniversary of the founding of the Southwestern Power Administration is highly worthy of our recognition, admiration, and tribute.

SENATE

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of all mankind, under the gleaming dome of this legislative shrine of our free land, we bow this day with gratitude which a thousand tongues could not exhaust, for all America means to us and to the world.

In this melting pot of democracy, by Thy providence and purpose Thy children of all cultures and colors have come from the four corners of the earth, here to be fashioned and molded into a new race of emancipated men and women endowed with a costly birthright where no tyrant can molest or make afraid.

In these most dangerous days the Republic has ever known, subdue, we pray, all selfish clamor, that amid our national confusion the voice of Thy guidance may be heard.

Thou who art the author of liberty hath taught us that the essence of our freedom is not in having rights, but in fulfilling them. In Thy light may there be revealed to this bewildered generation, with all its moral failures, that to insist on grasping for that which may be justly claimed, and then to use such blessings for self-gratification and indulgence, is but to prove that those thus oblivious to responsibility are unworthy of such inheritance. Make sensitive the conscience of our citizenship, that when duty and responsibility crumble, our boasted rights go down with their walls; but that if our God-given birthright is a lighted candle in the lamp of our service to our fellows and to our Nation, then in our brief day we may be among the builders of better homes, of cleaner cities, and of a brighter world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 27, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1139. An act to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution consenting to an extension of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas; and

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. John William Bowen, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Robert Hackett, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Henry W. Buse, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

John F. Ackerman, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy;

Charles W. Abbitt, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force; and

Casimer S. Gappa, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Amendment of Section 5200 of Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 84), To Increase the Limit on the Maximum Liability of a Single Borrower to a National Bank

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 84), to increase the limit on the maximum liability of a single borrower to a national bank (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance for American Public

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Unnecessary Costs Incurred in Procurement of Radar Altimeters

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of radar altimeters, Department of the Navy, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Clarification of Intent of Congress Relating to Certain Annuity Increase Legislation

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to certain annuity increase legislation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Positions in National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions established in that Administration, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1540. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 473).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2098. A bill for the relief of Canelos Roditis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 2099. A bill to provide for the free entry of a rheogoniometer for the use of the University of Tennessee; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 2100. A bill to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harold H. Crain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2102. A bill to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Moss, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McIntyre, and Mr. Cooper):

S. 2103. A bill to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Javits):

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of November 18–24, 1963, as National Youth for Christ Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GLEN CANYON RECREATION AREA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to create a Glen Canyon Recreation Area. Authority to create this area was contained in section 9 of the act, Public Law 84–485, which authorized the Colorado River storage project, of which Glen Canyon Dam is a participating project. I have found, however, that the authority originally granted to administer the recreation area formed by the waters of the Colorado River now backing up behind the Glen Canyon Dam—and named Lake Powell for the first man to run the Colorado River, John Wesley Powell—does not provide an adequate basis for the administration of the Glen Canyon Recreation Area.

In addition to broadening the legislative authority for dealing with the Lake Powell area, my bill would do two things:

First, it would provide by law for review of the area to determine those portions necessary to preserve and provide public access to shores of the lake, and provide for public recreation within the present boundaries of the area established administratively by the Interior Department. The area now encompasses some 1,430,000 acres in both Arizona and Utah. I am sure that with study these boundaries can be reduced. Obviously, this area is far too large.

Second, the bill would make present mineral leasing laws apply to the entire recreation withdrawal, subject to a general regulation of the Secretary to protect scenic and recreation values.

In an order dated September 10, 1953, the Bureau of Reclamation, with the concurrence of the Bureau of Land Management, withdrew about 1¾ million acres for reclamation purposes in the Glen Canyon area. This closed them completely to mineral entry. At that time, however, there was considerable interest in connection with the search for uranium ore, and since construction of the Glen Canyon Dam would not be started for some time, the lands were reopened in 1954 to mineral location, entry, and patent, subject to the stipulation that each locator would remove all improvements without cost to the United States if and when it was determined that the lands would be needed for reclamation purposes.

The mineral opening order was revoked in 1957 on all of the lands in Arizona and about 160,000 acres in Utah, since most of them would be inundated as soon as the dam was completed. In July of this year, the Bureau of Land Management asked that the mineral reopening order be revoked in its entirety, which means that the adjacent recreation lands in addition to the inundated lands would be included. The order has been filed with the Federal Register. It would reclose all of the land in the withdrawal—1,430,000 acres—to mineral location and mineral leasing. I question whether this is either wise or necessary.

The bill I am introducing is patterned after the measure now moving through the Congress to establish the Lake Mead Recreation Area above Davis and Hoover Dams on the Colorado. There are several exceptions, however. There is a slight change in the section of my bill which relates to the acquisition authority, because there is no question about establishing the area—it is already subject to reclamation withdrawal. There is also some adjustment in language made necessary because the Department of the Interior now recognizes recreation as a primary objective in a multiple-purpose project, while when Lake Mead was established, reclamation was a primary objective but recreation had not been given this new recognition. There are also a few other minor variations made necessary because of changed conditions.

I realize that the revocation of the mineral opening order, which would preclude new mineral locations on the lands within the boundaries of the Glen Canyon Recreation Area, has only been filed with the Federal Register, and placed on "public view" and that the Department of the Interior is presently engaged in a program collecting all of the facts on which the Secretary can base a decision. But I am disturbed at even the possibility of such action. It would close up more than a million acres of Utah land to further mineral exploration.

The question of the extent to which mining activity could be carried out in a recreation area has been one of the issues in the Canyonlands National Park controversy. Opponents of a single park of substantial size have argued that multiple use of the lands involved would be better pursued if there were several small spot national parks where all commercial activities are forbidden, surrounded by a recreation area where multiple uses are approved.

The Department's proposed order on Lake Powell would reverse the situation. Should the restrictions suggested be adopted, they would shut out any possible prospecting for minerals or granting any new oil leases in a recreation area five or six times as large as the proposed Canyonlands Park. You will remember, the Senate-passed Canyonlands bill provided that nothing in the act should, during a 25-year phase-out period, preclude the continued application of the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, except that the Secretary of the Interior might prescribe regulations to protect the scenic, scientific and recreational values of the area. If the Glen Canyon order goes through, there would be more opportunity of mining in Canyonlands Park under the bill passed by the Senate, than there would be in the Glen Canyon Recreation Area.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, my bill to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2102) to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION TO STUDY THE HATCH ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself and Senators Neuberger, Moss, Long of Missouri, Brewster, Inouye, McIntyre, and Cooper, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a 12-man bipartisan commission to make a study of Federal laws that limit the participation of Government officers and employees in political affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 3 days for additional sponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested.

The bill (S. 2103) to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the major bulwarks of good government in this country has been our Federal laws protecting the integrity of the civil service from partisan political pressures. The Hatch Act over the years has done a valuable job in shielding Government employees from political coercion and of assuring that Federal funds will not be used for narrow political purposes.

In these ways the law has made a substantial contribution to a continuing high level of performance by civil service personnel and a remarkable record, overall, of honesty and efficiency in the administration of Federal programs.

Thus, without detracting from the value of the law, I would like to suggest that certain sections of it stand in need of revision. I think it is time for a thorough examination of the way the law has operated.

It should not be surprising that a law passed over 25 years ago needs to be brought up to date. As Mr. John Macy, who is Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and is responsible for enforcing the Hatch Act has observed, "These bills of 1939 and 1940 were cast in another time, and conditions have changed."

Over the years various suggestions have been put forward for amending this law, piecemeal as it were. Now it is my feeling—and I believe the opinion of the administration and the Civil Service Commission as well—that if this job is going to be done, it should be done in a thorough and comprehensive manner.

It is my proposal, therefore, that we establish a bipartisan commission, composed of Members drawn from both Houses of Congress, the executive branch, and private life, to conduct this study. The commission would terminate upon submission of its report and recommendations within 1 year.

Mr. President, the need for this legislation was highlighted for me recently in a particularly dramatic manner by a case in my own home, the State of New Jersey.

The New Jersey Commissioner of Labor, Mr. Raymond Male, was accused of violating the Hatch Act by campaigning for our present Governor, Richard Hughes, in 1961. The charges were ultimately dismissed by the Civil Service Commission, which held that Mr. Male was exempt from the Hatch Act because he was mayor of Princeton at the time. Governor Hughes has stated, and quite correctly, that New Jersey might have lost the services of "one of the most competent labor commissioners in the country."

Even though in this particular instance it was found that the law did not apply, I think the case illustrated a very serious situation for all State governments.

It seems incredible to me that the law should prohibit a member of a Governor's cabinet from expressing his views on the issues confronting the State and endorsing the candidacy of the man who is now Governor of New Jersey. Yet, under the provisions of section 12 of the Hatch Act officials or employees of State governments whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States are prohibited from actively engaging in political affairs.

The National Association of Attorney Generals has recently proposed to rectify this situation by amending the law so as to exempt State cabinet level officials. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that this is a group of men intimately acquainted with the problems in this area and more than competent to pass judgment on them. It seems totally inconsistent to me to exempt department and agency heads and assistants on the Federal level, as the law presently does, and not on the State level.

If a well qualified man has been nominated for an important post by a Governor of a State and his appointment has been confirmed by the appropriate branch of the State legislature, he is in essentially the same position in regard to public moneys and the public trust as his counterpart on the Federal level. Yet he is prohibited from engaging in the same scope of activities.

A different but equally important area that I would hope that this commission would explore is found in the Nation's Capital. Something ought to be done to help solve the problems confronting the large number of Government employees in Washington. It is bad enough that the people of the District of Columbia lack their own representation without, in addition, depriving large numbers of knowledgeable Government employees from participating in the meager political life that now exists in the District. Nor can we lose sight of those Government employees residing in Virginia and Maryland whose skills are largely lost to their home communities.

Mr. President, we are in the peculiar position of constantly urging all our citizens to play an active role in public affairs and then placing legal barriers in the way of a large group who are capable and willing to do so. I think it is a matter of the first importance to see that laws designed to accomplish one purpose do not inadvertently impinge on the constitutionally guaranteed right of American citizens to participate in the political process of their community and Nation.

For that reason I earnestly hope the Senate will give this proposal serious consideration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT PRESIDENT TO VETO ITEMS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which would permit the President to veto items in appropriations bills without having to veto the entire bill.

The same proposed resolution is being offered today in the other body by Representative Halpern of New York.

Mr. President, this joint resolution in one form or another has received my sponsorship and support for many years, first as a Member of the other body; now, for the last three Congresses, in the Senate. I speak in all sincerity when I say that in my judgment at no time has it been more imperative to authorize an item veto power to the President than right now. We are in perilous fiscal waters. Threatened as we are with mounting annual deficits, an ever-increasing national debt, a short-run emergency in our international payments position, and a deplorable inability on the part of Congress to organize and discipline itself to maintain its constitutional supremacy over the Nation's pursestrings, it is absolutely essential that we avail ourselves of such a reasonable device as the item veto so that questionable and excessive spending items may more readily be weeded out of money bills.

The item veto is not an unfamiliar fiscal tool in American Government. Forty-one State legislatures have vested State Governors with the item veto power. Even sparingly used, it has worked, and worked well to save State taxpayers from unreasonable expenditure burdens. Based on the experience of the States, many of the Nation's foremost political scientists and public administrators, economists, and thoughtful citizens in every walk of life have long endorsed adoption of this same tool by the Federal Government. Every President, starting with Ulysses S. Grant down to Dwight D. Eisenhower, has also espoused it, and I am hopeful that President Kennedy after he has had an opportunity to give the matter more extended study will lend his support to the joint resolution introduced today.

Waste and pork barreling in the Federal Government is now undergoing renewed and vigorous attack in many responsible quarters. Impetus toward fiscal reform also has its roots in a widespread feeling that substantial tax reduction, to which everyone is quite naturally sympathetic, would nevertheless be imprudent if we did not pledge ourselves to take more effective steps to control Federal expenditures. I think it is a source of hope for the success of this joint resolution that the Nation is becoming more aroused on the issue of economy in Government and will give the needed grassroots push behind measures such as the item veto which hold out excellent prospects for proving beneficial in this area.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] has been second to none in this body in his devotion to fiscal responsibility, and I am very pleased and gratified to have his enthusiastic cosponsorship of this measure. I also ask that the proposed joint resolution lie on the desk for a period ending the close of business on Friday, September 6, so that other Senators who may wish to join as cosponsors may do so.

And, Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed joint resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk as requested by the Senator from New York.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 114) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:
>
> "Article —
>
> "Section 1. The President shall have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him.
>
> "Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to commend the Senator from New York on introducing a joint resolution providing for a Presidential item veto. Such authority is badly needed. As the Senator so eloquently said in his fine statement introducing the joint resolution, the item veto has been adopted in the vast majority of our States and has been found an essential economy tool in State after State. I have talked to many Governors and former Governors. They all have said that such authority is imperative, if they are going to have real efficiency and economy in their operation. The fact is that if a Governor or a President is in the position of being able to veto specific items, then the waste, which is one of the prices we have to pay for the democratic process in the Presidential-legislative system, can be minimized and, to some extent, it can be eliminated.

As the Senator has so well said, President after President has called for action of the type proposed. All of us in this body believe in economy.

The proposal is one concrete and specific way in which we can make this possible. It is an excellent joint resolution and I hope that we can press it to hearings and favorable action through the present session of Congress.

Again I commend the Senator from New York, who year after year, starting back at the time when he was in the House of Representatives, has been pleading for that type of legislation and has been leading the fight for it. I do hope that we can get it in this Congress.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator very much for his kind comments. I am certainly gratified to have the cosponsorship of such a distinguished Member of our body. The Senator from Wisconsin is one who has fought for a program of economy over many years.

PROHIBITION OF EMPLOYMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES BY PINKERTON DETECTIVE AGENCY—AMENDMENT

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1543) to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment, in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] may be joined as a cosponsor on S. 2031, a bill for community facilities, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address entitled "REA: The Future of Rural Texas," delivered by himself before the annual meeting of the members of the Bartlett, Tex., Rural Electric Cooperative, at Bartlett, Tex., on July 22, 1963.

WHY FOREIGN AID FOR TITO, KHRUSHCHEV'S CLOSE ALLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time, I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the one consistent major argument advanced by defenders of our policy of providing foreign aid for Yugoslavia has been that this aid divides and splinters the Communist world, strengthens the pro-Western world, and enfeebles the pro-Soviet forces in Yugoslavia.

After 14 years and more than $2 billion of this aid—more than we have given any neutral nation, with the possible exception of India—it is clear that the argument that we are winning Yugoslavia and its Communist Dictator Tito over to our side has collapsed completely.

There are few more expert or experienced reporters on Eastern European-Soviet relations than Cy Sulzberger, of the New York Times. The New York Times has vigorously championed foreign aid to Yugoslavia, and I presume still does so. No one can accuse either Mr. Sulzberger or the New York Times of bias against our foreign aid program or the policies of giving large and generous assistance to Yugoslavia, which we have followed in three administrations.

But this morning's New York Times reports that Yugoslavia's "bonds with Moscow have strengthened, while those with the West have weakened * * * there have been ups and downs in Soviet-Yugoslav relations. But basic wounds have healed. Tito needs Soviet aid, and Khrushchev is trying to harmonize, if not integrate, Yugoslavia's economy with that of the Eastern bloc."

Mr. Sulzberger concludes:

> Belligerent pressures have subsided in the Balkans, but the balance of power has again changed. Yugoslavia, which once leaned Westward for solace, has subtly drifted to the East. We simply cannot measure how far.

Mr. President, I submit that this report from Cy Sulzberger, of the New York Times, utterly destroys the argument that our foreign aid to Communist Dictator Tito has succeeded or is likely to succeed in splitting Yugoslavia from the Soviet Union.

Our foreign aid program has the good and high purpose of winning for freedom against the tyranny of communism throughout the world. The President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have properly defended and championed the foreign aid program as our first line of defense in the contest between freedom and tyranny.

What sense does it make, Mr. President, for us to provide aid to the government of a Communist dictator, who is a dedicated Communist, and proudly admits it, particularly when this Communist has now become increasingly more closely alined with the Soviet Union, and against the West and the United States of America? Does aid to this devoted Communist help freedom?

With utmost seriousness, Mr. President, I call upon the State Department to reconsider its past policies of pleading for aid to Tito; and I say to those in the State Department, "Gentlemen, the situation is changed. It is perfectly obvious now that our aid to Tito will not and cannot win him away from his alliance with the Soviet Union. How about recognizing the clear fact that the situation in the world has changed, and change our policies to meet the changed circumstances?"

Mr. President, I do hope our Foreign Relations Committee will seriously consider deleting any aid of any kind to Yugoslavia. If it does not do so, I anticipate that the Senate will have a chance to debate this issue fully and to decide whether the clearly changed circumstances of Tito's close reconciliation with the Soviet Union will still permit us to pour U.S. taxpayers' dollars into this Communist-controlled and Communist-dominated country.

Mr. President, the liberal position favors aid to Yugoslavia. It has traditionally. But this position has become frozen in the solid concrete of bias. The essence of liberalism is willingness to recognize change, to accept change, to adapt to change, and survive, improve, and grow in the process. I submit that in this case those who consider themselves true liberals should take another long, hard look at their position. Aid to Yugoslavia has become blind, empty dogma.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by C. L. Sulzberger, and published this morning in the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE COMMUNIST COLLOQUY

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

ATHENS, August 27.—It is unlikely we will ever know precisely what Tito and Khrushchev have been saying to each other at the Marshal's sybaritic Brioni retreat. Some years after participating in earlier Soviet-Yugoslav talks, Milovan Djilas recalled their substance in "Conversations with Stalin." But Djilas is now in jail. It is improbable that anyone in the Tito-Khrushchev entourage is preparing another indiscretion.

The ambiance of the present colloquy differs vastly from that in the spring of 1955 when Khrushchev first flew to Yugoslavia in an effort to heal the breach caused after Stalin outlawed Tito from Communist ranks. Both Khrushchev and Tito are today in stronger positions and the ideological quarrel that once divided them has faded in mutual antipathy toward China.

Eight years ago Khrushchev still shared power with Bulganin. It was by no means certain he would manage to establish firm ascendancy. Indeed, the mere fact of his visit of apology to Belgrade, a kind of Communist "canossa," infuriated his Bolshevik opponents.

Within 2 years of his original split with Moscow, Tito had started secret negotiations with Greece. Oddly enough, the first message was sent by Djilas, then No. 2 Yugoslav, to the Greek King and chief of staff.

Ultimately these negotiations led to signature of the Balkan treaty of 1953 and the Bled military alliance of 1954. These bound Yugoslavia to Greece and Turkey, both members of NATO. When Khrushchev first flew to Belgrade in 1955 the Greek chief of staff was there elaborating joint military plans. However, one immediate result of those Tito-Khrushchev talks 8 years ago was to infect the Balkan pact with sleeping sickness. Although never formally denounced, it is now quite dead.

Tito has gradually moved from pro-Western neutrality, indirectly linked with NATO, to a position of pure neutralism, and today this neutralism is increasingly tinged with a pro-Soviet bias. That doesn't mean the Marshal would ever reconcile himself to becoming a Russian satellite. Nevertheless, his bonds with Moscow have strengthened while those with the West have weakened.

KHRUSHCHEV A TITOIST?

In many respects, however, Khrushchev might be said to have become a Titoist himself. He inferentially admits Tito was right in preaching that there are different roads to socialism (meaning communism). Titoism's spread profoundly shook the once monolithic Soviet empire in Eastern Europe, which almost came apart in Poland and Hungary. Only when a modified version of Titoism came to be accepted in Moscow did the crisis ease.

There have been ups and downs in Soviet-Yugoslav relations. But basic wounds have healed. Tito needs Soviet aid, and Khrushchev is trying to harmonize, if not integrate, Yugoslavia's economy with that of the Eastern bloc.

China and Albania served as magnets drawing, or pushing, Moscow and Belgrade together. The Chinese attacked Tito long before they dared excoriate Khrushchev. And because Albanians traditionally regard Yugoslavs as enemies, they became increasingly pro-Chinese and anti-Russian when the Khrushchev-Tito friendship waxed.

At various times Tito has harbored aggressive intentions toward Albania and once went so far as to claim Albanians are Slavs, which isn't true. Stalin, as Djilas recounts, proposed that Tito grab his tiny neighbor. Khrushchev is also furious with Albania, but it is improbable that he would ever incite Tito to seize it.

Khrushchev has much to gain by winning increased allegiance from Tito. By so doing he can reduce Titoist pressures elsewhere in East Europe. Yet, vis-a-vis the first successful Communist heretic, Khrushchev has practiced ideologically the old tactic of joining what he couldn't lick. As for Tito, he is an old man who spent 46 years as active revolutionist and conspirator. Psychologically he must hanker, before dying, to make his peace with communism's spiritual citadel.

The circumstance of this dialog is perhaps more significant than anything Tito and Khrushchev may decide. Belligerent pressures have subsided in the Balkins, but the balance of power has again changed. Yugoslavia, which once leaned westward for solace, has subtly drifted to the East. We simply cannot measure how far.

OUR NATION'S MOST PRESSING PROBLEM: UNEMPLOYMENT—LET US RESOLVE IT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in July, 5.6 percent of the U.S. civilian labor force were unemployed. This meant that 4,108,000 men and women were seeking jobs, but were unable to find them, and in most cases were unable to provide for their families. I find this an intolerable situation in one of the richest countries in the world.

This fact is emphasized sharply for all Senators today as thousands and thousands of men and women from all parts of the country come to Washington to engage in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

But the problem is by no means uniquely the Negro's. True, many Negroes are unemployed because of racial discrimination. Others are unemployed because they lack the training for certain skilled jobs. But many are unemployed because there simply are not enough jobs to go around. This is also the problem of many whites who seek—and have sought for many months—jobs that are not there.

We must get the economy of the United States on the move, so the jobs will be there for those who seek them. As President Kennedy so well said earlier in his administration: "Let's get America moving." More jobs provide the answer.

Mr. James Reston in his article in today's New York Times clearly points out the relationship between today's march on Washington and our lagging economy. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I want to quote one paragraph, in particular, from Mr. Reston's article:

> Already some of the President's advisers are insisting that only an ambitious public works program, on top of all the other tax, training and relief programs, will really deal with Negro unemployment in the cities. The President is not agreeing yet, not because he is convinced they are wrong, but merely because he has so many other problems that he cannot take on another at this time.

I agree with Mr. Reston, and with the President's advisers. I hope they will continue their insistence on an ambitious domestic public works program.

Last March I introduced a bill, S. 1121, which would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works program from $900 million to $2.6 billion. I described the amount to be authorized under my bill in these terms:

> The same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

I did so, Mr. President, because I believe we can no longer continue to pour economic assistance into foreign nations throughout the world unless we act quickly to bolster our economy here at home.

I ask my colleagues to imagine the feelings of an unemployed man in the United States persistently but fruitlessly seeking employment to provide for his wife and children when he reads in the paper of "U.S. Algerian Plan Giving 150,000 Jobs." I ask unanimous consent that the news report from the New York Times of August 21, 1963, describing this plan be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we cannot afford to do less for our unemployed men and women in the United States.

I hope that there will be speedy action in the Congress to increase the authorization of appropriations for the accelerated public works program by an amount sufficient to get our economy going and get our unemployed back to work.

In my judgment this issue transcends all others. It is necessary for our domestic economy. It is necessary to strengthen us in relation to our foreign problems—in relation to our strength as a nation with global responsibilities. I can think of no policy or program which will have so many concomitant benefits.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1963]

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN AND ALL THAT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 27.—The reaction of the white or northwest section of Washington to this week's big Negro demonstration is mainly one of annoyance. For a whole day, inhabitants of this privileged sanctuary won't be able to buy a drink at a bar, or get a taxi downtown, or count on the colored cook coming in for dinner. Think of the white man's burden.

The white folks in the capital have always been annoyed by resident or visiting petitioners. Though the right to petition a government for redress of grievances was granted by King John to his barons in Magna Carta and guaranteed to all Americans in the first amendment on December 15, 1791, Congress has usually been irritated whenever large numbers of their fellow-citizens showed up to protest.

In 1836, the House of Representatives even adopted a gag rule to the effect "that no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any States or Territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House or entertained in any way whatever."

Later, under the leadership of Congressman John Quincy Adams, this was repealed, but the leaders of Coxey's unemployment marchers were arrested anyway for walking on the grass, and this stubborn resentment against complaining demonstrators still exists.

JOBS AND FREEDOM

The fact that annoyance is still the white resident's principal reaction to the march here indicates the extent of the gap between white and Negro thinking—this in a city that is 53 percent Negro and whose public schools are almost 85 percent Negro.

Despite all the hubbub of the last few days, the Congress has scarcely noted the full objective of the protest. The demonstration was not designed merely as political agitation for the passage of President Kennedy's civil rights legislation, but was officially titled the "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom."

The jobs part of it may prove to be tougher in the end than the freedom, for the Negro leaders are not only asking for equal opportunity in the field of civil liberties but for preferential treatment on jobs.

Asa Philip Randolph, the 74-year-old director of the march, emphasized the point here this week. Getting jobs away from whites to give to Negroes, he said, was no solution to the problem. A vast increase in the economic growth of the Nation was needed to wipe out unemployment for all, and only special training and treatment for Negroes would enable them to work effectively in an automated society.

This, of course, is precisely the problem Washington has not been able to lick, and there is even less likelihood that the Kennedy administration will get its economic growth and full employment programs through the Congress than its civil rights program.

In July, there were 3,382,000 whites unemployed in this country and 939,000 Negroes. In other words, the Negro unemployed percentage was over double the white—11.2 to 5.1 percent, and in some cities, Chicago for example, the Negro unemployed were over 17 percent.

EQUALITY OF PREFERENCE?

This problem is not getting better, but worse. The demand for skilled workers and the scrapping of unskilled workers are increasing faster than the training and education of the Negro. Meanwhile, the Negro population is increasing faster than the white—25.4 percent Negro in the fifties to 17.5 percent white.

Even within the Kennedy administration there is no agreement that its economic proposals would meet the Negro's problems, even if they were all approved by the Congress, which they certainly won't be.

Already some of the President's advisers are insisting that only an ambitious public works program, on top of all the other tax, training, and relief programs, will really deal with Negro unemployment in the cities. The President is not agreeing yet, not because he is convinced they are wrong, but merely because he has so many other problems that he cannot take on another at this time.

Accordingly, this week's march on Washington is not the end of the Negro drive for civil equality but also the beginning of a drive for economic preference and full employment. This may "annoy" Washington, but the American Negro has obviously decided that he has to annoy the white man to wake him up.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 21, 1963]

UNITED STATES-ALGERIAN PLAN GIVING 150,000 JOBS

ALGIERS, August 21.—The United States and Algeria signed here today their biggest Government-to-Government aid program, a food-for-work plan that will give jobs to 150,000 Algerians. It is expected to provide support for 1,500,000 persons, including women and children.

Under this interim accord, the United States will provide monthly about 25,000 tons of wheat and other surplus products through January 1, 1964. By that time it is expected that a new longer-range aid program will be worked out.

One of Premier Ahmed Ben Bella's closest confidants, Labor Minister Bechir Boumaza, expressed his Government's thanks and stressed Algerian efforts to get useful work for the jobless unofficially estimated to number 700,000 in a population of 11 million.

The day's agreement was the third signed this year involving U.S. aid to Algeria. All involve the use of food surpluses. Already agreed to are American technical assistance and supplies for a special 60,000-worker plan involving four rural development projects. CARE-Medico, Inc., a nonprofit organization, will help handle continuing relief feeding of 1,500,000 needy.

Last winter, Mr. Boumaza noted, about 4,600,000 persons, or nearly half the Algerian Moslem population, were on food relief.

THE INDEPENDENT ROLE OF CONGRESS IN OUR SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last Monday, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] received the highest honor bestowed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal Award and Citation.

In accepting this award at the VFW Convention in Seattle, Senator RUSSELL delivered an outstanding address devoted to the preservation of our system of government. I know of no other Member of this body more qualified to speak on this subject than my friend and colleague, for it is to this end that Senator RUSSELL has unswervingly dedicated more than 30 years of his life.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RUSSELL

Commander in Chief Gentry, distinguished officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and its auxiliary, delegates to the 64th Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and their guests; any person of sensitivity would react with the deepest humility and appreciation to being selected as a recipient of the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal Award and Citation. Certainly I am humble and grateful for several reasons.

If for no other reason, I would have to be moved by the receipt of an award bearing the name of one whose foresight and wisdom caused him to be consulted and heeded by the highest officials of our Government over almost half a century. An association with Mr. Baruch is one of the experiences of my public life that I cherish most. As the Senate considers the treaty to control testing nuclear weapons, we remember that it was Mr. Baruch who at the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission in 1946 advanced for the United States the plan that called for the development of an International Atomic Development Authority with responsibility for the control of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to our security. And we should not forget that reliable inspection was a cornerstone of this control.

Another thought that makes me so appreciative is that you have permitted me to join a distinguished group of Americans, the previous recipients of this award—prominent officials, inspiring religious leaders, and heroic military officers.

But perhaps my chief source of gratification is that my efforts have met with the approval of this great organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with whom I have always felt a kindred spirit.

Because my congressional responsibilities have been heavily concentrated in the defense field, I have had constant reminders of the VFW's contributions to national security.

I have welcomed your support of measures to make military service attractive, to maintain the personnel strength of our Armed Forces, to add to our strategic forces by accelerated construction of Polaris submarines, and to avoid a premature abandonment of manned bombers.

I have applauded your recognition that events in the Far East bear heavily on our security; that we must resist Communist encroachment there and elsewhere; that the Monroe Doctrine is as important today as when it was enunciated.

I salute you for your vigilance and the soundness of your approach to problems affecting the national security, and for your extensive contributions to sustaining a national determination to remain strong and free.

It is extremely flattering to be selected by your national council of administration as the person "who has made and is making the greatest contribution to American security," as I believe the criteria for the Baruch Award and Citation reads.

Efforts to maintain American security involve direct and indirect contributions by so many persons in our country that it is virtually impossible to make a contemporary judgment of relative contributions to defense. Service in the Armed Forces, payment of taxes, employment in industries producing equipment, agricultural production of food and fiber—all of these areas and others afford an opportunity to enhance the national security. I should like to think that in accepting this award, I accept a small part of it for all those whose cooperative efforts are directed to this end.

Although I realize there are many others to whom this honor might properly be paid, I can say in good conscience that no person could have a greater desire to contribute to our national security. There could hardly be a more important objective. If my efforts have contributed to our country's security, this is reward enough in itself.

When called upon in times of national danger to support a powerful military establishment, the American people have always responded magnificently. Continuously since the tragic events of Korea, beginning in 1950, there has been a broad popular understanding of the importance of maintaining the numerical strength of our Armed Forces and of equipping them with modern weapons.

Of course, defense is costly. Despite this cost, it is far less expensive and less risky to devote a fairly substantial part of our national effort to defense each year instead of having the illusory savings of drastic reductions requiring even larger long-term expenditures when a crisis looms.

The recent attitude and statements of the leaders of the Soviet Union give some basis for cautious hope that the immediate future will see an improvement in relations between the United States and Russia.

We or our survivors may one day look back to the year 1963 as a turning point in our national destiny. If the treaty to refrain from testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere should be widely adhered to and observed, this action might point the way to other international agreements. Such other agreements would have to be judged separately, each on its own merits.

It is precisely the expectation of other agreements that causes me concern about the Senate's ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. After one ratification in this area, succeeding ones become easier through rationalizations such as "we can't stop now." The consequences of unwise actions in the arms control and disarmament areas are so staggering that not only this treaty but any subsequent related treaties are deserving of the most careful scrutiny and soul searching.

I have seen the "don't stop now" philosophy become compelling in foreign aid legislation. It has become customary for the Congress to vote substantial foreign aid programs each year, but I know that many Members do so with strong reservations about whether the benefits are proportionate to the cost to our taxpayers.

If we make mistakes in foreign aid, as I know we do in much of it, the cost is measured in wasted dollars. This waste is serious enough, but if we become committed to a series of international agreements, each one seemingly relatively innocuous, but cumulatively representing disarmament by excessive but misplaced trust, the cost would be the destruction of our national existence and independence.

In the National Capitol, one of the favorite sports of this year has been criticism of the Congress and the manner in which it is discharging its constitutional role. This is a subject on which I have strong feelings. Because of the fundamental importance of active legislative participation in national decisions to the continued functioning of our form of government, I hope you share my interest in this subject.

Congress, of course, is a human institution and it is subject to the same imperfections as any other organization composed of human beings. Ideally, the 100 Senators and 435 Representatives should be paragons of wisdom, intellect, energy, and integrity, but the Congress, in practice, probably will always be a relatively faithful mirror or cross-section of the national population. To improve the quality of the Congress, we must improve the characteristics of the population from which Congress is drawn. Election to the House or Senate does not magically transform a person into a statesman nor does it free him from the frailties that are a part of all mortals.

This is not to say that there is no room for improvement in congressional procedures. Challenges of the contemporary age are so complex and so numerous that in attempting to deal with them, the Congress may leave itself too little time for self-examination and reflection as to why it transacts its business in the way it does. Surely, we should continue to improve our procedures, abandoning methods that have outlived their usefulness and adopting changes that will contribute to a more effective legislative process.

But it seems to me that much of the criticism of the Congress is based on fallacies and misconceptions about the way our Government is meant to function, and the division of power for the safety of our people and our liberties.

The first of these is the fallacy that all problems have an immediate legislative solution. If anything distresses or endangers a part of our populace, the almost involuntary reaction is "pass a law" or "Congress must investigate." As a proud member of the Senate and the Congress, I would be the last to depreciate the legislative role. The undeniable truth, however, is that some conditions cannot be reached by law and some problems are not susceptible to legislative solutions.

The second fallacy on which congressional reform is sometimes urged is that Congress should be judged by volume, not quality—that those years in which many bills are enacted are fruitful ones and that Congressmen have not earned their pay if many laws are not added to the statute books. If members of Congress were paid on a piece rate basis, we probably would observe more make-work activity, but it does not necessarily follow that the public interest would be served.

Another unsound argument for drastic changes in congressional procedures is that only a small number of the President's legislative proposals have been approved. I use the term "the President's" in an impersonal sense here, for not only in this administration but in most preceding administrations has this argument been advanced. It runs something like this: The President has made x number of legislative recommendations to the Congress; only one-half or one-fourth of these have become law; therefore, Congress is not doing the job and must be uprooted.

There are at least two good reasons why at any selected point in the life of a Congress the number of laws enacted is less than the number of executive branch recommendations. First, under the division of labor and system of specialization by which the Congress necessarily functions, bills are referred to committees for hearings, and hearings take time. If Congress should precipitately vote on executive branch recommendations, the box score might be more impressive, but the Congress would hardly be fulfilling its independent role under our constitutional system that was conceived to provide checks and balances against authoritarian executive power.

The second reason is that many Presidential recommendations have their origin in the platforms of political parties. For practical, but nonetheless deplorable reasons, the prevailing practice is for these platforms to promise a little something for everything and everybody. No realistic observer should expect all these planks to become law. No patriot would hope for them to be.

I suspect the real reason for much of the reform clamor is a failure to recognize that the formulation of legislation represents much give and take and compromise. The changers say, in effect, that if I don't have my way and a majority of my colleagues disagree with me, something is wrong with the system.

My final thought on this subject is that if reform is pursued until Congress becomes so mechanical and automated as to produce instantaneous decisions on every legislative measure as it is introduced, our Government and our economy would soon be changed so significantly as to be unrelated to any our forefathers intended or we now enjoy.

One of the many things for which I am thankful this morning is that the continued flourishing growth of your organization is another strong bit of evidence that it is never out of style to be patriotic.

There has been a great deal of propaganda that the existence of national sovereignty is the major obstacle to enduring peace—that if nations would only yield all their powers of self-government and self-determination to a supranational body, the primary cause of international strife would be eliminated.

This is an easy position for those nations that have little sovereignty and weak governments, whose people have little to lose, either in being secure in their personal liberties or in economic blessings. For those of us who do have much to lose in those areas, it is immeasurably more difficult to risk.

We should never be ashamed or embarrassed to consider first the interests of the United States and her people. We should not have to apologize or feel any guilt complex over our power and prosperity.

If we are irresolute in preserving and defending our system and our privileges, we would be unworthy heirs and unfaithful to those who have served and died beyond our shores.

Let me thank you again for the attainments of your organization and for the honor you have paid me today.

LEADING NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CALL FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to additional editorial support for efforts to reform the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Responsible editorials appeared recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Atlanta Constitution, and the Denver Post—three of our leading newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 24, 1963]

The Immigration Anachronism

President Kennedy has joined his two predecessors in urging improvement of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952. President Truman vetoed the measure but was overridden. President Eisenhower urged reforms but was ignored. What will be the fate of Mr. Kennedy's proposals?

Certainly they go to the heart of the injustice in our immigration policy. The injustice is that national quotas for immigrants are based on the proportion of nationals from each country making up our population in 1920. As Mr. Kennedy and his predecessors said, this system favors immigration from northern Europe, where there is little pressure for emigration, at the cost of southern Europe and everywhere else.

Furthermore, unused quotas cannot be applied to the quotas which are filled. The results are that the total number of immigrants in any one year never reaches the total of 156,000 permitted, and some nations have mortgaged their quotas for years ahead while others hardly need quotas.

Mr. Kennedy urges Congress to reduce the national quotas by 20 percent a year until they are erased, thus releasing quota numbers to a pool to be distributed on a new priority basis. First priority would go to immigrants with skills needed in America, second priority to relatives of persons living in America, and third priority to those who first apply for entry. This third category in effect redistributes quotas to nations with the greatest demand for emigration.

Unfortunately, defense of the quota system has been strong by unregenerated nativists in Congress. They would, if they could, reconstitute the United States as an Anglo-Saxon republic with a modest blessing to racial second cousins. This sort of unrealistic and impracticable xenophobia is an insult to most of the world and a disservice to America. The Kennedy administration will need to muster all its power and influence to overcome it.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 27, 1963]

New Immigration Plan Makes Sense

The Kennedy administration has proposed an equitable and reasonable revision of the country's antiquated immigration quota system.

Adopted in a day when much of America's population was composed of first- and second-generation immigrants, and ethnic antagonisms ran high, the existing program is unrealistic in the 1960's.

The present system ties quotas to percentages of various ethnic stocks living in America in 1924. It gives highest precedence to northern Europeans—who nowadays do not even use up their allotment.

The Kennedy proposal is not a wide-open door.

It would raise the immigration total from 92,000 a year to 164,500. Over a 5-year period, it would erase the national-origin criterion and in the interim, "pool" unused quotas. It would, however, limit immigrants from any one country in a given year to 16,450.

First precedence would be given to those whose training and education would make a contribution to the national welfare. (Since chronic unemployment is largely limited to the unskilled, the Kennedy proposal should not upset the economy.) Second in priority would be those with relatives who are U.S. citizens.

The President's plan merits congressional approval.

[From the Denver Post, July 25, 1963]

Fairer Immigration Standards Proposed

The national origins quota system of our immigration laws was intended to restrict the coming in of persons from Southern Europe and the Far East in favor of newcomers from English-speaking and Scandinavian nations.

It was enacted in 1924 and has remained basically unchanged ever since. Its rigid quotas result in such anomalies as Greece, with a yearly quota of 308 persons, having 97,577 persons registered as wishing to enter the United States. How long it would take to exhaust that backlog it is futile to try to figure out. At the same time Great Britain, with a yearly quota of 65,361, sends only about 25,000 persons yearly to the United States—but its unused quota cannot be used by citizens of any other nation.

To replace this system, President Kennedy sent to Congress this week a proposal to phase out the national origins quota system over a 5-year period, and phase in a system based on two more equitable criteria:

1. Preference for immigrants having valuable education, training or skills needed in the United States;
2. Opening doors wider to immigrants having relatives in the United States.

Only vestige of the national quota system retained would be a provision that not more than 10 percent of the total admitted under quota in any one year could be from one country. The total would be raised from the 156,700 permitted annually now, to around 165,000.

This could increase the flow of immigrants from such big backlog countries as Greece and Italy to 16,500 a year or more.

The "or more" is due to the fact that, to permit reunion of families split by immigration, a whole new nonquota class of immigrants would be created—parents of U.S. citizens. They are now a preferred class of immigrants under the quotas; under the administration bill they could enter outside the quota.

The present immigration law now has one big nonquota class—citizens of any Western Hemisphere nation which was independent as of 1952. The new bill would update that to include three Caribbean colonies that have, or are due to achieve, independence since 1952: Jamaica, Tobago, and Trinidad.

We can see room for legitimate argument about some facets of this proposal, and we wonder about the legitimacy of nonquota status for all immigrants from the Western Hemisphere.

Offhand, if the new criteria are set up, we cannot see why immigrants from Western Hemisphere nations should not meet the same standards as those from elsewhere.

But in general, the bill seems to us to be reasonable. It would replace a system based on racial and national discrimination with one having two worthwhile and humane objectives: to assure the United States of a continuing flow of usefully-skilled new citizens, and to reunite the families of U.S. citizens.

PROPOSED NATIONAL SEASHORES IN MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as Senators know, I am cosponsor, along with Senator McNamara, of two proposed national lakeshores in Michigan. Naturally, then, my eye immediately caught a headline in a recent Christian Science Monitor, "Have You Ever Visited a National Seashore?"

In it the writer contrasts visits to busy, crowded, noisy beaches common to too much of the Nation with those to the primitive, peaceful, windswept—almost isolated—beaches at such national seashores as Cape Hatteras.

As I read his description of the national seashores now in existence, my mind kept wandering back to Michigan.

Parading through my thoughts were pictures of the magnificent duned beaches and palisades along Lake Michigan which would be included in Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore, of the sparkling inland lakes set in low, forested hills, all rimmed by a high glacial moraine.

In technicolor were the views of the multicolored sandstone cliffs in which centuries of waves have carved out caves, arches, and suggested forms along a 15-mile stretch of shore in the proposed Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

Equally as beautiful—if not more so—I thought proudly, as the areas described in this article.

Then a touch of reality struck: the one difference is that the article describes areas which are guaranteed to stay beautiful for generation after generation to enjoy.

It is a guarantee not yet given to the two beautiful areas of Michigan. But one that should be.

I ask that the Christian Science Monitor article be printed in the Record at this point, in the hope that my colleagues will read it and decide, when the vote comes, to give to the people of the Midwest the promise of beauty forever which has already been given to other sections of the country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Have You Ever Visited a National Seashore?

If you happen to be one of those persons who love the sea you might want to visit one of our national seashores. You probably are familiar with big, bustling, noisy places by the seashore where boardwalks and amusement parks are crowded to the water's edge and the ocean forms a strange almost unrealistic background.

You are also possibly acquainted with large public beaches where it is difficult to find your place in the sun.

A national seashore is different from commercial seashore spots and public beaches; it is an unspoiled beach area where you can wander along a lonely windswept beach.

The National Park Service, of the Department of the Interior, has set aside unspoiled beach areas accessible for public recreational purposes in North Carolina, Massachusetts, California, and Texas. These areas are preserved for all the people's enjoyment.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore was the United States first seashore. It was established in 1953, from land acquired almost exclusively by public donations. Cape Hatteras is on the windswept outer banks of North Carolina. Cape Hatteras Light, tallest in the Nation, flashes 193 feet above the sea and warns ships against treacherous Diamond Shoals.

The cape is divided into three parts: Bodie (pronounced "Body"); Hatteras; and Ocracoke—each separated from its neighbor by an inlet. At Cape Hatteras you can get a feeling of isolation: you can swim, boat, sail, fish, take a ride in a beach buggy, or walk along the primitive wilderness shoreline. There are also dunes to climb. You can see many shipwrecks, some as recent as World War II; take a ride on a ferry in Oregon Inlet; and see wild horses from the highway.

Not so remote as the outer banks, but equally historic and primitive in portions is the Cape Cod National Seashore authorized in 1961 by the 87th Congress. This Congress in 1962 also authorized Point Reyes in California, and Padre Island in Texas.

Cape Cod, shaped like a bold bent arm, thrusts some 70 miles into the Atlantic Ocean from the Massachusetts mainland. Heaped up by glaciers long ago, then molded by winds and waves and currents, Cape Cod has been endowed with plant and animal life in rich variety.

On the ocean side of the cape's forearm lies Great Beach (named by Thoreau), a magnificent ocean shore. "A man may stand there and put all America behind him," wrote Henry David Thoreau of Cape Cod, in the 19th century. He thought Cape Cod was so great that he wrote a book about it.

Point Reyes is 30 miles northwest of San Francisco. Drakes Bay at Point Reyes has a beach that is in substantially the same condition as it was in 1579. This is the place where Sir Francis Drake may have repaired his vessel, the *Golden Hind,* before continuing out across the Pacific on his journey around the world.

Point Reyes is a little geological "island in time." A panorama of history is found there, Coast Miwok Indians lived here. In 1602, Sebastian Vizcaino named his anchorage Puerto de los Reyes, or Port of Kings. The long narrow valley of the Point Reyes Peninsula is the site of the great San Andreas fault, or earthquake crack. If you will visit Point Reyes (although little or no land has yet been acquired for the authorized park) you will see bird rookeries on the off-shore rocks, herds of sea lions in sheltered coves, marine birds relaxing on fresh-water lakes, mule deer on brush-covered slopes, and dramatic evidence of faulting.

Padre Island National Seashore in Texas is distinctly different from Cape Cod and Point Reyes in being subtropical. It is the fourth national seashore, and is on the south Texas coast of the Gulf of Mexico between Corpus Christi and Port Isabel. It is bounded on the west by warm water of Laguna Madre, with its exceptional waterfowl and fishes, and on the east by the clean, temperate waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

It is on one of the greatest flyways in North America, a place where migratory birds funnel through in tremendous numbers and with virtually no molestation. Among the birds-in-residence are white and brown pelicans, American and snowy egrets, Louisiana, little blue and great blue herons, Wilson plower, laughing gull, the black skimmers, and red-winged blackbirds.

At the moment Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island are still "paper" national seashores. They have been authorized by the Congress but they are not established. The land must be acquired and when enough land is acquired for efficient administration—they hope this summer for Cape Cod—the national seashores will be formally opened, and visitor facilities will be developed.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has commented: "The establishment of three national seashores in one congressional session—the 87th—is a historic feat in the history of conservation. The people of the United States and the generations to come now have a total of about 285 miles of new shoreline for their enjoyment."

PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF OUR TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal for August 25 contained an excellent article entitled "The World 'Fish Fight' Gets Hotter." This outstanding article was written by Mr. R. G. Lynch who displayed an acute awareness of our international fishing problem. Mr. Lynch pointed out the arguments in favor of legislation to protect our territorial waters from encroachment by foreign fishing vessels.

I am pleased to report today that the Senate Commerce Committee has announced hearings for Thursday, September 5, on my bill, S. 1988, which would impose for the first time penalties on foreign vessels taken within our territorial waters.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Milwaukee Journal be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The World "Fish Fight" Gets Hotter

(By R. G. Lynch)

International competition for fisheries has the seas seething with incidents and diplomats busy exchanging notes. Armed force has been used repeatedly to protect national claims in the waters of five continents. Hardly a month passed without another incident. More than 40 nations have extended their territorial claims, 10 others their claims to exclusive fishing rights beyond the traditional 3-mile limit.

Most are satisfied with a 12-mile zone, but South Korea claims 60 miles and Chile, Peru and Ecuador draw the line 200 miles out at sea. Freedom of the seas is at stake, for the extended limits have implications for merchant shipping and navies. Even a 12-mile limit, enforced on both sides, could remove important passages from "open sea" classification. The Straits of Gibraltar are only about 12 miles wide.

The United States favors a 6-mile territorial limit plus a 6-mile national fishing zone. This proposal fell only one vote short of approval at a 1960 United Nations conference at Geneva, Switzerland. Since then several more nations have gone to 12 miles and Canada and Denmark have announced that they will do so in 1964.

Alaska's congressional delegation is pressing for similar action by the United States, primarily to protect fisheries which are particularly important to Alaska's economy, and also for security reasons. Senator Bartlett, Democrat of Alaska, said recently in the Senate: "The presence of large Soviet fishing ships at close range is undesirable from the standpoint of national defense."

BRITAIN ASKS CONFERENCE

Not long after Bartlett's speech, a news story reported 50 Russian trawlers passing only 4 miles off Cape Cod, near Boston, Mass. Early in the summer, two Soviet trawlers passed within view of President Kennedy's Florida home.

Scores of incidents involving war vessels and fishing craft have been reported. In May an Ecuadorian gunboat seized two California tuna boats. In April, an Icelandic gunboat fired on a British trawler. In March, Brazilian sea and air forces ran French vessels off lobstering grounds.

Earlier, the U.S.S.R. and South Korea imprisoned Japanese fishermen, North Korea seized South Korean vessels, Venezuelan patrols chased Trinidad boats, Morocco warned off Spanish fishermen, Greece and Turkey disputed Aegean Sea fishing rights, the Bahaman Government threatened to fire on Florida fishing vessels, British warships protected British fishermen in the vicinity of Iceland.

Great Britain and Iceland appeared to have settled their dispute a year ago. The new outbreak in April, on top of winter clashes with Russians, in the North Sea, prompted the British Government to propose a fall conference of North Atlantic nations. At the same time, it served notice that it would withdraw May 15, 1964, from an 1882 North Sea fisheries agreement and a 1939 agreement with France.

The tension over fisheries is due in large part to intensive fishing by the Japanese and the Russians, both with government support. Japan's fleets fish all over the world. U.S.S.R. fleets are aggressive in the North Pacific and North Atlantic Oceans and spreading to other seas.

British captains reported last winter that Russians had trawled through areas clearly marked with buoys and destroyed a lot of their gear. (Alaska has had similar incidents.) A Soviet trawler was boarded by angry British fishermen earlier in the winter after it had fouled their lines. A Norwegian skipper charged that U.S.S.R. warships had driven 50 Norwegian, French, and British vessels off international fishing grounds near Norway.

The breakdown of international law has continued despite United Nations efforts to bring about agreement in a series of conferences. One in 1958 brought the necessary two-thirds agreement on sharing and conservation of open sea fisheries, but the territorial dispute had to be referred back to the U.N. Assembly.

U.S. POSITION DIFFICULT

The United States has served notice, after each foreign extension of limits, that this Nation reserves the rights of its nationals in all waters beyond the 3-mile limit established by international law. This is expected to be done, even with Canada.

But our Government finds its position increasingly difficult, both in international relations and at home, under Alaska's pressure. It has made no attempt to protect American fishermen with force. Congress passed a fisherman's protective act some years ago, providing reimbursement for fines for violations of disputed waters. But loss of time usually exceeds the fine. A tuna boat's overhead runs to $1,000 a day and more, and it may take weeks to process a seizure case.

South American governments until recently appeared more interested in revenue than fisheries protection. They collected fees of $1,500 and up for a boatload of tuna. Americans finally stopped paying.

Now Chile, Peru and Ecuador are said to be planning a joint ban on foreign fishermen within 200 miles of shore. A Japanese publication, Suisan Keizai Shimbun, reported this a few weeks ago, quoting Chile's Foreign Minister as having said that United States and European vessels "are ravaging the fishery resources" by their "wanton intrusions into our territorial waters."

Until this situation developed, the United States had to contend mainly with Mexico's sporadic seizures of shrimp boats in the Gulf of Mexico.

The State Department handled the recent Ecuador gunboat incident with caution, reluctant to press a shaky government (which shortly was ousted, anyway). The seizures of American tuna boats were very popular; the gunboat captain became a hero.

Ecuador and its neighbors justify their 200-mile limit on the ground that the United States and Canada have set "limits" as far out. They point to agreements under which the Japanese refrain from taking salmon and halibut in certain areas. The Japanese Government currently is being pressed by its fishermen and newspapers to end the halibut agreement when the three nations' representatives meet in Tokyo next month to discuss fisheries.

ALASKA SEIZED BOATS

Brazil, when it ran off French lobster boats, argued that lobsters were a Continental Shelf resource because they live on the bottom. Recognition of national rights to shelf resources was approved by the 1958 Geneva conference and is close to the necessary ratification.

Prompted by Alaska's Senators, our State Department followed Brazil's example. In July it asked the U.S.S.R. to stop taking king crabs from the Continental Shelf off Alaska. Senator BARTLETT said early in August that he had been informed that the Soviet crab fleet had disappeared from the area.

Alaska is extremely jealous of its fisheries. One of its first acts as a State was to outlaw salmon traps, which were operated almost entirely by interests in other States. Alaskans have complained bitterly about Japanese and Russian fishing along their coast. A year ago, without Federal authorization, Governor Egan ordered two Japanese vessels seized in Shelikof Straits and has since refused to permit foreigners to fish there.

The 12 mile limit for which Alaska's Senators are pressing would close large areas to foreign fishing. The method is to survey a line from headland to headland and fix the fishing limit 12 miles outside. This closes bays and straits.

In the last three summers, about 200 Soviet vessels have worked the Atlantic Georges Bank and as many have been in the Bering Sea, North Pacific, and Gulf of Alaska.

The Soviets are building and using a modern fishing port near Havana, Cuba—terminal, boatyard, and processing plant. In February 185 Cubans went to Russia for fishery and port management training. In April Castro announced that the U.S.S.R. would supply material, scientific equipment and instructors for a Cuban fisheries school.

Another cause of tension is the new awareness of the importance of food from the sea by nations not historically interested in fishing. Their peoples are learning how to fish, with Japanese, Americans, and Russians as teachers.

The doubling of the world catch from 1938 to 1961 resulted partly from more fishing and partly from improved technology. Huge stern trawlers, mother ships with large freezing and storage capacity, and fish locating equipment have increased efficiency.

But the United States, world leader in technology, has fallen behind in fishing equipment. Fishing vessels can be built and operated more cheaply by other countries. Congress has provided subsidies, loans and mortgage insurance, but this Nation has not added a single stern-ramp trawler or factory ship to its fleet. Its only fishing vessel over 1,000 tons is a tuna purse seiner, recently launched. No trawler over 150 tons has been built here since 1951.

The U.S.S.R. has the most modern fishing fleet—at least 100 stern trawlers of 3,000 tons, a dozen 15,000- to 20,000-ton factory ships (600–800 in a crew). It expects to add 750 large vessels in the next 2 or 3 years. They are being built in Soviet yards and in Germany, Denmark, Norway, and Japan.

Modern stern trawlers also are operated by Japan, Great Britain, Norway, East and West Germany, Poland, France and South Africa.

Japan traditionally has led the world in fishing. The United States was a respectable second in 1938 and still a poor second in 1956. Since then it has fallen to fifth place. In the last decade, our fishing activities have shrunk by 16,000 vessels and 31,000 men.

THE MILITARY IS OUT OF BOUNDS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense has recently issued orders converting the military and naval commanders of the Nation into political arms of the executive department of the Federal Government and putting the Armed Forces of the Nation at economic warfare with the civilian population in order to coerce civilians engaged in commercial enterprises into conformity with the administration's views in respect to racial relations. The Asheville Times, of Asheville, N.C., made some trenchant observations upon these orders in an editorial entitled "The Military Is Out of Bounds," published on August 22, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Times, Aug. 22, 1963]

THE MILITARY IS OUT OF BOUNDS

Not only southerners, but all Americans, ought to be concerned by the nefarious Gesell report, basis for a recent Defense Department directive which, if carried out, would come dangerously close to forcing integration on communities near military bases by economic warfare.

The order, fortunately, is far less sweeping than the original report recommended, but it still is a vicious instrument that understandingly has provoked controversy, destined in the end to do irreparable damage to the good relationship that has existed between military and civilian population.

The Defense Department contends there is a regrettable misconception about its plans to make broad use of off limits powers to declare whole communities out of bounds for servicemen. We have no misconception about the principle involved.

Defense officials emphasize that they will move slowly and that they do not and cannot have an overall plan. They apparently have serious qualms of their own.

The problems of the Negro servicemen essentially are the same as those of the Negro civilian, and we are and have been in favor of resolving these in an orderly and peaceable manner, fully cognizant that it all cannot be done in a day or a year or decade.

It is true that a military man is not in a particular community of his own choice and is not free to move elsewhere.

Most civilians, too, are bound to the community in which they live. Family ties, jobs, homeownership, and other factors limit their ability to seek a change of scenery because of social or other customs and practices with which they don't agree.

On the other hand, the serviceman is a transient. He knows he will be stationed at a particular base for only a relatively short length of time.

And communities near military bases have a great many additional problems because of the presence of the servicemen. A disproportionate number of taverns, juke joints, and honky tonks always spring up in these areas, schools are overcrowded, and other services taxed to capacity.

Concessions are made to the men in uniform, partly because of the dollars and cents a military base brings to an area, and partly because of a desire to make life more pleasant for these men and their families.

The Negro serviceman is treated by the community in which he is stationed no better or no worse than his civilian counterpart, and we see no reason why he should be suddenly sanctified by Mr. Gesell or Mr. McNamara at the cost of turmoil where honest efforts are being made to bring equality of opportunity to the black man.

We covet these opportunities for the people of his race, but the military branches were created for the defense of our Nation, not as instruments to enforce social reforms. They ought to stick to their own knitting.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the turbulent events in South Vietnam have caused great concern in my State, which has a population of Buddhists larger than that of any other State.

At the 51st annual legislative assembly of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawaii, held from August 13 to August 15, 1963, 120 lay and ministerial representatives of 50,000 Buddhists in Hawaii adopted a resolution protesting the religious persecution against Buddhists in South Vietnam.

I fully share the alarm voiced by Hawaii's Buddhists over the suppression of the right of the Buddhists in South Vietnam to worship freely, without harassment and intimidation.

Freedom of religion is so basic to our form of government that we are shocked by the overt actions taken by the South Vietnam Government against the Buddhists. We Americans must be particularly sensitive to the religious persecution in that country because as a nation we are committed to defending South Vietnam against the common totalitarian Communist enemy.

I deplore the religious oppression that has shattered that country's unity and I urge our Government to take all appropriate measures possible to dissuade the Government of South Vietnam from further persecution of the Buddhists.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawaii be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION, 51ST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, HONPA HONGWANJI MISSION OF HAWAII, AUGUST 13–15, 1963

Whereas disturbing news of religious persecution against Buddhists in South Vietnam, with that country's Government as the instigator of this great unrest, is being heard around the world reaching even this far-flung corner of the globe; and

Whereas the unrest has now reached proportions almost beyond human understanding in its viciousness, as evidenced by the cruel and inhumane atrocities inflicted upon the freedom-loving Buddhists of that country, to wit: the massacre of the followers of Lord Buddha gathered for the observation of his birth on May 8, 1963, in the Tu Dam Pagoda, in Hue, arising out of the issuance of a discriminatory Government edict prohibiting the hoisting of the Buddhist flags; and

Whereas Dictator-President Ngo Dim Diem, his elder brother, Archbishop of Hue, Ngo Dim Thuc, his younger brother and political adviser, Ngo Dim Nhu, hold unlimited control over the policies of South Vietnam, bringing about the elimination of the separation of state and church so necessary in the well-being of any freedom-loving country; and

Whereas protests and appeals from Buddhist leaders and organizations, including the Cambodian Government, have met nothing but deaf ears, while the suppression, oppression, and persecution of Buddhists are being intensified; and

Whereas Buddhism has been the religion of Vietnam for time immemorial, and 80 percent of the total population of about 15 million are Buddhists even to this day, and thus entitled to worship and to propagate their religion freely, without fear of harassment and without fear of prosecution; and

Whereas Buddhists of the world should join in a united effort to bring this matter to the attention of the freedom-loving peoples of all countries, so that the peoples of all religions may be made aware of the existence of such a dastardly situation in Vietnam, and request their support and cooperation in the eradication of this great shame: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this the 51st annual legislative assembly of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawaii decry and protest the intolerable situation existing in Vietnam, call upon the Government to desist from further persecutions and make amends in a humanitarian way for what has gone on, and restore the fundamental rights of men to the people of that country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. U Chan Htoon, president, the World Fellowship of Buddhists; Hon. U Thant, Secretary-General, United Nations; President John F. Kennedy, United States of America; Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senator, Hawaii; Hon. Hiram L. Fong, U.S. Senator, Hawaii; Hon. Spark M. Matsunaga, Congressman, Hawaii; Hon. Thomas P. Gill, Congressman, Hawaii; Lord Abbot Kosho Ohtani, Nishi Hongwanji, Kyoto, Japan, president, Japan Buddhist Association; Pope Paul VI, Vatican City, Rome, Italy; Hon. Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister, United Kingdom; President Charles de Gaulle, Paris, France; and Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Ambassador, Saigon, South Vietnam.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS OF THE NORTHWEST LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for the past several years, as Senators will recall, I have been striving, along with other Senators from the Pacific Coast area, to find some relief for the vast lumber industry of our Northwest from the severe transportation problems that are largely responsible for the threatened extinction of many segments of this important industry.

Some progress has been made in this direction—but the firm grip of the Canadian sawmills on the vast Atlantic Coast and Puerto Rican markets has only been scratched. Since October 24, when the temporary suspension of Jones Act requirements for use of U.S.-flag vessels in this trade became effective, more than 5 million board feet of lumber have been shipped from northwest mills to Puerto Rico, with indications of further sales to be consummated. Compared to the Canadian shipments to that Commonwealth, the shipments from the U.S. mills are but a small part of the total market, but they represent a sizable movement of lumber that probably would not have been possible without the permitted use of foreign vessels.

A second costly encumbrance upon the northwest lumber industry will be lifted shortly, I am confident, when the President affixes his signature to S. 1032, which I introduced, to exclude cargo which is lumber from present statutory requirements that freight rates be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission 30 days prior to their effective date. Its enactment will remove another advantage presently enjoyed by the foreign vessel operators who, unlike their U.S. counterparts, can adjust rates for lumber carriage at a moment's notice when they find it necessary to procure the cargo.

The temporary suspension of the Jones Act provision regarding lumber shipments to Puerto Rico will expire at midnight October 23. Because it has proven effective in promoting sizable lumber sales to Puerto Rico, and because I believe the Secretary of Commerce will continue to give due consideration to the interests of any U.S. carriers desirous of participating in this trade, I am sending to the desk on behalf of my colleague and myself a bill to continue the exemption granted last October for shipment of lumber to Puerto Rico when vessels of U.S. registry are not reasonably available for this service.

The bill will not disturb the existing provision that any suspension of statutory requirements for use of U.S.-flag ships to carry lumber to Puerto Rico shall terminate whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines that the conditions required for such suspension no longer exist.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "The Lumber Problem," from the Marine Digest of August 17, 1963, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE LUMBER PROBLEM

The steady loss to Canadians of Washington-Oregon-California cargo lumber markets on the U.S. Atlantic coast is shown dramatically in Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau figures for the first 6 months of 1963.

The U.S. Northwest, in the first half of 1960, shipped 510 million board feet of cargo lumber, as against the British Columbia total of 408 million.

In 1963, the half-year totals are 252 million for Oregon-Washington-California, and 558 million for British Columbia.

Reason for the alarming decline is that U.S. producers must use high-cost American-flag vessels for intercoastal shipments, while Canadians are free to charter more modern, efficient foreign carriers at a saving of some $12 per thousand board feet, according to Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president of the Western Forest Industries Association.

British Columbia has water-shipped more lumber into the U.S. Atlantic market during the past 6 months than its combined shipments to the rest of the world, McCracken said.

If action is not taken soon by Congress, McCracken added, the cargo lumber industry in Oregon and Washington will be lost. "It is a problem of critical importance to our lumbering and port communities," he said.

The first half totals since 1960:

[Millions of board feet]

	British Columbia	Oregon-Washington-California
1960	408	510
1961	429	315
1962	517	273
1963	558	252

June 1963 shipments to the U.S. Atlantic coast market were as follows: British Columbia, 91 million board feet; Washington,

> 33 million board feet; Oregon, 2.4 million board feet; and California, 0.
>
> This problem is not all one sided, but a solution is long overdue.

SOUTHWEST POWER ADMINISTRATION HAS 20TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, 20 years ago this weekend, on August 31, 1943, the Department of the Interior implemented legislation permitting the establishment of an agency to sell hydroelectric power to be generated at the Denison and Norfolk projects, which were then under construction in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas. This agency was named the Southwestern Power Administration, and Mr. Douglas G. Wright was named Administrator.

The tremendous growth of the Southwestern Power Administration during these past 20 years is a monument to the genius of Douglas Wright. He and his efficient staff associates and fellow employees of the Southwestern Power Administration are not resting on their laurels. The growth which has occurred in the first 20 years of the Southwestern Power Administration will most assuredly continue.

The first generating units at the Denison and Norfolk projects had a capacity of 35,000 kilowatts each. During the years, nine other hydroelectric projects have been incorporated into the Southwestern Power Administration marketing grid. I am advised that when unit No. 7 at the Bull Shoals project in Arkansas is put into commercial operation this month, the total installed generating capacity of Southwestern Power will amount to 836,000 kilowatts.

SPA's area of operation in the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Missouri, and Kansas has enjoyed a rapid increase in industrial activity, and the availability of electric power has been a key factor in this boom. Douglas Wright, who has presided over the sale of 18 billion kilowatt-hours of energy since 1943, expects to see eight additional hydroelectric plants within the Southwestern Power Administration network by 1969, with a total installed capacity of 1,584,500 kilowatts. This will be almost doubling within 6 years the capacity which Southwestern Power Administration has accumulated in 20 years.

Douglas Wright recently expressed his philosophy this way:

> The power industry, both public and private, has the important obligation of keeping, not abreast, but ahead of the unprecedented demands for electric power and energy which will be brought about through this rapid acceleration of industrial growth.

And Mr. Wright added that the Southwest has the greatest power potential of any area on earth and SPA will do its part to continue developing it.

The arguments which opponents of public power vociferously advanced in opposition to the establishment of the Southwestern Power Administration have long since been forgotten. Now we see throughout the Southwest the flowering of a great concept of efficiently integrated private and public power resources. Under Douglas Wright's brilliant leadership SPA has undertaken an interconnection between the Missouri and Arkansas River basins which will further extend its marketing activity through seasonal power interchanges. Up to this time, 61 percent of Southwestern Power Administration electrical energy has been marketed to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and defense installations, and 39 percent has been supplied to privately owned utilities. SPA and Doug Wright pioneered in developing multiparty contracts for the maximum utilization of power in the Southwest.

There will be no pause in the massive throb and hum of the Southwestern Power Administration's far-flung facilities to mark this 20th anniversary, so I take this occasion to pay tribute to the SPA and to the men and women of the agency and their great team captain, Douglas Wright. They can be proud, and the people of the United States can be proud, of the accomplishments in the first 20 years of SPA, and we can all look forward to a fabulous future for his dynamic organization.

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE ENDORSES COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the American Veterans Committee which completed its 20th anniversary convention on June 2, 1963, adopted a platform which expressed their wholehearted support for the principle of the cold war GI bill. They based this support on the vital service to the Nation provided by these veterans and the proven successes of the World War II and Korean GI bills. The platform declared that the men who have helped to maintain the freedom of this Nation are "entitled to basic readjustment benefits to enable them to return without distress to civilian life at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities. This support of the cold war GI bill is a specific example of the "fundamental belief" of the American Veterans Committee as expressed in its platform that the "integration of veterans into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program."

In addition the platform states the "two basic standards" which the AVC believes should be used to evaluate veterans' benefits:

> (a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors, taking account of the veterans ability and opportunity for gainful employment?
>
> (b) For all veterans who did not incur disability: Are the benefits so designed as to enable the veterans to readjust from military service to civilian life with minimum economic loss?

The cold war GI bill obviously fulfills the second of these standards. The critics of the bill often seem to approach it on the basis that it will be a giveaway whereby the veteran will be getting something for nothing.

The proven successes of the two previous GI bills are sufficient to demonstrate the fallaciousness of this argument. The goals of the cold war GI bill are the same as the results of the World War II and the Korean GI bills: to enable the veteran to readjust to civilian life and to catch up in some measure with those men who have increased their skills and experience while the veteran was serving his country for 2, 3, 4, or more years.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point section III of the platform of the American Veterans' Committee which expresses their support for the principle of the cold war GI bill.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

III. PEACETIME GI BILL OF RIGHTS

> Experience with the World War GI bill of rights has given ample evidence of the value in increased productivity to the Nation and in the increased taxes to the Government of that law's education and training provisions.
>
> American Veterans' Committee endorses a modified GI bill of rights for peacetime draftees and volunteers who have been on extended active duty. It is our belief that such men who enable our country to maintain peace and meet its commitments and responsibilities to our allies are entitled to basic readjustment benefits to enable them to return without distress to civilian life at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities.
>
> Therefore, in principle, American Veterans' Committee endorses any peacetime bill of rights which will carry out the principles hereinabove set forth and which will allow for equitable readjustment benefits to peacetime veterans.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, AND REPAIR OF BRIDGE ACROSS MOUNT HOPE BAY, R.I.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island, or its instrumentality, to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the unfinished business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The unfinished business will not come before the Senate until 2 o'clock, unless the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent that it be laid before the Senate at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. If there is no objection, I make that request.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island, or its instrumentality, to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the general statement which appears in the report No. 451, Calendar No. 427, beginning on page 1, and continuing through to the committee views on page 3, be printed at this point in the RECORD as an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1936 is to authorize the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, after it has obtained title to the Mount Hope Bridge, constructed under the authority of the act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1391), to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge in accordance wtih the laws of the State of Rhode Island applicable to such bridge, subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 84), pertaining to the construction of bridges over navigable waters.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The act approved March 3, 1927, authorized the construction of a toll bridge across Mount Hope Bay between Bristol and Portsmouth, R.I. The bridge was completed in October 1929 at a cost of about $3.9 million, and has been in operation as a toll facility since that time.

The island of Aquidneck in Narragansett Bay, which consists of the communities of Portsmouth, Newport, and Middletown, has two bridge connections with the mainland, the Mount Hope Bridge at the extreme northern point of the island, and the Sakonnet River Bridge, about 1 mile south of that point. The Sakonnet River Bridge is toll free. The Mount Hope Bridge has a one-way toll of 25 cents or a commutation toll of 10 cents.

A toll bridge across the west passage of Narragansett Bay from Saunderstown on the mainland to Conanicut Island in the bay, on which the town of Jamestown is located, was completed in 1940, and is now being operated as a toll facility. The authorizing act provided that the Jamestown Bridge would be toll free after the retirement of the revenue bonds issued for its construction, which will occur in 1964 or 1965, after which the bridge will become the property of the State and be free of tolls.

A toll ferry carries traffic across the east passage of Narragansett Bay between Jamestown and Newport.

The Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority was created by an act of the State legislature in 1954, with authority to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain bridges as toll facilities and to sell revenue bonds to finance its activities. At that time consideration was given to construction of a bridge across the east passage of Narragansett Bay between Jamestown and Newport, but it was not found to be economically feasible. In 1956, 1960, and 1963, the act creating the turnpike authority was amended, creating a new State agency with authority to take over the Jamestown Bridge and the Mount Hope Bridge, issue its revenue bonds to retire the outstanding bonds on those two bridges, and to extend and use the tolls therefrom to assist in financing the construction of a bridge from Jamestown to Newport.

Public Law 741, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 879), authorized the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, when it obtained title to the Jamestown Bridge, to combine that bridge with any other bridge, bridges, structures, or approaches, and to charge and collect tolls in accordance with State law for the use of such bridges financed by the bridge authority, and to pledge the use of the tolls collected from the combined project also in accordance with the act creating the turnpike and bridge authority. The residents of Jamestown opposed that legislation, as the continuation of tolls on the Jamestown Bridge which was almost paid for, prevented free access to the mainland from the island. The Turnpike and Bridge Authority Act was amended in May 1963 to remove the Jamestown Bridge from the authority contained in said act, which will allow the Jamestown Bridge to become toll free in a short time and permit residents of Jamestown toll-free access to the mainland.

S. 1936 will amend the Mount Hope Bridge Act, by deleting the requirement that if the bridge be taken over by any municipality or other political subdivision or subdivisions of the State of Rhode Island, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of tolls shall be adjusted so as to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid for the bridge and its approaches within 25 years from the acquisition thereof.

The bill would provide that if and when title to the bridge becomes vested in the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, the maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge shall thereafter be governed by the laws of the State of Rhode Island, subject to the terms and conditions of the act of March 23, 1906.

This action will permit the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to continue the existing tolls on the Mount Hope Bridge at the present moderate rate, making possible the financial feasibility of the construction of the Newport-Jamestown Bridge across the east passage of Narragansett Bay. The revenues from the Mount Hope Bridge that will become available to the turnpike authority will amount to approximately $400,000 annually. Without combining the income from the two facilities, Mount Hope Bridge and the proposed Newport-Jamestown Bridge, the project will not be financially possible.

The residents of Newport County are aware of the urgent need for the Newport-Jamestown Bridge, and voted overwhelmingly in favor of a referendum in 1960 which meant a continuation of tolls on the Mount Hope Bridge, which would enable the proposed bridge to be financed. If this bridge is not constructed, the present Newport-Jamestown ferry, which provides the only passage across Narragansett Bay to the western part of Rhode Island and to Connecticut and New York, must continue in operation. This ferry provides inadequate service and operates at an annual deficit of about $250,000. The residents of the area feel that the proper economic development of the southern part of Rhode Island and neighboring area of Massachusetts, is curtailed because of the inaccessibility to the island of Aquidneck from the west.

No Federal-aid highway funds were involved or are involved in the construction of the Mount Hope Bridge.

The General Bridge Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 525–533) requires that if tolls are charged for use of an interstate bridge constructed or taken over by a State or States or any political subdivision thereof, rates must be sufficient to make the bridge free of tolls within 30 years. There is no statutory requirement under either the General Bridge Act of 1946 or the act of March 23, 1906, on the regulation of tolls on intrastate bridges. Since the Mount Hope Bridge is an intrastate bridge, deletion of a requirement for a sinking fund to amortize its cost is not believed to be at variance with existing general bridge laws. The laws of the State of Rhode Island provide adequate safeguards for the regulation of tolls, and the act of March 23, 1906, and the General Bridge Act of 1946, adequately protect the interests of navigation.

Mr. PASTORE. Action on the bill will permit the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority to continue the existing tolls on the Mount Hope Bridge at the present moderate rate, making financially feasible the construction of the Newport-Jamestown Bridge across the east passage of Narragansett Bay.

I ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1936) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Mount Hope Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island", approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1391), is amended by striking out section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3. If and when title to such bridge shall become vested in the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of said State, the maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge shall thereafter be governed by the laws of the State of Rhode Island applicable to such bridge, subject, however, to the terms and conditions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am indeed glad that our bill S. 1936, authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay, subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906, has passed the Senate. It is a meritorious bill, going in an unexpected direction in this day of increasing Federal Government injection into local and State affairs, necessary to meet our mid-20th century problems.

The bill actually goes in the opposite direction and removes the Federal Government from the responsibility for supervision over various functions concerning an intrastate bridge, the Mount Hope Bay Bridge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SELECTED EXCERPTS ON 1963–64 HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE ON SUBJECT OF MEDICARE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Concurrent Resolution 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963–64 national high school debate subject of medicare, which were, in line 9, strike out "twenty-five thousand six hundred and sixty-five" and insert "fifty-one thousand three hundred and thirty"; in lines 10 and 11, strike out "ten thousand three hundred" and insert "twenty thousand six hundred"; in lines 11 and 12, strike out "fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty-five" and insert "thirty thousand seven hundred and thirty"; and to amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress relating to the 1963–1964 national high school debate subject of medicare."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand this involves a reprint of a document.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The concurrent resolution was passed by the Senate, and the House increased the number of the copies of the document involved.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now that the two Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore and Mr. Pell] have done such valiant work with respect to S. 1936, having to do with the welfare of their State, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 426.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth sentence of section 508(a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508(a)), is amended by striking out "in not to exceed 100 counties", and inserting in lieu thereof "in not to exceed 150 counties".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the bill, I believe appropriate excerpts from the report should be printed in the Record. The distinguished Senator who reported the bill is present. I wonder if he would ask to have that done.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an appropriate excerpt from the report may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 277) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill is identical to S. 2859 which was considered and passed by the Senate on June 23, 1962. The bill was also considered and reported favorably by the House Committee on Agriculture on September 19, 1962. However, this was too late in the session for it to receive consideration by the House of Representatives.

This bill would permit Federal crop insurance to be offered in 150 additional counties each year. At present expansion is limited to 100 new counties each year.

Crop insurance is offered farmers in selected counties by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. This Corporation is wholly Government-owned and provides all-risk crop insurance protection against unavoidable causes of loss.

In 1948 the crop insurance program was placed on a limited, experimental basis to gain experience and accumulate actuarial data. This was done by Congress because of the adverse experience the crop insurance program had from 1938 to 1947 when it was on a national basis. During this experimental period (1948–61) expansion to new counties has been limited. In no year during this period did the number of new counties allocated approach the 100-county limitation. The objective was the development of a sound program that could be operated on a national basis.

Although expansion in the last 14 years has been limited, the Department feels that the experience gained during this period is sufficient to justify a more rapid rate of expansion so as to provide more farmers with the protection provided under the all-risk crop insurance program.

Table I summarizes the crop insurance operation for the crop year 1963.

Table I.—*1963 crop year (estimated)*

Number of counties	1,096
Number of county programs	2,379
Number of commodities insured	20
Number of crops insured	421,000
Premiums	$28,500,000
Indemnities	$25,600,000
Loss adjustment cost	$1,050,000

In 1948, when the program was placed on a limited basis, the law provided that not more than seven commodities might be covered the first year and not more than three additional commodities each year thereafter. Table II shows the commodities now covered and the number of county programs in effect in 1963:

Table II.—*Commodities insured and number of county programs in effect in 1963*

	County programs
Apples	3
Barley	164
Beans	26
Cherries	1
Citrus	12
Combined crop	26
Corn	380
Cotton	198
Flax	85
Grain sorghum	67
Oats	168
Peaches	19
Peanuts	33
Peas	13
Potatoes	9
Raisins	7
Rice	9
Soybeans	371
Tobacco	212
Tomatoes	3
Wheat	573
Total	2,379

Crop insurance is a program under which farmers pay a premium for the protection they get against crop losses. Premiums in effect for the various crops are designed to cover loses and provide for a reasonable reserve, but not administrative costs, although some administrative costs are paid out of premium income.

The total cost of the program, including administrative expenses, since its inception in 1938, amounts to $202,061,804. Of this, $68,506,130 are the losses experienced because indemnities and other costs charged against premiums exceeded premiums.

However, for the period 1948–62 premiums exceeded indemnities and other costs paid out of premiums by $4,493,870. During this period $5,711,958 in loss adjustment costs and $3,574,569 in administrative costs were paid out of premiums.

Administrative costs (appropriated) for the entire period 1938-62 amounts to $133,555,674. Of this, $87,728,600 is chargeable to the 1948-63 period.

Table III shows complete data on the program from its inception:

TABLE III.—*Income and expenses, 1939–62*

Crop year	Number contracts in force	Program operations								Administrative cost (appropriated)	Surplus or deficit (−), including administrative cost
		Premiums (income)	Indemnities (cost)	Provision for uncollectible accounts (cost)	Income from commodity transactions	Loss adjustment cost	Administrative cost charged to program	Other net income (not distributed)	Net surplus or deficit program		
1938										$234,546	−$234,546
1939	165,775	$3,410,940	$5,601,562		−$1,418				−$2,192,040	4,351,672	−6,543,712
1940	360,596	9,155,000	13,694,264		−175,210				−4,714,474	5,650,839	−10,365,313
1941	371,390	7,096,349	18,924,481		4,182,655				−7,645,477	5,028,729	−12,674,206
1942	462,019	14,747,185	24,936,874	$93,750	1,946,845				−8,336,594	6,775,802	−15,112,396
1943	422,420	17,459,455	33,231,256	281,250	776,532				−15,276,519	6,447,732	−21,724,251
Total, 1938–43	1,782,200	51,868,929	96,388,437	375,000	6,729,404			$28,628	−38,136,476	28,489,320	−66,625,796
1944	(1)									1,708,605	−1,708,605
1945	151,341	9,273,559	23,245,858	136,938	87,000				−14,022,237	2,502,248	−16,524,485
1946	364,569	33,091,352	63,488,727	493,062	2,237,370				−28,653,067	6,210,990	−34,864,057
1947	397,931	40,648,690	35,243,844	1,353,801	3,128,432				7,179,477	6,915,911	263,566
Total, 1944–47	910,841	83,013,601	121,978,429	1,983,801	5,452,802			632,303	−34,863,524	17,337,754	−52,201,278
Total, 1938–47	2,693,041	134,882,530	218,366,866	2,358,801	12,182,206			660,931	−73,000,000	45,827,074	−118,827,074
1948	169,125	12,683,974	6,754,015	63,500	−25,937				5,840,522	4,284,468	1,556,054
1949	165,076	11,501,239	15,530,993	57,600	231,981				−3,855,373	4,010,701	−7,866,074
1950	306,685	14,103,899	12,798,839	71,600					1,233,460	4,780,354	−3,546,894
1951	343,210	19,110,633	21,338,643	194,000					−2,422,010	5,583,014	−8,005,024
1952	340,686	21,200,815	20,609,019	212,000					379,796	5,952,023	−5,572,227
1953	406,630	27,097,685	31,056,228	271,000					−4,229,543	6,706,607	−10,936,150
1954	346,887	22,654,797	28,030,713	227,000					−5,602,916	5,940,033	−11,542,949
1955	319,958	22,329,676	25,504,643	223,000		$534,232			−3,932,199	5,810,356	−9,742,555
1956	324,949	22,139,250	27,890,137	221,000		913,224	$138,254		−7,023,365	6,210,016	−13,233,381
1957	307,604	17,407,504	12,003,808	174,000		751,423			4,478,273	6,210,000	−1,731,727
1958	324,435	17,616,315	4,504,805	176,000		485,660	172,260		12,277,590	6,376,700	5,900,890
1959	339,463	18,461,773	14,137,841	185,000		710,096	400,851		3,027,985	6,376,700	−3,348,715
1960	330,448	17,796,931	10,316,173	143,000		618,012	486,306		6,233,440	6,376,700	−143,260
1961	320,292	18,149,059	16,093,470	145,000		649,311	618,821		642,457	6,561,000	−5,918,543
1962	363,760	21,867,345	23,966,775	175,000		1,050,000	1,758,077		−5,082,507	6,549,928	−11,632,435
Total, 1948–62	4,709,208	284,120,895	270,536,102	1,464,408	206,044	5,711,958	3,574,569	1,453,968	4,493,870	87,728,600	−83,234,730
Grand total, 1938–62	7,402,249	419,003,425	488,902,968	3,823,209	12,388,250	5,711,958	3,574,569	[2] 2,114,899	−68,506,130	133,555,674	−202,061,804

[1] No insurance.

[2] Includes miscellaneous income items for interest earned on premiums, nonrefundable credits, and miscellaneous prior year adjustments of premiums, indemnities, and provision for uncollectible accounts.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before the calendar is considered, may I ask the distinguished majority leader for a little more explicit statement concerning the program for next week than he gave us yesterday afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], it is the intention of the leadership to lay before the Senate at the conclusion of business today Calendar No. 434, S. 1716, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which will be the unfinished business when the Senate returns on Tuesday next after its brief meeting on next Friday. As of now, and subject to correction, that will be followed by consideration of Calendar No. 425, S. 1915, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the majority leader for this information.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a call of the calendar for consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 428.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first measure, Calendar No. 428.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1756) to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "him", to insert "on June 30, 1963,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628; 48 U.S.C. 486c) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "*: Provided,* That notwithstanding the requirements of this sentence, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to collect, or as he may determine to be justified by the special financial condition of the applicant or other unusual circumstances, to compromise or release any claim or obligation assigned to or held by him on June 30, 1963, in connection with any such agreement until such time as such claim or obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may delegate to the head of any other department or agency of the United States any of his functions, powers, and duties with respect to such collection, compromise, or release of claims or obligations as he may deem appropriate, and may authorize the redelegation of such functions, duties, and powers by the head of such department or agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

S. 1756: JUST, NEEDED LEGISLATION

Mr. BARTLETT subsequently said: Mr. President, I am pleased that today the Senate has passed S. 1756, a bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act. I introduced this measure on June 20 in behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] as well as myself. Representative RIVERS has introduced a companion measure in the other body.

S. 1756 was carefully considered and reported by the Senate Public Works Committee.

The Alaska public works program was of very great assistance to what was then the Territory of Alaska. Authorized August 24, 1949, it was extended through June 30, 1959. During this period close to $70 million was allocated across Alaska for the construction of streets, schools, water systems, and other much needed public projects.

Under the terms of the program, applicants were required to repay half the allocations over periods ranging from 20 to 30 years. Already, but 4 years from the expiration of the program, more than half the total indebtedness of over $31 million has been repaid. The repayment record of Alaska local governing bodies has been excellent.

In three cases, however, three small cases, repayment according to the original indebtedness agreement would cause severe hardship for the communities involved. These communities are Hoonah, Skagway, and Haines.

In the city of Skagway, $160,000 was spent on making street improvements. This included grading, crushed stone surfacing, and drainage facilities. The surfacing technique which was used by the firm undertaking the project was experimental and, as it turned out, faulty. Large chuckholes soon developed in the streets; the condition of the streets was worse than ever. The Alaska public works program expired before a repair contract could be entered into. Skagway is a small city of but 700 citizens. Its annual budget is but $81,000. It has barely been able to keep its streets in passable condition and does not have the money to maintain both its faulty streets and repay its share of Alaska public works funds.

In the community of Hoonah, $72,000 was spent in 1951 on a water supply project. Hoonah has a population of about 680. The annual income which Hoonah receives from its water system is not even sufficient to cover the minimum maintenance costs of the system and cannot be stretched to meet the payments due the United States. Under the terms of the Alaska Public Works Act the community is required to divert property tax revenues to pay U.S. obligations. However, for technical reasons beyond the control of the town, very little of the community's property is on tax rolls. The community is unable to pay its Alaska public works debts.

The Haines school was built by the Alaska public works program. The roof was not properly laid according to the specifications. As a result the Haines Independent School District has been forced to replace the roof at a cost of $6,000. This unforeseen and inexcusable expense has interfered with the ability of this body to meet its payments.

Through inadvertance and contrary to usual practice the act authorizing the Alaska program made no provision for the settlement of payments and indebtedness after the expiration of the program. The bill before the Senate today corrects this deficiency. It simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to collect or settle by compromise or release these three claims.

This bill was drawn up in close cooperation with the Department of the Interior, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget. All favor the enactment of this bill which is, in fact, a simple housekeeping measure.

I was pleased to sponsor the original proposal to establish the Alaska public works program. The program has now been completed. This legislation is necessary to see that the obligations existing still are handled in a businesslike manner.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 452), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1756, as amended, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, either directly or through another appropriate Federal agency, to collect or settle by compromise or release, claims of the United States against cities and other Alaska public bodies arising out of agreements entered into between the United States and such public bodies pursuant to the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628), held by him on June 30, 1963.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949, authorized a program of useful public works to assist in the development of the Territory of Alaska. Under the provisions of the act, the Administrator of General Services was authorized to construct various public works and transfer these to applicant public bodies in Alaska pursuant to agreements under which the applicant would agree to pay not less than 25 percent and not more than 75 percent of the cost of such works. The act further required that the aggregate amount to be recovered under all agreements thereunder should not be less than 50 percent of the aggregate cost of all works provided by the United States.

The act authorized the appropriation of $70 million to carry out its provisions, and included a termination date of June 30, 1955. Functions of the Administrator of General Services under the act were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 15 of 1950.

Upon appropriation of funds for carrying out the purposes of the act, in the early stages, the Territory, larger cities, and other public agencies that were in a favorable position took advantage of the provisions included therein, and planned and completed numerous projects. Some of the smaller schools and other districts were not capable of acting with such rapidity, and their programs lagged, with a resulting balance of authorization remaining near the expiration date of the act. The date for termination of the act was extended to June 30, 1959, by Public Law 498, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 483).

The act was further amended and clarified by Public Law 233, 85th Congress (71 Stat. 515), to facilitate its administration by providing expressly that the Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to convey both public and acquired lands of the United States which had been utilized in the furnishing of public works, after transfer of jurisdiction over the lands for that purpose, to purchasers of the public works. It also granted authority to the Secretary to include in conveyances a reservation of minerals and a right of reversion in case the grantee public body should fail to utilize the land for the purpose for which granted, and included provisions to validate and confirm previous conveyances in connection with the program.

The terms of the Alaska Public Works Act did not include provisions for the settlement of payments and indebtedness after the expiration of the program. This is not in accord with the usual practice of designating a Government agency to handle the housekeeping and closing-out functions of a program after its expiration. This function is now being performed by the Office of Territories, of the Department of the Interior, although Alaska is no longer a territory.

Almost all of the authorization of $70 million for the program was expended, half of which was to be repaid over periods of from 20 to 30 years. In general, the repayment record of the Alaska communities which participated in the program has been good. More than half of the total indebtedness of over $31 million has already been repaid.

In certain cases, because of the work transferred, or the unusually difficult state of the city's finances, repayment of indebtedness according to the terms of the original agreement involves a particular hardship for the community concerned. Under the existing law, the Secretary of the Interior lacks authority to deal adequately with these special situations, even though settlement or compromise of the indebtedness might clearly be the most appropriate means of final disposition. S. 1756 would permit the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and make such final settlement as he deemed justified, and to make the fullest use of Federal agencies or departments, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, having particular knowledge in connection with similar transactions.

The committee was advised that there have been three cases in the past in which disputes of payment have arisen, that could be negotiated and settled under the provisions of S. 1756. The total amount of these outstanding claims is $238,000.

AMENDMENT

The committee recommends an amendment to S. 1756, that would make its provisions applicable only for settlement of claims existing on June 30, 1963, to prevent perpetuation of the settlement authority granted by the act. Any future claims would be processed by the Attorney General of the United States.

FEDERAL COST

The three outstanding claims now pending that could be settled under the provisions of S. 1756 total $238,000.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is aware of the tremendous value of the Alaska public works program in providing community facilities to communities in the Territory and State of Alaska. As in other construction programs in Alaska, construction costs were high and local material was used wherever practicable. In several cases, however, the unexpected deterioration of the work transferred, which required heavy maintenance or replacement costs to local public bodies, created a particular hardship to meet the repayment of the indebtedness. The financial resources of many of the communities and public bodies in Alaska are extremely limited, and additional burdens placed on them are often beyond their ability to cope with. The committee believes that S. 1756, as amended, would provide adequate authority to deal with these special situations in closing out the program under the Alaska Public Works Act, and recommends its enactment.

RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, ON THE DES MOINES RIVER, IOWA

The bill (H.R. 1135) to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 453), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 1135 is to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock, and any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to by any other name shall be held to refer to such dam as the "Red Rock Dam" and to such reservoir as "Lake Red Rock."

MODIFICATION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT FOR REND LAKE, ILL.

The bill (H.R. 4823) to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 454), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 4823 is to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake Reservoir, Big Muddy River, Ill., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180, 1189), as recommended in House Document No. 541, 87th Congress, 2d session, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests for any work done by them on the project against their required reimbursement for costs allocated to water supply purposes, if such work is approved as being in accordance with the project as authorized.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Rend Lake Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962. The plan of development consists of a rolled-earth dam on Big Muddy River 103.7 miles above its mouth. The dam would be 42 feet high above the flood plain, with a reinforced concrete spillway located in the east abutment. The combined length of dam and spillway would be 8,900 feet. Outlet works through the earth section of the dam would consist of two 6- by 6-foot sluices for regulation of the pool under normal operating conditions and drawdown of the pool. The reservoir would have a capacity of 302,500 acre-feet, consisting of 111,500 acre-feet for flood control, 109,000 for water supply, 57,000 for pollution abatement, and 25,000 for siltation. As an adjunct to the project, two small impoundments would be provided on two of the upper arms of the reservoir for wildlife conservation.

A breakdown of the estimated cost of the Rend Lake Reservoir is as follows:

Lands and damages	$10, 100, 000
Relocations	9, 400, 000
Reservoirs	2, 743, 000
Dams:	
Main	6, 715, 000
Subimpoundments	865, 000
Roads, railroads, and bridges	470, 000
Recreation facilities	1, 829, 000
Buildings, grounds, and utilities	186, 000
Permanent operating equipment	$30, 000
Engineering and design	1, 781, 000
Supervision and administration	1, 381, 000
Total	35, 500, 000

The Federal Government will be repaid a sum of $6,031,000 by local interests for costs allocated to them for water supply. The project has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.4. The estimated costs for relocations includes additional costs for raising Interstate Highway 57 through the reservoir area.

The area in southern Illinois in which the Rend Lake project is located, has been an area of chronic unemployment and underemployment for many years, since the economy of the region is based primarily on coal mining, and employment in that industry has decreased a substantial amount. Agriculture has fallen behind national trends in production, and many commercial buildings in numerous towns are neglected and vacant. There has been a substantial loss of population in the Big Muddy River basin, especially among younger people. Seven of the eight counties of the basin have been classed as distressed economic areas. There is an inadequate water supply in the area, and venture capital is not available for establishment of industry.

The authorized project will provide a basic need for permanent improvement of the depressed economy of the region through the provision of water supply and recreation potentials which should lead to relief from present unemployment in the area which creates hardships to many individuals and families.

It is understood that the State of Illinois has expended, and plans to continue to expend, funds for construction of Interstate Highway 57. Part of the construction cost will be incurred by raising this route through the reservoir area. If the Department of the Army were in a position to proceed with construction of the project at this time, the additional cost of raising the highway because of the project would be borne by the Federal Government. However, the Department is not in a position, at this time, to enter into a contractual arrangement with the State of Illinois to assure Federal participation in the cost of raising the highway as required by the project. H.R. 4823 would authorize the Department of the Army to give the State credit for such expenditure, should the State proceed with the construction without such agreement.

This procedure has been followed in other instances where local interests were given credit for work done leading to accomplishment of the project prior to entry of the Federal Government into the actual construction phase. Several projects authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1960 provided that credit for work performed by local interests prior to completion of construction, could be included in their 20 percent of the project cost.

CONSTRUCTION OF BANK PROTECTION PROJECT ON THE GUYANDOT RIVER AT BARBOURSVILLE, W. VA.

The bill (H.R. 2671) authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 455), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 2671 is to authorize construction of such emergency protection works as the Chief of Engineers deems necessary to repair, restore, and prevent further erosion of the banks of the Guyandot River in the vicinity of Water Street in Barboursville, W. Va.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Barboursville, W. Va., with a 1960 population of 2,331, is located in Cabell County, on the Guyandot River about 8 miles above its confluence with the Ohio River, and immediately above the mouth of Mud River.

The Corps of Engineers has investigated a bank stabilization project at Barboursville, under the provisions of section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 653), which authorizes allotment of funds for the construction of emergency bank protection works to prevent flood damage to highways, bridge approaches, and public works, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable. Allocations are limited to $50,000 for this purpose at any single locality during any one fiscal year.

The area at Barboursville in immediate danger from caving banks of the Guyandot River is a reach about one block long of one of the main streets of the town. Slippage and erosion are beginning to undermine the paved surface along a 100-foot length of this main street, known as Water Street. The adjoining buildings, including a church, rectory, a number of private residences, and a public building upstream from the most seriously affected area, and a bridge, block store building, and a service station located immediately downstream from such area, are in danger.

The endangered portion of Water Street is vital to circulation of traffic to the central business district of the city, as an alternate thoroughfare is not reasonably available. Failure of the endangered length of Water Street would have serious consequences for the community, industry, and residential area of Barboursville.

The type of erosion occurring in this area is progressive. Part of Water Street is presently blocked off so that only one-half of its area is available for use.

Construction of a bank protection project along Water Street at Barboursville was approved by the Chief of Engineers in March of 1957 under the general authority of section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946. The project was approved subject to certain requirements of local participation and cooperation, including a cash contribution of the construction cost in excess of $50,000 Federal limitation specified in the act. The city was unable to provide the required contribution and the authority to construct the project was canceled.

The unprecedented floods of March 1963 on the Guyandot River and the active bank caving in this location caused by them, have created an emergency situation from which early relief is desired. To follow the normal survey report procedures, followed by specific congressional authorization, might extend over a period of several years, during which time the hazard to city property from bank erosion would remain.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee believes that the situation at Barboursville is of an emergency nature, and that approval of the bank protection work at Barboursville is warranted. Delay in providing the necessary protection will leave city property and a main traffic artery open to the hazards of bank caving and subject to extensive damages. The improvements appear to be urgently needed, and enactment of this legislation is recommended.

FEDERAL COST

A limitation of $150,000 on the Federal cost of the proposed project is included in H.R. 2671.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is most gratifying to receive such prompt and favorable action in the Senate on H.R. 2671. This is a most important measure to the citizens of Barboursville, W. Va., where the flooding of the Guyandot River earlier this year created a critical problem of bank erosion.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Representative KEN HECHLER, the author of the measure just passed by the Senate, for his initiative and diligence in introducing the bill and guiding it through the House of Representatives. I am pleased to have been able to expedite its progress in the Senate Committee on Public Works, where I serve as ranking subcommittee chairman. As a result of this prompt congressional action on the bill, we are hopeful that the project will be included in the current appropriations bill and construction will proceed in the near future.

DESIGNATION OF McGEE BEND DAM AND RESERVOIR AS THE SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TEX.

The bill (H.R. 7594) to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 456), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7594 is to change the name of the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 10), to the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir, in honor of the late Sam Rayburn, a Member of Congress from Texas and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to under any other name or designation shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the "Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir."

APPRECIATION OF CONGRESS TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS FOR ITS SERVICES TO THE NATION

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 179) extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its services to the Nation was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 457), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 179 is to express the appreciation of the Congress of the United States for the service rendered by the American Association of State Highway Officials for 50 years' service in development and operation of a nationwide highway transportation system. It also provides that two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be designated as a special committee of the Congress to deliver a copy of the resolution to the 50th annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials to be held in Atlanta, Ga., the city of its origin, in December 1964.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The American Association of State Highway Officials was organized in November 1914, after several State highway officials met in Atlanta, Ga., for that purpose, with the object of cooperating with each other and with the Federal Government in the exchange of ideas on road building.

At the meeting in Atlanta, a request was made by 18 highway engineers and commissioners representing 16 States, to the then existing highway departments, to meet in Washington, D.C., in December 1914, for the express purpose of officially starting the American Association of State Highway Officials. At that time all the States did not have highway or road departments. As a result of the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, a highway department was created in every State.

The American Association of State Highway Officials was organized at the Washington, D.C., meeting, for the purpose of providing mutual cooperation and assistance to the State highway departments and the Federal Government, as well as for the discussion of legislative, economic, and technical matters pertaining to the administration and operation of the road program.

In the period immediately prior to World War I, highway officials felt the need for Federal aid in financing highways and insuring that there would be a continuity of highway routing and construction across State boundaries. From its early inception, AASHO has played a prominent part in the road development of the United States.

Through the years, the association has been one of the leaders in recognizing the need for an adequate highway system to serve all of the people. Through extensive research activities it has kept the highway departments of this Nation in the lead in development of specifications and standards for construction and maintenance of all types of highways.

Throughout the life of the association, testimony by its officials and other members before the various committees of the Congress has been very helpful in furthering the development of the highway program in this country.

The association has been instrumental in the development of a uniform nationwide numbering, marking, and sign system for our Federal highways, including the Interstate System. The Federal-Aid Highway Act approved June 25, 1956, required the adoption of geometric and construction standards for the Interstate System. These required standards were adopted by AASHO on July 12, 1956, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce on July 17, 1956.

The accomplishments of AASHO in cooperation and coordination between the many facets of the highway industry, the planners, the builders, the suppliers, and others, have returned vast dividends to the Nation in construction of a truly national highway system unsurpassed in the world, and keeping such system abreast of the rapidly increasing traffic demands of a growing population and economy.

In December 1964, AASHO will observe its 50th anniversary at the annual meeting in Atlanta, Ga. A similar resolution was adopted by the Congress on July 5, 1939, recognizing AASHO's contribution to highway development, and a delegation was sent to its annual meeting.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NONREIMBURSABLE COST OF CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 46) to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "betterment", to insert "and water conservation"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all costs heretofore or hereafter incurred from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation and costs transferred to it for: (1) investigations and surveys of potential projects, divisions of projects, or rehabilitation and betterment and water conservation requirements of existing projects; (2) studies relating to the comprehensive plan of development of the Missouri River Basin; and (3) general engineering and research studies shall be nonreimbursable, except for costs incurred in connection with projects or divisions of projects and rehabilitation and betterment work authorized prior to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 460), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

The Reclamation Act of 1902 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to make examinations and surveys of potential reclamation projects. The purpose of these studies is to obtain data on the land and water resources of the West from which projects can be selected for construction as the need arises.

This process is still going on, and the objective of the current investigation program is to provide Congress with the information it needs to evaluate the merits of potential developments.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the only Federal agency in the water resource development field required by law to charge the cost of preauthorization studies as a reimbursable item. The costs of all such investigations under the Corps of Engineers are nonreimbursable.

Similarly, the Department of Agriculture, in developing plans for watershed improvement and in providing financial assistance in carrying out those plans, consider investigation costs as part of the Federal participation in the program. These costs are not charged to the project beneficiaries.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare carries out extensive investigations of water quality and pollution control that are undertaken entirely at Federal expense.

AMENDMENT OF INDIAN LONG-TERM LEASING ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 48) to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act, which has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "grazing," to strike out "purposes." and insert "purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, but no lease shall be executed under this section for purposes that are subject to the laws governing mining leases of Indian lands."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Any restricted Indian lands, whether tribally or individually owned, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, farming, or grazing purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, but no lease shall be executed under this section for purposes that are subject to the laws governing mining leases of Indian lands. The term of a grazing lease or a farming lease that does not require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land shall not exceed ten years. The term of a farming lease that requires the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land shall not exceed twenty-five years. The term of any other lease shall not exceed fifty-five years, except leases of land on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation, the Dania Reservation, the Southern Ute Reservation, and the Navajo Reservation which may be for a term of not to exceed ninety-nine years. No lease shall contain an option to renew which extends the term beyond the maximum term permitted by this Act. The Secretary of the Interior shall not approve any lease with a term that is longer than is necessary in his judgment to obtain maximum economic benefits for the Indian owners."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 461), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The primary purpose of S. 48, as amended, is to amend section 1 of the 1955 Indian Leasing Act (69 Stat. 539) relating to leases of individual and tribal lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, and business purposes by increasing the maximum term of such leases from 50 to 55 years.

The Senate report on S. 34, a bill that became Public Law 255, 84th Congress, the Long-Term Leasing Act, explained the need for such legislation in the following terms:

"The bill, as reported, would permit the Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the United States to lease their lands for a period of 25 years with the approval of the Secretary, for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases. In addition, these lands could be leased for farming purposes which require the making of substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the production of specialized crops. The bill in section 2 would also authorize leasing of restricted lands of deceased Indians for the benefit of their heirs or devisees.

"In general, the laws now governing the leasing of restricted Indian lands preclude leasing for periods of longer than 5 years. The absence of authority for long-term leases discriminates against Indians who own restricted lands that are suitable for the location of business establishments, residential subdivisions, summer homes, airports, or for other purposes that require a substantial outlay of capital by the prospective lessee. It also penalizes Indian owners of raw but potentially valuable farmlands on which the cost of subjugation is too great for the Indian himself to finance. In such cases, prospective lessees are willing to undertake these expensive improvements only if guaranteed tenure by a long-term lease.

"Because of existing limitations upon the duration of leases, many Indian lands which could be profitably utilized under long-term leases are idle, and the Indians are deprived of much-needed income. Other lands that are leased for shorter periods would bring much higher rentals to the Indians if the lands could be leased on a long-term basis. Enactment of S. 34 will remove these unfair restrictions."

NEED

In the interim since enactment of Public Law 255, there have arisen several instances where the 50-year maximum leasing period was inadequate for the proper development of resources. To meet the special needs of the Palm Springs Indians, the Navajo Tribe, and the Dania, Southern Ute, and Colorado River Reservations, Congress has granted 99-year lease authority.

The minimum unexpired lease period for a construction or a development loan under the National Housing Act, the Federal Reserve Act, and the policies of most insurance companies, is 50 years from the date the mortgage is executed. The present Indian long-term leasing law permits the equivalent of a 50-year lease (25-year initial term plus an option to renew for 25 years). Extending that period to 55 years will give enough time to complete financial arrangements for development before the unexpired term of the lease is reduced to less than 50 years.

This represents a relatively minor change from a 50-year maximum to a 55-year maximum, but the effect on financing improvements will be great.

Although many financial institutions prefer to base loans on a 99-year lease, the committee believes that 99-year-lease authority should be handled through separate legislation on a case-by-case basis.

In addition to the 55-year-lease authority, the bill makes the following changes in the present law:

1. The bill covers all farming leases. The present 1955 act covers only farming leases that involve the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land. Other farming leases are governed by other provisions of law, which in general provide for 5-year leases of dry farmland and 10-year leases of irrigable farmland. The 1955 act is broadened to cover all types of farming leases.

2. The bill omits the reference in the present law to the production of specialized crops because the reference is ambiguous, but it retains the basic provision about substantial investments in the improvement of the land.

AMENDMENT

The bill as introduced omitted the language of the present law to the effect that business leases may include the "development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases." The Department of the Interior suggested that it would be desirable to retain this language, but to clarify it by a statement that the authority to lease land for the development or utilization of natural resources does not extend to leases for purposes that are subject to the Indian mineral leasing laws.

Two additional amendments recommended by the Interior Department relating to 35-year farming leases and additional authority to lease lands in heirship status were not adopted. The committee is convinced that authority contained in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745) is adequate for the purpose of leasing heirship tracts. Where longer term farming leases are needed, legislation should be submitted on a case-by-case basis.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1868) to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CORRECTION OF LAND DESCRIPTION IN THE ACT EXCHANGING LAND BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTHERN UTE INDIAN TRIBE

The bill (H.R. 5883) to correct a land description in the act entitled "To Provide for an Exchange of Lands Between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for Other Purposes," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 463) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5883 is to correct an error in the description of the Southern Ute Indian tribal land transferred to the United

States under the act of October 15, 1962, for use in connection with the Navajo Dam and Reservoir project.

NEED

The error consisted of the insertion of an excess comma in a description that was intended to cover one tract of land. The comma broke the description into two portions and made it cover two tracts that are different from the one intended. One of the two tracts (a half section) is not owned by the Southern Ute Tribe and could not properly be included in the exchange. Part of the other tract, although owned by the tribe, is not needed by the United States.

CANCELLATION OF IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST NON-INDIAN-OWNED LANDS, WIND RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT

The bill (H.R. 6710) to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 464), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 6710 is to grant congressional approval, in accordance with the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389–389e), to an order by the Secretary of the Interior canceling certain irrigation charges on 80 acres of land against Clarence R. Jacobson, a non-Indian landowner on the Wind River Indian irrigation project in Wyoming.

NEED

In 1919, Mr. Jacobson purchased this land, with a water right for 80 irrigable acres. Because of adverse physical and geological conditions the land was not susceptible to irrigation. Therefore, Mr. Jacobson did not pay the charges. By 1951 the delinquent charges and interest amounted to $3,466.58. Lengthy investigations and negotiations resulted in a compromise whereby Mr. Jacobson paid a portion of the delinquent charges, $2,331.59, and the Secretary of the Interior canceled the remaining $1,134.99 of the original charges in accordance with the act of June 22, 1936, which, however, also requires congressional approval before the order becomes effective.

COST

No expenditure of Federal funds is involved in this legislation.

ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS OF LAND IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The bill (H.R. 3887) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountain National Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 465), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3887 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of approximately 525 acres of land from the State of North Carolina. The land will be utilized for a scenic roadway entrance to the Cataloochee area of the Great Smokies National Park in North Carolina.

H.R. 3887 was introduced following receipt of an executive communication requesting that this be done.

WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS AT CHOCOLATE MOUNTAIN AERIAL GUNNERY RANGE, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H.R. 5222) to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 466), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5222 is to withdraw from the public domain 132,572 acres of land in Imperial County, Calif., and reserve them for the continued use of the Department of the Navy as part of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range.

EXPLANATION

H.R. 5222 describes the southern portion of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, which has been used by the Department of the Navy since 1943. The public lands in the northern portion of the range were withdrawn from all forms of appropriation and fee title acquired to the privately owned lands in the northern portion. A permit for the use of the 132,572 acres of public lands in the southern portion of the range was issued in 1950 for the duration of the then existing unlimited national emergency, with leases continued on the 119,554 acres of privately owned land comprising the balance of the 252,126-acre southern portion of the Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range described in H.R. 5222.

Following termination of the emergency period in 1952, an application was made to the Department of the Interior in 1953 for the withdrawal and reservation of the 132,572 acres of public land involved in H.R. 5222. Before the withdrawal was completed, the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27) became effective. It provides, among other things, that no withdrawal of more than 5,000 acres may be accomplished except by act of Congress.

During consideration of the bill, which was submitted as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1963, Navy witnesses demonstrated to the committee's full satisfaction the military need for use of the lands involved.

The proposed withdrawal and reservation will be for a period of 5 years with an option to renew for an additional 5 years. This assures a review by the administrative agencies involved 5 years from now and a further review at the end of 10 years. If the Department of the Navy desires to extend its use beyond this term, it will have to request further legislative action, thereby assuring congressional scrutiny of the necessity for such continued use.

COST

Enactment of H.R. 5222 will cause no increase in the budgetary requirements at this time. Additional funds may be required when military use of the property ends for decontamination. The amount likely to be required cannot be determined at this time.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS IN RESPECT TO LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL TO THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) to express the sense of Congress in respect to the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest, was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 467), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 61 is to state the policy of the Congress with respect to, and thereby to encourage, the preservation and marking of the route followed by Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark in their exploratory trip of 1804–06.

House Concurrent Resolution 61 was introduced by Congressman KYL. Companion measures were introduced in the Senate by Senators BURDICK and MILLER.

BACKGROUND

The Lewis and Clark Expendition, commissioned by President Jefferson, was the last of the series of great North American transcontinental explorations that began with the Spanish in the first half of the 16th century. On May 14, 1804, 2 months after formal cession of the area embraced within the Louisiana Purchase, Lewis and Clark set off from St. Louis on their trip up the Missouri. Five and a half months later they reached Mandan, N. Dak., where they went into winter quarters. From there they departed on April 9, 1805, reaching the mouth of the Marias River on June 4, Great Falls on June 13, Three Forks on July 25, Shoshone Cove on August 10, Lemhi Pass on August 12, the Salmon Valley on August 29, the Bitterroot Valley on September 4, Lolo Pass on September 12, the Clearwater Valley on September 18, the Snake River on October 10, the Columbia River on October 16, the Cascade Mountains on October 22, tidewater on November 2, and the Pacific on November 15, 1805.

The importance of this trip in American history cannot be overestimated. Fortunately, as the data reproduced in the appendix to the House report (No. 293) indicate, there are very large acreages along the route followed by Lewis and Clark that are in the ownership of the United States, the States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, and their political subdivisions. It will thus be relatively easy for almost the full route to be marked out and preserved for the public. Adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 61 will, it is hoped, encourage this worthy end.

COST

Enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 61 will result in no increase in the Federal budget.

SELECTION OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF COMMUNITIES, STATE OF ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6118) to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "section", to strike out "six hundred and forty" and insert "one hundred and sixty".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ALASKA STATEHOOD ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. BARTLETT subsequently said: Mr. President, last week the House passed H.R. 6118. This bill is a companion to S. 1374, introduced in the Senate by my colleague from Alaska and me, to amend subsection 6(g) of the Alaska Statehood Act. The Senate Public Lands Subcommittee held hearings on S. 1374 while the House did the same on H.R. 6118. The House then passed H.R. 6118 with an amendment.

I urged the Senate committee to halt consideration of S. 1374 and to report out H.R. 6118, but to make a small change in the House-passed version. I am gratified that the Senate committee did adopt the change I proposed.

As introduced, H.R. 6118 would have removed the present restriction from State selections of land, granted under subsection 6(a) of the Statehood Act, that they include at least 5,760 acres. The House Interior Committee, in its wisdom, recognized that to enact the bill in its original form would allow the State to make selections of infinitesimal size. While the State would, in all probability, not desire to make a large number of very small selections, it was felt some safeguard should be placed in the bill to protect the Bureau of Land Management from an overburden of work in surveying the selections. The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for surveying the exterior boundaries of all State selections. The House committee decided upon a 640-acre minimum and so amended H.R. 6118. It is my information, however, that the House committee did not have the benefit of the views of the State or of the Federal departments concerned with the legislation before arriving at the 640-acre figure. Between the date the House Interior Committee reported the amended version of H.R. 6118 and the date it was referred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was able to obtain a letter from the State and to make informal contact with the Interior Department and the Forest Service to get their comments on the proposed change.

The State expressed an immediate appreciation for the concern of the House committee as to the establishment of a minimum size of selection. In answer to that concern, it recommended a 160-acre figure. This figure was reached after consultation with representatives of the Forest Service in Alaska. It was agreed that selections as large as 640 acres would involve the same types of land waste problems as the original 5,760-acre requirement. This would be especially true in the national forest lands of southeastern Alaska. I have confirmed the position of the Forest Service on the State-recommended figure through contact with officials here in Washington. As a matter of fact, they would prefer the bill as introduced with no limitation and, while they would not oppose the House version of H.R. 6118, they desire the smallest minimum possible.

As for the Department of the Interior, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a letter sent to the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee expressing its views.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1963.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: With respect to S. 1374, a bill "To amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities," we have been requested today by telephone to inform your Subcommittee of our views on an amendment thereof, envisaging minimum community site selections of 160 acres.

In our report to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on S. 1374, we stated that we would not object to total deletion of the minimum acreage requirement of 5,760 acres for community sites.

We believe that 160 acres is a reasonable minimum acreage for a community site and, accordingly, would have no objection thereto.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, enactment of H.R. 6118 as reported by the Senate Interior Committee will allow the State of Alaska to get on with its community development program which has been delayed considerably, first by administrative attempts to discover whether the 5,760-acre minimum applied to community grant selections and, secondly by congressional consideration of H.R. 6118. I am hopeful the House will be able to accept the Senate changes to H.R. 6118 and that my remarks will be of some assistance in stating the need for a smaller minimum selection than that passed by the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 468), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 6118 would amend the Alaska Statehood Act (72 Stat. 339; Public Law 85-508) to provide that the State may exercise its right of selection of certain Federal lands for community expansion purposes in tracts of not less than 160 acres. At present, under a formal Department of the Interior ruling (A-29314, dated Oct. 30, 1962), the State's selections under the statehood act for community purposes are required to be in blocks of not less than 5,760 acres unless the State can show that a desired area of lesser acreage is in fact an isolated tract.

The committee received evidence that blocks of 5,760 acres were in many cases unnecessary for community expansion purposes, and well might prove an unsound utilization of publicly owned lands, especially in the national forests. Also, with the amount of land authorized for community expansion purposes by the statehood act limited to 800,000 acres, the requirement for selection in 5,760-acre blocks may well inhibit community development in rapidly growing Alaska.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

As introduced, S. 1374 and H.R. 6118 would have removed any minimum acreage requirement whatever from Alaska's selections under the community development grants in the statehood bill (sec. 6). The Interior Department interposed no objection to the bill in this form, and the Agriculture Department affirmatively supported it. However, in both the House and Senate the need for some sort of reasonable limitation in the interest of good administration and sound management was urged. The House amended the bill to establish this minimum at a section of land—640 acres. During executive consideration of H.R. 6118 by the Senate committee, evidence was submitted showing that this amount was unnecessarily large. An example was cited of a small community in a national forest which needed additional land on which to build an airfield. Six hundred and forty acres was far more than was needed for this purpose, and acquisition by the municipality of that amount from the forest would result in a certain amount of wastage and administrative complication. Therefore, the Senate committee decided upon the quarter section, or 160 acres, as set forth in its amendment. This figure has the approval of both the Bureau of Land Management and of the Forest Service as well as that of the State of Alaska.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK, N. MEX.

The bill (S. 1175) to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Carlsbad Caverns National Park situated in the State of New Mexico shall consist of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: south half section 35; section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: sections 25 to 29, inclusive; sections 31 to 36, inclusive.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: south half southeast quarter section 19; south half south half section 20; south half south half section 21; southwest quarter southwest quarter section 26; sections 27 to 33; inclusive; west half section 34; northwest quarter northeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 22 east: sections 24, 25, 35, and 36.

Township 25 south, range 23 east: sections 1 to 33, inclusive; northwest quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: north half section 1; west half section 2; northeast quarter section 2; sections 3 to 8, inclusive; west half section 9; northeast quarter section 9; northwest quarter section 10; west half section 17; northeast quarter section 17; section 18; northwest quarter section 19.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: north half section 5; north half section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: north half section 1; west half southwest quarter section 1; section 2; section 11; west half west half section 12; northwest quarter section 14.

Township 26 south, range 23 east: northwest quarter section 6.

All of which contains 46,786.11 acres, more or less.

And the tract of land, including Rattlesnake Springs, lying in section 23, township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, acquired by the United States for water right purposes by warranty deed dated January 23, 1934, recorded in Eddy County, New Mexico, records in deed book 64 on page 97, containing 79.87 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of acquiring the State-owned lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, consisting of 2,721.12 acres, and described as follows:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
NEW MEXICO

Township 24, south, range 23 east: section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: section 32.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: section 32.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half north half, southwest quarter section 2.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half section 2, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary or are in the public interest, including the reservation of surface rights-of-way across Federal lands situated in township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, for the construction of roads and utility lines between park headquarters and Rattlesnake Springs, exchange the following described 2,719.80 acres of public land of approximately equal value:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 25 east: southeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: south half section 1; west half section 11; west half section 14; section 15; southeast quarter section 17.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: south half section 5; lot 6, northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: west half west half section 13; north half northeast quarter section 14.

(b) For the purpose of acquiring the private lands or interests in lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary, exchange on an approximately equal value basis any of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
NEW MEXICO

Township 25 south, range 24 east: southeast quarter section 9; south half, northeast quarter section 10.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half, south half northeast quarter section 14.

(c) Notwithstanding section 2(a) of this Act, when an exchange involves lands in section 32, township 24 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, which the State of New Mexico has leased, the Secretary may compensate a lessee for the reasonable value of his improvements to the lands. Reasonable value shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior by obtaining an impartial appraisal.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to convey to the State of New Mexico a right-of-way over lands between the western boundary of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 24 south, range 25 east, and the vicinity of the caverns for the use of the State in constructing a park-type road for public use thereon: *Provided,* That the State may construct a road which shall meet the general standards of National Park Service roads and shall agree to reconvey its interests in such lands and any improvements thereon, without cost to the United States, upon completion of such road. The location of the road shall be determined by the Secretary, after consultation with officials of the State of New Mexico.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 5. Section 4 of the Act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 279; 16 U.S.C. 407c), is repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 469), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred S. 1175 to revise the boundaries of Carlsbad Caverns National Park, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

The Carlsbad Caverns National Park in New Mexico has become one of the most popular national parks in the Nation. It had 556,000 visitors in 1962. It stands third among all park units in revenues collected, being surpassed only by Yellowstone National Park and Yosemite National Park. In the 1962 fiscal year more than $547,000 in guide fees, concession, and miscellaneous payments were turned into the Treasury from the Carlsbad operations.

S. 1175 is intended to revise the boundaries of the park to make a net reduction of 1,815.57 acres, permit the exchange of lands with the State of New Mexico and private individuals, and facilitate the administration and protection of the area.

A total of 4,497.5 acres will be excluded that are within the present boundaries. Of this total, 2,719.8 acres will be exchanged for 2,721.12 acres of State lands which will remain or be included in the park. The measure authorizes acquisition of another 640 acres of private inholdings by exchange.

The lands being eliminated from the park are flat lands below the escarpments, of no park or scientific value. They include Federal rangelands, 800 acres of State land, and 80 acres of private land.

The lands to be added include acreage on the periphery needed to bring a park road entirely within the boundaries and to permit protection of scenic values.

COST

In addition to the exchanges of State and private lands authorized, which will not require funding, the bill authorizes the Park Service to pay the owner of certain improvements on State land which will come into Federal possession the reasonable value of those improvements. The estimated value is $300.

CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF MICHAUD FLATS IRRIGATION PROJECT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1582) to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (88 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "land.", to strike out "The Secretary may execute a contract on behalf of any Indian who is a minor, or who is deemed by the Secretary to be in need of assistance in managing his affairs, or who, after reasonable search, cannot be located." and insert "The Secretary may execute a contract on behalf of any Indian (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project in the State of Idaho, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute a contract required by subsection (b) of this section on behalf of any Indian who owns an undivided trust or restricted interest in a tract of land when the contract has been signed by or on behalf of the holders of a majority interest in the land. The Secretary may execute a contract on behalf of any Indian (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 470), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1582, as amended, is to amend section 3 of the act of August 31, 1954, providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project, Idaho, by adding a new subsection (c) to facilitate the execution of contracts for the delivery of water to individual Indian allotments.

NEED

Under the 1954 act it was provided that prior to the undertaking of construction, a contract or other arrangement must be made with respect to a water supply for the Michaud division lands. Much of the land included in the Michaud Flats irrigation project are Indian lands. The contract requirements with respect to tribal lands of the Bannock-Shoshone Tribe have been satisfied by a tribal resolution and ordinance.

With respect to allotted lands, however, both the consent requirement and the limitation of water-supply requirements call for a contractual agreement of the landowners. Contract forms have been prepared and many of them signed by non-Indian landowners. Difficulty has been experienced, however, in obtaining the signatures of all landowners of Indian allotments. This is due mostly to the fractionated heirship status of the land and the difficulty of procuring the addresses of minority interest landowners. Many of these heirs are scattered throughout the United States.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract on behalf of any Indian holding an individual interest in trust or restricted land where the contract has been signed by or on behalf of a majority of the interests in the land. The Secretary may also execute the contract on behalf of any Indian who is a minor, who has been adjudicated non compos mentos, whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 3306) to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

COMPROMISE AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT OF THE NAVAJO TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas lease unto pursuant to the agreement, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Oil", to insert "& Refining"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the agreement entered into by the Navajo Indian Tribe, Shell Oil Company (a corporation), and Humble Oil & Refining Company (a corporation), dated May 1, 1959, as amended by subsequent agreements dated September 14, 1960, November 7, 1962, and January 7, 1963, respectively, and on file with the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby approved, such agreement having been entered into for the purpose of compromising and settling, among such tribe and corporations, certain matters arising out of disputed title claims between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the State of Utah to the oil and gas rights in section 16, township, 40 south, range 24 east, Salt Lake meridian, and in section 16, township 40 south, range 26 east, Salt Lake meridian, both in San Juan County, Utah.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Navajo Tribe of Indians is hereby authorized to lease, in accordance with the undertakings of such tribe in the aforementioned agreement, as amended, any interests which it might have or hereafter acquire in those lands described in the first section of this Act, and the Secretary of the Interior shall approve any lease so made.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress of the validity or invalidity of the respective claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe and the State of Utah to the lands described in the first section of this Act, and the determination of such conflicting claims shall be unaffected by anything in this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 472), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 912, as amended, is to give approval to an agreement between the Navajo Tribe, the Shell Oil Co., and the Humble Oil & Refining Co., dated May 1, 1959, as amended. The bill also authorizes the tribe to enter into an oil and gas lease with the two companies in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

NEED

The Navajo Tribe and the State of Utah each claim title to two sections of land in Utah which were leased to the two oil companies by the State in 1952 and 1953. The oil companies began production in 1957 and 1958, and, at about this period, learned of the Navajo claim to the land. The claims have not been settled by the Secretary of the Interior.

On May 1, 1959, the oil companies entered into an agreement with the tribe which provided that:

1. If the tribe's title is established, the oil companies will pay to the tribe 12½ percent royalty on all production after April 30, 1959, plus 4⅙ percent royalty on all production after the date the tribe's title is established.
2. The oil companies and the tribe will enter into a new lease on the standard tribal form, providing for a 16⅔-percent royalty thereafter.
3. The tribe will look solely to the State of Utah for recovery of any rents, bonuses, or royalties which accrued before May 1, 1959.
4. The oil companies will maintain a neutral position in the title dispute between the tribe and the State.
5. The parties will seek congressional approval of the agreement.

On June 3 and 4, 1959, the two State leases were amended to provide that if the tribe establishes its title to the land the State will repay to the oil companies the full amount of the royalties paid under the leases, beginning with royalties paid for May 1959 production. The oil companies agreed to forego any right they might have to suspend payment or to pay the royalties into escrow.

The royalties paid by the two oil companies to the State for the period preceding May 1, 1959, were approximately $234,015, according to affidavits filed in connection with the pending appeal regarding title to the land. The amount of any rents or bonuses that may have been paid by the two oil companies or their predecessors is not known.

AMENDMENT

The committee adopted a perfecting amendment recommended by the Department of the Interior in its report.

ADULT INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 438, S. 1868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1868) to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for holding this particular measure to the last is that there is involved a $5 million authorization. The bill was reported from the committee unanimously. It meets with the approval of the minority leadership. I ask that it be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," approved August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act the sum of $12,000,000 for each fiscal year, and not to exceed $1,500,000 of such sum shall be available for administrative purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 462), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1868 is to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended by the act of September 22, 1961 (75 Stat. 571, 25 U.S.C. 309), entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the program from $7,500,000 to $12 million annually and by increasing the portion of this amount that may be used for administering the program from $1 million to $1,500,000.

BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

Although the Indian vocational training program has been in operation less than 7 years, it has become a most effective tool for equipping American Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 with salable work skills. In its report on S. 3416, 84th Congress, the bill that became Public Law 959, this committee made the following observations in connection with the need for Indian vocational education:

"The American Indian's standard of living today is below that of the general population. S. 3416 is an attempt to do something constructive about this problem. With the Indian's average income below that of his non-Indian neighbors, there is a consequent drop in living standards. One of the major problems faced by Indians is that reservation resources are inadequate to support the increasing population at a reasonable standard of living. Additional land might solve this problem for a short while, but it would not be the permanent solution, for with the increasing birth rate, the present situation would develop again in the future. Because of the lower standard of living on the reservation, the Indian is turning more and more to wagework off the reservation. Being unskilled in any trade, the Indian usually works as a laborer at lower wages. Low wages, in turn, create problems of poor health, housing, clothing, food, and sanitation.

"Laborers are fast disappearing from the labor scene, while semiskilled and skilled workers are in demand. The Indian represents a valuable source from which to fill that need. This increasing demand for skilled workers has been recognized by Federal and State Governments with appropriations for vocational training rising from $3,039,061.15 in 1918 to $164,761,217.75 in 1955. S. 3416 would extend this training to Indians who cannot take advantage of vocational programs because of the remote location of most reservations.

"For many years people have been prone to consider the Indian as an agriculturist, but actually there has been a changing pattern in effect brought about by the inadequate resources on the reservations to support the population and the desire of many Indians to follow some other kind of work. A study of the work experience of 301 Indians from 1946 through June 30, 1952, indicates that 220 were engaged in agricultural occupations and 23 in construction work in 1946. The year 1952 found 34 in agricultural occupation and 128 engaged in construction work of some kind.

"The training program contemplated by this bill will have two purposes. First, it should be of great value in preparing and orienting participants in the Indian relocation program, and second, it should stimulate industries to locate near Indian reservations. Although the relocation program is of recent creation, it appears obvious that since the marginal reservations cannot support their growing populations, it is imperative that some of the tribal members be equipped with vocational skills which will encourage them to seek employment elsewhere.

"The program envisioned in S. 3416 would be of direct benefit, not only to the individual Indian, but to the Nation. The Indian trained under this program would command a higher salary and be able to adequately support his family at a decent standard of living. In turn, individual Indians would cost the Federal Government less in special services and begin paying higher income tax, thereby beginning a circle. As the individuals began supporting themselves, and paying taxes, the Federal Government would be training others. Another point to be considered is that for every individual Indian trained and earning a good living, the Government will not have to support his children, whereas if he remains on the reservation as at present, the Government would be required to give him, and later his children, special services."

NEED

The number of Indians who are qualified and wish to participate in the program greatly exceeds the number for which funds are available. As of November 30, 1962, there were 1,283 individuals in training. There were 346 applicants waiting on registers at the various training destinations, and 624 applications were in process at various reservations. If the additional funds authorized by S. 1868 are made available, many more applications are expected. The increase in funds resulting from legislation enacted by the 87th Congress has proved inadequate due to the increasing popularity of the program with young Indian people. Also, increased costs of institutional training have reduced the number of Indian participants in training.

The Department of the Interior estimates that, on the basis of present costs, an appropriation of $7,500,000 can be expected to finance the cost of 2,470 institutional training units and 1,370 on-the-job training units (in varying stages of training), during 1 fiscal year. An appropriation of $12 million would increase the number of training units to 3,906 institutional training units and 1,500 on-the-job training units.

The Department of the Interior informed the committee that it expects to request approximately one-third of the increased funds made available by this legislation in each of the next 3 fiscal years.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Did I correctly understand that Calendar No. 425, Senate bill 1915, is being considered by the policy committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be considered by the policy committee. In response to the question raised by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I announced that the pending business on Tuesday would be Senate bill 1716, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and that possibly, following action on that bill, S. 1915, the so-called dairy bill, in which the Senator from Wisconsin has such long abiding and intense interest, may be the next order of business.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much. This dairy bill is vitally important to Wisconsin as the Nation's dairyland; but I want to serve notice on my colleagues that it is of important and substantial benefit to virtually all of the 50 States. Milk is the No. 1 cash farm crop in America. Passage of this bill can put dairy farm income on the road to recovery and cut the cost of the farm program at the same time.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the serious problems confronting the country and the Nation today has to do with the President's civil rights proposals. Today in Washington a large number of American citizens, said to be in the neighborhood of 100,000, are demonstrating. Yet in connection with the President's proposals for civil rights—which I strongly support—it is important to appreciate that unemployment is one of the greatest present difficulties in the way of a successful granting to our Negro citizens of their civil rights.

The invitation which has been received by all Senators to view the demonstration this afternoon contains on its face a request that we appear "to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom."

At the very heart of the discrimination against our Negro citizens is their inability to obtain their fair share of jobs. Therefore, a number of the measures dealing with unemployment are of great importance in the area of assuring equal opportunity to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color.

In this morning's New York Times appears a thoughtful and provocative article by the well-known columnist, James Reston, pointing out, among other things, the importance of the job implications in connection with civil rights. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this column may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1963]

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN AND ALL THAT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 27.—The reaction of the white or northwest section of Washington to this week's big Negro demonstration is mainly one of annoyance. For a whole day, inhabitants of this privileged sanctuary won't be able to buy a drink at a bar, or get a taxi downtown, or count on the colored cook coming in for dinner. Think of the white man's burden.

The white folks in the Capital have always been annoyed by resident or visiting petitioners. Though the right to petition a government for redress of grievances was granted by King John to his barons in Magna Carta and guaranteed to all Americans in the first amendment on December 15, 1791, Congress has usually been irritated whenever large numbers of their fellow citizens showed up to protest.

In 1836, the House of Representatives even adopted a gag rule to the effect "that no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House or entertained in any way whatever."

Later, under the leadership of Congressman John Quincy Adams, this was repealed, but the leaders of Coxey's unemployment marchers were arrested anyway for walking on the grass, and this stubborn resentment against complaining demonstrators still exists.

JOBS AND FREEDOM

The fact that annoyance is still the white resident's principal reaction to the march here indicates the extent of the gap between white and Negro thinking—this in a city that is 53 percent Negro and whose public schools are almost 85 percent Negro.

Despite all the hubbub of the last few days, the Congress has scarcely noted the full objective of the protest. The demonstration was not designed merely as political agitation for the passage of President Kennedy's civil rights legislation, but was officially titled the "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom."

The jobs part of it may prove to be tougher in the end than the freedom, for the Negro leaders are not only asking for equal opportunity in the field of civil liberties but for preferential treatment on jobs.

Asa Philip Randolph, the 74-year-old director of the march, emphasized the point here this week. Getting jobs away from whites to give to Negroes, he said, was no solution to the problem. A vast increase in the economic growth of the Nation was needed to wipe out unemployment for all, and only special training and treatment for Negroes would enable them to work effectively in an automated society.

This, of course, is precisely the problem Washington has not been able to lick, and there is even less likelihood that the Kennedy administration will get its economic growth and full employment programs through the Congress than its civil rights program.

In July there were 3,382,000 whites unemployed in this country and 939,000 Negroes. In other words, the Negro unemployed percentage was over double the white—11.2 percent to 5.1, and in some cities, Chicago for example, the Negro unemployed were over 17 percent.

EQUALITY OR PREFERENCE?

This problem is not getting better, but worse. The demand for skilled workers and the scrapping of unskilled workers are increasing faster than the training and education of the Negro. Meanwhile, the Negro population is increasing faster than the white—25.4 percent Negro in the fifties to 17.5 percent white.

Even within the Kennedy administration there is no agreement that its economic proposals would meet the Negro's problems, even if they were all approved by the Congress, which they certainly won't be.

Already some of the President's advisers are insisting that only an ambitious public works program, on top of all the other tax, training, and relief programs, will really deal with Negro unemployment in the cities. The President is not agreeing yet, not because he is convinced they are wrong, but merely because he has so many other problems that he cannot take on another at this time.

Accordingly, this week's march on Washington is not the end of the Negro drive for civil equality but also the beginning of a drive for economic preference and full employment. This may "annoy" Washington, but the American Negro has obviously decided that he has to annoy the white man to wake him up.

Mr. CLARK. Mentioned in Mr. Reston's column is the impact on the entire civil rights problem of congressional reorganization. It has long been my view that the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of this body is how we can modernize, streamline, upgrade, and render more democratic the rules, customs, manners, and procedures under which the Senate of the United States operates.

I have had occasion to refer to this subject before. I shall do so many times again.

The Economist of London, under date of August 10 this year, has an extremely interesting article, entitled "Can Congress Be Reformed?" I find myself in disagreement with some of the statements in this article, particularly its reference to me as "a liberal with little influence." Nevertheless, the article is well worth reading. I commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN CONGRESS BE REFORMED?

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The curiously becalmed congressional session of 1963 is developing a climate ripe for the first reform of Congress since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The demand for improvements from both inside and outside Congress has now reached such a point that it is entirely possible that some first step, such as the creation of a commission to study the much-studied question of reforming Congress, may be taken before the end of the year. Yet so difficult and intricate are the obstacles in the way of congressional reform that it is doubtful whether this first step, even if followed by the appropriate succeeding steps, will lead in the end to any real change in the way Congress works.

The abnormally long and generally unproductive session of 1962 was the direct cause of a good deal of reform talk when Congress reconvened this January. It was generally believed, however, that this talk would disappear once Congress got down to the task of legislating. The fact that the talk has grown louder instead of being silenced is proof enough that Congress has never really got down to that task this year. Congressional Quarterly, a private legislative news service, reports that Congress has completed action on only 5 percent of President Kennedy's requests and those bills were of a minor nature.

In all fairness to Congress, its record of very nearly complete inactivity this year is not entirely of its own making. When the same party controls both the Presidency and the Congress, as is now the case, the pace of legislation is usually set by the President and, for tactical reasons, Mr. Kennedy has consciously slowed the pace. In the first place, he made it clear from the outset of this session that he was interested primarily in the passage of a tax reform bill and in little else; because there was never any possibility of final action on the tax bill before the autumn, Mr. Kennedy was setting the stage for a long, unexciting session. Secondly, the eruption of the Negro crisis and the introduction of broader civil rights legislation, to which the President attached great importance, killed whatever chance had existed for other bills and raised the possibility of the first year-around session of Congress since the war.

Actually, the first session of the 88th Congress will have nothing to be ashamed of if it adjourns shortly before Christmas after passing tax reform and civil rights bills; other sessions of Congress have accomplished far less without being subjected to nearly as much criticism. But month after month of inactivity this year has exposed the rusty condition of the congressional machinery and has made the legislative branch a favorite target of columnists and leader writers; it has even made some members of Congress self-conscious. The demand for reform is no longer limited to liberals with little influence, such as Senator JOSEPH CLARK, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, and Senator CLIFFORD CASE, a Republican from New Jersey. It is significant that an immensely influential Democrat, Senator MONRONEY of Oklahoma, is renewing his interest in the subject; in 1946, as a Member of the House of Representatives, he drew up, with the late Senator Robert La Follette, the last reform act.

All this has led to great expectations among the press and the academic community of a new day dawning on Capitol Hill. Such euphoria is based on the faulty notion that reforming Congress is very much like reforming a corrupt police force or a vice-infested city, a nonpartisan affair upon which all men of good will can agree. On the contrary, few issues bear more connotations of partisanship and ideological conflict. Although a majority of Congress certainly agrees that some kind of reform is in order, the gulfs between the kinds of reform which are actually proposed are close to unbridgeable.

What Senator CLARK has in mind, for instance, is not so much congressional reform as congressional revolution. His detailed program would shatter the existing congressional power structure, destroying the weapons often use by the conservative southern Democratic oligarchs to thwart the will of the majority. This clearly political objective lies behind Mr. CLARK's proposals for imposing strict majority rule in the Senate, stripping committee chairmen of their immense powers and diminishing generally the discretion given to committees. In fact, some of his proposals, such as a rule which would require standing committees to report every administration bill by July 4 of each year, seem no less than an attempt to superimpose a quasi-parliamentary system on the present one. But Congress has no more intention of adopting the Clark reforms than of voting itself out of business.

On the other hand, when southern conservatives, such as Senator BYRD of Virginia and Senator MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, talk about congressional reform they really mean a reform of existing congressional budgetary procedure, a goal which the liberals can agree with in principle. But, in detail, the conservative proposals—the McClellan plan for changing the budgetary process, for example—would mean much tighter congressional control over spending, including a congressionally-imposed ceiling on expenditures. This, in turn, could be achieved only by establishing a legislative budget which would take priority over the President's annual budget, thereby cutting deeply into one of the executive branch's most important powers. Senator CLARK and other liberals regard the McClellan plan as closer to retrogression than to reform.

On its face, the question of congressional ethics, a favorite preoccupation of some liberal reforms, particularly those in the Republican Party, would seem to be one area free of ideological controversy. Although Congress imposes on officials of the executive branch an over-zealous interpretation of the statutes which deal with conflicts of interest, its own Members are not bound by these statutes at all. In view of this, the proposals of the liberal Republicans—to limit the outside employment of Members of Congress, who would be given a compensatory increase in salary, and to require disclosure of holdings of securities of over $10,000 in value—would seem moderate enough. Yet these proposals have little more chance than Mr. CLARK's more revolutionary ones. Most Congressmen insist that the voters can be counted on to get rid of Members who are guilty of unethical behavior, a doctrine which would make some sense only if the electorate were given far more information about congressional behavior.

The remaining aspect of congressional reform concerns procedure and in all probability any reform plan adopted by Congress after all the study commissions have had their say will deal almost exclusively with procedural reform, just as did the La Follette-Monroney Act. This might include a set time schedule for consideration of appropriations bills or even a recognition that legislating is a year-around job which requires Congress to be in session all year apart from a summer holiday (the requirement of the La Follette-Monroney Act that Congress must adjourn each year by July 31 was last obeyed in 1956). Moreover, the Senate may relax its procedures to make it easier for committees to meet while the Senate itself is in session and tighten them to insist on germaneness of debate under certain conditions, changes which would make filibusters, like that expected next month over civil rights, a trifle harder to keep going and slightly less burdensome. This is the kind of reform now advocated by Senator MONRONEY and this is the kind of reform, if any, that will be passed.

Such minor steps might help Congress to operate more smoothly in normal years through, given the unusual set of circumstances prevailing this year, it is unlikely that they would have made much difference to the melancholy 1963 session. In a broader sense, however, it is a little absurd to believe that a few changes in procedure will do much to cure the deep spiritual malaise that has been afflicting Congress for a decade or more. Indeed, the very unwillingness of Congress to venture on a bold program of self-reform is itself a symptom of that malaise.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator mind if I withheld yielding for a moment or two? I shall be glad to yield as soon as I am through. It will not take me long.

This article places some of the blame for some of the slow pace in which the Congress has acted this year on the President.

It states:

> When the same party controls both the Presidency and the Congress, as is now the case, the pace of legislation is usually set by the President and, for tactical reasons——

With that statement I agree. But I am in disagreement with the following statement, which is that:

> Mr. Kennedy has consciously slowed the pace. In the first place, he made it clear from the outset of this session that he was interested primarily in the passage of a tax reform bill and in little else.

I do not agree at all with that statement. The President has sent to us 104 separate recommendations for legislative action. In my opinion, it is our duty or obligation to act on them, one way or the other, to pass them, defeat them, or modify them, but to do something about them. I do not think the Economist is correct in making this particular statement.

The article, however, ends with a rather melancholy conclusion. It states:

> It is a little absurd to believe that a few changes in procedure will do much to cure the deep spiritual malaise that has been afflicting Congress for a decade or more. Indeed, the very unwillingness of Congress to venture on a bold program of self-reform is itself a symptom of that malaise.

With that conclusion I agree, but I have not given it hope. I urge upon my colleagues a further and careful consideration of the entire program of congressional reform, in the hope that in due time this program may be placed in a position in which it can measure up to the responsibilities that confront us in a constantly shrinking and ever-changing dynamic country and dynamic world.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator is much too modest in his reference to the statement of the London Economist, that he is a liberal with little influence. I do not agree with that statement. I believe he is a liberal, and I am sure he has decided influence in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. No words could be sweeter to my ear than those just uttered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. With reference to the criticism which the London Economist, at a distance of 3,000 miles, has leveled at an institution which only yesterday showed that it knows how to move very rapidly when a national crisis impends, I believe the Senator should take such criticisms with a grain of salt. At no time during my service in the Senate—a period of about 17 years—when any great crisis faced the Nation, involving the question of the national security, has there been a failure to act swiftly, as was the case yesterday, on the threatened railroad strike. Then, I believe, critics of our system must have had every reason to reexamine their criticism, if they propose to be fair.

So much for that.

I should like to make one further comment. I noted with interest that the Senator read from the invitation which all of us received from the committee which planned and is carrying out the march on Washington, taking place today. The Senator from Florida received one of those invitations. I thought that little good psychology and little courtesy or good manners was involved in the way the invitation was phrased, in that it requested us to come to listen to the "demands" of our constituents. I thought it would have been much more appropriate if we had been requested to come to listen to or hear a petition. We have been told that this was being done under the constitutional right of petition. As I understand, it is being done under two constitutional rights, the right to petition, and the right to assemble; and I agree with the Senator with his statement in that regard. I wonder if the Senator had the same reaction that the Senator from Florida had to the use of the word "demands," in connection with an invitation which should at least have been courteous and based on a sincere desire for Members of Congress to attend the affair at the Lincoln Memorial to listen to persuasive facts—not to demands.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my friend from Florida, first, that I agree that the meeting today in Washington is being held under the constitutional right of petition for the redress of grievances. That is essentially the intent behind the invitation, regardless of its semantics. We are requested to come and listen to what they have to say with respect to what they consider to be their constitutional rights for jobs and freedom. Perhaps I read from the invitation a little out of context. It would be wise to ask unanimous consent that the entire invitation be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I make that request.

There being no objection, the invitation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young, cordially request the attendance of JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., at the Mass Assembly for Jobs and Freedom, Wednesday, August 28, 1963, at 2 p.m. at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom.
>
> March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, 170 West 130th Street, New York City, 27.
>
> R.S.V.P.
>
> (This card will admit you to the section reserved for Members of the Congress of the United States.)

Mr. CLARK. I point out that a number of eminent American citizens, of both the white and Negro races, are hosts and that they "cordially request" our attendance at the mass assembly. Then the invitation refers to the "demands of your constituents."

Perhaps I would have phrased it differently. Personally, I take no offense at it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the word "demands" is printed in italics, whereas the rest of the invitation is not.

Mr. CLARK. No. If the Senator will look over my shoulder at the invitation, he will see that the words "cordially request the attendance of" are also in italics.

Mr. HOLLAND. The words "cordially request the attendance of" are in italics. Later the words "to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom" are also in italics.

The Senator from Florida had a distinctly adverse and irritated reaction to the use of those words. He thought that very poor psychology and very poor courtesy was shown in asking Senators and Members of the House to leave their respective Chambers of Congress, where business was being transacted, to go down there to listen to the "demands" of these people. The Senator from Florida feels it was a very poor word to use, and that it was a discourteous word to use, a word which did not leave in the proper attitude the recipients of the letter.

Mr. CLARK. I do not share the irritation of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JAVITS. On the first subject I would say that I, too, join with the Senator in feeling that I should attend the rally, and I will. I believe that the expressions which were used in the invitation are expressions of intense belief which those who are demonstrating hold on the subject of their demonstration. I did not take it amiss. I hope very much that other Senators will not, though I appreciate the views of the Senator from Florida on that subject.

In the substantive point which the Senator has raised, it is one of the real aspects of this situation; namely, the economic side and the job side. Antidiscrimination alone does not solve it, because though we would give opportunities, we do not wish, and would not, preempt the opportunities of others, because that would not be justice.

There is, of course, the general effort which must be made, and on which we have fallen down very badly, and that is in connection with the matter of the endemic unemployment problem, and the gearing up of the American economy to a higher note of employment and productivity. I have given my prescription for that, as has the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is as ardent as I am.

The specialized aspect, however, requires attention. I believe that there is a very good case for a specialized effort, from the standpoint of making it possible for Negroes to compete on the basis of the possession of equipment and training. I am against quotas for jobs, but I believe that in this connection they should receive preference, because there exists an opportunity for real nondiscrimination.

An analysis prepared at the request of the Joint Economic Committee shows that there would be an absolute gain in the American gross national product of an estimated $13 to $17 billion annually if there could be an effective utilization of Negroes on the basis of their present state of training and education, thus contributing measurably to our national productivity, if nondiscrimination became real, rather than as it is now, so often honored in the breach rather than in performance.

I thank the Senator for his most pertinent observations.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator from New York says is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to say that at last I find myself in a position where I can agree, in part at least, with the position of the distinguished Senator from New York on these matters. I fully agree that vocational education ought to be stepped up as is provided in the proposed program. I fully agree that job training, meaning apprenticeship and training for advancement, ought to be stepped up at a greater rate. I would be happy to vote for provisions of that kind, together with a substantial appropriation of funds therefore, if we were permitted to do so.

The Senator from New York has placed his finger upon an important part of the program, upon which I believe all Senators could agree, if only the drastic and, we feel, coercive provisions were not included, provisions which we believe would only get the country into greater confusion and turmoil, if enactment of them is accomplished.

I realize that the distinguished Senator from New York does not agree with my last conclusion. Nevertheless, I desire to have the Record show that there are features in the proposed civil rights legislation upon which I believe all of us could agree, and which would be more meaningful in connection with the permanent advancement of the economy of the minority groups in question than anything else we could do. I only wish we had the opportunity to deal with such proposals separately.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I believe there will be such an opportunity. Bills will be coming before the Senate which will provide this opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD GERMANY—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the speech delivered in this Chamber a few days ago by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] specifically as it pertains to our foreign policy toward Germany and the anxieties expressed by the West German Government in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

Senator Morse emphasized that we should strive now to the best of our abilities for a relaxation of tensions between ourselves and the Soviet Union, and that recognition of East Germany should not, in this case, be the single dominant factor in our considerations. He further stresses that if future unification of Germany "is a practical objective and not just a pious dream, it can only be reached by negotiations, and that those negotiations must take place among the Soviet Union, East Germany, West Germany, France, Britain, and the United States."

As Senator Morse suggests, it is time that we ought to say to West Germany, or to any nation, "We are going to determine American foreign policy in the best interests of America." I congratulate Senator Morse for raising this question and wish that all our decisions in the field of foreign policy could provide affirmative answers to the same question.

His question, too, reminds me of Lord Palmerston's famous statement:

> We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.

This means that policies must be determined by national interests, that national interests can and do change in a changing world, that it is the national interests which must be followed and which must determine policy and that the policies in themselves are not immutable. This sound advice should certainly apply to our American policy toward Germany. We must always ask ourselves the question: Where lies our American national interest? In other words, our national interests should determine our foreign policy and not vice versa.

I regret that I was not able to be present to hear the address by the senior Senator from Oregon, but I take this opportunity to commend him particularly for his most constructive and enlightened views.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Few commendations have meant as much to me as the commendation just uttered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I want him to know that a considerable amount of my thinking on the German problem has been influenced by a notable speech he made earlier in this session of Congress. I look upon him as one of the Members of the Senate having most perceptive knowledge of the German question.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of a number of nominations which have been reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations at the desk, reported by the Committee on Armed Services, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The legislative clerk read sundry routine nominations reported today by Mr. Russell from the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The questions in on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am proud to announce that 16 people have traveled the thousands of miles between Utah and Washington to participate today in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

The arrival of this delegation from Utah is particularly meaningful, because less than 1 percent of the population of our State is Negro, and civil rights have never been a paramount problem. But Utahans have an abiding interest in the national ceremony taking place today here in Washington, and our delegation exemplifies Utah's dedication to the right of free petition, to the right of free movement, and above all, to freedom of the spirit.

During the past months, we Americans have been dramatically confronted with the stark truth about discrimination and race relations in the United States. We have all been made aware of the need for immediate and meaningful action to insure the American Negro the full citizenship and equal rights to which he is entitled, by both the law of the land and all natural law of "right and wrong," for the American Negro has served notice that he is no longer content merely to watch, to wait, and to hope for these rights.

As a result, a great national debate is now taking place, in individual homes and in group meetings across the Nation, as well as here in the Congress. In good faith, all Americans—northerners and southerners, colored and white—seek to find the solution to this most pressing problem.

In at least one respect, Mr. President, the search for this solution is an extremely difficult task. The problem of civil rights for the Negro is deeply rooted in our history and tradition. As we are all well aware, it began more than 300 years ago, when the first slave ship landed on the shores of Virginia, and discharged its human cargo into the chains of bondage. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that the issue has been beclouded by emotionality. Fears, fancies, and years of distrust and distortion have surrounded the question of civil rights. Moreover, the question is not alone a legal one. It has social, economic, moral, and even psychological aspects and overtones which must be considered and weighed.

Yet, in another respect, the search for a meaningful solution to this problem should not be difficult. It should not be difficult, because when we cut through these complexities to the heart of the problem, we are faced with but one simple, and fundamental, question to which we can give but one answer. That question is whether we, as Americans, are still committed to the principles of human rights and human dignity.

Mr. President, can there be any answer to this question but "Yes"?

It seems to me that all must recognize that what the Negro is asking of us today is neither new nor revolutionary. He asks only what those who settled this country asked, and what was achieved almost two centuries ago. He asks only that we extend to him the privileges which we have all come to expect and enjoy. What the Negro is saying to us today, with demonstrations and petitions, in essence is: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal." Certainly, these are not new words.

Early in life, every American child—Negro or white—learns the American creed. He recites the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. He reads the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. He studies about the American Revolution. And he is taught that with hard work, decency, and integrity, anything is possible in this wonderful land of ours. Yet, equally early in life, every Negro child learns that all he is taught to believe in does not hold true for him. He is a product of our American culture and American values; yet he cannot be a full participant in them. It is this situation which must be corrected, for I do not believe there is any way in which the perpetuation of this situation can be reconciled with our national conscience and belief.

At issue, then, is the granting of a full measure of human rights to every American. This can and must be done both by legislative action and by individual action. What this means is that we will have to take action to assure not only equal opportunity in housing, in education, in employment, and in voting rights, but also equal treatment and consideration in all areas of public activity.

We have all known for a long time that in many communities throughout the Nation the Negro is turned away from theaters, restaurants, hotels, and other places of business, supposedly "open to the public." This is both an injustice and an indignity. Those who would perpetuate this practice have put forth long and laborious legal arguments against legislation to assure nondiscrimination in places of public accommodation. They argue for the many rights of property, but not for the rights of persons. In doing so, they have attempted to surround the accommodations proposal with a smokescreen of legalisms—imposing and impenetrable. As citizens, and as lawmakers, I feel that we must dissolve that smokescreen, clear the air, and look first and foremost at the underlying human issue invloved.

Deliberate and systematic discrimination—whether practiced overtly or covertly—denies the Negro of both his rights and his dignity. By displaying our lack of respect for him as a human being and as an American citizen, we rob him of his self-respect, and, in many cases, of his ambition, his initiative, and his pride. Our contempt for him as evidenced by his exclusion can become his own self-contempt. What, then, is left for any man?

Certainly, under our Constitution the rights of property deserve and demand protection. But the rights of man deserve and demand priority. Every individual has the right to select his own circle of friends and associates, and cannot and should not be compelled to open his home or private property to any person with whom he does not care to associate. However, this liberty does not give license to discriminate against a particular race or particular group when he opens his private property to the general public and invites the general public to come in and trade. Such discrimination is unwise and undesirable, and should be unlawful. This is the objective of the public accommodations proposal.

No responsible person is suggesting that the Negro or any other minority group be given preferential treatment in any area of American life. What we do propose, however, is that he be given an opportunity to compete on his own merit and to partake of the activities of this Nation according to his own desire.

Granted, the full realization of equality of opportunity—in practice, as well as in theory—will be some time in coming. Despite the action which we take today, the Negro must come from far behind. Long years of discriminatory practice have placed him in a disadvantageous position, and he will often lack the skills and education required in order to take advantage of the opportunities which are opened. Nonetheless, the opportunities must be there for him. When this is the case, then the Negro, himself, must equip himself to take advantage of what is available. We can open jobs on all levels to the Negro, but he must qualify himself for them.

To accomplish this and to implement the equal opportunity in which we all believe, the law and legal action are but limited tools. To be meaningful the law must be lived. Individual citizens and private organizations must take action on their own initiative—not because they are compelled to do so, but because they wish to do so. In this regard I am particularly proud of the practices of Federal agencies in my own State of Utah. These agencies and their personnel followed equal employment practices long before the President's Committee was established. Today, a little more than 1 percent of the total Federal employees in Utah are Negro—and this, as I emphasized earlier, in a State with a Negro population of less than 1 percent.

Mr. President, as each of us alone wrestles with this problem, let him remember some of the simple and proud facts of our own history: We are a nation of immigrants. Somewhere in the dim and distant past of each of us, there have been the sting of discrimination and the pain of prejudice. We should well be able to put ourselves in the shoes of those who are discriminated against today and view the problem from their point of view. If we keep our hearts and minds on the human side of this issue, I am confident that the right solution will be found—one in keeping with the finest traditions of this Republic.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, AND FROM THEN UNTIL TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. on Friday, August 30, 1963, for a pro forma session, at which no business will be transacted; and that when the Senate adjourns on August 30, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, September 3, 1963.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives during the adjournment of the Senate, and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees be authorized to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 434, Senate bill S. 1716, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That (a) subsection (d) of section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(b) Subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of such section 203, and all references thereto, are hereby redesignated as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

SEC. 2. The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "for the period ending June 30, 1964".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

That (a) section 203(d) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "3" to "2", and in line 11, after the word "thereof," to strike out "322,000,000" and insert "$322,000,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203(d) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "a like amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "$322,000,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill today. It will be the pending business on Tuesday. I am sure the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] joins me in expressing the hope that we will have as full an attendance as possible on Tuesday next.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR METCALF AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. METCALF was appointed to act as President pro tempore of the Senate on Friday next.

FURTHER RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business for the Senate for the time being, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5 o'clock p.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of today, the Secretary reported that he had received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, and it was signed by the Vice President.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRACTICAL NURSES' LICENSING ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 421, Senate bill 933.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 933) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(2) by striking 'prior to the expiration of one year immediately following the effective date of this Act', and inserting in lieu thereof 'at any time during the period commencing July 29, 1961, and ending on the expiration of ninety days immediately following the date of enactment of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes" '; (3) by" and insert "(2) by"; in line 18, after the word "and", to strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; in line 19, after the word "new", to strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections"; after line 19, to strike out " '(b) Any application made by an applicant for a license pursuant to this section which has not been approved prior" and, in lieu thereof, to insert " '(b) In the case of any application made by an applicant for a license pursuant to this section which, because of noncompliance with clause (4) of subsection (a) of this section, was not approved prior"; in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "date of enactment" and insert "effective date"; on page 3, line 6, after the word "may", to strike out "desire.' " and insert "desire."; after line 6, to insert:

" '(c) In the case of any person who failed to apply for license under this section because the period during which she was actively engaged in caring for the sick did not meet the requirement that such experience shall have taken place within the District of Columbia may, within the ninety-day period immediately following the effective date of this subsection, apply for a license under this section: *Provided,* That such experience took place within the Washington metropolitan area.' "

And, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect fifteen days after its approval."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make on the committee amendments.

The Practical Nurses' Licensing Act presently provides that an applicant, otherwise qualified, who desires to obtain a practical nursing license without written examination, must have been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of the Nurses' Licensing Act—effective date, July 29, 1961.

S. 933, as amended, and as reported by the committee, would amend existing law so that a nursing applicant could obtain a practical nursing license, without written examination, if she has lived in, or has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area for the 1-year period preceding the effective date of the Nurses' Licensing Act.

I understand that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has amendments that he wishes to have added to the bill.

I am authorized, on behalf of the committee, to notify the Senate, after the Senator from Arizona finishes explaining the amendments, that I will accept them on behalf of the committee; and I hope the Senate will accept them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 14, it is proposed to strike out "for" and insert in lieu thereof "at any time during".

On page 2, line 15, strike out "for" and insert in lieu thereof "at any time during".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "because" and insert in lieu thereof "solely because".

On page 2, line 25, strike out "not approved" and insert in lieu thereof "disapproved".

On page 3, line 3, immediately after "reconsidered", insert "in accordance with such clause, as amended,".

On page 3, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (c) Any person who failed to make application for a license under this section on or before July 30, 1962, may make application for such a license under this section, as amended, at any time during the ninety-day period immediately following the effective date of this subsection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my amendments provide that a nursing applicant, otherwise qualified, could be licensed as a practical nurse, without written examination, if the applicant has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia at some time during the year immediately preceding the effective date of the Nurses' Licensing Act, or if at some time during the year immediately preceding the effective date of such act the applicant has resided in the District, and has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area.

I have taken a personal interest in this legislation because during the last 6 months of Mrs. Hayden's illness in 1961, she had the benefit of the services of a very competent nurse.

When the same nurse applied for a license to practice nursing in the District of Columbia, her competency or ability was not questioned. The sole and only reason given for denying a license was that she had not been engaged in nursing services in the District of Columbia during all of the period between July 29, 1960, and July 29, 1961.

The amendments I have offered will enable a very good nurse and others like her to render the services they are qualified to perform.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. To keep the record perfectly clear, I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona one question. While I know the answer, the record should show it. There is no question that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona goes only to the question of time of service; it does not go to any question of competency. Any nurse coming within the terms of the Senator's amendment would still be required to meet the tests of competency in order to be allowed to nurse.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 933) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 2 of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (74 Stat. 803; sec. 2–421, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:
>
> "(e) The term 'Washington metropolitan area' means that area comprising the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland, the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, Virginia, and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Virginia."
>
> SEC. 2. Section 10 of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (sec. 2–429, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is amended (1) by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" immediately before the first word of such section; (2) by amending clause (4) to read as follows: "(4) has been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia at any time during the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act, or at any time during the year immediately preceding the effective date of this Act has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area;"; and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:
>
> "(b) In the case of any application made by an applicant for a license pursuant to this section which solely because of noncompliance with clause (4) of subsection (a) of this section, was disapproved prior to the effective date of this subsection shall, at the written request of such applicant made within the ninety-day period immediately following such date, be reconsidered in accordance with such clause, as amended, without additional charge to such applicant other than the repayment to the District of Columbia of any fee or portion thereof which may have been refunded to the applicant by reason of the denial of a license for which application was made, and such applicant may submit, without charge, such additional information in support of such application as she may desire.
>
> "(c) Any person who failed to make application for a license under this section on or before July 30, 1962, may make application for such a license under this section, as amended, at any time during the ninety-day period immediately following the effective date of this subsection."
>
> SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect fifteen days after its approval.

FOREIGN AID—REPLY TO SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] delivered an address on the floor of the Senate purporting to answer President Kennedy's criticism of the drastic cut in the foreign aid bill made by the House of Representatives. In his address the Senator from Arizona chose not to defend the cut or the action of 91 percent of the House Republicans voting for it. For example, he did not describe the situation which will prevail in Latin America, a situation which was discussed in a very moving and persuasive article printed in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, August 27, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arizona did not describe the situation that will prevail in a number of countries on the Soviet border, nor technical assistance programs abroad, if the cut is sustained. He did not suggest why the Republican leadership and the Republican membership in the House chose 1963 as the year for action against a program that has been a pillar of American foreign policy since 1948—a policy which has had strong bipartisan support through two previous administrations. He would not guess what alternatives those Members have for a world riddled by poverty and torn between free and totalitarian methods of economic progress. Unfortunately, the Senator did none of those things. Instead, he decided to spotlight six votes cast by a former Representative and a former U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts—Senator Kennedy—during the course of his 14 years in Congress. I might add that those were 14 years in which foreign aid was a pattern of our legislative program.

The technique used by the Senator from Arizona was not to support the action, as such, of his fellow Republicans in the House, but rather to try to show how the President was himself an opponent of foreign aid during his years in Congress. Of course, that conclusion was not true. I intend to prove it.

Surely the Senator from Arizona would wish to have placed before the public the complete record of the President's action on foreign aid. In the interest of accuracy I intend to do just that, beginning with the President's first year of service in this body. I regret that I have not had the time to research all of his years in the House of Representatives. As I recall, the President became a Member of this body in the election of 1952.

The record demonstrates that, as a U.S. Senator, President Kennedy gave prudent and committed support to foreign aid during all his years in the Senate. It is important to remember that the foreign aid programs he supported were recommended and administered by a Republican President, who time and again reminded his party and our country of our obligation to help friendly countries gain the dignity of economic and social well being. Many Senators on this side of the aisle stood with President Eisenhower time after time in an effort to support his program of foreign aid. The record of the Democratic Party in the Senate, then under the leadership of the present Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON, is one of which we can be proud in terms of bipartisan support for foreign policy measures.

The majority of Democrats in the Congress, including the then Senator from Massachusetts, Senator John Kennedy, never let partisanship advantage deter them from supporting President Eisenhower when the President presented his foreign aid bills to the Congress. Democrats understood that whatever temporary gains they might make by opposing the program which, as has been often said, has no constituency and has very little political popularity, were gains not worth making at the expense of stability and hope in the world.

As a Senator, Senator Kennedy did support some cuts in foreign aid bills offered by former President Eisenhower.

It is the prerogative of the Congress to make prudent cuts. But those rare instances are a far cry from the process of guillotining that was performed in the other body last Friday. No one questions the need for congressional review of the program or the responsibility of Members of Congress to make reductions in authorizations or appropriations when reason dictates that they should be made. What the President has challenged—and rightly so—is the wholesale evacuation of one of our great parties from the front it has occupied, with considerable success, since the Marshall plan.

I remind Senators once again that the overwhelming majority of Democrats in the Congress during the Eisenhower years supported the administration in its foreign aid program and its foreign policy. I remind Senators that that was not the case the other day, when an overwhelming majority of Republicans voted to slash—frankly, to gut—the foreign aid program.

President Kennedy made a responsible reply to what took place. The President has not challenged the fact that cuts were made. Members of Congress have the right and privilege to make cuts. But the Republican leadership attack upon the program and the slice and the size of the cut was not an effort to trim off the fringes or the fat, if there is any, but rather cut into the bone, the marrow, and the structure of foreign aid itself.

I should like to recite the record of President Kennedy from 1953 to 1961 when he served in the Senate. The Senator from Arizona stated, quite accurately, that Senator John Kennedy voted on July 29, 1953, for a $50-million cut in the mutual security appropriation—$50 million is a far cry from the $585 million supported by the Republicans. What the Senator from Arizona did not point out, however, was that Senator Kennedy voted with 54 percent of his Democratic colleagues on July 1953, to stem a $1.5 billion cut in the Eisenhower foreign aid program. An effort was made in this body to cut the President's program by $1.5 billion. The majority of the Democrats, then a minority party, stood up and defended the President of the United States, because it was the responsibility of our party to have bipartisanship in our foreign policy.

In another key vote the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, and 67 percent of his Democratic colleagues were joined by only half the Senate Republicans in resisting a $1 billion cut in the Eisenhower foreign aid program.

On July 29, 1953, Senator Kennedy voted against a $600 million cut in the foreign aid appropriations.

Senator Kennedy voted against a $500 million cut in military aid funds on the same day, July 29, 1953.

On another key vote the man who is now the President of the United States, who was then a Senator from Massachusetts, voted against a $1.2 billion cut in the foreign aid appropriations offered by a Republican Senator to the Republican President's foreign aid appropriation bill. On July 1, 1953, the Senate authorized $5.3 billion. Senator Kennedy voted for this.

Senator Kennedy voted year after year, on final passage questions, in support of the foreign aid program.

He voted, for example, for a $6.6 billion foreign aid program. The amount was $6.6 billion as compared to the request being made today of $4.4 billion from the administration.

In 1954, the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, and most other Democratic Senators voted against a proposed $1 billion cut in the foreign aid authorization bill of 1955. Incidentally, only slightly more than one-half of their Republican colleagues joined in supporting President Eisenhower against this crippling amendment.

With Senator Kennedy's support, a $3.3 billion authorization bill was passed by the Senate in 1954.

Senator Kennedy voted in 1955 against the restoration of a $420 million cut in military assistance made by the House because the program was overfunded, as was demonstrated before the committees. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] must have thought so, too, since he also voted to sustain that same cut in 1955 in the military assistance aid program, when it had been found, after careful examination—and I recall it vividly—the vast amounts of money were in the pipeline which were not being used, and that the program was overfunded.

The Senate adopted resolutions demanding that there be a more accurate accounting by the Defense Department of the military assistance funds.

In the same year the Senator from Massachusetts voted against a $200-million cut in Asian economic development.

Similarly, he opposed a cut of $200 million in defense support for Asia.

Senator Kennedy voted for a $3.2-billion appropriation in 1955.

In 1956 Senator Kennedy voted to defeat a motion to cut $1.6 billion from the foreign aid authorization bill.

He supported final passage of a $4.3-billion foreign aid authorization bill.

With Senator Kennedy's support, a motion to cut military assistance funds by $565 million was defeated, in a close vote in the Senate, 42 to 46.

A similar amendment to cut military assistance by $300 million was defeated with Senator Kennedy's support.

Our now President, then Senator, joined in voting to defeat an amendment to drastically cut defense support and development assistance funds in 1956.

He joined in supporting a final appropriation figure of $4.2 billion that year.

Senator Kennedy, on June 14, 1957, voted to cut $90 million from the defense support authorization, an authorization of more than $800 million. On the same day he voted against a cut of $710 million in defense support. That is the money which was used for our support measures in Greece, in Turkey, in Korea and in other areas where we were hardpressed. Senators will remember the year 1957. That money was used in the Middle East, where we were hardpressed by the Communist forces.

The President, then a Senator, took what I consider to be careful and considered action, not a meat ax approach.

He voted against a $500 million cut in military assistance.

He voted against reducing by $150 million the President's contingency fund, thus granting to the Chief Executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign relations.

He voted to increase by $225 million the military assistance funds.

He voted for an appropriation of $3.3 billion in 1957.

In 1958 he voted against a reduction of $500 million in military assistance funds.

Contrary to the implication in the remarks of the Senator from Arizona on Monday, Senator Kennedy on July 6, 1958, voted to allocate a cut already made by the Foreign Relations Committee, sustaining the committee's reduction.

As a matter of record, the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, voted against a $100-million cut in military assistance appropriations; and he also voted against a $50-million cut in defense support funds on August 23, 1958.

Senator Kennedy voted for an authorization of $3.5 billion in 1958.

In 1959 Senator Kennedy was against a cut of $550 million in military assistance authorizations.

He voted against a cut of $235 million in defense support funds on July 7, 1959; and on the same day he opposed a similar cut of $83.5 million in the same category.

He voted against a $45 million cut in the special assistance authorizations.

He voted against a move to cut the contingency fund authorization by $30 million.

He voted finally for an appropriation of $3.6 billion in 1959.

The record in 1960 was a further record of the Senator from Massachusetts voting to support the Republican President's foreign aid program.

I could go further and document what this man has done from the day he entered the Congress. I could not say that I voted on every item exactly as did the President of the United States, but when six little items are selected out of this tremendous array of votes over many years—the 14 years of service of a man in the Congress of the United States—I think the time is at hand to answer the charge. No one can logically be critical of an individual Senator voting to make what are considered to be prudent reductions. This has happened with respect to many of us.

But there is a great deal of difference between the leadership of a party leading the fight against the foreign aid program and an individual Senator casting an individual vote.

Mr. President, had the former majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the present Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, led the fight against foreign aid from 1953 to 1960, we would have cut the heart out of it. We would have wrecked it, because there were Democratic majorities at that time, with the exception of 1 year, in the Senate. But the Vice President, then majority leader of the Senate, and the late distinguished and beloved Sam Rayburn of the House of Representatives led the fight for President Eisenhower's program, and for President Truman's program. They did so not because they were Democrats, but because they knew that the programs were vital to the security of the United States.

The issue is not so much that an individual cut is made here or there, because surely the committees of Congress make such cuts. The committees should review and carefully analyze and scrutinize every request made by the executive branch.

During all the time since 1946, when UNRRA was in existence, through the interim aid program of 1948, the Marshall plan program, mutual security, the Foreign Assistance Act, and now what we call the AID Act, we have seen a pattern of responsible bipartisan leadership support for foreign aid as a matter of principle.

We witnessed what I consider to be a serious break in that, and I implore my colleague of the Senate to restore order, to restore the balance, to repair the damage, and not to engage merely in an act of acrimony, abuse, or criticism.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations must review the Foreign Aid Act. I have no doubt that some cuts will be made below the administration's request. Every item of that bill is being gone over with meticulous care, as it should be.

I am happy to say that in the committee there has been bipartisan, friendly cooperation. I want to make sure that we sustain that attitude in the Senate.

I have no doubt that when the bill comes to the Senate, many efforts will be made by Senators who are opposed to foreign aid, some who feel it ought to be reduced, some who feel there ought to be certain reductions in certain categories, to make reductions. But that is a far cry from taking a big whack at the program and leading an attack on it on a partisan basis. I deplore that attitude. I hope and pray that we may avoid attacking the program on a partisan basis, because the country can only suffer from a partisan attack. Not only would the countries we aid suffer, but this country would suffer. America needs now, and will need in the future, responsible action in the field of national security and foreign policy. National security is not merely the defense budget and the Pentagon—national security is the State Department. National security is the Central Intelligence Agency. National security is the foreign aid administration. National security is involved in the Peace Corps. National security is involved in food for peace. National security is involved in the health of our economy. And we have a responsibility to maintain the strength of this Nation in every one of the categories I have mentioned.

I am sorry I could not answer these charges before. I was unable to do it yesterday, because we were deeply involved in matters relating to railroad legislation. But I will welcome any rejoinder on the part of my friend from Arizona or any other Senator.

I think the record of the President of the United States has been accurately stated. I have not said he did not vote for some cuts. What I have said is that there was no "gang-up" by Democrats on foreign aid during Republican years of administration. And I have further said that the President of the United States record—President John Fitzgerald Kennedy's record—is a record that can stand the careful scrutiny of the most severe critic. It is a record of generosity, and it is a record of giving the benefit of the doubt to the man in the White House, a record of giving the benefit of the doubt to the former President of the United States since the present President served in this body as a U.S. Senator.

I, too, gave the President of the United States the benefit of the doubt in these matters. I, too, voted to sustain military aid funds when I had doubts as to their value. I, too, voted to sustain funds for the Far East when I had doubts as to whether or not it was the proper thing to do. I did so because I knew the Chief Executive of this country has unbelievable burdens, tremendous responsibilities, and if this country gets into serious international trouble we must depend upon our President. He is the Commander in Chief. He is the spokesman for this Nation on foreign policy. He is the only spokesman we have, and I do not believe in weakening his strength. I do not believe in tying his hands. I believe in giving him the tools to do the job.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

BAD CUT FOR THE AMERICAS

Although the inter-American Alliance for Progress has been disappointing in many ways—and even moribund in some places—it still has promise and vitality in it as it begins its third year of operations. That is why the House, in making other cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill, should have supported the administration's request for $600 million for the Alliance in the next fiscal year.

The House has reduced that figure by $150 million, and President Kennedy has responded with these words: "Under the terms of this bill, hopeful social and economic progress in Latin America will be stalled and our shield against Communist aggression in this hemisphere will be weakened. It will mean that the Soviet Union will be giving almost as much to the small island of Cuba, as the United States is to the whole of Latin America. This is no way to defeat communism."

These are strong words, and perhaps a bit on the exaggerated and oversimplified side. But there can be no doubt that the House cut threatens to have a demoralizing effect on all our friends to the south who believe that there is something much more than mere rhetorical possibilities in the Alliance for Progress. And this is particularly true because of the fact—as just emphasized by Dr. Milton Eisenhower (who strongly favors the Alliance)—that the whole enterprise is under heavy attack from the extremists. These include, at one end, the Communists, who regard chaos as their best handmaiden. And at the other end, according to Dr. Eisenhower, "are the oligarchists, the privileged, who stand for nothing but the most glacial sort of social change."

It is against these opposing oppressive and retrogressive or standstill forces that the Alliance for Progress has been designed to operate and bring about a better world south of the Rio Grande. Of course, not even the most optimistic New Frontiersman now feels that such a world can be brought into being in a hurry. But good advances are in sight, or at least possible. Thus, by way of example, Peru, Argentina, and the countries of Central America are committed to programs that should lead to genuine economic, political, and social betterment.

As for Brazil, the biggest and potentially the richest of all our neighbors in the Americas, it has done a poor job trying to curb its inflation and take care of its other woes. That is one of the reasons why the House has voted as it has. We submit, however, that there continues to be a lot of hope for the Brazilians and that the Alliance for Progress, given time and our country's help, will have a chance of attaining its goals.

Meanwhile, the Senate will do a good day's work if it undoes what the House has done in this matter. Meanwhile, too, what should be kept in mind is that the United States withholds funds from countries like Brazil when they fail to abide by the Alliance's rules. This is a fact that should reassure those who have suspected that our Government has been just throwing money away in the Americas, wantonly, without any political or other sense.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to announce my position on the final vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 102 was passed yesterday afternoon. I was present Monday, returning from Texas on a long flight Sunday night to be here for Monday's vote, but last evening at the time the bill was passed I had gone back to Texas again for a long-standing engagement for which tickets for a public function had been distributed for many weeks. I returned at 7:30 this morning.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on Senate Joint Resolution 102.

PRICE INDEX RISE HIGHEST IN 4 YEARS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the New York Times for today, August 28, 1963, contains an article entitled "Price Index Up Sharply in July; 2-Month Rise Highest in 4 Years." The article states that the consumer price index moved up sharply in July for the second consecutive month and today stands at 107.1, compared with the 1957–59 base of 100.

Measured against previous indexes, this is an all-time high.

I point out in that connection that this means that the purchasing power of the dollar is at an all-time low.

As of July 31, 1963, the value of the dollar was 45.18 cents in purchasing power, compared with the 1939 value of 100 cents. These figures are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I think it appropriate to say that in January 1961, the value of the dollar was 46.6 cents. In February 1963, it had fallen to 45.6 cents. In June 1963, it had dropped to 45.4 cents. On July 31, it had fallen to 45.18 cents, an all-time low.

The value of the dollar will become lower and lower so long as a majority of the Members of Congress persist in spending billions of dollars more than the Government takes in. In that connection, the problem of the outflow of gold will grow worse and worse, until Congress lives up to its responsibility to play square with the people's hard-earned money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in today's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE INDEX UP SHARPLY IN JULY; 2-MONTH RISE HIGHEST IN 4 YEARS

WASHINGTON, August 27.—The Consumer Price Index moved up sharply in July for the second straight month.

The combined increase in prices during June and July amounted to nine-tenths of 1 percent—the largest advance in any 2-month period in 4 years.

The July increase, the Labor Department announced today, was half of 1 percent. That put the index at a record of 107.1 compared with the 1957–59 base of 100.

This means that a typical city family paid $10.71 last month for what it could have bought for $10 in the 1957–59 period.

Nearly every category of consumer commodities and services contributed to the rise.

Footwear and new cars were the only products, other than a few scattered food items, whose prices dropped during the month. The usual pattern of month-to-month change in the index is a number of decreases and a number of increases.

Increased food prices were the largest single factor in the July rise. The rise was, in part, caused by drought, which reduced supplies of such items as lettuce and tomatoes.

The normal July decline in hog marketings caused pork prices to rise 5 percent. Prices of beef and veal also rose.

Other food items that contributed to the overall 1.1-percent rise in food prices during July included fresh eggs, apples, and soft drinks. The increase in soft-drink prices reflected the earlier increase in the price of sugar, the Labor Department said. The retail price of sugar, however, dropped in July.

A large increase in gasoline prices—the result of heavy summer demand that ended most gasoline price wars—helped push up the overall cost of transportation by four-tenths of 1 percent.

The only offsetting drop in the transportation area was a decline of seven-tenths of 1 percent in the prices of new cars. However, this was partially offset by a rise of four-tenths of 1 percent in the prices of used cars.

The prices of durable goods other than automobiles rose.

The cost of household operation, personal services, and medical care all also contributed to the rise.

A fairly widespread increase in movie admission prices sent the cost of recreation up.

The increase in average prices, coupled with a shorter factory workweek meant that the average factory worker's spending power declined by 70 cents a week in July.

The July increase in the Consumer Price Index will bring wage increases ranging from 1 to 3 cents an hour to about 1,025,000 workers under cost-of-living allowances. These workers are employed primarily in the automobile, aerospace, farm equipment, and construction equipment industries.

Twenty-five thousand more local and intercity truckers will receive wage increases ranging from 1 to 8 cents an hour under cost-of-living adjustments that are made annually or semiannually.

PRICES HERE SET RECORD

Consumer prices in New York rose last month to a record level, Herbert Bienstock, regional director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, announced yesterday.

The Consumer Price Index rose 0.5 percent from June to July to a high of 109.2 percent, making the 12-month rise 2.6 percent.

Leading the rise were food prices, up 3.1 percent since December. Average prices for fruits and vegetables were 13 percent higher than a year ago and 3.7 percent over the level a month ago.

THE SO-CALLED CHICKEN WAR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the full import of the so-called chicken war currently dividing the United States and the Common Market nations is very ably summed up in an editorial published in the September issue of Farm Journal. It warns that while the phrase "chicken war" may lend itself to comical overtones, it is not a laughing matter. The editorial is concerned, and rightly, with the long-range effects of the controversy. It notes that not only has the Common Market hiked tariffs in poultry from 5 cents a pound to 13½ cents a pound; it has also raised tariffs on our fruit by 36 percent, on our wheat and flour by more than 100 percent, and on our tobacco by nearly 50 percent. "All this," says the Journal, "may be but a forerunner of more to come." What are some of these additional targets that the Common Market could very well shoot for? Let me quote from the editorial:

> The EEC countries now buy 52 percent of our dollar exports of feed grains, 31 percent of our wheat and flour exports; 31 percent of our tobacco exports, 20 percent of our fruit and vegetable shipments—a total of $1.2 billion worth of our farm stuffs a year. Moreover, they pay us in U.S. dollars.

Needless to say, we cannot afford the loss of a $1.2 billion annual export market. This is what could happen if matters continue the way they are now heading. It is something that the entire Nation should be concerned with; for what happens to the farmer shapes the well-being of the urban dweller.

Already we are feeling the effects of Common Market protectionism. During the fiscal year which ended July 1, American agricultural exports declined by $42 million, to $5.1 billion. These declines occurred in exports of cotton, wheat, tobacco, inedible tallow, and poultry meat products.

I believe the Journal makes a very good point in the last paragraph of the editorial:

> It would be too bad to get into a tariff-raising contest with the EEC. Both sides would lose. But if one wants to play the game this way the other will be forced to. That ought to be made clear, right now and with no pussyfooting around.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "What the 'Chicken War' Means," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE "CHICKEN WAR" MEANS

These days the things that affect your income most may not happen on your farm at all. They may not happen in your neighborhood, in your county, or in your State. Or even in your country.

Suddenly we've got a "chicken war" looming between the United States and the six countries of the European Economic Community (Common Market). The EEC had pledged a stable tariff of 5 cents a pound on our poultry. Overnight they broke their promise, turned on us, hiked poultry duties to 13½ cents (up 170 percent), and cut American farmers out of $46 million of sales.

Some city newspapers are laughing this off as some kind of comical "chicken war" of small proportions. It is nothing of the kind. The Common Market, all through its formative years, has assured us that tariffs on our other goods would be "reasonable." But in the last year, when they got down to deciding the issue, they hiked tariffs on our fruit by 36 percent, on our wheat and flour by more than 100 percent, on our tobacco by nearly 50 percent. And all this may be a forerunner of more to come.

We've given European farmers a very great deal of help, both with money and know-how. In return, they are clamoring for higher tariffs against more American farm products. "We can raise a lot more of our food here—why let the Americans do it?" they say. And given high-enough support prices, protected by sufficiently-high tariffs, they can do it.

They have some juicy targets to shoot at. The EEC countries now buy 52 percent of our dollar exports of feed grains, 31 percent of our wheat and flour exports; 31 percent of our tobacco exports, 20 percent of our fruit and vegetable shipments—a total of $1.2 billion worth of our farm stuff a year. Moreover, they pay us in U.S. dollars.

When you consider that in this country 1 acre of cropland out of every 5 is devoted to raising something for export—and that our export crops are the ones in surplus trouble here—you can see the enormity of U.S. farmers' stake in what's going on. Not only crops farmers but livestock men are affected.

For that matter the whole country has reason for tremendous concern. Partly due to an already unfavorable balance of trade we're losing gold to the rest of the world at a frightening rate. In view of this the Nation can't afford to let anything serious happen to its farm exports—not when they comprise one-fourth of all U.S. sales abroad.

The one encouraging thing that's happening is that our Government is at last beginning to talk in the only terms anybody over there seems to be able to understand—possible increase of some tariffs here. Some may call this retaliation. It might better be called self defense—defense not only of our farmers but our gold supply.

Conversation, reasoning, pleading, cajoling have gotten us nowhere. We've sent two Secretaries of Agriculture over there—Benson and Freeman. The President wrote Mr.

Adenauer of Germany a note. It's been largely a waste of time. Now, late in the day, we're starting to act. It would seem about time.

We may lose some of our markets over there anyway. European farmers are fast gaining some of the efficiencies we've achieved in this country. If they can out-do us in a fair race, power to them. But if they're going to do it by walling us out we'll have to consider our own walls. Trade can't be a one-way street.

It would be too bad to get into a tariff-raising contest with the EEC. Both sides would lose. But if one wants to play the game this way the other will be forced to. That ought to be made clear, right now and with no pussy-footing around.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this afternoon I attended the program at the Lincoln Memorial conducted by the leaders in charge of the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. It was the most moving and inspiring experience in my life in connection with any matter involving public affairs.

I rise to congratulate and compliment and commend the dedicated American citizens who rendered such a noble service in directing and conducting that program.

Of the many that could be mentioned, I particularly want to pay tribute and extend my congratulations to Mr. A. Philip Randolph, director of the march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

I commend Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who made an eloquent and brilliant speech in the program, who courageously outlined the legislative responsibilities that lie ahead for the Congress and for the American people.

I congratulate Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

I am sure that those who were present or saw the program on television must agree with me, by an overwhelming majority, that Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., made a plea this afternoon that will go down in the history of American oratory and will inspire fellow Americans for years to come. That speech set forth not only his dreams about which he spoke so eloquently, but also the dreams of all patriotic Americans who want to save this Republic, for this Republic cannot long endure if we continue to deny to the people of America the guarantees of the Republic.

To me the moving program this afternoon set forth more clearly, eloquently, and unanswerably than anything which has happened in America in recent times the point that some of us, in our feeble way, have been trying to make in the Senate for many years.

The program spelled out in irrefutable proof the fact that we have never delivered to the colored people of America, since the Emancipation Proclamation, the Constitution of the United States. Time and again tens of thousands of fellow citizens whose skins are black raised their voices to the heavens this afternoon in a plea for deliverance from the economic bondage in which the white man still holds them, for deliverance of the Constitution and its guarantees to them.

No group of politicians in Congress, in Alabama, in Mississippi, in Georgia, or in any other Southern State, or in any Northern State, can answer the plea that went up at Lincoln's Memorial this afternoon, that in our time, immediately, we deliver the Constitution of the United States to the colored people of America, and guarantee them, through enforcement, the rights set out in the Constitution.

I congratulate and commend not only those already mentioned in these remarks, but also every other participant in that program this afternoon. In my judgment they kindled a great fire of enthusiasm for freedom for the Negroes of America, which is destined to sweep this country from coast to coast.

I ask unanimous consent that the printed program of the march on Washington for jobs and freedom, August 28, 1963, which was presented most fittingly in the shadow of the great memorial which has been built to the Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

It is fitting that this program was held at unquestionably the greatest shrine in the United States. If we have a national shrine, temporal in nature, it is the Lincoln Memorial. Although it has been said by some that too many people overlook the fact that Lincoln is dead, the inalienable principles of human rights for which Lincoln stood must never die in this Republic; nor must they continue to be denied to the Negroes of America. It was particularly fitting that the historic program should be held at Lincoln's shrine.

I ask unanimous consent that there also be printed in my remarks the statement by the heads of the 10 organizations calling for discipline in connection with the Washington march of August 28, 1963, signed by a group of patriotic and dedicated fellow American citizens.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a list of the 10 demands of the leaders and the participants in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom, which constitute 10 commandments to the politicians of America to take the necessary steps to bring about the deliverance of the Constitution and its guarantees to the colored people of America.

There being no objection, the program, the statement, and the demands were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom: August 28, 1963

LINCOLN MEMORIAL PROGRAM

1. The national anthem, led by Marian Anderson.
2. Invocation, the Very Reverend Patrick O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington.
3. Opening remarks, A. Philip Randolph, director March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom.
4. Remarks, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk, United Presbyterian Church of the United States of America; vice chairman, Commission on Race Relations of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America.
5. Tribute to Negro Women Fighters for Freedom, Daisy Bates, Diane Nash Bevel, Mrs. Medgar Evers, Mrs. Herbert Lee, Rosa Parks, and Gloria Richardson.
6. Remarks, John Lewis, national chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.
7. Remarks, Walter Reuther, president, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL–CIO; chairman, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.
8. Remarks, James Farmer, national director, Congress of Racial Equality.
9. Selection, Eva Jessye, choir.
10. Prayer, Rabbi Uri Miller, president, Synagogue Council of America.
11. Remarks, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League.
12. Remarks, Mathew Ahmann, executive director, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice.
13. Remarks, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
14. Selection, Miss Mahalia Jackson.
15. Remarks, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress.
16. Remarks, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
17. The Pledge, A. Philip Randolph.
18. Benediction, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College.

Statement by the heads of the 10 organizations calling for discipline in connection with the Washington march of August 28, 1963

"The Washington March of August 28 is more than just a demonstration.

"It was conceived as an outpouring of the deep feeling of millions of white and colored American citizens that the time has come for the Government of the United States of America, and particularly for the Congress of that Government, to grant and guarantee complete equality in citizenship to the Negro minority of our population.

"As such, the Washington march is a living petition—in the flesh—of the scores of thousands of citizens of both races who will be present from all parts of our country.

"It will be orderly, but not subservient. It will be proud, but not arrogant. It will be nonviolent, but not timid. It will be unified in purposes and behavior, not splintered into groups and individual competitors. It will be outspoken, but not raucous.

"It will have the dignity befitting a demonstration in behalf of the human rights of 20 millions of people, with the eye and the judgment of the world focused upon Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963.

"In a neighborhood dispute there may be stunts, rough words and even hot insults; but when a whole people speaks to its government, the dialog and the action must be on a level reflecting the worth of that people and the responsibility of that government.

"We, the undersigned, who see the Washington march as wrapping up the dreams, hopes, ambitions, tears, and prayers of millions who have lived for this day, call upon the members, followers, and wellwishers of our several organizations to make the March a disciplined and purposeful demonstration.

"We call upon them all, black and white, to resist provocations to disorder and to violence.

"We ask them to remember that evil persons are determined to smear this march and to discredit the cause of equality by deliberate efforts to stir disorder.

"We call for self-discipline, so that no one in our own ranks, however enthusiastic, shall be the spark for disorder.

"We call for resistance to the efforts of those who, while not enemies of the march as such, might seek to use it to advance causes not dedicated primarily to civil rights or to the welfare of our country.

"We ask each and every one in attendance in Washington or in spiritual attendance back home to place the cause above all else.

"Do not permit a few irresponsible people to hang a new problem around our necks as we return home. Let's do what we came to do—place the national human rights problem squarely on the doorstep of the national Congress and of the Federal Government.

"Let's win at Washington."

> Mathew Ahmann, executive director of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, vice-chairman of the Commission on Race Relations of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America; James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress; A. Philip Randolph, president of the Negro American Labor Council; Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and chairman, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

In addition, the march has been endorsed by major religious, fraternal, labor and civil rights organizations. A full list, too long to include here, will be published.

WHAT WE DEMAND [1]

1. Comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation from the present Congress—without compromise or filibuster—to guarantee all Americans access to all public accommodations, decent housing, adequate and integrated education, and the right to vote.
2. Withholding of Federal funds from all programs in which discrimination exists.
3. Desegregation of all school districts in 1963.
4. Enforcement of the 14th amendment—reducing congressional representation of States where citizens are disfranchised.
5. A new Executive order banning discrimination in all housing supported by Federal funds.
6. Authority for the Attorney General to institute injunctive suits when any constitutional right is violated.
7. A massive Federal program to train and place all unemployed workers—Negro and white—on meaningful and dignified jobs at decent wages.
8. A national minimum wage act that will give all Americans a decent standard of living. (Government surveys show that anything less than $2 an hour fails to do this.)
9. A broadened Fair Labor Standards Act to include all areas of employment which are presently excluded.
10. A Federal Fair Employment Practices Act barring discrimination by Federal, State, and municipal governments, and by employers, contractors, employment agencies, and trade unions.

Mr. MORSE. In closing, let me say that the symbolism, the significance, and the meaning of this great historic program which was held this afternoon at the site of Lincoln's shrine, place a serious responsibility upon this session of Congress.

The significance of this program this afternoon cannot be laughed off. It cannot be brushed aside. We politicians must come to grips with it. We must come to grips with those in our midst who indicate that they are ready to use whatever parliamentary weapons are available to them to deny the delivery of the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America.

The senior Senator from Oregon repeats the call to duty on the part of those who believe in the civil rights program, believe in delivering civil liberties to the Negroes of America, believe that the time has come to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America, to make it perfectly clear that we will stay here not only until January 1, but that we will continue in session as long as is necessary to pass the legislation that will carry out the demands which the Negroes of America are entitled to have fulfilled.

I renew the position I took several weeks ago, when I said to my leadership that if, as, and when the filibuster against the President's civil rights program starts on the floor of the Senate, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, there should not be any recess. I am not moved by the argument that the program as outlined may impose some hardships on our colleagues in the Senate. We will protect any colleagues who cannot suffer any of the hardships that may be involved in breaking the filibuster.

Mr. President, come with me and look at the sufferings and hardships that the white people of America, by their failure to deliver the Constitution of the United States to the colored people during the past long 100 years, have imposed upon the colored masses of America. Do not talk to me about hardships suffered by politicians. It is about time they suffered some hardships. If they do not want to suffer some hardships in order to carry out the trust of their office, which they swore to do when they raised their hands at the desk and took their oaths to uphold the Constitution of the United States; if the job is too tough for them; let them resign and get out of the Senate.

There is much at stake in this historic battle. Time is wasting. We do not have much time. Speaker after speaker this afternoon did not hesitate to use the ugly word and say that a revolution is on in America—a revolution for constitutional rights—a peaceful revolution. But we never know the ultimate course of revolutions, if people who are revolting believe their rights are constantly faced with one setback after another.

I shall continue to pray that this revolution may be resolved quickly, to remove the danger of any threat to the Republic, and that it may be done within our constitutional processes of government by law. But that is up to us, the politicians. We shall have much to answer for if we start to water down, to duck and hedge, weave, and equivocate, in respect to the rightful demands of the colored people of America, expressed again in the shadows of Lincoln's shrine this afternoon, at the great, historic meeting that was held there.

I make these comments now because now is the time for constitutionalists in the Senate to stand up and be counted. Now is the time to make the issue perfectly clear to Senators who, in all sincerity, but with great misguided judgment, try to argue that the Negroes of America should not receive now the constitutional guarantees which have been denied them these long 100 years.

To the American people, I say, in closing: Every one of you has responsibilities of citizenship. You must stand up and be counted as to whether you are going to sustain the foundations of this Republic, or whether, for selfish reasons, or out of prejudice and bigotry, or for any other reasons, you will support a denial of constitutional rights to the Negroes of America. Let me say to you, my fellow citizens, that unless you make clear to your elected politicians that you want the Constitution delivered to the Negroes now, the image of the United States throughout the world, in all our foreign policy relations, will soon develop into the ugly image of hypocrisy. Already, in too many places in the world, the United States is looked upon as the most hypocritical nation in the world because of our failure to practice our professings of freedom and constitutional guarantees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened with keen attention and interest to the eloquent remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], concerning the demonstration—all day—here in the Nation's Capital, in the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom.

Early this morning it was my privilege to meet with the representatives of the United Church, a Congregational church group, which met at one of the fine churches in this community. There were several hundred delegates or representatives of the Congregational denomination. I was very much moved by what took place in that church, and I was very much impressed by the caliber of the people in attendance. Later on, I was privileged to meet with representatives and delegates from Minnesota that joined in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. I believe there were about 100 or more Minnesota delegates here in the Nation's Capital for the massive demonstration.

This afternoon, I attended the activities and ceremonies at the Lincoln Memorial. I wish I were an artist, Mr. President, because the scene I witnessed was beautiful. It was an experience that will live in my memory as long as I live.

---

[1] Support of the march does not necessarily indicate endorsement of every demand listed. Some organizations have not had an opportunity to take an official position on all of the demands advocated here.

I wish to associate myself with splendid and moving remarks of the Senator from Oregon; and for a few moments I should like to interpret for the Senate the meaning of this meeting as I saw it.

First of all let me say that in Washington during the past few weeks there were many who expressed worry and concern because of the possibility of disorder or violence in the Nation's Capital, due to the large number of people who were coming here from all over the United States.

Tonight the American people have been reassured, not by words but by deeds. There was no violence; no disorder.

We have seen self-discipline, good manners, orderly procedure, and respect for law and order. All those great qualities of the American character were exemplified today.

I was in favor of the demonstration, and I said so in the Senate. I was not for it because I thought it would change overnight the attitudes of some Members of Congress; but I was for it because the people wanted it, and because I believe in constitutional guarantees.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Oregon referred to the oath he took, as a Senator, to uphold the Constitution. I, too, took that oath, Mr. President; and at all times I will uphold the Constitution to the best of my ability. That great document contains the guarantee of the right of petition, the guarantee of the right to assemble peacefully, the guarantee of the right to speak, the guarantee of freedom of the press, the guarantee of freedom of religion, and, in a sense, a guarantee of freedom of thought and freedom of conscience. Today, all these freedoms were brought into being—into living reality—all of them took on added light. This afternoon the Constitution became a living document, not merely a legal instrument, setting out the procedures and institutions of government. Today it became a living document in the hearts, the minds, and the souls of millions of Americans.

I was delighted and honored to be a part of the meeting today. Many Members of Congress went to the Lincoln Memorial and joined with the more than 200,000 good citizens of the United States who gathered in the beautiful area between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. Our fellow citizens gathered to speak up for freedom. That was the purpose of the meeting. Songs of America were sung. Songs of our religious faiths were sung, and the assembled thousands were addressed by leaders who spoke up for democracy and freedom.

Mr. President, that great gathering took place on what amounted to a huge stage.

During the day, many newspaper reporters asked me, "Senator, do you think this demonstration will influence Congress?" "Senator, what do you think of the demonstration? What is your evaluation of it?"

First, Mr. President, let me say this was a demonstration by thousands of our citizens of good conduct, orderly procedure, respect for law and order, self-respect, and self-discipline. It was also a demonstration that when Americans are faced with difficult problems, they still have faith and a sense of good humor. There were more smiles on the faces of those who today participated in that demonstration, yes, many more smiles than you will ever see behind the Iron Curtain. Not long ago I was privileged to be a member of the Senate delegation which went to Moscow. Although I found there people who were hard at work, and dedicated to their country and to their system—people who are strong and healthy, one thing seemed to be lacking—the happiness of the soul which is revealed by a smile on the countenance. A smile is an expression of the soul and of the spirit.

I venture to say that today millions of Americans saw on the television the panorama of healthy, enthusiastic, vigorous Americans who conducted themselves with honor and dignity and possessed a sense of self-reliance and good humor.

It was a wonderful demonstration. Prior to it, when I was asked about the demonstration, I said in the Senate, "It will be a blessed event." Mr. President, it is, and it was. It was good for the city of Washington, D.C.; it was good for the Nation; it was good for the entire world; and it was good for the United States of America throughout the world.

At the demonstration I saw Americans who were dedicated to the principles of individual liberty, political freedom, and the Constitution of the United States. I saw there an integrated audience. It has been said that one picture is worth 10,000 words. Today, millions of the American people saw, by television, people of various races, creeds, and nationalities standing together, singing together, speaking together, walking together, playing together, and working together in the Nation's Capital. Let no one tell me it is necessary to have segregation.

More good things took place in Washington, D.C. this afternoon than in many a year. People joined together, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. A moment ago I said that the scene was like a huge stage, and the 200,000 people present, including the speakers and other participants, were in a sense actors upon the stage.

Every newspaper in America—indeed, almost every newspaper in the world—was represented today. Books, magazines, periodicals, radio and television were represented. There was full coverage. What a tribute to free speech and a free press. What a tribute to our democracy. People in our great country were demonstrating and petitioning their Government in their Capital City, and the great free press of America—the news media of America—carried the whole story to the whole world. The USIA was there to take the story to every country in the world as it is, and not doctored or censored, but as it is and as it was. It was marvelous.

Yes. The participants were like actors in a mighty drama. Who was the audience, and where was the audience? Not here. The audience was back in every village, town, hamlet, city, and farm home in America—185 million people—because this great drama went out to the people this afternoon. I venture to say that there was more mass education on the issues of social justice and human rights in America today than in all the history of our Republic.

We often talk about the power of television, the press, and the written and spoken word. Today we witnessed it. Millions of people, for the first time in their lives, were brought face to face with the cruel realities of social injustice, as revealed by one witness after another, as in a mightly court of public opinion. Millions of people heard for the first time the full meaning of bigotry and discrimination. They also heard the message of opportunity and equality. Millions of people heard about the President's civil rights program and about other features of proposed civil rights legislation. They heard about it from people who not only spoke about it, but those whose very lives are involved in it.

I shall never forget what an old preacher friend of mine once told me: "HUBERT, you will never know what it is to grieve until you have suffered. You will never know pain until you have experienced it. You will never know injustice until you have been the victim of it."

Those who can best portray the ugliness and the tragedy of inequality, injustice, and inhumanity are the ones who have experienced it. People were on the platform today who had been thrown in jail only because they asked to be given the full privileges of American citizenship. People were speaking today who had been beaten by police and whose only crime was that they wanted to vote. They wanted the protections of the Constitution. But today there was no bitterness. I never heard one word of bitterness.

It was wonderful to note the sense of understanding, the compassion, and the charity of those who spoke and participated. What a tribute to our country. What a tribute to the Judaic-Christian faith of our country. What a tribute to the ethical and moral standards that we have inherited. This afternoon every American has a right to be proud. Yes, every American ought to reexamine his conscience, too, as to what he has been doing to his fellow man.

Let it be crystal clear that when any man is denied freedom, it thereby diminishes the freedom of all.

Freedom is indivisible. Liberty is indivisible. Whenever freedom is denied one, it is denied in part to all. As the poet said: "There is a tide in the affairs of men."

Indeed, that time is here when we are going to achieve the fulfillment of the promise of the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation. I am happy that I am alive in 1963. What a wonderful time to be alive.

I have often thought what a historic moment it must have been in January 1863, when the great Abraham Lincoln proclaimed the end of slavery, set free millions of the slaves. But what a great privilege it is to live in 1963—the space age, the atom age, the age of human rights. This is the age of excitement. It is the age of achievement. Consider what we have been able to do in recent years in the fields of science, medicine, good living, industry, and technology. Contemplate what we are going to do, in the field of human relations. We must do it. It is inevitable.

Mr. President, sometimes I pity those who stand in the way, because what we see is like the relentless force of nature itself. Man cannot overcome nature nor can he overcome literally the strength of the spirit.

There is a mighty force at work in the world. It is the force of justice, and it is expressing itself in a Nation committed to justice. What our Nation needs to give to the world is not a big bomb, as we have been told in recent hearings. The Soviet Union can make a bomb as big as we can, and has made a bigger one. The Communists can produce arms, weapons, missiles. But they are having a hard time producing justice, because it is not in their system, and they are having a difficult time giving reality and meaning to what we, for lack of a better phrase, call love or compassion, and understanding. This is what we have to offer to the world. We have a great heritage of social justice and, like the wonderful great prophet of social justice of the Old Testament, Amos, who is too seldom quoted and too seldom read, said in those moving words:

> Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.

And justice will roll over this earth like a mighty river if we give it the headwaters. Those headwaters must be in the United States of America. That is what I think was going on today.

Mr. President, I have been asked the following question: Will the Congress be moved by today's demonstration. That is a question for each Member of Congress to determine. Members of Congress will be either moved to do what is right in this body or they may be moved out of this body.

They will hear from the people. I am not at all sure that this particular demonstration as such will have an immediate direct effect upon the Congress. Most of the Members of Congress who were present at the demonstration today were already for the civil rights program. Members of Congress that have been opposed to it were not there. But we have representative government. The message went out to every home and every family in America today. And the people will speak up.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the television networks, the independent radio and television stations, the newspapers of America, all the radio stations, and the news media of America. I wish to thank them—yes, generously thank them—for what they did today in public information. They really performed a fine public service.

Mr. President, the Congress will be affected by what happened here today. It will be affected because the people back home will talk to Members of the Congress, and either the Congress will listen or some Members will be brought home never to return.

It seems to me that one has a very difficult case to prove when he tries to prove that segregation is constitutional.

One surely cannot prove that it is morally right. One surely cannot prove that it is politically right. One can say that it is convenient, or that some desire it, or that it has existed and we want to keep it, but one cannot justify it morally, ethically, politically—and I do not think one can justify it even economically.

So today we really and truly witnessed a marvelous event. Every segment of our society was present; labor, business, the professions—the young and the old, those of different races, creeds, and nationalities.

And the great spiritual leaders were there. Was it not a wonderful thing to have a meeting highlighted by prayer, by music, by a plea for unity, by a plea for social justice, by a plea for respect for law and order? Was it not wonderful?

Imagine what could happen in America as a result of the injustices which have been perpetrated upon some. Imagine what could happen if the Communist or the demagog were able to get hold of a movement such as this. But they will not get hold of it. Do Senators know why? It is because the great spiritual leaders of America and men like A. Philip Randolph—from labor and from business, who have practiced fair employment practices in industry for many years, have spoken up in the best tradition of this country. They have taken on social responsibility. When free men take on social responsibility and take up the cause of social justice the demagog does not have a chance.

So I rejoice at what has happened. I predict that it will influence the Congress.

I join with the Senator from Oregon in saying that we shall be in session until we pass that legislation, whatever may be the cost and whatever may need to be done to have it accomplished. We dare not walk away from this challenge.

I hope that the Congress will become as excited about the abuses of freedom within America as Members do about what happens behind the Iron Curtain. I wish there were as many speeches made on this floor about abuses and the denial of freedom within America as are made about Cuba and Castro.

Let us clean our own house. Let us come to the world with clean hands, with clean hearts, with clean consciences.

Mr. President, the trouble is that we prefer to lecture and to condemn the Khrushchevs and the Castros rather than to face up to our own iniquity, to face up to our own evil, and our own shortcomings.

No Senator can justify illiteracy in this country. No Senator can justify discrimination and bigotry. No man can justify the denial of equal justice under the law.

Oh, the fact that it happens one may be able to become accustomed to, but one cannot justify it before God, a court, or within his own conscience.

At the conclusion of today's meeting there was a pledge read by A. Philip Randolph, and those present took the pledge—and they meant it. I shall put it in the RECORD. It says:

> Standing before the Lincoln Memorial on the 28th of August, in the centennial year of emancipation, I affirm my complete personal commitment to the struggle for jobs and freedom for all Americans.
>
> To fulfill that commitment, I pledge that I will not relax until victory is won.
>
> I pledge that I will join and support all actions undertaken in good faith in accord with the time-honored democratic tradition of nonviolent protest, of peaceful assembly and petition, and of redress through the courts and the legislative process.
>
> I pledge to carry the message of the march to my friends and neighbors back home and to arouse them to an equal commitment and an equal effort. I will march and I will write letters. I will demonstrate and I will vote. I will work to make sure that my voice and those of my brothers ring clear and determined from every corner of our land.
>
> I pledge my heart and my mind and my body, unequivocally and without regard to personal sacrifice, to the achievement of social peace through social justice.

Mr. President, I take that pledge here in the Senate. I think it is a pledge for every American. How wonderful and fortunate it is that we have a leader who can stand before a multitude and ask people to take a pledge of democratic processes—a pledge to work through the courts, to work through the legislative process, to vote, to hold nonviolent demonstrations.

It is a pledge to law and order. It is a pledge to work with one's neighbors. It is a pledge to education.

Mr. President, to some areas of the world people take pledges to commit injustice, to destroy, to engage in subversion and to practice deceit.

There were people who came to Washington, who stood in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial, facing out to that monument of purity and simplicity, the Washington Monument—people by the thousands—who came to take what kind of a pledge? A pledge to be good Americans. A pledge to work through the processes of free government. A pledge to work through community action. A pledge of loyalty to our country and the Constitution.

Let no man criticize this group. They have come away from their demonstration with a badge of honor. I feel about 2 feet taller today because of what I witnessed my fellow Americans do. I join in saluting and commending them. I hope they will all return safely to their homes. When they get there, I hope they will be inspired with the message they have heard today, and that they will insist the Congress respond to the will and voice of the people.

I am confident that voice will be heard loud and clear.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the motion to recommit the space bill was defeated in the other body by a vote of 177 to 200. It is my understanding that a final rollcall is being taken now, and that very shortly the space bill should reach the Senate—in perhaps 10 or 20 minutes. The Senate will then take action on it.

Mr. President, in the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

NASA AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the House authorized a total of $5,203,719,400 for NASA for fiscal year 1964. The Senate authorized $5,511,520,400. The conference committee agreed to a total of $5,350,820,400. Broken down, this represents an authorization of $4,119,575,000 for research and development. This figure represents $232,125,000 less than the administration's request, $105,700,000 less than the Senate approved, and $106,400,000 more than the House approved. The total amount authorized for administrative operations is $518,185,000. This figure represents $42,115,000 less than the administration's request, $21 million less than the Senate authorized, and $10 million more than the House authorized. By virtue of the conferees' report, $713,060,400 was authorized for construction of facilities. This figure represents $86,939,600 less than the administration's request, $34 million less than the Senate approved, and $30,701,000 more than the House approved. In terms of the total administration's request, the final figure represents $361,179,600 less than the administration's request, $160,700,000 less than the Senate authorized, and $147,101,000 more than the House authorized.

Mr. President, I would like to reemphasize the fact that while the Senate committee was concerned, as always, with the actual monied requests for NASA programs, for the first time in its deliberations on NASA's fiscal year 1964 budget, major emphasis was placed on the managerial aspects and resulting administration of individual programs and projects. The Senate recognized the fact that these budget requests represent the very best estimates by the administration of what amounts would be necessary to carry out its operations. They further recognized that these estimates were, in many cases, arrived at much earlier than the time in which these programs would be implemented. Therefore, while attention was paid to the individual amounts, the Senate committee's primary emphasis was on the manner in which these programs would be conducted and the manner in which the Congress could properly be notified in the event that changes were made necessary due to further advancements in the state of the art. I believe the Senate committee's action of enumerating the individual amounts requested by NASA for its research and development programs and tightening the requirements of NASA with respect to its reprograming activities reflect this concern.

I believe, and I am sure the committee would agree, that in working out a better arrangement for the proper notification by NASA to the Congress when program changes are necessitated, and a general tightening of the flexibility which NASA has in connection with its transfer authority of funds, the end result gives NASA sufficient authority to carry out its fiscal year 1964 program with sufficient internal flexibility and yet with sufficient safeguards so that the Congress can keep advised on the conduct of our Nation's civilian space program and the manner in which NASA expends its funds to carry out its purposes.

I would like, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing the amounts requested by NASA, the results of the original House and Senate action with respect to these amounts, and the result of the conference committee action on those items wherein the House and the Senate disagreed. I hope that the conference report will be agreed to.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Action of conference committee on NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1964 (H.R. 7500)

	NASA request	House action	Senate action	Conference committee action
Research and development:				
Manned spacecraft system	$1,556,600,000	$1,436,600,000	$1,556,600,000	$1,496,600,000
Launch vehicle and propulsion system	1,168,500,000	1,138,500,000	1,153,500,000	1,147,500,000
Aerospace medicine	16,700,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Integration and checkout	153,000,000	125,000,000	140,000,000	125,000,000
Systems engineering	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Meteorological satellites	63,700,000	63,700,000	63,700,000	63,700,000
Communications satellites	51,100,000	42,175,000	44,175,000	42,175,000
Advanced applications satellites	1,000,000	0	0	0
Industrial applications	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Geophysics and astronomy	194,400,000	190,400,000	194,400,000	194,400,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	322,600,000	254,400,000	282,600,000	274,400,000
Bioscience	35,200,000	21,200,000	21,200,000	21,200,000
Launch vehicle development	130,700,000	127,700,000	127,700,000	127,700,000
Facility, training, and research grants	55,000,000	30,600,000	50,000,000	40,000,000
Space vehicle systems	61,962,000	53,462,000	53,462,000	53,462,000
Electronic systems	30,362,000	30,362,000	30,362,000	30,362,000
Human factor systems	18,200,000	13,200,000	13,200,000	13,200,000
Nuclear-electric systems	68,768,000	68,768,000	68,768,000	68,768,000
Nuclear rockets	96,687,000	91,687,000	96,687,000	94,187,000
Chemical propulsion	22,497,000	24,497,000	24,497,000	24,497,000
Space power	16,524,000	16,524,000	16,524,000	16,524,000
Aeronautics	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
Tracking and data acquisition	231,500,000	216,700,000	220,200,000	218,200,000
Total	4,351,700,000	4,013,175,000	4,225,275,000	4,119,575,000
Administrative operations	560,300,000	508,185,000	539,185,000	518,185,000

Action of conference committee on NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1964 (H.R. 7500)—Continued

	NASA request	House action	Senate action	Conference committee action
Construction of facilities:				
Ames Research Center	$13,076,000	$11,044,000	$11,044,000	$11,044,000
Flight Research Center	4,081,000	0	1,157,000	1,157,000
Goddard Space Flight Center	20,932,000	17,032,500	20,332,500	17,032,500
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	7,000,000	2,998,200	2,998,200	2,998,200
Langley Research Center	9,768,000	8,204,700	8,204,700	8,204,700
Launch Operations Center	312,855,000	279,677,000	300,316,000	284,916,000
Lewis Research Center	25,835,000	18,634,000	18,634,000	18,634,000
Manned Spacecraft Center	37,736,000	35,102,000	35,102,000	35,102,000
Marshall Space Flight Center	38,496,000	28,980,000	28,980,000	28,980,000
Michoud plant	10,003,000	8,688,000	8,688,000	8,688,000
Mississippi Test Facility	111,690,000	92,696,000	102,196,000	100,196,000
Nuclear rocket development station	20,490,000	15,650,000	15,650,000	15,650,000
Various locations	176,038,000	148,653,000	168,253,000	[1] 159,953,000
Wallops Station	2,000,000	0	505,000	505,000
Facility planning and design	10,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000
Total	800,000,000	682,359,400	747,060,400	713,060,400
Grand total	5,712,000,000	5,203,719,400	5,511,520,400	5,350,820,400

	Research and development	Administrative	Construction of facilities	Total
Total	$4,119,575,000	$518,185,000	$713,060,400	$5,350,820,400
Less than NASA request	232,125,000	42,115,000	86,939,600	361,179,600
Less than Senate approved	105,700,000	21,000,000	34,000,000	160,700,000
More than House approved	106,400,000	10,000,000	30,701,000	147,101,000

---

[1] **Items in conference on various locations:**

	NASA request	House action	Senate action	Conference committee action
Electronic Research Center	$5,000,000	$3,900,000	$5,000,000	$3,900,000
Instrumentation ships	90,000,000	80,000,000	89,000,000	83,300,000
LEM Test Facility	15,000,000	11,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
Manned Space Flight Data Acquisition and Tracking Facility	21,000,000	14,500,000	21,000,000	19,500,000

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall that at our prolonged hearings on this measure the NASA Administration particularly requested the restoration of three facilities projects at the Launch Operations Center at Cape Canaveral, which had been denied by the House. I recall that those projects were all placed in the Senate version of the bill.

Without enumerating them, I wonder if the distinguished Senator can tell us whether, under the conference report, those three projects restored by the Senate committee remained in the conference-approved measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. This was one of the items on which the Senate conferees felt there must be affirmative action. The calibrations and standards laboratory, the launch equipment shop, and the optical and electric component servicing facility were entirely omitted from the House bill. If we had taken the House bill as it was, those three facilities would have been denied forever. Therefore, we put them in the bill. While there was a cut in the overall appropriation, those three items are back in the bill and have been agreed to in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for having insisted on that, because, as I recall—and I am sure the Senator does also—the Space Administration felt that the program would be seriously injured if immediate authorization and provision for these three projects were not included this year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The Space Administration insisted on this authorization. It said these facilities were vital projects, and therefore the conferees agreed to put them back in.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire about the language of the conference report relating to the electronic center. Was the House language accepted, or was the Senate language accepted?

Mr. ANDERSON. The House language was accepted. I believe that if we had fully understood what the difficulty was with the House, we might have accepted the House language in the beginning. The House did not get as full a report on the electronic center as it desired. The Senate committee considered the matter a little later than did the House, and had received a full report. Therefore, on the basis of the report which it had received, the Senate committee felt it had enough information on the need for the facility, but only wanted information on the location of it. The House committee was never given information on the need for it, it felt; nor did they have sufficient information on the location of it. When we met in conference we learned what the situation was, and we accepted the House language, feeling that there should be not only an expression of the need for it, but also an expression with respect to the location of it. These things are still open. The House language was accepted by the Senate conferees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate what the Senator has said about this item. In looking over the justification for the laboratory, I saw many items that were listed in the report which appeared to me could well be undertaken on contracts outside a single center. I feel that there is a need for the center, and I do not want to be misunderstood with respect to that. However, I do not feel that all the items that are listed as being possibilities, or as being within the framework of the center, ought to go into one center. It appeared that this would be a concentration of a little too much in one place. I was pleased that the conferees gave some consideration to taking another look at the entire program with respect to the need and the location of the center, and its functions.

Mr. ANDERSON. It developed that there were many communities which desired to bid for this facility, and wanted an opportunity to be heard. The area around San Francisco has two locations, one, a part of the University of California, and one connected with the Stanford Research Laboratory. The area so ably represented by the Senator from Minnesota has one also.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the Twin Cities.

Mr. ANDERSON. At Minneapolis. The Chicago area, so ably represented by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], also has a network of facilities which might be useful.

There is in Ohio another group of facilities. Finally, there is the network in the New England States, comprising five laboratories, close to Boston.

We did not feel it wise to limit NASA to any one particular place until it had had an opportunity to examine all the proposed locations and bring back to the respective committees of the Senate and the House the results of studies, and request approval by those committees. Therefore we considered all of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator repeat the overall amount approved by the conferees?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is $5,350,820,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator from New Mexico care to estimate what percentage, roughly, of the whole amount will now go to the Apollo-Gemini-Saturn and related facilities, which are referred to as the moon shot?

Mr. ANDERSON. If we charge everything to the program, it might run as high as 60 percent. I do not believe it is quite fair to charge everything to the program. I would say it would be about $1,600 million. I would not want the Senator to come back, however, later and say, "You misled us." If we charged everything to the program, it would be about 60 percent so far as the manned flight was concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But certainly at a minimum it is $1,600 million for the so-called moon shot program?

Mr. ANDERSON. Per se, and probably more, depending on how one looks at it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I have correctly understood the general statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, he believes that all of the principal fields of operation of the space project are well supplied with funds for 1964 and will be able to continue their operations without serious handicap of any kind. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senate committee felt that some additional money might have been appropriated. The question comes down to how much we delay projects or how much we put them off until another year. For example, I do not personally believe that it saves money to say that $10 million shall be spent in 1964, and $15 million more in 1965. If the whole $25 million were authorized in 1964, it would be satisfactory. However, I say to the Senator from Florida that, on the basis of all the evidence we had, I believe the space program all the way through is adequately financed by the sums in the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee and the chairman of the conference committee, that it is not helpful in the long run to withhold authorizations for a project so as to provide for it piecemeal. The Senator will remember that I agreed with him on that point. However, I wished to hear him say it, and he has said it, and he has satisfied me completely, that there is no important project or subproject of NASA which in 1964 will be required to suffer injury in any way by the 1964 authorization measure, provided the appropriations follow closely the track of the authorization measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is my assurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 28, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 1139. An act to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution consenting to an extension of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas; and

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY AT 9 A.M.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate, under the previous order, stand in adjournment until Friday, next, at 9 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, August 30, 1963, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 28, 1963:

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admirals

Capt George D. Synon
Capt. John B. Oren

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Robert Hackett, O18380, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. John William Bowen, O18904, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Henry W. Buse, Jr.
Herman Nickerson, Jr.
William P. Battell
George H. Cloud
Frank C. Tharin
Lewis J. Fields
Raymond L. Murray
Frederick E. Leek

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Paul R. Tyler
William J. VanRyzin
William T. Fairbourn
Bruno A. Hochmuth
William R. Collins
Louis B. Robertshaw
Rathvon McC. Tompkins
Paul J. Fontana

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Paul J. Fontana
George S. Bowman, Jr.
Wood B. Kyle
Lewis W. Walt
Joseph O. Butcher
John F. Dobbin
Carl A. Youngdale
Ormond R. Simpson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles J. Quilter
Donn J. Robertson
Lowell E. English
Alvin S. Sanders
Gordon D. Gayle
Melvin D. Henderson
William G. Thrash
Marion E. Carl
Arthur H. Adams
Frederick J. Karch
John W. Antonelli

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Charles W. Abbitt to be colonel, and ending George S. Wilson to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 14, 1963.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Casimer S. Gappa to be major, and ending Hugo F. Zettler to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 14, 1963.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning John F. Ackerman to be captain, and ending Robert R. Yount to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 6, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 14: 34: *Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people.*

O Thou God of men and of nations, we rejoice that as Americans we have been blessed with a lineage of great and noble patriots and heroes whom Thou didst lead in the building of a nation in which all men have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Inspire us to carry on with faith and fortitude to make our beloved country truly the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Show us how we may awaken within ourselves and in the heart of all our citizens those inner controls, disciplines, and restraints with which we have been created.

Grant that we may be so devoted and loyal to our form of government as a republic that it will become increasingly less necessary to multiply legislation and enact laws to govern our character and conduct.

Fill us with a passion to live in harmony with Thy holy will and help us to see and understand clearly those limitations which we must impose upon ourselves if we are to be a law-abiding people whose God is the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964 and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1139. An act to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1194) entitled "An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 136]

Adair
Avery
Barry
Blatnik
Cameron
Celler
Corman
Diggs
Evins
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodling
Grant
Hébert
Horton
Jones, Ala.
Leggett
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
O'Brien, Ill.
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Sheppard
Staebler
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Watson
Williams
Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 505, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 665) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

That after the passage of H.J. Res. 665, it shall then be in order to call from the Speaker's table and consider in the House the joint resolution of the Senate (S.J. Res. 102) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which makes in order the consideration of the joint resolution reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the temporary settlement of the threatened railroad strike. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate and, as a similar resolution has been adopted on yesterday by the Senate, there is a provision in the rule that provides that after this House joint resolution is adopted it would be in order to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution and consider the same.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as we all know, is the culmination of a very disturbing situation in the railroad industry that threatens a strike on tomorrow of all of the railroads in the country unless some action is taken by the Congress. I do not think anybody is going to like the resolution particularly well. However, we are confronted by an emergency of great importance. We must pass some legislation today, or the country is going to be tied up in a nationwide railroad strike tomorrow. I say that I do not think any of us are going to like it very well. In the first place, none of us like the idea that Congress should be used as a forum to break up an individual, or settle an individual, labor dispute. I am sure that the House does not like the idea of passing a resolution, which I believe is unprecedented, that requires compulsory arbitration of a labor dispute. Personally I do not like the idea that we must pass this resolution, which I had hoped would be a settlement of this controversy if we had to do it, but as a matter of fact, when you read the resolution—and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has worked on it very hard and they have been very frank in its contents and what it will do—but when you read the resolution you find that it provides for an arbitrated settlement of the major issues in controversy which relate to firemen and yard and road crews and also to safety crews. They are submitted under the resolution to compulsory arbitration. However, there are other issues in dispute between the parties which are not covered by this resolution and are to be left to the processes of collective bargaining, with the hope—and I think perhaps a well-founded hope—on the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that those minor issues may be settled in the regular way. However, these major issues which are to be submitted to compulsory arbitration will not produce a permanent settlement even of those issues, because this joint resolution provides that this arbitration award is for a period of 2 years after the effective date of the award. At the end of that 2 years the whole controversy may flare up again and we may have to deal with it at another time. That seems, however, unlikely. If this goes into effect and this arbitration award takes effect, and if the changes are made in personnel that the award provides for, it is felt, and I think with good grounds, that at the end of 2 years that will be out of the way and this question will not come back to haunt us again. I join in that hope. I am not so sure what is going to happen. But that in substance is what the resolution provides.

It does provide a certain limitation of time on the arbitrators. The arbitrators, as I assume most of the Members know who have read about this in the press, who have not seen the bill which just came in, are to be appointed, two by the industry, two by the unions, and three others to be appointed by the four selected by the parties if they can agree on the selection. If they cannot agree then so many of the three as cannot be agreed upon shall be appointed by the President.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not too familiar with the subject matter; I was not on the committee that considered the joint resolution, but I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield so that I might ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], a question with respect to the parliamentary procedure with which we will be confronted. Will the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas this: The rule makes in order House Joint Resolution 665. Will it be the purpose of the gentleman, once debate is concluded on House Joint Resolution 665, to substitute for that joint resolution Senate Joint Resolution 102?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, I think, could very well answer the question, but I shall be glad to respond. It is the purpose to take up House Joint Resolution 665, debate it and amend it to conform to the Senate-passed resolution. If the House agrees to it and the amendments, then it will be the intention, as provided by the rule, to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

Mr. GROSS. As amended.

Mr. HARRIS. As amended. And then it will go on to the President for his signature.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I might say in further answer that the rule provides on page 2 that it shall be in order to call from the Speaker's table and consider in the House the joint resolution of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 102, after the passage of House Joint Resolution 665.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a happy situation in which I find myself. Like the gentleman from Virginia, as he has expressed himself, I have many grave doubts concerning the legislation which we have before us today and, of course, concerning the situation which confronts the Nation.

I do not believe that any of us who are gathered here in this Chamber this afternoon want to see or to experience or to cause to come about a great nationwide railroad strike that would paralyze our national economy, that would create great unemployment throughout the country, that would be extremely costly to many people, and would probably, in the end, solve but little.

Neither do many of us want to see a situation come about whereby our Federal Government can or may seize the Nation's railroads and have Government operation thereof.

Mr. Speaker, some of us are old enough to remember and to recall the national experience that came when the Government of the United States did attempt to run our great railroad transportation industry years ago. We recall the troubles and the difficulties which were created thereby.

None of us, of course—few of us at least—believe in compulsory arbitration as a means to settle management-labor disputes. Most of us, if not all of us, believe difficulties and disputes between management on the one hand and labor on the other should be settled through collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, most of us are aware of the fact that we have had this particular problem as to what should be done as to the railroad industry in connection with this management-labor dispute for the past 4 years, or more. Many of us know that there is every indication that all the different efforts made by the executive branch of Government, under the laws which have been passed by Congress for the purpose of handling matters like this, have failed and failed miserably, I might say, to bring about a solution of this great problem that confronts us. That, of course, is to be regretted.

It is also to be regretted that, in the last moments, the last hours, to say the least, before a great nationwide strike in the largest transportation system of our country, the railroad industry, is scheduled to come about at 1 minute after midnight tonight, unless some action is taken. So this matter has been dumped into the hands and into the lap of the Congress. We are being called upon at the last minute to take some action, to assume the responsibility, that others should have met and, perhaps, could have met and perhaps could not. I indict no one. But for us, the Members of Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, to step in and in virtuality become the arbiter and to reach some sort of decision as to how to settle this great issue, is a serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, this perplexing problem has been placed, of course, before the other body as well as before our own. This problem, in turn, has been given to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has wrestled with it for some time. The Committee has brought forth this resolution on this bill.

I believe few people in this House, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has said, relish or like or desire to vote for it. Many of us yet have the difficult decision to make as to whether or not we should support this legislation, as a last desperate attempt to protect this Nation from a strike that would be most injurious to all the people of America.

It seems we can all agree among ourselves, with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who was very frank when he appeared before the Rules Committee and agreed that this joint resolution does provide for compulsory arbitration of two issues which now divide management and men in the railroad industry. This resolution contains a sort of a limited proposition, and would be maintained only for 150 days under its provisions, or for 180 days under the provisions of the resolution as it passed the other body, the Senate. It would be effective for that long, or possibly for 2 years thereafter, but it would be compulsory arbitration on only the two primary issues involved in the dispute: One would be the use of firemen on diesel locomotives, and the other would be as to the makeup of traincrews.

As the committee has pointed out, and as many of you know, back in the late days of July, and in the early days of this month, management and labor in the industry had reached an almost virtual agreement that those two issues be arbitrated. They agreed in substance, although they had not signed any agreement, as to how those issues could be solved. It was believed at that time there would be a settlement of the dispute based upon the almost complete meeting of the minds between management and labor on those two particular issues. Then suddenly, as will so often happen in the affairs of men, a disagreement broke out between management of the railroad industry and the brotherhoods as to how they could or would settle the other less important disputes that were still left to be taken up and considered. As a result the whole tentative agreement to arbitrate, to submit to arbitration willingly and readily on these two issues: first, firemen on diesels and, second, the makeup of traincrews, was called off. So the whole problem, the whole dispute, was right back where it started nearly 4 years ago.

After that the matter was brought to the Congress with the usual saying: "You men and women of Congress go ahead and take charge, and pass legislation" because seemingly when others get stuck, when the problems become almost insurmountable, when it is a truly difficult problem, somehow or other it is customary to come to Congress and say "you take the responsibility." That has been done before, and it will probably be done in the future. So Congress has come up with this resolution as a solution, whether it is good or bad. There is a grave question in my mind about it. I do believe this settlement could be used and would apply for maybe 150 days or 180 days, and perhaps for 2 years, depending on which resolution is adopted. Of course, then, another strike could start afterward. On the other hand, labor and management would be free to go ahead and settle their own differences by collective bargaining before the board of arbitration might come out with its decision, if they wished to.

If they could not come to some conclusion between themselves, as it is hoped they will, some of us fear that this resolution may establish a precedent so that in the future whenever there is any management-labor dispute of national importance that affects any great industry, that affects any large group of people, that might be injurious to the general public, perhaps both sides, or perhaps the executive branch of Government as well, may rush up to the Congress and say: "You boys and girls assume this burden; take over the responsibility of solving this dispute. Pass a bill to do it."

Yet it is my understanding, as explained by the sponsors of this legislation, that the adoption of this joint resolution is not to be considered—and if that is correct, the record should show it—as a precedent to be used in the future in connection with wage and labor disputes.

Let me point out, if I may, and make clear, that under this joint resolution there is no authority given whatsoever for the arbiters to be named under it to pass on any question of wages, working hours or working conditions, but only as to who shall be employed in the capacity of firemen on diesel engines or who shall be employed to make up traincrews, and there is in this legislation no authority, and no precedent set, that would give the Congress in future years some reason or precedent to take action to control, through arbitration, wages, salaries and working conditions, for labor or for management, either one; because when that day comes and Government becomes the master, and neither management nor workmen have anything to say about wages or working conditions, then free collective bargaining will become a thing of the past, and no longer will we have free management or free labor in this country.

I have said these things because I believe they need to be said for the record. This August 28, 1963, is a historic day in many ways. Today certainly marks the first time the Congress of the United States has ever contemplated, or has ever taken the step that it may take today, in connection with this labor-management dispute.

It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of every Member of this House, that the passage of time will prove that whatever may be done here today is not only in the best interests of the Republic and its people but will prove, through the passage of time, to be a wise action.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce regarding the provisions of State laws having to do with the full-crew laws that are in existence, I understand, in some 17 States, including the State of California.

May I ask this question of the chairman of the committee: Is it his understanding that nothing in this joint resolution is to in any way preempt on behalf of the Federal Government the field affecting State full-crew laws? If he may make a comment on this, I would appreciate it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This issue was raised in the course of the hearings before the committee. Questions were asked of the various people representing management and the labor industry and witnesses representing the labor brotherhoods, the employees' representatives, and the Secretary of Labor. It was made rather clear in the course of the hearings that it would in no way affect the provisions of State laws. The committee in executive session discussed the question and concluded that it was not the intent of the committee in any way to affect State laws. On page 14 of the committee report we included, in order that this history might be made, this language:

> The committee does not intend that any award made under this section may supersede or modify any State law relating to the manning of trains.

In a footnote on page 112 of the hearings before the committee on House Joint Resolution 565, the original bill, there is a discussion of the legal basis for State "full-crew" laws, and a citation to several Supreme Court decisions upholding these laws, such as *Missouri Pacific R.R. Co.* v. *Norwood* (283 U.S. 249).

Therefore, since this bill does not mention the subject of State laws, and since, as the committee report shows, we do not intend to affect these laws, I am confident they are not affected by the bill.

I think that is about as clear as we can make it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Then certainly as I would understand it, of course, it would be the intent of the Congress that we are not preempting the field in which States have legislated in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy between the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], raises a question that has not previously been discussed on the floor of the House. It was discussed in the committee yesterday before the Committee on Rules. I do not like to remain silent in view of the statement that a State law can overcome the constitutional provision which gives exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal Government in matters of interstate commerce. I do not know what precedents may have been found with reference to this question, but of course, in the matter of purely intrastate commerce under our Constitution the State, of course, would have authority, but when it comes to dealing with interstate commerce I think the provisions of the Constitution are such and the decisions of the courts are such that there is no way in which a State can overcome the power of the Federal Government under the interstate commerce clause.

I simply wanted to make my own position clear with reference to that question, for whatever it may be worth.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding to me at this point. Would this not mean in effect that about the only kind of train operation in which State laws would prevail would be in the switching of cars involving switch engine operations?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, it is just a question of what is or what constitutes interstate commerce. Now, as you know, the decisions of the courts and the actions of the Congress have gone a long way in putting almost everything under interstate commerce.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution which provides compulsory arbitration. I think the opposition should likewise be heard. I spoke in 1946 against the then resolution on the railroad labor question which would have drafted railroad employees into the armed services, and again I speak against this type of resolution. First, we must realize this is setting aside regular collective bargaining procedures and collective bargaining practices completely in the railroad industry in these two major areas—firemen and crew consist.

Second, it is not simply setting aside these practices for 150 to 180 days, but it is setting them aside for up to 2 years, so that for 2 years on the making of an award in these areas there would be very readily what we call slave labor in this country.

Third, it goes further than any bill we have ever had because it not only says who shall be employed and who may be employed, but it also destroys job tenure; it destroys seniority and it aims at certain people in certain jobs which they have held for years, to the certain extinction of their jobs and their livelihood. This is the first time this has ever occurred in this country.

I have appreciated the gentlemen on the Committee on Rules expressing their doubts on both sides on the proposed legislation. The doubts are tremendous and they should be large, because this is the buck being passed to Congress to impose controls in the railroad industry. Congress by this resolution is also passing the buck to the President, because whoever appoints those three final arbiters is the one who has the real responsibility.

The next point is this: this is certainly a precedent for every other industry in the transportation industry. There are not just the railroads in the transportation industry. There are trucks, there are river transportation and the merchant marine. So we are making a precedent, even if it is limited narrowly to transportation, because we are on notice that this resolution makes rules applicable within the whole transportation industry in interstate commerce. These precedents will apply equally to all public utilities in interstate commerce.

Next, I represent a very large labor district in the city of Pittsburgh. I am very proud as a Republican to do it. I have been here for 19 years representing these people in the labor movement. We have an area which has every type of person in it. We in Pittsburgh believe in free collective bargaining. By this resolution, prior to any action such as a strike, Congress is taking away free collective bargaining, because—let us face it—Congress is being frightened in advance of any national emergency. This resolution is not a cooling off period, but compulsory arbitration and final settlement of the terms of a contract concerning employment by the force of Government compulsion.

I would repeat in this time of emotion in the House. There is no strike on now. There is no national emergency. The deadline is midnight tonight and the parties should be in continuous collective bargaining with the national interest in mind by both parties. The President should yet call the parties together. Let Congress stay in session and see if the parties cannot settle the dispute as they were very close to settlement very recently. Why should Congress, ahead of time, when there are these hours remaining, take away from the parties their basic rights of collective bargaining? They should be doing collective bargaining right now instead of watching what Congress is going to do. Labor and management should realize that if the basic rights of collective bargaining are taken away from the parties in our industry, the same procedure can be used in all other industries, and contract provisions be imposed by Government force through compulsory arbitration. These contract provisions are being imposed without the consent of the parties, and binding on both management and employees.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Both sides of this railroad dispute have been in to see me in my office, and not a few of them. My advice to each one is, go back and bargain collectively. Come up with a good contract agreement, as you should, not only for the benefit of the railroad business but for the benefit of the labor movement of this country. Management and labor should run the U.S. railroads, not the U.S. Government.

I would like to point out further that this is a very unusual thing where railroad management and the owners in this country are not only sitting on the lap of Government, but they are jumping on it. Where is this industry, this free enterprise that has said, "Let me handle management affairs without Government interference, and keep big government out"? Where is this brave new world of free enterprise which is always coming in here and saying to me, "Jimmy, do not put more controls on us"? Here in the railroad dispute, we have industry itself coming in and asking for compulsory arbitration.

Let me say further to you that when we study the enforcement of this law, it is to be enforced by the Attorney General. This is provided under section VII. It states:

> The obligations imposed by this joint resolution, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

I would point out again this is an ex post facto law, the first we have ever had in labor-management situations. The ex facto provision is on page 2, line 6, where it says:

> That no carrier * * * and no labor organization * * * shall make any change, except by agreement, or pursuant to an arbitration award as hereinafter provided, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any such notices.

In addition it says this:

> Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

That, Mr. Speaker, is against the Constitution of the United States. This body cannot set aside an action previously taken, or even a contract by an ex post facto law or change even a partial agreement made between labor and management.

May I point out further that the method of enforcement of this particular resolution is by force. This is return to the old junction procedures without specifically saying it. The administration must now come to injunction by force and by court order. We people in the steel industry and in the coal mining areas of this country know what rule by injunction was. We have advanced beyond that in Pennsylvania. I hope the Congress will defeat this resolution, because first, it is ex post facto; secondly, it is rule by injunction; and thirdly, this proposed legislation is settling the terms of agreement and employment by Government action which is a completely new departure in labor-management legislation in America.

I would emphasize that the Taft-Hartley 80-day delay provision is a cooling-off period only and does not settle the terms of the contract for the parties, as this legislation does. We must remember that the Taft-Hartley Act did not settle or terminate the dispute, it simply postpones and maintains status quo for 80 days. I emphasize the Taft-Hartley Act postponed, in order to have a cooling-off period. This proposed legislation makes the Taft-Hartley Act provisions look like a summer tea party. This legislation not only provides a cooling-off period, not for 80 days but for 150 to 180 days, and on top of that, imposes for 2 years the word of the Government on everything through compulsory arbitration. This determines who shall be employed, who loses his job, and can easily be extended to wages, hours, and working conditions. It is impossible and implausible to divide up collective bargaining so that by this legislation there can be collective bargaining on one part, or on two parts or six parts, of an industrial dispute such as this, and then have forced arbitration on two basic proposals in dispute between the parties, with the arbitration board decisions binding on both parties. My experience in collective bargaining has been as attorney representing both management and labor and as a small employer. I have 70 or 80 employees on 6 newspapers who are represented by their chosen union. And let me tell you that we have our arguments. I have had big disagreements with the representatives of these employees. We have worked out all problems by collective bargaining and voluntary agreement. I like collective bargaining procedures and oppose this resolution which substitutes, for collective bargaining and freedom of contract, compulsory arbitration and imposition of settlement on the parties by Government force and action. This is a bad precedent.

Congress should make these people go back to free collective bargaining, the industry must get over this attitude of sitting on its hands and waiting for Congress to do something and rescue them. The railroads must be run by people in the railroad industry, and they will be better and more efficiently managed and run.

Neither Congress nor the President should assume the authority to direct the terms and procedures which mandatorily prescribe rules that determine the provisions contained in a labor-management contract large or small. We in this House should make the conditions which encourage free collective bargaining, the best that can be worked out. As soon as this House takes over the settlement of disputes, that is the beginning of the end for collective bargaining in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 665) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 665), with Mr. Bass in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bennett] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair at this time recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I know there is a lot of apprehension in the minds of the Members of this Congress over this very difficult, sensitive, and somewhat emotional question. We are called upon to assume a responsibility that is one of the Congress and no one else can do it, in many instances.

Now, Mr. Chairman, regardless of our personal feelings and regardless of how we may vote and wish that the matter could be resolved in some other way, the time comes when we must assume our responsibility in the interest of the Nation. We are in this instance called upon to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reports House Joint Resolution 665, as amended, unanimously. There are 33 members of our committee. Thirty-one members were present for the consideration and action on this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, it was not because we cherished the responsibility. It was not because we actually wanted to have to take this action. But it was because when we found out all of the facts and circumstances that I shall try to relate to the members of the Committee, it became clear that we must do our duty.

Mr. Chairman, I will make only one brief remark with reference to the statement which was made a moment ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The gentleman is certainly incorrect in the statement that he made a moment ago as to what we were doing with reference to action in contravention to the Constitution. The action we are taking here today is perfectly appropriate under our processes. The resolution follows the negotiation agreements, the tentative agreements and near agreements of the parties involved. It also follows a pattern that has been agreed to by labor and management in other instances under our labor-management procedure.

Let me give you the problems involved here.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. In view of the fact I mentioned the gentleman's name in answer to what he said a moment ago. I respect the gentleman's views. I just disagree with his position.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is why the Congress, if everybody agreed, and we always agreed, nobody would be thinking very much. So it is better to argue our respective points of view, and get legislative intent by checking the proposed language in the legislation.

If the gentleman will refer to page 3, line 3, and read with me:

> Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

That means previous actions by the parties and these could include previous agreements as there is no restriction, are to be promptly canceled under the terms of House Joint Resolution 665. This provision really says when actions by the parties have been taken, even if an agreement has been made, this would be prohibited as soon as this act goes into effect. That action of the parties, or even partial agreement is canceled.

Under our U.S. Constitution that is ex post facto passage of legislation. Of course this is against the U.S. constitutional guarantees against subsequent legislation later making illegal, or subject to penalty, previous legal actions entirely proper at the time they take place. The possibility of setting aside a partial agreement by the parties is against the guarantee of contract rights under the provisions of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has made a statement that is contrary to the facts and circumstances, and I think it should be made very clear here at this time. In the first place, there is not an agreement involved that the gentleman mentioned. In the second place, ex post facto laws are applicable in criminal proceedings only, as the gentleman knows. In the third place this would provide if we could not pass this bill until after midnight tonight that provision would be applicable, and matters will go back to the status quo as of now. There would not be any agreement, there is not any agreement between the parties. That is the reason it is necessary for us to consider this proposal because of the impasse that has been reached by the parties on these two major issues.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I ask you what your words mean specifically? You say "any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored."

If there is no restricting action excluding a partial agreement, then what do you mean? You cannot unring a bell, you cannot undo a position that has already been taken.

Mr. HARRIS. That language refers to the imposition of work rules proposed by the railroad industry included in the notice of September 2, 1959, and the counterproposal that was presented by the railroad employees in their notice of September 7, 1960. There is no agreement involved. It is the notices each of the parties had and issued at that time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So then the gentleman means that the actions taken are the actions of management in stating what the rules are for working conditions, employment, hours, wages, and things of that kind. Congress on behalf of the U.S. Government is interfering in setting aside such management actions after they have taken place?

Mr. HARRIS. No. We intend to deal with the subject before 12:01 tonight, and we will not have that situation.

As it has been heretofore, we can very easily get off into these side issues. Unfortunately, in my judgment that is one of the difficulties of this whole matter, that instead of getting to the major issues involved we let some side issue enter into it and prevent an agreement on the major issues, and everybody has told us that if they could ever be settled the others would follow.

The parties to this dispute are railroads and terminal and switching companies, which served the notices of November 2, 1959, proposing changes relating to rates of pay, working conditions, and operating rules, and approximately 200,000 of their employees. These carriers operate more than 92 percent of the total railroad mileage in the United States, employ over 94 percent of the industry's employees, and own over 95 percent of the total net investment in railroad plant and equipment in this country.

The employees involved in this dispute are the operating employees, of the carriers. Such employees are represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, the Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America. These operating employees constitute 27 percent of all the employees of the carriers that are parties to this dispute, and receive 34 percent of the total compensation paid to all such employees, including executives and officers. Thirty-nine percent of such operating employees are engine service employees—engineers, firemen, and hostlers—and 61 percent are train and yard service employees—road conductors and trainmen and yard foremen, helpers and switchtenders.

This problem did not start in the last day or two or the last few weeks. This problem started in 1957. For over 100 years there have been work rules established through various procedures, agreement, and so forth. They just about came to a head in World War I. If you will recall, during World War I the Government took over the railroads. The Director General at that time just about made permanent the work rules that had developed by that time, and they have been the code that has been followed since.

Even though we have seen many technological developments, even though we have experienced in our own lifetime these advancements and different methods of operation, the same common law procedures, so to speak, that were put into effect by the Director General during World War I have been continued. In other words, we have had the patterns that were established and confirmed at that time, which are being used today and have been used since, even though we have seen in our lifetime many advancements and technological developments. That is really the background. That is really the fact that brings the problem to us today.

In 1957 efforts were undertaken to do something about it. Consideration was given to changing some of these work rules. You have heard these terms, charges, and countercharges, one against the other. We have heard the verbiage that has been used that causes the other party to see red, almost. This has developed over a period of time to where both of the parties have gotten to the point, as we know how human nature works, that it is very difficult then to cast aside all that has happened during the years and then come up with an agreement.

So efforts were made in 1957 but no agreement was reached nor was any progress made.

The Railway Labor Act has been a pretty good law during all these years. It served its purpose as the Congress intended and as the Nation approved, between the railroads and their employees. I think it was a very well worked out instrument which it was hoped would serve the purposes of the Nation and of this great industry.

During all of these years since 1926, with very few exceptions, it has worked very well. One occasion, you will remember, was in 1946 when as you know the House passed a resolution which was unprecedented but which never did get through the other body. But the issue was settled anyway. We have had some extraordinary experiences in this industry but in one way or the other these problems have been met all during these years. On November 2, 1959, the carriers proposed work rule changes in accordance with that act. The changes in work rules which were proposed by the carriers were quite extensive and covered employment of firemen, the consist of crews and road and yard service, manning of self-propelled vehicles, elimination of many interdivisional runs, combination of road and yard work, and compensation.

On September 7, 1960, the railroad brotherhoods affected served notice on the carriers of rule changes which they proposed. These rule changes, in essence, covered the six matters proposed by the carriers, and also dealt with the subjects of employment security, and training of engine service employees through apprenticeship programs.

The parties, by joint agreement, requested the President to establish a Special Study Commission which was to make determinations and recommendations on the issues involved in the notices of the carriers and of the brotherhoods. In 1960 President Eisenhower established a Commission to go into all of these problems that were raised and the issues involved and the disputes that had existed between the parties. The Presidential Railroad Commission was composed of five representatives of carriers, five representatives of the brotherhoods, and five members representing the public. After 13 months of hearings and deliberations, and receipt of more than 15,000 pages of oral testimony and more than 300 exhibits, plus field inspections and surveys, the Commission submitted its report on February 26, 1962. They made personal investigations. They went all over the country personally observing the operation of the railroads. They did their best to accumulate all the facts and all the information that they could obtain affecting these problems from all sources.

In February 1962 that Commission made its report. It is a rather voluminous report consisting of some 300 pages in which the Commission endeavored to bring to a head these various questions involved and to make recommendations as to how they should be settled, or at least to recommend a basis of negotiations. So this report included such issues as the question of the firemen, and the question of the traincrews, and technological problems. There are innumerable other problems raised with reference to wages and various work rules affecting hours of service and so on. Well, there was a great deal of controversy over this report between the parties themselves.

National conferences began on the issues which remained in dispute on April 2, 1962, and continued through May 17. On May 21, 1962, the organizations applied for the mediation services of the National Mediation Board pursuant to section 5 of the Railway Labor Act. Between May 25 and June 22 approximately 32 meetings were held by the organizations and the carriers under the auspices of the Chairman of the Mediation Board but no agreement was reached.

On July 16 the National Mediation Board terminated its services in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. On the following day the carriers served notice on the organizations that as of August 16, 1962, changes in rules, rates of pay, and working conditions would be placed in effect by the carriers. On July 26, the brotherhoods brought suit seeking a judgment that the proposed rule changes would violate the Railway Labor Act. On March 4, 1963, the Supreme Court held that there is no legal barrier to the carriers initiating the proposed changes in work rules embraced in their notices of November 2, 1959.

The opinion and decision of the Supreme Court was released on March 4, 1963. On March 13, 1963, representatives of the parties met in Chicago in a further attempt to settle their differences, but no agreement was reached.

On March 29, 1963, a certified copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court was mailed to the district court and the case was remanded to that court. On April 2, the carriers announced that their second promulgation of rules and rules changes would become effective on April 8, 1963. On April 3, 1963, the President of the United States signed Executive Order No. 11101 creating Emergency Board No. 154 to investigate the dispute and report its findings. This operated to suspend the proposed rules and rules changes.

After holding public hearings, beginning April 11, 1963, the Board submitted its report on May 13, 1963. That report made a number of recommendations for settlement of the dispute.

The emergency board took the record that had been accumulated by the Presidential Commission.

The President then, after the Emergency Board was set up, sent over the information from this Commission; that is, all of the facts and information that the Commission had developed, and the recommendations.

That Emergency Board No. 154 made its recommendation on May 13 of this year, 1963, in an effort to get the issues in dispute to a point where there could be negotiation between the parties toward a settlement. That is a very good report and it was well received by all parties, I must say. It was not agreed to by all parties in every respect, but there were many articles in this report that were considered by both the railroads and the employees to have merit. It was the basis of agreement, or certainly of negotiation toward agreement, but that did not get the parties together, because time was slipping on.

Conferences between the carriers and organizations were resumed in Washington, D.C., on May 20, 1963, and continued through June 1, 1963.

On the afternoon of June 1, 1963, the Secretary of Labor was advised by representatives of the parties that there was no prospect of the parties reaching an agreement without assistance such as had been offered by the President in a statement on May 14. The Secretary of Labor thereupon tendered his services, and those of the Assistant Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board, to aid the parties in their efforts to resolve the dispute; and, at the request of the parties, assumed general supervision and direction of their negotiations.

From June 4 to July 10, 1963, approximately 100 meetings were held by the Secretary of Labor and his assistants with some or all of the parties to the dispute. Meetings were also arranged between representatives of the carriers and representatives of the organizations which were not attended by the Secretary or his assistants; but no agreement was reached.

On or about June 15, 1963, the Secretary reported to the President that no progress had been made toward bringing the parties into agreement; and on that day the President requested the parties to make one last major effort to resolve the dispute, and to proceed immediately to the hardest kind of bargaining with the assistance of the Secretary of Labor, Assistant Secretary Reynolds, and the National Mediation Board. At the President's request the parties agreed to maintain the status quo through July 10 to permit the completion of this procedure.

The President called in all parties and had conferences with them trying to do something about getting a basis for a settlement. He got the railroads to agree to postpone invoking the so-called new work rules for a period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

During this time in which additional days were given, the President made every effort to get both parties to the point where they could negotiate a settlement. However, this effort failed. It fell apart.

On July 9, 1963, the President of the United States proposed to the parties that they agree to submit all issues in dispute between them for final settlement to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Arthur J. Goldberg. The carriers accepted this proposal of the President but it was rejected by the organizations.

On July 10 the President of the United States created a special six-man subcommittee of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee to undertake immediately a comprehensive review and report limited to the facts and issues in this case and the respective positions of the parties; and the carriers and the organizations agreed to withhold any rules changes or strike notice until July 29 to permit appropriate consideration of this matter by the special subcommittee. The 29th of July was given as the date when work rules would go into effect. In the meantime, the special committee went into the problems that had been developed by the Presidential commission and the emergency board to narrow the issues to the point so that they would know just what was involved. This special committee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy was composed of the Honorable Joseph L. Block, Mr. G. E. Leighty, Mr. George Meany, Mr. Stuart T. Saunders, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, and the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, who was the vice chairman and, of course, is the Secretary of Commerce. The function of this special subcommittee was to narrow the issues to the point where we would know just what was involved. I refer you to the message of the President, which is available, of July 22, on page 12, which includes the report of this special subcommittee which narrowed down to eight the number of specific issues involved on which disputes were bringing about the strike. The President then made an effort to get the parties back together unsuccessfully. There were conferences that were held in an effort to see what could be done.

As a result, the President submitted his message to the Congress of July 22, with which you are familiar, and recommended a solution to the problem since they had reached an impasse and no settlement could have been made. The effort of the President was to avert a nationwide strike which would bring a catastrophe on the Nation.

The President's special message to the Congress summarized the situation, and stated in part as follows:

> On July 10, at my request, the parties agreed to maintain the status quo until July 29 to permit time, first, for the Labor-Management Subcommittee to examine and report the issues, and, second, for the Congress to consider this entire matter. It was my hope—and remains such—that the parties would recognize the importance of settling this dispute without resort either to legislation or to a crippling national strike. However, too little progress has been made in the past 11 days to release me from my July 10 commitments to transmit to the Congress on this date a review of the case and my recommendations for its disposition.
>
> We face this prospect: In the absence either of an agreement, postponement, or reversal of position on the part of the parties, or of enactment of some contrary measure on the part of the Congress, July 29 will almost certainly witness the start of a general rail strike. The carriers on that date can be expected to initiate work rules changes along the lines of those approved by the various panels. And the brotherhoods thereupon can be expected to strike 94 percent of the Nation's rail mileage.

This message contained a draft bill, which I introduced that day, and which was House Joint Resolution 565. Under this joint resolution, the Interstate Commerce Commission would have been authorized to issue interim rules binding for a 2-year period on matters in dispute between the parties affecting the manning of engines and train crews; and could have dealt with other matters in dispute according to special procedures devised by the Commission.

The identical resolution was also introduced that day in the other body, as Senate Joint Resolution 102, by Mr. Mansfield for himself and Mr. Dirksen.

We had 7 days—mind you, 7 days in the Congress to deal with this subject. We called hearings immediately. In the course of the hearings I asked the railroads to give us 30 additional days, and with the support of the committee, and with Senator Pastore on the other side during the course of their hearings making a similar request, we advised them that we simply could not hold hearings and develop the facts and come to a resolution within 7 days. So the 30 days' extension was given. Efforts were made to proceed. We conducted hearings at length. We had all parties interested before the committee. We had voluminous hearings which are available to the membership in which all of the information was brought together and developed by the committee in an effort to see what could be done.

The committee held hearings on House Joint Resolution 565, the President's proposal, on July 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, and 31 and on August 1 and 2 of this year, receiving 1,026 pages of testimony and exhibits. Testimony was presented by the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, by representatives of the carriers, by representatives of each of the five brotherhoods involved, by a representative of the Railway Labor Executives Association by the Acting Secretary of Commerce. In addition, the committee received a briefing from the Secretary of Labor during the progress of negotiations following the close of the hearing.

At the same time the matter was referred back to the Secretary of Labor, to get the parties together to see if they could not bring about a settlement by negotiation, through collective bargaining. Some progress was made. It was thought at one time that the parties were so close that there was no reason at all why the parties could not agree in the regular, established way. They were so close to an agreement on the issues involved, including the two major issues, that we were all encouraged that the matter would be resolved finally. We insisted that the Secretary present to the parties a statement in writing as a basis of agreement for them to negotiate a settlement. That was done. It was well received by the parties. Negotiations at length were held by the parties on the major issues, including the suggestion of the Secretary of Labor that it be submitted for binding arbitration to a board of arbiters.

The carriers accepted the suggestion unqualifiedly. The brotherhoods accepted it qualifiedly. Further negotiations brought them almost to the point of settlement. But even though they agreed in principle on how to bring about a settlement, they could not agree on procedure to bring it about. Then as they considered the matter further, other issues became involved and it was contended that they had never really been negotiated, that there had never really been a serious attempt to settle them. Consequently the whole thing fell apart and again we had an impasse. Time was slipping by. In the meantime, it was decided, because of the rules of the House and of the other body, and because of prior experiences, that it would be advisable to permit the other body to act first. That was understood by the leadership on this side and the leadership on the other side.

Consequently, we waited for the other body to act. Last week the Senate Commerce Committee met and reported a bill which was a substitute for the bill suggested by the President. The President had said that the ICC should undertake to settle the dispute in accordance with the procedures of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, and then there were other provisions. The employee representatives were unalterably opposed to the Interstate Commerce Commission having authority or jurisdiction to consider and settle the dispute. They raised objections to the point that it became necessary to proceed with some other course. So the committee on the other side of the Capitol amended the resolution to provide for a board of arbiters to be composed of two members from management, two members from the railroad employee organizations, and the four of them agree upon three members to be known as the public members. The first procedure was to set up within 5 days two members from the railroads and two members from the employees. Then within the next 10 days they would agree on the other three members.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as the amendment was proposed, there will be 5 days during which there will be appointed two members from the railroads and two members from the railroad brotherhoods. If within the 5 days they do not appoint their members, the President then will, within the next 5 days, make the appointments, together with the public members of three, to consist of a board of seven.

Through the cooperation of the Senate committee, I was furnished a copy of the text of their proposed language in sufficient time to be able to introduce it in the House, as House Joint Resolution 665.

On Monday of this week, August 26, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce met in executive session and considered House Joint Resolution 665, and after several amendments had been agreed to, reported the resolution to the House unanimously.

Yesterday, August 27, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer], the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. Rogers], and I appeared before the Rules Committee to request a rule on the bill, and the bill is now before the Committee of the Whole House for its consideration.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 137]

Adair
Addabbo
Ashley
Barrett
Barry
Bell
Boland
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Cohelan
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Edwards
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Flood
Forrester
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gilbert
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hawkins
Healey
Holland
Horton
Joelson
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Leggett
Lindsay
Lloyd
McMillan
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Minish
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Stratton
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry

Toll
Udall
Vanik
Van Pelt
Watts
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyman

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BASS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 665, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 340 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized. He has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I had just explained that the bill that had been reported by the committee on the other side set up a board of arbiters and had described how they would be selected. The resolution which I introduced on Friday last in the House provided that the major issues that were included in the notices to which I have referred, namely, the problem with reference to the firemen on the railroads and the crew consist issues, would be arbitrated by the board, and the other issues would have a period of time for negotiation. On the failure of agreement to be reached on the other issues within that period of time, they in turn would be referred to the board of arbitration.

Mr. Chairman, it developed that there was serious opposition among the representatives of the brotherhoods, the railroad employees, to referring the other issues to the board of arbitration. Their objection was based—and I think there was some merit to it—on the fact that no real negotiations had occurred on those issues. That resulted, in my judgment, primarily because of the fact that this whole matter had gone to the courts earlier and the courts had, in the early part of this year, decided the case, and decided that no legal barrier existed to prevent the railroads from imposing additional work rules. But as a legal matter it caused the railroads to have to go back to their original notices and to stay with them because it was on those notices that matters had gone all the way through in the proceedings under the Railway Labor Act.

So the railroads had to stay with their original notices and, as I understood, they were really not in a position at that point to get down to the negotiations on the other issues involved.

The railroads took the position that two issues, the fireman-helper and the "crew consist," were the two major issues and those had to be settled before they would enter into negotiations to any great degree on the other issues.

These issues are as follows:

1. EMPLOYMENT OF FIREMEN

Present rules require, with certain exceptions, that there be two men—an engineer and a fireman—in the cab of diesel passenger, freight, and yard locomotives. Typically, a "head-end" brakeman also rides in the cab of diesel road freight locomotives. The carriers by their notices sought the right to remove all firemen, except in passenger service, contending that the work traditionally performed by firemen has almost entirely disappeared or could be performed by other employees. The brotherhoods contended that firemen are essential for safe and efficient operations as well as for relief of engineers and for training future engineers.

2. CREW CONSISTS

Road and yard train service crews generally consist of one conductor and two brakemen. The carriers proposed a national rule to gain the unrestricted right to determine appropriate crew consists; the brotherhoods sought a national rule establishing one conductor and two brakemen as a minimum crew in all instances.

The brotherhoods said that section 6 in the bill as reported to the other body, which I mentioned, and which I introduced, was obnoxious to them, and that they could not do anything other than oppose it with all they had. This developed after the committee on the other side had reported the bill.

Then when our committee met on Monday of this week we took all these facts into consideration.

There are six other general issues involved in the current dispute. The Secretary of Labor, the carrier witnesses, and witnesses representing the brotherhoods all testified to the committee that if the two key issues could be settled, then all other issues involved in this dispute could be handled by collective bargaining. The joint resolution as agreed to by the committee now provides that these issues are to be handled by collective bargaining. The resolution prevents any rule changes, and any strikes or lockouts arising out of the present dispute for 150 days, and it is assumed that these issues will be settled considerably before the expiration of that period.

These other six issues are as follows:

1. MANNING OF MOTORCARS AND SELF-PROPELLED VEHICLES

Motorcars and self-propelled vehicles are used in a variety of maintenance, repair, construction, and inspection operations.

The Commission and the Emergency Board recommended that the parties negotiate a rule which would eliminate (with certain exceptions) existing rules which require the use of engine, train, or yard service employees on, or in connection with, the operation of motorcars and self-propelled vehicles used in maintenance, repair, construction, or inspection work. Indications are that this matter may be settled if other issues are resolved.

2. INTERDIVISIONAL RUNS

Interdivisional runs extend over territories where more than one group of employees hold seniority rights. The carriers seek the unrestricted right to establish such runs and to effect the necessary related changes with provisions for an equitable distribution of earnings opportunities between affected employees and the negotiation of protective conditions.

3. COMBINATION OF ROAD AND YARD WORK

Over the years a jurisdictional distinction has developed with respect to the work to which road service and yard service crews are entitled. Three problems have been posed by this distinction: Extending switching limits; road crews performing work in yards; and the discontinuing of yard engine assignments. The carriers sought the elimination of restrictions affecting their operations in each of these areas. The brotherhoods maintained that any further combination of road and yard service should be prohibited unless sanctioned by local agreement.

4. COMPENSATION (WAGE STRUCTURE AND FRINGE BENEFITS)

The industry's pay structure is one of extreme complexity. Many engine and train service employees' pay varies from day to day because of the interrelationship of a variety of factors such as a dual basis of pay (miles or hours), overtime weight of the locomotive or length of train, higher than standard rates, and special allowances. Both parties sought to modernize the existing structure. In the aggregate, the carriers' proposals would have reduced their payrolls; the brotherhoods' proposals would have increased them.

5. EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

The brotherhoods proposed extensive protection for employees affected by technological change, mergers, consolidations, or similar actions. Their proposals incorporated financial and other protections including limitations on reductions in force.

6. TRAINING OF ENGINE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Formal apprenticeship programs—which do not exist for operating employees—were requested by the brotherhoods for engine service employees.

At the expiration of the 180 days, the parties will no longer be subject to this resolution insofar as concerns these six issues; however, every qualified person who has testified to the committee who has been asked the question has answered that when the two key issues are removed from consideration, these six issues can, and will, be solved through collective bargaining.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say here that it seemed as though each day we had presented to us a different situation from what the situation was the day before and we had to consider this matter on the basis of being a day-to-day problem and use our best judgment in the committee until we reached the point where no further progress could be made.

So the committee considered all of these facts and developments; and not only our committee on this side but the committee on the other side. We were working along together almost simultaneously, keeping in mind that we were, like the other body, proceeding first step-by-step, because we did not want to run into the same kind of problem out of the experience that we had in the past.

So, considering this fact, our committee struck section 6(b) of the bill, that was in the bill reported by the other committee, to which the railroad Brotherhoods objected so strenuously. We struck out that provision which would have left the lesser issues to the Arbitration Board. But in the meantime the Brotherhoods took the position that they did not want an award from the Board on the two issues, the major issues, to become effective until by negotiation and collective bargaining all the other issues were settled. Well, we came to an impasse on that, an impasse due to the fact if that position were to be accepted, we would not have settled anything; we would have done nothing; we might as well have taken no position.

So, Mr. Chairman, the committee, in striking out section 6(b) also amended the bill to the effect that the award on these two issues would become effective within a period of 60 days following the filing of the award by the Board of Arbitration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take the time in order to explain this fully, because I think it is very important. We felt that here was one side whose proposals might make it impossible for the solution to work. Here on the other side were proposals that might make it impossible for the proposed solution to work. So, we did this: We said there was some merit to the contention that these other issues ought to be negotiated through collective bargaining, but at the same time everyone recognized that there was an impasse on the two issues and that there should be some final solution. So, we said that the Board of Arbitration shall make an award on those two issues, to be filed with the district court, and that 60 days following that date the award would become effective.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was another provision in the bill that would have provided that there could be no change in work rules on the other issues, no strike, no lockout, no action taken at all, for an indefinite period of time under the resolution. The committee did not think that that was the right procedure. The committee therefore set a period of time during which the regular collective bargaining process should work. So we amended the bill so as to provide that after 150 days the provisions of the resolution would terminate. Therefore, on the other issues they would be back under the collective bargaining proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, why did we decide that? Let me repeat and emphasize this, and I want every Member of this House to note this: Every witness whom we had before the committee—the railroads, the Brotherhoods, the Secretary of Labor, and all the rest—expressed their opinion and told us if these two major issues, crew consist and the fireman problem, could be resolved through collective bargaining, they could resolve all the other issues.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has given full faith and credit to what they told us. I say, Mr. Chairman, here on behalf of all of our committee, that I expect the parties to do precisely what they said they could do. There has been some question raised about the problem being dumped back in our laps at the end of 180 days. Now, perhaps so. I do not know. But if both parties in their testimony and presentation to the committee will carry out in good faith and settle the dispute as they have said in their own good judgment that they could do, this will not be back here on us.

Therefore, the committee felt that we should have confidence in both sides to carry out what they themselves said they could carry out under the regular processes of collective bargaining. It is for that reason we put a terminal date on the resolution of 150 days, which by amendment on the other side was extended to 180 days. I propose to offer that amendment when we consider the bill under the 5-minute rule.

So we have been trying to take a course that would bring these issues to final resolution where they could be settled. The resolution provides that on the two major issues, order of the arbitration board would be in force for a period of 2 years. Then the issues go back under the regular established procedure of collective bargaining.

Why did we do that? Because we have train crews all over the country—passenger trains, freight trains, freight yards, short lines, main lines—all of these various services which require negotiation as to what is needed insofar as adequacy of service and safety of service, the burden of work. Many other questions need to be negotiated through collective bargaining by agreement on a local level. In other words, services at some places may require a crew that is different from the crew that would be necessary in other places. Therefore, we felt that a problem as intricate as this should be put back under the usual and regular processes for it to work, and I have confidence it will. That will be our expectation.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that we have done the best we could in order to avoid a nationwide strike at midnight tonight. I do not have to take the time to try to tell you what would happen in this Nation if there were to be a nationwide railroad strike. You know yourselves what would happen in your communities, what would happen to the service to the people, what would happen to the economy of the people, what would happen to the wages of our people, what would happen to employment all over this country. Simply stated, it is a matter of national importance and imperative interest that we take action on this resolution today. I commend it to you for your consideration and I urge your approval of the committee action.

One final word. I am sure that many Members, although they are relieved that a legislative solution has been devised for this problem, are disturbed over the fact that the bill provides for compulsory arbitration, and are fearful that this bill will set a pattern for future labor disputes to be submitted to the Congress, and for compulsory arbitration to be imposed as a solution to labor disputes.

That may happen, but I believe that this resolution does not provide nearly as strong a precedent for the imposition of compulsory arbitration as a pattern for the resolution of labor disputes as many may fear. True, this resolution provides for compulsory arbitration, but it is arbitration that the parties themselves had already agreed to in principle; their dispute was not over the question of whether there would be arbitration, the dispute was over when the arbitration would occur. Future proposals for compulsory arbitration in other fields are likely to involve both the question of "whether there shall be arbitration" and "when shall arbitration occur." This resolution is only a precedent with respect to the latter question, since the parties to this dispute had already agreed among themselves upon the answer to the first, and most crucial, of these two questions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Not being able to be aware of all the hearings and everything that took place therein, may I ask: The gentleman mentioned he is going to offer an amendment under the 5-minute rule to conform with the Senate bill. That holds it down to the two issues in question, the firemen and the train crews, I believe, in the form of the Senate bill?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, I have not said, and I think you ought to know, that there is built into this resolution still the processes of collective bargaining. Any time on these issues that the parties can agree on any one of the issues or any number of them, then it takes that away from this process.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation of that. My question deals with the original bill. You have here the original resolution. Who made those recommendations to cover all of the issues under compulsory arbitration?

Mr. HARRIS. The original recommendation?

Mr. BECKER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. The President of the United States.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. As the gentleman said, it was on June 10 that the President had asked for the statutory 30-day period. It was actually June 15.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the correction.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have been interested in this, and it is not a new interest.

My other point is this: I think we should know what the enforcement provisions are in this bill. The gentleman says that the enforcement provision must be on a suit by the Attorney General in any U.S. court having jurisdiction of the parties. The parties to the negotiation actually have been the organizations of the brotherhoods and the railroads themselves. Does this mean there will be injunctive processes or mandamus and suits in equity against the organizations alone, or will this joint resolution open up the procedures to blanket injunctions against the individual members, the employees of these railroads, and the members of the organizations?

Mr. HARRIS. It would be applicable to the organizations involved because they are of record and are included in the notices of the dates I mentioned.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then that can be no blanket injunction, it is just a blanket injunction against all the members of the railroad brotherhoods who might or might not have notice of it.

Mr. HARRIS. They would have notice. No, you could not just go ahead and get a blanket injunction against anybody.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. One other point: I would like to know the full extent of the time that this will be active. To begin with, there is a 30-day organizing period. That is on page 3. Then you go over to section 5, and you find that the Board shall make an award not later than 90 days after the enactment of this joint resolution. So that is 90 days, is it not?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, a total of 90 days.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then you have in the next part of that section 5—60 days more.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So that you really have 150 days there, separate and apart from the organization time.

Mr. HARRIS. I intend to offer an amendment to that section when we get to it to conform to the amendment adopted by the Senate, establishing 180 days.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then on page 5, likewise, at the end of section 4 there is the proviso:

> But not to exceed 2 years from the date the award takes effect, unless the parties agree otherwise.

So that really the time we are covering here is 30 days for organization and 60 days thereafter.

Mr. HARRIS. Sixty days thereafter.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Sixty days within which they can file the award, but 90 days after the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then 60 days after the filing of this award.

Mr. HARRIS. Before it becomes effective.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Before it becomes effective. Then it becomes effective for 2 years.

Mr. HARRIS. Not longer than 2 years. If the parties reach an agreement otherwise during that 2 years, then to all extents and purposes the award is terminated.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. When you have changed the act as you mentioned previously by taking out section 6(b), with reference to section 5 you still left on page 4 the statement:

> The Arbitration Board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, incorporating in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, resolving the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement.

That is a blanket authority to the arbitration board to solve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, but you limit that by saying:

> Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of those portions.

Then you outline the two major items, the notice of November 2, 1959, and the notice of September 7, 1960. It says it shall be the final disposition on those two items. Yet it says above it shall be binding on both the carriers and the organizations, parties to the dispute, on everything that is in disagreement between the parties.

Mr. HARRIS. No; not on everything.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is what I want to get clear.

Mr. HARRIS. Only these two issues.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So that really you are reading into this language that the only binding effect and the only things before the arbitration board are the two items, so that they do not have jurisdiction to go generally into those matters which were not in agreement between the parties?

Mr. HARRIS. The parts of these two features that are not in agreement. There are innumerable items in these two issues, on some of which agreement has been reached and on some of which no agreement has been reached.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am just trying to limit the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Board.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; and I am going to offer an amendment to clarify the language that the gentleman read here to make it more explicit.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WAGGONER. Earlier in the chairman's explanation he stated there was serious objection on the part of the brotherhoods to binding arbitration on side issues. Was it the gentleman's intent to infer or convey the meaning that there was no serious objection to binding arbitration on the two important issues involving crew consist and firemen?

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say I cannot speak for these organizations, the railroads or the brotherhoods. They speak for themselves. I have merely tried to relate to this House the facts in sequence and in chronological order the best I could as to what resulted. I can say to the gentleman that serious opposition was expressed with reference to the other issues involved. In my own judgment, being perfectly realistic, I think both parties have come to the conclusion that something else has got to be done or else there is going to be a strike, if they are committed to carrying out what they have announced as their intention.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Will the gentleman yield for one other brief question?

Did I understand the gentleman correctly when he said 31 of the 33 members of the full committee were present and their vote was unanimous to bring this recommendation to the floor?

Mr. HARRIS. I stated that 31 of the 33 Members were present and it was reported by our committee unanimously.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman could give me any information as to whether or not this measure, if adopted, would apply to the situation we have in Florida with reference to the Florida-East Coast Railroad?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, it would. I know the gentleman may not have liked the answer, I am not sure of that—but I do know that so far as that railroad is concerned they have expressed a desire and a hope that they could be excluded from the legislation. I have a rather long letter from them. But as I understand it, they did issue the notice of November 2, 1959, and therefore they are included in the resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. What I was particularly concerned about, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield a moment further, the trustee in bankruptcy who was the predecessor of the present management did issue the notice of November 2, 1959. Thereafter management declined to follow the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board in respect to rates of pay and the like. The nonoperating brotherhoods then struck. Then the operating brotherhoods began to respect, of course, their picket line and so normal operation of that railroad ceased to exist. Now then, I have no doubt but that the bill would apply to the recent stoppage of work on the part of the operating brotherhoods, because the present management did give notice of the revised operating rules. What I am particularly concerned about is would the proposed legislation affect the nonoperating brotherhoods who declined to work not by any affirmative action respecting rule changes—but because of management refusing to follow the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board.

Mr. HARRIS. The resolution covers only the carriers that served notices of November 2, 1959, and the labor organizations that received the notices or served the labor organizations notices of September 7, 1960.

Mr. PEPPER. That notice was issued. What I was concerned about was the failure of management to observe the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board and whether that would constitute such action as would make this situation subject to the regulation of this proposal?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the issue of notice is involved here.

Mr. PEPPER. The notice was issued.

Mr. HARRIS. That is true. I think that determines the jurisdiction.

Mr. PEPPER. The gentleman feels that that would make this situation subject to the regulation of this proposal?

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly the committee did not feel we could start making exceptions here, there, and yonder. If so, then we would be in difficulty in trying to arrive at some logical solution to the problem.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question here is whether it will be possible for anybody to strike; when is that time?

Mr. HARRIS. When would it be possible for anybody to strike?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. After the passage of House Joint Resolution 665.

Mr. HARRIS. With reference to the problems here?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No. On anything. When could they strike?

Mr. HARRIS. Those that are involved are the ones that are mentioned here.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. But when can they strike?

Mr. HARRIS. Under the amendment that would be adopted to conform to the Senate resolution, it will be 180 days.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. And at the end of a 2-year period that these arbitration rulings have been in effect, what would happen then?

Mr. HARRIS. As I explained a moment ago, it goes back to the usual collective bargaining processes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So then it is as if this resolution had never been passed at that time?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. Harris] made a very excellent presentation of the issues, and I shall not make any presentation in that respect. I think nearly everyone looks upon this resolution with considerable reluctance and no one looks at it with a great deal of enthusiasm. I am speaking now of the Members of the House. We were confronted with an almost impossible situation, and under the circumstances, we reached what I believe is a fair and reasonable settlement.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, however, that there are some dangers inherent in this resolution, and I think it ought to be made clear that Congress by the passage of this resolution does not intend to require compulsory arbitration in future disputes unless the situation is comparable to this particular case. There is a difference here, and I think a justification for compulsory arbitration, in that compulsory arbitration of the two main issues was separately agreed to by the railroads and the brotherhoods prior to the time this present resolution was considered by our committee last week. So, when both parties to the controversy agreed to something, Congress is merely confirming what the parties are willing to accept.

Had we passed the resolution that originally was reported by the Senate committee, providing that all issues—wages, hours, and all other items of controversy as well as the two major issues—would be covered, then we would have been forcing the parties to accept compulsory arbitration.

I think the freedom of collective bargaining is one of the basic freedoms of this country and to do anything to destroy it would be contrary to the public interest, just as contrary to the public interest and just as dangerous to the public interest as would be a strike.

And so, upon balance, you have these two considerations. That is why I believe that the record should be made abundantly clear that we are not by the enactment of this legislation telling labor and industry in this country that we want, from now on, whenever a major dispute arises, a Government agency appointed to settle the dispute by compulsory arbitration. If that were the precedent we were establishing here I, for one, would vote against this resolution.

We are told the public interest demands that the Congress avoid a nationwide railroad strike even at the cost of restricting the rights of employees and their employers. It is difficult to quarrel with the fear that a nationwide tieup would seriously impair our economy. But, let us not forget that what is today described as being "in the public interest" can tomorrow be repugnant. The public interest is not always the same.

The only saving factor in this legislation, in my view, is that the Congress is being asked to impose arbitration on only those issues which the parties themselves have already agreed to arbitrate. This fact does not absolve us of our responsibility to protect constitutional and traditional freedoms, but it apparently softens the blow and soothes our conscience.

I have no intention of discussing the merits of the case nor the positions taken by the parties, but I do not believe this case would have gone unsolved had both parties honestly sought to solve their own problems.

What the Congress will do today to maintain peace in the railroad industry should never be allowed to become a precedent that could be used to destroy collective bargaining. All labor and management should make it their goal to reestablish the faith of the American people and the Congress in the collective bargaining process. I fear that faith may be at a low ebb today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I offer this unasked for advice to the parties involved in this dispute. Forget the antagonism. Forget the slogans. Let the so-called "featherbedding" insults gather dust in the files of Madison Avenue. Talk to each other and work together. I do not think anyone will deny that the irreconcilable aspect of this case is founded in the "featherbedding" claims of railroad companies and the hostile reaction of the men. I have even read newspaper accounts of remarks of railroad officials bragging that the "featherbedding" campaign was the basis for the decision of the Presidential Railroad Commission and even the Supreme Court decision in this case. I am sure such is not the case, but I am just as sure that the antagonism generated by that word put this problem in our laps.

I sincerely hope that this legislation—even though it raises questions of great import—will create a more harmonious relationship between railroad management and the employees.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think we should be very plain here today who are the parties to this dispute. Actually the parties to this dispute are the carriers who had given notice on November 2, 1959; but under the President's bill, were there not some carriers left out and now they are back under? How about the carriers that were dealing individually and had not given such notice?

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the jurisdiction in the original bill that was submitted was limited to the notices referred to a number of times here and the resolution involved deals with the same notices.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There are some short lines that were not included under the President's original bill; for example, the Bessemer and Lake Erie.

Mr. HARRIS. The same carriers under the original proposal are affected by this proposal.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. What about the individual carrier who wants to bargain himself? How about the individual carrier who does not want to bargain through an organization?

Mr. HARRIS. Under the resolution the committees involved are the ones that are included with reference to the authority of this resolution.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Suppose there is a carrier, an individual railroad, that did not give notice on November 2, 1959, and does not belong to an organization?

Mr. HARRIS. Then that carrier is not a part of this resolution.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is what I felt; I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who has expressed substantially my feelings on this legislation—and I am disturbed about it—this question. Within the last 24 or 48 hours I read a newspaper story to the effect that the head of the Teamsters, Mr. Hoffa, was aiming for, and I suspect will probably achieve, a nationwide contract. If that is accomplished, it is foreseeable that at some future date we could have a nationwide trucking strike which would substantially affect the economy such as the railroad strike could at the present time.

Are we establishing today any precedent for such a strike in the trucking industry so that the Congress would be called upon to pass similar legislation to handle that kind of a crisis?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. There are those who say that the passage of this legislation would create a precedent for doing what the gentleman is talking about. There is this significant difference, as I mentioned a few minutes ago: Here both the parties—the railroads and the brotherhoods—have agreed voluntarily, prior to the consideration of this particular resolution, to submit these two issues to compulsory arbitration.

Now, if that had not been the case, I personally would not vote for the resolution because I think I prefer the suggestion made by the brotherhoods and by Mr. Meany of the American Federation of Labor to force these people to continue collective bargaining and I would not give up on this issue with reference to collective bargaining at this point were it not for this fact. Therefore, in the case of a trucking strike which the gentleman mentioned, I would not vote for compulsory arbitration until I was satisfied that there was not one single solitary thing left that could be done, and until I was satisfied that on balance the public interest generally would suffer greater than the rights of the parties involved to exercise their freedom to bargain freely and collectively.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there has been a mutual agreement arrived at between management and labor as to the voluntary submission to this arbitration?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Both management and labor agreed about a week or 10 days ago to submit the two issues covered here to compulsory arbitration, or to arbitration which, in effect, would be compulsory.

Mr. DENT. Then the problem that disturbs me at this point is this: Why do we need legislative action if they have agreed to this form of arbitration?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Because they could not agree on the procedures that they should follow in setting up the arbitration board as well as other things, which were principally procedural matters. Of course, there were the other issues involved. The Brotherhoods did not want to enter into compulsory arbitration on the main issues until the other issues were resolved by collective bargaining.

Mr. DENT. If that is the case, why do we not then just pass legislation setting up the procedure without the specification of days, numbers and the results to be obtained? Why do we not just say then that this procedure shall be followed to carry out the already agreed to agreement between the two parties involved in this disagreement?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think in the interest of orderly procedure we had to do something along the line that was done in this Senate resolution and as we propose to do here. Without that kind of orderly procedure the parties themselves might not again be able to agree, and so as long as we have had to tackle the issue in the fashion we have, I think we would be remiss in our duty if we did not specify particularly how they should proceed.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. This has gotten to the point in which I am interested, and that is the parties have not agreed—the railroads and the brotherhoods—with regard to how the Arbitration Board should be composed; is that correct? And, who shall serve on the Arbitration Board?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. They cannot agree on a number of procedural matters. I am not certain whether it covered the points mentioned by the gentleman from Florida, but they could not agree.

Mr. CRAMER. Just one additional point. In the committee language on page 3, if the members chosen by the parties; that is, the four, failed to name one or more additional three members within 10 days, such additional members may be named by the President. Is it not true if either the railroad or the brotherhoods do not feel that the three additional or any one of the three additional parties proposed will not represent what they believe to be their best interests than they are obviously going to refuse to come to any agreement within the 10-day period, and the result is going to be that the President will end up by making an appointment of the three additional persons; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. You can assume that the President will make these appointments, although I do not want to say irrevocably they will not agree. The chances are they will not be able to agree on the three members; then the President will make the appointments. I think you have to assume what it actually provides is a presidentially appointed Board to settle this issue.

Mr. CRAMER. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In section 6 with respect to the issues that are in the notices of November 7 and September 7, as I understand it they can go ahead and negotiate and if these are not settled do they automatically go back subject to the arbitration?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. No. The only matter subject to arbitration is the matter of the firemen and the train crew consist issue. All other matters are left open to collective bargaining and have no relation to the arbitration provided for.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There is no precedent that we might be willing to arbitrate or for Congress to act on any of these other issues?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Not in my judgment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman will agree we want to make legislative history and give notice to all the parties that we will not consider a further extension of this bill to those disputes?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to be sure. I am not intimating they have to get hung up in a deadlock and come back to the Congress to act on these issues.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to repeat what I said during the explanation of this legislation a moment ago, and I want to emphasize it again: Witnesses representing railway management and witnesses representing the brotherhoods, the employees, the Secretary of Labor, and everyone who came before the committee, feel that if these two major issues can be settled, in their opinion, all the other issues could be resolved.

As I said a moment ago, the committee has taken on full faith and credit what they have said to us. We expect them to do it, and, as I said to the Rules Committee, if the 150 or 180 days, as the case may be, expire and they bring another difficult situation on the Nation, I am going to be very unhappy about that; I think the other members of the committee will, and I feel that Members of the Congress will be unhappy about it. I should think, as the gentleman mentioned a moment ago, this should be ample notice to all parties that we are taking them at their word and expect them to settle those other issues and not threaten the Nation with a nationwide strike.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I extend my thanks to the gentleman for a very fine statement?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. May I also make clear, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, that this legislation is not intended as any precedent for the future in either the railroad industry or any other industry.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope we will not take this as a precedent for doing away with the traditional principle of collective bargaining.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, from the many conservations which I have had with Members of the House during the past several weeks on the possibility of a railroad strike, I know how deeply all of you are interested in averting, if possible, a railroad strike in this country.

Recently I took a rough telephone survey in the largest town in my own congressional district, which is Decatur, Ill. Decatur is a town of approximately 90,000 people. From this survey, I came to the conclusion that within 72 hours approximately 9,000 people would be unemployed as a result of stoppage of rail transportation.

It is almost impossible to tell the hardship that would result to the farming community if such a stoppage existed—even for a short time. Farming is the largest industry in central Illinois. Some grain is being shipped every day. Right now, we are in the process of clearing the elevators of last year's crop, in order to make room for the crop that will be coming in soon after October 1, of both soybeans and corn. A railroad strike now could cause havoc to the farming community. I imagine surveys in your communities would reveal much the same thing as to employment.

I realize that neither of the parties to this dispute wish to cause harm. I am sure that both parties to the dispute are people of good will, who have tried in every reasonable way to reach agreement, in order to avoid a railroad stoppage. I commend both parties to the dispute for the long and earnest way in which they have tried to settle this matter. However, as of today, they have not been able to reach agreement.

It is at this point that the President of the United States has asked the Congress to consider legislation which would avoid such a stoppage—and the economic and social results which would come from a strike. The Congress must now, in addition to considering the parties to the dispute, also take into consideration the broad public interest. It is for us to decide today what that public interest is and how the interest of the public is to be met. That is why we are all here today, listening to the debate that will take place and finally we will be called upon to vote on our own consciences whether or not we believe that this legislation is needed, and whether or not it is in the broad public interest.

We are confronted with the most extraordinary situation, both in terms of the impact of a strike on our economy, and in terms of the issues involved. These issues are the ones that have very little collective bargaining play left in them. The matters under debate today are regarded almost as do-or-die issues by both parties. Each party has considered the issues to be vital and it is very likely that both parties could stand a strike much longer than the country could stand it. Therefore, the parties being unable or unwilling to make agreement or accept arbitration, the responsibility now lies with the legislative branch.

I know it may be asked if the parties had a chance to really work out their problems. These matters have been under consideration by both parties and by the President since 1958. President Eisenhower appointed one Commission to go into the matter and that Commission handed down certain recommendations. Again in 1961, President Kennedy appointed the Presidential Railroad Commission which held 13 months of hearings and deliberations and received more than 15,000 pages of testimony and more than 300 exhibits, including field inspections and surveys. This Commission submitted its report on February 26, 1962.

Litigation has been had in the Federal courts and a portion of this matter was considered in a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on March 4, 1963, of this year.

President Kennedy, by Executive order in April of this year, established an emergency board, headed up by Judge Rosenman. They were unable to successfully mediate the dispute, but they did hand down a number of recommendations. In spite of all of the study that has been given to this matter, the parties have been unable to settle this dispute and the President has submitted a special message and proposed legislation to the Congress.

Let me outline what has been done by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member. Our committee held hearings on July 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, and 31, and August 1 and 2 of this year. We received over 1,000 pages of testimony and exhibits. We heard from the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and representatives of both management and labor. Later the committee received a briefing from the Secretary of Labor on the progress of negotiations following our hearings. I believe that our committee has done everything that could conceivably be done to get at the facts of this dispute and to encourage the parties to the dispute to bargain collectively in the hope of getting favorable results. This we have been unable to do and on last Monday, August 26, in executive session, the committee reported out House Joint Resolution 665 for your consideration.

This legislation would prohibit both management and labor from making any changes in pay, rules, or working conditions, except by agreement, or in accordance with an arbitration award made under this legislation.

Another section would establish a seven-member arbitration board with two members appointed by the carriers and two appointed by labor. These four would choose the remainder. However, unless within 10 days the remaining three members or any part thereof are not agreed on, the President appoints any three or the additional members not already agreed on by the parties to the dispute.

This arbitration board of seven is required to resolve all matters of dispute and to include in this decision all matters in which the parties were not in agreement on. This award is made binding on both parties and is a complete and final disposition of the two major issues; use of firemen and the makeup of road and yard crews. The arbitration award is to be in effect for the period to be determined by the arbitration board, but that period cannot exceed 2 years from the date that the award takes effect. The award can be in effect for a different period if the two parties agree thereto. The arbitration award must be made and filed in the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia not later than 90 days after the enactment of this law. The arbitration award cannot take effect or be enforceable until 60 days after it is filed in the U.S. District Court.

We have also required that the parties to the dispute resume collective bargaining on all issues other than the two major issues which I have mentioned heretofore—use of firemen and makeup of road and yard crews.

This legislation will expire 150 days after the date of its enactment with respect to all issues except the two principle issues upon which an award has been made and filed. The award itself will continue in effect not to exceed 2 years from the date it takes effect, unless the parties hereafter agree to a different period.

I know that the Members of this House want to do the right thing. It will be up to each Member to search his own conscience to determine whether or not he supports this legislation. I think I can assure the Members of this House that unless this legislation is passed there will be a rail stoppage. It appears to me that the parties to this dispute are in such unalterable disagreement now that no settlement is possible, except by this legislation. Those of you who believe that you cannot support this legislation must inevitably look to a railroad stoppage. The Senate has already passed legislation so near to this that the only remaining action is on the part of this House. If it is successfully passed today, I feel sure the President will sign the bill.

I have searched my conscience and I believe that the only alternative to this legislation is a rail strike and for that reason I am supporting it. I trust that all Members of this House can see their duty to support this bill.

Everyone who testified before our committee said that if these two principle issues could be settled the parties to the dispute could collectively bargain on the remaining six or eight issues on hours, wages, and working conditions. All that we have brought before this House are the issues on which the parties are unalterably in disagreement. It is only on those issues that we are asking a vote in the House today.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to make sure we understand that at the end of 150 days or, if the resolution is amended to meet the terms of the resolution passed by the Senate, 180 days, carriers are then free to enforce the contested work rules regarding the 6 items if they are not settled, and only if they are enforced will there be a strike even at that time. I think that should be understood so that we know clearly it could come back to us, but only if the carriers enforce the work rules, on the 6 items, if they are not agreed on by bargaining during the 180 days.

I want to make that point in the RECORD, and I yield back the balance of my time. I recommend the adoption of the resolution and the amendments to be offered by our chairman.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, the House is in a situation today I think similar to the other body as it relates to the proposed ratification of the test ban treaty. Those who will support it have some very, very serious reservations, and those who are opposed to it are rather reluctant to go on record that way. We are in that situation today for the reason that the carriers and the brotherhoods failed to reach an agreement on some very serious issues. They have talked about this matter for upward of 4 years, and we are placed in the position now where in less than 9 hours the work rules will be invoked and a strike will ensue unless the House takes some action today.

Therefore, in the committee we were in the position that our feet were being held to the fire and an answer had to be forthcoming. In effect this is it.

I think many of us are opposed to the principle of compulsory arbitration. I know I am for one. However, in view of the situation we are in the President of the United States pointed out the very serious impact on the economy of this country which would result from a strike, and due to the fact that this is a unique situation, some of us have perhaps found ourselves in the position of rising above principle in order to adopt the type of compulsory arbitration involved here as it relates to the two issues of crew consist and the firemen issue.

I want to point this out for the purposes of the Record. In the report of the other body they specifically point out that this is not to set a precedent, although it does, and that this is a one-shot compulsory arbitration, which we hope it is. We may again 6 months from now, about the 1st of April, be faced with a strike in the railroad industry, and I think the Members would like to keep that in mind.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, there are some principles of such basic nature that they must not be violated. It is my view that the principle of voluntary arbitration or collective bargaining is one of these. Conversely, compulsory arbitration must be avoided.

Any legislator knows the folly of the oft-heard expression, "This is an exception. This is not a precedent." A precedent is a precedent. Compulsory arbitration is compulsory arbitration, and dressing it in variant language will not make that fact less obvious.

Nor is there logic in saying now that the only alternative to a strike is adoption of this resolution. No branch of the Federal Government has given its best effort toward solving the immediate problem. I need not point out that the deep, underlying issues involved in the railroad dispute will soon be common in other industries.

We have not been offered a solution—only a delay. Let no one forget, the day of reckoning, the day when we must meet this issue squarely, will come. The Nation can find little solace in knowing that a solution is delayed beyond the next presidential election.

Today we are opening the crack in free bargaining. We are opening the way for complete domination of the economy by agencies of the Federal Government through control of wages, prices, and working conditions. It is entirely possible that the Congress, through this precedent, will become the dumping ground for all serious labor disputes.

We have been forced into the position of trying to sweep a very large problem under a very small rug. We might as well try to hide the Washington Monument under a bedsheet.

I deplore the circumstances which bring this resolution to the Congress, hours before a strike deadline. I deplore the lack of responsibility demonstrated. I oppose this resolution.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Glenn].

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that stood out in the committee hearings; that is this, no one likes compulsory arbitration. We heard this from management, we heard it from the brotherhoods. And I am quite sure that the majority of the members of the committee are in complete accord. I know that I am. However, there is one other thing that stood out even further than the matter of compulsory arbitration and that is the welfare of the Nation. Everyone was convinced that this strike, if it takes place at midnight tonight, will do unlimited harm to the economy of the United States and to so many people who are dependent upon railway transportation, both passenger and freight.

So the committee in its wisdom had to decide whether or not to establish what might be called a precedent, or to harm the Nation's welfare to the point where it would be months before we could recover even if the strike lasted only several days. Under such circumstances I think the committee was right in doing as it did in coming out with a bill which involves just the issues that were presented and doing so unanimously.

If we pass this bill and avoid a strike, the welfare of the United States is certainly going to be protected and the American people will give credit to the Congress for doing the job which it is supposed to do—that is, protect the welfare of all the people. If the bill does not pass, of course, then the American public will blame the Congress for not passing it. We may well assume whom the administration will blame, which side of the aisle will be blamed if the bill is not passed. Our side will be blamed. I ask every Member on our side and every Member of the House to vote for this bill, because there is nothing else we can do to protect the welfare of our Nation at this point with a deadline of midnight tonight.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Sibal].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well for the House to take a moment and think about what would happen in this Nation if this strike were to go into effect tonight. We are talking about 700,000 railroad jobs. We are talking about 6½ million jobs outside of the railroad industry. We are talking about the severe damage to and possibly the failure of many businesses, small and large, throughout the Nation. We are talking about a shortage of food and medical supplies. We are talking about the very probable failure of the New Haven Railroad in my State which is in bankruptcy and could not survive a major strike. We are talking about the resultant death of the economy in various sectors of the entire State of Connecticut and all of southern New England in general.

In addition to this we have written into this resolution the actual agreements, as far as they went, of the parties. We have limited our approach in the field of compulsory arbitration as much as we possibly could and at the same time prevent this strike.

I would also point out that the resolution you are being asked to vote upon today is really the House resolution except for the 30-day additional period which the Senate added to it. The McGee amendment in the Senate conformed the Senate resolution to the House resolution. Your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which agreed to this basic approach on a bipartisan basis, as the chairman has pointed out, voted 31 out of 33 Members for the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SIBAL. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman mentioned something that I think is most important for the Members of the House to keep in mind. That is, after our committee on Monday amended this resolution to meet the problems as we tried to explain them here today, the other body was taking up that afternoon those amendments adopted in our committee, which were transmitted to the other body. As the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut has just said, Senator McGee offered the amendments over there. They were all accepted with the exception of a modification or two which we will try to adopt in the next few minutes.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to thank him for bringing this to the attention of the members of the committee.

Mr. SIBAL. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all enthusiastic with this joint resolution. But in this instance we have to do the best we can under the circumstances and the need and necessity of meeting a deadline.

When our chairman, the distinguished member from Arkansas, asked that management postpone the imposition of the new work rules for 30 days, we were all hopeful that under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor, the issues could be resolved without congressional action. However, after 30 days of intense mediation, and I want to compliment the Secretary for his diligent efforts, no accord was reached. Both sides agreed to the Secretary's formula that the issues be decided by labor, management, and public members as a Board and that the decisions of the Board would be binding upon the parties. But this proposal broke down over a procedural matter.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which held lengthy hearings on the dispute, it was a difficult and troublesome matter for me. I have always been opposed, on principle, to undertaking a course of action leading to any form of compulsory arbitration. I did not endorse the President's bill for that reason. This resolution provides for binding arbitration of the two major issues and whatever the board decides might be said to be temporary only and not compulsory arbitration in its true sense. This view holds that the board decisions on the two major issues are only binding for 2 years and after that period management could continue abiding by the Board's decisions and the organizations would again be allowed to strike if they felt compelled to do so. This view also holds that the other six major issues, if not settled within the 180-day period, would be subject to no restriction by this joint resolution. If they are not settled and if these other rules were put into effect, then the organizations would have the right to strike on the 181st day from the enactment of this legislation.

As I have said, this legislation was a troublesome matter for me because of the binding arbitration feature of it and I disliked very much to assent to any measure with even the least degree of compulsory arbitration. But the greater problem of keeping the country operating indicated a need on the part of the committee to avert a nationwide stoppage of rail transportation in the public interest. I believe the committee felt that this joint resolution was the only choice we had to keep the country running. Notwithstanding my own desires and beliefs, I felt I could not in good conscience overlook the public interests by opposing this legislation when I knew, as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce knew, that this resolution was the only way left, as every other possible route to solution had been exhausted.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that the general public is not familiar with the term "compulsory arbitration." I doubt whether many of them know exactly what it means. We know, organized labor knows, and management knows. But to the vast majority of the public all they know is that if there is a strike tonight, Congress failed to do its duty. And we are going to have a strike tonight unless this legislation is passed.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, if Congress passes this legislation, we will be shirking our duty, as I see it. It seems to me we are being pressured into something that is very temporary, very expedient, and is not going to solve the problem.

This bill involves compulsory arbitration, and it will establish a precedent because if and when there are other strikes facing the Nation you can bet your last dollar we are going to have to consider these matters. Also there are other issues to be considered beside the two areas which are covered. By the passage of this bill we are buying time, and it strikes me, as I read the report, that it is the unions that have been holding up this matter.

Turn to page 7 of the report. The carriers accepted the Commission's recommendation; the brotherhoods rejected it. On page 8, the Secretary of Labor's proposal, carriers accepted, the brotherhoods rejected. Further on, the appointment of Supreme Court Justice Goldberg to arbitrate the carriers accepted, the unions rejected.

I can see some reason for rejecting these. However, it strikes me that our principal problem is the monopolistic position of labor. I know we have some of those union representatives present, and I hope the word gets through that unions must discipline themselves and take some action on this featherbedding matter and other such matters. I think if we put the railroad unions under the Taft-Hartley Act, if we would stop trying to treat the symptoms and get down to the disease, we would be accomplishing something. Strikes are serious, and we are being forced under pressure because of a strike due tonight. I say the monopolistic position of labor in the United States is more serious than any single strike and we ought to address ourselves to the real trouble. I think railroad unions ought to be under the Taft-Hartley Act. In the spirit of antitrust law I favor having labor and management all under the same laws. It is not the carriers that hold monopolistic position. It is the railroad unions. A strike is serious, but condoning labor's monopolistic position is more serious. We are abandoning basic American freedoms. For years we have permitted union labor's power to grow unrestrainedly. We are now forced to face this monstrous power to strike and stop nationwide transportation. If we pass this bill we will be sidestepping the issue and our duty, as I see it.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, this is an unfortunate measure. It has been stated that there is nothing else we can do. Whether that is true or not I do not know, but certainly it was not true when this impasse arose some time ago. We had the authority, and we have the authority now, to provide for a further cooling-off period. Until we get to the roots of the problem, the roots involved in featherbedding, the roots involved in the whole problem of nationwide bargaining, the roots involved in the imbalance of power in nationwide bargaining, we will not accomplish anything.

This bill is not a proper solution to this problem. Others have been suggested. For instance, I introduced a bill, as did several other Members on my side of the aisle, which would have attempted to do something about this whole matter. That has been given no consideration. As far as I can see there is no mention of any consideration of this in the committee report. I had a letter from the chairman of the committee in response to the request I made that my bill be given a hearing and that other such bills be given a hearing. Other solutions of the problem were discussed by witnesses, but we see nothing of what those solutions might have been.

This bill is ex post facto in effect. It weakens the collective bargaining processes, and I think we should be turning to other solutions. Perhaps some will feel they have to vote for this today, but I will not do so.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman mentioned a bill he introduced. That was not given consideration. He said he had a letter from the chairman about the bill. I think it should be said that one bill the gentleman introduced went to another committee, the Committee on Education and Labor. It did not go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; therefore, it was not before our committee for consideration.

Mr. TAFT. In order to correct the chairman, I heard the chairman state that fact, but the bill itself states it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I have a letter from the chairman indicating this matter is being considered by his committee. There were identical bills introduced by the gentleman from Michigan and several others which were before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I would like to know, will the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if this bill is passed, go on to consider these vital issues that are behind this dispute, and come out with some permanent solution? Will the Congress face up to it? The question the country has before it is not whether we are going to solve this particular dispute now, but will the Congress face up to handling the problems that are of such a generally serious nature?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It will have the effect of avoiding a strike which we all agree would be disastrous to our economy. We could take time discussing the breakdown of collective bargaining, which we all deplore. We could also spend time discussing the effect of compulsory arbitration, toward which this is perhaps a beginning step. Once we have this precedent, I fear we may find ourselves back at some future date expanding and broadening the scope of compulsory arbitration.

I am unhappy that collective bargaining has broken down in the transportation industry and that it has become necessary to turn the matter over to Congress for solution. I do not like the idea of our getting into the area of compulsory arbitration, even if it be in a limited area. Collective bargaining has been one of the bulwarks and strengths of America. It means freedom from governmental interference. The fact that the legislation under consideration today is temporary and not permanent does not satisfy me, because a precedent will have been set. Once we have broken down the historical prohibitions against compulsory arbitration it will become easier to pass compulsory arbitration legislation in the future.

Neither management nor labor should rejoice, nor will they benefit in the long run from compulsory arbitration. It will mean that management and labor can expect governmental boards and commissions to decide their problems for them and to tell them what to do. It would be well for management and labor to learn a serious lesson today. Namely, that they had best make more serious efforts to bargain and to compromise their differences. The people of this country expect this from labor and management. They will not tolerate prolonged strikes in major and vital areas of our economy such as the transportation industry. Our Nation cannot afford a strike.

Those of us from Connecticut have a particular interest and a broad concern in this legislation. As the distinguished chairman of the committee has stated, there would be a disaster imposed on the national economy by the strike but, for those of us in Connecticut and New England, it would not be a question of disaster to the economy for just a temporary period. It would, perhaps, mean the closing down of an already bankrupt railroad, one which is under Federal court jurisdiction in the State of Connecticut at the present time and has been for the last 3 years.

The trustees have been running the New Haven Railroad and have continued to operate the railroad and can do so only as long as there is a good chance for reorganization. The trustees have said that they can operate and reorganize without additional Federal financing barring a natural catastrophe or a railroad strike. The Federal judge who has jurisdiction over the trusteeship himself has stated that a strike would be a catastrophe for the New Haven Railroad and it might have to terminate operations. It is therefore impossible to escape the conclusion that we cannot have a strike in the New England area in general and certainly not in Connecticut.

The lives of many working men and women depend on the continuation of our particular railroad in the New England area. We have heard comments made here today about the fact that the brotherhoods may be to blame or about the fact that management may be to blame. I am not interested in assessing blame here today, whether it is the brotherhoods or management. I happen to know the working men and women of the New Haven Railroad, many of whom reside in my home city of New Haven. No finer group of working men and women can be found anywhere. They recognize the fact that the problem they face is the result of the bankruptcy of the New Haven Railroad. They have had to work out the terminations of employment for many people. They have had to accept reductions in size of the working force. But no one can blame people for fighting for their jobs and the jobs of their families. This is what they are trying to do. This is what we must understand is sought to be accomplished, to find some workable solution to this problem so that our economy will not be adversely affected.

To my own city of New Haven and the State of Connecticut a strike would mean a loss of an annual payroll of over $21 million. It would mean a layoff of over 3,000 railroad employees in one city and one area, with the indirect results rapidly spreading throughout the rest of the economy.

For these reasons I emphasize that we cannot afford a strike. For these reasons I believe this legislation should be passed, even though it concerns me, as I know it does many Members of this House and even though we are entering into an area which we would much prefer not to enter. We are entering into a type of labor-management relation which is somewhat removed from collective bargaining. And whether or not it is compulsory arbitration it certainly begins to approach it—something that I hope we abhor and will attempt to avoid as much as we can here in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Jarman].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, 3½ years of constant but fruitless collective bargaining between the railroads and the unions have failed to achieve a settlement of the railroad dispute.

Basic to this entire problem is the fact that a nationwide railroad strike would be intolerable. It would create widespread economic chaos and distress.

Congressional action is now essential to prevent serious injury to the public. I urge the passage of this bill as an emergency legislative solution to a difficult national problem.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, in 1946 the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, and I in the other body objected at the same time to the passage of legislation which would by legislative process have resolved the railroad labor-management controversy threatening a national railroad tie-up. While that was a rather abrupt termination of the legislation which had been initiated in this House I think all of us in the long run were glad that that legislation of rather extreme character was not enacted.

We need not deceive ourselves today. With all the safeguards that we may throw around our decision we are today constituting the Congress as the final board of arbitration for all major labor disputes in this country. If we are to do that—and always there will be an emergency presented that will seem to demand that we take such action—but if we are to do that, at least, just as a court does, it should be made very clear in our decision what it is that we decide.

I take it that what we decide here today is the pending railroad labor-management dispute with respect to two issues, upon the substance of which the disputing parties have agreed to compulsory arbitration, but with respect to which they have not been able to reach agreement on procedural steps. Therefore to avoid the stoppage of the railroads of this country at midnight tonight, we are in substance by this process and procedure resolving those procedural difficulties. At least for myself I want it clearly understood as to what the limited character of this decision is by this Congress, so that when the next appeal is made to the Congress—as it assuredly will be—we can stand on the record of what we do here today and the exact facts and circumstances upon which we acted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked my distinguished colleague to yield this time to me to clear up a statement I made a moment ago. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft], was referring to a different bill during our colloquy. I have had a check made and find that the gentleman did introduce a bill, H.R. 7749, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am informed it is similar to the bill that was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine], and one or two other bills. I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman that during the course of the hearings the bills were referred to and they were considered. The gentleman from Ohio did discuss the bill and a good many questions were asked along that line, and the idea encompassed in the bill was discussed by members of the committee during our consideration of it. But it was felt under the circumstances that the approach would not be appropriate and certainly it was felt that there would be great difficulty in obtaining favorable consideration of it.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we all recognize that for many, many years the matter of national emergency strikes has been of deep concern to the Congress and to the country. I think it is very obvious that the measure now before us does not ultimately settle anything. Therefore, I would suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas, as far as the Railway Labor Act is concerned, it might be very well for his committee, without regard to what happens to the legislation before us today, to give continuing interest and consideration to other measures that have been suggested which might in some way undertake to deal permanently with this problem which confronts us today.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to this bill because I do not believe in Government ordered compulsory bargaining. I tried to get a rollcall but found it impossible because so few were willing to join with me and demand the yeas and nays. It seems to me that we should have had a vote on this vital issue.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives today faces another of those painful decisions which occasionally is handed to us as a final arbiter in a dispute that has not been possible to resolve by the effected parties—I say this is a painful decision because we will not have settled the dispute—we are only doing that which seems most expedient in our position of being responsible for the welfare of the Nation.

I want to say that I regret that this resolution is before us. I think we are without question engaging in compulsory arbitration. I think we are unquestionably setting a precedent for Congress to act as a final arbiter of labor-management disputes. This is not a proper function of Congress in view of our traditional American policy of maintaining free collective bargaining.

I say this with the hope that those of us who are Members of Congress and the general public will have a full realization of the unfortunate determination that Congress is making today.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that a nationwide railroad strike would quickly cripple our national economy, and inflict serious hardship upon millions of people who are not parties to the dispute. Workers in industries generally would soon be added to the unemployment rolls, the delivery of mail would be disrupted, and business in many areas would grind to a halt.

I am mindful of the great contribution which collective bargaining has made to the American way of life, and that its processes are not lightly to be disturbed. However, I believe that the seven-member arbitration board will do its best to arrive at a decision that is fair and unbiased on the two limited issues to be submitted to it.

If economic justice can be provided without disruption of our Nation's economy, I am for following that path. It should be remembered that the railroad industry is a public utility whose rates are regulated and whose service is subject to governmental scrutiny. As such a public utility, the industry, and its employees should submit to arbitration in the public interest.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, basically, I am opposed to compulsory arbitration. I have always accepted the principle that collective bargaining is one of the cornerstones of the free enterprise system.

Make no mistake, once the Congress attempts to arbitrate disputes, on that day, a precedent has been established which may well undermine the free enterprise system.

However, every Member of this body must face up to the fact that the public interest is paramount to the interest of any person—whether it be labor or management.

Each of us has one question we must answer today. How can we best serve the public interest?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the compulsory features of this legislation. A case has not been made for this assault on free collective bargaining.

This legislation is more expedient than it is wise.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the labor dispute between the carriers represented by the Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees and certain of their employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America, labor organizations, threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; and

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers; and

Whereas it is desirable to achieve the above objectives in a manner which preserves and prefers solutions reached through collective bargaining; and

Whereas, on August 2, 1963, the Secretary of Labor submitted to the carrier and organization representatives certain suggestions as a basis of negotiation for disposition of the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues in the dispute and thereupon through such negotiations tentative agreement was reached with respect to portions of such suggestions; and

Whereas, on August 16, 1963, the carrier parties to the dispute accepted, and the organization parties to the dispute accepted with certain reservations, the Secretary of Labor's suggestion that the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues be resolved by binding arbitration but the said parties have been unable to agree upon the terms and procedures of an arbitration agreement: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change, except by agreement, or pursuant to an arbitration award as hereinafter provided, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

Sec. 2. There is hereby established an arbitration board to consist of seven members. The representatives of the carrier and organization parties to the aforesaid dispute are hereby directed, respectively, within five days after the enactment hereof each to name two persons to serve as members of such arbitration board. The four members thus chosen shall select three additional members. The seven members shall then elect a chairman. If the members chosen by the parties shall fail to name one or more of the additional three members within ten days, such additional members shall be named by the President. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the three arbitrators not named by the parties at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. Promptly upon the completion of the naming of the arbitration board the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the board and to the parties to the dispute copies of his statement to the parties of August 2, 1963, and the papers therewith submitted to the parties, together with memoranda and such other data as the board may request setting forth the matters with respect to which the parties were in tentative agreement and the extent of disagreement with respect to matters on which the parties were not in tentative agreement. The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, incorporating in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, resolving the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of those portions of the carriers' notice of November 2, 1959, identified as "Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power" and "Consist of Road and Yard Crews" and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as "Minimum Safe Crew Consist" and implementing proposals pertaining thereto.

Sec. 4. To the extent not inconsistent with this joint resolution the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, the board's award shall be made and filed as provided in said sections and shall be subject to section 9 of said Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby designated as the court in which the award is to be filed, and the arbitration board shall report to the National Mediation Board in the same manner as arbitration boards functioning pursuant to the Railway Labor Act. The awards shall continue in force for such period as the arbitration board shall determine in its award, but not to exceed two years from the date the award takes effect, unless the parties agree otherwise.

Sec. 5. The arbitration board shall begin its hearings thirty days after the enactment of this joint resolution or on such earlier date as the parties to the dispute and the board may agree upon and shall make and file its award not later than ninety days after the enactment of this joint resolution: *Provided, however,* That said award shall not become effective until all other issues in the dispute arising from the aforesaid notices have been disposed of as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 6. (a) The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959, and September 7, 1960, not to be disposed of by arbitration under section 3 of this joint resolution and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such issues by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed toward promoting such agreement.

(b) If any of the issues referred to in paragraph (a) have not been resolved by collective bargaining within thirty days after the award is filed in accordance with section 5 of this joint resolution, the National Mediation Board shall certify to the arbitration board the status of the issues then in dispute, and the arbitration board shall make a decision resolving these issues. The arbitration shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this joint resolution. The arbitration board shall make and file its award on these issues not later than 60 days after such issues have been certified by the National Mediation Board.

SEC. 7. The obligations imposed by this joint resolution, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall expire when all disputes covered thereby are disposed of by the arbitration herein provided or by agreement of the parties as provided in section 6(a) hereof.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this resolution has been discussed thoroughly and analyzed, and in view of the fact that it has a good number of "whereases," although it is not a very long resolution at that, but there are several sections to it and I will have some conforming amendments to offer to bring it into conformity with the Senate resolution, under the circumstances with which we are all familiar, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 19, strike out "all other issues in the dispute arising from the aforesaid notices have been disposed of as hereinafter provided." and insert in lieu thereof: "60 days after the filing of the award."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 22, strike out "(a)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, strike out lines 7 through 17.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, strike out lines 22 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall expire 150 days after the date of its enactment except that it shall remain in effect with respect to the last sentence of section 4 for the period prescribed in that sentence."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 7, line 2, strike out "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof "eighty".

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes.

As I indicated a moment ago, this is a conforming amendment wherein the House resolution as reported with its amendment has a total of 150 days that this resolution would remain in effect. The other body amended it and made it 180 days. This amendment therefore is merely extending the effective date of the resolution for 30 days from the time that was included in the House amendment.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, as I understand it, if this legislation is passed today which is the same as that passed on yesterday by the Senate, then there will be no trouble insofar as any conferees' report is concerned and it can go on immediately to the White House?

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, what we are trying to do, as I have indicated before, our purpose is to bring this bill into conformity with the Senate bill with these amendments in order that it can go on to the White House for the President's signature between now and tonight.

Mr. CHELF. Without conference reports or anything further?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. CHELF. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, as a youngster in an orphanage many years ago I always wanted a toy train. I never was able to own one because I did not have any parents to buy it for me. At any rate, at a tender age, I was conscious of and in sympathy with the problems of the railroads of America. I have remained interested in this great industry over the years. Likewise, I have always had a soft spot in my heart for the many thousands of splendid railroad employees of the Nation. I guess that I was more interested and closer to all railroad employees simply because I had two brothers, who, during their lives, worked for the "Old Reliable," the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., at Louisville, Ky. A great railroad.

As a result of my deep interest in both railroad management and railroad employees, I am sincerely anxious to get this great dispute settled. While I feel that I owe great consideration to the railroads and all of their fine employees, I cannot forget the fact that I owe a far greater consideration to the American people. Therefore, I shall have to vote for this resolution today. We absolutely cannot allow a railroad strike to start at midnight. The Nation's interest is paramount to those of all others. This bill is not perfect but it will stop this strike.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened this afternoon in the committee with increasing restlessness to what, with all due respect to my colleagues, I consider to be tortured reasons for doing serious damage to the device of collective bargaining in the United States by adopting the devastating principle of compulsory arbitration. This is a precedent. This is compulsory arbitration.

I know, and I think all of us know, of no institution in American economic life which has been more carefully nurtured, which has received more diligent attention from more brilliant people in the last generation than the device of collective bargaining. It may very well be, as has been asserted here a number of times this afternoon, that collective bargaining will not take us through periods of national emergency such as this one. But if that is the case I submit to the House that the best process is for appropriate committees of this House, under appropriate resolutions and bills, to look into this matter and to do something about it. After hearing this debate, I have not become convinced that this should be done, but I do submit it to be the proper procedure.

Furthermore, I am not ready to believe, after hearing this full debate, that the American people are so anxious to avoid this strike at midnight as to avoid it at the cost of permanent damage to the processes of collective bargaining which I think will follow. This meeting this afternoon will be repeated, as many of these gentlemen have suggested this afternoon. For that reason I oppose this resolution, and I wish to go on record to that effect.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROMWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for his very courageous and eloquent statement. It is a sad day for the Nation when Congress does not face up squarely to an issue. I regret to say it but the Congress has been avoiding the real issues which underlie the resolution before us today.

The problems which grow out of national, industrywide bargaining are not confined to the railroad industry alone. When unions and management bargain on a nationwide, industrywide basis they invite what the House is about to impose upon them here today—compulsory arbitration. And compulsory arbitration carries with it a denial of the right to strike.

Long ago in this session, Congress should have undertaken, in an orderly way, a serious study of the broad policy problems associated with industrywide bargaining and industrywide strikes. Unfortunately this administration, and, I regret to say it, this Congress have not given this subject, which is complex and politically dangerous, the serious attention it deserves. The matter immediately before us is symptomatic, only a sample of more problems to come. A man by the name of James Hoffa has already served notice that within a short time he expects to have the whole Nation tied up under one collective bargaining contract. So, the trucking industry, which is not under the Railway Labor Act, may soon be in a similar situation.

On July 24, 1963, I introduced a resolution which I would commend to the attention of my colleagues. The resolution, House Joint Resolution 569, calls for establishment of a joint Senate-House Committee on Industrywide Bargaining. Representatives on the joint committee from the House would include members of the Committees on Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The joint committee would be authorized and directed to make a thorough study of industrywide bargaining and industrywide strikes. It would be my hope that such a committee would be so constituted that it could operate in an atmosphere as free as possible from political pressures, and that it would come up with sound legislative recommendations meriting the support of Congress and the Nation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROMWELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I was not going to participate in this debate. But I simply want to say that I concur wholeheartedly in the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa and also the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan; I must go on record to that effect.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL], for his remarks and join with him completely in his views.

This resolution not only sets aside free collective bargaining in this railroad dispute, but it sets a precedent that will haunt Congress in future national labor disputes.

It is difficult to understand how both railroad management and labor could accept this legislation unless both sides are convinced that in the end there will be no settlement of the disputed issues. Certainly this legislation does not compel a settlement of all the issues involved.

Not only does this legislation set aside collective bargaining, but it, in fact, outlaws a strike; it sets aside an important decision of the courts and the recommendations of a Presidential commission.

With adoption of this resolution Congress will have turned its collective back upon the carefully enacted body of laws governing the settlement of labor disputes. Slice thick or thin all the arguments made this afternoon in behalf of this legislation and the remaining product is compulsory arbitration. This is the precedent that will be set with enactment of this legislation for all of management and labor.

What, I would like to ask, will be the situation if and when steel management seeks to increase the prices of its products to meet expenditures necessitated by wage increases to steelworkers? Will President Kennedy again use his enormous powers to bludgeon steel management or will Congress enact legislation compelling the President, through compulsory arbitration, to meet with representatives of the steel industry and adjust the price schedules for steel?

And this record should show clearly that this legislation is before Congress only because President Kennedy was an unmitigated failure in bringing about a settlement of the railroad management-labor dispute. Neither his vaunted affinity for labor nor his alleged concern for business could produce results.

This can well be a most unhappy day for labor, management, Congress, and the vitally affected fourth party—the public.

It is scarcely necessary for me to say that I am opposed to the resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the other side of the aisle to be the only Members who rise here and say that they are against compulsory arbitration. I am somewhat leery of their reasoning today and especially when they bring up Mr. Hoffa in this matter, which I do not think is directly in point. But I must say that I think in this instance the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is right. I hope that a resolution along the lines which the gentleman has outlined will be adopted, because I have just returned—as some of the Members know—from a trip to Europe. I must report to this House, without any question, that many European countries today are far ahead of us in management-labor relations legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is time that we do what the gentleman has said, bring the skills that are within these separate committees together to try to face the matter, even though we may not have the same solutions originally with which we start out.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to say that I find it very difficult, as I am sure most of my colleagues do, to face an issue today with so much certainty, and I agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] that we are going to have to come back and face another railroad strike within a relatively short time. I hope to be proven wrong. But how can you vote today for compulsory arbitration and not realize that many other areas, such as shipping, steel, automobiles, and others may take this as a precedent to ask Congress to set up compulsory arbitration for their disputes.

So, Mr. Chairman, although I know what dangers it presents to the country, I believe that the two parties, if forced because we did not pass this legislation, if forced to, then would feel the weight of public opinion and would then really have to bargain and reach a decision.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I have decided to vote against the resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to participate in this debate. But some of the things that have just been said here recently moved me to make a few observations.

Mr. Chairman, it was my great privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce some years ago. It is a great committee, a committee which has jurisdiction over the Railway Labor Act. Any suggestion that the concern of some of us for the preservation of collective bargaining is a sort of a new-found devotion is just wrong. Back in 1945 it was my privilege to serve with the great late Senator Bob Taft, of Ohio, on a joint committee of Members of this body on our side and Members of the other body on our side of the aisle to draft certain statements of principles and policies in which we believed. We said in that statement that we believed in the fundamental process of collective bargaining as the very cornerstone of our competitive enterprise economy.

We said that the processes of collective bargaining and mediation should be strengthened. And we also said that we believed that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after that time I had something to do with writing the Taft-Hartley Act. Those of you who were here at the time—and may I say parenthetically that in spite of the fact that it was called a "slave-labor act" and in spite of the fact that we have had Democratic Congresses year after year, many times too often in my opinion, they have not repealed or changed the first line of that act.

Mr. Chairman, we struggled with this business of what to do about national emergency strikes. The bill was the Hartley bill before it was the Taft-Hartley bill. We acted on it first in the House. When it was here before us we adopted a provision to the effect that in any collective bargaining operation the representative of the employees could not likewise be the representative of the employees of a competing employer.

We provided for the 80-day process and in spite of what all of the critics have said by and large that process has been very, very effective. But you must bear in mind that at the end of that time, at the end of the 80-day period, there was no prohibition against the right of labor to strike.

We are up against a different proposition here today. Nobody realizes that any more than I do. But as I said a moment ago, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], on our side, yielded to me, what we do here today is not going to settle permanently any of these very vital national questions. Under the Taft-Hartley Act employees excluded employees covered by the National Railway Labor Act. But whether it is the National Railway Labor Act or whether it is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, this problem is still with us.

To my mind free collective bargaining is the cornerstone of our competitive enterprise system, and its processes must be protected. So whatever happens here today, I sincerely hope that both the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will devote their known and manifest talents to the consideration and I hope some fair determination of this very difficult question.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for some time and I have listened to some audible sentiments expressed by the distinguished minority leader, by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. They have spoken about legislation that they feel is necessary for our committee to give consideration to. The legislation that these gentlemen would urge upon the House of Representatives is simply this: It says that management would be subject to criminal prosecution for hiring more men to perform jobs than is necessary. That is a laudible thing. But this legislation to which these gentlemen are so devoted provides for the prosecution of management for hiring more vice presidents, for hiring more economists, for hiring more labor lawyers, yes, for hiring more railroad lobbyists than are necessary. It does not affect only the hiring of the little fireman who makes his $20 a day, it does not affect only the hiring of the engineer, the switchman, or brakeman who gives a full day's service for a full day's pay.

I think we ought to analyze this situation and determine how we as a nation can be faced with a nationwide strike. This is not a new thing, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and let me say further I yield to no one in my interest in preserving collective bargaining according to the laws, the principles, and traditions which we have established in this country.

It was during the Eisenhower administration that this whole thing came to a head, and let me say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that not one thing was done about this until the present administration came to power and until President Kennedy and this administration brought to bear the forces of this administration on a knotty problem. Let me say to the gentlemen on that side of the aisle that this is a nationwide strike threatened because management has posted on a nationwide basis notices of work rules which labor feels it cannot accept.

Let me stress something else to my good friends.

I would commend to the distinguished minority leader, who was a member of this committee at one time, that he read the Railway Labor Act again. It says that bargaining in railway disputes will be on a systemwide basis. Let me remind some of my colleagues on the Republican side who speak of their devotion to free collective bargaining that this free collective bargaining has failed in this instance because both parties to the dispute, management and labor, under the leadership of the Republican administration—found it worthwhile to try to resolve a nationwide issue on a nationwide basis. Let me say nothing was done by the previous Republican administration to head that unwise decision off. So let me say to my good friends on the Republican side, if you are going to be political, read a little history first.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It does give me quite a chuckle and a smile to hear some liberal Members on this House floor now arguing, first, for compulsory arbitration, second, for setting aside hard-won collective bargaining procedures, and third, for setting aside collective bargaining procedures prior to the time an emergency exists and there is still time for an agreement to be made by the parties by collective bargaining before midnight, which is the deadline tonight. The President should be asked to call the parties to the White House for continuous collective bargaining action, and ask the parties for further voluntary extension of time which the parties have agreed previously, if necessary, to avert a possible strike, in the interests of the American people, and to prevent a national emergency, which nobody seeks. Agreement can be reached.

It is very surprising to me to find in section 7 of the legislation, the following enforcement provisions:

> The obligations imposed by this joint resolution, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

That is a return without saying it to the old rule by injunction in labor management disputes. We in Pennsylvania have proceeded far beyond rule by injunction, in industrial disputes. In rule by injunction the court orders actions on a personal basis, by peremptory order. This is control by compulsion and force without the labor and management people in some cases having an adequate chance to object to the ruling nor controvert the facts upon which the ruling is based. Likewise, it is the force of the court to control the actions of free Americans, and their conditions of employment. There is no provision that there must be a jury trial, nor any limit on the use of injunctions nor procedures to protect employees' rights.

I would point out to the liberals who are speaking on the floor on this resolution that there is no limit on the kind of injunction that can be made by any U.S. court under section 7 of this legislation. In certain jurisdictions of the United States there are courts that as far as modern enlightened labor management procedures are concerned, would be to the right of Caesar and would even make King Herod look like a New Dealer.

Let me tell the liberals that once you leave basic principle and give up the right of collective bargaining in one instance, as I said before on the floor this afternoon, it will become a precedent in every instance. You labor people that are listening to me today, please remember that the collective-bargaining procedure is your basic right. It is the basic foundation of your existence and your economic life. When you see this House of Representatives give up that hard-won right of collective bargaining on the basis that we are afraid to face the ultimate issue, I hope that the people listening to me know that we in this Congress will be making a basic bad mistake. I strongly favor collective bargaining, and I have been under collective-bargaining procedures as an employer. I consider it an honor and a duty to have my representatives conduct collective bargaining with self-respecting employees. The railroad industry should continue collective bargaining.

Let me say further to you people who are in other transportation industries, this precedent is for every one of you. Secondly, it is a precedent for every person in the utilities field. Likewise, it is a precedent in the steel industry or any major industry that might affect the basic security of this country. These industries are losing the right of collective bargaining before a strike even takes place.

I am sorry various people feel it is time to set aside collective-bargaining procedures the United States has had for years and give up basic hard-won labor rights. I hope somebody in the leadership, as this is a most-important and basic decision, will call for a rollcall and let every Member stand up and be counted on this critical issue. Let us show we are in favor of free collective bargaining, or whether to give it up and go back to the prediluvian, antediluvian, old pre-Herod time before the time of collective bargaining that so many of us have fought for.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. I join the gentleman. I hope there is a rollcall on this vote, because I want to see who the people are who talk so much of collective bargaining and who will vote against it. I certainly will vote against this legislation on a rollcall vote.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania I supported collective bargaining all my life, both before and after coming to the Congress. I supported this bill in committee and I will support it here on the floor of the House, and I expect that the overwhelming majority of the working people with whom I am acquainted will applaud my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask the Chairman of the main committee a few questions on this bill. It would seem to me that if we were to take a vote right now on the question of whether we are for or against compulsory arbitration as it is understood and defined in the classical sense, my guess is that the vote would be unanimous on both sides of the aisle against it. I think we are all agreed that we are opposed to compulsory arbitration in the classical meaning of the word. I have always opposed compulsary arbitration and oppose it now. But after reading this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure that we have here before us in this legislation the question of compulsory arbitration in its purest sense.

On page 2 of the joint resolution, in the preamble, you will find a whole series of conditions setting a precedent that were met prior to the time that the request was made of the Congress to set up the ground rules for binding arbitration to end the dispute.

Reference in the resolution is made to the August 2 memorandum submitted by the Secretary of Labor in which he discussed the tentative agreement that was reached with respect to portions of the suggestions made by the Secretary of Labor.

The last "whereas" on page 2 I think sets out the preamble as explicitly as anything in this resolution. It says:

> Whereas, on August 16, 1963, the carrier parties to the dispute accepted, and the organization parties to the dispute accepted with certain reservations, the Secretary of Labor's suggestion that the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues be resolved by binding arbitration but the said parties have been unable to agree upon the terms and procedures of an arbitration agreement:

As I understand compulsory arbitration, it is a situation where legislation is passed and rules are set up and the procedure is established to move in and resolve a labor dispute regardless of what the feelings may be of either party. I do not think that this is quite the situation here. Here we have these conditions precedent. Both sides already agreed to resolve their differences by binding arbitration. What they have asked Congress in effect is to stand by as an impartial third party and set up the ground rules under which this binding arbitration will be conducted. I submit that this is a far cry from the classical term of compulsory arbitration. I should like to yield to the chairman for the specific question as to whether or not he agrees with this interpretation. The real heart of this legislation I think is found on page 4, line 9, where it provides that—

> The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, incorporating in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, resolving the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of those portions—

And so on.

Would the chairman be good enough to comment as to whether or not we have here in this legislation the classical type of compulsory arbitration that has been discussed here on the floor today on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I can say to the gentleman that the answer to his question I think is included in the language in the resolution on page 2 where it says:

> That no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change, except by agreement.

As I have continuously emphasized all afternoon, "except by agreement," means there is built into this resolution the continued authority and encouragement of collective bargaining in the usual way. If the processes of collective bargaining insofar as these two issues are concerned cannot result in an agreement, then the language says "or pursuant to an arbitration award as hereinafter provided."

Mr. PUCINSKI. But would I be correct, would the chairman be so good as to comment further, in assuming that unlike the classical sense of compulsory arbitration, in the case before us today, the two sides have in effect come before Congress and asked for procedures to be established for the resolution of their dispute?

Mr. HARRIS. I think the debate made that clear.

Mr. PUCINSKI. To that extent it appears to me there is a difference between the term "binding arbitration" as used in this legislation and the term "compulsory arbitration" as we know it in its traditional or classical sense of the word. I believe the distinction should be kept in mind as the Members draw their respective conclusions on the very important legislation.

But in any event, it is my judgment this legislation does not establish a precedent for solution of labor disputes in other industries. The mere fact that the legislation is being handled by the House Interstate Commerce Committee and not the Labor Committee clearly demonstrates whatever precedent is established here shall be limited only and exclusively to the railroad industry.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the debate today. The issue seems to be between compulsory arbitration and the public interest. It seems to me compulsory arbitration violates one of the basic freedoms of our Nation and system of government.

A railroad strike would affect the public interest in the days ahead, but what, Mr. Chairman, affects the public interest the most? A temporary disrupting of our economy or giving up of a basic freedom?

I have concluded there is more danger to the Republic in taking away our freedoms than that which proponents of this bill claim to be the reason it should pass.

I cannot support the bill and I shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> On page 3, line 17, after the period insert the following: "If either party fails to name a member or members to the arbitration board within the five days provided, the President shall name such member or members in lieu of such party and shall also name the additional three members necessary to constitute a board of seven members, all within ten days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution."
>
> On page 3, line 20, strike out "three."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely conforms to the action taken by the other body and is a procedural amendment simply providing that if neither party, as required by this legislation, names the members to the arbitration board, then the President shall name them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chariman, this is a most difficult issue which faces the Committee at this time. I had not intended to speak, but I have sat here and listened to remarks made, and I have particular reference to those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], which I think could be made by any person with the assurance firmly in mind that the majority action of this body would save them from the folly of the course which they would urge upon us, because the position taken and urged by the gentleman is that we have at 12:01 midnight a strike, a strike which no one appearing before the committee contended this Nation could tolerate.

Now, I recall 8 days of hearings and every member of the committee was most anxious to receive the advice, the benefit of the knowledge of anyone who could contribute anything to aid in solving this difficult problem. I do not recall the gentleman from Pennsylvania coming before the committee and giving us the benefit of his wisdom and the advice he has given us today.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, I have maintained this position before your committee. I put in a resolution for a voluntary 30-day cooling-off period which was not given the opportunity for a hearing by the gentleman's committee, largely because of the rush of the committee on other railroad legislation. Likewise I went to the Commerce Committee of the Senate, when they had their hearings, and, on invitation, actually sat behind the members listening to the debate.

Mr. MOSS. I will yield to the gentleman if he wants to deal specifically with the point, which is that he did not seek an opportunity to appear and speak at the time. We already had a 30-day delay by voluntary action of the carriers in withholding the posting of their notice.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let me comment on that, if I may. My resolution, I hope, in a small way helped obtain voluntary agreement from both parties. I am against the strike as is everybody here and I wish the gentleman would not infer that anybody here favors a strike of any type.

Secondly, the President of the United States should be meeting with these people this very instant helping to work out an agreement by consent.

Mr. MOSS. I did not ask for the gentleman's advice now.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has brought the debate back to the issues at hand. We face a possible nationwide railroad strike. The zero hour is not far off. Considerable discussion of types of labor-management legislation that might be considered by the House has been had. But we face a situation and not a theory. The committee has brought in a bill written to conform to the action of the other body, a bill which will forestall and we hope entirely prevent a strike. I think the committee is to be complimented on its fine work and I think the House should follow the leadership of the committee and proceed to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that I, for one, have no apology to anyone for giving this resolution my full support in committee and I give it that full support here on the floor of the House. I feel that I am acting responsibly and in response to the needs of this Nation.

And, if I wanted to seek political advantage, representing as I do a major rail center, the easiest thing in the world for me to do would be to step into this well and demagog and tell them that I do not want to do anything that could ever impinge even remotely upon their full freedom to strike. But that is not the responsible course. It is not the course I would follow or urge upon any member of this Committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> On page 4, beginning in line 9, strike out "The" and all that follows down through line 23 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, as to what disposition shall be made of those portions of the carriers' notices of November 2, 1959, identified as 'Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power' and 'Consist of Road and Yard Crews' and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as 'Minimum Safe Crew Consist' and implementing proposals pertaining thereto. The arbitration board shall incorporate in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, shall resolve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of the aforesaid issues covered by the decision of the board of arbitration."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, in addition to this being a conforming amendment, it is a clarifying amendment. It does not change anything at all, but it is considered to be advisable and better language with reference to the specific issues involved.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to again repeat what is in the preamble to this resolution:

> Whereas, on August 2, 1963, the Secretary of Labor submitted to the carrier and organization representatives certain suggestions as a basis of negotiation for disposition of the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues in the dispute and thereupon through such negotiations tentative agreement was reached with respect to portions of such suggestions—

Mr. Chairman, this portion of the preamble now means that there were certain agreements reached then by both sides in the preamble?

Mr. HARRIS. As far as the issues involved here are concerned, which I insist that we keep in mind, there were certain parts of those issues on which agreement had been reached. There were certain parts of them on which tentative agreements had been reached. There were certain parts of them on which no agreement had been reached. So, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. In the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arkansas the following is stated:

> The arbitration board shall incorporate in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement.

That means as of that date?

Mr. HARRIS. That is direction to the arbitration board of standards which the Congress establishes for the board to follow.

Mr. STAGGERS. And, also further continuing:

> Shall resolve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the major purpose of this resolution.

Mr. STAGGERS. One further question with respect to this. There is also the statement:

> Shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement.

Mr. HARRIS. That is a direction to the board.

Mr. STAGGERS. That would be the intent of this resolution, and it should be carried forth.

Mr. HARRIS. Not only a direction, but the act would so provide.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has stated what his plans of procedure are. May I ask, will this amendment if adopted result in this bill being sent to conference, with the possibility we will have no conference report?

Mr. HARRIS. If this amendment is adopted, and the other two amendments conforming are adopted, it will be brought in exact line with the bill passed by the other body.

Mr. COOLEY. Then the gentleman will substitute the Senate bill and send it on to the White House?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. The rule makes that in order, and it is my intention to do just that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 6, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 7. (a) In making any award under this joint resolution the arbitration board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation."
>
> On page 6, line 18, strike out "SEC. 7." and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was approved and adopted by the other body last night as a technical amendment. In my judgment it is a technical amendment. At the outset I had some question about it, but in view of the fact that it provides that the Board shall give due consideration to the effect of the award upon safe and adequate transportation service and in addition thereto requires the Board to give consideration to the interest of the carriers and the employees affected, I have changed my mind. I was under the impression on first consideration of the amendment that it did broaden the authority of the Board, and I was concerned about that. But after going into that and giving consideration to these provisions, the language itself, and discussing it with the sponsor in the other body and those who have given consideration to it, including the Secretary of Labor, I find it does not broaden authority at all but is to meet a technical problem in connection with the operation of this resolution by the Board in its consideration of these problems.

In order further to explain the position and to make legislative history I will ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, when we get back into the House, a letter from the Secretary of Labor to this effect, also an interpretation from the Solicitor to the same effect in order to make it abundantly clear that is what we intend and that is the way we expect it to be so interpreted.

(The letters referred to follow:)

U.S. Department of Labor,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1963.

Hon. Oren Harris,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: You have inquired of me regarding the effect of the inclusion in Senate Joint Resolution 102 of the following provision in section 7(a): "In making any award under this joint resolution the Arbitration Board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and the employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation."

I have requested the advice, regarding this matter, of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor. His memorandum to me, of even date, is enclosed.

It is my judgment, identical with the view expressed in Mr. Donahue's memorandum, that section 7(a) is properly considered as a perfecting provision, completing what is otherwise provided for and anticipated in the joint resolution and having no independent or altering effect. This conclusion covers the effect of this provision both on the functioning of the Arbitration Board provided for in the joint resolution and on any question of review or enforcement which may conceivably arise.

Respectfully,

W. Willard Wirtz,
Secretary of Labor.

U.S. Department of Labor,
Office of the Solicitor,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1963.

MEMORANDUM

To: The Secretary of Labor.
From: Charles Donahue, Solicitor of Labor.
Subject: Amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102, embodied in section 7(a).

You have asked me for my opinion concerning the effect of the adoption in the Senate on August 27 of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 102 which adds a subsection (a) to section 7, providing: "In making any award under this joint resolution, the arbitration board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and the employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation."

In offering this amendment, Senator Cotton described it as one of "four technical amendments" worked out by the staff of the committee. They were described by Senator Magnuson as "technical amendments which were unanimously agreed upon by the Committee on Commerce," which would "perfect the joint resolution along the lines of the objectives of the committee."

All four amendments, including the above quoted language, were unanimously agreed to en bloc (see Congressional Record of Aug. 27, 1963, pp. 15962–15963. The legislative history of section 7(a), quoted above, clearly indicates to me that its adoption was not intended to change or affect in any way the scope of the authority of an arbitration board appointed under the joint resolution or the factors which such resolution would direct such a board to consider in making its award under the terms of the resolution. In reaching this conclusion, I have examined the amendment in question in relation to the legislation in its form prior to the offering of the amendment by Senator Cotton. Section 2 of the joint resolution establishes an arbitration board of seven members. Section 3 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the board and to the parties to the dispute his statement of August 2, 1963, which has been reproduced as appendix B to House Report No. 713, dated August 26, 1963, to accompany the companion legislation in the House, House Joint Resolution 665. Subsequent to this submission to the arbitration board by the Secretary of Labor, the arbitration board is directed to make a decision which shall give due consideration to those matters on which the parties are in tentative agreement. The board shall also make an award resolving the matters relating to the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues on which the parties are not in agreement.

It is apparent that section 7(a) is properly considered as a perfecting provision, completing what is otherwise provided for and anticipated in the joint resolution and having no independent or altering effect. This conclusion covers the effect of this provision both on the functioning of the arbitration board provided for in the joint resolution and on any question of review or enforcement which may conceivably arise.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Harris: On page 7, after line 4, add the following:

"Sec. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution and the application of such provision to other parties or in other circumstances not held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather standard form of amendment that we consider often. Most of the committees use it. Personally, we in our committee did not think it was necessary, but the other body thought it was, and last night the amendment was offered and adopted. Therefore, we offer it at this time in order to conform to the action of the other body.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Without objection, the amendment was agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate and commend the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his clear and concise presentation of this delicate and complex problem. He has been very fair and very courteous to all parties concerned and to all members of the committee in their views. I do not believe that anyone who has come before the committee can say that he has not been treated fairly. I should also like to congratulate him on his attention to this problem and devotion to duty as the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There has been discussion of compulsory arbitration. May I say briefly just a few words in relation to that. Section 6(b) of this joint resolution was compulsory arbitration, and I offered the amendment in the committee to knock it out, and it was knocked out. I said before the committee, to those 31 members of whom the chairman spoke, that I would never agree as long as I was a member of this committee or a Member of this House to compulsory arbitration, that made compulsory the arbitration of working hours, rates of pay, and working conditions of men in this country. But I would say that the parties to this agreement had agreed to binding arbitration and it was brought to our committee under those circumstances. They said that procedure had to be set up, and that is what this joint resolution is doing.

If I thought this was compulsory arbitration on wages, hours, and working conditions I would not vote for it. Those men today who say they are not going to vote for this joint resolution realize that if they fail to settle this before midnight, we will have a nationwide railroad strike on our hands. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others who say it could be settled before midnight that it is impossible, because some of these organizations cannot vote without polling their entire membership.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **STAGGERS**. I yield.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. On June 15 of this year the President of the United States again asked the parties for 30 more days to try again.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. The gentleman is speaking of something in the past.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Let us try it again.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. In 6 hours? It is physically impossible to bring these men in from all over the Nation.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. If the President of the United States would request another 5 days, I am sure both parties would agree.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. That has been suggested. That is one excuse for voting against the joint resolution. You are either going to face the problem now or give an excuse. There is no way at this late hour to solve this problem unless you vote either "no" or "yea" on this legislation as it is today.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania. I respect the gentleman's position. I think he has stated very plainly how he feels. I hope the gentleman respects my position, because I am opposed to the joint resolution just as sincerely. I hope the gentleman will join with me in having a vote. Let us have a vote on it.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. I want to be fair to management just as well as to the working people of this Nation. I will do everything in my power to do just that. Strong and vigorous management as well as labor is needed for the well-being of the Nation.

Neither party to this dispute, railroad management or railroad labor, is satisfied with the provisions of this bill and neither am I.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by my colleague on the Commerce Committee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS]. I also want to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee for his intelligent and most fair manner in which he conducted the hearings and presided over the lengthy executive sessions in an effort to bring about a reasonable solution to the railroad crisis.

As the gentleman from West Virginia stated, the issue before us at this time is quite clear. The decision we make today will determine whether or not there will be a railroad strike tonight. Let me repeat what the gentleman from West Virginia said, that no one wants this strike, as all of our hearings showed and all of our witnesses testified.

Like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], I have been associated for many years with organized workers, and I share his views in regard to compulsory arbitration, and his deep concern for workers in the railroad industry. It concerns me very much that no important legislation has been adopted by the Congress to meet the challenge of automation so that working people will share in its fruits rather than to be cast aside with little hope for the future welfare of their families. Until some effective action is taken by the Congress to end the waste in human and natural resources that comes with automation and unemployment, there will be many more crises such as we face in the railroad industry today.

If we are concerned about what may happen on the railroads after 180 days we ought to get busy at once in seeking to end the cause of this conflict, and like problems that are growing fast in many other big industries in our country. We ought to pay more attention to the human problems associated with the railroad dispute.

Like most, if not all, of my colleagues on the Commerce Committee, who have been close to this railroad dispute, and who have listened to testimony from every interested party, I am not impressed by some of the criticism I heard during this debate. It came from critics who had no constructive alternate to offer, and who have suddenly become exponents of collective bargaining and the rights of the working man.

If a strike would come tonight, we could expect these same critics to blame the Congress and the President for not averting a shutdown of the railroad industry. They would be ready, too, to criticize any action that would follow, whether it be seizure of the railroads or action that would displease the rail workers.

Some administration opponents may see politicial mileage in a nationwide strike, or in taking a stand which they hope and believe will not prevail when the final vote is taken today.

Mr. Chairman, every member of our committee has approached this question in a constructive and responsible manner. I do not believe that the criticism, which seems to me to be completely irresponsible, will have much influence on those of us who are concerned about the public interest, the problems of the railroads, and particularly the welfare of the railroad workers and their families.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: On page 7, after line 4, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 9. No railroad which is affected by this resolution shall remove or reduce any services being rendered at the time of its passage so long as this resolution is in effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request to limit the debate?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the limitation of time the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized for 2½ minutes and the gentleman from Arkansas will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take as much time as it has taken to give me the time that I am getting. I only introduced this amendment to call your attention to the fact that while we are here today prescribing rules mandatorily and arbitrarily in this matter of the dispute between labor and management in the railroads, little consideration has been given to the fact that during this period of time much can be done by railroad management itself to reduce and remove services now being rendered, which in the end may cost more jobs than the arbitration award may try to save.

I do not think any person in this room has not been faced with the problem of reduction of services and the removal of services in his or her community by the railroads because of economic conditions. I believe sincerely this balloon has been blown up far beyond the proportions that it really would reach, by those who say that this kind of stoppage would be a major catastrophe in this Nation.

I believe that in areas that I represent, the railroads could almost stop running for passenger service insofar as they concern the welfare of the community I represent, because most of the services have been taken off voluntarily by the railroads. If we were really sincere in this effort, then we should have had a resolution before us establishing a 60- or 90-day injunctive period during which their work must continue and at the end of that period if you desire to have an arbitrarily rendered decision on the matter, then let it take effect at that time. However, no one need believe that at the end of 180 days you will not be faced with the very same resolution you have here today, because any one of the six unresolved problems before these two units now being forced to resolve their problems by compulsory arbitration will be faced up to and if any one should threaten a strike and is likely enough to cause a strike, then the same situation will be before us again and we would have the same problem that we have today. Any situation which is the cause of disagreement between management and labor can be the spark for a strike. There has never been, in the eyes of some people, any justification for any strike under any considerations. I do not like to see a strike. I have also come from the ranks of labor and served both in management and in the labor union end of the situation. Compulsory arbitration serves no one and serves nobody and no cause. However, I only wanted this time to point up to the House the seriousness of the voluntary reduction of services by the railroads caused by economic conditions over which they have a great deal to say.

So far as I am concerned, I withdraw the amendment and yield back to the kind gentleman from Arkansas all of the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BASS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H.J. Res. 665) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, pursuant to House Resolution 505, he reported the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 286, noes 66.

So the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 505, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 102 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the labor dispute between the carriers represented by the Eastern, Western, and Southeastern Carriers' Conference Committees and certain of their employees represented by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America, labor organizations, threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; and

Whereas it is essential to the national interest, including the national health and defense, that essential transportation services be maintained; and

Whereas all the procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted and have not resulted in settlement of the dispute; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers; and

Whereas it is desirable to achieve the above objectives in a manner which preserves and prefers solutions reached through collective bargaining; and

Whereas, on August 2, 1963, the Secretary of Labor submitted to the carrier and organization representatives certain suggestions as a basis of negotiation for disposition of the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues in the dispute and thereupon through such negotiations tentative agreement was reached with respect to portions of such suggestions; and

Whereas, on August 16, 1963, the carrier parties to the dispute accepted and the organization parties to the dispute accepted with certain reservations the Secretary of Labor's suggestion that the fireman (helper) and crew consist issues be resolved by binding arbitration but the said parties have been unable to agree upon the terms and procedures of an arbitration agreement; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no carrier which served the notices of November 2, 1959, and no labor organization which received such notices or served the labor organization notices of September 7, 1960, shall make any change except by agreement, or pursuant to an arbitration award as hereinafter provided, in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions encompassed by any of such notices, or engage in any strike or lockout over any dispute arising from any of such notices. Any action heretofore taken which would be prohibited by the foregoing sentence shall be forthwith rescinded and the status existing immediately prior to such action restored.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an arbitration board to consist of seven members. The representatives of the carrier and organization parties to the aforesaid dispute are hereby directed, respectively, within five days after the enactment hereof each to name two persons to serve as members of such arbitration board. The four members thus chosen shall select three additional members. The seven members shall then elect a chairman. It the members chosen by the parties shall fail to name one or more of the additional three members within ten days, such additional members shall be named by the President. If either party fails to name a member or members to the arbitration board within the five days provided, the President shall name such member or members in lieu of such party and shall also name the additional three members necessary to constitute a board of seven members, all within ten days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the arbitrators not named by the parties at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Promptly upon the completion of the naming of the arbitration board the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the board and to the parties to the dispute copies of his statement to the parties of August 2, 1963, and the papers therewith submitted to the parties, together with memorandums and such other data as the board may request setting forth the matters with respect to which the parties were in tentative agreement and the extent of disagreement with respect to matters on which the parties were not in tentative agreement. The arbitration board shall make a decision, pursuant to the procedures hereinafter set forth, as to what disposition shall be made of those portions of the carriers' notices of November 2, 1959, identified as "Use of Firemen (Helpers) on Other Than Steam Power" and "Consist of Road and Yard Crews" and that portion of the organizations' notices of September 7, 1960, identified as "Minimum Safe Crew Consist" and implementing proposals pertaining thereto. The arbitration board shall incorporate in such decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, shall resolve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement, and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement. Such award shall be binding on both the carrier and organization parties to the dispute and shall constitute a complete and final disposition of the aforesaid issues covered by the decision of the board of arbitration.

SEC. 4. To the extent not inconsistent with this joint resolution the arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Railway Labor Act, the board's award shall be made and filed as provided in said sections and shall be subject to section 9 of said Act. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia is hereby designated as the court in which the award is to be filed, and the arbitration board shall report to the National Mediation Board in the same manner as arbitration boards functioning pursuant to the Railway Labor Act. The award shall continue in force for such period as the arbitration board shall determine in its award, but not to exceed two years from the date the award takes effect, unless the parties agree otherwise.

SEC. 5. The arbitration board shall begin its hearings thirty days after the enactment of this joint resolution or on such earlier date as the parties to the dispute and the board may agree upon and shall make and file its award not later than ninety days after the enactment of this joint resolution: *Provided, however,* That said award shall not become effective until sixty days after the filing of the award.

SEC. 6. The parties to the disputes arising from the aforesaid notices shall immediately resume collective bargaining with respect to all issues raised in the notices of November 2, 1959 and September 7, 1960 not to be disposed of by arbitration under section 3 of this joint resolution and shall exert every reasonable effort to resolve such issues by agreement. The Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board are hereby directed to give all reasonable assistance to the parties and to engage in mediatory action directed toward promoting such agreement.

SEC. 7. (a) In making any award under this joint resolution the arbitration board established under section 2 shall give due consideration to the effect of the proposed award upon adequate and safe transportation service to the public and upon the interests of the carrier and employees affected, giving due consideration to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation.

(b) The obligations imposed by this joint resolution, upon suit by the Attorney General, shall be enforcible through such orders as may be necessary by any court of the United States having jurisdiction of any of the parties.

SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall expire one hundred and eighty days after the date of its enactment, except that it shall remain in effect with respect to the last sentence of section 4 for the period prescribed in that sentence.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this joint resolution and the application of such provision to other parties or in other circumstances not held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 665) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today on the bill just passed, and to include certain statements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, if a vote had been taken on record on this railroad bill I would have voted "no" and want the RECORD to show that I would have voted "no."

FREEDOM MARCH

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today at the Lincoln Memorial a historical event in the life of our Nation is taking place. It is also taking place in the homes of millions of people who with mind and heart join the tens of thousands of Americans, black, brown, yellow and white, who are demonstrating in positive fashion on behalf of jobs and freedom. The march toward freedom is not going to be stopped. Some faltering steps have been taken and great strides must yet be made.

It is a bit difficult to realize that less than 25 years ago Marian Anderson was refused permission, on grounds of her race, to sing in Constitution Hall by its proprietor, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

As a result, in that year 75,000 persons marched to Lincoln Memorial to hear the voice of that wonderful American and famous Negro contralto.

The Washington Post this morning reprinted an article written that April day in 1939 by Edward Folliard, who covered Miss Anderson's open-air concert. In the article he quoted at length the welcoming remarks of Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Mr. Ickes' remarks are still inspiring:

> "In this great auditorium under the sky," he said, "all of us are free. When God gave us this wonderful outdoors and the sun, the moon, and the stars, He made no distinction of race, or creed, or color.
>
> "And 130 years ago He sent us one of his truly great in order that he might restore freedom to those from whom we had disregardfully taken it," Ickes continued. "In carrying out this task, Abraham Lincoln laid down his life, and so it is as appropriate as it is fortunate that today we stand reverently and humbly at the base of this memorial to the Great Emancipator while glorious tribute is rendered to his memory by a daughter of the race from which he struck the chains of slavery.
>
> "Facing us down the Mall beyond the Washington Monument, which we have erected as a symbol of the towering stature and fame of him who founded this Republic, there is rising a memorial to that other great Democrat in our short history, Thomas Jefferson, who proclaimed that principle of equality of opportunity which Abraham Lincoln believed in so implicitly and took so seriously. In our own time, too many pay mere lip service to these twin planets in our democratic heaven. There are those, even in this great Capital of our democratic Republic, who are either too timid or too indifferent to lift up the light that Jefferson and Lincoln carried aloft.
>
> "Genius, like justice, is blind. For genius has touched with the tip of her wing this woman, who, if it had not been for the great mind of Jefferson, if it had not been for the great heart of Lincoln, would not be able to stand among us today a free individual in a free land."

Mr. Speaker, the promise of the good American life is nearer realization in the year 1963 because the Secretary of the Interior, during President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, spoke those words. Under the Roosevelt administration and under succeeding Democratic administrations major steps were taken to bring the Negro into the mainstream of American life. Under President Truman, a policy of desegregating the armed services was embarked upon. Today, under a Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, and a Democratically controlled Congress, major civil rights legislation will be passed, I am certain.

In the swirl of controversy surrounding the national legislation for civil rights, I think it may be forgotten that many States, including Oregon and the District of Columbia, have already enacted antidiscrimination statutes.

Oregonians take pride in the progress made. In 1949, Oregon was the sixth State to pass a fair employment practices law. It guarantees a resident of Oregon, regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin, a right to earn a living at a job of his ability and skill.

Four years later, Oregon enacted a public accommodations law prohibiting discrimination in places of public accommodation.

In 1957, the fair employment and public accommodations statutes were strengthened. That same year, the first housing act was enacted, covering all publicly assisted housing.

Two years later, the housing statute was broadened to prohibit discrimination in the rental or sale of any type of housing.

These statutes have not been dead letters. Their administration has been vigorously carried out.

The fears of the timid—the fears of those who preferred the status quo—were found to be unwarranted. Even the bigots have been largely silenced because progress has been made—though no one pretends the millennium has been reached. And soon I hope—because of national legislation—Negroes of my State will be able to travel in any State and enjoy the freedom found in Oregon, and the freedom guaranteed to them because they are American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I also include, under unanimous consent, a column by James Reston that appeared in the August 28, 1963, edition of the New York Times:

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN AND ALL THAT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 27.—The reaction of the white or Northwest section of Washington to this week's big Negro demonstration is mainly one of annoyance. For a whole day, inhabitants of this privileged sanctuary won't be able to buy a drink at a bar or get a taxi downtown, or count on the colored cook coming in for dinner. Think of the white man's burden.

The white folks in the Capital have always been annoyed by resident or visiting petitioners. Though the right to petition a government for redress of grievances was granted by King John to his barons in Magna Carta and guaranteed to all Americans in the first amendment on December 15, 1791, Congress has usually been irritated whenever large numbers of their fellow citizens showed up to protest.

In 1836, the House of Representatives even adopted a gag rule to the effect "that no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House or entertained in any way whatever."

Later, under the leadership of Congressman John Quincy Adams, this was repealed, but the leaders of Coxey's unemployment marchers were arrested anyway for walking on the grass, and this stubborn resentment against complaining demonstrators still exists.

JOBS AND FREEDOM

The fact that annoyance is still the white residents' principal reaction to the march here indicates the extent of the gap between white and Negro thinking—this in a city that is 53 percent Negro and whose public schools are almost 85 percent Negro.

Despite all the hubbub of the last few days, the Congress has scarcely noted the full objective of the protest. The demonstration was not designed merely as political agitation for the passage of President Kennedy's civil rights legislation, but was officially titled the "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom."

The jobs part of it may prove to be tougher in the end than the freedom, for the Negro leaders are not only asking for equal opportunity in the field of civil liberties but for preferential treatment on jobs.

Asa Philip Randolph, the 74-year-old director of the march, emphasized the point here this week. Getting jobs away from the whites to give to Negroes, he said, was no solution to the problem. A vast increase in the economic growth of the Nation was needed to wipe out unemployment for all, and only special training and treatment for Negroes would enable them to work effectively in an automated society.

This, of course, is precisely the problem Washington has not been able to lick, and there is even less likelihood that the Kennedy administration will get its economic growth and full employment programs through the Congress than its civil rights program.

In July, there were 3,382,000 whites unemployed in this country and 939,000 Negroes. In other words, the Negro unemployed percentage was over double the white—11.2 percent to 5.1, and in some cities, Chicago for example, the Negro unemployed were over 17 percent.

EQUALITY OR PREFERENCE?

This problem is not getting better, but worse. The demand for skilled workers and the scrapping of unskilled workers are increasing faster than the training and education of the Negro. Meanwhile, the Negro population is increasing faster than the white—25.4 percent Negro in the fifties to 17.5 percent white.

Even within the Kennedy administration there is no agreement that its economic proposals would meet the Negro's problems, even if they were all approved by the Congress, which they certainly won't be.

Already some of the President's advisers are insisting that only an ambitious public works program, on top of all the other tax, training, and relief programs, will really deal with Negro unemployment in the cities. The President is not agreeing yet, not because he is convinced they are wrong, but merely because he has so many other problems that he cannot take on another at this time.

Accordingly, this week's march on Washington is not the end of the Negro drive for civil equality but also the beginning of a drive for economic preference and full employment. This may "annoy" Washington, but the American Negro has obviously decided that he has to annoy the white man to wake him up.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, a week ago Monday I obtained unanimous consent for a special order for today. At that time I was not aware, of course, that such important legislation would be considered in the House. Due to the lateness of the hour and the legislation that is still to be considered, and in view of the many commitments which Members have, I shall not use my special order of today.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I happened to see an article in the Birmingham Post-Herald the other day saying Mr. HUDDLESTON had cast his first vote against the foreign aid bill. The thing that intrigued me was the statement that one of the reasons was he thought the bill had not received adequate consideration in the committee. Presumably if that is his first vote against it, he voted for it last year when we considered it in the committee for 24 and 12 days in markup. This year we considered it in committee for 32 days and 19 days of markup, a total of 51 days altogether.

I would suggest to the gentleman that before he reflects on a committee of the House like this he be a little more alert and call the committee and find out how much consideration it did give to the bill.

TO CREATE A SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXPENDITURES FOR RESEARCH PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY OR SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 504, Rept. No. 718), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The said committee is directed to make a complete, full, and thorough investigation of the numerous research programs being conducted by sundry departments and agencies of the Federal Government and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the committee shall give special attention to the following: (1) the overall total amount of annual expenditures on research programs; (2) what departments and agencies of the Government are conducting research and at what costs; (3) the amounts being expended by the various agencies and departments in grants and contracts for research to colleges, private industry, and every form of student scholarships; (4) what facilities, if any, exist for coordinating the various and sundry research programs, including grants to colleges and universities as well as scholarship grants.

In order that this investigation of the numerous research programs may be better coordinated, without limiting the scope of the said committee's investigation, it is directed, among other investigative procedures, to make use of information currently available in the various committees of Congress which have legislative jurisdiction over Government research activities to the end that the said select committee may be able to recommend the necessary legislation to coordinate and prevent unjustifiable duplication in the numerous projects and activities of the Government relating to scientific research.

The committee shall report its findings to the House with such recommended legislation as the committee may deem appropriate to correct any deficiencies. The committee shall make such reports to the House prior to December 1, 1964, and may submit such interim reports as it deems advisable. Any reports submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as the committee deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, along with the minority leader of the other body, I met this morning with people who were here in connection with civil rights. As I said to all reporters who asked me, it was a very pleasant meeting, both informative and enlightening. I also said no commitments were asked and none were given. Someone just handed me a UPI dispatch which quoted Mr. Whitney Young, identified as director of the National Urban League, as saying that I pledged support for all sections of the program. That just does not square with the facts. Let me repeat: no commitments were asked and none were given. I must say that in all my time here I have been very reluctant to challenge any statement made about me, but in view of what everybody else who was there knows—and if there was a misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman who made the statement, I will understand it—I wanted the record corrected at this point.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill—H.R. 7500—to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 706)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,350,820,400, as follows:

(a) For "Research and development", $4,119,575,000, of which amount $20,000,000 is authorized only for implementing Project Surveyor-Orbiter as requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in its budget estimates for fiscal year 1964, and enumerated as follows:

(1) Manned spacecraft systems programs, $1,496,600,000;

(2) Launch vehicle and propulsion systems program, $1,147,500,000;

(3) Aerospace medicine program, $11,000,000;

(4) Integration and checkout program, $125,000,000;

(5) Systems engineering program, $37,000,000.

(6) Meteorological satellites program, $63,700,000;

(7) Communications satellites program, $42,175,000: *Provided, however,* That no part of any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the furnishing of any scientific or technological services for the exclusive benefit of any person providing satellite communications services other than an agency of the United States Government, except at the request of such person and on a reimbursable basis;

(8) Industrial applications program, $3,500,000;

(9) Geophysics and astronomy program, $194,400,000;

(10) Lunar and planetary exploration program, $274,400,000;

(11) Bioscience program, $21,200,000;

(12) Launch vehicle development program, $127,700,000;

(13) Facility, training, and research grants program, $40,000,000;

(14) Space vehicle systems program, $53,462,000;

(15) Electronics systems program, $30,362,000;

(16) Human factor systems program, $13,200,000;

(17) Nuclear electric systems program, $68,768,000;

(18) Nuclear rockets program, $94,187,000;

(19) Chemical propulsion program, $24,497,000;

(20) Space power program, $16,524,000;

(21) Aeronautics program, $16,200,000;

(22) Tracking and data acquisition program, $218,200,000.

(b) For "Construction of facilities", including land acquisitions, $713,060,400 as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $11,044,000.

(2) Flight Research Center, Edwards, California, $1,157,000.

(3) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $17,032,500.

(4) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $2,998,200.

(5) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $8,204,700.

(6) Launch Operations Center, Cape Canaveral, Florida, $284,916,000.

(7) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $18,634,000.

(8) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $35,102,000.

(9) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $28,980,000.

(10) Michoud Plant, New Orleans, Louisiana, $8,688,000.

(11) Mississippi Test Facility, Mississippi, $100,196,000.

(12) Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada, $15,650,000.

(13) Various locations, $159,953,000.

(14) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $505,000.

(15) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $20,000,000.

(c) For "Administrative operations", $518,185,000.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) No part of the funds authorized by this section may be expended for the establishment of an Electronic Research Center unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives a detailed study of the geographic location of, the need for, and the nature of, the proposed Center, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the establishment of such Center, or (2) forty-five days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such study to those committees.

(i) Until such time as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall establish uniform design criteria and construction standards for facilities for which appropriations are authorized pursuant to this Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall utilize for such facilities design criteria and construction standards established either by the General Services Administration, the United States Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks, or the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14), of subsection 1(b) may in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed a total of $693,060,400.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (15) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 5. The Administrator is hereby authorized to transfer, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (15) of subsection 1(b)), to any other agency of the Government whenever the Administrator determines such transfer necessary for the efficient accomplishment of the objectives for which the funds have been appropriated. Not more than $20,000,000 of the funds authorized by this Act may be transferred by the Administrator under this section, and no transfer in excess of $250,000 shall be made under this section unless the Administrator has transmitted to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives a written statement concerning the amount and purpose of, and the reason for, such transfer, and (1) each such committee has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to that transfer, or (2) thirty days have passed after the transmittal by the Administrator of such statement to those committees.

SEC. 6. Section 307 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the Administration shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made."

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1964".

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH E. KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES FULTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON ANDERSON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STUART SYMINGTON,
JOHN STENNIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
CLIFFORD CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill, and substituted a new text. The committee of conference has agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain amendments made by the managers on the part of the House.

The differences are explained as follows:

Total appropriations authorized by the Senate amendment for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1964 were $5,511,520,400. This represented an increase over the House bill of $307,801,000. As a result of the conference, this figure was adjusted so that the total appropriations authorized are $5,350,820,400. To this sum, the managers on the part of the House agreed.

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested a total of $1,207,400,000 for Project Apollo in fiscal year 1964. This program is directed toward the eventual landing of men on the moon. The House reduced this request by $120,000,000 when investigation showed that the use of the amount in question could not be wholly identified since the prime contracts for this work had not been finalized. The Senate amendment restored this reduction. Since subsequent developments and testimony disclosed that the major spacecraft contracts involved had been formally negotiated and the programming of the money was made more concrete, managers on the part of the House agreed to an adjustment of the original House cut and accepted a Senate recession of 50 percent of the restored money. Thus the total reduction in Project Apollo stands at $60,000,000. The total amount approved for Apollo is $1,147,400,000.

(2) NASA requested a total of $45,000,000 for continued research and development into high-energy third-generation engines. This money was specifically earmarked for the development of the M–1 engine, a 1.5-million-pound-thrust oxygen-hydrogen engine of considerable capability. The House reduced this figure to $15,000,000 because at present no specific mission exists for the M–1 engine and because it was felt that development of advanced engines should proceed relatively slowly so as not to be obsolete by the time they become operational. The Senate amendment restored half of the reduction, that is, $15,000,000; it would have made the amount available for development of the M–1 engine total $30,000,000. The managers on the part of the House concur that all avenues of research and development concerning new ideas for propulsion and new high-energy fuels must be pursued at a reasonable rate in order to guarantee a properly advanced space propulsion system in the years ahead. Since additional information suggested that the House figure would hold the development of the M–1 engine to a below-optimum rate, it was agreed to accept a Senate recession of $6,000,000 of the amount restored. Thus the total reduction in the M–1 project stands at $21,000,000. The total approved for the M–1 is $24,000,000.

(3) NASA requested a total of $153,000,000 to fund its integration and checkout programs in connection with the manned lunar landing project. The House reduced this amount by $28,000,000 because the terms of the contract covering this phase of activities had not been completed and because NASA failed to establish a definite need for money over and above what such contractual services were expected to cost. The Senate amendment restored $15,000,000. The Senate agreed to the House position in this area so that no increase in funds is involved here. The total authorized is $125,000,000.

(4) NASA requested $51,100,000 for Communication Satellites. The House bill authorized $42,175,000. The Senate amendment increased this amount by $2,000,000. The Senate conferees receded to the House figure and the authorization amount remains $42,175,000. Additionally, the managers on the part of the House agreed to the inclusion in section 1(a)(7) the provision that "No part of any funds authorized to be appropriated by this act may be obligated or expended for the furnishing of any scientific or technological services for the exclusive benefit of any person providing satellite communications services other than an agency of the U.S. Government, except at the request of such person and on a reimbursable basis."

(5) NASA requested $194,400,000 for the geophysics and astronomy program. The House bill reduced this request by $4,000,000, the amount specifically requested for "follow-on international satellites", on the basis that this request appeared to be premature. The House took the position that after negotiations had taken place and agreements with foreign nations had been reached, NASA might appropriately request authorization for funds. The Senate amendment restored the $4,000,000 on the basis that, subsequent to the House hearings, international negotiations "had been nearly consummated". The managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration of $4,000,000 for "follow-on international satellites" because information recently furnished to the House Committee regarding arrangements with both France and Great Britain confirmed the advanced state of negotiations.

(6) NASA requested $322,600,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program. The House bill reduced this request to $254,400,000, representing reductions in the Ranger, Surveyor Orbiter and Mariner projects. The Senate amendment included the reductions in both the Ranger and Mariner projects, but restored the full amount of the House reduction in the Surveyor Orbiter project. Specifically, NASA requested $28,200,000 for initial funding of the Surveyor Orbiter project. The entire amount was eliminated in the House bill, but was restored in the Senate amendment. The elimination of the Surveyor Orbiter project was justified by the House on the basis that the history of the project indicated it had neither been clearly defined nor considered urgent by NASA, and also because of the manned lunar orbital mission currently planned by the Office of Manned Space Flight. The restoration was made by the Senate because of persuasive testimony by NASA officials, backed up by members of the scientific community, as to the significance of the project both for scientific reasons and in support of the manned lunar landing project. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $20,000,000 so that initial funding for the Surveyor Orbiter project could begin during fiscal year 1964. The managers on the part of the House also concurred with the provision of the Senate amendment which requires that these funds be utilized only for implementing the Surveyor Orbiter project.

(7) NASA requested $55,000,000 for the facility, training, and research grants program. The House bill reduced this amount by $24,400,000 to $30,600,000 in order that the fiscal year 1963 level of effort would be maintained. The Senate amendment restored $19,400,000 of the House reduction reflecting general support for the program. This action by the Senate resulted in a $5,000,000 reduction in the NASA request. The managers on the part of the Senate agreed to a further reduction of $10,000,000 for a total reduction of $15,000,000, insisting that the goals and scope of the program would be impaired by any greater reduction. The managers on the part of the House therefore agreed to a total authorization of $40,000,000 for this program in fiscal year 1964.

(8) NASA requested $96,687,000 for research and development of nuclear rockets. The House bill reduced this amount by $5,000,000 in view of delays in the reactor part of the program, primarily the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission, which has resulted in reduced effort in NASA's engine and vehicle development projects. The Senate restored the $5,000,000 reduction in view of recent favorable developments in the reactor development project. In conference, the managers on the part of the Senate agreed to a reduction of $2,500,000 in recognition of delays already encountered. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a total authorization of $94,187,000 in view of the importance of the program.

(9) NASA requested $231,500,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The House bill provided a total authorization for this item of $216,700,000. The Senate amendment restored $3,500,000 to be applied to network operations. The managers on the part of the Senate receded on this item, agreeing to a limited restoration of $1,500,000 for network operations. This amount is needed to cover increased contractual costs resulting from additional facilities becoming operational in the network. The final authorized amount for Tracking and Data Acquisition totals $218,200,000.

(10) NASA requested $560,300,000 for administrative operations. The House authorization was $508,185,000. The Senate amendment resulted in an increase of $31,000,000 over the amount contained in the House bill. The Senate action called for an increase of $20,000,000 for personnel compensation, $6,000,000 for other services, $2,000,000 for supplies and materials, and $3,000,000 for equipment. The managers on the part of the Senate receded on the above items, except that the conferees agreed to an increase of $10,000,000 for personnel compensation. Recent evidence convinced the conferees that the initial House action would restrict new personnel hires to a point where NASA could not adequately handle its increased workload. The resulting amount authorized for administrative operations totals $518,185,000, which includes $283,487,000 for personnel compensation, $80,000,000 for Other Services, $22,000,000 for supplies and materials, and $23,000,000 for equipment.

(11) NASA requested $1,157,000 for the construction of a High Temperature Loads Calibration Facility at Edwards Air Force Base. The House bill eliminated this project from the program. The Senate amendment restored this project. Because of recent decisions on the supersonic transport program taken subsequent to the House action, the managers on the part of the House are convinced of the need for the project, and agreed to the Senate amendment.

(12) NASA requested a total of $312,855,000 for construction of new facilities at the Launch Operations Center, Cape Canaveral, Fla. The House bill reduced this amount by $33,178,000 to a total of $279,677,000. This reduction was with the understanding that no specific projects were denied. It was a general reduction based on the demonstrated obligational capability of NASA. The Senate amendment restored $20,639,000. The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to accept a restoration of only $5,239,000. The position of the managers on the part of the House that the reduction be of a general nature and without denial of specific projects or programs as originally requested by NASA for fiscal 1964 was sustained.

(13) NASA requested $111,690,000 for new facilities at the Mississippi test facility. The House bill reduced this request by $18,994,000. The Senate amendment restored $9,500,000. The managers on the part of the House agreed to restore $7,500,000 to include: $3,500,000 for the advanced saturn first stage (S-1C) static test facilities; $1,500,000 for the advanced Saturn second stage (S-II) static test facilities; and $2,500,000 for the F-1 engine systems test stand. The revised amounts authorized were based on a refined analysis by the managers on the part of the House of NASA's ability to obligate funds at this site during FY 1964. Thus the total authorization for this facility is $100,196,000.

(14) The NASA request for various locations was $176,038,000. The House bill authorized $148,653,000. The Senate amendment increased this item to $168,253,000. The managers on the part of the Senate receded on this item to $159,953,000. The conference action was as follows:

(a) The NASA request for $5,000,000 for the establishment of an Electronic Research Center was reduced by the House bill to $3,900,000. The House bill also stipulated that none of the funds authorized would be committed by NASA pending the submission to the committees of both the House and the Senate of a further detailed study as to the location of, need for, and the nature of, the proposed center. The Senate amendment restored the $1,100,000 reduction and deleted the language of the House bill requiring the detailed study, but sustained the requirement for a report to the respective committees as to the specific geographical location. The managers on the part of the House insisted that the $1,100,000 reduction prevail since the facility planning and design item was included elsewhere in the bill and is intended for this purpose. The managers on the part of the Senate agreed to the House reduction and also acceded to the House requirement for the detailed study.

(b) The action of the House on instrumentation ships for tracking and data acquisition was to reduce the NASA request by $10,000,000, thereby providing a total authorization of $80,000,000. The Senate amendment restored $9,000,000 of this reduction. The action agreed upon by the conferees was to restore $3,300,000 of the reduction, making the authorization total $83,300,000 for these ships. Additionally, there was a difference in the number of ships recommended in the House and Senate reports. The House report provided for the transfer of funds from NASA to the Department of Defense for the modification of four existing ships in the Department of Defense inventory and for the commissioning and modification of one additional vessel to be obtained from the Maritime Commission's reserve fleet. The Senate report provided for the commissioning and modification of three such vessels to be utilized in a national tracking ship pool.

The conferees agreed that insufficient attention has been paid to the total national needs for tracking and communication for space missions. Not only is there the possibility that it might be necessary to be in more than one ocean simultaneously, but there is always the factor of political uncertainty regarding some of the current land-based stations. The closing of a tracking station at a critical time, for example, could upset the time schedule of the entire program and could be quite costly as well as damaging to the success of the mission.

The conferees also feel that it was senseless to maintain two separate fleets of tracking ships. Obvious economies can be realized if a single pool of ships can be maintained for use when needed. It is clear that a more comprehensive analysis of national tracking needs, for both military and civilian use, is required.

The intention of the action of both Houses was to make ships available to the using agencies that would result in the most efficient utilization of tracking vessels and at a minimum cost. It was decided therefore that a joint study should be commenced by appropriate executive agencies that would result in a pooling of tracking ship resources and that would determine the most desirable method of meeting their joint ship requirements. Under rules and regulations negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense, the managers of both the House and the Senate agreed that the scheduling, navigation and operation and maintenance of such ships shall be the responsibility of the Department of Defense. The study shall determine the NASA priority with respect to the use of Apollo ships that will result in no delay in the Apollo program and that responsibility shall be established for the operation and maintenance of the instrumentation on such ships according to the type of mission planned. This study and resulting agreement is to be reached and presented to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate by January 15, 1964, for the consideration of these committees. It was further agreed that NASA should not commit nor obligate funds for instrumentation ships until an agreement has been reached and approved by the committees. In the absence of an agreement by January 15, 1964, NASA shall report back to the respective committees, advising them of the problems involved.

(c) NASA requested $15,000,000 for the construction of the second increment of facilities to provide a Lunar Excursion module test facility. The House bill reduced this amount by $3,500,000. The Senate amendment restored $3,000,000. After reconsideration of the NASA obligational capability, the managers on the part of the House concluded that a restoration was justified.

(d) NASA requested $21,000,000 for the installation of three manned space flight acquisition and tracking facilities. The House bill reduced this amount by $6,500,000. The Senate amendment restored this amount to the full NASA request. In conference, the managers on the part of the House and the Senate agreed to restore $5,000,000 for these facilities since it appears that present negotiations for base rights in overseas areas could be jeopardized if funds approximating the full amount were not authorized.

(e) NASA requested $2,000,000 for the construction of a new rocket launch complex, modernization of certain existing facilities, and the extension of the beach protection system at Wallops Station, Va. The House bill eliminated these items as not being urgent at this time. The Senate amendment restored $505,000 for the extension of the beach protection system. The managers on the part of the House, based on a separate technical analysis, determined that the preclusion of further beach erosion will result in future contruction economies and accordingly agreed to the Senate amendment.

(f) For facility planning and design, NASA requested $10,000,000. The House, recognizing this item as essential to improved construction management practices within NASA, increased the amount to $15,000,000. The Senate amendment authorized $25,000,000 for this purpose. After due consideration as to the long-range construction requirements to support known missions and the necessity for better advance planning on the part of NASA, the managers on the part of both the House and the Senate agreed to include $20,000,000 for facility planning and design. This increase was considered warranted by the managers on the part of the House in view of the $1,100,000 reduction in the amount for the Electronics Research Center for facility planning and design, and the $7,902,000 reduced elsewhere in the program for the same purpose.

(15) The Senate amendment changed section 1(a) of the act by specifying the major R. & D. programs to be covered in line items. The House agreed to this language inasmuch as the effect is expected to improve NASA's bookkeeping processes and keep the individual sums allocated to specific programs clearly identifiable.

(16) In section 3 of the bill the Senate imposed a 30-day waiting period on such requirements as NASA may have for the transfer of funds from research and development to construction of facilities—unless the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate indicate earlier that they have no objection to the proposed transfer. This provision was not contained in the House bill. The managers on the part of the House concurred in the Senate language.

(17) Both the House and the Senate in section 4 of the bill imposed new restrictions on the reprograming of funds by NASA. The Senate language differs from that of the House in several ways, to which the managers on the part of the House acceded. The changes were largely technical and for the most part tend to tighten the restrictions. Further comment is necessary, however, on one point. Where the language of the House specified that "programs or items" which had been reduced or deleted by Congress or never presented to the Congress could not thereafter be altered or undertaken without congressional approval, the Senate removed the words "or items" because of the possible excessively restrictive nature of this phrasing. It is the understanding, however, of the conferees that the meaning of the remaining word "programs" is not limited simply to the "programs" as specifically set forth in section 1(a) of the act, but is intended also to cover any identifiable subprogram or project which may be included in these line items.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH E. KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES FULTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have for consideration today the conference report on H.R. 7500, the NASA Authorization Bill.

The House disagreed with the Senate's amendment to H.R. 7500 which amendment struck all after the enacting clause and inserted new language.

Before proceeding further, permit me to say that I will be followed by the subcommittee chairmen of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, all of whom were conferees, who will explain the action in conference of the managers on the part of the House in those areas where the subcommittees of our committee had jurisdiction during the committee hearings on this bill.

In order to get this matter in focus, permit me to recapitulate the total figures of H.R. 7500 as passed by the House and amended by the Senate before we get into specific items.

The overall NASA request was for a total of $5,712 million. The Senate reduced this figure to $5,511,520,400. This represented an increase over the House reduction of $307,801,000.

As a result of the conference, the total amount authorized is $5,350,820,400. The Senate, therefore, receded from its amendment by a total of $160,700,000 while the House managers agreed to a restoration of $147,101,000.

In all sincerity, I want to assure the Members of the House that its managers attempted to hold firm on all items in the House bill as far as practicable but after all, the purpose of a conference is to adjust legislative differences and in order to maintain the House position on items the managers thought to be the most important, we necessarily had to compromise on others. We believe we have brought back a report which can be accepted by the House as the very best agreement which its managers could conclude in conference.

Turning first to the overall figure for research and development, the Senate agreed to a reduction from its figure of $4,225,275,000 to the agreed figure of $4,119,575,400. This amounts to $105,700,000 a sizable figure in itself.

In construction of facilities, we were able to persuade the Senate managers to reduce their total of $747,060,400 by $34 million. This results in a total construction authorization of $713,060,400.

The Senate authorized for administrative operations the sum of $539,185,000. We were able to reduce this by $21 million. So the total authorized for this item in the conference report is $518,185,000.

Now we accepted a few language changes contained in the Senate amendment because we felt these tightened the bill. For instance, for the research and development authorization as contained in the House bill, the Senate amendment line itemed the research and development programs. We felt this was a healthy change because it is expected to improve NASA's bookkeeping processes and keep the individual sums allocated to specific programs clearly identifiable.

We also agreed to some language changes appearing in the Senate amendment regarding transfer of funds from research and development authorizations to construction of facility authorizations. This language change requires a 30-day waiting period after notification of the two committees when such transfers are contemplated. Again, we believe this to be a healthy change and one which will provide better congressional supervision of these activities.

I am also happy to report that the language and authorization concerning the proposed Electronics Facilities Center as appeared in the House bill is retained word for word and the Senate receded to our position on this item.

After the Members have heard the explanation of our other conferees on specific items, I feel that all will agree that the managers on the part of the House have come back with a good conference report for which we ask your support.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There was so much confusion and noise earlier that I could not keep up with the gentleman. Did the gentleman say how much this authorization bill is now above the House figure when the bill left the House?

Mr. MILLER of California. About $147 million.

Mr. GROSS. $147 million?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes. The difference was $307 million. The other body receded roughly $160 million. We agreed with them on $147 million. So we just about split the $307 million—$160 million and $147 million.

Mr. GROSS. Was research and development increased by the other body?

Mr. MILLER of California. It was increased, but as to just how much I would have to look through my statement here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from California, on his excellent statement, which I agree with. When we were in the conference with the Senate as House conferees, the House did everything it could to maintain the House position. I believe this is a reasonable compromise. It is an increase of $147,101,000 over the House figure, and $160,700,000 below the Senate figure, and $361,179,000 below the NASA request. It is the best solution we could work out by agreement. We in Congress must see to it that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration does spend the money carefully and efficiently. That is the main problem we have on this kind of large program in science and research in the space field.

My further comment is I hope the House will adopt my bill in this session which proposes the institution of an Inspector General system for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We have such separate inspection now under the State Department in the international development program under the AID organization. We have that kind of an Inspector General program in each of the military services, who are working on various military space and aeronautical programs such as these for peaceful uses and exploration of space and aeronautics. Likewise we have had the U.S. Department of Agriculture institute such an Inspector General program by an administrative action of the Secretary of Agriculture last January.

I believe the House committee is to be complimented on its fine work over these weeks and months this year and for the cooperation of all Members, regardless of their party, in working out a good result for this bill.

Speaker MARTIN had served with me on the House conferees. He was unable to be here today, but he likewise agrees to the conference report. It was a unanimous agreement by all of the conferees of the House and Senate, so we submit it to you as a unanimous agreement by both the Republicans and the Democrats in each of the two bodies who served on the conference.

As one of the House conferees, I would like to report to the House on the action of the conference committee on NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1964—H.R. 7500:

	NASA request	House action	Senate action	Conference committee action
Research and development:				
Manned spacecraft system	$1,556,600,000	$1,436,600,000	$1,556,600,000	$1,496,600,000
Launch vehicle and propulsion system	1,168,500,000	1,138,500,000	1,153,500,000	1,147,500,000
Aerospace medicine	16,700,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Integration and checkout	153,000,000	125,000,000	140,000,000	125,000,000
Systems engineering	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Meteorological satellites	63,700,000	63,700,000	63,700,000	63,700,000
Communications satellites	51,100,000	42,175,000	44,175,000	42,175,000
Advanced applications satellites	1,000,000	0	0	0
Industrial applications	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Geophysics and astronomy	194,400,000	190,400,000	194,400,000	194,400,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	322,600,000	254,400,000	282,600,000	274,400,000
Bioscience	35,200,000	21,200,000	21,200,000	21,200,000
Launch vehicle development	130,700,000	127,700,000	127,70 ,000	127,700,000
Facility, training, and research grants	55,000,000	30,600,000	50,000,000	40,000,000
Space vehicle systems	61,962,000	53,462,000	53,462,000	53,462,000
Electronic systems	30,362,000	30,362,000	30,362,000	30,362,000
Human factor systems	18,200,000	13,200,000	13,200,000	13,200,000
Nuclear-electric systems	68,768,000	68,768,000	68,768,000	68,768,000
Nuclear rockets	96,687,000	91,687,000	96,687,000	94,187,000
Chemical propulsion	22,497,000	24,497,000	24,497,000	24,497,000
Space power	16,524,000	16,524,000	16,524,000	16,524,000
Aeronautics	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
Tracking and data acquisition	231,500,000	216,700,000	220,200,000	218,200,000
Total	4,351,700,000	4,013,175,000	4,225,275,000	4,119,575,000
Administrative operations	560,300,000	508,185,000	539,185,000	518,185,000

	NASA request	House action	Senate action	Conference committee action
Construction of facilities:				
Ames Research Center	$13,076,000	$11,044,000	$11,044,000	$11,044,000
Flight Research Center	4,081,000	0	1,157,000	1,157,000
Goddard Space Flight Center	20,932,000	17,032,500	20,332,500	17,032,500
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	7,000,000	2,998,200	2,998,200	2,998,200
Langley Research Center	9,768,000	8,204,700	8,204,700	8,204,700
Launch Operations Center	312,855,000	279,677,000	300,316,000	284,916,000
Lewis Research Center	25,835,000	18,634,000	18,634,000	18,634,000
Manned Spacecraft Center	37,736,000	35,102,000	35,102,000	35,102,000
Marshall Space Flight Center	38,496,000	28,980,000	28,980,000	28,980,000
Michoud plant	10,003,000	8,688,000	8,688,000	8,688,000
Mississippi Test Facility	111,690,000	92,696,000	102,196,000	100,196,000
Nuclear rocket development station	20,490,000	15,650,000	15,650,000	15,650,000
Various locations	176,038,000	148,653,000	168,253,000	[1] 159,953,000
Wallops Station	2,000,000	0	505,000	505,000
Facility planning and design	10,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000
Total	800,000,000	682,359,400	747,060,400	713,060,400
Grand total	5,712,000,000	5,203,719,400	5,511,520,400	5,350,820,400

	Research and development	Administrative	Construction of facilities	Total
Total	$4,119,575,000	$518,185,000	$713,060,400	$5,350,820,400
Less than NASA request	232,125,000	42,115,000	86,939,600	361,179,600
Less than Senate approved	105,700,000	21,000,000	34,000,000	160,700,000
More than House approved	106,400,000	10,000,000	30,701,000	147,101,000

[1] Items in conference on various locations:

	NASA request	House action	Senate action	Conference committee action
Electronic Research Center	$5,000,000	$3,900,000	$5,000,000	$3,900,000
Instrumentation ships	90,000,000	80,000,000	89,000,000	83,300,000
LEM test facility	15,000,000	11,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
Manned space flight data acquisition and tracking facility	21,000,000	14,500,000	21,000,000	19,500,000

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman from California yielding me time. I will be very brief. I simply wanted to notify the House that at the appropriate point in the proceedings I hope to introduce a motion to recommit, with instructions. My motion, Mr. Speaker, would recommit the conference report with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist that the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the bill shall not exceed the sum of $5,203,719,000. I might add that this particular sum is the amount which was in the bill as it passed the House.

As our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, pointed out, in conference the conferees adjusted the differences with the Senate so that it amounts to an increase of $147,101,000. I am hopeful that the House will be able to insist on the savings and stand by the original position as the bill passed the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Washington hope with me that there will come a day when we will not get this report back from a conference with the Senate where we have split the difference with them? They ask for $300 million and they added $300 million in that body, and we get the "split the difference" treatment all over again in this bill. I shall support the gentleman's motion to recommit.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness to the conferees they were extremely well informed and they did their utmost in order to maintain the position of the House. I have no quarrel with the fact that in these conferences we must adjust the differences between the two bodies. Nevertheless, I think the amount allowed by the House was adequate, and I support it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. Before going any further I certainly want to say to him and the other conferees on this very important measure that I have no quarrel with them. May I say further at the outset that when this authorization bill was before us the other day I voted for it.

We had very many discussions as to the amounts included, with the members of the committee on our side. Personally I thought there were some items in the bill that were too high. Realizing the importance of the program, I voted for it. Now I am going to support the motion to recommit and this is why. It is not, as I say, particularly confined to this measure. It is simply in recognition of the fact that many of us feel that with respect to authorizations and appropriations we have got to begin to get hold of the spending of our Government. We believe it is important. Just the other day President Kennedy wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mills], and said that we have got to have a tax reduction bill, and then he proposed a tighter rein on Federal expenditures.

I think we ought to start getting hold of the reins right now. As has already been indicated, we struggle here to obtain that kind of control and many times it is a difficult sort of vote to cast, because I have discovered in my experience here that the people who want the money are very vocal and articulate and they make their voices heard, while the people who believe in economy generally just believe in it in rather general terms.

The thing I object to is, if I may put it in plain language, that when we take the heat on some of the authorization or appropriation bills, too often those bills then go over to the other body and—of course, I have the greatest respect for the other body and I would be the last to speak of them otherwise—but too often, either in their wisdom, or their lack of something else, they "up" the item that we cut in the bill and almost invariably now the administration leads the drive for restoration. Then the matter goes to conference and, as has already been suggested, too many times we just split the difference. And there we are with at least 50 percent of our effort gone out the window.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion to recommit. If it does not prevail, I am going to vote against the conference report.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion to recommit the conference report, which will be offered at a later point in the proceedings. I should like to state also that I am in agreement with our distinguished minority leader and will vote against final passage of the conference report in the event the motion to recommit fails.

I do this reluctantly. I supported the bill originally reluctantly. But I think the important thing for the Members of the House of Representatives to remember is that this bill we are talking about today compares with $3.6 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the fiscal year 1963.

Mr. Speaker, the discussion during the debate on this bill and the discussion this afternoon on the conference report, for the most part, has been with reference to the differences between the administration's budget of $5.7 billion, the House bill which was $5.2 billion and the Senate bill which was $5.5 billion. The conferees have resolved this difference in the conference to somewhat around the figure of $5.35 billion. This still compares with $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is too high. I believe there are a number of reductions which can be made. I have reference, specifically, to the two amendments upon which this body took action, namely, the Pelly amendment to reduce advance design planning funds, and the Roudebush amendment to reduce the amount for facility, training, and research grants. In both cases a major portion of the money was put back in in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to vote for the motion to recommit which will be offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] as a protest against the continual rising expenditures of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to further belabor the points of difference that existed between the House and the other body and the result of the conference on these points of difference. Let me just say to the Members of the House that I certainly shall vote against the motion to recommit that is about to be offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly], for several reasons. However, I shall vote against it primarily because I found it was wise and prudent, if not in the national interest, for the House to yield to the Senate position in several instances. I find it wise and prudent that we do so, Mr. Speaker, because time was on the side of the Senate. The Senate had the benefit of some 2 or 2½ months of time after the subcommittees and the full committee in the House received the testimony from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite three examples. There were eight differences of opinion between the two bodies insofar as they related to the subject matter before my Subcommittee on Space Science and Advanced Research and Technology. One, for example, was the high-temperature loads calibration laboratory to be located at the Flight Research Center at Edwards Air Force Base in California. The House in its wisdom at the time the hearings were held found this: there was no follow-on program to the X-15. They therefore disagreed, with the NASA request. Since that time the NASA has developed an ongoing program that is a follow-on program to the X-15. Because the decision has been made to carry on and develop, if you please, a supersonic transport program, it is absolutely essential that we authorize this laboratory where this kind of work can be performed. So, if we agree to the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Washington, it would be impossible to use wise and prudent judgment in accepting the benefit of the late hearings of the Senate on this particular facility.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee that I had the privilege of chairing, in its judgment, at the time we had our hearings, disapproved the $4 million NASA request as it related to international satellites. We said, if and when the NASA organization enters into negotiations with foreign countries for the purpose of effectuating agreements in these areas, then it would have to come back and we would again give consideration to it. However, since the time we had our hearings, Mr. Speaker, NASA has entered into negotiations with both Great Britain and France and its representatives are about to consummate an agreement on the international satellite program. For that reason, we yielded to the Senate and acceded to the Senate request for an additional $4 million.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, there is one other area, the Surveyor Orbit project from which we on the House side cut out some $28.2 million.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the House committee considered this proposition, the NASA organization had not yet made up its mind just precisely what these manned lunar supporting programs were going to be. Since that time the programs have been definitized, since that time the whole scientific world, the National Science Foundation and most everyone who has any knowledge on the subject, feel the project is absolutely essential in connection with a manned moon landing. So we acceded to the Senate in this request, not for the full $28 million, but $20 million, to get the program off the ground because the experts tell us, as I said before, it is absolutely essential for the manned moon landing program.

Mr. Speaker, I say in conclusion if this motion should prevail it would be the worst part of wisdom, to be sure, and it would preclude the Congress from doing things that have got to be done.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler].

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to ask a few questions of the chairman regarding subsection (h) of the conference report dealing with the proposed Electronics Research Center. I would like to ask the chairman in connection with this section of the report when the "further detailed study" called for by the conference report will be made?

Mr. MILLER of California. The House succeeded in getting its complete language in the report adopted. The gentleman sat in committee, he heard all of the arguments, he knows this as well as I do, that the matter will go to NASA, that NASA must come back with a detailed study as to size, location, and type of buildings; that it must be in by February 1 next year. Then both Houses of Congress have 45 days in which to review the matter and if neither House takes adverse action the matter will then stand approved.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for that answer. Could the gentleman assure me that other areas of the United States besides Boston, Mass., will be considered as a possible location for this Center?

Mr. MILLER of California. They could be considered.

Mr. WYDLER. Will they be considered?

Mr. MILLER of California. I cannot state what the findings are going to be or what is going to happen. The gentleman knows of the language we wrote in the law.

Mr. WYDLER. I am asking the chairman whether in his understanding there will be other areas considered?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, there will be other areas considered.

Mr. WYDLER. Is it the gentleman's understanding other areas will be given an opportunity to present facts to justify the location of the Center in those areas?

Mr. MILLER of California. I cannot speak for NASA, but I imagine NASA will be happy to receive any such suggestions.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as the junior member of this conference committee, I simply would like to express my admiration and appreciation to my fellow managers on both sides of the aisle and in both the House and the other body. I believe a great deal of constructive work came out of this conference.

In many respects, the final product of the conference represents a clear improvement over the work of either the Senate or the House. I cite as one example that section of the conference report which deals with instrumentation ships for use in the Apollo program. When the House Committee on Science and Astronautics first started to wrestle with this problem, we heard testimony on a request by NASA to fund three instrumentation ships. At the request of our committee, Department of Defense witnesses appeared to appraise the proposal both from an administrative standpoint and on the question of how many ships would be needed for the mission and how much they would cost. After the Senate bill was passed, the conference came to grips with the administrative issues involved and wisely concluded that NASA and the Department of Defense be directed to reach an agreement by January 15, 1964, and report to the respective House and Senate committees their conclusions based on the principles that the scheduling, navigation, operation, and maintenance of the ships should be the responsibility of the Department of Defense, and that NASA be accorded priority for the use of the Apollo ships and control of the operation and maintenance of the instrumentation. NASA cannot commit or obligate funds for instrumentation ships until the NASA-Department of Defense agreement is concluded. It seems to me that the conference committee has arrived at a statesmanlike solution to a thorny administrative problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that substantial cuts in administrative operations have been retained by the conference committee. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics held extensive hearings on this subject, and I was deeply impressed by the work of the members of the Subcommittee on Applications and Tracking and Data Acquisition, including the gentleman from Indiana, Representative J. Edward Roush; the gentleman from Georgia, John W. Davis; the gentleman from New York, William Fitts Ryan; the gentleman from Tennessee, Richard Fulton; the gentleman from Washington, Thomas M. Pelly; the gentleman from Illinois, Donald Rumsfeld; and the gentleman from New York, John W. Wydler. Also, W. H. Boone, technical consultant of the committee, and C. Edward Wise, Jr., of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, performed admirably in analyzing the budget requests for administrative operations and other aspects of the authorization bill.

How to assess the appropriate amount of funds to be allocated to personnel operations is a difficult question. Our committee found that NASA was paying the highest average grade level in the entire Federal Government: GS-10, considerably above comparable agencies and activities throughout the Federal Government. We discovered many instances of courageous, extremely hard-working, conscientious individuals and their staffs in the space program. As in any program of this size, where the expansion has been rapid and at times headlong, there are evidences of overstaffing. We feel that when an organization gets so huge that its Administrator does not see his mail from Members of Congress, or allows his organization to leave such letters unanswered for long periods of time, then it is time to blow the whistle on excessive personnel expansion.

The answer is not more personnel to handle the correspondence, but better utilization of existing personnel.

For example, a letter which I directed to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on May 31, 1963, was answered on July 17, 1963. A subsequent letter which I addressed to the Honorable James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA on July 29 remained unanswered on August 19, at which time I directed a followup letter to Mr. Webb. I then received an acknowledgment of my July 29 letter from Mr. Paul Dembling of NASA, indicating that Mr. Webb was out of town.

In the perspective of the tremendous forward surge which America is making in the space program, perhaps these comments appear somewhat picayune. Yet I believe they symbolize some of what is wrong with the administrative operations of NASA, and in part motivated some Members to support some economies in this feature of NASA's budget.

I am proud of the work which the House Committee on Science and Astronautics accomplished this year in reviewing the NASA authorization. I am also proud of the report of the conference committee, and urge its adoption.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and disappointed about what has happened on the floor here today. First, about 7 months ago I was chairman of an 11-man subcommittee that began hearings on a major portion of this bill. We agreed to begin with the thought that we were going to comb this thing with a fine-tooth comb and, if we could find a spot where we could cut a dime, we would cut it. I was asked to say that that part of the budget could not be cut but I said, "Of course not. If we can find a place to cut it we will cut it."

We worked for 7 months. We did everything laymen could do to find out the truth about this bill. It was reported out of that subcommittee unanimously. We went to the full committee, and there the different subcommittees questioned the other subcommittees, and our subcommittee was questioned. There were some different views or additional views reported out of the full committee, but there was not a single person who voted against the bill that was reported out of our subcommittee and then out of the full committee.

At the time we were working on this there were such things as the Apollo contract involving a billion dollars, where the contract was not formalized. The truth was the people did not know what the cost was going to be. We cut about $120 million off that contract. In the conference the Members of the other body argued with us that now the contract had been formalized and we know what the cost will be. I would say to this House that this is a tight budget. Unless I miss my guess, NASA will be back here in January asking for more money.

I think the conferees did a good job. I came back over here feeling pretty good about it. I am sure any member of the committee of conference will tell you I was one person who demanded that we go as far as we could for the House position. The Senate gave $160 million and we gave $147 million. I do not know how the House can expect us to go to conference and demand that the Members of the other body accept the House position. The former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], signed this conference report. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] signed the conference report. All members signed it. I think that the Members owe a vote of confidence to the conferees on this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good conference report. We fought hard in the conference. We got as much as we could. We gave in only in those instances where it was impossible to reconcile the positions of the two Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER.** Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. PELLY. I am opposed to the conference report, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER.** The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Pelly moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 7500 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist that the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the bill shall not exceed the sum of $5,203,719,000.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Pelly) there were—ayes 80, noes 88.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 200, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

YEAS—177

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hoeven
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie

Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—200

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—56

Adair
Auchincloss
Baring
Barry
Berry
Broomfield
Buckley
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Dawson
Diggs
Forrester
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gibbons
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Griffiths
Hébert
Hoffman
Horan
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Lloyd
Long, La.
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Monagan
Montoya
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Pilcher
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Staebler
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Watson
Wharton
Williams
Willis
Wyman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Wyman for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Goodling for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Williams for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Grabowski against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Staebler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rains with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Montoya.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Watson.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan and Mr. GARY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 249, nays 125, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—249

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brotzman
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—125

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Findley
Foreman
Fountain
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Gross
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Hoeven
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stinson
Taft
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Younger

NOT VOTING—60

Adair
Auchincloss
Baring
Barry
Berry
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Dawson
Diggs
Fallon
Forrester
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Gibbons
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Griffiths
Hébert
Hoffman
Horan
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lloyd
Long, La.
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Montoya
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Pilcher
Rains
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Scott

Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Watson
Wharton
Williams
Willis
Wyman

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Barry for, with Mr. Goodling against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Wharton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Broomfield.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Monagan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Roberts of Texas.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. Colmer with Mr Jennings.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Rivers of Alaska.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Baring with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Staebler with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. MACDONALD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1135. An act to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock;

H.R. 2671. An act authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.;

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.;

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 5883. An act to correct a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes";

H.R. 6710. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7594. An act to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Texas, as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir;

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress in respect to the Lewis and Clark Trail from Saint Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest; and

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution extending the appreciation of Congress to the American Association of State Highway Officials for its service to this Nation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6118. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 46. An act to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable;

S. 48. An act to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act;

S. 277. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year;

S. 912. An act approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement;

S. 933. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes;

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1582. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project;

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under the act;

S. 1868. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training; and

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of selected excerpts on the 1963-64 national high school debate subject of medicare.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes."

REHABILITATION OF GUAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6225) to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the committee, explain this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we are considering a bill which will provide sorely needed assistance to one of our territories — Guam, our westernmost possession in the Pacific. This is a different kind of an aid bill than we debated on the floor last week. It is different because most of the money involved will be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest. Let me explain my point.

H.R. 6225 provides $45 million in rehabilitation and rebuilding funds for Guam which last fall suffered heavy destruction from Typhoon Karen. This storm, of unprecedented proportions, destroyed 3,150 civilian homes and 386 commercial buildings and damaged 4,650 civilian homes and 428 commercial establishments. Guam was declared a disaster area and shortly emergency rehabilitation measures were forthcoming. Plans were made to rebuild on a modern basis. In the meantime, the homeless Guamanians had to live in makeshift shelters. Then, in April of this year, a second storm, Typhoon Olive, leveled many of the temporary housing units.

Much of the rehabilitation requirements is unrelated to the typhoons but is attributable to the ravages of World War II. During the capture of the island in 1941 and its liberation by our American troops 3½ years later, Guam was virtually demolished. After 1944 the island recovered somewhat but not in a logical fashion. Much of the post-World War II and pre-Typhoon Karen building was either partially or, at best, improperly planned. Rehabilitation funds should have been made available 15 years ago. The capital city, Agana, and most of the villages were rebuilt on the ruins that reach back to the turn of the century when the United States obtained the island from Spain.

It is on this background that the rehabilitation program envisaged by this legislation will be developed. The bill provides that of the $45 million over $34 million will be in the form of loans and repayable to the Federal Government over a 30-year period. The remaining $10,700,000 will be in grants. The Guamanians want it that way. They do not want handouts. They realize it costs money to run a government and they want to contribute their share.

Not only am I personally acquainted with the present Governor of Guam, the Honorable Manuel F. L. Guerrero, and many of the members of the legislature, but I count among my warm friends the other several civilian Governors who have served since 1950 when organic legislation was first granted the territory. Each one of these gentlemen speaks highly of the Guamanians, and I know their affirmations to be true, and the willingness of the Guamanians to shoulder their responsibilities. I have every reason to believe the money will be wisely expended and repaid to the Federal Treasury.

I urge prompt and favorable action on H.R. 6225, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman, did Japan ever make a contribution to the rehabilitation of Guam? Did Japan ever pay reparations to Guam for having shot the island up?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. As I understand the situation, Japan has not entered into any agreement to help rebuild Guam.

Mr. GROSS. So whatever has been done there, we have done it. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I think I can say that Japan took Guam without too much destruction, but when we went in to win the war, unfortunately much damage was done in Guam.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we would not have had to level Guam or we would not have had to shoot the place up if the Japanese had not gone in there in the first place.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am in agreement with my friend. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. But there has been no responsibility on the part of the Japanese. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could the gentleman tell us something about these loans and the interest and the length of time they are to run?

Mr. ASPINALL. The interest rates would be the same rates that the Government would have to pay on the money that it borrows as of that time. The term for repayment would be 30 years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the question has been raised and I am sure the gentleman is in a position to tell us whether or not this bill has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and whether these amounts have been budgeted.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is $11 million below the Budget estimate?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. This has also been accepted by the people of Guam.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand that Guam is of course a part of the United States.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And of course we did spend a good deal of money by the way helping to rehabilitate and rebuild Japan, is that not correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What this bill does is to spend a relatively small amount of Federal funds directly in rebuilding some of the facilities in Guam and this is nothing but a loan at the going rate of interest that the Federal Government must pay on money that it borrows, to the people of Guam and to local citizens of the United States who live on Guam.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct except for the grant moneys heretofore mentioned.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the loans are to be paid back over a period of 30 years; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The loans are to be paid back in 30 years from the time they receive the money from the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this is not the first bill to provide money for Guam and that there have been one or more bills in the past, have there not?

Mr. ASPINALL. There has been no bill such as this bill. Guam has received moneys for certain expenses and damages that they have suffered as a result of war damage. I should say further that Guam has received an authorization payment for the taking of certain lands 20 years ago, but they have not received the money up to the present time. This is still in the hands of the military. They have received certain contributions as the result of the disasters that they suffered from typhoons Karen and Olive.

Mr. GROSS. I want the record to show that I am not opposed to this bill, and I also want the record to show that this is not the first money that is going to Guam. They have had grants, and several of them, as I understand the situation.

Mr. ASPINALL. No, not in any great amount and not to cover the purposes of this bill.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not there are any lobbyists involved in this little gift from our taxpayers?

Mr. ASPINALL. I can assure my friend from New York that there are no lobbyists as far as our committee knows that are involved in this, and I think I would know if there were.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the war broke out, the Guamanians had no citizenship. They were only nationals completely subject to the domination of the Navy. I was there in September, about 2 months after the invasion. Their major city was completely destroyed. Towns up and down Guam were leveled by us when we were trying to take the island back. I think it is well to remember that. As I recall it, when the war broke out the Guamanians had over 2,300 of their boys in the Navy on our ships, over 10 percent of the population, and they did not even at that time have citizenship. In the midthirties some will remember a delegation came over here to visit with Members of Congress in an attempt to get citizenship at that time and they were denied it. I think if there was ever a meritorious bill that passed this House with reference to a people that deserved it and were patriotic 100 percent during the Japanese occupation, this is it. I visited a schoolteacher on one side of the island who had buried in an oilcloth from his table an American flag and a number of books. I was there when he dug them up to put in his schoolhouse the day following our return. So I say, if ever people deserved at our hands this kind of legislation, it is the people of Guam. This is an excellent bill which is long overdelayed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the purpose of this Act is to provide for rehabilitation in connection with the damage caused in Guam by Typhoon Karen on November 11, 1962; to provide for the construction of necessary public works, including the acquisition of real property; to develop and stimulate trade and industry; and to provide facilities for community life through a program of useful public works and community development.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior not to exceed $56,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act, to be paid to the Government of Guam in such sums as may be requested by the Governor of Guam and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available until expended. No payment shall be made unless it is requested prior to June 30, 1973. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act and paid to the Government of Guam shall be available for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including the employment of consultants, such as engineers, architects and other technical experts, personal services and rental in Guam and elsewhere, supplies and equipment, travel expenses, transfer of household goods and effects, purchase, repair, operation, and maintenance of vehicles, and such other expenses as may be necessary for carrying out the foregoing purposes. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall also be available for use by the Government of Guam to permit Guam to qualify for participation in Federal programs.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall withhold from sums collected pursuant to section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1421h), before such sums are transferred to the Government of Guam, such amounts as the Secretary of the Interior estimates will reimburse the United States, with interest as set forth below, over a period of thirty years beginning June 30, 1968, for—

(a) 100 per centum of such moneys as are paid under section 2 hereof for water projects, power projects, or telephone projects;

(b) 100 per centum of such moneys as are paid under section 2 hereof for use by the government of Guam to permit Guam to qualify for participation in Federal programs; and

(c) 50 per centum of all other moneys as are paid under section 2 hereof.

The foregoing amounts, until reimbursed to the United States, shall bear interest beginning July 1, 1968, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, which rate shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the advance, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. All sums so withheld shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. The government of Guam in carrying out the purpose of this Act may utilize, to the extent practicable, the available services and facilities of agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government upon a reimbursable basis. Reimbursements may be credited to the appropriation or fund which provided the services and facilities or the appropriation or fund currently available for providing such services or facilities. Agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government shall make available to the government of Guam upon request of the Secretary of the Interior such services and facilities as they are equipped to render or furnish, and they may do so without reimbursement if otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 5. No portion of the sums to be repaid by the government of Guam to the Treasury, as provided for in section 3 hereof, shall be considered to be public indebtedness of Guam within the meaning of section 11 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1423a).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "$56,000,000" and insert "$45,000,000".

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Guam" insert "with the concurrence of the territorial legislature".

Page 4, following line 12, add a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Guam, with the assistance of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the Government of Guam as the President and the Governor, respectively, may designate, shall prepare a long-range economic development plan for Guam. Of the moneys authorized to be appropriated by section 2 of this Act, not more than $200,000 shall be available to agencies of the Department of the Interior to carry out the purposes of this section. Other Federal departments and agencies designated by the President to furnish such assistance may do so without reimbursement or transfer of funds. An interim report of the Secretary and the Governor on progress towards formulation of such plan shall be presented to the President and the Congress on or before September 1, 1964, or nine months from the date on which appropriations to carry out this Act first become available, whichever occurs later, and the final report on the plan shall be presented on or before July 1, 1965, or eighteen months from the date on which appropriations to carry out this Act first become available, whichever occurs later."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I have just made and that the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], and any others desiring to do so may be placed in the RECORD immediately preceding the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in recommending approval of H.R. 6225. Guam needs rehabilitation and reconstruction not only because of two destructive typhoons but because the island was not given the attention it deserved after World War II. Following the liberation of Guam in 1944, the military departments decided to construct permanent installations—warehouses, offices, and homes. The permanent military installations on Guam and on Saipan, 125 miles north, suffered relatively few damages although they were struck by the same winds that demolished the temporary structures. The civilian installations were of the quonset and Butler hut type, which are satisfactory for temporary uses but cannot withstand the elements. Instead of developing the villages in a modern manner as we should have done we permitted them to grow in a crazy quilt pattern. In the long run, the typhoons may have been blessings in disguise because now we are forced to rebuild and this time it will be done in a sensible manner.

It is going to be costly. It will cost at least $50 million and probably more. I seriously doubt if the $45 million in this bill will do the job. In the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I offered an amendment to restore $6 million of the $11 million by which the total authorization was reduced. My amendment was defeated. I offered the amendment because I felt the Guam and Federal authorities who surveyed the needs had justified the request and that that amount would be used in a judicious manner. Not only do I think it would be wisely used but I am certain the Guamanians will repay the amount they are expected to repay. In the past, they have met their obligations and in the future they will do so. I am not going to offer my amendment on the floor today but if the other body authorizes the larger amount I am going to encourage my colleagues to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join my chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], in recommending favorable consideration of H.R. 6225.

I want to discuss the careful planning that went into preparation of this legislation and the lengthy hearings devoted to it in our committee. Shortly after the onslaught of Typhoon Karen, Guamanian and Federal authorities surveyed the damages and made recommendations for emergency and long-term rehabilitation. These recommendations were studied several months before they were sent to Congress in the form of an executive communication by the Secretary of the Interior.

Initially, the total program would have cost $70 million but the Bureau of the Budget reduced it by 20 percent. We called Governor Guerrero and his public works officer, Speaker of the Guam Legislature Won Pat, Mr. Christobal, member of the Guam Legislature, Interior Department officials, and representatives of the Office of Emergency Planning before the committee to find out how thoroughly this proposal had been analyzed and how the funds were to be used. We held several days' hearings on the bill before we finally reduced the total to $45 million. It still calls for a sizable expenditure—$45 million is a lot of money. But we cannot ask Guam to get along on less. As explained by our chairman, many of the purposes for which the funds will be used stem from World War II. If we had rebuilt Guam as we should have done in the late forties or early fifties we could have done so at half the present cost. Permanent, stable construction like that provided by the military on Guam and neighboring Saipan would have withstood much of the typhoon damage. However, it is too late to talk about what we might have done. We must get on with the tremendous job that is facing Guam.

We have before us a bill which authorizes a $45 million appropriation against which the government of Guam may draw in order to provide public works and community development projects.

On page 3 of our committee report we explain how the money will be spent. Every item has been studied and pared down; yet, we have assured ourselves that while the overall amount to be appropriated is firm, the individual items, the categories and purposes, and the dollar estimates must be kept flexible in order to insure proper utilization of funds. Let us consider each of the five categories.

Education: Six schools were either or almost totally destroyed and must be rebuilt at a cost of over $2 million. In addition, three more schools and the college of Guam were badly damaged and must be rehabilitated at a cost of $2½ million.

Village development: Three villages, Senajana, Yona, Asan and the capital city, Agana, have been designated too unsafe and unsanitary for inhabitants. Approximately $6½ million have been allocated for these projects.

Public works: Existing public works must be rehabilitated. This includes sewer and drainage systems, street lights, curbs, and gutters. The penitentiary is in very bad condition and many of the public works quonsets of 1945 vintage collapsed during the storm. Approximately $5 million will be used for these projects.

Resources development: Of the $6 million to be used for resources development roughly $5,500,000 will be earmarked for commercial port and air terminal facilities.

Public utilities: The big item of expenditure, of course, is for provision of adequate public utilities, that is, water, power, and telephone facilities. Originally, $23,600,000 was tagged for these purposes but the committee reduced the figure by $5 million.

When this bill was first considered in our committee the total outlay was for

$56 million. We reduced this total by $11 million by decreasing the amount for power facilities by $5 million and the sum recommended for village development by $6 million. Since the power project is not scheduled for completion until 1970 sufficient time will remain to finance the construction in another manner.

Whether the reduced village development amount will be adequate will depend in part on the success achieved under another item of pending legislation in the other body, which permits the Guam Housing Authority to sponsor a portion of this village development program.

Mr. Speaker, we have brought a bill to the floor that is long overdue. Its need is emphasized by damages done by two destructive typhoons. I do not wish to mislead my colleagues. A goodly portion of the expenditures will be for projects unrelated to the typhoons but attributable to damages related to World War II, as well as general deterioration of the temporary construction over the past 18 years. I hope H.R. 6225, as amended, will be promptly enacted by Congress.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of H.R. 6225. Despite the fact that $45 million is a lot of money, I want our colleagues to understand that this is not a gift to the people of Guam who are, incidentally, like ourselves American citizens.

Of the $45 million at least $34 million of it is in the form of a loan, the repayment of which will begin in 5 years, June 30, 1968, and will continue for 30 years. The Guamanians are agreeable to repaying the loan and paying an interest rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. Under the terms of the legislation, the Secretary of the Treasury will withhold from Federal income taxes sufficient funds to pay the annual loan installments, which will be in the neighborhood of $1,300,000. Since 1950, when Congress enacted Organic legislation for the territory the Federal income taxes covered into the Guam treasury have averaged $3,850,000. Now, of course, the military importance of Guam may change in the future but this is the chance the Guamanians will have to take. If the collections continue and local revenues remain stable the Government of Guam should experience little difficulty in meeting its repayment obligations to the United States.

Assuming that the entire amount authorized to be appropriated is made available, it will require about half the collections to pay off the loan.

The bill also provides for the creation of a joint Federal and Guam committee to study long-range economic developments for the island. We do not want Guam to have to depend solely on military employment and expenditure. Perhaps fishing, agriculture, or tourism can be developed. We want to leave no stone unturned in an endeavor to find new sources of income for Guam. I hope this joint committee will come up with some sound proposals.

The bill provides that the legislature will concur in the projects to be developed before they are recommended by the Governor and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Since I have confidence in both the Governor and the Legislature I feel certain that the Secretary will not be asked to justify unsound projects.

I hope the House gives speedy approval to this measure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] the chairman of the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the author of H.R. 6225, and all the members of the committee for bringing before us a measure that should pass by a unanimous vote.

I doubt that there has ever been a committee of the House that has ever worked with more diligence and more dedication than the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As a Member of the freshman class of the 81st Congress, I feel a sort of reflected glory because my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], is the first Member of that class to attain a chairmanship of a major committee of the House. His name will go down in the history of our country and it is now held in admiration and affection, as evidenced recently by the awarding to him of an honorary doctor's degree by the University of Alaska.

Guam is far in the Pacific, very close to the Bamboo Curtain. There is among the people in Guam a love of the United States and a devotion to the things for which our country stands that have undergone the test of war, of catastrophe, and of the demands for clear thinking and resolute action in times of peace.

Guam is no foreign land. It is part and parcel of the United States. Over its soil waves the Stars and Stripes. H.R. 6225 provides for its rehabilitation from the damage of heavy wartime bombardment and the tragic devastation wrought by Typhoon Karen.

It is one of the most meritorious bills introduced at this session of the 88th Congress and its passage by unanimous vote of the House will be the best evidence we can give to the people of Guam of our deep and abiding friendship for them as fellow Americans of the highest qualities of loyalty and patriotic devotion.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6225, which would provide for the rehabilitation of Guam.

Because Hawaii is the State nearest to Guam, the people of Guam look to Hawaii's Congressmen to serve as their spokesmen in Congress. It was for this reason that together with Senator INOUYE and the gentleman from Hawaii, Congressman GILL, I made an inspection trip to Guam shortly after it had been struck by Typhoon Karen on November 11, 1962.

The devastation was nearly complete. It was as if a giant bulldozer had run over the island. On April 29, 1963, a second typhoon destroyed the temporary housing units which had been constructed after the November typhoon.

The island of Guam was twice a battlefield during World War II, and suffered widespread devastation each time. It was never completely rebuilt and rehabilitated since World War II.

It is time that we undertake a permanent reconstruction of its basic facilities. The people of Guam are industrious and forward looking. They have lived through the trials of wartime battles and peacetime typhoons, and their spirit is still remarkably high. But they are sorely in need of help and their patience should not be put to further test.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Guam are our fellow Americans. They have proved themselves worthy of our support in peace and in war. This westernmost territory of the United States is only about 600 miles from Red China. When trouble strikes again, Guam will be in the forefront of military operations.

Guam has a great potential in the maritime, business, and agricultural fields, as well as in its role as a supporting community for a strong military base. But it needs the help this bill would provide for its reconstruction and rehabilitation to insure her future growth and usefulness, not only for her own people but for us as a nation.

I urge the unanimous approval of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 500 was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and for next week and then the week after. Before making that inquiry of the majority leader, I want to say that the program which I anticipate he will announce has been under very recent discussion between the majority leader, the Speaker, and myself, and I have been in contact with many Members on our side, as I am quite sure the Speaker and the majority leader have been in contact with Members on the other side of the aisle.

I just want to say, as far as I am concerned, the program that was finally devised and worked out meets with my full agreement. We are coming up to the Labor Day weekend, and a lot of Members with youngsters are getting them back in school. We have work yet to do in this Congress, and certainly every one of us wants to conclude this session as early as we can, but, as we go along, if we can dispose of the bills that are ready for consideration that is probably the best we can do. If there is to be an extended session certainly, as far as I am concerned, I think a few days off now and then for the purposes of the Members are very much deserved. And so, having said as much, Mr. Speaker, I trust I am not anticipating too much as to what the majority leader will announce concerning the program. I now yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his statement and his cooperation in connection with this matter. I have heard from enough Members on my side to concur in the statement of the distinguished majority leader that many Members are anxious to have a few days off during Labor Day week, and I am happy that we have been able to arrange the program accordingly.

We have finished the legislative program for this week and we do not intend to announce any legislative business for next week.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of September 9, 1963, is as follows:

Monday: Consent Calendar, if we get permission to set it on that day, and the Private Calendar likewise. Also it is District Day, but there are no bills.

Some suspensions may be announced. We are not prepared to announce any at this time.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week: S. 1576, Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This is an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later. We expect to have additional program.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AUGUST 30 AND MEETING DAYS FOR THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 3

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement just made, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to make some unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. HALLECK. I yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday, August 30; and when it adjourns on Friday, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, September 3; and when it adjourns on Tuesday, September 3, it adjourn to meet on Thursday, September 5; and that when it adjourns on that day it adjourn to meet on Monday, September 9.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be another session of the House before Thanksgiving?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think he was listening when I announced the program for the week of September 9.

Mr. GROSS. We are getting closer and closer to this Christmas decoration business, are we not?

Mr. ALBERT. And if the gentleman pushes me harder and harder I might have to relent on that agreement to make him Santa Claus.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to that by saying that I thought the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] read me out on that role a few days ago. I was not anticipating being Santa Claus.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTERIM AUTHORITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Friday next, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR, SUSPENSIONS, AND THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the consent calendar and any suspensions that are in order on Monday, September 2, and the call of the Private Calendar in order on Tuesday, September 3, may go over to Monday, September 9.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] have unanimous consent to include extraneous material in his special order previously entered for Friday, August 30.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AGAINST PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, today, has taken a unique step in an effort to prevent a railroad strike at 12:01 a.m. tomorrow morning. The Quincy Patriot Ledger, on July 9, had an editorial which shed sensible light on this difficult situation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

AGAINST OUR INTEREST

The railroad unions, now poised for a strike of disastrous consequences, have blundered.

They have forced public opinion into line against them; they have emerged from 4 years of negotiations with the image of the force which is against progress.

And by alining themselves on the side of reactionary thinking they endanger the entire balance of labor and management relations built up during the years. They are forcing the Kennedy administration to take strong action to avert a stoppage which would in effect close ports and snarl a major part of the Nation's commerce so dependent on ability to move goods.

The threatened strike Thursday morning at 12:01 would not radically affect Boston's commuters, already somewhat hardened to loss of commuter service, but its effect in New York and Chicago would be immense.

The issues of the threatened strike preclude much public sympathy for the unions. Regardless of the issues in this conflict, one point is clear: the railroads are sick and they need a change to regain strength.

The issues, of course, are not just wages; they are issues of job security, but of a spurious kind. The railroads contend that they have nearly 40,000 firemen working in diesel locomotives, both on long runs and in the yards, who are no longer needed. They contend that with equipment now in use, a second brakeman is another freeloader in the railroads' trains. The brakeman who rides in the cab with the engineer can efficiently and safely perform all the brakeman's duties, they say, and provide a safe replacement for the fireman as well.

The railroads estimate that the annual savings from the removal of this featherbedding would come to nearly $600 million annually.

A related issue is that of pay systems. Under the present and badly outmoded rules, an engineer is paid a day's pay for 8 hours' work or 100 miles, whichever comes first. And on a 16-hour run from Chicago to Denver, rules require eight changes of entire seven-man crews as the train enters regions set up by unions in days when trains were slower. Under these rules, an engineer can be paid 4½ days' wages for taking a train round trip from New York to Washington on runs which take 4 hours of work each way.

These rules were agreed to during the days when a freight train might take 8 hours to travel 100 miles and as such were a form of incentive pay.

The issues have grown over generations of agreements whose cumulative effect has been to force the railroads out of competition with the airlines and truck systems.

President Kennedy's factfinding Commission which reported this spring was the second such body which has called for drastic changes in railroad work rules. And the Supreme Court, considering the unions' challenge to the railroads, ruled that the railroads do have the power to set their own work rules. It was the management's decision to effect these changes in rules on Thursday which brought labor's answer of strike.

Labor has rejected arbitration and has rejected any plan offered by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. They are, in effect, forcing the Government to make a decision which may end in Government seizure of the railroads or in compulsory arbitration under new legislation. The unions stand to lose in either case and certainly would lose public support if they strike.

The 20th century is here and the railroad unions should recognize it, join it and take some responsibility for keeping the railroads in the transportation picture.

RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to wrestle with this great problem of attempting to assist, if possible, in settling the current railroad dispute in a fair and just manner to all concerned.

Many of my colleagues likewise have, like Jacob in the Bible, wrestled into the night hours while seeking the blessing of a happy solution of this entire puzzle.

Three sides are clearly recognizable in this disputed controversy. First, there is the public interest or the national commonwealth; second, there is the carrier interest or the railroad industry; third, there is the employee interest or the railroad firemen group throughout the country.

The argument of public interest is that there must not be a strike, because it would disrupt lives and business and probably cause financial losses.

The argument of the railroads is that they must save money by eliminating jobs.

The argument of the firemen is that they should keep their present jobs as their only means of livelihood at a time when millions are already unemployed.

In the face of these arguments Congress is asked to pass a law that would set up a jury of arbiters, the final judgment of which would be binding and compulsory.

The ultimate effect of this bill we have before us today, as I see it, would be to sweep 32,000 men out into the empty street of joblessness. Of course, we can readily dig up billions to prevent any sizable unemployment in various other countries while promoting a soothing prosperity somewhere out there in the vast alienism beyond our national boundaries. Yet we seem to have no plan, no remedy, no statesmanship whatever for 32,000 men and their families here at home.

We apparently are willing to say to these men, "You have absolutely nothing negotiable in this controversy, your lifetime occupations mean nothing, you must now join the millions of others of unemployed because government and management have simply run out of ideas as well as compassion for your future careers."

Mr. Speaker, there must be some other, better way to handle this problem rather than within the terms of this present bill. A government magnanimous enough to send 100 billions of dollars into the circumnavigating channels of a foreign aid program that has been constantly sparking ideas from some of our best minds for more than 15 years ought to be resourceful enough to keep 32,000 men from having to abide in channels of heartaches and hopelessness because of unemployment in the days ahead.

EXPORT OF AUTOMATED MINING MACHINERY TO THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1963, and again on August 27, 1963, I discussed with the House a decision by the administration to grant licenses to authorize the exportation to the U.S.S.R. of automated mining machinery valued in excess of $9.5 million.

My statements on this matter can be found beginning at page 15682 in the August 23 Congressional Record and at page 16046 of the Record for August 27.

The Department of Commerce admitted in a letter to me concerning these licenses that because of the size of this order and the productivity of the mining machinery there is little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union. In spite of this the licenses were granted. In my view this action is contrary to the express intention of Congress last session in strengthening the Export Control Act of 1949 and is contrary to the welfare and security of the United States.

I am setting forth my letter dated August 27, 1963, to the President urging that the decision to grant these licenses be reversed:

> August 27, 1963.
>
> The President,
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. President: I am writing with regard to the decision by the Department of Commerce, as announced in the Department list of export licenses approved for August 21, 1963, to authorize exportation to the U.S.S.R. of automated mining equipment valued in excess of $9.5 million for use in the mining of potash.
>
> Because of the fact that the exportation of this equipment to the U.S.S.R. would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union, I believe the approval of these licenses is contrary to the express direction of Congress which, as you know, in 1962 enacted strengthening amendments to the Export Control Act of 1949, and is contrary to the welfare and security of the United States.
>
> I would therefore respectfully request that the decision to allow the exportation of this machinery to the U.S.S.R. be reversed.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> Glenard P. Lipscomb,
> *Member of Congress.*

SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, school doors are opening again throughout the Nation this week. However, if current trends hold true nearly 16 percent of our youth, ages 16 to 17, will not return to their classrooms this year.

There is increasing concern at the local, State, and National levels over the growing problem of school dropouts. The problem is particularly acute in relationship to the Nation's continuing unemployment situation, and, in metropolitan areas, to the impact it has upon juvenile delinquency.

The importance of boys and girls returning to school to complete their education is highlighted by U.S. Labor Department statistics which reveal that the demand for unskilled labor will decline by some 50 percent by 1975. On the other hand, the demand for skilled workers will increase by 150 percent. Automation and changing technology are but two factors in the demand for more skilled workers.

We, in Congress, are aware of the serious problem which the school dropout poses to our Nation. The Federal Government must assume its proper responsibility in helping provide solutions to the problem.

However, attacking the dropout problem is essentially a local program. Teachers, administrators, school board members, parents and taxpayers all must assume responsibilities.

Each community must decide what it is willing to invest to provide a high school education for every youth who can profit by it.

This is a problem which cannot be solved overnight. We must seek long-range solutions. It is gratifying, however, to take note of how many communities and how many organizations have joined in special projects and programs designed to encourage young people to continue in school.

In my congressional district, the Wichita Urban League is developing a program in education and youth incentives. The mayor of the city of Wichita proclaimed "Stay in School Week" which was observed August 19–25. The Wichita Eagle and Beacon, television, and radio have placed emphasis upon back-to-school publicity. An essay contest was sponsored by the Urban League.

I believe such a local program is commendable and is indicative of the vital role which each community can and must play if we are to make progress in preparing our young citizens for the important responsibilities which they must bear tomorrow.

AN ESSAY FROM THE HOOVER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION, AND PEACE RELATIVE TO SOVIET VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in context of the pending partial test ban treaty, I am pleased to present for the information of Members of this body and the other body, a current, up-to-the-minute treatise on Soviet practices with respect to treaties. It was authorized by Dr. F. G. Lassner of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, Calif., and is as follows:

Sample Study of Soviet Treaty Practices

(By Dr. F. G. Lassner, Hoover Institution, Stanford University)

The following is a short study of selected Soviet treaty practices. It is not based on a comprehensive listing of all treaties; nor does this study contribute a complete analysis of how treaties fared at the hands of the Kremlin. However, a large enough sample of treaties was examined to permit a number of broad conclusions.

Economic treaties, in general, are being observed by the U.S.S.R. This is so because treaties of this sort operate to the advantage of the U.S.S.R., and because many of them are drawn with Communist bloc states; i.e., they are treaties within the same political entity. But where trade agreements conflict with the immediate political interests of the U.S.S.R., they are wholly or partially voided (viz treaties with such dissident satellites as Albania, China, Yugoslavia, etc.).

Many treaties signed by the U.S.S.R., especially at the end of World War II, called for free elections, or plebiscites. The U.S.S.R presumably expected Communist and affiliated parties to win elections in Eastern Europe. When this hope was disappointed, despite systematic attempts to bring about electoral victories by skulduggery (e.g., outlawing of certain parties), political warfare and insurrectional methods were used to seize political power.

Treaties of strategic significance habitually have been violated by the U.S.S.R. whenever violation was in accord with the requirements of Soviet strategic operations. This will become apparent by reading, for example, the attached list of violated and observed nonaggression and friendship treaties.

Duplicity treaties sometimes are drawn by the U.S.S.R. when this suits the Communist strategic interest. An example is an agreement of October 8, 1939, in which the U.S.S.R. agreed with Germany on the division of Lithuania. A treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania concerning mutual assistance and other matters was signed—as a deception—just 2 days later, on October 10, 1939.

The U.S.S.R., on occasion, attempts to play off one country against another through the negotiation or drawing of treaties, of which one set tends to be deceptive. In 1922, the U.S.S.R. negotiated with the Western powers, only to sign the Treaty of Rapallo with Germany. In 1939, extensive discussions with France and England on mutual security were terminated through the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact. Agreements made in 1939 with Nazi Germany on the division of Poland were annulled 2 years later by treaty with the Polish government-in-exile; in addition, the U.S.S.R. shortly thereafter drew agreements, which were not mutually compatible with two different Polish exile governments. As another example, the U.S.S.R. was anxious to obtain recognition by the United States in 1933 because of the rise of Hitler. In 1939, however, as a result of the Nazi-Soviet pact, the attitude of the U.S.S.R. became hostile to the United States and in some measure contributed to the Japanese aggression at Pearl Harbor.

The U.S.S.R. has signed agreements which have a purpose that differs from the objects stated in the treaty. The U.S.S.R., for example, joined the United Nations for many reasons connected with their strategy of revolution, but not for the humanitarian reasons stated in the U.N. Charter. Also, economic treaties with non-Communist states often have been made for purposes of penetration, and not to enhance the economic development of the treaty partner.

In summary, it may be concluded that in the Soviet scheme, treaties are a tool either to solve some practical problem (Danube River navigation or International Postal Union treaties) or, more importantly, to further the offensive-defensive strategy of the U.S.S.R. More often than not, treaties are concluded with a particular country whose assent or benevolent neutrality is needed to carry out a particular strategic operation, or else the treaty partner is itself the intended victim, or target, of Soviet direct or indirect attack.

SOME CATEGORIES OF TREATIES WHICH HABITUALLY ARE VIOLATED BY THE U.S.S.R.

1. Treaties pertaining to repatriation and treatment of civilians and war prisoners. A whole series of such treaties was made after World War II. Examples are:

Joint declaration by the U.S.S.R. and Japan concerning political relations, October 19, 1956 (provisions on repatriation of Japanese nationals).

Agreement concerning repatriation of Japanese prisoners of war and civilians from the U.S.S.R. and from territories under Soviet control, as well as Korean nationals from Japan to Soviet-occupied North Korea, with two annexes. December 19, 1946.

2. Treaties between the RSFSR and certain bodies concerning establishment of autonomous republics within the RSFSR. Such autonomy on several occasions was unilaterally abrogated at a later date by the RSFSR.

3. Treaties of nonintervention: The U.S.S.R. frequently has violated such treaties outright, or has denied that activities in which it was engaged constituted an intervention within the meaning of the treaty. Intervention by the U.S.S.R. has consisted both of propaganda and political warfare, and of outright political or military activities. Examples are:

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and Rumania constituting an agreement concerning noninterference in each other's internal affairs, June 9, 1934.

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and Bulgaria constituting an agreement concerning noninterference in each other's internal affairs, July 23, 1934.

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and France concerning Soviet adherence to the principle of nonintervention in the Spanish civil war.

Joint declaration by the U.S.S.R. and Japan concerning political relations October 19, 1956 (provisions on noninterference in internal affairs).

4. Treaties related to the International Labor Organization. U.S.S.R. has adhered to conventions on a variety of subjects: Child labor, right to unionize, annual holidays with pay, freedom of association, etc. Some of these agreements were first drawn in the early 1920's. Examples are:

Convention concerning decrease of work hours to 40 hours per week (ILO convention No. 47) of 1935, U.S.S.R. ratified June 4, 1956.

Convention concerning slavery of 1926–53, U.S.S.R. ratified August 1956. Several supplementary conventions of 1956 on abolition of slavery and slave trade "and institutions and practices similar to slavery" ratified by the U.S.S.R.

Convention concerning equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value (ILO convention No. 100), ratified by the U.S.S.R. on April 4, 1956.

Convention concerning forced or compulsory labor (ILO convention No. 29) of 1930–46. U.S.S.R. ratified June 4, 1956.

5. Treaties pertaining to the control of narcotics. These are violated by the U.S.S.R. through proxies (China, Cuba). Examples are:

International Opium Convention, with annex and protocol, February 19, 1925. Soviet adherence October 31, 1935.

Convention for limiting the manufacturing and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs, with protocol of signature, July 31, 1931. Soviet adherence October 31, 1935.

Protocol amending the agreements, conventions, and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded 1912, 1925, 1931, 1936, December 11, 1946.

6. Treaties establishing certain rules or regulations, or prohibiting certain practices. These either have been or are being violated by the U.S.S.R.; they are antithetical to Soviet custom and observation of such agreements cannot be expected. The U.S.S.R. was not a signatory to some of these treaties before World War II, and went out of its way to act contrary to the spirit of many of the provisions. Examples are:

Geneva convention concerning the treatment of prisoners of war, with five annexes, 1949. Supersedes agreements of 1929.

Geneva convention concerning the protection of civilian persons in time of war, with three annexes, 1949.

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, December 9, 1948.

Convention on the political rights of women, December 20, 1952 and March 31, 1953.

Recognition of the Hague conventions by the U.S.S.R., March 7, 1955.

International convention for suppression of counterfeiting currency, with protocol, April 20, 1929.

Convention on forced labor, June 28, 1930.

7. Armistice agreements and/or peace treaties after World War II contained many provisions violated by the U.S.S.R., especially in treaties with the present satellite countries. The U.S.S.R. also hampered allied control commissions in carrying out their assignments. Examples of such provisions are: free elections, noninterference in internal affairs, inspections, etc.

8. Some miscellaneous agreements wholly or partially violated by the U.S.S.R.:

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and the United States concerning establishment of diplomatic relations, with related documents, November 16, 1933. (Provisions of this agreement, especially those in which signatories promise to refrain from certain activities, have been violated.)

Joint declaration by the U.S.S.R. and Japan pledging respect for the territorial integrity and inviolability of Manchukuo and the Mongolian Peoples Republic, April 13, 1941.

Agreement between the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom providing for limitation of naval armament and exchange of information concerning naval construction, with protocol of signature, July 17, 1937. Modification July 6, 1938. (U.S.S.R. never exchanged any information.)

November 16, 1937, (1) convention for creation of an International Criminal Court and (2) convention for prevention and punishment of terrorism.

Convention concerning privileges and immunities of the United Nations, February 13, 1946. U.S.S.R. accession September 22, 1953 (agreements on duties and privileges of diplomats frequently are violated by the U.S.S.R.).

Kellogg-Briand Pact, treaty of Paris, signed August 27, 1928, renunciation of war. Protocol concerning entry into force of the General Treaty of August 27, 1928, for renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy (Litvinov protocol). February 9, 1929, U.S.S.R.-Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania—later Lithuania, Danzig, Persia.

Commercial treaties with Albania and China have been abrogated by the U.S.S.R. to a greater or lesser degree as a result of the political disagreements with these countries.

Agreements between the U.S.S.R. and the United States regarding return of lend-lease naval vessels.

Agreements between the U.S.S.R. and other Allied Powers on establishment of provisional government, holding of elections, etc., in Korea.

Agreement by the Allied Control Council for Germany concerning establishment of three corridors for air travel between Berlin and West Germany, November 30, 1945.

NEUTRALITY, FRIENDSHIP, MUTUAL ASSISTANCE, AND NONAGGRESSION TREATIES BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND OTHER COUNTRIES

Where the U.S.S.R. had a strategic goal or some immediate or long-range political objective, these treaties have been violated. When this was not the case, if the other contracting party was geographically removed from the U.S.S.R., or where treaties were drawn with other Communist states, the treaties in general have been observed.

Not violated:

Treaty of friendship and neutrality between the U.S.S.R., and Turkey, with three protocols, December 17, 1925.

Treaty of neutrality and nonaggression between the U.S.S.R., and Germany, with exchange of notes, April 24, 1926, extended 1931.

Treaty of neutrality and nonaggression between the U.S.S.R., and Afghanistan, with final protocol, August 31, 1926, extended 1931, 1936, and 1955.

Treaty of friendship, nonaggression, and neutrality between the U.S.S.R., and Italy, September 2, 1933.

Gentlemen's agreement between the U.S.S.R., and the Mongolian People's Republic, concerning mutual aid in case of attack by a third party, November 27, 1934.

Protocol of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R., and the Mongolian People's Republic, March 12, 1936. Converted into treaty of friendship and mutual assistance, February 27, 1946.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R., and Germany, August 23, 1939, and secret protocol concerning spheres of interest in Eastern Europe.

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R., and Rumania, February 4, 1948.

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R., and Bulgaria, March 18, 1948.

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R., and Finland, April 6, 1948.

Treaty of friendship, alliance, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R., and the Chinese People's Republic, February 14, 1950.

Treaty of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance (Warsaw Pact), May 14, 1955. U.S.S.R., Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania.

State Treaty for Austria, May 15, 1955, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, France, Austria. (Not an outright nonaggression treaty, but Austria's status guaranteed by U.S.S.R.)

Violated:

(NOTE.—The nonaggression pacts with the three Baltic countries were violated by the U.S.S.R. when the latter, in June of 1940, sent each country an ultimatum demanding formation of a new government and the entrance of Soviet troops into major cities.)

Treaty of friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Tannu-Tuva, August 1926 (included reciprocal recognition of independence). U.S.S.R. later annexed.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania, with two exchange of notes, September 28, 1926. Extended 1931, 1934, reaffirmed by treaty of October 10, 1939.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania concerning the definition of aggression, with annex, July 5, 1933.

Treaty of nonaggression and neutrality between the U.S.S.R. and Latvia, March 9, 1927, extended 1932 and 1934.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Latvia on conciliation procedure, June 18, 1932.

Pact of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Latvia, October 5, 1939.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Finland concerning nonaggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes, with protocol of signature, January 21, 1932. (U.S.S.R. expelled from League of Nations for violating this treaty.) Extended 1934.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Finland concerning conciliation procedure, April 22, 1932.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Estonia concerning nonaggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes, May 4, 1932, extended 1934.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Estonia concerning conciliation procedure, June 16, 1932.

Pact of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Estonia, September 28, 1939.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Poland, with two protocols of signature, July 25, 1932, extended 1934.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Poland concerning conciliation procedure, November 23, 1932.

Joint communique by the U.S.S.R. and Poland concerning diplomatic and commercial relations, November 26, 1938. Confirms 1932 nonaggression treaty.

Note from U.S.S.R. to Poland abrogating existing treaties between the U.S.S.R. and Poland, September 17, 1939. Reason: Polish Government has "ceased to exist". Followed by joint declaration of friendship and mutual aid by the U.S.S.R. and the Polish Government-in-Exile, December 4, 1941.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and France, November 29, 1932.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and France, concerning conciliation procedure, November 29, 1932.

Treaty of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and France, with protocol of signature, May 2, 1935.

(NOTE.—The nonaggression pact was certainly violated in spirit through the Russo-German pact of 1939; and the mutual assistance pact was violated outright by the Russo-German pact of 1939.)

Treaty of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia, with protocol of signature, May 16, 1935.

Treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovakian Government-in-Exile, with protocol, December 12, 1943.

Treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia, April 11, 1945. (Denounced by the U.S.S.R. September 28, 1949; in October, Yugoslavia accused the U.S.S.R. of having broken the treaty. Most commercial treaties between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia violated by the U.S.S.R. after the break in relations.)

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom concerning alliance in the war against Germany and collaboration and mutual assistance after the war, May 26, 1942. Annulled by U.S.S.R. on May 7, 1955.

Treaty of alliance and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the French Provisional Government, December 10, 1944 (annulled by U.S.S.R. May 7, 1955).

Pact of neutrality between the U.S.S.R. and Japan, April 13, 1941 (denounced by U.S.S.R. on April 5, 1945).

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Hungary, February 18, 1948 (violated as a result of Soviet actions in Hungary in 1956).

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and China, August 21, 1937.

Agreement concerning the evacuation of Soviet forces from Chinese territory after the capitulation of Japan, July 11, 1945.

Treaty of friendship and alliance between the U.S.S.R. and China, August 14, 1945 (annulled by exchange of notes of February 14, 1950 between the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic. Declared null and void by Government of Republic of China on February 25, 1953—the General Assembly of the U.N. accused the U.S.S.R. of violating this treaty).

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and China concerning relations between the U.S.S.R. and China, August 14, 1945. Supplements the above treaty, some clauses violated by the U.S.S.R.

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and China concerning Outer Mongolia, August 14, 1945 (calls for a plebiscite).

Additional agreements made about the same time (about Darien, Port Arthur, etc.), violated by the U.S.S.R. in fact or in spirit.

Exchange of telegrams between the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic concerning establishment of diplomatic relations, October 1, 1949. (On same day, the U.S.S.R. informed Nationalist diplomatic representative in Moscow that U.S.S.R. considered him to represent only the province of Canton, and would break off relations. This appears to be how the U.S.S.R. rid itself of treaty obligations with Nationalist China.)

MARCH FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today over 100,000 Americans gathered in front of the Lincoln Memorial to "redress old grievances and help resolve an American crisis." It was a moving reminder that, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, American citizens have not achieved the equality promised by Abraham Lincoln and guaranteed by the Constitution. The time truly has come to change rhetoric into reality.

The very fact that so many were willing to travel at their own expense, on their own time and from long distances to Washington to stand up and be counted underlines the urgency of the issue.

The more than 100,000 marchers represented many, many more who could not come in person to petition their Government.

This demonstration was in the finest democratic tradition for the highest principles of that tradition—equality for all citizens. Equal opportunity means equal education, equal access to housing and public facilities, equal voting rights, equal job opportunities. Civil rights means that a man is counted as a man regardless of his religion, race, or color.

The gathering at the Lincoln Memorial represents a stirring protest to the failure of Congress to meet its obligations to its citizens. Congress has not passed meaningful civil rights legislation.

The march represents the outpouring of aroused public feeling which Congress cannot ignore. We have been asked by the administration to take a major step in the march for freedom. The President's proposed Civil Rights Act should be passed without delay.

We also must pass other legislation-laws to outlaw discrimination in employment, to deny Federal funds to programs in which discrimination is practiced, more effective voting legislation, a broadened Fair Labor Standards Act, school desegregation legislation, legislation to deal with youth employment, Federal aid to education. I could go on. The list is long because the failures are many. Each day's delay is another day of discrimination, another day which Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Indians, and other minorities are not willing to endure.

I commend the sponsoring organizations and their leaders who worked hard and long hours to organize this most impressive march, and those who gave up a day's pay, or a day spent in enforced idleness because of unemployment, to come to Washington to demonstrate for democracy. I urge that we do not ignore this protest, that we do not turn our backs on our fellow citizens who have endured so much.

ACCESS TO AND EXIT FROM THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, August 23, I introduced a measure which would require the Secretary of Commerce to permit a greater degree of access to and exit from any part of the Interstate Highway System which goes through any city, town, or village having a population of 25,000 or less, than he permits on other parts of the Interstate System.

The great State of New Mexico, of which I am so proud, and indeed the entire Southwestern section of these United States is currently undergoing a revolutionary period of economic growth. Industrial and manufacturing concerns throughout the country have recognized and are now taking advantage of the limitless possibilities offered by New Mexico. We are delighted at this recent recognition and particularly since we have for some time been making a massive effort to awaken and inform all the Nation of New Mexico's unexploited possibilities.

Presently, however, the No. 1 industry of our State and of the entire region is tourism. The exquisite natural beauty with which we have been endowed draws people from all quarters of this land in much the same way as a magnet draws metal. Excited as we are at the increasing growth of our industrial community, we have no intention of displacing our tourist industry in its behalf. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we are increasing our efforts to feature our God-given beauties, and simultaneously are holding out a hand of welcome to the foresighted companies who, seeking to advance themselves, join us in the New Mexico family.

It is quite obvious, however, in spite of our diligent efforts that the Bureau of Public Roads is intent upon stunting our growth and laying waste our hard-won accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, the misdirected policy of this Bureau in completely bypassing communities is absolutely unjustifiable and contemptuous of our citizens' rights. During the past 5 years, I have made every conceivable effort to find a logical basis for this policy. There is no logical basis. The truth of the matter and, indeed, the crux of the entire situation is that the same standards of construction and interchange are employed in the sparsely populated West as in the heavily populated East. No consideration has been given to the vastly different habitation patterns existing in the various sections of our country. For example, in New Mexico a town of 10,000 people or less is often a center of commerce for the three or four surrounding counties, while in the East a community of comparable size may very well be of secondary importance. I have repeatedly called the Bureau of Public Roads' attention to this cardinal difference. Nevertheless, they have yet to take this into account but, instead, continue in their determination to stifle large parts of our Nation with an ill-considered blanket strategy.

Not only is this policy unjust to our citizens but is equally unjust to the Members of the Congress and all concerned with the economy of this Republic. Relentlessly we seek to stimulate our economic growth and increase our gross national product, but at the same time there exists the counteracting force of the Bureau of Public Roads. No longer can we allow our efforts to be thwarted without challenge.

Frequently, the Bureau of Public Roads has announced that their studies show that no economic hardship has resulted from a bypass. When a small shop owner depends upon travelers for 90 percent of his sales volume, as many New Mexico businessmen do, it is ludicrous to claim that business is not harmed when these same travelers are routed away through the desert. One need not be an economic wizard to see that. Moreover, it is quite clear that no manufacturing concern will consider newly locating in an area without access to the main superhighway.

As though this were not enough, the Bureau has even stated that business in some towns has improved after being bypassed by the Interstate System. If there exists such a town, it is a rarity. Raton, located in my own State of New Mexico, shows exactly the opposite to be the case. Preliminary studies clearly attest that trade has decreased up to 90 percent in many cases, and estimates are that the situation will get worse in coming years. I for one will not stand by, Mr. Speaker, and see entire towns disrupted and eventually devastated.

Each and every day my office is deluged with communications from every corner of New Mexico demanding protection from the impending amputation. Throughout New Mexico, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada there have grown private associations of small businessmen dedicated to preventing encroachment on their private property rights. These people ask only that they not be denied their constitutional right to earn a living.

To this they are entitled. I intend to do everything in my power to see that they are not deprived of it.

Mr. Speaker, considering this only from the aspect of the economic impact upon my State, should this negative policy be allowed to continue the economic stability and prosperity of New Mexico will be seriously endangered. Both the community and State treasuries derive a considerable portion of their tax revenue from the businesses located upon the now existing highways, but denied such revenue many communities will simply dry up. We must all recognize that the fate of so many communities is the eventual fate of the State.

I am sure that I speak for the entire Congress when I say that this was not the purpose of the Congress when it approved construction of the Interstate System. This vast network was envisioned as a means of uniting one side of our Nation with the other. Surely, it was not intended to blot out everything which lies between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The people of every community by virtue of their tax support of the Interstate program have an undeniable right to determine for themselves whether or not they should be bypassed by it. To deny them that right is to deny them the right to exist. Nonetheless, the Bureau of Public Roads is currently applying all available means of pressure on local communities in an attempt to impose its will on an outraged people. This must not be allowed to continue.

I have, therefore, asked, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress instruct the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads to redirect their efforts in a manner which will benefit the people of New Mexico and other States and the suffering business interests located therein.

INTRODUCTION OF SENIOR CITIZENS BILL

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on a day when we are particularly concerned with human rights I am pleased to join our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Hon. John E. Fogarty, in introducing a bill to aid 18 million citizens over age 65. Our senior citizens need help and need it now. The White House Conference on Aging in 1961 called for action and we must act. Leaders of business, labor and voluntary agencies have asked that we move in this area without hesitation, pledging their support and cooperation.

The purpose of this bill is to make money available for community planning, research and development projects as well as training projects—all to help our senior citizens.

In introducing his Older American Act of 1963 to the House on August 6, the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island said:

> Time is very much of the essence, and to enact such legislation during this session of Congress will require a concerted effort of all who believe in the dignity and independence of their fellow man.

I urge this House to follow the wise words of one who has led the way in this area as well as many others, displaying his usual foresight and compassion for those in need.

I ask support of this legislation and early enactment.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on August 22, the gentleman from California [Mr. George P. Miller], chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, assigned major duties of legislative oversight to a standing Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, of which I am chairman.

In recent years, the Congress has taken an increasing interest in the use of science to attain the national goals of the United States. This interest has accompanied the growth of Federal support of research and development, both basic and applied.

The Congress charged the Committee on Science and Astronautics with responsibilities in the area of scientific research and development when it established the committee in 1959, under the provisions of the rules of the 85th Congress. The Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development will look into the evaluation and coordination of our research effort.

I believe Members of the House should be interested in the first steps being taken by the subcommittee and the concept of its role in remarks which I made at the initial meeting this week of the subcommittee:

> The Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development will be performing a function of its parent Committee on Science and Astronautics to oversee generally the field of research and technology—fundamental as well as applied. In beginning its work the subcommittee will be helping to coordinate and direct activities in which the full committee has been engaged since its creation.
>
> Understandably, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has heretofore been forced to concentrate a major share of its attention on the rapidly growing and extremely complex national program of space exploration. Because that undertaking is so vital, diverse, and complicated, and because it involves one of the largest areas of expenditures in the Federal budget, the committee has felt obligated to explore the space program with extreme care on an annual basis. This has necessarily consumed a very high percentage of the committee's effort and staff work. By the same token, much of the committee's effort in the pure science field has also had some connection with astronautics.
>
> Nonetheless, the committee has been constantly aware of the needs which the increased tempo of science and research has been creating. It has constantly called attention to the need for increased coordination and liaison in regard to such basic problems as unnecessary duplication of applied research, the tendency to slight fundamental or basic research, the problems connected with producing sufficient scientific manpower and the proper distribution of it. All of these areas, and others, need continued oversight and attention if the national scientific effort is to be successful and efficient.
>
> The subcommittee, which expects to operate on a continuing basis as an arm of the full committee in carrying out its duties, will devote its attention to science per se—and to the many administrative and operational facets of science in its relationship to Government, as well as to specific scientific disciplines.
>
> Essentially the subcommittee's first task is to determine its agenda and to list the subjects on that agenda in accordance with their importance.
>
> We need to identify those problems which substantially involve a knowledge of science and technology for their solution. At the same time we recognize that other factors are involved in the formulation of public policy—economic, governmental, national, and international factors. All major factors must be weighed in the balance before prudent decisions can be made on legislation and appropriations. We need to seek ways and means whereby priorities can be established—priorities which have the support of all the people.
>
> We shall be glad to have the advice and counsel of scientists and engineers, of those who are connected with universities and industries, and of any citizen who wishes to express his opinion of our goals and how best to achieve them.
>
> One of the subcommittee's objectives is "the strengthening of congressional sources of information and advice in the fields of science and technology." A number of bills have been introduced during this session of Congress proposing several different methods by which Congress can receive advice in these fields. There seems to be considerable variation of opinion in defining exactly what the problem is, and this, no doubt, accounts for differences in proposed solutions. Once we have defined the problem and reached a consensus on its nature, we can look at each proposed solution in terms of its pros and cons. We must adopt some such orderly procedure for evaluating the numerous suggestions which have been made in this field. Some Members would like to increase existing committee staffs; some would like to employ temporary consultants in scientific and technological fields; some would like to refer questions to the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council; some would like to develop close connections with the Office of Science and Technology; some wish to establish a group of scientists in the House and in the Senate; others wish to strengthen the staff of the Legislative Reference Service.
>
> It is the opinion of other Members, however, that this work can be best accomplished through those standing committees which have responsibility throughout this broad field. Our own committee, through its past activities and by sharpening its perspective with the formation of this subcommittee, can become a focal point for this function.
>
> But we cannot see our way through all these proposals unless and until we determine precisely what kind of advice and what kind of information is needed by Congress in the many sciences and branches of engineering involved. And naturally, we must also determine what can best be done when our experts disagree.
>
> As it begins its work, the subcommittee will make a concerted effort to secure the assistance and advice of the scientific community. A first step will be consultation with the distinguished members of the full committee's Advisory Panel on Science and Technology—which is comprised of 15 outstanding scientists, technicians, educators, and industrialists in all parts of the Nation.

FORMER SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY'S EFFORTS IN BEHALF OF A BIPARTISAN POLICY IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, recently certain statements were made concerning President Kennedy and his record on foreign aid when he was a Member of the U.S. Congress. Since only part of the story appeared, and that out of context, I feel the true facts should be included in the Record.

During his service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator John Kennedy worked and voted within the committee for a sensible program geared closely to bipartisan foreign policy goals. He always voted for and strongly supported committee approved authorization bills on the Senate floor.

Contrary to the misleading picture created earlier this week by some Members by ripping certain votes out of context, John F. Kennedy was always, and remains, a strong supporter of foreign aid as an important and flexible instrument of our foreign policy. The following points are significant:

In 1953, Senator Goldwater stated accurately that Senator John Kennedy voted on July 29, 1953, for a $50 million cut in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act.

What Senator Goldwater did not point out was that Senator Kennedy voted with 54 percent of his Democratic colleagues on July 1, 1953, to stem a $1.5 billion cut in the Eisenhower foreign aid program.

In another key vote, he and 67 percent of his Democratic colleagues were joined by only half of the Senate Republicans in resisting a $1 billion cut in the Eisenhower foreign aid program.

Senator Kennedy, on July 29, 1953, voted against a $600 million cut in foreign aid appropriations.

Senator Kennedy voted against a $500 million cut in military aid funds on the same day—July 29, 1953.

On another key vote, Senator Kennedy voted against a $1.2 billion cut in aid appropriations offered by a Republican Senator to the Eisenhower appropriation bill.

Senator Kennedy voted yea on final passage of a $6.6 billion foreign aid appropriation.

In 1954, Senator Kennedy and most other Democratic Senators voted against a proposed $1 billion cut in the foreign aid authorization bill of 1955. Incidentally, only slightly more than half of their Republican colleagues joined in supporting President Eisenhower against this crippling amendment.

With Senator Kennedy's support, a $2.7 billion authorization bill was passed by the Senate.

In 1955 Senator Kennedy voted against restoration of $420 million cut in military assistance made by the House because the program was overfunded. Senator GOLDWATER must have thought so too since he also voted to sustain the cut.

In the same year, Senator Kennedy voted against a $200 million cut in Asian economic development.

Similarly, he opposed a cut of $200 million in defense support for Asia.

Senator Kennedy voted for a $3.2 billion appropriation.

In 1956, Senator Kennedy voted to defeat a motion to cut $1.6 billion from the aid authorization bill.

He supported final passage of a $4.3 billion aid authorization bill.

With Senator Kennedy's support, a move to cut military assistance funds by $565 million was defeated in a close 42-to-46 vote.

A similar amendment to cut military assistance by $300 million was defeated with Senator Kennedy's support.

He joined in voting to defeat an amendment to drastically cut defense support and development assistance funds.

He joined in supporting a final appropriation figure of $4.2 billion.

In 1957, Senator Kennedy, on June 14, 1957, did vote to cut $90 million from defense support authorization—an authorization of over $800 million. On the same day, he voted against a cut of $710 million in defense support. His was a careful, considered action, not a meat ax approach.

He voted against a $500 million cut in military assistance.

He voted against reducing, by $150 million, the President's contingency fund, thus granting the Chief Executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign relations.

He voted to increase, by $225 million, military assistance funds.

He voted for an appropriation of $3.3 billion.

In 1958, he voted against a reduction of $500 million in military assistance funds.

Contrary to the implication of Senator GOLDWATER's remarks on Monday, Senator Kennedy on July 6, 1958, simply voted to allocate a cut already made by the Foreign Relations Committee. This is another example of the half-truth giving an inaccurate picture of history.

As a matter of record Senator Kennedy voted against a $100 million cut in military assistance appropriations and also against a $50 million cut in defense support funds on August 23, 1958.

Senator Kennedy voted for an appropriation of $3.5 billion.

In 1959, Senator Kennedy was against a cut of $550 million in military assistance authorizations.

He voted against a cut of $235 million in defense support funds on July 7, 1959, and on the same day opposed a similar cut of $83.5 million in the same category.

He voted against a $45 million cut in special assistance authorizations.

He voted against a move to cut the contingency fund authorization by $30 million.

He voted finally for an appropriation of $3.6 billion.

This, then, is the historically accurate record of Senator John F. Kennedy's support of a bipartisan foreign aid program, complementing a bipartisan foreign policy.

Does it show, as the Senator from Arizona purported to do last Monday, that the President when he was in the Senate failed to support a sensible foreign aid policy? Hardly.

What does it show?

It shows that time and again Senator John Kennedy voted with President Eisenhower in support of a program which was, and is, in our national security interest.

It shows that Senator Kennedy and other Democrats never let partisan advantage deter them from support of a bipartisan program.

It shows a careful discrimination between slashing, irrational irresponsible cuts and prudent, intelligent consideration of the national interest.

The attack on the President's record on foreign aid as a Member of Congress is done in the worst possible taste by taking certain aspects of it out of context. It is an attempt to rationalize the appalling withdrawal from a bipartisan foreign policy that started with Senator Vandenberg. It takes away the real weapons to effectively combat communism and substitutes old rehashed anti-Communist speeches by those who wish to do nothing but make speeches. The reckless blind wielding of the meat axe that cut so deeply into the foreign aid bill also smashed the image of unity that has long enabled our Nation through our President, regardless of party, to properly protect our national security interest.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION OF SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 671) to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the first week in March of each year to be Save Your Vision Week. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced an identical resolution in the Senate and has been joined by a number of his colleagues of the Senate in its sponsorship. I hope that a number of my colleagues in this Chamber will feel impelled to offer similar resolutions.

Save Your Vision Week is one of the very first of the promotion of good causes to have been observed in our country, having begun as long ago as 1927. The American Optometric Association was the original sponsor of the event and has continued it ever since. It is joined in this observance by numerous organizations and groups representing the illuminating engineers, public utilities, educators, driver examiners, safety personnel, health professions and so many others that I will not take your time to list them here.

All of the Governors of our States and most mayors of our cities, have at one time or another, issued proclamations calling upon their constituents to observe this special week during the first part of March.

In my own State of Colorado, Gov. John A. Love, signed the proclamation for Save Your Vision Week this year. Following his proclamation there were public education presentations during the week on the values of good vision by some 25 Colorado radio and television stations. Many of Colorado's leading newspapers carried instructional messages on care of the eyes and how to improve our visual environment.

Save Your Vision Week encourages community action for the betterment of us all. The Denver Metropolitan Lions Clubs this year raised sufficient funds to purchase an expensive electronic instrument for use in the detection of glaucoma—a disease which may cause blindness particularly among persons past middle age. It will be used by the optometrists of Denver in screening as many of the over 40 population as they can reach by invitations to use their service, at no charge from the profession.

After the Save Your Vision Week campaign this year, a number of our prominent citizens got together to undertake operation of the Colorado Optometric Center which will include, in addition to care for needy persons, programs in vision research, vision problems of brain-injured children, care of children whose vision problems contribute to tendencies of delinquency, reading problems, specialized visual training, industrial vision, and many community problems related to vision.

The board of trustees for this new community center is headed by John R. Streltzer, U.S. collector of customs for the Denver region, and a former State representative. Serving with him on the board are such farsighted citizens as Colorado's Supreme Court Chief Justice, Albert T. Frantz, Governor Love, and Lt. Gov. Robert L. Knous. If expanded observance of Save Your Vision Week occurs through passage of my resolution, we may expect more lay persons to emulate the community leadership for better vision which has been stimulated in the State which I am so proud to serve.

As with many of our great blessings, we are inclined to take vision for granted. We tend to forget that our sight must be protected, that much blindness is preventable, that many visual problems can be reduced if action is taken in time. Save Your Vision Week recalls to us the need to care for our vision.

Of all the impairments among civilized man, vision tops the list. These figures may serve as some kind of index of the need for vision services in our general population:

An estimated 100 million people in the United States—as many as 58 percent of the population require some kind of vision—correction by glasses, visual training, or other treatment.

About 9,800,000 children need vision care; a large number of these children should be wearing glasses.

About 350,000 persons are legally blind. Of this number approximately 75 percent could be wholly or partially rehabilitated if they were informed about their condition and where they should go for improvement of their remaining vision.

Some 1,500,000 persons are blind in one eye.

An estimated 2,600,000 Americans have, or have had to some degree, a crossed eye. This condition has caused about 1 million persons to have reduced vision in one eye.

Education of the public to the benefits they can derive from vision services, and proper visual environments, may enable more of our citizens toward greater independence and prevent more severe visual problems. Recent scientific skill and knowledge have improved the variety and effectiveness of our vision specialists' services. Save Your Vision Week assists in making known to our citizens the importance of caring for their vision. Passage of the resolution I am introducing would be tangible evidence of this House's interest in the visual health and rehabilitation of all our citizens.

That inadequate vision contributes heavily to accidents is becoming widely recognized, not only in our factories and commercial establishments, but also among our Nation's drivers. The latter, in particular, are becoming more aware of the importance not only of visual acuity, but also of depth perception, field of vision, and color discrimination. However, there is a lingering belief on the part of many managements that the individual worker is usually aware of his vision inadequacies and has been corrected so far as possible. Unfortunately, this belief is too often ill founded.

The onset of impaired vision, whether through disease or the aging process, is frequently so gradual and subtle that the affected person may be totally unaware of his loss until some special event such as Save Your Vision Week causes him to seek out a vision specialist for an examination.

In this space age our sights are on distant stars and planets revolving in orbits coming ever closer to our reach. What good is it to see so far and yet neglect the vision and visual needs of so many now so near?

The God-given gift of vision is our most precious asset. For human eyes, only the best is good enough. Through annual observance of Save Your Vision Week we demonstrate most dramatically the importance of good vision which is more important than machines or material to the efficiency and productivity of our Nation.

KEEP RED CHINA OUT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have added my name to the list of congressional endorsers of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The purpose of the committee is not only to prevent Red China's admission to the U.N. but also to oppose trade relations with the Peiping regime and to prevent it from occupying any further free territory in southeast Asia.

The aims of the committee are especially timely. In the past few months certain groups in America have again begun to urge an accommodation with the Red Chinese. These advocates of a new look at our China policy urge consideration of not only Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations but also establishment of diplomatic and trade relations with the Peiping regime.

The benefits flowing from such an accommodation with Red China would be few. Neither recognition, trade, nor U.N. membership would change its policies, which since 1950 have been characterized by repeated aggression against its neighbors.

In that year the Chinese attack on American and South Korean forces prolonged the Korean war and caused a great loss of American life.

In 1950 they also invaded and conquered Tibet eventually forcing the rightful ruler of that country to flee into exile.

In 1958 they increased their threats against Quemoy and Matsu and shelled the islands for 2 solid months.

Last year even India suffered from Chinese aggression when Peiping tried to resolve its border claims by force.

Throughout this period the Red Chinese have provided support to rebel groups in Laos and South Vietnam.

And only last month Red China's ally, North Korea, made unprovoked incursions into South Korea and took the lives of three American servicemen, thus adding more names to the long list of Americans who have lost their lives in that peninsula.

Contrary to benefiting the United States, admittance of Red China to the United Nations would sanction its past aggressive activities and give free rein to such activities in the future. It would also dishearten our allies in Asia—especially in South Vietnam and Laos where we have worked so hard and spent so much to stem the tide of Red conquest. Trade relations would also benefit Red China far more than the United States and would only help to solidify their tyrannical rule. The idea of nonstrategic trade with Red China is sadly reminiscent of the 1930's where nonstrategic scrap metal trade with Japan later paid us dividends in the form of bombs at Pearl Harbor and Guadalcanal.

It is clear that recognition of an aggressive nation such as Red China will bring us no benefits. Rather it will harm our national interests.

I am opposed to any so-called two China policy in the United Nations. The Republic of China is a member in good standing of both the Security Council and the General Assembly. There is not justifiable reason to change its status. Admitting the Peiping regime would make a mockery of the U.N. Charter and further strengthen the Communist world against the free world.

I also am opposed to any trade relations between the United States and Communist China. Such trade would help an avowed enemy far more than it could possibly benefit us.

I believe we must stand firm in preventing any further Red Chinese occupation of free territory. In the interest of national security and national honor, we cannot abandon Quemoy and Matsu and sacrifice the lives of thousands of free Chinese soldiers and the civilian population of these islands.

A timely reminder of the true nature of the Communist threat was provided, Mr. Speaker, by an editorial published in the Rochester, N.Y., Times Union earlier this month, which commented on the death of Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley. A former Ambassador to China, General Hurley's warning in 1944 as to the true nature of the Chinese Communists went unheeded in Washington. It is worthwhile to remember, as the editorial states, that "the fundamental goal of every Communist is the worldwide triumph of his ideology and the burial of freedom and private initiative." In recognition of the truth of this statement I am proud to add my name to those of many of my distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate as a congressional endorser of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues the complete text of the editorial to which I have referred:

GENERAL HURLEY'S WARNING IS STILL WORTH HEEDING

Nearly two decades have passed since Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley stood Washington on its ear by insisting that the Communists were up to no good in China.

His warning was recalled this week when the ramrod-straight, mustachioed, dashing general died in New Mexico at 80. It had almost been forgotten. It shouldn't be because it bears lessons for today.

FEARED CHICOMS

After serving President Hoover as a Cabinet member and then Presidents Roosevelt and Truman as diplomatic troubleshooter, General Hurley was named Ambassador to Chiang Kai-shek's embattled Chinese Government in Chungking in 1944.

He resigned in late 1945 in protest over U.S. policy toward China. His objections were chiefly to the granting of U.S. aid to the Chinese Communists, who were fighting Chiang's Nationalists about as hard as they fought the Japanese, and to the Yalta concessions made to Stalin at Chiang's expense to induce Russia to enter the war against Japan.

Anti-Communist views of such generals as Hurley and Wedemeyer were unpopular in that time. The important thing, Washington felt, was to end the war and, after that, to unify feuding factions in China. The Chinese Communists were largely considered "agrarian reformers," and Chiang was pressured to bring them into his government.

A conservative Republican, General Hurley became so embroiled in politics (he lost three straight senatorial elections) and assorted rightwing causes that he seemed more obstreperous than constructive.

Yet, looking back, it is plain that General Hurley was acutely, painfully correct in his foresight. The Communist plot unfolded. In 1949 Mao Tse-tung took over China and launched a bitter anti-U.S. campaign which has yet to reach full fury.

It is too simple a reading of history to contend that an anti-Communist policy in China during and after World War II would have been always feasible, or that it would have prevented the Reds' takeover. Chiang's government was too corrupt, and the tide of Chinese history flowed against him at that point.

FUNERAL PLOTTED

General Hurley provided no practical alternatives, just as those who in this day argue that coexistence with Communists is impossible overlook the fact that the alternative policy likely is nuclear nonexistence. The United States can accept some accommodations with Communists when doing so is in America's national interest as well as all of mankind's.

But let us all never forget, as General Hurley did not, that the fundamental goal of every Communist is the worldwide triumph of his ideology and the burial of freedom and private initiative, however tactics may shift. Americans may not be able to shoot down these gravediggers, but it will always be folly to help them with their shovels.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks; and also that all Members who wish to speak on today's march on Washington may insert their remarks in the RECORD following my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation's Capital is host to more than a hundred thousand citizens, representing every one of the States that comprise our Union. These men and women are here to participate in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. The primary purpose of this crusade is not to intimidate the Congress but to expose to public view in dramatic fashion the intensity of feeling, not only of those directly affected, but, equally important, by those who most earnestly believe the unjustifiable discriminatory practices with which we are all so familiar cannot and must not be tolerated longer.

The question of full and complete civil rights and privileges for all our citizens is a moral issue. It is also an economic issue. It is further an international issue. And it is one that must be faced and resolved with expediency. When the civil rights of only one citizen is violated, the rights of all are put in jeopardy. We want to—and indeed, we must—assure that in our great land there are no second-class citizens.

I have noted that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], has requested and obtained permission to address the House today for 5 hours. I most sincerely hope he will not permit these remarks to become partisan, for if he should, there will be those who will inquire how many will stand to be counted when the House has before it for consideration a complete civil rights bill; complete as to subject matter already included and that which we trust will be added, such as fair employment practices, or as it is now better named, equal employment opportunity.

Thus I ask my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in a return to the spirit of the founding documents of our Nation. Let us end the ravages of segregation and discrimination in our land, and assert our leadership of the world through assurance of freedom to all Americans.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, citizens from all parts of our Nation have gathered in Washington today for one of the greatest demonstrations in our history in support of a piece of legislation before Congress. The right of citizens to come to the seat of their government, and to petition Congress for a redress of grievances, is one of the great rights protected by the first amendment of the Constitution. That this march is occurring here today—with every step being taken by our Government and the District to assure its peaceful and unhindered conduct—is striking proof that the Constitution remains a living document in our own time in spite of the problems that give rise to the march.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to participate more fully in today's events, by accepting an invitation from the march leaders to be present at the Lincoln Memorial. Unfortunately, one of my committees was involved with extremely important matters this morning. And this afternoon, of course, the House is considering the railroad labor dispute, a matter of such overriding national importance that I could not in good conscience fail to be present for the full debate and final vote. My own view, Mr. Speaker, is that a Member of Congress should certainly make every effort to respond to invitations to outside events of national significance, particularly when related to matters of legislative concern, and to receive constituents and others who have an interest in pending legislation. But I believe my primary obligation is to meet fully my legislative responsibilities, both in committee and on the floor. I could hardly serve my district and my State in an effective manner by doing otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I make these remarks to affirm the fact that my absence from the march today indicates no lack of support on my part for the President's civil rights proposals. Most of the President's recommendations, including the controversial public accommodations section, are already law in Oregon, as well as in many other States. Our experience with such laws in Oregon has been uniformly favorable. My State's civil rights laws are among the best in the Nation, not the least of the reasons for their success is that compliance has been secured by persuasion and conciliation rather than coercion. Indeed, thanks to the intelligent administration by our Commissioner of Labor, Norman Neilsen, no recourse to the Oregon courts has ever been necessary to effect the purposes of the statutes I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, the march on Washington for jobs and freedom is a historic affirmation of the right of petition, a striking expression of protest against widespread injustices, and a call to the conscience of all Americans. The President's recommended legislation, which I expect we will soon be considering, is an affirmation of our national responsibility to correct those injustices and a call to the conscience of all of us as legislators. I wait the opportunity, joined by many others, I am sure, to answer the call of the President, the petition of our Negro citizens, and the demands of the times.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in commenting on the dramatic demonstration taking place here in Washington today. It symbolizes the deep feelings of Americans of all races that inequality of treatment of any of our citizens is no longer tolerable under our system of democratic government. Discrimination, second-class citizenship, denial of voting rights and other basic rights guaranteed all persons under the Constitution weaken our Nation at home and cripple our foreign policy in vast nonwhite areas of the world. Such undemocratic practices undermine our governmental system and divide our people. The time is long overdue when we must face up to this vast socio-economic problem of our time.

Mr. Speaker, the comprehensive civil rights bill now being considered by the House Judiciary Subcommittee deals with the many aspects of this problem. President Kennedy has forcefully provided the type of leadership that will make possible the important steps forward to eliminate injustices that cause racial tension. As he said during the campaign:

> Only a President willing to use all the resources of his high office can provide the leadership, the determination, and direction which are essential if we are to eliminate racial and religious discrimination from American society.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the question of basic constitutional freedoms is not a partisan one. I am confident that when the civil rights bill is before us our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will search their consciences and do what is necessary to help correct the racial injustices which all of us know exist throughout the Nation.

The many thousands of people who assemble at the shrine of the great emancipator today to dramatize these injustices do not seek any special treatment or consideration above that afforded other citizens. All that the freedom marchers seek is fair treatment, guarantees of rights to which they are entitled and which have been too long denied them—in voting, employment, education, housing, transportation, and in public accommodations.

Mr. Speaker, I salute these Americans who are demonstrating so conclusively, their deep convictions in the vital area of human rights today, and particularly commend and welcome, those from our own State of Massachusetts who have made the trip. We here in Congress have an obligation to act on the Civil Rights Act of 1963 before adjournment. Those of us in both parties who believe strongly in the objectives of this march on Washington must work closely together to make certain that a good civil rights bill is enacted and the underlying causes of racial unrest eliminated from our society.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues today in calling attention to the people of this great Nation the significance of the events that are taking place in this Capital today, August 28, in the year of our Lord 1963.

The giant demonstration by the colored citizens of this Nation point up to the failures of many of the facets of our governmental operations—failures that have allowed a situation to grow up in this country which has caused a cleavage between its citizens because of the discrimination caused by the color of the skin of one as against the other.

Basically, the prime problem can be said to stem from a failure to insist upon an equality in educational opportunity, an equality in job opportunity, and an equality in housing opportunity.

Though we must, as a racial group—accept upon all our shoulders the direct blame for such failures—the colored race is not entirely without blame. Far, far too many of our colored population have been lax in their own personal attitude toward the advancement of their own families.

You will note that in the main, those parents who made their families their prime concern have succeeded in overcoming the obstacles placed in their way, and although it took a great deal of self-sacrifice they are responsible for having placed in many positions in Government and in civil life a great number of qualified, capable Negroes who have added immeasurably to the stature of our race. All of us, at one time or another, except the very early settlers—have had to come through in a lesser, or greater degree—barriers of prejudice and bigotry and discrimination.

I can speak with authority and personal knowledge of the struggles of the early immigrants like my parents who came from Italy. They were strangers in a strange land with strange occupations, strange habits and customs. It can be said without fear of contradiction that the immigrant peasant class, to which my parents belonged, came to this country—passed on through their lives in this Nation little known, unheralded, and not too well remembered.

They were indeed a lost generation, however, in their own minds, and in their own hearts they knew that they would live on in the next oncoming generations because of the sacrifices they made to educate their children, to protect their welfare, even though it meant—in many instances—living as close to the line of abject poverty as one could live without falling over the abyss into degradation.

They worked side by side in the commonest of common labor with the Negro, the Mexican, the Pole, and the Slav—and the many others from Central Europe who were the great nonentities who built the industrial and mining strength of this Nation. However, the Negro had an added handicap because on top of the bigotry and prejudice aimed at many of these immigrants because of religion, language and their peculiar customs, the Negro had the added handicap of color.

The sons of these immigrants have now, as a result of the faith and sacrifices of their parents, have entered into the lifestream of American politics and business, professors and the clergy.

A new sense of responsibility has been awakened and perhaps we shall, in this day and age, witness the emergence of our Negro citizens as equal partners in this Nation of ours which has done so much for so many of the world's forgotten people.

This demonstration today is an effort as I see it to call attention to the awakening of the Negro peoples and many of our white citizens to the needs of the moment, to remedy the wrongs and to push forward with speed and deliberation the reforms that are necessary in order that this Government may serve all of its peoples, equally, faithfully, without favor for one over the other.

The Negro must realize, as all of us have long ago realized, that the road will not be the smoothest, that there will be obstacles to overcome, but he must also be convinced that there will be many helping to remove the obstacles and to smooth the road in order that this Nation can, with its united peoples, provide leadership so badly needed in a world that has never known peace on a universal scale.

I pray with all of the well wishers that the leaders of this great movement will consider well their every action so that the respect due their race will not be blemished by any actions of theirs, or their followers.

I have faith in the future and have no fear the peoples of this Nation will assume their responsibilities, each in their own way guided by their conscience, and in their inborn humanitarianism that has made this Nation the nation amongst all nations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today the eyes of the world are on Washington. The world watches this mighty Nation being petitioned by thousands of its citizens to redress grievances and humiliating wrongs suffered by those citizens because of the color of their skin.

This is no time to congratulate ourselves that we feel secure enough to permit such a massive demonstration. Indeed, if congratulations are due, they are owed to those courageous Negroes who so deeply believe in democracy, that they continue to use only constitutional rights in the face of outrageous provocation by those who would deny them those rights.

Our duty, in this Chamber, will not be discharged by congratulations or by participation in the demonstration. Our task is to come back here and see to it that a decent civil rights bill is passed, and by decent, I mean one that insures equal rights in education and in voting, fair employment practices, and equal access to public accommodations to every citizen of this country, no matter what his color.

I do not like to hear talk of giving up one to get the others. Simple morality demands that men of good conscience put an end to the ludicrous spectacle of dividing up equality, and giving a little equality here and a little equality there. Let us resolve to do, at long last, what is right and just.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in endorsing the President's civil rights program.

There can be no turning back at this point. A rejection of the civil rights bill would be a disaster without precedent in our history.

Throughout the Nation, and throughout the world we have taken our stand in favor of liberty and justice for all citizens—regardless of race and color. The Bill of Rights must be made a living document for all Americans. It is to our credit that we have the courage to recognize that this has not always been the case.

The right to vote, the right to an adequate education, the right to a decent job, and the right to live in clean and wholesome surroundings are basic rights for all our citizens. By insuring that these really are rights for all Americans we will strengthen our society and elevate our American way of life.

When we ask support for these principles we are following in the footsteps of our Founding Fathers. These are basic American requests—we must be sure that our American Government understands and grants them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to formally "go on record" in support of the President's civil rights program.

As a resident of one of the original States of this Union—and one, which I am proud to say, has recognized the rights of all its citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color, for many years—I feel the President's program is proper.

American citizens—from coast to coast—should have the right to vote. We know that many who already have this privilege do not exercise it, but no person born and raised in America, 21 years of age and over, should be denied the opportunity to do so if he cares to use it.

I feel that all should have an equal opportunity to secure an education. Again we know that many who have this advantage do not fully appreciate it or use it. But that does not permit us to condone present practices which deny this right to all.

All able-bodied Americans who want to work should have a chance to do so. However, we are today witnessing an increasing rate of unemployment due to the ever-expanding use of automation and the disappearance of unskilled and semiskilled jobs. Without additional education—both academic and occupational—few, if any, will ever again be employable.

The pride of home and family is inherent in the American citizen. To deny anyone—because of race, creed, or color—the right to live and raise his family in surroundings he can afford is contrary to our belief that each generation should progress beyond the preceding one, and benefit from the Nation's growth. Every man should have the chance to give his family the best he can afford.

These are "rights" the President is seeking for all Americans.

As one of the sponsors of the Fair Employment Practices Act in Pennsylvania, and a stanch supporter of the equal rights program in my home State, I am happy and proud to join the President in his attempt to extend these rights to all our people throughout the Nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, today, on this historic occasion of the peoples march on Washington, the need to enact civil rights legislation has taken on the utmost urgency.

In war and peace the American people have met challenge after challenge with vigor and resourcefulness. But perhaps the most persistent challenge of all is the one which confronts the Nation today—the challenge of civil rights. Constitutional amendments, court decisions, acts of Congress, executive orders, State and local legislation, the work of private agencies, as well as efforts of Negroes and other minority groups, have helped to remove many of the barriers to full citizenship.

But there still remain profound inconsistencies between this Nation's principles and its practices. Let us demonstrate that the Congress has the capacity for action. The civil rights challenge is not a sectional nor partisan problem. Rather, it is a national crisis that demands bipartisan unity and a nationwide solution.

The time has come for the Congress of the United States to enact affirmative and comprehensive legislation to make it clear to all that racial discrimination has no place in American life.

Let us heed the words of our President in his message to Congress:

> In this year the emancipation centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take the opportunity afforded by today's march on Washington for jobs and freedom to reiterate my support for the Civil Rights Act of 1963 now being studied by the House Judiciary Committee.

It is my hope that the demonstration now in progress will prove a peaceful and effective means of calling the attention of the Congress to the manifold problems confronting the American Negro. I intend to personally participate in this demonstration, for, as a member of a minority group, I can only sympathize with those who must constantly face the frustration, degradation, and economic inequities that must result from any discrimination based on color, race, creed, or national origin.

Nonetheless, I recognize that Congress cannot legislate the spirit of tolerance that is the only true solution to the problem of racial discrimination. It can, however, take positive steps to assure that Negroes are not denied those rights promised them by our Constitution. Consequently, I favor the pending legislation in the belief that it is needed to end certain discriminatory practices presently afflicting the Negro.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that thousands of Americans have felt impelled to journey here today to give witness to their burning desire for equality of opportunity and rights for every citizen, is a severe reproach to this country. It dramatizes how great a gulf still remains between the American ideals—that all men are created equal, that our Government is to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty—and the realities of discrimination against our Negro citizens.

I deeply regret that this demonstration, involving great inconvenience, effort and expense, was necessary to attempt to make America what it professes to be. Every act of discrimination, every failure to use our powers to end racial injustice brands us as hypocrites. Racial discrimination cannot be squared with our ideals.

Ironically, it has been charged that those who wish to recall America to its ideals are lead by Communists or are Communist inspired. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The demonstration today is profoundly American and is remarkable in its demonstration of loyalty by American Negroes to a country and a society in which they have suffered so many injustices. Yet it is the measure of the Negro citizens of America and of the attraction of our ideals that Negroes are not disaffected or seeking some form of equal separatism. They want and should immediately have full participation in America.

We should be thankful that American Negroes have chosen this goal. This was their decision. But the attainment of their goal is a job for all Americans.

The march on Washington for jobs and freedom is intended to give unmistakable evidence, that may be seen and believed by all, that a great, final advance in civil rights must be made now. In the legislation now before this Congress, we should aim not only at taking another step, but at using all the available legislative power to eliminate racial discrimination. We must pass a comprehensive, effective civil rights bill and see that it is vigilantly implemented.

I hope that the demonstration today will also help to change the views of those Americans who have been indifferent to the problem of racial discrimination.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today thousands of Negro citizens have come to Washington from every part of the Nation to seek redress of their grievances.

The Constitution guarantees all citizens the right to come to the Capital and peaceably assemble for this purpose. Accordingly, the march on Washington is in the highest tradition of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the national character of this event is most noteworthy. It demonstrates that the discrimination and injustices inflicted upon the Negro are not confined to one section of this land. These immoral practices occur throughout the country.

Consequently, there must be national action to remedy this situation. Only in this way can the many interrelated problems facing the Negro be solved.

The proposals submitted by President Kennedy deal effectively with some of the most urgent and pressing needs of the Negro community. The passage of a strong civil rights bill would show the people of the Nation and the world that this Congress does respond to the call of the people and is determined to fulfill the promise of America.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the State of New Jersey, and the 11th Congressional District which it is my honor to represent in the House, has participated so wholeheartedly in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. The citizens of New Jersey of all races, creeds, and colors, have demonstrated their commitment to the democratic ideals on which our Nation was founded. They want the blessings of liberty assured for all Americans and their children. They want the great American principle of equality translated into action. There can be no second-class citizenship, no denial of equal access to the facilities of our society, in a free and democratic nation.

The people of America have shown a will to resolve this issue. We in the Congress must meet our responsibility to act promptly on the pending Civil Rights Act of 1963. The crisis demands statesmanship and wisdom on the part of all Members.

The Congress must also face up to the acute problems of a sluggish economy, intolerable unemployment, and desperate poverty. Let the Congress move forward to secure equal employment opportunities for minority groups and full employment opportunities for all.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, today from all over the country, 140,000 Americans have convened in our Nation's Capital to exercise one of the fundamental rights of our Constitution—the right to assemble peaceably and petition the Government for a redress of grievances. On this day, whites and Negroes join together to petition that the guarantee of equal rights and individual liberties set down in our Constitution be extended to all Americans. Knowing as we do that these human rights should be truly inalienable and self-evident, we observe the realization of their 30-year old hopes and plans for a march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

We are today in the midst of a social revolution. The demonstrations, the tensions, and the strife which we are witnessing are the results of a national awakening, a realization that prejudice, discrimination, and second-class citizenship are incompatible with the basic tenets of a free society—equal rights and equal opportunities for all citizens.

As the President has pointed out, the racial problem which confronts us is basically a moral issue. The diseases of ignorance, hatred, and prejudice shall be eradicated only through the curative processes of education, understanding, and a new dedication on the part of all Americans to those ideals set down in the Declaration of Independence and reaffirmed 100 years ago in the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today marks an historic milestone in the march of the American Negro for the equal rights which are the just due of every American citizen. But although this is an historic moment, in a sense the march on Washington is just a repetition of history. Many times in the past, large groups of American citizens have come to their Nation's Capital to exercise their constitutional rights, embodied in the first amendment to the Constitution, "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." This amendment is one of 10 making up the Bill of Rights and I am most proud to say that my State, New Jersey, was the first to ratify these significant amendments. In 1892 came Coxey's army. In 1913 came the suffragettes; and in 1932 there were the bonus marchers. These are but some of the most notable examples. The thousands of American citizens, black and white, who are assembling here today are but exercising an historic privilege of the American people to speak their mind through peaceful demonstration.

It is very unfortunate, in a way, that such a demonstration should be necessary, that 100 years after the Emancipation, the American Negro should still bear the oppressive burden of racial discrimination. But with continued efforts by all Americans of all races, this situation is well on the way to being rectified. In this context, the march on Washington, and the civil rights bill now pending before the Congress, are but small steps in the greater march toward freedom and equality. If we as a nation are to fully realize the ideals of American democracy, it is incumbent upon us, in the months and years ahead, to work together, hand in hand, to eliminate all irrational forms of discrimination. The struggle for social justice is not settled in one day or in one law, but only by constant and deliberate efforts by every citizen. Only thus can the American ideals of self-respect and self-direction be realized for all.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and my fellow Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the march on Washington for jobs and freedom now taking place here today.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope and fervently pray that this march will be carried out in the great American tradition of peaceful petitioning for the redress of grievances. I know this peaceful demonstration, the march on Washington for jobs and freedom will be a moving dramatization of the pressing need for enactment of the President's comprehensive civil rights bill now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am only too happy to add my voice to those who are paying tribute to the march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that I am a Member of this 88th Congress, for we have the privilege of meeting the greatest domestic challenge of the century. We are given a rare opportunity to earn an outstanding place in the history of our country; we are called upon to end the terrible humiliations and soul-shattering degradations now suffered by millions of our fellow citizens, Negroes and members of other minority groups.

The more than 150,000 persons petitioning us in Washington today are not asking alms or favors; they are demanding only what is rightfully theirs. Every right-thinking American looks to us for responsible leadership; discrimination based upon color, race, religion, or national origin, is a moral wrong and it must be wiped out now.

I urge this Congress to discharge its responsibility on the side of fairness and equality and pass the strong civil rights legislation necessary to guarantee equality to all. Woe unto us and the future of our Nation if we fail in our duty at this time. It is my earnest prayer that when the work of this Congress has been completed on the civil rights legislation before us, we will have earned the respect of the true freedom-loving people of our Nation who desire to help their fellow man and of all those throughout the world whose eyes are upon us now, when the crucial issue of civil rights is our major responsibility.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who bid welcome to the thousands of American citizens who are today discharging an inalienable American right—the right to march on the Nation's Capital. Indeed, this right is as old as the Republic itself, and one on which I look with approval.

The right to petition the Government becomes almost a duty when there is an unfilled gap in the performance of our democracy. The massive demonstration that we witness today, which is intended to induce this Government and all of its citizens to call upon our moral, legal, and humanitarian forces to correct a longstanding injustice and denial of elementary rights to some of our citizens, is in the finest of our traditions.

The exercise of the right of petition is certainly most commendable when it is supported by a just cause. To those who march today, from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial, I offer this modest voice in acclaiming that yours is, indeed, a just cause.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, today's demonstration by many thousands of our Negro citizens, and others who agree, is likely to be of more symbolic value to the participants than an effective lobbying device. Certainly, those of us who are for a strong civil rights bill know who we are; those who will oppose are obvious; those who will waver will do so for many reasons not connected with the present gathering in Washington, even though some may use it as an excuse.

The symbolism of the march is salient because of its effect on the individual who participates, and his friends across the Nation. The acceptance of inferior status makes such status possible; to proclaim that you will no longer accept inferiority is the first crucial step to freedom and equality.

Why should any be disturbed at the symbolism of the march? They ask only what is guaranteed already. Certainly, it is our responsibility as Members of the most powerful governing body in the world—and in most cases as members of that world's white minority—to recognize and implement the obvious: This is a free nation and it must be free for all if it is to be the leader of a free world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a simple faith in God and without that faith there would be no purpose in life. I cannot envision the God of my faith judging the quality of a soul by the color of its human encasement. I have the faith, too, and it is a simple unquestioning faith, that in time as God shall rule it, there will be a world of peace and contentment in a climate of brotherhood. This is my faith. I think it is the faith of most Americans, however, confused temporarily and perhaps frightened some of good will and of good hearts may be in the change from a status quo to which they have been accustomed.

There can be in our good land no second-class citizens. There can be no steerage quarters in the American ship of state now that we have become the greatest and most powerful nation in the world, the bulwark and the hope of mankind in its grasp for that brotherhood that alone can bring contentment, and fullness, and dignity, and atunement to the Divine concept, to the human race.

What is transpiring in the Nation's Capital today is far and above the mean measure of one race of Americans in dispute with another race of Americans. It marks and dramatizes the year of moral awakening, stirring in the hearts and minds of all Americans the voice of conscience and building a determination that we, in this generation and in this, our country, will build on earth a brotherhood of man, real and enduring.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today's march for freedom and jobs has been denounced by some as unwarranted and unnecessary.

Rather, it should be an historic reminder that the great promise of 100 years ago—of the Emancipation Proclamation—is still only a dream for far too many Americans. It is a reminder that equality of opportunity for all Americans, regardless of their race, creed, or nationality, has not yet been fully achieved, and that we in this Congress are both confronted with the challenge and the opportunity of making this dream a reality.

There can be no question that discrimination in this great and wonderful country of ours continues to exist today; discrimination in jobs, in education, in voting, in housing, and in the many and varied facets of our daily life. This discrimination has been amply exposed in surveys and studies, and it is eloquently demonstrated by the thousands marching in our Nation's Capital today.

Mr. Speaker, all men are not created equal in abilities, in talents, or in motivations, but they should not be denied an equality of opportunity simply because their skin is dark. This country has consistently denied such prejudice and it should be our job today to insure that this pledge is translated into practice.

We are presented with such an opportunity in the legislation proposed by the President—legislation which I am proud to have joined the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and several of my colleagues in sponsoring. This legislation would enable us to take a further and urgently needed step. It would enable us to close still further the existing gap between our goals and our realizations.

Mr. Speaker, the dread disease of discrimination has plagued us for far too long. Its tragic economic waste and moral wrong must not be allowed to continue.

The marchers today are testimony to this point. Let us heed their call. Let us pass strong and effective legislation before we adjourn; legislation which will insure simple justice and basic rights of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the thoughtful article, written from London by the noted columnist, Robert Estabrook, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, to our colleagues' attention.

As Mr. Estabrook states so clearly:

> How long can a nation which does not insure equal treatment for a tenth of its citizens be respected as the guardian of freedom?

The article follows:

Race Equality as Test of Beliefs

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—Europe, and indeed the whole world, will be watching the United States critically tomorrow as civil rights champions converge on Washington. In no small way, what happens over the next few months will be viewed as a measure of American beliefs and leadership. How long can a nation which does not insure equal treatment for a tenth of its citizens be respected as the guardian of freedom?

Often the most persistent questions Americans are asked abroad concern what their country intends to do about the grievances of its Negro citizens. What are the limits of legislative remedies? Can a skeptical Congress be persuaded to vote more than token guarantees? What does the civil rights surge mean for President Kennedy's political future? Could the Republicans actually gain votes by opposing congressional action?

It is no real assuagement of the American illness to note that there also is discrimination elsewhere. Assuredly there is—discrimination relating to race, color, caste, religion, economic circumstance, language and ethnic background. It infests the Communist world as markedly as the non-Communist. One of the more sinister implications of the Soviet-Chinese dispute is the Chinese resort to racism.

Significantly, nothing brought President Kennedy more applause in Berlin than his assertion that Americans are determined to respond to Negro demands for equality and opportunity. Hitler's master race indignities are too recent to require elaboration. The revulsion conditions many European attitudes.

The United States can reasonably ask, not sympathy, but fair judgment. It can cite what has been accomplished in the last 20 years and what the Government is trying to do. It can point to accommodations by people of good will in the South and the support of millions of white citizens for equal opportunity for their Negro compatriots. It can seek understanding that individual relationships condition the problem, that housing and jobs in the North are as important as elimination of more patent discrimination in the South.

The fact that no other major country faces quite the same adjustment with so large a minority brings a certain forbearance abroad. Britain, for example, has a race problem in her own teeming cities with squalid housing conditions. A subtle color bar exists here with respect to well-paying jobs.

Yet, all of this begs the question. Events in America are news. People in Europe, Asia, and Africa know when notables there are denied equal facilities—though not about little daily discriminations—even when they are unaware of discriminations in their own countries. Pictures of police dogs in Birmingham went around the world—and created a ghastly impression.

In fact, world judgments will tend to be essentially unsophisticated, ignoring domestic irritations about tactics and timing. People will have little patience with the niceties of whether the law should apply to Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse, and they won't understand the filibuster any more than they comprehend the intricacies of nuclear fissions. But they will surely get the point if Congress fails to act.

It may be said that change is coming too fast to be orderly, that personal relationships cannot be legislated, that the opinions of others really don't matter in world power terms. The answer is that no nation can schedule change wholly to suit the convenience of its government. Other countries have found that world opinion, in the United Nations and elsewhere, has a very direct bearing upon their ability to carry out their purposes.

The fundamental reason for reform is not so much what others think as what is right as a matter of conscience. Nevertheless, the United States is on trial, and what is at stake, really, is the tarnishing of the American ideal. How well we rally to provide new opportunities will be as much an index to Mr. Kennedy's leadership as relations with the Soviet Union—and a lot more persuasive to many persons.

Former Indian Ambassador G. L. Mehta, a sensitive interpreter of the United States, put the underlying consideration well in a recent speech: "If materialism—whether capitalist or Marxist—is to be defeated, it will not be by amassing personal fortunes or producing fearfully destructive weapons, but by the purposes and ideals to which America has so richly contributed in the struggle for freedom, human dignity, and social justice."

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming cascade of empirical data has descended upon those engaged in the civil rights debate. The legal, sociological and economic aspects of such legislation have been covered in great detail. The most incisive and rational resources of man's inductive reasoning have been mounted and girded for the occasion. But, as so often happens, the product of this cerebral talent pales beside the simple words of one sensitive person.

Mr. Speaker, I beg the attention and the indulgence of this House while I read a short letter received just last week from a resident of my district:

MR. FRASER: I would like to express my feeling on integration as a citizen of the United States.

I believe that all men are created equal. No man should be persecuted from the time he is born because of his color or creed. This has been said many times by many people, but I believe this to be a fact, and I will do everything I can as long as I live to uphold this.

The idea of Negroes being segregated in schools, in churches (of all places), and restaurants, or any other place is ignorance. I am sure the Negro runs into this sort of thing from the time he is seven or eight and starts to go out of the home.

I have three children, and I would hurt and feel terrible inside if this happened to them. Imagine how a Negro mother must feel. I will try my very best to bring up my children with the idea that people are to be treated as individuals for their own merits. The idea of color or religion should never come into the mind, but the individual should be able to judge people for their own worth.

We have lived in a university village for almost 5 years, and the children are about as different in color, race and creed as any you can imagine. We lived next to Indians from India, Jewish children, Negro, Japanese, Chinese, and a family from Czechoslovakia. I have had one of each of these children in my home and had a Boy Scout troop that was like the United Nations, with the children getting along very well. We had as one of our projects something about each of the countries, and each boy was very proud of his country. We all shared with each other, and everyone learned from this—especially me, as a Scout leader. There was no discrimination that I know of. We had behavior problems, on a small degree, but with any group of boys you will have this. It had nothing to do with nationality, but with individual problems of children.

I think that Americans should not wait for the Negro or any other minority to obtain these simple rights that we as whites take so for granted. The Negro has waited long enough, and with everyone behind them I think that the next generation or two will see a real change in the outlook of what freedom really means. The problem is really a problem of the whites, and our conscience should not let us rest until all of us do something for these unfortunate people.

As Christians, and children of God, how can we discriminate against anyone without hurting God and committing a sin? We are all one flock and have one shepherd.

I do not understand all of the processes of law, and how some southern Congressmen can hold on to these old ways, when the law of common decency and the law of Christ himself says that all men are brothers, and we should love all of our brethren.

I have had this in my heart for a long time, and it has been said by many people before, but, if it will in a very small way help in making a decision in Congress for the enacting of civil rights bills, it will make me very happy.

A mother and housewife.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Earl Sigfrid.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Speaker, the thousands of American citizens who have come to Washington, D.C. today to express their sentiments on a great national problem are in the best tradition of a vital America. The letter I have read speaks in part for the many who had to stay at home.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the House Judiciary Committee. I believe that the time has come to put through the strongest possible bill. It should contain a fair employment practice section. It should also contain the provisions of title III of the 1957 bill which passed the House.

The times are not the same as in 1957 or 1960 when another civil rights bill became the law. Things are vastly different now, and I believe that most Members of Congress realize it. Here is our chance to really pass an extensive civil rights bill which will establish equality for everyone regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Democratic Party has taken the lead in this field through President Kennedy. There are many members of the Republican Party who will join this effort to produce a bipartisan result.

It was my privilege to represent the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania when the conference committee met on FEPC legislation. I helped to bring out the FEPC bill which became the law in Pennsylvania in 1955.

This is a very vital feature of equality—equal job opportunity, which will solve most of the problems. I hope that when the bill comes out the Members of Congress will support the FEPC provisions.

Make America strong; support the civil rights bill.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to determine whether history is made up of a a few great events or innumerable small incidents. Likewise, we cannot really say whether the great events of history are of a whole piece or are composed of many fragments.

Today, August 28, 1963, we are witnessing what surely must be one of the great events of our history. Even now, many people are gathered at the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial in a march for jobs and freedom. To those participating in the march, it is very likely the greatest day in their lives, to those on the outside, it is another event in history, another incident to try to understand. But to us here in the House of Representatives, this great march is another thing: It is a living petition demanding the redress of long held grievances. I do not think that any of us here can understand the forces that have caused this massive assemblage, nor just how we can overcome the grievances behind it. But surely this demonstration demands the best in each of us, and our forthright efforts to understand the enormous problem facing us; it demands our honest attempt to redress these grievances, and solve these problems.

We have proclaimed since the beginning of our Republic, "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Yet, we have in fact not lived up to the promises of that declaration, and have often deliberately acted to deny men their unalienable rights. The scores of thousands of people here today are asking that the goals of the United States with respect to freedom and equality for all men be implemented.

It is incumbent upon us to do all in our power to make all men equal before the law. Laws alone are not the solution to the problems of the American Negro, but nevertheless, legislation is part of the remedy, and we cannot refuse to delay much longer than we have already.

The marchers in Washington today are asking simply for equal chance in life, asking only that all men be treated as men, to be weighed for their worth. Our part in this is to see that the law is colorblind.

This is a time of crisis; it is a time of testing whether our institutions can in fact provide the freedom and equality all men are entitled to. I believe that our institutions can meet this challenge.

Those who would deny freedom and equality for all Americans are denying the principles on which our country is founded. We all know that the realization of the principles enunciated by Jefferson is a difficult problem, but though the road be long and hazardous, we are thrust upon it and must travel it.

It is time for us to live up to our ideals; it is time to act. Long and tragic experience throughout history shows that a minority cannot be exterminated, cannot forever be suppressed, and cannot be denied a place in society. We must admit all men into our open society, lest it become closed; we must allow all our citizens equal access to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in greeting those who have come to Washington to stress the importance of this great work we are engaged in to obtain the equal and moral rights for all citizens. I am happy to greet many of my constituents who have come to Washington on behalf of this cause. The importance of the speedy enactment of legislation guaranteeing to all the rights and privileges under our Constitution I know will not be dimmed when this day has passed.

The eyes of the Nation and the world are focused on Washington, D.C., today, on what we do here, and the departure tonight of those who have traveled here to bring their message will not turn those eyes away. As a lifelong supporter of equal rights for all, I shall continue to work toward the enactment of effective laws for the benefit of all, and I am confident that the year 1963 will go down in history for its contribution to the equality of man—a contribution as great, if not greater than, the contribution of the year 1863.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject to which we address ourselves today is no longer a sectional problem. Events of recent months make it clear that America must face up to a moral challenge that knows no State or other bounds. Our motives will surely be challenged. We shall be accused of seeking political advantage, of pitting group against group in the cynical expectation of winning votes in a national election campaign.

But the tide sweeping across our land today will not wait for a time or a climate on which all can agree. After a century of denial, the time has come to affirm, by law, that the Constitution means what it says.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House will find the courage to make that affirmation.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today to express my approval and hearty support of the great march for jobs and freedom which is now so appropriately taking place on the grounds of the Washington and Lincoln Memorials.

I know that this monumental demonstration will result in legislation being passed by Congress to guarantee Negroes and other minority groups of our country the right to vote, the right to nondiscrimination in places of public accommodations, the right to desegregated public education, the right to equal employment opportunities, and other rights which constitute first-class citizenship.

My congratulations go out to A. Philip Randolph, the director of the march, and to his able and tireless coworkers who have made this an effective demonstration of a just cause.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today in Washington marks an important milestone in the future destiny and welfare of millions of our American citizens. Tens of thousands of our crusading population are in Washington for the purpose of reemphasizing to Congress and the American public the fact that millions of our citizens do not enjoy the full privilege of citizenship which our forefathers outlined when they wrote our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I do feel that the crusade to Washington will have a valuable effect on public opinion throughout America. It will crystallize public sentiment to bring about needed legislation which will place every man, woman, and child in America in the same status under our Constitution, regardless of race or nationality.

I hope and trust that before this Congress adjourns, a fair, equitable, and effective civil rights legislation will be enacted into law. It should guarantee, in the future, that no citizen or group of citizens can complain of not being given complete and full recognition and protection as American citizens.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, today we witness the strange sight of people demonstrating for simple rights recognized in America more than 100 years ago, and actually, long before that.

The issue is not whether the demands for which the demonstrators march are morally right and legally based. That issue has long since been settled.

The only issue facing us is the extent of our tolerance for further suspension of constitutional rights.

Those toward whom tolerance is granted by this delay certainly should be as fair and compassionate as those against whom the wrongs are committed.

Certainly tolerance is neither earned by or due to those in open defiance of the laws of our land; or whose conduct involves both moral injustice and a lack of fiscal integrity in the use of public funds contrary to law.

"Deprivation of constitutional rights calls for prompt rectification." They are present rights, "not merely hopes of some future enjoyment."

The President's civil rights proposal is a fair and sound approach in the correct direction of achieving overdue legal equality and the fundamental substance of that equality; such things as training opportunities, better schools, more jobs, and full enjoyment of voting rights.

Individual professions of civil rights support, fragmented solutions offered on individual programs, or parliamentary devices to avoid the real issue will not suffice. Issues of human dignity must be faced, not in back alleys, but on the high road of forthrightness and responsibleness.

Full support to the President's Civil Rights Act of 1963 and whatever parliamentary steps are needed to enact it, alone will substantially demonstrate at this time one's true position on civil rights and human dignity.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the theme of today's demonstration in Washington is march for jobs and freedom. In addition to its concern for needed civil rights legislation, today's march, like the bonus march of 1932, is closely related to unemployment and the economic distress suffered by millions of our citizens regardless of race or color.

Without "meaningful and dignified jobs at decent wages"—to quote from the list of demands of the demonstrators—there can be no meaningful freedom. Without employment, equal access to public accommodations, decent housing, and adequate and integrated education are empty goals.

I hope that one of the major values of today's march will be to alert the citizens of this country and their representatives in the Congress to the need for responsible action by all levels of government to combat the major problems of joblessness and lost productivity.

Congress will have an opportunity before this session ends to vote on legislation such as area redevelopment, medicare and other programs to meet public and human needs. These bills, and a variety of other legislation, designed to stimulate employment, education, and productivity, are necessary measures which will help answer the demands of all Americans for meaningful and dignified jobs at decent wages.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, in noting this great day in the history of Washington and our Nation.

This Nation is in the midst of an upheaval unprecedented in its history. Every facet of our American culture is involved in this change—be it evolution or a peaceful revolution. Today, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, this Nation is reaching out as never before for a finer and fuller way of life; and for the first time, all Americans are beginning to enjoy the realization of the American dream.

Much remains to be done—we are only at the threshold. But to accelerate our progress, we must know the facts. Official information about minority groups is sadly lacking. The only reliable source is the U.S. census every 10 years. The latest information on family structure, education, income, employment, and many other matters is in the 1960 census. Today we just do not know how many Negroes or Puerto Ricans there are in New York City, or how many Mexicans in Chicago or Los Angeles. We do not know how many are employed, how many have adequate housing. We do know that too many, especially the young people, cannot find jobs, that too many families are badly housed and ill-fed, but it is very difficult to get public officials interested without up-to-date statistics with which to confront them. This is no less true for problems of juvenile delinquency, school dropouts, per capita income, educational achievement, and many, many others. In spite of worthy efforts on the part of some communities—New York City, Cleveland, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C., come to mind—to get facts with which to get action, these problems are too big for any single community to handle. They need to be attacked on a nationwide basis, for they are national problems.

Our largest cities in particular simply cannot keep up with the economic and social forces at work in every single ward, precinct, and school district; yet it is in the family, the school, and the neighborhood that action must be taken to be effective and enduring.

Now is the time to plan the particular remedies for the particular problems that yet face us, and now is the time we need information in order to gage the quantities of time and talent and money necessary for the task, and the areas in which they need the most immediate and intensive application. We must and we will pinpoint the causes and wash away the effects of the social and economic inequities too long permitted to exist beneath the surface of our way of life.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, this has been a truly historic day in our Nation's Capital. From all parts of the country, by bus, train, and car, tens of thousands of men and women, young and old, Negro and white, have assembled in dramatic support of the proposition that all Americans are entitled to the same rights of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I spent part of this morning at the Washington Monument and have just returned from the ceremony at the Lincoln Memorial and I know that the other Members of the House and Senate who were there will agree with me that this enormous peaceful conclave does our country proud. It was a privilege for me to participate in this historic event and I was anxious to do so for two reasons. First, because I know there cannot be full citizenship for anyone, white or black, so long as minority groups have partial or incomplete citizenship. Second, because it is hypocrisy and a moral wrong to perpetuate discrimination in a nation which describes itself as "indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Mr. Speaker, I took the position many months ago that peaceful demonstrations deserve the support of all Americans, whether they be in Danville, Va., Toledo, Ohio, or Washington, D.C. Nothing could be more thoroughly or typically American than protests for full rights of citizenship. And it is well to recognize that it has remained for the American Negro to be the first to mobilize and to protest—not with arms—but with peaceful courage which stirs the conscience of all Americans.

These demonstrations should be a source of both pride and shame to America. Of pride, because here aggrieved people can make their protest without fear of official reprisal, and because for us moral conviction is so potent an influence on legislation that these demonstrators have made their appeal solely to it. Yet of shame, because equality of rights and opportunity is the request of the demonstrators, and not an accomplished fact. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that, with the example of these marchers in mind, this session of Congress will act to remove the inequalities which shame us today.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION AGAINST DOUBLE JEOPARDY IN THE CASE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1961, one of my constituents, Sfc. Ray C. Jackson, after 18 years and 2 months of outstanding service in the U.S. Army, was called unsuspectingly to appear before a general court-martial in Manheim, Germany. Sergeant Jackson was subsequently tried by the military court on charges brought by five enlisted men serving in the ranks directly under Jackson. During the court-martial, Sergeant Jackson's civilian attorney thoroughly and completely discredited the testimony of the accusors. I might mention here, that I now know that at least two of the five accusors were subsequently given undesirable discharges.

As a result of his day in court, the accused was categorically exonerated of every single charge levied against him. At this point, justice had been served. Upon open confrontation in a court of competent jurisdiction, and after a thorough airing of all evidence, Sergeant Jackson was proved to be falsly accused. One can only imagine that at this point, Sergeant Jackson's sigh of relief could only have been paralleled by his original sighs of disbelief when the charges were first made.

After the trial, Sergeant Jackson was sent back to his company and was, in effect, held under arrest in his quarters. He was soon very amazed to learn that he would have to face an administrative board hearing on the very same charges. It was at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the channels of military justice which are designed to protect the constitutional rights of every U.S. citizen became frighteningly clogged.

Acting on the very same evidence, and I shall repeat that: the very same evidence, the 208 board, on which no legal authority sat, doled out to Sergeant Jackson an undesirable discharge and broke him to private. After reading the testimony, in both the courts-martial and the 208 proceedings, of the officers and noncommissioned officers that served over and with the sergeant from Peoria, Ill., all of which was highly favorable to Jackson, I was shocked at the outcome and realized that something had to be done to correct this injustice.

I would feel terribly amiss, Mr. Speaker, if at this time I did not call your attention to the fine work done by Senator Sam J. Ervin's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in this area. In recently conducted hearings, Senator Ervin has investigated in detail the advantages and shortcomings of military procedures of this nature. In addition, the Senator has introduced a series of bills to amend various sections of the Code of Military Justice and several Senators have cosponsored the bills with him. Today I have introduced a companion bill in the House.

The sad fact in this case, Mr. Speaker, is that Sergeant Jackson was tried and acquitted before falling victim to the administrative board and had no recourse at that time. Let there be no doubt, the effects of administrative board hearings in many cases—and I would submit that this is one such case—are far from minor. In this respect, I think it is appropriate to consider the whole question of the propriety in certain types of cases of administrative board hearings themselves. Senator Ervin's subcommittee has lucidly pointed out some of the dangers that are inherent in these procedures:

> On the other hand, the serviceman who is brought before a board considering the issuance of an undesirable discharge may not have the opportunity to confront adverse witnesses or to subpena witnesses in his own favor. The Department of Defense directive of January 14, 1959, governing administrative discharges, specifically grants the serviceman the right to a hearing before a board of at least three members, to appear in person before this board, to be represented by counsel, who if reasonably available, should be a lawyer, and to submit statements in his own behalf. There is no mention in this directive of confrontation or of assistance to the respondent in producing witnesses in his own behalf. Some of the service regulations provide additional safeguards, such as the right to have witnesses appear who are reasonably available (p. 4).
>
> In light of the severe consequences attendant upon an undesirable discharge, the subcommittee would recommend that administrative discharge boards be provided with some procedure for compelling the attendance of witnesses (p. 4).
>
> Furthermore, although the Defense Department directive of January 14, 1959, requires that counsel be furnished, a lawyer need be provided as counsel only if he is 'reasonably available.' During the hearings, the subcommittee directed its attention on several occasions to the criterion of reasonable availability; and each service furnished information concerning the extent to which lawyers were declared reasonably available as counsel before administrative discharge boards (p. 5).
>
> Boards considering projected administrative discharges are not required by statute to have a law officer, legal adviser, or board member with legal experience. Nor does the governing directive make any provision for a lawyer to be present to advise a discharge board on legal points that may arise at the hearing (p. 9).

As these citations suggest, the protection of the individual rights of a citizen in the Armed Forces is dangerously subject to nonuniformity.

Mr. Speaker, without going into further detail about the findings of the Senate subcommittee in the areas of administrative board discharges, I would just like to call the attention of my colleagues to their existence. Should the Members find time to peruse them, I am sure they will find them as enlightening as I have. Furthermore, I am sure that every Member's office, at one time or another, has received a complaint from a serviceman or veteran concerning this problem we discuss here today, which may have been passed over lightly due to a lack of information.

Ordinarily I do not relish the thought of intervening unnecessarily in strictly military affairs because as a Member of Congress and an ex-serviceman, I had been under the impression, for the most part, that the channels of military justice were open to all and usually equitable. However, Senator Ervin and his staff have uncovered cases which seem to me to be anything but isolated and action by the Congress is imperative. Furthermore, I am becoming more convinced that military justice so far has not been exactly laudable in more cases than I would care to hear about and it has seriously caused me to doubt its true equity. That such an injustice could have been inflicted on a U.S. citizen, such as Ray Jackson, while serving his country on foreign soil in the U.S. Army strikes me as more than tragic.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have been led to digress here from the case at hand, but I want to make it clear that I have found that this particular case has not arisen in a vacuum. Yet, the question which remains is, what shall be done in the near future to reduce the spheres of injustice, and more importantly, from which direction shall such necessary reforms proceed. The alternatives are clear; they must proceed from the military if possible, from the U.S. Supreme Court if necessary, and from the U.S. Congress eventually if nothing is done.

However, these alternatives should not be seen as inherently antithetic. There is no good reason why the military and civilian authorities cannot or should not work together in this field. It is my understanding that the American Bar Association is working with the military at this time in an attempt to resolve these problems. Moreover, I was advised that Senator Ervin's subcommittee did have some degree of cooperation from the military. I urge the House to act swiftly on these measures in order to obtain a meeting of the minds as soon as possible. Then the Congress may enact legislation with the cooperation of all, rather than on an arbitrary basis which may become necessary. Testimony indicates there is affirmative statutory prohibition in Army regulations against double jeopardy of the type demonstrated in the Jackson case. In addition, we are all aware that the fifth amendment contains a prohibition against twice putting anyone in jeopardy of life or limb. I feel that congressional intent is clear and implemented this same constitutional prohibition through article 44 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 44. However, the military has circumvented congressional intent through administrative proceedings and corrective action must be taken immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that I have received the cooperation of the military on the Jackson case. The Army Board for Correction of Military Records has granted Mr. Jackson a hearing, which was originally scheduled for this morning, but in view of the civil rights march on Washington today, the hearing has been rescheduled for September 18. I certainly intend to be on hand to submit a statement in Mr. Jackson's behalf and I am pleased to report that counsel for Ray Jackson has been obtained through the efforts of Mr. Lawrence Speiser, director, Washington office of the Civil Liberties Union. Mr. Robert J. Muth, of the law firm of Covington & Burling, has agreed to take the case, and he has already spent considerable time and effort to right the injustice done to my constituent.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray Jackson is a Negro, so it is very appropriate on this day that I bring this case to the attention of my colleagues.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Patman, for 30 minutes, on Friday next, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fascell.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Beermann) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McClory.

Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Dole.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Hagan of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fraser.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 46. An act to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 48. An act to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 277. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 912. An act approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 933. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1582. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1868. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1139. An act to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution consenting to an extension of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas; and

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, August 30, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1160. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 64th quarterly report on export control covering the second quarter 1963, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1161. A letter from the National Adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., transmitting the audit report of the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A. for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–761; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1162. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 512. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8200, a bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 513. Resolution for the consideration of S. 1576, an act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 504. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 718). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 8289. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from $1,200 to $1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8290. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla., for administration as a part of said park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 8291. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 8292. A bill to broaden the constitutional protection against double jeopardy in the case of military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 8293. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 8294. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8295. A bill to amend section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to include within the definition of "State banks" branches of foreign banks authorized under State law to accept deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 8296. A bill to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8297. A bill to provide social security coverage as self-employed individuals for State and local public officers, not otherwise covered under Federal-State agreement, who are paid on a fee basis by persons other than the State or local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 8298. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration of Aging"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8299. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1954, to establish a National Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.J. Res. 672. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 674. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 675. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 676. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution directing the National Capital Planning Commission to study and recommend changes in the laws and zoning regulations of the District of Columbia which prescribe height, use, and area limitations on buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 510. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 511. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in certain legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 8300. A bill for the relief of Gordon W. McGrew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 8301. A bill for the relief of Capt. Robert H. Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 8302. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Bylina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 8303. A bill for the relief of Laura G. Carbonell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8304. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shiu-sun MA (King); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Foreign Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct an erroneous impression which has caused some to criticize the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the assumption that this year it failed to devote sufficient time and study to the foreign-aid bill. The exact opposite is true.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am proud of the conscientious manner in which the committee has fulfilled its legislative responsibilities. Last year the committee held 24 days of hearings on foreign-aid legislation and spent 12 days in markup sessions to complete its drafting, and during the period heard 43 official and 22 public witnesses.

This year the committee devoted even more time and energy to this important foreign policy legislation, beginning its hearings on April 5 and ordering the bill reported on August 6, after spending 4 months in intensive study, consideration, and hard work. During those 4 months the committee received testimony in 38 sessions from 63 official and 42 public witnesses, following with 19 sessions for amending the bill.

During the markup sessions 100 amendments were proposed and considered. Forty-six of them were approved, more than doubling the size of the bill. Each and every member had as much time as he needed for presentation of his views and the offering of amendments. I want to stress that many of the most significant and important amendments originated with minority members, all receiving bipartisan support, and some of them were adopted unanimously.

Some of the testimony received by the committee was classified by the executive branch and could not be published for security reasons, but the printed hearings number over 1,700 pages. The committee also received from the executive nearly 2,000 pages of presentation data which required careful study and analysis. I think all this adds up to pretty good evidence that the committee regarded and discharged its responsibilities.

Our attendance record was excellent. For this I believe a large share of credit is due our distinguished chairman, Dr. MORGAN. We have come to hold him in affectionate esteem for his unfailing good humor and his absolute fairness in presiding. Under such a chairman, committee work becomes a pleasurable duty, and it is easy to understand why Members participate with enthusiasm in the committee sessions. Because of the scope and complexity of the foreign aid program, every staff member receives specific assignments to help committee members. This is done on a nonpartisan basis. As a member of the minority, I can state that this has worked out well and efficiently, for under the committee rules any of us is entitled to the services of any staff member on committee work. In referring to the long hours devoted by the committee members to the foreign aid legislation, I also want to express my appreciation for the loyal and efficient dedication to our assistance displayed by all the members of the committee staff.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have said all this, I believe my colleagues will understand my taking the floor to correct the charge, even though it has been made by only a few that the committee has been remiss in the time and study it gave the foreign aid bill. No major legislation has received better examination, study, and careful effort to produce improvement.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the first week in March of each year to be Save Your Vision Week. In so doing, I am cognizant of the fact that various and sundry organizations have, for promotional purposes, designated days, weeks, months, and years as reminders of various good causes.

The idea of Save Your Vision Week goes back as far as 1927. Since then the Governors of practically every one of the 50 States have on one or more occasions issued such a proclamation, and the mayors of our larger municipalities as well as some of the smaller ones have done likewise. However, we are prone to take some of the best things in life for granted, and therefore, to neglect them. God's gift of eyesight is one of these.

We are concerned with juvenile delinquency and school dropouts, and well we should be. Where surveys have been made, the results have uniformly shown that the dropout or the delinquent had an uncorrected visual problem. How much this contributed to the final result it is difficult to say, but certainly it is a factor which can and should be corrected, and the importance of which should be brought home to the American people.

We are all appalled by the colossal amounts of damage suffered in highway accidents and the loss of life. Again, there are no accurate statistics to show what part faulty vision played in the tragic result. We do know that from 80 to 90 percent of the decisions made by the driver of an automobile or truck are dependent upon vision. The optometric profession has carried on exhaustive studies on the subject of visual problems in highway safety. Save Your Vision Week will call attention to this important factor in the operation of motor vehicles.

During the past few years we have been fascinated with the idea of the exploration of space and the realms beyond. Aeronautics and space exploration present their peculiar vision problems.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is in the interest of our national welfare that a Presidential proclamation should be issued each year calling upon the American people in the interest of their own well-being, our national economy and defense, to not only save their vision but to make certain that it is functioning at the highest possible level.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Joint Resolution 676, authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the first week in March of each year to be Save Your Vision Week.

It has been said that most of man's knowledge of the world about him comes through his eyesight. For complete participation in the joy of living as well as in our ordinary day-to-day activities, the means by which we see—our eyes—are unquestionably one of man's most cherished possessions.

Save Your Vision Week was first observed in 1927 and has been sponsored annually since then by the American Optometric Association, working with other organizations to educate our citizens on the protection, conservation and enhancement of their vision.

Save Your Vision Week in my State of Kansas has alerted our citizens to specialized vision needs. In 1957 Kansas initiated a campaign entitled "Reading Takes Seeing" to emphasize that all schoolchildren should have their vision screened and those detected with vision problems referred to specialists for care. In 1959 the importance of vision in driving was emphasized. Thousands of citizens learned their seeing ability was not up to par when behind the wheels of their automobiles.

The theme in 1961 was "Enjoy Golden Years," the purpose, to assist the elderly person in continuing as a functioning individual. "Getting Rid of Vision Delinquents" was the basis for the 1962 campaign aimed at the estimated 50 million individuals who fail to take proper care of their eyesight.

The efficiency and productivity of industry in Kansas is dependent upon the vision of its workers. Breakage, spoilage and accidents have been reduced by calling management's attention to the visual requirements of their plants through Save Your Vision Week programs.

A close personal friend, Dr. Arthur D. Glenn from my hometown, Russell, Kans., is first vice president of the Kansas Optometric Association. He knows the potential importance of observing this special week devoted to informational messages and activities concerning a priceless possession—our vision.

The officers of the Kansas Optometric Association, in addition to Dr. Glenn, are: Harold E. Ripple, Jr., Hiawatha, president; Eugene C. Jeffery, Kansas City, Kans., past president; Eugene D. Nelson, Topeka, president-elect; L. I. Powers, Hutchinson, second vice president; Lewis E. Mock, Jr., Dodge City, secretary; Wendell D. Waldie, Wichita, treasurer. Officers of the Women's Auxiliary are: Mrs. Howard Sharpe, Atwood, president; Mrs. Franklin Reinhardt, Great Bend, first vice president; Mrs. Marvin E. Woolen, Olathe, second vice president; Mrs. L. I. Powers, Hutchinson, third vice president; Mrs. Harold E. Ripple, Hiawatha, secretary; Mrs. Harold A. Snider, Emporia, treasurer.

Some 83 million persons—more than half of the total population, six and over—are overdue for vision examinations. It is known that some 51 million of them—nearly one-third the total—are in immediate need of vision care, ranging from a simple correction of their lenses to surgical attention.

The visual welfare of our Nation is a matter which should concern us all. If a few may be saved from blindness, a few more from highway accidents, and others from failure in their jobs, through "Save Your Vision Week," this resolution will have served its purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join in support of this most important resolution, as set forth below:

Whereas vision is of the utmost importance to every individual and to the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas many Governors and mayors have, over the past 36 years, issued proclamations calling upon their citizens to give special attention to vision care during the first week in March of each year; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has supported significant research to protect man's priceless gift of vision; and

Whereas the U.S. Post Office Department has authorized the use of special cancellation stamps during that week and the preceding week for the purpose of reminding our citizens that their vision demands constant care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week," and inviting the Governors and mayors of State and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations. The President is further requested to consider including in such proclamation an invitation calling upon the press, radio, television, and other communications media, the health care professions, and all other agencies and individuals concerned with programs for the improvement of vision, to unite during such week in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of vision to their own welfare and that of our country, and to urge their support of programs to improve and protect the vision of Americans.

Freeman Notes Relationship of Agriculture and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has recently returned from his trip to the Soviet Union and other East European nations. Upon returning, the Secretary made some pertinent and timely observations on agricultural practices in the countries he visited.

Mr. Freeman's statements are given in a press release of the Department of Agriculture dated August 21. It deserves the attention of all Members of Congress, especially those of us who are particularly interested in foreign affairs and in agriculture. By unanimous consent, I hereby include this press release in the RECORD:

JUDGE COMMUNISM BY AGRICULTURAL INTENTIONS

Agriculture provides a little used, but effective window through which Americans can more clearly judge the capabilities and intentions of Communist nations, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today.

"Agriculture, both in the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations, is closely meshed with national policy and the overall potential of each country. Through agriculture, we can better understand their problems and the measures being taken to solve them. And, in doing so, we will be better equipped to formulate policies that promote our own national interests and the cause of world peace.

"In this respect, no point struck me more forcefully during my recent trip through Russia and Eastern Europe than the realization that food and agriculture are among the finest instruments we have for building a world based on the achievement of peaceful goals."

The Secretary summarized his observations at a press conference held after his return from a survey trip of agricultural policies and programs in the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. He made these points:

The prestige of the United States and of U.S. agriculture is high, as evidenced by the warm welcome and generous hospitality the American group received in each country, and by the lack of incidents or signs of hostility.

While all five countries have governments that are solidly Communist they are not identical and cannot be treated as a unit. Each of the five peoples have their own history and tradition, and a real spirit of nationalism.

Trade has kept a door open to the West, and to close it now by removing Poland and Yugoslavia from the most-favored-nation status would only force greater Communist solidarity, and would deprive the United States of potential markets.

The Communist system of agriculture does not stand well in comparison to U.S. agriculture. The family farm system is far superior in making much more efficient use of resources.

Americans should not be misled, however, into overlooking the progress which Soviet agriculture is making and will continue to make.

Russia is shifting agricultural priorities from the new lands to more intensive cultivation of available cropland.

The people of the five countries are anxious to learn from the United States, and this country also has much to gain from reciprocal exchanges and broader people-to-people contacts.

The Secretary returned August 13 from his factfinding study of Eastern Europe where he had discussions with the political heads of five countries. They were Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, President Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, of Rumania, Prime Minister Todor Zhivkov, of Bulgaria, and President Tito, of Yugoslavia. In Poland, the President and Prime Milnster were out of the country, and Secretary Freeman talked with Vice Chairman Edward Ochab, of the Council of State, and Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki.

"In each country, the people were without exception very friendly. Wherever our party went, we were given a most cordial welcome. There was not a single instance of hostility or criticism," the Secretary said.

"Wherever I had an opportunity I talked to people on the farms, in factories and in the markets. Particularly in areas away from large cities it was evident that most of the people had seen few Americans—and never an American official. When I brought these people the greetings of the President and the American people, and expressed our hopes for a peaceful world, the reaction invariably was an expression of friendship and a desire for peace.

"In the U.S.S.R. and the other Communist nations, American prestige is high. Perhaps no other event in recent years has impressed the peoples of these countries of our dedication to the cause of peace than the agreement to ban nuclear testing above ground and in the atmosphere," the Secretary said.

"There is no doubt that, for these people, personal memories of the horrors and destruction of war intensify the hope for peace. This hope dominated the expressions of people everywhere we traveled.

"In all the countries we visited, the governments are firmly and solidly in the hands of dedicated Communists. Government policy is in accord with the current party line, and dictated and carried out in accord with party principles.

"For agriculture, this means that if the officials in power decide on a certain agricultural policy, the whole bureaucratic mechanism is thrown into gear to implement that policy—whether it relates to which field crops to plant or how much fertilizer to use.

"We found evidence in each country, however, that officials have learned that too much uniformity and rigidity limits agricultural progress because it fails to allow for local differences and the variations of nature. As a result, more flexibility—especially with regard to adaptation to climatic conditions—is being permitted. But the planning on farms and in regions still must conform to the overall plans and requirements of the State, which determines all priorities.

"This means that if Chairman Khrushchev carries out his determination—as he indicated to me he would—to sizably increase his capital inputs in agriculture, there will be an increase in production, particularly grain and row crops. The Chairman indicated he would give strong emphasis during the next 5 years to mixed feed, fertilizer, and chemical production. It is apparent that he is shifting agricultural priorities from the new lands, where the Russians have placed substantial amounts of virgin land into grain production in recent years, to more intensive cultivation of historic cropland.

"The five governments are solidly Communist, but the five nations cannot be viewed as a unit, or single bloc. Each of the five peoples has its own history and tradition—and there is a noticeable spirit of nationalism in each country.

"Even within the bloc, Poland has never been able to carry out the Communist principle of collectivization of agriculture. Between 80 and 90 percent of the land is owned and worked by the stubbornly independent peasants. The official goal is to change this situation, but Communist officials are realistic enough not to push the transition too far or too fast.

"Yugoslavia, which is outside the bloc, and has far more significant relationships with the West, likewise has retained the ownership and operation of most of the farmland (88 percent) in the hands of the peasants—and the right to own a limited amount of land is written into the Yugoslavian constitution. Yugoslav officials said their goal is social (state) ownership of the land.

"They emphasize they will not seek this goal by force or coercion, but by evolution and education—which, they say, may take 10, 20, or 50 years. It is significant, with all their penchant for 5-year plans and timetables, that they refuse to set a timetable for this.

"These facts are very significant for the American people. It is clear that American exports to these two countries (Poland and Yugoslavia) under Public Law 480 have been a significant factor in preventing the forced socialization of the land, and thus in keeping alive a spirit of individual ownership and enterprise. Trade has kept a door open to the West, and the door is opened widest in Yugoslavia.

"In my judgment it would be a serious mistake to close this door by ending the most-favored-nation status that up to now has been accorded Poland and Yugoslavia. To close this door would both force greater Communist solidarity and deprive ourselves of potential markets. On the other hand, by continuing the most-favored-nation treatment we can promote trade that is of mutual benefit, and move toward developing valuable commercial markets for American products.

"I have returned with a number of strong convictions, but none more firmly reinforced than the demonstrated superiority of the family farm system of agriculture based on private ownership of the land.

"United States and Soviet agriculture are scarcely comparable. In my conversation with Chairman Khrushchev, he said his goal is to surpass the United States as the No. 1 agricultural producer. I accepted his challenge with confidence and told him the incentive built into the family farm system will insure that it will continue as the most powerful engine for efficient agricultural production.

"My observations convince me that the socialist system is bureaucratic and unwieldy, and by its very nature inefficient and wasteful. There is a lack of balance, and many extremes. For example, while the Soviet Union has made definite progress in production of grain and row crops, it lags far behind in the yields and production of animal products and fruits and vegetables, which require more skill at individual levels.

"In comparison, the U.S. farmer has a training and background much broader than those we met in the Communist countries. We observed few farmers in the five countries who could match the American farmer with his working knowledge of agronomy, mechanics, veterinary, business management and other agricultural skills.

"We should not be misled, however, into overlooking the progress which the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations are making. It is significant progress by their own standards, and all indications are that it will continue and be accelerated in the years ahead.

"The agricultural practices we saw were, of course, their best, and many of them were impressive. Near Orenburg, we found a 22-percent protein spring wheat. In the Krasnodar region, we found sunflowers with a 46-percent oil content. In Bulgaria, we saw hybrid tomatoes which were equal or superior in quality and yield to our own. We found very good research being carried on at several research institutions.

"There also are several important institutional improvements underway in the Soviet Union. They are getting technical and scientific know-how into practice more effectively by encouraging more local discretion and adaptation to local conditions. There are, in addition, increasing numbers of trained people, as well as more and improved machinery.

"One of the more significant weaknesses in Communist agriculture is in the storage, marketing, processing, and distribution of food commodities. Focusing on production, they are overlooking an aspect of the farm-to-dinner-table process which most Americans take for granted. This, I predict, will prove to be a serious oversight in the years ahead.

"I left the United States feeling that reciprocal people-to-people contacts and the exchange of information on agricultural subjects is of mutual benefit. I now feel this even more strongly. We found in Eastern Europe that the talk of exchanges met with immediate and favorable responses. We had an opportunity to see some of the effects of exchange programs, and to push for reciprocity in exchanges. And, while U.S. agriculture is far advanced in comparison to these five countries, there are advantages we can gain by such exchanges.

"We can expect to get germ plasm to breed into our plants—our apples, pears, plums, alfalfas, and many forage grasses and legumes came originally from Russia—to obtain more disease and insect resistance, winter hardiness, drought resistance, and other desirable qualities. We would like to explore Siberia for cold-resistant plants and send entomologists to seek more effective biological controls for plant and insect pests, either in the form of natural enemies or insect diseases.

"Few people realize that the United States, through past exchange programs, already has obtained over 2,260 different plant specimens from the Plant Breeding Institute of Leningrad.

"I strongly recommend expanding our exchange programs involving reciprocity to the end that both parties to the exchange benefit. In addition to the material gains resulting from such exchanges, there is the increased understanding and good will which follow when people come to know each other as human beings.

"Finally, the clear evidence of increased attention to the agricultural sector in the countries we visited is a sign and a trend we should welcome and encourage. Investments in raising the standard of living are investments in the peaceful capabilities of these nations."

Labor's Contribution to the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to celebrate Labor Day 1963 this September 2, the opportunity arises to recognize the contribution of the leadership and members of the U.S. labor movement to the free world. I am happy to take advantage of this opportunity to voice my regard and commendation for this group of patriotic American citizens.

The growth of the labor movement in the United States is a tribute to the high standards of good citizenship of its members and the outstanding examples of cooperation for mutual benefit between labor unions and management. Nowhere in the world can be found a more outstanding group of fellow craftsmen. United in pride of occupation, they are constantly alert to discoveries of new methods and techniques for improved standards of workmanship which contribute to the national good.

During the past 100 years, many of the landmarks of our national progress have been initiated and given impetus by the labor movement. Public school education came into being in our country as a result of the demands of labor leaders. School lunches, safety measures in shop and factory to cut down accidents among workers and public—these and many more have had the support of the labor movement. The U.S. labor movement has always been found in the forefront of all movements for the betterment of our fellow man. The flourishing state of members of labor in our country stands as a monument to the democratic process at work, arousing the admiration—and sometimes envy—of workers the world over.

One of the most vital contributions of the labor movement has been its activities in the International Labor Organization at Geneva, where both labor and management are part of the policymaking force. In addition to planning and implementing aid to workers all over the world, including the newly developed nations, such as Nigeria, representatives of U.S. labor unions have drawn world attention to the fact that in the Soviet Union and Soviet-dominated countries, there is no free labor movement.

I join my colleagues and all our citizens in a tribute to and deep desire for a continued happy and progressive relationship between labor and management to the end that our Nation may maintain its security and fulfill its role as leader of the free world.

Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently I circulated a public opinion questionnaire in more than 85,000 households in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, comprising Lake, McHenry, and Boone Counties. I am particularly pleased to report that almost 15,000 questionnaires were returned with answers, comments, and—in some instances—an accompanying letter expressing individual views.

Reviewing these questionnaires and reading the many opinions has been one of the stimulating experiences of my service as a new Member of Congress. I am proud of and grateful for the overwhelming interest in good government and good citizenship which led to these responses from my constituents. And, I include the compiled opinions of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

1963 questionnaire—Final results

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a Federal income tax cut this year (check 1):		
A. Without a reduction in Federal spending?	14.9	--------
B. Only if Federal spending is reduced?	85.1	--------
2. In relation to Cuba—		
A. Do you think the Cuban situation has been handled wisely?	21.5	78.5
B. Do you favor a naval quarantine of Cuba to eliminate the Castro-Soviet threat through economic pressure?	78.8	21.2
C. Do you believe the Government should manage the news as was done in the Cuban situation?	36.8	63.2
3. Do you favor the creation of a joint committee of Congress to examine the President's budget and recommend sound fiscal policies?	86.3	13.7
4. Do you favor adoption of one of the following farm programs (check 1):		
A. Rigid controls and quotas on individual production, mandatory land retirement—a strictly regulated farm economy?	3.6	--------
B. No controls, no supports, no protection—a completely free farm market?	27.4	--------
C. Moderate and flexible price supports, voluntary large-scale land retirement—a gradual withdrawal of Government from the farm economy?	69.0	--------
5. Does our Nation need a youth program under Federal control, such as—		
A. The Domestic Peace Corps?	33.9	66.1
B. The Youth Conservation camps?	48.2	51.8
6. Do you favor Federal aid to education such as—		
A. Aid to public grammar and high schools?	36.7	63.3
B. Aid to private and parochial grammar and high schools?	17.1	82.9
C. College construction grants?	46.4	53.6
D. Federal scholarships for higher education?	55.5	44.5
E. Federal income tax credits for parents paying tuition?	73.6	26.4
7. Do you favor Federal subsidies to assist urban mass transportation?	26.8	73.2
8. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation—		
A. To guarantee the right to vote?	88.3	11.7
B. To enforce school integration?	43.3	56.7
C. To grant equal opportunity for employment on Federal work?	83.2	16.8
9. On foreign aid, do you favor—		
A. A sharp reduction in foreign aid spending?	86.3	13.7
B. Any foreign aid to nonalined nations?	22.2	77.8
10. Do you favor hospital and nursing home care for people over 65 financed by increased social security taxes and increased Federal income taxes for those not under social security?	28.2	71.8
11. Do you favor the creation of a Federal Crime Commission to investigate and intensify the war against organized crime?	83.2	16.8

REA: The Future of Rural Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, July 22, 1963, I addressed the annual meeting of the members of the Bartlett, Tex., Rural Electric Cooperative at Bartlett, Tex. Because of a number of requests that this speech be printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at that meeting be printed today in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA: THE FUTURE OF RURAL TEXAS

Chairman H. M. Keith, members of the Bartlett Electric Cooperative, fellow Texans, the State of Texas can be called the heartland of the REA. One of our proudest Texas accomplishments is that we have strung over 156,000 miles of REA-financed lines along the Rio Grande, through the Panhandle, across the west Texas plains, on the central Texas blacklands, and among the east Texas piney woods. Our 79 active borrower rural electric co-ops serve 384,000 consumers over these lines. This is more consumers served on more miles of line than in any other State in the Union.

A great Texan, the beloved late Sam Rayburn, sponsored the Rural Electrification Act in the U.S. House of Representatives. It has often been said that, had the service of Mr. Sam to his country been limited to his part in passing this act alone, it would have been sufficient to give governmental immortality to his name.

The members of this cooperative can feel especially proud because it was here that the first REA loan in this State, and one of the first in the Nation, was approved in September 1935, and the Bartlett Electric Cooperative, Inc., placed the first REA-financed line in operation on March 9, 1936.

In February 1935, I was appointed by the late beloved Gov. James V. Allred as a member of the original board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Authority of Texas, which built the series of six fine dams on the Colorado River above Austin. You grew up together. Actually, the Lower Colorado River Authority was set up by Texas a few months before the national REA was passed by Congress.

Over our entire State, at the time REA was created in 1935, only 11,466 farms, or 2.3 percent of the total, were receiving central station electric service. Today, 28 years later, an estimated 223,000 farms, or 96.2 percent of all farms recorded in the State by the 1959 census of agriculture, are being served. What is more, approximately 70 percent of these electrified farms in Texas are being served by REA borrowers.

Nationally, farm electrification advanced very slowly during the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central generating system went into service, to 1935, when REA was created. Less than 11 percent of all farms in the United States had electric service in 1935. Today REA estimates that 97.6 percent of our 3.7 million farms recorded in the 1959 census are now electrified. Slightly more than half of these electrified farms are served by REA-financed electric systems.

Opponents of REA are quick to say that the original purpose of REA has already been accomplished, that virtually all the Nation's farms have electric service, and that all the additional powerplants and transmission lines rural America needs can be financed in the free market. I doubt seriously if Mr. and Mrs. John McGuffin of New Mexico would agree with this. The McGuffins lived on their ranch for 21 years without such 20th century conveniences as electric lights, refrigerator, television or washing macine. They would still be without these modern "necessities" if a rural electric cooperative had not last year extended 3.5 miles of line to their ranchhouse to make them the 5-millionth consumer to receive electricity through REA loans.

Despite the fact that some of their areas have grown in population, rural electric cooperatives continue to serve the most difficult and the sparsely settled areas of the Nation. Nationally the co-ops average little more than three consumers per mile of line. All but the smallest commercial utility systems have, on the average, 33 consumers to each mile of their line.

The comparison from the standpoint of revenue is even more dramatic. In 1960, REA-financed systems averaged $414 revenue per mile of line, compared to $6,580 per mile for the commercial companies. No other source of power will accept the risk and challenges of serving the typical REA co-op territory. The fact that some of the original territory of REA borrowers has prospered does not abolish the responsibility or the right of the cooperatives to continue serving these areas.

The rural electric program is good for all Americans. It is making tremendous contributions to our national strength and progress. However, numerical progress in rural electrification has obscured the fact the rural areas still have far to go before parity is achieved. Seldom mentioned is the fact that the consumer on the lines of an average REA borrower system still has to pay almost 20 percent more for 250 kilowatt-hours used in a month than the average city consumer.

Why does this rural disadvantage exist? The truth is that it costs more to provide quality electric service to rural areas. In addition to low revenues and low density of consumers—your cooperative averages less than 1.7 consumers per mile—power requirements in rural areas tend to be high during certain periods of the day, and often negligible during the rest of the day. Rural electric cooperatives, then, with relatively few commercial or large powerloads to even out power requirements, must make proportionately greater investments in facilities used only for a few hours a day.

That the rural electrification program has succeeded so well in the face of such severe obstacles is ample reason for pride on the part of all those with even a slight connection with REA. The fact is that REA has succeeded far beyond the dreams of its founders.

When REA was organized, its opponents argued that farmers would never use enough electricity to pay for building the lines. Contrary to these pessimistic views, rural consumers are using electric energy in much greater amounts than REA supporters expected when the original lines were built.

On the farm alone more than 400 uses of electricity are known, at least 250 of which increase production or make farming more profitable. Use of electricity from REA-financed lines by farm and nonfarm consumers has more than doubled in the past 10 years. Average monthly consumption of electricity per consumer has increased from 182 kilowatt-hours in 1952 to 400 kilowatt-hours in 1962.

Rural electric cooperatives have created a new market for power that did not exist before the task of rural electrification was undertaken. Cooperative systems purchased $97 million worth of power from the private power industry last year.

The rural electrification program has brought increased business into rural communities. The rural market for electrical appliances and equipment is estimated at $1 billion a year. In addition, the availability of electric power in rural areas encourages the establishment of industry and general economic development. And of course, each co-op is directly responsible for some employment in its area and injection of currency into local economies.

Rural electric cooperatives have made an outstanding record in repaying their loans. From its beginning REA has advanced more than $5 billion to its electrification and telephone borrowers. Adding its commitments, the total would be over $6 billion. Repayments to the Treasury have totaled more than $1.8 billion principal and interest. Loans outstanding total approximately $3.7 billion. The $1.2 billion paid on the principal is about 25 percent of the principal borrowed. This has been repaid, plus $640 million of interest money paid to the U.S. Government over and above the principal. This interest was paid for the right to use Government funds to get started. In the long history of REA only two loans have ever been foreclosed, at a net loss of only $44,478. No bank, no Government agency, nor any other group of borrowers have ever before compiled such a record.

On January 1, 1963, REA borrowers in Texas had repaid almost $100 million on the principal of their $354 million in loans and had paid $46 million in interest. No borrower in Texas was overdue in payments on its REA loan, nor has any Texas borrower ever been foreclosed.

It is well that our hearts should swell with pride at the glorious history of REA, but we should never lose sight of our role in the years ahead.

Demands of tomorrow—in a dynamic, expanding economy—will dwarf the electric power requirements of yesterday. Anyone familiar with the electric industry knows that the demand for electricity in the Nation is doubling every 10 years, and on the rural systems about every 7 years. Meeting this increased demand will require continued large capital outlays. Failure to meet it is to fail to meet the needs of rural people for adequate and reliable electric power.

Rural electrification has increasingly become more than a matter of mechanical technology. REA and REA-financed electric systems have for 28 years been among the leaders in the battle to raise living standards in rural areas. This period has established the rural electric co-op as a powerful social and economic force in the development of rural life.

Rural cooperative systems have been termed "private enterprise with a built-in public conscience." This public conscience has already worked to change the face of rural America. Your actions have furnished an example to the whole world of ordinary citizens taking the initiative and shaping their future. This banding together for a common cause in a spirit of cooperation is a unique trademark of the rural electrification movement.

The success of the REA program in raising rural living standards has made it a logical choice as a leader in the rural areas development of the Department of Agriculture. The achievements of the past can be a beacon of light to lead the way for improved conditions in all rural areas.

Presently our rural economy is not progressing as rapidly as it should be. REA and REA-borrowers can contribute toward breaking this economic roadblock.

The stake of rural electric co-ops in rural areas development is obvious. Cooperatives serve rural areas. If the economic base of rural areas becomes stagnant, people move away. This has already happened in large degrees. Testimony to this is offered by 500,000 idle services on the lines of rural electric cooperatives today. If the economic base of the area served shrinks, so does the business base of the co-op.

However, if new economic opportunities are provided to hold people in the area, it means growth for the cooperative and the area as well as greater benefits to consumer-members in terms of better service at lower rates, since the electric business is a volume business.

Cooperatives have recognized this mutual interdependency and have taken steps to stimulate local economies. Many rural electric systems are making remarkable progress in developing small rural industries for which the economic potential to themselves and their communities far exceeds the investment required to attract the industry.

These development projects are scattered throughout the country. They include a lumber project in Idaho, a furniture factory in Kentucky, a commercial recreation enterprise in Illinois, a meatpacking plant in Nebraska, and a wood chipping plant in Mississippi. In addition to these local industries, 600 REA-financed systems report they have assisted their communities in launching a number of public facilities including hospitals, water systems, and sewerage systems.

Remarkable progress has been made but the need for further development is great in rural America.

The role of the REA is far from finished. Rural electric cooperatives, on the basis of their performance, have earned a permanent place in rural America. REA can look back upon a distinguished record of achievement, but the biggest challenge lies now in the future. We know that REA and rural electric cooperatives will continue to be a social and economic force for progress in rural America.

Now that is the record of the REA for the past 28 years. But where does the REA stand in Congress today?

The House Appropriations Committee has approved $425 million for REA under the agriculture budget. The amount is enough to meet the needs for loans to local cooperatives. But provisions have been included that will hamstring the REA and delay the loans by practically giving private power suppliers a veto over the loans. It demands that a final last chance must be offered to the private supplier to offer an acceptable contract. The effect of this language would be delay and more delay. It is to be hoped that this private power veto over REA loans can be eliminated in the Senate.

There are some six anti-REA bills pending in Congress, all but one of them sponsored by Republicans, that would raise the interest rate on REA. This is a longtime goal of the private power companies in the continuing effort to bury REA. I intend to oppose these bills to raise the interest rate on REA loans. I am against all these recent increases in high interest rates on money. To raise the interest rates on REA loans would set off a chain reaction of high interest rates for everybody.

I am also a strong supporter and a coauthor of the act creating the area redevelopment program, to bring new industry to areas of weak economy. Area redevelopment is important to the REA. The Senate passed a bill for extension of the ARA program after it was knocked down by a few votes in the House. I am hopeful that the Senate ARA extension bill will be brought forward again and will be passed by the House.

ARA and REA, together can build a new prosperity for rural Texas. That is the hope of the future for the rural counties in Texas.

SENATE

Friday, August 30, 1963

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. Metcalf].

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senate, under previous order, will now adjourn to Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1963

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 3 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Wednesday, August 28, 1963, until Tuesday, September 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Sisk.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

August 30, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable B. F. Sisk to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 6: 14: *Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness.*

O Thou God of our fathers and their succeeding generations, may the mind and heart of our President, our Speaker, and all Members of Congress daily be made strong and vigorous with great moral and spiritual ideals and principles.

Grant that in all their plans and labors, their struggles and sacrifices, they may be sustained by a radiant vision of the ultimate triumph of the forces of truth and righteousness.

We cannot foretell what the future has in store for us; but we will trust Thee and not be afraid for we have Thy divine assurance that, as our days, so also shall be our strength.

May we encourage one another as we seek to establish a commonwealth of freemen, doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with Thee in the ways of peace.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 28, 1963, was read and approved.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Sisk). The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Wednesday, August 28, 1963, the Speaker did on August 29, 1963, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H.R. 1135. An act to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock;

H.R. 2671. An act authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.;

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.;

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 5883. An act to correct a land description in the act entitled "An act to provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes";

H.R. 6710. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7500. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7594. An act to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir.

A LADY IN THE BALCONY

Mrs. **GREEN** of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **GREEN** of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, discrimination by man evidences itself in diverse ways—subtle and not so subtle. And as Columnist Art Buchwald, in his own inimitable way, points out in a recent column that discrimination comes in varying sizes and shapes. Under unanimous consent I place in the Congressional Record a Buchwald column printed in the August 29, 1963, editions of the Washington Post. Once again Mr. Buchwald, by humor rather than by the frenzied blaring of trumpets, causes the wall of rationalization for discrimination to topple:

A Lady in the Balcony

(By Art Buchwald)

One of the things that came out of the march on Washington was a protest by women reporters that they were discriminated against by their male counterparts at Washington's National Press Club.

Miss Elsie Carper, president of the Women's National Press Club, protested last Monday to A. Philip Randolph, chairman of the march on Washington, who was scheduled to be guest speaker at the men's National Press Club, that women would have to sit in the balcony during his talk.

She asked that Mr. Randolph change the site of his speech so that the men and women reporters would be allowed to sit together.

The embarrassed Mr. Randolph turned down Miss Carper's request, though he did come out for equality for women and said he was against discrimination of any kind. He went ahead and gave the talk to an all-male audience with a few women sitting in the balcony.

The question of discriminating against women has always been a ticklish one in the Nation's Capital. Although the majority of members of the National Press Club consider that some of their best friends are women, the feeling is that women aren't ready to take their places as men's equals, and no amount of legislation will change the attitude toward the female reporter by male members of the Press Club.

ENTER AGITATORS

One correspondent spoke for several members at the bar when he said, "Our women were very happy to sit in the balcony until outside agitators from the North came down here and started causing trouble. Women prefer to be together. That's why they have women's colleges and women's magazines. We've always treated our women good, but they wouldn't know what to do with equal rights if we gave it to them."

Another newspaperman agreed. "You said it. You start mixing the sexes and you know what you'll wind up with? Babies. I've seen it happen during the war."

"I don't mind women asking for equal pay and wanting their children to go to school with our children," said a third reporter. "But what I'm worried about is that if we let them eat with us, pretty soon they'll want to dance with us, and neck with us, and before you know it all the barriers will be down, and they'll be wanting to play poker with us."

"We don't ask to go to their beauty parlors," a columnist said. "Why should they ask to come to our club?"

Everyone at the bar nodded their heads.

SCANDALOUS CHICAGO

A young reporter said, "I was in Chicago recently at the Playboy Club and you know what was going on there because women are permitted to sit downstairs? The women were kissing the men, right in public. I saw it with my own eyes."

"I hope you walked out," the others said.

"You bet your life I did," the reporter replied. "I told them we don't do things like this in Washington and they accused me of being a bigot."

"Damn Yankees," someone muttered.

"I said," the reporter continued, "that our women know their place and if a woman in Washington attempted to kiss a man in public she'd be tarred and feathered and rode out of town on a rail."

"Good for you," the others said.

A public relations man said, "I heard that the agitation at the Press Club for women to sit with men is Communist-inspired."

"It's got to be," a fellow drinker said. "They would never have thought of it themselves."

"I sure would like to know who is behind it."

"The Communists have the most to gain," a Hearst man said. "You desegregate the sexes and you have chaos—marriages, divorces, fights, riots, and crime, everything the Communists are working for."

BASIC ERROR

"Our mistake was letting them sit in the balcony in the first place," a TV commentator said. "We opened the door an inch and now that they've got their foot in they want to squeeze in the rest of their anatomy."

"You can say all you want about women," a man from a wire service said. "You can talk about equal rights, equal job opportunities, equal schooling, and equal public accommodations, but it still boils down to one question. Would you want your brother to marry one?"

Everyone at the bar, including the bartender, shouted "No."

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ak unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, latest reports indicate that free world shipping to Cuba is continuing to outnumber Russian shipping. This information shows that in July there were 37 calls on Cuba's ports by free world ships, and 24 calls by Russian ships. This month's incomplete figures project that free world shipping will continue to be greater than Russian shipping. The American people should not be satisfied until there are no free world ships calling on the ports of Communist Cuba.

If we can influence our allies to discontinue their trade with Cuba then Russia will have to bear the entire burden of supplying goods to Castro. This extra tax on Russia's economy will not only hinder her own progress, but will complicate her efforts on Communist fronts in other parts of the world.

The House adopted the amendment that Congressman FASCELL and I offered to the foreign aid bill to cut off all aid to foreign countries continuing to trade with Communist Cuba. This action will again serve notice to our allies that we demand an effective ban on free world trade with Cuba.

As far as trade is concerned, Chile is an example of a country realizing our position against communism in Cuba and the whole Western Hemisphere. She has taken positive action in cutting off her shipping to Castro. Since the beginning of 1963, she has not had any of her ships, nor her goods in other ships, arrive in the ports of Cuba. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Chile in 1962 exported goods to Cuba worth $4,860,000, and imported from that island products valued at $6,170,000. To stop trade with that Communist island was a great economic sacrifice for Chile. The Congress applauds this action by the Chilean Government, and calls upon the other free world nations to follow their example to rid communism from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on the statement he has just made and to ask him this question. Does he know the number of free world ships which have gone into Cuba during 1963 which were oil tankers?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do have the figures. I do not have them with me. But we do know the number of allied ships that have gone into Cuba. It is a very large number. It is shocking that this should continue.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] which was adopted by the House to the Foreign Assistance Act will be of great help in stopping it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, Congressman FASCELL, and me which was adopted by the House would have this effect. This is the intent, to cut off all Allied shipping to Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not President Kennedy now have the authority to put the pressure on these free world nations?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. They claim they have been putting on pressure but it has not been very effective, as the gentleman knows. We have been trying to put on some pressure from Congress in a very positive way, not only by the Foreign Assistance Act but by calling for the closing of our ports to the ships trading with Cuba. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 7687, which I hope the Congress will adopt, to close our ports to the shipping of any country which allows its ships to go to Cuba.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR JOBS AND FREEDOM

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, August 28, 1963, will go down as a proud and glorious day in the history of this Nation.

The march on Washington for jobs and freedom was a breathtaking, moving, overpowering demonstration. The more than 200,000 men, women, and children who assembled for this event in this Nation's Capital were petitioning their Government in a peaceful, effective, and lawful way.

Mr. Speaker, in the manner in which it was planned, by the tone of the speeches and the conduct of the marchers, this extraordinary assemblage imprinted on the soil of this Capital City, and indeed, upon the Nation, a new high in the battle for civil rights. President Kennedy echoed the sentiments of the country when he said:

> The cause of 20 million Negroes has been advanced by the program conducted so appropriately before the Nation's shrine to the Great Emancipator—but even more significant is the contribution to all mankind.

The embattled leaders of the civil rights movement have a right to be immensely proud of the tremendous success of this march. What a day it was for them. Surely, it can be termed one of the crowning achievements of those like A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Dr. Martin Luther King, and scores of others who have carried the burden over the years of marshaling the people behind their just cause and stirring the conscience of this land. I salute them in this golden hour and express the deep conviction that it will lead to better tomorrows.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House voted to cut $585 million from the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. This cut followed on the heels of a cut of over $400 million by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the total reduction in the foreign aid bill from the President's request of $4.5 billion is approximately 22 percent. This is a larger cut than has been sustained by any other major program. Some of the reasons advanced in support of cuts beyond those made by the committee do not, it seems to me, fully recognize the objectives sought by our aid program. Nor does this cut do justice to the effective leadership being provided by the Honorable David Bell, Director of AID.

Mr. Speaker, the execution of our aid programs is steadily improving. We are learning from experience. For example, the Clay Committee recommended many constructive changes in the aid program.

Most of these recommendations reflected changes already being effected. General Clay's endorsement of the committee's figure confirms this fact.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the full significance of the $585 million cut should be made known to the House since we will be voting again on aid bills during this session. Following is an excellent summary by Mr. Bell of the impact of this cut:

STATEMENT BY DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AUGUST 24, 1963

The statements of the President and of the Secretary of State yesterday have indicated the seriousness of the drastic reductions made in the foreign aid bill by the House of Representatives. These cuts dealt a severe blow to the ability of the United States to achieve freedom and peace in the world.

The reductions cut deeply into the funds requested for our military assistance program, the Alliance for Progress, and other purposes.

To cut military assistance by $225 million would prevent us from meeting existing military plans as laid out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff concerning countries with which we have joint arrangements for mutual defense against Communist aggression. Since our military assistance goes primarily to nine countries—such as Korea, Turkey, Pakistan, and Vietnam—along the frontiers of the Communist bloc, it is clear that such a reduction would affect these besieged countries most.

The cost of freedom is not cheap. But it should be remembered that our military assistance helps maintain over 2½ million fighting men in countries facing the Communist bloc and that it costs 10 times as much to maintain a ready U.S. soldier overseas as it does to keep his allied counterpart adequately equipped and in place. The military assistance program helps provide the United States and the free world with the maximum amount of strength at the lowest possible cost to the American taxpayer.

To cut the Alliance for Progress $150 million would halt the momentum which has built up in the first 2 years of this long-term effort. The reduction of this amount in the Alliance means that funds available for lending this fiscal year would be less than those available last year despite the fact that both Peru and Argentina have emerged from a period of relative inaction to one of potential dynamic activity.

The Alliance is more than a program for economic and social development—it is the hope for the future in Latin America, the action program to prevent any future "Cuba's" in the Western Hemisphere.

To illustrate the effects that this cut could have, consider these examples: $50 million would build 10,000 new classrooms for 500,000 children; $1.5 million would enable the United States to provide a daily meal to 6 million additional school children through the food-for-peace program, utilizing surplus U.S. agricultural commodities; and $2 million is the cost of touching 2 million people with the healing hands of freedom provided by 60 mobile medical units.

To cut $160 million from the authorization for development loans would severely limit our ability to help the countries of Africa and Asia to move forward in their efforts to remain free and develop self-supporting economies. Two-thirds of the loan funds permitted in the House bill are already allocated to four countries. This means that sharply limited funds would be available for development lending elsewhere, particularly to the young nations of Africa. The $160 million cut is equivalent to all of the loans made last year to all of the countries in Africa and the Far East. The cut would mean a major halt in important power development, water supply and other projects which are basic to developing countries striving to lift themselves by their own bootstraps.

To cut $50 million from the contingency fund reduces the President's emergency funds to a dangerously low level. It brings the contingency authorization down to $150 million—a reduction of 50 percent in the President's request and compares with final appropriations in 1962 and 1963 of $275 million and $250 million.

Nor will the reductions proposed significantly help one of our serious national problems, the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments. Eight out of every ten dollars now committed under the entire AID program will be spent in the United States to purchase American-made goods and services. The particular cuts made in this program by the House would have almost no effect on the balance of payments because they relate to categories under which expenditures are almost completely tied to procurement in this country. Therefore, the reductions effected by the House would not be in our payments deficit but in U.S. exports.

Finally, in the debate on the aid bill, there was much criticism of the foreign aid "pipeline" and some claims that the 1964 program could be funded from unexpended balances in this "pipeline." This claim is not true. "Pipeline" is simply the term used for those funds appropriated to a Government agency, committed by the agency for specific purposes, but not yet actually expended under these commitments. It may take several years to spend the funds necessary to build a dam, for example, but we cannot promise to build dams in two countries with only the money we have set aside to build one dam.

The President has expressed the hope that the Senate will redress the action of the House. I join him in that hope. I cannot subscribe to the view that the United States is too poor and too tired to help people around the world who are striving to help themselves.

PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION PRAISES CONGRESS AND CONGRESSMEN

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, it is, unfortunately, all too rare to find distinguished educators and philosophers who are ready to stand up and do battle for the Congress of the United States and its membership. All too frequently, they center their attention on criticisms. They fail to call attention to the good.

Consequently, I was particularly pleased to read in the Washington Evening Star, of July 17, 1963, a letter to the editor from Carl J. Friedrich, president of the American Political Science Association, in which he paid a sterling tribute to the membership, based on long study and on personal experience.

Professor Friedrich has had a long and distinguished career. He studied at the Universities of Marburg, Frankfurt, Vienna, and Heidelberg, where he received a Ph. D. degree in 1925. He holds honorary degrees from many American universities, including Harvard. Since 1926, he has been on the staff at Harvard, starting as an assistant professor and finally becoming the Eaton professor of science of government in 1955. He is a member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard. He has written many books on a variety of subjects, including politics and philosophy.

In 1947, Dr. Friedrich was an outstanding member of the fine staff of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, known as the Herter committee. He was with the committee during its entire trip to Europe and after its return. His help and assistance was invaluable in enabling the committee to make the recommendations which culminated in the Marshall plan. This is generally credited, as Dr. Friedrich stated in his letter, with laying the foundation for the remarkable recovery of Europe.

Only five members of the Herter committee still remain in Congress. They are: HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina; GEORGE MAHON, of Texas; EUGENE KEOGH, of New York, all Democratic Representatives. I am the only Republican member of the committee who is still a Member of the House. Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, then a House Democratic Member, also served with distinction on the committee. My good friend, Francis E. Walter, who recently passed away, was an outstanding member of my particular subcommittee.

We all feel the same pride in the work of the committee that Dr. Friedrich expresses so ably in his letter. I am sure that the other Members equally appreciate the fine tribute, based on experience and knowledge, which Professor Friedrich pays to the hard working members of the Herter committee as well as to Representatives in Congress, as a group, and to Congress as an institution.

Dr. Friedrich's letter follows:

PRAISES CONGRESS

(By Carl J. Friedrich, president, American Political Science Association)

Some weeks ago you published in a news story from Charlotte, N.C., the "jaundiced view of politicians" of the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale. It is regrettable, to say the least, that a man in a responsible position should thus abuse those who serve the Nation in elective public office.

It is, of course, a conventional pastime of the man in the street to work off his frustrations by such abuse. But in these times when constitutional democracy in general, and our American Republic in particular, are confronted with the totalitarian challenge to representative government, such reckless misrepresentation of the plain facts ought not to go unanswered.

Let me then stand up and be counted as one who believes that the large majority of the men serving in the Senate and the House of Representatives are dedicated public servants. It has been my privilege as a lifelong student of politics to be personally acquainted with quite a few of these men. I have no hesitation in saying that I have found them men of intelligence, courage and integrity, and what is perhaps even more important: very hard working.

Knowing the record, I believe that a careful statistical study would show that Members of Congress work longer hours than most Americans, including ministers and college professors. When I had the honor of serving as an expert consultant with the congressional Committee on Foreign Aid (Herter committee) I was deeply impressed with the long hours put in by all the members who went abroad to convince themselves that the Marshall plan proposals made sense. Their epochmaking report became one of the most important documents of the postwar years, and all of Europe owes its remarkable recovery to the labor of these men.

Needless to say, I often have disagreed with one or another of these men. But I have always found them open to fair argument and anxious to discover the best answer. I feel proud of our representatives, and only wish we could bring it about that the representatives of other nations now trying to become constitutional democracies would become equally devoted and public spirited.

WOOL IMPORTS AND LABOR DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 400 New Hampshire workers and their families are going to celebrate Labor Day by joining the ranks of the unemployed. The A. G. Dewey Mills, of Enfield, N.H., has had to close down for 10 days as a result of the steady increase in wool imports.

Mr. Speaker, just a while ago, I joined 11 Republican Congressmen from New England and reminded President Kennedy of the explicit and repeated promises made by him and his administration for 2 long years to do something about wool imports. Mr. Speaker, nothing has been done.

It is a sad commentary on the Kennedy administration that 400 families in New Hampshire, on the eve of Labor Day, must join the ranks of the unemployed. Several weeks ago, these workers petitioned the President for relief. They received no answer. It seems strange to me that the President can find time to indulge in petulant outbursts against the U.S. Congress for not rubberstamping his inflated requests for foreign aid, but cannot find time to answer petitions asking for long promised help.

This callous disregard for the plight of hard-working citizens makes a mockery of Democratic prating about the problems of the unemployed and distressed areas.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record at this point, the letter addressed to the President by 11 New England Congressmen which I have referred to.

August 21, 1963.

Hon. John F. Kennedy,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: This letter is a desperate appeal for action to save the domestic wool textile industry. There can be no doubt that the time for such action is long overdue.

As you know, the steady deterioration of the Nation's wool textile industry has contributed substantially to the growing and unsolved problem of chronic unemployment. While there may be honest differences of opinion as to the efficacy of programs which purport to create new jobs, there can be no dispute as to the wisdom of guarding against the further loss of jobs in an industry already determined to be necessary to the Nation's security.

The impact of the depression of the wool textile industry has already been felt in related domestic industries—from wool growing to apparel manufacture. The circle of uncertainty continues to widen.

It is with reluctance that we remind you of the direct and explicit promises that have been made by you, Mr. President, and officials high in your administration, that relief would be forthcoming. For example, on August 31, 1960, you wrote to Governor Hollings, of South Carolina, as follows:

"Clearly the problems of the industry will not disappear by neglect nor can we wait for a large-scale unemployment and shutdown of the industry to inspire us to action. A comprehensive industrywide remedy is necessary.

"Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy.

"The Office of the Presidency carries with it the authority and influence to explore and work out solutions within the framework of our foreign trade policies for the problems peculiar to our textile and apparel industry. Because of the broad ramifications of any action and because of the necessity of approaching a solution in terms of total needs of the textile industry, this is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge."

On June 30, 1961, you wrote Congressman Carl Vinson as follows:

"It should be borne in mind that the contemplated [cotton textile] negotiations are designed as one of the series of efforts to assist the textile industry. Our objective is to assist the industry to overcome all of the handicaps which it faces. The State Department is being instructed to get the best possible relief, not only for cotton, but for other fibers."

In January 1962, your special assistant, Lawrence F. O'Brien, wrote Congressman Vinson and Senator Pastore, saying:

"After the conclusion of the permanent [cotton] textile agreement, the problems of the wool and manmade fiber industries will certainly be attacked."

On February 26, 1962, in a letter to Congressman Vinson, you stated:

"I have also requested the Departments involved to implement my program for the wool, manmade fiber and silk divisions of the industry. Almost all of the points in the program announced on May 2, 1961, apply equally to each of these."

On August 28, 1962, your Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, in a letter to Congressman F. Bradford Morse, stated:

"We are determined that imports of wool textile products will not be permitted to exceed current levels and we will take all necessary steps to prevent this."

On January 18, 1963, a Washington press dispatch stated:

"A group of Senators from wool and wool textile States said they received assurances from President Kennedy today that 'something will be done' to restrict imports on wool products. Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, told newsmen * * * that the President promised to propose within a month measures to limit such imports."

In spite of the foregoing promises and commitments, Mr. President, no action has been taken to stem the flood of woolen textile imports that threaten to destroy the industry.

1. Wool textile imports increased by 78 percent between 1961 and 1962.

2. The record shows that wool textile imports in the first quarter of 1963 were 41 percent above the comparable 1962 figure and are currently at an annual rate in excess of 160 million square yards.

3. In the year ending March 30, 1963, 85.4 million pounds of wool textiles were imported.

4. The ratio of imports to domestic production rose from 15.1 percent in 1962 to 23.2 percent in the year ending March 30, 1963.

5. Three hundred and five woolen textile mills have closed their doors in the past 15 years displacing 105,000 workers.

It has been clear for some time that this situation is not going to improve unless prompt action is taken by your administration. We cannot wait for the conclusion of an International Wool Agreement. As the Senate Special Subcommittee To Study the Textile Industry said on July 18, "We favor resolution of the problems by such means as an effective international agreement to limit imports of wool textile and apparel products. If this is not achieved, however, the United States must take unilateral action to insure that the defense-essential wool textile and apparel industries are not irreparably damaged by the unrestrained flood of imports."

Each of us has seen the personal hardship and despair of the people who suffer from the decline of the domestic wool textile industry. The remaining plants and mills are struggling to keep their place in the market and provide jobs for 60,000 textile workers.

But they cannot keep their heads above water for very long without Executive action. Not long ago a plant, newly modernized, was forced to shut down due to the competition of goods produced abroad by workers who are paid as little as 14 cents an hour.

It is too late to save the jobs and the investments in the mills already closed. But you can still preserve the livelihood and self-respect of the 60,000 remaining textile workers and their families; they deserve the relief that has been promised for so long.

We believe, Mr. President, that your firsthand knowledge of the problem faced by the people in our districts would make a meeting with you particularly productive. We respectfully request an opportunity to discuss this matter with you personally at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph W. Martin, of Massachusetts; James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire; Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts; F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts; Robert T. Stafford, of Vermont; William H. Bates, of Massachusetts; Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts; Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine; Abner W. Sibal, of Connecticut; Stanley R. Tupper, of Maine; Louis C. Wyman, of New Hampshire.

INSURING NEW ENGLAND ADEQUATE AIR SERVICE

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which can insure that the New England area will continue to receive adequate air service. I know

I do not have to tell any Members of this body how important adequate transportation by air, rail, and road is to the well-being of any section of our Nation. Just as air transportation is vitally related to the well-being of the New England economy, the ability of airlines to compete in the profitable air transportation markets is vitally related to their ability to provide local service.

This measure would eliminate the possibility that one aspect of a carrier's service could be cut off, and its ability to provide other service impaired or destroyed. The bill would require the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant certificates of unlimited duration to a carrier which can show first, that it is the holder of a certificate or certificates of public convenience or necessity originally issued pursuant to the authority contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; second, that it has operated, for a period of at least 6 years, carrier service under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity; and third, that it has rendered adequate and efficient service thereunder.

It is only equitable that a carrier which renders capable service for so long a period not be subject to the constant threat that its temporary certificates will be revoked.

I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] for his leadership in preparing this legislation. He has attacked the serious and complex problem facing New England with intelligence and diligence. I am proud to join with him today in introducing this legislation, and I hope that it will receive the prompt, sympathetic, and favorable consideration of the House.

LABOR DAY REFLECTIONS

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday we will observe Labor Day. It is practical for us to look back over the years of development of the Nation by workingmen and women, and equally important to look forward to the future to determine how we might best solve the basic problems confronting our economy.

When we speak of problems facing the economy on Labor Day, the matter of greatest concern should be the 6.5 percent of the country's work force that remains unemployed.

Since Labor Day signals the start of the school year, it is practical for us first to emphasize to the young people of high school age the importance of staying in school, and acquiring the education which they will obviously need in the years to come. The job opportunities that face the youth of today demand skills that are obtainable in our educational system. School dropouts become unemployment statistics, as we well know. That is why, as we commemorate Labor Day, I urge our young people to continue their educational pursuits.

It is also practical for us to emphasize that job retraining is the key to ending unemployment facing many of our adult workers. The impact of automation in our economy, the development of modern and effective production methods require that the ever-growing labor supply have the needed skills which must be met by expansion of apprenticeship training, and retraining men with obsolete trades to meet the opportunities of today and the future.

We have hope for continued vigorous growth. It is practical, especially on Labor Day, to emphasize that a properly trained and adapted working force is essential to the expansion of our economy.

Our history has demonstrated the ability of our Nation and its people to meet the problems that confront us. History has also demonstrated the inherent strength of our free enterprise economic system. The role of the workingman in the growth and prosperity of our economy has never been more important than today and in the years to come.

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the march on Washington for jobs and freedom is over. And the fearful, the cynical, the hypercautious, the annoyed, the hostile, even the disinterested, have all been answered by more than 200,000 Americans of all races and faiths and national origins and economic and social conditions who gave their Capital, their country, and their world a demonstration we can never forget—an intensely moving demonstration of quiet determination, of relaxed confidence, of total commitment to the ideals of democracy, of freedom and opportunity and respect for every human person.

Early newspaper reports, Mr. Speaker, suggest that Congress, almost alone among the millions who watched Wednesday's thousands seeking justice, seemed unimpressed or unresponsive. I doubt the accuracy of these reports—not because I believe the march has somehow changed men's minds and hearts about civil rights, but because I do believe that not even the most insensitive spirit or most hardened conscience could fail to be stirred by this great and dignified example of standing straight and tall for what is right.

Whether any votes were changed, we may never know. But I believe there are votes enough now in Congress to pass a comprehensive and effective civil rights bill. What happened on Wednesday can only strengthen the resolve and stiffen the determination of those of us who believe that freedom now must become a reality.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES—A PILOT'S PLEA

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters concerning the CAB decision decapitating Northeast Airlines by taking away 83 percent of its business. One which I received from a pilot has particularly impressed me. Coming as it did, just before Labor Day, it is an especially stark reminder that over 2,200 people, like this pilot, are in grave danger of losing their jobs. And not because their company was not successful—no, rather because they had all worked too hard and made their airline too successful.

The Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel, upon receiving a copy of this letter, made the following comments in part in a lead editorial on August 23, 1963:

NOBLE EFFORT

Amid all the expert and carefully documented testimony calling for a reversal of the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision denying Northeast Airlines permanent certification of the New York-to-Florida route, we doubt that any of it will be more convincing—or appealing—than a letter circulated by one of the airline's pilots, Capt. Bob Mudge, of Lynnfield, Mass.

The pilot apologizes for not being a writer, but he doesn't need to, because he begins telling his "Northeast Story" in a manner calculated to capture readership:

"Want to get in a fight? Boy, we have a beauty going right now and we sure can use your help."

Mudge then proceeds to detail the history of Northeast and its Florida run. But it's his explanation of his action in circulating the letter which cannot fail to rally a sympathetic public to his cause.

Whether they make it or not, certainly they deserve to, after such a noble effort.

I am certain my colleagues will be interested in reading the letter which follows in its entirety:

THE NORTHEAST STORY

Want to get in a fight? Boy, we have a beauty going right now and we sure can use your help.

Our story is rather long and complicated—but we feel it is one vital to the principles of our country and therefore is important to every American citizen. We sincerely hope you will read this story, consider its implications carefully, and then join us in this fight.

Seven years ago, Northeast, a small New England airline, was given a chance to compete against the bigtime airlines to large cities south of New York. It was a tremendous opportunity. For the first time in 23 years we were free of Federal subsidy and on our own. We were proud—mighty proud.

Jumping into the bigtime all at once is quite a thing for a small airline. These were tough years. We tripled our size which ran up fantastic training costs. We had to buy new fleets of aircraft to properly serve these new markets. A DC-6B fleet for Florida, a Viscount fleet for the high density commuter market, and no sooner had we done this than the big boys started playing with pure jets. With more help from free enterprise, we, too, got a fleet of beautiful new Convair 880's. If we had been proud before, you should have seen us when the first 880 arrived. The country cousins had the right tools to work with, and not 1 cent had been provided by the Government.

We had financial problems, plenty of them. Our biggest problem was somewhat like moving into an expensive new neighborhood and trying to pay off your mortgage in 5 years instead of 15. Because of the temporary nature of our route certificate we had to finance our planes over an unrealistically short time. Add to this the high cost of training, the abnormally high cost of advertising necessary to create an identity in a new market—a new market?—many new markets—and supporting originally low load factors inherent in developing a new route and you have fantastic costs. We lost all right—a lot of it. Every cent of it, though, was from private enterprise. Private enterprise had faith that we would eventually develop into a successful airline. Private enterprise still has this faith.

On July 26 the Civil Aeronautics Board lowered the boom. After hearings they decided Northeast should no longer be allowed to fly south of New York. They cited three reasons:

1. The public benefits anticipated when the certificate was granted have not been realized.

To us, the term "public benefit" when applied to a transportation system means simply the carrying of people from one place to another, as they desire, in a safe, comfortable, and convenient way. In a freely competitive route structure the degree to which a particular carrier has succeeded in meeting this public benefit can readily be determined by the share of the market he attracts.

If one carrier flies 60 percent of the traffic, another 30 percent, and a third 10 percent, it is obvious that the first carrier has more fully met the public benefit than either of the other two. How did Northeast do on this score?

As you read these figures bear in mind that we were a small carrier competing for the first time in the big league. We took on American, Eastern, and National over routes on which they all held permanent certificates and for the most part were firmly entrenched. We had to battle every step of the way.

Since the CAB said, in granting these route awards, that it was concerned greatly with improved service for New England to points south, let's study the traffic going south out of Boston.

In 1962 we carried 61 percent of all the passengers between Boston and Miami. Northeast ended up dominating the market while competing against two permanent certificate holders. In the smaller markets to Jacksonville and Tampa we did our share by carrying 25 percent and 33 percent respectively.

Look at the commuter routes. Boston-Philadelphia we carried 67 percent of the traffic. Boston-Washington we hauled 73 percent. On both of these routes we were competing against American, Eastern, and National on an unrestricted basis. Not bad for country boys—we dominated both markets completely.

The CAB says the public benefits anticipated have not been realized. Just what did the CAB expect us to do—run everyone else right out of business? After all, we only held a temporary certificate and we had a hundred and one other big problems facing us. If we carried many more people in these markets, we might well be facing charges of monopoly.

2. The future prospects for operation of Northeast's system on a profitable basis are extremely remote.

Most of us have been brought up to believe that in America's free enterprise system that a businessman has the right to risk his own capital as he sees fit. That, if a man sets his eye on a star, he has the right to pursue this star. If it costs him much money to finally arrive there—this is his business and his alone. That, even should he spend every cent he has in the pursuit of this star, and he then fails—this too is his right.

In this case we find a Government official taking on the responsibility of evaluating a business risk for a private enterprise. The Hughes Tool Co. entered the picture several years ago when Northeast was in serious financial trouble. This company believed in the future of Northeast and invested millions of dollars in this belief. The CAB allowed Hughes Tool Co. to pursue its star with its course laid clear before them. Just prior to the decision, plans were made that would finally put Northeast on a sound financial footing. The Hughes Tool Co. offered to dissolve some $26 million of debt and was rapidly working out arrangements for the settlement of much of our remaining obligations. Our financial picture looked bright.

Not only was our past debt picture looking bright, but we had now attained good market identity—we carried the highest load factor in the industry in early 1963. This, in turn, meant that our tremendous advertising costs necessary to develop these routes could now be put on a more normal basis. Our training costs had leveled out. All we needed was a permanent certificate so that our long-range equipment programs could be put on a more realistic basis.

The action of a Government agency evaluating a business risk and enforcing irrevocably on the business its decision is one aspect of this case that is important to all people in this country. Just how much control over an individual business can a Government official have? Does a private businessman have the right to evaluate his own risks or not? Certainly the Government must have some say in cases where it has money invested—but in this case Northeast was not asking for Federal subsidy (even on its short haul routes)—yet the CAB is forcing us to fly these short haul routes only, in a hopeless competitive position on a subsidy of some $3,700,000 a year. This is your money.

There is some justification for the CAB entering into control of airline business when the public convenience and necessity are involved. When this is the case, they must act in the public interest and for the public convenience and necessity. When the public selects one carrier on a route 73 percent of the time from a free choice of several carriers—they should be allowed the right to fly this airline. The CAB does have public responsibilities.

This apparent eagerness on the part of the CAB to force a subsidy status on Northeast is all the more surprising, when, in the same paper announcing the final decision, appeared an article announcing that the CAB was taking steps to cut subsidies to airlines. The confusing CAB.

3. The remaining two carriers are capable of meeting the requirements of this market.

This is probably the crux of the whole decision. Chairman Boyd stated that he wished to reduce competition and that two carriers are enough on this market.

How quickly we seem to forget the protection and service provided the public last summer while Eastern was grounded by a strike. Northeast was the prime carrier on many routes involved that kept things moving. We worked around the clock—but the job got done pretty well.

Or perhaps we forget that in a technology such as ours, airplanes can get "bugs" in them. Remember the DC-6 groundings? Remember the Martin? Even remember the Electra which was not grounded, but which did have severe restrictions placed on it and the public in masses chose to fly other types of equipment until the Electra was finally proved safe. In this particular instance our two competitors happened to fly Electras, but Northeast was able to come to the rescue with other types of equipment. In the future we shall see new aircraft types taking to the sky—who is to say that these too will not have bugs which could result in groundings or loss of public confidence?

The chances of all three carriers on a competitive route operating the same type of equipment is remote—but we have already seen it happen in the case of the two carriers to whom the CAB would entrust our east coast routes. How quickly we forget.

Before Northeast was granted the right to fly south of New York, the passenger desiring to fly to Florida was faced with the problem of simply not being able to get any seat at all, of waiting until a most inconvenient time, or paying scalper's prices for a reservation. Out of Boston he had no nonstop service and was forced to go through New York. At New York it was not unheard of for him to find that his seat had seen sold to someone else and he had to get off. It was largely because these two carriers to whom the CAB would now entrust this even larger market did not adequately service the route that Northeast was granted the certificate.

What has happened since Northeast entered these markets? We have pointed out that of the total traffic flying, Northeast has come to dominate many of these markets and has carried its fair share of most of the others. But what about development of the routes? Has Northeast simply stolen traffic from the other carriers and thus made them lose money? Or has this extra competitive effort brought about development of the routes? Let's see.

It is true that on the New York-Miami route the traffic has not grown as anticipated. Actually, since 1957 it has only grown 1.4 percent. In this market we have only carried a little over 20 percent of the total. But, there are many other important markets involved here. Boston-Miami has grown 27.5 percent and, remember, this is one of the routes that was of prime concern. Some others:

	Percent
Boston-Philadelphia	77.0
Boston-Washington	163.7
Boston-Jacksonville	63.9
Philadelphia-Jacksonville	147.6
Philadelphia-Tampa	156.9
Baltimore-Miami	134.4
Baltimore-Tampa	1,181.5

In view of these figures it would seem that perhaps we had done more to stimulate new traffic than we did the capturing of old. Effective competition can do more than this—it can improve service for public convenience.

What kind of service did the two prime carriers give on the Boston-Washington run before Northeast began to fly?

The year 1956: American, one nonstop; Eastern, one nonstop.

The year 1963: National, no nonstops; American, one nonstop; Eastern, five nonstops; Northeast, nine nonstops.

What kind of service did the two prime carriers give on the Boston-Philadelphia run before Northeast began to fly?

The year 1956: American, two nonstops; Eastern, one nonstop.

The year 1963: National, no nonstops; American, one nonstop; Eastern, five nonstops; Northeast, five nonstops.

Look a bit closer: American is not complaining—they are making money. Note that in the case of effective competition, American has given way on service so that it is scheduling realistically to the traffic it is carrying. Eastern, on the other hand, is keeping up schedules but not flying the traffic to justify it. This is particularly apparent when you consider Northeast is flying largely 44-passenger Viscounts while Eastern is using larger and greater-capacity aircraft. It is rather obvious that since Northeast carries 73 percent and 67 percent of the traffic over these routes that Eastern is overscheduling seats in relation to their share of the market. Is it any wonder that it now claims it is losing money?

This is simply competition at work—nothing more sinister than that. Take the Washington-New York market. Here Eastern really licked us. We had originally come to dominate this market, and then Eastern got the air shuttle idea. This was fine, new service. The public liked it, and our traffic fell off rapidly. If we had been preparing a case for the CAB rather than operating an airline efficiently, we perhaps would have chosen to keep flying our flights, keep flying empty seats around the route, then pleaded with the CAB that there was overcompetition and that Eastern should be forced off the route. We could then provide the public with the service they have already indicated they did not want. This may sound ridiculous—and it is—yet it is exactly what is happening to us now. In the case of Northeast in the Washington-New York market when we lost our competitive position, we did what any realistic businessman would do—we got out of the unprofitable market and concentrated our efforts where we felt we could be successful. This is not new—American has done the same thing and so has National. National essentially does not serve the Boston-Washington market at all nor the Philadelphia-Boston run even though they hold a permanent certificate over these routes for commuter service. Instead they are concentrating on their southern transcontinental route and making millions.

If normal competitive forces are permitted to work, we will find results like those just mentioned. The carrier desired by the public will prevail. The other carriers will go elsewhere to seek their markets—areas they can successfully serve. No Government mandate is needed. When the Government starts tampering too heavily with our free enterprise system, we will find cases such as ours where the carrier overwhelmingly selected by the public is being removed and those less capable and less desired by the public allowed to exist. National will retain the right to serve these routes on which it has made no serious effort to serve—yet it was granted this right at the exact same time as Northeast.

If the Government must tamper with the free enterprise system—how can it justify elimination of the prime carrier? While we have no ill feeling toward National, logic would point to the elimination of this carrier from many of these routes. First, it has failed obviously to compete in these markets. Secondly, it has a highly profitable southern transcontinental route on which it is concentrating. In no case would it involve a Federal subsidy payment. Would it not be more logical to eliminate this carrier if only two carriers are desired on these routes?

The fact that National holds a permanent certificate while we held only a temporary does not seem to be all important. In the first place, we understand the Board at this time is under proceedings to remove permanent certificates and claims full right to do so. Secondly, if this is a firm policy of the Board to eliminate third carriers on runs as important as this—then many permanent certificates will have to be lifted in the near future. This particular route in question is the second heaviest in the country.

The question may well be asked as to whether or not a permanent certificate can, or should, be revoked. We don't know the answer, but for years we have felt that our marriage certificate represented a pretty permanent status—yet we all know that there are methods of dissolving or modifying these agreements which hold so much permanency in both courts and church. Take, also, our country's Constitution. Even this can be amended and modified when circumstances indicate such action necessary. It is, therefore, rather difficult to conceive of a permanent certificate issued by the CAB that is so powerful that it cannot, under some circumstances, be changed. If, however, it truly cannot be revoked, then it would seem rather silly for the CAB to formulate a new policy which can be applied in only the Northeast case.

We don't really want National eliminated—we just want the right to compete freely. Normal competitive forces will effectively eliminate those carriers unable to compete. We don't mind losing a fair race. We just hate to win the race and lose the decision.

At the time Northeast was granted its new routes on a temporary basis, National and Eastern (among others) were granted permanent certificates into what was previously largely Northeast territory. They got turnaround rights at such places as Boston-New York-Washington (EAL) and Boston-Philadelphia and Boston-Washington for National. Now, with the revocation of all rights granted to Northeast and none of these granted National and Eastern, Northeast finds itself in a hopelessly competitive position even on its old Boston-New York run.

If you believe that Northeast has earned the right to fly these routes; if you believe that the third carrier has stimulated business and substantially aided in the development of these routes; if you believe that free enterprise should be allowed to evaluate its own risks without Government interference; if you think that Government should refrain from unnecessary subsidy payments—then vote for Northeast now. We are on the verge of immediate bankruptcy and it is not certain that we have the necessary funds to adequately fight this case. We will not give up, but we do need your help desperately. You can save an airline by:

1. Writing to President Kennedy, your congressional representatives, Senator MIKE MONRONEY (chairman, Aviation Subcommittee), Chairman Alan Boyd of the CAB. Tell them your feelings on this case. As a matter of fact, even if you do not agree with us, write and tell these men. This is a very important case, not only for Northeast but for the entire country. It is dealing with some very fundamental principles.

2. If you have occasion to fly between east coast cities—fly with us. In this way you will cast your vote to indicate to Government that you feel our services are valuable and at the same time you will help us finance our battle for life as an airline.

3. Finally, if you can, let us know that you have helped and are joining us in this fight. We would like to thank you for writing and welcome you aboard our flights.

BOB MUDGE,
Captain, Northeast Airlines.

P.S.—I apologize for the length of this story—I find I am more pilot than writer. Should you desire further information, please write to me at: 9 King's Road, Lynnfield, Mass.

"NOW—SEE THE INNARDS OF A FAT PIG"

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 19, when a substantial discussion took place on this floor relative to a recent article in the August 16 issue of Life magazine entitled "Now—See the Innards of a Fat Pig," by five writers identified as Keith Wheeler, Henry Suydam, Norman Ritter, Bill Wise, and Howard Sochurek, I stated that I would make some additional comments at a later date.

In taking this time to do so, it is not my purpose to either defend or defame the article, but rather to make sure that the public may be properly informed as to additional facts that relate to the moneys spent foolishly, which seems to be the purpose of the article. While I might question some of the statements made, I would at least say that the story will serve some purpose if it causes the public to question some of the spending programs of their Government.

I think it is imperative that all of us, whether we are Members of Congress, interested citizens or taxpayers, always be on the alert to any instances in which Federal moneys may be spent foolishly. This ought to be a prime requisite at all times, but no doubt is even more pertinent at this stage in our history when we are experiencing a most difficult time in attempting to maintain our economic security in view of recent unexplainable budget deficits and a constant growth in our national debt.

I agree, and so stated on August 19, that we should never condone any kind of distortion of facts or misleading statements which would leave an erroneous impression with the public. For this reason, it becomes even more significant that we as Members of Congress, and everyone else concerned, do our very best to convey to the interested public all facts and all sides of every subject, including an article such as has been previously referred to. Sometimes I wish there was as much hue and cry in these Halls about wasteful spending as there is about inaccuracies in a magazine article.

My own interest in the article was generated because of 4 years of service on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and present service on the House Appropriations Committee. The experience in both cases has alerted me to the need for a continuous careful scrutiny of all proposed Government expenditures, in order that the best interests of all taxpayers, as well as the future economic security of our Nation might be protected. Because of the repeated references to reclamation projects in the article, as well as in the comments on this floor later, and because of having had occasion to serve on the committee when one of the projects referred to, namely, Fryingpan-Arkansas, was passed, I shall confine my remarks to this area particularly.

To say or imply that all reclamation projects have always served our best interests would be most erroneous, for there have been many projects that have rather been a most pronounced economic liability. This is not to say that there are not good projects, and I found occasion to be in support of projects which, in my estimation, were good, while serving on the committee. This, I am sure, is the purpose of every Member of Congress.

That there is some question regarding the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, as to whether or not it is a worthy project, in view of existing agricultural surpluses, and power and water controversies, I suppose is best explained by the minority report issued by the committee under date of July 11, 1961, signed by myself and other members of the committee.

Summary of Views in Opposition to the Enactment of Bill—Submitted as a Minority Report

1. The project is the forerunner of the huge Gunnison-Arkansas project. The Bureau of Reclamation's project planning report (1950) designated the Fryingpan project as the "initial development of the potential Gunnison-Arkansas project." The Gunnison-Arkansas project would probably involve a construction cost approaching $1 billion. Although it is stated that the Fryingpan project would stand by itself, and the bill indicates that the Gunnison-Arkansas project is not contemplated, it seems probable the people of the Arkansas Valley will not and cannot be satisfied with the very small amount of irrigation water furnished by the project (one-half acre-foot per acre or less on the area to be served) and will demand the Gunnison-Arkansas project which, according to previous Bureau reports, would divert upward of 900,000 acre-feet annually from the Colorado River Basin or about 10 times the amount of water proposed for diversion by the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

2. The project is substantially the same proposal that has been previously rejected for consideration by the House of Representatives. Consideration of this legislation to authorize this development started in the 82d Congress with the introduction of a bill upon which a Department report was requested but not received and no hearings were held. In the 83d Congress, on a bill covering this project, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation held 5 days of hearings and ordered the bill reported to the full committee. The bill was reported to the House and a rule granted. The House refused to consider the rule and on July 28, 1954, by a vote of 195 to 188, defeated the rule. In the 84th Congress, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation held 8 full days of hearings and also field hearings, reported the bill to the full committee, and the full committee reported the bill to the House. A rule was granted on August 15, 1958, but no action was taken before adjournment. In the 86th Congress, substantially the same bill was again introduced. The subcommittee held 2 days of hearings, but no further action was taken by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2206, in the words of its author, has "* * * very little new to be brought into the hearings * * *." While the changes are an attempt to bring the bill into line with reclamation law, the basic defects which have caused Congress to refuse to consider this bill still remain.

This statement is substantiated by the testimony offered by the Department witnesses because the substitution of the Ruedi Dam and Reservoir in lieu of the Aspen Dam and Reservoir makes no changes whatsoever. Either of these facilities would furnish regulation of replacement water for the Colorado River Basin uses. The water supply aspects of the project are unchanged. The hydropower generation remains unchanged and the irrigation benefits remain unchanged. It is remarkable that the same Bureau witnesses who appeared in prior years and stated that it was impossible to bring this project within the existing reclamation law now state that by a mere shifting of a few figures and a slight increase in the cost of energy to preference and nonpreference customers, which heretofore the same witnesses said could not be justified, the project is feasible.

The project is of questionable engineering feasibility, is financially unsound, and lacks economic justification.

(a) The excessive cost of the transmountain diversion feature of the proposed project—$63 million to develop an annual supply of 69,000 acre-feet of water for irrigation and municipal use—is unwarranted and without economic justification.

The cost to the Federal Government would be about $23 per acre-foot or 4.5 times the estimated project revenue for irrigation water. The supply for irrigation furnished by the transmountain diversion would be only about 2 inches or one-sixth of an acre-foot per acre. The large cost of such a small supply would far outweigh its value.

(b) The $62.7 million power development features of the project are of highly questionable financial feasibility. The cost of power from five of the seven plants would be materially greater than the assumed price of 6.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The estimated power output and power revenues from the plants are unsupported and appear exaggerated. Furthermore, there is no assurance that the power could be sold at the required rate of 6.5 mills or more per kilowatt-hour over the protracted repayment period of about 50 years, considering the availability of other competing sources of power and possible obsolescence of hydroplants.

(c) There is grave doubt as to the engineering feasibility of the Arkansas power canal—one of the major features of the proposed hydroelectric development. The project plans propose to construct and operate this unit as an open canal (actually a series of open canals aggregating 60 miles in length) to convey water to a series of six powerplants between the vicinity of Leadville and Salida, located along the canyon of the Arkansas River at elevations of over 7,000 to nearly 10,000 feet above sea level in a rugged mountain region where, for several months of the winter, severe ice and snow conditions prevail. The practicability of operating an open canal under such conditions is highly questionable. Under similar conditions on the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado a few miles to the north, the Bureau of Reclamation found it necessary to substitute tunnels and covered conduits for the open canals originally proposed. This change in plans has been stated to be one of the major reasons why the construction cost of that project to date has nearly quadrupled over the estimates offered to Congress.

The former Secretary of the Interior has reported that if covered conduits are found to be required, the total construction cost of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would be increased about $64 million and that such an increase would render the project infeasible. An additional cost of $64 million for the power development would raise the total project cost to $234 million or more—an increase of about 40 percent over the Bureau's estimate.

It is interesting to note that no Bureau witness contradicted testimony offered in prior hearings of the increased cost of construction if covered conduits are found to be required.

In view of the foregoing, the economic justification and financial feasibility of the power development as proposed for the project is highly questionable, which casts doubt on the feasibility of the entire project.

(d) The high cost of the irrigation features of the project—$217 per acre construction cost for a supplemental water supply of 0.6 acre-foot per acre, which is equivalent to $1,156 per acre for a full water supply—present a serious question as to the justification for the project as a Federal reclamation undertaking. As compared to this cost, the average value of irrigated farmland in the area does not exceed $225 per acre. If, as indicated by testimony of Bureau of Reclamation witnesses, the service area were reduced from the originally proposed 322,000 acres to 280,000 acres or less, the cost per acre would be increased proportionately by 10 percent or more.

There is no assurance that the irrigators could or would pay the proposed rate of $5.40 per acre-foot for project water. (The project planning report found that the irrigators would be able to pay only $3.60 per acre-foot.)

Moreover, estimated repayments from conservancy district taxes appear to be over-optimistic and not fully assured. It appears improbable, therefore, that irrigation revenues as estimated could or would be realized.

(e) The economic justification of the project is claimed on the basis of an unrealistic evaluation of benefits and costs with benefits estimated over a period of 100 years, which is highly speculative. Large indirect benefits are included.

One of the most startling features of the testimony offered to the Congress this year is the report from the Bureau of Reclamation that the benefit-cost ratio of the irrigation features of the project based on estimated direct benefits are in excess of 1-to-1 ratio. This is the same project on which the same witnesses have appeared before prior Congresses and stated that the benefit-cost ratio of the irrigation features of the project, based on estimated direct benefits on the basis of a 50-year payout period, to be substantially less than 1 to 1. This complete change of testimony by the same people on the figuring of cost-benefit ratio is further evidence of the fact that their economic justification is based on an unrealistic evaluation of benefit costs.

3. The Arkansas River development features of the project appear to be a feasible reclamation undertaking which could be authorized as a separate unit, excluding the costly and uneconomic transmountain diversion and power features of the project.

It appears from the report of the Bureau of Reclamation (H. Doc. 187, 83d Cong.) that the Arkansas River development features of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project could be carried out independently of the proposed transmountain diversion features as a financially feasible undertaking under existing reclamation law. A capital cost of $50 million would cover the entire cost of such a development, including the cost of municipal water supply delivery systems. The reimbursable cost of the water supply itself aggregating 92,000 acre-feet a year would only be $19,699,000.

The Bureau's report indicates that the Arkansas River development by itself would have substantial benefits. A large benefit would be realized from the flood control provided by the Pueblo Reservoir. In addition, the project could provide municipal water in the same amount as estimated for the proposed project—namely, 20,500 acre-feet—as well as 71,500 acre-feet for supplemental irrigation, which would materially relieve present shortages in supply.

The remainder of the project as proposed, including the transmountain diversion features and the power system and involving a cost of about $110 million, should be deferred for further consideration of questions of feasibility and economic justification. Such a procedure would be in line with the recommendations originally made by both the Budget Bureau and the Department of Agriculture in reporting on the project.

4. Testimony before the committee during extended hearings last year as well as this year indicates beyond refute that this project is not in the best interest of either our national economy or the agricultural problem that confronts the entire Nation. This was substantiated by facts and figures presented to the subcommittee in prepared statements and in response to questions raised during the course of the testimony.

The following utilization of the 280,000 acres was submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation:

Crops, acreages, yields, and returns to farmers, Southeastern Colorado Conservancy District Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado

[In thousands]

Crop	Acreage		Yield		Unit
	Without	With	Without	With	
Alfalfa	136.9	119.8	400	515	Ton.
Forage	5.0	5.0			
Grains	109.1	113.6	4,907	6,964	Bushel.
Sugarbeets	15.9	22.6	203	355	Ton.
Beans	4.8	5.4	4,924	7,149	Pound.
Fruit and vegetables	11.5	9.9	1,204	1,594	Hundredweight.
Seed crops	3 4	1.0	1,005	355	Pound.
Popcorn	4.0	3.3	7,618	8,474	Do.
Total	280.6	280.6			

It was further stated by Mr. Young, president of the Southeastern Water Conservancy District, that the Arkansas Valley presently produces approximately 80,000 head of cattle, 140,000 lambs, 850,000 turkeys and chickens, and 14,500 milk cows each year. In response to questioning he indicated that there would be substantial increases in the production of each of these livestock categories were the project to become a reality.

Without further details relative to each of these specific products, let us examine briefly the degree to which the present agricultural surplus problems would be aggravated by the increased production of these agricultural commodities.

First, we note that there would be in addition to the anticipated increase in livestock production, an annual increase of 115,000 tons of alfalfa hay, 2 million bushels of small grains, 152,000 tons of sugarbeets, and 2.2 million pounds of beans. These increases would come about in direct conflict to actions that have been taken by the Congress during recent months as well as all of the years in which the Congress has legislatively tried to reduce agricultural surpluses.

There are presently in the soil bank in the State of Colorado 1,299,881 acres while throughout the entire Nation there are under similar contracts roughly 22 million acres. A very high percentage of these acres have been seeded to alfalfa and other hay crops, and farmers who have contracts for these acres are not permitted to either cut hay or graze this land. In other words, it has been necessary to take 4,767 farms in Colorado and 303,413 farms throughout the Nation out of production at a total cost to the taxpayer of $337,986,884. This is the amount of money that is paid to participating farmers for not harvesting any agricultural commodity or cutting hay (alfalfa) on these acres. It is rather obvious that the authorization of this project costing $170 million in order to increase the production of hay is in direct conflict with the soil bank contract expenditures.

Figures indicate an increased production of over 2 million bushels of small grains per year. Here, again, we see the same kind of direct conflict. Figures released by the Department of Agriculture on June 1, 1961, indicate that the State of Colorado had a signup to comply with the newly enacted feed grain program which would divert 313,000 acres at an immediate cost of over $2 million to the taxpayer. For the entire Nation the diverted acreage amounts to over 24 million acres at a cost of over $312 million. Again, we see a direct conflict and a doubling up of expenditures.

The production of sugarbeets would be increased by 152,000 tons annually at the taxpayers' expense, while as recently as May 17 and 18, the Agricultural Committee held hearings and heard testimony for 2 days from farmers who expressed a desire to raise sugarbeets at no cost to the taxpayer if legislation could be enacted which would only permit them to do so. As yet there has been no response to these requests which have been prevalent for more than 20 years. In fact, these farmers have been denied this desire for all of these years because of existing limitations in the production of sugarbeets.

Let us look briefly at the livestock situation, and it is of interest to note that the project will substantially increase the production of sheep and lambs. According to a release by the Department of Agriculture on June 1, 1961, it has been necessary for the Department to purchase 11,928,000 pounds of lamb at a cost to the taxpayer of $4,333,000 in order to improve lamb prices to producers. This cost represents purchases during the short period of time from the 27th of February 1961 to June 1, 1961.

In addition, the Department of Agriculture indicates as of June 21, 1961, that for the 1960 marketing year, in order to bring the average wool price up to previously announced levels, it has been necessary for them to make payments which amount to 47.6 percent of the returns that each producer received from the sale of wool during this year. The total cost of this program for the 1959 marketing year was $53,888,000. There have been like expenditures in other categories of livestock production, most notably in the production of turkeys and chickens.

These figures surely exemplify most explicitly the degree to which the American taxpayer by the approval of this project will be called upon to furnish dollars that will only aggravate and cause additional expenditures in other areas where we are trying to reduce surpluses. Just as significant is the fact that if we have any hopes of effecting an improvement in our agricultural problem or even holding our own, it will be necessary for farm families in other areas to make comparable reductions in the production of alfalfa, hay, small grains, sugarbeets, and livestock. This they will be called upon to do at great sacrifice to their individual farm operation and at expense to the taxpayer. It seems not only unfair but discriminatory that on the one hand we ask farm families to make substantial sacrifices in order to alleviate a surplus problem and in other instances we provide large expenditures of public funds so as to permit others to expand their production capacities. Such a program surely does not leave any indication of either fiscal responsibility or equity among farm families throughout the Nation.

While this program calls for an initial appropriation of $170 million, this is only a small part of what the actual cost of this project will be to the Nation during the years ahead. For it will be necessary to expend additional large sums in order to pay for the storage of surplus commodities produced by virtue of this project or to make payments to other farm families for reductions in their production that may be comparable to these increases.

This project indicates the degree to which the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, in recommending this project, is in direct conflict with all recommendations and suggestions to improve the agricultural situation made by the Department of Agriculture. While this project proposes increases in production of agricultural commodities, the Department of Agriculture is very vigorously proposing programs that place restrictions and controls on segments of agriculture to produce less.

Therefore, it is our opinion that this project is not in compliance with either the agricultural or the economic needs of the Nation, now or in the forseeable future.

5. From evidence which has been submitted over the years from a number of persons and organizations on the western slope of Colorado, from where the water involved would be diverted, strong objections to the entire project have been registered. The changes in the present bill from prior bills have not eliminated the adverse testimony. The people on the western slopes of Colorado feel that the economy of the western slope will be damaged by the taking of water from the Colorado River Basin, where the supply is already short, and placing it in the Arkansas River Basin, where the present supply has not been fully used. They, as well as some of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have no confidence in the operating principles in the bill in connection with uses of water on both the eastern and western slopes of Colorado. Residents of the western slope are fearful that this and future transmountain diversions will stunt the economic development of an area which holds enormous industrial potential assuming there is water to serve it.

It is rather interesting to note that while the Colorado Water Board appeared and testified in favor of this project, the same board for years questioned the advisability of transmountain diversion in the San Juan-Chama project heretofore considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, pointing out that if the San Juan-Chama diversion were authorized it might adversely affect the development of a portion of the western slope of Colorado.

6. This bill for the first time puts the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation in the business of subsidizing public schools in the district served by the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Despite its adverse report on this provision by both the Department af the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, the committee has continued to keep this provision in the bill.

7. In prior bills no attempt was made to protect existing water rights. In an effort to show that these rights were now being protected the committee went far beyond protection and now has made this bill a vehicle for institution of a multiplicity of suits under any and all circumstances and by any and all persons.

Section 6(e) of the bill, beginning on line 10 through the end of the section on page 12 contains the following language:

"And any person or entity whose rights may be affected, impaired, or infringed upon by reason, or as a result, of such noncompliance may maintain an action, suit, or proceeding in the U.S. District Court in and for the District of Colorado seeking appropriate relief, and consent is hereby given to the joinder of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and his subordinate officials, employees, and agents as a party or parties to such action, suit, or proceeding, as a defendant or otherwise."

This language constitutes an open invitation to unnecessarily burden the operation of this project, intended for the benefit of all the people, with a multiplicity of individual suits with diverse claims for relief, which could well involve the actual operation of the project in the injunctive processes of the courts.

Despite the request of the Department of the Interior to delete this language it was retained by the committee.

8. The changes in the present bill from former bills by substituting the Ruedi Reservoir for the Aspen Reservoir will work an undue hardship on the Aspen area for a number of reasons:

(a) It leaves the Aspen area without any replacement storage, while at the same time containing the same collection system which can only help those downstream from the Basalt project.

(b) The bill directs the additional diversion above Aspen of 14,000 acre-feet through the Twin Lakes diversion.

9. The original development plan and a water right decree of June 20, 1958, for the Basalt project provided for full use of the waters of the Fryingpan River in western Colorado. The supplemental consent decree, approved by the district court of Garfield County, Colo., August 3, 1959, established an equal priority date of July 29, 1957, for the use of the Fryingpan River water for serving both projects.

Obviously, in reaching this consent agreement it was necessary that a part of the water previously decreed to the Basalt project for maximum development under the project be surrendered to make possible a decree of equal date for Fryingpan River water needed for the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

On the basis of testimony submitted to the committee in prior Congresses, this decree in and of itself makes the water supply uncertain. The Bureau of Reclamation gave testimony that they only had records over a 34-year period. To be workable, the project required all of the waters collected from the collection system on the Fryingpan and the Aspen Reservoir on Hunter Creek to make the necessary diversions. The consent decree clearly shows that the necessary water for this project is therefore unavailable.

10. The costs disclosed by this bill are not all that would be necessary because the bill authorizes a study of a reservoir to be built at a later date on Castle Creek.

For the foregoing reasons, as well as many others reflected in the material which was presented to the committee, this legislation, which involves an expenditure of $169,905,000 together with an additional $64 million if covered conduits are found to be required, should not be approved until there is a real economic justification which to date has not been presented.

Mr. Speaker, over the years there have been any number of irrigation projects that have proved to be liabilities and indicate great losses to the American taxpayer. Records issued by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that at least five have had to be abandoned, with numerous attempts to revive and justify their existence. The record further indicates that as of June 30, 1962, there had already been written off, in one manner or another, more than $83 million of authorized irrigation appropriations.

It is to be remembered that this condition exists even though the moneys chargeable to irrigation projects are repayable interest free, so that even when the projects are repaid in full, in the respective repayment period of usually 50 years, the American taxpayer is still out the interest on these large amounts of money.

A typical example of a project that has become a liability—and, as I have indicated, there are many others—is the Riverton project in the State of Wyoming. There are presently in progress attempts to revive this project, and I am sure it would be of interest to note at this point a few of the comments relating to the project under date of August 7, 1963, in a letter to the Speaker signed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum:

> For the purposes of consideration of the problems affecting the project it may usefully be divided into two parts. One, the Midvale Irrigation District, embraces 45,353 acres of irrigable land in the project's first and second divisions. It is the older section of the project, having been constructed between the world wars. The other section of the project is the third division. It has 11,831 acres of irrigable land and was opened up after World War II. Both sections of the project have encountered many of the same problems that confront other irrigation projects in the intermountain region as well as problems peculiar to the Riverton area. The situation can only be remedied by repairing or replacing deteriorated project works, lining canals and laterals, and installing effective drainage. A program to accomplish this has commenced in both sections of the project.
>
> The Midvale Irrigation District has had to undertake the task under the rehabilitation and betterment program because construction was completed. Rehabilitation and betterment contracts in a total amount of $4,450,000 have been executed, and all funds covered by existing contracts will be obligated by the summer of 1963. With that expenditure plus outlays of $50,000 for drain tile by individual farmers only 20 percent of the Midvale area will have been adequately reclaimed or protected from waterlogging and salinization, and the Midvale District's outstanding contractual obligation will require a repayment period of 108 years. The financing of additional protective works through the rehabilitation and betterment program would require a further extension of the repayment period which is entirely unrealistic.
>
> In the third division protective work has been carried on as a part of the regular construction program. However, the 10-year development period of the division expired before satisfactory repayment arrangements were made. In consequence, construction work has been halted. A conventional repayment contract for the third division, providing that the water users repay the construction costs allocated to irrigation in annual installments in accordance with their ability, would require a repayment period in excess of 300 years. Therefore, protective work in the Riverton project must stop after this year unless alternative financing arrangements can be made.
>
> Estimated costs of replacing deteriorated structures and completing measures to preserve or reclaim project resources are summarized in the following table:

	Midvale	3d division	Total
Canal lining	$2,628,399	$238,095	$2,866,494
Drains	6,505,408	717,959	7,223,367
Structure replacement	1,756,730	31,287	1,788,017
Total	10,890,537	987,341	11,877,878

Mr. Speaker, I make particular note of the statement that "a conventional repayment contract for the third division, providing that the water users repay the construction costs allocated to irrigation in annual installments in accordance with their ability, would require a repayment period in excess of 300 years."

Surely these are the kind of expenditures and future obligations that Congress ought to be cognizant of in any endeavor to practice the prudent use of the taxpayers' moneys.

While these experiences are surely indicative of unnecessary expenditures chargeable to the taxpayers throughout the Nation, they still do not relate the even more adverse and costly effects that these projects have had on our national economy, but more particularly the agricultural economy, with which, I am sure, everyone is concerned today.

Recent years have seen an almost continuous debate and concern regarding the farm problem and the accumulation of surpluses. I should very briefly identify the extent to which the entire surplus problem has been aggravated by the production of surplus commodities on these same projects. As of June 30, 1962, there was a total of 6,714,136 acres, plus 597,388 acres that carried multiple crops, making a total of 7,293,524 acres of irrigated lands. Of this total, there were 1,597,132 acres devoted to the production of cereal crops, 3,199,573 acres of forage crops, 1,383,839 acres of miscellaneous field crops, which includes sugarbeets and cotton, and 193,671 acres devoted to the production of alfalfa, sugarbeets, corn, and other crops for seed.

A hurried analysis of these figures indicates that more than 90 percent of the total acreage is devoted to the production of crops that have been placed in the surplus or restricted categories.

Permit me to make a brief further reference to the actual production in each of these categories. During fiscal 1962, the records show that a total of more than 38 million bushels of barley, 23 million bushels of corn, 18 million bushels of wheat, 9 million bushels of oats, and 6 million bushels of sorghums was produced on these acres, plus more than 8 million tons of sugarbeets and 109 million bushels of potatoes. These totals indicate a most direct relationship to the cost of the existing agricultural program. Storage on the grain crops alone would be more than $1.1 million per year.

But of greater significance is the fact that farmers in other areas have been forced to reduce their production of these same crops at a substantial cost to government and at the same time must carry their share of the Government expenditures relating to these reclamation irrigation projects. When we note that the production of sugarbeets on these projects is more than three times as large as the total acreage produced in the States of Minnesota and North Dakota combined, and that the production of potatoes is almost one-fourth of the total national production, it becomes pretty obvious that these projects constitute a substantial part of the entire agricultural problem.

Surely it should come as no great surprise that the taxpayers throughout the Nation should express their concern, as well as objection to the Government burden of the respective agricultural programs, when such a substantial part of the problem has been generated by Government itself.

I find it hard to be critical of farm folks who may have raised objections to further Government restrictions, when they note that the contributions they have made by reducing their production has only amounted to added production in other areas at their further expense. The great volume of bushels that I have just referred to could all have been produced on nonreclamation farms without the cost of a single nickel to the taxpayer.

I have yet to mention the most flagrant waste of moneys in this category, which is the forage production on more than 3 million acres, while at the same time we have paid farmers throughout the Nation for not cutting forage on roughly 22 million acres at a cost of more than $300 million per year.

There are many further analogies that could be made in this field. I think these figures will suffice, however, to point out quite clearly and distinctly that Congress ought to take a pretty careful look at any Government expenditures that would affect the national economy and the taxpayer as I have just identified. There are other categories of expenditures that have been referred to in the article. It shall not be my purpose at this time to document a comparable analysis of each of them. History and experience have certainly shown that in almost every last category of Government expenditures there has been waste and a constant need for Appropriations Committees and the Congress to scrutinize them most carefully, and even then, there have been, from time to time, revealed expenditures that could certainly not be justified.

As one who has had the experience of opposing some of these projects, I can attest to the problems that confront a Member of Congress in registering his opposition to what the article has identified as "a piece of pork." The statement credited to Senator DOUGLAS, and I quote: "You can't go on being Horatius at the bridge forever," is no doubt most appropriate.

In view of the many demands brought to the Congress every day for additional and new programs as well as expenditures, it would seem to me to be most logical that some of these moneys might be transferred to more useful purposes—or better yet, do not spend them at all, and rather try to achieve a balanced budget.

I find it most difficult to attempt to explain to today's younger generation that they must of necessity help to pay for expenditures of this kind that have contributed to the constant growth of our national debt.

I stated at the outset that it was not my purpose to either commend or condemn the article in Life magazine, and that we ought not to condone at any time a misrepresentation of facts; and with this same thought in mind, it occurs to me that if the article has served, as I think it was intended to do, to call to the attention of the public a better acquaintance with the expenditure of moneys in these respective categories, then it cannot be all bad.

It would be my hope that these observations, together with the others that have been made, might serve to further alert Congress to the great need for a careful scrutiny of all Government expenditures, so that the future may hold an improved economic security for this Nation. Perhaps, instead of crying because we have been stuck by the barbs of a magazine article, we should roll up our sleeves and make an honest attempt to pry the lids off our pork barrels.

ERIC JOHNSTON MADE AMERICA A BETTER PLACE, AND AMERICA A BETTER PLACE IN THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, human progress depends in large measure on the contributions of dedicated, gifted individuals. Each generation is indebted to those outstanding citizens whose vision, courage, and regard for their fellow man make the path easier for all of us.

In our generation Eric Allan Johnston was one such man. His death last Thursday bereaves all of us who knew him.

It was my privilege to know him as a friend for 25 years. His accomplishments were astonishing. Active in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for many years, he was elected its vice president in 1940. In 1942 he was elected president of that organization in a successful revolt against the old guard and proceeded to revitalize that organization, being hailed as "the first breath of fresh air to blow through the chamber in 20 years." He set an unprecedented record by being elected president of the chamber of commerce for four terms.

A brilliant, articulate, relentless advocate of business, he never failed to place first and foremost the human purpose of business and he never lost sight of the common human destiny that business, labor, and government must serve.

Typical was his action to bridge the vast gulf between the chamber of commerce and the White House that existed in 1942. He went to see the President—an act that his predecessors would not have dreamed of. Although he is reported to have argued strongly with President Roosevelt, he stayed to lunch that day and soon thereafter went to South America as Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Inter-American Development.

His 35,000-mile tour of Russia's industries in 1944 as an official guest of the Soviet Union established coordination at a crucial juncture of the war. His genius at getting people to work together to achieve high purposes was recognized by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. He served the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Committee for Economic Development, the War Manpower Commission, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Committee, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Advisory Board of the Mutual Security Act. He served as President Eisenhower's special ambassador to the Near East. In 1945 he became director of the Motion Picture Association of America and immediately set himself against the twin evils of bigotry and license.

He was an enthusiast, a man who loved his country and its institutions, who respected the motives of his fellow citizens and inspired the best in all men.

He saw the American social, business, and political system as providing freedom and opportunity for all. In his book "We're All in It" in 1948, he said:

> America's strength is built on a social system which has bestowed more freedoms on us than are possesed by any other people; an economic system of opportunity, a productive capacity for abundance, and a political system which adjusts itself to the changing times while always preserving the dignity of the individual. We can say to ourselves, in quiet pride and not in arrogance, that if the Communist world had a tenth as much to boast about it would shout it from the housetops. We will be prouder, and America will be strong and impregnable in direct proportion to the degree that every American believes he belongs to the system; that he is a stockholder in it and that justice does not live only in the courthouse but can as easily be found in the warehouse, the countinghouse, and the factory.

Yes this is the kind of America that served Eric Johnston well, and the kind of America Eric Johnston served well. Left fatherless as a young boy, he had sold newspapers to help support his family.

To him, any suggestion that Americans are people of poor conscience, each seeking to use our institutions for selfish gain at the expense of his neighbors would have been beyond the bounds of reality. He said:

> The United States after all is a success because our national conscience has been at work since our beginnings and every forward step throughout the years can be traced directly to it * * *. We Americans believe in ideals and idealism. We even give our lives for them * * *. A common sense of right or wrong has determined our great decisions. The taproot of our success is a national sense of economic morality.

He recognized and pointed out our weaknesses, yes, but these are America's real weaknesses, not the ones listed in the official pronouncements of the national chamber today.

> We have shortcomings—

He said—

> they aren't pretty names: slums, discrimination, unequal opportunity, unfair distribution of the fruits of our abundance, inadequate educational facilities, inadequate public health, wasteful plundering of our natural resources * * *. It's going to require Government action in one way or another to help us get rid of our major shortcomings. This shouldn't frighten us—social legislation isn't socialism. There is something of a race going on among the three systems—American capitalism, Russian communism, and European socialism. It's a race to raise living standards. It's a competition to make more things, to deliver the goods, to attract converts.

Fifteen years ago he warned that:

> All our efforts to create a stronger and better society would go by the boards if we had another deep depression in America. All our efforts at world leadership would go by the boards too. From a rallying point for the democratic world, we would degenerate into an infection center.

He said:

> It isn't State planning * * *. It is instead combining the tremendous organizing power of the State with the initiative, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and power of the individual American. Properly put to work, these two great forces in our economic life—public direction and private enterprise—can pull in double earnest to produce more abundance than we now have and can maintain and strengthen our freedoms. There is nothing radical or reactionary in using the organizing power of the State to advance the public interest. Let's take just one example: The antitrust laws * * *. They are unique among world laws and rules. They make what in some countries is considered the good business of combinations and cartels, what in ours is considered the bad business of conspiracy.
>
> The same principle follows through in our Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, farm parity legislation, Federal deposit insurance, unemployment insurance, and old-age benefits. The Employment Act of 1946 is proof of our acceptance of the premise of purposeful direction by Government * * *. The act further divorces us from our former policy of complete laissez faire and marks the opening of a new chapter in our economic life.

Mr. Speaker, these are the remarks of a man who understood with a rare clarity the genius of America—and knew how to tap that genius to raise both America and our neighbors to new heights.

More recently, he criticized the Federal Government, which raises 69 percent of all taxes, for contributing "a tiny remnant" of the cost of education in this country.

> The Federal Government—

He said—

> is where the money is. And that's where the money must come from. And it must be used not just for school construction—but for teachers' salaries and for more teachers. Down in Washington—

He said—

> they're still debating—and debating—aid to education. And it's still the same old debate—a balanced education or a balanced budget. I'll tell you my solution. I think it's time to turn off the oratory and turn up the dollars—right down there in Washington—and now.

To Eric Johnston, extending a helping hand to his neighbor at home and abroad was a privilege and challenge, not a mark of corruption and moral disintegration. Unlike some of today's spokesmen for business who sow only seeds of divisiveness, turning man against man, and economic group against economic group, he saw mankind's salvation in his ability to work together in great enterprises while at the same time according individual freedom for all, including freedom to dissent. Nor was he fearful that one man's freedom would encroach on another man's privileges. Speaking of the newly emerging nations of the world, he said:

> When these nations look to us for encouragement and for understanding, shall we give them the impression that we have come to fear freedom * * * have come to fear the rights of all nations to work out their own destinies?
>
> If this is our attitude, supine and senseless, we will ourselves find out in time that fear is contagious. Of the contagion of fear we can die a forlorn, miserable, unlamented death.
>
> But if fear is contagious, so are dissent and courage and hope and boldness contagious, too.
>
> Of the contagion of courage, we can wake from our sleep, haul on our seven-league boots, and once again stride forward.
>
> We can speak out to all men and for all men, and gladly teach the lessons of freedom along the highways of the world.

There is an old saying that when the lions die the jackals come to howl. Manifestly a lion has died, but let us not believe that his roars will be quieted. Some jackals have come to howl, but these howls will not still the eloquence of this man of courage and high purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I think I like best a speech that Eric Johnson made to an audience of young people, in Beverly Hills, in April of 1961. He said:

> Today, to be safe seems to be all-important to many persons. The ugly houses suffice. We seem to want nothing more. And we resent anyone who tries to give us more.
>
> I say the ugly houses are not enough.
>
> What about those shining castles?
>
> Certainly, they might crumble—and yet, perhaps they won't. Perhaps they'll stand. Maybe, if we go after them, they will turn out to be sturdier, more worthwhile than the ugly houses. Maybe, we shall have built something that outshines what has been built thus far.

THE REPUBLICANS AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., set the record straight in a speech at the Republican candidates dinner in Essex County, N.J. He emphasized Republican's commitment to the progress of civil rights as he pointed out the areas of concern and the measures taken by Republicans. Public accommodations, fair employment practices, and Federal-assistance programs deserve more than the Kennedy administration's hinting and ducking. Republicans return President Kennedy's request of support in civil rights with a request that the Democratic administration join our sincere efforts in this fight which we have been waging since Lincoln's time. The thoughtful speech by my respected colleague from Ohio, BOB TAFT, JR., follows below. It certainly deserves the careful attention of Members of Congress and the press:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION

> The civil rights revolution which is in process in this country presents all Americans and, particularly, the leadership of each of our political parties with a challenge of utmost importance. While it is still possible that the action and approach taken by Congress in attempting to deal with these problems may be a bipartisan one, this seems less likely as each day passes. The question is whether the leadership of the Democratic Party, divided for a century by an ever-deepening rift on the question of civil rights, is now attempting to find and cultivate company in its misery by claiming a split, or embarrassment, in the Republican Party on the same issues? If so, we Republicans must not allow it. With the help of pseudoliberal columnists and big Federal Government advocates, we see daily charges of division among Republicans as to just how the Congress and the Nation should face up to the problems of racial discrimination that still exists in many parts of American life.
>
> As on most issues, there is a basic unity within the Republican Party as to the principles which should guide us in dealing with these problems. In the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party has always stood, and will continue to stand, for true equality of opportunity for all citizens regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. In accordance with this doctrine, the Republican Party has backed, and will continue to back, a legislative approach to the civil rights problems in a direct and forthright way. Claims that the Republican Party is catering to the South on the segregation issue are wholly baseless. No segregationist belongs on a Republican ticket or even in the party. The Democrats cannot say this, and won't say this. Perhaps the attacks show an attempt to explain away the final awakening of the South to the necessity of a two-party system for its well-being and a final recognition there that its best interests, along with those of the country, lie in the direction of a responsible fiscal policy and protection for, rather than a surrender to government of the individual liberty and equality of all citizens.
>
> Accordingly, it is not surprising that most Republicans in Congress will support most of the proposals in President Kennedy's civil rights message and in the administration's bill H.R. 7152, introduced as a result of that message. Particularly this is not surprising since most of the recommendations and provisions in the program were already included in the legislative proposals dealing with civil rights introduced by many Republican Members of Congress. For instance, before the President's message, there were already pending in the Congress (and with Democrat support there could have been enacted) Republican proposals dealing with the following areas:
>
> 1. In the field of voting rights, the President's proposal has now shifted to the approach already taken by the Cooper-Dodd bill, a far more realistic and legally sound approach toward literacy tests than had previously been backed by the administration as an irrebuttable presumption of lit-

eracy on a proof of 6 years of schooling. It still contains no provision requiring that votes be counted properly, a safeguard Republican measures seek for all Americans.

2. A specific authorization for suits by the Attorney General to enforce school desegregation had been backed by the Republican members of the Judiciary Committee as early as January. It has finally been endorsed by the administration.

3. Permanent status for the Civil Rights Commission had been backed, and is still backed, by the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee. The administration's proposal was, and apparently still is, one for a limited extension of life.

4. Republican proposals had suggested an equal employment opportunity commission to serve as a watchdog against discrimination on Government contracts or by Government agencies and, particularly, to check on labor practices in this connection. A similar proposal has now been backed by the administration.

5. Injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations had been backed by many Republicans before the President's message, but it is based on the sounder approach of protection of equal rights under the 14th amendment, rather than on an unlimited extension of Federal power under the interstate commerce clause.

6. Federally assisted programs in education and other fields have, in many cases, used Federal money to assist and aid programs which discriminated on account of race. Unfortunately, even today this is still true, although the President by Executive order could ban it in many programs, such as motels built with ARA help. Republican attempts to attach amendments to such legislation have been beaten down a considerable number of times by the Democratic Party in a coalition of northern urban Democrats and southern Democrats opposing any such limitation. The payoff has been liberal grants and loans in southern congressional districts.

Certainly the Republicans claim no monopoly on these proposals for tackling the difficult problems of discrimination. But these examples suffice to show that the Republican Party is sincere and active in its approach to the problem and that Republican support can, therefore, be expected for many of the provisions of the civil rights measures now finally receiving support from the administration. In view of the general backing that civil rights legislation seems sure to receive from the Republican side of the aisle, how do we account for the concentrated attempt to play up any disagreements or questions raised by Republican Members of Congress as to any facets of the program. The only answer is politics.

Before getting into any such criticisms or what the policies of the Republican Party should be, it might be well to examine at least three areas in the administration's civil rights proposals which raise serious questions as to the sincerity of the high-sounding pleas for a bipartisan approach to these problems.

The first provision of the President's civil rights proposal we might discuss is the section 601 provision. We will be hearing much on this in coming weeks. Section 601 of H.R. 7152 proposes that in lieu of specific mandatory provision prohibiting discrimination in programs granting Federal aid, we should enact a very general provision stating that no Federal aid law shall be interpreted as requiring that financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which there is discrimination. It should be noted that this is merely a permissive provision under which the President, or the administrator of the particular program, may decide either to withhold Federal funds where there is discrimination, or to grant Federal funds notwithstanding the fact that there is discrimination. In other words, it is a license to the administrator of any Federal program to use Federal funds in a way that may well carry on or even promote discrimination. As compared to this approach, Republican members have been advocating specific prohibitions put into selected Federal aid bills and, particularly, into all Federal aid bills dealing with the various federally aided education programs, prohibiting the use of Federal funds under any such circumstances, unless it can be shown that the school or program in question is moving with all deliberate speed toward desegregation and elimination of discrimination. In testimony before the Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Quigley, the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, this week specifically objected to any such mandatory provisions in the Gill bill, H.R. 6938, a measure proposed not only by all of the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee, but also by many of the Democrat members of that committee. Moreover, in his testimony Mr. Quigley, for all practical purposes, admitted that he had not cut off Federal aid in spite of such discrimination and that this has not been done because he feels that the federally assisted programs were intended by Congress to be financed even if there was discrimination. On the basis of performance to date, with the powers already in the President and the administrators, it seems very doubtful whether discretionary power of this sort would be used unless there is included in the legislation a mandatory direction to use it. The language of the administration's proposal and the President's message would not override the directions to spend Federal moneys in specific programs. Nor are they intended to do so.

A second aspect of the administration's proposal that should be examined is the primary reliance put upon the Interstate Commerce power in the title II provisions seeking to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations. The inherent extension of Federal power not limited to the area of civil rights, which is implicit in reliances on the Commerce power, seems certain to make it unacceptable to many Republican Members of Congress, and also to many Democrats, who would accept reliance on the 14th amendment, which deals with equal rights and would not be a precedent for extending Federal power over almost every aspect of private life by Federal governmental regulation. Likewise, the failure in the public accommodation section of the bill to prescribe some reasonable minimum limitation on size for application of the act seems designed to raise objections and to jeopardize the chance of its successful passage. This approach raises the question whether it is really desired by the administration to enact such a provision or whether they seek a political issue, or excuse of some sort, instead.

Finally, the attitude of the administration toward a fair employment practices bill is interesting. Apparently at the last moment the President decided to at least give lipservice to the passage of a bill of this type such as is now pending before the Education and Labor Committee. This is interesting because apparently it was not included in earlier drafts of the civil rights message. It is also interesting in view of the fact that the Secretary of Labor and others speaking for the administration had earlier indicated that they did not advocate the passage of this legislation. Furthermore, the administration's civil rights bill itself makes absolutely no mention of fair employment practices and, apparently, is willing to leave the fate of this proposal to the Congress without any particular comments or instruction. I believe that I can say, however, that we do expect to ask the administration to comment on this measure and to state its position before the committee acts. This does not mean that we should ignore this problem of discrimination in employment, which is the most troublesome discrimination of all in our country today. Rather, working along with the other members of our Education and Labor Committee we hope to come out and propose to the Congress a reasonable and workable provision for the establishment of a fair employment practices commission and then to ask and expect support from the Democratic Party in backing such a proposal. Here, as elsewhere, it is important, through proper procedural requirements, to see that the rights of all citizens are properly protected and that State programs already making good progress in this area are not interfered with or supplanted.

In these three areas of federally assisted programs, public accommodations, and fair employment practices, one cannot help but wonder whether the administration is not still seeking to appease and play footsie with southern Democrats in the hope of keeping them in line on other legislative proposals and in the 1964 elections. If a bipartisan approach to the civil rights problem in this country can work, and I believe that it can, then the President and other members of his administration will have to stop dodging the tough questions and indicate to the leadership of their party in the Congress and to the country generally what they believe a proper bipartisan approach should be. On these ticklish problems which I have outlined, they have not done so yet. Their failure is likely to create major difficulties for the enactment of sound laws facing up to these problems. These difficulties could result in defeat for much of the civil rights program. If it does so, regardless of the protestations, the responsibility will be the administration's.

ROBERT TAFT, JR.

FOREIGN AID—A FOOLISH FANTASY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] for 60 minutes.

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of mankind has there been demonstrated such shortsighted generosity as our expensive, badly executed, unrealistic, uncontrolled and uncontrollable foreign aid giveaway program. This is the only Federal aid program I know of that does not exert Federal control along with the granting of funds. For years, foreign aid has been pictured as the manifestation of American generosity—sharing our bounty with underdeveloped nations—and a powerful and decisive weapon in the cold war.

On this premise, American taxpayers have contributed more than $124 billion, including the interest we have paid on the money we borrowed to give away, in foreign aid—about 1 out of every 17 tax dollars—to over 100 nations in the last 16 years. This program has been a dismal failure. It has not achieved its goals and I cite a few examples:

Argentina: After $640 million in aid, this country suffers from inflationary chaos and is under direct military domination.

Brazil: $1.9 billion later, Brazil is on the brink of communism.

Cuba: After $52 million in aid, this country is a Red satellite which has stolen $1 billion in private U.S. property.

Haiti: $100 million has helped keep this country under tyrannical rule and push it to the verge of a Communist takeover.

Indonesia: After $670 million, this country is under an armed pro-Communist dictatorship bent on conquest and her economy is wrecked.

India: $3.9 billion later, India stands with Russia and against us on nearly every issue.

Iran: After $1.3 billion, Iran is a tight monarchy without a parliament.

Laos: $460 million in aid has produced a Red-dominated coalition government which is about to fall to the Communists.

Poland: $522 million has gone down the drain to entrench Communist control of this country.

South Korea: After $5.4 billion in aid, she is ruled by a third military junta and anti-U.S. demonstrations are common occurrences.

South Vietnam: $2.4 billion has produced a country racked by Red guerrilla war.

Turkey: After $3.8 billion, Turkey's Government is politically unstable and her economy weaker than before U.S. aid started.

Venezuela: $274 million has failed to produce a stable government and has encouraged Communist sabotage of American-owned property.

Yugoslavia: $2.4 billion in U.S. aid has served only to push this Communist country deeper into the Soviet orbit.

THE WATERMELON PATCH

It was not but a few weeks ago, when they were holding the World National Congress of Communist Organizations in Brazil, the United States of America asked Brazil not to allow this Communist congress to meet there. But they did. At this very time, Brazil had their representatives here in Washington, D.C., asking for U.S. Federal foreign aid in the amount of $398 million for this country that is going Communist, a country that is infiltrated at the top of its government with Communists. In fact, there are so many Reds down there that they say they are so pink on the inside with communism and so green on the outside with U.S. foreign aid dollars, that they call them watermelons. Incidentally, they got the $398 million they came after, because, as our State Department put it, "They promised to do better in the future."

MORE AID TO INDIA

As discussed before this House earlier this month, I have received reliable information indicating that part of the equipment being idled by the closing of the 17 long-range radar stations and 6 SAGE centers across the United States, some of them in west Texas, is being shipped to India as a part of our foreign aid program to that country.

It is a deplorable and almost unbelievable situation indeed when our Government is willing to close down our own military centers and ship our equipment to any country, much less a socialist country such as India that has continually played footsie with the Communists.

Apparently, it was not enough for us to try to outdo Russia in aid to India by sending them almost $4 billion in goods and dollars, we now must give India our radar equipment to try to compete with Russian military gifts.

U.S. State Department officials have told India that any intermixture of United States and Soviet arms aid would create both military and foreign policy problems between the two Governments. U.S. officials say they do not want to have U.S. radar equipment intermixed with Soviet radar equipment, or to have the two aid programs intermixed. Officials noted that the U.S. military equipment and Soviet equipment are not built to the same standards.

One solution to such a problem might be for us to immediately stop shipment of all U.S. equipment to India and then it would be more difficult for it to be intermixed with the Soviet equipment.

This kind of giveaway program coupled with the recent announcement by Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, on his around-the-world junket, committing us for another $50 million in U.S. taxpayer aid to Tito's Yugoslavia is typical of the fuzzy-thinking New Frontier diplomats and programs that the U.S. taxpayers are getting sick and tired of.

AID TO 104 COUNTRIES

The foreign aid authorization bill, H.R. 7885, last week, passed by the House of Representatives and now under consideration by the Senate provides handouts to 104 of the 112 countries of the world. We are sending aid to every dictatorship on the face of the earth, most of the Socialist nations and many Communist countries.

The Agency for International Development has 64,508 employees engaged in this foreign aid program, traveling around the world dishing out our hard earned tax dollars to all comers.

NO. 1 OPPONENT

My good friend and colleague, Otto E. Passman, of Louisiana, a powerful and articulate opponent of our foreign aid program has labeled it, "one of the greatest foreign-policy failures in history." As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, has worked thousands of arduous and thankless hours in trying to "contain" and trim this wasteful program and to encourage commonsense in its policies and operations and to curb as much as possible its waste and mismanagement. The Members of this Congress, and, indeed, the taxpayers of this country, can, and should be thankful that we have a man like Otto E. Passman in this key Appropriation Committee assignment. I am pleased to have the opportunity of joining him in this effort.

As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] has pointed out, entirely too much emphasis has been placed on meeting personal desires of political leaders of recipient governments or in carrying out the unsound schemes of our own people; and too little emphasis has been given to commonsense thought and action.

Documentation of these charges can be had by the hundreds, and many of them are chronicled in detail in the thousands of pages of the record of the hearings of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations.

Such things as these:

Six hundred technical aid projects in one country, and more ready to be started before completion of the existing ones.

A highway in Vietnam on which the costs skyrocketed from an original estimate of $18 million to more than $129 million before completion.

A fertilizer plant in Taiwan, started with foreign aid money and estimated to cost $34 million, which was inoperable because equipment did not meet the specifications for the desired operations.

Radio towers installed in Saigon which had not been put in operation because their utility was undetermined and their location in doubt.

Three million one hundred thousand dollars for an air-conditioned yacht for the Emperior of Ethiopia.

Four hundred thousand dollars for battery-powered TV sets in remote jungle villages—merry-go-rounds driven by children would recharge the batteries.

Independence day gifts to new African countries, gifts to Guinea and Mali because of their "changing political attitudes," $5.6 million to Indonesia for completion of a road to an athletic stadium—all from, of all places, the President's contingency fund, which was appropriated by Congress for the purpose of taking care of crises which were unforeseen at the time the funds were approved.

The shipping of millions of dollars worth of navigational equipment to countries incapable of using it.

Supplying enough rifles to one country so that each soldier could have, on the average, 1½ rifles per man, and programing enough rifles and carbines in another country to provide an average of two weapons per soldier.

Plans to supply additional aircraft to a country with a shortage of trained pilots.

Fighter planes for and a loan to an African country to buy jet airliners.

Pouring into Korea $200 million a year, which is beyond the capacity of the country's economy to absorb productively, or of its Government to administer efficiently, the result of which has been to encourage corruption and hamper development.

The transfer of military funds to the contingency fund, and then a further transfer to economic programs.

One thousand 23-inch TV sets were ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped countries overseas at a cost of $400,000 for areas with no electric power supply.

Foreign aid funds were used to buy suits for undertakers in Greece.

U.S. aid to Kenya was used to buy extra wives for Government officials.

A stockbreeding farm was erected in Lebanon with U.S. aid. Nine stalls were built for each bull.

The Peace Corps sent a man, his wife, and nine children to the Philippines. One-way fare cost $13,190. The corpsman's salary is $10,190.

MYTHS VERSUS TRUTHS

One of the myths advanced by the administration in attempted justification of its foreign aid policy is the claim, addressed to the American taxpayer, that approximately 80 percent of the dollars appropriated for the program are spent in the United States. The fact is, 100 percent of the dollars appropriated for foreign aid will ultimately have an effect on the U.S. economy—in one of these three ways: For the payment for goods and services shipped free of charge to foreign countries; for the purchase of U.S. gold by foreign nations as a result of the free dollars that we have credited to them; or for speculation.

A question we might well ask is this: If 80 percent of the foreign aid dollar is spent in the United States and this expenditure is beneficial to our economy, would there be more prosperity in America if expenditures for the program were doubled or tripled? The answer is, of course, that our own resources would soon be depleted, our false prosperity would come to an abrupt end, and we would be a bankrupt Nation.

Another myth used by the administration to sell foreign aid to this country is that the program provides employment for approximately 600,000 people. But, looking at this matter objectively, it should be understood that the wages and salaries of these 600,000 people are not paid by the foreign governments, but by checks drawn on the U.S. Treasury from funds provided by the American taxpayer.

WHAT IS A "NEUTRAL"?

There are those who say that of all things, we must assist and aid those neutral nations of the world. A neutral nation, in my opinion, is no different than a middle-of-the-road politician. Usually, you will find one of two things, if not both, in the middle of the road, a dead skunk or a yellow stripe.

A neutral is a cross between a chicken and a worm, committed solely to the uncommitted, alined only to the nonalined and partially impartial. It is one who has figured out a way to receive duplicate relief checks and be able to face east and west simultaneously. A neutral is like a ballplayer who takes a called third strike with the bases loaded and two outs in the ninth inning and his team is losing, for fear he might break his bat by hitting a home run.

The only neutrals we should recognize and support are those who have the intelligence and courage to be neutral on our side. There is no sense, reason, or logic in the freedom-loving nations of the world, especially the United States, giving away the fruits of our labors, gained by free people under free enterprise, to those nations who are neutral-Communist and who show nothing but contempt, ridicule, and disrespect for our assistance to them. If they expect to receive our aid, our wealth, and our help, if they want to maintain their neutrality, then let it be pro-America.

WE CANNOT BUY RESPECT

We cannot buy the respect of other countries—and I think it is well past time for the leaders in our country to realize this. We have no reason to fear anyone. We have no reason to be indecisive—to falter—to lack confidence—for we are the most powerful nation in the world. Why should we let our national will be undermined by the unjustified weakness of a few voluble people who shamefully claim they would rather be Red than dead? Why do we continue to negotiate and compromise with those whose word is no good, whose morals are rotten, and whose goal is to enslave all the free people of the world?

If someone stole your refrigerator out of your home, would you call them up and say, "Come on back over and let us negotiate over my dishwasher"? If you came home and found your house burned to the ground and your wife and family murdered and kidnaped, would you stop for a moment and say, "I must listen to both sides of this"? Pray tell me, Americans, have we not been practicing this idiotic foolishness day after day in our dealings with the Communists?

Is it not time we stopped worrying about how popular we are—and become concerned about how right we are? We should assure the world that we intend to stand for what we believe to be right—unpopular though this stand may be. We must guard against compromise—for, as I see it, there can be no compromise with what is right. The moral fiber of a nation is measured by its willingness to stand for what it believes to be right.

If we would have the nations around the world follow us, then let us give them something to follow, let us show them some uncompromising determination, and give them the leadership they can honor, respect, stand up for and, yes, fight for, if need be.

As an example, how can we expect the free countries of Europe to believe in us if we say we believe in freedom and that we are ready and willing to assist them in resisting a Communist takeover of their country, when right here in our own hemisphere, we have allowed the Communists to establish a foothold in Cuba? I think this is well demonstrated by the fact that Mr. de Gaulle is determined to build up his nuclear forces in France, in spite of our assurances that we will help him. If America does not have the leadership, willingness, and guts to stand up for freedom when communism is established 90 miles off our shores, are we going to help or assist the countries of Europe when the Russians push communism into their homeland? I do not blame Mr. de Gaulle. If I were in France or in any other country, I think I would take a second look at it too.

WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE?

We must initiate drastic reductions in foreign aid in all instances, except where technological and military assistance is necessary to the defense of the free world and is economically advantageous to the United States. We must initiate some tough-fisted management over it. We must use commonsense in our administration of it and curb its waste and mismanagement.

We can do this by restricting grants to the careful distribution of surplus farm products to friendly underdeveloped countries to fill hungry bellies, by providing needed medicines to the sick and by providing technological assistance and instruction to those who show a willingness and desire to help themselves. Our money and equipment sent to countries needing help should be only to non-Communist countries, and this should not be grants; rather it should be in the form of sound, hard, reasonable interest-bearing loans, backed up with collateral, that are to be repaid according to a specified, sensible, businesslike schedule.

I realize that even if the Executive were to decree a fundamental shift in foreign aid policy—most certainly an unlikely occurrence—time would be required to carry out the change. Nations addicted to our largess would need time to make adjustments—time to cure themselves of their addiction to the drug, foreign aid. But we must start, and we must start now, if we expect to preserve the value of our dollar, correct the balance-of-payments problem and stop the outflow of our gold. We must stop subsidizing our foreign competitors in the aid-recipient countries that do not, and will not, tax their own people at rates even remotely close to U.S. rates. As long as our aid continues to be treated by the recipients as a substitute for their own internal initiative and effort, it cannot, and will not, be effectively utilized.

HOW ABOUT THE POOR AND HUNGRY?

To those of my colleagues who ask me, "Don't you care about the poor or the hungry people of Africa or India?" I reply, of course, I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about the poor overburdened taxpayers of America who are stuck with the bill for the irresponsible waste involved in these aid programs.

For those of you who say we are stopping communism with this foreign aid program, I ask you to point out one instance—point out one instance—where we have stopped the spread of communism with our foreign aid program. All around the world we are seeing communism spread and we are seeing Socialist countries become Communist countries. We are seeing them take our aid, and laugh in our faces and bite our hands if we do not keep them full for them to eat out of.

I say to you, why do we not give some aid to the taxpayers of America who bear the burden of paying the cost of this program—the families all across this country whose Federal income tax goes for providing giveaways to Communist countries?

Mr. Speaker, I say at a time when we have millions of hungry and uneducated Americans in our own country, according to President Kennedy, why do we not give them some aid? How about feeding them and educating them, first? Why do we not look after our own family before we start trying to raise the living standards of the world?

BORDERING ON TREASON

Mr. Speaker, I say it is an unforgiveable disgrace indeed for a country with a national debt greater than all the countries of the world combined, to continue to tax our people to give away our goods to try to buy friends among people who readily turn against us when the till goes empty and the chips are down. Any supporter of this wasteful throw-away program, who has one hungry child or one depressed business in his district, should hang his head in shame, if he continues to vote funds that are to be so irresponsibly spent. How absurd, how foolish, how ignorant can we get when we throw our money away to our enemies? Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it borders on treason.

In the August issue of the Reader's Digest, Mr. Charles Stevenson presented shocking evidence that U.S. aid, poured out to Communist and neutral countries, is strengthening our enemies and often subsidizing their efforts to win the cold war. I commend the Readers' Digest for printing this story and I recommend it to you for your reading and study. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Stevenson's story at this point:

[From Reader's Digest, August 1963]

LET'S STOP SENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO AID OUR ENEMIES

(By Charles Stevenson)

Once more the annual battle over foreign-aid apropriations is stirring passions in Congress. Amid the strongest criticisms yet from taxpayers, amid repeated allegations of "waste" and "misuse of funds," our legislators are being prodded to cut deeply into the $4.5 billion which President Kennedy insists they must vote to see the Agency for International Development (AID) through another year.

But it's time to face up to an important fact: Simply reducing appropriations won't cure what's wrong with an aid organization which is in more trouble than ever after going through 10 different administrators, 5 major reorganizations, and more than 100 billion tax dollars.

"The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid," says Dr. Hans Morgenthau, who heads Chicago University's renowned Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy. "None of our objectives has been achieved," says Eugene Black, recently retired President of the World Bank. "Soviet influence remains at high tide. Our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction."

Chairman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of the House Appropriations Committee, who is closest to the woe, sums it all up after a thousand hours of official hearings. "The trouble," says PASSMAN, "is that too much of our foreign aid has deteriorated into a subsidy of Communist takeover. And the spenders are so power hungry, they so withhold the truth from the public, they are so beyond the normal controls of Congress, that there seems no way to confine assistance to helping people help themselves unless we kill the entire operation and begin over."

The record carries its own proof. Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, looked at the Government's books to discover that even in the face of yearly budget trimming by Congress, the authorities haven't been able to spend as much aid money as they've been given in any year since 1958. Yet, crying poverty, they quietly accumulate funds from several different appropriations, of which the current request represents just a part. Then they earmark this money as "obligations" for future spending. Senator BYRD has discovered that the unexpended balances from previous appropriations have soared from $11,787 million in 1958 to $21,273 million in June 1963—enough to keep the aid administrators going for many more years even if they never get another cent from Congress.

In dishing out aid money, the spenders give slight heed to Congress or even to their own handpicked advisers. An example is Gen. Lucius D. Clay's proaid group which President Kennedy named to advise about reforms. The Committee reported to the President: "The United States should not aid a foreign government in establishing government-owned industries which compete with existing private endeavors. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

The Committee opposed any such ideas as having the United States advance $512 million to start building a $1,883,766,000 Government-owned steel plant for India. We already are handing over up to $775 million a year—some $3 billion since 1960—to keep India's socialistic experimentations afloat, while that country's healthy private enterprises mark time waiting for a bureaucracy to grant permits for their every expansion scheme. As for this steel plant, 150 technicians, appointed by AID to investigate in India, reported back that they had been unable to prove that the venture is feasible.

Nevertheless, President Kennedy announced his support for the Government plant; retired Ambassador to India Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith had said that "by this procedure we will not arouse suspicions that we seek to mold Indian economic policy to our own image."

Even more disturbing is our aiders' persistence in siphoning subsidies into Poland and Yugoslavia.

"When we help a Communist form of government we are undermining the security of our own country," Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, protested last year on the Senate floor. Others agreed. Over administration objections, Congress last August forbade sending more than food to any country that is part of the Communist conspiracy.

Yet, 3 months later, we extended Marshal Tito $136,700,000 in aid—just about as much as he received in the previous year. "Oh, but most of this was food for peace," I was told at AID headquarters in Washington. "And it wasn't assistance. Tito paid for that food."

The trouble is, such "purchases" lack reality. For example, over the past 9 years, we've given Tito cotton, oils, and wheat, which cost us $901 million. Most of this is not U.S.-owned surplus: a broker buys the grain the Yugoslavs want on the Chicago exchange when they want it and we pay for it. We then pay the freight to seaboard. There we pay for storage. Then in most cases we pay shipping costs to Yugoslavia, where Tito markets the wheat for his own government's profit.

Tito "pays" the United States only in part, and then by crediting to us some Yugoslav paper dinars. We can't take these dinars out of Yugoslavia. By agreement we pass 90 percent of the money back to the Yugoslav Government, either as gifts or as "loans" repayable only in more blocked dinars, for Tito to spend on developing his country's airports, highways, mines, papermills, railroads and canals. We must use the remaining 10 percent to maintain our Belgrade Embassy. About all we get out of the arrangement is the privilege of keeping a U.S. Information Agency reading room in Belgrade.

Tito tells his people—and we don't contradict him—that he receives nothing free from the United States; he pays for what he gets. As our bounty has flowed in to bolster his sagging economy, he has assailed the United States for seeking international controls of atomic blasting when Russia is in a testing mood. He has supported Russia's policy on Berlin. He votes with the Communist bloc at the U.N. He spearheads anti-Western movements among African and Asian nations.

It's much the same with Poland. We sent Ambassador Jacob Beam to woo Poland away from Moscow with gifts. And although Beam reported back to the State Department that the Poles had "perhaps fallen into the habit of considering our economic cooperation as a matter of right" and returned here almost 2 years ago to admit failure, our Government has refused to stop funneling aid to Polish communism. It has answered Congress' growing anger at this policy by supplementing $61 million in cash aid in the last 7 years with $672 million worth of agricultural surplus commodities, $81 million of it in the last 12 months.

Our diplomats in Warsaw say that except for our food there would be Polish breadlines. Indeed, not only has food of peace prevented a possible explosion in Poland; a House committee has now found that receipt of our agricultural commodities by Poland allows it to export food to other bloc members, thus helping the Soviet conspiracy to solve its most awesome internal problem. What we do has so eased the pressures on Russia to feed its dependent states that it is able now to use its own wheat to spearhead its infiltration of Latin America.

Meanwhile, our help to the Poles has enabled them to send $13 million worth of aid to Castro's Cuba and $15 million worth to North Vietnam, reportedly including arms useful in guerrilla operations against our own soldiers in South Vietnam. It enables the Poles to aid East Germany, whose economy is in a shambles because its largest industries have been meshed with Soviet and Czech endeavors in turning out rockets and nuclear arms. In last year's Berlin crisis Poland showed her gratitude to us by mobilizing her armed forces to support Soviet threats.

In country after country, the record shows, our officials have encouraged aid which helps communism more than it helps us. A report by the House Committee on Government Operations tells how "the United States team in Cambodia made a deliberate determination to finance and construct two radio stations which when completed became an adjunct to a Chinese-Communist gift to the Cambodian Government of a radio broadcasting complex." When a subordinate passed along his discovery that U.S.-financed materials were being used in the construction of a Russian-built hospital in Cambodia, the report states, an AID superior caused the man to be transferred, given an unsatisfactory efficiency rating, and ultimately fired.

In June 1959 the Government of Burma wanted help from the United States to build a road linking Rangoon with Mandalay. Engineering firms sent to investigate reported back that the kind of road the Burmese wanted was economically unfeasible. No agreement was reached.

Then, in March 1962, Gen. Ne Win took over Burma, established a military dictatorship and jailed his predecessor.

He kicked out the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation because they represented private enterprise, in spite of the fact that they were spending $12 million of private funds on the most effective agricultural and educational development programs in the country. He is nationalizing the economy. He denounced capitalism as "the pernicious economic system in which man exploits man." He canceled extensive English-teaching programs which had been sponsored for years by Americans and British in a land where English was the language of educated people. He prohibited Burmese from coming to America as Fulbright scholars. He has also invited in Chinese-Communist technicians, management, and assistance projects.

Now, with Ne Win's transition complete, we are giving him military equipment at a rate of $10 million a year, although this does not show on any aid books. And last spring, on top of another $21 million of assorted assistance for 1963, AID announced it was going ahead with the first 42-mile leg of the Rangoon-Mandalay highway, although no agreement has yet been reached on the feasibility of the rest of the road.

Congressional alarm is also mounting over assistance given to countries which expropriate private property. Last summer our legislators stipulated by law that assistance must be cut off from any country which seized U.S. investments. But by late fall so little was being done that Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, charged that "specific instructions had gone out from the State Department to our representatives abroad to soft-pedal this amendment." Not until 6 months after enactment of the amendment (and a week beyond the congressional deadline for required enforcement) did the State Department finally get around to suspending AID projects that cost us $25 million in Ceylon, which had seized American oil properties without compensation so they could be used to market Soviet petroleum products. Food for peace shipments to Ceylon still continue—with most payments returned to the Ceylon Government to be used for further economic development.

The United States solved the problem of Brazil's seizure of an American-owned telephone company by dangling the prospect of more millions if she paid for the property. Then with the new aid flowing in—$398 million over the next 21 months—Brazil has been able not only to pay for the seized properties but to nationalize still more, and enter into a trade pact with Russia.

Congress is on record as opposing aid to countries which "live on our aid while they channel their own resources into arms from Russia." Yet this is exactly what is happening in the case of the United Arab Republic. Ever since 1956, Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser has been mortgaging the better part of his exportable cotton crop to the Soviet bloc as payment for more than $100 million a year in arms and other assistance. The purpose: An incessant war of subversion and violence aimed at taking over the 90 million inhabitants of the Arab world and alienating them from the United States and the imperialist Western nations. He has confiscated Egypt's industries and taken over virtually everything in the country which represented foreign private investment.

What have we done about this? Why, we have continued to pay Nasser every year. In the last 5 years our aid has doubled, tripled, quadrupled. The effect has been to subsidize Nasser, to keep his economy going so he could hand over some of the chief resources of his country to the Soviets for their arms and help in agitating against us and independent Arabs.

Our 1962 direct economic assistance to Nasser—$224,100,000—outdistanced anything we did for anyone in the world except India, Pakistan and, because of earthquake reconstruction, Chile. We treated him better than Turkey, our desperately poor fighting partner. We gave him far more than we gave all the friendly Arab nations put together. In addition, in just the first 6 months of fiscal 1963, we agreed to have him "buy" another $546 million worth of food for peace commodities with Egyptian currency. This is more than anybody else in the world received, and it brings Nasser's food for peace assistance alone to more than $1 billion.

These commodities are sold on the Egyptian market for currency, which when paid to us is mostly turned back to Nasser to meet his budget deficits and build more state-owned factories. Our aid enabled him in a single gesture to distribute a $43 million dividend to 1,500,000 factory and government workers as "profit shares and bonuses" so as to convince the people that his state ownership did indeed provide them with more prosperity than "imperialistic" private investments from abroad.

The Egyptian people know nothing about our assistance. "Assistance? What assistance?" Nasser says, "I pay you for what I get, don't I?"

Last year, when news of our latest aid filtered around the Mediterranean, other Arab leaders reacted with such apoplectic amazement that our Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, John S. Badeau, had to race around by plane in an attempt to placate them.

"But we are your allies," they said. "You are underwriting the Egyptian-Soviet conquest of the Middle East. Now Nasser will have more resources than ever with which to undermine us."

Our officials said such fears were groundless. Yet within weeks the first of 40 new Mig fighting planes arrived in Egypt from Russia. Our aid enabled Nasser to go into a Yemen war with 18,000 troops, then 20,000, then 28,000 by daily airlifts in Russian-supplied planes. Our aid means funds which enable his Voice of Cairo radio to goad the officers, soldiers, and students of Saudi Arabia and Jordan to overthrow Saud and Hussein, the chiefs of those two countries. "How long are you going to tolerate them?" the Voice shouts. "Overthrow these lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the arch enemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, the Jews."

"These are the words that we are subsidizing," Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, recently told the Senate. "What kind of policy is that for the people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?"

But still the aid flows in.

Small wonder then that Algeria's Premier Ahmed Ben Bella, whom Nasser eggs on, can fly directly to Cuba after talking aid terms in Washington, and there demand that we abandon our Guantanamo naval base. Small wonder that on arriving home Ben Bella can say: "Algeria will have a socialism a la Castro. No power in the world can prevent our country's advance on this road." Small wonder, indeed. Our aid to him—$91,800,000 in the past year—makes it possible.

The same sort of appeasement adds to our woe in Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous nation. We were responsible for the formation of Indonesia; after World War II we threatened to deny Marshall plan aid to the Dutch unless they gave up their control of these East Indies. But Indonesia's President Sukarno also coveted grandeur and Dutch West New Guinea, a primitive land of Negroid Papuans, 1,800 miles from his own capital but adjacent to Australian territory. So while he has neglected his economy and poured the wealth from his tin mines and rubber plantations into Russia to pay for Mig fighters, long-range bombers, guided missiles and submarines, we have pumped $787,300,000 in gifts into the country. We've trained doctors and dentists for a population which suffers for lack of medical care, only to see Sukarno draft them so he could have a standing army of 250,000. When his emerging industries slowed to 20 percent of normal production for want of exchange with which to import repair and maintenance parts, we advanced emergency millions so he could buy these parts from abroad.

"Sukarno's no Communist," I was told both in Washington and Djakarta. "He only wants to bring West New Guinea into Indonesia, and he must. Otherwise his revolution is incomplete."

Have our efforts strengthened our position in Asia? Already dispatches indicate worries that Sukarno is setting up in West New Guinea the same sort of outpost against adjacent Australian-held territories as Castro has established against us in Cuba. He has threatened to use his military force, the most potent in southeast Asia, if independent Malaya, Singapore, and the British dependencies on British Borneo carry out their announced plan to join in an anti-Communist federation come August 31. In the presence of the titular head of the Chinese-Communist state, he has signed a manifesto calling for enforcement of Red China's major policies in Asia; the Chinese in return have vowed to support Sukarno's cause against Malaysia.

Because of this strange compulsion of our officials to pour fuel on burning problems, instead of trying to put out the fires, we have exported more dollars than our private enterprise can bring back from oversea investments and trade. Faith in our currency has declined due to our increasing deficits at home and abroad. Our gold supply has dwindled dangerously.

This is admitted by our Commerce Department. Our Government is so worried that it has sent Ambassadors literally begging past and present foreign beneficiaries of our charity to help us out—to at least let us sell to American tourists there a small part of the currency we have acquired in exchange for food for peace. But what was the answer? No. And this from Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Seeking some way to stop the run on gold, the Commerce Department is now discouraging European investments by American private enterprise. "We have put up a caution light on investment in the developed countries," says Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, "because of our balance-of-payment difficulties."

Yet the administration in the face of all this wants a bigger aid appropriation this year; and Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that anyone who tries to cut the requested amounts will be cooperating with Communist global strategy.

Is it not time to ask ourselves why?

Is it not time to consider the advice of Chairman George Champion of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank? He would have us and the other friendly capital-supplying nations coordinate our aid through an independent banking-type organization staffed by professionals from the world of banking and private enterprise. Such a multinational approach has also been proposed by experts like retired World Bank President Black and Herbert V. Prochnow, former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The means for getting such an operation underway already exists within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which most Western nations and Japan participate. All that's needed is for Congress not to be content with cutting aid appropriations, but to order a phaseout of our current aid operations and establish a special joint congressional committee which can at last start working toward a new order.

PROPOSED INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX WILL NOT ACCOMPLISH INTENDED PURPOSE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by and large I have been a stanch supporter of the administration's various programs, and will continue to be so. But when I am convinced that a proposal of the administration will not accomplish the good that it is intended to accomplish and will likely have the opposite effect, I cannot but rise in opposition to such proposal.

The proposed interest equalization tax falls within this category, and I urge its defeat. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not alone in this view. Hawaii's Gov. John A. Burns, former Member of this House, shares this view. Dr. James H. Shoemaker, an internationally recognized economist, now vice president of the Bank of Hawaii, recently testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means to this same effect. Mr. George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, and one of Hawaii's most highly respected citizens, expressed similar views, pointing to the adverse effects that the proposed tax portends, not only for Hawaii but also for the entire Nation. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Chaplin's editorial which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of August 28 at this point in the RECORD:

THIS IS FREE TRADE?

In principle, everyone favors free and unrestricted trade among nations. In practice, the enthusiasm sometimes diminishes.

No one in recent years has been a more ardent supporter of the principle of free trade than the Kennedy administration. In fact, free trade has almost become an article of faith with the administration, somewhat like the protective tariff in the days of McKinley.

So it is all the more ironic that the White House is now proposing to Congress a graduated tax ranging from 2.75 to 15 percent on the purchase of foreign securities by U.S. investors. That is the exact opposite of free trade and a blood brother to the protective tariff.

The reason for the Kennedy proposal is the continuing outflow of U.S. gold reserves, due to an unfavorable balance of payments. The administration would hope to cut down on U.S. investment abroad and thereby slow the gold outflow.

On the surface it seems logical, but experts are warning that it might have just the opposite effect, particularly in the case of Japan.

During the past 5 years the United States has sold $1.5 billion more to Japan than Japan has bought from the United States. If the proposed tax goes through, the experts say, Japan might have to impose restrictions on purchases from the United States which could have the net effect of actually increasing the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

One puzzling point is that good investments in a booming economy like that of Japan presumably return funds to U.S. investors. So how, in the long haul, is this a serious problem with respect to balance of payments?

The proposed tax is of particular concern to Hawaii. In the islands there are an estimated 10,000 holders of Japanese securities, with investments believed to approach $25 million.

When the President's tax proposal was made public last month it contributed to a slump on the Tokyo stock exchange which cost island investors an estimated $5 million in paper losses.

But the problem goes beyond the immediate concern of securities buyers. Japan is preparing to liberalize its import of Hawaiian pineapple products. And it is preparing to lift its restrictions on travel abroad by Japanese citizens. Application of the proposed tax could prompt Japan to suspend its pineapple and travel plans.

Both activities mean much to the Hawaiian economy. Bank of Hawaii economist James Shoemaker has testified in Congress that tourism from Japan, now putting about $8 million a year into the Hawaiian economy, could rise to around $20 million a year in a short time.

And, of course, the Hawaiian pineapple industry needs all the new business it can get to offset the increasing competition from foreign pineapple and from domestic canners of other fruits.

Shoemaker said with respect to tourism that "even if a significant fraction of the potential travel from Japan to Hawaii were curtailed * * * the effect would be to increase rather than decrease our (Hawaii's) negative balance-of-payments position."

As for the total national picture, he said, "it appears probable * * * that in a different manner and to a less marked degree, the negative effects on the economic relations between the United States and Japan would be such as to offset any favorable effects on our balance-of-payments position."

The continuing outflow of U.S. gold reserves is a matter of serious concern, directly influencing the future stability of the dollar. The Kennedy administration is seeking every possible way to halt the drain.

But the proposed tax on foreign securities seems not to be an answer, containing seeds for as much harm as good. It is a step in the opposite direction of free trade and could lead to erection of greater barriers.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have, on previous occasions, spoke of the anti-South prejudice that asserts itself in the reporting and editorializing of the northern press, radio, and television on the subject of civil rights.

I do not believe any man who is truly honest will deny that the news media are biased in their coverage of this subject.

Perhaps one of the clearest indictments returned against the totalitarian press was contained in an editorial in the Shreveport Journal of August 15 which cited an earlier writing of Lucius Beebe. Since there is no chance of this story appearing anywhere else in print, I would like to have it placed in the RECORD so others will have a chance of reading it:

BOBBY KENNEDY'S TOTALITARIAN PRESS

Lucius Beebe, writing in his column, "This Wild West," in the San Francisco Chronicle, has leveled a stinging indictment against the American press in general for its anti-South prejudice in reporting and commenting upon so-called civil rights demonstrations which have plagued certain parts of the Nation.

A portion of Mr. Beebe's column from the August 12 issue of the Chronicle follows:

"It is a safe bet, predicted on the Kennedy family tradition of opportunism in politics, that Robert Kennedy cares less for the advantage of the Negro cause or for his loudly espoused 'civil rights' program than Governor Faubus or any of the self-declared segregationists of the Deep South. It is a bet that assuredly will find no takers in the editorial rooms of any informed newspaper in the land.

"Yet, despite the enlightened sophistication which obtains in all American newspaper offices regarding the motives governing any aspect of public policy by the younger Kennedy, the press of the Nation has ranged itself with totalitarian solidarity behind him in an issue he has ruthlessly exploited for his own political advantage and with a cynicism unknown to American politics until the ascendency of the Kennedy family.

"With doomsday screeches of rectitude and social-minded breast beating to endanger the human rib cage, the supposedly responsible newspaper and magazine press of the Nation has gone all out and without any least qualifying trace of impartial aloofness for a cause that has to date manifested itself in little but riot, mob rule, civil commotion, and tangible evidence of immaturity and incapacity for self-government from which these same editors avert their gaze in dismay when confronted with their precise parallels in Africa.

"The reporting of Negro disorders in the South both pictorially and editorially has been so prejudiced in favor of mob rule by a lawless minority as seriously to compromise the reputation of the American newspaper press for dispassionate reporting. It has abounded in the now familiar photographic record of Negroes set upon by 'ferocious and inhuman' police dogs and repulsed with fire hoses out of all proportion to the importance or significance of the episodes involved, and only the Luce magazines, to their incalculable credit, have even tentatively printed photographs of vast mobs of hostile Negroes taunting and setting upon lone unarmed policemen or of Negro hoodlums baiting police dogs with garments as a bullfighter incites a bull in the ring.

"The newspaper and magazine press of the Nation has reduced the Negro population to an estate of filth, blasphemy, ignorance, crime, and squalor dictated only by its hanker for unbridled sensationalism and circulation through shock impact. The Attorney General of the United States views the colored population with equal cynicism as nothing more or better than a limitless source of political suffrage."

CALM WITH KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy has demonstrated on numerous occasions the moral leadership which the people have a right to expect from their Chief Executive in matters pertaining to civil rights, and which was sorely missed throughout the previous administration. The recent civil rights demonstration, the march for freedom and jobs, in which more than 200,000 peaceful and freedom-loving Americans participated, dramatically illustrates this. Never before in the history of this country have so many people conducted such a peaceful demonstration with as much purpose, with as much dedication, and with as much righteousness on their side.

The prophets of gloom, the racists, the doubters, the critics all were proved wrong in their predictions of turmoil, violence, and confusion. Apparently they were the only ones confused, and they probably still are. Many reasons have been advanced to explain the phenomenon of the civil rights demonstration and why it was so successful.

But the main reason has been overlooked. The main reason is President Kennedy. It is the President's moral courage, his early public statements that the demonstration came within the finest American traditions whereby every citizen and every group has the right to petition our Government. In fact, the President said he hoped that anybody with a grievance would come to Washington, D.C., to present it, that such people had a right to ask for redress of their grievances. This early statement brought forth the most vehement criticism from the radical right, the ranting Republicans, and several syndicated columnists. But just as in the past, during the Cuban crisis, during the Berlin crisis, immediately after the Supreme Court prayer decision, and during the recent railroad dispute, to mention only a few significant instances, it was the President's coolheadedness and his determination to meet the situation intelligently and calmly that brought us through to a peaceful and successful conclusion.

President Kennedy's moral stamina, his refusal to vacillate or to hesitate during times when events required some magnitude of guidance and leadership has now brought the United States of America and every American universal thanks and encomiums for showing the world how in an open society a free and democratic Government receives a petition for the redress of grievances.

Kennedy is still the remedy. Let us stay calm with Kennedy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Dulski, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, September 11, 1963.

Mr. Foreman, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Gonzalez (at the request of Mr. Dingell), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Pucinski, for 1 hour, on September 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Short.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Rhodes of Arizona) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Halpern in two instances.

Mr. Michel.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Dingell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell in two instances.

Mr. Grabowski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1163. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Navy of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over for the period January 1 through June 30, 1963, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1164. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Action Report," covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 2357 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1165. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of all claims paid by this Department relating to tort claims for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2671–2680; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1166. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives referring to the dates of June 18 and September 28, 1962, relating to funds used for research and development to provide facilities for testing and related work on the Advanced Saturn launch vehicle; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1167. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 17, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Core Creek, N.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted October 8, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1168. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 7155. A bill to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1277. A bill for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit; with amendment (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 8305. A bill to provide that until June 30, 1968, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8306. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 8307. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 8308. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8309. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 8310. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8311. A bill to provide that the Niagara Thruway shall be operated as a freeway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 8313. A bill to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 8314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain land for addition to Greenbelt Park, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 8315. A bill to amend section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the carriage by U.S.-flag commercial vessels of certain cargo 100-percent gross tonnage contained in such section; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 8316. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8317. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain land for addition to Greenbelt Park, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 8318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 25-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 8319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction in certain cases for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8320. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 8321. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices to measure the work of an individual employee in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 679. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 8322. A bill for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8323. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 8324. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Loza-Bedoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 8325. A bill for the relief of Anthanosios Gianoupolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8326. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Hembree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8327. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Zagara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 8328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christina Protonentis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (by request):

H.R. 8329. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hamid Y. Mouallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 8330. A bill for the relief of Dr. Andres Parras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

America Has Lost a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing outpouring of expressions of sorrow that I share so deeply with my colleagues and with people everywhere in all walks of life is its own testimony of the depth of feeling held for that outstanding statesman, the late Senator Estes Kefauver. He was a man who personified the personal characteristics with which we associate the term "statesman."

Throughout his long years of service to the people of this Nation, he demonstrated an unshakable tenacity of purpose and an unflagging concern for the rights of the individual. He would not be deterred in his fight against organized crime or against those who would attempt to circumvent laws designed to protect the public against those who would profiteer at the expense of the consumer.

It has been my privilege and my pleasure to have been associated with Estes Kefauver in a number of endeavors during the years I have been in this House. Throughout his tenure, his honesty, and integrity permitted no course other than that which principle directed. He feared no odds and would not be turned aside by threats of adverse consequence, when he entered into battle for what he knew to be right.

The Senate and the Nation has lost an indefatigable leader and champion of the people. It is incumbent upon us that the memory and deeds of this great man continue to be an inspiration to our future endeavors to the end that the work he strove so mightily to complete for the good of the Nation may be carried forward as he would wish.

Along with his other countless friends and admirers, I extend to Mrs. Kefauver, and to the children my heartfelt sympathy in their great loss.

Independence of Trinidad and Tobago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, the nation of Trinidad and Tobago celebrates the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Governor General, Sir Solomon Hochoy; and His Excellency the Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago to the United States, Elias E. I. Clarke.

Trinidad and Tobago is one of the world's new nations and is a fairly close neighbor of the United States. I would like to take this opportunity to extend to the people of Trinidad and Tobago the warm good wishes of the American people on this day of joy, their Independence Day.

Trinidad and Tobago are the most southerly of the islands of the West Indies, lying just off the coast of South America. Trinidad, discovered by Columbus on his third voyage in 1498, came under British control in 1802, with the signing of the Treaty of Amiens. Tobago, originally discovered in 1596 by the English Captain Keymis, came under British Crown control in 1814. Earlier dominated by sugar, coffee, and cocoa, the island's economy benefited from the development of petroleum resources, which today account for four-fifths of the nation's exports.

Ruled separately as Crown Colonies until 1888, Trinidad and Tobago amalgamated in that year, and have grown closely together since then, sharing common administration and budget control. Crown colony government lasted until 1924, when under the urging of the outstanding political leader of Trinidad, Capt. Arthur Andrew Cipriani, the constitution was amended to provide for a legislative council.

Full adult suffrage was introduced in 1945, and led to a series of elections and proposals resulting in a new constitution in 1950, which increased the number of elected representatives in the legislative council, and created an executive council designed to ready the island's political leaders for full self-government. This constitution remained in force until 1956, when a further change provided for a Chief Minister and an elected Finance Minister, and by 1958 this had become a full cabinet government, under the premiership of Dr. Eric Williams, who had been earlier elected the islands' first Chief Minister in 1956. Dr. Williams brought his government to full internal self-government in 1961, and negotiated the achievement of full independence for Trinidad and Tobago as of August 31, 1962.

We here in Washington are especially proud of Eric Williams, the Premier of Trinidad and Tobago, since before entering politics he graduated from Oxford University and held a teaching post here at Howard University. Dr. Williams' People's National Movement Party won 13 of the 24 elected seats in the 1956 elections, and increased its majority to 20 of the 30 elected seats in the 1961 elections. The remainder of the seats in the 1961 election went to the Democratic Labor Party. Out of an electorate of 365,000, 88 percent voted in the elections, a good indicator that the citizens of Trinidad and Tobago value their votes highly, and can be expected to maintain continuing civic interest and responsible participation in their Government.

Thus, on this first anniversary of their day of independence, the future prospects are bright for the people of the island nation. The American people will continue to support and encourage the development of our newest neighbor, Trinidad and Tobago.

Chairman Cooley Acts Promptly on REA Loan to Ski Resort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have today written to the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, concerning an REA section 5 loan for $110,000 to a ski resort in Pennsylvania. I complimented the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, for his prompt and efficient action in calling a hearing to confront the REA Administrator for authorizing this 2-percent loan to the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative which will be reloaned at 4 percent to the Blue Knob Development Corp., of Altoona. I feel it is most important to call this to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to extend proper commendation to the committee chairman for his authoritative and direct action. I would also hope that a large number of my colleagues would indicate a desire to attend those hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the REA Administrator's action was in direct defiance to the instructions of the committee chairman at the hearings in February of 1962 in addition to the committee language contained in House Report No. 1691 of the 87th Congress, 2d session. In addition, other congressional leaders have become concerned with the outside business activities of REA borrowers, not related to the well-being of the American farmer, and I know this subject was discussed during the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1964.

During those hearings, I pointed out to REA Administrator, Norman Clapp, that considerable publicity had been given to several 4-percent loans made out in a number of Iowa communities to managers of co-ops to finance the purchase of their own homes. Under unanimous consent I include at this point the colloquy that followed between our very able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and Mr. Clapp:

> Mr. WHITTEN. May I interrupt here. I am like Mr. MICHEL. Let us not endanger a good program by having Federal funds used far beyond the intent of the act. We have the Farmers Home Administration, which make rural housing loans. We have set up new programs to finance homes for the elderly. The Farmers Home Administration is actively engaged in these things, and to have the REA associations do the same things is not intended.
>
> Mr. CLAPP. I understand, Mr. Chairman. My first statement to Mr. MICHEL was that we do not approve of a co-op lending money to the manager to build a home.
>
> Mr. WHITTEN. You disapprove, but what are you doing about it?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. We are investigating this particular case.
>
> Mr. WHITTEN. When you investigate it, what are you going to do?
>
> Mr. CLAPP. As soon as we find out what the facts are, we will cross that bridge.

Mr. Speaker, I will be anxious to find out if Mr. Clapp has crossed the bridge. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Missouri, PAUL JONES, chairman of the special Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations, to which this instant case has been referred, will check all the bridges. Understandably, the tentative date of September 5 had to be postponed, but I am sure that a large number of my colleagues will be watching the committee calendar at the end of September for a definite date.

Deeds Rather Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully wish to call attention to a project which has just recently been completed in one of our Connecticut communities. I believe this project has meritorious possibilities in the cause of developing our friendship with the newly formed States on the African Continent. For that reason, I would hope that it could be emulated by other communities across our country and, for that reason, mention it here.

The project, officially dubbed "Books for Africa," was sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of New Britain, Conn. The operation was organized by a local citizen, Daniel J. Kulak. They were joined in this good work by the American Hardware Corp., the New Britain School Department and the Peace Corps. The idea was to collect outdated textbooks, no longer in use by the local school system, pack and ship them to Africa, for distribution by the Peace Corps there. The value of the books to the community at the time was only nominal—as dust collectors in the storage rooms of the city's schools. Overseas, however, they would be given a new lease on life, and service again to humanity.

Starting at 9:30 in the morning one day, the local jaycees went to work rounding up the books. The American Hardware Co. contributed the space in their plant for storing, and the materials for packing. By 5 o'clock that evening 10,000 books had been collected. Then, another 10,000 had been added. From New Britain, the books came to Peace Corps headquarters here in Washington for reshipment to Africa where Peace Corpsmen and Corpswomen will use them in classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, deeds such as these; examples of human understanding and helpfulness; I believe, bespeak more eloquently the fair and unselfish spirit of the American people than many thousands of splendid words, carefully put together. For such are deeds that speak for themselves the simple love and compassion of their doers. Most of us who have traveled overseas have witnessed the grudging destitution which surrounds the lives of old and young alike. But our deepest sympathies lie with the innocent children whose tender lives will be blighted, perhaps forever, by circumstances far beyond their control.

In these children, however, also lie the best hopes for the future stability and development of these areas. Young and eager to live, their spirits have not yet been broken by the brutalizing forces of poverty. A textbook in the hands of one such child is a tangible symbol of that hope; another material proof that we in America want to see them attain the full realization of their worthy aspirations. It is not possible, I think, to assay the true value of such deeds by our private citizens, but I do sincerely believe that the benefits that flow from them are many and very long lived. So I would urge my colleagues here and citizens everywhere to consider the merits in such acts. The simple deeds of the kindhearted people back home often speak as forcefully and more directly than some of the best planned and well-intentioned projects of our Government.

Results of Public Opinion Poll of Ohio's 11th District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a poll of many thousands of voters of Ohio's 11th Congressional District has shown interesting results with voters expressing firm opinions on a number of major legislative matters before the Congress.

On multiple questions where respondents were asked to "choose one," many voters put checks on all three of the questions expressing favor for one and opposition to the other two choices.

Since the mailing was general and only one questionnaire went to a single address, I received many requests from other individuals in families saying they also wanted questionnaires to answer. In some cases a wife would write and say her husband filled out the questionnaire and she wanted one, and vice versa. One wife wrote:

> My husband and I don't always agree on political questions, but we do on this, so you can count this for both of us.

Approximately 15,000 questionnaires were returned to my office—opened and sorted there—and then turned over to Automation Information Data System, Washington, D.C., who transferred the responses to IBM cards and tabulated the results. This firm has certified the results which are shown on the following table:

[Percent]

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose
1. Taxes (choose 1):		
a. The proposed income and corporate tax reduction of approximately $13,500,000,000 spaced over the next 3 years?	21.7	42.1
b. An immediate tax reduction of $10,000,000,000?	12.9	44.2
c. No tax cut unless accompanied by corresponding decrease in Federal spending?	65.4	13.7
2. Education:		
a. Federal assistance for public school construction?	44.5	55.5
b. Federal assistance for teachers' salaries?	24.5	75.5
c. Inclusion of private and parochial schools in any general Federal-aid program?	21.0	79.0
d. An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition and educational expenses of a taxpayer or his dependents?	79.1	20.9
e. Federal grants to colleges and universities for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and research facilities?	57.5	42.5
3. Medical care (choose 1):		
a. Compulsory health care for those over 65 financed through social security system?	36.3	49.5
b. A voluntary private health insurance program for those over 65 with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year toward the cost of the premium to each taxpayer?	39.6	24.3
c. No new Federal program at all?	24.1	26.2
4. Civil rights:		
a. Increased Federal enforcement of voting, educational, and employment rights for all?	70.7	29.3
b. Continued Federal aid to States which practice, encourage, and support discrimination in public facilities?	37.1	62.9
5. Foreign affairs:		
a. Amending Atomic Energy Act so as to permit U.S. sharing of nuclear weapons and secrets with NATO allies?	25.3	74.7
b. Further concessions on number of on-site inspections in attempt to achieve a nuclear test ban with Soviets?	25.5	74.5
c. A more aggressive Cuban policy—including U.S. armed blockade and military intervention—if Soviet troops and weapons are not withdrawn?	86.2	13.8
6. Foreign aid (choose 1):		
a. Continued foreign aid at approximate $4,000,000,000 per year level?	8.2	53.8
b. Gradual reduction of foreign aid commitments?	72.5	10.5
c. Discontinuation of entire foreign aid program?	19.3	35.7
7. Mass transit: A Federal program of grant and loan assistance to assist cities in planning, establishing and maintaining mass transit systems?	35.0	65.0
8. Space: Continuation of expenditures at present accelerated levels in the manned-space program?	53.3	46.7

Meat Cutters & Butchers Union Develop Vital Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to address the annual conference of Butchers District Council of New York at the Concord Hotel at Kiamesha Lake, N.Y. I was particularly impressed by the fine representation of the national, State, and local leaders of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butchers Workers of North America who participated at the conference. These included the union's international president, Jack Lloyd, and Leon Schechter, international vice president, and Joseph Belsky, international vice president of the New York and New England area.

The conference was chaired by Irving Kaplan and, from what I understand, a most intelligent and foresighted plan for action was formed not only for the betterment of conditions of the workingman, but for a better America through an enlightened program to strengthen our democratic processes.

I especially want to pay tribute to Morris Horn, a dear friend and constituent of mine, who serves with such distinction as chairman of the legislative committee of the district council which covers the New York-New Jersey area. Mr. Horn, working with the international, and with the leadership of the AFL-CIO, has helped formulate a broad and comprehensive legislative program which commendably encompasses important national issues that affect not only the members of the union but every citizen of our country. In brief, the program covers such vital matters as civil rights, tax law revision, job opportunities, and medicare.

With these subjects as guidelines for my presentation to the gathering, I was pleased to forthrightedly express my own views. In view of the pertinence of this program to the Members of Congress, it is a privilege to include these in the RECORD:

WHERE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IS NEEDED TODAY

It is truly a pleasure and privilege for me to be with you today and to share with you some of my thoughts on a few of the major issues which we in Congress are facing today. I am sure all of you have been reading news stories about the slow progress of Congress this year; you have read columnists and heard commentators on the air severely critical of this so-called do-nothing Congress. Let me assure you that I, too, am far from satisfied. But, let me add that there are many reasons for this situation. If we examine them, we may be in a better position to do something about it and still, even at this late hour, to make a legislative record of which the Congress and the Nation can be proud.

The weaknesses of the congressional machinery and the extraordinary power or influence of key persons in the Congress, notably the chairmen of major committees, are well known. Most of the chairmanships, you will recall, are in the hands of southern Democrats. Nevertheless, if we can judge at all from past experience, these faults, serious though they be, will not prevent important legislation vital to the Nation from being passed if enough pressure is brought to bear for its passage.

The Congress has been presented this year with truly mammoth legislative proposals dealing with taxation and with civil rights that, in the best of circumstances, would be time consuming, considering the complexity of the issues and the range of emotions involved. This of course is on top of many other vital issues, such as medical care for the aged, programs for jobs, the vote on the railroad strike, and the nuclear test ban treaty.

Because of the importance of these issues—issues that could mean our very survival, we should do our utmost to marshal our most effective weapon. That is the American people.

Now I don't pretend to set myself up as an expert on public opinion even though I do hear a great deal from my constituents and try always to be alert as to the true feelings and beliefs of those I have the honor to represent in the Congress. Personally I have grave doubts that Americans are complacent.

Is it creditable to believe that the American people are not concerned when 1 in 10 is handicapped in the exercise of his ordinary civil rights, just because of the color of his skin? Are we as a Nation content when we have 5 million of the men and women in our labor force unemployed, when 1 out of every 16 workers cannot find a job? And this is a nagging persistent long-term unemployment problem in most cases. Can we Americans be satisfied when the most elemental kind of medical care is beyond the reach of millions of our people, especially those over 65 among us? Can we rest easy when our economy remains sluggish, when we know that Government action in terms of tax reduction, tax reform, and soundly selected Government public works programs, would do much to speed up our rate of economic growth?

It is on some of these issues that I want to say a few words today. And I am particularly glad to have you as an audience. You are representatives of the largest and one of the most influential economic groups in the Nation. You are some of the 14 million members of the AFL-CIO. It is your voices, individually and collectively that must be heard. It is you who must prove that we as a Nation are not just "fat, dumb, and happy."

Let me start out with a few comments on the civil rights legislation before the Congress. I have introduced numerous bills designed to guarantee full civil rights and equal opportunities for all Americans. I was pleased to introduce a companion bill, H. R. 7338, to the administration civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee. This is a bill which should be passed without any weakening or softening amendments. If anything it should be strengthened. Let me review the chief provisions of the bill for you.

In the crucial area of voting rights, the bill would guarantee equal voting rights in Federal elections, abolish discriminatory literacy tests, permit court-appointed voting referees, and speed voting rights suits in Federal courts. Surely, there is nothing more basic in the American way of life than the free and equal right of franchise, and anything that prevents any responsible adult American from exercising that right cannot be tolerated.

In order to expedite school desegregation, the bill would provide technical and financial aid to local school authorities engaged in such school desegregation, and would authorize court action by the Attorney General to speed up this desegregation.

A Community Relations Service would be set up under this bill to help local communities solve racial disputes and ease racial tensions. In view of the various kinds of racial frictions and clashes, actual, and potential, that can be found almost everywhere in these United States, North and South, this service could be most helpful. Certainly the successful experience gained in handling race or color related problems in one area should be utilized wherever applicable in other parts of the country.

The bill would prohibit racial discrimination by all Federal contractors and subcontractors. The U.S. Government would be empowered to withhold Federal grants when it finds the funds are being used in a discriminatory way. I would like to see this mandatory and am doing my utmost to strengthen the bill.

And finally, there is the public accommodations provision. This is, of course, the provision that has aroused the most intense publicity in the press and has been argued up and down the land. The bill, as you probably are aware, would guarantee equal access for all to public accommodations, such as hotels, motels, restaurants, stores, and places of public entertainment. It is with real alarm that I learn of one concession after another being made in this section of the bill, providing for exempting a considerable variety of businesses from its provisions. I think this is a tactical mistake. Far worse, it is a moral mistake. As I said in testifying before the Judiciary Committee of the House, which is considering this bill, "Our actions must be bold and must brook no compromise of principle."

How on earth can you justify one place being allowed to discriminate and another not to. That is why I advocate, and so many others do, a strengthening, not weakening, of the bill, to apply the 14th amendment principle to cover all.

I am grateful that the president of the AFL–CIO, Mr. George Meany, has likewise come out strongly for the bill. I can but applaud his statement in his June 13 message to President Kennedy: There is no public issue of greater importance to America than equal rights and equal opportunities for all citizens. . . . We can no longer expect Negro Americans to be content with a little liberty. They are entitled to full liberty, full citizenship, full standing in the community, not next year but now. . . . I pledge the unstinting assistance of the AFL–CIO to the prompt achievement of a full, enforceable civil rights program on every front." Mr. Meany was candid enough to say, I would like to add, that the problem of discrimination is not absent in organized labor. But he welcomed most of the provisions of this bill which would help organized labor in its effort to achieve greater equality of opportunity and civil rights.

I want to make it quite clear that I agree with Mr. Meany that discrimination in employment is by no means primarily a matter of union responsibility. Time and time again unions have taken the lead in bringing a company around to establishing a fair employment and promotion policy. Again and again, the labor movement has asked for equal employment opportunities laws, applicable to unions and management alike, while all too often businessmen and their associations have held back.

Now I should like to turn to our national tax policy. As you know, the President last winter proposed an extensive tax program designed in the first instance to stimulate the economy, and, second, to take some initial steps to put the tax burden on a fairer base. There has been a growing awareness in Washington that our entire tax structure has been acting as a drag on the economy; that taxes are discouraging both consumption and investment; that therefore tax reduction and tax reform would have to be a matter of top legislative priority. The President proposed a bundle of tax changes in January of this year which are far too numerous for me to detail here. But I do want to point out a few of the highlights. For individuals the administration proposed a reduction of rates from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent, in a three-step sequence with the final range effective in 1965 and subsequent years.

There would also be reductions in corporate taxes. After 1965 corporations would be taxed at a rate of 22 percent on their first $25,000 of income and at a rate of 47 percent of income above $25,000, compared to a rate now of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of income and 52 percent on incomes above $25,000. Some of the tax reforms would, for certain income recipients, reduce the amount of the tax cut. The repeal of the dividends tax credit would have its greatest impact on high income groups. Much wider in its application would be the proposal to limit itemized deductions (for such expenses as interest, State and local taxes and charitable contributions) to those in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. The administration estimates the net effect of its tax package would be a reduction of more than $10 billion when the reductions and reforms have become fully effective in 1965.

But I contend that the President has failed to go nearly far enough in terms of tax cuts for low- and middle-income families. It is these families who most need the boost in purchasing power that a substantial, prompt tax cut would give; it is their purchasing power that would do most to get our factories and workshops operating full blast again instead of, as at present, limping along at 15 percent less than capacity. So rather than give major tax reductions to corporations and upper-income families, I would much prefer increasing the personal exemption of each taxpayer and his dependents by at least $300 a person. And I would not delay. The sooner we can get the economy moving again, operating at the potential our human and natural resources make readily possible, the easier it will be to solve the Nation's social and economic problems, such as unemployment, job discrimination, school dropouts and juvenile delinquency. We should have a $10 billion tax cut this year, not spread over 3 years.

The tax reforms proposed by the President, like his tax cuts, have merit, but again do not go far enough, and do not provide adequately for closing loopholes enjoyed by the wealthy. Curtailing capital gains treatment of lump-sum pension and profit distribution, and tightening the tax law on capital gains income by extending the holding period from 6 to 12 months to become eligible for capital gains rates are all to the good. We should know by now that the tax cuts requested by the President, even if he gets all that he asked for, will be too little and to late to totally solve the intolerable unemployment situation, one that becomes worse with each business cycle. Tax cuts will help considerably, but much more is needed. We must expand our programs at all governmental levels—Federal, State, and local—for badly needed public facilities: schools, hospitals, highways, water supply and sewage disposal works, parks. The needs of the American people for public works such as these are urgent. The employment that filling these needs would create is substantial.

We should rapidly expand our programs to provide useful training to young people about to enter the labor market and retraining for those whose jobs have become obsolete. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 have barely been able to operate on a pilot project basis. They must grow to reach more areas and more individuals that need help.

Federal aid to education, at college and graduate school levels, as well as in elementary schools and for vocational training, will not only create jobs in construction and for teachers directly, but will prepare workers and their children for more skilled and higher paid jobs in the future.

It is quite clear to me that we are going to have to meet the problems created by automation head on. The programs of education, retraining, and area redevelopment are part of the answer, but only part. Automation and related technological advances are unquestionably going to bring enormous benefit to our society, by raising levels of productivity and making possible production in quantities and of uniform quality hitherto undreamed of. But it also is bringing unemployment and underemployment in its wake. The adjustment will not be easy or automatic.

What is needed above all is more job opportunities. This will require resourcefulness and ingenuity. It may even become desirable to explore the feasibility of shortening the workweek from 40 to 36 to 35 hours a week, at least in certain industries, as a means of opening up more jobs.

There is one final issue that has been before the last Congress and which must be resolutely faced this year. It is an issue in which I am intensely interested. I refer to adequate medical care for the aged. I have long advocated medicare under social security. I was privileged to cosponsor the original Forand bill, 5 years ago and to be identified as a sponsor of its succeeding legislation, the King-Anderson program. The facts in favor of this legislation are plain, and, no doubt, well known to many of you through your own personal experience. Few elements in the cost of living have risen more rapidly than hospitalization and other kinds of medical care. And for those over 65 this care is needed at least three times as often as for those under 65. Further, today's older people generally are least able to bear these high hospital and medical expenses, both because they have lower incomes, on the average, and less insurance than younger persons. Let me cite just one figure for you. Half the aged couples, where one or the other is hospitalized, have total medical bills of over $800 in a single year. Yet statistics show that more than 50 percent of those over 65 have incomes of less than $1,000. This situation is a source of untold anxiety for the aged and their children.

We know, of course, that there have been many proposals to deal with this acute problem. But all methods thus far do not, and perhaps cannot, get to the crux of the problem. Basically, experience has shown that the health insurance now available to older individuals which provides reasonable protection is too costly for most of the aged to afford, and such health insurance that is now available to older individuals at moderate cost provides only severely limited protection. Let's not kid ourselves into believing the problem can be met by private plans. It just can't. Let's face it.

The situation is intolerable. And with every passing month it is getting worse. Hospital and other medical costs continue to soar. The proportion of the elderly in our population is increasing; the need for a sound medical insurance program is undeniable. It's vital.

(In 1946, only 17 years ago, an average hospital room cost $9.70. Last year, an average hospital room cost $34.50.)

The sensible answer, the only answer, it seems to me, lies in a Federal health insurance program, financed by social security. It fits the original concept of social security, the whole philosophy of which is based on providing at least minimum economic security to a person when he gets older and his earning capacity decreases or ends. Well, that is only part of an older person's security. Equally important is his health. This is what is proposed by the Anderson-King bill (H.R. 3920 and S. 880). Under this bill, 18 million persons over 65—and that includes those not under social security—would be protected beginning in January 1965, and all present workers and their wives (or widows) would be covered when they reach 65. The health insurance under this bill would include hospital care, nursing facility care, hospital outpatient diagnostic services, and home health services, all up to certain specified amounts each year. This insurance program would be financed by certain modest increases in social security. Basically social security and railroad retirement contribution rates would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent each for employees and employers, and four-tenths of 1 percent for self-employed persons, and the taxable earnings base would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200. Thus under the proposed law a worker earning $5,200 or more would in 1965 be paying in social security $201.50 of which $17.68 would be for hospital insurance. This total of $201.50 would be $27.50 above the amount payable by the same worker in 1965 under present law without hospital insurance.

The present Kerr-Mills medical assistance program for the aged is certainly unsatisfactory. As a matter of fact, it's a disgrace; it means test provisions are degrading and an insult to human dignity; it's onerous. I might add as of February of this year, less than 7 out of every 1,000 aged persons in the United States were receiving any assistance under this program. All but the poorest, who have no choice, are neglected by it. Benefits are often meager and uncertain. In fact, in nearly half of the States, no benefits have been paid at all.

Let's not permit certain bugaboos to blind us to the merits of medical insurance under social security. It is not, as some would claim, an opening wedge to socialized medicine. It is no more socialized medicine than are Blue Cross or other private insurance plans that pay hospital or medical bills. It would not interfere with the patient's free choice of a doctor—or hospital—or control medical fees. The Government would in no way provide care, offer services, or suggest any physician or facility. Under this program, its sole role would be to set up the means for paying for an aged person's hospital and related care by a small tax levied on him and his employer during his working years. Neither would it interfere wth private insurance. In fact, it would probably increase the demand for a variety of private insurance plans. With basic protection assured under social security financed hospital insurance, older persons could use what funds they have to buy supplemental coverage, such as surgery, drugs, physician visits and dental care, which would not be covered by social security hospital insurance. Further, without the burden of insuring the high-cost aged, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and other commercial health insurance firms could hold down their rates and sell insurance more effectively.

While it is too early to make a prognosis of the fate of the King-Anderson proposal, you may be certain that I shall use whatever power and persuasion I have to get it enacted into law. It is a measure that should receive the warmest endorsement of all who want to see that our senior citizens are able to live out their lives without the threat of costly medical care ever corroding their minds and hearts.

Let me conclude by describing to you a cartoon I saw in a Washington paper earlier this week (Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1963). It shows a lifeboat, entitled U.S. Economic Progress, apparently adrift in a stormy sea. In the boat huddled together are men designated by the labels, "education opportunities," "employment situation," "civil rights," "business," and "unions." The caption to the cartoon reads, "In This Boat We're All Integrated." How true; I could not agree more wholeheartedly. It is our economic progress that makes solutions to the problems I have been discussing with you here possible. Our future as a free people and as a leader in the world depends on our ability to make economic progress constructively and without undue delay.

My only quarrel with the cartoonist (Herblock) who created this picture of the diversity of America and its problems "integrated" in a lifeboat, is that he failed to show a helmsman or even any oars that would suggest that we have a destination and a determination to reach it. Let us make sure that our ship of state has a noble and worthy goal. Let us see that the boat is fully manned. Let us make sure that a helmsman will fearlessly steer a true and steady course. That is where you as individuals, your unions, your neighbors; yes, all the American people, come in. They have the power in their hands—through their work, dedication, alertness—and through the power of the ballot.

Independence of Malaya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 the Federation of Malaya celebrates the sixth anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Majesty Yang di-Pertuan Agong, Tuanku Syed Putra ibni Al-Marhum Syed Hassan Jamalullail; and His Excellency the Malayan Ambassador to the United States, Dato Ong Yoke Lin.

For most nations of the world, the Second World War ended with the ceremony of surrender enacted on board the battleship *Missouri* in 1945. Some, however, were faced with continued fighting, an internal conflict of communism against democracy. For the people of Malaya, the war was not to end until July 1960.

For 15 years the Government in Malaya battled the Communist guerrilla forces, some 11,000 well-trained and heavily armed terrorists, who wreaked havoc and destruction in the name of freedom. A British colony until 1957, the independent Malayan regime continued British practices in their struggle for democracy and existence, using effective propaganda methods and crack jungle-trained military units. The Prime Minister, the father of Malayan independence, the Tunku Abdul Rahman has declared:

> We believe that we cannot coexist with the Communists. We are non-Communist and will remain so.

To this day his policies and actions have fulfilled this statement.

The Federation of Malaya, constituting 11 states, 9 of which are constitutionally governed by hereditary sultans and 2 by appointed governors, gained its independence from British sovereignty on August 31, 1957. The transition was cordial and without incident, showing the willingness and good intentions of both the colonial power and the independence forces to carry out the spirit of the United Nations.

Although the Communist war was in progress, from the very first, the new Malayan Government gained world recognition and admiration by its stability, harmony, and progressive outlook. Because of these attributes, Malaya today has the highest per capita income and the most vigorous and prosperous economy in southeast Asia. The nation produces 40 percent of the world's natural rubber supply. Furthermore, the nation is the world's first producer of tin. Since 1957, the total industrial production has doubled, the annual agricultural crop has tripled, and the output of iron ore has doubled. To attract additional investment capital, the Government, instead of nationalizing foreign companies, has enticed foreign concerns by passing legislation which grants tax concessions to new industries. The results of these astute policies is an enviable economic record.

The attentions of the Malayan Government are focused today upon a new political scheme which would federate the British colonies of Singapore, North Borneo, and Sarawak with Malaya under one federal government. Scheduled to come into being later this year, the states concerned are waiting word from a United Nations factfinding commission. It is the concern of this United Nations group to determine whether or not the people of Borneo want to federate into the new Malaysian Federation. Politically, economically, and ethnically speaking, all states would benefit from this undertaking. The danger of communism, especially in the colony of Singapore, demands that such action be taken.

To overcome suspicion and possible hostility from neighboring countries, Malaya has actively participated in regional agreements. The recent Maphilindo pact, concluded among the Philippines, Malaya, and Indonesia, is an attempt at regional security. The Association of southeast Asia—Thailand, the Philippines, and Malaya—is actively engaged in cultural and economic cooperation. It is the hope of this association to be the forerunner of an Asian common market.

Relations with the United States have been friendly and cooperative. During their fight against communism, our Government sent 10,000 carbines and 10 helicopters to the Federal forces. Our economic assistance has produced roads, bridges, and a dam. At the present time a $10 million loan is helping to develop the facilities of Port Swettenham, in order to handle the increased trading activities of the country.

As the Malayan people celebrate their 6th anniversary of independence on August 31, we in the United States must honor these people, too. Their courage, progressiveness, and stanch stand against communism demand our admiration and assure continued close and amicable relations between our Government and the Government of the Federation of Malaya.

Iron Ore Imports Should Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, U.S. production of iron ore decreased almost 30 percent while iron ore imports more than tripled in the period from 1952 through 1962. The same 11 years saw a complete reversal of our position in the world steel market. In 1952 we sold abroad 3½ times as much steel as we imported. In 1962 we imported twice as much steel as we exported.

It is against this background, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced a bill to establish a reasonable quota on the importation of iron ore into the United States. I have sponsored such legislation for the last several years in the firm belief that it offers the best hope of reviving a basic industry that has been on the decline since shortly after World War II.

In limiting the quantity of foreign ore that could be fed into our blast and steel furnaces we would be forcing the big steel companies to reopen some of their ore mines and draw more heavily from their domestic supplies. This, in my opinion, would be a good thing for this country, the iron ore miners of Michigan, and for the people in the iron mining communities who depend on this industry.

As I have done in the past I again want to emphasize that my purpose in sponsoring this legislation is not to penalize in any way the steel companies which own and operate our domestic iron ore mines and also own a major part of the reserves in Canada and Venezuela. Some of these companies also are participating in development of Africa's vast iron ore reserves. What I propose is that we regulate the flow of iron ore from abroad on a reasonable annual basis to save our domestic ore industry from destruction or substantial injury.

The table below, prepared from statistics compiled by the Bureau of Census, reflects the sharp increase in foreign iron ore imports from 1952 through 1962 with the corresponding decrease in domestic production:

Iron ore imports, 1952–62 [1]

[In thousands of long tons]

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Canada	1,822	1,841	3,537	10,077	13,723	12,537	8,289	13,458	10,595	9,683	16,844
Venezuela	1,846	1,950	5,210	7,160	9,254	12,291	12,180	13,542	14,555	10,478	10,313
Others [2]	6,093	7,283	7,045	6,235	7,434	8,823	7,075	8,617	9,428	5,644	6,274
Total	9,761	11,074	15,792	23,472	30,411	33,651	27,544	35,617	34,578	25,805	33,431

[1] During the same period, domestic production has decreased from an annual average of 98,984,000 long tons in 1952–56 to an estimated 71,000,000 long tons in 1962.

[2] Other countries exporting iron ore to the United States include Brazil, Chile, Denmark, India, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, and Sweden.

It has been contended that research, and not legislation to limit imports, is the key to the iron ore problem. This opinion is rooted in the progress that has been made in developing economic ways of concentrating or beneficiating lower grade ores, especially the taconites of the Lake Superior ranges. Research offers much hope for the future. However, the development of these new processes is costly and the construction of plants to put them to practical use requires tremendous investments. Full commercial utilization of our lower grade ores is a decade or more away and meantime our miners and their families are suffering deprivations because of this unfair competition from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, our increasing reliance on foreign sources of iron ore could be disastrous in time of war. If we permit the destruction of our domestic industry, how could we replace foreign supplies cut off from us in time of war? Abandoned iron mines cannot be brought back into production overnight. The skills of miners who have had to leave their home communities to seek other ways to make a living would be difficult to replace in time of emergency. The present situation is a threat to our national security.

By following a shortsighted policy of ever-increasing dependence on foreign ore supplies the steel companies have helped promote a free trade policy which, in the face of growing protectionism abroad, can only have an adverse effect on American industry and American working men and women.

For many years the iron ore producing areas of our country have been trying to digest the bitter fruits of the steel companies' policy of developing foreign ore sources at the expense of the domestic iron ore industry. Due in large measure to that policy all of the western half of Michigan's Upper Peninsula is a depressed area, and has been so designated by agencies of the Federal Government. Not only do we have heavy unemployment in the iron ore mining areas of this country, but we also have serious underemployment resulting from the part-time operation of those mines which have not shut down.

Now the steel companies themselves are tasting the same bitter fruits of their buy-foreign policy. The U.S. share of world steel production declined from 46 percent in 1950 to 25 percent in 1961. Our participation in world steel trade dropped from about 17 percent of the total in the early 1950's to an average of less than 6 percent during the last 3 years.

In the past, despite inadequate tariff protection, our steel industry was able to compete with foreign producers because of our more efficient plants and labor force. While steelworkers received higher wages in this country, their per capita output also was greater. The situation has changed and our steel producers no longer have these balancing advantages. Through our foreign aid program, we subsidized construction of steel plants in foreign countries that are more modern and efficient than many plants in this country. Western Europe and Japan have found a ready market in the United States for the product of their new plants. For the first time in more than a half century this country became a net importer of steel in 1959, a situation that continues down to this day. The following table reflects this change for the worse in the world steel trade picture:

Imports and exports of steel mills products, 1952–62

[In net tons]

Year	*Imports*	*Exports*
1952	1,201,435	4,005,248
1953	1,702,991	2,990,751
1954	770,822	2,791,886
1955	973,155	4,060,998
1956	1,340,746	4,347,903
1957	1,154,831	5,347,678
1958	1,707,130	2,822,910
1959	4,396,354	1,676,652
1960	3,358,752	2,977,278
1961	3,164,256	1,989,179
1962	4,100,448	2,013,102

Source: American Iron and Steel Institute.

Steel management and labor have been slow to see the handwriting on the wall. They now are beginning to realize how badly they are being hurt by imports of finished steel products, as evidenced by the recent visit to the White House of Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., and David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers Union.

According to the press reports, they asked President Kennedy for help in halting the unfair competition from foreign steel mills. Mr. Blough pointed out that foreign steel imports last year totaled more than 4 million tons, representing a loss of 70 million man-hours of work, or the equivalent of 37,700 full-time jobs in the American steel industry. Even more jobs will be lost this year because foreign finished steel products now are pouring into this country at an annual rate of 5 million tons.

Mr. Blough should realize that iron ore imports have a similar impact on our American iron miners. The buy-foreign policy which his company, and other major producers, have pursued for several years are costing the jobs of increasing numbers of iron miners in this country. Iron ore imports jumped to 33 million tons last year. Production of this ore in the United States would have provided a year's employment for 10,000 iron miners who could have had almost 43½ million man-hours of work. Since the iron ore miner currently earns an average of $3.03 an hour, these foreign imports represent a loss of wages totaling $131,805,000. Our now unemployed, or underemployed, iron miners would be paying substantial income taxes instead of having to rely for their sustenance on unemployment compensation and job-creating public works projects, beneficial as the latter might be to our depressed iron mining communities.

I believe that the steel industry, as well as the iron ore industry, should have tariff or quota protection. But it is somewhat ironic that the steel companies should be asking for protection against imports of finished steel at a time when they are increasing their imports of iron ore at the expense of the domestic iron ore industry, which is virtually being destroyed.

The steel companies cannot have their cake and eat it. If they want protection against imports of finished steel, they should be willing to go along with a quota on the importation of the raw material.

Unless both the steel and iron ore industries receive tariff or quota protection, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can expect to keep the foreign mills from making even greater inroads into the American market. A steelworker in the United States in 1962 earned an average of $4.16 an hour. In comparison, a Japanese steelworker earned 63 cents, an Italian steelworker 98 cents, a French steelworker $1.27, a Belgian steelworker $1.33, a British steelworker $1.38, a German steelworker $1.45, and a Canadian steelworker $3.46. In each case these hourly earnings include supplemental benefits which in many countries represent a substantial portion of the worker's wage. There is a similar variance between the earnings of American iron ore miners and those in foreign mines.

I do not wonder then that the steel industry and the steelworkers' union have become concerned about unfair foreign competition. My only wonder is that their concern has been voiced so late. Had it been expressed during last year's debate on the reciprocal trade program it might have had a greater impact.

It was just a little over a year ago that the House passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As I predicted when I voted against this misnamed act, we have seen a steady deterioration in our world trade position since it became law last October. Our foreign trade is contracting rather than expanding. Even stanch supporters of the Trade Act have suggested that the United States be armed with retaliatory tariffs in the event we are not able to work out a mutual reduction of tariffs with the Common Market countries of Europe.

Recent events have brought a rude awakening to those who were contending a year ago that our Tariff Expansion Act, in combination with the Common Market, would usher in a new free trade era that would spell unparalleled prosperity for all the free world.

Free trade cannot be a one-way street. Our policy of lowering tariffs and eliminating barriers to the importation of foreign goods in the face of the tariff walls being thrown up around the Common Market countries will be the ruination of American industry unless we take counteraction in our own self-interest.

Although trade act proponents last year agreed that tariff concessions would be harmful to some segments of American industry and labor, they hailed the trade adjustment assistance section of the bill as providing special benefits to cushion the injurious effects on companies, workers, and farmers.

As yet, however, no company, no worker, no farmer has received any help under this section. Before such assistance may be extended, the Tariff Commission must find that injury resulted from imports due to tariff concessions. So far the Commission has decided nine cases brought before it by five industries, two companies, and four groups of workers, all seeking relief under section 301 of the Tariff Expansion Act of 1961. The Tariff Commission rejected every one of these cases, justifying the view of many of us last year that the trade adjustment section was merely an empty promise.

We are now told that the White House is attempting to pump some life into this moribund program. By injecting new blood into the Tariff Commission, the administration, according to an article in the August 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal, hopes "to create a more sympathetic agency climate" for claims of injury resulting from imports.

More than a transfusion of personnel on the Tariff Commission is needed to provide genuine relief for the thousands of American workers who have been hurt, and who are continuing to be hurt, by foreign competition. It is time for a thorough reappraisal of our whole free trade policy because that policy works to the advantage of foreign producers and foreign workers and against the best interests of our own industries and our own workers. More and more of our people are losing their jobs as a result of unfair foreign competition. We must protect our own people first. Free trade is like foreign aid. It is a give-away of our resources to foreign countries who neither understand nor appreciate our generosity.

I hope the Congress will repeal the reciprocal trade program in its entirety and rewrite a trade policy based on reality, commonsense and enlightened self-interest. Unless this is done our free trade policy is going to be responsible for one of the greatest depressions this country has ever seen.

Straws in the Wind—From Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Federation of Independent Business sent me a statistical chart, showing results of their semiannual survey of independent businessmen in every State in the Union, with respect to certain legislative proposals.

I would like to share these findings on various issues with Members of the House of Representatives because it shows the attitude in my State of North Dakota among independent businessmen, as compared to national attitudes in the same group.

Nationally, 30,238 responded. Of this, 127 ballots were received from North Dakota—meaning that my State had a percentage of 0.0042 percent of the national vote. Since North Dakota is considered one of the lesser States, populationwise and incomewise as well, I decided it would be good to compare our percentage of votes on the various issues with those responding from larger, more populous, and more prosperous States, such as New York, California, and for purposes of comparison on labor issues, Michigan. Michigan, as we all know, has been known for some time as a State in financial chaos. However, since Gov. George Romney has had his hand at the helm of state, there has been a 73-percent reduction in its whopping deficit. This stood at $85.6 million on June 30, 1962—and has been cut to $23 million as of June 30 this year.

California showed a response of 2,527 votes. New York responded with 2,450, and Michigan with 1,303. While California and New York were the only 2 States who responded over the 2,000 mark, Michigan was joined by Illinois, 1,204; Indiana, 1,231; Ohio, 1,335; Pennsylvania, 1,648; Texas, 1,695; Virginia, 1,072; and the State of Washington, 1,109, as States returning ballots over the 1,000 mark.

Tax cuts were naturally an item of great interest to the businessmen. They voted separately on individual income taxes and corporation income taxes. The first category gave a choice between having the same percentage of cuts regardless of income—to which the national vote came to 68 percent yes and 32 percent no. North Dakota's percentage showed 70 percent yes and 30 percent no. California showed 77 percent yes, and 23 percent no; New York showed 63 percent yes and 37 percent no; and

Michigan answered yes 68 percent and no 32 percent.

The second choice on the first category asked if they preferred bigger cuts in lower income brackets. To this, the national vote responded 74 percent yes and 26 percent no. North Dakota responded 79 percent yes to 21 percent no; California responded with 61 percent yes to 39 percent no; New York, with 82 percent yes to 18 percent no; and Michigan with 73 percent yes to 27 percent no.

On corporation income taxes, businessmen were asked if they preferred the Senate small business committee plan. Briefly, this plan means the proposed reversal of the normal tax and surtax rates would result in a reduction of approximately 27 percent in the tax liabilities of small corporations earning $25,000 or less per year. To this, the national vote responded 85 percent yes and 15 percent no. North Dakota voted 78 percent yes and 22 percent no. California voted 77 percent yes to 23 percent no; New York voted 88 percent yes, and 12 percent no. Michigan voted 87 percent yes and 13 percent no.

On the same category of corporation income taxes, the businessmen were asked if they felt taxes should be reduced regardles of size. Nationally, the average showed 45 percent yes to 54 percent no. North Dakota showed a 45 percent yes vote to a 55 percent no vote. California responded with a 59 percent yes vote and a 41 percent no vote. New York voted 42 percent yes and 58 percent no, while Michigan voted 47 percent yes to 53 percent no.

To the 64 dollar question should Congress cut taxes in 1963? The national vote was 60 percent yes and 40 percent no. This I thought was rather illuminating, and should be viewed in the context of a comparison with some later questions asked on tax reform and Government spending, which appear later in my remarks.

On this important issue North Dakota responded with an exact twin percentage, 60 percent yes to 40 percent no. California voted 74 percent yes to 26 percent no; New York responded with a 73 percent yes vote to a 27 percent no vote; and Michigan, 82 percent yes to 18 percent no.

Unfair price competition was the next large category of questions. The survey chart showed four categories of action needed to curb unfair competition. The first category asked if the businessmen approved of stronger use of present antitrust laws. Nationally, they responded 86 percent yes to 14 percent no. North Dakota's response was 76 percent yes and 24 percent no. California answered with 84 percent yes to 16 percent no; New York, with 86 percent yes to 14 percent no, and Michigan with 83 percent yes to 17 percent no.

The second category asked whether the businessmen felt they needed firm retail price proposals. The nationwide vote was 53 percent yes to 47 percent no. North Dakota answered 65 percent yes to 35 percent no. California answered 57 percent yes to 43 percent no. New York answered 58 percent yes to 42 percent no, and Michigan responded with a 56 percent yes vote to its 44 percent no vote.

The third category question was whether they preferred a firm manufacturer price proposal. Nationally, the businessmen replied 74 percent yes to 26 percent no. North Dakota voted 82 percent yes to 18 percent no. California voted 65 percent yes to 35 percent no; New York with 77 percent yes to 23 percent no; and Michigan, 74 percent yes to 26 percent no.

The fourth category asked if the businessmen favored a proposal to curb "loss-leaders." Nationally, the vote was 84 percent yes to 16 percent no. North Dakota responded 87 percent yes and 13 percent no; California, 76 percent yes to 24 percent no; New York, 85 percent yes to 15 percent no; and Michigan, with 86 percent yes to 14 percent no.

The survey now entered the always vital field of labor legislation, or labor regulation. Here there were two categories offered for vote. The first category asked if the businessmen favored proposals for the 35-hour week, an issue very much on the minds of the labor leaders today. Nationally, the vote showed 3 percent yes and 97 percent no. North Dakota, a right-to-work State, voted 3 percent yes and 97 percent no—identical to the national average. California, which is not a right-to-work State, voted 4 percent yes to 96 percent no; New York, also not a right-to-work State, voted 3 percent no to 97 percent yes, and Michigan, again not a right-to-work State, voted 2 percent yes to 98 percent no.

The second category for labor regulation asked if the businessmen felt antitrust law should be applied to labor unions the same as to business. This issue, much in the minds of business as well as labor these days when we are threatened with a nationwide railroad strike, or a form of compulsory arbitration between railroad unions and railroad management on certain issues—reflected a national response of 99 percent yes to 1 percent no. North Dakota voted 96 percent yes to 4 percent no; California, 98 percent yes to 2 percent no; New York, 99 percent yes to 1 percent no; and Michigan, a trifle more than 99 percent yes and a trifle less than 1 percent no.

The large questions of tax reform and Government spending were linked together in the survey, under a subheading of How To Secure Funds for Tax Cuts, by: Under this was suggested six methods. The first one was by closing so-called tax loopholes. To this the national response was 63 percent yes to 37 percent no. North Dakota voted 69 percent yes to 31 percent no. California responded with a 59 percent yes to a 41 percent no. New York, with 64 percent yes to 36 percent no, and Michigan voted 68 percent yes to 32 percent no.

The second method was by a reduction in Government spending. The nationwide businessmen's response was 97 percent yes to 3 percent no. North Dakota, 96 percent yes to 4 percent no. California voted 97 percent yes to 3 percent no; New York, 93 percent yes to 7 percent no; and Michigan, 96 percent yes to 4 percent no.

The third method suggested a cut in foreign aid. To this, the businessmen nationally voted 94 percent yes to 6 percent no. North Dakota's vote was 94 percent yes to 6 percent no, again a twin to the national vote. California voted 94 percent yes to 6 percent no—triplets. New York voted 88 percent yes to 12 percent no, and Michigan, 93 percent yes to 7 percent no—almost making it a quadruplet vote. This, along with a check of the other States, should be a convincer to the administration—as least as far as independent businessmen are concerned—that foreign aid is a highly unpopular subject.

The fourth method suggested was whether or not Federal payrolls and employment should be cut. To this, the national vote was 92 percent yes to 8 percent no. North Dakota almost twinned with a 93 percent yes to 7 percent no. California responded with a twin to the North Dakota vote, 93 percent yes to 7 percent no. New York voted 89 percent yes to 11 percent no, and Michigan, with 92 percent yes to 8 percent no.

The fifth method was whether funds for the tax cut could be secured by reducing public works. Nationally, the vote was 32 percent yes to 68 percent no. North Dakota voted 27 percent yes to 73 percent no. California, 37 percent yes to 63 percent no. New York responded by 28 percent yes to 72 percent no. Michigan voted 39 percent yes to 61 percent no.

The sixth and last method suggested was to secure funds for a tax cut by a cut in "social welfare" programs. To this, the independent businessmen voted nationally, 78 percent yes to 22 percent no. North Dakota responded with a 73 percent yes to 27 percent no. California, with 83 percent yes to 17 percent no, and New York by 94 percent yes to 6 percent no. Michigan voted 73 percent yes to 27 percent no, thereby joining North Dakota in this vote.

In this semiannual survey, the last category was imports-exports. Under this were two categories asking whether the 1962 trade law had helped your business operations, or harmed your business operations.

Under the "helped" column, the national vote was 9 percent yes and 91 percent no. Under the "harmed" category, the national vote was 36 percent yes to 64 percent no.

North Dakota voted 6 percent yes and 94 percent no as far as "helped" was concerned, and 40 percent yes and 60 percent no to "harmed."

California voted that the trade law "helped," 12 percent yes and 88 percent no; and that it had "harmed," 30 percent yes and 70 percent no.

New York felt the trade law had "helped" 9 percent yes to 91 percent no; that it had "harmed," 24 percent yes to 76 percent no.

Michigan voted 7 percent yes and 93 percent no, that the trade law had "helped," and then voted 21 percent yes to 79 percent no that it had "harmed."

I considered this to be quite an eye-opener, in that the highly industrialized States, which should be reflected in small business operations, were not too enthused over the benefits of the 1962 Trade

Expansion Act, so thoroughly endorsed by the Kennedy administration. On the other hand, there were not too many who wanted to declare definitely it had harmed their business. This leads to the somewhat general conclusion that perhaps it has not had any particular impact one way or the other.

The last—but by no means least important issue voted on in the survey asked this question: As an importer or exporter, have you used SBA—Small Business Administration—Commerce, or State Department aids?

Nationally, the vote showed 7 percent yes to 93 percent no; North Dakota voted 18 percent yes to 82 percent no; California voted 14 percent yes to 86 percent no; New York voted 11 percent yes to 89 percent no; and Michigan voted 1 percent yes to 99 percent no.

From all the above, I felt it was small wonder that the independent businessmen seemed to feel it would be helpful if there was a reduction in Government spending, and a cut in Federal payrolls and employment. Apparently the Government aids did not quite live up to their reputation. This, in essence, compares to the well-known situation of the small farmers under Government agriculture controls and supports. After many years of operation, it has become increasingly apparent that the ones who actually benefit from the Federal Government subsidies or aids are the large, or commercial farmers, rather than the small farmer, running the so-called "family farms." Yet the whole philosophy behind such Federal aids is supposedly to "help the little man."

That is why it seemed to this semiannual nationwide survey of the National Federation of Independent Business—the little man in the business field—can be looked upon as straws in the wind. The fallacy of helping the little man reflects in small business in almost the same ratio as it does in agriculture.

Small business, as well as the small farmer, obviously would appreciate simple fairness, and an opportunity to conduct their business with more freedom and less Government control or interference.

To put it in slang phraseology—"with friends like this"—referring to Federal Government activity—"who needs enemies?"

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SISK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

SEPTEMBER 3, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable B. F. SISK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Nehemiah 1: 11: *O Lord, I beseech Thee, let now Thine ear be attentive to the prayer of Thy servants.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, humbly and gratefully we turn our souls in prayer to Thy listening ear and understanding heart for Thou alone canst supply our many temporal needs and satisfy our eternal longings.

Fortify us against those moods of fear and anxiety which so frequently assail us when we are confronted by difficult tasks and heavy responsibilities.

Help us to feel that all the duties which we are called upon to discharge demand and are worthy of our very best effort and the dedication of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

Grant that we may never be guilty of becoming careless and complacent in these perilous days when we are challenged to emulate those vast multitudes who, in years gone by, made such tremendous sacrifices to purchase and preserve the freedom which we are now privileged to enjoy.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 30, 1963, was read and approved.

DESIGNATING 1964 AS "SEE AMERICA YEAR"

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a resolution (H.J. Res. 658) I have introduced asking the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year."

It is the purpose of this measure to encourage our citizens to see America in 1964 rather than tour overseas. In 1962, U.S. tourism abroad resulted in a $1.4 billion deficit item in the balance of payments and the figures for 1963 indicate that the problem will be even more serious this year. Thus, if we can persuade Americans to travel in the United States, we will help to solve a crucial problem in our balance of payments and, in addition, Mr. Speaker, the dollars remaining in this country will add measurably to the domestic economic recovery.

In the near future, Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be considering a tax-cut proposal. One of the purposes of the pending tax legislation is to stimulate our domestic economy by increasing the spendable income of the Nation's consumers. As the result of a tax cut, many of our citizens will have sufficient means available to consider extended vacations and travel. However, Mr. Speaker, if the American people take this additional income and spend it overseas, we will have, in fact, negated much of the desired effect of the proposed tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, 1964 is a crucial year in the balance-of-payments situation. The resolution I have introduced is a voluntary approach to the oversea tourist problem, but I am confident our citizens will respond to this appeal. I urge each of the Members to give this resolution his support.

K. TOURS U.S.-BUILT PLASTIC PLANT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an article published in the Washington Post yesterday morning. It bears out an observation that I made a year ago when the House saw fit to adopt my amendment prohibiting aid to Communist countries.

This article tells of Mr. Khrushchev's visit to a plastic plant in Yugoslavia, two-thirds finished, at a cost of $40 million. There are admittedly approximately $23 million of U.S. grant money in this concern.

Mr. Khrushchev's visit was heralded by flags of Red Russia and Yugoslavia over the entrance.

U.S. newsmen were excluded from entering the plant. The U.S. technicians at the plant were not introduced and there was nothing to indicate U.S. aid.

One of the Americans there said:

> If I ever have anything to say about this kind of thing when I get back to the States, I'd cut it all out. We pay for it, we build it, and we don't get a word of credit. Most of the workers themselves don't even know this place is an American project.

This is how our money is being used, and I hope that on future aid projects at least there will be one little bitty note of some sort on there to indicate that the U.S. taxpayers are helping foot the bill.

The article I refer to follows:

K. TOURS U.S.-BUILT PLASTIC PLANT

(By David Miller)

ZAGREB, YUGOSLAVIA, September 1.—Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and his host, Marshal Tito, toured a model Yugoslav factory today that turned out to be a capitalist creation.

The $40 million plastic plant was financed partially with a $23 million U.S. grant. It is equipped with U.S. machinery, designed by U.S. engineers, and constructed under supervision of U.S. technicians.

Yet nowhere at the plant—about two-thirds finshed—was there a sign recording the U.S. role. Instead, the entrance was gaily decorated with Yugoslav and Soviet flags—a bitter note for the handful of Americans who have spent nearly 2 years here on the project.

According to the Americans, no local newspapers ever have said that the plant was built with American money or American know-how.

OVERCHARGE IN RENTS

They also complained about local overcharging in rents and food and said a request to local authorities to study the Serbo-Croatian language at a Zagreb institute had been rejected without explanation.

"If I ever have anything to say about this kind of thing when I get back to the States, I'd cut it all out," one American said. "We pay for it, we build it and we don't get a word of credit. Most of the workers themselves don't even know this place is an American project."

"We pay $200 a month for a five-room apartment that a Yugoslav could get for $50," his wife said. "The price of food jumps three times as soon as I open my mouth and they know I am a foreigner."

"We're cheated and it hurts," she said. "But the terrible thing is that the Yugoslavian people don't know we are trying to help them."

AMERICANS SNUBBED

Whether Khrushchev ever was told the plant was American financed is unknown. He spent less than an hour at the installation, examining various technical units, but he may have noticed the names of American companies on the equipment. He was not introduced to any of the four American engineers standing near the main entrance and they were not permitted to accompany him on his tour.

The newsmen were invited to the plant by local authorities, who even made a bus available. Once inside the gates, cameras were prohibited and all except two correspondents (from the Soviet news agency Tass and one from the Belgrade newspaper Borba) were turned away when Khrushchev and Tito began their visit.

Police forcibly kept the American reporters from the administration building where Khrushchev and Tito were greeted by plant authorities. After 10 minutes of angry exchanges, the American newsmen left as a group, ignoring a press briefing arranged by plant representatives.

Khrushchev and Tito reached the plant in twilight after driving from President Tito's hunting lodge at Brda and lunching with local authorities in Zagreb after a procession through the city that attracted tens of thousands.

Both leaders visited a school, where Khrushchev cast some personal doubts about the courses as being too general, and was honored at a dinner Sunday night.

He left Zagreb on Marshal Tito's special train for an overnight trip to Belgrade. He leaves Belgrade for Moscow on Tuesday.

WHAT IS THE FULL PRICE TAG ON THE INSTALLMENT PLAN TREATY OF MOSCOW?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, since signing of the test ban treaty in Moscow, much has been hinted about "further steps to ease tensions between Soviet Russia and the West." But in sharp contrast to all the ballyhoo which surrounded signing of the Treaty of Moscow, there is a veil of secrecy about the substance of "what comes next?" However, certain hints have been dropped from the New Frontier's highest plateau. These seem to be "first steps" toward softening up the American public for acceptance of what may be the added surcharges to be collected by Mr. Khrushchev for agreeing to the document.

Amongst such surcharges may be one or more of these developments:

First. A summit meeting, or at least an early meeting—later this year or early next year—between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev.

Second. A U.S. cutback in production of fissionable materials needed for fabrication of defensive atomic weapons—whether or not the U.S.S.R. agrees to do the same.

Third. Increased trade with the Soviet Union, including lifting of the export embargo of many strategic items now barred from shipment to Communist countries.

It must be recalled that after the treaty signing, Secretary of State Rusk lingered on for a while in the Soviet Union. Certainly no one believes he did so just to lose a game of table tennis to Khrushchev. There is strong suspicion he prolonged his visit to work out the details of the installment plan payments the United States must make on the already outrageous price for agreement—and come to an understanding about the pact's usurious interest rate and staggering carrying charges. It would be naive to assume he was working on a plan for "treaty insurance" to protect the United States against secret preparations for testing followed by a surprise denunciation of the bargain by the Kremlin at some future time when it serves the Communist purpose.

That some price over and above the signatures on the document was extracted seems inescapable. Even though the bare agreement appears to many, who are knowledgeable in the ruses of the Russians, to give them incredible opportunity to achieve a nuclear jump on the West, surely there is more behind its sudden acceptance—after laying on the negotiating table since 1959—than this. Rarely, if ever, have the Soviets affixed their signature to a deal until they have euchred out the last possible concession. Then, characteristically, they suddenly agree, before the other party comes to his senses and realizes how much he has given away.

THE KHRUSHCHEV-KENNEDY MEETING

The next development after the Rusk layover in Russia was an announcement that Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko—the Kremlin's international hatchetman—will come to Washington this month "to discuss new tension-easing steps" with the President. Then Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin paid a visit to Mr. Kennedy, after which he told the press they had talked about "steps to ease tensions." He also left open the possibility that Khrushchev himself may visit the President sometime soon. It could be incidental to a conclave of the U.N.—where now jovial Mr. Khrushchev once pounded his shoe on a table.

What is behind this sequence of meetings and talks? Sweetness, light, and sociability? Hardly. Before the other body proceeds to advise and consent to ratification of the treaty, it should insist on seeing the full cost of this installment plan treaty—complete with interest and carrying charges. It should be fully aware of how far the administration is preparing to go along the "yield and concede" path.

It should be informed of the extent to which the President will go in making concessions in any Khrushchev-Kennedy parley, and to what extent they may already have been made in the preliminary talks.

THE CUTBACK IN U^{235} PRODUCTION

On August 14, Charles Stelle, the U.S. delegate to the disarmament conference in Geneva, offered, on behalf of the United States, to convert fissionable material to peaceful purposes on a 60–40 basis with the U.S.S.R.—our diversion from weapons use would be half again theirs. The Soviets promptly rejected the offer out of hand. Yet, on August 20, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was notified that the Atomic Energy Commission had not yet reached a decision on renewal of a contract with the Allied Chemical Co. for operation of a facility at Metropolis, Ill., which processes raw material essential for the production of U^{235} for weapons use. The inference logically deductible from these actions is that the United States is planning a cutback in production of these materials despite Russia's refusal to do so. Is this part of the price for the test ban treaty—which can safely be disclosed only after the other body has been persuaded to ratify it?

THE TRADE CONCESSIONS

It is a fact that the United States sent a trade delegation to Soviet Russia on July 27. It has just returned from there. This followed a similar visit to the United States by a Soviet trade delegation in June. This exchange, it is interesting to note, brackets the test ban treaty negotiations. Was there any understanding, written or verbal, expressed or implied, out of this exchange that our trade policies with respect to Communist countries would be revised, once the treaty is signed? My suspicions on this were quite naturally aroused when my office called the Department of Commerce merely to confirm the fact of the exchange and was hastily assured, without raising the question, that no trade negotiations were involved. "The two delegations were composed of trade experts who concerned themselves solely with studies of the organization and techniques of international trade," we were told.

It would seem that the collection of such knowledge by the two countries, each about the other, would hardly be a justifiable exercise unless something is to be done with it.

If something is to be done with it, then trade means a two-way exchange. What does the Soviet Union have to offer us in trade that we want and need? The answer is, nothing. On the other hand, we have much in the way of manufactured goods, particularly items now on the restricted list and embargoed from export to the U.S.S.R., which would be of great strategic value to that country if it could get its hands on them.

The Soviet Union and its puppet countries have kept up a running fire of insistence upon a lowering of trade barriers by the United States. Judging by the eagerness with which the administration jumped at the test ban treaty, it is not absolutely out of mind to expect it might be equally ready to enter into a trade agreement with the advantages all on the side of the Reds, who are our avowed enemies in an economic, as well as political and military, sense.

At the present time the Soviet Union can purchase anything in the United States that is not on the list of strategic materials. What is there to talk to them about other than such items as are now on that list?

As matters stand, the other body is being urged to ratify the test ban treaty while, at the same time, there seems to be a strong possibility it is being kept partially in the dark as to the real cost of that treaty by way of future installment payments. These installments need not necessarily be subject to the advice and consent of that body. They need not be in the form of treaties which the Constitution subjects to constitutional review, but could be in the form of executive agreements which require no such scrutiny.

There is far too much hazard to the security of our Nation inherent in this whole chain of events to permit the other body to proceed safely, without absolute assurance it is being shown the full price tag on the treaty of Moscow.

CURBING THE OUTFLOW OF GOLD

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am urging President Kennedy to use the long-neglected tourist-dollar exchange program to curb the outflow of gold.

It was enacted 2 years ago and by now could have reduced the outflow substantially, perhaps as much as $500 million. Despite our critical gold situation, tourist-dollar exchange has been utilized only to a tiny fraction of its potential.

Under the program, U.S. tourists, upon entering a foreign country, can exchange their dollars at the U.S. embassy for equal value in local currencies.

The exchange keeps tourist dollars spent abroad from becoming a claim on our gold. The local currencies are acquired when the United States sells surplus farm commodities overseas under Public Law 480.

State Department fuzzy thinking and foot dragging is largely responsible for the delay in putting the tourist-dollar exchange program into full effect. Department officials seem to be more concerned about the gold problems of foreign countries than our own.

The program is authorized in agreements with 21 countries but the administration is actually carrying it out in only one—Egypt—and even there on a very small scale.

Curiously, the administration let 10 other countries—among them Communist Poland and Yugoslavia—veto the program.

For example, in the 2 years since the tourist-dollar program became law, the United States signed agreements under which Communist Yugoslavia acquired, on giveaway terms, farm commodities worth $151,600,000. Yugoslavia did not want the tourist-dollar exchange program included, and Kennedy negotiators did not insist.

In 1962, U.S. tourists spent $3 million in Yugoslavia, all of which became a claim on our gold.

Had our negotiators insisted upon the tourist-dollar program in the agreements, a $3-million-a-year assist to our gold problem would have been possible in Yugoslavia alone.

Full text of my letter to the President follows:

AUGUST 30, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During your recent European tour you expressed concern over the continued outflow of U.S. gold. Similar concern was expressed recently by Treasury Secretary Dillon before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

I am glad your administration recognizes the critical character of the gold outflow. I hope it will be checked long before your target year of 1968. At the present outflow rate, our gold supply will be exhausted by that date.

I wish respectfully to point out that for 2 years you have neglected legislative authority which makes possible a substantial improvement in our gold problem. I refer to section 104–s, title I, of Public Law 480, which became law as a part of the Agricultural Act of 1961. I am especially interested because I initiated this amendment.

As you know, Public Law 480 is the program under which surplus U.S. farm commodities are sold abroad. Sales made under title I of this act do not yield dollars but are paid for in the currency of the recipient country. Only a specified amount of this currency can be used by the United States, and then only for authorized purposes which are listed in the agreements. Before each agreement is signed, details of course are decided by the negotiators you designate, who work with negotiators of the recipient country.

Known as the tourist-dollar amendment, section 104–s added "exchange for tourist dollars" to the list of authorized U.S. uses which can be specified in title I agreements.

In countries where the amendment is utilized, American tourists, upon entering the country, can exchange their dollars at the Embassy for the equivalent in U.S.-owned local currencies.

The exchange is voluntary on the part of the U.S. tourists, of course, but to the extent that they make the exchange, our gold problem is eased. Ordinarily, dollars spent abroad by tourists become a claim on the U.S. gold supply. Exchange dollars do not.

Unfortunately, your administration has utilized this amendment only to a tiny fraction of its potential.

Here is the record:

Total value of Public Law 480, title I, agreements made since tourist-dollar amendment became law (August 1961): $2,716,270,000. (Your negotiators did not insist that the tourist-dollar provision be included in all these agreements. As a matter of fact, more than half the total value—$1,471,900,000—did not include this provision.)

Total value of agreements which included tourist-dollar exchange as one of several authorized uses for local currencies: $1,244,370,000.

Of this amount, your negotiators agreed that only a fraction be made available for the various authorized uses (including tourist-dollar exchange); to be exact, only $199,500,000.

Of this amount, a fraction has actually been set aside specifically for tourist-dollar exchange. In fact, Egypt is the one and only country where this has occurred. Value of the currencies set aside for tourist-dollar exchange in Egypt: $12,400,000.

Amount of dollars actually exchanged in 2 years under the tourist-dollar amendment provisions: $10,000.

It is impossible to say exactly how much the gold outflow would have been reduced had you utilized tourist-dollar exchange to the fullest extent possible during the past 2 years.

The above figures certainly show the reduction could have been substantial. In my opinion, it could have been as much as $500 million.

Why the breakdown in the tourist-dollar exchange program? There are several reasons:

1. You have not followed through effectively with countries that have accepted this program.

Tourist-dollar exchange is authorized in agreements with these 21 countries: Egypt, Turkey, Greece, Syrian Arab Republic, Bolivia, Iran, Guinea, Morocco, Brazil, Uruguay, Nationalist China, Ceylon, Tunisia, Vietnam, Israel, Paraguay, Sudan, Korea, Ethiopia, Cyprus, and Senegal.

Of these, only in Egypt has exchange actually occurred. Even there, exchange has not been utilized even to a fraction of its potential. Your officials were slow in setting up the mechanics for it. Today little is apparently being done to explain the program to tourists.

To illustrate the importance of this program, U.S. tourists in 1962 spent $8 million in Egypt. These $8 million became a foreign claim on our gold. Had the tourist-dollar exchange been set up promptly and thoroughly explained to all U.S. tourists arriving in Egypt, most if not all of the $8 million would have been exchanged at the American Embassy for equal value in United States-owned Egyptian pounds. Thus, an $8 million foreign claim on our gold would have been prevented.

As it is, in a 2-year period, only $10,000 have been exchanged for Egyptian pounds.

2. Your negotiators have not insisted on tourist-dollar exchange in agreements with countries reluctant to cooperate. These countries succeeded in persuading your negotiators to omit tourist-dollar exchange from title I agreements: Indonesia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Finland, India, Pakistan, Iceland, Congo, Philippines, and Burma.

To illustrate, in the 2 years since the tourist-dollar amendment became law, the United States signed title I agreements valued at $151,600,000 with Communist Yugoslavia. Yugoslav negotiators did not want the tourist-dollar exchange, and your negotiators did not insist. Consequently, none of the agreements included this provision. In 1962, U.S. tourists spent $3 million in Yugoslavia, all of which became a foreign claim on our gold.

Had your negotiators insisted upon tourist-dollar exchange in the agreements, and insisted also that an ample percentage of currency be available for various U.S. uses, a $3-million a year assist to our gold problem would have been possible in Yugoslavia alone.

I urge that you insist on these provisions in all future agreements. It is unlikely any country would reject a title I agreement simply because we insist that part of the proceeds be available for tourist-dollar exchange.

I am aware that our foreign policy objective in such countries as India and Pakistan has been to give full opportunity to earn dollar credit, but this same explanation is not valid in all countries.

Even in India and Pakistan, I strongly urge a policy reappraisal. Which is more important to the United States and to the free world: the Indian and Pakistani dollar shortage, or the U.S. gold outflow? In all candor, we must admit that our gold outflow is so critical it must take precedence.

3. Your negotiators have not insisted that ample currency be made available for U.S. uses. In Yugoslavia, for example, the percentage was only 10 percent. We should insist that at least one-third of proceeds be available for U.S. uses.

It is painfully apparent that, to date, little has been done to utilize the tourist-dollar exchange.

Inasmuch as title I agreements are largely donations, and in view of the critical character of our gold situation, I respectfully urge that in future agreements you instruct U.S. negotiators to (1) insist on tourist-dollar exchange in all title I agreements, (2) insist that at least one-third of currency proceeds be available for U.S. uses.

I also urge that you direct responsible officials to promote dollar exchange effectively and continuously among U.S. tourists. I am sure most of them will welcome this painless way to help our gold problem.

While I do not expect tourist-dollar exchange to end the gold outflow, every dollar exchanged is a full dollar gain in gold. In this critical hour every ounce of gold weighs mightily.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

FOREIGN AID—A FOOLISH FANTASY

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of mankind has there been demonstrated such shortsighted generosity as our expensive, badly executed, unrealistic, uncontrolled, and uncontrollable foreign aid giveaway program. This is the only Federal aid program I know of that does not exert Federal control along with the granting of Federal funds.

American taxpayers have contributed more than $124 billion, including the interest we have paid on the money we borrowed to give away, in foreign aid—about 1 out of every 17 tax dollars—to over 100 nations in the last 16 years. This program has been a dismal failure. It has not achieved its goal and I cite a few examples:

Argentina: After $640 million in aid, this country suffers from inflationary chaos and is under direct military domination.

Brazil: $1.9 billion later, Brazil is on the brink of communism.

Cuba: After $52 million in aid, this country is a Red satellite which has stolen $1 billion in private U.S. property.

Indonesia: After $670 million, this country is under an armed pro-Communist dictatorship bent on conquest and her economy is wrecked.

India: $3.9 billion later, India stands with Russia, and against us on nearly every issue.

Poland: $522 million has gone down the drain to entrench Communist control of this country.

Yugoslavia: $2.4 billion in U.S. aid has served only to push this Communist country deeper into the Soviet orbit.

AID TO 104 COUNTRIES

The foreign aid authorization bill, H.R. 7885, last week, passed by the House of Representatives and now under consideration by the Senate provided handouts to 104 of the 112 countries of the world. We are sending aid to every dictatorship on the face of the earth, most of the Socialist nations and many Communist countries.

The Agency for International Development has 64,508 employees engaged in this foreign aid program, traveling around the world dishing out our hard-earned tax dollars to all comers.

NINE STALLS FOR EACH BULL

Entirely too much emphasis has been placed on meeting personal desires of political leaders of recipient governments or in carrying out the unsound schemes of our own people; and too little emphasis has been given to commonsense thought and action. Documentation of these charges can be had by the hundreds, and many of them are chronicled in detail in the thousands of pages of the record of the hearings of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations. Such things as these:

Six hundred technical aid projects in one country, and more ready to be started before completion of the existing ones. A highway in Vietnam on which the costs skyrocketed from an original estimate of $18 million to more than $129 million before completion. A fertilizer plant in Taiwan, started with foreign aid money and estimated to cost $34 million, which was inoperable because equipment did not meet the specifications for the desired operations—$3.1 million for an air-conditioned yacht for the Emperor of Ethiopia. One thousand 23-inch TV sets were ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped countries overseas at a cost of $400,000 for areas with no electric power supply. Foreign aid funds were used to buy suits for undertakers in Greece. U.S. aid to Kenya was used to buy extra wives for government officials. A stock breeding farm was erected in Lebanon with U.S. aid. Nine stalls were built for each bull.

HELPS WHO?

One of the myths advanced by the administration in attempting justification of its foreign aid policy is the claim, addressed to the American taxpayer, that approximately 80 percent of the dollars appropriated for the program are spent in the United States. A question we might well ask then, is this: If 80 percent of the foreign aid dollar is spent in the United States and this expenditure is beneficial to our economy, would there be more prosperity in America if expenditures for the program were doubled or tripled? The answer is, of course, that our own resources would soon be depleted, our false prosperity would come to an abrupt end, and we would be a bankrupt nation.

Another myth used by the administration to sell foreign aid to this country is that the program provides employment for approximately 600,000 people. But looking at this matter objectively, it should be understood that the wages and salaries of these 600,000 people are not paid by the foreign governments, but by checks drawn on the U.S. Treasury from funds provided by the American taxpayer.

To those who ask me, "Don't you care about the poor or the hungry people of Africa or India," I reply, of course, I am concerned about them, but I am more concerned about the poor overburdened taxpayers of America who are stuck with the bill for irresponsible waste involved in these aid programs. At a time when we have millions of hungry and uneducated Americans in our own country, according to **President Kennedy**, why do we not give them some aid? How about feeding them and educating them, first? Why do we not look after our own family before we start trying to raise the living standards of the world?

PROPOSED SOLUTION

We must initiate drastic reductions in foreign aid in all instances, except where technological and military assistance is necessary to the defense of the free world and is economically advantageous to the United States. We must initiate some tough-fisted management over it. We must use common sense in our administration of it and curb its waste and mismanagement.

We can do this by restricting grants to the careful distribution of surplus farm products to friendly underdeveloped countries to fill hungry bellies, by providing needed medicines to the sick and by providing technological assistance and instruction to those who show a willingness and desire to help themselves. Our money and equipment sent to countries needing help should be only to non-Communist countries, and this should not be grants, rather it should be in the form of sound, hard, reasonable interest-bearing loans, backed up with collateral, and to be repaid according to a specified sensible, businesslike schedule.

Mr. Speaker, it is an unforgivable disgrace, indeed, for a country with a national debt greater than all the countries of the world combined, to continue to tax our people to give away our goods to try to buy friends among people who readily turn against us when the till goes empty and the chips are down. Any supporter of this wasteful throwaway program, who has one hungry child or one depressed business in his district, should hang his head in shame if he continues to vote funds that are to be so irresponsibly spent. How absurd, how foolish, how ignorant can we get when we throw our money away to our enemies? In my opinion, it borders on treason.

PARTISAN OR AMERICAN?

President Kennedy angrily attacked the foreign aid cut as "shortsighted, unwise, and dangerously partisan."

Mr. Kennedy should have realized that the Members of Congress were voting and speaking the feelings and sentiments of the people of their districts whom they represent. Instead of attacking the responsible Members of Congress who voted this cut, both Democrat and Republican, with a highly partisan statement bristling with adjectives attacking their judgment, their motives, and in fact, their patriotism, the President should realize that the folks who are footing the bill for this foreign aid throwaway program are growing sick and tired of it, and they are demanding their Representatives do something about it. If the folks also demonstrate disapproval of his domestic program at the polls next year by granting him retirement, do you supose the President will attack this as, "shortsighted, unwise, and dangerously partisan"?

RUSSIAN TRAWLERS IN U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on August 27, 1963, the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee released its report on Russian trawler traffic in the U.S. territorial waters. Under the able leadership of our distinguished colleague from Virginia, Porter Hardy, the subcommittee made significant findings and recommendations for immediate action to be taken to prevent Russian trawlers from espionage activity in our territorial waters.

I would like to commend the Hardy committee for its effective investigation of this problem and for its positive recommendations. These recommendations should be implemented immediately for our own safety and national security.

British experts say that Russia is operating about 100 trawlers as spy ships, equipped with radar and electronic devices. They said Russia appeared to be using bases in friendly countries including Cuba and Egypt—for spying operations ranging from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic; and yet when these Russian trawlers are within our territorial waters off the coast of Florida, our intelligence sources call these same highly technical outfitted trawlers harmless fishing vessels who are involved only in "innocent passage."

The Coast Guard and U.S. Navy should initiate daily air and sea patrols of territorial waters of all of the U.S. coasts. It is pointed out in the Hardy report that these harmless fishing trawlers have the potential of extensive espionage activity. It is vital to the peace and security of our Nation that our shores be protected from invasion and espionage; and to continue to allow Russian trawlers, clothed in the innocent passage doctrine, to sail through our territorial waters undermines this peace and security.

BACKWARD STEP IN U.S. EVOLUTION

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, sighs of relief could be heard in Washington when the civil rights march was over. The absence of violence became cause for rejoicing, as though nonviolence, encouraged by the presence of thousands of police and troops, was a victory in itself.

David Lawrence helps to put this event into perspective—few have questioned the cost of this march to the taxpayers, little has been said about the tremendous inconveniences and violations of other rights and privileges by this occasion. Now comes a voice of commonsense to say what must be said. Others may join, too, in proclaiming this demonstration a day of disgrace for our Nation.

The article follows:

Backward Step in U.S. Evolution: Rights March Called Day of Disgrace for Its Effect on American Image

(By David Lawrence)

The march on Washington will go down in history as marking a day of public disgrace—a step backward in the evolution of the American system of government. For the image of the United States presented to the world is that of a republic which had professed to believe in voluntarism rather than coercion, but which on August 28, 1963, permitted itself to be portrayed as unable to legislate equal rights for its citizens except under the intimidating influence of mass demonstrations.

The press, television, and radio, the public forums in halls and stadiums—all have been available heretofore as mediums through which the "right of petition" could be effectively expressed and public opinion formed on controversial questions. But a minority group—led by men who drew to their side church leaders and groups as well as civic organizations—decided that a massive publicity stunt would be a better way to impress Congress and the President with the idea that unemployment and racial discrimination can be legislated out of existence.

Government by mob has on a few occasions in the past darkened the pages of American history. A. Philip Randolph, the leader of the march this week, frankly characterized the march as a symbol of revolution. He said:

"In our pluralistic democratic society, causes must gain acceptance and approval and support. They can only gain acceptance, approval, and support if they can get attention, and in order to get attention—with numerous causes seeking the focus of public opinion—it is necessary for the dramatization to be developed of a given cause. * * *"

Mr. Randolph, however, was not content with trying to mobilize American public opinion. He told an audience at the National Press Club on Monday that the march on Washington would bring into "world focus" the struggle of peoples of color in America "for first-class citizenship." He added:

"It will have the value of giving the peoples of the world some concept of this problem. * * * It will serve to bring world pressure upon the United States of America to step up the struggle to wipe out race bias, because in the cold war—in the conflict of the free world with the totalitarian world—the free world is seeking the alliance of the Afro-Asian world. And in order that the free world may win the alliance of the Afro-Asian world, the free world must show that we are not only making promises to Africa and promises to Asia to help them advance their cause, but we are going to keep our promises, fulfill our promises with our own citizens at home—especially Negroes of African descent.

"Africa will not trust the United States in its promise to the peoples of Africa unless they realize and understand that the Negroes here in America are giving and evincing basic trust in the promises that have been made by our own country to them. And so the march on Washington is an expression, a great step forward of the confrontation between the civil rights revolution and our American society."

But could not the merits of the civil rights revolution have been presented effectively to American audiences without street demonstrations? Could not the State Department and the Voice of America, instead, have dealt comprehensively abroad with the story of efforts being made inside the United States to deal with the civil rights problem?

Also, would it not have been better if the leaders of the march had not by their tactics incurred some unfavorable publicity? What shall be said for instance, of the Gallup poll result published this week in many newspapers which indicated that 63 percent of the American people disapproved of the march on Washington and thought it unnecessary? Last month another Gallup poll revealed that 6 out of every 10 Americans believe the mass demonstrations by the Negroes would hurt their cause.

The right of petition is a fundamental principle of the Constitution, but it assumes an orderly and nonprovocative procedure. The Federal Government had to go to large expense to police the Wednesday demonstration here and to keep people from crowding into the city who might participate in disorders. To say that the march was successful because large-scale violence was avoided is to ignore the bitterness and resentment prevalent on that day in a city whose normal community life was disrupted. Tens of thousands of people remained secluded in their homes lest they become injured or subjected to unwarranted delays in moving to and from their residences. American citizens were prevented from pursuing their customary ways. Their right to go to their places of employment was impaired by fear of bodily injury.

Would this have happened if the petitioners had relied on the process of reason in a voluntary society, or was it a sample of what happens in backward countries when some force stronger than the individual takes over and prevents freedom of movement? Are injustices remedied by creating more injustices, and is the cause of civil rights advanced by interfering with the civil rights of nonparticipants in the mass demonstrations?

These are questions which will need answering, and the full effect of what may come to be called the mess in Washington could be reflected in future elections. For what was proved by the big demonstration—that in free America only the mob can get laws passed covering the issue of civil rights?

SOCIALIST SQUEEZE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the El Paso Herald-Post, Mr. Robert W. Lee, of El Paso, Tex., has been outspoken in his support of private enterprise and in opposition to growing, engulfing socialism in this country and around the world. In the editorial "Socialist Squeeze," Mr. Lee expresses the opinion of not only a great majority of west Texans, I believe, but also, many responsible citizens across the country. I commend it to you for your review:

Socialist Squeeze

The survey report on the proposed steel mill at Bokara, India, avoided expressing either approval or disapproval. It merely listed the apparent facts, produced at a cost of $686,344 to the U.S. Government.

Representative Otto E. Passman, of Louisiana, a leading critic of the project, says the prohibition of conclusions was on direct order of David E. Bell, foreign aid director. Whether that is true or not, the investigators did manage to slip in a paragraph which is damning in its implications.

"Current (Indian) Government policy," says this paragraph * * * "assumes * * * the continued existence of the presently privately owned steel mills. * * * Present price controls and the current level of retention prices do not appear * * * to permit an adequate return on invested capital * * * expansion in the privately owned steel industry is, therefore, most likely to be confined to the rounding out of existing facilities and the major burden of producing future steel supplies will fall to the government."

It is said that private interests can't raise the necessary capital to build steel mills in India and that, therefore, the government must build them. A U.S. soft loan of just under a billion dollars is asked for this one.

Private capital, we suggest, normally is available to any enterprise which has a good chance of becoming profitable; and Indian private operators, notably the Tata Iron & Steel Co., have proved they know how to make steel. They have been in successful operation since 1912.

But if price controls, taxes, etc., prevent them from making an adequate return on invested capital they will, of course, not be able to obtain that capital.

Thus a Socialist system can be imposed despite pious insistence that the "private sector" of the economy is being protected and given a fair chance against the "public sector."

This system isn't exclusive to India. We see it at work in our own country in form of exorbitant taxes and other restrictions which dry up profits, inhibit modernization and expansion, and thus handicap economic progress. It is importantly responsible for continuing unemployment.

This isn't entirely by accident. The basic Socialist theory, often deviously employed, is that our key industries, such as steel, should be "nationalized" as in Britain, in other words run by the Government—and that these tax policies hasten the day.

Despite House action, temporarily blocking a loan for the Bokara mill, we have not heard the last of this. The proposal will be renewed. It should be rejected in justice to the Indians themselves. We should not encourage them in a course which, in the words of the Clay Committee report, is inconsistent with our knowledge of "economic organization and consequences."

And we should look to trends here in the United States, which place an economic squeeze on private enterprise in a manner closely akin to the misguided system in India.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS IN GHANA, AFRICA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have asked for this time to give to my colleagues in the House, for their information and intelligent evaluation, a report on recent developments in Ghana.

The progress made on the Volta River project, the establishment of a national bank to facilitate foreign private investment, and the enactment of a law guaranteeing against expropriations cannot fail to meet the favorable attention of my colleagues and of Americans generally. News of the rapid improvement in Ghana's balance-of-payments position also will be received with a sense of reassurance.

VOLTA RIVER PROJECT

Construction of the high dam on the Volta River is substantially on schedule.

Ghana has consistently met its commitments to its lenders with respect to paying its share of the costs of constructing the dam. Ghana's obligation is to cover 50 percent of the costs from its own funds, with the balance being loaned to Ghana on a matching basis.

As of March 31, 1963, total expenditures on the Volta River project were $42,560,000. Of this amount, Ghana has spent $33,320,000, and has drawn down the remainder under its various loan agreements, from the following lenders: World Bank $3,200,000, AID $2,130,000, Eximbank $2,980,000, and the United Kingdom $930,000. Ghana has so far drawn down less than it is entitled to draw, presumably to save interest.

GHANA NATIONAL INVESTMENT BANK

Ghana has established a development bank, to encourage the establishment and expansion of private industrial, commercial, and agricultural enterprises, to encourage Ghanaian small business concerns, and to facilitate foreign private investment. The initial share capital is $28 million, 25 percent of which is available for public subscription.

The National Investment Bank is expected to stimulate significant new private investments in Ghanaian light industry, and to encourage the further development of the private enterprise sector of the Ghanaian economy.

CAPITAL INVESTMENTS LAW

Ghana has recently adopted a law to encourage private investment, including foreign investment, in Ghana. The law is as favorable to private enterprise as any development legislation in the world.

It provides that no investment made under the law shall be subject to expropriation, and guarantees fair compensation for any project taken over in the public interest because of exceptional circumstances. Ghana agrees to submit any dispute as to compensation for expropriation to arbitration under the aegis of the World Bank.

Apart from permitting temporary measures to safeguard Ghana's balance of payments, the law provides for unrestricted remittance of profits, and of capital in the event of sale of an investment. The law provides tax exemption for a period of from 5 to 10 years, certain customs exemptions, and exemption or deferment of other taxes.

The act is to be administered by a Capital Investments Board. The first Board, appointed on July 15, 1963, includes the Honorable William M. Q. Halm, governor of the Bank of Ghana and the former Ghanaian Ambassador to the United States, the director of the School of Business Administration of Ghana University, and permanent Government officials concerned with economic policy. The membership of the Board is believed to be strongly pro-West and sympathetic to private enterprise.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

For several years, largely because of declining prices for its major export, cocoa, Ghana's balance-of-payments position had declined. In calendar year 1962, Ghana experienced a deficit of $20 million in its balance of payments. This deficit has now been largely corrected, and there is good reason to expect that, in calendar year 1963, Ghana's balance of payments will be in equilibrium, or at worst show a slight deficit.

The rapid improvement in Ghana's balance-of-payments position has come about through increases in the world price for cocoa, and measures taken by the Government of Ghana to reduce imports and to limit the outflow of convertible currencies.

MEXICAN BRACEROS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, one of the very few times that I have imposed on the time and patience of the House has to do with the brief debate with respect to extension of Public Law 78, known as the bracero bill, for the importation of Mexican labor into certain areas of the United States. It is definitely known that less than 1½ percent of the farmers of the United States use this labor.

In Texas, ever since the increase in the minimum wage from 50 to 70 cents, a year ago, the use of this labor has dropped 76 percent in less than a year's time. This illustrates that in my native State this labor has been shamefully exploited and has worked great harm to the domestic laborers of our own country.

In the New York Times of September 1, 1963, there is a very interesting and factual account written by Charles Green, an Associated Press correspondent in San Antonio, Tex., who joined a crew of Mexican migrant farmworkers this summer. That is the way the New

York Times has described it. This was not a crew of Mexican workers. This was a crew of Americans of Mexican descent that are to be differentiated from the imported Mexican labor.

Naturally, the word "Mexican" is used in a general sense in categorizing or referring to this large conglomeration of Americans of Mexican descent or Spanish speaking—or Latin Americans—as they are variously designated. But there is a big difference between the imported bracero with no rights other than those of an indentured slave who is brought in singly—he cannot bring his family with him—he cannot bring his wife—he is not permitted to come to our country as our fathers did, in freedom seeking employment and terms of employment that as a freeman he should be able to seek. But he comes here in bondage under a contract and a form of indenture, in a way that was outlawed by this Congress even in that conservative epoch of the reconstruction period of the eighties and which was not again sanctioned by law until 1951 when using the excuse of the Korean conflict, a crisis was found to exist in the foreign labor recruitment program and this law was then enacted.

It is very interesting to read from this article the actual experience that this reporter had with the group he joined in San Antonio in order to remove once and for all the misconceptions and the outright falsehoods that have been spread particularly since the defeat of Public Law 78 here in this House in May.

Within the last month on Capitol Hill there has been a swarming literally of lobbyists representing groups all the way from the Campbell Soup Co. to phony ersatz farmers from California who have been inundating this Capitol and the Members of the House with information that would lead anybody to think there was an absolute emergency need for this type of labor.

I invite the attention of those who have been propagating this misconception and distortion of the truth to read this article and to read it studiously because there is more inherent in this article than just what is described by this reporter in picturing the lot of these workers.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would be very interested in knowing who these phony ersatz farmers from California are. I have had several of them here who are very interested in this program. They are farmers. Please tell us who these phonies are that you refer to.

Mr. GONZALEZ. If I knew who they were, I would not be describing them as phony and ersatz. All I know is that they visited me in my office and when I demanded to know their identity and to see their credentials, they just walked out of my office, but they introduced themselves as coming from California and as knowing the farm situation and of being involved in the farming industry in California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Our Speaker pro tempore, who is now occupying the chair, our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and I have many acquaintances who are perfectly legitimate California farmers who come here and tell us a very convincing story that leads us to a very different conclusion than the conclusions you have, and they are certainly not phony and ersatz farmers.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am sure the gentleman speaks the truth and I have some gentlemen who come from Texas who are ranchers and I am sure they identify themselves properly and also maintain the same contention that you say your visitors from California are stating to you. But my remark stands and that is I had these visitors who said they were from California and who said they were farmers, and the moment I asked for their identification they left the office and there were four of them on four separate different occasions.

But we get back to the fact that we still have very, very powerful interests such as the Campbell Soup Co. who for some reason or other feel that in order to market Campbell soups, they have to use slave labor and they have to impose these hardships on domestic labor and also, incidentally, to use subsidized labor because it costs the American taxpayers better than $1½ million to enforce or at least attempt to enforce the law—because there never has been adequate enforcement of the provisions of the bracero law.

I have had crew leaders complain that their livelihood would be done away with if the bracero law were abandoned. But the whole history of bracero legislation when it is written in its full content will be a terrible blot and stigma on our American history. Ever since its inception it has been dog-tracked with graft and kickbacks on insurance policies that have been taken out on the braceros. The whole history of it has been indeed sordid. And this is based on my personal opinion and observations over a period of 10 years.

This is something I have brought up even before my admittance into the National Congress, and I take advantage of the forum here as a Member of this House to present my views.

I include this article, referred to above, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1963]

Migrant Workers Hunt for Jobs—Annual Farm Tour Brings in $1,000 in Earnings

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Charles Green, an Associated Press correspondent in San Antonio, Tex., joined a crew of Mexican migrant farmworkers this summer. As one of them, he traveled in the back of a truck to the tomato fields of Indiana and the cherry orchards of Michigan. His account follows.)

MOUNT SUMMIT, IND., August 31.—Alex Torres waved a skinny arm expansively. His hazel eyes glinted.

"Tomorrow," he said, "we go to Michigan for the cherry. I told you not to worry, to let me find the work. I'm crew leader, I worry for you. We make good money in cherries, good money. You see."

He leaned back in his chair in the Doghouse, Mount Summit's only bar, and beamed at us as the waiter brought four more beers to our celebration.

Until that night there hadn't been much for Alex Torres, the leader, to beam about.

We were migrant farmworkers, traveling from south Texas in Mr. Torres' beat-up $350 truck. It was the truck that made Alex, who is 39 years old, the leader.

There were 21 in his crew—10 men and women, 11 children. And for 12 days, since leaving San Antonio, we had been unable to find work.

An estimated 127,800 people like us leave south Texas every summer to work on farms in 38 States. Almost a million others travel from other parts of the South and Southwest.

SOME FIND WORK

Some find work; some don't. This was a good night for us. We knew we had work waiting at Seth Tompkins' cherry orchard near Old Mission, Mich.

The grin splitting Mr. Torres' face, wrinkled and burned a dark mahogany by the sun, showed what a fine night it was for him.

On a hot day in San Antonio, he had herded us into his truck, expecting to reach Mount Summit in 48 hours and sure of a job hoeing weeds in the tomato fields.

There is a single folding bed against one plywood wall in the back of the 1949 truck. As we traveled, five of us could sit on the bed, cushioning some of the bumps. Others sat on mattresses on stacks of blankets on the floor.

The canvas cover turned the back into an oven during the day. Every crack in the pavement reached us as a jolt. Any railroad crossing was enough to lift us off the floor.

In 48 hours we were still in Texas. The truck was broken down and some of us were trying to sleep on the gravel parking lot where we'd pushed it.

But Mr. Torres got it fixed, and we bounced on.

The truck smelled constantly of stale food, sweat, and urine.

A MELON BRIBE

At an Arkansas inspection station, a skinny man in khakis made us crawl out so he could look for contraband vegetables.

"You sure got a lot of junk," he said. "It would take you a long time to unload it, then load it again. Why don't you just give me that there watermelon instead?"

Mr. Torres shrugged. The inspector took the melon. We rolled on to a farm labor rest camp near Hope, Ark., maintained by the State.

"This Arkansas is the funny damn place," Mr. Torres said. "They have this nice place for us—showers, tables, everything, and we don't have to pay nothing. Then they have men like that who steal from us."

This was his first year as boss of a migrant crew. A man in New Castle, Ind., let him have that $350 truck on credit last year. He hadn't been able to make a payment in 8 months—but now he should make $3,000 as crew leader, more than enough to pay off the balance and get his family back to Texas for the winter.

The rest of us might make $1,000—the average annual wage for migrant farmhands.

Ninety hours after we left San Antonio, the truck still hadn't gotten us to Mount Summit. It had broken down again, at a roadside cafe in southern Illinois.

NO RAIN, NO WORK

When we finally got to Mount Summit there was no rain, no weeds, no work.

The Brooks Foods, Inc., cannery has a camp for the migrants who come to work in the nearby farm fields. We got to stay there free in one-room shacks.

There are about 200 of the 8- by 12-foot shacks, mostly with screen doors and windows, in an area 100 yards wide and 400 yards long. Tomato wastes from the cannery are dumped into a stagnant pond on one side of the camp. The pond stinks.

"This is a nice place for the peoples," said Victor Bonilla, Jr., a crew member. Victor is 31, a native of Crystal City, Tex.

"Some other camps, they don't have nothing for the peoples. And here we don't pay no rent or lights."

R. L. Beavers gave us credit for food at his general store, knowing the migrants would finally pay. They always have.

Nights, we often crowded into the shack of Mr. and Mrs. Victor Bonilla, Sr. They had a special attraction—a television set they had brought north.

Some nights we sat outside, watching the children play. Little Freddy Torres has a toy truck. It cost a quarter at a rummage sale.

Because he's the boss, Mr. Torres got two shacks for himself, his wife and four children—Blanche, 12; Freddy, 7; Noel, 5; and Sorina, 2 months. I ate with the family.

Other summers, the children have gone to classes at a school operated by the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches of Christ. But this summer the school closed early because of a shortage of funds.

The teacher, Mrs. Mary Oclander, still visited the camp daily, worried about impetigo, a skin disease, spreading among the children.

"I tried to get the Henry County health officer to come over from New Castle," she said "but his nurse keeps saying he's not interested."

Twice a day Mr. Torres went to town to call Michigan collect, seeking work. On the 7th day, he reached Seth Tompkins—and found jobs for all of us.

At 4 o'clock the next morning, he roused us for the drive to Old Mission.

We reached the orchard at 2 a.m., the next day. Mr. Tompkins and his wife got out of bed to meet us.

Their camp is small, two dilapidated houses, four small cabins and some tents behind Mr. Tompkins' own house.

The camp has one cold water faucet, no hot water, four outhouses. The cabin windows are unscreened. The cabins have kerosene cookstoves. Mr. Tompkins furnishes the kerosene.

"You gonna like this work here," Claudio Bonilla, 23, said.

"Picking cherries is good. We work in shade, pick fast as we want, make good money. It's cooler here than Texas."

We got 50 cents for a crate of cherries. It takes two water pails to fill a crate. An experienced hand can pick 15 or 20 boxes a day when the crop is good. The crop was poor this year, so 15 boxes was a good day's work.

A cherry picker straps his bucket to his chest with a cloth harness that leaves both hands free. By sundown it feels like an ox yoke. The pain grinds from your neck to the middle of your back as you reach overhead to pick.

Saturday is a big day—payday and bath day. Mr. Torres got the most pay—$40. I got the least—$9.

NOT ALWAYS WELCOME

Saturday evening we went to Traverse City, 18 miles away. Vic Bonilla, Jr., gave me a warning:

"Some places don't serve the Mexican peoples," he said. "They don't like us, we stay away."

Mr. Torres agreed.

"But I don't blame 'em much," he said. "The Mexican, he a lot like the Indian. Sometimes he don't drink so good. Might get in a fight or spit on the floor."

It started to rain about the time we got to town. If we could have picked the next day, Sunday, we would have made 75 cents a crate instead of 50. But the rain spoiled that.

"I want to buy me a nice lot in San Antonio," Mr. Torres said. "Then I can build a house on it, get me work driving a cab and stay in Texas."

Ahead of him still lay weeks in the cherry orchard, the trip back here to Mount Summit for the tomato harvest, and the settling up for his truck and the food bill at Mr. Beavers' store.

That's the life of the migrant farmworker. The Right Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of the Catholic diocese of San Antonio, calls it "our national badge of infamy."

Mr. Torres scarcely knows any other life. When it isn't migrant season, he sometimes works in a filling station in Dilley, Tex., his hometown, or drives a cab in San Antonio.

In addition thereto, I should like to pinpoint at least the Texas situation. I do not claim to be speaking for California, Oregon, or any other State, but I am well versed with the situation as exists in the State of Texas. May I say that those who argue for extension of this law are not asking for an extension of the law confined to California alone; they are asking for an extension of the law to cover all of the United States.

I have here in my hand a telegram from a grower, a shipper and a producer. The proponents of this extension maintain there will be dire things happening unless they can use this labor. Here is a man who wires from McAllen, Tex., and his telegram reads as follows:

> Regarding extension of bracero bill, Public Law No. 78, sincerely hope you oppose. We have had widespread unemployment of migratory workers for the fourth time in 15 years. We have also had a surplus of local labor with situation prevailing on overproduction of all fruits and vegetables. We see no justification for public law bill No. 78, we in our valley operations and west Texas operations have been users of braceros but believe in the best interest of all concerned; farmers, shippers, migratory labor, and local labor and taxpayers, bill Public Law No. 78 should be opposed.
>
> GRIFFIN & BRAND, INC.,
> O. E. BRAND, *President.*

I wanted to be sure that pressures on this gentleman would not develop as happened in a similar case earlier this year when I received a note from another grower in this area, but because of pressure he said:

> Believe me, if I had known this would be brought to public attention, I would have to take back what I said.

To make sure this would not happen I addressed myself to Mr. Brand, and a little over an hour ago I talked to him on the telephone and here is what he said:

> We do not need braceros. I have used braceros, and I assure you we do not need them.

He said further:

> This is the first year we have had all the labor and more than we can use ourselves. This is the fourth time—

As he said in the telegram—

> in 15 years in which we have had in the area generally surplus labor.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. FINO, for 30 minutes, on September 11; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND, for 1 hour, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. YOUNGER in one instance.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO in two instances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTON PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 27, 1963:

H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act.

On August 28, 1963:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

On August 30, 1963:

H.R. 1135. An act to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock;

H.R. 2671. An act authorizing the construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.;

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.;

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 5883. An act to correct a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes";

H.R. 6710. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7500. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7594. An act to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Texas, as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1169. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unreasonably high prices paid for nickel cadmium aircraft storage batteries under Department of the Air Force negotiated fixed-price contract AF 01(601)–22629 with Sonotone Corp., Elmsford, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1170. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on continued uneconomical use of first-class air-travel accommodations by employees of defense contractors; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1171. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract assigned to Clarence W. Anderson and Margarette E. Anderson, to operate a trailer village at Boulder Beach in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, which will extend the expired contract through December 31, 1963, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 8331. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 8332. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8333. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 8334. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8335. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8336. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit the retirement on full annuities, without regard to age, of those officers and employees with 30 years or more of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8337. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to enable the Government to retain the services of experienced employees who are eligible for retirement by encouraging their continued employment on a part-time basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsing the march on Washington for the passage of the civil rights recommendations of the President and for equal opportunity for education, employment, and housing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DEROUNIAN introduced a bill (H.R. 8338) for the relief of Yong Hi Ha, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, whose mercy faileth never, we lift the doxology of our grateful hearts for the bounty and beauty of the good earth that sustains us, for the blessings of home and family and friends, for work to do and zest in doing it, and for this free land in which our lot is cast—

For the priceless gift of freedom,
 For the home, the church, the school;
For the open door to manhood
 In a land the people rule!

We beseech Thee that Thou wilt go with Thy servants, here commissioned by the people, into the work of this new week, that they may find a strength not their own to undergird them, wisdom sufficient for the thorny problems that face them, and light enough upon the pathway just ahead to meet the searching demands of this anguished time.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 28, 1963, and Friday, August 30, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolutions:

On August 27, 1963:

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

On August 28, 1963:

S. 1066. An act for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; and

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Frederick R. Meier, to be postmaster at Cross Plains, Ind., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6225) to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6225) to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 29, 1963, the following reports of a committee were submitted on August 30, 1963:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1033. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes (Rept. No. 475).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1172. A bill to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518 (Rept. No. 474);

H.R. 5623. An act to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 476); and

H.R. 6012. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea (Rept. No. 477).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 5781. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine (Rept. No. 478).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on August 30, 1963, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1135. An act to designate the dam being constructed and the reservoir to be formed on the Des Moines River, Iowa, as the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock;

H.R. 2671. An act authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.;

H.R. 3887. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land in the State of North Carolina for the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4823. An act to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.;

H.R. 5222. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes;

H.R. 5883. An act to correct a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes";

H.R. 6710. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7500. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7594. An act to designate the McGee Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River, Tex., as the Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is in order.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to attend the Interparliamentary Union, to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, September 10 to 20, 1963.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be permitted to file its report on the nuclear test ban treaty by midnight tonight, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present a certified copy of a resolution entitled "Resolution endorsing the march on Washington for the passage of the civil rights recommendations of the President and for equal opportunity for education, employment, and housing," passed by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on August 26, 1963.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR THE PASSAGE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT AND FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

Whereas President Kennedy has instituted important civil rights legislation which is currently before Congress; and

Whereas this legislation aids in guaranteeing all Americans access to all public accommodations, decent housing, adequate and integrated education, and the right to vote; and

Whereas over 100,000 Americans of all walks of life will march on Washington on August 28 in the current year to speak out in a single voice for the passage of the President's civil rights program and to demonstrate their opposition to the forces of discrimination that rob millions of Americans of their dignity and their rights, to equal opportunity for education, employment, and decent housing; and

Whereas the members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives believe in equal rights and opportunities for all Americans and vigorously denounce any form of racial and religious discrimination: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives endorses the march on Washington and respectfully requests the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to actively support this demonstration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the house of representatives August 26, 1963.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

NOMINATION OF ASHTON C. BARRETT AS MEMBER OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (EX. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Ashton C. Barrett, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, and I submit a report thereon, together with the individual views of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Ohio.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF (for Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself), Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 2104. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2105. A bill for the relief of Martin Morales Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Anthony N. Nicklow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2107. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amir H. Mehregan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution designating 1964 as the U.S. Customs Anniversary Year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which relates to the printing of certain hearings on the nuclear test ban treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That five thousand additional copies of the hearings on Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st Session, "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DESIGNATION OF 1964 AS THE U.S. CUSTOMS ANNIVERSARY YEAR

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as U.S. Customs Year, marking the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. customs service. The proclamation would be in recognition of 1¾ centuries of dedicated service and it would call upon the American people to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

President George Washington established the customs service in 1789 when he signed the fifth act of the First Congress. It was this service which provided the chief revenues of the Republic in its early days, greatly contributing to the Nation's financial stability. The collector of customs, the customs house, and the customs officers for 175 years have symbolized Federal authority in the ports and on the waterfronts. The many tasks of the service have been performed with honesty, resourcefulness, and efficiency.

It is very fitting that an occasion should be designated to commemorate the contributions of the customs service to the national welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 116) designating 1964 as the U.S. Customs Anniversary Year, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to proclaim the calendar year 1964 as United States Customs Year marking the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the United States Customs Service, in recognition of the one and three-quarter's centuries of dedicated service in the United States; and calling upon the American people to observe this Anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN YUGOSLAV REFUGEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, our Nation has expressed its concern on many occasions for those who seek to flee from oppression and totalitarianism in all its evil forms.

However, there exists in our country today a small group of refugees from a Communist state who are faced with forceable deportation unless Congress intervenes in their behalf. These men are refugees from Yugoslavia. They are strongly opposed to the Communist regime in that country but because there is inadequate provision in our law for political asylum, they are about to be returned to the Yugoslav authorities.

These men are farmers and fishermen. Their escape route was by the sea. At least two of them have been recognized as refugees by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. All of them profess strong opposition to communism and indicate a longing to remain in the United States.

A number of active and vitally important relief agencies have urged assistance for these refugees; namely, the Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, the International Rescue Committee, and the American Council for Nationalities Service. The endorsement of these men by such highly respected and knowledgeable agencies is ample reason for a full inquiry into these cases before any order of deportation is enforced.

Such an inquiry may indicate that compelling equities do not exist in every case to the same degree. But all of these cases deserve careful study before these men are forcibly deported back to a Communist state. The joint resolution I am submitting today will provide the basis for such a procedure.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 117) for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees, introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authorities of August 13 and 23, 1963:

S. 2038. A bill to establish in the legislative branch of the Government a Congressional Office of Science and Technology to advise and assist Members and committees of the Congress on matters relating to science and technology: Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Keating, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

Authority of August 23, 1963:

S. 2068. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954: Mr. Beall, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Fong, Mr. Holland, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Thurmond.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 20, 1963, the names of Mr. Allott, Mr. Case, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. Ribicoff, to the bill (S. 1731) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, submitted on August 20, 1963.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INCREASED PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to announce that public hearings on the subject of pay for Federal employees have been scheduled for Wednesday, September 4, 1963, at 10:30 a.m. in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building. The Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, will be first to testify. He will be followed by other representatives of the administration.

Those wishing to testify may arrange to do so by calling Capitol 4-3121, extension 5451.

PLIGHT OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from a poultry producer in New England with respect to the "chicken war."

While I do not necessarily agree with all of his observations, I do most emphatically agree with that portion of his memorandum stating that the basic "trouble with the poultry industry is that while the U.S. Government has protected the price of grain, which, in the main, is chickenfeed—literal, not figurative—the Government has refused to aid or protect or peg the prices of chickens or eggs. This, of course, has resulted in the chicken industry being caught between highly supported and fixed costs of feed as against lower and lower competitive and noncontrolled prices for their products. In other words, they are paying higher and higher prices for grain and feed and selling chickens and eggs at a lower and lower price."

I have been saying this for a long time. Until this situation is corrected, the poultry farmers will be in serious financial trouble. This is one problem that tariffs cannot solve. And let us face the truth—that a vote for high price supports for feed grains is a vote against poultry farmers—and no flowery language to the contrary can hide this truth.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum from the New England poultry producer be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorandum

Subject: The American poultry and chicken industry which is behind the proposed reprisals.

At my country home in the Berkshires of Massachusetts, I have for the past 14 years operated a working farm in the poultry and egg business and averaged for over 10 years the production of over 60,000 breeding eggs per year. These breeding eggs were for meat chickens.

More recently I have concentrated on table eggs, producing or having a production potential of about 80,000 dozen per year. During these 14 years I have had a chance to become thoroughly acquainted with the U.S. poultry industry.

I believe that it is definitely not an industry to be protected at the cost of our foreign relations or at the cost of further reprisals by the EEC or damages to other industries.

While there is no doubt that the poultry and egg industry in the United States is in poor shape and that exports would help it, exports have no bearing, past, present, or future, with the major problems of the industry or why it has fallen to the point where the small- or medium-sized independents can no longer make any profits.

The export market has little influence and will never help a situation caused by improper Government manipulation. Basically, the trouble with the poultry industry is that while the U.S. Government has protected the price of grain and has paid farmers to underproduce grain and has raised the price of grain, which, in the main, is chickenfeed (literal, not figurative), the Government has refused to aid or protect or peg the prices of chickens or eggs. This, of course, has resulted in the chicken industry being caught between highly supported and fixed costs of feed as against lower and lower competitive and noncontrolled prices for their produce. In other words, they are paying higher prices for grain and feed and selling chickens and eggs at a lower and lower price.

Another reason for the great problems in the chicken industry is that Southern States have in the last few years subsidized chicken farms and farming in areas where Negro help resulted in low labor costs and where the weather or climate involved minimum trouble and costs, and finally where southern poultry industry dumped on the chicken and egg markets produce for less than costs or at lower cost than the regular nonsubsidized chicken industry could produce where labor was higher and climate colder.

It is therefore doubly ridiculous to see the U.S. Government embarking on tariff reprisals against the remainder of the free world and NATO in order to protect an industry which is suffering from this same Government's mistakes. Not even the increased exports prior to the protective tariff in Europe against the American poultry industry had done much good to the depressed situation in the poultry industry. In other words, notwithstanding the chicken lobby or the complaints against restrictions on exports of poultry and eggs, the poultry industry in the United States will not be greatly helped even if there was unrestricted exportation, for American mass production methods are now well understood throughout the world and in a very short period competition in an industry involving such small margins would be too great to assimilate the cost of shipping.

So not only are increased tariffs or reprisal methods by the United States against the EEC dangerous and unsound, but the alleged reason for doing this is unsound and will not be the cure for a sick poultry industry in the United States of America.

SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY—EFFECTIVE LEADER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on August 14 the Senate passed S. 1321, a bill to establish a National Service Corps. The legislation provides for a program of assistance and understanding for the less fortunate in this country. This is a proposal to provide a means by which Americans of all ages and talents may offer their skills and friendship to those less fortunate.

Comparison has been made, and perhaps aptly, between S. 1321 and the bill which set up the Peace Corps. Assuredly there are similarities. But there are differences too, and many. One which is striking and strange to me is the seeming reluctance of the Congress to initiate on a very modest scale a means whereby Federal guidance may be given so that Americans who want to assist other Americans but who do not know quite how to go about it may find the way open to them. The Peace Corps proposal, which has worked out so splendidly well, had much less legislative difficulty.

It will be recalled that S. 1321 was passed by the Senate by a very narrow margin.

It is my belief that it never would have passed at all had it not been for the dedication, the hard work, and the great skill of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams].

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the Senator from New Jersey introduced the bill in April and presided over the extended hearings which followed. Testimony was taken from many witnesses. The views of all were sought. The measure was redrafted and improved before being reported to the Senate. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] was floor manager of S. 1321. In that capacity he demonstrated rare parliamentary skill. He fought with courage and sometimes almost alone while the bill was being debated before the Senate. For his effectiveness, for his persistence, for his concern for people, his desire to improve their lot in life, the Senator from New Jersey deserves the thanks of all Americans.

SECURITY RISKS IN "ACCOMMODATION" POLICY TOWARD SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader reported on August 26, 1963, that "Vital information is being withheld from the public about the part security risks have played in drafting and executing the administration's 'accommodation' policy with Soviet Russia until after test ban hearings in the Senate."

This news story asserts that Mr. Otto Otepka, the State Department officer who had a lot to do with sending Irving Scarbeck to jail and who investigated William Wieland, has been removed from security operations. This, and other assertions, implications, and overtones of this intensely fascinating news story warrant further investigation by appropriate and responsible officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this news story printed in the Record following my remarks, and I respectfully invite the attention of my colleagues to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Aug. 26, 1963]

Claim Data on Security Risks Is Being Withheld

(By Don Browne)

Washington.—Vital information is being withheld from the public about the part security risks have played in drafting and executing the administration's "accommodation" policy with Soviet Russia until after test ban hearings in the Senate.

State Department sources reveal that testimony about these risks by Otto Otepka, a civil service officer for many years in charge of all personnel appraisal in State is being quarantined by a series of maneuvers by State Secretary Dean Rusk. Otepka was responsible for sending foreign service officer Irving C. Scarbeck to jail for passing U.S. secrets to the Soviets, for investigating William Wieland in connection with State's Cuban policy, and other such cases.

With quiet but ruthless efficiency, Otepka has been removed from security operations. His phone has been taken away from him, and he himself has been placed under close observation as a security risk when he thereafter "dumped" what he knew, under subpena, to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

RUSK SUMMONED

So serious were Otepka's revelations that Rusk was personally and urgently called before the subcommittee. So, too, were a score or more other State Department officials.

State sources now privately disclose that, realizing the disastrous effect all this could have on the fate of the test ban treaty, Rusk has managed to delay his own testimony, thus in turn delaying the release of the Otepka testimony.

Rusk also has obtained a White House order to prevent some 25 key State Department officials from even speaking to members of the subcommittee and their staffs.

DELAY TESTIMONY

At the same time, Rusk has succeeded in getting Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee, to agree that Rusk does not have to testify earlier than August 30. Seemingly the delay has meshed with desires of subcommittee chairman JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, preoccupied with civil rights matters, and with those of Senator DODD himself who is seeking reelection.

The effect of this agreement is to put off Rusk's testimony on security violations until after Senate hearings and consideration of the test ban treaty. Thereafter, if another postponement cannot be obtained, the Secretary can call for time to review his own testimony.

SIGNED WAIVER

The State Department Office of Security was completely reorganized after the then Administrator of Security, and Otepka as appraiser, refused to clear Harlan Cleveland as Assistant Secretary of State. Whereupon, Secretary Rusk signed a security waiver to permit Cleveland to go to work.

Cleveland was cleared after this reorganization, along with others newly appointed to high posts in the Department.

HAS TOLD ALL

Now, Otepka, removed from active participation in security by the very risks he has investigated has told all, and this fact has sent tremors through State now involved in making the most important across-the-board deals with Red Russia.

Involved are a Soviet proposed nonaggression pact, a detente to which President Kennedy has agreed to discuss with Soviet Premier Khrushchev. To this unilateral action, West Germany and France strenuously have objected.

The motives behind all these Kennedy administration moves have been cast in doubt by the testimony of Otepka, a security official of the utmost integrity, and who came to the State Department years ago from the Civil Service Commission itself.

BALANCE OF POWERS BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal, on Friday, August 16, 1963, published an exceptionally perceptive article on Federal-State relationships, entitled "Unbalanced Government."

The article, written by Dr. Harley L. Lutz, professor emeritus of public finance at Princeton, is dedicated to the proposition that "the constitutional design of a balance of power between Federal and State Governments should be restored by bringing closer to home many governmental functions and services that have been swept into the Federal orbit."

Dr. Lutz analyzes the "major influences that have promoted the excessive growth of Federal power," pointing out how, commencing in the 1930's, the Federal-centrist Government ever-increasingly has "assumed full or partial responsibility for various services and activities, the performance and financing of which were, and are, within State and local administrative and fiscal capacity."

The professor states a political fact of life, Mr. President, when he concludes that "the Federal Government bought its way into the sphere of State and local functions," and, "all disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding, Federal aid means Federal control."

I believe that the caliber and content of this article commends it to the attention of those seriously concerned about the dangerous diminution of personal liberty in this country and of local control of our political and economic affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be entered in the RECORD, following my remarks, and respectfully I draw the attention of my colleagues to its message.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNBALANCED GOVERNMENT

(By Harley L. Lutz)

The United States is a federation of States under a Constitution which established a balance of powers between Federal and State Governments. The concept of balance is essential. If the States should have too much power the Union would disintegrate. If the Central Government should acquire too much power the States would lose their authority, and eventually their identity, as the central monolithic state developed.

The federation form does not require completely static balance. Historically, the trend was toward the Federal Government from 1789 to 1800, then toward the States to 1860. Over the past 100 years the pendulum of governmental power has swung again toward Washington, and at an accelerated rate during the past 3 decades.

In consequence, the Federal Government is now too big to be managed efficiently and economically by any man or group of men, however competent they may be. Its size and power threaten the fundamental nature of the Republic by undermining the sovereignty of the States; its cost impedes economic growth by imposing an excessive burden on the economic resources that must support both the people and the Government; and its enforcement of policies, at times by methods suggestive of the police state, violates both the spirit and the practical realization of personal freedom. The constitutional design of a balance of power between Federal and State Governments should be restored by bringing closer to home many governmental functions and services that have been swept into the Federal orbit.

A POSITIVE GUIDE

This monumental task cannot be accomplished by throwing brickbats at the lunatic fringe of either right or left. It will require a positive guide to action on which reasonable persons can agree, and also an understanding of the forces and influences to be combated. First, let us consider the major influences that have promoted the excessive growth of Federal power.

To begin with, the States have not been as jealous of their constitutional prerogatives nor as aggressive in asserting them as they were more than a century ago. Civil War and reconstruction severely damaged for a time the States rights concept. The centralizing trend, which had proceeded at a very moderate pace after 1865, was stepped up by the expansion of the Federal administrative and fiscal structure in two World Wars. Even so, the States could have achieved some degree of better balance in their favor had it not been for two other developments, one practical and the other ideological.

The practical development was the steady expansion after about 1930 of Federal grants-in-aid, whereby the Federal Government has assumed full or partial responsibility for various services and activities, the performance and financing of which were, and are, within State and local administrative and fiscal capacity. There is continued pressure, within and without the Federal Government, to extend the area of these grants and to increase existing grants. This device is appealing to those who believe that someone else is providing the money, and to State and local officials who are thereby enabled to take credit for improvements and benefits without the disagreeable necessity of increasing taxes or debt.

The Federal Government has bought its way into the sphere of State and local functions. Its acts of purchase have seldom been questioned by the Supreme Court which has construed the term "general welfare" so broadly that there is almost no area of government functions into which the Federal Government is not legally free to enter, there to spend money and exercise control. All disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding, Federal aid means Federal control.

The ideological development has been the rise of the current concept of "liberalism," which is a distortion of the 19th century definition akin to the upside-down connotations of "democracy" behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. The 19th century liberal advocated liberating individuals from the restrictions and controls of Government. The present-day liberal advocates more, not less Government; more, not less control and regimentation of persons and businesses; more, not less support of the people by Government through the modern counterpart of the Roman "bread and circuses."

COMBATING THE TREND

The Constitution provides a guide to positive action to combat the centralist trend and to restore a reasonable working balance between Federal and State powers and responsibilities. The constitutional allocation reserves to the Central Government:

First, those truly national tasks which can be performed only by and at this level of Government. National defense and foreign affairs are the two major national tasks.

Second, certain other functions which, though capable of performance by the States, would be adverse to the interests of citizens generally if so performed.

For example, each State would be competent to determine its own system of weights and measures; its own currency system; its own postal system; its own rules regulating commerce with other States and foreign nations; and its own procedures relating to bankruptcy, naturalization, and immigration. These matters were reserved to Congress, not because they could be dealt with only at the Federal level, but because the resulting "balkanization" of the country, if they were left to the States, would have been disastrous.

The Constitution further provides for reserving to the States, or to the people, all powers not delegated to the Congress nor prohibited to the State. This pattern is even more sensible and necessary today than it was in 1787.

A LIST OF CONSEQUENCES

Some of the consequences of permitting the Federal Government to assume jurisdiction over, and responsibility for the many functions and activities that belong elsewhere and that were, in effect, reserved by the Constitution to the States, or to the people, are considered herewith.

1. An excessive diversion of attention and effort from the truly national tasks: This is obvious in view of the time and energy that the President and the Congress devote to relatively small matters, each involving political dickering, and sometimes bickering. These local and sectional issues include such diverse matters as wheat planting, juvenile delinquency, waste treatment, urban renewal and transport, depressed areas, and many others.

The price we pay for administrative and congressional application to the thousand and one matters that should be dealt with elsewhere is an excessive cost of national defense, loss of prestige before the world, and rising suspicion among nations that we want, and need, as friends. After spending upwards of $100 billion to combat and contain communism around the world, we have allowed the Communists to take over Cuba. We have had worsening relations with Canada, France, England, Latin America, and as a world leader we have been plagued by unhealed sore spots of which Korea, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, and Indonesia are examples.

Defense costs are admitted to be excessive but progress in their reduction is at snail's pace. Moreover, there is sharp difference over the best defense as the debate continues over missiles, manned bombers and other matters.

The truly national tasks cannot be competently managed as a part-time job. They are so large and important as to require the full attention and energy of the Congress and the Federal administration. The decisions made and actions taken in the areas of defense and foreign affairs are vital to the stability, prosperity, and security of the free world. The talents and capacities for competent national leadership are available but they must be conserved for that purpose, not wasted on matters that are not genuine Federal business.

2. Excessive cost: Over the past decade the major factor in the rising Federal budget has not been the Military Establishment, as such, but the domestic civilian services. Each year additional services and programs are introduced. Every new Federal activity means another administrative unit, more employees, and an appropriation of funds. There is much overlap and duplication and the ramification of Federal operations has led to a host of big and little bureaucratic empires which compete for funds and authority while contributing to diffusion of responsibility and tangled redtape. The ultimate cost of Federal projects is often concealed by the practice of small annual appropriations which get the undertaking launched, thereby establishing a commitment to carry it through to completion.

WAGES AND HOURS

Federal regulations relating to wages and hours have led to cases of local rejection of public improvement grants because of the added cost. There are heavy costs of compliance with other regulations which fall on taxpayers, not on the budget. Recent examples are the rules relating to expense accounts and those promulgated under the Drug Control Act of 1962.

A reallocation of functions and services would transfer both costs and revenue resources to the States and their local units. These governmental divisions would have more to do and more to do with. Savings could effect through lower expenses of operation and in some cases by deciding not to continue programs deemed locally to be unessential in the given circumstances. When the bill is to be paid locally, a harder look is to be expected at the relation between costs and benefits.

3. Retention of punitive tax rates: The doctrine that Government must support the people requires that an ever-widening array of benefits be provided. The people pay the cost of these benefits in one way or another but it is politically advantageous to foster the illusion that someone else is paying. Hence, to support this illusion there is stubborn insistence on retention of punitive tax rates despite general recognition that they produce comparatively little revenue while sapping away funds that otherwise might go for capital formation and economic growth. The inconsistency of seeking a higher rate of growth while burdening the Nation's productive resources with destructive taxation suggests that there still lingers the notion that wealth can be multiplied by dividing it.

4. Government by crisis: The technique of promoting centralism by asserting the imminence of crises which require Federal intervention was developed to a high pitch of efficiency during the 1930's and it has continued to be a useful tool in the centralist kit. The crisis need not be real, for a fictional one will serve as well to support the double argument, first, that the Federal Government knows just what to do and is ready, willing, and able to act in the alleged emergency; and second, that the States are unwilling or financially unable to act.

State or local inaction is likely to be due to hardheaded realization that no emergency impends. It is seldom, if ever, due to financial incapacity, though a plea of poverty has served, for reasons noted above, as an excuse to let Uncle Sam do it. The fact is that the wealth and income of the citizens of the several States is the same aggregate as the wealth and income of the citizens of the United States. There are no constitutional restrictions on State and local taxation, other than those of their own devising, except the prohibition of duties on imports and exports.

CONFLICTING STATISTICS

The alleged crisis in education is a good example. Conflicting, and to a considerable extent, questionable statistics purporting to show classroom and teacher shortages have been used to support the demand for large Federal spending on school construction and salaries. The scare effect has been compounded by projecting the alleged deficiencies as far ahead as 1970 with the implication that the projected results are with us today. The steady progress being made by State and local action toward closing any real classroom gap that may exist is disregarded. The rising proportion of college graduates preparing to teach refutes the case for Federal stimulus of teacher supply.

5. Competition with taxpaying citizens: The centralist trend has extended the area of Federal Government operations beyond the scope of public functions into the field of private business. Here the Government competes on very unequal terms with its taxpaying citizens while compelling them to provide the capital and sustain the losses of its ventures. In addition to the objective of Federal control and domination, the purpose is to provide further benefits to individuals, groups, and sections. The Treasury supplies loan funds in some cases at interest rates below its own cost of borrowing. Electric power is sold to favored customers at rates below those that private, taxpaying companies can afford to charge. This is called the "yardstick" method of comparing public and private operation. Risks are assumed with public funds that no private investor would dare take with his own money. The lack of a profit motive in Government business operations is paralleled by absence of concern to conserve capital. Losses can always be made up by another appropriation, as is customary in various Government corporations.

There are other consequences of centralism which must be passed over here. The fatal contradiction of current liberalism, however, cannot be too much emphasized. It is the conflict between governmental power and liberty. The authority of Government is absolute and the individual never has a choice between obeying its rules or not. The larger the scope of Government operations, the greater the area of absolutism and the smaller the area within which the individual is free of Government compulsion.

There must be enough government to assure an orderly community life at home and security against foreign aggression, on one hand, but not so much government as to imperil personal liberties and destroy the economic basis of individual self-support through excesses of spending, taxing, and regulating, on the other. The balance between these extremes can be achieved only by arresting the centralist trend and bringing more of the functions and services back home.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S STAND ON THE ISSUES FACING AMERICANS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on July 15, U.S. News & World Report published an article entitled "Taking a Stand on Issues: GOLDWATER'S Own Words." I commend to the attention of the Senate and the people of the United States these comments of our colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, in which he clearly and succinctly states his views and the views of American conservatism. Senator GOLDWATER is among the Senate's most able speakers, and his words as reproduced in this article are forthright and eminently lucid.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING A STAND ON ISSUES: GOLDWATER'S OWN WORDS

(Where does Senator BARRY GOLDWATER stand on the big issues facing the United States? What are the Goldwater views on labor, taxes, spending, civil rights, foreign aid, Government powers? Now that the Arizona Senator is out front among those mentioned as the Republican most likely to oppose President Kennedy in 1964, his attitude on such issues takes on growing importance.)

(NOTE.—Following is a running series of excerpts from statements and speeches made by Senator GOLDWATER that put on the record the position taken by the Arizona Republican on dominant issues, at home and abroad.)

ON POLITICS

Up to the first of the year, I frankly felt that it would be next to impossible to beat him [President Kennedy] in 1964, but it has been a combination, a compiling of errors that has changed my view. Cuba is part of it. The situation with France is another part. Skybolt in England and the Polaris. Canada. The domestic economy not moving forward rapidly enough. Unemployment that plagues us. Instead of reducing expenditures so we can reduce taxes, he is asking more and more expenditures. Issues are piling up to the point that, unless some miracle happens in the next 16 or 18 months, I think he can be beaten.

I charge that there is today a cynical alliance between the politicians who call themselves liberal and the corrupt big-city machines whose job it is to deliver the bloc votes of the big northern cities. It is the corrupt big-city machines which elect these men to public office. I charge that the politicians who have inherited the tradition of liberalism in this country today are not liberals at all, but merely ambitious men who have become the captives of the big-city machines.

I think that the Republican Party has only one position and that is a position to the right. I do not mean by that, that the Republican Party go to the far right, nor that it become a middle-of-the-road party. There are millions and millions of conservatives in this country in both parties who are concerned lest conservatism be stamped out. The only place the Republican Party can occupy is a position to the right of center.

ON GOVERNMENT SPENDING

We cannot afford to leave the destiny of our great Nation in the hands of men who actually believe that spending money is the basic solution to all problems.

The naive and narrow idea that spending our resources in larger quantities will somehow solve every dangerous and complex problem of foreign and domestic policy is the characteristic—and fatal—weakness of the liberals. They are obsessed with the economic solutions for every problem.

Public debt mounts to astronomical heights and cannot be paid off except by ruinous inflation or repudiation. The Federal debt is a time bomb hanging over the security of our people. Have you ever seen such outrageous taxation, such a staggering national debt, such waste of public money, such a pyramid of Government subsidies, dangerous inflation, so many lavish political promises, such a gigantic Federal bureaucracy, so much Government favoritism to special groups, such moral laxity and so little responsibility in public life?

This $100 billion spending plan (the budget for fiscal year 1964, combined with tax reduction and a planned deficit of $12 billion, is nothing but a calculated program of inflation. It will weaken the dollar, boost prices, and increase the pressure from labor unions for new and exorbitant wage-and-hour demands.

ON FOREIGN AID

What could be more foolish than the belief that our good friends will become enemies if we stop paying them?

We should adopt a discriminating foreign-aid policy. Aid should be furnished only to friendly, anti-Communist nations that are willing to join with us in the struggle for freedom. Moreover, our aid should take the form of loans or technical assistance, not gifts. And we should insist that such nations contribute their fair share to the common cause.

Increasingly, our foreign aid goes not to our friends, but to professed neutrals—and even to professed enemies. We furnish this aid under the theory that we can buy the allegiance of foreign peoples—or at least discourage them from "going Communist"—by making them economically prosperous. This has been called the "stomach theory of communism" and it implies that a man's politics are determined by the amount of food in his belly. Everything we have learned from experience and from our observation of the nature of man refutes this theory.

I feel that proper doctrine to guide foreign aid would have to be based upon the goals of our own national security. It would not be a doctrine of vague altruism but of concrete effort to extend freedom. It would recognize the vastly different capacities of vastly different nations to absorb aid and use it advantageously in terms of building free institutions. It would certainly never approach the struggle between East and West as a mere exercise in bribery, with the booty going to the side that promises to spend more.

Our present policy of government-to-government aid strengths socialism in those countries. We are not only perpetuating the inefficiency and waste that always attends government-controlled economies; by strengthening the hand of those governments, we are making it more difficult for free enterprise to take hold. For this reason alone, we should eliminate all government-to-government capital assistance and encourage substitution of American private investment.

ON LABOR

Graft and corruption are symptoms of the illness that besets the labor movement, not the cause of it. The cause is the enormous economic and political power now concentrated in the hands of union leaders.

I strongly favor enactment of State right-to-work laws which forbid contracts that make union membership a condition of employment. These laws are aimed at removing a great blight on the contemporary American scene, and I am at a loss to understand why so many people who so often profess concern for civil rights and civil liberties are vehemently opposed to them.

One way to check the unions' power is for the Government to dictate through compulsory arbitration the terms of employment throughout an entire industry. I am opposed to this course, because it simply transfers economic power from the unions to the Government, and encourages state socialism.

Let us henceforth make war on all monopolies, whether corporate or union. The enemy of freedom is unrestrained power, and the champions of freedom will fight against the concentration of power wherever they find it.

Unions exist, presumably, to confer economic advantages on their members, not to perform political services for them. Unions should, therefore, be forbidden to engage in any kind of political activity. * * * I see no reason for labor unions or corporations to participate in politics.

We must never destroy the workers' right to strike. We must control it where it applies to the national defense and the operation of the Federal Government.

My bill * * * contains a strike-vote procedure based on the following simple requirements:

First, a strike shall be unlawful unless notice of intention to strike is given to all those concerned at least 30 days prior to the actual beginning of the strike; and

Second, at any time after such notice has been given, a petition may be filed with the National Labor Relations Board by an employee in the enterprise to be affected, asking the Board to conduct an election by secret ballot among the employees in the establishment to be or being struck, on the question of whether they favor a strike or its continuation. If such a petition is supported by 30 percent of said employees, the Board shall conduct such an election and the strike or its continuation shall be lawful only if a majority, so voting, cast their ballots in favor thereof.

ON TAXES

The idea that a man who makes $100,000 a year should be forced to contribute 90 percent of his income to the cost of government, while the man who makes $10,000 is made to pay 20 percent is repugnant to my notions of justice. I do not believe in punishing success.

The graduated tax is a confiscatory tax.

I believe that, as a practical matter, spending cuts must come before tax cuts. If we reduce taxes before firm-principled decisions are made about expenditures, we will court deficit spending and the inflationary effects that invariably follow.

I wouldn't want to see a tax reduction without first a reduction in the domestic budget. But I'll say this, that we have to have a tax reduction in this country within the next year or two, or I feel we're going to have economic trouble. Now I say that small business cannot expand due to one thing, and that's the tax picture. * * * And, in business, you either expand or you die.

We should have the kind of liberalization of our tax laws that would permit quick writeoff depreciation and put an immediate spur to the economy by enabling our industrial plants to begin large-scale replacement of some $95 billion in obsolete equipment with which they presently are saddled. President Kennedy's gesture of a tax credit in this direction was laughable, and the businessmen who said they wanted it were not for any long-range improvement in the economy.

ON CIVIL RIGHTS

I continue to believe that it is both wise and just for Negro children to attend the same schools as whites. But I believe the matter of school integration is left to the States under the 10th amendment.

When I consider the overall issue of civil rights, I come back to the concept that the States have all the rights not specifically reserved to the Federal Government in the Constitution.

As a merchant, I feel that a man in business who advertises for customers to come to his store * * * and to make purchases from him cannot deny that customer, regardless of race, creed or color, the opportunity to purchase in any department of that store or business.

I have great respect for the Supreme Court as an institution, but I cannot believe that I display that respect by submitting abjectly to abuses of power by the Court and by condoning its uncontitutional trespass into the legislative sphere of government.

Despite the recent holding of the Supreme Court, I am firmly convinced not only that integrated schools are not required but that the Constitution does not permit any interference whatsoever by the Federal Government in the field of education.

It may be just or wise or expedient for Negro children to attend the same schools as white children, but they do not have a civil right to do so which is proteced by the Federal Constitution or which is enforceable by the Federal Government.

ON BIG GOVERNMENT

We don't need the Federal Government wet-nursing Americans from the time they are born to the time they die. We need Americans who will take care of America so the Government never needs to worry about the people—the welfare of the people.

The Government must begin to withdraw from a whole series of programs that are outside its constitutional mandate—from social-welfare programs, education, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal and all other activities that can be better performed by lower levels of government or by private institutions or by individuals. I do not suggest that the Federal Government drop all of these programs overnight. But I do suggest that we establish by law a rigid timetable for a staged withdrawal.

If we take from a man the personal responsibility for caring for his material needs, we take from him also the will and opportunity to be free.

ON FOREIGN POLICY

We should withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Communist governments, including that of the Soviet Union.

The Republican Party should announce that victory is our goal in the cold war—not just ending it.

We should make it clear in the most explicit terms that Communist governments are not tolerated in this hemisphere—and that the Castro regime, being such a government, will be eliminated * * * I think we can operate an effective economic blockade of Cuba and I think we can do it at no risk of war.

In nearly every case where we have called upon the United Nations to do our thinking for us * * * we have been a less effective foe of communism than we otherwise might have been.

Our present policy of not recognizing Red China is eminently right, and the reasons behind that policy apply equally to the Soviet Union and its European satellites.

ON EDUCATION

Federal aid to education inevitably means Federal control of education.

It is evident * * * that increased school expenditures have more than kept pace with increased school needs.

What could be more ludicrous than the idea that the problem of the quality of education in this country can be solved merely by appropriating very large sums, so we can build bigger and more elaborate facilities?

ON AGRICULTURE

I think we have to arrange some kind of a program that will gradually get the farmer out from under the control of Government and subsidies. I don't know how long that would take. I am certain that it would be a terrific economic shock if we dropped it tomorrow. It might take 3 or 4 or 5 years but, at the end of that time, the 30 percent of agriculture which is now under Government would be under the law of supply and demand.

I would start down the hill on agricultural payments. I would stop the $7 billion dollars a year and start getting down to, let's say, $1 billion a year.

I cannot conceive of a more absurd and self-defeating policy than one which subsidizes nonproduction.

The only way to persuade farmers to enter other fields of endeavor is to stop paying inefficient farmers for produce that cannot be sold at free-market prices.

ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

I'll say here that social security is a part of our American life. I wish that, when they framed it, they would have made it voluntary. If a man wants it, fine; if he doesn't, he doesn't have to take it. But this compulsion—you have to do it—is one of the denials of the freedoms that is very dangerous in this country, because it can be extended.

Anyway it is put, the plan * * * for aid to the aged is socialized medicine. What is voluntary about a plan that would entail the participation of every taxpayer whether he wants to or not? What is free about a plan which has the Federal Government intervening in anyway at all? Where in the Constitution is the Federal Government given the right to become a Federal doctor?

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement on the interest equalization tax measure, which was recently introduced as H.R. 8000. Since the President of the United States delivered a message to Congress on this subject on July 18, I have given much thought to this proposal. As of now, I have some reservations as to the appropriateness of such a tax at this time.

I am fully aware of the administration's concern over the lagging rate of our economic growth and over the persisting high rate of unemployment. I also share the anxieties connected with the adverse international balance of payments and its effects on our domestic economy. The outflow of gold must be stabilized and our foreign trade expanded. I therefore do not argue with the basic objectives of the administration's efforts in this proposal. I do, however, question the means of trying to achieve the goals we all seek.

In the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and in all subsequent major public pronouncements, we have correctly advertised to the world our national policy of encouraging freer trade—not only in goods and services but also in the international flow of capital. We have urged other countries to join us in reducing or eliminating the restrictive barriers, and we have made much headway with the enlightened cooperation of our trading allies. Private business groups, too, have contributed much to the development of a proper climate for more trade and freer trade.

However, the proposed interest equalization tax runs directly counter to the basic national policies we laid down in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This tax is intended to further restrict, not to encourage, the free flow of capital in the international money market. This is a negative tax and a negative approach to solving our continuing deficit in the international balance of payments. I am perfectly aware of the distinctions made in the President's message between longrun objectives and shortrun expediencies. This tax is proposed as a stopgap measure until the end of 1965—until our deficit position has been rectified. I know, too, that other restrictive measures have already been taken, such as tying foreign aid to American procurement. We are about to consider further restrictions on imports from the European Common Market.

At this point I am concerned with the increasing use of shortrun expediencies which can, if left unchecked, severely undermine our stated longrun objectives of expanding our foreign trade while strengthening our political alliances.

It is easy for an ostrich to stick its head in the sand, to ignore our deficits and the outflow of gold. Let us not lose sight of the principles and goals we so nobly expressed only a short time ago by becoming mired down in shortrun expediences—going in the opposite direction. I say in all sincerity and humility that we should accentuate the positive and deemphasize the negative in our attempts to move our economy forward and balance our international accounts.

Let us look at the positive side:

First. It is generally agreed that the only true way to prevent the outflow of private capital abroad is to make investments within our country more attractive. The incentives to private investments in our domestic economy must be further strengthened. Only last year, as a first step, we made favorable revisions of depreciation rules, permitting business savings of over $2 billion a year in taxes and significantly increased the net return on capital investments in this country. The major tax revision program submitted by the President in January contains other significant lifts to investment incentives. Cutting down the corporate income tax rate from 52 to 47 percent is intended to cut corporate tax liabilities by over $2.5 billion a year. Reduction in individual income tax rates, especially in the upper brackets, also intends to spur investments. Increased consumption expenditures also create the demand for investments.

Let me emphasize at this point that I am for the President's tax program of making investment in America more attractive and more competitive with foreign securities. This is a positive program. Over the long run, only a dynamic domestic economy can attract and utilize the volume of savings generated in our affluent society. I believe that the President's major tax revision program should be given top priority in this session of Congress.

Second. I also support two other positive programs recently submitted by the administration aimed at improving our balance-of-payments deficits: (a) The Department of Commerce has advocated a vigorous program to promote American products abroad and providing ample facilities for export financing fully comparable to those available in other industrialized countries. I think this is a good positive program and should be adopted; and (b) the U.S. Travel Service should likewise be strengthened to draw more tourists from abroad. Last year about two-thirds of our deficit in our international balance of payments was accounted for by American tourists going abroad—far more than our net outflow of private capital. Here again is a positive program we have not even begun to exploit.

Third. I find some comfort in noting that the term "deficit" as used in connection with the balance-of-payments problem has a positive side as well as a negative side. When we invest abroad, this is recorded as a minus or as contributing to our deficit—at least in the short run. Indeed, equating "investment" with "deficit" is strange usage of these words. Secretary of the Treasury Mr. Dillon recently testified before the Joint Economic Committee and said:

> Today, the aggregate value of private investment holdings abroad by Americans total over $60 billions. Nearly two-thirds represents direct investment in foreign enterprises—the kind of investments which can be expected to yield a steady increase in earnings over the years ahead. The increase in these private assets since the end of 1949, when our long series of deficits began, has roughly matched our loss of gold and the rise in foreign claims on the United States.

One of the most encouraging items in the U.S. balance of payments is the steadily rising return we are getting from our private investments abroad. From $2.87 billions in 1960, this climbed to $3.85 billions in 1962. It exceeded $1 billion in the first quarter of 1963 alone and is "one reflection of the basic strength of our international investment position" according to Mr. Dillon. "Deficits" that are incurred through Americans investing abroad, therefore, cannot be put in the same category as American tourist expenditures.

Fourth. While we are all eager to reduce our deficit in the international balance of payments as quickly as possible, I feel we can afford to be a little more patient. I say this as the impression gathered from reading the experts is that the tide is beginning to flow in our favor. The peak of American private investments in Western Europe accompanied by a heavy outflow of gold to Europe is now behind us. The point of diminishing returns has definitely set in. With near full employment, price levels have increased faster abroad and upward cost pressures remain strong. If we can maintain a reasonably stable price level and push through needed tax revisions, the prospects seem good that we can ride with this tide to correct our adverse balances without leaning on crutches of expediencies. Reviving the economic health of our country without inflation can do more to strengthen our international financial position than reverting to temporary, stopgap protectionism.

While emphasizing the positive aspects of our attempts to rectify our adverse international balance-of-payments deficits, I am not ignoring the dangers we court in reverting to protectionist policies, even in the short run. There are also some doubts on the effectiveness of the proposed interest equalization tax in achieving the modest goals it seeks. I raise these questions and doubts before we decide whether to take this step, even on an interim basis: (a) In the last few years, we have made much progress in our longrun objective of gradually reducing the barriers to freer trade with our allies. Through a series of high level conferences, both public and private, we have begun to develop the kind of confidence conducive to the expansion of international trade. Has this confidence been seriously undermined, especially with our two best customers, Canada and Japan? and (b) purchases of foreign securities by Americans are a very small part of some $50 to $60 billions of loanable funds generated in our economy. We appear to lack confidence on our own ability to compete for our own funds as we set up artificial barriers. Will our recognized position as the world banker be further undermined? (c) according to our Treasury Department, the purchase of new issues of foreign securities in the United States by our residents amounted to $1,076 millions in 1962. Of this, Canada accounted for $457 millions, or 42 percent. The preliminary figures for the first half of 1963 indicate a much larger share for Canada. Despite this flow of capital from the United States, Canada has been experiencing serious balance-of-payments difficulties and her unemployment rate ran well above ours in the last 5 years. Can we afford the risk of further upsetting the very delicate Canadian economy? If not, can we exempt Canada, the biggest borrower, and still apply the tax to all the other nations whose combined offerings of new securities will be less than that of Canada this year? (d) even as applied to Japan, another large borrower, there is some doubt that the actual borrowing will be decreased to any substantial extent. Will the interest differential be sufficiently narrowed to discourage American investors? and (e) direct foreign investments will be exempt from this tax. While it is true that this type of investment has been decreasing over the last few years, it still remains quite substantial. As direct investments abroad are made primarily by business firms, would not the outflow of this type of capital have a greater effect in lessening employment opportunities within our own country? Should we not then consider equally stiff or stiffer taxes on direct foreign investment if we are to carry through with a tax on foreign securities bought by Americans?

Several other questions may be raised on the wisdom and effectiveness of this proposed tax at this time. I would like to conclude by restating my basic confidence in our ability to invigorate our own domestic economy. With additional investment incentives, I have every reason to believe that our own securities can be made more attractive to our own investors. There are signs that the tide in the international balance of payments is beginning to run in our favor. By accentuating the positive programs, we may very well attain the desired equilibrium while promoting the principle of greater freedom in the flow of goods, services, peoples as well as capital among the free nations of the world.

In conclusion, I express my appreciation to Mr. Charles Bischoff, of Stanford University, and now of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who provided excellent research aid for me and my staff in this, as well as in other statements and testimonies.

I also ask unanimous consent to have Gov. John Burns' statement against H.R. 8000 printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN A. BURNS, GOVERNOR, STATE OF HAWAII, IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 8000

The President's special message to Congress last month on the Nation's balance of payments was an extremely able and perceptive statement of the problem. All Americans should be aware of the necessity of balancing our international payments and receipts without weakening our domestic economy and foregoing the goal of full employment.

The President has set forth a program to accomplish this task by expanding our exports, encouraging foreign tourist travel to this country, and reducing our Federal expenditures abroad. It is a program designed to stanch the Nation's gold outflow and earn for us the time necessary to build up our national resistance to payments imbalances through the improvement of our international competitive position. With the exception of the so-called "interest equalization" tax, I believe the measures set forth by the President are well conceived and should be carried out.

However, I believe H.R. 8000 is inconsistent with other parts of the President's program, as set forth in his message to you. By levying a tax on foreign securities sold in this country—15 percent in the case of equity investments and a graduated scale up to 15 percent in the case of debt securities—we are inviting retaliatory measures from other countries, which could frustrate our efforts to expand our exports and encourage foreign travel to our shores.

Let me take the case of Japan, because it is a country with close ties to my State. In 1961—the last year for which we have figures—Japan-Hawaii trade was more than $20 million in commodities alone. Tourist travel and sale of securities would raise that figure substantially. True, this trade was imbalanced—$14 million worth of Japanese exports to Hawaii and $6 million worth of imports from Hawaii. But we in Hawaii had been looking forward to a dramatic reversal in this trend next year when travel restrictions were to be eased; now the outlook is less certain. According to the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, in the 12 months following the relaxation of the present currency restrictions imposed by the Japanese Government, Hawaii could have conservatively anticipated playing host to 50,000 visitors spending an average of $150 each. This alone would have wiped out the 1961 deficit in our trade with Japan.

When Japan signed an agreement to join the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, its Government agreed that effective July 1, 1964, its citizens would be allowed to take out of the country $500 per person per year in excess of transportation costs. Although Japan may not repudiate this agreement, she might very well take other steps—such as visa restrictions—to negate its effects, at least in relation to the United States. For make no mistake about it, gentlemen, this measure before your committee will hit Japan hard. Through May this year, 90 percent of the $125.5 million of foreign securities came from the United States, according to Yamaichi Securities Co. An official of the firm has predicted the tax, if enacted, could mean a loss to Japan of $200 million worth of security sales in the United States this year.

The mere announcement of the tax triggered the sharpest drop in the Japanese stock market since the end of World War II—a 20 percent decline. The news immediately sent the country's foreign minister to Washington, and Japan's Finance Minister announced that the proposed tax would have a great effect on his country's balance of payments. He said it would mean a reexamination of Japan's international monetary and trade policies.

We in Hawaii can be expected to feel the full brunt of such changes.

Tourism is a key sector of our State's economy—and our most promising growth industry. The Far East in general and Japan in particular represent a whole, new, untapped market for that industry. Hawaii is prepared to do its part in the national program to stimulate foreign travel to the United States, but we believe that H.R. 8000 will complicate this effort.

It also may represent a setback in our attempts to sell more Hawaiian pineapple products to Japan, which recently has eased its tariff restrictions on them and increased its dollar allocation for their purchase. In 1960, Hawaii sold only 600 cases of canned pineapple to Japan. The figure doubled in 1961. Last year we sold 23,800 cases, and in the first quarter of this year, we sold 25,900 cases. The industry is anxious to increase its sales to Japan because that country imported 1.1 million cases of canned pineapple last year.

Finally, H.R. 8000 would have a severe effect on the 10,000 residents of Hawaii who now own more than $20 million of Japanese securities. The 20 percent decline in the Tokyo market cost them an estimated $5 million.

Returning to the national picture, it should be noted that U.S. investment in foreign securities is not a one-way street. In addition to the $1 billion of foreign capital invested in the United States in 1962, Americans received $800 million in interest and dividends on their foreign securities. The $124 million worth of Japanese securities purchased by U.S. citizens last year compares with $516 million worth of machinery bought by Japanese businessmen in the United States.

Quite aside from its probable effects upon my State, gentlemen, I am opposed to H.R. 8000 because I believe that it is inconsistent with our national foreign policy objectives and would do more harm than good. Authorities on the subject say the tax will affect only an infinitesimal amount of our payments deficit, which is running at more than $3 billion a year. I am convinced it will simply drive away the better credit risk borrowers who can get their money elsewhere, leaving the market to the borrowers who will pay anything for their money just so long as they get it.

It is directly contrary to the policy of free world trade and free capital exchange. It would threaten our position as leader in free world finance because it represents a unilateral barrier to international monetary movements.

Gentlemen, I recently returned from Japan. There I saw for myself what we have all read concerning that country: That its economic strides are far and away the most impressive in all Asia and its advances since the end of World War II eclipse even those of West Germany. Japan is the strongest bulwark against communism in the Far East because its economic performance has refuted Communist dogma. The lesson of Japan has been recognized elsewhere in Asia, to the frustration of Communist imperialism.

But Japan is an island nation, just as Hawaii is an island State; we both live by exports. As a rapidly developing industrial nation, Japan needs expanding markets for manufactured goods. In turn, that country is a widening market for imports of both goods and capital. Japan knows it cannot step up its sales overseas without dismantling protective barriers at home.

Fortune magazine, in its July issue, makes the point that "in this acknowledged quid pro quo lies new opportunity for U.S. businessmen." The article concludes: "There is great growth potential for all industrial capitalist nations in an integration of Japan into the free world economic system. And the system itself will be importantly fortified if Japan, its principal outpost in Asia, prospers for all to see."

I agree with this conclusion, and I believe that in the case of Japan alone, H.R. 8000 can be seen as a temporary expedient of dubious value which can have unfavorable effects on our Nation's long-range goals, including those directed toward balancing our international accounts.

The proposal of the President embodied in H.R. 8000 was unquestionably thoroughly considered before being proposed. We believe that we have briefly set forth the basis for a determination that in the case of our friend and neighbor Japan, as in the case of Canada, more harm than good would result. The President's proposal may be applicable and beneficial in many other areas. Of this we have very limited knowledge. We do have knowledge in this one instance. It is respectfully recommended that should H.R. 8000 be deemed beneficial in the wisdom of the committee that Japan be exempted entirely or specially treated.

ST. JOHN FISHER COLLEGE HOST TO UNPRECEDENTED MEETING OF CHURCH LEADERS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with considerable pride that I invite attention to a unique and important gathering of church leaders which recently occurred at St. John Fisher College, in my home city of Rochester, N.Y. There a reception and luncheon were tendered to the leaders of the World Council of Churches by this outstanding Catholic institution. In all, some 50 world Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Church leaders, including four of the six presidents of the world council and Metropolitan Nikodim of the Russian Orthodox Church, took part in the gathering.

In welcoming the guests to the reception, the Very Reverend Monsignor Charles J. Lavery, head of the college, stated that:

> Unity has today become the great hope, not only on a national and international level, but also on the level of the spirit.

Mr. President, meetings such as this emphasize the common spiritual basis of all our major faiths. This was the first time a Roman Catholic institution had been host to delegates at a world council meeting, but I am confident that it will not be the last. Communication is essential to understanding and mutual confidence, and meetings such as this are a wonderful omen for all mankind.

I commend Monsignor Lavery for his initiative in arranging this reception. It is typical of many magnificent activities he has undertaken during his brilliant service as head of St. John Fisher College. All of us, regardless of our particular denominations, are indebted to him for the great service he has performed in cementing the bonds of love and peace which unite all believers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an interesting article entitled "Catholics Honor Heads of Two Faiths," written by George Dugan, and published in the New York Times of September 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Catholics Honor Heads of 2 Faiths—50 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Chiefs at Fete

(By George Dugan)

Rochester, September 1.—Fifty world Protestant and Eastern Orthodox leaders were feted here today by a Roman Catholic institution.

The occasion was a reception and luncheon tendered to leaders of the World Council of Churches by St. John Fisher College. The college school is administered by the Basilian Fathers.

Council spokesmen said it was the first time so many highly placed Protestant and Eastern Orthodox leaders had joined with Catholics at a public function.

The guests included four of the six presidents of the World Council and Metropolitan Nikodim of the Russian Orthodox Church.

After the meal the Russian prelate and Archpriest Vitaly Borovoy of Leningrad chanted a blessing of thanksgiving in their native tongue. Metropolitan Nikodim then added in Latin, "Pax vobiscum" (Peace be with you").

STRESSES CHANGE

Before the luncheon grace was offered by the Right Reverend R. David Say, Anglican bishop of Rochester, England.

The Reverend Charles J. Lavery, head of the college, welcomed the guests. He reminded them that "as religious groups we are living in a greatly changed atmosphere."

"We look forward with confidence to the tasks we must undertake together," he said. "Unity has today become the great hope, not only on a national and international level, but also on the level of the spirit.

"Our mutual goal is union with God through love and union with others through a true love because of God.

"As this love grows through the power of the Holy Spirit, then the soil is prepared for us sincerely to join Christ in His prayer to the Father that we may all be one in them."

The Reverend Dr. Ernest A. Payne, general secretary of the Baptist Union of Britain and Ireland and vice chairman of the world council's policymaking central committee, also spoke. The committee is in session here.

HAILS LATE POPE

Dr. Payne described the fete as "unique." He paid warm tribute to the late Pope John XXIII.

He promised his hosts that the council's prayers would be directed at the Second Vatican Council when it reconvenes in Rome on September 29.

The four council presidents who attended the luncheon were:

The Reverend Dr. Martin Niemoeller, of the Evangelical Church in Germany, Sir Francis Ibiam, Governor of Eastern Nigeria, and a Presbyterian; the Reverend Dr. David G. Moses, member of the United Church of Northern India and president of Hislop College, Nagpur, and Charles Parlin, Methodist layman from New York.

The two other council presidents, the Most Reverend Arthur Michael Ramsey, archbishop of Canterbury, and Archbishop Iakovos, head of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, were out of the city.

The two official Catholic observers at the council meeting also attended. They were the Reverend Gustav Weigel, a Jesuit, and the Reverend John B. Sheerin, a Paulist.

Other guests included:

The Reverend Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, president of the United Lutheran Church in America; Bishop Hans Lilje, of the Evangelical Church in Germany; the Right Reverend John Sadiq, bishop of Nagpur in the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon; the Reverend Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secertary of the world council, and Msgr. James C. McAniff, vicar general of the Roman Catholic diocese of Rochester.

SAMPLE STUDY OF SOVIET TREATY PRACTICES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in recent weeks during discussion of the proposed nuclear test ban treaty, attention has been focused on the Soviet Union's history of treaty and agreement violations. I suggest that this pattern on the part of Communist Russia is significant and is certainly an important factor in connection with the Senate's consideration of the proposed treaty. Dr. F. G. Lassner, of the Hoover Institution, at Stanford University, has prepared what he calls a Sample Study of Soviet Treaty Practices. In this study Dr. Lassner makes clear the point that the Soviets honor treaties only so long as it is to their advantage to do so. To quote Dr. Lassner:

> Treaties of strategic significance habitually have been violated by the U.S.S.R. whenever violation was in accord with the requirements of Soviet strategic operations.

Mr. President, I feel that this study by Dr. Lassner will be of particular interest to all my Senate colleagues; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sample Study of Soviet Treaty Practices

(By Dr. F. G. Lassner, Hoover Institution, Stanford University)

The following is a short study of selected Soviet treaty practices. It is not based on a comprehensive listing of all treaties; nor does this study contribute a complete analysis of how treaties fared at the hands of the Kremlin. However, a large enough sample of treaties was examined to permit a number of broad conclusions.

Economic treaties, in general, are being observed by the U.S.S.R. This is so because treaties of this sort operate to the advantage of the U.S.S.R., and because many of them are drawn with Communist-bloc states, i.e. they are treaties within the same political entity. But where trade agreements conflict with the immediate political interests of the U.S.S.R., they are wholly or partially voided (viz. treaties with such dissident satellites as Albania, China, Yugoslavia, etc.).

Many treaties signed by the U.S.S.R. especially at the end of World War II, called for "free elections," or plebiscites. The U.S.S.R. presumably expected Communist and affiliated parties to win elections in Eastern Europe. When this hope was disappointed, despite systematic attempts to bring about electoral victories by skulduggery (e.g.

outlawing of certain parties), political warfare and insurrectional methods were used to seize political power.

Treaties of strategic significance habitually have been violated by the U.S.S.R. whenever violation was in accord with the requirements of Soviet strategic operations. This will become apparent by reading, for example, the attached list of violated and observed nonaggression and friendship treaties.

Duplicity treaties sometimes are drawn by the U.S.S.R. when this suits the Communist strategic interest. An example is an agreement of October 8, 1939, in which the U.S.S.R. agreed with Germany on the division of Lithuania. A treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania concerning mutual assistance and other matters was signed—as a deception—just 2 days later, on October 10, 1939.

The U.S.S.R., on occasion, attempts to play off one country against another through the negotiation or drawing of treaties, of which one set tends to be deceptive. In 1922, the U.S.S.R. negotiated with the Western powers, only to sign the Treaty of Rapallo with Germany. In 1939, extensive discussions with France and England on mutual security were terminated through the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact. Agreements made in 1939 with Nazi Germany on the division of Poland were annulled 2 years later by treaty with the Polish government-in-exile; in addition, the U.S.S.R. shortly thereafter drew agreements, which were not mutually compatible with two different Polish exile governments. As another example, the U.S.S.R. was anxious to obtain recognition by the United States in 1933 because of the rise of Hitler. In 1939, however, as a result of the Nazi-Soviet pact, the attitude of the U.S.S.R. became hostile to the United States and in some measure contributed to the Japanese aggression at Pearl Harbor.

The U.S.S.R. has signed agreements which have a purpose that differs from the objects stated in the treaty. The U.S.S.R., for example, joined the United Nations for many reasons connected with their strategy of revolution, but not for the humanitarian reasons stated in the U.N. Charter. Also, economic treaties with non-Communist states often have been made for purposes of penetration, and not to enhance the economic development of the treaty partner.

In summary, it may be concluded that in the Soviet scheme, treaties are a tool either to solve some practical problem (Danube River navigation or International Postal Union treaties) or, more importantly, to further the offensive-defensive strategy of the U.S.S.R. More often than not, treaties are concluded with a particular country whose assent or benevolent neutrality is needed to carry out a particular strategic operation, or else the treaty partner is itself the intended victim or target, of Soviet direct or indirect attack.

SOME CATEGORIES OF TREATIES WHICH HABITUALLY ARE VIOLATED BY THE U.S.S.R.

1. Treaties pertaining to repatriation and treatment of civilians and war prisoners. A whole series of such treaties was made after World War II. Examples are:

Joint declaration by the U.S.S.R. and Japan concerning political relations, October 19, 1956 (provisions on repatriation of Japanese nationals).

Agreement concerning repatriation of Japanese prisoners of war and civilians from the U.S.S.R. and from territories under Soviet control, as well as Korean nationals from Japan to Soviet-occupied North Korea, with two annexes, December 19, 1946.

2. Treaties between the R.S.F.S.R. and certain bodies concerning establishment of autonomous republics within the R.S.F.S.R. Such autonomy on several occasions was unilaterally abrogated at a later date by the R.S.F.S.R.

3. Treaties of nonintervention. The U.S.S.R. frequently has violated such treaties outright, or has denied that activities in which it was engaged constituted an intervention within the meaning of the treaty. Intervention by the U.S.S.R. has consisted both of propaganda and political warfare, and of outright political or military activities. Examples are:

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and Rumania constituting an agreement concerning noninterference in each other's internal affairs, June 9, 1934.

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and Rumania constituting an agreement concerning noninterference in each other's internal affairs, July 23, 1934.

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and France concerning Soviet adherence to the principle of nonintervention in the Spanish civil war.

Joint declaration by the U.S.S.R. and Japan concerning political relations, October 19, 1956 (provisions on noninterference in internal affairs).

4. Treaties related to the International Labor Organization. U.S.S.R. has adhered to conventions on a variety of subjects: child labor, right to unionize, annual holidays with pay, freedom of association, etc. Some of these agreements were first drawn in the early 1920's. Examples are:

Convention concerning decrease of work hours to 40 hours per week (ILO convention No. 47) of 1937. U.S.S.R. ratified June 4, 1956.

Convention concerning slavery of 1926–53. U.S.S.R. ratified August 1956. Several supplementary conventions of 1956 on abolition of slavery and slave trade "and institutions and practices similar to slavery" ratified by the U.S.S.R.

Convention concerning equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value (ILO convention No. 100), ratified by the U.S.S.R. on April 4, 1956.

Convention concerning forced or compulsory labor (ILO convention No. 29) of 1930/1946. U.S.S.R. ratified June 4, 1956.

5. Treaties pertaining to the control of narcotics. These are violated by the U.S.S.R. through proxies (China, Cuba). Examples are:

International Opium Convention, with annex and protocol, February 19, 1925. Soviet adherence October 31, 1935.

Convention for limiting the manufacturing and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs, with protocol of signature, July 31, 1931. Soviet adherence October 31, 1935.

Protocol amending the agreements, conventions, and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded 1912, 1925, 1931, 1936, December 11, 1946.

6. Treaties establishing certain rules or regulations, or prohibiting certain practices. These either have been or are being violated by the U.S.S.R.; they are antithetical to Soviet custom and observation of such agreements cannot be expected. The U.S.S.R. was not a signatory to some of these treaties before World War II, and went out of its way to act contrary to the spirit of many of the provisions. Examples are:

Geneva convention concerning the treatment of prisoners of war, with five annexes, 1949. Supersedes agreements of 1929.

Geneva convention concerning the protection of civilian persons in time of war, with three annexes, 1949.

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, December 9, 1948.

Convention on the political rights of women, December 20, 1952, and March 31, 1953.

Recognition of the Hague conventions by the U.S.S.R., March 7, 1955.

International convention for suppression of counterfeiting currency, with protocol, April 20, 1929.

Convention on forced labor, June 28, 1930.

7. Armistice agreements and/or peace treaties after World War II contained many provisions violated by the U.S.S.R., especially in treaties with the present satellite countries. The U.S.S.R. also hampered allied control commissions in carrying out their assignments. Examples of such provisions are: Free elections, noninterference in internal affairs, inspections, etc.

8. Some miscellaneous agreements wholly or partially violated by the U.S.S.R.:

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and the United States concerning establishment of diplomatic relations, with related documents. November 16, 1933. (Some provisions of this agreement, especially those in which signatories promise to refrain from certain activities, have been violated.)

Joint declaration by the U.S.S.R. and Japan pledging respect for the territorial integrity and inviolability of Manchukuo and the Mongolian Peoples Republic, April 13, 1941.

Agreement between the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom providing for limitation of naval armament and exchange of information concerning naval construction, with protocol of signature, July 17, 1937. Modification July 6, 1938. (U.S.S.R. never exchanged any information.)

November 16, 1937: (1) Convention for creation of an International Criminal Court, and (2) convention for prevention and punishment of terrorism.

Convention concerning privileges and immunities of the United Nations, February 13, 1946—U.S.S.R. accession September 22, 1953 (agreements on duties and privileges of diplomats frequently are violated by the U.S.S.R.).

Kellogg-Briand Pact. Treaty of Paris, signed August 27, 1928. Renunciation of war. Protocol concerning entry into force of the general treaty of August 27, 1928, for renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy (Litvinov Protocol). February 9, 1929, U.S.S.R.—Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania—later Lithuania, Danzig, Persia.

Commercial treaties with Albania and China have been abrogated by the U.S.S.R. to a greater or lesser degree as a result of the political disagreements with these countries.

Agreements between the U.S.S.R. and the United States regarding return of lend-lease naval vessels.

Agreements between the U.S.S.R. and other Allied Powers on establishment of provisional government, holding of elections, etc., in Korea.

Agreement by the Allied Control Council for Germany concerning establishment of three corridors for aid travel between Berlin and West Germany, November 30, 1945.

NEUTRALITY, FRIENDSHIP, MUTUAL ASSISTANCE, AND NONAGGRESSION TREATIES BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND OTHER COUNTRIES

Where the U.S.S.R. had a strategic goal or some immediate or long-range political objective, these have been violated. When this was not the case, if the other contracting party was geographically removed from the U.S.S.R., or where treaties were drawn with other Communist states, the treaties in general have been observed.

Not violated

Treaty of friendship and neutrality between the U.S.S.R. and Turkey, with three protocols, December 17, 1925.

Treaty of neutrality and nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, with exchange of notes, April 24, 1926. Extended 1931.

Treaty of neutrality and nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Afghanistan, with final protocol, August 31, 1926. Extended 1931, 1936, and 1955.

Treaty of friendship, nonaggression, and neutrality between the U.S.S.R. and Italy, September 2, 1933.

Gentlemen's agreement between the U.S.S.R. and the Mongolian People's Republic concerning mutual aid in case of attack by a third party, November 27, 1934.

Protocol of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the Mongolian People's Republic, March 12, 1936. Converted into treaty of friendship and mutual assistance, February 27, 1946.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, August 23, 1939, and secret protocol concerning spheres of interest in eastern Europe.

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Rumania, February 4, 1948.

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Bulgaria, March 18, 1948.

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Finland, April 6, 1948.

Treaty of friendship, alliance, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic, February 14, 1950.

Treaty of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance (Warsaw Pact), May 14, 1955. U.S.S.R., Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania.

State Treaty for Austria, May 15, 1955, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, France, Austria. (Not an outright nonaggression treaty, but Austria's status guaranteed by U.S.S.R.)

Violated

(NOTE.—The nonaggression pacts with the three Baltic countries were violated by the U.S.S.R. when the latter, in June of 1940, sent each country an ultimatum demanding formation of a new government and the entrance of Soviet troops into major cities.)

Treaty of friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Tannu-Tuva, August 1926 (included reciprocal recognition of independence). U.S.S.R. later annexed.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania, with two exchanges of notes, September 28, 1926. Extended 1931, 1934, reaffirmed by treaty of October 10, 1939.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania concerning the definition of aggression, with annex, July 5, 1933.

Treaty of nonaggression and neutrality between the U.S.S.R. and Latvia, March 9, 1927. Extended 1932 and 1934.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Latvia on conciliation procedure, June 18, 1932.

Pact of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Latvia, October 5, 1939.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Finland concerning nonaggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes, with protocol of signature January 21, 1932. (U.S.S.R. expelled from League of Nations for violating this treaty.) Extended 1934.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Finland concerning conciliation procedure, April 22, 1932.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Finland concerning friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance. April 6, 1947. Extended 1955.

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and Estonia concerning nonaggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes, May 4, 1932. Extended 1934.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Estonia concerning conciliation procedure, June 16, 1932.

Pact of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Estonia, September 28, 1939.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and Poland, with two protocols of signature, July 25, 1932. Extended 1934.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and Poland concerning conciliation procedure, November 23, 1932.

Joint communique by the U.S.S.R. and Poland concerning diplomatic and commercial relations, November 26, 1938. Confirms 1932 nonaggression treaty.

Note from U.S.S.R. to Poland abrogating existing treaties between the U.S.S.R. and Poland, September 17, 1939. Reason: Polish Government has "ceased to exist". Followed by joint declaration of friendship and mutual aid by the U.S.S.R. and the Polish Government-in-Exile, December 4, 1941.

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. anad France, November 29, 1932.

Convention between the U.S.S.R. and France, concerning conciliation procedure, November 29, 1932.

Treaty of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and France, with protocol of signature. May 2, 1935.

(NOTE.—The nonaggression pact was certainly violated in spirit through the Russo-German pact of 1939; and the mutual assistance pact was violated outright by the Russo-German pact of 1939.)

Treaty of mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia, with protocol of signature, May 16, 1935.

Treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovakian Government-in-Exile, with protocol, December 12, 1943.

Treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia, April 11, 1945. (Denounced by the U.S.S.R. September 28, 1949; in October, Yugoslavia accused the U.S.S.R. of having broken the treaty. Most commercial treaties between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia violated by the U.S.S.R. after the break in relations.)

Treaty between the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom concerning alliance in the war against Germany and collaboration and mutual assistance after the war, May 26, 1942. Annulled by U.S.S.R. on May 7, 1955.

Treaty of alliance and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the French Provisional Government, December 10, 1944 (annulled by U.S.S.R. May 7, 1955).

Pact of neutrality between the U.S.S.R. and Japan, April 13, 1941 (denounced by U.S.S.R. on April 5, 1945).

Treaty of friendship, collaboration, and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and Hungary, February 18, 1948 (violated as a result of Soviet actions in Hungary in 1956).

Treaty of nonaggression between the U.S.S.R. and China, August 21, 1937.

Agreement concerning the evacuation of Soviet forces from Chinese territory after the capitulation of Japan, July 11, 1945.

Treaty of friendship and alliance between the U.S.S.R. and China, August 14, 1945 (annulled by exchange of notes of February 14, 1950 between the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic. Declared null and void by Government of Republic of China on February 25, 1953—the General Assembly of the U.N. accused the U.S.S.R. of violating this treaty).

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and China concerning relations between the U.S.S.R. and China, August 14, 1945. Supplements the above treaty. Some clauses violated by the U.S.S.R.

Exchange of notes between the U.S.S.R. and China concerning Outer Mongolia, August 14, 1945 (calls for a plebiscite).

Additional agreements made about the same time (about Darien, Port Arthur, etc.), violated by the U.S.S.R. in fact or in spirit.

Exchange of telegrams between the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic concerning establishment of diplomatic relations, October 1, 1949. (On same day, the U.S.S.R. informed Nationalist diplomatic representative in Moscow that U.S.S.R. considered him to represent only the province of Canton, and would break off relations. This appears to be how the U.S.S.R. rid itself of treaty obligations with Nationalist China.)

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Wednesday the city of Washington witnessed one of the most significant demonstrations in the history of our Republic. More than 200,000 Americans—both Negroes and whites—marched from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial. In perfect order and with great dignity and restraint, they marched to show their deep concern that equal civil rights should be accorded all American citizens, regardless of their race. This is the first task of our democracy. We should do this in order to be true to our religious faith. We should do it in order to make the 14th amendment a reality in all sections of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, salient excerpts from the notable addresses delivered on that occasion, sketches of the 10 leaders of the march, and editorials on the march which have been published in a number of leading American newspapers.

There being no objection, the excerpts, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS AT LINCOLN MEMORIAL, AUGUST 28, 1963

MOST REV. PATRICK O'BOYLE, ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON

Invocation

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, amen.

Our Father, who art in heaven, we who are assembled here in a spirit of peace and in good faith dedicate ourselves and our hopes to You. We ask the fullness of Your blessing upon those who have gathered with us today, and upon all men and women of good will to whom the cause of justice and equality is sacred. We ask this blessing because we are convinced that in honoring all Your children, we show forth in our lives the love that You have given us.

Bless this Nation and all of its people. May the warmth of Your love replace the coldness that springs from prejudice and bitterness. Send in our midst the Holy Spirit to open the eyes of all to the great truth that all men are equal in Your sight. Let us understand that simple justice demands that the rights of all be honored by every man.

Give strength and wisdom to our President and Vice President. Enlighten and guide the Congress of these United States. May our judges in every court be heralds of justice and equity. Let just laws be administered without discrimination. See to it, we implore, that no man be so powerful as to be above the law, or so weak as to be deprived of its full protection.

We ask special blessing for those men and women who in sincerity and honesty have been leaders in the struggle for justice and harmony among races. As Moses of old, they have gone before their people to a land of promise. Let that promise quickly become a reality, so that the ideals of freedom, blessed alike by our religious faith and our heritage of democracy, will prevail in our land.

Finally, we ask that You consecrate to Your service all in this crusade who are dedicated to the principles of the Constitution of these United States. May we be sensitive to our duties toward others as we demand from them our rights. May we move forward without bitterness, even when confronted with prejudice and discrimination.

May we shun violence, knowing that the meek shall inherit the earth. But may this meekness of manner be joined with courage and strength so that with Your help, O heavenly Father, and following the teaching of Christ, Your Son, we shall now and in the days to come live together as brothers in dignity, justice, charity, and peace. Amen.

REV. DR. EUGENE CARSON BLAKE, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

I wish indeed that I were able to speak for all Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox Christians as I speak in behalf of full justice and freedom for all, born or living under the American flag.

But that is precisely the point. If all the members and all the ministers of the constituency I represent here today were ready to stand and march with you for jobs and freedom for the Negro community together with all the Roman Catholic Church and all of the synagogues in America, then the battle for full civil rights and dignity would be already won.

I do, however, in fact, officially represent the Commission on Religion and Race of the National Council of Churches.

For many year now the National Council of Churches and most of its constituent communions have said all the right things about civil rights. Our official pronouncements for years have clearly called for "a nonsegregated church in a nonsegregated society." But as of August 28, 1963, we have approved neither a nonsegregated church nor a nonsegregated society.

And it is partially because the churches of America have failed to put their own houses in order that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, 175 years after the adoption of the Constitution, 173 years after the adoption of the Bill of Rights, the United States of America still faces a racial crisis.

We do not, therefore, come to this Lincoln Memorial in any arrogant spirit of moral or spiritual superiority to "set the Nation straight" or to judge or to denounce the American people in whole or in part.

Rather we come—late, late we come—in the reconciling and repentant spirit in which Abraham Lincoln of Illinois once replied to a delegation of morally arrogant churchmen. He said "Never say God is on our side, rather pray that we may be found on God's side."

We come in the fear of God that moved Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, whose memorial stands across the lagoon, once to say:

"Indeed, I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just."

Yes, we come to march behind and with these amazingly able leaders of the Negro Americans. We come to present ourselves this day; our souls and bodies, to be "a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service," in a kind of tangible and visible sacrament which alone in times like these can manifest to a troubled world the grace that is available at Communion table or high altar.

MATHEW AHMANN, CATHOLIC CONFERENCE FOR INTERRACIAL JUSTICE

Who can call himself a man, say he is created by God, and at the same time take part in a system of segregation which destroys the livelihood, the citizenship, family life and the very heart of the Negro citizens of the United States?

Who can call himself a man, and take part in a system of segregation which frightens the white man into denying what he knows to be right, into denying the law of his God?

The wind of the racial revolution has finally bent the reeds of the conscience of our people. Never before has the direction we must take been so clear. Yet, many bend before the winds of justice in confusion; the balance yet lies with the silent and fearful American.

It is he who sees the direction of the future dimly before his conscience, who must act, if a wholesome integrated community of Negro and white Americans is to be built without violence and without rending this country's spirit.

The United States of America is a country which produced the Marshall plan, helped resurrect the spirit and economy of Europe with great dedication and billions of dollars. We have come to the aid of the refugees of the world.

What man can say that this great country with its democratic ideals, its vital and resilient spirit, its sophisticated resources cannot bring an end to racial discrimination at home now, and within a decade or two end the other disabilities under which, for so long, so many Negro citizens have labored.

We dedicate ourselves today to secure Federal civil rights legislation which will guarantee every man a job based on his talents and training; legislation which will do away with the myth that the ownership of a public place of business carries the moral or legal right to reject a customer because of the color of his hair or of his skin.

We dedicate ourselves to guarantee by legislation that all American citizens have integrated education and the right to vote on reaching legal age.

We dedicate ourselves today to secure a minimum wage which will guarantee economic sufficiency to all American workers, and which will guarantee a man or a woman the resources for a vital and healthy family life, unencumbered by uncertainty, and by racial discrimination. A good job for every man is a just demand, and it becomes our motto.

But, we are gathered, too, to dedicate ourselves to building a people, a nation, a world which is free of the sin of discrimination based on race, creed, color or national origin; a world of the sons of God, equal in all important respects; a world dedicated to justice, and to fraternal bonds between men.

RABBI JOACHIM PRINZ, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

I speak to you as an American Jew.

As Americans we share the profound concern of millions of people about the shame and disgrace of inequality and injustice which make a mockery of the great American idea.

As Jews we bring to the great demonstration, in which thousands of us proudly participate, a twofold experience—one of the spirit and one of our history.

In the realm of the spirit, our fathers taught us thousands of years ago that when God created man, he created him as everybody's neighbor. Neighbor is not a geographic term. It is a moral concept. It means our collective responsibility for the preservation of man's dignity and integrity.

From our Jewish historic experience of three and a half thousand years we say:

Our ancient history began with slavery and the yearning for freedom.

During the Middle Ages my people lived for a thousand years in the ghettos of Europe.

Our modern history begins with a proclamation of emancipation.

It is for these reasons that it is not merely sympathy and compassion for the black people of America that motivates us, it is above all and beyond all such sympathies and emotions a sense of complete identification and solidarity born of our own painful historic experience.

When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned many things. The most important thing that I learned in my life and under those tragic circumstances is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most shameful, and the most tragic problem is silence.

A great people which had created a great civilization had become a nation of silent onlookers. They remained silent in the face of hate, in the face of brutality and in the face of mass murder.

America must not become a nation of onlookers. America must not remain silent. Not merely black America, but all of America. It must speak up and act, from the President down to the humblest of us, and not for the sake of the Negro, not for the sake of the black community but for the sake of the image, the idea and the aspiration of America itself.

Our children, yours and mine in every school across the land, every morning pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands and then they, the children, speak fervently and innocently of this land as a land of "liberty and justice for all."

The time, I believe, has come to work together—for it is not enough to hope together, and it is not enough to pray together—to work together that this children's oath—pronounced every morning from Maine to California, from North to South—that this oath will become a glorious, unshakable reality in a really renewed and united America.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH, SLEEPING CAR PORTERS

We are gathered here in the largest demonstration in the history of this Nation. Let the Nation and the world know the meaning of our numbers. We are not a pressure group, we are not an organization or a group of organizations, we are not a mob. We are the advance guard of a massive morale revolution for jobs and freedom.

This revolution reverberates throughout the land touching every city, every town, every village where black men are segregated, oppressed and exploited.

But this civil rights revolution is not confined to the Negroes; nor is it confined to civil rights. Our white allies know that they cannot be free while we are not. And we know that we have no interest in a society in which 6 million black and white people are unemployed, and millions more live in poverty.

Nor is the goal of our civil rights revolution merely the passage of civil rights legislation.

Yes, we want all public accommodations open to all citizens, but those accommodations will mean little to those who cannot afford to use them.

Backs school aid

Yes, we want a Fair Employment Practice Act, but what good will it do if profits geared to automation destroy the jobs of millions of workers, black and white?

We want integrated public schools, but that means we also want Federal aid to education, all forms of education.

We want a free democratic society dedicated to the political, economic, and social advancement of man along moral lines.

Now, we know that real freedom will require many changes in the Nation's political and social philosophies and institutions. For one thing we must destroy the notion that Mrs. Murphy's property rights include the right to humiliate me because of the color of my skin.

The sanctity of private property takes second place to the sanctity of a human personality.

The plain and simple fact is that until we went into the streets the Federal Government was indifferent to our demands.

All who deplore our militants, who exhort patience in the name of a false peace, are in fact supporting segregation and exploitation. They would have social peace at the expense of social and racial justice. They are more concerned with easing racial tensions than enforcing racial democracy.

The months and years ahead will bring new evidence of masses in motion for freedom. The march on Washington is not the climax to our struggle but a new beginning, not only for the Negro but for all Americans, for personal freedoms and a better life.

Look for the enemies of Medicare, of higher minimum wages, of social security, of Federal aid to education, and there you will find the enemy of the Negro, the coalition of Dixicrats and reactionary Republicans that seek to dominate the Congress.

We must develop strength in order that we may be able to back and support the civil rights program of President Kennedy.

We here, today are only the first wave. When we leave it will be to carry on the civil rights revolution home with us, into every nook and cranny of the land. And we shall return again, and again, to Washington in ever-growing numbers until total freedom is ours.

MRS. DAISY BATES, NAACP DIRECTOR

The women of this country, Mr. Randolph, pledge to you, to Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins and all of you fighting for civil liberties, that we will join hands with you as women of this country.

We will kneel-in, we will sit-in, until we can eat in any counter in the United States. We will walk until we are free, until we can walk to any school and take our children to any school in the United States. And we will sit-in and we will kneel-in and we will lie-in if necessary until every Negro in America can vote. This we pledge you, the women of America.

WALTER P. REUTHER, AUTO WORKERS PRESIDENT

For 100 years the Negro has searched for first-class citizenship. I believe that they cannot and should not wait until some distant tomorrow—they should demand freedom now. Here and now.

It is the responsibility of every American to share the impatience of the Negro Americans. And we need to join together, to march together and to work together until we've bridged the moral gap between American democracy's noble promises and its ugly practices in the field of civil rights.

There is a lot of noble talk about brotherhood and then some Americans drop the brother and keep the hood.

To me, the civil rights question is a moral question which transcends partisan politics, and this rally today should be the first step in a total effort to mobilize the moral conscience of America and to ask the people in Congress of both parties to rise above their partisan differences and enact civil rights legislation now.

Now the President—President Kennedy—has offered a comprehensive and moderate bill. That bill is the first meaningful step. It needs to be strengthened. It needs FEPC and other stronger provisions. And the job question is crucial; because we will not solve education or housing or public accommodations as long as millions of American Negroes are treated as second-class economic citizens and denied jobs.

I am for civil rights, as a matter of human decency, as a matter of common morality. But I am also for civil rights because I believe that freedom is an indivisible value. That no one can be free unto himself, and when Bull (formerly Safety Commissioner Eugene) Connor with his police dogs and firehoses destroys freedom in Birmingham he is destroying my freedom in Detroit.

This rally is not the end, it's the beginning. It's the beginning of a great moral crusade to arouse America to the unfinished work of American democracy. The Congress has to act. And after they act, we have much work to do.

ROY WILKINS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NAACP

We came to speak here to our Congress, to those men and women who speak here for us in that marble forum over yonder on the Hill.

They know, from their vantage point here, of the greatness of this whole Nation, of its reservoirs of strength, and of the sicknesses which threaten always to sap its strength and to erode, in one or another selfish and stealthy and specious fashion, the precious liberty of the individual which is the hallmark of our country among the nations of the earth.

We want employment and with it we want the pride and responsibility and self-respect that goes with equal access to jobs. Therefore we want an FEPC bill as a part of the legislative package.

Now for 9 years our parents and their children have been met with either a flat refusal or token action in school desegregation. Every added year of such treatment is a leg iron upon our men and women of 1980. The civil rights bill now under consideration in the Congress must give new powers to the Justice Department to enable it to speed the end of Jim Crow schools, South and North.

Now, my friends, all over this land, and especially in parts of the Deep South, we are beaten and kicked and maltreated and shot and killed by local and State law enforcement officers.

It is simply incomprehensible to us here today and to millions of others far from this spot that the U.S. Government, which can regulate the contents of a pill, apparently is powerless to prevent the physical abuse of citizens within its own borders.

Now, the President's proposals represent so moderate an approach that if it is weakened or eliminated, the remainder will be little more than sugar water.

Now, we expect the passage of an effective civil rights bill. We commend those Republicans in both Houses who are working for it. We salute those Democrats in both Houses who are working for it.

In fact, we even salute those from the South who want to vote for it but don't dare to do so. And we say to those people, just give us a little time, and one of these days we'll emancipate you. They'll get to the place where they can come to a civil rights rally, too.

If those who support the bill will fight for it as hard and as skillfully as the southern opposition fights against it, victory will be ours.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

There will be neither rest nor tranquillity in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our Nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

And that is something that I must say to my people who stand on the threshold which leads to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds.

Again and again, we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force. The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers as evidenced by their presence here today have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny.

Never be satisfied

There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, "When will you be satisfied?" We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their selfhood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating "for whites only." We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

No; we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like water and righteousness like a mighty stream.

Now, I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells.

Continue to work with the faith that honor in suffering is redemptive. Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

Now, I say to you today, my friends, so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a State sweltering with the people's injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with—with this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope.

JAMES FARMER, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CORE

(Delivered by Floyd B. McKessick, national chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, for Mr. Farmer, who is in jail in Louisiana on charges stemming from civil rights demonstrations.)

From a soft Louisiana parish jail, I salute the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. Two hundred and thirty-two freedom fighters jailed with me in Plaquemine, La., also send their greetings.

I wanted to be with you with all my heart on this great day. My imprisoned brothers and sisters wanted to be there too. I cannot come out of jail while they are still in; for their crime was the same as mine—demanding freedom now. And most of them will not come out of jail until the charges are dropped or their sentences reversed.

I know that you will understand my absence. So we cannot be with you today in body, but we are with you in spirit. By marching on Washington your tramping feet have spoken the message—the message of our trouble in Louisiana.

You have come from all over the Nation and in one mighty voice you have spoken to the Nation. You have also spoken to the world. You have said to the world by your presence here as our successful direct action in numberless cities has said, that in the days of thermonuclear bombs, violence is outmoded to the solution of the problems of men.

It is a truth that needs to be shouted loudly. And no one else anywhere in the world is saying it as well as the American Negro through their nonviolent direct action.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1963]

Sketches of the 10 Leaders of Civil Rights March on Washington

MATHEW AHMANN

Executive director of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice. Was organizer and executive secretary of the National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago a year ago. Graduate of St. John's University in Minnesota. Author of "The New Negro" and "Race: Challenge to Religion." Married, father of four children. Thirty-one years old. Did graduate work in sociology at the University of Chicago. Was social worker for the Chicago Department of Welfare. Acted as business and circulation manager of Today magazine. Field representative of the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago. Later, its assistant director and action director.

DR. EUGENE CARSON BLAKE

Chief executive officer of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. President of the National Council of Churches of Christ until 1957, now serves as vice chairman of the council's commission on religion and race. Urbane, toughminded liberal. Attended Lawrenceville School, Princeton, and Princeton Theological Seminary. Taught school in India, taught religion at Williams College and has held pulpits in Pasadena, Calif., Albany, N.Y., and New York City. Was an opponent of McCarthyism in the 1950's. Arrested in a Baltimore civil rights demonstration this summer. Fifty-six years old. Is married to the former Valina Gillespie. No children.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Founder and president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Helped direct the Negro bus boycott in Montgomery, Ala., in 1956 and the Birmingham demonstrations last May that preceded the summer's national wave of protests. Has been in jail at least 12 times. Travels 200,000 miles a year on civil rights business. Son of a clergyman, is copastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta. Left Morehouse College in Atlanta in 1948 to attend Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa., where he was voted outstanding student in his class. Received Ph. D. from Boston College in 1955. Married to the former Coretta Scott. Is 34 years old. Has three children.

JOHN LEWIS

Chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. At 25, youngest of civil rights leaders. Former philosophy student at Fisk University, Nashville. Graduate of American Baptist Seminary. Took part in freedom ride from Washington to Birmingham, Ala., in 1961. Beaten by white mob when riders arrived at Montgomery, Ala. Arrested 24 times in civil rights demonstrations. Was also attacked by a white during a freedom ride stop in South Carolina. Succeeded Charles McDew, becoming the third chairman of the student committee, known popularly as SNICK. Is a member of the militant Nashville group, which has provided a number of leaders to the civil rights struggle. Is unmarried.

FLOYD B. M'KISSICK

National chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality. Marching in place of CORE president, James Farmer, who chose to remain in jail in Louisiana rather than come to Washington. Joined civil rights movement at age of 12 when pickets from his home town of Asheville, N.C., demonstrated at the State capitol in Raleigh against lack of accreditation for the Negro law school at North Carolina College. Graduate of University of North Carolina Law School, where he became the first Negro to attend after winning a suit to force his admission. Largely authored the Durham plan, successful negotiating formula used in Durham and other North Carolina cities. Married to the former Evelyn Williams. Has four children.

RABBI JOACHIM PRINZ

President of the American Jewish Congress. Expelled from Germany by Adolf Eichmann in 1937, when he was rabbi of the Berlin Jewish Community. Rabbi of Temple B'nai Abraham in Newark, N.J. in 1939. A lifelong Zionist, he quit the active Zionist movement when Israel became a nation in 1948, a step that brought him much criticism. Has been in frequent civil rights controversies. Won a libel suit against a rightwing magazine that called him a Communist. Has been a U.S. citizen since 1944. Married to the former Hilde Goldschmidt. Has four children, one by adoption. Is 61 years old.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

Director of the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. Founder and president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. Only Negro vice president of the AFL–CIO. Organizer of two previous mass movements on the Capital, including the march-on-Washington movement in 1941, the antecedent of today's march, which prompted President Franklin D. Roosevelt to establish the Fair Employment Practices Commission. Born in Crescent City, Fla., son of a preacher. Worked his way through the City College. Arrested in 1917 but soon released for opposition to entry in World War I. Is 74 and married to the former Lucille Campbell—and to the works of Shaw and Shakespeare.

WALTER P. REUTHER

President of the United Automobile Workers Union, vice president and head of the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO. An oldtimer at picketing and labor demonstrations. One of three members of the AFL–CIO executive council who strongly criticized that group's failure earlier this month to endorse today's march. Is married to the former May Wolf. Has two children. Is 55 years old. Father and grandfather were active union officials. Completed high school through night courses. Active tennis player, swimmer, and hiker. Received CIO's award for furthering fight against racial discrimination in late 1940's.

ROY WILKINS

Executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Chairman of the leadership conference on civil rights. Joined the NAACP in 1931, after resigning the managing editorship of the Kansas City Call. Served as assistant secretary, under the late Walter White. Elected to succeed White in 1955. Native of St. Louis, was graduated from University of Minnesota in 1923. Married the former Aminda Badeau in 1929. Is 62 years old. Succeeded Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in 1934 as editor of the Crisis, official organ of the NAACP. Avid reader and author in his own right. Received elementary and secondary education in St. Paul.

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

Executive director of the National Urban League. Forty-two years old. Former dean of Atlanta University's School of Social Work. Abandoned premedical studies for social work after combat engineer duty in the Army in Europe in World War II. Joined staff of St. Paul Urban League in 1947. Became director of Omaha Urban League in 1950. Quit in 1954 to accept the Atlanta University post. Served on the President's Committee on Youth Employment and the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. Received the Florina Lasker award in 1959 for outstanding achievement in the field of social work. Elected head of National Urban League in 1961.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1963]

Living Petition

Freedom—the sound and spirit of the word alike—reverberated yesterday across the grounds of the Washington Monument. At the end of the Mall, inside the great Memorial erected to his memory, the gaunt, grave, silent figure of the Great Emancipator sat and listened, remembering, perhaps, the words of other marchers for freedom long, long ago: "We are coming, Father Abraham, 300,000 strong." Surely Abraham Lincoln yesterday heard the voices singing "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah," demanding fulfillment at last of the promise for which he lived and died, and shouting with simple faith in themselves and in their fellow Americans: "We shall overcome. We shall overcome."

They came from every portion of America. California had a throng there under a proudly held banner of the State. There was a delegation from West Memphis, Ark. The NAACP of Evansville, Ind., turned out in strength. So did the NAACP of Shreveport, La., and of Erie, Pa., and of Pittsfield, Mass., and of an endless catalog of the towns and cities of the land.

Every kind and class of American was there. The Vermont Stone Cutters Association formed a goodly group. The Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workers of North America, the United Automobile Workers, the civil libertarians of every hue, the Protestants, Catholics and Jews, white men and black men, black women and white women, children and their parents and their grandparents, the humble and the great—all were present. America sent to that great meeting in her Capital the representatives of every one of her manifold aspects and estates.

It was part picnic, part prayer meeting, part political rally, combining the best and most moving features of each. It was a happy crowd, much more gay than grim, full of warmth and good feeling and friendliness, instinct with faith and high hope, united in a sense of brotherhood and common humanity. It was a most orderly march, not with the precision of a military parade but with the order that grows out of a clear sense of common purpose, a fixed and certain destination.

No one could view that vast sea of faces turned upward toward the Lincoln statue without an awareness of commitment and dedication. No one could hear the scourging words spoken yesterday by A. Philip Randolph and Martin Luther King and others without a sense of guilt and grief and shame. No one could hear the tones of Marian Anderson's deep and beautiful voice singing, "He's Got the Whole World in His Hands," without profound emotion and involvement.

If the words spoken yesterday were heard by Abraham Lincoln at one end of the Mall, let us hope that they were heard by the Congress of the United States at the other end. For this was something much more than a mere outlet for emotion. Dr. King was altogetehr right in saying that "Those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the Nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquillity in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our Nation until the bright day of justice emerges."

There is a magnificent opportunity at hand to cut out once and for all a cancer in America demeaning and degrading to all Americans. Not Negroes alone, not white libertarians alone but Americans in general marched yesterday—and must march in unity and in brotherhood tomorrow and tomorrow.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1963]

Equality Is Their Right

The huge assemblage of Negro and white citizens in Washington yesterday to demand equality in all aspects of American life embodied, in concept and in execution, the noblest tradition of our democracy. It reflected their conviction that, if enough of the people demonstrate that they care enough, no force in the United States is more powerful than an appeal to conscience and to basic morality.

They massed, 200,000 strong, at the Lincoln Memorial beside the seated figure of the President who signed the Emancipation Proclamation a century ago. Their declarations of resolve to make that freedom real—in jobs, voting rights, schools, housing, and access to places of public accommodation—echoed Lincoln's own warning: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

From President Kennedy came assurances that most Americans have given decisive recognition to the principle that every citizen is entitled to full participation in the national community. How decisive this recognition is in Congress will be demonstrated in the action of the House and Senate on the President's omnibus civil rights bill. The marchers made it plain that they regarded the administration package as a minimal legal underpinning for equal treatment and equal opportunity. Any substantial dilution, in the words of Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, would make the bill "little more than sugar water."

The discipline maintained by the civil rights pilgrims was as impressive as their dedication. That so vast a movement could be carried out with such decorum is a tribute to the responsibility of both leaders and followers—a responsibility not always evident in other demonstrations.

It was a day of special gratification for A. Philip Randolph, the 74-year-old leader of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, who perhaps more than any other American, has consecrated his life to the fruition of the civil rights movement. The massive dignity that has always been his armor against the walls of racial exclusion was the dominant characteristic of the crusade he led to the Capital.

Whether the march will change any votes on Capitol Hill no one can be sure. The segregationists lost no time in making it plain that they were unimpressed—that, if anything, they were more confirmed than ever in their hostility to the President's program. But for those who were uncommitted the spirit of the marchers and the depth of feeling that brought them hundreds of miles to Washington must leave a mark. The Reverend Charles Billups, captain of a busload of Alabama Negroes, may have summed it all up best.

"The only weapon we have," he declared, "is protest. This ride isn't going to be a waste of time. I think this march will be remembered indefinitely." So do we.

[From the Chicago's American, Aug. 29, 1963]

A Smiling March

The great anxiety among friends of the Negroes in their struggle for full civil rights was that the march on Washington should be carried out in good order.

It did better than that—it was carried out in extreme good nature. With something like 200,000 people engaged in it, it moved in a smiling mass from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial.

The object of the march was to persuade Members of Congress to vote for the civil rights bills. Some of the Members called this "a new concept of lobbying." It was not, however, actually new. It had been tried out, unsuccessfully, by Coxey's Army 70 years ago and by the bonus marchers in 1932.

Most of the Congressmen no doubt already had their minds made up on the civil rights bill, but in any case they were on hand to meet the Negro leaders and discuss the matter with them. This was made much simpler by the fact the marchers were not scowling threats of reprisal but were friendly and confident.

The marching crowd was, naturally, mostly Negro, although thousands of white people were in it too. The marchers had poured into Washington from every part of the United States to join in the demonstration. They had come by air, by train (a couple trainloads were from Chicago), by automobile, and by bus. Their presence made it clear that the Negroes were deeply resolved to get the rights given them by the Constitution, and that countless white people were ready to help them.

The gathering of the huge crowd into an organized unit was a tremendous task, and we congratulate the planners and managers—mostly Negroes—on accomplishing it brilliantly.

A well-arranged, dignified march on Washington has been carried out at last, and it is a pleasure to give credit for it to the organizing genius of Negro leaders and to the good sense and friendly outlook of the Negro marchers.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 29, 1963]

Yesterday's March

James Baldwin, the talented Negro writer, dealt perceptively with the problem in a brief, off-the-cuff interview during yesterday's historic march on Washington.

It is time, he said, for Americans to get over their terror of the Negro.

If it is time, and we think it is, the march should have great impact.

Clear across the land the fearful had predicted trouble. Much Washington business was closed on the ostensible theory that traffic jams thus would be limited. But another motive was fear of vast disorder. The simple fact is the Nation's Capital, aside from the assembly area, practically was deserted—as quiet and as traffic-free as on a Sunday morning.

The conduct of the great throng, estimated at more than 200,000, put those fears to shame. The marchers were orderly, well mannered, and quietly dressed.

There was no disorder.

For this, great credit is due the Metropolitan Police and police reserves, the National Guard, and other special forces pressed into service for the occasion. These men conducted themselves in a remarkably friendly, kind, and relaxed manner. It was almost as if they, themselves, had been caught up in the excitement of brotherhood. In any case, they left no doubt as to whose comfort and safety they were there to insure.

The marchers disciplined themselves. They waited patiently for their turn to cross the street, standing aside so those in the rear could see. And their speakers were both dignified and articulate.

To our mind, the spirituals of Mahalia Jackson and the inspired eloquence of the Reverend Martin Luther King most closely reflected the spirit of the throng, and the applause they evoked could be heard for blocks beyond the Lincoln Memorial. Indeed, it was heard around the world.

Reverend King termed the Negro "an exile in his own land."

When the Negro tried to cash the check of liberty written in the Declaration of Independence, he said, it came back marked "insufficient funds." But still, he said, he refused to believe the "bank of justice" is bankrupt and urged faith and trust in white citizens saying, "We cannot walk alone."

No one, of course, can walk alone, of whatever race or nationality or condition. The human family, inevitably, grows closer and closer. And as another speaker said yesterday, in a world which has created the thermonuclear bomb, malice is a suicidal urge. If the Negro's firm determination to win social progress by peaceful protest proves itself, he will have contributed immeasurably to the stability of the institutions which, in aggregate, represent civilization itself.

Close your eyes to the dark complexion of the great majority of the watchers and one heard the lesson loud and clear; then this did not seem essentially a Negro demonstration at all. It was a gathering in the authentic American tradition of trying to get ahead through barriers of class and station. The spiritual overtones were phrased in the still familiar catchwords of the American Revolution and independence.

All in all, yesterday's march was a respectful exercise of the right of the people to assemble and petition for redress of grievances. It is difficult to deny the justice of the list of eight demands to which they pledged themselves, though many may question the suggested methods of achieving them.

The judgment of those who inspired the march, and persisted against the advice of even many of their friends, was amply vindicated.

The demonstration is bound to have a favorable effect, both on Congress and the country.

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 29, 1963]

The March and Its Meaning

Yesterday in Washington, all in all, was a good day. The fact that such a massive demonstration could be brought off without serious mishap was in itself historic. The organizers of the demonstration, and local officials, deserve all our congratulations.

There was, not surprisingly, bitterness in the speeches. Yet the things that seemed to set the mood of the occasion—and that stick in one's mind today—were the good-natured things. The cheerful manners displayed throughout—the expectant atmosphere at the Washington Monument as each arriving group added its enthusiasm to the congregation—bobbing signs on sunlit Constitution Avenue, packed for an hour with a chanting tide of strollers—tired feet being cooled in the Reflecting Pool—all the singing—especially Mahalia Jackson, suddenly bringing the crowd to roaring life with her proud trumpet voice—the hypnotic swing of Martin Luther King's oratorical finale. And above it all the shadowy figure of Lincoln, pensive and benevolent on his marble throne.

The march, no doubt, gave Negroes new confidence in themselves and what they can accomplish; otherwise, it seems unlikely to have much effect on civil rights progress, one way or the other. Not many minds were changed—certainly not in Congress. Television watchers around the country who found themselves moved by the proceedings were not segregationists when they tuned in. Perhaps the zeal of the marchers themselves, and of other activists in the cause, may have been sharpened by the experience here. On the other hand, surveys seem to indicate a bad reaction, in presumably sympathetic urban areas, to the whole concept of this demonstration. Whether, on balance, the effort of August 28 was worth it in a practical sense will be debated for a long time to come.

It will not have been worth it if the euphoria of the occasion leads to impossible hopes. In the day's speeches, one line recurred again and again: "We want freedom now." It is important that all concerned understand what these words legitimately mean—and what they cannot mean. They cannot mean that the Negro is going to achieve full status in our system now, no matter who wishes it. If he expects otherwise, he is doomed to cruel disappointment.

Freedom, yes—in a formal sense. The Negro is entitled to freedom from legal restraints on his citizenship rights. He is justified in insisting, with support from all Americans, that no law should inhibit his education, housing, public accommodations, access to jobs, political expression, and the like. As a matter of fact, however, he is not going to obtain even these minimum objectives immediately and everywhere. And when he has obtained them, as he must—when his Government finally treats him as an individual citizen, without regard to the color of his skin—the problem of Negroes as a group will not have been solved. Long after legal segregation is gone, economic and social segregation will remain. The only process that ultimately can lead large numbers of Negroes out of their trap of frustration is the hard, slow, cumulative process of education. It will happen, but not now. Not this year, or next year, or in this generation.

All intelligent Negro leaders know this. Though no one said it at the Lincoln Memorial yesterday, they did sing it. The anthem of this revolution is: "We Shall Overcome—Someday." That last word was put there by someone who knew the difference between truth and demagoguery.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 29, 1963]

A GREAT DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The march on Washington was an inspiring example of constructive citizenship. It proved that a vast number of people can assemble in order, and dignity, for a righteous cause.

The demonstration in the Nation's Capital was in every way a credit to all its leaders, and to all its participants. They did what they planned—to speak in a mighty voice for equal rights for all. Credit also goes to the police, who conducted themselves superbly, to the administration, which gave intelligent counsel, and, we might add, to potential troublemakers who decided on restraint.

The cynic can say that the marchers didn't change a single vote in Congress. They may ask: What was accomplished?

Well, the mere fact that there was a demonstration, in such size and organized success, advanced the cause of racial equality. It was a skillful piece of propaganda, of course, but the march on Washington can't be ignored as a persuasive force. Call it pressure if you will, but it was pressure—peaceable, decent, and honorable—for what is right.

The spirit of the demonstration spoke eloquently for individual rights, and its orderliness reflected the nobility of its purpose and the dedication of its movers. We have in truth witnessed a historic day in the fight for democratic ideals.

CHICAGO URBAN LEAGUE STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Mr. Edwin C. Berry, the highly respected executive director of the Chicago Urban League, presented to me a forceful and impressive statement of his views on the President's civil rights legislative proposals and other legislation in this field. Mr. Berry writes with great authority and understanding of the effects of discrimination against Negroes in public accommodations, schooling, employment, voting, and the administration of Federal programs. His statement is constructive, and deserves the attention of all Members of Congress. I hope it will be widely studied; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EDWIN C. BERRY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHICAGO URBAN LEAGUE, SATURDAY, AUGUST 3, 1963, IN THE OFFICE OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, CHICAGO

The administration's civil rights program is an imperative first step to help Negroes in Illinois and the Nation break down barriers which restrict their rights to equal opportunities.

The President's omnibus civil rights package represents the historic high water mark by the Federal Government in the proposal of plans and policies necessary to wipe out second-class citizenship. While it is the furthest Government has ever gone nationally toward providing the framework for civil rights solution, it nevertheless represents the irreducible minimum of legislation urgently needed for progress in human rights.

There can be no compromise on this legislation. There can be no watering it down. The alternative to passage of this legislation may well be a reign of strife and violence paralyzing our cities which could do untold and irreparable damage to our society.

In brief, the Government's program calls for:

1. Equal access for all citizens to public places such as hotels, restaurants, and theaters.

2. Empowering the Attorney General to file suits against school boards accused of racial discrimination and to provide aid for school districts that are desegregating.

3. Broadening the Federal manpower and training programs to reduce unemployment.

4. Strengthening the powers of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities, headed by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

5. Creation of a Federal community relations service to assist biracial committees in towns and cities to bring about orderly integration.

6. To extend the life of the Federal Civil Rights Commission.

7. To strengthen Negro voting rights by a Federal statute guaranteeing the right of any person with a sixth grade education to vote.

To begin with, I would like to point out that the Nation as a whole and all minority groups in particular will benefit if these forward steps are passed by Congress. Life will hold new meaning, dignity, and opportunity for 20 million Negroes as well as many millions of other minority group persons if the President's program is enacted. There are more than 1 million Mexican Americans, 5,500,000 Jews, 900,000 Puerto Ricans, 500,000 American Indians, and 700,000 persons of oriental descent, as well as millions of persons of the Catholic faith who frequently encounter bias and who will be benefited by the President's bills.

In addition, the implementation of civil rights legislation will provide a spur that may yet energize the sluggish pace of economic growth, reduce the welfare load, reduce expenditures for delinquency and dependency, and curtail the staggering burden of foreign aid expenditures necessitated, in part, by the resentment of colored people abroad to practices of racial discrimination in this country.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

If anything, property rights of individual businessmen will be enhanced and property values increased rather than curtailed by these civil rights proposals. In a very practical sense, the dollar value of any business which excludes certain groups from its patronage is going to be markedly less than the dollar volume of businesses which enjoy nonrestrictive sales policies. Reports from the South concerning department stores which have voluntarily desegregated indicate an early upsurge at the cash register.

The only persons who ought be denied the right to patronize public places are those who are drunken or disorderly and whose presence poses a real, rather than a fictional threat to property rights. Property values in America have been increased by the labor and toil of persons from every nation in the world and representing every faith, race and walk of life.

Recently, novelist John Howard Griffin, author of "Black Like Me" darkened his skin color and went into the South. The black Mr. Griffin was denied service at numerous restaurants and department stores. He then removed his artificial color and returned to the same places of business to find that he was served and accepted. It is ludicrous for diehard southern spokesmen to contend that Mr. Griffin, the white man, did not jeopardize property rights but that Mr. Griffin, the Negro, did. If anyone is placing the property rights of a businessman in jeopardy, it is those in business themselves who restrict their dollar volume by their failure to serve all men regardless of creed or color.

The public accommodations plank will benefit Negroes traveling through not only the South but through Northern and Western States, too. Right here in neighboring Indiana a recent civil rights survey cited in the Hammond Times states that in 16 cities customers are denied service because of their color in 22 percent of roller rinks, 23 percent of motels, 31 percent of trailer courts, 45 percent of all taverns, and 56 percent of all nursing homes, even though Indiana, like 29 other States, has a public accommodations statute.

Negroes, today, must wear an invisible mask of psychological scar tissue because of their rejection by headwaiters and motel operators and drugstore soda jerks. The Negro cannot say "I want a soda" or "I want a glass of water" but "Where can I get a drink of water?" or "Where can I get a soda?" The further south one travels in Illinois, the more frequent is the discrimination encountered in public places. As a general rule, it would seem that State investigatory commissions are too understaffed to give early attention to charges of discrimination in public places brought by Negroes. Moreover, if past performance is any kind of guide, the passage of a Federal law outlawing bias in public places will give countless fairminded and courageous businessmen throughout the Nation a rationale to take the lead in integrating their businesses. Those who presently fear to act contrary to local custom can take pride in the fact that a new national law will have been passed obliging them to open their doors to Negro Americans.

It is our conviction that the public accommodations section should be strengthened to include stringent penalties against businessmen who would deny service to Negroes. Men must be judged in the American tradition—on their merits as individuals—rather than on their ethnic or racial origins. It is the most galling injustice to see a Negro judge denied a cup of coffee in a diner while a white hoodlum dines at leisure at the counter.

SCHOOLS

A plank in the proposed legislation of urgent concern to Negroes in both the North and the South is that of racial segregation in the public schools.

The Government reports that since the historic Supreme Court decision of 1954 striking down the concept of "separate but equal" and advising school districts to exercise "all deliberate speed" in desegregating, only 8 percent of southern school districts have desegregated their facilities. It has been said that, at this rate of progress, it will require another century before all southern school districts have integrated. Here in Chicago, the number of integrated schools is hardly any different than that of the South. Ninety percent of all pupils attending elementary schools are enrolled in institutions that are completely or virtually schools of all, or one, race. As you know, studies by the Urban League have found that Negro students here are attending schools with older facilities and fewer facilities, with more substitute and more uncertified teachers, and with less vocational and training opportunities than their white counterparts. It is not surprising then to recognize why half of all Negro youths in Chicago fail to earn their high school diplomas. Although their need for quality and equality of education is great, they are being systematically starved and deprived of the knowledge which is indispensable to the exercise of their obligations as citizens and to their right for equal opportunities in employment.

At the same time, the preference of all-white and all-Negro schools instills feelings of inferiority in Negro children and feelings of racial superiority in white children. White children today are developing the unrealistic idea that they are personally superior while Negro children develop the equally unrealistic idea that they are personally inferior. Both concepts are fallacious, detrimental to the healthy development of the individual, and foster personality characteristics which conflict with the values of the American democratic tradition. A growing body of evidence indicates that confusion, conflict, moral cynicism and disrespect for authority is occurring in white children because of the schism between our religious and democratic principles of brotherhood and actual practices of segregation. The white pupil in the all-white school begins to feel that the moral law does not apply to him, that racial exclusion is preferable; and acquires distorted views of Negroes with whom he has had no contact. In turn, Negro pupils suffer feelings of inferiority and personal humiliation which confuse them about their individual worth, seriously lower their levels of aspiration and hinders their capacity to learn and relate to others. There is no evidence that Negro pupils in segregated schools can distinguish whether their institutions are segregated by law, as in the South, or because of housing segregation, as in the North.

A Federal law empowering the Attorney General to file suit against a discriminatory school system would have particular meaning here in Illinois where local school boards, under the provisions of the newly passed Armstrong law, are obliged to cease and desist from discrimination.

The administration's proposal could be strengthened by an amendment requiring segregated districts to submit desegregation plans as well as timetables for orderly changes in keeping with the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in a case concerning Memphis, Tenn., in which the Court declared that, "The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now."

On the subject of education, I would like to point out that, in my opinion, the current riots against Negroes, such as the one in Englewood, stem, in good measure, from segregrated schooling. The arrogance which segregation instills in white children, as well as a cynical disrespect for law and order and the notion that they are above the law, is visible in the tragic drama now being enacted in Englewood, where hundreds of teenagers are roaming the streets in defiance of the Negroes' right to live where they please.

These teenagers may have been taught about democracy, but it is difficult to believe that words about equality are little more than abstractions when delivered in an all-white classroom in an all-white school in an all-white neighborhood. The white power structure here might also point out that the right to live where one pleases in accordance with their ability to pay is the right which Negroes are attempting to assert by nonviolent means. They should not be denied this right by violence. If Englewood area homeowners are so concerned about property values, they can begin helping to maintain them by refraining from throwing rocks through windows.

The Federal Government ought also assist Negroes in education by requiring many of the smaller colleges which discriminate against them to accept them under the public accommodations section. This should also include banning of quota systems against Negroes and other minorities by the better white medical and law schools.

EMPLOYMENT

In employment, a condition of chronic economic depression hovers like a pall over Negro communities throughout the Nation. In Chicago 11 percent of the Negro labor force is unemployed because of discrimination and automation. Moreover, in no year since the termination of the Second World War has unemployment among Chicago Negroes been less than 10 percent. The President has said that any community suffering from chronic unemployment in excess of 7 percent is a depressed area and entitled to special Federal aid. I would like to point out that this city's Negro ghetto—housing 900,000 persons comprising a population greater than the entire city of Cleveland, Ohio—constitutes such a depressed area where joblessness, hopelessness, and despair are mortared into the brick and cement of everyday life.

While Negro income has been increasing here and nationally, it has not kept pace with increasing income reported by white families. According to figures by the National Urban League, the median annual income of Negro families has declined in the past decade from 57 percent that of white family income to 53 percent of white family income. Today, the Negro male worker has a median annual income of $3,075 as compared with the male white worker's $5,137. In my opinion, it is extremely difficult for any worker to support a family on $5,137—or $100 a week—much less $3,075, or about $60 a week.

For these reasons, it is imperative that FEPC legislation be enacted by the Congress to outlaw discrimination in private industry, even though it has not yet been requested by the President. The recommendations of Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and ABRAHAM RIBICOFF calling for an FEP statute on the Connecticut State model ought be translated into legislation and law. Their recommendations, which would bar bias by unions as well as employers, and in promotion and apprenticeship and other training programs, are indispensable if Negroes are to achieve a higher level of self-sufficiency.

Negroes have been systematically denied equal opportunities in unions, apprenticeship programs, and vocational schools because of their color. The results lead to reports like the one by the U.S. Census Bureau on craftsmen, foremen, and other related workers in Chicago for 1960. This report disclosed that, of 345,000 workers in these areas, only 18,181—or 5.3 percent—were Negro, although Negroes made up about 25 percent of the city's population. Some excerpts from that report document the stone wall of racial hatred which exists against Negro jobseekers.

"In 1960, only 603 of 22,239 carpenters were Negroes, or 2.8 percent; only 322 of 14,050 electricians were Negroes, or 2.3 percent; only 1,310 out of 13,986 painters, paper hangers, and glaziers were Negroes, or 9.4 percent; only 270 of 11,240 plumbers and pipefitters were Negroes; only 62 out of 2,264 structural metal workers were Negroes; only 48 out of 5,969 tinsmiths, coppersmiths, and sheet metal workers were Negroes—less than 1 percent; out of 1,039 boilermakers, only 34 were Negroes; out of 29,041 machinists and job fitters, only 1,059 were Negroes; out of 11,742 printing craftsmen excluding compositors and typesetters, only 252 were Negroes; out of 1,371 airplane mechanics, only 50 were Negroes; out of 2,416 locomotive engineers, only 4 were Negroes; and out of 1,553 locomotive firemen, only 21 were Negroes."

A Federal FEP law which says that industry must hire qualified Negroes, but which fails to open up labor unions, training programs, and vocational schools to permit Negroes to qualify themselves for skilled employment is only kidding. Americans who adhere to the interracial community of thought will no longer stand for such tomfoolery.

While it is true that Negroes are making headlines each week concerning their breakthroughs in new employment, progress into the skilled, managerial, and professional areas appears to be far less rapid than the rate at which unskilled and semiskilled blue collar Negroes are being automated out of work.

In the professions and white collar positions, anti-Negro bias has turned our downtown areas, at rush hours, into places which resemble a snowstorm with only a few colored flakes sprinkled in. Nationally, only 1 Negro in 16 holds a white collar job, compared with 1 of 6 white employees. Locally, fields such as insurance, banking, finance, electronics, and mass communications remain predominantly all-white citadels. In the communications field, there is no clearer indication of America's dilemma than the news policies of the press, radio, and television with their full coverage of civil rights and their general dedication to the concepts of equality on one hand—and their hiring policies on the other hand.

A Federal FEPC could crumble the fortresses of discrimination before the majesty of the law. Here in Illinois, the passage of a State FEP act in 1961 brought a flood of phone calls to the Urban League from employers requesting qualified Negroes. More than 100 corporations, government offices, and other places of business, hired Negroes for the first time or promoted Negroes to skilled or professional positions for the first time through the offices of the Urban League as a direct result of the new law. While significant gains were made, the relatively weak Illinois statute is not sufficiently inclusive to bring most employers under the purview of nonbias legislation. A supporting Federal law regulating interstate commerce would provide a framework within which Negroes who have fought for their country will have the opportunity to work for their country.

A Federal law regulating employment is desperately needed because the hiring and promotion policies of employers—if the Chicago record is any yardstick—range from tokenism to racism. Racism must go and tokenism must go. The great corporations in America, who control the bulk of the wealth, the resources, and the financing for our free enterprise system must extend the American heritage of free enterprise to all qualified men who labor and toil rather than to only qualified white men. As the Bureau of Jewish Employment Problems reported here 4 years ago, at least 1,484 Chicago firms are known to bar Jews, Catholics, or Protestants from office jobs. Some 700 of these firms are large corporations, some of which held at that time Federal contracts. More recently, the American Jewish Congress reported that discrimination by private employment agencies in six major cities, including Chicago, is "shockingly widespread" and that 90 percent of the employment agencies surveyed agreed to fill telephone calls for "a white Protestant stenographer" even though they are prohibited from doing so by State law.

The magnitude and enormity of discrimination against Negroes was spelled out by the Bureau of Jewish Employment Problems report. It studied the records of white collar employment agencies which had in their files 30,000 applications for help. Findings showed that 27 percent of the positions involved discrimination on the basis of religion or nationality and that 98 percent of the openings excluded nonwhites. While I have no doubt that these figures have improved a few percentage points since 1959, I am also convinced that the average qualified Negro in Chicago today, more likely than not, will be discriminated against at the employment agency, in the employers' offices, in the union office, in the vocational school, and in the apprenticeship program. In short, every single means by which a man might enter into the work force in order to support himself and his family is almost certain to represent an economic bottleneck through which he can only creep on all fours toward the shining goal of a decent job.

While the President's program for broadening the Federal manpower and training agencies are vital, it is imperative that a bill barring discrimination in apprenticeship, on-the-job training and other joint labor-management training programs must be enacted. A bill introduced several weeks ago by Representative OGDEN REID of New York calling for the creation of a five-member apprenticeship training commission appointed by the President to regulate labor organizations, employers and certain other hiring and training organizations would do much to get at the taproots of employment discrimination and deserves public support.

Until job bias is removed, Chicago will continue to suffer losses which have been estimated at a minimum of $500 million annually. This is sheer economic stupidity. It is a flagrant waste of purchasing power, manpower and brainpower. Nationally, the Urban League estimates the country's losses from employment discrimination alone at $28 billion. Viewed another way, if job bias continues to siphon off money at this rate, we shall have suffered an economic loss at the end of 11 years great enough to have paid off our entire national debt of $306 billion.

A nation which has invested billions of dollars to conserve its timber stands and water resources can do no less than undertake the conservation of its human resources. Discrimination not only produces income losses to minorities by the denial of jobs and promotion, but it increases the task of employers to find qualified personnel and strains the public taxing resources while making it difficult for the depressed minorities to carry a greater share of the tax load.

It is a travesty for corporations holding Government contracts to actively promote that discrimination which weakens the Nation at home and hinders its military posture abroad. The principal purpose of military and economic expenditures is to secure the outposts of democracy around the globe from assault by dictators. Yet, it is anomalous and ironic that those manufacturing the weapons of defense should, by their moral and legal dereliction, put propaganda weapons into the hands of our enemies. There is strong evidence, here and elsewhere, to indicate that many defense contractors sworn to uphold fair hiring and promotion policies stand in naked contempt of their obligations. Legislation strengthening the powers of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities would be a blow to discrimination at home and to our enemies abroad.

Unemployment in our urban ghettos is an economic time bomb ticking toward an explosion of tragic proportions. Fifty percent of Negro males between the ages of 16 and 21 have no gainful employment and are on the streets this summer. Many of their fathers, the hardest hit by automation and discrimination, are also sitting on their front porches. If these are denied the opportunity to forage for food in socially acceptable patterns—if they cannot work, they will beg or steal—but these men will not stand by idly while their families go hungry. The congressional committees taking testimony on the civil rights programs are trifling with time. While no man should presume to tell Congress how to work, the Congress ought recognize that it is taking testimony concerning men who are out of work and who are out of patience with being out of work. If the Congress wishes to avoid a reign of strife, and public disorder paralyzing our urban centers and stifling our economic growth, it must act swiftly to adopt and implement the President's programs for relief and change.

Negro Americans are in total revolt against the status quo. They are not only fighting for their liberty, but for life itself.

OTHER PROPOSALS

The President has asked the Congress to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission and to strengthen Negro voting rights. These are excellent measures and should be adopted. The plank calling for creation of a Federal community relations service to assist biracial committees speed integration in towns and cities across the Nation is also priority legislation if public order is to be preserved. In cities having agencies like the Urban League, the pace of integration generally appears to be more rapid and winning greater communitywide acceptance by men of all colors.

In our opinion, however, the proposal on voting might be significantly improved by urging universal suffrage rather than requiring persons to have at least a sixth grade education before they can vote. In Louisiana, we are told that 58 percent of that State's Negroes could not fulfill this educational requirement. Thus, persons with the greatest interest in electing responsible school board officials to improve their educational opportunities will be still denied the right to do so, and a vicious cycle will be perpetuated. In addition, the suggestion to establish Federal voting registrars to enroll Negroes on a wholesale basis strikes us as a sound one. A Federal building, like the post office, flying the U.S. flag and manned by Federal civil service employees protected by armed marshals is obviously needed in many communuities where, men today are being shot, intimidated and assaulted in the attempt to exercise their constitutional voting right.

Negroes must be protected from violence when they seek to vote. An addition to the Federal civil rights package empowering the Attorney General to file civil rights suits to guarantee the right to vote and to be protected from police brutality should be passed.

In addition, the general public must be spared the burden of seeing their Federal taxes poured into the ratholes of discrimination. No public moneys should be allocated by the Government for any project which will indulge bigots with the spectacle of separate facilities, or for construction of segregated schools or military installations or for the construction of any federally aided project or public works built by discriminatory contractors.

For instance, if Mississippi is to get the proposed $400 million Federal space research center, it must be built without separate lunchrooms and toilets. This would not only prevent the immoral waste of tax dollars for duplicate and degrading facilities, but would have a salutary educational value by preparing Mississippians for the coming shock that they will not find any separate toilet facilities on the moon.

The withholding of any Federal aid for any segregated project, whether a sewer in a depressed area or an Army base in a thriving one, embodies the "tax dollar concept" which the National Urban League and other civil rights agencies believe is a vital one in laying Jim Crow to rest. By applying the concept in all areas of Federal jurisdiction, from public works to banks which make use of the Federal deposit system, the Government's task of destroying discrimination will have been advanced on a broad frontier.

An example of the exercise of this authority right here in Chicago would be the right of the Federal Public Housing Authority to withhold approval of U.S. moneys for construction of housing by the Chicago Housing Authority on sites built inside of, or contiguous to, predominantly Negro areas if reasonable evidence exists that such sites will contribute to the ghetto pattern of development. Under the President's Executive Order No. 11063 on equal opportunity in housing, local housing agencies may still concentrate low-rent projects in predominantly Negro areas. By applying the tax dollar concept to this well-intended Federal order, the Public Housing Authority could prevent the CHA from erecting a number of sites which they now seek to build in predominantly Negro areas of residence on grounds that no Federal taxes can be used to promote segregation.

SUMMARY

It has been estimated that discrimination costs this Nation an estimated $28 billion in employment alone. When the aggregate total of racial hatred in employment, housing, education, health and welfare and foreign aid is added up, the total in billions of dollars must be nearly beyond the imagination of mortal man to grasp. This toll is all the more unbearable because it is needless. Moreover, the ramifications of our discrimination overseas are such that the whole question of national survival enters into the picture.

When Negroes are deprived of their just rights in Little Rock or Deerfield, the loss is not restricted to those persons directly affected, both white and black, but to the entire Nation. The time has come to recognize that injustice at home arms our enemies abroad. The North Koreans were regaled with tales of our discrimination against Negroes for years before being incited to attack South Korea. There is a direct relationship between the deaths of American troops in Korea, Laos, or Vietnam at the hands of foreign colored soldiers and the activities of white supremists here. Those who oppose serving Negroes in restaurants or admitting them to suburban housing may face the sterner test of taking on two-thirds of a world peopled by men of color who resent the insults and indignities heaped on their diplomats and first citizens assigned to counsels and missions here. Thus, learning to live amicably with Negroes at home is an indispensable prerequisite to learning how to live with the rest of mankind. The surest way to prevent the Soviet Union or any other Communist power from "burying us" is to bury Jim Crow first.

To our credit, after nearly 350 years, we have begun to face up to our obligations and responsibilities as a people. The disturbances sweeping the Nation during this sum-

mer of change and discontent are deep, serious, and grave. But they need not be schismatic and destructive. They represent a rendezvous with our consciences which, we as a people, ought to welcome with glad hearts. Let us take strength from the fact that this Nation has begun at last to put away its tradition of racial hatred and discrimination. In so doing, what began as a Negro revolution and has broadened into a revolt by all minorities for a better day, may yet broaden into a second American revolution as breathtaking and earthshaking as the shot heard around the world in 1776. This second American revolution, with its growing support by all manner of men, black, white, yellow, Christian, and Jew, shows every promise of completing the business that was begun by the first American revolution. It shows promise of giving all men the right to representation at the ballot box as well as the burden of taxation at the assessor's office. It shows promise of giving to those men who were not created equal the right to create themselves equal. And it gives to all Americans, regardless of race, faith, or belief, the opportunity to unify the Nation so that the distinctions of the past which have separated us for so long may give way to a democracy of the present which shall unify us forever.

A TRIBUTE TO LABOR

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on the Fourth of July it is the customary practice to remind ourselves of the unstinting heroism and selfless sacrifice of our Founding Fathers. This is as it should be. Contemporary America would not have been possible without the contributions of the men of the American Revolution.

However, we did have another struggle, a continuing struggle, which we commemorated yesterday. This is the movement of labor for a decent standard of living for themselves and for their children, for a life of honor and self-respect in the community at large, for a future free from the evils of man's inhumanity to man.

Labor has worked long and hard to make possible the economic gains which nowadays we often take for granted. Minimum wages, workmen's compensation, and child labor prohibitions were unheard of a generation or two ago. But due to the untiring efforts of working people all over this Nation, we now look upon these laws as indispensable to the health, welfare, and security of all.

Important as these economic gains have been, labor should also be recognized for its contributions to some of the major social gains of this century. These social gains have benefited not only those in the ranks of labor, but also the general citizenry of our Nation. I refer, for example, to those among the trade-union movements of the past who strongly urged the creation of a comprehensive public school system. Today, there are in the ranks of labor those who continually urge modernization and updating of that school system, which has come to be among the best in the world.

Labor should also be given credit for its part in extending civil rights in the history of this country. Before 1860, the right to vote was often denied to those who did not own property. Early union movements sought to give all wage earners the right of the franchise.

In recent times, labor has fought to extend civil rights to all. Organized labor has sought to give to the American Negro the same political, economic, and social rights and privileges which other Americans have taken for granted over the years.

In many ways, these social gains and the economic gains are part and parcel of the same advances made by labor. Economic gains, such as those I have mentioned, and such additional ones as old-age pensions, industrial safety laws, and the broad coverages of the social security system, undoubtedly help the workingman. But who is to deny that by helping the workingman, such laws ultimately help the general society to make social advancements?

Who is to deny that social gains—such as extended franchise rights and civil rights—and educational gains—such as a modern public school system—eventually redound to the benefit of all—the workingman and the community at large?

In this sense, the American labor movement has heeded well the counsel of a pioneer organizer, Samuel Gompers, who stated:

> I do not value the movement only for its ability to get higher wages, better clothes, and better homes. Its ultimate goal is to be found in the progressively evolving life possibilities in the life of each man and woman. My inspiration comes in opening opportunities that all alike may be free and live to the fullest.

Without a doubt, Mr. President, labor will be accorded their proper place in the history of a developing America. We who today are their beneficiaries should spend a day in thanksgiving for their sacrifices and efforts of the past. The general affluence of our society and the pervasive intellectual and institutional advancements of our country are in great measure due to the contributions of labor.

Labor, however, duly recognizes the challenges it faces in the future. Labor organizations fully realize that social programs must be continued and expanded, for the benefit of all. Toward this end, we find various labor groups committed to all types of community programs, ranging from help for the aging and rehabilitation for the physically disabled, to consumer counseling services and service to all children and youth.

Labor duly recognizes the challenges it faces with regard to the trust and faith entrusted to it. We find evidence of this in making a comparison between the losses suffered by companies that furnish bonds to union officials, as well as to officers of banks, savings and loan firms, and similar financial institutions. These figures indicate that the losses are significantly smaller among the thousands of union officials who are now required to be bonded under the Landrum-Griffin Act, as compared to the millions of dollars paid out annually to cover thefts by those who are bonded in other institutions. In 1961, for example, premiums paid by banks and other institutions totaled $23,944,000, with losses amounting to $17,095,000, for a loss ratio of 71.4 percent. In the same year, premiums paid by unions totaled $1,462,000, with losses at $257,000, for a loss ratio of 17.6 percent.

In the previous year, the difference was even greater. Premiums paid by banks and other institutions totaled $21 million, with losses at $17 million, for a loss ratio of 81 percent. Unions, on the other hand, paid a total of $1,402,000 in premiums, with losses amounting to $104,000, for a loss ratio of 7.4 percent.

William Botkin, international secretary-treasurer of the International Woodworkers of America, indicated that labor unions are now compiling figures, over a 5-year period, including premiums, losses, and the amounts recovered from guilty individuals, to support labor's attempts to receive lower rates on bonds for union officials. I am certain the figures will prove that on the basis of past and present performances, labor deserves much lower rates.

Labor is meeting this challenge and is discharging itself rather well. But on the basis of what I have said, it should not be concluded that all labor unions are pristine pure and lily white. Continuing efforts must be made by labor organizations to discharge fully and honestly the public trust. Every indication is that this is precisely what is happening.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join with millions of other citizens of this country in paying tribute to the workingman of America, who, through his various organizations, has indelibly left his mark on the pages of our history.

AVERELL HARRIMAN EXPLAINS THE ATOMIC TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Averell Harriman deserved a full-fledged welcome when he returned to Washington after the negotiation and initialing of the treaty that soon will come before the Senate for approval. Perhaps it was better, however, that he was not so honored, for it would have been somewhat incongruous to greet, with a many-gunned salute, a man who had just negotiated a nuclear test ban agreement. In the absence of any official ceremony to recognize such an accomplishment, the simple, informal, and wholly sincere welcome extended by his friends and neighbors was a most moving and appropriate event.

I ask unanimous consent that an article, by Max Freedman, which expresses well the mood of that occasion and the stature of the man who was honored, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 31, 1963]

HARRIMAN EXPLAINS A-TEST TREATY—INSIGHT INTO HOPES THAT INSPIRED PACT FOUND IN ENVOY'S RESTRAINED REMARKS

(By Max Freedman)

Sometimes a small occasion explains a great event. That happened on Sunday night when Mr. Harriman returned to Washington after reporting to President Kennedy on the negotiations in Moscow which produced the test ban treaty. A group of friends and admirers gathered outside his home to welcome him after his successful mission. It was no time for a set speech but in his informal remarks Mr. Harriman gave the whole country a sudden revealing insight into the purposes and hopes which inspire the treaty.

For anyone with a sense of history, it seemed specially appropriate that Mr. Harriman should have brought back this treaty. He knew Russia in the compulsory comradeship of war. Just as he had later been the first to predict the range of Stalin's ambition. Now, in different conditions, he had returned with a treaty which may open a new and better phase in the cold war. There was no boasting about peace with honor, no predictions about peace in our time. His restraint in the hour of triumph reminded everyone of the President's somber warning that there are no shortcuts on the road to peace.

But think of the credentials which give Mr. Harriman the right to be heard on the subject of our relations with Russia. He recalled his visit to Russia with Lord Beaverbrook in one of the darkest periods of the war when England and America were eager to hasten the flow of arms to our stricken Soviet ally. He knew how dauntless Stalin could be in war and how deceptive in peace. He is no casual student of Russia, feeding on superficial impressions. When he tells us that something new is happening in Russia to which we should pay attention, his advice is worth heeding.

He sees cracks in the ancient Soviet tyranny. The brutality of Stalin's day is gone. Inside the Kremlin there is a liberation from old fears. No ferment of freedom is visible in Russia. But Mr. Khrushchev wants to be known not only as the man who made the Soviet Union strong in the nuclear age but as the leader who gave new security and abundance to the Russian people. He cannot achieve these results while the world is dominated by the arms race and is threatened with nuclear war.

Mr. Harriman thinks Mr. Khrushchev wants to prove that his doctrine of coexistence produces peace and prosperity, while the more militant Chinese doctrine brings only fear and poverty. At no time did Mr. Harriman suggest that the time of peril has passed for America. He assumed that he was speaking to a generation of responsible Americans who had learned a great deal about Russian communism since 1945. He said Mr. Khrushchev shares Stalin's faith in the inevitable victory of communism; but Mr. Khrushchev thinks this victory will be won by peaceful competition. That competition should be greatly welcomed by America.

The American people by this time should be wise enough and experienced enough to be able to lower their fears without lowering their guard. The test ban treaty is no more than a foundation for peace. Our task now is to strengthen that foundation and then, over the years, see what kind of a structure for peace can be built.

Mr. Harriman thinks Mr. Khrushchev hates nuclear war as much as President Kennedy does and is ready to join in common action to prevent it. This shared interest in survival, is, in fact, the best sanction against Russian cheating or Russian betrayal of the treaty. For Russia's breach of the treaty, or its repudiation, would give the signal for an intensified arms race that would bring new dangers to mankind.

By the same token, the refusal of the Senate to ratify, or its willingness to do so only with reservations, would make America responsible for new perils to peace. The Senate would then be saying it does not trust the President's initiative when he tries to reduce world tensions. It would be saying that any negotiated settlement with Russia is impossible or futile or contrary to America's interest. No such message to Russia or the world will be given by the Senate. It will debate the treaty frankly and carefully, as it should, and then will ratify it by a wide margin.

Mr. Harriman made no partisan claims. He recalled that former President Eisenhower had worked for such a treaty. The model for the Republicans today, quite plainly, is General Eisenhower, not Senator Lodge against President Wilson.

If Mr. Khrushchev had stood outside Mr. Harriman's home, his faith in the treaty would have been confirmed. He would have understood that Mr. Harriman is not soft on communism but is strong for peace. The same is true of the American people.

PHILIP GRAHAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish I could have come to know better the late Philip Graham. His eloquence, dedication, and fundamental decency were exhibited well by a feature article published on Sunday, August 11, in the Washington Post. Excerpts from Philip Graham's speeches and articles during his 17 years as president of the Washington Post were reprinted with brief identifications, and with an introduction by Alfred Friendly. For the wisdom they contain, I ask unanimous consent that selected portions of these writings be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CAREER OF ELOQUENCE REFLECTS PHILIP GRAHAM—NEWSPAPER EXECUTIVE SPOKE ON BROAD RANGE OF SUBJECTS

(A chief executive who excelled: The Washington Post enjoyed the rare fortune of having a chief executive who excelled in the abilities central to fulfilling its purpose.

That Philip L. Graham, as president, should have set the goal, fixed the policy of the newspaper and headed its business operations was taken for granted—although there was vast admiration for his way of doing it. But what was unique was the fact—accepted without resentment and with great pride by the staff—that Mr. Graham could outsleuth the paper's star reporters, outthink its sagest pundits, outwit its most genial spoofers and outwrite its fanciest—or most fancied—stylists.

Some selections from what he wrote and said during the 17 years he was head of the Washington Post are presented here as a portrait and measure of the man.—A. F.)

[Identification notes appear in parentheses]

DIGNITY AND FREEDOM

(The hundreds of thousands of words that Philip L. Graham produced in an intensely articulate career revealed a constant reaching for ideals and a consistent rejection of ideology. There were only two pieces of doctrine he was willing to embrace and these, perhaps, were only opposite sides of the same coin: All men are children of God; their dignity and freedom are ends in themselves. In a speech 13 years ago to the Association of National Advertisers he approached the issue by discussing its antithesis.)

At that year's (1903) conference of the Russian Social Democratic Party, which was held in exile abroad, a delegate asked whether the absolute authority of the party, demanded by Lenin and his associates, was not contradictory with those fundamental liberties which were the avowed end of socialism. He asked whether even the "sacrosanctity of the person" could be violated by the party. The party's answer was that, if the revolution demanded it, everything must be sacrificed. There was no "sacrosanctity of the person" * * *.

These doctrines have developed into the terrifying new mark of our times. Up to now, whatever the disagreements between philosophers and politicians as to the answers of questions, there was agreement about the importance of the questions. Questions about what kind of life man should lead, about the existence and meaning of God, about the way man should be governed.

The new mark of Leninism was the assertion that the way to answer questions was by wiping out the questions themselves. This meant what we have come to see in the Soviet Union—the elimination of reason except for narrow practical and technical accomplishments. The aim of the system is to eliminate great questions from the minds of its citizens by propaganda, by terror, by death. Then it is possible to have a state with only one goal, "a smoothly working machine providing for the needs of such of its members as are permitted to survive." When we understand that, we understand the seriousness of happenings that once struck us as strangely odd if not even humorous. Thus, the punishment of Shostakovich for not following the "line" in music. Or the violent insistence on opposition to all established knowledge about genetics.

Here is the complete triumph of security over freedom. It reaches its fullest flowering in that complete degradation of mankind shown by the late George Orwell in his "1984." Implicit in the system is the idea that man was created with a brain not to seek after truth, but just so he could have a somewhat better knack than rhinoceroses in creating material wealth.

It should be obvious then that our peril lies not just in the Russian manifestation of this system but in the broad system itself. The possibility of "coexistence," to which Stalin refers with purring calm at intervals that suit his purposes, is obviously inconceivable. The chasm between us is as wide as our belief in the meaning of man. The stakes are not just free enterprise, or the American way of life. They are the stakes of civilization, that period whose name connotes man's emergence from the animal kingdom.

(A year later, in 1951 after discussing the same history, Mr. Graham spoke to a meeting of his old fraternity chapter at the University of Florida.)

The Russians are so dedicated to and fanatical about their totalitarian program that they have created a fear that penetrates more than our international arrangements. They have so awed us with their threats and their evil, that we find spreading suspicion and distrust in our domestic lives. We are adopting some strange habits for a people who have grown great in the pursuit of reason and the search for truth. We are now wondering whether self-preservation does not demand restrictions on thinking and limitations on ideas.

I think much of our present odd behavior comes from the fact that we have taken freedom for granted for so very long that we have failed to remember its qualities. Freedom does not require that a man believe in the Republican Party or white supremacy or the progressive income tax or collective bargaining. What freedom requires is a belief in the importance of man—man as created in God's image—which God, and this is an essence of freedom, some men may deny exists.

Freedom asserts that man's life is important; not just so he can have a Cadillac or a dishwasher or make money, but because his life, the life of every different one of us, is a manifestation of some great and mysterious force.

This is an idea that is immeasurably more powerful than Stalin's 175 or 400 divisions. Because it denies Stalin's ideas that man is just an accidental piece of furniture—something to be fitted into 5-year plans, or fifth column groups, or concentration camps.

Faith in the power of freedom is the real hope for our survival.

(Two years ago, Mr. Graham was called on to speak to the National War College on "Public Support for Cold War Requirements." He quipped that he had a preeminent qualification to do so since he was "beginning to get to be old enough to know that there are seldom any answers to big questions." But his answer was that freedom built public support.)

If I have any slight insight into the problem of achieving public support in times of crisis, it is that we should never cheapen the underlying nobility of freedom—and freedom alone makes the subject of public support relevant to a serious discussion of our serious problems. Too often we do cheapen this aspect of freedom. We are willing to win quick and fleeting public approval by high pressure, by phony emotional appeals.

How many times have you heard this false analogy argued: that since we are a nation of salesmen we ought to be able to sell the system of freedom, as though freedom, which has its roots so deep in the spirit that none of us can every fully comprehend it, can be cheaply equated to filter cigarettes?

We should all beware of shortcuts, of tricks, of easy ways to gain public support of our Nation's aims. The long, slow process of better education; the difficult building of decent environments which give every man dignity and self-respect and a sense of responsibility; the sustaining of the complex sort of culture in which freedom can flourish and the nobler aspects of the human spirit can unfold—all of these are the essential underpinnings of true popular understanding—of public support which is more meaningful and more powerful than the purported streamlined efficiency of the dictators.

About the future it is not given to man to have knowledge. Man can only have faith.

Paradoxically, my faith has been more rekindled by a citizen of the Soviet Union in recent years than by any other man. For I feel that no one can read the great novel and the poems of the late Boris Pasternak without realizing that a love of freedom is a deeply central part of all human nature.

If you lend your efforts to the constant recreation of an atmosphere congenial to freedom, I have faith that this deep central yearning of the best of mankind will determine the future of mankind. President Kennedy calls it the revolution of freedom—and it is the most revolutionary force on earth. Public support for the cause can be evoked by decent leadership—not only by that of Presidents, but by the sort of leadership you are destined for. And in one of those beautiful circular movements of life, decent leadership evokes decent public response, and decent public response ennobles decent leadership, and the good can continue begetting and enlarging the good.

At least, that can be our faith.

THE M'CARTHY THREAT

(By the early 1950's, Philip Graham had long been discussing the menace to freedom from communism. He now saw, in McCarthyism, the single most important threat to freedom from the domestic scene. His opposition to Senator McCarthy had been instant, unremitting and total. Some of his reasons are found in a speech to the National Council of Jewish Women in Washington on May 18, 1953.)

The value of exercise in behalf of freedom is so obvious that I don't intend to dwell on it. Certainly we all learn as the years go by that there is nothing dear and precious and fine in this life that can be kept alive without loving care and attention. As parents we all know that a human warmth with our children is not a thing merely to be purchased at a toy counter or a task to be delegated to someone else. And the same is true of freedom—freedom is nothing at all to be turned over to a babysitter.

The two dominant assaults against freedom today are, of course, being made by the Communists on the one hand and, on the other hand, the self-styled anti-Communists who are convinced that the way to defeat totalitarianism is by becoming even more totalitarian.

I want now to pay my brief respects to a second powerful force which is also assaulting freedom. It is a force built upon the bewilderment and sincere anxiety of people who are legitimately alarmed over what communism has done to civilization. Fear and bewilderment and frustration are familiar qualities in times of great historical crises. Occasionally a leader appears who has the evil genius of turning these reactions into a dominant force against the more noble qualities of humanity. Lenin and Stalin performed this role in Russia and Hitler performed it in Germany—Huey Long was willing to attempt it in the America of depression times. And now McCarthy is attempting a similar exploitation of our troubles.

He is a man of savage ability and primitive shrewdness—enjoying that exemption from the rules of decent civilization which the semicivilized so often claim. And in less than 5 years he has achieved in distorted form the ambition of many young men of ability. He has earned a place for himself in our history books for he has wrought incalculable harm to the real security of our Nation and to freedom.

(Among the abominable outgrowths of McCarthyism, Mr. Graham insisted, were the governmental loyalty security programs. He spoke of them to the National Civil Liberties Clearing House in Washington on May 17, 1955.)

These programs—carried on through both Democratic and Republican administrations—simply fail to acknowledge the dignity of the individual. And just as it is possible to rationalize arbitrary actions in the property sphere, so we have abundant rationalizations of the loyalty security programs.

For example: "No man has a right to work for the Government." This is solemnly uttered and solemnly believed. Yet at least 1 out of 12 working adults works directly for the Government and many more work for Government contractors and so are covered by the loyalty security program. And I should estimate that at least 2 million of the 5,000,000 Government employees have to work for the Government, having been invited to do so by General Hershey.

There are, of course, many other rationalizations. Once again we hear about what is practical. The standard form goes like this: If enough Communists get into enough sensitive Government positions they could take over the Government. If they took over the Government they would deny all freedom. Therefore, it is said, the loyalty security programs are justified—as a practical necessity—and what is Ladejinsky hollering about anyway?

The curse of such expediency is that after one embraces it, it is so anesthetic that one forgets all history.

Thus in the loyalty security programs—and in related fields—we have lost all sight of the history of human credibility. Our system of law has discovered over hundreds of years that many people—and the number expands in times of excitement—are conscious or unconscious liars. This has been one of the great historical discoveries of civilization and so has been our painstaking development of measures for guarding against this propensity for prevarication.

Yet even the simplest sort of safeguard—that of confrontation of accusing witnesses—has been ignored by these new programs. And so we live through the national shame of Mr. Matusow and Mrs. Natvig, neither of whom is an unfamiliar type to those legendary schoolboys who read McCauley.

As an exintelligence officer I recognize the need for truly undercover operatives against fifth columns. As a semiliterate person, I also recognize that the cause of our difficulties is the Communist conspiracy and not Roy Cohn.

But I cannot believe that we can long tolerate the stupidities of things like the loyalty security programs and still keep the flame of freedom alive. I cannot but believe that this period of adult delinquency must and will be soon behind us. Very soon I pray we will return again to a living belief in the dignity of man—to Churchill's "unfailing faith that there is treasure if you can only find it in the heart of every man."

(Unsparing in his criticism of his own calling, journalism, Mr. Graham saw no need to be hesitant about aiming barbs at his former profession, the law. He raised the question of lawyers' failure to act on the loyalty security programs in an address to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on November 15, 1951.)

But what has happened to the voice of the legal profession during the years that these problems have been in ferment? To many who have listened for it, the bar has appeared suddenly struck dumb.

Over 30 years ago this association raised its voice against the expulsion of the Socialist legislators at Albany. One of your most eminent members, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, added to the literature of liberty when he reminded the legislature for this association that "it is of the essence of the institution of liberty that it be recognized that guilt is personal and cannot be attributed to the holding of opinion or to mere intent in the absence of overt acts." At about the same time, 12 distinguished lawyers, led by Dean Roscoe Pound, agreed as a public service to examine the deportation raids of Attorney General Palmer.

Only 13 years ago, the Supreme Court decided that the Constitution extended to Mr. Frank Hague's Jersey City, despite his contrary view. There appeared as amicus curiae in the Hague case, the American Bar Association's Committee on the Bill of Rights, composed of such leaders of the bar as Douglas Arant, Zechariah Chafee, Grenville Clark, Lloyd Garrison, Monte Lemann, John Francis Neylan, and Charles Taft. If there has been such a committee in the past 6 years, its existence has become a closely guarded secret.

That is not to say there have been no expressions of concern from the legal profession. The roster of opposition to the American Bar Association's support of a special oath for lawyers, for example, contained some eminent names. But they are largely the men who did the same work 20 or 30 years ago. The hush of quiet seems to typify many of those generations of the bar who are junior to Charles C. Burlingham, John W. Davis, or John Lord O'Brian.

It is to the shame of this great profession that others have largely provided the leadership and taken the blows in defense of those constitutional rights of which you should be especial guardians. A group of businessmen, the Committee for Economic Development, saw fit to publish a serious and intelligent analysis on "National Security and Our Individual Freedom," but nothing vaguely comparable has come from the bar. It is to the credit of this association that you have given attention to the need for establishing procedural standards for congressional committees. But by and large the bar has shown little interest in that degradation of our democratic institutions of which Senator McCarthy has become symbolic. When a Senator proposed a sort of loyalty investigation for all Federal judges as though they were postmasters or county agents, when another Senator announced that a Federal judge in Hawaii would not be reappointed because his ideas on reasonable bail did not coincide with the Senator's ideas, when Congressmen filled the RECORD with attacks on the rulings of Judge Kaufman—on all those occasions and on others, many people waited for the bar's support of the American tradition of an independent judiciary and, save for a few honorable exceptions, they waited in vain.

Especially needed in these times of fear has been the creation of some respected body to examine how we can achieve a better balance of individual freedom and national security. The President—after some initial reluctance—proposed such a Commission and appointed to it a group of most distinguished Americans headed by Admiral Nimitz. Senator McCarran, who cannot imagine making any adjustments in the name of individual freedom, has managed to prevent the operation of the Nimitz Commission. So in the fall of this year, in a remarkable state document, the President of the United States asked the American Bar Association to turn its attention to the same matters. He reminded the bar that: "Lawyers of the past have risked the obloquy of the uninformed to protect the rights of the most degraded." He concluded by saying: "I believe the bar has a profound contribution to make in this vital area of national policy and practice, and, moreover, has a moral responsibility to make that contribution."

There is no evidence to date that this unique appeal from the President to the bar has awakened that moral responsibility.

I thought of the ironical fact of that excellent document of the Committee for Economic Development which I have mentioned. That document is a reminder to the American people of the claims of individual freedom, and it was produced by a group of businessmen under the leadership of a retail merchant. In the days of our past when the American ideals were being given their original form, our countrymen relied for such reminders upon Thomas Jefferson and not upon the forebears of Abraham and Strauss.

THE ACTIVIST

(These columns are filled mainly with his ideas and concepts, but Philip Graham spent far more of his time and energy on concrete projects than on philosophizing. The areas of his intense activity were many and only a couple can be illustrated here. One, for which he was perhaps most renowned, was a continuing campaign for the widest mass participation in political financing, for vast numbers of small political contributions instead of a few donations from the "big money" interests. He launched his thesis before the School of Business of the University of Chicago on June 1, 1955. First outlining the fantastically grave and difficult problems facing the Nation, he offered the following analysis.)

I would like to suggest that in one respect at least we are facing up to this situation as though we were a nation of lunatics. I would also like to suggest that unless we change our habits we shall probably achieve the fate we deserve.

Now my suggestion has one refreshing aspect. It will not require this assemblage of potential cardiac cases to raise your blood pressure in anger against anyone except yourselves. I do not suggest that we can solve all our problems by denouncing Yalta, 90 percent of parity, the Dixon-Yates contact, Owen Lattimore, or high taxes.

What I put to you is simply this: We face problems that involve life and death for all of us; yet we insist on having the lowest sort of opinion of the very people we entrust with those problems; and we force them to operate under conditions which do everything to repel decent men.

Who are these people who bear this great responsibility, and whom we treat so stupidly? They are, of course, the politicians. They include Dwight D. Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, 96 Senators, 435 Congressmen, 48 Governors, the 750,000 other elective officials, and the Cabinet officers and tens of thousands of appointive officials and political workers who must live under our existing system of politics.

These are the people whose day-by-day actions will very largely determine the greatest conflict in the history of the world. Yet how do we tell them we regard them? We tell them that we consider them just a little above outlaws. Thus this spring in a nationwide Gallup Poll, 7 out of 10 people with an opinion stated that they would not like to see their children enter politics as a life's work.

Let us suppose that instead of running a great nation we were running a pickle works and that our pickle sales were dropping every month. Clearly we would not begin by telling our sales department that all salesmen were stupid and crooked and unnecessary. Yet we do treat problems which are rather more urgent than pickle sales in just that fashion. And if we continue to do so we probably have as much chance of survival as the buggy manufacturers had of licking Henry Ford.

But before we discuss the solution, let us diagnose the basic problem in a bit more detail. For the problem is deeper than merely a question of public attitudes. Although they are considerably more esteemed than politicians, nevertheless farmers, labor leaders, industrialists and even newspaper people are frowned upon by a goodly number of their fellow men. Yet these people at least can operate in an environment permitting them to maintain their self-respect.

So while it is a serious matter that politicians rank close to lepers in the popularity polls, it is a much more serious matter that we force politicians to live in a system which goes a long way toward depriving them of self-respect.

The fundamental defect in our present system of politics—as is so often the case in life—has something to do with money. It has specifically to do with our habits regarding contributions for political campaigns. Even putting the best possible face on the situation, it can only be described as morally squalid, ethically shocking, and spiritually revolting.

As of 1955 the principal characteristics of our system of political finance can be accurately described in the following manner:

1. We maintain a bold-faced, official lie about the cost of political campaigns and the amount of political contributions.

2. We almost universally fail to respond to—or even to recognize—the duties of the individual citizen in a free society.

3. We consequently force politicians to live in close connection with the filthy power of gangsters and the acquisitive power of special interest groups and favor seekers.

The problem then is how to convince millions of Americans of an obvious fact—that good citizenship requires political contributions by each individual to the party or candidates of his choice. Good citizenship requires this just as much as it requires contributions to one's church, one's community fund, the Red Cross, or other causes.

(Another of many fields of his intense personal activity was urban renewal, particularly for Washington. To the Washington Building Congress, Mr. Graham looked, with an accuracy that has stood 11 years of test, at the city's urban problem as it appeared in November 1952.)

The problems are very much more than dollar problems. There are human and social problems being created by the unbalanced migration of upper and middle income families out of our city. No city can be a healthy city unless it has a balanced, representative population. And yet the opposite is occurring. This is most graphically shown by statistics on racial components. These show that the ratios of white and colored populations in the entire metropolitan area have been relatively unchanged for 50 years. But this is not true of the District when taken alone, where from 1940 to 1950 the colored population rose from 28 percent of the total population to slightly more than 34 percent. The rise of colored population in our cities is part of the story of the rise of the Negro in America. A great migration from the South has been under way, and the percentage increase of colored population in Washington has been less large than in most other large American cities.

The rise of the Negro, let us be clear, is a matter for pride on the part of all Americans. But that rise will be complicated and not aided if by lack of planning we allow our urban centers to become predominantly places for those who are at the lower end of the economic ladder. Instead we must do our utmost to work toward balanced growth of cities and suburbs to build a strengthened democracy.

The basic problem with Washington, as with most of our cities, is thus an unbalanced migration out of the city. It is important that we work for balance—and not against migration. For the growth of the suburbs is in everyone's interests. That growth should make for better and safer and healthier living for us all, and is certainly to be preferred to increasingly congested city living.

Balance in the growth of our city has many aspects. There are two primary ones I would like to single out:

First, we ought to plan our city so that it manages to attract a balanced share of all segments of population. That means we cannot stand by passively and merely let present structures become blighted slums. There are many advantages of downtown living—with air-conditioning it even has perfect weather. By imaginative private projects and by projects under the Redevelopment Land Agency, we must see that we make the most of the advantages of city living and keep a balanced population attracted to them.

Second, we must recognize that a housewife living 15 miles away from our downtown shopping and service area need not be further away in time than was her grandmother who lived on Florida Avenue, that is to say, we can make her close to the downtown area if we are imaginative and resourceful in tackling problems of mass transportation, of traffic control and of parking. Ife we do not, if we fail in this, then we shall have destroyed much of the value and the usefulness of our central city. And if that is destroyed, we shall face a Pandora's box of problems as to how we can ever maintain the city.

(Mr. Graham viewed the same urban problem in more general terms 3 years later, in September 1955, at an ACTION luncheon in Philadelphia.)

The fact is—depending on how you define city—either a majority or, at least, a very large proportion of our people happen to be born and live and die in cities. Now the obstetrical care in the maternity wards is generally very fine and the same is true in the funeral parlors and the burial grounds. But the in-between period—which we enthusiastically describe as life—is not always a span of shining joy. As I think we all know, the modern urban apparatus often falls far short of providing a support for fostering in man the fullest growth of his finest qualities. Instead, too often it gives a nudge to his weaknesses for delinquency and depravity.

We have learned, I think, that sprawling unplanned cities in the 20th century not only make bad cities, but they make bad people. We are concerned about doing a better job in this area, not to improve the oft-mentioned standard of living, but to improve the less-mentioned, but more important, standard of the human spirit.

Anybody who is at all remotely familiar with citizens organizations is well aware of the following law of nature. It is 1,000 times as easy to espouse, maintain, and propagandize a so-called principle as it is to work for any constructive accomplishment. Now that law of nature has flourished, particularly in the housing and city planning field. Today we have millions of Americans living in slums which any proud pig would scorn, because thousands of our so-called leading citizens lost themselves for a decade or more in the joys of bombast, epithets, stubbornness, and self-righteousness over the pros and cons of public housing instead of doing anything about doing anything. And public housing is only one of a number of issues which among housers and planners has been elevated to such a position of delicacy that one can discuss them just about as freely and objectively as one could conduct a seminar on miscegenation in Charleston, S.C.

The facts are that our cities by and large are pretty miserable places for a lot of people to live in. The further facts are that there is no excuse for this. There is only one explanation, and the explanation is the stubbornness, the obtuseness, and laziness of men. The answers in the main are not only realizable but obvious. The central weakness seems to me to be poor citizen organization and inadequate citizen support.

THE CERTAINTY OF UNCERTAINTY

(Because he rejected ideologies, and because he loathed pretensions, Mr. Graham reserved his strongest vitriol for the concept of "certainty." He spoke on the subject at the Founder's Day Dinner of Lincoln University, on February 25, 1952, in Philadelphia.)

My feelings of doubt arose because of a particular quality with which we seem recently to have invested some of the more disputatious areas of life. That quality is the quality of certainty—of dogmatic, unbending sureness. You are familiar with the quality—with this peculiar state of mind. You are told that such and such action must be taken—and taken at once. Not tomorrow—but now. Otherwise, the world will certainly come to an end, and you will be at fault.

Well, it seems to me that we are coming more and more to exhibit that quality about more and more difficult and vexatious subjects. The area of race relations, regrettably but certainly, we must admit, remains such a difficult area. Numerous other examples of difficult problems come to mind—many aspects of foreign policy, the problem of academic freedom in our universities, the clash of individual rights and governmental powers, the direction of modern economics, and so forth.

Increasingly, it seems to me, we find an almost mathematical rhythm about such matters. As the complexities and the difficulties of the subject matter increase, the dogmatic certainties of those involved with the problem increase in direct proportion.

For example, in the more detached and rational parts of our mind we recognize that historians are still giving us new light on the sources and direction of our Civil War. And that war ended almost 90 years ago. Yet today we listen to the most positive and pompous utterances pretending to give the exact truth about the Korean war—a war where the guns are not yet even quiet and where the facts are necessarily only partially available.

As another example, take the subject of how we should deal with the vast problems of China and the rest of Asia. It is a problem with the most unimaginable complications. And yet in the town from which I come, there are thousands of noisy people with dogmatic solutions in contrast to only a handful with the patience to study some of the relevant facts.

In a different area, I think most of us realize the enormous complexities arising from modern industrial life. We know that the improvement of institutions to help make it a better life is inevitably a drawn-out job of trial and error. Yet there is almost no indication of that in the outpourings of those who are most articulate. Manufacturers' associations pronounce that the adoption of this or that bit of legislation means inevitable progress down the road to socialism—and probably the road to Hell. Simultaneously, great labor organizations indulge in the fraudulent pretension that they can mathematically evaluate the soul of a legislator. They claim they can total up his votes on a few measures, and then grade him in a range that runs from 100 percent virtue to 100 percent evil.

Now that kind of certainty, I suppose, must offer a kind of personal enjoyment. It must become a rather efficient anesthetic, as it dulls the lively pains which doubt and uncertainty can kick up. But it is an anesthetic to which, happily, most of the human race are allergic. Although the attitude of dogmatic sureness seems to be growing, it still remains true that the majority of men cling to the old-fashioned concept that infallibility is a quality reserved for God.

(The British scientist-author, C. P. Snow, had become somewhat less than Mr. Graham's favorite pundit when he proposed that the scientist should be the key decisionmaker in today's world. Mr. Graham had thought, and continued to think, that the role belonged more properly to the "politician," in the highest sense of the word. Hence when Sir Charles propounded as a "certainty" that atomic war would ensue in 10 years if the nuclear arms race were not halted, Mr. Graham replied in one of the occasional articles he wrote directly for his newspaper. It appeared April 16, 1961.)

War, said Clemenceau, is too important for generals. Peace is too important for scientists, even for Sir Charles P. Snow, whose speech to American scientists was in this space last week.

Long ago Justice Holmes wrote that he hated a man who knows. But C. P. Snow suddenly knows. He knows out of something he calls engineering truth and statistical truth.

He knows that the spread of nuclear power to other countries will certainly cause war. He and his fellow scientists "know it in a more direct sense than any politician because it comes from direct experience."

Now, politicians have direct experience, too. Their laboratory covers the whole sweep of life—even including scientists. They know no engineering truth or statistical truth or even political truth.

C. P. Snow is certain that we confront an either-or. Either we negotiate nuclear disarmament or a holocaust destroys mankind. He is not the first scientist to be certain. Fifteen years ago we were warned of the certainty of nuclear war.

If mankind could really be certain, we acted very foolishly when we did not impose our will on the Russians during the years of our atomic monopoly. But the only certainty we have is that Churchill's "peace of mutual terror" has somehow continued.

Certainty is a dangerous belief. It is certain that each of us, at some uncertain moment, will face death. Mass death, by nuclear war, is not certain. It may be likely if the bombs proliferate and a few hundred men in governments are foolish. But it is not certain.

To avoid that likelihood, we have politicians carrying burdensome tasks. When we are wise, we support them in an atmosphere of law, of human respect, of intelligent democratic discussion.

All the politicians of the West know that we must have nuclear disarmament. Yet no one knows as a certainty that present disarmament negotiations will lead to actual disarmament.

The end, the final hope, is clear. There is no certainty about the means. Scientists and others do us a great harm by making an oversimplification of the heavy tasks of our politicians.

Great politicians, such as Lincoln, know that patience and wisdom are the watchwords of hope. At their best, politicians (then called statesmen) know only truth.

They know that truth is a great single thing which cannot be fractured into engineering or statistical truth. Also, they know that truth can be but dimly perceived and patiently pursued by humankind.

PAINFUL DOUBTS

(As the preceding passages illustrate, Mr. Graham was not one to withhold criticism, even if he acted from his own personal uncertainty principle. But of nothing did he finally become more critical than of his own business, the press. His dissatisfaction with the commonplace in the press developed slowly. It was most clearly expressed in February 1960 at a University of Minnesota seminar.)

What I am feeling, rather than thinking, is that the press is stale and disoriented. Not in techniques for we are encased in and fascinated by techniques. Our staleness and our disorientation are caused rather by our basic assumptions. They are shallow, out of date, and almost entirely unexamined because we all of us spend all of our time with techniques.

There is a clue to what concerns me about journalism in a recent British novel, "The Rack," by A. E. Ellis, which deals with the psychology of tuberculosis. In it there are hordes of doctors who with all the paraphernalia of modern medicine still cannot cure. And the most articulate of them speaking with that sense of omnipotence which the lack of power so often evokes, derides the efforts of philosophers. Ah, philosophers, he says in effect, when they are sick they come to doctors; and who has ever heard of a sick doctor going to a philosopher?

In this considerable novel, an ailing man places all his faith in the cures of doctors who cannot cure.

Perhaps we are doing the same in journalism, placing all our hopes in whatever doctoring is fashionable at the moment. We pursue Dr. Flesch who has a cure-all in short sentences, or Dr. Gallup who shows us that many people will choose escape over even mild thinking, or Dr. Neilsen and Dr. Politz who seem to have discovered that everyone has abandoned all work, play, and bodily functions in order to spend 26 hours a day perusing the various media.

Those of us in journalism have listened to thousands of hours of discussions of such techniques. We have probably not spent 1 hour asking: What are we doing? Where are we going? Our most passionate energies are expended tinkering with the superstructure, with none left over for contemplating the foundation.

(If Philip Graham rejected the concept of certainty, it was clear he took no pleasure in doing so. The question of "What are we doing? Where are we going?" haunted him, and unhappily. He reached constantly for the answers but, as the following extract from a speech on November 5, 1959, suggests, a fulfilled resolution of the problem escaped him. One sees that although the nominal audience was the American Electric Power

Association, the speech and the painful doubts were to and of himself.)

Where I get in difficulty—at times almost unbearable difficulty—is when I try to examine the meaning of what I am engaged in.

When these difficulties get too great we in the newspaper business do what I suspect people in your business do. We retreat to the ritual of reciting old rules that we know are meaningless.

We say that we just print the objective news in our news columns and confine our opinions to the editorial page. Yet we know that while this has some merit as an oversimplified slogan of good intentions, it also has a strong smell of pure baloney.

If we keep wages too low in some few areas where unions still let us do it, or if we neglect decent working amenities as long as we can avoid the cost, we defend ourselves by muttering about our concern for stockholders. As though by announcing compassion for a relatively anonymous and absent group we can justify a lack of compassion for people we spend our working days with.

If we are brutally careless about printing something that maligns the character of some concrete individual, we are apt to wave the abstract flag of freedom of speech in order to avoid the embarrassment of a concrete apology.

If we are pressed even harder, we may salve our consciences by saying that after all there are libel laws. And as soon as we say that we redouble our efforts to make those laws as toothless as we possibly can.

And if we are pressed really quite hard, we can finally shrug our shoulders and say, "Well, after all we have to live." Then we can only hope no one will ask the ultimate question: "Why?"

I certainly have been guilty of all those stupid actions—and a great many more stupid. And I suppose that more than a few of you have done as poorly.

What I prefer to recall are those rare occasions when I have had some better sense of the meaning of what I am engaged in. In those moments I have realized that our problems are relatively simple and that some simple, ancient, moral precepts are often reliable business tools. In those moments I have been able to keep in mind that it really doesn't matter whether I am kept in my job. In those moments I have been able to look straight at the frailty of my judgment. And finally I have been honest enough to recognize that a few—a very few—great issues about the meaning of life are the only issues which deserve to be considered truly complex.

We are agreed, I am sure, that the free exchange of ideas and the release of mankind from burdensome toil are important goals in the development of civilization. But we will be very foolish people if we decide that my newspaper methods and your methods of producing energy are the only—or even the best—methods of furthering these goals.

The realization of this does not mean we have to be any the less able or the less passionately interested in our jobs. Instead, by paying attention to the broader meaning of what we are engaged in, we may be able to join our passion to our intelligence. And such a juncture, even on the part of but one individual, can represent a significant step forward on the long road toward civilization.

INDIANA YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMP

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today the State of Indiana began a pilot project which I hope will be a model for the youth employment opportunities bill currently before the Congress. I am speaking of the Indiana Youth Conservation Camp, at Harrison State Forest, near Corydon, where 100 young men between the ages of 17 and 22 will spend the next 2 months. They are out of school and out of work. The purpose of the camp is to get them back to school or back to work. All have been carefully selected by the Indiana Employment Security Division. None are juvenile offenders.

In addition to conservation work, they will receive a minimum of 8 hours a week of education in basic subjects, such as mathematics, English, and the social sciences. Furthermore, they will work in small groups, in an attempt to make up any deficiencies which dropping out of school may have left them with.

This educational effort is of prime importance, because time and time again we see that a basic education is the bare minimum needed in order to survive in our changing employment market. With this education, plus the knowledge of what it means to put in a hard day's work, these young people will be, I hope, motivated either to seek further employment or to return to school.

Whatever they do, the employment security division will try to help them find jobs at the end of the program.

Although the division will not guarantee jobs, I doubt that the young men will have trouble finding them, for after their training they will be more desirable as employees.

The camp was established by an executive order of Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, upon the recommendation of the Indiana Youth Council.

Besides the council and the employment security division, the following State agencies are also sponsoring the camp: the Indiana National Guard, the division of labor, the department of conservation, and the department of public construction.

The young men will receive $25 a month, and $100 at the end of the 2-month period, to help them get started on their next job—which we hope will be a permanent one.

This is the type of program that enactment of the youth employment opportunities bill will allow us to continue. I believe this program demonstrates the established need for enactment of the bill and establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and a Hometown Youth Corps.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the morning hour over?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Wednesday last the Nation and the world saw the heart of the American Negro revealed in an unforgettable demonstration of unity and democracy. In a dignified, extraordinarily disciplined, and intensely patriotic manner, 200,000 Americans—from all sections of the Nation and from all levels of life—came to the Capital of their country to appeal for redress of the very real grievances of the Negro.

This march on Washington for jobs and freedom could not help but touch the conscience of every American and, I hope the conscience of Congress. This living petition was directed to the Congress, which has lagged behind the other branches of the Federal Government in insuring and protecting the right of the Negro to full citizenship.

I was impressed, Mr. President, by the large number of non-Negroes in Wednesday's march, especially by the number of religious leaders. Their presence was symbolic of the fact that the struggle to redeem the soul of a nation, plagued by 100 years of racial discrimination, is everybody's struggle.

The march demonstrated that the first amendment right of peaceable assembly and petition for redress of grievances is a living part of our political history. This is what the Negro community is seeking to invoke in demonstrations across the country. This march proved that the first amendment rights can be exercised without danger of violence and disturbance.

But despite the polite and orderly behavior of the crowd, and the moderation of the speakers, it was plainly evident that this demonstration was a symbol of the civil rights revolution—a revolution which we in Congress cannot ignore as we get down to the business of discussing meaningful civil rights legislation this year. The Reverend Martin Luther King summed it up when he said at the rally in the Lincoln Memorial:

> There will be neither rest nor tranquillity in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights.

The words spoken by Dr. King, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, Walter Reuther, John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Mathew Ahmann, and other leaders of the march, are important to the Nation and to Congress, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the invocation and their speeches, as published in the New York Times of Thursday, August 29, 1963; and also an editorial, published this morning, comparing the bitter fruit of Governor Wallace's efforts to close the public school system of his State, in order to avoid desegregation, rather than allow children to return to school normally, as they should, under the traditionally American circumstances.

There being no objection, the excerpts, invocation, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1963]

MOST REV. PATRICK O'BOYLE, ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON, INVOCATION

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, amen.

Our Father, who are in heaven, we who are assembled here in a spirit of peace and in good faith dedicate ourselves and our hopes to You. We ask the fullness of Your blessing upon those who have gathered with us today, and upon all men and women of good will to whom the cause of justice and equality is sacred. We ask this blessing because we are convinced that in honoring all Your children, we show forth in our lives the love that You have given us.

Bless this Nation and all its people. May the warmth of Your love replace the coldness that springs from prejudice and bitterness. Send in our midst the Holy Spirit to open the eyes of all to the great truth that all men are equal in Your sight. Let us understand that simple justice demands that the rights of all be honored by every man.

Give strength and wisdom to our President and Vice President. Enlighten and guide the Congress of these United States. May our judges in every court be heralds of justice and equity. Let just laws be administered without discrimination. See to it, we implore, that no man be so powerful as to be above the law, or so weak as to be deprived of its full protection.

We ask special blessing for those men and women who in sincerity and honesty have been leaders in the struggle for justice and harmony among races. As Moses of old, they have gone before their people to a land of promise. Let that promise quickly become a reality, so that the ideals of freedom, blessed alike by our religious faith and our heritage of democracy, will prevail in our land.

Finally, we ask that You consecrate to Your service all in this crusade who are dedicated to the principles of the Constitution of these United States. May we be sensitive to our duties toward others as we demand from them our rights. May we move forward without bitterness, even when confronted with prejudice and discrimination. May we shun violence, knowing that the meek shall inherit the earth. But may this meekness of manner be joined with courage and strength so that with Your help, O Heavenly Father, and following the teaching of Christ, Your Son, we shall now and in the days to come live together as brothers in dignity, justice, charity, and peace. Amen.

Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, National Council of Churches

I wish indeed that I were able to speak for all Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox Christians as I speak in behalf of full justice and freedom for all, born or living under the American flag.

But that is precisely the point. If all the members and all the ministers of the constituency I represent here today were ready to stand and march with you for jobs and freedom for the Negro community together with all the Roman Catholic Church and all of the synagogues in America, then the battle for full civil rights and dignity would be already won.

I do, however, in fact, officially represent the Commission on Religion and Race of the National Council of Churches.

For many years now the National Council of Churches and most of its constituent communions have said all the right things about civil rights. Our official pronouncements for years have clearly called for "a nonsegregated church in a nonsegregated society." But as of August 28, 1963, we have achieved neither a nonsegregated church nor a nonsegregated society.

And it is partially because the churches of America have failed to put their own houses in order that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, 175 years after the adoption of the Constitution, 173 years after the adoption of the Bill of Rights, the United States of American still faces a racial crisis.

We do not, therefore, come to this Lincoln Memorial in any arrogant spirit of moral or spiritual superiority to "set the Nation straight" or to judge or to denounce the American people in whole or in part.

Rather we come—late, late we come—in the reconciling and repentant spirit in which Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, once replied to a delegation of morally arrogant churchmen. He said, "Never say God is on our side, rather pray that we may be found on God's side."

We come in the fear of God that moved Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, whose memorial stands across the lagoon, once to say: "Indeed, I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just."

Rabbi Joachim Prinz, President of American Jewish Congress

I speak to you as an American Jew.

As Americans we share the profound concern of millions of people about the shame and disgrace of inequality and injustice which make a mockery of the great American idea.

As Jews we bring to the great demonstration, in which thousands of us proudly participate, a twofold experience—one of the spirit and one of our history.

In the realm of the spirit, our fathers taught us thousands of years ago that when God created man, he created him as everybody's neighbor. Neighbor is not a geographic term. It is a moral concept. It means our collective responsibility for the preservation of man's dignity and integrity.

From our Jewish historic experience of three and a half thousand years we say:

Our ancient history began with slavery and the yearning for freedom.

During the Middle Ages my people lived for a thousand years in the ghettos of Europe.

Our modern history begins with a proclamation of emancipation.

It is for these reasons that it is not merely sympathy and compassion for the black people of America that motivates us, it is above all and beyond all such sympathies and emotions a sense of complete identification and solidarity born of our own painful historic experience.

When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned many things. The most important thing that I learned in my life and under those tragic circumstances is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most shameful and the most tragic problem is silence.

A great people which had created a great civilization had become a nation of silent onlookers. They remained silent in the face of hate, in the face of brutality and in the face of mass murder.

America must not become a nation of onlookers. America must not remain silent. Not merely black America, but all of America. It must speak up and act, from the President down to the humblest of us, and not for the sake of the Negro, not for the sake of the black community but for the sake of the image, the idea and the aspiration of America itself.

Our children, yours and mine in every school across the land, every morning pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the republic for which it stands and then they, the children, speak fervently and innocently of this land as the land of "liberty and justice for all."

The time, I believe, has come to work together—for it is not enough to hope together, and it is not enough to pray together—to work together that this children's oath—pronounced every morning from Maine to California, from North to South—that this oath will become a glorious, unshakable reality in a morally renewed and united America.

A. Philip Randolph, Sleeping Car Porters

We are gathered here in the largest demonstration in the history of this Nation. Let the Nation and the world know the meaning of our numbers. We are not a pressure group, we are not an organization or a group of organizations, we are not a mob. We are the advance guard of a massive moral revolution for jobs and freedom.

This revolution reverberates throughout the land touching every city, every town, every village where black men are segregated, oppressed, and exploited.

But this civil rights revolution is not confined to the Negroes; nor is it confined to civil rights. Our white allies know that they cannot be free while we are not. And we know that we have no interest in a society in which 6 million black and white people are unemployed, and millions more live in poverty.

Nor is the goal of our civil rights revolution merely the passage of civil rights legislation.

Yes, we want all public accommodations open to all citizens, but those accommodations will mean little to those who cannot afford to use them.

BACKS SCHOOL AID

Yes, we want a Fair Employment Practice Act, but what good will it do if profits geared to automation destroy the jobs of millions of workers, black and white?

We want integrated public schools, but that means we also want Federal aid to education, all forms of education.

Now, we know that real freedom will require many changes in the Nation's political and social philosophies and institutions. For one thing we must destroy the notion that Mrs. Murphy's property rights include the right to humiliate me because of the color of my skin.

The sanctity of private property takes second place to the sanctity of a human personality.

The months and years ahead will bring new evidence of masses in motion for freedom. The march on Washington is not the climax to our struggle but a new beginning, not only for the Negro but for all Americans, for personal freedoms and a better life.

Look for the enemies of medicare, of higher minimum wages, of social security, of Federal aid to education, and there you will find the enemy of the Negro, the coalition of Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans that seek to dominate the Congress.

We must develop strength in order that we may be able to back and support the civil rights program of President Kennedy.

We here, today, are only the first wave. When we leave it will be to carry on the civil rights revolution home with us, into every nook and cranny of the land. And we shall return again, and again, to Washington in ever-growing numbers until total freedom is ours.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Southern Christian Leadership Conference

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of captivity.

But 100 years later, we must face the tragic fact that the Negro is still not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. So we have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition.

In a sense we have come to our Nation's Capitol to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check; a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds."

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this Nation. So we have come to cash this check—a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice. We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to open the doors of opportunity to all of God's children. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.

It would be fatal for the Nation to overlook the urgency of the moment and to underestimate the determination of the Negro. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality; 1963 is not an end, but a beginning. Those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the Nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest or tranquillity in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our Nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something that I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force. The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny and their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, "When will you be satisfied?" We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No; no we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a desert State sweltering with the heat of injustice and oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day the State of Alabama, whose Governor's lips are presently dripping with the words of interposition and nullification, will be transformed into a situation where little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls and walk together as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plains, and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith with which I return to the South. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our Nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrim's pride, from every mountainside, let freedom ring."

And if America is to be a great nation this must become true. So let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania.

Let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado.

Let freedom ring from the curvacious peaks of California.

But not only that; let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring.

When we let freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every State and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "Free at last; free at last; thank God Almighty, we are free at last."

ROY WILKINS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NAACP

We came to speak here to our Congress, to those men and women who speak here for us in that marble forum over yonder on the Hill.

They know, from their vantage point here, of the greatness of this whole Nation, of its reservoirs of strength, and of the sicknesses which threaten always to sap its strength and to erode, in one or another selfish and stealthy and specious fashion, the precious liberty of the individual which is the hallmark of our country among the nations of the earth.

We want employment and with it we want the pride and responsibility and self-respect that goes with equal access to jobs. Therefore we want an FEPC bill as a part of the legislative package.

Now for 9 years our parents and their children have been met with either a flat refusal or token action in school desegregation. Every added year of such treatment is a leg iron upon our men and women of 1980. The civil rights bill now under consideration in the Congress must give new powers to the Justice Department to enable it to speed the end of Jim Crow schools, South and North.

Now, my friends, all over this land, and especially in parts of the Deep South, we are beaten and kicked and maltreated and shot and killed by local and State law enforcement officers.

It is simply incomprehensible to us here today and to millions of others far from this spot that the U.S. Government, which can regulate the contents of a pill, apparently is powerless to prevent the physical abuse of citizens within its own borders.

Now, the President's proposals represent so moderate an approach that if it is weakened or eliminated, the remainder will be little more than sugar water.

Now, we expect the passage of an effective civil rights bill. We commend those Republicans in both Houses who are working for it. We salute those Democrats in both Houses who are working for it.

In fact, we even salute those from the South who want to vote for it but don't dare to do so. And we say to those people, just give us a little time, and one of these days we'll emancipate you.

JAMES FARMER, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CORE

(NOTE.—Delivered by Floyd B. McKessick, national chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, for Mr. Farmer, who is in jail in Louisiana on charges stemming from civil rights demonstrations.)

From a south Louisiana parish jail, I salute the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. Two hundred and thirty-two freedom fighters jailed with me in Plaquemine, La., also send their greetings.

I wanted to be with you with all my heart on this great day. My imprisoned brothers and sisters wanted to be there too. I cannot come out of jail while they are still in; for their crime was the same as mine—demanding freedom now. And most of them will not come out of jail until the charges are dropped or their sentences reversed.

I know that you will understand my absence. So we cannot be with you today in body, but we are with you in spirit. By marching on Washington your tramping feet have spoken the message—the message of our trouble in Louisiana.

You have come from all over the Nation and in one mighty voice you have spoken to the Nation. You have also spoken to the world. You have said to the world by your presence here as our successful direct action in numberless cities has said, that in the days of thermonuclear bombs, violence is outmoded to the solution of the problems of men.

It is a truth that needs to be shouted loudly. And no one else anywhere in the world is saying it as well as the American Negro through their nonviolent direct action.

The tear gas and the electric cattle prod of Plaquemine, La., like the firehoses and dogs of Birmingham are giving to the world a tired and ugly message of terror and brutality, and hate.

If we can solve our problems and remove the heavy heel of oppression from our necks with our methods, then man has no problem anywhere in the world which cannot be solved without death.

We will not slow down; we will not stop our militant, peaceful demonstrations; we will not come off of the streets until we can work at a job befitting of our skills in any place in the land.

We will not stop our marching people until our kids have enough to eat and their minds can study a wide range without being cramped in Jim Crow schools.

We will not stop until the heavy weight of oppression is removed from our back, and like proud men everywhere, when we can stand tall together again.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., National Urban League

One should not seek here to atone for his past failures as a responsible citizen of the majority group. The evils of the past, and the guilt about it, cannot be erased by a 1-day pilgrimage, however magnificent. Nor can this pilgrimage substitute for an obligation to tomorrow by these same citizens.

And so, this march must go beyond this historic moment. For the true test of the dedication and the commitment which should flow from this meeting will be in our recognition that, however impressed or however incensed our congressional representatives are by this demonstration, they will not act because of it alone.

We must support the strong, we must give courage to the timid, we must remind the indifferent, and warn the opposed. Civil rights, which are God-given and constitutionally guaranteed, are not negotiable in 1963.

Furthermore, we must work together even more closely back home where the job must be done to see that Negro Americans are accepted as first-class citizens and that they are enabled to do some more marching.

They must march from the rat-infested, overcrowded ghettos to decent, wholesome, unrestricted residential areas dispersed throughout our cities.

They must march from the cemeteries, where our young, our newborn die three times sooner and our parents die 7 years earlier. They must march from there to nearby established health and welfare centers.

They must march from the congested, ill-equipped schools which breed dropouts and which smother motivation to the well-equipped, integrated facilities throughout the cities.

And finally they must march from a present feeling of hopelessness, despair, and frustration to a renewed faith and confidence due to tangible programs and visible changes made possible only by walking together.

Walter P. Reuther, Auto Workers President

It is the responsibility of every American to share the impatience of the Negro Americans. And we need to join together, to march together and to work together until we have bridged the moral gap between American democracy's noble promises and its ugly practices in the field of civil rights.

There is a lot of noble talk about brotherhood and then some Americans drop the brother and keep the hood.

To me, the civil rights question is a moral question which transcends partisan politics, and this rally today should be the first step in a total effort to mobilize the moral conscience of America and to ask the people in Congress of both parties to rise above their partisan differences and enact civil rights legislation now.

Now the President—President Kennedy—has offered a comprehensive and moderate bill. That bill is the first meaningful step. It needs to be strengthened. It needs FEPC and other stronger provisions. And the job question is crucial; because we will not solve education or housing or public accommodations as long as millions of American Negroes are treated as second-class economic citizens and denied jobs.

I am for civil rights, as a matter of human decency, as a matter of common morality. But I am also for civil rights because I believe that freedom is an indivisible value. That no one can be free unto himself, and when Bull [former Safety Commissioner Eugene] Connor with his police dogs and firehoses destroys freedom in Birmingham he is destroying my freedom in Detroit.

This rally is not the end, it's the beginning. It's the beginning of a great moral crusade to arouse America to the unfinished work of American democracy. The Congress has to act. And after they act, we have much work to do.

Mrs. Daisy Bates, NAACP Director

The women of this country, Mr. Randolph, pledge to you, to Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, and all of you fighting for civil liberties, that we will join hands with you as women of this country.

We will kneel-in, we will sit-in, until we can eat in any counter in the United States. We will walk until we are free, until we can walk to any school and take our children to any school in the United States. And we will sit-in and we will kneel-in and we will lie-in if necessary until every Negro in America can vote. This we pledge you, the women of America.

Mathew Ahmann, Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice

Who can call himself a man, say he is created by God, and at the same time take part in a system of segregation which destroys the livelihood, the citizenship, family life and the very heart of the Negro citizens of the United States?

Who can call himself a man, and take part in a system of segregation which frightens the white man into denying what he knows to be right, into denying the law of his God?

We dedicate ourselves today to secure Federal civil rights legislation which will guarantee every man a job based on his talents and training; legislation which will do away with the myth that the ownership of a public place of business carries the moral or legal right to reject a customer because of the color of his hair or of his skin.

But, we are gathered too to dedicate ourselves to building a people, a nation, a world which is free of the sin of discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin, a world of the sons of God, equal in all important respects; a world dedicated to justice, and to fraternal bonds between men.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 3, 1963]

View From Lincoln Memorial

Under the shadow of Lincoln, 200,000 Americans assembled in Washington last week. The 16th President of the United States and his proclamation of freedom stood as a monumental centerpiece to this great rallying of Negroes and whites. From here as from no other shrine of liberty for all in the United States, people could look back and into the future.

The specific aim was to demonstrate for rights and for jobs and to influence Congress to pass a strong civil rights bill. All America was the audience; the administration and Congressmen were at the focal point of this personal cry for a redress of grievances. Will they be swayed?

There was another Congressman who came to Washington once, the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District in Illinois. He made no great impression. But near the end of his congressional term, on January 10, 1849, Representative Lincoln proposed that no person should be held in slavery within the District of Columbia. When he saw that support for his plan gave it no chance for adoption, he did not formally introduce it as a bill. He did support a bill prohibiting the slave trade in the District, but as usual it failed to pass.

Slavery takes different forms. Taking the long view from the Lincoln Memorial, the bill Lincoln realized at the time he could not introduce successfully is before Congress today. It is to abolish the slavery that enchains a man's dignity in the segregated slums and schools and public places of America. The chains of physical ownership have been broken but not the bonds that stand in the way of true freedom. That was the aim of this great assembly. All Americans, and specifically this Congress, must finally act to make whole the dream of the Great Emancipator.

NEW YORK BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT ON PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS PROPOSAL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last week the Association of the Bar of the City of New York again demonstrated the kind of responsible professional leadership it has become widely known for over the years. The association's committee on Federal legislation published a report on the proposed public accommodations section of the omnibus civil rights bill now before the Congress, detailed the formidable constitutional bases for the proposed section, and strongly recommended its enactment. I am pleased to note the committee's emphasis on the desirability of basing the section upon both the commerce clause and the 14th amendment of the Constitution.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point of my remarks, an editorial—from the New York Times of August 28, 1963—which lauds the association's work.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For a Strong Civil Rights Law

To the voices of those who are marching on Washington today to urge congressional passage of a strong civil rights bill was added yesterday an authoritative legal one.

The Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York City Bar Association strongly backed the rights bills now before the House and Senate, especially the controversial section forbidding racial discrimination in access to privately owned places of public accommodation.

Cutting through the legalistic fog that has enveloped this administration proposal on Capitol Hill, the committee found constitutional support for congressional action in both the 14th amendment and the commerce clause. The two are "complementary and not competitive sources of congressional power," the lawyers observed.

"It is a primary, ancient and honorable function of the law to provide the instruments for the peaceful and just resolution of disputes among men," the committee said. This, in effect, is the message the civil rights marchers are bearing to the Capital. Congress ought to heed both pleas—so dissimilar in approach, yet so similar in their recognition of the need for providing a means under law for redressing grievances that are equally violative of basic law and basic morality.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I want to address myself now to a fundamental and critically important thesis, which also is signalized for us this morning—entirely a happenstance—by a very important statement made by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, upon the same subject. I am very glad to note the attention which the problems of the international balance of payments and the international monetary situation of the United States are receiving. I believe this situation may very well bring about most untoward economic results. If allowed to go unchecked, this problem could produce a worldwide depression—similar to the 1932 model, for example, which we must remember was touched off by the failure of the Kredit-Anstalt, in Vienna—an event which took place quite remote from the United States; yet it shook our Nation to its foundations and resulted in probably the worst depression in modern times.

So it seems to me that it is critically important that we do the right things, and that we do them on time. Hence, the attention which is being directed toward the subject is entirely in order. I discussed our critical balance-of-payments situation on the floor of the Senate in great detail in mid-July. I address myself to it again today, because it has not been remedied. From what I can see, it is not likely to be remedied in adequate time if measures which are now being pursued continue to be the sole measures which we apply.

First, let us understand what we are talking about. The fact is that our imbalance in international payments has worsened and not improved. During the second quarter of this year it exceeded even estimates of people like myself who have been critical of the administration's policies. These estimates have indicated that our deficit would be running at a little over $4 billion a year this year. Instead, the second quarter showed an adjusted yearly rate of imbalance of $5.2 billion. This is extremely serious, because it represents one of the principal factors, upon which the world can evaluate our situation in the United States in terms of the reliability and substantiality of our economic policies as well as our dollar solvency.

The main point of my criticism of the administration's handling of the balance-of-payments deficit to date is its failure to seek a basic solution, and its emphasis on short-term measures, on the theory that the deficit is an isolated problem and not a symptom of economic dislocation of the United States and, indeed, of the whole free world economic community.

The President's own words at his August 20 press conference show that the administration holds this theory. The President said that recent events and the administration's short-term measures indicate an improvement in the international balance-of-payments problem.

Soon thereafter, as if to confound that idea, we learned that the deficit was greater than estimated, and was really approaching truely emergency proportions.

There has been no improvement, on the contrary, there is increased danger. Our solutions must take into account that we are in a worsening and not an improving situation, and that the imbalance of international payments threatens to continue a new course unfavorable to us. Nor can I see any solace in the President's words when Secretary Dillon as recently as 8 weeks ago has testified before the Joint Economic Committee that even at a lower rate we cannot afford this imbalance for more than a year or two.

The President said that no new methods of curing this imbalance in international payments will be brought up by this country at the next meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

I feel strongly that this is the time, and the IMF is the forum which should be used for the purpose of making the greatest single effort in respect of this very trying financial problem. We should discuss the calling of a well-planned and well-organized international monetary conference to adopt basic long-term solutions aimed at a problem which by its very nature is long term.

The principal point that I shall be making today, which I believe is buttressed by every bit of evidence before us, is that the world must face the problem, not on a piecemeal basis, and not on a short-term basis, but through a deliberate international monetary conference called, if possible, under the auspices of the International Monetary Fund for the purpose of reforming the international monetary system and getting on the path of such reform now.

There is no time to waste. Time is running out, and very quickly. This is an absolutely essential move on the part of our Nation. The heart of the problem is that though the international monetary system has demonstrated effectiveness in such a situation as the Cuban crisis and the rejection of the British application for membership in the European Economic Community, the unfortunate fact is that when the international monetary system is confronted with the problem of the maladjustment of the free world's economy, the corrective mechanisms of the existing system cannot be relied upon to operate quickly and effectively enough.

Major imbalances take years to eliminate unless they are corrected by measures which hamper economic growth or world trade. That is the fundamental dilemma which we face. The measures which we tend to take—and I shall analyze those in a few moments—are measures which tend to hamper economic growth or world trade. What the world's monetary system needs is a growing stock of international credit which would permit corrective action without penalizing one nation or one group of nations, and without disrupting international trade.

As an example, very recently we increased short-term interest rates and raised our rediscount rate in order to attract funds to the United States on a short-term basis. We took that action notwithstanding the fact that the classic remedy for dealing with endemic unemployment, which is what we face in our country, is exactly to the contrary—to reduce interest rates and to reduce the rediscount rate. Yet, caught in the trap between the imbalance of international payments, which we cannot afford much longer, and our need for alleviating that situation by attracting short-term money to the United States, we took a regressive step in terms of the fundamental economic difficulty of the country, namely, endemic unemployment.

The basic flaw in the existing international monetary system is that it depends for additional liquidity or credit upon continuing the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States, which add dollars and gold to finance rapidly growing international financial and trade transactions. The great danger to the world is that, to the extent that we succeed in eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit, we also remove liquidity from the international monetary system equivalent to that deficit which is indispensable to its operation.

I repeat that statement because it is so serious. Today we are financing the world through our imbalance of international payments to the extent, in round figures, of $4 to $5 billion a year. As we eliminate our balance-of-payment deficit, we will remove the stimulus to world economic activity and world trade, leaving the world open to a worldwide depression, because the world has made no plans to deal with this subject since World War II except American aid and American financing of the kind that I have described.

Admittedly, reform of the existing monetary system would require years. But I would be greatly disappointed if an international monetary conference such as I urge should confine itself to evolving a mechanism for financing large and ever-increasing deficits or confine itself exclusively to the liquidity problem. On the contrary, I believe it should undertake an inquiry into the problems of international economic adjustment, including such crucial and unresolved problems as the deteriorating terms of trade between industrialized and developing countries. It should undertake to consider problems related to the marketing of primary commodities as well as simple manufactures which are exported by developing countries. It should undertake to examine the strengthening of rules for international trade competition. It should also undertake to examine international business practices detrimental to increasing trade and investment.

Such an international monetary conference would seek to bring the economy of the free world abreast of the necessities of the free world as they exist today. The international imbalance in payments which we suffer is but a thermometer which shows that the patient has economic fever. The thermometer, if we pay attention to it, will save us. If we pay no attention to it, it could destroy us.

An international monetary conference such as I have described would have to be prepared with the same meticulousness as characterized the highly successful Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. It is just as vital.

In order for all to see how vital it is, I propose to examine the variety of measures put into effect by the administration in recent months to halt our international balance-of-payments deficit—a series of measures which I consider, as they deal with the problem, to be tantamount to building "sand castles" to protect our shores, instead of strong works of stone and concrete.

There is some merit to certain of these measures on a short-term basis, but they will not carry us through the peril. For example, there are the administration's decisions to increase short-term interest rates, to sell Treasury bonds to foreign governments denominated in their currencies, to help to establish jointly with nine other industrialized countries a $6 billion supplementary reserve for the International Monetary Fund in order to help those countries whose currency comes under speculative attack, and to arrange a $500 million standby credit from the International Monetary Fund. All of these are perfectly sound short-term decisions.

But the interest equalization tax proposal, on which the administration is placing such reliance, in the opinion of many of us will not work. The tax will not inhibit the sale of European securities in the United States, or their purchase by United States investors. The tax really has been weakened by numerous exceptions; including the exemption of commercial bank loans, the exemption of Canada, and the exemption of direct investment.

Indeed, Secretary Dillon killed the proposal himself. According to the Treasury Department's own data, interest rates in important world financial centers would still remain significantly above our own, even after the tax was imposed.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum to Treasury Secretary Dillon, dated July 17, 1963, entitled "Comparative Long-Term Interest Rates," be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

JULY 17, 1963.

Subject: Comparative long-term interest rates.

MERLYN N. TRUED,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

Attached are some hastily gathered materials suggestive of the general level of long-term interest rates here and abroad. I would hope these data might be useful.

(Attachments: Central Government Bond Yields, July 17, 1963; Industrial Bond Yields, July 17, 1963; IBRD Bond Yields; Table IV: Costs of Purchasing Securities; Table III; Initial Costs of Public Issues; and Short and Long-Term Interest Rates.)

Central Government bond yields [1]

	1962 [2]	1962 [2]				1963 [3]
		I	II	III	IV	
United States	3.95	4.06	3.89	3.98	3.88	4.00 June.
United Kingdom	6.00	6.33	6.18	5.82	5.66	5.44 June.
France	5.02	5.03	5.12	4.99	4.95	5.01 May.
Germany [4]	5.9	5.7	5.8	6.0	6.2	6.10 May.
Italy	5.26	5.06	5.27	5.36	5.35	5.20 April.
Switzerland	3.13	3.02	3.22	3.15	3.12	3.15 June.
Netherlands	4.21	3.99	4.27	4.34	4.24	4.12 June.
Canada	5.09	4.95	4.91	5.40	5.11	4.90 May.

[1] Average yields to maturity on issues with at least 12 years' life in percent per annum.
[2] IFS, July 1963, p. 33.
[3] Telephone conversation with editor, IFS.
[4] Covers bonds of all public authorities, including some with lives of less than 12 years.

Industrial bond yields [1]

United States	4.37
United Kingdom	6.30
France	6.23
Germany [2]	6.0
Italy	5.94
Switzerland	3.69
Netherlands	4.38

Canada: No comparable data given by the source. Last week, however, the 1982 Bell Telephone 5¾'s yielded 5.47 and the 1981 Consumer Gas yielded 5.65.

[1] At end-March 1963. For the United Kingdom, the yield on industrial bonds is the average redemption yield, allowing for stamp duty, on 12 industrial debentures with about 20 years to maturity; accrued interest is excluded and tax ignored. For other countries the nearest comparable yields have been quoted.

[2] At the end of January 1963.

Source: Quarterly Bulletin, Bank of England, June 1963, pp. 110–111.

IBRD bond yields [1]

	1962	1962				1963, May
		I	II	III	IV	
New York: 3¼ percent of 1981	4.10	4.27	4.28	4.17	4.10	4.03
London: 3½-percent of 1974	4.75	5.72	5.50	5.20	4.75	4.51
Frankfurt: 5 percent of 1974	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03
Milan: 5 percent of 1976	5.48	5.10	5.31	5.46	5.48	5.65
Zurich: 3½ percent of 1976	3.43	3.50	3.45	3.34	3.43	3.46
Amsterdam: 3½ percent of 1975	4.03	3.91	4.00	4.21	4.03	3.99

[1] Yields to maturity in percent per annum at end of period.

Source: IFS, July 1963, p. 33.

TABLE III.—*Initial costs of public issues*

[Percentages of sum raised, except where indicated]

	Domestic companies				Foreign governments	
	Initial tax		Approximate total costs		Initial tax	Approximate total costs
	Loan	Share	Loan	Share		
Belgium	0.7	[1] 2.3	3½–5	5¼–6¼	1.6	([2])
France	([3])	1.7	[4] 6	[4] 7½–8	([3])	([2])
Western Germany	[1] 2½	2½	7–8	8–8½	[1] 2½	7–8
Italy	[5] 0.62	[6] 1.12	5½–8½	([2][6])	([3])	([2])
Netherlands	[1] ¾	2½	3¼	5⅛–5⅝	2	4–5
Switzerland	[1][7] 0.6	[7] 2	[1] 3–3½	[8] 4½	[1][7] 1.2	3½–5
United Kingdom	[1][9][10] ⅛	[1][9] ½	3	3¼	[10][11] 2	4¼–4½
United States	[1][12] 0.16	[12] 0.13	1–2	4–4½	([3][12])	1¼–4¾

[1] On par value.
[2] Not available.
[3] Nil.
[4] Including turnover tax.
[5] Including 0.5 percent annual tax on bonds normally paid by borrowers and not reclaimed from subscribers.
[6] Share issues (apart from rights issues) are infrequent and are usually privately subscribed.
[7] In addition, a tax of 3 percent on interest and dividend payments is payable annually by Swiss companies; for nonresident borrowers the tax is payable in advance at 2 percent of total interest payments.
[8] This can vary very widely.
[9] In registered form.
[10] Stamp duty is shown at the reduced rates for which provision is made in the finance bill now before Parliament.
[11] In bearer form.
[12] Ignoring a small fee payable to the Securities and Exchange Commission when the documents are filed.

TABLE IV.—*Costs of purchasing securities* [1]

[Percentages of total cost, based on purchases equivalent to £10,000]

	Shares		Government bonds
	Including stamp duties	Excluding stamp duties	
Belgium	1.1 (0.8)	0.8 (0.6)	0.4
France	1.3 (0.8)	.7 (0.5)	.3 (0.2)
Western Germany [2]	1.0	.9	.5
Italy	.4	.3	.2
Netherlands	.7	.6	.7
Switzerland [3]	[3] .4	.4	.3
United Kingdom	[4] 1.8	.8	.2
United States	[5] 1.2-0.4	[5] 1.2-0.4	(6)

[1] Where significantly different rates are applied for cash deals and deals for the account, the latter are shown in parens.

[2] Including duty at the reduced rates applicable to nonresident investors.

[3] Including a small stamp duty.

[4] Stamp duty has been included at the reduced rate of 1 percent for which provision is made in the finance bill now before Parliament.

[5] New York Stock Exchange commission rates decrease as the price of the individual share unit rises. The rates chosen cover a range of share prices from $28 per share (1.2 percent) to $140 per share (0.4 percent).

[6] Negligible.

Mr. JAVITS. We cannot depend on the uncertain results of this measure in such crucial times, and I do not believe Congress should look on this proposal as significant under present conditions.

Some of these measures are good.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate my colleague's yielding with respect to the so-called equalization tax, to which he has referred, before he passes on to consideration of other measures.

Does it not impress the Senator that this is neither more nor less than a tariff on the importation of foreign securities, and a rather substantial tariff, contrary to the general liberal trade policy which this country has followed in recent years?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question that it represents, on money, an aspect of protectionism.

Second, it has already been so emasculated by exceptions—including some exceptions for Japan as well as a general exception for Canada; and its own exclusions, which represent significant exceptions—that it runs counter to what I think is the desirability of the United States continuing to be the banker for the world. It tends toward controls, which in this situation I believe would only be necessary if there were no other way to accomplish the desired result.

I shall refer in a moment to other ways in which this can and should be done.

Finally, it would not be effective, since even with the inclusion of the tax there would still be a brake in terms of interest rates for raising money in this country.

Lastly, and very importantly, it is completely confounded by the fact that we are now beginning to turn the corner on foreign private investment, obtaining more income. Leaving out the undistributed profits—which are not distributed—merely taking into consideration money actually brought here from abroad, we are now getting more income from foreign investment per annum than the money which goes out, without the interest equalization tax. We are already showing a profit, as it were, in terms of the international balance of payments from that account.

Under those circumstances the whole thing falls like a house of cards. I thoroughly agree with my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is making a very interesting presentation. I shall listen with interest.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, in answer to the question by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], I said, that there are other ways in which we could do what needs to be done with respect to some discipline in our capital market with respect to the flotation of foreign issues.

First, we should give whatever assistance is necessary to help West European nations develop their own capital markets. It is incongruous that the same countries which are amassing sizable dollar and gold reserves at the expense of our international balance-of-payments deficits should come to the New York market for their capital needs, while they continue to maintain strict restrictions on capital movements in their own countries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks three documents, one entitled "Summary of Controls Over Major Capital Movements Exercised by Major Industrial Countries" prepared by the Treasury; and a report entitled "The European Capital Markets," issued by the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York; and an article from the July 19 issue of the Wall Street Journal relating to restrictions on capital movements in principal financial markets of the world; all of which bear out the fact that we are asked to keep open our efficient capital markets for the very countries which are building up their reserves at the expense of our imbalance of international payments while they are lax in expanding their own markets for the flotation of securities and are maintaining strict restrictions upon capital flows.

There being no objection, the summary, document, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of controls over capital movements exercised by major industrial countries

Country	Type of capital movement				
	Convertibility of currency on capital account	Direct investments abroad	Portfolio investment abroad	Commercial credits, 5 years and under	Financial loans
Belgium-Luxembourg	External	Control via free market	Control via free market	Control via free market	Control via free market.
France	do	Liberalized	Free	Liberalized	Individual licensing and banking laws.
Germany	Full	Free	do	Free	Free.
Italy	External	Largely liberalized	Generally permitted, with some exceptions.	Credits up to 5 years liberalized, all other credits under 1 year liberalized.	Loans within the EEC under 5 years, less than $80,000, and with interest less than 6 percent are free. Loans over 1 year liberalized.
Netherlands	do	Liberalized	Control via free market	Liberalized	Individual licensing.
Switzerland	Full	Free	Free	Large credits controlled under banking laws.	Large loans controlled under banking laws.
United Kingdom	External	Individual licensing and control via free market.	Control via free market	Controlled over 6 months	Controlled under both banking and exchange control laws.

Country	Type of capital movement				
	Deposits in foreign banks	Flotation of securities issues by nonresidents	Repatriation of direct investments by nonresidents	Repatriation of portfolio investments by nonresidents	Areas where special regulations apply [1]
Belgium-Luxembourg	Control via free market	Banking laws and free market exchange rate.	Control via free market	Control via free market.	None.
France	Generally not permitted	Controlled under both banking and exchange control laws.	Liberalized	Free	French franc area.
Germany	Free	Free	Free	do	None.
Italy	Generally not permitted	Controlled under both banking and exchange control laws.	Liberalized	Liberalized	OECD; EEC.
Netherlands	do	do	do	Control via free market.	Guilder area.
Switzerland	Free	Controlled under banking laws	Free	Free	None.
United Kingdom	Generally not permitted	Controlled under both banking and exchange control laws.	Free on approved investments	Control via free market.	Sterling area: Uniscan.

[1] Payments to bilateral account countries not listed here are also under special controls.

NOTE.—The notation "liberalized" indicates that prior authorization is required, but is freely given. The notation "control via free market" indicates that transactions are permitted, but that the call on foreign exchange to finance them is restricted by channelling them through a free market, the supply of foreign exchange which is limited. Tendencies for outflow to increase result in changes in the free market exchange rate rather than in an increased outflow of foreign exchange.

THE EUROPEAN CAPITAL MARKETS

The high rate of economic growth in Europe during the past 15 years was due in large part to a high level of investment in new productive capacity. The role which the European capital markets played in this development may be suggested by a few facts:

The market value of all outstanding securities in the Common Market in 1962 was roughly $120 billion—which is less than 13 percent of the U.S. volume.

Yet in 1962, total issues of new securities in the EEC were $8.3 billion, or about 42 percent of the U.S. total.

Moreover, this represents an increase in new issues of more than 100 percent during the last 5 years.

Further, European capital needs were supported by an inflow of private long-term capital from the United States of more than a billion dollars in 1962.

Until recently, only a small share of Europe's long-term capital funds came from formal capital markets. High business profits in Europe have been the major source of industrial capital funds. But business profits have been shrinking during the last years, and more and more companies have found it necessary to seek additional capital by floating new bonds and stocks.

This raises the question of what the role of European markets will be in meeting future needs. This is of great importance to American companies operating in Europe because it will affect where and on what terms they will be able to satisfy their investment requirements.

A second problem arises from the large outflow of long-term capital to Europe that has occurred because of the higher interest rates and greater profits that have been made in that area. This has produced a continuing strain on the U.S. balance of payments. For this reason, growing concern has been expressed about the adequacy of the European capital markets. Thus it is useful to examine more closely the institutions—and the dimensions—of these markets.

THE MARKETS ARE SMALL

A broad definition of the term "capital market" would include that whole set of financial institutions which help to channel the financial savings of a country into real investments. Another definition, more narrow than the first, refers only to the issue and exchange of marketable securities. It is the latter type of markets for bonds and stocks in Europe which are alleged to be too small and relatively undeveloped, and about which the following paragraphs will be concerned.

One measure of the scope of the capital market is its absolute size. Rough estimates of the value of securities outstanding in Europe are taken from calculations of the par value of private bonds and of government bonds held by the public, plus the market value of shares outstanding. By this measure, the total value of listed securities outstanding, government and private, in all of Western Europe today approximates $300 billion.

The countries in Europe with the largest volumes of marketable securities are Britain, $153.6 billion; Germany, $36.6 billion; Italy, $35.7 billion; and France, $33.3 billion. The comparable figure for the United States is $925 billion at the end of 1962. The magnitude of this difference is somewhat surprising, considering the fact that the gross national product of the United States is just double that of Britain, France, Germany, and Italy together.

Yet the relatively small volume of securities in Western Europe is easy to explain. The financial aftermath of World War II—inflation, devaluation, and currency reform—reduced sharply existing debt in Europe. Continuing inflation discouraged the acquisition of fixed-interest securities, and low levels of per capita income, together with a huge pent-up demand for housing and durable consumer goods, left relatively few funds for investment in newly issued shares. Furthermore, profits were high and little incentive existed for companies to finance expansion from outside sources.

As a result of changing conditions, however, a more significant volume of new issues has appeared in recent years on the various capital markets of Europe.

NEW ISSUES ARE INCREASING

In 1962, all new public and private issues, net of redemptions, in the EEC countries totaled $8.3 billion, or about 42 percent of the comparable U.S. figure. And though the government sectors of the European economies include the railroads and various public utilities, net issues of corporate securities in Europe were nearly as large as the U.S. volume. The total for the EEC, Britain, and Switzerland was 85 percent of the respective U.S. market in 1962.

This is a good showing—and reflects a phenomenal growth in volume of new corporate issues in Western Europe. In the European Economic Community alone, new corporate bonds and stocks, net of redemptions, issued in 1962 had a market value of $6.8 billion—an increase of over 100 percent since 1957. During the same period, net issues by corporations in the United States decreased slightly.

There can be no doubt that the European captial markets have responded quickly and at an unprecedented pace to the rising demand for investment funds. At the same time, it is evident that the demand for funds has exceeded the supply that could be generated through regular capital markets. Two facts illustrate this:

First, business investment in excess of depreciation in plant and equipment in the EEC countries has been increasing rapidly and is now larger than that of the United States. Even after allowing for the different methods of measuring aggregate depreciation in the various countries, the comparison is striking. In 1961, when investments in the United States leveled off, net investment reached about $10 billion in the United States as against an approximate Common Market total of $20.6 billion.

Yet the volume of new private issues in that year was larger in the United States, some $5.8 billion for the EEC as against $8.8 billion for the United States. Much of the difference in Europe was made up through "short-term" bank borrowing.

Second, certain leading European companies and public authorities have been able to raise additional capital at reasonable rates by floating new issues in the New York market. The net outflow of U.S. private capital to Western Europe in the form of new issues, direct investments, long-term loans, and portfolio investments amounted to $1,052 million in 1962. The inflow from Western Europe of such funds was a mere $163 million.

Thus the European financial markets present a picture both of very rapid growth and of continuing capital scarcity. The growth is evidenced by the fact that new corporate issues have been rising faster than net investments. The scarcity is evidenced by the comparatively large share of investment funds obtained from short-term and medium-term bank credit.

A favorable omen for continued growth is the rapid expansion of personal savings in the major European countries. In Germany, for example, personal savings rose from $4.9 billion in 1957 to $6.8 billion in 1961. In time, the financial institutions are certain to channel a larger portion of these funds into the capital markets.

Another hopeful factor is the slow but steady improvement of the institutions of the European capital markets, although one must realize that developments of recent years took place in a number of separate national markets rather than in a single large economy.

THE MARKETS ARE SEPARATE

Whereas New York is the center and ultimate clearing point for most new issues in the United States, there is no equivalent financial center in Western Europe. There the stock exchanges are primarily national in character, and even today the number of listings of foreign securities in London, Paris, or Frankfurt is small.

This national separation of markets is still more apparent in the flotation of new issues. London, which used to be a primary source of long-term capital for the entire world, nowadays serves Commonwealth countries primarily. In 1962, Great Britain permitted the flotation of a single nonsterling loan: a $5.5 million issue by the Government of Iceland. Not a single issue of a country outside the franc zone was floated in Paris last year nor in any other year since the end of World War II, and the only foreign loan floated in West Germany in 1962 was a $25 million bond issue by the city of Osaka.

Government controls constitute still another limitation affecting foreign capital issues in most European countries. These controls are designed to channel capital into domestic needs at interest rates lower than would prevail in free markets.

The Netherlands and Switzerland are the only European countries where foreign securities are regularly floated, although on a relatively small scale. In these countries interest rates are lower and total borrowing costs compare favorably with those prevailing in the New York market. In part, this is because new issues require a government license, and total foreign issues are limited by a predetermined quota.

In West Germany, on the other hand, there is a minimum of capital market controls and the effective bond rate last year was close to 6 percent which, together with a 2.5-percent tax on new issues, made the German capital market unattractive to foreign borrowers.

INTEGRATION PROCEEDS SLOWLY

The Treaty of Rome stipulates the eventual removal of all restrictions against capital movements among the six countries of the EEC. This important liberalization is expected to become fully effective by 1967. It does not necessarily mean that the European capital markets will be open to all would-be borrowers—it implies only free access of the member countries to each other's markets.

The removal of legal restrictions will be a great step forward, though it may not by itself assure effective integration of the European capital markets. Integration is complicated by the divergent banking structures in the member countries. In Italy, industrial long-term capital is supplied in large amounts by government lending agencies. In addition, the large deposit banks with nationwide branch systems are all nationalized. Investment banking in France essentially involves the making of long-term loans. New capital issues, on the other hand, are mainly distributed by nationalized nationwide deposit banks. In the Netherlands and Germany a few very large banks dominate the capital markets, operating as investment bankers, deposit bankers, and security brokers all in one.

This great divergence of banking institutions and underwriting practices in the EEC countries means that integration of the capital markets in Europe will be a rather slow process, though much depends on the future pace of overall economic integration.

The lack of integration is illustrated by the fact that almost all underwriting consortia formed in Europe today involve banks of one country only. However, one recent issue (a new bond of the Municipal Bank of Norway) proved to be an exception. The bonds in question were denominated in 17 European currencies, thereby insuring the lenders not only against devaluation, but also allowing them to benefit from a possible future appreciation of any of the 17 currencies in which redemption may be demanded. This method could be employed in the future—but would likely require the prior consent of the central banks involved.

Volume of new securities in selected countries—Actual proceeds, net of redemptions, in 1961

[In millions of dollars]

	National Government [1]	Other public authorities	Total Government	Corporate bonds	Stocks	Total corporate	Foreign securities	Total new issues (net)
Belgium and Luxembourg	101.0	317.3	418.3	16.6	106.0	122.6	----------	540.9
France	−151.9	24.3	−127.6	862.8	656.2	1,519.0	----------	1,391.4
Germany	512.0	466.0	978.0	1,016.1	823.9	1,840.0	3.0	2,821.0
Italy	216.4	18.4	234.8	1,156.4	666.8	1,823.2	24.0	2,082.0
Netherlands	73.5	48.6	122.1	34.2	48.6	82.8	119.3	324.2
United Kingdom	−590.0	64.1	−525.9	313.0	1,151.4	1,464.4	154.6	1,093.1
Switzerland	−8.9	8.1	−.8	222.9	83.3	306.2	196.7	502.1
8 European countries	152.1	946.8	1,098.9	3,622.0	3,536.2	7,158.2	497.6	8,754.7
United States	−3,300.0	4,700.0	1,400.0	5,100.0	3,700.0	8,800.0	600.0	10,800.0

[1] Change in public holdings of marketable debt having a maturity of 1 year or more.

Sources: EEC—All. Stat. Bulletin, Midland Bank Review, Statistique et Etudes Financiere, Monatsbericht der Deutschen Bundesbank, Schweizerische National Bank—Monatsbericht, Finance Accounts of United Kingdom, B.I.S.—Annual Report.

IMPLICATIONS FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

Despite these favorable signs, it is unlikely that American firms will find it profitable to issue securities in Europe in the near future. At present, only Switzerland and the Netherlands offer long-term funds on terms comparable with those in the United States. With the establishment of freedom of capital movements within the EEC, any free Netherlands funds are likely to be absorbed by the other Common Market countries. This leaves Switzerland, where a substantial volume of foreign securities are floated each year. However, the Swiss authorities seem to favor corporate borrowers that operate in Switzerland itself. At any rate, the Swiss volume of foreign flotations is not likely to increase.

Subsidiaries of American companies in Europe will most likely continue to obtain capital funds in Europe—from retained earnings and depreciation, and from bank loans. However, the meager possibilities of issuing securities in continental financial centers mean that part of U.S. subsidiary capital will continue to be raised in the United States.

CONCLUSION

Over the near future, it seems likely that Europe will remain an area of relative capital scarcity compared with the United States, and that investment funds will tend to flow chiefly from the United States to Europe.

As the European capital markets become broader and deeper, however, and as the institutions serving them become more integrated, the cost of channeling savings into investments should decline. It may then become easier to float major issues in Europe, and, as a secondly result, the demands on the U.S. capital market should become relatively smaller.

NEW U.S. OPERATIONS IN WESTERN EUROPE

The table below represents a sample of 1,874 new business ventures established in Western Europe by U.S. firms during the period January 1958 through January 1963. The table shows their distribution by country and industry. Other patterns and trends appearing from a study of the sample are shown in the following charts.

New operations of U.S. companies in Europe—1958–62

	Belgium-Luxembourg	France	Germany	Italy	Netherlands	European Economic Community	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Other EFTA	Total EFTA	Other Europe	Total Europe
Machinery, nonelectrical	46	56	47	44	27	220	62	41	9	112	9	341
Electrical machinery and electronics	18	34	10	40	12	123	25	20	4	4.	5	177
Household appliances	1	15	7	6	4	33	9	8	1	18	2	53
Transportation equipment	14	28	6	17	6	71	10	15	1	26	------	97
Agricultural and construction equipment	6	12	5	4	2	29	10	5	1	16	------	45
Office machinery	6	9	9	4	5	33	8	10	4	22	3	58
Instruments and watches	4	19	25	11	18	77	15	13	1	29	3	109
Basic metals and metal products	21	19	20	18	11	89	14	11	1	26	2	117
Research and engineering	5	16	9	4	6	40	4	8	------	12	------	52
Petroleum and other fuels	6	9	9	12	4	40	2	4	6	12	3	55
Chemicals and products	53	45	43	50	40	231	25	27	7	59	8	298
Rubber	6	9	3	4	4	26	2	1	------	3	2	31
Paper	7	12	7	5	2	33	8	9	5	22	3	58
Textiles and clothing	13	7	8	6	12	46	12	9	3	24	2	72
Food, beverages, and tobacco	14	14	16	12	13	69	15	14	2	31	3	103
Glass	3	1	1	4	------	9	1	1	2	4	------	13
Services:												
Finance	3	11	8	5	2	29	3	4	------	7	1	37
Retail and wholesale trade	2	3	2	------	------	7	3	1	2	6	------	13
Hotels	1	4	3	1	1	10	1	3	------	4	2	16
Marketing and publicity	2	5	5	3	1	16	4	7	1	12	------	28
Other services	5	7	3	2	7	24	5	7	1	13	1	38
Others	9	10	13	9	2	43	10	3	6	19	1	63
Total	245	345	268	261	179	1,298	248	221	57	526	50	1,874

The trend is toward full ownership in EEC

	Percent
1960:	
Wholly U.S. owned	50
European partner	35
European licensee	15
1961:	
Wholly U.S. owned	56
European partner	34
European licensee	10
1962:	
Wholly U.S. owned	60
European partner	32
European licensee	8

But in Britain, partnerships are becoming more common

	Percent
1960:	
Wholly U.S. owned	51
European partner	26
European licensee	23
1961:	
Wholly U.S. owned	41
European partner	33
European licensee	26
1962:	
Wholly U.S. owned	45
European partner	38
European licensee	17

The trend to equity purchase is rising in Germany and Belgium

Germany: 11, 18, and 22 percent.
Belgium: 8, 12, and 13 percent.

But declining elsewhere in EEC

France: 21, 21, and 10 percent.
Netherlands: 18, 14, and 11 percent.
Italy: 24, 21, and 7 percent.

Headquarters, sales and service companies are shifting to EEC

	Percent
1960:	
EEC	34
Other	9
Switzerland	57
1961:	
EEC	25
Other	9
Switzerland	66
1962:	
EEC	47
Other	3
Switzerland	50

Equity purchases are also more common in Britain than in EEC

	Percent
United Kingdom	29
Germany	22
Belgium-Luxembourg	13
Netherlands	11
France	10
Italy	7

Where U.S. firms established in 1962

	Percent
Paper:	
EEC	46
Other Europe	42
United Kingdom	12
Textiles and Clothing:	
EEC	60
Other Europe	23
United Kingdom	17
Services:	
EEC	62
Other Europe	26
United Kingdom	12
Petroleum: [1]	
EEC	62
Other Europe	38
United Kingdom	
Machinery, Nonelectric:	
EEC	66
Other Europe	16
United Kingdom	18
Office machinery: [1]	
EEC	69
Other Europe	31

[1] Includes United Kingdom.

Where U.S. firms established in 1962—Con.

Electrical machinery:	*Percent*
EEC	70
Other Europe	19
United Kingdom	11
Transportation equipment:	
EEC	70
Other Europe	20
United Kingdom	10
Instruments:	
EEC	72
Other Europe	21
United Kingdom	7
Food, Beverages, and Tobacco:	
EEC	74
Other Europe	11
United Kingdom	15
Research and engineering: [1]	
EEC	75
Other Europe	25
Metals and products:	
EEC	78
Other Europe	11
United Kingdom	11
Chemicals and drugs:	
EEC	85
Other Europe	9
United Kingdom	6
Appliances:	
EEC	89
United Kingdom	11

And how they established

Germany:	*Percent*
Wholly U.S. owned	53
European partner	35
European licensee	12
Netherlands:	
Wholly U.S. owned	53
European partner	42
European licensee	5
Italy:	
Wholly U.S. owned	60
European partner	31
European licensee	9
France:	
Wholly U.S. owned	63
European partner	31
European licensee	6
Belgium-Luxembourg:	
Wholly U.S. owned	67
European partner	23
European licensee	10
United Kingdom:	
Wholly U.S. owned	45
European partner	38
European licensee	17
EEC:	
Manufacturing companies	90
Headquarters and sales companies	10
United Kingdom:	
Manufacturing companies	96
Headquarters and sales companies	4

[1] Includes United Kingdom.

OTHER NATIONS' CURBS ON FOREIGN LOANS HELP DRAIN U.S. DOLLARS THROUGH NEW YORK

NEW YORK.—Most leading industrialized nations have long restricted capital movements out of their countries, thus holding down the size of foreign borrowings in their markets.

For more than a year U.S. authorities have been urging European nations to liberalize such restrictions to reduce the volume of foreign borrowing in New York.

Complete freedom of capital movement into and out of the United States has been the chief reason making New York by far the largest market in the world since World War II for the sale of new foreign bond issues. From the end of the war to 1962 new foreign dollar securities marketed in New York totaled $10 billion. Foreign investors are estimated to have bought a fifth of these securities and U.S. investors the remainder, so that the dollar outflow totaled $8 billion.

In 1962 the total of new foreign bond issues sold in the United States rose to a record $1¼ billion, double the average for the 6 previous years. Borrowing in the first half this year ran at an annual rate of $1.5 billion. Administration officials hope to cut that rate in half by 1965.

SWITZERLAND IS SECOND

The second largest international market is Switzerland, where foreigners sold $165 million new bonds in 1962 and $232 million the year before. Large sums held by Swiss banks for foreign depositors mean the country often has more capital than is needed for domestic expansion.

The Swiss, however, tend to restrict the size of individual foreign securities issues made in Switzerland to a maximum of $23.2 million each. The Swiss National Bank, the country's central bank, must be informed of all loans to foreigners exceeding $23.2 million and has the right to veto such transaction if the economic interests of Switzerland are thought to require it.

From 1956 to 1958 Switzerland closed its markets to foreign borrowers because Swiss borrowers had difficulty finding all the funds they need. In 1962 the national bank again restricted foreign loans, this time by limiting new foreign securities issues in Switzerland to one a month. The bank took this step because of a growing deficit in the current account on the Swiss balance of payments.

The Netherlands, where new foreign securities issues totaled $63 million in 1962 and $149 million in 1961, is generally ranked as the third international capital market.

DUTCH LIMIT SIZES OF ISSUES

The Dutch authorities, however, generally limit the size of new foreign securities issues to $13.8 million each, and from 1955 to 1961 the Dutch market was closed entirely to foreign borrowers, because too great a proportion of Holland's savings was flowing abroad. Early in 1962 the central bank again restricted its authorization of new foreign flotations to arrest a decline in the nation's balance of payments.

London, once ranked as the world's leading capital market, provided foreign bond borrowers with an average of $1 billion a year immediately before World War I, at the rates of exchange then prevailing. Since World War II, London has restricted issuing of new foreign securities almost exclusively to borrowers from other countries in the British Commonwealth. Last year, however, it experimentally allowed a small foreign bond flotation by the Government of Iceland, which raised $5.6 million.

Since 1958 Germany has been one European country that has kept its capital market completely open to foreigners, but relatively high interest rates helped hold down foreign borrowing there. The only foreign bond issue floated in West Germany last year was a $25 million issue by the city of Osaka, Japan. In 1961 and 1960 foreign securities issues in Germany totaled less than $5 million a year.

FRENCH MARKET CLOSED

Among the other major European nations, the French have completely closed their capital market to foreign borrowers, and foreign borrowings in other markets in Europe are small, scattered, and generally restricted by governments.

Under the Treaty of Rome, which set up the European Common Market, member nations are committed to remove restrictions on capital movements between each other's countries.

European nations have recently eased restrictions some, although the two latest instances aren't directly concerned with government regulations on foreign securities in these lands. In December the Austrian National Bank granted permission for certain kinds of capital exports to be made by residents, and in April the Italian authorities gave permission for Italians to buy securities traded on any stock exchange in the world.

In the New York market, the bulk of new foreign securities issues come from Canada, the World Bank and Israel. Because of special circumstances tying these borrowers to some extent to the New York market, the U.S. authorities look to the Europeans to borrow more at home and less here. In 1962 European countries raised an estimated $315 million in new securities issues in the United States, while similarly borrowing $185.5 million in each other's markets.

Because of the free availability of capital in the United States, European borrowers in the past have often sold new securities issues here even when interest rates were unfavorable. In some cases European borrowers raised what they could in European markets, then sought the remainder, at higher rates, in New York.

Foreign bond issues offered publicly in the United States thus far in 1963, as compiled by Moody's Investors Service, Inc., include:

Issue	Amount	Date offered
Japan Development Bank	$22,500,000	Jan. 31
Denmark	30,000,000	Feb. 27
Finland	12,500,000	Mar. 13
Mitsui & Co., Ltd. (Japan)	10,000,000	Mar. 24
Copenhagen Telephone Co	15,000,000	Apr. 10
Australia	30,000,000	Apr. 11
Norway	25,000,000	Apr. 25
Japan	27,500,000	May 2
City of Copenhagen	15,000,000	May 22
Oslo	10,000,000	June 13
City of Milan	20,000,000	July 11
Mexico	40,000,000	July 17

Major foreign bond issues known to have been placed privately in the United States thus far in 1963 include:

Issue	Amount	Month sold
Quebec Hydro-Electric Commission	$300,000,000	February.
Bayer Foreign Investments, Ltd. (Canada)	30,000,000	March.
Bell Telephone Co. of Canada	50,000,000	April.
Province of Ontario	20,000,000	May.
Belgium	20,000,000	Do.
Consolidated Goldfields of South Africa	18,000,000	June.
Shell Funding Corp. (Royal Dutch)	115,000,000	Do.
Pechiney Enterprises (France)	17,500,000	Do.
Nippon Express Co., Ltd. (Japan)	15,000,000	Do.
Pacific Petroleums, Ltd. (Canada)	32,000,000	July.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a liberal. I am proud of the term. I never apologize for it. But I think this is another example of the fact that liberalism does not mean mawkishness, muddleheadedness, or softening of the brain. Liberalism does not mean that one does not understand the realities of competition, that one does not understand the realities of national selfishness, or that one is not determined to utilize the economic power available to correct a situation in the interests of the health of the total economy of the whole free world.

We should utilize all the persuasive power at our command to induce the cooperation of our friends, to induce them to take steps toward the development of their own capital markets and to remove their restrictions on capital movements. But should persuasion not suffice, we should give serious consideration to taking proper steps, including the establishment of a capital issues committee in the New York market, to be composed of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, the Treasury, and key commercial banks and underwriters, which would be required to pass judgment on which proposed foreign capital issues would be consistent with our national interest.

The Swiss National Bank, the central bank of the second largest world financial center, has traditionally exercised such reviewing authority, as have several other key financial centers in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and France.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record with my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of September 1 recommending exactly such a capital issues committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1964]

Stopping the Dollar Drain

The huge outflow of dollars that took place in the first 6 months of this year has reportedly been reduced since President Kennedy proposed a tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds. This stanching of the drain, however, is unlikely to be permanent. Prospective foreign borrowers are simply holding off, waiting to see whether Congress will approve the administration's interest equalization tax. If it does, the hemorrhaging appears bound to resume, for this means of halting the outflow is an ineffective tourniquet.

The tax is difficult to reconcile with President Kennedy's frequent assertions that the present tax structure must be simplified and trade barriers relaxed. The addition of the tax would complicate the tax structure and would establish a tariff on capital, putting into effect a two-price system for funds. And despite the administration's claims that the tax will not interfere with the workings of the free market, it is clearly a form of control.

Worst of all, there is little evidence that this masked control will work. It is not the low cost of capital but the ready availability of funds that attracts foreign borrowers to the United States. Interest costs would be a deterrent if they were put up high enough, but the administration is not going to an extreme. Moreover, it has granted an exemption to Canada, the largest of all foreign borrowers, so that the amount that may be saved is hardly worth the cost of the new tax.

With the drain of dollars caused by foreign borrowing having run at an annual rate of $2 billion during the first half of the year, the administration is right to contemplate specific action to curtail the flow. Its proposal, however, would bring new leaks. If controls are to be used, the one sure method to stop the drain is to establish a capital issues committee, charged with limiting the number and amount of foreign issues as long as the emergency exists. This is the only way immune to loopholes and not involving an artificial price for funds. It is, moreover, a device well known and trusted by Europeans.

It might be possible to get by without any specific action. But if the administration is bent on reducing the drain created by foreign borrowing, it should fashion an effective tool.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, United States capital will stay at home when we have succeeded in creating an attractive economic climate in this country conducive to a high rate of investment by United States and foreign investors alike. This includes a more equitable tax treatment of corporate and individual investors, contemplated under the new tax bill; provision of additional incentives to increase productivity; and the establishment of effective means to resolve damaging labor-management disputes.

I add to that list the reconsideration of the antitrust laws of the United States, which, certainly in their application to the operation of American business abroad, are archaic and seriously disadvantage American business in competing, especially in the newly developing areas, with foreign business. A great deal of our business today is taken by foreign business because of the inhibitions we impose on American business concerns through archaic interpretation of the antitrust laws.

The proposal for a tax reduction will receive a great deal of consideration. One point of difference between Governor Rockefeller, as he stated his position this morning, and the President of the United States, is in the timing of a tax cut.

I say to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], whom I welcome into the Chamber, and who has taken such a great interest in the subject of my discussion this morning, that I was waiting for him. I am at the place in my discussion where I am pointing out the difference between Governor Rockefeller, in this morning's statement, and President Kennedy on the timing of a tax cut. I do not see that the question of a tax cut represents a material difference between them. It is true that the House Ways and Means Committee is considering the reduction of the corporate tax to 48 percent, instead of 47 percent, as the President originally desired, and as Governor Rockefeller wants to have; but essentially the tax cut is distributed in about the same way—that is, when it entirely takes effect, something in the area of $9 billion in the individual tax rates and about $2.3 billion in corporate tax rates.

There is a material difference in timing, however. Governor Rockefeller thinks the tax cut should take effect upon enactment, which would, or could, apply retroactively to the year 1963, and to income for the year 1963. The House Ways and Means Committee proposes to make the tax cut effective in two installments, one on the first of January, 1964, and the other on the first of January, 1965.

I would take my position—and I hope the President comes to that view and presses it in the Senate Finance Committee—with Governor Rockefeller.

I think there should have been a tax cut last October, when—and I am speaking for myself—the testimony before the Joint Economic Committee clearly showed that the President's advisers were of the mind that we should have provided an incentive tax cut, with which I thoroughly agree. As the British say, the time to resume is when we want to resume.

I think we made a great mistake in deferring, and we make a mistake when we defer, in a state of uncertainty as to whether or not to accept the deficits involved in a tax cut. The important point is that it should be done when it will be most helpful. I deeply believe it would have been most helpful last year. That point has passed.

I, too, would like to see the tax cut made retroactive to the 1963 tax year. I believe that is the way to give the economy the stimulus which will help us in respect of unemployment and improve our gross national product, which we are all looking for so ardently, as well as be of considerable assistance in the balance-of-payments field, and help to make American investment much more desirable and attractive at home than it seemingly is as of now.

I would like to cast my vote for a tax cut effective now—subject to the parliamentary requirements, but effective on the 1963 tax return—which still can be done this year, if we act before January 1, and which I feel is in the most urgent interest of the country.

I address myself now to another aspect of the problem which can very materially influence our balance of payments, and that is the restriction of tourist expenditures. There again we have a strange anomaly, as in the case of international capital movements, when a good many of our friends and allies and trading partners throughout the world, almost without exception, place restrictions on their tourist expenditures. We do not. I am all for our not doing it. But I do not want our not doing it at the cost of allowing others to do it. Therefore, we must utilize our economic power, to induce others to remove such restrictions. If they fail to do so let us impose it ourselves. We would much rather approach the situation by having the tourist restrictions of others lifted.

Mr. President, this is a serious problem. A total of 72 countries, including 19 of the fully developed, industrial countries of the free world, maintain such restrictions today.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record as a part of my remarks a compilation upon this subject, country by country, furnished to me by the International Monetary Fund as recently as July 5, 1963.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Restrictions on the Sale of Dollar Exchange for Travel Purposes

CARIBBEAN

Barbados: $280 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Bermuda: Sums up to $500 with additional amounts granted.

British Leeward Islands: $280 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

British Windward Islands: $280 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Dominican Republic: $100 per person at the discretion of the Central Bank.

Jamaica: $700 per person.

Nassau (Bahamas): $700 per person.

Trinidad and Tobago: $700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

CENTRAL AMERICA

El Salvador: $200 a person each six months with additional amounts approved.

SOUTH AMERICA

British Guiana: $393 per person per year.

Brazil: $250 a person with approval of Bank of Brazil in foreign banknotes and travelers checks, with no limit on domestic currency.

Surinam: $1,050 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.

EUROPE

Austria: $576 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.

Cyprus: $700 per person per year with additional amounts authorized.

Finland: $250 per person per trip.

France: $1,200 per person per trip with additional allocations granted.

Greece: $266 per person per trip.

Iceland: $338 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Ireland: $700 per adult per year with additional amounts granted.

Italy: $880 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.

Malta: $700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Monaco: $1,200 per person per voyage with additional allocations.

Netherlands: $830 per person for a 2-weeks trip, plus $42 a day up to 75 days with additional amounts granted.

Norway: $500 per adult per year and $250 per year for children under 12.

Portugal: $3,480 per person per trip.

Spain: $275 per person per year.

Sweden: $1,160 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.

Turkey: $222 per person per year.

Yugoslavia: $10 per year per person.

United Kingdom: $840 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.

AFRICA

Republic of Cameroon: $162 per person per year.

Ethiopia: $480 per person per year.

Ghana: $308 per adult per year and $196 for minors per year.

Guinea: Allowance subject to individual license.

Libya: $446 per person per year; $195 for children under 12.

Malagasy Republic: $300 per person per year.

Morocco: $160 per person per year.

Federation of Nigeria: $700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: $28 per day up to $840 per person per year; $14 per day up to $420 per child under 12 with additional amounts granted.

Sierra Leone: $700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Sudan: $288 per person per year; $72 per child under 16 per year.

Tanganyika: $700 per person with additional amounts granted.

Tunisia: $71 per person per year.

Republic of South Africa: $2,800 per adult per year, and $1,120 per year for children under 12.

Uganda: $700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

Zanzibar: $700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

MIDDLE EAST

Aden: $840 per person per year with additional sums granted.

United Arab Republic (Egypt): $172 per year per adult.

Iran: $500 per adult; $250 per child under 10 years of age.

Iraq: $504 per person per year, and $210 per person under 18.

Israel: $433 per person per trip.

Jordan: $500 to $600 per month.

Syria: Allowance subject to authorization from exchange control authorities.

FAR EAST

Australia: $4,400 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

British Borneo (Sarawak): $700 for each person in any travel year with additional amounts granted.

Brunei: $1,500 for each person with additional amounts granted.

North Borneo: $700 for each person with additional amounts granted.

Burma: $31 allowance.

Cambodia: Allowance subject to individual license.

Ceylon: $430 per person and $210 per child under 12 years of age. Residents who have traveled abroad in past 7 years will not be allowed further exchange.

India: Allowance subject to approval by Reserve Bank.

Indonesia: Allowance subject to approval by Reserve Bank.

Japan: Allowance subject to absolute control by Bank of Japan.

Korea: Allowance subject to approval by the Bank of Korea.

Laos: Allowance subject to approval by the exchange control authorities. No limit on export of national currency.

Nepal: Application must be made to Ministry of Finance for allowance.

New Zealand: $1,668 per person per year, and $1,167 per child under 12. In addition, $1,112 available to those who had not received an allocation for travel during previous 5 years.

Pakistan: $420 per person once every 3 years for a limited number of tourists per month.

Singapore: $1,400 for each person with additional amounts granted.

Taiwan: Foreign travel must be made with self-provided foreign exchange only. Tourists may take out $200 in foreign currency and $12 in national currency.

Thailand: $630 per person up to 90 days with additional sums available.

Vietnam: $140 to $200 converted authorization required from the National Exchange Office.

Source: International Monetary Fund, Exchange Restrictions Division, July 5, 1963.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am pleased to state that my thinking on this item coincides with that of the Senator from New York. I have had this subject in mind for some time. I obtained a report on the imbalance that results from the dollars spent by American tourists in foreign countries and foreign tourists in the United States, and the record gives these alarming figures:

In 1960, the deficit was $1,261 million. In 1961, $1,250 million. In 1962, $1,430 million, for a total of $3,941 million.

So in 3 years we have suffered a deficit of practically $4 billion, solely out of the difference between the dollars spent by foreign tourists in our country, and the dollars spent by our tourists in foreign countries.

These tourist imbalance figures, when included together with other items which make up our imbalance, show a total deficit for the year 1960 of $3,881 million; for 1961 of $2,370 million; and for 1962 $2,186 million, making an aggregate total of all deficit items for the 3 years of $8,437 million in our balance of payments.

I concur in what the Senator from New York has said about hoping these nations will change their restrictions. If they do not, we shall have to adopt restrictions which will be similar to those of the foreign countries.

Mr. President, an immediate remedy is for the President of the United States to call forcefully the deficit problem to the attention of the people of our country, and to make the plea, "See America." There are many things to be seen here. The problem of imbalance of payments is a dangerous one. It forebodes trouble for our country unless we solve it. One way to solve it is to curb the great deficit that occurs from the dollars spent by American tourists in foreign countries.

I want to commend the Senator from New York for his discussion of this very, very important subject.

I note, in reading his statement, that he referred to the $1.4 billion deficit for the year 1962.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly right. I may state to the Senator from Ohio that I, myself, was responsible for considerable activity in respect of "Visit U.S.A."

We dedicated a whole year to the idea "Visit U.S.A. Year." I was chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee in the other body when that idea was developed, and I was happy to see the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] carry through to completion that idea in the Senate.

I am sure that we would rather—and I am certain that the Senator from Ohio joins me in this statement—see foreign tourists spending as much money in this country as our tourists spend abroad. We would like to see a greatly increased number of them visit our country. That is certainly our hope, just as it is our hope that many more of our people will travel all over the world, even many more than do today.

However, when it comes to this issue as it relates to the question of balancing our international payments, it does seem to me—and I am very much honored to have the Senator from Ohio join me on this point—that it is anomalous to shut our eyes when other governments place restrictions on their tourists, particularly countries in which the economic situation has improved so tremendously, and arbitrarily shut the door to their capability to lifting those restrictions, and at the same time expect us to do nothing about the subject—unless they believe that we are inclined to be softheaded about all this—and therefore it seems to me that we may have to go through on this point. After all, big nations cannot bluff. We could well say to them, "Lift your restrictions, or else." If the restrictions are not lifted, we should begin to apply our restrictions until theirs are lifted. It is the only language, apparently, in which we can speak in terms of hard realism, in the light of the financial and economic situation prevailing in those countries. They must not expect to continue cozily in the old way, which they adopted after World War II under very different circumstances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The program espoused by the Senator from New York, which Congress adopted, with respect to a course of action which induces people to visit our country, has been productive of good results. Statistics on the influx of visitors from foreign countries have been encouraging. The number has been increasing. However, the deficit is still frightening. The deficit in 1962 was $2 billion. Of that, $1,400 million represents the imbalance resulting from what tourists from the United States spent in foreign countries.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to get the figures clear on this point. I can give the Senator the exact figures, because I am well aware of the situation. The total tourist expenditures of U.S. tourists abroad in 1962 was $2½ billion. The deficit in 1962 was $1,400 million. In 1963, it is expected to be $1,600 million. There has been an improvement with respect to receipts from those who visit us from abroad, in the sense that those expenditures have moved up from something in the neighborhood of $900 million in 1960 to approximately $1,050 million in 1962. Further improvement is contemplated as a result of the World's Fair in New York in 1964, and the productivity of our tourist promotion efforts. However, we are certainly not doing for the U.S. Travel Service what we should. The dollars that they spend for promotion are paid back many times over. I have often thought of advocating the idea of giving the agency a percentage of the improvement that is brought about, in terms of dollars to be spent for promotion.

The fact is that the tourist problem, as the Senator has pointed out, is very critical, and represents about a $3 billion outflow, which we have been suffering for almost 10 years. That is figuring half of what has been pretty much accepted as our normal imbalance of payments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that the imbalance in 3 years has been nearly $4 billion. It is something we should begin to think about. This is a field in which an appeal should be made to our own citizens, to give recognition to that danger. We should ask them to see America, and we should say to them, "You will be serving two purposes. Your esthetic and cultural richness will become stronger. At the same time you will be helping to extricate the United States from a fiscal and monetary situation which may become calamitous."

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I am glad to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said. This is merely by way of a postscript. He has referred to our asking our citizens to do more of their shopping in their own country. What the Senator has been discussing is significant in the Senator's State, as it is in our State also, particularly from the standpoint of our being so close to the Canadian border. The Canadian Government very recently reduced the amount of goods that a Canadian citizen may purchase in this country, cutting the amount back from $100 to $25.

I made some remarks on this subject the other day. I asked representatives in the State Department, and the President, and others, to make strong representations to the Canadian Government, to restore the $100 duty-free allowance for goods purchased in the United States. Curiously enough, I received quite a bit of mail from Canadian citizens, who feel very strongly about it, and who share the sentiments of the Senator from Ohio and others of us. In other words, the Canadian citizens who have written to me do not support the action taken by their Government in this respect. They do not wish to have such a limitation placed on their purchases in this country. As we all know, Canadians are extensive shoppers in this country. It seems to me that this would be a reasonable request. It may be a relatively small matter, but the purchases of Canadians in this country are quite extensive, and it would have an effect on this problem with which we are confronted in this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has mentioned ties in with the general views being expressed by his colleague from New York [Mr. Javits].

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe some action must be taken in this field. It is one in which we must be effective if we are to cure the problem.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator that an appeal should be made to our citizens, but I do believe that even a stronger and a more hardheaded appeal should be made by our Government to the officials of foreign nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleagues in the Senate for their meaningful and very helpful contributions.

Mr. President, having covered two subjects which relate to our problems in the field of the imbalance of international payments, I now wish to discuss my next subject. That is the question of what to do to help us with foreign trade. I would like to say a word about nontariff barriers.

Here we face a rather odd situation, in that we are being hurt as much, at least, by nontariff barriers as we are by tariff barriers in terms of expanding international trade. So I propose that we should undertake a major effort at the forthcoming General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiations to eliminate nontariff barriers to trade, including discriminatory customs procedures and procedures for the issuance of import licenses, indirect discrimination against automobiles made in the United States, unfair health regulations, unfair dumping procedures, unfair types of laws, best known as "Buy American" laws, which endeavor to give domestically a preference outside tariff laws, and various regulations dealing with quality control and security, all of which restrain trade.

I recognize the difficulty that such negotiations may involve, particularly with the European Common Market.

The postwar grand design of Western economic unity, in which Britain's entry into the Common Market was inseparably a part of an economically united Europe, in close partnership with the United States, has come under severe attack as a result of General de Gaulle's veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market and his intransigence with regard to meaningful trade negotiations with the United States.

The economic costs to the United States of an economically united Europe are now becoming apparent as we are experiencing increasing competition with European goods in our markets and as our goods find it increasingly tough to compete with European manufactures in the markets of other countries.

There are great advantages for us and the free world in the European Common Market. However, should we fail to obtain a general reduction of such nontariff barriers maintained by the European economic community and a number of GATT countries, such as taxes and tax rebates, quotas, and tariff valuation procedures, as well as licensing procedures, special technical standards, and discriminatory ocean freight rates—the latter being a subject recently discussed before the Joint Economic Committee—it is certain that the forthcoming "Kennedy round" of tariff negotiations will serve the cause of expanding U.S. exports little or not at all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a series of articles from the Journal of Commerce of June 18, 19, and 20 and an article from the June issue of the OECD Observer, the official publication of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, showing the extent of nontariff barriers to trade and their harmful effects.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 18, 1963]

TRADE TALK PREPARATIONS—UNITED STATES PRIMES NONTARIFF ITEMS FOR GATT BILLING

(By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—Administration officials are being urged to work at least as hard to reduce nontariff trade obstacles as to cut actual tariff rates in next year's General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiations. About 20 American industries have reported to the Commerce Department what they consider their biggest export barriers. Tariffs are shown to still play an important role, but the U.S. companies seem to be concentrating now on the relatively little known nontariff hurdles blocking U.S. sales abroad.

FACE SOME OBSTACLES

To a remarkable extent, the same obstacles facing one industry trouble most of the others. These nontariff barriers appear over and over again in the form of internal taxes, quotas, licensing procedures, special technical standards, tariff variations, and discriminatory ocean freight rates.

Industries from automobiles to food products are airing such problems with the Government as part of the U.S. effort to prepare for the coming GATT bargaining round.

To a remarkable extent, the same obstacles facing one industry trouble most of the others.

For the first time, GATT negotiations are expected to assign a significant role to discussions of world trade obstacles other than tariffs.

The U.S. industries are especially singling out what they find restrictive in their most lucrative sales area, the European Common Market. Here, taxes and tax rebates, quotas, tariffs, and tariff valuation methods have been brought under attack.

U.S. aluminum companies, for example, complain that the Common Market's 9 percent external tariff on ingots dims chances to improve exports. This tariff, they say, is completely unnecessary since the Common Market is not nearly self-sufficient in ingots.

U.S. TRADE OBSTACLES DESCRIBED IN SERIES

The trade obstacles most troubling U.S. exporters, as revealed in the current series of industry meetings held by the Commerce Department, are discussed today in the first of three articles. Today's article treats some of the major tariff and nontariff barriers imposed by the European Common Market, while obstacles in other countries will be explored tomorrow. A third article will attempt to assess U.S. chances to lower the trade barriers.

PRACTICES TERMED DAMAGING

American auto makers, food canners and electronic manufacturers also would like to see a reduction in Common Market duties, which in these three sectors generally range over 20 percent.

The canners and car makers, however, indicate that other Common Market practices are more damaging than high tariffs.

France embargoes canned fruits, it was reported, and almost rules out imports of canned vegetables, clear violations of GATT regulations. West Germany retains quotas on many canned fruits and vegetables and uses a system of import tenders discouraging U.S. bids, U.S. food representatives claim.

The canners also warn against prospective Common Market regulations governing labeling and food additives, which they say could have "serious consequences" for U.S. exports. Common Market canners, the American spokesmen reveal, have proposed specifications that would require the U.S. industry to change such basic factors as tin can sizes.

ASK ROAD TAX SWITCH

American auto producers meanwhile urge the United States to persuade the Common Market and other countries to switch their annual "road taxes" from a horsepower basis to a system based on car value. Foreign regulations, they say, cause owners of American "compacts" to pay hundreds of dollars more a year than do owners of comparable European models.

On a broader front, almost every U.S. industry is complaining of the myriad taxes imposed by the Common Market nations.

Italy, for example, charges a 20 percent duty on television receivers plus an import "equalization" tax, which brings the total charge to over 31 percent. France levies a 13.6 percent C.I.F. duty on air-conditioning equipment and then imposes a 25 percent sales tax on the duty paid value.

Also generally attacked is the method used by Common Market countries, as well as by some less developed nations, basing tariff charges on cost, insurance and freight. This multiplies a disadvantage for U.S. exporters in many instances, electronics industry spokesmen say, since landed cost increases with distance.

U.S. aluminum firms point to another handicap facing American exporters as a result of Common Market policies—tax rebates. West Germany gives its exporters rebates of up to the full amount of the turnover or sales tax, and Italy does the same. France allows dollar-earning exporters to retain special sums to cover trade promotion and travel expenses.

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 19, 1963]

FRUSTRATIONS ARE CITED—UNITED STATES EYES NONTARIFF OBSTACLES

(By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—U.S. industry spokesmen, in talks with government officials, are bringing into sharp focus the varied and frustrating obstacles fencing in world trade.

Troubled not only by export hurdles set up by the European Common Market, American businessmen are often hampered—and sometimes completely barred—from selling to other countries, particularly the underdeveloped lands.

U.S. textile men contend that about 50 nations literally prohibit textile imports. Spain and Australia are said to close their borders to intermediate chemicals and reportedly Mexico blocks entry of almost all canned foods, Japan bars foreign television receivers and Colombia embargoes air conditioners, to cite a few examples.

ORGANIC CHEMICAL PROBLEM

In stark contrast to these complaints, most sectors of the organic chemicals industry insist that removing tariff or nontariff barriers will not substantially increase their exports. In many instances, organic chemical representatives say, they are just being underpriced by lower cost foreign competition.

As might be expected, several American industries have checked off foreign trade blocs other than Europe's Common Market as pursuing policies stalling U.S. exports. Paper product makers caution that lower duties within the European Free Trade Association will seriously damage their future exports to Britain, and food processors don't like the protective wall being built by the Latin American free trade area and the Central American Common Market.

POINT TO CONTROLS

Many of the less developed nations, the U.S. businessmen point out, exercise unusually onerous controls against imports, to limit foreign exchange outflow, protect local enterprises, or just out of sheer bureaucracy.

Pigments manufacturers cite Argentina as a case in point. Besides getting a license, importers must post advance deposits covering up to 100 percent of their transaction. Then there's a surcharge, an obligatory certificate describing the product's constituents, the notarizing by a county clerk of invoices, and if more than one page is involved a blue ribbon must be secured with the official company seal set in wax.

Further required is a consulate fee in U.S. dollars, forms from the U.S. Agency for International Development, and with every bank draft a bank certificate. At draft maturity, a second notice listing ocean vessel, bill of lading and date must be supplied the importer for delivery to the Argentine Central Bank.

CASCADING TAXES

The most common devices used by Latin Americans and other developing lands to impede imports appear to be "cascading taxes, heavy cash deposits for licenses, currency restrictions, and tariffs ranging up to 200 percent ad valorem." Administrative "foot dragging" on processing license applications and excessive paperwork also has been frequently singled out as significant obstacles.

The cascading tax, as applied by some Latin American countries, is more sophisticated than the system prevailing in many Western European countries, it is said. The importer must pay the tariff, landed cost charges, administrative charges, customs fees and finally a "social security" tax.

U.S. auto makers have more specific grievances against several of the larger Latin republics. They point out that Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico require that locally produced components be used in increasing amounts in domestic car production.

The only apparent way to circumvent this and maintain imports into these countries, car producers say, is to expand or build new plants.

MORE COVERT WAYS

The developing nations, U.S. businessmen make clear, have more covert ways of holding back imports. Sweden, for example, maintains certain electrical code requirements, specifying such things as a particular wire, which effectively block U.S. appliance sales.

U.S. pharmaceutical firms face stringent registration requirements in countries like Austria and Denmark. Great Britain imposes particularly severe health standards on meats and Canada forbids certain food can sizes common in this country.

South Africa levies, according to some American industry spokesmen, an arbitrary freight "antidumping" charge. If the South African authorities think a freight rate is too low, they automatically impose an extra fee.

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 20, 1963]

INTERNATIONAL PIONEERING—NONTARIFF TALKS UNIQUE TO GATT

(By Richard Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 19.—The United States will explore a new facet of international bargaining at proposed GATT trade negotiations next year when it tackles the problem of nontariff barriers.

It appears that there will be difficulties enough to settle on a generally acceptable technique for bargaining relatively straightforward tariff concessions. The United States, the European Common Market and other members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) still have many delicate tariff negotiation procedures to work out.

FIFTY-NATION ORGANIZATION

But while tariffs have been negotiated in past GATT meetings, though on a more limited formula than proposed now, the 50-nation trade organization has never attempted to take up nontariff questions other than in a way incidental to the tariff discussions.

Now, however, everyone is agreed that such trade obstacles as taxes, quotas, discriminatory laws and health regulations should be given almost equal time as tariff matters.

The present survey of 30 or more American industries being carried out by the Commerce Department, to guide U.S. negotiators next year in their trade bargaining, discloses that some leading industrial representatives feel that reducing nontariff barriers abroad would be more rewarding than persuading countries to give further tariff concessions.

Representatives of the food industry, for one, have urged categorically that nontariff trade obstacles be attacked before tariffs are negotiated.

The prospects for U.S. negotiators to eliminate significantly nontariff trade barriers look mixed, however, a good part of these obstacles are bound up in laws or partly justified because of special circumstances.

FREIGHT RATE ISSUE

Without exception, American industries are complaining that ocean freight rates, as imposed by international shipping "conferences," discriminate against U.S. exporters. Rates for the same product are substantially higher from the United States to other countries than for any other foreign trade. Cars, for example, can be shipped more cheaply from Hamburg to Rio de Janeiro than from New Orleans to the Brazilian port.

In order to pare this differential, the United States will have to weave through the most complex of situations. Any rate change would need ultimately the consent of foreign shipping lines.

The present rate structure, which emerged during the immediate postwar years, has long been approved by U.S. lines, which form a minority element in the shipping conferences. The rationale is that without a fixed rate U.S. lines would be destroyed by the lower-cost foreign competition. In return for the high U.S. outbound rates the American shipping companies reportedly receive special treatment in non-U.S. intercoastal foreign trade.

Another objection raised by American exporters—that European countries base their tariff charges on c.i.f. rather than on f.o.b., values, is not expected to be satisfied. The 1960-61 GATT negotiating round was predicated on the West Europeans using c.i.f. and the U.S. f.o.b. valuation systems. To revise this agreement would considerably complicate next year's negotiations, officials here say.

Foreign taxing procedures that work against imports presents another complicated nontariff problem. Some of these taxes, such as an equalizing fee applied by certain countries to offset taxes on their domestic goods, involve statutory laws and thus legislative consent for amendment.

The United States, as regards its own nontariff barriers, is entangled in this legislative question. U.S. negotiators will be unable to bargain away laws such as that placing coal-tar chemical tariffs on an American selling price basis.

LIMITS ON ACTION

The most that can be done in these instances is to pledge executive action proposing changes to the national legislature. However, the administration of some laws, for example the antidumping or buy American acts, could be negotiated, including perhaps regular consultations on the administrative procedures in dispute.

Negotiating nontariff obstacles such as national health standards or electrical codes obviously will not be easy, either. But wherever regulations and not statutory law is involved the task will be considerably simplified.

Most of the foreign quota and licensing restrictions U.S. exporters denounce are found in the less developed countries. Here again, U.S. negotiators hit a problem—GATT recently agreed that the industrialized nations should go fairly easy on the protective trade barriers of the less developed lands.

[From the OECD Observer, June 1963]

Administrative and Technical Regulations: The Lesser Known Obstacles to Trade

When corset boning is exported to one major OECD country, each individual bone has to be marked with the country of origin even though the bones will never be visible in the finished article. Similarly the small metal nameplate for dogs' collars must be stamped with the country of origin on the inside. Yet who can know where they were made once they have been fixed to the collars?

Regulations like these, even if of only minor importance, hamper trade since the exporter has to meet different requirements for each different national market. Marking regulations are, however, only one, and probably one of the least important, of a whole series of administrative and technical regulations which influence in varying degrees the movement of international trade.

In the past, import duties and quantitative restrictions constituted the normal barriers to trade. With the passage of time quantitative restrictions have been substantially reduced and, in fact, virtually eliminated for nonagricultural imports; customs tariffs have been significantly lowered; and efforts are continually being made to achieve further progress in this domain.

As these barriers to trade disappear, the restrictive effects of existing administrative and technical regulations become more apparent; and it may become more tempting to use certain of the regulations as a substitute for the normal forms of protection.

Two different categories of regulations are covered by the general heading of administrative and technical regulations which may hamper trade. One group comprises the regulations directly related to trade: for example, customs formalities; rules concerning the classification and valuation of products for customs purposes; and procedures for the issue of import licenses, permits, and certificates. A number of these regulations were initially introduced between the two World Wars, others in the difficult period immediately following the last war when balance-of-payments difficulties forced even countries intimately wedded to a liberal trade policy to resort to exchange control and import licensing. As currencies became convertible again and quantitative restrictions could be relaxed, the machinery previously necessary to control imports became to a great extent redundant. Controls of this nature are, however, seldom scrapped as soon as they might be. They may be retained solely for statistical purposes or because it is feared that, once discarded, it would be difficult to reintroduce them. Thus even when imports are no longer restricted, an import licensing procedure may be retained; and the retention of such a procedure when it is no longer necessary may provide a degree of protection for the home producer.

Even if they serve a useful purpose, the formalities connected with importing and exporting may constitute an obstacle to trade because of the time it takes to complete them. Moreover, the complexity of many of the formalities to be completed by anyone who wishes to engage in trade constitutes a nuisance factor which cannot but be regarded as an impediment to trade.

Thus an importer may be required to fill out several extremely detailed forms, each similar but not identical to the other, and each requiring a large number of copies. He may be obliged to wait weeks or even months for his import license to be granted. Moreover, complex rules of classification and valuation may make it impossible for him to know at the time he places an order exactly how much he will have to pay in the way of import duties; and he must spend time keeping abreast of a host of constantly changing rules or employ someone else to do so.

The second category of technical and administrative regulations includes a multitude of rules not directly related to trade but having to do with security, public health, quality control, the prevention of fraud, or the rationalization of production. A country may, for instance, require that imported seeds and livestock be inspected for diseases of various sorts, that farm machinery meet certain safety standards, that fertilizers be analyzed chemically before being put on sale, that drugs be tested by medical authorities. The validity of this group of regulations is rarely open to doubt, but their diversity from country to country and their undue severity and complexity in many cases constitute an obstacle to trade and a hidden element of protection for the home manufacturer.

The OECD is to an increasing extent directing its attention to the knotty problem of administrative and technical regulations. Its objectives are to eliminate unnecessary or discriminatory regulations which hamper trade without harming the legitimate interests that may be involved; to reduce the timelag between technological development and changes in legislation so as to lessen the number of outmoded rules; and, finally, to facilitate trade through encouraging simplification of procedures and standardization of rules from country to country. In 1962, the Council of the Organization recommended to member governments that they review the administrative and technical regulations in force in their countries with an eye to eliminating those which are not essential and those which hamper trade; it also set up the machinery through which the OECD could handle problems that might arise in this area.

Because of the diversity of technical and administrative regulations, the approach of the Organization to achieving these aims is flexible. In some cases a country whose exporters have been experiencing difficulty owing to the regulations of another member country will refer the problem to the OECD which tries to resolve the differences through consultation. In other cases the OECD may take the initiative and conduct an inquiry into the difficulties that exist in a specific problem area. Or the organization may undertake a systematic country-by-country survey of the regulations in force in a particular domain. In the latter case the action resulting from the survey is likely to be a set of standardized rules and regulations which all member countries are urged to accept.

In the past, the specific actions of the OEEC and OECD have been principally concerned with regulations of the second group, e.g., those not directly connected with trade. The following examples show the nature of the organization's work in this area.

The Council has recommended that governments of member countries harmonize and simplify insofar as possible the procedures for labeling and registration of pharmaceutical products and move toward the reciprocal recognition of national registrations; for this purpose it has issued for both registration and labeling a set of standards to which it recommends that member governments adhere.

The Council has adopted a scheme for introducing international quality standards for certain agricultural products; for example, apples, pears, and tomatoes.

The Council has passed a resolution setting forth standards for the application and supervision of national safety regulations on welded gas cylinders.

The OECD has recently been intensifying its work in the realm of administrative regulations directly related to trade, in particular those having to do with customs formalities (including procedures for valuation and classification of goods) and Government buying procedures.

With a new round of trade negotiations about to take place following the U.S. Trade Expansion Act, the intimate link between the problems posed by administrative regulations on the one hand and the lowering of trade barriers on the other has become more evident. Certain important countries have indicated that they are no longer prepared to conduct tariff negotiations if the concessions they might obtain risk being counterbalanced by the protective effects of administrative regulations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the next point which complicates our effort to come abreast of the balance-of-payments problem is burden sharing for the defense of the West.

Our European NATO allies should also begin to assume a more equitable share of the burden of Western defense. It is noteworthy that $3 billion of our imbalance in international payments is attributable to foreign aid, military aid, and the maintenance of our forces abroad. The economic recovery of Europe, their intense desire to assume a larger role in the councils of the free world brings with it the responsibility of financing an increased share of that defense. We should let our allies know that our patience is running out and that unless they are ready to discuss burden sharing with us in a meaningful fashion, we may regretfully have to consider the advisability of making severe cuts in our military expenditures in Western Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table entitled "Defense Expenditures of NATO Countries as Percentages of Gross National Product at Current Market Prices, Calendar Year 1962."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Defense expenditures of NATO countries as percentages of GNP at current market prices, calendar year 1962

	Percent
Belgium-Luxembourg	3.0
Denmark	3.0
France	6.5
Germany	5.1
Greece	4.5
Iceland	([1])
Italy	3.5
Netherlands	4.5
Norway	3.7
Portugal	7.1
Turkey	5.4
United Kingdom	6.4
European NATO countries	5.4
Canada	4.5
United States	9.8

[1] Not available.

Source: Statistics and Reports Division, Agency for International Development.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is very clear that the only thing which has enabled us to tolerate a serious imbalance in our international payments for as long as 5 years now is the fact that we have been running a material export surplus. But in order to do the job which the world apparently requires and desires us to do, even more of an export surplus than the one we are running is required. Hence, one of the major things we must consider in connection with this matter is how to increase our exports.

In this respect, Mr. President, I believe we face again—as we faced in connection with the restrictions on tourist expenditures and the restrictions on the flotation of capital issues—a situation of discrimination by many of our allies; for although they are giving export incentives to their own citizens, we are not giving export incentives to ours.

Incidentally, this is pointed out very clearly in an article written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak entitled "Inside Report—An Economic Carrot," which was published yesterday in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Economic Carrot

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

As the deficit in this country's international balance of payments grows dangerously worse, there is sharp disagreement within President Kennedy's Cabinet over one possible remedy that would command the backing of the business community.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has been promoting a special tax reduction for businessmen who export. This conceivably could cut into the international payments deficit by increasing exports. In fact, top Commerce Department officials have talked the idea over with their counterparts at the Treasury in private negotiations this summer.

But the answer from the Treasury, which has primary responsibility for tax policy, has been a flat "No." There isn't even any formal conversation between Commerce and Treasury in progress at the moment.

There is some question, however, whether the Treasury's "No" will be final. A straw in the wind comes from Representative Al Ullman, of Oregon, a liberal Democrat and the Treasury's best friend on the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee. Ullman has become interested in the export subsidy scheme and recently broached the subject to Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon.

Ullman typifies the bipartisan concern on Capitol Hill over our international payments crisis. It has been a long time since liberals scoffed at the gravity of the payments deficit. It is hard to scoff when the dollars leaving this country exceed the dollars entering it by an annual rate of $5.2 billion. The dollars held overseas can be exchanged for gold on demand, and an accelerated gold outflow could lead to possible economic disaster here.

What's more, there is a notable lack of enthusiasm in Congress over the way the Treasury is handling the crisis. The Treasury's major proposal—to reduce outgoing dollars by levying a tax on the purchase of foreign securities—smacks of controls and coercion. Moreover, many Congressmen fear more currency controls to come.

The great appeal of a special tax break for exporters then is that it involves persuasion, not coercion, of business—an economic carrot, not a stick.

It presumably could interest more businessmen in export markets and permit a drop in export prices so that U.S. products would be more marketable abroad. Greater exports not only would reduce the payments deficit, but would also stimulate the economy back home.

A simple plan devised by private economist, Eliot Janeway, has attracted much interest in the Commerce Department. Janeway would provide a tax credit to corporations and individuals for the export of commodities, manufactures, and services to countries with hard—that is, convertible to dollars—currencies.

What's the Treasury's objection? Mainly loss of revenue—billions of dollars perhaps. This objection, reasonable enough for doctrinaire budget balancers, seems a bit strange for a Treasury team that is advocating an $11 billion general income tax cut.

A more sophisticated argument, however, is advanced by Secretary Dillon in a July 5 letter to Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, who has been interested in export subsidies. Dillon points out that income tax subsidies violate GATT, the international trade rule book.

This is a really remarkable stance in view of the way export subsidies are spreading all over the European continent. De Gaulle's France, for instance, completely exempts export earnings from its principal tax on business.

The Europeans are simply taking advantage of a GATT loophole permitting export subsidies through transaction taxes (though not income taxes). It may or may not be coincidental that West European countries make great use of the transactions tax—and we do not.

So, instead of trying to expand U.S. exports through our own tax subsidies, Dillon is "taking a very firm stand against the proliferation of special tax export incentives used by our European competitors."

The probability that this firm stand won't mean a thing to tough European finance ministers is one reason why the United States may yet turn to Luther Hodges' subsidy scheme, in self-defense, if for no other reason.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we should give immediate consideration to updating such laws as the Western Hemisphere Trading Corporation Act, the Webb-Pomerene Act, and the China Trade Act, all of which were designed 20 to 40 years ago as incentives to U.S. exports and U.S. investments in certain areas of the world. It seems to me that we must modernize all of these acts and generalize their application. I have asked the Legislative Reference Service to make a thorough study of them; and on the basis of this study, I expect to introduce appropriate legislation in the near future.

We should also fully utilize the tariff-cutting authority contained in the Trade Expansion Act in the next round of tariff negotiations—which opens officially May 1, 1964—as a most effective initial step to bring about adjustment of the free world economies to one another.

Should it become apparent during these negotiations that the President's authority to cut tariffs is insufficient under the Trade Expansion Act, Congress should immediately consider amendments proposed during this session by me and by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Both of these amendments are designed to deal with the problems caused by rejection of the United Kingdom's application for membership in the European Common Market, which makes our Trade Expansion Act of 1962 already obsolescent, in part; they would give the President flexible power to cut tariffs further, in order to obtain meaningful cuts in the tariffs of our principal trading partners, and would deal effectively with the so-called 80-percent clause of the Trade Expansion Act—a clause which now is completely ineffective, because although it was assumed the United Kingdom would be admitted to the European Common Market, that has not occurred.

Mr. President, we have been threatening the European Common Market with retaliation; and, indeed, in connection with certain items we have already retaliated against what we consider to be unfair treatment of our exports in the European Common Market.

I recall correctly we retaliated in connection with special tariff rates on carpets and glass. Now we are threatening to retaliate again, unless the European Common Market takes a position more friendly to our exports of chickens and similar agricultural exports.

But, Mr. President, we would be extremely unwise if we were to resort to the process of retaliation—which not only hurts others, but also hurts us—if we can find any other way by which to correct a situation which needs correction.

I come now to another remedy. Again, all of these are remedies within our means; they do not require a change in the international monetary system or the convening of an international monetary conference. The latter remains—I repeat—a key recommendation I am making in this speech. But at this point I am referring to measures we can use—short of a long-term, definitive remedy—to help ourselves.

I come now to the subject of our gold-reserve requirement. Let us remember that we still have a 25-percent gold-reserve requirement as backing for our currency. However, less than half of the central banks in the world today have legal gold requirements against their currency note issues and deposit liabilities. This is a very important point. We are in the minority in the world in continuing a 25-percent gold-reserve requirement. The 33d annual report of the Bank for International Settlements stated, in June:

> The fact that a substantial part of the U.S. gold stock is legally designated as cover against the internal money supply, where it serves no function, naturally increases the doubts about the adequacy of the gold stock to fulfill its essential function in settling international balances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the gold and foreign exchange cover requirements of selected foreign central banks for the latest period available. It indicates that the United States is in the minority, not the majority, in that regard.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gold and foreign exchange cover requirements of selected foreign central banks by Federal Reserve Board, March 1961

Central bank of—	Liabilities against which gold or foreign exchange reserves are required	Required reserves (percent)		Status of reserve requirements; recent changes; qualifying provisions
		In gold	In gold or foreign exchange	
Argentina	Notes and demand liabilities		25	Suspended since October 1949. Only net foreign exchange holdings may be included. Gold cover requirement of 20 percent eliminated by 1957 legislation.
Australia		(1)	(1)	
Belgium	Notes and demand liabilities	33½		In effect since Apr. 12, 1957. Previous legislation, which had been suspended from May 1, 1944, required a 30-percent cover in gold and 40 percent in gold or foreign exchange.
Brazil	Notes		25	In effect (but note qualification). Basis of requirement significantly reduces ratio of cover of total outstanding notes. Currency is issued exclusively by Treasury, which can either put it into circulation directly itself, or under general legislation, i.e. through Rediscount Department or the Bank Loan Fund of Bank of Brazil. Gold and foreign exchange cover requirement applies only to currency issued under latter of the two methods. A large part of notes in circulation was put into circulation directly by the Treasury.
Canada		(1)	(1)	Unless the Governor in Council otherwise prescribes, Bank of Canada is not required to maintain gold or foreign exchange reserves in any minimum or fixed ratio to its liabilities (sec. 25 of Currency, Mint, and Exchange Fund Act of 1952). Sec. 26 of Bank of Canada Act of 1934 had specified reserve of not less than 25 percent of note and deposit liabilities, to be held in gold coin or bullion, net amounts of specified types of foreign exchange, and specified quantities of newly mined Canadian silver. This requirement was suspended from 1940 until 1952, when suspense procedure was superseded by sec. 25 of Currency, Mint, and Exchange Fund Act cited above.
France	Notes and other demand deposits	35		Suspended since Sept. 1, 1939, by decree. Statutory requirement of a 35 percent reserve in gold bullion or gold coin had been in effect only from June 1928. Previous legislation generally stipulated that Bank of France metallic reserve must at all times be adequate "to assure full convertibility" of note issue.
Germany		(1)	(1)	
India	do	(2)	(3)	In effect; requirement established in 1956. Foreign exchange assets must total at least 4,000,000,000 rupees and may be in the form of deposits abroad, foreign government securities maturing within 5 years, and bills of exchange bearing at least 2 good signatures and maturing in not more than 90 days, provided that these claims are payable in the currencies of countries which are members of the International Monetary Fund. At least 85 percent of the gold must be held in India. The minimum amount of foreign exchange required may be lowered temporarily from 4,000,000,000 to 3,000,000,000 rupees by Cabinet action. Previously, Reserve Bank was required to maintain gold and foreign exchange reserves equal to at least 40 percent of note issue, and at least 400,000,000 rupees of such reserves had to be in gold.
Italy	Notes and other demand liabilities		40	Suspended since July 22, 1935. Requirements had been established by a decree-law of Dec. 21, 1927.
Japan		(1)	(1)	
Netherlands	Notes, drafts, deposits, and other current account balances.		50	In effect. Under royal decree of June 27, 1956, issued in conformity with art. 2 of decree of Jan. 11, 1956, requirement is 50 percent in gold and convertible foreign exchange; may be changed at any time by royal decree. Except in period 1914–29, when requirement was 20 percent in gold coin and bullion, required cover from 1860's to 1949 was 40 percent in gold coin and bullion; this was suspended in 1940 and abrogated in 1945.
Sweden	Notes	(4)		In effect. Requirement specified in Sveriges Riksbank Act of June 30, 1934, as amended to May 22, 1959. (See ch. III, art. 11, which states gold reserve may not remain below this figure.) In addition, the Riksdag establishes a ceiling on the note-issuing authority of the bank. In June 1960, total notes outstanding amounted to 6,800,000,000 kroner; minimum gold reserve of 150,000,000 is less than 2.2 percent of this amount.
Switzerland	do	40		In effect since 1905. Requirement is currently in force under art. 19 of Federal law on the Swiss National Bank, Dec. 23, 1953.
Union of South Africa	Notes and other liabilities, including notes of other banks for which it has assumed liability under sec. 15 of Currency and Banking Act.	25		In effect. Requirement established by October 1948 amendment to Reserve Bank Act of 1944. In computing the reserve ratio the Reserve Bank may deduct from its liabilities an amount equal to the book value in Union currency of its assets outside the Union. Minister of Finance may suspend reserve requirement for 30 days, subject to extension by him for periods not exceeding 15 days each (language of sec. 17 of Reserve Bank Act of 1944, as amended by sec. 9 of Act No. 49 of 1948). From May 1944 to October 1948, required reserve was 30 percent in gold coin and bullion against notes only. Between 1920 and 1944, requirements were 30 percent in gold against notes, and 30 percent in gold and specie against deposits and bills payable; silver specie was limited to one-fifth of latter reserve.
United Kingdom	Notes in excess of £2,350,000,000	100		In effect. From 1844 to 1928, an increase in note issue had to be matched by a corresponding increase in Bank of England gold holdings. Since 1928, bank has been required only to hold gold coin and bullion to the full value of notes in excess of a specified total fiduciary issue. Current applicable legislation: Sec. 2(1) of Currency and Bank Notes Act of 1954. Current fiduciary ceiling of £2,350,000,000 established by United Kingdom Treasury in 1960, under legislation permitting it to establish for 2 years, and renew for another 2 years, ceiling above that laid down by Parliament. As of Dec. 14, 1960, notes covered by gold amounted to £364,976.

[1] No minimum required of gold or foreign exchange.
[2] Rs1,150,000,000.
[3] Rs5,150,000,000.
[4] SKr150,000,000.

Source: Prepared by the Division of International Finance, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Mar. 2, 1961.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have some $15.8 billion in gold on hand. The 25-percent gold requirement is a lien on $12 billion of that amount. One of the problems we face is the maintenance of confidence in connection with the flow here of short-term funds. That confidence is tied to our ability and our determination to honor the imbalance against us with gold, if need be. So I believe we face the very serious question of whether we now have any business tying up most of our gold stock in what seems to be a largely sterile exercise of backing our currency, at a time when most countries do not depend on any such backing.

There are many things which we can do by ourselves. But I repeat that the main thrust of the speech I am making today is in the area of long-term remedies. It is very clear to me that everything we have done up to now has failed to improve our underlying balance-of-payments position, despite the fact that we have taken many steps. Many of them have been good and constructive, but they demonstrate to us that interim or short-term remedies will not solve our basic problem. Therefore, today I want to address myself to this basic, long-term problem, which I feel absolutely demands an international monetary conference and a new framework for the international monetary system to be developed at that conference.

Mr. President, how can the existing system be modified? The international gold standard worked reasonably well in pre-1932 depression days, largely because of the ability of the Bank of England to make it work and also because of the fact that the pre-1914 world was much less complicated than the one in which we find ourselves today. In those days there was much greater flexibility in the domestic economies of the western countries, and deficits among them were automatically settled through equilibrating short-term capital movements and gold flows.

But today neither the United States nor any other country is willing to allow its economy to be subjected to inflation or depression as a result of forces operating in other countries. Dominant in the minds of most people and of their governments is the concept of full employment, the achievement of a prosperous national economy which takes priority everywhere over the desirability of reestablishing a world economy along the lines that existed prior to 1914.

Some conservative economists and bankers insist that the United States should try to convince other countries to follow, and also should follow itself, policies which would completely subject domestic economic policies to the discipline of the balance of payments, and that we should return to an automatic international payments mechanism under some form of a gold standard no matter what the domestic economic consequences.

There are growing indications that the willingness of our European creditors to hold additional dollars as reserves is diminishing. The inadequacy of new gold production to provide adequate additions to world reserves is widely recognized.

It is therefore quite evident that the proposals that have been circulating for the fast few years including those of Triffin, Bernstein, Stamp, Maudling, and most recently of the authors of the Brookings study for world monetary reform, should be carefully evaluated. An additional proposal for the evolutionary change of the present international monetary system put forth by central bankers of Germany, Italy, and Switzerland and senior officers of the Federal Reserve Bank in the latest Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, while extremely modest, indicates that they too question the adequacy of the existing mechanism upon which the world's whole monetary credit structure rests.

My assistant, Mr. Szabo, has discovered in the statement of Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, made before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on July 25, 1963, a clear indication that he, too, is deeply troubled by the inadequacy of the pace of expansion of international credit and the existing monetary system of the world. I ask unanimous consent that pages 31 to 35 of Mr. Heller's prepared statement referring to the longrun evolution of the international monetary system may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Walter W. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Accompanied by Gardner Ackley and John P. Lewis, Members, Before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, July 25, 1963

LONGRUN EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

In the last 2½ years, much has been done to render the international monetary system less vulnerable to crises and to provide facilities for dealing with speculative attacks on national currencies. Central banks of the leading industrial countries have cooperated with the U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve System in the development of currency swap arrangements and techniques for intervention in forward exchange markets, in the pooling arrangement for dealing with speculation in the London gold market, and in generally improved coordination. Through these devices, it has been possible to deal with the speculative outbursts which occurred in connection with the revaluation of the mark and the guilder in March 1961, the Berlin crisis in the summer and fall of 1961, the Canadian exchange crisis in mid-1962, and the Cuban crisis in October 1962. Through the negotiation of the special resources arrangement in the IMF, an additional pool of up to $6 billion of convertible currencies has been made available for use in time of emergency.

These are notable accomplishments, and efforts to extend their scope are continuing and will continue. By contributing to the stability of the international monetary system, they have helped to make it possible for the United States to finance a continuing balance-of-payments deficit without resort to extreme and costly restrictive actions, giving us time to bring to bear constructive measures which will reduce unemployment, increase productivity, and accelerate economic growth—measures which, when fully in effect, promise a constructive and lasting solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

But while the techniques of central bank cooperation that have been worked out in the past 2½ years have been constructive, we feel—and our feelings are shared by many officials in Europe—that further changes in the international monetary system will be needed in the future if the system is to be able to meet the needs of an expanding and prosperous world economy and a steadily growing volume of international trade in the years ahead. Despite the improvements that have been introduced, the present system tends to impose deflationary pressures on countries which are in deficit. Such pressures are appropriate when a balance-of-payments deficit results from inflation. But for major countries of the modern world—and the present U.S. situation is such a case—deficits may also frequently arise from structural changes over which they have little control. In such cases, deflationary measures are not the appropriate nor necessarily an effective way to eliminate a deficit and the United States has deliberately avoided such measures. Balance-of-payments imbalances do set in motion basic corrective forces working through price and income changes in both surplus and deficit countries. But in the modern world characterized by domestic policies aimed at the maintenance of high employment and reasonable price stability in all countries, these forces necessarily work slowly.

Since the basic corrective forces are slow-acting and since the function of official reserves is to finance the inevitable deficits that continue while the discipline of these corrective forces is making itself felt, it follows that large reserves are required. Moreover, since the potential payments imbalances will increase in size as world income and trade grow, reserves must expand steadily. In recent years, the growth of reserves has resulted primarily from gold production, from increased foreign holdings of dollars generated by U.S.-payments deficits, and from ad hoc adjustments in the resources of the IMF. To leave the generation of reserves entirely to gold production and to the deficits of reserve currency countries is to rely upon chance factors which bear little relation to need. Gold production is an inadequate and independable source of reserve growth, and the increments to foreign holdings of dollars will stop when we succeed in eliminating our deficit. Under past procedures, a U.S. surplus would actually shrink world reserves.

It seems clear that all countries would benefit from monetary arrangements which provide greater assurance that the growth of world reserves will keep pace with income and trade but not grow so rapidly as to exert an inflationary influence. We also need to insure that existing reserves are readily available for use when needed. In the latter connection, the U.S. standby arrangement with the IMF is a significant step forward, since it will help to establish the principle that the resources of the IMF can be drawn upon as a matter of course when a country is in deficit without implying the existence of a balance-of-payments crisis.

Apart from the question of a more systematic provision for adapting the growth of reserves to the world's needs, it would be desirable to share with other industrial countries the pressures and burdens that now tend to be concentrated on the reserve currency countries—the United States and the United Kingdom. Progress has been made in developing means to eliminate the disruptive tendencies that now may result from shifts of reserves between one country and another, between one reserve currency and another, or between reserve currencies and gold, but still further protection is desirable. And we need to clarify further the responsibilities that devolve upon surplus as well as upon deficit countries.

Many proposals have been advanced for improving the international monetary system to meet some or all of these needs. A number of these proposals would operate through the IMF, increasing the scope and flexibility of its operations. U.S. officials have not yet arrived at a judgment concerning the merits of specific proposals. But we are studying them carefully, both within our own Government and in joint deliberations with other interested countries. Moreover, we remain fully open to any new proposals and initiatives advanced by other countries.

The development of an improved international monetary system is important to the longrun expansion of the world economy. The elimination of the current U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will not mean the end of world balance-of-payments problems. Other countries will have deficits when we get into surplus, and we ourselves can expect the periodic recurrence of deficits.

> Strengthening the international monetary system, however, is a process that will inevitably take time. Agreement will have to be reached among the participating countries on the particulars of the improvements to be adopted, and there will be many technical details to be settled. Moreover, it cannot be looked upon as a solution to our immediate problem, or as a substitute for a determined attack on our balance-of-payments deficit—although a more effective payments system, if it were now in operation, might help the United States in its present situation. We must, therefore, continue to take prudent and responsible action to deal with our deficit.
>
> Finally, it is important to recognize that, in a world of convertible currencies and increasing capital mobility, it has become more difficult to adapt national monetary policies primarily to domestic objectives. Therefore, every effort should be made to increase the flexibility of national fiscal policies. If both fiscal and monetary policies can be adjusted quickly, it becomes easier to adapt simultaneously to domestic and balance-of-payments requirements. For example, if the tax cut proposed by the President were already in effect, there would be a stronger case for an increase in our interest rates as a means of dealing with our balance-of-payments deficit. The need to take monetary action at the present time to meet urgent balance-of-payments problems intensifies the need for vigorous tax action to meet the persistent problems of domestic unemployment and underutilization. In the final analysis, a full employment and full utilization economy offers us the soundest basis for mastering our balance-of-payments problems in a way fully consistent with leadership in the free world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the heart of each of these proposals is a reform of the world monetary system which would provide additional liquidity to existing world reserves within the next several years to preserve stability in the system, to guard against disruptive capital flight, to maintain orderly exchange markets, and to enable countries undergoing temporary deficits to make adjustments over a period of time without having to sacrifice such highly desirable national policies as full employment and economic growth.

Consideration of world monetary reform to have lasting value should come within the context of free world economic integration alongside the steady removal of those barriers which make the adjustment of one economy to another in the free world extremely difficult.

What do I mean by "adjustment"? In the days before the depression it was not the international movement of gold that brought about adjustment, but rather the fact that internal credit and prices were directly linked to the gold supply that brought about price changes, including changes in wages, incomes, and employment. Changes in individual prices caused terms of trade to shift, resulting in increased exports and imports sufficient to effect adjustment. The system operated with reasonable efficiency and automaticity.

The pre-1914 system would not work today. Countries experiencing weakness in their balance of payments would find it difficult to sell their goods because other countries would be disposed to keep them out by one form of import restriction or another. Governments and central bankers, as well as labor leaders, industrial leaders, and the citizenry generally are not willing today to adjust to these equilibrating forces.

This is the dilemma in which we find ourselves. On the one hand, we can allow the U.S. economy to adjust to other economies, but at the cost of some added unemployment. At the other extreme, the maintenance of full employment and unwillingness to adjust means persisting deficits in the balance of payments and the increasing need for international liquidity, which, incidentally, is kept liquid by our own deficits under the gold standard. Under the gold standard there was no problem of liquidity because the pluses and minuses in the international accounts never got very far out of line with each other. In the absence of willingness of countries today to allow their economies to adjust to each other, the maintenance of fixed foreign exchange rates means the necessity of creating an ever-increasing supply of credit for the sake of financing a persistent imbalance in a given direction. At the present time, these balances are in the form of dollars. During the period of dollar shortage the financing was accomplished by the payment by the United States of large quantities of dollars in the form of foreign aid of one kind or another.

That was true for the 10 years following World War II. We should move more slowly, but steadily in the direction of allowing our economy to adjust to the economies of other countries and other countries should allow their economies to adjust to ours. Adjustment in today's terms means a willingness to accept each other's goods in accordance with the principle of competitive advantage and a willingness to allow capital to move freely. For this reason, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—or a more realistic version of it—is at the very center of the problem. The new international economic system that has emerged since the end of World War II—namely, GATT, the Bretton Woods institutions, that is, the IMF and the International Bank, large-scale economic aid by industrialized nations to less developed countries, the development of the EEC, a general commitment in Western countries to full employment policies—will be part and parcel of this adjustment process.

If we and the other industrialized nations could agree upon substantially freer trade, there would be a strong possibility that shifts in the movement of goods would go a long way toward attaining international equilibrium and toward the disappearance of the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. If labor and business should help to maintain unwarrantedly high wages and prices, the forces of international trade, if allowed to function, would provide a powerful corrective.

To be effective, commerce must be free. Import quotas and other types of quantitative trade restrictions imposed by governments will have to disappear. Ideally, tariffs should also be eliminated except possibly for infant industries in newly developing countries. Certainly they should be reduced substantially. Foreign trade policy is thus one of the most important instruments at our disposal for solving what we glibly call the balance-of-payments problem.

This is why I urge that an international monetary conference be planned now. World monetary reform is essential, and I am confident that it will take place in the not too distant future. Forces of equilibrium are at work even now while we are in a balance-of-payment deficit position, and it will not be long before the pendulum will be swinging to the other direction, causing deficits abroad and requiring measures to be taken in Western Europe which may impinge on their national objectives.

These economic forces will bring about a greater responsiveness of our European friends to consider dealing with this problem in the broadest possible context. We must begin to devise a world payments system which takes cognizance of changes in the world economy since the Bretton Woods Conference days in 1944 and which will be flexible enough to fit into the economic order of 5 to 10 years from now; which would fit into a world of lower barriers to trade, investment, and capital flows; a world of increasing specialization of national economies, and which would leave room for improvements in the form of trade in the raw materials as well as the early manufactures of developing economies.

The process of this adjustment to lesser barriers to trade, freer competition in the area of trade and investment, would undoubtedly cause economic dislocation. Therefore, we should bring into existence the means to ease the adjustment process within the various national economies as well as among countries.

The new facility created early this year by the IMF to broaden its balance-of-payments support of member countries—particularly those exporting primary products—which experience temporary declines in their export earnings due to circumstances beyond their control is one evidence of this trend.

There are mechanisms available to ease the adjustment process in the United States through the Trade Expansion Act which contains machinery to assist industries as well as workers to adjust to economic dislocation that may result from reduction of tariff protection. There is also the Manpower Development and Training Act which attempts to deal with the reallocation of our manpower to the most efficient uses through retraining. These concepts could very well be applied on an international scale.

The President's Independence Day address in 1962, delivered in front of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, is particularly relevant in the context of my remarks. The President, in referring to Atlantic partnership and the increasing integration of Europe, said the following:

> I will say here and now on this day of independence that the United States will be ready for a declaration of interdependence—that we will be prepared to discuss with a united Europe the ways and means of forming a concrete Atlantic partnership—a mu-

tually beneficial partnership between the new union emerging in Europe and the old American Union founded here 175 years ago.

All this will not be completed in a year, but let the world know it is our goal.

This is the type of leadership which I am urging upon the Senate today. This is the type of approach we must bear in mind and act upon as we attempt to deal with the immediate problems at the moment.

I have given my analysis of what we can do to improve our situation on the immediate problem. But if the whole world is to go forward it must have a broader credit base, a broader monetary base than it has today. From what I can see, there is no really effective way in which this can be done.

Can such lofty goals be achieved through the utilization of gold which is available to us or which is being newly mined, or through the ad hoc arrangements through the International Monetary Fund and with central banks? Obviously not.

All of these are palliatives and will break down, as they are threatening to break down now.

Nothing less than a new basis for world credit is required. The only basis that I can see myself is the real analogy between what is taking place in the world today and what took place in the United States some decades ago, which brought on the development of our Federal Reserve System.

Somehow or other we must show how tangible, substantive improvements in international trade can be translated into credits which will finance that trade. We must come to the conclusion that gold does not represent wealth—that wealth is represented by the productive power of goods, which contributes to the well-being of people, and that the greatest and most substantial wealth is found in the productive power of goods to facilitate the future economic development of peoples—whether dams, harbors, roads, means of transportation and communication, educational systems, or health systems. These are the fundamental evidences of wealth. That wealth must be translated through an international banking system into credits which will enable that wealth to constantly expand and to be built up.

It seems to me that there is no other way.

This cannot be done, in my view, except through the convening of an international monetary conference, which will signalize the determination of the free world to proceed upon a new line, as the Bretton Woods Conference demonstrated in 1944.

We are quickly approaching the crossroads. The United States will have to decide whether to take the path of free world economic integration, or to return to a new version of obsolescent economic nationalism, and to engage in make-do practices of the kind we have been engaging in up to now, which are not solving the fundamental problem.

I am confident that we can deal with our immediate economic problems without departing from the historic foreign economic policy precepts which we have been following without interruption for the past 30 years. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 shows that.

We must couple that with a world monetary and credit reform, which is absolutely demanded by changed economic circumstances since the establishment of the International Monetary Fund 20 years ago. We must continue to work for a true Atlantic partnership, for a true integration of the free world's economy. In this way we can insure the decisive superiority of free institutions as the ruling principle for all mankind. We can then marshal far more effectively the thousand billion dollars of productive power which resides in the Atlantic Community—the greatest force ever known to man—with which the victory for freedom should be made absolutely secure.

I have often said—and it is a good note upon which to end this speech, upon which I have lavished much time and attention—that if Khrushchev had a thousand billion dollars of production in the Communist bloc he would pulverize us in less than 5 years. Here we sit, tangled up in our own feet, because somehow or another we do not know how to integrate this tremendous productive machine. I propose, at least in terms of a credit and monetary base, that we get together for the purpose of seeking to agree upon how we may do it.

That is the principal point I have tried to make today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an outstanding analysis of the state of the free world's monetary and trading system by Thorkil Kristensen, Secretary General of the OECD, which appeared in the August issue of the OECD Observer and a fine editorial prepared by Harvey Segal entitled "Bankers, Not Theorists," which appeared in the September 2 issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the OECD Observer, August 1963]

Western Cooperation in Monetary Matters and Trade

(By Thorkil Kristensen, Secretary-General of the OECD)

The industrialized countries of the West will be faced with three major economic problems in the next few years. The way in which are we able to handle these problems will be decisive both for the economic and political relations between all the Western countries and for the relations between the West and the rest of the world.

What are these three problems? They are, first, the reinforcement of the international monetary system; secondly, the progressive abolition of barriers to international trade; and thirdly, a consistent policy for our economic relations with the less-developed countries.

These three problems are closely interlinked and the question of trade policy is, so to speak, the focal point. If we were able to reduce, on a vast scale, the economic barriers between the different countries, that would unquestionably result in remarkable changes in all the relations between the peoples of the world. But an effective monetary policy which would allow satisfactory economic growth without thereby prejudicing financial stability is obviously one of the essential conditions for a large-scale liberalization of trade, which in its turn will to all appearances be a major element in a constructive policy toward the less-developed countries.

We must therefore begin with monetary policy, which during the coming years will be one of the most important instruments in facilitating the bold reduction of trade barriers. It must never be forgotten that it was the collapse of the international monetary system in the thirties which led to the unfortunate wave of quantitative restrictions before the war. If, in contrast to this, the Common Market has been able to reduce internal customs tariffs in a spectacular fashion without major difficulty, the decisive reason for this is undoubtedly that member states have generally found themselves in a favorable monetary situation during recent years.

In principle, the international monetary system is a world system. It should not be overlooked, however, that by far the greater part of international monetary transactions take place either within the Western World or between certain Western countries and other countries, especially the underdeveloped countries. It is therefore on the monetary policy of the West and very particularly on the policy of a fairly small number of major Western countries that the operation of the world monetary system will largely depend.

It is evident that each government has a national responsibility for the maintenance of the internal and external stability of its own country. Nevertheless, since the restoration of convertibility we have seen a rapidly growing interdependence between the industrialized countries in this field. Not only has there been a remarkable increase in trade and other current transactions but, what is perhaps even more important, long-term and short-term capital movements have assumed sometimes alarming proportions. The question has therefore arisen what is to be done to avoid the appearance in certain cases of a dangerous disequilibrium in the balance of payments.

THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL LIQUIDITY

The problem is a complicated one. In the first place it is necessary to insure that countries possess sufficient monetary reserves to finance, where necessary, what may be a substantial deficit over a certain period. In the second place countries must find themselves constrained to embark upon internal policies designed to restore equilibrium, unless the deficits and surpluses merely reflect a passing imbalance. This means that the ordinary course of international transactions must be insured without, however, disregarding monetary discipline.

Now, the volume of a country's monetary reserves is largely governed by national government policy. Nevertheless, the total amount of reserves, and even to some extent their distribution between the different countries of the world, will increasingly depend upon international cooperation. More particularly, the countries which find themselves in a strong position can help the others to strengthen their reserves, but in doing so they can also require the assisted countries to satisfy the conditions which seem to them to be proper. How can we insure that the results of this cooperation will be a suitable combination between the necessary financing and the necessary discipline? That is the core of the monetary problem.

In principle, the monetary system is always based on gold, but gold production is not enough to increase monetary reserves to the extent required by an expanding world economy. Other means have therefore had to be found to insure that economic growth is not checked by the lack of national or international liquidity. National liquidity is largely the responsibility of national governments, but time and time again the economic expansion of a country has been checked by lack of foreign exchange, or in other words by insufficient international liquidity.

There has been much discussion in recent years about the problem of international liquidity. I will not recall all the different proposals which have been made. It is enough to indicate that there are four different ways of increasing the monetary reserves of a country or, in general, the reserves existing in the world as a whole.

The first would be to raise the price of gold from time to time so as to increase overall reserves by increasing the monetary value of gold stocks and also more indirectly by the increase in gold production which would undoubtedly result from the price increase.

The second way would be to create a growing quantity of an international currency by an agency, preferably worldwide, such as the International Monetary Fund, which would make this currency available to the different countries by loans on certain terms.

The third way would be to accept the system of flexible exchange rates. Under such a system there would be no need for monetary reserves since, if a particular country had a deficit in its balance of payments, the exchange rates for its currency would fall, which, in turn, would bring about an increase in the country's exports and a fall in its imports.

Finally, the fourth way would be the grant of credits by one country to another either by bilateral agreements or through the intermediary of an international institution such as the International Monetary Fund.

These, then, are the four ways which might be contemplated, but it looks at the present stage as though countries would probably not be prepared to accept any of the first three.

THE SOLUTION: INTERNATIONAL CREDITS

With regard to the price of gold the decision in practice lies with the American Government alone, which is in any event an undesirable state of affairs from the international point of view since an increase in the price of gold would affect the situation in every country.

The fact is that the American Government has on many occasions declared that it has no intention of raising the price of gold, which seems highly reasonable. If it had been desired that the role of gold should remain unchanged from one century to another, its price should have been changed from time to time according to needs, but as everyone knows we have for a long time been in the period of monetary history when metal is more and more widely replaced by instruments of credit (bank notes, bank accounts, etc.) both in internal circulation within the different countries and in international monetary reserves.

This is an inescapable trend. Credit is much more practical than metal and in this way the manipulations and speculations in gold prices are avoided which might create some danger for monetary stability.

While it is inevitable that gold should play a constantly diminishing part in the monetary system, the best policy would no doubt be to maintain its price and to increase monetary reserves by an increase in international credits which would correspond to the development which has already virtually taken place in the internal monetary circulation of the different countries.

The creation of an international currency by a world institution will perhaps sooner or later be accepted as a suitable solution. At the present stage, however, it does not look as though most countries are ready to delegate such powers to an institution over which the government of an individual country would have only a very limited influence.

As to the third method, the acceptance of flexible exchange rates, it is against the existing rules of the International Monetary Fund. These rules were made for the very purpose of avoiding the uncertainty created by the fluctuations in exchange rates which were so frequent during the thirties. Moreover, if there were no rule about the relative value of the various national currencies the door would be open for large-scale speculation and manipulation. It therefore seems that this system also would not be generally accepted in the world as it is today.

There remains the fourth method; namely, the grant of credits by one country to another. In fact this was the method used to solve the problems of international liquidity which arose during the postwar years.

This method may take many forms. Countries can make their currency available to the International Monetary Fund which in turn will make it available to other countries according to their needs. On the bilateral plane, a government may borrow abroad or a central bank may accept deposits from another central bank.

The most interesting cases from the point of view of monetary policy are those where two countries grant each other reciprocal credits, because this means that the reserves of both countries have increased at the same time. In other words the aggregate monetary reserves of the whole world have increased. In fact this means that so far as countries can agree together they are in a position to increase international liquidity by the creation of claims on the part of one country against the other.

It is not surprising that this was exactly the way in which the international monetary system evolved, since the whole nature of monetary reserves is that they are claims held by one country against another. This is easily understandable in the case of foreign exchange but in fact it also applies to gold reserves. In the case of gold, however, the claims are, as it were, against an unknown debtor country since gold is current in all countries. The same would apply to a genuine international currency created by a world institution and the position is almost the same in the case of convertible currencies because they can be changed into the currency of almost any country.

We must not overlook this fundamental fact: That monetary reserves are really claims which enable their holder to have a deficit in its balance of payments over a certain period. By accepting a quantity of these reserves, whether in gold or foreign currency, the surplus countries finance the deficits of the deficit countries.

That is why, in spite of everything, there are limits to the possibility of augmenting aggregate reserves by the grant of credits from one country to another. Countries which expect to be in surplus in the near future will not be prepared to finance the deficits of other countries without limit. In consequence if they are asked for supplementary credits, they may either fix limits or impose the conditions which they think justified or both.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSULTATION AMONG INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES

For this very reason the most important arrangements in the sphere of international monetary cooperation in recent years have either been bilateral arrangements between two industrialized countries or arrangements among a small group of industrialized countries. The most important of these arrangements is the new loan convention, linked with the International Monetary Fund, but signed by some 10 industrialized countries and valid for those countries only. (December 1961; $6 billion.)

Obviously it is among the industrialized countries between whom current transactions and capital movements have taken on considerable scale that substantial deficits and surpluses must be looked for. It is therefore incumbent on these countries to come to appropriate arrangements if it is desired to avoid a dangerous disorder in the international monetary system.

If a surplus country is to finance the deficits of some other country under arrangements of this kind, limits and conditions must naturally be imposed. In the case of large-scale arrangements there will be generally be some hesitation in making use of a worldwide institution over which the countries in question have only a limited influence.

It is for this reason that monetary consultations between industrialized countries have in recent years become one of the most important instruments of the international monetary system. In making the necessary arrangements consideration must obviously be given to the possible effects not only on the two countries in question but also on other industrialized countries in which imbalance might appear in the near future. Bilateral consultations are therefore not enough. These problems must be discussed in a small group composed of the countries most concerned.

The main forum for such monetary consultations is the OECD Economic Policy Committee, and more especially its Working Party No. 3, which consists of some 10 industrialized countries with major responsibilities in this sphere.

It is in consultations of this kind that attention is paid to the monetary discipline already spoken of. A certain degree of discipline is inherent in the monetary system itself, since in the deficit countries the private banks must buy foreign exchange from the central bank to bridge the gap in foreign payments. By these purchases the banks reduce their liquid assets, which means a reduction in national liquidity, which in turn will impel the national economy to cut down its activity and its imports. By these means therefore the deficit has unleashed forces which tend to redress the balance of payments. In surplus countries there will be a chain of similar effects but in the reverse direction.

It must be emphasized that these corrective effects come about regardless of the national organization of the monetary system. Whether the gold standard is used on its own or whether monetary reserves partly consist of foreign exchange, in both cases the banks must cut down their liquid assets if it is necessary to bridge a gap in foreign payments.

What might make monetary discipline lax is the fact that the national authorities are in a position to counter these automatic effects by deliberate expansion of credits in deficit countries or their contraction in surplus countries. There is no international mechanism which could automatically prevent national governments from following such a policy should they so desire. It is only monetary consultations between the industrialized countries which can bring to light all the national and international consequences of such a policy which might well be dangerous to financial stability. These consultations are therefore an essential element in the international monetary system at any rate at the present stage in world economic history.

Are there desirable reforms which could be gradually brought about by such consultations?

For the time being there seems no adequate answer to this question. We are in an experimental period. A number of different forms of arrangement have been tried out. It is too soon to draw any firm conclusions.

It may well be that in the future such consultations will lead to understanding on certain more or less generally accepted rules of conduct concerning the composition of monetary reserves and perhaps also on some other elements of monetary policy such as fixing the various national rates of interest in relation to each other. It must not be forgotten, however, that each case must be judged in the light of the concrete circumstances of the moment. No two cases will ever be exactly alike.

It follows that general rules can never completely take the place of monetary consultations between the industrialized countries of the West.

COOPERATION PUT TO THE TEST

There is every likelihood that the monetary cooperation of the West will be put to the test during the next 2 years. The ministerial meeting of the GATT which came to an end on May 22, 1963, concluded with an agreement that fresh tariff negotiations would be opened on May 4, 1964. One of the most decisive conditions for a further effort to reduce customs tariffs and other trade barriers will no doubt be the existence of a generally favorable economic climate in the industrialized countries, that is to say the maintenance of full employment with little exception and a state of approximate equilibrium in the balances-of-payments. Such are the precise objects of monetary cooperation.

Nevertheless in the contemplated negotiations within the GATT the cooperation of the West will be put to the test on a scale much greater than that of monetary policy alone. In practice, if it is desired to do away with trade barriers on a large scale there must be a substantial adaptation of industry, agriculture, and manpower. Since the coming negotiations will be a very important event from the political point of view, their preparation requires exceptional care. No major aspect of the problems raised by the Geneva decision must be overlooked.

The coming negotiations have a historical basis. They are, as it were, one of the consequences of the efforts which have been going on since the Second World War toward European integration. The most important result of these efforts has been the establishment of the Common Market, which in turn has set off a chain of other events. Then followed the negotiations in Paris in 1958 for a large European Free Trade Area and after their breakdown, the establishment of the smaller free trade area, EFTA; this in turn was followed by the association of Finland with EFTA, the association of Greece with the European Economic Community, the negotiations for Britain's entry into the Common Market and finally the new American Trade Expansion Act, the main object of which was to allow negotiations with the EEC on the reciprocal reduction of customs tariffs and freer trade in agricultural products.

The issues at stake in the forthcoming negotiations are therefore of some importance. If, following the breakdown of the Paris negotiations in 1958 and the suspension of the Brussels negotiations in 1963 there were to be a failure in the tariff negotiations at Geneva in 1964, the consequences for Western cooperation as a whole might become extremely grave even on the purely political plane. On the economic plane the result would probably be a new wave of protectionism and isolationism on both sides of the Atlantic. The disappointment which follows the frustration of an attempt at progress generally has results of this kind.

THE ADAPTATION OF INDUSTRY

There are still many questions to be settled about the methods and formulas of the contemplated tariff negotiations, but these problems will be discussed in the organs of the GATT before the opening of the negotiations proper and we need not therefore concern ourselves with them here. Let us rather consider the problems of adaptation which will arise in the various sectors of the national economies if we embark upon the progressive reduction of barriers to international trade. It is only so far as we find ourselves able to surmount these difficulties that we can dare to pursue an expansionist policy in the field of trade.

European industry has for many years been in a period of constantly intensified competition. There was first of all the European liberalization of trade, that is to say the progressive abolition of quantitative restrictions followed by the very rapid lowering of the internal customs tariffs of the EEC and EFTA, the result of which was an exceptional increase in trade in industrial products between member countries. Not only was the adaptation to an enlargement of trade accomplished without major difficulty but at the same time the competitive strength of European industry in world markets was reinforced in a remarkable manner. Keener competition has unquestionably been an invaluable stimulus to European industry.

Obviously, the industrial progress of Europe has been more marked in some branches than in others, and it may well be that in some branches of industry production has declined. In a generally favorable economic atmosphere, however, the labor thus liberated can be absorbed fairly easily.

American industry was in the forefront of world industrial development in the 20th century. The recovery of Europe has, however, probably deprived the Americans of some of their lead. It therefore seems that in the case of U.S. industry also an enlargement of markets and keener competition would be a very valuable stimulus. The initiative taken by the President of the United States in proposing the Trade Expansion Act to Congress was undoubtedly inspired by thoughts of this kind.

There is, however, one special problem which will arise for Western industry if freer entry into Western countries is accorded to manufactures from low wage countries, that is to say from countries which are now poor but are in the process of development.

An increase in the exports of these countries will be necessary and there is every indication that this problem will play an important part in the coming tariff negotiations.

It may very well be that over the next few decades a division of labor may be contemplated between the Western countries and the countries which are launching out to modern industrialization. These countries will have fairly low wages but they will not have all the technical, commercial and administrative advantages of Western industry. It follows that in some branches or for some products production costs may be lower in the poor countries whereas in other branches or for other products the West will keep its lead.

We must identify these problems so as to know the tasks which will face us in connection with the adaptation of industry. During the next few years however, imports of manufactures from the poor countries will probably be fairly limited in relation to Western production as a whole, which will make our task easier.

THE NECESSARY EXODUS FROM AGRICULTURE

In the sphere of agriculture the problems will be much more difficult because European and American agriculture are already very inadequately adjusted to modern conditions. Production per man-hour is much lower than in industry and most farmers therefore find themselves in a social position which leaves much to be desired. The reason is that there are still a large number of small farms, especially in mountain districts which do not allow the use of modern techniques or even the full use of the family labor force.

It must be admitted that adaptation to the extraordinary changes which have come about during the last 100 years is harder in agriculture than in industry. As the standard of living rises a decreasing proportion of income is spent on agricultural products. The consequence is that a steadily diminishing proportion of the population has to be employed in agriculture. This is an inescapable trend which is particularly marked in a period of rapid economic growth such as the present.

But the necessary exodus from agriculture is difficult because the life of the peasant is a traditional life and very often an isolated life. Families are therefore very reluctant to leave their villages and go to the towns. It is perhaps for this reason that agriculture has been strongly protected since the 1930's and even over a large part of Europe since the 1880's. The effort has been made, as it were, to protect the peasants against the necessary exodus. The result is that agriculture today still has a labor force which is much too large, including a great number of small farmers.

Obviously it has been possible to retard the inevitable exodus to some extent but in the long run this is a policy of despair. These measures of protection and subsidy may perhaps have made life easier for the politicians of past generations but in return they have made it much more difficult for the statesmen of today and especially for ministers of agriculture.

We have reached a stage where protection and subsidies have caused excess production in the West. The position has become somewhat dangerous. The traditional food-importing countries desire to cut down their imports, while the exporting countries for their part desire to increase their foreign sales. It is for this reason that points of view clash so regrettably in discussions on agricultural policy. It is enough to refer to the divergence between Germany and France in the negotiations on the common agricultural policy of the European Community and the discussion between the United States and the representatives of continental Europe on the entry of American foodstuffs into Europe.

How can we get out of this impasse? It is a very serious and very complicated problem. It must be handled as a matter of urgency because if we fail to tackle this question in the immediate future not only may agriculture find itself in an unbearable situation within the next few years but European and Atlantic cooperation will perhaps be jeopardized by discord between exporting and importing countries.

It is not possible to deal with the whole of this delicate problem here. Two points which appear essential should, however, be emphasized.

TOWARD A WORLD ECONOMY

Over the last 10 years there has been large-scale exportation toward some underdeveloped countries of agricultural products mainly from North America. Since the importing countries are poor, these exports have had to be financed by credits on favorable terms. It seems, however, that there will be a growing market in the overpopulated countries of Asia during the next few years. We must therefore consider how these exports can be made an integral part of Western development assistance policy.

It is certain that exports of this kind will at the same time help to solve the agricultural problems of the West, but this policy must be pursued with caution so as to avoid further disturbance of agricultural markets. Furthermore, it seems obvious from the world point of view that the two large North American countries with a sparse population have an enormous relative advantage over certain densely populated Asiatic countries like India and Pakistan in the supply of agricultural foodstuffs.

The other point I should like to stress is that by its very nature the problem of low incomes in agriculture is a social problem. It must be treated as such. It would be better to give the peasants social assistance rather than guarantee them artificial prices and thus encourage production which cannot be sold.

In the case of young people from the villages the best solution would be to provide them with general education and vocational training which would allow them to enter industry or the modern public services.

In many countries this constructive policy has already been started. It must be further extended and developed, since, as I have indicated, it is basically a problem of adaptation to changing circumstances.

As we know, these problems are extremely delicate. We must therefore act with some caution. We must, however, not be blind to the fact that the situation is becoming somewhat dangerous.

That is the core of the problem of trade. The expansion of trade is one of the inevitable consequences of modern technique. The West has been the leader and pioneer in creating this technique, among other things in the sphere of means of transport which has brought the continents closer together. The appropriate conclusions must be drawn in the matter of trade policy.

Today the world can be circled in 90 minutes. In the face of this impressive fact the ideas of national or continental isolationism appear to be thoroughly obsolete and almost ludicrous. The only possible solution is a movement toward a genuine world economy. The West must once again take on the role of leader in this movement.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 2, 1963]

Bankers, Not Theorists

(By Harvey H. Segal)

(Note.—Harvey H. Segal, a former professor of economics at New York University's School of Business Administration and at Rutgers University, is an editorial writer for the Washington Post. His column will appear on Mondays.)

Since 1958, when the return to general currency convertibility subjected the international monetary mechanism to severe pressures, there has been an essentially sterile dialog between proponents of reform and practicing central bankers.

The latest and unfortunately disappointing installment appears in the August number of the Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. It is a curious piece entitled "Conversations on International Finance," the joint product of four central banking officials: C. A. Coombs of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, M. Ikle of the Banque Nationale Suisse, E. Ranalli of the Banca d'Italia, and J. Tuengeler of the Deutsche Bundesbank. All have been intimately involved in foreign exchange operations and their notes were published "with the thought that they would be of interest to a wider public."

The criticism of the present gold-exchange standard system, which the four bankers accept boils down to this: Gold production adds far less to the monetary stock than is necessary to conduct growing volume of international trade, and therefore the dollar reserves of countries other than the United States must be continually expanded. But dollar additions to international liquidity—or the means of payment—can be made only if the United States runs balance-of-payments deficits. But there is the dilemma.

Continuous deficits subject the international value of the dollar to inordinate pressures and inhibit the efforts to stimulate the growth of the domestic economy. On the other hand, a U.S. surplus would diminish international liquidity as other countries used dollar reserves to settle their international accounts.

The authors of the "Conversations" acknowledge this dilemma, but in attempting to come to grips with it they rely essentially on faith in the proposition that solutions to difficult economic problems will somehow emerge through the pursuit of well-established practices.

To cope with the recurrent pressures on the dollar, they would rely heavily upon currency swaps and sales of U.S. Treasury obligations that are denominated in foreign currencies. The effectiveness of these devices in shoring up currencies over the short run cannot be doubted. But they do little to resolve the basic conflict with which the United States, the principal reserve-currency country, is now confronted. The raising of the Federal Reserve System's discount rate in July, when 5.7 percent of the labor force was unemployed, was the last of a series of efforts to defend the dollar which have run counter to the domestic goals of higher employment and more rapid rate of economic growth.

Nor are the four central bankers any more convincing when they turn to the second horn of the dilemma; the contraction of international liquidity that would occur when and if the United States achieves a balance-of-payments surplus. That problem, they are confident, would be dispensed with by the announced willingness of the United States to accumulate reserves of foreign currencies, in their words "a truly revolutionary development which has added a new dimension to the international financial system."

But would an international monetary mechanism based on a multiple currency standard and multiple currency reserves be stable? Suppose that one of the currencies widely held as a reserve suddenly became weak. Could its value then be maintained in the face of pressures through a series of currency swaps and loans?

Perhaps, but it would seem that the scheme that the central bankers envisage embodies the same weaknesses that plagued the national banking system between 1863 and 1913. Under that system country banks kept reserves in Reserve city banks and Reserve city banks held theirs in central Reserve city banks. Recurrent panics toppled the credit pyramid because there was no ultimate source of liquidity in the shape of a central banking institution.

The problem of the international monetary system is roughly analogous, save for the complication introduced by the various national currencies. What is needed is a central bank for central banks, a supernational institution, the embryo of which already exists in the form of the International Monetary Fund.

Yet the central bankers' remarks on expanding and increasing the "automaticity" of the IMP's drawing facilities are extremely cautious, and their conception of that institution's future role is shrouded in ambiguity.

While the sincerity of this effort can hardly be doubted, it brings to mind a passage in Walter Bagehot's classic "Lombard Street," written 90 years ago. Distressed because the directors of the Bank of England were not acquainted with relevant principles, Bagehot remarked that:

"They could not be expected themselves to discover such principles. The abstract thinking of the world is never to be expected from persons in high places; the administration of first-rate current transactions is a most engrossing business, and those charged with them are usually but little inclined to think on points of theory, even when such thinking most nearly concerns those transactions."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield with great pleasure to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When the Senator from New York announced last week that he would make the speech he is making today, I commended the Senator at the time and I said that he was well qualified to make this kind of speech.

The speech the Senator has made is one of the outstanding speeches made in the Senate this year. Certainly in this field it is without question the most comprehensive and constructive.

The Senator has made an unusual speech with respect to the international balance-of-payments problem, because he has not selected one or two or three aspects of it, but has dealt with the whole problem comprehensively. In my judgment, he has gone directly to the crux of the problem.

The Senator started his speech by stating realistically, honestly—and I think accurately—the great seriousness of the problem. He dealt with capital movements and what we can do about them, in a critical way which was also constructive. He dealt with tourist restrictions; with the elimination of nontariff barriers, a subject often neglected and very seldom mentioned, though it is important; with the burden of defense expenditures; with export incentives; with the possibility of removing the gold reserve requirements; with additional international liquidity needs; and also with the slow, basic economic adjustment which—I am sure he agrees with me—is fundamental, and which we must reach.

There is one principle which I believe has pervaded the speech of the Senator from New York, which I think is quite important and which I think we have neglected. That is the great force and power this Nation possesses to enforce its will and to provide leadership.

To give one quick example, in the area of influencing the flow of tourists the Senator emphasized that we experience a deficit of about $1.4 billion a year. We certainly have the power—at least the threat of power—to impose severe financial economic consequences on a nation which will not cooperate.

I believe the Senator from New York would agree that this power would have to be exercised with the greatest of restraint, but tourists from the United States do go abroad, spending billions of dollars a year, and this gives us a force to require reciprocation and the elimination of tourist restrictions against this country.

This is also true in the area of foreign aid and in the area of defense, for we contribute far more than all the other countries combined.

Since we possess this kind of power, we can use our contributions and our ability to make the contributions to get the kind of cooperation which we all agree the free world must have if we are to succeed.

I should like to be a little more specific and perhaps disagree a bit with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York.

The Senator seems to disagree—I am not sure whether he flatly disagrees, or has made a final commitment—with the so-called interest equalization tax proposal of the administration. I noticed that the Senator said at one stage that this plan has been weakened by numerous exceptions, including the exemption of commercial bank loans.

I should like to ask the Senator from New York if in his judgment it would be better if we did not exclude commercial bank loans. After all, the bill will come before the Senate. We can amend it, and we can make it the kind of instrument we wish to make it, so as to be effective.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out to my colleague precisely my position on the interest equalization tax. I believe it is not as good as the technique of the capital issues committee in the New York market. I believe, as a result of my own research and inquiries in the New York market, that a capital issues committee is entirely practical and would work to far better effect than an interest equalization tax.

Now that that has been said, I will not inhibit myself from voting for the interest equalization tax if it comes before the Senate, if our Government can show a good reason why it should be supported. I do not know of any reason why the Government should not cooperate with a capital issues committee, or encourage the organization of one. The Government may be able to demonstrate that, notwithstanding the exceptions already made to the interest equalization tax, it still remains meaningful at least in terms of a standby, so that the matter of capital flotations in this country will not run away from us even further than it has—and we are now close to the $2 billion mark.

I give my views on the subject in terms of alternatives. I agree with the need for certain exemptions. We had to exempt commercial loans. We had to exempt direct investments. We had to offer some indulgence for Canada, which is our best customer in terms of the surplus of exports from us, so that we would not cut off our nose to spite our face and inhibit the best market for our own exports, heavily attributable to the flotation of capital issues.

The exemptions deemed necessary have resulted in making the whole program one of relatively small significance. Therefore I would rather approach the problem in a different way. But if left only with the interest equalization approach, I am not saying I would not vote for it, if it demonstrated some capacity as a standby solution, as a sort of stop-loss approach to capital flotation which, at present, is running at an annual rate of about $2 billion.

That is an important point. I was very careful in my statement not to cut off that possibility, but to indicate that I might support it if I had nothing else to support.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that one great value of the interest equalization tax is that it leaves the determination of what security to invest in to free market forces? While it is true that there is an inhibition to free market forces to some extent, it is within the framework of the tax law, and the decision is left to the investors to use their own judgment in investing in the security of any country. No nation will be banned or cut off; but this freedom would not exist under the capital issues committee proposal. We are free to maintain our interest rates in this country at a level which does not restrain our economic activity.

Mr. JAVITS. Freedom is always a relative thing, and we are free; but it is not as effective in this respect, and it is not worth sacrificing effectiveness for freedom. After all, freedom is relative. When the rediscount rate is raised, interest rates are raised for foreigners, and Americans as well. This is an absolute act by a government agency, or a quasi-governmental agency. We are free, but the market is not permitted to seek its own level. We come to the point of government decision that it is in our national interest to raise the rediscount rate, so we sacrifice the right for the market to seek its own level.

I think the argument can be made that it will cause the buyer considerable freedom if he can buy the security he wants to buy, but I point out that, in my opinion, its disadvantages probably outweigh its advantages, if there is some other way to do it. The disadvantages are, in the first place, that it will have no effect, because even if the equalization tax is paid, interest rates will still remain higher abroad, and I doubt that we will stop the outflow of American dollars.

Second, there is involved an area of governmental control over capital issues; and if there is to be any control, people would rather have the control in the hands of an agency composed of government as well as private enterprise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield at that point, I point out that we can make the remedy as effective as desired. We can maintain whatever differential is necessary, on the basis of the balance of payments, to put our securities on the same basis as foreign securities. There is no magic in the tax figure suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury. We in Congress can fix the figure that will protect us.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct; but protection involves adding a self-defeating provision in another respect. We have much to gain, since we are the biggest importer, exporter, and investor in the world, from economic viability and prosperity in the world, which is indispensable to us.

The Secretary of the Treasury, through the interest equalization tax, would discourage rather than prohibit foreign flotations. Markets abroad are not as available as markets in this country; there are customers in the United States ready, willing, and able to buy foreign securities. So we are trying to find our way, in the most sensitive manner, and as perceptively as we can, among the main alternative remedies. Among the alternatives, I suggest that the capital issues committee would be more effective and a better remedy, considering the facts of international finance, than the interest equalization tax.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is an outstanding statesman because he does not simply criticize and say a certain proposal is wrong. He makes a constructive proposal. On the other hand, he makes it easier for us who defend the present proposal by the administration to criticize his.

The Senator is proposing a capital issues committee composed of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, the Treasury, and key commercial banks and underwriters, to pass judgment on which proposed foreign capital issue is consistent with our national interest. It appears that American citizens are to be prohibited from investing in a large number of foreign issues on the ground that it is against the national interest. Would not this involve hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps billions of dollars, of foreign securities, and put us in the position of discriminating, on a specific basis, against the securities of nationals in a particular country? It seems to me that this policy would be most difficult for us to administer without serious charges of discrimination. Switzerland can do it, for many reasons for which we cannot do it.

Mr. JAVITS. As the Senator from Wisconsin explained it, my proposal sounded better than when I made it. My reason is that it would not necessarily restrict the flow of dollars. It might increase the flow of dollars, provided they were dollars which, when utilized to buy foreign securities, were used in our national interest.

Let me give some practical examples. For a long time we untied our foreign aid—the Senator from Wisconsin is familiar with it—and it was almost a doctrine of the Treasury and the State Department. We were setting the fashion in the world by absolutely untied foreign aid, and were saying that, academically, this was the right way to give aid, so the country and the person aided could have the entire range of international competition in order to use the aid to the greatest effect.

We found that that theory did not work. It was hurting us. We were put in the position where we had either to cut off aid or place some restrictions on it.

With respect to the capital issues, we are somewhat in the same position. We are still laboring under the same academic illusion that the interest equalization tax is the better way, because it leaves those involved free to raise money and spend it as they will.

I do not think we can afford that luxury at this moment, with the imbalance of payments which we have and with the restrictions on our international business. It would be more to our national interest that there should be security flotation in this country. That is a more effective measure to apply. The major flaw in the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin is that this is not a time when we are free to indulge in a classic demonstration of economic liberalism—a time when we are suffering a deficit at the annual rate of $5.2 billion in our balance of payments.

The question is, what do we do about it? Do we cut off military or foreign aid? Of course not. That is very clear. Do we restrict our tourists to $500 a year for expenditures? No; we will not do that if we can avoid it. Do we do other things? Do we try to attract all the money in the world to the United States, on a temporary basis, by raising our rediscount rate, not to 3½ percent, but to 5 percent? The British raised it to 7 percent. No, if we did that, we would probably have 8 million unemployed. Unemployment is dangerous enough now.

I ask unanimous consent that a Wall Street Journal article of August 27, 1963, by Alfred Malabre, describing the disastrous domestic economic consequences of Britain's efforts to correct its balance-of-payments deficit problem through higher interest rates in 1957 and 1960 be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bridled Britain: Its Measures To Retard Gold Drain Hold Lesson for United States

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Last month's increase of the Federal Reserve discount rate to 3½ percent from 3 percent, in one respect, was not unusual. The Federal Reserve Board has boosted the interest it charges member banks no less than 13 times in the last 9 years.

But in another sense the latest increase was most extraordinary. For the first time in the post-World War II era, the Fed raised its rate for reasons not tied to happenings in the domestic economy.

The rate boost, as Fed officials readily concede, was aimed at easing the United States worrisome international balance-of-payments deficit and the resulting gold drain. It is impossible to ascertain whether the payments deficit will continue to worsen—it jumped sharply in the second quarter—and necessitate further Federal action.

If additional measures are required, however, a hint of what may lie ahead can be gleaned from a review of the balance-of-payments woes that have recently plagued the United Kingdom. Though Britain's experience is not strictly applicable to the United States, it indicates that a balance-of-payments problem can be licked with stern action, but at some cost.

Discount rate increases, of course, tend to push up short-term interest charges, generally, and curb capital outflows to countries offering more attractive returns to investors. An international payments deficit, such as America's, occurs when a country spends more abroad than it takes in from foreigners. The U.S. gold drain is linked to its balance-of-payments problem because dollars accumulating abroad may be used to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury.

The Fed's previous postwar rate boosts were designed chiefly to prevent too rapid inflation in the domestic economy, by increasing borrowing costs. And they were modest, seldom pushing the rate higher than the 3-percent level.

THE 1957 EXPERIENCE

Not so in postwar Britain. Without exception, recent increases of the United Kingdom bank rate (comparable to the Fed's discount rate) have been initiated to improve the island's shaky international balance of payments.

Take, for instance, the sterling crisis of 1957. Because of a persistent payments deficit, Britain's gold and dollar reserves, used to settle foreign debts, shriveled by September 1957 to $1,850 million, down about 20 percent from the level at the year's start. To halt the decline, United Kingdom authorities on September 19 of that year boosted Britain's bank rate two full points to 7 percent—twice the current Fed rate.

Other restrictions were also imposed, including a freeze on Government spending and more stringent borrowing regulations for banks. The measures were aimed at sharply curbing inflation that was spurring import demand and pricing some British-made goods out of foreign markets.

The impact of these moves on Britain's foreign reserves was dramatic. By September 1958, the country's gold and dollar holdings were at $3,120 million, nearly 70 percent above the crisis level of a year earlier and higher, in fact, than at any time in 7 years.

But this is not the full story of the 1957 crisis. Britain's industrial output, which had been climbing steadily for 5 years, began to slide soon after the restraints were imposed. It fell from 119 percent of the 1953 base in late 1957 to 113 percent in mid-1958. Employment, at 106 percent in late 1957, skidded to 104 percent in a few months and didn't regain 1957 levels until the end of 1959. By that time, the United Kingdom exchange reserves again strong, the bank rate was back down to 4 percent.

British monetary authorities were unable, however, to leave the bank rate at the 4-percent level for long. Britain's reserves began tumbling again in late 1959, and on January 21, 1960, the bank rate was raised to 5 percent. When the pressure on reserves persisted, the authorities, in a series of steps were forced finally in July 1961 to bring the rate back up to the 7-percent mark.

In addition, brakes were applied to consumer buying, so as to free more production for export markets and trim import demand. Downpayments, normally at the discretion of lenders, were fixed at not less than 20 percent on installment purchases of such consumer goods as autos, TV and ratio sets and major home appliances. Also, a 2-year repayment limit was slapped on a wide range of products bought on credit.

KEEPING OFF INFLATION

When the credit controls were imposed in April 1960, Chancellor of the Exchequer Derick Heathcoat Amory told the House of Commons that the measures were to keep off inflation and thereby give Britain a more healthy external position.

As before, the effect of the restraints on United Kingdom reserve was swift. In July 1961, when the bank rate again hit 7 percent, Britain's holdings of gold and convertible currencies stood at $2,452,800,000, the lowest total in 3½ years. A short 4 months later, reserves amounted to $3,556 million, a 45-percent rebound from July's low point.

But industrial production, at a record in mid-1961, began a 6-month decline and did not return to 1961's high level until mid-1962. By then, with reserves rebuilt, the bank rate was down to 4½ percent. Employment, also at a peak in mid-1961, similarly dropped for several months and did not turn up again until the second quarter of 1962.

Recently, British reserves have held at relatively high levels. In a burst of optimism, United Kingdom officials have vowed to steer an expansionary course in the months ahead. How long this may be possible, however, is open to question. Britain's living costs have pushed markedly higher in recent months. And just last week it was reported that the nation's trade gap widened to $216 million in July, up sharply from $98 million in June. The July gap constituted the United Kingdom's largest excess of imports over exports in any month since August 1962.

The list of economic restraints Britain has used in the postwar period to bolster its exchange reserves is long. Besides bank rate adjustments and other actions already noted, tactics employed at one time or another include pay freezes for workers, steep purchase taxes geared to crimp domestic sales of many goods and, to reduce the drain on United Kingdom treasury funds, higher charges for such Government services as postage.

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE

The impress of Britain's balance-of-payments woes on its economic growth is suggested by matching United Kingdom performance against those of other industrial powers. In a recent review of various Western economies, the Bank for International Settlements stated that Britain's economic growth rate has been unsatisfactory. The BIS concluded that "if the persistent balance-of-payments obstacle to expansion could be overcome, a better record could be achieved in the present decade."

The following table dramatizes Britain's lagging expansion. The percentages express, by country, the average annual increase of gross national product (the value of goods and services produced) for 1950–60. Distortions caused by inflation have been adjusted for.

	Percent GNP gain
West Germany	7.5
Italy	5.8
Netherlands	4.7
France	4.6
Switzerland	4.3
Canada	3.7
Sweden	3.5
Belgium	3.1
United States	3.0
United Kingdom	2.6

The United Kingdom growth rate, the table shows, has been slower than in any other major Western country. And BIS studies reveal British expansion in some recent years has been well below the 2.6-percent average.

There is, of course, another side to the coin. The restrictive measures have doubtless enabled the pound to weather repeated devaluation threats. The record also shows that Britons have suffered less inflation in recent years than most West Europeans. The United Kingdom cost-of-living index has risen only about 10 percent since 1958, far less than the corresponding increases in such lands as France and Italy, where living costs have spurted some 25 percent since 1958. It's no coincidence, parenthetically, that the United Kingdom money supply (demand deposits plus currency in circulation) has increased less, recently, than that of any other West European nation.

GREAT DISSIMILARITIES

To be sure, there are great dissimilarities between the British and American economies. Britain's was hit especially hard by World War II and has been strained in the postwar years by the disintegration of the colonial empire. Moreover, as an island, Britain relies heavily on imported goods. United Kingdom imports traditionally exceed exports, and this places constant pressure on the country's balance of payments.

Thus far, the U.S. action to curb its payments deficit can hardly be likened to the drastic restraints that have been resorted to in Britain. Some U.S. officials even contend last month's half-point discount rate boost won't hamper continued business growth.

Still, the British experience appears noteworthy, as the gold drain persists and the

> payments deficit swells. It is an experience that America, with a naturally favorable trade balance and a highly modern industrial plant that wasn't ravaged by the war, would presumably strive to avoid as the decade once labeled the "soaring sixties" unfolds.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that one of the least harmful worries is to create the Capital Issues Committee. In that way we give ourselves some discretion about where and for what reason we may invest our capital. That is the only point. We are not yet in the situation where we have complete freedom of action. We must do something. That question is, What shall we do?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The question is, How far do we want to go? The Senator takes the position that the Capital Issues Committee would flatly—and it would have to do so flatly—prohibit investments in certain countries or with respect to broad kinds of investments. It would have to do that flatly, to be effective. The Senator would have that done in a comprehensive way.

I suggest that we follow the administration's procedure, which I believe to be a much more moderate approach to a solution of the problem. That would discourage investment in this country and leave us free for such investments as we wanted to make. We should also follow the suggestion of the Senator from New York, which the administration is pursuing today in other areas. It seems to me, also, that though we have an adverse balance-of-payments situation, we still have more gold than any other country has. We can proceed with greater prudence without moving in a drastic fashion through the establishment of a committee which would flatly prohibit investment in broad areas, instead of putting the situation on a basis where as much freedom as possible is left to the investor.

Mr. JAVITS. By way of moving on to other ideas, I believe that the Capital Issues Committee is the more moderate of the two programs. If we passed an interest equalization tax law, it would take a great deal of work to undo it when we felt it had served its purpose. On the other hand, the committee can be set up at 10 o'clock on a Monday morning, and a week later, if we do not like it, we can do away with it. It seems to me that that kind of discipline is much less decisive and a much less complete commitment than would be the case if we passed a law. If we did pass a law, I would hope it would be for only a short time, perhaps for a year, or for 2 years at most, and perhaps we should couple the law with the capability of termination on the part of the President, if we found it did not work or if it worked adversely to American interests.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; an expiration date tied to the act would be desirable. There is no question that if it were a law it might create some difficulties. Nevertheless, what I suggest is a much more moderate approach; and it would be possible with such a law to get at the problem in such a way that it would not involve our relations with other nations very critically. Furthermore as this problem is solved and payments become more favorable, what a joy to vote wholeheartedly and conscientiously for a tax cut.

Nevertheless, there is one part of the Senator's address which comes to the real crux of the whole problem. He says:

> In the absence of willingness of countries today to allow their economies to adjust to each other, the maintenance of fixed foreign exchange rates means the necessity of creating an ever-increasing supply of credit for the sake of financing a persistent imbalance in a given direction.

This is the real crux, the real problem. The Senator has put his finger on it.

The Senator asks that we improve our financial agencies so that we can have a great increase in international credit. I believe that is a most important thing to keep in mind, namely, that other countries also must adjust. I gain the impression, from talking with some economists, including some who testified before the Joint Economic Committee, that we need not worry about the international balance-of-payments situation, because we still have a great deal of gold, and that eventually things will work out.

They will not work themselves out. We must recognize the fact that there must be some degree of austerity. The program should be gradual; it should be practical. We do not want further unemployment. We must not take extreme measures. But we must adjust, and that means at least a measure of austerity, of balanced budgets or lower deficits, of reduced costs. We must keep prices down and do all we can to operate as efficiently as we can.

This is the central idea. That is the most important lesson we can learn from the past. Historically, austerity, reducing cost, was the only way that we could solve the imbalance-of-payments problem.

We know we cannot shove prices down by measures that would increase unemployment. On the other hand, we cannot afford to go "out into left field" and say we do not need to make adjustments. We must make adjustments. The emphasis should be on how we make them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the able Senator from New York for his presentation of this all important subject to the Senate today. Unfortunately I could not be present to hear all of the discussion, but look forward to studying the RECORD. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senator from New York has once again demonstrated his statesmanship in his presentation of this thought-provoking and constructive address. It is one of the finest I have heard on one of the fundamental problems that we now have confronting us as a leading free enterprise nation. I would ask the Senator:

Regardless of what we decide—and I hope that what we do will be the best way—I am impressed by what the Senator has said; if I understand his presentation, it is necessary, essential, that we do something about this continuing outflow of gold. Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I would say to the Senator from Missouri that in this regard I do not quote only myself, but I quote also the Secretary of the Treasury, who has given us a year, and at the most 2 years to solve this problem. He says that beyond that we cannot take this kind of situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Recently I read a book, which I believe the Senator has read also, or has heard reference made to it, by Heilborner and Bernstein, called "A Primer on Government Spending."

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is a brilliant if somewhat overcondensed book. It intimates that a school of economists in this country believe, in effect, that gold is relatively unimportant as compared to production. I believe that not true if the thought is carried to the point where gold becomes unimportant. If we continue to lose gold, it seems clear that in the not too distant future we will have a very serious situation develop in our economy. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. JAVITS. I say to the Senator that in the absence of any other standard—except in the field of short-term adjustments through the International Monetary Fund, and through the relationship which exists among the central banks—the Senator is absolutely correct, in terms of international credit. That is true in the absence of any other basis for international credit than dollars, the pound sterling and gold.

There are two schools of thought as to what we ought to do about gold. One school says that we should do what the British did in the blitz of 1942, when they sent an army division to North Africa. In other words, we should take the $12 billion which we have tied to our currency and invite all the people of the world by saying "Bring your dollars and we will pay for them in gold," and let that be the end of it.

Others say, "Leave that $12 billion on lien."

I believe we should do one of two things. We should "hit" the international balance of payments with many ad hoc measures, and cut it down. This is too serious even to deal with on the basis of long-term remedies. We must do something immediately. We can get at the problem through the promotion of tourism, the reduction of tariff barriers, tax incentives for exports; and we can do something in terms of foreign flotation of securities in the United States, and also toward attracting short-term money; and so forth.

The fundamental problem is the fact that the world has not adjusted to itself in terms of $200 billion of export-import trade; the size of the national economies; and the fact that people will no longer take suffering merely because the the bookkeepers are not doing a good job. That is what it really comes down to. The latter aspect is what I had hoped to emphasize so heavily in my speech.

But to answer the Senator directly as to why we are standing where we are, while the fever chart is operating on the basis of the old thermometer, namely, the gold we have, of course, the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no other thermometer we can use at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New York, and again congratulate him on his most able address.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York further yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While I have been somewhat critical of one or two phases of the Senator's speech, it is a great speech. I have learned much from it; I am sure the country will.

We ought to keep one or two things in mind. First, there has been an adjustment of our economy vis-a-vis the world economy in this sense: Prices have been rising more rapidly, and real wages in many instances have risen more rapidly, in other countries than in this country. Their inflation is consistently worse and far worse than ours.

Mr. JAVITS. Other countries are still far behind.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that their prices are rising more rapidly now.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is an extremely responsible man. He has handled this problem well. Nevertheless, it would not be an accurate reflection of the temper of America and of realism if we did not recognize that there is a feeling on the part of many persons that one way to help solve the problem is by reducing our foreign aid sharply, by reducing our troop commitments abroad sharply, and by recognizing that we cannot carry the burden of the world on our back in the way we have done in the past.

The Senator has partially dealt with this question by saying that we must share the defense burden. He said nothing about foreign economic aid. I presume he has not brought that up because such aid is imperative if we are to lead the free world against communism. Nevertheless, we have a number of ultimate alternatives in mind, as President Kennedy himself has said. It may be, if we do not solve the problem in this way, that it will have to be solved in the long run by making certain sacrifices in the area of common defense, vital as those areas are, if we are to maintain financial leadership, which is a part of the ability of the United States to lead the free world as it has in the past.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a great believer in the "carrot and stick." What the Senator from Wisconsin has said exactly illustrates that point. I believe that for us to reduce our international commitments would be a fatal blow to the struggle against communism and the struggle to maintain a free world. Therefore, I would not take that course except in extremis. But we are adults, and we know there may be exceptional situations. That is what the Senator is talking about. Therefore, I am advocating that we use our economic power and time to prevent our situation from deteriorating to that end, on the ground that solely an appeal to reason to our allies may not accomplish the purpose. That is the essence of what I have tried to explain today.

I should like to add one further point. The Senator from Wisconsin has rendered us all a service in dramatizing the situation before the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] spoke. He said that we must adjust. I should like to add to that, as a combination of our common thinking, not only that we should adjust, but that we must adjust. We should adjust because morally a nation which has duties and responsibilities to itself and its future and to the peace cannot waste itself away in frippery. We cannot increase our gross national product, much as we love the ladies, producing lipstick and perfume and silk stockings. We must have the hard reality, the muniments of power, in order to retain our place in the world. Unfortunately, in our world the only thing that toughens us is competition. Therefore, we do not want to immure ourselves from the situation of competition, because to do so will destroy us; we will decay. We must keep in the competition. Therefore, not only should we adjust to this necessity; we must adjust. It is good for our Nation that we should know what we are doing; but we must move out into the field of competition with other nations and with other combinations of nations. That is the real way in which we shall keep ourselves from growing soft. In that way, we shall keep ever ready to meet whatever eventuality life may bring us.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that one beneficial aspect of adjustment on our part, so called, is that we tend to restrain whatever other tendencies we might have had toward inflation. We fight to keep prices down. But with increased international liquidity for which many plead, there is a possibility that we may adjust later than we should, and that other countries may adjust to us by permitting their prices to rise even faster. We should be conscious of the intimate, close connections between our international economic responsibilities and our domestic economic responsibilities. The groups in our Nation that suffer from inflation are, by and large, those that are less economically and less politically strong and the least represented.

At the same time, this is true in other countries. We may come to a position where this association, in terms of international liquidity, can permit a greater degree of inflation before we have to take the hard, tough, austere position which may lead to bringing prices under control, which could be seriously damaging to our people and to peoples throughout the world, unless we are conscious of it.

The Senator from New York has made a marvelous speech. I have been privileged to be on the floor to listen to it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin. By way of substantiating how we both feel, I am opposed to an increase in the price of gold in dollars. I am rather of the mind that we ought to consider seriously revoking our offer to buy gold at $35 an ounce.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York underlined that point in his speech. If he did not take this position, there would not have been the same urgency and force behind his speech. He has emphasized in his speech that we must act in this way; otherwise, there is the grim alternative that he has just mentioned, the devaluation of the dollar, which would be inflationary.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That would have an adverse effect on many Americans.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I am grateful to him and to other Senators for their participation in the discussion.

VISIT BY KHRUSHCHEV TO PLASTICS FACTORY IN YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the newspapers report an incident that occurred in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, while Khrushchev was visiting that country. The reports say that Marshal Tito took Khrushchev to a model plastics factory and there, with great fanfare, exhibited to Khrushchev an achievement of the Yugoslav Communist government in the establishment of a $40 million plastics plant.

For the building of this plastics plant, the U.S. Government contributed $23 million. The alarming aspect of what happened in Zagreb resides in the fact that as the delegation arrived at the plant, the flags of Yugoslavia and of Red Russia were being flown on high, but the flag of the United States was nowhere visible.

When Tito and Khrushchev entered the plant, the Russian newspaper reporters were allowed to enter. The U.S. reporters were taken to the door, but were not permitted to enter the plant at all.

There is some concern as to whether Khrushchev was even told that the plastics plant was built with the dollars of American taxpayers. There is some question whether the people of Yugoslavia know that $23 million of U.S. money was used for the construction of that establishment.

I believe that at this time we can well ponder again to which area the thinking of Tito is oriented. Is it to his benefactor, the United States, or is it to the person with whom he contends he is in disagreement? I cannot help feeling strongly that our generosity is thus dealt with in a brutal and unjustifiable way; and I shall have more to say on the subject of why we are giving such extravagant aid, amounting to $2,500 million, to Tito, who contends the Communist economy has rebuilt Yugoslavia. He does not tell the truth, for Yugoslavia has been rebuilt by the $2,500 million supplied by the Browns, the Greens, the Whites, the Fergusons, and all the other people of our country, through the payment of taxes.

MAGSAYSAY AWARD TO PEACE CORPS IN ASIA

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier this week, announcement was made that the Peace Corps volunteers in Asia—now numbering over 1,000—have collectively been named to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding. The Magsaysay Award has been termed Asia's equivalent to the Nobel Prize.

As further distinction, these men and women are the first nonresident Westerners ever to be so honored.

All Americans can only take deep pride in this outstanding tribute to these accomplishments of the Peace Corps. We should be grateful for the high honor they bring our Nation in their contribution toward a better life for these people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the press release, dated August 23, announcing this award, together with background memorandums thereon; and also an editorial from the Philippines Herald.

There being no objection, the release, memorandums, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., August 26,1963.

Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver has accepted an invitation to go to Manila August 31 to receive the Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding on behalf of Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian nations.

President Macapagal of the Philippines Republic will present the award to Mr. Shriver in ceremonies to be held in Manila, Saturday evening, August 31.

"The Magsaysay Award is the finest tribute Peace Corps volunteers have received," Shriver said. "They are the first group of Americans to receive the award. We are deeply gratified and very pleased."

Established in 1958 to honor the late President of the Philippines, the Magsaysay Award recognizes persons in Asia who "exemplify his greatness in spirit, integrity, and devotion to liberty." It has been termed Asia's equivalent to the Nobel Prize.

The 1963 award was given to the volunteers "for their contribution to work among people and service to the cause of peace and humanity in a direct and personal way."

In commenting editorially on the awards, the Manila Evening News said: "In 22 months of quiet and sometimes painful, often discouraging labor, Peace Corps volunteers who came to this part of the world have secured a verdict not before vouchsafed to any other foreign group. What millions of dollars in machinery and foodstuff and other material gifts had failed to accomplish, the Peace Corps workers achieved in less than 2 years—an understanding with Asian peoples that promises to pass all tests."

The Philippines Herald termed the award "a signal honor, for the award, normally for Asians, is being conferred this time on persons who, while not of the region, have contributed to the cause of peace and understanding in this area. That the honor is most deserved, everyone will heartily agree."

Volunteers serving in Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak, and the Philippines were cited by the award foundation. The foundation also commended the work of volunteers serving in the Near East, Africa, and Latin America.

Presently there are about 2,000 Peace Corps volunteers serving or in training to serve in Asia. Worldwide, there are 6,657 volunteers currently overseas or in training. They are serving in 47 different nations, all over the world.

In its award citation the Magsaysay Foundation said of the volunteers: "The problem of achieving peace amidst the tensions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

The award carries with it a cash prize of $10,000. Like the Nobel Prize, there are several categories of the Magsaysay Award: international understanding government service, public service, community leadership, literature, and journalism.

Past award winners have included the Dalai Lama, Malayan Prime Minister Abdul Rahman, Thai civic leader, Nilawan Pintong, Indonesian public health physician, Raden Kodijat, Burmese social worker, Daw Tee Tee Luce, British missionary doctor, Sir Henry Tristram Holland, Indonesian labor leader, Koesna Poeradiredja, and Mother Teresa, founder of the Missionaries of Charity in India.

MEMORANDUM ON THE RAMON MAGSAYSAY AWARD

The Ramon Magsaysay Awards, established in 1958 and given annually, is one of Asia's highest honors. Established to honor the late President of the Philippines, the award gives recognition to persons in Asia who "exemplify his greatness of spirit, integrity, and devotion to liberty."

The award is given in five fields each year:

Government service: Outstanding service in the public interest in any branch of government or the military.

Public service: Outstanding service for the public good by a private citizen.

International understanding: Advancement of international amity, building of friendship between peoples of different countries.

Community leadership: Action that would help the man on the land to have fuller opportunities and a better life.

Journalism and literature: Effective writing and publishing as a power for public good.

Each of the five awards carries a cash prize of $10,000. The board of the Magsaysay Foundation may omit awards in one or more categories in a given year if they do not find an appropriate candidate.

The awards are persented each year in Manila on August 31, the anniversary of the birth of Ramon Magsaysay.

Some distinguished past winners of the award are as follows:

Dalai Lama, Tibet, winner Community Leadership Award, 1959.

Chintamon Deshmukh, joint winner, Government Service Award in 1959, a former Finance Minister of India, currently president of the Indian International Center in New Delhi.

Jose Vasquez Aguilar, Philippines, joint winner, Government Service Award, 1959.

Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Alhai, winner, Community Leadership Award, 1960, Prime Minister of Malaya.

H. Koesna Poeradiredja, Indonesia, and Palayil Narayanan, Malaya, joint winners, Community Leadership Award, 1962.

Mochtar Lubis, Indonesia, winner, Journalism and Literature Award, 1958.

Tarzie Vittachi, Ceylon, winner Journalism and Literature Award, 1959.

Nilawan Pintong, Thailand, winner Public Service Award, 1961.

The Peace Corps volunteers are the first nonresident Westerners ever to win the award. Only one other American has won the award. In 1961, Genevieve Caulfield was given the Award in International Understanding "in recognition of her international citizenship in guiding to full and useful lives those in other lands afflicted like herself by blindness." Miss Caulfield has worked in Japan, Thailand, and is now in Vietnam where she runs a small elementary school for the sightless in Saigon.

Often called the Nobel Prize of Asia, the Magsaysay Award is given to persons or groups working in 1 or more of the 26 Asian nations. This year's Award in International Understanding is being given to Peace Corps volunteers working in 11 Asian countries: Philippines, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaya, North Borneo, and Sarawak.

While the award cites specifically the accomplishments of persons in Asia, the board also commended the Peace Corps volunteers serving in the Near East, Africa, and South America.

The board stated: "The problem of achieving peace amidst the tensions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PEACE CORPS IN ASIA

The Peace Corps presently has 1,262 volunteers at work in Asia, with another 604 candidates in training for service there.

Volunteers are working in five southeast Asian countries. They range from the Philippines, where there are more than 450 volunteers in the organization's single largest program, to Indonesia, where 17 regional physical education instructors are working in one of the smallest and newest projects. They include also Malaya, Thailand, North Borneo, and Sarawak.

Teaching is the major activity among the more than 900 volunteers assigned to this sweeping area. Some volunteers teach at important universities and colleges. But most work in secondary and elementary schools in rural regions. A small number are in physical education. And a growing number are in community development, 4-H, agriculture and health programs.

In the Near East and south Asia, volunteers cited by the Magsaysay Foundation are working in Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, Pakistan, and India.

The Peace Corps' activity in this region increased sixfold during the agency's second year of existence. As one example: On June 30, 1962, there were 83 volunteers at work in India and Pakistan. Today 287 volunteers are serving in those two countries.

Again, one major field of endeavor is education. Nearly half of the volunteers here are involved in it, in one way or another. Other work includes community development, public works, health and agricultural extension.

Here is a country-by-country rundown of Peace Corps work in the 11 Asian nations cited by the Magsaysay Foundation:

Afghanistan: The first nine volunteers arrived here in September 1962, making up the smallest Peace Corps group overseas. They included five English teachers, three nurses and an automobile mechanic. Since then they have been joined by 26 more volunteers, 19 of them secondary school teachers and 7 printers.

Ceylon: Thirty-six volunteers have been at work here since September 1962 in 20 teachers colleges and secondary schools, where they are participating in Ceylon's campaign to improve its educational system and extend the curriculum into scientific and technological fields. They are teaching science, health, physical education and home economics.

Indonesia: When 17 Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Indonesia last May they were greeted by a Communist "Yankee-go-home" demonstration, but also by some reassuring words of welcome from top national leaders.

Known there as Sukarelawan Pembangunan (volunteers for development) the group of 15 men and 2 women are working as athletic instructors in the islands of Java, Sumatra, and Sulawesi.

Malaya: Of the 169 volunteers here, 90 are teachers at all levels from elementary to university, 53 are health workers, and others serve as architects in charge of school construction, heavy equipment operators, and surveyors engaged in road construction, foresters, and soil analysts.

The health workers include two doctors as well as nurses and laboratory technicians who work in district hospitals, rural health centers, in leprosaria, in yaws and tuberculosis control programs and in maternal and infant care. Peace Corps nurses treat as many as 1,200 patients and have given inoculations to many thousands more.

North Borneo/Sarawak: After almost a year of operation in these last two British colonies on the vast island of Borneo, the Peace Corps has 91 volunteers spread out across the two regions which stretch along almost 800 miles of the island. About half are secondary and primary school teachers. Others are nurses, lab technicians, social workers, malaria control specialists, 4-H organizers, specialists in truck farming, pig raising, and veterinary work. Peace Corps surveyors are leading work parties plotting roads that will open up trackless jungle areas.

India: India's size and complexity present the 115 volunteers there with a formidable challenge. The population of 440 million is more than four times that of any other country served by the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps' first project there was in the Punjab, in the fields of agricultural extension, rural housing, town planning, farm machinery production, small business improvement, and youth work. Since then, additional volunteers have become university teachers. Volunteers now work in five different Indian States.

Nepal: The majority of the volunteers here—51 out of 65—are teachers in secondary schools and colleges. Twelve others are in agricultural extension work. These volunteers are teaching about 3,000 Nepalese. The agricultural extension workers have vastly increased egg production at experimental farms and have launched chicken raising projects.

Pakistan: The Peace Corps in Pakistan has expanded in the past year from 57 volunteers to 117 now working there. Fighting such natural hazards as drought, typhoon, and flood, they have made considerable progress throughout the country. They are working in such diverse fields as gardening, education, and flood control and irrigation, in many cases with the local villages themselves. In the Ganges-Kobadak region, PCV's work hand in hand with the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization.

Philippines: A Peace Corps program rich in people-to-people contacts has evolved in this nation. There are 474 volunteers currently serving in the Philippines in a program designed to improve the quality of Philippine education. Most are serving in rural elementary schools. Others are in high schools, normal schools and colleges. They are helping teach English, science, math, and community education.

Thailand: In mid-1963 about three-quarters of the Peace Corps' 227 volunteers in Thailand were in education. A small group was teaching advanced subjects at universities in Bangkok. Some were instructing at trade and agriculture schools. A dozen physical education instructors were spread around the country. The bulk of the volunteers were teaching English in secondary schools and teacher colleges far out in the remotest provinces.

[From the Philippines Herald, Aug. 10, 1963]

Well-Deserved Award for Peace Corps Volunteers

U.S. Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian countries including the Philippines have been singled out collectively to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding—a signal honor—for the award, normally for Asians, is being conferred this time on persons who, while not of the region, have contributed in a unique manner to the cause of peace and understanding in this area. That the honor is most deserved, everyone will heartily agree.

In deciding to cite the Peace Corps volunteers, the RM Award Foundation noted: "The problem of achieving peace amidst the tensions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet a few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

The award is made more significant by the fact that the first Asian contingent of Peace Corpsmen were detailed to the Philippines. That was in October of 1961. By the middle of this year, they have spread out all over Asia, including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaya, North Borneo, Nepal, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and Sarawak. What they have done and are doing in the Philippines is most eloquently indicated by the many favorable and highly complimentary reports about their services in various parts of the country, sharing their energy and technical skills with the people, as teachers, athletic coaches, nurses, doctors, laboratory aids, mechanics, engineers, etc., and, in the process, promoting friendship, understanding, and the cause of peace.

The award, established to give recognition to those in Asia who exemplify the late Magsaysay's "greatness of spirit, integrity and devotion to liberty," carries a $10,000 prize which the Peace Corps has indicated would be put to "appropriate" use. But it's not the cash award, of course—for the Peace Corps volunteers have embraced their work in a spirit of service and self-denial—as much as the honor that deservedly goes with it and the gratefulness of the people who have been the beneficiaries of their services. One might say that the conferring partakes of the nature of an expression of thanks to these volunteers for the splendid thing they are doing for the cause of peace and understanding in our part of the world.

THE PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in consideration of more dramatic issues of the day—such as the nuclear test ban treaty, civil rights, defense, space and foreign aid programs—I hope that one of the most serious and persistent problems facing our Nation will not be overlooked.

According to the latest figures, during June, some 94,200 Missouri citizens seeking work could not find jobs.

As long as this type statistic is considered normal, not only is our economy failing to fulfill its potential, but we can be sure our gross national product is not increasing in adequate fashion to take care of the annual increase, in millions, of our population.

Despite our pride in the results of our open democratic society, it is clear that nothing approaching the good life is within the reach of millions of the citizens of the United States.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial from the August 21 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Not as Bad in Missouri, But—."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Not as Bad in Missouri, But—

Unemployment in Missouri in June was not as bad as in the country as a whole, according to the division of employment security. It stood at 4.8 percent of the labor force compared with the national figure, adjusted for the season, of 5.7 percent.

Yet there is slight cause for satisfaction here since in June 94,200 Missourians were looking for jobs and could not find any. There were 4,600 fewer unemployed than in June 1962. But this improvement seems to be due partly to the fact that some people had left the State in their search for work. There was an increase of only 1.5 percent in its labor force in 1963 over 1962, and the increase in St. Louis was only three-tenths of 1 percent. That is not growth.

Perhaps in Missouri as well as in the rest of the United States, too many of us are not sufficiently aware of the human tragedies embraced in these statistics—the increasing hopelessness of fathers and mothers unable to provide for their children, the frustration and anger of those denied a place in "the affluent society," the apathy, irresponsibility and delinquency of a growing number of young people. But if we cannot fully appreciate unemployment in terms of its victims, we might be somewhat more aware of its threats to us as a source of depredation and depression. Morally, we cannot tolerate it; economically, we cannot afford it.

MUSIAL TIES ANOTHER RECORD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday, one of the great athletes of all time equaled another record. When Stan Musial doubled against the Pittsburgh Pirates, he tied the record of the late Tyrus Raymond Cobb. Both Cobb and Musial now have 724 doubles in the record book—more than any player except Tris Speaker, who had 796.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article in the New York Times by Arthur Daley with regard to the retirement of Musial. It is entitled "In Fond Farewell."

All of us will agree with Mr. Daley's last line: "Baseball enriched itself by having him."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1963]

In Fond Farewell

(By Arthur Daley)

Having been away when Stan Musial announced he would wave farewell to baseball at the end of this season, this admirer never did get a chance to wave back at him. But the delay really doesn't matter. That's the beauty of dealing with Musial. He's so lacking in formality and pretense that protocol has no importance.

Musial is more than an extraordinary ballplayer. He's an extraordinary person as well.

"Any guy who ever says anything bad about Stan Musial," once declared Hank Sauer, the onetime Cub outfielder, "has to have something wrong with him." No one ever expressed it better.

"Stan the Man" has rewritten the National League record book with his exceptional accomplishments and replaced in wholesale fashion the presumably imperishable marks posted by Honus Wagner, one of the greatest ballplayers. Like the immortal "Flying Dutchman," Musial will be voted into the Hall of Fame on the first bounce.

BY A LANDSLIDE

Even in that he is likely to shatter all precedent. Five years after his retirement Musial will be eligible for selection by the voting members of the Baseball Writers Association. The probability is overwhelming that Musial will be voted into Cooperstown unanimously.

Pause for a moment and savor the significance of that step. Ty Cobb failed to win unanimous endorsement for reasons that defy comprehension. Babe Ruth also was omitted from some ballots, as were Wagner, Christy Mathewson, and Grover Cleveland Alexander, the other charter members of the hall.

It took Rogers Hornsby and George Sisler and other fantastically talented performers several years to make it. Even Joe DiMaggio missed out on his first try, a shocking denouement. But if any press-box tenant fails to vote for Musial, he should have his credentials torn up.

When selection day arrives, however, it will not hurt the Cardinal superstar one bit to have won for himself more personal popularity than any other ballplayer who ever lived. The warmth of his personality has swept into his rooting section without any known exception among his fellow ballplayers, club officials, writers and fans.

ONE OF THE BOYS

He took his greatness in stride and never lost the common touch. This observer has seen rookies stand in awe of Ted Williams and Mickey Mantle and other headliners. But Musial still is regarded as one of the boys. He laughs and jokes with the kids until each feels perfectly at ease with him. Laughter is his constant companion.

None of this is a pose. It just wells up from his natural wholesomeness. He has shown it in so many little ways. One spring day in St. Pete this reporter had just left the ball park when Musial fell into stride alongside.

"Walk me to the garage," he said, "and I will drive you back to your hotel."

"But it will take you out of your way," he was told.

"So what?" he said. "I want to do it."

Baseball was not even discussed as two old friends ambled along until pause was made in front of the Cadillac agency. Musial stopped.

"Can you imagine an ordinary guy like me owning a Cadillac?" he said. The incredulity in his voice was genuine.

On another day in St. Pete an idea popped into the mind of that easy conversationalist.

"Hey," he said, starting to laugh. "I just realized something. I have not had a raise in salary for 5 years. Maybe I should hit the boss for a hike in pay."

He sounded like a bank clerk about to ask for an increase from $80 a week to $85. He was then earning $80,000 a year. He did not even ask for the hike, but it came anyway. It was at $100,000 per annum.

A GENEROUS MAN

When Musial was a 19-year-old kid playing for Daytona Beach, he was befriended by Dickie Kerr, the former White Sox pitcher who was his manager there. The only expression of gratitude Stan could afford then was to name his first-born son Richard Kerr Musial. But many years later the now wealthy Musial bought a home for his benefactor and was embarrassed when the news leaked out.

Notre Dame wanted to give a scholarship to Dick Musial, a fine high school athlete.

"No thanks," said Stan. "I can afford to pay his way through college. Give the scholarship to someone who needs it more."

A remarkable man is Stanley Frank Musial. Baseball enriched itself by having him.

DR. FREDRIK SCHIOTZ ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last month one of Minnesota's and this Nation's most respected church leaders, Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz, of Minneapolis, was elected president of the Lutheran World Federation, at the closing plenary session in Helsinki, Finland. Dr. Schiotz also serves as president of the American Lutheran Church.

This is a singular honor bestowed upon one of the truly outstanding religious leaders of the United States and the world. Dr. Schiotz received his education at St. Olaf College, in Northfield, Minn., and at the Luther Theological Seminary, in St. Paul. He also holds an advanced degree from Concordia College, in Moorhead, Minn. In short, this distinguished churchman is a son of Minnesota, if ever one existed.

In 1961, Dr. Schiotz represented the American Lutheran Church during the historic World Council of Churches assembly at New Delhi, India. He was one of the 100 clergymen named to the central committee of the world council.

The United States and the State of Minnesota should take pride in the leadership of Dr. Schiotz as manifested by his service in these numerous capacities. His election as the head of the World Lutheran Federation presents him with great responsibilities, but I am confident they will be fulfilled beyond expectation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial, from the Minneapolis Star, commenting on the election of Dr. Schiotz and an article from the Minneapolis Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Aug. 14, 1963]

LEADER OF LUTHERANS

A singular and well-deserved honor has come to Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz with his election to the highest Lutheran Church post. As president of the Lutheran World Federation he will be the top representative of more than two-thirds of the world's 73 million Lutherans and an influential leader in current ecumenical movements involving other churches and religions.

Dr. Schiotz was educated in Minnesota (at St. Olaf College, Northfield, and Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul) and has served churches in Duluth and Moorhead. After broad experience, pastoral and administrative, which took him repeatedly to many other countries, he returned to Minneapolis in 1954 to become head of the Evangelical Lutheran Church and guide its merger into the American Lutheran Church, of which he is also president. The fact that he has been chosen to succeed another American, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry of New York, speaks well for both Dr. Schiotz and the reputation of American leadership within the worldwide organization.

Dr. Schiotz is to be congratulated, and Minnesotans will look forward with interest to the closer bond with church people of other countries which inevitably will result from his new responsibilities.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 10, 1963]

DR. SCHIOTZ TO HEAD WORLD FEDERATION

HELSINKI, FINLAND.—An American church leader today succeeded another American as president of the Lutheran World Federation.

The Reverend Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz of Minneapolis, Minn., president of the American Lutheran Church, was elected unanimously as the fourth head of the federation at the closing plenary session of its fourth assembly. He will serve for a term of 6 years, until the next assembly.

As president of the American Lutheran Church, Dr. Schiotz heads the third largest Lutheran body in the United States.

A graduate of St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., and Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Dr. Schiotz holds advanced degrees from Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn., and Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

He has served as pastor of Zion Lutheran Church, Duluth, Minn., Trinity Lutheran Church, Moorhead, Minn., and Trinity Lutheran, Brooklyn, N.Y.

He was elected president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1954. He was chosen in April 1960, to be president of the American Lutheran Church.

In September 1960, he was elected chairman of the board of directors of the Lutheran World Federation broadcasting service at the board meeting in Bukoba, Tanganyika. In this position he played a role in supervising the construction of a 100-kilowatt radio station at Addis Abba, Ethiopia, at a cost of almost $1 million.

He represented the American Lutheran Church during the World Council of Churches assembly at New Delhi, India, in 1961.

When he was elected to head the American Lutheran Church (ALC) in April 1960, Dr. Schiotz delivered an address that included the suggestion that ALC should try to help Minneapolis rid itself of the "evil" of segregated housing.

In 1961 he took a stand opposing Federal aid to parochial schools, stating that such aid "would inevitably lead to deterioration of the public school system."

He supported a move by Minneapolis Protestant churches to "save Sunday" as a day of rest and worship by avoiding shopping in stores that remain open on Sundays.

In 1961, at New Delhi, India, Dr. Schiotz was one of 100 clergymen named to the central committee of the World Council of Churches. The committee governs the world council between assemblies which are held every 6 or 7 years. He is one of 20 Americans named to that committee.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Gallup poll released over the past weekend has revealed heartening public support for the limited nuclear test ban treaty. Sixty-three percent of the Americans interviewed said they would like to see the treaty approved; 17 percent said it should not be approved; 20 percent expressed no opinion. These figures correlate with those of other public opinion polls taken in recent years in the United States on the test ban treaty.

The Louis Harris poll of July 8, 1963, showed that 73 percent favored a test ban agreement similar to the one now under consideration.

The Minnesota poll published on Sunday in the Minneapolis Tribune showed that 83 percent of the citizenry of Minnesota favor Senate approval of the test ban treaty, without reservation. I am very proud of that record. I am very much pleased that our State has this interest in these matters. The citizenry of the State of Minnesota take a keen and continuing interest in all matters of domestic policy and international policy. The fact that 83 percent of the citizenry of the State of Minnesota took that position in a statewide poll conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune—a poll which has a record for accuracy—is very heartening to me.

One of the facts about which I was very much concerned during the hearings on the test ban treaty was the great emphasis placed on the development of more weapons under the treaty. Seldom did anyone discuss the contribution our country can make to the achievement and maintenance of peace.

Our country is not short of weapons; neither is the world. Mankind has learned how to slaughter itself at an ever-increasing rate, and has used the full impact of automation, science, and technology in developing its capacity to kill. But today the shortage in the world is learning how to live. We are strong on dying, but short on living. The Senate will make a good name for itself during its consideration of the nuclear test ban treaty if occasionally a voice is raised in this Chamber to indicate that one of the purposes of the treaty is to search for more reliable pathways to peace.

As the President of the United States has so well stated, peace is a process, and we must develop this process step by step.

If a little more emphasis were placed upon that aspect of the nuclear test ban treaty, we would be raising some basic questions that should be discussed. It would in no way diminish our strength. Our strength is a fact. It is a reality based upon unbelievable power. But there is another source of power and another kind of strength which we seem to neglect all too often. It is the power of mankind's search throughout history for a just and enduring peace. I am not a bit ashamed to stand in this body day after day and say that the best intellects of our country and of the world should be organized and fixed upon the search for the steps and the processes of peace. If we will spend more time on that question, we may spare ourselves the destruction which will surely be inevitable, sometime, somewhere.

It is genuinely reassuring to me to find that the American people are a little more confident about these matters than are some of their Representatives in Congress. I have the feeling, however, as I indicated several weeks ago, that when the vote is taken on the test ban treaty, the doubts will fade away and the vote will be overwhelmingly in support of the treaty. Statements of doubt might permit some Senators to say, "I had to raise those doubts." If anything goes wrong, one can always point to the doubts. But what the Nation needs is not only doubters but also advocates. I will not be a doubter, but an advocate. If we have ten doubters, we ought to have one advocate—someone who will take a stand to work for the treaty. I will be one of those, as I have been. I will let others develop their expertise knowledge in the field of doubt and concern.

But this support among the American people is not a new phenomenon. Several years ago an earlier Gallup poll disclosed a similar attitude. In short, the American public has consistently favored a cessation of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space.

The Senate, of course, has the clear responsibility to examine such an issue most carefully and objectively to determine whether such a test ban would effectively protect this Nation's security. Much of the information needed for such a determination is not available to the general public. We have engaged in precisely this task over the past month. The 16-to-1 vote by the Foreign Relations Committee in favor of the treaty revealed a congruence between the judgments of the Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee and the opinion of the American public.

As one of those Senators supporting ratification of this treaty, I interpret the results of this Gallup poll and of the Minnesota poll as good news.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Gallup poll of August 31, 1963, on the limited test ban treaty as carried by the Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Gallup Poll—Public Expresses Its Full Approval of Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

(By George Gallup)

Princeton, N.J., August 31.—If the American people were asked at this time to vote in a nationwide referendum on the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia, the evidence shows that they would approve it by a large majority.

In a Gallup poll just completed, 6 out of every 10 Americans who have followed the issue say they would like to see the Senate vote approval of the treaty. Only 17 percent think the treaty should be voted down.

Those who said they had heard or read about the agreement with Russia for a partial ban on the testing of nuclear weapons were asked this question: "Do you think the Senate should vote approval of this ban, or not?"

The findings:

	Percent
Should	63
Should not	17
No opinion	20

The above figures are based on the 78 percent of the persons interviewed who said they had heard or read about the ban on testing. This is a high awareness figure when compared with the public's interest in other major issues of this type, and in comparison with the 60 to 65 percent of the American public who have voted in recent presidential elections.

Analysis of the results by such background factors as region of the country, city size, political beliefs, and level of education shows substantial proportions in favor of ratification among these major groups.

Support for the test ban treaty is lowest in the South, but even in this section of the country, more than twice as many people favor ratification as oppose it, as the following table shows:

[In percent]

	Should ratify	Should not	No opinion
East	73	15	12
Midwest	63	16	21
South	48	21	31
Far West	61	21	18

Republicans are somewhat more opposed to Senate approval of the treaty than are Democrats, but again proratification sentiment predominates, as follows:

[In percent]

	Should ratify	Should not	No opinion
Republicans	58	24	18
Democrats	67	13	20

Greatest opposition to ratification is found among supporters of Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, a critic not only of the current test ban agreement with Russia but of the Kennedy administration's cold war policies in general.

Twenty-seven percent of those who favor Goldwater over Kennedy in a Gallup poll trial heat race, think the Senate should reject the treaty.

However, even among Goldwater followers, almost twice as many believe the treaty should be ratified as take the opposite view.

[In percent]

	Should ratify	Should not	No opinion
Goldwater followers	52	27	21

Source: American Institute of Public Opinion.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN SUPPORTS LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the statement supporting ratification of the limited test ban treaty approved by the National Council of Jewish Women, Inc. The council's untiring dedication to careful study of public issues is a matter of record. I commend their statement to other Members of Congress and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement in Support of Ratification of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, August 27, 1963, by the National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.

The National Council of Jewish Women, an organization established in 1893, with a current membership of 123,000 in 329 local communities throughout the country, is gratified to have this opportunity to express our endorsement of the agreement for a nuclear test ban treaty. We strongly urge that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee give favorable consideration to the ratification of this treaty.

For the past 15 years our organization has publicly backed the U.S. Government in its untiring efforts to secure an end to nuclear weapons testing. We would, of course, have hoped for the suspension of all testing, including underground, with provision for necessary inspection and control, but we welcome the present treaty as an important first step.

The National Council of Jewish Women has followed closely and with continued optimism the efforts of three U.S. administrations to reach some sort of a solution to this frightful dilemma. As far back as March 1961 at our biennial convention we anticipated agreement when we adopted a statement reiterating our continuing concern for an early agreement to halt nuclear testing with proper safeguards, and calling upon our fellow citizens to join us in pledging firm public support for Senate ratification of such an agreement when it has been concluded. At our last national convention in February 1963, the National Council of Jewish Women once again urged the U.S. Government in our national resolutions to continue to strive for international security through international agreement on general disarmament which will include effective inspection, and through completion of a treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing.

After careful consideration of the provisions of the agreement, and with complete awareness of its potentials as well as of its limitations, the National Council of Jewish Women wishes to go on record in support of the ratification of this treaty. In considering the effects of such an agreement, it appears to us that for every step backward from the dangers of nuclear war there will indeed result a "step toward peace." A reduction in the cold war tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States can become a step forward in resolving the fundamental disagreements between the East and the West. A reduction in the spread of nuclear weapons and nuclear know-how to other countries in the world which have signed the treaty is indeed a step forward in avoiding the dangers of accidental nuclear warfare. A reduction in the radioactive pollution of the atmosphere is certainly a step forward toward safeguarding the health and the lives of this and future generations.

The National Council of Jewish Women has taken due notice of the limitations and risks implied in the treaty, as indicated by President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. But the testimony of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, have confirmed our conviction that those risks are much less than those to which we have already been exposed and would continue to face if unlimited testing were to go on.

It is important that this treaty be ratified as quickly as possible and that the major powers press forward toward greater control over nuclear weapons and toward general disarmament. Until such disarmament becomes not only possible but practical, the nuclear test ban treaty is an indispensable first step on the path to permanent security. As such, we believe it should be ratified by an overwhelming majority vote of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "No Reservations, Please," published in the Washington Evening Star on Tuesday, August 27. The editorial relates to the statement of former President Eisenhower and reads in part as follows:

General Eisenhower's qualified support of the test ban treaty is welcome. But the qualification suggested in his letter of endorsement should not lead to adoption of formal reservations by the Senate. For this might nullify the treaty.

I am sure Senators and the public know that only yesterday the President of the United States pointed out that a reservation to the treaty would require renegotiation of the treaty. The President has made clear that in his responsibility as the Chief Executive of this Nation and the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces a reservation is unnecessary. The editorial to which I referred also recommends that—

The "understandings" which have been submitted by the administration at the urging of Senator JACKSON and others are another matter. While not a part of the treaty, these should be formally presented to prevent any failure to achieve a meeting of the minds between the Senate and the Executive. This does not necessarily imply distrust of anyone in the administration. The treaty will remain in force, however, long after this administration has passed from power, and the legislators are fully justified in basing ratification on understandings which cannot in good faith be abandoned in the future unless there should be such a change in world conditions as to warrant new treaty undertakings.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO RESERVATIONS, PLEASE

General Eisenhower's qualified support of the test ban treaty is welcome. But the qualification suggested in his letter of indorsement should not lead to adoption of formal reservations by the Senate. For this might nullify the treaty.

Mr. Eisenhower proposes a "reservation" which would make clear that the United States, despite any treaty, retains full right to use nuclear weapons to repel aggression. There should be no doubt about this right, and we do not think there is any. The plain purpose of the treaty is to ban nuclear tests in space, in the atmosphere, and in water. It is not intended to restrict free use of weapons in event of conflict, and it is hardly conceivable that any signatory so believes. In order to avoid a possibility of misunderstanding, however, the Senate committee report and the debate should make it clear that ratification of the treaty is contingent on the express condition that it has no application to the use of nuclear weapons in time of war.

The understandings which have been submitted by the administration at the urging of Senator Jackson and others are another matter. While not a part of the treaty, these should be formally presented to prevent any failure to achieve a meeting of the minds between the Senate and the Executive. This does not necessarily imply distrust of anyone in the administration. The treaty will remain in force, however, long after this administration has passed from power, and the legislators are fully justified in basing ratification on understandings which cannot in good faith be abandoned in the future unless there should be such a change in world conditions as to warrant new treaty undertakings.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from New York has returned to the Chamber. He was called away from the Chamber for a moment following his remarkable address today on the subject of our international payments-deficit problem and the whole problem of international financing. The Senator from New York has given a great deal of attention to this controversial and highly complex and difficult subject. I claim no expertise knowledge whatsoever. I am merely an interested citizen and Senator. I rise to commend the able Senator from New York and to ask him a question or two.

I join with Senators who have commended the Senator from New York upon his presentation. I knew of his plan to make his address today. I know of the many hours of hard work that went into the study and preparation of his remarkable address. It is not important whether or not we agree with every paragraph of his speech. I cannot say that I disagree. What is important is that a subject of such complexity and importance should be discussed in this forum, and not merely behind the door of a committee room, sealed off from the public.

Today the United States is the most important commercial, industrial, and banking nation in the whole world economy. Our policies relating to gold, exports, tourism, foreign aid, and troop commitments overseas in terms of our responsibilities in the world today are most vital and they need to be discussed in totality. They need to be discussed in relationship to one another as they relate to the problem of the balance of payments.

As a student at the university, I had a limited formal education in economics. But I find that much of that training is not of great help when we come to the tough day-to-day problems of economic growth, survival and policy for growing countries. I am concerned over what appears to be a fixation with policies that relate to a period no longer with us. I do not mean to place myself on record as saying that now we should abandon the so-called gold standard, or gold as a means of exchange between nations. However, I feel that there is need for some advanced thinking in terms of international financing just as there is need for advanced thinking in the exploration of outer space. If we were to apply to our exploration of outer space the same kind of thinking that was applied to the development of the Model T automobile, or even the first airplane, we would find ourselves far removed from any accomplishment or achievement in the great new sphere called outer space.

I do not believe that this country can withdraw from the foreign aid program. I do not think the answer to the balance-of-payments problem—again I think I have the support of the Senator from New York—is to withdraw foreign aid. I believe the answer is to find ways and means of bringing commerce between the nations to a higher level and of improving our position of liquidity in the international scene without reneging on our responsibilities. For example, I do not believe that we can abruptly reduce the number of our troops overseas. Perhaps some phasing out can be done in certain areas. I think that question can be examined by the appropriate committee of Congress.

It ought to be examined not because we are angry with De Gaulle, or somebody in Germany or England, or even because of the cost involved. Whatever we do with relation to our troops overseas should be done primarily in terms of, "What will this do for our security?" or, "What will this do with respect to our responsibilities as a world leader against the forces of totalitarianism and communism?"

I do not think we can put the dollar sign ahead of survival and ahead of security.

I was very much interested in some of the short-term proposals of the Senator from New York. For example, there was the minor item of increasing tourism to the United States. That is not so minor, if we really work on it. We can do something about it. We ought to have the airlines, shipping lines, and others figure out packages for tours which people can afford to buy.

Everyone cannot afford a Cadillac, so the automobile makers brought out a compact car.

Everybody cannot afford a $50,000 or $60,000 home, so the homebuilders designed homes that people could afford.

It seems to me, if we desire tourism in the United States, we must find ways of inviting substantial numbers of people to come to this country at prices they can afford to pay. This can be done, if we work at it. But if we pretend it cannot be done, or if we feel that tourism is only for the rich and well born, then tourism will be at best a token enterprise in the American economic scene.

I also believe that we can do a great deal about the export business. I have been a longtime advocate of export insurance. That is available now to a limited degree under the Export-Import Bank, but we were slow in getting at it.

We have never really competed for markets. We have permitted the Belgians, the Dutch, the British, the French, the Italians, the Germans, the Japanese—practically every other country—to get in ahead of us in the competition. Why was that? It was because the big market was at home. It was not necessary to look for markets. It was not necessary to train young people in the field of international economics.

I have given some advice to my older son, in an endeavor to encourage him to study the field of international economics. I said, "If you are going to make any kind of headway from now on in the field of business enterprise, you will have to know something about international trade. We must either know international trade, or we will become a second-rate industrial economic power. There are tremendous frontiers in international opportunities."

I agree that we must find ways and means of increasing exports. This means also financing them.

I do not believe that any country today is rich enough to be the world's banker. No matter how rich we are, we are not that rich. We have assumed that for a period of time the English were the world's bankers. Then we said that the United States took up the burden of being the world's banker. But today no one nation should be in this position.

The requirements for capital throughout the world are so great that no one country, no one central bank, and no one banking structure can possibly finance the tremendous capital requirements of the world. We are finding this out.

For example, in India it is necessary to have a consortium. We have found the same to be true in other areas of the world.

That is why I believe a new method of international financing is absolutely essential.

The World Bank is available. The International Development Bank for Latin America has been provided. We have established new structures, but they are puny structures. They are inadequate. They do not have the capital resources required.

We are still trying to continue as national sovereign states with national economic structures, occasionally coming to grips with reality by saying, "Yes, we think we should participate a little in an international financing program."

If the system which we call free enterprise is to survive it must have capital and credit, and such credit and capital must be made available to new customers. The markets are not to be found only in Western Europe. The markets will be found in the years to come in Asia and Africa.

There is needed, therefore, a kind of international financial structure which will look ahead for 50 years, and take some risks. If one is to take a big risk in an uncertain world for the next 25 or 50 years, many participants should be involved. This is a simple principle of insurance. The base is spread to make the program actuarially sound. In this instance of international finance we must spread the base.

I would make one other point, and then I shall ask the Senator from New York for his observations.

I do not believe that governments in the modern day and age can long survive and meet the needs of growing economies and the social responsibilities of representative governments if their policies are dictated by central banks. Banks should be the instruments of the government. The government should not be the instrument of the banks.

I can use an analogy. We almost saw it happen in the United States. I use the analogy of letting the generals determine our foreign policy, or letting the generals determine what treaty we ought to sign. Generals are experts, and experts should be on tap, and not on top. Policy decisions must be made by those who are in charge of public policy. Those are civilians, to use a broad term. One does not let economists operate a bank. The bankers operate the banks and employ economists. One does not let bankers operate a government. The bankers become secretaries of the treasury or ministers of finance, but there are always chancellors and prime ministers, or a president and a congress or parliament. That is where the policy is ultimately set.

We have placed far too much reliance upon what we call the traditional financial structure, in an untraditional world. We have relied on the orthodoxy of finance in an unorthodox world.

I have been looking into this subject, in preparation for the Senator's speech. The Senator was kind enough to inform me last week that he intended to make the speech. I have interested myself in a report of the Brookings Institution, the Salant report. The report was prepared under the able direction of Walter S. Salant, with a team of nationally known economists. I read the accountings in the report. I have been gathering information on this subject for several weeks.

There is one particular item which really struck me in the report. Mr. Salant and his economists pointed out in simple terms that the physical structure of the world economy has continued to grow but the lifeblood to feed the economy has remained about the same.

If a person had only the amount of blood in his system that he had at the age of 5, when he had a weight, let us say, of 35 pounds, when he attained the age of 25 and had a weight of 175 pounds, he would be in serious physical difficulty.

The world is suffering from a kind of economic sickness because the physical structure of the world in terms of commerce has grown tremendously, but the blood flow of capital has been restricted to that which existed in a much smaller world.

If we use the gold standard, for example, it has been estimated that monetary gold and foreign exchange reserves of central banks were $61.2 billion at the end of 1961. By 1968 world trade will increase, on a conservative estimate, by 35 percent, says the Salant committee of the Brookings Institution. If the imbalances between nations remain in the same relation to world trade, the reserves must increase 35 percent, or $21.4 billion of new gold reserves. Add that to the $61.2 billion and there will have to be $82,600 million by 1968. What, in actuality, are we going to have? Gold supplies are not likely to increase by over $4 to $7 billion, and the United States is expected to supply only $3 billion more to foreigners over this period. So the world will be short of the needed reserves by about $13,700 million, just to stay even in relation to our present situation.

One does not have to be very intelligent to figure that out. When a body is demanding oxygen to keep it going, and the oxygen is choked off, what happens to the body? It starts to wither. What happens to the person? He falters and becomes weak. If there is an economy that is going to grow, in the next 7 years, by 35 percent, and there is a gold reserve that is barely one-fifth of the increase that will be required to meet that growth in world commerce, what happens? There will be deficits. The problem is that simple. A large operation cannot be financed by a country bank.

A huge corporation cannot be financed out of postal savings.

In the world today we are attempting to finance a huge, worldwide development without the necessary reserves. There is in existence a system which requires the money system to be based on gold, and there is a shortage of gold. So credits are issued, and we get into inflation and deficits—and we are facing that trouble now. That is why I think the Senator from New York puts his finger on the problem when he states that we must find new ways and means of international financing.

Now I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. With the present structure, even with the remedial steps which could be taken, such as the tax on securities, which I do not believe will be too effective, or the raising of interest rates, which will tend to slow down domestic expansion, can we get fundamental solutions?

Mr. JAVITS. Flatly, no; and to that list may be added such measures as tourism and export promotion as well. Those measures are all desirable and necessary as things stand today, but the only measure which would adequately deal with our current international financial problems would be to put into effect a new base for international credit, a new base for monetary support, which would give the world an adequate mechanism so that the nations would not have to prosper at the expense of other nations. They must produce efficiently and effectively in order to live, prosper, and grow, but at the same time should not be caused undue difficulties while they are trying to supply and help others arrive at that stage, as we are doing.

One of the qualities we all enjoy in our colleague from Minnesota is that he has a sure instinct for putting his finger on the main point, even though he may not be an economist and even if he cannot phrase the problem in the technical words of an expert in the subject. He is well able to do that in the fields in which he is a specialist, like disarmament and nuclear control. While he is obviously unable to do it in this field, he has unerringly picked out the central theme, as I tried to do. We must, as we did with the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in the United States, find a way in the international sphere in which we are no longer impaled on a cross of gold. In the pre-1914 days, when we had a situation of imbalance, as we do today, the banks had to limit their credit, people were put out of work, factories were shut down, the country would grind slowly through a depression, and would come back economically only when shortages developed and there was a demand for people to go back to work. The pre-1914 system required that they pay for the necessary adjustments.

Today we do not want to do that. We have a choice of whether we want to go the way of the Communist system, under which the government dictates what one can or cannot do, and what sanctions are to be imposed if a person does not work harder, and he is sent to jail, or worse; or whether we shall alter our system of credit which is imbedded in the credit and banking scheme. The international monetary system we have today is completely inadequate to do the job. It must be changed.

The call which I am issuing on the floor today, which has been joined in by other Senators, is that the poultices, the bandaids, as the Senator from Minnesota calls them, are insignificant. When one meets with an accident, he must be bandaged and put in temporary splints, but if a person is to be cured, he must receive better treatment. We are not doing it. It must be done.

There is nothing holy about gold. We must find a way to expand international credit. Otherwise, we shall find ourselves in trouble. We are in trouble only because the custodians, the bookkeepers, and the thinkers have fallen short of the whole point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a valid observation and a valiant effort in this regard.

When I came to the Congress, I made up my mind that I was going to learn something about taxation. One can be a great liberal for housing, minimum wage, unemployment compensation; he can have a heart bulging with good will; but ultimately it is the tax policy of the country which determines the economic development of the country, and determines justice and injustice. So I spent a great deal of time in my first year or two in the Congress studying tax policy.

I made some very revealing discoveries. I learned that one does not become rich by working. One becomes rich by thinking, and sometimes thinking rather devious and clever thoughts. They are called tax adjustments. Some people call them tax loopholes.

I learned something else—that if jobs are desired, there must be investment. Some of my liberal brethren and I came to a parting of the ways, in a sense, on this issue, in my home State, as well as here. For example, there is a vast resource in Minnesota known as taconite, a substance from which high-grade iron ore can be obtained. In order to produce that iron ore, hundreds of millions of dollars must be invested. As the Senator from New York has said, a tax policy which encourages such investment—a tax incentive—means jobs, long-term jobs, self-respecting jobs, productive jobs. I have, therefore, supported the investment tax credit. I disagreed with some of my colleagues in the Senate, with whom I agreed on almost every other issue. But I know that investment tax credits have the effect of encouraging investment, and investment means jobs.

Our capital structure for international financing is, at best, outmoded and antiquated.

Back in the 18th century, if a person wanted to buy something, he had to have cash. Everything was on the basis of a cash transaction. There was no credit, and there were no checking accounts. Everything was on the basis of cash.

Pretty soon people found out, in the 19th century, that if we were to have an industrialized society, with export and import business, it was necessary to have credit, and it was necessary to have checking accounts, and communication between banking structures. Therefore the system was changed. That system was not changed because some philosopher said it was the right thing to do. On the contrary, the necessity for survival brought about that change. Necessity is a very good teacher. We should stop quoting philosophers. I am not interested in hearing someone lecture about the values of the gold standard, or that, because grandfather did it, grandson must do it, also; or that if we leave the gold standard we leave a sound principle and sound economics. That is something that is done to fool those who are ready to be fooled. What we really need is a mechanism that works. The Brookings Institution is not known for its radical proposals. It has come forward with a report on the U.S. balance of payments. The report was prepared by a team of nationally known economists under the direction of Walter S. Salant. Copies of the report have been made generally available. This is a complicated report. That is why, I suppose, it will not be read as widely as it should be.

This afternoon I heard used the word "austerity." That word was applied when it was sought to break the backs of the people. That was when farms were foreclosed and business institutions wrecked, and when credit was cut off, and when the number of the unemployed increased.

The banks and the Government got the gold standard back in order. The gold was piled up, and the people were plowed under.

That cannot happen any more. If it happened, there would be a revolution. Franklin D. Roosevelt came to grips with that problem. Some bankers screamed when he decided to embargo gold, and not let it be shipped out of the country. He met the problem on the political ground. We are facing today a new problem. The old answers will not work. The old answers meant taking it out of the backs of the people. We must have a better solution today.

That is a serious problem we face. In the years ahead we shall be compelled to take a greater interest and a greater responsibility in international financing. We shall have to develop new markets, not merely work over the old ones. We must develop new industries and new commodities and channels of trade, new wants and new desires. This will require long-term financing and long-term credit. It will require the industrialized nations to build up reserves, and it will mean some pooling of those reserves, for the benefit not only of themselves, but also for the benefit of the rest of the world. They cannot live by themselves.

The only way to meet the threat of international communism on the political front is to have some international institutions of free peoples on the economic front. The international Communist movement can put shackles on the national states that it controls. It can treat the people with brutality to get from them what it wants. We cannot do that, and should not do it. However, we can work out our problems through the processes of mind, and evolve mechanisms which meet international requirements.

Certain international requirements must be met. They will be met, or everything that we have been trying to do—militarily, diplomatically, economically—will all go down the drain.

I have now had an opportunity to review the Salant report, and its general conclusions and policy recommendations. My judgment is that the Salant report provides a coherent and comprehensive analysis of the chronic problems brought on by an unsatisfactory system of international payments—not only by an unsatisfactory system, but by an obsolete system.

We are now considering measures to close our balance-of-payments deficit. We must accomplish this in order to stem the gold outflow and minimize the chances of a speculative attack on the dollar. If such an attack occurs, its repercussions would be felt throughout the Western World. Without a stable dollar, there would be an insufficient supply of liquid reserves for the expeditious transaction of international commerce. All international trading nations would be affected.

Incidentally, there is a war of nerves going on in connection with this subject. There are rumors to the extent that in certain European areas people will demand gold, and that the demand on our gold reserves will be so large that our gold reserves will be wrecked. They would not do that, Mr. President, because they are tied into this operation so closely that they cannot do it. They would be wrecked themselves if they did it.

Furthermore, it is ridiculous to talk about the American economy as being in an unfavorable condition because of the statements of a few European central bankers and other bankers, when we are running at approximately a $600 billion gross national product, and when we have the most sought-after dollar in the world. If it is so unstable, so bad, and so weak, why does everyone grab for it? If anyone were to put a platter of dollars out, he would soon see who is after them.

I know that our economy works. It is productive. We produce goods and services and have substantial employment. Therefore, I know that the currency is good money and good collateral.

So we ought to let the central bankers of the world know that if they ever want to call the cards, so to speak, we have the chips with which to pay off. We too have a great many cards to call. We protect large portions of the free world.

When we face the real competition and real problems of the international scene, the differences we have over rates of exchange will fade into insignificance, unless we let the people who are dedicated to minutiae and trivia decide what should be the grand policy of our great Nation or of other great nations.

In order to close the payments deficit and keep the dollar at a stable price relative to gold, we have pursued economic policies which are in some sense at cross-purposes with our continuing need for domestic economic growth. Domestic economic growth is a highly important consideration. The overall balance-of-payments deficit as measured by the Department of Commerce would possibly be closed by manipulating short-term interest rates to attract foreign currencies. Raise the interest rates, and enough foreign money will come in; but by pursuing an exclusive course of deflationary monetary policy, we severely limit American opportunities for vigorous investment, industrial expansion, and economic growth.

Interest rates on short-term money are too high. I never thought that I would see the day when the Government would be paying more than 3½ percent on 91-day notes. That is like printing money. We let private banks print money, and then they charge the Government of the United States 3½ percent interest. I remember the days of Franklin Roosevelt, when it was said that he was a spender and did not understand anything about economics; that if the Government paid more than 1 percent interest on 91-day notes, the Government was really in serious trouble.

In the previous administration and in this administration, the cost of short-term money has been scandalously high. So increased interest rates are not the remedy that is needed. That is like taking aspirin to cure cancer. It may have a momentary effect to relieve the anguish and pain, but it does not get at the root of the problem or disease.

By increasing interest rates to please the concerns of foreign bankers about the stability of the dollar, we sacrifice the economic interest of millions of Americans. In order to maintain our position as banker of the Western World, we have adopted measures which severely injure our chances for maximum growth and national prosperity. We cannot be banker for the whole world; we are not that rich. What we ought to be doing is to involve other countries in international financing and quit pretending that we have inherited the mantle of the world's banker from the British. The British are smart enough to know that they cannot be the world's banker. We ought to quit kidding ourselves. What are needed are international financial institutions, in which there are large consortiums, pooling arrangements, and other facilities which can properly finance economic development.

There is no economic reason why we must rely exclusively on monetary policy, even for the solution of the pressing problems of our current deficit. This problem could be solved with a less adverse effect on our domestic economy by applying expansionary fiscal policies. The administration's current tax bill is an important first step in this direction.

I believe that tax reduction is vital, if one really believes that tax policy basically affects investment policy—and I believe it does. Therefore, one of the most urgent matters before Congress today is the tax proposal. The kind of proposal that will ultimately be adopted, I cannot predict. But if it is to do some good, it must provide a substantial tax reduction now. It must not be a long-term promise that can be reversed a year or two later by a succeeding Congress. It must be a tax reduction now. A tax reduction at this time, combined with a natural and gradual rise in interest rates, would serve to discourage capital outflows without dealing an unnecessarily harsh blow to national prosperity.

However, as the Salant report demonstrates so well, no shortrun solution of the deficit problem will insure us against future crises in the balance of payments. Such crises are built into the present payments structure and will likely require deficit countries to apply deflationary policies to meet the crises without putting equal pressure on surplus countries to follow expansionary policies. Our total reliance on the gold standard might well lead us to invoke contradictory economic policies. As long as we rely solely on the gold standard, there might be an immovable barrier blocking the path to full employment and maximum utilization of our resources.

Important as the deficit in the balance of payments is, I suggest that the deficit in our plant use is more difficult, more pressing. Thirteen percent of the plant capacity of this country is unused. Five million Americans, ready to go to work, are unemployed. If we had as much real concern in every place in public and private life over this situation as we do over the balance-of-payments problem, we might solve both. They are intertwined; they go together. We cannot solve one problem without solving the other. But we must place proper emphasis upon both.

Our present system of fixed exchange rates combined with an inadequate international monetary mechanism forces all countries to be much too sensitive to balance-of-payments pressures. Without exchange rate adjustments, correction of balance-of-payments deficits is likely to require a great deal of time, but the international liquidity needed to make a slow adjustment is not available.

This problem is dealt with extensively in the Salant report. Recommendations are made. Thus, even surplus countries become concerned when their balance of payments starts to deteriorate, and they immediately take restrictive measures which may momentarily help them out of their "fix," but proceed to make the situation more difficult for someone else. Everything today is interdependent and interrelated.

The only effective way in which deficit countries can improve their balance of payments is through a deterioration of the position of surplus countries, under the present system. Thus, if all countries formulate domestic policies to meet balance-of-payments needs, a downward bias will be forced upon the world economy and the purposes for which these policies were cast will not be achieved.

One of the few beneficiaries of this shameful state of affairs is the Soviet Union. Over the past 5 years the nations of the West have bought annually an average of more than $240 million in gold from the U.S.S.R. Fixed exchange rates and the gold standard underwrite this substantial subsidy to the Russian gold mining industry every year.

In the light of these facts, a detailed study demonstrating the need for a freer and more rational system of financing international payments has been long overdue. That is what this is all about. I therefore commend the Brookings Institution and the authors of the Salant report for making this significant contribution to our understanding of this vital public issue. Their conclusions strongly suggest that it is time to put an end to the antiquated payments system under which international commerce today creaks and groans. As the authors indicate, it is time to explore the establishment of new international machinery to deal with an increasing volume of world trade. More trade can benefit us all. But we cannot have more trade, Mr. President, unless we have more money to finance it; and under the present system we cannot have more money to finance it if we continue the gold reserve basis we now have. It is crystal clear that this requirement starves the world for the capital that is needed in order to save the world from being taken over by the forces of totalitarianism. Our thinking is constantly upon the military. Consider Vietnam. It is another example of the failure, or at least the ambiguity, of policy. We felt that by sheer military policy we could do something there. Although this example does not relate to international economics, Mr. President, it proves that concentrated emphasis upon sheer, brute power is not at all the answer to these problems.

More trade can be of benefit, but more trade requires financing. I know that the Joint Economic Committee—and my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], is one of the most active members of that committee—will, with its usual care and objectivity, examine this delicate problem of international finance. But I also hope other Members of Congress will raise these basic questions for examination and consideration.

Surely the Members of Congress should debate these problems. Many, like myself, will make statements which possibly will not make too much sense; but Congress is the place to discuss these matters. Congress certainly has a responsibility ir this connection. These problems should not be dealt with only by the Federal Reserve System or the central banks of Europe. We are talking about the survival of an entire social order. We are talking about whether the United States of America and other free Nations are going to be able to survive economically and politically. We are asking ourselves whether the present system of economics and of international finance is adequate to meet the needs of the hundreds of millions of people who are knocking at the door and are asking for goods and services.

If we cannot answer those needs, finance them, and help work out an economic structure that will make possible their fulfillment, then someone else will do it, because—as the late William Jennings Bryan said—humanity is not going to perish on a cross of gold. I never thought we would have to be arguing about this question again. I thought it was put to rest about 60 years ago, and, for certain, about 30 years ago. But we are right back with it, because the problems we are solving at home are not being solved internationally.

Mr. President, if the U.S. domestic economy had to survive on the gold standard, many of our families today would be living in tepees, instead of in houses, and many of our farmers would not be independent operators, but would be tenants. In the thirties, we had to solve our financial structure problems, and we did; but we never got around to doing that internationally. Probably one of the reasons for the great depression of the thirties was the failure of the London Economic Conference and the failure to come to grips with the great economic problems of international fiscal liquidity, international financing, and the flow of international commerce and trade.

Mr. President, as in the case of so many of the problems which confront us these days, the answers are never self-evident or easy; but the problems exist, and the answers must be found.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles on the Brookings Institution and the Salant report. One was published in the New York Times; the other was published in the Washington Post.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very perceptive editorial dealing with this subject. It was published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1963]

PAYMENTS DEFICIT IS FOUND TO LIMIT U.S. EMPLOYMENT—BROOKINGS STUDY URGES NEW INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY TO HANDLE THE PROBLEM

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The balance-of-payments deficit has prevented the United States from attaining full employment and has impaired its foreign aid program, according to a Brookings Institution study.

The study was undertaken at the request of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It concluded that establishment of new international financial machinery was the only means of assuring that these higher priority programs were not subordinated to balance-of-payments considerations.

It pointed out that international payments deficits, under existing world machinery for financing them, might force other nations to adopt undesirable policies that would restrict their own economic growth and hurt the United States as well.

The study was released today. The principal author was Walter S. Salant, an economist on the Brookings staff.

FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS

Balance-of-payments deficits occur when a nation's expenditures in all of its business, financial, and aid transactions with foreigners exceed its income from foreign sources.

The Brookings group, which had been asked to do a study of the U.S. balance-of-payments outlook for 1968, said the country would be running a surplus by that time. The authors declined to specify the year in which a surplus would be reached.

Traditionally, nations that run payments deficits over a long period of time are forced to restrain their own international economic expansion to lower their price structure and thus give their export products a competitive advantage in foreign markets.

This form of discipline, the study said, "induces restraint without regard as to whether internal conditions call for restraint or expansion."

Its benefits can be far less than the social costs it imposes when expansion is needed.

In the United States recently, the report said, balance-of-payments considerations have played an important role in failure to achieve the objective of maximum production and employment.

FEARS ARE CITED

It continued:

"The expansionary fiscal policy needed to restore high employment has been delayed and made more difficult to achieve by fears that expansion would make the balance of payments worse.

"The lowering of interest rates to levels which promote high domestic investment and growth has been inhibited by apprehension about capital outflow."

The study found that the United States has not, on the whole, compromised its basic foreign policy and defense objectives because of balance-of-payments considerations.

But it said that these considerations have led to some undesirable policies, such as tying economic aid to procurement in the United States and requiring military expenditures to be made in the United States rather than abroad.

"Moreover," the report said, "there is increasing pressure to compromise the objectives of foreign aid for balance-of-payments reasons."

The report proposed that the United States immediately begin to press for creation of new international financial mechanism that would see countries through relatively short-term balance-of-payments difficulties without requiring them to impose drastic restrictions on their domestic economies.

Establishment of the new international machinery would also be aimed at providing the world with additional cash resources with which to finance what the study estimated would be a 35-percent increase in world trade in the next 5 years.

PAYMENTS

The study group did not attempt to choose among the dozen or more specific proposals that have been made in recent years for changes in international financial institutions.

It conceded that obtaining agreement for the creation of new institutions or new financial resources and mechanisms within existing institutions—principally the International Monetary Fund—would be difficult.

If it proves impossible to establish new international financial machinery, the report said that an alternative—clearly second best, according to Mr. Salant—would be a modified system of flexible foreign exchange rates, which would permit the values of different currencies to fluctuate in relation to one another.

AID REJECTS PROPOSAL

This latter proposal was immediately denounced by Under Secretary of the Treasury Robert V. Roosa. The idea of flexible exchange rates, he said, has been the perpetual plaything of people who think about money but do not have any responsibility for a national monetary policy.

Mr. Roosa characterized the Brookings study as useful, however, and said that he agreed that there was a need to study the possibility of creating new international financial machinery.

He indicated that he felt less urgency than the Brookings group did about the establishment of new international financial mechanisms.

"We do not believe there is a need for a change in the system at this moment," he said.

A high Government official revealed, meanwhile, that the Government of Japan had apparently accepted another step the United States took recently to combat its payments deficit. That was the proposed imposition of a tax, ranging up to 15 percent, on purchases of foreign securities by Americans.

UNITED STATES EXPLAINS VIEW

The Japanese have been informed, it was indicated, that the United States does not feel it can grant any further exemptions from the tax, other than that already given to Canada on newly issued securities.

But U.S. officials, in lengthy conversations with Japanese officials, have made it clear that the objective of the tax is not to keep Japanese securities out of this country altogether but only to reduce to some more reasonable level the total volume of all foreign securities floated in this country.

The official revealed that the administration would submit to Congress its draft legislation on the foreign securities tax on or around August 5. The draft bill will make clear certain technical points that have worried the securities industry in this country, such as the liability for the tax of bond and stock dealers who maintain a certain relatively fixed inventory of foreign securities but constantly move securities in and out of that inventory.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1963]

STUDY BACKS REFORM OF MONETARY SYSTEM

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The world's monetary system is a straitjacket, inhibiting full employment and faster economic growth. It must be replaced soon by a new mechanism that expands the means of payment for transactions between countries.

This is the principal finding of a major study issued today by the Brookings Institution. The 290-page report was commissioned by President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers and is virtually certain to be a focus of future debate about the balance of payments.

The study was directed by Walter S. Salant, a Brookings staff economist. He was assisted by five other economists. Brookings is a noted nonprofit research organization with a reputation for generally conservative work.

The study's conclusion is distinguished less by its originality—many economists are in agreement—than by the weight of its underlying analysis.

EFFECT ON OTHERS

The Brookings report finds that there are forces at work that will probably wipe out the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments by 1968. However, the study emphasizes that this is no solution.

When the United States reaches a balance, other nations will be cramped by a lack of liquidity or means of paying for their imports and investments abroad. This is because the means of settling accounts between countries consist largely of gold and dollars.

If the U.S. accounts are in balance—if this country receives from foreigners as much as it spends abroad for goods, services, aid and investment—other nations won't be receiving additional dollars. Since the study estimates that supplies of gold can expand at only a limited pace, the world will then be short of the reserves it needs to finance increased trade.

U.S. DILEMMA

The Salant report notes that the United States and other nations have rejected the classical solution to this bind, rigorous deflation and unemployment. But under the existing monetary system, nations with balance-of-payments deficits do tend to hold back on domestic policies that would stimulate jobs and output.

In the words of the study:

"The United States faces a dilemma. On the one hand, U.S. balance-of-payments deficits make the rest of the world increasingly reluctant to go on accumulating liquid dollar claims, and they hamper pursuit by the United States of vital domestic and international objectives. On the other hand, large and sustained surpluses may not be attainable; even if attained, they would not be desirable since they might not free the United States from undesirable constraints and they would impose constraints on other free world countries."

INADEQUACY OF MECHANISM

"Thus, no position of the balance of payments—whether surplus, deficit, or balance—would simultaneously free the United States from undesirable constraints and provide for needed expansion of international monetary reserves. It is clear, therefore, that the present problem is not primarily a balance-of-payments problem. More fundamentally, the problem is the basic inadequacy of the international monetary mechanism in relation to requirements of the free world."

The study does not draw a blueprint of a new currency system. A variety of schemes have been suggested, most of them flowing from the ideas of the late John Maynard Keynes and Prof. Robert Triffin, of Yale. In oversimple forms, both economists proposed a world central bank that would create new means of payment as needed much as the Federal Reserve creates domestic money in the form of credit.

FOUR CHARACTERISTICS

The Brookings report, however, does describe four characteristics that a new world money mechanism should contain. It should:

1. Provide enough means of payments to finance deficits of advanced nations that are adapting to new technologies and new tastes.

2. Provide large amounts of this additional liquidity automatically.

3. Prevent rich countries from piling up international means of payments by requiring all industrial nations to hold some of their currency reserves in an international institution. This institution should give its borrowers and depositors debits and credits in a new international unit of currency.

4. Insure that leading nations consult frequently and coordinate interest, credit, tax, and other policies that have a big impact on international payments.

SHORT-RUN MEASURES

The Salant report comes at a time when the Kennedy administration is moving toward support of a new world monetary system. The measures taken in recent days to tax foreign securities and tighten money should not be confused with such a move. These steps are designed to deal with the short-run problems of reducing the U.S. payments deficit.

The President, however, is understood to be increasingly aware that the whole system of payments is hindering his other programs to enlarge jobs at home and keep troops abroad.

The Treasury Department has been regarded as the chief force resisting change in the Government. However, over the weekend, Robert Roosa, the Treasury Under Secretary, expressed the new spirit in the upper reaches of the Government.

TREASURY AGREES

He said that the Treasury agrees that there is a need to work for new, long-run monetary arrangements. "The development of a system centered solely on the dollar," he said, "is becoming lopsided. Very careful study is necessary to insure that in the future we will be able to multilateralize the burdens, opportunities, and responsibilities."

While the Brookings study urged the United States to press immediately for an agreement, Roosa would not go so far. Lengthy, careful, and confidential discussions will be needed before any international consensus is reached, Roosa said.

Roosa also demurred from endorsing the study's prediction that there would be a shortage of liquidity by 1968. However, he said, this is "enough of a possibility so that it calls for urgency. We should work at this now so if this is the case by 1968, we will have reached a consensus by 1968."

STUDY'S ARITHMETIC

To reach its conclusion of a liquidity shortage, the Salant study used this arithmetic: Monetary gold and foreign exchange reserves of central banks were $61.2 billion at the end of 1961. By 1968, world trade will increase on a conservative estimate by 35 percent. If the imbalances between nations remain in the same relation to world trade, then reserves must increase by 35 percent, or $21.4 billion.

However, gold supplies are not likely to increase by more than $4.7 billion and the United States is expected to supply only $3 billion more dollars to foreigners over this period. So the world will be short of reserves by $13.7 billion.

Much of the study, entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," is an attempt to forecast this country's accounts 5 years hence. The Salant team began with assumptions supplied by Mr. Kennedy's Council, including an assumption that the economy would grow 4.8 percent a year or much faster than its recent pace.

SURPLUS PREDICTED

The Brookings team concluded that the deficit would become a surplus for two principal reasons: Europe's prices are rising much more rapidly than those in the United States so this country will earn even more from its oversea trade. Second, growth here will outpace Europe's, making investment more attractive and luring investors' dollars back from abroad.

The Brookings study figured that military spending overseas would drop, but that this would be more than offset by increased economic aid.

If the world does not adopt a new expanding payments system, the report proposed what it called a second-best proposal. This scheme, unlikely to draw much attention outside of academic circles, would create two currency blocs.

FLEXIBLE EXCHANGE RATES

One would center on the United States and the United Kingdom and the other on the Common Market. Rates at which currencies exchanged in each bloc would be fixed, as they are now. But the rates of exchange between the blocs would be completely flexible, moving up and down in accordance with the supply and demand for currencies. Such an arrangement would automatically correct deficits between the blocs but create a host of divisive political and other problems.

Other economists who joined in the study were Emile Despres and Lorie Tarshis of

Stanford; Lawrence B. Krause and Alice M. Rivlin of Brookings; and William A. Salant, a brother of Walter.

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1963]

The Road to Yale

When Robert Triffin, a Yale University economist, first broached his plan for a more effective international monetary mechanism, he found himself cast in the role of a latter-day Jeremiah sounding warnings toward which the central bankers and statesmen of the free world turned deaf ears. But 5 years of anxiety over the dollar glut have changed all that, and an important measure of Triffin's vindication is a Brookings Institution report on "The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," written by Walter S. Salant and his associates.

As the title suggests, the efforts of the Salant team were largely directed toward forecasting the components of the U.S. balance of payments for 1968, an effort which they frankly characterize as more speculative than most economic projections. They conclude that the basic balance in 1968, the net balance of transactions on account of trade and long-term capital movements—will show a surplus. This projection is based upon a number of explicit assumptions about economic growth here and abroad, the trends of export prices and the height of tariff barriers, assumptions that will doubtless cause some arching of eyebrows within the economics profession. But for the general public the significance of the book lies in the excellent last chapter where the authors make a most persuasive case for the creation of a new international monetary mechanism.

There has been a good deal of uninspired writing about placing our house in order, but the Brookings authors demonstrate that the difficulties which beset the free world will not be resolved by a U.S. payments surplus. The dilemma, as they see it, is this:

On the one hand, U.S. balance-of-payments deficits make the rest of the world increasingly reluctant to go on accumulating liquid dollar claims, and they hamper the pursuit by the United States of vital domestic and international objectives. On the other hand, large and sustained surpluses may not be attainable; even if attained, they would not be desirable since they may not free the United States from undesirable constraints and they would impose constraints on other free world countries.

The Brookings authors wisely refrain from any attempt to make a detailed blueprint. But the nature of the fixed exchange monetary mechanism which they urge the United States to press for immediately is clearly outlined. It must provide for the growth of international liquidity—the means of settling balances of indebtedness among countries. It must prevent sudden and unsettling shifts of reserves from weak to strong-currency countries. And it must provide automatic credit facilities which would permit countries sufficient time to eliminate their balance-of-payments deficits without recourse to self-defeating, deflationary policies.

With the imprimatur of the respected Brookings Institution, it can be expected that the cause of international monetary reform will acquire more new converts in high places. Treasury Secretary Dillon is beginning to see a glimmer of light. And it is clear from his weekend remarks that Under Secretary Roosa will in the future desist from the unsportsmanlike practice of shooting birds on the ground as he did with the Maudling plan at the last meeting of the International Monetary Fund. All the signposts point toward Yale, and the question now is the speed at which the repentent sinners can be moved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the Brookings report recommendations, as published in the Washington Post, as follows:

The Brookings report, however, does describe four characteristics that a new world money mechanism should contain. It should:

1. Provide enough means of payments to finance deficits of advanced nations that are adapting to new technologies and new tastes.
2. Provide large amounts of this additional liquidity automatically.
3. Prevent rich countries from piling up international means of payments, by requiring all industrial nations to hold some of their currency reserves in an international institution. This institution should give its borrowers and depositors debits and credits in a new international unit of currency.
4. Insure that leading nations consult frequently and coordinate interests, credit, tax and other policies that have a big impact on international payments.

Then the report makes some short-term recommendations.

Mr. President, I do not know whether those four characteristics are sound. I am not in a position to decide about that; but I do know they lay out some guidelines. Instead of arguing for days about the size of the debt limit or whether the Area Redevelopment Administration should have $350 million or $250 million, or what we should be doing in some minor area of our economic system, or whether we should add another $50 million or $100 million for the Farmers' Home Administration, or whether we should cut foreign aid by $500 million or $200 million, or not cut it at all, I believe the most important subject before Congress is international fiscal liquidity and international financing, because our entire foreign aid policy and our national security policy and those of the free world rest upon what is done in the field of foreign trade—what happens in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the development of new customers, new markets, new industries, new demands, and new needs; how those markets can be financed, and under what terms; the interest rate and the length of term for the use of capital? How are we going to finance a $200 billion commerce in foreign trade with a gold reserve, in the nation's central banks, of $61 billion, much of which has to be committed to domestic needs? It seems to me that any Member of Congress who has deep concern for the welfare of his country will attempt to make some analysis of this problem.

I do not claim that my analysis has made any great contribution, but at least it will most likely irritate someone, and then I can be accused of several things—all of which can start a bit of turmoil, which, in turn, with enough discussion and turmoil, may result in a little more heat and eventually more light. So if I have contributed something to raising the temperature of the debate, I shall be pleased; and if it develops that the result is to throw more light on the subject, I shall be even more pleased.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, to enable him to provide us with light.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Minnesota has cast much light on this problem. He has discussed a report which richly deserves exposition, discussion, and application. The Brookings report on the international balance of payments is a fine one. It should be given the full treatment, and the Senator from Minnesota has done just this.

I should like to underline two points the Senator made: One of them, which he emphasized so very well, is that this report while primarily concerned with the international balance of payments, for once stressed the overwhelming importance of solving the problem while having full regard for our own economic salvation, our economic stability, and our economic expansion and growth, along with our international responsibilities. The Senator pointed out that if we merely consider the international situation, the damage which can be done to our own economy can be very serious, and not worth the cost. Have I correctly stated the Senator's point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's precise analysis of that portion of the report is so clear that I hope every Senator will read it. The interdependence between the two is one of the central points in the Salant report.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The other point that the Senator has stressed so well is our international interdependence. The point that he brought out in the Brookings report which I think few people have yet grasped—but I think they will in the future, as the Senator has emphasized it—is that as our adverse balance of payments becomes favorable, what will happen? Our friends, our allies and our supporters—Western Europe, Japan, and, other free countries that are allied with us, their favorable balance becomes adverse. As our balance of payments improves—if it does improve—it may improve, as the Senator has pointed out, at the expense of our allies. As the Senator pointed out, we may have to adopt policies which will contract and retard their economy, and which will require them to raise their interest rates and taxes and cut their own progressive programs of growth. We must recognize that as we gain in this sense, we may gain at the expense of our friends.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As we lose, it may be that our friends in other countries are gaining something. The problem for us is not only to determine how we might convert our adverse balance of payments promptly into a favorable balance, but how to work cooperatively together, as the Senator has so well said, in a consortium so that not one country alone, whether that country be Great Britain or the United States of America will call the tune and the signals. But a group of free countries that wish to expand their economies all over the world, can work to do so together. They would act in a constructive way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. What we generally do, when we plan a project for international development, is as follows: For example, consider a project in Ghana or India. And, parenthetically, if we are looking for a good risk, Minnesota is a better risk than Ghana. We get together in a great consortium for a necessary big project in a foreign country. When we get together, we get together at the time that we have to dish out the money. What we ought to be doing, it seems to me, is talking about basic policies that relate to the flow of capital before the money has to be dished out.

Exchange rates, interest rates, convertibility and similar questions ought to be the subject of an international consortium before we have to dip into the Treasuries of the respective countries. In our own instance, a very large dip is taken out to meet the capital requirements of other countries. After we have met the capital requirements of other countries, we are immediately faced with the fact that the outflow of capital from our country is so large that a difficult problem at home is posed. The very people who are delighted to see us help finance some of the long-term capital improvements overseas are the very ones who only a few months later will come back and say, "We have doubts as to the stability of the dollar because there seems to be an outflow of gold from your country."

We could stop that course by stopping the outflow. But in so doing we might very well jeopardize our entire foreign policy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is one other specific point I should like to raise. The Senator has pointed to our dilemma in monetary policy because of the balance-of-payments problem. The capital flowing out of our country for investment overseas is one of the reasons given for raising interest rates though it is not very well documented.

The argument runs that interest rates abroad are higher than our interest rates. It is said that we should increase our interest rates to terminate the flow of capital out of our country and persuade foreigners to invest here. There are several holes in that argument. As we increase our interest rates, other countries increase theirs. Every study by such economists as Bell, Gemmill, and others has shown that interest differentials have a minor effect on the flow of capital. Trade is far more important.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is one factor in a dozen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In fact, even a study made by those who propose to raise interest rates shows that interest rate differentials account for only about 15 percent of the total flow of capital.

The Senator may be interested in the proposal, which I think is a practical and good proposal, made by the administration to cope with the problem. An interest-equalization tax is proposed. It would not interfere with anyone's freedom to invest, but would tend to recognize, through equalization, the fact that interest rates in other countries may be higher than they are in this country. A tax would be imposed on American investors who invest in foreign securities. Such action seems to me to be logical and sensible. At the same time, it would permit us to have relatively low interest rates in this country which would stimulate growth, even though other governments had raised interest rates in their countries. It is an important proposal which has merit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is sort of like a production payment to keep down the cost of food.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is really a payment in the form of a tax to maintain a level of stability in interest rates and not permit it to get out of hand and leapfrog. If we raise interest rates to equalize with rates in Great Britain and France, the central banks of those countries raise their interest rates to attract capital. The first thing we would discover is that there would be an international race to raise interest rates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Twenty-four hours after we raised our rediscount rate, Belgium raised theirs by exactly the same amount. That is bound to happen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Our action had very little effect, as the Senator knows. It certainly had very little good effect.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. From time to time he has delivered some excellent speeches on this subject in the Senate as a result of careful study. I envy his being on the Joint Economic Committee, because I think it is one of the most important committees in the Congress. The Senator could possibly enlighten us. Is that committee at the present time making either a staff study or a committee study of the whole problem of balance of payments and international financing?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The question is under consideration. The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has been discussing it with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. It is my understanding that the committee chairman is very likely to hold hearings on the subject. At any rate, several subcommittees have been investigating the question of international balance of payments. One of the subcommittees is headed by the distinguished Representative from Milwaukee, Representative Reuss, who is an expert in the field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is very able.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He has done a marvelous job. A series of staff studies on this subject has been made. They are constructive. Whether the study will be magnified to a full committee effort in the future is a question. Incidentally, we had a series of hearings on the Brookings report. We heard not only members of the Brookings' staff but others who came before our committee and did a fine job in explaining the report and supporting their recommendations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to encourage the Senator from Wisconsin as a member of that committee to press vigorously and continuously for a genuine and overall study by that committee. Something needs to be done about the subject. I for one do not believe that the only recommendations I ought to weigh are those emanating from the Department of the Treasury. They have one particular point of view. I have respect for that point of view.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator. The Senator has made the point that the Joint Economic Committee is the correct committee to study the problem. The committee covers the whole economic spectrum, including not only the tax policy, but monetary questions and others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Including the domestic policy and the domestic implications. Some proposals that are recommended would have disastrous effect upon our own economy and employment in this country. I feel that we have to take into consideration such questions as well as the so-called outflow of gold.

I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will express my point of view to his colleagues. I am sure that I speak for a number of Senators with whom I have talked privately, and who do not know the answers to the problems. I do not know the answers. I know some of the problems. If we can identify the problems, than possibly we can begin to find some of the answers. But the Joint Economic Committee is the proper committee of Congress to engage in the study because it has such a wide range of jurisdiction. As with most subjects which are intricate, this one requires many areas to be considered.

That is one of the real problems today in relation to national security. We do not have any one place to which we can go to discuss such problems. We must jump all around Congress and appear before different committees, all of which argue over their respective jurisdictions. In the present instance, the Joint Economic Committee has the jurisdiction. I hope that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], who is one of the Nation's foremost economists, will take on the problem and with the able assistance of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] and others, will dig into it as they can.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

(At this point Mr. Hart took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Congressional Record following my remarks a compilation made by the Congressional Quarterly in their issue for the week ending August 30, 1963, beginning on page 1507, on the subject of Federal grants-in-aid.

The statistics given in this article, drawn from the Treasury Department and other Government agencies, should be extremely helpful to all Senators desiring to examine the impact of the various grants-in-aid programs upon their constituencies.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Grants-in-Aid Top $10 Billion Mark

Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments and to individuals in fiscal 1962 exceeded $10 billion for the first time.

A 6-percent increase in total grants from fiscal 1961 pushed the total to $10,385,549,-

606. The 6-percent jump followed a 7-percent rise during fiscal 1961.

The increase continued a trend that has been broken only once since 1953. That was in fiscal 1960 when total grants dropped by 4 percent. (See table I, below, figures are based on Treasury Department data.)

Following are the highlights of the 1962 data:

Grants to State and local governments for all purposes rose by $793 million, or 11 percent, to $7,895 million from $7,102 million in fiscal 1961, continuing a trend unbroken since 1953. Major increases went for highways, $161,161,857, and for aid to dependent children, $135,652,209.

Grants to individuals decreased by $233 million, or 9 percent, to $2,491 million from $2,724 million in fiscal 1961. The decline followed a 26-percent rise between fiscal 1960 and 1961. Part of the 1962 drop resulted from a $177,219,291 decline in grants under the temporary extended unemployment compensation program of 1961. This program was largely responsible for the 26-percent increase in 1961. In addition, fiscal 1962 figures included a $103,517,949 decline in veterans readjustment benefits. A sizable increase occurred in Army National Guard grants, $78,714,006.

Total grants in fiscal 1962 were $10,386 million, a $560 million or 6 percent increase from the 1961 total of $9,826 million. The 1962 increase was slightly smaller than the 7-percent jump recorded in 1961. Federal tax collections decreased by $72 million in fiscal 1962 to $94,320 million. The ratio of grants to tax collections rose 1 percent to 11 percent. (See table I, below.)

Further details concerning grants appear in the accompanying tables, as follows:

Table I: This shows the amounts spent from fiscal 1953 through fiscal 1962 for total grants, grants to State and local governments, and grants to individuals, together with the percentage increase or decrease for each category since the previous year and since 1953. Amounts listed as "Federal Tax Collections" are actually "Internal Revenue Collections" and do not include customs receipts and some other items. They do include social security payroll taxes, however, while social security benefit payments are not included in grants to individuals. Thus the ratio of grants to taxes shown is only a rough indicator of relationship in any single year; it does serve to point up the overall trend, however.

Table II: This shows the relative benefit-to-burden standing of the 50 States, determined by dividing each State's share of total grants paid in 1962 by its share of total Federal tax payments. (Both of these figures also appear in table III.) Because actual tax collections in each State do not accurately reflect the true incidence of taxation (auto, liquor, and tobacco excise collections, for example, are credited to the home States of manufacturers although the taxes are in turn paid by every purchaser of these products), Congressional Quarterly used tax-burden figures prepared by Tax Foundation, Inc., based on a special allocation formula as applied to estimated 1962 revenues. States were then ranked in order of their benefit-to-burden ratio, ranging from Alaska, whose relative share of grants was 4.81 percent of its relative share of taxes, to Delaware, where the relative share of grants was only 0.38 percent of its relative share of taxes.

Table III: This shows, for each State, total grants, population, and per capita share of grants for fiscal 1962 and fiscal 1961, as well as percentage shares of total 1962 grants and the Federal tax burden, as described above. Grants averaged $56 per capita, based on the July 1962 census estimates of population, and ranged from $226 per capita in Alaska to $34 per capita in New Jersey. There is a rough correlation, it will be noted, between a State's per capita share of grants and its benefits-to-burden standing in table II. (Some reasons for the wide variation in these figures are discussed in "How Programs Work," below.)

Table IV: This table shows each State's allocations under the largest grant programs conducted by the Federal Government. However, table IV in this fact sheet has been rearranged, compared to similar tables in previous years, in an attempt to provide a more comprehensive picture of the impact of grant programs.

In previous years, table IV presented the 9 largest individual programs among the more than 100 separate programs listed in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury. However, many of the individual programs, while separate in themselves, are part of larger programs with a general or specific purpose. By combining related individual programs, it is possible to more accurately convey the scope of Federal grants-in-aid and to show almost the total amount going to each State. Such a combination has been made for table IV.

For example, there are 13 separate programs providing grants for aid to education in some form. None is among the nine largest programs listed by Congressional Quarterly in the past. However, taken together, education grants are the sixth largest category (col. 6). Another example is the public health category (col. 4). It is composed of many relatively small programs which, when combined, provide one of the largest-grants-in-aid totals.

Included in the 14 columns are all but 14 of the 110 individual programs listed for fiscal 1962. The amount of grants in the columns is $10,106,674,851, only $278,874,755 short of the total $10,385,549,606 in grants made in fiscal 1962.

Table V: The component parts of each of the 14 columns in table IV, showing only total national grants, are listed in the table.

PROGRAMS COMPARED

The nine largest grant programs for fiscal 1961, as reported by Congressional Quarterly in 1962, were, in declining order of size: highways, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, temporary extended unemployment compensation, Army National Guard, unemployment compensation, agricultural conservation reserve program, readjustment benefits, and Air Force National Guard.

Under the presentation in table IV of this fact sheet, aid for highway construction and maintenance remains the largest grant program. Old-age assistance continues to be part of the second-largest program, although now it is included with other items in a larger category, public assistance (col. 2). Unemployment insurance programs (col. 3) also continue high on the list of major grant programs. It should be noted that the items composing unemployment insurance grants do not include the benefit payments paid to most jobless workers, which are not grants; such payments are paid for by special taxes on employers which are imposed by the States and are useable only in those States where they are levied.

Rather, the category includes compensation for Federal employees, grants to States for administration of their compensation programs and a temporary extended unemployment compensation program enacted in 1961 in response to the recession. The expiration of the temporary program on April 1, 1962, will considerably reduce the size of the unemployment insurance category in following years. The temporary program comprised nearly $304 million of the total in column 3.

One of the most striking additions to table IV under the revised listing is public health research and services. It indicates the increasing scope of Federal aid for public health matters. The category (column 4) is composed of 31 separate programs, only 1 larger than $76 million and less than one-third larger than $20 million. The largest item is grants for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act of 1946: $167,575,281.

The public health category is composed of grants for services, such as hospital construction and water pollution control, and for research, such as heart disease and allergies and infectious diseases. However, total fiscal 1962 grants for public health research were $464,315,087, only a little less than twice as large as total grants for public health services, $255,850,952.

Food distribution (column 5) is another important addition to the major grant programs. The programs included in the category, which are administered by the Agriculture Department, involve not only welfare and nutritional goals (e.g., food stamp redemption or school lunch programs) but also the desire to remove surplus agricultural commodities from the market.

TABLE I.—*Recent trends in grants-in-aid*

[By fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Total grants	$4,054	$4,284	$4,595	$5,152	$6,468	$7,421	$9,590	$9,175	$9,826	$10,386
To State, local governments	2,802	3,005	3,149	3,463	4,064	4,932	6,457	7,011	7,102	7,895
To individuals	1,252	1,279	1,446	1,689	2,404	2,488	3,134	2,163	2,724	2,491
Percent increase or decrease since preceding year:										
Total grants	----------	+6	+7	+12	+25	+15	+29	−4	+7	+6
To State, local governments	----------	+7	+5	+10	+17	+21	+31	+9	+1	+11
To individuals	----------	+2	+13	+17	+42	+3	+26	−31	+26	−9
Percent increase or decrease from 1953:										
Total grants	----------	+6	+13	+27	+59	+83	+136	+126	+142	+156
To State, local governments	----------	+7	+12	+24	+45	+76	+130	+150	+153	+182
To individuals	----------	+2	+15	+35	+92	+99	+150	+73	+118	+99
Federal tax collections	$69,687	$69,920	$66,280	$75,113	$80,172	$79,978	$79,798	$91,775	$94,401	$94,329
Percent of Federal taxes returned to States as grants	6	6	7	7	8	9	12	10	10	11

TABLE II.—*How States rank*

The redistributive effect of Federal grants is shown by dividing each State's share of total grants (col. 1) by its share of the 1962 Federal tax burden (col. 2), yielding a "benefit-to-burden" ratio or index (col. 3) according to which 35 States (and the District of Columbia) received relatively more in grants than they paid in taxes, while 15 States received relatively less. States are ranked according to this index.

Rank	State	1	2	3	Rank	State	1	2	3	Rank	State	1	2	3
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*			*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*			*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1	Alaska	0.53	0.11	4.81	18	Georgia	2.37	1.33	1.78	35	Texas	4.81	4.26	1.12
2	South Dakota	.86	.22	3.90	19	South Carolina	1.10	.65	1.69	36	Virginia	1.77	1.70	1.04
3	North Dakota	.78	.21	3.71	20	West Virginia	1.09	.68	1.60	37	Rhode Island	.45	.52	.86
4	Wyoming	.58	.18	3.22	21	Oregon	1.48	.95	1.55	38	California	8.91	11.16	.79
5	Mississippi	1.42	.46	3.08	22	Arizona	.93	.62	1.50	39	Indiana	1.83	2.29	.79
6	Arkansas	1.31	.45	2.91	23	Nevada	.31	.21	1.47	40	Massachusetts	2.79	3.53	.79
7	Vermont	.47	.17	2.76	24	Colorado	1.41	.97	1.45	41	Wisconsin	1.64	2.07	.79
8	Idaho	.66	.26	2.53	25	District of Columbia	1.00	.69	1.44	42	Maryland	1.48	1.94	.76
9	Montana	.74	.30	2.46	26	North Carolina	2.03	1.45	1.40	43	Ohio	4.37	5.74	.76
10	New Mexico	.88	.37	2.37	27	Kansas	1.31	.96	1.36	44	Florida	1.88	2.52	.74
11	Alabama	2.20	.97	2.26	28	Nebraska	.88	.65	1.35	45	Michigan	3.33	4.47	.74
12	Oklahoma	2.13	.94	2.26	29	Minnesota	2.00	1.64	1.21	46	Illinois	4.41	6.93	.63
13	Louisiana	2.62	1.23	2.13	30	Iowa	1.39	1.15	1.20	47	Pennsylvania	4.39	6.92	.63
14	Utah	.73	.37	1.97	31	Missouri	2.66	2.28	1.16	48	New York	7.10	13.54	.52
15	Tennessee	2.16	1.19	1.81	32	New Hampshire	.38	.33	1.15	49	Connecticut	1.12	2.22	.50
16	Kentucky	1.86	1.03	1.80	33	Maine	.50	.44	1.13	50	New Jersey	2.03	4.29	.47
17	Hawaii	.61	.34	1.79	34	Washington	1.80	1.58	1.13	51	Delaware	.20	.52	.38

TABLE III.—*State allocations of U.S. grants-in-aid*

[Columns may not add to totals shown because of rounding]

	1962 total grants (1)	1962 estimated population (2)	1962 per capita grants (3)	1961 total grants (4)	1961 estimated population (5)	1961 per capita grants (6)	1962 share of grants (7)	1962 share of Federal tax burden[1] (8)
							Percent	*Percent*
Alabama	$229,038,000	3,358,000	$68	$221,154,000	3,302,000	$67	2.20	0.97
Alaska	55,503,000	246,000	226	48,441,000	234,000	207	.53	.11
Arizona	96,992,000	1,509,000	64	91,701,000	1,391,000	66	.93	.62
Arkansas	136,614,000	1,823,000	75	129,735,000	1,797,000	72	1.31	.45
California	925,522,000	16,970,000	55	829,170,000	16,397,000	51	8.91	11.16
Colorado	146,782,000	1,907,000	77	138,834,000	1,781,000	78	1.41	.97
Connecticut	116,636,000	2,597,000	45	114,730,000	2,614,000	44	1.12	2.22
Delaware	21,041,000	469,000	45	21,948,000	458,000	48	.20	.52
District of Columbia	103,870,000	784,000	132	93,416,000	761,000	123	1.00	.69
Florida	196,246,000	5,459,000	36	217,351,000	5,222,000	42	1.88	2.52
Georgia	246,184,000	4,100,000	60	243,724,000	3,987,000	61	2.37	1.33
Hawaii	64,373,000	693,000	93	51,144,000	657,000	73	.61	.34
Idaho	68,612,000	698,000	98	60,785,000	684,000	89	.66	.26
Illinois	459,018,000	10,146,000	45	457,511,000	10,258,000	45	4.41	6.93
Indiana	190,855,000	4,715,000	40	188,759,000	4,711,000	40	1.83	2.29
Iowa	145,346,000	2,777,000	52	139,719,000	2,770,000	50	1.39	1.15
Kansas	136,503,000	2,219,000	62	137,494,000	2,194,000	63	1.31	.96
Kentucky	194,096,000	3,082,000	63	172,841,000	3,076,000	56	1.86	1.03
Louisiana	272,877,000	3,330,000	82	245,904,000	3,321,000	74	2.62	1.23
Maine	52,482,000	999,000	53	53,893,000	992,000	54	.50	.44
Maryland	154,031,000	3,191,000	48	130,189,000	3,188,000	41	1.48	1.94
Massachusetts	289,845,000	5,161,000	56	262,630,000	5,234,000	50	2.79	3.53
Michigan	346,543,000	7,991,000	43	356,158,000	7,954,000	45	3.33	4.47
Minnesota	208,469,000	3,475,000	60	211,785,000	3,470,000	61	2.00	1.64
Mississippi	147,778,000	2,248,000	66	154,098,000	2,215,000	70	1.42	.46
Missouri	276,935,000	4,346,000	64	258,409,000	4,378,000	59	2.66	2.28
Montana	77,009,000	709,000	109	73,538,000	682,000	108	.74	.30
Nebraska	91,451,000	1,484,000	62	100,937,000	1,431,000	71	.88	.65
Nevada	32,238,000	335,000	96	28,015,000	299,000	94	.31	.21
New Hampshire	39,531,000	632,000	63	38,043,000	621,000	61	.38	.33
New Jersey	211,557,000	6,245,000	34	193,745,000	6,244,000	31	2.03	4.29
New Mexico	92,054,000	1,020,000	90	96,301,000	983,000	98	.88	.37
New York	737,852,000	17,402,000	42	660,045,000	17,033,000	39	7.10	13.54
North Carolina	211,414,000	4,731,000	45	194,843,000	4,614,000	42	2.03	1.45
North Dakota	81,138,000	642,000	126	85,230,000	640,000	133	.78	.21
Ohio	454,412,000	10,097,000	45	429,586,000	9,876,000	43	4.37	5.74
Oklahoma	222,016,000	2,448,000	91	215,277,000	2,360,000	91	2.13	.94
Oregon	154,710,000	1,864,000	83	136,430,000	1,799,000	76	1.48	.95
Pennsylvania	456,403,000	11,376,000	40	450,156,000	11,468,000	39	4.39	6.92
Rhode Island	47,062,000	865,000	54	47,139,000	867,000	54	.45	.52
South Carolina	114,767,000	2,436,000	47	121,705,000	2,407,000	51	1.10	.65
South Dakota	89,798,000	721,000	125	82,559,000	690,000	120	.86	.22
Tennessee	224,393,000	3,634,000	62	223,916,000	3,615,000	62	2.16	1.19
Texas	500,295,000	10,116,000	49	485,855,000	9,788,000	50	4.81	4.26
Utah	76,060,000	967,000	79	74,181,000	916,000	81	.73	.37
Vermont	49,795,000	390,000	128	36,338,000	395,000	92	.47	.17
Virginia	184,179,000	4,177,000	44	163,301,000	4,059,000	40	1.77	1.70
Washington	187,303,000	3,006,000	62	170,827,000	2,902,000	59	1.80	1.58
West Virginia	113,364,000	1,773,000	64	112,416,000	1,850,000	61	1.09	.68
Wisconsin	171,272,000	4,092,000	42	163,183,000	4,022,000	41	1.64	2.07
Wyoming	60,505,000	365,000	166	57,403,000	338,000	170	.58	.18
Territories	163,599,000			137,349,000				
Undistributed	252,686,000			216,439,000				
Total	10,385,550,000	185,822,000	56	9,826,279,000	182,953,000	54	100.00	100.00

Source: Treasury Department, Census Bureau.

---

[1] Computed by Tax Foundation, Inc.

TABLE IV.—*Fiscal 1962 Federal grants-in-aid—State breakdown of 14 largest programs* [1]

	Highways (1)	Public assistance (2)	Unemployment insurance (3)	Public health research and services (4)	Food distribution (5)	Education (6)	Agricultural conservation (7)
Alabama	$64,757,712	$70,767,230	$9,710,340	$8,164,450	$17,166,602	$10,680,774	$11,371,627
Alaska	16,174,101	1,880,804	3,972,965	4,066,049	311,932	9,434,372	67,583
Arizona	39,024,879	17,609,991	7,066,958	3,499,649	5,102,501	8,751,691	1,799,911
Arkansas	33,828,076	36,392,792	7,335,077	6,970,606	14,375,351	6,822,399	12,667,477
California	275,233,574	262,802,735	121,409,226	58,671,121	28,153,274	70,324,603	8,102,355
Colorado	32,856,998	41,541,879	7,232,533	8,199,397	5,547,069	13,633,317	13,691,590
Connecticut	34,161,298	21,393,202	14,613,455	10,403,576	4,524,357	8,091,781	536,053
Delaware	4,701,439	2,962,397	1,908,827	1,441,636	1,644,749	1,827,931	672,718
District of Columbia	19,168,701	10,436,698	6,488,544	9,762,736	2,846,399	9,204,355	----------
Florida	42,723,565	63,068,499	16,147,806	15,002,231	13,392,557	13,648,045	5,328,638
Georgia	61,141,748	69,226,902	13,807,813	13,461,846	14,417,376	12,762,152	19,646,310
Hawaii	6,902,319	4,957,263	4,963,977	3,079,038	1,953,919	11,268,792	135,971
Idaho	26,978,168	8,791,295	4,616,776	2,031,402	1,736,369	3,072,306	7,185,187
Illinois	141,833,283	121,809,066	49,737,063	34,296,170	22,273,435	19,998,079	17,195,597
Indiana	67,528,736	26,929,148	24,694,977	11,420,907	13,460,224	11,664,624	15,156,076
Iowa	38,463,749	32,922,331	5,878,495	9,044,684	10,482,046	6,691,312	23,332,181
Kansas	36,828,187	27,552,981	6,927,069	7,362,689	5,861,666	10,956,976	24,385,798
Kentucky	58,793,626	52,414,128	12,898,178	9,742,517	22,085,547	5,069,337	14,075,697
Louisiana	63,283,941	119,290,834	13,950,662	12,264,355	18,111,885	6,430,876	7,474,709
Maine	13,605,463	14,217,593	4,079,737	2,606,267	3,793,765	3,783,098	2,516,387
Maryland	44,354,374	22,596,709	14,971,377	21,337,392	7,482,326	14,489,673	2,796,734
Massachusetts	61,348,995	79,086,059	30,706,705	50,580,589	10,667,424	24,956,087	613,225
Michigan	98,913,908	75,292,875	35,636,316	22,033,946	35,690,378	16,060,861	14,739,168
Minnesota	58,689,455	42,289,892	13,275,367	16,199,528	11,402,350	7,332,260	28,844,706
Mississippi	35,612,372	38,271,464	7,336,885	8,361,498	19,035,327	5,290,579	11,529,375
Missouri	79,366,607	90,345,510	15,081,207	16,581,384	16,006,697	9,576,648	21,084,984
Montana	33,901,962	6,392,088	4,289,545	2,143,262	2,187,116	4,244,092	10,438,369
Nebraska	29,237,594	15,032,192	3,881,943	4,145,739	2,819,482	5,626,653	18,270,850
Nevada	16,277,380	2,863,882	2,701,590	1,405,608	419,146	2,805,970	412,708
New Hampshire	17,442,822	4,894,512	2,852,922	2,959,877	1,684,713	3,246,091	711,076
New Jersey	69,906,897	34,594,122	33,234,731	10,155,966	8,674,661	13,982,457	1,586,556
New Mexico	22,041,363	17,100,995	4,704,153	3,159,356	6,628,332	9,523,301	9,542,362
New York	141,663,543	211,539,249	112,819,954	86,824,069	47,025,231	35,698,972	11,515,602
North Carolina	42,930,433	60,760,400	16,022,653	21,694,979	18,155,009	13,016,078	11,837,825
North Dakota	16,480,744	8,745,564	2,884,454	3,077,825	2,255,491	3,646,702	34,706,243
Ohio	175,431,827	95,331,386	50,628,402	26,355,924	28,474,233	19,303,229	15,345,820
Oklahoma	35,267,726	88,683,458	9,649,245	7,952,692	17,138,908	13,299,107	24,912,946
Oregon	50,163,326	22,004,094	11,428,435	11,971,579	6,202,653	7,427,539	5,952,135
Pennsylvania	98,801,465	108,467,523	53,774,421	41,370,039	46,500,292	21,560,383	10,890,862
Rhode Island	8,491,934	12,179,766	6,460,597	4,079,757	1,644,819	5,094,151	81,347
South Carolina	34,071,133	22,533,181	7,001,871	7,411,400	7,647,086	7,425,401	11,845,639
South Dakota	36,574,494	9,324,652	1,895,646	2,194,149	2,764,207	4,925,287	24,116,649
Tennessee	67,880,923	44,971,345	14,924,832	14,016,450	19,377,806	9,262,431	13,135,067
Texas	128,734,600	139,252,153	31,120,182	26,150,663	28,834,778	25,306,418	62,832,854
Utah	27,403,222	10,706,047	5,854,613	5,368,735	3,244,353	5,735,128	4,397,849
Vermont	29,734,916	5,011,049	2,442,792	2,805,205	1,420,797	1,140,830	1,541,715
Virginia	76,081,512	22,442,362	6,971,327	13,704,883	11,862,478	20,961,836	7,048,703
Washington	56,446,808	44,869,782	14,195,097	12,291,117	11,190,140	15,798,087	6,840,331
West Virginia	22,047,675	44,703,088	5,894,684	3,585,985	17,625,790	2,906,904	2,584,588
Wisconsin	55,160,386	33,561,506	9,552,284	16,481,550	11,581,719	9,087,607	16,271,668
Wyoming	27,751,237	2,928,690	2,344,189	899,393	1,166,246	2,153,790	3,509,298
Puerto Rico	3,707,781	8,962,962	7,695,628	2,959,169	21,534,789	3,990,605	993,957
Virgin Islands	----------	303,994	143,459	69,354	201,797	347,071	----------
Other territories	----------	124,548	28,221	18,345,621	406,810	1,764,482	----------
Undistributed	5,930,330	----------	7,219,361	----------	18,823,664	11,014,716	----------
Total	2,782,839,810	2,433,133,869	887,065,569	720,166,039	653,018,071	601,848,336	576,773,076

	National Guard (8)	Public and rural housing and urban renewal (9)	Conservation practices (10)	Veterans benefits (11)	Agricultural experimental stations and cooperative agricultural extension work (12)	Vocational rehabilitation (13)	Child care (14)
Alabama	$8,664,336	$9,255,007	$2,911,298	$5,372,251	$3,045,229	$2,694,893	$1,933,259
Alaska	3,373,752	733,309	5,336,574	59,042	373,110	156,704	392,469
Arizona	3,985,883	414,219	2,465,771	1,580,190	817,965	665,225	417,296
Arkansas	5,927,956	1,140,327	2,677,174	1,763,331	2,456,351	1,970,889	1,073,996
California	20,792,987	20,295,435	10,062,566	19,658,730	2,511,786	5,092,695	3,968,387
Colorado	4,666,062	1,407,854	4,564,510	2,254,039	1,122,230	1,031,211	935,978
Connecticut	6,386,754	10,400,368	540,436	2,253,023	694,660	457,871	1,021,068
Delaware	3,006,721	1,179,938	277,336	227,951	441,152	212,024	335,350
District of Columbia	2,385,828	9,013,360	----------	2,293,357	----------	1,174,619	696,641
Florida	5,105,196	3,107,440	1,476,000	6,643,995	1,215,834	2,684,004	1,812,134
Georgia	10,244,898	12,804.456	2,785,481	5,698,979	3,169,128	3,613,412	2,133,004
Hawaii	8,312,676	5,530,750	232,901	317,905	597,333	470,453	477,678
Idaho	3,504,631	21,976	1,992,190	541,206	850,590	230,010	448,792
Illinois	10,327,973	23,423,616	645,048	5,621,407	2,703,275	3,340,127	2,142,779
Indiana	6,330,155	3,071,495	1,228,957	3,027,712	2,348,710	728,166	1,447,174
Iowa	7,387,059	1,452,370	1,442,482	2,025,201	2,516,387	1,253,149	1,121,663
Kansas	5,664,568	3,353,852	1,409,746	1,743,772	1,794,333	998,113	851,279
Kentucky	3,804,244	4.110,504	2.152,995	2,230,032	3.032,074	857,098	1,505,842
Louisiana	5,381,411	4,368,109	2.094,262	3,684,602	2,026,284	2,257,810	1,496,179
Maine	3,736,829	309,192	600,752	555,341	805,326	413,173	482.578
Maryland	7,053,223	11,602,377	572,150	2.128,955	1,049.973	818,073	1,521.613
Massachusetts	9,966,173	7,798,639	472,606	5,108,162	916,631	2,351,763	1,462.760
Michigan	11,848,016	15,195,063	1,805,281	5,453,991	2,543,329	2,455,120	2,686,325
Minnesota	8,681,861	5,087,666	1,751,486	3,119,600	2,340,451	2,093,187	1,678,478
Mississippi	7,523,421	1,734,474	3,749,480	1.696,153	3,119,395	1 187.000	1,552,677
Missouri	6,908,671	9,347,388	1,391,951	3,337 277	2.711.736	1.658,681	1,376,834
Montana	3,663,662	225,725	3,489,226	689.079	952,738	372,512	454,571
Nebraska	3,449,205	371,656	874,575	1,005,503	1,523,348	556,629	446,082
Nevada	2,030,023	327,050	1,115,406	137,600	462.015	85,818	277,207
New Hampshire	2,513,601	982,800	532,104	373,605	532,309	142,930	332.989
New Jersey	10,259,997	17,438,842	463,640	3,354,191	909,478	1,442,421	1,049,525
New Mexico	3,919,882	171,434	10,385,069	1,043,432	832,179	282,229	633,096
New York	20,228,570	36,605,871	2,180,896	9,680,213	2,620,834	9,288,681	3,466,780
North Carolina	5,355,963	5,530,570	1,704,980	2,695,966	4,129,468	2,686,311	2,614,442
North Dakota	3,223,254	266,372	1,360,820	553,583	1,110,013	402,960	415,357

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE IV.—*Fiscal 1962 Federal grants-in-aid—State breakdown of 14 largest programs* [1]—Continued

	National Guard (8)	Public and rural housing and urban renewal (9)	Conservation practices (10)	Veterans benefits (11)	Agricultural experimental stations and cooperative agricultural extension work (12)	Vocational rehabilitation (13)	Child care (14)
Ohio	$10, 525, 849	$14, 041, 920	$789, 143	$5, 611, 061	$3, 077, 320	$2, 246, 545	$2, 858, 559
Oklahoma	6, 202, 275	155, 954	7, 952, 613	3, 133, 663	2, 106, 927	1, 698, 073	1, 031, 684
Oregon	4, 925, 596	1, 379, 282	27, 111, 476	1, 619, 240	1, 208, 886	809, 779	657, 579
Pennsylvania	15, 333, 325	30, 075, 608	1, 688, 290	8, 794, 987	3, 202, 922	6, 393, 174	3, 548, 952
Rhode Island	3, 628, 364	2, 504, 710	127, 155	688, 600	415, 254	551, 859	518, 958
South Carolina	5, 412, 741	1, 435, 866	1, 547, 612	2, 448, 858	2, 262, 952	1, 384, 300	1, 510, 508
South Dakota	3, 796, 471	----------	633, 271	573, 493	1, 104, 552	336, 982	334, 361
Tennessee	9, 374, 286	13, 494, 944	6, 330, 982	3. 129, 772	3, 055, 982	2, 004, 090	1, 907, 800
Texas	13, 350, 583	11, 103, 383	10, 819, 255	7, 891, 448	4, 722, 656	2, 497, 996	3, 734, 447
Utah	4, 343, 148	33, 900	3, 829. 587	1, 600, 043	767, 546	453, 189	459, 960
Vermont	3, 738, 866	33, 507	254, 508	317, 519	576, 017	296, 506	343, 589
Virginia	5, 987, 598	8, 686, 758	1, 245, 040	1, 748, 114	2, 554, 931	1, 810, 657	1, 920, 454
Washington	7, 019, 811	1, 907, 653	5, 845, 703	3, 291, 413	1, 450, 746	1, 076, 675	1, 013, 914
West Virginia	4, 123, 923	582, 982	1, 321, 275	1, 495, 728	1, 705, 164	1, 668, 833	1, 114, 344
Wisconsin	6, 825, 916	1, 626, 869	1, 562, 294	2, 735, 397	2, 379, 322	1, 460, 847	1, 358, 462
Wyoming	2, 115, 501	5, 670	14, 322, 251	204, 755	652, 140	115, 066	337, 116
Puerto Rico	4, 531, 779	8, 241, 505	27, 760	2, 054, 644	2, 309, 385	1, 129, 490	273, 650
Virgin Islands	----------	275, 676	40, 434	----------	----------	27, 498	----------
Other territories [2]	----------	259	30, 370	3, 824, 638	----------	67, 074	1, 754, 532
Undistributed	207, 620, 327	----------	7, 323	----------	8, 926, 184	----------	----------
Total	554, 471, 790	323, 760, 947	162, 232, 510	159, 092, 758	100, 757, 531	82, 154, 594	69, 359, 951

[1] The figures presented in each column are the total of numerous separate grant programs. The component parts of each column are listed on table V, with national totals.

[2] Includes American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and certain foreign countries.

Source: Treasury Department.

HOW PROGRAMS WORK

Many factors help to account for the uneven distribution of grants-in-aid, both within programs and as between programs. Allocation formulas vary from one program to the next; some, like the public assistance programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, are "intended to provide the highest percentages of Federal participation to the low-income States, which generally have relatively large proportions of needy people and make relatively low assistance payments," according to HEW. Such programs redistribute income, in effect, from high-income to low-income States.

Other programs, like readjustment benefits paid to veterans, result in allocations that vary largely according to population. Another type of program tends to benefit some States much more than others because of the less-than-national character of the need to be met. This is true of payments to farmers under agricultural conservation programs, of primary benefit in the South and Midwest; and of urban renewal and public housing payments, concentrated in the more urban States.

Following are the formulas governing allocation of funds under certain typical grant programs.

Highways: Two formulas apply. Funds for primary, secondary, and urban roads (the so-called ABC system), are distributed as follows: one-third in the ratio of a State's area to total U.S. area; one-third in the ratio of a State's rural population to total U.S. rural population in 1940; and one-third in the ratio of a State's rural delivery and star route mileage to total such mileage in the United States. Funds for the Interstate System were distributed for fiscal 1957–59 as follows: one-half according to population and one-half according to the foregoing formula for ABC roads. This was then revised to conform with new estimates of the cost to complete the system. States must match Federal grants for ABC roads dollar for dollar, but 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System is met with Federal funds.

Old-age assistance: Federal funds equal four-fifths of the first $31 of a maximum average monthly payment of $66 per recipient plus a percentage of the next $35 of such average payment, which varies according to the average per capita income in the State for the most recent 3 years; except that the Federal share of payments in any State shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 65 percent. Unlike the highway programs, in which total Federal grants are limited by congressional authorization, old-age assistance is an open-end program in which total Federal grants are limited only by the "load" of persons qualifying for assistance under the various State programs.

Hospital construction: Under the Hill-Burton Act of 1946, Federal grants for construction of hospitals and medical facilities are allotted to the States in the ratio which the population of each State, weighted by the square of its allotment percentage, bears to the sum of the corresponding products of weighted populations for all of the States. The allotment percentage is tied to a State's per capita income. Total Federal grants are limited by appropriations; matching requirements vary according to a State's fiscal ability, ranging from one-third to two-thirds of project costs.

Pollution control: Grants for the construction of waste treatment facilities, limited to a maximum of 30 percent of cost or $600,000 for any single project, are allotted to the States as follows: one-half according to population and one-half according to per capita income. Total grants under the program are limited to the amount of the authorization—$80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, and $100 million for each of fiscal years 1964–67.

School aid: Grants to build and operate schools have been paid since 1950 to school districts overburdened by Federal activities in their areas. Neither of the two laws governing the program requires allocation of funds by State or local matching; total grants are limited only by the extent of demand. Payments are related to per-pupil costs in the areas affected and vary with the category of children involved, being higher for those whose parents both work and live on Federal property than for those whose parents either work or live on Federal property.

Airport construction: Federal grants to pay one-half the cost of building airports were authorized in 1946; a 3-year extension enacted in 1961 authorized total grants of $75 million per year, of which $50 million is allocated to the States according to their area and population, and $17 million at the discretion of the Federal Aviation Agency, and the rest used for special purposes.

TABLE V.—*Breakdown of 110 Federal grant-in-aid programs with fiscal 1962 spending totals, as arranged by CQ categories*

Highways:	
Federal-aid highways trust fund	$2, 751, 950, 343
Other (forest roads; public lands highways)	30, 889, 467
Total	2, 782, 839, 810
Public assistance:	
Old-age assistance	1, 233, 078, 598
Aid to dependent children	836, 954, 495
Aid to permanently disabled	196, 947, 709
Aid to the blind	46, 304, 414
Medical assistance for the aged	118, 855, 403
Assistance to U.S. nationals (repatriated)	452, 652
Cooperative research (Social Security Administration)	540, 598
Total	2, 433, 133, 869
Unemployment insurance:	
Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration (trust fund)	448, 724, 728
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and exservicemen	134, 408, 572
Temporary extended unemployment compensation (trust fund)	303, 932, 269
Total	887, 065, 569
Public Health (research):	
Health research facilities	1, 033, 902
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities	53, 529, 330
Neurology and blindness activities	41, 728, 218
National Cancer Institute	51, 152, 945
National Institute of Dental Research	7, 904, 459
Allergy and infectious disease activities	33, 243, 270
National Heart Institute	67, 319, 742
Mental health activities	66, 846, 801
General research and services	75, 605, 244

Table V.—*Breakdown of 110 Federal grant-in-aid programs with fiscal 1962 spending totals, as arranged by CQ categories*—Con.

Public Health (research)—Continued	
Nursing services and resources	$6,466,211
Chronic disease and health of the aged	310,153
Community health practices and research	4,129,093
Accident prevention	937,435
Air pollution	1,634,162
Milk, food, interstate and community sanitation	2,212,838
Occupational health	1,211,850
Radiological health	1,335,815
Water supply and water pollution control	1,809,408
Hospital and medical facility research	925,805
General research support grants	15,000,055
Construction of health research facilities	29,978,351
Total	464,315,087
Public Health (services):	
Control of venereal disease	2,568,834
Control of tuberculosis	4,001,003
Community health practices and research	15,785,357
Mental health activities	6,650,161
National Cancer Institute	3,436,142
National Heart Institute	4,566,458
Water supply and water pollution control	4,355,961
Chronic disease and health of the aged	4,808,440
Hospital activities (construction)	167,575,281
Waste treatment works (construction)	42,103,315
Total	255,850,952
Public health services and research total	720,166,039
Food distribution:	
School lunch program	167,501,083
Food stamp program	13,152,695
Value of commodities distributed	181,832,875
Value of commodities donated	199,904,523
Special milk program	90,626,895
Total	653,018,071
Education:	
Colleges of agriculture and mining	14,519,000
Cooperative vocational education	40,178,617
Assistance for school construction (impacted areas)	42,084,492
Maintenance and operation of schools (impacted areas)	226,307,926
Library services	8,196,654
Defense education activities	65,833,507
Expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded (to States)	554,382
Expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded (to individuals)	361,422
Defense education activities	40,530,653
Cooperative research	3,724,461
Fellowships and assistance to schools (Atomic Energy Commission)	8,850,506
Research grants awards (National Science Foundation)	140,501,848
Education—Continued	
Fellowship awards (National Science Foundation)	$10,204,868
Total	601,848,336
Agricultural conservation:	
Agricultural conservation program	237,850,237
Conservation reserve program	332,683,936
Great Plains conservation program	6,238,903
Total	576,773,076
National Guard:	
Air Force	217,724,712
Army	336,747,078
Total	554,471,790
Public and rural housing and urban renewal:	
Urban renewal program	162,532,113
Urban planning assistance	6,903,110
Public Housing Administration (annual contributions)	154,262,784
Rural housing grants	62,940
Total	323,760,947
Conservation practices:	
National forest fund (shared revenues)	25,279,109
National grasslands (shared revenues)	416,545
State and private forestry cooperation	14,026,413
Watershed protection and flood prevention	38,783,821
Lease of flood control lands (shared revenues)	1,611,813
Federal aid in wildlife restoration, fish restoration, and management	19,792,421
Migratory Bird Conservation Act, etc	497,655
Mineral Leasing Act	39,065,885
Special funds (shared revenues)	16,018,695
Tennessee Valley Authority (shared revenues)	6,740,153
Total	162,232,510
Veterans benefits:	
State homes for soldiers and sailors	7,365,937
Approval and supervision of training establishments	1,086,303
Automobiles, etc., for disabled veterans	668,838
Readjustment benefits and vocational rehabilitation	149,971,680
Total	159,092,758
Agricultural extension work, research:	
Agricultural experimental stations	34,460,282
Cooperative agricultural extension work	66,297,249
Total	100,757,531
Vocational rehabilitation:	
Office of vocational rehabilitation	65,077,625
Grants for special projects	7,612,908
Training and traineeships	9,464,061
Total	82,154,594
Child care:	
Maternal and child health services (to State)	$23,851,671
Services for crippled children (to State)	24,091,677
Child welfare services (to State)	18,645,853
Maternal and child health services (to individuals)	985,966
Services for crippled children (to individuals)	544,115
Maternal and child welfare services (to individuals)	131,304
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses	1,109,365
Total	69,359,951
Other programs: Following are the 14 programs not included in the broader categories listed above:	
Cooperative projects in marketing (Department of Agriculture)	3,388,010
State marine schools	541,478
Civil defense	16,789,813
Disaster relief	14,381,924
American Printing House for the Blind	670,000
White House Conference on Aging	31,245
Bureau of Indian Affairs	7,571,190
Federal airport program	57,857,651
Payments to States under Federal Power Act (shared revenues)	54,261
Grants for research and management counseling (SBA)	444,848
Miscellaneous grants [1]	95,249,287
Sugar Act program	77,927,715
State marine schools (subsistence for cadets)	675,662
Area Redevelopment Act	3,354,161
Total	278,874,755

[1] Primarily Federal payments to the District of Columbia tax collections for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and payments to certain U.S. territories.

CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I suppose nearly every newspaper in America had a comment on the freedom march in Washington last week. One of the most thoughtful and in my judgment one of the finest editorials printed anywhere was written by the Milwaukee Journal. I shall read the first and last paragraphs of that fine editorial:

> A quarter-million Negroes have just taught other Americans their finest lesson in the whole meaning of the first amendment "right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The last paragraph reads:

> The most dangerous error now would be to settle back with a sigh of relief and say, "Well, that's over." It isn't over; it has just begun. How far inside the door does crisis have to come before democracy will act to cure itself?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

The American Way

A quarter-million Negroes have just taught other Americans their finest lesson in the whole meaning of the first amendment "right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Wednesday's huge Washington demonstration added immeasurably to the dignity and impact of the onrushing struggle for Negro equality now. This was done by the superb self discipline of the marchers with no slightest loss of spontaneity and fervor and grim purpose.

The complacent white man who takes his freedom for granted, if he was thinking as he watched and listened Wednesday, must have envied these people their thrilling consciousness of freedom's worth. Those who still have to seek it do indeed know best what it is.

The great event was not least a triumph over the extremist and rabble rousing fringe of Negro leadership. Randolph and Wilkins and King are leading their race not against democracy but within it and for it, relying on its own processes. Their followers who thronged the capital are good Americans now, wanting only to be whole Americans.

One remark of Wilkins' perfectly expressed how their struggle seeks to serve democracy. Addressing himself sympathetically to southerners in and out of Congress who are merely afraid to speak and vote for Negro equality, he said with a little smile but not at all in jest: "We will emancipate you." The Negroes' cause is freedom for their white fellow citizens—freedom from fears and discriminations that deny it to others.

Heartening was the prominent role of religious leaders of all faiths. For the pendency of civil rights legislation in Congress was only the pretext of the march. Primarily it was a call to national conscience, a "massive thrust," in Randolph's phrase, to stir the whole American people into awareness of a righteous and imperative cause. It achieved that effect dramatically.

Through TV's "equal time" coverage the country could hardly have failed to note how pathetic, and foreboding, were the comments of the Southern and even some Northern Senate leaders, instinctively mouthing the same tired old nonsense about how Congress won't be intimidated and how comparatively well off American Negroes are.

The most dangerous error now would be to settle back with a sigh of relief and say, "Well, that's over." It isn't over; it has just begun. How far inside the door does crisis have to come before democracy will act to cure itself?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a thoughtful, sensitive, penetrating analysis of the civil rights march, written by Ira Kapenstein, an outstanding reporter for the Milwaukee Journal, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Civil Rights March Won't Be Forgotten—Demonstration Was Orderly, Inspiring, Deeply Saddening, Writer Says

(By Ira Kapenstein)

Washington, D.C.—The civil rights revolution engulfed the Nation's Capital Wednesday.

It was peaceful. It was orderly. It was so poignant, so dramatic that it will never be forgotten.

"We Shall Overcome," sang the marchers, some 200,000 strong. They sang with emotion, with conviction. The melody lingers on. It will reverberate for generations to come.

In a city where history is made every day, a whole new chapter was written. The greatest civil rights demonstration ever held left an indelible imprint.

It was tremendously inspiring, yet deeply saddening.

Inspiring because a people was rising up in a peaceful way to demand what they believe is due them.

DEMOCRACY AT WORK

Saddening because 100 years after the abolition of slavery hundreds of thousands of Negroes had to come to the Lincoln Memorial to demand equal rights.

It was democracy at work. The splendid success of the march on Washington was in its peacefulness. The demonstrators, black, and white, did themselves proud.

There were no riots, no ugly incidents. The marchers left Washington as they had found it—in peace.

Only the weeks and months ahead will tell whether the march accomplished its primary goal of persuading Congress to adopt strong civil rights legislation in this session. But the civil rights leaders certainly could not have hurt their cause.

The 150 Members of Congress who went to the rally—and the 385 who did not attend—could not help but be shaken by the great tidal wave that swept across Washington Wednesday.

The message was clear: It was "freedom now" and it was "pass the bill" and it was "the world is watching."

UNFORGETTABLE SCENE

The scene at the Lincoln Memorial was unforgettable. As far as the eye could see, from the top of the memorial steps, the multitude was packed together. They filled the memorial grounds so tightly that hundreds fainted and had to be carried off over the heads of other demonstrations.

They converged on either side of the Reflecting Pool, almost all the way back to the Washington Monument. They overflowed toward Constitution Avenue on one side and Independence Avenue on the other.

The demonstrators were under great physical strain. Many of them had ridden buses or trains all night. They stood for several hours on the Monument Grounds before the march began. They walked the eight-tenths of a mile to the memorial in a hushed pilgrimage. Then they stood for another 4 hours or more.

After it was all over, they went back to their buses or trains or cars for the long rides home. A few more affluent ones flew.

MAHALIA JACKSON STOPS SHOW

But it was hard to find anyone who complained. They knew that what they had set out to do had been done so well. The many weeks of tremendous preparation had paid off.

In the montage of the day's climactic events, there is one picture that stands out with clarity. It is of Mahalia Jackson.

The Negro gospel singer stopped the show. She captured the hearts of the people. She sent their spirits soaring. When she was done, the tempo of the rally had quickened so much that it was breathtaking.

Miss Jackson sang one song with such great emotion that the crowd would not let her go. She was brought back for an encore. She was given the mightiest ovation of the day.

The words of Miss Jackson's songs were hard to distinguish over the loud speaker system, but it mattered little. The rhythm, the spirit, the love came through so clearly that it brought tears to the eyes of many.

It was left to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., to bring the rally to a thundering climax. He accomplished his mission.

"I HAVE A DREAM"

When Mr. King said "I have a dream" that one day all men will be equal, the crowd dreamed with him.

They roared their consent when he told them that their job was to make come true the words from the old Negro spiritual—"Free at last. Free at last. Thank God, I'm free at last."

The march on Washington is over. Its leaders hope that the past will be the prolog of a great era for the peaceful revolutionaries.

A. Philip Randolph, the aged and scholarly Negro leader, said the demonstration had achieved its basic objective before the march even started.

It has "awakened and aroused the conscience of the Nation on the question of freedom and equality for the Negro," Randolph said.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Sheboygan Press also had a superlative editorial pointing out how admirably handled and organized was the civil rights march, and what a fine reflection it was on the people involved. I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March Was Admirably Handled

The much heralded march on Washington in behalf of the cause of equal civil rights for Negroes has come and gone and has left various reactions—mostly favorable.

From the standpoint of dramatizing the claim that many civil rights have been denied the Negro since as far back as the end of the Civil War, the gathering and parade in the Nation's Capital proved a decided success. The event brought home to the Nation that the Negro is tired of waiting any longer—he wants equal rights now. The fact that approximately 200,000 persons, including many white people of various religious faiths, were present for the occasion could not help but be impressive concerning the justice of their cause.

The manner in which the participants conducted themselves was admirable. It was a peaceful gathering with no violence and no evidence of mob spirit. It could be variously described—in its progressive stages—as resembling a church picnic, a religious revival and a political rally.

When one considers the huge mass of people attending and the fact that they were there to espouse a cause, this was indeed remarkable. This orderliness did not just happen by itself. It showed careful preparation of all participants beforehand and excellent cooperation between leaders of the march and Washington and Government officials.

In each city where groups originated to join the march, they were carefully briefed that this was to be a peaceful gathering with no violence or show of mob spirit. On the trains and buses that took them to Washington, they were given a refresher course in the same vein. That they had learned their lesson well was proved by their flawless conduct in Washington.

Prior to the day of the march, many people viewed with alarm the possibilities of such an occasion, and with reason. They realized that there is potential danger in any large gathering brought to one city from all over the United States. They feared that a minority group, not necessarily connected with the cause of the marchers, might incite mob spirit and a riot. No one could anticipate how well schooled the parade participants had been in the importance of their proper behavior while in Washington.

True, there were troublemakers present who would have liked nothing better than to incite a riot which would harm the Negro's cause. George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American Nazi Party, was there with a group, but Washington police took care of him in short order. They allowed him to conduct his own sideshow to which nobody paid any attention. When he was prevented from getting near the marchers, he finally gave up and with his small group of followers, dejectedly headed back to his Arlington, Va., headquarters. Likewise, Communists who passed out literature, received no attention from the marchers.

The effect of the demonstration on the Negro cause? What influence it may have on Congress is problematical. However, A. Philip Randolph, 74, Negro director of the march and president of the AFL-CIO Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, had this comment: "The march has already achieved its objective. It has awakened the conscience of the Nation."

It may well be that he has a strong point there. Remember, these demonstrators were not in Washington as enemies of the people or the Government or to overthrow any part of the existing Government. They were merely there to demand, in peaceful public assemblage, rights that they have been denied for 100 years.

If nothing else, the march on Washington proved that the Negro—not only the highly intelligent and intellectual, but the Negro in all walks of life—can accept responsibility. They proved that by their exemplary conduct in Washington, of which they can be justly proud.

TELEVISION'S SPLENDID CONTRIBUTION TO CIVIL RIGHTS UNDERSTANDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning in the Chicago Sun-Times, an article appeared reporting on the fact that NBC not only had a fine 3-hour documentary on civil rights last night, but also carried it at an enormous cost to NBC, because it was necessary to forgo all advertising. This is a great contribution by private enterprise to better understanding in America. Many of us have criticized the television industry for various things, but when the industry does something such as this—considering how well the documentary was done; being balanced, thoughtful, and penetrating—the industry deserves commendation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Richard Elden, entitled "TV Nets Pick Up Some Big Costs," published in the Chicago Sun-Times, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV NETS PICK UP SOME BIG COSTS

(By Richard Elden)

Sponsors decline to pick up the tab for TV's special coverage of the civil rights story. Almost all of these public affairs programs have been without sponsors.

Monday evening, for example, NBC presented its unprecedented 3-hour documentary, "The American Revolution of 1963."

Only 1 commercial minute on the primetime program was sold—to Abbott Laboratories. Since it would have been impractical to have an isolated 1-minute commercial on a 3-hour show, Abbott was asked to withdraw.

Gulf Oil, which backs many NBC "instant specials," and Bell & Howell, a consistent news and public affairs sponsor, declined to become associated with the Labor Day special.

For its public service decision to give the Nation's No. 1 problem a big play NBC lost an estimated $500,000.

Last Wednesday the network's all-out coverage of the march on Washington also went begging for a sponsor.

CBS devoted 5½ hours to the dramatic demonstration in the Capital while NBC gave it 5 hours and ABC 4 hours.

Except for the initial portion, broadcast during Calendar (CBS) and the Today Show (NBC) none of the TV coverage of the march had national sponsorship.

Another civil rights program that has been unable to find a sponsor is the current five part ABC series, "Crucial Summer." The fourth installment will be presented next Sunday from 9:30 to 10 p.m.

This virtual abandonment is not surprising, according to network officials. Documentaries are hard to sell under any circumstances.

Said one network spokesman: "Documentaries don't deliver a mass audience. Therefore it's a little bit harder to get advertisers."

However, there are signs that some of the forthcoming programs are managing to obtain sponsors.

The 1-hour ABC special on October 21, "Crisis: Behind the Presidential Commitment," will be sponsored by Xerox. And CBS Reports, a sponsored series, will devote a program to civil rights shortly after returning to the air this fall.

But nevertheless a reluctance on the part of sponsors to get involved in the civil rights controversy still exists. One trade publication comments:

"The fear of the advertiser is that the dramatic footage of the actual strife gets people riled up, in the core of their stomach, and such an experience might alienate customers and outlets of national advertisers, especially in the South."

TRIBUTE TO JOHN MICHAEL DOAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very proud of the fact that a man from Wisconsin, who is a prominent lawyer—and I concede a Republican; at least, his associations in Wisconsin have been Republican—has been a leader in the civil rights fight. He has been the representative of the Department of Justice "on the spot" more than any other member of the administration. I refer to John Michael Doar, from New Richmond, Wis. He has done an excellent job under fire again and again, at great personal risk to himself. He has probably prevented violence "on the spot" more than anyone else. He has won the support and admiration of both whites and Negroes alike under these tense circumstances.

He is so outstanding that although he is a Wisconsin native, not a New Yorker, the New York Times has featured him this morning in a biography. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UBIQUITOUS RIGHTS AID: JOHN MICHAEL DOAR

The white man was surrounded by Negroes bent on avenging the murder of Medgar W. Evers. Sidestepping bottles and rocks, he moved along Farish Street, in Jackson, Miss., urging the mob to lay down its weapons.

At the street's end, a double line of police stood ready to move in with clubs and guns. "My name is John Doar, D-o-a-r," he shouted above the curses and jeers. "I'm from the Justice Department, and anybody around here knows I stand for what is right."

The scene, the man, the dialog, could have come from the imagination of a scriptwriter. But friends of John Michael Doar insist there's nothing theatrical about the performance of the Assistant Attorney General in the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

Observers sometimes liken his manner to that of Gary Cooper, or his voice to that of James Stewart. They then add immediately that his total lack of self-consciousness and his aversion to publicity make comparisons with any actor misleading.

Yet his daily routine often sounds like a tour by a summer stock company.

"John Doar's in Birmingham," one reporter told others at dinner recently.

"No, he's in New Orleans," another said.

"No, I saw him here in Jackson," a third spoke up.

"You're all right," said a fourth. "He was in Birmingham this morning, argued a case in New Orleans this afternoon and arrived in Jackson tonight.

ACTIVE IN MEREDITH CASE

Yesterday he was in Tuskegee, Ala., where Gov. George C. Wallace delayed the opening of the public schools.

Last fall he was at the side of James H. Meredith when the Negro was turned away at the University of Mississippi by Gov. Ross R. Barnett. When Mr. Meredith finally entered Ole Miss on September 30, 1962, Mr. Doar again was there, sharing his dormitory room while a riot raged all night.

Top Negro leaders praise Mr. Doar for his honesty and his conviction. "He hears the dialog, and he understands it," one Negro leader, who has been critical of other Government officials, said.

However, Mr. Doar has detractors. Impatient young Negroes in Jackson, for example, thought his intervention with the mob was unwarranted. "What did he really accomplish?" one asked. "He got the police off the hook, that's all."

Segregationists in northern Mississippi took some pleasure in the early difficulties Mr. Doar had as he argued the Government's case in voter registration suits.

Reprimanded by one judge for failing to produce sufficient evidence, Mr. Doar has since showed up in court with stacks of affidavits and exhaustive records. "He goes in with evidence by the bale now," a court reporter said. "I'll bet that judge is sorry he opened his mouth."

Mr. Doar was born on December 3, 1921, in Minneapolis. He grew up in New Richmond, Wis., was graduated from Princeton University, and served as second lieutenant in the Army Air Corps in World War II.

After discharge from the service, he went West, graduating from the University of California's Law School at Berkeley in 1950. Explaining his choice of school, he says, "California was the best place to make a fortune."

RETURN TO WISCONSIN

When his father, also an attorney, became ill, Mr. Doar returned to New Richmond to assist him in his practice. He stayed 10 years.

In the spring of 1960, Harold Tyler, chief civil rights attorney in the Eisenhower administration, called a friend of Mr. Doar's and offered him the divsion's No. 2 spot.

Since the administration was in its final months, the other man declined but suggested Mr. Doar.

"I liked trial work, and I knew this would be tough trial work," Mr. Doar said later. "Also, I had some clear ideas about civil rights in this country. It just appealed to me."

When Robert F. Kennedy became Attorney General, he appointed Burke Marshall to replace Mr. Tyler. Mr. Doar calls Mr. Marshall "the greatest 40-year-old lawyer in the country." Although he is a Republican, Mr.

Doar stayed on his job when the Democrats came to Washington.

In the last 3 years, he handled dozens of tasks: Negro voting suits, freedom riders, and the case of the Mississippi Negro leader who had his home burned to the ground and then was charged with arson.

Mr. Doar's wife, Anne, and their four children wait for his return at their Chevy Chase home in Washington. The children are Gael, 11 years old; Michael, 7; Robert, 2; and a 3½-month-old son, John Burke.

When Mr. Doar quelled the bottle-throwing in Jackson, the baby, a month old, had no name. "We haven't had much chance to pick one," Mr. Doar explained then.

But he remembered when the child had been born.

"It was May 12," he said, "at the time of the Birmingham riot."

ADMINISTRATION'S INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX HAS MERIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in connection with a brief colloquy I had with the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] with respect to the interest equalization tax, I ask unanimous consent that a thoughtful editorial published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Securities Tax," which supports the administration proposal, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES TAX

It is a curious fact that whenever a tax is proposed, whether to raise revenue or, for example, to reduce purchases of foreign securities, witnesses invariably rise up before Congress to testify that the tax will have exactly the opposite effect. For complicated reasons, it will always reduce revenue, or it will hurt instead of help the balance of payments. Rarely, according to these witnesses, will the tax do the simple straightforward thing for which it was designed.

In the case of the proposed tax on foreign securities, there was indeed some reason to fear that the mere recommendation of such a levy would bring on a panicky outflow of funds. The conspicuous fact so far is that this has not happened. As for the long-term loss to the balance of payments from future investment income foregone, that is looking a good many years into the future. A tax on direct foreign investment, on which the return would be higher, would begin to backfire at a much earlier date, but such a tax is not proposed at this time.

The chances are that the securities tax, if enacted, will do the job it is meant to do. Few will deny that it is an unpalatable tax, at odds with liberal policies of trade and finance and ill becoming a country that is banker to the world. But the bankers who today protest it must ask themselves whether they did not bring it on themselves. There might have been a possibility of restraining the flood of new foreign issues by some informal means. Something like voluntary self-policing, or moral suasion, or a capital issues committee to schedule access to the market, might have done the job.

But any hint of such methods has always been met with the cry of "exchange control." This cry, widely repeated, would have been the signal for a large outflow of money. Some of the bankers testifying before the Ways and Means Committee now suggest that these less formal methods might have been preferable. But it was in good part their own negative attitude that blocked informal methods and brought on the tax proposal.

WISCONSIN PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY—GREAT CHANCE FOR PEOPLE TO HAVE VOICE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wisconsin Sentinel has recognized the importance of the Wisconsin primary in a significant editorial. Many powerful partisans in our State feel that the primary should not involve contenders for the Presidency. But I have felt that this was the only purpose of the presidential primary election, and that the people of America have too little voice in determining who will be the nominees of their parties. The Milwaukee Sentinel seems to share these sentiments. It carries a thoughtful editorial on the coming presidential primary in Wisconsin. We hope this primary will involve top contenders. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Useful Primary," may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USEFUL PRIMARY

The idea of a presidential primary sprung from the conviction that all voters, not just the few who are delegates to a national convention, should participate in the nomination of candidates. That idea should not be subverted by devices calculated to deprive the voters of that choice and to return the choice to the proverbial "smoke-filled room."

The presidential primary has its imperfections. There is the possibility that, in Wisconsin, a voter may cross over into the other party's primary in order to help nominate a man he considers the weaker candidate and thus to defeat the opposition's best candidate. But the risks of a large-scale crossover, with its resulting distortion of party sentiment, is far less an evil than keeping the voters out of the nomination process altogether.

The popular choice in the primaries has not always been the choice of the conventions, as in the case of the late Estes Kefauver in 1952. But, on the other hand, there is serious doubt that John F. Kennedy would be President today if he had not won the Wisconsin primary and six others in 1960. Robert A. Taft, and not Dwight D. Eisenhower, might well have been the Republican nominee in 1952 if he had swept the primaries that year. Whatever the respective merits of the popular choices, the voters of some States play a vital role in the nomination—and hence the election—of presidential candidates. To that degree, democracy was well served.

There is afoot in Wisconsin a bipartisan effort to bypass the primary through the familiar favorite son device.

On the Democratic side, there are rumored plans to have Governor Reynolds run as a stand-in candidate for President Kennedy. The President, the strategists claim, would have nothing to gain by running in a field that might be heavily populated by Republican candidates.

On the GOP side, there is a substantial movement to have Representative JOHN W. BYRNES run as a favorite son so a contest between Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, the front runners, can be avoided. The maneuver is admittedly designed to elect a slate of delegates uncommitted to any of the major candidates and to allow that slate, free from citizen influence, to dispose of its votes at the national convention as expediency demands.

It should not have to be pointed out that Reynolds, whatever his political following, is not a prospect for the presidency. Nor can it be seriously argued that BYRNES, however competent and respected, is a potential nominee. The favorite son maneuver, by either party, can only serve to deprive the voters of Wisconsin of their choice of the presidential nominees in 1964.

There are two ways to overcome this cynical disregard of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Wisconsin primary law. One is to have the real candidates, avowed or not, enter the primaries by consenting to have a slate of delegates pledged to them entered in the primary.

The second way to have a meaningful primary is to have citizens, running singly or in teams, for delegate to the national convention, uninstructed as to any candidate but with their preferences well known to the voters. Such a movement on behalf of Michigan's Gov. George Romney is now reportedly underway in Wisconsin. It is a healthy example of democracy, and one which supporters of other candidates should follow.

Wisconsin is justly proud of its presidential primary system and the opportunity it gives its voters to choose their President. We hope that the April 7 primary will offer such an opportunity.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY] about the program for tomorrow, and, insofar as he knows, for the remainder of the week.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow it is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate consider Calendar No. 434, S. 1716, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] will be present tomorrow. I am hopeful that tomorrow the Senate will finish consideration of that particular bill. If it can, the Senate will then consider the Proxmire dairy bill, Calendar No. 425, S. 1915, which is a bill to amend the Agricultural Act, as reenacted and amended, by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

On Thursday, if the Senate can complete consideration of that bill, the leadership will call up Calendar No. 449, S. 1540, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes—possibly.

I add that there is a possibility that the medical education bill may be on the calendar, judging from my discussions with the majority leader. I would want to discuss that with the minority leader, but if that were on the calendar, we might wish to have that considered. Apparently it has considerable support and will not be very controversial.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would that take long?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think so. I think we could finish by the weekend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then there is a possibility of going over on Thursday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senate can complete work on these measures by Thursday, the Senate could go over until Monday.

Next week, as the Senator knows, the Senate will have before it the treaty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Did I correctly understand that the dairy bill would be considered on Thursday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 3, 1963:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

George L. Mehren, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice John P. Duncan, Jr.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

John Morgan Davis, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Thomas C. Egan, deceased.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 3, 1963:

The nomination sent to the Senate on May 2, 1963, of Frederick R. Meier to be postmaster at Cross Plains in the State of Indiana.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

No. 2—Louisiana: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last week, I brought to the attention of this House the vast amounts that are gambled every year in the State of Maryland. I pointed out how most of these moneys support every filthy ramification of underworld activity. Today, I would like to discuss the extent of gambling in the State of Louisiana and the tremendous revenue that is made available to the crime syndicates in that State.

In 1962, the State of Louisiana had a parimutuel turnover of over $45½ million from which the State received about $2½ million. However, according to the McClellan committee, this is far from being the whole story of gambling in that State. Indeed, the mathematics of the situation would be intriguing were it not so shocking.

From the testimony taken by the McClellan committee, Mr. Speaker, it appears that 16 times as much money is wagered off the tracks as is bet on the tracks. Simple multiplication leads to the conclusion that over three-fourths of a billion dollars is wagered every year illegally on the horses alone. This figure represents less than half of the total illicit gambling in that State. Therefore, it can be well estimated that gambling in the State of Louisiana reaches the $2 billion a year mark. I wonder whether the members of the Louisiana congressional delegation are aware of this tremendous gambling activity in their State?

The director of the New Orleans Crime Commission somewhat contradicts my estimates of the amount of money gambled annually in Louisiana. His testimony before the McClellan committee indicated that only $1 billion is involved in gambling. Whether it is $1 or $2 billion, we do know that this money goes into the hands of the crime syndicates and a good portion is used to corrupt the governmental process in that State.

Mr. Speaker, all of the 77 foreign countries that operate government lotteries have found that control and regulation has not only helped solve their gambling problems but has produced much needed revenue for their treasuries. A national lottery in the United States would not only be the most effective method of undercutting illegal gambling in this country but would pump into our own Treasury $10 billion a year in additional needed revenue. Just what are we waiting for, anyway?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of August 31, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, August 31, 1963)

REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE—DO FEDERAL LAWS AFFECT YOU?

Each year thousands of legislative bills are introduced, many controversial. Some are passed, some not. Do these, can these affect you? Let's see.

A FEW OF THE ISSUES

(NOTE.—Each law (1) requires yielding some freedom, (2) costs. (Remember, figure $1 billion equals $5.30 per capita or $21.20 per family of 4).)

1. Foreign aid: $100 billion given away since World War II, including aid to Communists dedicated to enslaving you and your children. (Cost, $2,120 per family of 4.) (Yours?)
2. A Communist Cuba, with missiles that can hit Dallas. (Cost to you?)
3. Military protection: $55 billion, approximately. (Your cost?)
4. Government business operations: 700 Government corporations spending $40 billion yearly—power development, housing, construction, insurance, banking, real estate, transportation—competing with Dallas business. (Your cost?)
5. Government loans, favoritism for selected people. (What does this cost you?)
6. Trade agreements hurt Dallas competitively—other nations won't match our tariff cuts. Also, Communist labor undercuts us—costs Dallas jobs. (Cost to you?)
7. Government wage setting increases costs of doing business without regard to production increase. (Your cost?)
8. Farm subsidies increase costs of both groceries and taxes at the same time. (Cost to you?)
9. Tax changes affecting every taxpayer, concerning deductions, exemptions, rates—individuals work 2 months or more per year to pay taxes. (Your bill?)

There are many other issues.

Should your Congressman study and judiciously resolve each issue with each Dallas resident in mind, or abandon independence of judgment, "go along to get along" in hopes of not alienating congressional administration leaders, thereby attempting to bring home a larger share of "Federal bacon"?

Legislative issues are all important as Congressmen themselves see it, by the careful assignment of Members to committees and the expectation they will give committee work first priority. Pressure groups—AFL–CIO, Teamsters, farm groups, veterans, Federal workers, educational societies, professional societies, and all the others, each consider their legislative bills most important and rate a Congressman on how he votes on their particular measures. Patriotic and good government groups display the importance of issues by publishing the voting records of Congressmen and urging their reelection or defeat on the basis of those records.

Who pays the cost? The wealth? Not on your life. You do. Eighty-four percent of individual income tax comes from the brackets below $10,000 tax liability. If we took all the money from the very wealthy, we could run the Government for less than a month, so it is the great bulk of the low and middle income people who support the Government. It is up to you, then, to decide if my work on the Ways and Means Committee, the tax committee, and my struggle to hold down spending is important to you.

Most Dallas people believe the issues are the important part of a Congressman's job. Some even realize they are footing the bill, not someone else. It seems the only persons who think otherwise are those (1) who have a special interest in a particular program or project; (2) who are under political pressure because of some real or fancied indebtedness to the party in power or a key individual in government; (3) who have decided since they pay taxes, they'll try to get back all they can; (4) who never have thought about it.

WHERE DO YOU STAND?

Today's questions must be answered. They will be, with or without you. Make your presence felt. Everyone is needed. It's our problem, our country, our future. How about it?

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

Labor Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, September 2 was Labor Day. As in the past, we took particular note of this day and that which it represents. In 1882, the first celebration of Labor Day took place, as a holiday in honor of the American workingman and American industry. The advances since then, by free American labor, through the union movement, collective bargaining, and remedial legislation, are known to and enjoyed by all.

Labor, over the years, has helped to make the United States a great Republic. All of this under the free enterprise system established by our Founding Fathers. This great free enterprise system necessarily had to be fostered and maintained by those involved in its operation—labor and management. Both of these groups had successes and failures, but each continued to respect and recognize their interdependent rights and responsibilities. I believe that each kept in mind the importance of the free enterprise system to the United States.

In all of the disputes between labor and management, the parties endeavored to maintain a balance between them through the great system of collective bargaining. As a result of the settling of their differences, the outside force—the public—often suffered. But Mr. Joe Public realized the problems and knew that fairness would prevail.

The great industrial system of our Republic expanded in proportion to the growth of our Republic and, in parallel fashion, the responsibilities placed upon the system expanded. Presently, Mr. Speaker, the Nation is faced with a possible breakdown of this system by the dispute in the railroad industry. The dispute involved has been under collective bargaining negotiation for 4 long years and a nationwide railroad strike is still on the horizon.

However, due to the inability of the parties to settle their dispute and the absence of legal machinery to compel such settlement, the Congress of the United States was forced to take action. On August 28, 1963, Congress passed a resolution, which resolution follows the negotiation agreements, the tentative agreements and near agreements of the parties involved. It also follows a pattern that has been agreed to by labor and management in other instances under our labor-management procedure. This resolution will prevent the strike which threatened to rock the very foundations of our Republic. It gives ample time and procedures to management and labor to settle the item in dispute—a dispute arising from the advances of science in our age of automation.

This action by Congress was reluctantly accepted, but the responsibility was forced upon us. We now hope that management and labor will pick up the tools, apply them to the instruments furnished by Government, and continue to strengthen the free enterprise system in the new age of space.

We who have faith in America want to pass on to future generations the reasons for celebrating the great day for labor—Labor Day.

The Railroad Crisis: A Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a national disaster was averted on August 28 when the Congress acted to prevent the impending rail strike.

Major critics of the 88th Congress have joined together with one voice to sing our praises. The Washington Post in an article on Sunday last said:

> Acting in the unusual role of strike arbiter, the so-called standstill Congress has just given a surprising demonstration that it hasn't forgotten how to move fast when a national emergency threatens * * * for 3 happy days, Congress had been in business again.

Mr. Speaker, critics of this Congress may yet discover that the 88th Congress has been in business all along, and intends to perform other amazing deeds before this session is over.

However, there is one point concerning the settlement of the railroad crisis that I wish to deal with in particular. Some sources have claimed that the rules of procedure we established on August 28 tend to favor management and restrict labor. I cannot imagine how this claim can be truthfully made. It is my belief that our action was in the best interests of the entire Nation, and as such is worthy of recognition.

As proof of my contention I cite the vote cast in the other body on Senate Joint Resolution 102. Only two votes were recorded against the measure. One was cast by a Member strongly prolabor, and the other was cast by a Member known to be strongly antilabor. I believe this vote alone should silence those individuals that are attempting to confuse the public on the real questions at issue.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been a strong champion of organized labor for many years. Let us note again his remarks on the floor of the U.S. Senate on August 27.

Senator MORSE said in part:

> I repeat again what I said last night: Congress has always, as a matter of course, tended to treat railway labor differently, legislatively, than the rest of labor. Thus, we have the National Mediation Board, the Washington agreement, the boards that are established to handle the retirement funds of the railroad brotherhoods, the Chicago board that considers grievances that arise with respect to the expenditures of funds. There is a set of separate legislation for railway labor, including the Interstate Commerce Act and the Railway Labor Act of 1926.

I agree with Senator MORSE. The operation and performance of the Nation's railroads is a matter of concern to the entire country. Of necessity, railroad labor is in a separate category from other branches of the labor movement.

I believe that the Congress has acted in the best interests of both management and labor in this present dispute. For 4 years this issue has been rankling and festering within the railroad industry. Time and time again negotiations have broken down until the final impasse was reached.

I believe the railroad brotherhoods have been mainly responsible for the failure to reach agreement. They have acted irresponsibly, and with little regard for the welfare of the public.

Senator MORSE also believes the brotherhoods have been at fault. On August 27 during the same Senate debate he said:

> I received a call this morning from Oregon from a brotherhood man * * * he had been listening to the radio and listening to news reports in regard to the speech I made on the floor of the Senate last night, which to him added up to my refusal to follow the brotherhoods because of their failure in leadership for many months, and because of the great disservice that they have performed for the rank and file of the railroad workers of this country, by the adamant position they have held and their refusal to cooperate with their Government, and their refusal to adopt every proposal that the Government had made for a peaceful solution of the problem so that it would never get to the floor of the Senate.

Senator MORSE continued in stronger terms:

> The chiefs of the five operating brotherhoods must take full responsibility * * * for the adoption of the first compulsory arbitration law in the history of Congress. The rank and file of the American labor movement will understand the disservice of these political chiefs—and that is the best description I can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Senator MORSE in one respect—we did not enact a compulsory arbitration law—we enacted some rules of procedure, but in every other aspect I do agree with the Senator.

The railroads are not just the business of the carriers and the employees. The railroads are part and parcel of the entire economy. Manufacturers, growers, farmers, and others—all across the country—were helplessly facing bankruptcy because of this dispute.

The Congress had to act, and the Congress did act. I am convinced we acted wisely and well. We acted not only for the parties involved but for the entire Nation. I salute my colleagues in both Houses—when this urgent call came the people found us ready. Full honor is due the leadership of both political parties. This was truely a bipartisan action in the best American tradition.

No. 3—Massachusetts: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to point out to the Members of this House, more particularly to the members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, the vigor of gambling in that State and the extent to which crime syndicates have taken over a lucrative industry.

Of necessity, this can only be a cursory glance at Bay State betting—it would require more than a lifetime to write a biography of each bookie joint in the President's home State.

However, Mr. Speaker, the American public got a pretty good idea of illicit gambling when it was privileged, last year, to watch the filmed exposé of gambling in Boston.

Legal gambling in Massachusetts, as evidenced by the parimutuel turnover, last year, amounted to about $110 million with almost $8 million going into the State treasury. However, this represents only a small part of the story. The real big story lies in the tremendous illicit gambling that goes on in that State.

Thanks to the bluenoses and the moralist contingent, Massachusetts' share of the figure for national off-track betting, last year, came to more than $1.4 billion. This is the action that fills the horse parlors and makes the professional gamblers happy.

Still, off-track betting, as revealed by the McClellan committee, is generally figured to constitute only a little less than half of the total illegal gambling in the United States.

On the basis of these estimates, I wonder whether the Massachusetts congressional delegation realizes that gambling in their State may amount to nearly $3 billion a year. Because of Massachusetts' refusal to control and regulate gambling, it has aided and assisted the forces of organized crime to flourish in a tax free industry—all to the detriment of the State and its people.

The gambling syndicates usually profit to the extent of about 10 percent of the take which would come to almost $300 million a year. But part of it is eaten up by political overhead expenditures—such as the corruption of the processes of law enforcement and general government. This is the biggest and most important expense of the gambling rings.

The remaining gambling profits, which are the chief source of revenue for the underworld, help bankroll every form of crime known to man. This I am afraid, will continue to be true so long as gambling remains illegal and unchained. This will persist so long as government harbors illegal gambling.

Mr. Speaker, a national lottery is one potent weapon that can strike a lethal blow at organized crime in the United States and, at the same time, pump into our Government treasury over $10 billion a year in additional revenue. Is it not time that we withdrew our head from the sand?

Beware the Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Senate is considering the test ban treaty with Russia, it is highly important that all views be given ample consideration because those of us who would like to see a lessening of the tensions in the cold war do not want to accomplish this by signing a treaty which would limit the United States to World War II defensive weapons.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER's thought-provoking article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 3 follows:

BEWARE THE TEST BAN

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California)

The limited nuclear test ban is a Russian bear trap. It will help the Soviet Union and hurt the United States. It will allow the Russians to catch up in nuclear-weapons development, in which they are behind, and prevent us from catching up in areas in which they are ahead. This topsy-turvey treaty raises the ominous possibility that, in time, the Soviet Union could gain the clear-cut nuclear supremacy it needs to achieve communism's unalterable goal of world domination.

Despite serious ideological differences between Moscow and Peiping, neither has abandoned the idea that the West shall be buried. Their dispute is over how, when and how deep.

For a decade and a half America's overall nuclear superiority has deterred the Kremlin from seeking its goal quickly and explosively with nuclear weapons. Our ability to retaliate with fearsome damage to the Soviet Union has made that method too costly. Our deterrent also has curbed Russia's cold-war activities. Fears that limited wars might get out of hand and escalate to nuclear war have tempered Soviet adventurism.

America's superior nuclear arsenal has been maintained by American scientists in unrestricted competition with Russian scientists. Now the rules of competition are to be changed. All testing is to go underground. President Kennedy has said this will be a first step toward reducing world tensions, freeing us from the fear and danger of fallout, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and limiting the arms race in ways that will strengthen our security more than unrestricted testing. He has argued that it is a step toward peace well worth taking, because the terms of the treaty will allow the United States to retain its present nuclear superiority.

But will it allow us to retain superiority? Is it a step toward peace as we understand it—or as the Hungarian freedom fighters savagely were taught it?

Here is the nub of the matter and here there is room for discussion—and dissent. Power, not good intentions, rules the world. No one knows this better than the Russians. Why, after all these truculent years, have they suddenly decided there shall be a test ban agreement? What is behind Khrushchev's quick change from the frowning Russian rocket rattler of last October's Cuban crisis to the smiling Russian treaty peddler of today? Has the wolf jumped out of his skin and a lamb jumped in? Hardly. He obviously believes the pact is giving him something at the expense of the United States. Khrushchev thinks he is getting a bargain. He is.

While allowing underground testing, the treaty bans explosions in the atmosphere, underwater, or in space. For the Soviets, nothing could be better. With underground tests they can develop the kinds of small, tactical weapons that the United States has been building successfully for years. They will have the unrestricted opportunity to equal or surpass us. In the atmosphere the Russians already have made tremendous advances with strategic weapons far more powerful than any that the United States has. In 1961, when Khrushchev coolly broke the testing moratorium, Russian scientists detonated one weapon with a force of 58 megatons. It can be scaled up to a yield of 100 megatons and safely placed in Soviet arsenals without further testing. The exact yield of the biggest American weapon is a military secret, but a good bet is that the Red army calculates it at not over 30 megatons.

During the 1961 series of 31 atmospheric shots and continuing with last year's series of 49, the U.S.S.R. also made some startling advances in the development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Caught flat-footed by the sudden Soviet test resumption in September 1961, we could not get our own atmospheric series under way until April 1962. With nearly 90 tests, we made some significant advances on our own, but technical difficulties cut our high altitude experiments severely. On balance, we need to continue testing far more than the Russians. These are the reasons why:

First, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has testified that the Russians, like ourselves, are rapidly hiding their missile bases and other military installations far underground in protective cocoons of concrete. Without atmospheric testing we cannot increase the yield of our warheads. Knowing the limitation on those yields, the Russians easily can pour enough concrete to protect against them. When that is done, our retaliatory strikeback forces will be left threatening empty launching pads and invulnerable fortresses. That kind of threat against the Soviet homeland is hardly sufficient to deter the Kremlin. Nuclear war will be become more likely, not less.

Second, our nuclear deterrent will be weakened in yet another way by a ban on atmospheric testing. To pose a credible retaliatory threat, we must be strong enough to absorb a suprise Sunday punch and then rally to devastate the attacker. The enemy's nuclear attack will create weird disturbances in all unprotected electrical circuitry. Yet to strike back convincingly, millions of electrical circuits at SAC bases, in our bombers, missiles, and Polaris submarines all must work in unison and function perfectly—beginning with transmission of the command to retaliate through every step of the massive strikeback operation, right down to triggering our warheads over enemy targets. We know a good deal about nullifying these electromagnetic disturbances, but we need to know very much more. That knowledge can be learned only from atmospheric testing.

Third, the United States starts with the sobering knowledge that, if war comes, we will be on the defensive. This means we will be using defensive nuclear weapons over our own territory and that of our allies. Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," has pointed out time and again that these weapons must create little or no fallout. Otherwise we will severely hurt ourselves in our own defense. We have made a good start toward developing cleaner nuclear explosives. But we need to learn much more and, again, we need to test in the atmosphere to do the job.

Fourth, we need to test in the atmosphere to perfect the antimissile missile, the weapon that we may need desperately to preserve our nuclear deterrent. The technical problems of creating a defense against a warhead hurtling down on the United States are great. Secretary McNamara has expressed doubts that it can be done at all. However, Khrushchev, in fact, insists that the Russians have already turned the trick. "We can hit a fly in the sky," he says.

If Khrushchev's claim that his scientists have solved the technical problems is correct, then as soon as the Russian missile defense system is put into operation our nuclear deterrent will be largely nullified. Our only course of action is to develop an antimissile missile of our own. To do this, we have to test in the environment in which the weapons will be used—the atmosphere.

Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has forcefully pointed out how vital it is to test new weapons under realistic conditions. "At our peril," he has said, "we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads, and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode."

Fifth, because the treaty will be unpoliced, the Russians could make a quantum jump militarily by the trick of surprise abrogation—clandestine preparation leading up to the sudden start of tests. Last year President Kennedy himself said that an atmospheric test ban treaty would be "extremely vulnerable" without provision for "adequate inspection" guarding against secret preparation for a surprise abrogation. Although President Kennedy has promised to keep in readiness our own plans to resume testing quickly, our program is bound to sag unless it is kept alive by at least some limited atmospheric testing. This was explained by the President in 1962 before the resumption of our own tests when he said, "we cannot keep topflight scientists from concentrating on preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution.

Sixth, there is need for the United States to continue testing, because the treaty fails to rule out Soviet cheat tests either in the air or in space. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has asserted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the pact places no faith and trust in the Kremlin, and that it is self-enforcing, since the United States could easily detect any atmospheric tests by the Russians. His assertions do not square with the Atomic Energy Commission's inability to classify three sets of manifestations from the Soviet Union early in June as nonnuclear. There is no assurance they were not very low-yield or very clean air shots that released only small amounts of fission products. As to space cheating, series after series of very profitable Soviet tests in outer space could be carried on entirely without suspicion on our part.

For all these reasons, the test ban treaty helps Russia militarily. It also helps Russia psychologically and politically.

The negotiation and signing of the treaty in Moscow, together with Premier Khrushchev's role as the only participating head of state, gives Russia a credible claim to the peacemaker image. In addition, the treaty helps Khrushchev in his struggle with the Chinese. The negotiation tells both East and West that Khrushchev's book on "How To Succeed in Aggression Without Really Bombing" is still a best seller.

An ineffective treaty removes the pressure of world opinion for an effective one that would stop Russian progress as well as our own. Furthermore, an unpoliced treaty ratifies the Soviet closed-society principle and forestalls future attempts to open it up.

This treaty also hints our extreme reluctance to use nuclear weapons at all, except in a final showdown with the Soviet Union. Communist and other aggressors seem to be left free to intensify conventional attacks without fear of our calculated use of nuclear arms to block them. Stepped-up Red Korean action along the Korean armistice line already has cost U.S. casualties.

In addition, the treaty could be interpreted as preventing us from giving needed nuclear weapons to our allies. This comes at a time when our NATO allies seriously resent their inability to deter the Soviets independently should we refuse or become too weak to do so. Without the freedom to share our weapons, this estrangement will deepen. The dissolution of NATO could well result. This, for years, has been one of Khrushchev's priority objectives. The nuclear test ban, also, comes at a time when our allies in the Far East are increasingly worried that the Red Chinese will soon get nuclear weapons.

APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the test ban proposal, however, and the most difficult to argue against, is its emotional appeal. As Khrushchev knows all too well, the treaty seems to assure the worried peoples of the world that after the long years of fear everything is going to be all right. Surely the treaty must be the beginning of a thaw in the cold war. Surely, the Russians must now be ready to work for a real peace.

For Americans this line of wishful thinking could be disastrous. We could rapidly develop a false sense of security that would lead us to drop our guard. We could be emotionally pressured into more comprehensive disarmament agreements without adequate controls.

All the "first steps" sought by President Kennedy with his partial treaty could be gained through much wiser means—a simple treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union stipulating that atmospheric testing be stopped whenever certain reasonable, agreed-upon levels of fallout had been reached. These "first steps" would be substantially free from the military, psychological, and political disadvantages of the treaty at hand—which solves none of the basic conflicts between Russia and the United States. The problem of Berlin would still exist. So would Laos. So would Cuba. And there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that Americans would not continue to be killed in Korea and South Vietnam.

In such a world, the United States must keep up its nuclear guard. And the only safe way we can maintain the nuclear deterrent is by refusing to accept a Communist scheme to force us to stop testing in the atmosphere.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit by whose word man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening: Even amid all the cruel tragedies which beset Thy children on this earth, which could be so fair, may we discern the shining ascent which is leading upward to the City of God.

Set our feet, we pray Thee, with steadfast purpose day by day upon the glowing pathway of righteous duty and selfless service. In spite of suspicions, betrayals, animosities, and disillusionments, which plague the councils of men, still gird our hearts to seek peace and pursue it—a just peace that scorns all thought of expediency or appeasement of evil, that the sundered family of mankind at last may be bound by golden cords of understanding fellowship around the feet of the one God who is the Father of all.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 3, 1963, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 3, 1963, the following executive report of a committee was submitted on September 3, 1963:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session. The treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Ex. Rept. No. 3).

LIMITATIONS OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2104, TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO EXTEND TIME FOR FILING OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2104 of title 38, United

States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reports on Research and Development Procurement Actions

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the second quarter of 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Audit Report of Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Inc.

A letter from the national adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., Inc., Daytona Beach, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that corporation, for the fiscal year ended July 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1049. A bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem (Rept. No. 479).

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. I ask that the report may be printed, and the bill placed on the calendar.

I have been advised that minority views will be filed later this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that when they are filed they may be printed and may become a part of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Subsequently minority views of Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Tower were submitted on the above bill, and they were printed as part of S. Rept. No. 480.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the excise tax on lacrosse balls and sticks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2109. A bill for the relief of Col. John H. Awtry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2110. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Tarver, Charles L. Garwood, James S. Rivers, John P. Hines, and R. F. Hudgins, owners of the Cordele Hotel, of Cordele, Ga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 2111. A bill to fix the beneficial ownership of the Colorado River Indian Reservation located in the States of Arizona and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. Hartke):

S. 2112. A bill for the relief of Verra Hionis; and

S. 2113. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Athanasopoulos and his wife, Ourania Athanasopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Ribicoff):

S. 2114. A bill to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2115. A bill to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Boggs when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PERIODIC REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for periodic congressional review of future Federal grants-in-aid to the States and to local units of government. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives. I am honored that more than a quarter of the Members of the Senate have placed their names on this measure as cosponsors. This distinguished list includes Senators Mansfield, Bartlett, Bennett, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Byrd of West Virginia, Case, Clark, Dodd, Douglas, Ervin, Gruening, Hartke, Inouye, Jackson, Long of Missouri, McCarthy, McGee, McIntyre, Metcalf, Miller, Moss, Pearson, Pell, Randolph, and Ribicoff. I ask unanimous consent to have this bill lie on the table for 7 days so that other Senators may join in cosponsoring it.

The proposed legislation would implement a recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which the senior Senator from South Dakota, the senior Senator from North Carolina, and I are members.

The present bill embodies technical improvements over S. 2286, a corresponding measure introduced in the 87th Congress, mainly involving definitions of terms used in the bill.

The objective of this proposed legislation is to establish a uniform policy and procedure for review of new grant-in-aid programs which are designed to assist States or their political subdivisions in meeting recognized national needs. The bill is intended neither to encourage nor discourage the use of the Federal grant-in-aid device, but only to improve it where it is found desirable by the Congress.

The grant-in-aid has been a most useful instrument in furthering Federal-State-local collaboration. Some authorities consider it the most significant manifestation of cooperative federalism. It has been used to encourage concerted State and local action in carrying out governmental functions in the national interest. It has been designed to meet emergency problems of a critical nature, as well as to provide for long-term cooperative programs. Generally speaking, the history of grants-in-aid indicates they have done much to strengthen our Federal system of Government by increasing the effectiveness of State and local governments.

Nevertheless, as all of us know, there is a persistent tendency for such programs, once enacted, to go on and on, no matter how useful they may be, without a meaningful or consistent congressional reexamination of their effectiveness as instruments of intergovernmental cooperation. The record shows that only 14 Federal grant-in-aid programs have ever been terminated, in spite of numerous efforts in Congress to terminate or redirect particular grants. In my judgment, the failure of Congress to give continued and systematic attention to the problem helps to explain why this device is frequently the target of severe criticism. Congress ought to have a uniform policy and procedure for periodic review of grants-in-aid, not only to answer the critics, but to assure ourselves that programs we adopt are either adjusted to meet changing conditions or terminated when their original purposes have been achieved.

Under the bill, any new grant program hereafter enacted by the Congress would automatically expire at the end of 5 years unless an earlier date were specifically provided, or unless application of the act had been specifically waived, in recognition of the intent to provide continuing Federal assistance in a given program. The bill provides that the appropriate legislative committees in the Congress shall, at the end of 4 years, address themselves to the following questions:

First. The extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met.

Second. The extent to which the States or political subdivisions thereof are able to carry on such programs without further financial assistance from the United States.

Third. Whether or not any changes in the purpose or direction of the original program should be made.

The proposed legislation does not apply to existing grants, but we hope that such programs also will be assessed periodically by Congress and the executive agencies in terms of the same criteria provided in the bill. The importance of Federal grants-in-aid is beyond question. Programs that have almost quadrupled over the past 10 years and will consume over $10 billion of Federal funds during this fiscal year alone demand the continued and effective attention of Congress.

We are aware, of course, that grant programs are presently subject to general legislative oversight by the cognizant legislative committees and to annual review of budget requests by the Appropriations Committees. In addition, the executive agencies give close attention to the operation of programs for which they are held responsible.

Yet, I am certain the proposed legislation would have two salutary effects. It would strengthen the existing review machinery through a systematic and uniform policy and procedure for review and reexamination of new grant programs. It would also encourage the Congress, as well as the executive branch, to make a decision at the time new grant-in-aid programs are considered as to whether such programs should be used merely as devices to stimulate concerted State and local action, or as long-term cooperative ventures. Basically, I believe this proposed legislation would serve to strengthen the grant-in-aid approach to intergovernmental cooperation. Through systematic review and revision procedures, we would be able to strengthen the good points of grant-in-aid programs. We would also be able to redirect them to meet changing conditions and challenging new national problems, avoid disruption of such programs, and prevent the continuation of programs beyond their useful life.

This kind of legislation, in my opinion, can have far-reaching significance in improving our Federal system of government. It is the kind of bill which all Members can conscientiously support, since its basic objective is to strengthen congressional control over Federal aid programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 2114) to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is the purpose and intent of this Act to establish a uniform policy and procedure whereby programs for grant-in-aid assistance from the Federal Government to the States or to their political subdivisions which may be enacted hereafter by the Congress shall be made the subject of sufficient subsequent review by the Congress to insure that (1) the effectiveness of grants-in-aid as instruments of Federal-State-local cooperation is improved and enhanced; (2) grant programs are revised and redirected as necessary to meet new conditions arising subsequent to their original enactment; and (3) grant programs are terminated when they have substantially achieved their purpose.

EXPIRATION OF GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. Where any Act of Congress enacted in the Eighty-ninth or any subsequent Congress authorizes the making of grants-in-aid to two or more States or to political subdivisions of two or more States and no expiration date for such authority is specified by law, then the authority to make grants-in-aid by reason of such Act to States, political subdivisions, and other beneficiaries from funds not theretofore obligated shall expire on June 30 of the fifth calendar year which begins after the effective date of such Act.

COMMITTEE STUDIES OF GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Where any Act of Congress enacted in the Eighty-ninth or any subsequent Congress authorizes the making of grants-in-aid over a period of four or more years to two or more States or to political subdivisions of two or more States, then during the twelve-month period immediately preceding the date on which such authority is to expire the committees of the House and of the Senate to which legislation extending such authority would be referred shall, separately or jointly, conduct studies of the program under which such grants-in-aid are made with a view to ascertaining, among other matters of concern to the committees, the following:

(1) The extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met.

(2) The extent to which such programs can be carried on without further financial assistance from the United States.

(3) Whether or not any changes in purpose or direction of the original program should be made.

Each such committee shall report the results of its investigation and study to its respective House not later than ninety days before such authority is due to expire.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "State" means the government of a State, or any agency or instrumentality of a State.

(2) The term "political subdivision" means a local unit of government, including specifically a county, municipality, city, town, township, or a school or other special district created by or pursuant to State law.

(3) The term "grant-in-aid" means money, or property provided in lieu of money, paid or furnished by the United States under a fixed annual or aggregate authorization—

(A) to a State or political subdivision of a State; or

(B) to a beneficiary under a State-administered plan or program which is subject to approval by a Federal agency;

if such authorization either (i) requires that States or political subdivisions expend non-Federal funds as a condition for the receipt of money or property from the United States, or (ii) specifies directly, or establishes by means of a formula, the amounts which may be paid or furnished to States or political subdivisions, or the amounts to be allotted for use in each of the States by the State, political subdivisions, or other beneficiaries. The term does not include (1) shared revenues, (2) payments of taxes, (3) payments in lieu of taxes, (4) loans or repayable advances, (5) surplus property or surplus agricultural commodities furnished as such, (6) payments under research and development contracts or grants which are awarded directly and on similar terms to all qualifying organizations, whether public or private, or (7) payments to States or political subdivisions as full reimbursement for the costs incurred in paying benefits or furnishing services to persons entitled thereto under Federal laws.

CUTTING THE POTENTIAL OUTFLOW OF U.S. GOLD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures.

Mr. President, we are all aware of the balance-of-payments situation which threatens the stability of the American dollar in world money markets.

The simple fact of the matter is that as a nation we spend more dollars abroad than we get back for our goods and services. We need to take any reasonable steps to cut down on the number of dollars left abroad and thus, first, reduce the prospective drain on our supply of gold; and second, restore full faith in the dollar's good name.

I am proposing that we take one such reasonable step by making it possible for the United States to use immediately some of the foreign currencies we now own in foreign banks—currencies which have been set aside in "cigar box" fashion for specified uses. This dusty money does us little if any good. Fund reservations have been made for as much as 5 years ahead of expected need.

What I propose is a banking and bookkeeping change. It would not interfere with any U.S. programs now in effect.

But this change would improve our balance-of-payments situation by between $35 and $40 million during the next fiscal year, according to a Bureau of the Budget estimate. Approximately $75 million would actually become available for general use upon enactment of the bill I am proposing.

According to a review by the Comptroller General last October of administration and utilization of U.S-owned foreign currencies, the United States does not own excess currencies in most countries and has to spend dollars to buy them.

To quote from this review:

> These dollar expenditures could be postponed for appreciable periods if use were made of foreign currencies on hand which are earmarked for specific purposes but which are not needed currently and will not be needed in the near future for these purposes. During fiscal year 1960, the dollar outflow to France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom would have been lessened by over $150 million, and interest charges of some $4 million on the national debt could have been saved, had use been made of U.S.-owned local currencies which were kept in reserve for future expenditure. These reserves were primarily for commitments relating to the proceeds of Public Law 480 sales.

At present a Foreign Service officer has to go out and buy foreign currencies with dollars even though the United States may have thousands of the foreign unit of exchange on account in a bank of that country.

Let me sketch the background to the situation and then illustrate how the proposed bookkeeping and banking adjustment would work.

The U.S. Government acquires and expends large amounts of foreign currencies in the course of its oversea operations. Prior to World War II, U.S.-owned foreign currency, other than that purchased with dollars, was acquired only through the collection of consular fees and other relatively small items and was used to defray regular U.S. operating expenses payable in local currencies, principally those of the Department of State. Postwar foreign-aid programs have, however, generated substantial quantities of U.S.-owned foreign currencies under the terms of intergovernmental agreements.

For example, again referring to the Comptroller General's review last October, for the fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962, the Bureau of the Budget estimated the amount of foreign currencies acquired by the United States, other than by purchase with dollars, at about $1.3 billion a year. This money came primarily from sales of surplus agricultural commodities.

The dollar equivalent of U.S.-owned foreign currency was about $3.3 billion in fiscal year 1960. The Comptroller General's review states:

> It is significant to note that the larger portion of this foreign currency was concentrated in a few countries, including India, Yugoslavia, and Poland, where the aid programs are generating U.S.-owned local currencies in excess of the U.S. requirements. On the other hand, the bulk of the U.S. requirements for foreign currency are in few other countries, including Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy, where the United States has to purchase local currencies with dollars. A Bureau of the Budget presentation shows that of the $3.3 billion in foreign currencies $2.2 billion was available only for loans and grants to the foreign countries, while $1.1 billion was for U.S. uses.

In addition to sales of surplus agricultural commodities, chief sources of foreign currencies are: First, purchases with dollars; second, contributions of foreign governments under the mutual security program; and third, loan repayments.

The situation in brief, then, is this: At the same time the United States owns various quantities of foreign currencies, it must frequently spend dollars to buy additional units of these currencies to finance U.S. operations in these countries.

This practice worsens our balance-of-payments situation since it deposits additional American dollars overseas as potential drains on our gold reserve.

The plan to resolve this situation, which is covered in the few words of the bill I am introducing, would operate in the following manner.

In the case of a reserved account of U.S.-owned currencies in a foreign bank, the resident U.S. disbursing officer would be allowed to draw on the reserved fund for his current authorized uses.

The particular account drawn against would be credited with an equivalent value in dollars by the U.S. Treasury, and these dollars in turn would be credited, in the case of Public Law 480 projects, to the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation which caused the deposit of the foreign funds in the first place through sale of U.S. surplus farm products. When the time came to carry out an authorized project requiring foreign funds, available foreign currencies in the account could be used. If these were insufficient, the Treasury would authorize use of dollars to buy the needed currencies up to the total amount credited to the reserved account.

If we had a million lire in an Italian bank and the money was earmarked for an educational exchange program, for instance, the lire would simply lie there until a program was begun requiring use of the lire.

Under the change I propose, the disbursing officer attached to our Italian Embassy could draw out that money to pay authorized U.S. obligations. Whether he drew out 100,000 lire or 500,000 lire, or the whole amount, the educational exchange program in question would still be credited with 1 million lire on U.S. Treasury books. When the program needed the money, it would be provided either from lire on hand or lire purchased with dollars.

The Embassy, on the other hand, would have had its account lessened by the amount of lire spent. The net effect of this bookkeeping and banking interchange would be to use the available foreign funds and keep U.S. dollars in U.S. hands. No U.S. agency would get more money to spend from this arrangement. No agency could exceed the amount appropriated to it in dollars.

It is appropriate to refer here to a decision given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Comptroller General on March 28, 1963. The Comptroller General had been asked whether legislative language providing that certain amounts of foreign currencies be set aside or made available for purposes of carrying out special programs requires that the currencies be actually segregated and considered as committed only for such purposes. The Comptroller General said that segregation in reserved status and exclusive use for specified programs was apparently the legislative intent.

He added, and I quote:

> The evident purpose of the legislative declaration to set aside certain amounts of title I (Public Law 480) currencies for agricultural market development activities and international educational exchange activities being so clear, we do not feel warranted in approving procedural accounting devices which would operate to circumvent that purpose.

While the legislative intent at the time may have been to segregate the moneys, I am certain that those favoring the legislation in no way intended to put a strain on the U.S. balance-of-payments, a strain not in effect in 1954. The change in bookkeeping and banking procedures I am advocating, I repeat, would in no way interfere with the programs provided for in the legislation.

While the plan I have briefly outlined would work for most U.S.-owned foreign currencies, it would have to be postponed in cases where an international agreement with the country in which the currencies are to be spent requires that currencies will be used for specified purposes, since concurrence of the other country would be required.

Since January of 1960, however, executive branch policy has been to avoid any restrictions in international agreements which would limit the use of currencies accruing to the United States for its own programs.

Some idea of the complexity of the foreign currency situation is indicated by the fact that from July 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962, the United States purchased nearly $1 billion worth of foreign currencies from 104 countries.

This situation of U.S.-owned foreign currencies moldering at the same time that we freshen our supply of the same currencies with U.S. dollars has interested me for some time. I was glad to see the administration move to do something about it by including a general provision for greater use of U.S.-owned foreign moneys in the fiscal 1964 budget. This general provision would apply only to the 1964 budget, however, and I believe the banking and bookkeeping improvement should be made permanent so that from now on we realize the greatest possible benefit from foreign funds we own.

The bookkeeping and banking change I am advocating has the endorsement, in principle, of the Treasury, State, and Agriculture Departments, as well as the Comptroller General and Director of the Budget.

Enactment of this bill would be a definite help to our balance-of-payments situation. We cannot afford to overlook any reasonable means to correct the very serious problem, and the change I am advocating deserves immediate consideration because it is relatively easy to make and would not dislocate U.S. programs or our relations with other countries. I strongly urge that the appropriate committee act upon it as soon as possible. Until a change is made we will continue to have idle foreign moneys on our hands, and the $35 to $40 million improvement in our balance-of-payments situation will not be realized.

In order to emphasize the acute nature of the overall credit condition influenced by our gold outflow, I would like to have reprinted at this point in the Record a summary of the situation by J. A. Livingston, financial editor of the Philadelphia Bulletin.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gold Loss Becomes "Force Majeure" in President's Economic Decisions

(By J. A. Livingston)

Bond yields up, stock yields down.

That's the latest politicoeconomic message tapped out in Wall Street. The opening paragraph of the July Federal Reserve Bulletin helps explain it:

"As the first half of 1963 unfolded, domestic prospects brightened. Yet the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments persisted. These economic developments * * * suggested a need for a modification of current monetary policy."

And President Kennedy, in his latest press conference, updated that explanation. He said that the state of the economy is good but that the balance-of-payments problem is delicate. Hence, the contrary tendencies in Wall Street—bond yields up, stock yields down.

During periods of prosperity, as now, investors and speculators are hopeful. They count on a stream of higher earnings and dividends. Common stocks gain favor. Expectations rise.

And so stocks have pushed within striking distance of the bull-market highs reached several months before the Blue Monday crash of May, 1962. Correspondingly, yields on industrial shares have declined to about 3 percent, not much above the alltime low of 2.8 percent in December 1961. Bonds have moved in the opposite direction.

PRICE OF MONEY RISES

In shifting from a policy of positive ease to moderate ease, the Reserve Board has reined in the lending power of banks. Instead of encouraging loans and investments, the Reserve Board has forced banks to borrow at the discount window.

Collaterally, the price of money to borrowers—including the Treasury—has gone up. In the last year, yields on 3-month Treasury bills have risen from about 2.6 to 3 percent. And the higher cost of money gradually extended—though less markedly—to corporate bonds. To underline and reinforce its money policy, the Reserve System raised its discount rate. Commercial banks now pay 4 percent to borrow from Federal Reserve banks.

What a change. U.S. commercial banks used to pay the cheapest price to borrow from the central bank. Now, they pay more than banks in Switzerland (2 percent), Holland (3.5 percent), France (3.5 percent), Germany (3 percent), and the same as banks in Belgium, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Canada.

WATCHING THE GOLD SUPPLY

The balance-of-payments deficit has become—for President Kennedy—a "force majeure," something he can't ignore. As a candidate for office, he promised low interest rates to stimulate economic expansion. Now, he must modulate domestic decisions to the gold supply, which has fallen from a high of $24,771 million in August 1949 to $15,583 million.

Protection of the dollar is not the sole reason for higher interest rates and tighter money. Maybe lenders are getting too carefree. Not so long ago, in a statement to the House Committee on Banking and Currency, William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said: "I am impressed with the indications that credit quality has deteriorated."

And the lead article of the August Business Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia features a Shakespearean title: "The Quality of Credit—Is It Strained?" and echoes Martin's sentiment: "The evidence suggests some deterioration in the quality of credit."

The Review notes that three out of five bank examiners have the impression that State member banks accept risks more marginal than several years ago and are less insistent on debt reductions and cleanups.

UNDER COVER OF INFLATION

Yet, here's a paradox. Money continues plentiful. Big increases in time deposits have impelled savings banks, savings and loan associations, and commercial banks to look for loans. As a result, it is not uncommon for conventional mortgages in many parts of the country to be placed at 5¾ percent. Three years ago 6 percent was uniform.

Automobile loans have lengthened in time and payments have been minimized. But personal incomes have risen. Result: Installment delinquencies in general have been moderate, according to the records of the American Bankers Association.

Yet, home foreclosures are at an alltime high. This is partly because more homes are built every year and mortgages are created. But deterioration also has taken place. The foreclosure rate is now above 4 per 1,000. Three years ago it was less than 3 per 1,000.

The deterioration might even be more pronounced if real estate weren't still in a bull market. Prices of existing homes continue to advance. This means that a hard-pressed owner, threatened with foreclosure, can often sell out—and at a profit.

We must ask this question: Is inflation concealing strain underneath?

Mr. BOGGS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2115) to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures, introduced by Mr. BOGGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency of the Government may be used by Federal agencies for any authorized purpose, except (1) that reimbursement shall be made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned, and (2) that any foreign currencies so used shall be replaced when needed for the purpose for which originally reserved or set aside.

PEACE BOND BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the United Nations peace bond bill, S. 1171.

The United Nations peace bond bill is designed to permit individual American citizens to demonstrate their faith in the United Nations and their support for its peacekeeping activities in a concrete and meaningful way by investing in specially designated bonds to be issued by the U.S. Treasury. The proceeds of the sale of these "peace bonds" are to be available to the President of the United States, to be used by him from time to time in support of the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations.

The peace bond bill was originally introduced by me in the 87th Congress, on February 7, 1962. Thereafter a hearing was held on July 12, 1962, at which the Department of State expressed its warm endorsement of this legislation. Testimony in support of the bill was also given by representatives of the United Auto Workers, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the American Association for the United Nations, and the American Veterans Committee. The bill, however, was not reported out of committee, and died with the close of the 87th Congress.

On March 21 of this year, I introduced an improved version of the United Nations peace bond bill, which incorporated certain changes based on suggestions made in the course of the hearing on the prior bill. Six other Senators joined me as cosponsors of the new bill.

The process of refining and improving this bill has continued, and I have been privileged to receive very helpful advice from high officials and experts in the Treasury Department. The amendment which I now offer contains further changes based upon their recommendations.

There are three principal changes embodied in this amendment:

First, interest rates: The amendment provides that interest rates on United Nations peace bonds shall be lower than interest rates on U.S. savings bonds by at least one-half of 1 percent. Although the prior version provided that the interest yields should be the same, it was never intended to have the peace bonds compete with regular Government savings bonds for the American investor's dollar.

This provision makes it plain that they are not in competition. Those who wish to demonstrate their support for the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations in a tangible and meaningful way by investing in peace bonds would have to forgo the additional interest obtainable by investing in U.S. savings bonds. The market for savings bonds should not in any way be diminished by the availability of peace bonds.

Second, redeemability: The prior version of the bill provided that peace bonds would be redeemable at any time. This sentence has been deleted by the amendment. It is contemplated that for a relatively short period, to be determined administratively by the Treasury Department—on the order of 2 years—the bonds shall not be redeemable. This change is entirely consistent with the fundamental purpose of the bill. Peace bonds are not meant to serve as a substitute for U.S. savings bonds, and do not require the same degree of liquidity. A peace bond investment is not a commerical investment; it is an expression of faith and support, and ought not to be made out of funds which may be needed in family emergencies.

Third, promotion and sale: Peace bonds should not be advertised and promoted at Government expense, and the amendment makes this prohibition explicit. The costs of such promotional activities can and should be borne by those nongovernmental groups and associations which have as their objectives the strengthening of the United Nations and the furtherance of its peacekeeping activities.

The Federal Government should cooperate, however, to the extent of making United Nations peace bonds available to the public through the same market channels which handle U.S. savings bonds, to the extent practicable. It is not expected that all or even a great majority of the more than 15,000 banks, savings and loans, and other outlets for savings bonds will also sell peace bonds. But enough outlets should be provided to make it reasonably convenient for one to purchase peace bonds anywhere in the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and joint resolution:

Authority of August 28, 1963:

S. 2103. A bill to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of August 27, 1963:

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week": Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PASTORE.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALTER E. CRAIG TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, September 12, 1963, at 10 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Walter E. Craig, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge, district of Arizona, vice Arthur M. Davis, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GRUENING:

Excerpts from remarks by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH at Hager reunion, Boone County, W. Va., on August 25, relating to the objectives of the Soviet Union.

GOVERNOR WALLACE OF ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning there appears in the Washington Post a penetrating, courageous, and sound editorial that needed to be written and published. It is entitled "Malicious Mischief." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALICIOUS MISCHIEF

The American people are quite familiar with the antics of Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, and they could not have been much surprised when he sent State troopers to Tuskegee to block the opening of Macon County's only white school on an integrated basis. At the University of Alabama in June the Governor had demonstrated his capacity for mischief. At that time, however, some were willing to interpret his vain stand "in the schoolhouse door" as misguided devotion to the policies of the Old South. Now, however, it seems obvious that he is merely playing a game that is related more to his own political future than to anything else.

The maneuver at Tuskegee was especially disgraceful because it upset desegregation plans over which there was little controversy. A Federal court had ordered the high school at Tuskegee to desegregate. The school board was not only ready to comply; it voted to reopen classes in defiance of the Governor's order. The little tyrant of Alabama thereupon sent his troopers to Tuskegee to forbid the entrance of all students and all teachers to the school. This kind of conduct is especially farcical because of the Governor's persistent harping on the importance of local control of the schools.

There was scarcely a pretense of using the State's police power to maintain order. Rather, Governor Wallace's action amounts to flagrant use of troopers in defiance of law and order. Apparently the Governor is determined to follow a similar course in Birmingham. No one could seriously suppose that this kind of official mobocracy will prevent the desegregation of public schools in Alabama, and Governor Wallace probably has no such expectations. Rather he seems to be chiefly interested in dramatizing himself as a victim of a Federal crackdown in the hope that he may win a presidential nomination of a segregation ticket in 1964.

What he is really demonstrating, however, is a kind of ineptness which recommends him only for oblivion. It would be inconceivable to trust larger power in the hands of a demagog who uses it so recklessly. The administration in Washington is naturally reluctant to accommodate the Governor by sending Federal marshals or troops into Alabama to undo the effects of his petty tyrannies. At the moment one must hope that the people of Alabama themselves will repudiate this despicable form of politicking.

The Governor's conflict with his own attorney general, the Macon County School Board and the local authorities in Tuskegee suggests that the ferment of public disgust is beginning to work. It will be a happy day for the whole country when this sense of outrage becomes strong enough to retire all the George Wallaces to private life.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this editorial pays its just disrespects to the Governor of the State of Alabama, who is a disgrace to the great office he holds. I am satisfied that he does not represent truly the State of Alabama, which is really a great State. In my part of the country he would properly be described by the use of the slang word "punk." In his attempts to deny constitutional rights to the colored people of Alabama, his legal tactics are those of a shyster. I am satisfied that this man, who has clothed with infamy the governorship of the State of Alabama, and who seeks to discolor the great history of this Republic, based upon the constitutional rights of all its people—including the black, the brown, the red, and the white—will stand in the pages of history of Alabama and in the pages of the history of this Nation a complete disgrace.

This morning he is answered by an Alabaman whose letter is published in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the editor of the Post, written by Eddie H. Livingston, of Dothan, Ala., which is his answer to Governor Wallace of Alabama, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE AND THE UNION

I am an Alabama white man, born and raised in southeast Alabama. I know the South as well as anyone. I know that Governor Wallace does not represent the moderate white people in the South. He speaks only for himself and his violent red-neck followers. Wallace is 100 years behind the times. He speaks of the "sovereign State of Alabama." There is no such thing. The Civil War ended what was loosely known as a confederation of sovereign States.

Today we have a sovereign Nation consisting of 50 States. Governor Wallace ought to learn the difference. He must not forget that the South lost the war. Slavery was just one issue, or more aptly, the excuse, for the Civil War. The main issue of the Civil War was to keep this Nation from drifting into the feudal state of Europe with its destructive system of a confederation of sovereign States.

Already the bickering between the several States had almost caused war between States. Lincoln and other statesmen knew the situation had to be corrected. Hence the slavery issue. Lincoln was trying to save the Union, as he so plainly said.

The southern cause was greatly damaged in the Civil War, simply because the national Confederate government had no authority over the several southern sovereign States.

The issue today is union. Governor Wallace and his kind would destroy our Nation in the cheap guise of States rights. The oath of office Wallace took, to become Governor, pledged his allegiance first to the Union, then Alabama. Wallace shamefully violates that oath every time he slurs, smears, slanders, and curses the United States of America.

The Union must be preserved. I am hopeful for the Union.

EDDIE H. LIVINGSTON.

DOTHAN, ALA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the beginning of his letter, Mr. Livingston states:

> I am an Alabama white man, born and raised in southeast Alabama. I know the South as well as anyone. I know that Governor Wallace does not represent the moderate white people in the South. He speaks only for himself and his violent red-neck followers. Wallace is 100 years behind the times. He speaks of the "sovereign State of Alabama." There is no such thing. The Civil War ended what was loosely known as a confederation of sovereign States.

At the close of his letter, he states:

> The issue today is union. Governor Wallace and his kind would destroy our Nation in the cheap guise of States rights. The oath of office Wallace took, to become Governor, pledged his allegiance first to the Union, then Alabama. Wallace shamefully violates that oath every time he slurs, smears, slanders, and curses the United States of America.

I congratulate Mr. Livingston, because I think he represents the new voice of the South. In Alabama there are tens of thousands of wonderful citizens who recognize that the time has come for the bigots, such as their Governor, to recognize that, after all, constitutional rights will prevail.

I close by stating that, in my judgment, whatever powers of the Federal Government must be used in order to preserve the Constitution everywhere in the Nation, including Alabama, should be used to save the Union.

LET THE PUBLIC KNOW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for a number of years, I have been concerned over the fact that certain officers in the Pentagon habitually mark "top secret" or "secret" various and diverse documents which is no way warrant those classifications. Many times I have received a sealed envelope, inside of which I would find another sealed envelope marked "top secret." Finally, after extracting from the outside sealed envelope the inner envelope marked "top secret," and after removing from the latter the material it contained, I would find that it dealt with information I had either read in the newspapers several days previously or which radio commentators had been discussing for perhaps a week.

In connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty and, in fact, in connection with all matters pertaining to the defense of our country, I feel very strongly that at all times Senators should receive—as they do—all information available to the President and to other leading officials of the executive branch of the Government. We know that any information pertaining to the defenses within the Soviet Union or the distribution of their weapons or missiles should not be publicly disclosed, if to do so might endanger our national security or the lives of some of our agents overseas or reveal the identity of our informers. Of course, such information should be kept highly secret. Also, much of the material marked "top secret" and much of the material which is highly classified by officials in the Pentagon should be carefully screened, of course, for no one wishes to divulge information which could be helpful, either directly or indirectly, to the Soviet Union. Beyond that, we should overcome the tendency in the Pentagon to keep from the American people facts they are entitled to know. The silly nonsense of indiscriminately marking documents "top secret" should be done away with forthwith. Much of the testimony—in fact, practically all of it—regarding the limited test ban treaty should be made public.

Mr. President, I urge that Congress immediately take steps to require that all information in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty or in connection with any other matter, be made available to the American people if its publication would not actually endanger the national security. All of this information—much of which is now regarded "top secret"—should be made available to the public. To do so would not be at all harmful to the Nation. The people of the United States are entitled to be as adequately informed as possible on the many serious problems faced by their country.

WANTED—A PERMANENT DIRECTOR FOR THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION'S MEDICAL BUREAU

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent editorial detailing the urgency of the selection and appointment of a permanent Director for the Food and Drug Administration's Medical Bureau appeared in the August 5, 1963, issue of Drug Trade News.

Editor Louis E. Kazin of the Drug Trade News tells me that his publication strongly feels:

> That the selection and appointment of a permanent Director for the FDA's Medical Bureau must get immediate action.

In the editorial the newspaper states:

> We've delayed too long already in obtaining such a man. It's difficult to believe that no single person in our country can meet the demands of the assignment.

Later the editorial comment suggests:

> Already, there are distressing indications throughout the country of a slowdown in the introduction of new drugs. And, at the same time, reports from Washington indicate that some persons in the Medical Division of FDA are calling for data and setting up restrictions which will not necessarily contribute to public safety, but will certainly deprive the general public of vital research activities.

Mr. President, such reports are ominous bellringers. They portend no good for the public.

I share the editor's conclusion that:

> We just can't believe that there isn't a single person available with the necessary qualifications.

The time for action is long overdue. I urge Commissioner George Larrick of the FDA to end this crisis promptly because its solution is vital to the health and welfare of this Nation and its people.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial to which I have made reference, entitled "The Need for an FDA Medical Director Is Pressing, Vital, and Immediate," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Need for an FDA Medical Director Is Pressing, Vital, and Immediate

We believe that it is necessary for our industry, Congress and Government officials to develop an all-out effort aimed at finding and appointing a permanent director for the Food and Drug Administration's Medical Bureau as soon as possible.

We recognize, of course, the difficulties involved in obtaining the services of a physician with sufficient stature, experience and capabilities to adminster this highly important and burgeoning department which, since the passage of the Drug Amendments of 1962, has taken on a high degree of significance not only for the industry and professional groups involved, but the general public as well.

Congress has provided the FDA with funds to expand the personnel of the medical division. And this it is doing. On the other hand, there is still no permanent director.

Although physicians now in the service of FDA may be highly capable and fully qualified for their particular assignment, it should be apparent to all that leadership is necessary.

Commissioner Larrick has done and is doing a splendid job of adjusting the members of his staff to their increased responsibilities. But he cannot do it alone. The position of medical director is one of extreme importance. It demands a man whose professional qualifications are above reproach.

On the other hand, such an individual must also be concerned with an ever-increasing amount of medical and scientific knowledge. Vast horizons await him. Even though he will be able to call on any number of fully qualified assistants, the guidelines, especially in interpretive areas, will be his to draw.

We have delayed too long already in obtaining such a man. It is difficult to believe that no single person in our country can meet the demands of this assignment.

Admittedly, his position will be an uneasy one. Even if he has all the qualifications, then "rigid, bureaucratic thinking," or the possibility that he will be restricted in the intelligent administration of such a department, will cause many a man to shy away from the job.

On the other hand, those entrusted with the responsibility of finding the right person for this position must avoid judging such a man in terms of social and political considerations—and there is some indication that these philosophies are playing an important role in evaluating the worth of a candidate for the job.

He will, of course, be required to conduct his departmental affairs within the limits of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

On the other hand, no competent, scientifically trained person, having long experience in medical affairs, should approach this job in terms of a strict "adherence to the letter of the law" concept.

He obviously will not be able to ignore changes in the basic act which have given him increased powers and assigned a vast and increasing number of responsibilities to the Medical Bureau. But laws in themselves can never provide all the protection the general public needs with respect to the introduction and continued use of new drugs.

Already, there are distressing indications throughout the country of a "slowdown" in the introduction of new drugs. And, at the same time, reports from Washington indicate that some persons in the medical division of FDA are calling for data and setting up restrictions which will not necessarily contribute to public safety, but will certainly deprive the general public of vital research activities.

As we go back and forth over the situation, it becomes obvious that the medical director will need to be a man of strength, in terms both of his relationships with Congress, and with his associates.

Do all these problems and qualifications call for a paragon? Well, frankly, we don't believe such a paragon is necessary. No man can be all things to all people.

If Congress, or those at decisionmaking levels, are going to insist that such a person submerge his medical knowledge and disciplines and make political and sociological ideologies of paramount importance, then we can expect the search to go on for some time. If a "compromise candidate" is chosen, the problems he will face will be endless.

No physician should need to be politically acceptable. In fact, we were greatly puzzled when a candidate recommended by Mr. Larrick was labeled "too controversial" for the job. The truth of the matter is that this will be a highly controversial assignment. However, "incompetency" and "controversial" do not necessarily go hand in hand.

The new director will be dealing with a large number of medical men. And doctors don't always agree. In fact, disagreement and controversy at a constructive level might well lead to the best possible solution in a given case.

As a suggestion, one might consider the dean of a medical school reaching retirement age. Here, monetary aspects would not necessarily be the deciding factor.

Such an individual could render an outstanding service to both industry and the FDA, by organizing and setting up a blueprint for future action.

Because of his age and position, he would be less apt to fall subject to pressures not concerned with medicine.

We don't believe that the general public, the medical profession and our industry can afford to wait this thing out ad infinitum. It might be well to let Congress know that such delaying tactics can be highly destructive to the health and welfare of our citizenry.

We just can't believe that there isn't a single person available with the necessary qualifications.

DANGER OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION—INTERVIEW WITH J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, has earned his Nation's gratitude for his role in the battle against Communist subversion. Not only has he performed a valuable service in the enforcement of our laws in this field, but he has made a major contribution by calling attention to the methods by which our enemies seek to undermine and destroy us.

Thus it is that when Mr. Hoover speaks out on the subject, the whole Nation listens with respect.

A recent warning by him that the battle-hardened members of the Communist Party in America constitute a soft spot in our national security, deserves the careful attention of all Americans.

The warning was made in an interview with Jack Lotto and appears in the August 24 issue of the New York Journal-American. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER WARNS—BEWARE OF RED DECEPTION

(By Jack Lotto)

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover warned today that the U.S. Communist Party is a danger to the country and its "battle-hardened" members are a "soft spot" in our national security.

He said that despite its current public claims of poverty, the Communist Party is well financed, disciplined, and organized. The party, Mr. Hoover stated, is deliberately giving the impression of being a weak, inactive organization of no significance, which is allegedly being "harassed" by the FBI.

"To say that communism is not a danger in the United States today," Mr. Hoover said in an exclusive interview for the New York Journal-American, "is to help this party strategy."

He added: "Part of the Communist strategy today is to make it appear that the party is weak and is being harassed by the FBI and congressional investigating committees. The Communists like to pose as 'martyrs' and secure the assistance of unthinking sympathizers. There is nothing the Communists would like more than to be accepted as respected citizens who are considered thoroughly loyal and working in the best interests of America. Party leaders spend great effort in trying to create a false image of respectability."

Mr. Hoover said some 165 Red fronts are under investigation and FBI agents have burrowed deep into the Communist Party to gain "vital intelligence information." The number of informants, the FBI chief declared, "is proportionately small to the total party membership."

Mr. Hoover's answer was in response to questions about what appears to be a concerted current propaganda pitch to the effect that the U.S. Communist Party is a weak, inactive and debilitated party of no significance.

Interwoven in this propaganda is the theme that the FBI shouldn't waste its time and the taxpayers' money to investigate this subversive conspiracy. Further, the propaganda from Communist, pro-Communist and "ultraliberal" writers asserts that FBI agents seem to make up most of the party membership, and there should be an investigation of FBI methods of combating subversion.

This writer asked Mr. Hoover: "In your opinion, what is the current extent of Communist Party activity and menace in the United States, how does the FBI meet the vital task of keeping informed on Communist activities above ground and underground, and how many suspected Red fronts are in existence or under investigation?"

The FBI Chief responded: "As long as 10,000 hardcore Communists exist in the United States, they represent a 'soft spot' in our national security which can be exploited by world Communist leaders.

"Conditioning in Marxism-Leninism creates a favorable attitude of an individual toward world communism. Hence, membership in the party does much to make the person amenable to possible espionage activity for the Reds. Not that the member is a spy today, but later, if asked, he will be ready to respond.

"FBI PENETRATION, FACTS AND FANCY

"The FBI does have informants deep inside the Communist Party. These are necessary for the FBI to gain vital intelligence information. However, claims that the party is composed chiefly of FBI informants and supported by FBI funds are absolutely wrong. The Bureau, of course, cannot, for obvious reasons, identify the exact number of informants. However, it is proportionately small to the total party membership.

"The FBI is currently investigating some 165 known or suspected Communist front or infiltrated organizations. Inasmuch as the party is under Government prosecution, it is making widespread use of fronts. The fronts provide needed funds, propaganda platforms, springboards to reach non-Communists, and a convenient cover for various party activities.

"The party currently is in no shortage of funds. Even though publicly claiming to be in debt, the party still operates the Worker in New York City and finances other publications. The Communists have poured thousands of dollars into legal defenses, yet they have money to finance trips by their leaders and to carry out a nationwide program."

Mr. Hoover continued: "The party now has an aggressive campaign of propaganda and agitation. For example, in the past 2 years, top level party leaders have made some 90 appearances on college and university campuses. They have drawn large audiences; in fact, as high as 12,000 for one speech. In these appearances they spew the party line, hoping to recruit students, influence educational opinion and create as much dissension as possible on the campus. In some instances, school officials, recognizing the danger involved, denied party leaders permission to speak. The Communists exploited these incidents, crying that freedom of speech had been denied, and thriving on the resultant school and community agitation.

"CALLS MEMBERS TOUGH, FANATICAL

"The Communist Party, USA, is composed today of hard-core, fanatical members. During World War II, party membership reached some 80,000, but this consisted of many opportunists, self-seekers and curiosity-minded people. To join the party was very easy—the potential member need only walk into party headquarters and join.

"Today, the situation is changed. The party is extra security conscious. No longer is it fashionable to be pro-Russian. If a member joins the party today he risks his job, his reputation, his social standing. The easy joiners have now left the party, leaving a residue of bigoted fanatics. This explains to a large extent the drop in party membership. Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, has estimated party membership at some 10,000. The party prefers to remain small, developing mass strength through front groups it controls.

"The party organization is today tight, well organized, and disciplined. For some years party leaders were underground, where they learned Leninist principles of organization. Officials lived in hideouts, changed their physical makeups, used aliases. This provided conspiratorial training and a knowledge of subversive deceit.

Moreover, Government prosecution (both under the Smith Act and the Internal Security Act of 1950) has caused a hardening of party spirit. The Communists today are not soft or weak—but battle-hardened members who know what communism means and how to carry out its directives."

OPPOSITION TO PREJUDICE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the able director of the Michigan regional office of the Anti-Defamation League, Sol I. Littman, wrote a story which appeared in the ADL Bulletin of June 1963.

It is a true story. Michigan is the setting. Prejudice is described. The article also describes the courage of live heroes, Joseph Megdell and Will Roberts. The story has a happy ending, even though the existence of the prejudice described is regrettable.

I hope this story is read by my colleagues and by people across this country, for it has a timely and important message.

It is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I REFUSE TO CATER TO PREJUDICE": JOSEPH MEGDELL SHOWS FLINT THAT STICKING TO PRINCIPLE IS GOOD BUSINESS

(By Sol I. Littman)

Taking chances comes naturally to Joseph Megdell of Flint, Mich. So too does fighting for human rights.

"Thirteen years ago, Will Roberts and I scraped together $6,000 to open our first store in Flint. Neither of us had any retailing experience. We couldn't afford help, so we started the first self-service store in the area.

"We hired our first two employees within the year. We didn't realize it, but we were setting another precedent in the Flint area—one of the first two salespeople was a Negro. Now we have approximately 600 employees, and an office staff of close to 50. Negroes hold many of our most important positions, and they make up about one-half of our clerical and sales staff."

Today, Megdell and Roberts Yankee Stores is the second largest retail firm in the Flint area.

"It is no longer news that sticking to principle is also good business," Megdell said. "My private secretary ranks second to none. I'm lucky because the discriminatory employment policy in this community brought her to work for me. She is qualified to be secretary to the president of General Motors."

Yankee Stores now have 6 outlets in the Flint area and 14 in Michigan. One would expect Megdell and Roberts to have grown more cautious in order to protect their investment. But they haven't.

Three years ago, the mayor of Flint attempted to set up a human rights commission to deal with some of the interracial problems that confront this northern industrial community. The mayor approached a number of community leaders to chair the new commission. None would accept. Finally, he came to Joe Megdell. Joe knew the pressure exerted on community leaders to reject the post, but he felt Flint needed a human rights commission badly. He accepted.

The commission held only one meeting. The community's realtors feared the commission might pave the way for an open occupancy housing ordinance. It was decided to hold a referendum on the commission. There was a record turnout on election day. The commission was defeated by a vote of almost 8 to 1.

"The moderates didn't vote—as usual," Megdell commented wryly.

Flint, with a population of 200,000, has one of the toughest problems in intergroup relations in Michigan. The city is almost entirely dedicated to the manufacture of automobiles, and like other cities based on the auto industry, it has large numbers of southerners, both white and Negro. Outside the factory walls, there is little communication between the races. The political undercurrents are treacherous, and radical right groups have always found plenty of recruits in Flint.

The race question is not the only one to disturb Genesee County, where Flint is situated. The community's 900 Jewish families are aware that they are barred from the Downtown Club and from almost all of the golf and country clubs. The Atlas Valley Country Club is the only one in the area which permits Jewish membership—but under a strict quota.

"You have to wait your turn. One Jewish member has to die before another Jew is admitted," declared Megdell. "I accepted a position on the board of directors. I hoped I could influence a change in policy. But I was just kidding myself. I resigned in 1959 as a protest against the quota."

Some people were unhappy about Megdell's making an issue of social discrimination. But he refused to demean himself or his religion by remaining a party to the quota system.

His partner, Will Roberts, stands alongside Joe Megdell in all his battles. Joe Megdell is 49, married, and has three children.

Early in 1963, the two partners initiated plans to open another Yankee Store, this one in Oswosso, Mich., 60 miles north of Detroit. Construction was already underway when Megdell was visited by a member of the local chamber of commerce. After welcoming Megdell to this community of 17,000, the visitor suggested that Yankee Stores follow "local custom" in its hiring practices. He pointed out that there were no Negroes living in Oswosso and there would be local resistance to hiring them.

Megdell's reply was abrupt. He stopped construction and announced that Oswosso would have to do without a Yankee Store.

"We just aren't going to have one policy in Flint and another in Oswosso 25 miles away," Megdell said. "We aren't in business to cater to people's prejudices."

Megdell has also fought the radical right. Last October, small green, white and pink cards were found concealed in merchandise in some of the Yankee Stores. They bore the sarcastic message: "Always buy your Communist imports in Yankee Stores."

Megdell was not surprised. The month before he had received a letter from a so-called Committee To Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene. The CWACMLBS had spot-checked his stores for merchandise manufactured in Communist countries. The letter was signed by a young factory worker at the A–C Spark Plug Division of General Motors who, according to the Detroit Free News, was a member of the John Birch Society.

When the "card party" hit him, Megdell knew he was pretty much alone. Some 18 stores in the Flint area had agreed to stop selling items from behind the Iron Curtain. Megdell knew that some of the major chains—Arlan's, Sears, Roebuck, Kresge—were planning to remove dog baskets from Czechoslovakia and hatracks from Poland rather than risk radical right boycott.

But Joe Megdell also knew that trade with certain Iron Curtain countries was being sanctioned by the U.S. State Department. "This Government welcomes the expansion of contacts which flows from increased trade in peaceful goods with Eastern Europe," a State Department spokesman had made clear. And Megdell refused to be intimidated.

"In a nutshell," Megdell said, "I told them to go to hell. I object to anybody walking up to a legitimate businessman and telling him what merchandise to carry and what not to carry. As long as we operate within the law, and according to State Department policy, we are not going to be afraid just because some punks threaten us with boycott. My stores carry less than 1 percent of their stock in Communist-made imports.

"I told my store managers that when they come in to distribute those cards, to throw them out."

Again, the Flint community looked in wonder at Joe Megdell to see how he would make out this time.

There were six or seven card parties in Yankee Stores after that. But they did not work—Joe Megdell refused to be cowed. The Committee To Warn of the Arrival, etc., took to distributing pamphlets door to door, urging people to boycott Yankee Stores. Megdell got dozens of phone calls from people who had gotten pamphlets. All of them urged Yankee Stores not to give in.

How did the radical right pressure affect business?

"Retail sales in the Flint area have been way down generally in the last quarter," Megdell said seriously. Then, smiling, "Except for Yankee Stores, that is. Our volume is way up."

TEXAS STATE BUILDING AND TRADES COUNCIL IN ANNUAL CONVENTION ENDORSES GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas State Building and Construction Trades Council in their 24th annual convention held in Houston, Tex., adopted a resolution expressing their enthusiastic endorsement of S. 5, the cold war GI bill.

A copy of this resolution has been telegraphed to each Member of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX.,
August 26, 1963.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The following resolution was passed at the 24th Annual Convention of the Texas State Building and Construction Trades Council:

"Whereas S. 5, the GI bill for retraining and education of the cold war veterans, is sponsored by 39 U.S. Senators; and

"Whereas this bill patterned after the GI bill of World War II and the Korean conflict is a simple act of justice that would allow the 45 percent of our young men to go into the service to achieve some equality of opportunity on their return to civilian life with the 55 percent who do not enter service; and

"Whereas the success of past GI bills resulted in additional education for 10 million veterans and the lesson this country learned from their achievement should not be cast aside by succeeding generations; and

"Whereas the problem of rising unemployment will be aided by the education and training of these GI's; and

"Whereas a step-up education program is essential to the peace, security, and well-being of the American citizenry; and

"Whereas the cold war GI bill has been advanced through the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and is now pending before the Senate for action: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Texas Council authorize its secretary to send telegrams to all the Members of the U.S. Senate urging passing of the GI bill and to notify all State building trade councils in the United States of this action and urge similar resolutions to be adopted and to express particular appreciation to the cosponsors of the GI bill who are Senators Yarborough, Humphrey, Sparkman, Morse, Neuberger, Hill, Smith, Byrd of West Virginia, Gruening, Hartke, Eastland, Long of Missouri, Burdick, Bible, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Douglas, Pell, Bartlett, Inouye, McGee, McGovern, McCarthy, Fulbright, Cannon, Moss, Pastore, Nelson, Fong, Johnston, Hart, Clark, Dodd, Young of Ohio, Metcalf, Magnuson, Bayh, Edmondson, and the late Senator Kefauver.

"Sincerely,

"LESLIE G. BURNETT,
"Executive Secretary."

FISCAL REFORM FOR BRAZIL—BIG GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, because of the interest I have expressed in fiscal reform for Brazil, to whom we have loaned nearly $2 billion, with the hope that its galloping inflation could be curbed before the country was utterly bankrupt and the present Republic, although a socialistic one, is turned into some form of dictatorship, Mr. F. George Steele, of La Jolla, Calif., has sent me an interesting statement entitled "Background Data on Brazil." The opening page of that statement entitled "Summary of Brazil" reads as follows:

Background Data on Brazil

SUMMARY OF BRAZIL

Area: 3,286,270 square miles. Brazil, the fifth largest country in the world, is slightly larger than the continental United States. It borders on every South American country except Chile and Ecuador, occupying almost 47 percent of its continent.

Economic life: "Brazil ranks third in the world in cattle production; first in coffee; seventh in cotton; second in forest reserves; fourth in meat production; second in sugar" (World Almanac, 1963); third in chromium; fifth in mica (American Peoples Encyclopedia).

"Agriculture is a mainstay of Brazil's economy, but only 4 percent of its area is under cultivation," (Information Please Almanac, 1961).

"Brazil is one of the richest countries in the world in (natural) resources. Little has been done to exploit these resources, however * * * and mining is relatively undeveloped. Coal reserves have been estimated at 5 billion tons. Brazil is reputed to possess the world's largest reserve of high-grade iron ore. Manganese deposits [are] among the largest in the world. Gold ranks first [as a product]; limestone is mined. Mica, bauxite, barytes, copper, molybdenum, nickel, tin, wolfram, titanium, silver, thorium, and platinum [are important minerals]. The mining code of 1934 * * * placed the mining industry under Federal control, excluding foreign capital investment. Mineral deposits discovered after 1934 became state property.

"Brazil * * * is the most highly industrialized nation in Latin America with the possible exception of Argentina. Foreign commerce is * * * relatively small. Improved methods of transportation would allow the exploration of vast areas as yet untouched. * * * The growth of Brazilian railway transport has been slow. * * * Most of [the railroad] lines are owned by the federal government or by the states" (American Peoples Encyclopaedia).

In 1960 Brazil had fewer miles of railroad than developed in United States by 1860. Trucking is handicapped by the lack of roads; there is less than one-twentieth the intercity road mileage available to present day United States.

"Brazil buys about $400 million worth of goods from the United States, sells it $600 million. * * * U.S. investors have poured about $1 billion into Brazil; the U.S. Government, about $1.7 billion in aid and loans. Yet * * * Brazil has no stable government, is drifting deeper into inflation * * * it poses the key test of U.S. policies aimed at heading off communism in the Western Hemisphere" (U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 18, 1961).

"Brazil * * * is in a disturbingly confused state. Its leadership is indecisive. Its governing system * * * is uncertain. Rumors of impending coups are common conversational fare. Communism * * * is active and influential. The army, a potentially strong political force, seems not entirely sure of its political desires. And the economy resembles a Mad Hatter's dream. The foreign debt exceeds $2½ billion. The unpledged gold reserve is probably down to $30 million. Inflation gallops upward at a rate above 40 percent annually * * * Foreign capital has faced uncertainties for years * * * political threats of exchange controls, unchecked inflation, corruption, the prospect of restrictive legislation. British concerns have ceased investing further and American companies, which already have some $1,300 million in Brazil, are reaping crops of gray hair" (C. L. Sulzberger in New York Times, Dec. 13, 1961).

Population (Government estimate 1960): 70,800,000, comparable to United States in about 1895. Brazil contains almost exactly half the people of South America. "European, Indian, and Negro stocks have blended to produce a genuinely Brazilian nation in which racial prejudices, if not entirely absent, are less of a problem than in any other country of multiple origins" (Economist, London, Oct. 11, 1952).

Last fall, the President of Brazil promised fiscal reforms as a basis for continued aid from our Government and loans from the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, and the Monetary Fund. Most of those promised reforms have never materialized. As a result, inflation, which had previously been running at the rate of about 6 percent a month has gone considerably above that figure and Government workers, which means nearly all workers, because the country is dedicated to socialism, have demanded, and undoubtedly will receive, large increases in pay, which in turn will force the Government to resort still more to the use of printing press money with which to pay its current bills. Incidentally, every Government worker who can stay on the payroll for as long as 5 years has a guaranteed Government job for the rest of his life and, of course, the Government employees and the Government pensioners constitute the voting block that controls all elections.

The foregoing summary of the size and economic wealth of Brazil, which indicates that it could have emulated our example of becoming the richest nation in the world, serves as a tragic illustration of what socialism and a vast bureaucracy dedicated to reckless spending can do to any nation, regardless of its natural resources and potential wealth.

All of which makes quite pertinent the article in the September 9 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Is Big Government in United States Getting Too Big?" Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Big Government in United States Getting Too Big?

The vast establishment of Government, growing ever more vast, gives signs now of getting out of control.

Each year, spending by Government moves to a new high.

As spending rises, so do taxes. A tax cut, if one is voted by Congress, soon will be offset by tax increases to support ever-expanding social security costs, ever-rising State and local spending.

With increased spending goes a rise in the power of Government over business and over the lives of individuals.

President Kennedy, even now, is asking that the vast spending power of Government be used to coerce communities and corporations into doing what Government demands.

The demand, too, is for still more power to be lodged in Government, involving new programs calling for new spending and new tasks for Federal police to carry out.

CONGRESS ACTING AS A BRAKE

Big Government—a growing number of Members of Congress are concluding—even now is too big. Heel dragging in a Congress that is heavily Democratic, acting to resist many White House demands for new powers, is related to this conclusion.

HOW BIG IS BIG GOVERNMENT?

One out of every six workers in the United States is employed by Government—Federal, State, and local.

Workers on public payrolls number 12.3 million. Fifteen years ago, there were 7.1 million.

Of all spending for goods and services in the United States, Government accounts for $1 out of $5.

Taxes, other Government receipts amounts to 35 percent of total national income.

One dollar out of every $4.50 of personal income in the United States is accounted for by direct Government payments.

Spending by public agencies totals $165 billion a year—more than three times outlays of 15 years ago.

Of total outlays for construction in the United States, Government accounts for $1 out of $4.

More than a third of all home-mortgage debt is insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government.

The facts themselves are regarded as impressive enough.

In the year that ended last June 30, nearly $115 billion flowed out of Washington. In the current year, the flow will swell to more than $122 billion. Out of State capitals and local-government treasuries will pour about $57 billion more. That flow likewise is rising fast.

Never in history, in war or in peacetime, has any government of any nation spent at the rate the Government in Washington now is spending. Plans call for a steady and even-sharper rise in that spending.

COMING: INTEGRATION POLICE FORCE

Officials recognize that politics long has played a part in the way these Federal billions are spent.

Now Congress is being asked to give the White House power to grant or withhold money to enforce racial mixing. Individuals, communities, corporations, all will feel the impact of this expanded power, once it is granted.

A law giving the President authority to shape race relations, if experience is a guide, could later be used for other purposes.

Money or loans or licenses, under White House plans, would go to those who are found to be in compliance with rules laid down in Washington. These and other things would be denied to a community, a business, or an individual if rules are judged not to have been met.

The President wants power as well to authorize Federal police to keep watch over employment practices of all employers, large or small. Hiring and firing will, in the event that Congress agrees, be a concern of these police directed by Washington.

Power is being sought by the President, in addition, to withhold Federal loans, grants of all kinds, guarantees of bank deposits, mortgages, various subsidies, in case he or his agents decide that racial discrimination is going on.

This request for power to grant or withhold the vast benefits that Government can confer is being described by some analysts as the first open proposal to use the Government billions for a political purpose.

The range of Government powers, under White House plans, would be expanded into whole new fields.

Hospital care for retired persons, under social security, will be pushed hard by the

White House in 1964. This is said by doctors to mark the first full step toward socialized medicine in the United States. Grants of money at this time give Federal agents a degree of power over many community hospitals around the United States.

Aid for college building programs is moving through Congress. Federal aid, once granted, will open the way for a voice by the Federal Government in the operation of colleges and universities accepting the aid.

Aid for elementary and high schools has been pushed hard by the White House. School aid at this level, however, is strongly resisted in Congress and in many communities where there is strong feeling that money in Washington will open the door to Federal control over the education of the Nation's children.

VOTES, BEDS, MEALS

The President also wants Congress to give him added authority for Federal agents to police voting in the South.

He seeks power for the Government to investigate and to act on complaints from members of the public who feel that they may have been discriminated against in a motel or a restaurant or most other places of business.

Power also is being sought for the Government in Washington to undertake suits against local governments that do not do as the Federal Government directs in the integration of local schools.

The Government now possesses, through the Area Redevelopment Administration, money and power to help local communities. This power could be used to aid some communities while overlooking the plight of others.

Power is being sought to set up a Domestic Peace Corps to recruit and finance groups of youths to work in city slums, hospitals and other areas needing aid. Plans also call for a Youth Conservation Corps to be recruited to work in the countryside.

HOW THE HAND OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT KEEPS REACHING OUT: ON TOP OF VAST PRESENT POWER, GOVERNMENT SEEKS THESE NEW POWERS

Power to police all race relations.

Power to investigate and hale into court businessmen whose customers complain of discrimination.

Power to grant or deny billions of dollars annually to projects in communities, depending on how they accept or fail to accept integration rules laid down in Washington.

Power to take away deposit insurance of banks or mortgage guarantees if Federal wishes are not complied with.

Power to police local registration of voters.

Power to use the FBI in policing activities once considered local.

Added power to regulate stock markets.

ANOTHER WPA?

Under study has been a plan to create an agency similar to the old Works Progress Administration of the New Deal—a job-creating agency of public works. It is understood that this plan has been sidetracked for the time being.

The Kennedy administration also favors giving the Federal Government power to try to build and improve mass-transit systems for the Nation's traffic-clogged cities.

These new powers are proposed on top of the vast powers that the Federal Government now exercises over almost every form of individual and business activity.

The huge defense program gives the Government power to give or withhold big contracts for everything from pins and needles to complicated jet bombers and missiles. The awarding or withholding of these contracts often gives the Defense Department the power of life or death over many communities.

Members of Congress spend a good deal of their time trying to make sure that defense contracts either are given to firms in their areas, or that defense contractors are kept operating in those areas.

Communities such as Huntsville, Ala., and the area around Cape Canaveral, Fla., have expanded into thriving cities as a result of space activities. They depend entirely on these Federal operations.

EYES ON MERGERS, PRICES, SIGNS, LABELS

Businessmen and corporations run into the Federal Government at nearly every turn. The Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission are constantly active to detect evidence of mergers and pricing practices that Government may suspect as being illegal. FTC also polices advertising, labeling of products and other activities of business. Now there is a proposal to give Government more power in supervising the design of packages.

Labor-management relations come under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board, which supervises union elections for bargaining power and keeps an eye on union contracts with employers. This agency is directed to see that fair labor practices are observed in American industry. Then there is another agency to enforce payment of minimum wages and to see that prevailing wages are paid in various regions by Government contractors.

Rates are regulated by Government for railroads, electric-power companies, pipelines, interstate truckers and barge lines. The Government determines the routes of airlines and can pay or withhold subsidies to airline companies. Radio and television stations operate under Government license. Shipping lines and shipbuilders often operate under Government subsidy.

A good many of the country's farmers operate under Government controls of one form or another. Prices are supported by Government for wheat, feed grains, cotton and tobacco, and a number of other commodities. Production controls are applied to several of these crops. Dairy farmers, too, receive aid from Government and are subject to Government control. As a result, a large portion of the Nation's agricultural industry can be said to be "socialized."

Government also is heavily engaged in the banking business. Home mortgages often are guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration. Bank deposits are guaranteed and supervised by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Savings and loan associations are aided and supervised by the Home Loan Bank Board. The Export-Import Bank makes direct loans to finance exports and varies insurance guarantees for exports made by American firms.

Along with the growth of the Federal Government has come a growth in the size and power of State and local governments. State and local governments, in fact, have been growing at a faster rate than the Federal Government in recent years.

Much of State and local growth is related to Federal programs. Thus State highway building gets money from the Federal Government. Urban-renewal projects and slum clearance are financed in part by the Government in Washington. Public housing gets some Federal subsidy. And there are continuing proposals to increase these activities.

The White House seeks large new spending powers: Power to extend or deny aid to local schools under Federal terms and conditions; power to aid or deny aid for college construction; power to set up a "youth corps" to work in cities; power to set up a "conservation corps" to work in the countryside; and power to aid mass-transit plans in cities.

All of this is in addition to existing powers that include, among others: power that goes with cash spending of $120 billion each year; power to enforce minimum wages, maximum hours of work; power to police labor relations; power to support farm prices and restrict output; power to grant or deny subsidies in a wide range of fields; power to grant or deny loans for many purposes; power to condemn private property for an increasing range of Federal projects; power to police private business practices in many areas; power to draft youths into the armed services in peacetime; and power to regulate transportation and communications.

NUMBERS TELL THE STORY

The upshot of these growing activities of government are expressed in earlier paragraphs.

The public payrolls now contain 12.3 million workers—about 17 percent of all the workers employed in the United States. The growth in public employment amounts to 5.2 million workers over the past 15 years. Government has become the biggest employer in the country.

Government payments to workers, pensioners, and other individuals come close to $103 billion a year—more than a fifth of all the income received by individuals in the country.

Governments also are heavy buyers of goods and services. They now pay out $124 billion a year for these purposes. That amounts to more than a fifth of all the goods and services produced in the country.

In total spending, Federal, State and local governments pay out $165 billion a year. That is more than three times the outlay of 15 years ago and amounts to more than 35 percent of the national income.

The construction industry finds a sturdy prop in government. Public construction this year is running at $17.5 billion—more than a fourth of the total outlay for all types of construction activity in the country. Government programs extend to everything from roads and schools to public housing, water and sewerage systems, military installations, and reclamation projects.

FOR GOVERNMENT, $1 IN $3

All this activity costs money and government's take from taxpayers is growing by leaps and bounds.

The Federal Government now is collecting $107.1 billion a year. To this sum is being added $52.6 billion taken by State and local governments. That amounts to 35 percent of the national income—more than a third of what all people and business corporations receive.

Last year individuals paid $95.5 billion in Federal, State and local taxes. That meant they paid more than a fifth of their personal income to the tax collectors. Back in 1947, personal taxes amounted to 18 percent of personal income and even at the peak of the Korean war the tax take was below 20 percent.

The sharpest rise in Federal taxes since World War II has been in social security taxes for old-age benefits and disability insurance and in the railroad retirement fund. Tax receipts for these welfare benefits are more than double what they were in 1955. And they will rise further in years ahead if hospital care and other benefits are added to the program.

State and local taxes are increasing at a more rapid clip than Federal taxes. Last year, individuals paid more than $25 billion in State and local taxes. That compares with less than $5.2 billion in 1946.

There appears to be no end in sight to the growth of government. Programs are piled on top of programs year after year at every level of government. And, as these programs expand, the tax collector will take an ever larger bite out of the incomes of families and the earnings of business firms.

SENATOR RUSSELL ON MEET THE PRESS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Sunday, August 11, 1963, my distinguished senior colleague, Senator Richard B. Russell, appeared on the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Meet the Press" program during which he discussed the so-called civil rights bill and other legislation now pending before the Congress.

Inasmuch as many Members of the Senate may not have had the opportunity to see this program and to benefit from the views expressed by Senator Russell, I would like to have a transcript of his remarks printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Meet the Press"

Mr. Spivak. This is Lawrence Spivak, inviting you to "Meet the Press." Our guest on "Meet the Press" is Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia. He is the leader and major spokesman of the southern forces in Congress who are opposed to the President's civil rights program. Senator Russell is chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is certain to have an important influence on the nuclear test ban agreement vote in the Senate.

We will have the first question from Claude Sitton of the New York Times.

Mr. Sitton. Senator Russell, do you think that this Nation has a racial problem now? By that I mean, do you think that the right of qualified Negroes to vote is abridged; do you think that they receive the same quality of public education that is given to whites; do you think Negroes encounter problems in finding places to eat and sleep away from home?

In other words, do Negroes really receive equal treatment in the United States with other citizens?

Senator Russell. You have a number of questions there, Mr. Sitton. Of course we have a racial problem. I don't know of any civilization that has ever existed where there were two different races who lived together that did not have a racial problem. I don't think that the difficulties that you enumerate are confined to the Negro. I have always contended that the so-called disadvantage of the Negro was no greater than that of the white at the bottom of our economic heap, and I am convinced that the 20 million Negroes in this country are better off insofar as educational facilities, income, and dropouts in school are concerned than are the 20 million whites who are at the very bottom of our economic heap.

The principal objection that Negroes seem to have today to their educational facilities is not the physical facilities so much as the fact that the schools are not integrated. They seem to object to having a school, even though it is equal physically and though it has teachers of their own race who have had more years' experience in teaching—they still say that to have equal educational facilities they must attend the schools with the whites.

I don't doubt but that there are in some areas in the country difficulties for Negroes in traveling—I am trying to remember your triple- or four-barreled question—where they have difficulty in finding accommodations. I don't think that they do along the main lines of travel in this country. There are Negro restaurants in every town in the South of which I have any knowledge where they have any considerable number of Negroes, and it is not at all unusual to send down to get some of their barbeque and some of their other specialties. They are very fine cooks.

Mr. Sitton. May I ask a single question then? You have always been a strong advocate of the rights and responsibilities of the legislative branch of the Government. Do you think that Congress now has a duty to take affirmative action to resolve the crisis over civil rights in this country?

Senator Russell. No, I don't. I don't think the Congress should pass any civil rights legislation at this time. We are in a very critical period in our adjustment of racial conditions and racial relations between the two races. It has been only 9 years since the Supreme Court struck down the so-called separate but equal system. That had regulated the lives of our people. Every board of school trustees when they met to arrange to issue bonds or to build schoolhouses—they were controlled by the separate but equal doctrine. Taxes were levied along that line. The people's lives had been geared to it. It had been sustained by the Supreme Court on a number of occasions.

The effect of the Supreme Court decision declaring that system invalid is just now reaching the places where the difficulties will be greatest. It is not in Atlanta, the cities of Charlotte and Richmond where you have a great police force. It will be in that hundred or more counties in the South where you have more Negroes than you have whites. I think some time should have been allowed to adjust the relations between the races in public facilities before we moved into this new idea of controlling privately owned and operated facilities.

Mr. Sitton. Secretary of State Rusk, who also comes from Georgia, has said that if he were a Negro he would join others in demonstrating against segregation. What would you do if you were a Southern Negro?

Senator Russell. He doesn't have to be a Negro to do that. He can join them anyhow. A great many white people do.

Mr. Sitton. What would you do if you were a Southern Negro, Senator?

Senator Russell. That is impossible for me to say. I have never been a Southern Negro. I have lived with them all my life. But I wouldn't undertake to say what I would do if I were, Mr. Sitton, because I have never been, Mr. Sitton.

Mr. Sitton. Senator, you have said that problems in the field of voting, education and denial of equal access to public accommodations are essentially the responsibilities of the State.

Senator Russell. No, sir; I never said anything about private accommodations because I don't think the States have anything to do with that themselves. I think that's controlled by the Constitution.

Mr. Sitton. Not even regulation from the standpoint of health standards and that sort of thing?

Senator Russell. Yes, yes. They've got that.

Mr. Sitton. Well, Senator, when the States fail to carry out their responsibilities, doesn't the Federal Government have a duty to step in to preserve the constitutional rights that are being violated?

Senator Russell. They have moved in, whether constitutional rights were being violated or not, and they have moved in vengeance. The Attorney General of the United States devotes all of his time and a large part of his staff and the activities of the FBI to dealing with it. This is not a new problem. We have made more progress in the hundred years since the end of the institution of slavery than two races have ever made living together anywhere else on earth.

I know people say that that is a long time. It is in the life of an individual, but it isn't so long in the life of a people or in the history of a great civilization, and the Negroes in this country today have more rights, they have more of the good things of life than all of the Negroes all over the earth. Mr. Rusk, of course, has a right to have his views. I am not persuaded altogether by his views. I may say there are a number of other people who are from Georgia who don't agree with my views in this matter.

Mr. Kilpatrick. Senator, let me move over to the area of the treaty with Russia. Do you expect to support that treaty?

Senator Russell. I hope that I will be able to support it, Mr. Kilpatrick, and I shall do so, unless I think it is going to lead into another chain of events that will seriously impair this country's ability to defend itself in case of aggression. I shall not support it on any basis of having the slightest confidence in what the Russians do or say or sign, because I do not believe that they will observe any treaty that they sign except for as long as it serves their own interest and their own selfish purposes.

Of course the whole world is yearning for relief from this great fear of the holocaust of a nuclear war, and I share that. I am the only member that is left of the original Senate Atomic Energy Committee. I know just how devastating it can be, and I hope that I can support it, and I shall, if our Joint Chiefs of Staff and other technicians say it doesn't gravely impair our means of defending ourselves.

Mr. Kilpatrick. It has been publicly reported that the Joint Chiefs of Staff oppose the treaty or that they did oppose it before their arms were twisted to make them be quiet. Have you any information on that point?

Senator Russell. I understand there is perhaps some testimony in the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. Kilpatrick. I haven't seen it with my own eyes; I wouldn't feel at liberty to discuss it because it is classified up until now.

Mr. Kilpatrick. May I ask you, if this is not classified, do you believe as it has been said, that this treaty will handicap the United States in the development of an antimissile missile?

Senator Russell. Of course this treaty cramps us where we are behind. The Russians, when they violated the no-test agreement last year, conducted a long series of tests with bombs of unprecedented magnitude and strength in the atmosphere, and they undoubtedly are ahead of us in that area today. We are far ahead of them in the area of tactical weapons where most of the testing can be done underground. This treaty gives them an advantage, but I would be perfectly willing to let them have that advantage in view of our superiority in weapons, if they are acting in good faith and this is not to lead into a series of treaties that would disarm this country.

Mrs. Craig. Senator, war arises in the hearts of men. Men fight for what they hold dear, and they need the best weapons they can get. Would this treaty prevent our perfecting better weapons than our enemy has?

Senator Russell. That is a question that we must ascertain, and that is a question that the Senate Armed Services Committee and its Subcommittee on Preparedness will go into very exhaustively. We are initiating these hearings in conjunction with the Foreign Relations Committee, who undoubtedly have prior authority in this field, but we have a very significant responsibility, and we intend to discharge it. We intend to get the views of the members of the Joint Chiefs; not only those who are now serving but some who have served in the recent past, and also of some of the outstanding scientists who have no direct connection with the Government that would cause them to be persuaded against their will.

Mrs. Craig. There are reports that what Mr. Khrushchev wants is a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries. Would that bind us to the perpetual captivity of Poland and Hungary and the rest of the satellites?

Senator Russell. That is certainly the understanding and construction that has been placed on it up until now, and if the press is to be believed, Secretary Rusk has been to Bonn to convince the premier of Germany that we have no intention whatever of signing a nonaggression treaty that would leave Germany divided, and that of course would take care of the Iron Curtain countries.

Mrs. Craig. What do you understand is meant by a nonaggression treaty—we don't attack anybody?

Senator Russell. I have been somewhat confused by that expression too, to be frank with you, Miss May. We have no idea of attacking Russia or anyone else. Our whole Defense Establishment is geared for defensive purposes, but I suppose that it means that we would surrender any claim in the future to assert the right of Germany to be reunited.

Mr. Newman. Senator Russell, you said in answer to Mr. Sitton's question that you could not say whether you would demonstrate if you were a southern Negro since you have never been a southern Negro. You have never been able to put yourself in their place. You are a Senator from Georgia, which has a very large Negro population. Is it not really part of your obligation to try to see things as some of your constituents do?

Senator Russell. Yes; we have a very large Negro population, and I have endeavored to represent the Negroes of my State just as fairly as I have the white people. I don't think that the use of this Federal force to compel integration of the races is going to help either the Negro or the white citizen of Georgia. I think that any temporary gains that might be made by forcing Negroes into restaurants or even into schools over the long run will be more than wiped out by the bitterness that will be engendered between the races. There is great bitterness there now where there was none whatever 20 years ago.

Mr. Newman. How then do you account for the great increase in activity on the part of Negro organizations and other groups that sympathize with them?

Senator Russell. I suppose it is because they have been convinced that I am in error in just what I have said, and because they are determined to get into the white schools and into the white restaurants and into the swimming pools. They apparently have not been willing to have any restaurants or swimming pools of their own, or if they have them, they think they are inferior and they must get in those that are operated by the white people. I can't account for it. I think that most of it has been generated by persons outside the South. I know that we've got some of the great leaders down there. Dr. Martin Luther King and one or two others. Dr. King is of course a native of Georgia. But the actual demonstrations in cities such as Albany, Ga.—there were only a few Albany Negroes involved in it. Most of the actual demonstrating was done by those who came in from the outside and a number of white people who came in from the outside.

Mr. Newman. What you are saying, then, is if the local Negroes never complained about their position, you would not feel that any change in the position would be advisable?

Senator Russell. No, I didn't say that. I don't think that any change in position in this hysteria that we have today—of course this country is on an emotional binge on this subject today. Nobody considers constitutional rights. They don't consider what effect the law will have 10 years from now. They don't read the fine print. There aren't a dozen Members of the Senate who can explain these bills in detail. They haven't explained it to their people, how far they go. The school bill, for example, it has been aimed at the South before. Now it is aimed at curing racial imbalance in schools all over the United States, so the Federal Government and the Attorney General are evidently going to move into New York and these New Jersey cities and elsewhere, where they are forcing the white children to be bussed across town and the Negroes to be bussed across town so they will have a proportionate number of the two races in the schools. That is something new that is in this bill. That section VI is the most unconstitutional provision in 99 words that has even been conceived in the mind of man.

Mr. Newman. Why then do you think that the administration finds it necessary to bring in these proposals which you think are so bad? Do you think these proposals meet any need in the country that has been brought out by Negroes and other people?

Senator Russell. The only need that they meet is to meet the fears of the President and the Attorney General and his advisers, that were generated by these riots and demonstrations. You couldn't have a clearer example of that. On April 19 the President in answering a question before the American Society of Newspaper Editors said that he didn't have the authority to cut off Federal aid to any State and didn't think any President ought to have it. If he could cut it off in one State for one purpose, he could cut it off in another State for another purpose. But 2 months later when he came in with his bill, he included that provision in it. I think that he was just overpowered by the political pressures that were brought to bear on him, and against his better judgment he sent this bill in. That is my own view about it.

Mr. Sitton. Senator, let's come down to a basic issue that does not involve segregation: the question of voting rights. Here the Congress under the Constitution has specific power to take action. In fact, it is charged with taking action in this case.

Senator Russell. Where do you find that in the Constitution, Mr. Sitton?

Mr. Sitton. In the 15th amendment, sir.

Senator Russell. Yes.

Mr. Sitton. Would you be in favor of congressional action to remedy infringements of voting rights in Georgia and other Southern States?

Senator Russell. Mr. Sitton, if we have any real trouble on Negroes voting in Georgia, I don't know where it is. We did have some trouble in two or three remote rural counties, but I understand that has been very largely ironed out. There is a higher percentage of Negroes registered in Atlanta than of white people who are registered there, who are eligible to vote.

The Attorney General asked for a law in 1957 on voting rights, and he got that law. He found what he deemed to be flaws in it. In 1960 the Congress enacted another bill and gave the Attorney General power to bring suits in that instance. No one claims there is not ample and adequate power now in the laws for the Attorney General at no expense to any prospective voter to bring a suit at the expense of the taxpayers and see that he is registered. But the Attorney General evidently doesn't want to go to that trouble, so he devised a bill that just says that everybody can vote if they can show that they have been in the sixth grade, without regard to any limitation of any State [law]. There are some 30 States that have voting requirements that will be repealed by that provision. The Constitution says in two places that the qualifications for voters in Federal elections shall be the same as that for electing members of the most numerous body in the State assembly. Of course any Negro is entitled to vote, and I am in favor of his voting if he is qualified to vote. They have been voting in my county ever since I can remember. There have been difficulties in some of the counties. I really think that this voting provision is just a carryover, and it is something that one of these organizations cooked up. The administration is in an impossible position because they are never going to be able to satisfy these people even if they pass this bill. With these four large Negro organizations bidding against each other for plaudits and contributions, one of them will cook up something else, you can be sure of that, if this bill passes, where they will want to go further, and I think they've got themselves in an impossible position.

Mr. Kilpatrick. Let me talk politics for a moment, Senator. How popular is Senator Goldwater in Georgia?

Senator Russell. Senator Goldwater's stock is selling far above any Republican par that has ever been known, either heretofore or at the present time.

Mr. Kilpatrick. Pardon me, sir, I was about to ask in the event of a Kennedy-Goldwater contest next year, do you believe that Georgia would stay in the Democratic column?

Senator Russell. It is always difficult to say what will happen next. I think that as of today Senator Goldwater would probably carry Georgia over President Kennedy.

Mr. Kilpatrick. Would you yourself expect actively to support President Kennedy next year?

Senator Russell. We'll wait and see what happens next year. It would be very difficult for me to actively support him, I may say. I am a Democrat, and of course I like to go along as far as I can, but I have no intention of getting out and knocking myself out supporting the Kennedy administration next year.

Mrs. Craig. Senator, aside from whether or not the Federal Government or the State should handle integration, what is your basic reason for objecting to colored people moving freely around in our society wherever they are well behaved and have the money to go? What is your reason for that?

Senator Russell. My only reason for it is, Mrs. Craig, that if a man runs a place and doesn't want them in there, whether they are well behaved or not, he has a right to run his business and say they can't come. And if a Negro is running a place of business and wishes to say that none but Negroes can come in, under the Constitution of the United States he has a right to run that business that way.

The Constitution talks about three things: life, liberty, and property, and a man cannot be denied any of those without due process of law. This is no process of law. This is just Congress saying he hasn't got any property right to control his own property. And if you use the commerce clause to say whom a man shall serve in his restaurant, you can use it to say what he shall serve the person who comes in and who shall serve him and even what he shall charge for it. There would be no limit to how far you could go. It is one of the most farfetched proposals and holds entirely the probability of breeding more trouble and bringing us into socialism faster than any law that has been presented in a very long time.

Mr. Newman. Senator McGovern, of South Dakota, and some others have stated recently that the United States has far more nuclear weapons than it could ever use in all-out war. Is the time perhaps approaching when the production of these weapons might be curtailed and the budget cut?

Senator Russell. I don't accept Senator McGovern's analysis, but we undoubtedly are approaching the stage where we will not need to manufacture and prepare nearly as many nuclear weapons. This question of overkill is a matter of mathematical calculation. A group of professors at Columbia have calculated that we have far too many. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and our military people say that we haven't. But we are approaching a saturation point.

Mr. Sitton. Sir, there have been reports that the southern bloc in the Senate might prolong the debate on the nuclear test ban treaty and thus delay consideration of the administration's civil rights proposals. Do you think this would be proper?

Senator Russell. I haven't even heard that report. Where did you hear it, Mr. Sitton?

Did you actually read that in the press? I haven't read it.

Mr. Sitton. Yes, sir.

Senator Russell. I haven't heard it at all.

Mr. Sitton. Do you think it would be proper?

Senator Russell. No, I do not, and I don't think there is any possibility whatever of it happening. Of course we are hit by everything that comes along, now. Everything that papers like the great paper you represent and the two or three who control the editorial policy of the country can think up that will give the southerners a black eye before the people of the country in this all-out campaign they are making to jam this unconstitutional bill through the Congress, they resort to. I don't believe that any responsible Member of Congress has said that the southern bloc had any such plans.

Mr. Kilpatrick. Another political question, sir: Over the past couple of years you have supported the President on only about 36 percent of his domestic rollcall issues. Other southern Senators have supported him on even less, while Mr. Dirksen, the minority leader, has, himself, supported the President on about 32 percent of them.

My question is whether you and others similarly situated, have ever thought of becoming Republicans, or have you thought of a realinement under such labels as "Conservative" and "Liberal"?

Senator Russell. No, sir. I haven't thought of becoming a Republican, but I think it is inevitable there will be a party realinement in this country along conservative and radical liberal lines. I don't know just how it is coming about because now both parties have a big left wing and a big right wing, and both of them are oil and water. Really to have a true two-party system we will have to come to a liberal and a conservative party.

Mr. Spivak. Do you think it will come about within the next few years, Senator?

Senator Russell. I don't know when it will come, but I think events are hastening the day. I wouldn't undertake to prophesy just when it will come about, but I don't know that it would be too bad a thing for the country to clear the air. You've got Javits and Goldwater in the Republican Party, and Humphrey——

Mr. Spivak. Our time is up, Senator. I am sorry to interrupt. Thank you very much for being with us.

VICE ADM. JOHN S. McCAIN

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on August 7, the Senate confirmed the nomination of Rear Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, for promotion to the rank of vice admiral.

At the time Rear Admiral McCain's nomination was being considered, the distinguished minority leader addressed the Senate, expressing admiration for the admiral's distinguished record and endorsing his promotion. At that time, I was unavoidably absent from the Senate chamber. Consequently, I take this occasion to associate myself with the very appropriate remarks of the distinguished minority leader concerning soon-to-be Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr. Personally, I am particularly proud that the Secretary of the Navy has seen fit to recommend Admiral McCain to the Secretary of Defense and the President, for the high rank of vice admiral.

There are, indeed, few officers in the Armed Forces who are as well known to, and as highly respected by, Members of this Senate as Rear Adm. John S. McCain, Jr. As former Chief of Legislative Liaison, for the Department of the Navy, we came to know him well and admired him for his intellect and his straight and clear thinking. Always a "team player" within the Department of Defense, he is widely recognized as perhaps the most forceful and dedicated spokesman for sea power. His presentation some few months ago to the Appropriations Committee of this Senate on the four ocean challenge made a lasting impression upon his listeners.

Rear Admiral McCain's nomination to vice admiral is for the rank he will hold in his new assignment as commander, Amphibious Forces Atlantic Fleet. This is unquestionably one of the most important seagoing commands within our Navy. Rear Admiral McCain's varied experience, gained from years of command in submarine and amphibious units, gives him added qualification for his new assignment.

Admiral McCain comes from a long line of distinguished citizens of the State of Mississippi. His forebears have served their State and our Nation well. Admiral McCain's father, as many Members of the Senate will recall, was the late Adm. John Sidney McCain, U.S. Navy, who, together with Admirals Halsey, Spruance, and Mitchner, gave our naval power in the Pacific a bold combat leadership that will long be remembered and admired by a grateful Nation.

I am proud of Admiral McCain's record of distinguished service to the Nation in war and in peace, and I know he will continue to add strength and leadership to the Navy and to our national defense program.

I understand Admiral McCain will assume his new command on September 7 when the change of command ceremony will take place aboard the U.S.S. *De Soto County* at Little Creek, Norfolk, Va. I am pleased to make these remarks in advance of that changeover.

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the conscience of the Nation was stirred by the dignified and impressive civil rights march on Washington of last Wednesday. The best evidence of an increased moral concern is now to be seen in the editorial pages of the press. I ask unanimous consent that a number of newspaper editorials and columns, in addition to those I put in the Record yesterday at page 16227, be printed in the Record along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Aug. 29, 1963]

WASHINGTON MARCH SERVED ITS PURPOSE IN DRAMATIZING A NATIONAL PROBLEM

History will assess the value of yesterday's civil rights demonstration in Washington. It was carried out in orderly fashion and in accord with American principles and traditions. It served its purpose in bringing to national attention the exasperations, frustrations, and aspirations of the Negro race to become first-class citizens.

The fact that the demonstration was orderly and comparatively calm is somewhat in contrast to tendencies to violence in other instances. The latter create resentment instead of understanding and make even more difficult adjustments and genuine achievement. The good effects of this demonstration could be destroyed by rowdyism and unruly mobs.

There will be those who will say the demonstration was inspired and led by Communists. It was not. This right to protest is as old as the Constitution itself. We are forcefully reminded of it in a news story a few days ago originating in Peking. Some organization calling itself the Chinese Peoples Committee for World Peace sent a cable to the NAACP offering support of the march and denouncing the Kennedy administration for "ruthless persecution of Negroes."

Roy Wilkins, the NAACP's executive secretary, in an acid reply put the whole matter into perspective. He told the Communists, anxious to exploit racial tensions, that the demonstration "is in support of the civil rights legislation proposed by President Kennedy" and in opposition to some racial practices now prevalent in this country. He concluded with this comment:

"We await the opportunity to send our felicitations to Chinese citizens gathered in a huge demonstration in your nation's capital to protest living conditions under your government and welcomed there by your heads of state."

The demonstration was huge and dramatic and designed to impress upon all America the existence of a problem that must and can be solved within the framework of our institutions by men of intelligence, understanding and good will.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 30, 1963]

SEEKING TO FULFILL

From its columned memorial in the Capital the image of Lincoln looks out over a prospect become again serene. The reflecting pool mirrors only the elegant shaft of the Washington Monument. The crowds are gone. One might almost think nothing had happened there. What really did happen?

Not enough, to start with, to persuade Congress that all the demands of the marchers must be enacted posthaste into law, or to impel Congress toward faster action on the civil rights legislation now before it. So things should be. Even had the purpose of the march been intimidation, which it was not—the purpose was persuasion—the House and the Senate are bound in their deliberative responsibilities not to be moved by any one particular application of pressure. The pressures already working on them are heavy enough.

If minds in either Chamber have been changed by Wednesday's rally, no one has heard about it, though Representative Broyhill of Virginia, says the march could "just antagonize any fence sitters"—a remark devoid of public value except to show which side of the fence Mr. Broyhill is on, and how far over on that side he is.

The remark all the same does bring us to the longer range and more profound meanings of the rally. It is hard to believe that any genuine fence sitter, if such there be, could have been antagonized by Wednesday's rally. It is hard to believe that a true fence sitter could have failed to be swayed the other way—not by Marian Anderson's voice (a voice past its prime, but a spirit not) or Mahalia Jackson's, or by Martin Luther King's eloquence, moving as all these were, but by the crowd itself, in its earnestness and its good will. Supposing our fence sitter to be strictly political, surely he might be budged by the knowledge that these petitioners represented millions of votes, with millions more to come as the right to vote becomes established everywhere.

There is more to it, a lot more. A foreign diplomat in Washington who phoned this office yesterday on another matter (his own country, a democracy, is small and new and beset with difficulties) said incidentally: "You might be interested in how it looked to some of us who are not Americans—here were democracy and liberty expressing themselves, and seeking to fulfill themselves."

You can't weigh that, or measure it, or put it in a package, or feed it through an electronic computer, but it is the story of Wednesday in Washington. It is Wednesday's lesson, and it is a lesson that will not be forgotten as we seek on and on to realize our destiny as a nation.

[From the New York Post, Aug. 29, 1963]

THE MARCH

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—It was part camp meeting, part joyful picnic, and part a determined, almost fierce political rally uniting people of so many kinds and conditions.

Above all, it was an answer to the scoffers hoping for the worst. Governor Wallace, of Alabama, had sneered at what he called an organized civil war, a rabble looking for trouble.

No one watching that vast crowd sweeping away from the Lincoln Memorial could help but be impressed by the quiet and the patience with which they stood as the hours wore on, listening to a program that was inevitably too long. They had come from all over the country, schooled in the need for dignity and restraint. All the dire forebodings about what might happen with such an influx of people were put to naught.

At times it seemed they were almost too restrained. Only when the chant, "Pass that bill," now and then swept over the assemblage, starting just under the speakers' platform and sweeping out to the farthest reaches under the elms along the Mall, did the crowd seem to take life.

But the depth of feeling was there just beneath the surface. In the response to the fiery words of John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, calling for the marches and the demonstrations to continue until equality should be won, you could be sure that this was not just a glorious outing that was an end in itself. The Negro leaders who spoke were all veterans of a war still going on, and the march was merely a pause in which to recite battles won and warn of the long and difficult campaign still ahead.

How much that great demonstration—the greatest test in the history of the Capital—will mean for civil rights legislation is hard to say. In the cold light of the morning after, as the weary marchers return home, it may seem small indeed. Attitudes are hardening on both sides of the integration line.

In the House, Members of the liberal bloc feel the Kennedy administration has made a characteristic tactical error in asking for less than a full measure of civil rights and expecting to take less than that. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and others have been pressing the White House to include a fair employment practices provision. The crowd held up an impressive number of signs calling for a Federal FEPC.

Administration supporters are saying that it will be enough to get the basic structure of civil rights legislation, then expand upon it in the years ahead. A lot of hard work and a lot of luck will be necessary for even the first fundamental step. But if the legislation is watered down—the public accommodation section amended to cover only establishments with 50 or more employees, for example—the deep and dangerous frustration for which the march was a temporary outlet will build up again.

The crux of the whole matter is jobs. The most forthright expression of this came from Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers. Without jobs for both whites and Negroes in an expanding economy, civil rights tend to seem a theoretical privilege for the affluent of both races.

Regardless of how much it finally means in the civil rights score, this great orderly mass outpouring will go down in the history of the Capital as a triumph. The setting and the day were perfect. As the hours wore on, the shaft of the Washington Monument threw a deepening shadow on the Reflecting Pool, framed by the crowd stretching almost its entire length.

They had sat through to the end with little movement, with only at the extremities people coming and going as the oratory wore on. They were rewarded by the closing speech of Martin Luther King, Jr., which rose above mere oratory to a moving peroration of what the future can mean for an America that has wiped out the hatred of race prejudice.

King and the other leaders had shown not only that they could organize such a gathering but that in this critical juncture they could hold the support of the mass of the Negro people. The extremists were pushed to the remote sidelines. And that is perhaps the greatest measure of the success of a day that has had few if any parallels in the life of this city.

[From the New York Post, Aug. 29, 1963]

BREAKTHROUGH

Let no one be deceived by the exuberant, almost carnivallike atmosphere of yesterday's historic march. The Negroes who poured into Washington in such multitudes are also the ones who have been out on the picket lines, getting their heads bashed in and risking their lives in the struggle for freedom now.

"Anyone who cannot understand the significance of your participation here today is blind and deaf," said Ralph Bunche. To which we say amen.

America cannot afford to disappoint the men, women, and children who marched in Washington.

Their orderliness, discipline, and good humor reflected their hope and anticipation that President Kennedy's civil rights program will be approved by Congress.

We do not want to think of what might happen if that program is defeated or emasculated. The presence of a hearteningly large number of whites among yesterday's 200,000 is an assurance to the Negro community that it will not be alone in its angry reaction to such a betrayal.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 29, 1963]

RALLY IN THE CAPITAL

The atmosphere of yesterday's mass civil rights rally in Washington was one of orderliness, but it was an orderliness underlaid with fervor and with determination. If anyone had previously doubted that the Nation has come to the time when it has to live up to its moral, philosophical, and political professions, the doubt can linger no more. Our Negro citizens will have their rights and their privileges as citizens, and will no longer wait through generation after generation. They will not wait through one more generation; and the country cannot ask them to wait.

The keynote of the demonstration was the word "Now," printed over and over on placards and sounded over and over from the platform in front of the Lincoln Memorial. In truth not all the demands repeated yesterday can be satisfied tomorrow, or this year. Some of them must wait, not because gradualism is any longer a respectable or a possible concept—it is not; events have carried us past that—but because of the nature of people and of political institutions. The great fact is that action has been and is being taken toward meeting the fundamental demands, and that it will be steadily, swiftly accelerated.

As one speaker said in effect yesterday, it has fallen to the Negro to bring this country face to face with the full responsibilities of nationhood, and face to face with its most serious failure to meet those responsibilities. In the time to come when all citizens are just citizens, to be judged and treated only according to individual character and ability, that may be the historic meaning of the days of decision we are passing through now.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 30, 1963]

IMPRESSIVE TO CONGRESS AND COUNTRY—PEACEFUL FREEDOM MARCH HELD VICTORY FOR RIGHTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—That which many most feared—and some of ill will recklessly hoped for—did not befall the freedom march on Washington.

It was solemn and responsible, buoyant and confident—and deeply persuasive.

These were the 200,000 Negro citizens and many whites who were massed in the Lincoln Memorial Hall in peaceful, fervent, and determined demand that the rights of their prized American citizenship be made equal for all.

They knew what they wanted.

They were petitioning their Congress and their Nation for redress of wrongs.

There is no doubt that Congress—and millions of fellow Americans—were listening.

The consensus in Washington is that their petition will be heeded.

The results in law and in climate will not be instant, but the effect of this momentous and moving rally will be visible in the weeks to come.

The most important reason is that the freedom march, which the latest Gallup poll showed most people feared would disintegrate into violence and chaos, exhibited unmatched dedication to nonviolence, order, and respect for law.

It had to do that to succeed. It succeeded.

It was a riskful venture. It could have failed. It would have failed had not its leaders—and their followers—demonstrated unusual discipline and responsibility. This cannot fail to impress a Congress and a country to whom every word and act was unfolded on the TV screen.

A majority already exists in the halls of Congress for strengthened civil rights legislation. But this majority might well erode had it become evident that the leadership of the civil rights groups was not in responsible hands and could not be maintained in responsible hands.

The freedom march was a resplendent feat of responsibility.

Great credit goes to these Negro and white leaders—and to their followers, because unless there is responsibility in followership, then responsibility of leadership goes for naught.

It is estimated that nearly 30 percent of the participants in the march were whites. That was good because it underlined that, while the Negroes have long been most aggrieved, the issue is not equality of race but equality of citizenship. Other U.S. minorities have been subjected to discrimination—Jews, Catholics, and so-called hyphenated Americans of various nationalities. This discrimination has waned or been substantially corrected.

No one is contending that Congress can create equality by law. It can't. But we can create equality of opportunity and we can enforce, for all Americans, the constitutional right of equal protection under the law. This includes the right to vote, and the right to equal access to all publicly financed institutions and businesses serving the general public.

No doubt there are honest differences of opinion concerning the "public accommodations" provision of the pending civil rights legislation. Some will conscientiously argue that no private business, even if catering to the public, should be compelled to serve anyone it does not wish. But this argument is usually advanced by those who have long supported State legislation that has compelled many private businesses not to serve Negroes. One can hardly have the argument both ways.

The freedom march has been an impressive act of mobilized citizenship. It will be a prod and a challenge to Congress. It will influence but not dictate the terms of new legislation. Congress does not take comfortably to dictation—even from the President. But it cannot escape its own responsibility.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 30, 1963]

Today in National Affairs—Who Is Going To Organize Criminal Assault Victims?

(By David Lawrence)

Washington.—If a march on Washington is the most effective way nowadays to attract national attention, who will organize the next "march"?

Civil rights are supposed to include the right to be safe from robbery, from assault, from rape, from murder. These rights are presumably guaranteed by those provisions in the Constitution which protects the "life, liberty, and property" of all citizens.

Orlando W. Wilson, superintendent of police in the city of Chicago, said recently:

"Everybody seems to be organizing today to protect civil liberties. I would like to organize the victims of criminal assaults who have been robbed and raped in our streets."

Mr. Wilson is a leading authority on police work, having served as police chief in other cities and as dean of the School of Criminology of the University of California before going to Chicago. He said in a speech this month to a committee of the American Bar Association:

"Crime is overwhelming our society. * * * In the name of protecting individual liberties, we are permitting so many technicalities to creep into our system of criminal justice that we are no longer convicting a sufficient high proportion of guilty criminals."

In the Nation's Capital, Police Chief Robert Murray tells of the frustration among his men due to restrictions on their efforts to enforce the law and due to court decisions that have liberated criminals through technicalities. Chief Murray says:

"The criminal is being afforded more legal protection than the ordinary citizen. I often wonder who, besides the police, is concerned about the rights of citizens to be free from attack by criminals."

Crime in the United States is getting out of hand generally, but some amazing statistics have been issued lately showing the relationship between strict law enforcement and the crime rate. Official figures show, for instance, that in 1962 in Washington, D.C., aggravated assaults were the highest per capita in America. Yet, in Seattle, Wash., and in Milwaukee, Wis.—where criminals are dealt with as criminals—the percentage was about one-tenth of what these crimes were in the National Capital.

* * * * *

"If a person is adjudged insane by competent authorities and his incarceration administered properly, then we in law enforcement can have no kick. But when that person is released to prey upon the public, we are appalled."

The House of Representatives has passed a bill providing for a change in criminal laws that will help the police in the Nation's Capital, which is governed solely by Federal laws. The Senate, however, is under pressure to block the effort with opposition coming from so-called liberal groups and organizations which are more concerned with safeguards for the civil rights of those accused of crimes.

The newspapers tell daily of murders, assaults, robberies, rapes, and other crimes. But since people in one section of a State are far away from the scene of a vicious crime or don't know the victims, the easy assumption is that "it can't happen here." Yet in the city of Washington, for example, people in the very best residential neighborhoods, as well as those in other areas, do not dare to venture out alone at night.

This very week the newspapers have reported the murder of two girls in a New York City apartment—one shortly to start teaching school and the other a magazine employee. They were college graduates in their twenties and the daughters, respectively, of a prominent surgeon and a successful author. Two days before, the wife of the Chilean consul general was murdered as she sat before her television set at 7 o'clock in the evening at her country home.

TWO COURAGEOUS WOMEN WITNESS FOR EQUAL JUSTICE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, among the 210,000 participants in last Wednesday's march for freedom in Washington were two women who have shown courage in working to advance the cause of equality and justice for all citizens. Both Miss Joyce Barrett and Mrs. Jacob Karro have demonstrated, through their self-sacrifice and inspiring deeds, that civil rights are not merely the concern of the southern Negro, but affect the whole fabric of our society. I salute these two women who, along with countless others, feel that America cannot be a nation of onlookers to the problems which beset us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks, two newspaper articles describing the experiences and deeds of these women of courage and conscience.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1963]

Georgia Civil Rights Worker: Why Does She Do It?—"I Want To Be Free"

(By Sue Cronk)

One of Wednesday's freedom marchers, a young white woman from Georgia, stayed behind to plead yesterday for women's help in the civil rights drive, in the South.

"If women would just come to the jails in groups and tell the police, 'We're watching you,' it would help," said Joyce Barrett.

Joyce, a 24-year-old graduate of Temple University in Philadelphia, was jailed with another white woman on May 21 in Albany, Ga., for passing out voter registration leaflets on the streets.

"We were stripped in view of male prisoners in the cell block," she said. "Our toilet facilities were next to a male cell with no separation in between.

"The policemen came and stared at us, making insinuations about our morals and taunting us for our beliefs.

"One day they put a female dope addict in our cell. She was having withdrawal symptoms and we had to keep her from hurting herself. When we struggled with her, I fell back and hit my head on a steel bunk. They left her with us 2 days.

"No one was allowed to see us except our attorney. He'd bring us toothbrushes and the police would take them away. We often were denied soap or wash cloths. * * * The cell was built for 4 people and there usually were 10 to 14 in it."

Joyce said she was sentenced to 30 days in the Albany city jail. After 6 days she began to fast, and 9 days later she was released on probation.

A cousin of Representative William A. Barrett, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Joyce is a native Philadelphian who became a full-time staffworker for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee about 6 months ago. She has been working in southwest Georgia since then, "getting paid as much as any other staffer—$5 a week. Except that we've been paid only 1 week."

She came with a group of 150 from Albany. As their train moved through southern towns, she said, "hundreds of people came down to the tracks to see it and touch it and sing freedom songs. They dream of being able to protest and not get arrested."

Joyce's arrest was just one of many, she told a leadership conference sponsored Thursday at the Shoreham Hotel by the National Council of Negro Women as a followup to the march.

She repeated her story yesterday at a press conference held by Delta Sigma Theta, a 25,000-member social service organization founded in 1913 by Howard University undergraduates. Joyce has been a member for 2½ years.

Joyce is highly critical of the Justice Department and the FBI, claiming that her SNCC headquarters "has filed more than 100 affidavits with the Justice Department in the last year and a half" with scant result.

Weary and rumpled, wearing the bibbed denim overall dress that has become a uniform among voter registration workers in the South, Joyce returned to Albany last night.

"Why?" she was asked yesterday. "You're a white woman. You don't have to get involved in this. Why are you doing it?"

"Because I want to be free," Joyce said. "I feel that white people are as messed up as Negroes by segregation. If you hate somebody, you have to hate yourself. When we were in jail and the whites were harassing us, we saw how sick and unhappy they are."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1963]

Bannockburn Housewife: Her Danville Deeds Weren't Lost in Shuffle

(By Sue Cronk)

When 80 Negroes from Danville, Va., came to Washington to march for jobs and freedom last week, they were welcomed warmly in a white Bethesda neighborhood.

Residents of the Bannockburn area took the Negroes swimming in their community pool. They cooked suppers for them, put them up in their homes last Tuesday night and packed box lunches for them to take to the march on Wednesday.

The community's friendly gesture was sparked by a 53-year-old housewife who spent 11 days in a Danville jail cell this summer because, "just because I'm white, I don't feel I can stand aside and watch the burden of the civil rights problem being carried only by the colored people."

Mrs. Jacob I. Karro, wife of a Labor Department lawyer and mother of three, drove to Danville July 18 "after seeing a television show on the police brutality there. I wanted to see what it was all about."

On the morning of July 20 she joined a Negro man, woman, and three teenagers in walking back and forth at the corner of Union and Main Streets. The Negroes carried placards asking for better jobs. She carried one saying, "No more segregation."

Five to seven minutes after their demonstration began, all were arrested.

Anne Karro was booked on six charges. The chief one was violating Danville's corporation court injunction against participating in demonstrations. The others ranged from contributing to the delinquency of the three minors with whom she had walked to walking 6 instead of 10 paces behind the person in front of her.

Bond was set at $2,000. "It made me feel very dangerous," Mrs. Karro said.

Here is her account of her imprisonment.

When she was being booked, the arresting officer told Mrs. Karro—a blue-eyed, blonde Englishwoman—that he couldn't decide whether to list her as white or Negro.

She was placed in a cell in the white section of the city jail with women arrested on traffic, drunkenness, fraud, and assault charges.

Her 6-foot-2 by 7-foot-8 cell contained the only toilet facilities—an open commode and a sink with cold water—for all the white women prisoners. Lack of room made it necessary for her and her cellmate to climb up on their bunks when the other prisoners used the toilet.

She had to wait 8 hours to get a mattress for her bunk and 6 days to get a drinking mug.

Meals consisted of grits with eggs or bacon for breakfast, two starchy vegetables and sometimes white sowbelly for dinner, and a fried cold cut sandwich for supper. The women had to scrape and wash the male prisoners' dishes before they themselves were allowed to eat.

As she was denied reading or writing materials and exercise periods, she spent the rest of the day "just lying on my back. I counted 198 rivets in the ceiling of my cell."

Mrs. Karro could hear young Negro girls who had been arrested for demonstrating "crying and screaming for their mothers" when they were abused through painful pelvic examinations.

Mrs. Karro's husband, who learned from a wire service reporter of her imprisonment, was allowed to see her for 20 minutes when he drove to Danville July 21 and hired a Danville lawyer.

Mrs. Karro thus far has been found guilty of two of the six charges against her, has been fined a total of $30 and had $400 added to her bond. Appeals are pending. She still faces trial on the remaining charges.

Free on bail, she "sort of slunk back home. I felt I'd been lost in the shuffle, that I didn't make any difference in the Danville situation, that there was still no way of reaching anybody.

"But I was so wrong. My whole neighborhood was on fire. Many neighbors said they were apologetic and ashamed that they'd felt too chicken to do something similar. I realized that what moved me was not peculiar to me but felt deeply by many people."

So Mrs. Karro and some of her neighbors, the majority of whom, she said, "wouldn't object to colored families moving here," opened their homes and hearts to the Danville marchers.

The same Bannockburn group was instrumental in obtaining the desegregation of Glen Echo Amusement Park.

Mrs. Karro has been "very much disturbed for a long time on the question of civil rights."

"I can't understand why more people who feel as I do aren't standing up to be counted," she said. "After all, it's as much a white problem as a colored problem. In fact, it's an American citizenship problem."

NONSENSE ON THE HOT LINE TO MOSCOW

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, all of us are intrigued and educated and, from time to time, our minds are improved by the eminent columnist of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston.

However, I never knew he was a humorist until his column, written for the New York Times on Sunday, September 1, came to my attention. The article, entitled "Nonsense on the Hot Line to Moscow," is not only humorous but, in his inimitable style as a humorist, which talent I did not know he possessed—and parenthetically I point out that Fletcher Knebel had better be careful—Mr. Reston pointed out more cogently than many of us have been able to do, the stupidity and uselessness of trying to trust our enemies, the Russian Communists. I ask unanimous consent that the column to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONSENSE ON THE HOT LINE TO MOSCOW

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 31.—The emergency hot line from the White House to the Kremlin opened this week:

Washington: Testing, testing, testing.

Moscow: Chairman Khrushchev wants to know why you are testing. As is well known, the test ban has just been signed. What is this provocation? Who is——

Washington: Please be patient, Moscow. We are not testing bombs, we are merely testing these new communications machines to see that they work. The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog's back. The quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog's back. Do you get it, Moscow?

Moscow: We do not get it at all. We received something about animals. Are you calling us lazy dogs?

Washington: Please listen carefully. There are no lazy dogs and, honest, there are no quick brown foxes jumping over them. These are words, meaning nothing. Let's begin all over again. We are going to send some new words to make sure that all the keys are working. Ready?

Moscow: Ready.

Washington: Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country. * * * Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country——

Moscow: Why?

Washington: What do you mean, why?

Moscow: Why is this the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country? Is something happening over there? Why are you calling up your citizens to come to the aid of the country. Is there an emergency?

Washington: We are going to try again, Moscow. Please confirm the following numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Over.

Moscow: 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. Why are you sending us a countdown? Chairman Khrushchev is very upset.

Washington: Please put him on the line. We want to talk turkey to him about this.

Moscow: This is Khrushchev. I do not understand what Turkey has to do with this line. The Turks are lackeys of the capitalist warmongers. They have your missiles on our border. What do they have to do with this line?

Washington: Please observe carefully. When we say we want to "talk turkey" on something, that is merely a popular expression which means that we want to talk straight and truthfully about it. Do you understand now?

Moscow: Certainly not. As is well known, the Turks are notoriously crooked and untruthful, and if they use this line to make any moves against us, our rockets will wipe them out in an instant.

Washington: The purpose of this line is not to wipe people out but to keep from wiping people out. Please test the machine from your end, Moscow. Say something nice.

Moscow: Peace and friendship.

Washington: That's better. President Kennedy wants to say a word to you, Mr. Chairman.

Moscow: Where is he?

Washington: In Hyannis Port.

Moscow: What's he doing there?

Washington: Running away from Washington.

Moscow: Hello, Mr. President. This is Khrushchev. How's your back?

Hyannis Port: Sore. We've had a busy week. You know how it is: People fighting over the budget. Cutting foreign aid. Wanting to test everywhere. Trouble in Vietnam. Trouble on the railroads. Everybody wanting everything—now. But it's pleasant here—nice and sunny. How's the weather there?

Moscow: Why do you ask about the weather? You know the weather is a military secret. All this talk about the weather on this line, and Turkey, and mobilizing people to come to the aid of the country, and lazy dogs, and countdowns—instead of peaceful coexistence—worries me.

Hyannis Port: You are too suspicious, Mr. Chairman. You always assume the worst. You see things that don't exist. You misunderstand our words. We merely want to use this line to keep in touch, but we don't want to harry you.

Moscow: You couldn't bury us if you tried.

Hyannis Port: I didn't say "bury" but "harry." That's what I mean. You're too suspicious.

Moscow: What about the lynchings in the South?

LOCAL AVIATION AND AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the development of local air service in this country depends upon the development of a satisfactory replacement for the DC-3. I have urged the CAB and the FAA to join in this effort, through cost analysis of existing aircraft and close study of the profitability of small aircraft service on local routes. Areas of this country with low urban density are fully entitled to take part in the age of the 1-day business trip and the weekend vacation. My own northern New England region is just such an area. Given the vast outlays of the Federal Government for supersonic aircraft development and metropolitan airports, equity demands more attention to the need for a small 18-seat to 24-seat aircraft.

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE OF DECLINING SERVICE

Mr. President, the New England States are now weathering a crisis with Northeast Airlines, which has arisen at least in part from the lack of such an airplane. Large aircraft, in the 40-seat to 50-seat range, cannot profitably serve small cities. With low levels of passenger demand, no airline can schedule more than a flight or two a day with a large airliner. And with too few flights, subject to cancellation if too few reservations are made, demand will not build up to a point where a large passenger aircraft would be required. Less service leads to less demand, and finally, in an all-too-familiar pattern, to cancellation of routes.

AN UP-TO-DATE DC-3 IS WHAT WE NEED

Mr. President, few airplanes have so captured the imagination of the world as the DC-3. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from an article by E. J. Kahn, Jr., published in the New Yorker magazine in September 1960, describing this workhorse of the skies, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in these days of concern with our balance of payments, I hardly need observe that a replacement for the DC-3 would be a sizzling export item, in heavy demand everywhere in the less settled areas of the globe.

Yet a further opportunity would be to help develop so-called third-level air service. I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article, from the September 1963 issue of the New Englander magazine, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. This article describes the type of local service operations, in addition to those of regularly certified carriers, which would be expanded if we had such an airplane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Sunday's New York Times carried an excellent article on the work of the CAB in trying to develop a low-cost small aircraft for this purpose. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, we urgently need a breakthrough toward more economical operation in the 18-passenger to 24-passenger range. I hope the CAB and the FAA will provide this breakthrough. In 1958, the passage of the Federal Aviation Act provided the basis for such studies, with section 312 empowering the Administrator to undertake or contract for developmental work for improved aircraft, aircraft engines, and other developments which offer special advantages to aeronautics. Originally, of course, such studies were the province of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, set up as early as 1915. Senator Ralph Flanders said, in 1955:

> There is not an airplane flying in this country today—certainly not a military one—the design of which does not depend to some degree upon the scientific investigations of the NACA.

Mr. President, I point with deep enthusiasm to the awakening of interest in small airplane development. Capt. Roger Crowley, director of the New Hampshire Aeronautics Commission, has been a leader in this field. Work now in progress should be intensified and accelerated to bring closer the day when an economical and reliable replacement for the DC-3 will take to the skies. On that day, Mr. President, we will take a great stride in developing civil aviation in the United States and in the world.

Exhibit 1

Excerpts From New Yorker

(By E. J. Kahn, Jr.)

Abroad, far more than here, the DC-3 is still the ubiquitous workhorse it once was, being currently in harness to 174 scheduled airlines in 70 nations. (In the Netherlands, Hungary, and Chile, it has been depicted on airmail stamps—an honor that it has yet to win at home.) A British magazine also called Flight calculated last year that the DC-3's operated by scheduled airlines came to 1,672. "It is a sobering fact that numerically about 30 percent of the world's total transport air fleet consists of DC-3's," this Flight said. Of 86 airlines, collectively using 69 makes of aircraft, that recently reported on their comings and goings to the International Air Transport Association, a trade group with headquarters in Montreal, 57 lines were flying some DC-3's, while 2 additional companies, in Poland and Czechoslovakia, were flying Russian-built copies of the DC-3. Air Ceylon's equipment consisted of one Super Constellation and two DC-3's, Air Vietnam's of one DC-4 and six DC-3's. The Indian Airlines Corp. had 83 planes, 60 of them DC-3's. For Garuda Airlines, in Indonesia, it was 20 DC-3's out of a fleet of 39; for Iranian Airways, 10 out of 17; for Jugoslovenski Aerotransport, 13 out of 22; and for Real Aerovias, in Brazil, 69 out of 107. To this day, quite a few airlines—Transportes Aéreos Salvador and Liberian National Airways among them—own nothing but DC-3's. There is no machine other than a DC-3 on which one can now take a scheduled flight between—to name just a few of countless routes—Great Whale and Montreal, Montreal and Chibougaman, Tebessa and Bône, Amman and Jedda, Beirut and Aleppo, Asmara and Taiz, Abadan and Isfahan, Quito and Cuenca, Asunción and Curitiba, Tegucigalpa and La Ceiba, Vaasa and Turku, Blackpool and the Isle of Man, Jersey and Guernsey, Reykjavik and Egilsstadir, Granada and Tangier, Lourenço Marques and Quelimane, Nicosia and Tel Aviv, Vientiane and Luangprabang, Djakarta and Surabaja, Biak and Manokwari, Brewarrina and Coonamble, and Patna and Katmandu. An editor of a magazine called Airlift who made the Patna-Katmandu hop by Indian Airlines Corp. DC-3 not long ago wrote an account of the flight, rhapsodically headed, "DC-3 Bucks Himalaya Peaks To Serve Smiling Nepalese," which said of the Katmandu landing facilities, significantly, "The airport isn't much to brag about, but it's adequate for DC-3's."

* * * *

If the DC-3 is already a grand old lady, it is nonetheless hazardous to guess at how long its life span may turn out to be. In 1950, the magazine Aero Digest asked rhetorically, "Who among us is emboldened to deny that the DC-3 will go on forever?" Just what constitutes an airplane is arguable. Some vintage DC-3's have had over 50 changes of engine, and, except for the fuselage, little is left of their other original parts, either. (In the DC-3's defense, of course, it can be pointed out that every living creature is constantly renewing its cells.) Last year, Southern Airways detected a cracked wing bolt in one of its DC-3's, and sent the bolt to the Douglas Co., soliciting advice as to the cause of this defect. Careful examination revealed that the wing bolt had been part of the plane when it was assembled, 22 years earlier. By tracing the plane through its successive owners, the Douglas people established that the bolt, which, according to their engineers, had a theoretical life of 16,000 hours of flight, had actually stood up for 64,879 hours and 52 minutes. "The only message we could think of to send Southern was 'Congratulations,'" a Douglas engineer said later. North Central Airlines, the largest of the U.S. feeders, which operates out of Minneapolis, has two DC-3's that flew 50,000 hours each for Eastern Air Lines, for which they were built, in 1939, and that have racked up 20,000 hours more each since being sold to their present owner. Together, they have flown a good 20 million miles, and both are still going strong.

The DC-3, of course, is not indestructible. Grace Moore was killed in a DC-3 crash, and so was Carole Lombard. In 1949, a Canadian Pacific DC-3 earned the unsought distinction of being the first airliner to be blown up in flight, when a man who hoped to collect insurance on one of its passengers—his wife—planted a bomb in it. Generally, though, the DC-3 is both hardy and resourceful. In fact, one DC-3 foiled a would-be murderer when, flying across Mexico, it survived a bomb that ripped open one of its gas tanks; it landed 45 minutes later, and no one aboard was scratched. (It was through Mexico's bracing skies, too, that a hitchhiker once travelled from Torreón to Mexico City, a 3-hour ride, while clinging to a DC-3's tail.)

The second plane to land at the South Pole was a fancy four-engine Navy craft; it got stuck there, and couldn't take off until a DC-3 settled alongside with some spare parts. A few years ago, another DC-3 landed on a frozen Quebec lake. The ice was thin, and the plane broke through and sank. The owner despairingly sold what he assumed was its carcass to the first bidder, who fished the plane out, drained it, started the engines, and zoomed away. In England, a DC-3 once landed on the roof of a house without appreciably damaging either the house or itself. Many pilots regard the DC-3 as an exceptionally forgiving plane. They say it has the knack of somehow compensating for their errors. Indeed, some of them go so far as to insist that it can fly all by itself, citing as evidence an incident that took place 3 years ago in Missouri. An Air Force DC-3 ran out of gas, and the pilot and crew parachuted. Presently, the plane landed gently in a field. The only damage it suffered came when, as it was rolling to a halt, one wing hit a bale of hay.

In the air, the DC-3 has weathered some remarkable wrenches and tugs, including direct hits by lightning bolts, 16-inch naval shells, and kamikaze planes. During the war, one DC-3 pilot whose plane was riddled by antiaircraft fire decided to ditch it in a Pacific lagoon. After hitting the water, the plane bounced 50 feet into the air. Heartened by its resiliency, he changed his mind and flew on to his base. More recently, a DC-3 ferrying a cargo of monkeys from Pakistan to Morocco got to its destination even though several monkeys broke loose and swarmed all over the pilot's compartment, playfully pulling at the controls. When a DC–3 does crash, the reason is apt to be that the plane is not pressurized, which means that it cannot be flown comfortably over 17,000 feet and thus may bump into mountains. In 1957, however, a Frontier Airlines DC–3, in turbulent air over Arizona, plummeted 4,000 feet and scraped a hill, which sheared 12 feet off one wing, yet the pilot was able to right the plane and get it safely home, where he laconically reported, "Aircraft settled uncontrollably, contacting west slope of mountain peak on my left wing."

* * * * *

Right after V–J Day, DC–3s were a glut on the airplane market. Many of them were abandoned—and still stand rusting—on remote Pacific bases, DC–3's in good shape were sold as surplus for as little as $1,200, and incapacitated ones for as little as $250. (Some of the latter were trucked off and converted into homes.) At the time, nearly everybody in aviation assumed that the DC–3 was all but washed up as a passenger plane, and it was then that Douglas stopped manufacturing it. The company tried to make the best of what seemed like a bad situation by introducing the Super DC–3—a plane 2½ feet longer than the original model, and incorporating various improvements, which increased the cruising speed to around 240 miles an hour with a load of over 30 passengers. The company promotionally acclaimed its new offering as a plane "capable of carrying on indefatigably in the noble tradition of its famous ancestor," but despite this hoopla, and a transcontinental sales tour that Donald Douglas himself made in a Super DC–3, it never proved to be all that capable. The Navy bought 100 of the planes, but all other customers together ordered a mere 10.

In the meantime, the famous ancestor found itself in gradually mounting demand. Its relatively low purchase price made it extremely attractive to shoestring entrepreneurs offering modest nonscheduled air-coach transportation. Cargo carriers found it appealing, too—notably in the Antipodes. Before long, DC–3's were trundling emigrants from Italy and Cyprus to Australia, beef from inland Australian abattoirs to coastal ports, and sheep from Australia to grazing lands in New Guinea, and were being used to spread fertilizer in New Zealand. DC–3's were also being used to harass brown-tail moths in the United States while DC–3's on skis were patrolling the DEW line, and DC–3's on floats were wafting fishermen to remote trout-packed lakes. DC–3's were doing everything, and quite a few of them still are.

* * * * *

Early this year, when a new one-and-a-half-million-dollar control tower was opened at the Newark Airport, the first plane to be waved aloft from it was a DC–3, the property of the Federal Aviation Agency. That same day, the electrical system of a DC–3 carrying a professional basketball team over Iowa went on the blink, but the plane made a smooth emergency landing in a snow-covered cornfield. Douglas Aircraft employees now shuttle back and forth between plants at Santa Monica and Long Beach in four DC–3's; the company, which no longer owns even one, charters these from an airline called the Stewart Air Service, and at night the four planes—Stewart's whole fleet—keep in trim by hauling gamblers to Las Vegas and back.

Although 15 years have passed since the Douglas Co. turned out its last DC–3, it made and sold a million dollars' worth of spare parts for the planes last year. Almost every day, the Douglas offices receive an order for parts from some current DC–3 owners—Malayan Airways, perhaps, or the Royal Nepal Airline, or an American business firm that maintains a private plane. The larger corporations, like the larger airlines, have lately been turning to larger planes, but the executive of close to 400 companies that can scarcely be called small—among them Campbell Soup, Abitibi Power & Paper, Freeport Nickel, Webb & Knapp, Rockwell Spring & Axle, Fort Worth Pipe & Supply, and North American Life and Casualty—still fly in DC–3's. Some of these are elegantly fitted out. Houston Lumber has one with mink-covered doorknobs. The furniture in Alcoa's is all of gleaming aluminum. A rancher in Texas, one of dozens of individuals with a DC–3 at his beck, has upholstered the interior of his in unborn calfskin. It is not uncommon for such private craft to be fitted out with divans and dressing rooms and picture windows and hi-fi and tape recorders and air-to-ground phones and cedar closets and the latest electronic equipment and fogproof, iceproof, birdproof windshields and, of course, bars, which in the aircraft-trade press are called refreshment consoles. Pillsbury Mills has equipped its DC–3 as a laboratory to test the quick-rising properties of biscuit mix at varying heights, and a number of other firms use the planes as traveling showrooms, in which new products are demonstrated aloft to customers consoling themselves with refreshments.

The first 20 DC–3's built cost American Airlines $110,000 each. Today, used DC–3's may sell for as much as $260,000, and one that is fit and fitted for corporate use is not likely to fetch less than a $150,000. As for the DC–3's owned by a few Middle East sheiks, who fancy studding the panelling with precious jewels, their value is impossible to compute. Even the dowdiest old cargo-carrying DC–3 cannot be bought anywhere in the world for much under $25,000, and in this country the minimum market price is $50,000—a substantial appreciation since the end of the war. W. S. Shackleton, of London, a leading international dealer in used planes, who ships old Aer Lingus DC–3's from Ireland to Tanganyika and who sold a couple of DC–3's to the Sydney Morning Herald to deliver papers, observed recently that the DC–3 still plays the most significant role of all in the used-plane market.

* * * * *

There can be no doubt that the DC–3 has exerted a powerful pull on man's emotions. A few years ago, Donald Douglas got a nine-page, single-spaced letter from a Canadian banker who had been a wartime wing commander in the R.A.F. At the age of 20, he wrote Douglas, he had traveled from Halifax to Montreal merely to gape at a DC–3—a beautiful mechanical beast, he called it. He had at once fallen for the beast, and on flying aboard it as a passenger had found the experience "smooth and firm and straight and level." During the war, he had flown a DC–3 himself, and when the Japanese destroyed it on the ground, he was heartsick. "I missed her—as a person, not a piece of machinery," he wrote. "And that, to a driver who gets a 'right' plane in his hands, is the spell of the DC–3. If ever an inanimate object earned, deserved, and received the love of a man, your DC–3 was that object. In fact, I, and probably thousands of others, consider it callous to refer to her as 'inanimate.'" Douglas was touched by this testimonial, since he, too, is fonder of the DC–3 than of any other inanimate object his company has manufactured. "The Three is certainly the best and best-loved airplane we've ever produced," he said not long ago, speaking like a father. "But the circumstances that made it great just happened. They were not of our making. I doubt whether any airplane will have the same impact, or the same opportunity, again."—E. J. KAHN, Jr.

EXHIBIT 2

THIRD-LEVEL AVIATION: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Flight 107, all six passengers safely strapped in, taxied gracefully toward the broad runway at Logan. She glided by one of American Airline's parked jets, a trim sardine saluting a pregnant whale, and an hour later touched down neatly at Nantucket.

She was an Aero Commander, one of the modern blue and white fleet of fledging National Executive Flight Service, a small third level airline with big ideas about future service for New England.

The phrase third level is awkward, without much meaning for those outside the airline business. At the top of the hierarchy are the big boys, the so-called trunklines. They include American, Eastern, National, United and TWA and so on.

Next come the regional or local lines, of which Mohawk and Allegheny currently serve New England. Unlike the trunk carriers, these get Federal subsidies (together Mohawk and Allegheny received more than $11 million in 1962), but national policy seems aimed at whittling this down as soon as possible.

At the bottom in size, like "Baby Bear" in the tale of "Goldilocks," come the third level lines. A more meaningful label might be "scheduled air taxis."

Unlike the bigger carriers, the third-level lines do not need a Government-granted certificate of public convenience and necessity. They can fly wherever they want. They do, however, need an air taxi certificate, under a separate set of regulations monitored by the Federal Aviation Administration.

FAA checks the equipment and facilities of these small lines; goes over the records of the personnel, and its inspectors fly over the scheduled routes at least once every 6 months with the pilot in command. Unless there are special dispensations, a copilot is needed during bad weather operations. Generally, says the FAA, the third-level carrier safety records and equipment in New England are good.

FAA has been besieged to loosen up on some of its third-level regulations, but so far hasn't made any sweeping changes in this regard.

At this writing there are eight third-level ventures in New England. Five are Massachusetts-based, and Connecticut has three. Some of these are less than a year old, and it is obvious that the business mortality rate can be high.

From the experience of the eight lines, it can be deduced that such service must fill a need where regular travel is not satisfactory or is slow; or the third-level plane must connect with trunk lines at a major airport, such as Boston's Logan, or LaGuardia or Idlewild in New York. Mostly its business is seasonal.

Even now, while Northeast still supplies limited service to smaller New England communities—albeit somewhat reluctantly—the consensus is that there is a real need for more third-level routes.

Among the leading forces who attest the truth of this, and who are trying to implement it, is Crocker Snow, the Massachusetts Director of Aeronautics.

Confronting Northeast, or any other big airline asked to serve New England, is an inescapable elementary fact: This region has a concentration of fairly large population centers—but they are too near each other, geographically.

Short hauls are the bane of the airlines; just as they have been to the railroads. Offsetting this in minor part would be a sensible grouping of regional airports.

Medium-size industrial cities might not generate enough airline traffic to support a big-plane carrier, but it might be just the thing for a third-level line.

The New England Council conducted, in June 1962, an experiment serving northern New England. A consultant's report prepared for the council subsequently declared that there are 14 potential air taxi or feeder service routes in the 6-State region. It noted that six of these were already in service, mostly south of Boston. (Since the writing of this New England Council report, some of the six have bitten the economic dust, while new ones came into being.)

The big vacuum appears to be in northern New England. There are some fairly obvious factors which will help shape the future of air service in this thinly populated area. They include:

The probable cutting off of all Boston & Maine Railroad passenger service in the near future; the extension of the superexpressways, interstate routes as 95, 93, 89, and 91; the possibility of the granting of permission to the third level lines to carry mail as a source of revenue.

There are others, too: The relaxing of FAA regulations, the lifting of the 12,500-pound maximum weight ceiling set by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and perhaps as important as any of these, the sincere and wholehearted cooperation of the smaller communities which could benefit from such service.

Until a few weeks ago there might have been added a pair of irritations for the two-third-level carriers operating out of east Boston. National Executive Flight Service, which goes to Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, and thence to La Guardia; and the older Boston-Provincetown Air Lines, griped, with justification, that the Massachusetts Port Authority forced them to locate out in left field, far from the convenient center of the passenger terminal area. Also, that their landing fees of $3 each were too high.

Thanks to a campaign by the New England Council and others, the port authority has cut the landing fee in half, and given the two small carriers nearly ideal locations, plump in the middle of the busy section—where passengers have easy transfer access to the trunklines.

Logan, incidentally, is home base for several helicopter taxi outfits. One of these, Carson Helicopter of New England, Inc., engaged from April to June 1963 in scheduled service (three daily flights) to Manchester, Concord, and Claremont, N.H., using three twin-engine conventional planes.

Richard Carson, a former Pennsylvanian who came here via Harvard College, says the venture lost money, and he would not try it again with fixed-wing aircraft. His firm concentrates now exclusively on contract work with helicopters. Carson does think, however, that short-haul 'copter service to downtown Boston still offers an opportunity.

To prove that helicopters can survive in the helicopter taxi business, serving the area encompassed by Route 128, is Massachusetts Helicopter Airlines, Inc. Its president, Allan D. Russell, reports that his half-hourly service between Logan and Hanscom Airport in Bedford, with stops as necessary at numerous "helistops," has drawn encouraging response, and there is a chance of expansion to other major urban areas. Russell describes the business as a "scheduled shuttle service."

One of the undeniably successful third-level carriers is Yankee Airlines, which schedules three flights each weekday between Pittsfield and LaGuardia. John Heaton, Yankee's president, got his big chance when Northeast dropped Pittsfield service in March 1962. Mohawk had cut out of Pittsfield some months earlier.

Yankee uses three nine-passenger DeHavilland Doves, a reliable British plane with two engines. Initially General Electric, with its big Pittsfield installation, was the source for much of Yankee's business. Since he began early in 1962, says Heaton, the idea has caught on with other business clients and now things are really looking up.

In its first 15 months, Yankee boarded 6,721 passengers. There are 12 full-time employees (for both Yankee and its older parent firm, Greylock Airways). Only recently the CAB granted Yankee the right to carry airmail between Pittsfield and New York. Says Heaton, "We don't plan on, and aren't asking for, any subsidy."

Outlooks so sanguine are not shared by others. Some who took a fling at third-level operations in the past, some now in it, and others who might be tempted, feel it is too marginal a venture; they could not make it pay without public help from some source—call it "subsidy" or what you will.

National Executive Flight Service's president, Joseph C. Whitney, which took on the task of serving a 190-mile northern New England route in 1962—after the New England Council's 1-month experiment—takes the view that no large carrier wants to serve that area on its own; and neither do those of the Allegheny and Mohawk size, "unless they are pushed into it."

National Executive Flight Service has an excellent fleet of small planes. But Whitney feels that CAB's weight limitation of 12,500 pounds hurts. He would like to add something like the old, reliable DC–3 or a Martin 202.

Whitney's line duplicates in part some of Northeast's service to the islands. It charges more than Northeast, but offers a more frequent schedule. Reportedly National Executive Flight Service and Northeast get along fairly well, with National Executive Flight Service handling overflow during the peak summer weekends.

But as with so many of the others, National Executive Flight Service looks toward charter and contract business for its real year-round bread and butter. Charter revenue this year is double that of 1962.

National Executive Flight Service's third-line neighbor at Logan, John Van Arsdale's Provincetown-Boston Airline, carries about 10,500 passengers yearly. Van Arsdale, who is optimistic about future potential, claims his firm is New England's biggest.

But even he concedes that without several side ventures, including a star route and mail contract with the Post Office Department, the hauling of passengers alone between Boston and the tip of Cape Cod would not pay. In the winter months nearly the whole operation moves to the wealthy resort town of Naples, Fla., where scheduled flights are made to Miami, 98 miles away.

It is only 45 air miles to Provincetown from Boston, and Van Arsdale's fleet of five twin-engine planes do it in 20 minutes. This is as good an illustration as any of the fact that the oddities of New England geography can provide a basis for a third-level airline. No other public transportation serves Provincetown directly; even the bus passengers from Boston must change at Hyannis. The New Haven gave up hauling passengers there many bankrupt months ago.

Also flitting around the cape area is the solidly established Cape & Islands Flight Service, Inc. Its president, George E. Parmenter, began flying newspapers to the islands from Hyannis in the early 1950's. Today, although newspapers are a relatively minor item, Nantucketers still fondly refer to it as "the paper plane."

Winter sees two flights scheduled daily, and no less than seven trips daily to Nantucket in the summer. Last year the passenger totals ran to nearly 11,000. George Parmenter figures to make a go of it without subsidies. "The operation must be self-supporting," he says—and he intends to prove it.

Wiggins, based at Norwood Airport, has long been a household name in the air taxi and charter business. Like East Coast Airways, at Bedford, Mass., it goes the whole bit by offering transportation in addition to flight instruction, aircraft sales and service and the maintenance and repairs necessary at airfields.

Newest entry in the third-level sweepstakes in Massachusetts is Colony Air Lines which has three flights each weekday between Fitchburg, Worcester, and LaGuardia. George Vine, a 48-year-old New Yorker, who is the entrepreneur, uses eight-passenger Beechcrafts.

One of the busier regional air taxis—although not on regular schedules—is Newport (R.I.) Air Park. Its spiffy fleet of Aero Commanders has carried such notables as President Kennedy, his wife's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Auchincloss, and a host of other notables—business VIP's, diplomats, international sportsmen.

Robert F. Wood, Newport Air Park's president, notes that in the 4-month 1962 summer period it carried nearly 6,000 passengers and 2,200 pounds of cargo. The latter included living and dead stretcher cases, monkeys, donkeys, penguins and ducks.

The southern New England shoreline has also witnessed other activity with smaller scheduled air taxis. An outfit calling itself Bi-Air shuttles between Trumbull Airport at New London and Block Island. The 1962 peak occurred in August, with 94 flights, all with an Aero Commander.

Another Trumbull Airport third-level carrier is Pilgrim Airlines, which has two round trips daily to Idlewild. Even in the winter months of December through February, it carried 665 passengers and 3,400 pounds of freight.

A native Block Islander, Melville Frazier, also flies from that island to Westerly, R.I. His three planes have no schedule, but seem to make at least as many trips as does scheduled Bi-Air.

New Haven Airways runs two daily flights to Idlewild from New Haven, and anticipates an expansion of service.

Third level airline operations seem dormant in northern New England now. Some air taxi and charter operators, like Harold W. Buker, Jr., at North Springfield, Vt., aver that some activity of this genre "will be absolutely essential to the economic welfare of this whole area." Buker's outfit, with 6 planes and 10 full-time employees, carried 2,871 passengers in 1962.

Others, such as F. M. Greenwood at Rutland Airways in North Clarendon, Vt., do a substantial amount of survey work for timber and marble quarry outfits. At the Augusta, Maine, airport, a two-place helicopter owned by Maine Helicopters, Inc., performed yeoman tasks for the gigantic Telstar project at Andover, Maine, in 1962. Once, early in the construction program, the inflated dome covering the tracking station's huge antenna developed a rip—near the top. The ground crew was hard put to get up and fix it. The helicopter managed to carry a steeplejack up to make the repairs.

Not all of the lines or services have been listed here. There are others, at Providence, Portland, Hartford, and so on. But from the volume of passengers now being carried it's clear that New England's third levelers are performing a useful transportation service; and the fact that they are doing this without subsidy is especially pleasing to New Englanders. So far, however, they have only survived and prospered in areas where there is a great advantage in time between what they offer and other forms of transportation, plus a substantial amount of traffic. How can we get this type of air service extended to economically less attractive parts of New England?

Airmail will help both the operators' pocketbook and the public business. Now that the pattern has been set by Yankee Airlines it should be studied at other places.

Star route airmail contracts would be even better, since they cover all premium mail. This includes air, first class, and newspapers. It looks as if legislation is necessary to make these generally available in New England. The Post Office Department and the CAB are working on this and should be encouraged.

Of vital importance is the quality of the airports to be used. Acceptable service must be dependable, which means that outlying airports have to be equipped for bad weather operations as are the big city terminals. Fortunately, scaled-down versions of the very expensive large airport electronic and optical gear will do, since small airplanes are less demanding than big ones. The New England States are doing much to fill a Federal void in this respect.

And perhaps most important of all is a receptive attitude on the part of the Government agencies which regulate, and the public which can benefit from, air transportation by small airplanes. This looks like the best way out for many communities which cannot begin to fill the many seats the major airlines have to carry around to justify their built-in overhead.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1963]

NEW PLANE URGED FOR LOCAL ROUTES—LOW-COST $500,000 AIRLINER ADVOCATED BY CAB

WASHINGTON, August 31.—Forty years ago the Nation was told it needed a good 5-cent cigar.

Today, it is being told it needs a good $500,000 airliner.

The Civil Aeronautics Board this year is paying 13 local service airlines more than $80 million to serve smaller communities that do not provide sufficient traffic to be profitable.

And the Board believes that it could cut this subsidy bill by having those airlines operate a transport that would be cheaper to buy and cheaper to fly.

The so-called "airlines of main street" serve the small-city market with three basic types of equipment, each inherently unsatisfactory for the job. They fly modern propjet F-27's, postwar twin-engine Convairs and Martins, or the beloved obsolete DC-3.

The trouble with the F-27's, Convairs and Martins is that they are too big for many of the cities they serve. It makes little economic sense to operate a 52-passenger Convair or a 40-passenger F-27 or Martin into a community that is lucky to board 5 passengers daily.

A STARTLING STATISTIC

A recent CAB study of more than 86,000 local service flight departures showed that the small communities seldom need a plane capable of carrying more than 24 passengers. One statistic was startling: 76 percent of the departures had 18 or fewer passengers.

The trouble with the smaller DC-3 is simply its age. It costs 71 cents a mile to fly. Maintenance and spare parts for a plane designed in 1935 are expensive.

What the local service airlines would like is a modern plane about the size of a DC-3, selling for around a half-million dollars. The Association of Local Transport Airlines had a special committee draw up specifications for a DC-3 replacement.

The committee called for a plane that could carry 18 passengers and baggage plus 1,000 pounds of cargo, operate on a 3,500-foot runway, fly 500 miles nonstop or through three stops with a full payload without refueling, have an approach speed of only 60 miles an hour, cruise at least 300 miles an hour and cost only 40 cents a mile to fly.

NONE ON DRAWING BOARD

Not a single U.S. manufacturer has such an airliner on the drawing board although the market potential is enormous. The local service airlines alone still operate nearly 200 DC-3's.

The French have a smaller airliner with many of the desired characteristics, the Nord 262, but this craft has a direct operating cost of 60 cents a mile.

Therefore it does not meet a prime requisite of both a transport so inexpensive to fly that it could break even or make a little money serving low-traffic communities.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has been conducting serious studies of the DC-3 replacement problem. It has talked with more than 25 manufacturers both here and abroad. From all these studies the Board got this sad news:

Taking into consideration all factors under a manufacturer's control—such as development costs, fuel consumption, maintenance, and overhaul intervals, the price of parts and depreciation—there is no present way to build an 18- to 24-passenger airliner that would sell for less than $500,000 and still have direct operating costs even as good as the DC-3's 71 cents a mile.

The lowest figure given the Board for operating costs was 93 cents, the highest $1.36.

The Board concedes that it may be necessary for the Federal Government to underwrite part of the development costs for a jet-age DC-3, just as it is doing for the supersonic transport.

A number of aviation experts would rather see the $750 million Federal investment in a supersonic airliner going instead toward an aircraft for which there is an obvious need.

THE PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the naval shipyards constitute an essential element in the Nation's preparedness. The postwar years have placed upon the U.S. Navy heavy demands for worldwide readiness and the flexibility which armed conflict under modern conditions would require. Let us remember that the Korean conflict, the strife in Laos, and the confrontation in Cuba were resolved only because the Navy was at hand with appropriate forces.

The naval shipyards have a real part to play in guaranteeing this readiness and building the required features into naval vessels. For this reason, the Navy must be determined to maintain all naval shipyards at the best possible levels of performance. This means highly skilled management, up-to-date machinery, stable workloads, and a host of other methods, such as training.

The Flying A magazine, published by the Aeroquip Corp., of Jackson, Mich., recently described one such training program at the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard. Without this splendid concentration of skills, there could have been no attack-type submarines. These versatile and highly sophisticated weapons are, however, "Portsmouth's Proud Line," as the title of the article makes plain. I ask unanimous consent that this description of Portsmouth's relentless drive for quality in marine construction be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTSMOUTH'S PROUD LINE: BUILDING QUALITY INTO SUBMARINES IS A WAY OF LIFE AT THIS GREAT NAVAL SHIPYARD

Early last year a group of Navy specialists from throughout the submarine fleet reported to the U.S. Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth, N.H., to attend a new and unusual school—one devoted completely to the study of flexible marine piping. For a solid week they studied the identification of the many types of hose and fittings; how to assemble and inspect them properly; how to install them; and how to test them properly. Upon graduation each man received a certificate proclaiming his competence in the field of flexible piping knowledge.

The significant thing about the school is that it reveals how extensive the use of flexible marine piping has become in submarine applications. Virtually unheard of as recently as 15 years ago, and still regarded as rather experimental even 5 years ago, flexible marine piping is now used extensively, and is of critical importance in the Navy's—and Portsmouth's—relentless drive for quality in submarine construction. In fact, the flexible piping assemblies installed on a submarine now get as much engineering attention as the pumps and other equipment they serve. On a submarine every component is important, and flexible marine piping is especially so because of the increasing need for sound attenuation (reduction) and vibration control. Today's silent service has to be quieter than ever, and flexible marine piping is helping to achieve that end.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is an appropriate setting for these changes in the status of flexible marine piping, for the Shipyard is a world leader in submarine technology. Almost as old as the Navy Department itself, Portsmouth was established in 1800. It has grown progressively as the Navy has progressed from sails to steam and from steam to atoms. Its proud line of submarines began in 1917 with the launching of the L-8, which was followed by eight more undersea craft in 2 years. And between 1918 and 1941, more than 30 additional submarines were built at Portsmouth, each improved as a result of lessons learned from the earlier ones. By 1941, Portsmouth had perfected a number of important submarine developments, such as all-welded steel hulls. Thus, its "know-how" was ready to be put to work in a big way during World War II, when employment reached 20,000 and a total of 75 advanced fleet-type submarines were built. On a single memorable day in 1944—January 27—no less than four new subs were launched.

Since World War II, Portsmouth has developed and built many pioneering submarines such as U.S.S. *Albacore* in 1953 with its radical streamlined hull, U.S.S. *Barbel* in 1959, first of the superquiet high speed diesel subs, and U.S.S. *Dolphin*, a research vehicle capable of diving to extraordinary depths, still under construction. In addition to many conventional submarines, the shipyard also completed the Polaris-carrying U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, in 1961, and has two others of a more advanced type of fleet ballistic missile submarines now under construction. Another leader in submarine technology is the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics in Groton, Conn. E.B. has also played a major role in the development of modern undersea weapons, particularly the Polaris submarines.

It was in fact the very success of the Polaris weapon system which created a new challenge for Portsmouth. The invulnerability and enormous power of Polaris posed a difficult question: Is there any practical defense? The answer was that probably the best defense against a Polaris-type weapon system at sea was a good offense in the form of a fleet of highly developed attack-type submarines. And the prime design responsibility for this weapon was assigned to Portsmouth.

All of the accumulated knowledge and experience of 40 years have been poured into the design of a new class of nuclear-powered attack submarines, whose primary function is to seek out and destroy aggressor submarines. The first submarine of this new class was built at Portsmouth in 1961; two others are already in service, and several more in the class are under construction at Portsmouth.

At Portsmouth, the quality starts with quality design. An experienced, complete design engineering staff is constantly seeking new and better materials, processes, and components, to meet the challenges posed by ever-increasing operational needs.

It all began in the early 1950's when the need for sound attenuation and vibration control became critical. A noisy submarine has two strikes against it: (1) it can easily be heard by an enemy at great distance and (2) its own sound-powered detection equipment (sonar) is less efficient. These can be fatal defects.

A search for the sources of sound on submarines showed that much of it arises in auxiliary systems components such as pumps, actuators, and other rotating machinery. One approach was to mount these components resiliently; another was to add extra sound insulation. These both helped. But frequently the rigid pipes serving the components would act as vibration and sound transmitters or even worse, as amplifiers. Solution: flexible pipes. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard engineers proposed using reinforced rubber hose lines instead of steel pipe in critical systems, and the results were dramatic. There was a very significant drop in the noise levels of systems using flexible piping. Working closely with Portsmouth designers, Aeroquip engineers have learned how to provide the most effective sound attenuation in all the vital fluid systems aboard a submarine.

On the new attack submarines, flexible piping is used in many fluid systems. Aeroquip is the major supplier of flexible piping in Portsmouth designed submarines. These include pneumatic lines for the high pressure air systems, lines for lube oil, ballast tank blowing, fresh and salt water, steam, electronic cooling, and the CO_2, scrubber system. The last system makes possible long underwater cruising by continuously removing carbon dioxide from the submarine's atmosphere and replacing it with oxygen. Overall, Aeroquip Flexible Piping on the typical nuclear submarine is called upon to handle operating pressures from high vacuum to several thousand PSI, with diameters ranging from one-quarter inch through 6 inches.

Aside from the prime design goal of sound attenuation, flexible piping offers several important secondary benefits. One benefit is that components isolated by flexible piping last longer and work better because of reduced vibration. Another is that flexible piping is often much easier to install and maintain, because it bends easily. And another, reusable fittings allow emergency replacement of hose to be made at sea without special skills or equipment.

At Portsmouth, the path of a piping assembly from the design engineer's mind to installation on the submarine is an eight-step plan with tight IBM card control at every stage from initial planning through procurement, installation, and final inspection. This system allows full knowledge and control of every item on the submarine. Considering that the typical attack sub uses hundreds of flexible piping assemblies and many thousands of other components, elaborate and precise control is clearly necessary.

In addition to the procurement sequence, there is an overall engineering design control system. This system also uses IBM cards, with a microfilm drawing of each component on each card. When design changes occur, as they often do, it is a simple matter to locate the parts affected and update the cards. Duplicate sets of the flexible piping cards and microfilm readout equipment are maintained in the design division, the hose assembly area, the supply area, and the inspection division. Thus, complete engineering detail is quickly available and constantly kept current in all the key locations.

With the flexible piping concept fully established, the need arose for making sure that the assemblies would receive proper maintenance in the fleet. Hence the fluid piping school was launched at Portsmouth's piping shops as a special section of the shop. The shop maintains a full school curriculum and still carries out a full schedule producing assemblies for new construction and replacing of old assemblies.

The school has graduated over 50 men so far, and the rate will probably increase. In this way, the fleet is assured of a steady supply of men knowledgeable in the maintenance of flexible piping assemblies. It is another of Portsmouth's ways of assuring that the quality built into its subs at the shipyards will continue to receive quality maintenance in the fleet.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the work force at the naval shipyards is an asset of untold value in troubled times. In the seacoast region of New Hampshire, where the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is located, 24 new industries have located in the last 5 years. These industries are technically advanced and widely diversified, relying upon the reputation of New Hampshire's working men and women for diligent and skillful efforts on the job. Some 161 new industries have located in New Hampshire in the last 10 years, as a further tribute to the many rewards of life, work, and community activity in our State.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard represents a concentration of talent, energy, and devotion to the Nation's needs. Consequently, I urge the Navy to do everything necessary to maintain this productive center at the competitive strength and instant readiness which the Navy's needs demand, and which the industrious people of southeastern New Hampshire have shown to be their characteristic habits of work. Few other locations in the country could provide so solid a guarantee of productivity and effort as the seacoast region of New Hampshire, with a work force that is dependable and energetic. The Navy would do well to organize their skills up to the limit of its management capability, to provide our Atlantic Fleet with the home port and repair facilities which the times demand. We have every reason to be proud of our Navy and pleased with the contributions of our naval shipyards and their workers—close partners in providing for the defense needs of America.

OBJECTIONS TO APPROVAL OF THE TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have been bringing to the attention of Senators various articles, editorials, and speeches which either warn against ratification of the proposed Moscow test ban treaty or call on the Senate to study this matter thoroughly and consider deeply all of the valid objections which have been raised in criticism of the treaty. Today I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks the following items:

An editorial from the San Diego Union of August 24, 1963, entitled "We Can Deceive Ourselves: Americans Must Be Vigilant."

A column from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of August 23, 1963, entitled "Heed the Teller Warning."

An editorial from the Tonasket Tribune, of Tonasket, Wash., entitled "Moscow Treaty Is a Fraud."

An editor's report by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers, entitled "Tighten the Brakes."

An editorial from the Nashville Banner of August 28, 1963, entitled "Admiral Burke Says 'No'."

A column which appeared in the Nashville Banner of August 28, 1963, entitled "Does East-West Test Ban Treaty Mean an End to NATO?" This article was written by Constantine Brown.

A statement by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy, retired, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on proposed treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, for inclusion in the record of the hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 30, 1963.

An editorial from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., of August 22, 1963, entitled "Risked His Career."

An article by Mr. Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., on August 28, 1963, entitled "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Fails Kennedy."

A column by Alice Widener, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on August 30, 1963, entitled "The Value of Reservations."

A column, by Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on August 29, 1963, entitled "What's Beyond the Treaty?"

A column, by George Todt, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner on August 22, 1963, entitled "Defense Before Moon."

An editorial from the New York Journal American of August 25, 1963, entitled "Call de Seversky."

Two articles by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky. They appeared in the New York Journal American on August 25 and 26, 1963, respectively, and are entitled "De Seversky Warns of A-Pact Perils" and "Tests a Must To Build Top Nuclear Arms."

A recent column, by Alice Widener, publisher, U.S.A. magazine, which appeared in the Shreveport Journal entitled "U.S. Senators Should Study Red Pamphlet: Booklet Suggested to Solons Voting on Test Ban Treaty."

A recent "Report From Washington," by Mr. Walter Trohan, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune entitled "More Cause for Concern Than Confidence in Atom Treaty."

An editorial from the Augusta Herald of Augusta, Ga., dated August 29, 1963, entitled "Burke Has Eyes Open to Aims of Foe."

A column, by Paul Harvey, as printed in the Augusta Herald on August 28, 1963, entitled "U.S. Will Get No Nuclear Bargain by Playing at Russian Roulette."

A column, by Earl E. Spicer, Jr., which appeared in the Blacksburg Sun of Blacksburg, Va., on August 29, 1963, entitled "Test Ban Treaty Should Be Rejected."

An article, by Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., on August 31, 1963, entitled "Germans See Test Treaty as Kremlin's Greatest Victory."

A recent advertisement entitled "Defeat the Treaty of Moscow."

A front page editorial from the August 23, 1963, issue of Manchester Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., entitled "Power, Teller Oppose 'Tragic Mistake'."

An article, by Congressman Craig Hosmer, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 7, 1963, entitled "Beware the Test Ban."

An editorial from the Augusta Courier of Augusta, Ga., of September 2, 1963, entitled "Why Nikita Laughs."

An editorial from the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., of September 1, 1963, entitled "The Senate and the Test Ban."

An editorial from the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., of August 30, 1963, entitled "Soviet Duplicity on Test Ban."

The "Case Against J.F.K.'s Moscow Treaty," which appeared in the September 10, 1963, issue of National Review. The first article is by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., and is entitled "False Dilemmas." The second article is by Mr. James Burnham, and is entitled "False Analysis."

"U.S. Intelligence: Is It Good Enough"—an article which appeared in the September 9, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

My weekly newsletter of August 26, 1963, entitled "The $64 Question."

A column, by Holmes Alexander, which appeared in the Augusta Herald of Augusta, Ga., August 28, 1963, entitled "LeMay's Reason for Skepticism."

There being no objection, the editorials and other items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Aug. 24, 1963]

We Can Deceive Ourselves—Americans Must Be Vigilant

The clinking of champagne glasses in Moscow and the beguiling assurances of the administration that the Communist offensive has been halted are supposed to generate a wave of optimism in the United States that the cold war is coming to an end.

Presumably fear is being lifted from our lives and the American people can lay aside their historic obligations to freedom, dance the twist, and vote for the Kennedys.

But that is not the America that most of us know. Americans have never been afraid to fight, or even die, for what is right.

Peace is not to be bought by signing a scrap of paper, as with the partial test-ban treaty. Nothing has come out of the Senate hearings into the treaty that give any assurance that peace is any nearer, or that the relative strength of the United States has been maintained or improved, or that the Soviet Union signed it in good faith.

We have, in fact, nothing. Premier Khrushchev acceded to the treaty after President Kennedy made his controversial speech at American University. The Moscow radio summed it all up with a statement that the speech was a "renunciation of the policy of strength."

In a foreword to a government book containing the "Public Papers of the President of the United States," Mr. Kennedy writes that 1962 was the year in which the Soviet offensive momentum was halted. The response of the United States to the placing of missiles in Cuba is supposed to have frightened the Communists into a retreat down the road of coexistence.

But what is the real situation? There is a major Soviet base within 100 miles of the United States; nearly all Latin America is seething with unrest and disorder; Southeast Asia is either under rising Communist pressure or racing toward socialism; American influence has virtually been eliminated from Africa and the Middle East; American bases are being scrapped in strategic areas.

Where, we ask, has the Communist offensive been turned back, or even blunted?

The people around the President seemed convinced that the American people desire peace above all else, that they are tired of the cold war and only want to make the "world safe for diversity."

The call to struggle, sounded in earlier days by a young, eager but naive President, has faded into the mist of abandoned goals. We now cry "peace in our time."

Where have we heard that before?

We can't help but believe that this is a misreading of the people's knowledge and a misjudging of the people's will. Are Americans so afraid of the possibility of nuclear war that they will seek disarmament instead of strength? That they will accept compromises and not victories? That they will be silent while their leaders whisper with the enemy? That they will complacently accept placing trust in the untrustworthy?

We do not think so. The American people, if they are made aware of the necessity of winning the cold war for the sake of tomorrow, if not just today, would respond just as they always have to a call to defend their heritages.

The United States, however, is retreating behind a mask of words that seek to make us believe we are advancing. Can we be induced to deceive ourselves?

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Aug. 23, 1963]

Heed the Teller Warning

Dr. Edward Teller earnestly urges the Senate to refuse to ratify the limited nuclear test ban treaty with Russia. The nuclear physicist's reasoning is that more atmospheric testing is essential to development of an antimissile defense. Without such a defense, Dr. Teller insists, we may be at the mercy of Soviet attack.

This, it is now plain, will be the crux of the Senate debate on the treaty, once current committee hearings have ended.

Dr. Teller's warning must not be ignored. In fact, President Kennedy's attempt to dismiss the scientist's objections so casually at his Tuesday news conference was uncommonly petty. No one, not even the President, can deflate the importance of Dr. Teller's testimony.

But there is a middle ground. This is where most of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other defense leaders have been trying to find a place. The military bosses have spelled out the safeguards that are necessary if the United States is to enter into a treaty which it well knows can be violated by Red Russia whenever that appears to its advantage.

The generals and the admirals insist that there must be a vigorous program of underground testing—permissible under the treaty. They want our nuclear laboratories kept at top strength, in readiness for atmospheric testing if that avenue is again opened by a treaty violation in the Soviet Union. They demand improvements in methods of detection of enemy tests.

Needless to say, they also want an antimissile defense. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara insists that development of an antimissile weapon can continue without additional atmospheric tests, and President Kennedy insists the Soviet hasn't got an antimissile defense and won't get one as a result of this test ban.

Americans must put credence in such assurances from the White House and the Pentagon.

But we also can listen to Dr. Teller. And if we take his warning to heart, this Nation can, without rejecting the test treaty, give greater emphasis to antimissile development and research.

Secretary McNamara and the President have not been enthusiastic about the potential success of our antimissile projects, and thus have not permitted the military to spend much money or effort in that field.

By now it seems inevitable that the Senate will ratify the test ban pact by better than the required two-thirds majority. Well and good, for America should not renege on a plan it has advocated for so many years simply because Moscow now finds it advantageous to agree with us.

But let us heed the Joint Chiefs in their demand for safeguards, and in particular let the President and Congress take cognizance of Dr. Teller's testimony. If that could lead to a speedup in antimissile defense efforts, this test ban would indeed be helpful to America.

[From the Tonasket (Wash.) Tribune]

Moscow Treaty Is a Fraud

All that pomp and ceremony in Moscow last Monday, when a partial nuclear test ban treaty was signed, was a pious political fraud, conceived in iniquity and designed to lull into a false sense of security a world which yearns for peace.

This bogus treaty does nothing to remove the threat of nuclear annihilation which hangs over the entire world. It settles no world problems. It does nothing to lighten the crushing burden of armaments under which the peoples of the world are groaning. It is a fake, intended by the Communists to anesthetize the free world while the Reds proceed to enslave other portions of the globe under the pretense that they are now devoted to the ideals of peace and brotherly love.

Americans, wake up. We now have negotiated 54 solemn treaties with Soviet Russia, of which 50 have been brazenly broken by the Communists. As a token of Khrushchev's integrity and good will, why should not the Senate of the United States insist that Cuba be freed and every vestige of communism purged from that unhappy island before America ratifies this Moscow pact to partially ban the testing of nuclear bombs?

So long as the Communists hold fast to the menacing ideology which condones the shame of the Berlin wall, so long as they embrace Castro and murder Americans in Laos and in Korea, there can be no peace, and treaties to ban the testing of nuclear bombs are but a travesty.

A treaty to ban communism would be more sensible.

Editor's Report: Tighten the Brakes

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

San Simeon.—A considerable part of this past week has been spent carefully reading and thinking about the testimony in Washington on the limited nuclear test ban agreement. It has been a kind of busman's holiday, but it is in the interest of all Americans to try to make sure we're on the right bus this time, and to yank the stop cord hard if we're not.

If it is the right bus, then we're inching slowly in low gear toward the distant prospect of peace. If it's the wrong bus and we don't pull the stop cord, we could be traveling toward the precipice of disaster.

There were some news commentators and columnists and a couple of Senators, too, who seemed to feel that the hearings would be a mere charade, a meaningless formality preceding ratification of the treaty. They couldn't have been more mistaken and they should have known better.

Our Senators have never been an august body of yes-men even in a hot August. And the witnesses summoned before the Senate committees have been the most highly qualified men, presenting their views with complete candor.

The result merits being called a great debate. It is what President Kennedy promised it would be, and what the American public is entitled to receive. More importantly, it is in the American tradition and is our safeguard against stumbling blindly into a Munich of our own making.

Last week's witnesses included three knowledgeable men who are opposed to the test-ban agreement and others with very strong reservations.

The three were Dr. Edward Teller, "father of the H-bomb" and one of our foremost nuclear physicists; Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif., and onetime associate of Dr. Teller, and Gen. Thomas S. Power, head of the Strategic Air Command (SAC). The reservations came from former Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard F. Libby and former Atomic Energy Chairman Lewis L. Strauss. In fact, Mr. Strauss is against the agreement in its present form.

Additionally, I recommend to your attention an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, in your Journal-American today.

It is not the intention here to burden you with a lengthy rehash of the testimony nor to foist on you a pontifical interpretation of it. I hope just to touch the high spots and present them fairly.

Let's start with Dr. Teller. I still believe in getting information direct from top-level people, rather than depending on handouts and news leaks. Dr. Teller was in New York a couple of weeks ago. We had met before, but we are not close friends, so it was routine to seek him out and ask him some questions.

His views were transmitted to the Hearst Headline Service Bureau in Washington and resulted in a story, under the byline of Ed Edstrom, in our papers August 12. Needless to say, Dr. Teller's opinions were similar to those he voiced this past week in Washington.

In brief, these are his beliefs:

That Russia may have an effective antimissile missile (now known as the ABM) in 3 to 5 years, largely as result of the superbomb tests they set off in 1961.

That the test-ban treaty would block any U.S. effort to match this development and leave us as badly off "as if Russia had a nuclear attacking force and we had none."

That an effective ABM cannot be developed without atmospheric testing.

That the Russians could cheat on the treaty by testing undetected millions of miles in space.

That the treaty would endanger, if not cripple, Operation Plowshare; experiments in peaceful uses of nuclear explosions, such as creating canals and harbors.

Dr. Foster opposed the agreement on the ground that it would prevent us from prooftesting weapons systems, and further prevent us from determining whether there is any advantage in a supermegaton bomb.

General Power, whose testimony was in closed session, opposed it as endangering our security beyond the extent of reasonable risk.

Dr. Libby gave his worried or reluctant acquiescence to ratification. His chief concern was that we have not tested a superbomb.

Now we come to Lewis Strauss, a man of devoted service to our country and of devout religious convictions. Mr. Strauss urged the Senate to buttress the treaty with two formal stipulations and advocated four other safeguards. I concur in every instance.

The formal stipulations are:

Make it clear in the treaty that the United States could use nuclear weapons to aid an ally if necessary and eliminate the 3 months' notice requirement for withdrawal from the pact.

Reserve the right to build harbors, canals, etc., by peaceful nuclear explosions on U.S. or friendly territory requesting our help.

His other suggested safeguards are:

Congress should order maintenance of test readiness facilities as well as vigorous underground testing; create annual awards for weapons laboratory personnel; give generous appropriations to agencies operating detecting systems; and require the President to report immediately all information on tests or suspicious events by other countries.

The Strauss recommendations should be painstakingly considered by the Senate—and all Americans.

On the other hand—and it is a preponderant other hand—the Nation has been presented with testimony in support of the treaty from a bevy of experts no less qualified than those who have opposed it.

Further, it is significant that these individuals have been supported by no less than 35 American Nobel Prize-winning scientists, many of them formerly active in the nuclear weaponry program.

Intriguing testimony was submitted to the Senate by Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering at the Pentagon. Dr. Brown has achieved this position at the precocious age—for the job—of 36, which means he must be a very bright young man indeed.

Dr. Brown learned his nuclear physics at Dr. Teller's knee. And while expressing deep personal affection for his mentor, Dr. Brown said he flatly disagreed with Dr. Teller's stand. "He thinks I'm wrong," he said. "I think he's wrong."

No five men in history have conceivably held more destructive force at their fingertips than the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their Chairman.

They are not nuclear physicists. They are servicemen supplied by those physicists with fearsome armament. Their responsibility is consequently staggering.

The five—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman; Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force; Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army; Adm. David L. McDonald, Navy; Gen. David M. Shoup, Marine Corps—have endorsed the treaty, and this in itself is about as important a development in the debate as has yet occurred.

It is disturbing, though, that their endorsements were given with varying degrees of enthusiasm. General LeMay, a tough flier, told Senators he would have been against the treaty if it had not already been initialed, or signed or been before the Senate. General Shoup, however, said bluntly: "I had access to the words of the treaty before it was initialed and I was in favor of its being initialed."

The point is that the Joint Chiefs did give their assent to the document, freely and without pressure as the uncompromising opposition of General Power has shown. The treaty could hardly have survived if the position of the Joint Chiefs had been the reverse.

The administration, in fact, derived star-studded support from other famous names whose integrity is without question; individuals like John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Neither of these men would have supported the treaty, or any part of it, unless they were reasonably certain that it was in the best interests of the United States.

We have witnessed a remarkable range of disagreement, dissent, and debate during this historic event, and will no doubt continue to do so. Military and scientific minds on the highest level have found themselves completely counter to each other on a clearly defined set of circumstances.

Going back to the figure of speech with which this piece began, I see no compelling reason for yanking the stop cord so far.

But I do think the brakes of the bus ought to be tightened as Mr. Strauss recommended.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Aug. 28, 1963]

Admiral Burke Says "No"

Senators consulting military judgment on the test ban treaty have had with that no more realistic appraisal than retired Adm. Arleigh A. Burke provided yesterday. His dissent is not partial—amounting to assent with reservations. It is flat disapproval, attended by sober warning of national regret to come if any instrument of agreement conditioned on the Soviet's good faith is ratified.

As former Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke has borne a heavy burden of security responsibility; a realist not given to wishful thinking, retreating from a position of strength, or succumbing to the enemy's seductive overtures.

He reminded again of the necessity—once proclaimed—of the "open sky" policy, and enforceable, mutual inspection, to make any such compact as nearly foolproof as possible. The plan now advanced partakes of none of these. It is at best a "gentlemen's agreement," similar to those Russia has broken before.

Air Force Gen. Thomas S. Power, chief of the Strategic Air Command, has given like warning * * * significantly, risking his position to speak his mind. So has Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, chief of the military space development. Adding to their testimony concerning what this step might well do in retarding the acquisition of more knowledge—for security and weaponry vital to it—Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb, has admonished against blind acceptance of Soviet promises.

These witnesses have no personal axes to grind; and are given to no dog-in-the-manger attitude of opposition for opposition's sake. Their concern is for the security of their country, not just for the present moment, but for the future. Their dissent is from any formula of hazardous loopholes, and built-in boobytraps. The warnings they propound relate to these, and no less to the question of just why Russia—after a decade of resisting the search for agreement—suddenly acquiesces in it.

Admiral Burke speaks bluntly, and to the point. His opinion was solicited, for an evaluation based on informed judgment. The Senate needs the maximum of competent testimony to guide in making up its mind on the supremely important question before it. None can say it has not been warned.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Aug. 28, 1963]

Does East-West Test Ban Treaty Mean an End to NATO?

(By Constantine Brown)

Bonn.—Is the limited nuclear test ban a prelude to dissolution of the NATO? This is the question asked by many Germans this reporter has talked to in the last few days.

While spokesmen of the Bonn government express a cautious approval of the Moscow treaty, responsible politicians of both parties are concerned over what price Germany has been called on to pay for the relaxation of tensions between Washington, London, and

Moscow. It is generally agreed—even in official government circles—that there is much in the treaty which should cause real concern for the future of the Bundesrepublik.

Americans have pledged themselves not to accept the partition of Germany. The present division is an arbitrary act by the U.S.S.R. which we have solemnly declared we cannot recognize. There can be no genuine "accommodation" with Moscow, it was repeatedly stated in Washington unless East and West Germany are reunited.

But the fine print in the treaty shows that the Pankow regime can be recognized by the "back door"; it provides that any other country can join the Moscow Pact by merely indicating its desire to do so. This means, in effect, that the Pankow regime can inform Moscow that it wants to become a signatory and there is nothing we can do about it.

The second step, a nonaggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw military combine, which Premier Khrushchev insists on, would be another "in" for East Germany, a member of the Warsaw Pact along with the U.S.S.R. and other satellites. The signing of that agreement would mean an indirect recognition of Soviet occupied Germany.

These two back doors to the legitimate family of nations are canceling out the strong words President Kennedy used in front of the Berlin wall only a few weeks ago. And Germans are beginning to realize that the Washington-Moscow-London understanding can only be achieved if Khrushchev's main objective—the permanent division of Germany—becomes an accomplished fact.

During President Kennedy's triumphal tour of Germany, one of his advisers was overheard by a German dignitary to remark that the United States could not afford to have Germany as its close ally. The implication was that a strong Germany represents the main Soviet fear, and, if there is to be a relaxation of tensions between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., this would be a hindrance.

The objective of the NATO was not only to create a barrier against Russia's further advance in Western Europe but it was also dedicated to the eventual reunion of the two Germanys. The Federal Republic has contributed substantially toward the support of the alliance in the last few years and has complied with most of our requests for more manpower, greater military expenditures, and greater preparedness for any eventuality.

If an accommodation between Washington and Moscow is accomplished the whole NATO concept will have lost its meaning. Germans conversant with American politics believe that this final accommodation will occur a few weeks before the 1964 presidential elections at the latest.

As soon as there is a nonaggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw coalition, it will be said in America that the maintenance of large and costly armies in Europe has become unnecessary. Many thinking Germans expect that we may wish to reshuffle the Western coalition because they realize that the NATO, under the new political climate, would have lost its purpose.

Today there are only three actual military powers in Western Europe; United States, France, and Germany. There is no doubt in the minds of Germans that soon after a nonaggression pact is signed, as a sequel to the partial test ban, Washington will start withdrawal of the bulk of its forces. The argument that a full division could be flown over the Atlantic in case of an emergency at a much greater speed than a single combat team could be transferred to the battlefield in the last war will be a powerful argument in favor of such a withdrawal.

France, for all intents and purposes, only gives lipservice to the NATO. General de Gaulle is prepared, in the event of an aggression to launch all France's technical and manpower. But he considers the NATO as a has-been.

The Germans, with an acute shortage of labor, are wondering why they should devote so many men to their army and spend upward of $5 billion a year for the upkeep of their armed forces if America and Russia come to terms on the basis of the cementing of their country's partition.

STATEMENT OF ADM. ARTHUR W. RADFORD, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED), FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, ON PROPOSED TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was unable to appear before your committee in person but I do appreciate the opportunity to submit for the record the statement which follows:

"Ten years after signing the armistice agreement at the end of the Korean war, we—the United States—have reached another important signing. Shall we, or shall we not, agree to the Atomic Test Ban Treaty now before the Senate for ratification? Important witnesses before your Senate committee have argued that we should. Equally important witnesses have argued that we should not. Others have recommended approval with reservations.

"I would be happier to be able to join those who recommend approval and to testify that I believe ratification of this treaty represents a new approach to a strategy for peace—that it means that the Soviet Union and its allies now have a deep interest in a just and lasting peace and in halting the arms race. Unfortunately, I do not believe this to be the case. To me it is frightening to see otherwise dedicated citizens refuse to accept proven facts. One such fact is that to us and to the leaders of the Communist conspiracy, a just and genuine peace means two entirely different things. 'Peace'—Communist style will come to the world only after either capitalism or communism has been liquidated. Khrushchev has frequently made it plain that peaceful coexistence means a continuation of a relentless struggle by all available means—including shooting wars of liberation. Couple this with the fact that as late as July 14 last—just before the test ban agreement was concluded—the Soviet open letter to the Chinese included this paragraph: 'We [the U.S.S.R.] fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but also are doing everything for this to be accomplished by way of the class struggle and as soon as possible.'

"Thus just a few days before agreeing to this test ban treaty—the Soviet hierarchy was assuring their Chinese allies of their devotion to previous Communist aims.

"Military men whose responsibilities include the defense and security of our country are worried about this treaty. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have listed their reservations. I join with many of my former colleagues in expressing deep concern for our future security if this treaty is ratified as it now stands.

"Undoubtedly the Communist leaders of the U.S.S.R. believe that this treaty is to their advantage—otherwise they would not have signed it.

"Almost certainly it is an agreement which will ultimately result in the U.S.S.R. obtaining important advantages in the development of more advanced atomic weapons with all the disadvantages that this implies for us.

"The treaty is imprecise—it is vague in areas where it should be specific. Unless we insist upon clarification now—we will find ourselves in great difficulties later on. Remember our difficulties about access to Berlin?

"The future is a long time—but the Communists are willing to wait. Can we continue our readiness to suddenly conduct very sophisticated atomic tests in the atmosphere over a period of years? Can the Congress maintain defense expenditures for this purpose at high levels over a long period of time?

"The security of the free world has depended since World War II upon the atomic deterrent possessed by the United States of America. The free world will continue to depend upon it until it fails us or the U.S.S.R. is willing to accept international inspection and control in a treaty to reduce armaments. Our free world Allies who have signed and who will sign this test ban treaty—are doing so because they trust us for they cannot possibly understand the pros and cons of atomic weapons development.

"The decision of the Senate of the United States in connection with this treaty will change the course of world history—either way it goes."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Aug. 22, 1963]

RISKED HIS CAREER

Whatever their opinion of the nuclear test ban, Americans should honor the personal integrity and courage that led Gen. Thomas S. Power, U.S. Air Force, head of the Strategic Air Command, to oppose the treaty negotiated by the administration. General Power came out flatly against the treaty, saying it was not in the best interest of the Nation.

In taking this stand, General Power laid his career on the line. The Kennedy administration does not forgive or forget. The public need not be surprised some months from now to receive announcement that General Power has been given a relatively minor assignment.

Though he has held high responsibility in the Air Force for many years, General Power may have performed his finest service Monday. A soldier who follows the dictates of his professional convictions, despite the likelihood of penalty by politicians, deserves the thanks of his countrymen.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times & Democrat, Aug. 28, 1963]

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY FAILS KENNEDY

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Kennedy's nuclear treaty now threatens to fail him in two fields where, unhappily, he has failed before—his credibility and his judgment.

He has led us to believe that the suspension of aboveground testing could be militarily and scientifically justified at no additional peril to the national safety. He has sent his administration spokesmen to Capitol Hill with slickly prepared testimony that bore the evidence of collaboration and ghost-written unanimity.

Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, Atomic Energy Chairman Seaborg, and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Taylor, each in turn, swore up and down that the risks were minimal and the advantages manifest. But I do not think anyone could listen, as I have done, to Gen. Curtis LeMay, the Air Force Chief of Staff, and to Dr. Edward Teller, the Nation's foremost nuclear physicist, without feeling that the President's case for the treaty is little else than a political appeal to Russia and to "world opinion." As a proposition for military and scientific sufficiency, the treaty has reached the brink of unbelievability.

The treaty asks us to accept nuclear parity, when what we need is superiority—and preferably supremacy. It asks us to swallow the theory, voiced by McNamara and blasted by Teller, that we can go underground and successfully test the components of the unimaginably complex antimissile defensive system without ever trying the system in the atmosphere as a whole. It asks us to believe that the President—after making himself the author and advocate of this partial disarmament pact, and the hawker of all the horrors of nuclear weapons—could, after so doing, creditably use nuclear threats and nuclear arms in a short-of-war action to deter, for example, a Red Chinese invasion of India. It asks us to believe, as Teller pointed out, that we can deny atmospheric, antimissile weapons to European allies who are faced with Russia's nuclear arsenal, and yet not expect the NATO alliance to be blackmailed by fear. Mr. Kennedy's plausibility as a wise treatymaker lay in a near-shambles before the LeMay-Teller testimony. And his judgment did not look much better. In the promotion of the treaty he seems to show himself more as the political campaigner whose fluffs and mistakes will be forgotten tomorrow, rather than as the leader who is making decisions that must stand the unrelenting proof of time.

For his form of presentation has left many Senators and observers with the impression that he demands a Cabinet and a military staff who will sing for their suppers. His political approach has given credence to Teller's accusation that our atmospheric tests of 1962 were stopped short of the need to surpass Russia's advantages—stopped at a point where public and world opinion might go against the administration.

The President has denied this serious charge, as he might be expected to do, and his administration witnesses have backed him up. But the tests were feeble compared with Russia's. They are said in military circles to have been psychological rather than scientific. They were not satisfactory to General LeMay, among others, whose job is to win our wars. In these circumstances, as in the question of what side deals may have been discussed with Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy stands in need of a credibility rating which was not high when the treaty was broached, and has not been recently improved.

Finally, taking the promotional ballyhoo as a whole—the American University address with the Munich music of appeasement, the Harriman mission, the Moscow spectacular of the signing ceremonies—it is evident that the President is very close to making the one big, conspicuous blunder that his knowledge of history must have warned him to avoid. He has encircled the Senate with choices not unlike those which Woodrow Wilson laid down on the League of Nations.

The present Senate, faced with this overpublicized nuclear treaty, can do three things—all of them very bad. To ratify the treaty would be to compound what many Senators regard as a dreadful mistake in Presidential judgment. To reject the treaty outright would leave the American image, like Venus de Milo, maimed though still symmetrical and valid. To revise the treaty with reservations that Russia would probably refuse to accept seems the least of the evils at hand—yet, even that would precipitate a far worse crisis than the one we had before Mr. Kennedy undertook this radical and ill-conceived remedy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 30, 1963]

THE VALUE OF RESERVATIONS

(By Alice Widener)

A reservation to an international treaty is a keeping or reserve of rights. In 1945 almost all Senators were in favor of quick ratification of the United Nations treaty without reservations. They sincerely believed that the Soviet Union and China were and would remain our loyal, grateful allies. Only cautious Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas had the wisdom to draw up a reservation to the treaty, so we could keep our own internal domestic affairs free of meddling or domination by the new organization.

Today, thanks to the protection of the Connally reservation to the U.N. treaty, the new extremist Afro-Asian majority at the U.N. cannot meddle in and aggravate our difficult domestic racial situation.

Moreover, without the Connally reservation, it is quite possible that our domestic business antitrust affairs would be out of the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and American courts and under that of a Socialist-controlled U.N. Restrictive Business Practices Commission and World Court.

As every American now knows, ratification of the U.N. treaty vitally affected each citizen, because U.S. foreign policy after World War II was based for years on the U.N. as a cornerstone. Its defective construction and resultant cracks became apparent only when it had to bear very heavy weight. Endangered, the United States was forced to bypass the U.N. cornerstone and build new regional alliances.

The historical lesson is obvious. Today the Senate is being called on by the Kennedy administration to ratify the proposed nuclear test ban treaty without reservations.

Averell Harriman and George F. Kennan are among the main pleaders for quick Senate ratification of the test ban treaty. In 1945 they were the top diplomats in our Embassy in Moscow. Both defended the disastrous Yalta and Potsdam agreements; both advocated the ineffective "containment of communism" strategy; both cried "beware" of the Soviets at the time when we had a monopoly of nuclear power and then urged us not to do anything "too detrimental to Russian prestige."

During the present debate on the test ban treaty, it is essential in making judgments about the future to study the score on majority and minority opinions of the past. Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, recounts the following: "In the fall of 1949, just after the Soviets detonated an atomic bomb, the United States was considering whether to develop a thermonuclear weapon. The official U.S. intelligence estimate * * * said the Soviets could not develop a thermonuclear weapon until the late 1950's. All the scientists, except one, agreed with the estimate, and opposed U.S. construction of a thermonuclear bomb.

"The one exception was Dr. Edward Teller who, in October 1949, urged that if the United States didn't hurry with the development of the H-bomb, the Soviets would get one first.

"Fortunately, President Truman decided against the official—intelligence—estimate and for Dr. Teller's lone scientific opinion. The estimate was wrong; Dr. Teller was right." In 1952, the United States exploded a first H-bomb only 9 months ahead of the Soviet Union.

Today Dr. Teller warns against the proposed nuclear test ban treaty. Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of our Strategic Air Command (which has borne responsibility for more than 90 percent of the nuclear defense of the free world) is against its ratification. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are unanimously opposed to it unless "adequate safeguards" are included.

Certainly, the least that Americans should expect from the Senate today is our protection through wise reservations to the test ban treaty. Anyone doubting the need for such reservations should study 17 pages headed "Nuclear Test Ban Chronology" in the brilliant new book "Nuclear Ambush—the Test Ban Trap," by Earl H. Voss, in which is revealed—bare of editorial comment—who was right and who was mistaken in policies affecting our nuclear defense.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Aug. 29, 1963]

WHAT'S BEYOND THE TREATY?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy and his spokesmen for the nuclear treaty have stressed that the United States and U.S.S.R. have a common interest in eliminating radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests, in retarding the expansion of nuclear weapons and in working toward eventual disarmament in a peaceful world.

These hopes summarize the so-called political arguments for the treaty. They express a belief that, somehow, we must learn to share the world with Russia since neither democracy nor communism can stop the world and get off. They do not express a will to destroy Russia, except as the last resort of self-defense.

The one word that wraps up the administration's motivation in seeking the nuclear treaty and other agreements beyond the treaty is—coexistence.

It is not a word that the President is likely to use, for it carries a connotation of surrender, and the President does not have surrender in mind. What he does have in mind is a detente, a relaxation of tensions, between America and Russia. Far from being a new idea, it is one that dates back at least as far as the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

In those days, as middle-aged persons will recall, there was hope that we did have common interests with Russia. It was believed then, as it is now, that these interests could be exploited in the hope of a closer relationship which could occur through political evolution in both countries.

To define this political evolution, let us turn back to a strange discussion that went on between President Roosevelt and Communist leader Earl Browder. They never met. But they conversed through a go-between, Miss Josephine Truslow Adams, formerly a teacher at Swarthmore College, and very active in Communist Party activities.

Miss Adams was a friend of both Roosevelt and Browder, and served as the carrier of both men's ideas. Frank S. Meyer, the author and former Communist, gave testimony 6 years ago, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in which he expressed very well the reasoning by which a nonsurrender detente is sometimes considered a political possibility. Meyer said:

"Franklin Roosevelt was, I believe, from the conversations I had with Miss Adams, convinced that the Soviet Union would move from its lack of civil liberties toward civil liberties, while the United States moved from its constitutional and free enterprise situation to socialism, and both would end at the same point."

Here, I think, is a bit of background on the nuclear treaty which has not been discussed and certainly is not much understood.

The nuclear treaty has been called a first step, but toward what ultimate destination? We will, of course, never have full disarmament between a closed society and an open society. Russia would become a partially open society only by allowing inspection, and there is no inspection clause in the treaty.

But if, instead of two societies, one open and one closed, the two nations became something of a merged society, the need for large armament, and for an arms race, would diminish to the vanishing point.

The thing to look for in American politics is any symptom that America is moving away from what Meyer calls a constitutional and free enterprise situation and moving toward socialism.

If we detect the New Frontier's domestic policies tending in that direction, we can better understand the New Frontier's foreign policies, especially the nuclear treaty. Both policies lead toward a detente which, I would suppose, many Americans will believe is even worse than war.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Examiner, Aug. 22, 1963]

DEFENSE BEFORE MOON

"At the very least, the Senate should demand an ironclad assurance that antimissile development will not be inhibited by the President's personal pessimism."—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona. (U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 14850, Aug. 13, 1963.)

Many knowledgeable experts on American military affairs fear that the proposed partial nuclear test ban treaty now before the U.S. Senate, if ratified, may have the end result of cutting back our effort to obtain an adequate antimissile missile (AMM) defense.

One of the leaders who advise caution is the junior Senator from Arizona, BARRY GOLDWATER. His well-thought-out premise on this important component of our deterrent posture may be found on pages 14849-14850 of the August 13 issue of the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let's read it.

GOLDWATER says J.F.K. has confidence enough that we can put a man on the moon and is willing to spend $5 billion a year to prove it.

NOT SIMPLE

This would, admittedly, take lots of scientific know-how and advanced electronic techniques—even for Buck Rogers himself. (Not to mention Flash Gordon.) However, the point is that it can and probably will be done.

But for some strange reason, hard to fathom, the President radiates no similar amount of confidence in America's scientific genius when it comes to producing a needed AMM. How come?

Actually, the latter problem is no more extensive nor difficult than the comparable feat of landing a live astronaut on the lunar surface.

It is important that we keep our feet on the ground, as well as our heads in the clouds, regarding matters such as these. And we should guide ourselves by the adage first things first.

While much of the public would be delighted to find us beating the Reds to the moon in the future, few of us consider it more desirable than an adequate—and competent—military defense.

If we have to choose between these two items then the administration is making a sizable strategic blunder to concentrate on special joyrides rather than second-to-none national defense and the fundamental security of the American people.

THREE POINTS

"Dreams of peace," says the practical GOLDWATER, "cannot shut our minds to the nightmare possibilities of an armed and aggressive Soviet Union able to leapfrog our defenses by a breakthrough in defensive capabilities—a breakthrough made possible by their past violations of the test moratorium and then sheltered by the restrictions which the treaty would place upon the free world or its leaders."

In spite of the fact that Defense Secretary McNamara and his boss in the White House have indicated that it is hopeless to try and build a successful AMM, GOLDWATER refutes their opinions with these three main points of argument:

1. An imperfect defense is better than nothing.

2. There are capabilities in the U.S. inventory for limited defense.

3. There are feasible capabilities for sophisticated defense systems.

"To say that anti-ICBM is hopeless," declared GOLDWATER, "is to cover 5,500 miles with a single sentence."

Just what does all this mean to us? The Arizonian, who is a highly regarded major general in the U.S. Air Force Reserve, thinks it could mean that the President is choosing to ignore the integral part that U.S. national defense plays in our whole deterrent posture.

How much of a risk is it to our national security if we fail to come up with an effective AMM before the Reds accomplish this vital mission?

TOO TRUSTING

It seems obvious to many observers, including this writer, that the present administration has become somewhat too trusting of the Reds and their siren promises of peaceful coexistence in recent months. Is it really justified?

Are we, perhaps, joining up with the wily Communist leaders in a gullible mousetrap play called "international partnership for world government and world peace through law"—and will we get taken, but good, if we do? Can we guess?

The present controversial unilateral disarmament of the United States—such as dropping the much needed Skybolt, B-70, Dyna-Soar, a nuclear airplane, dismantlement of missile bases in Turkey and Italy, and cutback of AMM—looks suspiciously like something of this questionable nature may be in the wind.

[From the New York Journal-American, Aug. 25, 1963]

CALL DE SEVERSKY

The debate before Senate committees on the nuclear test ban treaty is hearteningly in the American tradition.

It is quite clear that President Kennedy has kept his promise that no administration pressure would be exerted. Highly qualified pro-and-con witnesses, as well as those whose support is hedged by reservations, have spoken out in complete candor. This has been no precooked discussion.

Accordingly, the Hearst newspapers urge the Senators to request the appearance before them of Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

Major de Seversky wrote a two-part article for our papers. The first—which we hope you read—appeared Sunday, and the second—which we recommend to your attention—is in this paper on page 2.

We published the pieces in the public interest, not as an expression of our views.

Beyond any doubt, Major de Seversky rates as a highly qualified witness. He has a distinguished record as an aircraft designer, inventor, Government consultant, lecturer before the Air War College, and author of three controversial books.

It would be in their own interest and that of our country for the Senators to invite Major de Seversky to testify.

DE SEVERSKY WARNS OF A-PACT PERILS

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, never in the history of human conflict has so much ballyhoo accompanied such a confused piece of diplomacy. We are so glad that we finally have succeeded in getting Khrushchev to sign something on the dotted line that we have gone berserk in our exuberance.

The test ban treaty has been acclaimed by the administration as a first step to peace while at the same time they assure the American people that the treaty will not hinder the growth of our nuclear strength.

In his testimony, Secretary of Defense McNamara informed the Congress that under the treaty, we will build more and bigger atomic bombs, more nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles, more atomic warheads for artillery, for antisubmarine warfare, for depth charges, surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles.

In other words, our stockpile will grow. Thus the administration guarantees that the nuclear armament race will be pressed forward with great vigor in spite of the self-imposed handicap of the treaty.

It is officially conceded that the Russians are in possession of a much greater rocket boost than we are. Because of that, for the last few years they have been putting into orbit five times greater payloads. In addition, using Mr. McNamara's words, the U.S.S.R. "is technologically more advanced than we are in the high yield range (of their nuclear weapons)."

Therefore, it is dangerous naivete for Mr. McNamara to speculate that "the Soviets probably have no missiles at this time which will deliver a 100-megaton warhead to ICBM range."

Should we be prevented by the treaty from likewise developing the large megaton weapons, it is only a matter of time before Russia will be able to suffocate our entire Nation in one single salvo of scores of thousands of megatons—after which our second strike capability becomes purely academic. At best, it is a post-mortem force and of little concern to the American people. That is why I agree entirely with Dr. Teller that to ratify the treaty would be "a dreadful and tragic mistake."

To me, it is inspiring to see that in these days of military and political chaos and confusion in our country, we have men of intellectual courage who, in spite of the risk of official retaliation and reprisals, do not hesitate to boldly state their innermost convictions so that our Nation may know the truth.

The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to people like Edward Teller, Gen. Thomas S. Power, Gen. Bernard Shriever, Adm. Lewis Strauss, and Dr. Willard F. Libby. Gen. Curtis LeMay, who is singularly handicapped by being a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a body whose unanimous obedience may be required by the Secretary of Defense or the Commander in Chief, has candidly agreed that if the treaty had not been signed, he "would have been against it."

MISSILE DEFENSE FAR BEHIND REDS

I also agree with Dr. Teller on the subject of antimissile defense. My personal deduction from the analysis of the Russian capability indicates that the Russians are 3 years ahead of us in the development of this decisive weapon system.

Therefore, I concur with Dr. Teller's view that Mr. McNamara's judgment that Russia has not developed a successful antimissile defense system is an "undue exaggeration." More than that, I must repeat what I said in my book, "America, Too Young To Die," in 1961:

"The scientists who maintain that this (ABM) is an impossible or gargantuan task are misleading us and selling science down the river."

This is exactly what the Department of Defense "Whiz Kids" are doing now in order to justify the treaty blunder. Each war has always differed radically from the preceding one. The intellectual surprise of the new conflict will be the decisive role of its defensive phase through electromagnetic interception and nuclear impact. The inexorable progress of technology will make this antiballistic missile system operational much sooner than the skeptics expect.

TELLER RIGHT ON H-BOMB

Our country should profit from Dr. Teller's wisdom and scientific foresight. He was right before when he insisted on the development of the hydrogen bomb, and he is going to be right again. But because of the treaty it looks as though the Russians will profit by his insight. In that case, if some of our missiles should survive the first blow and we should be able to mount some second strike, only a few missiles will get through. The Russian people and their industrial complex will only sustain an acceptable damage.

Another mischievous statement that very often comes from the Defense Department is that because we have tens of thousands of nuclear weapons, we have nuclear superiority vis-a-vis the U.S.S.R. We must remember that nuclear warheads do not crawl, walk, swim or fly toward their targets. They have to be brought at the right time to the right place by some system of delivery.

Therefore, in the final analysis, it is not the stockpile of atomic weapons that will decide the issue, but superior means of delivery. So when it comes to strategic delivery in a major war, the stockpile of tens of thousands of nuclear warheads shrinks to a mere 500—consisting of 500 ballistic missiles that can deliver today an aggregate of about 2,000 megatons.

REDS COULD SPELL FINISH FOR UNITED STATES

By 1966, the Secretary of Defense assures us that we will have over 1,700 ballistic missiles that can deliver an aggregate of about 4,500 megatons of nuclear energy. By that time the Russians may have, say, only half of that number, or 900 ICBM's with a delivery capacity of 90,000 megatons—a salvo 20 times greater than ours—that can effect complete saturation of the entire territory of the United States. In addition, these huge megaton bombs exploding over our territory will make our radio communications and radar ineffective, depriving our country of its defensive power.

It is also misleading on the part of Mr. McNamara to state that "the United States, without any further testing, can develop a warhead with a yield of 50 to 60 megatons for B–52 delivery." Even if we could develop such bombs without further testing, their delivery to the target is a moot question. The B–52 is an obsolescent bomber. With its subsonic speed, its capability of penetrating Russian defenses, which are becoming deadlier every day, is on the wane.

The Air Force desperately tried to remedy this deficiency by the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile, but the Skybolt was canceled by Mr. McNamara. The Air Force also desperately tried to replace obsolete B–52's with B–70 supersonic bombers. Their production likewise has been held up by the Secretary of Defense. It appears that everything is being done to emasculate the manned delivery system of our Strategic Air Command.

Paradoxically, Mr. McNamara now dangles before the American people a 60-megaton bomb, which he says we may develop without testing, and which will ride to the Russian target in a bomber which, by that time, will never be able to penetrate the Russian defenses.

[From the New York Journal-American, Aug. 26, 1963]

TESTS A MUST TO BUILD TOP NUCLEAR ARMS

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

The assertion that we can develop effective nuclear weapons systems without testing is gibberish. Can you imagine if before World War II, we had designed, built, and stuffed our hangars with 50,000 airplanes which, by some treaty, were prohibited from being test flown?

Then, in time of war, the pilots who were trained in simulators would be ordered to jump into the cockpits of these untried aircraft and go straight into glorious battle. Sounds myopic, doesn't it? It is, and that applies to any phase of technology—including nuclear weapons and antiballistic missile defenses.

On October 22, 1962, U.S. News & World Report stated:

"Soviet scientists, in one spurt that started August 5, detonated 18 nuclear devices with a yield of 150 million tons of TNT. That is more power than was unleashed by all U.S. tests since the birth of the atomic age."

The article also stated that "at the conclusion of 1962 tests, the U.S.S.R. detonated about 2½ times as many weapons as the United States, involving 13 times as much explosive power—and putting Russia ahead in monster bombs and heavy missile warheads."

Because they already have the undisputed lead in large nuclear weapons, they are bound to press miniaturization of the warheads in the development of smaller weapons, through subterranean tests. Thus, on the balance, under the treaty, Russia is infinitely better off, and that is the major reason why Khrushchev is so glib about it.

POLITICAL GESTURE?

I am inclined to agree with Dr. Teller that the nuclear test ban is a purely political phenomenon, designed for domestic consumption on both sides of the globe. By coincidence of circumstances, it is important for Khrushchev to show the Russian people that he is a man of peace and that the great saving through cessation of nuclear testing will be diverted to the consumer's good, which, of course, is a fraud.

His money will go into mass production of larger ICBM's with more powerful nuclear warheads, deployed in better hardened sites.

We have no right to impose on our people confiscatory taxes to support $80 billion of military and allied expenditures unless we see to it that this is the best that science and technology can produce. Otherwise, we might just as well disarm unilaterally and let the Russians take us over.

While the Russians have apparently decided to employ huge megaton weapons, Secretary McNamara speculates that "we can achieve a higher confidence of kill by using two or three smaller weapons instead of one very large one." This is just a rationalization of past blunders. We missed the boat on large rocket boosters, and had no alternative but to go into proliferation of small ballistic missiles tipped by small nuclear warheads.

MADE EARLY ERROR

It must be clear to the reader that, had we designed larger rockets in the past we could have more than matched the Russians today in their large missiles and could have produced and installed them in hardened silos at the same rate as we are now doing with the small ballistic missiles.

To perpetuate this blunder, in view of the Russian nuclear progress, is irresponsible.

Before the last war we built our airplanes without sufficient armament, armor, or self-sealing tanks because we thought that rate of climb was paramount in combat. We were wrong. Our planes were shot down like clay pigeons by the enemy at the start of the war.

Because of lack of airpower we were kicked out of the Philippines, Malaya, and the South Pacific. If at that time the Japanese had possessed the means to destroy our industrial capacity by now we would have been a Japanese colony.

Since nuclear war has not yet been fought, it is dangerous to gamble on a single doctrine. If we are wrong this time, we will be done for. Our country is rich enough to implement both doctrines, and to do that we must conduct testing in the atmosphere in order to develop superbombs. That, alas, is prohibited by the treaty. The eminent scientist Dr. Willard F. Libby has advised Congress to examine whether "the possession of this weapon is a commanding advantage for the Soviets."

MANY FALLACIES

For years our leaders pooh-poohed Russia's ability to cope with modern technology. They told us that:

It would take scores of years for Russia to develop the atomic bomb—Russia developed it in 4 years.

It was beyond Soviet capacity to develop a hydrogen bomb—Russia dropped an operational hydrogen bomb from an airplane 5 months ahead of us.

Russia would never be able to cope with the production of jet aircraft—she has hundreds of supersonic jet bombers.

Russia would never develop ICBM's—Russia designed one a year ahead of us and put it promptly into production.

Russia would never be able to put a manmade satellite into space—the Russian sputnik was orbiting ahead of our own.

Russia would never be able to hit the moon—they hit the moon ahead of us, and have taken photographs of its unseen backside—an accomplishment we have yet to do.

We would be ahead of the U.S.S.R. in putting a man into space. They were the first to accomplish this feat.

It would take years for them to develop atomic submarines. These submersibles are rolling off Russian shipyards probably as fast as ours.

MELANCHOLY STORY

The melancholy story goes on and on. It represents an appalling record of our Central Intelligence, or more likely a slanted interpretation of the facts provided by Intelligence. Now, again, we are being told that Russia will have difficulty in conducting underground tests because of their lack of technological know-how. Quite the contrary.

In 1961 I flatly predicted that both sides would break the moratorium and resume nuclear testing. Even thus, I state again that the nuclear treaty will be abrogated and this time, more than likely, by the United States because it will find itself perilously outdistanced by the Soviets.

In that case, Russia will brand us as warmongers and the treaty will prove to be a political boomerang.

Naturally, everyone is against pollution of the atmosphere, just as they are against air pollution and against littering of the streets. But the scientific fact remains that the danger to national health through nuclear testing has been exaggerated by muddleheaded scientists and zealots who are willing to have peace at any price.

The fact is, according to official statistics on the subject, that the radioactive pollution produced by nuclear testing when distributed around the globe is considerably less than that produced by natural sources, and insignificant in comparison to the radioactive dose experienced in one X-ray.

In any case, these hazards should be weighed in relation to the security of our own country as long as the threat of nuclear attack is still with us.

It is a cruel hoax perpetrated on the American people who naturally yearn for peace, to make them believe that somehow the nuclear test ban treaty will lead to peace and the abolition of nuclear war. The limitation of armaments in the past has never stopped wars. War itself must be abolished at the outset.

I agree with Dr. Teller that the nuclear test ban treaty is "not a step toward peace" but a step "away from safety, and possibly a step toward war."

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal]

U.S. SENATORS SHOULD STUDY RED PAMPHLET

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY.—Properly to discharge his responsibility to the American people before voting on the proposed nuclear test ban treaty, every U.S. Senator should study carefully the brand new Communist pamphlet "A Scientist's Responsibility."

Issued this month in New York City by Crosscurrents Press, Inc., of 156 Fifth Avenue (a registered agent of the official Soviet propaganda outfit Novosti Press Agency), the new pamphlet is in English and is written by top Soviet physicist V. S. Yemelyanov.

Who is he? The Soviet-controlled Crosscurrents Press alleges in the pamphlet foreword, "Vasily Semenovich Yemelyanov is deputy chairman of the State Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, under the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and served as its chairman from 1960 to 1962." Actually, however, Yemelyanov does not devote himself solely to peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In Moscow, November 1960, he took part in the Sixth Pugwash Conference with Jerome Wiesner, now scientific adviser to President Kennedy, with Walt W. Rostow, now chief of our State Department policy-planning council, and with Paul W. Doty, Harvard chemistry professor.

Shortly thereafter, on January 31, 1961, Professor Doty reported on a roundtable discussion of the Pugwash Conference over WGBH-TV in Boston, "Yemelyanov is the overall head of their (the Soviets') atomic energy program, I think, and its chief administrator on the actual operating side."

As chief Soviet atomic administrator, physicist Yemelyanov would be one of the Russians mainly responsible for honoring Soviet commitments under the nuclear test ban treaty. Yet at this very moment, Yemelyanov is poisoning the international intellectual atmosphere with highly unscientific, extremely ugly hate literature against the West and the United States.

If Yemelyanov's attitude toward us is regarded as trustworthy and friendly by the Pugwash crowd and by our test ban negotiators, then they must be under the delusion that relentless enmity is friendship.

As a self-styled responsible Soviet scientist, Yemelyanov makes the following libelous charges in print:

"The flashes of the first atomic bomb explosion brightly illuminated those persons who desired at all costs to test this atomic weapon. They illuminated the new pretenders to world domination—the monopolists of the United States of America.

"The forces of reaction are striving by all means to preserve the capitalist system. In this age of science the reactionary forces cannot do without the aid of scientists. The monopolists are able to exploit these scientists for whom ambition and mercenary interest are above the interests of science.

"The scientists who are assisting world reaction to maintain its power are supported by monopolistic, militaristic circles with huge financial resources and also by the whole apparatus of compulsion of the modern capitalist state. Many are convinced that Teller (Dr. Edward) has supported the ambitious aspirations of those American adventurists who were envious of Hitler's laurels and who, in fact, had never been ideological opponents of this fascist dictator."

Thus does responsible Soviet scientist Yemelyanov, boss of the Soviet atomic program, libel the great scientist Dr. Edward Teller, a naturalized American of Hungarian birth who taught in Germany but was an anti-Nazi and left there soon after Hitler came to power. Thus too does Soviet scientist Yemelyanov deliberately seek to distort history by trying to show American pro-Hitler military sentiment before World War II, whereas it was the double-dealing Soviets who signed a friendship pact with Hitler and thereby enabled him to attack Poland and make war.

Furthermore, responsible Soviet scientist Yemelyanov constantly denounces American military action in Korea and Vietnam but says nary a word against Soviet military action in ruthlessly suppressing freedom in Hungary, Poland, and East Germany.

What is the real drift of the new pamphlet by Soviet Chief Operational Atomic Energy Administrator Vasily Yemelyanov? It is hate for the capitalist nations of the West. His whole phony plea for disarmament and peaceful coexistence is a libelous, vicious, and warped attack against the West and a eulogy of all pro-Soviet, Communist and fellow-traveling figures such as the late Frederick Joliot-Curie, French scientist member of the Communist Party, who was removed by the French Government in 1950 from his post as its atomic energy commissioner.

There is scarcely a single propaganda slander against the United States and its policies which is not repeated in print as fact in Yemelyanov's pamphlet. This Communist document is the real tipoff on what is the actual frame of mind, emotional attitude, and intellectual ethic of those top Soviet administrators with whom our Nation seems about to sign a treaty affecting our own lives, fortunes, and fate.

Any U.S. public official who engages in the great debate over the proposed nuclear test ban treaty without scrutinizing the new Communist pamphlet "A Scientist's Responsibility" by Soviet physicist and atomic administrator, V. S. Yemelyanov, is derelict in carrying out a loyal American's responsibility.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 19, 1963]

MORE CAUSE FOR CONCERN THAN CONFIDENCE IN ATOM TREATY

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, August 20.—There is more cause for concern than confidence in the records of the architects of the nuclear test ban treaty, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman.

Further, there is nothing cheering in President Kennedy's drive for approval of the treaty as contrasted with his repeated insistance that no effective limitation of tests can be achieved without adequate inspections.

Harriman's record in relations with Russia is hardly inspiring. In 1941, before the United States entered World War II, Harriman undertook a mission to Moscow as lend-lease expediter for President Roosevelt. In that capacity, he aided Josef Stalin in getting everything Russia wanted not only to prosecute the war but to build herself up to challenge the West in the postwar period.

Later, Harriman returned to Moscow as Ambassador. In that role he attended the Tehran and Yalta Conferences in which questioned concessions were made to communism. He was also in attendance at the Potsdam Conference where the concessions extending the Communist orbit in Europe and Asia were signed, sealed, and delivered. Harriman has defended Yalta as a much misunderstood high-level meeting.

HE OPPOSES MAC ARTHUR'S KOREAN VIEWS

In 1950 Harriman was sent to Gen. Douglas MacArthur during the Korean war. MacArthur sought to enlist his aid in recruiting Chinese Nationalists to take part in that struggle. Harriman returned to report with some horror that MacArthur "has a strange idea that we should back anybody who will fight communism."

In 1959, Harriman undertook a tour of Russia, contracting to write for a number of American newspapers. Harriman was taken by the hand and shown things the Russians wanted him to see. He wrote glowingly of Russia under Nikita S. Khrushchev, even suggesting the Berlin crisis be eased by limited Western acceptance of the Communist regime in East Germany. He also described Khrushchev as completely confident that Russia will gain supremacy over the United States in a few years and that he also was confident of an eventual victory of communism over capitalism.

Today Harriman is describing Khrushchev as "very friendly" and counting the dictator's smiles as diplomatic triumphs for the West.

Rusk's record is not as unqualifiedly enthusiastic for Russia as Harriman's but he had his crimson moments. Just before the outbreak of the Korean war he told the World Affairs Council the Red Chinese revolution was "not Russian in essence" and insisted that it did not "aim at dictatorship." Rusk was then as now in the State Department, but not its head.

U.S. ASKED TO THINK OF REDS' SIDE

After the Chinese Communists entered the war, Rusk invited Americans to think of themselves as Chinese Communists in order to understand their misgivings that the United States might enter the war against them. He was one of those who opposed MacArthur's proposal to bomb Red Chinese bases being used to supply troops in Korea. Later he denounced the Government of Red China as not Chinese but a "colonial Russian Government." His statement was so strong the Truman administration was obliged to explain there had been no change in administration policy.

On August 10, 1961, President Kennedy said nuclear experts had made him feel "more strongly than ever that without an inspection system" no country in the world can be sure that "a nation with a closed society is not conducting secret nuclear tests." A few months later, November 2, 1961, he said he would sign a treaty only if it provided "for adequate inspection and control."

In 1962 he insisted in five speeches that the United States would not and could not accept any treaty without inspection. As late as last March, he declared that the administration would not submit a treaty that would permit indefinite underground testing and predicted that the Senate would not approve a treaty which would permit indefinite underground testing. Today he is demanding approval of a treaty which allows underground testing and does not provide for adequate inspections.

[From the Augusta Herald, Aug. 29, 1963]

BURKE HAS EYES OPEN TO AIMS OF FOE

As the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee in Washington listens to views on the subject of the nuclear test ban treaty from a parade of witnesses, it should give more credence to one qualified military or naval expert than to a hundred politicians.

One such naval authority appeared the other day—Arleigh A. Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Burke told the Senators flatly that a treaty is no good if one side is cheating, and that some form of verification or limited inspection ought to be attached to anything which the U.S. Senate ratifies.

The administration supporters of the "sign now, look later" move want no conditions or reservations. Their position is that any ifs which are hung on the treaty might require further negotiation, and that this might so miff the good people in the Kremlin that they would back out.

If Soviet Russia is as thoroughly in favor of a test ban as President Kennedy and the irresponsibles in Washington claim it is, renegotiation would be no problem. If they should back out over such a safeguard as limited inspection, it is a pretty good sign that they planned some kind of hanky-panky under cover of the treaty.

Admiral Burke has had to make a business of gaging the enemy's intentions, and he and other Armed Forces leaders are justified in taking a skeptical look at a political system which throughout its history has been dedicated to our destruction.

[From the Augusta Herald, Aug. 28, 1963]

UNITED STATES WILL GET NO NUCLEAR BARGAIN BY PLAYING AT RUSSIAN ROULETTE

(By Paul Harvey)

Returning from vacation to read the fine print in Mr. Khrushchev's proposed "limited nuclear test ban treaty," I share Dr. Edward Teller's suspicions.

Dr. Teller, who in the past has been right with rather exasperating consistency, thinks we're being took.

To ratify this document "would be a dreadful and tragic mistake * * * a possible step toward war."

He urged the Senate to vote no. Similarly, General LeMay says this treaty "gives the advantage to the Soviets."

SAC's General Power urged the Senate to reject it—said, "It is not in our Nation's best interests."

True, only a few voices were raised in opposition compared to the barrage of yes votes from administration spokesmen and the tagalongs.

Many conscientious Senators were embarrassed openly to renounce a negotiated treaty. Others were politically afraid to cast what constituents might construe as a vote against peace.

President Kennedy said, "We have enough bombs to kill 30 million people in 1 hour; how many weapons do you need?"

This, of course, does not adequately answer the military critics. If Russia has or discovers a defense against such weapons, and we do not develop an adequate defense, then we are at the mercy of men who are without mercy.

General Schriever, responsible for research and development for our Air Force, says the treaty would handicap his work.

Even Defense Secretary McNamara concedes that we don't know any way to protect our antimissile radar from the blackout caused by a nuclear blast, and that the nuclear test ban "treaty" may prevent us from finding a way.

But political considerations outweighed seasoned military judgment. So be it.

Assuaged by President Kennedy's promise of "adequate safeguards," most of the few reluctant Senators fell into line.

This column has been anxious about the fallout hazard as far back as January 1, 1957, so a bona fide cessation of nuclear testing would be entirely welcome, except—let's face it—this document is no "treaty," it never should have been labeled a "treaty," and the fact that it was supports the inescapable conclusion that all signatories wanted the ballyhoo which they knew would attend treaty ratification.

It could have been a simple head-of-state agreement, requiring no confirmation by our Senate or Britain's Parliament.

But President Kennedy wants to go to the polls as a "peacemaker."

Macmillan imagines enough hot air can keep his discredited government afloat.

And Khrushchev can hereby stalemate our antimissile research while he reinforces his much-vaunted missile superiority. No, the "treaty" is not all bad. But you can play Russian roulette in a health food store. And it's no bargain if you get 12 mushrooms.

And one of them is a toadstool.

[From the Blacksburg (Va.) Sun, Aug. 29, 1963]

The Big Ballyhoo—Test Ban Treaty Should Be Rejected

(By Earl E. Spicer, Jr.)

A few weeks ago this column was devoted to a discussion of the proposed nuclear test ban treaty. It was predicted then that the treaty would be approved by the Senate, but not until after much study and deliberation. At the time that article was written the writer did not express an opinion because he had not formed one, but now, after hearing much of the testimony, it seems that in the best interest of the United States of America the treaty should be rejected.

The Members of the Senate have learned through the hearings which have been held by various Senate committees that almost all of the witnesses who are in a position to hold a valid opinion as to the effect of the treaty on our security are against it. Dr. Edward Teller, known as the father of the H-bomb, has told Members that he is definitely opposed to the treaty. Dr. Teller is convinced that the Russians, through the atmospheric tests which they conducted in 1961 and 1962, perfected an antimissile missile. This is something which Dr. Teller says cannot be done without atmospheric testing which is prohibited by the treaty. Dr. Teller is convinced that the Russians are willing to sign now in order to prevent the United States from perfecting an antimissile missile. It must be remembered that the Russians have been unwilling to sign the same treaty in the past.

The general in charge of the Strategic Air Command, whose job it is to deliver nuclear warheads to the enemy in time of war, has gone on record as opposing the treaty.

Now comes the big ballyhoo which is being sold to the American public. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have gone on record as officially approving the treaty when in reality they oppose it.

Gen. Curtis LeMay stated that had the treaty not already been signed he thinks he would be opposed to it. He told Members of the Senate that when he studied the treaty and weighed the military advantages to the United States against the disadvantages he found that the United States came up on the short end. The other three members of the Staff agreed with LeMay.

The general told the Senators that what caused the Joint Chiefs of Staff to endorse the treaty were political considerations. It does not take a genius to realize where the political considerations came from and who evaluated them. The political considerations were made at the White House by a member or members of the Kennedy family. The prime political consideration was the slap in the face the President would get if the Members of the Senate, the majority of whom are members of the President's party, rejected the treaty. As far as analyzing the political advantages which the treaty gives the United States over Russia we must realize that the United States does not win political battles with the Communists.

The Korean war was a political defeat for the United States. The decision to let the Communists run free north of the Yalu was completely political. Gen. Douglas MacArthur lost his job because he, the greatest military mind in dealing with the Chinese, opposed the political decision.

The presence of a Communist base in Cuba is striking evidence of another political defeat we have suffered at the hands of the Communists. As in Korea a military action in Cuba could have easily made the Western Hemisphere relatively free from Communist aggression, but as it is we, by our inaction, are supporting a Communist regime in our backyard.

The 50 treaties which the Russians have broken are dramatic examples of political defeats we have suffered at the hands of the Communists. There are those who contend that Russia actually loses in the propaganda war when she breaks a treaty, because it shows the world that she is a liar. How many times must that be proven before we choose to treat her like one?

The list of political defeats we have suffered from the Russians is long, consistent and, after a while, boring, but that list gives us strong reason to believe that if the test ban treaty is a political treaty we shall again come up with the short end of the stick.

[From the Nashville Banner, Aug. 31, 1963]

Germans See Test Treaty as Kremlin's Greatest Victory

(By Constantine Brown)

Munich.—Secretary of State Rusk's talks to Chancellor Adenauer and his Cabinet relating in detail his conversations with Premier Khrushchev, led the German Government to agree to participate in the limited test ban treaty.

The essence of these long, candid talks is that Khrushchev is interested in avoiding a nuclear war between the Soviet Union and the United States; that he is interested, under conditions to be further discussed, in a nonaggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact powers. But he is as determined as ever to push the ideological warfare between the Communist and capitalist blocs to Communist victory.

Mr. Rusk is said to have informed the German Cabinet that Khrushchev expressed himself frankly. He wants to avoid a shooting match with the West. He was reluctant to consider any concession in the German and Berlin situations.

The German Cabinet yielded despite misgivings. It regards the efforts of the United States and Britain to bring about an accommodation as the most spectacular victory the Kremlin has yet obtained.

Ever since Khrushchev came to power he has had two principal objectives—disruption of NATO and avoidance of nuclear war. Khrushchev is not only the most successful and astute diplomat of our age but he is also a realist. The two go together.

He knows that war fought for an ideology leads to nothing. Wars are fought for profit.

America alone, in the history of the world, has fought two world wars for ideological reasons. And we have neither "ended all wars" nor "made the world safe for democracy." The world is in a more perilous state than in all its history and democracy is rapidly on the wane.

The Kremlin boss and his military, who have a major voice in the Kremlin councils, do not want to lose the life of a single man unless it yields a gain to Russia. This is the basic political philosophy of the Kremlin which has not been engaged in a shooting war since 1945. Russia's massive power has been used only to terrorize the weak.

Khrushchev has proceeded methodically and patiently to put into effect his basic policies. By promoting the test ban treaty he has now become assured that whatever adventures he may wish to engage in, there will be no retaliation from America, the only power which can threaten Soviet Russia with utter destruction.

NATO, minus America's nuclear threat, is not overly important. The Warsaw powers have upward of 224 combat-ready divisions between the Elbe and the Urals. Against this force the NATO has on paper some 65 divisions, including the doubtful Italians and the Turks who are in a domestic political turmoil.

In the unlikely event of a war in Europe, we could raise, of course, as many divisions as the Russians. But by the time these could be organized the NATO would have been chewed up by the overwhelming Warsaw Pact forces.

All this is hypothetical. Russia does not intend at this time to make any bellicose move in Europe. But it is eager to see the NATO disintegrated to further its policies of "peaceful expansion" in Western Europe.

It is the political unity of Western Europe which concerns the Kremlin—not its military potential. In recent years there was a strong drive toward such a unity to work on parallel lines with the United States. This move has now been halted because of the dissensions between the Europeans and the United States. The nonaggression pact which is regarded here as inevitable within the next 12 months will be the crowning victory of Khrushchev's skillful and patient efforts.

[An advertisement]

We Call on the Senate of the United States: Defeat the Treaty of Moscow

In September 1963, we shall be asked to repeat the reckless venture in appeasement that culminated in the "peace in our time" agreement signed in Munich on September

30, 1938. The new treaty of Moscow, like the Munich Pact, was born of a longing for peace; and the one, like the other, must prove tragically illusory because it ignores the nature of the enemy; and it forgets that the surest guarantor of peace is our own strength.

The high-powered campaign to discredit opponents of the test ban treaty—reminiscent of the shameful attacks on Winston Churchill in 1938—has done much to intimidate dissent. We believe that a hearing for the voices of prudence and principle is a national imperative.

Opposition to a test ban treaty has stressed the chance that the Communists would "cheat." That chance is a near certainty. Communists always cheat in any agreement with the intended victims of the revolution; for Communists, negotiating and signing and violating treaties are only special modes of warfare.

Even so, cheating in the narrow sense of conducting clandestine weapons tests is not of primary importance. It is our own renunciation of testing that is more serious.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as other spokesmen for the armed services, have made clear that as a purely military proposition the treaty of Moscow is detrimental to the interests of U.S. security. Some military leaders have gone on to remark that the military disadvantages are outweighed, in their opinion, by political factors—such as the possibility of reducing the causes of world tensions. Whether such conclusions were extracted by pressures from their civilian commanders we need not decide: the point is that these political questions are not within the field of military expertise. The military judgment, to put the matter briefly is (1) outer-space testing is almost as hard to detect as underground testing, and may well become the most important kind of testing; (2) atmospheric testing is of the utmost importance now—to explore and match recent Russian attainments, we must be prepared to test; but most decisively, we must be prepared to test to achieve a breakthrough as the critical frontier of military technology, the antimissile missile.

But even these vital technical and strategic considerations are not the most important danger. The crucial defect of the Treaty of Moscow is exactly what the administration now puts forward as its primary justification: That it will build up confidence. Just so. It will nourish in Western public opinion a fraudulent confidence in the good will and peaceful intentions of the enemy. Promotion of such confidence—far more precious an adjunct of their operation than anything a nuclear test series might bring—is the real motive of the Communists in signing the treaty. It is a variant of the old Nazi-Communist routine of signing a nonaggression pact (Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Baltic nations) as part of the psychological preparation for an aggression.

The President and his aids have breezily defended the treaty as merely a first step. A first step toward what? Toward complete and general disarmament?—to quote the treaty's preamble, a formulation that originated, significantly, in Khrushchev's 1959 speech at the U.N. Or—another Soviet-invented formulation—as a step toward reducing the causes of world tensions? But such reasoning, if advanced seriously, falsely assumes that world tensions are caused by armaments or, what comes down to the same thing, are caused by mutual Soviet-American distrust.

The truth of the matter, clearly visible except to political ostriches, is that the chief cause of world tensions is and has been for 20 years the Communist determination to dominate the world—a design for which the Soviets have sought to prepare the free world by just such evasions as the treaty of Moscow. That being the case, the treaty—far from being a step toward the reduction of tensions—is destined over the long run to increase them by jeopardizing our military superiority and blunting our will to resist.

Khrushchev needs the treaty of Moscow. Having signed it with one hand, he hopes it will create a fog ("the spirit of Moscow"?) around the world, while, with his other hand, he keeps pushing—in Cuba, with missiles and submarines, subversion schools and propaganda mills, munitions depots and radar monitoring stations; in British Guiana, where the first Communist toehold on the Latin American continent is forming; in Venezuela, where terrorism and sabotage are on the increase; in Berlin, where the wall is beefed up daily, and Communist guards are still shooting unarmed civilians; in Laos, where Averell Harriman's troika regime is pulling the country straight toward Communist takeover; in Russia and East Europe, where thousands of Congolese and other Africans are being trained for the next round of rebellion in Africa; in Yemen, where Soviet engineers are rolling out an airstrip as a staging point for Africa and points west; on Africa's Golden Horn, where Soviet experts are building a new port for Soviet "trawlers," submarines, warships, and in the United States, where the Communist Party has announced as its top priority effort an increase in the racial turmoil and violence now afoot, North and South.

We appeal to the Senate to take notice that the worldwide aggression of the Communist bloc is accelerating at this moment; that the treaty of Moscow serves Khrushchev by disguising his real work, which can be observed and measured by anyone who cares to look; and that to ratify this treaty would be to help to undermine the will of the West to survive.

We appeal to all Americans to write to their Senators to inform them that the ratification of this treaty would be, like the soft stance before Hitler, not a step toward peace, but a step toward weakness and war.

Dr. Edward Teller, Fermi Award winner; "Father of the H-Bomb": "The treaty will impede the development of missile defense in the United States. A corresponding inhibition in Russia will be very much less effective.

"The treaty erects a new barrier against our cooperation with our allies in the area of preparedness, particularly in missile defense. By prohibiting certain types of experimentation, the ban imposes limitations on future developments. In this way, progress is impeded and we deprive ourselves of possibilities which might acquire great importance in the future.

"Some consequences may become highly dangerous. I feel that it is my duty to conclude * * * that ratification of the treaty would have grave consequences for the security of the United States and for the free world. The signing was a mistake. If you ratify the treaty, you will have committed an enormously greater mistake. You will have given away the future safety of our country and increased the dangers of war."

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (presenting the combined views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, August 14 before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate): "They concluded that the United States would not be able to overtake the present advantage which the U.S.S.R. probably has in the high-yield weapons field, whereas the Soviets, by underground testing, probably could retrieve in time any lead which we may presently have in the low-yield tactical field."

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff: "If the treaty had not already been signed by the United States, I would recommend against it."

Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander, Strategic Air Command: "The treaty is not in the best interests of the United States. It would be a mistake to ratify this treaty."

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER: "The decision that the risks are acceptable is not (a conscientious military evaluation). It is an echo of a State Department evaluation and not one that necessarily sounds very deeply the real evaluations of our professional military."

Dr. John Foster, director, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory: "The disadvantages resulting from the treaty in restricting our knowledge of site vulnerability, penetration (of warheads) and defense, I believe, are very serious. Our current judgments are based on relatively few atmospheric tests. Wide margins of error are possible in weapons effects which we do not fully understand."

Dr. Willard F. Libby, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission: "The Soviets in 2 years have changed the balance of testing from one in which we were far ahead to one in which they are far ahead.

"It is a most serious point * * * we cannot test these * * * weapons * * * within the provisions of the treaty."

Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission: "It is a temporary document, which is a clay pigeon, and at some time, not of our own choosing, it will be breached by the Soviet Union."

Wire or write your Senators today.

Enlist the support of other Americans in your community to join with you in opposing the Treaty of Moscow. Arrange to reprint this advertisement in your local newspaper. Send your contribution to enable the commitee to continue its work. Act quickly and decisively. Time is short.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST THE TREATY OF MOSCOW,
79 Madison Avenue,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: To help underwrite the cost of this advertisement, and to enable the committee to mobilize national opposition to the Treaty of Moscow, I enclose my contribution of $———

Name________________________________
Address______________________________
City__________ State________ Zip Code____

(Make checks payable to the National Committee Against the Treaty of Moscow.)

Ad hoc organizing committee: L. Brent Bozell, chairman; Prof. James D. Atkinson, Prof. James Washington Bell, Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Hon. Spruille Braden, Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., Mr. James Burnham, Adm. Charles M. Cooke, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Bishop Albert L. Fletcher, Prof. J. D. Futch, Prof. Jerzy Hauptmann, Prof. Bernard C. Heyl, Dr. Willmoore Kendall, Prof. Russell Kirk, Dr. Anthony Kubek, Mr. Frank S. Meyer, Adm. Ben Morreell, Prof. Ben Edwin Perry, Prof. Charles E. Rice, Mr. William F. Rickenbacker, Prof. E. Merrill Root, Prof. David N. Rowe, Mr. William A. Rusher, Prof. Hans F. Sennholz, Rt. Rev. Alexander Turner, Gen. William H. Wilbur, Mr. C. Dickerman Williams, Prof. Emmett L. Williams, Jr., Dr. Karl A. Wittfogel, Dr. Max Yergan.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Aug. 23, 1963]

POWER, TELLER OPPOSE "TRAGIC MISTAKE"

The sole criterion on which the nuclear test ban treaty should be decided is this: Is ratification in the best interests of the United States?

Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander of the Strategic Air Force, says it is not. Dr. Edward Teller, "father of the hydrogen bomb," also demurs. Other prominent military experts have issued statements of guarded approval, expressing concern about the Soviet Union's superbomb lead and asking for safeguards of U.S. military superiority. From a strictly military point of view, it is obvious that the Joint Chiefs' support of the treaty is based in large measure on international political considerations—which doesn't happen to be their field of specialized knowledge—and probably on some rather forceful arm-twisting.

But General Power has flatly opposed the treaty, according to Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which heard his testimony behind closed doors, because he has a "lower confidence than others that the United States can or would retain our present undoubted nuclear superiority * * * the only deterrent to war."

The SAC Commander is reported to have testified that it would be a great mistake to ratify this treaty.

It also is significant that General LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff and Powers' predecessor as SAC boss, testified in public session that he probably would be opposed to Senate ratification of the treaty if the United States had not already signed it. And Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, head of the Air Force Systems Command, has testified in closed session that he felt he could carry out his mission better without the treaty.

Dr. Teller's very influential testimony revolved around his belief that Khrushchev "wants to stop the atmospheric tests and prevent us from obtaining the knowledge" that Soviet Union has on defending against oncoming missiles.

Dr. Teller minced no words in describing future Senate ratification of the treaty as a tragic and dreadful mistake and as not a step for peace but rather a step away from safety, possibly a step toward war.

Responding to the claim of administration witnesses that progress could be made on antimissile defense by underground tests, Teller said that such tests could be brought to a reliable conclusion only through tests in the atmosphere.

To Senator FULBRIGHT's charge that he was asking the committee to believe him rather than the Government witnesses who had testified to the contrary, Teller replied: "I would like to suggest that the committee call the Government witnesses and other witnesses and ask what kind of tests had been planned, how many and for what purpose (before the signing of the treaty in Moscow)."

General Power and Dr. Teller are to be heartily commended for standing their ground in opposition to the test ban treaty in the face of emotional tirades that they are against peace. They are aware that the personal abuse they receive now is not important. What is important is the survival of freedom.

In their summation of the position paper the Joint Chiefs prepared for the Senate committees studying the treaty, Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott claim in their timely column on today's editorial page that the military disadvantages of the nuclear test ban treaty to the United States outnumber the advantages seven to four.

That is a more impressive argument than any of the political arguments, based on wishful thinking, that the administration has brought into the discussion.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Sept 7, 1963]

BEWARE THE TEST BAN

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The limited nuclear test ban is a Russian bear trap. It will help the Soviet Union and hurt the United States. It will allow the Russians to catch up in nuclear weapons development, in which they are behind, and prevent us from catching up in areas in which they are ahead. This topsy-turvy treaty raises the ominous possibility that, in time, the Soviet Union could gain the clear-cut nuclear supremacy it needs to achieve communism's unalterable goal of world domination.

Despite serious ideological differences between Moscow and Peking, neither has abandoned the idea that the West shall be buried. Their dispute is over how, when and how deep.

For a decade and a half America's overall nuclear superiority has deterred the Kremlin from seeking its goal quickly and explosively with nuclear weapons. Our ability to retaliate with fearsome damage to the Soviet Union has made that method too costly. Our deterrent also has curbed Russia's cold-war activities. Fears that limited wars might get out of hand and escalate to nuclear war have tempered Soviet adventurism.

America's superior nuclear arsenal has been maintained by American scientists in unrestricted competition with Russian scientists. Now the rules of competition are to be changed. All testing is to go underground. President Kennedy has said this will be a first step toward reducing world tensions, freeing us from the fear and danger of fallout, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, and limiting the arms race in ways that will strengthen our security more than unrestricted testing. He has argued that it is a step toward peace well worth taking, because the terms of the treaty will allow the United States to retain its present nuclear superiority.

But will it allow us to retain superiority? Is it a step toward peace as we understand it—or as the Hungarian freedom fighters savagely were taught it?

Here is the nub of the matter and here there is room for discussion—and dissent. Power, not good intentions, rules the world. No one knows this better than the Russians. Why, after all these truculent years, have they suddenly decided there shall be a test ban agreement? What is behind Khrushchev's quick change from the frowning Russian rocket rattler of last October's Cuban crisis to the smiling Russian treaty peddler of today? Has the wolf jumped out of his skin and a lamb jumped in? Hardly. He obviously believes the pact is giving him something at the expense of the United States. Khrushchev thinks he is getting a bargain. He is.

While allowing underground testing, the treaty bans explosions in the atmosphere, underwater, or in space. For the Soviets, nothing could be better. With underground tests they can develop the kinds of small, tactical weapons that the United States has been building successfully for years. They will have the unrestricted opportunity to equal or surpass us. In the atmosphere the Russians already have made tremendous advances with strategic weapons far more powerful than any that the United States has. In 1961, when Khrushchev coolly broke the testing moratorium, Russian scientists detonated one weapon with a force of 58 megatons. It can be scaled up to a yield of 100 megatons and safely placed in Soviet arsenals without further testing. The exact yield of the biggest American weapon is a military secret, but a good bet is that the Red army calculates it at not over 30 megatons.

During the 1961 series of 31 atmospheric shots and continuing with last year's series of 49, the U.S.S.R. also made some startling advances in the development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Caught flatfooted by the sudden Soviet test resumption in September 1961, we could not get our own atmospheric series underway until April 1962. With nearly 90 tests, we made some significant advances on our own, but technical difficulties cut our high-altitude experiments severely. On balance, we need to continue testing far more than the Russians. These are the reasons why:

First, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has testified that the Russians, like ourselves, are rapidly hiding their missile bases and other military installations far underground in protective cocoons of concrete. Without atmospheric testing we cannot increase the yield of our warheads. Knowing the limitation on those yields, the Russians easily can pour enough concrete to protect against them. When that is done, our retaliatory strike-back forces will be left threatening empty launching pads and invulnerable fortresses. That kind of threat against the Soviet homeland is hardly sufficient to deter the Kremlin. Nuclear war will become more likely, not less.

Second, our nuclear deterrent will be weakened in yet another way by a ban on atmospheric testing. To pose a credible retaliatory threat, we must be strong enough to absorb a surprise Sunday punch and then rally to devastate the attacker. The enemy's nuclear attack will create weird disturbances in all unprotected electrical circuitry. Yet to strike back convincingly, millions of electrical circuits at SAC bases, in our bombers, missiles and Polaris submarines all must work in unison and function perfectly—beginning with transmission of the command to retaliate through every step of the massive strike-back operation, right down to triggering our warheads over enemy targets. We know a good deal about nullifying these electromagnetic disturbances, but we need to know very much more. That knowledge can be learned only from atmospheric testing.

Third, the United States starts with the sobering knowledge that, if war comes, we will be on the defensive. This means we will be using defensive nuclear weapons over our own territory and that of our allies. Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," has pointed out time and again that these weapons must create little or no fallout. Otherwise we will severely hurt ourselves in our own defense. We have made a good start toward developing cleaner nuclear explosives. But we need to learn much more and, again, we need to test in the atmosphere to do the job.

Fourth, we need to test in the atmosphere to perfect the antimissile missile, the weapon that we may need desperately to preserve our nuclear deterrent. The technical problems of creating a defense against a warhead hurtling down on the United States are great. Secretary McNamara has expressed doubts that it can be done at all. However, Khrushchev, in fact, insists that the Russians have already turned the trick. "We can hit a fly in the sky," he says.

If Khrushchev's claim that his scientists have solved the technical problems is correct, then as soon as the Russian missile-defense system is put into operation our nuclear deterrent will be largely nullified. Our only course of action is to develop an antimissile missile of our own. To do this, we have to test in the environment in which the weapon will be used—the atmosphere.

Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has forcefully pointed out how vital it is to test new weapons under realistic conditions. "At our peril," he has said, "we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads, and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode."

Fifth, because the treaty will be unpoliced, the Russians could make a quantum jump militarily by the trick of surprise abrogation—clandestine preparation leading up to the sudden start of tests. Last year President Kennedy himself said that an atmospheric test ban treaty would be extremely vulnerable without provision for adequate inspection guarding against secret preparation for a surprise abrogation. Although President Kennedy has promised to keep in readiness our own plans to resume testing quickly, our program is bound to sag unless it is kept alive by at least some limited atmospheric testing. This was explained by the President in 1962 before the resumption of our own tests when he said, "We cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

Sixth, there is need for the United States to continue testing because the treaty fails to rule out Soviet cheat tests either in the air or in space. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has asserted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the pact places no faith and trust in the Kremlin, and that it is self-enforcing, since the United States could easily detect any atmospheric tests by the Russians. His assertions do not square with the Atomic Energy Commission's inability to classify three sets of manifestations from the Soviet Union early in June as nonnuclear. There is no assurance they were not very low-yield or very clean air shots that released only small amounts of fission products. As to space cheating, series after series of very profitable Soviet tests in outer space could be carried on entirely without suspicion on our part.

For all these reasons, the test ban treaty helps Russia militarily. It also helps Russia psychologically and politically.

The negotiation and signing of the treaty in Moscow, together with Premier Khrushchev's role as the only participating head of state, gives Russia a credible claim to the peacemaker image. In addition, the treaty helps Khrushchev in his struggle with the Chinese. The negotiation tells both East and West that Khrushchev's book on "How To Succeed in Aggression Without Really Bombing" is still a bestseller.

An ineffective treaty removes the pressure of world opinion for an effective one that would stop Russian progress as well as our own. Furthermore, an unpoliced treaty ratifies the Soviet closed society principle and forestalls future attempts to open it up.

The treaty also hints our extreme reluctance to use nuclear weapons at all, except in a final showdown with the Soviet Union. Communist and other aggressors seem to be left free to intensify conventional attacks without fear of our calculated use of nuclear arms to block them. Stepped-up Red Korean action along the Korean armistice line already has cost U.S. casualties.

In addition, the treaty could be interpreted as preventing us from giving needed nuclear weapons to our allies. This comes at a time when our NATO allies seriously resent their inability to deter the Soviets independently should we refuse or become too weak to do so. Without the freedom to share our weapons, this estrangement will deepen. The dissolution of NATO could well result. This, for years, has been one of Khrushchev's priority objectives. The nuclear test ban also comes at a time when our allies in the Far East are increasingly worried that the Red Chinese will soon get nuclear weapons.

APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the test ban proposal, however, and the most difficult to argue against, is its emotional appeal. As Khrushchev knows all too well, the treaty seems to assure the worried peoples of the world that after the long years of fear everything is going to be all right. Surely the treaty must be the beginning of a thaw in the cold war. Surely, the Russians must now be ready to work for a real peace.

For Americans this line of wishful thinking could be disastrous. We could rapidly develop a false sense of security that would lead us to drop our guard. We could be emotionally pressured into more comprehensive disarmament agreements without adequate controls.

All the first steps sought by President Kennedy with his partial treaty could be gained through much wiser means—a simple treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union stipulating that atmospheric testing be stopped whenever certain reasonable, agreed-upon levels of fallout had been reached. These first steps would be substantially free from the military, psychological, and political disadvantages of the treaty at hand—which solves none of the basic conflicts between Russia and the United States. The problem of Berlin would still exist. So would Laos. So would Cuba. And there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that Americans would not continue to be killed in Korea and South Vietnam.

In such a world, the United States must keep up its nuclear guard. And the only safe way we can maintain the nuclear deterrent is by refusing to accept a Communist scheme to force us to stop testing in the atmosphere.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Courier, Sept. 2, 1963]

WHY NIKITA LAUGHS

In Moscow, Nikita Khrushchev talks of nuclear test bans with a jovial smile. But he isn't smiling at the prospect of peace or of lessening world tensions. He is smiling because he sees a chance of gaining a little more time to perfect his inner space program aimed at gaining military supremacy on this planet.

Each passing day it becomes clearer that the test ban talks in which the Kennedy administration places such high hopes may well be the final act in one of the most successful hoaxes in history.

If Khrushchev can once again mesmerize the United States with his flute song of peace he will have gained the last measure of time he needs to settle once and for all the military supremacy of the world.

"We will bury you," he has exulted. He meant it literally and he has good reasons to be exultant.

Consider: What is Khrushchev offering in the test ban talks? He no longer needs to experiment with his big bombs. He already has demonstrated he has developed them to the point where they are large enough for his purpose—which is to dominate or destroy the United States. So he offers nothing when he offers to halt nuclear testing.

In 1961 the Russians exploded a 55- to 60-megaton bomb. "You do not have 50- to 100-megaton bombs," he crowed then. "We have them stronger than 100 megatons." Equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT, a 100-megaton bomb is 5,000 times the strength of the Hiroshima bomb.

But he does need a year or two more to develop and build his Vostok fleet to carry these monsters in world orbit. And since strong and urgent voices warning of this danger are beginning to be heard in this country, Khrushchev needs to lull the United States into a slowdown and keep this Nation's eyes fixed in the wrong direction: the moon.

For this is the hoax which has proved so successful. The Reds have enticed the United States into the wrong race. They have stressed an outer space program with moon shots while concentrating on their inner space goal.

They have demonstrated that they can lift far heavier capsules into orbit than we can. Their plan is a threat to orbit a fleet of these space vehicles loaded with 100-megaton bombs which can be detonated without warning by turning a key in Moscow.

Farfetched? Listen to the Air Force-Space Digest, voice of the U.S. Air Force: "It is possible to place very large-yield devices in orbit, which have virtually instantaneous delivery time. Detonated at orbital altitude, such a weapon could set fire to a large part of the United States."

Exploding 100-megaton bombs at orbital altitude (from 150 to 300 miles) would generate heat as fiery as that of the sun. Bursting at 150 miles instead of 93 million miles, hundreds of thousands of square miles of this country could be incinerated in a flash!

No longer does Khrushchev depend on missiles which can be detected, knocked down or rendered inactive. There will be no warning of an orbital flash and no prediction of delivery is needed.

If the United States has not perfected the same weapon and the same method of delivery by the time Nikita has, then we had better, all of us, be on the moon.

The Nation's top military leaders, entrusted with the survival of the country, and many of the more powerful Members of Congress have warned that we are in trouble of losing the military race while concentrating on putting a man on the moon. But their warnings apparently have fallen on deaf ears in the administration.

Over the last weekend, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in a speech at the Air Force Historical Foundation at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Ala., warned that the United States is risking loss of the military battle by concentrating on a peace-oriented moon program.

"We are moonstruck," declared the Senator, who is a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. "While our eyes are fixed on it (the moon) we could lose the earth or be buried in it."

"It is the defense of our part of this planet, not the moon, that should concern us," he said. "Space weapons are the real new frontier of defense—not the moon."

Says Air Force chief Gen. Curtis E. LeMay: "We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program."

And what is our program? It comes as a shock to find that there is no top priority inner space program in this Nation which has as its goal the prevention, warning or deterring of the Vostoks.

Despite the clear and present danger, despite the warnings of the Nation's top military brains, the Kennedy administration continues to give top priority to the prestige of the moon program for peaceful purposes.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions.

That is what Nikita is counting on and that is why Nikita laughs. For the picture he sees is not one of peace. It is a picture of the globe of this earth with the United States facing threat of white-hot nuclear fire bursting from orbital flight.

He needs just a little more time.

THE SENATE AND THE TEST BAN

Action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in voting 16 to 1 to support ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty rather plainly indicates that the agreement will have strong support when the full Senate gives its decision.

Nevertheless, we believe that the Senate would make a serious mistake if it ratifies the treaty. Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, normally a supporter of the administration, voted in committee against the majority because he fears that the treaty will not defend U.S. interests.

Other Americans have similar doubts. President Eisenhower has called for a reservation to the treaty that would give the United States unquestioned right to use nuclear weapons in the national interest. The Foreign Relations Committee has attempted to cover some objections by reporting to the Senate U.S. understandings and interpretations of the treaty's terms. We fear that this move will not be adequate to protect the United States.

The advice of Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy (retired), former Chief of Naval Operations, who urged the Senate to reject the nuclear test ban treaty, should carry great weight in the Senate. A man of unusual ability and realism, Admiral Burke warned that the Russians will cheat and that we will regret ratification.

During the period he was Chief of Naval Operations (1955–61), Admiral Burke was close to developments in the atomic field. The Polaris missile program, which is this country's principal missile defense system, was the product of his leadership.

Today, as director of the Georgetown Center of Strategic Studies, Admiral Burke is associated with some of the leading authorities on defense. In short, he is not just another retired officer remote from the current scene.

If the Senate won't reject the treaty, as Admiral Burke, Dr. Edward Teller, and other patriotic realists advise, at least it should use their wisdom as the basis for incorporating safeguards and special reservations in the document. These would include provisions for resuming atmospheric tests and for allowing the President to use tactical atomic weapons in the event war in Asia or elsewhere makes this imperative.

The realists of America cannot be ignored except by exposing the country to grave peril.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Aug. 30, 1963]

Soviet Duplicity on Test Ban

Signing a limited nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union ignores lessons we have learned in the past by trying to do business with the Russians.

We have been doublecrossed in most of our agreements with the fountainhead of world communism. We have been betrayed before on a test ban agreement.

American legal authorities tell us that the treaty as a legal instrument is a monstrosity and some of its important language is "disturbingly imprecise." They say it was drawn with superb skill in duplicity by the Soviet negotiators.

Whether it means that we shall formally recognize all signatory governments is open to debate. Our State Department insists that it will not mean recognition of the East German puppet government. East Germany, meanwhile, is making a big propaganda display to show that exactly the opposite is true.

We know that Russia is ahead of the Western nations in the development of superbombs. We know that it is ahead of us in the development and deployment of protective systems against nuclear attack. We know that the treaty will prevent us from overtaking the Russians in either of these phases of development. We know that, even with honest observance of the agreements by the Russians, they will be given license to overtake the United States in the production of tactical nuclear weapons.

We don't know what tricks Khrushchev has up his sleeve, but we know that after a prolonged exhibition of stubbornness in the area of mutual disarmament, he has suddenly become ebullient about the treaty now being considered by the U.S. Senate.

His enthusiasm for concluding the treaty was obvious at formal activities in connection with the Moscow signing.

Ordinarily, newsmen find their work in the Soviet capital to be a tough and frustrating job. Doors are locked, sources are unavailable, and questions go unanswered. Most of the correspondents had never seen Khrushchev's inner sanctum, and had never expected to see it.

But the offices of Khrushchev and Foreign Minister Gromyko were opened to them for the signing by Secretary of State Rusk and British Foreign Secretary Lord Home. Visiting photographers were put on an equal footing with the Soviets.

Khrushchev gave newsmen the run of his Black Sea estate when he entertained Secretary Rusk there, even allowing them the use of his telephones to report their stories. The open-handed friendliness amazed not only the newsmen, but also the bodyguards who had been used to keeping them at bay.

Two days after Rusk's departure, two of the favored correspondents were summoned curtly to the Foreign Ministry press department. They were confronted by the same English-speaking press official who had been so hospitable to them during the Rusk visit.

Stiffly, he read out charges against them in Russian. Both, he said, had been accused of traffic violations. He warned them that a repetition might result in severe measures. Two of the charges, both several months old, involved parking and crossing from one traffic lane to another without giving the proper signal.

The meaning of this incident was unmistakable. It was the Russians' way of saying, "We've got what we want now. The party is over. You're back behind the eight ball."

Do our treaty makers get the same message?

[From National Review, Sept. 10, 1963]

Under the Sign of the Umbrella

1. FALSE DILEMMAS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Governor Rockefeller said a most interesting thing 2 weeks ago, namely, that the proposed nuclear test treaty—the treaty of Moscow, one may as well call it, as the historians inevitably will—was (a) a lousy idea, but was nevertheless (b) something we have no alternative than to ratify. The position is interesting from two points of view. First, it is revealing about Rockefeller, who desires very much to be President. Second, it is revealing of the way in which our foreign policy is continually tripping over itself.

Mr. Rockefeller said the proposed treaty does not make sense considering the highest demands of the national security. In saying so he was not saying anything particularly unorthodox. He was merely restating an axiom of American defense policy as understood over the years. That axiom is this: that the Americans are, so to speak, on top of atomic development; that atomic virtuosity was congenitally ours, just as heavy-booster missile virtuosity appears to have been Russian. In atoms, we got there first, just as the Russians orbited first; and over the years we maintained a natural lead that brought us to a stage of atomic sophistication which seems to reflect our preternatural genius in scientific affairs.

The Russians, by contrast, have all along been imitators in atomic technology. Granted they have now—depending on whom you listen to—equaled us in one dimension of atomic weapons, or even surpassed us. But it is generally conceded that just as it has thus far proved impossible to overtake the Russians' flamboyant accomplishments in heavy sputnikery, so the Russians have not succeeded in duplicating our infinitely diverse accomplishments based on atomic know-how.

That being the case, the prevailing opinion in this country has been that we should maintain and enlarge our atomic lead at all costs. The idea of both of us swearing off the atom was deemed preposterous—something like proposing to Sonny Liston and his estranged sister that they make up by both giving up boxing. Mr. Eisenhower was uniquely responsible, by unilaterally undertaking a moratorium on testing in 1958, for setting aside that axiom. Mr. Kennedy has merely taken Mr. Eisenhower's thinking one step forward. And here we are, with the Senate preparing to ratify this dangerous treaty, according to which we are prepared to abort at the present level America's great momentum in atomic ingenuity, in order to freeze the existing situation between ourselves and the U.S.S.R.

What Rockefeller wants

Mr. Rockefeller senses that this decision is wrong, but advances an argument which, he tells us, transcends that of our defense arsenal. He says: Unless we ratify Mr. Kennedy's treaty, we stand, under the present psychological circumstances, to damage the United States even more than we would stand to do by not ratifying it and cultivating our atomic superiority. Here he is bringing two arguments into a single focus. On the one hand there is the purely scientific and military argument. As far as that is concerned, he says, there is only one answer: The United States should continue to develop her atomic technology. The other argument is political and psychological. It is based on the worldwide fear of nuclear testing, a fear largely compounded from superstitious fears of radioactive infestation of the atmosphere, and hysterical relapses into the mischievous notion that war is avoided by appeasement. Mr. Kennedy has, by his actions, so maneuvered the twin fears of radioactivity and war, says Mr. Rockefeller in effect, that they overwhelm, in the public psychology, the military question. Under the circumstances, he says, let us go ahead and ratify the treaty.

I do not know of another conjunction of affairs that more dramatically signifies the terrible loss of America's strategic and philosophical faculties. The point has never been more vividly made that we have failed in making truly clear to the world the moral and imperative purpose of American defense superiority. We are, after all, arming ourselves not because American citizens desire atomic superiority for its own sake, nor because American citizens stand to lose less than other peoples by increasing the radioactivity in the atmosphere: but because our atomic program has been the basis of the defense of the free world, and the only hope of the enslaved world. If the purposes of our atomic development program had been kept clear to the peoples of the world, they would not be resenting, but rather applauding, a decision to vigorously prosecute our atomic superiority. As it is, Nelson Rockefeller finds himself submitting to an implicit contradiction between (1) the demands of the national security, and (2) the good opinion of mankind. That there should be so critical a tension between the two suggests a philosophical Waterloo.

Others as well, including Senator DODD, and perhaps even Senator GOLDWATER, are experiencing the agony. Both these men, and others on whom the American people have counted for singleminded attention to the best interests of American defense, feel that they are stymied by the diplomatic dilemma Mr. Kennedy has visited upon them: vote for this treaty, or appear before the eyes of the world as (a) in favor of an increased contamination in the milk that babies drink and (b) in favor, by continued nuclear testing, of tweaking the chin of Apocalypse.

God help us, the treaty will probaby be passed, and probably a lot of stern and rigorous anti-Communist Senators will vote for it, following the line of reasoning of Mr. Rockefeller. When it happens, however less the radioactivity in the atmosphere, this citizen of the free world will breathe less easily.

2. FALSE ANALYSIS

(By James Burnham)

This summer Norton reissued Alfred Leslie Rowse's "Appeasement," the ten-thousandth or so study of how an attempt, a generation ago, to deal with an aggressive totalitarian movement by negotiation, compromise, and conciliation not only failed to maintain peace but made general war inevitable. Not a single reviewer of "Appeasement" questioned this thesis as illustrated by the author from the "Case of Nazism and the Third Reich." Not a single reviewer, or the author, suggested there might be a fresher, and from a practical standpoint rather more relevant, illustration.

One might think the outward symbols too strikingly parallel to be ignored. In 1963 the Anglo-American leaders rush to the home base of communism to sign the capitulatory papers, just as the Anglo-French leaders rushed to the home base of nazism in 1938. (Moscow-Munich: a numerologist ought to enjoy the fact that they have the same initial and same number of letters.) In both cases the totalitarian chiefs dangle the same bait before the westerners: peaceful coexistence in our time. Doesn't it occur to any Senator to ask himself: Why did our representatives go to Moscow to sign the test ban? Why didn't their representatives come to London or Washington? Or why, at any rate, didn't both sides meet halfway at Geneva? The diplomatic geography reveals, as it almost always does, the true balance of political forces; it shows who is pulling whom.

Symbols aside, nothing could have been plainer than the declaration of the Soviet Communist Party contained in the text of its reply to the Chinese Party published in Izvestia on July 14: "We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible." Let us add that what they were concretely doing to that end at that very moment was negotiating the treaty with Harriman and Home in the Kremlin.

What Khrushchev wants

We are told by the Kremlinologists that Khrushchev signed the treaty because of "fear of China." The absurdity of this explanation would be obvious if Western opinion had not been dizzied by 5 years of twaddle concerning the nature of the Sino-Soviet split. The last thing Russia has to fear in the politically significant future is a nuclear threat from China—which would be in no sense be countered by the treaty in any event. Actually, this treaty, so far as it affects China at all, helps Chinese nuclear development—since China is not a signatory—and leaves the way open for Soviet use of Chinese territory and facilities for its own further nuclear advance. In the main arena of the real Sino-Soviet conflict—the international Communist movement—the treaty is a negligible factor.

The belief that Khrushchev wants the treaty because the Soviet economy is being badly hurt by the arms race has some substance—though it is a curious argument to use in favor of our signing it. But his primary motives are two-fold, one defensive, the other offensive.

Whatever Khrushchev's long-term worry over a "yellow peril" of the distant future, his present fears are focused nearer home. He fears the present stirrings within the East European captive nations (abetted by the increasing restlessness of the Soviet intellectuals); and he especially fears the possibility of a rearmed Germany getting nuclear weapons and seeking reunification. Khrushchev hopes that the treaty of Moscow is indeed step 1 in a series—some of the further steps being already agreed to in secret conversation—that will provide: (1) U.S. underwriting of the East European status quo; (2) U.S. acceptance of the present division of Germany as permanent; and (3) a U.S. guarantee that West Germany will not get nuclear arms.

In terms of offensive strategy, Khrushchev sees this treaty as the best possible—umbrella, we may appropriately call it—for conducting the psychopolitical, paramilitary, guerrilla, and limited warfare operations that he judges to be the most suitable methods for accomplishing "the destruction of imperialism and capitalism * * * as soon as possible." That is exactly what the Communists explained, in all frankness, in their July 14 statement. That is exactly what Khrushchev's "man in Havana," in his July 26 speech—delivered the day after the signing of the treaty—was announcing as he called on Latin American revolutionaries "to take the fullest advantages of [the] incomparably favorable prerevolutionary conditions [to] make revolutions." "Every people that does what the Cuban people have done," Fidel promised, "will have the all-out support of the Soviet Union." That is exactly what is shown by the Communist-triggered events in Laos and South Vietnam that are wrecking the entire Western position in southeast Asia even as the treaty debate goes on. That is exactly what the Kremlin's strategists count on to smooth the transformation of Cyprus into a Mediterranean Cuba by the end of 1964.

And at the same time Khrushchev knows that the Treaty of Moscow will inevitably lower the sense of urgency in American opinion required to sustain a long-range armament program. Already the critical research and development projects—which make the least public impression and are therefore politically most vulnerable—are being pruned; and the projects decisive for our future security have lead times of 10 to 15 years. That 90-day escape clause in the Treaty of Moscow won't be much consolation when we wake up one day to find ourselves already 5 years too late.

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Sept. 9, 1963]

U.S. INTELLIGENCE: IS IT GOOD ENOUGH?

(NOTE.—Spy slip-ups of the past have got Congress worried. Members want to be sure Russia can't secretly cheat on an H-test treaty and pile up a massive arms lead.)

Can U.S. intelligence be counted on to safeguard an atomic-test treaty with Soviet Russia?

That question is at the heart of a debate now going on before Congress.

Safeguarding such a treaty with Russia, it is agreed, is closely tied to reliable performance by U.S. intelligence agencies.

Members of Congress want assurance that U.S. defenses will not be endangered by a test ban. They want foolproof detection of violations of any kind, checks on possible secret Red preparations for massive new tests, and an eye kept on development of a new "missile killer" or any other dramatic weapon by Russia.

Some experts question whether U.S. intelligence is good enough to do the job. The White House has just given fresh assurance that it is. All this has set off a reexamination of U.S. intelligence performance in the past.

SUCCESSES VERSUS FAILURES

That record is marked by both notable success and dismal failure.

Main responsibility for policing the treaty will rest with the Central Intelligence Agency, run by civilians. The CIA was set up largely as a result of a military-intelligence disaster at Pearl Harbor. It now operates with 12,000 Americans, untold thousands of foreign agents and a budget close to $1 billion a year.

Credit is given to CIA for a number of victories in the cold war. These are far-ranging. For one thing, the Agency disclosed technical skill by pinpointing missile-test sites inside Russia as early as 1954. And it has masterminded political coups in Iran and Guatemala. Dozens of other successes are necessarily kept secret.

Failures of CIA also are numerous. The accompanying chart gives an idea of some publicized intelligence errors of the past.

Critics maintain that, on the surface, there is good reason for skepticism over CIA's ability to collect accurate information from Communist countries and over the record of Government officials properly to interpret and act on that information. In some cases—notably the buildup of Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962—intelligence information was available but was felt to be mishandled by policymakers.

On August 24, the administration told the Senate that it plans to police the test ban treaty with improved intelligence and test-detection procedures.

This pledge by the White House is based on intelligence tools and techniques now available but not ordinarily associated with old-fashioned cloak-and-dagger methods.

ATOMIC DETECTIVES

The United States now has perfected a variety of means—at ground stations, aboard planes and ships—to ring Russia with sensitive instruments to detect nuclear blasts under water or in the atmosphere. Equipment includes seismograph stations and special microbarograph instruments. Other equipment also is used.

It now is possible, with this equipment, to pinpoint within hours the exact spot of a Soviet atmospheric explosion and even the ingredients and construction of the bomb.

Detection in space is not so easy. But before the end of the year the United States will launch satellites with electronic "sniffers" to report on any nuclear explosions in deep space.

SPY SATELLITES

For keeping check on Soviet missile progress—both offensive and defensive—the United States is counting heavily on Samos camera satellites that have taken over the mission of U–2 reconnaissance planes.

Samos is a secret Air Force project but these details have been published: Between six and nine satellites are at work today, in orbits that cover all of Russia. They are sending back photos as good as those returned by U–2 flights.

What concerns a large number of authorities, however, is this:

Despite ample information in the past, the United States has still committed blunders. Ability and willingness of policymakers to make best use of all intelligence is still questioned. Inability has contributed to failure in the past and provides a basis for uneasiness in Congress now.

CRITICS SEE THESE 12 BLUNDERS

1. Soviet A-bomb, 1949; U.S. Central Intelligence Agency underrated Russia's scientific capability and its espionage system, predicted the first Red nuclear explosion for 1951 or later. The blast come 2 years earlier than forecast, took American officials by surprise.

2. Korean invasion, 1950: Buildup by North Korean attackers was either ignored or misinterpreted by U.S. intelligence groups. They compounded initial failure by estimating there would be no massive intervention by Red China.

3. Bomber "panic," 1955: The United States suddenly discovered Russia flying big intercontinental bombers 3 years earlier than anticipated, erroneously gave the Red air force credit for massive fleets. Result was "crash" investment of billions in bomber defenses now largely outmoded.

4. Attack on Suez, 1956: CIA claims it had secret in advance of British-French Israel invasion of Egypt, but warnings were ignored. Washington was also caught short in 1956 by Hungarian revolt.

5. First sputnik, 1957: Intelligence had ample information about Soviet advances with mammoth rockets and interest in space exploration, but failed to anticipate actual launching of first artificial satellite. United States was thus encouraged to keep own effort to snail's pace.

6. Phony missile gap, 1959: Air Force and CIA are charged with badly overestimating Soviet missile intentions and capability. Reds were erroneously credited with superiority. Intelligence thus helped politicians create missile scare in 1960 election.

7. Bad guess on Laos, 1960: CIA and State Department decided to force a change in Laos, put their chips on Gen. Phoumi Nosavan. He turned out to be ineffective and unpopular. By the time Washington recognized the error, Laos was on the road to partial Red takeover.

8. Bay of Pigs invasion, 1961: Considered CIA's costliest mistake. The Agency planned and conducted a disastrous military operation, using Cuban refugees. Failure brought charges that CIA badly misgaged the likely reaction of Cuban people to liberation from offshore.

9. Berlin wall, 1961: Three years before wall was built, American intelligence had possession of detailed plan for its eventual construction. Sixty days before wall was built, the United States got new and urgent warnings. But West was startled and the United States paralyzed by lack of preparation.

10. Soviet atom tests, 1961; United States once more was caught without warning when Russia broke 3-year moratorium on nuclear testing and began the most extensive series of atmospheric explosions ever held. Preparations—it now is known—had been going on for more than a year.

11. Soviet missiles in Cuba, 1962: Aerial reconnaissance photos, at the last moment, uncovered Soviet missiles going into place all over Cuba. Critics claim that other positive evidence of a massive arms buildup was plentiful but ignored for weeks by White House policymakers.

12. Vietnam crisis, 1963: American officials in South Vietnam—relying heavily on military and civilian intelligence officers stationed there—were embarrassed and caught completely off guard when President Diem's government launched a nationwide crackdown on Buddhist opposition.

STROM THURMOND, U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE, AUGUST 26, 1963

THE $64 QUESTION

Testimony on the Moscow test ban treaty, both in public and secret sessions, reveals that there is one awesome question on which the whole issue precariously hangs. The question: "Do we dare risk the entire national security of the United States on the validity of our official intelligence estimates?"

All of the intelligence experts admit freely that our intelligence is poorest on what is happening in the Soviet Union and in Red China. By comparison, Cuba is an open book. Our official intelligence estimates do not have a history that exactly inspires confidence. Consider the record.

When the Soviets came up with the atomic bomb, it was a complete surprise to the United States. Official estimates took the position that the Soviets could not master the atomic bomb before the mid-1950's, but they tested on August 19, 1949.

In the fall of 1949, just after the Soviets detonated an atomic bomb, the United States was considering whether to develop a thermonuclear weapon. The official intelligence estimate, even after being fooled by the Soviets on the atomic bomb a few weeks earlier, said the Soviets could not develop the thermonuclear weapon until the late 1950's. All the scientists, except one, agreed with the estimate, and opposed U.S. construction of a thermonuclear bomb. The one exception was Dr. Edward Teller, who, in October 1949, urged that if the United States didn't hurry with the development of the H-bomb, the Soviets would get one first. Fortunately, President Truman decided against the official estimate and with Dr. Teller's lone scientific opinion. The estimate was wrong; Dr. Teller was right. We exploded a thermonuclear bomb on October 31, 1952; the Soviets followed on August 12, 1953, with a hydrogen bomb explosion.

When the Communists invaded South Korea in June 1950, the United States was caught off guard. Official intelligence estimates took the position that it wouldn't happen. On the basis of those estimates, U.S. military forces had been withdrawn from the area, making the attack possible.

When the Soviets launched Sputnik I in October 1957, the United States was caught by complete surprise. Official intelligence estimates had let us down again.

Along in 1958, official intelligence estimates said the Soviets had a multitude of ballistic missiles, and thus was born the missile gap. It was such a scare that it became a major issue in the 1960 presidential election. It then turned out that the whole estimate was phoney; the estimates were wrong, and the missile gap was a fraud.

On September 19, 1962, an official intelligence estimate was issued which took the position that there were no Soviet missiles in Cuba, and that the Soviets would not put any missiles in Cuba. This one got disproved in a hurry. Now it is admitted that missiles were in Cuba when the estimate was written.

The official estimates now admit that the Soviets are ahead of us in some fields of nuclear technology. They also admit that we don't have much hard information on which to base our estimates. In the areas of technology where we have the most information, official estimates admit the Soviets are ahead; in areas of technology where we have the least information, official estimates assume that the United States is ahead.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, who knows something about our intelligence methods in this field, has little confidence in our intelligence estimates. He stated that if the treaty were not already signed, he would recommend don't sign it.

Gen. Thomas Power, who commands the Strategic Air Command, and is even closer to the problem, says the estimates are wrong, and that it's far too dangerous to sign the treaty. The Soviets might well have a clear superiority in technology now. Gen. Bernard Schriever, who commands our missile development, says he can't do his job properly if the treaty is ratified.

Dr. Teller, who has the best experience in the nuclear field, and who has a history of making correct judgments, says the intelligence estimates are wrong.

What is the difference? If the treaty is ratified, and any significant part of the estimates is wrong again, the United States is finished. Russia will have us hands down in the nuclear field, and the only choice that would be left to us then is surrender or be wiped out.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Aug. 28, 1963]

LEMAY'S REASON FOR SKEPTICISM

(By Homer Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Secrecy in Washington is never leak-proof, but a reporter must satisfy his conscience that in revealing hush-hush testimony he is not giving information to the enemy. With that restriction in mind, I think it is enlightening to report the tenor of General LeMay's dialogue in his closed-door session with the Preparedness Subcommittee.

LeMay and the other Joint Chiefs of Staff were called separately and individually to the White House, a day or so after the Moscow signing of the nuclear treaty. They were told that their opinions on the treaty must be based upon both military and political considerations. The legal basis for asking military men to make political judgments lies in chapter 5, paragraph D(8), of the fundamental Defense Department statute and it reads: "* * * The Joint Chiefs shall * * * perform such other duties as the President or Secretary of Defense may prescribe."

On this broad authority, LeMay was instructed to think politically, but he was then turned over to State Department briefers to be told what to think. He was told that among the major political results expected to flow from the treaty were (a) widening the Sino-Soviet rift and (b) achieving a worldwide detente, or relaxation of tensions, between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

LeMay told the Preparedness Subcommittee that he didn't believe either of these results would follow the treaty ratification. That is, he remained unconvinced by whatever proof the State Department offered him. The Air Force Chief of Staff later told the Fulbright committee in open hearing that, had the treaty not been already signed, he would have opposed it wholeheartedly rather than accept it, as he did, with misgivings.

What misgivings? LeMay disbelieves, as does Edward Teller, Secretary McNamara's stated optimism that the U.S.A. has nuclear superiority and can maintain it under the treaty. The McNamara opinion is not based on technical knowledge of Russian nuclear power. It is based on intelligence estimates. This means we take the little that is known about Russian discoveries and then extrapolate this material to reach some conclusions. When asked what if these conclusions were faulty in the wrong direction, the burly LeMay, with his expressive voice and manner, said: "School's out."

Well, what are the chances that the intelligence estimates are reliable enough to sustain the risk that Russia may soon come up with a missile defense system which will make the U.S.S.R. relatively impregnable to an American retaliatory attack? This same Stennis Preparedness Committee on May 9, 1963, published a document entitled "Investigation of the Preparedness Program." While directed specifically to the Russian sneak occupation and fortification of Cuba, the Stennis report does assess our intelligence estimating capacity as follows:

"The deficiency in the performance of the intelligence community appears to have been in the evaluation and assessment of accumulated data. Moreover there seems to have been a disinclination on the part of the intelligence community to accept and believe the ominous portent of the information which had been gathered.

"In addition, the intelligence people apparently invariably adopted the most optimistic estimate possible with respect to the information available. This is in sharp contrast to the customary military practice of emphasizing the worst situation which might be established by the accumulation of the evidence."

There, in brief, is why LeMay and others are skeptical of a treaty which proposes a limited disarmament on the basis of intelligence estimates. Our policymakers, on whom the President relies, are not good at "evaluation and assessment." They have a "disinclination * * * to believe * * * the ominous portent." They adopt "the most optimistic estimate possible" and this habit is "in sharp contrast to the military practice."

Underestimating the enemy is the cardinal sin in military strategy. When we did it last year, the Russians moved into Cuba in such force that we dare not try to dislodge

> them. If we underestimate this year on the matter of Russia's nuclear potential, "school's out."
>
> That's the opinion, not of a newsman, but of our foremost military airman, Gen. Curtis LeMay, and of other military men who are less outspoken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for several weeks, the Senate has had the proposed treaty on nuclear testing. The question has been examined intensively not only by the Committee on Foreign Relations but also by members of the Armed Services Committee and the Senate members of the Committee on Atomic Energy, all of whom were invited to participate in the hearings, and all of whom collectively comprise more than one-third of the membership of the Senate.

There has been in process, in short, a very thorough Senate consideration of the proposed treaty. The specific questions have already been asked and answered, as far as it has been possible to answer them. The specific doubts have been raised, and, as far as possible, laid to rest.

We are now approaching a point at which we must put the penultimate question in solitary conscience. It is this decision which will produce the final vote by which the Senate will either give or withhold consent to ratification of the proposed treaty.

The issue now is not whether Germany mistrusts the treaty or France mistrusts it more or Communist China most of all.

The issue, now, is not solely the meaning of the treaty for health and human genetics, or for military strategy or for the technology and costs of scientific arms competition.

All these issues and others have been considered in the painstaking interrogation of the past few weeks. Each has its own unique significance. But each is a fragment of the penultimate question and must be so regarded if we are to reach sound decision.

For the question which now confronts us is the one question which is the sum of the many questions. And a rational response to it can only be the sum of the many responses, weighed in the scale of such wisdom and judgment as each of us may possess. The attitude of no single expert or group of experts in or out of Government, no single official or group of officials of this Government, no single scientist or group of scientists can be controlling on this question. The question is for us alone to decide. It is not for any scientist, military leader, cabinet secretary or whatever to decide for us. It remains now for elected Senators to decide for themselves, to confirm or refuse to confirm the judgment of an elected President.

This penultimate question which confronts us is simply stated: Does the proposed treaty serve, on balance, the interests of the people of the United States, when those interests are considered in their totality? Or to put it negatively: Is the proposed treaty, on balance, inimical to the interests of the people of the United States?

If it is inimical, obviously, the President should not have had the treaty signed in the first place and, certainly, the Senate should not now consent to its ratification. But if the treaty passes even a minimal test, if reason tells us that, on balance, the treaty is not inimical to this Nation, then that alone would seem to be sufficient grounds for approving it. For if we mean what we say when we speak of supporting the leadership of the President, irrespective of party, in his great national responsibilities in foreign relations, we must mean, at least, that in matters of this kind, we are inclined to give him the benefit of those vague and residual hesitancies by which each of us in his own way may be possessed.

And may I add, Mr. President, that I do not see how any Senator can vote either for or against this treaty with a sense of absolute assurance. In any major essay in foreign relations there are bound to be—and there should be—hesitancies. They would be there if we debated the proposed treaty or any major issue, a month, a year, or a decade.

There were doubts and hesitancies when a Republican Congress voted a Marshall plan under a Democratic President. There were doubts and hesitancies when a Democratic Congress voted a Middle East resolution under a Republican President. The doubts are there year in and year out when Congress considers the foreign aid program. For the simple truth is that there are no certainties, no absolutes in significant matters of foreign relations.

Indeed, were there no doubts on this question of a nuclear test ban that in itself would be cause for the deepest concern. For the absence of any doubt would suggest either a dangerous delusion or an insipid insignificance in the treaty.

The truth is that there are risks in this as in any venture in foreign relations. But I remind the Senate that there are also risks in failing to venture, in standing still in a world which does not stand still for this or any other nation. And at this moment in the world's time, the risks of a paralyzed uncertainty may be far greater than those which might stem from the pursuit of this venture.

Indeed, there is a strong presumption that such must be the case. I say that, Mr. President, because this proposed treaty is no instant fancy, no sudden concoction. We have not arrived in haste at this point of decision. The active pursuit of a treaty to ban nuclear tests began many years ago under the administration of President Eisenhower. The previous administration was not passive and negative in its approach. It sought a treaty in a most active and positive fashion. Indeed, the former Vice President, Mr. Nixon, journeyed to Moscow in 1959 in an effort to further this objective, among others, of U.S. foreign policy. And in a letter dated April 13, 1959, President Eisenhower wrote Mr. Khrushchev that:

> The United States strongly seeks a lasting agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

Note, Mr. President, the phrase "strongly seeks."

In short, Mr. President, the search for a nuclear test ban treaty was clearly a cardinal element in the foreign policy of the Nation during the second Eisenhower administration. When Mr. Kennedy assumed office, he did not have to continue that search. He could have abandoned it. He could have ignored the efforts of the previous administration. He could have turned his back on the affirmations in favor of a nuclear test ban treaty, as they were contained in the platforms of both parties during the 1960 presidential campaign and upon which Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon stood for office. That is a prerogative of the Presidency, and Mr. Kennedy could have exercised it had he judged, after a full examination of all relevant information, that the policy was detrimental to the interests of the Nation.

But Mr. Kennedy did not so find. On the contrary, he pursued the matter even as Mr. Eisenhower had done before him. And he continued to pursue it in spite of repeated setbacks and frustrations not unlike those undergone by his predecessor, until an agreement was, at last initialed by his distinguished agent, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Averell Harriman, on July 25, 1963. That agreement, I would note in order to emphasize its nonpartisan nature, is more closely in accord with the concept of a nuclear test ban as it is contained in the Republican Party's presidential platform in 1960 than it is with the similar plank in the Democratic Party's platform.

It is conceivable that one President of the United States may have misjudged the American interest in this highly significant matter, although I do not for a moment suggest that such was the case with President Eisenhower. But I find it most difficult to believe that two Presidents in succession would be guilty of negligence or poor judgment on precisely the same question of national interest. No, Mr. President, there is a strong presumption that a test ban treaty is not only not inimical to the interests of the people of the Nation but also is to their positive advantage.

Further, Mr. President, when members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services and the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy probe every word, comma, and period of the text of the treaty; when they examine every conceivable implication of the treaty for days on end; when they hear countless relevant witnesses of the executive branch, including the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the CIA give sober but unmistakable support for this treaty; when the committees summon for testimony not only the advocates of this treaty but also its most articulate and competent opponents—in short, when the treaty is subjected to the most stringent Senate committee scrutiny and the great preponderance of informed testimony is favorable—there is a strong presumption that the treaty is in the positive interests of the United States.

I should like to read an extract from the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the combined committees in executive session. This testimony I understand, after checking, has now been cleared. I refer to this extract because of the particular importance which is attached to the defense aspects of the treaty.

> Senator Mansfield—

Asking a question of General LeMay—

> General, did I understand you correctly—you do favor the ratification of this treaty?
>
> General LeMay. Providing the safeguards are forthcoming.
>
> Senator Mansfield. General Wheeler—

Who, of course, is the Chief of Staff of the Army—

> Did I understand you in the same sense?
>
> General Wheeler. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator Mansfield. Admiral McDonald?

Who, of course, is the Chief of Naval Operations—

> Admiral McDonald. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator Mansfield. General Shoup?

Who, of course, is Commandant of the Marine Corps—

> General Shoup. Definitely.
>
> Senator Mansfield. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

And yet, Mr. President, a strong presumption is not enough in a matter of this kind. Each Senator has an individual responsibility to examine this treaty for himself in the light of his own conscience and his own concept of the interests of his State and the Nation.

The Senator from Montana has done so, and he has just returned from reporting to the people whom he represents on his position on this treaty, which will be before the Senate very shortly. And having done so, he is persuaded that the proposed treaty does no violence to, but, on the contrary, serves the interests of the people of his State and the Nation.

It serves those interests, immediately and tangibly, in matters of public health as they may involve a resident or a child yet to be born in Montana or in any one of the 50 States. I refer, Mr. President, to the question of radiation which, as an uninvited but ever-present spectator, has haunted these hearings of the past few weeks. To be sure, there may be a lack of certainty among scientists and doctors on the precise effects of manmade radiation on health and the human species. But let there be no mistake about it. There is a minimal concept of the dangers of radiation from which reputable scientific and medical opinion does not depart. It is expressed very clearly in the unanimous report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Facts of Atomic Radiation, 17th Session of the General Assembly, 1962. In this report, scientists from 15 nations, including France, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Canada recorded their unanimous agreement that—

> The exposure of mankind to radiation from increasing numbers of artificial sources including the worldwide contamination of the environment with short- and long-lived radionuclides from weapons tests calls for the closest attention particularly because the effects of any increase in radiation exposure may not be fully manifested for several decades in the case of somatic disease and for many generations in the case of genetic damage. There should be no misunderstanding about the reality of genetic damage from radiation. The Committee therefore emphasizes the need that all forms of unnecessary radiation exposure should be minimized or avoided entirely, particularly when the exposure of large populations is entailed.

Mr. President, so far as I am aware, that statement has not been challenged from a reputable medical or scientific source anywhere in the world. It is a most conservative statement and one must question the sobriety of anyone who would pass off the factor of radiation damage as irrelevant or propagandistic in the consideration of the proposed treaty. It is of central importance. For what the statement says, in effect, is that we do not know precisely how harmful manmade radioactivity is but we are certain that it is not good for human health or for the genetics of the human race. It is not good, in short, for men, women, and children—and particularly children—in Montana, Arizona, Ohio, Washington, Nevada, Mississippi, Utah, or Missouri any more than in London, Paris, Moscow, Peiping, or Tokyo. What the statement says, in effect, is that radiological technicians in hospitals do not wear heavy protective clothing and dentists do not shelter themselves for the fun of it when they take X-rays. They do so because the stuff of X-rays, as of nuclear bomb tests, is insidiously dangerous. What the statement says, in effect, is that it is highly inadvisable to put even minute quantities of strontium 90 or 89 into milk or to add other radioactive isotopes such as iodine 131 or cesium 137 to bread, as though they were vitamin A, B, C, or D. They are quite the reverse in their effect on human health and on the human species. The statement says, in short: Handle manmade radioactivity with extreme care or, preferably, do not handle it at all.

Yet we have been compelling our own people to handle it, as well as the Russian people and others, and the Russians have been compelling their people as well as ours and others to handle it. That has been the consequence of bomb tests because, beyond the radiation released in proximity to a test site, the phenomenon of fallout results in a wide distribution throughout the world from each detonation, wherever it may occur. And radioactivity is both ideologically neutral and wholly indifferent to national boundaries. When carried in the air currents and clouds of the atmosphere it places free peoples, Communist peoples or whatever, all on this planet, in the same radioactive boat.

We will find some scientific voices saying that it is not too bad and very temporary, this thing which has already been done by nuclear bomb tests to the planetary setting in which all human life is lived. We will find some scientific opinion which takes the opposite view, that the genetic damage already done has been very substantial. And we will find many scientists who say so far it is not too bad, but we had better avoid much more. That there are these differences is a reflection not so much of a disagreement on the facts but of a paucity of facts and of differing values which are put on the integrity of the individual human life. Some are more prepared than others, apparently, to sacrifice this integrity on the altar of science for what is regarded as a valid scientific or defense purpose.

In terms of statistics, our own Federal Radiation Council has made some estimates of the human costs of the radioactive byproducts of nuclear bomb tests. The figures which it supplies are exclusive of the effects of the last Russian test series of superbombs in 1962. The Council indicates that all tests in the United States and throughout the world through 1961 could produce in this Nation in this and future generations anywhere up to 15,000 cases of gross physical and mental birth defects and, possibly, up to a maximum of 2,000 leukemia cases and up to a maximum of 700 cases of bone cancer within the next 70 years. Other adverse health effects of these tests, as, for example, those of radioactive iodine 131 to children's thyroids in the vicinity of test sites in the Mountain States of the West, are strongly suspect. The same is true of cesium 137 which has been delivered in heavy quantities to Eskimos in Alaska as a result of Soviet tests in the Arctic.

Still other ill effects cannot even be guessed at, as, for example, those of carbon 14, which has a radioactive life of several thousand years and may be said, therefore, to have already altered the human environment permanently.

Because of the difficulty in understanding some of these terms, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks definitions of some of the items which I referred to, as well as others not mentioned, be incorporated in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the definitions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Definitions

Radionuclide is an isotope of an element with radioactive characteristics.

Isotope is an unstable variation of an element.

Strontium 90 is a long-lived radionuclide (half-life 28 years) with chemical properties similar to calcium. (Strontium itself is an alkaline earth-metal element at No. 38.) Strontium 90 tends to deposit in bones, entering the body in the total diet but especially through milk, wheat products, and vegetables.

Strontium 89 is a radionuclide, similar to strontium 90 but has a half-life of only 50 days. It, too, deposits preferentially in bones. Milk is the significant dietary contributor of strontium 89 but it also attaches to the surface of other foods.

Cesium 137 is a long-lived radionuclide (half-life 30 years). (Cesium itself is a soft metallic element at No. 55.) Cesium 137 distributes throughout the soft-tissues of the body, with milk, meat and vegetables the main sources. As in the case of strontium 90, dietary measurements of cesium 137 fluctuate in consonance with the fallout rate.

Iodine 131 is a short-lived radionuclide (half-life 8 days). (Iodine itself is a nonmetallic crystalline element at No. 53.) Deposited in the body, iodine 131 concentrates in the thyroid gland. Residence time, as well as half-life, is short. The most significant dietary contributor is milk.

Carbon 14 is a very long-lived radionuclide (half-life 5,760 years). It is similar to nonradioactive carbon and is produced both naturally by cosmic radiation and artificially by bomb tests. The level of carbon 14 in the environment tends to decrease only as it enters carbonates of the deep ocean waters and sediments. All items of diet contribute to the amount of carbon 14 in the body in proportion to their carbon content.

Tritium is the radioactive isotope of hydrogen (half-life 12.4 years) which is produced both naturally and by fallout. It combines with oxygen to produce radioactive water which goes everywhere ordinary water goes. On July 22, 1963 the Department of Interior announced that tritium had reached the highest concentration in rainwater ever measured by the Geological Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is all very well to note that the statistical projections suggest only a very small number of Americans as adversely affected by all tests throughout the world through 1961. But it would not be very well to tell that to the specific Americans who will suffer the consequences. Furthermore, it is clear that the Russian test series of 1962 will add to the specific totals of health damage already projected in the United States. It is clear, too, that any additional tests in the atmosphere by the Soviet Union, the United States, or any other country will do the same and, in the absence of a treaty, the addition to the totals can be large or small, depending upon the whim and the capacity not only of ourselves but of the Soviet Union or any other nation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened with great interest to the able address of the distinguished majority leader. Like me, he does not claim the capacity to reach scientific judgment in this complicated and technical field.

As the Senator knows, it has been my privilege to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have listened to many scientists discourse upon this subject. One thing I have never heard any scientist say is that any additional radioactivity would be beneficial to the human race. They may disagree as to the level of radiation that would be tolerable—the tolerance point, so to speak—they may disagree as to the averaging and as to the probabilities of individuals being severely damaged as a result of accidental dosage of more than the median amount of radiation; but I have never heard any scientist say that any additional radiation would be helpful to the human race.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. This is not the first time he has made comments of that nature; and, in all honesty, I must admit that one of the reasons I am making this speech today is because of the comments he has made on this particular subject over the years. So I am deeply appreciative of the comments he has just made.

Mr. President, it is clear, in short, that however small the effects appear to be in the statistical computation, nuclear bomb testing has already caused a damage to human health and, potentially, its continuance is a great danger to human health. It is so clear that it can be said in this Senate that we will not find one reputable scientific voice which will advocate the continuance of bomb tests on the grounds that they are a kind of fillip for human health or a genetic stimulant for the improvement of the human species.

Therefore, the fundamental, if unspoken, assumption of the treaty must be that neither this Nation nor the Soviet Union seeks the dubious distinction of being the foremost contaminator of the earth's physical environment with radioactive substances. It is the assumption that the Russians are at least rational enough and human enough to be concerned with this menace to the health of their children and their grandchildren as we are with respect to ours.

Those may be erroneous assumptions. It may be, I suppose, that the Russians are so obsessed with being first that it is all the same to them whether the race has to do with the Olympic games, the moon, economic growth, the ballet, or radioactive contamination. It may be that this obsession is so strong that they are prepared to sacrifice even their progeny to it.

Even if it were so, even if the Russians were indifferent to the pollution of their own place, along with every other nation's place, in the earth's environment, then all it would signify is that this treaty has little meaning. It would signify that the treaty will not do much good. But, then, with the safeguards which are provided and assured, neither will it do much harm.

For what would happen, Mr. President, if we ventured on the assumption that the Russians did not wish to menace the health of their own people any more than we and events proved us wrong? At some point in the future, then, the Russians would resume atmospheric and marine testing. But would they not be able to do that in any event in the absence of a treaty? What is to stop them? And if they resume this dubious process of denaturizing the physical environment of mankind what is to stop us from joining in this macabre competition once again? Not this treaty, Mr. President. There is nothing in this treaty which would stop us in those circumstances. And it has been made very clear in the hearings that we intend to rejoin this competition on very short notice if it is forced upon us.

No, Mr. President, if there is any safe assumption in this treaty, it is that there is an absolute mutual interest—that of the preservation of human health—which applies to every nation on this globe. This common interest will either be pursued in good faith by all nations—especially by the United States and the Soviet Union—or all will suffer the consequences of the failure to do so. There is no escape. There is no way, neither sneak nor open, to gain an advantage in this matter of health—not for us, not for the Soviet Union, not for any nation. For the simple fact is that if there are no atmospheric tests, the Geiger counters will taper their rhythms everywhere. If there are tests, the counters will click their warning to human health in every part of the world.

To be sure, Mr. President, there are other nations—France and China in particular—which, health factors notwithstanding, have already announced that they will not adhere to this treaty. Such states will remain legally free to test nuclear weapons in any other environment. But without this treaty such would still be the case. Even at worst, these countries cannot conceivably pose, for many years, anything remotely resembling the kind of threat to human health which is implicit in a resumption of unrestricted nuclear testing by the United States and the Soviet Union. With the treaty effectively maintained between the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, we will have at least a period of respite which, in itself, will be of some worldwide health benefit. And with the adherence of the great bulk of the civilized nations of the world—over 80 nations have already signed the agreement—there will be an opportunity for a vigorous and concerted search for additional ways to make the treaty universal in its application.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that there are no grounds for sanguine expectations that this treaty, even if it is ratified by this Nation will bring an end to the more dangerous types of nuclear testing. It is a tangible hope; that is all. But against that tangible hope there is certain dispair. In the absence of this treaty, the process of radioactive contamination of the environment by bomb tests will continue and in all probability intensify. Past experience indicates that deploring these tests in speeches and party platforms will not end them. Introducing Senate resolutions against them will not prevent them. Passing resolutions in the U.N. General Assembly will not inhibit them. Voluntary moratoriums will not stop them. All these experiences, short of a treaty, have been tried and they have not succeeded. The inescapable fact remains that a total anarchy in this critical matter still exists in the world. The inescapable fact is that not only this Nation but every nation is still completely free at this moment to wreak damage not only on its own heritage of the earth's environment but on that of every other people. And the inescapable fact is that the fear of losing a technological military advantage or the hope of gaining one—this terrifying fear and this elusive hope—which in the past, have impelled the Russians no less than ourselves to overlook the hazards to human health in these tests will almost certainly compel us to do the same in the future. We shall be so impelled, and they shall be so impelled, unless this treaty enters into force and is scrupulously maintained on both sides. The likelihood—I venture to say, the certainty—is that without this treaty, the danger to the health of all Americans, of all human beings, from bomb-made radioactivity, will multiply. Neither an embarrassed silence nor a soft-pedaled evasion of experience and fact changes the reality one iota.

Even if the treaty comes into force, it is obvious that this treaty, in itself, will not halt the continuing and intense scientific and technological competition to gain a military advantage or to avoid losing one. That will go on for the present on both sides, as is very apparent from the Senate hearings and from statements emanating from Moscow. But what the treaty does do is to put a muzzle on one aspect of that competition. What the treaty does do is to force the competition, insofar as it is now dependent on nuclear testing on both sides, out of the atmosphere and from the seas and onto the design boards and into the factories and beneath the ground.

The treaty may not work, Mr. President. It may be cheated or frightened or suspicioned or reserved or exceptioned into discard, quickly or in time. It may be, in the end, no more effective than the voluntary moratoriums and the resolutions or whatever of the past. And the world will go on deploring these tests even as they multiply.

I hope no Senator will vote for ratification of this treaty on the mistaken belief that it is a guarantee that bomb tests will now cease for all time. The truth is that in voting for ratification of this treaty, as I have already stated, we will be voting for a hope. But let me stress, Mr. President, that it is a significant, a tangible hope.

And so long as that hope, that tangible hope is present, the Senator from Montana is not going to tell the people of his State, that he voted to dash it, to kill it. He is not going to tell the people whom he represents that President Kennedy brought this hope, first raised under President Eisenhower, to binding treaty form—this hope that there will no longer be avoidable increases in the incidence of leukemia, bone cancer, thyroid cancer, birth malformations, and other radiologically induced deficiencies among Montanans and Americans and all human beings—but, for a variety of reasons, he could not support the President. The Senator from Montana is not going to say that he could not support the President because the French Government or the Chinese Communist government did not like the treaty. Nor will he say it because a prominent scientist out of a large number of prominent scientists registered the very unscientific fiat of his own opinion that the treaty was a dreadful tragic mistake. Nor will he say it because he is convinced that in a wasteful spending competition on armaments, our taxpayers can outspend the Russians, spend them into bankruptcy without going bankrupt ourselves.

Nor will he say it because the statistical evidence showed only a few Americans would die before their time or only a few American children would be born malformed because of tests already conducted. Nor will he say it because the treaty might also be signed by East Germany and he would much rather that the East Germans begin testing nuclear bombs than that even the remotest suggestion be given that the United States had, by getting into the same treaty, somehow recognized the existence of this East German regime.

Nor will he say it because he believes that Russians, who most certainly cannot be trusted in many things, cannot be trusted even to cease denaturizing their own environment along with ours and everyone else's on earth.

No, Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is not going to tell Montanans that he opposed this treaty on any of these grounds. Yet all have been advanced at one time or another in the past weeks as grounds for rejecting this treaty.

There is one ground—one ground alone—on which the Senator from Montana would be prepared to go home and tell the people who sent him to Washington that these tests in the atmosphere and in the seas must go on despite the great potential threat of their continuance to their health and to their children's health.

He would not make light of these health risks or pass over them but he would ask his constituents to accept them in all their grim portent because he was persuaded that this treaty would expose the Nation, to a greater extent than we now are, to a military attack which would destroy both the meaning and much of the substance of the life which we have built.

He would not ask them to accept the health risks of indiscriminate and uncontrolled nuclear testing if all he had was a personal surmise that the risks of military attack would increase, if all he had were vague personal doubts and hesitancies in the face of a new course. To ask them to accept the health risks, he would have to find in the total record specifics for concluding that the risks of military attack would be significantly increased by our adherence to this treaty. He would have to find, in specifics, affirmative answers to these questions:

First. Is there some nation, other than the Soviet Union—Communist China, for example—which, by not adhering to this treaty, is likely to develop a nuclear technology which will approximate ours in the next decade, another nation which could close the nuclear gap solely because it tested and we did not? The answer is "No."

Second. If the Soviet Union, then, is the one nation which poses a nuclear threat to the United States in the next decade or more, has that nation already achieved a substantial advantage, on balance, over the United States in the military technology derived from nuclear physics—the kind of advantage which we might neutralize by a continuance of aboveground tests on our side even though they also continued to improve their techniques through such testing on their side? The answer, insofar as it is possible to answer the question, on the basis of fact, knowledge and the overwhelming judgment of the most highly skilled and qualified witnesses in the Nation is "No."

Third. Is there any reason to assume that our adavnces in nuclear science and its application to military technology will be hampered to a greater degree than that of the Soviet Union, in the complete absence of atmospheric and marine tests on both sides? The answer is "No."

Fourth. By the terms of this treaty, will the Soviet Union be legally authorized to do anything which we are not also authorized to do? The answer is "No."

Fifth. By the terms of this treaty are we legally forbidden to do anything which the Soviet Union is not legally forbidden to do? The answer is "No."

Sixth. Is there any other than the most remote possibility that the Soviet Union could engage in prohibited but significant tests without detection? The answer is "No."

Seventh. If the Soviet Union were to engage in a clandestine test and if it were identified or if we had very valid reason to believe that such a test had occurred even if not identified, would we ourselves still be bound to forego a resumption in testing above ground? The answer is "No."

Eighth. Is there a significant possibility that a single Soviet test suddenly sprung upon us could so alter the balance of military forces between the two nations as to increase the risk of military attack upon us. The answer is "No."

In short, the answer to every specific doubt which involves the possibility of the Soviet Union or any nation gaining some unique or significant military advantage as against ourselves in this treaty is not "Yes" but "No." And because it is no, I cannot in good conscience ask any citizens of Montana to accept the heightened risks to the health of their families which will be inevitable in the absence of the ratification of this treaty by the United States.

If there are not specific grounds of unique disadvantage to the military defense of the Nation for rejecting this treaty, what other grounds can there be? One detects in the few articulate opponents of this treaty a consistent theme which suggests a basis for the remaining doubts and hesitancies. It is, apparently, the belief that our scientific-military complex is so superior to all others that if not subjected to any limitation as to nuclear testing, it will produce an amazing advance in military-nuclear technology. The complex, it is suggested, will achieve some incredible breakthrough so as to widen, once and for all, the gap as between ourselves and the Soviet Union. That the Soviet Union, of course, in the absence of a testing limitation, will also be free to seek a similar breakthrough is either overlooked or regarded of little consequence. That there are dangers to health in the continuing process of uncontrolled testing by both sides, of course, is either overlooked or regarded as of little consequence.

Mr. President, I have the highest respect for our nuclear physics, our industrial technology, our military leadership, and our capacity to merge them into a powerful complex for the purpose of the Nation's defense. This complex is second to none in the world. But admiration and respect for these capacities do not and must never compel the elected officials of this Nation to accept the dictum of this complex as to what is best for the people of the United States.

The fact is that this treaty will introduce no curbs upon the creativity and dynamism of the complex which are not also placed equally upon such complexes in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the world. That men of scientific genius or highly developed technological specialization may find such curbs irksome or burdensome is understandable. But there is too much at stake here, for the Nation and for the world, for the Senate to be persuaded by individual considerations of that kind.

Indeed, reason and experience must lead us to question most seriously the course of policy which flows from such considerations. It is the course which assumes that if we will only continue to debar any restraints on testing, if we will only continue to throw considerations of public health to the winds, our scientists and our technicians will create that decisive nuclear gap, that ultimate military gap, which will insure the Nation's security.

Have we not in reality followed precisely such a course since the first atomic bombs in the New Mexico Flats and over Hiroshima and Nagasaki? What restraints, indeed, what reins have been placed on the full exploration of this immense power of nuclear destruction in all these years? Not those of money, to be sure. Not those of a ban on testing, to be sure. Through all these years since World War II there has been no treaty to bar nuclear tests of any kind. We have tested again and again. The Russians have done the same.

What has happened, Mr. President? We began in 1945 with the atomic bomb, with what we believed was the decisive gap, the ultimate gap. By 1949, 4 years later, the Russians began to close that gap with their first atomic test. In 1952, we opened what we believed was the decisive gap, the ultimate gap, with the first explosion of the immensely more powerful hydrogen bomb. And by 1953, 9 months later, that gap too began to close in a Soviet test of a similar type of weapon.

So we must ask ourselves, Mr. President: What has happened in all these years of unrestricted testing? Has the gap widened with the free rein which has been allowed to the scientific-industrial-military complex? Have we gained the absolute advantage, the ultimate advantage which will guarantee the Nation's security? The truth is that the gap has not widened. On the contrary, it has narrowed almost to the vanishing point. It has narrowed both in terms of the basic knowledge of the sciences involved and in terms of the application of that knowledge in military technology.

Once no nation, except ourselves, could have inflicted on any other, tens of millions of nuclear deaths in a matter of hours. Now, we ourselves, no less than others, are subject to a catastrophe of this magnitude.

In short, the Nation has not been made more secure in any real sense by this indiscriminate and unchecked pursuit of security by nuclear development through almost two decades, for the simple reason that others were also engaged in the same indiscriminate and unchecked pursuit. This furious and frantic race for superiority in the capacity to inflict nuclear devastation in mass or in caliperic refinement in the interests of national security in the end has provided security to no nation. It has provided only the assurance that the prospect of immediate and massive destruction to others will be at least as great as that prospect is to ourselves. That is vitally important insurance in the kind of world in which we live, but let us not delude ourselves as to the nature of the coverage. We have provided, not security for the Nation, but only insurance that if our civilization is put to the nuclear torch by any hand, others will be consumed in the same stupendous blaze.

To cling to the belief that the continuance of indiscriminate testing is the margin which provides for the security of this Nation is to fly in the face of the reality of experience. It is not a scientific view. It is not even an understandable pride and faith in our own great scientific, technological, and military capacities. It is a mystic and egocentric belief which borders—and I choose the words carefully—on a most dangerous and tragic obsession.

Mr. President, this treaty, in itself, is no answer to that obsession. This treaty is but a slender strand of hope drawn painfully from the web of conflicting interests, hideous fears and fatuous and immature arrogances out of which are spun the relations of nations in our times. It is an evidence, slight and uncertain, but an evidence, that there exists that capacity of courage and that will to life which may yet bring to bear on this stiffling entanglement the quiet and simple power of human reason.

Do not, Mr. President, look for miracles from this treaty. There are none. This Nation, the Soviet Union, and the world are destined to live for a long time with feet dangling over the grave that beckons to the human civilization which is our common heritage. Against that immense void of darkness, this treaty is a feeble candle. It is a flicker of light where there has been no light.

The Senator from Montana will vote for this light, and he will hope for its strengthening by subsequent acts of reason on all sides. He will vote for approval of this treaty because it is, on clear balance, in the interests of the people of his State and the United States. He will vote for it because it is a testament to the universal vitality of reason. He will vote for it because it is an affirmation of human life itself.

Mr. President, that the record may be complete, I ask unanimous consent that two previous statements which I have made in connection with the treaty be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Congressional Record, July 29, 1963]

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, at the present time the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are meeting, in informal session, to hear a briefing on the proposed partial test ban treaty by the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who is accompanied by Mr. William Foster. At the meeting the questions are both searching and blunt, judging from what I can gather; and I am sure everyone would agree that the proposed agreement was openly arrived at and could be considered an open agreement.

In response to questions, the distinguished Under Secretary of State, Mr. Harriman, stated that there were no gimmicks or side issues attached to the proposal, which shortly will be before the Senate.

In connection with the proposed partial nuclear-test-ban agreement, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a statement issued by me over the weekend, relative to this most important matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

"The proposed partial test ban agreement represents a breakthrough in the cold war and could, if properly observed by both sides, be the first break in the clouds in many years.

"It is a tribute to the persistence, bipartisanship and wisdom, first, of President Eisenhower in 1959 and, then, of President Kennedy and of the many Members of the Senate and Congress as, for example, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the majority whip [Mr. Humphrey], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] whose resolution in favor of an agreement along the lines which have been reached is cosponsored by 33 other Senators, members of both parties.

"These men recognized the need for an end to above-ground tests—on public health grounds, if no other—and refused to be discouraged in spite of many setbacks and disappointments. They thought in far-sighted terms and in human terms—of this generation and of children yet to be born—American children, Russian children, indeed, all the world's children.

"The agreement would not mean a cutback in defense appropriations but a stabilization rather than an increase of those expenditures.

"In a sense it is a gamble, but in view of the critical nature of the problem and the fact that we can continue underground testing, it is in my opinion worth the effort. The escape clause protects us in an honorable manner and safeguards rather than weakens our defense. The fact that our chief negotiator was Averell Harriman who has never been taken in by the Soviet Union, ever since he first served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union two decades ago, is in earnest that our rights have been fully protected. The agreement, in my opinion, serves the interests of our country, our people, and our security.

"If this agreement is approved it does not mean that there will be total or unilateral disarmament either soon or in the future. What this new agreement will give us is more clean milk and water and food for our children, less strontium to pollute the air, and some basis for hoping that future generations will grow up as normal, healthy human beings.

"This agreement will, in my opinion, serve the people's interest, give us some time to face up to other differences, and allow more 'breathing' space to the end that a better kind of peace for mankind can be achieved.

"It would be wrong to make too much of this agreement. But, even more, it would be wrong to make too little of it. A step, however small, in the direction of preserving a world fit for human habitation is an immense stride in the history of human civilization."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 31, 1963]

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there have been inferences in the press to the effect that political partisanship may be motivating the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in their attitudes toward the nuclear test treaty.

It is most disturbing to me, Mr. President, to witness this effort to fan the flames of partisanship on a matter of such urgent and overriding national importance. I must reject any such inference insofar as it involves the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] or, for that matter, any other Senator—Republican or Democrat.

Both are men of the highest patriotism, and have shown time and again a mature and unqualified capacity to place the national interest in foreign relations above partisan consideration. They have consistently supported the main body of American policy through several administrations—administrations of both parties.

Their attitude is entirely in order. It is their responsibility as Senators—not as Republicans—in positions of great responsibility to be most prudent and careful in the consideration of this proposed treaty. And may I say that the same applies to the majority leader and the rest of the leadership on this side of the aisle.

It would have been, indeed, inappropriate at this time for the Senator from Illinois, no less than the Senator from Montana, to have gone to Moscow for the ceremony of signing the treaty.

There is a great backlog of legislation in process in the Senate at this time, highly important legislation to the Nation in many fields; and both the minority leader and the majority leader must continue to try, as we have been trying, to bring this legislation to the point of decision in the Senate.

As it is, an exceptionally appropriate bipartisan group will go to Moscow from the Senate—not necessarily to approve, but to represent the Senate for the signing. That is as it should be, for an occasion which involves the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent with respect to treaty ratification. The Senators who are going—the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the deputy majority leader, whose name has long been associated with this effort; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has great knowledge of the subject matter of the treaty; the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Republican in this body, wise with a long experience in the Senate and in foreign relations and atomic energy; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] ranking Republican of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees—this group of Senators who are going, Mr. President, is admirably equipped to represent the Senate with dignity and wisdom on this highly significant occasion of worldwide significance.

This bipartisan group, Mr. President, of which I personally am extremely proud, is in keeping with the spirit of bipartisanship which has guided the policy of the United States from the outset on the matter of nuclear testing. In a matter which involves the safety of the Nation and the health of our people, and particularly our children, there is no room for partisanship. Certainly a treaty which would seek to prevent precisely those nuclear explosions which are most contaminative of our physical environment can be regarded as such a matter. Certainly, too, this proposed treaty has implications for the safety of the Nation.

I do not prejudge, Mr. President, the Senate's action with regard to the treaty. But the records of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in matters of this kind, as I have noted, offer great assurance that the question of the treaty will be examined in terms of the highest national interest and free of partisanship.

Moreover, Mr. President, both parties in the campaign of 1960 adopted positions clearly in line with what has now been achieved in the initialed treaty to end nuclear testing. I must say, in all honesty, that the Republican platform is clearer on this point than the Democratic platform. But I am sure that this is primarily a matter of draftsmanship, and is not indicative in any way of a lesser desire on the part of Democrats to bring about an end to these dangerous tests. Democrats as a whole are just as concerned as Republicans when the safety and health of the Nation are at stake. In any event, Mr. President, I read into the RECORD at this point the reference to nuclear testing in the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1960.

The Democratic platform, 1960, section II, under the heading "Arms Control," states:

"A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.

"Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, preserving outer space for peaceful purposes, preventing surprise attack and limiting the risk of accidental war."

The Republican platform, 1960, under the heading "Foreign Policy," states:

"We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit. We support the President in any decision he may make to reevaluate the question of resumption of underground nuclear explosions testing, if the Geneva Conference fails to produce a satisfactory agreement. We have deep concern about the mounting nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements. And an equal concern to protect all people from nuclear danger leads us to insist that such agreements have adequate safeguards."

Again I say that I am extremely proud of the bipartisan group which has been selected to represent this body and this country at Moscow. I do not believe that under any circumstances a more capable group, or men of greater integrity and patriotism, could have been selected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous statement by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I need no defense for my conduct. I have always been willing to assume full responsibility for what I say and do. Under the Constitution the Senate has the duty and responsibility to advise and consent to a treaty. That action must constitute an independent judgment, and that judgment I will render under my oath, according to my conscience, and within the limit of my perception as I can bring it to bear.

I recall that once a President sought assistance in building up support for a League of Nations. Members of my party followed him throughout the country. He returned from that tour a broken and dejected man. It always hurt me to think that happened to a great scholar who was then the President of the United States—Woodrow Wilson.

For myself I try never to embarrass the President of the United States. I shall always bend over backward to make certain that he is not projected into any awkward situation.

Ten days ago I went to the Press Gallery of this body. The question was asked whether I had been invited to go to Moscow. The answer was that I had not been invited, directly or indirectly, remotely or otherwise, by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

Second, I stated that if I were invited, I would not go. I made that statement publicly on a number of occasions. In so doing, I closed the door for myself and for anyone else who might undertake to invite me. I will never embarrass anyone. I made that abundantly clear. Not the least, of course, of the considerations that entered into that decision is the fact that we are beset with so much work. I did not feel that I could take time off and go to Moscow for that purpose, since the occasion was a ceremony of signing, and no negotiation was involved.

I am deeply grateful to my distinguished friend from Montana for the generous statement that he made on the floor of the Senate. Beyond that, I know of nothing I need say. I have neither encouraged nor discouraged any Member of this body from taking that trip if he were invited to go. Every Senator has equal prerogatives. I do not feel that it is either my responsibility or my prerogative to undertake to tell other Members of this distinguished body what they should do under those circumstances. So I leave the case there.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last night the President of the United States asked me to go to Moscow as a representative of the United States in the final ceremony preliminary to the signing of the test ban treaty. Of the 100 Members of the Senate, I do not believe there is anyone who dislikes the thought of a foreign trip any more than I do. But when the President of the United States asked me to take the trip in the interest of the United States, I did not think I had any right to fold my hands and tell him that I did not want to go, and that I am not going.

Mr. President, when any program is initiated that looks toward the easing of tension throughout the world, and has for its purpose the averting of a war throughout the world, even though such program offers only a faint hope—and in my opinion that is what the proposed test ban treaty does—I do not think I have any right to say that I am not interested in any effort for peace in the world regardless of whether it promises immediate and early success or not.

Mr. President, as one Member of this body who was asked to go to Moscow I can say that I have not been asked to commit myself in any way. I understand that no Member of the Senate will be asked to sign the treaty. I agree that Congress should examine every line of the document when it is submitted to us for our approval or disapproval. It is proper that we should weigh the benefits of approval against any possible disadvantages or risks which we may run. It is probable that we may have to weigh our hopes against our fears. I have heard it said that Congress ought not to be represented at this meeting because Congress did not participate in writing the treaty. May I say that many Members of the Congress were shown the treaty 10 days ago—a week ago last Monday. I have examined it closely. I have read and reread it from end to end and from the middle toward both ends. I know that probably half the Members of the Senate have had the same opportunity that I have had.

I do not believe it is a proper function of the legislative branch of Government to write treaties. It is our function to approve or to disapprove them after they have been prepared by the executive branch of the Government.

In this case I must say that the executive branch of the Government did seek the approval of three committees of the Congress before finally authorizing the initialing of the treaty a week ago.

My position now is that, unless I am shown more evidence than has appeared to date that the treaty will be disadvantageous to the United States, I expect to support its approval when it comes before the Senate for a vote. I reserve the right to vote as I believe proper when the time comes and after full hearings have been held.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to say to the distinguished majority leader that his is one of the most definitive, moving, and persuasive statements that I have heard during all the many days of testimony and the many years of hearings relative to the possibility of a treaty to ban nuclear tests. The Senator from Montana has answered the great fundamental question of whether this treaty is in our national interest and whether it serves the purposes of the United States in its course of world leadership. I am indebted to him, and I am sure his statement will be a document which will give persuasive argument to many a person in this country who supports the treaty and wishes to express his or her views about it.

The Senator from Montana expressed what I am sure is in the hearts of millions of Americans when he stressed the importance of the treaty as a ray of hope and light in the darkness of our present despair.

I wish to compliment him, and to say how much I appreciate the privilege of being present today to hear this moving and powerful message.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am deeply indebted to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who, as always, is most kind and generous in his statements and in his understanding of what has been said.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to enactment of S. 1716, the unfinished business. This bill proposes to eliminate the provision of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 which requires matching funds on the part of any participating State, beginning on July 1, 1964. Under the terms of this measure, the matching funds requirement would not be instituted until June 30, 1965; and, therefore, the Federal Government would be required to provide 100 percent of the financing for this program until that time. Also, the third-year authorization for training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act is doubled from its present level of $161 million to $322 million.

In support of this measure, the argument is made that more time is needed for the State legislatures to enact enabling legislation and provide the necessary matching funds. However, Mr. President, the legislatures of all 50 of our States have met at least once, and many of them twice, since this program was originally enacted by Congress. During this time, only three States have completed action authorizing full participation in this program. This overwhelming lack of support for the program bears closer scrutiny.

As a typical example, I should like to point to my own State of South Carolina and to show what activities of this nature are in progress there. In May 1961, the State Legislature of South Carolina enacted a bill creating an Advisory Committee for Technical Education. This act authorized the Governor to appoint to the advisory committee a layman for each congressional district. These six men, along with the superintendent of education and the director of the State development board, as ex officio members of the committee, have total responsibility to the Governor and the legislature to establish policies and practices to implement the technical education program in South Carolina. The technical education program in South Carolina has two basic elements: the special schools and the technical educational centers.

Special schools are accelerated training programs which can be, and have been, set up in any community in the State to equip citizens to perform specific tasks. To date, some 52 special schools have been conducted, and these have been spread over every section of South Carolina. As a direct result of these 52 schools, 5,400 South Carolinians are now at work in new jobs, ranging from the manufacture of cocoa doormats to missile components,, including such varied items as automobile grilles, adding machines, and precision tools.

These special schools are geared to meet the needs of expanding and new industries which move into or originally locate in our State. When a company decides to build a plant in South Carolina, the staff of the Advisory Committee for Technical Education consults with the company's engineers, and establishes a program to train new employees early enough to have them ready to begin production work the day the plant is completed and begins operations.

The typical participant in one of these special schools is a young adult South Carolinian who is either unemployed or underemployed and is willing to invest his time in learning a new skill in order to increase his opportunity and his income. He is not paid during this training period, and he must have the desire to learn and the mental and manual abilities to understand and apply the newly learned skills.

The second element in South Carolina's technical educational program is the technical educational centers which are equivalent to what many States call technical institutions or, in some cases, community colleges.

A technical educational center in South Carolina comes into existence when a local community initiates a request for such a facility. The community may consist of one county or a group of counties. However, a request by a community does not automatically insure the construction of a technical educational center. A survey of the area is taken by the advisory committee to insure that there are proven needs for technical training in the community. There must be job opportunities for the students upon graduation, and the local community must be willing to raise the money and construct the physical plant. If all of these factors are present, then the technical educational center is approved.

To date, nine technical educational centers have been approved across the State of South Carolina. The Greenville Center has been in operation since September 5, 1962. Four more centers will open this fall. They are the Spartanburg Center, serving Spartanburg County; the Richland Center, serving Richland County and the Midlands area of South Carolina; the Tri-County Center, serving Anderson, Oconee, and Pickens Counties; and the Sumter Center, serving Sumter, Clarendon, Kershaw, and Lee Counties.

Other technical educational centers now under construction are the Florence-Darlington Center and the Charleston Center, the latter serving Charleston, Berkeley, and Dorchester Counties. Two more centers are in the planning stage, one in York County and the other in Lancaster.

The purpose of a technical educational center, as they are instituted in South Carolina, is to improve the educational level of South Carolina's citizens from 16 years of age and up, thereby enabling them to acquire the skills which are of the greatest demand in the marketplace of business, commerce, and industry. The technical educational centers also contribute greatly to the industrial development of South Carolina by providing industry highly skilled and trained workers.

The technical educational centers operate from 8 a.m. until 10:30 p.m., 12 months a year, providing classrooms, shops, and laboratories staffed by competent faculty members. South Carolinians may attend classes day or night the year around, and ambitious individuals may enroll in continuing programs as full-time students. Citizens who are already employed may attend special classes to upgrade their ability toward the goal of providing a better living for their families.

These technical educational centers also provide an obvious educational tool in setting up certain of the special schools already discussed. The shops, classrooms and laboratories have already been used for special schools to assist industry in getting a start much faster and more economically.

Professional surveys of future industrialization and demands for technical skills indicate that there will be approximately 17,000 South Carolinians enrolled in these centers by early 1966.

Mr. President, the curriculum of these schools is very broad, including most all courses necessary in today's modern industrial society. I ask unanimous consent that a typical course catalog be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. South Carolina is justly proud of its technical educational program, and I can well imagine that there are numerous other States in the Union which have similar programs. Perhaps this is one of the basic reasons why the State legislatures have not been as receptive to the Manpower Development and Training Act as was originally anticipated. The State governments jealously guard against Federal encroachment in areas in which they have primary responsibility and where they have already seized the initiative. The Manpower Development and Training Act requires far too much Federal involvement in these programs, and I submit that there is resentment of Federal dictation in the individual States.

Mr. President, this is an area in which the States and the individual communities are much better aware of their own requirements than any administrator in the Federal Government. The very effective program in South Carolina illustrates that where the need is felt, local initiative can provide the answer. However, the pending measure, in effect, penalizes those areas in the country which have engaged in self-help by extending the paternalism of the Federal Government to those who have been most irresponsible. The pending measure is both unnecessary and unwise, and I urge the Senate to reject it.

Exhibit 1

Catalog of Courses of Richland Technical Center, Columbia, S.C.

AREAS OF STUDY

Technical division

Courses offered in the technical division are designed to meet an increasing demand for high level industrial skills in South Carolina. Students entering the technical division are required to meet educational and aptitude standards appropriate to the course of study chosen. Such standards demand a firm educational base and a level of maturity expected of adults.

Students who successfully complete courses in this division will be prepared to offer prospective employers the training, knowledge, and skill approaching that of the professional engineer. Obviously more time is required to attain such a degree of proficiency than would be necessary in the less exacting trade courses. Applicants for the technical division will therefore be urged to enroll for the full-time program.

Extension division

The term "extension" denotes an effort to project the training program beyond expected limits. The extension division therefore offers avenues of learning to those men and women who, though employed, seek to update, upgrade, and generally enhance their individual knowledge and performance.

Included in this division are supervisory level courses designed to stimulate those individuals who aspire to advance their knowledge in the fields of management.

Special classes both day and night will be provided to accommodate such students.

ADMISSION PROCEDURE AND REQUIREMENTS

General requirements

Any person may enroll in a course if he meets the admission requirements. Such requirements will necessarily depend upon the courses of study chosen. A regular full-time student should be a high school graduate or equivalent and possess certain basic aptitudes and interests. No person currently enrolled in public school may apply for admission without the consent of the principal of the school in which he is enrolled.

The applicant should be in reasonably good health with no impairment of vision or physical defect which would restrict the free use of arms and hands. The applicant may under certain conditions be required to furnish evidence of satisfactory health.

The center is coeducational, and its program is not restricted to high school graduates. Technician level students should, however, possess the qualities and maturity of high school graduates. Such students must have completed 2 years of mathematics, including 1 year of algebra. Physics and chemistry are also desirable prerequisites for students of technology.

Individual adults are accepted in areas of study for which they are deemed qualified by reason of background, experience, or aptitude.

Admission procedure

An applicant meeting the above general requirements should first obtain application forms from the center office and request his secondary school to forward a transcript of his high school record to the center. Applicants should secure such forms in person, if possible. Otherwise, application forms will be mailed upon request.

While application for enrollment may be made at any time preceding the anticipated date of entry, it is strongly recommended that this be done at least 30 days prior to such date. Sufficient time will thereby be allotted for necessary testing, counseling, and the proper evaluation of results.

No application will be considered complete until all requested information has been supplied and until a personal interview has been completed with either the director or the counselor.

Upon receipt of notification of acceptance, the applicant should visit the center office and discusss with his counselor his program for the ensuing quarter. All full-time and preemployment students are required to take the general aptitude test battery administered by the local office of the South Carolina Employment Security Commission or the differential aptitude test battery administered by the center.

Candidates for admission to the Richland Technical Education Center are subject to appropriate State and local laws relating to qualification for admission to public schools and to public institutions of higher learning in South Carolina. The center reserves the right to refuse entry to any applicant for proper cause or to refer to the advisory board for disposition any application received.

Entrance requirements may be modified or changed from time to time to meet the demands of the industrial community.

Admission with advanced standing

The Richland Technical Education Center will accept work and give credit for work completed in other technical education centers, technical institutes, or colleges. Applicants for admission with advanced standing should complete the regular application form and submit it together with a transcript of work from prior schools. Acceptance of such credit will be at the discretion of the director.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Degree course defined

The Associate of Science degree will be conferred for satisfactory completion of courses at the technical level. Time required for courses in the technical division will range from 6 to 8 quarters of work for full-time students. The course of study chosen by the individual will determine the time required.

Certificates

Certificates will be awarded to those students who complete special training courses established to fill specific demands of industry.

Tuition and charges

Any South Carolina citizen may attend the school without tuition charges but a minimum supply fee will be charged all students for teaching supplies, aids, consumable materials, and laboratory breakage.

Students will be required to furnish such textbooks and manuals as prescribed for the courses taken. Books and manuals will be available through the center's bookstore.

Persons qualifying for veteran's training may attend this school and the charges for attendance are the same as a regular student.

Attendance requirements

Only excused absences will be permitted. The director shall exercise the right to require of any students satisfactory evidence of circumstances bearing upon a particular absence.

No unexcused absences or "cuts" will be allowed. Only those absences occasioned by the student's illness or the serious illness or death of a member of his family will be authorized.

Withdrawals

Any student who must withdraw because of illness or personal hardship may, if his work was deemed satisfactory at the time of withdrawal, reenter the course as a beginning student provided that such action is taken upon the immediate next offering of the course.

Refunds

No refunds will be made to students who withdraw without authority or who are dismissed for cause.

Students who are given permission to withdraw will receive a refund of their supply fees on a prorated basis. If there is no breakage chargeable to the student, the laboratory deposit will be refunded in full.

Dismissals

A student who fails in two attempts to achieve a passing grade in any subject may be dismissed from the school. Also, a student may be dismissed for infraction of rules as set forth under general regulations.

Readmittance

Readmittance of students who have been dismissed or who have withdrawn without authority will be at the discretion of the director.

Student conduct

Students will be expected to conduct themselves at all times as individuals of prudence and maturity. The rights and feelings of others will be respected. Each student shall demonstrate a high regard for school facilities and property and for the personal property of others.

School regulations which serve to control such activities as vehicle traffic and parking, smoking, loitering, and other aspects of personal conduct must be strictly observed.

Students may be promptly dismissed for conduct which is considered incompatible with standards of propriety and good judgment.

Student insurance

Certain risks are inherent in any work involving regular contact with mechanical and electrical equipment. While stringent precautions will be taken to insure safety, it is felt to be in the best interests of all students to provide some measure of insurance protection.

A group policy providing the desired insurance protection will be maintained in effect by the center and all students will be required to subscribe to such coverage. The cost of accident insurance to the student will always be kept as low as possible in relation to benefits available.

Grading system

Grades will be issued to students at the end of each term. The student will be graded on the acquirement of technical skills, promptness, ability to work under direction, interest in the work, initiative, and ability to apply related technical information.

Students enrolled in the regular technology programs will be graded by the following letter-grade system:

A—93–100, excellent.
B—86–92, above average.
C—78–85, average.
D—70–77, passing.
F—Below 70, unsatisfactory.
I—Incomplete.
WP—Withdrawal passing.
WF—Withdrawal failing.

Incomplete: Assigned when the student is unable to complete his work or take the final examination because of illness or for other reasons over which the student has no control. This grade is given only with the approval of the associate director. An "incomplete" must be removed within the first 6 weeks of the next term in which the student is enrolled. Otherwise, the grade becomes an automatic "F."

Counseling and testing

All applicants for admission will be given a series of aptitude tests prior to acceptance and registration. The counselor will schedule interviews with students concerning interpretation of their test scores and he will advise them concerning course selections. Applicants are not encouraged to enroll unless it is believed that the student has made a sound choice and that he will profit from his study.

Students may use the services of the counseling office at any time.

Also, many reference materials are made available to students during the training program.

Placement service

The center provides placement service through the Employment Security Commission which assists students and alumni in securing employment. The objective of this service is to guide and assist the student and graduate to obtain the type of position for which he is best suited.

Active contacts are maintained with industries throughout South Carolina. Informative booklets, brochures, and industrial directories are available to students and alumni in the center's library, and group and individual job interviews are arranged.

Library

A technical library is maintained in the administrative area of the center for use by faculty and students. The library contains scientific and technological volumes as well as subject matter materials in related fields and several current periodicals.

Canteen

A refreshment area equipped with a variety of modern vending machines is provided for the convenience of students.

Interpretative guide to code identification of courses

A simple code has been devised to designate each course offered by the center. The principal purpose served by the code is to eliminate confusion resulting from many courses with similar names, e.g., electronics, technical electronics, industrial electronics, etc. In completing various forms, students will often be required to use the code symbols. The code serves a secondary purpose of providing an abbreviation of the course title when recording such titles in small spaces. It will also facilitate the transcribing of information when the use of data processing equipment is desired.

Certain courses are required of every student irrespective of the course of study. Such courses are called basic core courses and are identified by the code symbol BsC. Other courses are common to all courses of study at the technical level. Such courses are designated as technical core courses and are identified with the symbol TcC.

In addition to the above, there are those few courses which are found in more than one course of study but are not common to more than two or three. The courses have been labeled parallel courses and carry the code PrL.

All other courses carry a code designation peculiar only to the course of study in which the course is found.

COURSES OF STUDY

	Code designation
Chemical technology	C
Civil technology	CV
Data processing	DP
Electronic technology	E
Mechanical technology	MT
Technical drafting and design	DD
Tool and die design technology	TD

CORE COURSES

Basic core courses (found in all courses)	BsC
Technical core courses (found in all technical courses)	TcC
Parallel courses (found in more than one course)	PrL

In addition to the letter portion of the code, each code designation will carry a number. This number will indicate the number of that course as it appears in the directory of those courses in this catalog. Thus CV4 indicates that the coded course is one in civil technology; that it is No. 4 on the list of civil technology courses.

Basic core, technical core, and parallel courses are listed. A code designation of TcC3 indicates that the course is a technical core course and that it is No. 3 on the list of those courses.

TECHNICAL DIVISION—CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY, CIVIL TECHNOLOGY, DATA PROCESSING, ELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGY, MECHANICAL TECHNOLOGY, TECHNICAL DRAFTING AND DESIGN, AND TOOL AND DIE DESIGN TECHNOLOGY

Chemical technology

The chemical technology student studies the fundamentals of general chemistry and organic chemistry and learns how to perform qualitative, quantitative, and analytical analyses. He studies substances and the reactions between them and learns the methods and procedures used in the discovery and development of new products.

In the unit operation laboratory, he learns material handling; crushing, grinding, and sizing; he studies chemical machinery and methods used in extraction, distillation, evaporation, drying, absorption, and heat transfer; he also devises, installs, and operates chemical manufacturing processes.

The chemical technologist finds employment in a wide variety of fields such as foods, metals, paints, glass, plastics, rubber, fuels, paper, building products, dyes, oils, lubricant, heavy chemicals, and textiles.

Occupational opportunities include research assistant, control chemist, laboratory technician, chemical analyst, and pilot plant foreman.

1st quarter	Hours
BsC1, speed reading	24
TcC1, technical math I	60
PrL9, inorganic chemistry I	96
PrL3, electricity	60
TcC6, communications I	60
TcC8, physics I	60
Total	360
2d quarter	
TcC2, technical math II	60
C1, inorganic chemistry II	144
PrL11, physics II	60
TcC4, Technical drawing I	60
TcC7, technical report writing	36
Total	360
3d quarter	
TcC3, technical math III	60
C2, qualitative analysis I	120
PrL12, physics III	60
PrL4, electron theory	60
TcC5, technical drawing II	60
Total	360
4th quarter	
C3, chemical calculations I	60
C6, organic chemistry I	96
C8, quantitative analysis I	96
C10, unit operations I	72
BsC3, industrial human relations	36
Total	360
5th quarter	
C4, chemical calculations II	60
C7, organic chemistry II	96
C9, quantitative analysis II	96
C11, unit operations II	72
BsC2, industrial economics	36
Total	360
6th quarter	
C12, qualitative organic analysis	96
C13, instrumental analysis	72
TcC9, research project	120
C5, chemical calculations III	72
Total	360

Chemical technology—Course descriptions

C1, inorganic chemistry II: Concentrates on the generalizations and fundamental principles of inorganic chemistry, and will be a continuation of inorganic chemistry I.

The laboratory work is primarily designed to continue improvement in manual dexterity and techniques in the handling of simple chemical apparatus to prepare the student for the more advanced courses he will undertake in the second year.

C2, qualitative analysis I: The classroom work in qualitative analysis offers the opportunity to review and practice the balancing of chemical equations, stoichiometric calculations, and equilibrium calculations while the laboratory work continues the emphasis on technique by allowing the student practice in chemical reactions and ending with identifying unknowns.

C3, C4, C5, chemical calculations I, II, and III: The courses will be the backbone of the second year of chemical technology. Since chemical and chemical engineering operations are almost entirely mathematical in nature, the calculations taught in these courses will fit closely with the unit operations course. Calculations to be included are those of material balance, heat balance, equilibrium calculations, reaction rate calculations, fluid mechanics, mechanical separation, heat transfer, combustion, correlating data, and economic calculations.

C6, C7, organic chemistry I, II: These courses provide a basic research type understanding of organic chemistry by bringing out the well established reactions for synthesis of the different organic structures. The classes of organic compounds are studied separately with both their synthesis and typical reactions. The laboratory work continues to give practice in the handling of laboratory equipment with reasonable skill being attained in handling organic reactions studied in the classroom.

C8, C9, quantitative analysis I and II: These courses will equip the student to be proficient in the analytical field of wet chemistry. He will practice analytical laboratory methods requiring precise attention to detail as he works on gravimetric techniques such as weighing, sampling, precipitating, filtering, washing, ignition, etc.

C10, C11, unit operation I, II: Study of industrial applications and plant operations. Designed to cover the unit operations of chemical engineering from theoretical and practical standpoints. A study of fluid mechanics, transportation of fluids, measuring devices, size reduction, handling of solids, mixing, mechanical separations, measurement, filtration, heat exchange, evaporation, diffusion processes, distillation, absorption, extraction, crystallization, filtration, and industrial process equipment.

C12, qualitative organic analysis: Trains the student to think in terms of the fundamental organic reactions and particularly to the reactions of the functional groups. He is also trained to search the literature on organic chemistry to obtain information, physical properties and derivations. The student is left to his own initiative in identifying unknown organic compounds.

C13, instrumental analysis: The student will augment his knowledge of analytical methods through study and use of instruments such as pH meters, polarographs, colorimeters, polarimeters, refractometers, etc.

Civil technology

Civil technology is one of the oldest and broadest fields of engineering. The civil technologist is a builder. He changes the course of rivers, builds dams, roads, and buildings and transforms a wilderness into a thriving city. His work is coordinated with many other fields of engineering. He may help build airports and buildings for the aviation industry; pipelines to carry oil or gas for the chemical technicians; and dams and power stations to produce electricity for the electrical engineer.

The civil technologist today has an almost endless choice of materials and efficient equipment with which to build his highways, bridges, and buildings. He is limited only by his ingenuity and his ability to create. His is a continually challenging job offering a number of specialties. His interest may lie in structural design—the design of steel, wood, or concrete framing for buildings or bridges; or he may prefer hydraulics, flood control, and irrigation. On the other hand he may specialize in surveying construction, or the designing and building of highways.

Occupational opportunities include civil engineer assistant, estimator, structural designer, surveyor, design draftsman, and highway technician.

1st quarter:	*Hours*
BsC1, speed reading	36
TcC1, technical mathematics I	60
TcC4, technical drawing I	60
TcC8, physics I	60
PrL3, electricity I	60
CV1, introduction to engineering structure	84
Total	360
2d quarter:	
TcC2, technical mathematics II	60
TcC5, technical drawing II	120
PrL2, chemistry	60
PrL11, physics II	60
CV2, electricity II	60
Total	360
3d quarter:	
TcC6, communications	60
TcC3, technical mathematics III	60
CV3, surveying I	60
CV4, plan reading and cost estimating	84
BsC2, industrial economics	36
Electives (choose one)	
CV5, drafting II–A (arch. option)	60
CV6, drafting II–B (highway-option)	60
Total	360
4th quarter:	
TcC7, technical report writing	36
CV7, surveying II	84
PrL5, engineering materials	60
CV8, concrete construction	60
CV9, hydraulic technology	60
Electives (choose one)	
CV10, building construction methods	60
CV11, highway construction methods	60
Total	360
5th quarter:	
PrL14, strength of materials I	60
CV12, materials testing laboratory	60
CV13, soil mechanics and testing	60
Electives (choose a and c or b and d)	
CV14, highway design I(a)	96
CV15, structural design I(b)	96
CV16, survey III highway (c)	84
CV17, design drafting architect (d)	84
Total	360
6th quarter:	
CV18, materials inspection methods	60
TcC9, research project	60
BsC3, industrial human relations	60
Electives (choose a and d or b and c)	
CV19, highway design II(a)	96
CV20, structural design II(b)	96
CV21, heating and air conditioning (c)	84
CV22, hydrology and drain (d)	84
Total	360

Civil technology—Course descriptions

CV1, introduction to engineering structures: A presentation of the history of architecture and the development of structural design, covering spanning methods and construction by means of reinforced concrete, structural steel, wood frame, and prestressed concrete. The application of modular design in modern building and the relation of climate, weather, and topography to design and structural detail. Also, methods of highway construction with old and modern design concepts.

CV2, electricity II: This course is an extension of electricity I into the field of alternating current electricity. Includes the study of electromagnetic circuitry, inductance, capacitance, generation of alternating electromotive force, single-phase AC circuits, transformers, and relays. The applications of these principles to the field of electric power and electronics are studied. Classroom demonstrations and audio-visual methods are employed to supplement classroom instruction. Laboratory work provides opportunity for the student to verify and apply the principles studied.

CV3, surveying I: Theory and practice of surveying including transit and tape surveying; differential and profile leveling; care and adjustment of instruments; symptoms and correction of maladjusted instruments; introduction to mapping; and precise baseline measurements.

CV4, plan reading and cost estimating: This course consists of two parts: (1) A study of highway and building construction drawings to develop interpolation, terminology, and understanding of material symbols, dimensions and views; (2) the preparation of material lists and taking off quantities of materials and labor hours from work drawings and specifications.

CV5, drafting II–A (architectural option): Architectural drawing, including cross sections, longitudinal sections, interior elevations and relationships of the section detailed to the balance of the structure. Also included are sectional and full scale drawings of structural details, perspective drawings, plant layouts, the taking of field dimensions, and the drawings produced from them.

CV6, drafting II–B (highway option): The study and preparation of complex topographic preliminary maps, details, contours, cross sections, profiles, route plans and profiles.

CV7, surveying II: Transit-stadia surveying and map; use of plane table; location of an inaccessible pier involving triangulation and base-line measurements; complex computation involving principles of triangulation and coordinate positions. Also covered are computation of horizontal and vertical curves, trigonometric computing as applied to highway surveying, and basic surveying law.

CV8, concrete construction: Basic theory and description of concrete applied to beams, roads, slabs, and columns. Laboratory work in testing of materials for concrete and in the design and control of concrete mixtures. Also the study of gravity sections.

CV9, hydraulic technology: Starting with the study of fluids at rest, this course includes a review of basic properties of fluids and the topics of pressure forces, center of pressure, resultant force and interpretation of readings from various kinds of manometers, pressure gages and hydrostatic devices. In connection with fluids in motion; the general energy equation is applied to head calculations, pumping problems, friction losses, cavitation and velocity of flow from pitot-static and venturi meter data. Also covered are the topics of viscosity and its effect on water flow; orifice meters and discharge from weirs.

CV10, building construction methods: Study of good construction practices relating to various types of structures under a variety of physical conditions.

CV11, highway construction methods and materials (highway option): Study of good construction practices for road building of various types under a variety of climate, soil and terrain conditions. Comparisons are made between various roadbuilding materials, their source, methods of manufacture, physical and chemical properties and grading. In addition, the building of forms and related structures are studied.

CV12, materials testing laboratory: An experimental study of the mechanical properties of engineering materials with emphasis on the demonstration of the physical laws that govern the use of materials in particular applications. Included is compression, tension and flexure testing; freezing and thawing; soundness and hardness testing; design and testing of bituminous concrete; testing of liquid asphalts.

CV13, soil mechanics and testing: Physical and mechanical properties of soils, elementary principles of field and laboratory identification and testing. Theories of soil mechanics, optimum and density, plastic flow and limits, percolation tests, bearing and friction piles and sandpiles.

CV14, highway design I (option): Design, construction, maintenance and planning for highways. Location, and their use in roadway surfaces; treatment of existing surfaces.

CV15, structural design I (option): The structural design of buildings framed in timber and steel. Foundations of buildings, design of footings, pile foundations, foundation and retaining walls, methods of erection and field trips to available construction jobs.

CV16, survey III highway (option): Computation and theory of highway curves; field work of staking simple, compound, spiral and vertical curves; field notekeeping; coordinates and coordinated survey; a short preliminary and final location survey; earthwork problems and an introduction to aerial photography.

CV17, design drafting (option): Continuation of drafting II–A (3d semester) including special emphasis on chapters 30 and 31 of French's "Engineering Drawing."

CV18, materials inspection methods: Sampling techniques; tests and test specimens of concrete in field; tar and asphalt sampling and inspection in field; batch plant inspection; transit mix trucks, pavers and stationary mixers; bituminous concrete plant; inspection of brick and precast concrete units and inspection of construction procedure in specification and conformance.

CV19, highway design II (option): Continuation of highway design I. Interpretation of bridge plans, bridge and structure drafting, elements of bridge and structure design, beams and slabs.

CV20, structural design II (option): Drafting of reinforced structures. Structural drafting of a flat slab building, including beams, columns, footings, and stairs. Differential expansion of materials, expansion joints, flashing, caulking, detailing of designs to prevent air and water infiltration, and assembly of component parts.

CV21, heating and air conditioning (option): (1) Heating: A study of the methods of heating, fuels, estimation of heating loads, capacity requirements of boilers and related equipment, automatic controls, sizing and layout of piping and air ducts. (2) Air conditioning: An investigation of cooling loads and apparatus is followed by problems in air conditioning undertaken with the use of psychrometric charts.

CV22, hydrology and drainage (option): Study of rainfall and runoff relations. Applications to floods and flood control, water supplies, methods of extending short records of stream flow, culvert and storm sewer design, and drainage laws.

Data processing

This course introduces the student to the general purpose high-speed electronic computer as a versatile and powerful instrument for problem solving and data processing. The two basic objectives are (1) To acquaint the student with the theory and philosophy of computers through mastery of theory. (2) To illustrate some applications of new concepts through examples and analysis of commonly used techniques on computers.

Much of the course will deal with those methods which highlight the interrelation between analysis of problem, computer capabilities and limitations, and coding procedures. The general outline consists of purpose of program, analysis of problems, calculation procedures, flow charting, memory requirements, estimate of running time, and sample problems.

Occupational opportunities: Banking, civil service, industry, business, and insurance companies.

	Hours
1st quarter:	
TcC1, technical math I	60
TcC4, technical drawing I	40
DP1, basic computing machines	40
DP2, unit record equipment I	80
DP3, accounting I	60
TcC8, physics I	60
BsC1, speed reading	20
Total	360
2d quarter:	
TcC2, technical math II	60
TcC5, technical drawing II	40
TcC6, communications I	40
DP4, unit record equipment II	60
DP5, data processing applications	60
DP6, introduction to programing systems	40
DP7, accounting II	60
Total	360
3d quarter:	
TcC3, technical math III	60
TcC7, technical report writing	40
DP8, programing systems	100
DP9, data processing application	100
DP10, accounting III	60
Total	360
4th quarter:	
BsC3, industrial human relations	40
DP11, computer programing I	110
PrL19, statistical quality control	50
DP12, business organization I	40
DP 13, cost accounting I	60
BsC2, industrial economics	60
Total	360
5th quarter:	
DP 14, computer programing II	110
DP15, business organization II	40
DP16, statistics II	50
DP17, cost accounting II	60
DP 18, systems development and design I	100
Total	360
6th quarter:	
DP 19, computer programing III	80
DP20, systems development and design II	100
DP21, advanced computing and programing	104
DP22, data processing field project	40
BsC4, fundamentals of management	36
Total	360

Data processing—Course descriptions

DP1, basic computing machines: All data processing systems, regardless of size, type, or basic use, have certain common fundamental concepts and operational principles. This course is intended to provide a foundation for future detailed study of specific systems. It describes the evolution of computer systems—from manual methods to the stored program. Lectures include an introduction to problem organization, detailed coverage of storage media, fundamentals of input and output operations, and elementary programing techniques.

DP2, unit record equipment I: This course is a survey of unit record equipment. It illustrates the need for machine processed solutions to accounting and recordkeeping problems. The concept, power, and flexibility of the unit record approach are imparted to the student during these sessions.

DP3, accounting I: Accounting I emphasizes the principles, techniques, and tools of the accounting function. It provides the necessary background for understanding the mechanics of accounting—the collection, summarization, analyzing, and reporting, in monetary terms, of information about the business. It is a prerequisite for accounting II. Financial information requirements of persons outside the business—stockholders, banks, other creditors, and government agencies—are reflected in the techniques, rules, and conventions which are studied. The accounting services outside the firm are categorized as:

(a) External reporting for internal control.

(b) Reporting to society:

1. Tax determination.
2. Legal requirements.

(c) The balance sheet and the income statement.

As the mechanics of accounting become well formulated, the concepts of data processing machines are introduced and related to the performance of accounting functions within an organization. Use of case studies will be necessary.

DP4, unit record equipment II: Unit record equipment as an independent system is discussed and studied throughout the course. In addition to this emphasis, its use with and support for computers should be included.

Laboratory exercises are executed, involving planning and wiring a range of unit record equipment. Practical exercises offered are typical of those performed in existing computer installations.

DP5, data processing applications I: Designed to acquaint students with actual business data processing applications. All applications studied will be approached in the following manner:

I. Theory and concepts of the application.

II. Procedural approaches—unit record equipment.

III. Procedural approaches—basic computing machines.

IV. Practical case studies.

DP6, introduction to programing systems: The necessity for programing in data processing procedures is investigated. Methods of programing and application are reviewed and foundations are laid for further study in this area.

DP7, accounting II: Accounting II emphasizes management uses of accounting information. Accounting is presented as a source of financial data for management control. Accounting services are shown as they contribute to the recognition and solution of a management problem. Accounting services "within the firm" are categorized as:

(a) Management information for policy determination.

(b) Operational planning.

(c) Control of revenue and expense.

(d) Conservation of assets.

(e) Day-to-day operating information.

The concept of performing accounting services on data processing machines is strongly emphasized throughout the course. Students will have completed basic computer and unit record equipment courses.

DP8, programing systems: A continuation of the introductory course. This course will follow typical industrial approaches of determining the need and then establishing the proper system. Each student will be subjected to various situations of programing and will conduct a study to determine a clear approach to the programing problems.

DP9, data processing application II: A continuation from the first course of applications. Designed to subject the student to advanced theory and then establish an application of the theory. This will advance the student in his understanding of the various machines and systems as they relate to typical industrial situations. All applications will follow in this manner:

I. Theory and concepts of the application.

II. Procedural approaches—unit record equipment.

III. Procedural approaches—basic computing machines.

IV. Practical case studies.

DP10, accounting III: Acounting III is designed to look at the overall function of accounting practices in an industry. The concept of performing accounting services on data processing machines is strongly emphasized throughout the course. An organized approach to the problems of accounting principles used in data processing will be established.

DP11, computed programing I: The basic computing machines course provided the concepts and foundation for the upcoming detail study of data processing machines. In these computer programing courses the student engages in discussions of functions and capabilities of the IBM 1620 data processing system and studies basic programing. He performs programing drills, exercises, and case studies which serve to bridge the gap from the academic to the real world of data processing. The 2-hour-per-week laboratory session further reinforces basic principles by providing hands-on training.

DP12, business organization: Familiarizes the students with the concepts and structure of American business.

DP13, cost accounting I: This basic concept of the cost accounting function within a manufacturing organization. Material costs, labor costs, manufacturing overhead as burden and marketing costs that enter into the cost accounting system are treated in detail. The collection, processing, and interpretation of this data for providing management with pertinent facts about their business is a primary objective of the course. The computer as a tool for performing the cost accounting function is emphasized throughout. Cost accounting systems are designed for the purpose of providing figures for inventory valuation of the balance sheet and of determining cost of goods sold for the income statement.

Selected case studies are used in illustrating the objectives of the cost accounting system, its relationship to the overall accounting system, and its uses to management. The case studies reflect the role of the computer in various types of cost accounting systems.

DP14, computer programing II: This is a continuation of computer programing I. The principles presented in that course are employed repeatedly in this one. Programing for the 1620 with tapes and random access storage is taught during the quarter.

DP15, business organization II: A continuation of business organization I. Goes into detail of the organization levels and department structures and shows the integrated relationship of departments. The financial structure of the business will be given major emphasis.

DP16, statistics II: An advanced course in statistics. Helps the student to gain an understanding of the mathematical models to interpret physical phenomenon and to predict with reasonable certainty the outcomes of experiments related to practical business problems. The course will include computer exercises in the applications of statistics to business problems.

DP17, cost accounting II: An advanced course in cost accounting concerning the material cost, labor costs, manufacturing overhead, direct labor, and indirect labor. Also included in this course will be a study on inventory control and accounting for inventory with the aid of computers. After the inventory information is gathered a study of its use will be conducted. Typical industrial situations will be used in this course.

DP18, systems development and design I: The effective use of data processing equipment and management sciences in meeting the information needs of business requires that much skill and knowledge be applied to the development and design of data processing systems. The evolution of a system takes place in three distinct stages.

(1) An analysis of present information flow.

(2) System specifications and equipment selection.

(3) Implementation of the system.

This course is designed to guide the student through the three stages in an organized approach. The detailed steps of each phase of system design are shown in their relation to the overall study.

DP19, computer programing III: An advanced course of the principles that are employed in programing the 1620. In this course a study of the various computers will be conducted to show the relationship of the 1620 to other types of computers. Methods of analyzing the program to gain maximum efficiency of the program will be taught.

DP20, systems development and design II: An advanced course of systems which will employ the basic steps of (1) an analysis of present information flow, (2) system specifications and equipment selection, and (3) implementation of the system. An analysis of an assigned situation will be required for each student.

DP21, advanced computing and programing systems: The objective of this course is to provide the student with sufficient knowledge of programing systems concepts so that he may easily master any specific system with a minimum of instruction. Furthermore, he will be qualified to analyze, evaluate, and make minor modifications to such systems.

It is not intended that the actual programing language of the various systems be taught. However, individual phases of certain selected systems are treated in detail in order that the student may learn advanced programing and logic decision techniques that are applied in sophisticated systems.

Electronic technology

The electronic technology program provides a broad theoretical and practical training for those who seek careers in radio, television, and the giant electronic industries. Special equipment is used by the instructor to present circuits of complicated electronics theory in step-by-step demonstration. In the laboratory the students develop skills in the use of modern electronic testing equipment and measuring instruments. Analysis of circuits, construction of electronic components and repair of radio and television receivers will be a major part of the laboratory work.

The related subjects will include applied physics, industrial economics, technical mathematics, technical reports, materials and processes, industrial organization, and technical drawing.

Occupational opportunities include computer maintenance technician, instrument mechanic, radio and TV control room operator, and civil service electronics inspector.

1st quarter:	Hours
BsC1, speed reading	24
TcC1, technical math I	60
PrL24, basic electricity (DC)	156
TcC4, technical drawing I	60
TcC6, communications I	60
Total	360

2d quarter:	
TcC2, technical math II	60
PrL25, basic electricity (AC)	120
TcC5, technical drawing II	60
PrL13, shop processes	60
PrL2, chemistry	60
Total	360

3d quarter:	
TcC3, technical math III	60
PrL4, electron theory	144
BsC2, industrial economics	36
PrL6, graphical analysis	60
TcC7, technical report writing	60
Total	360

4th quarter:	Hours
PrL23, vacuum tubes and rectifiers	60
TcC8, physics I	60
E1, circuit tracing	84
E2, special circuit design and analysis	156
Total	360

5th quarter:	
E3, transmitter theory and application	120
PrL8, industrial electronics	156
E4, transistor application	84
Total	360

6th quarter:	
TcC9, research report	108
E5, ultra high frequency and microwaves	96
E6, industrial instrumentation	96
BsC3, industrial human relations	60
Total	360

Electronic technology—Course descriptions

E1, circuit tracing: Study of layout and representation. Problems in circuit design involving switches, relays, and electronic components; the selection and proper designation of standard complexities of multiple-purpose circuits; concentration of schematic representation of electronic equipment.

E2, special circuit and design analysis: Acoustics and electroacoustic devices, sound recordings, designs and testing of voltage and power amplifiers, inverse feedback, transistor amplifiers, and computer circuits.

E3, transmitter theory and application: Amplitude modulation and frequency modulation; radio frequency oscillators and power amplifiers, antennas, modulators, radio-frequency measurements; two-way communications; requirements for radio operator's license, electromagnetic transmission; and communication application.

E4, transistor application: This course is designed to familiarize the student in all phases of transistor application in radio, television, power supplies, etc.

E5, ultrahigh frequency and microwaves: Line sections, wave guides, and cavities; UHF tubes and oscillators, klystrons, magnetrons, and traveling wave tubes; microwave antennas; principles of radar and microwave systems.

E6, industrial instrumentation: Electrical and electronic process instruments such as electric and pneumatic temperature controls, thermoelectric devices, pH meters, conductivity bridges, pressure transducers, strain gages, etc. Application of the techniques of calibrating and servicing industrial instruments.

Mechanical technology

The mechanical technology student learns the principles of machine design and their applications. He studies torsion, bending, and flexure of metals; industrial machinery, clutches, brakes, springs, and flywheels. He designs linkage, gear trains, and cams to give required motions to machine. He makes accurate and complete engineering drawings of the parts he designs so that they can be produced in the factory. He studies industrial materials and the processes used in their production.

Occupational opportunities: Sales engineers, research assistants, layout and detail draftsman, machine designers, assistant plant engineers, plant safety technicians, and mechanical test technician.

1st quarter:	Hours
BsC1, speed reading	24
TcC1, technical math I	60
TcC4, technical drawing I	60
TcC6, communications	60
PrL17, introduction to machine tools	120
MT1, measuring instruments, basic	36
Total	360

2d quarter:	*Hours*
TcC2, technical math II	60
MT2, metallurgy	36
PrL18, manufacturing processes	72
TcC5, technical drawing II	60
PrL5, engineering materials	72
TcC8, physics I	60
Total	360
3d quarter:	
TcC3, technical math III	60
MT3, statics and dynamics	120
PrL3, electricity	60
PrL2, chemistry	60
PrL19, statistical quality control	60
Total	360
4th quarter:	
PrL14, strength of materials I	84
MT4, kinematics	90
MT5, fluid mechanics	90
PrL7, hydraulics and pneumatics	36
TcC7, technical report writing	60
Total	360
5th quarter:	
MT6, dynamics of machinery	90
MT7, machine design I	114
BsC3, industrial human relations	60
MT8, thermodynamics	96
Total	360
6th quarter:	
MT9, heat transfer	60
BsC2, industrial economics I	36
TcC9, research report	48
MT10, precision measuring (metrology)	30
PrL20, industrial engineering principles	60
MT11, machine design II	90
BsC4, fundamentals of management	36
Total	360

Mechanical technology—Course descriptions

MT1, measuring instruments (basic): Instruction and practical experience in use of simple measuring devices, including calipers, micrometers, thread gages, ring gages, indicator comparators, and elementary electronic instruments.

MT2, metallurgy: Study of the important alloy systems of copper, nickel, aluminum, zinc, lead, tin, and iron. Included is a study of carbon steels, high alloy steels, and powdered metallurgy. Emphasis is placed on composition, structure, working and forming characteristics, physical and chemical properties, and some practical applications.

MT3, statics and dynamics: Resolution and composition of forces, equilibrium of force systems, friction, centroids, and moments of inertia will be introduced and discussed. Types and principles of motion and action of unbalanced force systems affecting the motion of rigid bodies will be treated in detail.

MT4, kinematics: The study of displacements, velocities, and accelerations involved in cams, gears, and linkages.

MT5, fluid mechanics: Fluid statics, one-dimentional flow of incompressible and compressible ideal and real fluids, flow of real fluids in pipes, and fluid measurements will be stressed.

MT6. dynamics of machinery: Static and dynamic balancing of shafts, vibrations and critical speeds in shafts, gyroscopic forces in machines and an introduction to servomechanisms will be covered.

MT7, machine design I: A study of standard machine parts, subassemblies, and design problems. Designs of one machine required of each student.

MT8, thermodynamics: A study of the thermodynamic principles, state properties, heat, work, and theoretical cycles. Use of thermodynamic tables and charts for steam, air, and refrigerants.

MT9, heat transfer: Detailed study of steady-state heat transfer by conduction, radiation, liquids, and condensing vapors. Overall transfer of heat transfer to design problems.

MT10, precision measuring (metrology): Instruction and practical experience in use of advanced measuring and layout equipment such as gage blocks, ultrasensitive gaging equipment, optional comparators, air type gaging equipment, lightwave equipment, surface plates, height gages, sine bars, etc.

MT11, machine design II: Actual design of machine elements by application of the methods of stress analysis, combined stresses and deformations, plastic deformations, and stress prediction.

Technical drafting and design

The courses outlined in this curriculum have been arranged to provide optimum specialized technician instruction in a 2-year program.

The courses are arranged in a sequence that gives the student the required technological and specialized courses as they are needed to coordinate his laboratory experiences.

The curriculum is designed to qualify the graduate for performance of duties in the field of mechanical drafting and design technology requiring the application of engineering principles, but as applied to the technical rather than the engineering field. Since the technician is called upon to design as well as to perform, emphasis is placed upon both knowledge and skill. As the student develops in drafting skills, mathematics, and related sciences, a gradual shift is made in the curriculum applying these skills to practical problems in design.

Occupational opportunities are found in government service, construction companies, engineering consulting firms, and architectural firms.

1st quarter:	*Hours*
TcC4, technical drawing I	156
TcC1, technical math I	60
BsC1, speed reading	24
BsC2, industrial economics I	60
TcC8, physics I	60
Total	360
2d quarter:	
TcC5, technical drawing II	120
TcC2, technical math II	60
PrL11, physics II	120
TcC7, technical report writing	60
Total	360
3d quarter:	
DD1, technical drawing III	120
TcC3, technical math III	60
PrL12, physics III	60
DD2, metals laboratory	60
TcC6, communications	60
Total	360
4th quarter:	
DD3, technical drawing IV	120
PrL15, technical math IV	60
DD4, physics IV	72
BsC3, industrial human relations	36
PrL14, strength of materials	60
Total	360
5th quarter:	
DD5, technical drawing V	120
DD6, technical math V	60
DD7, methods and material	60
DD8, applied mechanics	60
DD9, manufacturing and technical costs	60
Total	360
6th quarter:	
DD10, technical drawing VI	150
PrL10, mechanisms	60
TcC9, research report	150
Total	360

Technical drafting and design—Course descriptions

DD1, technical drawing III: A study of illustrations. The theory of axonometric projection in isometric, dimetric and trimetric are studied. Cavalier and cabinet projection are introduced during this course, and each student completes an exploded pictorial assembly drawing.

DD2, metals lab: A course of study centered within the machine tool laboratory where the individual studies the various tools and machines and related processes. The individual has the opportunity to observe and follow the layout and production of a product.

DD3, technical drawing IV: Covers the theory of practical application of sections and conventions. The use of sectional views and how they are developed for use on a drawing are studied in detail. Dimensioning practice in conjunction with sections and conventions is studied. A presentation of working drawings as actually used in the shop. All notes, dimensions, tolerances, and specifications needed for a working drawing are discussed and used in projects.

DD4, physics IV: A presentation of wave, sound, and light motion, reflection and refraction of light, lenses, and dispersion, interference and diffraction of light.

DD5, technical drawing V: This course introduces assembly drawings, the different types, their use and purpose. Assembly drawings are made from a set of working drawings prepared by the student in previous courses.

DD6, technical math V: An introductory course in differential and integral calculus. Calculus problems involving maximum and minimum volumes, velocity and accelerations of bodies are the topics of study. Designed to show the student the value of higher mathematics.

DD7, methods and materials: Study of the metallurgy of ferrous and nonferrous metals and their alloys, the characteristics and properties of nonmetallic engineering materials; the forming, fabrication, treatment, and inspection devices utilized in industry. Some of the topics within the course are metal casting, heat treatment of metals, powder metallurgy, welding and allied processes, hot and cold forming of metals and plastic molding.

DDS, applied mechanics: Study of external forces and internal stresses as found in structures and machines. Conditions of equilibrium are studied. Evaluation of internal stresses caused by compression or tension are made graphical and analytical methods of solution are introduced. Force systems such as parallel, concurrent and nonconcurrent are studied in coplaner and noncoplaner situation. The course embraces concepts of centroids and center of gravity, moments of inertia, and fundamentals of kinetics.

DD9, manufacture and technical costs: A practical approach to determining manufacturing and tool costs. Methods of determining and distributing indirect expenses and the estimating of material, direct labor, and tool costs by calculation and use of standard data will be studied. Elementary corporation accounting methods are presented.

DD10, technical drawing VI: A continuation of drawing exercises and problems of increasing complexity.

Tool and die design technology

In this curriculum the student learns to design cutting tools, gages, jigs, fixtures, punches, and dies. He will study production line layouts, production forecasting, planning and control, inventory control, and quality control. He studies methods of determining and distributing expenses, and estimating material, labor, and tool costs. He makes flow charts and process sheets showing each step required in the manufacture of a product. He learns to make time and motion studies and the techniques helpful in measuring labor equitably.

Tool and die design technology graduates are employed in the fields of design and production engineering.

Occupational opportunities include tool designers, tool and die layout draftsmen, foremen, manufacturing process technicians, and methods technicians.

Quality and production control technicians are utilized to an ever-increasing degree in manufacturing and processing plants.

1st quarter	Hours
BsC1, speed reading	24
TcC1, technical math I	48
TcC4, technical drafting I	72
TcC8, physics I	48
TD1, machine processes I	168
Total	360

2d quarter:	
TcC2, technical math II	48
TcC5, technical drafting II	72
PrL1, physics II	48
TD2, machine processes II	192
Total	360

3d quarter:	
TcC3, technical math III	48
TD3, tool design I	72
TD4, machine processes III	156
TcC6, communications	60
PrL3, electricity	24
Total	360

4th quarter:	
PrL15, technical math IV	48
PrL2, chemistry	24
TD5, machine processes IV	180
TcC7, technical report writing	36
TD6, electronic controls	24
TD7, tool design II	48
Total	360

5th quarter:	
PrL10, mechanisms	48
TD8, metals processing	24
TD9, tool design III	72
PrL7, hydraulics and pneumatics	36
TD10, machine processes V	180
Total	360

6th quarter:	
TD11, metallurgy (ferrous)	48
BsC2, industrial economics	36
PrL14, strength of materials I	36
TD12, machine processes VI	168
TD13, precision instruments	24
TD14, castings	48
Total	360

7th quarter:	
TD15, strength of materials II	48
TD16, metallurgy (nonferrous)	36
TD17, jigs and fixtures I	56
BsC3, industrial human relations	36
TD18, quality control	48
TD19, dies I	136
Total	360

8th quarter:	Hours
TD20, strength of materials III	48
TD21, jig and fixtures II	48
TD22, supervisory	36
PrL21, time and motion	36
TD23, dies II	72
TD24, business machines	48
TcC9, research report	36
BsC4, fundamentals of management	36
Total	360

Tool and die design technology—Course descriptions

TD1, machine processes I: The fundamentals of bench work including measurements, layout, chipping, filing, and small assembly. Operation and construction of engine lathes, bench lathes, drill presses, performing such operations as turning, facing, drilling, threading, boring, reaming. Small hand and turning projects will be completed.

TD2, machine processes II: Additional experience in machine shop involving layout work setting up machine tools. Emphasis is placed on cutting speeds, feeds, tool machine maintenance. Student begins work which requires a high degree of accuracy and fine finish.

TD3, tool design I: The basic concepts of tool design. Emphasis will be placed on the language of tool designing. Each student will design a simple tool for actual application.

TD4, machine processes III: Instruction in the calculating, cutting, and measuring of spur, helical, worm gears; the making of tape, cutters, punches, and simple dies, jigs, and fixtures, use of vernier height gauges, protractors, optical comparators, optical flats, and other precision measuring tools.

TD5, machine processes IV: This course is designed to concentrate on lathes and lathe accessories. The course emphasizes the design of cutting tools and complex setups related to turning, boring, cutting threads, and tapers. Related mathematics calculations are utilized. Experiments are performed in the cutting of ferrous and nonferrous metals.

TD6, electronic controls: Extension of electricity into the field of AC electricity. This course will include a study of electromagnetic circuitry, inductance, capacitance, simple and multiphase circuits, transformers, regulators, single phase motors, circuit protection, and switching equipment, electrical instruments and measurements. Use of hydraulics and pneumatics as activation devices is also taught.

TD7, tool design II: This course will give the student experience on the drawing board. Covers the principles, practices, tools, and commercial standards of jig and fixture design. Problems involved will develop a knowledge of the principles of single point tools, turning tools, cutters, broaches, etc. and will acquaint the student with various types of jigs and fixtures.

TD8, metals processing: Covers the forming, fabrication, treatment, and inspection devices for metals and plastics in industry. Topics covered will include heat treatment of metals, powder metallurgy, welding, and allied processes, inspection and measuring instruments. Process capabilities and relative advantage of each process in relation to costs for equivalent results are emphasized.

TD9, tool design III: This course will continue on the drafting board, and the student will design cutting tools, gage design, punch, and progressive dies. The student will design to the use of air operated as well as fluid operated dies.

TD10, machine processes V: A comprehensive study of milling machines and milling machine accessories. Emphasis is placed on lathing tools, work holding devices, and complex setups relative to flat, contour, and angle milling, boring, and the cutting of gears.

A study is made of the various designs of milling cutters and their applications. The student will acquire knowledge and skills in the fundamentals of the tool and cutter grinder.

TD11, metallurgy (ferrous): The metallurgy of ferrous metals and their alloys and the constitution of properties of nonmetallic engineering material will be emphasized. The nature of a metals constitution diagram, metallagraphic examination, mechanical properties, and corrosion will be included. Laboratory testing of materials and an investigation of their behavior in basic applications supplement classroom instruction.

TD12, machine processes VI: A continuation of the tool and cutter grinder and emphasizes the grinding of various types of materials used in the manufacture of cutting tools. Additional studies are made pertaining to grinding processes involving surface and cylindrical grinders. The student will acquire manipulative skills and will apply measuring instruments to grinding operations.

TD13, precision instruments: A laboratory study in the application of inspection methods and the use of precision measuring equipment determining compliance of manufactured parts to blueprints and specifications. The individuals will obtain experience in the use of micrometers, vernier, and optical gages, blocks, indicators, light wave equipment, and optical comparators.

TD14, castings: A complete study of castings. Die casting, sand casting, permanent mold casting, cold chamber, gooseneck, plastic mold, investment, shell mold, slush molding will be included. A study of the application of each process will be included to give the student an understanding of each process as it would relate to particular conditions. A cost analysis will be used to show costs of the various processes.

TD15, strength of materials II: This course is designed as a study of nonferrous metals and is a continuation of PrL14.

TD16, metallurgy (nonferrous) II: A study of nonferrous metals with emphasis placed on composition, structure, working and forming characteristics, physical and chemical properties, and practical applications of these studies.

TD17, jig and fixtures I: The student will design and build jigs and fixtures utilizing previous experience on a variety of machines. A comprehensive study of materials selection will be conducted. The student will be required to follow typical industrial procedures and tolerances.

TD18, quality control: This course is constructed to cover dimensional control, basic sizes, and applications of tolerances allowances and limits, theory of precision and nonprecision measurements, comparison measurements, industrial applications, experience with optical, electrical, and air limit gages and comparators.

TD19, dies I: Requires each student to select the proper material and build various types of dies using the experience and knowledge gained up to this point. Each student will work from typical industrial drawings, using standard industrial tolerances and fit the die to the particular application. Each student will follow the die project from beginning to the production stage.

TD20, strength of materials III: This is a continuation of course II. Each student will be required to work typical problems of industry involving strength of various materials. The problems will be concentrated in metals. A study of the various effects of time, temperature, and surroundings on metal will be considered. Students will be taught to select the proper metal for a given situation.

TD21, jig and fixtures II: Continued from the TD17 course. Each student will be subjected to more complex jigs and fixtures in this course. Air operated as well as fluid controlled projects will be considered. Actual production line jig and fixtures will be built.

TD22, supervisory practices: This course is designed to (1) develop self-confidence by providing basic training in public speaking.

Each student will have an opportunity to develop a good understanding of personnel problems that face the modern supervisor in industry. The second part of this course is designed to give an understanding of setting up a training program effectively.

TD23, dies II: Continues the investigations and practices initiated in dies I (Td19). The student will build from drawings complex dies of a typical industrial design. Each student will use his experience and skills gained in the machine shop to build these dies. Each student will follow the work from selecting the materials to the actual die.

TD24, business machines: This course is designed to give the student a working knowledge of the various business machines as they may apply to his work. The adding machine and calculator will be used to solve typical industrial problems.

CORE COURSES—BASIC, TECHNICAL, PARALLEL

Basic core courses—Course descriptions

BsC1, speed reading I: A 24-hour course designed to increase the eye span and reading speed. Particular emphasis will be placed on comprehension and understanding.

BsC2, industrial economics I: An analysis of how the American business system works and the relationship between business and government through understanding of corporate structure, tax systems, and relationships between local, State, and Federal Governments.

BsC3, industrial human relations: An analysis of the basic functions of the superior, his related problems, and an approach to decisionmaking.

BsC4, fundamentals of management: An analysis of the basic functions of the superior and his related problems and an approach to decisionmaking.

Technical core courses—Course descriptions

TcC1, technical math I: Review of arithmetic and the fundamentals of algebra; addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division; expression of stated problems in mathematical form; transformation of equations; fractions; factoring; exponents; roots; radicals; and an introduction of second order equations.

TcC2, technical math II: Review of algebra, geometry, and the fundamental concepts of trigonometry; use of tables; solution of right triangles; law of sines and cosines; special products of factoring; simultaneous equations; exponents and radicals; quadratic equations; logarithms and vector algebra.

TcC3, technical math III: This is a course designed to help students master applied analytical geometry. Mathematics used in solving problems involving vector and harmonic motion; complex rotation and vector algebra; functions and graphs.

TcC4, technical drawing I: An elementary course designed for students having limited or no drawing experience. Basic fundamentals are taught. This is a prerequisite to technical drawing II.

TcC5, technical drawing II: Use of templates; electrical circuit drawings, terms, symbols, and standards.

TcC6, communications I: Emphasis is placed throughout on writing, speaking, and listening. Student's weaknesses are analyzed and pinpointed, and the instruction is geared to improving skills in areas that are weak. The course is a prerequisite for technical report writing.

TcC7, technical report writing I: Techniques of collecting and presenting scientific data; informal and formal reports; special types of technical papers.

TcC8, physics I: Graphical and mathematical analysis of forces; law of motion, machines, mechanical power, strength of materials, fluid mechanics, thermal conductivity, and optics.

TcC9, research report: Individual assignment to the development of special interest to the student with the instructor's approval. A written report will be made. Frequent conferences are required between student and instructor to help guide the student's progress and the preparation of the report.

Parallel courses—course descriptions

PrL2, chemistry: A study of the fundamental principles of general chemistry including the common elements, equations, and types of chemical reactions. Emphasis is placed on the principles of inorganic chemistry and the application of these principles in the industrial processes. Laboratory exercises parallel and supplement the work in the classroom.

PrL3, electricity: Designed to give the student a thorough background in electricity typical of that found in industry. Subjects covered include matter and electron theory, magnetism, direct current, alternating current, Ohm's law, power sources of electricity, electric circuit, electromagnetism, motor control devices, and transformer and distribution systems.

PrL4, electron theory: Introduction to the technical concepts of electronic components and circuits. Principles of vacuum tubes and transistors, tuned circuits and basic circuits for power supplies, detectors, amplifiers, and oscillators, etc.

PrL5, engineering materials: The metallurgy of ferrous and nonferrous metals and their alloys and the constitution and properties of nonmetallic engineering materials (plastics, wood, concrete, etc.) and topics included are: the nature of metals, constitution diagrams, metallo-testing of engineering materials. Investigations of their behavior in basic applications supplement classroom instruction.

PrL6, graphic analysis: Graphic representation and graphic analysis; layout methods used in pattern and template work; graphs, charts, and plots; and introduction to descriptive geometry and graphic calculus.

PrL7, hydraulics and pneumatics: A study of the various types of fluid power equipment now available and the general functions which they perform. A description of proven hydraulic and pneumatic circuits for performing a wide variety of functions. Control circuits and safety devices are covered in detail as they apply to manufacturing operations.

PrL8, industrial electronics: Time constant and electronic timing circuits; photoelectric controls, welder and motor controls; saturable reactors and magnetic amplifiers; synchros and servomechanisms; induction and dielectric heating; radiation detection; and applications in the field of industrial control and automation.

PrL9, inorganic chemistry: Course includes basic considerations of atomic structure, stoichiometry, chemical equations, gas laws, kinetic theory, liquids, solids, solutions, acids and bases, chemical kinetics, electrochemistry, a study of hydrogen and oxygen, aqueous solutions, alkaline earths, and properties of the elements.

Laboratory work is designed to prepare the student for the more exacting procedures to be found in the later courses.

PrL10, mechanisms: Mathematical and drafting solutions of problems involving machine elements. Includes: linkage motion, velocities and acceleration of points within a link mechanism, layout methods for designing cams, belting, pulleys, gears, and gear trains.

PrL11, physics II: A study of sound covering wave motion, resonance, interference, intensity level, and the decibel; a study of mechanics including vector quantities, concurrent coplanar forces in equilibrium, uniformly accelerated linear motion, force and acceleration, friction, work and power, energy forms and transformations, torque in equilibrium, uniformly accelerated rotational motion, unbalanced torque and rotational acceleration, moment of inertia, and centripetal acceleration and force.

PrL12, physics III: A basic understanding of magnetism, electrostatics, Ohm's law, resistance, batteries, electrical power, energy, heat, electrolysis, ammeters and voltmeters, magnetic fields and currents, electromagnets, electromagnetic induction, electric generators, electric motors, self-inductance and mutual inductance and a.c. and d.c. currents.

PrL13, shop processes: Student develops use of hand tools, machine tools, equipment, and various types of materials he will encounter in his work.

PrL14, strength of materials: The principle involved in the analysis of stresses which occur within machine and structural elements subjected to various types of loads such as static, impact, and dynamic. Analyses of these stresses are made, as applied to thin-walled cylinders and spheres, riveted and welded joints, beams, and columns.

PrL15, technical math IV: Applied mathematics involving the use of plane geometry, plane trigonometry of both right and oblique triangles, and the solid geometry of compound angles. Special emphasis will be given to the solution of tool and die problems involving these mathematical processes.

PrL16, electrical power systems—In plant: A study of the design, operation, and technical details of modern power distribution systems including generating equipment, transmission lines, plant distribution, and protection devices. System load analysis, rates, and power economics are studied.

PrL17, introduction to machine tools: General discussion of uses, capabilities, and characteristics of basic machine tools of industry. Actual experience on turning, milling, shaping, drilling, tapping, reaming, boring, and grinding machines.

PrL18, manufacturing processes: Discussion of metalworking manufacturing processes comprising all machining operations, metal stamping and drawing, die casting, investment casting, forging, rolling, extruding, drawing, spinning, gas welding, electric welding, spot welding, riveting, high energy forming, magnetic flux forming, grinding, lapping, sandblasting, barrel finishing, polishing, buffing, cleaning, plating, anodizing, phosphating, and other so-called factory operations. Advantages, disadvantages, peculiarities of each and conditions under which each would be used would be discussed.

PrL19, statistical quality control: Beginning course in statistical measurement and analysis. Use of probability tables would be stressed. Some experimentation and practical applications through lecture demonstrations.

PrL20, industrial engineering principles: Investigation of scope of industrial engineering, including job analysis, methods and standards, layouts and processing, manufacturing costing, and incentive systems.

PrL21, motion and time study: Techniques of motion and time study, processes and operation charts, multiple activity charts, micromotion study, and stopwatch time study. Also of significance are the principles of motion economy, time study methods, standard data, and formula construction.

PrL22, production planning and control: Involves the most economical methods, machines, operations, and materials for the manufacture of a product. Also included is the planning, scheduling, routing, and detailed procedure of production control.

PrL23, vacuum tubes and rectifiers: This is a dual course that will teach the theory and applications of vacuum tubes as well as the theory and operation of rectifiers. Course begins with the history of vacuum tubes and continues with a study of the diode, triode, tetrode, pentode and power tubes, as well as multipurpose tubes and electron beam tubes. At this point the course will be devoted to teaching the theory and operation of rectifiers, including full-wave, half-wave, bridge typed, and multiphase rectifiers as well as voltage multipliers and dry disk rectifiers.

PrL24, basic electricity (dc): Electron theory, electrical units, Ohm's law, resistance combinations, meter connections, magnetism and magnetic circuits, electric power, characteristics of electrical conductors, inductance and capacitance; direct current generators, motors, and controls, and the use of common measuring and metering equipment.

PrL25, basic electricity (ac): Characteristics of alternating current waves, analysis of the behavior of alternating current components, phase and power factor, power measurements in delta and wye connected systems, two- and three-phase systems, application of vector algebra in the analysis of sines and parallel combinations of impedance.

(At this point Mr. COOPER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, ours must be a nation where no one should be forgotten, where the young have faith and the aged have hope, and where all must stand equal before the law and protected in all their civil liberties.

Before this session of the Congress adjourns, we shall be engaged in a great debate which I hope will lead to legislation establishing for all time first-class citizenship for all Americans.

There just cannot be any compromise on civil rights. There is nothing immoderate, arbitrary, or dictatorial in providing a comprehensive civil rights law.

For too long, 20 million Americans have been denied the basic rights our forefathers envisioned when they conceived the Constitution of the United States. It is left for us now to guarantee those rights to allow citizens the right to vote, to use public accommodations equally, and to be eligible for employment without discrimination. These rights have been affirmed in the courts as belonging to all Americans, not to almost all.

No greater domestic issue faces our country today than the problem of guaranteeing first-class citizenship for all Americans. Racial problems are, in reality, moral problems and not political issues. We should have no sympathy whatever for those who believe that the best the Congress should do for Negroes is to give them a license to fight for their God-given rights while Representatives and Senators remain idle by the roadside to see if they can win these rights. The Federal Government must not remain neutral or be a mere onlooker. Too often, those who speak out for States rights fail to lift their voices on behalf of civil rights. We, who are Senators of the United States, must exercise our responsibility to the Constitution and to millions of Americans who have heretofore been treated as second-class citizens.

Mr. President, I fervently hope that the Congress will stay in session and continue in session as long as necessary to pass the civil rights legislation which will be before us shortly. After the issues have been fully and fairly debated and after all Senators have been given an opportunity to express their views, during a period of some weeks, I would vote in favor of cloture. In the event that a cloture petition fails to win the necessary votes, we should then be prepared to remain in session as long a time as it takes to enact this legislation into law.

The argument has been made that a prolonged attempt to break a filibuster will cause serious hardship to some of our colleagues. The magnitude of the problem at hand does not justify this excuse for abandoning the fight for meaningful civil rights legislation or for accepting amendments which would make the bill nothing more than a half-hearted gesture. We who favor the President's proposals will protect any colleagues who for various reasons cannot suffer the hardships that will be involved in breaking a possible filibuster.

Frankly, we Senators of the United States have no right to speak of hardships when we look at the suffering and humiliation endured by our Negro citizens due to failure to deliver to them the full blessings of liberty provided by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens. To speak of hardships for Senators in breaking a filibuster when millions of citizens are denied the right to vote, the opportunity for decent employment, the right to equal education for their children, the right to use public accommodations equally, is to make a mockery of the legislative process.

We of the United States of America have carried the torch of liberty higher and more proudly than have the citizens of any other nation in all history. On the other hand, we have shamefully tolerated social and economic segregation of 20 million of our fellow Americans.

These two traditions are mutually exclusive and one of them must yield. One hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln warned "those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

If our democracy is to survive, discrimination because of race or color must be eliminated. The breathtaking pace of modern life no longer permits slow, leisurely adjustments to reality. Time is wasting. We daily hear the struggle of our Negro citizens for full equality referred to as a revolution—a peaceful revolution. However, the ultimate course of revolutions is always uncertain if people who are revolting are faced with repeated setbacks and no redress for their legitimate grievances. This revolution must be resolved peaceably and without unreasonable delay. We in the Congress have the duty to act—and act justly.

Lipservice is not leadership. Pious evasions do not solve problems but merely perpetuate them. To temporize is to encourage defiance of the law and contempt for the law.

We do not seek to establish new rights. We seek only to preserve old rights—rights as old as mankind itself. I have received letters from uninformed, or misguided, constituents who fear that the President's civil rights proposals will in some way infringe on their own liberties or way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is nothing in these pending legislative proposals which will deliver to our Negro citizens rights or privileges which they do not already enjoy in the State of Ohio and have enjoyed in our State for years. I am proud of this fact, as all Ohioans should be. What this legislation will do is extend these rights to all Americans regardless of the States in which they live or in which they travel.

This legislation will not, by itself, abolish injustice. That must come through the growing understanding and good will of the people. However, it will at last extend the assurances of our Constitution, our Declaration of Independence, and our heritage of freedom to all Americans. It will be a step forward on the long path toward mutual tolerance and understanding.

In this regard, Mr. President, we must also keep in mind that we—and I refer to the white citizens of America—are not in reality giving anything. In assuring these rights to our fellow Americans we are only reassuring them to ourselves. Civil rights are for all of us. It is for our sense of decency, for our conscience, and for human dignity—our own and our neighbors. Those who for selfish reasons or out of prejudice and bigotry or for any other reasons are standing in the way of constitutional rights for the Negroes of America are, in a sense, to be pitied. They are trying to hold back the tide of human progress, to halt the relentless force of the strength of the human spirit. It is a hopeless cause and a pitiful waste of human effort.

We are a Nation committed to justice. We cannot continue to deny to 20 million of our own citizens what we offer to the world. We in the Senate who fervently believe in the cause of civil rights must be prepared to achieve the fulfillment of the promises of the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation before this session of the Congress is permitted to adjourn.

THE AUGUST 28 MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, August 28 should not be permitted to slip into history without the city of Washington, its leaders, and its residents taking the bow they so properly deserve as gracious hosts.

Two hundred thousand Americans from all sections of this land participated last Wednesday in one of the greatest single demonstrations in this country's history. This great Capital City could not have acquitted itself more admirably and proper note should, and must, be taken of that fact.

For several months, the leaders of this city and those in suburban communities, spent long hours making detailed plans to permit a large number of Americans to come to their Capital City and seek, by orderly demonstration, a redress of their grievances as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Certainly, the detailed and thoughtful planning permitted this great demonstration to go forward in perfect order and with great dignity.

August 28 has now come and gone and the city of Washington has shown by putting its best foot forward that it has lived up to a reputation as the greatest capital city of the greatest nation in the world.

Singling out those who deserve praise, the individual citizen of the Washington area deserves the greatest as each lived up to the responsibility of welcoming Americans to their capital. Individually, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia government are to be commended and possibly the greatest accolade belongs to Maj. Robert V. Murray, Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, who served as the commander of all control units. Through his cautious, yet firm and understanding, approach the many details in advance planning fell into proper place. Chief Murray, down through his many fine years as the commanding officer of one of the finest—if not the finest—metropolitan police forces in the country, has been schooled in handling unusual situations. Actually, unusual situations are not new to the Washington Police Department and Chief Murray's officers showed outstanding training. In many ways, the life of a policeman in Washington may well be more difficult than one in any other American city. It is here that they must have the patience, tact, and courtesy mingled with effective forcefulness to do their jobs. It is here that small problems can be telescoped into incidents of far-reaching impact.

Great credit also must go to Mr. Luke Moore, U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia; and to the chiefs of police and officers of all the suburban communities whose fine cooperation was invaluable. Praise must also go to the Washington firemen who were called out on special duty; to the District of Columbia National Guard; and to all others in this city, too numerous to mention individually or collectively, who made Wednesday, August 28, the day it was.

In my judgment, there are few cities able to handle an assemblage of this size and character. Washingtonians have been conditioned to all types of demonstrations and hold the belief that every citizen is entitled to express his opinions in an orderly manner.

Great credit also must go to Washington's newspaper, television, and radio media which devoted much time and space to advance publicity about arrangements and which handled the reporting of that day's activities with great perspective.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to salute the people of Washington for conducting themselves as gracious hosts to other Americans on Wednesday last.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ARTICLE ON "WHAT BUSINESS CAN DO FOR AMERICA"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the influence of business on our national economy and our American society is immense and dynamic. Today, more than ever before, the role of businessmen should be understood and respected.

President Kennedy has expressed such understanding and respect in a special article published in Nation's Business, titled "What Business Can Do for America." This brief article is an effective summary of the contributions America's business community can make to meet such major challenges as unemployment, the need for new tax policies, the balance-of-payments problem, the patterns of prices and—yes—civil rights.

I urge all of my colleagues to read the President's article. And I commend the magazine Nation's Business for publishing it. For the development of effective national policy in a free society, we need such contact between businessmen and the Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "What Business Can Do for America," by President Kennedy, published in the September issue of Nation's Business, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT BUSINESS CAN DO FOR AMERICA

(By President John F. Kennedy)

(The President writes directly to Nation's Business readers on taxes, price policies, world trade, investment, economic growth, and civil rights.)

Members of the business community play a vital role in maintaining and building the strength of the American economy—in converting its great potential into higher standards of living and free world leadership.

It is to this community—guided by the free play of market forces but responsive to the national interest—that I address these thoughts on what business can do, and what government and business can do together, to achieve these common aims:

Getting our economy back to maximum operation,

Speeding our rate of growth,

Improving our competitive position in world markets,

Avoiding inflation, and

Equalizing opportunity for all.

These are the aims all of us share. Each group in our economy has a responsibility to take actions to help achieve them—and in so doing to help America and help themselves.

TAXES

Although the present expansion, now in its 30th month, has reversed the postwar trend of ever-shorter expansions and more frequent recessions, and has generated solid gains—a 13-percent growth in real output, a 21-percent rise in industrial production, a 13-percent rise in personal income, a 30-percent rise in corporate profits—both unemployment and idle capacity remain far too high.

Too many of our plants stand idle, too much of our work force is unemployed, too many of our potential sales are not made and, thus, part of the country's economic strength lies fallow.

This administration has proposed tax action that would advance our economy, that would turn potential into actual sales, that would move workers from employment agencies to their jobs, that would keep machines humming full time, that would lead to new and larger orders for raw materials and equipment.

The drag of inadequate markets has slowed our economic growth in recent years. This drag will not fall away simply because we wish it so. In part this drag consists of what you and I know is a burdensome tax system born of war and inflation. The tax program I have recommended can lighten the drag on growth: Through its impact on consumer markets and sales and through its stimulus to after-tax profits, it would set the stage for the more vigorous investment response that is crucial to the future growth of business and the country.

This action—tax reduction and reform—would spur output and investment. It reflects a conscious decision to stimulate the economy chiefly through private rather than public channels, to give American business the opportunity, and the responsibility, of meeting the needs of the American economy and all its citizens.

Government is not interested in making a larger share of the decisions on where to spend, but it is interested in creating the climate through tax reduction and reform for more investment spending by business and for more buying by consumers. When tax revision is enacted, it can be made more effective as you revise your investment and other plans upward, in accordance with the improved profit and demand picture.

But tax revision has not yet been enacted. You can help even today in creating a stronger America by supporting that tax revision program. There exists no magic tax policy that will fully satisfy everyone and every interest—yet prompt action on tax relief and reform will benefit us all. If we quarrel over every sentence, the book will never be written. The full support of the business community for prompt and appropriate tax action is urgently needed. The common interest in an overall program of tax reduction and reform must transcend the particular interest of individual groups.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Our balance-of-payments position has been a source of continuing concern. Here, too, we have made progress. But the times demand even greater progress and even greater effort. Government can do much to defend and strengthen the dollar and to promote the interests of U.S. business around the world.

In our tax and monetary policies, in our international monetary arrangements, in our rigorous dollar-conserving measures in aid and defense, and in our export credit and expansion programs—buttressed by the strong new measures announced in July—we are making a major effort to bring the U.S. balance of payments into equilibrium. But again, there is a role that only you can play.

The Trade Expansion Act and the forthcoming tariff negotiations with the European Economic Community and other nations are opening a new era of world trade and international business opportunity. The time has come to seize these opportunities, to seek out the potentials that lie in foreign markets.

Although many producers have responded quickly and successfully to the growing challenges of foreign competition, we are far from being a nation of exporters. U.S. firms can meet the test of the world market successfully if they search out their opportunities aggressively.

I urge you—and the prospect for new profits urges you—to redouble your own export efforts. Your active personal support for the White House Conference on Export Expansion to be held September 17 and 18 can also contribute to a successful national export effort.

This Nation's efforts to increase production and profits comprise another key element in the improvement of our balance-of-payments position. As we expand our home market, and increase rates of return by cutting costs and making full use of our productive capacity, investment funds that now go abroad will stay at home. And as they stay at home, they will help to build the base for faster growth of our own economy.

PRICES

Our remarkable wholesale price stability in the past 5 years, while prices in most other industrial countries were rising substantially, has given us a solid base for an improved international competitive position.

Investment to reduce costs and improve products and measures to advance the skill and productivity of our workers will further strengthen our competitive position—but only if the productivity gains are not dissipated in fruitless spirals of rapidly rising wages chasing higher prices, and vice versa. That is why we have called upon labor and business to exercise responsible restraint, basing wage and profit increases on fair shares of rising productivity.

The continued need for a vigilant national effort to avoid a resumption of the inflation of past periods will become even more urgent as we move closer to full employment and full-capacity operation. Relative price stability can be continued if all of us—labor, business, and Government—work at it. If the overall level of prices is not to rise, price increases on some products and services must be matched by price decreases in others. Such increases and decreases are a necessary and desirable part of a free market economy.

But what is unnecessary and undesirable is a general rise in prices. Current prices cannot be looked upon as a floor—let alone as a springboard for higher prices in the future. American business pioneered in exploiting the possibilities of mass markets—of seeking higher profit levels through lower prices and expanding sales, not through increased profit rates on limited output. This basic philosophy is as relevant today as it was 50 years ago and time has proved its worth.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The achievement of full employment and of a faster rate of economic growth will be of prime importance in giving substance to "equal opportunity." But beyond this, you, as businessmen, can play a leading role in giving all Americans a direct chance to share in the creation of a stronger economy and in the fruits of that economy. In communities all across the Nation, businessmen hire workers and serve customers and thus have an opportunity in their everyday business conduct to make a decisive contribution to the practice of American democracy. I ask of all of us that we judge each other not as white or nonwhite but as Americans and in so doing expand our markets, increase our productivity, and strengthen our Nation.

THE JOINT TASK AHEAD

Business can help on all these fronts—on tax revisions, on investments, on exports, on prices, on equality of opportunity. But business cannot achieve our common goals alone. This is too much to ask of any group. Nor, and let me make this clear, can Government do it alone.

Business, labor and Government are partners and no one partner can complete the task if the other partners are not doing their shares. That is why, in much of what I have said, I have spoken of what we can do together.

For business decisions not only influence current and prospective economic conditions, they also reflect these conditions. It is Government's task to create a climate in which your decisions to expand and invest, to export, and to assist in defending the stable dollar, are sensible and meaningful.

The present economic expansion is an example of the interaction of Government policies and business performance. Part of the rise in economic activity is the result of business decisions made in response to last year's investment tax credit and depreciation guideline revision. The latter were Government policies; but you made them effective.

A recent private survey indicated that over $1 billion of the business expenditures on new plant and equipment planned for this year are directly related to last year's tax credit and revised depreciation guidelines—measures the Executive and the Congress took to encourage new investments. Without this $1 billion margin, business investment plans for 1963 would have shown much less change from 1962.

I have no reason to doubt that the future will tell the same story: that Government can pursue policies to encourage expansion, and we will do that; that businessmen can make these policies effective by playing the dynamic role the free market assigns to them, and you will do that.

Our aims are the same. If you fail, all America fails. But, in fact, we will succeed. The results will demonstrate to men everywhere the power and thrust of the American free enterprise system—the mightiest engine of economic progress the world has known.

"THE LIBERAL: WHAT HE IS AND ISN'T"—ARTICLE BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an article which appeared in the New York Times magazine section of September 1, entitled "The Liberal: What He Is and Isn't." This article is authored by my able and distinguished colleague the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. Senator McCarthy is an author in his own right, having written several books on the subject of American politics and the political philosophy of American democracy. In this article he treats the subject of liberalism in a most responsible, mature, and illuminating fashion.

The Senator properly notes—and I concur with him—that the true liberals of the 20th century are, in a real sense, pragmatists and realists who have dealt with massive social and economic problems in what has proven to be the most effective fashion. They have come to grips with problems of a changing society and have sought realistic and workable solutions to those problems.

American social and economic policies over the past generation have reflected this liberal pragmatism, and these policies have carried America to a position of world leadership and a standard of living without parallel. We still have many problems which challenge us, but we should not overlook our substantial accomplishments of the past generation.

Senator McCarthy also properly emphasized that effective liberals have not relied on mere words or slogans in answer to these problems; they have acted; and in general the policies of action have been successful.

The pragmatism that has characterized true liberalism in the past will continue to drive liberals into a constructive confrontation with today's problems and the problems of tomorrow.

I believe this particular article is "must" reading for every political person and for every citizen who is truly interested in the functions of American politics. Senator McCarthy has made a real contribution to the literature of American politics.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The Liberal: What He Is and Isn't," be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE LIBERAL: WHAT HE IS AND ISN'T

(By Eugene J. McCarthy)

In the years since the end of World War II, the decline, if not the passing, of liberalism has been frequently celebrated in the press and on public platforms by conservatives, neutrals, and even by some liberals.

"Time has run out on the liberals," it is said. "Liberals have lost their old landmarks." "Liberalism is on the defensive." "It has been driven from the high ground." "There is a rising tide of conservatism." "Conservatism has captured the 'American consensus.'" So run the charges and the claims.

Examining their validity is made difficult by the lack of any clear definition of a liberal or of liberalism. Most of the definitions currently in circulation are the creations of conservative critics. To assert that liberalism is not what its critics say it is, however, contributes little to the discussion. Nevertheless, a genuine understanding of liberalism today does call for denials as well as affirmations.

American liberalism in the second half of the 20th century is not simply a continuation of the liberalism of the 18th and 19th centuries. It is not a particular system of philosophy—a school of political, economic or social thought—nor is it, as some claim and others charge, a way of life. It is not a demanding faith, as the Americans for Democratic Action assert—although it does make some demands on its adherents—nor yet an undemanding faith, as described by Prof. William Leuchtenburg of Harvard. And it is not without faith or without a home for faith, as Dr. Frederick Wilhelmsen of Santa Clara University has said.

American liberalism is no more materialistic in its metaphysics than American conservatism or more rationalistic in its psychology. Nor can it be fairly described as more utilitarian, more positivistic or relativistic in its ethics and value judgments than conservatism. And it cannot be described as more opportunistic or Machiavellian in its politics.

If the differences between liberals and conservatives in the United States are not differences over basic ideas of equality, human dignity or freedom then what is American liberalism? What are its characteristics? Essentially, I see it as a practical movement directed toward the fuller realization of these basic ideas.

The liberal movement in this century is identified and associated with the New Deal of the first two Roosevelt administrations. The New Deal involved political and economic changes which were a response to urgent practical demands, rather than the fulfillment or advancement of an ideology or a doctrinaire theory of political, economic, and social organizations.

Roosevelt's program provided for the pooling of social risks, as in the case of social security, and the pooling of economic risks, as in the case of the Federal Deposit Insurance program. It included such projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the hydroelectric developments in the Far West. In each case, the decision was based on practical considerations—the development and distribution of power, for example, or the related problems of navigation and flood control—rather than on an ideological demand for social ownership or collectivization.

At the same time, other projects were introduced providing for greater Government control over such things as the investment market and the wages and hours of workingmen, along with efforts to protect the small independent business and the independent family-size farm.

In the immediate postwar period, the liberal influence was strong in support of international programs such as the Marshall plan, point 4, and the United Nations and its agencies. But what of liberals and of liberalism today?

Liberals have not lost their old landmarks. Indeed, it may be that they are looking at them somewhat too longingly at a time when they are no longer an adequate guide to need or progress; but certainly the initiative in economic, social, cultural, and political action still rests today with those who are generally called liberals.

Perhaps it is true that liberals propose more than they dispose, but it is also true that in nearly every area of governmental action, the substance and direction are essentially of liberal origin. To cite only two examples, the fight for the extension of civil rights to Negroes and the battle to provide medical care for the aged were originated and sustained in the last 10 to 15 years by the liberals.

On economic problems, tne liberal approach is somewhat more complex and sophisticated than it was during the New Deal period. During the depression, for example, it was accepted that unemployment was a sign of distress within the economic system. But today's unemployment is plainly not the product of depression, for the economy is operating at higher and higher rates of productivity. Liberal economists and politicians are now writing and talking about frictional unemployment and structural unemployment, which are different in nature and cause from the simple unemployment of the past.

To meet the new situation, liberals are not only proposing some of the old, or quantitative, remedies—improved unemployment compensation, the area redevelopment program, manpower retraining, the youth conservation program (a new version of the old Civilian Conservation Corps), accelerated public works programs, and the like—but are also supporting a more sophisticated approach. Even conservatives seem to have accepted that deficit financing, for instance, can be used as a means of countering a recession or of bringing the economy back from a depression.

Today, the argument behind the administration's proposed tax cut is that deficit financing (either through a tax cut or an increase in Government expenditure or both) can move an economy already operating at a high level to an even higher level of productivity without an intervening recession or depression.

Basic to this argument, of course is the issue of whether the Federal budget can or should be used as an instrument for economic growth. The conservatives are still arguing the case for a balanced annual budget—an objective long since abandoned by industry itself, and by most American families—and still arguing for repeal of the income tax and a lower ceiling on the Federal debt as the answer to every economic problem from inflation to the imbalance of payments.

American liberalism is something more than a purely practical response to present problems. It is characterized by certain basic attitudes which, when associated with reasoned judgment, and a historical perspective, give character and direction to action.

The liberal is ideally and characteristically an optimist—not blindly so, as one who fails to understand the reality of the times, but with a full awareness of the difficulties of a situation and the potentiality for failure of man and his institutions. Although hopefully confident that improvement and progress can be accomplished, he does not believe that things are necessarily getting better and better of their own accord or that progress is inevitable.

The ideal liberal is normally progressive, willing both to advocate and to accept change—an impeccable position since no individual or institution can ever claim perfection. But he need not always advocate something wholly new. He may support elements of the status quo, or he may even advocate a return to conditions known in the past. He does not necessarily believe in change for the sake of change or, as some critics of liberals insist, in historical determinism and the inevitability of collectivization.

The liberal is normally tolerant of the opinions and actions of others, yet he exercises this tolerance without undermining his own position, without conceding that another position might be right, without agreeing to disagree, and certainly without accepting that one man's opinion is as good as another's. The basis for his tolerance is a genuine humility arising from his awareness of human limitations and from a sense of the dignity of every man.

While liberals are for moving ahead—sometimes slowly and haltingly—they are, as conservatives charge, on the defensive. Even their old programs, like the TVA, social security, and rural electrification, are under continuous sniping attack.

Liberals are also on the defensive in the areas of basic civil liberties and constitutional rights. Those who would like to believe that these are taken for granted are often called away from the fight to extend human rights and economic justice to minorities in order to deal with more fundamental challenges.

The question of freedom of speech, for example, was not much of an issue in the thirties, but today it is. The right of privacy was not seriously challenged during the depression, but today it is threatened by such proposals as those to permit the extension of wiretapping. The right of trial by jury and habeas corpus can no longer be taken for granted in the face of proposals relating to the arrest and pretrial treatment of accused persons. The right of assembly requires attention as a result of issues raised by picketing, freedom marches, and public meetings.

Liberal victories today are not as dramatic as they were in the thirties. Then they were set against a static and frozen background. Today, they must be measured against a moving economy and a fluid society. The sound of the trumpet is not quite so clear, nor is the direction of the charge. Those who pass judgment on the liberal effort contrast it in enthusiasm, confidence and certainty with that of the thirties and find it wanting. The response today is not to storm the barricades but to push on across the plain.

If conservatives have a better response to the challenges of today, now is the time for them to demonstrate it in word and in action. It is not enough to declare themselves for freedom, truth and justice, or to declare themselves, even more vaguely, for traditional values. Conservatives can become a positive force in American history only if they demonstrate as much confidence in the future as they claim to have in the past.

SUMMER PROJECTS DEMONSTRATE WORTH OF YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long indicated my interest and concern with the problem of youth employment. Supporters of the Youth Employment Act, currently awaiting action by the House Rules Committee, have maintained that the work experiences of the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps would prove extremely valuable in rescuing school dropouts from useless and unproductive lives.

The subject of school dropouts is with us once again as our schools reopen in the 50 States. We read that in some areas there has been an improvement in the situation. I hope this will be a characteristic tendency in our entire Nation, because young people need to be encouraged by their seniors to realize that an education is absolutely essential for useful employment and productive lives.

Recently programs in the District of Columbia and the State of Oregon, programs almost identical to those established by the Youth Employment Act, have demonstrated the validity of the argument that school dropouts can be rescued from useless and unproductive lives if they are given an opportunity for wholesome, useful work experience.

In the District of Columbia 1,100 young people of high school age participated in a pilot or crash program of summer jobs developed by Washington Action for Youth, President Kennedy's Juvenile Delinquency Committee for the District of Columbia. The Federal Government and many private employers cooperated in providing these summer jobs for the District of Columbia high school students. Washington Action for Youth hoped that if these students—all potential dropouts—could experience the responsibilities of regular employment, they would be more likely to return to school and pursue their formal education. Moreover, they would be far less likely to get into trouble during the summer if they were employed on a regular basis.

At the conclusion of this special program, the directors of Washington Action for Youth requested that each employer ask each jobholder about his or her future plans. The results have been most encouraging. As reported in the Washington Post, most of the young people planned to return to school and cited their job experience as the principal motivating factor in this decision. These jobs, in themselves, did not equip the jobholders with sufficient skills to remain steadily employed in today's job market. But the experience of steady work did awaken in most of the youngsters an appreciation of the discipline of sustained work and a realization that additional education was absolutely essential to their future employment plans.

The Congress must make it clear to our young people that there is little or no hope for gainful employment unless they acquire an adequate education. We have the responsibility to see that our school systems, both public and private, are equipped to provide full educational opportunity for our young people. As we discuss these problems of unemployment, it does little good to think only in terms of public works, area redevelopment, Federal spending, State spending, and private investment, unless we also add job training which is absolutely essential in terms of education in our school systems.

Many of the young people in the District of Columbia job program learned enough about their particular jobs to stimulate their desire to follow similar paths in their academic pursuits. One young girl worked as an assistant to the librarian at the State Department and learned a great deal about the profession of library science. Numerous other examples could be cited.

In my opinion, the lesson is clear. These jobs were similar to the types of positions that would be developed by the Hometown Youth Corps. Just as Washington Action for Youth met a real need in the lives of 1,100 Washington young people this summer, the Hometown Youth Corps would meet a real need in the lives of thousands of others from coast to coast.

I lift my voice again to appeal for help for these young people. There has been considerable criticism of our young people. Also, there was a high rate of unemployment this summer among our youth. Unemployment among our youth inevitably produces delinquency, social problems, and other trouble. It is a pattern that cannot be avoided. The answer, it seems to me, for this country is to provide gainful work for young people.

Many thousands of our young people will be cast upon the dump, so to speak, of human wreckage if our Government and the country remain unconcerned about their welfare.

The other day Congress passed a space program bill costing $5,300 million, 60 percent of which is for the purpose of putting a man on the moon. Yet we cannot get a bill through Congress that will put a young man to work in a forest, so he can lead a wholesome life and make a contribution to himself, his family, and his country.

It seems to me that we could do a great deal more on the earth than on the moon. I am perfectly willing to go along with the challenge and experience of seeking new frontiers on the moon. What about the old frontiers back home, where young people should have an opportunity to work?

They will work, if they are given an opportunity. However, Congress has been derelict in providing the opportunity that our young people justly deserve.

I will not remain silent on this subject until something is done about it. The Senate has met its responsibility in terms of the Youth Employment Act. I do not believe that the earth must stop merely because the Rules Committee of the House will not move. There is a job that needs to be done.

I am also pleased to learn of the outstanding success achieved in Oregon by a special summer program that detailed 200 boys to the forests near Portland. A similar program was conducted in Beltrami County in my State of Minnesota. It was done at the county level. A similar program was also conducted in the neighboring State of Wisconsin.

Patterned after the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, the Oregon program put these boys to work building forest trails, clearing picnic sites, and building camping areas. Mr. R. C. Burgess, a retired forester, supervised the project for the Metropolitan Youth Commission of Multnomah County, Oreg. Mr. Burgess said at the conclusion of the project:

> The whole project has been good, not only for the country in getting work done at the park, but also for the boys in giving them a job to do and paying them some wage, even if a small one.

These programs give the youth of our country an opportunity to perform a fine quality of work. As a result of their experience there has come about a constructive change in the habits of the young men who work on these projects. However, in my advocacy of the Youth Conservation Corps, I have never suggested that the enrollees would become highly skilled craftsmen or independently wealthy on the basis of their YCC experience alone. But they would learn certain basic skills; they would experience the discipline of work and accomplishment; they would earn a small wage; and they would be given the opportunity to pursue certain academic subjects while participating in the scheduled work programs.

It is time we realized that many young people—principally school dropouts—need an experience such as this to restore their self-confidence and to give them the motivation to resume more formalized academic or vocational education. For many of these young people, they now face the future alone and without hope. The Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps possess the potential to change this picture, to provide an opportunity for constructive accomplishment and achievement.

I suggest that Senators, who live a rather busy life, but generally in comfortable circumstances, visit one of the great cities and see what is going on. They should go to cities of 250,000, 100,000, 500,000, or a million or more population and see the problems that exist in those cities because young people are unable to find gainful work. It is truly social dynamite. Until we solve that problem—by the manpower training bill before us, the Youth Employment Act, and other measures—we shall continue to have a social malignancy that will spread throughout our social and economic structure.

The projects to which I have referred, in the District of Columbia and in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., demonstrate the workability of the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps.

It is my sincere hope that the first session of the 88th Congress will not adjourn until action is complete on the Youth Employment Act. We have completed action on it in this body. Let us hope the House will soon take similar action. The Youth Employment Act represents sound and constructive legislation. The youth of America deserve this opportunity without further delay.

I wish we could get many people in Congress as concerned about the problems of American youth as they are about the nuclear bomb, about which we know little. All we know is what we read about and are told. Most of them have never seen one. If they did see one, they could not identify it. However, any Members of Congress could identify a boy.

Why do we not do something about an area in human life and human experience about which we know something, such as young people? Most of us are parents. Everyone of us knows that there are difficult days in bringing up a family. Everyone knows that there are problems which are almost insurmountable in many families, and that there are families in America which do not have the means to provide the special training that is frequently required for young people to gain employment.

There is before the Senate proposed legislation to provide for a certain amount of retraining. The Senate has passed a youth employment bill, which will do something for thousands of young people. It has been said that it will not do enough. If we tried to pass a bill which would deal with the whole problem, it would be defeated because, it would be argued, it was too costly. On the one hand we are criticized because it does not do enough.

On the other hand, if we tried to solve the problem completely, and face it on the basis of the magnitude of the problem, the Senate Chamber would be emptied in fear and trepidation because of the cost of the program.

The Senator from Minnesota is an advocate; he is not an apologist. I shall advocate this program until everyone becomes so tired of hearing about it that something will be done about it. There is no excuse whatever in the United States, which has a gross national product approximating $600 million, for failing to meet the urgent problems of youth employment and youth training. If we fail to meet these problems, it will not make any difference whether we reach the moon or not. It will not make much difference whether we have nuclear weapons or not. We shall destroy ourselves by our failure to attend to the problems of earth, much less the problems we shall face when we get to the moon.

I congratulate those public servants responsible for organizing this crash summer job program.

In particular, the Attorney General has taken the lead in developing the job opportunities. Mr. Jack Goldberg and Mr. Rodney Clurman, of Washington Action for Youth, were instrumental in making the program such a fine success. On behalf of the Washington community and the Nation, they deserve our sincere thanks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD the Washington Post's report on the Washington Action for Youth summer job program.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE THAN 1,100 SLUM YOUNGSTERS SEEN HELPED BY TEST SUMMER JOB PROGRAM HERE

(By Eve Edstrom)

For more than 1,100 of Washington's young people, this weekend signals the end of something new and the beginning of something old.

The something new was job experiences provided under the leadership of Washington Action for Youth. WAY wanted to give a "shot in the arm" to discouraged slum children alienated from the rest of the community.

WAY did just that—and more. In the words of WAY Executive Jack R. Goldberg, the young people "took more than a buck out of the summer job program."

For many of them, their first jobs have made them decide to return to school Wednesday instead of joining the army of school dropouts.

As the young people approached their final pay periods last week, WAY asked all private and Government employers to ask the jobholders what school they plan to attend this fall. WAY then will follow up to determine whether the youngsters are, in fact, back in school.

Should there be some stumbling block to their return—such as exclusion by school authorities because of difficult behavior or learning problems—WAY and the local office of the U.S. Employment Service will attempt to funnel such youth into new job training programs that will get underway this fall.

But it now appears that the bulk of the young people do intend to go back to school for a variety of reasons directly connected with their summer jobs.

WAY, for example, asked the young people to detail how they spent their summer pay. More often than not, they said their pay enabled them to buy school clothing and to set aside funds for school fees to make their return possible.

Furthermore, numerous job supervisors lost no opportunity to stress the importance of schooling. One youngster, who worked in the Municipal Building mailroom, said of his supervisor:

"We always say good morning or good afternoon or, you know * * * [he] talks to you for a little while and asks you what you are doing in school * * * [and] are you still going back to school?"

Asked if this encouraged him to go back to school, the boy said:

"Yes, it has encouraged me to go back to school * * * [and] to go to college if I can."

In a few instances, the decision to return to school was triggered by a bad job experience. One boy was equipped to do nothing else but janitorial work and he complained about the "bad pay, the poor working facilities, the mean ways of the boss." But when asked if he had learned anything from the job, he said:

"No, I haven't * * * [except] one thing: To go to school and study and learn as much as I can in the different fields to get a better job."

But most of the young people liked their jobs while recognizing the need for additional education.

A typical response came from a young girl who worked as a librarian assistant at the State Department. She said her job was just great, that there was nothing she disliked about it, that she had learned a great deal about library work, foreign countries, and the need to stay in school and get your education to increase job skills.

Just as enthusiastic were numerous employers of the young people. One office manager for a U.S. Senator rated a secretarial aid as perfect. The supervisor of an office clerk at the Naval Medical Center said that "I wish this boy had been my son."

One private employer asked WAY officials if they had used any special screening techniques because the young people were so much better workers than beginning employees hired by the company.

The employer couldn't believe it when WAY said the only screening method used was to select young people from the lowest income families in the Cardoza High School area.

Much of the credit for the success of the summer job program goes to recreation department roving leaders who met regularly with the young workers to counsel them.

At these sessions, all types of on-the-job problems and solutions were discussed. One boy, for example, said he wished he could do something else besides cutting grass. Another boy said he had the same problem but had solved it. Asked how he did it, he replied:

"I worked real hard on the grass-cutting job without complaining like most of the other boys did. After I had worked good for 2 weeks I asked the boss if I could do some other job * * * so he said: 'Can you paint?' Now I am painting and those other guys are still cutting grass."

ROVING LEADERS ACT

When the young people didn't do well on their jobs, the roving leaders immediately took steps to correct the situation.

In one instance at a naval installation, supervisors had recommended that two boys be fired because their aggressive behavior was an adverse influence on other employees. The two boys claimed the supervisors were "riding their backs." Individual counseling sessions didn't change the boys' attitude.

Consequently, Roving Leader Daniel L. Lowry arranged a meeting between the supervisors and all of the young people who had been placed at the installation by WAY.

During this meeting, the two boys admitted that their supervisors had ample reason to fire them and pledged to do better. The change in their attitude came after one of the boys asked if his work record could be read by Lowry.

FULL RECORD

"His record cited everything good and bad that he had done since his first day on the job," Lowry said. "He was really shocked that such an accurate record had been kept."

"I explained to the group that when seeking employment elsewhere this record would be made available to the perspective employer," Lowry continued. They then and only then realized the importance of establishing a good work record * * *

"I feel that because of this particular session every boy in that group grew a little and was given a better outlook on the importance of attitudes in regard to work situations.

"The supervisors got a chance to see a little about what is on the fellows' minds and what makes them react the way they do and they too, I believe, grew also."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As I interpret and assess the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, is it correct to say that he would want the Senate and the country to realize that perhaps it is as important to give attention to the making of a boy into a man as it is to place a man upon the moon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hesitate to set priorities; but I should say that if one were to discuss this question with his wife or with his mother, the persons who are closest to him, the answer would most likely be that it is more important to try to have a good, wholesome community in America than it is to see whether we can poke around in the craters of the moon.

I voted for the space program, because I believe it is a vital part of scientific development. But to return to what the Senator from West Virginia has said—and, by the way, he has been very active in this area—we have an equal responsibility to ourselves and to our young people.

Congress refuses to do something for the people who most need assistance. We pass laws to provide investment tax credits for business; we pass laws that deal with the big problems of corporations, or even of trade unions. But when it comes to doing something for the old people, many of whom are helpless, we hesitate; we see more reasons not to provide assistance than there are stars in the heavens.

When it comes to doing something for the young people and for our schools, we close our eyes and say, "We cannot do that."

We ought to be trying to solve the problems of unemployment, delinquency, and narcotic addiction—the problem of narcotic addiction being one that is growing by leaps and bounds among the young people. Congress closes its eyes to the problem of narcotic addiction. Instead, we concentrate on subversion. Yet among the real problems in this country are subversion, perversion, and narcotic addiction among young people.

What is needed is a reawakening on the part of Members of Congress concerning the important social problems that face young people today, and also among our elderly citizens.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Minnesota speaks persuasively and cogently.

Perhaps most Senators were in their home States over the weekend. I was in West Virginia for 5 days. I sensed there a surging of opposition to programs of the magnitude on which we are now voting in reference to space exploration and foreign aid, especially foreign aid programs that are not more carefully guided to those within the various countries who need the assistance. There is a general feeling—at least among the citizens of West Virginia—that somehow we must tighten the programs which are administered in an effort to help the uncommitted peoples of the earth.

The President has announced, not once, but several times within the past 2 weeks, that the United States and the Soviet Union have the capacity to bring destruction, devastation, and death within 60 minutes to 300 million persons. The frank conviction of our constituents raises a most important question: Why, then, continue to add to the stockpile of nuclear, atomic, and other types of weaponry?

I bring to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who articulates these problems so well, the view that it is good for a Senator to be home for 5 days and to talk with people individually and in small groups, rather than to make addresses to audiences who must listen to us. I have learned once more of the concern of the people—our constituents—about expenditures on the far-flung fronts of the world and in outer space, while too little action is taken in Congress to meet the urgent, immediate, imperative problems at home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I found much the same reaction. If Senators do not learn when they are home for 5 days what the people are thinking about, they may learn to think at home for a long time.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to have the special attention of the assistant majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I shall not make a definitive statement, because I know it is not the kind of subject on which the Senator from Minnesota can give a view off the top of his head.

My question relates to the timing for the civil rights debate. I had not intended to address myself to that subject today, until I saw the confluence of a number of things: First, the expression by several Members of the Senate and Members of the House about the march of August 28 and what it really meant—and it meant a great deal. My own view is that it set the mood in the country; it gave a sense of urgency to the cause for civil rights legislation which, notwithstanding all the exigencies of the time, may not have been realized before the march took place.

The other factor is, of course, the new evidence of defiance of the United States by Governor Wallace, of Alabama, this time at Tuskegee, throwing himself against the carrying out of a court order by posting State troopers on a high school campus, which the New York Times quite properly calls a disgrace to America, which we take pride in describing as a government of law, and not of men. In Alabama, at least for the moment, it seems to be a government of one man—the man being Governor Wallace.

The third factor is the outbreak of disorder, such as the shameful outbreak at Folcroft, Pa., in an area of the North, with respect to the moving by a Negro family into a housing development.

I have felt very keenly—and I so expressed myself on the floor of the Senate on August 19—that it was extremely desirable and important to transfer, so far as could be done, the debate on civil rights from the streets of America to the Chambers of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and I expressed the belief that this could have a salutary effect on the country in terms of tranquillity and the feeling of citizens that we were moving along toward action.

In addition, I have the parliamentary concern that if civil rights legislation is left until the last, until the end of November or December, Senators who are interested will stay, but Senators who are not particularly interested will leave; and thus the opportunity will be frittered away, with the result that we shall have an emasculated bill which very largely will be attributable to the timing of its consideration.

This is my view. I state at once that a contrary view is just as sincerely held by some who, in my view, are as sincerely devoted as I am to the cause of the enactment of civil rights legislation. Certainly, in this connection I do not claim for myself any virtues which I would not attribute to others. Under the circumstances, I call attention to a colloquy I had with the majority leaders on August 19, in which I asked the majority leader—and this appears on page 15258 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—whether, when the public accommodations bill was reported by the Commerce Committee, he would promptly have it considered by the Senate. He then said no, that he could not give that assurance, because his idea—and in the colloquy he developed it—was that such a bill reported from the Commerce Committee would be utilized as on—and I use his word—"insurance"; and he said that a civil rights bill was unlikely to be reported by the Judiciary Committee, and that his best thought about the way to handle this matter was to wait for a bill from the other body, and to intercept it at the door, and to have it become the bill upon which we would work our will.

Mr. President, that view runs counter to the experience we had with civil rights legislation in 1957 and in 1960, in the sense that we started our debate and got into the subject before the House acted. The House action was a kind of final act in the drama which enabled us to drive to a conclusion, but it was extremely important to test the extent and character of the debate, the seriousness of a filibuster, and so forth, by starting at the earliest possible moment. So I wish to spread this question on the RECORD. Of course, knowing as I do the bona fides of Senators on the other side of the aisle, I do not ask the question in a challenging way, and I do not ask for a reply here and now. I realize that the assistant majority leader probably could not give it to me now, anyway.

But I put the question of record: Is it not right to ask that the question of timing be reconsidered, in view of what has occurred; and should not there again be a review of what I consider to be, and of what I believe others consider to be, the urgent reasons for an acceleration of the timing, so that, at the very least, the civil rights bill may be brought up for debate promptly upon the making of the report by the first committee which is likely to report it—which is the Commerce Committee of this body, in reporting the public accommodations part of the bill.

I point out that—according to a news report on the ticker today—the Senate Commerce Committee, so we are advised, reached "general agreement" on two proposed changes in President Kennedy's public accommodations bill, but put off until next week any actual voting. Obviously this committee is involved in this process, for its bill is in the markup stage, and it is most likely that the Commerce Committee will be the first of our committees to report such a bill. I understand that in the other body the Judiciary Committee may not report the omnibus bill quite as quickly as the Senate Commerce Committee will report its bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, again I raise the question, and hope an answer may be forthcoming from the majority leader as soon as he is able to give consideration to it, which I hope will be promptly and at once. Is it not right to review again the timetable which the majority leader outlined, which is based upon intercepting the House civil rights bill when it comes over here, which may not be, so far as we can see now, until October, or perhaps even later—although I hope and pray that may not be the case. Is it not right to review that timetable, with a view to evaluating most seriously the suggestion which I made then, and which I repeat now—namely, that we proceed, in the national interest, with the civil rights debate as soon as the Commerce Committee has reported the public accommodations bill?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague in regard to the scheduling of civil rights legislation. The history of previous Congresses shows that a program of putting off the consideration of civil rights until it is one of the last, if not the last, item on the agenda, has been proved to be a program of tokenism. Members of Congress begin to be desirous of leaving; and the determination of many to face up to the problem—which exists earlier in the session—begins to evaporate.

There is every expectation—we must view this matter realistically—that there will be a filibuster against civil rights, and that cloture will have to be invoked. The invoking of cloture under the present rules of the Senate will not be an easy task but it can be accomplished if Senators on both sides of the aisle who favor the enactment of civil rights legislation will exhibit to the same degree the determination and fortitude which has been evidenced by Senators who are opposed to the enactment of civil rights legislation.

However, if the leadership postpones the debate and gives civil rights a low priority in the legislative calendar we shall invite difficulty and build up pressure for compromising the major provisions of the proposed legislation. This would be a regrettable situation under any circumstances but particularly so in these times of tension and crisis. Indeed it would be tragic if the final result of our efforts were to be the passage of a bill which did not adequately meet the No. 1 domestic problem confronting the Nation.

Therefore, I join my colleague in urging that the majority leader give consideration to bringing this matter before us as soon as the Commerce Committee has reported its bill. I understand this

Committee will be able to report a bill in the relatively near future. There is no reason for not using this bill as the vehicle for the consideration of this whole subject of civil rights. I would strongly urge that such a procedure be followed, rather than to mark time and to wait until we receive a bill from the other body. Such a bill may or may not be adequate, but great pressures would be placed upon Senators to accept that bill, without making any changes whatever, and those of us who wish to have meaningful civil rights legislation enacted will be told that we must not tinker in any way with the bill, for fear that to do so would be to interfere with the eventual enactment of civil rights legislation.

The Senator from New York has performed a service in keeping at this question, in order that we may have a meaningful, and not a token, civil rights measure. As a result of our work in this session, I hope we shall not have a measure with merely the label of "civil rights," but a really meaningful law to advance the cause of legal opportunity and equal justice.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague for joining with me in respect to this call for reevaluation of the timetable.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Disgracing America" published in the New York Times, of September 3, may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISGRACING AMERICA

Shame and indignation must be the reaction to recent events showing the disgraceful lengths to which some opponents of Negro equality in this country will go. In Tuskegee, Ala., armed and steel-helmeted State troopers acting under Governor Wallace's orders surrounded a school to prevent the admission, required by Federal court decree, of 13 Negro children; the school board has properly defied him, leaving the situation in confusion. In Plaquemine, La., Saturday night—when no court prohibition against demonstrations was in effect—mounted State troopers, electric cattle prodders in hand, rode headlong into a crowd of Negro demonstrators, trampling children in the process. And here in the North, in a community 5 miles from Philadelphia, a howling mob of whites rioted, threw rocks, and inflicted property damage for 2 consecutive days in an effort to stop a Negro family from moving into a housing development. But in this last case, happily, the forces of law and order were on the side of the Negroes trying to exercise their legal rights.

We know that in contrast to these scattered incidents, many examples might be cited of recent orderly progress by Negroes, in cooperation with whites, toward greater equality. But every case in which force and violence—or the threat of such force and violence—are used against Negroes seeking to exercise the rights of free citizens in a democracy represents a stain upon America. It is also a potential danger, for violence invites counterviolence.

Less than a week ago some 200,000 demonstrators, most of them Negroes, marched to Washington to exercise their constitutional rights of petition. Refuting some predictions of unimaginable violence, it was a law-abiding and inspiring demonstration. The example of restraint and respect for constitutional processes contrasts strongly indeed with the spirit shown in the cases cited above. It will prevail finally in the cause of justice.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the replies of the majority leader on the question of timing made in the colloquy of August 19 may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the replies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I would not give that assurance, because frankly, that bill should be used as insurance.

I would not like to bring a bill to the floor of the Senate and see it amended to death. I would rather wait for a bill from the House which is a whole bill and, if necessary, meet it at the door, put it on the calendar, and then consider the whole spectrum rather than a part of it. I would assume that a bill passed by the House would have some kind of public accommodations proposal in it.

* * * * *

Therefore, on the basis of the two possibilities, the leadership must, in its judgment, do what it thinks best so that if at all possible a good and as whole a civil rights bill as possible, rather than a fragmentary portion, can be brought to the Senate for consideration, debate, and disposition.

Mr. JAVITS. I invite attention to the fact that, according to the latest press information, the Tuskegee high school is still closed by order of Governor Wallace, notwithstanding a court order, and notwithstanding the demand of the board of education.

Legislation may not open that school. But legislation and the effort to obtain legislation will certainly move in that direction, as one of the sections of the civil rights package of the President would give the Attorney General the right to sue in school desegregation cases.

If Governor Wallace were facing the Attorney General of the United States, as he may still be facing him perhaps later today or tomorrow, we might have a very different situation. In any case, what the country is going through demands more urgent action than is now contemplated in the Senate. Without claiming for myself a virtue which others possess in at least as high a degree as I do, in connection with an interest in proposed civil rights legislation, I only lay before Senators these new developments, which in my view dictate a reevaluation of the timetable as outlined by the majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recognize the deep concern that the two Senators from New York have over the problems of civil rights and the necessity for effective and prompt action. I say to those Senators that the responsibility for scheduling proposed legislation rests with the majority. I cannot speak for the majority leader today or for the policy committee of the majority, which is now in session. But, as the assistant majority leader, I can say that the Senate will take up the President's civil rights program in full. We will not engage in tokenism. We will not be a part of any action that fritters away an effective program or that seeks to pass an emasculated bill. I mention the terms "fritter away," and an "emasculated bill" and "tokenism," because they were used on the other side of the aisle by the Senator from New York.

Certain Senators on this side of the aisle believe that the best way to obtain effective civil rights legislation, and not merely debate civil rights legislation, is to await the action of the House of Representatives, which has a record of producing strong, effective, and comprehensive civil rights programs. When that program moves to this body after House action, it should be placed on the calendar immediately by intercepting the House bill, or it might be sent to committee with a date certain for a report back to the Senate. Precedent has been established for such action.

We recognize the urgency of the problem. So does the Kennedy administration. The headlines that appear in today's issue of the Washington News are "'U.S. Troops Set To Force Birmingham School Integration."

The Attorney General is on the job. The officials of the Department of Justice are on the job. Court orders are being obtained. Court orders will be enforced. The Attorney General of the United States already has the Supreme Court decision. He intends to see that it is enforced. But he also would like to see the local authorities bring to bear upon these problems their sense of good judgment and responsibility with respect to the Constitution of the United States.

I assure Senators on both sides of the aisle that when civil rights legislation is ready to be acted upon in this body, it will be acted upon with determination.

Senators need not worry about any tokenism, because in any event, we shall not get away until Christmas. Senators might just as well plan on a full year in the Senate. If we have not finished the proposed legislation by the end of December, it will be taken up in January. There is no doubt about this. Other proposed legislation is also a part of the civil rights program. The bill now before the Senate relates to the training of unskilled people. Many of the unskilled people who are deeply affected are unskilled American Negro citizens.

The bill is before the Senate. But, Mr. President, for the Senate to hop, skip, and jump around on the basic civil rights program presented by the President title by title and article by article would be to indulge in a constant battle that would last for months and produce little, if anything. We propose to take up the basic civil rights program exclusive of its educational feature. We intend to take it up at one time and fight it out once and for all. For those who are worried that some of us may not be around or will lose our enthusiasm for the program, I suggest that we can lose enthusiasm in September just as well as in December. Enthusiasm is not related to the calendar. Enthusiasm is related to one's personality and sense of conviction. It surely has nothing to do with the time that we might bring up a piece of legislation.

I repeat that the civil rights program will be acted upon. It will be acted upon affirmatively and decisively for the attainment of comprehensive legislation. There will be no backing down or running away. If need be, the process of physical attrition will have to be engaged in in this body, with all-night sessions. We will act.

But, in the meantime, we have other things to do. We need education programs. We need tax legislation. We need legislation for the training of workers. Those items are all a part of the total challenge of civil rights. We can legislate fair employment practices, but if there are no jobs, there is little to be fair about. We need jobs. In short, a healthy economy is essential to equal employment opportunity. Make no mistake about it.

I can speak only for myself as a member of the policy committee and a member of the majority. But I can speak affirmatively and with strong advocacy and conviction. The people in New York, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Colorado, or any other State whose Senators may momentarily be present in the Chamber can rest assured that there will be legislation. All Senators need to do is to be present, to argue for it, and to vote for it. They should stand up and be counted. This Senator intends to do just that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. No one respects more than I the sincerity of the Senator from Minnesota; and that also goes for the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. JAVITS. I only wish to leave two points with the Senate in this colloquy. First, just as it is the responsibility of the majority to set a program, so it is the responsibility of the minority, if it feels keenly about it, to endeavor to accelerate that program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. That is our duty, as it relates to the duty of the majority.

Second, I am inclined to agree with the Senator that the issue of enthusiasm, real as it may be, and of Senators remaining in the Chamber, is the lesser of the issues.

I hope that as the policy committee on the majority side and the majority leadership evaluate this question they will evaluate it substantively with respect to public tranquillity and public order. I am deeply concerned, and I think with great justification, based upon what we see almost every day, in developments in this field, that when we defer debating civil rights on the Senate floor, we defer it at the peril of something worse happening to us in this field than has happened so far.

It is our duty, in the minority, as we read these signs in the sky, to do our utmost to accelerate the timetable of the majority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I see the same signs in the sky. I recognize the urgency of the situation. But I also recognize that if we wish to pass legislation in this body we must face the realities of the political situation existing in the two Houses of the Congress.

It is the considered judgment of the senior Senator from Minnesota that the best way to pass a civil rights program is first to permit the House of Representatives to act, to pass a bill and send it to the Senate—and then to have one battle on the major issues of the comprehensive civil rights program. We can take it up in the Senate and stay here and fight it out. We will fight it out.

I venture to say that on this side of the aisle there will be as many Senators standing firm as on the other side—or even more—and I hope there may be as many on the other side as on this side. It must not be a partisan matter. We will pass civil rights legislation. Let the word go out.

I shall have something to say about this legislation, because I shall be present and shall exercise leadership in this matter. I have been engaging in the civil rights struggle ever since I came into public life. I intend to see its fulfillment, its achievement, in this year—1963.

If it can be done in September, "hurray." If it can be done in October, two "hurrays." If it can be in November, three "hurrahs." But if in December, it will be the best Christmas present America has ever had.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to say "hallelujah."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his spiritual reference.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional members of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be accorded the privilege of the floor during the debate on the bill, S. 1716, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today morning business was concluded at approximately 15 minutes after 12 o'clock. It is now 2:30. During the ensuing 2 hours and 15 minutes able and distinguished Senators with unrivaled oratory have regaled a near-empty Chamber with orations and speeches on matters of great importance having nothing whatever to do with the bill before the Senate. This 2 hours and 15 minutes nongermane and irrelevant lapse I think demonstrates the important need for changing the rules of the Senate so that once important proposed legislation comes before this body we can pursue it until it is voted on one way or another.

I was about to proceed to discuss the pending bill, S. 1716, of which I have the honor to be floor manager, but I have been asked by the able minority leader to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Senators may be notified that finally the Senate is about to get down to business.

So, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who is in charge on the Republican side temporarily, has requested that the quorum call be allowed to proceed a little further.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator cannot reserve an objection. He must object or refrain from objecting.

Mr. MORSE. I plan to make a speech. I doubt very much that Senators will want to hear it.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator tell me how long it will take?

Mr. MORSE. It will be one of my briefer ones.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate will be in order. Senators cannot debate during a quorum call.

Is there objection to the request that the order for the quorum call be rescinded? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONDITIONS ON TAIWAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in a timely and informative article in the current issue of Harper's magazine, the former bureau chief of the United Press International in Taiwan has disclosed some pertinent information about conditions on that island.

I recommend this article by Mr. Albert Axelbank to everyone who has any interest at all in the American foreign aid program and in U.S. policy in the Far East. It is entitled "Chiang Kai-shek's Silent Enemies."

Mr. Axelbank depicts in all its ugly ramifications the details of the military dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek over the territory and the people of Taiwan.

How many Americans are aware, for example, that Chiang's remnant Chinese army has ruled Taiwan by martial law ever since it arrived in 1949?

How many Americans are aware that the huge military aid program we maintain for what we call Free China also maintains the military government on Taiwan, and has enabled Chiang's handpicked generals to play the dual role of military commanders and top officials of the Kuomintang Party?

How many Americans know that their military aid program enables Chiang's soldiers to rig and control elections?

How many Americans know that, while Taiwanese make up about 75 percent of

Chiang's Army, virtually all its top ranking officers are Chinese, that half of this army is stationed on the offshore islands of Kuemoy and Matsu as much to keep these men away from home as for any other reason, and that the Taiwanese soldiers on Taiwan itself are not issued live ammunition?

How many Americans know that the very country of Taiwan, which is being touted as an exhibit of the usefulness of our foreign aid program, had a literacy rate of 80 percent and a relatively high rate of industrial production before the Chinese ever arrived and before our aid program got under way?

These are some of the points covered by Mr. Axelbank. I am interested in his report that American military observers consider our military aid program there to have been worthwhile, because Chiang's army, navy, and air force are considered to be effective fighting units.

But whom they might fight does not seem to be of much interest to military observers. The conclusion I draw from Mr. Axelbank's article is that the demise of Chiang Kai-shek is going to bring a struggle for power on the island of Taiwan; that the military dictatorship we have built up there will last only as long as it can maintain its rule by force; that when the present generation of Chinese militarists passes from the scene, the people of Taiwan may well realize a modicum of self-rule; and that when that day comes, the United States may not be well remembered for the tyranny we foisted on these people.

Let us not forget that the native Formosans never had a word to say about the imposition of a U.S. puppet over them, which we have maintained these long years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In speaking of the possible passing of the present generation, would the Senator from Oregon advise the Senate of the age of Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know his exact age, but I know he is well over 70.

In short, we shall eventually face the same specter in Taiwan that we are now facing in South Vietnam.

The senior Senator from Oregon will always point with pride to the fact that he was against going into South Vietnam. I am against staying in. In my judgment, we should never have gone in alone. We should never have tried to pick up the failures of France in South Vietnam. Unless other free nations of the world wanted to go in with us, we should never have gone in. In my judgment, the loss of American blood in South Vietnam cannot be tolerated any longer. We had better have a showdown with our allies as to whether or not they are willing to go into South Vietnam with us. If they are not, we should get out. It is just that clear to the senior Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S SILENT ENEMIES

(By Albert Axelbank)

Behind the mask of a benevolent, freedom-loving Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa, there exists today an unpopular, elite party dictatorship that rules the island with an iron hand. In the guise of "Mobilization for counterattack against Communist China," the regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has trampled upon basic human rights and stifled free political expression. Under the cloak of "national emergency," it has waged a campaign of police terror.

As a result, Chiang's Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) government has alienated the overwhelming majority of Formosa's native-born citizens, who comprise 80 percent of the island's 11 million people.

This potentially explosive situation has not, unfortunately, received the publicity it deserves. For one thing, the Nationalists' press control has kept from the public eye many of the excesses of this autocratic regime. Paid propagandists have also painted a distorted image of Formosa as a democratic nation. Meanwhile, the world knows little about the Formosans' longing for independence, of their pent-up hatred for the Chiang government, or their fear to speak and write what they really think.

From late 1960 till the middle of 1962 I was the bureau manager on Formosa for United Press International and I watched a steady flow of repressive acts directed against the population by the Nationalist Government. I traveled widely over the island and spoke to hundreds of Formosans, including city mayors, provincial officials, merchants, doctors, soldiers, teachers, farmers, and pedicab drivers. Usually I took with me a Japanese interpreter since most of the Formosans preferred to speak Japanese although a few had received degrees at American universities and spoke fluent English.

Formosan disenchantment with Nationalist rule dates back to the end of World War II, when they hoped the island would be given equality with the other Chinese provinces. Instead, the Chinese looked upon Formosa as a conquered territory. Fifty years of harsh Japanese control—from 1895 to 1945—had molded the lives and personalities of Formosans. They were a law-abiding peaceable people, about half of whom spent their lives wading knee-deep in rice paddies. They had disliked their colonial status under Japan but they learned they could put their trust in Japanese law. Formosans spoke Japanese and many leading citizens had received their higher education in Japan.

Formosans also spoke South Fukien dialects, far different from the present official Mandarin of the Nationalist regime. Although most of their ancestors came from China in the 15th and 16th centuries A.D., they had lost much of their identification with the Chinese. One hundred miles of water between Formosa and China had insulated them from events on the mainland; in addition, Chinese control of Formosa—before the island was ceded to Japan in 1895 as a result of the Sino-Japanese War—had never been very effective. I have often started to address a group of Formosans as "You Chinese * * *" only to be pointedly told: "We are Taiwanese, not Chinese." (Taiwanese is the Japanese as well as Chinese name for Formosans.) There is, incidentally, very little intermarriage today between mainlanders—as the Chinese are called—and Formosans. Not long ago I heard a Formosan student say in a journalism class: "If I married a Chinese girl, my mother would lock me out of her house."

A RETREAT INTO BOUNTY

Formosa was handed over to China under the terms of the Cairo Declaration of 1943 (signed by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang). It stated that "all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China." When Japan surrendered, the Generalissimo's armies took control of Formosa. (However, the island's present status is ill defined. Is Formosa Chinese soil? Both Nationalist and Communist China say an emphatic "yes." But the Japanese Peace Treaty of 1951 is vague on this point. And virtually every American statement about Formosa's status since the Korean war—when the U.S. 7th Fleet neutralized the island—has been ambiguous. It appears that in order to counter Peiping's rabid claims to the island, America and its allies have purposely left the door open to other claims that Formosa may not be Chinese after all. If this is proved, perhaps by future establishment of an independent Formosa, then Peiping's claims might be voided—at least, say some observers, to the satisfaction of a majority of the United Nations.)

When Chiang's forces came to Formosa at the war's end, they found a standard of living much higher than they knew on the mainland: excellent roads, a good railway system, and numerous well-constructed buildings, many of which house Nationalist Government offices today. The island produced bountiful crops of rice, sugarcane, pineapples, bananas, citrus fruits, and tea. There was also a good industrial base with factories capable of manufacturing such things as cement, steel, aluminum, and refined petroleum. Moreover, the people's literacy rate of about 80 percent was, after Japan's, the highest in Asia.

Onto this richly endowed island came large numbers of carpetbaggers as well as corrupt and ruthless administrators from the mainland who exploited Formosa and cruelly treated its people. Chinese troops pillaged, raped, and murdered almost at will. Formosan rage finally exploded on February 28, 1947, after police beat to death a woman who allegedly sold untaxed cigarettes. The incident touched off islandwide demonstrations; the people demanded governmental reforms. To quell the unrest, Chinese soldiers wantonly shot or bayoneted to death an estimated 10,000 Formosans.

Because the Chinese mainland was convulsed in civil war, news of the massacre—reported by a few foreign journalists on the spot—received little world attention. The incident, however, has become engraved upon the memory of nearly every adult Formosan. They refer to it in private conversations as the "2–28 incident."

Two years later, Chiang suffered a headlong defeat on the mainland and fled with some 2 million Chinese refugees to Formosa. Martial law was declared—it's still in effect today—and many provisions of the Chinese Constitution of 1947 were brushed aside by Chiang's handpicked legislators and national assemblymen during the time of the Communist rebellion.

The influx of so many refugees almost overnight naturally added to the resentment of the Formosans. Jobs were scarce, food prices soared, and taxes were boosted to help support the military establishment of more than half a million men. Chiang might optimistically declare that existing hardships would be erased as soon as the "counterattack" was launched. But Formosans believed they were being tricked into accepting indefinitely an inferior status.

They were right. Today, 14 years after Chiang retreated to the island, Formosans still play a microscopic role in national affairs. The Chinese have justified this inequity by insisting that their Nationalist Government represents all of China, not just Formosa. They have accordingly set up the full apparatus of a Chinese National Government on the island—frequently overlapping the local and provincial governments—and they have staffed it chiefly with mainlanders.

Thus, in the 1,500-man National Assembly—it elects the President and Vice President and amends the Constitution—there are fewer than 40 Formosans. In the Legislative Yuan (Parliament) of over 500 members, no more than 2 dozen are Formosans. There is only one Formosan in the Cabinet—the Minister of the Interior. There are no Formosa-born ambassadors. And in the 600,000-man military today—of which Formosans provide more than 75 percent of the ground troops—the number of Formosan officers above the rank of colonel can be counted on both hands despite the existence of nearly 1,000 generals and admirals. In many police units, such as the Peace Preservation Corps of the Formosa Garrison Command, Formosans are almost nonexistent.

Since the United States gives tacit support to the thesis that this government legitimately represents China, the present situation on Formosa is likely to persist for some time. Nationalist officials have also argued that Formosans lack people qualified for top-level jobs in the Government, whereas many of the mainlanders are well educated and thus well fitted for their present posts. Formosans angrily contest the validity of this argument.

One prominent Formosan told me: "If the emerging African nations can provide their own leadership, don't you think that we can? Nearly all Formosans can read and write; thousands have political and administrative experience of 20 years or more. And an ever-growing number are university graduates. The Nationalists know that if they did permit equality of opportunity it would mean their eventual doom, since the Formosans are the vast majority."

Under American prodding to "broaden the base" of the Government, the Kuomintang has brought some Formosans into the National Government as well as the ruling party. But many Formosans view these handpicked Formosans with contempt. In fact, they have coined the derogatory term "half mountain people" to describe them. This means they are only "half" Formosan. These people went to China during World War II, where they worked for the Chiang government, and returned to Formosa at the war's end to accept its favors. These are the Formosans—virtually all of them Kuomintang members—whom the Nationalist Government points out to foreign visitors.

MILITARY AND PARTY BRASS

To cement his rule on Formosa, the Generalissimo has made effective use of the army and the secret police as well as the ruling Kuomintang Party.

Now 75 years old, Chiang has entrusted the control of the secret police to his stocky, reticent, eldest son, Gen. Chiang Ching-kuo. It is for this reason that young Chiang is sometimes called the regime's "hatchet man." In his youth he attended the Soviet Military and Political Institute. Today, at 52, he has his hand in just about every important organization on Formosa—from the mass Youth Corps to the Retired Veterans' Organization.

But Ching-kuo is best known because of his control over the secret and public police. On an island less than one-third the size of New York State, there are these known police agencies: Peace Preservation Police, National Security Police, Foreign Affairs Police, Military Police, Central Intelligence Police, Special Affairs Police, in addition to provincial and other local police. Their chiefs take orders from Ching-kuo.

Many of the ranking generals in Chiang's army are also the personal appointees of Ching-kuo. Almost all of them are the trusted lieutenants of the Generalissimo. For example, the Chief of the Armed Forces General Staff is Gen. Peng Meng-chi, a high Kuomintang official as well as a close personal friend of President Chiang. Another key general is the Generalissimo's dapper youngest son, Chiang Wego. At 47, he commands the army's armored corps and frequently participates in military exercises for the benefit of visiting American military brass.

Army generals, as a matter of fact, fill many of the ranking positions of the Kuomintang. The Generalissimo is, of course, the director-general of the party; Vice President Chen Cheng is the deputy director-general (he's also a full army general); and Chiang Ching-kuo and Peng Meng-chi, both full generals, are members of the ruling party's powerful central committee. The Kuomintang has been the vehicle of power for Chiang Kai-shek for over 35 years.

Because the top Government officials from President Chiang on down are mostly ranking Kuomintang members, it is often impossible to distinguish between the Government and the ruling party. Also, within the party are various offices that deal with almost every facet of daily life, including the press, public security, and education. The national anthem is actually the song of the Kuomintang. Formosans are bombarded with party propaganda, and in the schools and universities, the tenets of the Kuomintang are required study.

However, the Formosans are most bitter about the ruling party's fraudulent election practices. For instance, during the last local elections in Kaohsiung City, 100 citizens showed up at a polling booth only to find there were no ballots left; hired thugs had stuffed a total of 1,600 ballots into the box and used up all the printed ballots.

When Henry Yu-shu Kao, a well-known Formosan engineer, beat the Kuomintang candidate for mayor of Taipei in 1954, he surprised nearly everyone. But when Kao ran again, on an independent ticket, the election was rigged against him. It was discovered for instance that 10,000 votes for Kao had been voided because the ink on them had smudged. Nationalist soldiers were brought into the city to vote despite a law which said eligible voters had to live within the city for at least 6 months. And neutral observers were barred from watching the ballot counting. Such incidents are common.

Not surprisingly, the ruling party tightly controls the Formosa Provincial Government, as well as the city and county councils, the mayors and magistrates. And under the pretext of "national emergency" the National Government has stripped from the people some of the local voting rights granted them under the Constitution. The Constitution says the governor, provincial council, and provincial assembly will be popularly elected. But Chiang himself has appointed every Formosa governor—and all of them have been mainlanders, usually army generals. Recently Chiang chose as governor, Gen. Huang Chieh, a former army commander in chief who is a ranking Kuomintang official. He is also the former chief of the Formosa Garrison Command, an organization that has put fear into the hearts of many Formosans.

The Nationalist Government also appoints the provincial council, leaving only the assembly to be elected by the people. Yet any measures the assembly adopts may be deemed against the "national interest" and vetoed by the Judicial Yuan (High Court). Although the 77 assemblymen are virtually all Formosans, 54 of them are Kuomintang members. Nevertheless, many of the latter have confessed to me how tightly their hands are tied "from above." One well-known assemblyman, a Kuomintang member, once told me in a hushed voice as we sat in his office: "We are all puppets and the Kuomintang pulls the strings." For him, there is only one solution to the island's ills: the natural deaths of all the present old guard of the party and Government. "No matter how rigged an election," he said, "you can't elect dead men."

I recall one incident in the latter part of 1961 that showed the "rubber stamp" nature of the provincial assembly. The provincial budget bill was up for passage and some assemblymen pointed out that not a single figure was cited. Speaker Huang Chao-chin, an affable cigar-chewing member of the Kuomintang with a master's degree from the University of Illinois, apologized: "This won't happen again, I assure you." But he explained that the National Government wanted the bill adopted quickly and with a minimum of debate. It was.

A Kuomintang-affiliated mayor told me the military "milked" 80 percent of his city's budget. He said he had hardly any authority in his own city's affairs. "I'm helpless, I'm suffering," he lamented.

KEEPING THE OPPOSITION

The Government wields much more severe control over non-Kuomintang politicians. These include a handful of independents as well as members of the tiny majority parties—the Young China and the Democratic Socialists. They are known, euphemistically, as "the opposition." But the Nationalist Government has never allowed the minority parties to grow into healthy political organisms. While they have been torn by factionalism and lack strong leadership many of their members have blamed this enfeeblement on the Kuomintang, which has infiltrated their ranks so that they don't even know many of their fellow members.

The Young China Party was formed in Paris by a group of Chinese students in 1923, while the Democratic Socialists were organized in Shanghai in 1946. Each seeks a liberal interpretation of the Constitution and the protection of human rights; the Democratic Socialists also want to see China become a socialist state. Today, each has an active membership of around 300 (the Kuomintang claims 600,000), most of whom are mainland Chinese. To keep them alive, though ineffectual, the Kuomintang has often provided each with anti-Communist subsidies, for they serve as window dressing for Nationalist China's democratic facade.

The Government's suppression of both parties was clearly shown in January 1962, when club-swinging agents of the Formosa Garrison Command in mufti, broke up a general meeting of the Democratic Socialist Party. Police agents also disrupted an anniversary meeting of the Young China Party. Exasperated, a dozen or so Democratic Socialists proposed that "our party headquarters be moved to the United States in order to uphold the integrity of our party."

Non-Kuomintang, or opposition politicians, even if they are lucky enough to be elected provincial assemblymen or city councilmen, face almost daily harassment by the police; wires may be tapped, letters intercepted. They dare not associate intimately with foreigners—particularly Americans—for fear of police reprisals. When I interviewed a handful of Formosan opposition leaders last year in Taichung, central Formosa, the capital of the provincial government, I was stunned to see these provincial assemblymen search behind the curtains for hidden microphones. "Please don't mention our names," they begged, "or we'll surely be arrested." (Later, I learned that police questioned at least two of them after I left.)

When I visited the home of a noted Formosan opposition provincial assemblyman, he turned up the volume of his radio "so that police won't be able to tape-record our conversation." He told me: "I sleep with two suitcases near my bed every night. In one bag I've packed things I'll need if police come to arrest me and I have time to escape; the other's filled with some personal items if the police toss me in jail."

A FEW VERY BRAVE MEN

During the summer of 1960, about 70 Formosan political and business leaders plus a few mainlanders challenged the Kuomintang by announcing their intention to form a new political party, to be called the China Democrats. The new opposition party, said its leaders, would "bridge the gap which exists between Formosans and mainlanders." Its platform called for: (1) Free and fair elections with supervision of balloting by neutral teams, (2) more opportunities for Formosans at the higher levels of government and military, (3) free speech and freedom of the press, (4) freedom to engage in lawful political activity, (5) freedom from arbitrary arrest, (6) lifting of the martial law.

The chief leaders were some of the island's best known political personalities.

There was the Formosan Henry Yu-shu Kao, the urbane ex-mayor of Taipei who had been manager of the Taipei Chamber of Commerce and was one of the most popular men on the island. Li Wan-chu, another Formosan, was a distinguished, French-educated provincial assemblyman as well as publisher of the newspaper, Kung Lun Pao. For many years he had been a respected deputy speaker of the assembly, but at 62, he was a sick man, suffering from gout and diabetes. Another key man was magazine publisher Lei Chen, a mainlander who had formerly been a member of the Kuomintang but was expelled, reputedly because of his liberal views. His Free China Fortnightly was outspokenly critical of the Nationalist Government.

There was some speculation that the U.S. State Department considered the new party movement a possible alternative to the present regime. But no proof of this exists. In any case, one private American organization—Asia Foundation—had subsidized Lei's magazine, and the U.S. Information Service in Taipei subscribed to more than 100 copies. Afterward, when Lei was imprisoned and the new party foundered, American Embassy officials privately expressed keen disappointment.

The Formosa Garrison Command quickly pounced upon the new party. On September 4, 1960, Lei Chen was arrested on charges of sedition and, astonishingly, harboring a Communist agent. Simultaneously, police seized all of the new party's documents. At a 1-day military court-martial, the balding, scholarly Lei was meted a 10-year prison term.

On the same day he was arrested, a court summons was served against Li Wan-chu, charging him with fraud in a housing construction deal. Henry Kao also was served (the same day) with three summonses, charging him with malpractice in office and burglary while mayor of Taipei 4 years previously. "With these charges," Kao said, "the Goverment has a noose around my neck which it can tighten whenever it wants to." In 1962, the police accused Kao's physician-wife of performing illegal abortions, apparently to continue the harassment of Kao and his family.

After Lei's imprisonment, at a military jail outside of Taipei, many Chinese scholars appealed to the Generalissimo to pardon him but to no avail. A mainland-born writer named Hsu I-chun visited Lei and wrote this description of Lei's prison life for the Democratic China magazine: "His cell is adjacent to the prison's toilet and in summer the stinking smell is so strong as to make breathing difficult. What is worse, his cell is incessantly invaded by swarms of flies from the neighboring toilet. In fact, Lei's daily exercise is swatting flies."

During 1961 and 1962 the Nationalist Government continued its crackdown against the China Democratic Party. One well-known Formosan arrested was Su Tung-chi, an outspoken councilman from Yunlin, central Formosa, who had been elected four times since 1945. The charges against him ("plotting rebellious acts against the Government") appeared spurious; his arrest was, to many observers, an obvious reprisal for his recruiting activity. Moreover, Su had recently sponsored a strong resolution calling for a Presidential pardon of Lei Chen. It was adopted even though the Yunlin Council is dominated by Formosan Kuomintang members. Obviously, the Government disliked an opposition leader with so much influence.

Su's wife, the mother of six small children, also was arrested for the fourth time in 90 days. She was charged with "failure to inform the police" of her husband's allegedly subversive activities. Outraged by her arrest, mainlander Hsu I-chun protested against the Government's "infringement on the human rights of this poor, helpless woman." He warned, in an article in Democratic China, that "the people will not forever stand idly by and tolerate such unconstitutional practices." A few days after the article appeared, Hsu was kidnaped by secret police.

I revisited Formosa for a few days in July of this year and learned that Mrs. Su was still in jail. Hsu was being held incommunicado at a camp for political prisoners.

At the time that Su and his wife were arrested, well-informed sources told me that hundreds of other Formosans were rounded up by police because of their connections with the new party. The Formosa garrison command admitted to me that 60 Formosans had been arrested at that time for subversion.

Coinciding with the Government's suppression of the new party movement was an assault against the few remaining newspapers and magazines that were not strictly Kuomintang-controlled. Lei Chen's Free China Fortnightly was suspended indefinitely. Another magazine, the Humanist Monthly, was ordered suspended for 12 months for criticizing what it called the Government's political harassment of the new party leaders. Almost at the same time, a court sequestration order was issued against Li-Wanchu's Kung Lun Pao, charging Li with mismanagement of the paper. Within a few months the paper was grabbed up by Kuomintang interests. It was the sole surviving independent newspaper owned by a Formosan.

I am often asked if I was subject to censorship by the Nationalist Government. No, not directly. But the constant pressure which the Government put on Chinese nationals working as reporters for foreign newspapers, news agencies, and magazines certainly affected their news-gathering abilities. Within the past few years prominent Chinese newsmen who work for two large foreign news agencies have either been detained by police themselves or had members of their family arrested.

PROSPERITY DEVOURED

However dishonorable may be the Nationalist Government's political record on Formosa, the Chiang regime must nonetheless be credited with some notable economic achievements. Perhaps the most striking example of success in this field has been the land-reform program, which was accomplished with the help of American advisers. Even violently anti-Kuomintang Formosans have kind words to say about it.

In 1949 only one-fourth of all Formosan farmers owned their own land. Many had to pay rents as high as 60 or 70 percent of their crop. After reforms, these rents were cut to a maximum of 37.5 percent; and the number of owner-farmers rose from about 210,000 to 470,000 in 10 years.

Agricultural production has also risen about 40 percent in the past 10 years, while industrial output has climbed 180 percent. An accelerated economic development plan, currently underway, aims to make the island entirely self-sufficient in from 5 to 10 years. But a rising population, land scarcity, and a staggering defense burden make such a goal appear unrealistic. Moreover, Nationalist officials disclosed early this year that the island was no longer self-sufficient even in staple food.

If land reform aided the farmers, excessive Government demands in the form of taxes have to a large extent negated these gains. At the end of 1961, for instance, the Government-controlled press admitted that increased defense taxes on the farmer had actually lowered his standard of living to almost what it was 10 years before.

To support Chiang's military establishment, which devours over 80 percent of the Government's budget, the United States pumps into the island about $120 million annually in loans, grants, and food surpluses—much of this is listed as defense support—in addition to about $90 million a year as strictly military aid. Since 1950, American aid to Chiang has totaled slightly more than $3 billion.

Last year, to help meet its defense costs, the Government levied a highly unpopular 30-percent counterattack surtax. Formosans were irked not only because the tax hit their pocketbooks, but also because the tax was OK'd by the Legislative Yuan (which passed it in 10 minutes) where the number of Formosan Members is about 5 percent of the total.

Despite the high cost of American aid to Formosa, our military men say the money is well spent. They regard the island as a vital strategic link in our Far Eastern defense perimeter. They also rate Chiang's Army, Navy, and Air Force as very effective fighting units. More and more, however, they are voicing apprehension over the island's future, particularly over the question of who will succeed the Generalissimo when he dies; and what will happen if the Formosans take over. (One ranking U.S. naval officer told me: "I want to be miles away from this island when Chiang dies.")

WHO WILL FOLLOW CHIANG?

Chiang, meanwhile, shows few signs that he will soon step down from his pinnacle of power. Though in advanced years (he'll be 76 on October 31), he still gives innumerable audiences to visiting dignitaries. Foreign guests are usually impressed with his benign smile, his almost cherubic appearance. With him at these receptions are usually his wife, Madame Chiang, or other top, Western-educated officials, who interpret for him. He can, however, lose his temper if things don't go his way. And many times, he scolds his Ministers and other high officials of his government as if they were errant schoolboys.

Speculation about Chiang's successor usually centers on two possibilities: (1) Vice President Chen Cheng will be the next Nationalist President (and party leader) under the Constitution. But Chen, at 66, is in frail health. Last year he was hospitalized for almost 4 months for various internal disorders. But if he felt strong enough to assume Nationalist leadership, many foreign observers say he would be a more liberal ruler than Chiang. (2) Chiang's son, Ching-kuo, will inherit his father's mantle of power. I believe that if this occurred, Ching-kuo would prefer to remain behind the scenes as the regime's strong man.

Whether Chen or Ching-kuo takes over the government in the future, it is certain that he will faithfully hold aloft the banner of counterattack against the Chinese Communist regime. Many Nationalist officials maintain that this slogan will have positive meaning so long as there is hostility between the United States and Communist China. The Nationalists realize they do not have the ability to launch any invasion by themselves; but war—or the threat of war—nourishes their regime.

Two other possibilities, often discussed in connection with the future, concern, first a deal between Taipei and Peiping, and, second, a revolt by the Formosans. Both appear to be very remote. The Nationalists and the Communists have discredited all talk of a deal. Chiang and his followers are traitors in the eyes of Peiping. But such a possibility can never be entirely ignored. Does this mean that Nationalist China is an unreliable ally? Only, I believe, to the extent that it chooses to act unilaterally, without consulting the United States. However, U.S. military commanders on Formosa are confident this won't happen.

If Formosans were to stage an organized rebellion tomorrow, it's likely that it would be crushed. Most Formosans believe that Chiang's police agencies, including the military police, can effectively control the 9 million Formosans. Today, seven or more Formosans cannot gather together in public—under the martial law—without first asking police permission. Nevertheless, there is some fear expressed that a spontaneous uprising, such as the "2-28 incident" of 1947, might be touched off again. Without a doubt, police are extremely watchful for any stirrings of revolt. This seems to be the reason that about half of the Formosans in Chiang's army are stationed on the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu—far enough away so they could not cause any trouble on Formosa. And on Formosa, very few soldiers, incidentally, are given live ammunition.

If a poll were taken now to determine what status Formosans want for their island, I am sure that at least a two-thirds majority would favor independence. Of course, such a poll is impossible since just the mention of the words "independence" or "self-determination" on Formosa is taboo. But responsible Formosan leaders, both Kuomintang and opposition members, have told me that more than 90 percent of the people desire the establishment of an independent Formosan Republic—shunning both Communist and Nationalist Chinese ties.

A CONFUSION OF EXPERTS

Quite vocal on this subject is a militant group of Formosan exiles in Japan led by Dr. Thomas Wen-i Liao, a short, energetic Formosan who fled the island with some compatriots at the time of the 1947 massacre.

For 16 years Liao has confidently espoused the cause of Formosan independence: "Formosa for the Formosans." Most of his followers, and there are roughly a thousand of them in Japan, favor continuation of American aid to Formosa and close relations with the United States. In 1955 a group of these Formosans met in Tokyo and organized a Provisional Government of the Republic of Formosa and a Provisional Formosan Congress, and they elected Liao as President. The group appears to have numerous sympathizers on Formosa, but it is impossible to say how well organized this underground is. The press frequently reports arrests of suspected Liao followers.

The Nationalist Government, which considers Liao a traitor, has so far successfully pressured the U.S. State Department into withholding a visa for Liao, who has several times applied for one at the American Embassy in Tokyo. If he gets the chance, Liao, who received a doctorate in chemical engineering at Ohio State University, wants to plead his cause before the United Nations and the American public.

Some Formosans, who assume that the island's political complexion will remain unchanged for the next 15 or 20 years, foresee that the time will come when younger generation Formosans—and mainlanders who have become "Formosanized"—will live in harmony under a government run predominantly by Formosans. Other Formosans are pessimistic; they darkly envision eventual control over the island by Communist China—unless the island is soon sliced off from its present "Chinese" connections.

On Formosa earlier this year, I listened to a well-known Formosan passionately give his views on America's China policy. "When the U.S. supports Chiang Kai-shek it is supporting a dying regime," he said, adding, "Chiang wants to lead America into war with Red China. That is the only way he will ever get back to the mainland."

I agree with him. And I believe that a growing number of Americans also are critical of our aid to a government which suppresses the people and claims to be the "authentic" representative of China. Moreover, this policy is losing us many friends among the Formosans.

Because Washington gives strong public backing to Chiang, we are obliged to lead the fight in blocking Peking's entry into the United Nations although it appears that this stand works to retard a solution to the Formosa impasse. Obviously, the future of Formosa is tied closely to America's China policy; and I have heard a number of America's Far Eastern specialists say that no changes can occur in U.S. policy toward Formosa until there is a change in U.S. policy toward Peking.

The United States cannot, of course, officially favor self-determination or a plebiscite while the Nationalist Government exists in its present form. But America can do a number of things on Formosa to ameliorate the situation. The United States can tell Chiang: "Disband your secret police; permit anti-Communist opposition parties to exist; allow impartial supervision of elections; end martial law." Our Government might then assess its aid program to Nationalist China in terms of how well these objectives are carried out.

In the past, our Ambassadors to Nationalist China have not used the weight of their office to encourage such reforms. At the same time, many U.S. Embassy officials in Taipei, while deploring conditions on the island, have clung to the argument that "We can't intervene in the internal affairs of a sovereign government."

However, experts on the aims and the politics of America's foreign aid are generally agreed that this aid—if accepted—should be an instrument of democracy, not a subsidy for repressive dictatorship. One such expert is Dr. Edwin O. Reischauer, an authority on Asia who is the present U.S. Ambassador to Japan. In his book, "Wanted: An Asian Policy," he says that America "should be working for the development of a democratic Formosa with all the economic and political tools at our disposal." Formosa's future, he adds, is a problem "on which we can exert considerable pressure."

I believe the time has come to tell Chiang Kai-shek that we will not tolerate his blatant suppression of the Formosans. The least we must do is insist that the Nationalists wipe out, right now, the terror on the island and allow the Formosans some of the democratic freedoms we claim to uphold and defend.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying that a few days ago the President of the United States asked those opposed to the foreign aid bill to specify where they would cut it. For several weeks, day after day, week after week, with only a few days when a speech was not made because I was away on official business or for some other reason I could not be in the Senate, I have particularized as to where the foreign aid bill should be cut.

For the benefit of the Prseident and his administrators of foreign aid, I shall continue, day by day, to particularize as to where foreign aid can be cut. To the President and his administrators I say: Slash it in Taiwan. Cut it in Taiwan. In my judgment the time is long overdue for drastically reducing military aid in Taiwan.

Tomorrow I shall give the President my next chapter as to where I believe his foreign aid bill can be cut.

I will not vote to restore the cuts of the House in foreign aid.

THE NUCLEAR SHIP "SAVANNAH"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on several occasions in the past I spoke about the embarrassing position in which the U.S. Government finds itself in its inability to sail the nuclear ship *Savannah* on the high seas.

The ship cost our country $80 million. It is the pride of our creative ability. It was ready to sail several months ago. However, because of a dispute among union leaders as to how the ship was to be served and manned, this white and glowing vessel has lain dormant in U.S. ports.

Yesterday I learned that the labor leaders still are locked on the question of who shall do what particular type of work on the *Savannah*.

According to the Commerce Department, the issue has been settled by the awarding of a general agency contract for future operations of the *Savannah* to the American Export Lines. The contract was awarded July 15, 1963.

Now comes the startling aspect of the present situation. The ship will remain idle for another 8 or 9 months, because it is necessary to undertake a retraining program for the new crew, and provide additional improvements.

The training program started on September 3, yesterday. It will extend for 12 weeks. Three separate classes will be trained, one of them a Government crew, which will be licensed to operate the *Savannah*, if need be. The Maritime Administration will come to Congress and ask for $1,600,000 to train the men to operate the *Savannah*. The members of the unions and the leaders of the unions who are in dispute about who shall do what type of work on the *Savannah* were trained at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. Specific training was given to them at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States.

While the ship lay idle in port, those men knew that the Government did not have the men to operate the vessel. They knew that they were specifically trained to take charge of it. Knowing of the helpless position of the Government, they stood firm and refused to work unless the U.S. Government yielded to them.

I do not know how much was spent in providing specialized training to the men who are on strike. The figures show that we shall have to spend another $1,600,000 to train a new crew.

I am glad that the Maritime Administration and the Commerce Department have taken hold of the situation to the extent that they have. However, I regret deeply the fact that for 1 year the ship has lain idle, with our Government helpless to send it on the high seas.

The labor leaders and the men who were trained by the U.S. Government ought to give recognition to the embarrassing position in which our Government finds itself. Self-respect ought to compel them to say, "We are in the wrong. We are not serving our Government properly. We will go back to work and repay our beneficent Government for the money it spent in giving us our unique training."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to the pending business, S. 1716. It is a little bill on a big issue. The bill itself is only 11 lines long. It continues for a third year, or through fiscal 1965, which is June 30 of that year, the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which imposes the entire cost of the program on the Federal Government. In other words, it waives the provisions in the original bill, for 1 more year, which would require 50-percent matching on the part of the several States.

In determining whether to pass the bill, the Senate is really deciding—I hope today—to continue the Manpower Training and Development Act. However, if the extension is not passed, I think I can safely say, having heard all the testimony and having been chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which reported the bill, that the training program will die. It will die through apathy, just as it is getting off the ground; just as it is beginning to retrain in employable skills at the rate of 108,000 Americans per annum, retraining them in ways in which they will get jobs. Experience to date shows that 70 percent of those who have completed retraining courses will get those jobs.

The program is at present operating in all 50 States and in Puerto Rico and Guam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of projects, the number of trainees, and the amount of dollars allocated under the program to each of the several States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT PROJECTS

TABLE A.—*Estimated 1963 training and allowance payment commitments for institutional projects approved August 1962 through June 30, 1963*

State	Number of projects	Number of trainees	1963 commitments			1964 allowance payments for approved projects	Total program costs
			Total	Training costs	Allowance payments		
Total	1,504	57,643	$45,901,241	$32,627,408	$13,273,833	$24,945,814	$70,847,055
Alabama	30	1,569	774,813	583,627	191,186	648,092	1,422,905
Alaska	3	110	179,338	153,334	26,004	77,109	256,447
Arizona	8	335	404,175	276,584	127,591	195,039	599,214
Arkansas	21	541	540,847	461,259	79,588	471,309	1,012,156
California	110	5,275	4,018,822	2,684,568	1,334,254	1,635,074	5,653,896
Colorado	14	290	309,544	222,728	86,816	433,138	742,682
Connecticut	66	3,315	829,478	590,294	239,184	221,166	1,050,644
Delaware	2	39	19,325	9,735	9,590	0	19,325
District of Columbia	10	785	530,219	431,638	98,581	306,535	836,754
Florida	21	820	549,451	387,757	161,694	320,728	870,179
Georgia	15	385	688,581	489,431	199,150	152,720	841,301
Hawaii	9	371	135,095	[1] 106,073	29,022	49,622	184,717
Idaho	3	80	88,302	53,401	34,901	66,119	154,421
Illinois	71	4,985	3,685,066	2,819,832	865,234	2,129,461	5,814,527
Indiana	23	1,113	949,069	684,988	264,081	599,625	1,548,694
Iowa	20	518	884,783	751,504	133,279	358,729	1,243,512
Kansas	21	624	634,581	546,260	88,321	668,926	1,303,507
Kentucky	59	1,584	1,585,225	1,159,070	426,155	1,522,856	3,108,081
Louisiana							
Maine	42	1,218	372,358	315,924	56,434	82,196	454,554
Maryland	9	433	566,743	301,551	265,192	178,312	745,055
Massachusetts	60	1,330	1,565,565	1,153,404	412,161	895,258	2,460,823
Michigan	68	2,366	2,157,280	1,620,118	537,162	1,375,908	3,533,188
Minnesota	30	675	916,780	624,250	292,530	381,777	1,298,557
Mississippi	5	125	201,386	89,511	111,875	26,233	227,619
Missouri	57	2,214	2,244,566	1,807,953	436,613	1,823,380	4,067,946
Montana	16	237	219,645	132,172	87,473	99,281	318,926
Nebraska	13	310	300,515	206,243	94,272	319,054	619,569
Nevada	13	365	273,286	200,418	72,868	127,110	400,396
New Hampshire	13	692	159,925	121,012	38,913	77,988	237,913
New Jersey	57	2,441	1,528,362	1,148,304	380,058	807,148	2,335,510
New Mexico	8	369	193,375	122,523	70,852	41,692	235,067
New York	64	5,394	3,132,244	2,703,213	429,031	1,355,754	4,487,998
North Carolina	34	916	802,183	664,233	137,950	428,672	1,230,855
North Dakota	14	243	348,362	235,137	113,225	446,556	794,918
Ohio	81	2,265	1,618,932	972,181	646,751	790,426	2,409,358
Oklahoma	30	811	795,768	475,399	320,369	342,955	1,138,723
Oregon	14	505	460,814	[2] 325,809	135,005	380,664	841,478
Pennsylvania	112	3,382	4,501,167	2,069,750	2,431,417	1,444,165	5,945,332
Puerto Rico	62	1,270	613,912	423,853	190,059	183,151	797,063
Rhode Island	13	241	430,054	344,594	85,460	120,836	550,890
South Carolina	15	436	320,558	172,211	148,347	109,325	429,883
South Dakota	3	130	174,985	140,498	34,487	202,089	377,074
Tennessee	30	759	985,210	655,590	329,620	521,400	1,506,610
Texas	36	1,419	1,139,297	929,337	209,960	853,079	1,992,376
Utah	8	336	191,021	89,161	101,860	113,585	304,606
Vermont	6	140	232,405	195,001	37,404	155,881	388,286
Virginia	20	750	640,943	519,376	121,567	436,318	1,077,261
Virgin Islands	4	90	19,000	12,454	6,546		19,000
Washington	16	1,725	613,428	546,241	67,187	347,793	961,221
West Virginia	20	449	480,834	271,871	208,963	111,964	529,798
Wisconsin	21	779	772,090	539,899	232,191	426,460	1,198,550
Wyoming	4	89	121,534	86,134	35,400	83,156	204,690

---

[1] Includes $255 related institutional training costs for on-the-job training project.

[2] Includes $1,889 related institutional training costs for on-the-job-training project.

TABLE B.—*Estimated 1963 training and allowance payment commitments for on-the-job [1] projects approved August 1962 through June 30, 1963*

State	Number of projects	Number of trainees	1963 commitments			1964 allowance payments for approved projects	Total program costs
			Total	Training costs	Allowance payments		
Total	116	1,607	$596,520	$547,254	$49,266	$27,159	$623,679
California	4	112	23,208	23,208			23,208
Connecticut	1	8	9,334	7,107	2,227	743	10,077
Georgia	1	20	4,512	3,660	852	2,176	5,788
Hawaii [2]	1	16	847	847			847
Illinois	2	260	90,508	90,508			90,508
Kentucky	6	28	7,368	7,368			7,368
Maine	1	10	1,702	1,702			1,702
Michigan	17	126	36,505	36,505			36,505
Minnesota	7	112	16,084	15,744	340		16,084
Nevada	2	300	38,899	38,899			38,899
New Hampshire	3	34	10,877	7,405	3,472	6,560	17,437
New Jersey	4	21	14,321	13,211	1,110	2,858	17,179
North Carolina	2	28	7,430	6,970	460		7,430
North Dakota	2	60	10,406	6,206	4,200		10,406
Ohio	11	153	38,459	38,459			38,459
Oregon [3]	1	20	7,776	6,886	890	1,360	9,136
Pennsylvania	1	50	41,578	27,078	14,500	6,000	47,578
Texas	4	21	11,857	11,857			11,857
West Virginia	39	166	186,237	183,309	2,928		186,237
Wyoming	7	62	38,612	20,325	18,287	8,362	46,974

[1] Programs operating through the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.
[2] Excludes $255 supplemental institutional training costs.
[3] Excludes $1,889 supplemental institutional training costs.

TABLE C.—*Estimated 1963 commitments for special research, experimental and demonstration training projects approved August 1962 through June 30, 1963*

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

State	Number of projects	Number of trainees	1963 commitments			1964 allowance payments for approved projects	Total program costs
			Total	Training costs	Allowance payments		
California	1	125	$101,992	$101,992			$101,992
District of Columbia	1	25	27,250	27,250			27,250
Missouri	1	40	14,000	14,000			14,000
New York	5	420	298,545	298,545			298,545
Pennsylvania	1	60	16,800	16,800			16,800
Total	9	670	458,587	458,587			458,587

OTHER PROJECTS

State	Number of projects	Number of persons served	1963 commitments	1964 commitments	Total
California	2	3,000	$305,621		$305,621
Connecticut	2	600	126,060		126,060
Michigan	1	400	153,771		153,771
New York	1	20,000	2,000,000		2,000,000
North Carolina	1	600	140,000		140,000
Ohio	1	500	45,750		45,750
Pennsylvania	1	400	151,576		151,576
Total	9	25,500	2,922,778		2,922,778
Total program					3,381,365

Mr. CLARK. The program is just getting off the ground. There are good reasons why that is the case. The act was passed in 1962, but it was for an authorization only. The appropriation was not made until toward the end of the legislative session last year.

As is customarily the case with new programs of the Federal Government, a number of months were required to organize the program, to place it in operation, and to provide the necessary coordination between the employment offices in the 52 jurisdictions, the local school boards in the areas where such boards were responsible for the training programs, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, where machinery was set up to enable that Department adequately to screen the training programs in the interest of preventing boondoggling and eliminating waste. Therefore, it was not until the spring of 1963 that the program really got underway.

During that period, there was nothing to show for the program in the several States. During that period, some 29 legislatures met. From everything we have learned from the testimony and our contacts with the State employment agencies, the States were not alerted and were not aware that if they did not provide money for meeting the Federal program with matching grants, the Federal program would grind to a halt on June 1 of next year. Twenty-nine State legislatures will not meet in 1964, for they meet only on a biennial basis. Accordingly, those States will have no opportunity, unless special sessions of their legislatures are called, to provide the matching grants necessary to continue the program after June 30 of next year.

Accordingly, at the request of the administration, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings to determine whether the proposal requiring State-matching grants should be postponed for 1 year. The conclusion was reached, unanimously in the subcommittee, and by a vote of 13 to 2 in the full committee, that it was the better part of wisdom not to kill the program just as it was getting off the ground. Whether or not proposed civil rights legislation were to be brought before Congress, I would strongly urge the passage of this manpower development and retraining bill. There is every reason why the program should be continued for another year, in order that its full benefits and the impact of the reemployment which it generates might be brought home to the general public.

Nevertheless, I feel compelled to note that this particular bill was recommended in the President's message on civil rights, which he sent to Congress on June 19, 1963. I quote from page 9 of that message:

> Specifically, I now propose:
>
> (A) That additional funds be provided to broaden the manpower development and training program, and that the act be amended, not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State-matching requirements, but also (in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment) to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program.

The first part of the Presidential recommendation, namely, an amendment to the act to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State-matching requirements, is contained in the pending bill, S. 1716.

A few minutes ago, I sent to the desk S. 1831, a bill which would enact the other recommendations of the President's program. That bill is in the form of a report submitted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That bill also cleared the committee by a vote of 13 to 2; but it is only the relatively narrow amendment to the act, dealing with waiving State payment for 1 more fiscal year and, accordingly, increasing the authorization for expenditures under the program, to take up the slack at the Federal level, which will now not become available at the State level, that we are dealing with today.

Mr. President, what I have said rather fairly states the purpose of the bill, its impact, and why it seemed to the very large majority of the appropriate legislative committee that the bill should pass. I shall be glad to answer questions by Senators.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. By what amount does the amendment increase the moneys available to finance the program?

Mr. CLARK. By $161 million, which the President points out should be charged against savings made in other aspects of his budget.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many State legislatures met in 1963, but failed to pass any legislation implementing the provisions of the Federal law?

Mr. CLARK. Twenty-five.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many State legislatures passed laws indicating that they wanted to go along with the Federal Government?

Mr. CLARK. Four.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the four State legislatures which passed implementing legislation make any appropriations to finance their part of the obligation?

Mr. CLARK. Three of them did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Three, or two?

Mr. CLARK. Three.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So only three of the State legislatures which met in 1963 indicated by their action that they subscribed to this Federal program, which this year will cost $322 million, if the bill now pending before us is enacted?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is all I wish to ask.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Was any consideration given by the committee to the provision of a system of loans to States that have not seen fit to cooperate until now, in order that this policy of Federal-State cooperation in the program might be maintained?

Mr. CLARK. This matter was not considered in either the subcommittee or the full committee. But having heard that an amendment along those lines was contemplated to be offered on the floor, we made a little study, and discovered that 22 States, including the State of Georgia, have constitutional limitations on the borrowing of money, which would make it impossible for them to utilize such loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we have had that issue up before. A number of other States also have that constitutional inhibition on borrowing. Nevertheless, from time to time advances under other programs have been made to those States. I do not recall all of them; but that provision has been in the constitution of Georgia since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. I believe it was in the constitution of 1795; and all the constitutions since that time have included it. Nevertheless, under the RFC, which was the first and only effort made in the Hoover administration to combat unemployment, loans were made to all States, including those which had such constitutional inhibitions. The States were more or less left with the responsibility of determining whether the loans were legal and valid. Nevertheless, such grants were made available to the States.

Mr. CLARK. I can only add that two of the most zealous opponents of this bill, the able Senator from Arizona and the able Senator from Texas, did not propose any such loans.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard them suggested; but it did occur to me that we might maintain a semblance or a figment of Federal-State cooperation by advancing such funds to the States which decided to borrow them, but not pushing them on States which did not want to borrow them under any circumstances.

Mr. CLARK. That would require the calling of special sessions of State legislatures which otherwise would not meet until next year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, if that were done, they could pass laws authorizing legislation. I was not proposing that that be done, and I have not had occasion to examine the language of those old acts; but I know it was true in the case of the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1931; and I am sure that on one occasion it was done in connection with the unemployment compensation payments. By Federal law, we advanced to the States sums in excess of what they were able to match. I have forgotten the exact conditions under which they were advanced; but it was done, and it was a token of good faith and trust that the State would carry on with the program.

I have not discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Arizona; I did not know he had brought up that question.

Mr. CLARK. He did not.

Mr. RUSSELL. After hearing the Senator from Pennsylvania explain the bill, it ocurred to me, that that might be a solution. I do not propose to offer an amendment; but I wondered whether in the committee there had been any consideration of that procedure. We are going to have more and more of these programs as time goes on, it seems. Some of them are good; some of them are bad; some of them are indifferent. This one could be exceedingly helpful.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that we on the committee would not have looked upon that with much favor, had it been brought up—for two reasons: First, because a good many of us—including myself—are acutely aware of the very heavy financial obligations under which all of the several States are suffering and the limitations on their taxing power, as a result of the taxes which have been stolen or preempted by the Federal Government, if one may say so, through the Federal income tax.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the Government at Washington has preempted all such revenues. So it is very difficult for the States to finance any new programs.

Mr. CLARK. Furthermore, the staff counsel has advised me that in some instances it would be necessary for special sessions of State legislatures to submit referendums to the people before any such borrowing could be authorized.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have one other question. The Senator from Pennsylvania said this is part of the President's civil rights program. I am sure the Senator did not mean to leave the impression that the program would be confined to those whom the Census Bureau calls nonwhites. A white person would not be excluded, would he?

Mr. CLARK. No. Actually, we are fully as desirous of protecting the rights of white citizens, as I am sure the Senator from Georgia thinks some of us are of protecting the rights of Negro citizens.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that is true, because these days we hear a good deal about discrimination in reverse, and I would want the program made available to all citizens.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator identify the three States whose legislatures have enacted laws providing for matching participation?

Mr. CLARK. The four States whose legislatures have passed enabling legislation are Connecticut, Kansas, Montana, and Tennessee. The three States whose legislatures have appropriated money are Montana, Tennessee—which has appropriated $500,000—and Connecticut—which has appropriated $200,000.

Mr. GORE. This illustrates a point I wish to make, although the State which I have the honor in part to represent is one of the four whose legislatures did pass enabling legislation and actually made the appropriations. What indication does the Senator from Pennsylvania have that other States—particularly those in the Appalachian area, where unemployment is quite severe—will follow the example provided by Tennessee and the other three States by participating in this program, if this bill to extend its availability for another year is passed?

Mr. CLARK. The best answer I can make is that the State unemployment services all over the country have been deluging us with telegrams and letters urging us to continue the program waiving State payments for another year. It is true that their enthusiasm is not visibly shared by the State legislatures—for reasons which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee can guess as well as I can. I note that in the State of Tennessee there are presently 30 projects underway, retraining 759 individuals, at a total cost of $985,000, which is a combination of training costs and training allowances; and that for the coming year, 1964, the payment of another $524,000 was authorized, but has not yet been made.

Speaking of Appalachia, I turn to the State of Kentucky, where 1,584 trainees are being trained on 59 projects at a total cost of $1.5 million.

Alabama has 30 projects, with 1,569 trainees, at a total cost of $774,000.

Georgia has 15 projects with 385 trainees, at a total cost of $688,000.

West Virginia has 20 projects with 449 trainees, at a total cost of $480,000.

Those are some of the States in Appalachia.

Mr. GORE. I noticed a most encouraging sentence in the committee report, which I now have difficulty in finding. The sentence states the percentage of trainees who have found employment.

Mr. CLARK. Seventy percent of the trainees have found employment. That was the testimony given to the subcommittee by Program Director Seymour L. Wolfbein.

Mr. GORE. That illustrates a point which I believe is vital. As the Senator knows, our industrialized economy is rapidly becoming more complex and automated. As a result, greater skills are required for people to obtain employment in industry. Therefore, I congratulate the leaders of my State for being progressive and vigorous in taking advantage of the program.

If Tennesseans wish to take the narrow view that the program is one of which only four States have taken advantage, Tennessee being one of them, and ask why it should be extended to others, I point out that unemployment is a national problem. The problem of training unskilled people and retraining people whose skills are no longer needed in the endeavor in which they have previously been engaged is a national problem. Therefore I join the Senator in the hope that the program will be extended for another year, believing that in that time other States will qualify and will participate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful intervention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the Record a list of the 20 principal occupations in which individuals have received training. In each case 500 or more trainees have been trained. The list also includes the total number of trainees.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IV. Manpower Development and Training Act occupational training, leading occupations, by number of trainees (500 trainees or more), June 30, 1963[1]

Occupation:	Trainees (to nearest 10)
1. Machine operator, general	4,020
2. Clerk typist	3,670
3. Auto mechanic, entry or specialist	3,650
4. Nurse aid	3,410
5. Sewing machine operator	3,270
6. Stenographer	2,960
7. Welder, all	2,950
8. Licensed practical nurse	2,350
9. Electronics assembler, wirer solderer	1,980
10. Clerk stenographer	1,760
11. Auto body repairman	1,400
12. Subassembler I (aircraft manufacturing)	1,300
13. Electronics, mechanic or technician	1,270
14. Boot and shoe (cutter, stitcher, sewer)	1,260
15. Waiter-waitress	1,140
16. Typist	1,080
17. Salesman	1,000
18. Draftsman	850
19. Cook	750
20. Secretary	610

[1] Provisional data, subject to final review of projects.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the characteristics in terms of family status, age, education, number of years in the labor force, duration of unemployment, and other subjects, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

V. Characteristics of trainees enrolled in 1,104 Manpower Development and Training Act training projects cumulative June 1963

Characteristics of trainees	Total	Male	Female	Percent
Total enrolled	22,674	14,734	7,940	100.0
Family status—Total	22,674	14,734	7,940	100.0
Head of family or household	14,364	11,334	3,030	63.7
Other	8,193	3,323	4,870	36.3
Not reported	117	77	40	--------
Age, years—Total	22,674	14,734	7,940	100.0
Less than 19	961	516	445	4.3
19 to 21	4,268	2,684	1,584	18.9
22 to 34	10,179	7,349	2,830	45.0
35 to 44	4,764	2,797	1,967	21.1
45 and over	2,425	1,337	1,088	10.7
Not reported	77	51	26	--------
Education, grades—Total	22,674	14,734	7,940	100.0
Less than 8	688	540	148	3.0
8	1,750	1,357	393	7.7
9 to 11	6,781	4,696	2,085	30.0
Education, grades—Continued				
12	11,403	6,928	4,475	50.4
More than 12	2,006	1,182	824	8.9
Not reported	46	31	15	--------
Years in labor force—Total	22,674	14,734	7,940	100.0
Less than 3	4,840	2,055	2,785	21.5
3 to 9	10,146	6,686	3,460	45.1
10 or more	7,491	5,893	1,598	33.3
Not reported	197	100	97	--------
Duration of unemployment—Total	22,674	14,734	7,940	100.0
Less than 5	5,272	3,679	1,593	23.4
5 to 14	5,923	4,403	1,520	26.3
15 to 26	3,766	2,697	1,069	16.7
27 to 52	2,643	1,608	1,035	11.8
More than 52	3,985	1,543	2,442	17.7
Not reported	181	115	66	--------
Family farmworker	61	51	10	.3
Underemployed	843	638	205	3.7

VI. Characteristics of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees enrolled in projects by race and sex, cumulative, June 25, 1963

Characteristics of trainees	Total	Total percent		Nonwhite percent			Negro percent			Racial data not obtained
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	
Total	19,593	65.3	34.7	21.7	55.7	44.3	19.5	56.7	43.3	1,033
Family status:										
Head of house	12,409	79.0	21.0	21.4	70.0	30.0	19.7	69.2	30.8	621
Other	7,080	41.0	59.0	22.2	31.5	68.5	19.2	34.0	66.0	405
Not reported	104	66.0	34.0	16.5	56.2	43.8	16.5	56.2	43.8	7
Age, years:										
Less than 19	810	56.6	43.4	16.5	39.5	60.5	14.2	43.0	57.0	59
19 to 21	3,707	62.5	37.5	21.0	49.2	50.8	18.8	51.1	48.9	223
22 to 34	8,708	72.7	27.3	26.9	58.7	41.3	24.7	58.8	41.2	455
35 to 44	4,185	59.1	40.9	18.7	54.9	45.1	16.3	57.2	42.8	194
45 and over	2,134	55.1	44.9	8.6	62.9	37.1	7.2	64.6	35.4	102
Not reported	49	59.2	40.8	36.7	27.8	72.2	34.7	23.5	76.5	----------
Education, grades:										
Less than 8	575	80.0	20.0	21.0	74.5	25.5	16.4	74.4	25.6	50
8	1,489	79.0	21.0	11.5	69.8	30.2	9.6	75.6	24.4	77
9 to 11	5,823	70.2	29.8	23.7	64.8	35.2	21.5	65.7	34.3	324
12	9,889	60.7	39.3	20.8	49.0	51.0	18.9	50.1	49.9	484
More than 12	1,785	58.2	41.8	28.6	49.7	50.3	26.1	49.5	50.5	97
Not reported	32	61.3	38.7	12.9	50.0	50.0	6.5	100.0	----------	1
Years in labor force:										
Less than 3	4,186	42.7	57.3	24.5	31.6	68.4	21.0	34.0	66.0	269
3 to 9	8,720	65.9	34.1	22.4	57.8	42.2	20.5	58.1	41.9	472
10 or more	6,547	78.8	21.2	18.6	72.7	27.3	16.9	72.7	27.3	284
Not reported	140	51.5	48.5	33.3	40.9	59.1	31.8	40.5	59.5	8
Duration of unemployment:										
Less than 5	4,092	70.0	30.0	17.4	58.3	41.7	15.1	59.5	40.5	175
5 to 14	5,029	74.1	25.9	20.1	62.6	37.4	18.3	63.5	36.5	253
15 to 26	3,140	71.5	28.5	23.2	62.9	37.1	20.6	63.7	36.3	150
27 to 52	2,185	60.3	39.7	26.2	56.5	43.5	23.9	57.1	42.9	134
More than 52	3,343	39.6	60.4	25.3	37.8	62.2	23.2	39.8	60.2	223
Not reported	416	64.4	35.6	24.0	52.7	47.3	21.4	53.0	47.0	28
Family farmworker	218	82.5	17.5	18.9	97.4	2.6	15.5	100.0	----------	12
Underemployed	1,170	72.2	27.8	20.1	51.1	48.9	18.5	51.9	48.1	58

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to express commendation to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his objective presentation of the facts on this issue. They have been given without color and with complete impartiality. I am grateful to him for it.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his kind words.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we have listened to the informative presentation, as the Senator from Ohio has correctly characterized it, of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment in relation to the pending measure, Senate bill 1716. The measure is sponsored by seven Senators. As indicated during the opening remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania, it was reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a vote of 13 for and 2 against. As has been stated, the proposed legislation would defer for 1 year the State matching requirements for the program as required by present law. I shall not repeat the names of the four States which have participated by their authorization of matching funds, as required under the original act, for the year 1965. There has been informal indication that there will be opposition to the measure from those who have referred to the condition which they characterize as "foot dragging and general apathy" toward the program on the part of the States.

Nothing could be further from reality than to ascribe a general condition of apathy toward this program. I refer to the testimony of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz when he appeared before the subcommittee which is ably presided over by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. Wirtz said:

> We have received not a single * * * negative reaction from any State, and we have received positive reactions from almost all of them, with respect to the matter of the continuance of the program.

We desire to be fair in the presentation of the measure. Therefore, it is important for those of us who believe strongly in the pending legislation to point out that the failure of the States to authorize matching funds is not a direct or implied criticism of the worth of the Manpower Development and Training Act. It is an illustration of the inherent lag between the development of a relatively novel and highly constructive program at the Federal level and its implementation at the State level.

Twenty-nine of the State legislatures meet biennially in the odd numbered years. As has been stated, 25 of the State legislatures which met in 1963 took no action toward authorizing matching funds for the continuance of this program. Yet it is clear that this failure to act at that time did not constitute a rejection or opposition to the program.

I remind Senators that the budgets of the States were developed in late 1962. At that time the Manpower Development and Training Act program was in its early stages. As I know the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] recognizes, although his State showed an alacrity which I commend, it was a relatively untried program as well as a novel program. It was inadequately understood by many of the members of State legislative bodies.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my friend.

Mr. GORE. For whatever benefit it may be, I cite to the Senator the fact that these training programs are being sought by many communities in my State. In the past week I read of a county court which met and unanimously adopted a resolution in favor of the location of one of the training schools there. As I said earlier, the complexity of industry, developing as it is, makes it necessary for people to attain technical skills in order to be gainfully employed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Tennessee states the problem accurately and concisely. I hold in my hand a page from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, published this morning in our State capital city.

"Skilled miners in high demand," reads the five column headline. "Difficult to open new mines."

As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] know, coal mining is no longer an industry in which sheer manpower is required, as it once was. It is now mining by manpower with the assistance of machines. When a cutting machine knifes into a mountainside, 100 workers who were gainfully employed are displaced. Yet, in the mining industry itself, as the article by the business editor of the Gazette, George Lawless, states:

> Competition for skilled coal miners is raging in West Virginia. And the industry battle for certain skills promises to get more fierce in the years ahead.
>
> At the same time, the Nation's leading coal producer claims more than 20,000 unemployed miners—most of whom don't possess these needed skills.

I read further:

> As a result of automation and increasing mine mechanization, the State's mine work force shrank from a high of 120,000 in 1947 to less than 40,000 today.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. There is unemployment of more than 100,000 in this specific industry?

Mr. RANDOLPH. A decrease in the mine work force from 120,000 in 1947 to less than 40,000 today.

Mr. GORE. Is it not a choice of attempting to retrain as many of those workers as possible or of letting them face the dim prospects of marginal unemployment and perhaps subsistence on a dole?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is quite correct. I read further from the article:

> With the pushbutton mining came an increasing demand for skilled men, principally electricians and maintenance workers.

The article also says:

> We've been bringing in graduate engineers and taking some of our better looking younger people to put in training programs. Ultimately they will be qualified.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, to which these references have been made and about which the colloquy has ensued, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFICULT TO OPEN NEW MINES: SKILLED MINERS IN HIGH DEMAND

(By George Lawless)

Competition for skilled coal miners is raging in West Virginia. And the industry battle for certain skills promises to get more fierce in the years ahead.

At the same time, the Nation's leading coal producer claims more than 20,000 unemployed miners—most of whom don't possess these needed skills.

This job paradox was pointed out last week by former Gov. Cecil Underwood, a vice president of Island Creek Coal Co. He told members of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce: "There is a shortage of skilled workers which makes it difficult to open new mines."

As a result of automation and increasing mine mechanization, the State's mine work force shrank from a high of 120,000 in 1947 to less than 40,000 today. But with the pushbutton mining came an increasing demand for skilled men, principally electricians and maintenance workers.

"The potential for hiring is not good," says Melvin Triola, executive secretary of the Logan Coal Operators Association. He said electricians are "hard to get and hard to hold—they're in such demand everywhere."

Logan County produced 14,979,429 tons of coal last year, tops in West Virginia. In the past year, Island Creek opened four new mines in the county. It was the apparent difficulty in staffing these mines that led to Underwood's observation, but the situation is common throughout the State.

"There is a definite shortage of maintenance personnel," said a spokesman for one of the largest coal operations in McDowell County, the State's second largest coal-producing area. He said these qualified workers are going to satellite industries such as mining machinery manufacturers both in West Virginia and neighboring Ohio. "We've been bringing in graduate engineers and taking some of our better looking, younger people to put in training programs. Ultimately they will be qualified."

Another top coal operator complained that several of his top mechanics and electricians had been lured away to defense industries. "I know of at least two who are now working at Cape Canaveral," he said.

Paul Morton, president of Cannelton Coal Co. in the Kanawha Valley, said Tuesday that his firm had as yet experienced no difficulty in attracting technicians. "We have a better area to draw from. People like living in this area better than in Logan or McDowell. So far, we've had more problems with producing supervisory personnel."

Morton and other coal men explained that because of the seniority panel in the wage agreement with the United Mine Workers of America, younger miners aren't attracted to the industry. Older miners who are now in supervisory positions will be nearing retirement age in the next decade or so, and there are no younger men to replace them.

"When we've used up the older miners on the panel," Morton said, "we'll be up against it in another 10 years."

Triola points to the replacement problem as one of critical importance. In a study of potential mine employees made among Logan County high school graduates recently, he found:

Of 339 male high school graduates in Logan high schools last year, a total of 106 entered college (31.3 percent); 57 entered the Armed Forces (16.8 percent); 43 left Logan County to seek employment elsewhere (12.7 percent) and 22 found employment inside the county but outside the coal mines.

"That left only 111 young high school graduates remaining for potential mining employment. But when you consider that some of these may be handicapped or can't pass a physical for mine work then you see it doesn't leave much to draw from."

He noted that coal mining today offers a high-paying opportunity for those with the necessary skills. Last year the average wage in West Virginia was $6,580. "An electrician, for example, is the highest paid hourly worker around the mine. He gets a base wage of $26.68 for an 8-hour day."

Why are young people no longer attracted to coal mining? Triola feels it is because of the seniority system, which protects the older miners in their jobs, but discourages young miners from trying to move up to a new job classification or supervisory level.

"In a layoff," he explains, "the youngest man in a classification is cut off first. As the work force continues to reduce because of automation, we tend to have a work force of older employes.

"When the younger men are needed, they are no longer there. They're not going to stick around. They leave the industry because there is no inducement for them to stay. They feel that even if they go to work in the mines it is just a matter of time until they get cut off. There's just no future for them."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the RECORD should show—and I should have so stated in my opening remarks—that the Senator from West Virginia is the principal sponsor of the bill. He reported the bill to the Senate from the committee. On several occasions he was kind enough to preside over hearings when it was impossible for me to be present. He has followed the bill with great zeal, and is probably the leading expert on the subject in the Senate today. I commend him and thank him for the speech he is making in support of the proposed legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Pennsylvania is very gracious. I assure him that it is my responsibility to join Senators who have sponsored the bill, those on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and other Senators on both sides of the aisle, in moving to successful passage this vital and urgent measure. I think the Senate will respond affirmatively to the proposal.

It was evident during the hearing on S. 1716, and, of course, on other amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act—that the Congress, in enacting the original measure, admittedly did not allow adequate time for the development of the program and its assessment by the States before the deadline, when the States would be called upon to authorize matching funds.

So in proposing this amendment of S. 1716, we have come to the Congress in an effort to repair that impediment.

We are not considering a problem which is going to emerge 5 years from now. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said, it is at this moment a problem of national scope. It is a serious problem in the Appalachian States and in certain other States. It is here now. Whereas there has been automation in manufacturing and in mining, automation—by whatever word one wishes to characterize it—is now moving into the field of goods and services, marketing, and the activities of the Government itself, in the various agencies. For example, the Census Bureau has 50 statisticians today doing what it took 4,100 persons to do 10 years ago. In the Internal Revenue Service, in processing data on returns, 80 persons are today doing tasks which were carried on by more than 4,000 persons only a few years ago.

The ragged edge of a rail strike of a few days ago, with all its implications for a shutdown of a major portion of the freight carrying facilities of the country, had its basic cause in the loss of jobs. There are 40 percent fewer railroad workers handling the freight cargo of the United States, which is not much less than it was a few years ago. The problem daily becomes more acute. That is the reason why we faced a possible strike.

Two hundred thousand fewer persons a year are living on our farms. This attrition goes on every 12 months. People do not desire to go into the cities from our rural sections merely to make a move; it is because mechanization of the farm is a reality, as is mechanization of our transportation facilities, processes of mining and manufacturing.

So when the Senator from Tennessee speaks, as he did, so eloquently, although in brief remarks, about this problem being a national one, his statement is abundantly true.

Whereas the problem came with tragic impact a few years ago in West Virginia with the mechanization of our mines, and it is already moving into practically all other sections of our country.

I have faith that, regardless of party, Members of the Congress will respond to the urgency of continuing the program, because to return this measure to the committee would be to kill it. To propose loans would strike at the very core of the effort which is now emerging into a workable program.

We come forth today indicating that there was not sufficient time for the States to assess the program prior to their authorizing matching funds; we are attempting by this amendment to repair the deficiency.

The question of maintaining the present rate of progress in our manpower training program is of the utmost immediacy and urgency. To refer again to the testimony of Secretary Wirtz before our committee, the Secretary stated that:

> We have just finished the first year of the administration of this program. We finished * * * with considerable pride in the accomplishment. The thing has just been moved into high gear. And * * * it will slow down from here on out unless this matching problem is met, and met immediately.

The Congress must not allow this program to be placed in jeopardy because of the calendar of the State legislatures. The manpower development and training program is now in full stride, having passed its target enrollment of 60,000 for fiscal 1963, and is now maintaining an enrollment level of 108,000. Of those who have completed their training, an astonishing 70 percent have been placed in jobs for which they were trained under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Yet, if S. 1716 is not enacted in this session, the entire—and I emphasize the word "entire"—manpower development and training program will be crippled. The original goal established by the Manpower Development and Training Act provided for the training of approximately 400,000 of the unemployed during the 3 years authorized for the program. This is hardly an extravagant program, in view of the continued rate of unemployment which hovers near 6 percent, with more than 4 million workers in a state of enforced idleness.

The original Manpower Development and Training Act program envisaged the training of approximately 200,000 persons during its third year. With this goal in view, the Congress authorized the appropriation of $161 million for this period, with the expectation that the States would match this with an equal amount. As has already been pointed out, however, at the time the budgets of the States were being drawn for fiscal 1963, the program had not been in operation long enough or on a sufficiently wide scale to elicit cooperative action from the State legislatures which convened in 1963. Twenty-five of those States—those which did not act this year—will not again have the opportunity until January 1965, 6 months after the deadline in the original Manpower Development and Training Act.

There are, therefore, only two alternatives before the Congress: to reject the remedial action proposed in S. 1716, and thereby cripple the manpower training program in all of the States; or enact S. 1716 to authorize the additional $161 million, and thereby help move the American economy forward by maintaining the thrust of the original intent of the Congress as expressed in the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in 1962.

Today or tomorrow, when the vote is finally taken—and I trust it will be within a few hours—there will be an opportunity to accept the proposed amendment to the Manpower Training Act.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the need for S. 1716. As I have previously stated in the Senate, the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment has for many months been conducting hearings on the entire range of manpower and employment problems. From every source of testimony we have received evidence of the drastic toll on our human resources being taken by unemployment.

Especially is this so among our young people. As Secretary of Labor Wirtz pointed out in testimony before our committee, although employment rose last year by some 800,000, unemployment also rose by 400,000 as a result of the continued growth of our labor force. The main impact of the increase of the jobless fell upon our most youthful group of workers. There were, in fact, 300,000 less jobs in June 1963, for young people under 20 than there were in June of the year preceding.

The administration has embarked upon a broad program to ameliorate the problems of our disadvantaged youth. The Manpower Development and Training Act is an essential part of that program. By deferring for 1 year the date at which the States must provide matching funds, the Congress will enable the Manpower Development and Training Act program to proceed with the task of making our young people more employable and providing them with a broader foundation in work skills. This program must not be placed in hazard by the calendar of our State legislative sessions nor by the contingencies of economic expansion and contraction. The need for maintaining a consistent level of activity in this program should be equally apparent to those who administer it, in such matters as the approval of training programs under the act and the application of the test of a reasonable expectation of employment.

Though I would offer this precautionary advice to those who administer our manpower program, my primary responsibility is to bring to the attention of the Senate the preeminent importance of the need to enact S. 1716 and provide the additional authorization to keep the manpower program going at full strength. I therefore join the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who has provided such active leadership in the Manpower and Employment Subcommittee, in urging the Senate to approve the amendment under consideration. I have been joined in proposing S. 1716 by Senators Clark, McNamara, Pell, Kennedy, McIntyre, and Ribicoff. It is our belief that this measure is needed to insure the training of workers without cutting the very heart of the manpower program.

I recently returned from 5 days in my own State of West Virginia, where I found that the compelling need for the passage of the pending bill, to continue the Training Act unimpaired, is understood by our people. I believe Congress, if it carries this program forward, will do much not only to alleviate unemployment in our Nation, but also to enable us to meet the problems generated by the technological revolution of American industry. I therefore recommend approval of the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have listened attentatively to the very able presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and the equally able presentation made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. It is difficult to stand on the floor of the Senate and be opposed to retraining in general. It is like being opposed to mother love and wide roads.

However, some questions existed in the minds of the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and I feel it is incumbent upon me to speak about them.

Senators who oppose the enactment of the proposed legislation are not opposed to retraining. I believe most Senators have committed themselves to further expenditures in this field in the President's civil rights package. They feel that training is constantly needed. However, we do not feel that the Federal Government should be the sole judge of where and how the training should be conducted.

We do not deny that there is something wrong, something that has been wrong for some time, something that crosses the paths of two administrations.

We must admit that there is something wrong, because there is continued unemployment at a rate which I do not believe anyone can find acceptable.

In July, according to the Economic Indicators, our unadjusted rate of unemployment ran at 5.7, which, while it is considerably better than it was in January, is a little worse than it was a year ago.

Retraining is a necessary thing. I believe basic training is urgently needed. That is one of the reasons why many Senators on this side of the aisle have supported vocational training and junior college proposals, and talked about and supported interest in industrial-type high schools or manual training high schools, aimed at young people who are not going through high school and never had any intention of going through high school. These problems could in large measure be solved. I remind Senators that the dropout rate when I was in high school was higher than the one we are experiencing today. In those days, however, a young boy who knew he was not going to finish high school could go to an industrial high school or a manual training high school, whatever the case might be, and there acquire some skill.

I agree with the proponents of the bill that today there is little or no demand for unskilled labor. The idea that if one cannot do something with his hands, he can always get a job using a pick and shovel, is a fallacy. Those days have passed. Automation has moved into the fields of the pick and shovel to the point that such jobs do not exist. It is to that group that the proposed legislation is directed.

Another factor I wish to touch on, other than the drop-out situation and the need for employment at higher skilled levels, is one I mentioned earlier, which at least crosses over the administration's proposals, and probably more than that.

The only way in which jobs can be created is to have more capital investment. Capital investment is the lifeblood of any free enterprise economy. This has always been true. During or immediately following the years of high capital investment, unemployment has been reduced. As I look at Economic Indicators for August, I note that in 1957, capital investment, under the heading "Expenditures for new plant and equipment," was $36.96 billion. It dropped the next year, and then started to rise slowly. But the rate this year, 6 years after 1957, if the Indicators prove to be true, will be $39.24 billion, an increase in 6 years of $2.28 billion; or, to put it another way, an increase of about 5 percent over the 6 years.

We can retrain to perfection every unemployed person in the country; but if there are not jobs for them to step into, the retraining is wasted. Particularly is it wasted upon a man who wants to work. He does not want to be on relief. He wants to work with his hands and brain. He wants to be productive.

So before I proceed with my basic argument against the proposal, I call the attention of Senators to what I consider to be the real problem in the employment picture in America today. Our tax structure is so lopsided, difficult, and unfair that investment is not encouraged. More money is available for investment today than at any other time in the history of the country. If my memory serves me correctly, the amount is in the neighborhood of $400 billion in savings by the American people. This money is not being invested in new capital equipment, new factories, or new buildings at the rate I feel it should be invested, in order to relieve the basic unemployment problem. What should the rate be? I do not know. As a onetime businessman, I should judge that possibly a rate increase of 4 to 5 percent a year would produce the desired results. If that were true, instead of the figure running slightly more than $39 billion this year, compared with $36.96 billion in 1957, we could possibly expect it to be in the nature of $75.90 billion being spent for new equipment and factories in this year.

We can talk indefinitely about unemployment and education, and about what we intend to do for area redevelopment; but until this Congress or some subsequent Congress attacks the basic problem, which is wrapped up in taxation and is depriving the American wage earner and investor of initiative and ambition, and particularly the desire to have his money work for him, there will be a continuation of the unemployment problem throughout the country.

There must be some reason for the failure of the States to exhibit more interest than they have. I have read the hearings carefully. I have read the report carefully. I cannot find the answers that I think we should have, although possibly we cannot get them. I read from page 61 of the manpower retraining hearings before the Subcommittee on Unemployment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the first session of this Congress. This report was submitted by Dr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary of the American Vocational Association. The title of the report is: "Summary of Replies from State Directors of Vocational Education Regarding Matching Funds for the Manpower Development and Training Act for 1965."

At the outset, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the replies are from State directors of vocational education; they are not from the State legislatures or the Governors. Perhaps there would have been a much better understanding of what direction should be taken legislatively had we heard from the people charged with the responsibility of accepting the matching fund programs. The report contains a series of questions that Dr. Mobley answered. I shall read the questions and the answers:

> 1. If MDT matching funds for vocational education were requested from your 1963 legislature, indicate amounts requested.
>
> Thirty-six States replied "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $83,000 to $3,150,000.
>
> 2. If MDT matching funds for vocational education were appropriated by your 1963 legislature, indicate amount appropriated.
>
> Three States indicated that funds had been appropriated. One of these three States received one-half of the amount requested and no funds were earmarked for training or allowances.
>
> 3. If MDT matching funds for training allowances were requested from your 1963 legislature, indicate amount requested.
>
> Thirty-nine States replied "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $100,000 to $3,150,000.
>
> 4. If MDT matching funds for training allowances were requested from your 1963 legislature, indicate amount appropriated.
>
> None of the States had any funds appropriated.
>
> 5. If MDT funds for vocational education are to be requested from your 1964 legislature, estimate amount to be requested.
>
> Forty States indicated "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $50,000 to $2 million.
>
> 6. If MDT funds for training allowances are to be requested from your 1964 legislature, estimate amount to be requested.
>
> Forty-six States replied "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $50,000 to $2,500,000.
>
> 7. Will your State be able to participate in the Manpower Development and Training Act program when matching is required?
>
> Thirty-four States indicated "no." Six States answered "yes." Other States replied "doubtful," "probably," "questionable," "depends," "only to a limited extent," "very unlikely," and "yes."

I note that the report is dated July 3, 1963. As was stated in the minority views, the purpose of the bill, if enacted, would be to eliminate the provision contained in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, requiring State matching for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964. Since the States would be relieved of their financial responsibilities under this program, the Federal Government would be required to finance 100 percent of the cost of the Manpower Development and Training Act for fiscal 1965, at a cost of $322 million.

The reason why I read the report submitted by Dr. Mobley was to set forth the questions that arise in the minds of Senators who oppose the enactment of the bill.

Why have so many States refused to participate in the program? I am sure I have no pat answer for all the States. I cannot even give an answer as to why my State of Arizona has not participated, unless it be that under our vocational training program the State director or Governor or legislature may feel that the program is not needed. This question has not been answered. I would appreciate answers to it, because I think they would have some effect on the final disposition of the program.

Since the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in March 1962, only three States, namely, Connecticut, Montana, and Tennessee, have enacted enabling legislation and completed action appropriating funds in order to receive Federal matching grants under this program. The legislatures of the remaining 47 States have either taken only preliminary action or no action at all.

Because of the overwhelming lack of response to the Manpower Development and Training Act by the State legislatures, the administration now urgently requests the Congress to waive the requirement for State matching and to allow the Federal Government to foot the entire bill.

Again, Mr. President, if we had had from the States some understandable answers as to why they were not interested in it, when all of the funds are Federal Government money, we might better be able to understand why the administration is urging the action it is urging today.

I may say that this act was passed in March 1962, and since that time every State legislature has met either in 1962 or in 1963. Most of the legislatures will meet again during 1964.

Thus, there has been ample opportunity for all the State legislatures in the country, if they so desire, to authorize the necessary matching funds. To date, however, only three States—Connecticut, $200,000; Montana, $20,000; Tennessee, $500,000—have authorized appropriated funds which represents approximately one-half of 1 percent of the total authorization of $161 million contained in the act.

The net effect of the proposed legislation is to relieve the States of the burden of assuming their responsibility under this program and transferring it to the back of the already overburdened and deficit-ridden Federal Treasury. And this is sought to be accomplished in full knowledge of the fact that 47 State legislatures have refused to enact matching legislation.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, in his testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee commented:

> Lack of action by the States does not mean lack of interest. Instead, we have had urgent messages from many State employment service directors expressing their deep concern and earnest hope that these programs can be continued and accelerated.

Again I invite the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that other requests, in this expression of urgency, have come from those from whom we would expect them to come—namely, the State employment service director.

It is significant that while Secretary Wirtz may have received many messages from State employment service directors urging continuing of the Manpower Development and Training Act, he apparently did not receive a single communication from a State legislature pleading for the passage of this bill.

I do not mean that it did not come or that it does not exist. It was not indicated that it did. If it did, I am not aware of it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator from Arizona is quite correct when he says there have been no urgings from the State legislators. I believe one can almost conclude that the State legislatures are rather disinterested in this program. For that, there could be two reasons: First, because the program did not really get underway until this spring; and therefore, the impact within the States is relatively small. In the State of Arizona only three projects, with a relatively small number of trainees, are underway. However, I call the attention of the Senator from Arizona to page 186 of the hearings, where there appears a letter addressed to me by J. R. Cullison, director, vocational education, Phoenix, Ariz. My staff tells me that he is the State director of vocational education. In the letter he says:

> It appears that no State funds will be available to match Manpower Development and Training Act beginning July 1, 1964. The approval of S. 1716 is urgent.

It is probably true that a State director of vocational education has a certain vested interest in a program of this sort; so perhaps we should take his letter with a grain of salt, before giving his urgent recommendation our 100-percent backing. But I do think it is an indication that the man who is responsible at the administrative level for the vocational educational program in the State of Arizona believes the enactment of this bill is urgent. To me, that is fairly good evidence that we have, on the one hand, a program—which is just getting off the ground—with which he is familiar; furthermore, the fact that it has not gotten very far off the ground is one reason why members of the State legislatures are not particularly interested in it.

As I said earlier, in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], all of us know, I believe, the very heavy financial obligations of the States and their limited tax resources. I think those considerations, when taken together, explain why there has not been a great upsurging of support from either the State legislatures or the Governors. One may conclude from that—as my good friend the Senator from Arizona does—that we should drop the program because there is not any real urging behind it. But I would draw a different conclusion. I should say that there is an enormous amount to be gained by continuing the program, now running at the rate of 108,000 trainees a year, inasmuch as we have had the successful experience with the first 60,000 of the trainees of placing 70 percent of them in jobs because we have given them employable skills.

This decision must necessarily be a matter of judgment; but I respectfully disagree with the conclusions which the distinguished Senator from Arizona has drawn from the fact he has stated—which is correct—namely, that there has been no great urging from either the State legislatures or Governors for this proposed legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who has so well presented his arguments, that we always receive such notes of urgency from the State directors of programs financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. Each year, I am urged by my good friend in Arizona, the head of the vocational training program, in which I have much faith and confidence, to build and build and build. But I do think it is unusual that at some point in the testimony there was not submitted an argument which presented the position of a State legislature or of a Governor. I would not take this position, except for the fact that 47 States have failed to act. If only a few States had failed to act—as in connection with the Kerr-Mills Act, which 32 States have taken advantage of—one would be justified in concluding that, for various reasons, the other States had felt it wise to take advantage of the program.

Mr. Cullison, the Arizona State director, is a very capable man. With my limited knowledge of the field, I dare say probably he is one of the most capable fieldmen in the entire program. I think he probably would be influenced—as he should be for other purposes—by the map contained in the hearings; and I speak now only for my own State of Arizona and also from a rather intimate knowledge of the States directly to the east, to the west, and to the north. When I consider the rate of functional illiteracy, I find that 30 percent or more is entirely in the Navaho and the Apache Indian Reservations, where I doubt that an understanding of the English language is possessed by more than 10 to 15 percent of the people. They are very fine workers when they learn English and move off the reservations to places where they can employ their skills. When I consider the 20 percent or more in my State—represented, in large part, by those on the Navaho and the Apache Reservations; in fact, I may say that all of the shaded areas on the map are either very thinly populated or are populated by Indian tribes, most of whom—with the exception of those who live around the major cities—have not yet learned to speak English—I realize that that would constitute a convincing argument, if I considered only the map. But from my knowledge of New Mexico, I am sure that State also has—with one or two minor exceptions—the same problem, which fundamentally is an educational problem, which I may say we are dealing with.

After too many years of inattention in these fields, the Federal Government now has a highly commendable program of education on the large reservations which contain large populations. The rate of illiteracy will disappear almost entirely within the next 10 to 15 years. But when we discuss functional illiteracy, I comment as I have done because it might appear that my State was in bad shape, when the truth is that the map reflects areas in which we could not expect to find any functional illiteracy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with what the Senator from Arizona has said about his own State. He knows far more about it than I could ever hope to know. I point out that the question of functional illiteracy is not involved in the pending measure. It has to do with matters that will be discussed when the bill S. 1831, comes to the Senate for action.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for calling attention to that point. I thought I had the report on the other bill. But it is interesting anyway.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Arizona appropriately asked the attitude of the Governors of States in which no action had been taken. This afternoon I talked with the Governor of West Virginia, Hon. W. W. Barron. He authorized me to say to the Senate that the program in West Virginia is important, and that men and women who are unemployed are now being trained under the program. The skills of those people will be channeled into productive work in the State of West Virginia, and, in some instances, West Virginians will work in other States.

I have the conviction that if Senators were able to talk with their Governors, 90 percent, or even more, of the Governors of the 50 States would enthusiastically endorse the program as it is now moving forward, and would ask that no curtailment or impairment of the program come from the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for those remarks. I recognize that the problem which exists in his State is probably one of the most pressing and vital in the entire Nation. Many times I have said that in a State like West Virginia training and education is the only answer. While I believe more coal is being mined in West Virginia than was ever mined before, it is being done with about 30 percent of the people who were formerly employed in the occupation of mining. That situation gets to the very heart of the problem.

I wish that the committee had thought of those things before the report was written. I wish that Senators had consulted Governors and legislators to find out what their feeling is. When a program has been in progress and only three States have participated in it, some of those not participating being very conspicuous by their absence, I say that we are confronted with quite a mystery.

To continue briefly, since it is the legislature of the State and not the State employment service director which has the authority to appropriate State moneys, we believe that it is advisable for the Senate to give heed to what 47 State legislatures have refused to do, for whatever reasons, and therefore we urge the Senate to reject this legislation.

The administration's pressing entreaties for the passage of this proposal in the light of large-scale State inactivity stands in sharp contrast to its foot-dragging and general apathy to the implementation of the medical assistance for the aged program, the so-called Kerr-Mills Act, which too requires State matching.

It is common knowledge that the present administration, in its attempts to couple a medical assistance program for the aged to the social security system, has thrown up every roadblock at its command to hobble and shackle the Kerr-Mills Act. So far these attempts to scuttle the act have been unsuccessful as the record will indicate.

As of July 25, 1963, 32 States and territories have programs in effect for receipt of funds under Kerr-Mills; 12 have plans submitted, drafted, or in some other stage of implementation; and only 10 States need legislation. Compared to the nationwide disinterest exhibited by the States to the Manpower Development Training Act, the Kerr-Mills program can be viewed as a rousing success.

It is our belief that any program, such as the Manpower Development Training Act, which has the unqualified and enthusiastic endorsement of the administration, should stand or fall on its own merits without extraordinary inducements being offered in its behalf in order to keep it functioning.

In closing, I come to one of the chief fears of those who oppose the measure; namely, that it is not merely an extension of the program for 1 year with full participation by the Federal Government. If the Senate passes the bill, as sure as we are gathered here this Wednesday afternoon, the program will become another permanent program of the Federal Government. It will be another effort by the Federal Government to convince the States that the Federal Government can do these things better than the States can. As the proponents of the bill well know, the opponents of the bill do not lend themselves to Federal action unless it becomes absolutely necessary. Since 47 State legislatures have shown that they do not feel such Federal action is necessary, we who oppose the measure feel that the States can best do the job, or at least they should be given the opportunity to do it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Kansas is one of the States of the Union in which the legislature acted last January. Funds were made available as of January 1, 1964.

I should like to refer to the last statement by the Senator from Arizona. Looking to the future, there is grave danger that we will not require matching funds by States.

I believe I can speak rather frankly on the question, because our State has already made plans to match funds. But I am concerned that if the Senate passes the proposed legislation today, all that will be done will be to add 1 more year to the program. Next year we shall come back and attempt to do the same thing. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that that is the danger in the program. It is not the fact that there is a program with State matching funds. Our State has now voted matching funds, so I can speak frankly about the program. It is a good program. I have talked with people in my State about it. They are not complaining about the program. But I dislike voting for a program with the feeling that all we are doing is building a new Federal training program which I think should be taken care of through other programs, including vocational training and others.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, shortly I shall send to the desk a motion to recommit the bill, S. 1716. It will not take me very long to explain my reasons for making the motion. More Senators will be present in the Chamber. I hope that Senate aids will explain to Senators whom they serve that I shall ask for the yeas and nays at the appropriate time. Unless some Senator wishes to speak at the present time, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. I hope it will be a long quorum call and that all Senators will be notified that shortly after the quorum call has been completed, after a brief explanation, the yeas and nays will be requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. PROUTY. Does the Senator from Ohio wish to speak?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do.

Mr. PROUTY. I am willing to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I concur with the remarks made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. Of 50 States, only 3 have seen fit to avail themselves of the proposed benefits under the existing law.

During the first year of operation of the program, the Federal Government undertook to finance it entirely, anticipating that in the second year and the years to follow the States would see the wisdom of enacting laws allowing participation at 50 percent of the cost. Only 3 of the 50 States have seen fit to adopt such laws.

It is now argued on the floor of the Senate that if the U.S. Government for another year, at a cost of $322 million, will completely finance the training program, in the years of 1964 and 1965 the States will break through and enact laws providing for 50-percent participation.

They have not done so up to now. Three States have taken action, while forty-seven have not.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] made the statement that the unemployment services bureaus are asking that Congress pass a law providing for 100 percent financing by the Federal Government, although the State legislatures themselves have not taken action.

No action has been taken by 46 States. One State did take action, but did not appropriate money to support the action.

I predict that if Congress should pass this bill, next year we would be asked to continue the program further. The States in their wisdom, through their legislatures, do not wish to subscribe to what the Federal Government is doing. I think it is a matter of carrying on the program until we finally say, "Even though the States are unwilling to participate, the Federal Government will finance it to its fullest extent."

I cannot subscribe to that type of thinking. For that reason I shall not support the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator was kind enough to suggest a little earlier that I had attempted to present this matter objectively. I should like, in that same friendly vein, to ask the Senator for his view about the situation in his own State.

The tables which have been introduced into the Record this afternoon show that the State of Ohio is now carrying on 81 separate projects of an institutional nature—that is, training for particular skills in schools—in which 2,265 trainees are engaged. The total cost is slightly in excess of $1.5 million.

There are also in Ohio 11 more projects in which 153 trainees are receiving on-the-job training.

There is an additional project in Ohio serving 500 people in terms of special research, experimental and demonstration training projects.

Is it the view from the Senator from Ohio that the programs in his State are not serving a useful purpose? I ask the question assuming that the Senator knows—though he may not—that these programs are initiated by the State employment service. They are carried on largely by the local vocational school districts. To be sure, the programs must be screened for approval in Washington since the Federal Government puts up the money, but the programs are initiated at the State level and are carried on at the State level.

I wonder if the Senator can give me any information as to whether the State authorities who are responsible for the program in Ohio are dissatisfied with it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is thoroughly evident that when the money is available, being paid by the Federal Government, the States would be acting unwisely unless they took the money. But the Ohio Legislature has refused to enact a law which would require a 50-percent participation.

I am not astounded by the fact that to the extent that the money has been made available and to the extent that the Bureau of Employment Security has seen it desirable, the State has taken the money. But that has been the situation which has prevailed generally. The Federal Government says, "This money is available to you. Take it."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I note that there are now 212,000 unemployed members of the labor force in Ohio. I am sure the Senator from Ohio is as concerned as I am to see those people obtain gainful employment. Is it the Senator's view that there is no necessity for any kind of a retraining program, in the state of our economy today?

Mr. LAUSCHE. My position is that the State legislature, being more closely in contact with the problem, knows better what should be done than does the U.S. Congress, distantly removed from the problem.

This practice has been encouraged by the Congress through the years. Congress dangles a bait to the various States of the Union, and in that bait is a hook. Now, it is said, "We will give you 50 percent of the money, if you will put up the other 50 percent of the cost," but that the States do not wish to do. The ultimate result will be that the Federal Government will be asked to finance the entire program, and I do not think it should.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator take the position that there should be no retraining program at any level to help with respect to the unemployment situation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think if the State of Ohio—through its legislature and the influence of the institutions, the manufacturers, and the citizenry—thinks the program is good, the State will enact a law to adopt that course.

Mr. CLARK. And to pay for it?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am willing for the Federal Government to put up 50 percent of the total cost, but the State of Ohio should put up the other 50 percent. The State says it is unwilling to do so.

On the matter of unemployment, I should be delinquent unless I mentioned that I made inquiry about the formula used by the Department of Labor and the Census Bureau in determining who is an unemployed person.

From the figures given to me, I learned that there were 11 million families in the United States in which both the husband and wife were working. Also, there are 4 million persons holding two jobs. Many persons in Washington are holding two jobs, for the purpose of getting double compensation when they retire.

I also learned that children of the age of 14 to 15 who are not in school are considered as unemployed. I cannot subscribe to the argument, based on what I have said, that these statistics are reflective of the true situation with regard to the unemployed. How can children of the age of 14 to 15 be included in the statistics of unemployed, as well as those of the age of 15 to 16, and the 17- and 18-year-olds? I cannot see it. They ought to be in school.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The subcommittee took rather extensive testimony earlier this year about the method of compiling unemployment statistics. I think I speak for the entire subcommittee—the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will check me if he disagrees with me—both Republicans and Democrats, when I say that, by and large, the system used was considered to be fair and revealing. The test is, Is the individual looking for work which he or she cannot find, and is that individual legally entitled to take a job under the child labor law, or some other law? It seems to me that if, through poverty or any other legitimate reason—and some of the reasons are not legitimate—young children drop out of school and cannot find a job which they are legally entitled to take, they properly belong in the class of unemployed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that when a 14- or 15-year-old decides to quit school and look for a job and cannot find one, he is listed as unemployed. My position is that he ought to be in school. Why are we promoting a program to decrease dropouts from school? My prediction is that if this largess from the Government is continued, there will be more dropping out from school. There will be more seeking of job training, instead of efforts to acquire the training in the technical schools and in other schools to fit persons for the complex industrial life of the present day.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has been exteremely objective in the presentation of this problem. I regret, however, that I cannot approve the program.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, unemployment is the most pressing and major problem that confronts the American people. We boast that we are the richest and most powerful nation on earth. A distinguished economist, recently our Nation's Ambassador to India, has written a classic book called "The Affluent Society." "The Affluent Society" is the society of the United States, and yet we are confronted with the haunting and perpetual specter of 4 to 5 million people unemployed. The reason they are unemployed, among others, is that modern science and invention and technology have abolished many jobs. This bill offers a practical program to try to meet that situation. It is a program to train those who do not have the training so that they can be employed.

I know of no more pressing problem than this one. So I shall support S. 1716, and hope it will be enacted.

It is very well received in Alaska. We have a large number of unemployed there. We have many youngsters coming out of school who cannot find jobs, because unskilled labor is no longer needed. Skilled labor is needed.

This program is one designed to meet the situation. We cannot continue to pour billions of dollars into countries overseas to help find employment for the people of 90 or 100 foreign countries, and neglect our own.

A strange double standard is involved. Every time there is a proposal to help the unemployed, to lift the standards, to improve the way of life of the inhabitants of 100 foreign countries, such a proposal goes through almost automatically; but when a similar measure is proposed, designed to help the American people, we encounter all kinds of obstacles, we are deluged with reasons why we should not support it, why we must not do it. We do not have the same kind of attitude in spending what has amounted to $100 billion in trying to help resuscitate and revive the economy of the rest of the world, but when it comes to doing something for our own, we meet very great resistance. We are trying to do something for fellow Americans who come out of school, who want jobs, but who cannot find employment. That is also true of older people.

As the Senator from West Virginia pointed out, in West Virginia thousands of persons who were honorably and gainfully employed in the coal mines found themselves without employment because automation, modern invention, and technology threw them out of jobs which previously existed.

This program is designed to help people who are trained for one occupation, and for no other, to acquire a new skill so they will again become employable and employed.

I find it difficult to understand why any Member of this body, contemplating the tragedy of 5 million unemployed Americans, would be against the bill. I hope it will be enacted.

So I warmly support S. 1716, the bill before us, which would amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

This program has strong support in Alaska.

As of June 30, 1963, three projects were underway in Alaska which would bring new skills and new methods in old skills to 111 trainees at a cost of $300,000.

This modest start should be expanded.

In Fairbanks 48 trainees will receive 48 weeks of training as electronics mechanics.

Throughout the State a refresher course for electricians will be given 50 persons for 5 weeks.

In Juneau 20 students are taking a 6-week course for clerk-typists.

Mr. William R. Woodfin, Alaska director for vocational and technical education, earlier this summer wrote to me to urge that I support S. 1716 when it was considered by the Senate. He feels the proposed legislation is in the interest of the people of Alaska, as I know it to be. Indeed it is to the interest of the people of all the States. Mr. Woodfin believes the program "is lending much to the economic growth and development of the State."

This endorsement confirms the hopes of all of us who have supported the

Manpower Development and Training Act since it was first proposed.

As I said last year:

> With rapid technological changes occurring in industry, the needs of labor change and the skills become outmoded. The Manpower Development and Training Act provides a positive approach for meeting this challenge. I supported this legislation and endorsed its full funding.

The program is suited to Alaska and its training and employment needs. Eighty-five percent of the Alaska labor needs are in the nonindustrial areas and people must be trained to fill the needs of the labor market. It is suited to the 49 other States.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the letter I received from Director Woodfin be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ALASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Anchorage, July 24, 1963.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I should like to introduce myself as the new State director of vocational and technical education for the State of Alaska. While I have not had the privilege of meeting you personally, I did hear you speak at the recent groundbreaking ceremonies for the Federal Office Building in Juneau.

I look forward to my work in Alaska and sincerely solicit your support and encouragement as I direct the vocational education for our State.

You are aware, I'm sure, of the program we have in operation in the State under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The program is lending much to the economic growth and development of the State. Under the existing law Federal support to the States would be reduced from 100 to 50 percent after June 30, 1964. Alaska will, no doubt, be unable to spend matching funds in 1965 and it is therefore imperative we get passage of Senate bill 1716 if we are to receive the funds needed to continue the present rate of development in MDTA.

In the interest of the people of Alaska and vocational education, I sincerely urge your support for passage of Senate bill 1716.

Respectfully,
WILLIAM R. WOODFIN,
State Director,
Vocational and Technical Education.

Mr. GRUENING. The legislation we are considering was proposed to the Congress by the President on June 19, 1963. If enacted, it will postpone the effective date of the State matching requirement under the act of 1962 from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, "in order to provide the State legislatures with sufficient time to appropriate matching funds."

This means that the Federal Government would assume full responsibility for financing for an additional year if the contemplated training levels are to be maintained.

The bill also proposes to increase the third-year authorization for training programs from $161 to $322 million.

This increase of $161 million is a positive investment in our Nation's future. I have said many times that we should do as much for the folks at home as we do for those abroad.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the first training course under the Manpower Development and Training Act was not begun in New Hampshire until October of 1962. Gov. John King has written me that the program "did not really get started until February of 1963." But by that time the budget for the biennium beginning July 1, 1963, had been completed. Our New Hampshire legislative leaders had no real experience with the manpower retraining program and our legislature adjourned without providing for matching funds. It is worth pointing out that at least part of the reason for this was the delay in securing appropriations for the program at the Federal level in the summer of 1962.

The need for manpower retraining is acute. The demand for skills is very great and the number of unskilled men and women out of work for at least 15 weeks is about 1 million. Surveys have shown that the need for retraining is greatest among the long-term unemployed, and it is here that the manpower retraining program can make its greatest contribution.

The time is right for this action because of the uncertain future of the Area Redevelopment Act, which would have provided for an extension of the ARA retraining program. For one ARA retraining program in Berlin, N.H., there were 116 applicants for a course that could only take 16. Surveys in my State have shown a genuine need for retraining in a host of employment specialties. I strongly hope the Senate will proceed with all deliberate speed to enact S. 1716.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the pending bill to maintain the authorized level of training under the Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year. The bill must be passed to allow the Manpower Development and Training Act to meet its 3-year goal of training 400,000 unemployed.

This program is one of the most promising that Congress has yet passed toward reducing the unemployment rate. Here we can act directly for those unemployed who lack sufficient skills to effectively compete for jobs in today's technically oriented work force. The merits of this program to retrain the unemployed for useful work are obvious. I am advised that the first tentative results from my own State of Texas show that the first three completed Manpower Development and Training Act projects in Texas resulted in 31 out of 36 previously unemployed trainees being placed in jobs using their new skills. Think of the money this result will save in unemployment benefits, or will even gain the Government in tax payments.

In view of the fact that the States have not yet been able to accomplish the procedures to establish the matching programs contemplated under the original act, it is apparent that unless this bill is passed there will be a cutback in the program next year, long before the goal of 400,000 retrained workers is reached. The bill should be passed if we are to remove that number of workers from the rolls of the unemployed. We should continue this program until some impact is made on our long-term unemployed, and 400,000 seems a minimal goal to set. I urge continuation of the program at its presently authorized level through passage of this bill, giving the States a more reasonable period in which to establish their matching programs.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on August 7 of this year, I spoke briefly on the floor of the Senate in support of an amendment to restore a $30 million cut in funds for the Manpower Development and Training Act.

At that time I stated that—

> This is a practical, essential, and, at the same time, humanitarian program, one which has brought new opportunities and hope for the future to thousands of American workers and their families.

And because I am fully convinced of the correctness of this high opinion I hold of manpower training projects, I think it is very important that Congress pass the bill which we are considering today in the Senate.

S. 1716 would postpone for 1 year the requirement that the States match Federal funds, and double the authorization of funds for fiscal 1965, in order to maintain the training levels contemplated when the Manpower Development and Training Act was enacted.

Some of my colleagues have seized upon the fact that only three States have to date passed enabling legislation and actually appropriated funds in order to match Federal grants in fiscal 1965, as proof of the failure of the program.

They contend that the States themselves have shown a lack of interest and an unwillingness to assume part of the responsibility for manpower training activities.

I do not think this is the case at all. When one considers the fact that Federal funds were not made available until late last year, it becomes clear that many States just did not have sufficient time to evaluate the program fully, let alone take legislative action.

Connecticut, I am proud to say, is one of the three States that is prepared to participate with the Federal Government, should State matching funds be required after the completion of the present fiscal year.

But my State was one of the first to enter into this important field, and training courses were started as far back as 1959, 3 years before Congress gave final approval to the Manpower Development and Training Act.

So Connecticut was in a good position to take full advantage of the Federal funds available to it. As of the last week in June, approximately $1,060,000 for training costs and allowances to individuals were committed under the act. This money was for 67 approved projects, involving 3,300 trainees.

The most recent figures I have received from the Labor Department's Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, show 17 more projects approved in my State, to train an additional 965 individuals.

And just last week, Gov. John Dempsey announced the allocation of $144,574 in Federal funds to Connecticut, to finance 8 new projects for 640 trainees.

So a fair estimate of the results of retraining in my State alone, is 92 projects, and a total of 4,935 persons who have either benefited already or are now benefiting from the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I have placed some emphasis on Connecticut's experience and success, because I believe it illustrates what a realistic and practical way this is for us to help the unemployed find a new and constructive place in their communities.

We should give the States more time to make provision for financial participation, and by postponing the requirement now in the law that the States contribute 50 percent of the cost after June 30, 1964, we will be giving them a fair chance to do so.

There is a most compelling human reason for the second part of S. 1716, to double the Federal authorization of funds for fiscal 1965, from $161 million to $322 million. And this is that the future of about 100,000 persons may well depend on this increase in funds.

When the program was put into effect, it was intended to reach a 3-year goal of training 400,000 unemployed persons. But if the States do not match the Federal funds during the third year, and it is clear that most will not be able to do so, only one-half of the estimated 200,000 trainees during fiscal 1965 will be able to participate in training courses throughout the country.

We should not allow this to happen. The Manpower Development and Training Act has been successfully administered in Connecticut and in other parts of the country. The first year goal of 60,000 trainees has been achieved, and today training is proceeding at the rate of 108,000 trainees per year.

It is up to us in Congress to see to it that the third year goal of 200,000 trainees is met, and I urge my colleagues to give overwhelming support and approval to this bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move that the bill, S. 1716, be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to that committee to report the bill to the Senate not later than 1 week after the filing of a conference report on H.R. 5888, the Health, Education, and Labor Appropriations bill for fiscal 1964; or not later than 1 week after the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported to the Senate a Vocational Education bill, whichever shall last occur.

Mr. President, on the motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. At the outset, let me say that I have no intention of sabotaging the manpower retraining development program. However, I feel that we should look at this subject in a little deeper perspective than that in which it has been viewed up to now. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through its subcommittee, held two committee meetings. Five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. Three of them were administration witnesses, and the other two witnesses were persons who generally are sympathetic to this program.

Very few Senators, perhaps, realize the amount of money that is involved in the program. But I believe we should remember, too, that there are other bills before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with this subject. That committee has voted to report another bill, which would add $100 million to this program for the current fiscal year, and $100 million for fiscal 1965.

The Senate has already approved an appropriation of $110 million. With the appropriation and authorizations which are being sought during the next 2-year period, that is, fiscal 1964 and 1965, $632 million will be available for the manpower program.

I have seen no evidence which suggests that this amount of money can be justified. As I have said, the subcommittee has spent very little time on the various bills which will be before it. In addition to requests for the manpower program, $100 million has been approved by the Senate for the Youth Employment Act, which is now in the House. The Senate has a bill before it at the present time for vocational education, starting with $108 million for fiscal 1964, and running up to $243 million in 1967.

I make my motion to recommit in the hope that the committee will combine the various vocational and educational training and manpower bills in order that we can determine how much money can judiciously be spent. Under the requests for the manpower development and retraining program, and appropriations already made, and the authorizations requested, we can spend up to $632 million during the next 2 years.

At the present time only 22,142 persons have enrolled in the program. If my motion is defeated, it will be my purpose to offer a substitute amendment which will combine two bills, the one which the Senate is now considering, S. 1716, and S. 1831, which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has voted to report to the Senate.

In effect, I would reduce the funds, but certainly would not cripple the program in any way. I feel that the proper approach at this time is to return the bill to committee, in order that the committee may consider all bills of a similar nature and make as certain as it can that there is no duplication of effort, which I am sure will be the case if the various bills which are before us, some of which have been approved and some of which have not been approved, become effective, in the interest of sound fiscal policy and with a sincere desire to make certain that an education and retraining program will be put into effect and will be effective, and also will be as reasonable in cost as can possibly be anticipated. That is the only reason I have submitted my proposal at this time to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It will be noted that my proposal does not suggest that the committee should reduce the bill in any way. My purpose is to have all the bills brought before the committee, so that it can take sufficient time to study them and understand what they provide, and what is needed, and to invite experts from the agencies to tell us what the facts are. We have not had them; we could not possibly have obtained them during the two very brief hearings that were held.

In the interest of sound fiscal policy, and because I sincerely believe that a workable program can be effectuated for much less money than is proposed at this time, I hope the Senate will feel it proper to sustain the motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first, the hearings, a copy of which is on the desk of every Senator, occupy 214 pages, most of them in small print. The hearings on this particular bill are a part of comprehensive hearings on the entire subject of manpower and employment, which has been before the subcommittee ever since the early days of the year. Much of the other testimony has a bearing on the pending bill in an overall, general sense.

The background and need for the bill have been as fully explored in the subcommittee as has any other piece of legislation with which I have had anything to do since coming to the Senate. The fact that only 5 witnesses testified with respect to this small bill of 11 lines is no indication that the very voluminous statements and the other testimony which have been adduced with respect to other phases of the whole unemployment subject have not been carefully considered by the committee. The two key witnesses were the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Education, who should be well advised on the need for the proposed legislation.

Second, the subcommittee, of which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is a member, unanimously reported the bill to the full committee. To be sure, the Senator from Vermont reserved his right to submit amendments, and also reserved all his rights on the floor of the Senate.

I say without qualification that, as chairman of the subcommittee, during our hearings on the whole unemployment question, from the early days of this year forward, we have investigated the possibility of overlapping or duplication in various Federal-State programs. I think it is fair to say that there is no such duplication. In my opinion, the programs are inadequate in size. All of them are needed. I hope this one will be a part of the overall package.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the bill to the Senate by a vote of 13 to 2. It is a part of the President's civil rights program—the first part to come before the Senate for action.

I believe the necessity for the proposed legislation has been established on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I hope the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we must not operate under the misconception that there was a failure adequately to consider this proposal in the subcommittee. More than 40 persons either testified directly or filed statements with the subcommittee. I should like to have that statement clearly understood. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Vermont would not disagree with it.

Mr. PROUTY. I agree with the Senator. The statements were filed; but they are in small print, which is very difficult for anyone to read.

I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will agree that the subcommittee held only 2 days of hearings on the bill, and that only five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. Am I not correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. I said that some 35 statements were filed; and five witnesses appeared in person, making 40 or more witnesses, as I have indicated.

Mr. PROUTY. In addition to reporting the Senator's bill, the committee also voted to report another bill, one which involves $200 million for the present fiscal year and fiscal year 1965.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senate is not acting on that bill today; but it is a part of the package of the entire program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a compilation of grants-in-aid to States, individuals, and localities which was prepared by Congressional Quarterly. I think that publication has a well-deserved reputation for accuracy and carefulness. If one takes the trouble to examine those tables, he will discover that in 1962 the amount of Federal grants to States, localities, and individuals went above the $10 billion mark. In a 10-year period, the grants to States and localities have increased by 182 percent, and to individuals by 99 percent. That means that 11 percent of all the revenues derived by the Federal Government are disbursed in the form of grants-in-aid.

It would appear that the States are becoming satraps of the Federal Government; and as this procedure continues, the States will lose their identity. Certainly they will lose their independence of action. That is a matter of real concern to anyone who undertakes to examine into the subject of Federal-State relationship.

I recall the time when a distinguished former Member of this body was still alive. We lived at the same hotel. His portrait hangs in the majority leader's office. He was a colorful and flowery Member of the Senate. I am referring to J. Hamilton Lewis. He used to refer to me affectionately, when I was in the House, as his Republican leader. I had great affection for him.

I shall never forget an evening about 3 weeks before his death, when he said to me in the lobby, "Young man, I will not live to see it, but you will live to see it, for these colored spaces in the map that designate States will be nothing more than guides for the convenience of tourists, because the States will be gathered into the great emporium of power known as the Federal Government."

I think we are beginning to see that situation now. By this amazing bill, we are only building upon what has happened in other years. This is an astonishing bill. It starts with a misleading statement in the report itself. I read from the front page of the report:

> Its purpose is to postpone the effective date of the State matching requirements under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, in order to provide State legislatures with sufficient time to appropriate matching funds.

That is not a statement of fact, because the act expires in 1965, and the bill proposes to put the program on a 100-percent Federal basis for the last year of the life of the program. If I can read the English language, that is a misleading statement. It should not have appeared in the report, in the first instance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I mean in all good humor to challenge those rather strong words of the beloved Senator from Illinois. This 11-line bill will do exactly what the report says it will do. The Senator from Illinois did not continue to read the full quotation from the text respecting the purpose of the report; therefore, I shall do so. I continue to quote from where the Senator from Illinois broke off the quotation:

> This means that the Federal Government must assume full responsibility for financing for an additional year in order to maintain the training levels contemplated by the act at the time of its enactment. Accordingly, the bill also proposes to increase the third year authorization for training programs under the act from the present $161 million to $322 million.

And if one turns to the bill, which is only nine lines long, he will see that is exactly what it does. It changes the date "1964" to "1965," and it provides the additional authorization. That is all it does. If the program is to end at the end of next year—although I know the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows as well as I do that it is not going to, even though that is where its present legislative status leaves it—we shall have to meet that question when we come to it. We are not trying to meet it now; and I believe the Senator from Illinois should withdraw the word "misleading," which was used in reference to the report of this honorable committee, which adopted this factual statement of what the bill does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not propose to withdraw the statement. My artful friend is begging the question. Let him read the words I read:

> In order to provide the State legislatures with sufficient time to appropriate matching funds.

The report does not do anything of the kind. It goes on to say that 25 of the 29 legislatures which were in session took no action. This bill calls for congressional action instead of State action, and it would dip into the Federal Treasury, for the purpose of keeping these programs going.

I am not opposed to these programs; but I believe it is a fact of monumental importance that of the 29 legislatures which have been in session in the odd numbered years, 25 did not see fit to take any action; and evidently the Governors were not interested.

Can any Senator show me in the hearings a line of testimony that came from the lips of a Governor? I could not find in the hearings the testimony of even one Governor. Can any Senator show me in the hearings the testimony of even one member of a State legislature? There were only five witnesses before the committee. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] admitted that fact a moment ago. Who were they? Senators will find them listed in the hearings. The Secretary of Labor and four others, were the only ones who testified. But where was there an indication of State interest?

Mr. President, all I can conclude is that for the third year Uncle Sam will pick up the tab 100 percent; and unless I have no sense of history, after 30 years of service around here, this will become a permanent program on a 100-percent Federal basis—I will bet a good deal upon the truth and veracity of that estimate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding.

I should like the RECORD to indicate that the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia, has endorsed this program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did he appear before the committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH No, he did not. I was going to add that he did not appear there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Governor of Illinois did not appear there, either.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No, he did not; but I could read from the hearings——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I know that; but how many people read the hearings?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to have the RECORD indicate that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, received from the Illinois State Manpower Advisory Committee a letter——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; I know——

Mr. RANDOLPH. As to the efficacy of this program. If the Senator from Illinois is willing to permit me to do so, I should like to request unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Surely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Then, Mr. President, I so request.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE MANPOWER ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR ILLINOIS DOWNSTATE AREA,
August 5, 1963.

The Honorable W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As members of the State Manpower Training Advisory Committee for Downstate Illinois, we respectfully enlist your active support of the proposed legislation that Congress postpone for 1 year the requirement of State matching funds for fiscal year 1965, under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Despite the fact that Illinois has one of the largest programs in the country under Manpower Development and Training Act, we feel that too little time has elapsed since the program has been in operation to warrant a record which would justify an appropriation request for matching funds by the State legislature at this time, in view of the State's financial problems.

Congressional action is needed in the current 1963 session so that training projects can be planned and started which will not be hampered by the June 30, 1964, deadline. By early 1964, when the next session of Congress might act, very few programs of any length could be planned and put into operation. This would seriously curtail the number of projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act which could be started.

Every effort should be made to continue the manpower development and training program at the levels contemplated in order that maximum opportunity be provided for the training of the unemployed.

Respectfully,

Dr. Martin Wagner, Chairman; William Finnan; Dr. John Meade; Lawrence Schmidt; John D. Yolton; George Bagley; Dr. Kermit Johnson; Earl M. Potter; Dr. Ernest J. Simon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I point out to the Senator from West Virginia that although they will spend the money, I know of no member of the State legislature who came down here and testified in favor of the bill. None talked to me about it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe it is important—I do not want to labor this matter, but I know that my astute and articulate friend, the Senator from Illinois, realizes the importance of this point—to state that there is today in the United States of America a mobility of jobs which did not exist, let us say, 20 years ago; and I should like to read what Secretary Wirtz said about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us be sure it is on the point we are discussing.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Secretary Wirtz said:

> Thirty days from today, 400,000 people in this country will be working in a different labor market area from the one they are working in today.

So a person, who had been trained in Illinois, could then be working in West Virginia; or one trained in West Virginia could then be working in Illinois.

Therefore, simply to say that this program is to be boxed off, State by State, and it is not a national program—as the Senator from Illinois has said—is not correct. This is a national program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We began with the original bill, which provided that after 2 years of Federal financing, the Federal funds should be matched by State money. If that is not the case, then of course I cannot read the English language. But when the State legislatures met, they ignored that, and the Governors have ignored it. They let the legislators return home without taking such action. I remind the Senator from West Virginia that there are now 33 Democrat Governors in this country; furthermore, I hold no brief for the Republican Governors who also failed to appear. But I point out that in the sisterhood of States, the party representation of the Governors approximately matches that of the membership of the Senate. Did the Governors express an interest? If they did, I have not found it, strangely enough. And I quarrel about it. I remind the Senator that in the Finance Committee we shall be wrestling with a tax bill calling for the chopping of a hole in the Federal revenues, if one can be contrived; yet we are confronting a $9.2 billion deficit, as a result of the first years of this administration's impact, in order to get things moving again. When the Secretary of the Treasury was last before us, he gave an informal estimate that—he guessed—that when he came again—and he has to come some time in November—he would have to ask for a $320 billion debt ceiling. Where are we going in this fiscal situation? I should like to know.

But now we would make it so easy for the States, and we would dig another hole into the revenues of the country, by this expenditure on a 100-percent Federal basis. Mr. President, I must protest it.

The Assistant Secretary is in my State right now. In Chicago, they held a meeting which was attended by a thousand or more people. He talks about having the initial training start with a thousand people. I hope it works; but I think the State of Illinois can find in its budget its share of this money. If it cannot, there is something wrong in the capital of my State. I cast no reflection on our Democratic Governor; but surely we can do this.

Yet here we come—and with what a jaunty and blithe spirit—ready to assume this addition to the responsibility which in 1962 we put upon the States, and thus made possible the enactment of the original bill.

I remember some of the debate at the time. So it is amazing to me to find that only three or four of the legislatures took action. Where was the executive branch of the Government? Why did not it "lay it on the line" to the Governors, and also the State legislatures while they were in session? But, no, they returned home. And now, of course, it is proposed that we do the easy thing—namely, pick up the chit. But, Mr. President, one of these chits that runs into millions of dollars, is not hay—not even in my hometown; and I want my State to assume its responsibility, as was indicated when the act was passed in March 1962.

The State legislatures will meet again in 1964. Why not wait? Why not support the motion to recommit? Let us see what is in those two bills, so that when they come back from conference, we can see what we are laying out for the entire program of some kind of vocational training.

In addition, we ought to wait out the States on this question. Perhaps, if there is a sufficient expression of interest, we will finally get them to toe the mark with respect to the requirement that is in the basic law.

As I indicated, the mountainous grants-in-aid program, which is now over $10 billion a year, assuming 11 percent of the Federal revenue, will continue to roll on and on if someone does not protest, and if the Senate does not in part put a stop to it. As a result, I think that the statement is fully justified when one says that the States are becoming so deeply in debt to the Federal Government that they are beginning to forfeit their independence of action.

Mr. President, we had better send the bill back to the committee because there is a 100-percent chance that if we fail to do so, the program will finally incubate into a permanent 100-percent federally financed program, only to add to the burdens of this Government, which finds itself in fiscal difficulty to the point where all sorts of devices are now being used so that we will not creep over the danger line. We are issuing nonmarketable securities to foreign countries, getting our money in advance on military equipment, and inducing recipients to make prepayments on what they owe us. But we are going to run out of such devices. Those items are all nonrecurring. We had better put our house in order. We have an opportunity to do something in that field.

I wish it were possible to impress on the Senate and on the people how I apprehend and assess the danger that confronts us. Surely, the President must appreciate it. The Secretary of the Treasury must appreciate it, because I gain that impression from him every time he appears before the Finance Committee. We are going to run out of gimmicks. That is when the shooting will begin. That is all I have to say.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the vote, two things should be said briefly. First, long before I came to the Senate the able minority leader was inveighing in the Senate and in the House against Federal grants to the States. One of the best States-righters ever to serve in the Congress is the able and effective Senator from Illinois. The trouble is that the entire issue has been water over the dam since President Eisenhower received the Kestnbaum report almost 7 years ago. That able group of public servants, including Members of Congress, and headed by an able Republican, Meyer Kestnbaum, from Chicago, found after an exhaustive study that we could not return to the States the resources necessary to enable them to carry on the programs for the admitted needs of their citizens, and that the Federal Government had to supply the necessary money.

As I said earlier in the debate, the issue goes back to the days when the Federal Government stole the Federal income tax away from the States. That was the goose that laid the golden egg. When that was done, it became impossible for the States, without the assistance of the Federal Government, through grants-in-aid to the States, to finance needed and essential services.

A vote to recommit the bill is a vote to kill the retraining program as it gets off the ground. A vote to recommit the bill is a vote against a significant part of the President's civil rights program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall take not more than 2 minutes for this observation. I wish not to argue with the Senator from Illinois, but only to make the record complete.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned that State legislatures would be in session next year. I wish the RECORD to show that the legislatures of 29 States will not meet until 1965, though 4 of the 29 States have authorized matching funds under this act.

I also desire to emphasize a point I made previously. The problem is national in scope. As we debate the subject today, there are 400,000 workers who, within 30 days, will be working in another market area of our country. To say that the work stops at a county or State line is not sufficient; it is not responsive to the present condition of high mobility of the American working force.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to recommit, and I should like to express my reasons for so doing.

I believe it is rather unusual that, with the exception of four States, the State legislatures which met in session in 1963 did not take any action on the program, and did not provide matching funds. Also, I would have been glad to have heard more testimony and received more information about the effectiveness of the program, including the number of projects which have been started in the States and the placing of trainees at work.

My reasons for voting against the motion to recommit can be quickly stated. Perhaps a few of the States do not have the necessary funds, though that is doubtful. My judgment is that legislatures of the various States did not appropriate funds because they consider the problem of unemployment a national problem. I believe it is, too.

The reason that people are more fully employed in one State may result from special conditions. For example, the great defense industries in some States of the Union provide the people of those States full employment. But those industries are supported by the taxpayers of the United States through massive defense expenditures.

Similarly, unemployment exists in other States for reasons which are beyond the control of those States. These reasons include the great technological improvements which have closed industry and reduced employment. Perhaps the failure of the Congress to enact tax programs has also had its effect upon employment. I will admit to my leader that there is merit in what he has said about the fiscal program of the administration which has failed to move the economy. Continued deficits do have an adverse effect upon investment and unemployment.

Unemployment is not purely a local or a State problem. It is affected by great national movements and by circumstances which are beyond the control of State governments. I believe that the question of unemployment and its future impact is the most serious of the domestic problems which affect our country today.

It is argued in the Senate and by some who write to me that private enterprise can handle unemployment. But private enterprise is not handling this problem in the main, and the fact is that people are still out of work. The training program is probably the most sensible program we have to fit young and even older people for some productive employment.

I really do not see what would be accomplished by recommitting the bill. It will be reported to the Senate again, and we shall vote on the issue again, unless in some way it becomes involved in the question of civil rights. Then it might not be voted upon at all.

Because I believe the problem of unemployment is the greatest domestic problem that will be facing our country, and because it is a national problem and not a State problem, I think that we must provide for this training program to continue even if the Federal Government is to pay for it.

The program is underway. Funds needed have not been provided. It will not be possible to provide them the third year unless the Congress looks ahead and faces this problem.

For these reasons, I intend to vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I think perhaps the Senator is not aware that my motion to recommit is not merely a straight recommittal motion. The committee would be directed to report after the conferees on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to this program, made their report, or after the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the vocational education bill.

The purpose of this procedure is to mesh all the various bills for vocational education, for retraining, and so forth into a package, if possible, so that Senators may know what they are voting for, and can provide adequate money, and not a nickel more.

If the motion should lose, I shall offer a substitute which would provide about $432 million for the training program during the present fiscal year and fiscal year 1965.

This motion is not directed as a blow against the retraining program, in which I believe. We have been asked to provide much more money than can possibly be spent efficiently or effectively. I think no Senator can justify throwing money away when it cannot be efficiently or effectively used. That is my interest in the proposal at the present time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator tell us what percentage of the money has been used?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not have the figures. A relatively small percentage has been used, I assume. Perhaps the Senator from Pennsylvania can answer.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, I think I can answer. Seventy million dollars was appropriated. Fifty-six million dollars of this was actually expended. All of the $70 million has been committed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Seventy million dollars was appropriated?

Mr. PROUTY. One hundred and ten million dollars was appropriated.

Mr. CLARK. That is for the next fiscal year.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Fifty-six million dollars will have been expended by the end of this year?

Mr. CLARK. No, $56 million, out of $70 million was spent in fiscal 1963. I am pretty sure that statement is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the difficulty faced by those of us on the committee and others who are interested in this program is that we have not been able to get the answers we need.

I am not overly critical of those who serve in the Department downtown, because they do not know. The program is scarcely off the ground. They do not have the facts or figures, or the experience needed to know really what is going to happen.

I say this without the slightest criticism of them, because I believe those in charge of this program are trying to do a good job.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that the present enrollment is at the rate of 108,000 trainees per year?

Mr. PROUTY. The information I received this morning is that there are 22,000 actually in training at the present time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. At the rate of 108,000 for the year?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not know what the rate would be, but there are now 22,000 in the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if there is any virtue in the argument we have been listening to in favor of this program, why not make the 110 grant-in-aid programs all Federal? Let us have the debacle sure and complete—and right now.

I cannot escape the fact that when the Governors' conference met in Honolulu 2 years ago one of the Governors—I shall not name him—was reported to have made a statement with respect to grants from the Federal Treasury and to have said: "I think it is our duty to get all the money we can get out of the Federal Treasury because if we do not, somebody else will get it."

Two weeks after he made that statement I was addressing the National Convention of Local Officials in Chicago. I quoted him. That statement got into the newspapers. He sent me an air mail letter and said I had misquoted him. I cited him the documentation, and I never heard another word from that Governor.

But that is it—"Get it while you can, because otherwise somebody else will get it."

That will be a way of breaking the back of the Federal Government; and, goodness knows, we are in ample difficulty now.

That is my story.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I will make a response to what has been said. I think there is a distinction between this program for the training of unemployed persons and the usual grant-in-aid programs, and I will give just a few examples.

Aid is given to impacted school districts, where local situations are assisted. This aid totals some $300 million to $400 million a year. But the schools are under the control of the States, which also contribute. There is a direct local interest.

Road programs provide for expenditures which involve 50-50 sharing, because the roads provide direct benefits for the States and for their people. The airport programs are on the same basis. They are located in the States, and they directly affect local needs.

I make this statement to buttress the argument I made a few minutes ago that unemployment is not merely a local problem. It is a national problem. I cannot accept the argument made by my distinguished leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson]. If he were present and voting, I understand that he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken].

If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle].

If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper and Mr. Miller], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 150 Leg.]

YEAS—19

Allott
Boggs
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Goldwater
Hruska
Lausche
Morton
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—44

Bayh
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kennedy
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—37

Aiken
Anderson
Bennett
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Mechem
Miller
Moss
Mundt
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Prouty's motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it seems to me entirely appropriate that the Federal Government should extend for another year its 100-percent underwriting of the manpower development and training program.

The matching requirement was originally delayed for 2 years in order that the program might be gotten underway and its usefulness demonstrated to the States.

This has taken longer than anticipated. In many instances vocational education programs were not geared to undertake this kind of retraining program. Often the machinery had to be built from the ground up.

Also, these retraining programs have had to be initiated against the statutory requirement that there be an expectation of jobs for the trainees on their completion of a retraining course.

This has meant that the retraining program has not only been running a race against the abolition of semiskilled and unskilled jobs by automation, but it has also been faced with the fact of continuing unemployment among skilled persons. Happily this latter situation has improved over the last 2 years.

We in Michigan are ironing the bugs out of this program. The fact that 80 percent of those who have completed retraining courses have been employed is evidence that this program can prove of real value in Michigan if given a chance.

But it is clear that we do need additional time. Until the effectiveness of this program can be proven without a doubt in Michigan and across the country, we cannot ask the individual States, most of which have continuing fiscal problems and are burdened with the increasing costs of existing education programs, to appropriate funds for manpower retraining.

I believe it is equally clear that we cannot afford to let manpower retraining be stillborn because of the premature withdrawal of full Federal support.

Just as the fact of unemployment is a national problem, so too are the roots of unemployment national problems.

Because of the high mobility of Americans, the lack of educational and training opportunities in one State may well become the unemployment problem of another State. Michigan knows that unemployment in Detroit is the product not only of automation and the decentralization of the auto industry, but equally of the limited educational opportunities of many of our citizens who have moved to Michigan from other States in the last 25 years.

It is significant that the bill before us today is the result of a recommendation by the President in his civil rights message of June 19. It is significant because it means recognition of the vicious and perpetuating circle formed by discrimination, lack of education and training, unemployment, and economic deprivation.

Certainly manpower retraining is only a partial answer—but we cannot let even partial answers go unfulfilled.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe it is imperative that we approve the bill before us and give the manpower development and training program this extra impetus to become the effective weapon against unemployment which I believe it can become.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while many Senators are present, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, first, about the legislative program for tomorrow, and also whether it is likely that the Senate will be in session on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will consider a number of bills on the calendar which have been approved by the Democratic policy committee for action. There is also a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

Furthermore, it is hoped that on Friday the Senate will be able to take up the bill involving aid to medical and dental schools.

I had hoped to bring up the Proxmire dairy bill, but several Senators have requested additional time to consider other commodities in the field of agriculture.

On Monday next it is anticipated that debate will start on the test ban treaty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it might be appropriate at this time to have the distinguished majority leader's estimate of how long he believes consideration of the treaty is likely to take on the floor of the Senate, and whether it is possible to determine a day certain for a vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Both parts of the Senator's question are difficult to answer. However, the debate on the treaty will probably last anywhere from 1 week to 2 weeks. There will be no intention on our part to rush the treaty through; and every Senator who desires to be heard should be heard and will be heard. I do not anticipate any delaying tactics.

I would be glad to consider with the minority leader, sometime next week, the possibility of reaching agreement, for some time in the following week, on a day certain, when a vote could be taken. However, that remains to be seen; and I believe that in the meantime we had best let events take their course.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1716) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. If we may have order, we may be able to find out what the status of the pending legislation is. I should like to be advised as to what was the last question that the Presiding Officer put to the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question was on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has an amendment which he wishes to offer.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the action ordering the engrossment and third reading of the bill and the vote on the passage of the bill be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear to Senators who are present that I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment; nor on the passage of the bill.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may we have order?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I can explain it very briefly.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 202 the following new subsection:

" '(h) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the development of functional literacy and basic work skills those eligible persons who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and who will thereby be able to pursue courses of occupational training, and such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, except that the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply to the selection of persons under this subsection, and such persons shall be eligible for an additional fifty-two weeks of training allowances.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out the word 'nineteen' and inserting the word 'sixteen' in lieu thereof, by striking out 'but not more than 5 per centum of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under this section may be paid to such youths.', and adding the following: 'Provided, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than six months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.'

"SEC. 3. Section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: 'except that with respect to referrals under subsection (h) of section 202 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the training to be provided under such subsection (h) through other appropriate education agencies'.

"SEC. 4. Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out the word 'vocational' before the words 'education and training'.

"SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 305 is amended by striking out the word 'vocational'.

"SEC. 6. Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(e) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II.

" '(f) Not more than 20 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out title II of this Act shall be used for training allowances paid to youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age.

" '(g) Not more than 15 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out title II of this Act shall be used for training allowances paid to trainees under subsection (h) of section 202 thereof.

" '(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than 30 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in this section shall be used for training costs, exclusive of training allowances, of projects under title II of this Act.'

"SEC. 7. That (a) section 203(d) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by striking out '1964' and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out '1964' and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, first, let me point out that under my proposal I would combine the text of S. 1831 and that of S. 1716.

S. 1831 is the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It provides for $100 million additional for the Manpower Retraining Act for the current fiscal year, and an additional $100 million for fiscal year 1965.

In accordance with figures which I gave earlier, if we combine the $110 million which has already been appropriated by the Senate for fiscal year 1964, with the authorizations which have been requested, and with the provisions in S. 1831, we will find the total to be $632 million, which can be spent for the manpower retraining program during the present fiscal year and fiscal year 1965.

It seems to me that there is no justification whatever for appropriating or authorizing funds in this amount. We find, too, that at the present time only 22,000 people are participating in the program.

We find that the need for the $100 million which was authorized in S. 1831, the Clark bill, will have passed before the funds will have been appropriated, which means that we can reduce that amount by $25 million without any problem whatsoever.

The House has also appropriated $140 million for this program for fiscal 1964. Assuming that the Senate conferees and the House conferees split the difference, that means that probably the Senate appropriation will be increased by about $15 million. So under the provisions of S. 1831, I have reduced the $100 million by $40 million, leaving a remainder of $60 million. In other words, $170 million will be available for the program in fiscal 1964, the current fiscal year. Twenty percent of the total $170 million, under the proposal which I have offered, would furnish employment to approximately 100,000 individuals in the youth program, 42,000 individuals in the literacy program, which is a part of the Clark bill, and 62,000 individuals in the adult training program. That is for fiscal 1964.

For fiscal 1965, under my proposal, $261 million would be available. This amount would provide training for 154,000 persons in the youth program in fiscal 1964; training for 61,000 in the literacy program; and training for 116,000 persons in the adult training program.

On a 2-year basis, the total cost of my proposal will be $431 million. In my judgment, this figure is much higher than is necessary to carry out the program in an effective manner. My proposed substitute includes some parts of S. 1831 and also incorporates some features of that bill which I believe are highly desirable and necessary.

A new section 202(h) would establish the literacy program contained in S. 1831. The participants under this program would be limited to those having less than an eighth-grade education. It seems to me that anyone who has completed 8 years of schooling does not need to be taught to read or write. If he has not acquired that ability after having spent 8 years in school, I doubt whether he is ever likely to become proficient in reading or writing.

My proposal would also reduce the youth participation age from 19 to 16 years.

It would remove the 5-percent limitation on youth training allowances and make available 20 percent of the total appropriations.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute would require school dropouts to have been out of school for 6 months of the regular term rather than 3 months, as in S. 1831.

My substitute includes a new authorization, as does S. 1831, for the new program and the extension of youth training. As I stated earlier, it provides additional authorizations of $60 million for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965.

It places a 20-percent ceiling on the amount of funds which can be used in the youth training program, and a 15-percent ceiling on the new literacy program for training allowances.

It places a 30-percent ceiling on the amount of appropriations which may be used to defray training costs of title II projects.

I have checked and found that the average training course thus far has been in the vicinity of 33 or 34 percent, which seems to me unnecessarily high; nevertheless, I have reduced it only 4 percent.

My proposal incorporates 100 percent of Federal financing for S. 1716. It also strikes out the amount in S. 1716, but adds $60 million for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965 to the existing authorization of $161 million.

It seems to me that this program cannot possibly spend the amount which I have envisioned in my substitute. My proposal is very liberal. It could be cut substantially without having an adverse effect on the bill itself. In effect, if the amendment should be adopted, it would reduce the appropriation and authorization existing over the next 2 years by some $201 million, leaving approximately $432 million to be available for the program for fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965.

Frankly, I do not believe that amount of money could be spent; but I wish to be as generous as I can, because I sincerely believe that if the program can be made to work, it will satisfy a great need in our country today.

Mr. President, with that explanation, I am ready to vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with all deference to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the highest respect, this is not the way to legislate on the floor of the Senate. I have before me the Senator's amendment of 2½ typewritten pages. Only two Members of this body have read it. They are the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and I. I read it for the first time at the desk about 10 minutes ago.

The amendment would combine two bills, one of which is not before the Senate, and will not be for several days. It takes the provisions of one and the provisions of another as a substitute for a bill which has been carefully thought out by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senator from Vermont is a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill. He did not propose his substitute amendment in the subcommittee or in the full committee. It is now proposed at the 11th hour, on the floor of the Senate. I doubt whether any Senator could adequately understand the amendment on first reading it. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I should say that I did attend the meeting of the full committee. I had been seeking for several days to obtain a sufficient invitation to enable me to offer an amendment of this kind or one of a similar nature. But we were persuaded to act hurriedly in the committee meeting, and sufficient time was not taken, so I was unable to get some of the information necessary to justify in committee the $432 million proposal I am now offering.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is familiar with some of the proposals in the amendment, because he is familiar with the bill introduced by the Senator from West Virginia.

If sufficient time had been accorded me in the committee, it would not have been necessary for me to offer this amendment in the Senate at the last moment. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree with me as to that, because at times he has a tendency to rush things through when he is convinced that the time is ripe. I do not criticize him for that; I simply say that I did not have an opportunity to secure the desired information from the executive departments concerned to enable me to draft an amendment or a substitute for presentation to the committee.

This is perhaps not a desirable way to legislate; but it seems to me that we could have acted in committee with a little more reserve and time in order that we might have known what we were doing when we reported the bill. I dare say that few Members of the Senate have any idea today of what the committee has done.

The bill to which the Senator from Pennsylvania refers is one that came before the committee later, and should have been included in the bill now before the Senate, because it provides $200 million that will go into the program. In all fairness, Senators should have known today that $200 million was proposed to be added to the bill for manpower retraining. In my judgment, that was not being completely fair and straightforward with the Senate today.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the bill presently under consideration by the Senate, S. 1716, is designed to eliminate the State matching requirement under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This would take effect beginning July 1, 1964. The bill would also authorize the additional appropriation of $161 million for this important program.

Few persons would quarrel with the fact that unemployment in the United States is a major domestic problem, and one which is assuming alarming proportions. The Manpower Act is designed to combat part of this problem by retraining workers in new and valuable skills. It is not a perfect program; very few new programs are. It is an important one though, and must be pressed into further development by the Federal Government.

Only 10 States have taken the most initial steps in providing matching funds under the original act, and only 4 States have enacted enabling legislation. With many of the State legislatures not scheduled to meet next year, the program is in jeopardy of extinction unless Congress acts.

Some critics of this program might say the lack of State activity indicates a lack of support. Secretary Wirtz, in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, stated that he had not received one negative report from the States, and, in fact, had received positive reactions from almost all of them. This program is designed to meet a national problem. I feel that Congress must pave the way. As the program develops and as more projects are initiated and completed, the States will have an opportunity to legislate and on the local level to buttress these efforts. Until that time, it is the responsibility of Congress; and I urge my colleagues to join with those of us who support this program in insuring its continuation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1716) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203(d) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "a like amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "$322,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on this vote my colleague from Washington [Mr. Jackson] is necessarily absent on official business. He advised me that were he present he would like to be recorded as voting "yea" on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REGISTRATION OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES AS STAFF OFFICERS IN THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 454, House bill 5781, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the first sentence of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 1, 1939 (46 U.S.C., sec. 242), is amended by striking out "and (5) surgeon" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5) surgeon, and (6) professional nurse".

(b) Section 2 of such Act of August 1, 1939, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Applicants for registry as surgeon or professional nurse shall be required to possess a valid license as physician and surgeon or registered nurse, respectively, issued under the authority of a State or territory of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no further business, insofar as the consideration of proposed legislation is concerned, will be transacted tonight.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YUGOSLAVIA SNUGGLES CLOSER TO RED TRADE BLOC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some people still refuse to believe that Tito is closer to Khrushchev than ever before. Every day's developments show more convincingly that he is.

The objective evidence is reported in an article written by David Binder in today's New York Times which indicates that Marshal Tito has been given an associate status in the Communist economic organization, known as Comecon, which is the economic council for the Soviet Communist bloc states.

Let me read one or two short paragraphs from this:

> Yugoslavia had long sought observer status in Comecon, but at first political friction between this country [Yugoslavia] and the Soviet bloc and, later, a Soviet insistence that Yugoslavia become a full member blocked the move. The government of President Tito did not want full membership because it was thought this might compromise the country's good trade standing with Western countries. Yugoslavia has sought observer status in the Common Market, the Western equivalent of Comecon, for more than a year, but no action has been taken.

Mr. President, this again is objective evidence that Tito and Yugoslavia are moving closer to the Soviet bloc than ever before. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the article published in the New York Times and written by David Binder.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Yugoslavia To Get Status of Observer in Red Trade Bloc

(By David Binder)

Belgrade, Yugoslavia, September 3.—A Government spokesman said today that Yugoslavia would be granted observer status in the Soviet bloc's Council for Mutual Economic Assistance within the next several months.

The spokesman said it had been "agreed upon in principle" that this independent Socialist country would obtain associate status in the Communist economic organization, known as Comecon, before Premier Khrushchev arrived 2 weeks ago. The Soviet leader flew to Moscow this morning from Belgrade's airport, ending a 15-day visit to Yugoslavia.

An economic delegation that included Mikhail A. Lesechko, the chief Soviet representative in the economic council, was already in Yugoslavia when Mr. Khrushchev arrived.

Yugoslavia had long sought observer status in Comecon but at first political friction between this country and the Soviet bloc and, later, a Soviet insistence that Yugoslavia become a full member blocked the move.

The government of President Tito did not want full membership because it was thought this might compromise the country's good trade standing with Western countries. Yugoslavia has sought observer status in the Common Market, the Western equivalent of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Comecon, for more than a year, but no action has been taken.

The spokesman said that the status of observer in Comecon would enable Yugoslavia to be well informed on the Soviet bloc's plans for economic specialization and integration and on their long-range individual plans. He said the Belgrade government would thus be able to adapt certain industries to the needs of the bloc.

Mr. Khrushchev ended his 15-day stay on an amiable note. In a farewell address at the airport he stressed his view that there could be "various conceptions on different issues in the international workers movements" because the move toward socialism was "becoming evermore varied and all encompassing."

In a bow to President Tito's independent brand of socialism, he added: "We are convinced that the policy of Socialist forces cannot be built on the dramatization of existing differences."

Marshal Tito, in his airport speech, emphasized his agreement with Premier Khrushchev on the need to strengthen the policy of peaceful coexistence. He suggested that the area where this could be done most effectively was among the underdeveloped countries.

ATMOSPHERE IMPROVED

Yugoslav officials and Western observers remarked that the atmosphere had been improved by the Khrushchev visit, but that Marshal Tito had repeatedly emphasized his stance of independence.

As if to underline this, the Belgrade official said today that President Tito would probably visit President Kennedy in Washington this fall after his trip to four Latin American countries.

It was the second time in 5 days that a high Yugoslav authority had spoken of a Washington visit as a probability in conversations with Westerners.

Marshal Tito is expected to leave Belgrade September 14 for Brazil and spend the next 4 weeks touring that country, Bolivia, Chile, and Mexico. On the way back he plans to attend the session of the United Nations General Assembly. The official indicated that the Yugoslav leader would hope to see the President at that time.

U.S. Embassy officials said that they had no knowledge of such a plan, but that they were aware of Marshal Tito's wish to visit the United Nations. They suggested that a Washington visit would depend on a vote by Congress to rescind a bill barring Yugoslavia's most favored nation trade status. It was thought possible that Congress would make a decision on this bill by mid-October.

Informed sources remarked it was possible that a Tito-Kennedy meeting was being planned by the White House without the use of State Department channels.

A Government spokesman made an official apology today to Western reporters who had covered the Tito-Khrushchev tour. Sunday, in Zagreb, several correspondents were roughed up by policemen while being ejected from a chemical plant.

Greeted in Moscow

Moscow, September 3.—Premier Khrushchev returned to Moscow today. He was greeted at the airport by President Leonid I. Brezhnev and other leading officials. The Premier, who looked tanned and relaxed, made no statement at the airport but drove off immediately after shaking hands with the officials. He was accompanied by his wife.

Plan for Talk Denied

Washington, September 3.—White House sources said Friday that President Kennedy had "no plans at present" to meet this fall with President Tito. They said today that this was still their comment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on this particular point. It seems to me that we have been going along under a delusion as to what Tito is, and the Communist Government of Yugoslavia. We have made no effort whatsoever to separate the Communist government from the people of Yugoslavia.

If the Senator from Wisconsin at a later point in the process of foreign aid debate might see fit to put in any kind of amendment which would restrict or prohibit aid to this type of country, I would be very happy to support him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] very much. He is absolutely right when he makes the point that it is most important that there be a distinction between Tito on the one hand and the Yugoslav people on the other.

Aid to Yugoslavia today is aid to the Tito government the oppressor, not to the Yugoslav people. The fact is we have many, many Yugoslavs in Wisconsin, and I have yet to meet a Yugoslav from Yugoslavia who has lived there as a citizen who is not opposed to aid to Tito. Why?

They know it helps Tito, and Tito is a Communist dictator, a suppressor of his people's liberty who has allied himself, as he said recently, on every major issue with the Soviets to enable him to stay in power.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado very much, and I do hope that there is an amendment he and I can support on this subject. If no other Senator offers an amendment to ban aid to Tito, I intend to offer one myself.

JANESVILLE GAZETTE SUPPORTS DAIRY BILL BEFORE SENATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Janesville Gazette, one of the outstanding Wisconsin daily newspapers, carried an editorial recently entitled "Workable Plan for Milk," in which they give support to the dairy bill which will come before the Senate within the next week or two. This bill was scheduled to come up tomorrow, but, unfortunately, for various reasons it cannot come up until after the test ban treaty debate. I see the assistant majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, with an expectant look in his eye. I hope, with his great talent, the Senator will give us the kind of support on this bill of which he is very capable, indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this the Proxmire bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This will help the farms of Minnesota as well as the farms of Wisconsin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make sure that my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who with great humility did not deny himself the opportunity to proclaim that this is the Proxmire bill, that it did get through the committee and was put on the calendar. The policy committee has moved that it be taken off so that all these procedural steps have been taken, and after we eliminate contamination of the atmosphere by the approval of the nuclear test ban treaty, which will assure that milk will no longer have strontium 90 contamination in it, I believe that will be the appropriate time to pass the Proxmire dairy bill.

There may be an amendment to that by my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. But it is a constructive proposal, and I wish to assure the Senator from Wisconsin, after his words of commendation and flattery, that I shall do everything I can, coming from a great dairy State like Minnesota, to see that the bill is properly acted upon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. His support will mean a very great deal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the editorial published in the Janesville Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorial ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Workable Plan for Milk

Government policy these many years has been to aid farmers, both through research and education and by direct means of subsidy in a variety of programs. In all of these, producers of grains, cotton, etc., seemingly have been of special concern, while the dairyman generally has been at the end of the list.

It is true that there have been dairy programs, and costly ones. These, however, have taken but two forms: The purchase of surplus supplies of dairy products in the hopes that market prices on milk might be raised, and the attempts at Government control of marketing, through orders regulating dealers and distributors of milk.

While the need for an adequate dairy plan was as plain as the need for the wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco and many others, the problem has been to frame legislation which will have a chance of accomplishing the purposes for which it is intended.

The complexity of the dairy industry, with the conflicting interests of farmers, dairy cooperatives, general farm organizations, processors, manufacturers, industrial users, and retail outlets has been the despair of legislators seeking an answer. The more Congress looked into the matter, the more discouraged it seemed to become; an attitude not helped by the continuing and often bitter disagreements within the industry itself.

Senator Proxmire has now come up with a dairy plan which seems to overcome former ones. While he is sponsor and the author of the measure just approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee, the contents represent the thinking of many experts in dairying. A good deal of the credit might be claimed by A. L. McWilliams, the general manager of Pure Milk Association of Chicago, the organization with which many farmers in this area are associated.

The biggest talking point for the bill, it appears, is that it should not encourage farmers to produce more and more milk, a necessity for many of them as they strive to increase income and meet rising costs.

The marketing of milk has taken on fantastic pricing forms as efforts have been made to balance out factors affecting producers and buyers, their locations, the uses they make of milk, milk quality and a host of other considerations. But the general pattern for sales on fluid markets has been to establish a blend price. Thus all farmers are paid uniformly, with proceeds of bottled milk and cream which dealers buy at a high price, and of milk utilized for manufactured purposes, bought at a low price, pooled and distributed.

Under this plan, the more bottled milk that is sold the higher the blend price. But many farmers produce excess milk which goes into the cheaper classifications, and thus lowers the average price for all. Income thus goes down, and more farmers join the surplus producers in order to fatten their checks by bigger volume of sales.

PROXMIRE's bill seemingly will go a long way toward ending this self-defeating system. In essence, and stripped of the many technical features, it provides for a two-price system so that a farmer will be able to receive payment at a relatively high rate for his share of the bottled milk market. Anything he produces beyond the necessities of this market will be sold at a lower price. The effect should be that those who hold production to market needs will get the benefit of the top price. Those who choose to produce excess milk will sell a part of it for a much lower price.

Some difficulty and cost may be foreseen in the administration, but probably it will not exceed other farm aid attempts involving endless and costly paperwork. In any event, there is a chance of some benefit to the taxpayer-consumer. The plan should assure ample milk supplies on a steady basis the year around. It should minimize the need for Government buying of surplus dairy produce and it ought not increase retail prices of milk, although some advances may be expected in dairy products if excess milk production, used for manufacture, is curtailed.

If we must have control and a degree of subsidy, we should at least have programs which do not increase the very difficulties we seek to remedy. Hopefully, the Proxmire bill will be a more effective one for the dairyman.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, September 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Fundamental Objective of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some excerpts from an excellent address which the able and distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] delivered at the Hager reunion at Ramage Park in Boone County, W. Va., on Sunday, August 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT HAGER REUNION, RAMAGE PARK, BOONE COUNTY, W. VA., SUNDAY, AUGUST 25, 1963

There is no doubt in my mind concerning the fundamental objective of the Soviet Union. It continues to strive for world domination—for defeat of democracy and capitalism by the methods of communism.

I believe this to be the Russian aim and I am dedicated to those policies and actions which will thwart the communistic achievement of such a goal. Ours is a commitment to the preservation of the democratic way of life within the free enterprise system—competitive capitalism.

There is not, in my judgment, any incompatibility between such dedication and being in favor of ratification of the limited test ban treaty negotiated by the United States with Soviet Russia and Great Britain.

Admittedly, in such a treaty the Kremlin visualizes certain advantages. We believe there are definite benefits for our country in a ban on nuclear testing in the atmosphere. Great Britain obviously views the agreement as one which is in its self-interest, too. On balance, then, the treaty is an instrument with a potential for improving the individual and combined positions of all three of the great powers. But, with approximately 60 other governments having also become signators to the limited test ban pact, there is an even broader potential for improving the well-being of the citizens and governments of the world as we search for a peace based on justice.

There is no unanimity among scientists on the meaning and the values of the limited test ban treaty, just as there is no absolute consensus concerning the degree of effects of radiation fallout from nuclear tests conducted in the atmosphere. This makes political decisions concerning these issues more difficult to arrive at and longer to develop.

For my part, I prefer to stand on the side of ratification of the treaty as a hopeful instrument to aid the cause of peace. I must agree that it is a hopeful instrument rather than an absolute. But why should we disregard hope and possibility for peace while searching for the absolute means to that desirable status for mankind? Why should we continue contaminating the atmosphere and why continue adding fallout to the problems of life on this planet when there is hope and possibility that it is unnecessary to take these risks?

It is equally appropriate to inquire if we should be continuing to add, at costs of millions on millions of dollars, to our nuclear stockpiles. There is a mounting doubt—a growing degree of it in official circles—about this country paying the costs of increasing its so-called overkill capacity. The term "overkill" is applied especially to the nuclear materials being stockpiled above the 22 billion tons of TNT equivalent already manufactured and stored.

One expert has called attention to the fact that there are about 2,000 cities in the world (including those of the United States) with 100,000 or more population. And he says that allowing 30 percent failure to deliver nuclear warheads to such urban targets, the U.S. nuclear stockpile already represents enough to deliver the equivalent of 2.5 million tons of TNT per 100,000 of population in all 2,000 cities throughout the entire world. Still allowing 30 percent failure, this means that the nuclear attack delivery systems of our country could return and knock into atomic rubble all such cities—370 of them—in the whole Sino-Soviet block approximately 500 times, and all cities in the U.S.S.R. alone—140 of them—about 1,250 times. That is overkill capacity as some experts believe it to exist in our country's nuclear stockpiles at tremendous expense to the taxpayers.

Those who champion the validity of the stockpile as it exists and who contend that we should continue adding to it, declare that we must have ample nuclear material left over after our country suffers initial losses to the enemy.

But those persons who point to the overkill capacity present in the stockpile, and who protest the expenditures for additions to it, declare that if the United States should lose 90 percent of the nuclear materials already stored—which is an absurd percentage to anticipate—there still would be left in nuclear stores enough to blow up all targets in the entire world 11 times.

Certainly our atomic weapons have been and continue to be our so-called peace insurance. Although some of us urge working toward disarmament, certainly no one with the real interest of the country before him would destroy this insurance already manufactured and stored unless and until there would be evolved a worldwide disarmament agreement in absolute and totally reliable terms.

But in decrying the additions to and wasteful expenditures for overkill capacity, we are not questioning the validity of the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, the number of Polaris submarines, or the planes and other carriers of nuclear warheads involved. Our concern is with what we believe to be the excess of nuclear materials—for nuclear explosives alone are costing our Government more than $2 billion a year. We must have enough—but we should not stockpile too much.

There have been indications that the Secretary of Defense might be willing to negotiate cutbacks in the overkill nuclear materials stockpiling program. I hope Congress will help him do it. There are interests at work to defeat such developments. However, the Defense Department has a chance to make any waste cuts previously accomplished or in the process of being accomplished look insignificant by comparison if there is a recognition of the savings that can be made in not adding to the overkill capacity already present in the nuclear stores.

We must not be emotional on this issue. Adjustments in the stockpiling of nuclear materials must be negotiated carefully. National security is involved, but this does not imply sanction of wasteful and unnecessary additions to stores of warheads.

I share the conviction that America should have a defense force and arsenal which is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

second to none. But I also feel positive that the time has come to question the assumption that we are adding to defense and security by increasing more and more the nuclear stockpile.

It is also my conviction that the security of our country rests on economic and political, as well as military competence. While we are building up a probable excess of nuclear stores we are simultaneously permitting a wasting of human capabilities. This represents a depletion of the basic resource of our Nation. It spells insecurity at home and an unacceptable society for emulation abroad.

We cannot afford or tolerate the policy and the expense of overstocking an overkill capacity of nuclear materials.

We cannot either tolerate or afford it from the economic, political, or moral standpoints.

The self-defeating nature of the nuclear arms race is that each side reacts to the other's moves in a constantly rising scale of armaments.

Is it not reasonable to assume that just as we attempt to counter arms moves by the Soviets, so do they try to gear their efforts to counter ours? Could we not then well afford to make a serious effort to move the arms race into reverse by carefully calculated actions designed to shift the competition with Russia away from arms spending into more peaceful pursuits?

Let us hope that the test ban treaty negotiated and initialed in Moscow by representatives of the Governments of Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and the United States, may be a start along a course of shifting the competition into an area of more peaceful endeavors. We must not only exploit every international breakthrough on the cold war front which has a more peaceful potential—we must also take the steps in our own affairs which will set exemplary patterns for our adversaries to emulate if they are to demonstrate good faith in international bargaining.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SISK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

SEPTEMBER 5, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable B. F. SISK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Deuteronomy 6: 18: *Thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord.*

Almighty God, Thou knowest how greatly concerned we are about the welfare of our beloved country and the problems of its defense and security.

Help us to see clearly that if our Nation is to remain invulnerable and invincible then we must not fail to mobilize our moral and spiritual reserves.

Grant that our leaders and chosen representatives may seek and surrender themselves gladly and gratefully to the guidance of Thy divine spirit.

May we earnestly covet for ourselves a new maturity of faith and courage which will enable us to remain strong and steadfast when we encounter life's stern demands and difficulties.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 3, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 27, 1963:

H.R. 1206. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Krupinski;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Janet Lundie Farmer;

H.R. 2309. An act for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi;

H.R. 2450. An act for the relief of Lucia Carta Gallitto;

H.R. 3218. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Joseph James) Kapp;

H.R. 3629. An act for the relief of Pong Yong Jin (also known as Pang Yong Chin);

H.R. 5094. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith;

H.R. 5834. An act for the relief of Anthony Joseph Calandi;

H.R. 6177. An act to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital city and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs;

H.R. 6567. An act for the relief of Anthony Harry Giazikis;

H.R. 7043. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7824. An act to continue for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

And on August 28, 1963:

H.J. Res. 667. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1232. An act for the relief of Asterio Quitoriano;

H.R. 1237. An act for the relief of Clara G. Maggiora; and

H.R. 1276. An act for the relief of Federico Lopez-Blanco.

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Vagharshag Hovannes Danielian;

H.R. 1398. An act for the relief of Margaret Barker;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of John (Ivica) Beg Farkas and Ann (Anka) Beg Farkas;

H.R. 1731. An act for the relief of Eva Baker;

H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravil;

H.R. 2207. An act for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo;

H.R. 2239. An act for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini;

H.R. 2287. An act for the relief of Shin Sook (Renee) Whang;

H.R. 2444. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy;

H.R. 2765. An act for the relief of Mirko Jaksic; and

H.R. 5507. An act for the relief of Michal Goleniewski.

And on September 3, 1963:

H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; and

H.R. 6996. An act to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1716. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer, pursuant to 49 Stat. 425, as amended by Public Law 85-474, designated Mr. GRUENING as a delegate to the American group at the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, beginning September 12, 1963.

And that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64-3.

WHY DO RUSSIAN TRAWLERS GO UNDETECTED IN UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL WATERS?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced by the Coast Guard that since July the cutter U.S.S. *Northwind* has been making an oceanographic study some 15 or more miles off the northern Siberian coast in Arctic waters. This ship has been under daily surveillance by Russian planes.

It seems strange that the Russians keep one American vessel under daily surveillance that is outside Russian territorial waters and yet the Coast Guard in July said before the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee that it had no air or sea patrol along the eastern coast of Florida from Palm Beach to Miami and that it relied heavily on private shipping for notification of the presence of Russian trawlers within our 3-mile territorial limit. The U.S.S. *Northwind* has been operating 15 or more miles off the Siberian coast and its mission has been clearly defined as oceanographic study. Russian trawlers have been trespassing inside our territorial waters within the 3-mile limit from the beginning of this year we know for sure and perhaps before that. These so-called harmless fishing boats are loaded with highly technical electronic and radar gear. These same "harmless vessels" are capable of dropping off spies and saboteurs safe from detection all along our coast.

Unless we initiate daily air and sea patrols along our territorial waters, the United States suffers danger to its security. As a strong sovereign nation we should not allow ships, whether they are called fishing boats or trawlers, that are loaded down with technical apparatus, that cannot only provide the means for spying on our shores, but also jam our communication networks, to tread across our territorial waters. Any Russian ship should be placed under surveillance by air and sea, even if it only comes close to our shores. Innocent passage is one thing, but spying is a matter of great concern and should be stopped.

CONTRACT WITH THE CONSOLIDATION COAL CO. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF COAL-TO-GASOLINE PILOT PLANT IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, signed a $9,993,000 contract on August 30 with the Consolidation Coal Co. for the design, construction, and operation of a coal-to-gasoline pilot plant to be located at Cresap, W. Va. As the Secretary of the Interior, he should be complimented for his interest in the people and the coal industry, which come under his jurisdiction as Secretary.

Now, if our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, would take an equal interest in the welfare of our grain farmers by urging Congress to enact legislation which would provide that all motor fuel contain at least 5 percent alcohol made from our surplus grains, as was provided in the Jensen-Mundt grain alcohol bill, and which would utilize 400 million bushels of our surplus grains annually, then it could be said that Mr. Freeman was really interested in our farmers, who in truth and in fact are yet the basic driving force in our American economy.

Let us hope that Mr. Freeman will follow Mr. Udall's lead.

Mr. Speaker, during several recent sessions of Congress, Senator Karl Mundt and I introduced similar grain alcohol bills which provided that all motor fuel shall contain 5 percent alcohol made from our surplus grains.

The present farm program which has been altered and realtered year after year has long ago proven its ineffectiveness in reducing surpluses so detrimental to a prosperous agriculture over the long pull. It has piled surplus upon surplus to the tune of over $8 billion at the present time, which might be tolerated if good results were in sight.

It has been of little benefit to the family sized farmer, and has reflected to the detriment of many small town merchants irrespective of the millions poured into most every county to pay the farmers for not raising certain crops, forcing millions of farmers to fertilize to the hilt in order to raise enough cash crops on their reduced acres to pay for ever higher and higher manufactured goods, operating costs and higher and higher taxes, and while grain prices were being forced down and down.

Oh, yes; livestock prices have during the past 2 years been pretty good, but I ask what will happen when meat production catches up with consumption, and that time is almost here?

Now let us take a look back for the purpose of seeing why we have had this farm problem with us these many years.

Before the advent of the iron horse, trucks, tractors, autos, and many other modern gasoline burning devices, our flesh and bone horses and mules ate the production of over 43 million acres of our land. Please compare that amount of acres with the acres we have been trying by law to take out of production with a farm program, most of which is still in effect today. There is one effective solution, and only one solution to the farm program which will stabilize our farm income on a higher level, and in turn our national economy, and that is by making law the bill we have introduced.

Please remember always that our farmers buy on an average over twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods—costly trucks, tractors, farm machinery, lumber, posts, wire, and so forth—when his dollar is worth 100 cents at the counter, year after year, than does the average other Americans. So, it is plain to see that labor and business benefit proportionately over the years according to the ability of our farmers to buy.

Following is the full text of our bill:

A Bill To Amend Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 So as To Provide for the Utilization of Surplus Agricultural Products Through the Use in Motor Fuels of Alcohol Manufactured From Agricultural Products Grown on Farms in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (relating to disposal of surplus agricultural products) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"USE IN MOTOR FUELS OF ALCOHOL MANUFACTURED FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

"Sec. 213. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'agricultural product' means any agricultural product grown on farms within the United States.

"(2) The term 'motor fuel' means any petroleum product (including gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, benzine, and crude oil) which (A) has a specific gravity of thirty-six degrees or above, Baumé scale, and (B) is suitable for use as fuel in an internal-combustion engine.

"(3) The term 'United States' means the various States of the United States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"(b)(1) Beginning six months after the effective date of this section, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell motor fuel in interstate or foreign commerce unless at least 2 per centum, by volume, of such motor fuel is alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

"(2) Beginning eighteen months after the effective date of this section, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell motor fuel in interstate or foreign commerce unless at least 5 per centum, by volume, of such motor fuel is alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

"(3) Any person violating the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. Each sale of motor fuel in violation of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall constitute a separate offense.

"(c) Subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to sales of motor fuel during any period prescribed in a proclamation by the President declaring that, for purposes of this section, agricultural products from which alcohol is produced are not in surplus.

"(d) This section shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than ten days after the date of its enactment."

Now let us see what the effect of this bill would be if made law. I shall be as brief, positive, and as accurate as I possibly can by using facts and figures obtained from interested Federal agencies and from other responsible sources.

A 5-percent alcohol mix in all motor fuel would consume annually at the present rate of motor-fuel consumption over 700 million bushels of grain.

The feed value of the mash after alcohol has been extracted is about 40 percent of the original grain, hence our grain surpluses would be reduced over 400 million bushels annually after sufficient plants get into operation, which is estimated to take a period of 18 months.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has now about 2 billion bushels of corn and wheat in storage. We are told that we should have about 400 million bushels of wheat and 400 million bushels of corn in our ever-normal granary at all times to insure a plentiful supply in case of a severe reduced production caused by drought, and to use in the event of any national emergency. Hence we now have about 1,200 million bushels of these grains in surplus supply, which is costing hundreds of millions of dollars to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

store annually in addition to the first cost, and which is depressing all grain prices; and will in due time bring all livestock prices down in line with grain prices, because the law of supply and demand will always operate to a very marked degree regardless of any artificial controls or laws enacted by the Congress of the United States so long as our free enterprise system is permitted to operate.

If the time should ever come when supply and demand is stopped from operating, our American liberties, under the free, private enterprise system, will be no more, for then some form of dictatorship will be our lot. And let us never forget that farming is yet the greatest of all free, private enterprises in our land.

Under the provisions of our bill it is plain for all to see, who want to see, that its enactment into law would immediately begin to stabilize farm income on a higher level, reduce the price-depressing, costly surpluses to nil in a few years, and yet keep our grain surpluses on a safe, ever-normal granary level.

During World War II a number of grain alcohol distilling plants were built by the Government to produce artificial rubber and other materials for our military needs, but immediately after that war ended these plants were shut down, or disposed of, and during that time we learned that commercial alcohol could be produced economically. We learned that from a bushel of low-grade soft wheat 2½ gallons of alcohol could be processed, and that today, from a bushel of low-grade corn, costing the processor $1.25 per bushel, grain alcohol, or agrol as it is called, can be manufactured for 45 cents per gallon after selling the residue for stock feed. Alcohol from wheat would cost a little more per gallon, because of the first cost being a little more.

Now I am quite sure the processor could make a good profit by selling his agrol to the retail dealers for 65 cents per gallon, and I am also quite sure the retail dealers would be glad to sell it for 80 cents per gallon.

A 5-percent agrol mix would mean one-twentieth part of such motor fuel, and one-twentieth of 80 cents is 4 cents. And we know by experience that regular gasoline mixed with alcohol gives you equal or more miles per gallon than does straight high grade gasoline, which costs from 3 to 5 cents more than regular gasoline. Every racing car, every racing speedboat, and every jetplane uses an alcohol mix in their motor fuel now. Many nations have laws requiring that all motor fuel contain alcohol made from farm crops. Few did so, however, to reduce crop surpluses, but because of the high cost of gasoline there, primarily due to a shortage of gasoline. Brazil is an exception. A number of years ago Brazil had a great oversupply of sugar, hence sugar prices, one of their main crops was causing a greatly distressed agricultural and in turn a depressed national economy. What did they do? They passed a Federal law which provided that all motor fuel must contain at least a 10-percent mix of alcohol made from their surplus supply of sugar, and it had the immediate effect of not only making their farmers much more prosperous, but also it had the overall effect of helping to stabilize their entire economy. And that is how unrest in Brazil was brought to nil and is yet thus.

Now you may ask what are we waiting for, and justly so. Here is the answer in a few words. I will go back to 1935 when six Members of the House and Senate introduced identical bills as Senator MUNDT's and mine, with the exception that their bills provided for a 10-percent agrol mix in all motor fuel. But lo and behold, then, as now, a number of the large oil and gas producers of our Nation, because of selfish reasons, brought concerted pressures on Members of Congress from oil-producing States, who even at that early date were powerful enough in the Halls of Congress to not let such a bill out of committee, and to this day such a bill has not been voted out of committee; and hence to the floor of either House for a vote by the representatives of the people. For example, during the last session of Congress I asked one of the top members of the House Agriculture Committee in charge of such bills, who is from the State of Texas, if Senator MUNDT and I could be heard on our bill before his committee. He said sure, but he boldly told me to my face that he would have to oppose the bill because a lot of oil is produced in his State. Those were his exact words. My question was, How long will those people keep their heads in the sand? Then in 1958, to add insult to injury, the two chemists, or so-called mineral engineers, who were loaned to the President's Commission by their employers of huge oil-producing interests, to look into and recommend new industrial uses for farm products, wrote in the Commission's report to Congress, in short, that a 5-percent agrol mix in motor fuel would operate to the detriment of motor fuel; which is pure hogwash. And that a 10-percent mix would consume annually about 2 billion bushels of grain, which was more than we would be justified in using for that purpose.

Should our bill become law you would soon see agrol distilling plants spring up in many, many sections of our country, especially in the breadbasket of America, financed by private investors, and by farm-owned corporations, giving employment to thousands upon thousands of folks who are now seeking employment. Especially would such plants be a godsend to many of our farmers and their sons who have time in the off seasons from fieldwork to take employment close to home, and who want to stay on their family-sized farms.

ADM. GEORGE W. ANDERSON'S SLASHING ATTACK UPON SECRETARY OF DEFENSE McNAMARA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the slashing attack made yesterday by Adm. George W. Anderson, former Chief of Naval Operations, upon Secretary of Defense McNamara and his whiz kids, is a warning to the Nation of the deterioration that is taking place in the Department of Defense.

Admiral Anderson was recently fired as Chief of Naval Operations by McNamara because he opposed the more than $6 billion TFX fighter plane contract award to the General Dynamics Corp. and Gen. Curtis LeMay, chief of the Air Force, was placed on a year's probation for taking the same position in opposition to McNamara's award of this large contract.

On this subject, Admiral Anderson said that:

> The abrupt reversal of military recommendations without interim consultation, as was the case in the TFX contract, is fraught * * * with grave dangers.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress ought to be as gravely concerned as is Admiral Anderson at the lack of confidence and trust between the military and civilians in the Pentagon for the security of this Nation is at stake.

I compliment Admiral Anderson upon his courage in speaking out as he did yesterday afternoon at the National Press Club.

AMERICAN STUDIES ABROAD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of my colleagues and of Americans generally a special report from the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs that is by far the most complete and authoritative presentment yet made of the successful effort our country is making against anti-American propaganda, not by the use of counterpropaganda, but on the educational front and in depth.

It is entitled "American Studies Abroad" and is authored by Walter Johnson, distinguished American historian, professor of history at the University of Chicago, and member of the U.S. Advisory Commission. It represents months of on-the-spot observations, conversations, and studies.

The report is basically concerned with the degree to which courses about the United States have become institutionalized in the educational systems of many countries. It is a recital, stimulating to all Americans, of the establishment of chairs of American civilization in universities and colleges in the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, France, India, Japan, and other countries.

I quote a few passages from Dr. Johnson's report:

> Through the encouragement of American studies overseas, we have tried to stimulate leaders, scholars, teachers, writers, and stu-

dents to take American civilization seriously, to learn and teach more about us and our past.

The term "American Studies" as used in this report means the study of the past and present civilization of the United States through specific courses in academic departments (such as literature, history, geography, government, et cetera) of universities and colleges and in secondary schools.

It is in our national interest that other people in the world understand the United States—its history, civilization, literature, ideals, and institutions.

While in some countries much has been accomplished in introducing knowledge about the United States in the curriculums of secondary schools and universities, much remains to be done in all countries before educated citizens have the requisite knowledge to interpret intelligently, and with perception, day-to-day information about developments in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Dr. Johnson's report as must reading to all Americans who see in the outcome of our fight to win the hearts and minds of people the surest guarantee of the future of free and democratic government.

PORTLAND, WORLD SEAPORT OF THE PACIFIC

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Oregon, the Pacific Northwest and the American maritime trade are proud of the port of Portland. The port ranks 11th among U.S. ports in the number of vessels which make it a port of call.

Recently, the New York Journal of Commerce in its August 26, 1963, issue published an article on the port to whose economic well-being the people of Portland and Oregon have contributed so much.

In recent years, voters have approved $16 million in bond issues for harbor improvements. The port itself has expended another $6.5 million for upkeep and improvements in recent years. And an estimated 13,000 persons are dependent upon port payrolls. Currently, a project to deepen the main ship channel to 40 feet is being undertaken as a joint Federal-local venture.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD the Journal of Commerce article that follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Aug. 26, 1963]

PORTLAND

"Portland, world seaport of the Pacific," is proud of its facilities and knowhow in handling both inbound and outbound products for the shipper. Ranking as No. 1 seaport on the west coast for 5 of the past 7 years, Portland continues to grow in the ability to handle customer needs.

Located 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean where tides and southwesters have little influence on operations, Portland has 15 general cargo berths available to shippers. Other commercial facilities include five dry bulk berths, five grain berths, and three liquid bulk berths. Bunkering service is available from several proprietary oil docks within the harbor.

TWO PORT COMMISSIONS

Two commissions serve the port area. These are the Commission of Public Docks and the Port of Portland Commission. Here is the general division of jurisdiction:

Commission of Public Docks—this body has the responsibility for all matters revolving or pertaining to maritime commerce (the terminal facilities, the berthing and servicing of vessels, the solicitation and handling of maritime cargoes and the like).

Port of Portland Commission—this body has jurisdiction of the Portland International Airport and of the Swan Island drydock facilities; also, certain responsibilities in regard to deep water channels, their maintenance, industrial lands, and their development.

Much of the commerce in the harbor is served through three terminals owned by the commission of public docks. Located at terminal No. 1 is the largest capacity lift crane in the harbor, a 100-ton shear leg. Floating cranes, both public and privately owned, with lift capacities up to 75 tons are also available, in addition to dockside gantry cranes.

LARGEST BULK UNLOADER

The largest bulk unloader on the West Coast is also on commission of public docks property, at terminal No. 4, at the entrance to the harbor. In free digging, this 130 foot high giant can unload 900 tons of dry bulks an hour into rail cars, trucks, or into stockpiles. At an opposite pier, a bulk outloading facility can load ships at an average rate of 350 tons an hour, depending upon the weight of the material. Coke, sulphur, and wood chips are among the many commodities that are outloaded from this facility.

Lumber exports totaled over 71 million board feet in 1962, and recent innovations in log loading techniques have enabled Portland to boast the fastest, most efficient loading operation on the Columbia River. By the use of floating cranes, logs may be picked up in 20-ton bundles and loaded aboard ship, and the increase in board feet loaded per gang hour has reached 65 percent since this operation commenced early this year.

HEAVY GRAIN EXPORTS

The fertile island empire supplied Portland with grain enough in 1962 to export over 54 million bushels to foreign markets. Handling this outflow are six elevators with a combined capacity of 16.5 million bushels.

At terminal No. 4 stands the largest grain elevator on tidewater west of the Mississippi River. Leased to Cargill, Inc., the elevator has an 8-million-bushel capacity. In addition to barge and truck unloading machinery, the facility also has a rail car tipper capable of unloading 10 fully loaded boxcars an hour. Tipping the cars 65 degrees end to end, and 20 degrees side to side, the tipper can unload 500 tons of grain an hour.

Extensive ship repair work is also carried on in the Portland harbor. Three floating drydocks capable of lifting 14,000, 18,000, and 27,000 tons respectively, handle the bulk of major ship repair work that is carried on in Portland. Two of these drydocks are owned by the Port of Portland Commission, and the other is leased to them by the U.S. Navy. Ship conversion, scrapping, and repair work is carried on by a number of firms in the harbor.

THE MEXICAN BRACERO LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, from time to time it has been my privilege to use this forum to attract the attention of the Members of this body, as well as its constituencies, to the problem attending the importation of Mexican bracero labor which has been possible because of the enactment of special legislation soon after the beginning of the Korean conflict in 1951–52.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a change, which was a departure since the 1880's, in this type of importation of indigent labor. Those of us who have resided in areas which are directly impacted and directly effected are well aware of some of the byproducts of this practice. Our opposition to this type of legislation, contrary to what some critics have stated, is not based on any type of indirect or direct pressure or lobbying, but because those of us who have watched the emergence of this type of labor practice have seen at first glimpse at home in our districts and in the surrounding areas the impact of this slave-type labor.

Mr. Speaker, so many people seem to think and have set this notion loose and abroad in the land that this is sort of a foreign-aid-in-reverse program or that it is a Peace Corps-type operation in reverse and that it helps the Mexican economy and that the Mexican Government and others are very much in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that there is no official pronouncement, other than the agreements that have been entered into between the two countries. But when you speak to the leaders who are I am sure in a position of firsthand knowledge in Mexico, such as those who know the labor situation, there is no question about their position. There is no equivocation. They are deadset against it and will tell you so.

THE MEXICAN BRACERO LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak. However, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has again referred to braceros as slave labor. This represents a mighty strange accusation in light of the fact that the so-called slave laborers all over Mexico are lining up for the privilege of coming to this country and earning a few dollars in order that they may go back to Mexico and buy a cow or a small farm or a business of some sort.

Furthermore, the record is entirely clear that the Republic of Mexico feels this is a very, very important program for the economy of Mexico. The Government of Mexico is on record to that effect.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I also live in a so-called impacted area and disagree entirely with the observations and contentions of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. We have far, far more braceros, fine Mexican nationals, in California than they do in Texas, and I consider myself to know fully as much about the program as the gentleman from Texas does. I repeat, I disagree entirely and completely with every contention he has made.

As evidence of the distress felt by most Mexicans over the suspension of the bracero program and the harmful effect it will have, both politically and economically on our good neighbor to the South, I draw your attention to the following translation of a portion of an article by Gustavo de Anda in the Mexico City magazine Impacto, July 1963 issue:

THE POSSIBLE SUSPENSION OF BRACERO CONTRACTING—WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH 400,000 MORE UNEMPLOYED MEXICANS?

(By Gustavo de Anda)

It has not yet been realized how greatly important the suspension of bracero contracting for agricultural employment in the Southern and Western United States is to the Republic of Mexico.

Maybe it is reasoned that, since the contract now in effect terminates on the last day of this year, there is time to promote a new agreement. But the truth is that nothing has been said about the matter and there is no evidence that something effective is being done to promote it.

Perhaps many think, without measuring the depth and gravity of the case, that it is best this way * * * but they are very much mistaken.

We have only to recall that, through presidential declaration, it was made known that each year we need upwards of 300,000 new jobs just to keep up with the present impetuous demographic developments. Think now. If to this obligation imposed on us by our population growth we should add the burden of creating jobs for more than 400,000, the problem acquires tinges of national tragedy.

As the direct result of the Second World War, the true bracero program was initiated and now consists of the hiring of a Mexican work force contracted by the Government, based on agreements between the two countries, and exclusively for agricultural labor for specific periods of time.

In this manner and through these years, this human stream has crossed the calvary of the wetbacks and wire artists who were their forerunners and converted itself into a national necessity. The return of that turbulent stream traveling northward paid back a flow of currency which contributed to our balance of payments which at present is in jeopardy.

For that reason, we cannot but become alarmed when the bracero program is about to be suspended. From the point of view of the bracero and his family the situation is a grave one. Traditionally he has entered into one or two contracts a year and this has given him a standard of living which his country has not been able to offer.

Where are the 400,000 Mexicans going to work when contracting is suspended—those who, year after year, have crossed the border seeking their daily bread in the land of hard winters, which even the Spanish colonists shied away from?

THE BRACERO LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire if the gentleman from California will answer a question. We have heard much about this program. May I ask the gentleman if there are certain regulations and restrictions and so forth that are thrown around these braceros when they bring them in here? If the gentleman knows, will he tell me that, please?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Yes. I will be very happy to.

The law, as well as the treaty between our country and the Republic of Mexico, lays down very clear, stringent and quite proper restrictions which refer to these people. Furthermore, no farmer in this country can acquire or use the services of a bracero if there is a domestic farm laborer who wishes the job and is ready, able, and willing to take that job.

Mr. HALEY. And that must be certified to by the Secretary of Labor. Is that right?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Yes. It certainly must. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

CRITIQUE OF SECRETARY McNAMARA'S TEST BAN TESTIMONY

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the greatest repository of knowledge in the world on the technical details of war, revolution and peace is the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, California. A director of that institution is the eminent scholar, Dr. Stefan T. Possony. I am proud to present, for the first time in print, the following analysis by Dr. Possony of Secretary McNamara's testimony of August 13 regarding the pending partial test ban treaty:

CRITIQUE OF SECRETARY MCNAMARA'S TEST BAN TESTIMONY

(By Stefan T. Possony)

During his Senate testimony on August 13 supporting the partial test ban treaty, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara talked about the increase in the number of nuclear warheads in the strategic alert force and the doubling of the megatonnage of that force, but passed over in silence the reduction of megatonnage due to the retirement of aircraft. If megatonnage is important, as his argument infers, the net changes in our overall capabilities must be considered.

Mr. McNamara also cast some doubt, though this doubt is now weaker than it was some time ago, on Soviet capability to deliver 100-megaton warheads. Yet in a recent article, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky argued cogently that since the Soviets have advantages in missile boost, it is "dangerous naiveté for McNamara to speculate" that the Soviets "at this time" have no missile to deliver a 100-megaton warhead to ICBM range. Incidentally, Mr. McNamara's phrasing implies that the Soviets may now be able to deliver a 100-megaton warhead at closer range which, of course, has enormous implications with respect to such problems as Europe, Japan, and Cuba.

The presumed U.S. capability to develop relatively small warheads to assure penetration by saturation of "sophisticated and very elaborate ballistic missile defenses" would be meaningless or superfluous, if the Soviets as the President stated, cannot develop such defenses. On the other hand, if they are able to develop such defenses, then the question arises why we are delaying the U.S. antimissile and are depriving ourselves through the test ban treaty, of the particular type of firepower that is needed to render our missile defense truly effective?

According to de Seversky, "the intellectual surprise of the new conflict will be the decisive role of its defensive phase through electromagnetic interception and nuclear impact. The inexorable progress of technology will make the antiballistic missile system operational much sooner than the skeptics expect." Accordingly, if the President is wrong and the Soviets get such a system, even though we are able to mount a second strike, "the Russian people and their industrial complex will only sustain an acceptable damage." In other words, our deterrent force would be insufficiently fearsome to deter a Soviet surprise first strike.

Mr. McNamara indicated that by 1966, we will have 1,700 missiles, neglecting to state that this is merely a 5,000-megaton force. He argued that the Soviets are "estimated to have today only a fraction as many ICBM missiles," thus comparing a U.S. capability of 1966 with a Soviet capability of 1963. He passed over in silence the difference in megatonnage, the implications of this difference, and also the possibility that the U.S. "estimate"—"our ballistic missiles and numerical superiority will increase both absolutely and relatively"—may be erroneous.

Even if the Soviets were to have just two-thirds of our missile strength, about 1,000 ICBM's, they would hold 100,000 megatons against our 5,000 megatons. This firepower would be enough to destroy U.S. military forces, industry, and a large portion of our population; while, at the same time, the Soviet bloc could absorb a 5,000-megaton attack and protect its population against the resultant fallout—even assuming that we were able to deliver the entire warhead megatonnage and assuming further that the sudden massive fallout would not preclude any military operation.

Mr. McNamara did not provide any definition of what he called our capability "to destroy the enemy." Did he mean that we can destroy Soviet military force or industry or population by a 5,000-megaton salvo minus the megatons the Soviets destroy before U.S. delivery?

Indeed, if the Soviets were to strike by surprise, they could protect their population by prior evacuation against an anticipated less-than-5,000 megaton blast, while our population could not be effectively protected against 100,000 megatons delivered with the suddenness on which Soviet strategic planners place so much emphasis.

In his discussion of high-yield weapons, Mr. McNamara neglected to refer to the Soviet announcement of a 160-megaton bomb. He completely ignored the possible implications of such explosives for genocidal type of warfare and for space delivery.

Mr. McNamara stated that we could develop bombs of 50 to 60 megatons for B-52 delivery and, by underground testing up to 1 megaton, achieve 35 megatons for our Titan II. He did not say that we would do these things, nor did he comment on the feasibility and cost of underground shots in the megaton yield range. He did not say how much we could or would increase the yield of our Polaris and Minuteman missiles.

Mr. McNamara discussed the possibility of using several smaller weapons on the same target rather than a single large one. He said there would be the incident advantage that a numerically larger salvo would saturate Soviet defenses. But why should we need to employ saturation tactics if the Soviets are supposedly unable to build effective antimissile defenses? On the other hand, if we go for the saturation-by-larger-numbers concept, why did Mr. McNamara kill Skybolt? It is clear that our scheduled 1,700 missiles could be expected to take care only of 500 Soviet ICBM missile sites, certainly of not more than 850 at most. That number of missiles would not be adequate to handle even the present estimated Soviet MRBM and ICBM force. Granted that three or four 15- to 20-megaton warheads are the equivalent of one 10-megaton warhead: such a superyield warhead is still far more potent than three or four current Atlas, Titan I, Polaris, and Minuteman, and even Titan II warheads. It is interesting to note that since the United States does not have antimissile defenses, according to the President, the Soviets safely could employ smaller numbers of large yield devices and would not need to resort to saturation tactics, hence would not need larger numbers.

It is true that a balance should be struck between yields on the one hand, and hardness, concealment, camouflage and mobility on the other. But this does not mean that within a given and desirable system, like Minuteman, the yield should not be maximized. Present yields of Polaris and Minuteman are useless except, by and large, for attacks on soft targets.

In his testimony Secretary McNamara said "No consensus has ever been formed with regard to the wisdom of a 100- versus a 50-megaton bomb." This is very ambiguous language, because it implies that we are (a) acquiring 50-megaton bombs, (b) are keeping a bomber delivery force, and (c) would develop missiles which could carry 50-megaton warheads. But apparently we are not programing for any of these three things.

With respect to missile sites vulnerability, Mr. McNamara simply argued theory against experimentation. If the theory is right, he is right. But this would be the first time in physics that a theory is accepted without experimental verification.

The Secretary provided no certain assurance that the Soviets have not already conducted the pertinent vulnerability tests, but only expressed the "belief" that they have not done so and hence do not know the vulnerability of missile sites in the U.S.S.R. or in the United States. He did not add that tests of this type may more easily escape detection than other tests higher in the atmosphere. He did admit, however, that if the pessimists who evaluate our theory of hardening were right, "less than two sites" could be killed by a single superyield missile. This implies that, let us say, 10 superyield missiles may kill 20 Minuteman sites. This is an admission of the greatest gravity.

With respect to antiballistic missiles, the United States undoubtedly has the present capability of weaponizing a variety of possible ABM warheads. The question is whether we would have the information to acquire an optimal ABM warhead.

As for the blackout problem, Mr. McNamara admitted there are various uncertainties, but asserted that we "will be able to design around" those. This is true only if the relevant theory is correct, and it is precisely this point which we do not know. It is doubtful that a better understanding of the blackout phenomenon would "at most permit some reduction in the number of ABM radars." This answer again presupposes that the theory is substantially correct.

Mr. McNamara asserted that the vulnerability of ballistic missile warheads to radiation can be fully tested underground, which is an overstatement. But he admitted that the vulnerability to blast cannot be tested underground. For the time being, blast vulnerability seems to be the most important danger. Furthermore, there is no announcement that we would go all out to develop radiation warheads.

In talking about warhead improvement and the equipment of missiles with penetration aids, the Secretary did not refer to the fact that such aids are costly in weight and space and therefore would reduce our already inadequate yields.

The idea that unlimited indefinite testing by both sides would result in "technical parity" is another oversimplification, based on the notion that ultimately, because the facts of nature are identical everywhere, no one would be able to design a better weapon. This would mean, for example, that identically priced automobiles, which are produced in different countries, and by various corporations in this country, are all of the same quality; or that in past military history, artillery, for example, was everywhere of the same effectiveness. This theory overlooks the following facts:

1. Strategic situations are not symmetrical, hence each belligerent needs weapons specifically designed for his needs.

2. Research programs are differently oriented.

3. Funding is different.

4. Intellectual and scientific gifts are unevenly distributed.

5. Knowledge of the facts of nature is not acquired at an identical pace in different countries, and understanding of these facts is not uniform.

6. One side may make a key discovery considerably in advance of another.

7. The utilization of scientific discoveries by strategists and military staffs may follow different patterns.

8. Industrial capabilities are uneven.

9. Technological surprise has characterized military history since about the time of Napoleon—despite free international scientific intercourse, and despite the absence of limitations on experimental programs.

Mr. McNamara thinks that if we limit Soviet testing to underground, we can gain more experience more rapidly, because such testing is more difficult and more expensive. This is entirely fictional: the Soviets suffer from no scientific or economic constraints limiting underground tests. Mr. McNamara is contradicted by General Taylor, who stated that the test ban would not permit the United States "to overtake the present advantage which the U.S.S.R. probably has in the high-yield weapons field, whereas the Soviets by underground testing probably could retrieve in time any lead which we may presently have in the lower yield tactical field."

With respect to the discovery of deep space tests—the treaty speaks ambiguously of "outer space"—Mr. McNamara's testimony clearly indicated that such tests would be feasible for many years, simply because no detection system has been installed and only a first launch experimental model of a detection satellite is available.

With respect to detectability of low-kiloton shots in the atmosphere, Mr. McNamara passed over in silence both clean shots and shots in the subkiloton range. He averred that such tests "could not produce significant advantages"; which of course depends entirely on the purpose of the test. For example, Professor Teller argued that very small yield atmospheric shots are needed to determine the impact of nuclear explosions on the radars observing incoming missiles and to identify the problems incident to attack by multiple warheads and decoys. Such tests could be conducted clandestinely. The scientist stressed—and history bears him out—that all factors in antimissile defense are interrelated and that therefore nuclear tests cannot be dispensed with. If we do not understand the phenomenon, we cannot design good penetration aids, yet Mr. McNamara stressed our skill in designing penetration aids as one of our great capabilities.

Secretary McNamara also admitted that the feasibility of clandestine testing in the South Pacific is rather good.

He offered no reasons for his assumption that underwater tests, for example, to "determine vulnerability of submarines and surface missiles with their associated electronic gear" could be detected. On his own admission that atmospheric tests in the South Pacific may not be detectable, this argument is certainly open to grave doubt or, while it may be valid in theory, it does not seem to correspond to our actual detection capability. He did not mention that tests in lakes may be confused with underground shots, and that therefore the treaty is not self-enforcing with respect to those types of shots.

Mr. McNamara minimized the danger of surprise abrogation by saying that even if the Soviets suddenly resumed atmospheric testing, they would not be able to achieve a significant time advantage. However, if their atmospheric tests were preceded by extensive underground testing, and theoretical work, and if their theories were as reliable as Mr. McNamara claims ours are, these tests could be restricted to determine "final workability." If this were so, and if the weapons were deployed on the assumption that they are workable, his assessment that the Soviets could not achieve a significant time advantage would be wrong; moreover, highly successful tests of unexpected weapons could demoralize U.S. strategic leadership. The implication of such a situation is self-evident.

Mr. McNamara admitted that the treaty prohibits the development of high-yield weapons, the determination of weapons effects, and the determination of final workability of anti-ICBM's.

He also stated his belief that the treaty would have the effect of retarding the spread of nuclear weapons, but in no way attempted to assess this point with respect to NATO. From the testimony of General Taylor, it appeared that the United States is ahead in strategic weapon systems and in its "ability to wage tactical nuclear war," whereas the U.S.S.R. which "lags somewhat behind the United States at low yields," is ahead in the MRBM capability and in the yield-to-weight ratios of high-yield devices. Does this mean, for example, that except for the MRBM threat, the United States is capable of defending its allies, but will experience difficulties in defending itself?

As already pointed out, General Taylor indicated that the treaty prevents us from catching up in the high-yield area and allows the Soviets to catch up in the low-yield area. Furthermore, he stated that without testing, our antiballistic missiles would have "less desirable characteristics," and that knowledge of weapons effects is presently "incomplete at best." General Taylor admitted that in connection with the ABM the "Soviets may possess some information not available to the United States." The treaty would make it impossible to "conduct environmental tests of current weapons or of those which might be acquired in order to verify their performance."

General Taylor admitted the possibility of "illicit explosions in the atmosphere, under water, or in outer space" which would enhance Soviet capability in the field of ballistic missiles, missile defense, antisubmarine warfare, and high-yield technology. He disclosed that unlike Mr. McNamara, the Joint Chiefs are impressed by the possibility of an "abrupt abrogation by the Soviets followed by comprehensive series of atmospheric tests."

These enormous military disadvantages are allegedly overshadowed by the treaty's "contribution toward the restraint on the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the reduction of causes of world tension. Both of these advantages, if achieved, should contribute to the fundamental objective of the U.S. Armed Forces." Disregarding proliferation, how may international tension be reduced, international relations be stabilized, and a move toward a peaceful environment be achieved, if the U.S.S.R. gains militarily, if the Soviet first strike becomes more potent, if the U.S. second strike grows perceptibly weaker, if the MRBM threat is not neutralized, if the U.S.S.R. gets a unilateral antimissile defense, and if they are overcoming their specific nuclear deficiencies, while we will be stuck with ours?

In context of the foregoing, the following statement of Professor Teller is notable: "The proposed atmospheric test ban strikes simultaneously at both the vulnerable elements in our second strike force." Namely the pact inhibits us in overcoming the vulnerability of our sites, and the weakness of our antimissile defense. It also reduces the possibility of enhancing our capability of penetrating their defenses.

Mr. McNamara's testimony was based on the following fundamental fallacies:

1. He neglected to admit and assess vast intelligence uncertainties, especially with respect to future estimates.

2. He implicitly assumed that the future will not be too much different from the present.

3. He did not mention, even once, the possibility of Soviet deception, but argued that the treaty is advantageous to the United States; yet he did not explain why the Soviets would content themselves with a continuous position of alleged inferiority.

4. He offered no argument for the paradox that on the one hand, Soviet objectives have remained unchanged and that, on the other hand, this treaty which is supposed to give military advantages to the United States has been accepted by the Soviet Union.

5. He presented no analysis of Soviet intentions.

6. He assumed that current theories set forth by the scientists are more or less foolproof and require no experimental validation.

7. He did not tie his testimony on specific nuclear questions to other relevant facts, such as the slowdown of the ABM program, the phaseout of bombers, the confusion about the RS-70, our lack of a military space program, and so on.

The greatest paradox is that, according to the administration's argument, this treaty is a first step to peace, but will not hinder the growth of our nuclear strength. We will build more bombs, warheads, nuclear artillery shells, and depth charges. Yet the allegation is that already we have tens of thousands of nuclear weapons, and hence nuclear superiority. The administration's argument makes no reference to the means of delivery without which these weapons cannot be used, and which we are not acquiring in the requisite type and numbers.

Mr. McNamara's argument boils down to this: The United States can deter—and if necessary, win—a nuclear conflict by maintaining a strategic force which, in terms of missile firepower, will possess only 5 percent of the strength of the future Soviet strategic force. Against this superior force, we are told, the United States needs no particular defense. If this is the new strategy which the treaty inaugurates, only God can help us. What kind of defense miracle will have to come to pass if, as General Taylor expressed it, "militant communism remains committed to the destruction of our society"?

The United States, in signing the test ban treaty, proposes to deal with Khrushchev, the same man who said in his 1956 "Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party":

"Prominent leaders of bourgeois countries with increasing frequency frankly admit that there will be no victor in a war in which atomic weapons are used. These leaders still do not venture to state that capitalism will find its grave in another world war * * * but they are * * * compelled to admit openly that the socialist camp is invincible."

HALT ADDITIONAL FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives recently voted approval of an additional authorization of $3.5 billion for foreign aid. I opposed this increased authorization and voted against it. It is my hope that we can build support for a real cut during the weeks ahead.

With over $7 billion presently authorized and appropriated but unspent, the program could be continued at present levels for 2 full years without any additional money being provided. Congress should certainly insist that with $7 billion on hand, we take a long hard look at the program and its results before providing more funds.

In authorizing an additional $3.5 billion, some have said that the program has been "cut." After all, they say, the request was for $4.1 billion and the House approved "only" $3.5 billion.

This situation reminds me of a man whose wife has 10 new unworn dresses in the closet. The wife buys a new dress with the explanation that she has just saved $25 by buying a new $100 dress for only $75. She has in fact spent $75, and saved nothing.

A switch of 20 votes could have defeated the authorization bill in the House. The RECORD shows that 48 Members who voted for the $3.5 billion contained in the motion to recommit then voted for final passage. If only half of these had voted no on final passage of the authorization, defeat of any more authorization this year would have been assured. It is my firm belief that if we had been able to defeat the motion to recommit containing the $3.5 billion additional authorization, we could have gathered enough votes to defeat the entire bill on final passage.

Proponents of foreign aid are not concerned about the dollar amount in a House-passed authorization bill. From past history they know that it can be raised when the bill goes to the Senate. But they need a bill from the House to go to conference with the Senate. The way to prevent any increased authorization for foreign aid, then, is to prevent the passage of any authorization by the House. It does no good to pass a limited authorization, a restricted authorization, a reduced authorization or to cut the authorization. The only effective step is to prevent the adoption of any authorization. We came within 20 votes of doing just that, and could have won with the support of those who claimed to be for a cut but went right ahead and voted for final passage of the bill.

We will have additional opportunities to cut or halt foreign aid this year. The first will be on the vote on the Senate-House conference report, which will be the compromise between the authorization passed by each side of the Capitol.

As an opponent of any additional funds for foreign aid with $7 billion already on hand, I will oppose this conference report regardless of the amount it contains. If all those who say they want to cut foreign aid vote against the conference report, it can be defeated. This vote will show beyond doubt who wants to cut foreign aid, and who will permit the program to continue to grow.

TENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 10th Semiannual Report of the Office of Minerals Exploration from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *September 5, 1963.*

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Friday, September 6, 1963, to file certain reports on H.R. 8195.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TENNESSEE PRESS ASSOCIATION EDITOR AND PRESIDENT ADVOCATES ADOPTION OF TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the negotiation and signing of a nuclear test ban treaty is an important step in the right direction for our country—a step toward peace.

Proponents of the treaty have listed numerous important reasons why the treaty is necessary and beneficial to this Nation and to mankind.

One of the important reasons—which some have neglected to bring out in discussing the treaty is the point that the test ban will help prevent continued contamination of the atmosphere which leads to harmful fallout—a serious health hazard.

Col. J. Bill Frame, editor of the Lebanon Democrat, who is also president of the Tennessee Press Association, has written a very excellent column on the importance of preventing further contamination by nuclear fallout, pointing out that "3,000 children in Utah and Nevada have been affected by fallout from nuclear bombs tested in the air." Colonel Frame advocates adoption of this treaty in the best interests of the people of the United States.

Colonel Frame is a former military officer and distinguished combat veteran, and as president of the Tennessee Press Association advocates following the recommendations of our military experts and scientists, rather than the politicians who take a negative position for political purposes. The best interests of America should be to test as Colonel Frame has suggested.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include Colonel Frame's column, together with my own newsletter on the subject of the test ban treaty at this point in the Record.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat, Aug. 29, 1963]

SENSE AND NONSENSE

(By J. Bill Frame)

"Three thousand children in Utah and Nevada have been affected by fallout from nuclear bombs tested in the air."

That was the gist of a news story appearing in a Nashville newspaper last week. The children received the fallout through drinking milk from cows which had eaten grass that had absorbed the radiation from tests, the article stated.

Further, it was estimated by doctors that many of these children would be affected with cancer in the years to come.

Yet, in the face of this—and many other incidences of danger from nuclear fallout—there are literally thousands who oppose the test ban treaty signed between the United States, England, and Russia, and also agreed to and signed by many other nations.

The reason, "We don't trust the Russians."

The lack of trust, of course, is a good point. None of us trust the Russians. In fact, I have sincere doubts that the Russians trust the Russians.

So, we will keep our eyes open and our powder dry—just in case the Russians do as they have done before, ignored a treaty or agreement.

However, in this instance, it seems obvious that the Russians will gain and profit as much from keeping this agreement as we, or as any other nation.

They have every reason to know of the devastating effects of a nuclear bomb. Perhaps some of their children—and adults—have also suffered from the effects of the radiation.

Also, they want to gain strength for a showdown that must eventually come between them and the Red Chinese. World opinion still counts rather heavily, even with the Russians.

And, in any disagreement with the Red Chinese, the Russians want to appear before the world as peace lovers.

Nothing will do more to create this atmosphere for them than this agreement to ban testing of nuclear bombs.

It is rather difficult for us to determine whether much of the opposition is from a sincere belief that the agreement endangers our Nation, or whether it is dictated by political reasons.

We are fast getting to the point that we stick our tongues in our cheeks when politicians talk—especially where their talk might influence a few votes.

So, we might take this distrust a little bit closer to home than Russia—although not for the same reasons.

When men are talking, they are not fighting.

It is impossible, almost, to do both at the same time.

And I agree with Shakespeare that words won't hurt us—but nuclear bombs will.

So, let's talk.

Let's sign agreements and test bans.

But keep our eyes open, and our weapons at the ready.

Lives and health of our citizens are valuable. Let's not jeopardize either by needless nuclear explosions.

Most of the scientists, and military men with know-how, say that we can get the information we need by underground testing, and by experiments that will be within the provisions of the agreement.

They have no political ax to grind, and should have no selfish motives.

I'll take their word for it, rather than some politicians'—who want votes.

[From the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat, Aug. 29, 1963]

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By Joe L. Evins)

THE TEST BAN TREATY—A STEP TOWARD PEACE

Testimony was received this week from our top military authorities and scientists concerning the test ban treaty before the Senate for ratification. The majority of testimony and evidence supported and urged prompt ratification of the treaty by the Senate, as under the Constitution all treaties must be referred to the Senate for ratification or rejection.

The negotiations and signing of the nuclear test ban treaty by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union is a significant step forward in an attempt to halt the nuclear arms race and to resolve the fears and tensions which have built up between the East and West since World War II.

Among those who gave their endorsement and support to the treaty were Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Army Chief of Staff; Adm. David L. MacDonald, Chief, Naval Operations; and Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff. Scientific spokesmen who supported the treaty included Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering for the Defense Department—the Pentagon's top scientist—and N. E. Bradbury, Director of the Los Alamos, New Mexico, Laboratory which is chiefly engaged in weapon development. Dr. Brown pointed out that the treaty—which would ban all nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water—would not substantially impair the Nation's strategic superiority but would work to the advantage of the United States in the military weapons field.

The general line of testimony of distinguished military and scientific authorities was that the overall security of the United States would not be impaired by the treaty and that the signing of the treaty represents the first real step toward the avoidance of a nuclear war and the elimination of nuclear fallout radiation in the atmosphere which is considered hazardous to human life.

Proponents of the treaty gave numerous reasons for the importance in its prompt ratification by the Senate. Witnesses stated that the treaty can:

Act as a deterrent to the spread of nuclear weapons to many additional countries, thereby lessening the danger of nuclear war;

Drastically reduce or end the hazards of radioactive fallout;

Have the practical effect of slowing down the pace of the arms race;

Be a first step toward reduced world tensions and broader areas of agreement on the control of nuclear weapons.

The test ban treaty is a step in the right direction and is certain to be recorded in history as one of the major efforts to preserve peace.

Whatever action is taken must not be regarded, however, as a cause for the United States to let down our guard. America must always remain militarily strong to remain free.

DEVELOPMENT OF SHORT-RANGE AIRCRAFT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that in the development of science and technology, there will be gaps in our knowledge, and missing links in the chain of progress. Although the development of our aeronautical science has been remarkable, we lack at the present time an economic, short-haul aircraft for local air transport service.

The advantages of such an aircraft would be tremendous, not only for my own area in New England, but for any section of the country. The importance of available air service between local points to the economic progress of the country is becoming increasingly clear. An efficient, economical plane for such routes would enable airlines to provide more trips at lower cost and may in the long run reduce the need for federally subsidized service.

The Chairman of the CAB has urged manufacturers both here and abroad to cooperate with the Board in developing the specifications for a short-range plane. The CAB has set out its specifications in its recent report to the President on the airline subsidy reduction program. The requirements include a capacity of 24 persons and 1,000 pounds of cargo, a 500-mile nonstop range, a cruising speed of 300 miles per hour and an approach speed of 60 miles per hour.

The Board concluded that the development of this type of aircraft would require from 3 to 5 years. At present no U.S. manufacturer has such a plane either under production or even on the drawing board, although France has produced a plane that meets most of the specifications. The Nord 262 is presently undergoing testing and has received some trials on commercial routes within France. It seems clear that some kind of Government encouragement is going to be necessary to get an American plane out of the realm of discussion and into the air.

I am therefore proposing legislation today declaring that it is the policy of Congress to promote the development of improved local service aircraft by providing for temporary Federal assistance for its development, operation and testing.

Under this measure, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency would be authorized to prepare characteristics and specifications of the aircraft to be developed, provide by contract for its development and testing and consult with other Government agencies, aviation manufacturers, the air transport industry and representatives of labor groups.

Precedent for such a program can be found in Public Law 867, adopted in 1950. That measure provided for a 5-year program to promote the development of improved transport aircraft of the turbine-powered variety. A great many advances in the state of our technology have taken place in the last decade. For one reason or another, it has not been commercially feasible to develop a local service aircraft. But the need for such equipment is increasing. A temporary Federal program to assist in the development and testing of an economical, short-haul, low capacity vehicle will pay tremendous dividends by facilitating the local air service that is becoming more and more important to the health of our economy.

LET'S RESOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in 1960—the year Mr. Kennedy campaigned for the Presidency—more than 55 percent of the lumber shipped by water to the Atlantic coast market came from Washington, Oregon, and California with British Columbia supplying the balance. By the end of 1962, our share of this market skidded to 38 percent. At stake was the production of more than 500 million board feet of American lumber and the loss of some 5,000 jobs.

By August 1 of this year, British Columbia mills claimed 70 percent of the Atlantic coast waterborne lumber market. The situation of our timber industry continues to deteriorate despite the administration's campaign promises.

It is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, that on September 7, 1960, at Salem, Oreg., Mr. Kennedy said that it was time for a fresh and imaginative program to resolve the problems of our Nation's timber industry. Also the presidential candidate said:

> It is time, in short, for a Democratic program—and we have such a program—and in 1961 we are going to put it into action.

If this fresh and imaginative program of the administration is in effect, then please help protect us from our friends.

Statistics show the rapid advance of the British Columbians into a market held traditionally by west coast mills. This inroad is well illustrated by comparative 6-month shipments.

During the first half of 1960 Pacific coast mills shipped 510 million board feet compared with British Columbia's 408 million board feet. The figures for the first half of 1961 show that we shipped 315 million board feet to the east coast market while British Columbia shipped 429 million board feet. The situation continued to deteriorate during the first half of 1962 when our mills landed only 273 million board feet compared with British Columbia mills' 517 million board feet. The first 6 months of this year have been worse. Washington, Oregon and California sawmills shipped only 252 million board feet. Our Canadian neighbors shipped 558 million board feet. The drop from 510 million board feet during the first half of 1960 to 252 million board feet this year represents a loss of employment involving 3,580 persons.

Regardless of the administration's 1960 intention, Washington, Oregon, and California sawmills continue to lose their share of the east coast market largely because of the higher shipping cost they are forced to pay because of the Jones Act, which prohibits shipments of American lumber between American ports on foreign-flag ships. These higher costs amount to a $12 to $14 advantage per 1,000 board feet for British Columbians.

A little more than a year ago, after considerable urging by Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, the President outlined a 6-point program to aid the ailing industry, including a recommendation for legislation to repeal the detrimental provisions of the Jones Act.

I introduced such legislation both in the 87th and the present Congress. Although the administration's six points included recommendation of the proposed amendment, not one of its departments has reported its views to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. During the 87th Congress and again this year I asked for agency reports. Nothing has happened. Perhaps if the President again expressed his interest in the legislation, the departments might act more quickly.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this legislation, which also has been introduced by many other Members interested in solving the problem, can be estimated by looking at the results of an amendment to the Jones Act authorized by the Congress last year. As a result of this legislation, this restricted amendment allows shipment of lumber between American ports and Puerto Rico in foreign ships. West coast shippers have improved their situation in the small, but valuable, Puerto Rican market this year because our mills were given the opportunity to compete on an equal basis with British Columbia mills in obtaining transportation. It seems that it is all right for us to ship lumber from Seattle to Puerto Rico, but not from Seattle to Baltimore or New York.

During the first 7 months of 1963, Washington State shippers landed 6,445,560 board feet of lumber in Puerto Rico—the first shipments in 2 years.

I am convinced that the shipments to Puerto Rico this year indicate what is in store if the Pacific Northwest lumber industry is given a chance to compete on equal terms with British Columbia mills. What concerns me is the number of jobs we are exporting to British Columbia because our own Government will not let us ship lumber in foreign vessels. Meanwhile, unemployment in the State of Washington is greater today than it was a year ago. Based on strict economics, Northwest mills can compete with British Columbia mills when our Government does not impede them. I believe the industry could recapture much of the waterborne Atlantic coast market it has lost. To this end, I introduced another bill, H.R. 7961, to allow the lumber industry to use foreign-flag ships between American ports and to make permanent the temporary authorization for shipment of lumber on foreign ships to Puerto Rico.

This authority expires October 24, 1963, less than 2 months away. I hope the appropriate committee holds hearings immediately and that the appropriate agencies will render reports in time so this legislation can come before the House prior to expiration of the temporary authority. Otherwise our lumber industry again will undoubtedly lose a small but valuable market.

Mr. Speaker, the President also recommended negotiations with Canada on the subject of quotas. Certainly quotas would benefit American lumbermen, but the administration's idea is to persuade Canada to adopt voluntary quotas.

One hundred and five Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle, have joined with me in signing a letter which asks for quotas. It seems to me that this support indicates that if our negotiators do not have some leverage, Canada is not going to limit its lumber exports to the United States.

Recognizing this problem, several Members, including myself, introduced legislation requesting the President to impose an emergency temporary quota of 6 percent on imports of softwood lumber for a period of 3 years. Again, Mr. Speaker, the appropriate agencies have seen fit to keep their views on this subject to themselves. Also, this is true concerning legislation to amend the National Housing Act to require the use of American lumber in the construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages.

What action the agencies have taken has resulted in reports which, as in the case of H.R. 7082, my bill to alleviate the situation faced by the lumber industry, indicate sympathy, but recommend nothing.

To quote from a letter signed by the Secretary of Agriculture to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which I received this week, you find the following words of sympathy:

> We recognize the serious economic problems facing the forest industries of the United States and sympathize with the objective of the bills to relieve some of the industry problems.

Now that's real nice.

But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the same report says:

> The Department does not recommend enactment of this legislation.

Why the sympathy, but no action? The answer is the administration doesn't want to offend the people with whom it has to deal at the GATT negotiation table. Its dealing with our lumber people is something else, however.

Typical of the administration's approach is its attitude toward timber sales which allows a Canadian outfit to come in, bid on a small timber sale, win the sale and haul the logs off to British Columbia for processing. The result is the taxpayers' stumpage goes to Canada, where Canadians make this raw material into lumber and ship it to the east coast market. This means that we, as Americans, produce the raw material to eliminate jobs for our own people.

It seems, therefore, the administration is not expressing an interest in the lumbermen's problems and is seemingly content to drift along with policies that result in loss to foreign competition and rising balance-of-payments deficits. On the other hand, the administration often acts speedily and with vigor when a foreign country begins to suffer from economic ills.

For example, the Canadian dollar a couple of years ago was worth $1.05 in U.S. currency, but through manipulation the value was forced down, helping British Columbia mills to supply American markets at prices Pacific Northwest lumbermen could not meet.

Canada took action to drive the value of her dollar down, hoping to increase exports such as lumber, to reduce imports and to stimulate a more favorable balance of payments. Canada then tried to stabilize her dollar at 95 cents. The burden was too much, so in June of 1962, this country hastened to the rescue by making a loan of $250 million. At the same time our Treasury Department expressed satisfaction because Canada boosted its tariffs on numerous imports, most of which came from the United States by 5 to 15 percent.

Now the Canadian dollar is stabilized at 92.5 cents, but as an editorial in the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian expressed it:

> When the economy of a foreign country sags, the United States is quick to act. When the economy of a large section of the United States suffers from foreign manipulations, months go by without action of any kind, except further study by a Federal Commission.

Well, there have been discussions which have accomplished nothing as far as I can see. And, as far as studies go, the best way to kill anything in Washington, D.C., is to study it.

Mr. Speaker, some of the responsibility of the tremendous growth of British Columbia timber imports can be attributed to the favorable business climate under which the British Columbia mills operate. The British Columbia government has vested interests in most of the timber of the Province. It is interested in creating jobs, payrolls and taxes, rather than taking an ultimate return for stumpage. It gives aid to its lumbermen in helping to expand markets.

The Pacific Northwest timber industry, on the other hand, is caught in a cost-price squeeze which is almost intolerable and which already has forced more than a hundred mills to close. This is not a situation of its own making. It has been caused by acts of our Government and by acts of a neighboring government which is friendly to business and is determined to do something about it.

There is not anything we can do as legislators about the value of the Canadian dollar, wages in British Columbia or the policies of the British Columbia government toward its lumber industry. But, we can do something by passing the amendment to the Jones Act to allow our industry to ship lumber in foreign bottoms.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the administration talk about discussions and about studies in its attempt, if you can call it that, to solve this problem. I mentioned before that discussions are a poor method of action and that to kill something at the Federal level, all you have to do is authorize a new study.

The administration is always talking about unemployment. If it really wants to do something to provide jobs and equal opportunity for our fourth largest industry to compete, let the administration give its blessing to this legislation so that we can put people back to work.

However, the Members who signed the letter which I have mentioned, added a paragraph asking for a conference between American and Canadian Governments and industry representatives to help find a way to resolve our softwood lumber import problem.

I believe this should be a real conference. I mean representatives of those who are directly affected should attend, not just dealers, users, and Government representatives. The representatives should include mill owners, loggers, and investors as well. After all, a conference dominated by retailers and consumers will not solve a problem that directly affects both communities and manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, the lumbermen of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation are not asking for a handout. They are asking for the opportunity to compete on an equal basis with others. During the past 2½ years, their pleas have fallen on deaf ears and administration promises have come to naught.

I urge the President to act and to give active support to legislation which I and many Members of this body, regardless of party, believe will give the lumber industry the break it deserves.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman, my colleague from the State of Washington, for bringing to the attention of the House the problems confronting the Northwest and the western lumber producers.

As I have listened to the gentleman's statement, the gentleman seems to make the point that a large cause or the basic reason for the problem is Government inaction or inactivity. However, putting it another way the gentleman in effect says that the Government is responsible for the Jones Act which prohibits the carriage of Northwest lumber to the east coast via foreign-flag ships.

So, the problem here is one which, in effect, is created by the Government itself. The lumbermen in the Northwest and in the West therefore say to the Government, "You caused this problem; now help us solve the problem."

Thus, they say that the Government has not done anything, except by way of the action of the Congress in making a small exception to the Jones Act, permitting lumber to be carried from the Northwest to Puerto Rico.

I believe the gentleman said that this action resulted in the shipment of some 5 or 6 million board feet of lumber to Puerto Rico ?

Mr. WESTLAND. We shipped about 6½ million board feet to Puerto Rico in about the first 7 months of this year, the first lumber that had been shipped from Northwest ports in over 2 years. This is the direct result of having our Northwest mills on an equal footing with the British Columbia mills. That does not represent a big movement but it is indicative of what they can do if they are permitted to compete with British Columbia on an equal basis.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I know that the gentleman, since this problem became acute here last year and the year before, has been working diligently in an effort to get some kind of assistance or help or relief from the Government which caused the problem.

I want to commend the gentleman for looking after the interests of the people of the Northwest and especially those engaged in the lumber-producing industry.

I think the gentleman at the outset used a figure of 55 percent. I believe he stated that at one point the Northwest lumber producers produced or supplied 55 percent of the waterborne lumber to the east coast.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Does the gentleman have the date of that percentage?

Mr. WESTLAND. That was in 1960.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That was my recollection and I wanted a confirmation of it. But is it not true that 10 years prior to that, back in 1950, we had the bulk of the eastern seaboard lumber market? However, our participation in it has been decreased since 1950, but starting in 1960, the situation did become acute and that caused the lumber producers from the Northwest and the West to come back to Washington, D.C., to seek some relief from the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service especially, as well as the Department of Commerce. The gentleman will recall that we had a number of meetings in connection with the problem in an effort to find some kind of solution, and this was a bipartisan approach—Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle participated—does the gentleman recall that when the President submitted his recommendations for relief of the lumber industry, no one from our side of the aisle was called to the White House at all?

Mr. WESTLAND. That is quite true, in spite of the fact that both Republicans and Democrats who were interested in this lumber problem had urged action by the President and had introduced various kinds of legislation and had spoken out on this matter as well as had held meetings—a good many meetings together—and had worked together regardless of party affiliation in an effort to try to solve this problem when the President made his announcement and stated his six points—that he was going to give some relief to this situation. However, it was only the Democrats who were invited to the White House to participate as a result of his announcement. We felt that that was rather partisan politics, having politics enter into an economic problem which should not be involved with politics.

As the gentleman knows, we have Democrats in the States of Washington and Oregon and California who are just as much interested in this problem as the Republicans. This problem goes way beyond any partisan political issue.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the RECORD should show, however, that both Democratic and Republican Members of the House from the west coast have worked together in support of the various legislative proposals, and I am sure they will continue to work together in an effort to help our Northwest lumber industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on another proposal which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] has made. The gentleman has already made reference to it. That is a legislative proposal which would require that a certain percentage at least of lumber used in housing—that is Federal insured housing—must be American-produced lumber or U.S.-produced lumber. I assume that the gentleman used as a basis for that proposal the same basis that he has used for his statement to the effect that the Government, in the final analysis, was responsible and is responsible for our predicament and the Government ought to do something now to grant some kind of relief.

Mr. Speaker, this suggestion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] is a most excellent one and I certainly trust that the departments of Government involved will submit their reports at an early date so that the committee before which the legislation is pending can act upon it.

I am glad that the gentleman has needled, shall I say, the administration a little bit with respect to these reports. The committees are reluctant to act upon legislative proposals without reports from the departments. I trust that someone will heed what the gentleman has said and that the reports will be forthcoming and that the committees will act upon the constructive proposals which have been made by the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Tacoma, for his statement. I know that he over the years has been just as much interested and as active in trying to solve this problem as anyone in the Congress. It is my opinion that his influence in the Congress, as a result of his seniority, being the senior member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the Republican side, I know that he can do a great deal to help solve this problem. I am very grateful, personally, that he has joined in this discussion with me today. Both of us have the solution to the problem in our hearts and really are trying to do something to provide jobs for people in the Pacific Northwest and jobs that have been lost to British Columbia through no fault of their own, jobs that have been lost because, as the gentleman said, of actions of the Federal Government. All we want to do is have the Congress to act on the recommendations which the President himself has made. If we will do that, then I believe we can solve this problem and put people back to work.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from the State of Washington in their attempt to get the administration to take action, instead of expounding with words, to solve the problems of our timber industry.

As you know, the timber industry is the fourth largest industry in the United States and is the largest source of income for the people of my State. Each foot of lumber which the State of Washington loses in the domestic market to British Columbia directly affects the wage earners of the State, the communities dependent upon the industry and the counties which rely on taxes produced by both the wage earners and the industry itself.

We are talking about jobs. You and I know that the administration talks a lot about the problems of unemployment. We also know that it is neglecting an important industry which contributes substantially to the economy of the Nation. The loss of sales to sawmills of British Columbia is a loss of jobs to the people of Washington, Oregon, and California. When you look at the figures which compare the sale of lumber by Pacific Northwest mills with British Columbia mills, you cannot help but wonder why the administration is not taking positive action. Mr. Speaker, you become amazed when you realize that unemployment is greater today than it was last year at this time in Washington State.

It is as simple as that. Unemployment goes up when sales of timber drop off.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Members of Congress who are interested in the problems of our timber industry. We seek solutions, but are faced with the lethargy of an administration which produces nothing but sympathy and words ending in broken promises.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the forthright statement of my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], on the background situation concerning the Pacific Northwest lumber crisis. I join my colleagues in expressing exasperation over the lack of action by the executive branch of our Government. This lack of action seems inconceivable, and yet what other conclusions can we draw? The facts have been documented and have repeatedly been brought to the attention of the executive. Sympathy has been expressed, action has been promised, and that is all that can be said.

I would like to quote from an address by N. B. Guistina, president of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, before the annual meeting of the Industrial Forestry Association, at Portland, Oreg., on April 26, 1963. This is what Mr. Guistina had to say about the problem to which we are addressing ourselves today:

> Early last year NLMA directed a request to the Department of Commerce seeking its support in trying to set up a conference with Canadian lumber producers to develop a voluntary agreement that would restrict Canadian softwood lumber imports into the United States. After many weeks, with no response, NLMA was able to discuss the matter with the Secretary of Commerce only because a Member of Congress had written to the White House telling the President that the Department of Commerce was apparently not answering its mail. Early last summer the only action that the executive branch of Government was willing to take with regard to Canadian softwood lumber imports was to set up an Interdepartmental Study Group. This is Government's way of eternally avoiding a decision. It was only when a delegation of Pacific Northwest Congressmen approached the President in person—thus, bypassing the State Department and all of the other agencies that were then studying the matter—that the President announced his July 26 six-point program in support of the domestic lumber industry. More recently,

> when the U.S. Tariff Commission decided, on February 14, not to recommend any relief for the domestic lumber industry, it stated that the exemption for Canada from the requirement for marking lumber as to the country of origin did not amount to a tariff concession. On March 7, NLMA requested the Secretary of State to immediately withdraw the exemption based upon the Tariff Commission's ruling. As of last Friday, the Secretary of State had not seen fit to even acknowledge this request.
>
> I can report to you today without fear of contradiction, that our own State Department will oppose every proposal pending in the U.S. Congress, aimed at assisting the domestic lumber industry. You are familiar with these proposals. None is harsh, none suggests that all Canadian lumber be excluded from U.S. markets, none proposes the abolition of the U.S. Forest Service, none suggests that the U.S. lumber industry should receive an unfair advantage in its efforts to compete in this our own country. Yet, our biggest hurdle in securing the adoption of this legislation is overcoming the objections of our own Government.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps what the State Department needs is a desk to represent the United States. At least something must be done to gain serious and genuine concern of this problem. Otherwise it would seem that our pleas will continue to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], for taking this time on a very vital subject. Last February I joined with many of my colleagues, representing both political parties, in speaking on the House floor about the serious economic factors affecting our Nation's lumber industry. At that time I pointed out that the increasing amounts of lumber being imported into the United States from foreign countries, particularly from Canada, were causing our Nation's lumber industry to lose its domestic markets.

I, along with my colleagues, introduced at that time a resolution calling upon the President to impose an emergency 6-percent quota on the importation of foreign logs. It was felt that this quota was necessary to insure American producers their fair share of the American lumber market. In addition to this resolution, many other bills were introduced at that time designed to strengthen the economy of our domestic lumber industry. As my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], has pointed out today, the reports prepared by appropriate executive departments on these bills have, with one or two exceptions, all been unfavorable.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I could make the same speech today that I made last February. The situation in our domestic lumber industry has not changed, except that conditions have worsened. The administration has been totally ineffective in providing substantial relief for the declining lumber industry.

Canadian imports have increased steadily so that today about 15 percent of all lumber sold on the U.S. market comes from Canada. In addition, as of June of this year British Columbia sawmills have claimed 69 percent of the U.S. Atlantic coast waterborne cargo lumber market. In June British Columbia mills shipped by water into east coast ports 91.5 million board feet, as compared to 33.7 million board feet for Washington mills, and only 2.4 million board feet for Oregon. To alleviate this situation, many of us have introduced bills providing for the removal of restrictive shipping legislation. However, again as of this point, no action has been taken.

It is certainly true, Mr. Speaker, that most of the softwood lumber consumed in the United States is grown in the Pacific Northwest. But there is no doubt, either, that the economy of the entire lumber industry would be strengthened if action were taken to strengthen the softwood lumber economy. Timber products represent one of our Nation's most important agricultural crops. A recent publication prepared by the U.S. Forest Service shows that timber products amount to about one-seventh of the value of all farm crops harvested in the United States. Timber amounts to about two-thirds of the value of corn harvested and exceeded the value of wheat and cotton harvested. The timber industry employs a large share of America's total working force. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that three-fifths of the employment in timber harvesting is in the Southland of our Nation, as reported by 1958 statistics, the latest compiled. Fifty-seven percent of all timber harvest employees were employed in the southern portion of the United States, while 22 percent were employed in the North, and 21 percent in the West. Thus when any segment of the lumber industry economy is down, the entire Nation is affected.

This administration has done much talking about reducing unemployment. Unfortunately, the statistics on employment in the lumber industry prove that their efforts to reduce unemployment have here failed miserably. Employment in sawmills and planing mills has decreased from a total of 416,000 less than 19 years ago to a little more than 300,000 today. At the present time literally hundreds of thousands of workers formerly employed in the lumber and related industries field are out of work, and in spite of the many promises which have been made by this administration, they are still out of work. I was happy, Mr. Speaker, to join recently with over 100 of my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle in signing still another letter to the President, urging that he do something to prevent further deterioration of the lumber industry's economy.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] and I have read the press text he has issued.

I must characterize the remarks of my colleague on the other side of the aisle as a party line, partisan attack in respect to a vital regional economic problem that, I thought, hitherto was being dealt with on a nonpartisan or, if you will, bipartisan basis. And, if the choice were to reply in like vein to the contentions made just now, it could be asked: "Just what did the Member's own President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, do in respect to the problem of Northwest lumber during his years in the White House?" I suggest that the immediate past Chief Executive did nothing.

Furthermore, a charge against the Kennedy administration that it is studying this lumber problem to death comes with poor credentials from any member of the minority party. For it is certainly a hallmark of the Eisenhower administration that a whole range of domestic problems—welfare and education, to name two—was studied and restudied to the melody of the shuffling of position papers by avowed experts. These problems President Kennedy inherited when he took office in January 1961. Is it being said here today that the Northwest lumber problem was born on that inauguration day?

In all fairness the male Member from Washington and those who are keeping company with him today know there was a lumber problem in the months and several years preceding the date of Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. And who was keeping the store then? What magical solutions did they recommend at that time? How many conferences did President Eisenhower call?

In view of Mr. WESTLAND's remarks, I have consulted with my able colleague, Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, representing the Oregon Fourth Congressional District, which contains some of the most valuable lumber holdings in the United States, and he and I share the views that follow:

Surely, the distinguished Member from Washington knows full well that elements of the Northwest lumber problem are most complex and solution by governmental action is not easy.

The attack on the Kennedy administration today reflects an attempt by some lumber operators to create a false and unfounded impression that the Kennedy administration is not only unsympathetic, but also is not working effectively in an effort to resolve the problem. Our own knowledge, based on discussions with Kennedy administration officials, tells us that those who are charged with jurisdiction in this matter are working ceaselessly to provide a fair and equitable solution. We had hoped that the bipartisan approach to this problem would be a permanent feature of this important task. There are indications here today that it is not to be.

Let us look at the record.

On February 1, 1962, for instance, a Cabinet level meeting was held with lumbering interests at the invitation of Interior Secretary Udall and Democratic House Members. Responsible officials of the ICC, the Forest Service, and the Commerce Department attended. I have letters in my file from officials of lumbering interests stating that this was, in effect, a seminal and fruitful meeting.

The Commerce Department, under Secretary Hodges, has launched, in cooperation with lumbering interests, an aggressive and vigorous program of export expansion. A lumber trades mission has recently returned from a survey of Western Europe and Scandinavia and participants have said the results were most promising.

In March 1962, Eugene Foley, a top official of the Commerce Department and now SBA Administrator, toured the Northwest lumber areas in company with lumber representatives in order to obtain a firsthand impression and report.

During this time the cry arose from lumbering interests that import quotas on British Columbia timber should be imposed. Well, I have in my possession an editorial from the Portland Oregonian, a leading newspaper which states in an editorial:

> Artificial restrictions on imports are not the answer. The answers to our problems appear to lie in the expansion of markets.

Well, this is just what the Kennedy administration is pushing. And the lumbering interests in the Northwest well know this and have lent their support, willingly and eagerly, to this effort.

There has been an implied attack on the Forest Service. The Portland (Oreg.) Journal on February 2, 1962, said editorially that lumber hearings "have clearly pointed out that Northwest operators suffer disadvantages at the hands of the Canadian mills over which the Forest Service has no control."

Now one of Oregon's most distinguished newspaper editors and a former Republican Governor of Oregon, Charles A. Sprague, wrote last year that "competition of substitutes has shrunk the market for lumber." Here is an important element largely beyond the control of Government.

In July 1962, President Kennedy announced a six-point major program to assist the suffering portions of the lumber industry. Despite what has been said here today, advances in pushing this program have been made. We do not recall President Eisenhower making the tremendous investment in time and effort and trained manpower to draft and forward such a program.

Even as this discussion goes on today, American negotiators, with lumbermen represented, are preparing to meet with Canadian counterparts in an effort to resolve differences.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to place in the RECORD a paper entitled "Statement on the Lumber Problem," issued last December by the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Commerce Department.

I think this paper of some interest. It has been published as a reprint by the big-business, Republican-oriented National Lumber Manufacturers Association. The then president, Mr. Mortimer Doyle, in a preface to the reprint offers NLMA's "sincere appreciation" to the BDSA for its efforts. Mr. Doyle praises the paper as an "extremely well prepared summary and, more importantly, sets out in very readable form the very specific actions taken by this Kennedy administration to assist domestic lumber producers to overcome these problems."

Mr. Speaker, the lumber paper follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, STATEMENT ON THE LUMBER PROBLEM

This statement has been prepared in response to inquiries relating to various aspects of the lumber industry problem, including the impact of softwood lumber imports from Canada, intercoastal shipping regulations, Federal timber sales policies, timber blowdown on the west coast, etc. It reviews some of the factors involved and actions taken by the Government to assist the lumber industry.

The difficulties of the lumber industry are due to a complex of factors related to industry operations, governmental policies and regulations, technological changes, and domestic and international economic developments.

A major factor in this situation is the substantial increase in softwood lumber imports resulting from the competitive advantages of Canadian producers in raw materials, production and shipping costs, and the devaluation of Canadian currency. However, the industry generally suffers from overcapacity. It is characterized by a few large mills, a moderate number of medium-size mills, and a preponderance of small mills. The smaller mills operate seasonally or on an intermittent basis when lumber prices are high and cease operations when prices are low. The number of active mills in the industry therefore varies considerably from time to time. As the original timber is cut in one region, the center of production shifts to new areas. In certain areas some of the remaining mills have become obsolete. Layout and equipment designed to cut large logs is less efficient when used in cutting smaller logs now available to them. Adjustment of mill size and equipment to the available timber resource and modernization of equipment and techniques is correcting this situation, but not fast enough.

Overcutting of private timber in some areas has led to increased demand for public timber, particularly where public holdings are substantial. Adherence to good timber management principles, lack of access roads, and other limitations have not always permitted an increase in the supply of public timber sufficient to meet the requirements of all installed capacity of the facilities of a given area. This has resulted in bidding up of log prices. In other areas sawmill capacity is not adequate to utilize available timber.

Shipping laws, designed to preserve our important maritime fleet, have had effects not anticipated at the time of enactment, e.g., the Jones Act, which requires the use of domestic bottoms in intercoastal trade, has put American shippers at a disadvantage, costwise, compared to Canadian shippers, in the movement of lumber from the west coast to the east coast. Competition from other materials also has reduced the lumber market.

The foregoing factors are cited only to illustrate the complexity of the problem which will not be solved overnight. It will not be solved by the Government alone, nor by industry alone, but through a cooperative effort. Such an effort is being made.

The administration has been urged repeatedly to impose restrictions on imports of lumber from Canada. However, legal authority for such action is limited. Such authority exists under the tariff adjustment provision, section 351, or the national security provision, section 232, of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The Tariff Commission is now conducting an investigation of the softwood lumber industry pursuant to section 351 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the President has requested the Tariff Commission to complete the investigation as expeditiously as possible. If the Tariff Commission should find serious injury or threat of serious injury to the industry, the President could restrict imports by increasing the duty, establishing a quota or through orderly marketing agreements with supplying countries.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 which, under certain conditions, empowers the President to regulate imports of agricultural commodities which threaten the market for domestic agricultural products, has been suggested as a basis for the imposition of import quotas. The President, therefore, has requested the Department of Justice to advise him with respect to the applicability of this law to lumber imports and other laws which might provide authority for limiting imports of lumber.

Recognizing the impact of imported Canadian lumber on the U.S. market, the President announced on July 26 a six-point program to assist the lumber industry. The first point in this program called for negotiations with Canada concerning the amount of softwood lumber imported into the United States. Pursuant to this directive, two conferences were held in Ottawa at which all aspects of the problem were thoroughly explored. At the last conference on October 16–17, it was agreed that both countries have a mutual interest in a satisfactory resolution of problems facing the North American softwood lumber industry and that an ad hoc joint expert working group of Government officials would be established to examine cooperatively such matters as the results of the storm of October 12, 1962, on the Pacific coast, the longer-term North American supply and demand prospects for timber resources, wood utilization generally and market development. Since the Portland Conference on Windthrown Timber in October 30–31, which is discussed later in this statement, negotiations with Canada have been initiated to establish the above ad hoc working group. This working group should contribute significantly to the establishment of a rational basis for resolving the problems of the industry.

The second point called for submission of a request to Congress for additional funds for forest development roads and trails to assure prompt harvest of national forest timber. Such request was made and substantial increases in funds were authorized for the fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965.

The third point in the President's program dealt with the amendment of intercoastal shipping laws to permit the use of foreign vessels when conditions exist which indicate severe hardship to American shippers. In response to this point, Congress recently passed Public Law No. 87–877 which permits the use of foreign vessels in the shipment of lumber to Puerto Rico, provided domestic shipping services are not reasonably available. Several applications have been filed with the Maritime Administration requesting permission to use foreign vessels and a hearing on one case resulted in a preliminary finding favorable to the applicant. Hearings on the other cases are pending.

The fourth point called for an increase of 150 million board feet in the allowable cut of timber on lands managed by the Department of the Interior. This increase was put into effect immediately by that Department. The Department of Agriculture also announced on December 7 an increase of 547 million board feet in the allowable cut on the 42 national forests in the west coast and inland empire States where timber demand is critical. In addition, the Forest Service is working closely with the industry on matters concerning timber sales policies and procedures. A 15-member advisory committee on multiple use of the national forests met with the Secretary of Agriculture on November 27–28 to consider proposals of the lumber industry with respect to the allowable cut, timber appraisals, appeals procedures, and contract forms. The proposals were made to remove long standing objections to timber sales procedures and to aid recovery of the industry from economic distress.

The fifth point concerned the establishment of a preference for American lumber by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and other Federal departments and agencies. As a means of implementing this directive, the Department of Commerce is currently working in cooperation with the major lumber procuring agencies to assure maximum preference for American lumber in Government procurement programs.

We are informed that all lumber purchased by the General Services Administration, and substantially all of lumber purchased directly by the military, exclusive of local purchases, is obtained from domestic sources. Approximately 85 percent of the military purchases are made through the small business set-aside program which requires that the product be of domestic origin. Information is not readily available on the quantity and origin of lumber purchased locally by military installation, but the quantity is reported to represent a small proportion of total purchases.

The Secretary of Defense has directed that no contracts for construction or repair of public buildings and works be awarded without approval of his Office, if the contract provides for the use of foreign construction materials. Also, on purchases for use overseas, the Secretary recently directed that, subject to some exceptions, purchases be made in the United States of supplies of domestic origin. The allowable differential between domestic and foreign prices has been raised from 25 percent to 50 percent.

The Agency for International Development has requested its operations missions abroad to review the lumber procurement programs they finance with a view toward maximizing procurement from the United States.

The sixth point called for increased attention to loan applications filed with the Small Business Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration for lumber mills. Loans under these programs will be made to upgrade production of existing facilities and obtain better utilization of raw materials. For example, loans will be considered for the addition of dry kilns, chippers, and debarkers, and establishment of hardboard and particleboard plants. Loans will not be granted to create new primary capacity when the timber supply cannot support the existing and new facilities on a sustained yield basis.

On October 30–31 the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior sponsored a Government-industry conference in Portland to assess the extent of damage resulting from the storm of October 12 and to formulate recommendations for minimizing the impact of this disaster.

As a means of further implementing the President's 6-point program and the recommendations of the Portland conference, the Department of Commerce requested the principal lumber procuring agencies of the Government to give consideration to increasing or advancing their procurement schedules, if practicable, so as to reduce the effect of the excess lumber which will result from the storm. In specific response to this request the Agency for International Development instructed its operations missions in Korea, Japan, and other Pacific areas to urge maximum substitution of U.S. lumber for that imported from other sources, where technically feasible for domestic purposes and commercially feasible for export products, and to limit AID-financing of lumber and lumber products for use within the recipient countries to U.S. sources.

The Department also alerted the American Embassies in Europe, Japan, and Australia to the availability of excess lumber for export which will result from the storm and urged that importers in those countries be encouraged to consider the west coast as a source of supply. As a further measure to expand export markets the Department of Commerce has given special attention to oversea business trips by lumber executives and to specialized industry-financed trade missions. Representatives of the lumber industry, headed by executives of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, have recently returned from a successful trip to explore the potential market in several European countries. A specialized trade mission to be financed by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association is scheduled to visit lumber markets in Europe, Japan, and Australia in 1963.

BRACERO PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it certainly beggars the power of descriptive phrasing and the English language to call the type of labor made legal under Public Law 78, otherwise known as the bracero law, other than by the most descriptive phrase of all, and that is slave labor act. If it is not a slave labor classification, maybe perhaps the word coolie or maybe the word peon, which would be more apt or more illustrative because it is in more direct connection with what is really happening, should be used. We can deceive ourselves into thinking that because we have entered into an agreement whereby, for example, in my native State the imported worker is guaranteed by law more than the domestic native Texan worker and we can say that because of this protection and others they are very optimistically labeled as necessary, sufficient, and adequate safeguards, that this can be called something other than a slave labor act. But how would anybody define it in better terms if we were to say that a man were brought in under very specific and rigid conditions with no freedom on his part to come in here and negotiate the particular terms of agreement if they are not complied with after he reaches his place of employment? The truth of the matter is, in order to insure this, the subsidization of this program would have to be in excess of the $1.5 million that it now costs the American taxpayer in order to afford the luxury for 1.5 percent of the farmers to have this cheap, free almost, slave labor. It would require a substantial, I would say an overwhelming amount of money in excess of the $1.5 million in order to see that the provisions of the Bracero Act are carefully abided by. From personal observation, knowledge, and experience I happen to know that in my native State of Texas the letter of the law is certainly not followed. And what recourse does this so-called eager laborer, who is just "dying to come over to work under these terms," have if he is being cheated? The law says he shall then go to the nearest Mexican consulate in order to protest. Well, now, in the main this is a man who cannot read or write and certainly cannot speak English. I would like to know if he is in Deaf Smith County in Texas, how is he supposed to find out how to go to the nearest Mexican consulate in order to register his complaint if he is being mistreated? The truth of the matter is he is indeed a slave, because he has no recourse and if he does not work as he is expected, he is shipped back there with no recourse whatever.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would, except for the fact that the gentleman has stated categorically he does not agree in any way with anything I have said or might say, and so I cannot really see any constructive purpose.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. This is for a question.

Mr. GONZALEZ. As I say, it could not be a question that could ask for any creative or constructive answers inasmuch as you have stated you are categorically opposed to any remarks I might make in connection with this measure. But for the sake of courtesy, I will certainly yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman very much and I appreciate that.

Is the gentleman aware of the fact that Senators Morse, Yarborough, Engle, and Kuchel, and Justice Goldberg, Secretary Wirtz, Congressmen Udall, Sisk, Moss, and Duncan, to mention a few well-known liberals, do support this bill and program, so they must not consider it to be slave labor.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Well, in answer to that, sir, this bill has been enacted and reenacted on an average of once every 2 years since about 1952. I imagine that the record of the legislators who have served during that period has been a varied one. I was under the impression that recently when the Senate passed out the version it did on the 2-year extension with the amendment by Senator McCARTHY, that Senator YARBOROUGH had voted against it, if I remember correctly. I do not know for sure.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If the gentleman will yield, you are quite correct, but it is also correct that Senator YARBOROUGH voted against all of the McCarthy amendments, which would lead me to the conclusion he voted against the bill on the final passage on the ground that it was impractical with the amendments that were adopted.

Mr. GONZALEZ. It could very well be, or it could be he was against the whole thing in principle, both the amendments and the act itself. I do not know and will not hazard a guess as to what he had in mind. I cannot speculate, sir. Of course, his record is there, and we can certainly examine it, but that does not necessarily deter me from stating what I have stated because of the fact that I would then have to give false witness to that which I have myself seen, and the facts that have been brought to my attention as to the very practical nature of the situation as it exists, at least in my home State, although I have good reason to know it is not exclusively limited to the State of Texas.

I say this in answer to those who maintain, as the gentleman from California does, if I understand it, that this is a suitable or desirable program. I think it all depends, of course, on the point of view; and the fact that so many people have voted for or against it as the case may be does not prove anything, I do not think.

I have been arguing substantially and in essence as to the merits or demerits of the act itself from a very practical and very pragmatic standpoint. We have argued on the basis that I have called it a slave labor act because when a man does not have the freedom to bargain and does not have the freedom to correct an injustice after he has accepted and made a bargain, he certainly cannot be called a free worker. In this case it is certainly the truth. We have had case after case in which substantial departures from compliance with the law have been registered in Texas and there was very little in the way of relief that could be obtained. We had substantial and widespread violation of the terms of the contract in southwest Texas, for example. Had it not been for elements in our society in the city of Corpus Christi unconnected with the Labor Department and unconnected with the Department of Agriculture, and unconnected with the Mexican Government, these abuses would very likely not have come to light.

I would also like to say this: If it is necessary, I have not been against the importation of workers per se or the attraction of workers if we need them. If it is true that this need exists in a legitimate form, then I ask the question, Why not have the worker come over in freedom as our ancestors did and as our own fathers did? When our fathers came over they had to toil long and for poor pay. But they had freedom to walk from one job to the other as their need dictated. But this worker does not have that freedom. He cannot come into the United States in freedom. If we need this work, let us bring him over in human dignity. But the very same people who advocate the importation of braceros do not want this. And why do they not want it? Because, as the Texas ranchers have found when they have gone to the American consul in Monterrey and said:

> We have had Pedro Sanchez here for several months. We like the way he works. Now he has had to return because his time is up under the bracero pact. And we are applying to the American consulate now in behalf of Pedro Sanchez to bring him over here on an immigration permit or visa, to bring him over as a legal resident.

When Pedro Sanchez does come over as a legal resident, he can go and work for that rancher under the bracero terms, but he will not stay there because he is free to go off and find employment at better wages. This is the reason why the user of the bracero does not wish to bring over the bracero under other circumstances than bracero terms. This, in turn, has had a deleterious effect on our own domestic labor.

But this is not the sole and exclusive reason why I rise against the extension of the bracero pact. I feel that is a good enough reason but it is not the sole and exclusive reason because I am willing to grant that if we do have and there is a need for the legitimate use of this labor then I say let us bring it over under dignity, let us bring it over in freedom, let us bring it over in the tradition for which we stand.

BRACERO LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has a perfect right to his convictions. He has a right to state his opinions and his views with respect to any matter he wishes to discuss.

Now he has just spoken about the importation of bracero labor to this country and refered to that labor as "slave labor." He mentioned it earlier when he addressed the House and reiterated that this labor, brought into this country under Public Law 78, is "slave labor." I know of no better authority on this matter than the Mexican press or the people of that republic.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article from the Christian Science Monitor under date of June 5, 1963, referring to the issue raised in the debate earlier here when Public Law 78 extension was before the House, and when bracero labor was called by a colleague during the debate on this bill, at that time, as slave labor. This article refers to that pronouncement made on the floor of the House. The article is by Marion Wilhelm, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, and the dateline is Mexico City. In the article he quotes from a Mexico City newspaper, La Prensa, as follows:

> There is no doubt that we have been insulted—

He is speaking now of the bracero workers being referred to as slave labor on this floor when the bill was before us—

> but apart from the insult, they would leave us in the vulnerable position of losing from one day to the next the dollars that the braceros send back to maintain our very precarious balance of payments. And that means that some 300,000 Mexican families will suffer from the unemployment of their family wage earners.

Public Law 78 builds good will with our friend and neighbor to the south of us. These workers enjoy coming here to work and want the opportunity to return from year to year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas stated that the best way to solve this problem is to bring in immigrants for permanent residence in this country. That is the situation which exists at this time where some 2 million are being brought in from other countries as permanent residents each year. They complain about the 200,000 that come in under Public Law 78 but say nothing about the 2 million who enter the country to make America their domicile. These people compete with our own workers.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GATHINGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It seems to me that it should be very clear that the fallacy in the argument of the gentleman from Texas is simply this: These braceros, Mexican nationals, are brought here under contracts under the terms of the treaty as unattached men. They do not bring their families. They are here for a few months and are moved around entirely voluntarily, but moved from place to place as they are needed. They are recontracted to farmers in other States quite often. When they are no longer needed, they go back to Mexico.

If we brought in the immigrants which the gentleman from Texas has recommended, we would have many more hundreds of thousands of families wandering around this country and perhaps working a few weeks out of the year and taking jobs the rest of the year from industrial workers, and when they cannot find those jobs, adding to the problem of our welfare rolls. That is the difficulty with the gentleman's suggestion, as compared to the very practical program for a supplemental labor force by contract to meet needs that cannot be met with domestic workers.

Mr. GATHINGS. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. As a matter of fact, these 2 million that are coming in here are supplanting our own labor force with respect to jobs.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Which the braceros are not.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is true. They come in for a specific purpose and work by contract. When that contract is concluded they are carried back to the border or made available in the harvest of vital crops in some other area.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. And if the gentleman will yield further, they cannot be given a job unless the Department of Labor certifies that there are no domestic workers who are available and who are able and willing to do that job.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is true and to do that job in a particular vicinity. I am grateful to the gentleman from California for his participation in this discussion and for the contributions he has made.

Without a sufficient labor force to cultivate and harvest fresh vegetables and fruits supply shortages will occur as there will be less acreage grown. The price to the consumer will be higher and could be considerably higher for these foods. The effect upon the general economy would be great in the many industries who are a part of moving the produce from the farm to the table. It is not just the farmer who will suffer—there is the housewife's budget, the canner, the supplier of containers, fertilizer, distributor, the trucker, the railroads, and the workers in these industries are to be considered as well.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Tollefson, from September 9, 1963, to September 25, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Gonzalez, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Gathings, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Evins.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1716. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1173. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to excessive costs of maintenance and management of properties acquired upon default of loans made under the loan guarantee and direct loans programs, Veterans' Administration, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1174. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on illegal use of operation and maintenance funds for rehabilitation and construction of family housing and construction of a related facility of the Department of Defense, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1175. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to enact the interstate agreement on detainers into law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1176. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1177. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8339. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 8340. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide an incentive plan for participation in the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 8341. A bill to prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8342. A bill to promote the development of improved local-service aircraft by providing for temporary Federal assistance for such development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 8343. A bill to provide assistance in cambating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 8344. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.J. Res. 682. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.J. Res. 683. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.J. Res. 684. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 685. Joint resolution to authorize the construction of a hotel and related facilities in Mount Rainier National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. Res. 514. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 8345. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Martha Hyde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8346. A bill for the relief of Juan Hernandez-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8347. A bill for the relief of Yusif Shakir Farsakh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 8348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

265. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John C. Cascione, New York, N.Y., relative to requesting amendment of the 16th amendment of the Constitution so as to provide a low flat rate of tax upon all economic transfers without deduction, exception, exemption, allowance, discount, or reduction in any manner whatsoever, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, September 5, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, we turn to Thee for refuge from the noise and hurry of the world without, and from the tyranny of selfish moods and motives within.

May we fear only to be disloyal to the best we know, to betray those who love and trust us, and to disappoint Thy expectations concerning us.

In a world where we see the dreadful penalties of senseless human separations, dedicate us in this baffled generation as builders of bridges across all the yawning gulfs which rend this sadly divided earth.

Deliver us, we pray Thee, from petty irritations which spoil the music of life and distort our perspectives. Bring us to the ending of this day unashamed, and with a quiet mind.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the life and the way. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 10th semiannual report of the Office of Minerals Exploration from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 5, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, and with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the further information of Senators, let me state that it had been anticipated that tomorrow we would take up the bill, reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, having to do with aid to medical and dental schools. But because of the fact that a Senator has requested that he have a few days in which to file minority views, it is anticipated, unless the situation has changed, that that bill will not be brought up tomorrow, but that, instead, the Senate will consider Calendar No. 456, Senate bill 1831, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the appointment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to attend the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, September 10–20, 1963.

NEW YORK BAR ASSOCIATION URGES REJECTION OF MISGUIDED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York State Bar Association Committee on Federal Constitution recently issued an excellent report on the three constitutional amendments proposed by the Council of State Governments.

The committee was unanimous in concluding that each of the proposed amendments should be emphatically rejected.

The committee is composed of some of the leading members of the New York bar. Its report decisively refutes the flimsy arguments made by the proponents of these misguided amendments.

I know that the report of this outstanding committee will be of interest to many Members and ask unanimous consent that the text of the report be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the report was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THREE AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

The Council of State Governments[1] has proposed three amendments of the U.S. Constitution, which would (1) enable the State legislatures to propose constitutional amendments without action by Congress or any national convention, (2) remove all protections of the Constitution from the apportionment of representation in State legislatures, and (3) enable the States, through a Court of the Union consisting of their 50 Chief Justices, to reverse any judgment of the Supreme Court upholding the exercise of any power or jurisdiction granted to the United States under the Constitution. (See appendix.)

The proposal of these amendments must be taken seriously: one or more of them has been approved by one or both houses of the legislatures of 18 States.[2]

The proponents of the amendments assert a strong shift toward the extension of Federal powers and the restraint of State powers, and believe that grave imbalance now exists. The basic difficulty is that the Supreme Court's decisions concerning the balance between Federal and State power are final and can be changed in practice only if the States can muster sufficient interest in Congress, backed by a three-fourths majority of the States themselves to amend the Constitution."[3]

Balance between Federal and State power is always a proper subject for concern, as indeed is balance between the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary. A constitution of built-in checks and balances is ipso facto a constitution of built-in conflicts. The resolution of these problems is not easy, and indeed reasonable differences of opinion exist among thoughtful men, but the fact that such problems exist falls far short, in our opinion, of justifying the proposed amendments. The issue which the amendments raise is whether the American people will be better off in their constitutional life with our present federal system in which the National Government is supreme in its field, or with a structure in which the final arbiter is 50 State governments (or sometimes a majority, or two-thirds, or three-quarters of them).

THE AMENDMENT CHANGING THE AMENDING PROCESS

This proposed amendment would add a new method for proposing constitutional amendments, by direct action of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States. Thereby the entire process of amending the Constitution could be accomplished solely by State legislatures, requiring only proposal of the amendment by 34 State legislatures and rati-

---

[1] The Council of State Governments is a joint governmental agency of all the States organized in 1933. It conducts biennially a general assembly of the States, in which the principal representation is from the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation or similar statutory bodies of the several States.

At the assembly held December 6, 1962, at which 46 States were represented, the votes on the 3 proposed amendments were as follows:

Changing the amending process:	
For	37
Against	4
Abstaining	4
Apportionment:	
For	26
Against	10
Abstaining	10
Court of the Union:	
For	21
Against	20
Abstaining	5

The New York delegation voted for the proposal to change the amending process, and against the 2 other proposals.

Action of the assembly is reported in "Amending the U.S. Constitution To Strengthen the States in the Federal System," 36 State Government 10 (1963). This also contains the "Statement of principles" reported to the assembly by the national legislative conference committee on Federal-State relations.

[2] Shanahan, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments: They Will Strengthen Federal-State Relations," 49 ABA Journal 631 (July 1963), note 4.

[3] "Statements of principles, supra, note 1.

fication by 38. The present alternative of proposal by two-thirds votes of the House and Senate would be retained.[4]

It is hard to see any purpose of this additional method of proposing amendments other than (a) to remove the protection afforded to more populous States by the requirement of a two-thirds vote in the House[5] and (b) to eliminate the necessity of consideration and action on all amendments by a national forum (congressional hearings and floor debates, national publicity, etc.).[6] These purposes seem to us unsound. The proposed amendment would destroy the present balance in amending the Constitution, and permit revising the national charter purely by a series of local actions.[7]

THE APPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT

This would provide that no provision of the Constitution or any amendment thereto shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature, and that the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

This proposed amendment would forbid the application of the Constitution and Federal judicial power to the apportionment of representation in State legislatures. It would thus forbid application to apportionment of the right of any person to the equal protection of the laws, of the Federal guarantee to every State of a republican form of government, and of the right of citizens to vote notwithstanding race or color.[8]

These rights guaranteed by the Constitution are indeed fundamental. We would be loath to see their application curtailed in any way; and the proposed amendment would forbid their application to apportionment for all time, and no matter how egregious or willful the malapportionment might be. While many of us are concerned by the possibility of extreme applications of *Baker* v. *Carr*[9] and believe that the development of decisions under it should be watched with care, we do not believe that this is the time for an amendment or that the proper method is complete reversal of the decision, resulting in perpetual exemption of malapportionment, no matter how flagrant, from constitutional limitations designed to protect our rights.[10]

THE AMENDMENT FOR REVERSING THE SUPREME COURT BY STATE JUDGES

Under this proposed amendment, briefly, upon demand of five State legislatures within 2 years after any Supreme Court judgment relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a Court of the Union composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of all the States. The sole issue shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under the Constitution. A majority of such court may reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. Decisions of such court shall be final and shall not be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of the Constitution.

Thus the function of this amendment is to reverse the Supreme Court in any case where the chief justices of 26 States vote that the particular "power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States" is not "a power granted" to the United States under the Constitution. By the Constitution the people created a Federal Government of granted powers (and also expressly denied certain powers to the States). In this Federal Government every act of its executive, legislative and judicial branches can be valid only if the power thereby sought to be exercised is a power granted under the Constitution. Thus the scope of what this amendment could invalidate would extend back through the Supreme Court's decisions to every act of every branch of the Federal Government.

The proposed Court of the Union would be a court in little more than name. Its 50 judges would be selected, paid and removed by their respective States. From the very nature of the revisionary duty thrown upon them, their functioning would be legislative rather than judicial. This machinery for sectional and nonjudicial determination of all constitutional issues contrasts sadly with the wisdom of what it would replace—an independent Federal judiciary. Our Federal judges are appointed by the President, who is elected by the people of the Nation; they are confirmed by the Senate, which is elected by the people of the several States. They hold office for life or good behavior, and their compensation cannot be reduced.

The duty of the Court of the Union to decide issues as the representative of the several States is not only frankly admitted, but claimed on behalf of this proposal as a merit. "This procedure would make the States the final arbiter of disputes of major importance that relate to the rights or powers reserved to the States or the people." Again, the required vote is characterized as "at least 26 of the 50 States, speaking through their judicial branches of government." Finally, "* * * under this procedure the States themselves would be the final arbiters of the extent of their reserved rights and powers."[11]

The Articles of Confederation did not create any Federal judiciary, but did at least provide that "the Articles of this Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State."[12] The Court of the Union amendment would subjugate our Federal judiciary to the States, and turn the supremacy clause of our Constitution[13] upside down.

CONCLUSION

The purpose and effect of the three proposed amendments is to make our country's Government much like what it was under the Articles of Confederation and perpetual union. There the States severally entered into "a firm league of friendship with each other"[14]—which lasted 8 years.

It is the opinion of this committee, without dissent, that each of the proposed amendments should be emphatically rejected.[15]

Committee on Federal Constitution: Martin Taylor, chairman, New York; Theodore Pearson, secretary, New York; Ernest Angell, New York; William C. Breed, Jr., New York; Bruce Bromley, New York; Porter R. Chandler, New York; William Tucker Dean, Ithaca; Howard M. Holtzmann, New York; R. Keith Kane, New York; Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., New York; Ernest D. Leet, Jamestown; George Lindsay, Jr., New York; John E. Lockwood, New York; Henry S. Manley, Strykersville; Willis L. M. Reese, New York; William J. Rennert, New York; Harrison Tweed, New York; Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., New York.

JULY 30, 1963.

APPENDIX

The action of the general assembly of the States (see note 1, supra) took the form of recommending three resolutions for adoption by State legislatures without change and in such form as not to require approval or veto by the Governors. In each of the resolutions, the legislature petitions Congress "to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article" as an amendment to the Constitution. Following are the texts of the three articles thus proposed (omitting in each case the usual final section declaring the article inoperative unless ratified in 7 years):

[Amendment changing the amending process]

"SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.' "

---

[4] In addition to adding a new method for proposing amendments, the proposed amendment would delete both of the present provisions for conventions—(1) that on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments, and (2) that amendments may be ratified (if Congress so proposes) by conventions in three-fourths of the States.

The convention method of proposing amendments has never been used; it is the method sought to be availed of by the Council of State Government proposals. The convention method of ratifying amendments has been used once (amendment XXI).

The validity of the resolutions which the counsel proposes for use by State legislatures has been questioned. Black, "The Proposed Amendment of Article V: a Threatened Disaster," 72 Yale L.J. 957 (April 1963).

[5] It has been calculated that under this proposed amendment legislators representing about 15 percent of the American people could amend the Constitution, i.e., 38 percent of 40 percent (the 38 least populous States have about 40 percent of the Nation's population, and in those States on the average 38 percent of the people form constituencies sufficient to control the legislature). Black, supra, note 4, at 960.

[6] As creating a league of sovereign States rather than a nation, the Articles of Confederation quite naturally required unanimous consent for amendment. Even so, they recognized that amendments of the league should originate with and be worked out by the league's legislature. Thus article XIII provided that no alteration shall be made unless it be agreed to in a Congress of the United States and be afterward confirmed by the legislatures of every State.

[7] This proposal has a deceptive appearance of harmlessness. At the general assembly of the States it attracted the votes of 37 of the 46 States represented, while the apportionment amendment received a bare majority of 26 and the Court of the Union amendment a minority of 21. Evidently it is hard to realize that once the lid to the amending process is lifted, other less appealing changes will fly out easily.

[8] XIV amendment, sec. 1; art. IV, sec. 4; XV amendment, sec. 1.

[9] 369 U.S. 186 (1962).

[10] See the 73 p. Comment *Baker* v. *Carr* and "Legislative Apportionments: A Problem of Standards," 72 Yale L.J. 968 (April 1963), including discussion of the situation in New York at pp. 1019–1027.

[11] Shanahan, supra, note 2, at 635.

[12] Art. XIII.

[13] Art. VI, cl. 2. "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

[14] Art. III.

[15] Our discussion has been confined to the effects of the proposed amendments. For a highly critical analysis of the proponents' motives, see Commager, "To Form a Much Less Perfect Union", the New York Times magazine, July 14, 1963, p. 5, charging that the proponents are not genuinely concerned with the powers of the States and that "The ambition which animates them is not to strengthen the States, but to paralyze the Nation."

[Apportionment amendment]

"SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature."

[Court of the Union amendment]

"SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within two years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a Court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

"SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

"SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the national capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

"SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2116. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Manuela Cabasag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2117. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2118. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anson E. De Vera; and

S. 2119. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2120. A bill for the relief of Lauiro Torres Quiazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PLANS FOR UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN BUILDINGS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR MUNICIPAL PURPOSES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the preparation of plans for the preservation of Loew's Capitol Theater and Keith's Theater in the District of Columbia.

This bill, with the exception of a compensation clause which I shall describe in a moment, is identical with H.R. 7399, introduced by Representative HUDDLESTON, which the House passed without objection on August 26. With the same exception it is also identical with H.R. 7390, introduced by Representative WIDNALL, who has led in this matter and who secured favorable House action on a similar measure, House Joint Resolution 865, on September 24 of last year. The Senate took no action on the resolution last year because it came over so late in the session.

The bill would provide, first, that the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall prepare and present to both Houses of Congress before February 15, 1964, plans for the use as a municipal theater or for municipal purposes of the Loew's Capitol Theater and the Keith's Theater. Loew's Capitol Theater, of course, is located in the National Press Building and Keith's Theater is in the Albee Building on 15th Street, across from the Treasury Building. The Board of Commissioners would also submit a plan for acquisition of these two theaters by the District of Columbia government through purchase, gift, condemnation, lease, or otherwise. They would include in the requested plans detailed proposals for financing the operation of the theaters under municipal authority.

Second, the bill as passed by the House provides that no permit shall be issued by the Board of Commissioners for the demolition of either theater, or for the conversion of these properties to other uses, until 60 days after the date on which the Commissioners file the plans required under the bill. Since the plans would be filed no later than February 15, next, the moratorium on demolition or conversion would not last, at most, beyond the middle of April 1964.

The bill which I introduce today adds to the House-passed version a third section authorizing and directing the Board of Commissioners to pay compensation to the owners of the properties in question for losses due to the moratorium on demolition or remodeling. This compensation would be in addition to the payment of compensation for the property in the event it is acquired, and shall be paid regardless of whether or not the properties are acquired by the Commissioners or any other agency of the United States. Of course the compensation due because of the moratorium will be paid only if there is in fact a delay in the issuance of a permit as a result of the enactment of this bill. This new section of the bill also authorizes such appropriations by Congress as are needed to pay compensation under this section.

Mr. President, the report of the House Committee on the District of Columbia on H.R. 7399 summarizes very well the need for action at this time to authorize the Commissioners' study and the moratorium. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of this report, House Report No. 702, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The purpose of this bill is to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than February 15, 1964, a feasible plan for the acquisition of Loew's Capitol Theater and Keith's Theater by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters. It is further stipulated that no permit shall be granted for the destruction of those theaters or for their conversion to other uses, until 60 days after the date on which the above-mentioned plan is submitted to the 88th Congress.
>
> The motivation for this bill is the report that these two privately owned theaters are scheduled for conversion into use for business offices.
>
> Keith's Theater, located in the Albee Building at 619 15th Street NW., has a seating capacity of 1,600 and is reputed to be one of the most beautiful and acoustically perfect theaters in the world. Loew's Capitol Theater is in the National Press Building, at 1326 F Street NW., and is the largest theater in the city, with a seating capacity of 3,600 persons. We are informed that Loew's Capitol is the only theater in Washington with stage facilities large enough to accommodate the presentation of the larger types of ballet and grand opera productions.
>
> A joint resolution identical to this bill, House Joint Resolution 865, passed the House of Representatives on September 24, 1962, but failed of action in the Senate. At a public hearing held last year in connection with House Joint Resolution 865, spokesmen for a number of local organizations devoted to the performing arts, including the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, the Washington Ballet Guild, the Hayes Concert Bureau, and the Washington Civic Opera and Washington Civic Symphony, testified as to the need for the continuance of these two theaters as irreplaceable centers for live theatrical exhibits.
>
> We were informed that the performing arts, such as ballet, grand opera, and theater, are more lively today than ever before, and that throughout the United States enthusiasm, activity, and patronage are on the increase. Under these circumstances it would certainly be a most serious setback to this movement if the principal showcase of the Nation, a city now acclaimed in many circles as the capital of the world were unable to accommodate major musical, dance, and opera companies, including some which come from abroad as official visitors in implementation of international agreements undertaken by our Government. Any step reasonably calculated to assist in averting such an unfortunate development will certainly constitute a significant contribution to the cultural life of this city and of the Nation.
>
> In recent years, some 15 to 18 live shows which could have been accommodated on no

other stage in the District of Columbia have been presented each year at the Capitol Theater, and it has been planned to increase this number in the future. These presentations have included such internationally acclaimed performers as the Gala Royal Danish Ballet and the Bolshoi Ballet.

The Cultural Center which is now in the planning stage for the District of Columbia will not offer a solution to the problem posed by the threatened loss of the Capitol and Keith's theaters. In the first place, the most optimistic timetable calls for the completion of this Center in 1966; and also, plans for the Center include provision for a theater which will seat only 1,200 persons.

A Citizens' Committee To Save the Capitol Theater, composed of prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, attempted to negotiate a lease with the owners of the Capitol Theater, without success.

Also, within the past 2 months, a group of investors submitted a very substantial offer, reported to be some $8 million, for the purchase of the building in which the Capitol Theater is located, for the purpose of leasing the theater to keep a "much-needed entertainment and cultural center for our Nation's Capital." Despite this offer, however, the National Press Club Corp., which owns both the building and the theater, has proceeded with plans to convert the building into offices. This plan necessitated an application to the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment for a zoning variance, because the offices would create a greater density than now exists inside the building. On June 26, 1963, it was announced that the Zoning Board has granted this variance, and apparently the corporation intends to proceed with its plan.

It thus appears that citizens' efforts to accomplish the continued operation of these theaters are doomed to failure, and that the only feasible solution must involve the District of Columbia government, as proposed in this legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Further, Mr. President, I think it is only fair and reasonable that provision be made for compensating the owners of the theaters for losses in fact incurred because of the denial of a demolition or remodeling permit during the brief moratorium period. Of course there should be careful examination of this provision by the Senate District of Columbia Committee so that the Government would be protected against unreasonable demands for compensation, but I do not think such demands would be in the minds of the owners. To the contrary, if we could get quick Senate action, I think the owners would be anxious to cooperate. The period of the moratorium for which compensation could be asked is very short; if we could get rapid enactment of the bill, say by October, then there would be a maximum of 6 months' delay under the act.

It is probably well known by Members of this body who take an interest in the cultural life of this city that the Capitol Theater is the largest theater in the city, with a seating capacity of 3,600 persons. It is the only theater with stage facilities large enough to accommodate the larger forms of the performing arts such as grand opera and ballet. Despite its minor faults, it is the largest theater this city has and is likely to have. For even when the National Cultural Center is finished, the House committee report states, that facility will include a theater which will seat only 1,200 persons.

The Keith's Theater, with a seating capacity of 1,600, is considered by many to be very fine acoustically, perhaps the best in this city on this point. Representatives of actors groups tell me that they consider it the best theater in the city for legitimate stage productions.

By pointing out the reputed qualities of these two theaters, I do not intend, of course to make any criticism of the other theaters in the city. The point simply is that Washington has no facilities which can match the size and quality of these theaters, and this great city and National Capital cannot afford to lightly set aside an opportunity to rescue them for municipal use. The replacement cost of these two theaters would be enormous, and once they are lost, it is unlikely the metropolitan area would ever regain replacements.

Recent reports indicate that there is no immediate plan for the tearing down or remodeling of the Keith's Theater, although this may well come in a few years. The threat to the Capitol Theater, however, is immediate. Its owners feel obliged to close its doors in just a few days and then to proceed with a planned conversion. I hope, therefore, that the District Committee will be willing to take up this matter very soon. If there is hope for enactment of the bill or a similar proposal, then the permit for conversion of the Capitol Theater should be withheld to give the committee and the Senate time to act.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the fine speech which Congressman Widnall made on this matter in the House on August 26. It begins in the Record at page 15830. Congressman Widnall points out that this bill is not at all in conflict with the National Cultural Center, and makes a strong case that this important metropolitan center which is visited by 7 million people annually can not afford to give up these outstanding theatrical facilities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2117) to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes, introduced by Mr. Douglas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the Record, together with an explanation thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the desk; and, without objection, the amendment and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The amendment submitted by Mr. Javits is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"Sec. —. (a) so much of the second sentence of section 203(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as precedes the proviso at the end thereof is amended to read as follows: 'Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed an amount equal to 50 per centum of the average weekly manufacturing wage (according to the most recent data available) in the State making such payment or in the United States, whichever is lower:'.

"(b)(1) The first sentence of the second paragraph of such section 203(a) is amended by striking out 'the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the amount of his weekly training allowance as determined under the preceding paragraph'.

"(2) The second sentence of such paragraph is amended by striking out 'the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the amount of his weekly training allowance as referred to above'.

"(c) Section 304(b) of such Act is amended by striking out '$161,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$184,000,000'."

The explanation presented by Mr. Javits is as follows:

Amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

My amendment to S. 1831, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 would amend section 203(a) of the act so as to substitute for the existing formula for payment of training allowances a new formula providing for payment of an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the average weekly manufacturing wage (according to the most recent data available) in the State making the payment, or in the United States, whichever is lower.

One of the most critical problems affecting training under the Manpower Development and Training Act is the frequency of dropouts from such programs due to the inadequacy of training allowances. Under present law an eligible person may receive an amount equivalent to the average unemployment compensation payment prevailing in his State, unless his own record in covered employment warrants a higher payment, in which case he is entitled to receive the higher amount. Inasmuch as only 24 States presently permit receipt of unemployment benefits while taking approved vocational training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the actual training allowance payments in most States are equivalent to the average unemployment compensation prevailing in those States. I believe that this limitation, imposed by most States, is shortsighted in that it fails to recognize the longrun benefit to those States in encouraging retraining. By retraining the unemployed for marketable skills, the States would reduce their unemployment compensation costs in the long run. Expenditures for the training of the unemployed should be viewed as an investment in manpower.

Since a change in Federal unemployment compensation standards would be difficult and time consuming—State legislatures would have to approve changes in State programs and many legislatures meet only once every year or 2 years—I propose that the

Congress directly act by enacting a change in the present Manpower Development and Training Act training allowance formula and by increasing the funds to be spent for this purpose. It is obvious that it is in the national interest that our labor force, particularly those unemployed, be upgraded through federally financed training programs. This is why the Manpower Development and Training Act was enacted in 1962. It is therefore illogical not to provide the necessary financial incentives to encourage unemployed heads of households to sign up for a suitable training program, which may last as long as a year.

Linking the training program with unemployment compensation fails to provide an incentive to the unemployed to enter the retraining program rather than accept unemployment compensation without improving their capability for reemployment. Such an incentive is of prime importance for members of minority groups, whose employment opportunities have been so limited in the past that they are unlikely to be motivated readily to train for new opportunities.

Yet, improving the capability of the work force is a national economic goal and the purpose for which the Manpower Development and Training Act program was enacted. Thus the training allowance has no valid connection with unemployment compensation payments and misrepresents both congressional intent in enacting the program and the significance of the allowance, which was intended as payment for the cost of training by the unemployed work force for the national interest and not as a welfare or insurance payment to compensate the unemployed individual.

Under the present Manpower Development and Training Act formula, individuals are receiving weekly training allowances as low as $22.72 in Arkansas, $25.30 in Alabama, $24.99 in South Carolina, $23.05 in Maine, $23.50 in Mississippi, $32.32 in Pennsylvania, and $37.69 in New York. Any earnings from work done outside training time are deducted from allowances under existing laws. In six States this means less than $100 per month; in practically all States it means less than $150 a month. According to testimony given by Deputy Manpower Administrator Seymour Wolfbein before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower on June 6, 1963, there are already a significant number of cases where trainees dropped out because they could not support their families on the existing allowances; trainees trying to retain some kind of job while training find the conflict in hours impossible and drop out in favor of jobs they are holding.

I propose that the training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act be increased by using the above described new standards in order to provide Manpower Development and Training Act trainees with adequate temporary support.

I believe also that the increased costs of the new programs proposed today under the Manpower Development and Training Act should be reflected by an increase in the authorization for the program in this bill and have so proposed by amending section 304(b) of the act to increase the appropriation from $161 to $184 million.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR CLARK AND SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this occasion to extend my commendations to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who yesterday so ably managed the Manpower Extension Act and performed in his usual skillful manner; and also to commend the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], who contributed so much, through his knowledge and understanding of the problem, to bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. Both of them are to be congratulated for the fine work they performed in behalf of this most important measure.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

Address delivered by Senator Cannon before the 45th Annual Convention of the Nevada Department of the American Legion, Ely, Nev.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

CAN WE TRUST GROMYKO?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the public press last week, the American people were informed, in a statement by Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin, that President Kennedy had agreed to meet this fall with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, to discuss future steps to ease East-West tensions. The Soviet Ambassador to the United States made this announcement at the White House on Monday, August 26, following a 50-minute meeting with President Kennedy; and, according to press reports, the White House confirmed Ambassador Dobrynin's announcement, without designating a specific time and place for the important meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Gromyko.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Washington Post on Tuesday, August 27, dealing with the meeting between President Kennedy and Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin, which resulted in a definite understanding for our Chief Executive to meet eyeball to eyeball with Foreign Minister Gromyko, in the interest of relieving the longstanding East-West problems, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1963]

J.F.K. Agrees to a Meeting With Gromyko

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Kennedy yesterday agreed to meet Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko this fall to discuss future steps to ease East-West tensions.

The talks are to take place while Gromyko is in this country for the United Nations General Assembly, which begins September 17. Gromyko conferred with the President while here for the 1961 and 1962 General Assembly meetings.

Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin made the announcement following a 50-minute meeting with Mr. Kennedy, and the White House confirmed the statement without setting a specific time and place for the talks.

Dobrynin said he delivered to the President a letter from Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev expressing satisfaction over signing of the nuclear test ban treaty.

The letter was not made public, but Khrushchev told the President, Dobrynin said, that he had been pleased to see Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the senatorial delegation that went to Moscow for the treaty signing August 5.

Dobrynin said he discussed with the President steps that could be taken in the future "to develop relations and ease tensions."

Asked if Khrushchev might attend the U.N. meetings, the Ambassador replied cryptically that he was not prepared to answer the question.

Acting White House Press Secretary Andrew T. Hatcher indicated, however, that this was not expected, and informants said the subject of a visit was not raised in Khrushchev's letter.

Dobrynin recently returned from an extended visit in Moscow.

Rusk's talks with Khrushchev brought forth no specific plans for new ways to ease tensions as a followup to the test ban agreement.

The possibility of a nonaggression treaty and the proposal to station inspectors on the territory of each side to reduce the dangers of a surprise attack were among the subjects discussed.

But Rusk and the President have indicated that some time may elapse before detailed negotiations begin.

Rusk is expected to have preliminary discussions with Gromyko in New York before he meets the President.

When the latter two meet it will be the first time since October 18, 1962, when Gromyko assured the President that Soviet assistance to Cuba was entirely defensive.

At that time, the President already knew that Soviet missiles had been put in place in Cuba, but he did not tell Gromyko he had such information.

Four days later, when Mr. Kennedy announced to the world that Soviet missiles had been discovered in Cuba, he referred to Gromyko's assurances and said the information was "false."

A year earlier, on October 6, 1961, the President and Gromyko met at the White House at the height of the Berlin crisis. Although Gromyko called the meeting "useful," Rusk said it was "interesting, but that is all you can say about it."

Both the 1961 and the 1962 meetings lasted more than 2 hours.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is quite important that all Senators present—representing, as they do, the great mass of people in the United States who, for very good reasons, have growing distrust of the honesty and sincerity of Russia's somewhat sudden passion and desire for stabilization of world peace—concern themselves with the contents of this article.

I am in complete accord with President Kennedy and everyone else in this country who hopes, prays, and labors for a lasting solution of the troubled affairs of the world that have grown to monumental proportions between the East and the West since the conclusion of World War II. On untold occasions we have informed the Soviet Government, and by deed have demonstrated to it, that we seek no expansion abroad of countries or properties under the jurisdiction of other flags. Moreover, we have convinced the free world that our aim and purpose are to assist in providing and maintaining complete freedom for the many countries which today are threatened with loss of their freedom by the cunning machinations of the Soviet Government. The free world is aware of our contributions to easing the Soviet yoke that has been applied to many countries that once enjoyed their own way of life. We seek no loot at the expense of others. Since we won our freedom, it has been our traditional habit to help others enjoy their own way of life. We have firmly resisted all efforts by outside forces to dominate oppressed peoples and destroy their individual nationalities and cultures. In all of this effort we have acted honestly and aboveboard with the entire world.

In regard to the forthcoming meeting which President Kennedy will have with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko I would feel derelict in the performance of my duties as a U.S. Senator and in fulfilling my responsibility to the millions of people I represent in the State of Ohio if I did not raise my voice in caution to the President about the honesty, sincerity, and veracity of the man with whom he will explore methods and processes for relieving the existing hypertension that plagues the world today.

About 10 months ago—on October 18, 1962, to be exact—Mr. Gromyko was called to the White House for a meeting with President Kennedy about the missile buildup in Cuba by the Russians. Mr. Gromyko solemnly told President Kennedy that this Russian assistance was entirely defensive.

He insisted that Russian military installations in Cuba were made solely for defense against invasion, and that no offensive weapons of Russian origin had been placed there.

It is now a well-known fact that when President Kennedy questioned Mr. Gromyko at the meeting on October 18, 1962, about the size, character, and potential of Russian armament installations in Cuba, President Kennedy was aware that missiles capable of reaching virtually all major cities in the eastern and midwestern section of our country had been put in place by the Russians in Cuba. However, Mr. Gromyko, unaware of President Kennedy's intelligence, stubbornly and dishonestly maintained that the only arms assistance Russia had given Cuba was entirely defensive.

Four days after that meeting with Mr. Gromyko, President Kennedy, in a nationwide television and radio address, told the American people the exact facts, and warned the Soviet Government that if the long-range offensive missiles were not dismantled and removed from Cuba, the U.S. Government would take appropriate action. He referred to his conversation with Mr. Gromyko, and branded as "false" his answers to questions about the capability of the missiles Russia had installed in Cuba. The President also made known that there had already been underway for several days preparations in connection with troop, aircraft, and ship movements by the U.S. Armed Forces. What happened after that is history.

Mr. President, I cannot lose sight of the fact that on a matter that brought the United States closer to a devastating armed attack than at any time in its history, the Foreign Minister of the country that was responsible for our country's facing the vulnerable position that it did, deliberately lied to the President of the United States. As a result, I am loath to believe that President Kennedy or any other official of our Government could ever again place any credence in what Mr. Gromyko might have to say. After he lied about the grave conditions that could have resulted in the destruction in a few hours of half of our country, why should we expect him at a later date to practice and exhibit immaculate credibility in probing for relief from world tensions? Mr. Gromyko has been indicted and convicted in the eyes of the entire world of knowingly telling a falsehood.

How can anyone ever again believe what he might have to say, after he, as the Foreign Minister of his country, deliberately withheld from the President of the United States the truth about a stealthy and sinister project that, if successfully achieved, might have caused the United States today to be on the list of missing countries.

Mr. Gromyko lied once; and if given the chance, he will lie again. Were it within my power, I would never again let Mr. Gromyko darken the door of the White House, particularly when he is scheduled to arrive as a symbol of world peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been interested to hear what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has just said. It is true that false allegations were made last year during the visit between the President of the United States and Mr. Gromyko. But I assure the Senator from Ohio and the American people that the President was not taken in then by Mr. Gromyko, nor will the President be taken in now.

I think the answer was given last October, at the time when the gauntlet was thrown down and this country and the Soviet Union faced the prospect of war.

I have every confidence in the President. He will not be taken in by Gromyko or by anyone else; and I think the affairs of the country are in good hands when they are in the hands of Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I think the entire problem must be approached with caution. Frankly, I have grave doubts as to whether I would even invite that man to a conference.

The President was not taken in last year; at the time when Gromyko was making his representations, the President knew that Gromyko was not telling the truth.

Of course, when one understands that he is dealing with a man who has so little respect for truthfulness, one is placed on guard in all his dealings with the man. In dealing with Red Russia, certainly we had better be on guard, and not take as the full truth the representations being made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have full and unbounded confidence in the President of the United States—not only the present President, but also his predecessors in that office; and I am quite sure that the interests of the United States will be looked after well.

I would hope that some of those who are so much interested in the strength of the President would take into consideration the problems which confront him, not only domestically in so many areas, but also in the field of foreign policy. I would also hope that when they criticize the President—although I am sure the Senator from Ohio is not criticizing him—they would ask themselves one simple question, keeping in mind the difficulties facing him domestically and also in the field of foreign affairs. That question is: "What would I do if I were in his shoes and if I had to make the decisions?"

That is a fair question and a simple question, but the answer is quite difficult.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this morning a closed meeting was held by the Foreign Relations Committee subcommittee which is dealing with South Vietnam. The situation in that country is critical; and I understand the gravity of the problem in regard to South Vietnam which confronts the President.

I concur in what the President said in his statement a few days ago, that there must be a change of policy by the South Vietnamese and possibly a change of personnel. I concur in that remark, and I concur with the President that the oppressive measures chosen by the South Vietnamese Government against the Buddhists do not contribute to the solution of the problem in South Vietnam. It was a grave mistake of policy. That policy will not help South Vietnam, and it will not help our country. I make that statement to reveal my concurrence with the President's thinking on that item.

INDIANA HAS CAUSE TO BE PROUD OF SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] went to Logansport, Ind., a few weeks ago to join the many friends of our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] in honoring the senior Senator of the Hoosier State. I recently had the opportunity to read the remarks my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] made at the time and I consider them to be of particular interest to all who share with BOB BARTLETT, as do I, a warm affection and deep respect for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

My colleague observed:

> VANCE gets things done. VANCE works hard. These are the qualities that are appreciated in the Senate.

And in the course of his remarks, Senator BARTLETT made some astute observations about the nuclear test ban which soon will come before us.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join in complimenting the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] for his many actions which have benefited Indiana and all of America. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator Bartlett's remarks be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Senator E. L. (Bob) Bartlett of Alaska Before the District Meeting of the Second Congressional District Democrats of Indiana, Logansport, Ind.

The Democratic Party is proud of Indiana. The Democratic Party is proud of Vance Hartke. From his election in 1958, he has acted as a pilot and leader in the resurgence of our party in Indiana. And his leadership has expanded beyond Indiana's boundaries. Last year you elected a partner in the Senate for Vance—a man with whom he can work for the betterment of Indiana, Senator Birch Bayh. It is my confident expectation that next year will find Indiana in the Democratic column, from top to bottom: President, Senator—and even here in the Second District—a Democratic Congressman.

Indiana has cause to be proud of Vance Hartke. He has achieved as much in the 5 short years he has been in the Senate as most men achieve in a lifetime. You here in Logansport know what he has done. You can see the results. You can see the dams going up on the Wabash River—three of them under construction now on the upper river. When these are completed, your annual floods will be a thing of the past, and there will be water in the summer when the river dips low.

These dams would never have been built, funds would never have been appropriated without Vance Hartke in Washington.

As delegate and Senator, I have been in the Congress for close to 20 years. I have seen freshmen Congressmen and Senators come and go. Never have I seen a man as quickly accepted by his colleagues as Vance Hartke. Vance gets things done. Vance works hard. These are the qualities that are appreciated in the Senate. These are the qualities that have brought your Senator a seat on two of the most important and powerful committees in the Congress—the Finance and Commerce Committees.

The Finance Committee is the one that will handle the President's tax bill. It's time to cut taxes, and I know that Vance is going to see that they are cut.

Freshmen do not get appointed to these committees. Vance Hartke did. The respect, the admiration of his colleagues was demonstrated by his appointment as chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee. Most committee chairmanships are filled by seniority. This committee, however, charged as it is with the formulation of campaign policy, the distribution of campaign funds, the organization of a nationwide campaign strategy, is headed always by a man in whom the Senate and the party have special trust. This man was Vance Hartke. This trust paid off.

Last year we elected 21 Democratic Senators. How many Republicans were elected? Twelve.

So you can see it is important for Indiana to bring Vance Hartke back to the Senate in 1964. It is even more important to the Senate that Vance Hartke be returned. It is important to the Senate. It is important to the country. His voice is needed. His actions are needed.

Winds of change are blowing and across the world the sands of time are shifting.

In the United States, Americans are demanding their birthright of freedom and respect, the unemployed demand jobs, the young seek opportunity, the old seek security.

In the last year we have seen the Russians back down in humiliation when confronted with a firm, determined President and a united country. This year we are seeing the first great split in the Communist empire.

These two great events will change everything; their effects will be felt for many years. This will be a time of crisis, change, and opportunity.

Leaders in the executive and in the Congress will be tested.

In foreign affairs, as in battle, victory goes to the man who knows when to act as well as where and how to act. On May 27 of this year Senator Hartke and I joined Senators Dodd and Humphrey in cosponsoring a resolution calling upon the United States and the Soviet Union to sign a joint treaty to end all atomic testing in the atmosphere and under water. The President, sensing the time and the opportunity, seized upon this congressional expression of support and appealing to the Russians once again, this time succeeded.

Shakespeare's Brutus said it well: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of our life is bound in shallows and in miseries." Perhaps this treaty will, in a small way, lead us on to fortune, lifting man slightly from what there may be of shallows and of miseries in his life.

Soon we in the Senate will be called upon to ratify this treaty which the President has concluded with the Soviets. The ratification of treaties is among the gravest and most important of the responsibilities of the Senate. We are conscientiously bound to give every such agreement which comes before us the most careful and closest scrutiny. This, I can assure you, we will do. Fully three committees of the Senate have and will be holding hearings on the treaty. Before they are completed, we will have many thousands of pages of testimony, of facts, discussion, and debate. Already we have heard from the executives of Inland Steel, Eastman Kodak, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., and the Illinois Central Railroad Co.; all of these have endorsed the treaty. The Federation of American Scientists has, in formal resolution, endorsed the proposal. The former Ambassador to the United Nations, James Wadsworth, has also endorsed it. Mr. Gallup says that 77 percent of all Americans endorse it; Mr. Harris says that 73 percent of all Americans endorse it.

Literally hundreds of editorials from newspapers across the country have been placed in the Congressional Record. We shall hear testimony from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from the Disarmament Agency, the State Department, and citizens' groups.

It is my strong hope and belief that this investigation will demonstrate that the test ban treaty will not be harmful to the interests of the American people, that it will be as the President said, "a victory for all mankind"—not just one side or the other.

I cannot, of course, this evening present a full analysis of the pros and cons of the treaty. I should, however, like to take the opportunity to warn you against the nay sayers, the "automatic" opposition. When we are presented with a situation to act or not to act, it is always easier to do nothing, it is always easier to see the dangers and often the opportunities are clouded. So they are here. This treaty is a small thing. It is not disarmament. It is not a panacea. On the other hand, it does not appear to endanger our security. We have many safeguards. Let me list a few:

(1) The President has said that we shall continue underground testing. We have been testing in this manner for several years now, and we have both experience and knowledge in the field. The Russians have not. The London Economist estimates it will take the Russians up to 5 years to develop their underground testing capacity.

(2) The treaty provides for withdrawal from its provisions by any signatory if "extraordinary events have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country." If it develops that the United States must resume atmospheric testing because its weapons development requires testing, we may do so in 90 days. If we think—not know, but think, the Russians have resumed testing, we are free to leave the treaty and resume testing.

(3) There is no doubt that the United States, at this stage, is clearly ahead in our atomic delivery capability. For either side to alter the present, to us, most favorable status quo, it would be necessary for tests to be resumed. Resumption of tests would immediately be detectable and the President has pledged that our own atomic testing facilities will be kept on the ready alert. We will not be caught napping should the Russians resume.

I have heard it said that we should not make treaties with the Russians because the Russians break their treaties. And this may be true. They may have broken treaties. It is almost axiomatic in diplomatic history that treaties are broken when it is in the interests of a nation to do so. Treaties are kept when common interests are served, when keeping them is in the interests of all countries concerned, when the benefits to each outweigh the obligations to all.

Merely because treaties have been broken does not mean we should stop making new ones. Merely because attempts to save the peace have failed in the past does not mean that we should abandon these efforts. The whole dance of history can be recounted in three steps forward and two steps back. We do move forward, however, even though sometimes the pace is not perceptible.

If the test ban treaty survives—if the treaty is ratified by the Senate and upheld by the Russians—it will survive because the interests of the American people and the interests of the Russian people are as one in this regard. The proliferation of atomic weapons, the development of bigger and ever quicker bangs for ever larger amounts of bucks does not make life any safer or easier for a Russian parent any more than it does for an American parent. Fallout does not fall on Americans alone. While the strontium 90 which American children drink may come from a milk bottle, the strontium 90 the Russians child drinks may come straight from the yak. Be sure of it, however, the Russian child gets his fallout. The great clouds of radionuclides, drifting in the upper atmosphere across the globe, drop their hot dust with wide impartiality on Communist and free alike. If this treaty survives, it will be because the interests of man are more basic and that it is in the interest of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and our Nation to recognize the fact.

These are some of the thoughts and the problems which face us in the Senate today. They will not lessen in importance and gravity in the years to come. There will be need for reason and sense and wise counsel. There will be need for men like Vance Hartke.

I congratulate you all for having this splendid dinner.

I thank you all.

POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on August 27 I spoke on the floor of the Senate for the second time on the problem of population control, calling attention to a recent article by Father John A. O'Brien of the University of Notre Dame on the subject of family planning in an exploding population. I have now obtained the text of Father O'Brien's article, which appeared in both a Protestant publication and a Catholic publication, the Catholic publication being Ave Maria, and the Protestant magazine being the Christian Century. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY PLANNING IN AN EXPLODING POPULATION

(By Rev. John A. O'Brien)

How are we to deal effectively with the problem of a population increasing with a speed unprecedented in history? It is especially acute in the underdeveloped countries where the population is exploding, if not like bombs, at least like giant firecrackers. This is the question confronting not only the United States but also the other nations of the free world.

New developments and a more penetrating analysis of the pluralistic nature of the society in which we live offer well-founded hope for the cooperative action so desperately needed to solve this problem on both the national and international levels. Let us first examine the large area of agreement and see if the differences cannot be further narrowed without compromise of conscience.

Contrary to widespread belief, the Catholic church does not forbid birth regulation. For any serious cause a married couple is exempt from the normal obligation of parenthood for a long time and even for the whole duration of married life. The method sanctioned is rhythm, the use of the infertile or safe period. If the currently available means for predicting or ascertaining the time of ovulation—taking the basal temperature, and the glucose test of the cervical mucus—are carefully employed, the method is estimated to achieve a high degree of reliability. Pope Pius XII expressed the hope that further research will increase still more its effectiveness.

Furthermore, the church teaches that the primary end of marriage is not merely procreation but also the education of offspring. This means more than food, clothing and shelter: It means the ability to provide a suitable education and thus open to the child the cultural heritage of the race. In short, it means responsible parenthood. This is the note that is being sounded with increasing frequency and vigor by Catholic prelates, priests, educators and lay leaders.

This was the keynote sounded by Father William J. Gibbons, S.J., professor of sociology at Fordham University, at a meeting of the Catholic Sociological Society in St. Louis in September 1961. He declared that Catholics in the United States have been oversold on procreation and undereducated on the responsibilities it entails. He believes that too many Catholics think they are being virtuous if they merely refrain from using contraceptives. He points out that the size of the family "should take into account the physical and mental health of the parents, their economic condition, and the society in which they live. When you are faced with such problems as overcrowding, lack of work opportunities, and the rest, you need to retreat."

Similarly Dr. Robert Odenwald, formerly professor of psychiatry at the Catholic University, points out that in the past too many Catholics have tended to follow, almost blindly, the Biblical command to "increase and multiply." But in the light of the new knowledge and because of changing social and economic conditions, "the accent today is rightly placed on responsible parenthood."

"If cogent reasons indicate a limitation of family size," says Msgr. John A. Goodwine, theological censor for the New York Archdiocese, "there should be no difficulty in admitting that the avoidance of pregnancy would be within the bounds of reason and morality." He remarks that the significant change in Catholic thinking on family size that has taken place in the last dozen years "does not seem to be sufficiently understood."

Similar, too, is the note sounded by Dom Gregory Stevens, O.S.B., professor of moral theology at the Catholic University. Pointing out that the common notion that the church favors "absolutely a high birth rate" is false, he says: "Indiscriminate procreation is no moral ideal but mere irresponsibility, for the family must make prudent provision for the future welfare of the children both spiritually and physically. The church considers the primary goal of the natural institution of matrimony to be that of responsible parenthood."

To help parents realize their responsibility, Dom Stevens points out that they "must take into account the present and foreseeable future conditions of society. This is demanded for the sake of the children themselves as well as for the common good which all are strictly bound to promote as a matter of what St. Thomas called general justice."

Equally concerned that married couples understand their responsibility in the light of a soaring population, Father Charles J. Corcoran, C.S.C., for many years professor of theology at Holy Cross College, Washington, D.C., warns: "It is unfortunate that in the debates on family limitation, many Catholics forget that the right use of marital rights implies more than the willingness to procreate a child. It implies not only the willingness but also the ability to provide for the child's material and spiritual welfare. Correctly understood, this grave responsibility should serve as a potent check on an undisciplined, even if biologically proper, use of sex."

Reflecting this new emphais upon parental responsibility, Dr. John J. Kane, professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame, states: "Recent and tremendous social changes in the fields of education, economics, and family life place greater strains on American parents than they have perhaps every faced in the past. Children's expectations have risen dramatically and parents' hopes of meeting such expectations are perhaps stronger than ever. All of this means that the very large family patterns typical of the early part of this century can no longer be realized by most parents if they hope to meet their real responsibilities. * * * Considerable thought will have to be given * * * to the practice of some type of family limitation in the majority of cases."

Equally explicit is the conclusion reached by Father John L. Thomas, S.J., sociologist of St. Louis University and a recognized authority on marriage and the family: "Granted present nuptiality rates, age at marriage, and advances in health care, no country can long make reasonable provision for its population increase unless a good percentage of its couples take some effective steps to regulate family size."

The stress placed by Catholic theologians, sociologists, and psychiatrists in America in recent years is mirrored in the writings of their European counterparts. In a recent scholarly work, "Love and Control," Leon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens, archbishop of Malines, points out that conjugal love should be guided by reason and a clear consciousness of the duties of parenthood: Procreation should not be a matter of blind instinct. "One of the first and essential things to consider," he says, "when they (married couples) evaluate their circumstances in life is the education and training to give their children."

Father Stanislas de Lestapis, S.J., professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris and the Vatican's representative at the United Nations World Population Conference in Rome in 1954, says that "there is, in principle, a right, or better, a duty, to practice a form of birth limitation based on careful thought. * * * There is an optimum number for each family, and each family alone can judge what it is."

The Belgian demographer, Father Clement Mertens S.J., of St. Albert College in Louvain, calls attention to the "increasing awareness among the leaders of the church, and among theologians, moralists, and others, of the problems which large families now have to face. And there is an increasing awareness of the problems countries have to face where the population is increasing quickly." He acknowledges that instructions on birth regulation on the pastoral level is not without risks and difficulties.

Nevertheless, he points out: "Risks and difficulties do not justify inertia. * * * It is the duty of the ecclesiastical authorities in each country to face the problem and see that competent laymen, especially in the best universities, proceed with research which will permit them to cope with different given situations, according to regions or social classes, and to adopt means which will reach a solution."

Probably no other country in Europe has felt so acutely the pressure of population as Holland. This is reflected in the candor, understanding, and sympathy with which the Dutch bishops have discussed the difficult problems facing married couples today. Speaking on a television program in April 1963, Bishop William M. Bekkers of 's-Hertogenbosch explained that not everyone can reach at once the ideal in marital virtue.

"Those who have entered Christian matrimony," said Bishop Bekkers, "have received from God and under His blessing a mandate of life which is focused first on leading one life together in conjugal love, and second on founding and building together a good family. Science and its discoveries have enabled man to regulate human reproduction. The birth rate now falls within man's responsibility. One can even say that birth regulation, which is quite different from (contraceptive) birth control, is a normal part of the total task of a married couple."

Bishop Bekkers then pointed out that only the married couple is in a position to determine the number of offspring they can properly rear and educate. This is within the competence of their conscience, and no outsider can interfere with their decision. A physician or a spiritual adviser must respect the private conscience.

Recognizing the imperfections of the rhythm system, the bishop said: "Not even the rhythm method is without objections. For many people the rhythm method is a solution, but we also know that it causes insuperable difficulties for many others. We understand that there are situations where one cannot consider all Christian and human values at the same time. In that case the church does not immediately think of egoism or luxury.

"She knows that married couples, in well-intentioned love for each other and for their families, sometimes take steps which cannot be considered right steps in the eyes of the church. But the church also knows that what one person can reach cannot always be reached by others. She wants to give room for a gradual, perhaps slow and imperfect growing, like that which is possible in all other areas of life—in charity, honesty, and piety."

These scholars are but echoing the thoughts expressed by Pope Pius XII on the Feast of the Epiphany in 1957: "When the infant comes into the world, he must have a home to receive him, a home capable of providing him in good health, and to assist him in acquiring those faculties of mind and heart that will enable him to take his proper place in society when the time comes."

Similar is the emphasis placed by Protestant churches in recent years upon responsible parenthood. In a statement on "Responsible Parenthood" issued in 1961 by the

National Council of Churches, responsible parenthood is described as weighing "the claims of procreation and the situation of the family in society. In determining the number and frequency of offspring the parents should give careful consideration to the following four factors:

"(1) The right of the child to be wanted, loved, cared for, educated, and trained in the discipline and instruction of the Lord (Ephesians 6: 4). The rights of existing children to parental care have a proper claim.

"(2) The prospects for health of a future child, if medical and eugenic evidence seem negatively conclusive.

"(3) The health and welfare of the mother-wife, and the need for the spacing of children to safeguard them.

"(4) The social situation, when rapid population growth places dangerous pressures on the means of livelihood and endangers the social order."

The statement tells parents to remember "that having children is a venture in faith, requiring a measure of courage and confidence in God's goodness. Too cautious a reckoning of the costs may be as great an error as failure to lift the God-given power of procreation to the level of ethical decision."

Probably no religious faith places greater emphasis upon the responsibility of parenthood than Judaism. Reflecting this stress, Rabbi Albert M. Shulman, chairman of the Commission on Marriage, Family and the Home of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, says: "Parents have the serious obligation of regulating the size of their family so they will be able to provide properly for the health and education of their offspring. Procreation should not be a matter of blind instinct but of intelligent and careful planning. This is not only a social obligation but also a moral and religious one."

Reechoing the note sounded by Jewish religious leaders, Rabbi David H. Wilce declares: "The concept of the sanctity of life is enhanced and the holiness of marriage is given a new dimension when parenthood is freely elected, when children are born wanted, and when family size is determined by conditions of health and well-being for the individual family and for society."

The factors listed in the statement of the National Council of Churches and of Jewish religious leaders are much the same as those which Catholic theologians and sociologists are likewise stressing in their description of responsible parenthood. Here then is a vast area of crucial and strategic importance, where Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are in substantial agreement. Here they can work together, with each group following its conscience, to achieve the same important goal.

Here is a key which, if properly used, is capable of opening the door to constructive action in solving the population problem on the national and international levels. That key embodies the two crucial elements to make it work: the prudent regulation of births and the clear consciousness of the responsibility they entail, which is but another name for family planning.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that two recent newspaper articles dealing with the same subject, the first published in the New York Times on August 30 entitled "Church Pictured as Firm on Births," by John Sibley, and the second published in the Washington Post entitled "Birth Rate Seen Economy Drain on New Nations," under the byline of George Lardner, Jr., be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1963]

Church Pictured as Firm on Births—Catholics Resolute Against Contraception, Article in Periodical Here Says—Divine Law Mentioned—Priest Stresses There Is No Ban on Small Families, if Continence Is Practiced

(By John Sibley)

Despite "some Catholic defections, the Roman Catholic Church is not going to sanction contraception," a church spokesman said here last week.

The assertion was made by Msgr. George A. Kelly, director of the Family Life Bureau of the Archdiocese of New York, in commenting on a series of articles in the New York Times, August 5 through 8, titled "Catholics and Birth Control."

Writing in the Catholic News of August 22, Monsignor Kelly acknowledged that birth control was a topic of lively discussion among Catholic clergy and laity. He emphasized, however, that there would be no reconsideration of the church's moral stand.

"It is perfectly clear to anyone who knows enough to know anything at all that the Catholic Church does not disapprove of married couples making proper decisions about family size and child spacing," Monsignor Kelly said, continuing:

"But this is far from saying that the only real disagreement between most Catholics and most non-Catholics is over the means of family limitation.

"The fact of the matter is that we are engaged in a serious conflict over the very nature of sex, marriage and family life itself. Other questions aside for the moment, the Catholic Church believes that regulation of offspring—if by that is meant the two-or-three-child family—is not always and everywhere the most desirable kind of family life. And when family limitation is recommended or permissible the church teaches that such regulation must be the result of a regulation of marital intercourse."

QUESTIONS GOVERNMENT ROLE

Commenting on programs to counter what is seen in some quarters as a trend toward overpopulation, Monsignor Kelly said:

"The first skirmishes are taking place over the poor. Now in our pluralistic society no one questions the right to planned parenthood to expend its energy and money to sell its program and wares among the poor or the right of the same poor to buy the product being sold.

"But I, for one, seriously question how Government agencies, with their power over the poor man's check, can enter this delicate area of human relations without a good deal of coercion, even if only in a subtle and sophisticated way.

"And because these Government programs are promoted in Scandinavian and Iron Curtain countries, this is no reason why they belong in America. If a social worker can sell a contraceptive, why in 1983 can he not be empowered to promote abortion or why cannot Government begin then to penalize the parents of more than two children, as already has been recommended?"

Monsignor Kelly concluded:

"Let not anyone be misled by newspaper articles or television shows into believing that most married Catholics live by anything but the solid family values which contribute much to the strength of the American Nation or that the church is going to stop preaching in season and out those religious principles on sex, marriage and the family which alone create the kind of society in which all of us, even nonbelievers, can find fulfillment."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 19, 1963]

Birth Rate Seen Economy Drain on New Nations

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Most underdeveloped countries can still improve their living standards without reducing their birth rates, but they won't get very far, according to a National Academy of Sciences panel.

Per capita income in these countries will grow much faster and more steadily if the population explosion is tackled immediately, the panel concluded in a report published in the June issue of the Rockefeller Institute Review.

The eight-man panel was set up by the National Academy last year to consider the population problem. Its chairman is William D. McElroy of Johns Hopkins University.

Taking India as an example, the panel said that its population of 450 million will probably double in the next 25 to 30 years unless the birth rate there is reduced.

Yet, the panelists said, "agricultural experts consider it feasible within achievable limits of capital investment to accomplish a doubling of Indian agricultural output within the next 20 to 25 years."

During the same period, the report said, the rest of India's economic output will probably more than double even if the birth rate remains unchanged.

"For a generation at least, then, India's economic output probably can stay ahead of its maximum rate of population increase," the panel said.

Such a course, however, would hardly be satisfactory, panel members decided. India and the other less-developed areas of the world, they said, could do much better by tackling the birth rate.

With rapidly expanding populations, the report said, funds that might otherwise be invested in powerplants, factories and other key growth projects must be spent on products for immediate consumption.

On the other hand, "economists have estimated that a gradual reduction in the rate of childbearing, totaling 50 percent in 30 years, would add about 40 percent to the income per consumer that could be achieved by the end of that time.

"In the longer run," the report said, "economic progress will eventually be stopped and reversed unless the birth rate declines or the death rate increases."

Other members of the panel are: William Allen, Washington University; Bernard Berelson, and Warren Nelson, the Population Council; Ansley Coale, Princeton University; Harold Dorn, National Institutes of Health; Clement L. Markert, Johns Hopkins University, and Albert Tyler, California Institute of Technology.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the senior Senator from Pennsylvania for opening up on this very important and vital question of population control. It is a problem of worldwide scope. It affects our foreign aid program very definitely. The question has arisen in many parts of the Union. So far the question has been very little discussed in legislative bodies. I particularly congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on his courage and enlightenment in bringing these important publications as well as his own remarks to the attention of the Senate and to the public. He has rendered a great public service in so doing.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his kind words.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent agreement which has been cleared with the author of S. 1831, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I ask unanimous consent that when the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is taken up at the conclusion of the morning business, one-half hour be allotted to each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, September 6, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and that debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

CHANGES IN THE CABINET OF INDIA

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a year ago last fall, when in India, both members of the American missions and certain Indians expressed their conviction that Defense Minister Krishna Menon was making a mockery of the buildup of India's military position, and at the same time he continued his anti-American policies.

Accordingly, upon return to this country, I said I felt it would be a mistake for the United States to give more aid to India until Mr. Menon was relieved of the position of Defense Minister.

Actually, some prominent Indians I met on that trip told me that in the elections coming up shortly he would be beaten for his seat in the Indian Congress, which would have automatically resulted in his elimination from his defense position in Mr. Nehru's Cabinet.

By letting Krishna Menon lead the military attack on Goa, however, Mr. Nehru eliminated that possibility; and as a result, the fact he had built a paper tiger was not disclosed until after the Chinese Communists had attacked India.

Then many things happened, including the ostensible disappearance of Mr. Krishna Menon from the Indian Government. But since then there have been many rumors of his influence behind the scenes.

Of the many Indians who have been visiting us lately, none impressed me more than Finance Minister Morarji Desai. This gentleman appeared both tolerant and intelligent in his approach to the problems of his country, and its relationship to the United States.

Now, however, Mr. Nehru has again changed his Cabinet, and the thrust of that change appears to be the replacing of some six conservative members, including Mr. Desai, with leftist successors—people prone to continue the policy of anti-American neutralism so characteristic during the years of the ascendancy of Mr. Krishna Menon.

This would appear to nullify assurances from many recent Indian visitors, and this would seem to be an unfortunate development.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from Tuesday's issue of the Washington Evening Star entitled, "Nehru and Inscrutability."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEHRU AND INSCRUTABILITY

Although there may be less in it than meets the eye, Prime Minister Nehru's shakeup of his Cabinet remains disquieting. It is one of those things that help explain why our Congress is dubious about the wisdom of extending lavish, no-strings-attached aid to India.

In effect, the shakeup tilts the Nehru government more to the left than it has been since Indian public opinion forced the Prime Minister, some months ago, reluctantly to accept the reluctant resignation of Defense Minister Krishna Menon, his closest friend and a man animated by a strong anti-Washington, pro-Kremlin bias. As if to compensate for this loss, Mr. Nehru now has reshuffled his Cabinet in a way that robs it of the services of its most competent nonleftist ministers, men vigorously opposed to the kind of neutralism that is undeniably helpful to the Communist conspiracy around the world.

These men include Morarji Desai, who has been Finance Minister, and S. K. Patil, who has been Food Minister. Both are strongly anti-Red; both are friendly to the United States; and both favor close cooperation with the free and open West, as against the regimented and unfree Communist world. But Mr. Nehru, for reasons best known to himself, and despite the threat he faces from Mao's China, apparently does not want such advisers around him. Instead, pushing them out of office, he has replaced them with leftist successors who probably satisfy the insufferable standards of Krishna Menon's brand of neutralism.

All of which amounts to a mystery of sorts. Why, for example, should a man as able as Mr. Desai—who has often been thought of as Mr. Nehru's successor—be kicked downstairs? The inscrutable East, quite evidently, extends all the way to New Delhi.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the rights of every American are spelled out in the U.S. Constitution and in the amendments to it.

Among these rights are the right of freedom of speech and the press, the right of freedom of religion, the right to vote, the right to due process of law, the right to a speedy public trial and to legal counsel in criminal cases, and many other basic rights.

As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I have long been concerned with the question of constitutional rights for all Americans and I have given a great deal of study to this question.

Because I firmly believe the rights set forth in the Constitution should be enjoyed by all regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, I have cosponsored more than 20 bills to insure for all Americans the right to vote, to attend public schools, to have access to public accommodations, and other rights to which they are entitled.

My study also has shown the need to protect the rights of defendants in criminal cases in Federal courts. For example, although the Constitution guarantees a speedy public trial, sometimes the Government has used delaying tactics contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. The bill I have sponsored with others would prevent the Government from using tactics such as delay in bringing charges; repeatedly asking that a charge be dismissed and later bringing the same charge; filing multiple indictments in different courts without the defendant's knowing which case the Government will prosecute first; delay in going to trial long after indictment; and delay in imposing sentences.

My study has shown further a compelling need to insure fairplay and constitutional protections in trials of persons in our Armed Forces accused of wrongdoing.

I have followed closely recent developments in our Federal and military courts.

In the Federal courts, there has been a distinct trend toward providing greater judicial protection for the American serviceman. It is clear today that court-martial proceedings are subject to all the due process requirements of the Constitution, and that Federal civil courts can review court-martial convictions and dishonorable discharge cases.

Congress, recognizing the need to safeguard the GI's constitutional rights, enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice in 1950. The code expressly extended the protections afforded by the Bill of Rights to military personnel.

In addition, Congress established the first independent civilian tribunal—the U.S. Court of Military Appeals—empowered to review convictions imposed by military courts.

Although we have come a long way in implementing the constitutional rights for service personnel, hearings held by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee have shown that much is still to be done.

First. Many abuses which the code was designed to eliminate still persist:

(a) The GI defendant's right to an impartial trial has been denied in some cases because military tribunals have been subject to the pressures and influence of command and other superior officers.

(b) Protections afforded by the due process clause of the Constitution are violated in the summary court-martial, where a single officer acts as judge, jury, prosecuting attorney, and defense counsel.

(c) The defendant's right to a speedy trial is infringed upon by the unreasonably long and cumbersome procedures of military trials.

(d) Defendants have been harassed by unreasonable searches and seizures, and evidence so illegally obtained has been admitted into court.

(e) Judicially untrained persons have been allowed to preside over special courts-martial and to impose the very serious penalty of a bad conduct discharge.

(f) The constitutional right to counsel is denied in many cases.

Second. The provisions of the code have been increasingly circumvented by the military's resort to administrative action, which is not subject to the code's safeguards.

(a) Accused persons have been convicted in administrative proceedings and sentenced to a bad conduct discharge or a discharge under "other than honorable" conditions without the benefit of legal counsel or other constitutional safeguards.

(b) Servicemen have been discharged administratively under "other than honorable" conditions for the same alleged misconduct for which they already had been tried and acquitted by courts-martial—a clear violation of the constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy.

(c) Administrative board proceedings are not subject to appellate review, need not be presided over by an impartial and judicially trained officer, and rely on written statements rather than direct testimony and confrontation of witnesses who are compelled to appear.

Because I believe it is only fair and just that we do everything possible to protect the basic constitutional rights of men and women to whom we have entrusted the defense of our Nation, I am cosponsoring 16 bills which have been drawn carefully to meet specifically each problem I have described.

They include proposals to: expand existing limitations on command influence; provide statutory authority for the field judiciary system developed by the Army; eliminate the summary court-martial; authorize the use of a law officer in special courts-martial; require that legally trained counsel be furnished to any serviceman who is being processed for possible discharge under other than honorable conditions; and simplify certain aspects of court-martial procedure.

PROFESSOR BRZEZINSKI EXAMINES IMPACT OF TEST BAN ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD EUROPE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the current issue of the New Republic, the eminent Soviet scholar, Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, of Columbia University, has analyzed two profound questions related to the signing of the limited test ban treaty. First: Why did the U.S.S.R. suddenly agree to sign this treaty? Second: What ought to be the U.S. response in the months ahead?

I suggest that both of these questions are indeed fundamental. Many theories have been propounded by Soviet experts and pseudoexperts as the reasons for Soviet acceptance of a limited treaty. Professor Brzezinski is acknowledged to be as well informed on Soviet strategy and tactics as any political scientist in this country. He writes:

> Khrushchev's acceptance of an atmosphere-only test ban strongly suggests a major Soviet reassessment of the world situation and an implicit acknowledgment that Soviet policies of the last few years have failed. The Soviet leaders have evidently concluded that the general world situation is again in a quiescent stage. Instead of dissipating Soviet resources in useless revolutionary efforts or missile adventures of the Cuban variety, they will probably concentrate on consolidating their present position.

Professor Brzezinski goes on to itemize the factors contributing to the failure of Soviet policy. These include—a failure of the economy to grow as fast as predicted, a lagging standard of living, rising food prices, continued disaffection among intellectuals and artists, continued resentment of Moscow control among ethnic minorities, the Sino-Soviet ideological dispute, disaffection among satellite nations, the failure of Soviet policy in Africa and the Middle East. Finally, when Khrushchev felt the naked power of the U.S. strategic forces in his reckless adventurism in Cuba, he decided the time had arrived for a major consolidation of Soviet policy.

As Professor Brzezinski emphasizes, this clearly does not mean that United States-Soviet differences will dissolve. There exist today and for the foreseeable future the most profound and fundamental disagreements between the two regimes. However, the months ahead do offer the United States a rare opportunity to work toward the consolidation of Europe, particularly to continue the evolution toward national identity among the Soviet satellites which has developed over the past year. In short, the United States must pursue an affirmative and constructive policy toward all Europe which will, over a period of years, whittle away the ideological facades which have separated the satellites from the free nations on the continent.

The future of Europe is the central question that will confront the United States in the months ahead. It is my hope that we will use this opportunity to best advantage. It would be a grave error not to recognize that Europe is currently experiencing political developments with profound impact on the future of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "After the Test Ban: The United States Must Take the Initiative in Europe," by Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER THE TEST BAN THE UNITED STATES MUST TAKE THE INITIATIVE IN EUROPE

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Zbigniew Brzezinski is professor of government at Columbia University and director of its Research Institute on Communist Affairs. Author of "The Soviet Bloc—Unity and Conflict" he is also a consultant to various Government agencies.)

There are two significant questions to ask about the test ban: Why did the U.S.S.R. suddenly agree to it, and what ought to be the U.S. response in the months ahead? The answers to these questions, as I will try to show, are first, that Khrushchev and his colleagues have decided that their policies of the past 6 years have failed, and second, that if the United States is to benefit from this turn of events, it must now make a major new effort to reunify Europe. Failure to make such an effort could cause the American position in Europe to be challenged on two fronts: By new Soviet overtures to Western Europe and by Gaullist overtures to the U.S.S.R. Both developments would capitalize on Western European (particularly German) frustration with the status quo.

Khrushchev's acceptance of an atmosphere-only test ban strongly suggests a major Soviet reassessment of the world situation and an implicit acknowledgment that Soviet policies of the last few years have failed. The Soviet leaders have evidently concluded that the general world situation is again in a quiescent stage. Instead of dissipating Soviet resources in useless revolutionary efforts, or missile adventures of the Cuban variety, they will probably concentrate on consolidating their present position.

What produced this reappraisal in Moscow? Six years ago the Soviet leaders were extremely confident that the Soviet economy would continue to grow rapidly, and that Soviet society would be increasingly free of internal contradictions. With the emergence of the post-bourgeois, post-1917 generation, the oppressive Stalinist system seemed an anachronism. The Communist Party could henceforth rule benevolently, taking advantage of the greater spontaneous creativity of people reared under socialism.

Their hopes have not been fulfilled. Economic growth has not been as rapid as expected. Agriculture has remained underproductive. The standard of living has not risen in recent years, and has even declined in some respects because of major increases in food prices.

More important still, the hope of internal harmony has not materialized. The intellectuals and even the youth have proven unwilling to accept the doctrinaire rule of the party. Many ethnic minorities have shown increasing rather than diminishing awareness of a non-Russian identity, and there has been mounting resentment against Moscow control. So the party has had to involve itself more and more directly in the management of things and people, and this inevitably produces still more tensions. Furthermore, the Soviet leadership has been both irritated and embarrassed by recent Chinese charges that internal developments in the U.S.S.R. are not orthodox Marxism-Leninism. The Soviet leaders' uncertain and ambivalent attitude toward recalcitrant intellectuals reflects their inability to come to grips with these doctrinal problems. Unwilling or unable to recognize that contradictions have persisted within a Socialist society, the leaders naturally cannot formulate an effective policy for dealing with these contradictions, of which obstreperous intellectuals and youth are only one example.

The U.S.S.R. has also had troubles abroad. With respect to the Communist bloc, the Soviet leaders have realized since 1952 that the rigid Stalinist system, requiring monolithic unity and uniformity, is so longer practicable. The diversity of national settings clearly requires greater institutional diversity. This should in theory be offset by closer economic cooperation and by ideological unit.

Here again, hopes have been disappointed. The Sino-Soviet dispute has gradually escalated from a strategic disagreement to an ideological schism. This increasingly bitter national conflict has, moreover, set a precedent elsewhere in the bloc. Albanian defiance and Rumanian economic dissatisfaction portend further erosion of the Soviet position. In Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia some members of the Communist Party are bitterly dissatisfied with Soviet policies. The same is by and large true of the East German party. The bloc is increasingly characterized by confusion and disarray. Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria maintain a status quo position in international affairs and favor Khrushchev's position. North Vietnam, North Korea (and, one may suspect, East Germany) want to alter the status quo and are apparently sympathetic to the Chinese. At the same time, some parties (such as Hungary's and to a limited extent Czechoslovakia's) are moving toward greater domestic moderation. Some parties (such as Poland's) are moving toward greater domestic rigidity. Several parties (Rumanian and Bulgarian, for instance) are maintaining comparatively rigid Stalinism at home even though supporting Khrushchev in external affairs. All of this indicates that ideological unity is difficult to maintain without a central arbiter. Economic cooperation has also proved more difficult to achieve than the Soviet leaders expected.

The U.S.S.R. has been no more successful in dealing with the new nations than in dealing with the bloc. Events in the Congo and the Middle East have shown that neither Soviet economic aid nor the Soviet economic model are sufficiently attractive to insure the kind of political changes within the new nations which the U.S.S.R. wants. Yet the Soviet leadership has become so committed to its line, not to speak of its investments, that turning back is difficult. Furthermore, a more militant policy toward the underdeveloped countries would at this point look like an admission that the Chinese have been right all along.

The crucial failure of Soviet theory and practice has, however, been in dealing with the West. Up to last fall Khrushchev had been pursuing a policy aimed at "peace with victories." The Soviet leaders have always had reasonably high respect for American nuclear power, and they did not want all-out war. Nor did they want to assign scarce men and resources to preparations for large-scale war. Since they were increasingly confident, especially after 1957, that their ideological and economic weapons were superior to the West's and that the West might even be cowed by Soviet rockets, they saw peaceful coexistence as the slow but painless road to world communism. At the same time, the Soviet leaders expected sustained political and military pressure against the West to erode American resistance, bringing concessions in such vital areas as Berlin. These concessions, born of exhaustion, would in turn stimulate frustration and embitterment in Europe, and particularly in Germany. Disunity would mean more concessions, ad infinitum. And while NATO disintegrated, the preeminence of the United States in world affairs would be replaced by an American-Soviet duet. That is why Khrushchev had been so anxious to visit Eisenhower and the Soviet Union to deal directly with the United States. Such parity would in itself constitute a major gain for the Soviet Union.

This expectation proved wrong. The situation in Central Europe has not improved appreciably in recent years from the Soviet point of view. Out of frustration and a misguided sense of confidence, Khrushchev then turned to adventurism. By placing missiles on Cuba he and his colleagues apparently hoped to force a solution in Berlin and thereby unfreeze central Europe. In the course of the Cuban crisis, however, the Soviet leaders realized what they had previously doubted: that Mr. Kennedy was willing to use his immense military power for political ends. The Cuban crisis has thus been the critical watershed in American-Soviet relations. The decision to pull back led Khrushchev and his colleagues to a complete reappraisal of their policies.

In their reappraisal, the Soviet leaders rejected the Chinese argument that national liberation conflicts are the major factor of change in the international arena. The Soviet leaders realized that accepting the Chinese argument would mean committing more Soviet resources to this conflict. Even more important, the leadership in such a revolutionary movement would pass to Chinese hands, since China's is a more recent and more relevant revolution. Instead, the Soviet leaders preferred to conclude that the world is again in a quiescent stage, that revolutionary potentialities are low, and that expectations for the spread of communism must be geared accordingly.

The Soviet leaders hope, however, to use the present lull to consolidate Russo-American parity, gained in the late fifties, particularly in the course of Khrushchev's visits to the United States, and from eagerly quoted American statements conceding military parity. They also expect to assimilate knowledge gained from the recent nuclear tests and perhaps develop some new weapons system which would alter the balance of power. (This would, of course, spell the end of the quiescent phase.) Finally, they intend during the quiescent phase to improve their position in Europe and win greater Western acceptance of their permanent hegemony in the East. Beyond that the Soviet leaders may hope that the new Soviet-American agreement will prevent the French, and thus indirectly the Germans, from building effective nuclear weapons. This is a matter of some importance to the U.S.S.R., since a combined Franco-German nuclear force might well challenge the Soviet position in Europe in a way that America has not. And if such a force is built, the Soviet leaders may expect that American efforts to prevent it will generate new conflict within the Western camp. If the West Europeans were further embittered against American leadership, this would create new opportunities for Soviet diplomatic initiative, particularly toward West Germany.

Although the Soviets are eager to undermine European-American unity, their attitude toward intra-European unity is ambivalent. The Soviets have welcomed economic conflict among the West European nations, for conflict not only delays the emergence of the Common Market as a rival to the U.S.S.R., but also revalidates the Marxist-Leninist belief that capitalism contains inherent contradictions. Furthermore, a divided Europe is likely to remain dominated by the United States, and this permits direct Soviet-American negotiations about its future. The Soviet leaders think the United States basically shares the U.S.S.R.'s interest in preserving the European status quo. A united Europe, independent of the United States, might not accept the status quo. Nevertheless, if Europe is to be united, the Soviets want to insure that European unity is offset by European-American conflict. The U.S.S.R. wants to avoid any possibility of a united Europe's first rejecting the status quo and then persuading the United States to support European ambitions. If a test ban produces additional tension between America and its French and German allies—as indeed it already has—then that is a gain for the U.S.S.R. If American-European conflict eventually reduces American willingness to defend vital West European interests, better yet.

That is why the U.S.S.R. wants a nonaggression pact, or something like it, particularly with the United States, for the pact would directly and vividly demonstrate American acceptance of a divided Europe. The pact would also buttress the U.S.S.R.'s East European position, which recent divisions within the Communist camp have somewhat undermined.

Clearly then, the test ban agreement does not mark a sudden return to the comparative warmth of Soviet-American relations in 1942–45. The regime which a year ago was smuggling missiles into Cuba is not likely to deliberately undertake an enduring friendship with the leading imperialist power in the immediate future. To be sure, the test ban may have consequences not anticipated by Mr. Khrushchev and his colleagues. A thaw in American-Soviet relations, even if planned as a temporary pause, could gradually lead to an entirely new relationship. The test ban has already helped intensify the Sino-Soviet disagreement, and this could in turn push the Soviet Union further toward the West. Nor should we underestimate the process of change within the Soviet Union. Some day Khrushchev's successors might find new reasons for continuing a policy of quiescence and adjustment. Step by step the Soviet Union might gradually move toward genuine acceptance of the status quo.

Obviously American foreign policy must be designed to encourage such possibilities. But a policy resting on the division of Europe is not likely to do this. Such a policy would increase German frustration, encourage Bonn to seek a deal with Moscow, and thereby reawaken Soviet ambitions in central Europe. Furthermore, such a U.S. policy would leave European leadership to General de Gaulle. In the last 2 years De Gaulle has moved consciously and steadily to assert French leadership, not in a divided Western Europe, but in a reunited Europe. Underlying all the Franco-American debates concerning the French nuclear deterrent is his fundamental feeling that Europe is no longer threatened by Soviet attack, and that a new all-European policy is therefore possible—no, necessary.

Yet America offers Europe essentially a defensive posture. President Kennedy's recent trip to Europe was truly a trip of reassurance. The trouble is that Europeans no longer need to be reassured of U.S. willingness to defend them. The problem is quite different. General de Gaulle came close to saying this explicitly in his recent press conference: "The United States, which since Yalta and Potsdam has had nothing to demand from the Soviets, now sees prospects of understanding opening before it. The result is the separate negotiations between the Anglo-Saxons and the Soviets, which starting from the restricted nuclear test agreement appear about to be extended to other questions, notably European questions, and so far in the absence of the Europeans. This evidently runs counter to the views of France. For a long time, France has believed that the day may come when a sincere detente and even an entente will allow a complete change in the relations between East and West in Europe. When this day comes, and I have said this before, France expects to make constructive proposals concerning the peace, equilibrium, and destiny of Europe."

These words clearly convey the danger facing the United States should it adopt a static posture in Europe. At some opportune moment France is likely to put forth proposals concerning the reunification of Europe. These proposals will almost certainly strike a responsive chord among many Germans and Central Europeans. It is difficult at present to guess what they will be; much will depend on the general international context. But broadly speaking there are two possibilities: if world tensions increase de Gaulle might make proposals which he knew were unacceptable to the U.S.S.R., but which he thought would win enthusiastic approval in West Germany and perhaps elsewhere. Alternatively, if the context is of detente, the French may advance moderate proposals designed to protect the present territorial integrity of Poland and even transitionally the existence of East Germany (to which de Gaulle once referred as "Saxony and Prussia"). These proposals might include realistic steps toward European reunification, such as economic and political ties, presumably of an intermediate and indirect nature, between East Europe, Russia, and Western Europe. Coming from de Gaulle such a proposal might be palatable to the West Germans, presumably by then embittered with American passivity. Whatever the nature of his proposals, the United States would have no choice but to follow suit and to support his initiative. Anything less would be tantamount to supporting the division of Europe. The United States clearly could not afford to do that. But supporting de Gaulle would mean the abdication of American leadership and vindication of President de Gaulle's policies since 1961.

Given this alternative, the United States must design its own policy for reuniting Europe. Such a policy need not be provocative and should not ignore the Soviet stake in Central Europe. Indeed, its purpose should not be the splitting of individual East European states from the U.S.S.R., but rather encouraging the entire Soviet bloc into a closer relationship with the rest of Europe. In many respects all of these states share a common European heritage, a common religious past and a common sense of identification. Conflict with the Chinese has underlined this.

The United States should, therefore, propose new relationships between the Common Market and the Communist states, preferably taking advantage of some symbolic moment to speak through President Kennedy. The aim should be to improve the standard of living and the way of life in the Communist states, in keeping with Western values and without the coercion and terror which still characterize Communist policies. The United States should open an articulate dialog with Communist societies and should address itself to the internal tensions and difficulties which these societies face. There should be greater effort to discuss constructively and openly the internal difficulties which the Communist states face and to suggest ways of overcoming these difficulties in a manner which encourages the evaluation of these societies into more acceptable forms. Above all, we must address ourselves more to the restless youth, particularly in the Soviet Union. They are thirsting for knowledge about the world and also about their own past. Books and materials about Stalinism, in Russian, are eagerly sought by a generation anxious to understand why it happened and determined never to let it happen again. We must keep open channels of communication with the Communist countries, and speak directly to the peoples now under Communist rule. Instead of merely hoping for the political leaders in these countries to bring them into the Western camp, we must persistently invite them to join in a constructive all-European undertaking, thereby stimulating popular pressure on the Communist leaders. If the test ban agreement leads the United States to such an affirmative and peaceful engagement in the future of all Europe, it will indeed be a landmark in the history of postwar international relations.

MATSON BLAZES NEW TRAILS IN SHIPPING

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on August 10, 1963, an article entitled "Matson Blazes New Trails in Shipping," appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. I believe that this article is worthy of the consideration of my colleagues who are interested in our maritime industry. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Aug. 10, 1963]

MATSON BLAZES NEW TRAILS IN SHIPPING

For 81 years the houseflag of Matson Navigation Co. has been as familiar a banner on the Pacific Ocean as the Stars and Stripes. It has flown from the mast of virtually every conceivable class of commercial ship from windjammer to luxury liner.

The burgee with the big blue M has now been unfurled above a prosaic vessel that stamps a new Matson service—an oceangoing barge, the *Lumberjack*, which will be outfitted with gear to lift and carry lumber from the forests of the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii.

With the tug-drawn barge, Matson hopes to more than double its annual movement of 20 million board feet of Douglas-fir, redwood, hemlock, and plywood to the offshore State.

But introduction of the *Lumberjack* into its fleet of 13 freighters and two passenger liners has far deeper significance than the economic potential.

The barge is symbolic of a new kind of thinking that pervades Matson headquarters in San Francisco. Matson no longer considers its central business to be the running of steamships from place to place, but rather the creation and marketing of customized transportation services.

COURAGEOUS STEAMSHIP LINE

Says one management consultant who specializes in transportation:

"They've got more guts than any other steamship line in the country. Faced with a fleet replacement program, they didn't just get more modern ships; they * * * are taking a close look at the service they are performing, and they are using all the best techniques to improve it. They are establishing the criteria other lines must inevitably follow."

Any suspicion that this integrated systems approach to transportation is perhaps a management exercise in semantics is challenged by the fact that in the past 5 years Matson has spent or committed $27 million to underwrite the long-range shift in thinking that rescued the company last year from a sea of red ink.

The timing of the rescue coincided with the promotion of Stanley Powell, Jr., from executive vice president to president. But Powell ducks the bouquets for Matson's abrupt turnaround from a $1 million loss in 1961 to a $2.24 million profit in 1962.

He points out that the foundations for the turnaround were laid 7 or 8 years ago by his predecessor, Randolph Sevier, now chairman of the board.

It is acknowledged, though, that Powell carried the bricks for the foundations. And Powell will surely get them back, one by one, if the foundations crumble.

THREE PRINCIPAL SERVICES

Matson generates annual revenues of $99 million through three principal maritime services.

As an unsubsidized domestic carrier, it transports people (53,000 last year) and cargo (2.9 million tons in 1962) between the west coast and Hawaii.

In a joint unsubsidized operation with Isthmian Lines, it moves freight (257,000 tons in 1962) between Atlantic and gulf ports and Hawaii.

And a wholly owned Matson subsidiary, the subsidized Oceanic Steamship Co., carries passengers (7,200 last year) and cargo (235,000 tons) between the United States and Australia via the exotic ports of the South Pacific.

Financially, Matson has nowhere nearly matched the stride of the economy, a complaint that is familiar in the U.S. merchant marine.

Its bread and butter California-Hawaii freight service has yielded annual profits averaging only 2.35 percent of invested capital less depreciation since World War II. And in the past 10 years the company's consolidated earnings have averaged barely 2.2 percent of revenues.

Against that melancholy record Matson has come up with the new philosophy: The operation of ships is no longer an end in itself, it is the means to an end.

TURNING THE TIDE

The service that the *Lumberjack* will perform is one example of how Powell is trying to turn the tide. He and the men around him conceive it as Matson's function to study the market and create the service that fits best.

Matson already carries lumber and plywood to Hawaii—18 percnt of the State's domestic needs—from Seattle, Tacoma, and Portland. But its big C–3 freighters can't get near the shallow ports that lie in the shadow of the Northwest's sawmills.

The big-volume cargo that originates in these small lumber ports has been left to Pacific Hawaiian Line, Inc., which introduced barge service 5 years ago, and Oliver J. Olson & Co., which moved in later.

With the *Lumberjack*, Powell hopes to boost Matson's share of the traffic from 18 percent to around 45 percent.

In the clannish milieu of the society that once dominated Hawaii and still controls Matson, Stan Powell, 46, is a breed apart.

Almost three-fourths of the Matson stock is owned by four of Hawaii's Big Five companies—Alexander and Baldwin, (33.5 percent), Castle and Cooke, (24.2 percent), C. Brewer (14.2 percent), and American Factors (2.6 percent), all represented on the board of directors.

In his progressively higher finance roles, Powell saw the writing on the wall. Maritime transportation with its steeply rising costs was losing its shirt and not doing much about it.

Along with Sevier, then president, Powell is credited with the agitation that caused Matson to look for answers in applied research.

AN INWARD LOOK

If the research department, set up in 1956 under Powell's finance wing, did nothing else, it earned its keep by forcing management to take an inward look at its problems.

To do the job, Powell went outside the industry for a man who could take an objective approach. He hired a geophysicist, Foster L. Weldon, who had made a name in operations research at Johns Hopkins University.

Weldon and his staff had no trouble isolating their first project. Between San Francisco and Honolulu there are 2,091 miles of blue water. It takes a freighter 5½ days to cover that distance.

But Weldon found that 48 percent of the cost of delivering the freight was in the movement of it across a couple of hundred feet of dock at either end of the voyage.

Management made a key decision—a massive shift to sealed containers. This involved a staggering overhaul of the whole concept of ocean commerce and ultimately of Matson's role in serving it.

Where it works at all, though, the economics of containerization is exhilarating. The *Hawaiian Citizen*, in its conversion to a container ship, lost 24 percent of its cubic load capacity but gained 52 percent in its ability to move cargo.

The key is faster turnaround made possible by mechanized loading. A conventional ship may spend half its time in port, a container carrier only 20 percent. When you remember that a crew runs to 51 men, who are paid whether at sea or on the beach, the additional saving in labor cost also becomes significant.

When all conversions now in progress are completed this fall, Powell figures that Matson will be getting 50 percent better utilization out of the fleet—that 9 ships will be doing the work once expected of 14.

Once the concept had been established in research, it remained for the engineering development department to design the container best suited to the trade, to convert the ships to accommodate them on deck and in the holds, to design giant shoreside cranes that lift a 25-ton container 156 feet above the pier apron and with a 95-foot boom deposit it in a predetermined slot on the ship in 2½ minutes flat.

Freight salesmen had to convert shippers; rates had to be overhauled.

As the conversion progressed, it became plain to Matson that containers weren't the whole answer; not all cargo is economically adaptable to an 8- by 8½- by 24-foot aluminum box that can be set on a chassis and moved as a highway trailer.

One ship was converted to a floating garage to carry nothing but 517 automobiles.

Two C-4 freighters got extra midsections in their conversions to bulk sugar carriers. Instead of carrying raw sugar in 100-pound bags, they carry 16,000 tons in bulk in their 11 hatches—and also carry 378 containers.

Special tank containers were built for fluid cargo such as molasses and chemicals.

UNION GOES ALONG

Matson's shoreside mechanization did not escape the notice of the maritime unions. Harry Bridges saw it coming and decided that his militant longshoremen's union wouldn't fight it.

Instead he negotiated a juicy 5½-year contract with the Pacific Maritime Association giving shipowners a free hand to mechanize loading and unloading in exchange for a $29-million fund to compensate longshoremen for lost work and speed retirement.

So far, the offshore unions—sailors, stewards, firemen, engineers, masters—haven't felt the impact of mechanization. But it's now visible on their horizon.

In Beaumont, Tex., Bethlehem Steel Co.'s shipbuilding division is fabricating a unique vessel that Matson will use for distributing west coast container cargo discharged at Honolulu to smaller ports of the island State.

Leslie A. Harlander, Matson's manager of engineering development, conceived the new vessel, a 300-foot barge with a ship-type hull that mounts a giant crane and will carry 155 containers.

It can be hauled by a tugboat to the smaller ports and discharge and load containers. Or, with a powerplant, it can sail under its own steam with a crew of 6 men instead of the 51 who man the big freighters now used in interisland service.

It's a safe bet that the entire U.S. merchant marine will be watching when the barge slides down the ways in September. In preparation for formal discussions soon to begin, Matson Vice President Wayne L. Horvitz last week handed the unions an analysis of the barge's capabilities.

If the unions accept the barge as a self-propelled vessel with its pared-down manning table, they establish a precedent that may one day be applied to the big oceangoing freighters.

Matson's advanced studies indicate that with all the mechanical controls available, its biggest ships could operate comfortably with a crew of 15 instead of the present 51.

Powell will need capital to finance the ambitious fleet improvements that are yet to come. Unlike subsidized operators, Matson can't look to Washington for financial help in building and operating ships in domestic service.

The president would like to market some common stock. But he knows that's impossible until he can show investors a stabilized earning capacity at a level somewhat higher than it has been.

Over the past 16 years the return on California-Hawaii freight service has gyrated between 10.8 percent and minus 6.5 percent of invested capital (depreciated) and has averaged 2.35 percent.

INCREASED FREIGHT RATES

A little over a year ago, Matson increased freight rates in this trade by 9.8 percent, and the Federal Maritime Commission is now pondering whether this is reasonable.

In the 16 months the higher rate has been in effect the company's consolidated earnings have shown progressive improvement—$750,000 in the first quarter of 1963.

Against that background, Powell's prediction, barring unforeseen hitches, that the California-Hawaii freight service will realize 18 percent on invested capital this year gives Matson the jauntiest air it has worn in many a year.

Translated, the prediction comes to $4 million, a fat 69 percent over 1962.

Powell may get help from an unexpected quarter—the passenger department. Matson has had two domestic liners, the *Lurline* and the *Matsonia*. Last fall, Passenger-Vice-President Walter Sternberg laid up the *Matsonia*, which is encumbered with a heavy mortgage, but had to restore it to service when the *Lurline* engines broke down.

With only one liner in service, passenger operations have taken on a brighter hue. Even while shouldering the mortgage plus layup costs of around $5,500 a day on one ship, Sternberg is projecting the 1963 passenger loss at a little more than $500,000, down from $2.2 million last year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REGISTRATION OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES AS STAFF OFFICERS IN THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PEARSON obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A PROGRAM FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF A FREE CUBA

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 months several Members of the Senate, expressing the continued concern of the American people, have discussed this Nation's Cuba policy. These statements have been useful because Cuba, as the first and only Soviet Communist satellite in the Western Hemisphere, requires our constant attention.

This discussion has been directed almost exclusively to the immediate question as to how best to dispose of Castro and to remove communism from Cuba. And rightly so. For Castro and Cuban communism, as part of an international conspiracy, hold the avowed aggressive intent to destroy every free government in the Americas.

Nevertheless, while occupied with the immediate problem, we ought not in such preoccupation, lose sight of the ultimate Cuban problems when the day of a new opportunity for freedom arrives.

Let us assume that by utilizing one or more of the steps proposed by my distinguished colleagues, by the administration's present policy, or by some revised policy of the administration, Castro is ousted, communism falls, the foreign yoke of the Soviet Union is thrown off, and Cuba and Cubans, at long last, are free to establish their own government and to direct their energies and resources as they determine.

What then?

The millennium for Cuba will not have arrived. No plan or strategy is complete if elimination of Castro is the end in itself. The bitter legacy of Communist rule is likely to be its "scorched earth" imprint upon the institutions, the minds, and the spirit of man.

I suggest, therefore, that we give thought to the problems of the time when Castro and communism shall have passed from the scene of history and the reconstruction of Cuba begins.

And the time to begin is now. The task is immense. Careful preparation of a comprehensive program for the rehabilitation of Cuba, by Cubans, with the help of American nations is as important as any military plan, diplomatic squeeze play, economic pressure or any other technique which may be agreed upon to oust Castro. The overthrow must not exclude subsequent acts toward a cause as great as the downfall of a tyrant.

Cubans, like all other humans, want to know what the future holds. When our forefathers in 1776 pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, they conceived of an alternative form of free government and a life of liberty and equality. Who can expect the Cubans to revolt, to aid an invasion, to achieve any unity of leadership, or to acquire a sense of purpose when their alternative is to trade the known for the unknown or to choose between political personalities rather than political principles.

If an alternative to Castroism can be formulated that envisages the construction of a free Cuban society and the return of Cuba to the family of free nations, it may well act as a catalyst to provide the required unity of purpose and cohesion of leadership wherein personal ambitions and interests are subordinated and, once again, men will commit their resources and risk their lives.

The difficulties in preparing such a plan are compounded by the fact that the basic elements of a democratic society no longer exist in Cuba.

Castro has systematically destroyed all private endeavors and public associations supporting a democratic national structure. The Constitution of 1940 has been abolished. Human rights no longer exist.

There is but one political party. A Communist ruling class that numbers not more than 25,000 persons imposes its rule upon nearly 7 million citizens. Elections have been banned. The armed forces and police have been organized into a formidable and repressive security apparatus.

The right to hold private property has disappeared. Real estate, industrial plants, and businesses such as stores, shops, banks, and other commercial institutions have been confiscated and nationalized.

Education has become Communist indoctrination. Not a single private school remains. The public schools, including the secondary schools and universities, are subject to an iron discipline which coerces both teachers and pupils. All religious schools have been closed, and religious teachings outlawed.

The destruction and control of religious institutions, certain to meet with ultimate failure, is nevertheless attempted. Less than 200 out of nearly 1,500 Catholic priests and nuns have been allowed to remain in Cuba. Protestant ministers of different denominations have been jailed or expelled.

The Communists have discredited and destroyed the judiciary from the justices of the supreme court down to the municipal judge, public prosecutor, and district attorneys. At the same time, they have established the so-called revolutionary courts and peoples' courts which are Communist oriented and dominated.

The police state reigns supreme in a totalitarian fashion. Tyranny is the order of the day.

Thus is the account of the complete upheaval in Cuban national life.

Let there be no misunderstanding about a central fact. While it is asserted that democratic institutions existed prior to Castro, all recognize that under Batista they existed only in form. Proof again that evil breeds evil. But the democratic political and social structures, though ignored, did exist. Now they do not. Tomorrow, when Cuba is again free, her people must start from scratch to build these structures.

The major responsibility for preparing for the reconstruction of their liberated homeland will primarily be upon the Cubans. This is as it should be. But how may the reconstruction of a democratic political order be planned when exile leadership is divided, without authority or recognition, and when the people within Cuba exist under a police state? The answer is, it seems to me, that they shall need assistance from the nations of the Americas.

I recommended that the Organization of American States direct its Inter-American Economic and Social Council to undertake a comprehensive study of the economic, social, and political aspects of Cuban life in a manner similar to the study of Western Europe's economies undertaken in the summer of 1947 by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. It was the OEEC study, following General Marshall's commencement address at Harvard, that resulted in the drafting of the European recovery program which gave substance to the Marshall plan and the miraculous economic recovery of Western Europe.

In its study of the new Cuba, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council should direct special attention to the essential elements of a free society.

First is a constitution guaranteeing human rights, free elections, the peaceful and orderly transfer of power and forming a basic law of the land.

The second comprises the vital institutions, through which the day-to-day functions of a democratic political system are carried out. I believe the American model of government to be the greatest in the world. But the very foundation of our system is the recognition of free choice. Yet I would nevertheless urge upon any people to recognize that, while our Government structure may not apply to every nation, our experience points to certain truths. The chief one is that the diffusion of power among the various governmental institutions provides a matchless safeguard of individual freedom while at the same time permitting the effective functioning of a political system. Beyond the diffusion of power within government itself, any people must recognize the essentiality of other institutions of a free society—political parties, schools, churches, labor unions, civic organizations, and other voluntary associations.

The third essential element of a free society is mature leadership. In a democracy, a people entrust the day-to-day operation of their government to their chosen representatives and, in turn, to faithful civil servants. The personnel of government must be highly competent, but equally important, they must possess loyalty to democratic principles.

The fourth is an informed and capable citizenry. Such an informed population—not a brainwashed mass as in a Communist state—must be the aim of a new Cuban educational system. The people must be prepared to make intelligent decisions about public policy. Provision should be made for higher and increasing levels of basic educational and vocational training for the wide variety of skills and vocations that will contribute to an expanding and balanced economy which, in turn, is essential to a stable political system.

And last, a country and its people must have some dream of the goals ahead. They must voluntarily agree upon national goals and priorities. They must understand that where they are today is not as important as where they are going tomorrow, for this sense of purpose is essential to keep their system viable and is necessary to direct the institutions and the energies of its people.

The study that I propose to be undertaken by the OAS should conceive of a free Cuba joining once again as a full partner in the Western Hemisphere family of nations. It should propose economic objectives and suggest governmental structures. It should specify to the members of the OAS the nature and scope of technical advice, economic resources, and trade policies that will be required to assist Cuba in her recovery. Hopefully, this specification will be translated into firm commitments by the American nations which can be carried out upon Cuba's freedom from Communist rule. These commitments, together with the pledge that Cuba once again will be an equal member of the inter-American family, can assure a future for that nation which her present Communist allies cannot duplicate or guarantee.

This study by the OAS has, to some degree, a successful precedent in Europe which I have cited. Moreover, it is consistent with recent actions taken by the OAS. The Inter-American Economic and Social Council of that organization is playing an active role in the Alliance for Progress, a program designed to improve the well-being of people throughout Latin America. Under any proposal, the OAS, in similar fashion, in constant communication with the Cuban people, and consulting the most knowledgeable businessmen, scholars, and government officials in the hemisphere, could identify free Cuba's problems and recommend solutions.

This is the essence of my proposal in the long term.

But immediate steps should be considered by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to begin Cuba's long journey back from darkness. I spoke of the need for able leadership endowed with democratic ideals. For example, under OAS auspices in this country and elsewhere in the hemisphere, exiles could start training for possible service in a future free government.

Likewise, training could commence for future educational and vocational teachers, and other professional people who might be called upon to implement the plans for rebuilding the new Cuba.

These and many other steps can be initiated now in a minimum of time and in a manner consistent with a concept of a free society and the independence of Cuba.

The OAS study and the other steps I have suggested can be accomplished within the framework of the Punta del Este declaration of February 1962, which refused to accept the Castro regime but retains Cuba as a member of the OAS and of the inter-American family of nations. We can move ahead without recognition of any specific Cuban political element or present exile group. On the other hand, proposals emerging from the OAS study could provide the basis for the platforms of candidates who seek to lead a new Cuba. These would be leaders of a cause rather than political personalities in conflict.

In conclusion, let me outline three good reasons why we should prepare now for the rehabilitation of Cuba.

First, the sense of purpose of freedom-seeking Cubans needs to be revived. At the present time, morale is low because these people see few signs of support for their efforts to free their country. Moreover, if Cubans were to understand that we not only support their aspirations for liberation but that we are genuinely concerned with their fate after liberation, they would regain a new sense of resolution.

Second, Cubans and all other people of this hemisphere should recognize the staggering problems that lie ahead. They may be solved by adequate preparation or by the tortuous route of trial and error. We need only to look at the experience of Argentina to get some idea of the magnitude of the task of assuring a meaningful change. Only now, 8 years after Peron's flight, Argentina may—I repeat, may—be on her way to political stability. It should be noted that the legacy of Peron's dictatorship is probably not as bitter as the legacy which Castro will leave behind. In any event, the longer Cuba remains under Communist control, the greater will be the problems of recovery.

Finally, Cuba may provide the first case anywhere in the world where the Communist satellite status of a country will have been ended. The experience and examples set by the recovery of Cuba may be the inspiration and the pattern for other countries presently under Communist domination.

Mr. President, I have tried to see beyond the curve of the horizon to the day when Cuba once again will be free.

An OAS study of the problems of post-Castro Cuba and its suggestions could rally the spirit of the Cuban people. It could prove that their place is within the inter-American community, but above all, it is a means of preparing and making available a solid alternative to Castroism, communism, and slavery.

If such an alternative to communism is presented, not in metaphysical concepts of political theory or philosophy, but in terms of economics, living standards and individual freedom, its influence surely must increase in ever-widening circles throughout the world because its message is nothing less than the emancipation of man.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has made what I consider to be an exceedingly important speech in a series of speeches that have been made on the question of Cuba. Too often we forget that ending the rule of a dictator or the rule of communism or the rule of anything other than one of democratic processes does not in itself solve the problems of the country involved.

I have often wondered what would happen if Castro and communism were removed tomorrow. As the Senator has said, what then? The suggestions he has made are logical suggestions, which the present administration should find no difficulty agreeing with and pressing.

I thank him, as a fellow Senator, for having made these observations on Cuba and its problems.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for clarifying the very point that I sought to develop in the comments I have made.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have heard only a portion of the speech delivered by the Senator from Kansas. He was kind enough, however, to send me a copy of his speech on Cuba. I congratulate him on it, particularly for his efforts to keep the Cuban question before the American people. We cannot cure this problem by running away from it. We cannot cure it by talking about our glorious achievements in space or elsewhere. It is not going to go away, no matter how much we talk, in a sort of self-intoxication with our own glories, about what a great people we are.

I was particularly interested in one portion of the Senator's speech. I refer to his comparison in terms of what we might do with Cuba and what we had done in Europe under the OEEC.

I should like to ask the Senator a question on that point. Does he have in mind that if any such study were made, the opportunities for development in Cuba might offer a far greater source of criticism and a far greater impetus for the people of Cuba to do something to cure their ills than could be accomplished by all the criticism and chest thumping about what could be done in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. PEARSON. I cited the experience of the OEEC as a matter of precedent, to show that what I propose is not a new concept in any sense of the word. On the contrary, it has been tried before, and it proved successful. The point to be developed is that we must plan beyond the immediate downfall of a tyrant, and must form a hard alternative to the communistic structure which exists in Cuba today.

If the people of Cuba do not see some other alternative, when the day comes for liberation, it is quite difficult to understand how they are going to overthrow Castro or carry forward what apparently is the policy of this administration of isolation, and waiting for the people there, living in a police state, as they are, jeopardizing their resources and their lives, without knowing anything more than that they are going to trade the known for the unknown.

Mr. ALLOTT. The genius of the Senator's remarks lies in the fact that no matter what we may say and how often we may call the attention of this hemisphere and of the world to the situation in Cuba, and no matter what we may say in the effort to persuade the administration to let us know if it has a policy toward Cuba—and if it has a policy, what it is—all of this can perhaps be taken by the Cubans themselves only in the light of criticism. However, the best part of the Senator's remarks, in my opinion, is that if such a study group were formulated, particularly under the OAS, and if it were given a great deal of attention, and if the report were given a great deal of publicity in Cuba, then, without being critical of the Castro regime at all, we might open their eyes to the possibilities and potentialities of their own country, not politically, but economically, socially, and educationally and otherwise.

Mr. PEARSON. And that their future lies in the Western Hemisphere. This is something we can offer, and which our allies on the other side of the world can never hope to propose.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in permitting me to intervene in his remarks. He has made a worthwhile speech. I hope the administration will read it. I hope that Members of the Senate of the opposite party will read it. This is another proposed constructive step our country can take. We cannot avoid taking some steps soon to end the situation in Cuba.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have read the speech of the Senator from Kansas. Although I was not present to hear all of it, I heard a good part of the speech of the Senator from Kansas.

I should like to add my approval to that voiced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], for two reasons. First, Cuba is not going to sink into the Caribbean. It will continue to exist; and its people—those who live now and their progeny—will continue to exist 90 miles off the shores of the United States.

We must give those people some assurance on the question: After communism, then what? The sooner we give them such assurance the sooner it is likely they will get rid of communism.

Of course we understand that people will not fight for nothing, but that they will very definitely fight for something. Abstractions on freedom are very difficult to get across to people, although the people of Cuba, of all peoples in Latin America, should understand it. Nonetheless, it will be tremendously helpful to fortify it with assurances with respect to their economic, social, and spiritual future, with special emphasis on the economic side.

The Senator from Kansas has suggested a magnificent initiative. The Senator's speech is probably one of his earliest speeches in the Senate. I believe that the Senate and the country will be indebted to him for developing such a constructive and intelligent idea. His doing so illustrates that no matter how often a subject is discussed, there is still room for ideas.

That is something the administration ought to pay some attention to. They should understand that they by no means have letters patent on all the good ideas on a subject in terms of our relations with other nations of the world.

Finally, I congratulate the Senator from Kansas especially upon the perspicacity which dictated his statement that, just as the loss of Cuba to freedom was a disaster, so the regaining of Cuba will be a great boon to the free world, as it would have been if the first attempt had succeeded.

The Senator has given us a magnificent prescription on how to begin.

Mr. PEARSON. I am grateful to the Senator from New York for his comments.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in preparing for debate on the proposed partial nuclear test ban treaty, it is apparent already that many Members of this body are painfully torn between a wish to support the President and wishes also to see the treaty clarified and safeguarded to the maximum extent possible. For every paragraph of the treaty proposal, doubts and demands for safeguards have been raised.

Thus, it would seem to me perfectly clear that the Senate has an unmistakable obligation that goes beyond mere approval or rejection of the treaty as it now stands. That obligation begins with consideration of ways in which the treaty, now riddled with doubts, can be strengthened and made acceptable beyond any doubt. The able staff of the Foreign Relations Committee already has outlined seven ways in which the Senate can add to the treaty new elements of strength, clarification, and safeguarding. The ways, which all Members should study closely, range from amendments and reservations to simple interpretations and declarations of understanding regarding those sections of the treaty ambiguously drafted. And that there should be such ambiguous drafting is certainly natural and understandable inasmuch as no broadly experienced international lawyer was present, on our behalf, during the drafting. Nor was there a military representative on hand to help assure against those disadvantages of which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken and because of which they have proposed such elaborate subsequent safeguards.

At the level of formal reservations we have, at the outset, President Eisenhower's wise warning that the treaty itself—and not just some subsidiary understanding—make perfectly clear that our right to use nuclear weapons in the defense of our security is not inhibited by the treaty. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has echoed that warning and has suggested that he will seek to have such a reservation formally attached to the treaty.

The reservation has been criticized, however, as unnecessary. It is said that we never relinquish our right to self-protection. I accept that statement, but I do not accept as a fact that it answers fully the question which the proposed reservation seeks to resolve. I am confident that the President would not be inhibited by the treaty from defending this Nation with whatever weapons were needed. But I suggest that the concept of our national security stretches beyond our shoreline.

We cannot be isolationists in this nuclear world. Our weapons must be pledged to the defense of freedom and free men everywhere, pledged wisely and prudently but pledged firmly lest the ambitious enemy be encouraged by seeming isolationism and embark upon reckless adventures which would endanger the peace of the entire world.

In that context, the reservation assumes great importance. It would, I trust, make it perfectly clear that our nuclear weapons—particularly tactical ones—could be used, without violating the treaty, to defend freedom in, say, Europe or Asia, as well as on or at our own doorstep. If, as the President says, our use of nuclear weapons is not inhibited by the treaty, then it should strengthen, not weaken, the treaty to make this clear in a reservation.

Other clarifications of the treaty have been suggested. Some means of international inspection that would assure against clandestine nuclear test aid to nations not signatory to the treaty might well be evolved for consideration.

A means of permitting nuclear explosions for peaceful uses, such as those envisioned in our Operation Plowshare, surely is needed in the treaty.

A clarification of the term "territorial waters"—one of the prohibited test environments—surely is needed so that all understand it to include the vast interior waters of the Soviet Union.

The problems that may arise from the signing of the treaty by states not accorded diplomatic recognition by other signers surely should be clarified beyond any informal statements. Again, if everyone says he understands such-and-such to be the intent of the treaty, why not let the treaty or formal reservations to it spell out those understandings? Would this not strengthen the treaty?

I am hopeful that Members of the Senate with special knowledge and expertise in each of the treaty's questionable areas will rise to propose proper clarifications and, if needed, reservations.

There is one in particular to which I intend to address myself in the days ahead. It will, I hope, substantially contribute to the main design of the proposed treaty—its usefulness in easing world tension. It should provide the one great test of the intent and the feasibility of this treaty in the broadest area of its meaning, in the very area for which its supporters claim its greatest virtues.

The reservation in which I am interested and which I shall introduce and press for as a reasonable condition for acceptance of the treaty in essence is this:

That the effectiveness of the treaty be deferred until the U.S.S.R. has removed all nuclear weapons, all weapons capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and all military and military-technical personnel from Cuba, and until arrangements have been made for international inspection within Cuba to determine and confirm such removal.

The position of this country in regard to such removal amply has been stated by the administration. The situation in Cuba is a unique incursion into the territory of the Americas and a clear violation of existing arrangements between the American states. It is not sanctioned by any existing treaties or legal arrangements—such as those demonstrably sanctioning our military presence in Berlin. It is regarded by the vast majority of mankind as a clear breach of international law and order and a clear threat to the peace, a far more clear threat than the testing of weapons.

We are told that despite military disadvantages, for us, in this proposed treaty that political considerations or advantages justify our taking this so-called first step. I hold that those political advantages must be reflections of the real actions of the Soviet and not of illusory hopes and optimisms. And I hold that the Soviet presence in Cuba shatters those illusions and makes a lie of the optimisms.

What is the most urgent concern of the American people regarding communism at this moment? Is it the hazards of continued nuclear testing? No. Is it Berlin? No. Is it southeast Asia? No. Their greatest concern is the existence of a Soviet military base 90 miles from our shore, a base illegally occupied and brutally held.

This proposed test ban treaty cannot be a first step toward peace if it must stumble over Soviet missiles and troops in Cuba. Its risks cannot be justified if we are only to give in and get nothing.

The Soviets gain from the treaty an immobilization of our great nuclear lead, a breathing space in which to put to productive use the data gained from its own unique series of high-yield nuclear tests, a breathing space in which to consolidate its political position around the world. They want the treaty; they say they want the treaty; they need the treaty. Well, we need something, too; we need deeds to replace doubts.

The deeds of this Nation in easing tensions, in working for peace, are everywhere apparent. It is not we who stand on trial as disturbers of the peace in the world. It is the Soviets and international communism. It is they, not we, who must perform, not merely promise, on behalf of peace. It is they who have the opportunity to take the step toward peace of which so many speak and for which so many hope. We can do no more than we have, short of surrendering our future. The Soviets have many avenues of proof. The mere signing of the test ban treaty surely is not a convincing one. The removal of troops and weapons from Cuba would mean something, would give tangible evidence of what remains, in the treaty, totally intangible.

The reservation that I will formally propose when appropriate could be complied with in a few months. Only in that interim would the long-delayed test ban be further delayed. And, in practical terms, a cessation of testing in the proposed prohibited environments need not be delayed at all. The United States already has said it would not so test. The Soviets need only to similarly refrain from testing.

If the Soviets truly wish to ease the tensions which are felt by the American people—the tensions which the Soviets say cause them to fear for the peace of the world—if the Soviets truly intend this test ban proposal to be more than a gambit in their aggressive plans, then let them remove the immediate cause of present tension in America; let them remove their military base in Cuba.

A reservation embodying this needed demonstration of Soviet intent could make the treaty proposal perfectly acceptable even to its harshest critics. I will offer it in that hope at the appropriate time. For, as the treaty proposal now stands, devoid of hard-and-fast safeguards and clarifications, and devoid also of advantage to America equal to the existing advantage to the Soviets, it is a potential peril to peace rather than a step toward it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I completely agree with the premise of the Senator's remarks that the United States should have required as a condition to the signing of any test ban treaty that Russia permit inspection and that Castro permit inspection, so that we could be assured that there would be no nuclear weapons in Cuba. However, since the treaty was apparently signed without taking these outside factors into consideration—the factor of Cuba, so far as the American Government is concerned—does not the Senator believe that such a reservation, if adopted, would now surely, completely, and effectively block the treaty?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the answer to that question must rest with the Russians. If the Russians really mean that they want peace and if they want to ease tensions—and I must remind the Senator that the Russians are the ones who create tension in the world, whereas the United States has done more than any other nation in the history of the world to ease tensions—I suggest that if the Russians will not accept this reservation, should it be adopted by the Senate, it should be patently clear that they have no intension of furthering the interests of peace in the world. That is not a question for the Senate to answer; it is a question to put squarely to the Communist leaders in Russia.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator is probably right in his premise; but I am not sure that I made the real intent of my question plain, so I shall restate it in these terms: Did not the actual psychological moment for insisting upon such concessions pass when our representatives signed the treaty in Moscow?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think I could agree with that premise. By treaty processes—which are not unusual in the world—we must go through certain steps before the Senate can give its advice and consent on question of the wisdom or the lack of wisdom of the treaty.

Frankly, I was surprised that such negotiations were not talked about in Moscow. I should have thought that both the U.S. representatives and those of the United Kingdom would have brought up the subject of Laos, the subject of Cuba, and possibly the subject of Berlin; because, as I understand it, this treaty proposal is one that Khrushchev is now vitally interested in. Why he is, I do not know; and the fact that we do not know is, I believe, one of the weaknesses of the treaty. I do not believe that the time when we can negotiate has passed. After all, the Senate plays an important part in the negotiation of any treaty. Being an important part, I do not think we should throw out our obligations and our responsibilities, and say that anything we might adopt here as a reservation would kill the treaty, and therefore we should not propose it. I know the Senator from Colorado is not implying that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not implying that, and I am happy the Senator points that out and makes the distinction. I am only trying to point out that the best psychological moment for us to have insisted on this sort of agreement would have been prior to the signing of the treaty. The things the Senator from Arizona discusses, particularly the real reason why Russia wants the treaty so badly, are things that I am sure bother all Senators. But if the Russians do want it badly—and I think they do, because they are realists, if nothing else; no matter what else we may think of the Russians, they are realists, completely and utterly, and they do nothing without having a reason for it, and without having reason to believe they will benefit from it—my only point, which I think is a valid one, is that we have passed up the strategic time to insist on this sort of withdrawal from Cuba and inspection in Cuba.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I still disagree with the Senator. I agree that at the time of the negotiations it might have been psychologically proper to have brought this question up; but I do not believe, by any means, that we have lost control of the situation. If the Senator's logic were followed, we would apply that reasoning to any reservation or any amendment which might be offered to the treaty; namely, that they should have been discussed at the time of the original negotiations.

One of the greatest strengths of our Government is the power of the Senate to have a "say" in connection with the negotiation of treaties—particularly important treaties such as this one. I think it is incumbent upon Senators who feel strongly about these matters at least to offer the Senate an opportunity to vote either up or down any changes which we honestly believe should be made in the treaty.

Mr. ALLOTT. In reply, let me say that I do not imply that the action of the Senate in this respect is similar to its action on the question of confirmation of an appointment to a Government post, such as the one pending before us this afternoon. The Founding Fathers did very well when they required a two-thirds Senate majority in order to approve a treaty. They meant that action by the Senate to be more than just a rubberstamp or a pro forma action; and I do not mean to imply that Senate approval of a treaty is only that.

But I state frankly that I am critical of the administration and of those who did this negotiating, because now that our representatives have signed the treaty—and they did so before our Foreign Relations Committee had finished its hearings, although certainly the distinguished chairman of the committee did everything he could to push these hearings rapidly; he began them at once, and worked hard, day and night—we find that even before our committee could finish the hearings, the representatives of 86 countries had signed it.

I agree that Senate approval of the treaty is not a pro forma matter.

So I think our Government—particularly this administration—fumbled the ball by not insisting on a quid pro quo of this nature before Mr. Harriman ever put his signature to the treaty in Moscow.

I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Arizona in yielding to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I detect in the Senator's proposal of a reservation a view which, I believe, is important to develop at this point, because it may arise during the debate on the treaty. Does the Senator from Arizona take this position on the theory that we should use the present situation as a means of opening up all questions in connection with the cold war, in contrast to this administration's view—and also my view as one who favors approval of the treaty—that we should regard the treaty as a first instance of an ability to agree on something, and thus utilize the precedents, the techniques, and the atmosphere which has been created to perhaps later moving into other areas?

I agree with the Senator from Arizona that the Russians favor the treaty for their own reasons, and I believe we also favor the treaty for reasons which we believe good and sufficient.

Is the Senator from Arizona really challenging the concept that this agreement on one subject will hopefully open the door to the possibility of agreements on others, or at least will test the possibility of reaching other agreements in the entire disarmament field, rather than, as the Senator has indicated, using this reservation as a means of a full-dress review of all elements and questions in connection with the cold war?

After all, if we do that, no doubt the Russians will reply, "Fine; we will agree to the reservation; but you must stop arming the West Germans and must agree that you will never arm them with atomic weapons."

I ask the Senator from Arizona to state the basic strategy behind his proposal.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The basic strategy is that the Russians have opened up this proposal again, after we proposed the same treaty 5 or 6 years ago. The Russians now seem to be keenly interested in having this treaty put into effect as it now stands.

My understanding is that those who are called upon to negotiate should really negotiate. However, in past years when our representatives at Geneva offered proposals, the Russian representatives would offer counterproposals, and thus far no agreement on the subject of disarmament has been achieved at Geneva.

Furthermore, almost a year ago Russia agreed to remove her missiles and troops from Cuba; and as late at January of this year, Russia promised to have the number of her troops in Cuba very substantially reduced by March.

Now we are considering a field in which Russia has expressed a willingness to act; but she has not done so.

I have not offered reservations about other problems in connection with the cold war, because there have not been similar indications of Russian interest in that connection.

But I feel that this reservation to the treaty would be a valid and a wise one, because I believe it would test the real interest of the Communists in the treaty; and I believe no damage will be done if the reservation is adopted and if renegotiation is required. I suggest that almost any change which the Senate might make in the language of the treaty would, in my opinion, require renegotiation.

I do not wish to see the argument raised that we should close the door to all reservations merely because the treaty is one which some Senators and large blocs of the population want.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator, as is his wont, has raised a fundamental issue: Because the forces which dictate the treaty on both sides are in nice balance, shall we make the treaty something upon which we can agree, and perhaps go on from there with the view that even if we do not, something has been accomplished? Or shall we try to negotiate the fundamental issues of the cold war based upon the fact that the door has been opened by the treaty? The Senator has posed that issue well and properly.

I happen to feel that we ought to enter into the treaty. The treaty itself is enough of a landmark to warrant our going into it on its own merits. The Senator has a contrary view; and I again say that the Senator has raised what should be, and I am sure will be, a fundamental issue which Senators will have an opportunity to debate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Unfortunately I was not present during the early part of the Senator's presentation. Do I correctly understand that it is his intention to offer a reservation with reference to removing Soviet military personnel from Cuba?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. The language that I used is as follows:

> That the effectiveness of the treaty be deferred until the U.S.S.R. has removed all nuclear weapons, all weapons capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and all military and military technical personnel from Cuba, and until arrangements have been made for international inspection within Cuba to determine and confirm such removal.

Mr. KEATING. As the Senator is aware, I have a great interest in this subject. I believe I have had as much of an interest as anyone in this Nation in insuring that Russian troops and weapons are removed from Cuba. The maintenance of an advance Soviet military, political, and economic base in Cuba is intolerable. However, the export of subversion, terrorism, and gangsterism from Cuba to other Latin American countries is on the increase. To that extent, the situation in Cuba is becoming increasingly serious.

Nevertheless, I do support the test ban treaty, as a relatively worthwhile, if modest, step, toward the lessening of international tensions. Even though I feel very strongly the need to press vigorously for withdrawal of Soviet personnel and weapons from Cuba, I would have great difficulty in supporting a specific and limiting reservation to the test ban treaty to that effect. Particularly if the word "reservation" is used in the sense of requiring a renegotiation of the entire treaty, I would oppose such an attempt although I certainly do not oppose any independent efforts made here in the Senate or anywhere else in the U.S. Government to encourage Soviet withdrawal from this hemisphere.

In any case, I will study the language proposed by the Senator. But I must say I can see that if we were to attach any such reservation to the treaty, other signatories could well stipulate conditions with regard to things which we ought to do. Such efforts might well defeat the treaty altogether.

My personal view is that it is desirable to ratify this treaty. Therefore, I am reluctant to go along with reservations which would require renegotiation of the treaty; but I do commend the Senator for his insistence that more positive and effective steps be taken to remove Soviet soldiers and weapons from Cuba.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the people of the United States will be forever in debt to the junior Senator from New York for the magnificent way in which he exposed the situation in Cuba about a year ago. I believe I speak for all Americans when I make that statement and say that we admire the Senator for what he did.

The Senator has brought up a very important part of the reasoning behind my interest in offering the reservation. In sitting through the presentation of the testimony given before the Committee on Foreign Relations, so ably conducted by its chairman, I sensed that the only political gain that we could discuss would be the so-called easing of international tensions.

Who creates international tension? Not the United States, not England, and not our allies. International tensions are created by communism. They are created by the leaders of communism in Russia. If the Russians are sincere in their desire to ease world tensions, the proposed reservation provides a specific opportunity to do so.

I would agree with the Senator that the adoption of a reservation of the kind proposed, or any reservation—or any substantial change in the proposed language, including even a definition—would require some renegotiation. But I remind the Senator and other Senators that the treaty must be ratified by the Parliament in England. It must be ratified by the ruling body in Russia. Those bodies could introduce any reservations they might see fit to offer, and we would be faced with the necessity of renegotiation.

As the senior Senator from Colorado observed earlier, the place for that kind of reservation, most assuredly, was at the conference table in Moscow. But in the instance of the failure to discuss tensions around the world and in a positive way to end them, I believe it is incumbent upon those of us in this body who feel that the reservation is an avenue to accomplish that end, to offer it, to debate it, to vote it up or down, and see what can be accomplished.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that the Senator is entirely sincere in offering his reservation. I appreciate the complimentary but undeserved remarks which he has made about me. I did not wish to leave the impression with the Senator that I felt the only desirable effect of the treaty would be a slight relief of cold war tensions. If both sides live up to the treaty—and, as the Senator knows, we have our protection in that if the other side cheats, we can withdraw at any time—it will have this other important effect in reducing atmospheric pollution. This I know is of deep concern to this country and to all those interested in the health and welfare of future generations.

The proliferation of nuclear weapons and the increased pollution of the atmosphere which can go on if we continue to test and if other countries continue to test is a matter of very deep distress throughout this country. Hopefully, the signing of a partial nuclear test ban treaty would put an end to that. I recognize that we have no complete assurance of it. I feel that that is one of the important factors, in addition to the relaxation of tensions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD rose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Montana wish to have me yield to him?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I intend to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], but before doing so I wish to tell the Senator from Arizona that I have a few comments to make on the remarks he has just completed.

I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM FRANCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I asked the majority leader to yield so that I may introduce to the Senate a group of French parliamentarians who have been accorded the courtesy of the Chamber, as is our wont. They are headed by M. Jean-Paul Palewski, a deputy in the National Assembly.

The parliamentarians, whose names I shall read to the Senate, are here as members of the Finance Committee of the National Assembly, to look into questions relating to the budget and finances of this country. They will be conferring with our Government officials in the Bureau of the Budget. They meet with the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, the Director of AID, and others. They will look into the NASA and other scientific and atomic research agencies, and will confer with the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Heller.

Mr. President, France is a longtime traditional friend of our country.

We have our problems—and they are very grave, whether they concern Europe, Vietnam, or other places in the world. Often there is great dissatisfaction, as there is now, with French policy in one direction or another. But we all know, as is true in many families, that these are our quarrels. They do not affect the fundamental strength and solidarity which will meet any effort to intrude upon either of us or both of us together.

It is in the spirit of longtime friendship, with full realization of our problems, that we welcome to our Chamber and to our Nation these brothers in arms in World Wars I and II and in the effort to win freedom for all mankind.

I have the honor to introduce to the Senate the Finance Committee of the French National Assembly, which is composed of—

M. Jean-Paul Palewski, Delegate from Seine-et-Oise, president of the Finance Committee.

M. Philippe Rivain, Delegate from Maine-et-Loire, vice president of the Finance Committee, and rapporteur of the budget for agriculture.

M. Jacques Weinman, Delegate from Doubs, secretary of the Finance Committee, and rapporteur of the budget for national education.

M. André Voisin, Delegate from Indre-et-Loire, secretary of the Finance Committee, and rapporteur for aid funds to developing countries.

M. Yvon Bourges, Delegate from Ille-et-Villaine.

M. Louis Jaillon, Delegate from Jura, rapporteur for the Legion of Honor.

M. Louis Salle, Delegate from Loiret, rapporteur for the National Printing Office.

M. Roger Souchal, Delegate from Meurthe-et-Moselle, rapporteur for the budget of the post office and telecommunciations.

All are members of the Committee on Finance of the National Chamber of France.

[As their names were read, the distinguished visitors rose in their places and were greeted with applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair extends a cordial welcome to our distinguished guests.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to join the Senator from New York in extending the greetings of the Senate to our colleagues from the Fifth French Republic.

As the Senator from New York said, France and the United States today have their problems, but the overriding concept in our relationship with France is the fact that we have had a long friendship, dating back to our revolution, and we have never forgotten the assistance which the French gave us on that occasion. Because, gentlemen, your country was in part responsible for the independence of the United States of America, we thank you deeply. We are delighted to welcome you, and we honor you for the many contributions you and your country have made to the culture and the civilization of the world.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I preface my remarks by stating that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has made some thoughtful comments on the desirability of clarification of certain points in the treaty through floor interpretations and declarations of understanding. Much of this has already been done, of course, through Presidential statements and in other official pronouncements by his duly authorized agents, and in the report of the committee.

There is always room for improvement. Further clarification may come during floor discussion, and I would hope that the Senator from Arizona would draw on his long military and legislative experience to make a contribution in this connection. I am sure that he will.

I had the opportunity to read on the ticker this morning what the Senator from Arizona was to say. I had the opportunity to listen to his speech and to read it. I would bring to the attention of the Senate some comments, which may or may not be of interest to this body.

I note that on the first page of his speech, the Senator from Arizona states:

> That obligation begins with consideration of ways in which the treaty, now riddled with doubts, can be strengthened and made acceptable beyond any doubt.

"Beyond" is underlined.

There is nothing in the world today which is beyond any doubt. Everything is doubtful. Everything is changeable. The best we can do is to try to keep up with the changes as they occur.

On the same page the Senator refers to "President Eisenhower's wise warning," which I think was taken into consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I recall to the Senate a letter dated April 13, 1959, which President Eisenhower wrote to Mr. Khrushchev, which stated:

> The United States strongly seeks a lasting agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

Note, Mr. President, the phrase "strongly seeks."

There is a question about the "ambiguous drafting" of the treaty, and the statements and that "no broadly experienced international lawyer was present * * * nor was there a military representative on hand to help assure against those disadvantages of which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken and because of which they have proposed such elaborate subsequent safeguards."

I must take exception to the implication in the Senator's remarks that there has been inadequate military or legal consideration of the treaty. Countless lawyers from the departments concerned, and countless officers from the armed services, along with diplomats, have been involved in the process of forming the treaty from the outset, which, as the Senate will recall, dates from the second administration of President Eisenhower.

The names of Arthur Dean, one of the foremost international lawyers of our times, who was used quite often by the late great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and former President Eisenhower; of James Wadsworth, who was likewise used by that administration and by this; of John McCloy, who has been used by both administrations; along with those of General Taylor and of Mr. Harriman come readily to mind. There are many, many others.

Speaking of the attitude of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe it should be brought out in no uncertain terms that, with the four safeguards which the Committee on Foreign Relations agreed to, they have come out unqualifiedly for the treaty, provided such safeguards are contained therein.

I must take strong exception to the proposal of the Senator from Arizona that there be formal reservations to the treaty. If we wish to kill the treaty, that is the best and surest way to do it. I remind Senators that more than 80 nations have already ratified the treaty.

In the course of the distinguished Senator's speech, another statement is of interest, in which he says:

> We cannot be isolationists in this nuclear world.

No truer words were ever spoken. Then the Senator says:

> The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has echoed that warning and has suggested that he will seek to have a reservation formally attached to the treaty.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana stated, after he voted in the committee against reporting the treaty, that his mind was not made up, and that if the arguments were amenable to his way of thinking during the course of the debate, he might very well vote for this treaty.

I am sure that the able Senator from Arizona has an open mind and is willing to listen to the debate on the floor of the Senate, since hearings were held over a long period of time by three committees of the Senate, in total numbering more than one-third of the Members of the Senate.

The Senator from Arizona also says the Soviets would gain from the treaty. I do not believe the Soviets would gain from the treaty. I believe if anyone gains from it, it will be this country as much as the Soviet Union. The world as a whole would gain from the treaty.

At the bottom of page 4 there is the following statement:

> Its risks cannot be justified if we are only to give in and get nothing.

It seems to me that the Senator, on the basis of his attendance at the hearings—and I know he was there, because I was there with him—should know that the editorial opinions of the vast majority of the Nation's newspapers are in favor of the treaty. Certainly he knows we will get something out of the treaty. Certainly he knows that those who have studied the treaty on both sides of the aisle, Members of both parties, have made clear the potential of the treaty, first, to eliminate the spiraling race toward an illusory "ultimate weapon."

Second, eliminate the deadly clouds of fallout that have affected the people of every country on the face of the earth.

Third, provide a means of containing the spread of superweapons to many countries which do not now have them.

If anyone has any idea that this administration exerted any kind of pressure on anyone in favor of the treaty, he ought to do a little second thinking. The question was asked in open session if any pressure were exerted. The answer was unqualifiedly, "No."

The whole premise of this treaty, as it now stands, is that it is at least as much in the interests of the people of the United States as it is of the Russians or any other nation.

The whole premise of the Senator from Arizona's remarks is that we are getting the short end of the stick in this treaty. It is difficult to see how that premise can be accepted unless—

First. The Senator from Arizona feels that it is not in our interest to seek to ban those Russian tests, as well as our own, which are already a cause of gross birth malformations not unlike those produced by thalidomide and of unnecessary bone cancer and leukemia cases in this country and elsewhere, tests which, if they continue indiscriminately, could bring about a vast increase in this damage to health and to the genetic integrity of the people of the United States. If the Senator from Arizona sees no advantage to the United States in stopping Russian tests of this kind, then his premise might have some validity and his conclusions that we need reservations to the treaty might be understandable.

Further, this treaty assumes that the fears and hostilities as between ourselves and the Russians are so great that any effort to bring about a more peaceful situation must start from the humblest and the most narrow beginnings of mutual interest. But the Senator from Arizona apparently believes that we can hurry up the process, that instead of 1 stitch in time to save 9, we can take 2 and save 18, or 3 and save 27. I do not have that kind of confidence in the Russians. It would seem to me that the world will be very fortunate, indeed, if it can take this one stitch at this time and make it stick, let alone saving the 9 or the 18 or the 27.

I appreciate the Senator's eagerness for peace with the Russians and his anxiety to dissolve other problems in Russian-United States relations along with this one of limiting nuclear testing. But the Senator must know that any reservation to this treaty will require its renegotiation not only with the Soviet Union but with over 80 other nations. It is easy to see what will happen. We will ask for a reservation that the Russians withdraw from Cuba and the Russians will then ask that the United States withdraw from Greece or Turkey or Berlin or Vietnam or somewhere else. And Egypt will ask for an Israeli withdrawal from Palestine, and Israel will ask for a comparable Egyptian withdrawal, and Pakistan and India will ask for a mutual withdrawal from Kashmir. In the end, Mr. President, about half the world will ask reservations of one kind or another to the effect that the other half withdraw from the earth, and since the feeling will be mutual, we will be back where we started from—with each half urging the disappearance of the other, even though a nuclear disaster will provide for the extinction of both.

Of course it would be a wonderful thing to get the Russians out of Cuba. But I can think of no more unsatisfactory way of doing it than to assure the continuance of the assault of nuclear testing on the health of the families of the United States or to assure the continuance of the total anarchy which now prevails in the elusive search for security through unrestricted bomb testing. The reservations proposed by the Senator from Arizona would appear to me to provide this dual assurance.

The reservations sound most plausible, Mr. President, but they would not get the Russians out of Cuba. Who does not wish to get the Russians out of Cuba? Who does not wish to assure the defense of the Nation? But these reservations will do neither. The world is not that simple. And because it is not, these reservations would be—although I am sure the Senator from Arizona did not mean them that way—a mischievous toying with the health and the hopes of the people of the United States, hopes which have been sustained by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, for a saner and more mature world through curbs on nuclear testing.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. First, let me say that the bulk of the distinguished majority leader's comments are of a nature that will be thoroughly debated during the discussion of the test ban treaty. It is not my purpose today to argue the merits or demerits of my proposal. I think that can be done at the time of the presentation of the reservation; and it will be done whenever it is proper.

I wish to comment on one observation the Senator made on my remarks when I said that "Such ambiguous drafting is certainly natural and understandable inasmuch as no broadly experienced international lawyer was present." The Senator from Arizona would agree that many eminent lawyers, in both administrations, have been consulted. I used the words "was present." Nor was there a military representative on hand. I would be more critical of that than I would be of the lack of international lawyers. There was present, I believe, a military representative from the Judge Advocate General's Office, but he was not a man well versed in military weapons, tactics, and so forth. I believe the Senator from Montana was present in the committee hearing when this was brought out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think he was present also when I asked the Secretary of Defense if he had discussed the proposed treaty with all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He assured me he had. The Senator will remember that later General LeMay, in answer to a straight question, said it had never been discussed with him.

I do not inject that comment as a criticism against the Secretary or in support of the general. I merely wish to strengthen my point that there is grave military concern over this matter that will be very well expressed in the report now completed by the Preparedness Subcommittee, which will be out on Monday, a report which I believe every Senator should read, because it approaches this question from the military side and purposely avoids the political side.

I said the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has echoed that warning. I merely go on what I read in the press, that he was interested in introducing such a reservation.

The matters which the Senator has brought up are good subjects which must be thrashed out on the floor. I believe that all Senators owe it to the country to be present in the Senate during the debate. The report of the Preparedness Subcommittee makes no recommendation. The committee states that the decision is up to the minds of Senators themselves. I believe that when Senators have heard all sides discussed, they will be able to vote intelligently.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. He has made a contribution, and in the debate the subject will be discussed in more detail.

Also, if the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee is as good as its report on Cuba, which was issued a few months ago, and which I thought was an extremely good report, it likewise will be a distinct contribution.

I did not mean to imply that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said he might not bring up a reservation. All I wished to say was that he had indicated that he had not definitely made up his mind, and that he would wait until all the evidence was in, and then would make his decision.

So far as the military chiefs of staff not being present in the negotiations is concerned, I remind my colleagues in the Senate that our Government is a government of civilians; that, as far as the military are concerned, they are present to give advice and counsel, but not to make policy; they are present to carry out orders.

I would refer my colleagues to the last speech made by President Eisenhower, which was one of his great speeches, before he voluntarily retired from office, and in which he raised a warning flag about some of these matters, which would seem to indicate that the military under certain conditions, along with industry, might have too much to say in the plans of this country, and which I would hope all Senators, regardless of party, would take to heart.

I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arizona. He always makes a contribution. I know personally that he is deeply worried about the treaty and its implications. I know personally that he still has an open mind in consideration of the treaty, debate on which will begin next Monday, and which will continue for some time.

I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that the treaty will not be rushed through. Every Member of the Senate will have an opportunity to speak, and every side will be heard. At the conclusion of the debate every Senator in his own conscience will have to make up his own mind and render his own decision and make his own report to his own people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the address of the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I spoke to him a few moments ago in the hope that he might be able to remain in the Chamber while I made these remarks, because it is common courtesy in the Senate that when one disagrees with a colleague, he should at least notify the colleague and give him an opportunity to be present for whatever purpose of debate or discussion may be desired.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona is considerate and polite. He told me he had another appointment at this particular time and that we might discuss this question when it was possible for him to be in the Chamber later. I showed him my statement, so that the record might be clear, and said I had released the statement to the press; felt a moral obligation to make it in the Senate. Therefore, I make the following remarks:

The Senator from Arizona has presented today reservations to the nuclear test ban treaty. Those reservations, if they were to be adopted by the Senate—as I am sure they will not be—would require a renegotiation of the treaty. A renegotiation of the treaty at this stage of international relations would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. This has been explained in detail to the Foreign Relations Committee. Therefore, I consider the reservation proposed by the Senator from Arizona to be ill-timed, ill-considerate, and illogical. I consider that the proposed reservation does not represent constructive policy but, rather, political mischief. It would wreck the nuclear test ban treaty and would result in a staggering setback to the United States internationally. I am confident that the Senate and the American people will reject this or any other crippling reservation to the treaty.

The basis and purpose of the nuclear test ban are clear: To prevent the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. It is a simple, direct, concise, short treaty. There are no tie-ins, no hidden agreements, no secret understandings, no gimmicks. The treaty is what it is.

I know of no document that has received such exhaustive hearings, testimony, and scrutiny as this treaty. I am confident, as a result of the hearings and of the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations in reporting the treaty favorably to the Senate by a vote of 16 to 1, that the treaty will receive overwhelming ratification.

Linking Cuba and the test ban issues together would achieve neither of our present aims: neither the ratification of the treaty nor the reduction of Russian military activity in Cuba.

The presence of troops in Cuba is serious. It is a matter that requires our constant attention, vigilance, and action. The President has made it unmistakably clear to Chairman Khrushchev and to the Government of the Soviet Union that we consider this to be a serious situation, one to which we will give our constant attention—indeed, every effort of our diplomacy. The President has made that purpose equally clear to the American people.

However, the intelligence reports of the last 6 months have confirmed a downward trend in the number of Soviet troops in Cuba, and our constant pressure on the Soviet Union on this issue is producing results.

The only result that I can see from the reservation that has been proposed by the Senator from Arizona would be to negate what we have tried to do and have been doing, and to make it ever more difficult to accomplish any satisfactory result.

The administration will continue to insist upon a total withdrawal of Soviet military personnel in Cuba—not only personnel, but equipment, as well.

But the test ban treaty stands on its own feet. We are not trying to negotiate an international diplomatic smorgasbord. The treaty has a specific, clear-cut, limited purpose. It is known as a limited test ban treaty. The treaty does not inhibit our ability to press toward the solution of other outstanding international problems. The contrary is true. In fact, one of the political achievements or political benefits of the treaty would be to make possible a rational discussion of international issues that concern the world today.

The successful negotiation with the Soviet Union on the treaty and approval by the Senate of the treaty will open up, I repeat, the possibility for rational discussion of other major international issues.

Rejection of the treaty—which I cannot contemplate as a possibility—would so poison the international atmosphere that substantial progress on other international issues would be impaired for years to come. If we desire both progress toward peace with justice and freedom and the removal of Soviet influence in Cuba, we should reject this proposed reservation. I am confident that we will do so.

Mr. President, I notice that the able Senator from Arizona mentioned in his speech—of which I have a copy; and I have studied very carefully—the fact that "no broadly experienced international lawyer was present, on our behalf, during the drafting."

Mr. President, the treaty was not drafted in Moscow. It was drafted right here in the United States of America. Our representative took the draft of the treaty to Moscow. For example, the withdrawal provisions of this treaty are the result of the requests, the suggestions, and the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Furthermore, I know of no more able international person and diplomat than the distinguished Under Secretary of State, Averell Harriman, whose record of international service is unequaled by that of any other man in the United States—and, indeed, I should say it is unequaled by that of any other man in the world.

Although Mr. Harriman is not a lawyer, he has had a very successful life in business, in finance, in railroading, in government, in politics, and in international service. Mr. Harriman was our negotiator at Moscow, and no man in the United States is better acquainted with the Soviet Union and with the devious tactics of Soviet diplomats than is he. He is one in whom we can place our trust. Why would he wish to deceive anyone? He has lived a full life, and today he is giving again to his country of his great talents and resources.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear for the record the fact that an international lawyer was present during the drafting of the treaty here in the United States. Many were present; many were present in our State Department and in the President's office; and although a lawyer was not present at Moscow, we did have there a man seasoned in international diplomacy—one Averell Harriman; and I suggest that he is a match for any international lawyer. In fact, he did not achieve success in this world by being stupid or by being fooled. He achieved his position of respect, responsibility, and success by being intelligent, by being able, and by being persuasive.

The next point made was that "nor was there a military representative on hand to help assure against those disadvantages of which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken, and because of which they have proposed such elaborate subsequent safeguards."

Mr. President, I was in attendance at most of the hearings, and I have read the transcripts of those I could not attend, beacuse this treaty is the most serious business to come before the Senate in many years, and every Senator has an obligation to read every line of these hearings.

Who spoke for the military? I know we can find, here or there, a general who is opposed to the treaty, but I submit that the chain of command needs to be respected. And in this instance the chain of command puts at the top the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is General Taylor.

On page 296 of the hearings, we find the following colloquy, in which I was a participant:

> Senator Humphrey. First of all, I would gather that the Joint Chiefs were consulted in reference to this treaty, is that correct?
>
> General Taylor. That is correct, sir.
>
> Senator Humphrey. The Joint Chiefs made certain recommendations to the President and to the Committee of Principals relating to this treaty?
>
> General Taylor. This treaty or one very similar to it, as you know, has been before us for about a year. So in the course of the last year, since last year, a year ago last summer, to the present time, we have made many comments bearing on the treaty.
>
> Senator Humphrey. So that the record may be clear on this point, General, it was testified to here that there were no representatives of the Joint Chiefs in Moscow with Mr. Harriman, but there was a representative of the Defense Department. My question is, Were the instructions that Mr. Harriman received from the President of the United States and the Secretary of State based upon consultations and discussions that had been held with the Joint Chiefs as well as with other members of the administration?
>
> General Taylor. Under Secretary Harriman's directive was sent to the Joint Chiefs in draft form some time—I would say, 2 days perhaps—before the meeting of the National Security Council on July 9. We discussed it in detail in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I carried to the discussion table at the White House the views of the Joint Chiefs on that particular point.
>
> Senator Humphrey. So that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State were privileged to have the consultation, the advice, and counsel of the Joint Chiefs on the draft treaty proposal?
>
> General Taylor. They had had this draft treaty proposal almost a year, and they had made numerous comments in the meantime.
>
> When the Harriman mission was proposed we actively participated in drawing up his directive. Then during the discussions in Moscow, the negotiations, all the cable traffic was made available to the Chairman, who made the necessary extracts and reported daily to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
>
> Senator Humphrey. So that during Mr. Harriman's negotiations in Moscow you, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, were kept fully informed?
>
> General Taylor. Fully informed; yes, sir.
>
> Senator Humphrey. Were your associates in the Joint Chiefs kept informed by you?
>
> General Taylor. Indirectly by me; yes, sir.
>
> Senator Humphrey. So that the details of negotiations, insofar as the cables revealed them, were made available to you and by you, in turn, to your associates?
>
> General Taylor. That is right, sir; and we had the opportunity at any time to intervene had we thought that the course of negotiations was not on the right track.
>
> Senator Humphrey. Did at any time you as Chairman or any of the Joint Chiefs object or oppose the consummation of this treaty?
>
> General Taylor. Not in the final form. I saw nothing objectionable to oppose.
>
> Senator Humphrey. Before the treaty was initialed were you aware of its details?
>
> General Taylor. Yes, sir; by the cables.
>
> Senator Humphrey. By cable?
>
> General Taylor. Yes.
>
> Senator Humphrey. Did you find the treaty as initialed on balance in the interests of the United States?
>
> General Taylor. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator Humphrey. Serving the interests of the United States?
>
> General Taylor. Yes, sir; in the terms of the statement which I read at the outset.

Mr. President, what does that colloquy reveal? It reveals the stage at which the treaty was drafted, here in the United States—not in Moscow. It reveals that there was full consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

What else does it reveal? It reveals that during the discussions in Moscow, there were daily cables from our negotiator, who was operating under instructions from the President of the United States; that those daily cables were given to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and were discussed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was in constant touch with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, insofar as advice and counsel relating to the negotiations were concerned.

So I repeat that when the hearings are read, all the doubts and all the ifs, ands, and buts that will be raised about the treaty will be found to have been referred to, re-referred to, and answered a dozen times.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the Senate debate on the treaty in its full context will be one of the most enlightening experiences in many a generation for the American people.

I welcome the debate next week. It will afford an opportunity to review the formulation of our foreign policy relating to the security of the United States and to review our relationships with the Soviet Union, the Iron Curtain areas, our allies, and to have a better understanding of what the treaty is all about.

Mr. President, the treaty would not cure arthritis. It would not cure diabetes. It would not meet the problem of the common cold. The treaty is not designed to answer the difficulties in Berlin. It does not relate directly to the problems in Cuba, nor would it answer the problem of unemployment in the United States or the obsolescence of old machinery.

The treaty is directed toward nuclear testing. That is its limited specific purpose. To the credit of the President and his chief negotiator, Mr. Harriman, that purpose was kept in mind at all times. It should be well understood that the problems between ourselves and the Soviet Union are so deep, so complex, so intricate, and so important that the immediate solution of those problems is impossible. What we must hope is that we can preserve the world in one piece and keep it from blowing up and burning itself into ashes, so that man may use his reason and his sense of judgment to find answers to these almost impossible and difficult problems that are before us.

In the conversations with Mr. Khrushchev which were held in Moscow, to which some of us were privileged to listen, Mr. Khrushchev himself made clear that our problems are as hard and as difficult as a mighty oak. Mr. Khrushchev said, "You do not chop down that oak with one stroke. You have to chop at it."

He made clear that there would be no easy answers, and any man in his right mind knows that. I only hope and pray to God Almighty that we might be able to survive as a people and as a democracy so that we can find the answers, and so that we can pursue the process of peace.

I wish every Senator and every citizen of the United States would read President Kennedy's speech at American University. President Kennedy laid before us the process of peace. Peace is not something that we can reach out and get. It is something that we must work for, sacrifice for, and plan for. We must seek to create. That requires time. If the treaty should do nothing but buy some time, it would be worthwhile, just as our defense through our massive deterrent has bought time. We need time for the forces of nature, change, and for human reasons—and perhaps for some good luck—to work to the advantage of mankind for the preservation of the civilization that is ours.

I hope Senators realize that we have it within our power to destroy civilization, to cremate all of us, to end everything that we ever worked and lived for as creatures created in the image of their Maker. We can destroy all, and we can do it now.

What is the treaty about? It is an effort to prevent such destruction. As the able and distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], said yesterday in a brilliant and definitive speech, it is a little light in the darkness of despair. It is merely a little opening in the black cloud that hangs over the earth that can mean death to all, and if not death, at least great tragedy. Thank God we have the opportunity to kindle this little light. The Senator from Minnesota will not snuff it out by saying, "Perhaps we ought to shorten the candle. Perhaps we ought to tamper with it. Perhaps we ought to do this or to do that." Let us hope that somehow or other the treaty can lead toward a better understanding and a better world. I do not know whether it will, but I shall not be guilty of being its assassin.

What the world needs today is not more doubters. We need some advocates. We need people with faith, and not merely people with despair and hopelessness.

We need hope, not merely fear and the expression of concern.

I shall be an advocate. I realize the risks of being an advocate. It is much safer politically to be a doubter. Then, if things go wrong, one can say to his constituents, "I was one of those who expressed concern. I was present in the Senate, and I told Senators that the situation might get out of hand, that Khrushchev might cheat."

With that attitude one could report back to his constituents and be safer.

But the world needs people who are not doubters. We need people who will advocate a firm position.

[Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate prohibit demonstrations in the gallery.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota. Though the rules of the Senate prohibit demonstrations in the gallery, it is only fair to say that the spontaneous applause was a deserved tribute to the eloquent speech of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has exposed the whole picture, with an eloquence which is characteristic of him, but which I have seldom seen him exceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

REGISTRATION OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES AS STAFF OFFICERS IN THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the pending bill is about as noncontroversial as any measure which has ever been brought before the Senate. Nurses serve in professional capacities. However, under existing circumstances, aboard ships of the merchant marine, they are still classified in the same status as oilers and wipers. The bill would remove them from that status and register them as professional nurses.

It is true that some testimony was given before the committee on this subject which was not in complete agreement with the objectives of the bill, but it was a very slight difference. The bill was unanimously reported.

If enacted into law, as I trust it will be, the nurses serving on ships of the U.S. merchant marine will have professional status, and have that status recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the United States merchant marine, and for other purposes."

APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 452, H.R. 5623.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 5623), to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 46, line 10, to strike " "for temporary service." " and insert " "for temporary service"."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, very briefly, the bill is designed to place the Coast Guard in the same situation as the Navy and Marine Corps. They are now struggling with the so-called officer hump. During World War II many officers came into the service, and the situation now is that unless the bill is enacted there will be inadequate opportunity for many officers of the lower rank to advance. The years multiply before a man can advance to the rank of lieutenant junior grade from ensign, and from lieutenant to lieutenant commander, and so forth.

The bill is in two parts. The first part would give the Coast Guard authority for a 3-year period to make such retirements as seem desirable and necessary.

The second part would establish a system whereby promotion would be according to qualifications, instead of being based exclusively, as it is now, on seniority.

There was no opposition to the bill from any source in committee. It is supported by the administration. The Coast Guard, in testifying before the Commerce Committee, made a strong case for it. The bill was reported unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 453, H.R. 6012.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 6012) to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "vessel" and insert "vessels".

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the bill is strongly supported and endorsed by the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record 6 letters on this subject and other appropriate parts of the report.

There being no objection, the excerpts and letters from the report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts and Letters Pertaining to H.R. 6012

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 6012 would authorize the President to accept, on behalf of the United States, certain regulations formulated at the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, held in London, May 17 to June 17, 1960, and to proclaim an effective date for such regulations consistent with that established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, under whose auspices the London Conference was held. The bill would require that the regulations as set forth in section 4 of the bill be published in the Federal Register, and after the date specified in the President's proclamation, that they have effect as if enacted by statute and be followed by all public and private vessels of the United States and by all aircraft of U.S. registry to the extent therein made applicable. These regulations shall not apply to the harbors, rivers, and other inland waters of the United States nor to the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as the lower exit of the St. Lambert lock at Montreal; nor to the Red River of the North and the rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico and their tributaries; nor with respect to aircraft in any territorial waters of the United States.

Section 2 of the bill would provide that requirements of such regulations in respect of number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights to be displayed by vessels shall not apply to vessels of the Navy or the Coast Guard, whenever the Secretary of the Navy or of the Treasury, or any official designated by either, shall certify that it is not possible for such vessels or class of vessels to comply with the regulations. In such event the bill would require the vessel or class of vessels to conform as closely to the requirements of the applicable regulations as is found to be feasible. Details of the character and position of lights prescribed to be displayed on such exempted vessels or class of vessels would be required to be published in the Federal Register and in the Notice to Mariners, and after the effective date specified in such notice would have effect as part of such regulations.

Section 3 of the bill would provide that, on the date the regulations authorized to be proclaimed in section 1 thereof take effect, the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), would be repealed, and the regulations prescribed thereunder would have no further force or effect. Until that date, it is provided, nothing in the bill shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any regulations for the prevention of collisions heretofore prescribed by statute, regulations, or rule.

DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

Current international regulations designed to foster safety of life at sea, were drafted in 1948, were incorporated into statutory law of the United States by the act of October 11, 1951, and have been in effect since January 1954. Fifty-three other nations, including all the major maritime countries, have accepted the 1948 international rules.

As the report of the Department of the Navy points out:

"The 1960 regulations do not constitute a radical departure from existing regulations. Rather, they restate existing regulations in modernized, strengthened, and simplified form. Perhaps the most significant change is the annex to the rules. Even this is not a radical change, since it merely describes what may be called a code of conduct for the proper use of radar under conditions of restricted visibility * * *. The annex will, however, serve a useful purpose by describing clearly and concisely what these practices are and giving them recognition in the rules."

The annex deals with recommendations on the use of radar information as an aid to avoiding collisions at sea: It cautions against assumptions made on scanty information, warns that small vessels, small icebergs, and similar floating objects may not be detected by radar, and advises that radar indications of one or more vessels in the vicinity may mean that "moderate speed" should be slower than a mariner without radar might consider moderate in the circumstances.

Generally the proposed changes in rules are for the purpose of updating the requirements. They are designed to make for better understanding by mariners, and for greater safety in the navigation of vessels.

A new rule, 16(c) would require more careful navigation by a vessel which detects another vessel beyond visual or audible range. Another change would bar vessels under 65 feet in length and sailing craft from hampering the safe passage in narrow channels of larger vessels which cannot maneuver easily.

The procedure of formulation and submission to the Congress for authorization of the President to proclaim the regulations is the same as used for the adoption of the currently effective regulations which were prepared at the Conference on Safety of Life at Sea in 1948.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 8, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to authorize the President to proclaim the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, on or after a date established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The proposed regulations were formulated at the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, which met under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization at London, England, from May 17 to June 17, 1960. This Conference was held with the objective of drafting a convention which would reflect the technical progress in navigation and shipbuilding since 1948, particularly as regards radar and nuclear vessels, and to consider needed changes to existing rules. The Conference decided not to annex to the Convention the revised international regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Instead, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) was invited to forward the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, to the governments which have accepted the present regulations. The Conference also invited IMCO, when substantial unanimity has been reached as to the acceptance of the revised regulations, to fix a date on and after which they shall be applied by the governments which have agreed to accept them. IMCO was requested to give not less than 1 year's notice of this date to the governments of all states. (Final Act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960; S. Doc. Ex. K, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 9–11).

Pursuant to the proposed bill the President would be authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, the revised international regulations and to proclaim an effective date, so far as the United States is concerned, consistent with that established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Existing regulations for preventing collisions involving watercraft upon the high seas, and in all waters connected therewith would be repealed upon the coming into effect of the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, when proclaimed by the President. However, the proposed bill would not repeal or otherwise change existing navigation rules applicable to harbors, rivers, inland waters of the United States, the Great Lakes of North America, or the Red River of the North and the rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico.

Section 1 of the proposed bill would authorize the President, on behalf of the United States, to proclaim the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960, on or after the date fixed by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization for application of such regulations by governments which have agreed to accept them. Such regulations shall thereafter have effect as if enacted by statute, and shall be followed by all public and private vessels of the United States and by all aircraft of U.S. registry to the extent therein made applicable. However, they shall not apply to waters of the United States governed by the inland rules, the Great Lakes rules, or the western rivers rules, nor shall they apply to aircraft on any territorial waters of the United States.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would reenact the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 11, 1951, 65 Stat. 406, in order to retain the authority of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt vessels of the Navy and Coast Guard, respectively, from application of regulations pertaining to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of navigational lights, whenever the special construction of such vessels makes it impossible to comply with such regulations.

Section 3 of the proposed bill provides for the repeal of the act of October 11, 1951, on the date the regulations authorized to be proclaimed by the present bill become effective. In effect this would repeal the existing international rules for preventing collisions at sea, 1948, as of that date.

Section 4 of the proposed bill sets forth verbatim the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1960 (annex E to the final act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960).

It may be noted in passing that the revised regulations are a substantial improvement in many respects over those now in force, and that no changes were made which may be considered as degrading any rule from the standpoint of safety of navigation. The most significant change made concerned conduct in restricted visibility. A new rule 16(c) was adopted to provide for safe navigation by a vessel which detects another vessel outside of visual or audible range. Though not mentioning radar specifically, this rule—when considered together with the preliminary paragraphs to part C and the annex to the entitled "Recommendations on the Use of Radar Information as an Aid To Avoiding Collisions at Sea"—resolves several important questions which presently exist concerning a vessel navigating with the aid of radar.

Other changes of interest are: Vessels are defined by their length rather than by tonnage; the use of a white light synchronized with prescribed whistle signals is permitted; requirements for special lights for ships unable to get out of the way of approaching vessels because of the nature of their work were extended to ships replenishing at sea and ships engaged in the launching or recovery of aircraft; a new provision was added concerning lights and shapes for minesweeping vessels; rule 17, the sailing rule, was rewritten so as to cover two instead of three situations, as follows: (a) When each vessel has the wind on a different side, the one which has the wind on the port side shall keep out of the way of the other and (b) when both vessels have the wind on the same side, the one which is to windward shall keep out of the way of the one which is to leeward; rule 22 was strengthened to require that a vessel which is directed by these rules to keep out of the way of another vessel shall, so far as possible, take positive early action to comply with this obligation; a new rule was added requiring that in a narrow channel a power-driven vessel of less than 65 feet in length shall not hamper the safe passage of a vessel which can navigate only inside such channel; a requirement that a tug and tow carry a prescribed shape in daylight was adopted; specific authorization was provided for the permissive use of navigation lights in daylight in restricted visibility; a definition of "engaged in fishing" was added to include fishing with nets, lines, or trawls but not fishing with trolling lines; and the permissive use of colored masthead identity lights by sailing vessels was authorized.

A rule-by-rule analysis of those rules in which the 1960 conference made changes and a parallel-column print of the present rules and the revised international rules are attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your request for comment on H.R. 6012, an act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, has been assigned to this Department by the Secretary of Defense for the preparation of a report thereon expressing the views of the Department of Defense.

The purpose of H.R. 6012 is to authorize the President to proclaim the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1960, on or after a date established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The 1960 regulations do not constitute a radical departure from existing regulations. Rather, they restate existing regulations in modernized, strengthened, and simplified form. Perhaps the most significant change is the annex to the rules. Even this is not a radical change, since it merely described what may be called a code of conduct for the proper use of radar under conditions of restricted visibility. Prudent mariners have been following these practices for years. The annex will, however, serve a useful purpose by describing clearly and concisely what these practices are and giving them recognition in the rules.

The Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, strongly supports the enactment of H.R. 6012.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report on H.R. 6012 for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. KEAR, Jr.,
Captain, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief
(For the Secretary of the Navy).

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in reply to your request for the views of this Department with respect to S. 1459, a bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the President to proclaim the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1960, on or after a date established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The proposed regulations were formulated at the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, which met under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization at London, England, from May 17 to June 17, 1960. This Conference was held with the objective of drafting a convention which would reflect the technical progress in navigation and shipbuilding since 1948, particularly as regards radar and nuclear vessels, and to consider needed changes to existing rules. The Conference decided not to annex to the convention the revised International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea. Instead, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) was invited to forward the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1960, to the governments which have accepted the present regulations. The Conference also invited IMCO, when substantial unanimity has been reached as to the acceptance of the revised regulations, to fix a date on and after which they shall be applied by the governments which have agreed to accept them. IMCO was requested to give not less than 1 year's notice of this date to the governments of all states (final act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960; S. Doc. Ex. K, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 9–11).

The bill would authorize the President to accept, on behalf of the United States, the revised international regulations and to proclaim an effective date, so far as the United States is concerned, consistent with that established by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Existing regulations for preventing collisions involving watercraft upon the high seas, and in all waters connected therewith would be repealed upon the coming into effect of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1960, when proclaimed by the President. However, the bill would not repeal or otherwise change existing navigation rules applicable to harbors, rivers, inland waters of the United States, the Great Lakes of North America, or the Red River of the North and the rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico.

Section 2 of the bill would reenact the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406), in order to retain the authority of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt vessels of the Navy and Coast Guard, respectively, from application of regulations pertaining to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of navigational lights, whenever the special construction of such vessels makes it impossible to comply with such regulations.

Section 3 of the bill provides for the repeal of the act of October 11, 1951, on the date the regulations authorized to be proclaimed by the present bill become effective. In effect this would repeal the existing International Rules for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1960, as of that date. References in other laws to the act of October 11, 1951, would be deemed to be references to the new legislation.

Section 4 of the bill sets forth verbatim the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1960 (annex B to the International Convention of Safety of Life at Sea, 1960).

In summary, the bill proposes approval by the Congress of International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea which were considered and endorsed by the U.S. delegation to the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960.

The Department believes that the proposed revisions would benefit transportation at sea and accordingly recommends enactment of S. 1459.

The Bureau of the Budget advised there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE JONES
(For Robert E. Giles).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 14, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 9, 1963, enclosing for the comment of the Department of State a copy of S. 1459, a bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The Department of State wishes to express its support of the bill. The revision of the regulations for prevention of collisions was formulated by the Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1960. Representatives of the United States participated in the work of revision and the decision of the Conference to submit the revised rules for consideration by the governments which have accepted the present rules. The Conference also invited the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, when substantial unanimity has been reached as to acceptance of the revised rules, to fix a date on and after which they shall be applied by the governments which have accepted them. Enactment of S. 1459 will permit submission of notice of acceptance by the United States. The procedure of formulation and submission to the Congress for authorization of the President to proclaim the regulations is the same as used for the adoption of the currently effective regulations which were prepared at the Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1948.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

THE GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, August 19, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 6012, a bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

Except for minor technical changes which are acceptable to the Department, H.R. 6012 is identical to a draft bill which the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on April 8, 1963. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which was explained in more detail in the letters of transmittal, is to authorize the President to proclaim the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea which were approved by the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Navigation at Sea, 1960. These regulations, which have received the approval of 15 nations to date, would replace the 1948 international rules which were approved by a similar conference and which were incorporated into the statutory law of this country by the act of October 11, 1951 (65 Stat. 406). The proposed bill would not affect existing navigation rules applicable to the inland waters of the United States, the Great Lakes of North America, or rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico.

The Department urges early and favorable consideration of the proposed legislation by your committee.

Prior to the transmittal of the proposed legislation to the Congress, the Department was advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there was no objection to its submission from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

G. D'ANDELOT BELIN,
General Counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6012) was read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION RECORDS CONCERNING GOV. GEORGE C. WALLACE, OF ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have read in this morning's press that the senior Senator from Oregon is not one of the favorites of the Governor of Alabama. I wish to make it clear that a mutuality of disrespect exists between the two persons concerned. My record will speak for itself.

I say, most respectfully, that, in my judgment, Khrushchev does not have a more effective ally in the United States than the Governor of Alabama, because the course of action that the Governor of Alabama is following against human rights is typical of Communist strategy.

However, I have been informed from several sources this morning that the

Governor of Alabama has raised some question concerning the psychiatric soundness of mind of the senior Senator from Oregon. I am perfectly willing to let my record on that score speak for itself. But I would have the Record at this time show the following information:

Official records concerning the Governor of Alabama will show that Governor Wallace entered active military service on October 20, 1942, and was honorably discharged on December 8, 1945, with the grade of sergeant in the Army Air Corps. His military specialty was that of flight engineer, with nine combat missions completed in B–29's—a brilliant military record of dedicated service to his country.

He participated in the offensive against Japan and earned the Air Medal plus Area and Good Conduct Medals.

During service, he was hospitalized from April 1, 1943, to June 3, 1943, for acute cerebral spinal meningitis. He was also hospitalized in September 1945 for severe anxiety state, chronic, manifested by tension states, anxiety attacks, anorexia, and loss of weight. It does not appear that he was disciplined for any infractions while in service.

He filed claim for compensation in June 1946 and in December 1946 was granted service-connected disability for psychoneurosis, for which an evaluation of 10 percent was assigned.

He was last examined by the VA in November 1956 when he gave his age as 37, and stated he was married, had three children, and was occupied as a circuit judge. He was tense, restless, and ill at ease, frequently drummed the desk with his fingers, changed position frequently, sighed occasionally, and showed a tendency to stammer, resulting in the diagnosis of anxiety reaction. The 10-percent rating was continued.

His accreditive representative is the American Legion.

Since Governor Wallace has not been examined since November 1956 it would seem to be appropriate for him to volunteer to be examined at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ashton C. Barrett, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the confirmation of the nomination?

Mr. GRUENING. There is.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there is objection. I only wish that I might be here supporting the nomination of Mr. Ashton C. Barrett instead of opposing it. But based upon the evidence, presented during 2 days of hearings before the Commerce Committee, to which the nomination of Mr. Barrett for another term on the Federal Maritime Commission was sent by the President, I cannot agree with the majority of that committee that confirmation should follow.

The individual views expressed by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], are set forth in Executive Report No. 2 as are my individual views on this nomination.

Mr. President, Mr. Barrett testified before the committee on July 12 and again on July 19 of this year. The record of hearings has been printed. The transcript of the hearings constitutes a rather remarkable document in many ways. It deserves the reading of every Senator.

Mr. Barrett is a resident of Mississippi. He was warmly supported by my two friends the Senators from that State [Mr. Eastland and Mr. Stennis]. They recommended him highly. I know him to be a gracious gentleman, a kind gentleman, and a very real gentleman. My objection is only based on the ground that I do not believe he is qualified for the position for which he was named. I think the evidence on that score is amply set forth in the printed record of the hearings.

My colleague [Mr. Gruening] and I have a very special interest in the operations of the Federal Maritime Commission because of its close association with the economic life of Alaska.

I dare say that interest is fully shared by the present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], whose beautiful islands are likewise served, insofar as the carriage of freight is concerned, almost exclusively by water.

For many years we of Alaska, have, despite our very best efforts, been subjected to a long series of what we consider to be, and what we believe can be demonstrated from the record to be, wrongful rulings from the Federal Maritime Commission and its predecessors.

It is not so much that I desire now to launch an attack on Mr. Barrett. That I do not wish to do. I merely say that year in and year out, whatever administration may have been in office, it failed to staff the Commission, or Board, or whatever it might have been at the time, because the title has changed quite frequently, with persons qualified to assume and meet the responsibilities thrust upon them.

All too often this regulatory agency, whose chief purpose and function ought to be serving the public, has instead, been the faithful servant of the industry which it was supposed to regulate.

On all waterborne movements along or between the coasts of the lower 48 States, the commerce is under the regulatory control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is only with respect to the so-called offshore areas, in addition to foreign shipping, that the Federal Maritime Commission holds sway; and I use that phrase advisedly.

It is with respect to Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Alaska that waterborne commerce is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Only recently a new chairman, John Harllee, was installed in the Federal Maritime Commission. It is my hope—indeed, it is my expectation—that from this day on there will be greater recognition of the public interest or public concern and less recognition of the interests of the industry served. I hope this will not be interpreted as a personal criticism directed solely at Mr. Stakem, the first Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

I point out that since 1950 there has been a cumulative maritime rate increase for Hawaii of 126.9 percent. This is in a period of 13 years. For Alaska, for most areas there has been a cumulative rate increase of 72 percent. But a postscript needs to be added, because for western Alaska the increase has been on the level of 89.2 percent.

I am neither prepared nor equipped to say that the rates are wrong. I know they have been hurtful. I believe the increases have been too frequent and too many. There is some evidence to point this up.

We all know that the inflationary process has been in active progress since 1950. That being so, the rate for waterborne commerce carried between the Pacific coast and Atlantic coast should have been increased at the same comparative levels as has been true for Hawaii and Alaska. Has that been so? Indeed it has not been.

For example, in the category of drugs and medicines I discovered from the figures furnished by the Interstate Commerce Commission that the rate per hundred pounds in 1953 was $2.27, and by 1963 that rate had gone up only 3 cents.

The rate for hardware in 1953 was $1.61 per hundred pounds. Now the rate is $2.03.

In the area of canned and preserved foodstuffs, a much more significant item in terms of tonnage, in 1953 the rate was $1.37 per hundred pounds. There are two rates in 1963. One is $1.48; and on pallets it is exactly 1 cent more than 10 years ago.

It is interesting to learn, from material supplied by the Federal Maritime Commission, that often the rate per ton for waterborne freight is cheaper from Seattle, Wash., to Yokohama, Japan, than to Alaska ports, and this has no reference whatsoever to the rail export-import rate. This is true despite the fact that Japan is approximately 4,300 miles and Seward, Alaska is only 1,300 miles from Seattle, Wash.

Although I believe the nomination of Mr. Barrett should not have been made, and although I oppose it, it is not my purpose to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. My understanding is that my colleague from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] does not propose to make such a request, either.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I join my colleague in the expression of his views. We are not here at this time to try to defeat the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Barrett. We testified before the committee. The committee reported the nomination favorably. We realize it would be a useless effort to go further.

But I think it is important that the record be made. A record of it was so well made, in a very inoffensive manner, by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], whose individual views made no mention of the Commissioner whose nomination is before the Senate for confirmation, but who spoke up for the necessity of appointing qualified persons to the regulatory commissions.

The difficulty is not with the character or personality of Mr. Barrett. He is an estimable gentleman. He is kindly and well thought of. He has been a successful businessman in his community. No personal feelings enter into the views which my colleagues and I express. But, unfortunately, he is not qualified. He testified that he had had no previous experience whatever in maritime matters. The hope was that in the 18 months in which he had served, he would have acquired some knowledge and experience in that field. The report of the committee brought in by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] stated that the nomination of Mr. Barrett was unanimously confirmed by the Senate 18 months ago; that he had been a successful businessman and civic leader, with every indication that he would be a satisfactory and constructive Commissioner. Since then he has gained knowledge and experience from his service on the Commission.

Unfortunately, Mr. Barrett's own response to the questions bears out the very opposite—not only that he did not learn, but that he did not try to learn. I quote from a part of the individual views of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT].

> Mr. Ashton C. Barrett presented himself before the Commerce Committee on July 12 and 19 of this year. During the first day of the hearing, Mr. Barrett stated that he had been in the clothing business, the cleaning business, and the laundry business and in the real estate business, but that he had had no previous experience or association, directly or indirectly, with the martime business.

Here is the pertinent part, which indicates that not only did he not learn, but that he made no serious effort to learn and acquire the knowledge which it was hoped he would acquire in order to become knowledgeable and acquire the information needed to become a good commissioner:

> When the appointees to the newly established Federal Maritime Commission, including Mr. Barrett, first came before the committee in February 1962, their attention was called to four serious problem areas and the committee was assured by Commission members that action on each either was being taken or would promptly be taken. During the hearings on July 12 and 19 of this year, Mr. Barrett was confronted with these earlier pledges and was asked what action he and his fellow commissioners had taken with reference to them. His answers were manifestly unsatisfactory. In some instances he revealed a total lack of familiarity with both the pledges—

Solemn pledges made at the beginning of his services—

> and the problem areas which they covered. In a few instances where he displayed an understanding of the problems, he could do no more than indicate that the pledges had not been fulfilled—indeed, that some were no nearer to fulfillment than they had been in Feburary of 1962.
>
> The commissioners had promised the committee—

That is, the Commerce Committee—

> that provisions would be made in rules of the Commission whereby Governors of States would be given adequate notice under section 6 of the dual-rate law. On the first day of the hearings, Mr. Barrett was totally unfamiliar with this problem—

Although he had been a commissioner for 18 months—

> he later returned to testify that no action had been taken in this area and that none was planned.
>
> In regard to the second problem discussed in the 1962 hearings (revision of annual reports for domestic offshore carriers), Mr. Barrett reported that the Commission was still revising the form of the annual report. This is what the Chairman of the Commission said the Commission was doing in February of 1962.
>
> The third problem (need for authority to require a uniform system of accounting by domestic carriers in the offshore trade) was one with which Mr. Barrett was totally unfamiliar. Initially, Mr. Barrett stated that the Commission had authority to require a uniform system of accounting as do other regulatory agencies. This statement was retracted by Mr. Barrett when it was pointed out that the Commission in its 1962 annual report—

Which presumably he had not read, although he signed it.

Mr. Barrett, after he had made this completely incorrect statement, showing he did not know what was in the report which the Commission issued the previous year, of which he was one of the signatories, was then briefed by a member of staff and retracted that statement.

I continue to read from the individual views of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT]:

> Mr. Barrett did not acknowledge that any serious problem existed in regard to the fourth question (the need for formal notice of freight rate changes to the Governor or other principal executive officer in the offshore States, Commonwealths, and possessions served). He pointed out that formal notice was now given through tariff postings in public places. When asked to illustrate, Mr. Barrett said he thought this included posting the information in the private quarters of the captains of vessels serving the trade.

How could he possibly show more ignorance than to think that the public would be on notice by such a posting?

> The rules of the Commission actually require posting at the general office of the carrier and at the principal office at each port served. The problem of formal notice remains.

Mr. President, I do not wish to paint the lily or adorn the tale, but I think it is extremely regrettable that his friends from Mississippi felt their obligation to him was such that they wanted him to continue on the Commission. Here is a man who, after serving a year and a half on the Commission, has shown himself to be completely ignorant of the functions of the Commission. His decision in the recent Alaska rate increase case was a shocking one. It showed that he completely disregarded the evidence. It showed that he completely overturned the report of the examiner, who listened to the testimony, which showed that the Alaska Steamship Co. had been guilty of flagrant abuses, as for example, that the company had been charging private charities to the rate paying public. Other evidence was completely disregarded.

I could quote at great length the devastating testimony of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has pointed out how the Commission had allowed excessive rates on goods shipped abroad; that for the same goods, for the same service, on a ship going from New York to Hamburg, the rates are very significantly higher on goods returning from Hamburg.

The President has shown some awareness of the situation by demoting the previous Commission head, Mr. Stakem, and appointing Admiral Harllee in his place. That does not excuse individual members of the Commission; they are supposed to be knowledgeable and know what is going on. I share the hope expressed by my colleague that Admiral Harllee will be an improvement over the previous chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was amazed, in questioning Mr. Barrett when he appeared before the committee, to learn that after 16 months of service on the Commission he was uncertain as to whether the service between the mainland of the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was subsidized. I think this fact points to that which my colleague and I have sought to demonstrate—that not only was Mr. Barrett unequipped with professional knowledge when he took office, but he did not add greatly to his store of information during the year and 4 months that elapsed after he was confirmed as a member of the Commission.

I feel confident that from now on Mr. Barrett will address himself more attentively to the duties of his high office. We in the so-called offshore areas are in many respects, at the absolute mercy of the Federal Maritime Commission. If they do not treat the people of those areas, who number close to 3 million, justly, our economic life is hindered and our opportunities for development are lessened, and we are crippled in every way.

There was a time, in 1961, I believe, when we in Alaska had a faint hope, because then, for the first time, an examiner of the regulatory agency said that the increases sought by the principal steamship company should not be allowed, that they were unjust. He presented a massive record. We confidently expected that the Federal Maritime Commission would affirm those findings. We should never have had that confidence. We should have relied upon history, which was repeated.

Faced with the factual evidence accumulated by the examiner presented in his report, the Federal Maritime Commission completely disregarded his recommendations.

As my colleague from Alaska said only a few minutes ago, the examiner ruled that the steamship company could not make charitable donations to this organization, that organization, or any other organization, and charge such donations to the people of Alaska as an expense.

That finding was made by the examiner. Most regulatory agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, do not allow carriers to include such charitable contributions as an expense. What did the Federal Maritime Commission do when it said the Alaska rate increases were justified? It said the steamship company was privileged to make charitable donations and include them as an expense item.

If that is regulation in behalf of the public, we need a complete shift in the Commission. It is intolerable that such administration should be allowed.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had members of the Maritime Commission before his subcommittee not long ago, in a series of hearings. I testified at those hearings. It was developed then that freight rates for American goods shipped abroad competitively are in too many cases much higher than rates for like goods coming into this country. The Maritime Commission must have known something about this. I could excuse Mr. Barrett for the fact that he very candidly admitted he had never heard of it until he came before Senator DOUGLAS' subcommittee, because he, after all, had not been around so long. However, in my judgment, the Commission would never have done anything about it had not a congressional committee brought up the issue and demanded action. In my judgment, this is a sin of the Federal Maritime Commission and its predecessors.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that when this discrepancy between the outgoing freight rate and the incoming freight rate was called to Mr. Barrett's attention, he explained it by saying he thought high stevedoring rates were responsible for the difference? He thereby displayed his complete ignorance of the fact that the stevedoring rates are as high for incoming traffic as they are for outgoing traffic.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the case. I have been in Washington for quite a while, first as a Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives, and later as a Senator. However, my knowledge—and I believe it is informed knowledge—has told me that not once during that time has the maritime regulatory agency proposed a constructive action to benefit the then Territory of Hawaii and now the 50th State of the Union; nor has it done so with respect to Alaska, Puerto Rico, or any of the so-called offshore areas.

Whatever has been done, has been done only as a consequence of congressional prodding and pressures. The people downtown, the specialists, the experts, ought to come up to Congress with recommendations once in a while, and advise us, instead of having it the other way all the time. They ought not always supinely to authorize rate increases asked by industry, and ought to make prudent and careful inquiry to learn if such requests are justified.

I do not say that the maritime companies operating to the offshore areas do not have difficulties which do not confront other operators. They are not subsidized. I believe a very strong case can be made that if a subsidy is fair in one instance, it is fair in another. The 2 million people of Puerto Rico, the half million people of Hawaii, and the lesser number of people in Alaska should not be required to support a separate merchant marine. That is the present situation.

A short time ago I gave some figures which demonstrate that in the intercoastal trade, rates have changed hardly at all in the past 13 years, although they have gone up astronomically for offshore areas.

I should like to offer one further comparison. This comes from material supplied to me by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It reveals that using 100 as the base for 1950, rail rates for all commodities in 1953 were 111. In 1961 they were only 114. That is another demonstration of the fact that transportation rates have not advanced anywhere nearly as much as they have in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Alaska, and even the islands west of Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, following my remarks, table No. 4 of the ICC for the year 1961, from which I have just read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Likewise, I should like to have included a letter addressed to me by Chairman Harllee, of the Federal Maritime Commission, together with some rate comparisons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BARTLETT. These comparisons have to do with the subject I mentioned a while ago, namely, that in some cases it was cheaper to ship goods from Seattle to Yokohama than from Seattle to Seward, although the distance to Yokohama is 4,300 miles and to Seward it is only 1,300 miles.

In closing, I compliment and congratulate the chairman of the Commerce Committee for the submission of his individual views.

He said in the concluding paragraph of his individual views:

> I hope that there will be an immediate revitalization of maritime regulation which the reorganization of the Commission sought to accomplish.

I join in that statement.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE 4.—*Indexes of average freight rates by commodity groupings corresponding to Bureau of Labor statistics classification for wholesale commodity price index*

[1950=100]

Item	Index								
	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
All commodities	111	109	108	112	118	121	118	116	114
Farm products	111	111	110	112	118	120	115	113	112
Processed foods	110	109	108	111	115	115	110	108	106
Textile products and apparel	113	111	108	109	115	116	113	106	105
Hides, skins, and leather products	113	112	112	116	125	130	129	127	125
Fuel, power, and lighting materials	109	106	106	109	113	114	112	110	110
Chemicals and allied products	111	110	107	113	120	122	118	114	112
Rubber and rubber products	111	110	110	114	121	122	114	113	111
Lumber and wood products	112	112	112	116	123	127	124	124	124
Pulp, paper, and allied products	113	111	108	110	118	120	115	112	111
Metal and metal products	113	108	105	110	120	126	124	122	121
Machinery and motive products	113	113	113	118	127	134	132	131	121
Furniture and household durables	113	113	113	118	127	133	129	126	125
Nonmetallic minerals, structural	112	111	109	111	119	121	118	115	114
Tobacco manufactures and bottled beverages	111	110	105	107	113	112	107	104	102
Miscellaneous	112	112	110	115	122	125	116	113	112

EXHIBIT 2

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1963.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: In accordance with a request from your office we have prepared the attached table comparing ocean rates from Seattle, Wash., to Seward, Alaska, with rates from Seattle to Yokohama, Japan. The Seward rates are those of the Pacific Westbound Conference. Neither set of rates includes terminal charges.

Alaska Steam's tariff quotes all weight rates, whereas the conference tariff quotes rates in terms of weight or measurement, whichever yields the highest revenue to the carrier. Except for automobiles and canned goods, all commodities listed in the comparison move to Japan on a weight basis. Although some kinds of canned goods move on a weight basis and other kinds on a measurement basis, the $53.50 rate shown on the table is the lowest rate that can be charged for a ton of canned goods moving on a conference vessel to Yokohama. The automobile rates have been converted to the rate that would be charged for automobiles weighing 3,000 pounds and taking 500 cubic feet of space.

If you have any question in connection with this rate table, please do not hesitate to call upon us for clarification.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HARLLEE,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired),
Chairman.

Comparison of charges (not including terminal charges), Seattle, Wash., to Seward, Alaska, versus Seattle, Wash., to Yokohama, Japan

[Per ton of 2,000 pounds, except as noted]

Commodity	From Seattle, Wash., to—	
	To Seward, Alaska (Alaska Steamship Co.)	To Yokohama, Japan [1]
Asbestos shingles (minimum weight, 36,000 pounds)	$40.80	$41.50
Automobiles, unboxed	[2] [3] 199.50	[3] 596.00
Brick, building (minimum weight, 40,000 pounds)	31.40	33.25
Canned goods, n.o.s	34.00	[4] 53.50
Cement, building (any quantity)	26.60	24.00
Fertilizers, packed (minimum weight, 20,000 pounds)	27.20	15.76
Firebrick (minimum weight, 40,000 pounds)	31.40	33.25
Fire clay (any quantity)	26.60	33.25
Iron, steel, and other articles:		
Angles, bars n.o.s., beams:		
Minimum weight, 24,000 pounds	37.00	23.42
Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds	35.20	23.42
Concrete reinforcing bars (not bent):		
Less than carload	29.20	25.09
Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds	27.40	25.09
Welding electrodes:		
Minimum weight, 24,000 pounds	37.00	[5] 65.50
Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds	35.20	[5] 65.05
Iron, steel, and other articles—Continued		
Lead ingots:		
Minimum weight, 24,000 pounds	$37.00	$16.30
Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds	35.20	16.30
Rails:		
Minimum weight, 24,000 pounds	37.00	32.45
Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds	35.20	32.45
Sheets:		
Minimum weight, 24,000 pounds	37.00	21.52
Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds	35.20	21.52
Paints, varnishes, lacquers, in boxes (minimum weight 24,000 pounds)	40.80	57.75
Pipe, cement, containing asbestos fiber, in packages, bundles, or strapped on pallets (minimum weight, 36,000 pounds)	33.00	(6)
Tile, facing or flooring, clay or earthen, in packages (minimum weight, 36,000 pounds)	33.00	62.50
Wire or cable, copper, lead-covered (minimum weight, 30,000 pounds)	40.80	49.25

---

[1] Contract any quantity rates.

[2] Per automobile; $6.65 per 100 pounds. Based on an average automobile of 3,000 pounds and 500 cubic feet.

[3] Per automobile; $47.75 per ton of 40 cubic feet. Based on an average automobile of 3,000 pounds and 500 cubic feet.

[4] Some canned goods are dense enough to take a weight rate; other canned goods take a measurement rate. Charges on canned goods moving under a measurement rate would be more than $53.50, per 2,000 pounds.

[5] Carbon electrodes.

[6] Asbestos cement pipe, straight:

Up to and including 6-inch inside diameter	$44.78
Over 6-inch up to and including 8-inch inside diameter	48.79
Over 8-inch up to and including 12-inch inside diameter	53.71
Over 12-inch up to and including 16-inch inside diameter	59.06
Over 16-inch up to and including 24-inch inside diameter	63.08

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the views expressed by the majority of the members of the committee concerning the nomination of Mr. Barrett.

There being no objection, the views—Executive Report No. 2—were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Individual Views

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the nomination of Ashton C. Barrett, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Commission for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1967, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. Barrett was first confirmed by the Senate as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission on February 12, 1962, and served on the Commission until his term expired June 30, 1963. Mr. Barrett was elected by his colleagues on the Commission to serve as Vice Chairman between January and June 30, 1963.

Mr. Barrett has been in the laundry and drycleaning business in Mississippi since 1952, and has served as president of A. C. Barrett & Associates in the development of real estate in Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Barrett served as a national trustee from the State of Mississippi for the Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

The committee held hearings on the nomination of Mr. Barrett on July 12 and 19, 1963. Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi, and Senator John Stennis, of Mississippi, appeared before the committee and strongly endorsed the appointment. Mr. Barrett, in his extended appearance before the committee, was forthright, and we believe him to be a man of high character and integrity.

It should be noted that he has been a member of the Commission for approximately 18 months, and his service on it must be evaluated in the context of the following events:

1. The Federal Maritime Commission has not been during his service an established agency with a fixed and known body of law to administer. To the contrary, Mr. Barrett was one of the five original appointees to a newly reorganized regulatory commission, and four (including Mr. Barrett) of the five members had little if any previous maritime experience.

2. The reorganization process involved splitting (between the Federal Maritime Commission and the Maritime Administration) a limited budget, a small staff, and cramped office space. These are major handicaps for a body dependent on investigation, hearings, and filing of extensive documents and tariffs for the fulfillment of its regulatory mission.

3. The fundamental charter describing the Commission's duties, the Shipping Act of 1916, had, a short time before, undergone a sweeping revision requiring new orders and regulations to be promulgated and steamship conference agreements to be refiled, for agency approval, disapproval, or modification. This is an immense undertaking, as is illustrated by the fact that the revisions to the Shipping Act took 3 years of study, hearings, and drafting by three separate congressional committees.

Considering all of these handicaps, it becomes apparent that the Maritime Commission has started to function as it was intended only within a very short and recent period of time. It is manifestly unfair and inappropriate to heap blame on a candidate for renomination as if he were solely responsible for the agency's performance, all the more so because the events leading to this performance were well beyond the ability of any individual Commissioner to control.

Mr. Barrett was unanimously confirmed by the Senate 18 months ago. He had been a successful businessman and civil leader with every indication that he would be a satisfactory and constructive Commissioner. Since then he has gained knowledge and experience from his service on the Commission.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the Senate confirm the nomination.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the chairman of the committee [Mr. Magnuson] and of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] be printed in the Record following the majority views.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. Magnuson and of Mr. Bartlett—Executive Report No. 2—were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Individual Views of Mr. Magnuson

Two years ago the Federal Maritime Commission was established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 7 for the purpose of revitalizing the regulation of the waterborne foreign commerce of the United States. During the hearings on the reorganization plan and on numerous other occasions, Congress has emphasized the importance of appointing well-qualified men to the Federal Maritime Commission and other independent regulatory agencies, each of which have important influence upon significant sectors of our economy.

No agency has been more seriously overlooked nor more consistently neglected, so far as the appointment of qualified members is concerned, than has the Maritime Commission. Repeatedly, appointees selected to serve have had limited or no background in maritime matters and generally have had little familiarity with regulatory or legal problems.

I hope that there will be an immediate revitalization of maritime regulation which the reorganization of the Commission sought to accomplish.

Warren G. Magnuson.

Individual Views of Mr. Bartlett

The Federal Maritime Commission is the independent agency responsible for the regulation of the waterborne foreign and domestic offshore commerce of the United States. Its jurisdiction reaches the some 126 active steamship conferences which operate over trade routes directly involving U.S. foreign commerce. The Commission is charged with regulating the 31 American and 185 foreign shipping lines which belong to these conferences and engage as common carriers in this trade. This regulation affects carriers in regard to their services, rates, practices, and agreements. The Commission also regulates and licenses approximately 1,000 ocean freight forwarders and has regulatory responsibility over some 130 terminal operators.

In 1962 the U.S. foreign trade amounted to $16.4 billion in imports and $21.6 billion in exports. The bulk of this trade is transported by common carriers under Federal Maritime Commission jurisdiction. The regulation of the terms and conditions under which our imports and exports move has a direct impact on the level of our domestic economy, the U.S. trade balance, the balance of payments, and our relations with foreign governments.

In the domestic offshore trade, the Commission is responsible for regulating rates, charges, tariffs, and practices of common carriers by water to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the island possessions. Since water transportation is the dominant means of transportation to these offshore areas, the regulation of the water carriers serving the trades has a direct and substantial influence on the cost of living in the offshore areas and on the ability of these areas to participate and compete fully in the economic life of the Nation. Freight rates to Alaska and Hawaii have increased over 60 percent since 1950. During the same span of time, rail freight rates in the United States increased on an average of only 14 percent. In no instance did the Federal Maritime Board fail to approve a proposed rate increase before 1961. Following this precedent, the Federal Maritime Commission in the past 2 years has approved substantial additional rate increases for Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii.

The Federal Maritime Commission, therefore, is a regulatory agency of the first order of importance—an agency whose action, or inaction, has a substantial impact on numerous aspects of the Nation's economy, and an immediate impact on the economy of our offshore areas.

The Federal Maritime Commission was established by Reorganization Plan No. 7, which became effective 2 years ago this month. The Federal Maritime Board, the Commission's predecessor, was abolished and the new Commission became operative after an extensive investigation of the Board between 1959 and 1961 by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative Emanuel Celler, and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the chairmanship of Representative Herbert C. Bonner. The Celler committee report sharply criticized the Board, charging that ever since the Shipping Act was first adopted in 1916 the legislative intent had been frustrated by desultory regulation:

"For a period of almost 45 years, lethargy and indifference have characterized its attitude, laxity and inefficiency its procedures, and frustration and ineffectiveness its administration of the regulatory features of the shipping acts."

The detailed indictment of the Board continued:

"The Board's decline in prestige was a product of many factors—the low caliber of some appointees, the many reorganizations of the Board or its predecessors in the course of their history; the orientation of its members and staff toward shipping interests; the lack of personnel to supervise the industry adequately; an absence of desire or ability in existing personnel to antagonize potent economic groups. All these and other factors, too, played a prominent part in reducing the Board to little more than a token administrative body."

The Celler report then turned more specifically to the importance of appointing qualified men:

"Another factor in the continued inefficiency of the Board is the fact that, as Chairman Bonner of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries sagaciously observed, 'The question of qualifications for membership on the Board, or the predecessor Commission, seems to have been largely ignored in the postwar years.' "

The committee included the following among its recommendations:

"Care should be taken by the President and by his appointees to the Commission to insure that the Federal Maritime Commission will no longer be considered merely a way station on the road to private advancement. The subcommittee agrees with Representative Herbert C. Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who, deploring the caliber of previous appointees to the Board and its predecessor agencies, states on the basis of observations derived from years of experience, in a letter to the President dated December 15, 1960, 'Most of them took nothing to the Board, and their prior experience did not encourage tenure of service.' Appointment of members to the new Commission should be made with great care."

The words of the Celler report were well chosen. The complexity and importance of the problems with which the Maritime Commission must deal, the historical difficulties we have experienced in formulating and implementing effective regulative policy in this area, and the need for rejuvenation of an agency that has long been derelict in its responsibility are all compelling reasons for the exercise of utmost care in the selection of new appointees or in the reappointment of present Commission members.

Since the Federal Maritime Commission was created 2 years ago, Congress has enacted two legislative measures which substantially increase the importance and complexity of the Commission's work. The first of these laws provides for the licensing of independent ocean freight forwarders and for the regulation of the ocean freight forwarder industry. The second is the so-called dual-rate law, which substantially enlarges the Commission's responsibilities for the approval or disapproval of conference agreements, the filing and reviewing of inbound and outbound ocean freight rates, and the disapproval of any rate found to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. The Commission, however, has thus far been unable to implement fully the Freight Forwarder Act since several of the agency rules have been suspended by court action and the Commission has not placed into effect the rules called for under the dual-rate legislation. These new statutes increase the powers and responsibilities of the agency, but every indication is that the reorganized Commission has done little to improve upon the sad precedents set by previous maritime agencies in carrying out the regulatory functions delegated to it by Congress. Senator Douglas has summed up the situation in his commentary upon the testimony the Commission gave before the Joint Economic Committee concerning the existence of differentials between inbound and outbound freight rates:

"I want to characterize the testimony which we received from their representatives as inadequate, shocking, disgraceful and giving every indication that the Commission and the Commission's predecessor, the Federal Maritime Board, have been grossly negligent and gravely derelict in their duty to protect American industry, the public interest, and the U.S. national interest."

Our difficulties in the field of maritime regulation have resulted in repeated investigations, reconsiderations, and revisions of our maritime policy and administrative machinery during the past 47 years. The U.S. Shipping Board was established in 1916, the U.S. Maritime Commission in 1936, the Federal Maritime Board in 1950, and the Federal Maritime Commission in 1961. Throughout these years of investigation and reorganization, the call for able leadership has been a consistent theme. It has been recognized that unqualified personnel must bear the blame for many of the Commission's failings and that the appointment of highly competent men is the sine qua non of any improvement in the situation. Perhaps Dean Landis' 1960 report to the President-elect described the situation most clearly:

"No better service could be rendered to the administrative agencies as a whole than by gradually restaffing them with men who, because of their competence and their desire to fulfill the legislative mandates described in the basic statutes establishing these agencies, will inspire a sense of devotion to and pride in the public service by their many employees."

In conclusion, Dean Landis recommended:

"The prime key to the improvement of the administrative process is the selection of qualified personnel. Good men can make poor laws workable; poor men will wreak havoc with good laws.

"As long as the selection of men for key administrative posts is based upon political reward rather than competency, little else that is done will really matter."

Any appointee to the Federal Maritime Commission, therefore, should be considered in reference to the dreary history of the Federal Government's regulatory efforts in this field and in reference to the fact that today this agency has responsibilities of enormous economic consequence and thus should be accorded the recognition, attention, and respect merited by a regulatory agency of the first order of importance.

Mr. Ashton C. Barrett presented himself before the Commerce Committee on July 12 and 19 of this year. During the first day of the hearing, Mr. Barrett stated that he had been in the clothing business, the cleaning business, the laundry business and in the real estate business, but that he had had no previous experience or association, directly or indirectly, with the maritime business.

When the appointees to the newly established Federal Maritime Commission including Mr. Barrett, first came before the committee in February 1962, their attention was called to four serious problem areas and the committee was assured by Commission members that action on each either was being taken or would promptly be taken. During the hearings on July 12 and 19 of this year, Mr. Barrett was confronted with these earlier pledges and was asked what action he and his fellow Commissioners had taken with reference to them. His answers were manifestly unsatisfactory. In some instances he revealed a total lack of familiarity with both the pledges and the problem areas which they covered. In the few instances where he displayed an understanding of the problems, he could do no more than indicate that the pledges had not been fulfilled—indeed, that some were no nearer to fulfillment than they had been in February of 1962.

The Commissioners had promised the committee that provisions would be made in rules of the Commission whereby Governors of States would be given adequate notice under section 6 of the dual-rate law. On the first day of the hearings, Mr. Barrett was totally unfamiliar with this problem; he later returned to testify that no action had been taken in this area and that none was planned.

In regard to the second problem discussed in the 1962 hearings (revision of annual reports for domestic offshore carriers), Mr. Barrett reported that the Commission was still revising the form of the annual report. This is what the Chairman of the Commission said the Commission was doing in February of 1962.

The third problem (need for authority to require a uniform system of accounting by domestic carriers in the offshore trade) was one with which Mr. Barrett was totally unfamiliar. Initially, Mr. Barrett stated that the Commission had authority to require a uniform system of accounting as do other regulatory agencies. This statement was retracted by Mr. Barrett when it was pointed out that the Commission in its 1962 annual report had asked Congress for this additional authority. Although the 1962 annual report states that drafts of legislation to implement each proposal would be submitted, none have ever been received by Congress in respect to this matter.

Mr. Barrett did not acknowledge that any serious problem existed in regard to the fourth question (the need for formal notice of freight rate changes to the Governor or other principal executive officer in the offshore States, Commonwealths, and possessions served). He pointed out that formal notice was now given through tariff postings in public places. When asked to illustrate, Mr. Barrett said he thought this included posting the information in the private quarters of the captains of vessels serving the trade. The rules of the Commission actually require posting at the general office of the carrier and at the principal office at each port served. The problem of formal notice remains.

When Mr. Barrett was questioned about the difference between inbound and outbound ocean freight rates in the foreign trade, he said, "Frankly, Senator, it hadn't been called to my attention until the Joint Economic Committee called it to our attention." Later, Mr. Barrett sought to explain the differential by citing the higher stevedoring costs in the United States and higher wages paid to American seamen. When it was pointed out that the higher U.S. stevedoring costs apply to both inbound and outbound cargo and that the subsidized American-flag carriers are compensated by a Federal subsidy covering the difference in foreign and U.S. seamen's wages, Mr. Barrett offered no further explanations.

When Mr. Barrett was questioned on the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission, he was uncertain as to the Commission's authority in respect to contract carriers in the domestic offshore trade. Mr. Barrett asserted that the Commission has general jurisdiction over all carriers in the offshore trade, including contract carriers, but he thought that the rates of contract carriers were not within the jurisdiction of the Commission. The fact is that the Federal Maritime Commission has no jurisdiction over contract carriers in the domestic offshore trade.

After a careful and considered examination of the record of the hearing and of Mr. Barrett's background and qualifications, nothing suggests that the appointee has the qualifications which service on the Maritime Commission requires. Undoubtedly, Mr. Barrett is personally above reproach; he is honest, gracious, and congenial. He, however, has no background in maritime matters, no familiarity with governmental regulation, and no experience with the type of legal and economic problems with which the Commission must deal daily.

It should, in all fairness, be emphasized that Mr. Barrett was not alone responsible for the actions or inactions of the full Commission. He was only one member.

However, he did serve the Commission as Vice Chairman, and cannot be absolved of the Commission's collective failings simply because he is only one of its five members.

To consent to the appointment of an inexperienced man to the Maritime Commission is to acquiesce in a longstanding frustration of legislative intent in regard to maritime regulation. It is a disservice first to the public, which properly expects the full measure of regulation and protection granted by the law; second, to the maritime industry, which is dependent upon intelligent and predictable agency responses, and lastly to the appointee himself, who must be aware that his competences and interests lie elsewhere.

Confirmation should be denied.

E. L. BARTLETT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ashton C. Barrett to be a member of the Federal Maritime Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY AND COMMUNISM IN CUBA

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it has been a privilege to be in the Chamber today to listen to the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] concerning the situation in Cuba; the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] concerning the proposed reservation to the test ban treaty; the statement by the respected majority leader on the same subject; the fervent advocacy by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] of the treaty; and the discussion of the question whether there should be a reservation.

In at least one phrase, perhaps, the Senator from Minnesota in his own fervent advocacy got away from himself, when he said that anyone who proposed a reservation to the treaty would be an assassin of the treaty. I do not believe that statement is true or that the Senator from Minnesota really believes it any more than I do.

The test ban treaty is probably one of the most important proposals to come before Congress and the country in a long time. But I point out what I believe is extremely important; that is, that the Communist gains which have been made throughout the world have not been made by nuclear testing; they have not been made by nuclear arms; they have been made by infiltration, subversion, terror, and sabotage at a subliminal warfare level. Perhaps the most clear-cut example of that practice has been the Cuban situation.

During the past 2 months a series of speeches has been delivered by respected Members of the Senate, suggesting that the United States take action to establish a policy to try to eliminate communism from Cuba, whether the communism be in the form of Russian, Czechoslovakian, or Yugoslavian troops or technicians, or even Cuban Communists themselves.

More than a month ago—on July 18, 1963—in a speech I made in the Senate, I referred to the Cuban menace today and stated what it was accomplishing in Latin America.

One year ago yesterday the President said:

> It continues to be the policy of the United States that the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force. It will be prevented by whatever means may be necessary from taking action against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

That policy has not been followed by the administration in any of the actions concerning Cuba during the year since the statement was made. I outlined perfectly clearly in my speech of July 28 exactly the acts of aggression which have occurred since that time and the acts of aggression which are now occurring.

The proposals made by my distinguished senior colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and by other Senators who have spoken on the subject have been efforts to show that courses are available to the administration which, if adopted, could help to solve the Cuban problem. But all we have received from the administration is silence—an attempt to shove the whole Cuban problem under the rug. We receive no answer from the administration or its spokesmen. No policy is proposed. There is nothing but silence, while the Russians continue to use Cuba as a base; while their fishing fleet increases; while Cubans boldly entered a British island and kidnapped 19 persons and took them to Cuba, while Americans watched and took pictures, but did nothing to rescue the captives.

Is the United States a bastion of the free world—this country of ours which is supposed to be able to provide freedom for people and be a haven for all the rights we believe individuals should have? Or are we to sit by and watch complacently while the Communists in Cuba continue their infiltration and acts of terrorism throughout Central and South America?

On July 26, Fidel Castro, having returned from Russia, where he consorted at some length with Mr. Khrushchev, said:

> In the countries of Latin America, the prerevolutionary conditions are incomparably more favorable than they were in our country. This path to revolution does not open of itself. This path must be opened. This path must be opened by revolutionary fighters. And there is a way of opening this path if we wish to open it. * * * There are Latin American countries * * * where desperate masses await the breach to erupt into history.

Castro continues to make certain that we fully understand what he is saying, and reports as follows:

> The duty of the revolutionaries, of the Latin American revolutionaries, is not to wait for the change in the balance of power to produce the miracle of social revolution

> in Latin America, but to take the fullest advantage of everything favoring the revolutionary movement and make revolutions.
>
> And the duty of revolutionaries, above all at this moment, is to understand, to know how to grasp, the changes in the balance of power which have taken place in the world, and understand that this change helps the struggle of the people.

If I ever heard a series of advocacies by a person in charge of the Communist movement, who seeks, with the aid and abettance of Russia, to promote revolution in Cuba and to infiltrate and subvert Latin America and South America, this is it.

Yet when we offer proposals to try to get this country off dead center, to try to correct a situation in which we are apparently sitting on our hands while communism exists only 90 miles from our shore, what do we get? Silence; absolutely no response from the administration.

I fully recognize the importance of the test ban treaty. I look forward to listening to the debate and the arguments which will occur next week in the Senate. But the ratification of a test ban treaty with the Soviet bloc will not be a "cotton pickin' thing," as they say in the South, while we are confronted with a Communist government in Cuba and the question whether it is to remain. We must develop a policy of our own.

Many persons have asked me from time to time: How does the United States have any legal right, under our system, to seek to take action with respect to another country?

This is quite interesting, because this question was asked on a number of occasions, and the letter came to my desk without any instigation on my part. It is a personal letter from a man who is in the Revolutionary Council of Cuba, and is dated August 2, 1963. The first paragraph of his covering letter reads, as follows:

> I am pleased to enclose a copy of a memorandum on the treaties, resolutions and declarations which made it mandatory to take effective action against the Cuban Communist regime. It seems to me that the main issue on Cuba today—rather than war or peace, is whether or not this great country—

He is referring to the United States—

> intends to honor its solemn commitments and protect its own security.

That is the first paragraph of his letter. He also sent to me a 4-page memorandum on the series of commitments made by this country in connection with the Organization of American States. From reading the memorandum, it becomes perfectly apparent that time and time and time again we have committed ourselves to the Latin and Central American countries who are members of the Organization of American States to take such action as may be necessary in order to prevent the overthrow of any government in this hemisphere by outside aggressive force, including specifically the Communists of Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the memorandum, which is entitled "Solemn Commitments on Cuba."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOLEMN COMMITMENTS ON CUBA

1. A real policy for the liberation of Cuba is not a matter for discussion. It is a solemn commitment of this country, embedded in the historical joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, adopted on October 3, 1962, and which states that the United States is determined to "work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

2. Following the mandates of this joint resolution, the United States should rally the support of the great majority of Latin American republics to invoke article 6 of the 1947 Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty), which is a hemispheric ratification of the Monroe Doctrine. Article 6 states, as follows:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the organ of consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

3. In accordance with the declaration of solidarity for the preservation of the political integrity of the American states against the intervention of international communism (Declaration of Caracas, 1954), the mere domination of Cuba by international communism endangers the peace of the Americas and calls for a meeting of the organ of consultation.

DECLARATION OF CARACAS

"The domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

4. In the meeting of consultation (Conference of Foreign Ministers), the American republics could adopt one or more of the collective sanctions set forth in article 8 of the Rio Treaty:

Article 8: "For the purpose of this treaty, the measures on which the organ of consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelegraphic or radiotelephonic communications; and the use of Armed Force."

5. In view of the continued presence in Cuba of Soviet troops, the progressive fortification of the island (with strategic weapons) and the stepped-up Castro-Communist subversion in Latin America, the organ of consultation could urge the member states to take individual or collective self-defense measures, including the air and sea blockade of Cuba. These measures are provided for in article 6 of the Rio Treaty, article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and Resolution II of the eighth meeting of consultation (Punta del Este), which establishes the following:

"To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance."

6. At the same time, the United States should render adequate military support to democratic Cubans, both on the island and abroad. In order to render openly this support, the United States could recognize a Cuban defacto belligerent government (in exile or in arms). This government would have legal capacity to solicit or contract loans and to enter into military alliances with the United States and other countries granting recognition.

7. The Cuban situation admits no further palliatives of economic embargoes and diplomatic isolation, which prove to be totally ineffective. There is no other alternative but to take all the steps that are necessary to remove the Communist cancer from Cuba before it spreads to all of Latin America.

8. The moment is fraught with danger, but the greatest risk would be failure to take effective and immediate action, thus allowing the Soviet Union to continue its covert fortification of Cuba and its aggressive penetration of Latin America. This does not mean starting a war in Cuba. It means giving full military support to democratic Cubans, who are already engaged in combat, exercising their inherent right to revolt against Communist oppression.

9. Today Cuba is the testing ground for the validity of regional treaties, the efficacy of U.S. military alliances and the determination of the Americas to survive as a free continent.

10. The time for decision is now. Any vacillation or postponement of necessary action to repel the Communist invasion of this hemisphere would be tantamount to appeasement. The Soviet challenge must be met with expediency and courage in order to avoid a miscalculation of our resolve to defend freedom, which could give rise to a major world conflict. Cuba cannot become the Munich of America.

August 1963.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I believe it only fair at this point to make a comment or two concerning the recent action by Castro in the cays. After publicly announcing support of the FALN, in Venezuela, just a few days ago, the FALN followed up its previous attack on U.S. military personnel, which it had announced ahead of time, and then carried through,with a forcible attack on members and officers of the Venezuelan Government itself. The FALN announced it was going to do that; and it is supported, aided, financed, and armed by aid from Cuba. So the FALN followed through with exactly what it had threatened to do; but, so far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no retaliation at all or no objection from our country.

Recently, when approximately 19 or 20 anti-Castro refugees were on one of the British cays, Cuban Communists went there in patrol boats and seized them. U.S. Air Force helicopters hovered overhead, observing and taking photographs of what the Communists were doing, but were under orders not to interfere in any way. That went on for 2 hours.

As has been said on other occasions, in view of the communications system our Air Force has, it seems relatively easy for it at least to alert the British and say to them, "If you want to protect or safeguard persons on one of your cays, part of your own territory, now is the time. Either do something about it, or give us permission to do it as an ally of Great Britain"—so that in the future our own territory will not be invaded freely by Communists from Cuba engaged in illegal international kidnapings—which did occur on that occasion. But our forces did nothing except take photographs and report. As a result, 19 persons—who want the territory of Cuba returned to its own people and want them to be allowed to govern themselves—have been taken to Cuba, to be imprisoned along with the rest who still are there.

Because we got some of the Bay of Pigs personnel out of Cuba, I believe we have a general opinion these days that none of them remains in a Cuban prison, and that in Cuba there are no slave-labor camps, that everyone there is happy, and that the only change is that Castro has imposed a dictatorship on the island of Cuba.

However, Mr. President, anyone who reads the Cuban reports—whether those in the Free Cuba News or those from the Revolutionary Council, or the Cuban reports published by the student revolutionary group—can inform us to the contrary. Many Cubans who have been thrown into jail are used as laborers in the fields, where they are kept under guard, and at night are returned to the stockades or prisons from which they were brought. The regime that has been imposed upon them has become rougher and rougher. The effort and the prestige it enjoys in South America and Central America have increased. They have increased because our country, with the primary responsibility as the most powerful country in this hemisphere, has chosen to do nothing.

On many occasions we have asked on the floor of the Senate for replies from the administration as to the policy it would take with regard to Cuba; but we have yet to receive a reply. I am hopeful that if we keep this point before the public and before the Senate, before too long we shall have been of assistance in the development of a firm policy—not one involving the use of U.S. troops for invasion purposes; we do not need that, for many other steps to which Senators have already referred can be taken—but a firm policy designed to return to the people of Cuba the right to govern themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Castro Forays Scrutinized." The article was written by Bertram B. Johansson, the Latin America editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO FORAYS SCRUTINIZED

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

WASHINGTON.—Cuba's kidnaping of 19 Cuban refugees last week from Anguilla Cay, in the British Bahamas, is seen here, at least among unofficial, if not official, sources as a grim foretaste of things to come in the Caribbean.

These sources—fed information daily by the Cuban underground and by refugees continually slipping out of Cuba—see the operation first as a Soviet-Cuban probe of how much taunting the United States and Britain will stand in the Caribbean. Or how much intervention Cuba can get away with as it charges the United States with interventions far back into history.

FACTS AND FIGURES

The buildup of both the Cuban and Soviet fishing fleet in Caribbean and Atlantic waters, with fast patrol boats and vessels capacious enough to carry sea-bound weapons and infiltrators to any Caribbean point, is not taken lightly.

These groups, furthermore, see the Anguilla Cay incident as an outright violation of international law, where escaping Cubans, some 40 miles from their country, are captured or shot down by Cuban personnel on British soil, while U.S. air pilots look on doing nothing but taking photographs.

It is believed here the United States at least could have sent naval vessels to hold the Castro vessels and their captured human cargo under surveillance until British authorities arrived.

BOATS PIECED TOGETHER

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba—a group of United States, not Cuban citizens, based in Washington—points out some interesting facts and figures on escapees from Cuba:

The total number of Cubans who have fled the Castro regime through normal transport channels to the United States alone total 220,000 persons. Of these, 5,048 fled in small boats much like last week's Anguilla Cay group, from June 1961 through July 1963. The latter 5,048 came in 752 different boats.

The escape boats range in size from 12 to 60 feet long. Some are fishing boats constructed by the Castro government and stolen, forcing installation of guards at many boatbuilding establishments. Some are boats made clandestinely in a dozen different locations by persons who suddenly appear on Cuban beaches at night, bring the dozen pieces of the boat together, make it seaworthy and start out on their seaborne hegira to the United States.

More than 60 percent of the refugees arriving in the United States are workers and peasants. Only 5 percent are professionals. Premier Castro is keeping as many of the latter behind as possible.

The total number of Cubans who have fled to the United States, as well as Spain, Central America, etc., is an estimated 350,000 out of the population of 6 million.

Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of escapees from Cuba never reach the mainland or safety. Cuban fishermen who have left the island testify that there are many empty bullet-riddled boats bleaching on the sands of silent, uninhabited islets as grim testimony of Cuban-Soviet patrol boat efficiency and Premier Castro's determination that some people shall not leave Cuba.

Miami, especially, is said to be swarming with Castro intelligence agents, so much so that Cuban exiles are jittery about talking much among themselves for fear of informing and inadvertently cooperating with the Castro intelligence network.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have often commented on the stepchild status of civil rights legislation. At the moment there is no better illustration of its status, it seems to me, than the history of the congressional action, or lack of action, with respect to the Commission on Civil Rights.

We are now faced with the danger that the Commission may be ignored out of existence by following a civil rights timetable which would make it impossible to extend the life of the Commission before it had been forced to disband.

In this whole field there seems to be an attitude of patient determination; but those who maintain this attitude seem to ignore the fact that under present law the Commission on Civil Rights is required to submit its final report on September 30 of this year, and that 60 days thereafter the Commission will go out of existence.

All the determination and the good will in the world will not make a particle of difference to the Commission if we do not act to alter those dates.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights completed extensive hearings on proposed legislation to extend the life of the Commission on June 12 and, with only one dissenting vote, it voted a 4-year extension in the life of the Commission after defeat by a tie vote of a motion which I made to extend the Commission indefinitely.

On several past occasions, as Senators will remember, the extension of the life of the Commission has been approved by overwhelming votes of the Senate and of the other body. There is no reason to doubt that that would be the case today if the question were brought before the Senate. But this reservoir of overwhelming support might as well be drained if the Senate is not to be given any opportunity to act until the Commission is disbanded. The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights submitted its report to the full Committee on the Judiciary a month ago. The hearings of the subcommittee, which extended over a period of many days, and which were eminently fair to all points of view, have been printed. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights was opposed to the extension of the Commission, but he gave full opportunity to all those in favor of and opposed to be heard. As I have said, those hearings have been printed. The basis for action in the full committee has existed for months, but the bill continues to languish in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Yesterday, in the course of discussion of the programing of proposed civil rights legislation of a more extensive character, the assistant majority leader pointed out that "the responsibility for scheduling proposed legislation rests with the majority."

I do not dispute that statement. But it warrants one qualification, I believe, and that is that there are Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who are vitally interested in this issue; and it is the obligation of every Senator, in my judgment, to do what he believes is right and necessary to make certain that the Senate does not forfeit responsibility by inaction. It is not my intention, after going through all the extensive hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, after having had long discussions, and after having been one of those who voted to report the bill favorably to the full committee, to stand idly by and watch the death of the Commission on Civil Rights, no matter whose responsibility it is to schedule the proposed legislation.

Therefore I express to the leadership my hope that steps will be taken in some manner. Perhaps it can be done by appending the extension of the Commission to some other bill. I remember that on one occasion we appended such a measure to an appropriation bill. In some manner we should bring the subject before the Senate so that the Commission will not go out of existence virtually on the 30th of September. It is true that it will not actually go out of existence until 60 days after that time, but at present the Commission cannot keep its staff—and they are keeping their staff on tenterhooks—unless they know what will happen to the Commission.

Therefore, I hereby serve notice that I will feel it necessary at some time prior to the 30th of September to offer an amendment to an appropriate measure which is before the Senate to extend the life of the Commission at least for the 4-year period which has been voted by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

I have favored the extension of the Commission as a permanent or semipermanent agency because of the fine work that they have done. At any time it is open to the Congress to close up any agency that it desires to close. The easy method is by denying it funds to operate.

But, as we have all seen before, I see a great hazard in subjecting the Commission to the constant harassment of periodic renewals of its life. That is the reason why many of us—and the committee divided exactly evenly on the question—favored the extension of the Commission for an indefinite period. However, the majority favored the 4-year period. It will be my intention to offer such an amendment at some time before the life of the Commission expires, unless, as I hope, the issue can be programed in some other way.

I am entirely conscious of the fact that any individual Senator's effort to attach an amendment to some other bill is often met with failure unless it has the support of the leadership in such action. But it is my plea to the leadership to take action so that the Commission will not expire. If action is not taken, I shall feel it my duty to act accordingly as I have indicated.

LONG ISLAND ARTS CENTER

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, it was my pleasure, a few months ago, to attend the opening of the Long Island Summer Festival of the Arts, sponsored by the Long Island Arts Center, Inc., and the Nassau and Suffolk County governments of the State of New York, and with the support of New York State, business, and labor.

This great festival—held on the campuses of C. W. Post College, Adelphi University and Hofstra University—has brought to New York State such distinguished artists as Richard Tucker, the New York City Ballet, Jose Iturbi, Symphony of the Air, Carlos Montoya, Morton Gould, Lorin Hollander, the Paul Taylor Dance Co., and the prize-winning play, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" with the Broadway matinee cast. It has become, in one short summer, and in its first season no less, one of the most successful international festivals.

Tens of thousands of visitors from Long Island, from New York City, and from the surrounding area, have come to enjoy the great musical and artistic events of the festival.

Originally conceived by Norman E. Blankman, of Sands Point, N.Y., who is the president of the Long Island Arts Center, this festival of the arts has taken devotion, patience, considerable hard work. It has quickly received critical acclaim from the metropolitan and local press, particularly for its own opera and oratorio productions. The members of the committees, the workers and artists who have made this such a resounding success are all to be congratulated for this fine effort which will undoubtedly have a continuing impact on the Long Island community.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. What is the will of the Senate?

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 456, S. 1831, which is to be made the unfinished business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. A bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "following", to strike out "'*Provided,* That no allowances shall be paid to any such youth who drops out of school, for a period of three months after the date of dropout.'" and insert "'*Provided,* That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under 19 years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 3 months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.'"; and on page 3, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 304 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 202 the following new subsection:

"(h) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the development of functional literacy and basic work skills those eligible persons who will thereby be able to pursue courses of occupational training, and such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, except that the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply to the selection of persons under this subsection, and such persons shall be eligible for an additional 52 weeks of training allowances."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof, by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 per centum", and by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: *Provided,* That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed."

SEC. 3. Section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "except that with respect to referrals under subsection (h) of section 202 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the training to be provided under such subsection (h) through other appropriate education agencies".

SEC. 4. Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "vocational" before the words "education and training".

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 305 is amended by striking out the word "vocational".

SEC. 6. Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, September 6, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 5, 1963:

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Colin Munro MacLeod, of New York, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Thomas O. Holston, Jr., Akron, Ala., in place of C. W. Dent, retired.

James R. Baird, Dora, Ala., in place of J. C. Golden, deceased.

Alton L. Hamrick, Empire, Ala., in place of A. E. McGowen, resigned.

ARKANSAS

James L. Kirby, Gravette, Ark., in place of C. C. Fry, retired.

J. B. Barnes, Hartford, Ark., in place of B. L. Grisby, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Clara S. Fredinburg, Applegate, Calif., in place of P. L. Anthony, retired.

William G. Clark, El Cajon, Calif., in place of J. C. Roether, resigned.

Norma J. Giger, Fawnskin, Calif., in place of E. L. Thompson, retired.

L. Pearl Ramsay, Heber, Calif., in place of J. M. Lee, retired.

Margaret O. Stover, Hinkley, Calif., in place of M. C. Gordon, resigned.

L. Dorothy Mayfield, Stinson Beach, Calif., in place of E. E. Hain, retired.

COLORADO

Richard N. Heyman, Kersey, Colo., in place of H. R. Boles, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Anna M. Maye, Botsford, Conn., in place of A. W. Rasmussen, deceased.

Stanley K. Wasowicz, Middlefield, Conn., in place of R. A. Chadsey, resigned.

FLORIDA

Irma M. Keever, Ellenton, Fla., in place of C. P. Duke, removed.

Florence M. Johnson, Englewood, Fla., in place of H. G. Green, retired.

Elmer Robinson, Lehigh Acres, Fla. Office established January 1, 1961.

Cecile P. Heard, Sanford, Fla., in place of J. S. Field, removed.

GEORGIA

James H. Mitchell, Hiram, Ga., in place of P. G. Laird, retired.

IDAHO

John G. Rost, Boise, Idaho, in place of J. F. Hughes, deceased.

Lloyd R. Merrill, Moreland, Idaho, in place of N. C. Forman, retired.

ILLINOIS

Sally A. Sondgeroth, Eola, Ill., in place of G. L. Dodds, transferred.

Archie V. Gauwitz, Lacon, Ill., in place of B. M. Wright, resigned.

Norman L. Smith, Manito, Ill., in place of G. G. Smith, retired.

Frank E. Woodruff, Marengo, Ill., in place of R. E. Thomas, retired.

Harold C. Woodard, Milledgeville, Ill., in place of R. M. Coleman, retired.

A. Janet Masterson, Monroe Center, Ill., in place of L. B. Hayes, retired.

Oliver B. Westendorf, Montrose, Ill., in place of H. James, retired.

John J. Barry, Sheffield, Ill., in place of G. Edlin, resigned.

Charles W. Gruber, Towanda, Ill., in place of J. A. Crichton, retired.

George S. Mentel, Valmeyer, Ill., in place of E. G. Meyer, retired.

Richard E. Gilchrist, Waterman, Ill., in place of K. J. Tate, transferred.

Willis D. Spafford, Yates City, Ill., in place of L. A. Thurman, removed.

INDIANA

Charles A. Seger, Jasper, Ind., in place of A. Rumbach, deceased.

Albert S. Delano, New Market, Ind., in place of P. L. Smith, deceased.

IOWA

John W. Elliott, Ainsworth, Iowa, in place of D. W. Pearson, deceased.

Wallace P. Hawcott, Burt, Iowa, in place of K. J. Smith, retired.

Alice L. Brayton, Denmark, Iowa, in place of V. D. Nusbaum, retired.

Jeannette E. Rohwer, Dixon, Iowa, in place of A. H. Rohwer, deceased.

Leo L. Seyb, Donnellson, Iowa, in place of T. H. Seyb, retired.

Charles J. Murphy, Dubuque, Iowa, in place of A. F. Schrup, retired.

William P. Marshall, Farmington, Iowa, in place of F. H. Millen, resigned.

Emmett J. Hodapp, Granville, Iowa, in place of P. F. Goergen, transferred.

Marvin J. Hayostek, Lake Park, Iowa, in place of L. W. Threde, transferred.

Mabel J. Alverson, Popejoy, Iowa, in place of G. M. Schneider, resigned.

Daniel K. Murphy, Sioux City, Iowa, in place of H. J. Gleason, retired.

KANSAS

Dean H. Evans, Lebo, Kans., in place of A. S. George, retired.

Larence K. George, Neosho Falls, Kans., in place of S. A. Dennis, retired.

Frank J. Jira, Rush Center, Kans., in place of J. J. Keener, transferred.

Charles G. Meadows, Yoder, Kans., in place of D. M. Beachy, retired.

KENTUCKY

James D. Dearing, Alvaton, Ky., in place of W. E. Wagoner, Jr., transferred.

Bayne A. Keller, Dawson Springs, Ky., in place of G. B. Ramsey, retired.

Marianna T. Thompson, Edmonton, Ky., in place of H. R. T. Kinnaird, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Bobby R. Thomas, Campti, La., in place of C. C. Collier, retired.

MAINE

William F. Leonard, Camden, Maine, in place of A. F. Kelleher, retired.

Winifred V. Burton, Monhegan, Maine, in place of E. B. Nicholson, retired.

MARYLAND

Martha G. Catlin, Nanticoke, Md., in place of A. T. Walter, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John F. Condon, Beverly, Mass., in place of A. A. Gaukroger, retired.

Raymond L. Merrigan, North Adams, Mass., in place of H. V. Gunnason, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Hilbert G. Geyer, Frankenmuth, Mich., in place of F. W. Zehnder, retired.

Janet L. Ruddy, New Lothrop, Mich., in place of L. F. Flynn, retired.

Edgar A. Richards, Vanderbilt, Mich., in place of O. E. Niles, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Lowell E. Anderson, Clara City, Minn., in place of A. E. Weflen, resigned.

Bernard J. Newman, Eveleth, Minn., in place of G. P. Finnegan, deceased.

Robert L. Thompson, Garrison, Minn., in place of F. D. Enright, retired.

Ronald L. Christensen, Geneva, Minn., in place of C. T. Nelson, retired.

Louis L. Indihar, Gilbert, Minn., in place of Herman Frajola, retired.

Alfred E. Feierabend, Grey Eagle, Minn., in place of D. M. Alderman, deceased.

Donald L. Randleman, Renville, Minn., in place of Z. G. Hassell, retired.

Julian V. Melander, Willmar, Minn., in place of Olice Erickson, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Floyd R. Smith, Amory, Miss., in place of W. B. Schumpert, retired.

MISSOURI

Zula M. Stover, Cross Timbers, Mo., in place of N. C. Kugler, retired.

Charles C. Quinley, New Franklin, Mo., in place of J. B. Settle, retired.

James G. Magee, New Hampton, Mo., in place of J. B. Chipp, retired.

Elden C. Ommert, Raymondville, Mo., in place of R. M. Vollmar, deceased.

James E. Kurtright, Salem, Mo., in place of W. A. Dalton, removed.

NEBRASKA

Harold F. Zwonecheck, De Witt, Nebr., in place of G. W. Nicholas, retired.

Harold F. Ahlschwede, Gurley, Nebr., in place of H. D. Lessig, transferred.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Stanley C. Bogardus, Canaan, N.H., in place of F. R. Hutchinson, deceased.

Norwood A. Ball, Franconia, N.H., in place of W. E. Herbert, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

Beatrice B. Bowden, Pomona, N.J., in place of V. K. Turner, retired.

William J. Schultz, Roebling, N.J., in place of George Majoros, Jr., removed.

John E. Lillback, Vincentown, N.J., in place of H. S. Elbert, removed.

NEW MEXICO

Isabel Rumsey, Orogrande, N. Mex., in place of B. E. Voorhees, retired.

NEW YORK

Robert T. Johnston, New Paltz, N.Y., in place of C. S. Van Valkenburgh, Jr., resigned.

William F. Graff, Pennellville, N.Y., in place of C. M. McMahon, retired.

Mary L. McCann, Poplar Ridge, N.Y., in place of L. D. Cook, retired.

John G. Bittner, Rochester, N.Y., in place of L. B. Cartwright, retired.

Harry P. Johanesen, Ronkonkoma, N.Y., in place of J. L. Friedman, retired.

John E. Snedeker, Jr., Trumansburg, N.Y., in place of B. L. Wixom, deceased.

I. Louis Wood, Vernon Center, N.Y., in place of N. M. Van Baasten, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Tommie F. Bostic, Sr., Beulaville, N.C., in place of W. E. Gresham, retired.

William L. Hall, Leicester, N.C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.

Edward L. Womble, Rich Square, N.C., in place of G. S. Lambertson, retired.

Frances T. Slater, Toast, N.C., in place of P. Y. Snow, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Galerd F. Paul, Grand Forks, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Collette, retired.

Clarence H. Potter, Ray, N. Dak., in place of P. M. Schmitz, retired.

OHIO

Otto Zancanella, Adena, Ohio, in place of Silvio Zancanella, deceased.

John D. Hilger, Alvordton, Ohio, in place of P. J. Shadel, retired.

Victor J. Bodish, Columbus, Ohio, in place of A. M. Rowe, deceased.

Elton E. Wallis, Convoy, Ohio, in place of G. W. Shutt, transferred.

John B. Arlington, Mount Blanchard, Ohio, in place of O. O. Miller, retired.

Philip J. Ragazzo, Niles, Ohio, in place of D. C. Smith, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Mildred F. Almack, Deer Creek, Okla., in place of E. M. Smith, deceased.

Jean E. Haynes, Langston, Okla., in place of J. L. White, declined.

Marvin L. Johnson, Roosevelt, Okla., in place of S. B. Smith, transferred.

Ebert O. Simpson, Thomas, Okla., in place of E. A. Davis, retired.

OREGON

Neil T. Smith, Jr., Burns, Oreg., in place of D. L. Howser, retired.

Albert G. Riney, Condon, Oreg., in place of W. L. Hollen, retired.

Norma L. Benson, Days Creek, Oreg., in place of L. G. Wimer, resigned.

Conard G. Miles, Richland, Oreg., in place of M. E. Evans, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Andrew F. Gresh, Hiller, Pa., in place of F. E. Blair, deceased.

Martha I. Trostle, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.

George S. Burke, Meyersdale, Pa., in place of W. W. Gress, deceased.

Kenneth J. Headings, Reedsville, Pa., in place of C. F. McCartney, retired.

Alexander G. Albright, Schwenksville, Pa., in place of I. F. Mayberry, retired.

Stephen W. Bergstresser, Selinsgrove, Pa., in place of D. A. Portzline, resigned.

Walter J. Piwinsky, Slickville, Pa., in place of E. C. Kiraly, deceased.

Fred M. Kerr, Stoneboro, Pa., in place of W. D. McIntire, retired.

Everett A. Holmes, Thompson, Pa., in place of P. W. Walker, retired.

James A. Haney, Sr., Warminster, Pa., in place of E. D. Naylor, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gerald L. Cloos, Big Stone City, S. Dak., in place of C. L. Freiwald, retired.

Louis N. Jarding, Humboldt, S. Dak., in place of F. E. Phelps, retired.

Wesley E. Cloutier, Redfield, S. Dak., in place of M. L. Wilhelm, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Christine B. Harris, Finger, Tenn., in place of J. O. Massey, retired.

Lemuel H. Gill, Monterey, Tenn., in place of F. W. Medley, resigned.

James M. Taylor, Santa Fe, Tenn., in place of L. D. Mullins, deceased.

Jack R. Walker, Walland, Tenn., in place of Belle Emert, retired.

TEXAS

Juanita F. Perrin, Frankel City, Tex., in place of G. W. Blanchard, deceased.

Ben H. Moeller, Jr., New Ulm, Tex., in place of H. L. Muenzler, transferred.

Memory G. Wright, Jr., Troup, Tex., in place of G. V. Harris, transferred.

UTAH

John R. Rowberry, Logan, Utah, in place of Eugene Yeates, retired.

Orlo Goodrich, Vernal, Utah, in place of F. G. Slaugh, retired.

VERMONT

William L. McGraw, St. Johnsbury, Vt., in place of F. L. Barney, retired.

Edward E. Freeman, Saxtons River, Vt., in place of R. E. Olmstead, retired.

George A. Rooney, Springfield, Vt., in place of A. P. Morrison, retired.

Matthew J. Kenny, West Rutland, Vt., in place of J. P. Gilfeather, retired.

VIRGINIA

Bernard M. Anderson, Jr., Dublin, Va., in place of B. M. Anderson, retired.

S. Carson Broyles, Waynesboro, Va., in place of E. M. East, retired.

WASHINGTON

Pearly R. Lusk, Richmond Beach, Wash., in place of Margaret Bright, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert H. Edwards, Chester, W. Va., in place of A. W. Dalrymple, retired.

Edward C. Pastilong, Moundsville, W. Va., in place of C. E. Knapp, retired.

WISCONSIN

Robert A. Krenke, Dale, Wis., in place of V. C. Grossman, retired.

Viola K. Stauffer, Monticello, Wis., in place of H. A. Walters, retired.

Ronald L. Marcks, Pepin, Wis., in place of J. W. Johnson, deceased.

Francis J. Cosgrove, Richland Center, Wis., in place of J. G. Stoffel, retired.

Malen L. Teclaw, Thorp, Wis., in place of W. S. Wagner, retired.

WYOMING

Margaret H. Hennek, Wamsutter, Wyo., in place of E. J. Grinch, retired.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 5, 1963:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Ashton C. Barrett, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1967.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tito Not Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was asked today for my reaction to a proposed official visit to the United States by the Communist Dictator Tito. This request was made by station WMAL.

Whether or not Tito should be welcomed in our Nation's Capital is certainly a basic public issue. He has tried to pry, sneak, or embarrass his way into this Nation's Capital for a number of years.

My position on this issue follows:

An official invitation to Tito to visit Washington in connection with his forthcoming foray into Latin America raises a number of public issues.

Among those issues is whether it is compatible with our position as leader of freedom's cause for our Government to play host to one of the most infamous tyrants in history. It may be argued that Tito is head of a state and as such should be received in that capacity. In my judgement that argument is invalid. Tito does not represent the peoples of the Yugoslav Empire. He is, in fact, head of a police state regime. If we are a realistic people, and I hope we are, we would recognize that when our Government plays host to Tito it is in fact playing host to a police state regime.

Another issue is whether the United States should become involved with or take sides in the growing dispute between the Russians and the Red Chinese. As is known, Tito has long been an advance agent of Moscow in the schemes of the Communist conspiracy and was Moscow's agent assigned to subvert France and make it a Communist state in 1947. This Tito front for Moscow cost France $8 billion.

He is now playing an advance role for the Russians in an effort to line up free world support for Moscow against the Red Chinese. The United States should stay out of this feud among the conspirators. If they want to bury each other that is their business, not ours.

An official visit by Tito to Washington would be quickly interpreted in many parts of the world that the United States had lined up with Moscow in its dispute with Red China.

This fall marks the 20th anniversary of Tito's death marches in Yugoslavia. Those death marches involved several hundred thousands of Croatian and Slovenian patriots who opposed the Communist takeover of their homelands. Tito organized those marches which ended up in mass murders and mass burial of the victims. This is one of the black chapters in the Tito rise to total power in the Yugoslav Empire. It would be quite improper for the United States to lose sight of the meaning of this 20th anniversary of Tito's death marches by honoring him as an official guest of our Government.

I hope our Government gives full and careful consideration to the feelers put out by Tito a few days ago for an official invitation from the President. A visit by the Communist Dictator Tito would not be a calming influence in these troubled times.

Address of Senator Cannon at 45th Annual Convention of Nevada Department of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, my distinguished junior colleague, Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, recently was privileged to address the 45th annual convention of the Nevada Department of the American Legion in the city off Ely, in our home State.

His remarks to Legionnaires and their ladies were warmly received and his thought-provoking speech is worthy of the attention of this body. Senator CANNON, as most of you know, has an outstanding war record. He has a vital and keen interest in all our veterans and in the administration of legislation affecting their interests. He follows closely all legislation of this nature and his speech is a fine summation of the workings of the Veterans' Administration, as well as veterans legislation currently before the Congress. Just a few short weeks ago Senator CANNON performed a splendid job in managing the military pay raise bill before this body.

I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CANNON AT 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Fellow Legionnaires, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be with you today and an honor to speak to you about certain matters that are of current concern to veterans and their elected representatives in the Congress. Such matters as the creation of a standing committee of the Senate which I have sponsored and supported since going to the Senate, proposals for GI benefits for our cold war veterans, and the reopening of national service life insurance are serious matters indeed, and I shall get to them in a few moments.

First, I should like to express my thanks to Johnny Lougaris and others who invited me to be with you today, thereby gaining for me a long weekend away from Washington and into the friendlier and far more enjoyable environment of Nevada to share your company.

The present session in Congress is still very much in progress. And while no new records have been set for accomplishment, I can tell you that I have been assured we will be in Washington this year until we get the job done.

So, while I intend to enjoy my few days in Nevada on this trip, it is a little too early to celebrate the closing of business in the Senate which usually takes place about this time each year.

Few matters before the Congress are as important or are of the magnitude of the programs undertaken by the Veterans' Administration. There are, as you know, over 30,000 veterans in Nevada alone, and some experts have estimated that one-half of the adult male population of this country has experienced military service on at least one occasion of their lifetime. So it is not surprising that the affairs of the veterans affect virtually every segment of the Nation's population and are inextricably linked to the economy and welfare of the United States.

Only the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department have more employees than the Veterans' Administration's 175,000. The agency is responsible for administering over 300 statutes through its 279 field offices. Its recent budgets have been exceeded only by those of the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and the Treasury. It is larger than any of the 32 independent agencies in the executive branch. Its chain of 170 hospitals is the largest in the world, and through the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery it operates the largest single medical program in the United States. In addition, the Veterans' Administration administers the largest guardianship program in the country, having charge of the estates of nearly 400,000 children and other beneficiaries. Its present life insurance program represents about one-fifth of all ordinary life insurance in force in the United States—life insurance policies with a face value of $41 billion are handled by the agency.

The outstanding indebtedness on GI home loans equals about 25 percent of the total outstanding residential mortgage debt and Veterans' Administration payments of disability and death compensation to more than 4 million veterans and their dependents exceeds the total budgets for 7 out of the 10 departments now represented in the Cabinet. It is therefore easy to see why I have championed the establishment of a standing committee on veterans' affairs in the Senate and will continue to do so.

Some of our national legislators have even demanded Cabinet status for this aspect of our national life. In the Senate at present the Finance Committee handles compensation, pensions, and insurance matters; and the subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee handles veterans' education and training, vocational rehabilitation, GI loan matters, and bills relating to veterans' hospitals and medical care.

I have consistently maintained, as my predecessors have since the Reorganization Act of 1946, that a Committee on Veterans Affairs is certainly long overdue. I was chairman of a committee in 1959 which probably came closest to a successful resolution of this matter. We unanimously recommended the creation of this standing committee but were unsuccessful in gaining approval of the full Committee on Rules.

I believe that support for such a committee is growing and that an increasing number of Senators have come to realize that such a new standing committee is necessary if we are to fully and adequately discharge our responsibility to the Nation's 22 million veterans.

Another major piece of legislative business which continues to be of interest to the Legion is the cold war GI bill which was reported out favorably by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on July 2. This bill will provide readjustment assistance to cold war veterans; that is, for those who have served on active duty in the Armed Forces from Janury 31, 1955, to June 1, 1963. The readjustment assistance authorized is similar to that awarded to veterans of the Korean conflict. But unlike the aid granted Korean veterans, there is no mustering out pay and no provision for business loans. The minimum service required for eligibility for educational benefits is 180 days of active duty, whereas only 90 days were required as a minimum for World War II and Korean veterans. I believe the Senate record on this bill is fairly consistent. We passed this bill in 1959, but it did not reach a vote in the House. It was favorably reported in 1961 (as it was this year), but was not reported in time to be considered by the Senate.

Each year many thousands of cold war veterans return to civilian life. The vast majority of these entered the Armed Forces without any higher education or vocational training, and very few were provided with technical skills suitable for civilian life during their service in the Armed Forces. Consider their plight: They serve their Nation during a time of international tension and return to a situation of high unemployment where the unskilled person faces decreasing opportunities. The purpose of this bill is to provide readjustment assistance to these cold war veterans to continue their education and to obtain vocational skills, as well as to provide for direct and guaranteed home and farm loans. It is not a give-away. Rather, it will provide this country with hundreds of thousands of vitally needed men and women in the fields of education, science, and medicine and will pay for itself in the increased taxes which these veterans will pay on their higher earnings.

No, this is not a giveaway. In my opinion, the alternative is to give away much of the future for these patriotic young people and to give away the economic growth which is dependent upon skill and educated men. And perhaps we would even be giving away the confidence which most Americans have that the Congress does not forget the devotion of the men who protect this country around the globe.

As you know, bills have become law during this session of Congress which will be of great benefit to many veterans. I can only cite them without speaking of the details of their provisions. An increase of dependency and indemnity compensation for dependent parents and children was approved on May 15, as were statutory awards, as distinguished from disability compensation, for veterans with a service-connected loss of the powers of speech and of hearing. On April 2 the provisions governing burial allowances broadened eligibility (Public Law 883).

The question of further reopening of the national service life insurance program is still undergoing legislative study and consideration. In the last Congress a measure was passed reopening the program only to veterans with service-connected disabilities. A bill introduced in the present Congress provides for the reopening of the program to all veterans of World War II and Korea, with no requirement concerning service-connected disability. It provides that those veterans who did not exercise their right to apply for national service life insurance during their initial period of eligibility now shall be given a 1-year period in which to apply for insurance coverage.

Granting a period of grace to World War II and Korean war veterans would assure equality of treatment with World War I veterans who had 33 years in which to apply for life insurance funded by the Federal Government. As the matter now stands, those who served in the second war had only the 4½ years after the war within which to apply. The cutoff date was April 25, 1951.

It is the belief of the supporters of this bill that there were many reasons beyond the control of eligible veterans which prevented their application for insurance during this period of readjustment to the difficulties of civilian life. That the opportunity to apply for such insurance is a valuable one, is shown by the following figures: The cost of national service life insurance is far lower than similar commercial policies; the average net annual premium charged by four leading commercial insurance firms for 5-year term insurance at age 35 is $6.64 per $1,000 of coverage, compared with only $1.20 for national service life insurance.

The bill does not create a new Federal program, and does not make any new group of veterans eligible. It restores eligibility previously earned by veterans because of their active service in time of war. No addition to the cost of government is proposed since additional costs of administering the national service life insurance program will be charged in the premiums paid by those using the grace period provision of eligibility. If the bill is enacted, it is estimated that from 14 to 16 million veterans insurance purchase rights will be restored.

I am also pleased to report to you the successful passage by the Senate of the military pay bill, which represents the first increase in salary given to our men in uniform since 1958. Among the most significant elements of the bill, which I had the pleasure of managing on the floor of the Senate only 2 days ago and of being chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee which heard testimony, was to provide a cost-of-living increase of approximately 5 percent for retired persons. Above that, significant increases were recommended and approved ranging from 11 to 25 percent dependent upon length of service and proficiency. I believe this bill will go a long way toward improving the attraction and retention of service members for career military service, correct certain inequities in the military compensation system and establish a more equitable basis for the adjustment of military pay for service members after retirement.

As veterans, we cannot fail to be interested and, I hope, impressed by steps that have been taken in the past 3 years to strengthen the military establishment in several important ways. Congress has approved legislation which authorized additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces and to broaden the power of the Secretary of Defense.

This country today is stronger militarily than it has been in many years, and we in Congress intend to keep it that way.

Great attention today is drawn to the other side of the coin of our military capacity—that of the difficult problem of disarmament and a lessening of world tensions. The Senate at this moment is engaged in an exhaustive and penetrating study of the proposed nuclear test ban treaty. Certainly, everyone in our country would favor a nuclear test ban treaty if we could be assured that it would not endanger our security and the position of the free world which was dearly bought in terms of American blood and treasure. I personally am taking the position that I will not vote for a treaty of this kind until I have reasonable assurances that proper safeguards are available to prevent cheating by the Russians.

Second, such a treaty would be foolhardy if it represented an attempt at appeasement in the form of permitting the Russians to equal or surpass our present nuclear superiority. The lessons of the past are all too vivid in regard to this crucial subject.

Third, I want to be sure that this country has sufficient policy planning for the development of our strategy in the event that China, France, or other countries begin a massive testing program in the atmosphere.

The Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee will ask questions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to determine if the treaty will adversely affect our military position. Scientists of the Atomic Energy Commission will be called upon to tell us how rapidly we could resume testing if the treaty is violated by the Russians—a risk that certainly lies at the heart of this proposal. The Senate will also be anxious to know whether we can accomplish our defense goals through underground testing alone.

I would like to get away from my text here to tell you something more about the treaty. It provides that we would volunteer to discontinue to test nuclear weapons in space. Russia broke the moratorium in the past in atmospheric testing and some of our scientists believe that the Russians are well ahead of us in this area. Underground testing the treaty does not prohibit, and in this area we are well ahead of the Russians. Russia may be able to test underground to improve their capabilities, but we cannot test in the atmosphere, an area where we believe the Russians are ahead.

There are provisions in the treaty wherein either party may give a 90-day advance notice of withdrawal to resume atmospheric testing. The Russians may make all their preparations over a long period of time and then give us the 90-day notice of withdrawal.

One of the things that we are going to assure ourselves of is that our country is constantly prepared to resume atmospheric testing at least on a 90-day notice. We will not approve the treaty unless we are assured on this particular point by the President of the United States and our leading scientists.

I want to assure you that this is going to be subjected to long and intensive study by people we consider outstanding in the field.

The people who have already said they are for the treaty and will vote for it do not happen to be members of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, and without the approval of this committee, the treaty probably would not be approved. It must be ratified by and with the consent of the Senate of the United States.

And finally, I would like to know upon what firm intelligence we can now believe that the Russians genuinely believe in an easing of tensions and the cooperation between East and West which is certainly indicated in the treaty.

Our overall security should be the foremost consideration. This is part and parcel with the obligation. The country owes it to those who served in prior conflicts.

Our veterans did not ask what they could do for their country when what had to be done in its defense was clear for all to see. They went ahead and did it and did it well. And they continue to work for the good of the country in the manifold patriotic and community activities of a great organization such as the one assembled here today. I believe that the Congress can do no less than keep your faith.

It is always a pleasure to meet with Nevada Legionnaires and it has been an honor to have your attention this morning.

Thank you.

What Business Can Do for America—By President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Nations Business, the publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, President Kennedy has written a concise and lucid article on what American business can do for America.

The President not only discusses what business can do for our country but what government and business can do together in order to achieve certain aims and goals under our free enterprise system.

I believe that this article is of such importance and of wide general interest to the American business community and others that the President's statement should be read and restudied and given meaningful consideration and attention.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the President's article in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT BUSINESS CAN DO FOR AMERICA

(By President John F. Kennedy)

Members of the business community play a vital role in maintaining and building the strength of the American economy—in converting its great potential into higher standards of living and free world leadership.

It is to this community—guided by the free play of market forces but responsive to the national interest—that I address these thoughts on what business can do, and what government and business can do together, to achieve these common aims: Getting our economy back to maximum operation, speeding our rate of growth, improving our competitive position in world markets, avoiding inflation, and equalizing opportunity for all.

These are the aims all of us share. Each group in our economy has a responsibility to take actions to help achieve them—and in so doing to help America and help themselves.

TAXES

Although the present expansion, now in its 30th month, has reversed the postwar trend of ever-shorter expansions and more frequent recessions, and has generated solid gains—a 13-percent growth in real output, a 21-percent rise in industrial production, a 13-percent rise in personal income, a 30-percent rise in corporate profits—both unemployment and idle capacity remain far too high.

Too many of our plants stand idle, too much of our work force is unemployed, too many of our potential sales are not made and, thus, part of the country's economic strength lies fallow.

This administration has proposed tax action that would advance our economy, that would turn potential into actual sales, that would move workers from employment agencies to their jobs, that would keep machines humming full time, that would lead to new and larger orders for raw materials and equipment.

The drag of inadequate markets has slowed our economic growth in recent years. This drag will not fall away simply because we wish it so. In part this drag consists of what you and I know is a burdensome tax system born of war and inflation. The tax program I have recommended can lighten the drag on growth: Through its impact on consumer markets and sales and through its stimulus to after-tax profits, it would set the stage for the more vigorous investment response that is crucial to the future growth of business and the country.

This action—tax reduction and reform—would spur output and investment. It reflects a conscious decision to stimulate the economy chiefly through private rather than public channels, to give American business the opportunity, and the responsibility, of meeting the needs of the American economy and all its citizens.

Government is not interested in making a larger share of the decisions on where to spend, but it is interested in creating the climate through tax reduction and reform for more investment spending by business and for more buying by consumers. When tax revision is enacted, it can be made more effective as you revise your investment and other plans upward, in accordance with the improved profit and demand picture.

But tax revision has not yet been enacted. You can help even today in creating a stronger America by supporting that tax revision program. There exists no magic tax policy that will fully satisfy everyone and every interest—yet prompt action on tax relief and reform will benefit us all. If we quarrel over every sentence, the book will never be written. The full support of the business community for prompt and appropriate tax action is urgently needed. The common interest in an overall program of tax reduction and reform must transcend the particular interest of individual groups.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Our balance-of-payments position has been a source of continuing concern. Here, too, we have made progress. But the times demand even greater progress and even greater effort. Government can do much to defend and strengthen the dollar and to promote the interests of U.S. business around the world.

In our tax and monetary policies, in our international monetary arrangements, in our rigorous dollar-conserving measures in aid and defense, and in our export credit and expansion programs—buttressed by the strong new measures announced in July—we are making a major effort to bring the U.S. balance of payments into equilibrium. But again, there is a role that only you can play.

The Trade Expansion Act and the forthcoming tariff negotiations with the European Economic Community and other nations are opening a new era of world trade and international business opportunity. The time has come to seize these opportunities, to seek out the potentials that lie in foreign markets.

Although many producers have responded quickly and successfully to the growing challenges of foreign competition, we are far from being a nation of exporters. U.S. firms can meet the test of the world market successfully if they search out their opportunities aggressively.

I urge you—and the prospect for new profits urges you—to redouble your own export efforts. Your active personal support for the White House Conference on Export Expansion to be held September 17 and 18 can also contribute to a successful national export effort.

This Nation's efforts to increase production and profits comprise another key element in the improvement of our balance-of-payments position. As we expand our home market, and increase rates of return by cutting costs and making full use of our productive capacity, investment funds that now go abroad will stay at home. And as they stay at home, they will help to build the base for faster growth of our own economy.

PRICES

Our remarkable wholesale price stability in the past 5 years while prices in most other industrial countries were rising substantially has given us a solid base for an improved international competitive position.

Investment to reduce costs and improve products and measures to advance the skill and productivity of our workers will further strengthen our competitive position—but only if the productivity gains are not dissipated in fruitless spirals of rapidly rising wages chasing higher prices, and vice versa. That is why we have called upon labor and business to exercise responsible restraint, basing wage and profit increases on fair shares of rising productivity. The continued need for a vigilant national effort to avoid a resumption of the inflation of past periods will become even more urgent as we move closer to full employment and full-capacity operation. Relative price stability can be continued if all of us—labor, business, and government—work at it. If the overall level of prices is not to rise, price increases on some products and services must be matched by price decreases in others. Such increases and decreases are a necessary and desirable part of a free market economy.

But what is unnecessary and undesirable is a general rise in prices. Current prices cannot be looked upon as a floor—let alone as a springboard for higher prices in the future. American business pioneered in exploiting the possibilities of mass markets—of seeking higher profit levels through lower prices and expanding sales, not through increased profit rates on limited output. This basic philosophy is as relevant today as it was 50 years ago and time has proved its worth.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The achievement of full employment and of a faster rate of economic growth will be of prime importance in giving substance to "equal opportunity." But beyond this, you, as businessmen, can play a leading role in giving all Americans a direct chance to share in the creation of a stronger economy and in the fruits of that economy. In communities all across the Nation, businessmen hire workers and serve customers and thus have an opportunity in their everyday business conduct to make a decisive contribution to the practice of American democracy. I ask of all of us that we judge each other not as white or nonwhite but as Americans and in so doing expand our markets, increase our productivity, and strengthen our Nation.

THE JOINT TASK AHEAD

Business can help on all these fronts—on tax revisions, on investments, on exports, on prices, on equality of opportunity. But business cannot achieve our common goals alone. This is too much to ask of any group. Nor, and let me make this clear, can government do it alone.

Business, labor, and government are partners and no one partner can complete the task if the other partners are not doing their shares. That is why, in much of what I have said, I have spoken of what we can do together.

For business decisions not only influence current and prospective economic conditions, they also reflect these conditions. It is government's task to create a climate in which your decisions to expand and invest, to export, and to assist in defending the stable dollar, are sensible and meaningful.

The present economic expansion is an example of the interaction of government policies and business performance. Part of the rise in economic activity is the result of business decisions made in response to last year's investment tax credit and depreciation guideline revision. The latter were government policies; but you made them effective.

A recent private survey indicated that over $1 billion of the business expenditures on new plant and equipment planned for this year are directly related to last year's tax credit and revised depreciation guidelines—measures the Executive and the Congress took to encourage new investments. Without this $1-billion margin, business investment plans for 1963 would have shown much less change from 1962.

I have no reason to doubt that the future will tell the same story: That government can pursue policies to encourage expansion, and we will do that; that businessmen can make these policies effective by playing the dynamic role the free market assigns to them, and you will do that.

Our aims are the same. If you fail, all America fails. But, in fact, we will succeed. The results will demonstrate to men everywhere the power and thrust of the American free enterprise system—the mightiest engine of economic progress the world has known.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. **LEE METCALF**, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, from the trivialities of small concerns that irritate and frustrate, we turn to Thee, that we may regain a sense of the immensities and of the vast consequences of questions which cry for decisions on the most commonplace days and ways.

In all our dealings with matters of public weal, save us from posing as oracles of a righteousness and a wisdom we do not possess. With our paucity of knowledge, keep us from superficial judgments, lest we, too, be unjustly judged.

In such an hour in human relationships, save those who must speak for this Nation set upon a hill from agitation without vision, passion without poise, and heat without light.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. **LEE METCALF**, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. **MANSFIELD**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 5, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEES MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. **MANSFIELD**, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Upon request of Mr. **MANSFIELD**, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. **MANSFIELD**, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES RELATING TO ADVANCED SATURN LAUNCH VEHICLE

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of facilities relating to the advanced Saturn launch vehicle; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

A letter from Harold C. Woodward, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, expressing his opposition to proposed legislation relating to amendment of section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, transmitted to the Senate by Chairman Swidler of that Commission, on June 12, 1963; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON EXCESSIVE COSTS OF MAINTENANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES UNDER LOAN GUARANTEE AND DIRECT LOAN PROGRAMS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the excessive costs of maintenance and management of properties acquired upon default of loans made under the loan guarantee and direct loan programs, Veterans' Administration, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF CONTINUED USE OF UNECONOMICAL FIRST-CLASS AIR-TRAVEL ACCOMMODATIONS BY EMPLOYEES OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continued use of uneconomical first-class, air-travel accomodations by employees of defense contractors, Department of Defense, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNREASONABLY HIGH PRICES PAID FOR NICKEL CADMIUM AIRCRAFT BATTERIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unreasonably high prices paid for nickel cadmium aircraft storage batteries under negotiated fixed-price contract AF 01(601)–22629 with Sonotone Corp., Elmsford, N.Y., Department of the Air Force, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ILLEGAL USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the illegal use of operation and maintenance funds for rehabilitation and construction of family housing and construction of a related facility of the Department of Defense, dated August 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON APPLICATION FOR LOAN UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 by the Hooper Irrigation Co., of Weber and Davis Counties, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CONCESSION CONTRACT IN LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract assigned to Clarence W. Anderson and Margarette E. Anderson, authorizing the operation of a trailer village at Boulder Beach in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENACTMENT OF INTERSTATE AGREEMENT ON DETAINERS INTO LAW

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enact the Interstate Agreement on Detainers into law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FIRST LT. DAVID A. STAVER

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the convention of the National Prohibition Party at St. Louis, Mo., favoring the repeal of the equal time rules, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Graham A. Martin, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand;

William Matson Roth, of California, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador;

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Burma;

Gen. Herbert B. Powell, U.S. Army, retired, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to New Zealand;

William O. Hall, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in addition, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the diplomatic and foreign service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the diplomatic and foreign service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2121. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manoranjan Dutta and Mrs. Kanak Dutta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2122. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2123. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "CASTRO NETWORK IN THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 193); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, five thousand copies of part 6 of hearings by the Subcommittee on Internal Security on the "Castro Network in the United States."

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN TO ESTABLISH RESIDENCE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide additional time for certain homestead entrymen to establish residence.

These individuals, residents of my State, have filed homestead applications in Arizona and made good-faith efforts to improve the property but due to fortuitous circumstances have been unable to comply with the residence requirements.

I hope that the committee can give consideration to this bill and report it soon in order that these individuals can move onto the property and proceed with development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2122) to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence, introduced by Mr. Cannon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR STUDENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional exemption of $600 a year for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning.

A generation ago, Mr. President, a high school education was widely regarded as sufficient to compete successfully in adult life. The student who continued his education at the college level was the exception. And the cost of that education was modest.

Today, increasing numbers of our youngsters are finding that there is a shrinking demand for the skills and knowledge developed only through the high school level. Our very national security requires that we produce more scientists and engineers. We need more doctors, technicians, physicists. At the same time, our developing culture and economy require more advanced training in the arts and humanities, in business administration, in virtually every field.

Along with the increased enrollment in our colleges we have witnessed a steep increase in the costs of higher education. While it is still possible to work your way through college as a number of us here in this Chamber have done, the difficulty of doing this grows every year.

Parents who thought they were providing for their children's college education with a plan developed 15 or 20 years ago are finding their resources alarmingly inadequate. Large numbers of families are going into debt in order to help finance the education of their sons and daughters.

The bill I am today introducing seeks to provide some relief from the burden borne by these parents, by the students themselves and, in the case of young married couples, for the spouse of the student.

Mr. President, my opposition to so-called general aid to education is well known. It is based in large part on the concern that Federal aid inevitably means Federal control. This bill has the virtue of assisting students and their families financially, though not overgenerously, without the strings of Federal dictation.

The bill (S. 2123) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning, introduced by Mr. Hruska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], may be added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 176) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs—for the Veterans' Administration, submitted by me on July 24, 1963.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK KOWALSKI TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 17, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the nomination of Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for term expiring August 9, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post published a tribute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] for the fine speech he made the other day on the international balance of payments.

I concur in a great deal, although not all, of what the Senator from New York said. In the words of the editorial, Senator Javits' remarks have the unique virtue of cutting through to the heart of the matter and viewing the economic problems of the free world from a long-term perspective.

Indeed, Senator Javits' speech did this. But it also had the rare virtue of dealing with a broad and complex problem in a comprehensive way. Senator Javits covered the subject fully and brilliantly.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Javits' Long View," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Javits' Long View

Senator Jacob K. Javits once again demonstrated his firm grasp of the issues underlying this country's balance-of-payments deficit in a perceptive speech that has attracted too little attention. The challenge posed by the outflow of capital from the United States has elicited responses which are at best capable of dealing with short-term symptoms. Javits' remarks, made on the floor of the Senate, have the unique virtue of cutting through to the heart of the matter and viewing the economic problems of the free world from a long-term perspective.

In the Senator's view, "The heart of the problem is the international monetary mechanism which makes the adjustment of one economy to another in the free world extremely difficult." And he adds that:

"The basic flaw in the existing international monetary system is that it depends for additional liquidity or credit on continuing the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States which add dollars and gold to finance rapidly growing international * * * transactions. To the extent we succeed in eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit, we also remove liquidity from the system."

In order to resolve the liquidity dilemma and prepare for the changes that would follow upon successful efforts to eliminate the tariff barriers to freer world trade, the Senator proposes that the United States should take the initiative in convening an international monetary conference. This body would devise a world payments system which takes cognizance of changes in the world economy since the Bretton Woods Conference days in 1944. And it would also inquire into the unresolved problems encountered by underdeveloped countries in marketing their exports and consider rules for the strengthening of international competition.

The administration's efforts to resolve the balance-of-payments problem have been singularly lacking in boldness and imagination. Since conventional measures, after 3 years, have produced little in the way of tangible results, Senator Javits' proposal should be seriously considered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for his graciousness in submitting for the Record the editorial which refers to my speech. I shall carefully analyze the editorial; and if anything further needs to be said about my position, I shall certainly say it.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy and kindness to me.

SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO DEMOCRACY: EXPANDED NETWORK TV NEWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some of the major television networks have expanded their news policy, and now are engaged in what I believe is a historic policy of increasing the regular nightly national 15-minute news program to one-half an hour of news in prime time. Too little attention has been paid to what I believe approaches a revolution in the provision of news to the American people. Tens of millions of informed Americans follow the news primarily by watching and listening to these programs, because they serve them as eyes and ears to inform them of what is happening in their Government, their Nation, and the world. This is now a prime way in which the world's greatest democracy is informed and able to function as a democracy.

I recognize that this policy may be an expensive one for the television networks. However, regardless of whether it makes business sense, it does make very good citizenship sense; it is a wonderful asset to our democracy, for it enables our people to be better informed regarding what is going on in the world and to have better understanding of the complicated issues, which require explanation and analysis, as well as reporting.

These facts should be noted in the U.S. Senate. I commend the television networks on their fine work and their adoption of this new policy.

In my experience in Wisconsin, in speaking to high school students, I have found that the morning after a long documentary is shown on the television networks, their questions are almost entirely confined to what they saw the night before. This reflects the amazing impact of TV on the American people. I am sure that what is true of the high school students of Wisconsin is also true of millions of adult Americans. The impact of such programs is enormous.

So I believe the new policy of providing greater information in a longer period of time on our television networks is a great contribution to better understanding by the American people of the issues of the day; and I commend the televison networks for their action.

THE BIRMINGHAM SCHOOLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of Senators to the implications of the situation existing at Birmingham, where the Governor of the State of Alabama has brought about the closing of public schools which were to be desegregated according to order of the Federal court.

These events are altogether too reminiscent of the actions of Governor Faubus in Arkansas, which finally resulted in the calling out of Federal troops. In that situation there was also some fuzziness as to what the State really had in mind in posting troops at the doors of schools which were to be desegregated. In the case of Little Rock, there were disorders in the schools. In the case of Birmingham, a situation existed in which the action of the Governor in not making clear to the people of the State, especially the minority which is so rabidly segregationist, that the law would be enforced and that the law includes the laws of the United States, resulted in a situation in which he gave credence to those who would create public disorder, and gave the appearance of inability or unwillingness to enforce the laws of the United States, with the resultant disorder and disaster to the school system of Birmingham, which now has occurred.

Mr. President, I know the Attorney General is very seriously considering this question, as is the President; and it may very well be that the only way by which the schools in Birmingham can be reopened, pursuant to the orders of the Federal courts, which I am sure will be forthcoming in due course of time, inasmuch as the law is clear on that score, will be, again, with the aid of Federal troops. It may very well be that the President will have to send U.S. marshals or U.S. troops into Birmingham, in order to assure that the children of adult citizens of the United States shall have the rights of citizens of the United States inasmuch as they, too, are, of course, citizens of the United States, in that sense of the word.

Mr. President, in connection with these very serious and trying decisions—which President Eisenhower made, which President Kennedy has made, and which, in the case of Birmingham, President Kennedy may well have to make—it is valuable to the Chief Executive to have an expression of opinion from those of us in high places in the legislative branch and from the public itself, indicating support and understanding of the situation. The American people should clearly understand that there is no immunity from the disorder, difficulty, or danger arising in this situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the limitation in the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. There must be a balancing of the public interest as against these dangers. Dangers do exist, no matter what one does, as is evidenced by what already has occurred at Birmingham. A lesser danger to the people of the United States results from enforcement of the rights of citizens of the United States within the State of Alabama—to which those rights extend, just as they do to every other part of the Nation. Such enforcement would be by the United States, if need be, in the event that the State authorities—and certainly it is always preferable to have the laws enforced by the State authorities—are unable or unwilling to enforce them.

The President should know that in these dire circumstances, he has the support of the people of the country and of those in high places in the legislative branch who feel, as I do, that all measures, which may be necessary for the maintenance of laws in the interests of the Nation, should be taken; for ours is a nation of laws, not of men—whether in Alabama or in any other area of the Nation.

The Nation should assure him of that. The Nation should support him in whatever decision he has to make to see that the laws of the United States are enforced in Alabama, that the orders of the Federal courts are carried out, and that the children who seek the rights of citizens of the United States are not denied an education in the public schools of the State which should be open to them. It is the manifest duty of the States, as it is that of the United States, to protect these citizens in the exercise of their rights.

WALL STREET JOURNAL CHALLENGES BASIS FOR BIGGER DEFICIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the lead editorial appearing in this morning's issue of the Wall Street Journal is stimulating because it raises an interesting intellectual challenge to the advance guard economists. It questions those who say that the Federal debt cannot be compared with private debt. When they want to justify deficits they argue that the Federal Government, unlike the private individual or family or corporation, does not really have to repay the debt.

But these same economists are right out in front in comparing private debt with the public debt when they support a bigger deficit on the grounds that private debt has grown faster than the Federal debt.

The argument made by the Wall Street Journal is not that private and public debt are the same. Of course, they are quite different. But the editorial points out that there are serious penalties and payments that must be made when public as well as private debt is increased, as the Federal deficit has been increased in the past. The editorial points out also that private debt, while increasing, is constantly being paid off, but our Federal debt has not been reduced significantly for a long time.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Excuse for Excess" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excuse for Excess

It sometimes seems as though the advocates of perennial Federal deficits have worked themselves into an intellectual cul-de-sac.

On the one hand they contend that the National Government's budgeting cannot fairly be compared with that of individuals, businesses or even other levels of political authority; it's supposedly in a special category. Yet on the other hand they point to private indebtedness as a justification for Federal deficits; why shouldn't the Government be allowed to do what most families and companies do all the time?

To begin to sort out this multiple confusion, it's true that many people seem infatuated with charge account and credit card living. For ourselves, we are old-fashioned enough to wish there were a more general regard for savings and living within incomes.

But there is nothing inherently wrong, or necessarily dangerous to the Nation's financial structure, in large accumulations of private debt. One reason is that all concerned understand that debt must be repaid at some point; the few who may think otherwise can expect to end up in trouble.

This common consent is missing from the attitude of many Federal economists and their academic supporters. The public debt continues to mount as the budget deficits pile up year after year. Not only is there no thought of paying off any part of the debt; the policy of deliberately planned deficits insures against it.

To see no danger in such practice must require a major effort of the imagination. The deficits themselves are potentially inflationary; the growth of the debt imposes burdens and distortions on the whole economy. Just to service it now costs more than $10 billion a year.

Apart from those evils, the debt represents a huge overextension of public credit. Whereas private debt is constantly in the process of repayment, public debt can cause trouble because there is neither attempt nor intent to reduce at all.

It is no answer to say, as the officials often do, that the burden of the debt is declining because the debt is declining as a proportion of gross national product. The GNP in itself is swelled by the enormous Federal spending which helps keep the debt so high. And no amount of percentages can alter the fact that the debt has been steadily increasing instead of declining. Such statistical doubletalk should not commend itself to men in positions of responsibility.

Now by what special dispensation is it assumed that the Central Government can escape the consequences which apply elsewhere in the economy? Though differences obviously exist between public and private business, they are not of such a nature as to make it safe for the Government to continually defy economic laws.

For one difference, only the Government can create money. This unfortunately is also a way of saying that only the Government can actually cause an inflation, though other forces can contribute to its development. The belief that inflation is a form of economic salvation is indeed a sad delusion.

If it is accepted that creating new money is an unhealthy method of attempting to cover debts, then it seems clear that the Government is very much in the position of a householder or business enterprise. Far from being some unique entity wholly detached from the workings of the general economy, the Government by its nature is also subject to the sometimes painful rule that the money must come from somewhere.

We suspect that, deep down, the devotees of unending deficits know it. Otherwise they would not get themselves in the unwieldy position of putting the Government in a special category while at the same time taking comfort from the extent of private debt. That excuse for excess should be scant solace for them or the Nation.

STATISTICAL EXAGGERATION OF ECONOMIC LAG

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an article by J. A. Livingston, the perceptive financial columnist, calls into question the argument that our economy has been lagging quite as seriously as gloom sayers claim. He does so by pointing out that the usual basis for the argument that the economy has been lagging is that during the period from 1957 through 1963 there was a lesser expansion of our economy than in the period from 1947 through 1957. Livingston properly points out, on the basis of studies by a number of economists, that the period 1947 through 1957 was one of recovery from World War II and an expansion which resulted from the Korean war, and that the comparison is not fair. If we consider the most recent 5 or 6 years, including the past 2½ years of the Kennedy administration, it will be seen that we have done quite well in terms of our historic American experience.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Business Outlook—J.F.K. Challenged on Lag," by J. A. Livingston, published in the Washington Post, September 4, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1963]

J.F.K. CHALLENGED ON LAG

(By J. A. Livingston)

Have we become a Nation of growth addicts?

The August Federal Reserve Bulletin suggests we have. A staff paper by Clayton Gehman, an experienced, studious economist at the Reserve Board, directly challenges the thesis of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers that in recent years economic expansion has fallen far short of the long-term trend line and the Nation's potential.

The contention has important political connotations. Perhaps the President is using a false conclusion to push policies of taxation and spending to achieve the unattainable.

Gehman argues that a false base—a poorly chosen period—fosters the melancholy conclusion that "U.S. growth has been lagging."

This conclusion—this point of view—dominated the 1963 Report of the Council of Economic Advisers and influenced Presidential policy.

The Council said: "The 1957–62 period of economic development matches neither our own record of performance between 1947 and 1957, nor gains achieved by other free nations. The annual growth rates of output, income, and productivity all run about 1 percent lower in the most recent period (1957–62) than in the previous decade (1947–57)."

Not once does Gehman mention the Council's report, but his rebuttal is unmistakable:

"The 1947–57 period reflected some unusual conditions. Growth then was more rapid than in most earlier periods back to 1900 and more rapid—especially in the Korean period, 1950–53—than could reasonably be expected to continue. For the whole period from 1962 back to 1899 the average rate of growth in industrial production was about 4 percent per year."

Gehman has a case. When economic activity was slackening in 1949–50, the Nation retooled for the Korean war. Munitions production soared, consumers overstocked in fear of shortages. This overstocking resulted in a letdown, which depressed the subsequent rate of growth.

Gehman emerges with these conclusions:

"1. Growth in U.S. economic activity in recent years has been close to longtime rates.

"2. Increased productive efficiency in the use of labor and materials has been achieved.

"3. As a result, there has been more unemployment and less demand for materials than there would have been otherwise."

These observations are underlined by this statement:

"If one starts with 1959 and compares increases in either the gross national product or industrial production over the next 3 years, the rate of expansion in each has been at least as rapid as in similar business expansions starting with 1946 or 1955. This holds true even though the latest period includes the 1960–61 recession.

If Gehman is correct, then how is it possible that so many economists have accepted the slow-growth theory? In addition to the poor choice of years, Gehman suggests several reasons.

Growth trends have been calculated on the basis of gross national product estimates of the Department of Commerce. These estimates are exactly that—estimates—and can be underestimates.

Gehman thinks the Commerce Department underallowed for expansion in recent years in noncorporate purchases of capital goods. Instances: Your doctor buys an X-ray machine, or a lawyer purchases copying equipment, or a dentist high-speed drills, or accounting and brokerage firms computers. These are not directly included in the estimates.

Further, gross national product estimates are in dollars. They have to be deflated—price changes have to be removed. Gehman politely suggests that in recent years the price deflations have been overadequate. They've understated growth.

The study is presented in the Reserve Bulletin as a staff paper. It is not endorsed by the Federal Reserve Board. But you can be sure it was gone over carefully by the economists and statisticians in the Board and that the Governors knew about it. They'll have to bat back the political brickbats.

Caution: It would be a mistake to assume that Gehman is satisfied with the rate of growth. Who is?

He'd like to see it greater than 4 percent. Who wouldn't? What a boon to employment that would be.

Yet his message is unmistakably clear. Let's not sulk or despair because statistically the Soviet Union or countries in Western Europe has exceeded America's rate of growth in recent years.

We haven't really deviated from past trends. Our economic zest hasn't lessened. On the contrary, productivity has increased. We are using fewer men and less material to get the same rate of growth as earlier. That's why, unfortunately, we have unemployment.

Therefore, we have to question whether—by forced effort, by dint of Federal deficits or hurry-up tax cuts—we can sustain a rate of growth beyond the historic 4 percent.

MILWAUKEE TV STATION CALLS TITO CHAMPION TIGHTROPE WALKER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in an editorial a few days ago, the Milwaukee television station WTMJ–TV commented on the close and friendly relationship between Marshal Tito and Khrushchev. The editorial stated that the relationship between Tito and Khrushchev is "like long lost brothers." It also said that the relationship will continue as long as Khrushchev thinks he "needs Tito on his side."

This editorial raises once again the question of why we continue to provide foreign aid to Yugoslavia. I wish to make clear that the most-favored-nation treatment of Yugoslavia may be something quite different. One might argue possibly for treating Yugoslavia equitably in terms of trade. This is a more complex and difficult question. But it is very hard to justify giving the hard-earned tax dollars of the American taxpayer to a Communist dictator who is working with and for the Kremlin. But that is what our policy has been in the past, and will continue to be if the pending foreign aid bill, as it is now in committee, is passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tito Champion Tightrope Walker

Russia and Yugoslavia are putting on another big display of friendship designed to blot out the hatreds of the past. Premier Khrushchev flew to Belgrade where he and President Tito greeted each other like long lost brothers. The airport greeting was almost a carbon copy of Khrushchev's reception for Tito at the Moscow railroad station last December when the Yugoslav leader visited Russia. At that time the meeting was billed as a 2-week vacation for Tito but foreign observers said it looked more like a political honeymoon for an estranged couple.

Tito, in giving Khrushchev the red-carpet treatment now is causing world observers to wonder whether the carpet's color will turn from the subdued revisionist red to the garish scarlet of a Soviet satellite. It seems extremely unlikely, however, that 70-year-old Tito will give up his role of world champion tightrope walker—a role in which he seems to enjoy balancing Yugoslavia's position between East and West. And a role which has proved valuable in the reconstruction and economic growth of his country since World War II.

There have been many twists and turns in Soviet-Yugoslav relations since Stalin kicked Tito out of the Soviet bloc in 1948. After Stalin's death, Khrushchev went to Belgrade to apologize for Stalin's action. In 1956 the two leaders exchanged visits. And at that time they issued a new declaration of solidarity, with Moscow apparently accepting the doctrine of separate roads to socialism. Then came the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt and Tito tore up the agreement. The ideological warfare between the two again was resumed. By summer of 1958 relations between the two countries were as low as they had ever been since Stalin's death. At one point Khrushchev called Tito "the Trojan horse of communism's enemies." But a year later the two were meeting secretly in Rumania where they reportedly agreed on concrete forms of cooperation. Last December at a time of deteriorating relations with Red China, Khrushchev conceded that Yugoslavia was a Socialist country. And Tito, in turn, denounced Communist China.

How long will the brotherly love last this time? The answer is obvious—as long as Khrushchev thinks he needs Tito on his side. And as long as it lasts Tito can be expected to get as many economic concessions as possible. For his is not just an empty title of world champion tightrope walker.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to bring to the attention of the Senate today an editorial commending our distinguished presiding officer, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. While some in this body probably would not agree with the particular efforts for which the Vice President is commended, I am sure we would all agree completely with the writer's theme that he is a man of great courage. The traits which made him one of our Nation's greatest Senate majority leaders have made him one of our Nation's greatest Vice Presidents. His complete dedication to the American people has advanced civilization toward its goal of universal freedom and peace. When full equality and freedom are achieved in our great Nation, when the goal of the American Revolution is finally secured for all our people, the record will show that the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson has been instrumental in the attainment of this goal. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the St. Joseph News Press on August 16, 1963, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Carrying the Fight

Time and again in recent months, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson has demonstrated his loyalty to his Chief by hewing close to the administration line on civil rights.

Sometimes his pronouncements in favor of the Kennedy-backed civil rights program have put him in hot water with the southerners with whom the big Vice President from Texas has so long been associated. It hasn't seemed to bother him in the least.

At Houston, Tex., this week, Vice President Johnson told city officials from across the Nation that they must guarantee civil rights to all citizens or face the loss of local self-government. His statement openly angered certain southern delegates to the American Municipal Association session he addressed. That was to be expected.

Vice President Johnson easily could remain in the background and let others assume the full burden of carrying the civil rights fight. He hasn't though, and for that he is to be commended. He has shown his courage.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, our Economic Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has recently held hearings on S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill, in New York, Pittsburgh, and Louisville. The testimony in all of these cities was excellent and the interest keen. Louisville is blessed in having two of the finest and most public-spirited newspapers in the country, and I ask unanimous consent that editorials on the subject from the Louisville Times and the Louisville Courier-Journal be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Aug. 27, 1963]

The Credit Hearing Was Valuable

The hearing on credit practices conducted here over the weekend by a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate was colorful and valuable to the extent that it focused attention on a facet of the economy that should be of vital concern to the general public. We are, after all, a nation of installment buyers, and personal credit of all kinds reaches new heights every passing year.

Specifically, the hearing was on a truth-in-lending bill sponsored by Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois. It would require all firms and institutions dealing in consumer credit to disclose how much this credit is costing in both dollars and cents and the simple annual rate on the unpaid balance. The bill has nothing to do with regulating the charges; its objective is to inform the consuming public how much it is paying for credit, thus enabling the consumer to shop for credit in the same way he shops for merchandise. Credit abuses exist. The victims are all too often the poor and the uninformed. The Douglas bill would not guarantee these people protection from sharp practices. It would make it more difficult, however, for those extending credit to conceal its real cost to the consumer.

The opposition to the bill—retail merchants, commercial banks, and some other lending institutions—contend that it is impossible to express the cost of credit in terms of a simple annual percentage charge on certain kinds of loans and on revolving credit accounts. Senator Douglas and those who support his bill maintain that it can be done.

It may be that the Douglas bill, as presently drafted, is not the answer for certain types of installment credit. The Senator said he was willing to consider revisions. But it was clear from the testimony of opposition witnesses at the hearing that it is not compromise but the death of the Douglas bill that they desire. They want no part of Federal legislation in this field. The States, they argue, should do the job. But the question is, will they? Kentucky has made some progress. The 1962 general assembly enacted a watered-down version of the Douglas bill, which requires that the cost of credit, including installment credit, be stated in dollars and cents. This legislation was drafted in large part by representatives of retail merchants, who came forward with it as a substitute for a stronger bill that was first submitted. This legislation undoubtedly was a net gain. But is it enough? Some witnesses testified that it isn't. One of them was a Louisville attorney who has conducted a comprehensive study of credit practices in Kentucky for the health and welfare council of the community chest.

In any event, even if the Kentucky legislation is adequate, a need remains for some version of the Douglas bill on the national level, for many States do not have legislation like Kentucky's. Perhaps eventually they will, but meanwhile the consumer is at a disadvantage.

[From the Louisville Times, Aug. 27, 1963]

The Informed Buyer Has a Choice

Opponents of the truth-in-lending bill sponsored by U.S. Senator Paul H. Douglas insist that the name is unfair. The implication, they point out with some reason, is that anyone who is against it must be for falsehood in lending (or in charges for retail credit, which the bill also would cover).

The opposing witnesses who appeared before Senator Douglas' subcommittee here Saturday were unanimous in denying that they approve of misrepresentation or concealment of the true cost of credit. They said that what they object to is a provision in the proposed law which would require a statement of total cost of credit in terms of simple annual percentage of the principal sum involved. They don't like the term "simple annual interest" because they insist that more than interest is often involved—items like service charges, insurance of the borrower or perhaps searching titles.

What concerns the borrower, or the buyer on a time payment plan, is the cost of using credit. It makes no difference to him whether the cost is called interest, insurance, or a service charge. Kentucky has a State law that requires the seller or the lender to inform the buyer or the borrower what credit will cost him in dollars and cents. It does not require a statement of the cost in annual percentage rate.

Thus, if he buys a refrigerator on a 24-month time payment plan, he can read his whole contract and find out how much more he will pay than if he were paying cash. The difference may seem fairly larger, but if he can manage the monthly payments he will be disinclined to work out the percentage rate, even if he knows how.

Generally, opponents of the Douglas bill say they approve of Kentucky's credit law that requires a statement of credit cost in dollars and cents. Most of them, in fact, supported that law—as an alternative to one which would have required a statement of cost in annual percentage rate.

Their opposition to the Douglas bill is pitched primarily on the annual percentage rate requirement, but they further oppose it on the ground that credit regulation of this sort should be a State responsibility. Since American banking is based on Federal law, this contention seems somewhat ingenuous.

The argument is advanced with conviction by opponents of the Douglas bill that it is impossible to state the simple annual cost rate on revolving credit accounts in stores, and on certain "skip payment" loans by banks. Bankers and merchants whose judgment we trust have advanced this argument.

Yet we find it hard to believe that it is impossible to establish a statement of simple annual percentage while it is perfectly feasible to state costs in dollars and cents.

One revealing exchange took place between Senator DOUGLAS and a local department store executive. The department store treasurer said it would be impossible to include the annual rate in monthly statements to customers because "there is no time limit involved." Senator DOUGLAS said the annual rate could be expressed simply at 12 times the monthly rate or service charge (which in most systems of revolving credit is 1½ percent). The annual percentage rate in such an instance, Senator DOUGLAS pointed out, would be 18.

"Where's the justice," demanded the witness, "in forcing us to state 18 percent when the credit unions can state 12 percent? We're not in the moneylending business."

The justice, as Senator DOUGLAS quickly pointed out, is that a statement of the cost of credit is due the buyer—which is what the Douglas bill is about.

It is quite true that the merchant offering revolving credit accounts may borrow from banks, paying their interest rate, to finance his own time payment operation. He must collect enough over and above cash price of his sales to pay the bank interest and to carry the overhead of his credit operation. It may be reasonable to argue that he should be able to realize something from the transaction for his own trouble; he is not in business for philanthropy.

But the whole point of the debate is that the buyer or borrower should know what he is being asked to pay for the use of credit. Then, if he wants to, he may borrow the cash price at a lower "simple annual rate," pay the merchant at once, and bypass a middleman creditor.

Senator DOUGLAS said in Louisville that he "is ready to confer with the retail merchants of the State and the Nation to iron out details and language of the bill." If the only objection (aside from the Federal law aspect) is to the difficulty of computing simple annual percentage rates, this should not be an insurmountable barrier—given the will to surmount.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, foremost in the minds of our citizens is the question of whether the limited nuclear test ban treaty, which the Senate will be debating early next week, is in the best interests of the United States.

A highly informative article based on solid facts on this subject by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has appeared in the September 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I would like to make this article a part of my remarks and recommend its reading by those who are concerned for our country's welfare.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE THE TEST BAN

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The limited nuclear test ban is a Russian beartrap. It will help the Soviet Union and hurt the United States. It will allow the Russians to catch up in nuclear-weapons development, in which they are behind, and prevent us from catching up in areas in which they are ahead. This topsy-turvy treaty raises the ominous possibility that, in time, the Soviet Union could gain the clear-cut nuclear supremacy it needs to achieve communism's unalterable goal of world domination.

Despite serious ideological differences between Moscow and Peking, neither has abandoned the idea that the West shall be buried. Their dispute is over how, when and how deep.

For a decade and a half America's overall nuclear superiority has deterred the Kremlin from seeking its goal quickly and explosively with nuclear weapons. Our ability to retaliate with fearsome damage to the Soviet Union has made that method too costly. Our deterrent also has curbed Russia's cold war activities. Fears that limited wars might get out of hand and escalate to nuclear war have tempered Soviet adventurism.

America's superior nuclear arsenal has been maintained by American scientists in unrestricted competition with Russian scientists. Now the rules of competition are to be changed. All testing is to go underground. President Kennedy has said this will be a "first step" toward reducing world tensions, freeing us from the fear and danger of fallout, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and limiting the arms race in ways that will strengthen our security more than unrestricted testing. He has argued that it is a step toward peace well worth taking, because the terms of the treaty will allow the United States to retain its present nuclear superiority.

But will it allow us to retain superiority? Is it a step toward peace as we understand it—or as the Hungarian freedom fighters savagely were taught it?

Here is the nub of the matter and here there is room for discussion—and dissent. Power, not good intentions, rules the world. No one knows this better than the Russians. Why, after all these truculent years, have they suddenly decided there shall be a test ban agreement? What is behind Khrushchev's quick change from the frowning Russian rocket rattler of last October's Cuban crisis to the smiling Russian treaty peddler of today? Has the wolf jumped out of his skin and a lamb jumped in? Hardly. He obviously believes the pact is giving him something at the expense of the United States. Khrushchev thinks he is getting a bargain. He is.

While allowing underground testing, the treaty bans explosions in the atmosphere, underwater or in space. For the Soviets, nothing could be better. With underground tests they can develop the kinds of small, tactical weapons that the United States has been building successfully for years. They will have the unrestricted opportunity to equal or surpass us. In the atmosphere the Russians already have made tremendous advances with strategic weapons far more powerful than any that the United States has. In 1961, when Khrushchev coolly broke the testing moratorium, Russian scientists detonated one weapon with a force of 58 megatons. It can be scaled up to a yield of 100 megatons and safely placed in Soviet arsenals without further testing. The exact yield of the biggest American weapon is a military secret, but a good bet is that the Red Army calculates it at not over 30 megatons.

During the 1961 series of 31 atmospheric shots and continuing with last year's series of 49, the U.S.S.R. also made some startling advances in the development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Caught flatfooted by the sudden Soviet test resumption in September, 1961, we could not get our own atmospheric series underway until April, 1962. With nearly 90 tests, we made some significant advances on our own, but technical difficulties cut our high altitude experiments severely. On balance, we need to continue testing far more than the Russians. These are the reasons why:

First, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has testified that the Russians, like ourselves, are rapidly hiding their missile bases and other military installations far underground in protective cocoons of concrete. Without atmospheric testing we cannot increase the yield of our warheads. Knowing the limitation on those yields, the Russians easily can pour enough concrete to protect against them. When that is done, our retaliatory strikeback forces will be left threatening empty launching pads and invulnerable fortresses. That kind of threat against the Soviet homeland is hardly sufficient to deter the Kremlin. Nuclear war will become more likely, not less.

Second, our nuclear deterrent will be weakened in yet another way by a ban on atmospheric testing. To pose a credible retaliatory threat, we must be strong enough to absorb a surprise Sunday punch and then rally to devastate the attacker. The enemy's nuclear attack will create weird disturbances in all unprotected electrical circuitry. Yet to strike back convincingly, millions of electrical circuits at SAC bases, in our bombers, missiles, and Polaris submarines all must work in unison and function perfectly—beginning with transmission of the command to retaliate through every step of the massive strikeback operation, right down to triggering our warheads over enemy targets. We know a good deal about nullifying these electromagnetic disturbances, but we need to know very much more. That knowledge can be learned only from atmospheric testing.

Third, the United States starts with the sobering knowledge that, if war comes, we will be on the defensive. This means we will be using defensive nuclear weapons over our own territory and that of our allies. Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," has pointed out time and again that these weapons must create little or no fallout. Otherwise we will severely hurt ourselves in our own defense. We have made a good start toward developing cleaner nuclear explosives. But we need to learn much more and, again, we need to test in the atmosphere to do the job.

Fourth, we need to test in the atmosphere to perfect the antimissile missile, the weapon that we may need desperately to preserve our nuclear deterrent. The technical problems of creating a defense against a warhead hurtling down on the United States are great. Secretary McNamara has expressed doubts that it can be done at all. However, Khrushchev, in fact, insists that the Russians have already turned the trick. "We can hit a fly in the sky," he says.

If Khrushchev's claim that his scientists have solved the technical problems is correct, then as soon as the Russian missile defense system is put into operation our nuclear deterrent will be largely nullified. Our only course of action is to develop an antimissile missile of our own. To do this, we have to test in the environment in which the weapon will be used—the atmosphere.

Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has forcefully pointed out how vital it is to test new weapons under realistic conditions. "At our peril," he has said, "we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads, and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode."

Fifth, because the treaty will be unpoliced, the Russians could make a quantum jump militarily by the trick of surprise abrogation—clandestine preparation leading up to the sudden start of tests. Last year President Kennedy himself said that an atmospheric test ban treaty would be extremely vulnerable without provision for adequate inspection guarding against secret preparation for a surprise abrogation. Although President Kennedy has promised to keep in readiness our own plans to resume testing quickly, our program is bound to sag unless it is kept alive by at least some limited atmospheric testing. This was explained by the President in 1962, before the resumption of our own tests when he said, "we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

Sixth, there is need for the United States to continue testing because the treaty fails to rule out Soviet cheat tests either in the air or in space. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has asserted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the pact places no "faith and trust" in the Kremlin, and that it is "self-enforcing," since the United States could easily detect any atmospheric tests by the Russians. His assertions do not square with the Atomic Energy Commission's inability to classify three sets of "manifestations" from the Soviet Union early in June as nonnuclear. There is no assurance they were not very low yield or very clean air shots that released only small amounts of fission products. As to space cheating, series after series of very profitable Soviet tests in outer space could be carried on entirely without suspicion on our part.

For all these reasons, the test ban treaty helps Russia militarily. It also helps Russia psychologically and politically.

The negotiation and signing of the treaty in Moscow, together with Premier Khrushchev's role as the only participating head of state, gives Russia a credible claim to the "peacemaker" image. In addition, the treaty helps Khrushchev in his struggle with the Chinese. The negotiation tells both East and West that Khrushchev's book on "How to Succeed in Aggression Without Really Bombing" is still a best seller.

An ineffective treaty removes the pressure of world opinion for an effective one that would stop Russian progress as well as our own. Furthermore, an unpoliced treaty ratifies the Soviet "closed society" principle and forestalls future attempts to open it up.

The treaty also hints our extreme reluctance to use nuclear weapons at all, except in a final showdown with the Soviet Union. Communist and other aggressors seem to be left free to intensify conventional attacks without fear of our calculated use of nuclear arms to block them. Stepped up Red Korean action along the Korean armistice line already has cost U.S. casualties.

In addition, the treaty could be interpreted as preventing us from giving needed nuclear weapons to our allies. This comes at a time when our NATO allies seriously resent their inability to deter the Soviets independently should we refuse or become too weak to do so. Without the freedom to share our weapons, this estrangement will deepen. The dissolution of NATO could well result. This, for years, has been one of Khrushchev's priority objectives. The nuclear test ban also comes at a time when our allies in the Far East are increasingly worried that the Red Chinese will soon get nuclear weapons.

APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the test ban proposal, however, and the most difficult to argue against, is its emotional appeal. As Khrushchev knows all too well, the treaty seems to assure the worried peoples of the world that after the long years of fear everything is going to be all right. Surely the treaty must be the beginning of a thaw in the cold war. Surely, the Russians must now be ready to work for a real peace.

For Americans this line of wishful thinking could be disastrous. We could rapidly develop a false sense of security that would lead us to drop our guard. We could be emotionally pressured into more comprehensive disarmament agreements without adequate controls.

All the "first steps" sought by President Kennedy with his partial treaty could be gained through much wiser means—a simple treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union stipulating that atmospheric testing be stopped whenever certain reasonable, agreed-upon levels of fallout had been reached. These "first steps" would be substantially free from the military, psychological, and political disadvantages of the treaty at hand—which solves none of the basic conflicts between Russia and the United States. The problem of Berlin would still exist. So would Laos. So would Cuba. And there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that Americans would not continue to be killed in Korea and South Vietnam.

In such a world, the United States must keep up its nuclear guard. And the only safe way we can maintain the nuclear deterrent is by refusing to accept a Communist scheme to force us to stop testing in the atmosphere.

THE THREAT OF INFLATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, economists—who are opposed to Puritan ethics and advocate spend and spend while taxing less and less at a time when we are faced with an increasing national debt and with frightening deficits previously unequaled in a rising economy—are being challenged not only by learned but experienced individuals in business and industry.

Mr. President, while a majority in the Congress may describe as trivial the threat of inflation as a result of the philosophy of spend more and tax less, I point out that there are some guardians of other people's money in the field of private enterprise who do not share this economic philosophy. This is well pointed out in a letter received by me and which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNION CENTRAL LIFE
INSURANCE CO.,
Cincinnati, August 20, 1963.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I have been invited to join the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. The principles advocated by this committee are said by its representatives in a letter to me to be as quoted below:

"I want to reemphasize to you the committee's belief that: (1) a reduction in individual and corporate taxes is essential to insure adequate growth and strength of our economy; (2) controversial tax revision should not be permitted to delay such reduction and, (3) economies in and prudent control of Federal expenditures are essential."

I have declined to become a member of this committee, and I have written to them as follows:

"In our opinion it would be very inflationary to reduce Federal income taxes without a completely counterbalancing reduction in the cost of the Federal Government.

"We believe the interest of the American economy and, hence, of our policyholders is best served by the position I have outlined in the paragraph above."

We feel very strongly that there should be no tax reduction without completely balancing reduction in the cost of government. We feel a deep conviction that we should urge Congress to protect the American people—including whom are more than 500,000 of our policyholders—from the inevitable impetus to inflation which would result from tax reduction without an equal reduction in Federal expenses.

In order that there may be no mistake about our sincere opinion and our fear of this impending danger, I am writing you urging your very serious consideration of this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. LLOYD,
President.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since the inception of this administration, there has been much discussion over the various pump-priming methods which have been employed to assist labor surplus areas. In my own State of Rhode Island unemployment has been the most serious domestic problem since the end of the Second World War.

It is my belief that the Kennedy administration has done more to try to alleviate this situation since it took office in January of 1961 than any previous administration.

Mr. President, it has been the concept of the New Frontier that the best way to produce immediate employment and at the same time to encourage the construction of necessary public facilities and improvements is through Federal financial assistance. Although I believe much more should be done in this direction, especially in my own State, I must say that a good beginning has been made. As a great American, Al Smith, once said "Let's look at the record."

Therefore, Mr. President, at this point I should like to ask unanimous consent to submit the enclosed table of cumulative information on the activities of the Area Redevelopment Administration, accelerated public works and manpower development and training programs in Rhode Island into the RECORD, which has been compiled by the Library of Congress and my staff.

This table is complete to this date, September 5, 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Location of project	Description of project	Type of Federal program	Estimated Federal contribution	Number of jobs created, or number of trainees	Estimated man-month on-site employment
Blackstone Valley	Treatment plant	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	$1,040,000	(1)	1,056
Bristol	Sewer system	Accelerated public works	110,000	(1)	216
Cranston	Sewer facilities	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	1,200,000	(1)	(1)
Do	Osteopathic general construction	do	125,000	(1)	144
Do	Construct sewage facilities	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	323,000	(1)	330
Cumberland	Water system	do	51,000	(1)	75
East Greenwich	Public building	do	66,500	(1)	75
Lincoln	Construct town hall	do	125,000	(1)	124
Do	Water system	do	220,000	(1)	216
Mashassuck River Valley	Technical assistance for study of drainage problems and soil-bearing capacity.	Area Redevelopment Administration	37,000	None	None
Narragansett	Sewage treatment plant	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	206,000	(1)	(1)
Pawtucket	Memorial Hospital addition	do	125,000	(1)	12
Do	do	Accelerated public works	1,875,000	(1)	(1)
Providence	Improve or supply access roads, streets, water and sewer to industrial park.	Area redevelopment administration	$1,071,000	1,045	(1)
Do	Rhode Island Hospital addition	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	237,000	(1)	216
Do	Roger Williams Hospital addition	do	344,000	(1)	408
Do	Sewer treatment plant	do	639,000	(1)	624
Do	Roger Williams and Miriam Hospital construction.	do	287,000	(1)	(1)
Do	Modernize water supply	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	148,000	(1)	262
Do	Water facilities	do	13,000	(1)	19
Providence-Pawtucket area	Training: Bookkeeping machine operator, combination welder, sheet metal worker, typist, electronic mechanic, machine tool operator.	Area redevelopment administration	283,000	318	----------
Do	Training: typist. auto mechanic, machine tool operator.	do	158,000	178	----------
Do	Training: tabulating machine operator, console computing operator.	do	161,000	160	----------
Do	Training: sheet metal workers	do	19,000	20	----------
Do	Training: key punch operator	do	14,000	50	----------
Do	Training: machine operator general	do	25,000	25	----------
Do	Training: turret lathe operator	Manpower Development Training Act (institutional).	43,000	16	----------
Do	Training: auto mechanic	do	70,000	44	----------
Do	Training: programer computer	do	62,000	25	----------
Do	Training: sheet metal worker	do	16,000	20	----------
Do	Training: auto body repair—metal	do	16,000	15	----------
Do	Training: clerk-stenographer	do	9,000	25	----------
Do	Training: machine operator, general	do	211,000	101	----------
Do	Training: custodian	Manpower Development training Act (experimentation and demonstration).	20,000	48	----------
Do	Training: machine operator, general	do	47,000	12	----------
South Kingston	Public safety building	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	57,800	(1)	72
Smithfield	Mercy Hospital addition	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	998,500	(1)	(1)
Warwick	Sewage treatment	Accelerated public works	2,148,000	(1)	2,058
Do	Water storage tank	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	76,000	(1)	75
Do	Sewage facilities	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	1,827,000	(1)	600
Do	Interceptor sewers	do	170,000	(1)	164
Do	Library	Accelerated public works (HHFA-CFA)	310,000	----------	324
Woonsocket	Improve and extend water systems to industrial park.	Area redevelopment administration	186,000	255	(1)
Do	Woonsocket Hospital addition	Accelerated public works (DHEW-PHS)	178,000	(1)	132
Do	Construct sewage facilities	Accelerated public works (HHFA-DVA)	270,000	(1)	420

(1) Not available.

Source: Area Redevelopment Administration; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Community facilities Administration; Department of Labor, Office of Manpower Development Training. James R. King, Economic Analyst, Economics Division, Aug. 13, 1963.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in a recent issue of Chicago's American, the columnist, Andrew Tully, urged enactment of the truth-in-packaging bill. This legislation, which has been developed by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, will be of sound benefit to the consumer. Mr. Tully, in his column, writes that "there is nothing in the bill that any honest merchant should fear," for the bill "merely provides that the American consumer be given honest weight and honest quantity for his dollar." I hope the committee will report this bill to the Senate very soon, and I think all the consumers of this country will highly commend the Senator from Michigan when they receive the protection of this much-needed legislation.

This increased press support for the truth-in-packaging bill is encouraging, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tully's column, from Chicago's American of July 25, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: TRUTH IN PACKAGING

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON.—If Congress would get busy, it could save the citizen some of the money he spends in supermarkets, drugstores, and similar emporiums. All it has to do is pass the truth-in-packaging bill to curb deceptive labeling and packaging practices.

The bill already has been OK'd by a subcommittee of the Senate Antitrust Committee and is now being pondered by the full committee. Even with all the work Congress has permitted to pile up, it should take time to give the buying suckers a break.

Aside from the money the bill would save, it would be a remedy for a kind of mass frustration that has come over the public in its exposure to sneaky merchandising gimmicks. Drop in any food store or pharmacy these days to make a single purchase, and you are caught up in a bewildering assortment that makes it impossible to discover which item is the best buy.

PINT A "GIANT HALF QUART"

There are "full" quarts, "jumbo" quarts, and "giant" quarts. No longer is there the simple pint—it has been merchandised into the "giant half quart." Huge packages of dry cereal open to reveal a couple of inches at the top is pure air. Bread is pimpled with air holes, and ice cream is packed in such a way that the customer is shortweighted. Labels shriek that the price of an item is "4 cents off" the regular price, but nobody can find out what the regular price is.

A parade of witnesses have testified during the last 2 years concerning these sleazy merchandising tricks, and legislative voices deplored the situation. Particular attention was paid to the fine print on certain packages, which when translated often contradicted the label's promises as to weights, quantities, and sizes. Odd-sized packages were found to cheat on quantity, and the prettier the container was the more the consumer had to pay for what was in it.

CALLS FOR STANDARDIZATION

The truth-in-packaging bill would at least be a start toward ending this thievery. It would standardize the contents of small, medium, and large packages, and demand the truth on the labels of "giant" and "imperial" containers. It would halt the deceptive cents-off-regular-price gimmick, provide that weights and contents be printed in clear type, and insist that the merchandiser state what is meant by the claim that a given package serves "X" number of persons.

Producers always set up a whine when the Government steps in to try to regulate them, and there have been the customary bleats about this bill. It has been attacked as both confiscatory and un-American. But the fact is there is nothing in the bill that any honest merchant should fear. It merely provides that the American consumer be given honest weight and honest quality for his dollars. This may be an eccentric approach in these days, but it falls somewhat short of treason.

LACK OF ANY ADMINISTRATION POLICY IN REGARD TO VIETNAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in Tuesday's issue of the Washington Evening Star appeared an editorial in which the lack of any administration policy in regard to Vietnam is pointed out.

This editorial emphasizes once again the reluctance of the Kennedy administration to face up to a major decision at the appropriate time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "No Policy in Vietnam," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 3, 1963]

NO POLICY IN VIETNAM

However one may choose to interpret the President's comments on Vietnam in his televised CBS interview, they hardly add up to anything that can be called a policy. If Mr. Kennedy's points were set down, they would run something like this:

1. The repressions against the Buddhists were very unwise. We take this to mean that President Diem should not have struck back in the face of a Buddhist political attempt to overthrow his government.

2. The war in Vietnam cannot be won without popular support.

3. The Diem government might regain the support of the people with changes in policy (what changes?) and perhaps with changes in personnel. This last presumably refers to President Diem's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, tough-minded head of the secret police.

4. For the United States to withdraw its support in the war against the Communist Vietcong would be a great mistake.

Finally, the interviewer, Walter Cronkite, got down to what used to be called the $64 question. "Hasn't every indication from Saigon been that President Diem has no intention of changing his pattern?"

The President didn't answer this one. Instead, he took refuge in a wordy diversion which was in no sense a response to the most pertinent question in the interview.

All of which points to this conclusion: The war in Vietnam, which we will continue to support, will be lost unless the Diem government changes, and the President doesn't know or won't say whether Diem will change or not. Meanwhile, our Government persists in statements which tend to undermine the Diem regime without raising up any prospective successor.

Whatever this may be, it is not entitled to be called a policy. The more the administration explains what we are doing in Vietnam, the less sense it makes.

DUTIES ON JAPANESE FISHERY IMPORTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have previously addressed the Senate with reference to S. 1988, the bill introduced by me on August 6 which provides enforcement procedures and penalties which our Government may use in protecting the integrity of our territorial waters and our claims of fishery resources of the Continental Shelf.

At the time of the presentation of the bill newspapers reported that its introduction has been viewed in Tokyo as "a manifestation of unfriendly sentiment against Japanese fishermen." This report concerned me greatly.

So it was that I was moved to communicate with the Ambassador from Japan, His Excellency, Ryuji Takeuchi. The text of my letter to him has previously been made a matter of record.

On August 28, Ambassador Takeuchi replied and it is with the greatest pleasure I present the text of his response:

MY DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have received your letter of August 13 and wish to state in reply that I am now told by our authorities in Tokyo that no Japanese official has made a comment on your proposed bill such as the one reported by AP dispatches. You can rest assured that the Japanese authorities in Tokyo desire to maintain most cordial relations with your country on fishery questions as well as on all other matters.

Sincerely yours,

RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan.

I was pleased to read that the adverse comments reported from Japan have no basis in fact. True, we have had cordial relations in general with Japan. This is seen most clearly in the fact that throughout the years Japan has had in America a flourishing market for its fishery products. Its exports in 1962 were in excess of $100 million. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table indicating as clearly as anything can the importance of the U.S. market to the fishing industry of Japan.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value [1]	Tariff July 1, 1934 [2]	1963 tariff
EDIBLE PRODUCTS					
Frog legs, fresh, chilled, or frozen		1,322,863	$1,354,647	10 percent ad valorem	5 percent.
Frog legs, prepared or preserved		5,738	7,638	20 percent ad valorem	12 percent.
Fresh water trout, not elsewhere included, fresh and frozen		1,845,919	747,447	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fresh water n.e.s. and blue pike, fresh or frozen		300	131	do	Do.
Eels, fresh or frozen		800	812	do	Do.
Salmon, fresh or frozen		165,753	113,860	2 cents per pound	Do.
Cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk, fresh or frozen		318,500	51,385	1 cent per pound	Do.
Halibut, fresh or frozen [2]		394,164	107,260	2 cents per pound	Do.
Mackerel, frozen		447,695	73,390	do	0.75 cent per pound.
Sturgeon, fresh or frozen		130,620	47,399	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Swordfish, frozen		59,316	21,729	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound.
Shad, fresh or frozen		200	290	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fish, n.e.s., fresh or frozen		1,761,804	338,476	do	1 cent per pound.
Smelts, fresh or frozen		390,886	74,348	Free	Free.
Albacore, whole, fresh or frozen, not cooked		52,074,117	9,346,616	do	Do.
Albacore, n.e.s., fresh or frozen, not cooked		2,464,777	412,254	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., whole, fresh or frozen, not cooked		4,057,936	622,757	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., gilled and gutted, fresh or frozen, not cooked		66,863,020	11,392,298	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., filleted, fresh or frozen, not cooked		10,732,820	1,897,632	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., gilled and gutted, heads, tails removed		10,772,880	1,658,272	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., n.e.s., fresh or frozen, not cooked		963,656	101,857	do	Do.
Skipjack tuna, fresh or frozen, not cooked		1,291,618	141,455	do	Do.
Tuna, not elsewhere specified, fresh or frozen, not cooked		1,508,740	211,371	do	Do.
Cod, filleted, fresh or frozen		21,630	4,047	2½ cents per pound	1.875 cents per pound and 2½ cents per pound.[3]
Swordfish, filleted, fresh or frozen		18,425,981	6,232,416	do	1.5 cents per pound.[3]
Halibut and salmon, filleted, fresh or frozen		4,335,213	1,722,799	do	Do.
Yellow pike filleted, fresh or frozen		25,000	4,623	do	Do.
Fresh water fish except yellow pike, filleted, fresh or frozen		10,000	3,230	do	Do.
Flounders, filleted, fresh, or frozen		23,148	10,338	do	Do.
Wolf fish, filleted, fresh, or frozen		8,700	2,697	do	1 cent per pound.
Fish, filleted, boned, etc., fresh or frozen		3,903,804	1,161,359	do	1.5 cents per pound.
Cod, haddock, etc., dried and unsalted		2,045	750	do	0.2 cent per pound.
Shark fins, dried and unsalted		56,611	64,794	1¼ cents per pound	0.53 cent per pound.
Fish, n.e.s., dried and unsalted		115,796	82,970	do	0.3125 cent per pound.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 18, not over 23 cents per pound.		487	108	30 percent	20 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 23, not over 30 cents per pound.		5,934	2,220	do	15 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound, smoked.		4,960	2,188	do	12.5 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound		3,774	990	do	15 percent.

See footnotes at end of table.

Imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962—Continued

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value [1]	Tariff July 1, 1934 [2]	1963 tariff
EDIBLE PRODUCTS—continued					
Sardines in oil, skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound		2,100	$1,300	30 percent	24 percent.
Anchovies in oil, valued over 9 cents per pound		397	163	do	12 percent.
White meat tunafish in oil, canned		206,118	91,113	45 percent	35 percent.
Other tunafish in oil, canned		32,053	13,335	do	Do.
Bonito and yellowtail in oil, valued over 9 cents per pound		36,731	12,522	30 percent	15 percent.
Smoked pollock in oil, valued at over 9 cents per pound		12,039	6,653	do	Do.
Fish in oil, n.e.s., over 9 cents per pound		390,223	181,415	do	25.5 percent.
Salmon, not in oil, in airtight containers		4,422,325	2,237,655	25 percent	15 percent ad valorem.
Canned albacore in brine		26,081,906	12,053,459	do	12.5 percent.[3]
Canned tuna in brine, n.e.s		21,032,909	7,912,761	do	Do.[3]
Fish cakes, balls, and pudding, not in oil, airtight		358,516	125,955	do	3 percent.
Herring, smoked or kippered or in tomato sauce		998,010	180,483	do	6.25 percent.[3]
Bonito in brine, in airtight containers		63,499	24,119	do	12.5 percent.[3]
Fish, n.e.s., in airtight containers		158,708	113,164	do	Do.[3]
Salmon, pickled or salted		3,185	3,014	25 percent ad valorem	8.5 percent.
Cod, haddock, etc., pickled, salted, skinned or boned		7,825	1,594	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound.
Herring, pickled or salted, in containers, not over 10 pounds, net		30	118	1 cent per pound	0.14 cent per pound.[3]
Herring, pickled or salted, in containers, over 10 pounds net		250	213	do	0.1 cent per pound.[3]
Mackerel, pickled or salted, bulk or containers, over 15 pounds		6,500	989	do	0.2 cent per pound.
Fish, pickled, salted, n.s.p.f., bulk or containers, over 15 pounds.		118,759	54,547	1¼ cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound.
Fish, pickled, salted, n.s.p.f., in containers, not over 15 pounds		1,500	801	25 percent ad valorem	25 percent.
Salmon, smoked or kippered, n.e.s		122	420	do	10 percent.
Cod, etc., filleted, smoked or kippered		288	110	3 cents per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fish, smoked or kippered, n.s.p.f		600	200	25 percent ad valorem	6.25 percent.
Fish, n.e.s., in containers, not over 15 pounds		26,596	23,995	do	12.5 percent.[3]
Albacore, loins, and disks, prepared, n.e.s., bulk or containers, not over 15 pounds.		1,630,638	669,423	1¼ cents per pound	1 cent per pound.
Tuna, loins and disks, n.e.s., prepared, bulk or containers, not over 15 pounds.		8,566,867	3,117,844	1¼ cents per pound	1 cent per pound.
Frozen blocks or slabs, uncooked fish bits, etc		34,800	5,740	do	Do.
Other prepared or preserved fish		277,862	152,272	do	Do.
Fish paste and fish sauce		22,223	14,510	30 percent	8 percent.
Fish roe, n.s.p.f., not boiled		25,517	56,089	20 cents per pound	4 cents per pound.
Fish roe, n.e.s., for food, boiled, in airtight containers		2,883	4,108	30 percent	5.5 percent.
Crabmeat, etc., fresh or frozen		206,300	188,634	15 percent	15 percent.
Crabmeat, etc., prepared in airtight containers		3,441,854	4,635,347	do	22.5 percent.
Oysters, etc., in airtight containers		2,777,969	916,272	8 cents per pound	6 cents per pound.
Oysters, smoked, in airtight containers		1,402,155	669,265	do	4.5 cents per pound.
Other oysters, etc., in airtight containers		3,109,862	825,326	do	6 cents per pound.
Razor clams, canned		1,428	631	23 percent	7.5 percent.
Clams, n.e.s		1,354,180	809,241	Free	Free.
Clam chowder and clam juice and combinations		5,441	5,009	35 percent [4]	17.5 percent.[4]
Roch lobster tails		299,647	338,160	Free	Free.
Other fresh or frozen lobsters		47,144	48,939	do	Do.
Lobsters, canned		914	1,562	do	Do.
Turtles		20	330	do	Do.
Clams, quahogs, not in airtight containers		358,083	76,136	do	Do.
Shrimps and prawns		1,468,230	875,366	do	Do.
Headless shrimp, fresh or frozen		91,369	63,938	do	Do.
Peeled and deveined shrimp, frozen		1,281,491	848,229	do	Do.
Shrimp and prawns, n.e.s		1,080,953	951,313	do	Do.
Scallops, fresh, frozen, and prepared		82,576	96,353	do	Do.
Oysters fresh or frozen, not in airtight containers		94,228	53,175	do	Do.
Oysters, n.e.s., not in airtight containers		1,542,801	162,477	do	Do.
Abalone		105,313	171,897	do	Do.
Shellfish, n.s.p.f		2,669,865	695,434	do	Do.
Shellfish pastes and sauces, n.s.p.f		638	528	do	Do.
Total, edible		270,461,675	77,512,899		
NONEDIBLE PRODUCTS					
Whale oil, sperm, refined or processed	Gallon	5,638	4,605	1.87 cents per pound	0.47 cent per pound.
Cod liver oil	do	355,555	433,049	Free	Free.
Kelp	Pound	131,870	85,356	do	Do.
Coral, marine, uncut and unmanufactured	do	2,385	19,280	do	Do.
Fish scrap except fertilizer	Short ton	15	4,800	do	Do.
Whale bone, unmanufactured			318	do	5 percent.
Goldfish and other aquarian fish, n.e.s			17,002	do	Free.
Fish, inedible, n.e.s			2,843,549	do	Do.
Shells, mother of pearl and trocus, unmanufactured	Pound	299,406	164,184	do	Do.
Shells, n.s.p.f., unmanufactured	do	181,618	20,419	do	Do.
Fish solubles	Short ton	338	11,578	do	Do.
Halibut liver oil, advanced	Pound	3,947	5,590	10 percent plus 3 cents per pound.	5 percent.
Fish oils and fish liver oils, n.e.s., advanced	do	232,897	914,193	do	Do.
Agar-Agar	do	140,860	244,944	25 percent	15 percent.
Spermaceti wax	do	29,880	4,747	3.5 cents per pound	2.5 cents per pound.
Pearl essence	do	38,099	241,072	25 percent	9 percent.
Buttons, fresh water, pearl or shell	Gross lines	1,536,723		1.75 cents plus 25 percent	1.75 cents plus 25 percent.
Buttons, ocean pearl shell	do	3,434,053		do	Do.
Natural pearls and parts			363,619	10 percent	3 percent.
Cultured pearls and parts			17,934,159	do	5 percent.
Reptile and sharkskin, leather, n.e.s			17,781	25 percent	10 percent.
Luggage, leather, fitted with travel sets, etc			59,960	35 percent	Do.
Luggage, reptile, not fitted			7,685	do	17.5 percent.
Purses, billfolds, etc., leather, reptile			1,252	do	14 percent.
Leather manufactures, n.e.s., reptile			7,154	do	Do.
Shells, etc., cut, engraved, ornamented or otherwise manufactured.			25,427	do	17.5 percent.
Manufactures of shell and mother-of-pearl			173,805	do	Do.
Moss, sea grass, etc., dyed, manufactured, n.s.p.f			228,778	10 percent	22 percent.
Whale oil, sperm, crude	Gallon	5,206,777	3,563,470	0.67 cent per pound	0.065 cent per pound.
Total, nonedible			27,397,771		
Grand total			104,910,670		

---

[1] The dollar value is defined generally as the market value in the foreign country, excluding U.S. import duties, ocean freight, and marine insurance. Figures not checked by Tariff Commission. The above figures do not include 66,082,000 pounds of tuna received from the Canal Zone, Trinidad, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Ghana, Canary Islands, Ivory Coast, and the Fiji Islands. It is understood that these imports consist entirely or almost entirely of tuna landed in these countries by Japanese fishing vessels or shipment to the United States.

[2] Cuban rate not shown.

[3] In act correspondence with tariff schedule.

[4] On American selling price. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Prepared by Branch of Statistics, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Aug. 20, 1963.

Mr. BARTLETT. It should be pointed out that this enormous value of fishery exports to the United States came about in some degree because of the fact the duties imposed have been substantially reduced during recent years. The table clearly indicates that the United States duty on Japanese fishery imports have dropped substantially since 1934. These figures, I believe, will be of interest to all who are concerned with our relations with Japan.

THE "FIRST LADY" WALTZ

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been no limit to the tributes paid to our beloved first lady, Mrs. John F. Kennedy. Among those tributes is one that I consider particularly fitting—the dedication of a waltz in her honor.

An article concerning the "First Lady Waltz" and its composer, Jimmy McHugh, appeared in the July 27 issue of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S THE "FIRST LADY" WALTZ

Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy will be 34 tomorrow. As she rests at Hyannis on Cape Cod, she will receive many gifts. One of the most lasting will be a delightful song, "The First Lady Waltz," composed by Jimmy McHugh with lyrics by Ned Washington.

McHugh, the alltime hit composer, has produced such memorable tunes as "I Can't Give You Anything But Love, Baby," "Sunny Side of the Street," "It's a Most Unusual Day," "South American Way," and "Coming in on a Wing and a Prayer."

The song has been performed publicly twice—once by the U.S. Navy Band at the White House correspondents dinner for President Kennedy and later at the American Society of Artists and Composers gang dinner at the Press Club here.

Between songs, McHugh has occupied himself as Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce president, board member of ASCAP, sponsor of amateur swimming championships, and head of the Jimmy McHugh Polio Foundation. He has scored the music for many musical revues and motion pictures.

McHugh also is a patron of classical music, perpetuating an appreciation which developed from his first job after leaving college—office boy at the Boston Opera House.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA AT ANNUAL ORCHARD PICNIC

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on last Saturday, August 31, our esteemed colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as has long been his custom, entertained his neighbors and many friends at his Berryville home, with his 41st annual orchard picnic. As has been his practice on those occasions he addressed this splendid gathering of neighbors and friends, giving them a "Byrd's-eye view" of "What can be seen from Washington."

Mr. President, Senator BYRD's remarks in that address are and should be of great interest—not only to all of us and to all other officials and servants of the Federal Government, but they should be read and pondered by all citizens of this country. They merit the profound thought and concern of all of us.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our first picnic was in 1923. This is the 41st. If veterans of all of them are here, I am pleased. If so, you know that since 1933—when the people of Virginia sent me to the Senate—it has been my custom to give you a "Byrd's-eye-view" of what can be seen from Washington.

The text of the "Byrd's-eye-view" today lies in 17 famous words. I repeat them on this warm August day in Virginia. Spoken from the east portico of the Capitol of the United States on a cold day in January 1961, they were heard and translated the world over. Those words were: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

These were the challenging words of the President of the United States closing his inaugural address on January 20, 2 years and 7 months ago. Who has done what for whom in these past 31 months? Take a look at the record, and draw your own conclusions. You will find:

Presidential communications to Congress have approved some 200 programs involving increased Federal obligations of public money and credit. Federal officials have said expenditures will exceed $100 billion next year. At the 1961 picnic we predicted a $100 billion budget in 4 years.

Pressure continues on increasing Federal expenditures for housing, urban renewal, public assistance, public education, health, water resources, river basin development, etc. Spending is increasing for space, moon and ocean exploration, depressed area redevelopment, retraining the jobless, etc. (Going to the moon is estimated to cost $40 billion.)

More Federal spending programs are being formed for surface and mass transportation, acquisition and development of open spaces, and there are more and new Federal paternalistic programs for grants to States and payments to individuals and institutions for public assistance, health, agriculture, higher education, and other things that people should do for themselves.

Virtually no area of domestic-civilian activity by the Federal Government has been overlooked in Presidential message proposals for increased spending. Expansion of foreign aid programs, including the foreign (and new domestic) Peace Corps, the military buildup and civil defense are in addition.

Then we must add in vast increases in trust fund expenditures, outside of the regular budget, for unemployment, health insurance for the aged, social security recipients, and continuing increases for highways—both the interstate and the ABC systems. And so the administration's proposals go—on and on.

Some of these proposals might be desirable, if we were ready, willing, and able to pay for them, but the record shows that we are not, and the administration admits it. In effect, all of these new expenditures increase the public debt in a deficit financing situation. The figures in the official records are clear. For proof, all we have to do is look at what we have been doing to our fiscal condition.

In the fiscal year ended on June 30 before those famous words were uttered by the President, there had been a Federal surplus of $1.2 billion. There has been a Federal deficit in each fiscal year since January 20, 1961, and in the past 2 years it has totaled $6½ billion a year. This year it will be that high again, or higher, depending on the outcome of tax cut proposals.

In the fiscal year ended June 30 before those famous words were said, the Federal debt totaled $286.1 billion. Now it totals upward of $305 billion—an increase of nearly $19 billion. In 3 years interest on the debt has been increased by $1 billion a year, or 9.2 percent.

To take care of its activities, the Federal Government in the past 2½ years has added some 166,000 civilian employees and increased the civilian payroll by $1.7 billion a year. The civilian payroll is now running at an annual rate of $15½ billion or more; and there are more than 2.5 million civilians on the rolls.

And the great bulk of the increase—both in number of civilian employees, and in payroll costs, has not been in the military departments; it has been in civilian agencies. These figures continue to go up, and they do not include, of course, those employed as uniformed personnel in the Armed Forces.

"Ask not what your country can do for you," the President said, "ask what you can do for your country." That question was directed not only to those on the Federal payrolls, but to all of the 189 million people who now make up the population of the United States.

And recipients of Federal programs and their dependents, plus those on Federal civilian and military payrolls and their families, may well add up to half the population of the United States—all, consciously or not, subject to varying degrees of Federal control exercised by bureaus in Washington.

The arm of the Federal Government these days has a long reach, and no one is escaping the force of its centralized power. In earlier years Federal might was developed more subtly; now it grabs control openly. The Federal Government at the moment is seeking control over voting laws, State legislatures, schools, and business.

When I came to the Senate there were only two major so-called Federal-State aid programs—for land grant colleges and roads. There was no Federal subsidy of individuals, localities, States, business, agriculture, etc. These are the Federal programs which crack our fortitude and break down our system of government.

Now there are 110 programs through which the Federal Government is spending $10½ billion a year in grants and other domestic aid, with Federal strings of control attached. There are still more programs for Federal loans, insurance, guarantee of private housing mortgages, etc., also with Federal control strings attached.

These subsidy controls have been extended into business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, private and public institutions, and individuals. Name an area of endeavor, and there is probably a Federal subsidy to go with it.

These are marks of weakness; not of strength. And Federal controls are becoming more binding every day. First it was exercised through imposition of so-called Federal standards tied to the programs. Then it was broadened to force the payment of Federal wage rates, such as those established under the Davis-Bacon Act.

Now the control is being imposed through Executive and administrative order from Washington, with or without statutory authority. For example, there was the recent Executive order fixing by decree conditions of employment in business operations having Government contracts.

Another recent order authorized the withholding of Federal insurance and guarantees of individual private mortgages which do not conform to Federal ideas as to how residential neighborhoods should be integrated. These are some of the things the Government is doing for you.

Think over the Federal control in your life, and the lives of your children, and your friends. You are almost certain to conclude—on the basis of your own experience—that the Federal Government is seeking to be all powerful, and that we, our localities, and our States are becoming mere puppets.

Consider the Executive crackdown on the steel industry last year, when the Central Government made unprecedented use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal grand jury, and threats to withdraw and withhold Federal contracts from companies which dared not to conform to administration price control.

The President last year went so far as to recommend that he should assume the power of the purse. He actually proposed that he be authorized to cut taxes by Executive order, and spend money on projects for which no appropriations had been made.

Both of these powers would have undermined the Constitution which prohibits expenditures except "in consequence of appropriations made by law," and fixes the taxing power of the Government solely in the legislative branch. Congress, fortunately, defeated the proposals, but they are still being demanded.

Now the power grabbers in Washington want to go far beyond anything yet proposed. As a part of the pending civil rights program they want to make it illegal, under Federal statute, for business men, or women—in small business or large—to choose the people with whom they want to do business.

There are outstanding executive, administrative, and military orders which threaten that the Secretary of Defense may order military base commanders to declare "off limits" business establishments which choose among the military personnel they wish to serve.

We still have before us the administration's proposal to extend Federal control over the medical care of the aged people of the country. That is quiet this year. But the pressure will be on again next year with the presidential election coming up.

Power feeds on power. And the Warren Court has equaled, if not exceeded, the executive branch in usurping and centralizing power in the Federal Government. It has handed down two decisions telling schoolchildren when and where to pray.

Decisions by the Federal Supreme Court have been usurping more and more power for years. They have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with executive authority, and assumed legislative powers.

The Warren Court is now undertaking to dictate and influence the formation of political districts within States from which members of State legislatures are elected. Nothing could be further outside Federal jurisdiction.

Gerrymander by the Federal judiciary is something new and dangerous in our form of government. It could be used to destroy the effectiveness of our two-party system, and the safeguards against usurpation of power.

And in the face of all of this, Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, in a speech before the American Bar Association, August 12, told the Nation's lawyers and judges they should "put aside discredited theories of the constitutional law" and support the Warren Court.

Centralization of power makes it easy for pressure groups to concentrate their demands on the few in Washington who exercise authority. And, by the same token, it makes it easy for the few in authority to exercise vast power over the many.

Our strength is being sapped by paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big; usurpation of power by the Federal Supreme Court grown too mighty; and force of pressure groups grown too arrogant. They are undermining our system, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

Hope for the future—built on confidence—is the stimulating force for sound progress. But confidence is not stimulated by expanding Federal domination and control, or judicial usurpation of power, or excessive Federal spending; and we are feeling the oppression of all three.

There are deficits everywhere we look. The United Nations has a deficit of more than $120 million, and we will pay most of it. NATO has a deficit with only the United States and Canada fully meeting prescribed goals. There is a balance-of-payments deficit under which foreigners have taken two-thirds of our free gold. And there are planned deficits in the regular Federal budget.

We have bought half of the U.N. bonds. We are not demanding that our allies meet their NATO goals. The administration seems incapable of stopping the extremely dangerous outflow of gold, and gold backs our money. The management of our fiscal affairs is thoroughly irresponsible. We have tried too long to be Santa Claus, banker, and policeman for the free world.

Government economists say balancing the budget is still a goal; but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And to make us richer faster, they want the Government to create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

These ideas don't sound like men looking for New Frontiers. They sound like Rip Van Winkle. These economists must have been taking a long nap. For years at these prices we have been talking about the foolishness of trying to spend the country rich. We know from experience, our tax bills, and our debt, that it doesn't work.

But the new crop of conomists are still doing business at the same old stand, just as if they had discovered a shortcut to the promised land. And, some of the things for which the Government is spending money are remarkable. You can see plenty of horrible examples, if you look around. You would be surprised at how many people write to me about expenditures we could do without.

I had a letter not long ago from a lady in Arlington County. The Government had sent her 17-year-old daughter a fancy greeting card. It said: "The U.S. Army extends congratulations on the occasion of your high school graduation and wishes you continued success in all of your future endeavors."

The card was personally signed—with pen and ink—by "Your U.S. Army recruiter, M. Sgt. Burton L. Poole."

Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower advised me that last spring the Army had sent a million of these cards to high school graduates all over the country, regardless of sex or age. The Air Force had sent a half million. The cost was charged to Army and Air Force "Maintenance and operation."

Then there was the authenticated report that the Federal Aviation Agency used taxpayers' money to discover that the "average man's posterior covers 179.4 square inches, and exerts average pressure of 0.92 pound per square inch."

I am advised that the official title of the project was "An Analysis of the Sitting Areas and Pressures of Man," and that the findings were made available to the public, and other Government agencies through the Science Foundation Exchange but no record of the users has been kept.

I have an extensive file of correspondence on the project of Dr. Harry P. Harlow, of the University of Wisconsin, who is studying the "Nature and Development of the Affectional Relationship of the Infant Monkey and his Mother."

At last report, the Budget Director confirmed that the National Institute of Mental Health had given Dr. Harlow two grants totaling more than a million and six-hundred thousand dollars, and the indications were that the study was to go on and on.

It is difficult to be critical of health research, but it seems to me that much more care should be exercised in the expenditure of taxpayers' money, even in this important area.

Listen to another Institute of Mental Health project, as described by the Comptroller General of the United States: it was a project for the study of "The Social Role of Aging Wild Horses." The Comptroller General said taxpayers' money for this purpose was granted to the University of Colorado, for investigation.

The project was to extend previous research on the social behavior of elk, buffalo, and moose herds. The study was approved on the grounds that it appeared to be "an imaginative attempt to gather unusual information, which might yield a unique, and significant, contribution to problems of comparative behavior in man."

The Presidency of the United States is a high office, and Members of Congress almost invariably grant personal requests by the President. On July 9, Representative George H. Mahon, chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, announced the subcommittee approved a request, made by personal letter from the President, for two new twin-jet helicopters. The cost was $1,125,000 each.

The two new machines were to replace two single engine helicopters in the White House fleet. And that is a fleet which has grown from 4 to 10 machines in 2½ years, and all of these craft are 10-seaters. They represent an investment of $15 million, with maintenance costing a half million dollars a year. A $4.3 million heliport is being planned.

The President is a busy man, and he must be able to move and act quickly; and I certainly do not begrudge him any recreation he is able to find. But consider the land, sea, and air transport available to the White House. These are the 10 helicopters, the President's private $8 million fan-jet Boeing 707–320 airplane, 3 Boeing 707's assigned to the White House by the Air Force, 1 Air Force Douglas DC–6B for airports that can't take jets, a 21-foot Lincoln Continental automobile, and 3 other family cars, in addition to Secret Service vehicles, and the regular White House fleet, 2 yachts, another yacht available from the Navy, and a racing yawl supplied through the Coast Guard.

Maybe all of this is necessary; but somehow or another it seems to me that the President could set an example by getting along with a little less.

And for us farmers, let's not overlook the fact that two Agriculture Department chemists—Martin Jacobson and Morton Beroza—recently reported discovering that a male gypsy moth on the wing can spot the presence of a receptive, grounded, female gypsy moth as far as a quarter of a mile away—downwind.

Reports of this discovery said the gypsy moth and the silkworm moth sex lure "are the only two insect attractants" that scientists to date have been able to "identify chemically, and duplicate" but they are working hard on the cockroach.

I could continue listing horrible examples of places the Federal Government has been spending money that need not be spent, or had better not be spent. I haven't even mentioned foreign-aid examples, which top them all. For instance, there were: The $14 million drought relief program that didn't relieve; the $2 million road that didn't go anywhere; and the $125,000 irrigation project that didn't irrigate.

All of these were in Peru. Think over the fact that U.S. foreign aid has totaled more than $100 billion, and gone to more than 100 countries in addition to Peru. I don't go through this kind of rollcall to be facetious. I am simply trying to say Federal expenditures could and should be reduced.

If they were reduced substantially, I would be among the first to give serious consideration to reducing taxes. Taxes are too high, and they should be cut. But let me remind all who will listen, that there is only one reason for Federal taxes. And that reason is to meet Federal expenditures.

And we have collected enough Federal taxes to meet Federal expenditures in only 6 of the last 33 years. Now the administration says it is planning to spend more than we collect in revenue for years to come. So far as I can recall, no other administration in the history of this country has deliberately planned peacetime deficits.

To do this, it is proposing that we should reduce taxes for 2 years straight, spend more and more, disregard deficits, and push the debt higher and higher. Everything imaginable has been claimed for the tax cut which the administration has proposed, and all sorts of dire results are predicted if the proposed tax reductions are not enacted.

When we look the situation squarely in the face, we see the facts of life. And the Federal fiscal facts of life are that the national debt is already more than $300 billion, and under the administration's recommendations every dollar of the tax cut it proposes would be added to the debt we already owe.

I predict the Federal debt will reach $325 billion within 3 years if the tax reduction bill is passed. Interest on the debt alone is budgeted at $10 billion—that is $1 out of every $8.50 you pay in taxes—and it is going higher. And we know that 4-percent interest compounded semiannually doubles the principal in 17½ years.

Now let's bring this proposed tax reduction down to what it really means in dollars and cents to you and me, as taxpayers. If you take the tax rate schedule now proposed in the House Ways and Means Committee, you find that: In the first fiscal year the average reduction for individual taxpayers would be 8 cents a day. That would be 56 cents a week, $2.50 a month, or $30 a year. In the second year the reduction might rise to an average of 24 cents a day. And that wouldn't buy a package of cigarettes in many places.

And as to taxes on corporations: corporations with tax liability in excess of $100,000 (which pay 80 percent of the Federal corporate taxes) would be required actually to increase their cash payments in the first fiscal year under a scheme to accelerate their remittances. In the second year the corporate tax reduction would total only about $500 million.

That, my friends, is the way the administration's tax reduction proposals average out in terms of the bill as it is now drafted by the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives.

How much the Government will help you and the country with such a tax cut is questionable, but what it will do to the Nation's fiscal position is clear. The debt will go up $1 for every dollar taxes are cut for the foreseeable future.

Eliminate unnecessary Federal expenditures, and constructive tax reduction is sure to follow. As we stand now, tax reduction would be irresponsible and dangerous. People generally know this, and there is a feeling of reluctance about this proposal in the air.

Since this present 88th Congress was convened last January some 11,800 bills and resolutions have been introduced in the House and Senate. To date (through August 28) 103 have been passed. That's less than one in a hundred, less than 1 percent.

And we would be better off if many of those had not been passed. Percentagewise I think this record to date would please Thomas Jefferson, who held that the least governed are the best governed.

It should be noted that the railroad legislation passed this week was one of the bills enacted. It prevented a nationwide strike which would have done untold damage. It was an action that had to be taken and it was.

If little legislation has been enacted to date, there are reasons why Congress is moving slowly. Think over some of the legislation the administration is still pressing the Congress to pass, and you find yourself pondering questions like these:

Would you expect the Soviets to violate the proposed treaty banning tests of nuclear weapons in outer space, in the atmosphere, and under water, if it were entered into?

Do you think our great desire for peace is best served by ratification of the so-called nuclear test ban treaty by the United States?

Do you favor Federal legislation now pending in Congress which would deny to those engaged in hotel, motel, restaurant, soda fountain, amusement, and all retail business the right to choose their clientele on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin?

Do you think the Federal Government should live within its revenue income except in periods of national emergency?

Do you favor legislation, as the President proposes, reducing Federal taxes—with planned deficits—and increasing the Federal debt in the amount of the tax reduction?

Would you favor reduction in Federal expenditures to compensate for tax reduction?

If you favor reduction in Federal expenditures for tax reduction or for any other purpose, do you thing the reductions should be made in: Foreign aid; military activities; domestic-civilian programs; generally, in all categories?

Do you favor Federal aid programs which subsidize States, localities, individuals, business, housing, agriculture, education, health (including hospital construction), etc.? There are still some of these programs before Congress, such as the Federal aid to education bill.

If you favor Federal-aid programs, do you think the Federal Government should exercise substantial control over the programs through the imposition of standards, requirements, wage rates, civil rights decrees, etc.?

What fiscal discipline and other action is needed to stop the dangerous foreign drain on our gold reserves, and how much longer can we stand these continual withdrawals?

How should we answer these questions—each of us, in Congress, and out—if we faithfully are to meet the President's challenge: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country?"

COLUMBUS DAY SHOULD BE A LEGAL HOLIDAY IN THE UNITED STATES—SENATE BILL 108 SHOULD BE PASSED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, even as Columbus once faced the vast unknown horizons of the Atlantic, the United States is today confronted by the seemingly unbounded complexities of national and international affairs. We still face uncharted seas of diplomacy, amid the manmade tempests of oppression, subversion, and duplicity. We oppose the encroachments of communism, and seek to illuminate its fallacies in much the same manner as that in which Columbus dispelled the fears of a doubting and superstitution-bound world.

We navigate troubled waters in domestic affairs, as well, where we are working to repel the tides of unemployment, to hasten the conquest of disease, and to bring about the banishment of ignorance. Much remains to be done in the rehabilitation of the handicapped, in the relief of the destitute, and in bringing security to the aged.

As never in our history, the memory and meaning of Christopher Columbus inspire us to renewed dedication and purpose as we strive to meet these challenges at home and abroad. It is doubly fitting, therefore, that we set aside one special day for a rededication to the principles espoused by our forefathers, to reaffirm our faith in God, and to draw from the example of Columbus a new courage of conviction so vital in dealing with the tasks which lie ahead.

For these and other reasons it is my privilege to be a cosponsor of Senate bill 108, to make Columbus Day a legal holiday. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is the principal sponsor of the proposal, and he has been joined by 32 other Senators.

Mr. President, more than four-fifths of our 50 States make some official recognition of Columbus Day. The Discovery of the New World is commemorated in 44 States and Puerto Rico; and the occasion is, in my belief, of sufficient importance to warrant the establishment of a legal holiday throughout the entire land.

Christopher Columbus translated the dreams and theories of others into meaningful realities. With the self-discipline and clarity of mind which characterize men of destiny, he renounced a successful career as master of a merchant ship, and followed an idea. He turned away from early retirement and comfort, to risk his very life in an effort to open new trade routes to India. The fruits of his venture have been harvested by all of mankind for nearly 500 years. Truly, his example is a worthy one—and one which we can use to navigate safely the threatening seas of our time.

We must emulate the dedication of that early Italian explorer: his willingness to stake his future on his beliefs; his translation of an idea into action; his perseverence and resourcefulness, which enabled him to overcome the doubts of his fellows and the hazards of the voyage. We must take unto ourselves these qualities of his greatness if America is to continue to be a leader of the free world and a guardian of the rights and responsibilities of mankind.

The establishment of Columbus Day as a time of rededication and introspection could have yet another purpose for Americans: We would, at the same time, recognize the contributions and influences of other peoples and countries in bringing the United States to its current position of responsibility and respect among nations. Especially would a holiday of this nature be a deserved tribute to Americans of Italian descent—whose land of origin is that of Columbus.

Perhaps no nation has supplied more genius and inspiration in the development of human consciousness than has Italy. In the arts, in science, in music, and in service, Italians have been among those who pushed back the frontiers of ignorance and fear. Forever woven into the fabric of American life is the influence of Italy and her children. The continued enrichment of this country is insured by those of Italian ancestry in America, who keep alive the Italians' sense of humor, their love of beauty, and their zest for life. We shall ever be in their debt.

Christopher Columbus belonged to an age that has passed; yet he became the sign and symbol of a new age of hope. He trusted his ship to the fortunes of the open sea, carried mankind forward in its wake, and raised the curtain on a new world which has cradled the growth of freedom and dignity for the individual.

It is my conviction that passage of this proposal is a fitting way by which we can demonstrate our willingness to come to grips with the future. So I believe we should declare Columbus Day a legal holiday, to be observed with thought, reverence, and a spirit of rededication.

I believe all Senators will wish to give expeditious attention to Senate bill 108, which would make Columbus Day a legal holiday.

Mr. President, in a recent letter to my office, Earl E. Beaumont, State secretary of the West Virginia Council of the Knights of Columbus, has indicated that the provisions of Senate bill 108 have received enthusiastic support among the citizens of the Mountain State. Speaking on behalf of more than 3,400 members of the Knights of Columbus from the 18 councils in West Virginia, Mr. Beaumont urges that Congress act affirmatively on this proposed legislation to make Columbus Day a legal holiday in the United States.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a listing of the West Virginia councils of the Knights of Columbus, together with their membership totals, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Council	City	Membership
504	Wheeling	538
594	Parkersburg	298
603	Elkins	95
713	Grafton	72
771	Charleston	289
872	Clarksburg	154
942	Fairmont	100
963	Huntington	330
1169	Martinsburg	147
1404	Bluefield	102
1415	Weston	92
1907	Moundsville	193
2593	Wheeling	93
2954	Morgantown	263
3135	Williamson	18
3232	Montgomery	54
3734	Weirton	531
4694	St. Albans	57
Total (18 councils)		3,426

RESOLUTION OF DUTCHESS COUNTY, N.Y., AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the Dutchess County American Legion, of Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Passed by the Dutchess County American Legion, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Whereas the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, on August 13, 1963, authorized John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the U.S. Veterans' Administration to care for 2,000 veterans usually taken care by nursing homes;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy in his memorandum, said in part "the changing characteristics of our veteran population, particularly those who served during the First World War, are resulting in an adverse effect on the acute medical programs administered by the Veterans' Administration";

Whereas there are nearly 1 million veterans of World War I who are now aged 70 years or more and the number will increase 50 percent by 1966;

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital at Castle Point, N.Y., is ideally equipped for the treatment and care of patients needing nursing care, and due to their experience with patients needing long-term care, and is equipped for rehabilitation and retraining programs, and that there are buildings not now in use that can be used for this type of patient care: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Dutchess County American Legion at the regular constituted meeting on August 21, 1963, at the Arlington Post, American Legion, No. 1302, heartily endorse the action of the President of the United States and the Veterans' Administration in making available facilities for the care of veterans needing nursing home care and hereby petition and urge the Veterans' Administration to make every use of the fine equipment and buildings at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Castle Point, N.Y., for this program; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to President John F. Kennedy and to Hon. John S. Gleason, Jr., Veterans' Administrator and to Hon. Kenneth B. Keating and Hon. Jacob K. Javits, U.S. Senate, and to Hon. J. Ernest Wharton, Member of Congress, and that a committee of 10 members of the Dutchess County American Legion be appointed to further the purpose of these resolutions.

Adopted August 21, 1963.

Edwin J. Stoll,
Commander.
Arnold G. Frazier,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT 1963 CONVENTION OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted at the 1963 convention of the American Federation of Teachers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 23

(Submitted by Denver Federation of Teachers, Local No. 858)

Whereas the United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, has pioneered in securing collective bargaining status for the 40,000 New York City teachers; and

Whereas the United Federation of Teachers has adopted a policy of "no contract, no work"; and

Whereas the membership of the United Federation has rejected the offer of the New York City Board of Education; and

Whereas a strike has been called by the membership of the United Federation of Teachers to commence September 9: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers strongly support the strike action of local 2; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers recommend similar support on the part of the leadership of the AFL–CIO.

THE SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the present year marks the 70th anniversary of the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union of Wilkes-Barre, a worthy organization founded by the pioneers of the Pennsylvania anthracite coal regions. The hardships endured by these men and women, their sacrifices in order to lead a better life, and especially many fraternal organizations and societies they founded, helped to make great the Commonwealth which I represent. Mr. John C. Sciranka, the well-known American-Slovak journalist, has composed a lengthy and thorough article describing the Wilkes-Barre Union, its outstanding founders, and its wide variety of activities. The article appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader on August 12, 1963, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Slovak Catholic Union Milestone

Editor, Times-Leader News:

The Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, with offices at 173 North Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, this year is observing its 70th anniversary.

Inasmuch as the union was founded in Luzerne County and most of its activities took place here in the past seven decades, it is proper to review briefly at this time its history.

The organizers were representatives of Slovak miners from the anthracite region, who were members of other organizations already in existence. However, there were too many deaths claimed by the mines seven decades ago and even large insurance companies were reluctant in signing up the miners, who were considered a bad risk.

In those days, monthly assessments of members of fraternal organizations were calculated and established on the basis of death claims. There were no structural mortuary tables. All members were equal and paid dues alike.

The fraternal pioneers acted in good faith and true Christian and fraternal spirit and that is why it took in some cases almost 40 years until their organizations were put on sound financial basis, with actuarial calculations and modern insurance methods with reserves.

And these organizations, like the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, which was established for the Catholics of Latin and Byzantine Rites, were also instrumental in aiding the establishment of churches, schools, and other institutions. They were also ready to aid their persecuted brethren in Slovakia. The organization, through its newspaper, "Bratstvo" (Brotherhood), established 64 years ago by Edmund Uffalussy, was a great educational medium.

The sons and daughters of these pioneers, like for example Maj. Gen. William Shambora, formerly of Hazleton, later with the Medical Corps and commander of one of the largest U.S. military hospitals in Texas, admitted several years ago at the banquet of the Slovak Club of Luzerne County, that it was through the medium of this union and its official organ that the parents were encouraged to give their children better education, which in their old country was accorded only to the privileged class.

We could go on mentioning the great patriotic, humanitarian, and religious mission which this Slovak Union and similar organizations performed and still carry on but space does not permit it. However, on this 70th anniversary, it is proper to recall at least some of the pioneers, who made these sacrifices.

According to official records, the first meeting for the purpose of forming this organization was held on June 24 and 25, 1893, on the third floor of Francis Juskewicz's Building, 68 North Main Street, Pittston. This meeting was arranged by Edmund Uffalussy, Joseph Pison, and John Marinko.

The scheduled meeting on June 24, 1893, was opened by Vincent Kalman as chairman and Joseph Kiesel said the prayer. The following representatives were present at this historical founders conclave: John Dugas, John Marinko, Francis Oravec, and Joseph Kiesel, as representatives of St. Joseph's Society, Hazleton, which became branch 1, of the Pennsylvania Slovak Roman and Greek Catholic Union and which observed its 75th anniversary 3 years ago.

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES

Joseph Vysoudil represented St. Joseph's Society of Weston; Michael Mirdala, St. Michael's Society, Hazleton; Adam Jurisin, Blessed Virgin's Rosary Society, Ashley; John Bartek, SS. Peter and Paul Society, Wilkes-Barre; Michael Sekula, St. Valentine Society, Port Griffith; George Skrinak and Peter Dobos, St. John Society, Exeter; Andrew Skvir and J. Kascak, St. Vladimir's Society, Pleasant Hill; Andrew Pavlik, St. John Nepomucene Society, Freeland; Joseph Pison, St. Wendeline Society, Forty Fort; and Edmund Uffalussy, Vincent Kalman, and Stephen Wagner, St. John the Baptist Society, Pittston.

The deliberations continued and were adjourned until the following day, which was Sunday, June 25, 1893, when besides the above mentioned, also the following registered and took part in the initial founders meeting: M. Markovic and Stephen Bodnar, St. Mary's Society, Kingston; John Varganin, and Stephen Hudak, St. Stephen's Society, Plymouth; John Grula, St. John Nepomucene Society, Luzerne; and Andrew Lupco, St. Joseph's Society, Nanticoke.

Edmund Uffalussy was elected temporary chairman and Joseph Kiesel, temporary secretary. Here it was decided to form the Pennsylvania Slovak Roman and Greek Catholic Union. The death benefit was set at $500 for a male member and $200 for female. Those injured and not capable of performing their job will receive full benefit and the injured of the second class $100 benefit.

The following first supreme officers were elected: Francis Oravec, president; Andrew Skvir, vice president; Joseph Kiesel, secretary; Edmund Uffalussy, treasurer; Vincent Kalman, Andrew Pavlik, and John Dugas, auditors.

St. John the Baptist was chosen for the patron of the organization. Seven societies joined the new organization with a total membership of 456.

The first formal convention was held on June 25, 26, and 27, 1894, at Hazleton. Francis Oravec was again chosen president. He was followed in office by Edmund Uffalussy. During the third convention at Freeland on June 24, 25, and 26, 1896, Francis Oravec died and the entire convention attended his funeral.

The following served as supreme presidents of the union: Andrew Lupcho, Nanticoke, 8 years; John Marinko, Hazleton, one term; Michael Lapchak, Lansford and later Hazleton, from 1909 until 1918; John H. Kaminsky, Uniontown, from 1918 until 1925; Joseph Kiesel, Scranton, from 1925 until 1929; John Kridlo, Pittston, 1929–50 and the current president, Stephen J. Tkach, Dallas, from 1950.

Joseph Pison served in 1898 for a brief period of 2 months. He died in office.

The present supreme officers are: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula, New York, honorary chaplain; Hon. John T. Kmetz, Nanticoke, honorary supreme president; Rev. John A. Balberchak, supreme chaplain, Forest City; Stephen J. Tkach, Dallas, supreme president; Stephen J. Kavulich, Taylor, first vice president; Martin Desht, Allentown, second vice president; Martin Podskoc, Jr., Wilkes-Barre, secretary; Miss Anna Simkovich, Hazleton, treasurer; Michael Bonchonsky, Pittston, chairman of supreme auditors; Thomas Onzik, Larksville, secretary of supreme auditors; Andrew Dzurek, Hazleton, Aloysius Kridlo, Pittston, Frank Parrish, Hazleton, and John P. Stankovich, Pittsburgh, supreme auditors.

In 1898, Edmund Uffalussy, Edmund Lembick, Michael Lapchak and John Marinko were instrumental in aiding their wives and friends to organize the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, which is a separate organization with offices in Wilkes-Barre, publishing its official organ, Zornicka (Morning Star) and showing steady progress.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA.

IMPROVED LABELING OF PESTICIDES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the question of adequate labeling of pesticides has come up frequently during the hearings on the use of pesticides now being conducted by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations. The Federal pest control law has been described by those who administer it as being "basically a labeling law." It is of extreme importance, then, that the labeling requirements of such a law be adequate to afford the highest measure of protection to the public.

When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our subcommittee to present his Department's views on the pesticide problem, I asked him to look into the adequacy of present labeling requirements and to come up with some recommendations as to what he thought would be proper. I am very pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate, the action taken today by the Secretary of Agriculture, who has proposed a revision of the regulations covering labeling and enforcement under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, at this point, the Secretary's notice of rulemaking, as it appeared in this morning's Federal Register.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[7 CFR Part 362]

FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT: NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

Notice is hereby given in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), that the Department of Agriculture, pursuant to section 6 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135d), is considering the revision of the regulations for the enforcement of the act (7 CFR 362.1 et seq.).

The revision, in general, would strengthen the regulations with respect to labeling requirements, conform the regulations with interpretations and policies followed in administration of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and clarify certain provisions of the regulations. The principal specific changes that would be made are indicated below.

The use of an appropriate foreign language version of the label, in addition to the English version, would be permitted in areas of the United States where such language is spoken. The requirements regarding legibility and placement of labels are clarified in that specifications regarding size of type to be used in connection with required warnings or cautions are set forth, and provisions are made that the ingredient statement, required warnings or cautions, and designated signal words shall appear on the front part of the label or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase unless otherwise authorized by the Director. Provision is made that economic poisons shall bear the statement "Keep out of reach of children" and such a signal word as the Director may prescribe. Any claims such as "Safe," "Non-poisonous," "Non-toxic," "Non-injurious," or "Harmless" would not be permitted on the labeling.

The provision concerning determination of economic poisons highly toxic to man reflects certain strengthening of the testing procedures and specifies the number and type of laboratory animals to be used. Provision is also made that registration of any economic poison may be refused if, in the opinion of the Director, directions, or warnings cannot be written which would when followed prevent injury to the general public.

The regulation dealing with the handling of experimental compounds is clarified in that authority is provided for the Director to refuse a permit for shipment of an experimental compound for any use that might result in residues on food or feed unless a tolerance or an exemption from the need of a tolerance has been established by the Food and Drug Administration. The revision further provides for certain other restrictions on issuance of experimental permits.

It is proposed to revise the regulations to read as follows:

"GENERAL

"§ 362.1 Words in singular form.

"Words used in the singular form in this subpart shall include the plural, and vice versa, as the case may require.

"§ 362.2 Terms defined.

"Terms used in this subpart shall have the meanings set forth for such terms in the act. In addition, as used in this subpart, the following terms shall have the meanings stated below:

"(a) Act: 'act' means the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

"(b) Director: 'Director' means the Director of the Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee to whom he has heretofore lawfully delegated or to whom he may hereafter lawfully delegate the authority to act in his stead.

"(c) Official inspector: 'Official inspector' means any employee or agent of the Department of Agriculture or the Treasury Department authorized by the Director or by the Secretary of the Treasury to make investigations in connection with enforcement of the act.

"(d) Vertebrate animals: 'Vertebrate animals' means all species of the subphylum vertebrata including domestic vertebrates and vertebrate species of fish and wildlife.

"(e) Invertebrate animals: 'Invertebrate animals' means all forms of animal life other than vertebrate animals, including both domestic and wild species.

"§ 362.3 Administration.

"The Director is authorized to take such action as, in his discretion, may be necessary in the administration and enforcement of the act and the regulations in this part.

"LABELING

"§ 362.4 Labeling required.

"Every economic poison shall bear a label containing the information specified in the act and the regulations in this part.

"§ 362.5 Language to be used.

"All statements, words, and other information required by the act or the regulations in this part to appear on the label or labeling of any economic poison shall be in the English language: *Provided*, That shipments of articles intended solely for sale in foreign countries may bear labels or labeling in the appropriate foreign language. The Director may permit the use of an appropriate foreign language version of the label or labeling in addition to the English version on products intended for distribution in areas of the United States where a large percentage of the population does not speak English.

"§ 362.6 Labeling.

"(a) Contents of label and labeling: The label of every economic poison must show, clearly and prominently, the name, brand or trademark under which the product is sold; the name and address of the manufacturer, registrant, or person for whom manufactured; the net contents as prescribed in paragraph (d) of this section; an ingredient statement as prescribed in § 362.7, and an appropriate warning or caution statement as prescribed in § 362.9. The label or labeling of every economic poison must bear directions for use which are necessary and if complied with, adequate for the protection of the public.

"(b) Placement of label: The label shall appear on the economic poison or the immediate container thereof. If the immediate container is enclosed within a wrapper or outside container through which the label cannot be clearly read by a person with normal vision, the label must also appear on such outside wrapper or container if it is a part of the retail package. The label need not appear on shipping containers from which the retail package will be removed prior to being displayed or offered for retail sale.

"(c) Name and address of manufacturer, distributor, packer, formulator, or registrant: An unqualified name and address given on the label shall be considered as the name and address of the manufacturer. If the registrant's name appears on the label and the registrant is not the manufacturer, or if the name of the person for whom the economic poison was manufactured appears on the label, it must be qualified by appropriate wording such as 'Packed for * * *,' 'Distributed by * * *,' or 'Sold by * * *' to show that the name is not that of the manufacturer. If a person has two or more locations at which an economic poison is manufactured or packaged, or from which it is distributed, the name and address of the person's principal office will be acceptable except in cases where the Director determines that the address of the exact location is necesary for the protection of the public. The address of the manufacturer, registrant, or person for whom manufactured shall include the street address, if any, unless the street address is shown in a current city directory or telephone directory.

"(d) Name, brand, or trademark of economic poison: The name, brand, or trademark of the economic poison, appearing on the label shall be that under which the economic poison is registered.

"(e) Net content:

"(1) The net content shall be exclusive of wrappers or other material, and shall be deemed to be average content unless stated as a minimum quantity.

"(2) Net content shall be stated in the terms of weight or measure in general use by consumers and users of the type of economic poison to give accurate information as to the quantity of the economic poison. If there is no general use, the net content statement shall be in terms of liquid measure if the product is a liquid, and in terms of weight if it is solid, semisolid, viscous, or a mixture of liquid and solid. Statements of liquid measure shall be in terms of the United States, gallon, quart, pint, and fluid ounce at 68° F. The statements of weight shall be in terms of avoirdupois pound and ounce. All statements of net content shall be in terms of the largest unit present.

"(3) If the contents are stated as a minimum quantity, variation below the stated quantity is not permissible and variation above shall not be unreasonably large.

"(4) If the contents are not stated as a minimum quantity, variation shall be permitted only to the extent that it represents deviations unavoidable in good packing practice. The average quantity in the packages in a shipment shall not fall below the average quantity stated, nor shall there be any unreasonable variation from the average in the contents of any package.

"(f) Legibility of label and labeling: All words, statements, graphic representations, or designs required by the regulations in this part to appear on the label or labeling must be clearly legible and easy to read by a person with normal vision. The signal word and the statement 'Keep out of reach of children' prescribed in section 362.9(a) shall be of a size bearing a reasonable relationship to the other type on the front part of the label and to the size of the container. The signal word shall not be less than 18-point type and the said warning statement shall not be less than 12-point type, unless the label space on the container is too small to accommodate such type sizes in which case the Director shall prescribe the type sizes. When the size of the label space requires a reduction in type size, the reduction shall be made to a size no smaller than is necessary and in no event to a size smaller than 6-point type.

"§ 362.7 Ingredient statement.

"(a) Location of ingredient statement: The ingredient statement must appear on the front panel or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase, except in rare cases where the Director determines that, due to the size or form of the container, a statement on that portion of the label is impracticable, and permits such statement to appear on another side or panel of the label. Regardless of the placement of the ingredient statement on the label, it shall be sufficiently prominent and in type size which can be easily read by a person with normal vision. The ingredient statement must run parallel with other printed matter on the panel of the label on which it appears and must be on a clear contrasting background not obscured or crowded.

"(b) Names of ingredients: The common name of each of the listed ingredients must be given or, if an ingredient has no common name, the correct chemical name as accepted by the editors of "Chemical Abstracts" published by American Chemical Society. If there is no common name and the chemical composition is complex, the Director may permit the use of a new or coined name which he finds to be appropriate for the information and protection of the user. If the use of a new or coined name is permitted, the Director may prescribe the terms under which it may be used. A trademark or trade name shall not be used as the name of an ingredient except when it has become a common name.

"(c) Percentages of ingredients: Percentages of ingredients shall be determined by weight and the sum of the percentages of the ingredients shall be 100. Sliding scale forms of ingredient statements shall not be used.

"(d) Designation of ingredients:

"(1) Active ingredients and inert ingredients shall be so designated, and the term 'inert ingredients' shall appear in the same size type and be equally as prominent as the term 'active ingregients.'

"(2) If the name but not the percentage of each active ingredient is given, the names of the active and inert ingredients shall, respectively, be shown in the descending order of the percentage of each present in each classification and the name of each ingredient shall be given equal prominence.

"(e) Active ingredient content: As long as an economic poison is subject to the act the percentages of active ingredients in the economic poison shall be those declared in the ingredient statement.

"§ 362.8 Economic poisons highly toxic to man.

"Oral toxicity and inhalation toxicity tests shall be conducted on both rodent and nonrodent species of animals. Skin absorption toxicity tests shall be conducted on rabbits, unless testing on another species of animal is authorized by the Director. Economic poisons which fall within any of the following categories when tested on laboratory animals as specified in this section, are highly toxic to man or contain substances or quantities of substances highly toxic to man within the meaning of the act (such economic poisons being hereinafter in this part referred to as economic poisons highly toxic to man); *Provided, however*, That the Director may, upon application and after opportunity for hearing, exempt any economic poison which is in any of these categories, but which is not in fact highly toxic to man, from the requirements of the act and the regulations in this part with respect to economic poisons highly toxic to man:

"(a) Oral toxicity: Economic poisons which produce death within 14 days in half or more than half of the test animals of either species at a dosage of 50 milligrams at a single dose, or less, per kilogram body weight when administered orally to 10 or more animals of the rodent species, such as, rats, mice, rabbits, or guinea pigs, and 8 or more of a nonrodent species, such as dogs or cats.

"(b) Toxicity on inhalation: Economic poisons which produce death within 14 days in half or more than half of the test animals of either species at a dosage of 2,000 micrograms of a dust or mist product per liter of air, or 200 parts per million by volume of a gas or vapor, when administered by continuous inhalation for 1 hour or less to 10 or more animals of the rodent species, such as rats, mice, rabbits, or guinea pigs, and 8 or more of a nonrodent species, such as dogs or cats.

"(c) Toxicity by skin absorption: Economic poisons which produce death within 14 days in half or more than half of the test animals tested at a dosage of 200 milligrams or less per kilogram of body weight when administered by continuous contact with the bare skin for 24 hours or less to 10 or more animals.

"(d) Toxicity based on human experience: If the Director finds, after opportunity for hearing, that available data on human experience with any economic poison indicate a toxicity greater than that determined from the above described tests on animals, the human data shall take precedence and, if he finds that the protection of the public health so requires, the Director shall declare such an economic poison to be highly toxic to man for the purposes of this act and the regulations thereunder.

"§ 362.9 Warning or caution statement.

"Warning or caution statements, which are necessary to prevent injury to living man and useful vertebrate animals, useful vegetation, and useful invertebrate animals, must appear on the label in a place sufficiently prominent to warn the user, and must state clearly and in nontechnical language the particular hazard involved in the use of the economic poison, e.g., ingestion, skin absorption, inhalation, flammability or explosion, and the precautions to be taken to avoid accident, injury, or damage.

"(a) The label of every economic poison shall bear warnings or cautions which are necessary for the protection of the public, including the statement, 'Keep out of reach of children,' and a signal word such as 'Poison,' 'Danger,' 'Warning,' or 'Caution' as the Director may prescribe, on the front panel or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase: *Provided, however,* The Director may permit reasonable variations in the placement of that part of the required warnings and cautions other than the statement 'Keep out of reach of children' and the required signal word, if in his opinion such variations would not be injurious to the public. If an economic poison is marketed in channels of trade where the likelihood of contact with children is extremely remote, the Director may waive the requirement of the statement 'Keep out of reach of children' if in his opinion such a statement is not necessary to prevent injury to the public.

"(b) The label of every economic poison which is highly toxic to man as described in § 362.8 shall bear the word 'Poison' in red on a contrasting background in immediate proximity to the skull and crossbones and an antidote statement including directions to call a physician immediately, on the front panel or that part of the label displayed under customary conditions of purchase: *Provided, however,* the Director may permit reasonable variations in the placement of the antidote statement if some reference such as 'See antidote statement on back panel' appears on the front panel near the word 'Poison' and the skull and crossbones.

"REGISTRATION

"§ 362.10 Registration.

"(a) Eligibility: Any manufacturer, packer, seller, distributor, or shipper of an economic poison is eligible to apply for registration of such economic poison.

"(b) Effect of registration: If an economic poison is registered under the act no further registration under the act by other persons is required: *Provided,* That—

"(1) The product is in the manufacturer's or registrant's original unbroken immediate container; and

"(2) The claims made for it and the directions for its use do not differ from the representations made in connection with registration; and

"(3) The product contains the labeling accepted in connection with registration or otherwise complies with the act.

"(c) Procedure for registration: Applications for registration should be addressed to Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250. Application forms will be furnished upon request. All applications for registration shall be accompanied by duplicate copies of the proposed labeling, including all printed or graphic matter which is to accompany the economic poison at any time and, if requested by the Director, a full description of the tests made and the results thereof upon which the claims for the economic poison are based, together with such other information as may be necessary to assure compliance with the act and the regulations in this part. If any part of the proposed labeling submitted is in a foreign language, it shall be accompanied by an accurate and complete English translation. Applications should be submitted as far in advance as possible, and at least 30 days, before it is desired that registration take effect. However, the period of time required to process applications to determine the adequacy of the proposed labeling may exceed 30 days in some cases. Applications which require consultation with other governmental agencies will take a longer period of processing. No fees are charged for registration.

"(d) Effective date of registration: Registration of an economic poison shall become effective on the date the notice of registration is issued.

"(e) Responsibility of a registrant: The registrant is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of all information submitted in connection with his application for registration of an economic poison.

"(f) Changes in labeling or formulas:

"(1) Changes in the labeling or changes in the formula of a registered economic poison must be submitted in advance to the Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250. The registrant must describe the exact changes desired and the proposed effective date and, upon request, shall submit a description of tests which justify such changes.

"(2) After the effective date of a change in labeling or formula, the product shall be marketed only under the new claims or formula: *Provided, however,* The Director may permit a reasonable time for the disposition of stocks of the discontinued product, if in his opinion such an extension would not endanger the public.

"(g) Claims must conform to registration: Claims made for an economic poison must not differ from representations made in connection with registration, including representations with respect to effectiveness, ingredients, directions for use, or pests against which the product is recommended.

"(h) Duration of registration: If at any time it does not appear to the Director that the economic poison is such as to warrant the proposed claims for it or if the economic poison and its labeling and other material required to be submitted do not comply with the provisions of the act, the Director shall notify the registrant of the facts involved and afford him an opportunity to correct the labeling so as to comply with the act. If after a reasonable period of time, the registrant has not corrected the labeling, the Director may cancel the registration under the provisions of section 4c of the act. Unless canceled in accordance with this paragraph or with the acquiescence of the registrant, or unless continued in effect in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (i) of this section, the registration of an economic poison shall be canceled at the end of a period of 5 years following the date of registration of such economic poison, or at the end of 5 years following the date of any subsequent registered change in formula or labeling, or at the end of 5 years following the date of any continuance of registration pursuant to paragraph (i) of this section: *Provided, however,* That prior to any such cancellation the Pesticides Regulation Division shall send to the registrant a notice of intent to cancel, and, in the event such notice is not sent to the reigstrant 30 days prior to the expiration of the 5-year period, the registration shall remain in effect until 30 days following the date such notice has been sent to the registrant at his latest address submitted to the Pesticides Regulation Division.

"(i) Continuance of registration: If a registrant desires to continue the registration in effect, he shall notify the Pesticides Regulation Division in writing and it shall be continued in effect under the same terms as the original registration: *Provided, however,* That if, on the basis of information available at the time, it appears that the product or its labeling fails to comply with the act, the registrant shall be so notified and afforded the opportunity to make the necessary corrections. If the corrections are not made, registration will be canceled as provided in section 4c of the act.

"(j) Limitations on registrations: The Director may refuse to register any economic poison or any specific use thereof, if in his opinion, directions and warnings cannot be written which will, when followed, prevent injury to the general public. If, however, such an economic poison is proposed for certain acceptable uses, the Director may require the label, to bear a warning against specific unacceptable uses such as in the home or home garden.

"GUARANTEES

"§ 362.11 Guarantee of economic poison.

"(a) By whom given; Effect of guarantee: Any manufacturer, distributor, wholesaler, or other person residing in the United States may furnish to any person to whom he sells an economic poison a guarantee that the economic poison was lawfully registered at the time of sale and delivery to such person, and that the economic poison complies with all the requirements of the act and of the regulations in this part. The act provides that penalties for violation of section 3a of the act shall not apply to a person who establishes that he has received a guarantee as specified in the act.

"(b) Reference to guarantee: No reference to a guarantee or suggestion that such a guarantee has been given shall be made in the labeling of any economic poison.

"(c) Contents of guarantee: In order to afford effective protection, each guarantee must:

"(1) Be signed by and contain the name and address of the person giving it; and

"(2) State that the economic poison was lawfully registered at the time of sale and delivery and that it complies with all other requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

"(d) Scope of guarantee: A guarantee may be (1) limited to a specific shipment or other delivery of a product, in which case it shall be a part of or attached to the invoice or bill of sale covering such shipment or delivery, or (2) general and continuing, in which case, in its application to any shipment or other delivery of a product it shall be considered to have been given at the date when such product was shipped or delivered by the person giving the guarantee.

"(e) Expiration of guarantee: Any guarantee shall expire when the product is repacked or relabeled by the purchaser or when it becomes in violation of the act or the regulations in this part after shipment or other delivery by the person who gave such guarantee.

"(f) Forms of guarantee: The following are suggested forms of guarantee:

"(1) Limited form for use on invoice or bill of sale:

"-------------------- hereby guarantees
"(Name of guarantor)
that the economic poison herein listed is lawfully registered with the Secretary of Agriculture and that the same complies with all requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

"(Signature and post office address of guarantor)

"(Date)

"(2) General and continuing form:

"The economic poisons comprising each shipment or other delivery hereafter made by
--------------------, to or on the order of
"(Name of guarantor)
---------------------------- are hereby
"(Name and address of person receiving guarantee)
guaranteed to be lawfully registered with the Secretary of Agriculture and to comply with all requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as of the date of such shipment or delivery.

"(Signature and post office address of guarantor)

"(Date)

"COLORATION OF ECONOMIC POISONS

"§ 362.12 Coloration and discoloration.

"The white economic poisons hereinafter named shall be colored or discolored in accordance with this section. The hues, values, and chromas specified are those contained in the Munsell Book of Color, Munsell Color Co., 10 East Franklin Street, Baltimore, Md.

"(a) Coloring agent: The coloring agent must produce a uniformly colored product not subject to change in color beyond the requirements specified in the regulations in this part during ordinary conditions of marketing or storage, and must not cause the product to be ineffective or result in its causing damage when used as directed.

"(b) Arsenicals and barium fluosilicate: Standard lead arsenate, basic lead arsenate, calcium arsenate, magnesium arsenate, zinc arsenate, zinc arsenite, and barium fluosilicate shall be colored any hue, except the yellow-reds and yellows, having a value of not more than 8 and a chroma of not less than 4, or shall be discolored to a neutral lightness value not over 7.

"(c) Sodium fluoride and sodium fluosilicate: Sodium fluoride and sodium fluosilicate shall be colored blue or green having a value of not more than 8 and a chroma of not less than 4, or shall be discolored to a neutral lightness value not over 7.

"(d) Exceptions:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, the Director, after opportunity for hearing, may permit other hues to be used for any particular purpose if he determines that use of the prescribed hues is not feasible for such purpose and that such action will not be injurious to the public.

"(2) Any economic poison specified in this part which is intended solely for use by a textile manufacturer or commercial laundry, cleaner or dyer as a mothproofing agent, which would not be suitable for such use if colored and which will not come into the hands of the public except when incorporated into a fabric may be exempted by the Director from the requirements of section 3a(4) of the act and the requirements of this section.

"(3) The economic poison sodium fluoride shall be exempt from the requirements of section 3a(4) of the act and paragraph (c) of this section when (i) it is intended for use as a fungicide solely in the manufacture or processing of rubber, glue, or leather goods; (ii) coloration of the economic poison in accordance with said requirements will be likely to impart objectionable color characteristics to the finished goods; (iii) the economic poison will not be present in such finished goods in sufficient quantities to cause injury to any person; and (iv) the economic poison will not come into the hands of the public except after incorporation into such finished goods.

"ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING

"§ 362.15 Adulteration.

"An economic poison is adulterated if, upon analysis, it is found that any active ingredient listed on the label is not present in the amount represented in the ingredient statement; or if it is found that any ingredient has been added which will affect the effectiveness of the product as an economic poison and will increase its toxicity.

"§ 362.14 Misbranding.

"An economic poison or device is misbranded if the article or its labeling is false or misleading to the public in any particular.

"(a) Examples of false or misleading representation in the labeling of an economic poison or device which render it misbranded are the following:

"(1) A false or misleading statement concerning composition of the product.

"(2) A false or misleading statement concerning the effectiveness of the product as an economic poison or device.

"(3) A false or misleading statement about the value of the product for purposes other than as an economic poison or device.

"(4) A false or misleading comparison with other economic poisons or devices.

"(5) A false or misleading representation as to the safety of the economic poison or its ingredients, including a statement such as 'Safe,' 'Nonpoisonous,' 'Nontoxic,' 'Noninjurious,' or 'Harmless' with or without such a qualifying phrase as 'When used as directed.'

"(6) Any statement directly or indirectly implying that the economic poison or device is recommended or endorsed by any agency of the Federal Government.

"(7) The name of an economic poison which contains two or more principal active ingredients if it suggests the name of one or more but not all such principal active ingredients even though the names of the other ingredients are stated elsewhere in the labeling.

"(8) Prominent reference in the labeling to one or more active ingredients without giving their percentages in immediate proximity thereto or without giving equal prominence to the other active ingredients or to the inert ingredients.

"(9) A true statement used in such a way as to give a false or misleading impression to the purchaser.

(b) Justification of false and misleading statements not permitted:

"(1) The use of any false or misleading statement on any part of the labeling, given as the statement or opinion of any person or based upon such statement or opinion, shall not be justified by the fact that the statement or opinion is actually that of such person.

"(2) The use of a false or misleading statement in the labeling cannot be justified by an explanatory statement.

"ENFORCEMENT

"§ 362.15 Enforcement.

"(a) Collection of samples: Samples of economic poisons and devices shall be collected by official inspectors or by any employee of the Federal Government, or of a State or territory, or political subdivision thereof who has been duly designated as an official inspector by the Director.

"(b) Examination of samples: Methods of examination of samples shall be those adopted and published by the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, where applicable, or such other methods as the Director may find necessary to determine whether the product complies with the law.

"(c) Notice of apparent violation:

"(1) If, from an examination or analysis, an economic poison or device appears to be in violation of the act, a notice in writing shall be sent to the person against whom criminal proceedings are contemplated, giving him 20 days within which to offer such written explanation as he may desire. The notice shall state the manner in which the sample fails to meet the requirements of the act and the regulations thereunder.

"(2) Any such person may, in addition to his reply to such notice, file within 20 days of its receipt a written request for an opportunity to present his views orally in connection therewith.

"(3) No notice or hearing is required prior to the seizure of any economic poison or device.

"§ 362.16 Notices of judgment.

"Publication of notices of judgments of the courts in cases arising under the criminal or seizure provisions of the act shall be made in the form of notices, circulars, or bulletins as the Director may prescribe.

"PERMITS FOR EXPERIMENTAL USE

"§ 362.17 Shipments for experimental use.

"(a) Articles for which no permit is required:

"(1) A substance or mixture of substances being put through tests in which the purpose is only to determine its value for economic poison purposes or to determine its toxicity or other properties, and where the user does not expect to receive any benefit in pest control from its use, is not considered an economic poison within the meaning of section 2a of the act. Therefore, no permit under the act is required for its shipment.

"(2) An economic poison shipped or delivered for experimental use by or under the supervision of any Federal or State agency authorized by law to conduct research in the field of economic poisons shall not be subject to the provisions of the act and the regulations in this part.

"(b) Articles for which permit is required:

"(1) An economic poison shipped or delivered for experimental use by qualified persons but not under the supervision of a Federal or State agency authorized by law to conduct research in the field of economic poisons, for which a permit has been issued by the Director pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall otherwise be exempt from the provisions of the act and of the regulations in this part. Permits will be of two types, specific and general. A specific permit will be issued to cover a particular shipment on a specified date to a named person. A general permit will be issued to cover more than one shipment over a period of time to different persons.

"(2) If an economic poison is to be tested for a use which is likely to result in a residue on or in food or feed, a permit for shipment will be issued only when:

"(i) The food or feed product will not be used for food or feed except for laboratory or experimental animals, or

"(ii) Sufficient data are submitted to show that no illegal residue will be present on food or feed derived from the experimental program or

"(iii) A tolerance or exemption from the need of a tolerance, or a temporary tolerance or a temporary exemption from the need of a tolerance, has been established by the Food and Drug Administration to cover any detectable residue which may be present on food or feed derived from the experimental program.

"(3) A permit for shipment of any experimental economic poison for testing in any place likely to be frequented by people will be granted only if it is clearly shown in the application for such permit that the applicant's instructions for use reasonably assure the avoidance of injury to all persons concerned.

"(4) All applications for permits covering shipments for experimental use shall be filed in duplicate with the Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250, and must be signed by the shipper and must contain the following:

"(i) Name and address of the shipper and place or places from which the shipment will be made.

"(ii) Proposed date of shipment or proposed shipping period not to exceed 1 year.

"(iii) A statement of the composition of material to be covered by the permit which should apply to a single material or group of closely allied formulations of the material.

"(iv) A statement of the approximate quantity of material to be shipped.

"(v) Available data or information, or reference to available data or information, on the toxicity of the economic poison.

"(vi) A statement of the nature of the proposed experimental program, including designation of the type of pests or organisms to be experimented with, the crops or animals on which the economic poison is to be used, a statement of the dates during which the proposed experimental program will be conducted, and the States or geographical areas where it is proposed to conduct the program, and including the results of previous tests where necessary to justify the issuance of a permit for the quantity requested.

"(vii) An affidavit to the effect that food or feed derived from the experimental program will not be used or offered for consumption or sale for consumption, except by laboratory or experimental animals until acceptable analytical data are furnished to the Department to show that no residues are present in or on such food or feed or that the residues present are within the tolerance or temporary tolerance limits established by the Food and Drug Administration.

"(viii) The percentage of the total quantity of material specified under subdivision (iv) of this subparagraph which will be supplied without charge to the user.

"(ix) A statement that the economic poison is intended for experimental use only.

"(x) Proposed labeling which must bear (a) the prominent statement 'For Experimental Use Only' on the container label and any accompanying circular or other labeling, (b) a warning or caution statement if in the opinion of the Director it is necessary, which statement shall, if complied with, be adequate in his opinion, for the protection of those who may handle or be exposed to the experimental formulations, (c) the name and address of the applicant for the permit, (d) the name or designation of the formulation, and (e) an ingredient statement as prescribed in § 362.7.

"(5) The Director may limit the quantity of economic poison covered by a permit to such less quantity than requested as he may determine if the available information on effectiveness, or toxicity or other hazards, is not sufficient to justify the scope of experimental use proposed in the application, or may make such other limitations in the permit as he may determine to be necessary for the protection of the public.

"(6) An economic poison shipped under a permit shall not be offered for general retail sale.

"(c) General permit for economic poisons for experimental use which are also subject to the new drug requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act:

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section, a general permit is hereby issued under section 7.a.(4) of the act to the manufacturers and shippers of economic poisons for experimental use only, to ship such economic poisons: *Provided,* (i) That the product is a 'new drug' within the meaning of section 201(p) and 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. sec. 321(p) and sec. 355); (ii) that it is subject to, and the manufacturer or shipper complies with, the provisions of section 505(i) of said act (21 U.S.C. sec. 355(i)) and § 130.3 of the regulations (21 CFR 130.3) thereunder; and (iii) that the documents referred to in said § 130.3 shall be made available for inspection upon the request of any officer or employee of the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture at any reasonable time within 3 years after the introduction of the product into interstate commerce.

"(2) The general permit referred to in the preceding paragraph shall apply only insofar as the experimental uses are for drug purposes within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It shall not apply to other experimental uses even though the product may be intended for both drug and nondrug uses.

"(d) Cancellation of permits: Any permit for shipment for experimental use may be canceled at any time for any violation of the terms thereof or if it shall appear to the Director that the permit should be canceled for the protection of the public.

"DECLARATION OF PESTS

"§ 362.25 Forms of plant and animal life and viruses declared to be pests.

"(a) Each of the following forms of plant and animal life and viruses is declared to be a pest under the act when it exists under circumstances that make it injurious to plants, man, domestic animals, other useful vertebrates, useful invertebrates, or other articles or substances:

"Mammals, including but not limited to dogs, cats, moles, bats, wild carnivores, armadillos, and deer;

"Birds, including but not limited to starlings, English sparrows, crows, and blackbirds;

"Fishes, including but not limited to the jawless fishes such as the sea lamprey, the cartilaginous fishes such as the sharks, and the bony fishes such as the carp;

"Amphibians and reptiles, including but not limited to poisonous snakes;

"Aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, including but not limited to slugs, snails, and crayfish;

"Roots and other plant parts growing where not wanted;

"Viruses, other than those on or in living man or other animals."

Any interested person who wishes to submit written data, views, or arguments concerning the proposed revision of the regulations may do so by filing them with the Director, Pesticides Regulation Division, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250, not later than 60 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 3d day of September 1963.

M. R. Clarkson,
Acting Administrator,
Agricultural Research Service.

[F.R. Doc. 63-9541; Filed, Sept. 4, 1963; 8:50 a.m.]

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in the past, I have referred to the problem of "bureaucratic blight" in the Department of Agriculture. The proposed revision of the pesticide labeling laws advanced today by Secretary Freeman are an example, not of bureaucratic blight, but of highly competent technicians and civil servants acting in the public interest, under what is obviously firm and resolute leadership from the Secretary of Agriculture. He and his entire Department and those who worked with him from other departments in developing these new regulations, deserve our highest praise.

These regulations represent the best thinking of the Department of Agriculture, at this time. Secretary Freeman has wisely suggested a 60-day period in which all interested and affected parties can comment. I urge all consumer groups throughout the country to review this proposed regulation carefully and recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture any improvements that may be necessary. In this way they can contribute to the betterment of our consumer protection laws and regulations.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GRUENING AT DEDICATION OF FORESTRY LABORATORY AT UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on July 25, 1963, the able Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] delivered an outstanding address at the dedication of the Forestry Laboratory at the University of Alaska.

The Senator from Alaska has strongly supported a forward-looking forestry program for his State, and was qualified in every way to dedicate this laboratory, which he did with a worthy and timely address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America's Farthest North Forestry Laboratory

This is a happy and I believe an important occasion. We are here to join in the dedication of the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, which is a research facility of the Northern Forest Experiment Station whose headquarters is at Juneau, the State's capital—and an agency of the Forest Service.

However, we are dedicating more than a building, a fine building both practical and utilitarian, as well as architecturally attractive and in harmony with its surroundings both natural and man-made, for which the Forest Service, the university and the community are indebted to our locally resident, but already nationally recognized architect, Lee Linck, who was able to rely for the assurance that his design would be adequately materialized on the local firm of contractors headed by Ken Wright. There is something in this for everybody and that something is good.

But there is, I say, something more here than an edifice. We are also dedicating a venture, a prospect, and an investment; respectively a venture into knowledge of an area and of a resource therein in which to date almost no research has been done; we are dedicating a prospect of better utilization of that resource for the benefit of man, and therefore we are dedicating a more than self-liquidating investment by the Federal Government to make that great northern timber resource serve its maximum usefulness.

This venture is to be 1 of 10 such regional forestry experimental stations, actual or prospective, which are located in areas of diverse forestry resources. But I suggest that none other has quite the uniqueness and challenge of this northern outpost. It deals with a resource spread over an area of 120 million acres—an area larger than any of 48 of our 50 States. It deals with an area with the widest temperature fluctuations under the flag with recorded extremes of 100° Fahrenheit above and 76° below zero. It deals with an area which exhibits the widest alterations in exposure to sunlight in our country.

Finally the Laboratory will deal with a vast area that is virtually all in public ownership, Federal or maybe State, which precludes some of the limitations that exist in other heavily settled and densely populated areas.

So much for the broader geographic or spatial aspects of the Laboratory's mission. But there are no less significant factors related to time.

We are dedicating this Laboratory in an explosive age. We are hearing much of the population explosion which has a pertinence to the ever-increasing need of safeguarding and wisely utilizing our every natural resource.

We know of the political explosion of our time—sometimes of late referred to as the revolution of rising expectations. By that is meant the nationalistic awakenings and anticolonial revolts by the peoples of so-called backward and underdeveloped nations seeking a larger participation in the abundance and affluence which the more advanced peoples have wrought for themselves. Some, inclined to be cynical, view the so-called revolution of rising expectations as the expectation of more largesse from Uncle Sam and his foreign aid program. But the soundest part, in my view, of this Nation's foreign aid program has not been in the vast sums we have committed to foreign nations—now in excess of a hundred billion dollars—but in the education, the training, the skills, the know-how we impart to enable peoples to fend for themselves. And that clearly implies that we ourselves must have learned what to do with our own resources and not commit and repeat the errors which our earlier inexperience and seemingly inexhaustible abundance caused us to commit.

But there is a third explosion related to the foregoing of no less moment of which this laboratory is an integral part. It is the scientific explosion. True, scientific groping was known to the ancients, but modern scientific research is probably no older than Sir Francis Bacon in the 16th century, who is credited with being its father and which was developed haltingly through the great pioneers in science such as Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and in the last century by such immortals as Darwin and Pasteur. But it is really only in our own time that the fields of science have broadened both extensively and intensively, indeed exploded and brought forth such a plethora of new-found leads, insights, trails, and discoveries that today the greatest of all frontiers—research in science—beckons invitingly to the continued exploration and penetration of the mysteries of the cosmos. The forest laboratories are a part of this great surge to turn new light onto man's age-old natural inheritance.

There is also a local time factor that is pertinent. When Rampart Canyon Dam is authorized in the near future it will be necessary within the next decade or two to assess and start utilizing the considerable timber stands in the 11,000-square-mile area that will be flooded by the reservoir back of the dam. Here an almost immediate high priority assignment awaits the foresters particularly charged with the responsibility for Alaska's Arctic and subarctic. There will be need of the practical application on a microscopic scale of much that will have been learned here in the laboratory. The funds expended on research will be returned manifold into our State's and Nation's economy. (I would speak of the happy coincidence of the laboratory's establishment on the campus of the University of Alaska with the prospect of their close association in fields of common enterprise and concern. Research and teaching are closely related and I am hopeful that the interplay of these endeavors will become even more meaningful and more fruitful.)

A university—especially here where it is the State university—can and should embody and exalt the spirit of the State. It can and should supply much of its larger community's inspiration, guidance, and leadership.

The University of Alaska is destined to become not only a great center of research for all matters pertaining to the Arctic and subarctic but the only American institution of higher learning qualified by its location in the subarctic and on the edge of the Arctic to carry out successfully that tremendous assignment—an assignment which is important to the Nation and indeed to the whole world. For as the world's population increases it is inevitable that the hitherto sparsely inhabited regions of the earth will be invaded by man and settled. Research into the environment and ecology of this hitherto little studied region will facilitate that settlement and adaptation to this environment.

There is still another time factor that is pertinent. Alaska has just recently become a State—a scant 4½ years ago. It has inherited needs and problems from its 92-year colonial status. Here at the university with the heartening visible evidences of its dynamic growth is a concomitant of statehood. It has provided a great thrill for those of us who sensed the importance and need of this State university and saw it suffer under the financial difficulties against which Dr. Bunnell struggled so gallantly—Dr. Bunnell, the first president and its president for 25 years, without whose dedicated and determined persistence the university would perhaps not exist today. The changed attitude toward the University of Alaska shown by the Alaska State Legislature—the really important agency since it is the source of most of the university's funds—is a gratifying byproduct of statehood.

I regret to recall that in territorial days after the first great legislature in 1913, the absentee interests took over; their purpose and policy was to take out of Alaska as much as possible and to leave as little as they could. Indeed for the 92 years before statehood much was taken out and little put back by the political and economic forces that ruled Alaska from afar through their locally installed henchmen.

The Congress, where Alaska was for 53 years before statehood represented by only a voteless delegate in the House of Representatives was likewise wholly indifferent toward Alaska, when it was not downright discriminatory. It withheld from the University of Alaska funds that were its due as a land-grant college. It arbitrarily deprived the national forests of Alaska of some $7 million to which they were entitled—not as an economy measure—but distributed these funds among other States having national forests, and votes, and while Alaska's national forests, the Tongass and the Chugach, were established here long before statehood owing to the pioneering vision of Gifford Pinchot, appropriations for their needs were kept at niggardly minimums. In fact I make so bold as to say that this facility we are dedicating today would not have come as long as Alaska remained a territory.

So you, who will participate in the work, the research, the functioning of this Forestry Sciences Laboratory are enlisted in a great adventure, an adventure to which time and place beckon. I congratulate you. You will be working in congenial company; in an environment of scholarship and high purpose. I wish you and the Laboratory which will be your workshop a creative, successful and happy future. You will be helping to build your national Forest Service, our university, our State and our Nation and contributing to the knowledge that mankind needs for its steady advance.

THE PRESIDENT'S SOUND VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday morning Assistant Secretary of State Hilsman briefed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the growing problems incident to current operations in South Vietnam.

Last Wednesday an editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat commended the policies of this administration with respect to that country, and because I believe in most if not all of the conclusions of this editorial, entitled "Mr. Kennedy's Sound Vietnam Policy," I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Kennedy's Sound Vietnam Policy

The President has tackled the tough, abrasive problem in South Vietnam with good judgment and candor.

Unless there is an end to the autocratic influence some members of the Nhu family exert at Saigon, the guerrilla war against the China-backed Red Vietcong can never be won. Unless bayoneted violence against Buddhists stops, Vietnam will be lost.

That would mean the United States great stake in South Vietnam would disappear beneath quicksands of the little nation's wretched and stupid crisis.

More important, it would mean America and the West would have failed to halt the gunned encroachment of Asian Communists, driving to gobble all of southeast Asia.

In his statement Monday, Mr. Kennedy called for a change in policies, "perhaps personnel" of President Ngo Dinh Diem's regime, so the Government can regain popular support of the Vietnamese people.

Secondly, Mr. Kennedy declared it would be a "great mistake" to withdraw United States aid from the Vietnam struggle against Communist marauders from the north.

The President is right on both counts.

Ngo Diem has apparently lost touch with his people since last May when Government troops and police broke up a demonstration in the city of Hue, where Buddhists wanted to fly their flag in a religious ceremony. Eight Buddhists were slain, 14 wounded.

Things have since gone from bad to worse, with charges of Buddhist persecution and discrimination, culminating in raids on Buddhist pagodas by the military.

Yet it would be folly now for America to haul out of Vietnam, with our forces of more than 14,000 and our billions in military assistance.

That would simply leave Vietnam a beckoning vacuum for the Vietcong and power-hungry Red China.

Though the President did not spell out Vietnam policy in precise language, it is known the administration believes President Diem may recoup an effective Saigon rule, if he can free himself of his powerful brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, and Nhu's officious, more powerful wife, Madame Nhu.

These two characters, brilliant, despotic, and controlling the secret police, are probably at the bottom of Buddhist oppression.

President Diem, a Catholic, denies any religious discrimination. But the conduct of his brother and sister-in-law has caused a bitter division among the people. This must be halted, the ugly breach spanned by new, moderate, and equitable policies.

Mr. Kennedy obviously hopes Diem can shuck his brother and Madame Nhu from Government and form a competent, popular regime.

Diem is still highly respected in South Vietnam; his brother is feared. Buddhists form 70 percent of the population. Diem's Vice President, more than half the Cabinet ministers, the commander of the armed forces, and most of his senior generals are Buddhists.

During the 8 hectic years of his administration, President Diem established a government, a national assembly, and constitution which were really working until recently. He built roads, new schools, inaugurated land reforms, and created the Vietnam army, equipped by the United States. The economy was beginning to flourish. He had built the country from virtual chaos, absorbing 1 million immigrants from North Vietnam.

His ability and capacity, which seem ruthlessly undercut by a scheming brother and the ambitious Madame Nhu, could still be directed toward binding up the wounds of his moiled state. This apparently is what Mr. Kennedy seeks to promote. There is no other leader available.

But to function in the patriotic interests of his country and stave off the Communist aggression, Diem must be liberated from the activities of brother and sister-in-law, whose marplot designs, abetted by Communist subversion in Saigon, have all but destroyed Diem and his original programs.

For these reasons, we are convinced the CIA has not plotted—as charged yesterday in a Saigon newspaper—to overthrow the whole Diem rule.

> **President Kennedy and veteran Ambassador Lodge have a hard, Red row in Vietnam. The President's approach seems realistic and right. We deeply hope it succeeds.**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, with respect to which there is a limitation of debate of 30 minutes on any amendment, motion, or appeal, and 1 hour on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time necessary for the quorum call being charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require, under the unanimous-consent agreement, from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 11, after the word "following", it is proposed to strike out

> *Provided,* That no allowances shall be paid to any such youth who drops out of school, for a period of three months after the date of dropout.

And insert:

> *Provided,* That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know what the Senate is doing?

Mr. CLARK. I have asked to incorporate the committee amendments, so that the Senate can consider the bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. It is understood, Mr. President, that the amendments will be incorporated as original text?

I have amendments to offer, and other Senators have amendments.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc; and the bill, as so amended, will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need on the bill.

S. 1831 is a companion measure to S. 1716, which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday of this week. Both bills incorporate amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, recommended by the President to the Congress. Both bills are of some assistance in the upgrading of the labor skills of minority groups.

In his message of June 19 President Kennedy made certain recommendations "designed to improve the training, skills, and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike."

He further recommended amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act "not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also—in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment—to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program."

S. 1831 incorporates each of these proposals.

First, it provides for training in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as well as manual training in the use of tools, for those of the unemployed who are unable to take occupational training courses because they lack these skills.

Second, it provides for expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 16.

Third, it increases the percentage of funds available for the youth training program from 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances to 15 percent.

The bill authorizes additional annual appropriations of $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, in order to meet the cost of the expanded program.

The need for this bill arises from the fact that there are 3 million workers in our labor force today who can neither read nor write. Eight hundred thousand, or more than one-quarter of them, are unemployed. Perhaps as many as 25 percent of unemployed illiterates are Negroes.

In the first year of the Manpower Development and Training Act program eight applicants were rejected for every trainee accepted in the program. Many of them were rejected because they could neither read nor write, or had no knowledge of elementary mathematics, principally arithmetic.

In other words, they did not even have knowledge of the three R's, and yet, in order to be a gas station attendant today, one has to be able to handle a charge account; he has to be able to write out a bill; he has to be able to add and subtract; he also has to be able to do a little simple multiplication. A taxi driver has to be able to read road signs and his meter. He has to be able to make change. But 300,000 of our unemployed are unable to perform these elementary acts; and these are the hard core of the unemployed.

In addition to teaching the three R's under this bill, there would be training in how to use basic tools common to many occupations.

An interesting bit of testimony was that of Secretary of Labor Wirtz, who told the committee of an instance in which 500 women were interviewed recently in one public employment office before 30 were found to fill a class in practical nursing. In order to line up 20 trainees for hotel and restaurant cooks, 287 persons had to be interviewed. Many of those rejected were rejected because they could not read the simple instructions needed to carry on the occupation; others because they could not do the simple exercises in writing necessary to fulfill their job; still others because, as I have said, they could not add, subtract, or divide.

Under normal circumstances, those who will receive literacy training under the bill would have been applicants for ordinary occupational training in a manpower development and training course, but were rejected, because they could not read, write, or figure.

It is important that the intent of the literacy training program should not be confused with the normal instruction we expect of our educational system. We are speaking, by and large, of teaching older heads of households who must have some source of income while they learn the basic educational skills essential to obtain employment. We are talking for the most part about the 45-year-old unemployed coal miner and those who share his lot. The statistics on illiteracy among our unemployed reflect this: In March 1962, about only 4 out of 10 of workers 45 to 64 years of age had completed high school, compared to 6 out of 10 of those 35 to 44, and almost 7 out of 10 of those 18 to 44.

While the bill, for the sake of flexibility, permits literacy courses to run for as long as 52 weeks, Commissioner Keppel advised the subcommittee that the normal instruction period will last from 4 to 6 months. Of the $100 million which would be authorized additionally under the bill, it is expected that $50 million will be allocated to the functional illiteracy program provided by the bill, and that 50,000 literacy-deficient unemployed can be trained at that cost.

I turn now briefly to the parts of the bill dealing with youth. The bill would lower from 19 to 16 the age limit for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and it would increase the share of the training cost which may be allocated to youth.

Between January and June of this year a net increase of 400,000 unemployed between 14 and 19 entered the labor force. Only 100,000 of them got jobs. The remaining 300,000 were added to the unemployed. The unemployment rate for teenagers was 18 percent for boys and 19.3 percent for girls, compared to the national average of 5.6 percent.

It is important to note that these are young people looking for work they cannot get; and that of all the unemployed in 1962, 15.6 percent were under 19 years. Yet under the first year of the Manpower Development and Training Act, only 4.3 percent of the first 22,500 workers were under 19.

In making this change, the Senate is not being asked to do anything new. The age limit was brought down to 16 when the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed in 1962. The House raised the age limit, and in conference we accepted the House figure. In passing the pending bill, which I hope the Senate will do, it will be merely going back to the provision of the bill which the Senate passed last year.

Some concern was expressed that the training courses for young people might encourage them to drop out of school in order to receive training with pay. This matter was fully explored by the subcommittee with Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education. We feel that we have eliminated the possibility of young people moving into training courses in order to receive pay for training while completing their education, by providing that before they can qualify they must have been out of school for 3 months of the school year, consecutively. In other words, they cannot quit school during vacation time, for a full 3 months, and then go back to school. They must really have dropped out of school and be bona fide seekers of jobs in the labor force, or they will not qualify under the act.

There was a good deal of discussion as to whether the period should be increased to 6 months in order to further discourage people from dropping out of school in order to take these courses.

It was the consensus of opinion of the large majority of the subcommittee members, based on Dr. Keppel's recommendations, that 3 months was about the right figure. No one can be sure, of course, but that was our view after looking into the subject quite carefully.

The other $50 million authorized under the program would go for the adult training to which I have referred earlier. Therefore, between the adult training for literacy and the expanded youth program, the appropriation requested would be split 50-50. I should point out that when we increase the percentage of the number of youth who can be trained under the bill from the 5 percent presently incorporated in the law to 15 percent, as called for by S. 1831, we are doing more than tripling the number of young people who can be trained. This is because the training allowance for young people under the act cannot exceed $20 a week, and is presently averaging at $17 a week, because it is fixed at one-half of the unemployment compensation payment made in the particular State.

When we triple the percentage of the youths who can be trained, we more than increase the actual number, because the money involved is less for the young people than it is for the older people.

I believe that adequately explains the purpose of the bill. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many persons have been trained under the act?

Mr. CLARK. About 60,000 have been or are now being trained at the rate of 108,000 a year. The program was smaller, of course, in its earlier months.

Mr. ELLENDER. What success have they had in obtaining jobs?

Mr. CLARK. Of those who have completed the courses, 70 percent have obtained jobs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who does the training?

Mr. CLARK. The training is done in several ways. The largest number of trainees are being trained through the local school boards and local educational systems, largely, but not entirely, through vocational and technical schools.

Mr. ELLENDER. In schools established by the States?

Mr. CLARK. In schools established by the States, or by the local school districts. Some training is done under so-called on-the-job training in industry.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of this money is used to pay the student while he is in training?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to obtain that information for the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator a moment ago to say that some of the trainees are getting as much as $17 a week, and that perhaps the amount will be raised to $20 a week. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. No, the Senator misunderstood me. The training allowances for the young people are lower than the training allowances for older people. The act fixed the young people's training allowance at one-half of the unemployment compensation payment in the particular State in which they reside. However, there is a ceiling of $20 a week above which they cannot go. In practice it has amounted to approximately $17. The payments are different in the various States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that being paid at all?

Mr. CLARK. In order to permit them to live while they are receiving training.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the same thing apply to young people who live with their parents?

Mr. CLARK. These people, in order to qualify for a course, must be classified as unemployed. They must be individuals who are looking for work that they cannot find. This quite low training allowance has been paid during the past year with substantial success, in order to keep them in groceries, so to speak, while they are taking training. Otherwise, they would be out attempting to find jobs for which they are not trained. They would have dropped out of school, and in many instances would live with their families. In many more instances they are not living at home, because they come from broken homes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can understand that with respect to children 16 to 18 years of age. Are any additional payments made to any of the students who live away from the school where they are being trained?

Mr. CLARK. Not for the young people; only for the older people. That subject was under discussion. It was quite controversial. We decided not to include such a provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. The payment is made irrespective of the distance that the students live away from the school they attend. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the maximum amount paid to an illiterate who has been doing work in a coal mine, for example, and who has reached the age of 25 or more?

Mr. CLARK. Under the bill he would be entitled, while he was being trained, to the amount of the unemployment compensation which the particular State in which he lives would have awarded to him if he had a job and had lost it. Of course they cannot double up. If he is getting unemployment compensation when he starts his training, he would not get an additional allowance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The entire cost of the program is borne by the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What portion of the money is used to pay the schools where the trainees study?

Mr. CLARK. I can best put it this way: In the adult training program, the average training allowance per trainee—that is the money he is paid to live on——

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not mean that. We have settled that point.

Mr. CLARK. This goes back to the Senator's previous question. The estimated average training allowance for each trainee is $625 for the older people.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the entire course?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. The courses differ in length, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. CLARK. Some courses are longer than others. The average course costs $625. The training cost, which is the rest of the expense, and which goes to compensate the school district or employer, was $402. Therefore, roughly, 60 percent goes for training allowance and 40 percent for the cost of the program. That is, roughly, about $1,000 per trainee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The schools receive about $240?

Mr. CLARK. About $402. It is roughly $600 for the individual and $400 for the school.

Mr. ELLENDER. The entire cost is around $1,000?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. For the young people it is different.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are contracts entered into by the schools for a certain period during which students are to attend?

Mr. CLARK. The way the program works is this: The State employment service in Louisiana will recommend, in coordination with the local school system—usually the vocational school system—a series of training courses to run for various periods of time. They must certify that if that training course is instituted and completed, the trainee will have a reasonable opportunity to obtain gainful employment.

That plan, jointly worked out by the school district and the State employment service, must then be submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington to be screened and approved. Once it has be approved, it is returned, and the money to pay for it is authorized to be paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that under such a plan the time necessary to train the person or persons is the decisive factor?

Mr. CLARK. It is carefully worked out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the amount of the fee for the service that is paid by the Federal Government to the school is determined by the length of time required to teach the students?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Likewise, the amount of allowances made to the students is determined in advance, depending on the length of the course?

Mr. CLARK. They are weekly payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Irrespective of the length of the course?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. It is one-half of whatever the unemployment compensation rate is in Louisiana. I do not know what that rate is. The trainee receives that sum for the number of weeks he takes the course. If he took a course for 6 weeks, he would get half the amount for 6 weeks. If he took a course for 48 weeks, he would get half the compensation for 48 weeks.

Mr. ELLENDER. In all events, HEW would settle the number of months or weeks that are required to teach the students in certain professions; and the amount of compensation that would be allowed the schools would be fixed in advance. Then the payment or allowance would depend on what the State paid in compensation?

Mr. CLARK. That is almost correct, but not entirely. The plan comes up from below. All HEW does is to make certain it is a good plan. Either it will approve it or will say, "We do not like it; we think you ought to change it." But the plan is worked out in Pennsylvania or Louisiana by the State employment service and the local school system.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is based upon the requirements of the act?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. The operation is decentralized.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much has been spent to date on the program?

Mr. CLARK. A little more than $70 million has been committed. The appropriation was not made until August of last year. It was several months after that before the program could be established.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is proposed this year to increase the amount to $100 million more?

Mr. CLARK. One hundred million dollars a year more, because of the new programs under the act—that is, the functional literacy program and the expanded youth program—and the purpose is to split $100 million 50–50 between those two programs. But this is an expanded program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The authorization is for $100 million a year?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield; but first I wish to ask the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I shall have to ask the Senator to take the time of the opposition.

Would the Senator from New York yield time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the absence of the minority leader, and because I am the ranking member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Chamber at the moment, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I have only two questions. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the main thrust of the bill is to provide literacy type training for adults who are supporting families?

Mr. CLARK. No. There are three purposes in the bill. One of them is the literacy training program, which the Senator has mentioned; the second is the youth program, in which the age limit is reduced from 19 years to 16; and the third—really a part of the second—is to increase the percentage share of training allowances for young people in the program from 5 percent to 15 percent. But there are two main forks—the youth program and the adult literacy program.

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to have that point cleared up, because while the Senator pointed out the objectives of the bill, I thought he laid stress on the adult training program.

Mr. CLARK. I did not intend to.

Mr. MILLER. My second question is this: Surely the Senator recognizes that it is important to keep young people in school, and that they must be encouraged not to drop out. But does it not seem to the Senator as though the requirement set forth on page 2 is a little weak, so far as reducing the adverse possibility to the maximum degree? The bill merely provides that none of the high school dropouts or persons of that age can qualify unless they have been out of school for 3 months. It seems to me that all that is necessary for them to do is to drop out for 3 months—granted there will be guidance and counsel by the appropriate authorities—and then they can receive training for 52 weeks.

Has the Senator considered enlarging the period from 3 months to perhaps 1 year, or even 2 years, so that students will drop out at that peril? I think the program ought not to be subject to the criticism which has been advanced in the minority views to the effect that the proposal in the bill will encourage dropouts. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania does not want the bill to be used as a vehicle for encouraging dropouts.

Mr. CLARK. The committee gave careful consideration to this question. A number of members of the subcommittee interrogated Commissioner of Education Keppel and Secretary of Labor Wirtz carefully on this subject. It was the mature conviction of a large majority of the committee that the 3 months period set forth in the act was about right. Nobody can be certain. There was not a single member of the committee who thought that a person should have the benefit of this course 1 year after he had dropped out of school because he had to help his family earn a living or had to earn a living himself. Certainly no one in his wildest imagination thought of 2 years. There was some discussion as to whether a 6 months period would be better than a 3 months period. Nobody knows. But the expert testimony which we heard from the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Education satisfied the committee that the provision written into the bill was somewhat stronger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CLARK. I shall read the provision:

> *Provided*, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

In other words, that is how the educators feel. That is what the people who are dealing with juvenile delinquency think. That is what the committee concluded was correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. Perhaps 3 months would be all right, provided something else were included, that is, that the continuity of dropout shall be due to the necessity of helping to support the family of the individual concerned. But no such safeguard is written into this language. I would go along with what the Senator has said, but it is not set forth in the bill. I believe that something such as I have suggested would be helpful to the bill.

Mr. CLARK. With all deference to the Senator from Iowa, the situation in his State is different from that in mine. The youngsters who would be trained under this program in my State come from broken families. They do not have homes; they are on the streets. That is not the case in Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. There are broken homes in my State, too. I still believe we ought to provide safeguards in the bill, so that deliberate dropouts will be prevented and the people will not take improper advantage of the act. Those safeguards are not written into the bill. A provision should be devised which would not interfere with the overall thrust of the legislation.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I have no further time in which to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]; thereafter, I shall yield time to the Senator from Kentucky.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding this time to me.

Let me say I believe this a very important question.

I have an amendment which requires that there be absence during a 6-month period during the regular school year before the student will be eligible to participate in the program.

Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education, expressed serious doubt as to whether the 3-month period presently called for in the bill will work. He believes that it may work or that it may not work.

I should like to quote from the statement made by Fred Z. Hetzel, Director of the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia:

> However, we feel that such allowances should not be paid to any youth who has been separated from school for less than 6 months. This provision would greatly diminish any desire on the part of some of these youths to deliberately drop out of school in order to get weekly allowances from a Manpower Development and Training Act program.

I think that is true, particularly now that we are reducing the age from 19 to 16. In my opinion, a youngster who ordinarily would commence school this week or next week would be perfectly willing to wait 3 months, in the hope that then he could receive up to $20 a week as a result of taking the program.

So later I shall offer my amendment to change the period from 3 months to 6 months.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, my question will deal with the same subject. I should like to address it to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I preface my remarks by stating that in my hometown of Somerset, Ky., there is a vocational school; and not long ago I talked to its administrator, who told me that continuously there are approximately 400 persons who take training in it, and that one of the tragic things he has found is the existence of a large number of young people who are not literate and do not have the basic educational requirements even to undertake that training. So I am sympathetic with this approach.

In considering the proposal to make eligibility dependent upon failure to attend classes for a period of 3 months, I must say that I agree with the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Iowa. I believe this provision would be a great inducement to these young people to leave school; the temptation to do that and to receive the payments would be too great.

I wonder whether it would be best to require absence for one school year, with the further provision that if the Secretary or the Commissioner found the existence of certain other circumstances, such as the dire need by the family or some other affirmative condition, he could waive that requirement. The Secretary would certainly waive it if some unusual circumstance came into play.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. May I have half a minute more?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I do not claim to have full experience in this field, but I have served as a local official and as a juvenile court judge, and I know how difficult it is to keep young people in school. If there is an inducement for them to leave, they will leave.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that neither the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] nor I was consulted about the time allocation, which is quite short. So I should like to have an understanding with the Senator from Pennsylvania that if we have any problems about the time, we shall request unanimous consent for an additional hour on the bill. I hope very much he will not object.

Mr. CLARK. I would be prepared to respond right now to such a request, but neither the majority leader nor the minority leader is here.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not request it unless we really need it.

Mr. CLARK. Let me respond to the Senator from Kentucky: Secretary Wirtz testified before the subcommittee that he thought the 3-month waiting period was about correct. Senators understand that no part of a vacation period can be counted as part of the 3-month period, which must be 3 months while school is in session. When Commissioner Keppel came before the subcommittee, I asked his judgment as an educator on the 3-month period. He said:

> I don't think we have a body of experience that can tell us that 3 months is better than 4, or 5 months is better than 6.
>
> I would hope that the Congress might be willing to let us go at it at 3 months and, if we find that the magnet is too close to the pin and it is having the negative effect on school holding power, to come back and propose revisions in that. Let me put it this way sir: In my judgment as an educator, I do not think that 3 months presents—to misuse Justice Holmes' language—a clear and present danger—I do not think so, sir.

The committee took the judgment of that professional educator. I do not know that he is correct; but certainly I do not know that he is wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am not a professional educator; but at one time I did have some slight experience as a juvenile court judge, and had to deal with the problem of school attendance. It was my experience that if a student dropped out for a whole school year, even though every effort was made by the authorities and by his parents to persuade him to stay in school, and if after a year he still had no interest in attending school, the effort usually became rather hopeless.

I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], who is a member of the committee, that a school year should be the standard. But if the Secretary or those delegated by him decided that some special circumstances were applicable, the youngster could then be permitted to enter the program.

However, I believe this provision, as it appears in the bill before us, would be an inducement to the students to drop out of school.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee 1 minute of my remaining 6 minutes.

Mr. GORE. In the report I notice the reference to the purpose of the bill—namely, to protect against the possibility of purposeful dropouts from regular school in order to receive the stipends for training proposed under the pending bill. The committee report does not seem to me to spell out in satisfactory detail these safeguards. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania point them out?

Mr. CLARK. On page 2 of the bill is a proviso which stiffens to a certain extent the original proposal of the administration.

It reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend

school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

In addition, the program will train only 50,000 young people a year. The fact is that 36 million youngsters will enter the work force in the 1960's. Among those will be 7½ million school dropouts, at least one-half of whom will be 16 or over. So that between now and the end of 1965 there will be 5½ million new entrants into the working force. Of these 2 million will be school dropouts. With those safeguards in the bill it seemed to the committee, based on the opinions given by Dr. Keppel, Commissioner of Education, and Secretary of Labor Wirtz, that with the 3 months' waiting period and the additional requirements of the Secretary being satisfied, there was very little prospect that a youngster would drop out of school in order to get this money for training allowance, or that the program would be abused.

Mr. GORE. What is the stipend?

Mr. CLARK. It is one-half of the weekly unemployment compensation payment for the State in which the trainee resides.

Mr. GORE. Which on a national average is what?

Mr. CLARK. It is about $17 a week. One could not get rich on that.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that there may be a shortage of available time on the bill. That deficiency could be cured by adding to the time available on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent order entered on the bill be modified so that 2 hours of debate will be available on the bill instead of 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had without the time necessary for the call being charged to either side. I intend to offer an amendment I have had printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 186, as modified, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC.—. (a) So much of the second sentence of section 203(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as precedes the proviso at the end thereof is amended to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed an amount equal to 50 per centum of the average weekly manufacturing wage (according to the most recent data available) in the State making such payment or in the United States, whichever is lower:".

(b)(1) The first sentence of the second paragraph of such section 203(a) is amended by striking out "the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount of his weekly training allowance as determined under the preceding paragraph".

(2) The second sentence of such paragraph is amended by striking out "the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount of his weekly training allowance as referred to above".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. The purpose of the amendment is to reconcile the policy of the United States with the existing needs of this country.

It has been noted already that the standard of compensation for adult trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act is today based upon unemployment compensation. We are not now talking about youth and the special provisions made in the bill for youth. I have not touched upon that subject in my amendment. The compensation for adult trainees is today based upon unemployment compensation.

That results in the following situations:

First, trainees do not get sufficient allowances to live on. Hence, there is a rate of dropouts of about 23 percent among participating trainees. Since the trainees do not get sufficient compensation to continue, no matter how bad is the first job that comes along, they grab it because they have no alternative. When they do that, all of the money which the United States has invested in their training is, in substance, wasted, and the national purpose is not attained.

Reason No. 1, therefore, is that the dropouts total in excess of one-fifth of those enrolling in the program. That is the testimony before the committee. That is directly attributable to the fact that the training allowances are inadequate. They are inadequate because they are based on unemployment compensation. I shall discuss those figures later.

The standard which I propose is 50 percent of the average manufacturing wage in the particular State or in the United States, whichever is the lower. That would mean if my amendment should prevail, that in 19 of the 50 States the allowance would be 50 percent of the national average, because in those States the State average manufacturing wage is higher. In the other 31 States the training allowance would amount to 50 percent of the State average manufacturing wage.

On the whole, the amendment would result in increasing present allowances by an amount in the area of 25 to 30 percent. It would result in an additional cost to the Federal Government of something in the area of $20 million, or perhaps a little less, in view of the fact that my calculation at the figure of one-half of the average State manufacturing wage came to about $23 million, and I have now put on a ceiling affecting 19 States, which would rather materially reduce that aggregate amount.

Point No. 1 is that there is a very high rate of dropouts, for financial reasons, which makes the program self-defeating, because those who are being trained lose the benefit of their training because they cannot participate for the time necessary to complete the training.

The second point is that the internal operations of our Government are completely inconsistent in this important area. There are three programs under which there are allowances to trainees. This is one program. The Area Redevelopment Act is another. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is the third. Under each of those programs there are trainee allowances. Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 the training allowance is based upon the standard which I propose; that is, the average manufacturing wage in the State. Under the Area Redevelopment Act the standard is based on unemployment compensation. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, which the Senate is considering today, the standard again is based on unemployment compensation.

An individual trainee trained under one of these acts, rather than under another, would receive a different standard of compensation from that provided under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. So the second reason for acting in the way which I propose is the fact that the programs inherently and internally are inconsistent.

The third reason is the nature of the program itself. We are trying to change the status of a man who will be displaced by automation or otherwise disadvantaged because he lacks training by giving him training to improve his capabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes from the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. We seek to raise such a man to a level of capability as to permit him to fulfill his role in the United States in the national interest. The program works in two ways. An individual will perform his economic role by producing to his maximum potential, if he is retrained. He will also rehabilitate himself as a working unit in terms of himself and his family.

In order to do this, we do not wish to stamp a man as being unemployed. He is not unemployed. He is working for the benefit of the Nation as well as for the benefit of himself, in giving himself, because of national concern, a new opportunity in life and a new opportunity to contribute to the Nation. He should not have an unemployment psychology while he is so engaged. Yet, when we fix a standard of compensation for him which is based upon unemployment compensation we say exactly that. We say, "You are still unemployed. This is a kind of an extension of the unemployment situation, for you are still an unemployed man. You are not a man employed in training."

That is the concept which is important to understand for our country and for the purpose of making this whole effort and this whole program meaningful, as it should be.

The fourth and final argument is that the standard which is now set results in completely unrealistic allowances for trainees. For example, those allowances are as low as $22.72 in Arkansas, $25.30 in Alabama, $24.99 in South Carolina, $23.05 in Maine, and $23.50 in Mississippi. I am speaking of the weekly rates. Even in the important industrial States, the figure is $32.32 in Pennsylvania and $37.69 in New York.

When we realize what the allowances for adult trainees, as contained in the law, amount to we realize it is not possible for such persons to live on these allowances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table of the actual weekly allowances which are being paid under the Manpower Development and Training Act, based upon the third quarter of the fiscal year 1963, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, along with a comparison with the proposed allowances based on 50 percent of the average manufacturing wage, the ceiling I have proposed in my amendment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Comparison of present training allowance under Manpower Development and Training Act with proposed allowance of 50 percent of manufacturing earnings*

State	Weekly MDTA allowance, 3d quarter, 1963	Proposed allowance of 50 percent of manufacturing wage	Amount of increase
Alabama	$26	$42	+$16
Alaska	41	----------	----------
Arizona	32	*52	+20
Arkansas	24	33	+9
California	43	*56	+13
Colorado	43	*54	+11
Connecticut	39	*52	+13
Delaware	38	49	+11
District of Columbia	38	----------	----------
Florida	28	41	+13
Georgia	28	36	+8
Guam	----------	----------	----------
Hawaii	39	----------	----------
Idaho	39	47	+8
Illinois	40	*53	+13
Indiana	32	*54	+22
Iowa	32	*51	+19
Kansas	$38	*$53	+$15
Kentucky	33	46	+13
Louisiana	31	48	+17
Maine	25	39	+14
Maryland	32	48	+16
Massachusetts	39	45	+6
Michigan	37	*61	+24
Minnesota	31	*51	+20
Mississippi	25	33	+8
Missouri	34	48	+14
Montana	32	*52	+20
Nebraska	32	47	+15
Nevada	39	*61	+22
New Hampshire	32	38	+6
New Jersey	40	*51	+11
New Mexico	31	45	+14
New York	39	48	+9
North Carolina	23	34	+11
North Dakota	33	44	+11
Ohio	42	*57	+15
Oklahoma	27	45	+18
Oregon	36	*52	+16
Pennsylvania	34	48	+14
Puerto Rico	15	----------	----------
Rhode Island	32	41	+9
South Carolina	27	35	+8
South Dakota	31	49	+18
Tennessee	25	39	+14
Texas	30	48	+18
Utah	38	*54	+16
Vermont	32	41	+9
Virginia	28	39	+11
Virgin Islands	----------	----------	----------
Washington	33	*56	+23
West Virginia	24	51	+27
Wisconsin	42	*52	+10
Wyoming	45	49	+4

NOTE.—Average weekly manufacturing wage in the United States as of July 1963 is $99.88, as reflected in U.S. Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business, August 1963. The asterisks indicate States in which the proposed allowance of 50 percent of the manufacturing wage exceeds 50 percent of the U.S. manufacturing wage.

Mr. JAVITS. When we examine those figures we see that in absolute terms it is for all practical purposes impossible for the head of the household to make a living or even to get along on a minimum standard on the basis of the compensation which he would get under the act.

For all those reasons, Mr. President, I think it is essential that we face realistically the results of what we are trying to do in the interests of the Nation. Now, in my opinion, we are cheating, by dealing with the situation of retraining as if it were unemployment. It is not fair to the Nation, and it is not fair to the people concerned to do so.

I wish to refer to the testimony of Seymour L. Wolfbein, Director of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor; to the testimony of Walter Reuther, head of the industrial division, AFL-CIO, as well as of the United Automobile Workers; and to the testimony of Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the department of legislation, AFL-CIO—before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—bearing out the concept which I am putting before the Senate in the amendment.

These witnesses, particularly Messrs. Reuther and Biemiller, recommended two-thirds of the wage rate for the job for which the worker is being trained rather than one-half of the average manufacturing wage, as I have laid it before the Senate, but the principle which is involved is the same. It is the principle that we should try to attain a standard of employment rather than unemployment, in the compensation which we pay trainees, thereby really giving the trainee the feeling that he is entitled to have—that he is engaged in a constructive effort, in an affirmative effort, rather than merely being unemployed and receiving unemployment compensation, which is all the present law gives him.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time yielded by the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes more from the time on the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. The rate of dropouts, coupled with the character of the program which needs to be carried out in our national interest, couple with the effect upon the individual being trained, and the fact that there is complete inconsistency, among the laws of the United States, together with the support of the witnesses I have described, indicates to me, as we are now revising this act, the need to amend it in the way I have suggested.

I am thoroughly in favor of what is being done by the bill. I feel that it is extremely sound and constructive that the Government is addressing itself to a fundamental duty, which is to see that hardship does not fall on an individual because of a readjustment in our country which is not the fault of that individual. That is laudable. The question is, What are the terms under which we are going to do it? I think this is one of the terms which is wrong, so far as both the individual and the Nation are concerned. It is for that reason that I pressed this amendment in committee, and why I press it now.

I feel this is a deserving amendment and should be passed by the Senate, but no matter what we may do here today, I feel that we cannot get away from a situation in which the rate of dropouts is going to compel material improvement in training allowances. The thing for the Government to do is not to wait until it is hit over the head by some disastrous failure of the program, but to anticipate what it sees clearly written in the sky by the kind of legislation which it writes.

As we are reforming the act in very desirable respects, let us reform it by what I seek to do by this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I have great ideological sympathy with the position advanced by the Senator from New York. It may well be that when we have greater experience with the training allowances under the Manpower Training and Development Act, the administration will want to come before the committee and ask to have the allowances increased more or less along the lines which the Senator from New York has suggested. But we do not have enough experience under the act now to know what the best answers are to the problem of training allowances, which are probably too low.

The position which I think a strong majority of the committee would have taken had the amendment been brought to a vote in the committee would be to go along with the administration, with the President's recommendations, for another year, and then, based on the testimony continually being taken by our committee as a whole, on the whole retraining program, determine whether we want to increase the allowances. I am quite certain the majority of the committee feels opposed to the amendment.

There are practical and technical objections to the amendment, also. The amendment would base compensation on the manufacturing wage in a particular State, but a very large proportion of the trainees are being trained for nonmanufacturing occupations, where the wage is lower. These exclusions are of occupations which are not included in the Fair Labor Standards Act—hotels, restaurants, laundry, small retail firms, where training courses will give opportunity for employment where persons are not now equipped with employable skills. In some cases the trainee would be getting training allowances in excess of the amount he could expect to earn in the occupation for which he was being trained.

There is another important pragmatic reason for objection to the amendment. The States have a great role to play in this program. It is true that a few days ago we provided that the Federal Government should pick up the whole tab for the program, but it is hoped that in the near future the States will be prepared to pay their share of the cost.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an instant?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand there are just enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered on the amendment. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CLARK. The States have always wanted to base allowances on unemployment compensation. I do not think we should change that practically universal State desire for a new and untried training allowance procedure, as suggested by the Javits amendment.

It is true that the proposal would make available more opportunity for heads of households with higher aptitudes, but because it would increase competition for training, it would be more difficult to reach the hard core, less trainable individuals, whom we hope to get into jobs, even though paying less money than would be paid to more highly skilled workers.

For all these reasons I regretfully am compelled to oppose the amendment, and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In reference to the argument made by the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I appreciate the Senator's feeling about this issue—I remind him that, if my memory serves me correctly, the amendment was proposed in the committee and rejected.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Senator withdrew it, reserving the right to offer it on the floor, but my memory may be wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. At any rate, the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator a table or some figures indicating the amount of money that is paid to people engaged in manufacturing work?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I put that table in the RECORD. I shall be happy to refer to any State the Senator has in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us take New York as compared to New Hampshire.

Mr. JAVITS. In New York today a trainee receives, as a maximum, $39 a week. In New York, under the amendment, he could get a maximum of $48 a week.

In New Hampshire a trainee receives $32 a week as a maximum. Under the amendment which I have offered, he could get $38 a week, if he were getting half of the average manufacturing wage.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the difference between the New York and New Hampshire rate, on a weekly basis, would be what?

Mr. JAVITS. Six or seven dollars a week, at a maximum.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the State of Mississippi?

Mr. JAVITS. In the State of Mississippi he receives now a maximum of $25 a week. Under the amendment I have offered, he would receive a maximum of $33 a week. There is a difference of something in the area of 20 to 30 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice the Senator has increased the authorization from $161 to $184 million.

Mr. JAVITS. I struck that out of my amendment. I would like to tell the Senator why.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has only 1 minute left.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 3 minutes, 1 on the amendment, and 2 on the bill.

I struck out the authorization from the amendment because I felt if the amendment carried, a closer figure should be given and applied to the right section. The Senator will notice that the section of the bill which is amended by the bill itself increases the allowance by $100 million for various purposes of the bill. The section which I had proposed to amend in my amendment went back to the original bill. I think there would be some confusion. So, in lieu of that, I gave estimates that the increase would be in the neighborhood of $20 million. It was $23 million as originally designed. That is one-half of the manufacturing wage. With the ceiling of it based on the average, it is reduced in 19 States, and I therefore gave an approximation of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of the fact that this program may cost $20 to $23 million more than the program being advocated, is it the intention of the Senator to increase the authorization?

Mr. JAVITS. I would, if my amendment should be agreed to. If it were adopted, I would move another amendment for that purpose.

This is a program that costs money. It is a program on which we are spending money in order to make it effective. My position is that if we want to make it effective, sooner or later—the Senator from Pennsylvania says later and I say sooner—we must face the issue. These allowances are premised upon a wrong standard. If it is worth doing it is worth doing right. If a Senator believes it is not worth doing at all, he should vote against the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am intrigued by the interesting argument made by the distinguished Senator from New York. I have also listened to the rebuttal made by the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill. What does the Senator from New York have to say with reference to the argument made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, that in some instances the amount of payment, being one-half of the manufacturing level in a community, could mean that an individual may be receiving almost as much money for training purposes as he would if he were employed?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that is a valid argument. The Senator from Pennsylvania argued that we are training many people who are receiving more while they are being trained than they would if they had a job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes on the bill. The Senator argued that we may be training people for the service trade. It is true that the service trade wage averages somewhat less than the manufacturing wage average—however, not by as much as the Senator argues. I am drawing on my recollection, but this is a field with respect to which I have been keeping in close touch with what is going on. The average in the service trades is perhaps $15 or $20 less than the manufacturing wage. That still would not bring us down—this is a 50-percent figure, let us remember—to the point where it would be more attractive to take training than to have a job.

As the matter stands now, it is less attractive to take training than to have any job. One cannot make the grade in living expenses based upon the allowances which are being given. It is not being too generous to make it 50 percent of the manufacturing wage, because we are dealing with heads of families, or heads of households, under the Internal Revenue Act. There is no great romance in this matter if the Senate takes my standard, but it is a material improvement. Instead of waiting for this program to break down, let us anticipate the breakdown and give the program the best chance of success that we can give it.

I believe my amendment is very important. I want the program to succeed. I believe a 20-percent dropout would kill the program. I am trying to take time by the forelock. I do not want to wait and be told that the program has failed. Let us do something now to keep the people in the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania in order to clarify a question that I asked him a short time ago.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the distinguished Senator stated that under this program 60,000 unemployed had been trained.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is approximately correct. The figure is a little less than 60,000 are being trained. I believe it is 58,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not under the program that we are discussing, but under the old program. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The Javits amendment applies to the old program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The program that we are considering, as I understand it, is an entirely new program.

Mr. CLARK. Under the bill, but not under the proposed amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill it is an entirely new program as compared with what was done last year.

Mr. CLARK. It is an expanded program. It is not entirely new.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore when the Senator said 70,000 people were trained, it was under the original 1962 program.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. We would train more under the proposed program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator refers to the expanded program.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

I yield myself 2 minutes on the amendment.

I believe there are four reasons which could be summarized why we must oppose the amendment.

First, while there is a high dropout rate, the dropouts are getting jobs. There is no necessary conclusion that they are getting jobs, at least in part, outside of their training. If we have a high dropout rate it is at least an indication that the program is to some extent effective.

Second, the Secretary of Labor does not now think this rate is too low. He may decide later that it is. However, until he, in his position of some expertise, wants the allowance increased, I suggest that the Senate not oppose his judgment.

In the third place, the Javits amendment would cost $20 million more than what is proposed under the bill. We have gone far enough in increasing the authorization, at least for the time being.

In the fourth place, basing the training allowance on manufacturing costs is unrealistic, and provides the wrong standard.

I have before me a list of the 20 principal occupations in which people are being trained. Among them are clerks, typists, stenographers, nurses' aids, practical nurses, waiters, waitresses, cooks, salespeople. I submit it is not realistic or intelligent, with apologies to my friends from New York, to base the training allowance on the manufacturing wage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Why could not the same rationale be used for the program as under the Trade Expansion Act? If it is good in one instance, why does not the same principle apply?

Mr. CLARK. Because under the Trade Expansion Act most of the jobs are manufacturing jobs.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not know that for sure.

Mr. CLARK. We cannot export services.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 1 minute. The Senator from Rhode Island is exactly correct, because it is not what a man has been doing that he is being retrained to do. It is what he is going to do that he is being trained for. It is illogical to say that we will retrain him to do what he has been doing. I feel that there is an inconsistency in the law. It is my own judgment, and I state it unilaterally, that if the Senate does not do it now, the administration will come back to Congress in 6 months or a year and ask that we do something about it, with perhaps the same formula. If we want the program to succeed, the adoption of my suggestion is a necessary improvement for the hundred million people that we are trying to help.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we are talking about yielding a half minute and 15 seconds, as though time were the most precious thing in a body that is known for extended talk. Can we not talk for 5 minutes on this subject? Why are we constricted to yielding half a minute at a time?

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator wish me to yield him some time? I will be glad to yield him 5 minutes. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not wish to be pugnacious about it. Why must we have time peddled out? I have sat here when Senators talked for 23 hours on trivia. I understand we have 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. Are we talking about an individual who has been employed but who, through no fault of his own, and because of automation, has lost his job? Because he is a human being the Federal Government is interested in having him trained for another task.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. PASTORE He has lost his job, and because he is unemployed he is entitled to unemployment compensation benefits anyway?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Instead of offering unemployment compensation benefits, we are saying, "We will give you an opportunity to become trained rather than to stay at home and wait until the end of the week to collect a check. If you will only cooperate, we will provide you with an opportunity to be trained for a new task to start in a new direction, which will be better than staying at home."

Are we not psychologically saying, "You are in a different category by being trained for a new job than you would be if you merely received unemployment compensation"? We are seeking to lift the morale of the individual and to have him apply his talents to new training.

Why should we not follow the suggestion of the Senator from New York? I am surprised that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is an outstanding liberal and a farsighted man, should be opposed to this kind of amendment.

This situation strikes at the dignity of an individual who is willing to cooperate to learn another task because, through automation, he has lost a job he once had. All it amounts to is a pittance of $5, $6, or $7 a week.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. If we are going to do something, let us do it on a dignified basis. Everyone knows that it is going to cost a little more money to preserve a program rather than to destroy it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I find myself in——

Mr. PASTORE. In a box?

Mr. CLARK. No, I do not find myself in a box at all. I find myself in the logical position where my head must necessarily take precedence over my heart. The Senator from Rhode Island makes a strong appeal to the heartstrings, due largely to the basis on which the Senator from New York makes the appeal.

But there is a large category of individuals outside the group about whom the Senator from Rhode Island is talking and who are intended to be covered by the bill. We are thinking in terms of a hard core of unemployed persons who have not been in the labor force for a long while, persons whose unemployment compensation has expired, and many of whom are on relief.

The high-grade, blue-collar worker, who once received a high wage, may be entitled, as the Senator from Rhode Island says, to more than unemployment compensation. But to use a manufacturing standard is to use an unrealistic standard.

Finally, we do not seek to help a large number of persons for whom the additional payment would not be an inducement to take the course, but for whom the payment they receive is adequate to induce them to take the course. It does not seem proper to charge a higher cost to the taxpayer at this time.

I appreciate, in terms of compassion, that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New York made a strong argument; but the proposal was carefully considered in committee and was carefully studied by the Secretary of Labor. It was determined that it would be better to proceed in this way for another year.

That is the full strength of my argument. If it does not convince the Senator from Rhode Island, I certainly will not quarrel with him. It is not an amendment which I should fight and bleed and die to defeat; but on balance, acting with my head, not with my heart, I believe it would be wiser to defeat the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. My only rejoinder to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is to compliment him on his standards. But I shall support the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his support. I hope that the policy of dignity by the United States toward those whom the proposal will help to train will be followed by the Senate. I am ready to vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 151 Leg.]

YEAS—10

Aiken
Case
Fong
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Nelson
Pastore
Pell

NAYS—60

Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—30

Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Cotton
Dodd
Engle
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, La.
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Neuberger
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 8, it is proposed to insert "who are over 35 years of age or who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and" after "persons".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment is agreeable to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I can explain it very briefly. Originally it was my purpose to prevent anyone who had completed or had the equivalent of an eighth-grade education from being eligible for any activity under the so-called literacy program envisaged by the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggested that there were probably some people in the country who had had the equivalent of an eighth-grade education but were 35 years of age or over, and therefore perhaps have been unable to keep up on their reading and writing. It seems to me that those people would be very few in number. So with that change in the amendment, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania would be willing to accept it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would eliminate from the program, if I correctly understand—and I ask the Senator if I do—anyone under 35 years of age who had been through 8 years of school. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. Or had the equivalent of 8 years of school.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont would not apply to older workers—those 35 years of age or over—regardless of how much schooling they had had.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I see no serious objection to the amendment. I have polled most of the members of the subcommittee. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer a second amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the words "functional literacy" and insert in lieu thereof the words "elementary reading, writing and arithmetic".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is also agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not like the word "elementary." I understood that the amendment would merely refer to "reading, writing, and arithmetic." I would be prepared to accept an amendment to that effect, but when the word "elementary" is added, confusion might result. I hope that the Senator will be willing to withdraw the word "elementary" and make the language read "reading, writing, and arithmetic," in which case I would be happy to accept the amendment.

Terms such as "functional illiteracy" seem like gobbledygook. I like the simpler wording.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out the word "elementary" in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I accept the modified amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. One page 2, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "6".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would require that in order for a school dropout to be eligible to participate in the training program under the act, he must have been out of school for 6 months continuously during the regular school term. The bill would require a 3-month period for school dropouts. The longer period of 6 months would lessen any incentive which a potential school dropout might have to leave school in order to enter the program.

It seems to me that the last thing we would wish to do under the program would be to encourage any boy or girl to drop out of high school by reason of the fact that he or she would be entitled to an amount up to $20 per week under the allowance program. It is extremely doubtful that a 3-month period would be sufficient to discourage many boys and girls who might have a tendency to or be thinking of leaving school. I think that would be most unfortunate. Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education, expressed some concern about that particular question. He said, "We do not know what will happen. If too many drop out, we can change the law."

But I think perhaps the time to do that is now. In its present form, the bill is superior to the act, which does not require any time limitation whatsoever. But I believe that a 6-month period is far more realistic than a 3-month period. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Let the RECORD show that the best judgment of the Commissioner of Education and the best judgment of the Secretary of Labor is that 3 months is a long-enough time to keep school dropouts out of these training courses. No one knows what the right period is. There is no experience. But the professional educators are of the view that it would be wiser to allow a youngster to start retraining if during the school year he had been out of school for 3 continuous months.

Vacation periods are not included. However, this must be in the realm of judgment and of speculation. After having conferred with the members of the subcommittee who are present in the Chamber, I am prepared to take the amendment to conference. Therefore, I will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for accepting the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After line 17 on page 3, it is proposed to add the following new subsection:

> (h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than 30 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in this section shall be used for training costs, exclusive of training allowances, of projects under title II of this Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would limit the funds which could be spent for training costs of the projects under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act. The amendment would place the limitation at 30 percent of the funds appropriated.

The Department, up to the present time, has been operating at this percentage, or relatively close to it. Considering the large authorization which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday, September 4, of this year, the amendment would insure that training costs would not increase merely because there was more money to be spent.

I have a list of obligations by activity, which shows that with respect to the $140 million appropriated by the House for this program the training cost allowance is about 33 percent. I would reduce the percentage to 30, because it seems to me that perhaps administrative expenses and other costs, while the program was getting underway, were somewhat higher than is necessary now.

I think the money should be made available to the trainees, rather than be used to build up a huge administrative staff which is perhaps not necessary.

I point out that this would not be a limitation of dollars, but would be a limitation of a percentage of the appropriations made.

I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I regret that I must oppose the amendment. The amendment would to some extent put into a legislative straitjacket what ought to be the administrative discretion of the people who operate the program.

The Senator from Vermont has figures which appear to satisfy him that the administrative costs have been running about 33 percent. The figures the staff has made available to me indicate that these costs have been running as high as 40 percent. The Senator proposes to limit those costs to 30 percent.

I point out that it is a misnomer to call these costs administrative costs. We are paying some 40 percent of the money available to the local school districts to create and staff the courses necessary to do the retraining. This purpose of the program is not merely to pay training allowances to the people who are unemployed. In my opinion, that should be incidental. The purpose of the program is to finance, at the local school district level and through on-the-job training, an educational process for these people. To me it would be a grave mistake to put into the act definite cost percentages divided between training allowances and the necessary expenses for teachers' salaries, for the rent of classrooms, and for the buying of textbooks and tools with which training can be given. That is the purpose of the program.

I hope the Senate will not put the administrators into a legislative straitjacket. So far as the record shows, the administrators are doing a first-class job under the terms of the law, during the first year.

The committee will take a careful look at the program, as it has in the past. There will be a report from the Secretary month by month and year by year as to how the costs are divided.

I hope the Senate will exercise a bit of restraint as to writing legislative requirements into the act, and accordingly I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have seen the figures prepared by the staff or by someone downtown—I am not sure where they originate—which tend to justify the Senator's point of view. I have tried without success to determine how those figures were arrived at.

I have figures issued by the Department which indicate the obligations by activity. The estimate for 1964 shows that the training costs will amount to 33 percent. With respect to the appropriation of $140 million passed by the House a short time ago, the estimate indicates that the same figure will be applicable. The revised estimate for 1963 indicates that the costs for training will be 26 percent.

When we consider the $110 million appropriation approved by the Senate, we find that the training costs were 66 percent of the actual allowance payments. That seems rather high. I believe that the figure of 30 percent is adequate. If I can be persuaded later that it is not, I shall be the first to suggest a higher figure.

In view of the facts I have, which I think have not been rebutted to any successful degree, the figure of 30 percent is accurate, realistic, and one which we should require.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be that up to now the Department has actually been operating within a 30-percent limitation?

Mr. PROUTY. About 33 percent.

Mr. MILLER. About 33 percent. So it would appear that the Senator's amendment would not curtail or impede the operations of the Department?

Mr. PROUTY. It is not intended to. I am sure it would not.

Mr. MILLER. Why should the Department need to have more flexibility, to go over 30 percent? The Department should be trying to cut down, rather than to increase, the costs.

Mr. PROUTY. As the program expands, they will find it quite possible, if they so desire, to reduce the administrative figure. That includes administration as well as equipment, instruction, and things of that nature. The 30 percent figure is a generous, fair and realistic one. I hope the Senate will see fit to go along with my proposal.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his response. I am inclined to support the amendment, and there should be a yea-and-nay vote on it, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], on page 3, line 17. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business and his pair has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 152 Leg.]

YEAS——18

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Curtis
Dominick
Goldwater
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—49

Bartlett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Engle
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, La.
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE BUNDESTAG OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to inform the Senate that we have as our guests on the floor of the Senate five members of the German Bundestag. They are Mr. Martin Heix, trade union secretary, Christian Democratic Union; Mr. Carl Reinhard, farmer, graduate of Agricultural University, Christian Democratic Union; Mr. Otto Striebeck, journalist, Social Democratic Party of Germany; Dr. Uwe-Jense Nissen, plant medical officer, Social Democratic Party of Germany; and Mr. Ludwig Hamm, lawyer, Free Democratic Party.

We are delighted to have them with us. I hope Senators will take this opportunity to extend their greetings and best wishes to our honored guests.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the entire membership of the Senate, the Chair extends a hearty welcome to the distinguished visitors.

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsections."

After line 17 on page 3, add the following new subsections:

> (f) Not more than 20 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out title II of this Act shall be used for the training of and for training allowances paid to youths over 16 but under 22 years of age.
>
> (g) Not more than 15 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of carrying out title II of this Act shall be used for the purposes of subsection (h) of section 202 thereof.

On page 2, line 8, beginning with "by" strike out all down to and including the comma on line 9 of page 2.

Section 203(c) of Public Law 87-415, is amended by striking out the words "but not more than 5 per centum of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under this section may be paid to such youths."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment has two essential provisions. Each is discussed separately below.

First. The new subsection (f) provides that not more than 20 percent of all the funds authorized for the training projects under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act can be used for the training of youths aged 16 to 22 years. Under present law there is a limitation of 5 percent of "training allowances" of $20 per week for such youths. S. 1831 increases this percentage to 15 percent. Spokesmen for the Department have indicated a desire to gear this limitation to amounts authorized for the program, rather than to training allowances as the law presently requires. This seems a sensible change to be made in the law because of the disparity between training allowances for youths, $20, and allowances for adults, $35. This 20-percent limitation seems to conform with the relationship between adults and youths who need training.

Second. The new subsection (g) places a 15-percent limitation on the amounts of appropriated funds which can be used for the new literacy program, as contained in S. 1831. Testimony has indicated that there are roughly 300,000 "functional illiterates" who need this new program, whereas there are over 600,000 youths who need training. This completely new literacy program would be able to serve its purpose very well under this limitation, and the limitation would assure that the youths and the adults for whom the program was originally designed, would not be deprived of funds necessary for their programs already underway.

The amendment has been offered after discussions with members of the Department. They have not seen this particular amendment, but I believe they approve of it in principle.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I hope the amendment will be defeated. It is another attempt like the one which was defeated a few minutes ago, to apply legislative restrictions which would unduly hamper the Administrator in his conduct of the program.

No effective basis was laid in the hearings of the subcommittee by administration witnesses which would enable us to apply a definite percentage figure to this broad program. To do so at this time, without full consideration, would be an unwise step to take. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Later, in another amendment which I shall offer, in which there is a 20-percent restriction, I shall show that under this proposal at least 100,000 youths could be trained; and that 42,000 could be trained for fiscal 1964, with a 15-percent restriction on the literacy program. So we are not hampering the program in any way.

Under this amendment, not a single nickel need be spent for literacy or youth or adult training. It could be used for any of the three programs.

We are now adding $200 million to the authorization of $322 million which was approved last Wednesday. That money will go into the same pot. It could be used for whatever purpose the administrator decided was desirable and necessary. This is not a restrictive amendment; it merely places a ceiling on the amount that can be expended for the literacy program and the youth program. It seems to me it is a valid and reasonable proposal.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have another amendment to offer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall have to ask the Senator to charge the time for the quorum call to the time of the opponents.

Mr. KEATING. That is satisfactory. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 17, it is proposed to add the following new subsection:

> (i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act not more than 25 per centum of the funds authorized for the training of youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two years shall be used for the training of high school graduates.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment limits the amount of funds to be authorized for the training of youths who are high school graduates. The amendment limits to 25 percent of all funds available for youths the amounts for high school graduates. The Department of Labor and others have indicated concern that too large a percentage of funds for youths were being used for high school graduates, thus reducing too sharply the funds available to train those disadvantaged by the lack of a high school diploma.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Secretary of Labor Wirtz said—and I think it is quite significant:

> Two-thirds of all the unemployed people in this country today did not finish high school. But two-thirds of the trainees under this year's administration of the Manpower Development and Training Act—over two-thirds—did finish high school.
>
> Now, what that means is that because of the circumstances of the situation under the present law, we ought to be beaming this program more at those who did not have the advantage of a high school education, but as things worked out, it is beamed much more toward those who did have the advantage of a high school education.

Mr. President, the comments of the Secretary of Labor indicate that as the act has been administered up until now, the persons who need the program the least are the ones who are receiving the benefits. The average boy or girl who graduates from high school has an opportunity, through various programs, to fit himself for a productive adult life. But the training program was primarily intended to help persons who did not have educational advantages, who are high school dropouts, or who are illiterates.

I believe that some restriction of this nature is highly necessary and desirable at this time. A great many high school graduates would still be eligible under the proposal I am offering now.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The amendment is another effort to write unnecessary legislative restrictions into an act under which greater flexibility should be left to the administrator. We have a situation in which perhaps a majority of young persons between the ages of 18 and 22 who would want to train under this act are high school graduates. We do not have yet a sufficient statistical basis to determine what that percentage would be. But to write a 25-percent limitation into the act would make it more difficult to administer the act successfully. It would not reduce the cost. It could do no good, and it might conceivably do a perceptible amount of harm. Accordingly, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reiterate what the Secretary of Labor said; that is, that the program as it has been administered up to now is primarily of value to high school graduates; it does not reach down to high school dropouts and illiterates, for whom the program was originally designed and promoted.

The restriction I propose is not at all unrealistic. It is worthwhile, and would enable the administrator to perform far better work and for the benefit of persons who most need the assistance.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with "In" on line 13, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I said on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, the Senate should consider all programs related to the one being considered today; that is, programs involving vocational and educational programs of one kind or another.

I should like to read into the RECORD—and I feel certain I have missed some items—the amount of money which has been either appropriated or authorized or for which requests for authorization have been made in the field of education, manpower retraining, and development.

The Senate has already appropriated $110 million for the manpower development and training program for fiscal 1964. The bill before the Senate, S. 1831, authorizes $100 million for fiscal 1964.

S. 1761, which the Senate passed on Wednesday of this week, authorizes $322 million for fiscal 1965.

S. 1831, the bill the Senate is now considering, authorizes $100 million for fiscal 1965.

That is a total of $632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act for fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965.

In addition to this amount, $100 million has been appropriated by the Senate for the Youth Employment Act. The vocational education bill, which is before the Senate at the present time, will appropriate for this year $108 million, and for fiscal 1965, $153 million.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act, there is a program involving $4,500,000 for retraining and vocational education.

There is also an additional appropriation or authorization for $15 million for the vocational education; another authorization of $50 million for vocational education.

These items total $1,072,500,000 for the next 2 fiscal years.

Perhaps I should say that I have added $30 million to that figure, to conform with the House appropriations for the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that in the next 2 years the Government will be spending $1,072 million under what is known as the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Mr. PROUTY. No; it is $632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act. I say it will be spent; that is not completely accurate. That will depend on the amount appropriated. These are amounts which have been authorized or for which authorization is now being sought.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will be $632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition, $440 million could potentially be spent under other authorizations?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the total amount, from all sources, for retraining would be $1,072 million in the next 2 years?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think this is a good amendment, and I intend to vote for it—although like other amendments already offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I assume it will be defeated.

I understand that a yea-and-nay vote has been ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment, but not on the question of the passage of the bill. Therefore, at this time I wish to go on record as being opposed to passage of the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I do not wish to impose on the time of Senators who already have general knowledge of the outcome of the vote on this amendment.

The information I have, based on this $632 million figure, is that during the fiscal year 1964, 204,000 individuals can come under 1 of the 3 programs envisaged by the Manpower Development and Training Act as the bill proposes to amend it and during the fiscal year 1965, 385,000 will be eligible. That total can be broken down in different ways, but that is the maximum number of those who can be included under the program and under the funds which have been either appropriated or authorized, or for which authorization is sought.

It seems to me it is humanly impossible for the Department to administer a program of this magnitude, inasmuch as it is just barely getting off the ground at the present time. If double the money could be profitably used for this manpower development and training program, I would be willing and happy to vote for it; but all this money is unnecessary. We authorized $322 million last Wednesday. Two days later we are asked to authorize an additional $200 million, which would make a total of $522 million.

None of that money needs to be spent for an illiteracy program. None of it needs to be spent for a youth program. None of it needs to be spent for an adult program. There is no need to spend it for all or for one or two of these programs. So what is proposed today is simply that we add a $200 million authorization to the $322 million authorization we approved last Wednesday. I believe there is no justification for doing this.

I believe my record shows that I am and have been a friend of legislation of this type. I believe we are faced with very serious problems affecting our young people, and our unemployed; and I want to do everything humanly possible to help them. But simply to authorize and, later, to appropriate money is not enough. The program must be administered in an effective way. I believe Senators have approached this problem on the basis of faith, hope, and charity. All these are admirable virtues; but we must apply a little analytical judgment, as well.

I am not opposed to the program, but I object very strenuously to authorizing or appropriating about twice as much money as can possibly be spent.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say. I favor the program; but I am opposed to throwing money away or appropriating more than can possibly be used in an effective manner. In my opinion, the issue before us is as simple as that.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of the time under my control.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if this amendment is agreed to, the number of individuals who can be trained under this program and under the new program provided for in Senate bill 1831 will be cut from 100,000 to 60,000. In other words, if the amendment is adopted, 40,000 of those who now have no employable skills will continue to be unemployed.

The cost of the program is running about $1,000 a trainee. The Senator from Vermont proposes to cut $40 million from the program. Relatively few Americans are functional illiterates; most Americans can do elementary mathematics in their heads. So it is clear that if the authorization is reduced from $100,000,000 to $60,000,000, 40,000 people will be deprived of the benefits of the program. The issue before us is that simple.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it should be pointed out that last Wednesday we added $161 million to the program authorization, thus increasing it to $322 million. Now it is proposed that we add $200 million to all that. Certainly the two should have been combined, so that at that time Senators could have known the total which would confront them.

The pending amendment would strike out of the proposed authorization $140 million which is absolutely unnecessary.

The remaining $60 million authorization would be somewhat larger than I think necessary; but I am willing to have that amount authorized, in order to make my amendment more palatable to Senators who otherwise might oppose it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have voted "nay." I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is detained on official business and his pair has been previously announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 153 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Goldwater
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—38

Bartlett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Prouty's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the word "and."

On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to strike all after the word "failed" and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", and that such failure to attend school classes was due to the economic circumstances of the family or household of which the individual was a member, which required the individual to seek employment or training for employment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment is designed to spike the objection to the bill that the bill would be calculated in its results to encourage dropouts of our youngsters from school. The amendment would not be necessary were it not for the fact that the bill would lower the age for eligibility.

Inasmuch as the age limit is to be lowered, I think all of us should make it very clear that it is our intention to encourage people to stay in school, and that we do not wish to do anything to encourage people to drop out of school.

The bill will have a tendency in that direction, as a result of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to change the period of time involved from 3 months to 6 months, so that no one could become eligible unless he had been out of school for more than 6 months.

I am not sure that all of this will be necessary, because we can readily understand how a student might decide to drop out for 6 months and sit it out to become eligible for 52 weeks of training allowances. We would not want that to happen.

The bill provides that notwithstanding the 6 months of absence from classes all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities, must be gone through, but I suggest that all of these appropriate procedures of guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities will be an exercise in futility if the individual concerned has already made up his mind that what he is going to do is sit it out for 6 months and then become eligible for 52 weeks of the training allowances.

The amendment proposes to add a further criterion. That criterion would be that the failure to attend the class for 6 months was due to economic circumstances of the family or household of which the individual is a member, which economic circumstances required the individual to seek employment or to seek training for employment.

This is directly in line with what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] earlier stated when I asked him about the problem of school dropouts. The Senator raised the point, which was a valid point, that a student might be required to drop out of school in order to help earn bread for the family. This is a valid point. The student might drop out of school because it was necessary for him to obtain training for employment to help in the economic situation of the family. If an individual came from a broken home and was in a household, it might be necessary for him to help earn some bread for the household.

The amendment would do nothing more than gear the bill with that point made by the Senator from Pennsylvania in mind. It would provide another safeguard calculated to prevent the bill from encouraging dropouts, one of our greatest tragedies.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Iowa in this amendment. I think the Senator has explained it thoroughly. I wish to make only a few comments.

I agree wholeheartedly with the purpose of this amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act, because the purpose is to include young people between the ages of 16 and 19 among those who can be trained. Not only would they be included for basic skills, but also they would be included for functional literacy training, to give them at least the simplest fundamentals of reading, writing, and arithmetic skills to enable them to take basic training in school.

When we read that 500,000 or 600,000 young people were unemployed in the past year, we realize that the situation is sad. It is an indictment of our educational system throughout this country, that it does not provide to thousands and thousands of young people functional literacy, or even the basic requirements for earning a living for themselves and for their families.

It has been developed in the debate that the program should not induce young people to leave school when they are able to stay in school. The amendment which has been agreed to, to provide that there must be a failure to attend a school for 6 months will act against such an objective.

As the Senator from Iowa has explained, our amendment would provide another safeguard against dropouts. It would make money available to those boys and girls who need it most.

It is evident that the authorization in the bill, to be followed by appropriations, will not provide sufficient funds to train all the young people between 16 and 19 years of age who need training in basic skills or who need training in fundamental literacy requirements. The amendment, if adopted, would make whatever amounts of money are appropriated available to young men and women whose families are not able to keep them in school, and it would make this money available to them when the circumstances of the family made it necessary for boys and girls over 16 years of age to leave school to work or to be trained in order to go to work.

The provision we have offered touches a problem which has not been debated. The effect would be to provide the money which is made available to those boys and girls whose families are not able to keep them in school, when the circumstances demand that they work to help support the family as well as to support themselves.

If a family has funds to keep children in school, it is the duty of the family to use every bit of persuasion and effort it can to keep a boy or girl in school. If a family needs funds for its own sustenance, the boy or girl would have to go to work—and many of them do—to help provide for the family needs.

The effect of the amendment would be to direct whatever funds are appropriated to boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 19 whose families are not able to keep them in school and whose families need their help. I submit, upon that ground, that it is an amendment which should be adopted. If the money is not directed to those who need it, who by reason of the circumstances of their families have not been able to secure the schooling necessary to train them, I do not know to whom it should be directed.

That would be the effect of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the amendment offered by our two capable colleagues, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in my opinion provides for new procedures which would add a further layer of bureaucracy to the administration of the present training program.

I ask for the attention of the sponsors of the amendment, because I should like to stress the point that the amendment overlooks the fact that those who drop out, at the ages of 16 through 18, have in many instances left school for other than what might be clearly characterized as economic reasons.

I point to the language which I think, frankly, is ill defined: "Economic circumstances of the family or household."

I warn Senators that this could well mean that the Secretary of Labor, through representatives of that Department, would investigate bank accounts. This is possible, and I think is a practical possibility. The debts of the parent or parents of the household could be gone into, because if the economic circumstances are to be determined, an investigation must be made. Very frankly, one would have to investigate family by family, and household by household, to ascertain whether the youngster dropped out of school for any reason which could be described as an economic circumstance.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I can understand the Senator's concern about this question; but would not that investigation have already been made by the local authorities? It seems to me almost inconceivable that a family in circumstances justifying the dropout would not have been on the local relief rolls, which would have already required an investigation. So the Senator's concern, while recognizable, is perhaps a little unfounded, because the investigation would already have been made. I find it inconceivable to suppose that the Secretary would not go to the local authorities for this information.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The investigation required by the amendment as offered is in no sense required by the bill as reported. The factual determination presently contemplated by the bill does not go to the point of the economic circumstances of the family.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator from West Virginia if the financial circumstances of the family are not the very ones which cause the local authorities to provide for A, B, or C, or for other types of assistance, to the family?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I will read the language of the bill. I think it is important to check it, because, as I have indicated, it provides:

> That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under 19 years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 3 months—

It was amended to 6 months—

> during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.

The bill does not refer to the economic circumstances of the youngster's family.

Mr. MILLER. Not so far as the Senator has read; but my point is, if the Senator will read further, and add our amendment to what he has read, that it involves the economic circumstances, which is the point of his argument——

Mr. RANDOLPH. I interrupt the Senator to say that that is what I am opposed to, and that is what the committee is opposed to. The Senator has said that this investigation already has been concluded.

Mr. MILLER. I am suggesting to the Senator from West Virginia that his fear of a great mass of administrative detail that is going to have to be gone into by the Secretary in order to meet the requirement provided by our amendment is probably overstated. I believe that in a great many cases the determination of the economic circumstances of a family would already have been gone into by the local authorities, and all the Secretary's field agents would have to do would be to contact the local agents and ascertain whether or not a family was in a bad economic situation. I do not think it would require too much of an investigation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Before I yield, let me say that I disagree with the Senator from Iowa. I understand his position, but it would be a different type of investigation, and that is why we are against it. We think that type of investigation is not a practical one.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I must say that the Senator from West Virginia overemphasizes the kind of investigation which would have to be conducted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator have expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

Mr. COOPER. The language which was reported by the committee states, "the Secretary shall have satisfied himself." So that language would apply also to the amendment which we have offered, namely, that the Secretary shall have satisfied himself about the conditions provided. He would have to satisfy himself that the individual had failed to attend school classes for a period of 6 months, and that all kinds of procedures had been used to induce or encourage him to stay in school.

What we have offered is much more simple. The Secretary would merely determine from local information whether a boy or girl came from a family whose financial circumstances were such that they had no funds and that this training was needed to help him or her secure functional literacy or training for a job.

The fact that such boys and girls do not have these basic skills, or that they have not been able to secure the most fundamental educational requirements for finding jobs, would indicate in most cases that they came from families which, for various reasons, were not able to keep them in school or help them continue their education.

There is not enough money to train every boy and girl who is not employed. Certainly not enough money is provided in this bill for that purpose. I make the point that, on the basis of the money available, if we are to train persons for employment and if we are to try to give them some qualifications, this money certainly ought to go to individuals from families who themselves are unable to provide educational and training opportunities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield myself 1 minute.

If these individuals come from families who have the money to keep them in school or provide for their training, why should they not do it? Why should the Government do it? This amendment directs the aid to the boy or girl coming from the type of family with which the Senator from West Virginia and I are familiar, a family which cannot provide such opportunity.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I conclude by saying that I understand the concern of the sponsors of the amendment. I repeat to them that in reality they would adopt the concept of the pauper's oath and would apply it to the youth training program proposed by the bill. That is absolutely what would have to be done, because Senators are asking, in effect, for a profit-and-loss sheet within a family or household. There are many reasons why a boy will drop from school. They can and often do involve a complication of causes other than economic circumstances. These young men and women should nonetheless remain eligible for the training program, including the allowances.

The thought expressed by the Senator from Kentucky is understandable, but I cannot agree with the conclusion.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senators offering the amendment will do so.

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I withhold the request to yield back my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am really sorry the Senator from West Virginia has thrown out the old bugaboo about the pauper's oath. There is nothing further from the minds of the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Iowa than a pauper's oath procedure. However, if the Secretary saw fit to require a pauper's oath, which I do not think he would, he would be entitled to do so under the authority of the bill. But I find it difficult to believe that the Secretary would do so. I do not think it is the intent of any Senator to require a pauper's oath in order to meet the test of whether or not the economic circumstances of the family or household from which one of the dropouts came were such as to require him to drop out of school to seek employment or training for employment.

I suggest further that the local authorities would be pretty well able to advise the field agent or the secretary whether a family was in bad economic straits, so that the Secretary could be satisfied on this limitation.

The amendment is not a difficult one to enforce. It is pretty broad when we say that the Secretary must be satisfied on this point. The degree of satisfaction does not have to be one entailing minute examination of a balance sheet. I believe the local authorities would be in a pretty good position to lend assistance in this respect. I believe that they would see to it that families which could afford to keep their boy or girl in school would not be the recipients of Federal largesse. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct. If the amendment is adopted we shall have a brand new bureaucracy engaged in investigating the finances of every family that wishes to take advantage of the training program under the bill. It will involve a balance sheet and a profit and loss statement, and the equivalent of a Dun & Bradstreet investigation. In the end we shall practically require a young man to take a pauper's oath.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will take only 1 minute. This matter is not necessarily related to economic circumstances. What is the purpose of the training? It is not merely related to poverty. The purpose is to equip people to make a useful contribution to production. Many school dropouts are totally unacquainted with the industrial processes, the manufacturing processes, or the trade processes of the American economy. The purpose of the program is not merely related to poverty but, rather, to the upgrading of the skills of American workers. It would be a very foolish thing to subject them to this kind of limitation. I am sure the matter of economic circumstances will be a factor, and it should be, but it should not be the only factor. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Let us suppose that there is only so much money to go around. Would it not be better to see to it that the money went to the families which have an economic need for this program? We do not have enough money for everyone. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, the objective of the amendment is to see to it that the money goes to households which need this assistance. If we had all the money in the world and did not have to worry about these things, that would be one thing. However, we are limited with respect to the amount of money that can be used. I suggest that that is the reason for narrowing down the coverage to those who need the assistance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am confident that the question of economic need is a factor, and that it will be taken into consideration by the local authorities. I do not believe that the Secretary of Labor should make that judgment. I would prefer to provide a broader jurisdiction, or give more leeway at the local level, than to have this restrictive language added. I do not deny that the economic factor is important and should be taken into consideration.

Mr. MILLER. But there is nothing in the bill that deals with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The debate says something about it, and the original act contains something about it. Everyone knows that something ought to be done about it.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] are detained on official business and their respective pairs have been previously announced. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 154 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Aiken
Allott
Cannon
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Miller
Pearson
Prouty
Russell
Scott
Smith
Williams, Del.

NAYS—49

Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—34

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment of Mr. Miller and Mr. Cooper was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for a nongermane statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it will be a very germane statement. I ask unanimous consent that at the final printing of the bill, following what I hope will be its passage, the name of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] be included as a cosponsor. Inadvertently, his name was omitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio desired to have a few minutes yielded to him. I will yield time to him. Does the Senator desire 5 minutes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not more; perhaps less.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as this session of Congress moved forward, I had hoped that it would finally be possible for me, because of thrift, to be able to vote for a tax cut. It is obvious that there is no reason to reduce expenditures for the purpose of neutralizing the losses that will come from the passage of a tax cut bill. Old subsidies are being increased, and new ones are being established. New functions are being created by the Federal Government, usurping a field that historically and traditionally has been occupied by the State governments.

Government has entered into functions which never before have been performed by government, but always by private enterprise—functions such as area redevelopment, domestic peace corps, extravagant urban redevelopment, mass transportation at a cost of not less than $6 billion but probably closer to $10 billion, new subsidies for the building of fishing vessels, and supplemental public works, duplicating what we had in the 1930's. Also, on-the-job training for adults and on-the-job training for juveniles.

The program now proposed would have these young people told, "Drop out of school and forget your studies, and we will pay you and train you after you have done that."

Mr. President, 35 percent of the national income is now being spent for the maintenance of Federal, State, and local government. Since 1961, the national debt has been increased from $286 to $305 billion. Increasingly there is being vested in the Federal Government power which makes it possible for those in authority to bend the backs and twist the thinking of American businessmen and frequently induce immorality among those doing business—all because of the power of the omnipotent Central Government. Every day the power of the Federal Government is—by means of the action of Congress—being expanded.

On the basis of the evidence of what is happening, I cannot vote for this bill or any other bill which disregards the necessity of fiscal responsibility. More and more I am becoming convinced that the old adage or principle, "Do the essential things, and provide by taxes the funds to finance them," has been abandoned. In the 1930's there was substituted the philosophy "Spend and spend, and tax and tax." Then came the new era of "Spend and spend, but do not tax. Let our descendants, the children of the future, pay the bill; meanwhile, we will sing and dance." Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to that philosophy.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, S. 1831 is the second amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to be considered by the Senate in this session. This bill would provide for the Department of Labor to refer eligible workers to programs that will provide the training in basic literacy and work skills necessary to prepare these people to qualify for the direct occupational training now available under the act. It would also lower the minimum age qualification from 19 to 16, provided any such eligible person has been out of school for more than 3 months, and would increase the percentage of total allowances provided under the act that would be paid to such youths from 5 to 15 percent.

This bill is an important supplement to the President's recommendations on civil rights insofar as they affect the Manpower Act. It will enable us to reach in some measure, the more than 700,000 unemployed youths between the ages of 16 and 21, many of whom are dropouts. For example, in my own State of Rhode Island, where 7.7 percent of our eligible workers are unemployed, approximately 20 percent of our children drop out of school before they complete their 4 years. And in Providence the dropout rate shoots up to approximately 36 percent. While our unemployment rate nationally is nearly 5½ percent and it skyrockets to over 16 percent for those under 20. Coupled with these is the fact that one out of four of these unemployed youths are nonwhite.

We who represent this Nation in Congress must cope with this problem, for it is one of national proportions. We must in every manner possible enact significant legislation to meet this crisis, for growing unemployment means an ever-increasing burden on society. Those critics who decry the so-called welfare state would be well advised to support every effort to train our unemployed citizens in those skills necessary to enable them to gain and hold jobs. This bill before us is only a small step in that direction, but it is a forward step and one which we should not and cannot make with hesitation.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the debate today on the Manpower Development and Training Act, I believe we should not overlook the fact that Federal aid is not the only solution to solving our unemployment problems. A key to creating jobs is local initiative. Underscoring this is an article which appears in the September 1963 issue of Nation's Business. The article cites the work of South Carolina's Committee for Technical Education which, it notes, operates independently of other State agencies, including the federally aided department of education. This committee is unusual in that it is financed entirely by State and local money and makes no demands whatsoever on the use of Federal funds.

To say the least, this do-it-yourself approach is refreshingly needed and it shows what States and local communities can do if they take the initiative.

In this connection, the Fort Dodge, Iowa, Messenger, on January 24 of this year, published an article in which a New York Herald Tribune news service reporter, Harold I. Rogers, took a hard look at a survey conducted by the Connecticut office of the Federal Employment Service. I would like to quote from this article:

> The authorities selected 3,500 semiskilled workers as candidates for retraining, and actually interviewed 2,143 of them. That is, they looked up these workers and tried to get them to retrain themselves.
>
> From this number, 589 were selected to take machinist aptitude tests. When the day of the test rolled around, only 388 showed up.
>
> Only 140 passed it.

Mr. President, I feel this is a sad commentary on Federal efforts to reduce unemployment.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, entitled "Here's Do-It-Yourself Unemployment Cure" from Nation's Business and "Retraining: Does It Help Unemployment?" from the Fort Dodge Messenger, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Nation's Business, September 1963]

HERE'S DO-IT-YOURSELF UNEMPLOYMENT CURE

Curtis Pettit worked for 20 years as an oiler in a South Carolina textile mill, bringing home a paycheck which rarely exceeded $50 a week.

But one payday recently Mr. Pettit received a check of more than $100 for the first time in his life. He is now a skilled machinist in the Firestone Steel Products Co., at Spartanburg, S.C.

Who brought about the change? Mr. Pettit did—by seizing an opportunity offered to him by the South Carolina Committee for Technical Education. After investing 520 hours of his time in evening training classes, he qualified last April for the job at Firestone.

Now his foreman says: "When I want a top-quality job done, I give it to Curtis Pettit."

The committee for technical education has trained Mr. Pettit and 10,000 more of South Carolina's unemployed and underemployed workers since its establishment 2 years ago by the State legislature. Workers are now being trained at the rate of 800 each month, and program officials expect to be training 17,000 workers a year by mid-1966.

The problem of teaching workers the skills which will fit them for available jobs is of national importance. Although our country's expanding economy has provided about 870,000 jobs during the past year, they had to be divided among more than 1 million new workers.

For the past 5 years unemployment has surpassed 5 percent of the work force. As the mass of young workers enters the job market in the next several years, the gap between added workers and available jobs will widen.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that our rapidly developing technology has made some jobs obsolete, although it has created others.

The Kennedy administration wants to meet the unemployment problem through tax reduction, public works acceleration, and youth employment proposals.

Many States are taking action to meet the dilemma. A number of them are making use of money provided under the Manpower Development and Training Act, passed last year by Congress and for which the administration is seeking additional funds.

South Carolina's Committee for Technical Education—which operates independently of other State agencies, including the federally aided department of education—is an example of the imaginative approach of some States.

It is unusual in an important respect—it is financed entirely by State and local money, making no use of Federal aid.

This do-it-yourself philosophy, and the effectiveness with which it is getting the job done, has won the respect of business leaders throughout the State. Robert N. Mitchell, a vice president of the SCM Corp.'s Marchant Division and general manager of its calculator-manufacturing plant at Orangeburg, S.C., says:

"The committee's program has been a major contributing factor to our success. It was vital in helping us start up this plant and reach full efficiency in a short time. Without it, we would have been faced with a monumental task in getting a trained work force."

The purpose of TEC, as the committee is called, is stated concisely by South Carolina's Gov. Donald S. Russell:

"This program takes people who want a job and trains them to get it. We have many of these people in our State.

"South Carolina has been too long a single-industry State. TEC has helped us diversify our industrial base, which is necessary to develop our economy and create more jobs for our people."

The do-it-yourself approach runs throughout the program. J. Bonner Manly, one of the committee's eight members and an official of Abbeville Mills, describes it this way:

"At the State level, we are using the State's own money to help its people train for new jobs.

"At the local level, communities have raised about $5 million to build the technical education centers which form a major part of the program.

"But the key ingredient lies with the individuals who invest their own time and effort to upgrade skills and learn new skills so that they will qualify for better jobs. Our prime asset is their motivation to make their own investment in the program in order to benefit from it.

As in the case of other Southern States, in financial resources and per capita income. Yet we have a training program which is both productive and economical. Everyone contributes—there is nothing here for the person looking for a handout."

As in the case of other Southern States, South Carolina faces a double threat to employment. Mechanization of farming and Federal crop restrictions, together with growing foreign competition in cotton and tobacco, are forcing the farm population down at the rate of 12,000 persons each year. At the same time, automation in the textile industry, which historically has provided two-thirds of the State's industrial employment, is eliminating 6,000 jobs yearly.

"To find new jobs for all these people, plus the youths entering the work force, we have to run fast just to stand still," says A. Wade Martin, State coordinator of the committee. "We must industrialize to provide these jobs."

South Carolina officials believe that TEC is making a significant impact on the State's unemployment problem in two ways:

By training workers in industrial skills, it is providing a growing labor pool which makes expansion of existing industry possible and also attracts new industry to the State, thus creating new jobs. And for each new industrial job, two service jobs customarily come into existence in the community. New and expanded industry in the State produced about 12,500 new industrial jobs a year from 1959 through 1961. In 1962, as the committee began to swing into full operation, this figure jumped to 18,500.

By upgrading the skills of employed and underemployed workers—in addition to teaching new skills to the unemployed—the program makes it possible for them to move up the job ladder, leaving room at the bottom for less qualified workers who need jobs.

When a service station attendant, through training, moves into a job as an automobile mechanic, he leaves his former position open for a less skilled individual who has no job.

How does TEC operate? It is governed by a committee of six citizens, who represent different parts of the State and are business leaders intimately acquainted with the job needs of business and industry. These men are appointed by the Governor with the consent of the State senate. Two State officials, the superintendent of education and the director of the State development board, are ex officio members to insure coordination with their agencies. Mr. Martin, a methods engineer and former administrator of industrial and technical education in North Carolina, heads the full-time staff.

COUNTIES BUILD CENTERS

Eight technical education centers have been established where labor market surveys have shown a need for them. One—at Greenville—has been in operation for the past year, four will open this month, and three will open early in 1964. Each has a full-time administrative and teaching staff aided by an area commission for technical education, made up of local businessmen.

These centers—which contain classrooms, laboratories, and workshops—are built and owned by the counties which they serve. Building costs range from $540,000 to $850,000. Equipment, from machine tools to computers, is owned by the State. This permits shifting items from one center to another as needs dictate. TEC has bought more than $1 million in up-to-date equipment.

Strong emphasis is placed on keeping abreast of current employment needs and industrial practices. All faculty members must have had experience in industry and will be rotated back to their own industry periodically to familiarize them with the latest techniques.

For each type of training, a committee of men from that particular technical area or craft passes judgment on the teachers, equipment, and instruction. Robert L. Grigsby, director of the Richland Technical Education Center at Columbia, says:

"These committees are the life blood of each program. They keep us completely up to date."

The courses at the technical education centers are separated into three divisions:

The technical division—offering training for jobs at the technician level. Programs include data processing; technical drafting and design; chemical, electronic, or textile technology, and others. A high school education is required for enrollment, and the programs extend for 2 years of full-time instruction or 4 years of evening classes.

The trade division—where a student may learn the skills needed in air conditioning, refrigeration, and heating; automotive mechanics; industrial electricity; machine shop work, and welding.

The extension division—which makes available courses requested by a particular industry. Instruction, including supervisory level courses, is given at the center or at the plant.

ALL APPLICANTS TESTED

Students attending evening classes at the Greenville center include such men as E. J. Hall, a 33-year-old tool and die maker who is studying tool and die design. "I want to better my education and move up in my company," he says. "Because of this training, I've been promised the next job in design that opens up in my shop."

Standards are high at the centers. Applicants are given a series of aptitude tests and their school records examined. On the basis of this, they are advised whether they qualify for training as a technician or as a skilled craftsman. A continuing effort is made to prevent anyone from trying to train for a job which would be beyond his ability.

A major part of TEC's work during the past 2 years has been setting up and operating temporary training courses for corporations which have opened a new plant in South Carolina or expanded their existing plant. Nearly 70 such crash programs have provided trained workers and some are still in operation. About $315,000 of the committee's $1.8 million budget for the current fiscal year will be used to finance these operations.

Companies taking advantage of these programs, which have placed many of the State's unemployed and underemployed workers in skilled industrial jobs, praise the quality of their newly trained employees.

The State offers no payments to persons undergoing training—in contrast to the subsistence allowances paid under Federal programs. Officials credit this with screening out people more interested in benefiting from the Government payroll than in preparing themselves for a job.

"The degree of motivation is vital," says O. Stanley Smith, Jr., a Columbia businessman who is chairman of the Committee for Technical Education. "It's a fact of life that if you put your own time and effort into a project, you're motivated to do a better job than if it is handed to you on a silver platter. It's educationally unsound and a waste of money to pay people to learn. Education and relief are not the same and they shouldn't be mixed.

"We've found that the same motivation that moves the individuals in our program also moves our communities. I believe they have worked harder to help themselves by financing TEC centers than they would have if the money had been provided for them. Some current proposals for Federal aid include funds for construction. Imagine the effect of this on communities which already have paid their own way."

HOW PROGRAM WORKS

As R. L. Boynton, a training specialist who is conducting a program to provide aircraft assemblers for a Lockheed Aircraft Corp. plant at Charleston, puts it:

"When you have a fellow who will go through a training course on his own time with no pay, you've got a man who really wants to work."

Possibly the most dramatic of the crash programs are those which provide a trained work force for a new plant. A typical example is the program that trained 162 skilled workers for a multimillion-dollar Elgin National Watch Co. plant near Columbia.

Six months before the plant opened last February, specialists from the TEC staff began planning with Elgin officials a training operation which would be completed at the precise time the plant would be ready to go into production. The local community made available a school gymnasium as training quarters, and it was air conditioned and dustproofed to make possible the delicate work of watch assembly. TEC moved in some equipment from its pool, and Elgin provided the specialized equipment required.

Specialists determined the skills which would be needed and the number of workers with each skill. A critical path schedule was set up so that the training courses for different skills, which ranged from 4 to 12 weeks, would be phased in to reach completion at the same time.

Instructors from Elgin were placed temporarily on the committee payroll, and more than 300 applicants for training were interviewed and given aptitude tests. Of these, 196 were selected for training and 162 completed the course. All were hired by Elgin and, when the plant opened, a trained force was ready to go to work at jobs which had been completely unfamiliar 3 months earlier.

"The trainees' willingness and ability to learn was even greater than our expectations," says Marlen E. Benter, Elgin's chief industrial engineer. "Some of them came out of the program at 100 percent efficiency and, thanks to TEC, the lag between plant opening and full productivity was shortened by more than 4 months. We've exceeded our original production schedules and have moved the schedules up."

The plant, which has been assembling and casing watches, is now preparing to manufacture the parts. A second training program will teach new skills to nearly 300 people.

Members of the Committee for Technical Education are so enthusiastic about the results of their do-it-yourself training program that they journeyed to Washington recently to point out to the South Carolina congressional delegation the shortcomings of proposals to expand existing Federal programs and enact new ones.

Bonner Manly puts the consensus of the committee into these words:

"There are great opportunities ahead for people throughout our Nation, but they will never achieve them without investing their own time and energy."

[From the Fort Dodge Messenger, Jan. 24, 1963]

Retraining: Does It Help Unemployment?

(By Harold I. Rogers)

New York.—The Connecticut office of the Federal Employment Service has issued some disturbing figures which should—but probably won't—have an adverse effect on efforts to increase appropriations for the much-vaunted Federal job retraining program.

That program, you may recall, has been put into effect in areas where there are high rates of unemployment, in an effort to train workers to have more marketable skills.

Connecticut had one of the first such programs because its industrial areas were among the earliest to be blighted by the 1960–61 recession.

The authorities selected 3,500 semiskilled workers as candidates for retraining, and actually interviewed 2,143 of them. That is, they looked up these works and tried to get them to retrain themselves.

From this number, 589 were selected to take machinist aptitude tests. When the day of the test rolled around, only 388 showed up.

Only 140 passed it.

Of this number, only 84 completed the retraining program which was offered, not only free of charge, but which included also a subsistence allowance for the student and his family.

The record, then: Fewer than 3 out of every 100 of the semiskilled unemployed reached a goal. They either could not or would not become skilled workers. Most of the 84 out of the 3,500 who were selected for training eventually found their new jobs.

About the same record has been established in West Virginia, another State with an early retraining program because it had an early problem of high unemployment.

It's likely that there will be glowing and optimistic reports of the program when officials come before Congress for money to keep it going in 1963. Perhaps these figures will be remembered.

In the 18 months it has been in operation, the depressed-areas program claims to have created a mere 25,000 jobs. That's an average of only 500 per State and it's a mighty insignificant figure when placed beside the national unemployment total of at least 3.5 million.

Perhaps to some, however, this will serve as further evidence of the fact that Federal schemes for reducing unemployment are not working and that nothing really will work except a thriving, prosperous private economy.

Perhaps that will cause them to wonder why the private economy isn't working so well, and then they will realize that it is caught in a tight profit squeeze, largely of the Government's creation.

It should help with plans to reduce the tax rate, systematically and carefully.

And perhaps, somewhere along the way, the lawmakers will realize that part of the trouble accrues from the lopsided power given to labor leaders when they sit with their employers at the bargaining table.

For unless these things are realized in Congress, other Federal programs aren't going to be of much help. They never have. They never will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time remains to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 28 minutes remaining; the opponents have 37 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] desires to have some time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to state that I intend to vote "yea" on the question of passage of the bill—albeit I shall do so reluctantly. I believe we need a program of this nature, in order to take care of the needs of our young people who do not have sufficient education, and thus enable them to obtain jobs by which they can support themselves. It is most regrettable that today there are many unemployed who, unless they acquire new skills, cannot become self-supporting. So, in the end, such a program will save the taxpayers a great deal of money, if this program proves to be as effective as all of us hope it will be.

But I am concerned about the expenditures the bill would authorize—a much larger amount than I believe can be spent effectively and productively. So I believe this bill is a very poor way to legislate.

Mr. President, in the current fiscal year the Senate has already authorized the appropriation of $110 million; the House has authorized the appropriation of $140 million. Perhaps in the end the conference report will authorize a $125 million appropriation.

Under the provisions of this bill, we would authorize an additional appropriation of $100 million, which would bring the total authorization for the current fiscal year to approximately $225 million. I do not believe that much money can possibly be spent effectively. For the next fiscal year we have already authorized—or will have, when this bill is passed—appropriations of $422 million. I am sure that much money cannot be spent usefully.

I have submitted several amendments which call for reduced authorizations, both in the bill we passed last Wednesday and in this one. I had no expectation that those amendments would be agreed to; but I submitted them primarily in order to establish a record which I hope the members of the Appropriations Committee will examine carefully.

I favor the authorization of any appropriation which can reasonably and soundly be expended and will result in the doing of a good job. But I believe we are being somewhat irresponsible when we authorize the appropriation of funds which we know cannot be spent usefully.

After submitting that explanation, Mr. President, I simply repeat that although I shall vote for passage of the bill, I have serious reservations about the manner in which we have handled it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on the question of passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, all of us respect very deeply the views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] in regard to the need for tight administration of this program. I certainly agree with him in that respect.

However, I feel that few programs which come before the Senate are more directly related to what is troubling our Nation economically than this one. We have an enormous transition to make, involving tens of millions of Americans, from our present state of technology to a very much higher degree of automation. We face the doubling or the tripling of the requirements for technical training. Our Nation is far behind in this struggle. This deficiency is far more lethal to us than almost any other deficiency we could have; because if we do not blow ourselves up with an atomic bomb, freedom will either win or lose on the basis of the vigor and the vitality of our economic system.

The greatest asset of our Nation lies in the skills of its people. I believe this program, which is long overdue, is directly related to the effectiveness with which we adjust our technology and the skills of our people to modern times.

In addition, millions of our people have not had equal economic opportunity. This program can move in the direction of bringing it to them.

For all those reasons, Mr. President, I strongly favor the bill. Even though I have tried to do what I could to improve it, just as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] has done what he could to improve it and to tighten it up, I believe that, fundamentally, the enactment of this bill is very important to our Nation. So I hope very much it will receive a decisive majority vote in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless other Senators desire to have time yielded to them, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. CLARK. I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The bill has been read the third time. The question now is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CARLSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh]. If he were present and voting, he would "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long].

If present and voting the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Edmondson
Fong
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—26

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Pearson
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Carlson
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Fulbright
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Jackson
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 1831) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 202 the following new subsection:

"(h) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the development of reading, writing and arithmetic and basic work skills those eligible persons who are over thirty-five years of age or who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and who will thereby be able to pursue courses of occupational training, and such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, except that the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply to the selection of persons under this subsection, and such persons shall be eligible for an additional 52 weeks of training allowances."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof, by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 per centum", and by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "*Provided,* That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 6 months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed."

SEC. 3. Section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "except that with respect to referrals under subsection (h) of section 202 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the training to be provided under such subsection (h) through other appropriate education agencies".

SEC. 4. Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "vocational" before the words "education and training".

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 305 is amended by striking out the word "vocational".

SEC. 6. Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the second time this week I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], both of whom have once again shown their skill and knowledge of two vitally important measures which are for the welfare of the people. I only wish that this kind of record could be maintained week in and week out. But I am happy once again to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia for the great service they have rendered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his kind words. I should like the RECORD to note the great contribution made by members of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for bringing the bill to the Senate for passage. I express my appreciation also to members of the staff, who worked conscientiously and ably to help prepare the bill and expedite its passage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also extend my congratulations to other Senators on the majority side, and to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who offered worthwhile amendments, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and other Senators who made contributions to the bill and helped make it a better and stronger bill than when it was introduced.

CHINESE-RUSSIAN CONVERGENCE IN ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for some time, I have been attempting to follow developments in Sino-Russian relations in central Asia. Although the public information is sparse and not necessarily always accurate, it has been possible to obtain from it, against the background of history, a glimmer of the situation which is evolving in that region.

Several weeks ago, I put together some observations on the central Asian situation which I had intended to discuss in the Senate on August 13. But I was hesitant to do so at the time because of a lack of any recent substantiating evidence of the tentative conclusions which I had reached.

In today's press, however, there are significant reports out of Tokyo which relate directly to the subject of my observations. I ask unanimous consent that a selection of these reports be included at the end of my remarks; and at this point, Mr. President, I ask the Senate's indulgence that I may proceed with the observations on the Chinese-Russian convergence in Asia to which I have previously referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are obvious reasons of health and skyrocketing costs of armaments which provide common or parallel motives for the Soviet Union and the United States to have sought the test ban treaty. Beyond the obvious, other interests have undoubtedly entered into the search for agreement by each nation. These are not necessarily shared interests but nevertheless they are a part of the calculations of the balance of benefit on which the treaty rests.

It seems to me that the Senate should explore all of these factors in an effort to understand fully what is at stake in the act of ratification. Reference, for example, has already been made in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee to the growing estrangement between Russia and China. That the question has been raised suggests an awareness of what may be a most significant factor in the Soviet position on the nuclear test ban treaty. Yet our knowledge of the Russian-Chinese estrangement is too limited to permit a full comprehension of its implications either for Soviet policy or our own. For one thing, our reportorial coverage of the U.S.S.R., particularly east of the Urals, is extremely limited and spasmodic. For another, our knowledge of what is transpiring in China comes to us largely second or third hand.

It is understandable, therefore, that the Sino-Soviet estrangement has been analyzed in the press and elsewhere largely in theoretical terms. Scholars, journalists, and intelligence technicians pore over the documentation and statements and reports which emanate from Russia and China. And in this fashion, the estrangement is interpreted to the Nation almost wholly in terms of ideological differences and the struggle to claim the high priesthood of orthodoxy in the international Communist movement and with it, I suppose, the right to preach the eulogy at the burial of capitalism.

These ideological factors are undoubtedly deeply involved and I would not for a moment underestimate them. But if I may be so bold as to suggest it, it seems to me that the great emphasis which is given to them in the information which reaches the Government and the public may produce a serious distortion of our concept of the actual situation. We may see the problem largely as a clash of Marxist theories or Communist personalities which is destined to disappear as soon as the theories are straightened out or the present leaders, in time, go the way of all leaders.

I should like to suggest that other, more mundane and enduring considerations are involved in present Sino-Soviet difficulties, considerations which will not easily be exercised either by new theories or new leaders.

It is to one of these considerations that I direct the attention of the Senate today. It may well be the most significant factor, in the Russian-Chinese estrangement, largely overlooked in the overwhelming emphasis which has been given to the ideological differences between Moscow and Peking. I refer to the geographic and cultural convergence of Russia and China in the inner recesses of the Asian Continent.

This convergence, Mr. President, has been a source of intermittent friction between the two countries for a very long time. It has persisted irrespective of the ideological inclinations of Moscow and Peiping at any given time in history. It long predates the advent of communism in China and even Russia. Indeed, it predates the birth of Karl Marx by at least a century.

The first recorded clashes between Russians and Chinese go back to the 17th century. Three hundred years ago, Russian traders and Cossacks first made contact with the outposts of Chinese-Manchu imperial power in the region north of Manchuria. The early zone of Russian influence and authority in this desolate northeast corner of Asia, as against China, was established by a series of treaties beginning with that of Nerchinsk in 1689, and followed by Bur and Kiakhta in 1727, Kiakhta in 1768, and the Kiakhta protocol in 1792. A half century later the Russian press southeastward was resumed under Count Nikolai Muraviev-Amursky, the Governor General of eastern Siberia, and his chief military aide, Capt. Gennadii Ivanovich Nevelskoi. Again there followed a consolidation of the Russian position, in the Treaty of Aigun of 1858. This agreement brought into Russian possession large areas of Northeast Asia which had previously been under Manchu control.

Subsequently, Russia as well as other European powers and Japan exacted by guile, bribery, or naked power, special economic privileges and territorial concessions from weak and corrupt imperial officials of China. By this process, the Russians penetrated south into Manchuria, establishing themselves at Dairen and Port Arthur on the Yellow Sea by the end of the 19th century and penetrating Korea which had been for a long time in a tributary relationship with Peiping.

Since that high-water mark, Russian influence in northeast Asia at the expense of China has fluctuated. In the face of a Japanese advance and the weakness of the early Soviet state, it receded. Under the communism of Stalin it advanced once more at the end of World War II. And under the communism of Khrushchev it receded once more after the Chinese Communists came to power in Peiping.

Our sources of information are insufficient to provide a clear delineation of where the present line of convergence may lie, as between Russian and Chinese influence in northeast Asia. We are not even sure of what the precise situation in this connection may be in Korea where we are deeply involved, let alone in Manchuria, of which we know very little. One thing is reasonably certain, however, the actual Russian-Chinese conversion does not bear much relationship to the border-demarcations as shown on ordinary maps. It is also clear, in any event, that the convergence in the northeast is still much further south and east of any line which would have been recognized by a Ching emperor of the Manchu dynasty in the 17th century, the 18th, or early 19th century.

The recent history of the Chinese-Russian convergence in northeast Asia has been affected, of course, by the appearance of Communist ideology in Russia and China. But sufficient experience is now accumulated to suggest that the future history of the region will hardly be dominated by this factor.

And the history of the northeast, a history of Russian advance and recession and advance—sometimes warlike and imperious and sometimes peaceful and conciliatory—finds parallels elsewhere in central Asia. During the last century, for example, Mongolia was entirely under nominal Chinese sovereignty. It was largely the efforts of Russians under the czars coupled with the weakness of the later Manchu-Ching emperors which brought about a loosening of Chinese control over the vast stretches of land now identified as the Outer Mongolian People's Republic. And it was largely the same combination of Soviet strength and Chinese weakness under the Chinese National Republic which resulted in 1922, in the establishment of an Outer Mongolia, not only independent of China but brought progressively into a relationship, apparently in the nature of a protectorate, with the U.S.S.R.

South and west of Outer Mongolia we find in Sinkiang the same flow, ebb, and flow of Russian influence. Here, as elsewhere there was for centuries a tradition of Chinese suzerainty over small principalities of tribal peoples. But here as elsewhere this suzerainty has been quite devoid of significance in the absence of strong Chinese central power to assert it. Thus, in the last century, the southwest edges of Sinkiang were chipped away and added to what is now the contiguous territory of the U.S.S.R. And even as recently as World War II the Russians exercised for a time something close to indirect domination over principal trading centers and caravan junctions in Sinkiang.

Especially, since the advent of Chinese Communist control over the mainland, the line of convergence as between Russia and China in the Sinkiang area has apparently been pushed back westward once again. But how far and how firm this recession of Soviet influence has been, we do not really know with any degree of accuracy.

To recapitulate, Mr. President, I have sought to point out to the Senate, that, historically, there has been not a fixed but a shifting and uncertain line of convergence between Russia and China in the inner recesses of the Asian Continent. This line, Mr. President, is not necessarily the border as shown on contemporary maps but rather the changing extremity of the eastward and southward reach of Russian influence and the westernmost and northernmost extension of enforceable Chinese control.

Further, history indicates that while there have been periods of stalemate and recession, the overall pattern in the region for several centuries was that of Russian advance. It was an advance which paralleled roughly the spastic but steady decay of the Manchu-Ching dynasty through the reigns of a number of emperors. And it drew strength from the debilitation of the successor Chinese Republic in World War II and the collapse of the Japanese intrusion on the Asian mainland in that conflict.

What prompts me to make these observations at this time, Mr. President, is that they may be of more than historic interest in the light of the present Sino-Soviet estrangement. This break comes at a time when there has emerged in Peiping once again, a strong centralization of Chinese power. To be sure, the government which wields this power proclaims its Marxism. Indeed, it claims to be more Marxist than Moscow. Yet insofar as Chinese Marxism is expressed in practice on the borders of China, it appears to bear a remarkable resemblance to classic Chinese dynastic policy.

There are strong indications, for example, that the present Chinese Government is not disposed to regard any of its borders—at least none fixed after the time of the advanced decay of the Ching dynasty—as permanently constricting on the outward extension of its power. That such is the case is indicated by the Chinese assertion in Korea, in Vietnam, in Laos, in Tibet and beyond Tibet into Ladakh and the Northeast Frontier Agency at the two extremities of the Indian subcontinent.

What, then, of the Sino-Soviet border regions? Are these, too, to be affected by the reassertion of Chinese power? I have already referred to the recession of Soviet influence in Manchuria and Sinkiang, although to what extent and how voluntarily it has occurred, we do not know with any degree of precision. But whatever its extent, it would be a relatively minor recession should the Chinese assertion against the U.S.S.R., in time, parallel its policies with regard to Korea, Southeast Asia, and the Chinese-Indian border region. If there is this parallel then the Chinese claim against the U.S.S.R. could conceivably extend out of Sinkiang, through the Soviet Pamirs to Afghanistan. It could also embrace all of Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Maritime Provinces along the Pacific. For these areas fell within the reach of Manchu China in the heyday of the dynasty.

It is interesting to note in this connection, Mr. President, that when Mr. Khrushchev, late last year, taunted the Chinese Communists for accepting the presence of colonialists in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao while urging him to act against the United States, he was answered in an editorial on March 8 in the Chinese People's Daily and Red Flag which reads in part as follows:

> During the hundred or so years preceding the victorious Chinese Revolution, the colonial and imperialistic powers—the United States of America, Great Britain, France, czarist Russia, Germany, Japan, Italy, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, and Portugal—became unreservedly engaged in a campaign of aggression against China. They imposed on the various regimes of the old China numerous unequal treaties: The Treaty of Nanking in 1842; the Treaty of Aigun in 1858; the Treaty of Tsientsin in 1858; the Treaty of Peiping in 1860; the Treaty of Ili in 1881; the Convention for the Extension of Hong Kong in 1898; the Treaty of 1901; etc. By virtue of these unequal treaties, they annexed Chinese territory in the north, south, east, and west; or they caused territories to be ceded to them on lease along the coast of China and even in the Chinese hinterland. When the People's Republic of China was founded in 1949, our Government clearly stated its intention of eventually reexamining all the treaties concluded by previous Chinese regimes with foreign governments and, according to their respective texts, either recognizing, denouncing, revising or renegotiating them at the appropriate time.

Note, Mr. President, the reference in this catalog of unequal treaties to the Treaty of Aigun which fixed the present-day boundaries in Manchuria at China's expense and to Russia's advantage. And note in conjunction therewith this paragraph in the same editorial:

> Certain persons (an obvious reference to Mr. Khrushchev) would like us to raise the question of the unequal treaties here and now * * *. Have they realized what the consequences of this might be?

The implication is clear, Mr. President. The Chinese regard certain Soviet territories, no less than Hong Kong and Macao and Formosa, as having been taken inequitably from China and subject, therefore, to Chinese claim.

Now, Mr. President, I do not wish to leave the impression that China is about to embark upon a general war with Russia to bring back into the historic embrace of Peiping, certain lands along the inner Asian borders. But I do suggest that the arrow tips of Chinese influence are already pointed outward from Peiping into these sparsely inhabited regions whose predominant population is neither Chinese nor Russian but Mongol and other tribal peoples. Many techniques are already apparently operating to this end, including the Chinese aid programs in Outer Mongolia and the organization of autonomous tribal groupings on Chinese territory. Certainly, such limited information as we have with respect to the region hints at the likelihood that the Chinese arrows have begun to prick the Russians in these remote regions.

I would suggest further, Mr. President, that Soviet foreign policy is not formed in ignorance of these recent developments or the history which I have just recounted, or of the actions of the Chinese in southeast Asia and on the Indian border. And there is no reason to assume that, because it is Communist, Russian foreign policy is concerned any less with such considerations than might be the case with the foreign policy of any other nation.

I would suggest, finally, that is is becoming apparent that we have been in error in assuming for so long that the iron hand of Moscow was so unshakeably fixed on Peiping that it had superseded all other factors for all time in the considerations of the Communist leaders in China. Theoretical Communist world unity, whatever its weight, has not replaced certain enduring factors in the relationships of Russia and China as they are indicated to us by history.

And one of these factors, perhaps the most significant, as I have tried to explain to the Senate today, is the convergence of Russian and Chinese influence in the vast inner recesses of Asia. The problems which are posed by the convergence are not essentially those of Marxist theory. And they certainly are not those of a common border dispute, that is, whether to move the markers a few yards or a few miles in one direction or the other. What is involved is the ultimate disposition and utilization of a reserve of millions of square miles of territory largely devoid of human habitation.

This land and its contents constitute an enormous and largely unexplored and unexploited resource. Heretofore, it may have been of minor importance because of the inadequacies in techniques of modern development and transportation, particularly in that part of the world. But with the rapid dissemination and multiplication of these techniques, the region grows rapidly in significance to the two great peoples which converge upon it. And it grows, too, in significance as the population of China, already in the vicinity of 700 million, and growing at the rate of 13 million to 15 million a year, expands explosively and presses ever more heavily on limited resources even for a bare minimum of food, clothing, and shelter.

So, Mr. President, if we wish to understand fully the motives of the Soviet Union in seeking a nuclear test ban treaty, we ought not to overlook the factor of the Sino-Soviet convergence, a factor which is clearly indicated by history but which cannot be weighed accurately without a better understanding of what is presently transpiring in interior Asia.

In any event, it would be unwise to dismiss the likelihood of a growth of tension at various points of contact along the thousands of miles of this vague frontier. Some might anticipate with relish the prospects of these clashes, even if they were nuclear. That prospect might be bent and twisted, I suppose, into an argument against the proposed treaty to ban nuclear tests.

But that, Mr. President, would be a most distorted view of nuclear realities and contemporary international relations. For if the flames of a great nuclear conflagration are lit, it will matter little who holds the match or where in the world it is struck. Even the vastness of central Asia would be insufficient to contain the holocaust or to confine it to the two massive Communist powers of Eurasia. No, Mr. President, the probability of increasing tension in the Sino-Soviet convergence, as in the case of all significant international tensions, is one more reason for seeking to bring about rational control over the growth and spread of the immense destructive power of nuclear weapons.

Rather than an argument against this treaty, then, this probable tension in Sino-Soviet relations is an argument for this Nation to seek to improve its comprehension of the actual situation which exists in central Asia. For that region and what transpires in it is likely to have a most profound significance in a world in which the peace and security of this Nation is closely interwoven with that of all others.

Exhibit 1

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 6, 1963]

Peiping Accuses Moscow of Plot To Stir Uprising in China Area, Sees Two Nations on Brink of Split

Tokyo, September 6.—The Chinese Communists accused the Soviet Union today of trying to foment an uprising in Red China with the aid of tens of thousands of Chinese in a remote Sinkiang-Soviet borderland. They said Soviet-Chinese relations have reached "the brink of a split."

The Chinese reported the alleged Soviet Trojan horse plot against Red China in broadcasts which said differences in the international Communist movement have reached "a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

A broadcast monitored here said the Russians admitted tens of thousands of Chinese into Soviet territory last year in an attempt to overthrow the Chinese local government at Ili, a district bordering the Soviet Union in northwest Sinkiang Province. The area in central Asia was occupied by imperial Russia in 1861–1870.

FIRST MENTION

The accusation was the first mention of incidents along the thousands of miles of border separating the squabbling giants of communism.

The radio said the Chinese were "allured" or "threatened" to induce them to join a plot by Soviet officials in Sinkiang under order of the Soviet Communist Party. It gave no other details of the alleged plot except to say that the Chinese Government had made several protests to the Russians for the return of the Chinese and had been refused.

The matter has not been settled, it added.

Peiping accused the Kremlin of fostering a "two Chinas" policy. In the new massive verbal attack on the Soviet leadership the Chinese also took the credit for the crushing of the Hungarian revolt in the fall of 1956.

SOVIET TAUNT

From the Moscow side of the verbal barricades came a taunt from Ilya Ehrenburg, Soviet writer, that the Chinese are bent on instigating a global nuclear conflict which they would sit out as spectators and hope to survive as "victors."

Peiping's charges were in broadcasts of a statement published in both the official People's Daily and the Communist Party's theoretical journal, Red Flag. The statement was in answer to Moscow's July 15 accusation that China was trying to set up new world headquarters for communism in Peking and split the world along racial lines.

The Chinese charged that in 1956, "at the critical moment when the Hungarian counterrevolutionaries had occupied Budapest," the Soviet leaders for a time "intended to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon Socialist [Communist] Hungary to counterrevolution."

"We insisted on the taking of all the necessary measures to smash the counterrevolutionary rebellion," the Chinese said.

Soviet tanks and troops crushed the revolution with an attack on Budapest in November 1956.

The Chinese claimed Premier Khrushchev proposed 4 years ago that they accept the "two Chinas" theory and acknowledge the rule of the Nationalists on Formosa. As far as the record shows at the United Nations, however, Russia has violently opposed the "two Chinas" formula for resolving the question of Chinese representation.

The Chinese charge was contained in a little-noted section of Peiping's reply Sunday to Soviet charges August 21 that Communist China's enmity resulted from a Soviet refusal to give that country atomic weapons.

The statement also repeated claims that Soviet leaders had raised the quarrel from the Communist Party to Government level. The border troubles, recall of Soviet specialists and tearing up of hundreds of contracts proved this, it said.

It also repeated charges of "great power chauvinism"—another way of writing, "Do what I say because I'm stronger than you"—against the Russians and accused them of otherwise violating the norms of interparty relations.

There was no immediate Soviet reply to the Chinese charges and the grave assessment of relations.

The official Government newspaper Izvestia, however, kept up the drumfire of Moscow's propaganda against China. It spoke of the "empty talk of the Chinese leaders" and alleged their view was that "Communist society will be made up of people who have lofty ideals but empty stomachs."

"It is difficult to conceive a greater mistake," Izvestia wrote.

A WHOLE SERIES

The Chinese editorial said the Soviet "errors are not just accidental, individual and minor errors, but a whole series of errors of principle which endanger the interests of the entire Socialist camp and international Communist movement."

It said they dated from Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February, 1956, and his simultaneous proclamation of a new Communist dogma—that war is no longer inevitable.

After boasting of how hard their own leaders had tried to avoid a split, the core of the Chinese article said:

"Nevertheless, the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) leaders are determined 'to go our own way' and have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of split and have carried the differences in the international Communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

RENEGADE TITO

The article bitterly accused the Soviet Union allying itself "with the United States against China" and also with the "renegade Tito" (President Tito of Yugoslavia).

One of the ways the Kremlin tried to curry favor with the United States, Peiping's Sunday statement said, was recommending acceptance of the Nationalist regime on Formosa.

The Chinese Government said Khrushchev made his suggestion in October 1959, following his visit to the United States. Shortly after his return he went to Peiping for secret talks with Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Red boss, during Red China's 10th anniversary celebrations.

Such a Khrushchev proposal could account for the extraordinary chill which descended on the Peiping visit and the absence of a formal communique when it ended.

Khrushchev is said to have compared Formosa to the Far Eastern Republic which existed between 1920 and 1922 after the Russian Revolution, and to have noted that Lenin had recognized it. It eventually was taken over by Russia.

China Builds Defenses on Its Russian Border

Hong Kong, September 5.—Communist China has sent 900,000 students to build defenses in Sinkiang Province bordering the Soviet Union, the South China Morning Post reported today.

The British-owned, English-language paper quoted a refugee from Red China as saying the volunteers included more than 30,000 students from Shanghai who responded "to have something to do." Most were junior middle school students who couldn't get into senior middle schools because of limited accommodations, he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 6, 1963]

Peiping Sees Split With Russia Near After Border Plot

Tokyo, September 6.—Communist China said today that its relations with the Soviet Union have reached "the brink of split," in part because the Russians have been "provoking troubles on the Sino-Soviet border."

A Peiping broadcast monitored here charged that last April and May there was a Soviet plot to overthrow a local Chinese district government in the Ili district in Sinkiang Province, which borders on the Soviet Union.

The Peiping radio broadcast the charge in a long statement that declared that differences in the Soviet-Chinese relationship have reached "a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

The broadcast also charged that the Soviet Union wanted to "adopt a policy of capitulation" in the 1956 Hungarian revolution, but gave up the idea under strong Chinese pressure.

FIRST REVELATION

The border row, the first to be formally revealed by either nation, involved tens of thousands of Chinese who were admitted into Soviet territory, it was alleged, in April and May 1962.

The radio said the Chinese were "allured" or "threatened" to induce them to join a plot by Soviet officials in Sinkiang under order of the Soviet Communist Party. It gave no other details of the alleged plot except to say that the Chinese Government had made several protests to the Russians for return of the Chinese and had been refused.

The matter has not been settled, it added.

The radio quoted an article jointly published by the editorial departments of the official People's Daily and the theoretical journal Red Flag.

The statement answered Moscow's July 15 accusation that China was trying to set up a new world headquarters for communism in Peiping and split the world along racial lines.

FLIGHT WAS REPORTED

The Washington Post reported last June that between 50,000 and 70,000 refugees from Communist China had fled into the Soviet Union in the spring of 1962. At the same time, groups of Chinese clamored in front of the Soviet consulate at Kuldja, in Sinkiang Province, demanding arms to fight the Peiping regime, but apparently none were given them. Kuldja is the main city in the Ili District.

The border district of Ili was occupied by Imperial Russia for 10 years, 1861–70, and then reverted to central Asian somnolence. The district was attached in 1944–50 to a makeshift East Turkestan Republic. The main town, Kuldja, home of about 150,000 people, trades in tea and cattle, has industries such as tanning and textiles, and there are iron and coal mines about.

The Chinese article also claimed that for a time during the 1956 Hungarian revolt, the Russians "intended to abandon Socialist Hungary to counterrevolution.

"The Chinese Communist Party at that time resolutely opposed these erroneous methods and advanced correct suggestions," it said.

The Russian leaders, it said, adopted these suggestions, "but subsequent events showed that they nursed rancor against the Chinese Communist Party."

"CHAUVINISM" CHARGED

It said the Soviet Party had also committed "the error of great-power chauvinism" in handling "incident in Soviet-Polish relations" in the same period.

During the Hungarian revolt, the Soviet Union for a time did appear to be trying to come to terms with the regime of Imre Nagy by sending Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan to Budapest for secret talks. But after Nagy said he would take Hungary out of the Warsaw Pact, Red army tanks were sent into the country and the revolt was crushed in a blood bath. Nagy later was executed.

In Poland, however, Wladislaw Gomulka, then as now the No. 1 Communist, reportedly threatened to go on the air and call for an uprising against the Red army. Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev apparently backed down and permitted the Gomulka regime, which had come to power in the October revolt against former Stalinist rulers, to remain in office.

The article said Khrushchev "took the lead in organizing a large-scale surprise onslaught on the Chinese Communist Party" at the Rumanian Communist Party congress at Bucharest in 1960.

The Chinese delegation there signed a communique after the meeting "for the sake of the larger interest," but distributed a statement saying the future of communism "will never be decided by the baton of any individual."

CRITICISM REPORTED

At the Soviet Party congress in 1961, the article said, when Soviet leaders attacked the policies of the Albanian Party, Chinese Premier Chou En-lai "frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party in subsequent conversations with Khrushchev."

But Khrushchev flatly turned down these criticisms and advice, and openly said: "We shall go our own way."

The Chinese warning of a possible break between Moscow and Peiping was the most somber picture painted yet of relations between the two Red giants.

In its latest article, Peiping also accused the Russians of enlarging the Soviet-Chinese quarrel to government level.

"Having failed to subdue the Chinese Communist Party, the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took a series of steps to extend the ideological differences between the Soviet and Chinese Parties to the sphere of state relations—the recall of all the Soviet experts in China, the tearing up of hundreds of agreements and contracts, and the provoking of troubles on the Sino-Soviet border," the article said.

It also said "the past 7 years have amply proved that the road taken by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the course of allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China, allying with the reactionaries of all countries against the people of the world, and allying with the renegade Tito (President Tito of Yugoslavia) clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties."

DANGER SEEN WIDE

Peiping said the Soviet "errors are not just accidental, individual and minor errors, but a whole series of errors of principle which endanger the interests of the entire Socialist camp and international Communist movement."

It said they dated from Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956, and his simultaneous proclamation of a new Communist dogma—that war is no longer inevitable.

After boasting of how hard their own leaders had tried to avoid a split, the core of the Chinese article said:

"Nevertheless, the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) leaders are determined 'to go our own way' and have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of split and have carried the differences in the international Communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

TAIWAN MOVE NOTED

One of the ways the Kremlin tried to curry favor with the United States, was recommending acceptance of the Nationalist regime on Taiwan, the article said.

This charge was contained in a little-noted section of Peiping's reply last Sunday to Soviet charges August 21 that Red China's emnity resulted from a Soviet refusal to give China atomic weapons.

In the Sunday reply, Peiping said Khrushchev made his "two-China" suggestion in October 1959, after his visit to the United States. Shortly after his return, he went to Peiping for talks with Mao during Red China's 10th anniversary celebrations.

Such a Khrushchev proposal could account for the extraordinary chill that descended on the Peiping visit and the absence of a formal communique when it ended.

Khrushchev is said to have compared Taiwan to the Far Eastern Republic that existed between 1920 and 1922 after the Russian revolution, and said that Lenin had recognized it. It eventually was taken over by the Soviet Union.

The Far Eastern Republic was a buffer state that had a semiautonomous existence from late 1920 until it was merged into the Russian Federated Republic in November 1922. It was under Soviet control and had the closest possible relations with the Soviet Union before the formal merger.

SUNDAY STATEMENT

Peiping's Sunday statement said:

"We have not forgotten and will not forget what the Soviet leader, Khrushchev, said about the question of Taiwan after his visit to the United States in October 1959.

"He said the question of Taiwan was an incendiary factor in the international situation and that because the United States supported Chiang Kai-shek and the Soviet Union supported China, there resulted the atmosphere of an imminent great war. But what the Soviet Union stood for was the creation of all conditions to ease international tension and eliminate war.

"He further said that there was more than one way to solve every complicated question, depending on what basis you took. For example, after the October revolution, there was established in the Soviet Far East the Far Eastern Republic, and Lenin recognized it at the time; this was a temporary concession and sacrifice, but later on it was united with Russia.

"The meaning of this statement by the Soviet leader was quite clear. To put it bluntly, this was to ask China to agree to the U.S. scheme of creating two Chinas.

"This absurd view, of course, was rebutted and rejected by China, whereupon the Soviet leader made a series of speeches hinting that China was 'craving for war like a cock for a fight, and, like Trotsky, wanted neither peace nor war.' "

The statement then charged that "in accordance with the procedure mutually agreed upon by the Soviet Union and the United States," Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China has signed the nuclear test ban treaty "and is swaggering as if it were a sovereign state."

The Chinese further charged that not only had Khrushchev asked Red China to sign the treaty, which it has refused to do, "thus to create a situation of two Chinas," but "he also has threatened that if the Chinese Communist Government opposed this treaty and refused to be bound by it, the United States would help the Chiang Kai-shek clique to manufacture nuclear weapons. It turns out that in order to 'save millions of Chinese from nuclear death,' one China has to become two Chinas."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1963]

PEIPING ACCUSES MOSCOW OF PLOT

TOKYO, September 6.—Communist China accused the Soviet Union today of having marshaled tens of thousands of Chinese in a plot to overthrow the regional government of a district along the Soviet border.

The Peiping radio, reporting a new attack on Soviet policies by the Chinese Communists, said that the Soviet Union's actions had brought the relations between the two countries to the brink of a split.

The differences in the international Communist movement, the broadcast said, have reached a "new stage of unprecedented gravity."

The Peiping radio said the Russians admitted thousands of Chinese into Soviet territory in the spring of 1962 in an attempt to overthrow the local government at Ili, a district in northwest Sinkiang Province.

The broadcast quoted an article published by the Peiping newspaper Jenmin Jih Pav and the magazine Hung Chi, both official organs of the Chinese Communist Party.

The article was in reply to a Moscow accusation, published July 15, that China was trying to set up new world headquarters for communism in Peking and split the world along racial lines.

In the border incident, the Russians were said to have lured or threatened the Chinese to join the plot.

The broadcast gave no other details of the alleged plot except to say that the Chinese Government had made several demands to Moscow for the return of the Chinese and had been rebuffed.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1963]

ARTICLE DENOUNCES MOSCOW

(Special to the New York Times)

HONG KONG, September 5.—Communist China accused the Soviet Union today of deliberate policies to aggravate relations between the two countries.

The charge was made in an article jointly prepared by the newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao and the magazine Hung Chi, organs of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

Hsinhua, the Chinese Communist press agency, reported that the article was the first in a series commenting on the Soviet Communist Party's open letter, published July 14, attacking Chinese Communist policies.

The first article in Peiping's reply, Hsinhua said, consists of more than 20,000 Chinese characters and "cites a vast number of documents and irrefutable facts to show that since the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party (1956) the process in which Soviet leadership has gone further and further down the road of revisionism and "splittism" is the very process that has widened and aggravated the differences in the international Communist movement."

The facts of the last 7 years have amply proved, the article continued, that the Soviet leadership has taken the course of "allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China * * * and allying with the renegade Tito clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties."

The Chinese Communists said that the widening breach in the international Communist movement had begun at the 20th congress. It was at this meeting of the Soviet Communist Party that Premier Khrushchev exposed to the delegates the extent of Stalin's repressions and abuses of power.

From the outset, the article added, the Chinese have held that a number of the views advanced at the congress, "particularly the complete negation of Stalin and the thesis of 'peaceful transition' are gross errors of principle."

Hsinhua said the article exposed the "error of great power chauvinism" committed by the Soviet leadership in attempting to suppress the liberalization movement in Poland in the face of 1956. At that time, Premier Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders made a hasty flight to Warsaw in an attempt to prevent Wladyslaw Gomulka, a nationalist, from taking over the leadership of the Polish Communist Party.

CAPITULATION CHARGED

The article accused Moscow of capitulation in its shortlived acceptance of the Imre Nagy regime set up during the Hungarian revolt in 1956. After several days the Russians violated their pledge to negotiate an agreement, crushed the rebellion and arrested Mr. Nagy. He was executed in 1958.

"With regard to the counterrevolutionary rebellion in Hungary," the article said, "for a time Soviet leadership intended to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon Socialist Hungary to counterrevolution." The Chinese Communist Party at that time resolutely opposed these erroneous methods and advanced correct suggestions.

The article said the Soviet leaders had accepted the Chinese suggestions "but subsequent events showed that they nursed rancor against the Chinese Communist Party and regarded its perseverance in proletarian internationalism as the biggest obstacle to the Soviet party's wrong line."

The article was the first indication by Peiping that it had urged the use of force to put down the Hungarian rebellion.

The latest attack on the Soviet leadership by Peiping repeats many of the accusations made in the course of the deterioration of relations between the two countries, but it did give a few new glimpses of behind-the-scenes developments.

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN 1961

Referring to the Soviet party's 22d congress in 1961, at which the Albanian Communist regime was first publicly attacked by Soviet bloc leaders, the article said that Premier Chou En-lai, who defended the Albanians, had "frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party in subsequent conversations with Khrushchev."

"But Khrushchev flatly turned down these criticisms and advice," the article added, "and openly stated that 'We shall go our own way,' showing not the slightest intention of mending their ways."

The Chinese press agency said the article listed 10 main facts to show that since the 22d congress the Soviet leadership had become "more unbridled in violating the principles guiding relations among the fraternal parties and countries and in pursuing policies of great power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism to promote its own line of revisionism."

The article appealed to the Soviet leadership to "correct its errors and return to the path of Marxism-Lenism."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 6, 1963]

BATTLING RED GIANTS—AT THE BRINK

TOKYO.—Communist China harshly accused the Soviet Union yesterday of pushing the two Communist giants "to the brink of split" by committing "a whole series of errors of principle."

Couching its charges in the peculiarly stilted language of Marxist vituperation, Peiping broadcast a detailed and lengthy indictment of Moscow and warned that differences within the international Communist movement have reached "a new stage of unprecedented gravity."

The 2-hour radio broadcast, monitored in Tokyo, was an English translation of a 20,000-character editorial statement printed simultaneously yesterday by Peiping's official People's Daily and the theoretical journal Red Flag.

As news of the double-barreled attack on the Kremlin reached the West, there were also reports of an unprecedented anti-Chinese demonstration in front of Peiping's Embassy in Moscow.

Heading the list of Chinese grievances against the Soviets was the charge of "provoking troubles on the Sino-Soviet frontier." This was the first official acknowledgment of incidents along the thousands of miles of shared border between the two countries.

But there have been rumors of trouble in China's Sinkiang Province, and Peiping yesterday accused Moscow of attempting to overthrow the local government at Ili, a district bordering the Soviet Union in the northwestern corner of Sinkiang.

The radio said tens of thousands of Chinese were admitted to Soviet territory in furtherance of the plot in April and May of 1962. Peiping's request for the return of the Chinese had been refused, it added.

In Hong Kong yesterday, the English-language South China Post published a report from a Red Chinese refugee that 900,000 students have been sent to Sinkiang to build defenses.

But the Sinkiang question was only one point in a bill of particulars stretching back to 1956. The joint article yesterday was the first in a series catchily entitled "The Origin and Development of Differences Between Ourselves and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

Moscow's "errors of principle" began, according to the Peiping broadcast, as long ago as 1956, at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. "From the very outset," it said, China opposed "the complete negation of Stalin and the thesis of 'peaceful transition'" as "gross errors."

Yesterday's broadcast also charged that Soviet Premier Khrushchev was ready to compromise with the rebels in Hungary in 1956 but yielded to Chinese insistence that the uprising be put down: "The Chinese Communist Party at that time resolutely opposed these erroneous methods and advanced correct suggestions."

The broadcast continued: "The past 7 years have amply proved that the road taken by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the course of allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China, allying with the reactionaries of all countries against the people of the world and allying with the renegade Tito clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties."

The entire sweeping denunciation of Soviet policy was a counterchallenge to Moscow's open letter of July 14, which accused Peiping of trying to split the Soviet bloc and submovement. Since then, of course, Premier Khrushchev has gone out of his way to mend his fences with the "renegade" President Tito of Yugoslavia.

"Having failed to subdue the Chinese Communist Party," yesterday's broadcast continued, the Russians moved "to extend the ideological differences * * * to the sphere of state relations." Besides the border provocations, this stage included the withdrawal of Soviet experts in China and the "tearing up of hundreds of agreements and contracts."

The broadcast also gave broader emphasis to a charge the Chinese first made last Sunday—that Premier Khrushchev proposed 4 years ago that Peiping settle for "two Chinas" and acknowledge Nationalist control of Formosa. The proposal was made, the Chinese said, after Mr. Khrushchev visited the United States in 1959.

In Moscow, where there was no reply to the Chinese propaganda fusillade, the Chinese Ambassador's limousine was parked outside the Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday. The Chinese earlier had protested a demonstration at the Embassy by a score of Moscow University students urging the Chinese to sign the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The Chinese labeled the demonstration an "organized provocation."

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OPPOSE AID TO NASSER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, which is the oldest active war veterans' association in the United States, has indicated strong opposition to any further assistance to the United Arab Republic in view of President Nasser's aggressive military activities. In a letter to the President, Commander Heller, national head of the JWV, cited Nasser's August 11 statement that the United Arab Republic's economic structure was "strong" and he could afford to spend close to 12 percent of his budget on the armed forces.

Mr. President, there is, to my way of thinking, no reason in the world why the U.S. taxpayers should in any way subsidize Nasser's military buildup against the State of Israel. Nasser's plans are obviously offensive and not defensive.

Mr. President, I have supported the foreign aid program of our Nation in the past and, unless I am shown very compelling evidence to the contrary, I expect to support it this year. However, it is clearly absurd to permit U.S. aid to be used not for economic development but for the personal ambitions and aggressions of President Nasser, directed against Israel and even other neighboring Arab States. There is presently language in the aid bill passed by the House which, although not entirely satisfactory, does seek to limit the use of U.S. aid for this kind of militaristic activity. I shall do everything in my power to insure that that language remains in the Senate version and, if possible, is strengthened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD the text of a press release issued by the Jewish Veterans on this subject.

The Jewish War Veterans are a well-informed, responsible group. They have served their country without hesitation in time of war. In time of peace I believe their position deserves the consideration and careful attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JWV OPPOSES FURTHER AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

WASHINGTON.—National Commander Daniel Neal Heller, of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A., today informed President Kennedy that while the Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., supports restoration of House cuts in the foreign assistance bill, the organization is unalterably opposed to any further or additional assistance to the United Arab Republic in view of that country's aggressive military expenditures.

Commander Heller, in a letter to President Kennedy, cited Colonel Nasser's August 11 statement that the United Arab Republic economic structure was now so strong that he could divert "12 percent of our budget on the armed forces." Colonel Nasser went on to announce what appear to be preparations for war against Israel.

According to Mr. Heller, "Nasser's economic structure is so heavily subsidized by American assistance programs that the United Arab Republic is able to spend lavish sums on rockets, for offensive purposes and for the purchase of Soviet jet bombers and other Russian equipment as well as for the training of Egyptian officers in Soviet Union military bases."

Mr. Heller pointed out in detail how the United States propped up the Egyptian economy while Nasser increased his arms buildup, even hiring ex-Nazi rocket scientists.

Commenting on State Department claims that the United States should continue the massive aid to Nasser because America allegedly enjoys new "influence" in Cairo, Mr. Heller asked: "What evidence is there that we have such influence and that it has been effectively used?"

Mr. Heller noted that, "In recent days, both Egypt and Syria have perpetrated aggressive infiltrations into Israeli territory. The border situation is more volatile than at any time in recent years. Nasser and his Arab henchmen are growing bolder."

President Kennedy was informed of the Jewish War Veterans position that, "While we support our foreign assistance program generally, we have reached a conclusion that we must oppose further aid to the Nasser regime until Nasser's aggressive preparations, including acquisition of massive offensive Soviet weapons, are terminated."

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America is the oldest active war veterans organization in the United States.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on June 10, at the commencement exercises of the American University here in Washington, President Kennedy delivered an address, entitled "Toward a Strategy of Peace," that was billed by the White House as one of his most important foreign policy statements since his inauguration. That, it certainly was. In it the President called upon the American people to reexamine their attitudes toward the Soviet Union and toward the cold war. Clearly this represented a major new departure in the course of American foreign policy, coming as it did barely 8 months after the President had caught the Soviets in the deceitful act of installing nuclear weapons and their delivery systems in Cuba, next door to the United States.

His apparent success in facing down Khrushchev over the presence of Soviet strategic offensive weaponry in Cuba raised the hopes of the President and of his foreign policy advisers that perhaps we had reached a major and heartening turning point in our relations with the Soviet Union and in the course of the cold war. These hopes were further raised by Khrushchev's expression, at the turn of the year, of his willingness to agree to three on-site inspections annually on Soviet territory to investigate suspicious events in connection with an agreed ban on nuclear testing in all environments.

The President and his advisers apparently concluded that Khrushchev, after having gone perilously close to the brink of the thermonuclear war the previous October, was at last, after more than 4 years of intermittent negotiations, ready to agree to a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing.

But the administration's optimism was dampened soon thereafter. The United States, which had already made several successive concessions on the number of on-site inspections to enforce a ban on underground nuclear testing, refused to reduce the number below seven. More significant and dismaying, however, was Khrushchev's unwillingness to agree on the other essential features of an inspection system, including the composition of inspection teams and their functions.

As winter melted into spring, it became clear to the President that the nuclear test ban negotiations at Geneva had reached an impasse. Faced with this impasse, President Kennedy throughout the spring voiced his growing concern over the failure of the Americans, British, and Russians to reach an accord on a comprehensive test ban, and he expressed his alarm at what he regarded as increasingly dangerous prospects for the spread of nuclear weapon production and delivery capabilities to other nations not presently possessing them.

This was the setting of the President's "Strategy of Peace" address. Just before his speech, President Kennedy had persuaded Khrushchev to agree to a high-level British-American-Soviet meeting in Moscow to make a final striving for a treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments. In his speech, the President announced the forthcoming Moscow meeting and, to demonstrate the earnestness of American intentions, he declared that the United States would withhold testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere so long as other powers did likewise in the hope that this act would facilitate agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty.

Hardly had the President finished speaking, it seems in retrospect, and before we Americans could digest his advice, we had a treaty. Not the comprehensive ban we had sought, but a treaty nevertheless. On July 2, less than a month after the President's speech, Khrushchev announced his government's readiness to conclude a treaty banning nuclear testing in all environments except underground. On July 15, the Moscow conference previously called for by the President convened. Ten days later the treaty that Khrushchev was ready to accept was initialed.

This was a remarkable turn of events which, I confess, left me and, I suspect, others breathless. I realize, of course, that negotiations on a test ban treaty had been going on for nearly 5 years. Nevertheless, I was taken aback by the haste in which the treaty now before the Senate was concluded.

Evidence of this haste can be seen principally in two features of the treaty.

The first feature is its preamble. It is interesting to compare the preamble to the treaty now before us with the preamble to the draft treaty proposed at Geneva by the United States and the United Kingdom on August 27, 1962 a little more than a year ago. The preamble to the August 27 draft reads as follows:

> The Governments of the Union of Soviet Social Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America,
>
> Desirous of bringing about the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapon test explosions and determined to continue negotiations to this end.
>
> Confident that immediate discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and in the oceans will facilitate progress toward the early agreement providing for the permanent and verified discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in all environments,
>
> Have agreed as follows:

This statement, as we can see, is quite modest. The parties merely express their intention to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty and express their belief that the partial test ban will pave the way toward that end.

Now, listen to the preamble to the test ban treaty that is before this body:

> The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
>
> Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,
>
> Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,
>
> Have agreed as follows:

This preamble goes considerably farther than that contained in the August 27 draft. It gives great play to the sweeping goal of "general and complete disarmament," the Soviet line initiated 4 years ago by Khrushchev and subsequently adopted by President Kennedy. I have always felt that it is dangerous to tempt the average man in the street anywhere with such a utopian objective as this. Such temptations encourage false hopes and can cause profound dismay if not realized. I am happy that my viewpoint is shared by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me repeat his wise admonition voiced last April in a lecture before the student body of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University:

> Unlike the test ban negotiations, for which there seems to be at least a possibility of success, the discussion of "general and complete disarmament" is, in my opinion, an exercise in cold war fantasy, a manifestation of the deception and pretense of the new diplomacy. In a world profoundly divided by ideological conflict and national rivalries—conditions which are almost certain to prevail for the foreseeable future—it is inconceivable that the world's foremost antagonists could suddenly and miraculously dispel their animosities and vest in each other the profound trust and confidence which general and complete disarmament would require. There is nothing but mischief in negotiations which no statesman seriously expects to succeed. They become a forum for the generation of false hopes and profound disappointments, a cold war battleground for the exchange of epithets and accusations of bad faith in the face of certain failure. The net result is to reinforce the mirror image of mistrust and animosity through which the two societies (Russia and America) see each other.

So, Mr. President, in our apparently hasty eagerness to conclude a partial test ban treaty, we and our British ally apparently were willing to substitute this sweeping call for "general and complete disarmament" for the more modest and sensible, as well as more relevant, preamble contained in our draft of August 27, 1962. The preamble to the treaty before us echoes one of the major themes of Communist propaganda which, regrettably, the United States endorsed

2 years ago. Some will say, perhaps, that this is of no consequence because the preamble is not the operational part of the treaty. But it does unduly and, in my view, unnecessarily raise the hopes of mankind for something that, in my opinion, is utopian and highly unlikely of attainment so long as the nature of man remains as it has throughout recorded history.

The second feature of the treaty before us that exemplifies the evident haste in which the treaty was negotiated is the ambiguous phrase, "or any other nuclear explosion," which appears twice in article I of the treaty, particularly in paragraph 2 of that article, and which has stirred considerable discussion, questioning, and debate ever since the hearings on this treaty began in the Foreign Relations Committee. Two days after the treaty was initialed in Moscow, the New York Times authoritatively reported that some legal experts in the Department of State were concerned over the legal implications of that phrase, particularly with its effect upon the right of the United States to use nuclear weapons in hostilities. For this reason, the Times reported, President Kennedy inserted a statement in his speech to the Nation of July 26, reserving our right to use nuclear weapons in war. The doubts raised by this phrase have forced the highest officials of this Government, including the President, to give their solemn assurances that the United States will not be inhibited by this treaty from using nuclear weapons in hostilities in which it may become involved. Such confusion might have been avoided had this article of the treaty been more carefully drafted to insure unmistakable clarity. Article I of the British-American draft of August 27, 1962, was clear in this respect. But we have been told by the legal adviser of the Department of State that the Soviets flatly rejected in the Moscow discussions article II of that draft which dealt with explosions for peaceful purposes. Consequently he explained the controversial phrase I quoted earlier was inserted into the present treaty. Despite the legal adviser's explanation of the origin of this phrase, I stand by my contention that it bears the earmarks of haste to conclude the treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the texts of the Anglo-American draft treaty proposed on August 27, 1962, and the treaty now before us.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN ATMOSPHERE, OUTER SPACE, AND UNDERWATER

(Presented to the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament August 27, 1962, Geneva, Switzerland, by the United Kingdom and United States of America)

PREAMBLE

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, hereinafter referred to as the "original Parties,"

Desirous of bringing about the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapon test explosions and determined to continue negotiations to this end,

Confident that immediate discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and in the oceans will facilitate progress toward the early agreement providing for the permanent and verified discontinuance of nuclear weapon test explosions in all environments,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Obligations

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit and prevent the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

a. in the atmosphere, above the atmosphere, or in territorial or high seas; or

b. in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect proscribed, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE II

Explosions for peaceful purposes

The explosion of any nuclear device for peaceful purposes which would take place in any of the environments described, or would have the effect proscribed, in paragraph 1 of Article I may be conducted only: (1) if unanimously agreed to by the original Parties; or (2) if carried out in accordance with an Annex hereto, which Annex shall constitute an integral part of this Treaty.

ARTICLE III

Withdrawal

1. If any Party to this Treaty determines

a. that any other Party has not fulfilled its obligations under this Treaty,

b. that nuclear explosions have been conducted by a State not a Party to this Treaty under circumstances which might jeopardize the determining Party's national security, or

c. that nuclear explosions have occurred under circumstances in which it is not possible to identify the State conducting the explosions and that such explosions, if conducted by a Party to this Treaty, would violate the Treaty, or, if not conducted by a Party, might jeopardize the determining Party's national security.

it may submit to the Depositary Government a request for the convening of a conference to which all the Parties to this Treaty shall be invited, and the Depositary Government shall convene such a conference as soon after its receipt of the request as may be practicable. The request for the determining Party to the Depositary Government shall be accompanied by a statement of the evidence on which the determination was based.

2. The conference shall, taking into account the statement of evidence provided by the determining Party and any other relevant information, examine the facts and assess the significance of the situation.

3. After the conclusion of the conference or after the expiration of a period of 60 days from the date of the receipt of the request for the conference by the Depositary Government, whichever is the earlier, any Party to this Treaty may, if it deems withdrawal from the Treaty necessary for its national security, give notice of such withdrawal to the Depositary Government. Such withdrawal shall take effect on the date specified in the notice, which shall in no event be earlier than 60 days from receipt of the notice of the Depositary Government. The notice shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the reasons for the withdrawal.

ARTICLE IV

Amendments

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Depositary Government which shall circulate it to all Parties. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Government shall convene a conference, to which it shall invite all Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty or its Annex must be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the Parties, including all of the original Parties. It shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit or ratifications by two-thirds of the Parties to this treaty, including ratification by the original Parties.

ARTICLE V

Signature, ratification, accession, entry into force, and registration

1. This Treaty shall be open until -------- to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Government of ----------, which is hereby designated the Depositary Government.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force on ---------- for States which have deposited instruments of ratification or accession on or before that date, provided that the ratifications deposited include those of the Original Parties. If ratifications by all three original Parties are not deposited on or before ----------, this Treaty shall enter into force on the date on which ratifications by all of them have been deposited.

4. Instruments of ratification or accession deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty shall become binding on the date of deposit.

5. The Depositary Government shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or notices of withdrawals.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Government pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VI

Authentic texts

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Government. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Government to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

Done at ----------, this ------ day of ------, one thousand nine-hundred and sixty-two.

TEXT OF TREATY OF AUGUST 7

Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

(a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

(b) in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusion of which, as the Parties have stated in the Preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE II

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all of the Original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the Original Parties.

ARTICLE III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the Original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the Original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate at the city of Moscow the ------ day of ------, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

For the Government of the United States of America:

——— ———.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

——— ———.

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

——— ———.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, hastily drafted or not, a partial test ban treaty is now before the Senate for consideration. We have the responsibility of advising the President to ratify or not to ratify the treaty. This will not be an easy task, for we must weigh several factors, some of them conflicting ones, before reaching a decision. Among them, one is highly technical and exceedingly complex; the other is political and perhaps equally, if differently, complex.

The technical factor relates to the posture of the American second-strike strategic retaliatory forces. The Secretary of Defense, in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, asserted categorically that our "strategic missile force is designed to survive, and it will survive." He continued:

> We know, and the Soviets know, that in the event of a surprise Soviet first strike, at least a substantial proportion of our Minuteman missiles will survive. Also, we and they know that the Polaris submarines at sea and many strategic aircraft will survive. We can say with assurance that, even after such a Soviet strike, the total surviving U.S. strategic nuclear force will be large enough to destroy the enemy.

This is heartening. On the other hand, what about the effects of the detonation of 50- to 100-megaton devices upon the radar network designed to give us sufficient advance warning of a missile attack and upon the command and control systems which are integral components of our strategic retaliatory forces? Could such a detonation by the Soviets over the polar icecap black out our early-warning radar network, thus reducing the alert available to our retaliatory forces? Could a similar explosion over the United States in effect neutralize our missile forces by disrupting their command and control systems? Although he admits to uncertainties with respect to the effect of high-altitude detonation of supermegaton devices, Secretary McNamara indicates that we can clear them up through theoretical analysis of existing data and extrapolation. Some scientists, however, feel that we simply do not know very much about these matters and that, therefore, testing of supermegaton devices by the United States is necessary to ascertain the effects of their detonation upon the alerting and functioning of our retaliatory missile forces. Their view is reflected by the distinguished and well informed analyst of military affairs, Hanson Baldwin, who wrote in the New York Times on August 15, 2 days after Secretary McNamara's testimony:

> The blast, heat, radioactivity, and electromagnetic effect of 50- to 100-megaton explosions could black out radar and communications and could destroy control systems or the missile silos themselves.

The whole matter of the security of our strategic nuclear strike forces and the effects of supermegaton explosions on them disturbs me greatly. As I indicated a few moments ago, it is exceedingly complex and highly technical for the layman like myself. It is more difficult to evaluate when there are conflicting assessments by the experts. Moreover, no American can regard lightly the opinions of such great Americans as Adm. Arleigh Burke, Dr. Edward Teller, and Gen. Thomas S. Power, who have stated courageously why they believe this treaty not to be to the best of American interests.

Another factor we must weigh in considering this treaty is political. We have been advised by some people that in balancing the political factor against the technical one we shall discover that the political advantages to be derived from this treaty outweigh the technical drawbacks, such as the uncertainties I cited earlier.

President Kennedy hailed the treaty in his nationwide speech of July 26 as "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war." Perhaps he is right. I hope so. Much depends upon the nature of the next steps, however. If they are to be those outlined by Khrushchev on July 2, in East Germany, and on July 19, at a Soviet-Hungarian friendship rally in Moscow, I am genuinely worried. For Khrushchev's proposals, which include a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression agreement and the reduction of military forces on both sides of the line running through the heart of Germany, could, if adopted, weaken the West's position in central Europe and lead to the neutralization of West Germany and the dissolution of the Western alliance, which is the primary objective of the Soviets in Europe. Developments since the initialing of the test ban treaty have calmed my fears somewhat, but I feel that we must be most cautious and prudent in considering the next steps proposed by the Soviets.

We have an idea of Khrushchev's conception of the next steps. But what about President Kennedy's conception?

I have seen little evidence of an American initiative in this area. In fact, we appear to be following Khrushchev's lead, as evidenced by our interest in the nonaggression pact suggestion.

Can we not suggest that the next steps toward peace and reason and away from war be taken in Laos, in Cuba, and in Berlin? It was President Kennedy's initiative, in proposing the Moscow conference, that paved the way fur the treaty now before us. Now it is Khrushchev's turn.

At his meeting with President Kennedy in Vienna 2 years ago, Khrushchev solemnly pledged to uphold the independence and neutrality of Laos. This pledge has been termed a litmus-paper test of Soviet intentions by Kennedy administration officials. He has not kept it. Now he can.

Khrushchev pledged last fall to withdraw Soviet forces from Cuba in due course. Although President Kennedy has reported some reduction in their numerical strength, it is clear that this pledge has not been fulfilled. Now Khrushchev can fulfill that pledge.

It was exactly this point that I was driving at upon the floor of the Senate yesterday in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I suggested then that the time for such bargains was before the signing of the treaty; that we have now passed the psychological moment when we can demand a quid pro quo; and that the psychological moment passed when the treaty was signed. It will be much more difficult to get such a quid pro quo from the Communists at a time like this.

I have no doubt that any withdrawal from Cuba pursuant to any inspection will be a long one and reluctant one, something that will not occur unless it is precipitated either by the Cubans themselves or by the Cubans with the support of the United States.

Two years ago, the Communists erected the odious "wall of shame" in Berlin. If they truly desire to take steps toward peace and reason and away from war, they can signify their good intentions by dismantling the wall.

Mr. President, I have discussed some of the factors that I am weighing as I consider the test ban treaty. I am struck by the apparent haste in which it was concluded. I am deeply troubled by the possible gaps in our knowledge concerning the effects of high-altitude supermegaton explosions upon the posture of our retaliatory strategic missile forces. I am concerned about the direction in which this treaty, as a vaguely defined "first step," could lead us. Unfortunately, the factors that must be weighed in our consideration of this treaty are not cut and dried. For this reason, reaching a decision is difficult.

The history of the relations between the United States and Soviet Russia, since our first recognition of that country, is not such as to inspire confidence in either the Russian motivation or the reliability of any agreement made with Russians. In fact, based upon the number of broken treaties and agreements which the Russians have made, we have more reason to be suspect of their intentions of keeping this treaty than we have to believe that they will respect it. In the field of international relations between countries, we cannot place ourselves upon a plane of high idealism and refuse to look at the motivations of other countries. To do so would be to shirk the fundamental duty of the Senate in the coming week, when it must either approve or refuse to approve the treaty.

What is this motivation? Heretofore, I have suggested some of the things which may be the motivation; yet today, that motivation is not clear to me. I am sure there is a motivation, for the Russians are nothing if they are not realists. Is fear of nuclear war what causes them to sign such a treaty? I doubt it, because they know that the President and the Defense Department and the American people are completely saturated with the concept of defense only, which has prevailed over the years. It is illogical to assume that a country which never has pursued an aggressive or acquisitive policy is going to change that policy overnight and commence such a war, particularly when it knows that it can do so only at the price of a nuclear holocaust. Has the Red Chinese rift caused Russia to do this? No man with commonsense can believe that is true. It is true that the Chinese have the largest population on earth; but in this modern day and age, war can be waged only by a country with a great industrial potential. In this respect, Red China is industrially coming up out of the miocene ooze, compared with Russia's present industrial potential. China cannot and could not wage a major war, and is not likely to be able to do so in the next 10 or 20 years.

Mr. President, our concern is that possibly Russia has achieved a scientific breakthrough which, if known to the President, has not been told to the American people or to Congress itself. If this is true, then—to paraphrase Shakespeare—the treaty might well be the "sleep of death" which must give us pause. Against this eventuality, we have been given assurances by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the President, and many others high in authority. If this be just one more attempt at "gimmick" government, government by press agentry, adulation of the Kennedy personality cult, an election elixir, then this will indeed be the sorriest day for America. But we have no right to assume that these men do not act in good faith, or that they have withheld material facts from the people or the Congress. In fact, they have given us every assurance that they have not done so.

Despite the solemn warnings of the President and all others involved in drafting this treaty, the immediate reaction, as exhibited by my own mail and by the mail of most of the Members of Congress, is that the treaty will result in a nuclear utopia, that the specter of nuclear war is gone, and that world disarmament is around the corner. The reaction shown by most of the nations in the world, particularly those in southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, has been substantially the same. Last year, as a congressional delegate for the United States to the United Nations, I learned of the great concern which the representatives of these countries had about the nuclear race. In some cases, the concern was almost hysterical. As a result, Mr. President, today we find that even before the treaty was reported by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, 86 nations had scampered like wildlife before a forest fire to place their names on the treaty.

I must pay tribute particularly to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who so promptly held full committee hearings upon this matter.

Not to approve the treaty, therefore, would be to douse all the hopes of those nations—illogical though their hopes may be, in light of the treaty itself—and to say to them—figuratively, not literally—that we are not interested in the cessation of nuclear tests or in stopping the saturation of the earth's atmosphere with radioactive fallout. It seems to me this is a price we can ill afford to pay, if we are to retain the confidence of the world in our moral leadership. No one should ever have written a treaty which permitted such a stampede, before the United States had an opportunity to consider, on the merits of the treaty itself, rather than on the merits of international press agentry, the treaty as an effective basis for the control of nuclear tests.

But we are called upon to make a decision, Mr. President; and decision means choice. While I feel, to a degree at least, that this Nation has been blackjacked into approval of this treaty, failure to approve it could destroy our already fast-diminishing claim to the moral leadership of the world. The Berlin wall, the two Cuban escapades, Laos, and now South Vietnam, have tarnished our claim to that leadership; and I believe we cannot now do otherwise than approve this treaty. If, based upon a preponderance of evidence which would sway intelligent and reasonable minds, there were a clear-cut reason why we should not approve it, then—even though we would thus dash the hopes of every other nation on earth—I would not vote to approve the treaty. But in the absence of such a preponderance of evidence, I shall reluctantly vote in favor of approval of the treaty, unless facts which may appear subsequently supply a weight of evidence which clearly shows the treaty to be contrary to our national safety.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, provided it is understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session, the nuclear test ban treaty, which had been reported favorably by Mr. FULBRIGHT from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which was read the second time, as follows:

TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDER WATER.

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

(a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

(b) in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusion of which, as the Parties have stated in the Preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE II

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all of the Original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the Original Parties.

ARTICLE III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the Original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the Original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate at the city of Moscow the fifth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DEAN RUSK

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

HOME

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

A. GROMYKO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the treaty will be the pending business when the Senate convenes on Monday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I have been glad to yield.

INTERIM REPORT ON MILITARY AND TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, has been conducting extensive and exhaustive hearings on nuclear test ban matters since September 1962. During recent weeks the hearings have focused upon the military and technical implications of the pending treaty which would bar nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and under water. An earnest, determined, and conscientious effort has been made to develop all of the facts from qualified military and scientific people, and to arrive at solid answers to the many complex, troublesome, and difficult questions which are involved.

During the past week, I have received numerous inquiries as to the status of our hearings, with particular emphasis upon the question of whether the subcommittee proposes to issue a report and, if so, when. Another subject of inquiry has been the matter of the printing and public release of the transcripts of the hearings. I believe it is proper and fitting for me to advise the Senate and the public of the status of these matters.

The subcommittee plans to issue an interim report dealing specifically with the military and technical implications of the partial test ban and the impact which the treaty, if approved, would have upon our present and future military striking power. This report is now in the process of preparation, and it is hoped that it will be available for release early next week.

With respect to the printing of the transcripts, let me point out that the sensitive matters involved in our hearings made it mandatory that the testimony be received in executive session. We have made every effort to abide by all applicable security requirements and regulations. Therefore, before the testimony can be printed, it is necessary that the typewritten transcripts be gone over thoroughly in order to delete therefrom all sensitive information which, if made public, might be of value to a potential enemy. Subject only to this, we will make the testimony public to the greatest extent possible.

We are today releasing the testimony of General Power, which has been cleared for security.

Although the subcommittee staff has been working diligently to get the transcripts ready for printing, the magnitude of the problem now makes it clear it will be impossible to print them prior to the conclusion of the debate upon the test ban treaty. However, copies of the transcripts, in their classified form, are available in the office of the subcommittee and can be there examined by any Senator upon request.

Mr. President, a great deal of effort has been made to get those records cleared for security in time to be printed, but it is quite a long process, even after we get the transcript back with the deletions, to put it in shape to go to the printer.

I would now like to make a few remarks about the proposed nuclear test ban as an individual Senator. I preface these remarks with the statement that on these points I speak only for myself.

On May 28, 1963, I took the floor of the Senate and addressed myself to Senate Resolution 148 which had then just been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and others. As will be recalled, this resolution proposed that the Senate go on record as supporting a renewed offer by the United States to the Soviet Union of an agreement banning all tests that contaminate the atmosphere or the ocean and, in the event of the rejection of such offer, that we commit ourselves unilaterally to a moratorium on such testing.

I then pointed out that the question of banning nuclear testing in the atmosphere involves serious security considerations and was intimately related to the problem of national survival.

Some of the questions which I then said must be asked and answered before the necessary assurance could be acquired were:

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to provide our Nation with an effective defense against Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to provide our Nation with a certain capability of penetrating a Soviet missile defense employing nuclear warheads?

Are atmospheric nuclear tests required to assure the survival of our offensive missile systems after a surprise enemy nuclear attack?

Since my floor statement of May 28, 1963, these and other questions have been explored in depth and detail by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. We have had before us many of the most knowledgeable people in the country upon the military and technical aspects of the problem. The information which we have obtained has not been reassuring to me. On the contrary, the evidence before the subcommittee has given me, as an individual Senator, cause for great concern and alarm about the security implications of the proposed treaty.

In short, based upon a long and serious study and assessment of the testimony which has been presented to us—and I did not make any conclusion on that point until all of the testimony was in just a few days ago—I have come to the conclusion that the net military disadvantages to the United States which are inherent in the proposed treaty are so serious and formidable as to raise very serious questions as to the effect of the treaty upon our national security, safety and survival. Considering the treaty comprehensively I have found nothing in it which counterbalances this factor to the extent that I can say that the military risks which are inherent in the treaty are, on balance, acceptable. In fact, the contrary is true.

My concern in this matter is to do all that I can to insure that our vital interests are protected and that our capacity to defend ourselves against an aggressor is not degraded. Since I have reached the conclusion that unacceptable military and security risks are involved in the proposed treaty and that it is not in the national self-interest, I shall have no alternative but to cast my vote against its ratification. At a later date I shall discuss in detail the reasons and facts which have impelled me to take this stand.

I thank the Senator from Oregon again for his courtesy.

Mr. MORSE. It is my pleasure to cooperate with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

THE STOCKPILE INQUIRY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have before me an article which appeared in the press with respect to some remarks apparently written by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I have not seen what he said, but I have the article in my hand. Based upon that newspaper article, I desire to make a statement this afternoon with respect to the subject the Senator from New Jersey brought up.

A newspaper story today states that the Senator from New Jersey said in connection with the pending report on the stockpile that I had refused "to let the men accused in the report submit their defense with the release of the findings."

The Senator from New Jersey did request that the proposed report of the subcommittee be first submitted to those witnesses to whom he wanted to show it; but I found, to the best of my knowledge, that any such action would be without precedent; and I also felt that it would be improper to submit a subcommittee report of this character to any of the witnesses before it had been submitted to the full Armed Services Committee.

The Senator from New Jersey states that the report was "more the work of Timothy J. May, assistant counsel."

That is not correct. Mr. May did work on the report, as did many others, but every word of said report was first approved by the chief counsel of the subcommittee, Mr. R. C. Coburn, prior to its submission to me and my subsequent submission to the subcommittee.

The Senator from New Jersey is quoted as asserting Mr. May was formerly a member of the White House staff.

Mr. President, I do not see why that is particularly pertinent especially if Mr. May possessed information or experience which would help the chief counsel and the subcommittee get the facts; but in any case it is also an incorrect statement.

Mr. May was not a member of the White House staff at the time he was employed by the counsel of the subcommittee, and had never been a member of the White House staff. He had been a consultant to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. Since that office supervised stockpile policy, it was logical for Mr. Coburn to want his services.

When the report was originally submitted, some members thought it was too long.

Investigating these contracts was a very complicated accounting effort. It was understandable that after a year's hearings, a long report could be in order; but in any case, in an effort to accommodate those on the subcommittee who felt it was too long, it is now being reworked by counsel in the hope it will be satisfactory to the subcommittee.

The Senator from New Jersey is reported as stating that the inquiry was "limited to a partial examination of the handling of a few metals during the period of the previous administration."

That also is not correct.

Many contracts investigated were signed in both previous administrations, and also in the current administration, in many cases either after critical published reports or investigation by the General Accounting Office; and every contract was investigated that was requested by any member of the subcommittee or Member of the Senate.

The Senator is reported as saying that he is "not interested in covering up or accusing anyone." I am glad to know that.

Perhaps the reason for much of the above is the fact that the Senator from New Jersey was not appointed to the subcommittee until March 26, 1963, many weeks after the hearings were completed; and therefore the Senator from New Jersey did not participate, at any time, in any of the hearings.

The report is based on the record of the hearings. The Senate and the people are entitled to a summary of the findings. That is the duty of the subcommittee and I intend to see that that duty is carried out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my able friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. There is one thing about the statement made by the Senator from Missouri this afternoon which disturbs the senior Senator from Oregon, if it is correctly understood. The Senator said, I believe, that the committee is now at work cutting down the length of the report. I hope this does not mean that the Senate will be denied any information it should have in regard to this investigation, because in my judgment the Senate is entitled to all the information.

I have not participated in any way in the discussion of this investigation over the many months during which it has been going on.

The Senator from Missouri knows that there is an operation in the State of Oregon involving a nickel mine and plant which, in newspaper stories, at least, has been involved in the investigation to various degrees. I have received many inquiries about it. My answer has been uniform. I propose to wait until all the record is in and the committee has completed its hearings and made its full report.

I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee is not in a position in which, for any reason whatsoever, he has to delete from the report information which, in his original judgment, the Senate is entitled to receive.

As one Senator who has the kind of interest in the matter I have outlined, I wish to be sure that I have all the information, so that when I reach my evaluation of the report and reply to my constituents I shall know I have a full record.

I am also aware—and I have a little sense of humor about this—that there is always a desire in the Senate to be brief, but I have observed after 19 years here that sometimes the desire to be brief is motivated by the desire to cover up. I would much prefer to speak at length and to write at length, satisfied that by so doing I was making a complete record.

I hope that we shall not get such a brevity-stricken report that we shall not be able to present to our constituents all the information we should be able to present in our final evaluation of the Senator's work.

I wish to say something about the Senator's work, based upon my great respect for and unlimited confidence in him. As the Senator knows, although I have not in any way participated in the conferences in regard to this investigation, from the very beginning I have had complete confidence in the integrity and the dedicated public service purpose of the Senator from Missouri in conducting the investigation. So far as I am concerned, as is true of all such matters, the issue is nonpartisan when we are dealing with the public interest. It makes no difference to me, when alleged irregularities arise in an administration of this Government, whether it be under a Democratic or Republican administration. The senior Senator from Oregon has always insisted, and will continue to insist, that there be the most thorough investigation in the public interest.

I have been confident that the Senator from Missouri has been conducting such an investigation. I wished to make this statement before I asked the Senator for a reply with respect to two questions.

First, can the Senator give me assurance that he is not so cutting down the report that I, along with other Senators, will thereby be denied information to which all Senators are entitled?

Second, is it not true that all of the witnesses who may be involved in any charges or criticism in the report—which I have not seen—testified or had the opportunity to make whatever statements they wished to make in their own defense?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his considerate remarks with respect to efforts made in this regard. The Senator from Oregon is not only a great Senator, but also an articulate former dean of a law school. Therefore, when he emphasizes the importance of making a complete record he does it from a background equaled by few if any Members of this body.

The hearings were quite long. Because the records prior to these hearings had always been classified so the information was kept from the American people, and because there was so much money involved—specifically some $9 billion—the work could not have been done without extensive accounting research. I am glad to report to the able Senator from Oregon, and to the Senate that we had the fullest cooperation from the Comptroller General of the United States, an Eisenhower appointee, and his staff. Because of the tremendous amount of detail involved, the hearings would not have been possible without such cooperation.

The record of the hearings goes to some 4,000 pages. Any report, along with suggested legislation can only be of value when it truly portrays the various conditions and facts with regard to the various contracts in question; therefore, the report was relatively long.

I have not had the type and character of experience which the able Senator from Oregon has had, so I left it up to the subcommittee's chief counsel, one of the most able and prominent lawyers in this country, saying to him, "See if you can reduce the size of the report without affecting the record of the presentation to the Senate." He said, "I will do my best to that end," and that is what is going on at the present time.

In reply to the second question of the Senator from Oregon, there was no witness before the subcommittee who did not have an opportunity to testify completely with respect to a contract in question. All the witnesses testified under oath. Because there were discrepancies in the sworn testimony of members of the General Accounting Office team, the General Services Administration representatives before the committee from the Office of Emergency Planning and representatives of certain companies, it was necessary that further work be done in an effort to get the facts.

I again thank my colleague from Oregon for his kind remarks about my approach to this problem, and I would reciprocate with respect to any problem he presented to the Senate. I assure him that I have taken on this obligation as a Senator from Missouri, to give to the Senate the facts based on the record we have compiled.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that his replies to my questions satisfy me, and if after reading the record I feel it is desirable for me to check the records of the committee, it is my understanding that any Member of the Senate has access to those records, subject to the same rules of restriction that are imposed upon members of the subcommittee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Oregon is correct. The hearings themselves are now printed and a matter of record. We are working on legislation, because we want to have a constructive report, and I am sure there is not a member of the subcommittee but who agrees there should be some improvements in the legislation. We hope to present both a report and legislation to the Senate at an early time.

APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC MEMBERS OF RAILROAD ARBITRATION BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to the two subject matters I rise to speak about, I want to extend to the President of the United States my enthusiastic compliments and sincere congratulations for the appointment of very able public members of the arbitration board to arbitrate the two main issues in the pending railroad dispute that were referred to the board by congressional legislation.

The chairman of the board is Mr. Ralph T. Seward, a very able lawyer and an arbitrator of great distinction in the field of labor arbitration in the United States.

When I was a member of the War Labor Board, he was one of our top counsel. We assigned him many times to the arbitration of cases during the war, and in each case he performed outstanding service. After I left the Board to run for the Senate, he for a time, as I recall, was a member of the Board.

Another member of the board, Prof. James J. Healy, of Harvard University, was one of my associates on the special commission appointed by President Kennedy earlier this year to try to settle the dock strike, which had the east coast and the gulf coast tied up tighter than a drum. Professor Healy is undoubtedly one of the two or three top authorities in this country on the economic problems involved in labor relation contracts, particularly in respect to welfare funds, pensions, health benefit funds, and job security problems.

I had an opportunity to work day and night with Professor Healy during the time we sought to settle the dock strike. As I said earlier this year, about him and the other member of that special panel, Ted Kheel, of New York, I could not have had assigned to me two more able colleagues. I am delighted to know President Kennedy has appointed Professor Healy as one of the arbitration board members.

The third member of the board is Benjamin Aaron, who was one of the top members of the War Labor Board when I served on it, and also one of our most distinguished arbitrators. I am delighted to know he has been given this opportunity for further dedicated public service.

To the carriers and the brotherhoods, I say the President has given you three judicious, impartial men to consider the evidence on its merits, and you have every right to have complete confidence in the public members that the President has assigned to the board.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a story appearing in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Seward Given Chairmanship of Rail Panel," in which the qualifications not only of Mr. Seward but of Professor Healy and Mr. Aaron are set out, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEWARD GIVEN CHAIRMANSHIP OF RAIL PANEL

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Kennedy yesterday named Ralph T. Seward, a Washington, D.C., labor mediator, as chairman of the seven-man board to arbitrate the railroad work rules dispute.

The President also named the two other public members of the board. They are James J. Healy, professor of industrial relations at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and Benjamin Aaron, director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California.

All three have had long experience as labor arbitrators. They will have the real power on the seven-man board, which is empowered to decide the two main issues in the railroad controversy: concerning the jobs of locomotive firemen and the composition of train crews.

The labor and management representatives on the panel were unable to agree on the three public members, and the President therefore named them in accordance with emergency legislation passed by Congress August 28.

Labor members are H. E. Gilbert, president of the Firemen's Union, and Roy McDonald, vice president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Management members are J. E. Wolfe, chairman of the railroad negotiating committee, and Guy Knight, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

The joint congressional resolution creating the board and providing for binding arbitration directs the board to begin work within 30 days and to hand down its decision not later than 90 days thereafter.

In announcing selection of the public members, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said the board may begin its work Friday at the Labor Department.

Seward is impartial umpire of the Bethlehem Steel-United Steelworkers contract and has served in a similar capacity for a number of other major contracts. He was a public member of the War Labor Board for a brief period in World War II.

Healy has been arbitrator of a number of labor cases and has served on Taft-Hartley boards of inquiry. Aaron is a past president of the National Academy of Arbitrators and was a member of the War Labor Board from 1942 to 1945.

GOVERNOR WALLACE, OF ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next topic I wish to discuss briefly deals with the statement I made yesterday in regard to the psychoneurotic tendencies of the Governor of Alabama, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. President, in the intervening hours I have been "bombarded" by the press, seeking to obtain from me the source of the information about the psychoneurotic tendencies of the Governor of Alabama which I set forth in the RECORD yesterday.

The interesting thing is that the press has not been inclined to question the accuracy of my statement, but was persistent—that is a mild word to use in connection with the position taken by some members of the press—in their attempted interviews with me and in some of their representations to the members of my office staff, for they seem to be askance that they could not obtain from my office the information which they sought.

Mr. President, members of the great journalistic profession have taken great pride in standing behind what they consider to be one of the cardinal principles of their code of journalistic ethics—that no newspaperman will betray a confidence as to the source of his information. I am a little surprised that members of the press think that such a code should not be followed by politicians, but I want to say to all of them now, from the floor of the Senate this afternoon, that I do not violate my code of political ethics, either.

They have every right and duty to ask their questions, but they must expect others to observe their own rights and duties, too.

The information I put in the RECORD yesterday about the psychoneurotic tendencies of the Governor of Alabama is accurate information, and it will speak for itself. But then, says the press, "Didn't you violate some confidence?" The answer is "No." However, I will come to grips with what these questions of the press really mean and imply. I point out that there is no veterans' preference right in the United States to destroy the constitutional guarantees of Negroes in Alabama or anywhere else in this country.

It was not pleasant to make the speech of yesterday, but I stand on every word of it. In carrying out my trust in the Senate, I have the controlling objective at all times of putting the public interest first. When any personal interest interferes with that public interest, the Senator from Oregon can always be counted upon to stand up for the public interest.

The time had come to disclose to America the great danger to this Republic represented by the Governor of Alabama. The Governor of Alabama challenges government by law. When government by law is shaken in this country, the Republic is threatened. The Governor of Alabama challenges the preservation of the Union. When the preservation of the Union is challenged, our freedoms are threatened. The course of conduct of the Governor of Alabama is a course of conduct which incites and encourages riots and the shedding of blood. It is an ugly fact and a sad fact, but already his hands are dripping with blood.

It is my position that when any Governor, when any individual, when any group, or force in this country follows a course of action which threatens the preservation of the Union, which threatens government by law, which incites riots, which encourages mob action which leads to bloodshed, it is the duty of men who have taken the oath in high office in this country to sustain and protect the Constitution of this country, to stand up and be counted and to speak out in defense of the Nation, and its principles. That has been the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

If there are those followers of the Governor of Alabama, who wish to draw the issue of whether we are going to maintain a system of government by law and enforce the decisions of our courts, on which depends the preservation of the liberties and freedoms of every American, then the Government of the United States must meet that challenge with whatever force is necessary to preserve the Constitution and to continue and maintain a system of government by law.

So long as the Governor of Alabama follows what I consider to be a highly abnormal course of action, indicative, in my judgment, of a high state of nervous tension, which psychiatrists call a psychoneurosis, it is the duty of this Government to apply whatever checks are necessary to stop his course of action in order to preserve our system of government by law.

FOREIGN AID, GERMAN REPARATIONS, AND THE ISRAEL ECONOMY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I have been speaking almost daily in opposition to many parts of the pending foreign aid bill. I have a few additional remarks to make on that subject now.

Every time we hear a spokesman for the foreign aid program defend the pending authorization bill, we usually hear reference to two or three specific countries that are cited as successes of U.S. aid.

One of them is Israel. We know that Israel has, for the last 10 years, received very large amounts of economic aid. We also know that its economy is doing well and its aid is currently being reduced.

But this does not mean that Israel should be considered typical of underdeveloped nations, or that our aid program can produce the results elsewhere that have occurred in Israel.

For one thing, Israel has a very small population. Coupled with our large aid program, this has resulted in a high per capita application of capital. In fiscal 1962, for example, our aid to Israel ran at the rate of $35.83 per person.

Certainly any aid program of that intensity is going to produce results. But when we get to countries with populations of 20, 30, 50, and 100 million and more, aid of that magnitude is not possible.

There is another factor that makes Israel the exception rather than the rule. This is the large part that German reparations have played in its economic growth. I am sure that very few Americans know that West Germany has contributed to Israel in reparations about as much as the United States has extended to her in foreign aid.

An article by William Mehlman in the current issue of the Reporter magazine, brings out the important role these reparations have played in Israel's economic progress. Mr. Mehlman points out that the $825 million in reparations carried the burden of Israel's industrial development, while aid from other sources was applied to the peripheral problems of reclamation, road building, health services, debt refinancing, and imports of consumer goods.

I might add that few Americans are aware that Germany has been carrying this burden, because it seldom shows up in the reports of the defense or foreign aid expenditures of our European allies.

He points out also that most of the $615 million in personal indemnification paid by the German Government to victims of the Nazi crimes against the Jews has gone to residents of Israel.

I, for one, am thankful that Israel has accomplished such a high level of progress. Her continuing growth and prosperity will be welcomed by freedom-loving people everywhere, and will continue to contribute to the growth of democracy in the Middle East.

But we will make a grave mistake if we think that because Israel did well and because Israel received U.S. aid, our aid can produce the same results everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of Mr. Mehlman's article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

German Reparations and the Israeli Economy

(By William Mehlman)

Tel Aviv.—Eleven years have passed since the Israel Parliament, the Knesset, voted adoption of the German Reparations Agreement, amid an atmosphere of street riots and protestations that the government was bartering the sacred memory of 6 million European Jews. It is 10 years since the first installment of the $825 million in German goods that were to flow into Israel arrived at Haifa port. The agreement that was to run 14 years is ending its course almost 4 years ahead of schedule. Though the offices of the Shilumim Corp., the Israel Reparations Mission to Germany, will formally remain open until 1965, more than 90 percent of the goods ordered under the agreement have been delivered and the rest are already committed (mainly to fuel purchases), with interim financing arranged by Israel until final payment is received.

The remaining opposition to the principle if not the fact of reparations emanates mainly from the Herut Party, the political embodiment of the old underground groups to whom all things German are anathema. But even outside Herut, the question of whether acceptance of German tractors can be construed as payment or forgiveness for Nazi outrages against European Jewry is troubling in a nation one-fourth of whose citizens must live out their lives with personal memories of the camps and crematoria and the families they left on the ash heaps of the 1,000-year Reich. That such memories have not prevented 100,000 Israelis from claiming more than $600 million in personal reparations from Germany, covering everything from stolen property to interrupted educations, does not alter the fact that many thousands more would sooner starve than accept a German pfennig.

The economic arguments against reparations have lost their validity. The fears in 1952 that the Germans would treat the agreement as "a scrap of paper" once a few token payments had been made, that they would use it to foist inferior goods on Israel at exorbitant prices, that acceptance of German equipment would leave Israel helplessly dependent on Germany for services and spare parts, have all proved groundless. The Germans paid up in record time, most of the goods received were of first quality at market or below-market prices, and the agreement, far from reducing Israel to an economic vassal of Germany, opened a trade route, now running at $89.3 million a year, that has made Germany Israel's third largest customer. One reservation to the agreement that seemed plausible in 1952—that a shattered Germany could never make good on an $825 million obligation—proved to be the biggest bubble of them all.

More serious than any of the imagined difficulties in expediting the reparations payments was the problem of setting down the terms of the agreement itself. The Germans, looking toward the revitalization of their industrial plant, insisted that Germany be the sole source of all goods purchased under the pact. It was only the persistent diplomatic prodding of Dr. F. E. Shinnar, head of the Israel mission, that ultimately persuaded them to permit a special sterling account for the purchase of oil from British firms.

A second conflict arose over the categories of goods that would be made available under the agreement. The German Government was under pressure from German industrial interests to define the payments within a narrow range of plant and other capital equipment. Israel sought a broader definition that would include semifinished goods, building materials, and some consumer items as well as plant equipment. The agreement finally drawn up was the flexible one Israel desired, and here again credit must be given to the diplomatic efforts of Dr. Shinnar. It stipulated five main categories of reparations purchases: capital equipment, including ships and industrial machinery, 57 percent; ferrous and nonferrous metals, including materials for the manufacture of pipes, 18 percent; raw materials including semifinished goods, 15 percent; agricultural products, 4 percent; and services, including shipping, insurance, and administration, 6 percent.

THE BENEFITS

One of the effects of reparations was the flexibility they gave the Israel Government in the allocation of other funds received during the payments period. Over the reparations span, Israel sold some $600 million in independence and development bonds and received more than $700 million in transfers from such purely charitable sources as the United Jewish Appeal, United Israel Appeal, Hadassah, and Histadrut, to name a few. In addition to these unilateral payments, since 1954 the Government has received, in currency exchange, the bulk of $615 million in personal indemnification paid to private Israel citizens by Germany for loss of life, liberty, health, property, education, and pension benefits as a result of the activities of the Nazi regime. This money, presently flowing into private bank accounts at the rate of $135 million annually, is expected to surpass within the next 4 years the total payments made under State reparations. While indemnification payments have added to Israel's current inflationary problems, they have also contributed substantially to the country's foreign-currency reserves.

With reparations assuming the burden of industrial development, the Government was free to concentrate those outside funds on problems that would otherwise have received only divided attention at best. These included absorption of a million new immigrants (half of them from underdeveloped countries), reclamation of the Negev, inauguration of a national roadbuilding program culminating in the Beersheba-Eilat highway, expansion and modernization of hospitals and medical facilities, refinancing of the national debt, and the purchase of heavy quantities of food and other consumer items. Coming at a time when the country was under the severest pressure, the reparations enabled the Government to concentrate its efforts on precisely those areas not covered by the agreement and thus indirectly accelerated the pace of Israel's overall development during the 10-year period during which they were in force.

The complete record of reparations payments and how they were employed would make impressive reading if only for its size and variety. The highlights, as they apply to nine major economic areas, give a fair indication of the total picture:

Industry: New or replacement machinery supplied to 1,275 plants presently employing more than 200,000 workers.

Shipping: Forty-nine ships built and delivered, including bulk carriers, tankers, mixed cargo vessels, and two passenger liners, for a total tonnage of 466,000 tons, opening markets in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. More than 50 percent of reparations goods were carried in ships flying the Israeli flag.

Port facilities: Modernization and enlargement of Haifa port to more than twice its former capacity. Equipment received included a $2 million floating dock (capacity 7,500 tons) to handle ship repairs, a drydock capable of raising 18,000 tons, a 25-ton-capacity floating crane, 14 rail-operated mobile cranes, a 200-ton-capacity dredger, and building materials to launch the Israel Shipyards on the River Kishon.

Transportation: $11.5 million in new railway equipment, including automatic signaling devices making express trains possible for the first time in Israel, 12 passenger car sets, 400 freight cars for hauling potash and phosphates from the Negev, rails for the new line to Beersheba and for the replacement of the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem line. Modern aviation equipment was also supplied for the air terminal at Lydda.

Communications: More than $6 million in telecommunications equipment, including automatic exchanges for all major cities, a radiotelephone hookup to remote settlements, and a ring of Telex stations for Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, and Beersheba.

Power: Turbogenerators totaling 560,000 kilowatts, a 110-kilovolt high-tension station, power-correcting generators, transformers, and cables. The electric energy supply in Israel since 1953 has increased from 885 million kilowatt-hours to 2 billion kilowatt-hours.

Mining: $3.5 million in equipment for the Timna Copper Works, currently treating 500,000 tons of copper ore annually.

Housing: $80 million in construction materials, used in wiping out the "hut cities" of the early 1950's and replacing them with permanent homes for almost a million new immigrants.

Fuel: 9 million tons of oil purchased in England under a special sterling account set up by the West German Government.

TWO NATIONS ON TRIAL

Dr. Shinnar, the bespectacled former managing director of the newspaper Ha'aretz, who expedited the scheduling and placement of reparations orders as head of the Israel Mission in Cologne for 10 years, views the experience as a kind of international morality play. "We are both on trial," he said; "the Germans to show how well they could live up to the agreement, the Israelis to show how wisely they could use the funds at their disposal." Shinnar, who held the rank of ambassador plenipotentiary during his residence in Germany, relates that following the signing of the pact in 1952, the Israel Government was besieged with offers of help from international industrial and economic experts and dire warnings from all quarters not to attempt to carry out the agreement with local talent alone. The aid was politely refused and the warnings duly noted, and an all-Israel team took up residence in Cologne to tackle the $825 million reparations problem.

Whether Israel would have fared any better with the international experts is a question that misses the central point of the whole reparations story, as far as Shinnar is concerned. "The point," he said, "is that we had to show the Germans we could do it on our own and do it well. We had to eradicate the old stereotype of the Jew as a shopkeeper and peddler and replace it with the image of a new breed of Jew, politically independent and capable of building an economically workable state."

Considering the enormity of the task they faced, it is generally agreed that Shinnar and his group did a remarkable job. Certainly the mission ran a tight ship, holding administrative costs to 0.75 percent of the total while maintaining a staff that at one time numbered as many as 300. But some costly mistakes were made. The Israel Steel Works in Acre, built on the assumption that Israel could produce commercially acceptable steel from native ore, swallowed up $30 million in reparations. The ore may have been adequate in King Solomon's time but it falls somewhat short of 20th century standards, and steel production at Acre based on imported ore and fuel has been costing Israel $250 a ton—two to three times the price at which it can be bought on the world market.

The Government has attempted to rationalize the steelmaking venture as a standby defense installation to be used in the event of a war or an embargo on strategic materials. But a steel mill that must depend on imported raw materials to operate can be of little help against an embargo. Israel could have stockpiled a formidable supply of finished steel with the money it has cost to build and operate the Acre plant.

The end of reparations will unquestionably be felt, especially in the industrial sector, but it will not be a body blow to Israel's economy. The country is now too far advanced to be crippled by any single factor. Besides, the momentum of industrial development that German payments helped establish is now being carried forward at an accelerated pace by foreign investment. In the past 3 years alone, more than $435 million has poured into Israel in the form of Government-approved oversea investment. One of the major attractions the country has held for investors is its 1959 revised law for the encouragement of capital investments. Among other advantages, it allows oversea firms full repatriation of their profits in their own currency, a double depreciation allowance on their equipment, duty-free importation of raw materials, a 28-percent ceiling on corporate income taxes for the first 5 years of profitable operation, and Government loans of up to 50 percent on total capital outlay. This encouragement has been responsible for the entry of such companies as Studebaker, the Chemstrand Division of Monsanto International, E. W. Bliss, Leyland Motors of England, General Tire & Rubber, Miles Chemicals, Revlon, Fairbanks-Whitney, North American Rayon, Deere & Co., and Dayton Rubber.

This march of foreign firms into Israel has been notable for their willingness to ignore the Arab boycott, once a formidable deterrent to relations of any kind with Israel. The reasons are mainly economic. Aside from the incentives offered, oversea companies have found that Israel, with its per capita income of $700 a year, is a better market for their goods than the Arab countries, despite the vast disparity in population. Moreover, they have discovered that the Arabs eventually get around to buying what they need anyway.

Where Arab pressure has been attempted, oversea firms have stood up to it and managed to survive. Conrad Hilton recently informed the Egyptian Government that it could buy up his interests in the Cairo Hilton anytime it saw fit but that he was going ahead with the construction of his new hotel in Tel Aviv. The Cairo hotel has been the weak sister of the Hilton international family since its inception. Hilton expects to make money in Israel. No one, apparently, wants to repeat the mistake of Renault, which closed an active assembly plant in Israel in quest of the "larger" Arab market. Last year Renault sold a grand total of eight cars in Egypt. Studebaker, which moved in to fill the vacuum left by Renault's departure, is doing a profitable business among the less numerous but more affluent Israelis.

This injection of large doses of foreign investment capital has not yet enabled Israel to overcome a $400 million annual trade deficit, the inflationary effects of a recent currency devaluation, or its difficulties in finding common ground with its biggest customer, the Common Market. It has, however, added to a foreign currency reserve that now totals more than $600 million, which should enable the country to handle the payments now coming due on its independence and development bond issues. During 1963, the Government will redeem $24.5 million in independence bonds. Redemptions for 1964 are projected at $44.8 million. Current sales of more than $60 million a year in new development bonds should more than cover future payouts. Moreover, if the bondholders continue the present trend of cashing their bonds in Israel pounds for use on trips to Israel and to convert their matured bonds into Israel common stock and renewal bonds, future hard-currency outlays may be even smaller than anticipated.

THE COMMON MARKET QUESTION

Israel's big economic problem is its relations with the Common Market. The Six and the United Kingdom together absorb 43 percent of the country's exports, while supplying 45 percent of the products it buys. Any hope of reducing the current trade deficit from $400 to $250 million, as envisioned in the country's new 4-year economic program announced in February 1962, will depend upon Israel's ability to increase exports to Europe by 150 percent between now and 1966. The prospects for such an increase are not favorable. Three rounds of negotiations in Brussels aimed at agreement on a free-trade list of 150 export items essential to Israel have produced exactly three items—bathing suits, potash, and grapefruit. A Dutch plan that would have permitted a 25-percent tariff reduction on Israel goods exported to Europe in volume exceeding $250,000 annually, or $100,000 where the volume represented more than 50 percent of the total export of any single item, has been quietly shelved.

Israel is in no position to hurdle the 20-percent tariff barrier it will have to face by 1970 unless some arrangement is reached with Europe, nor can it hope to replace its European markets with expanded trade in North and South America, Asia, and Africa. "There is no question of replacement of markets involved here," according to Israel Gal-Edd, deputy director general of the ministry of commerce and industry and permanent member of Israel's negotiating team in Brussels. "Even if our difficulties with Europe were solved tomorrow, we would still have to triple our exports to every single one of these other markets in order to achieve our economic objectives."

These are the problems that will test Israel's skills, diplomatic and economic, in the months and years ahead. The reparations payments that saw the nation through the most critical decade of its independence are now part of Israel's past, as some day all such unilateral payments may be. Their termination has brought the country one step closer to the time when it must stand or fall on its own resources. But by being available when they were needed most, these unique voluntary payments by Germans in token expiation of an essentially incalculable debt may well have provided Israel with part of the economic strength it will need to cope with the demands of the future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the administrators of the foreign aid program do not make a case for themselves on the alleged success of foreign aid by citing Israel, because the other factors which I have mentioned explain in no small measure the reasons for the success of the economic recovery in Israel.

This morning in the Foreign Relations Committee we passed upon a very able and sound nomination of the President of the United States, that of Mr. Byroade, as the new Ambassador to Burma. As an ambassador he is bound to carry out the instructions and the policies of the administration. Therefore, when I asked the nominee in the hearing this morning whether it was his position that we should continue the foreign aid that we have been giving to Burma, I knew that I would receive an answer supporting the continuation of that foreign aid.

Obviously, that is his ambassadorial duty, so long as that is the policy of the administration. But I asked the question in order to point out—as I now point out from my desk in the Senate to the American people—that in continuing foreign aid to Burma, we continue to support a military dictatorship and we are supporting a good many military dictatorships in many parts of the world. The senior Senator from Oregon is opposed to supporting any military dictatorship anywhere in the world, including Burma.

I pointed out in my examination of the nominee for the ambassadorship to Burma—and a good nomination it is; I was pleased subsequently to vote for it and for a favorable report of it to the Senate—that the military dictator of Burma keeps in jail the former democratic leader of Burma, Mr. U Nu. Mr. U Nu is known by most of the Members of the Senate. He has been in Washington on several occasions. On one occasion, Mr. U Nu appeared at an informal meeting with many of us in the Committee on Foreign Relations. We met with him, as we do with many other distinguished officials from foreign governments when they come to the United States for a discussion, off the record, of U.S. relations with a given country—in this instance, Burma.

I expressed myself in the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, as I do now on the floor of the Senate, that I have great difficulty in reconciling the American foreign policy of giving military aid in support of a military dictator in Burma, a dictator who keeps in jail, at the very time we supply the aid, a former democratic leader of Burma. What answer did I get? I got the same answer that I always get from the State Department, an answer I have always rejected, and one that I reject now.

The answer on the part of the nominee—and this is State Department policy—was that he thought we ought to go ahead with the aid and fulfill the commitments we have made. That is a fallacious argument. It is based upon the false assumption that we should go ahead and fulfill foreign aid programs, no matter what happens in a country, after we make the commitments. The American people are entitled to better treatment than that. The American people, I say to my administration—for I am a member of the party of this administration—are entitled to a change in that policy.

The time is long overdue when the executive branch of the Government should make clear to the world that the United States will not continue to support a military dictatorship anywhere in the world. So far as I can see, with respect to human rights, there is no difference between a military dictatorship, Fascist in nature, and a Communist dictatorship. There are no human rights under any dictatorship. The policy of our Government to continue to support military dictatorships is costing us heavily in prestige around the world, because the policy proves us to be hypocritical. We cannot prate about supporting freedom and at the same time pour millions of dollars into any area of the world to support a military dictatorship.

That leads me to make a brief comment about South Vietnam. I am not at all impressed by the articles appearing in the newspapers today about the improvement in rapport between the Government of the United States and the Government of South Vietnam. Do you know why, Mr. President? It is because so long as Diem is the head of the Government of South Vietnam, we continue to support a tyrant, we continue to support a police-state dictator. We cannot justify that, in light of our professed ideals of seeking to support freedom for the masses of the people in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

I have said before, and shall continue to say as the historic debate on the foreign aid bill progresses, that the United States never should have gone into South Vietnam. I was opposed to our going into South Vietnam, because it was clear at the time that in going into South Vietnam, we were going in to support a tyrant, and we were going in alone.

We should get out of South Vietnam. I am not one who shudders and trembles at the knees when the blackmail argument is made that if we do not support its dictator, the country will go Communist. Let Khrushchev deal with dictators. They will cause him more trouble than they cause us. It is an unsound argument; it is a rationalization, seeking to justify an unsound policy, to argue that we ought to support Diem because if we do not, the Communists may take over. Everyone in this administration knows that if we withdrew our support from Diem, the anti-Communist forces in South Vietnam would throw him out within 90 days, and that hundreds of the exiles in Paris who are anti-Diem and anti-Communist would return to South Vietnam. Then there would be some chance of establishing in South Vietnam a moderate regime, anti-Communist in nature, but also democratic in purpose.

So I would have the United States get out of South Vietnam and save the American people the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars that our Government is pouring down that rat hole—and I use the descriptive phrase "rat hole" advisedly.

Also, it would save many precious American lives. There are places in this city that do not like to hear that said. They did not like to hear it when the senior Senator from Oregon spoke it the first time. But I shall continue to speak it. On the basis of the present policies that prevail there, South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy. The senior Senator from Oregon will not vote to continue to sacrifice the lives of American boys in South Vietnam.

Lastly, if the newspaper articles are accurate, I wish to say to Mr. Ball, the Under Secretary of State, before he even reaches the United States, that I find his newspaper reports most inconvincing in regard to Pakistan. They are most unconvincing. We should continue to make clear to Pakistan that there will be no foreign aid to that country so long as it continues to seek to build up ties between Pakistan and Red China.

If I read the news articles aright, and if the news articles are correct, Mr. Ball got no commitment from the so-called President of Pakistan. The word "President" in relation to the head of the Government of Pakistan should always be placed in quotation marks, because here again we are not dealing with a democrat; we are dealing with one who maintains a system of self-rule in Pakistan.

But I say to Mr. Ball and to the Secretary of State: So long as we do not have a commitment from Pakistan, one that is carried out in practice, not to build up its relations with Red China and provide for airplane landing rights and for various agreements in regard to defense, I am opposed to the sending of a single dollar of aid to Pakistan.

That is only part of my answer to the question the President of the United States raised some days ago, when he said to the American people that the opponents of foreign aid should tell where they believe cuts should be made. For weeks, I have been making a record of where the cuts should be made; and today I give him—again—part of my answer: Cut in Burma; cut in South Vietnam; cut in Pakistan. And in future speeches I will give him further suggestions.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate adjourn until Monday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, September 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 6, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

David Rabinovitz, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Wisconsin, vice Patrick T. Stone, deceased.

United Nations

The following-named persons to be representatives and alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1963:

To be representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Edna F. Kelly, U.S. Representative from the State of New York.

William S. Mailliard, U.S. Representative from the State of California.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

To be alternate representatives

Mercer Cook, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Niger.

Charles C. Stelle, of Maryland.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.

Mrs. Jane Warner Dick, of Illinois.

SENATE

Monday, September 9, 1963

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Judge of all men, in the fateful days which loom ahead for the Republic and for the world, we ask Thy enlightening grace upon the Members of this forum of our free land, which in the eyes of all the earth stands now in the valley of decision.

Thou who dost hate tyranny and any coercive fettering of the free will, hast made the mind and heart of each individual legislator a sacred inner closet to which the door is shut from all threats without, and where, in that hidden judgment hall, each steward of the Nation's welfare weighs the evidence, and then, even in a crowded chamber, deliberates and decides alone.

Give us such faith in the mental and moral integrity of those who by our side must face the same test and appraise the same testimony, that there will never be any doubt that divergent convictions grow out of the same pure patriotism.

Strengthen our belief that what is best for our America under God is best for the whole world, for Thou knowest that we have no dream of good for men and women and little children in our dear land that we do not passionately desire to share with all Thy children, of every race and kindred, beyond all the frowning frontiers of this now divided earth.

We ask it in the name of the Christ whose coming kingdom will unite all the sons of men. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington D.C. September 9, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

As in legislative session,

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 6, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk and had been printed in the RECORD on August 26, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Charles P. Sifton, of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, be permitted the privilege of the Senate floor during consideration of the nuclear test ban treaty. I make that request subject to concurrence by the distinguished minority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate is in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, there be a morning hour, and that statements in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today until 1 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BUDGET FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 32)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the District of Columbia, for fiscal year 1964, in the amount of $38,030,000, which, with the accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 283. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 482).

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 481)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon, together with the minority views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of July 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JULY 1963 AND JUNE 1963, AND PAY, JUNE 1963 AND MAY 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for July 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In July numbered	In June numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In June was—	In May was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,518,900	2,509,708	+9,192	$1,224,377	$1,363,047	−$138,670
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,467,237	1,459,684	+7,553	698,932	776,506	−77,574
Department of Defense	1,051,663	1,050,024	+1,639	585,445	586,541	−61,096
Inside the United States	2,356,384	2,346,936	+9,448			
Outside the United States	162,516	162,772	−256			
Industrial employment	562,025	561,153	+872			
Foreign nationals	162,374	163,619	−1,245	27,455	27,612	−157

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1963, and comparison with June 1963, and pay for June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	July	June	Increase	Decrease	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	116,679	[1] 115,795	884		$50,630	$54,675		$4 045
Commerce	32 494	32 358	136		17,073	20,443		3,370
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,487	81,063	1,424		40,077	43,054		2,977
Interior	70. 374	72,549		2,175	35,838	39,113		3,275
Justice	32. 288	32,081	207		19,394	22,043		2,649
Labor	9. 778	9. 581	197		5,216	5. 806		590
Post Office	590,133	587,161	2,972		260,272	287,938		27,666
State [2] [3]	43,053	42. 428	625		20,988	22. 854		1,866
Treasury	87,473	86,579	894		47,292	54,536		7,244
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	381	388		7	263	284		21
Bureau of the Budget	512	514		2	399	445		46
Council of Economic Advisers	51	61		10	36	38		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	77	1		38	48		10
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	30			25	27		2
National Security Council	41	39	2		30	35		5
Office of Emergency Planning	493	477	16		353	391		38
Office of Science and Technology	53	68		15	29	32		3
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations [4]	22		22					
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	19	10	9		4	3	$1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	36		10	21	24		3
American Battle Monuments Commission	434	422	12		89	92		3
Atomic Energy Commission	7,274	7,121	153		5,225	5,651		426
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	633	622	11		379	428		49
Civil Aeronautics Board	855	851	4		601	683		82
Civil Service Commission	4,081	4,085		4	2,386	2,675		289
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	7		1	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	92	79	13		46	53		7
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	3		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	304	300	4		286	257	29	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238			166	183		17
Federal Aviation Agency	46,549	46,337	212		30,700	33,150		2,450
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	5		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,538	1,515	23		957	1,067		110
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,247	1,236	11		755	868		113
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,257	1,252	5		796	883		87
Federal Maritime Commission	251	251			162	188		26
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	403	398	5		322	366		44
Federal Power Commission	1,222	1,218	4		787	860		73
Federal Trade Commission	1,176	1,177		1	771	881		110
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	147	144	3		70	78		8
General Accounting Office	4,651	4,647	4		2,820	3,157		337
General Services Administration	32,871	32,652	219		15,028	16,745		1,717
Government Printing Office	7,210	7,214		4	4,088	4,524		436
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,302	14,160	142		8,285	9,427		1,142
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			23	21	2	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,426	2,427		1	1,544	1,767		223
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,582	29,937	645		20,368	22,888		2,520
National Capital Housing Authority	434	453		19	193	219		26
National Capital Planning Commission	66	69		3	46	41	5	
National Capital Transportation Agency	82	86		4	56	62		6
National Gallery of Art	318	315	3		125	148		23
National Labor Relations Board	2,052	1,982	70		1,302	1,498		196
National Mediation Board	136	143		7	131	130	1	
National Science Foundation	1,071	1,099		28	644	690		46
Panama Canal	15,031	14,966	65		4,988	5,144		156
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	58	56	2		36	38		2
Railroad Retirement Board	2,002	1,995	7		1,040	1,173		133
Renegotiation Board	222	223		1	165	191		26
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	165	163	2		95	104		9
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,404	1,388	16		876	1,005		129
Selective Service System	6,926	6,916	10		2,068	2,369		301
Small Business Administration	3,406	3,387	19		2,008	2,272		264
Smithsonian Institution	1,633	1,615	18		720	786		66
Soldiers' Home	1,075	1,073	2		344	372		28
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	[5] 20	20			13	22		9
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	25			20	22		2
Tariff Commission	290	288	2		192	212		20
Tax Court of the United States	157	157			118	127		9
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,017	18,075		58	10,331	11,533		1,202
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	155	153	2		109	145		36
U.S. Information Agency	11,957	11,793	164		5,345	5,334	11	
Veterans' Administration	173,612	172,903	709		73,132	83,976		10,844
Virgin Islands Corporation	674	721		47	187	194		7
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,467,237	1,459,684	9,950	2,397	698,932	776,506	49	77,623
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			7,553				77,574	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,252	2,247	5		1,656	1,805		149
Department of the Army	376,596	375,933	663		186,255	203,023		16,768
Department of the Navy	344,682	343,971	711		177,910	200,583		22,673
Department of the Air Force	297,154	296,982	172		144,293	164,554		20,261
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,002	2,006		4	941	1,072		131
Defense Communications Agency	587	572	15		352	293	59	
Defense Supply Agency	25,070	25,032	38		12,082	13,106		1,024
Office of Civil Defense	1,133	1,133			812	920		108
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1		31	36		5
Interdepartmental activities	13	12	1		7	9		2

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1963, and comparison with June 1963, and pay for June 1963, and comparison with May 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	July	June	Increase	Decrease	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense—Continued								
International military activities	59	59			$38	$41		$3
Armed Forces information and education activities	425	421	4		203	228		25
Classified activities	1,650	1,617	33		865	871		6
Total, Department of Defense	1,051,663	1,050,024	1,643	4	525,445	586,541	$59	61,155
Net change, Department of Defense			1,639				61,096	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [6] [7]	2,518,900	2,509,708	11,593	2,401	1,224,377	1,363,047	108	138,778
Net change, including Department of Defense			9,192				138,670	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] July figure includes 17,206 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 16,782 in June and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The July figure includes 4,660 of these trust fund employees and the June figure includes 4,689.

[3] July figure includes 1,151 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,121 in June and their pay.

[4] Employees and functions of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations transferred from White House Office effective July 1, 1963. Agency originally created pursuant to Executive Order 11106 dated Apr. 18, 1963.

[5] Subject to revision.

[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[7] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	July	June	Change
Agriculture Department	1,655	3,291	−1,636
Interior Department	267	3,681	−3,414
Tennessee Valley Authority	68	158	−90
Veterans' Administration		39	−39
Department of the Army		242	−242
Total	1,990	7,411	−5,421

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	115,491	[1] 114,601	890	
Commerce	31,822	31,692	130	
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,838	80,439	1,399	
Interior	69,854	72,028		2,174
Justice	31,916	31,723	193	
Labor	9,675	9,478	197	
Post Office	588,673	585,710	2,963	
State [2] [3]	11,137	10,868	269	
Treasury	86,853	85,949	904	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	381	388		7
Bureau of the Budget	512	514		2
Council of Economic Advisers	51	61		10
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	77	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	30		
National Security Council	41	39	2	
Office of Emergency Planning	493	477	16	
Office of Science and Technology	53	68		15
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations [4]	22		22	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	19	10	9	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	36		10
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	6	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,237	7,088	149	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	633	622	11	
Civil Aeronautics Board	854	850	4	
Civil Service Commission	4,078	4,081		3
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	7		1
Commission on Civil Rights	92	79	13	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	304	300	4	
Farm Credit Administration	238	238		
Federal Aviation Agency	45,492	45,289	203	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,536	1,513	23	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,245	1,234	11	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,257	1,252	5	
Federal Maritime Commission	251	251		
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	403	398	5	
Federal Power Commission	1,222	1,218	4	
Federal Trade Commission	1,176	1,177		1
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	104	[1] 101	3	
General Accounting Office	4,550	4,551		1
General Services Administration	32,850	32,639	211	
Government Printing Office	7,210	7,214		4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,112	13,970	142	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,426	2,427		1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,571	29,926	645	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Housing Authority	434	453		19
National Capital Planning Commission	66	69		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	82	86		4
National Gallery of Art	318	315	3	
National Labor Relations Board	2,019	1,949	70	
National Mediation Board	136	143		7
National Science Foundation	1,057	1,085		28
Panama Canal	163	169		6
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	58	56	2	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,002	1,995	7	
Renegotiation Board	222	223		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	165	163	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,404	1,388	16	
Selective Service System	6,776	6,765	11	
Small Business Administration	3,350	3,331	19	
Smithsonian Institution	1,614	1,598	16	
Soldiers' Home	1,075	1,073	2	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	[5] 20	20		
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	25		
Tariff Commission	290	288	2	
Tax Court of the United States	157	157		
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,016	18,074		58
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	155	153	2	
U.S. Information Agency	3,362	3,304	58	
Veterans' Administration	172,618	171,910	708	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,402,438	1,395,446	9,347	2,355
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,992	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,188	2,183	5	
Department of the Army	328,264	327,072	1,192	
Department of the Navy	320,309	319,686	623	
Department of the Air Force	272,256	271,706	550	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,002	2,006		4
Defense Communications Agency	560	546	14	
Defense Supply Agency	25,070	25,032	38	
Office of Civil Defense	1,133	1,133		
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1	
Interdepartmental activities	12	11	1	
International military activities	37	38		1
Armed Forces information and education activities	425	421	4	
Classified activities	1,650	1,617	33	
Total, Department of Defense	953,946	951,490	2,461	5
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,456	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,356,384	2,346,936	11,808	2,360
Net increase, including Department of Defense			9,448	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] July figure includes 2,990 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,731 in June.

[3] July figure includes 785 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 758 in June.

[4] Employees and functions of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations transferred from White House Office effective July 1, 1963. Agency originally created pursuant to Executive Order 11106 dated Apr. 18, 1963.

[5] Subject to revision.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,188	1,194		6
Commerce	672	666	6	
Health, Education, and Welfare	649	624	25	
Interior	520	521		1
Justice	372	358	14	
Labor	103	103		
Post Office	1,460	1,451	9	
State [1] [2]	31,916	31,560	356	
Treasury	620	630		10
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	427	416	11	
Atomic Energy Commission	37	33	4	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	3	4		1
Federal Aviation Agency	1,057	1,048	9	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	43	[3] 43		
General Accounting Office	101	96	5	
General Services Administration	21	13	8	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	190	190		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	11	11		
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	14	14		
Panama Canal	14,868	14,797	71	1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	150	151		
Small Business Administration	56	56		
Smithsonian Institution	17	17		
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1		
U.S. Information Agency	8,597	8,489	108	
Veterans' Administration	994	993	1	
Virgin Islands Corporation	674	721		47
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,799	64,238	627	66
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			561	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	64	64		
Department of the Army	48,332	48,861		529
Department of the Navy	24,373	24,285	88	
Department of the Air Force	24,898	25,276		378
Defense Communications Agency	27	26	1	
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International military activities	22	21	1	
Total, Department of Defense	97,717	98,534	90	907
Net decrease, Department of Defense				817
Grand total, including Department of Defense	162,516	162,772	717	973
Net decrease, including Department of Defense				256

[1] July figure includes 14,216 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,051 in June. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The July figure includes 4,660 of these trust fund employees and the June figure includes 4,689.

[2] July figure includes 366 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 363 in June.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*

Department or agency	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,998	3,951	47	
Commerce	5,816	5,858		42
Interior	9,104	9,532		428
Post Office	271	257	14	
Treasury	5,255	5,194	61	
Independent agencies.				
Atomic Energy Commission	281	276	5	
Federal Aviation Agency	3,042	3,037	5	
General Services Administration	1,735	1,721	14	
Government Printing Office	7,210	7,214		4
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,542	29,937	605	
Panama Canal	7,620	7,466	154	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	164	162	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,825	14,805	20	
Virgin Islands Corporation	674	721		47
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,537	90,131	927	521
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			406	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 134,816	[2] 134,525	291	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,077	[2] 4,122		45
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,903	197,513	390	
Outside the United States	1,265	1,271		6
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	130,513	130,640		127
Outside the United States	1,123	1,130		7
Defense Supply Agency: Inside the United States	1,791	1,821		30
Total, Department of Defense	471,488	471,022	681	215
Net increase, Department of Defense			466	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	562,025	561,153	1,608	736
Net increase, including Department of Defense			872	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of July 1963 and comparison with June 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	July	June	July	June	July	June	July	June
Canada	35	35					35	35
Crete	62	63					62	63
England	3,003	2,990			122	123	2,881	2,867
France	21,289	21,260	17,455	17,550	11	11	3,823	3,699
Germany	78,722	79,262	66,631	67,179	84	85	12,007	11,998
Greece	255	250					255	250
Japan	50,631	51,308	17,806	18,220	14,448	[1] 14,555	18,377	18,533
Korea	6,202	6,202	6,202	6,202				
Morocco	1,567	1,642			747	751	820	891
Netherlands	56	52					56	52
Trinidad	552	555			552	555		
Total	162,374	163,619	108,094	109,151	15,964	16,080	38,316	38,388

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government reached its all-time high in fiscal year 1963 which ended June 30, and average employment over the full 12 months was at its highest point since fiscal year 1954.

Federal civilian payroll costs during the year totaled $15,346 million plus $334 million in U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls. The personal service cost of the Government exceeded $1 billion a month for the fifth consecutive year.

The payroll cost for employment by civilian agencies in fiscal year 1963 was $8,742 million and for civilian employment in military agencies was $6,604 million.

Figures by fiscal years since 1954 follow:

Annual Federal expenditures for civilian payroll, executive branch, fiscal years 1954–63

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Civilian agencies	Department of Defense [1] (civilian employment)	Total
1954	4, 865	4, 588	9, 453
1955	4, 921	4, 700	9, 621
1956	5, 359	5, 167	10, 526
1957	5, 602	5, 399	11, 000
1958	6, 040	5, 415	11, 455
1959	6, 564	5, 766	12, 330
1960	6, 877	5, 760	12, 637
1961	7, 622	6, 026	13, 648
1962	7, 978	6, 318	14, 296
1963	8, 742	6, 604	15, 346

[1] Excludes U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on regular rolls.

Employment by executive branch agencies during fiscal year 1963 (ended June 30) averaged 2,493,374 as compared with an average of 2,443,808 in the previous year. Employment by civilian agencies averaged 1,429,654, an increase of 44,522 as compared with an average of 1,385,132 in the previous year. Civilian employment by military agencies averaged 1,063,720, an increase of 5,045 as compared with an average of 1,158,675 in the previous year.

Average employment by fiscal years since 1954 follows:

Average civilian employment, by Federal agencies, executive branch, fiscal years 1954–63

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Civilian agencies	Department of Defense [1] (civilian employment)	Total
1954	1, 183, 389	1, 252, 775	2, 436, 164
1955	1, 182, 663	1, 184, 627	2, 367, 290
1956	1, 189, 458	1, 174, 584	2, 364, 042
1957	1, 219, 835	1, 174, 263	2, 394, 099
1958	1, 242, 941	1, 104, 403	2, 347, 344
1959	1, 266, 566	1, 085, 676	2, 352, 242
1960	1, 331, 605	1, 054, 740	2, 386, 345
1961	1, 335, 089	1, 037, 356	2, 372, 445
1962	1, 385, 132	1, 058, 675	2, 443, 808
1963	1, 429, 654	1, 063, 720	2, 493, 374

[1] Excludes foreign nationals not on regular rolls (averaging 168,281 during fiscal year 1963).

JULY 1963 EMPLOYMENT

Monthly reports on personnel certified to the committee showed civilian employment by executive agencies of the Federal Government during July totaled 2,518,900, compared with 2,509,708 in June. This was a net increase of 9,192, including a net decrease of 5,421 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87–658.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Post Office Department with 2,972; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 1,424; Treasury Department with 894, and Agriculture Department with 884. The largest decrease was reported by Interior Department with 2,175.

Total employment inside the United States in July was 2,356,384, an increase of 9,448 as compared with June. Total employment outside the United States was 162,516, a decrease of 256 as compared with June.

Employment by civilian agencies in July totaled 1,467,237, an increase of 7,553 over June. Civilian employment by military agencies in July totaled 1,051,663, an increase of 1,639 as compared with June.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,518,900 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 162,374 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during July who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in June was 163,619. A breakdown of this employment for July follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	35	--------	--------	35
Crete	62	--------	--------	62
England	3, 003	--------	122	2, 881
France	21, 289	17, 455	11	3, 823
Germany	78, 722	66, 631	84	12, 007
Greece	255	--------	--------	255
Japan	50, 631	17, 806	14, 448	18, 377
Korea	6, 202	6, 202	--------	--------
Morocco	1, 567	--------	747	820
Netherlands	56	--------	--------	56
Trinidad	552	--------	552	--------
Total	162, 374	108, 094	15, 964	38, 316

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated August 22, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2124. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the tenure, salary, and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2125. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2126. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to permit a widow of an employee, in certain cases, to qualify for a widow's annuity notwithstanding her remarriage; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2127. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of annual earnings includible in determining benefits, to strengthen the actuarial status of the Disability Trust Fund, to increase the amount that recipients of benefits may earn without suffering deductions from their benefits, to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in case of a child attending school, to liberalize the conditions under which disability benefits are payable, provide for payment of certain disabled widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

GOLD MINING REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry. This bill, I hope, will provide an answer some of us have been seeking to the grave problems encountered by the American gold mining industry.

On July 15, 16, and 17, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I conducted hearings on measures introduced earlier in this session to aid the gold mining industry. These bills were S. 1273, which I introduced together with other distinguished Members of the Senate, and S. 100, introduced by Senator DOMINICK.

S. 1273 and S. 100 represent means of attempting to restore the moribund domestic gold mining industry to life. I believe both of these bills are sound proposals which, if enacted, would be helpful in achieving increased production of gold by American gold miners.

However, in the course of the exhaustive study which the subcommittee made during the hearings on this legislation it became apparent that another plan, embodied in the bill I introduce today, might be more effective in overcoming the essential obstacles to increase productivity in the gold mines and the opposition of the Treasury Department than the proposals in the legislation then before us. This bill is designed to overcome the most serious detriment to successful gold mining today—that of greatly increased costs of producing a commodity for which the price was set by its only customer, the U.S. Government—in 1934.

Accordingly, I call the attention of the Congress to this new bill, on which I expect to hold hearings in the near future, to obtain the reaction of the gold mining industry, Members of Congress, representatives of the executive branch of Government, and others who are or should be concerned with the survival of this sector of the economy.

The purpose of the Gold Mine Revitalization Act is to compensate producers who sell gold in the United States for the difference in costs of production of this mineral today and the costs which were incurred for the same operations in 1940. The year 1940 is chosen as a base year because that was the year of our history when American mining reached its peak of production.

It was on January 31, 1934, President Roosevelt issued Proclamation No. 2072, which reduced the weight of gold in the U.S. dollar and effectively set the price of gold for all purposes, monetary and otherwise, for domestic gold miners at $35 an ounce.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that the gold mining industry is the only industrial enterprise in our free American economy for which the price at which it can sell its product is rigidly set by Government fiat.

No other American industry is required to operate on the basis of a price for its product set in 1934, nearly 30 years ago, and, to all intents and purposes, unchangeable.

It is apparent the cost of all components of production of gold—labor, equipment, construction, transportation, and other expenses have multiplied manifold. Yet, the gold miner is expected to produce in a situation in which profit is impossible, because costs of operation have gone far beyond the income which can be earned from sale of the product at the price compelled by this Government.

The bill I have introduced today would change this by authorizing the Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, to support the cost of producing gold to the extent this cost exceeds that of equivalent operations in 1940. The bill contemplates that payments to gold miners would be carefully limited to amounts actually required to allow profitable operation and only where the producer demonstrates that costs of efficient operation are so excessive a reasonable profit cannot be earned in the absence of assistance. In other words, gold miners would not reap a bonanza, but would be allowed help they need to produce gold.

This approach has the advantage of leaving the price of gold for all purposes, commercial and otherwise, at the established $35 an ounce. Thus, the risk is avoided that domestic producers would lose markets because of a rise in price.

Also, this proposal is designed to circumvent the stubborn resistance of the Department of the Treasury in both this and previous administrations, to legislation to aid gold miners on grounds this would, in some mysterious way, affect the value of the U.S. dollar.

The premise of the legislation is that the expressed interest of the U.S. Government in maintaining, for all time, the price of gold at $35 an ounce for purposes of international financial stability, requires the Government to finance the deficit incurred in its production by private operators.

I believe this premise is entirely justifiable, since the reasons gold miners now find themselves in their present plight are entirely the result of actions of the Government. I referred above to the Presidential proclamation of 1934 establishing the price of gold at its immovable level. While this is the root cause of the decline in the gold mining industry, gold miners suffered a devastating blow by governmental fiat during World War II which was, to all intents and purposes, a fatal stroke. I refer to the War Production Board Order No. L-208 of October 9, 1942, which shut down American gold mines completely. Gold miners who might have otherwise survived, even with the strict limitation on price of their product, could not finance the expensive operations required to reopen mines closed by this order. This was, in fact, the virtual death knell of gold mining in the United States. After having reached its highest level of production in 1940, when domestic mines produced 4,862,979 fine ounces of gold, gold mining declined to a virtual standstill during the World War II years. The industry has never recovered. In 1961, our domestic production declined to its lowest peacetime level since the high-water mark of 1940, and there is presently nothing to indicate that its steady downward trend can be reversed without swift and strong action by the Government.

Our Government, having taken action directly causative of the injury suffered by the gold mining industry, has a direct responsibility for mitigating the damage. While support of agricultural crops, subsidies to shipping and airlines, aid to depressed areas in general, and all manner of Federal benefits are now taken for granted in our domestic economy, I deeply believe that the gold mining industry has the strongest case of all for Government assistance. The reasons for its difficulties, as outlined above, are clear. There is no doubt of its need for help.

Certainly, this casualty of the Second World War on the domestic scene is more fully entitled to help than the myriad foreign nations to whom we have given so generously of our resources since that war. It was, after the Second World War, our unselfish and altruistic policy to go to the help, without stint, of our Allies and even our enemies in the past conflict. Even after their recovery, our policy of aiding over a hundred countries of the world, without even the reason that they were damaged during the war, has cost us untold billions of dollars.

Certainly, the domestic gold mining industry deserves aid from the Government. I believe this bill is a means of providing that which is needed. I hope we shall obtain early and favorable action upon it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until September 16, for additional cosponsers. I invite those who share my concern for the gold mining industry to join with me in sponsoring the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 2125) to revitalize the American gold mining industry, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

IMPROVEMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the social security program. My bill would provide for long-range improvements in the scale of general benefits. It would remove a number of existing inequities. In all, approximately 2 million social security recipients would benefit next year, alone. It provides for financing the cost of the improvements.

For the past 2 years, medicare has been the major consideration of Congress in the social security field. It is doubtful, I am afraid, that Congress will complete action on medicare legislation this year, although much depends upon how long we stay in session. I have, of course, supported in the past, and continue to support, health-care legislation. But, in addition, I believe we should also give attention to a number of existing inequities in the social security law and to its long-range adequacy.

No legislation can meet every need, remove every obstacle, pay every bill. But my bill is an effort to help resolve some of the more troublesome inadequacies and inconsistencies.

In substance, the bill—

First, helps those who wish to continue to work past retirement age, by permitting them to earn $1,800 a year, without losing social security benefits, rather than $1,200, which is the present ceiling on outside earnings. Beyond this improvement, the bill would reduce the present penalty on outside earnings between $1,800 and $2,400 a year by allowing retention of $1 in benefits for every $2 earned between these amounts. The provision, as a whole, would, in the first year of operation, materially assist about 900,000 social security beneficiaries.

For some, forced retirement creates more than financial hardship, important as that is. People are living longer, and feeling better for it, than at any time in the history of man. Forcing them out of the work force before their time often destroys their sense of usefulness, stability, and personal worth.

Second, provides an increase in the earnings base on which taxes are levied and benefits paid from the first $4,800 of income to $5,400. This would increase the maximum family benefit from $254 to $274, and the maximum benefits for the individual worker from $127 to $137. In the first year alone, this provision would benefit 700,000 family members; and eventually, all who receive social security will benefit.

This change is required in order to keep up with increases in the cost of living and to maintain a closer relationship between current salaries of workers prior to retirement and the amount of benefits on which they must live following retirement.

Third, pays benefits for children up to age 22, instead of 18 years, if the children are full-time students. When these benefits were established in 1940, it was presumed that, by age 18, a child would have completed his schooling and would be capable of supporting himself. This is no longer true.

The number of professional, technical, and other jobs requiring higher educational qualifications is growing at a much greater rate than the number of unskilled jobs.

A study made by the U.S. Office of Education in 1956 and a 1960 study by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan each showed that about 60 percent of the cost of college attendance came from family contributions. Another Office of Education study, published in 1958, reported that lack of financial resources was a major cause of college dropouts. And families that have lost the earnings of the family breadwinner are more likely to lack financial resources than are other families.

Not only may the child be prevented from going to college by loss of parental support and loss of his benefits; he may also be prevented from finishing high school. There are in the country about 500,000 high school students who have passed their 18th birthday. In April 1960, almost half of the students enrolled in the 12th grade were age 18 or older.

This provision would benefit, in its first year, 350,000 individuals who otherwise would be ineligible.

Fourth, eliminates a serious restriction in the payment of disability insurance benefits, by assuring benefits to an insured worker who has been totally disabled for a continuous period of between 150 and 180 days, for each additional month in which the worker continues to be totally disabled. Under present law, disability benefits are not paid unless the worker's disability is expected either to result in death or to continue to be total for an indefinite period. In the first year, this provision and the following one would bring benefits to a total of 585,000 disabled workers.

Fifth, reduces from the present 6 months to 4 months the waiting period for disability benefits. Under this provision, disability benefits could be paid beginning with the fifth full month of disability, not the seventh, as under the present law; and a worker's first check would reach him within 150 to 180 days after being disabled.

Sixth, provides benefits for disabled widows. Under existing law, a widow, whether healthy or disabled, cannot receive social security benefits until she reaches age 62. Yet a widow who is disabled needs money to live on at least as much as does a widow who can work. My bill requires that in order to be eligible for benefits, a widow must be disabled either at the time of her husband's death or within a 7-year period after his death. This would cover 60,000 widows, next year.

Seventh, corrects certain technical aspects of the retirement test which under present law, bar some beneficiaries from receiving benefits upon reaching age 72.

On the cost side, the bill would require expenditures from the social security trust fund amounting to .39 percent of payroll. Of this, .24 percent would be financed by the provision, which I have already described, increasing from $4,800, as at present, to $5,400 the portion of an individual's annual earnings which are taxed and credited for social security benefits.

The remainder of the benefits would be financed by substituting decimals for fractions in determining future tax rates. This change would not only have the effect of increasing slightly the income to the trust fund; it would also be consistent with the change already made under the amendments of 1961 in the social security rates for self-employed people. Furthermore, it would simplify the computation of taxes.

My bill also permits transfer of social security income from the old age and survivors insurance fund to the disability fund, thus assuring stability for both funds in the light of the cost of my amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2127) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of annual earnings includible in determining benefits, to strengthen the actuarial status of the Disability Trust Fund, to increase the amount that recipients of benefits may earn without suffering deductions from their benefits, to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in case of a child attending school, to liberalize the conditions under which disability benefits are payable, provide for payment of certain disabled widows, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Case, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON WAURIKA RESERVOIR, BEAVER CREEK, OKLA. (S. DOC. NO. 33)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated May 6, 1963, from the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Waurika Reservoir, Beaver Creek, Okla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO DISAPPROVAL OF ITEMS IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 28, 1963, the names of Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Scott were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 114) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and other Senators) on August 28, 1963.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that on Friday the Senate received the following named persons to be Representatives and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1963:

REPRESENTATIVES

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Edna F. Kelly, U.S. Representative from the State of New York.

William S. Mailliard, U.S. Representative from the State of California.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES

Mercer Cook, American Ambassador to the Republic of Niger.

Charles C. Stelle, of Maryland.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.

Mrs. Jane Warner Dick, of Illinois.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement by him, relating to the activities of the International Road Federation.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

Statement by him, relating to Save Your Vision Week.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 330. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that after the expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program, approval of courses under the war orphans'

educational assistance program shall be by State approving agencies;

S. 495. An act for the relief of Evanthia Christou;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 657. An act for relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Marija Lovsin;

S. 1154. An act to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., in Minnesota;

S. 1185. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.;

S. 1230. An act for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson;

S. 1489. An act for the relief of J. Arthur Fields; and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968.

ALLEGED USE OF AID GASOLINE BY RUSSIAN PLANES FLYING TO CUBA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, about 2 months ago I received a report charging that under our foreign aid program we were furnishing gasoline which was going to Conacry, Guinea, and that at the same time Guinea had an arrangement with Russia to use this point as a refueling station for their planes en route to Cuba. Allegedly the fuel which we were giving to this country under our aid program was going into the same tanks from which these Russian planes were being refueled.

Under date of July 29, I referred this allegation to Mr. David E. Bell, the administrator of our foreign aid program, and asked for either a denial or an explanation.

Under date of August 26, 1963, I received a three-page reply from AID; but this reply was marked "secret," and it had to be signed for in my office with the promise that I would not release it.

Without violating this classification of secrecy, I can quote the second paragraph of their reply, wherein they said:

> The allegation that AID has been paying for fuel for use in Soviet aircraft transiting Guinea on flights to Cuba, mentioned in your letter, is unfounded. The following facts are pertinent:

Mr. President, if that is a true statement, then why place a "cloak of secrecy" on the three pages outlining the true facts of the case? What are they afraid of? I see nothing in this letter which could in any way jeopardize the security of this country, and I flatly reject the right of this administration to place a cloak of secrecy on an operation that it thinks might look bad to the public.

Under the circumstances, however, I have no choice other than to withhold the contents of the reply; however, the Kennedy administration cannot classify my own letter.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of my letter directed to Mr. Bell, under date of July 9, 1963; and I most respectfully suggest to him that as the Administrator of the Agency for International Development he remember that the American taxpayers pay for this foreign aid, and have a right to read this full report and then determine for themselves whether these allegations are true or false.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1963.

MR. DAVID E. BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELL: I have received a report alleging that under our AID program we are paying for gasoline which is going to Conacry, Guinea, and that this gasoline is in turn being furnished by Guinea for use in Russian planes which fly to Cuba. Allegedly this involves some kind of trade between Guinea and Russia.

I would appreciate a report as to the accuracy of this allegation.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the situation in South Vietnam is rapidly worsening. Recent newspaper articles have graphically called our attention to the fact that American support of the unpopular Diem regime is not only proving futile in South Vietnam itself, but is undermining our moral position throughout the world. I ask unanimous consent to have the following articles printed at this point in the RECORD: Two articles published in the New York Times of September 9, and written by Tad Szulc and James Reston; an article written by Robert Trumbull, and published in the New York Times of September 7; and an article, written by Malcom Browne of the Associated Press, entitled: "United States Is Losing Many Friends in South Vietnam," and published in the Washington Post of September 7.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 9, 1963]

UNITED STATES CONSIDERING CUT IN SAIGON AID TO FORCE REFORM

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The United States is understood to have decided to cut its aid to South Vietnam if the Government there fails to change its attitudes drastically.

This major decision, reported today on high authority, is said to reflect the administration's deep conviction that the war against Communist guerrillas cannot be won under the present circumstances.

Continued aid, it is said, would no longer serve its original purpose without reforms in the Government.

Until now the administration has maintained that the war in Vietnam is its overriding concern and that any reduction of American assistance would compromise Vietnam's military posture.

Now, however, authoritative quarters said, the United States is prepared to consider selective aid cuts, fully aware of taking a calculated risk that might injure the Vietnamese military capacity.

NO DEADLINE REPORTED

No time limit has been set, as far as is known, for President Ngo Dinh Diem to institute the changes, aimed at recovering popular support.

But the administration's new position is reported to have been clearly conveyed to the President and to his brother Ngo Dinh Nhu, the politically powerful chief of the secret police, whom Washington links most closely to the August 21 raids on Buddhist pagodas. The United States now awaits the brothers' reaction.

Informants here stressed that no actual ultimatum had been presented to the Government in Saigon and that no specific demands, such as the removal of Ngo Dinh Nhu from his position of power, had been made.

Instead, it was said, the Vietnamese Government has been advised that the United States, for practical reasons and to guard its political posture at home and abroad, cannot go on supporting the prevailing state of affairs.

POPULAR BACKING STRESSED

The American view, as expressed by President Kennedy in a television interview last Monday, is that because of its repression of Buddhists and students last month and because of its continued stern attitude, the government of Ngo Dinh Diem is losing the loyalty of the Vietnamese population.

Thus, in Washington's view, it cannot hope for victory in a guerrilla war in the countryside, where peasants' allegiance is crucial.

While the administration regards Ngo Dinh Nhu and his wife as principal instigators of the current crisis, the U.S. pressure for changes in Saigon is said to go far beyond their removal from the Government.

To conduct the war with the support of the population, it is said here, the Saigon Government must abandon its authoritarian behavior not only in relation to the Buddhists but in all fields.

UNITED STATES WANTS MAJOR SHIFT

At this crossroads in its relationship with Ngo Dinh Diem, the United States seeks a basic change and not merely concessions, real or apparent, to the Buddhists.

The unrest in Vietnam was emphasized again yesterday by the arrest of 800 high school students in demonstrations in Saigon. The tension convinced the administration long ago that the underlying political problem of Vietnam transcended the dispute between the Roman Catholic Ngo family in the regime and the country's Buddhist majority.

"We cannot go on supporting a dictatorial regime," one official remarked today, "that is different from communism only in name and in its international connections."

For this reason, policymakers here say they do not regard the continued presence of the Ngo Dinh Nhus in the Government, or their removal, as the exclusive consideration.

It was underlined here, however, that the administration did not propose to set itself up as the sole arbiter of whether the regime had become acceptable to the population.

POLICY HELD FLEXIBLE

If changes are made—and no one in the administration was prepared to venture predictions now—the United States is expected to be guided by Vietnamese reactions in its next decisions on how to deal with the regime.

The decision to reconsider the aid policy was reported to have been reached painfully late last week in response to at least three developments.

One was said to be a realization that earlier pressures on the Government to mend its ways and reshuffle the Government had failed. The inability of the United States to induce Vietnamese military chiefs to take control is also mentioned.

Although this awareness was disappointing to Washington, the administration does not believe that its lack of success in the "first phase" implies the collapse of its policy on Saigon.

There is no thought here of accepting the regime in its present character or of seeking an accommodation with it. On the contrary, it has said, Saigon's defiance of the United States has led to the decision for progressive aid cuts if the Government does not profoundly reform.

The second basis of the decision is the realization here that the continued identification of the United States with the Vietnamese Government is increasingly compromising its politcial position in Vietnam and throughout Asia.

Officials noted that in yesterday's student demonstrations anti-United States slogans were shouted for the first time.

The third factor is the administration's belief that the public and congressional opinion would not tolerate much longer extensive aid to a dictatorial regime.

BELL OUTLINES POLICY

Aid to Vietnam this year will be close to $500 million. Of this, $207 million is economic assistance and support for defense. The rest is direct military aid, mainly in equipment and fuel. The United States also maintains nearly 14,000 military advisers to the Vietnamese Army.

This point was specifically made by David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. On the television program "Issues and Answers" over the American Broadcasting Co. network, he said today: "We want very much to be able to continue to join in an effective program to defeat the Communist guerrillas."

But he added, "It seems to me that it is necessary to recognize that the attitude of important Members of Congress and of the people of this country generally, certainly is cause for concern as to whether, in the absence of the kind of changes we would like to see, we could continue the program unchanged."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 9, 1963]

WASHINGTON IS PRIVATELY UPSET BUT IS PUBLICLY SILENT ON FINANCING

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The Kennedy administration was privately annoyed but publicly silent tonight about reports that it was continuing to finance the South Vietnamese special forces that recently raided Buddhist pagodas.

Officials here were vehement in their denials that U.S. funds were going from the Central Intelligence Agency to the special troops of Ngo Dinh Nhu, President Ngo Dinh Diem's adviser. But they were not prepared to take public responsibility for their private denials, apparently because they simply do not know precisely what is being done by the CIA in Saigon.

As far as can be determined here the situation is as follows:

First, there is increasing pressure not only within the executive branch of the Government but from the Congress to cut aid to South Vietnam. It is felt here that this is the only pressure the Kennedy administration has on Ngo Dinh Diem to change his policies.

Second, payments over the last fortnight have been continuing as before to the special forces, part of which were responsible for carrying out the pagoda raids. It is pointed out here, however, that some units of the special forces are engaged in the guerrilla warfare against the Communists of Vietcong to the south and north of the South Vietnamese capital of Saigon.

What annoys officials here in the light of this, is the suggestion that Washington on the one hand is calling for the replacement of Ngo Dinh Nhu and at the same time has decided to continue paying the forces that he is using to carry out his policies.

For the time being, it is conceeded here, this situation may exist. The trend of policy in Washington, however, is not to continue supporting Ngo Dinh Nhu and his forces, but to reduce aid. It merely happens to be the fact that, pending a decision about how aid is to be reduced, no specific decision has been made to cut off support from the special forces.

It is pointed out in Washington that 95 percent of the aid to the South Vietnamese Government has been "open aid." No one denies that the CIA is involved in the Vietnam operations, but this, officials here assert, is a very small part of U.S. aid. They also observe that the U.S. intelligence people will not have the power to support Ngo Dinh Nhu's forces if the State Department orders aid cut.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 7, 1963]

SUCCESS A DIEM HABIT

(By Robert Trumbull)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, September 6.—President Ngo Dinh Diem's latest defeat of U.S. pressure to reform his authoritarian regime follows a pattern going back to his assumption of power from the former puppet emperor, Bao Dai, in 1954.

NEWS ANALYSIS

President Ngo Dinh Diem's consolidation of power, begun when he was Bao Dai's Premier and nominal subordinate, was a textbook exercise in solidifying a shaky rule.

Three private armies existed in South Vietnam in 1954. Cao Dai, a religion based on Buddhism, Taoism, and Christianity had one. So do Hoa Hoa, a reformist Buddhist sect, and Binh Xuyen, a gangster organization.

In 1954 the leaders of Cao Dai and Hoa Hoa were Ministers of State, and the Binh Xuyen chief head of the national police. By the end of 1955 the private armies had been absorbed into the national army or dispersed, and their leaders were dead or in flight.

EARLY ADMIRATION FADES

Americans were loud in their praise of the skill with which this reform was accomplished. Admiration was soon tempered with dismay as the Saigon regime became more and more intolerant of any opposition.

With the emergence of President Ngo Dinh Diem's brothers and sister-in-law as powerful figures in the Government, and the handing of places of power and prestige to other relatives and palace favorites, it seemed that South Vietnam was getting a new royal family in the absolute tradition of the mandarin class from which the Ngos had sprung.

The consequent deterioration in Vietnam's political health was accompanied by an upsurge in the strength of the Communist guerrillas called Vietcong. With plenty of support from non-Communist peasants and others who chafed under Saigon's rule, the Vietcong began a major military effort against the Government late in 1959.

GUERRILLAS GROW STRONGER

At least in numbers and equipment, the guerrillas are stronger today than they were then, although the Government forces have also been enlarged and improved, and the Vietcong do not get all the covert assistance from villagers they once did.

Since late 1961 the United States has become massively involved in the Vietnamese war, with more than 15,000 American servicemen here in advisory and other capacities, and an estimated $1½ million in American taxpayers' money pouring into the country every day. About 100 Americans have been killed, about half of them by direct enemy action.

American influence with the Ngo Dinh Diem government has decreased in step with the increase in aid. Washington is now so committed to South Vietnam's war—"hooked," one American official put it—that the Vietnamese President and his inner circle were able this week to defy openly a public demand by the United States that Ngo Dinh Diem reform his government and undo its excesses or face the consequences.

It turned out that there were no consequences that Washington was in a position to enforce. Ngo Dinh Diem acted as if he knew this all along. The result was a diplomatic defeat for the United States that has resounded around the world, and lowered American prestige here and throughout Asia.

Specifically, Washington wanted the President to dismiss his younger brother and political adviser, Ngo Dinh Nhu, who controls the secret police and special forces that savagely repressed dissident Buddhists protesting against what they considered religious persecution by the Roman Catholic President's regime.

The Americans also wanted Ngo Dinh Diem to banish his brother's powerful wife from the palace circle.

Instead of getting out, Ngo Dinh Nhu and his outspoken spouse are calling President Kennedy "misinformed" in his denunciation of Saigon's repressive policies last Monday on television.

It is widely believed that Ngo Dinh Nhu has become the real power in the palace.

ONE BROTHER DISCIPLINED

It is reported from the ancient Annamese capital of Hue that Ngo Dinh Can, another brother of the President, has been removed as political overlord of central Vietnam for advocating conciliation of the Buddhists and other dissident elements.

He is said to have been replaced in power by Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, a third brother, who heads South Vietnam's Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Experienced diplomats of various nations here are appalled at what they consider Washington's ineptitude in handling the current crisis. They say the administration committed the fundamental tactical error of driving its adversary into a corner from which there was no dignified line of retreat. This blunder was even less explicable, they say, because Washington apparently had no workable plan of action ready for use when Ngo Dinh Diem defied the administration.

TREATED LIKE SECTS

One Asian diplomat remarked that "you can't play poker against a man who is playing chess." Another longtime observer of Vietnamese affairs commented that Ngo Dinh Diem "seems to be treating Americans as if they were just another dissident sect like the Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and Binh Xuyen."

This affair has put Henry Cabot Lodge, the new Ambassador to Saigon, in an acutely embarrassing position as he begins his tenure. His predicament is only worse by its conspicuousness than that of the other American Ambassadors who have been sent here to take a tough line with Ngo Dinh Diem.

Washington's diplomacy in Saigon has alternated between tough and soft lines, each change being signaled by the arrival of a new Ambassador. None of them ever got very far with Ngo Dinh Diem.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 7, 1963]

U.S. IS LOSING MANY FRIENDS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Malcolm Browne)

SAIGON, September 5.—"In the last few months, the United States has lost most of the friends it had in South Vietnam."

The remark came this week from a fairly high-ranking Vietnamese civil servant, who has visited America and likes Americans.

There is a growing feeling in official circles here that the American image has been badly tarnished in Vietnam.

The Communists, of course, have been American-haters all along.

The Ngo Dinh Diem government's alliance with the United States has been temporary all along. Palace officials never have disguised their hope that Americans stationed in Vietnam could be dispensed with as soon as possible.

American policy has been tailored to fit this attitude.

On a visit to Vietnam some months ago, Roger Hilsman, now Under Secretary of State for Asia, was asked about anti-American attitudes of Ngo Dinh Nhu, powerful brother of President Diem.

"I think we have to take a fairly Machiavellian view of this thing," Hilsman said. "This is their country. The main thing is to stop the push of communism into Vietnam, and I think this Government is doing that effectively."

EXPECTED REACTION

Open reproofs by the State Department and by President Kennedy of recent Diem government handling of the Buddhist crisis have brought the expected reaction. Anti-American allegations and insinuations from the palace here have reached an all-time high.

But the biggest loss of credit for the United States, according to the majority of Vietnamese in this correspondent's acquaintance, has been among opponents of the Diem government.

Some of these opponents are in high places. Some are military officers who would have happily supported a U.S.-sponsored coup.

Buddhist and student leaders clearly feel the United States has let them down.

"We were happy that President Kennedy has gone on record as opposing government repression here," one said, "but it is too little and too late. Many of our people feel there is no choice now but to join the Communist Viet Cong."

Some U.S. officials, while sympathetic to the ambitions of some of the opposition groups, feel the Vietnamese people as a whole are extremely naive about the workings of American policy.

"Its been the same thing with the 1960 coup leaders, the splinter groups, the sects, and now the Buddhists and students," a U.S. Embassy official said.

CAN'T CONVINCE THEM

"All of them have expected the United States to help them overthrow the Government and then turn over the reins of power. We just cannot convince any of them that American foreign policy does not work that way."

One of those who was not convinced was Lt. Nguyen Van Cu, a Starfighter pilot in the Vietnamese Air Force, who lived in America for nearly 2 years studying flying. Cu speaks English in the American vernacular.

On February 27 last year, Cu and another pilot took off in fully armed fighters and rocketed, bombed and strafed the presidential palace to rubble. The other pilot was shot down. The entire Ngo family survived, and Cu flew on to Cambodia.

Cu now lives in Phnom Penh, and teaches English for a living.

"We thought the Americans would follow through and give us a hand," he said wistfully a few months ago.

"It is not we who are naive, it is you Americans," a Vietnamese said.

"You bought Ngo Dinh Nhu, knowing perfectly well he likes you about as much as Ho Chi Minh (boss of Communist North Vietnam) likes you. I wish you luck.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator has read the charge which has been made—that we are subsidizing the Vietnamese troops which have been in operation against the Buddhists, has he not?

Mr. CHURCH. I have read the charge with dismay, and I think this is an appropriate time for an intensive congressional inquiry.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator believe it is about time for Congress to exercise some supervision and control over this situation?

Mr. CHURCH. I believe nothing can point up the need more dramatically than such action by Congress.

HOW TO KEEP THE BUDGET UP WITH THE TIMES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, all informed people in Washington regard James Reston, the Washington bureau chief of the New York Times, as one of the most knowledgeable and thoughtful writers on politics in the world today. His combination of extensive experience in both American domestic politics and his worldwide journalistic experience enable him always to present a fresh and incisive view of the problems which face our Nation.

His most recent published example of precise and unhackneyed thought is his column in the New York Times of Sunday, September 8. In this article, he points out that although it is difficult for any administration to reapportion its budget, a drastic rethinking must continually go on, if the budget is to be kept in line with changed circumstances, both domestic and international. In this context, he asks if it is in the vital interests of the United States to spend over $1 million a day to support a regime in South Vietnam which uses American equipment to raid temples. I, for one, believe such a policy can only prove self-defeating.

I recommend Mr. Reston's article to all Americans interested not only in the problems of South Vietnam, but to those concerned generally about the questions of priorities in the American budget and in the conduct of the American National Government. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1963]

HOW TO KEEP THE BUDGET UP WITH THE TIMES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Like every thoughtful citizen of the United States, the Federal Government has trouble with its money. The problem with money, both places, is the same: there isn't enough of it; the demands are unlimited, the supply limited. And this raises the hard question of priorities: What comes first? What's essential, what's not absolutely essential, and how do you tell the difference between the two?

This is the time of the year when Washington has to think about these questions. The budget for the coming fiscal year is now being formed, and again the reflex action of the Government is very much like the individual's reaction. It wants to avoid trouble. The easy thing to do is to dish it out as before, and the hard thing is to cut it up to meet the changing demands.

No sensible man who has trouble with his own budget would venture to be dogmatic about the Government's. Yet there is a sense of uneasiness here about the Federal budget—a feeling that it is not changing fast enough to keep up with the changing times.

THE BASIC QUESTION

Several things have increased the feeling here that a fundamental reexamination of the budget, not only by the Bureau of the Budget but by the President himself, is in order.

First, the problems of homefront now seem larger and more urgent than they did last year. The cry of the Negro for equality "now" may divide the country, but the demand of the Negro and the poor whites for jobs and decent housing gets a more sympathetic hearing, even among the segregationists.

Does the budget give a high enough priority to these things? Is it more of a "vital interest" of the United States to spend over $1 million a day in South Vietnam than to spend it, or at least part of it, on jobs and houses at home?

Second, the cost of defense is leveling off. The President has assured the country that we already have the power, even on the assumption of a major war, to withstand an atomic attack and still wipe out our enemies.

If this is true, is it really essential to go on spending $50 billion a year on defense? Is over $5 billion a year for space exploration really a serious scientific calculation, or is at least part of it aimed at politics and propaganda? Third, Europe is no longer poor and unable to provide most of its own defense. It is prosperous and increasingly competitive with the United States, whose balance-of-payments problem is getting worse under the present one-sided sharing of the burden.

Under these circumstances, is the cost of maintaining a quarter of a million men in Europe a generation after the war still necessary? Or could it be reduced without jeopardizing the security of the free world?

Fourth, the situation in the underdeveloped countries and particularly in the poor countries on the periphery of the Communist world is changing. The United States is spending billions on the assumption that, if it reduced its aid to South Korea, Nationalist China, South Vietnam, Pakistan and Iran, the monolithic Communists would overrun these areas.

But is this true since the split between Moscow and Peiping? Would Moscow really welcome a Chinese Communist conquest of Korea and South Vietnam, or would it cooperate to block Peiping's expansion, as it is now cooperating to oppose China's aims against India?

THE FALSE ALTERNATIVES

The official reflex action to such questions here is that the questioner is proposing retreat and isolation, but this is not the intent. So much money is involved in all this, that the question is merely whether 2 or 3 billion could not be pruned out of the defense and oversea budgets to help out with the increasingly urgent problems on the homefront.

Nobody is saying the question of priorities is easy. In the last few days Uncle Sam has been vilified because he dared to suggest that he did not want to be identified with suppressing the political opposition in South Korea or using American equipment to raid temples in South Vietnam or be a party to Pakistan's alliance with Communist China.

Everybody, including the soldiers and sailors in the Pentagon, want more from the budget and will fight against taking less, so the battle is hard all around. But will it be faced? That is the question raised by the new budget.

UNKNOWN CONSEQUENCES OF ATMOSPHERIC NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, while we have been developing, and loudly proclaiming, our nuclear might, we may quietly have been poisoning our own children.

The only comfort in the grisly evidence recently uncovered in Utah is its timing. It has placed an ominous emphasis upon the unknown consequences of atmospheric testing, and has directed the Nation's attention to one of the most important arguments for ratification of the test ban treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a pertinent and powerful article, published recently in the Idaho State Journal of Pocatello, Idaho, written by Eli M. Oboler, entitled: "It Seems to Me."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Idaho State Journal, Aug. 25, 1963]

It Seems to Me

(By Eli M. Oboler)

That it might be salutary to consider the implications of a turndown of the limited nuclear test ban treaty by the U.S. Senate. We are being told over and over by the prophets of doom, such as scientist Edward Teller, that there will be grave consequences if the Senate does advise and consent to the treaty's ratification. The head of our Strategic Air Force, Gen. Thomas S. Power, says, "It is not in the best interest of the Nation." And a few very conservative Senators, such as Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Barry Goldwater of Arizona cry calamity, seeming to dig up new—but not necessarily appropriate or reasonable—objections daily.

But what would happen if we did not start right now to make a serious effort to stop befouling the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the milk we drink? Recent studies in Utah seem to show that because of our nuclear testing—not Russian or British or French, but American testing—at our Nevada nuclear test site in 1953 some "700 infants under 2 years of age received an average radiation dose to their thyroid glands that was from 136 to 500 times higher than the existing permissible levels."

Most reassuringly, "medical experts * * * said privately * * * that the St. George sample of 700 youngsters was too small to be significant." I wonder what the parents of these 700 children think about this kind of callous statement, this statistically-motivated indifference. Somehow, 700 or 100 or even 1 are people, not numbers to most of us, and, as such, are mightly significant.

It looks to me like a rather simple—but deadly—logical sequence. Vote down the treaty and Russia and Britain and the United States all resume atmospheric testing. Resume this kind of testing—especially taking the advice of the Tellers and Libbys and testing really big bombs, in the 100-megaton range—and you befoul the air. Befoul the air, and you damage irreparably the health of this and future generations.

There are several interesting sidelights on this nuclear test ban treaty question. One is that both the Democratic and Republican Parties, in their 1960 official party platforms, came out in favor of stopping atmospheric nuclear tests. And I don't recall any of the present critics vocalizing publicly their sentiments in favor of testing, back only 3 years ago. Another sidelight is that, judging from senatorial mail to date, the mothers of America are pretty well united in opposition to further casting of nuclear garbage into the atmosphere. This may well be a definite determining factor in affecting how most of the Senators vote.

The major point in the matter of nuclear testing, I think, is that if we don't take the first possible step toward multilateral disarmament and true world peace now that we have the chance to do so, we shall perforce continue to live in fear and anxiety. And, worse than fear, we shall be in what can only be described as a literally hopeless condition.

Nuclear war is certainly not inevitable. But atmospheric nuclear testing inevitably means widespread pain and malformation and even death to too many of us to justify continuing such tests. The so-called military reasons for such testing, proffered by men who seem to have lost any sense of humanity or community of interests of the human race, seem to me like arguments for slaughter delivered by butchers. And if that language strikes you as somewhat florid or strong, go back to the beginning of this column and read again about the 700 Utah infants.

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART UDALL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in less than 3 years Stewart Udall has proven himself to be one of the great Secretaries of the Interior. A recent feature in Listen magazine depicts some of the qualities which have made him such an exemplary Secretary.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall—Builder of Monuments

(By Francis A. Soper)

Three centuries ago, Sir Christopher Wren designed a new St. Paul's Cathedral in London following the great fire of 1666. Over the north door of this cathedral appears this famous inscription regarding his work: "If you would see his monument, look around."

In various parts of the United States a person will one of these days be able to look around and see monuments to another builder, one of a different sort, indeed, but a dedicated builder nonetheless.

This modern builder is Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, whose personal passion is to preserve nature unspoiled. In what he terms the quiet crisis of our day he sees the beautiful open spaces of nature being swallowed up by the grinding wheels and massive progress of our mechanical age, leaving a shortage of open and green space.

Since assuming his office early in 1961, this vigorous son of the outdoors has developed a multipronged program to conserve the resources of woodlands, mountains, seas, and deserts and to develop scenic areas for the enjoyment of all the people.

He is convinced that "we are learning that the search of modern, urban man is not for new ways to conquer nature—but for ways to save the beauty of the out of doors so that, to use Robert Forst's words, "man can gain new insight from 'country things.'"

Nothing pleases Secretary Udall more than to find time to climb mountains himself, shoot rapids, and relax around an open campfire away from the rush of crowded concrete jungles. He believes in using and enjoying America's natural resources, and at the same time preserving them.

His is the conviction expressed by that frontiersman Robert W. Service in "The Spell of the Yukon":

"The strong life that never knows harness;
The wilds where the caribou call;
The freshness, the freedom, the farness—
O God! how I'm stuck on it all."

"We stand today at the open door of a new—and possibly final—opportunity," the Secretary says. "Our land-use patterns will soon be fixed. What we save now will be all that is saved. By our action, or inaction, we will determine whether our children will know the green and pleasant land which was our legacy."

And he goes on, "What we need now is a truly national program which affirms the worth of our vast land resources and prescribes solutions to prevent continued despoilment and promote the highest kinds of preservation."

To implement such a national program, this farsighted guardian of natural resources has developed and advocated the wilderness bill, now under consideration by Congress. The intent of this bill is to preserve free from commercial exploitation about 2 percent of our land and "leave it the way God made it."

One chief interest of Secretary Udall is the National Park system. Under his prodding Congress has created three national seashores—Cape Cod on the east coast, Padre Island on the gulf coast of Texas, and Point Reyes on the Pacific coast. These constitute the first major additions to the park system in some 16 years. A host of other plans, both for expansion of national parks and for encouraging the States to expand their public recreation facilities, is underway. A dozen or 15 new national park proposals are being studied.

And he is a man in a hurry. "We lose a million acres of open space annually to commercial and highway development, with the resultant diminishing of the qualities which formed our national character," he declares. "We are working against the relentless ticking of the clock—time is against us in our efforts to preserve open space."

Furthermore, this effort is not all along traditional conservationist lines. Mr. Udall sees great natural value in our swamplands as preservers of wildlife and centers for nature study. He envisions, too, great strides in researching the untapped resources of our seas. Our knowledge in this area is very limited, he says.

So, in his concept, conservation is defined broadly in the following way: "The wise use of our natural environment; it is, in the final analysis, the highest form of national thrift—the prevention of waste and despoilment while preserving, improving, and renewing the quality and usefulness of all our resources."

Nor do his wide-ranging convictions stop here. Though his official duties have to do with water, forests, minerals, parks, and wildlife, he is also deeply concerned with the physical fitness of the people who are to use and enjoy these natural resources.

"One of the reasons I think America has emerged as a strong country is that we have had to be strong. We have had a big country to conquer, and have had to be physically fit to conquer it. I think people are happiest when they are fit physically."

In advocating an adequate program of recreation and exercise, especially in the outdoors, this national leader echoes Theodore Roosevelt, who declared, "I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life."

And such a life is not exclusively for adults, in the opinion of Secretary Udall. Youth today need to learn how best to utilize the outdoors in their own program of keeping physically fit, and to cultivate positive living habits in the face of a general tendency to "take things easy," for of what use will well-kept resources of nature be if the people are not in a position to enjoy them firsthand?

In the early days of our Nation, he comments, men had to be more rugged physically. Today we have machines to do our work and to carry us around, so we have greater need for outdoor exercise.

And as he speaks he looks up wistfully from the chair in which he is seated in his spacious Washington, D.C., office and fixes his gaze on the large colored pictures on his wall showing the rugged Tetons of Wyoming and Rainbow Bridge in Utah. Obviously, he would feel more at home climbing the mountainous heights or tramping the trails in the open. His lean, muscular build shows that he is advocating that which he knows best.

True fitness results from a balanced approach, according to the Secretary, having to do with the body, the mind, and the soul. Also there is a negative aspect about it—the leaving behind of those things which are harmful or destructive in order to gain the better overall positive purposes in life. "We are much better off with clean habits," he observes. And his serious concern for the welfare of youth shows up clearly as he goes on, "If young people start off right, they will have every chance of living a long and happy life."

The importance of personal living habits and right mental attitudes, with spiritual undergirding, comes out again as Secretary of the Interior Udall concludes, "The future greatness of our country rests ultimately on what kind of individuals we are and whether each person achieves his own standard of excellence."

Indeed, if the Secretary's ideals are fully developed, his "monuments" will be not only in the form of new national parks, preserved wilderness areas, and conserved natural resources, but also in the better health of our citizenry, the balanced growth of our young people, and a greater strength of our Nation as a whole.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION RECORDS CONCERNING GOV. GEORGE C. WALLACE OF ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of yesterday, September 8, and the Washington Star of yesterday, September 8, appeared two editorials critical of the senior Senator from Oregon because he disclosed that the Governor of Alabama receives disability allowance for a service-connected psychoneurosis. I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 8, 1963]

The Governor's Disability

Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama should not be reproached or censured for a psychoneurotic disability incurred in the military service of his country. It is unfortunate that his medical record has been made a part of the political controversy in which the Governor has been involved. The files of the Veterans' Administration are not closed to Congress and probably should not be closed against legitimate congressional or public inquiry essential to protect the Government against fraud and irregularity. But it is regrettable that Senator Morse felt compelled to use for a political purpose a medical history that private doctor-patient ethics would keep confidential. It is one thing to be angry at Governor Wallace for what surely is a misguided policy. It is something else to reproach him for an incapacitating disability incurred in line of duty.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 8, 1963]

Off Limits

By any standard, the exchange of insults between Senator Morse and Alabama's Governor Wallace has been an unedifying spectacle. And it goes from bad to worse.

We hold no brief for Governor Wallace. His erratic behavior in trying to force the closing of certain schools in his State is as reprehensible as it is senseless. Even so there are areas in which a man is not legitimately subject to attack.

One of these has to do with war-incurred disabilities. Senator Morse, asserting that the Governor had questioned his mental competence, returned the compliment by citing "official records" to show that Mr. Wallace has been "granted service-connected disability for psychoneurosis, for which an evaluation of 10 percent was assigned." This condition apparently resulted from flying combat bomber missions in World War II. Mr. Wallace was honorably discharged from the service and was awarded the Air Medal.

Senator Morse mentioned the Veterans' Administration, although he did not disclose the source of his information pertaining to the Wallace medical record. A VA spokesman said officials there were "puzzled" since Senator Morse had neither requested nor received their records. The spokesman added that a Member of Congress is one of the few persons entitled by law to receive such information, but that it is given with the understanding that it is "confidential."

Whatever the fact as to this, a man's record showing a service-connected disability ought to be off limits for all participants in any name-calling contest.

Mr. MORSE. For the benefit of the editors of the Washington Post and the Washington Star, may I refresh their recollections in regard to what their public duty is as journalists. When men are elected to high public office, their qualifications to hold their office becomes a subject which the public has a right to know about. The Senator from Oregon received most of his information about the Governor of Alabama from Alabama.

There is no question about the accuracy of the statement made in the Record by the Senator from Oregon in respect to the fact that the Governor of Alabama receives disability payments for a psychoneurotic condition. I think it is rather pertinent to have the public know when any public official is holding public office and is not mentally sound or has a past record of mental unsoundness—in this case psychoneurosis. It is regrettable that the Governor suffered that malady. The senior Senator from Oregon paid him high tribute for a brilliant and dedicated war record. But the fact is that the Governor became sick. The fact is that he is drawing pay for a psychoneurosis condition suffered during the war. Many of the people of Alabama are disturbed about the behavior of their Governor. I was supplied with some of the information I used from Alabama. In my judgment the Governor's psychoneurotic history should be public knowledge for the public to determine to what extent that condition apparently brings forth some of the Governor's conduct, such as the position he is taking in Alabama this sad day.

I wish to say to the editors of the Washington Post and the Washington Star that whenever a public official, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, is disqualified in any way to hold a public trust, the senior Senator from Oregon, as long as he sits in this body, intends to make that information known to the public. In my judgment, that happens to be the duty that I owe my oath of office. It is a sad thing, but I cannot escape the conclusion that a good deal of the bigotry, racism and intolerance displayed by the Governor of Alabama probably was caused by the fact that he does have a record of suffering from a psychoneurosis.

Further may I say to the editors of the Washington Post and the Washington Star once a person is placed in a position of public trust he is not entitled to the protection of secrecy in respect to his qualifications to hold such a position of public trust. Any mental unsoundness involves a matter so vital to the welfare of the public that the public should not be kept in the dark about it as the editors of the Washington Post and Washington Star apparently seem to believe. The fact that a public official is a veteran gives him no more right to be protected from public knowledge of his limitations than anyone else.

Once a person enters the fish bowl of public service he is not entitled to nor has any right to expect that any of his defects or limitations which bear upon his ability to serve the public should be concealed from the public. The editors of the Washington Post and the Washington Star have permitted their prejudices to cause them to draw the distinction between the rights of privilege of a private citizen not holding a public trust and the rights of public officials.

INTERIM REPORT ON MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has today filed with the Committee on Armed Services an interim report on the military implications of the proposed limited test ban treaty. The report is also being released to the press and the public.

The report is the product of an extensive and exhaustive inquiry by the subcommittee into the military and technical aspects of the various nuclear test ban proposals. During the inquiry, which commenced last September, testimony was received from 24 witnesses. Among them were many of the most informed and knowledgeable persons in the Nation in this field. A broad range of testimony was received from both scientific and military experts and from both proponents and opponents of the treaty.

The overall purpose of the inquiry was to develop as fully and factually as possible the available military and technical information bearing on the subject matter to insure that the Senate would have available to it essentially the same body of military and technical evidence as is available to the executive branch in its formulation of nuclear test ban policies. After the negotiation of the Moscow treaty the subcommittee focused its attention on the potential impact of that treaty upon the future of our Military Establishment and strategic forces.

The interim report is directed specifically to the partial test ban agreement and the military advantages and disadvantages which flow or might flow from it. Political considerations and matters of foreign and international affairs, as such, are not within the scope of the report.

The report discusses, within the limits of security classification, the military, technical, and security problems which are associated with the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater.

The report is signed by all members of the subcommittee except the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The Senators so signing the report are myself, as chairman, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who declined to sign the report, filed a dissenting view. Additional views were filed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. These are included with the report.

From the testimony which the subcommittee heard it was abundantly clear that the ratification of the treaty would result in some military and technical disadvantages and risks for this Nation. Indeed there was little controversy on this point. There was, however, considerable divergence of opinion among the witnesses as to the extent and effect of the risks and disadvantages and as to whether they are acceptable on balance. Some of the witnesses viewed the risks and disadvantages as being of a minor nature and as being fully acceptable from the standpoint of our Nation's security. Others assessed them as being of serious and major proportions.

Among the military disadvantages associated with the treaty discussed in the report are the following:

First. The United States probably will be unable to duplicate Soviet achievements in very high yield weapon technology.

Second. The United States will be unable to acquire necessary data on the effects of very high yield atmospheric explosions.

Third. The United States will be unable to acquire data on high altitude weapons effects.

Fourth. The United States will be unable to determine with confidence the performance and reliability of any ABM system developed without benefit of atmospheric operational system tests.

Fifth. The United States will be unable to verify the ability of its hardened second-strike missile systems to survive close-in high-yield nuclear explosions.

Sixth. The United States will be unable to verify the ability of its missile reentry bodies under defensive nuclear attack to survive and to penetrate to the target without the opportunity to test nose cone and warhead designs in a nuclear environment under dynamic reentry conditions.

Seventh. The treaty will provide the Soviet Union with an opportunity to equal U.S. accomplishments in submegaton weapon technology.

Eighth. The treaty will deny to the United States a valuable source of information on Soviet nuclear weapons capabilities.

There were, of course, counterarguments. It was contended for example, that the Soviets would be equally inhibited. It was accurately asserted that progress could be made in some important areas without the benefit of atmospheric testing and that the test ban would not prevent qualitative improvements being made in our weapon systems either as a result of underground testing or by virtue of nonnuclear technology.

In addition, the testimony was unanimous that, except in the field of high yield weapons, the United States today holds a clear and commanding lead in nuclear weapons and weapon systems. This superiority is said to result from a larger and more diversified stockpile of nuclear weapons, by more numerous, varied and sophisticated delivery systems, and by a greater capacity to produce nuclear materials, weapons, and delivery systems. It was strongly urged by some witnesses that the treaty would tend to stabilize this superiority.

As against this, however, we learned from the evidence that the Soviets have overtaken and surpassed us in the design of very high yield nuclear weapons; that they may possess knowledge of weapons effects and antiballistic missile programs superior to ours; and that under the terms of the treaty it is entirely possible that they will achieve parity with us in low yield weapon technology. Thus the effect of the treaty is to legalize testing in the area where we deem the Soviets to be inferior—that, is low yield weapons—and deny to us the benefits of desirable testing in the higher yield areas where the Soviets are or may be superior.

After carefully weighing all of the evidence, the majority of the subcommittee has concluded that the proposed treaty will affect adversely the future quality of this Nation's arms, and that it will result in serious, and perhaps formidable, military and technical disadvantages. Any military and technical advantages which we will derive from the treaty do not, in the judgment of the majority, counterbalance or outweigh the military and technical disadvantages. It appears that the Soviets will not be inhibited to the same extent in those areas of nuclear weaponry where we now deem them to be inferior.

Admittedly, however, other factors, which are not within the scope of the subcommittee report, are pertinent to a final judgment on the treaty. Among these are matters relating to international affairs, foreign policy, and our relations with other countries. As the report states, when these are taken into consideration, each individual must reach his own judgment on the basis of personal philosophy, past experience, current knowledge, and the relative weight which he assigns to the various factors involved.

Another matter discussed in the report are the "safeguards" upon which the Joint Chiefs of Staff conditioned their approval of the treaty, and which are designed to reduce to a minimum the adverse effect of the treaty upon our weapon programs. The subcommittee considers it to be vital that, if the treaty is ratified, these safeguards be implemented to the maximum extent. We have already asked for and received certain assurances from the administration with respect to these safeguards but have not received the detailed information which we feel should be furnished. If the treaty is ratified it is the intent of the subcommittee to monitor the implementation of the safeguards on a regular basis.

However, as is said in the report, even the most thorough implementation of the safeguards will not reduce the military and technical disadvantages of the treaty. No safeguard can provide the benefits of testing where testing is prohibited and none can assure that this Nation will acquire the highest quality weapon systems of which it is capable when the means for achieving that objective are denied.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to read a few passages from the subcommittee report. They are:

> In considering the impact and effect of the proposed test ban it is important to remember that for nearly two decades this Nation has been confronted by an adversary who has openly and repeatedly claimed that his dominant goal is to destroy the nations of the non-Communist world. Only because we have maintained clear military superiority and the ability to inflict unacceptable damage upon him has the would-be aggressor been deterred. The basis of our deterrence is military superiority which, in turn, is based on our nuclear weapon programs and nuclear retaliatory forces.
>
> It is vital to our survival that no step be taken which in any manner would impair the integrity and credibility of our deterrence or degrade the ability of our military forces to protect our security if we should be challenged militarily by a hostile nuclear power.

Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate. After presentation of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the members of the subcommittee of which I am chairman will from time to time have further remarks to make.

THE RAMPART CANYON DAM ON THE YUKON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Saturday some 90 Alaska citizens, mostly from Anchorage and Fairbanks—the State's two largest cities—but with representation from other parts of our far-flung 49th State, assembled at Mount McKinley National Park to discuss ways and means of speeding the development of the State's virtually undeveloped hydroelectric resources through the river-basin development of the mighty Yukon at the Rampart Canyon damsite. This site lies about 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks in almost the geographical center of Alaska and about one-third of the way in the Yukon's 2,200-mile course through our State. The meeting was a civic enterprise sponsored by the initiative of Mayor George Sharrock, of Anchorage, with the ready cooperation of Mayor Darrell Brewington, of Fairbanks.

The unique excellence of this Rampart Dam project, which would produce the lowest cost power under the American flag, namely 2 mills per kilowatt hour at the bus bar, has long been known to the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army.

Four years ago the Senate Public Works Committee, then under the chairmanship of our distinguished late colleague, Dennis Chavez of New Mexico, sponsored a resolution directing the Corps of Engineers to begin a study of the feasibility of a dam in the 30-mile Rampart Canyon. Those studies have proceeded since that time and about $1 million have been appropriated for them—the amounts required and requested by the corps, having been regularly included in the Kennedy administration's budgets.

The corps retained the Development and Resources Corporation of New York to make the economic—that is, the marketing—studies, of the possibilities for the sale of Rampart's 4.5 million kilowatt installed capacity. The report, rendered a year ago, spelled out in detail the variety of industries that would be attracted by Rampart's low-cost power and concluded that all of it could be sold as soon as generated. In fact, the indications were that the demand would be so great that further sites on the river should be studied with a view to a whole river power and flood control development. The Development and Resources Corporation is a firm with an international repute as power developers and consultants, headed by the men who, nearly 30 years ago, were associated with the Tennessee Valley Authority and guided its initiation and development.

The corps is now about ready to report on the engineering and economic aspects of the Rampart Canyon damsite, and is awaiting some supplementary marketing studies being made by the Interior Department as well as some studies of the impact of the project on the natural resources of the region, for the reservoir back of the dam will be the largest manmade lake in the world and has a vast potential for an inland fresh water commercial and sport fishery.

The citizens assembled at Mount McKinley National Park over this last weekend were solicitous that a project of such vital importance not merely to Alaska's but also to the Nation's economy be delayed no longer than necessary; they were also concerned with some ill-founded attacks upon it based on misinformation and erroneous assumptions.

The meeting was addressed by Col. K. T. Sawyer, the able district engineer for Alaska; by Gov. William A. Egan; by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northeast Public Power Association; by Ivan Bloch, industrial consultant; by George Sundborg, my administrative assistant, an authority on hydroelectric power, and the author of the definitive book on Grand Coulee Dam entitled "Hail Columbia"; and by Irene Ryan, a former member of the Alaska State Senate, a geologist and mining engineer by profession, and a member of the Rampart Dam Advisory Committee by appointment of the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. All the addresses were notable. I ask unanimous consent that two of them: "What Next for Rampart?" by George Sundborg, and "A Report on Rampart" by Irene Ryan, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Next for Rampart?

(By George Sundborg)

The Rampart project, up to this time, has been fortune's child. The sun shines bright on it. Everything has gone exceedingly well. I am sure there has never been a proposal of this magnitude in the history of our country—in fact in all human history—where so much progress has been made in such a short span of years. Grand Coulee, the largest manmade thing on earth and the only power dam meriting comparison with it—though Rampart is more than twice as big in energy capability—was hardly more than a gleam in its proponents' eyes 5 years later. The beginning of a Grand Coulee feasibility study was a score of years away. And here we are practically ready to start the dirt flying on Rampart.

We've done wonders with Rampart because we've had the breaks. We've deserved them and worked for them; but we've had them.

First, nature has given us the physical setting of water supply, storage potential and favorable construction conditions at an incomparable site which make for the greatest remaining power project in the free world.

Second, the economic and political situation was right to proceed. Alaska had achieved statehood with it concomitant position of power in Congress. Our congressional delegation was able to obtain an appropriation for a beginning of the Rampart study in the 1960 River and Harbor Act by joining in the very first overriding of a veto of a popular President in the last year of his incumbency. I remember the day very well. The last vote needed to override President Eisenhower's veto was obtained when Senator Gruening, with a cast on his leg, left Walter Reed Hospital for a quick drive the length of Washington to the Capitol. I know it was a quick drive because I was at the wheel. The Senator went on the floor in a wheelchair. After getting the money for Rampart he went back to the hospital to finish recovery from a leg injury which stemmed from a hunting accident in Alaska.

Our next break came when the people of the United States chose as their President, by the narrowest of popular vote margins, a man who as U.S. Senator from Massachusetts had helped vote the first money for Rampart. He was pledged to Rampart before his election. In 1960 Senator John F. Kennedy said: "We must meet the challenge of Alaska—the challenge to reap its abundance, build its strength and provide a reservoir of natural wealth for a growing America. We must, of course, press forward with bold, and vitally needed, projects such as the Rampart Canyon Dam. * * * I foresee a land of over 1 million people—a giant electric grid stretching from Juneau to Anchorage and beyond. I see the greatest dam in the free world at Rampart Canyon, producing twice the power of TVA to light homes and mills and cities and farms all over Alaska."

After President Kennedy's inauguration an appropriation to speed the Rampart investigation was included each year in the President's budget.

Another break for Rampart came in the form of the character and ability of the fine Army officers who, as district engineers in Alaska, have directed the Rampart investigation. Alaska was fortunate to have Col. Christian Hanburger in charge of the work until last year. We are fortunate now to have Col. Kenneth T. Sawyer. They have had able assistants, including our friends Warren George and Harold Moats. At higher levels Gen. W. W. Lapsley has been our friend as North Pacific Division Engineer, Gen. Emerson Itschner as the Chief of Engineers when the investigation began and Gen. Walter K. Wilson as Chief now that the report is nearing completion, have made and will continue to make invaluable contributions.

A really great break came when an outstanding group of power consultants, headed by David Lilienthal, the late Gordon Clapp, and Walton Seymour, the men who guided the Tennessee Valley Authority to success—were enlisted to make the Rampart power market survey. Among their talented and knowledgable assistants were Ivan Bloch and Sam Moment. A Rampart Economic Advisory Committee including Gus Norwood, Irene Ryan, Stanley J. McCutcheon, Ed Merdes, Vernon Forbes, Barney Gottstein, the late Frank Mapleton, the late Samuel B. Morris, Dr. Edward S. Shaw, and Dr. William R. Wood, some of whom are here with us today, lent vital counsel.

The investigations which these engineers and economists have made show Rampart to be even better than we suspected. It is not only a giant but a wonder.

The canyon walls are of sound rock. The reservoir is water tight. The power can be produced to sell at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar and not to exceed 3 mills delivered to tidewater on Cook Inlet or Prince William Sound. The storage area is unique in that it contains not a mile of improved highway, not so much as a single railroad siding, no factories, no modern homes, not more than 10 flush toilets, almost no public buildings, no going industries, no scenic wonders, no recreational delights, no architectural monuments, no viable economy.

Search the whole world over and it would be difficult to find an equivalent area with so little to be lost through flooding. In fact, those who know it best say the kindest and best thing anyone could do for the Yukon Flats—the thing which would improve them most—would be to put them under from 100 to 400 feet of water.

By doing that we will receive in exchange a remarkable range of benefits. First there will be employment on the Rampart project itself—a $1.3 billion program of construction and related direct activity. The amount to be spent on construction in the 5 years immediately preceding initial power production will, the Development and Resources Corporation tells us, exceed Alaska military construction in the 1950–55 period. All of us who lived in Alaska then can appreciate what that means.

Next, immediately upon authorization of the dam—which could come next year—we will begin to build a highway to the damsite from Manley Hot Springs or Eureka, extend the Alaska Railroad probably from Dunbar, start to move the seven villages in the area to be flooded to new locations of their own choosing on higher ground or if they prefer along the river below the dam and log the 10 billion board feet of timber within the reservoir area. There will be substantial employment in connection with all this. In addition we will employ game patrols to insure that moose, bear and other big game animals in the reservoir area are not stranded on islands or peninsulas and ducks do not nest immediately in advance of rising waters.

Then there will be the incentive for development of cement plants (8 million barrels needed) and construction materials for the dam itself, the building of construction cities with housing and services to take care of all the workers who will be employed and the visitors who will be attracted to the great scene of activity. Finally, as end result, some 7,500 to 15,000 men will be employed permanently in electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries in Alaska, which, combined with 10,000 to 20,000 in related pursuits, will support in all a population increase of from 70,000 to 140,000 forever.

The busy and prosperous Alaska which will result will base its being on aluminum, electric furnace pig iron and steel, ferroalloys, copper, magnesium, chlorine and caustic soda, calcium carbide, abrasives, nitrogen, phosphorus, titanium and other products. The total power output of not only Rampart but the Woodchopper site upstream and the Kaltag Dam downstream will be required to keep this industrial complex going.

We are fortunate in that Rampart comes to Alaska at a time when the population of the State and Nation is growing at an unprecedented rate. The United States will have almost twice as many people in the year 2,000 as it has today. Alaska's population will also have grown manyfold.

Rampart has ripened just at a time when long distance transmission of electrical energy by direct current at very high voltages has been demonstrated to be feasible technically. This is no pipedream. A dam the size and capacity of Rampart is more than just theoretically possible. The Russians have already built one such dam and have others under construction. The Bratsk Dam on the Angara River, from which power generation commenced in 1961, has an installed capacity of 4.5 million kilowatts, almost equal to Rampart. Bratsk is longer (4,728 feet at the crest as against 3,900) than Rampart but not so high (410 feet vs. 440) and has only a small fraction of Rampart's storage (145 million acre feet against Rampart's 1.2 billion). The Krasnoyarsk Dam on the Yenisey River, now under construction, will have power capacity of 6 million kilowatts, larger than Rampart.

I mention these comparisons with the U.S.S.R. to indicate that Rampart is not ahead of its time. Soviet Russia has announced plans to increase hydroelectric power capacity tenfold by 1980. The United States also faces the need for more power for a growing population. We will require a 21-fold increase in electric energy capacity by the year 2,000, based on known population and power use factors. Rampart Dam, big as it is, can bring in only one-half of 1 percent of the total needed.

From Alaska's standpoint, there is no question but what Rampart is needed. We have no dependable statewide economy now. Rampart will provide it. Alaskans may differ on what power increment should be brought in next. Some favor a gas-fired or oil-fired unit in Anchorage, others a minemouth coal plant at Sutton or Healy, still others Bradley Lake or Snettisham, or a nuclear plant at Fairbanks. But all agree that these would be only interim short-range solutions. Rampart is in every Alaskan's future. The universality of supoprt is evidenced by the wonderful turnout at this meeting of Alaskans, sparked by Mayor George Sharrock of Anchorage and Mayor Darrell Brewington of Fairbanks.

Finally, we are fortunate because we have working for us in Washington a man who is absolutely dedicated to seeing Rampart on the line. His vision and drive are largely responsible for Rampart having made the progress it has.

And we all know Ernest Gruening will not rest or be satisfied until Rampart is a reality.

Are we, then, assured of success? Do we—please excuse the metaphor—have all our ducks in a row? Is everything copacetic? Far from it. Rampart has its enemies—waiting with a loaded shotgun and a red-hot mimeograph machine.

On March 4 last a leading American conservationist addressed a wildlife conference in Detroit. Of all the trends and developments in our Nation which he viewed with distaste and alarm none received quite so much attention as ours. I quote:

"There is a new proposal now for a project that dwarfs all previous projects in the unprecedented magnitude of fish and wildlife resources and habitat that would be destroyed. It is the proposed Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in central Alaska. Get acquainted with this proposal and you will find beneath its glossy surface a massive and irreparable threat to fish and wildlife.

"The 500-foot dam would block sizable upstream migration of salmon in the Yukon. The Rampart impoundment would cover 10,000 square miles—I said square miles—of the Yukon Flats that produce on the average of 1½ million ducks and geese a year. More ducks are produced there than are bagged in most flyways. They represent millions of man-days of recreation potential in all States, because Yukon Flats waterfowl are bagged in all flyways, from the Pacific to the Atlantic. Moose and furbearers also would suffer, and the dam would alter the annual water cycle that makes the Yukon Delta an important waterfowl breeding and concentration ground.

"Rampart Dam is synonymous with resources destruction. A very determined effort is being made to rush its authorization through Congress and conservationists everywhere had better look into the proposal and learn the facts that are involved."

The speaker quoted is Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute. We know Gabe very well in Alaska. Though a lifelong and professional conservationist in his utterances, he was responsible for and presided over the most ghastly conservation failure in Alaska history, and perhaps in our Nation's recent history, that is within the time that game management and conservation have become accepted practices. He was the first Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service after it was organized in 1940 by the amalgamation of the old Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture, of which he had been the Director, and the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce, the new agency resulting from this amalgamation being moved to the Department of the Interior. At that time the Alaska salmon runs were at their peak. However, those of us who are knowledgeable about Alaskan matters were convinced that the run would decline unless certain conservation measures were taken to prevent them. One was the abolition of fishtraps.

However, none of those holding those fears and with remedial proposals could prevail upon Gabrielson, and his regime saw the beginning of the steady decline of the Alaska salmon runs. As the Fish and Wildlife Service had absolute authority in the matter, Alaskans were helpless. Here are the figures of the salmon pack for the years in which Gabrielson was the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service: 1941, 6,906,503 cases; 1942, 5,089,109 cases; 1943, 5,396,509 cases; 1944, 4,877,796 cases; 1945 4,341,120 cases; and 1946, 3,971,109 cases.

But the decline continued after 1946, when it might still have been reversed, because when Gabrielson left his position in the Government as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service to become, in private life, the director of the Wildlife Management Institute, he was succeeded by his former assistant, Albert M. Day—cast in the same mold—a fine theoretical conservationist but wholly impractical and without conformability to realities. Day had been a subordinate of Gabrielson's in the Biological Survey, came over to the Fish and Wildlife Service as his Assistant Director, and succeeded him as Director from 1946 to 1953. He inherited and continued Gabrielson's ruinous policies. In these years, figures for the salmon pack were as follows: 1947, 4,302,466 cases; 1948, 4,010,612 cases; 1949, 4,391,051 cases; 1950, 3,272,643 cases; 1951, 3,484,468 cases; 1952, 3,574,128 cases; and 1953, 2,925,570 cases. The decline from nearly 7 million cases in 1941 to little over a third of that pack at the end of the Gabrielson-Day regime had acquired momentum and continued until the last year of Federal Fish and Wildlife mismanagement when, in 1959, the pack hit the lowest point in 60 years with only 1,600,000 cases.

The State government, which abolished fish traps and took the remedial measures which the Federal management failed to do, now has the extremely difficult task of trying to rebuild the sorely depleted salmon fishery and restore not only that one great natural resource, but with it the wrecked economy of our coastal communities and diminished State revenues, which resulted from that disastrous and needless decline in the salmon resource.

How ironical that it is the same Ira Gabrielson who now weeps over the fish—never a commercial run in the Yukon—and the other wildlife resources and would prevent Alaska's one great hope of rebuilding an economy which he was responsible for wrecking.

Alaskans encountered Ira Gabrielson next at their constitutional convention at College in 1956. I was among the delegates who heard him predict that unless we did as he said, namely to provide uniquely for fish and wildlife for administration by a board or commission, Alaska would face losing a remission of Federal excise taxes collected on fishing tackle and sporting goods for restoration projects. Your constitutional convention delegates listened carefully to Mr. Gabrielson. But they were not impressed. We put fish and game administration on the same working basis as other functions of State government, with responsibilities resting directly on the Governor who is elected by the people. Alaska has an excellent department of fish and game. We have not lost 1 cent of Federal matching funds for conservation purposes. Gabrielson's forecast of loss of revenue proved totally unwarranted.

Here is yet another later example of how far wrong this great conservationist was. When it was known that there was oil in the Kenai Peninsula and it was essential to Alaska that exploration and development take place there, the chief opposition stemmed from Ira Gabrielson's Wildlife Management Institute. Its representative at the hearings, C. R. Gutermuth, with the approval of Gabrielson, testified that prospecting and drilling would be ruinous to and destructive of the moose. We all knew it would not be so. Actually, all their dire predictions proved to be completely unfounded.

Consider the role of this one professional so-called conservationist in Alaska's recent economic history. Alaska and the Nation had a leading resource, the Pacific salmon, over whose virtual demise he presided. Alaska has a promising industry now emerging, petroleum exploration and production, which he tried to prevent, and now that we hope to set our economy on a permanent sound basis with the development of Rampart power, he is again trying to stand in the way.

How different would be the lot of the average Alaskan today if the Wildlife Management Institute had prevailed at the time of hearings on opening the Kenai National Moose Range to leasing in 1957. The range now accommodates some 65 producing oil wells and 7 or 8 gas wells. The oil wells are producing 30,000 barrels of petroleum every day. The treasury of the State of Alaska has benefited to the tune of more than $50 million from royalties, lease rentals, bonuses, and production taxes—money which otherwise would have had to come from taxpayers, you and me, to support State services. Have the moose suffered? We all know the answer. I had to drive around three of them on the Sterling Highway on a recent misty morning.

Now what about this duck business? Depending on what conservationist you believe, the Yukon Flats produce from 500,000 to 1,500,000 ducks a year. This sounds big. Mr. Gabrielson, remember, said that Rampart area ducks are bagged by hunters in all U.S. flyways. That sounds important, but let's put it in perspective. Of the ducks and geese shot in the United States, on all four flyways, in the period 1950-59, 85 percent came from breeding grounds in Canada, 11 percent were hatched in the lower 48, and only 4 percent came from all of Alaska. Notice I said "all of Alaska," not just the Yukon Flats area that will be flooded behind Rampart Dam. Where did these figures come from? They were given to Senator GRUENING's staff a week ago yesterday in a series of conferences held with William M. White, chief of the Branch of River Basin Studies of the Interior Department; Dr. A. J. Nicholson and Thomas Schrader, assistant chiefs of the same branch; Yates M. Barber, Jr., chief of the Reclamation Activity Section, and Walter F. Crissey, director of the Migratory Bird Population Station, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Actually, ducks hatched on the Yukon Flats head in a good many directions aside from the U.S. flyways. A substantial number are shot in Alaska, some fly out in the Alaska Peninsula—Aleutian Island direction, and some head for Soviet Siberia. Certainly we don't propose to be deprived of Alaska's best hope of economic development, Rampart Dam, in order to mollify these last—these feathered defectors.

It is understandable that duck hunters should be concerned about any threat to their supply of cannon fodder. The supply has been declining. In 1957 some 2.16 million hunters in the United States bagged an average of 5.6 ducks apiece. Last year only half as many hunters felt it worth their while to buy duck stamps. But they shouldn't blame Alaska, or look to Alaska to save a sorry situation.

Abundance of ducks is affected by many things. Ducks are migratory, covering a range of as much as 10,000 miles from the Arctic to Central and South America. Winter habitat 'way down South, and feeding and resting habitat during migration are fully as important as breeding habitat in the North. Hurricane Audrey changed the ducks' habitat in coastal Louisiana; the Columbia Basin reclamation project has affected it (for the better) in the Pacific Northwest; the grain crop in Missouri is important; one of the leading enemies of the duck is drought in the prairie Provinces of Canada; the advance of civilization everywhere is a factor.

Please don't blame Alaska. Kill by hunters wipes out as much as 45 percent of the total fall population of some of the important duck species. The average life of a mallard duck, under current U.S. gun pressure, is 1 year. Without gun pressure the natural mortality of migratory waterfowl would be only 10 to 15 percent a year. So please, Mr. Gabrielson, don't blame Alaska.

We note from a recent report that the breeding population of ducks in Alaska, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service, was down 15 percent in May of this year. This just goes to show what has happened already because of all this talk about Rampart Dam.

Ira Gabrielson and his Wildlife Management Institute are not alone in their efforts. They are working hand in glove with the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, Ducks Unlimited, the Outdoor Writers Association, the Wildlife Society, the National Audubon Society, the Defenders of Wildlife, Inc., and others.

There is also numbered among Rampart's enemies, in part at least, I am sorry to say, the Department of the Interior, some of whose employees are enrolled, practically full-time, in trying to cut Rampart off at the pass. Thus a Fish and Wildlife Service official at Juneau, without waiting for the evidence to come in, has been making speeches to Rotary and Lions Clubs inveighing against Rampart, speaking of a "tremendous fisheries run" in the Yukon, and saying there are "many other hydroelectric power sites in Alaska which might produce ample power without similar damage." To be realistic, however, what can we expect from a Department whose Secretary seems to conceive of his mission as dealing primarily, if not exclusively, with parks and recreation? If Mr. Udall thought otherwise he, or at least a principal associate from Washington, would be here at this important meeting instead of mountaineering on Mt. Kilimanjaro in Africa.

It would also have been wonderfully helpful had a representative of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries Branch of River Basin Studies been with us for this meeting. The branch is reportedly putting the final touches on a monumental study of what it feels will be the effects of Rampart on the breeding and nesting of ducks in the flats which will be covered. I would not suggest what will be the findings of the study, although I could guess, but I do suggest that had a representative been sent to this meeting the study would have been enhanced. Unofficially, Senator GRUENING has been told that this study is nearing completion and is to be released in the autumn.

One interesting ploy of the professional conservationists is to quote one another. Thus, Gabrielson's Wildlife Management Institute feeds a set of twisted statistics to the California Fish and Game Commission and then cites a resulting anti-Rampart resolution approvingly in the "Outdoor News Bulletin" of the Wildlife Management Institute. The Alaska Conservation Society, in its news bulletin, quotes as gospel the detractors of Rampart. Consider these sentiments published by William O. Pruitt, Jr., of the society, in reporting his attendance at a conference on northern resources at Whitehorse last March:

"Nowhere were emotion and outmoded concepts more evident than in the Rampart discussion. * * * Two or three mill power * * * Rampart will deliver power to tidewater cheaper than any other source in the United States. * * * Billions and trillions of kilowatts flew about like the snowflakes they are. * * * It was nice to visit Whitehorse (Canadians import some exceedingly good Scotch ale). It was good to have the chance of arguing the relative merits of the quick buck and the sustained yield, to be able to put our ACS bulletin into the hands of strangers."

How like a statement made by C. R. (Pinky) Gutermuth, of the Wildlife Management Institute at the Kenai Moose Range hearing back in 1957, when it was doing its utmost to prevent exploration and drilling for oil and gas: "Vociferous political and business leaders in Alaska are actually gushing in their frenzied and almost fanatical demands that the entire Kenai Moose Range be thrown open to exploration as the result of an oil strike in a part of the area this summer. Thoughts of quick dollars rather than good judgment and consideration for the longrun public good dominate the scene."

What is the longrun public good? Are not these professional conservationists as wrong on Rampart as they were on the Kenai? Let us have a look at what motivates them. Are they trying to save the ducks because they are nature lovers? Of course not. They are interested in preserving a duck only up to that moment when said duck is in the hunter's gunsight. In other words, they want the ducks saved in Alaska so they can be blasted out of the skies elsewhere. Even this would not be so subject to question if it were not that many of the high sounding conservation organizations receive a major part of their financial support from Remington, Savage and other gun and ammunition manufacturers.

Building Rampart will not mean the end of ducks in Alaska. What will a duck do on returning to the Yukon Flats, full of the instinct to reproduce, only to find an accustomed nesting ground under water? We know he will not stay aloft. The duck is a very smart bird, as every hunter knows. He is smart enough to go to where he can nest, even if that means flying another 50 miles. And do not let anyone tell you the sides of the Rampart Reservoir will be unrelievedly steep and sterile. Millions of acres of low, marshy ground will exist north and northeast of the reservoir.

Similarly, the building of Rampart need not mean the end of fish in the Yukon. Many of the ascending salmon now go into the Koyakuk, Tanana and other streams below the Rampart site. The salmon which are caught in the 15 or so fish wheels above Rampart are used mainly for dog food. Salmon can be lifted over the dam and released upstream to continue a food supply to Canadian and other residents. New species of fish including whitefish, lake trout, can be introduced in the reservoir. Creation of artificial spawning grounds downstream can actually increase the productivity of the Yukon.

The so-called conservationists, instead of preparing to capitalize on these exciting opportunities, do nothing but spread gloom and doom. They say 4,600 moose will be displaced and innumerable muskrats driven out. They see only disadvantage for the Indians of the area. Note the obviously manufactured similarity of these two letters which materialized in the Alaska Conservation Society Bulletin and nowhere else.

From the Village Council of Venetie: "All the people in Venetie do not like to have Rampart Dam. Because us native people use to live in this country. In wintertime we go trapping and summer we go fishing. What us native people going to do? If this Rampart Dam is building?"

From the Village Council of Chalkysik: "We the people of Chalkytsik are against the Rampart Dam. We depend on our country in order to make a living trapping, fishing, etc. * * * Having the Rampart Dam built would destroy so much game."

Actually, on a recent visit to villages in the reservoir area, Senator GRUENING and I found the sentiment for Rampart Dam overwhelming. It should be, for the project will vastly improve living and employment conditions in the Yukon Valley.

What the challenge of Rampart requires and deserves, is some truly constructive and creative conservation. Conservation does not mean locking the door on Alaska and throwing the key away. It means instead opening doors to the wisest and most rational use of our resources. It means saving and also using those resources for the benefit of man. In the words of William Faulkner, man will not only survive: he will prevail.

Here are questions conservationists might ponder. What would be better in Alaska—a reservoir of water in connection with a hydroelectric power project or the problem of disposing of nuclear wastes from a series of atomic power plants? What kind of river development should we prefer—one large dam in a single basin or a multiplicity of developments on many rivers?

What we seek is the best use of the land and water resources of the Yukon Valley. The Rampart project is that best use.

Alaskans are not likely to be prevented now—certainly not for the reasons being stated—from achieving so desirable and meaningful a goal.

A REPORT ON RAMPART

(By Irene Ryan)

Mr. Chairman, Senator GRUENING, Representative RIVERS, ladies and gentlemen, when our chairman, Mr. Sharrock, mayor of the city of Anchorage, first asked me who should properly give a progress report from the advisory committee on Rampart Dam, I suggested the names of several more capable individuals who served on that committee—only to find the ball promptly bounced back to me. I am still muttering and complaining to myself. I had pictured my role at this meeting as that of a rather lazy old bird willing to answer occasional questions and give sage advise on how to go about the next step. The next step or steps being obviously the reason for our present gathering.

First of all, I must explain that the advisory committee as an official group no longer exists. We completed our work in 1962 when we gave the stamp of approval to the final report submitted by the Development and Resources Corporation covering the economic feasibility of the project. We were retained by the Corps of Engineers to make suggestions in defining the limits of that study, to evaluate it and either to approve or disapprove the final conclusions. The report as finally submitted received the unanimous approval of the committee. And with that statement a progress report from the advisory committee must conclude.

However, I am sure you would be somewhat disappointed if I ended this report here. So I will talk about the Rampart Dam project, what I have found out about it, and what, in my opinion, it will do toward furthering the economic development of the United States, and most of all, what effect it will have on the Alaskan economy.

A SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATIONS

With the passage of the amended Flood Control Act of 1950 by the U.S. Congress the Army was directed under its Secretary and with the supervision of the Corps of Engineers to make a study of harbors and rivers of Alaska with a view to determine the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power and allied purposes.

In the fall of 1960 when the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate of the 86th Congress held hearings in Alaska, Colonel Hanburger, District Engineer, U.S. Army District, Alaska, appeared to make this statement: "During the early stages of the investigation leading to Interim Report No. 7, covering the Yukon and Kuskokwim River Basins, it was apparent that the Rampart Canyon project had the greatest potential power output of any hydroelectric project in the United States."

This statement officially verified an opinion held by many individuals since as early as the gold rush days of Alaska that at Rampart a feasible dam site existed to harness the waters of the mighty Yukon, a river listed as fourth in the world in capacity. It is exceeded only by the Amazon, Mississippi, Missouri and the St. Lawrence.

This tremendous potential, first estimated at 4,690,000 kilowatts (almost one-third of the total Alaskan hydropower potential) coupled with the low cost (estimated at 2 to 3 mills at the bus bar on a 50-year payout) is what makes Rampart a giant in the field of generation.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING who was Governor of the Territory of Alaska for many years and intimately acquainted with its resources and the problem of their development was quick to realize that Rampart could secure within a relatively short time that industrial and commercial development in Alaska, which without some comparable effort, would take decades. Early in 1959 the Senator introduced a resolution in the Senate Public Works Committee requesting a full-scale report on the hydroelectric capability of the Rampart project. Following this initial appropriation, Senator GRUENING, together with our Senator BOB BARTLETT and Representative RALPH RIVERS, has succeeded in securing congressional approval for the necessary continuing funds to complete the investigations.

On April 24, 1959, the corps was directed to initiate the study. Following preliminary geologic investigations and mapping, test drilling of the granite rock underlying the proposed site was started in March 1961 and completed April 1962.

Funds were allocated by the corps to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1960 to investigate the effect of the project on the wildlife resources of the area and these investigations are still continuing with assistance from the State department of fish and game.

In the spring of 1961 a contract was awarded by the Corps of Engineers to the Development and Resources Corp., of New York City, to make the power market study involving consideration of local and world resources and the industries that might be established in Alaska to utilize the large blocks of low-cost power. The Development and Resources Corp. is an internationally recognized consulting firm in this field. Mr. David Lilienthal, chairman, was former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, president, was former general manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Also, establishing thereby a precedent, an advisory board of specially qualified and recognized individuals was named to serve under the chairmanship of the division engineer to assist the corps in defining the scope of the economic study and to review the progress of the study at several stages of its development.

The members of the advisory board, which concluded its assignment in August of 1962 following review and approval of the report "The Market for Rampart Power," by the Development and Resources Corp., were: Mr. Samuel B. Morris, consulting engineer, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Edward Steve Shaw, Stanford University economist, California; Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash.; Mr. Frank H. Mapleton, mechanical engineer, Fairbanks, Alaska; Mr. W. T. Kegley, president, First National Bank, Juneau, Alaska; Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska, College, Alaska; Judge Vernon T. Forbes, president, National Bank of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska; Edward A. Weides, Fairbanks, Alaska; Mr. Bernard Gottstein, owner, J. B. Gottstein & Son, Anchorage, Alaska; Mr. Stanley McCutcheon, attorney, Anchorage, Alaska; and myself.

The feasibility report, originally scheduled by the corps for completion by the fall of 1964, according to an early announcement by Col. Christian Hanburger was to be completed by August of this year.

The U.S. Geological Survey published in 1962, Bulletin, 1111–H, "Geologic Reconnaissance of the Yukon Flats District, Alaska."

In addition to the continuing investigations by the Fish and Wildlife, the Weather Bureau and other Federal agencies, Mr. T. T. Contine with the Bureau of Reclamation is working under directive from the Department of Interior (which Department has been the marketing agency for federally produced power), to compile data and prepare the marketing section of the Corps of Engineers report and to prepare an impact report consisting of the summation of the view of all Interior agencies.

Also, this year the Federal Land Department has requested the withdrawal of the public domain affected, under the limitations and for the purposes defined in public power withdrawals.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY

On April 26, 1961, the effective date of their contract, the Development and Resources Corporation undertook a study for the U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, Corps of Engineers, to develop information and make judgments concerning the probable size and characteristics of the power market in Alaska within feasible transmission distance of the Rampart project on the Yukon River. This study was to provide the major basis for answering the question: "Is it in the interests of Alaska and the United States to develop a large block of low-cost hydroelectric power at the Rampart site?"

Some of the basic assumptions for the study were that:

Rampart power would be on the line at a level of 350,000 kilowatts of primary power in 1972, increasing at a constant rate of 1 million kilowatts in 1989, with a jump to 3,735,000 kilowatts (5 million kilowatts installed) in 1989 upon completion of the filling of the reservoir.

That the power would be made available at high load factors at (a) 2 mills, (b) 3 mills, and (c) 4 mills per kilowatt-hour, and should take into account other principal competing locations in the United States and elsewhere in the free world.

CONCLUSIONS

In their final report submitted April 26, 1962, the Development and Resources Corporation states the the principal conclusion of the study is that, if the Rampart project proceeds on the contemplated schedule, its power output can be sold substantially as it becomes available.

The projected market by 1990 was delineated as follows:

Energy available from Rampart—billions of kilowatt-hours	32. 7
Less transmission losses	1. 6
Net supply from Rampart	31. 1

Composition of use	Maximum	Minimum
By consumers who would use power whether or not Rampart is built:		
Energy they would use even from relatively high cost sources	7. 0	5. 5
Additional energy use by the same consumers if low cost energy is available	3. 8	2. 5
By new industries (other than primary aluminum production) attracted by low-cost power and Alaskan raw materials	9. 2	7. 6
By new homes and businesses stimulated by Rampart and by the new industries	5. 1	3. 7
Subtotal	25. 1	19. 3
Remainder available for primary aluminum production plants (desiring up to 35,000,000,000) and unpredictable developments, interregional markets	6. 0	11. 8

Although the installed capacity at Rampart makes it the largest on the North American Continent in terms of potential power from one project, Mr. Gus Norwood, of the Northwest Public Power Association pointed out that this amount is not going to be a very significant part of the total U.S. energy supply. The General Electric Co. load estimates for the United States assume 500 billion kilowatt-hours used in the year 1950, and it is now running about 800 billion kilowatt-hours; in the year 2000, 10.5 trillion. From 1950 to the end of the century we will have a 21-fold increase in the electric power supply needed for the American economy. Drawing Rampart into that curve, you will find that in 1972 the amount of power that Rampart would bring into the economy would be one-half of 1 percent of the total U.S. energy supply. When Rampart is in full production it would represent its highest percentage of the U.S. power supply, which would be about one-half of 1 percent.

The Development and Resources Corporation also touches on this in its report as follows:

"The projected growth in the Nation's economy will require prodigious amounts of electrical energy. Federal Power Commission estimates cited earlier indicate that more than twice as much additional generating capacity must be built in the United States before 1980 as the total of all plants built heretofore. Between now and 1990 it probably will be necessary to build nearly a billion kilowatts of generating capacity. The Rampart project's 5 million kilowatts would be only one-half of 1 percent of the required U.S. total new capacity. Devoting one-half of 1 percent of our new national power supply to development of the largely untapped resources in Alaska would not seem a disproportionately large allocation of national power capacity."

THE POWER MARKET FOR ALUMINUM

In the allocation of power from the Rampart project the Development and Resources Corporation have designated a possible range between 6 and 11 billion to primary aluminum production plants, unpredictable developments and interregional markets. According to conservative market forecasts aluminum production will increase between 6 and 15 million short tons annually by 1990. If all Rampart's potential were used by the aluminum industry, it would account for about 2 million short tons—only a fraction of the anticipated demand.

A major consideration in evaluating the possibility of the industry programing its expansion needs to utilize Rampart power is the extremely favorable competitive position pricewise. Again in the report it is stated:

"Any doubt that Rampart's half-percent contribution to U.S. needs for expanded power supply would be economically useful should be removed when it is considered that Rampart would produce and deliver energy to tidewater at lower cost than any other projected powerplant anywhere in the Nation."

They further state Rampart energy is in the cost range of all but one or two of the very cheapest of the great energy blocks in the world.

All the citizens of the United States are fortunate that this tremendous potential block of low-cost energy is to be found within the borders of one of the States.

Man alone is a weak creature—and I do not doubt inherently lazy, otherwise it would not have occurred to him to place his burdens upon the backs of beasts and to use their strength in pulling his loads. And just as he has learned to harness and use the various sources of energy in nature so have his comforts—and his troubles—grown. I have the 1950 centennial issue of Harper's at home and I was both amused and surprised at a reprint of a picture from their 1896 edition entitled, "The Electric Kitchen" as follows:

Back in August 1870, Harper's had published Jacob Abbott's article on the "Electric Light," telling how electricity had been used in mines, in signal lights on ships, and for stage effects and suggesting that it might in the end be found to be the most effective and economical mode of illuminating large public halls.

But by 1896, when this picture of an electric kitchen appeared in R. R. Bowker's piece on "Electricity" (Oct. Harper's), it was already being used extensively in lighting houses and providing power for trolleys and trains, and the article even describes electric ironing, electric welding, and fluorescent lighting. An interesting article in the November 1958 issue of Fortune, "Capital Goods: The Energy Explosion" by Charles E. Siberman and Sanford S. Parker points out that since 1947 consumer use of electrical and other energy has expanded nearly twice as much as business use and that consumer demand has accounted for about three-fifths of the energy capital expanded in the 10-year period since that date. The use of electrical energy in air conditioning has been a substantial factor in pushing up the demand and it is still growing and at the same time the cost per kilowatt of new generating capacity is beginning to rise.

The ever-increasing per capita use of energy coupled with our rapidly expanding population, point to the fact that industries dependent upon low-cost energy are going to be seeking those sources wherever available.

The Rampart project can keep some of them from taking their investment and payrolls from this country to some other continent, a significant factor in these times when we are struggling to find jobs for the increasing numbers of our young people.

IMPACT ON ALASKAN AND NORTHWEST ECONOMY

During the discussions with the Development and Resources Corporation representatives and the Corps of Engineers, the Alaskan members of the Advisory Committee were naturally most interested in the effect that Rampart Dam would have on the Alaskan economy.

First of all would be the immediate impact for construction expenditures. The building of a road and railroad extension, the construction of a workers' town, the construction of a cement plant and the expansion of all service industries.

The construction of one or more aluminum reduction plants at tide-water points and the transmission lines to them; the workers' homes and the service industries for this new labor force; these are all developments that we can all foresee.

But how about these Alaskan resources other than the power project itself, that we are always talking about? Let us look at a few.

There's the Klukwan iron deposit. Low cost electrical energy to operate the mining and milling machinery and to separate the magnetic iron from the gangue can make this development economically feasible. With electric furnaces why not go a step further and make steel? We have chrome at Seldovia, nickle occurs in southeastern Alaska, tungsten as scheelite in some of our presently closed gold lode mines. Copper and base metals occur at various locations in south-central Alaska.

Wherever in Alaska this electrical energy can be made available the prospects will be reexamined and reevaluated. It will have a substantial impact upon the development of our fisheries processing and storage industries, our timber industry, on the expansion of facilities for the tourist industry each of which in turn will develop many and varied processing and service industries.

But most important of all to Alaskans is that it is the only single project that I can envision that will have a substantial effect upon the cost of living and doing business in Alaska without reducing per capita income or lowering our standard of living.

Every Alaskan knows by heart the "wheel" that plagues us. We must broaden our economic base and bring in industry with year-round payrolls, but to do that we must reduce the cost of operating in Alaska. And why is the cost of operating in Alaska high? Because the cost of labor is high, the cost of transportation is high, the cost of everything is high, and why are these costs high? Because we have too few exports to balance imports, because we have too small a population to reduce unit costs, so we must broaden our economic base and bring in industry with year-round payrolls. Rampart attacks this "wheel" at more than one point. It will reduce costs and bring in industry with year-round payrolls. And the attacks are not just whittling—they are substantial. Without it, all we can do is whittle.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, while the Secretary of Agriculture trips around Russia and Iron Curtain countries, and while the administration remains stubborn against doing anything because of the rejection of the wheat plan referendum, the general agricultural situation worsens.

One need not be a statistician to be fully aware of the inflationary forces in the country. The costs of living and the costs of operating a farm continue to go up. The relative financial position of the families who live on the farm and whose sole business is farming, as compared to the rest of our economy, is not at all favorable.

It is my feeling that neither the Congress nor the administration should say to the American farmers, "Take what we have once offered you or nothing." This is especially true when many questions could be raised about either alternative submitted to the farmers in a referendum.

Honest difference of opinions arise concerning proposals that involve restrictions and direct subsidies and other like approaches to the agricultural problems. It must be conceded, however, that it is the responsibility of government to strive for those general policies and that economic atmosphere that permit our farmers to prosper, just as it is an objective of our Government to adopt policies that will lead to good wages and profitable business transactions. I wish to mention a few of these policies.

The importation of foodstuffs is being greatly overdone. Any grocery shopper, in the Washington area at least, will repeatedly find it impossible to buy American-grown products. I refer specifically to cooked ham. The increased importation of all foodstuffs is unreasonable; it is unfair and it is unwise. Unrestricted imports of our foodstuffs are not making us friends around the world. The people of the world are becoming more and more intelligent. When they see the U.S. act against its own best interests, they will continue to lose respect for us.

Ridicule would be heaped upon a hardware merchant whose inventory showed that he had an oversupply of almost all items carried if he continued to buy and buy heavily. An automobile dealer, whose sales and storage spaces were filled with cars he could not sell, would be foolish indeed to take the surplus cars off the hands of all the other dealers. Yet this is what we are doing by importing foodstuffs.

Here in the United States we have an agricultural surplus problem. These surpluses hang like a cloud over the market. This is costing us billions of dollars a year. The administrative overhead and the operations of the giant Department of Agriculture, with all its regional and local offices, are a heavy financial drain and these overhead expenditures do not put any money in the hands of our farm families. Some reasonable restraint on the importation of all foodstuffs, including livestock, meat products, grains, vegetables, and all other things must be imposed.

I have caused to be assembled a list of our agricultural imports of foodstuffs for the calendar year 1962. These items were imported not for the purpose of transshipment but for consumption. The total dollar value of these imports amounts to over $3½ billion. This is shocking when we note that the net farm income in our country for 1962, excluding Government payments, was only about $11 billion. If we include the Government payments, the net farm income is only about $12½ billion. A breakdown of these 1962 imports is as follows:

Foodstuffs—U.S. imports for consumption, 1962

[In U.S. dollars]

Animal and animal products edible	1,035,769,604
Animals, edible, except for breeding	111,043,691
Meat products	481,578,558
Animal oils and fats, edible	770,703
Dairy products	36,881,596
Fish and fish products, except shellfish	223,817,779
Shellfish and products	173,389,601
Other edible animal products	8,287,676
Vegetable food products and beverages	2,538,173,851
Grains and preparations	42,879,067
Fodders and feeds, NES	14,745,062
Vegetables and preparations	82,693,708
Fruits and preparations	161,127,571
Nuts and preparations	59,504,858
Vegetable oils and fats, edible	39,566,913
Cocoa, coffee, and tea	1,205,486,240
Spices	42,650,623
Sugar and related products	564,346,283
Beverages	325,173,526
Total, animal and vegetable	3,573,943,455

Obviously, some of these imports have to continue. I am not suggesting an embargo on imports. I am suggesting reasonable controls to protect the American farmer. To continue with these imports is just as wrong as it would be to permit business and industry to import laborers to be employed at substandard wages.

Mr. President, I would call attention to the fact that our total imports are 32 percent of the net farm income, exclusive of Government payments. Actually this percent is much higher because the foregoing table lists these imports at their foreign dollar value and at their wholesale price. I have not undertaken to translate the foreign dollar value to the American dollar value but it must be conceded that the dollar value of the American products displaced by these imports would be much higher than $3½ billion.

I would also call attention of the Senate to the fact that there is a chain reaction to these imports. When we import livestock and meat and meat products we are displacing not only the American production of livestock but we are displacing the American production of grain, proteins, legumes, hay, pasture, and all other livestock feeds. We are also displacing a great amount of American labor because many of these imports come in as finished products ready for the merchant's shelf.

There are many policies that could be adopted by our Government if there were a sincere concern for the long-range welfare of agriculture. A reasonable import control program is one.

One of the finest pieces of legislation passed in recent years was the domestic portion of the last Sugar Act. It called for an increase in the production of our sugar needs in this country. I praised that legislation then, and I do now. I say it should be but a beginning in the expansion of our domestic sugar production.

Our sugar production was so static for so many years that it is highly probable our sugar processing plants, especially the construction of new plants, are now more costly than they would have been had the industry been an expanding industry throughout the years. Many areas have not yet started to develop their sugarbeet potential because they need factories. A sugarbeet processing plant might cost from $15 to $18 million. Attention should be given to lowering this cost, and we ought to grant a liberal and rapid tax amortization toward building such plants. We are still importing a sizable portion of our sugar and an increased production would lessen the surface problem in reference to many other crops. Again, I do not advocate absolute restrictions on foreign production of sugar. I merely say that the U.S. share should continue to be increased. Further sugar legislation would be a second way that we could assist agriculture.

I have been active in the Congress of the United States in promoting the industrial uses of farm surpluses since I conducted the first hearing on that subject in 1945. The Congress passed a proposal of mine that set up a bipartisan commission to recommend industrial uses of our farm surpluses in 1957. I am aware that the current appropriation bill carries some money to start to implement such a program. We have not had an all-out acceptance of the industrial uses proposal by the Department of Agriculture. It should be a major concern and the Department should drive hard for results. In the absence of such an objective, additional money might well result in increased bureaucracy but very little tangible results as far as a market for farm products is concerned. I am convinced that through the magic of chemistry greater uses in industry can be found for the many products now produced, and that untold uses can be found for crops not now in production which are among the 250,000 plants that can be grown on this earth. This would be a third way that the long-range position of agriculture could be improved.

Mr. President, there are many other policies and principles which could be put into effect that would be helpful to our American farm families. Some fine organizations have long been active in promoting some of these programs. I will not attempt to discuss all of these additional activities that would be for the welfare of agriculture at this time.

It is high time that we turn our attention to those basic principles and policies which would be helpful to American agriculture and that we should stop looking for political gimmicks, the benefits of which are temporary. Such legislation is often rushed through for political purposes and ignores the long-range basic facts so essential to a strong agriculture. The American farmer is entitled to his place in our economy, which means the opportunity to sell at a fair price in the marketplace, to enjoy the American market, and to have the opportunity to expand the scope and volume of his products just as the rest of the American economy expands.

GRAIN STANDARDS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the wheatgrowers of this Nation have for years been confronted with such problems as allotment acreages, marketing quotas, price supports, a billion-bushel wheat carryover and foreign markets.

Now one of the pressing problems confronting U.S. wheatgrowers is a revision of our grain standards. It is important not only to farmers but also to every merchant, banker, and businessman—indeed, to every citizen in the important producing areas of this country.

The Department of Agriculture has proposed a number of changes in our present grain standards and hearings on these proposed changes will be held in the near future in several wheat-marketing areas. At these hearings producers, elevator and mill interests, and exporters will be given every opportunity to present their views; and, needless to state, all are not in agreement as to the need for the changes.

Some representatives of the grain trade advise me that proposed changes in their opinion could work to the disadvantage of the grower.

There is one point on which there must be unanimous agreement; that is, we must furnish wheat for the world market that is competitive.

Our present grain standards were established in 1916 under an act of Congress passed that year putting the authority to establish grain standards in the Secretary of Agriculture. Practically no changes have been made since that time, notwithstanding the tremendous advancement which has been made in grain production, storage, marketing, and distribution since 1916.

I am sure that there are few farmers and few businessmen who realize how out-of-date and ineffective our grain standards are at this time. This is especially true as they apply to wheat. As of this moment, No. 1 wheat, the top grade, may contain as much as 2 percent of damaged kernels, one-half of 1 percent foreign material, 5 percent of shrunken and broken kernels, and 5 percent of wheat of other classes. While dockage (trash) is not a grade factor, 99 percent may be included without being counted. It is there but only unofficially. In other words, although wheat may contain 13.49 percent of nonwheat, damaged wheat, and wheat of other classes, it is still graded and sold as No. 1. No. 2 may contain 15.99 percent of nonwheat, damaged wheat, and wheat of other classes.

All the facts indicate that Kansas farmers are producing excellent wheat. Last year, 1962, a statewide survey of farm-stored wheat was made by the Kansas State ASCS Committee. The purpose was to determine the physical quality of wheat on the farm before it got into the channels of trade. The number of individual samples taken was over 1,600 coming from all of the 9 crop reporting districts in the State. These were consolidated into 238 composite samples. They were inspected at the State grain inspection laboratory. This inspection showed the following results: Test weight per bushel, 60.7 percent; moisture, 11.8 percent; dockage, 0.29 percent; total damage, 0.4 percent; foreign material 0.1 percent; shrunken and broken kernels, 0.9 percent. No wheat of other classes was reported. This gives an average total for all defects of 1.69 percent, far below the proposed new standards for No. 1.

This year the Kansas State Grain Inspection Department is keeping a record of defects in carlot shipments of Kansas wheat arriving in terminal markets. The reports are not yet available except on dockage. This shows that of 4,573 carlots from practically all Kansas counties and from each of the crop reporting districts, the average dockage is 0.33 percent.

Probably the worst thing about the present standards is that they constitute an invitation and an inducement to lower the quality as the grain passes through the channels of trade by adulteration with dockage, foreign material, inferior and damaged wheat. There is nothing illegal about this, and it is not my purpose to criticize anyone engaged in such practices. Just as long as the adulteration does not exceed the limits set up in the present standards, it is permissible. The fault is in the standards as they now exist.

While I have not spoken critically of the activities which result in the deterioration of our wheat as it goes through the channels of trade, it seems to me that it is not out of the way to question those who oppose reasonable changes in the standards designed to enable our wheat to better compete in world markets with that from other wheat exporting countries.

I mention the foreign market for the reason that our millers and other processors have long since abandoned the use of existing grades in making their purchases. They buy on the basis of sample and laboratory tests using grades for hedging purposes only, if at all.

There is no procedure by which a foreign buyer can purchase wheat in the same way as is done in the domestic trade. If he buys by grade and orders No. 1, he has no way of telling whether there will be 1 percent of total defects or 13.49 percent—or anything in between. The sampling program conducted by Great Plains Wheat in the European market indicates that U.S. No. 1 and No. 2 wheat exported to that area had an average of about half as much in the way of defects as would have been permissible under present standards, but more than twice as much as that of our competitors Canada and Russia. It is not surprising that our share of the West European dollar market is decreasing while that of Canada is increasing.

This matter has become even more important since the establishment of the Common Market by reason of the fact that the buyer not only must pay for the nonwheat and damaged wheat, but also the variable levy on the same. This increases our disadvantage, and has undoubtedly contributed to our decline in dollar sales.

Apologists for the grain trade say that the foreign buyer can order by grade and get just what he pays for. As a practical matter this is not possible, because as I have pointed out, he does not know whether he is getting the top grade, the bottom, or somewhere in between. It is further contended that a foreign buyer can order by specification and get what he wants that way. This presents serious difficulties and is easier said than done.

Ordering by specification has been tried and found wanting. Experience has shown that there are many problems and pitfalls connected with the preparation and submission of specifications. In many cases the seller demands a premium. The practical and effective answer to the dilemma lies in making our present grades more specific and descriptive.

The Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture has recently proposed changes in the grading system which will reduce overall tolerances on No. 1 wheat, including dockage from 13.49 to 6.49 percent. This will be broken down into 3 percent total tolerances for damaged kernels, foreign material, and shrunken and broken; 3 percent for wheat of other classes; and count all dockage of one-half of 1 percent or above.

For No. 2 wheat, the dockage will be the same. Total defects will be 5 percent and wheat of other classes 5 percent, or tolerances of 10.49 percent as compared with the present 15.99 percent.

These tolerances are still quite wide—perhaps too much so—but they at least are more definite and meaningful than those under which we are operating at this time. They cannot hurt any farmer, and it is hoped that they will lessen inducements to lower the quality by blending inferior wheat with the quality wheat which is coming from the farm.

It is hard to overestimate the importance to our wheat industry of maintaining and expanding our export markets. For the past 3 marketing years our wheat exports have exceeded our domestic consumption, which has remained static since 1909. Any continued expansion must be in the field of exports. Last year our total exports were 11 percent less than the previous year and our dollar exports were 21.6 percent less. Our nondollar exports, while desirable under present conditions, cannot be expected to continue at their present volume indefinitely. Public Law 480 will expire next year and must be extended if that program is to continue. It is impossible now to say under what terms and conditions this will be done. In view of the fact that some people tend to consider 480 as a foreign aid program, and the further fact that opposition to foreign aid is increasing, there may be greater difficulty in extending the act than in the past. Furthermore, Canada, blessed with its largest wheat crop in history, is talking of setting up a 480 program of its own.

In any event, expanding our dollar exports of wheat is imperative not only from the standpoint of the wheat farmer, but also from that of the Nation. This becomes more evident every day as our balance-of-payments situation deteriorates.

If we are going to export for dollars we must be competitive from the standpoints of price and quality, and we must have the machinery which will enable our customers to know what they are doing when they buy. This is impossible under our present system, and we can expect no improvement while it continues in spite of all of our efforts otherwise. In other words, improvement of our grain standards is the key to dollar export expansion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Wednesday, September 4, issue of the Topeka Daily Capital, entitled "It's Good Business," and an editorial which appeared in the August 29 issue of the Garden City Telegram, entitled "For Tighter Grading," be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, Sept. 4, 1963]

IT'S GOOD BUSINESS

Indications are that the movement to tighten wheat grading standards is gaining momentum, at least enough to stir some grain trade interests into open opposition.

For the past few years, wheat producers have been advocating tougher restrictions on the amount of waste matter allowed in export wheat. Dockage for such items as chaff, sticks, and other waste matter in wheat shipped to foreign markets would be increased.

Promoters of the tougher restrictions say the U.S. wheatgrower suffers when chaff-diluted wheat arrives in foreign markets. Contention is that the foreign market price of U.S. wheat suffers and that in some instances the American wheatgrower is losing out to Canadian and other competition.

Canada requires that its export wheat meet specific grade standards upon delivery. The foreign buyer receives U.S. wheat without assurance of its cleanliness.

Wheatgrower associations are taking the initiative in establishing stricter wheat policies. Farm cooperatives are reported to be getting into the export business themselves in order to build up a market for clean U.S. wheat.

The associations and cooperatives contend some export interests deliberately have been diluting shipments in order to increase export profits.

Some grain dealers oppose tolerance changes in wheat quality standards on the premise that the grower would suffer. Contention is that elevators would be forced to grade wheat more closely, with the result that the grower no longer would receive benefit of the doubt.

Integrity of the farmer apparently is underestimated. The Kansas farmer isn't interested in receiving benefit of the doubt. He is interested in receiving the full price that his product deserves. He also is interested in seeing the foreign buyer get a fair shake for his money.

Early action should be taken to see that the British baker and the Italian noodlemaker get the quality of U.S. wheat they order.

It's a matter of good business, as well as ethics.

[From the Garden City (Kans.) Telegram Aug. 29, 1963]

FOR TIGHTER GRADING

Great Plains Wheat, Inc., was organized to promote the development of markets for Hard Red wheat.

In the past 5 years, Great Plains has been working for these markets, and in doing so has come into contact with many foreign buyers, importers, and processors. The story from all corners of the globe has a common current of criticism—imports of U.S. wheat haven't been up to snuff.

Great Plains set up a grain standards committee after realizing that changes were needed. It was concluded that growers, in deciding if they want changes, must determine if they want standards which will adequately classify the quality of wheat they are producing in terms of final use value, which will maximize their bargaining position in domestic and foreign trade, and which will help them accomplish their long-range quality objectives.

Last week, Great Plains Wheat president, Howard Hardy, issued a statement favorable to the proposed standards, and it didn't take long to smoke out the opposition—which is the grain trade.

Thanks to living in the home of Great Plains Wheat's headquarters, we have come in contact with several foreign grain buyers, millers, agriculture officials and government officials. All were impressed with what they saw here in the Great Plains in the way of wheat production and quality.

But they weren't speaking highly of our wheat which has been exported to their countries. It's clear that something is wrong with the present grading system which allows dirty and damaged grain to flow into foreign ports. Meanwhile, our northern neighbor, Canada, is paying strict attention to what they export, and has established a good reputation among the world buyers.

The grain trade's opposition is puzzling. Great Plains Wheat's stand is laudable.

GOVERNOR WALLACE'S DEFIANCE OF FEDERAL LAW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today debate begins on the nuclear test ban treaty and, as is quite proper, it will be led by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I shall have my own views to express on it a little later in the week. But I should like to speak today about the "atom bomb" we have in the United States in our domestic situation, characterized again this morning by the incendiary news that Governor Wallace, of Alabama, has ordered schools of three cities in Alabama—Birmingham, Tuskegee, and Mobile—not to integrate—in other words, not to give children their rights as citizens of the United States.

I appreciate very much that the Attorney General will not counsel precipitate or incendiary action on the part of the United States but that it is rather the design of the Federal Government to see that local people who are anxious to send their children to school will bring about correction of the situation. But, in the final analysis, the situation is intolerable in terms of the United States. The United States cannot stand by and allow its laws to be flouted. It cannot allow a Governor to invoke a doctrine which has no legal basis; namely, the doctrine of interposition; that is, that a Governor of a State or a State legislature can interpose itself between the rights of U.S. citizens and the Federal Government to enforce those rights.

Sooner or later—probably sooner rather than later—the President will have to make the tragic decision which he made in respect to the University of Mississippi, or which President Eisenhower made in Little Rock, or which was made in the University of Alabama case.

I think it should be very clear that the President will have the full support of the overwhelming majority of the people of the country—including many who do not agree in the matter of desegregation of the public schools, but who agree on the proposition that the laws of the land may not be flouted by any Governor, no matter how pleasant he may appear on television—and that the people, as well as the Congress, will approve the use of the authority of the United States under the Constitution of the United States.

I hope the administration is laying its plans to show that it intends to see that the laws are upheld, because the children have the right to an education under the laws of the United States; and that the necessary court actions, recommendations to Congress, and Federal authority may be used, so that no Governor—Governor Wallace or any other Governor—may flout the laws of the United States, on some theory of interposition which has no basis in law, and which may result, not in a rule of law but in a rule of anarchy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. In just a moment. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This is the "atom bomb" in the United States. The Senate is engaged in a historic debate today. While that debate continues for a week or 10 days, may we not forget that we have an atomic bomb in this country, and that justice shall not be denied, as depicted by the Governor's action in Alabama.

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with everything the Senator from New York has said. For days I have said on the floor that the question is whether or not we are going to preserve our system of laws and preserve the Union, because there does not have to be secession to destroy the Union. If the Governor's defiance of our system of law is maintained, in effect, the Union is destroyed.

I have pleaded for days, and repeat it today, from this side of the aisle, that this administration has the duty to use whatever power of government is necessary in order to make clear to our people in the North, the South, the East, and the West, that, after all, our Federal system is going to be preserved and the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court are going to be enforced.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very pleased to have the support of the Senator from Oregon. Unless this structure of law persists, the very people who are now minorities, even those who say they are against integration, will lose their protections. This system is for their protection as well as the protection of every citizen. So when a Governor defies the law, he frustrates the fundamental right of every American. This is the fundamental problem that the Government must face. So while it may be approaching the problem on a day-to-day basis, I think within a few days the Government must come face to face with the fact that Governor Wallace is defying the law of the United States, and this the United States and its people cannot tolerate.

THE CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT: AN ACT OF STATESMANSHIP BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a few days ago the preliminaries for the settlement of the longstanding Chamizal dispute were concluded by the signing of an agreement by Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Relations, Manuel Tello, and U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas C. Mann. I discussed this problem on the floor of the Senate on July 22, offering my congratulations to the Governments of our two neighbor countries and their people on the prospective settlement of a dispute which had marred our relations for nearly a century. I said then, and repeat now, that President Kennedy deserves the highest praise for his direct action to bring about a solution of a long, vexatious, and complex problem, which has become increasingly difficult with the passing of time and would become even more so if left unsettled any longer.

As the agreement will, in all probability, be presented in the form of a treaty for ratification by the Senate, a complete understanding of the history of this issue, its legal complexities, and the tangible and intangible values involved, is desirable.

Fortunately for this purpose a definitive and scholarly summary has just become available. It is found in an article by Gladys Gregory, for some time professor of government at Texas Western College, and the holder of a Ph. D. degree from the University of Texas. A resident of El Paso, she has, since her days as a graduate student at Austin, studied the Chamizal and other border issues. She writes with authority and with the combined expertise of a trained historian and of a living observer of the event. Her study is printed as No. 2 of volume 1 of Southwestern Studies published by Texas Western College and edited by Samuel D. Myles. It is a most valuable contribution.

The Chamizal award in 1911 favoring Mexico was rejected by the United States although our Nation had agreed to abide by the arbitral award, which, by the terms of the agreement, was to be carried out within 2 years. It was the first time in our history that our Government has declined to honor an adverse verdict after agreeing to abide by the result. As President Kennedy said to the press in Mexico during his visit there earlier this year:

> There have been long negotiations about the Chamizal. This territory was awarded in 1911, but the United States did not accept it * * * but it is a matter that we cannot afford to continue to treat with indifference because the United States failed, after agreeing to arbitration, backed down, and did not accept the report.

This, while in essence the situation, was a slight but wholly warranted oversimplification, because there were technical grounds for believing that the Commission in 1911 which made the award, consisting of a U.S. Commissioner, a Mexican Commissioner, and a Canadian jurist, exceeded its instructions. A half century of deadlock resulted. But, as Professor Gregory points out, that deadlock could be broken only "by an act of statesmanship on the highest level—a decision that could cut through the accumulation of historical, legal and technical flotsam and lagan the Chamizal case had accumulated."

President Kennedy performed that act of statesmanship.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Gregory's report "The Chamizal Settlement—A View From El Paso," be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT—A VIEW FROM EL PASO

(By Gladys Gregory)

July 18, 1963 was a great day in the El Paso-Juarez Valley, for on this date the Presidents of the United States and Mexico announced their historic decision respecting the Chamizal. Across the Rio Grande in Ciudad Juarez and throughout Mexico, the news was received with much satisfaction, as it signalized for the Mexicans a victory of right and reason that had been overdue for 50 years. The city council of Ciudad Juarez met in special session to hear and acclaim the eloquent address of President López Mateos, carried from Mexico City by radio and television to all parts of the nation. On the day following, the 19th, full-page advertisements, signed by civic leaders of the State of Chihuahua, appeared in the leading newspapers of Mexico hailing the event as a demonstration of international friendship and cooperation at its best.[1]

THE RESPONSE IN EL PASO

In El Paso the reaction was naturally more restrained, but at the same time, it was favorable. Although there was some criticism of the so-called Kennedy giveaway and some apprehension among residents of the Chamizal area, the weight of opinion, as reported in the local press, accepted the proposed settlement as announced. The mayor and council of the city, members of the county commissioners' court, and other local leaders viewed the outcome constructively. While they expressed concern that the interests of residents in the Chamizal should be fully protected, they welcomed the solution of an issue that had long disturbed the two border communities. They also recognized that the settlement would make possible the improvement and beautifying of an undeveloped area along the river, and that it would stimulate the economy of the entire area.[2] The prevailing attitude seems to have been summed up in the following statement of Federal District Judge R. E. Thomason who as a former mayor of El Paso and Member of Congress had gained an intimate knowledge of the problem:

"We wrestled with the Chamizal for 50 years and it would be an eyesore for another hundred years if we don't make a settlement now. I visualize the time when El Paso and Juarez will be the great twin cities of North America and there will be a tremendous development. I would like to see the agreement followed by a real drive to get rid of the slums, a fine beautification program, and a great monumental free bridge.

"The property owners in the area will get justice. Uncle Sam doesn't mistreat his citizens. If any of them don't get a fair value for their property and come into my court, I'll see that they get it."[3]

The latest stage in the long and tortuous negotiations seeking an agreement began during the meeting of June 1962, in Mexico City, between the Presidents of the United States and Mexico, John F. Kennedy and Adolfo López Mateos. The joint communique issued in the names of the heads of state was brief and to the point: "The two Presidents discussed the problem of El Chamizal. They agreed to instruct their executive agencies to recommend a complete solution to this problem which, without prejudice to their judicial position, takes into account the entire history of this tract."[4] Thus another attempt was made—this time at "the summit"—to deal with the exasperating issue.

INTERVENTION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

While in Mexico, President Kennedy indicated the priority he gave the matter by saying to representatives of the press: "As you know, there have been long negotiations about the Chamizal. This territory was awarded in 1911, but the United States did not accept it * * * but it is a matter that we cannot afford to continue to treat with indifference because the United States failed, after agreeing to arbitration, backed down, and did not accept the report."[5]

To carry out his commitment, President Kennedy promptly instructed diplomatic and executive officials of the United States to proceed without delay in working out the appropriate policies and details. Within a short time, on July 17, Thomas C. Mann, Ambassador of the United States to Mexico, arrived in El Paso and conferred with Joseph F. Friedkin, U.S. Commissioner on the International Boundary and Water Commission, and with officials of both the city and county of El Paso. Later Mr. Mann went to Austin, the capital of Texas, to meet with officials of the State who might be concerned.[6]

After further study of the problem, and after negotiations with Mexican officials, into which discussions members of the Department of State entered fully, Ambassador Mann returned to El Paso to explain to local leaders the proposals our Government would submit to Mexico. For 3 days during February of 1963, Mr. Mann and Commissioner Friedkin consulted with local authorities, with owners of property in the Chamizal zone, and with others who would be affected by the proposed settlement. The results of these talks seemed to indicate that fully 90 percent of the people contacted in El Paso were favorable to the project as it had been developed to this point.[7]

While negotiations and discussions continued, President Kennedy on March 6 said that the United States should erase the black mark resulting from its failure to carry out the decision of the arbitral tribunal that had tried to effect a compromise in 1911. At the same time, the Secretary of Foreign Relations in Mexico City, Manuel Tello, stated that an agreement was now within a millimeter of achievement.[8] However, considerable more effort was necessary to work out the terms incorporated into the agreement.

THE AREA IN DISPUTE

The bone of contention that required the attention of the two Presidents, and the redoubling of effort on the part of many of their subordinates, is a small strip of territory lying on the border of the Rio Grande between the cities of El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. Taking its Spanish name from the scrubby plants that once covered the area, the entire Chamizal tract includes about 630 acres of land. It extends from the Levee Road and Charles Street on the west in a northeasterly direction to join Cordova Island which is the property of Mexico, as indicated on the map on pages 26 and 27 [not printed in the RECORD]. Thus, the western and southern boundary of the tract is formed by the present channel of the river; its northern boundary is the river as surveyed in 1852; its eastern boundary is Cordova Island, which, though belonging to Mexico, is located on the northern or American side of the river. Cordova Island contains about 386 acres.

Several thousand persons live in the Chamizal zone. About 100 acres of the extreme western section are located within the downtown business district of El Paso. Two vehicular and pedestrian bridges cross the river in this area, connecting Stanton and Santa Fe Streets in El Paso with Lerdo and Juarez Streets in Ciudad Juarez, thus giving convenient access to the centers of both cities. This line of communication runs through the Chamizal for about three-tenths of a mile.

Looking at this small strip of land on the map and taking into account its relatively limited economic value, as the interests of nations go, one might reasonably conclude that the task of determining its nationality should have been rather simple. But unfortunately, such a conclusion would be quite erroneous. The hope for a rational and amicable agreement respecting the ownership of this narrow plot has been shattered time after time. High expectations of disposing of the issues involved were raised during the administrations of President Taft in 1913, President Coolidge in 1925, President Hoover in 1931–33, and during the terms of F. D. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. But in no instance could the baffling enigma of the Chamizal be resolved.

THE CAPRICIOUS RIO GRANDE

In some respects the failure may be ascribed to the limitations of diplomacy and to the stubborn persistence of nationalistic amour-propre on both sides of the Rio Grande, as we shall presently see in detail. But, in addition, we must recognize that the forces of nature have played a leading role in this international drama. Like the witches in "Macbeth," these forces seem to have brewed an evil influence destined to defeat the best of human intentions—a striking example of the mastery of matter over mind. The physical causes of the trouble can be traced directly to the vagaries of the Rio Grande. Never noted for consistency in staying within the low banks along much of its course, the river seems to have taken a special delight in wandering from its bed as it flowed through the level terrain in the Pass of the North. As one writer pointed out:

---

[1] See issues of July 18 and 19, 1963, El Fronterizo and El Mexicano (both of Juarez); also El Universal, Excelsior, La Prensa, and Novedades of Mexico City. Leading articles in Continente, July 1963; La Nación, Aug. 1, 1963; Todo, Aug. 1, 1963.

[2] The proposed settlement has aroused much interest and some controversy locally. For typical opinions, see the El Paso Times, July 11–21, 1963, and El Paso Herald-Post, same dates.

[3] The El Paso Times, July 19, 1963.

[4] United States-Mexico, joint communique, Mexico City, June 29–30, 1962.

[5] The El Paso Times, July 8, 1962.

[6] Ibid., July 18–22, 1962.

[7] Ibid., Feb. 19–24, 1963.

[8] Ibid., Mar. 7, 1963. See also El Fronterizo (Juarez), July 3, 1962; July 22, 1962; Aug. 14, 1962; June 5, 1963.

"Sometimes, worn thin by drought and bled by irrigation, it [the Rio Grande] is not a river at all but only a wide strip of white sand baking and glaring in the sun. It becomes an impressive stream only in times of flood and then it runs in a red torrent often half a mile wide, lifting an angry crest of sandwaves, devouring its own banks, earth trees and all, as though in a furious effort to carry away the whole country and dump it into the sea."[9]

The river rises in the Rocky Mountains of southern Colorado and flows for about 2,000 miles on its way to the Gulf of Mexico. It is estimated that the total effective drainage area of the Rio Grande is 177,500 square miles.[10] For part of its journey to the sea, it pushes its way through miles of a broad sandy valley, where, before the building of Elephant Butte Dam in 1916 and Caballo Dam some 20 years later, it twisted and doubled upon itself like a great sea serpent. For centuries it coiled and recoiled in the shifting sands of the semiarid regions.

Throughout its history, the great river has not always been friendly to man. Sometimes during a period of drought it has failed him altogether, and at other times of great flood it has washed away what he has built or planted. In spite of its treacherous character, however, crops have been grown in its valley for perhaps a thousand years. Probably the oldest irrigation in the United States was that of the native Indians found by the Spaniards when they entered the valley of the Rio Grande in New Mexico in the middle of the 16th century.[11]

In 1827 when Jose Ponce de Leon received from Mexico his famous land grant that is now the heart of downtown El Paso, the river flowed in front of his house, considerably north of its present course. It wound through and across the area now occupied by the principal streets of the business district—Mills, San Antonio, and Magoffin—and continued on eastward through Manzana, Stevenson, and Rosa, passing along the present site of the Standard Oil and Texaco refineries, and on toward the town of Ysleta. At that earlier time all of this property was within Mexico. The Chamizal extended from the northern banks of the river southward to Calle del Chamizal in El Paso del Norte, now called Calle Mejia in Ciudad Juarez. Since colonial times this extensive area has been occupied by the Spanish and Mexican settlers and their descendants. Eventually the river was to shift its course southward, flooding and overflowing, forming and leaving various beds—all to the discomfort and dismay of the increasing population of the community.[12]

THE RIO GRANDE AS BOUNDARY

In spite of the instability of the river as a boundary, leaders in the United States have long looked to the Rio Grande as a natural line defining our western limits. Since 1804 when Thomas Jefferson decided that the Rio Grande should be claimed as the western boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, the river has held an important place in international affairs.[13] The early leaders of Texas had a similar fixation on the river. At its first session in 1836 the Congress of the Texas Republic set the southern boundary of the new nation at the Rio Grande.[14] Following the War of 1845 between the United States and Mexico, which was waged essentially over territorial interests and claims, the Rio Grande assumed greater importance than ever before, since it was designated as the permanent boundary between the two nations. The significant position of the river was indicated in article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848:

"The boundary line between the two Republics [the United States and Mexico] shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande, otherwise called Rio Bravo del Norte, or opposite the mouth of its deepest branch, if it should have more than one branch emptying directly into the sea; from thence up the middle of that river, following the deepest channel, where it has more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico (which runs north of the town called Paso) to its western termination; thence, northward, along the western line of New Mexico; until it intersects the first branch of the river Gila; (or, if it should not intersect any branch of that river, then to the point of said line nearest to such branch, and thence in a direct line to the same); thence down the middle of the said branch and of the said river, until it empties into the Rio Colorado; then across the Rio Colorado, following the division line between Upper and Lower California, to the Pacific Ocean."[15]

Recognizing the need to define more precisely the course of the river, the framers of the Treaty of 1848 provided for a Boundary Commission, "who before the expiration of 1 year from the date of exchange of ratifications of this treaty shall meet at the Port of San Diego and proceed to run and mark the said boundary in its whole course to the mouth of the Rio Bravo del Norte. The boundary line established by this article shall be religiously respected by each of the two republics, and no change shall ever be made therein except by the express and free consent of both nations, lawfully given by the General Government of each, in conformity with its own constitution.

"If unhappily any disagreement should hereafter arise between the governments of the two republics, whether with respect to the interpretation of any stipulation in this treaty, or with respect to any other particular concerning the political or commercial relations of the two nations, the said governments, in the name of those nations, do promise to each other, that they will endeavor, in the most sincere and earnest manner, to settle the differences so arising, and to preserve the state of peace and friendship, in which the two countries are now placing themselves: using, for this end, mutual representations and pacific negotiations. And if, by these means, they should not be enabled to come to an agreement, a resort shall not, on this account, be had to reprisals, aggression or hostility of any kind, by the one republic against the other, until the government of that which deems itself aggrieved, shall have maturely considered, in the spirit of peace and good neighborship, whether it would not be better that such differences should be settled by the arbitration of commissioners appointed on each side, or by that of a friendly nation. And should such course be proposed by either party, it shall be acceded to by the other, unless deemed by it altogether incompatible with the nature of the difference, or the circumstances of the case."[16]

The Boundary Commission, on which both the United States and Mexico were represented, got off to a disappointingly slow start. For various reasons, its first meeting at San Diego, Calif., did not occur until 17 months after the treaty was signed. Various difficulties plagued its work from the beginning. It suffered from inadequate funds, supplies, and military protection. Errors in the prescribed maps caused much controversy between the representatives of the two countries. Finally, however, in December of 1856, the boundary survey was completed. It was to be accepted as the best delineation of the dividing line that could be produced.[17]

THE GADSDEN PURCHASE

In order to rectify the boundary in the area of the Gila River, the United States agreed to buy from Mexico, for $10 million, a tract of land beginning some 40 miles north of El Paso. The territory involved was commonly designated as "La Mesilla," and the transaction became known as the Gadsden Purchase of 1853.[18] Before this agreement had been reached, the Boundary Commission had completed a survey in 1852, establishing a firmer line between the United States and Mexico in the Chamizal zone. The Treaty of Mesilla of 1853 sought to make the treaty of 1848 (Guadalupe Hidalgo) conform to the new boundary resulting from the Gadsden Purchase. Article I of the new treaty provided for a mixed commission for the "settlement and ratification of a true line of division between the two republics; that line shall be alone established upon which the Commission may fix, their consent in this particular being considered decisive and an integral part of this treaty.

"The dividing line thus established shall in all time be faithfully respected by the two governments without any variation therein, unless by express and free consent of the two.[19]

While the Boundary Commission and its surveyors were trying to establish an acceptable line, the Rio Grande refused to cooperate; it continued its erratic ways. Because of the sandy texture of the soil in the El Paso area and the torrential rains at certain seasons of the year, the eroding power of the river remained as always.

A report by C. H. Ernst, major of engineers, U.S. Army, described the conduct of the river clearly:

"It is shifting from one position to another, eroding one bank and building up the opposite one, forming islands and bars, and then destroying them. The result of the natural changes is most noticeable in a bend where the erosion of the concave shore is sometimes continuous for many years, as appears to have been the case at El Paso. * * * The maximum distance between the shore at El Paso of 1855 and that of 1885 is about five-eighths of a mile and the total area added to the American territory is about 490 acres."[20]

FLOODS AND TREATIES

The river changed its banks again between 1853 and 1863 because of a serious inundation. Then in 1864 occurred the worst flood in the memory of the residents. The people north of the river were obliged to take refuge in the heights of Stormville, now Rim Road, in El Paso; and the inhabitants of El Paso del Norte (now Ciudad Juárez), to the south, moved in mass to the safer ground on which stood the Mission of Nuestra Señora de Gaudalupe. Such floods continued periodically until the great dams were built up the river, in 1916 and later, to control them. The floods and resulting changes in the course of the river led the two riparian nations to seek a measure of security in a new agreement, the treaty of 1884. Articles I and II provided:

---

[9] H. Ferguson, Rio Grande (New York, 1933), 3.

[10] H. Rept. No. 359, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 9233.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Cleofas Calleros, "El Chamizal—Que Es?" (El Paso, 1963), 4.

[13] American State Papers, Mar. 31, 1804.

[14] Laws of the Republic of Texas, 1st Cong., 1st sess., 1836 (Houston, 1837), 133–34.

[15] 9 U.S. Statutes at Large, 922, Art. V. Hereafter cited as Statutes.

[16] Ibid., Art. XXI.

[17] H. Rept. No. 247, 55th Cong., 2d sess., 55–56.

[18] 10 Statutes, 1031.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Chamizal Arbitration, appendix to the case of the United States of America (Washington, 1911), II, 759. Hereafter, Chamizal appendix.

"The dividing line shall forever be that described in the aforesaid treaty and follow the center of the normal channels of the rivers named, provided that such alterations be effected by natural causes through the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and not by the abandonment of the existing river bed and the opening of a new one.

"Any other change wrought by the forces of the current * * * shall produce no change in the dividing line as fixed by the survey of the International Boundary Commission of 1852." [21]

In this treaty an attempt was made to reach a decision regarding the general rules of accretion and avulsion, to specify conditions under which artificial changes in the course of the river could be dealt with, and to provide for property rights respecting lands affected by the creation of new channels. The treaty, however, did not specify how these objectives were to be achieved.

To meet increasing problems, including confusion over the boundary and uncertainty as to public and private titles to land, a new treaty was negotiated and signed. This convention of March 1, 1889, provided "for the creation of a Boundary Commission with the authority to investigate and determine the merits of each contest." [22] Originally, the Commission was set up for a 5-year period; then its life was regularly extended to 1910, when it was made permanent. The success of the Boundary Commission during its initial period was summarized by Anson Mills, U.S. Commissioner, as follows:

"During the 16 years of our active service (the revolution in Mexico in 1911 having put an end to activities) the Commission tried over 100 cases of all kinds, disagreeing only in the Chamizal case, and preserved the peace and quiet of the entire Rio Grande border for these long years, to the satisfaction of both governments and the people of the two nations." [23]

Under capable leadership, the Boundary Commission continued to improve conditions along the frontier. Its work in rectifying the channel of the river from El Paso to Fort Quitman should prevent any problem arising in the future in this section of the boundary. In keeping with the treaty of 1933, the Boundary Commission has successfully undertaken a project of flood control costing $6 million. The program has involved the assignment of 16,704.6 acres of land to the United States and 9,625.5 acres to Mexico. In all, 216 parcels of land have thus been exchanged.[24] The work of the Commission has been aided greatly by the construction of the Elephant Butte, Caballo, and Falcon Dams, which have done much to control the distribution and use of water along the river. Another large dam, Amistad, is scheduled for completion in 1968. The Commission has had to deal with many difficult technical problems, but it has been largely successful in defining and stabilizing the river frontier between the two neighboring nations. One problem, however, long defied solution: What could be done about the Chamizal? For one reason or another, every effort to deal with this highly perplexing problem bogged down in the sands of the shifting river or in the conflicts of diplomacy and national self-interest.

THE CHAMIZAL ISSUE EMERGES

As early as 1866 officials of both the United States and Mexico recognized the possibility that the devious ways of the Rio Grande could cause problems respecting the international boundary. The Secretary of Foreign Relations of Mexico, Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, notified the American Secretary of State, William H. Seward, that Mexico was seriously concerned.[25] About the same time Maj. W. H. Emory, U.S. Boundary Commissioner, called to the attention of Robert McClelland, Secretary of the Interior, the danger of a threatened avulsive change in the course of the river near El Paso. As a result of these reports, Attorney General Caleb Cushing drafted an opinion summarizing the principles of international law that applied. This opinion served as a reply to the Mexican Government and a statement of policy that the United States would consistently follow in subsequent negotiations.[26] Cushing's views were to figure prominently in the effort at arbitration in 1911.

The issue over the Chamizal first became troublesome in 1894 when the Boundary Commission met to establish the dividing line over the bridges between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.[27] On learning of the move, the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations notified Washington that no one had been authorized to define a boundary between the two countries, but only between the two cities. The Secretary pointed out that the channel of the river had changed in area since the boundary was fixed in conformity with the treaty of 1848 and that the first question which must be decided was where the actual dividing line lay between the two countries. The Mexican authorities intervened to reserve the rights of Mexico, avoiding a possible later claim of the United States that the boundary agreed on was the line established over the bridges.[28]

On June 21, 1894, the two Boundary Commissioners agreed on a line over the bridges, but they considered it to be provisional only. A week later, on June 29, the government of President Díaz notified the United States that Mexico could not approve this line as the boundary between the two nations. The Mexican note referred to the treaty of 1889 that created the Boundary Commission and declared that the agreement did not authorize the Commission to make such provisional arrangements. The note also referred to a claim that had been filed by Pedro I. García, alleging that a plot of land called the Chamizal had previously been a part of Ciudad Juarez, the title to which plot he held through Mexico, but that his land had been joined to the territory of the United States by a violent change in the course of the river. Since the claimant declared that the tract still belonged to Mexico, the Mexican government insisted that the Boundary Commission examine and decide the case of the Chamizal before fixing the dividing line between Ciudad Juarez and El Paso.[29] In this manner, the question of the Chamizal, which was to become increasingly complex, was converted from a routine matter of resolving border problems due to changes in the river, a matter under the control of the Boundary Commission, into a serious diplomatic question requiring the attention of the foreign offices of the two countries.

The second claim of the Mexican Government respecting the Chamizal occurred in 1897 after a flood had caused extensive damage in both El Paso and Ciudad Juarez. The people of the two cities demanded that something be done to prevent future losses from the uncontrolled waters of the river. As a result, the mayor of El Paso, Joseph Magoffin, and the Governor of Chihuahua, Miguel Ahumada, sought the permission of their respective national governments to straighten the channel of the river. The inhabitants of the two cities agreed to pay the cost involved—$8,000. The U.S. Government readily accepted the proposal. Mexico agreed also, but on the condition that the territory north of the new channel should remain under Mexican sovereignty. The project was completed in 1899 with the full cooperation of the two city governments. As a result of this rectification, Cordova Island, which lies north of the present channel of the river, was created and was retained by Mexico.[30]

Once the Rio Grande was thus brought somewhat better under control, and occupation of the Chamizal was made physically safe, its population began to increase rapidly. In 1892 construction of the Church of the Sacred Heart and a parochial school was begun. The Chapel of San Ignacio de Loyola was erected in 1905. These religious and educational institutions naturally attracted more people to the area, many of whom built permanent houses of brick. Within a short time much of the Chamizal was integrated into the city of El Paso and designated as the second ward. Legally, however, the owners of property in the area never were completely secure in their possession. Many deeds issued since 1900 have referred to the cloud on the titles resulting from the fact that the nationality of the property has been in dispute.[31]

LITIGATION AND DIPLOMACY

The problem of nationality lay dormant for some time, but it was brought to life again in 1907 when the El Paso and Northeastern Railway obtained a judgment in the Federal circuit court, authorizing the condemnation of land in the Chamizal for a right-of-way. On March 21, 1907, the Mexican Government protested to the American Secretary of State, Elihu Root, that the Chamizal was sub judice (in litigation) and the "area had unquestionably been Mexican in other times." [32]

Secretary Root acted promptly on March 29 by addressing a letter to the Attorney General of the United States which reviewed the legal issues involved and asked for a stay of execution of the court's order. Root pointed out that the Chamizal was in dispute between the United States and Mexico and that the Boundary Commission, which had jurisdiction over the matter, had not yet rendered a decision. If the area was still Mexican, as it undoubtedly was in other times, the incompetence of the U.S. court would be evident. Since the court apparently did not know the facts mentioned, its decision had denied the sovereignty of Mexico and asserted the dominion of the United States. The effort to dispose of property that was involved in negotiations created a serious difficulty and placed the United States in an untenable position, since it was unjustifiable, after having agreed with Mexico to submit the question respecting the nationality of the tract to a special tribunal, to decide the issue ex parte and on our own account. Root therefore requested that the Attorney General instruct the Federal marshal at El Paso to desist at once from executing the order of the court and that the

---

[21] 24 Statutes, 1011, Art. II.

[22] 31 Statutes, 1936.

[23] Anson Mills, "My Story" (Washington 1921), 301.

[24] United States, Treaty Series (Washington, 1934), No. 864.

[25] Alberto María Carreño, México y los Estados Unidos de América (2d ed., Mexico, D. F., 1962), 274 ff.

[26] Charles A. Timm, "The International Boundary Commission" (Austin, 1941), 151–1961.

[27] Chamizal appendix, I, 347–348.

[28] Salvador Mendoza, "El Chamizal: Un Drama Juridico y Historico (Mexico, D. F., 1962), 11.

[29] Chamizal appendix, I, 347–348.

[30] Department of State, Proceedings of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico (Washington, 1903), I, 149–167.

[31] Calleros, "El Chamizal—Que Es?" 10.

[32] Chamizal appendix, II, 701.

Federal district attorney be notified to suspend any further action in the case. The intervention of Secretary Root was effective: the interest of Mexico in respect to the Chamizal was thus recognized and protected.[33]

In 1909 another local incident occurred that had diplomatic repercussions in the national capitals of Mexico and the United States. When the city of El Paso undertook to install a waste-disposal plant in the Chamizal, Mexico officially protested.[34] A series of notes was exchanged in 1910 between the Mexican Ambassador in Washington, Francisco León de la Barra, and the U.S. Secretary of State, Philander C. Knox.[35] The arguments advanced by each side in this correspondence were fully reviewed in the arbitral proceedings of 1911 and they will be taken up later in that connection.

By now the controversey over the little strip of land in south El Paso, by no means the most desirable part of the city, had become quite serious. Both Governments recognized that the issue could not be settled by the exchange of diplomatic notes or by action of the binational Boundary Commission, each member of which would almost certainly continue to support the claims of his own Government. A new procedure was clearly called for, but what should it be?

IN SEARCH OF A PROCEDURE

As early as 1897 the two members of the Boundary Commission had agreed on at least one thing respecting the Chamizal. Since they realized that they could not dispose of the knotty questions involved, they mutually concluded that it would be well to add a third member to the Commission who should act as an arbiter in deciding this single issue.[36] The Department of State at Washington agreed to this recommendation, but the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations rejected it and declared that the case should be submitted to arbitration.[37] He proceeded to name several heads of state who might be suitable to serve on a special court of arbitration. To this proposal, officials at Washington replied that Mexico was broadening the question beyond the commitments of the United States—that the problem was not one of international law but of applying the ordinary rules respecting the effect upon a borderline of the change in the course of a dividing river. Wanting to avoid the formality of a new treaty and arbitral proceedings, the Department of State recommended the addition of a third member to the Boundary Commission, either American or Mexican, on whom the two nations could agree, to dispose of the matter.[38]

The Mexican foreign office, however, referred to article II of the treaty of 1889, which provided for only two commissioners, and denied that a third member would have legal competence to render a decision binding on the two Governments.[39] The United States did not reply to this last note, and the question lay at rest until Mexico revived it in July 1907, by submitting a new proposal. This time, the Mexican Government sought a compromise. Using article XXI of the treaty of 1848 and article VIII of the Convention of 1889 as a base, Mexico recommended an ad hoc mixed commission consisting of the two members of the Boundary Commission, plus a third member to be named by the Government of Canada, who would have the authority to decide the questions on which the other two Commissioners could not agree. The decision of the mixed commission was to be definitive and unappealable.[40]

While the Governments delayed a decision on the manner of dealing further with the dispute, they explored the possibilities of an exchange of territory. In a note of December 12, 1907, Mexico offered to trade the Bosque, the Cordova, and El Chamizal for the Isla de San Elizario and El Horcon.[41] The Mexican note also claimed that the Chamizal lay south of the course of the river of 1852, and therefore was in Mexican territory, a point the United States was not willing to concede.

In his communication of January 15, 1910, the Mexican Ambassador, de la Barra, insisted on a new treaty that would recognize the claims of Mexico to the Chamizal—or failing this, that the two nations without delay submit the issue of ownership to arbitration.[42] In reply, Secretary of State Knox, on March 22, accepted in principle the Mexican proposal.[43] He suggested that each country submit a list of three Canadian jurisconsults and that from these six, the two litigants select an umpire to act with the two regular members of the Boundary Commission in deciding title to the Chamizal. In the event the two nations could not agree on the umpire, the Government of Canada would name one of the six, who would serve as the third member of the mixed commission, with the right to vote. On June 17 Secretary Knox submitted to the Mexican foreign office the initial draft of a special treaty of arbitration, or a compromise, providing for the membership of the arbitral body, delimiting the territory in dispute, and defining the issue to be settled. Mexico agreed in principle to the terms proposed, and both Governments ratified the treaty on which arbitral action would be based.[44]

AGREEMENT ON ARBITRATION

Thus the two nations agreed that the case of the Chamizal would be decided in accordance with the well-established principles and procedures of international law. The method of settlement that the two Governments chose was used frequently by the ancient Greeks, and occasionally in medieval Europe. However, its use had lapsed for several centuries, and the process was not revived until the Jay Treaty of 1795, nor was it much in vogue until after the settlement of the Alabama Claims in 1872. In referring to the procedure as it was employed before the 17th century, one writer has observed that it "is often very difficult, sometimes impossible, clearly to separate cases of mediation from those of arbitration, either because the terminology was not very definite, or the expressions used were equivocal, or because the distinction was not clear to the minds of the negotiators." [45]

Many writers on international law have called attention to the distinction between arbitration and mediation. As one has noted: "The essential point is that arbitrators are required to decide the difference: that is, to pronounce sentence on the question of right. To propose a compromise is not within their province, but in the province of a mediator." [46] John Bassett Moore has explained the distinction by saying: "Arbitration is a settlement of international disputes, according to legal rules and methods, by arbitors chosen by the disputant parties themselves. Arbitration is a legal procedure. Mediation is an advisory, arbitration a judicial function." [47]

As a result of long usage, the arbitral process has become well established, and the procedures used are as fixed as those of a court of law. One point recognized in international law is the need to have a clearly defined agreement or compromis so that there may be no question as to the subject in dispute or the authority of the tribunal.[48] The convention of 1910 appears to have fulfilled this requirement. Article I specifically located the Chamizal tract, and about this point there was no dispute.[49] Article III stated that the Commission should decide "solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States or in Mexico." [50] The Convention also specified that the decision "rendered unanimously or by a majority vote of the Commission shall be final and conclusive." [51] The preamble stated that the decision should be in accordance with the various treaties and conventions existing between the two countries and in accordance with the principles of international law.[52]

In compliance with article II of the convention, Eugene Lafleur of Canada was chosen as presiding commissioner; Fernando Beltrán y Puga was named to represent Mexico, and Anson Mills, the United States.[53]

MEXICO SUBMITS HER CASE

On May 15, 1911, the Arbitration Commission met in the Federal Court House at El Paso, and it rendered its decision approximately a month thereafter.[54] In keeping with the terms of the convention of June 24, 1910, each Government submitted to each commissioner a printed argument setting out the points it relied on in its case and its countercase.[55]

Mexico claimed that the boundary between the two nations was a fixed and invariable line as determined by the treaties of 1848 and 1853, and that the boundary was not subject to changes caused by accretion. The Mexican argument called attention to the fact that the Treaty of Mesilla was signed in 1853 to make the terms of the treaty of 1848 conform to the new boundary as a result of the Gadsden Purchase. Article I of the treaty of 1853 provided for a mixed commission for the "settlement and ratification of a true line of division between the two Republics; that line shall be alone established upon which the commission may fix, their consent in this particular being considered decisive and an integral part of this treaty.

"The dividing line thus established shall in all time be faithfully respected by the two Governments without any variation therein, unless by express and free consent of the two." [56]

It was on the interpretation of these two treaties that Mexico based its claim that the boundary was at the place located by the survey of 1852, which, the Mexicans insisted, would mean that the Chamizal tract was Mexican territory regardless of the manner by which the river had changed its bed since 1852.[57]

---

[33] Ibid., I, 454.

[34] Ibid., 508.

[35] Ibid., 433.

[36] Ibid., 347–348.

[37] Ibid., 353.

[38] Ibid., 355.

[39] Ibid., 361–362.

[40] Ibid., 368–371.

[41] Ibid., 365–388.

[42] Ibid., 398–404.

[43] Ibid., 421–424.

[44] 36 Statutes, pt. 2, 481.

[45] J. B. Moore, "History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States Has Been a Party" (Washington, 1898), V, 4831. Hereafter, Moore, Digest.

[46] L. F. L. Oppenheim (ed.), "The Collected Papers of John Westlake on Public International Law" (London, 1914), I, 354. Hereafter, Westlake.

[47] Moore, Digest, VII, 25.

[48] E. Vattel, "The Law of Nations of the Principles of International Law Applied to the Conduct and to the Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns" (Fenwick tr., Washington, 1916), II, 277.

[49] 36 Statutes, pt. 2, 2481, art. I.

[50] Ibid., art. III.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid., art. V.

[53] Mills, "My Story," 294.

[54] Chamizal arbitration, "Minutes of the International Boundary Commission: Award; Dissenting Opinions; Protest of the Agent of the United States" (Washington, 1911), 35–36. Hereafter, Chamizal award.

[55] 36 Statutes, pt. 2, 2481, art. V.

[56] 10 Statutes, 1031, art. I.

The legal arguments of Mexico had been developed earlier by Ambassador de la Barra, who had argued that by the terms of the treaties, the International Boundary Commission was authorized to determine the boundary, that the decisions of the Commissioners were to have the same force as the treaties themselves, and that such decision could not be modified except by the consent of both Governments. He had said: "One of the direct consequences of that agreement is that the boundary was fixed in such a manner that it could in no wise be affected by a change in the course of the Rio Bravo or Grande, no matter what the cause might be."[58] To emphasize his point, he had described the bed of the river by dividing it into three zones. The middle zone, he had declared, ran through three canyons; the upper and lower zones were the portions in which the "river runs torrent-like across alluvium valleys, whereby its course is made unstable and subject to constant variations."[59] As a result, he had concluded:

"The logical deduction from the foregoing data is that the provisions of the Convention of 1884 were not directly applicable to the first and third zones of the Rio Grande, in those regions where its course had changed, since the invariable and fixed boundary line determined by the treaty of 1853 already deviated from the course of the river in 1884.

"The position of the dividing line during the period from 1853 to 1884 is clearly determined by the first of the conventions named * * * the line so established was in no wise affected by a change in the course of the river, whatever might be the cause of such a change. That is to say, from 1853 to 1884—and it should, as I will show, be so held from that to this date—all lands north of the dividing line established by the Commissioners in conformity with the treaty of 1853, were and remain American and all those south of that line are and remain Mexican."

The provisions of the Convention of 1884 could only be applicable to cases which might arise subsequently; but not to those which had occurred before, because they came under the rule stipulated in the treaty of 1853.

The Convention of 1884 could not and cannot, like that of 1905, be applied to cases antecedent to the first of those two dates, which were regulated by the treaty of 1853.

"That some of the clauses of a convention had been superseded by the provisions of a subsequent treaty, cannot in the least impair or destroy rights created by the first instrument unless there be an express agreement to that effect in the later compact."[60]

The communication that Señor de la Barra submitted to the Arbitration Commission ended with a summary of the correspondence between Mexico and the United States relating to the boundary, which correspondence, in his opinion, proved that the United States had also agreed to this principle of a fixed and invariable line.

REPLY OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States replied by summarizing the whole correspondence on the fixed-line theory and pointed out that "during the earlier portion of the period from 1853 to 1884, the Government of Mexico apparently shared the views of the United States; that during the later period it apparently manifested at times a disposition to adopt the fixed-boundary theory; and it would seem that partially as a result of discussions growing out of this attitude on the part of the Government of Mexico, the Convention of 1884 was negotiated and signed, whereby the two governments agreed on a formal interpretation of the boundary treaties in the sense of Attorney General Cushing's opinion."[61]

Mexico had also contended that since the Chamizal tract had been formed before 1884, the interpretation of that treaty in no way affected the title of that tract.[62] The position of the United States was that a true interpretation of the treaties of 1848 and 1852 meant that in accordance with international law governing river boundaries, the boundary moved with the river when it changed its location by accretion; that between 1852 and 1911 the river moved south by accretion; and that under well-established principles of law, the present channel of the river should remain the boundary.

According to the rules of international law, as the United States interpreted them, accretion occurs when a river eats into its opposite bank, thus moving in the direction of the receding bank. Conversely, avulsion occurs when the river suddenly breaks out of its old channel and makes a new one—the old river bed can be easily seen. In the Chamizal tract no abandoned river beds were discernible between 1852 and 1911. The United States insisted that the various reports, documents, and testimonies before the tribunal proved that "all the alterations in the banks and course of the river have been effected by causes which are natural to the Rio Grande, that the alterations have been through slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and that all the requirements specified in article I of the treaty of 1884 have been met at all times so that the dividing line has constantly followed the center of the normal channel of the river."[63]

The United States interpreted the treaty of 1884 as contemplating only two possible types of change, one by erosion, and the other by avulsion. It pointed out that the expression "slow and gradual" modifying "erosion" was in conformity with the doctrine laid down by Attorney General Caleb Cushing in his answer to a request from the Secretary of the Interior as to the effects of changes in the course of the river on the location of the boundary. In his opinion, given in 1866, Cushing quoted from many authorities on international law to prove his theory, which was as follows:

"Whatever changes happen to either bank of the river by accretion on the one, or degradation on the other, that is, by the gradual, as it were, insensible accession or abstraction of mere particles, the river as it runs continues to be the boundary. One country may in process of time, lose a little of its territory, and the other gain a little, but the territorial relation cannot be reversed by such imperceptible mutations in the course of the river. The general aspect of things remains unchanged. And the convenience of allowing the river to retain its previous function, notwithstanding such insensible changes in its course, or in either of its banks, outweighs the inconvenience, even to the injured party, involved in a detriment, which happening gradually, is inappreciable in the successive movements of its progression.

"But on the other hand, if, deserting its original bed, the river forces for itself a new channel in another direction, then the nation, through whose territory the river thus breaks its way, suffers injury by the loss of territory greater than the benefit of retaining the natural river boundary, and that boundary remains in the middle of the deserted riverbed. For, in truth, just as a stone pillar constitutes a boundary, not because it is a stone, but because of the place in which it stands, so a river is made the limit of nations, not because it is running water bearing a certain geographical name, but because it is water flowing in a given channel, and within given banks, which are the real international boundary. Such it the received rule of the law of nations on this point, as laid down by all writers of authority."[64]

The Mexican answer was that even if the boundary should be determined according to the theory of accretion and avulsion as defined in the treaty of 1884, the disputed tract would still be Mexican territory, for "slow and gradual" qualified the meaning of "corrosion." For some reason, the Mexican translation used the word "corrosion," rather than "erosion," as is found in the American original, meaning that the movement of the river must be similar to a corrosive change, as the rusting of iron.[65]

CLAIMS AND COUNTERCLAIMS

In addition to the issues of erosion and avulsion, a third point argued in the Chamizal case was that of prescription. The United States claimed international title to El Chimazal by reason of the undisturbed, uninterrupted, and unchallenged possession of "said territory by the United States of America since 1836."[66] Prescription in international law may be defined as "the acquisition of sovereignty over territory through continuous and undisturbed exercise of sovereignty over it."[67] This concept refers to long-continued possession in the face of a title held earlier by another. In the case of the Chamizal, the United States claimed a dual prescription, "first, to the Rio Grande as a water boundary since 1836; second, to the Chamizal tract since it was formed, beginning in 1852."[68] The question of how long a second country must occupy a territory in order to have clear title has not been clearly defined in international law. From 30 to 50 years has been given as the usual time of inactivity by the first nation.[69] The United States contended that Texas and the United States had had complete control over the tract from 1836 to 1895, when Mexico filed its first claim to the tract.[70] Mexico answered this contention by pointing out that the changes in the boundary had not been made successively but at times of great floods, and that on each occasion when such a change had occurred, the Mexican Government had called the attention of the United States to that section of the boundary, asking that notice be taken of the change.[71]

After considering the arguments presented by both sides in the controversy, the Arbitration Commission voted on six questions. All three Commissioners agreed that the United States had no claim to the Chamizal tract on the basis of prescription. The Presiding Commissioner, Lafleur, and the American Commissioner, Mills, voted together on two issues: against the fixed-and-invariable-line theory, and for the theory that the treaty of 1884 applied to all changes in the river subsequent to the survey of 1852. The Mexican Commissioner, Puga, and the Presiding Commissioner voted together on three issues: that the whole of the Chamizal tract was not formed by slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium within the meaning of article I of the Convention of 1884; that before 1864 the formation was due to slow and gradual erosion; and that between 1864 and 1868, the formation was not due to slow and gradual erosion.[72]

---

[57] Comisión Internacional de Limites entre México y los Estados Unidos, Sécción Mexicanna, "Memoria Documentada del Jucio del Arbitraje del Chamizal" (México, D.F., 1911), 3 vol., passim. Hereafter, Arbitraje.

[58] Chamizal appendix I, 405–406.

[59] Ibid., 407.

[60] Ibid., 407–408.

[61] Chamizal, U.S. case (Washington, 1911), 37.

[62] Arbitraje, passim.

[63] Chamizal, "Argument of the United States of America" (Washington, 1911), passim. Hereafter, Chamizal argument.

[64] Opinions of the Attorney General of the United States (Washington, 1852-—), XIII, 175.

[65] Chamizal appendix I, 186–187.

[66] Chamizal argument, 113.

[67] L. F. L. Oppenheim, "International Law" (4th ed., London, 1928), I, 309.

[68] Chamizal argument, 114.

[69] S. Pufendorf, "Of the Law of Nature and Nations" (Oxford, 1703), IV, 385.

[70] Chamizal argument, 116.

[71] Arbitraje, 34.

The American Commissioner refused to vote on the fifth question for two reasons. First, he claimed that by answering the question, he would be recognizing the authority of the Commission to divide the tract, a power which he insisted the Commission did not have, since article III of the Convention of June 24, 1910, provided that "the Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States of America or in Mexico." [73] Second, he claimed that the question implied the recognition of a method of change in the river bed due to means other than those provided for by the treaties between the United States and Mexico.[74] On the last question, the American Commissioner refused to vote because "the location of the river in 1864 is wholly obliterated and its position can never be reestablished in any one of the points of its former location, and, therefore, even if the Commission were empowered to render a decision segregating that portion of the tract formed after 1864, provided the channel of 1864 could be located, a decision to this effect under the present circumstances when the channel can by no possibility be relocated, is void because it is indeterminate, indefinite, and impossible of accomplishment." [75]

THE AWARD AND ITS REJECTION

The Convention of 1910 had provided that the decision "whether rendered unanimously or by a majority vote of the Commissioners shall be final." [76] All three Commissioners had voted together on one question, the U.S. Commissioner and the Presiding Commissioner on two, and the Mexican Commissioner and the Presiding Commissioner on three. Adding up the score, the result was a majority vote in favor of Mexico. Accordingly, on June 15, 1911, the Commission announced its award as follows:

"The international title to the portion of the Chamizal tract lying between the middle of the bed of the Rio Grande as surveyed by Emory and Salazar in 1852 and the middle of said river as it existed before the flood of 1864, is in the United States of America, and the international title to the balance of said Chamizal tract is in the United States of Mexico." [77]

In the opinion of Lafleur, the river had moved by slow erosion before 1864 and by rapid erosion after that date. Therefore Mexico should have title to the tract south of the riverbed as it existed in 1864.[78] The position of the American Government, however, was that the contention of Mexico to the effect that the adjectives "slow" and "gradual" justified a special concept of erosion at El Chamizal was not consistent with international law.

The Americans insisted that words must be understood in accordance with their subject matter; therefore, since "erosion" and "avulsion" were the only types of changes specified in the treaty, it was logical to deduce that the words "slow and gradual," which modified "erosion," indicated that no other form of erosion was possible, and merely distinguished between a "slow and gradual" process as erosion, and a "rapid process" as avulsion. "Gradual" and "rapid" might represent a difference in degree of erosive action but did not constitute two kinds of erosive action. It seemed clear to the American Government that if Mexico and the United States had intended to advocate a type of change unknown to international law, a definite statement to that effect would have been included in the correspondence relating to the treaty. There was no evidence of such correspondence. Furthermore, if three kinds of changes were recognized, why mention only two in the treaty? The treaty provided for locating the boundary as a result of "slow and gradual" erosion and as a result of "avulsion," but it did not mention "rapid erosion." [79]

As indicated in the minutes of the meeting of June 16, 1911, the Commissioners of the United States and Mexico were to submit their opinions on the points of the award from which they dissented. The Mexican Commissioner, Señor F. Beltrán y Puga, based his dissenting opinion on two points: first, that the findings of the majority were not supported by the record and the argument respecting the fixed and invariable line of 1852; and, second, that the Convention of 1884 was not retroactive.[80] Mr. Mills advanced no new argument but reiterated the points he had previously submitted. He gave his reasons for dissenting as follows:

"First, the Commission is wholly without jurisdiction to segregate the tract or to make other findings concerning the change at El Chamizal than 'to decide whether it has occurred through avulsion or erosion, for the effects of articles I and II of the Convention of November 12, 1884' (and article IV of the Convention of 1889). Secondly, because * * * the Convention of 1884 is not susceptible to any other construction than that the change of the river at El Chamizal was embraced within the first alternative of the treaty of 1884. And thirdly, because * * * the finding of the award is vague, indeterminate, and uncertain in its terms and impossible of execution." [81]

To summarize, Mexico claimed the entire tract by right of a "fixed and invariable line." The United States claimed the entire tract in accordance with the international principle of changes made by erosion. The Presiding Commissioner divided the tract between the two nations. Later Mexico agreed to accept the decision of Lafleur; [82] but the American Commissioner dissented, and his opinion was sustained by the Department of State of the United States.[83] The President of the United States, William H. Taft, expressed the same thought in his message of December 7, 1911, by saying: "Our arbitration of the Chamizal boundary question with Mexico was unfortunately abortive, but with earnest efforts on the part of both Governments which its importance commands, it is felt that an early, practical adjustment should prove possible." [84]

The New York World, commenting on the decision of the Arbitration Commission in 1911, referred to the "comic-opera conditions in El Paso," and concluded:

"The decision of the Chamizal Arbitration Commission apportioning between Mexico and the United States a 3-mile strip of land five blocks wide, included in the city limits of El Paso, shows an astuteness worthy of the celebrated tariff ruling on frog legs. The difference between tweedledum and tweedledee was never before so accurately defined in diplomacy. By crossing a street or turning a corner, citizens of El Paso will find themselves under the dominion of another nation and what that will mean in the matter of conflict of laws and encouragement of license may be readily understood. A comic-opera librettist never created a more diverting situation." [85]

LEGALITY OF THE U.S. POSITION

The problem of the Chamizal is of particular interest in the field of international law because it represents an instance in which a nation rejected an arbitral award. One of the prerequisites of arbitration is that the parties bind themselves to accept the decision of the judges. However, it seems to be a generally accepted principle of international law that under certain conditions the award may be repudiated; since "an award outside the limits of the submission is not binding, for in such a case the tribunal acts in excess of its powers." [86] By the terms of the Chamizal award, the tract was divided between the two litigants. This action, the United States claimed, was not in compliance with article III of the convention of 1910, "which provided that the Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States of America, or in Mexico," and for that reason, the U.S. Government felt it was justified in not accepting the decision of the Arbitral Commission.[87]

In reaching this conclusion, the United States followed the reasoning of leading authorities on the subject. Charles Calvo enumerates six situations in which parties are justified in refusing to accept and execute arbitral judgments. These are:

"1. Where the ward was unauthorized, or rendered outside of and beyond the terms of agreement;

"2. Where the arbitrators were under a legal or moral incapacity, absolute or relative, as where they were bound by previous engagements, or had in the formulation of their conclusions a direct interest unknown to the parties who chose them;

"3. Where the arbitrators or one of the parties had not acted in good faith, as when the arbitrators were bought or corrupted by one of the parties;

"4. Where one of the parties was not heard or enabled to vindicate his rights;

"5. Where the award bore on things outside the submission;

"6. Where the tenor of the award was absolutely contrary to the rules of justice and hence could not be the object of a compromise." [88]

Among the rules proposed by the Institute of International Law at its session in Geneva in 1874 and at its session at The Hague in 1887 is one relating to the requirement that an award be carried out. The rule is that the award "must pronounce in accordance with the provisions of the agreement to arbitrate." [89] J. B. Moore makes the same point when he says: "The sentence of arbitration shall be void in case of the avoidance of the agreement to arbitrate, or of an excess of power, or of proved corruption of one of the arbitrators, or of an essential error." [90]

---

[72] Chamizal award, 34.

[73] 36 Statutes, 2, 2481, art. III.

[74] Chamizal award, 4.

[75] Ibid.

[76] 36 Statutes, 2, 2481, art. III.

[77] Chamizal award, 4.

[78] Ibid., 30.

[79] Ibid., 42.

[80] Ibid., 49.

[81] Ibid., 36.

[82] Carreño, "México y los Estados Unidos," 383–392.

[83] Department of State, "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States" (Washington, 1870–1940), 1911, 598. Hereafter, "U.S. Foreign Relations."

[84] J. D. Richardson (comp.), "Messages and Papers of the Presidents" (New York, 1914), XVIII, 8038.

[85] Quoted in the El Paso Times, June 27, 1911.

[86] C. C. Hyde, "International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States" (Boston, 1922), I, 581.

[87] 36 Statutes, 1910, art. III.

[88] Charles Calco, "Le Droit International" (Paris, 1896), III, 485, 486. Hereafter, Calvo.

[89] Moore, Digest, V, 5058.

[90] Ibid., 5062.

Secretary of State Bayard, in 1888, expressed the policy of the United States in regard to the validity of awards as follows:

"No matter how solemn and how authoritative may be a judgment, it is subject to be set aside by the consent of the parties. To the awards of international commissions * * * this position applies with particular force, since it is a settled principle of international law that no sovereignty can in honor press an unjust or mistaken award even though made by a judicial international tribunal invested with the power of swearing witnesses and receiving or rejecting testimony."[91]

There have been many instances in which states have recognized the right to reject awards of international tribunals. An outstanding example was the rejection of the award in the northeastern boundary arbitration. The convention of September 12, 1827, between the United States and Great Britain provided that the points of difference over the boundary were to be submitted to some friendly sovereign or state and that the decision should be considered final and conclusive. The arbitrator, the King of the Netherlands, held that "neither the line claimed by the United States nor the line claimed by Great Britain so nearly answered the requirements of the treaty that a preference could be given to the one or to the other." He therefore abandoned as impracticable the attempt to draw the line described in the treaty, and recommended a line of convenience. Since the line recommended did not conform to a line claimed by either of the parties, and therefore was not within the special jurisdiction given the arbitrator, the Senate of the United States by a vote of 38 to 8, resolved, that the award was not obligatory. The consensus seemed to be that the arbitrator had not confined his decision to the limits prescribed by the compromise, and that therefore either state was justified in not abiding by it.[92]

Westlake, in discussing this award, says that "the arbitrator did not adjudicate on the respective lines proposed by the parties, but proposed an intermediate one as a compromise, which the United States was not bound to accept and did not accept."[93] Calvo, referring to the same case, says that the arbitrator, "instead of laying down a true line, left this in suspense and confined himself to suggesting a basis for an entirely new and hypothetical arrangement, which the parties agreed in disregarding."[94]

PRECEDENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

When in October of 1910, the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in the case of the United States against Venezuela concerning the Orinoco Steamship Co., annulled a previous arbitration award, the court pointed out that "excessive exercise of power may consist not only in deciding a question not submitted to the arbitrators, but also in misinterpreting the express provisions of the agreement in respect of the way in which they are to reach their decisions, notably with regard to the legislation or principles of law to be applied."[95] In an earlier case decided in 1884, although the award was in favor of the claim of the United States in a dispute with Haiti, the Secretary of State held that the arbitrator had "misconstrued his powers," and therefore the award was not binding.[96]

If these statements of writers on international law and opinions of courts and arbitral tribunals are accepted as precedents, the United States had the legal right to declare void the award which divided the Chamizal tract. In the case of the Chamizal, the subject in dispute was clearly defined, the question was clearly stated, and since the disputed tract was given neither to the United States nor to Mexico, the award rendered was outside of and beyond the terms of the convention of 1910, which controlled the proceeding.

On the question of jurisdiction over the Chamizal tract, Mexico voted it belonged to Mexico, the United States voted it belonged to the United States, and the third Commissioner, Lafleur, voted that it should be divided between the two nations. It would seem that if the Arbitration Commission was authorized to decide solely and exclusively as to whether the title to the Chamizal tract was in the United States or Mexico, the only possible answer was that Mexico had title to the whole tract or that the United States had title to it.

Because of the legal technicalities involved in the Chamizal arbitration, much confusion and misunderstanding have arisen over the outcome, especially the action of the United States in rejecting the award. On the surface, it has seemed to many persons that Mexico won the decision, since the vote on dividing the tract was 2 to 1. However, it is the author's view that this disposal of the case would not have been in accord with the instructions, to which both nations agreed, that the Commissioners were obliged to follow. This position is substantially the one adopted by the Department of State at the time.

OPINIONS IN MEXICO

As was natural, the reaction in Mexico to the award was entirely different than in the United States. The Mexican Government warmly welcomed the outcome and felicitated its representatives on their victory. But such good feelings and high hopes were short lived; they were dashed when the day for compliance with the award passed (June 15, 1913) without receipt of the territory. A leading contemporary authority, Licenciado Alberto Maria Carrena, voiced a broadly held opinion when he declared that Mexico had won a valid and binding judgment that should have been accepted and carried out. He believed that the arbitration failed only because the United States refused to respect its obligations under the convention of 1910. As for the contention of the American officials that the award could not be executed because it was physically impossible to locate the riverbed of 1864, Senor Carreno replied that this problem was not a legal one to concern the arbitrators but a physical one for surveyors and engineers, who could locate the line approximately and thus make possible substantial compliance with the decision of the tribunal. Senor Carreno detected in the rejection of the award the black hand of Yankee imperialism and later published two additional volumes to elaborate his broader thesis.[97]

Another contemporary Mexican writer viewed the matter differently. Writing in June of 1911, shortly after the terms of the award were announced, Roberto A. Esteva Ruiz stated categorically that the decision was a nullity, contrary to law, and unjust for Mexico. He cited the rules mentioned by Calvo and the precedent in the Northeastern Boundary Arbitration to show that Mexico had the legal right to repudiate the award. In his opinion, Mexico lost its case at El Paso, for his country was entitled to, and should have received, all of the Chamizal. The treaties of 1848 and 1853, according to Senor Esteva Ruiz, placed all of the zone within Mexico. They also fixed an invariable line along the Salazar and Emory survey, which could be changed only with the consent of both nations. Since Mexico had never agreed to any change, the boundary must remain as established earlier. The judgment of the arbiters based on the Treaty of 1884 improperly applied international law by making the terms of the treaty retroactive in effect. In this way, Mexico was deprived of territory that belonged in the national domain; Mexico thus had a greater right than the United States to protest, and to reject the award.[98]

Recent legal opinion in Mexico concerning the Chamizal arbitration is illustrated by the views of Licenciado César Sepúlveda, director of the faculty of law of the National University. While he believes that the United States was in error in rejecting the award, he credits American officials with sincere efforts to find a solution after the failure of the arbitration. On close examination, he finds untenable the two basic arguments that Anson Mills and the State Department submitted against the decision. He first brushes aside the contention that the award could not be physically carried out because the line of 1864 could not be located. This problem, he says, could not have concerned the arbitration commission, as it was a technical matter for surveyors. As for the second point—that the Commission exceeded its powers—Licenciado Sépúlveda insists that the arbiters acted within the limits of their authority. While article III of the convention of 1910 did restrict the Commission to the task of deciding "solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in Mexico or the United States of America," the purpose of this clause was simply to insure that the Commission dealt only with the territorial question, rather than with ancillary matters such as water rights. The compromise did not tie the hands of the Commission as the State Department contended; the Commission possessed the legal authority to decide the territorial issue involved, and its decision should have been respected. The best solution of the problem, he concludes, is for the United States to accept and implement the award of 1911, even if the American Government is 50 years late in doing so.[99]

NEW EFFORTS AT SETTLEMENT

Following the failure of the attempt at arbitration in 1911, the United States sought to find a solution by turning again to the processes of diplomacy. The Department of State now urged that the dispute be settled as speedily as possible without any discussion of the validity of the award or the possibility of scientifically relocating the channel of 1864. However, at that time, Mexican Ambassador de la Barra rejected the opinion of the American Commissioner, Anson Mills, that the award could not be executed; he added that, should the Commissioner "find the course of the river in 1864 to be undiscoverable and thus prove the correctness of the position taken by the American Commissioner, he would go much further in meeting the wishes of the United States."[100]

On August 24, 1911, the Secretary of State suggested to the Mexican Ambassador that negotiations be undertaken to incorporate the following terms in a formal agreement:

"1. A preamble reciting the pertinent articles of the present boundary treaties and conventions between the two governments.

"2. A recital of certain general differences as to the interpretation of these treaties as to the international title to the Chamizal tract in particular, and as to the validity of the recent award, and a statement of the desire on the part of both governments to settle these differences in an amicable way.

---

[91] U.S. Foreign Relations, 1887, 606.

[92] Moore, Digest, VII, 5960.

[93] Westlake, 415.

[94] Calvo, III, 485.

[95] *U.S.* v. *Venezuela*, "American Journal of International Law" (January 1911), V, 230.

[96] U.S. Foreign Relations, 1887, 605–606.

[97] Alberto María Carreño, "México y los Estados Unidos de América" (1st ed., 1922), ch. XX. See also his "La Diplomacia Extraordinaria entre México y Estados Unidos" (1st ed., 2 vol., 1951), passim.

[98] Roberto A. Estuva Ruiz, "Ensayos Jurídicos" (México, D. F., 1960), 241–253.

[99] Cesar Sepúlveda, "El Chamizal y algunas cuestiones diplomaticas pendientes entre México y los Estados Unidos," "Revista de la Facultad de Derecho de México," (México, D. F., 1962), XII, No. 47, 487–491.

[100] U.S. Foreign Relations, 1911, 602.

"3. Certain declaratory interpretation of the boundary treaties and conventions, particularly as to the following points: (a) The treaties of 1848–53 establish a fluvial or arcifinious boundary; (b) the treaty of 1884 is retroactive in scope; (c) two classes of changes only are contemplated in the treaty of 1884, i.e., erosion and avulsion, and these classes embrace all the changes which have taken place on the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers, since by virtue of the treaties of 1848 and 1853 certain parts of the dividing line between the two countries have followed the middle of the channel of the Rio Grande and the Rio Colorado, as well as changes which may take place in the future; (d) provisions relating to the adjustment of the international boundary line at El Paso and Juárez through mutual arrangement by a declaratory interpretation of the boundary treaties and the elimination of the Horcón Bar above Brownsville; (e) possible provision for the indemnification of private individuals who may be thought by one or the other government to be damaged through the adoption of the foregoing provision.[101]

In reply, however, Senor de la Barra was of the opinion that "inasmuch as the matter is finally adjudicated by award, nothing remains but to carry out duly the said decision by means of such arrangement as may be made to run the dividing line in accordance with the sentence." He also insisted that the award had placed Mexico in a different position by changing the legal situation—that, by the award, Mexico had acquired rights she could not surrender unless fully compensated therefor.[102] The State Department replied that the award was absolutely invalid, and that it would be impossible to locate the line of 1864. But the Department added that it did not ask the Government of Mexico to admit the invalidity of the recent award; it proposed only that these contentious matters be held in abeyance while the two Governments worked out through friendly negotiations a practical solution of their difficulties.[103] This approach, however, did not appeal to the Mexican Government.

PROJECTS TO TRADE TERRITORY

In 1913 the Department of State attempted again to effect a settlement. According to a plan submitted by Secretary Knox, Mexico would exchange the Cordova and the Chamizal tracts for the Horcon and a small area near El Paso and south of the river.[104] The bar of Horcon, which includes some 368 acres, was created by an artificial cut in the Rio Grande in 1900. The area is located near the mouth of the river. The first reports from Mexico indicated that these proposals were acceptable, but no one knows just how near a solution of the problem was at that time. When the United States refused to recognize the Huerta government in Mexico, the latter refused to consider the proposals further.

Later, a plan of the State Department provided for the United States to cancel the Pious Fund obligation of Mexico in return for her granting the United States title to the Chamizal tract. The Pious Fund was established in 1697 by the Government of Spain and the Catholic Church for the benefit of Jesuit missions in California. When in 1848 Mexico took over the fund, it had grown to several million dollars. Since the United States claimed the fund as a national asset when she acquired California, it became a basis for arbitration. In 1902, the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague ruled that Mexico should pay the United States $1,420,682.67 cash and $43,050.99 annually in perpetuity.[105] No payments, however, have been made since 1914.

On August 17, 1932, the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations, Senor Tellez, submitted the following draft agreements to the Ambassador of the United States in Mexico City: first, a convention covering the rectification of the river; second, a protocol covering the transfer of El Chamizal to the United States; and third, a protocol covering the release by the United States of the Pious Fund and its accrued and unpaid balance. Because of some technical points in the drafting of this document, J. Ruben Clark, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, submitted a counterdraft in which he combined El Chamizal with the Pious Fund. The Mexican Minister agreed to the change and said he wished to get the approval of President Ortiz Rubio and General Calles, and then submit the proposal to the entire cabinet.

The second section of the protocol provided that the channel of 1864 be located either 'in fact or by computation" in order to arrive at the extent of territory which had to be equalled in making the transfer of the Chamizal tract. The inclusion of this provision indicates that something in addition to the Pious Fund was to be given to Mexico in exchange for El Chamizal. Mr. Clark felt that the United States had two alternatives: "either to continue to repudiate the award and deal on that basis—a basis which had led us nowhere in 20 years—or to recognize that there was an award against us, and, while not relinquishing our own position regarding the award, secure from Mexico a relinquishment and transfer of her rights thereunder."

One suggestion was that the flood levee on the El Paso side of the river be taken as the northern levee of the rectified channel. This procedure would have thrown perhaps 10 acres of the Chamizal tract to the Mexican side of the river. Mexico requested that the possibility of moving the river north of the international bridges between the city of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez be considered, so as to transfer some of the actual tract, rather than just the bed of the river, south of the rectified river channel, or to make a similar adjustment lower down the river. Respecting this plan, L. M. Lawson, U.S. Boundary Commissioner, on October 21, 1932, said that from the viewpoints of both engineering and cost, it would not be possible to relocate the river as suggested. Such alterations, he declared, would introduce "reverse curves" in the river channel, which result would not be advisable. The estimated cost would be about $1,450,000 if the change was made at the bridges, or $670,000 if the change was made in the lower part of the Chamizal.[106]

When in 1930 the International Boundary Commission drew up a plan for rectifying the course of the Rio Grande, the Chamizal was included. The project called for exhanging about 10,000 acres of land between the two countries, beginning at the western point of El Chamizal and continuing to Fort Quitman. When the treaty of rectification was signed on February 1, 1933, it specified that work should begin south of Monument No. 15, on Córdova Island.[107]

BREAKING THE DEADLOCK

These various approaches, however, proved fruitless so far as a settlement of the issue of the Chamizal was concerned. The attitude of Mexico was that the award of the Arbitration Commission should be implemented, whereas the United States remained firm in contending that the Canadian and Mexican Commissioners had exceeded their powers in seeking to divide the tract. All efforts at an exchange of territory for territory, or land for money obligations failed because equivalent values, in the eyes of the negotiators, could not be arrived at. Another impediment has been the fact that for the past 20 years or so, Mexico has insisted that a substantial part of the land it would receive should be in the Chamizal tract itself. Clearly, the deadlock could be broken only by an act of statesmanship on the highest level—a decision that could cut through the accumulation of historical, legal, and technical flotsam and lagan the Chamizal case had accumulated. The intervention of Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos was aimed precisely at the stalemate that had persisted for 52 years. They directed their attack on the problem from the vantage point of confidence; they sought a practical compromise.

In effect, President Kennedy abandoned the rigid legal position the U.S. Government had maintained since it rejected the award of the Arbitration Commission in 1911. The change in attitude of the executive department was emphasized in Kennedy's statements that the United States, "after agreeing to arbitration, backed down, and did not accept the report," and that the United States should erase the "black mark" resulting from its refusal to comply. This approach in effect, though not technically, recognized the legal claims of Mexico to most of the Chamizal tract, broadly in keeping with the decision of the majority of the Arbitral Commission, Lafleur and Puga, and it overruled the position of Mills and the State Department. But by now, the problem has become much more difficult. During the half century since the award, many changes have taken place in the Chamizal. Whereas in 1911 the total area was valued at $500,000, the part now assigned to Mexico is estimated to be worth between $25 and $30 million.[108] As a result, the adjustment of the interests involved will be decidedly more complex and costly.

In deciding the new American policy, the Government at Washington was obliged to weigh such costs, plus any opposition that might develop in the country and in Congress, against the broader and more intangible benefits of good faith, good will, and national prestige. President Kennedy and his advisers doubtless concluded that with the passing of time the problem would become worse rather than better, and that the best way out would be to settle the issue once and for all, even though some loss of territory would be involved. The decision of the U.S. Government as announced on July 18 was thus a diplomatic or practical, and not a legal disposition of the problem. The present position of the Department of State is as follows:

"The United States has a proud record of complying with its international obligations and faithfully executing treaties to which it has agreed. * * * Our disagreement with the Chamizal award, even though based on valid arguments held in good faith, seems inconsistent, after we had agreed in a treaty to accept the result 'without appeal' with our historical position and goals as a nation."

There would be specific advantages in our relations with Mexico:

"A source of irritation which has troubled United States-Mexican relations for almost 100 years would be removed;

"Arbitration would be restored as a means of peaceful settlement of disputes between the United States and Mexico;

---

[101] Ibid., 599.

[102] Ibid., 603. During these negotiations de la Barra became President of Mexico. The correspondence was carried on under his direction.

[103] Ibid., 604–605.

[104] Ibid., 974.

[105] House document, 2d sess., 1903, Pious Fund arbitration, 4442.

[106] These negotiations were not fully documented. See U.S. Foreign Relations, 1932, V, 824.

[107] U.S. treaty series, No. 864.

[108] The El Paso Times, July 11, 1963.

"The Chamizal as an emotional issue in Mexico, which distorts what otherwise might be a favorable view of the United States, would be removed. Settlement would eliminate use of the Chamizal as the basis for propagating the view, even through the education system, that the United States does not live up to its treaty commitments; and

"The Communists and other enemies of the United States in Mexico would be denied one of the propaganda weapons they are using to injure United States-Mexican relations.

"The settlement should also have significant advantages for El Paso:

"An international dispute which has seriously impeded the natural direction of growth of El Paso would be removed and harmonious relations between the sister cities of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez would be strengthened;

"The development of El Paso, especially traffic circulation and the provision of public utilities, would be materially improved with the incorporation into El Paso of the upper half of Cordova Island;

"The cloud on the title to the lands in the Chamizal tract remaining in the United States, which has plagued property owners for some 100 years, would be removed;

"The revenue base in El Paso would be considerably enhanced because a blighted area in El Paso would be improved and contribute its fair share to the cost of municipal government;

"Settlement of the dispute will at last permit execution of the international flood control measures essential for the proper protection of El Paso;

"The international bridges at El Paso could be replaced with structures in harmony with the needs of the over 600,000 people who live in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez area; and

"The reestablishment of the Rio Grande as the boundary would facilitate border control, health control, and other inspection measures, as well as beautify the riverfront on both sides of the river." [109]

THE TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

The settlement on which the two Governments agreed has a double purpose: to end the dispute with Mexico and to establish a fixed river boundary between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez. The negotiators of the agreement have also had in mind the protection of existing property interests in the area. As a result, the settlement calls for the transfer to Mexico, and the exchange between Mexico and the United States, of several different parcels of land inside and just outside the Chamizal. Specifically, the agreement incorporates the following provisions:

1. The United States will transfer to Mexico a net amount of 437 acres of territory now under American jurisdiction, approximately the area that the Arbitration Commission awarded in 1911. Of this amount marked for Mexico, 366 acres will come from the disputed Chamizal zone and 71 acres from U.S. territory east of Cordova Island.

2. Cordova Island will be divided equally between the United States and Mexico. Each nation will have 193 acres. This transfer of territory to the United States is to equalize the transfer to Mexico of land necessary to establish the river as the boundary.

3. The Rio Grande will be relocated, beginning at a point marked "A" on the map included in this study. The new channel will be concrete lined, and will make possible an improvement of properties on both sides.

4. Both Governments will acquire title to all the land and improvements in the areas assigned to them, "free of any limitation on ownershp or encumbrance of any kind including private titles." No payments will be made, as between the Governments, for the lands transferred.

5. The United States will receive compensation for the 382 structures in the Chamizal zone and to the east of Cordova Island that will be transferred to Mexico. However, payment will be made by a Mexican bank (Banco Nacional Hipotecario Urbano y de Obras Publicas) and not by the Mexican Government. The value of the improvements passing to Mexico has been set at $4,675,000.

6. The two Governments will share equally the cost of relocating and constructing the new river channel, as well as the cost of building the new bridges. Each Government, however, will assume the expenses that will arise on its side of the river in the course of making these improvements.

7. After both Governments have approved the convention and passed the legislation necessary to implement the agreement, the Government of the United States will acquire by purchase or condemnation the properties to be transferred to Mexico. This process will take place within a period of time upon which the two Boundary Commissioners agree.

8. When all acquisitions and arrangements have been completed, the U.S. Boundary Commissioner will certify to this effect. Both Commissioners will then proceed to demarcate the new boundary. The record of their action will be submitted to both Governments for their approval.

9. The International Boundary Commission will be "charged with the relocation, improvement, and maintenance of the river channel, as well as the construction of the new bridges."

10. The nationality of present or former residents in the areas to be transferred will not be affected, nor will the jurisdiction of the Governments over legal proceedings or over the laws applicable to acts or conduct in the areas before the exchange, be altered.[110]

To clarify for the reader the transfers and exchanges involved in the settlement, the map on pages 26 and 27 has been divided into three sections. Section 1 includes all of the Chamizal lying south of the line of 1852. Of this area, 366 acres are to be cut to Mexico. About 1,750 persons live in the part to be transferred, most in the narrow western region. The land in this section assigned to Mexico contains about 233 single dwellings, many of them owner-occupied. Several factories and business establishments are in the zone and will be affected by the transfer. It is through this section that the streets of El Paso lead to the international bridges over the Rio Grande and directly into the center of Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. Almost all of the people in the area are American citizens of Mexican descent. Because the tract is disputed territory, clear titles have not always been given to the landholders.

Section 2, which is to be transferred to the United States, consists entirely of undeveloped land. According to plans, about 50 acres will be used for various Federal installations, and, depending on the action of Congress, the remainder may be given to the city of El Paso for a recreational area and for other purposes relating to the general welfare, or sold for private enterprises.

In section 3, which will go to Mexico, there are about 248 dwellings. The population is about 1,775. A new elementary school is in this area, and most homes are more modern and of greater value than those in section 1.

Of the entire acreage to be transferred to Mexico, more than half consists of agricultural land and stockyards. All the area marked for the United States is in section 2 and all is now undeveloped.

QUESTIONS TO BE RESOLVED

The settlement involves various legal and political questions, some of which have not yet been resolved. For example, the U.S. Government does not admit, nor can it admit, that the Chamizal is Mexican territory in keeping with the arbitration award of 1911. Legally, the United States must insist on its ownership of the entire tract, for otherwise it could never acquire title to the properties involved in the settlement, especially through condemnation proceedings. Again, since all American titles to land and buildings will become void as soon as they are transferred to Mexico, it is necessary for the United States to own them up to the moment of transfer. Leading court decisions hold that when two states or nations agree on a boundary, even though it be a compromise line, the conclusive presumption is that such line has always been the true boundary. The courts have accordingly ruled that titles held under grants from one country to land placed by a compromise in another country are entirely void.[111] For these reasons, all property claims and all details involved in moving the river channel must be completed before the title to any tract is transferred to Mexico.

In its present form, the agreement between the Governments of the United States and Mexico is a memorandum based on diplomatic discussions and an exchange of notes. It is technically a modus vivendi that must be converted into a convention or treaty before the two Governments may formally approve it. But since the memorandum contains the essential details of the agreement, there is no reason to anticipate difficulty in negotiating the necessary convention.

The next step will require action by the legislative branches of both governments to confirm the convention and pass the measures necessary to put it into effect. First, the Senates of the two nations must approve the convention, then their Congresses must enact the proper enabling legislation and appropriate the funds necessary to carry out the terms of the convention.

The outlook in Mexico is favorable, since the majority of leaders in the country appear to regard the settlement as a diplomatic victory. According to the Mexican Constitution, treaties are confirmed by a simple majority of the Senate.[112] Because of the special position of leadership the President occupies in the Mexican political system, he should have no trouble under normal conditions in securing this majority.[113] Although the Constitution of Mexico proscribes certain types of treaties,[114] boundary settlements are not specifically forbidden. Article 27, however, declares that "the national domain is inalienable and imprescriptible." Yet this restriction has not been applied in respect to rectifications along the boundary and settlement of water rights. The convention of February 10, 1933, for the rectification of the Rio Grande in the Valley of Juarez-El Paso, and the treaty of February 3, 1944, respecting the distribution of waters between Mexico and the United States, both of which Mexico has faithfully carried out, are precedents for the action of the Mexican President in the present case.[115] As head of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), which controls both branches of the Congress,[116] President Lopez Mateos should have no problem in securing such legislative measures as may be necessary to carry out Mexico's part of the agreement, unless there is some unusual and unexpected development.

---

[109] Department of State, "The Chamizal Settlement," July 1963, 5–6.

[110] Department of State, press release, July 18, 1963.

[111] *Henderson* v. *Poindexter's Lessee,* 12 Wheaton 530; *De la Croix* v. *Chamberlain,* 12 Wheaton 599.

[112] Constitution of Mexico, 1917, art. 76, par. I.

[113] William L. Tucker, "The Mexican Government Today" (Minneapolis, 1957), chs. 4 and 7.

[114] Constitution of Mexico, 1917, art. 15.

[115] Rodolfo Cruz Miramontes, "Derecho International Fluvial" (Mexico, D.F., 1958), passim. Also see his discussion in "Lectures Juridicas" (Universidad de Chihuahua, Escuela de Derecho, 1962), No. 10, 75 ff.

THE PROSPECT IN WASHINGTON

The outcome in Washington is less certain. What action the Senate and Congress will take is anyone's guess at this moment. The proposed disposition of national territory—or territory that many persons in the United States consider to be national—could arouse deep feelings of opposition in Washington and throughout the country. The two U.S. Senators from Texas are sharply divided. Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat, approves the agreement in full and has pledged his support in its behalf. As a former resident of El Paso, Senator Yarborough sees many benefits that the agreement will bestow on this border area. On the other hand, the Republican Senator from Texas, John Tower, strongly objects.[117]

The position of Senator Tower is interesting and important. He says that his opposition to the settlement is based primarily on the belief that a State of the Union must not be "dismembered" without its consent. He therefore insists that the people of Texas, acting through the legislature, must approve the settlement before he votes in favor of it.[118] Of course, the Senator is entirely within his rights in defining the conditions under which he will vote pro or con; legally, however, there is a question as to whether the people or the government of Texas has any control over the ultimate decision. When Texas was voted in the Union on March 1, 1845, the Congress at Washington agreed to annexation on this condition: "said State to be formed subject to the adjustment by this Federal Government of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments." [119] In a recent opinion, the Attorney General of Texas has concluded that the approval of the people of Texas is not necessary to legalize the transfer of the Chamizal territory to Mexico.[120]

Once the Senate of the United States has confirmed the convention, if it decides to do so by the necessary two-thirds vote, both Houses of Congress must pass legislation appropriating the funds necessary to buy the acreage that will go to Mexico and to effect the changes and improvements on the American side of the river. At this moment when other aspects of President Kennedy's legislative program are in doubt, it is not possible to make safe predictions.[121] The outcome respecting the Chamizal agreement would seem to depend in part on the right timing in submitting the issue to Congress for action.

In the event that opposition arises in the Senate and the two-thirds vote required to confirm the convention does not materialize, does that kill the Chamizal agreement? Not necessarily. Another approach is still available, although the treaty route appears to be better in the present case. The agreement may be approved by means of a joint resolution passed by a simple majority in both Houses of Congress. This method has been used on various occasions when action on treaties has been blocked by a Senate minority—for example, in the annexation of Texas in 1845 and Hawaii in 1895. The so-called Green-Sayre formula, according to which a subcommittee of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations acts closely with the executive department in working out the details of a foreign-policy project to be adopted by a joint resolution, may afford an effective method of overcoming obstructionism.[122] It must be borne in mind, however, that in keeping with article VI, paragraph 2 of the Constitution, a joint resolution, as a "law," must "be made in pursuance" of the Constitution, and it would be subject to stricter limitations than a treaty made "under the authority of the United States." Given this important constitutional distinction between laws and treaties, method remains as a possibility if the convention would be a safer procedure to use in transferring to a foreign country territory under the jurisdiction of a State in the Union.[123] Even so, the joint-resolution method remains as a possibility if the convention encounters strong minority opposition in the Senate.

THE TASK AHEAD

After the hurdles in Washington and Mexico City have been overcome, much work lies ahead in El Paso. The Federal Government must buy or legally condemn all the properties in the area destined for Mexico, plus land on the north side of the river, estimated at 56 acres, needed for the right-of-way of the channel.

The channel of the river must be moved and rebuilt. Plans should be drawn up to develop, utilize, and serve the territory along the north bank of the river, and these plans must be put into effect. The issue concerning a suitable highway along the north bank of the river must be disposed of.[124] Some 3,725 persons must be moved out of the area affected and provided with housing, schools, and other facilities elsewhere in El Paso. It is estimated that the cost to the Federal Government could finally amount to between $30 and $50 million. The city of El Paso and El Paso County must assume additional costs and responsibilities. At best, between 3 and 5 years may be required to complete the project in its various phases.[125]

Measured in any terms, the Chamizal settlement is a major undertaking, and it is of special significance to the inhabitants of the El Paso-Juarez area. From the local point of view, regardless of other considerations, the settlement offers an opportunity, long overdue, to eliminate a kind of "no man's land," much of it vacant and unimproved or occupied by substandard houses. The settlement opens the way for a beneficial program of rebuilding, unique because of its international aspects. It matches on the American side of the river the ambitious undertaking of Mexico in its Programa Nacional Fronterizo that is rapidly changing the face of Ciudad Juarez and other Mexican cities along the border. The social and economic interdependence of El Paso and Juarez has been firmly established during the many interesting years of their history as twin cities facing each other across the low banks of the Rio Grande. If finally put into effect, the accord that Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos have reached should materially advance the well-being of both communities at the Pass of the North, reducing the physical barriers between them and stimulating the development of mutual interests, both economic and cultural.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, today marks the beginning of formal debate in the Senate over ratification of the limited test ban treaty by the terms of which further nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space are to be prohibited for such time as the treaty shall remain in force.

We have already experienced in this Chamber a great deal of comment concerning this proposed treaty most of which, I daresay, stressed the advantages to be gained through its ratification with very few remarks devoted to a consideration of the risks involved and the consequent disadvantages which might accrue to the United States. Certainly, these, too, must be harshly examined and evaluated in order to determine whether all these purported advantages do indeed, far outweigh the cumulative risks.

Without presuming to suggest or define the parameters within which the debate should be confined, I will, nevertheless pose certain questions which I feel must be satisfactorily resolved during the course of debate on this treaty. Otherwise, I shall personally feel that I possess insufficient information upon which to exercise an informed judgment when vote is taken.

I am not unmindful of the fact that one of the parties to this agreement is the same country which, in recent years, among other things, ruthlessly repressed the Hungarian uprising; erected a shameful wall of tyranny around Berlin; surreptitiously deployed ballistic missiles in Cuba and, after months of stealthy preparations, shattered a moratorium on nuclear testing which had been in effect for 34 months. It has also seen fit to abrogate virtually all the agreements and treaties it has ever entered into with other nations whenever it served its purpose to do so.

My questions, however, do not concern the good faith or trustworthiness of the Nation with which we are here dealing as the questionable reliability of the leaders of the Soviet Union in abiding by the letter and spirit of their obligations is already a disgraceful matter of common knowledge and public record.

I would point out, however, that in August of last year at Geneva, a proposal by the United States, which was very similar to the treaty now under debate, met with adamant intransigence on the part of the Soviet Union and I consider it more than mere passing—strange that suddenly the Soviet Union found this limited agreement to be so vital to her national interests that it was negotiated, initialed, and signed with remarkable expediency and haste. The poor draftsmanship of its provisions, and the utter lack of definition of its terms not only reflects this haste but defeats its very purpose through the varied interpretations to which it is subject.

---

[116] Robert E. Scott, "Mexican Government in Transition" (Urbana, 1959), chs. 6, 7, and 8.

[117] El Paso Herald-Post, July 18, 1963; the El Paso Times, July 17, 1963. Senator Gruening, of Alaska, praises the Kennedy settlement, Congressional Record, July 22, 1963, pages 13073–13076.

[118] The Dallas Morning News and the El Paso Times, July 19, 1963.

[119] Joint resolution, Mar. 1, 1845, 5 Statutes, 797.

[120] The El Paso Times, July 17, 1963. The Attorney General has refused to file suit to test the validity of the Chamizal agreement. See El Paso Herald-Post, July 31, 1963. A suit is pending respecting the constitutionality of the transfer of territory from Texas. See the El Paso Times, Aug. 6, 1963.

[121] See U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 5, 1963, 44; the El Paso Times, Aug. 6, 1963.

[122] Elmer Plischke, "Conduct of American Diplomacy" (Princeton, 1961), 400–403.

[123] C. Herman Pritchett, "The American Constitution" (New York, 1959), 333–336.

[124] The El Paso Times, July 24, 1963.

[125] El Paso Herald-Post, July 18, 1963.

The 1961-62 series of nuclear tests conducted by the Soviet Union were massive, sophisticated, and impressive. Ours, on the other hand, were too hastily contrived to give us all the data which we might otherwise have acquired had there been time for more orderly preparation. With this knowledge of relative testing in mind, I would then ask:

First. Has the Soviet Union, through its most recent atmospheric test series, now achieved a nuclear advantage over the United States of a military or scientific significance?

Second. Are we reasonably confident and secure in the knowledge that our ballistic missile retaliatory second strike force will survive and operate in a nuclear environment?

Third. In seeking to slow down the arms race as a purported advantage of this treaty, will we adopt nuclear parity as the basis for deterring thermonuclear war rather than nuclear superiority?

Fourth. Will the treaty, as claimed, prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons when France and Red China refused to be bound and when underground testing is sanctioned for all nations whether they sign or not?

Fifth. How is one to define or interpret that which shall constitute an underground test within the meaning of article I, section 1, subsection (a) of the treaty?

Sixth. Do we possess the capability to detect all nuclear detonations occurring in the three environments prohibited by the treaty?

Seventh. Can any significant advances in nuclear technology be achieved by clandestine testing in those three environments at yields which may possibly be below our ability to detect?

Eighth. Will we be able to differentiate between a shallow underground explosion and an atmospheric burst detonated close to the surface of the earth?

Ninth. Can we, in fact, maintain an adequate readiness to test in those prohibited environments in the event the treaty should suddenly be abrogated?

Tenth. Will our scientific laboratories and the interest of our scientists deteriorate under a treaty which permits only underground testing?

Eleventh. Will we be restrained from ever determining feasibility, developing and deploying any defense whatever against ballistic missile attack?

Twelfth. Will this treaty permit the Soviet Union to achieve equality in the low yield tactical weapons where it is generally acknowledged that we have an advantage and yet, preclude us from ever achieving equality in the high yield weapon where the Soviet Union is unquestionably superior.

Thirteenth. To what extent can we satisfy, through underground testing, the military and scientific requirements which were to have been investigated by atmospheric tests planned for next year?

Fourteenth. What is the human tolerance for radioactivity and what is the truth about the danger of atmospheric contamination, even at previous rates of testing, in causing genetic damage and leukemia to the living and yet unborn?

Fifteenth. What will be the effect of ratification upon our Plowshare program—a project designed to deepen harbors, dig tunnels and canals, or otherwise cause beneficial changes to the topography through controlled and contained nuclear explosions?

Sixteenth. Will the participation of East Germany in this treaty constitute even so much as a tacit, implied, or suggestive recognition of that Communist regime as a sovereign national entity?

These, Mr. President, are the questions which, in my opinion, must be resolved in the course of this debate and I look forward with keen interest to their eventual resolution. Without satisfactory answers to them, it will be virtually impossible for any of us to measure and evaluate the gains versus the risks of entering into this limited test ban treaty.

I am also aware of the consequences which might flow from a failure to ratify this treaty. Some Members of this Chamber who had earlier expressed guarded reservations about it have already been labeled as "atom mongers" by the Russian-controlled press. Similarly, our national image in the world as a country desirous of peace with justice would undoubtedly be attacked and villified by such propaganda were we to fail to ratify.

However, I shall continue to reserve judgment on this issue until such time as the evidence convinces me that the paramount issue of our national safety and security will not be put in jeopardy by ratification of this treaty.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT DAVID O. McKAY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a milestone in the life of the man who is the first citizen of Utah and one of the most distinguished citizens of the Nation.

Yesterday was the 90th birthday of David O. McKay, president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormon Church.

This brief tribute will be but a trickle in the flood of greetings and felicitations which are flowing to President McKay, for he has received expressions of love, devotion, and admiration from almost every region of the earth.

President McKay has been president of the Mormon Church since 1951. For 16 years before that he carried the heavy responsibility of counselor to preceding presidents. The church is guided by three leaders—a president and two counselors—so for some 28 years President McKay has served in the presidency.

The growth of the church has been phenomenal under his leadership. Nearly one-third of the world's 1,800,000 Latter-day Saints have been baptized since 1951. The number of stakes—a stake is a geographical unit in the church roughly equivalent to a diocese—has risen from 180 to 350, and the annual number of converts from 17,000 to more than 100,000 last year.

In addition to the large Mormon population in Utah, there are very sizable numbers in other States, principally Idaho, Arizona, California, Nevada, Wyoming, Washington, and Oregon.

But it is not of the church, it is of the man himself, that I wish today to direct my remarks.

David O. McKay stands out as a spiritual, community, and educational leader of the West and of the United States.

Last December, in Salt Lake City, nearly 500 business and civic leaders, whose religious affiliations include Judaism and a dozen Christian denominations, gathered at a testimonial banquet in his honor.

Joseph Rosenblatt, a Jew and president of one of Utah's largest industrial corporations, voiced the feeling of all when he asked at this dinner:

> Does anyone know of any man who has lived with greater faith or purpose, and obedience to the exhortation of the Prophet Micah "to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with God"?

David O. McKay was born in Huntsville, a small farming community near Ogden, Utah, September 8, 1873. He still maintains a farm in Huntsville, where he raises horses and often spends weekends.

After being graduated from the University of Utah in 1897, he plunged at once into the life of educational and religious activity which almost exclusively has consumed all of the energies of a long and active life.

In 1901 he married Emma Rae Riggs, who has been, and is today, his constant companion and aid. In addition to the arduous work of the church, they have reared a large family, whose filial devotion is one of their greatest blessings.

In 1902 he became principal of Weber College, in Ogden. That same year he was made a member of the General Board of the Latter-day Saints Sunday schools. He held numerous positions in that organization, culminating in his appointment as general superintendent, which he held for many years—until 1934.

And his service has included the presidency of the European missions of the church and commissioner of the church board of education.

At the comparatively early age of 32 he became one of the 12 apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

As apostle, counselor, and president, he has carried a heavy load of responsibility in business and community affairs. He has served on numerous corporation boards of directors. He has served on the governing boards of three Utah universities—the University of Utah at Salt Lake City, and Utah State University at Logan—both of which are State-supported institutions—and the Brigham Young University at Provo, which is the Latter-day Saints Church university.

One measure of the tremendously increasing administrative responsibilities which President McKay has had to carry as head of the church is in the figures I have quoted on the organization's growth.

Other measures of that responsibility are the tremendous growth of our Nation and the dynamic changes which have rushed headlong through the years he has spent on earth.

When David O. McKay was born, Ulysses S. Grant occupied the White House. The Pony Express had ceased operations only 14 years before. Only 4 years before, the golden spike which linked our Atlantic and Pacific coasts by rail had been driven at Promontory Summit, not far from his birthplace at Huntsville.

President McKay was born before Utah was admitted to the Union, before the Spanish-American War, before the Boer War, before the organization of the Ford Motor Co.

His life spans the development of aviation from the epic effort of the Wright Brothers to the 1400-mile-an-hour flights of the X-15. It spans an immense sweep of scientific achievement from the discovery of radium to the explosion of the hydrogen bomb.

He was a young man before the invention of the motion picture machine or the radio receiver. He was 47 before American women were given the right to vote.

In 1870, 86,000 persons were counted in Utah; the census of 1960 counted 890,000; and today there are 1 million.

The city of Ogden has grown during that period from 3,127 to 70,100. And the Salt Lake Valley which has become the center of the church, now holds some 400,000 people.

And the Mormon people, who took 40 years to build the Salt Lake Temple with granite hauled from the canyons by oxcart, now dedicate a new chapel every week. For the organization which President McKay heads is engaged in a vast building program of temples, stake houses, and educational and office structures, in Utah, throughout the United States, and in many foreign lands.

With all of these administrative burdens, President McKay has remained a great teacher. Thoughtful personal preparation has gone into every one of the thousands of sermons and addresses which he has delivered. And he is a truly eloquent speaker. Blessed with a strong, resonant voice, he presents his points with an excellence of phrasing that makes his public utterances as pleasant to the ear as they are nourishing to the spirit and instructive to the mind.

William Shakespeare wrote that these are the things that should accompany old age: "honor, love, obedience, troops of friends." And these David O. McKay enjoys in overflowing abundance.

He exemplifies a firm faith in the fundamental doctrines of his church.

And he is a thorough citizen of the 1960's. In July he visited with Astronaut White, discussing enthusiastically space technology and thresholds of exploration. Until a scant few years ago, he drove his own automobile on the numerous visits he pays to units of the church organization in the States surrounding Utah. He is a confirmed jet air traveler. Last year, he visited church groups in Scotland. And he has just returned from a flying trip to Wales, where he presented an organ to the Mormon Church membership for their chapel in the community of Merthyr Tydfil, where David O. McKay's mother was born.

Today, one of his proudest accomplishments is the genuine affection that now exists between the Mormons and so many people of other religions. This was not always so. The Mormons were driven to exile beyond the borders of the United States in 1847. But today, in large part due to David O. McKay and his life, with its devotion to principle, to faith, and to true fellowship, there exists not only tolerance, but concord and genuine respect for the Mormon people and their prophet president, David O. McKay.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to join in the very fine tribute that has been paid to David O. McKay by the junior Senator from Utah. I have had the pleasure of visiting with this man. I can say in all candor that I have never met nor conversed with a more remarkable man. His service over the years demonstrates that he is one of the great, good men of the world.

On the occasion of his 90th anniversary, I feel certain the people of Idaho join with the people of Utah in extending their heartfelt felicitations to David O. McKay.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the senior Senator from Idaho. I am sure people everywhere feel this way about this great man, particularly the people of Idaho, who know him so well.

ROCHESTER'S LABOR NEWS URGES CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF TEST BAN AGREEMENT AND STRONG CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, among the responsible voices raised in favor of the limited nuclear test ban treaty and pending civil rights legislation have been those representing the American labor movement. As is so often the case when progressive, forward-looking measures are at stake, our unions have been in the forefront of the effort to secure congressional approval of these two vital items.

An interesting and forceful editorial in the Labor News of Rochester, N.Y., points up the close connection between these two matters. In order that more Members of Congress may have an opportunity to benefit from this excellent editorial and as an effort to increase support for the test ban agreement and meaningful civil rights legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Connection

In two separate actions, the Rochester AFL–CIO Council this week took steps placing it in the mainstream of world events; events which are going to change the Nation we live in, and the world in which we live, and of which our Nation is a part.

In one, the labor council is asking Congress to include equal employment opportunity guarantees in the nature of a Fair Employment Practice (FEP) amendment to President Kennedy's omnibus civil rights bill—a bill threatened with death by filibuster and threatened with death by even fairminded Senators because it may lose them future votes from segregationists.

In the other, the AFL–CIO Council here is asking our own State's two Senators to help the Senate ratify, and quickly, the nuclear bomb test ban treaty signed in Moscow 2 weeks ago, and thus put our Nation on record as supporting a retreat, even this small one, away from global insanity and global holocaust—because without such a treaty, the nations with bombs will be making bigger bombs, and the nations yet without bombs will be getting them; more triggers to pull, and more itchy fingers on the triggers.

At first glance, there seems to be no connection between these two actions. Both timely, both commendable, but what's the connection?

This. Simply and finally this. Unless this Nation of ours can emerge from under the darkness of racial discrimination against people with dark skins, and emerge completely, this Nation will no longer be in any position to teach freedom and democracy to a world which is two-thirds dark skinned

Unless our civil rights struggle is ended, and ended once and for all in victory for human rights, and human dignity, and quickly, the black, brown, yellow, and other off-white peoples of the earth will turn away from us in loathing and distrust, and our efforts to teach them freedom and democracy will be like whistling in the dark, inside a hollow tube bent back against our own ears, and for no other ears.

Unless we, here, today, in this Nation can lead the free world and make it believe in us and what we preach, and make it want to join us in the struggle for human freedom and dignity everywhere in this small sphere constantly growing smaller, no amount of bombs will in the end help us, because bombs are much worse teachers than words, and words are not as good as actions.

No test ban treaty will in the end help us if we are alone in the world, and we will be alone in the world some day soon if the headlines showing Birmingham and Oxford and Jackson (and lately Brooklyn, and Philadelphia, and Detroit, and maybe Rochester soon; yes, maybe even Rochester) are not erased, and erased for good.

The world is watching us. The world overwhelmingly wants us to approve the test ban treaty, and the free world wants to believe in us, because if the rest of the world cannot respect us and believe in us as a democracy which lives what it preaches, our signatures on treaties are not worth much in their eyes, and in turn, their signatures on treaties will not help us, either.

We have freedom, democracy, and human dignity to sell to the world. Let us sell them with clean hands, and if we sell these precious commodities in large-enough quantities, we will prevail over darkness even without test band treaties, and the bombs themselves, will turn to dust, someday, not humanity.

SECRET PAY BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY TO VIETNAMESE TROOPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "CIA Allegedly Pays Nhu's Troops Despite Leader's Disfavor Here," published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CIA Allegedly Pays Nhu's Troops Despite Leader's Disfavor Here

The crack Vietnamese special forces troops who stormed Saigon's Buddhist pagodas August 21 are still being paid secretly by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency which trained them for other purposes, highly reliable sources said yesterday.

The sources said their commander, tough, police-trained Col. Le Quang Tung, who is now considered the most powerful military official in South Vietnam under President Ngo Dinh Diem's family, receives $3 million annually from secret CIA funds for salaries and upkeep of his 2,000 troops.

Last Tuesday, Tung received his regular monthly payment of approximately $250,000 from the CIA in Saigon on schedule despite publicly announced U.S. anger over the wholesale arrest of Buddhists and other dissident elements in which Tung's troops figured prominently, the informants said.

The sources said there was bitter opposition from most CIA men in South Vietnam to continuing the monthly payments to Tung under the secret agreement in effect between the Agency and the South Vietnamese Government for a year and a half.

They said the CIA men in Saigon, according to information reaching here, pointed out that Tung's special forces units were created, trained, and armed by the CIA a year and a half ago for work with mountain tribesmen and clandestine operations into North Vietnam.

VIEW FROM THE FIELD

The sources said these men feel the Vietnamese Government has now, for its own ends, reversed the original purpose of these units.

These CIA men in Vietnam wanted to see the payments to Tung cut off as a show of disapproval for the Government's crackdown on Buddhists and other dissident elements.

They also hoped the United States would take this opportunity, the sources here said, to demonstrate to Diem and family that the United States will not tolerate in the future such misuse of American funds and equipment.

The sources said that during a CIA staff meeting in Saigon last Monday, all the members present but one strongly opposed continuing the payments to Tung.

The sources said that most of the CIA staff men left the meeting Monday with the impression that the payments would be cut off.

But at the meeting there last Tuesday, the CIA staff was informed that, apparently on orders from Washington, the CIA was doing "business as usual" with Tung and the payment went through on schedule.

EXTRAORDINARY PROGRAM

The sources said that creation and support of Tung's forces was never a part of the normal U.S. military assistance program in South Vietnam, but was totally a CIA undertaking.

The forces were armed with CIA funds, and given the best training in jungle fighting and guerrilla operations available, under CIA supervision, by officers of the U.S. Special Forces.

Some of the squads also were specially trained in assassination and sabotage, the sources said.

Tung himself, besides being commander of the special forces, is also chief of the Vietnamese presidential survey office, which is the top palace security service, and chief of the military committee which advises Diem's powerful brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, on secret military matters.

The special forces have never been placed under control of the regular Vietnamese armed forces, although the Vietnamese Government publicly claims that they are, the sources said.

Tung's six battalions of special forces have consequently seen little combat, although some of them have been used constantly as personal bodyguards for Diem and members of his family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article relates to special Vietnamese troops who stormed the Buddhist pagodas in Saigon on August 21 and who are still being paid secretly by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, which trained them for other purposes. The article states, in part:

> The sources said there was bitter opposition from most CIA men in South Vietnam to continuing the monthly payments to Tung under the secret agreement in effect between the Agency and the South Vietnamese Government for a year and a half.

The article continues by saying that although CIA men in South Vietnam apparently are opposed to such support, it is being continued by orders from Washington.

For a number of weeks I have been speaking against the foreign aid bill. I made one major speech on South Vietnam, and I have referred to the subject several times since. Only last week I reiterated my view as one who opposed the United States going into South Vietnam, in the first place, and said that we should get out.

I take note of a statement Mrs. Nhu is reported to have made in Europe in the past few days. We all know of the great political power she wields in South Vietnam. We also know that she and her husband, who is a brother of the President of South Vietnam, are vehemently anti-American. She is reported by the press to have said in Europe in recent days, in effect, that the United States does not dare to withdraw foreign aid to South Vietnam. I favor taking up that dare. I favor the United States getting out of South Vietnam. I favor the stopping of our aid to South Vietnam until that dictatorship, that tyrannical regime, is changed, so that it will at least stand for the principles we profess to support around the world, that is, the principles of freedom, which seek to protect the dignity of man.

It is shocking that we are giving support to a regime so dictatorial and tyrannical as the Diem regime in South Vietnam. I consider such support to be a misuse of the American taxpayers' dollars. We should announce again and again that so long as tyranny exists in South Vietnam, there will be no more support of that country by the United States.

When the foreign aid bill is before the Senate, I shall offer an amendment that will specifically propose to withhold any further aid to South Vietnam. Then let Senators stand up and be counted.

PREPARATION OF STOCKPILING REPORTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Nation's stockpile program is a keystone of our national defense. It is too important to the welfare of the American people to be used as a whipping boy for partisan politics or for press discussion of purported excerpts of the draft subcommittee report. The public's right to know about how this program has been handled demands that an objective study go to great lengths to avoid partisan political tone.

In making legislative recommendations about the future of this program, I believe we should have the views of the people—Democrats and Republicans—who over the years have had the responsibility for carrying out this program. Subcommittee consideration should not be limited to a partial examination of the handling of a few metals during the period of the previous administration. When the subcommittee report refers to such officials, simple fairness, as well as the public interest in a accurate and complete report, requires that they should have a chance to see the proposed report and make their comments to the subcommittee before final action is taken.

Furthermore, any sound appraisal of past policies requires at least knowledge of the goals established in comparable areas by the present administration.

I became a member of the subcommittee in April of this year, filling a post left vacant by the departure of Senator Prescott Bush from the Senate in January of this year. He, in turn, filled a seat which had been held by the late Senator Francis Case, who died in 1962. I was not a member of the subcommittee during any part of its hearings on the stockpile program, the last of which was held on January 30 of this year.

Shortly after I became a member of the subcommittee, a draft report, marked "secret," was presented to the members of the subcommittee by the chairman. This draft was the work principally of the assistant majority counsel. He was a member of the White House staff at the time of his appointment to the subcommittee staff, and is now back on the White House staff. The minority has had no counsel or other staff assistance since I became a member of the subcommittee.

A short time after the members of the subcommittee had been presented with the draft report, the chairman of our subcommittee called a meeting. At this time, I presented to the chairman a request that I be permitted to circulate copies of the draft report among at least those prominently referred to or mentioned therein.

My request was primarily based on the public interest in a balanced and accurate report, as well as the matter of fair treatment of public officials. A secondary consideration was my feeling that, since I did not participate in the hearings, and since it was manifestly impossible to go through the entire record and the documents filed, but not printed, the comments of those chiefly mentioned would be of help to me in determining what should be my position concerning the legislative recommendations made in the subcommittee report.

I am not interested in covering up or in accusing anyone. I am interested only in the facts and in developing wise and useful stockpile legislation for the future.

While the chairman thus far has refused to permit the draft report to be circulated, several stories which have appeared in the daily press purport to disclose the contents. In reporting on a program as important to our national welfare as the stockpile program, we have a particular responsibility to see that all the facts are gathered—both those which relate to Democratic administrations and those which relate to Republican administrations—and that the individuals referred to are treated with scrupulous fairness.

OPENING OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS IN WARRENTON, VA.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this Senate has seen two of its committees, Commerce and Judiciary, conducting long hearings these past weeks on legislative proposals intended to remove racial discrimination in areas of public accomodation in this country. The President of the United States has recommended the approach embodied in title 2 of S. 1731 now before the Committee on the Judiciary. This identical approach has been made the subject of a separate bill, S. 1732, on which very full hearings have been completed by the Committee on Commerce and action by that committee is anticipated soon. I hope and believe the action will be favorable. In this area of national concern, events have moved fast. In the chronicling of these events some chapters have been happy reports of progress; others, sad accounts of bitter opposition, even violence. In such fast moving reporting some of the happy chapters may have escaped national attention. It is for this reason that I would ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the story of progress which has been achieved in the city of Warrenton, Va. This account is described in the July 18 issue of the Fauquier Democrat. Here is a story of progress and of decency. It is a tribute to community leaders and organizations who recognize that America's tradition insists that a man be judged on his individual merit and character, not by the way he spells his name, nor by the color of his skin, or where he goes to church, or on which side of the railroad track he was born. I would hope this example may point the way to other communities whose roots spring from the same deep tradition

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Following Discussion Sessions, Warrenton Restaurants, Lunchrooms Desegregate

Most of the restaurants and lunchrooms in the Warrenton area desegregated last week, and chain stores in the area opened employment opportunities to qualified Negroes.

The voluntary desegregation occurred without incident as a result of weeks of discussion and communication between community members of both races.

Members of the Warrenton-Fauquier Chamber of Commerce participated in the discussions and the orderly changes so that, as one chamber of commerce member said, Warrenton could escape the economic blight and the bad reputation which communities like Cambridge, Md., and Danville, Va., have suffered.

Said the Chamber of Commerce president, Maximilian A. Tufts, "The community got together to try to resolve whatever honest glevances there are in a spirit of good will for the benefit of the whole community."

He congratulated chamber members, especially the restaurant and store owners, for their cooperation.

The officials felt that since the major grievances in the community were economic, the chamber of commerce was the logical organization to try to reach a solution to the problems. Members of the junior chamber of commerce, American Legion Post 360, and the Airlie Foundation, represented by Associate Director Henry Berne, participated in the discussions.

During the past few days, Mr. Tufts said that officials of other communities who heard about the effort here have phoned to ask for help and advice for their own communities.

One restaurant owner seemed to express the consensus when he said there would be no refusal of service on the basis of race, but service would be withheld in the future, as in the past, from customers who are disorderly, or improperly dressed.

"Our local people have been trying to work out solutions to whatever problems they have, and in their own way," said Mayor Byrnal Haley. "No pressures have been exerted from the outside, and we want none. We wanted to avoid a situation where outsiders could come in and try to tell our people what to do."

The chamber of commerce has adopted a policy of admitting Negro firms and civic groups to membership.

Although it had never been discussed, the Pitts Fauquier Theatre in Warrenton was also desegregated this past Sunday.

SUPPORT GROWING FOR VOLUNTARY WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am very glad to say that support is building up in the wheat States and among wheat associations for the voluntary wheat certificate proposal, S. 1946, which I introduced on July 29 with Senators Young of North Dakota, Burdick, McCarthy, McGee, and Nelson.

The respected Missouri Farmers Association, at its annual convention 3 weeks ago, endorsed the voluntary wheat plan.

The National Association of Wheat Growers in its recent "Report from Washington" indicated that "growers have more interest in this type of program—the voluntary certificate plan—than any other that has been introduced."

Wheat producers are faced with a half-billion dollar loss in income next year unless they are given an opportunity voluntarily to reduce acreage and maintain their income. This can have a serious effect on hundreds of communities in the wheat producing areas, and on farm suppliers and their employees everywhere in the Nation.

Numerous telephone inquiries and letters have come to my office supporting the voluntary wheat certificate proposal. My correspondence indicates a growing awareness of the consequences of uncontrolled wheat production and skidding prices in 1964.

On September 1, the Great Plains Conference of Young Democrats, adopted unanimously a resolution endorsing the voluntary wheat certificate plan.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the resolution at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Resolution on Wheat Legislation Passed Unanimously by the Great Plains Conference of Young Democrats Assembled in Oklahoma City on September 1, 1963

Whereas the defeat of the 1963 wheat referendum was a regrettable blow to American agriculture; and

Whereas the result of this referendum will mean a maximum support price of $1.25 per bushel of wheat for the 1964 crop; and

Whereas this drastic drop in wheat income will be accompanied by a corresponding decline in other agricultural commodities; and

Whereas this decline in farm income would precipitate a severe economic recession in the Great Plains States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Great Plains Conference of Young Democrats strongly urge the Congress to enact additional legislation on wheat, designed to prevent such a serious loss of farm income, while at the same time reduce, in an orderly manner, the wheat stocks held by the CCC; and be it further

Resolved, That the proposal offered principally by Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, containing a voluntary wheat certificate program be the basic approach for such additional legislation.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we shall soon be considering S. 1915 which amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, in regards to the marketing of milk. The avowed purpose of this bill is "to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk," but the people in the business of producing milk, speaking through their representative organizations, do not agree with the proponents of the bill. In a telegram I received from Mr. L. V. Toyne, who is the administrative officer of the Colorado Farm Bureau, he states:

> We are very much opposed to the Proxmire dairy bill, S. 1915, which is to come up Tuesday. We hope, too, you will vote against the McCarthy amendment S. 1961. Either of these bills is worse than no legislation at all. I don't know how much you have to do to wake people up such as those who continually want to give away all the money in the U.S. Treasury.

Also, in a letter I received from Otie M. Reed, executive director of the National Creameries Association he stated their position on this bill in these words:

> It is our considered opinion that S. 1915 will not achieve its avowed purpose. We believe this is a bad bill, and should be defeated.

I have even received correspondence from milk producers in the State from which the Senator who introduced this bill comes, voicing their opposition to this bill.

The American Farm Bureau Federation not only believes that S. 1915 will not solve the problem but will aggravate the situation, and in addition, maintain that it is the present marketing controls that have been the real culprit in creating the present surpluses.

It would seem, Mr. President, that the only result that is certain to be achieved by this legislation is that the cost of milk to the consumer will be increased. That is hardly a sound basis upon which to enact legislation.

The letters of the Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative and the American Farm Bureau Federation which I averred to earlier make many more excellent points concerning this bill, and for the benefit of other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Farm Bureau Federation,
August 30, 1963.

Hon. Gordon Allott,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Allott: You very shortly will have before you for Senate consideration S. 1915, dealing with major changes in the Federal milk marketing order program. It is our understanding that amendments will be offered on the floor to add to this bill provisions for making compensatory (Brannan type) payments to dairymen, on a nationwide basis, both within and outside marketing order areas.

Farm Bureau vigorously opposes S. 1915. We also are opposed to any amendments that would add to S. 1915 provisions for compensatory payments. There are many reasons for our opposition, the most important of which are:

1. We believe that Congress should move toward the private, competitive enterprise marketing system in agricultural production and marketing, and away from unnecessary governmental regulation. This proposal would result in fluid milk producers being directly regulated under Federal milk orders for the first time. They would be subject to penalties for violations and would have to keep such records "as the Secretary may prescribe."

2. The implied assumption that each fluid milk market is sufficient unto itself and completely independent of all similar markets is unrealistic and unsound. There is a great deal of overlapping of market supply and sales areas and intermarket movement of milk.

If a class I base plan were incorporated into a Federal order, adjacent markets with orders likely would be forced to adopt similar plans in self-defense. The end result could be a single, nationwide Federal milk order.

3. This plan could lead to severe restrictions on entry of new producers and some kind of trade barrier to keep out milk from other areas. We believe in reasonable competition in all areas of our economy, and in the right of new producers—particularly young people—to have an opportunity to engage in dairy farming if they so desire.

4. At first, many farmers might cut their milk production because they would receive the lowest class price for all milk delivered in excess of their individual allocations (quotas). If the farm price for fluid uses remained unchanged, the average farmer's gross income would drop when he cut his milk production. His "fixed" costs of production would continue whether or not he produced excess milk. This would cause a decline in his net income, resulting in pressure for higher class I prices that would reduce consumption, intensify competition from "new" or "outside" producers, and widen the spread between prices for fluid and manufacturing uses.

5. The Secretary of Agriculture would determine whether—and under what conditions—allocations would be transferable. If allocations were negotiable, this could stimulate corporation farming because of the advantage large corporations would have in terms of capital available for new investments, thus working to the detriment of family owned-and-operated farms. If allocations were not transferable under any conditions, current farming operations would be frozen. The situation would deteriorate further if one order market had a plan with negotiable bases and a nearby market had a plan with nontransferable bases.

6. If the allocation plan failed—as appears highly probable—pressure would mount for nationwide production controls—undesirable though those would be.

We believe the present dairy problem has been aggravated by proposals to institute compulsory or so-called voluntary quota programs. These proposals have caused many dairymen to maintain or expand production for base-building purposes.

Our dairy farmers expect their net incomes to increase and price-support purchases to decrease provided:

1. Talk about the possibility of dairy quota programs is terminated.

2. There is no increase in support levels.

3. Total consumption continues to increase in line with the upward trend that has prevailed since the end of World War II.

Since the level of dairy price support was lowered to 75 percent of the parity equivalent on April 1, 1962, substantial improvement in the national supply-demand situation has resulted. During the current marketing year dairy production is down from a year earlier; and CCC purchases under the dairy price-support program of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk are all substantially down from the same period a year ago.

We, therefore, strongly urge you to vote against S. 1915 and amendments to add to it compensatory payments on a nationwide basis. No new dairy legislation would be far better for our dairy farmers, consumers, and taxpayers than passage of these proposals.

Sincerely yours,
Charles B. Shuman,
President.

Wisconsin Dairies Cooperatives,
Union Center, Wis., August 30, 1963.

Hon. Gordon Allott,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Allott: It has been brought to my attention that the Proxmire class I base bill (S. 1915) will be considered in the Senate September 3 or 4.

Although purported to be desirable from the standpoint of the fluid milk interests operating under Federal marketing orders, it actually is not in the long-term best interests of the dairy industry as a whole; nor the consuming public. This conclusion stems from the following facts:

1. The new subparagraph (H) of the bill says "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section,". This essentially means "in spite of" or "an obstacle to the implementation of paragraph 8c(5) (A) through (G), (H) will overrule in determining how the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937, as amended, will be administered and legally interpreted.

2. In effect (A) through (G) would be noneffective whenever a conflict arose in interpretation or administration of subparagraph (H). This means that 8c(5)(G) which provides: "No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk, and its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof in any production area of the United States" will no longer limit the Secretary's powers to prevent him from establishing "trade barriers." (See pp. 16–21 of the Supreme Court decision *Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers, Inc., et al., Petitioners* v. *United States et al.* dated June 4, 1962). The above section and the subsequent interpretation thereof was largely the basis for eliminating the down allocation and compensatory payment provisions which were interpreted as restrictions to the free flow of milk and milk products.

3. Therefore bill S. 1915 would legalize restrictions via the class I base plan.

4. Such restriction to the movement of milk would have the following results:

(a) Would prevent the free flow of milk between production and consumption areas. It would prevent producers located in the various regions of the United States from competing for higher priced fluid markets on a free and equitable basis.

(b) It would allow class I prices to rise to exorbitant levels in high cost of production areas at the expense of consumers in these areas. In no case should the class I price in Federal orders differ more than the cost of transporting milk from alternative sources.

(c) It would provide a legal basis for allowing inequitable treatment of producers under a Federal order system which is national in scope.

(d) It would insulate fluid producers located in high cost of production areas from the competition of more efficient areas of production. In short it would legalize an economic trade barrier of the most flagrant type.

5. Furthermore in spite of all the wrong it could do, the bill would be relatively ineffective in accomplishing its primary objective, namely that of cutting milk production in Federal order markets. There are no areas where the variable costs of producing milk are higher than the lowest class price. To put it another way; producers will not cut back production unless the marginal costs of production exceeds the lowest class price. In either of the above cases the producer would continue to produce milk as long as the lowest class price was sufficiently high to help pay for his fixed cost of production such as machinery, equipment, buildings, interest on investment, etc. Any such bill, to cut production in Federal order markets, would have to incorporate an excess price, far below the level of price of the lowest class use.

6. Page 2, lines 6 and 7, includes within the base "reserves of milk as may be found essential thereto." Many markets are on a 3- or 4-day bottling schedule. This means that as the bottling week shortens the necessary reserves in the market could be interpreted to mean as high as 50 percent above fluid milk requirements. With the technological advancements in transportation the interpretation of necessary reserves should include supplies available from alternative sources. The bill as written would not only protect the producers within each Federal order from outside competition, but would allow for protected increases in production far above the level of production presently in most orders.

7. Page 3, line 11, states that bases are transferable. This particular provision would result in values being attached to bases with their subsequent sale to the highest bidders, or producers under orders which can do the best job of gaging the highest class I prices from their consumers.

In summary the bill entitled "S. 1915" would reverse the Supreme Court decision, disadvantage the consumer and in the long run the dairy producers, including those producers the bill was designed to help.

Your thoughtful consideration and opposition to this bill would be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,
Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative,
Robert J. Williams,
Public Relations and Procurement Director.

P.S.—This letter is in behalf of Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative which is the second largest in Wisconsin and Dairy Maid Products, Eau Claire, which is a federation of cooperatives with a total farmer membership of 21,000.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive M (88th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session. The treaty is in the Committee of the Whole and is open to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I consider it a high honor to have the privilege of presenting to the Senate, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

This treaty, if it receives the approval of this body, may well prove to be a turning point in history of incalculable significance to the human race—and especially to all Americans, who, because of our strength, bear a special responsibility for the prevention of a nuclear war.

In a few words, this treaty makes sense under the conditions confronting the world today.

I shall try to develop, in my remarks, the reasons why it makes sense; but I urge Senators to give serious consideration to all aspects of this treaty and to develop, as fully as possible, every facet of the questions involved.

This treaty, I am confident, will stand up under the closest scrutiny. It was because of my conviction about the merits of the agreement, that I invited the members of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to sit with the Committee on Foreign Relations during the taking of testimony and to have a full opportunity to examine each and every witness on the same terms as those available to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I was pleased by the cooperation of the members of the committees. Their questions did much to develop many of the more esoteric and difficult aspects of the scientific and technical problems involved.

In short, I believe an exhaustive and complete examination of all relevant questions is contained in the 1,000 pages of public testimony, together with the many hundreds of pages of executive hearings.

In deciding whether to render its advice and consent to the nuclear test ban treaty, Mr. President, the Senate must consider two basic questions: First, is the treaty compatible with the military security of the United States? Second, does it advance the broad purposes of American foreign policy? On the basis of extensive committee hearings, I believe the answers to both of these questions are affirmative, and that the treaty is indeed both safe and wise.

In my remarks I should like to comment briefly on the military and technical factors in the treaty, and then to discuss some of its broad political implications. Military and technical considerations were examined in detail in the combined meetings of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Atomic Energy, and are further elaborated in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. These factors have to do with the safety and prudence of our adherence to the treaty. Less attention has been given to the reason and purpose of the treaty, which have to do with its long-term implications for international relations.

At the outset, I should like to commend my colleagues on the three committees which heard testimony on the treaty for the responsible and bipartisan spirit of the proceedings. The hearings before the three committees and the subsequent deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Relations were characterized throughout by an awareness that this treaty, which in its broad outlines and intent were conceived by a Republican administration, and is now being implemented by a Democratic administration, is a matter of the national interest, transcending all considerations of personal and partisan advantage. It is particularly noteworthy and commendable that in the Foreign Relations Committee the motion to report the treaty favorably and without reservation was offered by the senior Republican in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and received the unanimous support of the Republican members of the committee.

Before examining the wisdom of our adherence to this treaty and the ways in which it can be expected to advance our overall national interests, we must assure ourselves that the proposed commitment is a safe one, one which will not derogate from the military superiority and strategic advantages which the United States now possesses.

It is the strongly held conviction of the officials who have the main responsibility for our national defense, both civilian and military, that the American nuclear force is, and under the treaty will remain, manifestly superior to that of any other nation. As the Secretary of Defense pointed out in his statement in support of the treaty, the U.S. nuclear force now contains, in addition to tactical, airborne, and other nuclear weapons, more than 500 missiles—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris—and it is planned to increase this number to over 1,700 by 1966. In addition, the United States has nuclear armed SAC bombers on air alert and over 500 SAC bombers on quick-reaction alert. By contrast, Secretary McNamara pointed out, the consensus is that the Soviets could place less than half as many bombers over North America on a first strike. It is estimated that the Soviets have only a fraction of the number of ICBM missiles that we have and that their submarine-launched ballistic missiles are short-range, require launching from the surface, and are generally not comparable with our own Polaris force. According to the best available estimates, our numerical superiority in ballistic missiles will increase both absolutely and relatively between now and 1966. In short, our nuclear superiority is both great and growing.

As to the effects of the treaty on this favorable military balance, the key fact is that whatever opportunities for progress in nuclear technology are opened or closed to the United States, the same opportunities will be opened or closed to the Soviet Union. In the judgment of the Secretary of Defense and most of his military and scientific advisers, the most probable ultimate result of unrestricted nuclear testing would be technical parity between the United States and the Soviet Union. By limiting the Soviets to underground testing, which is more difficult and more expensive than atmospheric testing and where the United States has substantially more experience, we can retard Soviet progress and prolong the duration of our technological superiority. In the words of Secretary McNamara:

> This prolongation of our technological superiority will be a principal direct military effect of the treaty on the future military balance.

Among the military-technological questions considered in the hearings on the treaty, three particular problems were the focus of special concern and scrutiny: The problems of the antiballistic missile, the high yield nuclear bomb, and the ability to resume atmospheric testing quickly in the event of Soviet violation or withdrawal from the treaty.

Should the Russians develop and deploy an antiballistic missile system, the preservation of our deterrent power and the maintenance of the balance of power would require us either to perfect an antiballistic missile system of our own or to develop means of penetrating the Soviet antimissile system. In the judgment of leading nuclear weapons scientists, the development of a highly effective antimissile system would be exceedingly difficult and perhaps impossible, while the development of an effective penetration capability is entirely feasible and, in fact, relatively easy.

At that point I should like particularly to invite the attention of Senators to the testimony of Dr. York and Dr. Kistiakowsky on the question of the antiballistic missile.

To continue progress in both an antimissile system and in penetration capability depends hardly at all on the testing of nuclear warheads but almost entirely on the improvement of delivery systems and of techniques of detection, identification, discrimination, and interception. Such information as to effects as may be required can be largely obtained through extrapolations based on previous testing experience and, as Secretary McNamara put it, "through designing around our uncertainties."

This is the judgment of such eminent nuclear weapons scientists, among others, as I have mentioned, Dr. Herbert A. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Eisenhower administration and former director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore; Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Special assistant for science and technology to President Eisenhower and now professor of physical chemistry at Harvard University—I stress the fact that those scientists were with the previous administration merely because it has been intimated by some that they believe some of the witnesses might have been influenced by pressure from the present administration; but the gentlemen whom I am naming would not under any circumstances have been susceptible to pressure, and they are quite independent of any influence of that kind—Dr. Stanislaw M. Ulam, resident adviser at the Atomic Energy Commission's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory since 1943; Dr. Harold Brown, currently Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense; Dr. N. E. Bradbury, Director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory; and Dr. Freeman J. Dyson, former chairman of the Federation of American Scientists and currently professor of theoretical physics at the Institute for Advance Study in Princeton.

The consensus of expert opinion on the antiballistic missile problem is that it is highly unlikely that the Soviet Union will have the capacity in the foreseeable future to develop an antimissile system that we could not saturate; that even if they had the money and ability to develop such a system, we would be able to detect it early enough to take necessary countermeasures; and, most important of all, that the treaty will impose no significant obstacles to the development of our own antimissile and penetration capabilities, while such limited obstacles as it does impose will apply as much to the Soviet Union as to the United States.

The problem of the antiballistic missile, and indeed of the overall relationship between nuclear warheads and delivery systems, was admirably summarized by Dr. Bradbury, who said in his statement to the committee:

> We tend to ignore the enormous role of the system in nuclear warfare and to concentrate on the more dramatic character of the nuclear warhead. The best nuclear warhead is no good in a crashing airplane, an intercontinental missile falling into the sea, or in a ballistic missile defense system which does not detect the target, discriminate among decoys, determine a trajectory, fire another missile, guide it to an intersection with the incoming one, and fire its warhead. In that sequence, the technical elegance of the warhead is almost the smallest problem. Or said another way, if a good and practical antiballistic missile system can be devised and built, it will have a warhead. This, one can guarantee.

As to the problem of high-yield nuclear weapons, the big bombs of 50 to 100 megatons which of course could not be tested under the treaty, the judgment of our foremost nuclear scientists, including those whom I have mentioned, is virtually unanimous that such weapons are neither necessary nor even desirable for our nuclear deterrent force, and that in any case we can construct such bombs whenever we wish without atmospheric testing. On the basis of expert scientific advice, both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have concluded that both for our attack capability and for the survival capability of our forces in the event of attack, large numbers of smaller missiles are much more desirable than smaller numbers of larger missiles. The Soviets are ahead of us, it is conceded, in the yield-to-weight ratios of very large weapons, but there is no question of our ability to design such bombs and the improvement of the accuracy and reliability of our present missiles is a much more effective approach than increasing their yield.

As Dr. Ulam wrote recently:

> When it comes to the question of very large bombs of 50 or more megatons, which the Russians have tested, it is quite clear, and therefore is no secret, that we could construct such bombs any time we want. As has been stated in the press, this country has tested bombs with yields of more than 10 megatons. When one considers the fact that such a bomb, if properly delivered, would ruin any city in the world, and if one remembers that two bombs of 10 megatons each have a much greater area of destruction than one 20-megaton bomb, it seems quite obvious that our arsenal contains large enough weapons. (Letter to the Washington Post, Aug. 16, 1963.)

Parenthetically, it seems to me that we have become so bemused in our public discussions with megatons and multimegatons that we have come to think of these weapons yields as rather neutral scientific phenomena, forgetting that we are talking about instruments of almost unimaginable destructiveness capable of killing tens of millions of people with a single explosion.

From my own experience in the hearing, listening to the distinguished scientists calmly describe such horrors objectively and dispassionately, all the testimony leaves me with the feeling that we surely are afflicted with what one might call "megaton madness," when we talk of even bigger bombs. Perhaps we would do well, in forming our scientific judgments of these weapons, to look again at the pictures of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were devastated by weapons of only 15 or 20 kilotons. Perhaps we would do well, when we speak of "small" bombs of 5 or 10 megatons, to remind ourselves that we are talking about weapons which, if used in warfare, would bring upon mankind a visitation of horror beyond anything ever approached or even conceived in all of the wars of human history.

> To talk of winning such a conflict—

Said Dr. Kistiakowsky—

> is to misuse the language; only a pyrrhic victory could be achieved in a nuclear war.

The third major technical problem of special concern during the hearings on the treaty was that of our capacity for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of Soviet violation or withdrawal from the treaty. Both Dr. Bradbury, Director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, and Dr. York, former Director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore, told the committees that while it will not be feasible to keep the laboratories ready for an instantaneous resumption of atmospheric testing, it will be possible to keep the laboratories in first-class operating order, to resume testing within a period involving no unacceptable risks, and to maintain a vigorous and productive group of scientists engaged in weapons development.

In his statement before the committees, Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

> We have the determination to retain a readiness to test in every relevant environment. This is a firm national policy. Its existence will not only render the risk of abrogation minimal, but will constitute a strong deterrent to abrogation.

There are, of course, other military-technological questions on which the three committees asked for and received detailed testimony. We were assured by administration witnesses that the Government intends to maintain a vigorous and effective program of underground testing and a continuing program of improving our ability to detect and identify clandestine tests. With regard to the feasibility of these and other safeguards, Dr. Kistiakowsky stated that "all of these things are completely feasible both from a purely technical point of view and from the point of view of the management of the U.S. scientific effort." Citing the successful maintenance of weapons research and development during the 1958 moratorium on testing, Dr. Kistiakowsky said:

> There is no reason why this performance should not be repeated in the present context which is less restraining because of the continuing of underground testing.

Senators will remember during that moratorium there was no testing at all.

In addition to these technological questions, there arose during the hearings and the subsequent deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Relations a question as to whether the language of article I of the treaty prohibiting any nuclear test explosion, "or any other nuclear explosion," might have the effect of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons in time of war.

The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense have all stated that the treaty will in no way restrict the use of nuclear weapons in time of war. A written opinion of the Legal Adviser to the Department of State, dated August 14, 1963, endorses this view in detail, explaining that the treaty has no relevance to a state of war and that the language in question was inserted solely to close a loophole through which nuclear explosions for military purposes might have been conducted under the pretense of being for peaceful purposes and not "nuclear weapon test explosions." The Soviet Government, in its reply of August 20 to a Chinese Communist note of August 15, made it quite clear that it regards the treaty as in no way curtailing the right to use nuclear weapons in time of war. There is in addition the generally accepted rule of international law with regard to the validity of treaties in time of war: "That provisions compatible with a state of hostilities, unless expressly terminated, will be enforced, and those incompatible rejected."—Justice Cardozo's opinion in Techt against Hughes, U.S. Court of Appeals of New York, 1920. It is a tragic certainty that in a third world war the nonuse of nuclear weapons would be regarded as incompatible with the state of hostilities.

There is no question whatever on that subject, as to the understanding of the parties to this agreement.

Lest there be any remaining doubt as to the right of the President to use nuclear weapons in time of war, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations includes the following language of interpretation of the treaty:

> The Senate should be assured that the committee, in recommending approval of this treaty, is entirely satisfied that the treaty in no way impairs the authority and discretion of the Commander in Chief in time of crisis to employ whatever weapons he judges the situation may require, in accordance with our constitutional processes.

The treaty as it stands is a sound and constructive document. The attachment of any reservation, whether on matters covered by the treaty text itself or on any of a number of extraneous issues of the cold war, would be unwise and irresponsible. It would necessitate a renegotiation of the treaty not only with the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, but also with the scores of other nations which have already acceded to the treaty. Such a renegotiation would take place in an atmosphere of doubt and mistrust as to American motives. The treaty as it stands contains reasonable and adequate safeguards for the vital interests of the United States. An attempt by reservations to reconfirm safeguards that are already provided for, or to introduce issues unrelated to the test ban itself, would probably result in the loss of the treaty, in a general worsening of the cold war, and in a breakdown of confidence in the United States that would make it exceedingly difficult to negotiate future agreements.

These, I believe, are the major reasons why it is safe and prudent for the Senate to render its advice and consent to this treaty without reservations. The military, technological, and legal considerations which I have discussed have to do mainly with safeguards in the event that the treaty is violated or otherwise breaks down. In the remainder of my remarks, I should like to suggest some positive reasons for our adherence to this treaty and to set forth some of the possibilities for advancing the aims of American policy and improving the world environment in the event that the treaty is respected by the signatories.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer to conclude his statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Speaking of some of the problems about Soviet Union treaties, I think the American people wonder, in view of the past record of the Soviet Union of having violated some 50 out of 52 treaties that have been concluded, what assurances or guarantees we have of detection of clandestine violations by the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have very great safeguards with respect to detection. Unfortunately, this is an area in which the testimony of those in charge of this program was taken in executive session; but that testimony is available to Members of the Senate. I recommend first that the Senator look into that testimony. I must generalize as to the development of the methods of detection with regard to violations.

A major effort in that direction has been underway for a number of years. Several new and promising methods have been put into effect. Methods of detection of nuclear weapon explosions have been developed, particularly with respect to explosions in the atmosphere, but also with respect to subterranean and underwater explosions, and finally with respect to those carried out beyond the atmosphere, in outer space, by means of the newly developed satellites, some of which are already in operation.

I think it only wise to say in public that I was amazed, and I believe all the members of the committee who heard the testimony were amazed and quite satisfied with the progress that has been made in the field of detection.

Mr. TALMADGE. Will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the Senator's conclusion, then, in response to my question, based on the evidence of our scientists who testified in secret session, and the evidence of our military authorities who testified in secret session, that if the Soviet Union clandestinely violates this treaty, we shall have that information almost immediately?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is a correct way to summarize the situation. It is possible that very small explosions—Senators have heard of the question of thresholds that was discussed in previous discussions of proposals for limitation of tests—could go undetected, but they would be so small that they would be of relatively slight significance.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator for clearing up that point. I think that is one of the problems that must perplex a great many people in America, and perhaps other countries. In the past, treaties that have been made by the Soviet Union have been violated whenever the Soviet Union thought it was in its own national interest. I believe the American people are assured that we, as we should, will carry out any treaty we make, and they therefore have some apprehension that this may be a one-sided treaty for the benefit of the Soviet Union and to the disadvantage of our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On that point I should like to make a comment or two.

It is true that in a relatively short period—a rather turbulent period—the Soviet Union has violated a number of international treaties, including such important political agreements as the nonaggression pacts with Lithuania, entered into September 28, 1926, Latvia, on February 5, 1932, and Estonia, on May 4, 1932, the arrangements for access to Berlin, and the Potsdam Declaration relating to the establishment of a Central German Government.

However, to obtain a proper perspective, it should be noted that, to all appearances, the Soviet Union has satisfactorily observed a significant number of multilateral and bilateral agreements to which it has been a party. A list of 27 of these other agreements appears on page 967 of the printed hearings, which are on the desks of Senators.

I think one might say that what distinguishes those observed treaties from those which have been violated is the interest of the Soviet Union, as the Senator from Georgia has stated. It is for this reason that the committee was concerned in its hearings and has set forth in its report the considerations which, it appears, have led the Soviet Union to enter into this agreement. Insofar as those considerations can be relied on to be continuing factors influencing Soviet policy, they provide some guarantee against future violations of the treaty.

First, it is apparent that the 1961-62 tests have led the Soviet scientists to believe that in many critical areas of nuclear weaponry they have achieved a rough technical parity with the United States. That is set out in our committee report, and it is quite clear in some of the testimony.

Some of the witnesses made the point—which I think is a good one—that the Cuban missile crisis is likely to remain in the minds of the Soviet leaders for some time. That was quite a shock. The statement of the Secretary of State in the hearings is highly important on that point.

The third factor is the well-known difficulties the Soviets are having today with the Chinese. I was interested in noting within the past few days that the Chinese are accusing the Soviet Union, through having signed this treaty, with recognizing Chiang Kai-shek's government on Taiwan. It is almost an exact duplicate of the point that has been made that we may recognize East Germany by our adhesion to the treaty.

In considering the question of Russian violation of treaties, it will be noticed that she has lived up to a number of them.

I do not think we can be so self-righteous as to say this country has never violated a treaty.

I did not follow it too closely, but I believe the Seneca Indians have been saying that this Government violated its treaty with the Seneca Indians in New York.

We have been a very fortunate country in many respects. We have been free to a greater degree than most countries—certainly more than the European countries—of attacks on our borders. So I do not think we ought to be too self-righteous on the question. I admit that the Russian record is not very good, particularly in an earlier period, not too many years ago, when the head of the Government was not Mr. Khrushchev. We made a treaty with Russia about 2 years ago relating to Antarctica. At that time people said that we could not trust the Russians. I do not recall anyone talking about the slightest violations by Russia of that treaty. I do not think there is much incentive to violate it.

I think the same situation applies here. In other words, there is a mutual interest. I am not saying that this treaty is exclusively in our interest. I do not believe the Russians would have signed it if they had not thought they had a common interest in the treaty.

A further protection, I remind the Senator, is the withdrawal clause. The withdrawal clause is so lenient that I do not think it would be necessary to abrogate the treaty illegally, when the withdrawal can be done legally very easily. The provision is very lenient. It was put in the treaty at the insistance of the military. But recognizing that in entering into this treaty there is a common interest in abiding by the treaty, therefore it would be not only to our advantage, but to their advantage as well.

Mr. TALMADGE. As I understand, the withdrawal clause provides for 90 days' notice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. But in the event of Soviet Union testing in violation of the treaty, it would require no notice on our part for us to begin tests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my opinion. If they violate the treaty, all bets are off, so to speak.

Mr. TALMADGE. It would be void at that moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. It would no longer be in effect. We should be sure, however, that they had violated it. We should not act on a trivial basis or in a capricious manner. We ought to be sure that there has been a clear violation. I am sure the Senator would be satisfied if he read the record of the best authority in this field, the man who is in charge of the subject, with respect to our great development in the field of detection.

I believe it to be beneficial to both sides that there has been this development, and that the idea of secrecy is less important now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Georgia has raised the last point with respect to abrogation. We are dealing with an important principle of international law. If there is a violation of the treaty by party A, party A abrogates the treaty, and thereby relieves party B of any responsibility under the treaty. The abrogation by party A is the same as though a match had been put to the treaty and burned it up, to use a figure of speech. I am glad the Senator from Georgia raised that point. I have read some comments which indicated that the editors who made the comments were not aware of the doctrine of abrogation. When there is abrogation, nothing is left.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One other treaty that the Russians made recently was the treaty over Austria, which had been preceded by a long period of negotiations. However, at last the treaty was signed. So far as I know, that treaty has not been violated. No advantage has been taken under that treaty by the Russians.

Perhaps it is not very popular to say it, but if my memory serves me correctly, when we found it necessary to build the Panama Canal, we found ways of abrogating, indirectly perhaps, a treaty which we had made in 1848 guaranteeing the sovereignty of Colombia. We thought it necessary to do that.

Therefore, none of us is absolutely without fault. When I refer to "us," I mean any nation. None of us is without fault with regard to international agreements. I agree that the record of our country is far better than that of Russia, particularly in recent years. Perhaps we have not been quite so sorely tempted, however.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first I should like to ask the Senator whether the Soviet Union has ratified the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have signed it. I do not know that they have ratified it as such. Of course they do not have the same procedures that we have. I do not know of any other country that has the procedures that we have. Whether or not the Supreme Soviet has actually acted, I do not know. I am not an authority on the constitutional processes of Russia. She is committed to the treaty.

Mr. MILLER. I am reading from the British Year Book of International Law, 1958, published by the Oxford Press, edited by Prof. C. H. M. Waldock, as follows:

> Soviet documents of ratification, according to the Soviet view "reflect the general style of Soviet diplomacy" and consequently are characterized by their "brevity, clarity, simplicity, and exactness of formulation." They are issued by the ratifying constitutional organ, namely, the presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Without them, there is no ratification; Soviet practice and theory have never accepted either oral ratification or ratification through fulfillment.

It goes on to explain a few more items. The point I wish to make is that I have seen nothing reported to the effect that the presidium of the Supreme Soviet has ratified the treaty. That being the case, I am wondering whether we know the treaty will be ratified by the Russians. If we do not know whether the treaty will be ratified, or hope that it will be ratified by them, the question is, When will they do so?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is quite a difference in the relationship of the executive in the Soviet Union with the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and what the situation is in this country. They have the party system, which determines the action to be taken. There is certainty of its ratification by the presidium of the Supreme Soviet. That is not always true under our system.

I do not believe that the fact that the Russians have not taken formal action is a valid reason for us to defer action on the treaty.

I think of the somewhat similar situation in Great Britain. I do not wish to go into a dissertation on the British Parliamentary system, with which I am a little more familiar than I am with the Russian system, but when the executive in Great Britain signs a treaty, unless a question is raised in Parliament, and there is a vote of no confidence, the treaty is considered to have been ratified. The British do not have the formal procedure that we have in this country. It is not possible under the British system for a Prime Minister to be Prime Minister unless he has control of the majority in Parliament. Once he loses it, he goes out of office. That is why our ratification is of special significance. As the Senator knows, the Supreme Soviet is not quite the kind of legislative body that the Senate is or that Parliament is.

Mr. MILLER. I quite realize that it is not democratic organization. However, I invite the Senator's attention to another statement in the book, at page 328, where it is stated:

> Soviet theory does not view an international treaty which is subject to ratification as having any legal force until (a) the ratification process has been completed, or (b) completion of the exchange or deposit of the documents of ratification depending upon the stipulation concerning ratification in the treaty text.

I have already quoted from the book regarding the ratification process, which indicates that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet will have to ratify the treaty before the Soviet Union will consider that it has been ratified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since the Senator raised the question, my assistant, who keeps up with these matters, has handed me a note saying that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has approved the treaty, but it has not yet been deposited.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator know when the Supreme Soviet ratified the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Approved it. The Senator from Alabama tells me it was within the past few days. I believe it is of no particular significance or importance. I believe that when they signed it, that was it. There is no doubt whatever as to what the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet does in a matter of this kind. That is not always the situation when a treaty comes before this body. I call to mind John Hays' famous remark about the fate of a treaty in this country.

Mr. MILLER. If I did not think it was an important question, I would not have asked it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not mean the way the Senator puts it. I do not mean that it is not important that the treaty be ratified by the Russians. I mean there is no doubt that it will ratified. There is not the slightest question that the treaty executed by the existing Government in Russia will be approved by the Supreme Soviet. I did not mean that it was not important that it be ratified. There is not the slightest doubt that it will be.

Mr. MILLER. On that point, I recognize that we might expect it to ratify the treaty; but I think it would be helpful, at least to some of us, if the Senator from Arkansas would provide for the RECORD the exact date on which the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet ratified the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall do so.

Mr. MILLER. Also, since I believe the treaty is barren on this point, I should like to ask whether the ratification process is intended to be consummated by an exchange or a deposit of the documents. As I understand, one of the two procedures is necessary for the treaty finally to become effective, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

About 10 days or 2 weeks ago, I read a report in the newspapers that the proposed treaty had been referred to a committee of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. I have not seen anything reported subsequent to that. I hope we might have such information.

As I understand, until the treaty has been consummated by a deposit or an exchange of the documents, it would be possible for the Soviets merely to withhold the filing of the documents. We do not know what the Soviets would do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What harm does the Senator think would come to us if the Soviets should withhold such filing?

Mr. MILLER. I assume the effect would be to leave us up in the air. It is similar to the practice in the real estate business. If one wishes to sell his house and offers it at a certain price, he ordinarily places a time limit within which a prospective purchaser must accept the offer.

We know we do not trust the Soviets. The treaty is not based on any trust or confidence in the Soviets. It would be entirely possible for the Soviet Union to sit on the treaty for 6 months or a year or 5 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean that under those circumstances the United States would be inhibited from testing or doing as we pleased?

Mr. MILLER. We would be so far as the other signatories of the treaty are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no; not at all. Unless all three of the original signatories signed and deposited the treaty, it would not become effective. If the treaty were not signed and deposited in a reasonable period, it would fail; just as if the United States failed to ratify it within a reasonable time—a specific date was not set, because we could not comply with such a practice under our constitutional system—if we dallied around and waited until next spring, I think the Soviets might say, "Forget about it. Let us not have anything more to do with it."

Mr. MILLER. And the United States could be of the same mind?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Most certainly. The treaty cannot become effective unless all three of the original parties approve it.

Mr. MILLER. Would it be the Senator's position that if the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet did not ratify, or if it did ratify and the documents were not deposited—which is necessary to consummation——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The treaty would be "off."

Mr. MILLER. The United States could say that all bets were off?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Soviets did not ratify it sooner than that—I used next spring as a way of putting it—I do not think we would wait around until next spring.

I shall obtain for the Senator the exact status of the treaty in the Soviet Union. I did not notice the report in the newspaper or anticipate such a question, but I am told that the treaty has already been approved by the Supreme Soviet, but has not been deposited.

The Senator from Alabama says that is what he read. I missed it. I did not anticipate a question on this subject.

Mr. MILLER. I certainly did not wish to ask a question that the Senator could not answer. I know the Senator will obtain the information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We will obtain the information. But I am sure that neither the Senator from Iowa nor any other Senator believes, after all that has happened, including the ceremonies last month, that there is even a remote chance that the treaty is in doubt, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned—provided the United States ratifies it—and I do not believe there is any question about the British believing it to be in doubt.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator also provide information regarding the next step? Assuming that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet has ratified the treaty, will the next process be the depositing of the document? If so, where and when will the exchange of documents take place? If the Senator could obtain that information, it would be appreciated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my understanding that the United States will deposit the document with the two other principal signatories. In other words, we will deposit the document in London and Moscow; and each of those countries will deposit with the other two principal signatories. But I shall submit an official statement for the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER. That is what some of us would like to have done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my understanding of the way in which the formalities are to be carried out.

Mr. MILLER. I would appreciate having the Senator clear up something else that has puzzled me; that is, the difference betwen amendments, reservations, and understandings. It had been my understanding that an amendment to the treaty could be adopted by the Senate and that that would require a renegotiation of the treaty. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MILLER. It was also my understanding that a reservation to the treaty would not require a renegotiation. Yet I believe statements have been made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and others to the effect that reservations would require renegotiation. I would appreciate having the Senator clear up this point, because I recall the Connally reservation, which, to my knowledge, did not require a renegotiation of the treaty involving the World Court. Since the Senator from Arkansas has had vast experience in this field, I would appreciate having him enlighten us on the subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Connally reservation merely nullified the action formerly taken, because it reserved to the United States the unilateral, exclusive decision as to whether a subject came within the jurisdiction of the court. For all practical purposes, that was the end of any useful participation by the United States in the World Court. As the Senator from Iowa knows, the World Court has never functioned. That is a good example of how a reservation can completely destroy a treaty. The Connally reservation destroyed the action that was taken by the United States in joining the World Court.

Mr. MILLER. I was not raising the question as to whether the Connally reservation was a good one or a bad one. Although the World Court has had very little business to transact, it has not been entirely without activity.

The point I sought to make was that the mere fact that the U.S. Senate adopted what is known as the Connally reservation did not necessitate the renegotiation of the treaty with respect to the World Court. I am wondering whether there is any difference between that reservation and a reservation that might be proposed to the nuclear test ban treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The best authority I have available, which was prepared in anticipation of such a question on this precise point, and one of the principal authorities in the field, is Charles Cheney Hyde's book, International Law:

> A reservation to a treaty is a formal statement made by a prospective party for the purpose of creating a different relationship between that party and the other parties or prospective parties than would result should the reserving state accept the arrangement without having made such a statement. A mere interpretative declaration made by a prospective party without such a design, and with a view merely to accentuate a common understanding, is not regarded as a reservation, unless another party or prospective party deems it to be productive of a different relationship between the state issuing the declaration and the other parties or prospective parties than would result were the declaration not made. In a word, whether an interpretative statement is to be regarded as a reservation and dealt with as such depends in practice upon the place which the states to which it is addressed are disposed to assign to it.

Of course, the Senate may include in its resolution language expressing its understanding or interpretation. So long as this language does not substantively affect the terms of international obligation of the treaty or relates solely to domestic matters, there would be no legal effect on the treaty. Under existing practice, however, the Executive would communicate such understandings or interpretations to the other parties.

The difficulty here would be whether the other parties would accept our interpretation of this question as being precisely a domestic matter. If there were any difference of view between the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of Great Britain as to the nature of the understanding, renegotiation might well be required. In other words, the other parties would have to accept our interpretation that the reservation did not affect the substance of the treaty.

The Senate may also include in its resolution language expressing its reservation. Normal reservation language would involve some change in the international obligations of the treaty and might affect its terms in such a significant manner as to require the Executive to communicate the terms of the reservation to the other parties to the treaty, thus enabling them to take such action as they felt appropriate, including reservations of their own, or even a refusal to proceed with the treaty.

Finally, the Senate may question the terms of the treaty itself. In this instance, there is no question that the treaty would need to be renegotiated.

The chief reason why I strongly recommended, in my previous remarks, against reservation, or even an understanding, unless it was so clearly a domestic matter that it could not conceivably lead the other parties to disavow the treaty, is that it would, at the very least cause great concern and confusion about our intentions. I would dislike to see that done. It is dangerous to put such things in the resolution of ratification. It was for that reason that the committee went to great length to include in its statement and committee report, which is quite distinct from the resolution of approval, what its understanding of the treaty is.

For example, as for the point about the use of nuclear weapons in time of war, we had not the slightest doubt about that, nor do we believe the Russians have. But we included it in the report.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the position of the Senator from Arkansas that a reservation of that sort would require renegotiation, and that it would be in the same status as an amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would not be in the same status as an amendment. I think it would be unfortunate to include any provision which is well understood and could well lead to misunderstandings, not only on the part of the Russians, but also on the part of many of the other signatories. I do not know what the understanding is to which the Senator refers; there are a great many of them. But I believe its inclusion would be a subject for discussion, and result in possible confusion and misunderstanding. That would be most unfortunate; and I do not believe its inclusion would add a thing to the treaty, because I think its treatment of the subject is quite clear, and we made it as clear as words can make it in the report. During this debate I am sure members of the committee will say, "That is what we believed, or else we would not have approved the treaty."

Mr. MILLER. But the Senator from Arkansas is not suggesting, is he, that after the treaty has been negotiated, a reservation would be improper, so far as the Senate is concerned—that the mere negotiation of the treaty means the Senate would not be acting properly if it saw fit to adopt a reservation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly not. The Senate has a perfect right to adopt reservations. I only say it would be very unwise for the Senate to do so. There would be nothing improper about it, but it would be very unwise. The procedure for the adoption of reservations is clearly laid out, but I think the adoption of reservations in this case would be very unwise, just as I think the Connally resolution—which I voted against—was very unwise.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator suggest that it would be unwise for the Senate ever to adopt reservations to a treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, I did not say that. But I know of none that I believe should be adopted. Perhaps the Senator from Iowa has in mind one that we have not thought of which may be both proper and wise. But certainly the treaty has been very carefully considered, as have also all the suggested possible reservations which have been brought to our attention.

As I earlier stated, the committee in response to a motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] voted in favor of having the committee report the treaty without reservation. We believe it is a very simple treaty, relatively speaking, and that there is no need for any reservation. That is all I am saying.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to make sure that I understand correctly the Senator's position. I understand that he is not saying it would be unwise to adopt any reservation whatever to the treaty, but that he is merely saying that those advanced thus far are, in his opinion, unwise. Do I correctly understand his statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those I have heard of, or which have been suggested, seem to me to be either irrelevant or extraneous. Certainly we should not include a reservation which would go beyond the concept of a test ban treaty. I believe such a reservation would be interpreted as an effort to kill the treaty; and it would jeopardize, I believe, final acceptance of a treaty, not only by the three original signatories, but also by the approximately 80 other countries that have acceded to the treaty to date.

If some unforeseen danger—one not yet developed during the very extensive hearings—were to be disclosed, that might be a different case. I suppose it is conceivable that there could be situations in which it would be wise to adopt a reservation. But I was trying to make the point that it would be unwise for us to attach to the treaty any of the reservations that, to my knowledge, have been suggested thus far.

Mr. MILLER. I see.

Does the Senator from Arkansas know whether the Soviets have yet made any reservations to the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my understanding that they have not. I understand that they approve of this treaty. Of course, they do not follow the same procedures that we do. I do not think they have adopted any reservations.

Let me ask the Senator from Alabama, who read the account of their approval, whether they adopted any reservations to his knowledge.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me, let me say I heard over the radio, and I was also told by someone who read it in a newspaper, that the ratification by the Presidium was without any reservations whatsoever.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I wish to suggest that there be printed at this point in the Record the memorandum relating to reservations, for I believe it will be helpful to many Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that would be a good idea. I did not read it all, and I believe it would be very informative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESERVATIONS, UNDERSTANDINGS, AND INTERPRETATIONS

A vote for a reservation to this treaty would be tantamount to a vote against the treaty. That should be clearly understood by each Member of this body and by every citizen. The highest officials of this Government believe that a reservation would kill the treaty. First, a reservation would require the approval of all 85 of the countries that to date have adhered to the treaty. This would also apply to any interpretation or understanding added to the resolution of ratification.

A reservation would also require renegotiation of the treaty. A Department of State memorandum on the question submitted last year to the United Nations contained this comment:

"It is understood by the U.S. Government that the term 'reservation' means, according to general international usage, a formal declaration by a state, when signing, ratifying, or adhering to a treaty, which modifies or limits the substantive effect of one or more of the treaty provisions as between the reserving state and each of the other states parties to the treaty."

Thus, a reservation would alter the contractual relationship defined by the provisions of the treaty and set the stage for a new round of negotiations with all that this would imply.

It is possible that an "understanding" or "interpretation" embodied, like a reservation, in the resolution of ratification would be similarly destructive. A committee staff memorandum on this question says: "Irrespective of what term is used to describe a condition imposed on a treaty * * * the view of the U.S. Government when it serves as a depositary is that the content or effect of the statement is of prime importance. If, despite the designation, the executive branch believes that the condition has the actual character and effect of a reservation, it would be so treated and thus would open the treaty to further negotiation."

Thus, a reservation would in all probability kill the treaty, while an understanding or interpretation could kill it. It must be remembered, first, that any one of the three would require the approval of all the other signatories; second, that none of the three is necessary; third, that any one of the three could encourage reservations and understandings from the other countries. The

> questions that have been raised which bear on the provisions of the treaty and their implications have been thoroughly explored by members of three Senate committees in an exhaustive series of hearings, and the bipartisan interpretation of these matters has in each case been clearly spelled out in the committee report.
>
> As for reservations and understandings that do not relate to the substance of this treaty, they are in my view not only irrelevant but mischievous and, as such, deserve to be rejected overwhelmingly not only by those, like myself, who unreservedly favor the treaty, but those of my colleagues who have expressed opposition and misgivings about it. This treaty will not end the cold war or turn swords into plowshares, and it should not be evaluated in these terms. It is a step in the direction of sanity and away from the hazard of nuclear war.
>
> If the Senate calls this treaty into question with a reservation or other qualification, it will invite the scorn of the civilized world; it will open the floodgates of Communist propaganda and give communism, a movement that has been largely emptied of its international force and appeal in recent years, renewed vigor. More important, by injecting a new issue, the treaty would almost certainly be lost, the cold war made more intense, the confidence of the world in American reliability diminished, and the effort of several years to discourage the chance of nuclear war by reducing tensions, braking the arms race and inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons rendered futile.

Mr. MILLER. I, too, believe it will be helpful. I also believe we should have in the RECORD some statement with regard to the alleged ratification by the Soviets.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that as a result of this exchange, the chief of the staff has telephoned the Department, and his been informed that the following is the correct statement:

> The treaty has been unanimously endorsed by the Joint Foreign Affairs Committee of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of the Union, and the Council of Nationalities. It is now before the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, which has the power to ratify.

It has not yet been acted upon. The confusion has resulted from the unanimous endorsement by the Joint Foreign Affairs Committee and the other two bodies—which is equivalent, I suppose, or somewhat similar to a report by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reporting to the Senate. The information that the Presidium itself had acted was not correct.

I repeat that in all honesty I do not believe there is the slightest doubt but that they will approve it, because I do not believe that much dissent among the Presidium is to be expected or would be tolerated.

Mr. MILLER. I share with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas his understanding of how they operate. Nevertheless, I am not very trusting, and I believe it would be well for us to understand, before the Senate votes on the treaty, that it has not yet been ratified by the Soviet Union, and we do not know whether or when it will be. We may expect that it will be; but it has not happened yet.

I believe all of us would feel more comfortable about the treaty if we learned that the Presidium had ratified it, and that the document was on its way here for deposit.

I wish to ask a further question about understandings: Can the Senator enlighten us about the status of an understanding, as compared, let us say, to a reservation? I ask this question because I understand that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] will propose that the Senate adopt some understandings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are having some difficulty with the semantics involved. I consider that our statements in the report constitute the understanding of the committee, and that if they are endorsed by the Senate, they will state the Senate's understanding of what the treaty means. That is quite different from being made a part of the resolution of ratification. We get into a very difficult gray area here; the question turns on the nature of the understanding. For example, the statement I read, which is from the best historical authority on this matter, concludes that where the understanding relates to a purely domestic matter which has no relationship to the substance of the treaty, it could very well be that such an understanding would not involve the slightest danger of invalidating the treaty or causing its rejection. In this area it is almost impossible to draw a sharp line, and to say that an understanding of one kind would invalidate or lead to the rejection of the treaty or require renegotiation, while an understanding of another kind would not have any of those results. I believe we would have to have the substance of the proposal before us and would have to study it, before we could make any kind of reasonable judgment as to what effect the proposal would have on the treaty. I consider our statement in the report to be a statement of our understanding of what the treaty does not do.

I would call it an understanding but one not requiring the action of other parties to the treaty. It would not be a part of the resolution; yet it would be a part of the treaty's history. It would be a part of what we intended the treaty to mean. An understanding which was not put in the resolution but would actually change the substance of the treaty—whether called an understanding or not—could, if the substantive effect of the treaty would be changed, lead to rejection of the treaty by the other parties to the treaty.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that case would there be a difference between an understanding and a reservation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When a reservation or an understanding is included in a resolution of approval, there might be difficulty as to the words used and as to what effect those words would have. That is what I am trying to prevent. Unless there is something very seriously wrong with the treaty, new language ought not to be inserted. What the Senator from Louisiana says, what I say, and what every other Senator says about the meaning of the treaty has significance in determining the way in which the treaty is interpreted.

What the Senator has said about the passage of proposed legislation is true, but a treaty is a little more delicate subject than a bill relating to domestic questions, because we are dealing with foreign countries, many of which do not understand our system very well. They might misinterpret our statements as an effort to reject the treaty.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that there would be serious objection to a reservation imposing a condition that might not be acceptable?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would clearly be so.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] desires to include in the treaty a reservation that the treaty shall not become effective unless and until the Russians withdraw their missiles and troops from Cuba. A reservation of that kind would nullify the treaty, in my judgment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Would it be the position of the Senator from Arkansas that, let us say for the sake of terminology, an understanding, if made a part of the resolution of ratification, would amount to a reservation, whereas if it were merely an understanding as a matter of, let us say, legislative history entered in the record but not made a part of the resolution of ratification, it would not be of the same stature?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Again the distinction as to what it is called is not the important point. The question is what the treaty, in substance, provides. Irrespective of the term used, it depends on what the depositary includes with respect to the effect of the understanding upon the contents of the treaty itself.

If language indicating an understanding is proposed and inserted in the resolution of ratification, and it would tend to vary from the understanding or the interpretation of the original parties, it would be the same as a reservation. I do not think we can judge the question in the abstract.

For the information of the Senator, I should like to quote from a memorandum which I had printed in the RECORD:

> It is possible that an "understanding" or "interpretation" embodied, like a reservation, in the resolution of ratification would be similarly destructive. A committee staff memorandum on this question says: "Irrespective of what term is used to describe a condition imposed on a treaty * * * the view of the U.S. Government when it serves as a depositary is that the content or effect of the statement is of prime importance. If, despite the designation, the executive branch believes that the condition has the actual character and effect of a reservation, it would be so treated and thus would open the treaty to further negotiation."

We come back to the question of what, in fact, we are proposing to do rather than what an action might be called.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, it is the content and not the label which is important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a question. Suppose Russia were to ratify the treaty and the Senate should insert a reservation such as the one I described in relation to Cuba. Would it not be possible for the Russians to come back and say, "We will agree with that provision in regard to Cuba if you withdraw your troops from Europe."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surely.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Russians might tell us, "You withdraw your troops from north Africa, Taiwan, and all over the world, or we will not accept the reservation."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. I think it is utterly unrealistic. It would be much better to vote against the treaty than to approach it in that manner by bringing in extraneous and irrelevant matters.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be much more frank and honest to say, "I vote against the treaty."

The essential purpose of the nuclear test ban treaty is to bring an element of sanity and restraint into the relations of great nations which know, but do not always seem to feel and believe and act as though they know, that a decision made in anger or fear, or a simple mistake, could result in the grisly incineration of millions of good people who are helpless against nuclear bombs and the complete destruction of human society.

National security does not and cannot depend on military power alone. Since the end of World War II American military power has been vastly increased by the development of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. At the same time, as Dr. Herbert York pointed out in his statement in support of the treaty, our national security has been rapidly and inexorably diminishing. In the early 1950's the Soviet Union, had it been willing to pay the price of retaliation, could have inflicted some millions of casualties on the United States by an attack with bombers carrying atomic bombs. By the late 1950's the Soviets, at heavy retaliatory cost, could have attacked us with more and better bombers, inflicting some tens of millions of casualties. By the mid-1960's the Russians will be able to launch an attack on the United States using intercontinental missiles and bombers that would cause perhaps a hundred million casualties. The United States, of course, will be able to inflict at least equal, and probably much greater, losses in a retaliatory blow against the Soviet Union. As Dr. Herbert York said:

> This steady decrease in national security was not the result of any inaction on our part, but simply the result of the systematic exploitation of the products of modern science and technology by the Soviet Union.

There is no technical solution to the paradox of growing military power and decreasing national security. A nation's security is a function of its overall position in the world—its political and economic strength as well as its military power, its diplomacy and foreign trade, its alliances and associations. Security in addition depends upon the general state of international relations, upon whether or not a nation has powerful enemies and upon the character and policies of its enemies. Security, in short, is not merely a military and technological commodity, but a combination of many elements, all of which must be taken into account in the shaping of national policy. Only if we regard national security as simply a matter of armaments and nothing more is it possible to credit the view of a noted witness that this treaty is "not directed against the arms race," but "against knowledge." The treaty before us represents a modest but realistic effort to increase our security by political means—by retarding the proliferation of nuclear weapons and by diminishing, however slightly, the tensions and animosities of international relations.

It is a dangerous oversimplification to regard national security solely in terms of weapons systems and military technology. The uncritical acceptance of a simple equation between security and armaments can only lead us into an accelerating arms race, mounting international tensions, and diminishing security. It can lead us to give undue weight to the political views of highly specialized scientists, such as Dr. Teller, whose experience and knowledge have only very limited relevance to the complexities of international relations. War, said Clemenceau, in his famous maxim, is too serious a business to be left to the generals. Some of our most thoughtful scientists, such as Dr. York, believe that it is also too serious a business to be left to the nuclear physicists. There is an alarming similarity, as Walter Millis and James Real point out in a recently published book, "between the credence given to a modern physicist pontificating on strategy or politics and that accorded an Aztec priest predicting tribal disasters." [1]

It is essential that we bear in mind, in our deliberations on this treaty and in all of our major policy decisions, that security has many dimensions besides military power. As Prof. Marshall Shulman pointed out in his statement in support of this treaty, it is quite possible for us to possess overwhelming military superiority and still be confronted with the erosion of our power and influence in the world if our alliance system is allowed to weaken, if confidence in our resolution is called into question, if our political and economic policies are ineffective, or if by ill-considered unilateral measures we provoke our adversaries into hostile countermeasures.

None of this is intended to suggest that a high level of military power is anything less than essential as a deterrent to Communist aggression. "But it is intended to suggest," in Professor Shulman's words, "that there may be a point beyond sufficiency at which purely military preoccupation may diminish rather than increase our security in the full sense of the word."

Armaments are a cause as well as a result of world tensions. This maxim, so frequently stated and so rarely acted upon, is at the heart of the nuclear test ban treaty. Its meaning was set forth in simple but eloquent language in Pope John's great encyclical, Pacem in Terris. The nuclear arms race, Pope John explained, is justified as essential for the maintenance of peace through a balance of armaments, but "one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, will have fatal consequences for life on earth."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator understand that the late Pope, by that statement, indicated he was thinking in terms of fallout or radiation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe so. It was one of the things he had in mind, certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have read rather carefully the report made by the committee which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas heads, and likewise the report made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I find almost no reference—certainly very small reference—to the question of danger to people in our time and in times to come from radiation or fallout, and the hazardous effects to be avoided by cutting down the degree of saturation in the atmosphere.

I wonder if it is not true that this is one area as to which the Soviets are as sure to have a desire to reduce or eliminate that danger as we have, or anybody else who has children, or grandchildren, or the hope for generations to follow, has? I wonder if enough attention has been given to that danger and to the chances of ameliorating it through the adoption of the nuclear test ban treaty?

Noting the comment made by the late Pope, I wonder if, after all, that is not one of the major considerations in this whole matter. Would the Senator care to comment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is a major consideration. On page 21 of the report we made reference to this question. There was some testimony about it in the hearings.

The testimony was, speaking very generally, mostly on other things. Considering the limited testing which has been going on, there has not been, worldwide, at least, a very dangerous buildup of fallout or radiation. On the other hand, if we continue to test and if there is extensive testing, we do not know how dangerous this could be.

I agree with the Senator. I do not think this was stressed as much as it deserves to be stressed, particularly because the principal attack upon the treaty arose from the military angle.

---

[1] Walter Millis and James Real, "The Abolition of War," (1963), pp. ix–x.

The response in the committee and of the witnesses is very often determined by the criticism. This related a great deal to the military situation.

That is one reason why so much attention has been given to this problem by the people of my State. I have given it more than I normally would, because of the danger, in my view, to the treaty which arises from the military. The military men are the principal critics of the treaty.

I think it is quite natural that military people, or those in any other profession, be very sensitive with respect to any inhibition upon the practice of their profession. I do not cast any reflections upon their patriotism, honesty, or anything else by that statement. I think it is a common factor.

Reduction of radioactive fallout is an affirmative consideration in favor of the treaty; and there was not much said about it, unfortunately. The Senator knows that witness after witness appeared—many of equal stature, in my view, with Mr. Teller—but most of the news was devoted to Mr. Teller, because he was attacking the treaty. Very little was said about Dr. York or Dr. Kistiakowsky. What they said was not news, because they were for the treaty.

Reduction of radioactive fallout is an item to be considered in favor of the treaty. Unfortunately, perhaps, the committee did not go into it sufficiently. Certainly it was not treated as an item of great importance, as it should have been.

I think the Senator is correct in his observation.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me that it is an important part of the entire approach to the treaty, and one of the most important objectives to be attained. Also, to follow up a point made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas a short while ago in his colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, this is a field in which there must be mutuality.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot conceive that any human being would not be concerned with the dire results of fallout or radiation on children, which I understand are much more severe with respect to children than to adults.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And with respect to children of unborn generations to come.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since we are trying to develop points as to which there are mutual reasons for arguing for the adoption of the treaty by the three principal signatories, it occurred to me that this was a point which should be emphasized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad the Senator has given emphasis to it on this occasion. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Some people say, "We wonder why the Soviets are willing to sign the treaty. It must be only to their advantage."

This is a good example of why it is mutually advantageous, rather than to the advantage of only one side.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator not think that the signing by more than 80 non-nuclear powers, who have no advantage to gain from this except greater security in life, evidences tremendous interest and a worldwide concern on the subject, which is something to be considered as the treaty is being debated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct. That goes a long way to explaining the very rapid acceptance by more than 80 nations of the treaty. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for raising the questions of radioactive fallout about which so little has been said, though it is pregnant with meaning, as the Senator pointed out, not so much for this generation, but for the generation growing up and generations yet to come.

I hope that when any Member of this body considers the treaty he will consider it not from a political viewpoint only and not from a military viewpoint only, but in the overall picture, taking into consideration much of the potential thinking which was in the minds of people but not mentioned or raised to any great extent during the course of the hearings before the committee.

I am impressed that, in addition to the very fine speech which the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is giving, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida has seen fit to raise this most important question, and also to cite the fact that, as of this moment, 89 nations have ratified this treaty and have indicated their willingness to go along with it. I think the Senate owes the Senator a vote of thanks for raising the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I want to thank the majority leader as well as to assure him that my own understanding of this problem is far from complete, but, as I have understood it through the years, there is no question at all over the fact that children with small thyroid glands are much more likely to be visited with disaster in that area of their body, which may lead to cancer of the thyroid, by reason of the pollution of the atmosphere by large quantities of radiation.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has gone into it more fully than I have. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my understanding. We had testimony that, I think, related to iodine 103. There are a few elements that seem to collect by and through milk, which affects particularly children, because they are the greatest consumers, relatively speaking, of milk.

It will be recalled that a few weeks ago there was a very strong protest made from the health authorities in Utah, because of the rather close proximity there to the place of tests, and the contamination had concentrated there. There has been a greater concentration in the Northern Hemisphere as compared to the Southern Hemisphere.

It has been called to my attention that, at page 862 of the hearings, it will be seen that Dr. Kistiakowsky said:

> The Soviets might embark upon development not of hundred, but thousand-megaton weapons. There are conceivable things. I am quite sure of that, and obviously other nations will also move into the nuclear arms race, and since for an inexperienced country it is so much easier to make tests above ground than underground, certainly the situation of wide-open testing will assist them in that desire, in fulfillment of that desire.
>
> So, I would say the amount of radioactive fallout will keep increasing. It is now still a comparatively small fraction of the total radiation which we are exposed to and thus one could make the argument that the occasional malformed babies, occasional cases of leukemia, and so on are numerically than significant compared with normal occurrences, but, of course, that does not help the people who have that misfortune.
>
> Increased fallout, well, obviously these frequencies of mishaps and tragedies will increase.
>
> I don't know what the end of it is, sir.

We had other testimony. One, a biologist from Harvard, was quite positive on this point.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to interject one more thought, as a member of the Senate legislative Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we have already received complaints from various sources, particularly from the good women of the country and women's organizations, with reference to this same subject, and particularly with reference to the contamination of children through milk, by reason of the fact that producing cows may be subjected to undue radiation from eating forage affected by fallout from atmospheric tests.

I know that here is a question which has disturbed many, many of our people. There cannot be any doubt of it, because we have had numerous complaints, and we have investigated them in a small way.

In concluding the point, I hope those who have come closer to grips with this whole problem, or series of problems, will not fail to give us all facts that can be produced for the RECORD with reference to this hazard to mankind that comes from undue saturation of the atmosphere with radioactive materials. It seems to me that this must be of concern to all people, whether we want to call it politics, whether we want to call it security, whether we want to call it mere humanitarianism, whether we want to call it self-interest, because almost all of us have children and hopes of grandchildren and others to come along, so it becomes a very selfish problem for all of us. If the treaty tends to reduce that concern, I think that is a maximum objective in connection with the whole treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I agree with him completely.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. On the question which has been discussed, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Florida and with the distinguished chairman of the committee that there was considerable testimony. There are many pages in the hearings and in the index with regard to fallout. In order to have the Record complete, though, I think I should read from page 214 of the hearings, in which Dr. Seaborg, in response to a question by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], made the following responses:

> Senator Russell. Dr. Seaborg, I read in the paper, I believe the day before yesterday, that there is twice as much radiation in milk today as there was 3 years ago.
>
> Is that approximately right?
>
> Dr. Seaborg. That would depend on the section of the country that was being referred to. I would like to say that there are probably sections of the country where there is twice as much strontium 90 in milk now as there was 3 years ago; yes, sir, Senator.
>
> Senator Russell. Has that yet reached a point where it is sufficient to endanger the human family?
>
> Dr. Seaborg. No, sir.
>
> Senator Russell. Is it a long way from it?
>
> Dr. Seaborg. It is a considerable distance from it; yes, sir.

The Senator from Georgia made another short statement on the same subject.

I thought those quotations should be a part of the Record at this time, because I believe we all have a high regard for the distinguished scientist, Dr. Seaborg.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The question of fallout radioactivity was of great interest to all members of the committee, because we realized its importance on generations yet unborn. However, there is something that ought to be kept in mind. It was brought out by my question to Dr. Seaborg and other witnesses who testified. There is not a great deal of fallout when only one nation is testing in the atmosphere or anywhere else, but with a combination of such nations—two at the present time, and perhaps in the next few years as many as five, and there is a possibility of expansion even beyond that number in years to come—a great mass of debris would be thrown out.

Furthermore, the debris does not merely float around where it is thrown out, and is not scattered uniformly about the earth, but it has a tendency to gather in pockets. There may not be enough in the atmosphere, if divided by the number of people in the world, to hurt an individual; but it is not found in that way. Instead, there are pockets of contamination in the Midwest, when there have been times, as the Senator from Florida has said, when the grass became so contaminated that it was assumed to be somewhat hazardous to be used for milk production.

There have been similar reports of contamination from Nevada. In Utah, only in recent weeks, pockets have been noticed there in which the contamination could easily, and perhaps rather quickly, reach a hazardous stage, if several different nations were testing and throwing out such debris all the time. I think we ought to keep in mind that such contamination is not of uniform distribution, but is subject to being thrown out into pockets.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's recalling that testimony.

The testimony of a biologist on the subject of health hazards of radiation from nuclear testing appears at page 949 of the hearings. I will not take the trouble to read it. I call attention to it for the benefit of Senators who may wish to look into this question.

The Senator from Alabama has summed up the situation. There has not been a great deal of testing. There was a short moratorium, and a short burst of great activity, following which there has been very little testing. So there has not been continuous, widespread testing as that which could result from nations aspiring to develop their own nuclear capacity.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me first read a short quotation. Then I shall yield. I read from page 949 of the hearings.

This is Dr. Meselson, of Harvard University, testifying:

> Bearing this in mind, a reasonable estimate for the number of children with gross mental or physical defects who will be born in the world because of the genetic effects of fallout from tests conducted to date is about 50,000. These defects include such things as muscular dystrophy, blindness, dwarfism, and other major deformities.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am just as concerned as anyone else about the potential fallout effects, not only on our present generation but on future generations also. However, I am amazed at the diverse testimony which has been given in this situation. The Senator from Arkansas has read a statement from a professor at Harvard University, indicating that there will be 50,000 genetic defects on the basis of the tests which have already taken place. Yet I believe this, too, should be made a part of the Record. On March 2, 1962, the President of the United States announced the resumption of nuclear testing. He said:

> It has been estimated, in fact, that the exposure due to radioactivity from these tests will be less than one-fiftieth of the difference which can be experienced, due to variations in natural radioactivity, simply by living in different locations in this country. This will obviously be well within the guides for general population health and safety, as set by the Federal Radiation Council.

There seems to be quite a split in opinion between the President of the United States on the one hand and the statement quoted by the Senator from Arkansas, made by a professor at Harvard University. I hope that during the course of the debate we might get at a common understanding on this subject, because I believe there are extreme viewpoints and divergent opinions very far apart on both sides.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not see any testimony to the effect that fallout was a good thing. I am sure the Senator does not mean to say that. He does not believe it is a good thing, does he?

Mr. MILLER. I do not; but when the President says the results of the tests he was directing to be resumed in 1962 will not show more than one-fiftieth of the amount of the variation between one part of the country and another, it is quite a statement and ought to be put in the Record, so that it may be taken into consideration in the light of what Professor Meselson has said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If something is not done about the continued acceleration of the tests, not only by the United States and the Soviet Union, but also others—and France is now making plans to conduct tests in the Pacific—the situation will become serious. In that connection, France has already aroused New Zealand, Australia, and Peru. Of course, they have protested.

There are others also. I believe there are eight countries which, it is believed, at some time or other will have the capacity for conducting such tests. If this continues, it is agreed that at some point it will become dangerous.

I do not believe that any of these people say that what has already happened has resulted in a disastrous situation, but they would like to stop it.

Professor Meselson estimates that 50,000 have been affected by what has already been done. In a world of 3 billion or so, I suppose some people might think that that is not very important, especially to those who are not affected. As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, it is important to those who are affected, particularly those living near test areas; and those people have protested.

Mr. MILLER. I believe that 50,000 genetic defects would be tragic. I find it inconceivable that such a great difference should exist between what the professor at Harvard has said and what the President said in his statement only a little more than a year ago. I believe the President's statement ought to be in the Record.

I also invite attention to page 224 of the hearing. I should like to quote from that page, as follows:

> Senator Hickenlooper. I want to ask you this, Doctor. Has science been able to pinpoint even one case where fallout can be scientifically attributed to radiation—that is, where one case of leukemia or bone cancer or things of that kind or mutation that can be scientifically attributed to fallout?
>
> Dr. Seaborg. From worldwide fallout, that is?
>
> Senator Hickenlooper. Yes, sir.
>
> Dr. Seaborg. Excepting these one or two freak cases of local fallout, I think that the answer would be no. I know of no case where a particular case could be attributed to fallout.

I find that to be quite a statement to put in juxtaposition with the statement about the 50,000 defects that Professor Meselson has presented before the committee. I do not know whom to believe at this point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Dr. Seaborg speaks about worldwide fallout. What does the Senator believe the doctor meant by that? He is excluding any of the cases in which there is clearly and demonstratively a connection between fallout and deformity. There were the cases in Japan, the cases of the fishermen in the Pacific, and so on.

It is like arguing that no one has yet proved that smoking cigarettes causes lung cancer. However, there are a great many doctors who think so. I cannot say that I know positively of a case that has been caused directly by smoking. I am inclined to think that it does have a bad effect, although I am a mild smoker.

What the Senator has quoted should be taken in connection with Dr. Seaborg's testimony at page 219, where Dr. Seaborg referred to the fact that "strontium 90 comes down from the upper atmosphere, the stratosphere, and so forth, at a rate faster than corresponds to its half-life, that is, through rains, and so forth. Then it comes down to earth, of course, which is a worse place for it to be than up in the stratosphere."

I believe that the overall conclusion to be drawn from Dr. Seaborg's testimony is that fallout is not a good thing, that it is not a good thing to put more strontium 90 into the atmosphere. What they are saying is that they cannot identify or trace a causal connection. If we should reach some unknown threshold, I suppose, it could become dangerous. I suspect it is very much like the argument that cigarette smoking causes cancer. I do not know how to resolve this kind of problem. I do not believe the Senator thinks that there is no health hazard involved.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder if it would be fair to state that up until now the amount of fallout from testing has been such as not to cause any particular alarm so far as genetic effects and other effects are concerned. At least, we have no scientific testimony on this point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Excluding the local areas close to the testing area. Dr. Seaborg spoke about worldwide effects. The people in Utah did not like it. I have had no particular protest made to me by people in Arkansas, although as of a certain date we know that strontium 90 is higher in the Ozarks than in other areas.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps it would be a fair statement to say that possible disasters or bad fallout effects are as much of a danger and would cause as much concern on the part of the people of the Soviet Union, as on the part of the people of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree.

Mr. MILLER. As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, there is a mutuality; and if we are concerned about fallout, we need to be not one iota more concerned than the people of the Soviet Union. There is a quid pro quo. It is sometimes made to appear as though the United States were the only country that needed to worry about fallout. I think it well to point out that the people of the Soviet Union need to worry about it as much as we do. It is no more an argument for us than it is for them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is going pretty far. He is saying that if the Russians do not mind dying from this disease, why should we bother about it?

Mr. MILLER. It is not quite so simple.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Soviets had a different attitude toward life than we do, there might be some difference in our views; but I do not think there is a difference in attitude. I do not believe it is a good argument to say that if the Russians do not mind dying from dwarfism or leukemia, we should not.

Mr. MILLER. That is not the argument.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It sounded as though it were.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator has doubts on that point, let me make it clear that the people of the Soviet Union are probably advised by their specialists—and they are as much aware of this danger point as we are—that it is dangerous to resume testing when the nuclear fallout reaches the danger point.

The Senator from Florida has stated that there is a mutuality, but we should emphasize that this argument holds true for the Soviets as well as for us. It ought to be made clear that when the United States resumed testing in 1962, the President gave the direction to do that and delivered a magnificent address to the American people disclosing his reasons for doing so. I am confident he would not have asked for the testing to be resumed if, based upon all the scientific advice that was available to him, he thought the testing would cause an undue amount of pollution of the air due to nuclear fallout from the testing.

We ought to keep that in mind, so that we will not overemphasize the fact that the nuclear fallout is of prime consideration, although the Senator from Florida has made a good point that it is a matter of mutuality, and we do not find many areas of mutuality at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his comment. He has referred to one of the points I was trying to bring out; that is, that this is an area in which there should be a mutuality of approach. The Soviets are just as human as we are.

Second, perhaps they are a little more concerned just now about this point than we. This is conjecture, but we know they have conducted a number of atmospheric tests with so-called dirty bombs that were not so far from concentrations of their people as was our last group of atmospheric tests conducted in the remote recesses of the Pacific.

While I have no information on the subject, it seems to me that we at least have the assurance that here is an area of mutual concern to them and to us. We might even feel that the Soviets have a little more cause for concern right now than we do because of the 71 atmospheric tests conducted by them, in 1961–62, some of them having a high degree of concentration in the exploding of nuclear weapons and nuclear bombs vastly greater in power than any we have exploded.

So my point is borne out—I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for bringing it out—that here is an area of mutuality which would rarely occur in an international issue between the Soviet Union and the United States. I do not want the U.S. Senate to lose sight of that fact.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding, and the Senator from Iowa for raising the question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I, too, commend him for making this point; it is an important one.

History may teach us little about the present arms race, which, because it involves nuclear weapons, has possibilities for catastrophe unparalleled in the past. But one lesson is clear. A continuing arms race, accompanied by mounting fears and tensions, has almost inevitably in the past led to war.

There is perhaps some instruction for us in the experience of Europe before 1914. None of the great powers of that era actually planned a major war, but each of the two major groupings, the Central Powers and the Entente Powers, was beset by fears of attack by the other. Fear grew into conviction as the two hostile alliances continued to arm against each other in a vain and desperate quest for security. Mutual fear generated the arms race, which in turn generated greater fear until almost by accident Europe was plunged into general war.

Europe emerged broken and devastated from the war of 1914 and from the Second World War which was spawned by the consequences of the First. But the nations survived. The simple, compelling fact of our own time is that the world's great nations, and many of its smaller ones, almost certainly could not survive as organized societies a third world war fought with nuclear weapons. It is this prospect, so obvious and yet so incomprehensible, that makes it essential for us to break out of the fatal cycle of fear and armaments and greater fear and finally war.

The nuclear test ban treaty will not break the cycle. It is far too modest an effort to have more than a marginal effect on the conflict between the Communist and the free world. But if it is faithfully observed, this treaty can in some small measure mitigate the fears and suspicions of the cold war and perhaps in time lead to further measures of limited accommodation. It is not likely—it is indeed all but inconceivable—that the conflict between communism and the free world can be resolved in our lifetime. But the final resolution of the conflict, however vigorously we may desire and pursue it, is not an urgent matter. The world has always been beset by conflicts—religious and dynastic, national and ideological—and few have been resolved by means other than the evolution of history.

What is urgent for both the Communists and the free world is the prevention of nuclear war. This single objective, the survival of the civilized societies of the earth, is the one elemental interest which all nations have in common, and none more so than the United States and the Soviet Union, which, being the principal possessors of nuclear weapons, would also be their principal targets.

Without in any way minimizing the seriousness of our conflict with the Soviet Union, we can and must recognize that this conflict is neither total nor absolute. There are areas of mutual interest between us, among which the prevention of nuclear war is preeminent. One of them we have just discussed; another is the prevention of nuclear war, which I believe is the preeminent one, because it would involve a far greater poisoning of the atmosphere. The nuclear test ban treaty is rooted in this single common interest. It is a tentative and cautious agreement aimed at attaining a measure of stability and moderation in the military confrontation between the two great powers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I must say at the outset that I intend to vote for the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I never doubted that the Senator from Kentucky would do so.

Mr. COOPER. It was my desire to vote for it, but I wanted to be satisfied about its effect on our security. I attended the hearings and heard most of the testimony given in public and executive sessions before I firmly made up my mind to vote for the treaty.

I have been listening with interest to the Senator's excellent statement, but I would like for him to clarify a part of his remarks.

We all agree that there are risks in the treaty which cannot be wholly resolved. I believe the Senator would agree with my statement. Further the risks have been known since negotiations looking toward a treaty ban on nuclear weapons began under the administration of President Eisenhower.

We have always recognized the possibility of clandestine testing by the Soviet Union. It is also possible that the Soviet Union may be ahead in some forms of scientific development, as they are in high yield nuclear devices. But the preponderance of testimony, including that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is that we will be able to maintain our overall superiority.

But against these risks—risks which we must accept if we ratify the treaty—we must balance another risk—the risk that the proliferation of nuclear weapons—the unabated nuclear arms race—may lead inexorably to a nuclear war which would leave no victor.

But I have just noted that the Senator has stated that there is little in the treaty which gives hope of breaking out of the cycle of the arms race. This seems to contradict what I believe is a chief argument against which to balance the risks we must accept if we ratify the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Against the arms race? I was referring to a modest contribution to the resolution of the cold war, which is quite a different matter.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator said:

> It is this prospect, so obvious and yet so incomprehensible, that makes it essential for us to break out of the fatal cycle of fear and armaments and greater fear and finally war. The nuclear test ban treaty will not break the cycle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the conflict? I believe the conflict between ourselves and the Russians, particularly the ideological conflict, will continue.

I believe this treaty is a very modest step. What is really significant is, not the length of the step, but the direction in which it is taken. The treaty constitutes a change from a continued, ever-increasing buildup of nuclear weapons; and this point is very significant.

There is a difficulty in connection with the treaty, in that it is a very moderate inhibition upon the freedom of action of both sides. However, the really significant point, in my opinion, is that we have arrived at any agreement at all.

Mr. COOPER. I agree.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Because we have been trying for a long time to arrive at an agreement. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, the previous administration made many such efforts, but they were always fruitless, and never resulted in an agreement on anything. Meantime our budget for these weapons grows larger and larger and I assume Russia's does, too.

The question may be asked: What does this treaty do? The testimony was that in the foreseeable future we must take other safeguards until other developments occur. Tests underground are much more expensive than tests in the atmosphere. I did not mean to leave the impression that the treaty is insignificant. It is only insignificant in the sense of procedures to resolve our basic differences. They must come through means other than military means.

Mr. COOPER. I understand, for I have read the advance copy of the Senator's speech. I agree with what he says, and also with the emphasis which must be given, in connection with the arms race, and our security.

I have listened to a great deal of the testimony, and I have read the great part of it. There does seem to be a kind of contradiction, for the Senator from Arkansas has said this ban will help inhibit the proliferation of nuclear weapons and will have an effect upon the nuclear arms race itself. But the administration asserts, and the scientists and the military assert that we will make redoubled efforts in the field of underground nuclear tests.

I believe this underground testing is necessary to assure our security, but it does raise the question whether this treaty will inhibit the nuclear arms race—at least between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But my point is that even with the same effort, underground tests will cost more.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. Nevertheless, everyone agrees that underground testing must go forward. But you have correctly stated that the treaty is a step which may lead to other agreements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. President Kennedy has said that the treaty would open the way to further agreements, and former President Eisenhower said, in his letter to the committee, that the greatest advantage he saw from the treaty was that it might lead to enforceable agreements between the United States and the Soviets and to a reduction in the arms race.

Does not the Senator think, then, if this treaty is only the first step, that the real test of the treaty may be found in the attitude of the Soviet Union during the year or two which follow its ratification? And may not this period tell us whether the Soviet Union will be willing to make any just settlement of the issues that create the danger of war?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, indeed. And that is very important.

Mr. COOPER. Whether the Soviets show any inclination to take further steps, such as an enforceable agreement on underground tests or an agreement in regard to Berlin, or one in regard to Cuba, will test the attitudes of the Soviets and show whether they intend to take the further steps toward the settlement of the issues they have created.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree. But we have to give them that opportunity, by our ratification of the treaty. If it is not ratified, we shall never know that.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that as we take this first step, with its known risks, the real test of Soviet intentions lies ahead.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's comments, and I am very pleased with his attitude—although, as I said at the beginning, I had no doubt that he would take this attitude, for he has had enough experience in this field to know its importance.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to ask a question about reservations and understandings. Is it not true that during the negotiations with the Soviet Union respecting the ban on nuclear testing, beginning under the administration of President Eisenhower, and continued under the administration of President Kennedy, the negotiations related almost solely to the subject of agreement upon nuclear weapons?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not also true that when Premier Khrushchev suggested in a speech—whether he suggested it in negotiations, I have no way of knowing—that the treaty might be followed by a nonaggression pact, it was the position of Members of Congress, that we should not consider such an agreement at all, but that our efforts should be directed solely toward a test ban agreement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, that was the position of our Government.

Mr. COOPER. It was our position, too, was it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Senator will agree that to attempt now to attach to this treaty a reservation regarding other issues—those about which we feel very strongly and correctly, probably would mean—and I believe it actually would mean—the failure of the limited step embraced within this treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky. He is absolutely correct. In my opinion, that would be a great mistake, and it would be very unwise to attempt it. Furthermore, I do not believe it would succeed. It would be a roundabout way of voting against the treaty or trying to destroy the treaty, in my opinion. That would be the intended result.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note on pages 658 and 659 of the printed hearings of the committee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator, a report from the New York Times of August 21, covering the subject which the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Iowa, other Senators, and I have been discussing—namely the question of danger to people from radioactive fallout.

I wonder if the Senator will permit me at this time to ask unanimous consent that the news item published in the New York Times to which I referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not at all. I shall be glad to have the item in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I make that request.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA FALLOUT FOUND A HAZARD—CHILDREN POSSIBLY HARMED, CONGRESS PANEL IS TOLD

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, August 21.—Several thousand children in Nevada and Utah have probably received hazardous doses of fallout radiation from nuclear testing in Nevada over the last 12 years, according to a report today to the congressional Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee.

The report was presented in behalf of the St. Louis Citizens Committee for Nuclear Information by Dr. Eric Reiss, associate professor of medicine at the Washington University School of Medicine.

The committee, composed chiefly of scientists, analyzed the fallout from about one-third of the 99 tests conducted at Nevada since 1951. It concluded that on several occasions the amount of radioactive iodine falling out in the region around the test site far exceeded the permissible radiation levels established by the Government.

As a result, according to the study, children drinking milk contaminated with the radioactive iodine probably received grossly excessive doses to their thyroid glands.

One reason for the high exposures is that the children were drinking milk from cows that foraged in highly contaminated pastures. There was no dilution of the iodine content, as normally occurs when the milk is drawn from a large milkshed.

In an interview, Dr. Reiss estimated that 3,000 children, mostly in Utah and Nevada, had received excessive doses of radiation. He predicted that this would result in 10 to 12 cases of thyroid cancer in the exposed children.

The report was highly critical of the Atomic Energy Commission's procedures for monitoring the health hazard posed by fallout from the Nevada tests.

It charged past and repeated Commission assertions that the hazard had been confined to the Nevada test site and that the Nevada tests had been carried out without any discernible threat to the safety of local populations.

An analysis of available evidence shows, the report said, that children in the States bordering the Nevada test site have probably been exposed to medically significant radiation.

The report criticized the Commission for its inadequate monitoring procedures, which failed to look for the amount of radioactive materials, particularly radioiodine, entering the food supply. With proper monitoring procedures, the report suggested, it would have been possible to take simple preventive measures, such as removal of local, contaminated milk supplies, that would have reduced the radiation exposure to children.

The Commission declined to comment on the report until its officials had an opportunity to read it.

By its timing and conclusions, the report is certain to enlarge the new fallout controversy developing over the health hazards posed by past tests in Nevada to children in Nevada and Utah. Somewhat similar conclusions—that some of the tests resulted in unexpectedly high fallout of radioiodine near the test site—have been reached by a University of Utah group and by Dr. Harold A. Knapp, a former fallout expert with the AEC.

The controversy has already reached the presidential level. At his news conference yesterday President Kennedy promised a further study of the reports but he said that as of now he did not believe that the health of the children had been adversely affected.

The President cited the reports as further justification for the nuclear treaty barring atmospheric explosions. The St. Louis committee, however, said that the hazardous fallout had also come from underground testing. It noted that venting—in which the explosion breaks through the surface—had been reported for at least seven underground tests in Nevada.

The St. Louis committee report is the first to assert that radiation exposures have reached levels at which there is general medical agreement that physical damage would result.

DOSAGES ARE ESTIMATED

In the past, the argument has raged over the effects of radiation exposures measured in fractions of a roentgen—levels so low that it is difficult to establish that they have a harmful effect. However, the St. Louis study finds that in some cases Utah and Nevada children have received radiation exposures to their thyroid glands measured in 100 rads or more—levels in the range considered cancer producing by the Federal Radiation Council. (A rad is a unit measuring the biological effect of radiation.)

For example, the report said, on at least seven occasions since 1952 children in Washington County, Utah—150 miles east of the test site—have received thyroid doses ranging from 5 to 100 rads or higher. From explosions in 1953, it estimated, children in St. George and Hurricane—two towns in the county—received doses to their thyroids ranging from 100 to 700 rads.

For normal peacetime operations, the Federal Radiation Council has proposed an average exposure of 0.5 rad to the thyroid for the general population, with a maximum of 1.5 rad for any one individual. A radiation protection guide of 30 rads is proposed for atomic workers.

In sufficiently large doses, radioiodine can cause thyroid cancer. There is still considerable uncertainty over how large a dose is needed, but in a recent report the Federal Radiation Council pointed out that cancer of the thyroid had been observed in children after exposures as low as 150 rem. (A rem is the dosage of ionizing radiation that will cause the same amount of biological injury to human tissue as 1 roentgen of X-ray dosage.)

Radioiodine is a particular threat to children because their thyroid gland is smaller and more sensitive to radiation. Fallout iodine 131 enters the food chain by falling on grass. It is consumed by cows and passed on into the milk. It then tends to concentrate in the thyroid.

CONTROVERSY OUTLINED

As the President noted at his news conference, there is some scientific controversy over the validity of the recent reports about iodine fallout from the Nevada tests. The argument is largely over the methods of extrapolation used to reach the conclusions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and other Senators who are in the Chamber to several parts of that article:

First, as was correctly stated by the Senator from Iowa, there is no complete unanimity between the scientists on this subject. The last paragraph of the news article, at the bottom of page 659, notes that fact.

Second, the news article covers the presentation of a report to the Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee of the Congress by Dr. Eric Reiss, associate professor of medicine at the Washington University School of Medicine, on behalf of the St. Louis Citizens Committee for Nuclear Information. The article states that the committee is composed chiefly of scientists, and gives the data which they report, which I shall not quote in detail, as the article will appear in the RECORD.

However, I invite the attention of Senators to the next to the last paragraph on page 659, which I believe bears out the statement that I made to the Senator from Arkansas. It reads as follows:

> Radioiodine is a particular threat to children because their thyroid gland is smaller and more sensitive to radiation. Fallout iodine 131 enters the food chain by falling on grass. It is consumed by cows and passed on into the milk. It then tends to concentrate in the thyroid.

Earlier in the article is an estimate by Dr. Reiss as to the number of children in Nevada and Utah who, he thought, could be expected to contract thyroid cancer because of the exposure to radiation to date. I would not want it to appear that either I or the doctor making the report are presenting that as a conclusive finding, but that is his prediction in the report. I thank the Senator for allowing me to have the article printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is very worthwhile.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask to have printed in the RECORD another report?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. On page 24 of the Washington Sunday Star appears an item entitled "Strontium 90 Level in Milk Hits New High; No Peril Seen," in which it is pointed out that the Nation's milk supply during June of this year contained a record high national daily level of 32 picocuries of radioactive strontium 90 per liter, according to the Public Health Service.

At the same time, the article wisely points out, the Federal Radiation Council stated last May that fallout levels this year probably would be substantially increased over those of 1962, but would still be, in relative terms, far short of the figures which would have caused concern or justify countermeasures.

The Public Health Service spokesman pointed out that the Public Health Service is watching with interest to see whether there will be a decline in the content during the remainder of the year, because apparently June was the high point of 1962.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would be fine to have that in the record.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article to which I referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRONTIUM 90 LEVEL IN MILK HITS NEW HIGH; NO PERIL SEEN

The Nation's milk supply during June contained a record high national daily level of 32 picocuries of radioactive strontium 90 per liter, the Public Health Service reported yesterday.

This was nearly double the national level of 17 picocuries recorded in June 1962, the highest for any month last year. A spokesman for the Service pointed out that the figures bore out estimates made earlier this year by the Federal Radiation Council.

A picocuri, newly adopted term replacing micromicrocurie, is one-millionth of a curie. A curie is the equivalent of the radioactivity produced by one gram of radium. A liter is slightly more than a quart.

DUE TO TESTING

The Council said last May that the fallout levels this year would probably be substantially increased over those in 1962 but would "still be, in relative terms, far short of figures which would cause concern or justify countermeasures." Excessive amounts of strontium 90 in food could cause bone cancer in humans who consume it.

The report said the increase would result largely from nuclear weapons testing in 1961 and 1962, most of it by Russia.

The highest average daily level ever recorded at an individual sampling station was at Minot, N. Dak., during June, at 62 picocuries per liter of milk. The June 1962, daily average there was 30, so there was slightly more than a doubling.

The May level was 56. For the year ended with June, the total was 10,962, making Minot third high among the 62 sampling stations on a 12-month basis.

The second highest level for an individual station during June was 59 at Rapid City, S. Dak., more than double the 27 recorded there in May. The 12-month total was 7,672.

HIGHEST AVERAGES

However, Little Rock, Ark., and New Orleans, La., continued to rank No. 1 and No. 2 in the Nation in total picocuries from 1 liter of milk daily for the 12 months ended with June.

Little Rock had a daily average for June of 52 and 12-month total of 13,055. New Orleans had a daily level of 42 and a year's total of 12,418. The May daily average was 51 at Little Rock and 40 at New Orleans.

In general, average daily levels went up during June in the Atlantic seaboard States from North Carolina northward to Canada. Charleston, S.C., reported an average daily level of 28 during both May and June, and there were decreases in June in Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

WATCH FOR DECREASES

The levels increased in June from most sampling stations in the Central, Midwestern, and Rocky Mountain States.

But the Pacific coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington and Alaska had decreases during June. Honolulu, the sampling station in Hawaii, reported a level of 10 during both months.

A Health Service spokesman said the Service is watching with great interest to see whether there will be a national lowering of the strontium 90 count in subsequent months, since June was the peak 1962 month.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One of the great difficulties of devising and agreeing on rational measures to prevent nuclear war is what Raymond Aron has called atomic incredulity, the fact that the consequences of such a war are almost beyond human comprehension. This atomic incredulity" is apparent in our diplomacy and strategic thought, in our political discussions and our daily life. We speak with grave concern and feeling of a traffic fatality or a mine disaster or of the risks faced by an astronaut circling the earth, but we speak almost dispassionately of megaton weapons, of big bombs and small bombs, and of showing the Russians that we are not afraid of war, as if these were rather ordinary subjects of discussion without any relationship to the destruction of our civilization and the death of hundreds of millions of people.

There is a kind of madness in the dialog of the nuclear age, an incredulous response to terrors beyond our experience and imagination. There are few examples in history of nations acting rationally to prevent evils which they can foresee but have not actually experienced. Somehow, we must find a way, and encourage our adversaries to find a way, of bringing reason and conviction into our efforts to prevent nuclear war. Experience in this case is clearly not the best teacher, because few would survive to profit from the lesson.

The United States and Russia, with their vast territory and resources, do not need nuclear weapons to be the foremost nations of the world. Indeed, without nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, Russia and the United States would be not only the strongest and richest nations of the world, as they are, but also the most secure and invulnerable to attack.

Of course, I mean if no country had them. I do not mean if they alone had them.

By their acquisition of nuclear weapons, the two great powers have destroyed the traditional advantages which wealth and size had placed at their disposal. Their security now is a tenuous thing, depending solely on their power to deter attack and, ultimately, on sheer faith that each will respond with reason and restraint to the deterrent power of the other.

There is in addition the prospect of proliferation. At some point in the future, Communist China and then many smaller Nations are likely to acquire nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by small nations will act as a great equalizer, giving them power out of all proportion to their size and resources and further undermining the advantages of size and wealth enjoyed by great nations like the United States and the Soviet Union. The short-range effect of the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the two great powers was to increase their military stature. The probable long-range effect will be that the great powers, having undermined the traditional sources of power in which their advantage was overwhelming, will have to compete on terms approaching equality with nations that could never before have challenged them.

The significance of these considerations is summarized by Edmund Stillman and William Pfaff in their admirable book, "The New Politics." "America and Russia," they write, "would have dominated the world at the war's end, atomic weapons or no. Had they been wise, they would have come to agreement early to avoid the spread of these weapons; but they did not. Their penalty is to see the beginning of a time in which the very category of great power is negated by events"—Edmund Stillman and William Pfaff, "The New Politics" 1961, page 138.

For these reasons, the United States and the Soviet Union share an overriding common interest in the imposition, however belated, of some limitations and safeguards on nuclear weapons. Looked at in this way, the test ban treaty, by decelerating the arms race and reducing the pace of proliferation, will help the two great powers to recover some of the traditional advantages of great size and wealth. These advantages, so recklessly and unknowingly cast away by the scientific genius of the great powers themselves, can never be fully recovered. But it is clearly in our interest to attempt to mitigate the trend toward nuclear proliferation—a trend which, if realized, will place vast powers of destruction in the hands of small as well as great nations; of those who are reckless as well as those who are responsible; of those who have little to lose as well as those who have everything to lose.

There is no longer any validity in the Clausewitz doctrine of war as "a carrying out of policy with other means." Nuclear weapons have rendered it totally obsolete because the instrument of policy is now totally disproportionate to the end in view. Nuclear weapons have deprived force of its utility as an instrument of national policy, leaving the nuclear powers with vastly greater but far less useful power than they had before.

So long as there is reason—not virtue, but simply reason—in the foreign policy of the great nations, nuclear weapons are not so much an instrument as an inhibition of policy.

By all available evidence, the Russians are no less aware of this than we. The memory of their 20 million dead in World War II is still fresh in the minds of most Russians. In a speech on July 19, Khrushchev castigated the Chinese Communists as "those who want to start a war against everybody." "Do these men know," he asked, "that if all the nuclear warheads were touched off, the world would be in such a state that the survivors would envy the dead?"

It is the vulnerability of the Soviet Union to nuclear war, clearly understood by the Soviet leaders, that has led them to proclaim the doctrine of "peaceful coexistence." Inhibited by the threat of nuclear annihilation, they seek to realize their ambitions by more traditional methods of diplomacy.

Now—

In the phrase of Stillman and Pfaff—

it is war that they seek to wage by politics.[1]

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I have listened with great interest to the excellent address by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations this afternoon. I am particularly interested in what he has just said, because it seems to me that this treaty may well indicate that both the Government of the United States and the Government of the Soviet Union have at last realized it may be better to try to halt the nuclear arms race than to try to win it.

As the Senator has well observed, there is no way to win—not for the United States, not for the Russians, and not for Western civilization. Something must be done to harness the nuclear monster we have loosed upon the world, or the armaments race will ultimately end in a fiery oblivion for all of us.

It seems to me—and I ask the Senator if he agrees—that the treaty, far from being of limited, minimal importance, as has often been suggested in recent days, may in fact be of great symbolic importance, as representing the turning point—when the two nuclear giants began to grope their way back toward a more rational relationship with one another. Only in this direction is there any hope for us, or for the Russians, or for the Western World.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has put it very well. There is a sort of inherent contradiction, if I may use that term. In and of itself, the treaty would not actually do much, but the significant fact is that an agreement is reached at all. The substantive provisions would not really inhibit either of the powers very much, because, as the testimony shows, underground testing can proceed, and there can be development of the system.

What the Senator says is extremely important. I think this is by far the most important document since those relating to the United Nations after World War II and relating to NATO, because it symbolizes a change in direction. We do not know what may happen. No one can foretell. We may later wish to withdraw. Who knows what may occur? We have that right, under the treaty. It may not develop in that manner.

On the other hand, it is an important treaty because it demonstrates the fact that these two great powers have found enough common interest in the matter to reach an agreement. That is quite significant.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator also agree that perhaps this realization on both sides could not have occurred if there had not been a nuclear showdown between the two nations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator refers to Cuba?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. I often think that had it not been for the Cuban crisis this treaty would not be before us today, because the resolve of the President of the United States, at that time, to risk nuclear war to uphold our vital interests must have made it apparent, as Khrushchev himself conceded in his exchanges with the Chinese Communists, that the American "paper tiger" had nuclear teeth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of State agrees with him. He is quite correct. Cuba was an important and significant contribution to the circumstances which led to the agreement.

Mr. CHURCH. Oftentimes in the course of the hearings, as the chairman knows, questions were raised which seemed to indicate suspicion or lack of understanding as to why Mr. Khrushchev, having twice rejected a somewhat similar treaty, finally accepted this one.

Does not the chairman feel that the Cuban crisis, which brought both countries to the brink of the abyss, must have chastened those men who tried to untie the knot of war even as it tightened around both sides? Does not the Senator feel that those tense terrible days made it somewhat logical to expect, afterwards, that the time was ripe for a treaty—that Khrushchev himself had been forced to reconsider his situation; and the President anticipated as much in the remarkable address he made at American University, in which he again invited the Soviet Union to make a start toward harnessing the unrestricted arms race through a partial test ban treaty of the kind before us?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct, in my view. I appreciate very much his emphasizing this point. I have no doubt in my own mind that this contributed greatly to the reconsideration by the Russians of their decision regarding the test ban treaty. I am delighted that this has resulted. It was a dangerous period. If things had continued the way they were going there would have been great danger.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly. I commend the chairman of the committee for the fine address he is making to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

In the pursuit of its ambitions, whether by militant or peaceful means, the Soviet Union, like any other nation, is subject to the unending pressures for change imposed by time and circumstance.

Man—

It has been said—

the supreme pragmatist, is a revisionist by nature (Eric Hansen, "Revisionism: Genesis and Prognosis," unpublished paper.)

Those who attribute to the Soviet leaders a permanent and unalterable determination to destroy the free societies of the West are crediting the Soviet Union with an unshakeable constancy of will that, so far as I know, no nation has ever before achieved.

The attribution of an unalterable will and constancy to Soviet policy has been a serious handicap to our own policy. It has restricted our ability to gain insights into the realities of Soviet society and Soviet foreign policy. It has denied us valuable opportunities to take advantage of changing conditions in the Communist world and to encourage changes which would reduce the Communist threat to the free world. We have greatly overestimated the ability of the Soviets to pursue malevolent aims without regard to time or circumstance and, in so doing, we have underestimated our own ability to influence Soviet behavior.

A stigma of heresy has been attached to suggestions by American policymakers that Soviet policy can change or that it is sometimes altered in response to our own. But it is a fact that in the wake of the failure of the aggressive policies of the Stalin period, the Soviet leaders have gradually shifted to a policy of peaceful, or competitive, coexistence with the West. This policy of "war by means of politics" confronts us with certain subtle dangers but also with certain opportunities if we are wise enough to take advantage of them.

The abrupt change in the Soviet position which made possible the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty appears to have been motivated by the general failure of competitive coexistence as practiced in the past few years and by a number of specific problems, both foreign and domestic. The most conspicuous of these is the public eruption of the dispute with Communist China. In addition, the Soviet leaders have been troubled by economic difficulties at home, particularly in agriculture; by the increasingly insistent demands of the Russian people for more and better food, clothing, and housing; and by difficulties between the regime and Soviet intellectuals and artists; by increasing centrifugal tendencies in Eastern Europe, aggravated by the dismaying contrast with an increasingly prosperous and powerful Western Europe; and by the negligible rewards of Soviet diplomacy and economic aid in Asia and Africa.

The most crucial failure of Soviet policy has been in its dealings with the West. Contrary to Soviet expectations of a few years ago, it has proven impossible to extract concessions from the West on Berlin and central Europe by nuclear diplomacy. Thwarted in Europe, Khrushchev embarked last year on the extremely dangerous adventure of placing missiles in Cuba, hoping to force a solution in Berlin and an unfreezing of central Europe. The debacle in Cuba led the Soviet leaders to a major reappraisal of their policies.

That reappraisal has apparently resulted in a decision to seek a relaxation of tensions with the West. The nuclear test ban treaty is clearly calculated to serve that purpose. From the Soviet point of view, a limited detente with the West at this time appears to offer certain clear advantages, of which three seem of major importance. First and foremost is the genuine fear of nuclear war which the Soviets share with the West, all the more since the United States demonstrated in the Cuban crisis that it was prepared to use nuclear weapons to defend its vital interests. Secondly, in the mounting conflict with the Chinese, the Soviet Union could claim a success for its policies and, more important, could use the worldwide popularity of the test ban to strengthen its position both in the Communist bloc and in the non-Communist underdeveloped countries, thereby further isolating the Chinese. Thirdly, Khrushchev appears to be interested in measures which will permit a leveling off, and perhaps a reduction, of weapons expenditures so as to be able to divert scarce resources for meeting some of the demands of the Russian people for a better life.

---

[1] Stillman and Pfaff, "The New Politics," p. 142.

In a recent article Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs, interpreted the Soviet adherence to the test ban treaty as follows:

> Khrushchev's acceptance of an "atmosphere-only" test ban strongly suggests a major Soviet reassessment of the world situation and an implicit acknowledgment that Soviet policies of the last few years have failed. The Soviet leaders have evidently concluded that the general world situation is again in a "quiescent" stage. Instead of dissipating Soviet resources in useless revolutionary efforts, or missile adventures of the Cuban variety, they will probably concentrate on consolidating their present position.[2]

If the test ban is conceived by the Soviets as an interlude in which to consolidate their position, strengthen their power base, and then renew their aggressive policies against the West, is it wise for us to grant them this interlude? It is indeed wise, for two main reasons: first, because it will provide the West with an identical opportunity to strengthen the power base of the free world, and secondly, because it will generate conditions in which the Soviet and Communist bloc peoples will be emboldened to step up their demands for peace and a better life, conditions which the Soviet leadership will find it exceedingly difficult to alter.

From the point of view of the West, an interlude of relaxed world tensions will provide a splendid opportunity to strengthen the free world—if only we will use it. There has been a great deal of discussion of the military safeguards which must accompany this treaty. Equally important are the nonmilitary safeguards which we must take to strengthen ourselves in a period of relaxed tensions. First of all, we must use the opportunity to bring greater unity and prosperity to the Atlantic community—by seeking means of resolving our differences over the control of nuclear weapons and by negotiating extensive tariff reductions under the terms of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Secondly, we must reinvigorate our efforts to strengthen the free nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America by providing a more discriminating and intelligent program of economic assistance and by encouraging cooperative free world aid programs through such agencies as the International Development Association. Finally, we can use a period of relaxed tensions to focus energy and resources on our long-neglected needs here at home—on the expansion and improvement of our public education, on generating greater economic growth and full employment, on the conservation of our resources and the renewal of our cities.

If we adopt these "nonmilitary safeguards" with vigor and determination, I think it can be confidently predicted that the free world will be the major beneficiary of a period of relaxed world tension, with a power base so strengthened that the margin of free world superiority over the Communist bloc will be substantially widened.

The second great advantage to the West of a period of relaxed tensions is that it will release long-suppressed pressures for peace and the satisfaction of civilian needs within the Soviet bloc. Public opinion, even in a dictatorship like the Soviet Union, is an enormously powerful force, which no government can safely defy for too long or in too many ways. Russian public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to war and overwhelmingly in favor of higher wages, better food and clothing and housing, and all the good things of life in a modern industrial society. The Russian people may well turn out to be a powerful ally of the free nations, who also want peace and prosperity. It is entirely possible that a thaw in Soviet-American relations, even though conceived by the Soviet leadership as a temporary pause, could lead gradually to an entirely new relationship. Pressed by the demands of an increasingly assertive public opinion, the Soviet leaders may find new reasons to continue a policy of peace and accommodation with the West. Step by step their revolutionary zeal may diminish, as they find that a peaceful and affluent national existence is not really so tragic a fate as they had imagined.

No one knows for certain whether Soviet society will actually evolve along these lines, but the trend of Soviet history suggests that it is by no means impossible.

> Indeed, the most striking characteristic of recent Soviet foreign policy—

Said Professor Shulman in his statement on the treaty,

> has been the way in which policies undertaken for short-term, expediential purposes have tended to elongate in time, and become embedded in doctrine and political strategy.

It is possible, I believe, for the West to encourage a hopeful direction in Soviet policy. We can seek to strengthen Russian public opinion as a brake against dangerous policies by conveying accurate information about Western life and Western aims and about the heavy price that both sides are paying for the cold war. We can make it clear to the Russians that they have nothing to fear from the West, that so long as they respect the rights and independence of other nations, they themselves can have a secure and untroubled national existence under institutions of their own choice, which, though repugnant to the West, will never of themselves be the occasion or cause of conflict.

The purpose of the nuclear test ban treaty is not to end the cold war but to modify it, not to resolve the conflict between communism and freedom—a goal which is almost certainly beyond the reach of the present generation—but only to remove some of the terror and passion from it. The treaty is only a modest first step in that direction. It is not the length of the step but its direction which is important. If the treaty works as we hope it will, we must in the years to come seek ways of modifying the nationalist and ideological passions that fill men's minds with too much zeal and blind them to the simple human preference for life and peace.

It is an open question whether we will be able to civilize national and ideological animosities as we have civilized personal rivalries and political, religious, and economic differences within our own society. As Aldous Huxley has written:

> There may be arguments about the best way of raising wheat in a cold climate or of reafforesting a denuded mountain. But such arguments never lead to organized slaughter. Organized slaughter is the result of arguments about such questions as the following: Which is the best nation? The best religion? The best political theory? The best form of government? Why are other people so stupid and wicked? Why can't they see how good and intelligent we are? Why do they resist our beneficent efforts to bring them under our control and make them like ourselves?[3]

Men will undoubtedly continue to contest these questions for centuries to come. The major question of our time—and it is a question that is implicit in this test ban treaty—is whether we can find some way to conduct these national contests without resorting to weapons that will resolve them once and for all by wiping out the contestants. A generation ago we were speaking of "making the world safe for democracy." Having failed of this in two world wars, we must now seek ways of making the world reasonably safe for the continuing contest between those who favor democracy and those who oppose it. It is a modest aspiration, but it is a sane and realistic one for a generation which, having failed of grander things, must now look to its own survival.

Extreme nationalism and dogmatic ideology are luxuries that the human race can no longer afford. It must turn its energies now to the politics of survival. If we do so, we may find in time that we can do better than just to survive. We may find that the simple human preference for life and peace has an inspirational force of its own, less intoxicating perhaps than the sacred abstractions of nation and ideology, but far more relevant to the requirements of human happiness and fulfillment.

There are, to be sure, risks in such an approach. There is an element of trust in it, and we can be betrayed. But human life is fraught with risks and the behavior of the sane man is not the avoidance of all possible danger, but the weighing of greater against lesser risks and of risks against opportunities.

---

[2] Zbigniew Brzezinski, "After the Test Ban," New Republic, Aug. 31, 1963, p. 18.

[3] Aldous Huxley, "The Politics of Ecology" (1963), p. 6.

There are risks in this nuclear test ban treaty, but they are lesser rather than greater risks and the political opportunities outweigh the military risks. As George Kennan has written:

> Whoever is not prepared to make sacrifices and to accept risks in the military field should not lay claim to any serious desire to see world problems settled by any means short of war.[4]

I hope the Senate will consent to the ratification of this treaty. If it does so, it will be taking a risk, but it will also be creating an opportunity. And if the treaty is faithfully executed and contributes in some small measure to the lessening of the danger of war, it will open the way to new risks and still greater opportunities. I believe that these too should be pursued, with reason and restraint, with due regard for the pitfalls involved, but with no less regard for the promise of a safer and more civilized world. In the course of this pursuit, both we and our adversaries may find it possible one day to break through the barriers of nationalism and ideology and to approach each other in something of the spirit of Pope John's words to Khrushchev's son-in-law:

> They tell me you are an atheist. But you will not refuse an old man's blessing for your children.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, following my remarks, a letter which I received from Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, former Ambassador to Great Britain, and former Director of the Budget, in which he supports the treaty.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 6, 1963.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the suggestion that I communicate to you my views about the limited nuclear test ban treaty which has been negotiated by the executive branch of our Government, and which has been submitted to the Senate of the United States for its advice and consent, I am writing you this brief letter.

The testimony contained in the hearings before your committee has been carefully reviewed. Especial attention has been given to the expressions of doubt made by witnesses regarding the provisions of the treaty which has been under consideration by your committee and which has been reported by your committee to the Senate.

According to the testimony of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, their competent advisers, and other competent witnesses, the risks that may be implicit in ratification of the limited test ban treaty can be substantially reduced to a minimal level. Accordingly, the positive aspects of ratification of the treaty are extremely significant and important to the security and future of our own country, to the security and future of the signatory powers, and to the security and future of those who accede to its provisions. Among other things, it tends markedly to limit—if not completely to eradicate—the spread of the development of nuclear lethal weapons to many nations that do not, at the moment, possess them. This is a substantial and notable restraint on the nuclear armament race and in itself is of inestimable benefit to our national interests and to our future. Moreover, the limited nuclear test ban treaty is the first time in a very substantial period that the national interests of both the Soviet on the one hand and the United States on the other have been sufficiently identical to result in an agreement covering a matter of great importance to the signatories and to the entire population of the world.

That an accommodation in this particular and important respect has been reached among two of the most important Western Powers and the Soviet suggests that step by step and seriatim, one by one, some of the other important issues on which, so far, no agreement has been reached, with the passage of time and the exercise of patience combined with eternal vigilance, can be duly resolved to the satisfaction of our national interest and to the benefit of the civilized world.

It cannot be asserted positively that these advantages over the span of years will, in fact, accrue to us. Nor can it be asserted positively that they will not over a span of years be fully or partially achieved. Only the future can draw aside the veil of obscurity in this regard.

There is, quite obviously, the risk that the Soviet may not observe faithfully the provisions of the treaty and may secretively, if this be remotely possible, resume testing in the prohibited environments. There is the hazard, also, that developments beyond the orbit of the Soviet's influence may force either the Soviet on its part, or our own country for our part to give notice of intended abrogation of the provisions of the treaty. Accordingly, however great may be the prospective advantages to our country that are implicit in ratification of the terms of the treaty, no one can say that there do not remain risks implicit in a formal accession to and affirmation of its provisions.

The testimony of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and their competent advisers justifies, however, the confidence that this particular risk, among others, can be reduced to a minimum point, by continued testing underground, by the maintenance of laboratories at a high state of scientific competence and efficiency, and by the preparation of procedures that can be immediately employed for a resumption of tests in outer space, in the atmosphere, and under water—should this eventuality, unhappily, become necessary.

But these risks implicit in ratification should be weighed against the risks that almost inevitably result from failure to ratify, or from the attachment of reservations which nullify the terms of the treaty. Failure to ratify the treaty or nullification of its provisions could be construed, and doubtless would be construed, by other nations as an affirmation by the United States of the position which is being so vigorously advanced by Peiping. This view, in effect, is that war is inevitable between the Communist world and our own world, and that coexistence—no matter under what terms it may be defined—is impossible of achievement.

This inference, which would naturally be drawn from any failure on our part to ratify the limited nuclear test ban treaty, would provide the Soviet with no alternative course except that of embracing implicitly or otherwise the views which are so vehemently argued by the authorities in Peiping. The full consequences of driving the Soviet into this intransigent and fateful position by failure to ratify the treaty need no elaboration by thoughtful men. It is almost impossible to calculate what might be the final consequences of such an irresponsible act for our country, for the part of the world with which we are reasonably compatible, and indeed, possibly for all mankind.

Among other things, one of the consequences might well be the extinguishment of the last ray of light that might otherwise illuminate the future of a large part of the human race, for it might lead the human race closer to disaster, whether as a result of a more intense nuclear arms race and fallout, whether by taking us further down the road toward nuclear war—or by both.

No matter what one may calculate to be the motives of the Soviet, the prospects for humanity implicit in a more rigorous nuclear arms race, should the treaty be rejected by the Senate, are so grim as to make the risks of ratification fall into their proper perspective and assume comparatively minuscule proportions of magnitude.

Those in positions of final accountability who would reject the provisions of this treaty should weigh carefully the responsibility which they must accept of visiting upon us and mankind the possible—if not probable—direful consequences that are implicit in failure to ratify the treaty now under consideration.

Accordingly, I am confident the hope of thoughtful and expectant people throughout the world and of those experienced in the field of international affairs, including dealings with the Soviet, is that the Senate without reservation or qualification will promptly and overwhelmingly place its stamp of approval on the limited nuclear test ban treaty which is presently before it for its advice and consent.

Very truly yours,

L. W. DOUGLAS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first I commend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, on the very full and complete argument he has made in behalf of consenting to the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I approach the subject from a slightly different point of view, that of the military.

As a member of the Preparedness Subcommittee, I listened to much closed-door testimony on the nuclear test ban treaty. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I was also invited to sit with the Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy at their hearings, most of which were public.

After careful consideration of all the testimony to which I listened, I have reached the conclusion that I will vote to consent to the nuclear test ban treaty. There is always a risk in any action and the question before the Senate is to determine which is the lesser risk—to consent to the treaty, or to refuse that consent. We must bear in mind also the fact that more than 80 nations of the world have already agreed to participate in the treaty as it is is written. If the United States fails to ratify this treaty—a proposal which, in substance this country itself offered in 1959 and again in 1962—when can we expect or hope to ge another agreement from the Soviets? The ratification of this treaty does not mean that we can trust the Soviets any more than we could before. The ratification does not mean that preparations for our own security can be lessened to any degree. But, if we fail to ratify this treaty now it will be a blow to the many nations in the world who are looking to us for leadership and who are looking to us to do our part to get a greater opportunity for peace in the world.

---

[4] George F. Kennan, "Disengagement Revisited," Foreign Affairs, Jan. 1959, p. 199.

The signing of this treaty by the three foremost nuclear powers at Moscow on August 5th of this year evoked a barrage of comment—some of which was optimistic, and some which loudly condemned it as a Communist trap by which we in the United States if we became a party to this treaty would jeopardize our national security. Probably the truth is somewhere between these two extremes. Certainly neither the President of the United States nor the Senate of the United States will consent to any international pact which is inimical to our national security. Nor, as the President stated so fully, can we harbor thoughts that the benefits from this treaty will be great. Certainly members of the administration and every Senator have tried to make a thorough, searching and penetrating examination of each specific provision and the overall consequences of the treaty if it is ratified.

Any examination must start with the premise that we cannot rely on the Soviets to keep their obligations beyond those which are for their own good and benefit. So we must be prepared to go forward with all of our national security programs. Every one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and military leaders who testified before both committees emphasized this, as did the civilian witnesses.

No one in the free world can positively know the reason why the Soviets have suddenly decided to sign such a test ban treaty when they had previously twice rejected it. This is a question that I have been asked time and time again and my answer is that we do not know. It may be their differences with China, or it may be because they want to get ahead more with their economic development. And it may be that their present willingness to sign is because through their recent series of atmospheric tests they have gained valuable information on the effects of weapons that they have or can have, and that therefore the nuclear power balance is more in their favor. Whatever made them decide to sign does not matter if we view the treaty solely in the terms of our own national self-interest, as we must. Therefore, I think we must view this problem not only in the terms of our willingness to accept and assume certain calculated, inherent risks, but also in our determination to minimize such of these risks as we can by taking those actions which we may lawfully take and still abide by the treaty in letter and in spirit.

The desirability of this treaty, speaking solely from a military point of view, must be weighed against the need of the United States to conduct, first, further atmosphere tests in order to resolve uncertainties in that vulnerability of our hardened missile launch sites and control centers, second, the ability of our warheads to penetrate an enemy defense and, third, our ability to develop and deploy a reasonably effective anti-ballistic missile defense system of our own.

The best available assessment of the relative positions of the United States and the Soviets in the field of military nuclear technology indicates to us that the Soviets possess an advantage over us in the very high yield weapon, in the information concerning its explosive effects, and, conceivably they have some advantage in the anti-ballistic missile defensive system. In my opinion, however, neither the Soviets nor ourselves have now or can develop in the near future an anti-ballistic missile defensive system that is effective.

We feel reasonably certain that super bombs—of 60 to 100 megatons—cannot be delivered over intercontinental distances by ballistic missile at the present time but only by strategic bombers. This calculation of course may have to be altered in the years to come. However, we want to remember that we do not possess very high yield weapons because it is the considered judgment of this administration and of the previous administration that we do not want them and do not need them to have an effective nuclear arsenal. However, testimony was presented to us that we can, through underground testing, develop weapons yielding 50 to 60 megatons for aircraft delivery and a 35-megaton warhead for ballistic missile delivery. Therefore, this treaty will not preclude us from closing, to a degree at least, the Soviet advantage in the high yield weapon. It will impede us, but not preclude us.

The second military consideration—missile launch site vulnerability—concerns nuclear weapons effects. Our chief military leaders have all testified that they have a high degree of confidence that our ballistic missiles systems will survive in a nuclear environment. Large yield atmospheric tests would undoubtedly give us greater confidence or make clear areas where some further hardening of our missile sites should be undertaken. However, we want to remember that some of these uncertainties can be eliminated by a better worked-out design, more dispersal and larger quantities of deployed missiles so that even under the most pessimistic circumstances a substantial nuclear force will survive for a devastating second strike.

Third, the testimony showed us that the warhead for an antiballistic missile can be readily developed through underground testing, but the problems of defense against oncoming warheads are most critical in the missile system itself. The critical antimissile problems are reaction time, performance of the missile, and the ability of the radars to discriminate between the warhead and decoys and to resist the blackout effects from radiation emitted by a nuclear explosion. The treaty, we are told, would only hinder the investigation into the resistance of the radars to the effects of blackout, something which our scientists hope and believe they can eventually design around. We cannot, of course, really know the effectiveness of an ABM system, in the absence of proof tests in the atmosphere to simulate operational conditions. However, the same restrictions and limitations apply equally to any signatory to the treaty, and I repeat, the testimony of our scientists was unanimous to the effect that the development of an effective ABM system is still a long way off.

Fourth, the ability of our warheads to penetrate a nuclear defense is directly concerned with the effects of blast and radiation created by an antiballistic missile explosion over the target. The radiation effects cannot be fully tested underground. But, as testified, like all offensive action, the key lies in saturating the defenses, and that we believe we are able and will be able to do in the years ahead. The Secretary of Defense testified that penetration aids, warhead hardening, and quantities of missiles, several of which are directed at the same target, will assure penetration and ultimate devastation of the target areas.

From a military standpoint then, the variety of our nuclear retaliatory or second-strike forces—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris missiles, land and carrier based, strategic and tactical bombers—provides us with an overwhelming nuclear superiority which will continue to constitute an adequate deterrent to thermonuclear war with or without this treaty. Therefore its ratification is a lesser risk than a stimulated arms race.

On the question of possible cheating, we cannot delude ourselves into believing that we can detect every single test the Soviets might conduct. There can certainly be a legitimate concern over clandestine cheating, but there is a question of whether it would add much in view of the fact that underground testing is permitted. Any cheating through atmospheric tests would have to be with very small yields, and tests of high yields in outer space would be far more expensive than the results would seem to warrant. Responsible officials testified that clandestine testing in their opinion cannot upset the power relationship.

I was most impressed by the joint statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which was presented before both committees by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the chairman. He emphasized, as did each of the Chiefs of Staff in their individual testimonies, that there were certainly some military disadvantages, but that in their opinion, these disadvantages can be minimized, and in some cases eliminated, by adopting the four safeguards which the Joint Chiefs so strenuously recommend to us in emphasizing their unanimous support of the treaty.

These four safeguards are:

First, we must aggressively conduct underground testing to the full extent of the capabilities of our laboratories and scientists to benefit from them. We must not let this program lag through lack of money or lack of execution on a stop and start, off again, on again basis.

Second, we must maintain our nuclear laboratories at their optimum capabilities so that the impetus of the work of those laboratories will continue to hold the interest, energies, and imagination of our nuclear scientists.

Third, we must be ready to test in the atmosphere on the shortest possible notice to guard against a sudden breach of the treaty and open resumption of testing by another signatory.

Fourth, we must take whatever steps we can to improve our detection system so that we will have convincing evidence whether or not the treaty is being violated. This is mighty important in helping us to decide whether we should exercise our own right to withdraw from the treaty if our supreme interest—as stated in the words of the treaty—is being jeopardized.

There is no question that we could do more in the military application of our nuclear technology without a treaty, but that does not say that the signing of the treaty is incompatible with our national security.

We also want to remember that many of the advantages that have stimulated emotional feeling in favor of this treaty are not at all what they seem. The message of the President of the United States on August 8 made this clear. We believe the treaty will inhibit and impede the nuclear arms race, but it will not prohibit it. The threat of a nuclear war remains to plague us—as it has since the brains and energies of our scientists unleashed the destructive force of the split and the fused atom. Our stockpile of nuclear weapons we know is not affected, nor is the production of more bombs and warheads prohibited. This treaty will not prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries which do not now possess them, but it gives us confidence that this proliferation will not be widespread because of the promise of some 80 nations to abide by it.

In any event the treaty will stop the pollution of the air we breathe and the food we eat from radioactive fallout. While the degree of genetic damage and the danger of cancer resulting from doses of radioactivity have never been definitely established, medical opinion is unanimous in the belief that any amount is harmful. This was brought out in the questions asked by and the answers given to the chairman of the committee. This is another worthwhile humanitarian benefit to be derived from this treaty. While the treaty does not accomplish all that many of our citizens emotionally hope it may accomplish, it is a step, a small step to be sure, for mankind throughout the world to somehow work its way out of the problems created by nuclear weapons.

Scientists testifying before us raised several questions on the wording of the treaty which must be clarified by definition. What, for instance, constitutes an underground nuclear explosion within the meaning of article I, section 1(b)? As one who listened to the testimony, I suggest that it shall be defined as one which occurs below the surface of the earth at such a depth as may be necessary to contain completely the fireball associated with such an explosion.

Second, the phrase "or any other nuclear explosion" in article I, section 2 shall be construed as not to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons by the United States whenever we deem such use to be necessary for our own national security or when we believe it is necessary to fulfill our commitments to any of our allies in the event of an armed aggression. Furthermore, the provision of article IV requiring 3 months advance notice of intention to withdraw as a party to the treaty does not apply in any case of an armed aggression.

Third, questions were raised at the hearings as to whether nuclear explosives could be used for peaceful purposes—in our terminology, Plowshare. I came away from the hearings with the feeling that the Plowshare program was important not only to us but to the economic improvement of the world and, therefore, certainly when we consent to this treaty, we should make it clear to the executive department of our Government that this must be worked out. We were assured by responsible witnesses that it could be and would be done.

There is no provision in this treaty which will require officials of the administration to implement the four safeguards recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But I am confident that any administration will do so and keep Congress informed, because in the final analysis Congress is responsible for the authorization and appropriation of the funds needed to maintain our security and the needs of our military establishments at all times.

We recognize, of course, that other countries have not signed the treaty and have stated that they will not do so, principally France and Communist China. We further realize that the possibility of nuclear devastation is not now and never will be eliminated by the treaty. We are also fully cognizant that the Soviets will only live up to its terms when it is to their advantage to do so. However, we know that we will live up to it, and as the leader of the free nations our influence in living up to it will have a tremendous effect upon other countries that may want to breach it.

We know that this will not lessen the efforts of the Soviets to establish communistic governments in other countries of the world, nor will it solve any other problems that we have now or may have in the future with Cuba. But we do know that the ratification of this treaty my three of the most powerful nations in the world is a step forward toward greater understanding of a more peaceful world, and thus a step forward toward our own security. With a constantly watchful administration and with a Congress that is sensitive to its responsibilities for our security, I hope that the ratification of this treaty will be a substantially lesser risk and that we may go forward with it. I shall, therefore, as one U.S. Senator, vote to consent to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has made a forceful statement. Coming from the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Armed Services, it should set at rest any of the doubts that have been voiced in one circle or another as to the significance of the treaty. It is a great service to make such a helpful speech to this body.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. Like him, I hope the Senate will consent to the treaty.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I join with the distinguished chairman of the committee in commending the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his thoughtful and careful analysis of the problem before the Senate and the forceful presentation of his viewpoint in favor of our granting consent to the treaty.

I was interested particularly in that part of the Senator's address in which he referred to what was understood by the committee. As I view it, we shall be faced with both reservations and understandings. A reservation, as I understand the term, if adopted, would require a renegotiation of the treaty. An understanding would not. However, even an understanding might have an adverse effect or an opposite effect from what was intended. In other words an understanding might have the effect of creating doubt about the plain wording of the treaty and the reasoning of the committee which considered the treaty, which we would not at all wish to create.

I do not know precisely what will be offered; but, as I view the Senator's approach to the problem, we would gain nothing. Nothing would be gained, from any point of view, by adopting as formal understandings points which have already been made clear in the committee hearings, and which are contained in the report of the committee. Am I correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from New York is correct. Certain definitions must be worked out within the administration; but I do not believe there need be any formal interpretation or reservation. I believe the constant attention Congress gives to this problem and to working it out with the administration will answer any doubt that may arise.

I believe the most important point I have heard discussed is the meaning of the word "underground." The Senator from New York has in mind the definition of the word "underground" and the extent to which the treaty would permit us to continue the Plowshare program, if for example, we wanted to build another Panama Canal, and problems of that character. All those are administrative problems to which Congress is very sensitive, because it must appropriate the money; and the administration must work with Congress. So I do not believe there is any need for a formal reservation or interpretation.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand, the executive branch has furnished to the committee certain communications to indicate what its understanding is. Am I correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened to definitions given in testimony before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the term "underground explosion." I have heard Secretary of State Rusk and several others define it; but so far as I know, there is no formal, written declaration of its meaning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do have some expressions from the State Department, particularly from the Secretary of State and others there, in regard to the question the Senator has raised. I am very glad he has raised it, because a discussion of these problems helps us to arrive at the correct definition.

The problem is troublesome in the case of venting, the determination of the amount of an underground explosion to be allowed to be vented above the ground and spread into another country. So long as it does not go into another country, we can use the "Plowshare." The limitation is whether the vents into the air are sufficient to affect anything outside our own jurisdiction.

I believe this debate is helpful to our reaching an understanding of the meaning of the treaty.

Mr. KEATING. I have read in the press—which is the extent of my knowledge of this matter—that some understandings may be offered—that is, offered formally, for adoption or rejection. I was trying to get to the bottom of what might be involved there.

In his statement, I believe former President Eisenhower raised the point that in the event of attack or aggression against our country or an ally of ours, nothing should interfere with our being able to take proper steps to defend ourselves. As I understand, he has made clear that he did not intend that to be stated in the form of a formal reservation, which would require renegotiation of the treaty with some 89 nations; he intended it more in the nature of a basic understanding.

Since I believe all—including the Soviets—are agreed on this point, offhand I see no necessity for the adoption of this statement as a formal understanding.

On the other hand, it seems to me that it would be rather unfortunate if such an understanding were proposed, and then were rejected. That might be construed as a rejection of such an understanding. I wonder what the Senator from Massachusetts, and the distinguished chairman of the committee, and other members of the committee feel should be done if we are confronted with such a situation.

My offhand reaction is that there is no necessity to encumber the treaty with language of that kind, for if such a proposal were made and then were voted down, the question is whether that would be regarded as an indication that we are not in agreement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding—and I should be glad to get confirmation of this from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—that all the responsible witnesses, both the military and the civilian, testified that if our national security were to be threatened in any way by an aggressive attack, we could retaliate immediately.

Mr. KEATING. That is also my understanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. In preparing the committee report, we had this point in mind, and expressly covered it. This is set forth in the official report of the committee, which is to be construed part of the history of this treaty; and I believe it would be.

I agree with the Senator from New York that it would be unfortunate to attach formally to the resolution of ratification either an understanding or any other provision unless it were really vital in connection with the discovery of some point we have not thus far discovered. I cannot speak for President Eisenhower; but from what I have read in the past and from what the Senator from New York and other Senators have said, I am quite sure it has been correctly stated that he did not intend it as a reservation. That is why we treat it with such care in the committee report. We hoped to satisfy everyone on this point. It is the universal understanding. The Russian Communists have made the same point in response to a Chinese assertion regarding this matter.

We in the United States might understand the meaning of such a reservation; but, even so, some of the 80 other countries might regard it as an attempt by us to renege or to qualify our endorsement of our participation. I think it would be very difficult to find a reservation which would be acceptable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Furthermore I believe it important to bear in mind the fact that any administration which implements the treaty will always be subject to questioning by Congress. It seems to me any problem that may arise will be solved better by a sensitive Congress rather than by a formal reservation.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I note that all of this debate has not brought out the real danger of a reservation or a statement of understanding. Let me state the real danger. Let us use, as an example, the assertion that the United States should reserve the right to use nuclear weapons in the event of war. Very well; suppose we adopted a reservation to the United States of the right to use nuclear weapons in the event of war. Then we would be admitting that the treaty did not permit the use of nuclear weapons in the event of war. That would be an outright admission, whereas such a statement of understanding would only cast doubt upon the right of the United States to use nuclear weapons in the event of war.

But it is understood by all the parties concerned, and it is also international law, that any country has a right to use any weapons it has in the event of war. Furthermore, I cannot conceive that any President who might be in office at the time would be so depraved as to refuse to use any weapons under his command in the event of attack.

But the danger of a statement of understanding—which is slightly less than the danger inherent in reservation—is that by adopting it, we admit that the treaty does not do what we know it is intended to do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is very helpful.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I, too, think that the statements were very helpful. My understanding is that a reservation is of greater importance than a statement of understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. In the present case it would be an admission that the treaty would not permit the use of nuclear weapons in the event of war. I am speaking of that particular reservation.

Mr. KEATING. Yes. It seems to me that the same might be true of other statements of understanding. I am speaking without knowing specifically what reservation or understanding may be before the Senate, but I apprehend that the Senate will be faced with the problem at some time during the debate. There will probably be statements of understanding offered with respect to which, on their merits, there might be unanimous accord. Senators will be faced with the problem of deciding what to do in relation to such statements of understanding. Again, speaking generally, it seems to me that the Senator from Vermont has correctly set forth that it would be unfortunate for Senators who are in favor of the treaty to support statements of understanding on issues which are now perfectly clear from the committee report.

I ask the chairman of the committee whether he, as an expert on international law, believes a statement of understanding really would add anything to the committee report itself. I assume that the statements in the committee report are statements of understanding and the basis upon which the committee recommended to the Senate that consent be given.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my understanding. Shortly before the Senator came to the Chamber there was an exchange in relation to that question. Whether a statement is called an understanding or a reservation does not entirely determine its character. It is what one actually intends to do. If the statement changes any substantive provision of the treaty, even though it might be called an understanding, it would still be of such a nature as to require renegotiation, and perhaps it would jeopardize the treaty.

I agree with what I believe the Senator is saying. Whatever we may say about the treaty, either in the report or as a part of the legislative history, it would be extremely risky to put it in the resolution of ratification of the treaty. I have not heard any statement that I would agree to as being necessary, proper, or wise to have inserted in the resolution of ratification. What the Senator from New York thinks it means, what the Senator from Massachusetts thinks it means, and interpretations received in the discussion for the purpose of forming a basis upon which to accept the treaty, are matters that are not only proper but desirable. But I think there is a great difference. I read some excerpts from one of the great authorities on international law, Mr. Chares. He finally came down to the distinction. An amendment would clearly require renegotiation. He pointed out the distinction between understandings, interpretations, and reservations. Those terms will not control. It is what we actually attempt to do that is meaningful.

Mr. KEATING. Who would make that decision?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Eventually each nation will decide for itself. If we insert in the treaty some provision that we think is innocuous, other nations might do likewise. It would open up the treaty. Our Government would communicate the reservation to the other original signatories, and if they should say, "We do not understand the treaty in that way; that is not what we agreed to," that would be the end of the treaty.

Unless we think a reservation would be really vital to our security, I believe it would be a great mistake to put in understandings, as I believe we have been using the term, although they should be developed in the debate.

Mr. KEATING. In general, I certainly share that view. Unless something develops——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Like the Senator from New York, I do not know what may develop. But those that I have read about do not seem to me to be of a nature to be attached to the treaty.

Mr. KEATING. What I am about to say is said with the utmost respect for the sincerity of Senators who are in favor of the treaty as it is, those who are opposed, and those on both sides who seek to attach understanding or reservations. Obviously one method of blocking the treaty would be to attach some condition, understanding, or whatever it may be called, which, in an ordinary legislative situation, we would call a crippling amendment. Such action could kill the treaty, as it has killed lesser bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. While that may not be the motive of Senators who seek to add reservations, I think we must be on guard. If we desire to take this rather modest step forward, we must be on guard against that type action as well as on guard when the vote comes on the treaty itself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I could not agree with the Senator more. He is absolutely correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Michigan wishes to ask me a question; and, frankly, I must catch an airplane. Will the Senator kindly defer his statement?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his kindness. I may be introducing something that is irrelevant to the question of the Senator from New York and others. But as we approach the close of the first full day's discussion of the treaty, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question which bears on the theme which runs repeatedly through the mail I am receiving, and, I suggest, the mail that a good many of our colleagues are receiving. We receive the impression that the treaty is good if it is bad for the other fellow; it is a bad treaty if it is good for the other fellow. It is the notion that two parties to the contract before the Senate cannot be subjected to the same test that we as lawyers apply to determine whether a contract relating to civil relations is good.

Has not the rule always been that a contract is a good contract when the interests of both parties are served and when their interest supports the honoring of the contract? Would it not be a stupid nation that would insist that all treaties to which it would become a party must be those which would always weigh only in its favor? Is that not a fallacy? The flood of mail would argue to us that if there is anything good for the other party to the treaty, namely, the Soviet Union, we should vote against it because it follows that it would be bad for us.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Michigan has the same view as I entertain. We must look at the proposal from the point of view of what is best for us, and assume that the Soviets would not have signed the treaty unless they believed it was best for them. So long as it helps our security, so long as it makes one little step toward greater opportunity for peace in the world, we must accept it with our eyes open to the possibility that the Soviets or any other nation may disregard it at any time if they think it is to their advantage to do so. But so long as the Soviet Union will stay with it, and we know that we want to stay with it, it is one little step forward to a more peaceful world. That is my attitude toward the treaty.

Mr. HART. That has been my attitude throughout. I thought it would be well on this very first day to nail down perhaps an oversimplified response to the repeated suggestion I have mentioned, and to suggest that there is relevancy in the example of the contract between two citizens.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HART. A contract makes sense when it serves the advantage of both parties to the contract. It is a good contract. I think sometimes treaties have a contractual nature and are subject to many of the tests that apply to civil contracts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE 150 JOBS AT $30,000

As in legislative session,

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on August 7 the Senate passed H.R. 5888 making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

On page 25 of that bill the Senate adopted an amendment, which is numbered 25.

Since the passage of the bill I have discovered—and I have checked this with the Department and have found my understanding to be correct—that the amendment, as it would be interpreted, would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the authority to appoint 150 employees at $30,000 per year. That certainly was not my intention when the Senate approved this amendment, nor was it my understanding. I have checked with several other Members of the Senate, and I have as yet to find any Member of the Senate who understood that the amendment would be interpreted in that manner.

I have carefully examined the Senate report. There is nothing in the Senate report to indicate that the bill which was presented to the Senate in any way intended to give the Secretary authority to appoint people to 150 positions at $30,000 per year.

If this is allowed to stand we shall face the situation that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is drawing $25,000 a year, could appoint 150 people to serve under him at salaries of $30,000 a year. That is more than the Cabinet officers receive.

If there is any basis for granting higher salaries to anyone in the Department certainly Congress would wish to consider it as a formal request. The Secretary would have the right to propose it. However, we should consider that problem on its merits, and at least know what we are asked to do.

I am confident that this particular amendment was erroneously drawn. I cannot conceive that anyone had any such intention at the time. If they did, as I say, the Senate was not so advised.

Since making this discovery I have taken it up with some of the Senate conferees. I have not been able to contact all of them. I hope that tomorrow we can get an assurance for the Senate by the chairman of the conference committee that our conferees will recognize this amendment as an error. The chairman of the Senate conferees should announce that this amendment will be deleted in conference.

In the absence of such an assurance I will have no alternative other than to offer a resolution tomorrow to express the sense of the Senate that the Senate conferees be instructed to withdraw their support. I hope that will not be necessary. I have tried to contact the chairman of the conference committee and am advised that he will be present later.

I thought I should bring this to the attention of the Senate this afternoon since it is a problem we will have to settle promptly. Certainly, if we are going to raise salaries in any such manner the Senate will want to do it as a direct vote.

I am not submitting a resolution now, but I will submit it tomorrow if it is necessary to do so to clear this up.

Mr. President, in the meantime I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the resolution which I shall offer if it is necessary, so that the Senate may be put on notice.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That the conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two

Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, are hereby instructed to recede from the amendment of the Senate numbered 25.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware called this matter to my attention. I know the Senator has called it to the attention of other Senators who are members of the subcommittee which handles the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have not spoken to all the Senators on this side. I feel quite certain that what the Senator has said will be given every consideration, as it should be. On the basis of the information I have been able to learn so far, it seems there was no intention that such a stipulation or proposal should be contained in the bill.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his forbearance in this regard and, before taking the floor this afternoon to bring it to the notice of the Senate as a whole, for his attempt to contact members of the subcommittee, an act which I think is both gracious and courteous.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, not for one moment would I wish to have my remarks interpreted to indicate that I thought members of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee as a whole tried to put something over on the Senate.

I read the amendment myself at the time the Senate passed it. I did not think it would be interpreted in any such manner. Of course, I, like others, was relying on the Senate report, which did not mention this feature. I am reasonably certain we can correct it; in fact, it must be corrected.

There is no question now but that such an interpretation would be placed upon the amendment. That has been confirmed by legislative counsel, by the staff of the committee, and by the Department itself. It is now clear that if the amendment stands in the bill as passed by the Senate it will be interpreted as granting authority to Secretary Celebrezze to appoint 150 employees at salaries of up to $30,000 a year.

INVASION OF U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS BY RUSSIAN FISHING VESSELS

As in legislative session,

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, over the weekend an Associated Press news dispatch from Moscow carried a story in which the Russians claimed there was no proof that their fishing vessels have invaded our territorial waters. There is proof. Evidence was given last week at hearings on legislation to establish penalties for violations of our territorial waters that on several occasions Russian whaling vessels have been sighted within our territorial waters off the Alaska coast.

The Associated Press dispatch to which I refer was printed in the Washington Evening Star for Saturday, September 7, among other newspapers. The headline was "Red Press Hits President and Ted Kennedy."

The text stated:

> Soviet propaganda organs today attacked both President Kennedy and his brother, Senator Edward Kennedy.
>
> The Senator was blasted for his remarks about Soviet fishing vessels off the New England coast.
>
> The official Soviet magazine Za Rubezhom (Life Abroad) said the Senator had failed to prove charges that the fishing vessels were violating American territorial limits or that they were spying.
>
> "As to the presence of Soviet trawlers off Cape Cod," Za Rubezhom added, "It is pertinent to ask: Why shouldn't the Soviet ships be there?"

I continue the quotation:

> Beyond the Cape is the Atlantic Ocean, which is known to be open for ships of all countries and all continents. * * * It is naive to suppose that experienced Soviet sailors will be intimidated by the threats of the American Senator.
>
> The AP article went on to say, The President was attacked by the official Soviet news agency Tass for an appeal he made to American businessmen.
>
> Tass said the President is mainly interested in promoting the growth of corporations at the expense of the American worker.

The Soviet magazine said that there is no proof of the violation of American territorial waters on the part of Soviet fishing vessels.

I say there is. I say there is official proof. I have a report from the U.S. Coast Guard, dated today, September 9, 1963, officially reporting additional incidents of Russian fishing vessels within the three-mile limit off Alaska. In this instance the Coast Guard and the U.S. Navy attempted to pursue the vessels. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of this incident, as supplied to me by the Coast Guard, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (a) Incident of August 28, 1963, off Adak, Alaska. On August 28, 1963, the CG *Lorsta*, Adak, reported to Commander, 17th Coast Guard District that five Russian vessels were operating 5 to 10 miles north of Adak. Commander, 17th Coast Guard District alerted Coast Guard units and requested Comalseafron to institute aerial surveillance from Adak and to dispatch a Navy tug from Adak to the area where the vessels were operating. The CGC *Sorrel* was in repair status and unable to get underway. Boarding officers from the *Sorrel* were placed on the Navy tug. Aircraft surveillance identified the vessels as four whale killers and one whale factory vessel, all Russian. One whale killer was observed by the aircraft to enter territorial waters. However, before the U.S. Navy tug arrived the Russian vessel had returned to the high seas. Since the aircraft had not signaled the Russian vessel to stop while it was in territorial waters, one of the conditions for establishing hot pursuit was lacking and the surface craft was therefore unable to continue the pursuit. Identification data and photos of the Russian vessels were obtained and are to be submitted to the Commandant. The Commander, 17th Coast Guard District has been requested to provide additional information to confirm the actual position of the offending Russian whalers.
>
> (b) Incident of September 8, 1963, off Kodiak, Alaska. At 12:55 (local time) September 8, 1963, a Coast Guard aircraft from Kodiak arrived off Low Cape, Kodiak Island in position 57N latitude, 155W longitude, investigating a complaint by U.S. fishing vessels that Russian fishing vessels were destroying U.S.-owned crabbing gear. This area is approximately 12 miles southwest of Kodiak Island. Three SRTB's (NN852 Kapatcha, No. 1048 and No. 7591) were sighted within one-fourth mile of a line between the U.S. fishing vessels *Vicky Lee* and *Lucky Star* which were located on a North-South axis about 5 miles apart. U.S. crab pots were set between the two U.S. vessels also on a North-South axis. The Russian trawlers were observed dragging in and around the crab pot buoys and at times passing less than thirty yards from them. When the Russian hauled in their drags they were full of crabs. There were piles of crabs on the Russian's decks. They continued to drag this area ignoring crab pot buoys and the Coast Guard aircraft.
>
> After checking other radar contacts, the Coast Guard plane returned and noticed the NN852 leaving the area, heading south toward fish transport vessels. The *Gladys R.* (another U.S. vessel) and a Russian SRT (unidentified) were now working in this area and were coming alarmingly close to one another. At one point the *Gladys R* told the Coast Guard aircraft that the Russian was blowing his horn, shaking his fist and waving him out of the way, and asked advice. He was advised that unless he was working his own pot at the time, he should back off and give the trawler some room. This he did. The plane departed at 4:31 p.m. local time with some separation between these two vessels.
>
> The SRT NN777 against whom the fishing vessel *Lucky Star* made the original complaint was located nested with a fish transport to the south of this area.
>
> Coast Guard Cutter *Winona* was ordered into the area and directed to collect statements, photos and films from U.S. fishing vessels and to patrol the area.

Mr. BARTLETT. The two episodes refer to situations discovered off Adak, and off Kodiak, Alaska. In respect to the first, violation of the territorial waters of the United States was observed. In the second, while the Russian fishing vessels were in international waters, they once more violated every tradition of the sea by ruining the crab pots placed there by fishermen from Kodiak, Alaska.

These episodes have occurred before. The Russians promised they would not be repeated. This matter was taken up with the Russian Government by the State Department. Assurances were given. They, too, have been violated, and on this occasion the violations were observed by the U.S. Coast Guard.

The summary supplies detailed information relating to these matters. The Russian fishing vessels passed within less than 30 yards from the crab pot buoys, and the Soviet fishermen were obviously taking Kodiak, Alaska, king crab, which are creatures of the Continental Shelf, subject to the protections of the convention on the Continental Shelf, which both the United States and Russia have ratified.

This violation is a most wanton incident and gives further proof that there is need for early action on the bill considered last week by the Senate Commerce Committee to give the Government some teeth so the Federal Government will have authority to act in these instances.

Surprisingly enough, as it is now, if a foreign fishing vessel is discovered in territorial waters off any of the coastal States, there is no penalty provided for such intrusion. All that can be done, if the ship or ships are discovered by the Coast Guard, is for the Coast Guard to warn them off. The legislation under consideration provides a penalty, and I think the bill should be reported and passed at an early date.

I am vitally concerned by the enormous fleets of Russian trawlers off our coasts. They have at time exceeded 500 in number. The House Armed Services Committee reported last week that our security was involved in the operation.

It is clear from the testimony given during the hearings last week on my bill, S. 1988, that the integrity of our territorial waters is not only threatened, but actually is being violated.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the report I received from the Library of Congress, which points out clearly that Russia has strong provisions protecting her own coastal waters, up to 12 miles from the coastline, from intrusion by foreign nationals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS FOR ENFORCING FISHING REGULATIONS WITHIN THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE U.S.S.R.

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Provisions for enforcing fishing regulations in general and within the U.S.S.R. territorial waters in particular have been subject to constant change in the Soviet Union. They form part of Soviet legislation on fishing on the one hand and of legislation on territorial waters on the other. A comparatively recent Soviet monograph on territorial waters lists 54 legislative acts regarding territorial waters issued between July 10, 1918, and September 14, 1944.[1] New regulations were issued in 1954, only to be replaced or amended 4 years later by a new Statute on the Protection of Fish Stocks and Control of Fishing in the U.S.S.R. of September 15, 1958, which has been in force at least since July 1, 1962. These statutes, inasmuch as they have been passed by the Councils of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Republics and are not in the nature of session laws (published in the Vedomosti of the U.S.S.R. and the Vedomosti of the individual Soviet Republics) are not as a rule available abroad unless communicated by the Soviet Government to the United Nations, as was the case with the 1935 and 1954 statutes on this subject.

Legislation originating with the councils of ministers on the Federal or republic level, is published in the Sobranie Postanovlenii i Rasporiazhenii of the Soviet Union Council of Ministers and comparable publications of the councils of ministers of the constituent and autonomous republics which, however, as a rule have a restricted circulation. It is due to this practice that the collections of the Library of Congress do not include the publication in which the integral authentic text of the above-mentioned statute of 1958 are included. Accordingly the excerpts from this statute are quoted from a secondary source, a 1962 commented edition of the RSFSR Criminal Code published by Leningrad University.

This study is limited to an outline of fishing regulations for U.S.S.R. territorial waters, including the penalties imposed for their violation, with particular emphasis on the special legislation on the enforcement of penalties for infringements by foreigners.

II. SOVIET CONCEPT OF TERRITORIAL WATERS

The Soviet concept of territorial waters is outlined in article 3 of the Regulations on the Protection of the State Borders of the U.S.S.R. of August 5, 1960,[2] which reads as follows:

"Article 3. The coastal marine waters to a distance of 12 nautical miles measures from the low water mark both on the mainland and around islands or from the other limits of the inland marine waters of the U.S.S.R. are the territorial waters of the U.S.S.R. In particular cases provided for by agreements between the U.S.S.R. and other states, the limit of the territorial waters may differ.

"The line of the outer limits of the territorial waters is the state border of the U.S.S.R. on the sea.

"In areas where the territorial waters of the U.S.S.R. adjoin the territorial waters of contiguous states, the state maritime border of the U.S.S.R. is established in conformity with agreements concluded by the U.S.S.R. with the contiguous states, or in the absence of such agreements, in conformity with the principles accepted in the international practice of states or along a straight line connecting the outlets of the land border to the sea."

III. GENERAL PROHIBITION FOR FOREIGNERS TO ENGAGE IN FISHING IN SOVIET WATERS UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

The principle that foreigners are prohibited to engage in commercial fishing in all U.S.S.R. fishing waters, i.e., "all waters used for the catching of fish, water mammals, crustaceans and other water animals and products," including "marine fishing waters" which "embrace all inland maritime waters of the U.S.S.R. and a maritime coastal zone 12 sea miles in breadth"[3] is firmly entrenched in the U.S.S.R. The first all-embracing federal legislative act on control of fishing and conservation of sea products dated September 25, 1935,[4] provided in section 12: "Foreign nationals and foreign legal persons may not carry on fishing or any other aquatic industry in any U.S.S.R. fishery, except as provided for by an international treaty concluded by the U.S.S.R. or under a concession granted by the Government of the U.S.S.R."[5] As stated by a Soviet authority on Soviet Maritime Law:[6]

"Violation of provisions of Soviet legislation by foreign ships passing through Soviet waters entails the application of corresponding sanctions. Such sanctions for fishing, hunting, and other industries are provided for, in particular, by the RSFSR Criminal Code (sec. 86) and the criminal codes of the other Soviet republics. The frontier guard has the duty to detain the trespassers and to turn over the case record concerning them to the court."[7]

The present situation with respect to the right of foreigners to fish in Soviet Union waters, including the territorial sea, is summed up in a recent Soviet monograph on the legal status of foreigners in the U.S.S.R.:

"The statute on the protection of fish stocks and on control of fisheries in the U.S.S.R. of September 1958 states that foreign citizens and juridical persons of foreign states may not engage in the fishing industry in Soviet waters unless this is provided for by agreements concluded between the U.S.S.R. and other states. This ban affects not only rivers and lakes, but also a territorial maritime belt 12 sea miles wide, and so-called internal seas. That is why foreign fishing boats are not allowed to fish in the White Sea, unless there is a special international agreement to the effect. Of course, the Soviet state may permit fishing in its territorial waters. For instance the Soviet Government, in view of the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Finland, and the request made by the Government of the latter country, has granted, in accordance with the Agreement on Fisheries and Sealeries of February 21, 1959, to Finnish citizens, residing in several communities along the shores of the Gulf of Finland, the right to engage free of charge in fishing and seal catching in a specified part of Soviet territorial waters in the gulf.

"Since the statute of 1958 pertains to fishing as an industry, the foreigner has every right to fish without restriction if he does so for personal consumption; however, like any Soviet citizen, he is obliged to observe all regulations affecting fishing."[8]

This basic rule prohibiting foreigners, in the absence of an international treaty, to engage in fishing for anything but personal consumption, is spelled out in articles 6 and 7 of the statute on the protection of fish stocks and on the control of fishing in the water reservoirs of the U.S.S.R., confirmed by the decision of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers of September 15, 1958,[9] which reads as follows:

---

[1] A N. Nikolaev, "Problema territorial 'nykh vod v mezhdunarodnom prave." (The Problem of Territorial Waters in International Law). Moscow, 1954. p. 241–246.

[2] Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR, No. 34 (1018), August 30, 1960, p. 747–756. English translation in The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, v. XII, No. 40 (Nov. 2, 1960): 3–6. These regulations replaced the Regulations for the Defense of the State Frontiers of the U.S.S.R. of June 15, 1957 (Sobranie Zakonov i Rasporiazhenii SSSR), 19[illegible], No. 62, text 625, p. 1218 ff. Excerpts translated in United Nations Legislative Series. Laws and Regulations on the Regime of the High Seas. v. I. * * * United Nations, New York, 1951. p. 1[illegible]3–119. Hereinafter quoted as "Regime of the High Seas" (1951).

[3] Secs. 1 and 2 of the Order of the Council of People's Commissars, No. 2157, for the Regulation of Fishing and the Conservation of Fisheries Resources, 25 September 1935 (Sobranie Zakonov i Rasporiazhenii SSSR. Collection of Laws and Ordinances of the U.S.S.R.), 1935, No. 50, text 420. p. 741 ff. Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations. In "Regime of the High Seas" (1951).

[4] For full title of this legislative act see preceding footnote.

[5] Regime of the High Seas (1951), op. cit., p. 126. See also the only known special monograph on Soviet maritime and fishing law: G. I. Imenitov. "Sovetskoe morskoe i rybolovnoe pravo" (Soviet Maritime and Fishery Law). Moscow, State Publishing House of Juridical Writings, 1951, p. 91. Among other topics covered, special short sections of this work are devoted to administrative penalties imposed by officials of the Fishery Control Service for minor offenses, inquiry, and investigation of fishing offenses (p. 98–101).

[6] A. D. Keilin. "Sovetskoe morskoe pravo" (Soviet Maritime Law). Moscow, State Publishing House of Water Transportation, 1954. p. 64.

[7] Keilin, op. cit., p. 64, quotes two cases of unlawful fishing by the British ships "Lasenniia" and "Etruria" and the penalties imposed. These cases were recorded in Izvestiia (November 16, 1950) and Pravda (May 13, 1950), ibid., notes 1–2.

[8] M. Boguslavski and A. Rubanov. "The Legal Status of Foreigners in the U.S.S.R." Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, n.d. p. 58–59. This book was published after 1960 because it mentions among U.S.S.R. treaties concerning foreigners the agreements on social security with the German Democratic Republic of May 24, 1960, and with Romania of December 24, 1960 (p. 26).

"Foreign citizens and juridical persons of foreign states shall be prohibited to engage in the industrial catch of fish and other water animals and plants in the water reservoirs of the U.S.S.R., with the exception of cases provided for by agreements entered into by the U.S.S.R. with other states.

"The catching of fish for personal consumption as a sport or hobby (without the right to sell the fish) shall be gratuitously permitted to all toilers in all water reservoirs, with the exception of reservations, fish hatcheries, lakes and other cultivated fish husbandries, if they comply with the established fishing rules."

IV. CRIMINAL CODE PROVISIONS CONCERNING PENALTIES FOR ILLEGAL FISHING

The unlawful, improper, or unlicensed exercise of industrial fishing may be subject either to administrative or criminal penalties, depending on the nature and gravity of the offense.[10] Criminal responsibility is provided for in the new criminal codes of the constituent Soviet republics, some of which became effective on January 1, 1961, replacing the old criminal codes patterned on the RSFSR Criminal Code. The new codes, including that of the RSFSR, have preserved a certain uniformity in their general parts in which the federal basic principles of criminal legislation of the U.S.S.R. and the constituent republics of December 25, 1958 (Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR. No. 1 (933), text 6) have been incorporated. However, with respect to special crimes, including violations of fishing regulations, differences exist with respect to the essential elements of particular offenses as well as to the kinds and modalities of penalties applicable. The pertinent provision of the RSFSR Criminal Code of 1960 is as follows:

Sec. 163. Unlawful Engaging in Fishing and Other Aquatic Industries. [the act of] engaging in fishing, hunting and [any] other aquatic industry in the territorial waters of the U.S.S.R., internal seas, rivers and lakes, ponds, reservoirs and their accessory waters without the proper permission, or during the closed season, or in prohibited areas or with prohibited implements, means or methods, shall be punished by deprivation of liberty for a period not to exceed 1 year, or correctional labor for the same period of time, or a fine of up to one hundred rubles, or confiscation of the catch, the [fishing or hunting] implements and of the vessels, together with their equipment, or both."

The same acts if they are committed repeatedly or involve the catching or killing of valuable species of fish or aquatic animals, or the causing of considerable damage, shall be punished by deprivation of liberty for a period not to exceed 4 years, or with confiscation of property, or both.[11]

Comparable provisions are incorporated in the criminal codes of some of the other Soviet constituent republics.[12] However, a number of them have adopted a more lenient attitude:

"According to the Criminal Codes of the Azerbaijan, Kirghiz, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and Kazak Soviet Socialist Republics the above-mentioned acts are subject to criminal punishment only in case the guilty person has already been subject to measures of administrative coercion at an earlier time." [13]

V. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

The enforcement of fishing regulations is incumbent upon the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Fisheries and a special fish conservation and control agency, whose organizational setup and functions are outlined in the Fishing Control Service Code of April 15, 1938.[14]

Enforcement procedures had already been incorporated in articles 24 and 25 of the Order of the Council of People's Commissars concerning the regulation of fishing and the conservation of fish resources of September 25, 1935.[15]

The regulations of August 10, 1954, concerning the conservation of fish resources and the regulation of fishing in the waters of the U.S.S.R., approved by the Order of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. of the same date, amplify the earlier rules:[16]

"Article 1. All waters (seas, rivers, lakes, reservoirs and ponds) which are or may be used for pisciculture or for the commercial fishing or commercial catching or gathering of other aquatic animals or plants, or which are important for the maintenance of stocks of commercial fish, shall be deemed to be fishery waters.

"Marine fishery waters comprise the internal maritime waters (inland seas, gulfs, bays and creeks of open seas) and territorial waters of the USSR (maritime frontier zone) to a width of twelve nautical miles measured from the low-water mark (both on the mainland and on islands) or, in the case of internal waters, from their outer edge."

"Article 6. Foreign nationals and bodies corporate of foreign States may not engage in commercial fishing or the commercial catching or gathering of other aquatic animals or plants in the waters of the USSR, except as provided in international agreements concluded by the USSR."

"Article 8. Rules governing fishing in fishery waters shall be made for the several fishery districts by the Minister of Fisheries of the USSR.

"The Fishery Rules shall specify, in particular, the boundaries of the area within which they apply, the prohibited areas and close seasons for fishing, the prohibited implements and methods of fishing, the mesh-sizes authorized for fishing equipment, the minimum sizes of fish and other aquatic animals authorized to be taken, the rules for non-commercial fishing by the public for personal consumption, and also, in waters in which such restrictions are necessary for conserving and increasing fish stocks, the authorized quantity of fishing equipment and of catches of fish of the several species."

"Article 23. A person who engages in fishing or the catching or gathering of other aquatic animals or plants in fishery waters without proper authority, in a close season, in a prohibited area, by prohibited methods or with prohibited implements, or who improperly discharges into fishery waters the unpurified and undecontaminated liquid wastes of an industrial or municipal undertaking or carries out blasting operations causing mass destruction of fish, shall be liable to prosecution as provided by law.

---

[9] Polozhenie ob okhrane rybnykh zapasov i o regulirovanii rybolovstva v vodoemakh SSSR, utverzhdennoe postanovleniem Soveta Ministrov SSSR ot 15 sentiabria 1958 g. (S[obranie] P[ostanovlenii] [Pravitel'stva] SSSR, 1958, No. 16, Text 127). Quoted on p. 297–298 of "Leningradskii Ordena Lenina Gosudarstvennyi Universitet imeni A.A. Zhdanova." Kommentarii k Ugolovnomu Kodeksu RSFSR 1960 g. (Leningrad State University of A.A. Zhdanov's Name. Commentaries to the RSFSR Criminal Code of 1960). Leningrad, 1962. Hereinafter quoted as Commentaries (1962).

[10] Sovetskoe ugolovnoe pravo. Chast'osobennaia (Soviet Criminal Law. Special Part). V.D. Men'shagin coeditor. Moscow, 1957. p. 316. Hereinafter quoted as "Soviet Criminal Law" (1957).

[11] Translated from Ministerstvo IUstitsii RSFSR. Ugolovnyi kodeks RSFSR. Gosudarstavennoe Izdatel'stvo IUridicheskoi Literatury. Moskva, 1960 (Ministry of Justice. RSFSR Criminal Code, Moscow, State Publishing House of Juridical Writings, 1960). p. 8[illegible]. Compare this provision with the earlier provision of the RSFSR Criminal Code of 1926 (effective January 1, 1927, to January 1, 1961):

"Sec. 86. The act of engaging in fishing, hunting or any other aquatic industry in seas, rivers or lakes of national importance without the proper permission or during the closed season or in prohibited areas or with prohibited implements, means or methods shall be punished by deprivation of liberty or correctional labor for a period not exceeding one year or a fine not exceeding 500 roubles and compulsory seizure of the unlawfully taken catch in all cases and optional seizure of the fishing or hunting implements and of the vessels used in the unlawful industry, together with all their equipment."

Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations made from text provided by the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations. "United Nations Legislative Series." "Laws and Regulations on the Regime of the Territorial Sea." United Nations, New York, 1957 (ST/LEG/SER.B/6: December 1956; United Nations Publication; Sales No.: 1957 V2). p. 355. Hereinafter quoted as "Regime of the Territorial Sea" (1957).

[12] For example, Section 159 of the Criminal Code of the Latvian SSR, effective April 1, 1961, and promulgated January 6, 1961, has the following wording:

"Sec. 159. Unlawful Engaging in Fishing and Other Aquatic Industries. [The act of] engaging in fishing, hunting and [any] other aquatic industry in seas, rivers, lakes and other reservoirs which are of industrial significance, without the proper permission, or during the closed season or in prohibited areas or with prohibited implements or means, shall be punished by deprivation of liberty for a period not to exceed one year or correctional labor for the same period of time, or a fine of up to three hundred rubles, or it shall entail the imposing of measures of public coercion."

(Ugolovnyi Kodeks Latviiskoi SSR. Riga, Latviiskoe Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1961. p. 57.) In this case the words "territorial waters" are conspicuously missing, although Latvia has a coastal line on the Baltic Sea. The omission of the words "internal sea" is justified inasmuch as there is no internal sea in the Latvian SSR. Internal sea is defined under Soviet law as follows: "By an internal sea is understood any sea entirely surrounded by the territory of a given state (e.g., the Sea of Aral), or one which, though having an outlet to other waters, belongs to a particular state (e.g., the Sea of Azov and the White Sea)." Boguslavsky-Rubanov, op cit., p. 59, note*. The second feature of the Latvian SSR Criminal Code provision distinguishing it from that of the RSFSR Criminal Code is the higher maximum limit of the fine (300 instead of 100 rubles) and no increased punishment for cases involving the catching of valuable fish species or the causing of considerable damage.

[13] Sovetskoe ugolovnoe pravo. Chast' osobennaia (Soviet Criminal Law. Special Part). M. D. Shargorodskii and N. A. Beliaev, editors. Moscow, State Publishing House of Juridical Writings, 1962. p. 272.

[14] Ustav sluzhby rybolovnogo nadzora utverzhdennyi Sovetom Narodnykh Kommissarov SSSR 15 aprelia 1938. g. (Fishing Control Service Code Approved by the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR on April 15, 1938). Imenitov, op. cit., p. 97.

[15] "Regime of the High Seas" (1951), p. 127–128.

[16] "Regime of the Territorial Sea" (1957), p. 577–578.

"A person who commits an offence as aforesaid for the first time, without using commercial fishing implements, explosives or poisons, or who contravenes any other provisions of the fishery rules or of these regulations, shall be liable to a fine.

"Article 24. Fishery conservation officers shall be entitled to detain persons committing offences against these regulations and the fishery rules and to seize fishing implements and floating equipment in their possession together with any fish and other aquatic animals and plants unlawfully taken.

"Fishery conservation officers shall be entitled to detain an offender for such time as may be necessary for the drawing-up of a report (record) of the offense against these regulations and the fishery rules. If the offender's identity cannot be established at the place where the offense is committed, the fishery conservation officers shall deliver the offender to the nearest rural Soviet or militia unit for the purpose of establishing his identity and domicile.

"Unlawful catches of fish and other aquatic animals and plants shall be seized by fishery conservation officers both at the place of taking and at points at which they are received and processed, and shall be delivered to fish products plants or to trade organizations at the prevailing acceptance prices. Seized fishing implements and floating equipment shall be held at the fishery conservation authorities' stores, or at other places at the discretion of the said authorities, until the fishery conservation authorities give their decision in the case, where administrative proceedings are taken against the offender, or until the court renders its judgment, where judicial proceedings are taken against the offender.

"Prohibited fishing implements which cannot be converted into authorized fishing implements shall be confiscated without a judgment of the court and shall be destroyed."

"Article 25. The scale of fines for offenses under these regulations and the fishery rules shall be as follows:

" 'Fines imposed by district fishery conservation inspectors: not more than 250 rubles for each individual and not more than 2,000 rubles for each undertaking, institution, or organization;

" 'Fines imposed by directors of fishery conservation and pisciculture departments (divisions) and their deputies: not more than 500 rubles for each individual and not more than 5,000 rubles for each undertaking, institution, or organization.

" 'An appeal against the imposition of a fine may be lodged within 14 days with the director next senior in rank, whose decision shall be final.' "—Dr. Armins Rusis, European Law Division, Law Library, Library of Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Since I started to speak, I note that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who was rather savagely attacked in the Soviet magazine, has entered the Chamber. I know he needs no defense from me; nevertheless, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is entitled to, and should, receive the very strongest commendation for his vigorous and proper support of the American fishing industry. As to the Russian publication charges against President Kennedy, they will receive serious consideration, I suggest, from no one. I suspect that this applies to the Soviet writers as well as to everyone else. What the President is seeking to do is to build every segment of American society, to improve the lot of all people everywhere, and to insure peace.

Finally, as a member of the Commerce Committee, I have been gratified because time after time when legislation concerning the fishing industry has come before that committee, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has appeared as a witness and has given very effective and helpful testimony and has made it easier to report and pass legislation so urgently needed if the American fishing industry is to survive, much less make progress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The junior Senator from Massachusetts recognizes the outstanding contribution the Senator from Alaska has made, not only in regard to this important phase of protecting our fishing industry, and of providing our various Federal agencies with the means for essential law enforcement against any of the trespasses by the Soviet Union, or by any other nation, in violation of the territorial waters of the United States, but I think the Senator from Alaska has also provided outstanding leadership in directing this problem to the attention of the Senate and really providing a platform for the fishing industry to bring into international focus the great needs of our fishing industry.

I come here as a junior Senator from a State that realizes the importance of the fishing industry in my home State of Massachusetts, but also recognizes that this problem involves not merely the State of Massachusetts, but the entire eastern seaboard, the Gulf coast, the western coast, and also the State of Alaska, which today plays a primary role in providing the American people the benefits of the sea.

It is always with true humility that I come before the Commerce Committee and testify before the Senator's subcommittee with regard to legislation dealing with the fishing industry, because we recognize in the State of Massachusetts, as I know personally, the truly outstanding contribution the Senator from Alaska has made.

Once more today, on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Alaska has presented outstanding examples of violations of territorial waters of the United States. He has brought forth significant evidence on the importance of these violations. I think it is incumbent upon all Members of the Senate to recognize that this situation demands the kind of legislation which has been proposed by the Senator from Alaska, and in which I am indeed delighted to participate.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts for what he has had to say. What concerns me, in addition to many other things, and I am sure what concerns the Senator from Massachusetts, is the great probability that if the maritime nations of the world are not prudent, this priceless resource, protein from the sea, will not be available for future populations and future generations.

Fishing efforts have expanded enormously in the last 15 years. We do not know, generally speaking, whether there is a condition of overfishing now. There may be. What we do know is that it may rapidly approach. Indeed, I am confident the time is now when the maritime nations of the world must get together and must join in research and in appropriate conservation measures, lest these resources, which otherwise can be made renewable forever, will have totally disappeared.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive M (88th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like at this time to express my strong support of the test ban treaty and my hope that this treaty will receive an overwhelming vote of ratification from the Senate.

The U.S. Government has advocated this type of treaty in negotiations with the Soviet Union since 1959. It has been proposed by two administrations, endorsed by the national platforms of both political parties, and supported by Americans of all political persuasion.

The treaty was finally negotiated last month because the Russian Government made to the United States a significant concession. Our Government made no concession from its previous position. The Russians abandoned their insistence on tying the test ban to a broader agreement on disarmament, without inspection safeguards satisfactory to us.

Mr. President, to reject the treaty under these circumstances would be to reject the approach our military and civilian leaders have urged toward disarmament over the last 10 years. We have been told by all our leaders that disarmament must be negotiated from a position of strength rather than weakness, for only if this were so, would our adversary be willing to make those concessions necessary for our protection. Many hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent to build up this type of strength. Now, when we have finally reached a position of clear military superiority, when we finally have the strength necessary to force concessions—as we did in these negotiations—how can we turn our backs on our own policies?

The only reason that would justify a rejection of this policy would be that the treaty as written dissipated our strength or endangered our security. I am not a military expert. But I accept the judgment of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the CIA, the Director of AEC, and the Director of Research and Development of the Department of Defense, that this treaty does not endanger our security. We have, as well, the commitment of the President that our weapons development will continue and that our atomic laboratories and testing grounds will be held at the ready so that testing can resume if our national security demands it.

I am also sure that one of the reasons for widespread public support and confidence in this treaty was the fact that it was negotiated by Averell Harriman, who has dealt with the Soviet Union longer than any other public figure in this country; who was the first to warn of the danger after the war; and who has become, over the years, the symbol of the hard, skeptical approach toward doing business with the Russians.

Mr. President, the Russians have their own reasons for wanting this agreement, as we have ours. We do not know whether there is a direct relation between the new Soviet attitude and their differences with the Chinese. Russia has withdrawn aid for Chinese nuclear development. The two nations have cut trade severely. They denounce each other publicly almost every day. The Russians have given aid to India, China's enemy. The Chinese have accused the Russians of plotting to recognize Formosa, and of encouraging open rebellion among minority groups in the north of China.

The significance of this can be seen if we consider, that if any one of these incidents had occurred between our Nation and, say, Great Britain, it would have been considered a most serious crisis.

These developments in the Communist world are partly the result of our strong and firm policies in recent years—a result of our military buildup, our world leadership and our willingness to stand up to the Communists regardless of the risk. The Russians have failed in Berlin, in the Congo, in the Middle East and elsewhere. These failures have shaken their hold on their empire. Russia has been forced to make concessions to us to keep support of its satellites. In this situation, which can only evolve to our advantage, it would be a grave mistake to aline ourselves with the Chinese against the limited test ban.

If we cannot arrive at a modest agreement like this, under present world circumstances, I do not know when we can. The overwhelming opinion of the people of my State is that this test ban agreemen is an act of mercy, and that by this act we will earn the gratitude of the people of the world for freeing them from the twin threat of fallout and possible nuclear destruction, but that if we do not approve this treaty, our Nation will be singled out before all the world as the nation which fastened these chains on mankind.

This is a viewpoint that has been reflected in the distinguished publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston, the Pilot, and in newspaper editorials in leading newspapers in Boston, Worcester, Haverhill, and Lynn. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Pilot, official organ of the Archdiocese of Boston, Mass.; Aug. 3, 1963]

Summer Thaw

"Prohibit, to prevent and not to carry out any nuclear weapons test explosion or any other nuclear explosion."

In such direct and simple words the recent Moscow agreement was drawn up by representatives from the United States, Russia, and Great Britain. The document on the nuclear test ban in the atmosphere, outer space and under water was refreshing for brevity in days when extended remarks have a habit of finding their way into any written or spoken word. Some are of the mind that the whole thing is too simple and the innocents should beware lest it blow up in their faces. Others who do not share this suspicion, but who have their own reservations on Russian pacts, take a more hopeful view of the matter.

Lest more be read into the wording of the agreement than was intended, it was quickly pointed out that "any other nuclear explosion" did not preclude use of these frightening weapons in wartime, nor did it forbid testing underground. For the latter, the United States wanted international inspection of sites, a condition to which the Russians would not agree because they felt this was merely a cover for spying.

Short as the meat of the agreement may be, it will be carefully analyzed before it is fully digested. Even though Mr. Rusk and his bipartisan group leave this weekend for the formal signing of the treaty, the whole business must be ratified by the Senate. The Members of this body are the ones charged with this responsibility by the Constitution and it is they who must ultimately answer to the American people. Already the President has called for a debate on the subject, and this debate is to involve all Americans, since this is a matter in the national interest.

Death is the lot of man, but the very thoughts of annihilation, which is what the thermonuclear arsenals of both East and West may hold, should be enough to make men and nations take any steps in the direction of peace. We are no longer at the point of killing by way of overcoming an unjust invader; we have reached and long passed what has been so technically and politely called overkilling.

We are not anxious to cast aside security or military power for tainted promises. On the other hand, we are anxious to explore the avenues of peace in terms of modern challenges to our national welfare. The test ban treaty may suggest to many a rocky road, but even that can take us out of the sure path of destruction.

[From the Pilot, official organ of the Archdiocese of Boston, Mass., Aug. 10, 1963]

A Change of Direction

Within 10 days of signing the nuclear test ban agreement we will be marking the 18th anniversary of the atomic blast at Hiroshima. If it is a time of promise, it is also surely a time for reflection.

The limited test ban treaty does not either outlaw the bomb nor does it make further testing impossible. Those who have signed it have, however, set their faces in a new direction and it is the direction of less terror rather than more, less destruction, rather than more, less danger rather than more, toward survival and against annihilation. Perhaps it is only a step, as everyone seems to say, but it is an about face, at least psychologically, and this is the most important thing of all.

We do not like to reflect on the Hiroshima anniversary; it was an unpleasant (at least) moment in our history. But the treaty just signed makes it possible for us to feel that we can manage somehow to face the day this year; up until now we cringed before it. The dread decision that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki has not yet been repudiated by the bulk of Americans; the set of our minds is not much different from what it was in 1945. In other words, we could do it again. But the treaty gives us reason to hope that change is in the winds.

If Americans could work so hard, at what may be some national disadvantage, to clear the air of atomic fallout, one wonders if they could ever again set a poisonous mushroom cloud over any city in the world for any reason. Perhaps this is more important than the ban and the inspection and the signing and all the rest. There has been a change of heart and, where once in a mood of might we could wipe out a city of families, nothing like that will ever be possible again. We have not yet done our penance, but we are almost ready to confess our sins.

Probably it is typically American that we cannot put into words our change of heart, that we cannot say before the world a confiteor of our transgressions. We are called a people of action, more gifted in doing things than in explaining why we have done them. If this is so, the world may understand what it means for us to have pressed for and found a ban with which to tie our own hands as much as those of others. We can hope that they will see in this our gesture of repentance, our turning away from the shame of Hiroshima toward a stronger and a more rewarding light. Perhaps many Americans wonder why they have felt so pleased to be part of this new nuclear agreement, since it is such a small thing and so truly limited. The answer may be that our hearts have sensed a change, and with it something like a liberation.

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 16, 1963]

Weighing the Risks

(By Uncle Dudley)

The military and scientific testimony on which the ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty will probably depend is now being presented at Senate hearings.

That this treaty will not unduly risk the security of the United States is the view of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Thirty-five American Nobel Prize winners take the same view.

The chief questioner is Dr. Edward Teller, "father of the hydrogen bomb."

Mr. McNamara has testified that this country has "tens of thousands" of nuclear warheads, 500 missiles and more than that number of strategic bombers. The American lead in atomic weapons, and in the ability to deliver them, has increased in recent years.

Two major questions have been raised by Dr. Teller. Soviet experience with higher yield nuclear explosions might enable the Russians in a surprise attack some day to deliver a superbomb which would destroy this country's ability to retaliate from land bases. One answer to this is that the United States has Polaris submarines.

The other point Dr. Teller makes is that Russia might gain an advantage in developing an anti-missile-missile warhead. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff are satisfied, because the treaty still permits nuclear tests underground, which cannot be detected (and do not poison the atmosphere). Atomic Energy Chairman Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, a Nobel Prize winner, believes that the warhead for an antimissile missile could be developed by underground testing.

All agree that the risks mentioned by Dr. Teller cannot be completely discounted, but Dr. Seaborg says they are "minor." He adds:

"On balance we improve security with the treaty."

Perhaps the risk most feared by the Joint Chiefs is that a false sense of security will develop. But that can happen, whether there is international control of weapons or not.

Between the world wars, Japan got the jump at sea because the United States did not maintain its fleet at the strength permitted by the naval limitation treaties. In the 1950's, when no similar pact existed, this country became so overconfident because of its air superiority that Russia went ahead in ballistic missiles.

Though the test ban treaty should relax tensions somewhat, it should give no sane person a false sense of security. It limits no armaments, leaves still unsolved the key question of international inspection. But it represents a hope that a turning point has come, and man over the years will gradually bring nuclear energy completely under control. On that the future of the race is likely to hinge.

In weighing the risks which will be incurred if the treaty is ratified, it is important to consider the far greater hazards if ratification should fail.

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 9, 1963]

Up to the Senate

(By Uncle Dudley)

As of now, prospects for ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty seem excellent, but the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds majority in the Senate creates potential boobytraps for any pact.

Bipartisan support is almost always necessary for ratification. When President Taft found that he lacked that for a treaty he dropped it. A great question of American internal politics can wreck a pact. The slavery issue prevented a two-thirds vote for a treaty annexing Texas; that republic had to be brought in by a joint resolution of Congress, which required only simple majorities in both Houses.

American adherence to the League of Nations, which seemed to have the public's support at the time, failed because President Wilson found himself unable to accept reservations offered by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, grandfather of the present Ambassador to South Vietnam. American foreign policy reverted to isolationism, with disastrous results.

A Senator has prophesied a vote of 79 to 15 for the limited test ban treaty. There is an overwhelming desire to make a beginning in the control of armaments and to avoid poisoning the atmosphere at the expense of generations unborn. The right to continue underground tests has evidently convinced the Joint Chiefs of Staff that national security is protected.

Yet Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb, questions the treaty. Democratic Senator **Henry Jackson**, of Washington, wants to make sure that it does not give Russia an advantage in the development of an antimissile missile.

Republican Senate Minority Leader **Everett M. Dirksen** did not go to Moscow for the signing of the treaty, because he did not want to commit himself in advance, even by implication. Walter Lippmann suggested in Thursday's Globe that West German Chancellor Adenauer may hope that the Senate will attach reservations of substance, which could require British and Russian acceptance before the pact went into effect. That could wreck the whole treaty.

Two memories haunt Americans. One is Khrushchev's sudden ending of the nuclear moratorium a couple of years ago, to get a jump in the resumption of tests. But that did not prevent this country from resuming as well; the present treaty contains an explicit escape clause.

The other memory is of the advantage gained by the Japanese in the 1920's and 1930's under the naval limitation treaties. But that was due, not to deception, but to the failure of this country to keep its fleet up to treaty strength. Everyone realizes that the present treaty is but a small beginning; this time there is less danger of losing the peace because no one now assumes it has already arrived.

But the test ban treaty looks like a good one. Those who would show it to be otherwise carry a heavy burden of proof. Anyone who may seek to wreck it for reasons of personal or partisan political advantage will assume a responsibility of dimensions too awful to contemplate.

[From the Worcester Telegram, Sept. 2, 1963]

The Great Gamble

As the testimony on the proposed nuclear test ban treaty draws to a close, most Americans share President Eisenhower's hope that "the agreement might open the way to better relations between the cold war opponents and, by small steps, bring about enforcible agreements for the reduction of the costly armaments race and progress toward the rule of law in the world."

Without question, hope is one of the main ingredients in the push for the treaty. There is also an element of trust involved. Not trust in the integrity of Khrushchev per se, but trust in his ability to see that an end to nuclear testing is in his own best interests, as well as everyone's else.

Trust and hope are risky things in international relations—especially when one is dealing with a dictatorship. There are many risks involved in the signing of this treaty.

No one can know for sure whether a halt to bomb tests will weaken our defenses in the long run. No one can know for sure whether the Communists plan to cheat. No one can know for sure whether the Soviets are making great progress on an antimissile missile, or whether the new period of international relaxation will prove to be a cynical Soviet tactic designed to seduce us into lessening our vigilance.

Under ordinary circumstances, it would not be prudent to ratify such a treaty. It cuts close to the heart of our national security. Expert witnesses have so testified, in opposition to other expert witnesses who think our national interests are safeguarded.

But these are not ordinary times, and nuclear bombs are not ordinary weapons. They do not lead to national security but to world insecurity. A nuclear arms race might prove to be a deadly risk for all mankind. Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, who used to be President Eisenhower's science adviser, told the Senators that there is no natural end to nuclear testing. "Every test raises questions as well as giving answers. There is no end to the race except one—war."

Another powerful argument for the treaty involves the radiation fallout hazard. No one knows how much danger there is to our children and grandchildren if nuclear waste continues to be blasted into the atmosphere, but some of the informed guesses are hair-raising. One thing cannot be denied—the ever growing concentration of strontium 90 and carbon 14 in the bones and tissues of children in North America.

The test ban treaty is not exactly a leap in the dark, but it is a leap into an uncertain future, where the perils are unknown. But the leap seems justified because, in this case, the known risks are worse than the unknown.

[From the Worcester Telegram, Aug. 17, 1963]

Weighing the Risks

No intelligent person can believe that the risks in the proposed nuclear test ban treaty are negligible. The risks are prodigious. The testimony of Dr. Edward Teller, and other competent witnesses before the Senate Armed Services Committee, makes it clear that we do not know for sure whether the Soviets are abreast of us in the anti-missile field and in other important phases of nuclear weaponry.

But the risks are also prodigious if we do not sign the treaty. An intensified nuclear arms race leading to bigger and bigger bombs probably would not strengthen our national security. Instead, it might lead to an intolerable heightening of international tension, with the result that an eventual atomic conflict would become increasingly likely. Nuclear blasts, by their very nature, kindle feelings of dread, hatred, and despair in the hearts of hundreds of millions of people. These are not the emotions on which to build a stable peace.

Some of the arguments put forward for the treaty are speculative at best. We are highly skeptical of the line that the treaty marks the advent of a new era in international relations, in which the United States and the Soviet Union will get along famously. All the evidence indicates that it will be decades and generations before we will be able to regard the Soviet Union as a reasonably trustworthy nation.

But a test ban would have one positive result that has been strangely ignored during most of the current debate. It would end radioactive fallout throughout the world. That is, it would stop the addition of any more fallout to that which is still coming down from the tests in previous years.

Perhaps the fallout question has been bypassed because of fundamental ignorance about it. Even the scientists disagree as to how much genetic damage will be done to coming generations by strontium 90 and carbon 14 filtering down from the big mushroom clouds.

But one thing which cannot be denied is the rapid increase of strontium 90 in milk and in the bones of children. And no scientists anywhere say that this is a good thing. They all say it is bad. How bad it is, no one knows.

Some experts say that more than a million children will eventually be born deformed or defective because of the radioactive fallout that has been released to date. The estimate could be wildly wrong. Let us hope so. But when dealing with unknown hazards, it is always wise to assume the worst.

In balance, the risks in not signing the treaty outweigh the risks in signing it.

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 7, 1963]

If They Fail To Ratify . . .?

(By Laurence Barrett)

Washington.—So far, the argument over the limited nuclear test ban treaty has skirted perhaps the most important issue: What the consequences would be if the Senate fails to ratify.

President Kennedy says this would be a "great mistake." Mr. Harriman says it would cost this country its position of world leadership. These are understatements. It is not too much to predict that rejection of this treaty will sentence the world to continued imprisonment in the dungeon that is the arms race for a long, long time.

Both in the administration and in Congress there is considerable optimism that the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate will be achieved. Yet there is an undercurrent of opposition, rather muted for the moment, and lacking in focus. If a rallying point emerges, the treaty could be in trouble. Rejection is not the only avenue of defeat. An attempt could be made to append "reservations" or even formal amendments. These could have the same effect as a negative vote.

One wonders whether those who for various motives are searching so hard for minute flaws in the treaty have honestly considered the larger question of what failure to ratify would mean.

If the United States is unwilling to take this very little step toward arms control, then its stated position since the end of World War II in favor of controlling the atom is a fraud. And the more recent American posture in favor of arms reduction and ultimate disarmament is doubly fraudulent.

It must be remembered that the treaty under consideration is essentially an American treaty, which both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations put forward for the world to see and desire. Were we seeking to deceive the world? Were we safe in the knowledge that the Russians would spurn any agreement, merely teasing humanity?

The treaty to ban tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water is the most modest advance possible that can still provide meaningful progress. If we fear this, then longer strides toward peace will frighten us senseless.

Would the Russians negotiate with us seriously again on anything else? It is difficult to see why they should. They could simply bask in their greatest propaganda victory of the cold war.

The arguments against the treaty vary from sober considerations of the military and technical implications to hysterical screams about what monsters the Russians are. The Senate must think about the former and try to be immune from the latter.

The Republican congressional leadership now gropes for some rational basis on which to question the treaty. It posed this choice last week: "Which will do most to preserve peace in the world, ratification of a limited treaty placing selective restraints on the development of nuclear weapons or a maximum up-to-the-minute defense capability so destructive as to prohibit attack? (This is the same Republican leadership that thinks the defense budget could be cut easily by a few billions.)

Actually, this seemingly logical question contains holes. The treaty does not prevent, or even seriously inhibit, continued weapons development. But there is a bigger hole. The question implies that an absolute deterrent exists, or is readily obtainable. This is a delusion. There exists only the means for mutual destruction.

No new weapon is immune to a still newer defense. No defense remains impermeable for long. The choice really is between an ever-quickening contest for more devastating weapons and a glimmer of hope that the race may slow to a more rational pace.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 29, 1963]

EISENHOWER AND THE TEST BAN

The Eisenhower proposal that the Senate write a reservation into the test-ban treaty before signing it is a useful cautionary signal. The suggested provision would protect the United States position on the use of nuclear weapons to repel aggression. While the treaty does not concern what weapons would be used by either side in the event of war, there are good reasons for keeping the record of negotiations very clear.

General Eisenhower is specially aware of this. In 1959 he participated with Premier Khrushchev in talks aimed at lessening tensions. Later Moscow referred time and again to these as creating a "spirit of Camp David," which the Soviets accused the United States of violating in subsequent moves for its own security. It would do the cause of world peace no service to have such a performance repeated.

But a writing of real reservations into the treaty could open up a Pandora's box of debate not only between Moscow and Washington but even within the Senate. It would open the United States up to suspicions among some signatories to the pact that the Americans were trying to sabotage it. The pact is not so ironclad a document as to merit renegotiation simply to make plain the United States interpretation of its effect on inherent right of self-defense.

As Chairman Fulbright of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee pointed out, this right is already recognized in the United Nations Charter. The Senator said he did not believe that Mr. Eisenhower's doubts require a basic change in the document waiting to be signed and should not technically be described as a reservation.

It would seem therefore that the Senate could reasonably accompany ratification with a declaration to cover the sense of the Eisenhower signal. The more important aspect of the Eisenhower statement is after all that a leading figure of the Republican Party is giving the pact his support, though necessarily qualified.

[From the Haverhill Gazette, Aug. 1, 1963]

NUCLEAR TEST TREATY

Reports from Washington indicate that more and more Senators are going to base their final decisions on a nuclear test ban treaty on the feelings of the residents of their home States.

If that is the case, we hope neither Massachusetts Senator will have any doubt about the feelings of the residents of this State. The Senators should be made aware that Bay Staters are in favor of the test ban treaty.

We can expect, of course, that Senator Edward M. Kennedy will vote in favor of the treaty so strongly recommended by his brother, the President. We have seen nothing to indicate Senator Leverett Saltonstall will oppose the treaty, even though some of his Republican colleagues are beginning to put forth reasons for possible votes against the treaty.

Nevertheless, both Senators should know that there is strong support in this State for the treaty and for the hopes for peace that were voiced by the President when the agreement was announced.

Ratification of the treaty by the Senate is essential to a continuation of the trend toward reason shown by the heads of the American, British, and Russian Governments in their handling of nuclear armaments.

Granted, we cannot trust the Communists and we must remain constantly vigilant in spite of any treaties and agreements that are signed. It is still logical, however, that we can never emerge from the shadow of nuclear holocaust unless a start is made on eventual abolition of these terrible weapons. And where else can we start?

Granted, too, that France and Red China scorn the agreement and have announced they will have no part of it. The fact remains both countries have far to go in their development of nuclear weapons—France has exploded a few and Red China has not yet exploded any—and the officials of those lands have not experienced the awesome power of true super weapons in the modern sense.

We must support an agreement which could be the start of a reasonable approach to international relationships. Treaties have been broken throughout history and will continue to be broken, but the time must come when men either learn to live together or bring about complete destruction.

[From the Haverhill Gazette, Aug. 9, 1963]

DECADE OF HYDROGEN BOMB RIVALRY COULD END WITH BAN RATIFICATION

(By Richard Spong)

The agreement to ban atomic tests, if ratified, will mark the end of a decade of hydrogen bomb rivalry. Having destroyed the atomic monopoly of the United States in September 1949, the Soviet Union announced to a dubious world on August 8, 1953, that it had achieved the hydrogen bomb.

The word came at the end of a long speech by Georgi M. Melenkov, then Soviet Premier, to the Supreme Soviet, Russia's Parliament. He spoke of the solace the United States—the trans-Atlantic enemies of peace—had enjoyed in a monopoly of a still more powerful weapon than the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb. This was no longer true, he went on: "The Government deems it necessary to report to the Supreme Soviet that the United States has no monopoly in the production of the hydrogen bomb either. Convincing facts are shattering the wagging of tongues about the weakness of the Soviet Union."

American and British scientists were skeptical. It was pointed out that evidence of a Russian H-bomb explosion would inevitably be carried through the atmosphere to the U.S. detection devices that had recorded three Russian atomic blasts between 1949 and 1951.

The doubt was short-lived. The Soviet Government on August 20 announced that it had tested a hydrogen bomb within the past few days. The announcement was confirmed by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC said that on August 12 it had detected an explosion in the Soviet Union that involved both fission (uranium-plutonium) and thermonuclear (hydrogen) reactions similar to those in U.S. tests of H-bombs. The AEC announcement, incidentally, disclosed for the first time an American hydrogen-bomb test as early as 1951.

Great Britain, as the result of a certain amount of backing and filling, did not explode its first hydrogen bomb until May 15, 1957. France is reported to be at least 3 years away from completing work on an H-bomb, but President Kennedy obviously meant France on July 26 when he spoke of the "four current nuclear powers." Several other nations are believed nearly capable of setting off an atomic explosion, but they would still be several years away from a hydrogen bomb.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman of a Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, said early in 1962 that Communist China might explode an atomic device "anytime within this year." Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman brought back from Moscow a more optimistic view. On July 29 he told reporters that Soviet Premier Khrushchev was not overly concerned about Red China's nuclear capabilities in the foreseeable future. Harriman added that since 1960 the Soviet Union had discontinued all technical assistance to the Chinese nuclear development program.

[From the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Aug. 16, 1963]

RUSK ALLAYS FEAR OF TREATY TRICKERY

In the light of public discussion of the nuclear test ban treaty, one fact stands out.

Many Americans now believe there is no longer a basis for abnormal fear that the Russians may have tricked our negotiators into signing something that contains a hidden time bomb.

Analysis of his testimony before the U.S. Senate committees shows that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has given unqualified assurance that the test ban treaty contains no "side arrangements, understandings or conditions of any kind."

Rusk also has declared without reservation that if the United States does detect infractions of the treaty by the Russians, this country has the capability—and the intent—to quickly resume bomb tests.

These statements by a man of Rusk's ability, experience, and integrity should go a long way toward calming any jitters the public may have had.

Everyone knows it's hard to do business with someone you can't trust. But all signs indicate that our representatives have been on constant guard against any fast shuffle during the treaty negotiations.

Why should anyone have been so suspicious of a hidden gimmick in the treaty?

For one reason, because of the "managed" news in the recent Cuban affair. Many Americans have felt they not only were kept uninformed in that case, but were actually misled as to the facts.

They have been wondering if they might not run into more of the same treatment in the test ban treaty. Secretary Rusk's frankness has dispelled that suspicion.

So now we can concentrate on keeping up our guard and watching like a hawk to make sure the Russians keep their word, as given in the treaty.

Our guess is the Senate and the country will decide the risk is worth taking when you consider the alternative.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have also received communications from leading scientists and physicians in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, all of whom underscore the urgency of this test ban from the scientific and medical viewpoint. I ask unanimous consent that these letters appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
LABORATORY FOR NUCLEAR SCIENCE,
Cambridge, Mass., June 28, 1963.
Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I respectfully urge you to use your influence in support of the administration's efforts to reach an early agreement with the U.S.S.R. on a permanent cessation of atomic testing.

In my opinion mankind as a whole has never faced a problem of such urgency and overwhelming importance as the problem of insuring that nuclear power will not be used for its destruction. I am convinced that a test ban treaty is the first necessary step toward the solution of this problem. I am also convinced that the risks to our national security of a continued arms race far outweigh whatever risks may be present in a test ban agreement, even though such an agreement may not provide absolute insurance against the possibility that a few small underground explosions remain undetected. Moreover, whatever small chances of violation may now exist, they will further decrease as the detection techniques continue to improve. Thus, one should hope that the technical problems of control no longer constitute a roadblock to the negotiations of a test ban treaty.

Sincerely yours,
BRUNO ROSSI,
Professor of Physics.

MASSACHUSETTS
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
LABORATORY FOR NUCLEAR SCIENCE,
Cambridge, Mass., August 9, 1963.
Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Thank you very much for your kind reply to my letter concerning the negotiations for a test ban treaty.

I am sure you were as gratified as I was by the successful conclusion of these negotiations. The agreement signed in Moscow, although limited in scope, represents a step of great importance because it will stop further radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, it will help check the spread of atomic armaments to other nations and it will create a more favorable climate for possible further negotiations. Since these benefits are as vital to the Russians as they are to us, I am confident that the U.S.S.R. has entered into this agreement with the serious desire to see it fulfilled.

I earnestly hope that the U.S. Senate will ratify the agreement promptly and with considerably more than the required two-thirds majority of votes. Such an action is undoubtedly in the best interest of our country and I am sure that it will be enthusiastically approved by the vast majority of our fellow citizens.

Sincerely yours,
BRUNO ROSSI.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE,
Boston, Mass., July 8, 1963.
The Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have sent today to the President. I earnestly hope that President Kennedy will have your enthusiastic support in what seems to me to be the most pressing issue before us at the present time.

Very truly yours,
HOWARD H. HIATT, M.D.

JULY 8, 1963.
THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I cannot adequately express my exhilaration at the news of recent days that a test ban may really be in sight. Your willingness to educate and lead our people in an area where education and leadership are sorely needed is gratifying indeed. It does appear as though the Soviet Union may be receptive at this time, and I should like to express my gratitude at your willingness to take the initiative. We can only hope that the efforts of our negotiators in Moscow will be characterized by flexibility on our part as well as that of the Soviet Union, and that this may be the beginning of a meaningful program of disarmament.

Respectfully yours,
HOWARD H. HIATT, M.D.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Boston, Mass., July 3, 1963.
The Honorable EDWARD KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: In view of the coming negotiations for a possible nuclear test ban treaty, I should like to voice my opinion that such a treaty would be of utmost importance to us in that it would stop future fallout, the hazards of which, both biological and genetic, I am fully aware as a physiologist. Further, it would tend to lessen the pressures of a spiraling arms race, reduce the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and be the basis for possible future negotiations toward disarmament. I do not believe that a test ban agreement would in any way endanger American security. On the contrary I feel that continued testing would, by increasing the accumulation of nuclear weapons and by the entrance of other nations into the nuclear arms race, tremendously increase the chances of a nuclear holocaust.

Again, I should like to urge that all efforts be made toward a test ban agreement.

Sincerely,
ATTILIO CANZANELLI, M.D.,
Professor of Physiology.

PHYSICS RESEARCH DIVISION,
GEOPHYSICS CORPORATION OF AMERICA,
Bedford, Mass., August 5, 1963.
The Honorable THEODORE KENNEDY,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am very pleased that at last we have been able to negotiate a test ban agreement in some form. I believe it will be very helpful to our political image if the Senate can ratify this agreement by the largest possible majority.

As a professional physicist working primarily in defense problems for over 20 years, I believe that the abandonment of testing can avoid pollution of the atmosphere, without necessarily harming our defense effort in any way. This requires of course that research and development in all of these matters continue without testing, and that the morale be not permitted to deteriorate. In short, I have faith in the capacity of the Defense and State Departments to outmaneuver the Russians even though the rules of the game may be moving toward peace.

Yours very truly,
ROBERT O'B. CARPENTER,
Manager, Optical Physics Department.

P.S.—Of course I speak only as an individual.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF
MEDICINE, DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOLOGY AND EXPERIMENTAL
THERAPEUTICS,
Boston, Mass., August 1, 1963.
The Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am most pleased by the chain of events that have recently lead up to the test ban treaty; however, I am a little disturbed that there is a possibility that the Senate will not ratify this treaty.

I hope that you will support with enthusiasm ratification of this treaty.

Sincerely yours,
CONAN KORNETSKY, Ph. D.
Research Professor of Pharmacology and Psychiatry.

PETER BENT BRIGHAM HOSPITAL,
Boston, Mass., July 26, 1963.
Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am writing to express my enthusiastic support of the preliminary test ban negotiations and my hope that it will be ratified in the Senate. This seems the first original and imaginative step in foreign policy that this administration has taken.

Sincerely,
SANFORD GIFFORD, M.D.

THE WORCESTER FOUNDATION FOR
EXPERIMENTAL BIOLOGY,
Shrewsbury, Mass., August 8, 1963.
Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: On June 27 you kindly replied to a letter from me in regard to the hope that nuclear test ban negotiations could be continued. I am sure you plan to ratify the action that was taken by the President, but I am writing again in the hope that you will be able to use as much influence as you can to see that the bill receives the necessary two-thirds vote.

You needn't bother to acknowledge this letter.

Sincerely yours,
BRUCE CRAWFORD,
Business Manager.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in summary, the Senate must decide whether it is wise to continue to pile up weapons and counterweapons, each more powerful than the last in a cycle of technology which has no end. Ten years ago we were told that the ICBM was the ultimate weapon. Now we hear about the antiballistic missile. Modern technology being what it is, there is no ultimate weapon, and each advance increases both the risk of war and its destruction.

Should we not instead choose the other course—starting now to strive, cautiously and patiently, to come to agreement by which nuclear arms can be controlled. We have a chance now to take the first step that we have been hoping for for 6 years. A limited test ban is better than an all-out arms race, and the time to make the choice is now.

Mr. President, 85 nations have signed this agreement to date. Once before in our history an international agreement was made, designed to preserve the peace. Nation after nation joined in, but the United States, whose President had labored so hard to create the agreement, stayed aloof by action of the Senate. Had the United States joined the League of Nations 44 years ago, a war which took 60 million lives might have been avoided.

Let history be our teacher and the cherishment of the people our guide, and I am sure this small but historic treaty will receive the endorsement it deserves from the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take the time, on the first day of debate on the test ban treaty, to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for the speeches they have made today. They have all made a distinct contribution to a better understanding of this most important treaty, about which there is wide disagreement, and about which much more will be said in the days ahead.

I believe also that the questions raised on the floor by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the able Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and other Senators, have all helped to bring about some clearing of the skies, so to speak, some breakthrough on the moot points with respect to the treaty now before us.

While I am disappointed that there will be amendments, understandings, and reservations offered to the treaty, nevertheless I respect the right of any Senator to offer such motions. I think they are a sign of deep concern. They should be heard and considered most seriously by the Senate. I look upon Senators who offer these particular motions as men of responsibility, who are deeply troubled by the problems which confront them in their consideration of the treaty, just as those of us are who favor the treaty. By that I mean, of course, that in this day and age nothing is certain, everything changes, and the problems and complexities of the world which confront us today create situations which our minds find hard to grasp and our intellects not sufficiently strong enough to grapple with them.

I am delighted with the progress of the debate today. I hope we shall be able to continue on a similar or even stronger level in the days ahead. As stated previously, there will be no attempt to rush the debate; but I would hope that any Senator who wishes to speak on this most vital subject will not take that statement as a means by which to dilly and dally and let things slide, but will make his speech as soon as possible, so that the treaty can be cleared as thoroughly as possible.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEEDED: A "DO SOMETHING" CONGRESS

As in legislative session,

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine in yesterday's edition contains a most interesting article entitled "To Make It a 'Do Something' Congress." The byline reads:

> As operated now, Congress blocks more laws than it passes and trivia rather than substance dominates debate, says an observer, who offers some suggestions for improvement.

The observer is Sam Zagoria, assistant to Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey. As we all know, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey has been most active in the area of congressional reform. He and I have cosponsored resolutions which we have separately introduced. My resolution is intended to create a joint congressional committee to investigate and report to the Senate and House of Representatives ways and means of rendering Congress a more effective legislative body.

Senator CASE proposes in his resolution a joint commission which would have certain outside members.

I am happy to say that the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has reported favorably to the full committee my proposal for a joint committee. Unfortunately, however, the subcommittee has excluded from the coverage of the proposed joint committee a consideration of the rules of either the House or the Senate, and this exclusion would seem practically to tear the heart out of the validity of the proposal. However, I have not abandoned hope that perhaps in the full committee, or even on the floor of the Senate, the integrity of the original resolution may be restored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article written by Mr. Zagoria. I commend it to all Senators as an able, carefully reasoned argument in support of that congressional reform which I believe to be essential to the proper functioning of Congress in the years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 8, 1963]

TO MAKE IT A DO-SOMETHING CONGRESS—AS OPERATED NOW, CONGRESS BLOCKS MORE LAWS THAN IT PASSES AND TRIVIA RATHER THAN SUBSTANCE DOMINATES DEBATE, SAYS AN OBSERVER, WHO OFFERS SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

(By Sam Zagoria)

(Sam Zagoria, a former Washington reporter and Nieman Fellow, is now administrative assistant to Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey.)

WASHINGTON.—As the 88th Congress toiled past Labor Day, go-home day of other years, Capitol Hill observers wondered why Congress is convening longer and accomplishing less. Press comments on its performance were filled with such phrases as "legislative meandering," "massive logjam of legislation," "greatest do-nothing Congress in a generation."

Technically, the 88th was supposed to close shop and head homeward on July 31—the adjournment date set by the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946—but by that date only three major bills had been enacted into law, a record more appropriate for the Washington Senators baseball team. In fact, in the boxscore of the Congressional Quarterly, an independent, experienced appraiser, at the end of the 88th's first 7 months, more than a third—38 percent—of the President's legislative proposals had received no action at all in either the House or the Senate.

But while leaders of the 88th banter cheerily on the likelihood of a Thanksgiving or Christmas adjournment, none feels the need to explain the delay in getting down to business or why so little business has been actually transacted. True, Congress is now occupied with the test ban treaty and civil rights, but behind them is a backlog of long-waiting legislation.

Why has this Congress accomplished so little? Let us join some of the millions of tourists from the 50 States and many foreign nations who each year ascend majestic Capitol Hill to watch Congress conduct the legislative business of the Nation. Most visitors, particularly those from abroad, approach a session of Congress, acclaimed one of the greatest legislative bodies in the history of the world, with awe and respect.

And what do they see?

If they came this summer there was a good chance that they would see chambers empty of all save fellow tourists. The House and the Senate were frequently out of session. This lackadaisical pace was hard to understand when, according to its own timetable, Congress should have been nearing a climax.

But, assuming our tourists are lucky and Congress is in session, then what do our guests see?

On the floor of the Senate is a handful of Senators and aids. A brief discussion of the bill at hand is interrupted by discourses on subjects about as close to each other as the North and South Poles. A discussion of civil rights disorders, the threat of a nationwide strike or the nuclear test ban treaty can be put on the shelf while a discussion of the future of the boiled peanut ensues. "Do the Senate rules permit such illogical conduct?" an astonished observer wonders. The answer is an unconditional "Yes."

On the floor of the House there may be discussion of prospects for action on a tax cut or tax reform bill or both. "But if this is brought to the floor under a closed rule, no amendments will be possible," points out one legislator. The observer in the gallery is puzzled. A closed rule means that the House Rules Committee has ordered that no changes can be made in the bill on the floor; only a vote on the entire measure is possible. But if each Congressman has equal power in the House and the duty to perfect and improve legislation, how can he do his job properly under a closed rule? That is a question which the Rules Committee has been successfully sidestepping since before most of us gave up playing hide-and-seek (a game incidentally not unknown to the chairman of this committee when distasteful legislation comes up).

But we have been talking only about discussion of important legislation—action is another subject altogether. Congressional sessions in recent years have shown some similarity to a Greek tragedy. First comes the triumphal heroic call to arms in the President's state of the Union message. We must, we can, we will, he trumpets to the Nation. The chorus is lifted—there will be help for education, a cure for unemployment, a remedy for rights denied, peace, prosperity, and purpose. The backup messages and draft bills flow in mighty rhetoric from the White House up Pennsylvania Avenue to the lofty Capitol. Once there, the message is conscientiously published in the anesthetizing type of the Congressional Record. Read in this document hardly anything seems urgent or exciting, but the public still thinks progress is being made.

Then the curtain falls—a silence as complete as if the messages had been sent to Siberia instead. Committees meet or do not meet; they take up legislation or do not take up legislation—all as the chairman decides. They convene hearings whose subject, length, and even witnesses are decided on largely as the chairman ordains. The urgent matters that the President of the United States, elected by voters of the whole Nation, cited for action are not assured of even a hearing much less a vote. Instead Congress rattles on, debating boiled peanuts, kite flying in Washington, and a potpourri of minor bills while the fires of civil rights burn on, the hunger for higher education gnaws, and time intensifies other needs.

The Greek chorus mourns, amending "Never on Sunday" to include most of the week.

The heart of the problem is the rules and procedures of Congress, many unchanged since the formation of Congress.

As the rules stand, they set up no procedure for the scheduling of legislation or for assuring a President of consideration for his legislative proposals. Nor has the congressional leadership drawn up a timetable of its own, partly because committee chairmen are unwilling to have a time limit put on their efforts. Without committee action, the leadership has nothing to put before the full House or Senate.

There is not even a firm requirement that the committees meet at all. They decide for themselves whether to meet at stated intervals or at the call of the chairman; but even a regularly scheduled meeting can be put over by the chairman. Some committees, such as Senate Judiciary, have on occasion not held meetings for months—as when Senator Eastland, the chairman, saw a civil rights bill in the offing.

When a measure finally gets out of committee and onto the floor, there is still no guarantee of quick action. The full House and Senate meet at the discretion of the leadership. They have to meet at least every 3 days, but this can be a formality. Members of both Chambers are supposed to be available for all sessions except when they have been granted a leave of absence, but this is not enforced. As a practical matter, the House rarely schedules a controversial or important measure on days other than Tuesday through Thursday; otherwise there might not be enough Members on hand for the leaders to raise a quorum or mobilize votes for a party's position.

There are yet other ways by which legislation is delayed or diluted. The Senate's rule of unlimited debate makes possible the filibuster to talk a bill to death; while the House has a rule of germaneness, requiring that talk be to the point of the pending matter, the Senate does not. A tabling motion—to put an amendment or a bill aside—can, in effect, kill a measure without its substance ever coming to a vote. An unrelated "rider"—an amendment having nothing to do with a bill's main purpose—can be used to weaken or bury it.

Partly because of these rules and procedures, the role of Congress in the Federal Government has been slowly changing. Our forefather's conception of a system of active government braked by a structure of checks and balances has been eroding into an unbalanced arrangement where the executive and judicial branches are the activists and the legislative branch only slows action.

This is not to argue that a President's legislative program—any President's—should be enacted from apple subsidies to zeppelin construction; but it is to say that the present method of helter-skelter legislating, with no rhyme nor rationale to the scheduling other than the whim of committee chairmen, is not an effective way to carry out the Nation's business.

What can be done about this? Congress could authorize a commission to study its rules and procedures and make recommendations for improvement. This is how we were able to achieve limited, but significant, progress on modernization and streamlining almost two decades ago. Legislation has been introduced by Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, and several colleagues for appointment of a commission, consisting of Members of Congress and outside experts, to make such a study. His view is that the workings of Congress should not be considered the exclusive preserve of its present Members, and that the public at large has a substantial stake and much objectivity in appraising the rules.

A similar bill, but one limiting the commission to Members of Congress, has been introduced by Democratic Senator Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania, and several House and Senate colleagues. His view is that Members of Congress are more likely to approve a commission limited to colleagues in the manner of the 1946 reform. Case and Clark have each sponsored the other's bill, recognizing that they will be lucky to achieve either this year.

A Senate Rules Subcommittee has now merged the two bills into one providing for a joint commission consisting of 6 Members of the Senate and 6 from the House to study 10 problem areas and additional topics aimed at improving the organization and operation of Congress. The next step is for the full Senate Rules Committee to take up this and three related resolutions.

One item high on the list of the Case-Clark proposals is a review of congressional scheduling. Perhaps there should be a leadership timetable for committee hearings and floor action requiring that some major problems be taken up before the summer wanes. Other ideas are for committees to meet on certain days of the week and the full House and Senate on other specified days; this would break the pattern of Tuesday-to-Thursday weeks and foil those Members who put outside activities, such as law practice, ahead of legislative duties. A program followed in some State legislatures for 2-year sessions, with the first year devoted to appropriations bills and the second to legislative bills, has also been urged.

A second high-priority item is a way to assure a President of consideration of his legislative program. As the Chief Executive and as a truly national officeholder, in contrast to representatives of districts and States, his view of the Nation's needs is entitled to a vote, up or down; yet year after year Presidents have been denied this.

Surely, determined and intelligent men could formulate a plan by which Presidential recommendations could be brought to a vote within a reasonable period. One simple way would be to provide that any major Presidential proposal be automatically reported to the floor within 60 days, if the committee with appropriate jurisdiction has not acted, then let the bill be debated on the floor instead of in committee. If this happened a few times, committee chairmen would probably tend to hasten action on remaining Presidential measures.

But logical as congressional reform is, the outlook for its enactment is decidedly dim. One reason is that there is no effective pressure or organization behind it, other than the American Political Science Association, a group given more to discussion than marches on Washington. Other causes have their backers, but congressional reform, while it has an enormous potential effect on such causes, has not attracted similar strength.

Then there is the built-in problem that congressional reform requires the help of some of the very people whose tremendous powers it seeks to reduce. It is somewhat like the problem faced by those seeking fair representation in State legislatures: Action was up to State legislators who enjoyed the fruits of unfair representation. Some Members of Congress who privately would agree on the need for congressional reorganization find it wiser not to "get out front" in this cause—why antagonize a powerful committee chairman?

It is ironic that many of these venerable gentlemen bow reverently to businessmen as models of efficiency, but see no need to adopt the businessman's practice of periodic reviews of procedures. What's good for business, they seem to feel, may not necessarily be good for Congress.

One big question in the future of congressional reform is the role of the President. He declined to take part in the Senate fight to change rule XXII—the filibuster rule—on the ground that this was the Senate's own business, but he did take an active part in the House fight to expand the membership of the House Rules Committee. If his program continues to founder in the hands of unfriendly committee chairmen, he may find it necessary to nudge along congressional reform, whether he wishes to or not.

Congressmen generally are, for the most part, overworked (in nonlegislative ways) and underpaid (by the standards of comparable industrial responsibilities and uncertainties of tenure). But these conditions will grow worse unless action is taken to regain the prestige and respect which Congress should receive. As long as constituents read press reports of Congressmen being in recess or discussing trivia, they will feel free to seek them out for endless ceremonial and menial chores.

As now operated, Congress is an effective instrument for those who want to block change—or progress. Its involved and power-centered procedures make things easy for the lobbyist seeking to retain favors already granted and for the legislator who does not want to take a position on legislation.

These are the people who win through congressional rules and procedures belonging to the era of candlelight and goose quills. Who loses? Those who believe in an effective, democratic, and dynamic Federal Government.

POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as in legislative session, Senators may recall that from time to time I have been placing in the RECORD and also commenting upon articles, columns, statements, speeches, and the like, dealing with the critical problem of population control. It has been my hope that by taking this action from time to time, I could induce other Senators to recognize the seriousness of the population problem and to give more serious thought to methods for its solution. The question will become quite pertinent when the foreign aid bill reaches the floor of the Senate. At that time, I shall have something further to say on the problem in support of an amendment offered in the Committee on Foreign Relations by the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and adopted without dissent, which would encourage the dissemination of information to countries that receive our foreign aid, and which desire such information, to enable them to take an adequate census of their population growth and to have access to information which would make programs of population control available.

This afternoon, I should like to offer for the RECORD a policy statement made by the Governing Council of the American Public Health Association, at its 87th annual meeting, held in Atlantic City, N.J., October 21, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the policy statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT—THE POPULATION PROBLEM

There is today an increase of population which threatens the health and well-being of many millions of people. In many areas of the world substantial population increase means malnutrition and outright starvation. In other areas it may mean increased stress in family life, reduction of educational opportunity, and the retardation of the industrial development on which a nation's rising standard of living depends. No problem—whether it be housing, education, food supply, recreation, communication, medical care—can be effectively solved today if tomorrow's population increases out of proportion to the resources available to meet those problems.

The patterns of family life directly affect human health and individual capacities. Serious public health problems are posed when family size impairs ability to sustain a healthful way of life, when childbearing may affect adversely the health of the mother and her offspring, when the cultural and spiritual aspirations of the family are frustrated by sterility.

The interplay of the biological, ecologic, cultural, and economic factors that operate to produce population change is not adequately understood. Especially lacking is scientific knowledge concerning human fertility. However, the healthful effects of family planning and spacing of births has been recognized by leaders of all major religious groups, as well as by leaders in medicine, welfare, and public affairs. Several methods are now available for the regulation of conception, one or another of which may be selected as medically appropriate, as economically feasible, or as consistent with the creed and mores of the family concerned.

The public health profession has long taken leadership in defeating disease, disability, and death. It must now assume equal leadership in understanding public health implications of population imbalance and in taking appropriate action.

The American Public Health Association retaining cognizance of the principle of religious freedom by all religious groups as expressed, for example, in the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States, believes therefore that:

1. Public health organizations at all levels of government should give increased attention to the impact of population change on health.

2. Scientific research should be greatly expanded on (a) all aspects of human fertility; and (2) the interplay of biological, psychological, and socioeconomic factors influencing population change.

3. Public and private programs concerned with population growth and family size should be integral parts of the health program and should include medical advice and services which are acceptable to the individuals concerned.

4. Full freedom should be extended to all population groups for the selection and use of such methods for the regulation of family size as are consistent with the creed and mores of the individuals concerned.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it will be noted that the American Public Health Association has gone on record on four principal subjects:

First. Public health organizations at all levels of government should give increased attention to the impact of population change on health.

Second. Scientific research in this area should be greatly expanded.

Third. Public and private programs concerned with population growth and family size should be integral parts of the health program and should include medical advice and services which are acceptable to the individuals concerned.

Fourth. Full freedom should be extended to all population groups for the selection and use of such methods for the regulation of family size as are consistent with the creed and mores of the individuals concerned.

Mr. President, on the same subject I have received a letter from James Creese, president of Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, to whom I sent a copy of the original speech I made on the floor of the Senate on the subject of population control, perhaps a month ago. Mr. Creese, a trained engineer and president of an outstanding institute of engineering and technology, has devised a quotient which I think has much merit in this regard. The quotient is as follows:

$$SL=\frac{N+T}{P}$$

In this quotient, SL represents the Standard of Living.

N is the productivity of nature.

T is the increment due to technology.

P represents population.

The gravamen of the quotient is that population expansion is a restrictive factor on the increase of the standard of living, where it must be divided into N, the productivity of nature, plus T, the increment due to technology.

I suggest that we might ponder the effectiveness of this quotient in our thinking on this subject.

Mr. President, finally, that extremely able, charming, and attractive woman, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce has written an article entitled "World Hordes Could Overwhelm United States if It Adopts Unilateral Birth Control" which was syndicated by the North American Newspaper Alliance, and published in yesterday's Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin.

Because I believe it important that all aspects of the population problem should be called to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the article, with which I find myself in rather profound disagreement, may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Sept. 8, 1963]

WORLD HORDES COULD OVERWHELM UNITED STATES IF IT ADOPTS UNILATERAL BIRTH CONTROL

(Should the Government encourage Americans to limit the size of their families, as many social scientists urge? No, writes Clare Boothe Luce, the former Congresswoman, Ambassador, authoress, and playwright. Though a Catholic, Mrs. Luce does not argue against birth control from the traditional Catholic Church point of view. Instead, in the following article, she says it would be bad from the standpoint of national security.)

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

NEW YORK, September 7.—Most Americans are aware that the world is facing a novel problem called the "population explosion," and that it has created a heated controversy over the question of birth control.

What all too few persons understand is why the problem has overnight become so urgent.

To illustrate what is bothering the demographers and population experts, let us take the birth statistics in the immediate family of President Kennedy and then make some very arbitrary "population projections" from them. All these are based on the supposition that there will be no atomic war before the end of the next century.

Joseph Patrick and Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy produced 9 children, 6 of whom are married and have so far given their parents 21 grandchildren. The President has two children; Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has eight; Senator Edward (Ted) Kennedy has two; Eunice Kennedy Shriver has three; Patricia Kennedy Lawford has four; and Jean Kennedy Smith has two.

Three of these families are, today, the average sized American family—two children. But all the Kennedy daughters and daughters-in-law are still young, and statistics show that children tend to repeat the fertility patterns established by their parents and approved, encouraged, or ordered by their religions.

MILLIONS OF KENNEDYS

If Senator KENNEDY's wife and his sister Jean should follow their parental and religious pattern and have, say 4 more children each, and if Eunice Shriver should have 1 more, the Joseph Kennedy's grandchildren would total 30.

Now, if each of these 30 children should maintain the fertility rate of his own respective Kennedy parent, and if their children should do likewise, when the last of the fifth-generation Kennedys was born 1,080 children could call Joseph Kennedy their great-great-grandfather. Of this number, 512 would be the great-grandchildren of Bobby; 8 would be the great-grandchildren of the President; Eunice would have 64 great-grandchildren; and Jean and Ted would each have 216.

And should these 1,080 great-great-grandchildren of Joseph and Rose Kennedy then persist at the same reproduction rate for 5 more generations, there would then be on earth 256 direct descendants of the President; 65,536 descendants each of Eunice and Patricia; and 1,679,616 each of Ted and Jean. And Bobby, by then, would have 16,777,216 direct descendants, thus making the illustrious Joseph Patrick Kennedy the ancestor of 20,267,777 children born in the 22d century.

Now suppose just 100 American contemporaries of Joseph Kennedy have thus far repeated the present Kennedy fertility pattern, and suppose these descendants would also follow this projected Kennedy pattern. These 101 Americans born at the end of the last century would be the ancestors of a total of 2,047,045,377 children by the middle of the next one. But only 2,816 of this tremendous number would be the direct descendants of their 9 John Kennedy ancestors who had maintained consistently a 2-child birth rate.

CONSISTENT BIRTH RATES

Plainly, these projected figures are totally unrealistic, as applied to 1 family, or 101 separate families, especially since they make no allowance for the normal death rate or intermarriage.

However, they do illustrate the staggering numerical difference which shows up between a consistently maintained birth rate of two children per family, as in the President Kennedy projection, and a consistently maintained birth rate based on large families of four, six or eight.

At this point, lest any one think that these projections are made to suggest that only Catholics are likely to account for a soaring American birth rate, let us take the case of a famous contemporary—and employer—of Joseph Kennedy; namely, former President Franklin Roosevelt.

Today, there are 5 living Roosevelt children, 19 grandchildren and 15 great-grandchildren. Assuming that each of Roosevelt's 19 grandchildren, their children and grandchildren should repeat Franklin and Eleanor's fertility rate, he would have 475 great-great-grandchildren, or nearly half as many as Joseph Kennedy. Indeed, if the 21 Kennedy grandchildren should limit their rate to 4 for 2 generations, the F. D. Roosevelt's fifth generation would then outnumber Kennedy's by 137.

The present population of the United States (fourth largest in the world) is now nearing 200 million. It is estimated that at the present rate of increase (1.63 percent per year), by the time Robert Kennedy's youngest child, Christopher, is 37 years old, the U.S. population will be about 344 million; and if Christopher lives to reach his grandfather's age it will be 656 million. (The new influx of immigrants with high family or religious patterns being considered today by Congress could send these figures quickly soaring to a billion.)

PROSPECT: DISASTER

The enormity of the school, traffic, housing, food, clothing, and unemployment problems which will confront the Kennedy's 21 grandchildren and Roosevelt's 15 great-grandchildren, and all their contemporaries, as they reach maturity, simply defies the imagination.

For example, if the present unemployment rate persists through the turn of the century, about 15 million people will be out of work. And if the rates of juvenile delinquency, murder and other crimes, suicide, divorce, alcoholism, insanity and illegitimacy remain at today's figures (although with the swelling of the hordes of unemployed, they will undoubtedly increase), these ugly aspects of society will seem to dominate the public scene by the sheer force of their swollen numbers.

Meanwhile, the pressures of the population explosion proceeding elsewhere on the globe will be cruelly—indeed disastrously—felt in all our political and economic dealings with our world neighbors. Today Americans represent one-sixteenth of the world's estimated 3 billion. But by the end of the century, there will be 7 billion people in the world. The United States will then represent only one-twentieth of the world population. Asia alone will account for 4.25 billion, and the Negro population of Africa will be double that of the population of America.

Plainly the domestic, political and economic dislocations which this projected spurt would create in these lands, would be far more severe than in our own.

One thing, however, can be said with reasonable certainty:

Within the next two decades either the world birth rate must be artifically brought down to the level of the death rate, or mankind will crash on the Malthusian reefs. And then those old-fashioned biological regulators—war, faminine and pestilence—will once more go into operation in order to solve the problem which we seem today unwilling or unable to solve by other methods.

Unhappily, mere public recognition of the urgent necessity for birth control will not solve the problem. At best, it permits governments, religious leaders and individuals to discuss rationally what methods can be applied which are both moral and efficient.

In passing, the U.S. Roman Catholic Church has—in approving the rhythm method—in effect, accepted the principle of voluntary birth control by natural or moral methods.

CONTROL GUARANTEED

Leaving aside the theological controversy over what methods are natural or unnatural let us assume—for the sake of argument—that all governments and all religions were soon to agree that the dissemination of birth control information, the manufacture, sale or use of safe contraceptive methods should be considered both moral and legal. Would this guarantee that all the world's couples would immediately avail themselves of them, and thereafter limit their offspring to two—the number which demographers today say will alone stabilize national populations? We know they would not.

Surveys have shown that the average American Jewish family wants two children, the average Protestant family wants three and the average Catholic couple feel that four is just about the right number. Curiously enough, such are the processes of democracy, that today, in America, the average Jewish, Protestant and Catholic family is two, three and four respectively.

The majority of Americans today are not having more children than they really want or can afford. (On an economic basis, the six Joseph Kennedy children can afford easily to send their 21 children to college. And Franklin Delano Roosevelt's 39 living progeny are all living most comfortably).

What, then, do the American proponents of birth control suggest should be done to prevent couples who want large families, such as these, and who can afford them, from having them? What laws do they propose that Congress would pass which, for example, could force the 40 living grandchildren of Joseph Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt to limit their future families to 2 children each? In other words, how can non-Catholics be made to take their pills, and Catholics to follow the rhythm method if they feel disinclined to do so?

DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS

And, assuming that cheap pills are the most effective method, how can billions of them be distributed, and gotten down the throats of a billion Asians and Africans, living in millions of rural villages, in time to prevent them from becoming 2 billion in the next two decades?

Above all, what argument can be used on couples in lands where there are no old-age pensions, social security, or old people's homes, which will persuade them to limit the number of their sons who, today as yesterday, are their only support in old age?

Is it, then, really prudent for this Nation to practice rigorous birth control until the Asiatics, the Africans, and the Arabic peoples begin to do likewise? Even in the terms of the ideological conflict, can the United States afford birth control until Soviet Russia and the other Communist countries also begin to practice it?

Let us assume that the United States in the next decade, did manage to stabilize its population at, say, 300 million, as the result of stringent (and compulsory) birth control and antimigration laws. If, at the same time, the rest of the world went merrily along at its present fantastic rate of increase, how, in the year 2000—only 37 years away—would our 300 million people be able to fight or feed, aid or ignore the 6.65 billion other peoples of the earth? For these would be living back to back, most of them in a half-starved condition.

LEBENSRAUM NEEDED

Even if 300 million Americans were willing to submit to increased taxation for increased foreign aid, in order to provide them with food, raw materials, and capital, would this satisfy them? For their most crushing and urgent need today is lebensraum, living room, land space.

Where, then, would this seem to exist except in underpopulated America? Would these starving and bottled up hordes not then find some way to invade America? Would not unilateral birth control be as dangerous to the security of the United States as unilateral disarmament?

There are the uncomfortable questions which the American proponents of birth control and planned parenthood for Americans are not asking, and then they are asked, have no answers for.

The best minds in government, in religion, in science, in economics, must soon get busy answering them, or tomorrow, as yesterday, the answers will be given by the four horsemen of the apocalypse, one of whom, War, will be an appallingly atomic character.

In which case, the problem for the surviving White House progeny—and all our progeny—will be the problem of too few on the earth rather than too many. And of these few, by far the fewest would be Americans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my reasons for not concurring with Mrs. Luce's views can be very simply stated. She takes off from the proposition that the Kennedy family and the family of Franklin Roosevelt are reproducing themselves at a rate which, if not curtailed, and if expanded to all other families in the country, would result in so enormous a growth in the population of the United States as to be something which should frighten even small children.

She suggests that, nevertheless, there is no way, and indeed no right, to persuade these two eminent families to decrease their activities. She asks what the advocates of population control plan to do about it, and what kind of laws they favor to bring this matter under control.

She makes an extremely witty and most interesting approach to a controversial subject; but I suggest that no one who takes seriously the problem of population control would have the slightest interest in attempting to dissuade, or indeed to prevent, well-to-do and wealthy families from having as many children as they wish.

The burden of the population-control problem rests, not with the well-to-do, but with the poverty stricken; not with the well-housed, the well-fed and the well-treated, but with those in misery, those with whom hunger prevails, those for whom educational opportunity is nonexistent, those who find the constant increase of population carrying down their standard of living.

In our country, as well as in lands overseas, there are areas of that sort, families of that sort, and racial groups of that sort. So I do not believe we contribute much to a careful analysis of the problem by ignoring the areas in which the problem really exists.

In fact, I suggest that Mrs. Luce has erected a strawman, and then has proceeded to knock it down, rather than to come to grips with the real problem. Mrs. Luce has suggested that the majority of American families do not want fewer children than the number they have. With this, I agree. But it seems to me this point is irrelevant to any serious discussion of the population problem.

The question is whether families which do not have the necessary information to enable them to have no more children than the number they wish are being deprived of essential individual freedom. I suggest that they are. As I said before, if we look around the world, we find that hunger is the best argument against having families larger than people wish; and knowledge is the way by which that situation can be remedied.

Mrs. Luce also said she does not think we should take any steps to decrease our own rate of population growth, although as I pointed out earlier, it is a severe drag on the rate of growth of our economy. She says if our population does not continue to increase at a high rate, our national security will be adversely affected, because the hordes of people in the underdeveloped countries which are reproducing at a greater rate than we are will eventually descend upon us in an invasion, and that unless we increase our population, we are sure to be overwhelmed.

Mr. President, in the light of our military posture, I suggest that the argument is naive and perhaps misses the point.

In conclusion, I suggest we give careful attention to the whole problem of population growth; that we need far more scientific research than we are presently getting; that we need to give careful thought to whether, when we pour tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars into foreign aid, it goes only to increase the capacity of those countries to further increase their populations, and thus in the end to dilute their standard of living, so that the end result of the aid will be, not to improve their condition, but only to some extent to impoverish the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, I support full and free Senate debate on this subject. I hope it will spread to the House of Representatives. This subject is dealt with almost every day on the front pages of our metropolitan newspapers.

As Stewart Chase said earlier this year, three critical problems confront America today: Bombs, babies, and bulldozers. In the course of the current debate, we are giving ample attention to bombs. I do hope that, in due course, we shall turn our attention to the question of bulldozers, which has to do with the survival of American cities and the provision of adequate shelter, adequate transportation, and adequate cultural advantages for the people in our great urban areas.

But as we proceed in our constitutional way to concern ourselves with the overridingly important problems of this constantly changing and increasingly complex world, let us not neglect the question of babies.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. Proxmire, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

PRESIDENT'S EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT OF JOHN GRONOUSKI AS POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just sent a telegram congratulating President Kennedy, and the letterwriters and postal workers of America, on getting a topflight administrator and an intelligent, realistic Postmaster General who will do a great job.

The President earlier today announced the appointment of John Gronouski, of Madison, Wis., as the new Postmaster General.

The new Postmaster General has made an excellent record in Wisconsin. He has a fine background in economics, government, and public administration.

John Gronouski is a personal friend of mine. I have watched his career with admiration for a number of years. He was born in Wisconsin and has earned three degrees: a bachelor's, master's, and Ph. D., at the University of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that John Gronouski will be the only Ph. D. in the Cabinet. So his presence will add an intellectual flavor to the excellent pragmatic Cabinet of President Kennedy.

He taught public finance and money and banking at the University of Maine; and public, State, and local finance and money and banking at Wayne State University, in Detroit, Mich.

In 1959 he was appointed Wisconsin Tax Commissioner by the then Gov. Gaylord Nelson, who is our present colleague in the Senate.

In this capacity John Gronouski headed one of the largest and certainly one of the most difficult and controversial departments of Wisconsin government.

Mr. President, if there is any one most exacting and critical problem of State government today, it is the problem of taxes: how to raise State funds.

And nowhere is this problem more difficult than in States which suffer a divided State governmental power with a Democratic Governor, for example, and a Republican legislature. This is exactly the situation that has consistently confronted Wisconsin since John Gronouski has been tax commissioner.

John Gronouski served in the eye of the hurricane as tax commissioner under both Gov. Gaylord Nelson and the present Governor of Wisconsin, John Reynolds. Twice he did a remarkable job—when it seemed that compromising conflicting partisan views would be impossible and the State's services would have to suffer the grim consequences.

Gronouski came up with acceptable compromises that have worked.

I am delighted that John Gronouski will serve in the President's Cabinet. His advice on thorny economic matters will be valuable to the President in many fields.

Gronouski is a particulary good appointment for two technical reasons: The Post Office has massive property valuation problems. It operates 41,000 post offices, stations, and branches. The new Postmaster General is a top expert in this area.

And, of course, the Postal Service with an annual budget of $5 billion needs topflight fiscal guidance. Fiscal policy is a strong Gronouski forte.

Mr. President, Mr. Gronouski is an excellent economist with a fine record at the University of Wisconsin. We are very proud of the fact that we have one of the finest economics faculties in the country.

AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

As in legislative session,

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report issue of September 16 contains a well-balanced and thoughtful article on Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. Headlined "Billions in U.S. Aid—And Tito Wants to 'Bury Capitalism' ", the text of the article is not as onesided as the headline would imply. For example, the article makes these points: First, Tito remains a Communist who votes and sides with Russia against the United States.

Second, Tito's communism uses Western style incentives and offers freedoms to its people which are unknown in Russia.

Third, Tito shows no sign of turning back to take orders from Moscow on how to run Yugoslavia.

Fourth, on the contrary, Tito needs Khrushchev less than Russia needs Tito. Now that China's "Communist reactionaries" are anti-Khrushchev, he needs Tito's Communist "liberals."

Mr. President, the fact is that once again we will be asked this coming year to vote funds for Yugoslavia in our foreign aid program. I strongly opposed aid to Yugoslavia in the past. I do so again. I think it should be made clear to all Senators that opposing foreign aid to Yugoslavia does not necessarily mean that a Senator is opposed to most-favored-nation treatment of Yugoslavia. We might have equitable trade relations with Yugoslavia, but that does not mean that the American taxpayer should be forced to give, as he has in the past, hard-earned $2½ billion to this Communist dictator.

There are certainly elements of difference between Tito on the one hand and Khrushchev on the other. Tito is at the other Communist extreme from the Mao Red Chinese militancy. Nevertheless, as a Communist, he is opposed to the United States and our anti-Communist drive and he makes no bones about it. He is opposed to freedom in our sense certainly, and while the freedom may be greater in some respects in Yugoslavia than it is in Russia, it is far, far less than it should be.

The fact is that Tito has jailed political prisoners. The fact is that Tito has deprived both his farmers and his factory artisans of much of the freedom and liberty they have had in the past. Djilas, a former top official in Yugoslavia, was jailed by Tito, why? His only crime, really, has been criticism of Khrushchev and criticism of Tito. In the past, unfortunately, the debate on both sides of this issue in the press and in the Senate has, it seems to me, been too little concerned with the full nature and extent of Tito's communism. We should recognize and concede that there are elements of difference, and perhaps elements of freedom in Yugoslavia. At the same time we should ask ourselves whether we should continue a foreign aid program to a Communist who is a dictator and who obviously is not on our side, merely because there are some differences between him and Khrushchev, especially when that dictator announces that he now supports Khrushchev on every major issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in U.S. News & World Report and the statistics in the accompanying table which sets forth the amount we have given to Yugoslavia throughout the years, totaling, as I have said, $2.5 billion, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Sept. 16, 1963]

BILLIONS IN U.S. AID—AND TITO WANTS TO BURY CAPITALISM

(After Khrushchev's visit to Yugoslavia: Has Tito moved closer to the Kremlin? Has $2.5 billion of U.S. aid gone down the drain? Here is an appraisal of the results of the meeting of the two Communist bosses. Alex Kucherov, of the international staff of U.S. News & World Report, was on the scene.)

BELGRADE.—To an American traveling through Yugoslavia with Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union and his host, President Josip Broz Tito, these questions occur:

Has U.S. investment of $2.5 billion in aid to Communist Yugoslavia really been worthwhile? What is the point of continued aid to a Communist country whose leader like Khrushchev, says to Americans, "We will bury you"?

Khrushchev and Tito have said that "this burying business"—as Tito put it—"is simply a matter of historical process." But the fact remains that U.S. aid is going to a Communist nation.

To a person watching the two Communists as they look around at Yugoslavia's unique "independent communism," these points become clear:

Tito remains a Communist who votes and sides with Russia against the United States.

Tito's communism uses Western-style incentives and offers freedoms to its people which are unknown in Russia.

Tito shows no sign of turning back to take orders from Moscow on how to run Yugoslavia. On the contrary.

Tito needs Khrushchev less than the Russian needs Tito. Now that China's "Communist reactionaries" are anti-Khrushchev, he needs Tito's "Communist liberals."

SIGNS OF NO RETURN

All in all, there is no sign that Tito, as a result of the Khrushchev visit, will cut away from the United States and the West, and return to communism, Moscow style.

There are, on the contrary, many signs that Khrushchev and Soviet satellite leaders in Eastern Europe are considering very seriously the idea of turning more and more toward "Communist liberalism"—Tito style.

It was apparent to all outsiders, Russians and Westerners, who followed Khrushchev and Tito on their tour over the past 2 weeks, that Yugoslavia is far and away the most prosperous of the Communist countries.

Industrial growth rate in Yugoslavia has averaged 8.5 percent a year since 1956—a rate of progress no other Communist country can match.

Food is more plentiful here than in any other country of the Soviet bloc. The housing shortage is severe, but not nearly as bad as in Moscow. Modern apartment buildings up to 13 stories high are rising everywhere. Yugoslavia has landlords, capitalist style. And some Yugoslavs own their own homes.

Clothing, expensive by Western standards when matched against Yugoslav wages, is adequate; most people you see on the streets of Yugoslavia's cities and towns appear quite well dressed, far better than in most other Communist countries.

COMPETITION—STATE STYLE

As in the Soviet Union, industry in Communist Yugoslavia is in the hands of the Government. Contrary to the Russian system, however, there is keen and open competition between the state-owned factories for markets—competition in which management, workers, and employees of successful factories all stand to make personal profits.

In Yugoslavia, Khrushchev found that all efforts to collectivize agriculture had been abandoned. At least 85 percent of the arable land is in the hands of individual peasants. These holdings are limited to 25 acres. And it did not escape Khrushchev's attention that, compared to the situation in Russia, where the farm problem is Khrushchev's major worry, Yugoslavia's "free" farm policy is a relative success.

Much of all this Yugoslav prosperity is due to aid from the United States and trade with the West.

Boom days of U.S. aid are about over.

Military aid, begun in 1952 to enable Tito to stand up to Soviet military threats in Stalin's day, ended in 1958. It totaled $700 million.

Economic development grants and loans are to be ended this year. These, too, totaled about $700 million and involved the application of U.S. industrial know-how to Yugoslavia's industrial problems.

BIGGEST PROJECT: PLASTICS

Largest single project in the U.S. program of economic development aid for Yugoslavia is a plastics plant now under construction at Zagreb. Tito took Khrushchev to visit this plant on September 1. That visit was particularly galling to Americans.

The plastics plant was financed mainly with a $23 million U.S. grant, equipped with U.S. machinery, designed by U.S. engineers and built under the supervision of U.S. technicians. Four of these technicians, with a number of U.S. correspondents accompanying Khrushchev on his tour, were barred from the plant as Tito took Khrushchev through it on September 1, accompanied by Communist technicians and correspondents.

During a scuffle with Yugoslav guards at the door of the plant the Americans shouted: "We paid for it—why can't we see it?"

Americans in Belgrade complain that the extent of U.S. aid to this country is kept a well-guarded secret from most Yugoslavs. But Yugoslavs do know that the United States is helping. Friendliness toward individual Americans is particularly strong here where the people can buy Western newspapers and magazines, and, in most cases, travel abroad freely.

Tito's portrait is everywhere in Yugoslavia, but he is revered primarily as a national hero who fought both Hitler and Stalin. In barbershops, the portrait may hang next to Western-style pinups while the radio blares Western tunes. Western tourists, relatively rare in other Communist countries, swarm on Yugoslavia's Adriatic coast.

MORE AID AHEAD

U.S. aid in the form of surplus farm products sold or given to the Yugoslav Government is still in the pipelines. Grains and other foods helped Tito's Communists meet food shortages in the past. But the continued need for such U.S. aid now is under question.

Ask Yugoslavs who do know the extent of U.S. aid, ask westerners who know Yugoslavia well, and you find wide agreement that U.S. aid has enabled Tito's Yugoslavia to follow its independent Communist course.

JOIN 'EM

Now, as one westerner put it, "what once was the Communist tail appears to be wagging the dog." Khrushchev, like Stalin, unable to persuade Tito to toe the Moscow line, is following the principle, "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em."

At Velenje, on August 30, Khrushchev asked: "What kind of revolutionary is it who * * * demands that everyone do nothing but agree with him? * * * This is stupid." Khrushchev not only appeared to be encouraging Tito's unorthodox communism, but also to be suggesting that Communist leaders of other countries might well borrow not only capitalist money but also capitalist methods.

Certainly, looking at the Yugoslav model, Communists can see that trade with the West helps build prosperity.

Only about one-quarter of Yugoslavia's total trade is with Communist countries. The United States, Italy and West Germany are Yugoslavia's best trading partners. Russia is a poor fourth.

Aid from the United States and trade with the West has built up Yugoslav prosperity under Tito, the man who declares communism will one day beat down capitalism. This aid, once vital to Yugoslavia's survival as an independent Communist country, now may no longer be economically necessary.

Question left for Washington's decision now is whether there is any political value to be found in continued aid to a Yugoslav leader determined to go his own way to communism.

18 years of aid to Communist Yugoslavia from the United States

[Year ended June 30]

	Millions
1946 (economic aid)	$265
1947 (economic aid)	33
1948	------
1949	------
1950 (economic aid)	40
1951	96
1952:	
Economic aid	106
Military aid	74
Total 1952	180
1953:	
Economic aid	123
Military aid	162
Total 1953	285
1954:	
Economic aid	68
Military aid	235
Total 1954	303
1955:	
Economic aid	142
Military aid	141
Total 1955	283
1956:	
Economic aid	98
Military aid	59
Total 1956	157
1957:	
Economic aid	122
Military aid	17
Total 1957	139
1958:	
Economic aid	96
Military aid	33
Total 1958	129
1959 (economic)	174
1960 (economic)	76
1961 (economic)	147
1962 (economic)	117
1963 (economic)	113
Total economic aid (including $700 million in loans)	1,800
Total military aid	700
Total (through June 30, 1963)	2,500

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 9, 1963:

U.S. Circuit Judge

George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit, vice Thomas M. McAllister, retired.

International Atomic Energy Agency

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the seventh session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The following-named persons to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the seventh session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey.
John Gorham Palfrey, of New York.
James T. Ramey, of Illinois.
Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 9, 1963:

Department of State

Graham A. Martin, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

William Matson Roth, of California, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.

Gen. Herbert B. Powell, U.S. Army, retired, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipoentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

William O. Hall, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The nominations beginning Roy T. Davis, Jr., to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Charles G. Williamson to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 26, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles H. Bayer, First Christian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who alone art eternal and who dost rule the earth where our little systems rise and pass away, we offer Thee this day. We pray Thy blessing upon all those who make decisions concerning others and particularly upon this body. Give to the Members of Congress a fresh courage. Keep them from the temptation of being preoccupied with what will work in a world that cries out for what is true. Direct them so that they may be more concerned with human values than with property values. And, O Lord, save us all from putting our ultimate confidence in devices that cannot ultimately save us. Accept us with our strengths and weaknesses, and by Thy mercy redeem the times in which we live, for we pray in the name of Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 5, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5623. An act to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5781. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the United States Merchant Marine; and

H.R. 6012. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1831. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer, pursuant to 49 Stat. 425, as amended by Public Law 85–474, had designated Mr. Allott as a delegate to the American Group at the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, beginning September 10, 1963.

SUPPORTING PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a letter purporting to be addressed to me and appearing in a St. Louis newspaper on September 4, 1963, was published without my knowledge or consent. It leaves the impression that I am criticizing President Kennedy. I am supporting President Kennedy.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE PARITY RATIO

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture announced over the weekend the parity ratio for August. It was 78—down 2 points from a year ago. Parity ratio shows the relationship between the prices farmers get, and the prices they pay.

After 2½ years of the Kennedy administration, the farmers of America are worse off than at any time since 1939. The average parity ratio for 1963 so far is 78 with no help in sight. The last year the parity ratio sank any lower was 1939, when it averaged 77.

What happened to the 90 percent of parity promised by candidate Kennedy in 1960?

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the accounts in this morning's press as they deal with the situation with South Vietnam certainly leave one with the feeling that in the executive branch the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

One story says that it has been learned on high authority that the U.S. Government has decided to cut its aid to South Vietnam in order to force reform in the Government of that country.

In a parallel column on the same page of the same newspaper there is a report that the American Central Intelligence Agency has decided to continue payments of a quarter-million-dollar-monthly fund used to support the special troops of the South Vietnamese colonel who led the raids on Buddhist pagodas on August 21.

Just who decides what within the executive branch would seem to be a pertinent question at this point.

Mr. Speaker, up until now proposed legislation to establish a joint congressional committee to oversee the foreign intelligence operations of this country had attracted only my nominal interest. I shall henceforth be actively interested in seeing such legislation come to the floor of the House and will introduce a companion bill to further indicate my affirmative interest.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate on September 10, 11, and 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4786) for the relief of the State of New Mexico.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the State of New Mexico is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $46,981.32, representing the amount by which the Department of the Army has determined the State to be liable on account of certain property of the United States which was destroyed, damaged, or lost as a result of a fire which occurred on May 30, 1954, at Clayton, New Mexico. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANOVER, N.H. AND NORWICH, VT. INTERSTATE SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 626) granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show, if it is true, that this is without cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, this is without cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas, by act of legislature approved May 16, 1961, the State of New Hampshire, and, by act of the general assembly approved April 3, 1963, the State of Vermont, have separately but identically authorized the establishment by Hanover, New Hampshire, and Norwich, Vermont, of an interstate school district; and

Whereas section 116: 7 of said act of May 16, 1961 (New Hampshire), and section 7 of said act of April 3, 1963 (Vermont), are identical to the following effect:

"AGREEMENT BETWEEN HANOVER AND NORWICH. Either before or after the corporate existence of the district begins. Hanover and Norwich shall enter into one or more agreements (not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter) which shall:

"a. Express the rights and duties and procedures of Hanover and Norwich and the district in relations to each other, to the extent that such rights and duties and procedure are not expressed in this chapter and/or by Vermont law.

"b. Determine the grades of school to be included in the district school system.

"c. Place a valuation on the existing plant to be taken over and determine Hanover's and Norwich's fair share of such valuation and the terms on which it is to be paid as hereinafter provided.

"d. Determine the ratio for the apportionment of expenses during the first two fiscal years.

"e. Establish the official name of the district. In addition, the agreements may include the transaction of any other business (except the election of officers) which might be transacted at the organization meeting. Such agreements shall be executed on behalf of Hanover in written form signed by a majority of the Hanover School Board and approved or ratified by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting by voice or ballot at an annual or special meeting of the Hanover school district. Such agreements shall be executed on behalf of Norwich by such officer or officers of Norwich or of Vermont as may thereunto be duly authorized.", and

Whereas, in accordance with said section 116: 7 and said section 7, the Hanover, New Hampshire, School Board on May 14, 1963, and the directors of the Town of Norwich, Vermont, School District on May 16, 1963, have entered into the following agreement:

"ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN HANOVER AND NORWICH IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 116:7 OF NEW HAMPSHIRE STATUTE AND SECTION 7 OF VERMONT STATUTE

"a. Procedural Agreements.

"1. The schools of the Hanover District, the Norwich District and the Union District shall be administered by the same Superintendent. The Union District may also hire an Assistant Superintendent.

"2. The curricula of the elementary schools of the Hanover and Norwich Districts shall be standardized so that children in both towns will have an integrated curriculum.

"3. The Union District will accept tuition pupils in grades 7–12 when this is to the advantage of its educational program.

"4. Except for the special cases listed below, the following statutory formula shall in general apply for apportionment of current annual appropriations after the first two fiscal years of operation:

". . . shall be divided between Hanover and Norwich in the proportion that the average daily membership of each in the district school for the preceding fiscal year bears to the total average membership for such year."

"Included would be special costs specifically applicable to grades 7–12, such as Athletics and Activities, Driver Training, Fixed Charges, and Health Supervision, except for those relating to the Hanover grade school personnel, and any Capital Outlay chargeable to the high school alone.

"Excluded are subsidy of school lunch, costs of operation, maintenance and capital outlay for the gym and cafeteria, and costs of operation, maintenance and capital outlay related to grounds. In these cases the following formulae shall apply.

"i. Subsidy of school lunch is to be apportioned in the ratio of the average daily membership of Norwich grades 7 through 12 to Hanover grades 1 through 12.

"ii. Maintenance and operating costs and capital outlay for the gym and cafeteria, after September 1, 1964, shall be allocated as follows: 85 percent of costs relating to the gym and 80 percent of costs relating to the cafeteria shall be charged to the Union District, with the remainder charged to the Hanover Grade School.

"iii. Except for items clearly assignable either to the Hanover Grade School or to the Union District alone, the costs of the operation, maintenance and capital outlay related to grounds, after September 1, 1964, shall be assigned as follows: 73 percent to the Union District and the rest to the Hanover Grade School.

"Costs allocated to the Union District under (ii) and (iii) shall be divided between the member towns in accordance with the statutory formula set forth above. Allocations in all exceptions mentioned above shall have periodic reviews, which will provide corrections as needed.

"b. Grades of School to be Included.

"Grades 7 through 12 shall be included in the district school system, beginning September, 1964.

"c. Valuation of Present Plant and Fair Share of Towns.

"The present school plant for grades 7 through 12, including building, land, and equipment in Hanover, New Hampshire, shall be valued at $1,215,000. The process of buying in shall take place as follows: Norwich shall compensate the Hanover School District for Norwich's share of the school plant, in a lump sum; Hanover shall then deed to the Union District the above specified plant.

"The cost of buying into the Union District and the cost of new construction undertaken during 1963–64 shall be divided according to the ratio of students in grades 7 through 12 in any school and resident in the respective towns as of April 1, 1963.

"d. Apportionment of Expenses During the First Two Fiscal Years.

"The operating expenses for the school year 1964–65 shall be based on the same ratio as in c above, computed as of November 1, 1963, and for 1965–66 on the ratio computed as of November 1, 1964.

"e. Name of the District.

"The name of the new district shall be the Dresden School District.

"f. Procedure for Future Amendments.

"Any amendment to the Articles of Agreement arrived at after the organization of the Interstate Union shall be by a ⅔ vote of the Directors resident in the town of Norwich and ⅔ vote of the Directors resident in the town of Hanover.

"Approved by the Hanover School Board on May 14, 1963.

"William L. Wilson,
"John G. Kemeny,
"Elisabeth M. Bradley,
"Almon B. Ives,
"Carol E. McLane,
"John W. Schleicher,

"Approved by the Directors of the Town of Norwich School District on May 16, 1963.

"Peter P. Plante,
"William W. Ballard,
"Cecilia Lewis."

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the establishment by Hanover, New Hampshire, and Norwich, Vermont, of an interstate school district as authorized by said act of May 16, 1961 (New Hampshire), and said act of April 3, 1963 (Vermont), and to the above-quoted agreement between the Hanover, New Hampshire, School Board and the directors of the town of Norwich, Vermont, School District.

Sec. 2. The right is hereby reserved by the Congress or any of its standing committees to require the disclosure and the furnishing of such information and data by the Dresden School District as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or such committee.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COURSES UNDER WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 330) to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that after the expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program, approval of courses under the war orphans' educational assistance program shall be by State approving agencies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Subchapter VII—State Approving Agencies

"§ 1771. Designation

"(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the 'State approving agency' for his State for the purposes of this chapter after the date for the expiration of all education and training provided for in chapter 33 of this title. Such agency may be the agency designated or created in accordance with section 1641 of this title.

"(b) (1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1772 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"§ 1772. Approval of courses

"(a) An eligible person shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education offered by an educational institution only if (1) such course is approved as provided in this chapter by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution is located, or by the Administrator, or (2) such course is approved (A) for the enrollment of the particular individual under the provisions of section 1737 of this title or (B) for special restorative training under subchapter V of this chapter. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administrator with a current list of educational institutions specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1773. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the educational programs established under this chapter. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions in which eligible persons are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1774. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions for furnishing courses of education to eligible persons under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1775. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) such courses are conducted under sections 11–28 of title 20; or

"(3) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the acceditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible person. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the eligible person and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the eligible person and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1776. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1653 or 1775 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, makeup work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the eligible person and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the eligible person and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the eligible person upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the eligible person is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The insitution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the eligible person fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the eligible person for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1777. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1778. Disapproval of courses

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section. The Administrator shall notify the State approving agency of his disapproval of any educational institution under chapter 31 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 1735 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out "An" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Until the date for the expiration of all education and training under chapter 33 of this title, an"; (2) by inserting immediately after "this section" in subsection (a) the following "or subchapter VII of this chapter"; (3) by inserting immediately after "section 1656" in subsection (b) the following "or section 1778"; and (4) by striking out subsection (c).

SEC. 3. Section 1736 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "The Administrator"; (2) by striking out "or any of the standards and criteria of sections 1653 and 1654 of this title"; and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Until the date for the expiration of all education and training under chapter 33 of this title, the Administrator may discontinue the educational assistance allowance of any eligible person if he find that the course of education in which the eligible person is enrolled fails to meet any of the standards and criteria of sections 1653 and 1654 of this title."

SEC. 4. Section 1737 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 1735 of this title, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The".

SEC. 5. The analysis of chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBSECTION VII—STATE APPROVING AGENCIES

"1771. Designation.
"1772. Approval of courses.
"1773. Cooperation.
"1774. Reimbursement of expenses.
"1775. Approval of accredited courses.
"1776. Approval of nonaccredited courses.
"1777. Notice of approval of courses.
"1778. Disapproval of courses."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCIPLINARY BOARDS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5691) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4110 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) The Administrator, within such limitations as he may prescribe, may delegate to the Chief Medical Director the authority vested in him by subsections (b) and (d) of this section to (1) appoint the chairman and secretary of a disciplinary board, such official to have the power prescribed by this section, and (2) receive and act upon the recommendations of such a board. Any person against whom disciplinary action is taken under authority delegated pursuant to this subsection shall have the right to appeal such action to the Administrator, but in the absence of such an appeal the decision of the Chief Medical Director shall have the same force and effect as a decision of the Administrator."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE C. & B. LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1185) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the State of Oregon (without cost to the United States) a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon in and to the following described land (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon): the west half of the southwest quarter of section 22, township 4 north, range 28 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, such land being a part of a tract of land conveyed to the State of Oregon by patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, pursuant to the aforementioned Act.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the State of Oregon conveying to the United States the land described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, of Hermiston, Oregon (without cost to the United States), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon, upon the condition that:

(1) The C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, convey to the United States fee simple title to the following described parcels of land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon: The west half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", the east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", less the westerly 135 feet thereof; the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, less railroad right-of-way; that portion of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22 and of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, lying south and east of U.S.R.S. canal "A", excepting from said north half of said northwest quarter of section 22, that certain portion thereof as conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed recorded October 19, 1960, in deed book 260 at page 512, records of Umatilla County, Oregon. All being in township 4 north, range 28 east, of the Willamette meridian, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Excepting any and all roads and water rights-of-way.

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the property to be conveyed to the United States by such company is of less value than the property to be conveyed to such company by the United States, the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value, which amount shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, authorized under subsection (b) of this section shall be made subject to a right-of-way in the land so conveyed for ditches or canals constructed under the authority of the United States, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon) conveyed to the United States by the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pursuant to the first section of this Act; except that there shall be reserved in the United States all minerals in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, referred to in the first section of this Act.

Sec. 3. The State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, shall pay to the United States such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to compensate the United States for its administrative costs in carrying out the provisions of this Act, which sum shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS OF SECTIONS 671 AND 672 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE CLERK AND MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7235) to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the clerk and the marshal of the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill should have a brief explanation. I am unable to understand exactly what is proposed to be done by this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The purpose of this legislation is to make the payment of salaries of clerks and marshals out of appropriated funds at the Supreme Court. At the present time the Clerk of the Supreme Court is authorized to collect certain fees in connection with his office. These fees are used to pay clerks and to pay other expenses including the printing of briefs and travel expenses of attorneys in behalf of persons whose motions to appear in forma pauperis in the Supreme Court have been approved. The objective of this legislation is to continue this method of paying these salaries until such time as the Congress authorizes them to be paid out of appropriated funds. Then the moneys collected under this system will be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. This in nowise affects the salary schedules now prevailing in the Supreme Court?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; it does not in any manner whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. And in the future the fees collected will be blanketed into the Treasury?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; they will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. And the expenses heretofore paid through the use of the fees will then be paid out of appropriated funds?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. In the synopsis of this proposed legislation, it indicates that the Court shall appoint and fix the compensation of necessary assistants and messengers with the approval of the Chief Justice of the United States. Does this permit the Court and the Chief Justice to change salary scales at will?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Existing law so provides. The adoption of this proposal and the appropriation by the Congress as to these salaries would then take effect. Under present law under fees that are collected, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has the right to do what the gentleman from Michigan has suggested.

Mr. FORD. But if this legislation becomes law, then these employees would come under the Classified Pay Act for Government employees?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am not prepared to say they would come under the classified civil service of the Federal Government. They would come under the appropriation that Congress itself would authorize. But this law does not become effective and will not become effective until Congress has made a determination of what is necessary for the payment of clerks and the salaries thereof.

Mr. **FORD.** I am still not clear. When a person is appointed a clerk or a messenger in the Supreme Court today, is the salary for that individual fixed by law, or is it at the discretion of the Court?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. It is my understanding it is at the discretion of the Court and he is paid from the fee.

Mr. **FORD.** If we enact this new legislation, will the Court have the same discretion?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. No. The Court will then be limited to the appropriations made by the Congress, and the moneys then will be placed in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. **FORD.** Yes, but that appropriation for the Supreme Court and our other courts is a pretty big sum, and it gives the Court rather extensive flexibility. So it would be conceivable then, if this becomes law, that the Chief Justice and the Court can fix such salary schedules for clerks and messengers regardless of what the going wage rate is for other Government employees. Is that correct?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Only when Congress by appropriation should so provide.

Mr. **FORD.** But we do not provide in an appropriation bill the precise pay for each clerk and messenger where the rate is not provided by law. I believe there ought to be some clarification of this. I do not think that the Supreme Court ought to have complete freedom to pay their clerks and messengers any amount they determine.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. They now have that freedom.

Mr. **FORD.** Yes, but it is circumscribed by the amount of fees that are collected.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. **FORD.** And that is somewhat of a brake; but if it just depends on the Congress, in the appropriation of the lump sum for the Supreme Court, that is a little broad, I think.

Mr. **GROSS.** I concur with the gentleman from Michigan. He has developed a point that needs further attention. I see no reason why clerks, messengers, and other employees of the Supreme Court do not come under the Class Act. This is news to me. I thought they were under the Class Act and, therefore, their salaries fixed under the Class Act, but now I learn they are not.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS.** Of course I will yield.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. If you want, I will read you subsection (c) of section 671 of the code.

> Compensation of the clerk, his deputies, assistants, and messengers, and the necessary expenses of his office shall be disbursed by the clerk from the fees collected by him, upon allowance and approval by the Chief Justice of the United States.

That is the present law, and if you do not change it, you still have the right to do it. Now the next section. What we propose to do is that the fees that are collected will then be placed in the Treasury of the United States and the appropriations made by Congress to pay the clerks.

Mr. **GROSS.** The gentleman is saying, is he not, that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court can fix the salaries of the clerks, messengers, and so on and so forth?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Under the present law.

Mr. **GROSS.** I think that law badly needs amending to bring employees of the Court under the Class Act so that we exercise the same control over their salaries as we do other employees of the Government. I am surprised this situation exists and I think this legislation ought to be amended.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further for a moment, there is a certain amount of independence of the judiciary in the three branches of our Government. For that reason it has been enacted and carried out for a long time. Now we are trying to get rid of it by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

1968 OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the resolution (S.J. Res. 72) favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no objection to the resolution as such, but I want the RECORD clearly to show I approve this invitation for the holding of the 1968 Olympic games in Michigan on the basis that this will not be accompanied with a request for money from the Federal Government to hold these Olympics. I am not opposed to the invitation being extended, but I am opposed to the expenditure of money from the Federal Treasury for this purpose.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resloution, as follows:

> Whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the Olympic games at Detroit, Michigan, in 1968; and
>
> Whereas Detroit has demonstrated a willingness and capacity to provide excellent facilities for the games and the visitors who attend them; and
>
> Whereas Detroit's midwestern location will offer foreign visitors a revealing look at the American heartland; and
>
> Whereas the United States has not hosted the games since 1932 and would be honored to welcome this enterprise in international good will: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Government of the United States, therefore, expresses the sincere hope that the Olympic games will be held in this country in 1968 and pledges continuing support of the principles on which the Olympic games are founded.
>
> SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7155) to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **FORD.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill or a member of the committee a question or two. It is my understanding that this bill proposes, among other things, that the present Department of Agriculture attachés who serve overseas will in some instances be elevated to the title of agricultural counselor. This is being done on the basis that our agricultural attachés need a higher grade and more imposing title in their contacts with representatives from other countries.

I would like to ask this question: Does this change from agricultural attaché to agricultural counselor involve any increase in compensation for the individuals involved?

I have another question which I would like to raise. The gentleman from Iowa and I discussed this matter before the House met today. This proposed legislation would permit or authorize the return of agricultural attachés or counselors, as they may be called, to the United States for a 3-year rotation of service.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FORD.** I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **GROSS.** It would permit agricultural attachés to be rotated back to this country. I think we all agree they ought to be rotated periodically. But it would permit them, regardless of whether they were supergrades or what their pay status as Federal employees may be, to be put in any other grade for a period of 3 years, and still draw their salaries as attachés. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which I am a member worked out a program for civilian employees in the Department of Defense which provides, as I remember it, that after a period of 90 days they must be provided with a job where the pay is comparable and the work is comparable. The Department of Defense has the same problem of rotation, but the floating assignment is for

DISCIPLINARY BOARDS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5691) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4110 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) The Administrator, within such limitations as he may prescribe, may delegate to the Chief Medical Director the authority vested in him by subsections (b) and (d) of this section to (1) appoint the chairman and secretary of a disciplinary board, such official to have the power prescribed by this section, and (2) receive and act upon the recommendations of such a board. Any person against whom disciplinary action is taken under authority delegated pursuant to this subsection shall have the right to appeal such action to the Administrator, but in the absence of such an appeal the decision of the Chief Medical Director shall have the same force and effect as a decision of the Administrator."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE C. & B. LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1185) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the State of Oregon (without cost to the United States) a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon in and to the following described land (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon): the west half of the southwest quarter of section 22, township 4 north, range 28 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, such land being a part of a tract of land conveyed to the State of Oregon by patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, pursuant to the aforementioned Act.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the State of Oregon conveying to the United States the land described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, of Hermiston, Oregon (without cost to the United States), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon, upon the condition that:

(1) The C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, convey to the United States fee simple title to the following described parcels of land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon: The west half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", the east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", less the westerly 135 feet thereof; the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, less railroad right-of-way; that portion of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22 and of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, lying south and east of U.S.R.S. canal "A", excepting from said north half of said northwest quarter of section 22, that certain portion thereof as conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed recorded October 19, 1960, in deed book 260 at page 512, records of Umatilla County, Oregon. All being in township 4 north, range 28 east, of the Willamette meridian, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Excepting any and all roads and water rights-of-way.

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the property to be conveyed to the United States by such company is of less value than the property to be conveyed to such company by the United States, the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value, which amount shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, authorized under subsection (b) of this section shall be made subject to a right-of-way in the land so conveyed for ditches or canals constructed under the authority of the United States, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon) conveyed to the United States by the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pursuant to the first section of this Act; except that there shall be reserved in the United States all minerals in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, referred to in the first section of this Act.

Sec. 3. The State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, shall pay to the United States such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to compensate the United States for its administrative costs in carrying out the provisions of this Act, which sum shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS OF SECTIONS 671 AND 672 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE CLERK AND MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7235) to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the clerk and the marshal of the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill should have a brief explanation. I am unable to understand exactly what is proposed to be done by this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The purpose of this legislation is to make the payment of salaries of clerks and marshals out of appropriated funds at the Supreme Court. At the present time the Clerk of the Supreme Court is authorized to collect certain fees in connection with his office. These fees are used to pay clerks and to pay other expenses including the printing of briefs and travel expenses of attorneys in behalf of persons whose motions to appear in forma pauperis in the Supreme Court have been approved. The objective of this legislation is to continue this method of paying these salaries until such time as the Congress authorizes them to be paid out of appropriated funds. Then the moneys collected under this system will be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. This in nowise affects the salary schedules now prevailing in the Supreme Court?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; it does not in any manner whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. And in the future the fees collected will be blanketed into the Treasury?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; they will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. And the expenses heretofore paid through the use of the fees will then be paid out of appropriated funds?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. In the synopsis of this proposed legislation, it indicates that the Court shall appoint and fix the compensation of necessary assistants and messengers with the approval of the Chief Justice of the United States. Does this permit the Court and the Chief Justice to change salary scales at will?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Existing law so provides. The adoption of this proposal and the appropriation by the Congress as to these salaries would then take effect. Under present law under fees that are collected, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has the right to do what the gentleman from Michigan has suggested.

Mr. FORD. But if this legislation becomes law, then these employees would come under the Classified Pay Act for Government employees?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am not prepared to say they would come under the classified civil service of the Federal Government. They would come under the appropriation that Congress itself would authorize. But this law does not become effective and will not become effective until Congress has made a determination of what is necessary for the payment of clerks and the salaries thereof.

Mr. FORD. I am still not clear. When a person is appointed a clerk or a messenger in the Supreme Court today, is the salary for that individual fixed by law, or is it at the discretion of the Court?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is my understanding it is at the discretion of the Court and he is paid from the fee.

Mr. FORD. If we enact this new legislation, will the Court have the same discretion?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. The Court will then be limited to the appropriations made by the Congress, and the moneys then will be placed in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FORD. Yes, but that appropriation for the Supreme Court and our other courts is a pretty big sum, and it gives the Court rather extensive flexibility. So it would be conceivable then, if this becomes law, that the Chief Justice and the Court can fix such salary schedules for clerks and messengers regardless of what the going wage rate is for other Government employees. Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Only when Congress by appropriation should so provide.

Mr. FORD. But we do not provide in an appropriation bill the precise pay for each clerk and messenger where the rate is not provided by law. I believe there ought to be some clarification of this. I do not think that the Supreme Court ought to have complete freedom to pay their clerks and messengers any amount they determine.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They now have that freedom.

Mr. FORD. Yes, but it is circumscribed by the amount of fees that are collected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. FORD. And that is somewhat of a brake; but if it just depends on the Congress, in the appropriation of the lump sum for the Supreme Court, that is a little broad, I think.

Mr. GROSS. I concur with the gentleman from Michigan. He has developed a point that needs further attention. I see no reason why clerks, messengers, and other employees of the Supreme Court do not come under the Class Act. This is news to me. I thought they were under the Class Act and, therefore, their salaries fixed under the Class Act, but now I learn they are not.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I will yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If you want, I will read you subsection (c) of section 671 of the code.

> Compensation of the clerk, his deputies, assistants, and messengers, and the necessary expenses of his office shall be disbursed by the clerk from the fees collected by him, upon allowance and approval by the Chief Justice of the United States.

That is the present law, and if you do not change it, you still have the right to do it. Now the next section. What we propose to do is that the fees that are collected will then be placed in the Treasury of the United States and the appropriations made by Congress to pay the clerks.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying, is he not, that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court can fix the salaries of the clerks, messengers, and so on and so forth?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under the present law.

Mr. GROSS. I think that law badly needs amending to bring employees of the Court under the Class Act so that we exercise the same control over their salaries as we do other employees of the Government. I am surprised this situation exists and I think this legislation ought to be amended.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further for a moment, there is a certain amount of independence of the judiciary in the three branches of our Government. For that reason it has been enacted and carried out for a long time. Now we are trying to get rid of it by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

1968 OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the resolution (S.J. Res. 72) favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no objection to the resolution as such, but I want the RECORD clearly to show I approve this invitation for the holding of the 1968 Olympic games in Michigan on the basis that this will not be accompanied with a request for money from the Federal Government to hold these Olympics. I am not opposed to the invitation being extended, but I am opposed to the expenditure of money from the Federal Treasury for this purpose.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resloution, as follows:

> Whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the Olympic games at Detroit, Michigan, in 1968; and
>
> Whereas Detroit has demonstrated a willingness and capacity to provide excellent facilities for the games and the visitors who attend them; and
>
> Whereas Detroit's midwestern location will offer foreign visitors a revealing look at the American heartland; and
>
> Whereas the United States has not hosted the games since 1932 and would be honored to welcome this enterprise in international good will: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Government of the United States, therefore, expresses the sincere hope that the Olympic games will be held in this country in 1968 and pledges continuing support of the principles on which the Olympic games are founded.
>
> SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7155) to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill or a member of the committee a question or two. It is my understanding that this bill proposes, among other things, that the present Department of Agriculture attachés who serve overseas will in some instances be elevated to the title of agricultural counselor. This is being done on the basis that our agricultural attachés need a higher grade and more imposing title in their contacts with representatives from other countries.

I would like to ask this question: Does this change from agricultural attaché to agricultural counselor involve any increase in compensation for the individuals involved?

I have another question which I would like to raise. The gentleman from Iowa and I discussed this matter before the House met today. This proposed legislation would permit or authorize the return of agricultural attachés or counselors, as they may be called, to the United States for a 3-year rotation of service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It would permit agricultural attachés to be rotated back to this country. I think we all agree they ought to be rotated periodically. But it would permit them, regardless of whether they were supergrades or what their pay status as Federal employees may be, to be put in any other grade for a period of 3 years, and still draw their salaries as attachés. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which I am a member worked out a program for civilian employees in the Department of Defense which provides, as I remember it, that after a period of 90 days they must be provided with a job where the pay is comparable and the work is comparable. The Department of Defense has the same problem of rotation, but the floating assignment is for a period of 90 days, not 3 years. This bill is fantastic in providing that they be permitted to come back to this country and serve in any slot—perhaps a grade 18 employee serving in a grade 9 or 12 slot. If the gentleman from Michigan is not going to ask that this bill be passed over, in the absence, apparently overseas, of the people who should explain it, I certainly will have to ask that it be passed over.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER.** This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business of the House be permitted to sit on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, September 10 and 11, during general debate.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER.** This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa.

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RICKERT & LAAN, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1263) for the relief of Rickert & Laan, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rickert and Lann, Incorporated, of New Orleans, Louisiana, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States for the marking duties (aggregating $5,835.98) levied, pursuant to section 304(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304(c)), upon certain nails imported through the port of New Orleans in three shipments identified as follows: C.E. 5251, November 3, 1959 (steamship Mondoro) 4,675 kegs; C.E. 6909, December 17, 1959 (steamship Monstella) 2,000 kegs; and C.E. 6964, December 18, 1959 (steamship Mongioia) 1,700 kegs. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Rickert and Laan, Incorporated, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by it, or withheld from sums otherwise due it, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARK JOHN JANAVARAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 322) for the relief of Mark John Janavaras.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mark John Janavaras shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mark John Janavaras shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Constantine W. Janavaras, a citizen of the United State: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVANTHIA CHRISTOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 495) for the relief of Evanthia Christou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evanthia Christou may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Vincent G. Kouspos, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Evanthia Christou, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAGIOTA MAKRIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 506) for the relief of Panagiota Makris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiota Makris may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mrs. Yianoula Makris, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Panagiota Makris pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY BANG WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 538) for the relief of Henry Bang Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bills, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Bang Williams shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee: That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Bang Williams shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Henry Williams, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of the said Henry Bang Williams shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and the language through the words "visa fee:" on line 7, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Bang Williams shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Henry Williams, citizens of the United States:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MOHAMMED ADHAM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 657) for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Doctor Mohammed Adham has resided in the United States since September 16, 1954, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIJA LOVSIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 909) for the relief of Marija Lovsin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Act of October 24, 1962 (Public Law 87-885), Marija Lovsin shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 1 of that act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAZIMIERZ AND ZDZISLAW KURMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2968) for the relief of Stanislaw and Zdzislaw Kurmas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101a(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Stanislaw and Zdzislaw Kurmas, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien children of Stanislawa Sawicka, citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and petitions filed in their behalf by Stanislava Sawicki, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLTON M. RICHARDSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1230) for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitation on the time within which applications for disability retirement are required to be filed under section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act as in effect in August 1956 (5 U.S.C., 1952 ed., 710) is hereby waived in favor of Carlton M. Richardson, a former employee of the Department of the Air Force, and his claim for disability retirement under such Act shall be acted upon under the other applicable provisions of such Act as if his application had been timely filed, if he files application for such disability retirement within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. ARTHUR FIELDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1489) for the relief of J. Arthur Fields.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitation on the time for filing applications for disability retirement under section 7(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2257(b)) is hereby waived in favor of J. Arthur Fields of Tooele, Utah, former employee of the Tooele Ordnance Depot, and his claim for disability retirement under such Act shall be acted upon under the other applicable provisions of such Act as if his application had been timely filed, if he files application for such disability retirement within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICK MASONICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1221) for the relief of Nick Masonich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bills, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nick Masonich, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the sum of $53,946.78, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for compensation for the total loss of use of his eyes which he sustained as the result of personal injuries received by him in an explosion occurring on August 17, 1921, while he was performing duties as a member of a station gang employed by the Alaskan Engineering Commission in connection with the construction of the United States Railway in Alaska, the said Nick Masonich never having received satisfaction in full from the United States for total blindness and total permanent disability: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$53,946.78" and insert "$17,000.00".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARVIN D. NELLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1452) for the relief of Marvin D. Nells.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marvin D. Nells, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $926.98. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Marvin D. Nells against the United States for compensation he would have received if he had been granted administrative leave from his employment at the Cleveland, Ohio, post office for the period he served with the medical mission to Liberia known as Operation Brother's Brother: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeandor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to credit the annual leave account of Marvin D. Nells, of Cleveland, Ohio, with the amount of annual leave used by the said Marvin D. Nells while serving as a member of a medical mission to Liberia known as Operation Brother's Brother in the period from January 30, 1962, to March 30, 1962, and the leave so credited shall remain available until used. The annual leave credited under the authority of this Act shall not be included in any lump sum leave payment in the event that the said Marvin D. Nells is separated from Federal employment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1526) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Nathalie Iline, New York, New York, shall be held and considered to be a retired employee for the purposes of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4505) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MRS. GERTRUDE RESKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4768) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the requirements in section 202(h)(1)(B) and 202(p) of the Social Security Act that proof of support be filed by the dependent parent of an insured individual within a specified period after the date of such individual's death in order to qualify for parent's insurance benefits on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income shall not apply with respect to the application of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin, Wallingford, Connecticut, for parent's insurance benefits under section 202(h) of such Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of her daughter Jennie Reskin (Social Security account numbered 044-10-1625), if she files such application, together with such proof of support, within the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. PAUL W. OBERDORFER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5743) for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Captain Paul W. Oberdorfer, United States Air Force, AO3123527, the sum of $130.63. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Captain Paul W. Oberdorfer against the United States for the cost of transporting his wife from New Orleans, Louisiana, to San Francisco, California, which was undertaken by the said Captain Oberdorfer in reliance on erroneous information given to him by United States Air Force personnel. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. W. ROBINSON & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6807) for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. W. Robinson and Co., Incorporated, of New York, the sum of $441.48. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said H. W. Robinson and Co., Incorporated, against the United States for overassessment by the Collector of Customs of the Port of New York of duties in connection with the importation of the items covered by consumption entry numbered 922100, dated February 13, 1961. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$441.48" and insert "$441.73".

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDUSTRIAL TRACTOR PARTS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4088) for the relief of the Industrial Tractor Parts Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any period of limitation or lapse of time, the following entries made at New York by Van Oppen and Company, Incorporated, as customhouse brokers for the Industrial Tractor Parts Company, Incorporated, may be reliquidated in accordance with the law applicable as of the dates the items covered thereby were entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, and refund of duties may be made in accordance with such reliquidation, if application for reliquidation is made within one year after the date of enactment of this Act:

Entry numbered	*Date of Entry*	*Date liquidated*
Warehouse 102779	March 26, 1959	May 3, 1960
Warehouse 46331	September 11, 1957	April 20, 1960
Warehouse 59693	January 3, 1958	April 20, 1960
Warehouse 6579	August 30, 1956	April 18, 1960
Warehouse 24860	February 21, 1957	April 14, 1950
Warehouse 100188	February 26, 1959	April 7, 1960
Warehouse 11970	October 18, 1956	April 6, 1960
Consumption 910409	February 24, 1959	March 28, 1960
Warehouse 20793	January 3, 1957	March 25, 1960
Warehouse 82243	August 22, 1958	March 24, 1960
Warehouse 12109	October 19, 1956	March 22, 1960
Warehouse 110967	June 15, 1959	March 2, 1960
Warehouse 57682	December 17, 1957	February 17, 1960
Warehouse 3163	July 30, 1956	January 27, 1960
Warehouse 5407	August 17, 1956	January 22, 1960
Consumption 742881	August 11, 1959	January 6, 1960

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER CARSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1345) for the relief of Peter Carson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Carson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Carson may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Walter Carson, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KATARINA PEZELJ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1347) for the relief of Mrs. Katarina Pezelj.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Katarina Pezelj shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportations, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Katarina Pezelj. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Katarina Pezelj shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOO YOU LYN (ALSO KNOWN AS HOM YOU FONG) AND LYN FONG Y. HOM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong) and Lyn Fong Y. Hom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong) and Lyn Fong Y. Hom, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom) shall be held and considered to have been physically present in the United States since July 9, 1951."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom)."

LEE SUEY JOM (ALSO KNOWN AS TOMMY LEE AND LEE SHUE CHUNG)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3384) for the relief of Tommy Lee (also known as Lee Shue Chung).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tommy Lee (also known as Lee Shue Chung) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 22, 1948, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Tommy Lee (also known as Lee Shue Chung)" and insert the following:

"Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung)."

JOHN STEWART MURPHY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5083) for the relief of John Stewart Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Stewart Murphy may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTMAS LAKE, INC., IN MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., in Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, in return for the payment of an amount equal to the sum of the fair market value of the rights conveyed and such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance, to Christmas Lake, Incorporated, in Minnesota, all oil, gas, and other mineral rights which are held by the United States in the following described lands situated in Carver County, Minnesota: Tract A, registered land survey numbered 14, files of registrar of titles, Carver County, Minnesota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAI CHAN CHENG LIU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6260) for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wai Chan Cheng Liu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Wai Chan Cheng Liu. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Wai Chan Cheng Liu shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANS-DIETER SIEMONEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1277) for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

USEFUL WATCHDOG

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, information from the news media today reports that Vietnam special forces troops are still being paid secretly by U.S. Central Intelligence Agency which trained them for other purposes.

The sources said that most of the CIA staffmen in Saigon left a meeting last Monday with the impression that the payments would be cut off; but at a meeting on last Tuesday, the CIA staff was informed that, apparently on orders from Washington, the CIA was doing business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply another indication of the need for a joint committee of the Congress to investigate the CIA and the intelligence activities of that agency. I think we are beginning to make progress. Many of us have introduced bills. For instance, I have introduced one, House Joint Resolution 211, and there have been others. A later one has been introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], House Joint Resolution 653.

We are beginning to make progress because newspapers across the country are beginning to draw attention to the need for a joint congressional committee to oversee our intelligence agencies including the CIA. I am hopeful that the Congress will get behind these resolutions and have a joint committee to fully inform the Congress on what is happening and what is going on in connection with these CIA activities.

I include as part of my remarks the following editorial from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 2, 1963]

Useful Watchdog

Representative John Lindsay, a Republican from New York, has revived a proposal for creating a congressional watchdog over our sprawling intelligence community. He suggests a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence that would operate in the same fashion as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Though in years past, similar suggestions have been brushed aside, perhaps Mr. Lindsay will find a more receptive audience.

The growth of the intelligence service poses a serious problem for representative government. The CIA and its counterpart agency in the Defense Department perform functions that are important, secret and outside the framework of legislative supervision. Yet the Cuban invasion is only the most obvious instance of an intelligence venture which points to the need for surveillance.

In the past, intelligence agencies have opposed watchdog committees, in part on the ground that leaks might occur. But as Mr. Lindsay points out, Congress is already entrusted with secret knowledge in the nuclear and defense fields without imperiling the republic. Though a joint committee on foreign intelligence would not of itself solve the problem of coexisting with a secret and powerful bureaucracy, it would be a wholesome step in the proper direction. Mr. Lindsay deserves support.

AN IMPORTANT ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman Oren Harris, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, had some very important words for the Arkansas Broadcasters Association at their convention Saturday in Little Rock.

Chairman Harris discussed matters that have generated considerable discussion among the country's broadcast licensees, particularly the matter of programing on controversial issues under the Federal Communication Commission's so-called fairness doctrine.

I believe that Members of Congress, broadcasters, and the public will want to give thoughtful attention to Chairman Harris' comments on these important topics, and for that reason it is my privilege to offer a transcript of his speech for insertion in the Record.

Some Correspondence on Broadcast Problems

President Mayo, members and honored guests of the Arkansas Broadcasters Association, ladies and gentlemen, when I was first elected to the House of Representatives I did not expect to become a year-around temporary resident of the District of Columbia. Air travel being what it is today, however, it has become possible to tend to congressional business in Washington during the week, and to spend the weekend seeing friends and neighbors here at home. That is exactly what I have been doing during the last 3 weeks and I am gratified that you have asked me to spend some of my weekend hours here with you.

Instead of listening to a speech tonight, I thought you might be interested in looking over my shoulder and reading some of my office mail. Of course, I know you would not be interested in just any correspondence. Therefore, I have picked out two letters which happen to involve the subject of broadcasting.

The first letter is dated September 5 and is addressed to the Honorable E. William Henry and his six fellow Commissioners. It reads as follows:

"Hon. E. William Henry,
"Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

"Dear Chairman Henry: On July 25, 1963, the Commission adopted a public notice advising broadcast licensees concerning their responsibilities in connection with programing on controversial issues under the Commission's so-called fairness doctrine. In its notice the Commission states: 'When a licensee permits the use of his facilities for the presentation of views regarding an issue of current importance such as racial segregation, integration, or discrimination, or any other issue of public importance, he must offer spokesmen for other responsible groups within the community similar opportunities for the expression of the contrasting viewpoints of their respective groups. * * * In determining compliance with the fairness doctrine the Commission looks to substance rather than to label or form. It is immaterial whether a particular program or viewpoint is presented under the label of "Americanism," "anticommunism" or "States rights," or whether it is a paid announcement, official speech, editorial or religious broadcast. Regardless of label or form, if one viewpoint of a controversial issue of public importance is presented, the licensee is obligated to make a reasonable effort to present the other opposing viewpoint or viewpoints.

" 'The Commission does not seek to prevent the expression of any viewpoint by any licensee on any issue. It does seek to prevent the suppression of other contrasting viewpoints by any licensee on any issue when licensed broadcast facilities have been used for the presentation of one view of the issue. This is required by the public interest standard of the law.'

"The quoted passages, in my considered opinion, give to the public interest standard of the Communications Act an interpretation which is contrary to the basic pattern of the act.

"Under the act the responsibility for broadcast programs rests with the individual licensee. In discharging this responsibility the licensee is called upon to establish and meet the needs of the community which he serves. At renewal time he must then give to the Commission an accounting of his stewardship.

"The authority and responsibility of the Commission with regard to programs thus is limited to determining periodically whether or not the licensee on an overall basis has performed in the public interest.

"There are specific statutory exceptions to this basic rule. The Communications Act imposes a specific obligation upon a broadcast licensee who permits use of his facilities by a political candidate. Another specific obligation with regard to programing is contained in section 317 of the act.

"These specific statutory obligations merely confirm the general pattern of the act that the licensee has the primary responsibility for determining on a day-to-day basis the content of programs and that the Commission is limited to a periodic overall review of broadcast programing.

"The passages quoted from the Commission's notice of July 25 can only result in obliterating this fundamental dividing line of responsibility with regard to programing between licensees and the Commission. If the Commission in an attempt to achieve fairness seeks to apply its fairness doctrine to the content of individual programs involving the discussion of issues of public importance then, contrary to the policy of the act, the Commission inevitably will inject itself into programing on a day-to-day basis.

"Let us assume that a station broadcasts a regularly scheduled religious program. The minister in the sermon thus broadcast criticizes the policy of a local builder not to sell his homes to Negroes. He appeals to his congregation and to the listeners to support this stand by picketing the sales office of the local builder.

"In conforming with the notice, must the station seek out the builder and offer him an opportunity to reply? Let us assume the builder desires to reply. In his reply he states that he alone cannot modify the mores of the community and he appeals for a modification of the Presidential order aimed at the prevention of racial discrimination in housing financed under Federal Government programs. The builder feels that the order should be extended to cover homes constructed with the aid of traditional loans advanced by banks or building and loan associations without recourse to veterans housing or FHA financing.

"Other builders oppose the stand taken by this builder. They feel that the constitutionality of the President's order as it now stands should be tested in the courts and that under no circumstances should the order be extended to conventional mortgage loan financing. Should these builders then be given an opportunity to voice their views over the station?

"A recent public opinion poll indicates that many more white Americans approve of nonsegregated schools and churches than approve of nonsegregated housing. Is the station to offer time for the presentation of this point of view as well?

"What about the point of view advanced publicly by some prominent white persons that Negroes should be redistributed among the 50 States so as to approach a roughly equal distribution of Negroes in relation to white population in each of the 50 States? What about the often publicized views of some prominent Negroes who favor concentrating all Negroes in some of the 50 States so as to allow Negroes to develop their own economic, social, and cultural institutions?

"Where is the discussion of public issues to stop which started with the broadcast of a regularly scheduled religious program?

"Will not the attempt to achieve 'fairness' with regard to individual programs lead to a blue-penciling by broadcasters of all programs containing references to public issues including sermons broadcast from churches? Will not stations want to avoid starting an interminable chain of argument and debate? Will they, therefore, be inclined to omit one of the sources of this danger, namely, religious programs?

"All of the facts in the example are taken from recent responsible news reports concerning 'contrasting viewpoints' which have been expressed on this particular 'issue of current importance'. I wonder how the Commission proposes to deal with cases like these under its public notice of July 25?

"The public notice, if actually enforced, is likely to have one further result: It is likely to place an intolerable administrative burden upon the members of the Commission which the members cannot possibly discharge without neglecting other important responsibilities placed upon them by the act. Thus, in order to meet the responsibilities under the public notice, the Commission staff rather than the members of the Commission will have to discharge the day-to-day determination of what constitutes fairness in programs involving the discussion of public issues. Certainly nothing like this was ever contemplated by the framers of the Communications Act. On the contrary, the very purpose of the act is to leave primary responsibility for programing with the licensees.

"I am, therefore, calling upon the Commission to review the content of its public notice of July 25 in order to determine whether it is in conformity with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. If the Commission, upon review, determines that it is not in conformity with the act I trust the Commission will appropriately modify its public notice.

"In either case I request your early advice as to the decision reached by the Commission in this matter.

"Sincerely yours,

"Oren Harris,
"Member of Congress,
"Chairman."

The second letter is addressed to a broadcaster friend—one of the many broadcasters whom I have had the pleasure of meeting in the course of my 27 years of service in the House of Representatives. It reads as follows:

"Dear Friend: I have been thinking about what you told me during your last visit at my office. You said, I remember vividly, that you had your 'belly full' and were about ready to sell your station. A broadcast station license, you felt, was tantamount to a hunting license for the FCC and the Congress to haunt broadcasters in connection with every aspect of their business.

"You were particularly exasperated over the FCC's proposed limitations on advertising and the Commission's recent public notice, purporting to interpret the fairness doctrine. You felt that our committee had contributed to your problems through its rating investigation and its editorializing hearings.

"To top it all, you indicated that your own industry organization, in your opinion, could not be counted on to be of much help in this connection.

"In other words, you are apparently on a very low limb—persecuted by those persons whom you consider your antagonists, and deserted by those on whom you had hoped to count as your friends.

"I promised you that I would look into some of the things which you mentioned and write you shortly giving you some of my thoughts in the hope that you would continue as a broadcaster. (By the way, you failed to mention anything about profits or losses. I hope there is at least some pecuniary compensation for all of your troubles, and if you decide to sell out you won't have to do so at a loss.)

"Let me take the things you mentioned one by one:

"First, with regard to the Commission's proposed advertising limitations. I believe firmly that after the comments are all in and after the Commission will have had an opportunity to think over this matter, it may very well drop the proposed limitations. In any event, Representative Walter Rogers, of Texas, who is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Communications and Power, has introduced a bill which would clarify that the Commission does not have any power to adopt rules limiting advertising. I take it that while the effect of the bill would be to eliminate the Commission's rulemaking power in this respect it could still in granting a license take into consideration whether the program service offered meets the needs of the community and this inquiry would include the question whether such program service involves excessive commercialization.

"I believe the bill constitutes a step in the right direction in that it would permit the Commission to cope with excessive commercialization as one aspect of programing on a case-by-case overall basis without letting the Commission inject itself into the day-to-day program operation of all broadcast stations.

"As to the second point—the Commission's recent elaboration of the fairness doctrine—I am in complete agreement with you. If broadcasters are to meet community needs by offering discussion programs of vital public issues—and they certainly should—fairness in connection with such programs should be judged on an overall basis. Otherwise this would lead to the Commission instead of the broadcaster having the primary responsibility for the content of the individual discussion program. Such a result would be completely contrary to the basic pattern of the Communications Act.

"I have written a letter to the Commission wherein I expressed some of my views on this subject. I expect to hear from the Commission before long and I shall send you a copy of their reply.

"Thirdly, you have mentioned our committee's broadcast rating investigation. This investigation has been concluded. I think you will agree with me—the facts are that many broadcasters have been taken in by many rating services. Perhaps some of the broadcasters did not mind too much being taken in. However, I believe you will agree that broadcasters cannot meet the public interest standard of the Communications Act and at the same time use false or at least misleading broadcast ratings.

"I have expressed before the view that legislation in this area should only be the last resort. Individual broadcasters, however, are not in a very good position to evaluate the adequacy of rating procedures and rating information. If broadcasters were required to shoulder this responsibility individually I venture to say that ratings would necessarily have to fall into disuse.

"The only way in which broadcasters can audit rating services is to do so collectively as has been proposed by the National Association of Broadcasters. The association has made good progress in establishing an audit bureau for rating services and I hope the association has the full support of its members in taking this step.

"This reminds me that you had some misgivings about your own trade association. Let me remind you that your association was responsible for the adoption of radio and television codes which contain specific provisions concerning the limitation of advertising. It is a fact that only about 38 percent of radio stations and 70 percent television have subscribed to the codes. I venture to say that had your association been in a position to exercise greater influence in this area the industry might not be confronted now with Commission rulemaking on advertising.

"I have already said that I don't agree with the Commission's proposed rule but I do believe that broadcasters individually and collectively can do more in this area than has been done in the past.

"The last point which you made concerns our committee's hearings on editorializing. As you know, the Communications Act does not contain any specific provisions on this subject and many questions have been raised as to what should be the ground rules for broadcast editorializing. I am of the firm conviction that the Congress should concern itself with the establishment of such ground rules and that it should not leave this important question to the FCC without at least laying down specific guidelines to the Commission. I am deeply disappointed that many broadcasters have viewed these hearings as an attempt on the part of Congress to interfere with free speech. Certainly, this was not our intention. As early as 1958, in speaking to the Connecticut Broadcast Association, I stressed the importance of broadcast editorializing and expressed the hope that this practice would become more widespread than it had been heretofore. I hold to the views then expressed.

"The attitude of many broadcasters toward our hearings on editorializing seems symptomatic to me of the prevailing mood of broadcasters today. Broadcasters in general seem to feel on the defensive.

"Let me suggest that the requirement that broadcasters must establish and meet community needs can be both your shield and sword. If you succeed in getting your communities behind you you need not fear greatly governmental criticism or interference. The Commission's Omaha hearings seem ample proof of my contention.

"I have a strong feeling that in recent months the Commission may have forgotten an important principle which it alluded to in its statement on programing. The Commission stated 'We do not intend to guide the licensee along the path of programing; on the contrary the licensee must find his own path with the guidance of those whom the signal is to serve.'

"The Commission's Notice of Fairness, its proposed rulemaking on advertising, and the proposed ban on horseracing information, seem to me examples of this new Commission attitude. I regret this attitude and I hope this trend will not continue.

"There is one more thing I wanted to say to you since you are operating a television station in addition to an AM–FM radio station. It has recently come to my attention that community antenna television systems are increasing by leaps and bounds. In my own State there are now more than twice as many such systems as there are television stations.

"The Commission, without any specific statutory authority from the Congress, has attempted to regulate community antenna television systems and this regulation has met with a great deal of opposition. The Commission has won an important judicial victory in the Carter-Mountain case. In that case the court upheld the contention of the Commission that it could use its power to license microwave operations for the purpose of regulating community antenna systems.

I don't agree with this approach but the court in this case upheld the Commission's point of view. I am still old-fashioned enough to believe that basic policies should be laid down by the Congress, and not by Commission fiat with judicial approval.

"I just wanted to mention this because it seems to me that a basic conflict seems in the offing between local television stations on the one hand and community antenna systems on the other hand. Unless some steps are taken to resolve this conflict, the Congress may well be called upon to do the resolving for the two contending parties.

"We just had some experience with resolving a management-labor conflict in the railroad industry and I can assure that none of us Members of Congress cherish the thought of having to do the same thing with disputes of this nature on a continuing basis.

"Thus you can see we Members of Congress have a few gripes of our own and I don't expect you to be able to take care of ours. However, I shall do my best to take care of some of your complaints and I shall also be glad to hear from you.

"Sincerely yours,

"Oren Harris,
"Member of Congress,
"Chairman."

DECISION OF COURAGE AND CONSCIENCE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a transcript of a court opinion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, over an extended period since July 13, the White Pantry Restaurant in Huntington, W. Va., has been picketed for refusal to serve members of the Negro race. The pickets have also engaged in sit-ins at the White Pantry Restaurant, and there have been nine demonstrations since July 13.

Recently, the management of the White Pantry Restaurant petitioned Circuit Judge John W. Hereford for an injunction to forbid mass demonstrations, limit picketing, and assure orderly conduct in the vicinity of the restaurant.

On Saturday, September 7, Judge Hereford handed down his decision which denied the injunction. It was a decision of courage and conscience, the words of which ring like a liberty bell. This was not a written opinion, but was delivered extemporaneously from the bench. The stenographic transcript of Judge Hereford's remarks follow:

The Court. Gentlemen, at the outset of the discussion of this evidence which has been rather long I would pay my respects to counsel on both sides. The case has been tried like gentlemen and has been ably presented on both sides, and I want to pay my respects to counsel.

This is a case that under ordinary circumstances would be fraught and loaded with a great lot of prejudice and feeling. In this case there has been as much freedom from that as any case I have tried. And that was because counsel have kept any prejudice from coming over into them and manifesting itself in the procedure of this case.

This is a case, of course, that comes to me under the chancery side. It is useless for me to say to counsel that this court has two sides. One is a side that deals with the cold principles of law that are rooted in the statute books or have been decided and the trail made that a court must follow. That is the law side. The other side—and that is the side that the case now before this court is on—is the chancery side or the equity side of the court.

The equity side of the court might be called the conscience side of the court or the side that the heart—and I mean the heart that beats—of a court must be on. And that is the side, of course, that any injunction such as this is filed on. So that a court has to sit in a case such as this as a court of conscience, a court of the heart, and weigh not necessarily according to the cold principles of law that the law side requires, but according to the heart and soul and conscience of the chancellor who presides over the trial of the case.

This, as any other case that involves a very much alive question in our America today, that of integration and segregation, is not a pleasant case for this court to decide, or any court. This question of integration and segregation is, as I have suggested, perhaps the most vital question that confronts the American political, social, and religious life of today. It is a sort of a dealing with the great promises of democracy that were made a hundred years ago, and the terrible failure of those promises a hundred years later, which has made it necessary for a race whose skin, unfortunately, God saw fit to make black, has to make manifest their wishes with relation to the performance of the promises that were made a hundred years ago.

In this case the court is called on to enjoin a practice that has been pretty prevalent throughout the United States, that of marching and sitting in and doing those things that are felt necessary by most of the colored race, and by a great portion of the white race, to bring to the attention of the body politic the rights of the American Negro in the way of being an American citizen; whether he be a first-class American citizen or a second-class American citizen that will not have the rights that those of us who God saw fit to make our skins white have the right to enjoy.

And that is what confronts this court today, is the question of the right of the American Negro, and the whites that are in sympathy with him and her, to make known their desires to be first-class American citizens.

I will say here and now as I said a few months ago in another case of like kind that I don't think any lawyer could dispute the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has by its decisions said that the American Negro has civil rights the same as any other citizen; that they are citizens, and that the spirit of the Constitution of the United States guarantees to them the same rights that it guarantees to me.

And yet, in spite of the spirit of the Constitution, and the spirit expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States with relation to the Constitution, there are still little people in this world that would still deprive the American Negroes, who are American citizens the same as I am, of the rights that were promised them 100 years ago but have been denied them for 99 to 100 of that period since the promise was made.

What this petitioner is doing is depriving the American Negroes of Huntington or elsewhere from coming into this place of business and enjoying the same privileges of his fine restaurant—although I have never been in it I am sure it is a fine one—declining to allow a person, just because his skin is a different color than mine, refusing to allow him the same privilege that I would be allowed if I walked into his place of business.

I say, that is something that the Supreme Court has, I think very definitely, watered down and placed in the area of condemnation. And if what the petitioner is doing was done by a governmental agency, by a State, by a city, by a county, they would be enjoined immediately from doing such a thing, from practicing segregation in a business that is operated by taxation. And yet the petitioner would come into this court and ask this court to protect him in his attempt to do that which the Supreme Court of the United States says that the State couldn't do or the county couldn't do.

Now, let us concede that as an American citizen he has rights the same as everybody else, and he has a right to be foolish if he wants to; he has a right to take the position that he is not going to permit integration in his place of business; he has a right to do all of those things. And I would be the first to accord him those rights. But I am saying now I am holding that he has no right to come into a court of law and ask me as judge of this court, in a court of chancery, in a court of conscience, in a court of the heart—he has no right to come into this court and ask me to protect him in doing something that the Constitution of the United States, according to the Supreme Court, says is not proper and could not be done by a governmental agency.

So this court is not about to lend its good offices to help this petitioner or any other petitioner to enforce something that is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

And I am going to go further and hold in this proceeding that when a man such as this petitioner gets a license from the State of West Virginia and from the city of Huntington—and the court take judicial notice of that fact—to serve the public in the form of furnishing a place for people to eat, and when that business that he is operating has to be inspected by the health department of the city, they have to make an examination of the cleanliness of the place, the toilet facilities, the cleanliness of the kitchen, they have to go in there and inspect it and place a rating on the business, and that has to be done by a public official, and that public official is paid by taxpayers' money, including taxes that are paid by the Negroes, and then make the Negroes help pay for inspecting a restaurant that only white people can eat in, and that the door is slammed in the face of the Negroes, is, I think, unreasonable and unpardonable.

I think, in addition to that, that there have to be fire inspections that have to be conducted by public officials that are paid by the taxpayers, including taxes that are paid by the Negroes too. And to tax the Negro in order to pay the salaries of somebody that has to inspect a business from which the Negro is shut out, is not good Americanism, is not constitutional, and is contrary, in my way of thinking, to the laws of the great State of West Virginia.

So I am about to say and am saying that when the State of West Virginia issues a license and the city of Huntington issues a license to do business and serve the public, that the Negro is as much a part of the public as the white man, and that they would be obligated to serve him too. And if the news medium that I think came out this morning over the radio and television correctly states that the Governor of West Virginia is on the eve of issuing a proclamation similar to the one recently issued in the State of Kentucky, which will state that any licenses issued by the State of West Virginia will carry with them and impose the responsibility of serving all of the public, and not just the public that is not shut out because their skin is black or some other reason, and if that is true and if that is the law of the State of West Virginia, an injunction ought to be applied for by the other side in a case like this; and if that becomes the law, and a Negro, just because he is black, is discriminated against in a place that is licensed in the State of West Virginia and goes in and is refused service, I think he then could apply to the court of conscience, the court of the soul, the court of the heart, and ask for relief and mandatory injunction which would forbid the operator from closing the door in his face and would require the operator to serve him the same as it would serve any other citizen in our State and our Nation.

So I would feel that I had fallen down on my responsibilities as a judge here if I did not discuss the principal reason for denying this injunction. I wanted to give both sides a chance, because I presume this case will go to the Supreme Court, and I invite it, I would not set myself up as God in a case like this, or any other case. And I always, when I decide a case, have the realization that towering over me is the shadow of a court that is higher than I, that can pass on it and will pass on it, and I am sure will pass on it intelligently and correct any mistakes that I might make.

I think I owe it in this case to set out some discussion of the evidence, and I don't want to take too long to do it. Of course, the court is bound by the allegations of the petition. The allegations of the petition that this case is tried on sets out and charges that the defendants staged sit-in demonstrations over his protest and in a manner so as to intimidate, harass, and embarrass the petitioner; that they refused to leave the restaurant when the petitioner attempted to close it in the late hours of the evening.

Discussing the evidence that bears on that point, I think the evidence clearly demonstrates that the petitioner closed his restaurant voluntarily. Nobody made him do it. When the demonstrators came in—American citizens, if you please—because he didn't like the color of their skin he attempted to close the door. And that happened on, I believe it was eight or nine different occasions, when the so-called demonstrators came into his place of business. They had a right to come in there. They were American citizens and here was a place that was open to the public. Maybe he had the right to throw them out. But I don't think he had a right to ask this court to help him with his throwing out or his closing the door and inflicting indignities on them. And so far as I could see every one of them were passively resistant. They did a great deal better, perhaps, than most people, because it is apparent they were trained. They were trained in carrying on this kind of a situation and handling this kind of a situation. And I would look a long time to find a greater number of indignities inflicted than were inflicted on them in that restaurant, the White Pantry.

They came in. They were cursed at. I don't think there is any question about that. It is true that one or two of the petitioner's witnesses said they did not hear him. One of them finally admitted he did hear him and he was cursing; he did not know what he was cursing about. And the petitioner himself admitted he did some cursing. The exact words that were said are not made completely plain.

Then at least five, six, seven, or eight occasions when the sit-inners were in the restaurant asking to be served and suffering the indignity of having the door shut, having the air conditioner turned off and having the heat turned on and some instruments for the disinfecting of the place, the killing of flies and insects, and so forth, set off in the place, and the floor scrubbed with ammonia, and various other things while they were there.

When asked on the witness stand when he used disinfectant or fly killer his answer was "When the insects come in," which, of course, was telling me that he placed the people in the category of insects. And various and sundry other indignities that it is not necessary to detail.

But the sit-inners were nonviolent, although indignity after indignity was heaped upon them. Even in one instance one of the sit-inners was slapped in a booth, and it was suggested that he go and kiss some of the Negroes, and that he was a nigger lover, and other things that were detailed in the evidence and undisputed in the evidence.

In the case of a man having a knife drawn across his chest, that is disputed. Let's take the petitioner's version of it and say that that didn't happen, and that this fellow didn't have a knife placed at his chest and didn't have himself grabbed by the collar and pulled across the counter.

Another allegation in the petition is that they clamored en masse for entrance by force, and they also attempted to enter the back door.

I think in most of these instances, all of them that I can recall, the only entrance they made was when the door was open, either opened permanently or opened temporarily and the demonstrators came in; that there was little or no effort to get in the place, there was no breaking and entering, there was nothing that I could see in the evidence that would justify me holding that clamoring en masse for entrance by force or clamoring for anything would provide an injunction.

They "completely obstructed said entrances and the sidewalk and alley." It is evident from this evidence that the police department refused to make any arrests that were within the province of the police department. If the public was being interfered with, the police department was there and they could have used whatever they needed to do to take care of it.

And then it is quite apparent from this evidence that the petitioner knew the path and the road to the justice of the peace, where, apparently, warrants were issued. And he not only knew the path but he traveled that path and secured warrants against some of these parties that are still pending.

Then there is another allegation in there that the entrance was completely obstructed, and they did irreparable injury to his business. I ask the question, who did the irreparable injury to the business? If this thing had been dealt with in an intelligent American fashion at the outset, the things that happened here at least on eight or nine different occasions would not have happened. If this man had accorded this group their American rights and been friendly and sociable and agreeable and served them one time, I am sure then leniency would have been manifest and they would have been compassionate toward him and his business. Instead of that the evidence here shows, and it is undenied, that the first time they came in this petitioner or some of his employees even broke the dishes and saucers that had been, I suppose, in his thinking, contaminated by being touched by a person whose color was black, and he broke the dishes because of that. He refused, according to the mayor of the city to walk into a room because a Negro sat on a committee that he had been invited to meet with.

And it would be difficult to find, outside of the State of Alabama and the executive mansion, of that State, a greater display of prejudice and hate than has been shown by the evidence in this case.

It is also charged in the complaint that Cleckley had announced and threatened, through the city's daily newspapers, that the defendants would later stage a demonstraton, and promised still greater demonstrations, and he would be hampered and had been hampered in the conduct of his business.

There is no evidence to establish that. When two newspaper articles that may have established it were attempted to be introduced they were objected to and the court had to rule that they were not admissible, so there was no evidence of that.

The petition further alleges that they carried placards on August 17, 1963; that they congregated, making ingress and egress a practical impossibility, to the inconvenience, harassment, and embarrassment of the customers and the inconvenience of pedestrian traffic along 9th Street.

I would have to say that under this evidence those things were done by the petitioner himself, who closed his place of business and refused to extend to the sit-inners or demonstrators any recognition of the rights of American citizens.

So I think that on the basis that I have set out—and it may be set out in the order, even the comments that the court has made in his findings may be included if counsel care to have them—show the injunction denied, the petition dismissed, at the cost of the petitioner.

Counsel will put in the order anything that they want that is proper to enable them to facilitate their appeal.

Mr. Williamson. With the court's permission, we will make such motions as may be proper after the drafting of the order.

The Court. I want to add this further, as a caution, and counsel, that are members of this bar and officers of this court, will be asked to see that this is done: That there will be no violence; that anything that is done in the future will not consist of any violence. Because the court can very quickly grant an injunction to avoid violence and destruction of property. And the court will, of course, go into it thoroughly, and if there be anything that is done by the management to incite violence on the part of the demonstrators, I would go into that, too, before I would pass any judgment and grant an injunction and stop the demonstrators.

As it now stands the injunction is denied, the petition is dismissed, and the defendants are cautioned to be very careful about any possibility of any violence.

Mr. Henderson. I understand when the petitioner gets a license from the city and State to do business to serve the public, and it has to be inspected with taxpayers' money, am I correct that your holding is that Negroes are as much a part of the public as the white persons, and are entitled to be served?

The Court. That is about what I have held.

Mr. Quinlan. Is that what you want in the order, your honor?

The Court. Yes, you can put that in the order.

Mr. Quinlan. I say, do you want it in it?

The Court. Yes, I would like to have it in the order as one of the reasons for denying the injunction. Then that the evidence does not sustain the allegations of the petition to entitled the relief sought.

Then, if you want, the reporter will be directed to write up my comments verbatim and let them go in the record as part of the order, and let the record show that that is made a part of the order.

Very well. Court is recessed until Monday morning at 9:30.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, there continues to be deep concern among many people over the effect of the cuts made in the foreign aid legislation.

I want to take this opportunity to include in the Record the transcript of the press conference on August 29 with David E. Bell which, very thoroughly, illuminates the impact of the cuts.

Press Conference of David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development, August 29, 1963

Mr. Bayley. This is an open press conference, although Mr. Bell will have the right to go off the record or to remove himself from attribution if it is necessary. Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell. Thank you.

Thanks very much for coming around, ladies and gentlemen. We said we would be available this morning because the Department of Defense and the State and the Agency for International Development have now made a preliminary analysis of the potential effects of the cuts in the aid legislation that were made by the House of Representatives last Friday.

As you know, we consider these cuts, if sustained, to have very serious effects, and I wanted to have the opportunity to give you some indication of our conclusions on this analysis and to answer questions about them.

First of all, the House cut to $350 million in lending authority for the Alliance for Progress. This is actually a lower amount than was enacted in the fiscal year 1963 in the final appropriation. This would not in our judgment meet the needs of the Alliance.

Question. Enacted in which year?

Mr. Bell. In the last fiscal year, 1963.

Question. Are you referring to the cut of $150 million is bigger than the total?

Mr. Bell. No, the $350 million of lending authority which would be available after the House cut is actually a lower amount than was enacted, was appropriated, for lending in the Alliance in the last fiscal year.

Question. What does that amount to?

Mr. Bell. That was $425 million.

Now this would therefore be a reduction at a time when requirements are rising. The Alliance, in our judgment and by all the evidence that is available, is beginning to roll. The governments are beginning to take the Alliance more seriously as time goes by, they are getting their projects and programs ready. More and more countries are doing the kinds of things that they have to do under the Alliance. Peru and Argentina are the latest illustrations of countries which have undertaken strong progressive economic measures. And in consequence the requirements for the U.S. support of the Alliance are going up at the very time that this action by the House would reduce the United States ability to play its part in the Alliance partnership. And not only would this be inadequate to meet the real needs—it would be a severe psychological blow to the Alliance.

We have, all of us, been thinking of the Alliance as a strong, steady, long-term effort started at Punte del Este, and it was intended it was to run for 10 years, and we have been stressing throughout the necessity to look ahead and plan and make commitments, and we have been saying "if you will do that, we will be there when you need us," and under this House cut we could not be there when they need us.

We cannot in our judgment defeat the Communist thrust in this hemisphere unless we have a strong, steady, continuing program. We cannot succeed by a policy of fits and starts.

This is not simply obviously the judgment of the administration. People, like Mr. Milton Eisenhower, who have studied Latin America, who indeed played a real role in the ideas that led up to the Alliance, would tell you exactly the same thing.

So that is point one. The Alliance for Progress would be seriously damaged.

The second point is that the House cut $225 million from the appropriation for military assistance. That is from the appropriation which provides military equipment and training to countries with which we have mutual security arrangements.

Now this element of the appropriation recommendations by the President had already been cut substantially by the House committee, had been cut $180 million already. So that the total cut made by the House is $400 million, just over $400 million, from an initial request of a billion four, leaving about a billion dollars only.

Now this cut would have necessarily a serious impact on a relatively small number of countries. Part of our military assistance is, as you know, going to Europe. This is a relatively small part. We are not making new commitments to Europe, but we are paying out under old commitments and these could not be cut. We could not cut military assistance in the southeast Asia situation where the hot war is actually in process. There are very small military assistance programs only in Latin America and Africa. Therefore the effect of this House cut, if sustained, would have to hit the countries on the rim of the Soviet-Chinese Communist bloc, from Greece around through Korea; and because of this concentration I speak of it would necessarily hit some of them by as much as one-third or more, which is a very substantial reduction.

This is exactly the kind of meat ax cut against which the Clay committee warned us in their report, warned the Congress and all of us. It is the kind of cut which disrupts orderly planning and orderly action. The forces that would be affected are of importance to U.S. security as well as the security of the countries we are helping.

The level of assistance to each of these countries is reviewed and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Defense Department each year. So far as I am aware, there was no logical case made against these levels of military assistance.

The direction of military assistance appropriations is downward. We have cut $500 million from military assistance over the past

3 years, and Secretary McNamara has testified that we are heading for an appropriation level of a billion dollars which we will reach in 3 or 4 years from now. But abrupt unplanned reductions of the kind that would be necessary under this House cut are the opposite of sensible adjustments and would cause immediate and severe difficulties, as I have indicated, in a relatively small number of countries.

The third category the House cut was the category of development loans apart from Latin America. The President's request was $1,060 million. The House cut $160 million, cut it down to $900 million.

The effects of this cut would be as follows: We have major multiyear programs underway under international consortiums where our pledges have been related to those of other countries with respect to four countries: India, Pakistan, Turkey and Nigeria. The planned programs for those four countries would require more than 80 percent of the funds that would be available under the House action. These programs would have to be trimmed obviously if this cut actually were sustained. But they would be exceptionally difficult to trim, and in consequence the major effect of the cut would fall on other countries, and the other countries are of two main types.

One is the new countries in Africa where our lending programs are not extraordinarily large. The countries are not large, but the loans we do make are very significant for U.S. policy interest, and this cut would eliminate the possibility of making a significant number of loans to a significant number of those countries.

Secondly, the cut would necessarily affect some of the countries which are doing best and where we now expect to phase out economic assistance in the relatively near future, countries like Greece and Israel and Taiwan. These are countries which are in the last stages of the process of getting on their own feet economically. Because they are doing reasonably well they would have to absorb a substantial element of the effect of this cut.

But it would also delay the very objective we are trying to serve, which is to complete the process that is supported by aid and get them on their own feet economically.

The last category the House cut was the contingency fund. They cut it by $50 million, to $150 million. If sustained, this would give the President a contingency fund at the lowest level since the contingency fund was established as a separate appropriation item in fiscal year 1959.

Typically, the contingency fund for the last several years has been appropriated at a level of $250 million.

Nobody can say in advance how much of a contingency fund is necessary. It is intended to meet unforseen emergencies. We do know the kind of thing we have needed the contingency fund for and how vital it has been. For example, in Latin America in the past the contingency fund enabled us to support the new government in the Dominican Republic when the dictatorship was overthrown. In Africa the contingency fund was used to assist a country like Guinea which moved to extricate itself from the Soviet entanglements that they had gotten themselves into, and we needed to be able to move quickly to assist them and the contingency fund was there for that purpose. In Asia it has been used to meet sudden Communist thrusts, as in Laos and Vietnam.

That is the kind of thing the contingency fund has been used for. The key question is: Is there any reason to assume that we will need a smaller one in the future than we have needed in the past? Our judgment is the opposite. This is a very risky time to reduce the contingency fund.

With the adoption of the test ban treaty we expect greater action by the Soviet Union and by Communist China in their efforts to gain dominance in the less developed countries—not smaller efforts, but greater efforts. And in consequence we think we should be at least as well able to meet emergencies as we have been in the past; and in consequence we think this is a very risky thing to do to reduce this contingency fund so much.

These are the reasons why, in summary, we think that the House cuts, if sustained, would do serious damage to U.S. interests and would be a severe setback to the U.S. efforts to achieve peace and freedom around the world to defeat the Communist thrusts.

I might make two quick additional points if I may.

Some of those who voted for the cuts may have thought that the cuts would assist the U.S. balance-of-payments position. If so, they were entirely in error. The items they cut, the military assistance items, the Alliance for Progress loans and the development loans in other parts of the world, cuts in those items will not affect the balance of payments deficit by one nickel. Those are appropriations which are spent entirely in the United States. That is, the part of the appropriations that would be affected in the military case, and all of the appropriations in the lending case are spent entirely in the United States. In consequence a cut in those appropriations will not reduce the U.S. payments deficit. It will only reduce U.S. exports.

Secondly, there was a good deal of talk in the Congress about the so-called pipeline, which on last June 30 was, for both military and economic assistance, about $6.9 billion. But these funds were committed to projects in previous years. They are not available to be committed to new projects, and in consequence they have no bearing whatever on the requirements that would be met by the appropriations the President asked Congress for this year.

The pipeline is not an unusually high pipeline for lending agencies, and the economic side of this program has been becoming a loan program in recent years. That is why the pipeline has been rising. It is now a comparable pipeline to that of the World Bank and of the Export-Import Bank. It is not unusual. It consists simply of projects for which funds have been committed and which are under construction. As they are finished the funds will be paid out. It does not include any significant funds which could be used to meet new program requirements.

There are a small number of these pipeline projects which get canceled during a year, but those we have taken account of, and we did not ask the Congress for appropriations for that much money because we expect to recover that from the pipline during the year.

These were the comments I wanted to make today.

There were, in addition to the dollar cuts, three amendments adopted by the House of a substantive nature which we regard as damaging to basic U.S. purposes.

One is the requirement that interest rates on our loans must be at least 2 percent. If we were running a commercial enterprise, this would, of course, be an entirely appropriate conception. But we are seeking to advance U.S. interests in some situations where 2-percent interest rates would put an undue burden on the countries which we are trying to help. We tailor our interest rates to the situation of the country we are trying to help.

In the last few months we have raised rates for Greece, for Israel, for Taiwan, and for two or three other countries. We are prepared and expect to raise rates for other countries when they can undertake such commitments. But to put a 2 percent floor under our interest rates would hurt a number of very significant countries which have very low foreign exchange earnings and whose foreign exchange earnings can be expected to rise only slowly.

Mr. Eugene Black, the former head of the World Bank, wrote to the Senate committee about a similar amendment a month or so ago and recommended very strongly that such an amendment should not be adopted.

A second amendment which was adopted was that which called for cutting off aid to countries which do not sign bilateral agreements with the United States permitting us to provide investment guarantees under our law, guarantees against expropriation as the principal point that is at issue. We have been seeking to obtain such investment guarantee bilaterals. We have been making very great progress. We signed one only recently with Argentina. We think we are about to sign one with Chile.

There are only a few countries left which do not sign them. But some of those countries have very strong views on this matter, and an amendment like this would probably be self-defeating, would probably lead to internal political pressures against signing the bilateral agreement on the grounds that they would not do so under outside coercion. And the question, therefore, with this amendment is not as to its objective, but as to whether it would be effective. We doubt that it would be effective.

The Cuba shipping amendment and the 50-50 private enterprise amendment are matters which are rather complex and we are still not too sure just what the effects would be.

I think that this is all that I had noted to say here by way of introduction, and I am open to your questions.

Question. Mr. Bell, does your last comment on the Cuba shipping amendment imply that the administration might in the end support it?

Mr. BELL. We have, as you know, strongly enforced the Cuba shipping amendment which was already in the legislation of last year and which was aimed at shipments of commodities which would be barred or which would fall under the Battle Act; that is to say, strategic commodities of any kind, and of economic assistance from the bloc countries to Cuba. We have been enforcing those provisions for a long time and have made a great deal of progress in preventing or in eliminating the shipping from the Cuba runs which would carry commodities of that type.

We have encountered, as I am sure most of you know, the problem that a lot of ships had been chartered and these ships have been going out on the Cuba run. The question is what additional restrictions would be appropriate.

Some ships, for example, have been going into Cuba in ballast and bringing out sugar to free world countries, not to the bloc countries, and this is at a time when there is a worldwide shortage of sugar, and the price in the United States, for example, has been very high indeed.

It is that kind of question, the extent to which this new amendment would affect that kind of shipping and the relative merits and demerits of that, which we are trying to examine right now and see what, if anything, we should recommend to the Senate.

Question. Why do you expect increased Soviet and Chinese efforts to gain dominance in underdeveloped countries?

Mr. BELL. At the present time?

Question. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Two main reasons. One is that the test ban treaty obviously signifies the awareness of the Soviet Union, although not of the Chinese Communists, as to the enormous threat of nuclear action. In consequence it signifies their determination to seek their ends by other means than nuclear—or at least "determination" is much too strong a word, but it indicates to some extent that they will seek domination by other means than the nuclear attack. None of us is letting his guard down and we aren't——

Question. Does that mean that previous to the signing of the treaty you thought they would seek to gain their ends by nuclear attack?

Mr. Bell. The strategic threat was obviously there. It remains. But it seems a reasonable conclusion that they will now stress more heavily the effort to gain dominance by peaceful penetration, so to speak—not so peaceful at that—including guerrilla action and all the rest of the subversion methods that they have developed.

The second reason is that there is obviously an increasing competition between the Soviets and the Chinese for the control and leading influence in the Communist parties in these various countries, less developed countries, and this cannot help but exacerbate or stimulate stronger local action. They will be competing with each other to advance the Communist cause in the less developed countries. And therefore it seems to us a very logical conclusion that we can look forward not to less trouble in the underdeveloped countries, but more.

Question. Mr. Bell, if the House cuts are sustained did your analysis determine what impact this would have on U.S. jobs, domestic effect?

Mr. Bell. Well, you can roughly translate—I think the figure that is usually used is that half a billion dollars would be 50,000 man-years. Isn't that right, Ed?

Mr. Bayley. Right.

Mr. Bell. $600 million, 60,000 man-years. That is a rough translation, but it is the one that is commonly used and accepted.

Question. Mr. Bell, yesterday I understand you met with former Ambassador Nolting and the President. Did you discuss or consider the prospect of cutting or reducing aid to South Vietnam?

Mr. Bell. I cannot comment on the current situation in Vietnam. The bill we are talking about rests on the assumption that there will continue to be a strong U.S. effort there to support the efforts of a free Vietnamese people to stave off the Communist threat.

The immediate situation, as everybody knows, is very difficult there, and this is not the place to discuss it.

Question. Mr. Bell, can you tell us whether the Russians have stepped up or cut down their foreign aid?

Mr. Bell. The latest information we have is that they have neither stepped it up nor cut it down. For some time they were increasing it. Now they are on what you might describe as a plateau. They are obviously attempting to refine it.

They have not been successful from their point of view with their aid programs in some conspicuous cases in the Middle East and in Africa. The evidence is, however, that they have not reduced their aid but are running it at about the level it has been.

Question. Any figure?

Mr. Bell. Expenditures are up under prior commitments. Mr. Miller, do you have the total figures in your mind?

Mr. Miller. No.

Mr. Bell. I should have them. I apologize. I am sure we can get some figures for you relatively quickly after this meeting.

Question. Mr. Bell, I am concerned about this job question again. I determined that in round figures this would be something like 50,000 jobs.

Mr. Bell. That's right—50,000 man-years.

Question. 50,000 man-years?

Mr. Bell. Of employment. Right.

Question. One amendment affects India. Do you know what it is?

Mr. Bell. The Broomfield amendment. Yes, this was a clear indication by the House that—well, let me say first, the amendment was not directed precisely, as you know, either toward the Bokaro project or toward any single country. Its effect, however, as was recognized by the House when they adopted it, would be to prevent us from going forward with the Bokaro project during the current fiscal year. We are still assessing the significance of this, and so is the Government of India, and that is about all there is to say about it at this time.

As you know, we were not ready to make a decision about the Bokaro project. There are questions still being explored by the Indian Government and by ourselves, and I had told the congressional committees previously that we did not expect to be in a position to make a final decision on Bokaro before next spring in any event.

But the effect of this legislative amendment would be to flatly prevent us from using any fiscal year 1964 funds for that project.

Question. Mr. Bell, looking back on the tactics, do you feel you would have been better off without the Clay report, that it encouraged rather than headed off the meat axe boys?

Mr. Bell. Well, I am not an awfully good judge of how Congressmen react. This is a relatively new field for me.

My own judgment is that the significance of the Clay Committee's report was to emphasize again the basic strength of the bipartisan commitment in this country to a strong foreign aid program.

The Clay Committee had a number of critical things to say about the program as it was being operated and managed. We have made some changes, as you know, many of them directly in line with the Clay Committee's recommendations.

As to the amount of funds, General Clay testified very explicitly that in comparison to the President's recommendation of $4.5 billion he recommended $4.3 billion of authorizations for the current fiscal year. And on Saturday after the House took this action he issued a public statement in which he expressed his regret and his apprehension at the severe damage, the severe effects that this cut would have.

I think this program has been a bipartisan program from the beginning when Senator Vandenberg was the Senate sponsor of the Marshall plan, and it seems to me that it has been very impressive over these years that the successive Presidents of different parties and national leaders of both parties have continued to support this program, and that was illustrated by the Clay Committee's findings and recommendations, the Clay Committee having included not only General Clay himself, who is a prominent Republican, but also Secretary Robert Anderson, who has been Secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower administration.

Question. In view of all this impressive bipartisan support over the years, including General Clay, what happened Friday?

Mr. Bell. Well, I think the vote speaks for itself. It is not my field really to discuss that much further.

I would hope, however—I think it would be a very sad day for the United States if we did not continue to have major bipartisan support for these efforts which are in the national interest and which are so important to the accomplishment of U.S. objectives around the world.

Question. What is your figure on the total authorization after the House cuts?

Mr. Bell. 3.5.

Question. 3.5?

Mr. Bell. Yes, almost exactly. Three point five–0 something.

Question. Is that the lowest it has ever been at this stage?

Mr. Bell. I am advised it was the largest cut at the authorization stage of the process that has ever been made. I don't think I have the figures in my head. It is certainly one of the lowest. No, I can't answer the question precisely. I am sorry. We can get it easily enough.

(An inspection of the records showed that twice in the history of the foreign aid program, in 1956 and in 1958, the House authorization figure had been slightly lower than $3.5 billion. The amount cut, however, was far less than the cut presently at issue.)

Question. Mr. Bell, the Associated Press reports that a buy-Japanese campaign is underway in Tokyo. Could you tell use how this might relate to the cuts?

Mr. Bell. It is news to me that there is a buy-Japanese campaign. We have a buy-American program and have had for years. Why would there be any relationship to the cuts?

Question. Well, Japan is getting further and further away economically from the United States. Economically do you think——

Mr. Bell. No, actually the trade relations between Japan and the United States are very favorable to the United States. They buy from us a great deal more than we buy from them. And the trade—you know, these exports to Japan we have always cited as one of the illustrations of the eventual commercial virtues of the economic aid program. We helped to put Japan back on her feet and she is buying stuff from us at a billion-dollar-a-year clip.

Furthermore, the Japanese have in the last 2 or 3 years begun to provide economic assistance themselves to less developed countries. They are making loans now, providing technical assistance. We have been urging them to reduce the terms on which they are making their loans, reduce interest rates, lengthen maturity. They have been moving somewhat slowly; but they have been moving in that direction.

I am not sure, in other words, that I see the connection that you speak of.

Question. Can one expect any effort at a later state of the legislative process to put this amendment on 2-percent interest back on——

Mr. Bell. Yes, this will first be considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They tentatively adopted some weeks ago a similar amendment and then they agreed to reconsider it. So that will be considered further in the Senate committee, and we hope very much that they will not adopt any such amendment.

Question. You mentioned the military aid to Western Europe which is under earlier commitments. Could you tell us how much is involved and which countries and when this is going to be phased out?

Mr. Bell. Are the figures classified?

I am advised that I can tell you the overall figures, I cannot go into country figures.

Let me first say that this is the tapering off stage of military assistance to Europe which several years ago was a very large figure, upwards of—I think it came up toward $2 billion in the highest year. But today it is ending, and including the so-called infrastructure payments this amount is around $200 million. Infrastructure is about $70 million and the actual military assistance about $130 million, something like that.

Question. Does that include Greece?

Mr. Bell. No, no. It does not include Greece and Turkey. This is Western Europe only. Italy, the Scandinavian countries, Britain, and so on. And in several cases it is a miniscule amount, $100,000 for a bit of training, or something like that. It is tapering sharply and will be ending in the next 2 or 3 years.

Question. Could you tell us what the infrastructure part of this is?

Mr. Bell. About $77 million. Now that, of course, isn't really military aid at all. It is the United States' share of payments for ports and pipelines and other facilities which serve U.S. troops in Europe and would serve a common defense effort if one was necessary there. It is in this bill by historical accident, and the Senate committee has raised some questions whether it should be in this bill, and perhaps it won't be too much longer.

Anyway it is there now, can't be cut, represents commitments we have made for this much of the cost of things that are under construction.

Question. Mr. Bell, it seems obvious that foreign aid is getting more and more unpopular with American people. Do you know why?

Mr. **Bell**. Well, I have no explanations that aren't in all of your minds. I think there is the feeling it is going on an awfully long time without enough results. You know the answers to that question also.

The results, when you examine them, are really quite impressive. We have half a dozen countries that are just about on their feet now, including some countries that were in very difficult straits a few years ago such as Greece and Taiwan, and we are tapering out our economic aid in those countries and in the process are raising our loan terms so that we are virtually making commercial loans to those countries now at almost no cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

The place where the bulk of the funds are going today—India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, and the Latin American countries—those Latin American countries which have been doing their share under the Alliance—these places are making good headway. It may take a while, but people can be assured that the kind of progress they would like to see is under way.

There remain a number of very difficult cases about which people do a lot of talking, but the aid to those places is a relatively small part of the total, and we are operating with respect to those places on a strictly contingent basis. Insofar as they undertake sensible economic policies then we stand ready to assist them.

Indonesia is an illustration. Aside from the training kind of thing which is clearly in our long-term interest, the assistance that we stand ready to give to Indonesia is contingent on their effective movement in directions that are in accord with the policies of the United States and the other free world countries.

So that I think there are good answers to this question.

A second point is the balance-of-payments question, and I have already indicated in general terms what the answer is. The parts of the program which were not cut by the House do include some elements under which the dollars do go out of the United States. For example, our contributions to international organizations are made in dollars. All countries make contributions to international organizations in convertible currency. That has been standard practice since the end of the war. So there is a small impact on the balance of payments from that source.

But in every aspect of the program that we can, we have tied it to U.S. procurement, and in the fiscal year just ended, over 80 percent of our economic aid commitments were for U.S. goods and services and therefore would not affect the balance-of-payments deficit, and a larger share of the military assistance commitments were made for U.S. goods and services.

I think people have been concerned about the budget deficit. There is no direct relationship to this kind of expenditure any more than any other, but since we have no domestic constituency to speak of, I suppose we are more vulnerable to an economy drive than other elements of the budget.

Question. Mr. Bell, do you detect any signs that the opposition is also bipartisan?

Mr. **Bell**. Oh, yes. It always has been. There have been over the years some southern Democrats who have not been persuaded that this program is sound and helpful, and there have been some Republicans over the years who have opposed it.

Question. What do your Senate sources say is going to happen over there?

Mr. **Bell**. I don't have a good reading. You probably have a better one than I do.

Question. Dave, how do you answer the argument at a time when we are trying to encourage Western Europe to get more into the aid business why should we philosophically get more involved in Africa? You say this is an area that would have to feel a cut.

Mr. **Bell**. Yes; but not because we are increasing our efforts in Africa. I haven't got the precise figures in mind, but there was no change in the program proposed for Africa this year. The program we are conducting in most countries is deliberately and quite properly in our judgment a minority contribution to the external assistance to the African countries. In most of the African countries the majority of the outside assistance comes from European countries, from France, from Britain, or from other European countries. Quite a bit is put in by the European economic community as a whole.

This policy is fine with us. It does not mean, however, that the United States should have no program in Africa. We think it is very important for us to have relatively small programs in most of the countries (a) because we do have a strong interest in their independence and in their development toward the free world, and so forth; and (b) if we put in a small amount it makes it politically feasible for them to receive large amounts from their excolonial metropoles which otherwise would be politically very difficult for them. They would be subject to political challenge as simply continuing colonialism under another name, and this is the kind of thing, these relatively small programs of ours but yet which are very important to U.S. interest, that would be hit by this cut.

Question: Subject to India proving the feasibility of the Bokaro plant could you assess for us the possibility of this acceptance by Congress, whether it——

Mr. **Bell**. Possibility of what?

Question. Subject to India proving the feasibility of Bokaro, can you assess for us the acceptability here, the chances of acceptance by Congress, whether they are good, fair or bad?

Mr. **Bell**. Well, I don't think you can say they are very good. The Broomfield amendment clearly reflected a substantial concern on the part of many Members of the House with respect to the Bokaro project on the grounds that it was very large and on the grounds that it was in the public sector, and while we do not yet know what the Senate will do—therefore I cannot give you a full answer—I think that it would have to be interpreted as indicating a significant obstacle to the possibility of going ahead with Bokaro, quite apart from the fact that it stops it altogether for this year. You were asking, I take it, about the longer run.

Question. Yes.

Question. Mr. Bell, your assertion that 80 percent of this economic aid is spent within the United States was challenged in a debate in the House. I was wondering, is that figure an estimate or is it firm and verifiable through statistics?

Mr. **Bell**. No, it is a firm figure. It must be properly understood—some of the people who challenged it said our actual expenditures in calendar 1962 were not as high as 80 percent in the United States. That is perfectly true, and we never said they were.

In the formal presentation of the administration's case there is a chart which shows, on one side, expenditures, and on the other side, commitments, and it shows that the expenditure level in the United States only reached, I think, 50 percent in calendar 1962; but the commitment level, as I indicated, in fiscal year 1963 was 80 percent. That is a perfectly solid figure.

Expenditures are being made from commitments of earlier years when the same policies weren't in effect. So the actual outlays, actual expenditures, are rising steadily. The percentage in the United States is rising steadily, and it will reach 80 percent when the present commitments result in expenditures.

But there is nothing phony about the obligations figure.

There is another point on which it is challenged, incidentally—that while we require that economic aid funds be spent in the United States, if we didn't provide the economic aid these countries would buy from the United States anyway. Well, this, of course, is just not so. We provide aid only where the resources aren't available to buy whatever it is that needs to be bought, and our statistical evidence is quite clear that in the countries where our aid has been going U.S. commercial exports have been rising, not falling, with the single exception of some of the Latin American countries where the impact of the recent price changes of their raw materials has been so severe.

That has nothing to do with the aid program. Our exports to Latin America have dropped because of that reason.

So that I think the case here is solid and sound.

Question. Mr. Bell, have you had any recent assurances from DAC——

Mr. **Bell**. Excuse me, Pete. Let me add that I sent a paper up to Senator **Douglas** a week or 10 days ago which went into this question of the relationship between the aid program and the balance of payments. Now has that been made public anyway? Did **Douglas** put it in the record? We sent it up for the use of the Joint Economic Committee where they have been looking into the balance of payments.

But this paper can be made public, and if you would like copies we have them, and it goes into these various questions that we have been talking about.

Question. Has the administration had any recent assurances from DAC of greater cooperation and greater payments?

Mr. **Bell**. Yes, I have been to two meetings this year, one in April, at which a significant step forward was made when they agreed with us that the terms on which aid should be made available to less developed countries should vary according to the repayment ability of the country concerned and that this meant with respect to a great number of recipient countries that those countries that have been making harder loans should soften their terms.

Now the rate at which they are in fact carrying out this commitment has differed. The British have taken a big step since that meeting. They have cut their interest rates in half. The Germans have made some impressive steps forward. Their most recent loan commitments to India contained a 7-year grace period—it was unheard of for the Germans—and I think 25 years total, and at 3 percent. These are very much softer terms than the Germans were giving a couple of years ago.

So that the DAC countries are moving in the right direction on terms.

Now on amounts, we had a recent meeting in—I think it was July—in Paris, and the Germans, the French, the British, and the Canadians all said flatly that their aid expenditures were going to be rising in the next year. There were one or two countries which did not say this and upon whom the rest of us looked with raised eyebrows and we hope we had some impact.

The Canadians particularly used some fairly substantial figures as to the increase.

Of course Canada is a relatively small economy, but proportionately they expect to raise their aid level a great deal under Mr. Pearson.

So there is some tangible evidence that these other countries are increasing their amounts of aid.

As you know, we have not felt that the amounts of aid that they have been providing needed so much attention as the terms on which they have been providing it. So that for us the more important objective is to get their terms softened.

We also think that some of them particularly should increase amounts. Canada has been one of those, and we are very glad that they are moving in the right direction.

Question. There was another amendment, Mr. Bell, that you haven't discussed and I wondered if you regarded it as inhibiting you in any way. That was one that was adopted in committee, and approved without any discussion, requiring the cutting off of aid whenever the President determines that an aid recipient is about to commit aggression against another recipient. Is that a binder of any consequence?

Mr. BELL. The wording is a little uncertain because as I recall it, as it was written it requires us to read the minds of other governments, and we are not quite sure how we would apply it. Therefore, I believe we are proposing or going to seek some modification at least in the wording. "Engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts"—that is the phrase. We don't differ with the idea obviously. We certainly have no intention whatever of assisting anybody to prepare for aggression. But it is a little difficult to apply an amendment of that kind, and I am not quite sure what we will propose in the Senate.

Question. Two questions. One is what is your realistic judgment as to what the final appropriation will be this year?

Mr. BELL. I have no judgment to offer you on that.

Question. Well, then I will go on to the second question. When you said that one-third of American arms aid will have to be cut to the countries around the Communist bloc——

Mr. BELL. Not necessarily all of those, but some of the cuts to those countries would have to be as high as a third.

Question. Are you prepared to specify which countries would get a third?

Mr. BELL. I am not prepared to specify it in public. We have been over the figures in private, yes. The arithmetic is clear.

Question. You are not including South Vietnam in that?

Mr. BELL. No, no. As I indicated, we obviously could not cut in a case where there is a hot war going on. That is one of the reasons why the cut would have to be this high in other places.

Greece is a clear case of a country which might suffer significantly under this cut and where, in deed, for the last 2 or 3 years anyway, we have been urging Greece along with other NATO countries to increase their military effort, not to decrease it.

So that it is a very awkward type of action which cuts across U.S. policy objectives very severely.

Question. Can you cite for us some examples of where past aid cuts have either directly or indirectly eventually adversely affected U.S. interests?

Mr. BELL. I ran across a very clear case on military assistance in the Far East when I was out there in December and January of this year. This was—well, let's see—I can't specify, is that right?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. BELL. I will have to say that I visited a country in which it had been necessary because of a cut last year to reduce the military assistance program very sharply. That was, in that case, about 40 percent, as I remember it, and the U.S. military told us that this was a very unhappy thing to have done from our point of view. We count on X troops in X country with X kinds of equipment, and that is in effect part of our common defense program.

Question. A point of clarification. You mentioned on Bokaro this amendment in the lower House had the support of the administration, so I take it——

Mr. BELL. No, it was not supported by the administration.

Question. By Mr. Morgan.

Mr. BELL. It was accepted by Mr. MORGAN and Speaker MCCORMACK as the best that could be gotten through the House.

Question. Well, does it mean that it is lost?

Mr. BELL. It was certainly not supported by the administration.

Question. Does it mean it will not be passed by the Senate?

Mr. BELL. No, we don't know yet what will happen in the Senate.

[VOICE. Thank you.]

(Whereupon the press conference was concluded.)

RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, today on picking up the daily newspaper that we receive here, the Washington Post, I noticed there was an article headed "Young Democrats Favor Recognizing Red China." The article goes on to say that this is a liberal, independent organization.

Just to make sure that the record is understood by the general public, this Young Democrats organization does not represent the sentiments of the Democratic Members of this Congress. On August 17, 1959 the Congress passed House Concurrent Resolution 369, opposing the seating of Red China in the United Nations. Two Democrats voted against that resolution.

On August 31, 1961, we passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, which in essence said that the Congress did not favor the seating of Red China in the United Nations, and no Democrat voted in opposition to this resolution.

I think it would be disastrous if we seated Red China in the United Nations. I think it would be unfortunate if we withdrew our troops from South Vietnam. I think it would be not in the interest of the United States if we extended recognition to the Communist regime in Cuba.

I want the House to know that the great majority of Democrats in this country are absolutely opposed to such nonsense as expressed by these so-called young Democrats who adopted this resolution in San Diego.

THE CORE-CITY PROBLEM: SETTING THE ARA RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, before this session closes, this body may again be asked to vote on a new version of the previously defeated area redevelopment authorization. Members from urban areas, having pockets of unemployment too small to permit qualification under the present act, and who voted against the authorization bill this year, are being contacted by the administration seeking to change their vote.

The argument offered is that if the new bill, S. 1163, passes, and only if it passes, their areas will be aided. For the benefit of those Members who may not be as familiar with the facts as one who has worked directly on this bill in the House Banking and Currency Committee, I would like to set the record straight. First, this bill does not provide any new authority for the Area Redevelopment Administration to include these pockets of unemployment, or core-city areas, under the act. Second, the bill's language only reiterates the present responsibility of the Secretary of Labor to collect the facts. The proposed amendment is not necessary for a thorough study of the problem, since a study has already begun without the suggested language.

At present, the Administrator cannot designate parts of a city as a redevelopment area due to a prohibition in the 1961 conference report to the House on the original act. This prohibition, I might add, is recognized by the Senate in its report on S. 1163. The language reads:

> It is not, however, the intention of the conferees to authorize designation of part of a municipality as a redevelopment area in any case, but with that exception it is recognized that designation of redevelopment areas will not necessarily follow political boundary lines.

The Deputy Administrator for the Area Redevelopment Administration, Mr. Harold W. Williams, in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, July 29, also recognized this limitation. He stated:

> We have taken that language to mean that unless a part of a municipality is a full labor market area, we may not break up a labor market to do that.
>
> Now our counsel advises us that another report changing that would not be sufficient to change our policy on that. I am advised, we are advised, that legislative intent to be changed would require a change in the law.

There is no such change contemplated in the language of the new authorization bill. The language Members may be referred to in this respect, the Williams amendment added in the Senate reads:

> When the necessary facts and data with respect to areas being considered by the Secretary for designation as redevelopment areas are not available or are incomplete, the Secretary of Labor shall find the facts and provide the data needed in making the determinations required by this subsection for such areas.

The language obviously is barren of any new authority. The unwary Member, however, may be told that this language is needed to study the problem, and to make recommendations for new legislation next year. In fact, the present language of the act immediately preceding the proposed sentence also directs the Secretary of Labor "to find the facts and provide the data" necessary for any determination by the Secretary of Commerce. The Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., interpreted the proposed amendment at our hearings on July 29, stating:

> We see no objection to this amendment, since it would merely supplement and clarify the Secretary's existing responsibilities under that section to find the facts and provide the data required for designations of urban areas.

Not only does this language reiterate "existing responsibilities," however, it is also unnecessary for a study directed toward new legislation. The report by the House Banking and Currency Committee on the defeated version of this authorization bill, directed the ARA to make a study and present recommendations on the core-city problem to the Congress next year. The language found in the present Senate version was not contained in that House bill, yet despite this fact, and despite the defeat of that bill, the Deputy Administrator of ARA has since told the Banking and Currency Committee that a study has already begun as directed.

In short, Mr. Speaker, if any Member accepts the idea that a part of a city in his district will be designated as an area redevelopment area if this bill passes, he will have accepted a check guaranteed to bounce. There is no such authority now, and no language in the bill will create it. Should the Member continue to vote against an unwise spending measure, no harm will be done to his district. The facts can be gathered under the present wording of the act, the study that has already started can be finished, and new legislation to enable the inclusion of the core-city areas will be introduced next session, even if this year's authorization is defeated. I hope my comments will be helpful to my colleagues who may be badgered on this point in the weeks ahead.

WOOL IMPORTS—OPEN AND SHUT CASE

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the good news of the reopening of the A. G. Dewey Woolen Mills in Enfield, N.H., has been dampened by the announcement of the temporary shutdown of the Brampton Woolen Co. in Newport, N.H. Their reason was the same: increasing wool imports from overseas.

On August 30, I pointed out to my colleagues the plight of the hundreds of workers who are losing their jobs because of President Kennedy's failure to keep his promises to give the woolen industry the same protection he has given cotton. Despite continued petitions and letters the stricken mills have received no help from the White House.

President Kennedy and his administration prate about their concern for the jobless, but with callous indifference they are treating the New Hampshire woolworkers and manufacturers like a yo-yo. As one mill opens, another closes. It is an open and shut case if there ever was one—a case of broken promises and indifference toward jobs and a whole industry.

Although the Brampton Woolen Co. hopes to be able to reopen next week, its future and the future of many others like it are at best uncertain. They have worked valiantly to stay alive in the face of accelerating increases in wool imports. Wool is asking for no more than the cotton industry received—and the President has repeatedly promised them.

ERIC ALLEN JOHNSTON

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, many fine and kindly things have been said of Eric Johnston since his passing from us.

Hundreds of obituaries, some long, some short, have appeared all over the world, commenting on the life and achievements of this remarkable American.

Already in the RECORD have appeared the splendid remarks about Eric Johnston of our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN.

I was his friend for 26 years and an admirer of his for 40. A virus attack denied me from attending the services held here in Washington, D.C., when Eric passed away, before his interment in his beloved Spokane.

His character had great depth. I have never known him to harbor a thought that was not constructive. To him America was indeed "unlimited" as he wrote so persuasively in a volume published in the forties. Retreat was unthinkable to Eric Johnston. He left his neighbors and every community better off wherever he lived.

To those of us who knew Eric well some mention of his great mother, Ida Ballinger Johnston, must be included as a compelling influence. She also passed away this year.

Mrs. Horan joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow, Ina Hughes Johnston, and their two daughters, Elizabeth and Harriet, and their families.

DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5691 will correct an inconsistency with respect to disciplinary action taken against employees of the Veterans' Administration. Under present law, the chief medical director appoints disciplinary boards to determine the correctness of charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of physicians, dentists, and nurses. The chairman and secretary of these boards, however, are appointed directly by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Recommendations are made by these boards to the Administrator for approval and action. Thus, the suspension, demotion or discharge of a staff nurse requires the personal approval of the Administrator, while in the competitive service, authority to take such disciplinary action in the case of higher ranking employees can be taken at lower administrative levels. H.R. 5691 would correct this inconsistency and permit the Administrator to the extent he considers proper to delegate authority to the Chief Medical Director to take disciplinary action in the case of physicians, dentists, and nurses.

The Veterans' Administration has advised that enactment of this legislation will result in no additional cost to the Government. I recommend its approval.

USDA GIVING ILLINOIS WHEAT PRODUCERS BOTH BARRELS

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the USDA is giving Illinois wheat producers both barrels in its oversea market policies.

In a protest letter to Agriculture Secretary Freeman, I have pointed to discrimination against soft wheat varieties widely grown in Illinois in the oversea subsidy policies set by USDA, and to virtual boycott of these varieties in sales overseas under Public Law 480.

The Government subsidy for hard wheat is now 14 cents a bushel higher than for soft wheat. Why the discrimination? The subsidy should be the same whether it is soft wheat in Illinois or hard wheat in Kansas. Illinois farmers are citizens and taxpayers just like Kansas farmers.

Two recent commodity newsletters published by Chicago grain commission firms discuss the present export subsidy on wheat. Both are sharply critical of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for establishing a subsidy rate which favors the export of Hard Red Winter wheat and clearly discriminates against the export of Soft Red Winter wheat.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and as the Representative in Congress of a district which produces Soft Red Winter wheat, I am concerned over these charges and would appreciate—from the Secretary of Agriculture—an explanation of the reasons which have led the Department to widen, day after day, the spread between export subsidies on hard and soft wheat.

I quote herewith the pertinent comments of Thompson & McKinnen's commodity letter:

> The Government subsidizes hard wheat at 51 cents per bushel and soft wheat at 39 cents per bushel. Thus Chicago prices which are 16½ cents under Kansas City are to the exporter only 4½ cents cheaper relatively. If the USDA were to give the same subsidy of 51 cents to soft wheat as they do to hard wheat, then soft wheat might experience a broader export demand. As it is now the subsidy discriminates so much against soft wheat that there is little hope for even a seasonal upturn in wheat futures unless the arbitrary action is revised. This is so because there is a surplus of soft wheat over and above domestic requirements. We are hopeful that after the winter wheat has been planted that the Government will revise their subsidies and not discriminate against soft wheat. This then should lead to a seasonal recovery in Chicago futures.

And these excerpts from the Closing Grain Review of Hayden, Stone & Co.:

> There is an unusual situation in the wheat market. Minneapolis: September wheat is 3 cents premium over the December. Kansas City: September wheat is 1⅝ under Kansas City: December, but in Chicago, September wheat is quoted at 6⅜ under the December futures.
>
> The disappointing action of Chicago wheat futures appears to be due to discrimination by the Government against Soft Red wheat by allocating a subsidy of around 50 cents on Hard and 38 cents on Soft Red wheat in the area which sets the price for Chicago wheat futures. It is impossible to understand the reason for this discrimination as Kansas City September futures at the close yesterday were 1.94⅝ and Chicago September closed at 1.76⅛, a discount of approximately 18 cents per bushel for Chicago wheat. Why this situation is not corrected is unexplainable.

Since these comments were published, it is my understanding that the subsidy advantage has been increased by a couple of more cents for hard wheat.

Growers in the Soft Red Winter wheat area, which principally embraces Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, have just harvested a bumper crop. Many of them are "15-acre" producers and are, therefore, ineligible for price support. They must depend upon the free market system to provide a fair return for their wheat. Through the years they have not contributed materially to the mountainous surplus of wheat which we have in the United States.

In fact, the July 1 carry-in of this class of wheat was something like 5 million bushels and CCC holdings of Soft Red Winter wheat are minimal. These supply figures underscore the fact that there is a strong and constant demand for this class of wheat both at home and abroad. It is priced lower than the hard wheats and many importing countries would prefer it to hard wheat for this and other reasons. Yet the discriminatory export subsidy established by USDA largely offsets the price advantage which would otherwise be enjoyed by Soft Red Winter wheat in the world export market. In effect, the grower who has not contributed to the U.S. wheat surplus, and who produces a product for which there would be a strong export demand in a freely competitive market, is denied access to that market by arbitrary decisions of USDA.

Compounding this injustice is the further fact that Soft Red Winter wheat is also discriminated against under Public Law 480. If you will review the purchase authorizations for wheat issued under this act in recent months you will find that only a handful of them permit recipient nations to buy Soft Red Winter wheat, regardless of what their own preference might be. Most of the big allocations, such as those to India and Pakistan, clearly specify that only hard wheats, Mixed and Soft White may be purchased.

Thus it seems to me that the USDA is giving Illinois wheat producers both barrels:

First. In the establishment of export subsidies which seriously restrict sales abroad.

Second. In a virtual boycott of Soft Red Winter wheat under Public Law 480 which further inhibits such export sales.

It has been hinted—see Wayne Darrow's farm letter of July 27, 1963—that the Public Law 480 boycott of Soft Red wheat is a retaliatory action against Midwestern wheatgrowers who voted overwhelmingly against the administration's wheat program in the May referendum. While I cannot bring myself to believe that any official or agency of the U.S. Government would undertake such a malicious action, neither can I understand the present position of USDA with respect to Public Law 480 allocations of Soft Red Winter wheat or its export subsidy policy which also discriminates against the sale of this class of wheat abroad.

I would appreciate having whatever explanation may be available from USDA officials at the working level who made the decisions.

Why the discrimination? The subsidy should be the same whether it is soft wheat in Illinois or hard wheat in Kansas. Illinois farmers, are citizens and taxpayers just like Kansas farmers.

WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, S. 330 will authorize the approval of courses under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, Public Law 634, 84th Congress, by State approval agencies upon the expiration of the educational provisions of the Korean GI bill on January 31, 1965.

At the present time, courses of education approved under the Korean GI bill are also considered approved for the purposes of the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. Upon the expiration of the Korean GI bill, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would become responsible for the approval of additional schools participating in the war orphans' educational program. S. 330 merely authorizes a continuation beyond January 31, 1965, of the same procedures and facilities presently being utilized in the approval of courses of education. I believe this procedure has operated satisfactorily in the past and recommend that it be continued.

The Veterans' Administration has stated that the cost of extending the approval system would be reduced to negligible proportions.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN CRITICAL SITUATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on August 27, 1963, I addressed the House on the critical situation existing in the American textile industry by reason of our unrealistic foreign trade policy. As a part of my remarks I included in the RECORD the agreement announced on August 27, 1963, between the United States and Japan with reference to the importation of textile products.

On August 28, 1963, the U.S. Government announced the conclusion of an agreement with the Government of Japan on the export of zipper chain from Japan to the United States. As we know, zipper chain is a long strip of fabric and metal which goes into the making of zippers.

In order that the House may have the benefit of the complete textile agreement which has been concluded with Japan, I will insert the agreement of August 28, 1963, with respect to zipper chain, and also the announcement of the Department of State dated August 27, 1963, furnishing a description of certain miscellaneous textile items which were not a part of the text of the formal arrangement with Japan at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the textile agreement recently concluded with Japan would place an undue hardship on the American textile industry during the next year. As our gold supply dwindles and as American exports continue to meet with resistance abroad, the American people are beginning to realize that our overall foreign trade policy needs to be reexamined.

The Congress and the executive departments should exert every effort to protect American industry from excessive imports.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PRESS RELEASE NO. 447, AUGUST 28, 1963

The U.S. Government today announced the conclusion of an agreement with the Government of Japan on the export of zipper chain from Japan to the United States.

Zipper chain is the long strip of fabric and metal which goes into the making of zipper. Under the terms of the agreement the Government of Japan agrees to limit exports to the United States of zipper chain chief value of cotton, to 85,000 pounds, for calendar year 1964. The Government of Japan also agrees that there will be no further shipments of zipper chain, chief value of cotton, during the remainder of this year. The last shipments occurred in early August. For its part the U.S. Government agrees to admit shipments now en route to the United States.

The exchange of letters between Ambassador Ryuji Takeuchi and Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs G. Griffith Johnson effecting this agreement follows:

AUGUST 28, 1963.

His Excellency RYUJI TAKEUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan, Embassy of Japan.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 28, 1963, which reads as follows:

"With reference to the recent discussions held in Washington between representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America with regard to the export of zipper chain from Japan to the United States, I wish to state the understandings of my Government:

"With regard to the shipment of approximately 54,000 pounds of zipper chain in chief value of cotton now in transit to the United States and fully described in the attached shipping schedule, it is agreed that the U.S. Government shall use every available means to facilitate customs clearance of such shipments.

"On its part, the Japanese Government confirms that there are no valid export licenses for the export to the United States of zipper chain in chief value of cotton now outstanding. In addition, the Japanese Government will suspend issuance of export licenses on the exports of zipper chain in chief value of cotton to the United States, from the present date to the end of 1963.

"For the year 1964, the total amount of exports from Japan to the United States of zipper chain in chief value of cotton will be limited to 85,000 pounds.

"If either Government considers it appropriate to make any arrangement concerning the product in question for the year 1965, the two Governments shall consult on this matter.

"I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government."

I wish to confirm on behalf of my Government the understandings set forth in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

_____ _____

(For the Secretary of State.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 28, 1963.

Hon. G. GRIFFITH JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: With reference to the recent discussions held in Washington between representatives of the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America with regard to the export of zipper chain from Japan to the United States, I wish to state the understandings of my Government.

With regard to the shipment of approximately 54,000 pounds of zipper chain in chief value of cotton now in transit to the United States and fully described in the attached shipping schedule, it is agreed that the U.S. Government shall use every available means to facilitate customs clearance of such shipments.

On its part, the Japanese Government confirms that there are no valid export licenses for the export to the United States of zipper chain in chief value of cotton now outstanding. In addition, the Japanese Government will suspend issuance of export licenses on the exports of zipper chain in chief value of cotton to the United States, from the present date to the end of 1963.

For the year 1964, the total amount of exports from Japan to the United States of zipper chain in chief value of cotton will be limited to 85,000 pounds.

If either Government considers it appropriate to make any arrangement concerning the product in question for the year 1965, the two Governments shall consult on the matter.

I should be grateful if you would confirm these understandings if they are acceptable to your Government.

Sincerely yours,

_____ _____.

Shipping schedule of zipper chain

Name of vessel	Port	Date	Quantity
Brooklyn Maru	Yokohama	Aug. 3, 1963	13,485
	New York	Aug. 29, 1963	
Mizukawa Maru	Yokohama	Aug. 7, 1963	6,950
	Los Angeles	Aug. 21, 1963	
President Taylor	Yokohama	Aug. 10, 1963	33,098
	Los Angeles	Aug. 21, 1963	
Total			53,533

DESCRIPTIONS OF SCHEDULE A NUMBERS INCLUDED IN LIST ATTACHED TO LETTER ON MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS (NOT A PART OF THE TEXT OF THE ARRANGEMENT)

(Department of State press release No. 441–A, Aug. 27, 1963)

No. 2061400: Printers' rubberized blanketing and molded cotton and rubber packing, chief value of cotton.

No. 3224800: Tubular mats or rugs.

No. 3224900: Rugs, not elsewhere specified (except grass or rice straw) and other floor coverings, wholly or in chief value cotton.

No. 3226110: Belts and belting for machinery not elsewhere specified of vegetable fiber, wholly or in chief value cotton.

No. 3226300: Rope used as belting for textile machinery.

No. 3230238: Tassels and cords, and tassels.

No. 3230275: Typewriter ribbon, whether or not on a spool.

No. 3230277: Garters, suspenders and braces.

No. 3230352: Other yarns, in chief value of cotton.

No. 3230451: Candle wicking of vegetable fiber, chief value of cotton.

No. 3230712: Cotton manufactures, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3970010: Tracing cloth, chief value of cotton.

No. 3971010: Coated or filled cotton cloth, not specifically provided for or prepared for use as an artist's cloth.

No. 3971020: Other coated or filled cotton cloths, not specifically provided for, not in part of India rubber, chief value of cotton.

No. 3971110: Waterproof cloth, wholly or in chief value cotton.

No. 3971210: Same as 3971110—except in part of India rubber.

No. 3971430: Window hollands of cotton; and oilcloth (except silk oilcloths and oilcloths for floors), chief value of cotton.

No. 3113997: Men's and boys' other outerwear, not elsewhere specified, not knit.

No. 3113998: Women's, girls' and infants' other outerwear, not elsewhere specified, not knit.

No. 3114260: Other women's, girls' and infants' outerwear, not knit or crocheted.

No. 3114960: Other men's and boys' outerwear, not knit or crocheted.

No. 3114965: Wearing apparel, not elsewhere specified, not knit, and ornamented.

No. 2061000: Friction or insulating tape, chief value of cotton.

No. 2067610: Belts and belting for machinery, vegetable fiber and India rubber, chief value cotton—valued less than 40 cents per pound.

No. 2067710: Same as 2067610 except valued 40 cents and over per pound.

No. 3224700: Floor coverings of grass or rice straw.

No. 3230461: Loom, harness, healds, and collets of vegetable fiber, chief value cotton.

No. 3230670: Catheters, etc., and all other urological instruments.

No. 9439950: (In sets only) badminton nets.

DESCRIPTION OF SCHEDULE A NUMBERS AS LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 5 OF ANNEX A (NOT PART OF THE TEXT OF THE ARRANGEMENT)

Category 63

No. 3113000: Collars and cuffs.

No. 3113362: Vests, men's and boys', not knit, valued $2 or more.

No. 3113365: Vests, women's, girls', and infants', not knit, valued $2 or more.

No. 3113958: Hats, caps, berets, bonnets, hoods, finished.

No. 3113962: Other headwear, not ornamented.

No. 3113965: Vests, men's and boys', not knit, value less than $2.

No. 3113969: Skirts, women's, corduroy, whether or not in sets.

No. 3113970: Skirts, women's, velveteen, whether or not in sets.

No. 3113971: Skirts, women's, other fabrics, whether or not in sets.

No. 3113972: Skirts, girls' and infants', corduroy, whether or not in sets.

No. 3113973: Skirts, girls' and infants', velveteen, whether or not in sets.

No. 3113974: Skirts, girls' and infants', other fabrics, whether or not in sets.

No. 3113975: Vests, women's, girls', and infants', valued less than $2.

No. 3113995: Neckties.

No. 3114001: Neckties, ornamented.

No. 3114155: Raincoats, three-quarters length or longer, women's ornamented.

No. 3114165: Raincoats, three-quarters length, girls' and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114175: Coats, other, three-quarters length or longer, women's, girls', and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114180: Other coats, not elsewhere specified, women's, girls', and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114225: Pajamas and other nightwear, women's, girls', and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114235: Skirts, women's, ornamented.

No. 3114240: Skirts, girls' and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114245: Trousers: slacks, and shorts, women's, girls', and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114255: Vests, women's, girls', and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114715: Hats, caps, berets, bonnets, hoods, finished, women's, girls', and infants', ornamented.

No. 3114720: Other headwear, finished, ornamented.

No. 3114895: Raincoats, three-quarters length or longer, men's and boys', ornamented.

No. 3114900: Coats, suit type, men's and boys', ornamented.

No. 3114905: Coats, other, ornamented.

No. 3114925: Pajamas and other nightwear, men's and boys', ornamented.

No. 3114950: Trousers, slacks, and shorts, men's and boys', ornamented.

No. 3114955: Vests, men's and boys', ornamented.

"Part of" section

No. 3113937: Outerwear, not elsewhere specified, men's and boys'.

No. 3113998: Outerwear, not elsewhere specified, women's, girls', and infants'.

No. 3114260: Outerwear, not elsewhere specified, women's, girls', and infants'.

No. 3114960: Outerwear, not elsewhere specified, men's and boys', ornamented.

No. 3114965: Wearing apparel, not elsewhere specified, not knit, ornamented.

Category 64

No. 3030000: Cotton sewing thread.

No. 3030100: Crochet, darning, embroidery, and knitting cottons.

No. 3081510: Velvet or velveteen ribbon, not over 12 inches wide.

No. 3081530: Velvet or velveteen ribbon, over 12 inches wide.

No. 3081600: Other cotton pile ribbon.

No. 3081710: Polishing cloths, cotton velvet, 60 cents and over per square yard.

No. 3081730: Velvet and velveteen manufactures, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3081812: Curtains and drapes, corduroy.

No. 3081815: Other furnishings, not elsewhere specified, corduroy.

No. 3081818: Other articles, not specifically provided for, corduroy.

No. 3081852: Curtains and drapes, plushes or chenilles.

No. 3081855: Other furnishings, not specifically provided for, plushes or chenilles.

No. 3081912: Curtains and drapes, terry-woven.

No. 3081915: Other furnishings, not specifically provided for, terry-woven.

No. 3081918: Other articles, not specifically provided for, terry-woven.

No. 3083500: Table covers, etc., block printed by hand, in part fringe.

No. 3083700: Table covers, etc., block printed by hand, other.

No. 3083900: Table covers, etc., not block printed by hand.

No. 3084112: Cotton blankets and blanketing cloth, jacquard-figured.

No. 3084400: Cotton blankets and blanketing cloth, not jacquard-figured.

No. 3086600: Cotton polishing cloths, except pile.

No. 3086730: Machine-made knit fabrics.

No. 3118200: Woven mufflers, unbleached, not hemmed.

No. 3124200: Woven mufflers, bleached, not hemmed.

No. 3134200: Woven mufflers, printed, dyed, or colored, not hemmed.

No. 3158020: Woven mufflers, not hemmed, not wholly of cotton.

No. 3158120: Women mufflers, hemmed, not wholly of cotton.

No. 3159020: Women mufflers, not hemmed, less than 17 percent wool.

No. 3159120: Woven mufflers, hemmed, less than 17 percent wool.

No. 3163001: Lace, handmade, not over 2 inches in width, and if 2 inches, not over $50 per pound.

No. 3163002: Lace, and lace fabrics, handmade, not over 2 inches in width, and if over 2 inches, not over $50 per pound.

No. 3163003: Lace, handmade, over 2 inches in width, more than $50 per pound and under $150 per pound.

No. 3163004: Lace and lace fabrics, handmade, more than $50 per pound and under $150 per pound.

No. 3163005: Lace, handmade, over 2 inches in width, more than $150 per pound.

No. 3163006: Lace and lace fabrics, handmade, over 2 inches in width, more than $150 per pound.

No. 3163580: Cotton articles, chief value of lace net or netting, handsewn.

No. 3163600: Cotton articles, in part machine-made lace.

No. 3163690: Cotton articles, not elsewhere specified, not in part machine-made lace.

No. 3166000: Veils and veiling, made on lace or net machine.

No. 3166200: Nets, 225 holes and over per square inch.

No. 3166300: Nets, under 225 holes per square inch.

No. 3166692: Nets and netting, not embroidered, made on Mechlin machine.

No. 3166695: Other nets and netting, not elsewhere specified, not embroidered.

No. 3168001: Cotton laces made on bobbinet-jacquard machine.

No. 3168002: Cotton lace fabrics and lace articles made on bobbinet-jacquard machine.

No. 3168003: Cotton lace, full gage, 12 points or finer, made with independent beam.

No. 3168004: Cotton lace fabrics, and lace articles full gage, 12 points or finer, made with independent beams.

No. 3168005: Cotton lace, full gage, 12 points or finer, not made with independent beams.

No. 31688006: Cotton lace fabrics and lace articles, full gage, 12 points or finer, not made with independent beams.

No. 3168007: Cotton lace made on Levers machine, not full gage, 12 points or finer.

No. 3168008: Cotton lace fabrics and lace articles made on Levers lace machine, not full gage, 12 points or finer.

No. 3168009: Cotton laces, machine made, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3168010: Cotton lace fabrics and lace articles, machine made, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3200012: Cotton lace window curtains and drapes made on a Nottingham lace curtain machine.

No. 3200015: Other cotton lace articles made on a Nottingham lace curtain machine.

No. 3200400: Cotton lace curtains, etc., embroidered, Swiss type.

No. 3220130: Cotton lace curtains, not elsewhere specified, embroidered, Swiss type.

No. 3220202: Cotton dish towels, not in part lace, ornamented, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3220205: Fabrics in the piece, not in part lace, ornamented, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3220207: Curtain paneling, panels and valances, not in part lace, ornamented, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3220212: Other fabrics and articles not in part lace, ornamented, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3220862: Cotton lacings and laces, braided, not ornamented.

No. 3220865: Cotton tubular braids, not ornamented.

No. 3220868: All-overs, edgings, not ornamented.

No. 3224000: Cotton hand-hooked rugs.

No. 3224050: Cotton floor coverings, braided.

No. 3224100: Cotton "hit and miss" rag rugs, without fringe.

No. 3224150: Cotton "hit and miss" rag rugs, with fringe.

No. 3224200: Cotton chenille rugs.

No. 3224300: Cotton imitation oriental rugs.

No. 3224500: Cotton pile rugs, not imitation, oriental.

No. 3230240: Tubings.

No. 3230273: Cotton zipper tape, not elsewhere specified.

No. 3230350: Cotton yarn containing wool.

No. 3230401: Cotton labels for garments and other articles.

No. 3230410: Ladder tapes.

No. 3230431: Candle wicking.

No. 3230500: Jacquard-figured napped cloth.

No. 3230682: Cotton pile curtains and drapes.

No. 3230685: Cotton pile other furnishings, not specifically provided for.

No. 3230688: Cotton pile articles, not specifically provided for.

No. 3903300: Hat braids, etc.

No. 3969010: Tire fabrics including cord fabrics.

No. 3230232: Cords, stranded.

No. 3230235: Other cords.

No. 3230278: Other fabrics with fast edges, not over 12 inches wide.

No. 9439950: (Excluding in sets) Badminton nets, not in sets.

PESTICIDES: A HAZARD TO WATER QUALITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, because controversy continues over the use of pesticides, I was pleased to receive recently from Mr. Hill R. Healan, executive director of the Association County Commissioners of Georgia, a reflective scientific paper on this subject, entitled "Pesticides: A Hazard to Water Quality." The paper was authored by John R. Thoman and H. Page Nicholson of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Atlanta. It was presented at the Western Resources Conference at Fort Collins, Colo., on August 6 of this year.

This study describes in detail the problems involved in the use of pesticides and describes the pollution study programs carried on by the Public Health Service. It focuses, particularly, on the results of a study made in Atlanta in 1959.

Though this paper is too long to insert in the Record in its entirety I feel the results and what may be done to control pesticide pollution are of interest and concern to everyone. Accordingly, I offer for insertion in the Record the conclusions of this informative study.

Pesticides: A Hazard to Water Quality

SIGNIFICANCE TO HUMAN CONSUMER

The significance of pesticide occurrence in domestic water supplies has not been investigated. In its report contained in the Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards—1962, the advisory committee appointed by the Public Health Service stated: "Consideration was given to the more common chlorinated hydrocarbon and organophosphate insecticides, but the information available was not sufficient to establish specific limits for these chemicals. Moreover, the concentrations of these chemicals, where tested, have been below those which would constitute a known health hazard. The committee believes that pollution of water supplies with such contaminants can become significant and urges that the problem be kept under closer surveillance. Further, the committee recommends that regulatory actions be taken to minimize concentrations of such chemicals in drinking water."

Although the quantities of pesticides found thus far in water are small, they may conceivably affect human health, especially since man is also subject to pesticides from multiple other sources. They will be considered potentially dangerous until their long-term impacts, singly and in combination, on biological systems become understood more completely.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO CONTROL PESTICIDE POLLUTION

Pending more complete investigation of low level toxicity, a number of actions would serve to minimize the impact of pesticides on water quality. One would be to improve legal control of aerial application of pesticides where needed. This is the most difficult means of application to control physically because of the necessary speed of the plane and its altitude, but incorrect or careless application of pesticides can be minimized and adequate maintenance of equipment can be assured.

A second desirable step would be to improve the education of pesticide users concerning the consequences of pesticide misuse. New information will become available constantly and should be gotten to the consumer as quickly as possible.

A third control is continued effort to promote and improve soil conservation practices, especially as they relate to retardation of surface water runoff. The Public Health Service studies have shown that transport of pesticides in surface water runoff can be a significant means of surface water contamination.

Fourth, greater dependence on the use of shortlived pesticides would help. Many in use today have been developed specifically to have long residual pesticidal capabilities. These will have continued value, but their use may well be restricted to situations where environmental contamination possibilities are minimal.

Fifth, search for more selectively toxic chemicals should continue. The pesticide TFM (3-Trifllouromethyl-4-nitrophenol) used for control of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes is an example of success in this area of research.

Sixth, part of the answer can lie in learning how to use more effectively nonchemical pest control methods.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Staggers (at the request of Mr. Albert) through September 20, 1963, on account of official business (NATO inspection).

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois (at the request of Mr. Albert) for today on account of death in the family.

Mr. St. Onge (at the request of Mr. Boggs) for an indefinite period on account of illness.

Mr. Mosher (at the request of Mr. Arends) through September 20 on account of official business as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs reviewing NATO installations in Europe.

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Arends) through September 20 on account of official business as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs reviewing NATO installations in Europe.

Mr. Berry (at the request of Mr. Arends) through September 20 on account of official business as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs reviewing NATO installations in Europe.

Mr. Hays (at the request of Mr. Albert) through September 20, 1963, on account of official business (NATO inspection).

Mr. Selden (at the request of Mr. Albert) through September 20, 1963, on account of official business (NATO inspection).

Mr. Clark (at the request of Mr. Albert) through September 20, 1963, on account of official business (NATO inspection).

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hall, for 15 minutes, on Thursday, September 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Alger.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Clancy) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Hoeven.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Hanna.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1831. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, September 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1178. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1179. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1180. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, relative to transmitting additional information relating to a letter dated June 12, 1963, which was forwarded by Chairman Swidler to the Speaker of the House, Mr. McCormack, pertaining to a proposed draft of a bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1181. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the adjustment or elimination of reimbursable charges of the Government of the United States existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to 47 Stat. 564; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1182. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the application for a loan of $1,163,000 for the Hooper Irrigation Co. of Weber and Davis Counties, Utah, pursuant to 70 Stat. 1044, as amended June 5, 1957, 71 Stat. 48; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1183. A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission concerning claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1184. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Finance and Administration, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the General Services Administration during fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1185. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the payment of local telephone service in private homes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1186. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of September 5, 1963, the following bill was reported on September 6, 1963:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8195. A bill to amend section 510 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted September 9, 1963]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive

Papers. Report pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; without amendment (Rept. No. 723). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 8349. A bill to amend section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 to increase the general authorization for small navigation projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 10-year net operating loss carryover for losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of property by governments of foreign countries and to specify the tax treatment of the recovery of such losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 8351. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 8352. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1920, to require executive departments and independent agencies of the Federal Government to obtain work, services, materials, supplies, and equipment from private sources, if available therefrom at a lesser cost, rather than from another department or agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 8353. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of a water resource project to be constructed on Calispel Creek, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 8354. A bill to amend title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to provide for the utilization of surplus agricultural products through the use in motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown on farms in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 8355. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8356. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 8357. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to encourage a supply of milk more closely related to the demand therefor, and to establish a temporary program of incentive payments to dairy farmers for reducing their production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.J. Res. 686. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LANKFORD introduced a bill (H.R. 8358) relating to the effective dates of the qualification of certain pension funds as qualified trusts under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

266. By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Petition of the late Senator Estes Kefauver; to the Committee on House Administration.

267. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Julia B. Kohler, secretary, National Prohibition Party, Kalamazoo, Mich., relative to supporting repeal of "Equal Time Rules"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

268. Also, petition of K. S. Summers, chairman, Board of Commissioners of San Juan County, State of Utah, urging the adoption of S. 1275, regarding Federal-State conflict over water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

269. Also, petition of J. E. Whitten, president, Association of Western State Engineers, Denver, Colo., relative to the Federal Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1961; to the Committee on Public Works.

270. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting the appropriation of $10 million for the purpose of improving commercial air travel safety by experimentation with gigantic parachutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

271. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to require institutions of higher learning to institute 4-year courses of study in the political theories and statesmanship of Jefferson, Paine, Madison, Jackson, and Lincoln, especially in the service academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to implement the recommendations of the Gesell report, which will be another step toward a cold war victory; to the Committee on Armed Services.

273. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to propose a resolution asking institutions of learning granting advanced degrees to require as a prerequisite a thorough knowledge of the publications of the U.S. Government Printing Office, and an especial knowledge of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

274. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to propose legislation requiring the U.S. Information Agency to devote part of its daily foreign broadcasts to the works and ideas of Jefferson, Paine, Madison, Jackson, and Lincoln; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

275. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., relative to a congressional request that the U.S. Department of State have one of its international conferences in Cumberland, Md., or perhaps, Martinsburg, W. Va., because of their relatively "unknownness" yet populated by patriotic and high-quality citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

276. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to consider legislation against any one-nation or unilateral approach to population control, because the United Nations is a more realistic and reasonable organization for handling such international problems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

277. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action to require the Congressional Directory henceforth to publish the names, chairmen, and members of the various subcommittees under the standing committees to which they belong; to the Committee on House Administration.

278. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional efforts toward increasing the circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and supporting a better newsstand distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

279. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action to cause to be published as a House document the prayers opening this session's daily meetings of the U.S. House of Representatives, and send a copy to each school in America; to the Committee on House Administration.

280. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional legislation to require the majority of the U.S. maps published by Federal appropriation, to be global-spherical type maps rather than Mercator type; to the Committee on House Administration.

281. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., relative to having published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appendix an article from September (1963) Esquire magazine written by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr. (Democrat, of New York), entitled "The Duties and Responsibilities of a Congressman to the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

282. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action to have published as a House document the facts and songs of the first civil rights march to the same Washington 102 years ago when 50,000 Union recruits answered Lincoln's call for volunteers to save the Nation; to the Committee on House Administration.

283. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting legislation demanding that the executive branch of the U.S. Government scrupulously enforce and honor all treaties with American Indian tribes, entered into since March 4, 1789; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

284. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting consideration of legislation admitting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico into the Union as the 51st State of the Union, as we need the support of the Latins as never before; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

285. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action to protest the recent U.S. district court decision in Phoenix, Ariz., which held that public school children do not have to stand during the playing of our national anthem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action declaring it to be the policy of the United States to emphasize and to promote pro-Jeffersonianism over anticommunism as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to support the Supreme Court in the forthcoming reapportionment decisions before it, and recommending specific readings for the Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action praising the freedom marchers to Washington, D.C., August 28, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

289. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting congressional action requiring the press, when referring to the Federal debt to use the total figure instead of in terms of its annual increments, which does not reflect the enormity of the debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Customs Night in the Port of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the first Congress of the United States assembled in the city of New York in the spring of 1789, one of the most urgent problems facing the lawmakers was to provide funds to operate the new government. The resources of the country had been depleted by the long War of Independence and little progress toward financial stability had been acquired during the brief experience under the Articles of Confederation.

It was natural that the legislators should turn to a practice founded in ancient times for raising revenue for governments—the levying of tariffs or duties—taxes—on importations of merchandise from foreign countries. The word "customs" as we know it today is said to have originated during the many disputes between the King and the House of Commons over the disposition of taxes in the early days of English history. The ruler's counsel claimed that by "ancient customs" these taxes were rightfully the King's and the Parliament had no jurisdiction over them. Ever since, the name "customs" has applied to those taxes on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into a country.

The idea of levies or tariffs on imports was not a novel one to the pioneers in the Original Thirteen States because customs duties had been collected by them for many years and forwarded to the English King.

America declared its independence on July 4, 1776. After almost 5 years of war, Lord Cornwallis surrendered in 1781. From then until 1789 this country was not a nation, but a set of small, independent States. The Continental Congress made calls upon the States for levies in proportion to the State's assessed land valuation. Usually the States ignored the requests and there were times when the U.S. Treasury did not have funds enough to pay even the most reasonable Government expenses. Every State had a different tariff law and its own collector of customs, whose duty it was to collect tariffs against neighboring States.

New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut placed heavy duties on the most humble of products. Chicken peddlers from New Jersey queued up at the New York customhouse to have eggs counted, chickens weighed, duties paid, and clearance papers issued. Connecticut firewood was measured; cabbages and turnips were appraised. Duties had to be paid on everything.

It was in the hope of ending this confusion that responsible men of the 13 young nations called the Constitutional Convention of 1787. On March 4, 1789, the new Constitution put an end to the existing strife and organized the Government for more orderly procedures, providing that:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The second statute passed by the new legislators was a law known as the Tariff Act of July 4, 1789. Four weeks later, July 31, the Fifth Act of Congress, signed by President George Washington and Vice President John Adams, was passed, establishing customs districts and ports of entry, and providing for customs officers as well as for methods to be employed in the collection of tariffs or duties. This was hailed by the press of the day as the "Second Declaration of Independence."

Thus, the U.S. Customs, a part of the Treasury Department, was one of the first administrative Government agencies to be created under the Constitution—as a matter of fact antedating the establishment of the Treasury Department itself.

For a long time the customs revenues were sufficient to pay the costs of our Federal Government. Even as late as 1910 almost 60 percent of the cost of Government was paid for by this form of income. After this date the internal taxes levied on corporation and individual incomes by the Federal Internal Revenue Service exceeded the revenue collected by customs.

Customs laws are broadly divisible into two parts: First, the tariff or schedule of the rates of duty on commodities; and second, the administrative provisions. The rates of duty are either specific—based on weight, measure, or a count of the merchandise; ad valorem—based on the value of the goods; or compound—based on a mixture of the two, quantity and value. The administrative part of the Tariff Act provides the machinery for the collection of the revenue and the functions of the Bureau of Customs. Customs receipts for the first year under the new Constitution amounted to approximately $2½ million. During the first 10-year period of the new Union, the expense of collecting this revenue amounted to 4½ cents on every dollar collected.

Today, over 173 years later, with the many complexities added to administering the tariff; the quadrupling of the number of customs districts requiring more employees; and the more than 560-fold rise in customs collections—over $1.4 billion for fiscal year 1961; Customs has been able to reduce the early low operating cost to 4⅕ cents for each dollar collected.

Today, the Bureau of Customs must cope with an increasing amount of foreign trade and travel. In fiscal year 1962 there was an estimated $16 billion worth of merchandise importations, and 160 million people and 46 million vehicles crossed our borders. This flow of goods and persons must be checked not only for violations of health, agriculture, and immigration laws; Customs, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, must guard against the noxious plant, the insect pest, the disease carrier, the unlawful immigrant.

A big job has been assigned to our customs service in guarding our farflung borders. Judging from its past history, however, its future duties will be carried out with efficiency and dedication.

New York made a big comeback in handling general cargo foreign trade last year when a total of 13,901,942 long tons of oceanborne exports and imports moved through the port. New York's general cargo foreign trade in 1962 was 7 percent above the 1961 level and 1.2 percent above 1960. The gain reversed a downward trend, at least temporarily, in which New York has slipped from handling 32.6 percent of the Nation's general cargo foreign trade in 1953 to a low of 21.4 percent in 1961. Last year's share was 22.6 percent of the national total of 61,588,350 tons.

General cargo exports and imports are the items of cargo that determine the true activity of a port. This package cargo brings in the most revenue and provides the most labor for a port compared with bulk cargo which usually is of low value and is unloaded or loaded by mechanical means with little labor.

The New York-New Jersey port is the Nation's leading general cargo port. It is comparatively low in the national list in handling bulk cargoes. Such ports as Philadelphia and Baltimore which handle millions of tons of iron ore rank high in this respect. New York handles virtually no ore imports. Nevertheless, it handled a respectable 27,988,500 tons of bulk cargo, mostly petroleum, in 1962, a gain of 8.7 percent over the 25,739,145 tons of bulk commodities handled in 1961.

Thus, the total movement of general and bulk cargo foreign trade through New York came to 41,890,442 tons last year, an 8.2 increase over the 38,733,257 tons of 1961. The combined movement of general cargo and bulk for the entire United States for last year was 289,722,525 tons, a gain of 7.8 percent over the 268,637,149 tons handled in 1961.

Consequently, the Port of New York handled 14.5 percent of the total national foreign trade tonnage last year compared with 14.4 percent in 1961.

On August 1, 1964, the Bureau of Customs will be celebrating the 175th anniversary of the creation of the customs service by the First Continental Congress. The month of August 1964 will mark the culmination of 1¾ centuries of unbroken dedication to the advancement and protection of the American people by the Bureau of Customs.

I want to particularly praise the inspectors of customs who as enforcement officers are our first line of defense against the illicit introduction of contraband into our country. These inspectors of customs act as the protectors of our revenue, protectors of our security, and do a most commendable job under very trying circumstances. The record of these inspectors of customs reveals complete and wholehearted cooperation with many of our other law enforcement groups.

I would also like to commend the U.S. Customs Inspectors' Association of the Port of New York, an independent organization, founded in 1893. This association is the second oldest Federal employee organization and is an organization comprised of members of the inspection personnel in the port of New York. The association will celebrate the 70th anniversary of its founding on November 16, 1963, and in conjunction with the Retired U.S. Customs Inspectors' Association have declared this evening as the customs night in the port of New York. A dinner-dance to celebrate the occasion will be held in the grand ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel in New York and in attendance at this affair will be active members of the association, retired members of the association and friends of the U.S. Customs Service.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out some 23,500 questionnaires into the 18 counties of my congressional district in order to gather the views of my constituents on several important issues. Every 10th name was taken from the telephone directories of the larger cities and towns, and every 5th name was taken from the directories of the smaller towns and rural communities. The questionnaires, therefore, reached Republicans and Democrats alike. There was about a 20 percent return of the questionnaires sent, which is considered to be a good response. Many were returned with additional comments and letters.

The questions presented were simple, direct, and to the point, even though in some cases it was difficult to answer by a straight yes or no. The responses I received was most gratifying.

This questionnaire poll clearly indicates that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa are rather conservative in their thinking. In this connection, it is interesting to note that only 28 percent of those answering the questionnaires approved of the way in which President Kennedy handled the Cuban situation; only 21 percent appraised the Kennedy administration as good in handling domestic affairs; and only 19 percent appraised the administration's record as being good in foreign affairs.

The following questions were presented, and the answers tabulated in percentages, as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Reducing Federal income taxes only with a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures?	89	4	7
2. Placing medicare for the aged under social security and increasing social security taxes to cover the cost?	21	77	2
3. Federal aid to education?	33	62	5
4. Continuing our foreign aid program?	22	71	7
5. A Domestic Peace Corps to work on local community projects?	31	59	10
6. The present feed grain program for agriculture?	40	44	16
7. The gradual elimination of Federal controls and subsidies in the agricultural programs?	69	25	6
8. Do you approve of the way President Kennedy has handled the Cuban situation?	28	64	8

	Percent			
	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion
9. How would you appraise the Kennedy administration thus far?				
(a) In domestic affairs?	21	47	31	1
(b) In foreign affairs?	19	39	40	2

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor a resolution which would designate the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week." Good vision is a precious and irreplaceable tool, both for the attainment of knowledge and in everyday life. It is important to focus our attention on the necessity for proper care of the eyes; with a national effort much could be done to improve or to save the sight of Americans.

Often the eyes are neglected until it is too late and medical science can do little to prevent loss of sight. There are over one-third of a million blind in the United States today, and 40 percent of these cases result from glaucoma and cataract. Much of this could have been avoided by early detection of disease through physical and laboratory examination. It is estimated that a million Americans over 40 have glaucoma unknowingly. If neglected, glaucoma leads to permanent blindness.

Proper care of the eyes, including the use of prescribed glasses, is important not only to prevent blindness but to improve general health. Bad eyesight causes 50 percent of headaches and can mean general deterioration of health. Ninety-eight percent of factory injuries to the eyes could be prevented by adherence to safety rules and proper use of corrective lenses on the job. Improved vision of drivers and pedestrians would mean at least 23 percent less accidents.

Better vision would not only improve safety records by a significant amount, but it could save industry more than $50 million per year in increased efficiency. Experiments with schoolchildren have shown that better vision reduces school failures by 21 percent. Often undiscovered defective eyesight in children results in unnecessary complications.

The gift of vision is precious. Save Your Vision Week would focus national attention on the necessity for improved eye care.

Hospital Insurance a Legislative Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, regarding the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, the King-Anderson bill, shortly to have hearings before the Ways and Means Committee.

This article appeared in the August-September issue of the Senior Citizens News published by the National Council of Senior Citizens.

I heartily commend this excellent editorial to the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress and to all right-thinking men everywhere:

HOSPITAL INSURANCE A LEGISLATIVE MUST

(By Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

The most disturbing problem confronting millions of older people today is how to pay for the expensive hospital and related health services they will almost certainly need during their remaining years. The problem is not limited to people of very small incomes or savings. It is of constant concern to millions of elderly people of modest means who know that a costly illness could wipe out their life savings and force them into poverty or near poverty. And it is of concern to their sons and daughters and grandchildren.

The irony is that this worry, this feeling of insecurity, this dread over the economic consequences of serious illness in old age could be ended for most people by one legislative action—passage of the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 as advocated so vigorously by President Kennedy.

Adoption of this legislation would be a great forward step in America's social and economic progress. It would mean greater peace of mind not only for millions of people 65 and over but for Americans of all ages. It is a practical step for dealing with a problem of major and growing proportions. It should be taken without further delay.

In less than two decades hospital charges have nearly quadrupled, and the costs of other health services have also risen sharply. The problem this presents for older people—and for those who feel a sense of responsibility for their welfare—is that the time in life when hospital and related health care is most likely to be needed is the very time in life when income is likely to be permanently reduced. The inevitable result is that millions of older people are confronted with the cruel choice of going without the health care they need, of accepting help from sons and daughters with their own families to support, or of seeking public charity.

This should not be. It need not be. More than a quarter of a century ago, our society faced up to the fact that in a rapidly growing, rapidly changing industrial economy, a system of social insurance was a necessary foundation on which to build financial independence in old age. As a result of this farsighted action, almost 15 million older people now receive about $1 billion every month as a matter of earned right. For the majority of older people, their social security checks are their greatest source of income; for millions, these checks represent their only income.

It is unthinkable that the same society which developed the social security system will continue to tolerate much longer the progressive—and acknowledged—erosion of the financial independence of retired workers that the system was designed to foster. In about half the States, elderly people can get various kinds of help with their medical problems under the Kerr-Mills program—but to get such help they must prove that they are not only sick but also medically indigent. And what if they move to a State that has no Kerr-Mills program?

Medical care under public assistance would still be needed for older people with special problems even after the President's program of hospital insurance goes into effect. But charity health care for otherwise financially independent older people is hardly a satisfactory answer in a society that prides itself on individual freedom and dignity.

Opponents of the President's proposal seem to imply that there are only two kinds of older people—the rich and the poor. The rich can take care of themselves. The rest can go on relief. The fact is, of course, that the great majority of older people are neither rich nor poor. Most can get along reasonably well—until serious illness strikes. This is when the bad times set in. This is when the retirement years, which should be filled with peace of mind, become filled with dread and suffering and a sense of frustration and failure.

Social security hospital insurance would go far toward making the retirement years the good years we all anticipate—years to be spent in enjoyment without the shadow of poverty always present.

Nor is social security hospital insurance a new or radical departure from the way we do things in this country. It would simply provide older people with paid-up insurance against the high cost of the hospitalization they so frequently need.

The fact that social security would pay hospital bills would in no way affect the practice of medicine. In fact the services of private physicians would not be covered in any way. The patient would select the doctor of his choice, just as now. The patient and his doctor would select the hospital of their choice, just as now. The plan would simply be a means of paying the bills for hospital care, nursing home care, the services of visiting nurses, therapists and other health workers in the patient's own home, and hospital diagnostic services.

This is the practical, sensible, financially sound solution to the high and still rising cost of illness in old age. This is the way to provide the health services that older people need and at the same time preserve their basic financial independence. Both the logic and the humanitarianism of the President's proposal are unassailable.

No. 4—"Michigan: The Gamblers' Paradise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to set before the members of this House, more particularly the Michigan congressional delegation, some interesting information about gambling in that State and how Michigan has permitted and allowed crime syndicates to take over a big tax-free business.

Last year, Michigan's pari-mutuel turnover came to $120 million from which the State legally received about $9 million in revenue. However, this small amount represents only a portion of the real story of gambling in that State.

Using the figures presented to the McClellan Committee, some $2.2 billion can be allocated as Michigan's share of the total national off-track betting turnover last year. Organized crime has been strong and healthy in that State since Prohibition, and gambling offers an even better source of funds to bankroll syndicate operations than did bootlegging.

This, Mr. Speaker, might come as a shocking surprise to the Michigan congressional delegation but it is estimated that illegal gambling in that State could be as high as $4½ billion a year. The crime syndicates in Michigan are making more out of bluenosed government attitudes about gambling than they ever made out of the Canadian whisky trade during the bootleg era. Michigan has truly become a gamblers' paradise—a haven for the crime syndicates.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the above figures, the gross profits to the gambling syndicates—10 percent of the total take—may amount to nearly $500 million a year in Michigan. Even after footing the necessary bills for law enforcement corruption, there is plenty of money left to finance every criminal scheme in the book.

The State of Michigan is paying a steep price for the foolishness and blindness of those who refuse to recognize and control the natural human urge to gamble. Only when we wake up to the need for government control and regulation of gambling will the great majority of the people of Michigan cease to be the unwilling consorts of crime. Only when we enact a national lottery will we bring to an end the filthy ramifications of underworld activities and pump into our Government Treasury over $10 billion a year which now is siphoned off by the crime syndicates. When are we going to wipe out hypocrisy and become realistic about this entire gambling problem?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following Newsletter of September 7, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS, HUMAN RIGHTS, PROPERTY RIGHTS—IS THERE A CONFLICT?

Capitalism: "An economic system in which capital and capitalists play the principal part; specifically, one in which the ownership of land and natural wealth, the production, distribution, and exchange of goods, and the operation of the system itself, are affected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions."

Socialism: "A political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods."

The Constitution embodies the limited form of government that makes possible a free society. Freedom from government domination enables capitalism to flourish. Specific grants of authority are given the Federal Government in its overall capacity over States and all subdivisions. A list or bill of specific rights is enumerated prohibiting Federal Government from transgressing beyond its specified areas, culminating in

Ninth rights retained by the people: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Tenth rights reserved to the States or to the people: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

NOW CONSIDER THE NEGRO LEADERS' DEMANDS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

1. Comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation from the present Congress—without compromise or filibuster—to guarantee all Americans access to all public accommodations, decent housing, adequate and integrated education, the right to vote.

2. Withholding of Federal funds from all programs in which discrimination exists.

3. Desegregation of all school districts in 1963.

4. Enforcement of the 14th amendment—reducing congressional representation of States where citizens are disfranchised.

5. A new Executive order banning discrimination in all housing supported by Federal funds.

6. Authority for the Attorney General to institute injunctive suits when any constitutional right is violated.

7. A massive Federal program to train and place all unemployed workers—Negro and white—on meaningful and dignified jobs at decent wages.

8. A national minimum wage act that will give all Americans a decent standard of living. Government surveys show that anything less than $2 an hour fails to do this.

9. A broadened Fair Labor Standards Act to include all areas of employment which are presently excluded.

10. A Federal fair employment practices law barring discrimination by Federal, State, and municipal governments, and by employers, contractors, employment agencies, and trade unions.

NOT CONSTITUTIONAL NOR CAPITALISTIC

These are outside the role of Federal Government. Would these be more appropriate and associated with socialism, as a governmental obligation? Yes. Should or can our form of government provide housing, education, jobs that are meaningful and dignified, wage levels, etc. No. If not, then should we change our form of government to see to it that Federal Government provides all these controls, regulations, and services? No. Finally, can Federal Government do these things without constitutional amendment? Unfortunately, yes.

OTHER CIVIL RIGHTS ARE TRAMPLED

This is the result of pressure groups demanding more, and Government promising performance outside traditional constitutional limitations.

1. Personal safety—the test ban treaty approval prevents developing our antimissile defense, jeopardizing our civil right of personal safety, our very lives. Cuban missiles presence also shows breakdown of Federal role in our common defense.

2. Freedom from enslavement—Communist gains in Asia, Africa, South America, and the Caribbean brings closer Communist goal of enslavement, if not, outright burial.

3. Right to expect constitutional use of tax money. Citizens cannot prevent Federal gifts of money to U.S. enemies, the Communists.

4. Freedom to pray—partially denied already by Court.

5. Right to home ownership. Federal programs seriously jeopardize all such ownership.

6. Right to hire and fire. Employers gradually losing all such traditional rights.

7. Right to work. Not without joining a union, abiding by leaders' dictates, and contributing the dues required.

8. Right to earn and keep. Tax laws still cutting into take-home pay. Social security taxes going up again. New tax controls to be imposed.

9. Right to serve whom you please in business. Federal Government being asked to remove present such privilege.

10. Right to access to public streets and sidewalks. Demonstrators now have superior right, sometimes even to protection by police and military, even to blocking traffic by lying down.

INCONSISTENT

Where are the liberals, the patriots, the Negroes, and the other pressure groups—who, in dedicated defense of civil rights, will protest these violations? Government must protect, not encroach upon our civil rights. Also, citizens must think through the matter of civil rights.

NEXT WEEK

Second installment. Civil rights, human rights, and property rights are identical, not in conflict. See you then.

Oceanography: Another Soviet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that there is no field of endeavor more worthy of our national effort than is research and development of knowledge of the oceans. Since approximately three-quarters of the earth lies beneath the waters of our seas and, since a substantial part of plant life, animal life, and mineral resources lie within and below the ocean waters, it constitutes for man the remaining single great frontier. As important psychologically as the penetration of space is, I submit that it will not add one whit to the foodstuffs nor to the store of basic industrial or chemical materials that we will need for tomorrow's world.

There has been, it is to be admitted, a gradual awareness of the importance of oceanography and its related sciences. However, to this observer there is a greater sense of urgency than is at present exhibited. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this fundamental technological race we are not apt to receive the stimulus and warning that came with the Russian sputnik. The careful and gradually developed superiority of the Russians in the knowledge and control factors relative to the ocean, its storehouse of goods, its temperatures, currents, its topography, its effects upon weather and a thousand and one other aspects not yet imagined but of likely and equal importance will be a fact and a factor irreducible by any effort of ours if we delay increased effort overlong. The leadership in the world of the future could very well hinge much more upon the control and use of the resources of the oceans than in the accomplishments in space.

I bring this subject to the attention of our body, Mr. Speaker, because I am disturbed at the disparity between the effort of the United States and the efforts of the Soviets in this important field. May I review briefly for my colleagues some details of the U.S.S.R. program.

Soviet effort in oceanography is guided by the Oceanographic Commission and the Institute of Oceanology both under the Academy of Sciences in the U.S.S.R. Independent work is being done by several agencies under the auspices of Maritime Fishing and Oceanography. This latter includes not only special studies in the Arctic and Antarctic but also allows for coordination of scientific and research work on the vessels of the vast fishing fleet of the Soviets. Also the merchant marine fleet of the U.S.S.R. is now fully equipped for weather reports and collection of other data useful in the data gathering center.

In 1959 an important economic conference was held in Russia and a new 7-year program for economic development was launched. It is interesting to note that oceanography held a prominent part in the conference. In the past 4 years several of the programs recommended by the conference have been inaugurated and are operative. From the little that we know of Russia's operations these facts about her equipment and capabilities are interesting. During the period of the International Geophysical Year there were 70 ships flying 17 different flags engaged in this cooperative effort to obtain information useful to all. Fourteen of these vessels were from the Soviet and according to available reports these ships covered 270,000 miles of ocean and made observations at more than 2,500 stations on water surfaces of the world. This effort was approximately twice that reported for the United States, the second most active power in the joint undertaking.

Russia is now using many converted trawlers like the *Persey-2* refitted in 1949 and known to be equipped with laboratories to handle analysis concerned with hydrology, hydrochemistry, hydrobiology, physiology, ichthyology and photography. This ship carries a 15-man scientific team. There are numerous converted W-class submarines like the *Severyanka*. She is equipped with underwater television, photographic equipment, exit and entrance for skindivers, and facilities for storing and preserving specimens. Several industrial survey ships have been completely renovated for scientific use such as the *Mikhail Lomonosov* which accommodates 35–40 scientists and has 16 complete separate laboratories. There are at least four of these ranging up in size to the *Vityaz*, a converted cargo vessel with a capability of covering 18,600 miles in 66 days. This ship carries a crew of 137 including 73 scientists.

All of these latter are the older ships involved in this important study. Joining them in the dynamic and increasing effort for Russia are the new "floating laboratories" like the *Sergey Vavilov* and the *Petr Lebedev*, two of seven new mobile research centers launched in the last quarter of 1960 alone. Another of the newest known additions to the oceanographic fleet is the *Voyeykov*, displacing 3,600 gross tons and equipped with 38 separate laboratories.

The Soviet tanker fleet is also being pressed into service to augment the data collection process. These ships are required to collect weather data, take soundings over their routes, and make other reports of diverse nature along their assigned routes.

The amount and type of information obtainable from an operation the size of that now in action for the Soviets is obviously considerable. One could with some expectation of accuracy conclude that every Soviet ship in some way or other is required to further their concerted oceanographic effort. The Soviet Government has demonstrated its belief in this work by providing the manpower and the funds for the ships, the equipment and its operation. It has done one other important and essential thing. It has encouraged and supported the institutions of higher learning to develop men of talent and interest in this important field and although the output of qualified graduates is not known in the Western World, what we know about our own efforts in this field indicates an appalling gap.

The best conclusion regarding the U.S.S.R. effort to gain dominance over the technology of the seas is contained in this quote from a recent report of Senator MAGNUSON's Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

> Since 1955, the U.S.S.R. has displayed a large, modern research fleet second to none, has announced the construction of new research facilities, has operated its research fleet throughout the oceans of the world, and has organized a sizable manpower force to conduct oceanographic research.

I suggest it is already late for America in this important matter. Remember when Britain ruled the waves, Britain led the world. Today one needs to rule not the waves but the other manifestations of the ocean, its wealth, its behavior, and its very nature. The nation which is first in this field will be first in the world of tomorrow regardless of who puts the first flag on the moon.

Mr. Speaker, I intend at a very early date to place in the RECORD some evidence of the effort we are making here in the United States. I hope the Members will find it interesting and instructive to compare this article on Russian performance with the indirectness of American activity.

International Road Federation Serves as World Stimulus for Improved Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have the pleasure of reporting on the activities of the International Road Federation which, through its world operation to stimulate interest in economic and social advancement through highways and highway transportation, has contributed materially to the advancement of the American image abroad, both from a governmental and private enterprise viewpoint.

Soon after World War II a group of imaginative business and industrial leaders looked into future global needs and took vigorous action to meet one of the most critical of these. The need was for an orderly development of integrated highway systems around the world which would foster postwar international trade and hasten the economic and cultural advancement of the new and emerging nations as well. Inherent in the idea was the formation of a world agency to encourage and facilitate the planning, financing, and construction of national and international highway networks and provide advice and counsel to help insure that a maximum return on road investment is realized.

The idea took shape in the founding of the International Road Federation, a nonprofit, nonpolitical service organization dedicated to the development and improvement of highways and highway transportation throughout the world. IRF offices were established simultaneously in Washington and London in 1948, and in Paris 4 years later.

IRF Washington is governed by a board of directors, composed of prominent businessmen and industrialists, an executive committee, and a small staff headed by a president. Although the activities of all IRF offices and national good roads groups are coordinated, each is autonomous and independently financed.

Fifteen years ago, when IRF emerged from concept to reality, there were eight national good roads associations. Today there are more than 70, with others in the formative stage.

In 1948 there were only guesses as to world highway expenditures, but the best estimates placed them at $6 billion. By 1962 this total had risen to $22.34 billion.

IFR was founded by businessmen in the belief that good roads are essential to social and economic development. Highways give access to untapped natural resources, open to cultivation vast new agricultural areas, provide new jobs, increase purchasing power. They make it feasible to multiply production, distribute surpluses, exchange ideas and services, and to provide a better way of life for the peoples of the world.

The federation promotes the international development and exchange of engineering and technical know-how in the highway field.

It provides a common meeting ground for existing national road associations and spurs the development of new ones.

It maintains active liaison with all organizations having objectives similar to its own.

It serves as highway transportation consultant to the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and as a service arm to governments, national and international lending organizations, and aid agencies.

IRF sponsors world and regional highway meetings and supports advanced training of highway and traffic engineers.

In cooperation with its more than 70 national associates it stimulates road consciousness among the governments and peoples of the world. Its educational efforts are directed toward the grassroots as well as the upper echelons.

IRF collects, publishes, and widely distributes basic information on the benefits of good roads, the need for soundly planned and executed programs of road development, and of road transport, and the techniques through which such programs can be realized.

In its 15 years of existence, IRF has achieved global prestige and recognition in many phases of its farflung operations. In 1958 the federation received the Christopher Columbus International Prize for Communications. IRF was the first winner in the land communications category and the citation mentioned the promotion of the Pan American Highway and the IRF fellowship program.

WORLD MEETING

IRF has sponsored four world highway meetings, the largest of which was held in Madrid in 1962, and was attended by 2,800 representatives from 78 countries and 10 international organizations.

President John F. Kennedy, in a message to the delegates, said:

> The work of the International Road Federation in the advancement of highways and highway transportation is, indeed, an important effort toward social and economic progress. I am sure this forum for the exchange of economic and technical information will be stimulating, not only to the assembled delegates and guests of IRF, but also to those everywhere interested in providing a better way of life for all peoples of the world.

Regional conferences at frequent intervals between world meetings have produced amazing results. A conference in Mexico stimulated renewed interest in the completion of the Pan American Highway. A meeting in Sydney, Australia, provided a common forum to resolve many problems localized in the Far East, while a southern South American conference in Buenos Aires broke down customs barriers which had retarded road programs for a lack of roadbuilding materials. An African gathering gave stimulus to a Pan African Highway.

IRF acts as highway information center for the world. A total of 573 persons from 74 countries visited the Washington offices during 1962. The visitors ranged from student engineers to cabinet ministers and their missions were almost as varied. Study itineraries were arranged for the visitors by IRF, at the request of foreign governments and U.S. Government agencies, as well as by private organizations and individuals.

FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The federation has trained 330 engineers from 77 countries since 1948. Each of its fellowship grantees has received 1 year of graduate engineering training, followed by extensive tours of road projects, Federal and State highway administrative offices, and various highway-related enterprises.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

IRF tells the highway story in four languages—English, French, Spanish, and German. It publishes the monthly highway news magazine, World Highways, and the quarterly, Road International. It maintains a close working relationship with domestic and foreign news media and assists in the development of highway stories of international significance.

SPECIAL INFORMATION SERVICES

Two of IRF's annual publications are basic source books of the global highway information. They are the "World Directory of Highway Administrators" and "Highway Expenditures, Road and Motor Vehicle Statistics." As a service to governments and businessmen, it publishes a semiannual listing of U.S. contractors and engineers doing work in other countries on roads, bridges, and airports. Periodical publications include bilingual tabulations of maximum limits of motor vehicle sizes and weights for various areas of the world. A news bulletin provides sponsors with information on up-to-date highway projects and programs. Special reports and publications have included Spanish-language manuals on soil mechanics, traffic engineering, and highway specifications. In addition, country road studies have been made covering most countries of the free world.

OTHER FUNCTIONS

IRF acts as semiofficial host to foreign delegations attending highway meetings in the United States. It performed this function, for example, for construction equipment expositions in Chicago, the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress and the World Traffic Engineering Conference.

At the request of Central American countries, IRF has developed a plan for an Inter-American Highway Authority to assure that this 1,573-mile section of the Pan American Highway, passing through Central America and Panama, is properly maintained and kept open to traffic yearround.

The federation pioneered in the establishment of operators and mechanics schools and this type of training program is continuing to be developed for additional areas. Meanwhile, plans have been advanced for a worldwide inventory of research and development in the road and road transport field.

IRF is supported financially by various industries—principally automotive, rubber, petroleum, and highway construction. Consulting engineers are also prominently represented among its sponsors.

Membership in IRF is available to associates or private groups interested in the advancement of highways and highway transportation worldwide. A list of sponsoring members, national associations, and fellowship students may be obtained from the IRF offices in Washington.

In the 15 years of IRF's existence there has been a phenomenal growth in roadbuilding and the construction of international highway systems around the world. Some indication of this growth in recent years is shown in the table below:

Highway expenditures in the free world

Year:	*Billions*
1955	$10.90
1956	12.90
1957	15.08
1958	17.13
1959	18.53
1960	18.87
1961	20.75
1962	22.34

The activities and responsibilities of the International Road Federation have kept pace with this increase. In the years ahead IRF proposes to continue its present functions and assume new ones as the developing countries of the world seek the best transportation systems for their particular needs.

Before an area or country can develop adequate roads the public must be made aware of the need for the and benefits of good highways. This knowledge will then be converted into desire and demand. Leaders of governments may defer action on road development or turn to other forms of transportation unless there is a public expression of preference for highways.

Although the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of road networks are necessarily a responsibility of government, business interests can contribute substantially to the development of highways throughout the world, and are doing so today through the International Road Federation.

Founded and supported by businessmen, IRF speaks the language of industry in world highway matters and at the same time creates a friendly climate for business enterprise. We believe that better roads mean better living for everyone—everywhere in the world.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, with a sense of our utter inadequacy when left to our own devices, as we face tasks that tower above our power to achieve, we bow for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer.

In this battle of the ages, between the darkness and the light, to which everything that is said or done in this Chamber is related, we can but pray that as those here commissioned to serve the Nation face their God and their conscience, with mankind's future at stake, the final verdict of all their deliberations will result in defeat for the darkness, and victory for the light—for the light is Thine, and in its glowing radiance there is life and joy, peace and plenty, for Thy children under all skies, when at last Thy will shall be done on the earth as it is in heaven.

We ask it through riches of grace, through Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, despite the fact that the Senate is in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, there now be a morning hour, and that statements in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 9, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 6, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 1139. An act to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1194. An act to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John A. Gronouski, of Wisconsin, to be Postmaster General, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 322. An act for the relief of Mark John Janavaras; and

S. 538. An act for the relief of Henry Bang Williams.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1263. An act for the relief of Rickert & Laan, Inc.;

H.R. 1345. An act for the relief of Peter Carson;

H.R. 1347. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katarina Pezelj;

H.R. 1452. An act for the relief of Marvin D. Nells;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom);

H.R. 2968. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas;

H.R. 3384. An act for the relief of Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung);

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of the Industrial Tractor Parts Co., Inc.;

H.R. 4768. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin;

H.R. 4786. An act for the relief of the State of New Mexico;

H.R. 5083. An act for the relief of John Stewart Murphy;

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 5743. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 6260. An act for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.; and

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 495. An act for the relief of Evanthia Christon;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 657. An act for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Marja Lovsin;

S. 1154. An act to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., in Minnesota;

S. 1165. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.;

S. 1230. An act for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson; and

S. 1489. An act for the relief of J. Arthur Fields.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1263. An act for the relief of Rickert and Laan, Inc.;

H.R. 1345. An act for the relief of Peter Carson;

H.R. 1347. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katarina Pezelj;

H.R. 1526. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom);

H.R. 2968. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas;

H.R. 3384. An act for the relief of Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung);

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of the Industrial Tractor Parts Co., Inc.;

H.R. 4786. An act for the relief of the State of New Mexico;

H.R. 5083. An act for the relief of John Stewart Murphy;

H.R. 5743. An act for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer;

H.R. 6260. An act for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.; and

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1452. An act for the relief of Marvin D. Neils; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4768. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Construction of Environmental Testing Laboratory, Manned Spacecraft Center

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of an environmental testing laboratory, Manned Spacecraft Center; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Amendment of Section 1485, Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Transportation of Remains of Deceased Dependents of Members of Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports on Cancellation of Accounts of Certain Indians

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the cancellation of accounts of certain Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Tort Clams Paid by General Services Administration

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Finance and Administration, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, during fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by U.S. Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Assistant General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission, during fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Title 13, United States Code, To Provide for Payment of Certain Telephone Service

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the payment of local telephone service in private homes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions Endorsing the March on Washington for the Passage of the Civil Rights Recommendations of the President and for Equal Opportunity for Education, Employment, and Housing

"Whereas President Kennedy has instituted important civil rights legislation which is currently before Congress; and

"Whereas this legislation aids in guaranteeing all Americans access to all public accommodations, decent housing, adequate and integrated education, and the right to vote; and

"Whereas over 100,000 Americans of all walks of life will march on Washington on August 28 in the current year to speak out in a single voice for the passage of the President's civil rights program and to demonstrate their opposition to the forces of discrimination that rob millions of Americans of their dignity and their rights, to equal opportunity for education, employment, and decent housing; and

"Whereas the members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives believe in equal rights and opportunities for all Americans and vigorously denounce any form of racial and religious discrimination: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives endorses the march on Washington and respectfully requests the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to actively support this demonstration; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives August 26, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

THE LATE SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER—RESOLUTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Executive Council of the American

Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C., relating to the death of the late Senator Estes Kefauver, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolutions Adopted August 12, 1963, Unity House, Pa., by the AFL–CIO Executive Council

Whereas death has taken from our midst Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, a man who served his country with unusual dedication, tremendous devotion and unequaled patriotism, and

Whereas Estes Kefauver was a true humanitarian, a firm disciple of democracy, a defender of consumer interests, and a warm and abiding friend of labor; and

Whereas all of America and all of the organized labor movement of this country is both the richer because of his lifetime service to the United States and the poorer because of his sad and untimely death: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO executive council, which last February unanimously chose Estes Kefauver to receive the Murray-Green Award of the AFL–CIO for his great services to the cause of humanity, joins its fellow Americans in mourning the passing of this great Senator; and be it further

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO executive council hereby determines that its Murray-Green Award will be given to the Senator posthumously; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions testifying to our great admiration, our deep sense of gratitude and our overwhelming sorrow be spread upon the records of the AFL–CIO executive council and that true copies be transmitted to the family of the late and great Senator whom we join in mourning his death, and to the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 1967. A bill to extend until June 30, 1967, the authorization contained in section 6 of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; (Rept. No. 483).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 1973. A bill to amend the Act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 484).

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 485)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Two hundred and three postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. Brewster and Mr. Beall):

S. 2128. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2129. A bill to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in (1) the Hague Conference on Private International Law and (2) the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law; and authorizing respectively appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2130. A bill to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2131. A bill to amend the Act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. Cooper):

S. 2132. A bill for the relief of Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 2133. A bill for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 2134. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Saxman, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2135. A bill for the relief of Anna Franchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. Hickenlooper):

S. 2136. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, MD. AND VA.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] who is necessarily absent, to introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes.

The bill is being introduced for the Senators from Maryland [Mr. Brewster and Mr. Beall]. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Senator Brewster accompanying the bill be printed at this point in my remarks. In addition, I ask that the bill lie at the desk for additional cosponsors until Friday, September 13.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 2128) to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson (for Mr. Brewster and Mr. Beall), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement of Mr. Brewster, presented by Mr. Jackson, is as follows:

Statement by Senator Daniel B. Brewster Accompanying Introduction of Legislation To Establish a National Seashore on Assateague Island, September 10, 1963

I send to the desk for myself and Senator Beall, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia. This is to be a joint Federal-State venture.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the development of Assateague Island and certain adjacent waters and small marsh islands for public outdoor recreation. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, waters, and other property, and to administer these for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation and conservation. The natural features of the island would be retained for the benefit of the public.

Assateague Island is a low, narrow, undeveloped barrier reef approximately 32 miles in length, lying parallel to the coasts of Maryland and Virginia, separated from the mainland of these States by Sinepuxent and Chincoteague Bays.

But Assateague Island is more than this—it is the largest remaining undeveloped seashore between Cape Code and Cape Hatteras. It is one of the very few remaining such areas in this country. Within a 250 mile radius of Assateague Island is to be found one-fifth of the population of the United States—about 33½ million people. Almost one-fourth of this number live within a 3 hour drive of Assateague Island.

Thus Assateague Island represents one of our last opportunities to acquire a sizable seashore for public benefit.

These are the simple geographic facts which motivate my introduction of this legislation. There are, however, additional factors which have influenced my decision on this matter, and which deserve to be made a part of the public record at this time.

For almost three decades, the outstanding recreational values of Assateague Island have been recognized. A 1935 survey of the National Park Service included Assateague as one of the 12 areas along the Atlantic coast to be preserved for public use and enjoyment. In 1943, the Virginia portion of the island was acquired by the Federal Government, and established as the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

In 1955, the National Park Service made a restudy of the Atlantic coast, but made no recommendations with respect to Assateague Island because, at that time, the 14 miles of the island immediately north of the Virginia line were being extensively subdivided by private developers, and it appeared that the opportunity to preserve the natural and untapped recreational resources of the island for the public had been lost.

In 1961, the Maryland General Assembly authorized the State roads commission to construct a bridge connecting Assateague Island with the mainland of Worcester County. The State subsequently acquired 640 acres with 2 miles of ocean frontage for development as a State park, and declared its intention to acquire the remaining 7 miles of the island to the north for similar development.

Tidal storms of 1962–63 focused increased attention on Assateague Island, and pointed up the urgent need for beach front stabilization and other protective work if the barrier reef was to be preserved in any form for development purposes.

In June of 1962, Maryland Governor Tawes and Interior Secretary Udall agreed to a joint study for purposes of determining the most feasible future utilization of the superb recreational opportunities offered by Assateague Island.

The following spring, the newly created Bureau of Outdoor Recreation published its report recommending the acquisition of Assateague Island for public recreational use. At the same time, contracts were let and construction began on the bridge. The cost of the bridge was to be borne jointly by Worcester County and the State of Maryland.

Since the filing of the report by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, intensive study of the proposals embodied in this report, and endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior, has been carried on by the appropriate agencies of the State government. In addition to these studies, public hearings have been held to permit all interested parties to be heard. Innumerable meetings have taken place between representatives of private property owners on Assateague Island, officials of Worcester County, State officials, and representatives of the Department of the Interior. These meetings have included several inspection tours of the island itself.

In recent months, the Maryland Department of Forests and Parks, under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. S. L. Hammerman, recommended public development of the island. Similar recommendations have been made by the Maryland Economic Development Commission and the Maryland State Department of Planning. Yesterday, the Maryland Board of Public Works, the State's highest authority in this field, unanimously approved the concept of public development of Assateague Island.

That the various State boards, agencies, and officials have now concurred in their approval of a plan for Assateague Island which embodies public development jointly by the State and the Federal Governments is a tribute to their foresight in these matters.

The studies which I have made of the reports issued by the Department of the Interior, the agencies of the State of Maryland, and the Worcester County Commissioners, including the pertinent engineering analysis, have convinced me that the future of this island demands exclusive public development.

Wise conservation and development of our natural resources today will return vast dividends tomorrow. Each failure to act now is an opportunity lost forever. The task of preserving our natural resources becomes more acute each day. To conserve and preserve what is left, and to reclaim some of what has been lost, is an obligation which we owe to ourselves and to future generations. We must continually bear in mind that we are only trustees of a rich and bounteous heritage found in the natural resources of our land.

The rapid rate of our population expansion makes it imperative that we act now to preserve for the residents of our cities, our suburbs, and our towns the recreation areas which will enrich the lives of their inhabitants.

Many of the challenges in the development of adequate recreational facilities are best met at the State and local level. Maryland officials are to be congratulated for their continuing efforts in this regard—efforts which, in the case of Assateague Island, have already brought about the acquisition of parts of that island for State park purposes, and the letting of contracts for bridge construction.

Only through further public development can we hope to preserve what is a precious possession not only of Worcester County but of the Nation. Only through public development will the necessary Federal funds and techniques be available for beach stabilization and protection. Only through public development can we hope to provide the large metropolitan area between Philadelphia and Washington with an unparalleled recreational opportunity. Only through public development can Maryland take advantage of the unrivaled publicity and promotional facilities of the Department of the Interior—facilities which have increased the number of visitors to the Hatteras National Seashore, with no nearby metropolitan area, by 500 percent in a period of 10 years; facilities which can be expected to bring 3 million visitors a year to the Assateague National Seashore by 1975. Only through public development can we expect to provide for the greatest economic benefit to Worcester County and to Maryland from this, one of its most valuable assets.

A national seashore at Assateague will serve as a magnet for visitors which will increase each year. In view of the plans of the Department of the Interior for only minimum facilities on the island itself, the areas adjacent to the island will acquire an enormous potential for private development and growth. With this in mind, it is not too early for the citizens and officials of Worcester County, with the assistance of the State, to begin the preparation of a master plan for the development of facilities along the bay side of the county to service the island.

Convinced of the importance of conserving for all time and for all people the unique natural features of Assateague Island, and for the many other reasons cited above, I lay before the Senate today a proposal which would place the entire 32 miles of the island in public ownership, and would make possible the comprehensive planning and development of this magnificent beach through joint State and Federal action.

Under this proposal, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire land, water, and other property within the boundaries of the seashore by donation, purchase, or exchange, or in such other manner as he shall find to be in the public interest, except that any property or interest owned by the States of Maryland or Virginia shall be acquired only with the concurrence of these States.

I want to take this opportunity to assure all Assateaque Island property owners that every effort will be made to bring about negotiated settlements of land transfers, and that every property owner will be justly compensated.

Owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary may reserve a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial purposes for a term of 25 years.

The Secretary is authorized and directed to compensate the State of Maryland in the amount of two-thirds of the cost of the bridge and its approaches presently under construction between Sandy Point and Assateague, and to pay a reasonable share of the cost of operation and maintenance of this bridge and its approaches. The State will thereupon reimburse Worcester County for its share of the cost of bridge construction.

The State of Maryland shall continue to own the area presently designated as a State park, and shall have the right to acquire from the Department of the Interior any additional area of the island northward from the State park as the State may from time to time determine to be needed for State park purposes.

The Secretary of the Interior will administer the Assateague Island National Seashore for general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. The seashore will furnish unlimited opportunities for hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating, and the park will be open to the public at all times.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE INTERNATIONAL (ROME) INSTITUTE FOR THE UNIFICATION OF PRIVATE LAW; AND AUTHORIZING RESPECTIVELY APPROPRIATIONS THEREFOR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in, first, the Hague Conference on Private International Law, and second, the International—Rome—Institute for the Unification of Private Law; and authorizing respectively appropriations therefor.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Acting Secretary of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, dated August 9, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2129) to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in, first, the Hague Conference on Private International Law, and second, the International—Rome—Institute for the Unification of Private Law; and authorizing respectively appropriations therefor, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States in (1) The Hague Conference on Private International Law and (2) the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and to appoint the United States delegates and their alternates to meetings of the two organizations, and the committees and organs thereof.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of (1) The Hague Conference on Private International Law and (2) The International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law.

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I submit herewith a proposed bill to provide for the participation by the Government of the United States in (1) The Hague Conference on Private International Law and (2) The International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law; and authorizing respectively appropriations therefor.

(1) The Hague Conference on Private International Law: This is an intergovernmental organization. Its purpose is "to work for the progressive unification of the rules of private international law." Membership is acquired by acceding to the statute, an intergovernmental agreement.

The first Hague Conference on Private International Law convened in 1893. Since then, conferences have been held in 1894, 1900, 1904, 1925, 1928, 1951 and 1956. In 1951, the Conference adopted a statute, providing, inter alia, for regular sessions to be held every 4 years, and for the establishment of a permanent bureau at The Hague under a Secretary-General. This statute entered into force on July 15, 1955, and was formally adhered to by the following 18 states: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom. (France, the 19th member, pending the ratification of its acceptance, participates on a de facto basis.)

The Hague Conference has limited itself to unification of the rules of conflict of laws through the use of multilateral treaties. It is an official governmental body operating on a full diplomatic basis and not a gathering of private lawyers and scholars. The conference proposes and adopts multilateral international conventions for formal submission to and ratification by, the member governments, under their respective constitutional processes. The budget is contributed by member nations, although the greater part of the expenses of the nine meetings held since 1893 have been met by the Netherlands Government. It is anticipated that $10,000–$15,000 annually would be needed for United States participation in the Hague Conference.

The following are some illustrative conventions prepared by the Hague Conference in the progressive unification of the rules of private international law: 1902 convention on the conclusion of marriage; 1902 convention on divorce and separation; 1954 convention on civil procedure; 1954 convention on the law applicable to the international sale of corporeal movables; 1956 convention on the recognition of the legal personality of foreign corporations, associations and foundations; 1955 convention on the conflict of laws between the national law and the law of the domicile; 1958 convention on the law applicable to the transfer of ownership in the case of a sale of an international character of corporeal movables; 1956 convention on the law applicable to maintenance obligations towards minors; and 1958 convention on the recognition and enforcement of decisions with regard to maintenance obligations towards minors.

The conference also has under current consideration and study the following matters: (a) simplification of formalities of legalization; (b) agency in international contractual relations; (c) modification of the conventions on family law of 1902 and 1905; (d) formal validity of wills; and (e) competence of the contractual forum.

(2) The International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law. This is also an intergovernmental organization. It was created, with its headquarters in Rome, through an international agreement resulting from an exchange of letters, dated March 31, 1926–April 26, 1926, between the League of Nations and the Italian Government. Under this agreement the institute was closely linked to the League of Nations with regard to which it had the status of an auxiliary, specialized agency. On March 15, 1940, the institute was reorganized, and its international status was reaffirmed through the enactment, by international agreement, of a constitution (statut organique) which became effective on April 21, 1940.

The purposes of the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law are: (a) to prepare drafts of laws with the object of establishing uniform legislation; (b) to prepare drafts of international agreements in the field of private law; (c) to undertake studies of comparative law; (d) to participate in projects undertaken in any of these matters by other organizations with which contact can be maintained; and (e) to organize conferences and to publish works on the above subjects.

The International Institute is responsible to the participating governments. Its organs are: (a) the general assembly, meeting regularly each year at Rome; (b) the president; (c) the board of directors; (d) the permanent committee; and (e) the secretariat.

The following 40 States are at present members of the Institute: Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Rumania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Vatican City, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

Membership is acquired by acceptance of the charter in writing. Participation is for a period of 6 years, which is implicitly renewed unless a year's written notice of withdrawal is given.

The budget of the International Institute is approximately $100,000 annually, and is met through a fixed annual contribution of 31 million lire from the Italian Government, voluntary contributions from member governments and, occasionally, contributions from outside organizations interested in the work of the Institute. It is anticipated that U.S. membership in the International Institute would entail $8,000 annually.

The International Institute has worked closely with other international organizations. It has concluded an advisory agreement with the Council of Europe, under which close collaboration has developed. The objective of the Institute has been carried out in many of its activities. Some of the drafts of international conventions prepared by the Institute at the request of the United Nations organs have been adopted as multilateral agreements.

The following are some illustrative uniform laws and conventions drafted by the International (Rome) Institute: Draft of a uniform law on the international sale of goods; draft of a uniform law on agency; draft of uniform provisions on compulsory insurance of motorists; draft of a uniform arbitral law; draft of a European convention for the reciprocal treatment of Nationals; preliminary draft of a convention on the recognition and enforcement abroad of maintenance obligations; draft of a convention on the contract for the international transport of goods by road; and draft of a convention on the contract for the international transport of goods by inland waterways.

The House of Delegates of the American Bar Association at its midwinter meeting in New Orleans, February 4, 1963, adopted without dissenting vote, a resolution in support of U.S. participation and membership in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and in the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law. This resolution provided, inter alia:

"The American Bar Association urges that all action necessary or appropriate be taken to cause the United States to become a member of the Hague Conference on Private International Law and of the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law in time to assure official representation by the United States at the next forthcoming meetings of these organizations."

The Executive Committee of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has also approved the above resolution.

As can be seen from the legal fields in which the Hague Conference and the International (Rome) Institute have been active, unification of private international law involves activities in a number of fields directly related to economic development and international trade. Successful efforts to harmonize laws relating to international trade, commerce, and financial interchange will go far to facilitate transactions crossing international boundary lines. Active U.S. participation in the works of the Hague Conference and International (Rome) Institute to unify the various laws in these fields is, therefore, important to American foreign trade and commerce and international investments.

The magnitude of the interests involved is illustrated by the fact that the United States annually exports merchandise valued at close to $20 billion and imports goods to a value approximating $13 billion. American industry has directly invested in plant and equipment abroad more than $25 billion, and U.S. private investors have outstanding some $8 billion in long-range portfolio investment. Over a million Americans travel abroad each year. A million or more are residents in foreign countries, and some 3 million aliens are resident in the United States.

Moreover, these figures are spiraling upward at an ever-accelerating rate. This large and increasing international movement of people, goods and money continually raises problems involving the application of extremely complex and unfamiliar legal rules, diversity of legal standards, uncertainty as to the applicable law, and conflict of laws. The result is risks for the trader, the investor and the traveler which could be substantially reduced through cooperative effort. U.S. membership in the Hague Conference, and the International (Rome) Institute, constitutes an excellent means of cooperating with the other major commercial countries in reducing these risks. American businessmen organizing and engaging in international trade, commerce and investments would have readily available adequate knowledge of foreign laws, uniformity of forms and provisions, common standards and rules concerning transactions in different countries. They would know beforehand the requirements for establishing their firms or branches; the laws governing their transactions; the restraints on the movement of goods and persons and the standards and rules regulating the settlement of disputes and how to avoid such disputes. They would save the expense of legal research and opinion; reduce operating costs in not having to train numerous experts, each with a specialized knowledge of a particular country. Their counterparts would in turn have access to knowledge of operations in the United States. Also, Americans traveling abroad, and other persons visiting the United States, would be more informed and be familiar with the legal rules governing their person, conduct and things.

It should be noted that private individuals and the individual States of the United States cannot participate in the activities of the Hague Conference and the International (Rome) Institute. They can only participate and receive the benefits of these activities through U.S. membership in these intergovernmental organizations. Official U.S. delegates to the meetings of the Hague Conference and the International (Rome) Institute will participate fully and actively in the proceedings of the two organizations. More importantly, they will be able to expound the U.S. points of view on the various legal matters under discussion and participate in the formulation of the uniform rules which will govern common transactions. For example, the U.S. delegates would be able to impart the experience of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in such matters as sales, negotiable instruments, bills of lading, warehouse receipts, agency, arbitration, reciprocal enforcement of judgments, judicial assistance, etc. This experience, accumulated over the past 60 years, on the relationship of the States of the United States is relevant to the international scene. Already, the International (Rome) Institute has taken due note of the method of drafting uniform laws as constituting perhaps another flexible mode of promoting the uniform rules of law. The resulting exchange of ideas, experience, and comparative study will be beneficial to U.S. lawyers, business groups, bankers, brokers, merchants, and individuals.

The Department is of the view that it is in the best interests of the United States to become a member of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, subject to the working out of suitable arrangements to meet the special requirements of the U.S. Federal system, and to participate more actively and fully in the activities of these organizations, in order that it may benefit from the extremely valuable and important services performed by them. Under the present organic statutes of the two organizations membership would impose no binding commitments on the part of the United States or any of the several states to ratify or adopt any convention or set of uniform rules proposed by that organization. We will make U.S. acceptance of membership conditional upon the continued maintenance of such provisions in the organic statutes of the organization. This will insure that our membership is predicated on the understanding that U.S. Federal constitutional and legal rerequirements would, insofar as the United States is concerned, at all times be paramount over any present or future activities or provisions of the two organizations in case there should be any inconsistency.

It is desirable and necessary that the U.S. Government participate officially in the activities of both The Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law. As already noted above, The Hague Conference is exclusively concerned with problems of conflict of laws, namely, in promoting uniform rules of conflict of laws; whereas, the International (Rome) Institute is concerned with uniformity in all fields of private law, including comparative law. Also, to a very limited extent the International (Rome) Institute includes conflict of laws in the scope of its activities. Except to the limited extent noted, there is no duplication in the activities of the two institutions which complement each other. These two institutions have firmly established themselves as authoritative and prestigious bodies in the legal systems of the European countries. The importance and impact of their activities are also recognized and felt outside Europe. For example, the members of the International (Rome) Institute include countries from Latin America, the Far East, Eastern Europe, and Africa. Many of the newly independent states, especially in Africa, have retained the judicial systems established by European countries formerly in control. The membership in both institutions includes the leading commercial and maritime countries of the world.

It is hoped that the Congress will be able to take action on this request during the current session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

George W. Ball,
Acting Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 18, 1963, I introduced two bills to establish new secondary market facilities for home mortgages.

One of these bills, S. 810, would authorize the Federal chartering of two types of organizations—one, mortgage insuring corporations to insure conventional mortgage loans, and the other, secondary mortgage market corporations to buy and sell conventional and other mortgage loans, and the creation of a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations.

The second bill, S. 811, would establish a secondary market facility to buy and sell conventional home mortgages. This proposed facility would be organized within the framework of the Federal home loan bank system.

At the time I introduced these two bills, I made the statement that the Federal National Mortgage Association offered a secondary market program for FHA and VA loans but that there was no organized market for conventional loans even though, by far, the largest part of our home financing is through the conventional loan.

Because hearings by the subcommittee will be conducted on September 17, 18, and 19 on the bills, S. 810 and S. 811, I am today introducing, by request, for appropriate reference a bill to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility.

I believe that the housing agency and industry witnesses will want to consider this third alternative to providing a secondary market facility for conventional loans, and I hope that they will have an opportunity to study the measure before their appearance before the Subcommittee on Housing.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2130) to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purposes set forth in section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title:

"The Association is authorized under section 304, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, lend on the security of, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured under the National Housing Act, or which are insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, or which are insured under a contract of insurance and by an insurer which are generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors (as determined by the Association), or which, although neither insured nor guaranteed, are of a quality generally acceptable to private institutional mortgage investors and otherwise meet generally the standards of the Association in its other operations under section 304: *Provided,* That the Association shall not purchase mortgages as to which the outstanding principal balances exceed 80 per centum of the appraised value of the properties covered thereby unless payment of such excess amount is insured or guaranteed.

"The Association is authorized under sections 305 and 306, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured under the National Housing Act, or which are insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no mortgage may be purchased at a price exceeding 100 per centum of the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items; (2) the

Association may not purchase any mortgage if it is offered by, or covers property held by, a State or municipality or instrumentalities thereof; and (3) the Association may not purchase any mortgage, except a mortgage insured under section 220 or title VIII, or insured under section 213 and covering property located in an urban renewal area, or a mortgage covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii, if the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $17,500 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage.

"For the purposes of this title, the term 'mortgages' shall be inclusive of any mortgages or other loans insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 2. Section 304(d) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is hereby repealed.

EXTENSION OF LIFE OF COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, which established a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

The principal purposes of the bill are to extend the life of the Commission from December 31, 1963, to December 31, 1968, and to eliminate the limitation on the authorization of appropriations.

The Commission has substantially completed a first step in the program it was authorized to undertake. It has made recommendations for improvement of the Federal rules of procedure and Federal statutes of international application, and is in the process of drafting a Uniform Interstate and International Procedure Act.

However, the major part of its work remains to be done. Studies of the procedure and practice of foreign countries must be made before the Commission can achieve its primary objective which is the harmonization of foreign law and procedure with our own. I believe it is important that we give the Commission additional time to complete its work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an explanation of it be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2131) to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 3 of the Act of September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85–906) is amended to read:

"(c) Five members shall constitute a quorum."

SEC. 2. Subsection (e) of section 3 of that Act is amended to read:

"(e) The public members of the Commission shall each receive fifty dollars ($50.00) per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, and the public members and the members who are officials of State government shall receive reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties."

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of subsection (b) of section 7 of that Act is further amended to read:

"The Commission shall submit its final report and the Commission and the Advisory Committee shall terminate and wind up their affairs prior to December 31, 1968."

SEC. 4. Section 8 of that Act is amended to read:

"SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The explanation presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

EXPLANATION TO ACCOMPANY BILL TO AMEND THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1958, TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE (PUBLIC LAW 85–906), AS AMENDED

The principal purposes of the attached bill are to extend the life of the Commission and Advisory Committee and to remove the limitation on the authorization of appropriations. Two other amendments of less importance are sought. One is to change the requirement of a quorum of the Commission from seven to five members. The other is to make it clear that the two members who are officials of State governments are entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the performance of duty.

The reasons for amending the act of September 2, 1958, as provided by the four sections of the attached bill, are as follows:

SECTION 1

The first section would amend subsection 3(c) by changing the requirement of a quorum of the Commission from seven to five members. Experience has proven the difficulty of selecting dates for meetings which will insure the attendance of the present quorum of seven members. The members are government officials who are extremely busy with their principal official duties, or are in private practice or other occupations which have first call upon their time. Not all of them live in the District of Columbia area. Some members do considerable traveling abroad in connection with their primary occupations. Some, when meetings are scheduled, are required to respond to obligations have a higher priority. In the interest of facilitating meetings, and insuring the regularity of action without the use of proxies, the requirement of a quorum should be reduced from seven to five.

SECTION 2

The second section would amend section 3(e) to make it clear that the two members of the Commission who are officials of State government are entitled to reimbursement for travel and other expenses.

That the officials of State government members are not specifically stated to be entitled to these benefits which are accorded to the three public members, is apparently the result of an oversight in drafting. H.R. 4642, 85th Congress, 2d session, when referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, contained, in section 3(a), a provision for only seven members, including three public members. Section 3(e) contained the provision of the present law for the payment to the public members of a $50 per diem and their expenses. When the Judiciary Committee proposed amendments to the bill, section 3(a) was rewritten to add two "officials of State government" to the three members to be appointed by the President. However, the Committee failed to rewrite section 3(e) to include these two "officials of State government" among the Presidential appointees who were to have their travel and other expenses paid. Even though, after some uncertainty, the statute was interpreted to permit these payments, it is believed that a clarifying amendment should be made.

SECTION 3

The third section would extend the life of the Commission and Advisory Committee for 5 years, to December 31, 1968.

The necessity for this extension appears from an examination of the purposes of the Commission and its program as prescribed by the Congress. The act establishing the Commission provides, in section 2, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. The Commission shall investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements. To the end that procedures necessary or incidental to the conduct and settlement of litigation in State and Federal courts and quasi-judicial agencies which involve the performance of acts in foreign territory, such as the service of judicial documents, the obtaining of evidence, and the proof of foreign law, may be more readily ascertainable, efficient, economical, and expeditious, and that the procedures of our State and Federal tribunals for the rendering of assistance to foreign courts and quasi-judicial agencies be similarly improved, the Commission shall—

(a) Draft for the assistance of the Secretary of State international agreements to be negotiated by him;

(b) Draft and recommend to the President any necessary legislation;

(c) Recommend to the President such other action as may appear advisable to improve and codify international practice in civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings; and

(d) Perform such other related duties as the President may assign.

The program which the Congress has set forth in section 2, consists, roughly, of three parts. First, a study of the law and practice of judicial assistance of the United States and State courts, the recommendation of revisions of the Federal Rules of Civil and Criminal Procedure and the appropriate Federal statutes, and the preparation of a uniform State law for adoption by the several States. Second, a comprehensive study of the law and practice of judicial assistance of the courts of foreign countries and the preparation of materials for the guidance of the bench and bar of the United States. Third, the reform and improvement of international practices in international judicial assistance by appropriate techniques which include the drafting of international agreements for negotiation by the Secretary of State. By these international procedural agreements the "procedures" mentioned in section 2 are to be made "more readily ascertainable, efficient, economical, and expeditious."

Part 1 has been substantially accomplished. The most important parts of the program, parts 2 and 3, remain to be undertaken.

Although the Commission was established by the act of September 2, 1958, no funds were made available to it until several months later. It thus did not actually begin its work until late in the spring of 1959. Because of the insufficiency of its $25,000 appropriation for 1959, the Commission's accomplishments were proportionately curtailed. In the remaining months of that first year, its staff examined the pertinent files of the Department of State and the Department of Justice and set up for the Commission a working library of information on existing law and practice in the form of "country" files—a country-by-country reservoir of material. The Commission's staff also made some basic studies and wrote certain reports preparatory to a later stage of its work when it would receive adequate funds. The Commission and Advisory Committee in the first half of 1959 had a few organization meetings, but a planned program of the Advisory Committee could not be carried out because of the lack of funds for travel and other expenses.

The life of the Commission was extended for 2 years to December 31, 1961, by Public Law 86-287 of September 16, 1959. The Congress, however, appropriated no funds for the operations of the Commission during the extended period. Late in September 1959 the Commission decided to seek other means of obtaining funds for carrying out its statutorily prescribed duties. The time needed to resolve this unusual dilemma meant that the Commission was completely without financial means for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1960. Pursuant to the approval of the President, the Commission, late in 1959, sought funds from private sources. In April of 1960, the Carnegie Corporation announced a grant of $350,000 to Columbia University for a 2-year study of international judicial procedure in collaboration with the Commission. The funds were made available in July 1960. The Columbia University Law School established a project on international procedure to carry out a program and administer the grant.

That part of the Commission's statutory program which was suitable for private collaboration was chosen. It was determined to make a study of the law and practice of international judicial assistance of the Federal and State courts, and to draft and recommend revisions of the Federal rules of procedure, the Federal statutes, and State law, as the first step in the "improvements" of existing international practices which Congress set as the ultimate objective in establishing the Commission.

As reported in the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission, which the President sent to the Congress on March 11, 1963, this first part of the statutory program has been substantially accomplished. Unless parts two and three are also undertaken and completed, the Commission will not have accomplished the purpose for which it was established.

As the principal deficiencies and difficulties of international practice lie in the disparate law and policy of foreign governments, revisions of the Federal and State rules of procedure and statutes are, alone, insufficient to effect the maximum improvements and should be followed by comparable revisions of foreign law and policy. Only a harmonization of domestic and foreign law and practice will bring maximum improvement to existing international practice. Additionally, the recommended revisions of provisions of the Federal Judicial and Criminal Codes will greatly improve the judicial assistance available in our Federal courts to foreign courts, but will do less to benefit litigants in our own courts. The same is true of the Uniform Interstate and International Procedure Act which the Commission and the Columbia project recommended to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and which the conference adopted and the American Bar Association has approved.

The Columbia project, as part of its own program, made a study of the law and practice of judicial assistance of the countries of Western Europe. These studies will be published in book form later this year, and should provide sufficient information on that area of the world for the Commission in the later stages of its program. The Commission, however, will have to make its own studies of the law and practice of the principal countries in other parts of the world, particularly Latin America, Asia, Northern Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East.

The Commission will be unable to resume work on its program until further funds are received.

During the period of collaboration with the Columbia University law school project on international procedure, the research and drafting were done, in greater part, at the university. The Commission, itself, maintained no staff other than its director, one attorney, and a stenographer. It is now necessary for the Commission to employ its own staff in sufficient numbers to carry out its program.

The Commission believes that another 5 years will be sufficient for the Commission to accomplish its purpose as set forth in section 2 of the act of September 2, 1958, if sufficient funds are received annually to permit continuous progress.

Judging by the 2 years taken by the Columbia project to gather the information relative to the procedure and practice of the countries of Western Europe, it is estimated that at least 3 years will be necessary to obtain reports on the law and practice of the principal countries of the rest of the world.

The procedure which will be followed is substantially as follows: For a given country, a jurist, either a professor of procedure, a judge, or a practicing lawyer who is an expert proceduralist, will be retained as a consultant to write a report on the law and practice of international judicial assistance of his country. This will be written according to a standard outline which has been used by the Columbia project in gathering information on the law and practice of Western Europe. The report will be translated into English.

On behalf of the Commission, the Columbia project has previously prepared, for the Pan American Union, an exhaustive report on U.S. procedure and practice, entitled "International Cooperation in Civil Litigation—A Report on Practices and Procedures Prevailing in the United States." This report had been requested by the Pan American Union in compliance with resolutions of the Inter-American Juridical Committee in 1959 and 1960. This same report, with the inclusion of two additional topics, was used by the Columbia project as the basic U.S. Report for the Varese Conference on International Judicial Assistance held in Italy, in 1961, by the Italian-U.S. Center of Judicial Studies with the cooperation of the Institute of Judicial Administration of New York University. When and if the proposed bill to revise sections of the judicial and criminal codes, which the Commission sent to the President on January 28, 1963 for transmittal to the Congress, is enacted and after the amendments to the Federal Rules of Procedure have been promulgated in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission, it will be necessary to revise and update the report.

The report, "International Cooperation in Civil Litigation—A Report on Practices and Procedures Prevailing in the United States", revised and modified, perhaps, to include criminal, quasijudicial, and other judicial procedure, will be translated into the language of each principal foreign country.

Once the two basic reports are prepared and translated, a conference will be held in the foreign country. The conference will be attended by the principal procedural experts of that country—law teachers, judges, practicing lawyers and those government officials having charge of judicial assistance matters in the foreign ministry and the ministry of justice of the country. A limited number of procedural experts from the United States will also attend. These may be members of the Commission or the Advisory Committee, professors of procedure, judges or practitioners. The conference will discuss all aspects of the juridical relations between the United States and that country and will prepare a statement of principles agreed upon by participants from both countries as necessary to a reconciliation and unification of the two systems of procedure. Should it become evident that the procedural difficulties between the two countries can best be solved by treaty, the conference will agree upon a set of rules, or specific provisions, to be recommended to the respective governments for embodiment in a treaty.

It is not expected that it will be necessary to hold such conferences in every foreign country; nor is it expected that it will be necessary to draft a treaty for each. Countries where we have the most frequent occasions to serve judicial documents, or to obtain evidence, with which our juridical relations are most troubled, or which have manifested the greatest interest in improving them, will be given first attention.

A pattern for this type of conference has already been set by the Varese and Varenna Conferences on International Judicial Assistance held by the Italian-United States Center of Judicial Studies in Italy in 1960 and 1961.

As complete information on the law and practice of a country is received, and especially as a conference is held which results in an agreed statement of rules to be proposed for adoption in a treaty or convention, the Commission would draft such a treaty for the assistance of the Secretary of State. The Commission, with its advisory committee and director, would, upon request, supply technical assistance to the Secretary in the negotiation of the agreements.

It appears probable that, by the end of 5 years, with continuous, adequate financing, the Commission will have collected sufficient information and will have drafted a sufficient number of treaties for representative countries so that a pattern will have been established which would permit the Commission to terminate and the Department of Justice or the Department of State to assume its remaining tasks.

SECTION 4

The fourth section of the bill would amend section 8 of the act of September 2, 1958, by removing the limitation of $75,000 on the authorization of appropriations.

In March 1959, as the Commission was being organized, it received a loan of $25,000 from the President's emergency fund. At the end of fiscal year 1959, only $16,000 of this loan had been expended or obligated. The Congress, by the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, appropriated $25,000 for the Commission. No further appropriation was made until the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963, which appropriated $10,000 for the Commission. Considering the $16,000 received in 1959 from the President's emergency fund as an appropriation, the Commission has received appropriations totaling $51,000, leaving only $24,000 of the present authorization now available. Funds very substantially in excess of the remaining authorization will be required for the operations of the Commission during fiscal year 1964.

The length of time necessary for the completion of the Commission's program will depend to a large extent upon the funds made available for its use.

LET US HELP SAXMAN GROW

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for conveyance of certain lands to the city of Saxman.

Saxman is a native village in southeastern Alaska. It was authorized and subdivided as a native townsite under section 3 of the act of May 25, 1926—48 United States Code 355(c). Survey 1652, which includes the Saxman townsite, was approved March 8, 1956.

Mr. President, Saxman is located in an area which is now undergoing industrial development. At present the unoccupied land within the city is tied up because the method of disposition provided under the act of May 25, 1926, is inadequate to take care of the prospective development within the city. It is expected a number of people will move into the Saxman area seeking employment at a recently completed rail-barge terminal facility and other industry attracted to the services offered by the terminal. The time is also ripe in Saxman for commercial development.

After considering several approaches to the development problems faced by Saxman city council, my colleague and I decided the most reasonable solution would be to deed the unoccupied land within the townsite to the municipal government. We feel this will allow the city council to both encourage commercial enterprise and control the pattern of residential housing and business establishment. It is hoped our colleagues will recognize the merits of, and the need for, our proposal, and help us in our efforts to get it enacted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2134) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Saxman, Alaska, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the trustee for the city of Saxman, Alaska, appointed under the provisions of section 3 of the Act of May 25, 1926, (48 U.S.C. 355c), shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, convey to such city all right, title, and interest held by such trustee to all lands within the townsite of such city which on the date of enactment of this Act are unoccupied and not held in trust for an Indian or Eskimo under the provisions of such Act of May 25, 1926.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, as well as for other purposes.

This bill has been drawn up to meet situations disclosed during the inquiry of the Committee on Foreign Relations into the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals.

That inquiry has not yet concluded. However, in order that the appropriate departments and agencies of the executive branch and other interested parties will have time to consider the basic changes which the committee is contemplating, I am introducing this bill today.

The views of the committee as to the purposes and effects of these changes in the present law will be spelled out in detail in the report which the committee will prepare at the conclusion of its study into the activities of nondiplomatic agents. However, I wish to call attention to certain of these changes in order that they may be given careful consideration, prior to hearings on this bill which, it is hoped, will be held next month.

The bill changes neither the general purpose of the 1938 act, which was passed, thanks to a significant investigation by the present Speaker of the House [Mr. McCormack], nor does it change the general legislative scheme which was chosen to achieve those purposes.

The 1938 act sought to lay a basis upon which the U.S. Government and American citizens could exercise informed judgments with respect to the activities of certain representatives of foreign governments, political parties, and other foreign principals at a time when such agents were being employed primarily for work of a political nature.

The means selected in the original legislation to achieve this end was public disclosure. It required that representatives of foreign principals register in some detail with the Department of Justice where that information would be made available to the public. In addition, the original act required that political literature circulated by these agents of foreign principals bear some indication as to its source in order, to quote from the purpose clause of the original legislation:

> That the people of the United States * * * may appraise (the) statements and actions (of foreign agents) in the light of their associations and activities.

This general legislative scheme has not been altered. However, in order better to fulfill the ends sought by the original legislation, a number of amendments are proposed.

I should like to point out that this bill does not seek to correct by amendment of the original act all the apparent abuses which have come to light in the course of the committee's inquiry. Many of these abuses, in my opinion, could have been avoided by enforcement of and compliance with the law which is presently on the books. However, enforcement has undoubtedly lagged and compliance has been poor because of a lack of awareness of the dangers which this law and its amendments were intended to correct. That lack of awareness may have stemmed in turn from the fact that no extensive hearings had been held in connection with this law since those which preceded its enactment some 25 years ago. It is my hope that the current hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations will to some extent clarify the importance of this law.

The bill does, however, deal with certain new types of activities by foreign agents with which the original drafters may not have been familiar.

The proposed legislation makes clear that it is concerned only with representatives of foreign principals who are engaged in activities of a political nature or bordering on the political. By making more precise the group required to register, it is hoped that compliance with and enforcement of the act will improve over past experience.

Further, the proposed bill attempts to assure that the requirements and responsibilities of registration cannot be avoided by the use of front groups or conduits as in some cases which have come to light during the committee's study.

The bill endeavors to prohibit all political contributions by foreign principals through their agents and, as a protection to the public, the bill would require agents registered under the act to make public all their political contributions.

The bill also attempts to assure that Members and committees of Congress as well as other agencies and officials of Government will be aware of a foreign agents' status by requiring full disclosure in all communications and filing of their latest registration at the time such agents testify before congressional committees.

The bill also seeks to prohibit arrangements whereby the remuneration of a foreign agent is made contingent upon his success in lobbying before the Congress or other agencies of Government.

The bill would prohibit agents of foreign principals from holding full-time jobs with the U.S. Government and in those cases where part-time employment is desirable, a waiver signed by the employing agency must be placed in the agent's file in the Department of Justice, available for public inspection.

This bill does not at present meet the problem of the labeling of foreign agent propaganda placed in newspapers and magazines, nor does it deal with the practices of "junkets" and other favors for newsmen which I believe—and apparently the public relations men who provide them—play a part in the placement of such material. The committee has some ideas in this field, and may formulate them into legislative language after hearing from witnesses from the journalism profession.

Finally, in order to insure that the disclosure, labeling and other provisions of the act can be enforced without resort to the criminal sanctions of the present law where the failure to disclose has not clearly been willful or gross, the bill provides for an injunctive remedy by which the Attorney General may secure compliance with the provisions of the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2136) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. Fulbright (for himself and Mr. Hickenlooper), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCORPORATION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill S. 1914, to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, that the name of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that on Friday, September 13, the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will hold hearings on S. 729, S. 1356, and S. 2056.

These bills, each of which is closely related to the other, are designed to provide additional revenue, earnings, and savings to the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems in sufficient amount to repair the actuarial deficit of $77 million per year in the first system and an operating deficit in the second.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 10, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 495. An act for the relief of Evanthia Christon;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 657. An act for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Marja Lovsin;

S. 1154. An act to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc. in Minnesota;

S. 1185. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.;

S. 1230. An act for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson; and

S. 1489. An act for the relief of J. Arthur Fields.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, our Nation cannot continue the intolerable and indefensible position it is now in in South Vietnam. Day after day, we are informed of the violation of human rights by President Ngo Dinh Diem, a ruthless dictator.

Our Nation's policy in Vietnam seems to be one of hope that this dictator and his associate rulers will become more benevolent and less ruthless. However, their actions and their statements give us no cause for hope. The time has come for us to be realistic and practical.

At the present time, we have about 14,000 U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam; we have there 500 military personnel dependents, 1,200 American diplomats and other officials and their dependents, and perhaps 200 private U.S. citizens, such as missionaries, businessmen, and tourists.

We have invested over $1 billion in military and economic support in this country. Over 100 American boys have given their lives in this operation. We are presently spending about $1½ million a day in South Vietnam. It is disheartening to read that within the last few days hundreds of school boys and girls have been arrested and hauled off to concentration camps, in U.S. trucks furnished that Government through our aid money.

There can be no question of brutality on the part of the police, under the control and domination of the dictator and his family who are ruling that country at the present time.

A military communique states that students over 20 years of age who were arrested would be drafted into the army, and those under that age would be sent to special "reeducation centers," which no doubt are concentration camps.

These inhuman acts and the religious persecution being carried on by that regime are contrary to every principle of human decency and are in violation of every human right.

The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has prepared a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the granting of military and economic assistance to a government in South Vietnam which persists in religious persecution offends the conscience of the American people and should not be continued.

When that resolution is submitted, I will cosponsor it and will assist in every way I can to secure early action on it.

Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, sister-in-law of the South Vietnam President, stated yesterday, with scorn, that the United States does not dare stop aid to South Vietnam. I, as one Member of the Senate, say let us accept that challenge; let us once and for all serve notice on the Diem regime that we will have no further truck with a government that practices religious persecution and has no respect or regard for human life and human rights.

I ask unanimous consent that three short newspaper clippings which are the basis for this statement be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PAYING TROOPS STORMING PAGODAS?

South Vietnam's American-trained counter guerrilla forces used to spearhead the government drive against Buddhist pagodas still are on a secret U.S. payroll, reliable sources said today.

These sources said Col. Le Quang Tung, who is considered South Vietnam's most powerful military commander, receives $3 million a year from the Central Intelligence Agency to pay and maintain his special forces.

Colonel Tung received his regular monthly payment of about $250,000 from the CIA Tuesday, despite publicity announced U.S. disapproval of the wholesale arrest of Buddhists, students, and other government opponents in which Colonel Tung's troops figured prominently, the informants said.

It was the counter guerrilla troops which stormed Buddhist pagodas in Saigon, August 21, and they have supported police making mass arrests of antigovernment student demonstrators since that date.

HAMBURG, GERMANY, September 9.—Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, sister-in-law of South Vietnam's President, scoffed today at reports the United States might cut off aid to her country if the Government continues its stern repression of its political opponents.

"They (the Americans) couldn't do it," she said in an interview published by the newsweekly Spiegel. "Nobody would trust them any more."

She also accused U.S. newspapers and news agencies of carrying distorted reports on the situation, charging American adventurers are sabotaging U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

Asked about French President Charles de Gaulle's implied offer to intervene in the situation, Mme. Nhu said the Government would accept French aid if it were offered.

SAIGON, September 9.—Helmeted combat police smashed through a gate at Chu Van An Boys' High School today and dragged 400 or 500 teenage anti-Government demonstrators off to a detention camp.

The raid, second of its kind in 3 days, increased the estimated number of high school students in custody to more than 1,000.

A wild anti-Government demonstration got underway at the high school about 8 a.m.

BARRICADE GATES

Students slammed and barricaded the school's heavy gates shortly before classes were to have begun, and began shouting anti-Government slogans.

When police showed up, the students pelted them with rocks and bricks for nearly an hour before authorization was given for police to smash their way into the schoolyard.

When police broke down the gates and swarmed into the yard, the students held them back for a time with a barrage of chairs, desks and stones.

CLUBBED, KICKED

Police forced their way into the yard and began rounding up the rioters, wrenching their arms behind their back or in some cases dragging them by the hair as they rushed them to waiting trucks.

Students who resisted were clubbed or kicked.

As the rioting died away, a lone sign in English on a second-floor balcony dramatized the students' protest against the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

"Help us," it read. "We are in danger."

Earlier the Government had hinted the U.S. Congress should investigate American officials and agencies which it says are "misleading" President Kennedy about conditions in South Vietnam.

The proposal, an oblique reply to President Kennedy's criticism of the regime in a telecast a week ago, appeared in a policy guidance document officially intended for Government workers.

The policy paper said the Government is carrying out a revolution "from the lowest level to the highest" through its strategic hamlet program, and that victory over the Reds is not far off.

Meanwhile, opposition to the Government was taking on increasingly anti-American tone.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Kansas for the statement he has just made, in supporting the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] in the resolution he is about to submit in connection with further aid to Vietnam.

I should like to note for the Record my concurrence with both the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Idaho, and my intention to cosponsor the resolution when it is submitted.

THE POPULATION PROBLEM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to continue with the information I have been placing in the Record, for the benefit of Senators, on the subject of the population problem, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an interesting news article, entitled "United States Studies Population Problems," written by Harold Simons, and published this morning in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Studies Population Problems

(By Howard Simons)

> The Federal Government currently is spending roughly $5 million to support research on reproduction that may relate to birth and population control.
>
> The lion's share of Government expenditures on birth-control-related research is being made by the National Institutes of Health. As of January 1, 1963, NIH was supporting 198 reproduction research projects budgeted at almost $3.5 million.
>
> These new estimates of the Government's involvement in a politically sensitive area of scientific research were made public yesterday by the NIH. They are contained in a supplement to a previous, hurried and controversial report on the same subject released on December 1, 1962.
>
> What the new survey shows is that there are at least 758 research projects underway here and abroad on reproduction related to birth control. Support for these projects is estimated to be a little more than $8 million, including U.S. Government spending.
>
> The largest non-Government support for such research, $1.3 million, comes from the Population Council, which derives almost all its funds from John D. Rockefeller III, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation.
>
> Domestic pharmaceutical houses are spending approximately $150,000 though the report says no clear dollar figure is available. In 1962 there were 14 such firms engaged in birth control studies. A year later the figure had increased to 21.
>
> In contrast to NIH-supported research, which reflects its "preoccupation * * * with basic research on reproduction and disease rather than on birth control itself," the pharmaceutical industry is seeking to develop birth control techniques.
>
> There are no substantive changes in the text that accompanied the new and the old NIH compilations of reproduction research related to birth control. In both the NIH stressed that: "It neither advocates nor condemns birth control, or any of the methods described."
>
> Nonetheless, throughout the text its authors made it clear that more research is needed. Thus, for example, the report notes that the surveys "clearly demonstrate that modern understanding of the details of the reproductive process leaves much to be desired."
>
> Essentially, yesterday's report represents little more than a guide to who is doing research where that might relate to birth control. The studies in the 248-page survey range from a Fish and Wildlife Service sponsored investigation of bird sterility to research by the Swedish Fur Breeder's Association on selecting mink for high fertility.

Mr. CLARK. The article indicates that the Federal Government is currently spending about $5 million to support research on reproduction which may relate to birth and population control. Most of the expenditure on this program is being made by one of the National Institutes of Health, which on January 1, 1963, was supporting 198 separate reproduction research projects, budgeted at approximately $3.5 million.

However, the account points out that many private agencies are also engaged in this research; and more than $1 million is being spent by the Population Council, which derives almost all of its funds from John D. Rockefeller III, the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. Also, domestic pharmaceutical houses are spending a not inconsiderable amount in the same area.

However, a report just issued by the National Institutes of Health, under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stresses the point that more research in this area is needed. It states:

> Surveys clearly demonstrate that the modern understanding of the details of the reproductive process leaves much to be desired.

I hope this information will be of use to Senators.

A GERMANENESS RULE FOR THE SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on June 27 of this year, I had occasion to appear before the Subcommittee on the Standing Rules of the Senate, of the Committee on Rules and Administration, so ably headed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, who now is our Presiding Officer. At that time, in speaking in support of a resolution which would create a limited rule of germaneness in the Senate, I quoted from Thomas Jefferson's Manual, which is printed as part of the Senate Manual, and which states:

> No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously.

At that point the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] interjected.

> How are you going to legislate against that?

I replied:

> I am very conservative on this. I think we have to allow Senators to speak superfluously and tediously. This is part of our constitutional right. And perhaps, every now and then, impertinently, within the limitations of rule XIX, section 2.
>
> But I do think we could go back to Thomas Jefferson at least to the extent of saying that a Member should not be permitted to speak beside the question except under pretty carefully laid down restrictions.

That statement of mine was picked up in Philadelphia, and a little poem entitled "The Fifth Freedom" was published in the Sunday Bulletin magazine of the Philadelphia Bulletin on September 1 under the byline:

> Senator Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, draws the line at tampering with a Senator's immemorial right to be a bore. He said, "I'm not sure we could or should deny a Member's right to speak tediously."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the poem may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Fifth Freedom

(Note.—Senator Joseph S. Clark, of Pennsylvania, draws the line at tampering with a Senator's immemorial right to be a bore. He said, "I'm not sure we could or should deny a Member's right to speak tediously."—News item.)

Hark. Hark. The Clark at Heaven's gate sings,
And freedom's on the rise.
Then blessed be the man who brings
This speakers' paradise.
Oh, none could wage so wise a fight
As he, our Senator,
To serve this immemorial right,
The right to be a bore.

Yet speaking for this paper, well,
The theme's not apropos;
Its writers on Olympus dwell
As Sunday readers know.
But when my verses grow inept
and slip to bad or medium,
Then I'll acclaim Joe Clark who kept
This country free for tedium.

—David S. Stern.

STRATEGY TO PREVENT DEATH OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, unless we act promptly to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights there is serious danger that the Commission will die before we even get a chance to consider the issue.

After months of hearings, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is still questioning its first witness—the Attorney General. It would be ridiculous to expect this committee to act on civil rights legislation in time to save the Commission.

The House Committee on the Judiciary has completed its civil rights hearings, but it is expected that more than a month may go by before the subcommittee and the full committee complete their work on the bill. Then it must run the hurdle of the Rules Committee, which has not been exactly cooperative in expediting action on similar bills in the past. And while the other body does not allow filibusters, other dilatory devices are available to the opponents of civil rights to prevent speedy House action on the bill.

Civil rights was officially added to this year's congressional agenda at a late date. An attitude which I have characterized as one of "patient determination" has compounded the delay in dealing with this issue. Under the present timetable, it is not only possible but highly likely that Congress will not complete its consideration of civil rights legislation until December or January—which will be too late to do the present Commission any good.

Last week, I pointed out that the Commission could be ignored out of existence by this timetable. Since I made this statement, it has been suggested to me by supporters of the Commission that "ignored" was the wrong term and that some who have given lipservice to the need for an extension of the Commission might welcome its demise.

I hope these reports are wrong. But I am disheartened by the fact that nothing has been said by the leadership to date about plans it may have for saving the Commission. As a result, the Commission has already been severely demoralized by uncertainty as to its future status or existence.

Under the circumstances that prevail, I have concluded that definite steps must be initiated to deal with this situation. I have therefore drawn up an amendment to extend the Commission beyond its present expiration date and I serve notice now that I will offer this amendment to the first bill on the Senate calendar to be called up for consideration after the test ban treaty is disposed of. If the next order of business is an appropriation bill, I will move to suspend the rules and offer this as an amendment to the appropriation bill.

In my judgment, the Commission should be extended indefinitely and that is the form in which my amendment will be offered. If this is unsuccessful, then I shall offer an amendment to extend the Commission for 4 years as voted by a 5 to 1 majority of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights. And if this fails, I shall offer a limited amendment to extend the Commission for at least the 60 to 90 days necessary to make certain that it does not expire before we get around to deciding its fate.

I regret as much as anyone the necessity of following such a procedure—but I have no doubt that an unorthodox procedure is preferable to killing the Commission in the regular order of business.

The Commission has performed an outstanding service and in my judgment, an overwhelming number of Members of Congress would support its extension if given an opportunity to vote. That is exactly the opportunity I am determined to provide by the course of action I have outlined today.

STATUS OF 59 YOUNG AMERICANS WHO VISITED CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the Department of Justice there is pending some unfinished business which I think is of grave importance. It deals with the 59 young Americans who paid their way to New York City and from New York City were financed in separate groups, making trips to the Hague, London, Amsterdam, and Prague. From those four diverse points they moved on to Prague. Fifty-nine of them assembled in Prague, and from there, in a Cuban plane, they were taken to Cuba. The indications are that the trips were financed completely either by Cuba or by some other foreign power. They made that circuitous trip to Prague, through Hague, London, Amsterdam, and Paris to avoid the immigration laws of our country. We have a ban against tourists going to Cuba except under extraordinary circumstances. In Cuba they participated in paying tribute to the supposedly great political leader of Cuba—Castro.

After their visit in Cuba they were taken to Spain, and from Spain, on August 29, they came back to the United States. When they came to the offices of the U.S. Government at the port of entry in New York, the immigration officials, on the basis of the violations committed, proceeded to declare their passports invalid. The officials contemplated stamping the passports "invalid." When that was sought to be done, this group of students, then consisting of 45, staged a sitdown. The officials were confronted with the problem of dealing with the sitdown or subsequently writing a letter to each of the participants, stating that the passports were void from the beginning. The yielding to this sitdown threat was wrong. Our Government should have stood firm.

I now come to the principle which I wish to discuss. In a democracy, if liberty is to be preserved, there must, as a prerequisite, be obedience to law and order. Without obedience to law, one cannot have a democracy; one can only have anarchy.

In New York a few days ago, the leader of the Teachers' Union declared that if an order were issued by the court he would not obey the order. I point that out because of the growing trend toward disobeying law and order.

In Alabama the Governor is defying the orders of the court.

With that situation prevailing, Mr. President, there are all the evidences that the citizenry, instead of complying with the principles of freedom, are beginning to defy the first rule which is essential for the preservation of a free people.

In the Department of Justice, a decision will have to be made as to whether these 59 young people shall be allowed to challenge the laws of our Government without responsibility. I say today on this floor, "Mr. Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, you must understand that our Government cannot survive if individuals can defiantly and brazenly violate the law without being required to pay the penalty for such violation."

It appears that our immigration laws have been violated. The Attorney General should make certain that the individuals involved are brought before the bar of justice and made to pay the penalty for their defiance of the dignity of the U.S. Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled "Students Back From Cuba Trip Stage Sit-In Against Invalidating Passports," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENTS BACK FROM CUBA TRIP STAGE SIT-IN AGAINST INVALIDATING PASSPORTS

NEW YORK, August 29.—Fifty American students who toured Cuba as guests of Premier Fidel Castro returned to the United States tonight. Forty-five of them staged a sitdown at the airport when State Department officials tried to stamp their passports invalid.

The sitdown lasted 2 hours and 40 minutes—until Federal officials agreed no such stamp would be placed on the passports. The students, however, were given letters from the State Department informing them that their passport privileges had been tentatively withheld.

As the students were leaving the terminal, at least 10 of them served with subpenas to appear before the House Un-American Activities Committee in Washington, September 12.

Clark Foreman, director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee who met the students at the airport, said the students "have a passport that they can use, and if it was improperly used, this will have to be determined by the courts."

Five students had their passports stamped with big, red "not valid" stamps before the sit-in demonstration began. Shortly before it ended, another student handed over his passport and left. He identified himself as Martin Nicolaus, 21, of Fontana, Wis.

He said his passport would expire at midnight anyway, and he did not want to get involved in a legal entanglement.

The students flew back to New York aboard a Spanish jetliner from Madrid. They had flown to Madrid from Havana. Four of the group apparently stayed in Madrid.

Three of the fifty-nine in the original group decided to stay a few days longer in Cuba, one came back last week and one drowned in a swimming accident at a Cuban hotel.

The students chatted and laughed as they left the plane here.

One turned to a photographer and shouted "Hey guy." Then he dropped to his knees and kissed the pavement.

Phillip Luce, 26, a student at the new school for Social Research in New York City, acted as spokesman for the group during the passport hassle.

"We only ask a guarantee from the State Department that they will take no action relating to our passports until we have had a proper hearing," Luce said.

Luce also made some comments about the trip.

If Cuba is a police state, he said, "it is a unique police state because the vast majority of the Cuban people carry arms."

He said he did not know of any Communist Party members in the student group, although "there may be."

Luce said the students met several counter-revolutionaries in the streets of Cuba and talked to political prisoners in Camaguey and Havana.

"They all expressed themselves freely in criticizing the Castro government," he said.

The Cuban people are not anti-American, he said, but are against the American Government.

STOP POLIO SUNDAY

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement which I made endorsing "Stop Polio Sunday."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT S. WALTERS

This worthwhile community service is sponsored by the Knoxville Academy of Medicine. They envision the administration of oral polio vaccine to approximately 85 percent of the persons residing in the Knoxville area in a mass immunization program set to begin in early October.

They have set aside the Sundays of October 6, November 10, and December 8 for the administration of a different type of vaccine on each of these dates. The present Sabine Oral Polio vaccine is available to immunize persons against types I, II, and III at intervals of 4 to 6 weeks, since a combined vaccine to effect immunization in one dose is not yet approved for general use. Accordingly it is planned to make type I available on Sunday, October 6. Subsequent dates are set for November and December for the other strains.

The cost of the program is to be defrayed by contribution of 25 cents from those receiving the vaccine with emphasis on ability to pay.

It is felt this program represents a dynamic and measurable contribution to the public welfare by the practitioners of medicine and is one further example of the unselfish dedication to the public good which motivates a great majority of the medical profession.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to be associated with such a worthy and effective cause. I want to urge all the citizens of Knox County to cooperate fully.

As the sponsors are emphasizing, this is an excellent way for us to combat the dread disease of polio.

THE ANTARCTIC TREATY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on page 16528 of the September 9 RECORD, the Senator from Arkansas is shown as saying:

> We made a treaty with Russia about 2 years ago relating to Antarctica. At that time people said that we could not trust the Russians. I do not recall anyone talking about the slightest violations by Russia of that treaty. I do not think there is much incentive to violate it.

In this connection, I would like to invite attention to an article which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of August 24, 1963, under the headline "Antarctic Inspections Are Considered by United States."

I would like to quote from this article by Staff Reporter Howard Simons:

> The United States is seriously considering a plan to make on-site inspections of foreign stations in Antarctica, it was learned yesterday.
>
> Such inspections are provided for under the terms of a 12-nation 1959 treaty that set aside the Antarctic Continent for "peaceful purposes only."
>
> Each of the 12 treaty signers, including the Soviet Union, has the right to inspect the Antarctic stations of all the other nations, providing that prior notice of such inspection is given. To date, none of the treaty signers has exercised this right.
>
> According to State Department officials, the contemplated inspection team would not be looking for anything in particular. U.S. officials, it is stressed, do not suspect that any of the treaty provisions, including those banning military bases, maneuvers, and weapons tests of any kind, has been violated.

Mr. President, my point is this: How do we know whether or not there have been violations if we have never taken advantage of the right to inspect other stations as provided for under the treaty? Can we say, then, that the Soviet Union—or any other nation, for that matter—has fulfilled treaty terms, that it has not violated the treaty? We just do not know.

And if the article is accurate, why is this particular time being selected to consider a plan to make on-site inspections? Is there something going on that makes us suspect there may be or may have been violations, despite the disclaimers of the unknown State Department officials quoted in the article? And why should we not look for something specific if we do inspect? Or is it to be a purely social get-together?

And why has there been a 4-year gap in fulfilling what the article terms a tacit State Department pledge to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the 1959 treaty ratification hearings that on-site inspections would be carried out?

I believe we are entitled to information relating to this sudden decision to make on-site inspections in the Antarctic. I believe we are entitled to information explaining how we are so positive that no violations have occurred in this region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this Washington Post article of August 24, entitled "Antarctic Inspections Are Considered by United States," may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTARCTIC INSPECTIONS ARE CONSIDERED BY UNITED STATES

(By Howard Simons)

The United States is seriously considering a plan to make on-site inspections of foreign stations in Antarctica, it was learned yesterday.

Such inspections are provided for under the terms of a 12-nation 1959 treaty that set aside the Antarctic Continent for "peaceful purposes only."

A State Department spokesman yesterday said that the question of sending a U.S. inspection team to Antarctica has been under discussion for a month. No decision has been reached.

The proposed inspection would have a twofold aim: to exercise the right of inspection granted in the treaty and to provide American inspectors with practical on-site inspection experience.

RIGHT TO INSPECT

Each of the 12 treaty signers, including the Soviet Union, has the right to inspect the Antarctic stations of all the other nations, providing that prior notice of such inspection is given. To date, none of the treaty signers has exercised this right.

According to State Department officials, the contemplated inspection team would not be looking for anything in particular. U.S. officials, it is stressed, do not suspect that any of the treaty provisions, including those banning military bases, maneuvers and weapons tests of any kind, has been violated.

ON-SITE INSPECTION

Then why carry out the proposed on-site inspection?

One reason given yesterday by officials was that such action would fulfill a tacit State Department pledge made to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the 1959 treaty ratification hearings. At that time the Department told the Senators that on-site inspections of Antarctica would be undertaken at some future date. Some officials presumably think the time has come to honor this pledge.

There is also reason to believe that some officials want the proposed Antarctic inspection to demonstrate the principle of on-site inspection.

The question of such inspection has been a subject of dispute between the United States and the Soviet Union in regard to a treaty that would ban all nuclear tests. It was the failure to resolve this dispute that led to the limited test ban treaty now before the Senate. This treaty forbids nuclear tests in the air, in space and under water, but permits underground nuclear testing.

The 12 treaty participants and the number of Antarctic stations each maintains at present are: Argentina (5); Australia (3); Belgium (0); Chile (4); France (1); Japan (0); New Zealand (1); Norway (0); The Union of South Africa (1); the United Kingdom (8); the United States (5); and the Soviet Union (4). In addition the United States and New Zealand operate a joint station, and the United States maintains a ship that is classed as a station.

CHINESE-RUSSIAN CONVERGENCE IN ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on September 6 I made a speech in this Chamber relative to Sino-Soviet relations. There has been a good deal of talk, and there will be more during the course of the debate on the treaty, as to whether the ideological split between the Soviet Union and Peiping is a real split or a split of a false nature. Whether it is real, whether it is true or false, remains to be seen; although the evidence to date seems to indicate that there is a great deal of validity to the contention that there are differences, now being expressed in somewhat contemptuous and insulting terms by Mr. Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung.

On the sixth of this month I tried to concentrate on the territorial questions as they may be involved in respect to Sino-Soviet relations. During the course of that speech I referred to the 17th century—to indicate the first advance of the Russians under the Tsars across Siberia into territory held by the Manchus, then the rulers of China. I did so to point out that while there may be differences as to how deep is the gulf, in my opinion, the gulf is a historical fact based on solid precedent which could well be a source of future trouble between these two great Communist powers.

I also pointed out at the time that, according to the best estimates—and that is the best one can do with respect to a country like Communist China—the population of China is 700 million, and the increase in population is somewhere between 13 million and 15 million each year. So I think there is much validity to the presumption that there are territorial difficulties, which are now beginning to show on the surface, between the Soviet Union and Communist China. In my opinion, as the population of China grows and expands, this will come more to the fore.

There is a third factor which we should keep in mind in considering Sino-Soviet relations. That is the attempt on the part of the Chinese—and they "have made no bones about it"—to look upon themselves as the leaders of the Asian and African peoples against the West, and it is one of the tenets on which they expect to assume the role of leadership in the world which at the present time is denied to them.

But to get back to the territorial question, one of the few men in the Nation—and I am sorry there are only a few—who have firsthand experience of the situation in central Asia, is the distinguished correspondent Mr. Harrison Salisbury. In the September 10 issue of the New York Times, there is an article by Mr. Salisbury which deals with China's border claims in Asia. The article refers to an assertion by Peiping of territorial claims which go back to the lines of demarcation as they existed in 1840, not only in southeast and south Asia but also in central and northeast Asia. Much of this latter territory is, today either held directly by the Russians or stands, as in the case of Outer Mongolia, in a kind of dependent relationship to Russia.

The Salisbury article is of great relevance at this time of heightening Soviet-Chinese tension, and I studied it with particular interest in view of the remarks which I had made on this subject of the Chinese-Russian convergence in Asia in the Senate on September 6. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times be included at this point in the RECORD.

I am only sorry in this particular instance that it is not possible to include in the RECORD with that article the map contained in today's issue of the New York Times, which shows quite clearly what the article is about. Territorially speaking, he brings home to those doubters in this respect that there are great pressures for conflict between these two nations, Communist China and the Soviet Union, in the period ahead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA'S BORDER CLAIMS—PEIPING DRIVE TO RECOVER "LOST" AREAS FROM SOVIETS SEEN IN SINKIANG QUARREL

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The Chinese-Soviet conflict appears to be heading toward revival of traditional great-power Russian and Chinese territorial rivalries in the Asian heartland.

This was the interpretation advanced by diplomatic specialists upon the sharpening quarrel between Peiping and Moscow over events along their remote Sinkiang-Kazakhstan frontier. Chinese allegations of Soviet intrigue in this border area are seen as a new step in a long-range Chinese drive to regain the vast territories lost by the Chinese Empire in the 19th century to Russia and other nations.

The first move in the Chinese campaign was a declaration last March that China does not accept as binding nine so-called unequal treaties by which Chinese territory was ceded to various European nations and Japan.

Three of these treaties were imposed by czarist Russia. One of them specifically ceded to Russia at least 500,000 square miles of central Asia with a present-day population of more than 10 million.

APT CONDITIONS AWAITED

When "conditions are ripe," Peiping said, the treaties will be put up for recognition, abrogation, revision, or renegotiation.

Evidence that China's ambitions to regain virtually the full sweep of the ancient Chinese Empire's domains in Asia were not a mere retaliatory move in the current Moscow-Peiping propaganda war was seen in an examination of earlier Chinese documents.

Particular attention has been directed to a map appearing in a Chinese history handbook published in Peiping in 1954 at a time when Chinese-Soviet relations ostensibly were on an even keel.

This map shows China's frontiers as claimed in 1840 and in 1919 and is captioned "imperialist encroachments of Chinese territory—1840–1919." It specifies 19 individual losses of Chinese territory.

The No. 1 loss listed is that of Tashkent and the central Asian regions now under dispute. The date is given as 1864, the date of the conquest of these areas by the Russians.

The map presents China's frontier as a line reaching as far west as Lake Balkash. This places the Altai Mountains and part of the Pamirs on the Chinese side of the line. It would incorporate all of the eastern portions of Kazakhstan into China, apparently including Semipalatinsk in the virgin lands area. It also includes Alma Ata, capital of Kazakhstan.

In addition, the Chinese claim appears to cover almost all of Soviet Kirghizia, including Frunze, the capital, the easternmost portion of Uzbekistan, including Tashkent and most of Tadzhikistan, which lies along the Afghan and Pakistani frontiers.

Historically, these central Asian areas never were more than the loosest appendages of the Chinese Empire, having been ruled in the 18th and 19th century by small, feuding emirs and khans who were easily displaced by superior Russian military power.

Russian domination was established about 100 years ago and there has been no substantial change of frontiers since that time.

However, the eastern border between Russia and China, and particularly the Sinkiang area now in dispute, has been a sector of active Russian-Chinese rivalry for 50 or 60 years.

The same Russian forces that annexed central Asia in the 1860's advanced into Sinkiang. By the Treaty of Ili (called by the Russians the Treaty of St. Petersburg) of 1881, the Russians formalized their title to the Ili Valley, which now forms part of Kazakhstan. This treaty was never recognized by the Chinese Empire.

Russian influence, however, was not contained by that treaty. Russian forces, traders, and settlers moved freely across the open deserts of Sinkiang. By the eve of World War I the region was virtually a protectorate of the Czar.

Under the Soviet Union, special Russian influence in Sinkiang continued. The area is populated largely by non-Chinese peoples, many of them nomads. They are Uighurs and Kazakhs for the most part—Moslem peoples identical with much of the population of eastern Kazakhstan and Kirghizia. For centuries they have roved freely over the central Asian areas with little heed to borders or frontiers.

STALIN DEFENDED CLAIM

A Soviet-oriented regime held sway in Sinkiang at the outbreak of World War II. In 1943 it switched allegiance to Chungking, but a Russian-inspired rebellion switched the area back in 1944. As late as 1949, on the eve of the Communist takeover in Peiping, Stalin was still negotiating with the Chiang Kai-shek government for protection of Russia's "special interest" in Sinkiang.

The first treaties signed between Communist Moscow and Communist Peiping in effect recognized these "special interests" by setting up joint oil and mineral exploitation companies in Sinkiang in which the Russians had the majority vote. These were not dissolved until 1955.

The other areas designated in the 1954 map in which Russian-Chinese claims are involved are those designated 17, 18 and 19. No. 17 covers territories obtained by czarist Russia by the 1858 Treaty of Aigun, whereby the Amur River Basin was taken from the Chinese Empire.

Area 18 involves the so-called maritime provinces of eastern Siberia taken by Russia under the Treaty of Peiping of 1860. This region includes the port of Vladivostok and the Pacific littoral of Siberia.

Area 19 is Sakhalin Island, occupied by Russia in 1806. Half of it was lost to Japan in the war of 1905, but all of it was reoccupied by the Soviet Union in 1945.

Among the other areas designated by the 1954 map are (2, 4) the Indian border regions, (3) Nepal, (5) Bhutan, (6, 7, 14) Burma, (8) the Andaman Islands, (9) Malaya, (10) Thailand, (11) Indochina, (12) Taiwan, (13) the Sulu Archipelago, (15) the Ryukyus and (16) Korea.

The seriousness with which Communist China views its campaign for recovery of "lost" territories is emphasized by growing internal propaganda.

ANNIVERSARY OF COMMODORE PERRY'S VICTORY ON LAKE ERIE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, American history is rich in slogan of triumph—red letter days in the saga of our victories.

Today we mark such a day—such a victory—and a message that has echoed down all our years since that September afternoon, just 150 years ago, September 10, 1813.

It was the message of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry announcing the victory of Lake Erie, and his words were, "We have met the enemy and they are ours."

The great mural painting above the grand staircase outside the doors of this Senate Chamber is a lasting tribute to a great American triumph, and to a great American.

Oliver Hazard Perry was born at South Kingstown, R.I., on August 21, 1785, but he was baptized and reared in the town of Newport, across Narragansett Bay.

At 12 years of age he went to sea as a midshipman, and at 19 he was Lieutenant Perry in command of the *Nautilus* in Mediterranean waters. At the outbreak of the War of 1812 he was in command of the fleet in Narragansett Bay.

The Great Lakes with their 500 miles of boundary with Canada was a grave danger point for the American Northwest. The British fleet ruled the lakes and threatened to invade us. Our one ship would be no bar to them.

Our country ordered a fleet to be built at Erie and put Oliver Hazard Perry in charge of the building. The construction of that fleet was little less than a miracle. The shipbuilders, recruited from Philadelphia and New York, had to make their way through a trackless wilderness. Guns and ammunition were hauled hundreds of miles by sled and oxcart over almost impassable trails. Everything iron was melted to furnish hardware for the ships. Within 6 months of the time they stood as trees of the forest, the vessels were finished and floated.

No crews of seamanship were available—negro slaves, boys, and soldiers became sailors. Perry's fleet commanded only 54 guns; the British fleet had 63 guns of longer range and well-trained crews.

At 10 in the morning of September 10 Perry sighted the British fleet. It was the beginning of a day of frightful battle so well portrayed by the brush of the artist. The tide of victory seemed against the Americans. Perry's flagship, the *Lawrence*, was almost shot to pieces. But its motto for the day was "Don't give up the ship." Desperately, the American ships closed in and gave fearful battle at close range. At 4 that afternoon the proud British flagship lowered its flag in token of defeat. On the deck of the *Lawrence*, Perry received their surrender, but refused the surrender of their swords. His warm desire was to treat such worthy foe with all honor and courtesy. The British deeply appreciated this generous gesture, and so one may find even a richer meaning to the message of that day: "We have met the enemy and they are ours."

Mr. President, I know many visitors have gone through the corridors of the Capitol, particularly the wing of the Senate, and as they gazed at the painting at the top of the staircase about 25 or 30 feet from where I now stand, they may have wondered what it was about. It portrays the victory of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, a Rhode Islander, on Lake Erie.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to join the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in paying tribute to the great naval hero of the War of 1812. The battle about which the Senator from Rhode Island has spoken took place near Put-in-Bay, Ohio. There is a monument at Put-in-Bay in honor of this distinguished American.

I cannot help thinking at this time that, while we speak of the great achievements of Perry, we also should have in mind the great heroism shown by so many Americans in the War of 1812. There is in Ohio, Fort Stephenson, which was commanded by a Maj. George Croghan. His was an extraordinary achievement; and he displayed heroism to the fullest degree.

I am delighted to join the Senator from Rhode Island in his remarks about Perry. I wish also at this time to pay tribute to all the men of our Nation who fought nobly in that war to preserve our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I wrote to Mr. William M. Haynes, chairman of the Guests Committee in connection with the Fort Stephenson Sesquicentennial.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 15, 1963.

Mr. WM. M. HAYNES,
Chairman, Guests Committee,
Fort Stephenson Sesquicentennial,
Fremont, Ohio.

DEAR MR. HAYNES: I am very grateful for your letter of June 28 in which you invite me to attend the Fort Stephenson Sesquicentennial Celebration being held July 27 to August 3, 1963, inclusive.

I recognize that you are, in this year of 1963, paying tribute to the heroic spirit of the rank and file of the military and the nonmilitary citizens in fighting for the preservation of the freedom of our country. In your county of Sandusky, on the river of that name, stands the town of Fremont, formerly named Lower Sandusky. In that town lived a band of Wyandottes called the neutral nation. Their area was called the place of refuge. Sanctuary was always found by the tormented and oppressed in the historic lands of the United States in which your celebration is now being held.

Your county is the birthplace of the three times Governor of Ohio and later President of the United States, Rutherford B. Hayes. When the name of Lower Sandusky was sought to be changed to Fremont, your distinguished citizen, Mr. Rutherford B. Hayes, opposed the suggested change; in the name and in support of his position he offered the following argument in verse:

"There is a prayer now going round
Which I dislike to hear,
To change the name of this old town
I hold so very dear.

"They pray the court to alter it,
I pray to God they won't;
And let it stand Sandusky yet
And not John C. Fremont.

"Sandusky is a pleasant name;
'Tis short and easy spoken,
Descending to us by a chain
That never should be broken.

"Then let us hand it down the stream
Of time to after ages,
And Sandusky be the theme
Of future bards and sages.

"Won't the old honest sagums rise,
And say to us pale faces,
'Do you our ancient name despise,
And change our resting-places?

" 'Our fathers, slumbered here;
Their spirits cry, "Oh, don't
Alter the name to us so dear
And substitute Fremont!" '

"Therefore my prayer shall still remain,
Until my voice grows husky:
Oh, change the people, not the name
Of my old home, Sandusky!"

In this celebration of 1963, in the midst of speeches, music, and prayer, you will be reminded of the heroic deeds of Maj. George Croghan and his intrepid men. On July 20 of the year of 1813, the British General, Henry Proctor, and Tecumseh with their men appeared near Fort Meigs to besiege that military base. The alertness of the then Governor, William Henry Harrison, recognized that the real goal of the enemy was Fort Stephenson on the Sandusky River where your distinguished town of Fremont stands today.

It is a rather commonly accepted fact that the defense of Fort Stephenson deserves to be ranked among the great achievements of American soldiers. In that fort were scarcely 200 men commanded by Maj. George Croghan. He was only 21 years of age but came of the finest fighting stock to be found anywhere. The mere mention that he was a nephew of George Rogers Clark bespeaks excellently of his fearless and heroic background.

It was believed generally that Croghan could not hope to hold out through a siege imposed by the British and the Indians because of the smallness of the number of men within the garrison and because of the belief that Croghan and those men could not sustain a siege or an attack. He was directed to set fire to the stockade and retreat through the woods when the British and the Indians appeared. Patriots of our country are moved to greater courage when they read the answer given by Major Croghan:

"Order for retreat received too late to carry into execution. We have determined to carry this place, and, by heaven, we can."

Came August 1, 1813, Proctor, the English general, and Tecumseh, the Indian chief, reached the fort with 1,200 men, more than half of whom were Indians. Proctor arrogantly sent a message demanding surrender and warning that if the fort were not given up the Indians would massacre the garrison. But read and listen to the words of Croghan:

"When this fort surrenders, there will be nobody left to massacre."

Proctor and Tecumseh began their attack; their battering kept up all night but with little effect. Croghan had only one cannon and it was a small one, "Old Betsy." When the signs of battle were growing ominous, "Old Betsy" began to speak more vigorously. "Old Betsy," now renown and supported by heroic men, sent the Indians fleeing into the woods and the British to their boats. Fort Stephenson was safe and triumphant. Ohio in 1813, through Major Croghan and his 200 men, was made safe against the invasion from Canada.

If only the spirit and patriotism of 1963 were that of Major Croghan and his intrepid men in 1813, how much more respected and safe our Nation would be.

For the spirit of manliness, patriotism, courageous and not cowardly political action, our leaders in Washington ought to study and follow that of the men of Fort Stephenson in 1813. If that were done, our country would be in a much safer position, more respected—not only at home but throughout the world.

I want very much to be with you during your celebration of this important and heroic event in the history of our country; I will be present unless my duties in Washington make it impossible.

Whether I am present or not, I join with the citizens of your area and those of Ohio in paying tribute to the heroic men who at Fort Stephenson in 1813 participated victoriously in the battle which contributed conspicuously in the preservation of our country. It is a year in which the citizens of your area justifiably rejoice and sing praises to the heroes of the past.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. SCOTT. This week the Senate began debate on one of the most important issues to face the United States in recent history. The nuclear test ban treaty and all of its ramifications will and should be fully discussed and considered during the next 2 weeks.

As one who is most anxious to support the foreign policy of the United States, I am presently uncommitted but favorably inclined to support ratification of this treaty. Such leading Americans as General Eisenhower, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and many others have recommended ratification.

However, I share the reservation as expressed by General Eisenhower:

> That in the event of any armed aggression endangering the vital interests of the United States, this Nation would be the sole judge of the kind and type of weaponry and equipment it would employ as well as the timing of their use.

This reservation was addressed to that provision in article I of the treaty which reads:

> To prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or

any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control.

The Foreign Relations Committee, in its report, seems to be satisfied that "the treaty in no way impairs the authority of the Commander in Chief" in this respect.

Although I do not reject the position taken by this distinguished committee, I do feel that the views and reservations expressed by the immediate past President of the United States should not be dismissed as lightly as I feel that they have been in the report. I cannot wholeheartedly agree with the overly casual assumption that the situation envisioned by a man with General Eisenhower's military and diplomatic experience could not happen.

Should such a situation develop our security would be in jeopardy. I understand that we would not be limited in defending ourselves if an enemy overtly attacked the United States. But what would be the situation if the United States determined that it was in its interests to use tactical nuclear weapons in the defense of one of our allies, for instance? Would our agreement to stop "any other nuclear explosion" mean that we were abrogating this treaty?

This situation demands a clear interpretation. I hesitate to support a Senate reservation written into the treaty, because this might require renegotiation of the treaty itself. Any other action by the Senate, in the nature of a "sense of the Senate" resolution, or the establishment of the Senate's understanding of the treaty by making "legislative history" through debate and agreement on presently doubtful situations would greatly clarify the boundaries of the treaty. But these actions would not be binding on the signatories.

Therefore I urge the President to make a statement indicating his understanding of this provision of the treaty, since it is the Chief Executive himself who must make the interpretations of treaties when a question arises of the type under discussion here.

There are two other points which I believe must be raised at this time. We are being asked to ratify a treaty which gives formal assent to a moratorium on nuclear testing which already is in effect among the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. Therefore, while this treaty and its ratification might not have any real effect on the number of nuclear tests conducted in the future—because the signatory countries can continue the moratorium even without this treaty—the fact that the United States is signing a major agreement with the Soviet Union could affect at least two other situations around the world.

First, I hope the Senate would make it clear that in ratifying this treaty the United States has not lost sight of the fact that the Government of the Soviet Union has not changed in the slightest degree its intent to "bury" the United States and the free world. The basic philosophy of the Kremlin is materialistic, atheistic communism and it is pledged to stamp out free institutions throughout the world.

From time to time we have witnessed an apparent "thawing" in the cold war. But always the Soviet leadership returned to its imperialistic objectives and created new crises through the world.

There are still millions upon millions of once-free people enslaved by Soviet imperialism. At the very times that there have been apparent relaxations of tensions between East and West, repressive measures were increased by Communist puppet leaders in some of the captive nations.

Mr. President, we are signing an agreement with a nation whose leaders have a philosophy alien to ours, a philosophy repugnant to our concept of international morality.

We must be satisfied that we are signing this agreement in our own interest. Let us never forget that when the Soviet leaders signed, the mere affixing of a signature changed nothing in their attitude toward the United States or their determination to destroy freedom wherever they could lay oppressive hands upon it.

The second point that should be discussed is that, bluntly, we cannot trust the Soviet Union. Their word today is a broken promise of tomorrow. If this treaty should be ratified, the United States should be constantly on guard against any of its provisions being abrogated by the Soviet Government. Treaties are generally based on mutual respect and understanding. This treaty should be based on our hopes for the future, our knowledge of the past, our awareness that one of the signatories must be constantly under surveillance for planned violations. The security and the prestige of the United States could hardly be more urgently involved.

It is the desire of each of us to support the President of the United States, to support the foreign policy of the United States. It is my hope that I can. But I would not be fulfilling my responsibilities as a Senator unless I publicly voiced some of the reservations which have greatly concerned me in considering this treaty.

This could be a major step toward peace, which all of us earnestly desire. It should not be a faltering step in that direction. To make it a firm one, and one in which we have faith, we in the Senate need some further information. This must come from the Chief Executive who is charged with conducting our foreign policy.

PLOWING THE SEA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a very forceful column entitled "Plowing the Sea," written by our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, and published in a recent edition of the Washington Sunday Star.

In the article Dr. Harris points out the dangers that beset a people when they become indifferent to their responsibilities to government, to their fellow men, to themselves, and to their families.

Dr. Harris discusses the prophecies of Amos, who diagnosed the ills of an ailing social order, which was shot through with trickery, bribery, exploitation, and injustice.

He further pointed out that any attempt to build a stable nation when the individual citizens of the Nation are selfishly feathering their own nests through injustice and dishonesty, and with methods that degrade the dignity of the individual, is like trying to plow the ocean with oxen. It simply cannot be done.

Dr. Harris stated:

> What avails anything prominent men in State or National posts of public service may advocate regarding our society in general if, in their personal lives they strike selfish blows at the foundation of the home, the institution of marriage, the fountainhead of all in our common life which is high and holy. In the words of a well-known columnist, who sees the truth in the ancient words of Amos: "Such men reveal instabilities of behavior which scholars have found to be historically characteristic of advanced societies on their way down."

Dr. Harris' words are worthy of the gravest consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Plowing the Sea

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

As the end of the vacation season hoves in regretful sight, cars often bumper to bumper, are headed toward the sea. For jaded spirits and tired bodies what a resistless magnet is the ocean. How one long landlocked yearns for the sight of it, the smell of it, the elixir of it. There is magic in the sea as we hear its mighty waters rolling evermore.

But there are some things that simply cannot happen on the surface of the sea. One sees cars heading for the open water laden with boats, but never a car seaward bound with a plow or a tractor. The prophet of old, Amos, fearless social reformer, coined a haunting phrase to suggest the ultimate in futility. He was speaking to farmers as he said: "As you gaze at the numberless acres of the ocean, there is one thing that is not within the bounds of possibility. You cannot plow the sea with oxen."

Now the discoveries of science have made our modern world, in many ways, the sort of world that Alice was looking at in her wonderland. As the little lassie was pursuing a white rabbit it was said in that topsy-turvy book: "You see so many out-of-the-way things had happened to her that Alice had begun to think that very few things indeed were really impossible." But, even in our modern, scientific wonderland there is nothing our bewildered day needs to be told more sternly and solemnly than that we are living in a universe where certain propositions automatically are vetoed. As Gilbert Chesterton whimsically put it: "When you decide to draw a giraffe you must draw him with a long neck. If, in your bold, creative way, you hold yourself free to draw a giraffe with a short neck, you will simply find that you are not free to draw a giraffe."

In our passion to save our democratic way, one of the fallacies is that we are attempting to do some things that cannot be done. We glory in our democratic freedom. But, one of the fundamental tenets of freedom (if it is to be kept) is that there are some things one is not free to do without colliding with the universe. That was what Amos, the fearless preacher of long, long ago, was sensing as he lifted up a truth for his own day and for all days. The prophet had diagnosed the ills of an ailing social order shot through with trickery, bribery, exploitation and injustice.

It was a day so much like ours that we would not be surprised to find it dated 1963. The leaders back there were endeavoring to do some things that cannot be done. Listen to Amos as he said: "You cannot cultivate the boundless acres of heaving water with a plow." And, for today he would of course add, "with a tractor." He was declaring that any attempt to build a stable nation, when the individual citizens of the nation are selfishly feathering their own nests through injustice and dishonesty, and with methods that degrade the dignity of the individual, is like trying to plow the ocean with oxen—it just cannot be done. It is as doomed to disaster as it is certain that an ancient plow or a modern tractor would be buried in the depths of the sea.

Another impossibility matching the one that Amos states has come down the ages with the wisdom of the centuries in the adage, "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." The frequent trouble with our day is that there are too many social engineers endeavoring to bring in the kingdom of human betterment by dealing mostly in blueprints rather than in white lives. They stress changing maps rather than changing men. Socialism of various brands, often sincere enough in its attempt to lessen exploitation and to bring more of the good things of life to more people, is still dealing with unchecked selfishness which will wreck the best laid plans of mice or men.

Then, we must not forget that you cannot build a wholesome and stable commonwealth by degrading the home whose sanctity is the hope of the future. You can no more do that than you can use a plow on the sea. What avails anything prominent men in State or National posts of public service may advocate regarding our society in general if, in their personal lives they strike selfish blows at the foundation of the home, the institution of marriage, the fountainhead of all in our common life which is high and holy. In the words of a well-known columnist, who sees the truth in the ancient words of Amos, "Such men reveal instabilities of behavior which scholars have found to be historically characteristic of advanced societies on their way down."

Who can doubt that if amid noisy debates of our day we gave Amos the floor and bad him speak, he would say: Where are your new men to make your proposed new order work? Do men plow the sea with oxen? And that seer would gladly accept a modern verse as part of his prophecy for the 20th century:

"We cannot have Utopia now,
    It's a waste of time to plan it;
For if we had Utopia now
    Would we find the men to man it?
You cannot work the utopian plan
    Unless you have the utopian man."

Any more than you can plow the ocean with oxen.

THE PROBLEM OF CUBA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of our great difficulties as leaders of government is that we are so concerned with the problems of the immediate, we all too rarely look ahead into the future.

This applies particularly to Cuba. We see it as an immediate problem today and tomorrow. We are concerned with the presence of Soviet citizens there, be they volunteers or technician, be they 10,000 or 15,000. We are concerned with the absence of freedom, the harsh political conditions that exist on that unhappy island, the arrests and executions, and the general misery that rests there so close to our own Florida doorstep.

Because of our preoccupation with the present—and I submit that it is an excessive preoccupation because Cuba is an aggravation and not a mortal threat—we all too rarely think of the future.

In this regard, reading through the Congressional Record a couple of days ago, I came across a remarkably fine speech by our colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. While not agreeing with his every point, I found myself in complete accord with his fundamental thesis that we must look into the future; raise our eyes a little bit and make constructive and productive plans for the happy, and I believe inevitable, day that will come when Cuba has thrown off its Communist yoke.

I congratulate Senator Pearson on a very real service he has done by means of his speech which takes our minds into the future, an exercise we do all too rarely, for which I thank my colleague from Kansas.

SENATOR ANDERSON AND SENATOR SALTONSTALL HONORED BY AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that two of our colleagues, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], have been honored by the American Political Science Association.

These two Senators were given the association's biennial Distinguished Service Awards for their outstanding work in the 87th Congress, at the association's annual meeting in New York, last week.

I take a great deal of pride in calling attention to Senator Anderson's selection for this honor. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is a native of South Dakota. He was born and reared in surroundings which build the sort of tenacious and resolute character mentioned in his citation.

All Senators will, I am sure, applaud the selection made by the Political Science Association, for, whether we have always agreed with Senator Anderson or not, all of us recognize him as an energetic and effective advocate of conservation of the Nation's resources, of the Nation's science programs especially in the fields of nuclear physics and space, of medical care for the aged, of modernizing Senate rules, and of many other measures to preserve and enhance the values of our democratic system.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with Senator Anderson. I have seen the steady procession of bills—the wilderness bill, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation bill, the water resources research bill and others—which have been processed and reported under his authorship and guidance. As was noted on the floor at the time S. 2, the water resources research bill, was before the Senate, no Senator had an earlier or steadier flow of important legislation ready for final consideration than the man whom the American Political Science Association has given its much-deserved recognition.

At various times during my public career, I have found the friendly counsel of Clinton Anderson to be invaluable.

Although I have not been as close to the work of the able Senator from Massachusetts, who was awarded the association's recognition from the minority side, I know that his citation for effective, quiet service is richly deserved. His dignity, wisdom and kindness has been an inspiration to me as a new Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an account of the American Political Science Association's awards. The article is taken from the Washington Star of Friday, September 6.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Four Lawmakers Win Political Science Honor

Four Members of Congress have been honored by the American Political Science Association with Distinguished Service Awards.

The biennial honors were presented last night in New York to:

Senator Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Space Committee.

Senator Saltonstall, Republican, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Republican Conference and ranking member of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

Representative Mahon, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Representative Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee.

The awards are made possible by a grant from the William Benton Foundation, set up by former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut.

The purpose is "to honor legislators for distinguished congressional service and to dramatize the crucial role of a freely elected legislative body in maintaining the values and processes of our democratic society."

The citations read in part:

Senator Anderson: "Resolute and effective in advancing causes in which he believes deeply, he consistently looks beyond the immediate necessities of policy, considering foremost the prospects for future generations.

"He is an eloquent and persuasive leader in the struggle for conservation * * * of the Nation's resources. Intimately involved in the complex and increasingly important relationship between Government and science, he plays a leading role in the careful development of atomic energy and the advancement of knowledge about space. Without regard for his own health, he champions vigorously the cause of medical care for the Nation's aged."

Senator Saltonstall: "Extremely successful in finding common ground on which advocates of divergent viewpoints can stand, he is particularly effective in conference committee and executive committee sessions.

"A committee man rather than an orator, he disdains publicity in favor of quiet service. * * * A party leader, he nonetheless has achieved a reputation for placing the national interest above partisan considerations, serving as an influential symbol of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs."

Representative Mahon: "Under his guidance, $1 billion a week flows from the Capitol to the Pentagon. His zealous concern for the national defense is tempered by concern for the Nation's economy. His respect and friendship for the Military Establishment is tempered by a commitment to civilian control."

Representative CURTIS: "With selfless tenacity, with a love of hearty debate * * * he seeks to maintain the vitality of the Congress and of his party. * * * He speaks with a compelling voice in the development of his party's approach to the problem of full employment in a rapidly automating economy. A student of Congress, he is in the forefront * * * in working for alteration of rules and procedures to meet the needs of a changing society in a changing world."

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION IN 1963, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President Kennedy delivered, today, an extremely important address before the National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction. His remarks deal with the great importance of his tax legislation to every family and individual in the United States. Mr. President, much is at stake in the proposed tax cut. It will mean a great deal to the hard-pressed taxpayers as individuals. But, even more, it will be of exceptional significance to the Nation. It is, in the view of the administration, not only an essential insurance against still another recession but it is a positive economic stimulant which will take up slack in the economy and hence provide more jobs and better income for the people in an expanding economy.

It is true, Mr. President, that this Congress is confronted with a great deal of highly significant legislation. We are trying to move it, and I am hopeful that we will continue to move it as it reaches the floor of the Senate from Committee. But the President has emphasized the great importance which attaches to the tax bill. He has called it:

> The most important domestic economic legislation to come before the Congress in the past 15 years.

In light of the President's evaluation, regardless of what each of us may personally think about the measure, it would be my hope that all of us would see the propriety and desirability of the Congress acting on this measure—one way or another—without delay and during this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by the President be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION IN 1963, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction, participants in the National Conference on Tax Reduction, ladies and gentlemen. I admire your concern for our Nation's business as well as your own. The bill you are here to support is the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in the past 15 years. Its passage is essential to the health and growth of our economy during the next 15 years. Its benefits are not limited to any one segment of society. If it is defeated, diluted or unduly delayed, the adverse consequences would be felt by every family and business in the country. It is not a partisan measure—and this is not a partisan gathering. It is a bill which, if it is to be fully effective, must be passed this year, without restrictive amendments; and I believe, with your help, that it will.

There is no need before this audience to describe in detail the tax reduction features you already know so well. The essential figures to bear in mind are these:

The bill provides for a total net tax reduction of $11 billion a year, of which $8.7 billion would go to individuals and $2.3 billion to corporations. This is in addition to the $2¼ billion reduction in corporate tax liabilities brought about last year through depreciation reform and the investment tax credit. These proposed reductions would be effective in two stages. Two-thirds of the individual reduction (or $5.6 billion) and more than one-half of the corporate reduction (or $1.4 billion) or a total of $7 billion, would go into effect on January 1, 1964, less than 4 months from today. The balance would be effective a year later.

There is also no need to convince this group of the importance of this bill as a boost to the economy. Your presence here, the leadership provided by the Business Committee for Tax Reduction and the Statement of Principles adopted by its members, bear witness to your conviction that our present high tax rates hobble the economy, and that a prompt, substantial and broadly based cut in individual and corporate tax rates is necessary to give the private sector of our economy the extra strength our present tax structure now drains away.

Even after 2½ years of steady advance, manufacturing in this country today is still operating at only 87 percent of capacity—business fixed investment is still below 10 percent of our total output—and unemployment, for the 70th straight month, is still above 5 percent. You know as well as I what that has done to your market for goods and services. You know as well as I that this Nation must create new jobs—jobs for workers replaced by automation, jobs for those displaced from the farm, jobs for young people leaving school, jobs to ease the problems of race relations and youth delinquency and labor unrest. And this bill reflects a conscious decision to give a major responsibility and opportunity to American business to meet those needs through private means.

This bill is only a part—but an essential part—of an overall economic program. We are simultaneously taking steps designed ultimately to balance our international payments, to balance our budget and, above all, to balance our economy at levels of full employment and production.

Tax reduction is essential to the achievement of all of these goals. By increasing our productivity and competitive ability, and by increasing the attractiveness of investing at home instead of abroad, it will help us improve our balance of payments. By expanding consumption and investment, it will help us create more jobs. By removing a restrictive brake on national growth and income, it will work against the recurrent forces of recession. And by reducing the costly drain of unemployment and recession while expanding our national income and tax revenues, it will—combined with an ever stricter control of expenditures—reduce and eventually end the pattern of chronic budgetary deficits.

Despite all of these advantages—despite the fact that our economy today is advancing partly in anticipation of a substantial tax cut—there are those who, for reasons of their own, oppose this bill; and their opposition warrants our attention. If they are unable to defeat the bill openly, or to find enough Members of Congress willing to oppose it directly, their strategy apparently will be twofold:

First, to delay the bill's passage until some time next year; and, second, to amend it in such a way as to prevent it from becoming fully effective in the absence of some other fiscal event, such as a reduction in next June's estimated net debt.

Either one of these moves would seriously undermine the gains already made as well as those we hope to make. Either one of these moves would dilute, if not imperil, the benefits this bill offers the Nation.

The disadvantages of delay are apparent. I have said since last December that this was the year for tax reduction. Inflationary pressures are in check. No major military crisis strains our resources. Our most pressing economic problems are underinvestment, unemployment and our balance-of-payments deficit. The sooner this bill is enacted, the sooner it will begin stimulating investment, enlarging employment and improving our payments balance.

This bill, moreover, is insurance—recession insurance—and the prudent man does not tempt fate by unnecessarily delaying his acquisition of insurance. Excluding war years, this Nation has had a recession on the average every 42 months since the Second World War—or every 44 months since the First World War. By January, it will have been 44 months since the last recession began. I do not say that a recession next year is either inevitable without a tax cut or impossible with one. But I do know that the prompt enactment of this bill, making certain both immediate and prospective tax reductions, will improve business conditions, increase consumer and investment incentives and make the most of the antirecession thrust that this tax cut can provide.

To wait until next year—even though the effective date of January 1 could be retained on a retroactive basis—would be to court uncertainty, inadequacy, and perhaps total failure. For at the beginning of each year, even in a second session, the mills of the Congress grind slowly. Next year there may be new pressures to hold off until some new crisis has passed, or some new economic trend is made clear, or some other political event is behind us. For those opposed to this bill, the time will never be right. "Delay," said the ancient Romans, "is always fatal to those who are prepared"—and this Nation is prepared now for a substantial cut in taxes. The time to enact this bill is now—for the opportunity may not come again.

The second strategy of those opposed to this bill is to make it dependent by law on other fiscal developments—for example, in the form offered in committee, to deny to both individual and corporate taxpayers the $4 billion worth of second-stage tax cuts unless the net public debt on next June 30 is $304 billion or less. To some, this may sound harmless, inasmuch as this figure is only slightly less than that resulting from Treasury Secretary Dillon's own rough estimate of the current budget deficit. But this amendment was rejected in the House Ways and Means Committee, and should be rejected if offered again on the House floor, for four fundamental reasons:

(1) The tax bill is needed on its own merits and should not be conditioned by any other event;

(2) Should lagging Federal revenues next summer make fulfillment of this condition impossible, that would be a clear sign to proceed with, not prevent, the second stage of tax reduction;

(3) Revenue, deficit and debt estimates for the end of this fiscal year are necessarily

uncertain at this time, depending as they do upon dozens of unpredictable contingencies to which this bill should not be tied; and

(4) This amendment would be self-defeating; for taxpayers, uncertain of receiving the full benefits of the bill, would hold back on their investment and expansion outlays, thus retarding revenues and enlarging the debt. If tax reduction is essential to the progress of our economy—and I think it is—then it is essential whether Secretary Dillon's estimate turns out to be accurate or not. The need for more private demand—for more funds in the hands of consumers and investors—will exist in 1964 and 1965 regardless of whether the net public debt on next June 30 is $304 billion or $306 billion or $302 billion. History teaches us that the public debt unexpectedly rises when public revenues fall unexpectedly short—and they have been consistently falling short precisely because our tax rates, which were originally designed to meet wartime and postwar conditions, are now imposing a restrictive brake on national growth and income. Thus, this amendment could deny the Nation a tax cut at the very time it needs it most—when revenues are falling short of expectations because of a slowdown in business activity.

Secretary Dillon's rough estimate, moreover, is exactly that—a very rough estimate—made at a time when the Congress has not completed action on legislation and appropriations for the current year. To require, as this amendment requires, that 11 months later his estimate must prove wholly correct is wholly unrealistic. Actually, the Secretary forecast a deficit for this fiscal year of $9.2 billion—which would, on the basis of the existing public debt, mean a net debt on next June 30 of $304.2 billion. This is an estimate both of what the Congress will do and of what the economy will do. If it were exactly correct, the Nation would lose a $4-billion economic boost because of a $200 million difference.

Yet $200 million is not even one-tenth of 1 percent of our national debt—it is not even one-half of the amount we are likely to collect on June 30 alone—and, while I always expect great things of Mr. Dillon, I do not expect the impossible. In the last 11 years, revenue estimates made at this time of year have only three times—in fiscal years 1960, 1962 and 1963—come within a billion dollars of the final actual figure. To allow the fate of a vitally needed tax reduction to be decided by the accuracy or inaccuracy of a necessarily inexact prediction comes very close to resting the national welfare on a game of chance.

Under such circumstances, how can any businessman or investor plan for the future? How can he make even a reasonable guess as to how close this estimate will be, how much Federal revenue will be earned, how much the Congress will spend, whether the weather will bring a bigger farm surplus, whether buyers will be found for Federal mortgages and other assets at reasonable prices, or whether some technological breakthrough or raw material price increase or international crisis will suddenly augment our outlays for national defense? The cost of last fall's Cuban crisis alone, for example, was nearly $200 million.

A businessman attempting to formulate his spending plans in advance will regard that kind of second-stage tax cut promise as no promise at all. It will become a highly speculative matter—and concrete plans cannot be based on speculation. Being less certain of his market and profit, therefore, he will not undertake as much expansion now—and this will not only shortchange the national economy but increase the national debt. As former Treasury Secretaries Humphrey and Anderson pointed out during the last administration, the debt limit does not and cannot control expenditures—for they depend on the appropriations voted by the Congress and not on any arbitrary ceiling.

This is not, let me make clear, an argument over the desirability of expenditure control. This administration has pledged a tighter rein over expenditures, and we are fulfilling that pledge. Last January I submitted a budget for fiscal 1964 which—except for unavoidable defense, space, and interest charges on the national debt—was lower in expenditures than the prior year, despite a steady growth in the Nation's economy and population. Such a reduction had been attempted only three other times in the 12 preceding years—and, to help achieve it, we pared $6 billion from civilian agency budget requests. I have since recommended still further cuts to the Congress, and we now expect to conclude the fiscal year with a total well below that submitted last January.

This administration is not opposed to expenditure control. On the contrary, we take pride in the fact that our budget expenditures for civilian agencies in the fiscal year just ended were $1.7 billion below the January estimates. We take pride in the fact that our debt, in terms of both dollars and percentage, rose last year at a considerably slower pace than the indebtedness of our Nation's consumers, private business and State and local governments. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the ratio of our Federal civilian expenditures to national output and to the expenditures of State and local government. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the postal deficit—we have reduced the cost of surplus food grain storage—we have reduced waste, duplication and obsolescence in the Pentagon—and we have achieved noteworthy economies in every Government agency. And, finally, we take pride in the fact that—in each of the three budgets I have submitted—expenditures other than those required for defense, space and interest increased less than they did in the last three budgets of my predecessors.

In addition to our efforts to restrict expenditures to those most urgently needed, we have pursued an intensive campaign to identify those existing Federal programs which could be effectively carried out by the private economy—for example, substituting private for public credit wherever feasible. In the last fiscal year over $1 billion of financial assets in Federal portfolios were transferred to private holders. We have also sought to initiate or increase "user charges" to cover a more equitable share of the costs of services provided by the Federal Government—to introduce modern equipment and management techniques for improving the productivity of all departments—and to control Federal civilian employment as well as expenditures.

Last year, if Federal civilian employment had increased at the same rate as population growth, it would have increased by 42,000 employees. It actually increased by only 5,600 persons—one-eighth the rate of population growth—so that we ended the year with far fewer Federal employees per 1,000 population than we began. To illustrate the significance of this accomplishment, let me point out that, during the same period, State and local government employment grew by about 300,000 persons.

Moreover, this administration's pledges on expenditure and debt control, unlike the amendment under discussion, have not been limited merely to the past and present fiscal years. In a recent letter to Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, I repeated my pledge to achieve a balanced Federal budget in a balanced full-employment economy—to exercise an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need—and, consistent with these policies, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, to apply a substantial part of the increased tax revenues toward a reduction in our budgetary deficits.

Assuming enactment of the pending tax bill, I expect—in the absence of any unforeseen slowdown in the economy or any serious international contingency—to be able to submit next January a budget for fiscal 1965 envisioning an estimated deficit below that most recently forecast for fiscal 1964. And any increase in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product—so that the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced.

This is true expenditure control. It cannot be done automatically by erecting some arbitrary, artificial figure and declaring that a much-needed tax cut will not go ahead if the debt exceeds that figure. The imposition of such a device can only reduce the effectiveness of the tax bill and invite the higher levels of unemployment which require still greater expenditures and debt.

No one, in short, is calling for a retreat from fiscal responsibility—unless it is the opponents of this bill. For without a quick and assured tax cut, this country can look forward to more unemployment, to more lags in income, to more and large budget deficits, and to more waste and weakness in the economy—and that course is the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

The Federal budget has been in deficit during 7 of the last 10 years, regardless of which party controlled the executive and legislative branches, regardless of where Congress set the debt ceiling, and regardless of what controls were placed on expenditures. Without a tax cut, there is at present no ascertainable prospect for reaching a balance. But with a tax cut, despite a temporary transitional increase in the deficit, this Nation can move within a very few years to an even higher trend of economic activity capable of sustaining both full employment and a balanced budget.

For all these reasons, the efforts of this organization and conference on behalf of the pending bill are vital to our Nation's future. I do not assume that every businessman here agrees with every provision of that bill. But after 7 months of intensive committee study, a fundamentally sound and strong program has been produced. It must be voted up or down on the floor of the House this month. Every month it is delayed costs this Nation dearly in lost output, jobs, profits and the increased danger of a downturn.

I do not promise that passage of this bill will achieve full employment on the following day or even in the following year. But I do know that we will never get there if we do not start moving—and the time to start is today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON H.R. 12, ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous consent request, with respect to H.R. 12, a bill to increase opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, which has been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and on which minority views will be ready tonight, that on Thursday, next, beginning at 12 o'clock noon, the bill be laid before the Senate and made the pending business, and that during the consideration of that measure there be allocated 1 hour of debate on each amendment, with one-half hour controlled by each side, and 1 hour of debate on the bill.

This proposal is being made with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the ranking minority member of the committee, and, I understand, with his colleagues on that side of the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—in accordance with the statement which I made a few moments ago, I shall offer an amendment to that bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. This is the first opportunity which will be offered to take such action. The limitation of time suggested is adequate to deal with the problem, and I therefore have no objection to the limitation. However, I would object to any provision of the unanimous-consent request relating to germaneness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish the Senator would reconsider his position. I assure the Senator that it is my intention to see to it this month that an amendment to that effect is offered to a bill. However, in view of the importance of the school measure, I believe it would be advisable for the Senator to consider postponing his action until later in the month.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very glad to do so if the distinguished majority leader is able at this time to tell me something more about his plans for action to extend the life of the Commission. If he is able to do so, I shall be happy to hear his statement. Perhaps he will wish to renew his request in a few moments. I shall be glad to have him tell me about it off the record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. It has been my intention to offer an amendment to an appropriate bill which would be forthcoming, at which time the matter in which the Senator from New York is so very much interested will at least be brought to the floor for consideration and debate until completion of action.

Mr. KEATING. At that time, I would assume, the distinguished majority leader would not have in mind any motion, at least not emanating from the leadership, to table such an effort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. KEATING. And that action will be taken prior to the end of this month?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my intention. To the best of my ability, it will be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will yield, I know that the Civil Rights Commission expires at the end of September. Therefore, action is imperative if the Commission is to be kept alive. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from New York, and I fully concur in the sentiments expressed by the majority leader. I would be as helpful as possible in order to consummate the action, so that the life of the Commission will be continued.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate this assurance; and on the basis of that assurance of the majority leader and the minority leader, I shall not offer the amendment to the bill which will be before the Senate on Thursday, and will not object to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, September 12, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, and during its consideration debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive M (88th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further debate, I ask that the treaty be considered as having passed through the several parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

If I may explain, this means that this will preclude offering of amendments, but will make it possible to offer reservations, which cannot be offered at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Merely to clarify the situation, a reservation that is offered is not a reservation to the treaty itself, but is a reservation to the resolution. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the resolution of ratification. It is necessary to go through this procedure before a reservation can be offered or considered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If a reservation is offered and is adopted, that reservation applies to the resolution, not to the treaty itself. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It applies to the resolution of ratification. If it were adopted, it would be voted on, when the final vote came, with the reservation included.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But the reservation would be included in the resolution, and not in the treaty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true; but it would be a part of the treaty. This is the way it has long been done. The Senate is following the regular procedure as delineated by the Parliamentarian. Up to now it would not be in order to offer a reservation. If this procedure is adopted, it will be in order to propose reservations to the resolution of ratification. Amendments could be offered up to the adoption of this procedure now. If it is adopted, they would not be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not intend to propose any reservations or amendments; but it seems to me that in connection with so vitally important a subject as this, it might be well if the distinguished Senator from Montana would give notice that tomorrow he will propose the unanimous-consent request, in order that the rights of all Senators may be protected. I have no actual knowledge, but I have heard over the radio that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut said he desired to propose understandings; and other Senators—I believe the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is one—have suggested that they intend to offer either reservations or amendments.

So that all Senators might be put on notice, it seems to me that it would be well to have the Senator from Montana state exactly the effect of the unanimous-consent request he will suggest, and thus put the Senate on notice that he will propose it tomorrow at the conclusion of the morning hour. I have no objection to his proposal, but I believe it would be fairer to offer it tomorrow, in view of the rather sparse attendance of Senators at the present time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is perfectly agreeable to the leadership. I wish to inform the distinguished Senator from Georgia that a quorum call was instituted for the purpose of calling Senators to the Chamber. Since they did not appear in large numbers, the leadership thought it well to proceed. I am delighted that the Senator from Georgia is present. His observation is a good one, and his suggestion will be followed.

On behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, notice is given that tomorrow this proposal will be brought before the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator from Montana that I shall not interpose objection tomorrow. However, it seemed that a proposal of this kind might well be placed before the Senate by means of actual as well as constructive notice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. That will be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would it be possible to place in the RECORD, if it has not already been done, a short memorandum explaining the differences between amendments, reservations, and understandings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I heartily subscribe to that suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have been a Member of the Senate for some time, but I am not completely clear as to the differences between such proposals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These are procedures which perhaps are not completely clear in the memorandum, but it is the best we could do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that the memorandum be amplified a little, because the treaty is considered in Committee of the Whole. It is the only time under the Senate rules that that is done. Perhaps the rule itself ought to be quoted, and then it should be stated that when the proposed unanimous consent request has been adopted, amendments will thereafter be precluded, and the treaty will then be subject to a reservation to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is an excellent suggestion. Senators will then know the path they are treading.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the Committee on Foreign Relations issued such a memorandum. Unfortunately, I did not receive a copy. Perhaps it was lost in the mail, because I feel certain one was sent to me. I wondered whether the distinguished chairman of the committee would not place it in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to do so.

(Subsequently Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted the following memorandum, which, without objection, was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD.)

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS STAFF MEMORANDUM ON THE ROLE OF THE SENATE IN THE TREATY-MAKING PROCESS

Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

In performing this function, the Senate has several options. Normally, the procedure for unconditional approval of a treaty is by adoption of a resolution of advice and consent to ratification which, in the case of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, would read as follows:

"*Be it resolved* (*two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein*), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, which was signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The Senate may, however, reject a treaty in toto, or stipulate conditions in the form of amendments, reservations, understandings, declarations, statements, interpretations, or statements in committee reports. For example, the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency was approved subject to an "interpretation and understanding." In that case, so that no uncertainty would exist as to whether the United States might be obligated by some future amendment that the Senate saw fit to reject, the resolution of ratification was approved "subject to the interpretation and understanding, which is hereby made a part and condition of the resolution of ratification, that (1) any amendment to the statute shall be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, as in the case of the statute iself, and (2) the United States will not remain a member of the Agency in the event of an amendment to the statute being adopted to which the Senate by a formal vote shall refuse its advice and consent."

This "interpretation and understanding" in no way affected the international obligation of the United States. It was, however, made a part of the operating instrument of ratification and Presidential proclamation and circulated to the other parties to the treaty with the following statement: "The Government of the United States of America considers that the above statement and understanding pertains solely to U.S. constitutional procedures and is of purely domestic character."

The Senate also approved the NATO Status-of-Forces Agreement subject to an "understanding." Article III of that agreement provided that under certain conditions members of a military force were to be exempt from passport and visa regulations, from immigration inspection, and from regulations on the registration and control of aliens. The effect of article III on U.S. immigration laws was not entirely clear, and in order to remove all doubt about the matter and to make sure that the United States could take appropriate measures to protect its security, the following language was made part of the resolution of ratification:

"It is the understanding of the Senate, which understanding inheres in its advice and consent to the ratification of the agreement, that nothing in the agreement diminishes, abridges, or alters the right of the United States of America to safeguard its own security by excluding or removing persons whose presence in the United States is deemed prejudicial to its safety or security and that no person whose presence in the United States is deemed prejudicial to its safety or security shall be permitted to enter or remain in the United States."

This "understanding" was also included in the instrument of ratification and the Presidential proclamation which was circulated to the other parties to the agreement. Here again, however, it had no effect on the international obligation of the United States.

Another, and perhaps better known case involves the so-called Connally reservation to the compulsory jurisdiction clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. In that instance the Senate gave its advice and consent to the deposit by the President of a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute—the so-called optional clause. By accepting the optional clause, the United States agreed that in certain types of legal disputes it would recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. However, in accepting that jurisdiction, the Senate stated that it did not apply to matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States. For technical reasons the Connally reservation is not viewed by all international lawyers as a true reservation; in fact, it was communicated to other parties and the obligation of other parties with respect to the United States is no greater than that assumed by the United States.

As a practical matter, if the Senate attaches a reservation to its resolution of advice and consent, the inference is that the contractual relationship is being changed. However, if the Senate uses language of understanding, the implication (but not necessarily the fact) is that the contractual arrangement is not being changed.

Irrespective of what term is used to describe a condition imposed on a treaty, however, the view of the U.S. Government is that the content or effect of the statement is of prime importance. If, despite the designation, the executive branch believes that the condition has the actual character and effect of a reservation, it would be so treated and thus would open the treaty to further negotiations. In this connection, the following extracts from a Department of State memorandum on the subject of "Depositary Practice in Relation to Reservations" which was submitted to the United Nations last year are relevant:

"It is understood by the U.S. Government that the term 'reservation' means, according to general international usage, a formal declaration by a state, when signing, ratifying, or adhering to a treaty, which modifies or limits the substantive effect of one or more of the treaty provisions as between the reserving state and each of the other states parties to the treaty. A true reservation is a statement asserting specific conditions of a character which (if the reserving state becomes a party to the treaty) effectively qualify or modify the application of the treaty in the relations between the reserving state and other states parties to the treaty. If the statement does not effectually change in some way, either by expanding or diminishing the treaty provisions, the application of the treaty between the reserving state and other states parties thereto, then it is questionable whether it is a true reservation even though it may be designated a 'reservation.' The terms 'understanding,' 'declaration,' or 'statement' may be used to designate a statement which may or may not be a true reservation. More properly, 'understanding' is used to designate a statement when it is not intended to modify or limit any of the provisions of the treaty in its international operation, but is intended merely to clarify or explain or to deal with some matter incidental to the operation of the treaty in a manner other than a substantive reservation. Sometimes an understanding is no more than a statement of policies or principles or perhaps an indication of internal procedures for carrying out provisions of the treaty. The terms 'declaration' and 'statement' when used as the descriptive terms are used most often when it is considered essential or desirable to give notice of certain matters of policy or principle, but without any intention of derogating in any way from the substantive rights or obligations as stipulated in the treaty. As a general rule, it is considered necessary in the case of any instrument of ratification, adherence, or acceptance embodying any of the above-mentioned types of statement, that the other state or states concerned be notified thereof and be given an opportunity to comment. If the statement is designated a 'reservation' but is not a true reservation, the notification to the other state or states may be accompanied by an explanatory statement designed to emphasize the fact that no actual modification or limitation of the treaty provisions is intended.

* * * * *

"The U.S. Government as depositary does not, as a rule, consider it appropriate for reservations to be set forth merely in a letter or note accompanying an instrument of ratification, acceptance, adherence, or accession. If the instrument is to be qualified by a reservation, it is considered that the reservation should be embodied in the instrument itself. A declaration, understanding, or other statement not constituting an actual reservation may, of course, be set forth in an accompanying letter or note, the text thereof then being notified to interested states at the same time they are notified regarding the deposit of the formal instrument."

One of the most authoritative statements on reservations appears in Charles Cheney Hyde's book, "International Law." Hyde states (vol. II, p. 1435): "A reservation to a treaty is a formal statement made by a prospective party for the purpose of creating a different relationship between that party and the other parties or prospective parties than would result should the reserving state accept the arrangement without having made such a statement. A mere interpretative declaration made by a prospective party without such a design, and with a view merely to accentuate a common understanding, is not regarded as a reservation, unless another party or prospective party deems it to be productive of a different relationship between the state issuing the declaration and the other parties or prospective parties than would result were the declaration not made. In a word, whether an interpretative statement is to be regarded as a reservation and dealt with as such depends in practice upon the place which the states to which it is addressed are disposed to assign to it."

AMENDMENTS

A distinction should be made between an amendment and a reservation. The difference between the two is that an amendment, if it is accepted by the President and the other party or parties to the treaty, changes it for all parties, whereas a reservation limits only the obligation of the United States under the treaty, although a reservation may, in fact, be of such significance as to lead other parties to file similar reservations, to seek renegotiation of the treaty, or, indeed, to refuse to proceed with ratification.

To put it another way, the distinctions between the two "are not in the essential objects sought, but in the form taken by the qualified assent and in the notice or action called for from the other party to the agreement. As the contrast is ordinarily drawn, an amendment to a treaty is a textual change in the instrument itself by way of an addition, alteration, or excision; it makes a part of the identical contract to which the two governments are to give their assent in the exchange of ratifications. A reservation, on the other hand, is an interpretation or construction placed upon some portion of the instrument by the Senate, to indicate the understanding with which the United States enters into the agreement as to the obligations which this country is to assume." (Haynes, "The Senate of the United States," vol. II, pp. 617–18.)

SUMMARY

In summary, therefore, and in order of importance so far as the effect on other parties is concerned, the Senate might take the following steps to make its views known or to qualify its consent to ratification of a treaty:

1. The Senate may advise and consent to ratification, but make its views known in the committee report. This would have no more legal effect on the treaty than other negotiating background or than legislative history has on public laws.

2. The Senate may include in its resolution language expressing its understanding or interpretation. So long as this language does not substantively affect the terms or international obligations of the treaty, or relates solely to domestic matters, there would be no legal effect on the treaty. Under existing practice, however, the Executive would communicate such understandings or interpretations to the other parties for such reaction as they may take.

3. The Senate may include in its resolution language expressing its reservation. Normally reservation language would involve some change in the international obligations of the treaty and might affect its terms in such a significant manner as to require the Executive to communicate the terms of the reservation to other parties to the treaty, thus enabling them to take such action as they felt appropriate, including reservations of their own or even refusal to proceed with the treaty.

4. Finally, the Senate may amend the terms of the treaty itself. In this instance, there would be no question but that the treaty would need to be renegotiated.

Committee procedure

The Committee on Foreign Relations transacts business by a majority vote of a legal quorum (currently nine members). Once a legal quorum is established, it is presumed to be present, and thereafter oral or written proxies are valid for the purposes of voting. This procedure applies with respect to any treaty reservations or amendments considered by the committee. However, on the final question as to whether the committee shall agree to report favorably a particular resolution of ratification, an actual physical quorum of nine members must be present.

Senate procedure

The act of ratification for the United States is a Presidential act, but it may not be forthcoming unless the Senate has consented to it by the required two-thirds of the Senators present (which signifies two-thirds of a quorum), otherwise the consent rendered would not be that of the Senate as organized under the Constitution to do business (art. I, sec. 5, clause 1).

Insofar as Senate procedure is concerned, rule XXXVII states that when a treaty is reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations it shall, unless the Senate unanimously otherwise directs, lie 1 day for consideration. Amendments or reservations are subject to approval by a majority vote.

An amendment or reservation may be modified before any action is taken on it. They are not, however, subject to modification after adoption by the Senate. Moreover, an amendment or reservation which is substantially the same as one previously offered and rejected is not in order.

The decisions made must be reduced to the form of a resolution of ratification, with or without amendments or reservations, as the case may be, which must be proposed on a subsequent day, unless by unanimous consent the Senate determines otherwise. After the resolution of ratification is offered, amendments to the text of the treaty or the resolution of ratification are not in order.

On the final question to advise and consent to the ratification in the form agreed to, the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting shall be necessary to determine it in the affirmative; but all other motions and questions upon a treaty shall be decided by a majority vote, except a motion to postpone indefinitely, which shall be decided by a vote of two-thirds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the following statement has been prepared by the Parliamentarian for guidance of the Senate during consideration of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

(Procedure under the rule)

The treaty is in the Committee of the Whole and shall be proceeded with by articles. This provision, however, may be waived by unanimous consent, and thus permit an amendment to be offered to any part of the treaty.

A majority vote is required for adoption of an amendment.

A motion to table an amendment would be in order.

Where there is no further debate or action to be taken in the Committee of the Whole, the proceedings are reported by the Presiding Officer to the Senate. If any amendment has been made, the Senate votes on concurrence therein. Further amendments are then in order.

Reservations are not in order while the treaty is being considered in the Committee of the Whole or in the Senate. They should be offered to the resolution of ratification.

When there is no further debate or amendment to be proposed, the next step would be the proposal of the resolution of ratification. It cannot, however, be proposed on that day except by unanimous consent. If any amendment has been made to the text of the treaty, it must be incorporated in the resolution of ratification.

After the resolution of ratification has been proposed, no amendment is in order except by unanimous consent. Reservations, however, are in order at that stage, and not before.

The vote on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification or on a motion to postpone indefinitely requires a two-thirds vote for adoption. All other motions and questions upon a treaty shall be decided by a majority vote.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1007.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. WALTERS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, which were, on page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "seven days" and insert "sixty days,"; on page 4, line 17, strike out "seven days" and insert "sixty days"; on page 6, line 2, strike out "forty-eight months" and insert "sixty months,"; on page 7, line 25, strike out "section 8" and insert "section 9"; on page 8, line 10, strike out "section 8" and insert "section 9"; on page 8, after line 19, insert:

SEC. 8. No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this Act except those lines and facilities hereafte specifically authorized by the Congress.

And on page 8, line 20, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive M (88th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY: THE NEED FOR POLITICAL PRIMACY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I support the treaty before the Senate banning nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, signed in Moscow on August 5, 1963, by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his scholarly, comprehensive presentation of yesterday in support of the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. I consider the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to be most conclusive, definitive, and comprehensive on foreign policy as it relates to the nuclear age and our relationships with the Soviet Union that I have heard or read to date. I particularly commend the Senator from Arkansas on the latter portions of his magnificent address, in which he discussed some of the broad diplomatic and political factors involved in the discussion of the treaty and its ratification or rejection. We need a more mature and thorough understanding of all facets of our foreign policy and the interdependence and interrelationship of the many factors that go to make up foreign policy. The Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has made a powerful and distinct contribution to a better understanding.

I support the treaty because, to my mind, it inhibits the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It reduces the chance of war. It minimizes the spread of radioactive fallout. It weakens the unity of the Communist bloc. It enhances the prospects for an era of peaceful coexistence.

The treaty strengthens our posture as a proponent of peace without weakening our security.

It is my view that the treaty is in our national interest, serves the objectives of our foreign policy, and contributes to the security and peace of the world in which we live. It advances us one step along a new course which, as Secretary Rusk has well said, might make it possible that "frail and fearful mankind may find another step, and another, until confidence replaces terror, and hope takes over from despair."

Throughout the preliminary discussions on the Senate floor and in the extensive hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have on several occasions identified myself as a strong advocate of the treaty. I have said that the world does not lack for doubters, but that there appears to be a definite shortage of advocates. While one unquestionably runs certain political risks in publicly assuming this posture, nevertheless I proudly stand here today and once again proclaim: "This treaty is clearly in the interest of the United States. Let us cast an overwhelming vote in support of its ratification."

Why this position of advocacy on a matter which all reasonable men agree carries a certain degree of military and political risk for the United States? Is not this either personal irresponsibility or political foolishness, or perhaps a combination of the two? Does this not reflect, as much of my mail has suggested, mere emotionalism, a blind grasping for a panacea to eliminate the tension and insecurity of the cold war? Do not these factors really lie behind my role as an outspoken advocate?

The senior Senator from Minnesota believes he has a responsibility to his conscience, to his constituents, and to his colleagues, to attempt to answer these questions.

First, the burden of the testimony in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the other two committees concerned the question of the impact of the treaty on the military security of the United States.

This is a vital matter, and is one to which we must give the utmost consideration. Every witness—those who supported and those who opposed the treaty—admitted that certain military risks were assumed in our halting atmospheric nuclear testing. Not one witness—even those most enthusiastically in support of ratification—could positively guarantee the absence of all military risks. In light of this, how does one justify, then, a position of advocacy in behalf of this treaty?

I stand here as a Senator who would never knowingly accept a military risk which would gravely impair the security of the United States. Every Senator has sworn to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. Surely no Senator would knowingly violate his solemn oath.

Therefore, in our debate on the solemn question of approving this vital treaty, we do not question each other's motives. We may have disagreements about matters of judgment or fact; but insofar as the motives and motivation of Senators are concerned, there can be no argument.

However, while none of the witnesses before the Foreign Relations Committee could positively guarantee an absence of all military risk, they could state the following—and I summarize, now, certain portions of the testimony:

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said:

> The risks under the treaty are either small or under control, and the values of the treaty are substantial even if we consider only the military area. The scales are clearly tipped in favor of the treaty, Mr. Chairman. It has my unequivocal support.

The Secretary of Defense is one of the President's principal officials. He has the awesome burden and responsibility of advising and counseling the President of the United States on the adequacy of our military strength. I am convinced that no Secretary of Defense in any administration would ever knowingly advise the President to sign a treaty which would in any way limit or reduce the national security of the United States. I have great faith in Secretary McNamara. I believe his testimony was both persuasive and well documented by fact and by experience.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, said:

> The Joint Chiefs of Staff have reached the determination that while there are military disadvantages to the treaty, they are not so serious as to render it unacceptable * * * it is the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that, if adequate safeguards are established, the risks inherent in this treaty can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences.

Throughout this debate, much will be said about the position and role of our military officials. It should be manifestly clear, however, that—with one or two exceptions—those responsible for the military strategy of this Nation and for the preparation and training of our military forces and their deployment have spoken in support of the treaty. Indeed, they have told us of their doubts and their apprehensions. But as mature, responsible men who have the duty to make decisions, they have decided in favor of the treaty.

It is fair to say that they could simply have stated that they were in favor of the treaty, without expressing doubts or concern. But these men, who wear the uniform of the armed services of the United States, are honorable. They spoke frankly to the members of Senate committees, as they did to the President. They expressed doubts; but then, when they came to the moment for decision, they spoke in support of the treaty.

Every general will admit that he has doubts about a particular strategy or tactic to be followed on the field of battle; but he must make a decision. Indeed, General Eisenhower had doubts about the Normandy invasion. Other great generals who have served this country have had doubts about the effectiveness of their plans; but they made decisions. They acted.

Today I state that although one can quote the doubts and the apprehensions, the important part of the testimony to be analyzed, studied, and evaluated is the portion in which the decision was rendered. The duty of responsible officials is to decide, not merely to discuss or to doubt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assume that the Senator from Minnesota is about to proceed to another point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to express my appreciation of the Senator's kind words of approval of my comments.

In regard to the military matter, which has caused considerable concern, I should like to emphasize again—as the Senator from Minnesota has done—that those in the highest positions of authority and with the ultimate power of decision in military matters—and, of course, they include the Commander in Chief, and also the Joint Chiefs of Staff—seven of the nine unified field commanders who were asked for their opinion, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and not by the committee, reported that they approve the treaty. One of the nine said he did not feel he was sufficiently informed to be able to take a position. Only two opposed it—General Power, of the Strategic Air Command, and General Schriever, another active commander, who is important in the field of missile development. In response to a request by the committee, the great General Eisenhower directly expressed his approval of the treaty.

According to my calculation, 14 of the most prominent members of the military, including General Eisenhower, endorse the treaty, two who still have such responsibilities oppose it.

Mr. President, I submit that on all controversial questions of any significance in any body in a democracy there will be at least that much dissent. It is not human nature for everyone to agree on an important matter of this kind.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree with that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. I would expect that men with different experiences and different roles to play in the Military Establishment of our country might well have differences in their points of view. Those differences have been expressed. I think the most important point for us to note is that in testimony in both public sessions and executive sessions, the military officers testified that they had not been under any pressure to support the treaty. There had been no arm twisting. They had made their decisions on the basis of their own observations, experiences, and reflection. It seems to me that this point in itself well merits some attention.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the question of pressure, it is inconceivable to me that men who have reached the stature of the Joint Chiefs—all of them among the most eminent in this country, if not in the world—would yield to any such attempt. It would be highly insulting to them to suggest that their solemn declaration—under oath—to the committee and to the Nation that they support this treaty was the result of some sort of pressure. I believe such a statement would be a reflection upon them. I do not for a moment believe that General Shoup or General LeMay, or General Wheeler, or Admiral McDonald were so afraid of losing their positions that under those circumstances they would distort their opinions on the effect of the treaty on this country. If they did, it would be a great disservice. I do not for a moment believe that any such thing happened.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fully concur in the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. I remind Senators that the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, when he had an honest disagreement over military policy, resigned from the armed services and stated his views as a matter of personal integrity and professional honesty.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First, yesterday I was detained in Rhode Island and did not have an opportunity to hear the very excellent presentation made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. He had already concluded when I arrived in the Chamber. But I took it upon myself to take his speech home, and I read it before I came to the Capitol this morning. I compliment the Senator for a very brilliant presentation.

On the point that has been raised, with the kind permission and indulgence of the Senator from Minnesota, I wish to make one observation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. PASTORE. The question as to whether pressure had been exerted on the Military Establishment of our country by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who asked the question categorically of the Joint Chiefs. He asked them whether or not anyone at any time had tried to exert any influence upon their judgment. As I recall, General LeMay said, in substance, "I would resent it if any such attempts were made." That such was the case was categorically denied. I hope that for once and for all that doubt has been banished from the mind of everyone.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Rhode Island has made it explicitly clear as to what transpired both in the executive and in the public hearings relating to this particular point in the many discussions that have taken place on the treaty.

The argument has been raised that the treaty was drafted without full consultation or cooperation of the military officials. On that point, General Taylor testified that he was in constant consultation; that he had advised and consulted with the President regularly; that he was in consultation on the treaty prior to Mr. Harriman's going to Moscow and during Mr. Harriman's mission in Moscow; that he was a part of the group of officials who worked out the instructions for Mr. Harriman's mission to Moscow; and that he also contributed to the rewording and redrafting of the treaty provisions while Mr. Harriman was in Moscow.

I believe that in executive session there was even more detailed documentation as to the close cooperation and collaboration between the Secretary of State, the President of the United States, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of Defense, the Chiefs of Staff, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. So that argument should be set to rest at once. There was all possible cooperation and coordination in the drafting of the treaty and in its final approval prior to the signing of the treaty by the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I should like to quote a statement of Dr. Harold Brown, who is Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense:

> Having satisfied myself as completely as is humanly possible that the proposed treaty cannot substantially impair our strategic superiority if we take the steps which we can to continue our nuclear developments and remain prepared, and that indeed it could enhance our strategic superiority compared with unlimited testing, I find the arguments for it on broader grounds persuasive, and I fully support its ratification.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said:

> I think there are some risks but they are minor and that in the balance the advantage is in the favor of improving the security of our country if we enter into this treaty.

Dr. N. E. Bradbury, Director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, said:

> I personally am of the opinion and belief that the proposed treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, space, and under water may be ratified by the Senate with only mild risks to our national defense posture but with the possibility of taking the first real, even if small, step in the direction of the prevention of a nuclear war.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The RECORD should show clearly at this point that Dr. Bradbury is at the head of Los Alamos, which produces most of our nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, and that he has been connected with nuclear and thermonuclear weapon development from the very beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator who speaks to us is in a position to know more about that subject than almost any other Member of the Congress or any citizen of our country. He serves as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I found Dr. Bradbury's testimony to be very compelling and persuasive.

Dr. Herbert F. York, former Director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense under both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy said:

> It is my view that the problem posed to both sides by this dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security has no technical solution. * * * I am optimistic that there is a solution to this dilemma; I am pessimistic only insofar as I believe there is absolutely no solution to be found within the areas of science and technology. The partial nuclear test ban is, I hope and believe, a first small step toward finding a solution in an area where a solution may exist.

Dr. York gave us some very simple testimony as to the impact of science and technology on national security. Every Member of this body should read that testimony. Dr. York came to us as a very competent witness, both in the field of weapons and in the field of basic science.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, former Special Assistant for Science and Technology to President Eisenhower said:

> Confronted with the opportunity to choose between, on the one hand, some rather small specific technical risks in ratifying the treaty, and on the other, some perhaps comparable or greater technical risks in continued unrestricted testing plus the general risks of a continued arms race which, at least, might be somewhat slowed by ratification, I hope the Senate would opt for what I regard as by far the smaller total risk and will ratify the treaty.

Finally, Mr. John McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, whose testimony could not be printed in the hearings also advocated ratification of the treaty, without qualification.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the record should indicate an additional fact in this connection. If Senators do not already know it, Mr. John McCone was appointed Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission during the administration of President Eisenhower. To indicate what a cautious, deliberate, judicious man he is, Mr. John McCone, for 6 months after he was appointed, never uttered one word of testimony before our committee. He cautioned our committee that he would not open his mouth on any subject until he had had an opportunity to learn, through intense homework, what were his responsibilities. He turned out to be one of the most efficient and best Chairmen ever of that Commission. He served under the Republican President. Later, when President Eisenhower retired from public life, Mr. McCone retired from the Atomic Energy Commission. Since that time he has been appointed by the President of the United States to be the head of the Central Intelligence Agency. He is in a better position than any other individual in this country to know central intelligence which affects the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has properly and helpfully pointed out that Mr. McCone has had long experience as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and is now the experienced director of the Central Intelligence Agency. He is in a position to relate intelligence information to nuclear information better than most men could. He is knowledgeable in the field of atomic energy as well as the field of nuclear weaponry and, as director of the Central Intelligence Agency, obtains considerable information as to what other countries—and particularly the Soviet Union—are doing in this very important area of weapons.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I noted that the Senator quoted Dr. York as saying that under this treaty the arms race might be slowed down. As I recall, no witness testified that the race would be slowed down. I believe there was some testimony to the effect that the treaty might well cause the race to be stepped up; because, while nuclear testing in the atmosphere would stop, the more expensive underground testing would continue, and probably be stepped up in degree.

As I understand the situation, one of the reservations or conditions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is that we would actually have a stepped up underground nuclear testing program. I believe the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department have indicated that they would abide by that condition.

I make this point because, as the Senator knows, I have not indicated how I shall vote. I have not made up my mind as to how I shall vote in regard to the treaty. If I vote for ratification it will definitely not be because I am persuaded that the arms race will be slowed down by the treaty. I would vote for it probably with the feeling that the arms race might be stepped up as a result of the treaty. I think it is well to point that out.

If there is some response which the Senator might care to give, to alleviate my concern in this regard, I should like to hear it. I have not yet seen anything which indicates to me that there will not be an acceleration in the arms race as a result of the conditions laid down by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as a result of the agreement by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission to carry out those conditions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The statement of Dr. York is a statement by a man who is prudent and cautious, and who fully understands the implications of nuclear power and nuclear weaponry. He worked for two administrations as a trusted adviser of President Eisenhower and of President Kennedy. This man will not tell the American people that "positively this will happen—absolutely it will reduce the arms race." He is saying to us—as a prudent, wise, and experienced man—that the treaty has within it the possibilities of reducing the arms race. I think that is the way we ought to deal with the treaty. I do not believe that dogmatic assertions will enlighten the American people or do honor and justice to a thorough and thoughtful consideration of the treaty by the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is both correct and incorrect. There is a distinction to be made between an arms race, such as we are discussing, and an increase in expenditures for armaments because it is more expensive to test underground. Everyone knows that if we should test any weapon of more than 5 kilotons, it is much easier to do so in the atmosphere than underground. First, for underground testing, it is necessary to build tunnels. It is harder to provide the trajectories desired. It is harder to reach the information which is desired. It is harder to install the sensitive instruments which are necessary to obtain readings underground. If the test is conducted in the atmosphere, the results are much simpler of attainment, and it is much easier to accomplish what is desired.

The point we are making—and I think the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct in this regard—is that if this "madness" is allowed to go unchecked, if we allow nation after nation to aspire to become a member of the nuclear club—and today it is not as expensive as it used to be to make a bomb—we face the risk of a terrible nuclear war.

If Senators will talk to Dr. Brown, I feel sure that Dr. Brown will tell them that today almost any industrialized nation can make an atomic bomb, if it wishes to do so.

The purpose of the treaty is to allow all nations of the world to become partners to it. The minute those nations become partners to the treaty, and they agree not to test in the three environments, we hope to accomplish a slowdown in the proliferation of atomic weapons. That is what we are discussing when we talk about slowing down the nuclear arms race.

For the next 2 or 3 or 5 years it may be necessary for us to appropriate more money for the Atomic Energy Commission, because it will be more expensive to maintain laboratories.

It will be more expensive to maintain Johnston Island in complete readiness, in case it is necessary to use it. It will cost more money to do the testing we wish to do underground. The budget may be larger, but I think it can be safely said on the floor of the Senate that the philosophy behind the treaty is to reduce the nuclear arms race in the hope that other countries will become signatories to the treaty and will not get into the nuclear club.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to respond to the Senator's statement.

I believe that the most violent opponent of the treaty recognizes—and of course I recognize it full well—that the purpose of the treaty is exactly as the Senator from Rhode Island has stated it. There is more to the treaty than the treaty itself. We now must consider the conditions which were prescribed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These cast a different light on the treaty, in my judgment, because the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said, among other things:

> We are not going to believe that this treaty is compatible with our national security interests unless the United States engages in a large-scale underground testing program.

That will be a program larger, in my judgment, than the program we would otherwise have. If anything, this will lead to a stepup in the arms race so far as we are concerned.

There is nothing in the treaty to prevent the Soviet Union—or the United States, for that matter—from assisting other nations in underground testing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Not in underground testing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; not underground testing.

Mr. MILLER. Granted, it may be more expensive. Granted, it may retard nuclear development in other countries, because of the greater expense of going underground to test, nevertheless, there is nothing to prevent that.

If I correctly understand the test provisions, the Soviet Union can well be expected to engage in a much greater, stepped up program of underground testing, in order to catch up with the United States in the tactical nuclear game.

That is the point I am making. The purpose of the treaty is clear. The treaty, standing by itself, as two sheets of paper, is clearly in line with that policy. However, when we consider the conditions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I suggest that they pretty well undercut the objective of slowing down the arms race.

The Senator from Rhode Island mentioned proliferation. I was not talking about proliferation, although I shall have something to say on that subject later. I think the treaty will have a tendency to retard it. The treaty certainly will not prevent it, because the Red Chinese and the French have indicated they will have nothing to do with the treaty. Therefore, the treaty will not prevent proliferation, but may retard it.

I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that I am not suggesting that Dr. York, or any other witness, should have stated, "On my word of honor there is not going to be a stepup in the arms race," or "On my word of honor there will be a slowing down of the arms race."

But he very carefully couched it in terms, "It might slow it down." It is a "might," a "maybe."

I should like to clear up this question. Was Dr. York testifying about the treaty as a treaty, or was he testifying about treaty with the Joint Chiefs of Staff conditions? I do not believe he was. I wonder what Dr. York's testimony would be if he were asked, "What about the Joint Chiefs of Staff conditions which are going to be laid down?" Would he make the statement that we are now about to slow down the arms race?

Mr. PASTORE. No Senator can argue that this treaty does not limit anything. It does. It limits testing in three environments—underwater, in the atmosphere, and in outer space. It is true that we are not going to stop all tests. This treaty is not to cut down all our nuclear activity. All we are saying is that all the things we must do we propose to do by underground tests.

The treaty is intended to limit the tests. If we do not have the treaty, the entire area is limitless. The Russians could test in outer space and could give assistance to any nation in the world, if they wanted to do so. They could test in the atmosphere, and could give assistance to any country in the world in that respect, and so could we. Under the treaty they could test only underground. It cannot be said that because the testing can take place in four environments without the treaty, and in only one environment with the treaty, the treaty accelerates anything. It does not.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, it does——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Iowa wish me to yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, one can say it, because, in the first place, we do not know whether there is to be any more atmospheric testing without the treaty. The mere fact that the treaty is ratified does not mean there will be less——

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator repeat what he said?

Mr. MILLER. The mere fact that the treaty is not ratified does not force one into the position that we are going to have more testing in the atmosphere. One cannot be forced into that position. I can argue just as effectively that we are forced into negotiating a comprehensive treaty——

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator admit that if we do not have this treaty and the Russians test in the atmosphere, we are going to test in the atmosphere, and after that they will test in the atmosphere, and then we will test in the atmosphere? That is the race.

The arms race is accelerated without the treaty more than with the treaty, because the treaty is restrictive. That is why so many people are against it. They think that by restricting testing it endangers the military posture of the Nation. I do not agree with that position, but that is the argument. I do not think the position can be taken that if there are four ways to test without the treaty, and only one way to test with the treaty, we would be better off without the treaty than with it. I cannot follow that non sequitur. Talk about non sequiturs—it does not even touch rationality.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like to get into this argument——

Mr. PASTORE. This is not argument; this is debate.

Mr. MILLER. But I would like to respond.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island has simplified the argument, and has put his finger on what is most pertinent in the treaty, namely, that it is not a comprehensive treaty; it is a limited test ban treaty. It has limited purposes. Those purposes are to limit testing in the environments of outer space, underwater, and atmosphere. Testing is to be permitted underground. Other countries could be assisted in underground testing without this treaty——

Mr. PASTORE. Only if the debris did not go outside the territory of that country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Without the treaty those countries could have unlimited testing. Without the treaty countries could receive information for testing in all other environments. But if the treaty is ratified and generally accepted by the nations of the world, those nations cannot be helped in receiving nuclear technological information or any other help for testing above ground, underwater, or outer space. The Senator from Rhode Island has made the case that if there can be limitation of testing in three environments, and it is to be permitted in only one environment, we are better off than if four environments are wide open for unlimited testing.

The Senator from Iowa wants to be heard. I yield to him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I realize that theoretically what the Senator from Rhode Island is saying is true, or at least is possibly true, but he forgets that we may not have any atmospheric testing, regardless of the treaty. I assume that what the President of the United States said in the commencement address at American University still stands, regardless of whether or not there is a treaty. He said this Nation would not be the first to test in the atmosphere. So I assume that intention still stands, regardless of what happens with the treaty.

The point is that if underground testing is stepped up, we may more than offset the amount of atmospheric tests which we forego. To say that we are limiting the tests to one environment, instead of four, does not mean that the number of tests is reduced. It depends on what developmental work is going on in a particular environment. There might be four times as much testing in the underground environment, and that might more than offset the testing that would have been done in the other three environments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Senators who were most insistent upon having assurances and specific details spelled out as to the amount of testing and the conditions of laboratories and the maintenance of scientific techniques for the development of nuclear weapons and nuclear science are now worried for fear that the treaty will not inhibit testing. So the Senator who has a doubt about the treaty and what it would do finds himself getting into the argument of those who also had doubts about the effects of the treaty, namely, that we must have assurances that we must not lower our guard, that we must not seriously impede scientific progress in the field of nuclear weapons. I do not think one can have it both ways.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield, who in a responsible position in this Government ever said that we would not maintain our safeguards? Who said we were not going to maintain or expand our laboratories? We have the best laboratories in the world at Los Alamos and Livermore. They are second to none, including those of Red China and Russia. Who said we were not going to maintain our facilities at Johnston Island? If that question was asked once, it was asked a dozen times. Who said we were not going to maintain underground tests if necessary? No one said that.

Those arguing this point dramatize it by saying, "I will do this if you say thus and so." This makes the position more riveted, but, after all, the President of the United States has given that assurance. The President can make recommendations; but in order to maintain the facilities on Johnston Island, Congress must appropriate the money; and if we do not do it, it is our fault. If the laboratories are to be maintained, Congress must provide the money. If we are to conduct underground tests, Congress must appropriate the money. If we do not do it, it will be our fault.

Talk to the effect that "we want these safeguards" dresses the treaty. It may be the ribbon on the package, but it has nothing to do with the substance of the package. Whether or not safeguards are provided is the responsibility of the Congress; and if the Senator from Iowa will stand with the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Minnesota in seeing to it that we do the necessary things, the Senator will have the assurances he wants. There are certain things that can be done in the atmosphere that cannot be done underground. What can be done underground is limited.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. That is exactly the point of what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] said about how the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the military officials argued about the limitations of the treaty.

It is not so much a question of cutting down on the number of tests. It is a case of quality. Those who are concerned about eliminating testing in the atmosphere are concerned about the fact that we cannot have the same quality of testing underground as in the atmosphere.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true. No one official in the Military Establishment who appeared before our committee—and if I asked the question of one witness, I asked it of at least six—would say that the balance of power is not in our favor but in favor of the Russians. They all agreed that the balance of power was in our favor.

If that is the case, if the balance of power is in our favor, and if we can bring to an end this madness, what is wrong with that? America does not want to make a 100-megaton bomb. I do not know what we would want to blow up with a 100-megaton bomb. I am told that one 20-megaton bomb is the equivalent of the amount of TNT that can be put in a freight train stretching from the east coast to the west coast. One 20-megaton bomb represents six times the explosive force of all of the explosives used in World War II.

People talk about a 100-megaton bomb. What do they want to blow up? Do they want to blow up the entire world? America does not want that kind of bomb.

Mr. McNamara, when he appeared before the committee, said that we have no desire to make a 100-megaton bomb. It is true that in the atmosphere it would be possible to achieve it. However, we can make a 60-megaton bomb now with the knowledge that we possess.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Without testing.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. When I am through, I will yield. I thought I was going along pretty well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator was going along very well.

Mr. PASTORE. If we test underground, we cannot go very far before the debris begins to get out of our territorial boundaries, and that is not permitted under the treaty. Once that happens, we are becoming too big from the standpoint of the bomb. The treaty prohibits such a procedure. We are limited.

If any Senator for any reason thinks Eisenhower sold out to Khrushchev when, in 1959, he made the same proposal that is now before us, or if any Senator believes that John Kennedy is selling out to the enemy because he is in favor of the treaty, that Senator should in full conscience and on his responsibility vote for the rejection of the treaty.

However, let me say to Senators who would reject the treaty that under our constitutional process a two-thirds affirmative vote is required.

This treaty was initiated by two administrations, a Republican administration and a Democratic administration. This is a treaty that we have been trying to get for years. It all began on April 13, 1959, when President Eisenhower made his suggestion. I am saying to those who are inclined to have doubts about the treaty that they have a double responsibility, because every vote that they cast counts for two votes. We need two votes in the affirmative to block one vote in the negative.

I do not like to imagine where we would begin all over again, if this treaty is rejected. We have been trying to get it since 1959. Every time Khrushchev said, "No." All we said was, "Will you talk again? Can we resume the talks?"

Khrushchev did not ask that the talks be resumed. We asked that the talks be resumed. This is our treaty. This is America's treaty. This is not Russia's treaty. If the Russians think it is of advantage to them, let them think so. What their motives are is of no concern to the Senator from Rhode Island. All I know is that this treaty is good for me. This treaty is good for my family. This treaty is good for my country. This treaty is good for the peace of the world. This is the reason why one should be in favor of it. If anyone does not believe it, he should vote against it.

However, let no one forget that the President of the United States is exhorting the Senate. He needs a two-thirds vote in the Senate. That is not easy to obtain always. There is talk about majority rule. We had best realize that every vote that is cast against it is the vote of two Senators under our democratic process in the Senate.

I say to those who have doubts about the treaty that I want them to open their hearts and look into their consciences. I want them to realize what they might be doing. If by their vote they destroy and kill the treaty, in all sincerity—in all reverence, I say God help us; God help us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island are of such quality and importance that they should stand on their own. For the moment I shall not yield for further inquiry.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Sentor yield on the particular point under discussion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the point of testing and its alleged contribution to the spread of the arms race?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator on that point.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota. I refer to the point which was opened up when the Senator from Iowa referred to the reduction of armaments under the treaty, and when the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island made the statement that there was hope in the treaty. It is important that the RECORD in the Senate, from a historical standpoint, be complete, and therefore I refer Senators to the statement of Secretary Rusk at page 29 of the hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was asking questions of the Secretary of State, as follows:

> Senator SPARKMAN. And is there any provision in this treaty for the reduction of arms or armaments in any way?
>
> Secretary RUSK. This treaty itself does not reduce weapons in being or prevent their further production.
>
> This treaty is aimed only at the question of nuclear explosions. I regret myself that it has not been possible to make greater headway in some actual physical disarmament measures consistant with our own security.
>
> But this treaty is not a step in that direction—this treaty is not itself dealing with that problem. It may turn out to be one small step that opens up some possibilities in this field but that has not yet become apparent.
>
> Senator SPARKMAN. It is a treaty of hope so far as that is concerned.
>
> Secretary RUSK. So far as actual disarmament is concerned, it is a treaty of hope. It is a treaty of fact insofar as explosions in those three environments are concerned.

I thought the reference to hope should be in the RECORD, from the standpoint of history. It was a hope.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his contribution to the colloquy. It is pertinent to the discussion. The point needs to be emphasized again and again that the responsible officers of the Government have not attempted to oversell the treaty. The President, in his message to the Senate, had this to say:

> This treaty advances, though it does not assure, world peace; and it will inhibit, though it does not prohibit, the nuclear arms race.

Then he went on to say:

> This treaty will curb the pollution of our atmosphere. While it does not assure the world that it will be forever free from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests, it will greatly reduce the numbers and dangers of such tests.

I believe it is fair to say that, from the President on down through all the echelons of Government, those who have been advocating the treaty have attempted to caution everyone as to its limits, as well as stating its assets. A factual, fair, and open presentation has been made.

No one can say what the future will offer. No one can say whether the treaty will work. The future is in the hands of men who make decisions daily and who may govern nations in the days to come.

As has been said, the treaty represents a significant step, small though it may be, and, as the Senator from Kansas has so well pointed out once again, it represents a hope that mankind can reduce the arms race, a hope that mankind may be more rational, a hope that mankind may find some understandings and agreements that will lessen international tensions.

Whether or not these hopes will be realized, only God can say.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. At the time when I raised the question about the arms race, I did not realize we would get as far afield as we did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it was interesting.

Mr. MILLER. I concur in the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island; and it might be well just to make a few replies for the record. We were asked whether anyone believes that the present President of the United States, or former President Eisenhower was selling out the United States.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota will make clear, on behalf of all who are in favor of the treaty—and I know he is in favor of it, and I hope any Senator on the other side who has already committed himself as being against the treaty will also make very clear, that if there is any one thing on which all agree, it is that no one has any monopoly on patriotism or on devotion to world peace or on integrity. Certainly both the most violent opponent, and the most violent proponent share those characteristics. So I do not believe we should even ask whether anyone is questioning any Senator's integrity or his desire for peace or his patriotism. On this treaty there will be honest differences of conscientious opinion based upon judgment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa knows that I fully agree with his statement. At the beginning of my remarks I said that any differences Senators may have are not related to our motives or our motivations.

We have sworn to uphold, preserve, defend, and to protect the Constitution. We have our constitutional responsibilities. If Senators were not to be permitted to express freely and openly their points of view on this treaty, the Constitution would never have required the advice and consent of the Senate. Nothing in the Constitution indicates that a Senator is not patriotic if he disagrees with the President. The President, being human, is of course, subject to error and to miscalculation. I am sure every President of the United States does the very best he can—within his ability, his experience, and his knowledge—for this country. Senators have both the privilege and the responsibility to examine carefully into every aspect of all proposed legislation and all proposals of the Executive, including every treaty that is sent to us. Therefore, rather than be critical of Senators who may wish to examine the treaty at some length, I say more power to them, because that process gives us an opportunity to have a thoughtful and responsible debate on this part of our foreign policy.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The other point is that great emphasis has been laid by some on the fact that the treaty is substantially the same as the treaty advanced by President Eisenhower, and by President Kennedy earlier in his term. Therefore, I suppose, the inference is that there is no reason why it should not be approved by the Senate today. I believe it should be pointed out that—granted that all these treaties are about the same—changes have occurred since the treaty was first proposed by President Eisenhower, and since President Kennedy later proposed it—in 1961, I believe.

For example, a massive series of atmospheric tests was made by the Soviet Union in 1961. From them, they could have obtained information—and we have had testimony on this point—which might have an impact on the security of the United States. So the facts and circumstances have changed.

There has also been the Cuban confrontation, in which the Soviet Union had covertly put intermediate range ballistic missiles into Cuba; and on that point Gromyko lied in his teeth to the President of the United States. Khrushchev said he would take the Soviet troops out of Cuba, but he reneged on that. Khrushchev also agreed to on-site inspections in Cuba, but he also reneged on that. So a few rather significant changes have taken place since this treaty first was proposed. Therefore, I believe we should evaluate the treaty in line with these changes, as well as in line with the fact that Presidents of both parties proposed such a treaty before these changes occurred.

I believe perhaps the final point should be made that, to the best of my knowledge, I have not heard any Member of the Senate indicate a partisan attitude on this matter. As a matter of fact, I wish we could act as the Committee of the Whole for the duration of this debate, and entirely ignore our respective party labels, because the treaty is completely outside the arena of partisan politics.

I know the Senator from Minnesota thoroughly agrees with me—as he did earlier—that the treaty is not a partisan matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, to raise—again—the question of partisan politics is really to set up another strawman. Everyone knows the treaty is not a partisan matter. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is being exceedingly helpful, brave, and forthright in connection with our consideration of the treaty.

I have repeatedly made clear, as have all other Senators, that this is not a partisan debate. Mr. President, the Senate does not advise and consent to treaties, under the constitutional provision, on a partisan basis. The Senate does so on the basis of the responsible position which U.S. Senators hold. However, if there need be further disavowal of any partisanship in connection with our consideration of the treaty, again I disavow it. We realize that on both sides of the aisle there are Senators who favor the treaty and Senators who oppose it. So, Mr. President, we can now settle, once and for all, any question about a partisan nature of this debate, by stating that the treaty is not in the slightest respect a partisan matter.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that the record may be adequate and explicit with reference to the position of the former President of the United States on the subject of a nuclear test ban, I invite the attention of Senators to the exhibits on pages 278 and 279 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session.

First is the full text of President Eisenhower's April 13 letter to Premier Nikita Khrushchev on a suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons, from Augusta, Ga., under the date of April 20, 1959.

Second is the text of President Eisenhower's letter to Khrushchev dated Washington, May 1, which was released from Denver, Colo., on May 16. I believe those two letters will clarify any differences that there may have been between the proposal before the Senate and those advanced by the former President of the United States. I should like to make clear that the former President was seeking, with all the influence and power at his command, to negotiate, first, a nuclear test ban treaty of a comprehensive nature, and, second, one of a limited nature. In his letter of May 5, 1959, speaking to Khrushchev, President Eisenhower said—

> I would again propose that toward this end we take now the first and readily attainable step of an agreed suspension of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere here up to the greatest height to which effective controls can under present circumstances be extended.

In his letter of April 13, the former President of the United States said:

> The United States strongly seeks a lasting agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We believe that this would be an important step toward reduction of international tensions and would open the way to further agreement on substantial measures of disarmament.

The full text of the letter outlines the details of President Eisenhower's proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letters of President Eisenhower be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER LETTER ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

AUGUSTA, GA., April 20, 1959.—Following is the text of President Eisenhower's April 13 letter to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev on a suspension of tests of nuclear weapons:

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Today the Geneva negotiations for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests are resuming. During the recess I have considered where we stood in these negotiations and what the prospects are for the successful conclusion which I earnestly desire. I have also talked with Prime Minister Macmillan, who reported to me of his frank discussions on this matter with you.

"The United States strongly seeks a lasting agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We believe that this would be an important step toward reduction of international tensions and would open the way to further agreement on substantial measures of disarmament.

"Such an agreement must, however, be subject to fully effective safeguards to insure the security interests of all parties, and we believe that present proposals of the Soviet Union fall short of providing assurance of the type of effective control in which all parties can have confidence; therefore, no basis for agreement is now in sight.

"In my view, these negotiations must not be permitted completely to fail. If indeed the Soviet Union insists on the veto on the factfinding activities of the control system, with regard to possible underground detonations, I believe that there is a way in which we can hold fast to the progress already made in these negotiations and no longer delay in putting into effect the initial agreements which are within our grasp. Could we not, Mr. Chairman, put the agreement into effect in phases beginning with a prohibition of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere? A simplified control system for atmospheric tests up to 50 kilometers could be readily derived from the Geneva experts' report, and would not require the automatic onsite inspection which created the major stumbling-block in the negotiations so far.

"My representative is putting forward this suggestion in Geneva today. I urge your serious consideration of this possible course of action. If you are prepared to change your present position on the veto, on procedures for onsite inspection and on early discussion of concrete measures for high-altitude detection, we can of course proceed promptly in the hope of concluding the negotiation of a comprehensive agreement for suspension of nuclear weapons tests. If you are not yet ready to go this far, then I propose that we take the first and readily attainable step of an agreed suspension of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere up to 50 kilometers while the political and technical problems associated with control of underground and outer space tests are being resolved. If we could agree to such initial implementation of the first—and I might add the most important—phase of a test suspension agreement, our negotiators could continue to explore with new hope the political and technical problems involved in extending the agreement as quickly as possible to cover all nuclear weapons testing. Meanwhile, fear of unrestricted resumption of nuclear weapons testing with attendant additions to levels of radioactivity, would be allayed, and we would be gaining practical experience and confidence in the operation of an international control system.

"I trust that one of these paths to agreement will commend itself to you and permit the resuming negotiations to make a far-reaching response to the hopes of mankind.

"Sincerely,

"Dwight D. Eisenhower."

The Text of the President's Letter to Khrushchev

Denver, May 16.—The text of President Eisenhower's letter to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, dated from Washington May 5, follows:

"Dear Mr. Chairman: I have your reply to my communication of April 13 in which I suggested ways in which we might move more rapidly toward the achievement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests under adequately safeguarded conditions. I do not disagree with your statement of the need to conclude a treaty which would provide for the cessation of all types of nuclear weapons tests in the air, on the ground, underwater, and at high altitudes. This is the objective I proposed last August, which my representatives at Geneva have sought since the beginning of negotiations there and which in my most recent letter I reaffirmed as the goal of the United States. I sincerely hope that your affirmation of this objective will prove to me that you would now be willing to accept the essential elements of control which would make this possible.

"You refer to the possibility mentioned by Prime Minister Macmillan for carrying out each year a certain number of previously determined inspections. I have also been informed that your representative at the Geneva Conference has formally proposed that agreement be reached on the carrying out annually of a predetermined number of inspections both on the territory of the Soviet Union and on the territories of the United States, the United Kingdom, and their possessions. In keeping with our desire to consider all possible approaches which could lead to agreement for discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests with effective control, the United States is prepared to explore this proposal through our representatives in the negotiations at Geneva.

"In particular, it will be necessary to explore the views of the Soviet Government on the voting arrangements under which this and other essential elements of control will be carried out, the criteria which will afford the basis for inspection and the arrangements which you would be prepared to accept to assure timely access to the site of unidentified events that could be suspected of being nuclear explosions. It will be necessary to know, also, the scientific basis upon which such number of inspections would be determined and how it would be related to the detection capabilities of the control system.

"I have noted your understanding that these inspections would not be numerous. The United States has not envisaged an unlimited number of inspections but adheres to the concept that the number should be in appropriate relations to scientific facts and detection capabilities.

"As I stated in my last communication, if you are prepared to change your present position on the veto on procedures for onsite inspection, and on early discussions of concrete measures for high-altitude inspection, we can proceed promptly in the hope of concluding the negotiation of a comprehensive agreement for suspension of nuclear weapons tests. I hope that your position on these basic issues will change sufficiently to make this possible.

"There are reports that your representative in Geneva has given some reason for thinking the Soviet Government may be prepared to modify its approach regarding these questions. If this should prove not to be the case, however, I could not accept a situation in which we would do nothing.

"In that event I would wish to urge your renewed consideration of my alternative proposal. It is that, starting now, we register and put into effect agreements looking toward the permanent discontinuance of all nuclear weapons tests in phases, expanding the agreement as rapidly as corresponding measures of control can be incorporated in the treaty.

"I would again propose that toward this end we take now the first and readily attainable step of an agreed suspension of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere here up to the greatest height to which effective controls can under present circumstances be extended. In my communication of April 13 I suggested that the first phase of such an agreement should extend to the altitude for which controls were agreed upon by the Geneva Conferences. We would welcome discussions of the feasibility of the present time of extending the first phase atmospheric agreement to higher altitudes and our representatives in the present negotiations at Geneva are prepared to discuss the technical means for controlling such an agreement.

"It is precisely because of my deep desire for a complete discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests that I urge again that you either accept the measure of control that will make such an agreement possible now or, as a minimum, that you join now in the first step toward this end which is within our reach. Such a step would assure that no time will be lost in setting up the elements of the system already substantially agreed and in stopping all tests that can be brought under control. While this is being done our negotiators would continue to explore the problems involved in extending the agreement to other weapons tests as quickly as adequate controls can be devised and agreed upon.

"Sincerely,

"Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Those of us who have followed this subject for years well remember the efforts of President Eisenhower in trying to obtain some sort of treaty in regard to testing. At present many people are writing to me and asking questions. One of the questions frequently asked is as follows: "How does it happen that Mr. Khrushchev would not agree to a treaty in 1958 and 1959, and now he seems to be enthusiastic about a treaty?"

It would be helpful if the Senator could give me some enlightenment on that point, so that at least I can answer my mail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas. He has placed far too much confidence in me, although his flattery makes me feel very well. I shall discuss what I believe are some of the motivations, as I see them, of the Soviet Union for being willing to sign the treaty. I note again the testimony of Dr. York, who, by the way, is considered one of the outstanding scientists. All during the 1940's and during the administration of President Eisenhower he made and continues to make a great contribution to his country.

The thrust of Dr. York's testimony was to the effect that while we may be able to build bigger bombs and more weapons, and to increase our military strength, we do not necessarily increase our security. For example, during the late 1940's, when we had a monopoly on atomic weapons, and during the 1950's, when we were far out in atomic weapons, we saw the gap of our security being closed even as we stepped up our pace to improve our atomic weaponry. In other words, even as we stepped up our efforts, the Russians were stepping up their efforts. While we were building bigger bombs, going away from the kiloton range in fissionable material to the megaton range in fusion bombs, and acquiring hundreds and thousands of such weapons, supposedly giving us unbelievable power—and they do give us unbelievable power—our security has not increased in direct proportion to the weight of the bombs or the yield of the bombs. We were much stronger in the 1950's vis-a-vis the Soviet Union than we are today even though we have a great arsenal of weapons.

I believe the Soviets may very well have come to the conclusion that they have enough weapons adequately to defend themselves, just as I hope we have come to the conclusion that we, too, have enough weapons adequately to defend ourselves. Possibly that within itself is one of the reasons why the Soviets have given favorable consideration to the treaty. But that is a subject I shall discuss in more detail later.

What I am most impressed about from the testimony—and it is a large volume of testimony—is the fact that, with few exceptions, the witnesses who appeared before the committee supported the treaty. They supported the treaty regardless of their politics, their occupation, or their profession. Some were in opposition. Those few in opposition were given a full hearing. But those who were in opposition were, to my mind, fully refuted by those who supported the treaty. There was excellent testimony from many scientists. I think it could be said that if one were in a court of law, he would judge from the evidence that was placed before the committee that the overwhelming burden and weight of the evidence was in support of the treaty and not opposed to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has made a very fine point relative to the preponderance of the evidence. In effect, he said that the overwhelming preponderance of the evidence was in support of the treaty. That was true from the scientific level, the military level, and the public level, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We hear a great deal of talk about our military being opposed to the treaty. Is it not true that the overwhelming evidence of the military supported the treaty? Under our system of government, the military leadership is the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Did they not testify that they participated in the negotiations, that they helped to write the instructions that Mr. Harriman carried to Moscow with him, that they were kept advised of the wording of the treaty as it developed, and that they approved it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Senator may well recall the testimony of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Shoup, who testified that he was kept fully apprised of the negotiations, even up to the very time that the initialling of the document took place.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has put into the RECORD some of the documents relating to the proposal by President Eisenhower showing the similarity of the proposal of President Eisenhower to that of President Kennedy. Does not the Senator also recall the testimony of Dr. Kistiakowsky?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I recall, he was President Eisenhower's consultant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was his science adviser.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Dr. Kistiakowsky testified that he was present in 1959 when the treaty was submitted, and that there was practically no difference between the effect of that proposal and the present proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Again I believe these references help to document the record that those officials who have had the responsibility for the security of our country and the direction of our foreign policy have fully supported the type of proposal and the objectives of the proposal in the treaty that is now before the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The testimony by Dr. Kistiakowsky may be found beginning on page 852 of the hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, what all of this leads up to is the fact that those individuals who either are now or have been primarily responsible for the military security of the United States have testified in support of ratification.

The doubts have been weighed and evaluated by those individuals. What doubts they have had have been reconciled in behalf of the treaty, because the advantages of the treaty to our country outweigh what they consider to be its limitations.

The individuals to whom I have referred include, among others, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the present and former Director of Defense Research, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the former science adviser to President Eisenhower.

Let us be perfectly clear about their testimony.

I have said in this debate that I wanted my remarks to be prudent; and I trust responsible, to the point, and conservative in terms of their implications relating to the meaning of this treaty.

Not one of the witnesses said there were no risks involved in ratifying the treaty. But each one did say these risks were far less than those encountered by not ratifying it. Every Senator knows that others testified in opposition to the treaty. But it is incontestible that those scientists, Government officials, and military officers supporting the treaty were precisely those with access to the latest and most comprehensive intelligence and scientific data on which to reach the most balanced conclusion.

That is an important statement, because some of the testimony in opposition to the treaty was not based upon the latest intelligence information. This point has not been fully made. The witnesses who supported the treaty—who came from the scientific community and from the military in the months of September and August, 1963—had full access to the latest intelligence and scientific data. At least one or more of the witnesses in opposition did not.

I have gone through the testimony. First, I was a participant in the hearings. I attended most of the hearings, although there were some I could not attend. I have gone through every page of this document which comprises the hearings, a copy of which is before each Senator. I have studied this volume of hearings. I can say, in all good conscience, that this testimony should set aside any honest concern any conscientious Senator feels with regard to the military security of this Nation, insofar as the impact of the treaty is concerned.

On the basis of this testimony, I have no reasonable basis for concluding that ratification of this treaty would expose the United States to unacceptable military risks.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a theme which has been consistently voiced by critics of the treaty. It was voiced recently by a Wisconsin newspaper, which also carried an excellent article by the Senator from Minnesota defending the treaty. On the basis of that theme the Wisconsin newspaper has taken a position against ratification of the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not very persuasive, then, was I?

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is, of course, an issue as to which there are many reasons for taking a position.

I know the Senator will deal with the theme in his speech, or perhaps he has already dealt with it. He is an expert on the subject. The theme to which I refer is the argument that the Russians cannot be trusted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The editorial finally concluded that the United States should not adopt or ratify the treaty because the Russians could not be trusted.

In the article written by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator said that this was irrelevant. The treaty is not based on trust, as I understand, but is based on our monitoring devices and our capacity to detect any test conducted by the Russians.

Is it not true, however, that it would be possible for the Russians to engage in subkiloton testing, testing of weapons of less than 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere? Could they not engage in some tests which might be useful to them which we could not detect?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a possibility. There was testimony concerning this by the scientists—not by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], but by men who have developed the weapons now in our nuclear arsenal. They are the most able atomic scientists in the world. The testimony was to the effect that such clandestine tests, if undertaken by the Soviet Union—at great risk, I add, of being caught—would allow little or no military advantage to them. That is what they said—"little or no military advantage to them."

I was going into a discussion of that point in my prepared statement today. I will say now that we do not base the treaty on faith, hope, and charity. The treaty is not based upon any great love for or respect for the officials of the Soviet Union. The treaty is not based upon any regard for their veracity or for their record of fulfillment of treaty obligations.

The treaty is based upon what we consider to be mutual advantages to the United States, to the Soviet Union, to the United Kingdom, and to other signatory nations.

Any treaty which does not offer advantages is seldom kept. Seldom is it worth the paper it is written on. A nation does not sign a treaty merely for an exercise in penmanship. A nation signs a treaty because it seems to have something within its context which is to its advantage, or meets some of the nation's needs.

Furthermore, the detection, identification, and monitoring in respect to the treaty, relating to nuclear explosions, is not to be done by an international agency. We will not rely upon the Soviet Union. We will not give the Soviet Union a veto. We will rely upon our own national system of verification, identification, and monitoring. We have spent hundreds of millons of dollars to develop such a system, and it is a good system. Every Senator knows it is a good system.

Those of us who have seen the reports from the Atomic Energy Commission, from the Air Force, and from the Central Intelligence Agency with regard to Soviet tests get those reports as the result of our monitoring, identification, and verification system. This is the only way we can know how many tests the Soviets have conducted. We seem to be fairly sure as to how many weapons or devices they have exploded or set off in the atmosphere, under ground, under water, or in outer space. Why are we sure about these things? Because we have developed a system which is a reasonably reliable one.

No one would say it is absolutely perfect. Of course, that would be ridiculous. There is not a man in America who can say that he can walk out of a door and be safe. But the odds are that he can.

There is no guarantee that everything will be perfect. Those who want that kind of guarantee are in the wrong environment; they should be in heaven, not on earth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct in that regard. Risks are involved, no matter what course we follow. There are terrible risks of nuclear accident or catastrophe of some kind if there is not at least some beginning toward control.

What I should like to ask the Senator relates to trying to assess the risks involved under this particular treaty. I understand, for example, that there are three possible ways under this treaty in which the Soviet Union, allegedly, could test, in the atmosphere, without being detected. These illegal tests might give the Soviet Union an opportunity to advance its art, to advance its knowledge, and advance its military capability, as compared to ours.

First, they could test out subkiloton explosions and antimissile systems to the extent of determining how a nuclear explosion, even a subkiloton explosion, might distort our capability to determine the path of incoming missiles. It was asserted that we have not conducted those tests to the extent that we would have liked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It depends on who said we have not conducted these tests to the extent that we would have liked. There are some who say there is no limit to the number of tests we want to conduct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am referring to Dr. Edward Teller, who, I think, raised several profound and disturbing questions—I am sure the Senator will agree—in the hearings. One of the questions he raised relates to what tests we had planned that we now will cancel in view of the proposed agreement. As I understand, the tests which he said we had planned included tests which would develop our skill in detecting incoming missiles and permit us to develop a better antimissile system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We shall have to explore this area in some detail, because Dr. Edward Teller made several points, or attempted to make several points, relating to the antimissile system. I believe his testimony was fully answered. His testimony was more than fully answered by Dr. Brown, Dr. Bradbury, Dr. York, and Dr. Kistiakowsky. There are those who finally disputed Dr. Teller's knowledge of anti-ballistic-missile development.

I do not claim to know anything about the scientific arguments, and I shall not argue with Dr. Teller, but the argument that was advanced by eminent scientists, men like Dr. Brown, who is a man of great competence, answered the argument of those opposed to the treaty. Dr. Brown has access to the latest intelligence information. Regrettably, Dr. Teller does not, because he is not in a position where the latest intelligence information is available.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] put this case right to Dr. Brown. He said:

> Dr. Teller on yesterday made a statement which you have referred to, which you have answered in part, at least, during the course of the questions asked this morning, but I want to ask a question verbatim because your name is mentioned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What page is the Senator reading from?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Page 557 of the hearings. I continue to read:

> I quote: "I would like to ask"—this is Dr. Teller speaking:
>
> "I would like to ask you to question witnesses, Dr. Brown, as well, who has the responsibility in this matter, as advisers of the Government, what tests, what atmospheric tests, have we planned. Why have we planned them? Why did we feel that we need them for ballistic missile defense, and for the insurance of our retaliatory capability? What would happen if we did not carry out these tests?"
>
> Dr. BROWN. Yes, sir. It is a series of questions. I will try to answer them.
>
> I cannot describe in individual detail the tests in open session, but I can tell you what kinds they were. They were, the tests which were planned, are planned, if atmospheric testing is resumed, and for which preparations are being made, include tests on the effects of surface shots on hard sites.
>
> They are large tests, hundreds of kilotons, and of course, would be easily detectable.
>
> They include tests on the effects of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere on blackout, and tests on the effects of nuclear explosions on reentry vehicles.
>
> Some of this information can be obtained by underground tests but much of it cannot and the information can be gotten better from atmospheric tests. If the atmospheric tests are not conducted, we are going to go ahead and design our systems so that these uncertainties, which could be reduced with atmospheric tests, are compensated for by the design of the systems, and that is what we would have planned to do anyway.
>
> This way we will have to compensate for slightly greater uncertainties. But there are some uncertainties that we can't compensate for no matter how many atmospheric nuclear tests were done.
>
> We don't know how big the Soviet warheads will be in 1970, we don't know how good their accuracy will be in 1970. We don't know how vulnerable their incoming vehicles will be.
>
> We have to design our systems around those uncertainties, and we will, we will design them, if necessary, around the remaining uncertainties in nuclear effects; we have already been doing so.

The testimony continues. Dr. Brown corroborates the testimony of Secretary McNamara that in the anti-ballistic-missile field we have considerable information, and denied that we had inferior knowledge as compared to the Soviet Union.

Later, Dr. Kistiakowsky, as did Dr. York, both eminent scientists, stated it seems to be extremely difficult to build an antimissile system that can stop penetration of an enemy's ballistic-missile system, and that it was felt we must build an effective missile system.

I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the best answer is to read the testimony and satisfy himself. He is not going to be satisfied by the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY, nor should he. I am no expert in this field. The Senator should not take my word for it. But I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin, who is a thorough student, a man who does his homework, that he read the testimony of Dr. Teller and Dr. Foster on one side, and Dr. Bradbury, of Los Alamos, Dr. York, former research defense adviser for the Eisenhower administration, Dr. Kistiakowsky, and Dr. Harold Brown. There are at least six or seven scientists, every one of them competent, every one of whom has made a great contribution to this country.

As a Senator who is not a nuclear physicist or a scientist, I must look at the testimony and ask, "Which of these men seems to make the most plausible argument?"

It seems to me that when one hears or reads the testimony he must be moved very much and influenced by the wise and responsible words of Dr. Kistiakowsky and Dr. York. These are not men who now work for the Government. They have worked for the Government, as has Dr. Teller, but they have occupied key positions in the nuclear weaponry field of the Government of the United States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. The record of the hearings should be read carefully. I have been doing it. I have almost completed reading the record of the hearings. Often hearings are so voluminous that it is impossible for a Senator to read them, but this is the most important decision that will be made in the 6 years I have been in the Senate, and I want to read the more than 1,000 pages of hearings very carefully.

I value very highly the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota. He has been my leader in the field of arms control. He is one of the best informed men in the country. As a Senator who must make up his own mind, I want to get a balanced view, and not merely the views of scientists or physicists. Responsible, sincere patriots came before the committee. Some say the treaty is bad, and some say it is good. We cannot defer to an opinion merely because of one's authority or position. We must make up our own minds. I am sure the Senator will agree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

I note for the information of the Senator that at page 852 of the hearings begins the testimony of Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, of Harvard University. On page 854 he discusses breakthroughs in design of warheads for penetration, relating to anti-ballistic-missile systems and advances in distinguishing between decoys and incoming weapons, which relates to radar and nuclear warheads. He comments on an anti-ballistic-missile system.

Listen to this testimony. This is Dr. Kistiakowsky, who, more than any other witness, impressed me. I was impressed by his Solomon-like characteristics. He seemed like a wise man, and seemed to me a very prudent, cautious, responsible man. All witnesses would fall within that category, but this witness more than any other. Here is what he had to say:

> Much has beeen made of the necessity to actually exercise any ABM system if it is to be effective when needed. I would make the following observations with respect to this argument.
>
> First, such tests are not likely to be very productive even with the best of efforts since they must be conducted against one's own, and not the adversary's, warheads. One can have as much, perhaps even more, confidence from underground nuclear explosions, properly instrumented, and ABM exercises that do not actually involve detonating warheads if coupled with a careful and continuing theoretical analysis taking into account all that is known from intelligence sources regarding the adversary's missiles.
>
> Second, the same disadvantages, if indeed there are any, in not exercising a system will apply equally to the Soviet Union.
>
> Before leaving the ABM problem, which seems to be, perhaps, the issue of greatest concern to those who question the wisdom of the treaty, I would like to make one other observation. I am not really intimately familiar with this important problem in all its technical details. Neither have been most of the other witnesses who have been heard. I would therefore urge that the committee give special weight to the testimony of Harold Brown, who, to my knowledge, is the only witness so far heard who can speak with real authority regarding the total ABM problem, and the related developments in offensive systems. He has access to all of the intelligence regarding Soviet activities and all of the expertise in the United States on our future capabilities that relate to the problem.
>
> Based on my own knowledge, I believe it very likely that the offense has now, and with even only moderate efforts to counter ABM development, will continue to have, a commanding lead over the defense for as far into the future as we can foresee.

If we go back to the testimony of Dr. Brown, at about page 528, we find that Dr. Brown had a great deal to say about the anti-ballistic-missile system. His testimony is too long to read. Dr. Brown points out that we have considerable knowledge in this area. We have the capability to develop such a system; but, like Dr. Kistiakowsky, Dr. Brown feels that the offense will always have the advantage in this area over the defense. I want the RECORD to note the extensive testimony of Dr. Brown, who was questioned at length by the members of the committee.

Dr. York had this to say, at page 758 of the hearings:

> However, I am very much more optimistic with regard to what human ingenuity can accomplish in the way of designing ballistic missiles which can easily beat or penetrate any anti-ballistic-missile system. The race between offense and defense is a race between a tortoise and a hare and if only the hare does not go to sleep, the tortoise has no chance.
>
> Therefore, in connection with the so-called Soviet anti-ballistic-missile problem, I believe the concern expressed by many is misplaced and that primary emphasis should be placed on making sure that our own ballistic missiles will penetrate, and not placed on the question of precisely where we stand vis-a-vis the Soviets in the development of antiballistic missiles themselves.

The matter of penetration has nothing to do with warheads. It has something to do with rockets, with the thrust, with the radar system, with the computers, and the other facets which Secretary McNamara described.

Therefore, as a Senator, and as a layman who has limited technical competence, I must ask, Whom am I to believe? What evidence must I consider? When I hear the testimony of the Secretary of Defense who is at the head of the greatest research department in the world, when I hear the head of the Los Alamos Laboratory, who is the director of the research for the Department of Defense; when I hear Dr. Harold Brown, who was a collaborator and partner with Dr. Teller in the development of the hydrogen bomb; when I hear Dr. York, who was with President Eisenhower as Director of Defense Research; when I hear Dr. Kistiakowsky, who is the science adviser to the President and one of the greatest scientists in the world; and when they all stand on one side and say this treaty is to our advantage and should be ratified, and when they say the problem is not the anti-ballistic-missile system, but it is a matter of perfecting the offensive, all I can do is consider the testimony and come to the conclusion that on the anti-ballistic-missile item, at least, the proponents of the treaty have the better of the argument.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator makes a conclusive answer, but I feel that we must evaluate the position of the proponents of the treaty. It is true that they have a preponderance in numbers. There is one more thing which, if it does not puzzle Senators, at least gives them some pause, and that is that there must be a subtle evaluation of the testimony of the administration witnesses after the treaty has been initialed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that there is a commitment. We cannot expect anyone working in the Defense Department or in the Military Establishment to come before the Senate committees and say, "We advise you not to support the President, not to support the position already taken by the administration; our position is that this treaty is unwise."

At least one member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General LeMay, indicated some hesitation about it. But there is a feeling that the testimony of Dr. Brown, who is under the orders of Secretary McNamara——

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is a civilian.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is true, but he is still under the direction and discipline of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Dr. Brown does not need the job.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure of that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He can leave this Government and get five times the money he is now getting in the Federal Government service.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator makes a point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is where he is because he loves his country, and he is putting his brilliance at the service of his country. Any one of these scientists could leave the Government service and get five times the income they now get.

I know what the Senator has in mind. Dr. Brown is a man of the highest professional and ethical standards. He has a great reputation, which is a part of his character and a part of his background; and no one can tell him how he is to testify.

By the time Senators get through working a witness over, if he is trying to take a position only to please Secretary McNamara or President Kennedy, he will be caught. The best way not to get caught is to tell the truth. No man has a greater reputation than Dr. Brown. The same is true of Dr. Teller. I do not question Dr. Teller's motivation and sense of integrity. Why should I? This man has done a great deal for our country. He ought to be honored, instead of abused. He has a point of view. But he has a minority point of view.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The most disturbing point raised by Dr. Teller is that we have been consistently wrong in our intelligence estimates of the Soviet Union's capacity and of our own capacity. In 1945, 1946, and 1947, after we had developed the atomic bomb, we were told by our outstanding experts that we could not develop the hydrogen bomb. We did it. We were told that the Soviet Union probably could not develop an atomic bomb for many years. They did it in 4 years. We were told that they could not make the hydrogen bomb for many years, but they did it. They beat us to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator hold up on that point for a moment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to make my point; then I will hold up on it.

It seems to me that the areas in which intelligence is likely to be most vulnerable and most likely in error is in trying to estimate the knowledge that a potential enemy may have and his capacity to develop his knowledge in this field, which has been proceeding at such a rapid pace.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The scientists who have advised this Government have not underestimated what the Soviet Union can do. Those who write press releases or make speeches, and the commentators, might have underestimated what the Soviet Union can do, because the favorite pasttime in the United States is to make the Communists look either like pygmies or giants; to make them look either 2 feet tall or 10 feet tall. They are neither. They are people. They have able scientists.

The U.S. Government has made it quite clear throughout the years that the Soviet Union was perfectly capable of developing an atom bomb. So are Israel, Egypt, and Formosa, if they are given the resources.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the estimates of time were crucial and they were far off.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Estimates of time are matters of human judgment. For example, we were wrong in our estimate of the time the Soviet Union would need to develop an atom bomb. That is understandable.

But I add, further, that even if we had a test breakthrough—and I shall discuss this point later—it takes time to be able to interpret what such a test means, to develop into weaponry the information gained from such a test, to get the weapon into the arsenal, and to phase it into military strategy.

One final point ought to be made. Who really believes that any nation can win a nuclear war? We discuss this subject as though it were a game of pingpong, a game of croquet, or a game of football. We speak of it as though someone will make a touchdown, and between halves the coaches will get the team together, think up a new play, and then come through with a touchdown that will win the game.

We talk about exploding nuclear bombs as though it were some form of sport. We are talking not about life or death. We are talking about death and destruction. We should put the discussion in proper perspective. I do not speak in criticism of the Senator from Wisconsin. I merely say that the discussion should be on the merits of a test ban treaty.

We are not talking about outlawing bows and arrows. We are not thinking of a limitation on the number of deer that can be shot next season. We are talking about weapons in existence today that are large enough to demolish any city in the United States. We talk about 100-megaton bombs. We talk about knocking out New York five times. There is no need to knock it out more than once.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The danger of nuclear war might be greatly enhanced if one side could obtain a sharp, decisive advantage, particularly in the area of an anti-ballistic-missile system so that that side would be able virtually to eliminate the retaliatory power of the other side. That is the point of the analogy the Senator from Minnesota gave us, which came from Dr. York, as to the difference between offensive and defensive wars; the race between the tortoise and the hare; if only the hare does not go to sleep the tortoise has no chance.

The question may be raised, "Are we going to act the part of the hare and go to sleep by not testing ourselves, thus giving the Soviet Union the advantage of testing in the atmosphere in violation of the treaty?"

They may thus be enabled to develop a perfect anti-ballistic-missile defense system which would give them a supreme advantage and the opportunity to achieve victory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator's question is directed in terms of the elucidation of information, and not argument.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to speak to the point. It is possible that the Soviets might test subkiloton devices or weapons in the atmosphere and not be caught. But there will be many windowpeepers, many private eyes, looking at them, because at least 100 nations will sign the treaty, and the risk of being caught, if one is trying to make a breakthrough in science, is too much. A signatory had better announce that in 90 days it will break the treaty; because under the treaty, I believe there is the right, for compelling reasons, for a nation's own security or its national needs, to serve notice that in 90 days it will abrogate the treaty. During that period of time, preparations for testing could be made.

Why take a chance on acting secretly when one can do what he wants to do without acting secretly? The treaty provides for abrogation by us as well as by other nations. It provides for a withdrawal from the treaty. If a nation abrogates the treaty, it runs the risk of being caught, without at any time obtaining a decisive military advantage from one little test or series of tests that it might be able to make.

The only knowledge I have on this subject is that obtained from the experts. I heard the experts, those outside the administration, who came before the committee at their own request or who were asked by the committee to appear. Those experts told us that the possibilities of decisive or significant military advantage from the abrogation of the treaty, sneakingly, were minimal. I cannot believe that the risk involved either in the cheating or the abrogation is as great as the risk of unlimited testing. That is what we are really discussing. We are not living in a world where we can say that no one is really going to test, or that no one will test without a treaty, and therefore everything will be fine. If we do not have a treaty, it is entirely probable that some nation will test.

If the Soviets test under the treaty, the argument goes, the testing ought to be wide open, as if we were not under a treaty. Would not that be correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. And so could we.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And so could we. So all that would remain would be to continue the race again. That was the burden or the heart of the testimony.

Under such competition, where we test, they test, we test, and they test, no one obtains a decisive advantage. In the competition of testing, the gap between our own superiority and the inferiority of the Soviets has closed; and the more they test, the less security there will be in the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to discuss one point that I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to make; namely, that the Soviets, by small tests, might develop an anti-ballistic-missile system. The testimony is quite clear, from Dr. York and Dr. Kistiakowsky, and others, that the real problem in the field is not the weapon itself—the nuclear warhead; the real problem is in the field of detection or discrimination; of the weapon's oncoming speed; of the explosion. The actual warhead is no problem. At one point it was said that we have all the warheads we need.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When I started my questioning, I asked the Senator from Minnesota about the possibility of subkilotonic explosions being used to distract our capacity to determine the path of the incoming missile; of its being used to destroy our ability to set up an anti-ballistic-missile defense that would work.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was also testified that we will pursue work on the anti-ballistic-missile system within the limits of the treaty, in order to test the penetrability of our weapons. We have a strong incentive to do everything we can to develop an anti-ballistic-missile system that will have no less penetrability than the Soviets have.

There is no intention on the part of our scientists to desist from experimenting to the limit of their capacity in the development of techniques of an anti-ballistic-missile system—the best we can get.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But we would not violate the treaty by testing subkiloton bombs in the atmosphere. The Russians could. If they did, they could do so without being detected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is making the efficiency of our own detection system a consideration, I can only refer him to the testimony of Dr. Northrop, who discussed the question in detail. It was necessary for him to do so, in executive session, because this is a sensitive field, but the Senator might read it if he wished to do so.

Dr. Northrop went into great detail, in executive session, about what is being done, what has already been done, and what is being planned to be done in regard to detection. He said that if there has been any breakthrough in the whole gamut of activities in this field, it has been in the area of detection.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. That is a very helpful answer. It means that there is some question as to whether a subkiloton explosion made now might be detected by us. Russia could not safely cheat. And in the future any explosion of that sort would be increasingly more likely to be detected by us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. It would have to be very subkiloton if it were to go undetected. I believe it would have to be much smaller than the kind, for example, that was dropped in the last World War. Dr. Northrop feels that great progress has been made and is being made in the field of detection—both atmospheric, underground, and underwater. That, unfortunately, was one of the areas of testimony which they did not wish to make public.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It should be made clear to the Senator from Wisconsin that he can see this testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Berkner report, of a few years ago, under the administration of President Eisenhower, stated that a considerable amount of advance had occurred in the field of the detection of nuclear explosions. The whole area of seismology has been updated. We have devoted to this field substantial amounts of our resources. This is one of the "hush hush" topics, and we can well understand why.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But our Government had a very good record in detecting nuclear testing by the Soviet Union. Not only do we know what tests have been made, we also know where they took place, the times, the sizes, the chemical composition, the metallic construction, the yield, and the other factors. This information was not obtained by us through any sort of mysticism; it was obtained through the processes of science. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were very reassuring on this point. The excellent report of the Committee on Foreign Relations states, on page 18:

> The dangers of detection and the cost and difficulty of testing in outer space would tend to impose severe restrictions upon such clandestine testing. Other clandestine tests in the atmosphere or underwater, depending upon their size, would involve a fairly high probability of detection by our conventional intelligence or our atomic energy detection system. Moreover, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider the resulting progress which the Soviets might make clandestinely to be a relatively minor factor in relation to the overall present and probable balance of military strength if adequate safeguards are maintained.

That means that the Joint Chiefs are saying to the Senate, in conservative language, "We have developed a very reliable system of detection, verification, and identification, and this system serves as an additional protection in connection with our adherence to the treaty."

If the Senator from Wisconsin will read what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has suggested, I am sure he will be very much reassured by the executive testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As shown on page 467 of the hearings, Dr. Teller made an interesting reply to Senator LONG:

> Senator LONG. In the event they were able to develop a missile defense against our ballistic missiles, and then proceed to breach the treaty just long enough to prove it out, would there be time for us to do the same thing after we found out that they had violated the treaty?
>
> Dr. TELLER. I am virtually certain there would not be time enough. We would be lucky to get off to meaningful testing in 3 months, whereas they, if they have indeed perfected, installed, but not completely proven out their anti-ballistic-missile equipment, they could abrogate the treaty in a day, use the next week for 100 or 500 detonations, and if they then find the results unsatisfactory, they will have lost a treaty.
>
> If they find it satisfactory, they will have won the world.

That testimony seemed to me—coming from Dr. Teller, the father of the H-bomb——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the H-bomb has many, many parents.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; but certainly he is one of the principal parents, and is a man of responsibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed he is.

Mr. PROXMIRE. His reply is very disturbing, and would suggest that it is possible—although unlikely—but possible that Russia could be in a position to test during a period of a very few days, and then find that their system worked, and then initiate a war in which they would be fairly certain to impose on us far, far more destruction than we would impose on them.

I recognize that any nuclear war would be a terrible disaster for mankind. But we are dealing with a different kind of country in the Soviet Union. These people have for 45 years been brainwashed with the notion that Communist domination—by force and violence, if necessary—is the wave of the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, I point out that Dr. Teller's theoretical objection has been answered by some of his distinguished scientific colleagues. So the question is, which scientists do we believe?

Furthermore, even if a test were to be made, it takes time to obtain such a weapon. It takes from 3 to 5 years to develop a weapon, after the test is made.

This matter has been testified to in the committee. If we assume that the worst happens—that the Soviet Union abrogates the treaty, makes a series of tests—perhaps a great series of tests such as the ones they made in 1961 and 1962—and makes a significant breakthrough—we should realize that once they have that scientific information, they still must be able to put it into what is called a weapons system, for the purpose of weapons delivery.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But, as I understand, that is not the way Dr. Teller answered the question. He said he assumed they would first develop the weapons using undetectable subkiloton tests. Then they would see whether they would work. They would try them out; and, if they did work, they would strike immediately with them. In other words, the weapon would be developed first; then a test would be run, to perfect and further refine the weapon. The test would be to determine whether the weapons would work; in fact. Once they found that they worked, "that would be it."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me interrupt at this point, to say that is not quite the point, even under Dr. Teller's testimony, because the weapons must first be installed. As shown at the bottom of page 467, to which the Senator from Wisconsin has already referred, Dr. Teller said:

> I am virtually certain there would not be time enough. We would be lucky to get off to meaningful testing in 3 months, whereas they, if they have indeed perfected, installed—

And so forth. Certainly such a system would not be installed before it was tested. That would be ridiculous. After it is tested, it must be installed, by whatever means one might undertake to use.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Read again what Dr. Teller said. He said: "If they have indeed perfected, installed," he said "installed," then they may test 100 to 500 detonations in a week. Then if it works, for us: Doomsday. Dr. Teller's position is that they would be perfected and installed before they were completely proven.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before they were tested?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me add that I believe Dr. York's testimony is the real answer. He pointed out that the only possibility, in his opinion, of perfecting an anti-ballistic-missile system is based upon the assumption that the missiles against which it was aimed remained static over a long period, so that we would know exactly what they were, whereas, as a matter of fact, the missiles and their delivery systems are being changed all the time. Certainly ours are being changed. This is one of the reasons why he feels quite strongly that an anti-ballistic-missile system can never become effective. That is why he made the reference to the tortoise and the hare. In short, if the missile itself is changed, the system which would have been effective against it is, of course, no longer applicable. There are new guidance systems, and a very complicated system of decoys. After a missile is launched, at a certain point six or eight decoys go off from it. How could we stop such a missile when it was used under conditions which he describes as making it virtually impossible to stop it. I believe his testimony was that it is virtually impossible to perfect an anti-ballistic-missile system; and that although we shall develop one, we shall do it for the purpose of testing the penetrability of our own missiles, not because we believe we will stop theirs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I presume, then, that we assume that the Russians will work on this, and that in the meanwhile we will change our missiles and will perfect them and prove them, in underground tests, and will do everything else we can, so that in the event our adversary does perfect an anti-ballistic-missile system, we will be prepared to breach it with a devastating new offense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is one of the reasons why we are spending so much money on this work.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In other words, the hare of U.S. nuclear offense will not go to sleep. It will keep on running.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are spending approximately $400 million on an anti-ballistic-missile system, partly with the idea we might stop theirs, but primarily to prove the effectiveness of our own missiles, rather than merely to build and to stockpile them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may recall my reading the testimony of Dr. Harold Brown at the point at which he said that even with present knowledge, recognizing that the nuclear warhead blast would have some effect upon an anti-ballistic-missile system—we are trying to build into our missiles the so-called ABM system—those compensating factors will not overcome all the lack of knowledge we may have relating to such subjects, for example, as blackout, nuclear blast, and other aspects that were discussed in his testimony.

But Dr. York is not to be shunted aside as an incompetent witness. He is recognized as one of the outstanding men in the field of nuclear research and weapon development. He had the following to say, as shown on page 763 of the hearings. He was talking about the anti-ballistic-missile system:

> I think this is a key question, because great emphasis has been given the ABM as being the only solution to this whole problem and one of the reasons we have been urged to reject this treaty by Dr. Teller and some others.
>
> Dr. YORK. Well, what I tried to say, Mr. Chairman, is that I doubt very much indeed, and I have testified in past years many times on this subject in the House and in the Senate that it is impossible to build an anti-ballistic-missile defense. If one is looking for salvation in that direction, one is looking in the wrong direction, the reason simply being the great advantage of offense over defense.
>
> It is the advantage of people working many years to try to develop penetration aids over a computer which must solve the problem in a matter of a few minutes.
>
> People really are smarter than computers. Computers do things faster. But planners who work on penetration aids can succeed, and can succeed with relative ease, and by relative ease I mean in terms of time or money, it is simply easier to build devices that will penetrate a ballistic missile than it is to build an antimissile which can cope with it.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. They can be more original, I take it, too, than computers.
>
> Dr. YORK. Yes, that is right. People as compared with computers.

Dr. York went on to discuss the entire subject of offensive capability.

We could discuss the subject for weeks. The President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of our country and has the primary responsibility as the Chief Executive for the policies which relate to defense and the security of our country, must seek advice on technical subjects. He does not seek advice on scientific questions from Democrats or from Republicans or from nonpartisans. He seeks advice from those he believes to be the best and most competent scientists in the Nation. The advice which two Presidents have received, including the advice of Dr. Teller, has added up to a policy decision by one President who is one of the greatest generals this country ever had, and who led this country to victory on the field of battle, and by another President, who has had to come to grips with some of the toughest postwar problems our country has ever had. The advice that those two men—President Eisenhower and President Kennedy—have received has led them to what conclusion? It has led them to the conclusion that the treaty is in our national interest and would lend itself to the fulfillment of our national objectives. They have listened to the point of view and advice of the opposition as well as to the advice of those with whom they find themselves in more receptive relationship.

Dr. Foster, who is now the head of the Livermore Laboratories, came in with doubts about the treaty and I believe expressed his opposition to it. Dr. Bradbury came in from Los Alamos. He is for the treaty. The President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, both of whom have asked the Congress for billions of dollars more for defense, are confronted with the question. Remember that we are spending approximately $10 billion more for defense this year than we did in 1960. President Kennedy has not said, "Let us pretend that the world is a jolly place and everybody is happy." President Kennedy has not said, "We get along well with the Russians. Let us lay down our arms and enjoy a happy picnic." No. This is a President who has had to face the Soviets in Cuba and in Berlin.

He has listened to the testimony of those who are worried about various things. He has listened to those who maintain that the anti-ballistic-missile system of the Soviets will overwhelm us. He has listened to the testimony of others. The President, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Secretary of State, and those who preceded them in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, have all come out on one side of the issue. They have said that a treaty banning nuclear tests in these environments in outer space, under water, and in the atmosphere is in our national interest.

I cannot help believing that such a body of testimony merits our favorable consideration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask one additional question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Dr. Teller also argued that it would be possible for the Russians technically to abide by the treaty, while violating its obvious spirit, by having explosions a few feet or perhaps a few inches underground. These would be large explosions which would test out their hardened missile sites, something we very much want to do but have not yet done. We would not conduct the same tests because we are more conservative in applying the terms of the treaty. While such tests might not be a technical violation, obviously they would violate the spirit of the treaty. The tests would scatter all kinds of radioactivity in the air.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I did not see Dr. Teller's assertion of that point in his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, earlier he testified to that effect before another committee. His testimony was printed in the New York Times.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I read it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wonder if the interpretation of the treaty makes clear that any explosion a foot or perhaps a couple of feet below the surface of the earth would be a violation of the treaty? It makes all the sense in the world that it should be, because it would scatter radioactive materials over the earth, and such tests would violate the purpose of the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly. The Senator has answered his own question. A definition of an underground test was entered into the report and appears on page 22 of the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire definition as printed in the report be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the definition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFINITION OF UNDERGROUND TEST

The Secretary was asked if agreed criteria had been established to determine what constitutes an underground test. This is a complicated question; very shallow subsurface tests may be more productive in terms of knowledge gained than deeper tests, and they are obviously cheaper. Secretary Rusk replied:

"There are potentially, looking ahead over the years, potentially many dozens, perhaps even hundreds, of contingencies which might develop through technical advance or otherwise, which I think could not be spelled out in detail in such a treaty; it would even be, I think, unwise to attempt to spell this out in the enormous detail that would be required to try to anticipate all those things that we could think about now because we would almost certainly not think about some that are going to arise with technical advance.

"Now * * * obviously this treaty permits a clear underground test where the explosion is underground, where the testing apparatus is based on that phenomenon, and I would think that we would not think that it applied to a surface explosion which was christened by a few shovelfuls of dirt.

"If these marginal things occur or any pretense is made with respect to it we will know about them and we will be able to take whatever action is necessary in our own security, either with respect to insisting that it be stopped or the treaty collapses or * * * resuming our own freedom of action."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Secretary said:

> Obviously this treaty permits a clear underground test where the explosion is underground, where the testing apparatus is based on that phenomenon, and I would think that we would not think that it applied to a surface explosion which was christened by a few shovelfuls of dirt.
>
> If these marginal things occur or any pretense is made with respect to it we will know about them and we will be able to take whatever action is necessary in our own security, either with respect to insisting that it be stopped or the treaty collapses or * * * resuming our own freedom of action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We would regard that as a violation of the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be regarded as a violation of the treaty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point is clearly understood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Science for the Defense Department, went into that question. The discussion is found on page 551 of the hearings. In part, it was as follows:

> Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, Dr. Brown, as I recall, and I think one other witness was very emphatic that we should have ground rules as to what is meant by "underground."
>
> Have you, as the Director of Science for the Defense Department, gone into that question at all and is any effort being made to determine what constitutes an underground test?
>
> Dr. BROWN. This is, of course, partly a legal question, Senator SALTONSTALL. From the technical point of view, I think what I can say is that any test, any large test, that is not underground will be detected as not being underground, and so then it is a matter of what policy the United States wants to adopt. I would view a test that put most of its energy into the atmosphere as an atmospheric test and it would be detected as such, and so I would assume, as the Secretary of Defense said, that a clearly atmospheric test is illegal, even if there is a foot of dirt over it. But from the technical point of view, I have said all I can say on an expert basis.

What it boils down to is that Dr. Brown said that if the test should spew up debris, the explosion spreads the debris in the atmosphere outside the borders of the nation holding the test; that is an atmospheric test and not an underground test.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I add, if the Senator will yield, that the language of article I(b) of the treaty is quite clear on this point. If any of the radioactive debris "be present outside the territorial limits of the State" the explosion is covered. If the explosion were close to the surface, it would be almost certain to have that effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The air currents would carry the debris.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That language would take care of it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Except that in a territory as large as the territory of the Soviet Union it is possible that this might be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is possible, but improbable. It depends upon the winds and the location.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is making a very helpful contribution to the record. We have now been able to put into the record the full comment by the Secretary of State and the definition given by Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering for the Department of Defense, that an explosion which was subsurface with a modest covering, in which the debris went into the atmosphere, would be considered to be an atmospheric explosion. This would leave the United States free to make its own decision as to the most appropriate U.S. response.

One advantage with respect to the treaty is that it leaves the matter of what we believe to be in our national interest to our own decision. It is true that it leaves that decision to the other parties, also, but we have always been concerned lest the Soviet Union exercise some kind of veto over the inspection arrangements. That has been eliminated in the treaty.

It is generally understood in the scientific community that our inspection and detection system is far superior to that of any other nation in the world. With the scientific apparatus we now have—seismic, acoustical, and electronic, plus our regular areas of intelligence information, I believe a test of the nature which the Senator has described as a limited subsurface test would be detected, and would give us grounds for any action we wished to take. I believe we are fully protected.

The Senator's questions have made the record much clearer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Arkansas for their very helpful responses. They have enlightened me as to portions of the treaty and the testimony which has been given about the treaty.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to pursue, with a few questions, the subject raised by the Senator from Wisconsin.

I believe the great concern of those who oppose the treaty is related chiefly to the fear that the Soviet Union may have acquired, or may acquire in the future, by clandestine tests, information which we may not have about the effects of nuclear bursts, which would enable the Soviet Union to develop an antiballistic missile or a communications blackout. I am sure that is the concern of all Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The thing which impressed me most about the testimony of Dr. Brown was that he discussed fully and openly both favorable and unfavorable factors. We must differentiate between the information the Soviet Union may have already acquired and the information it might be able to acquire if it were able to test without the tests being discovered.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin to page 530 of the hearings, in the testimony of Dr. Brown, in which he states his judgment about the tests which have already been undertaken both by the Soviet Union and by the United States. The subject is "U.S.-U.S.S.R. High Altitude Tests Comparable." Dr. Brown states:

> With respect to high altitude tests carried out for the purpose of determining the effects of nuclear bursts on communications blackout, radar blackout, and nuclear weapons vulnerability, Soviet and United States experience appears to be comparable.
>
> Each side has had about the same number of tests, over yield ranges and altitude ranges which are comparable though not identical; the number of nuclear tests carried out by related missile tests appears to be about the same although different techniques for making the measurements were used by the two countries.
>
> Enough has been learned by the United States, to verify the existence, nature, and rough independence of blackout characteristics on yield and on altitude, although important details still have not been explored. The same is probably true in the Soviet Union on the basis of the tests which they have done.
>
> Probably neither side understands the various phenomena sufficiently well to permit theoretical extension with complete confidence to some other altitudes, yields, and types of devices; but we have, and presumably the Soviets also have, enough information to enable us to take steps to design around our uncertainties.

That is a statement by Dr. Brown that our tests with respect to communications blackout and radar blackout are comparable to those of the Soviet Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Is the testimony by Dr. Brown contradicted by testimony of other scientists?

Mr. HUMPHREY. His testimony has been substantiated by the testimony of other scientists. Earlier today I read the testimony of the famous Dr. Kistiakowsky, who said that he considered Dr. Brown to be the foremost expert in this area and the most knowledgeable man, because he had available to him the most up-to-date information, including scientific and intelligence information. Dr. York also testified along similar lines.

Mr. COOPER. I note in the statement that Dr. Brown says that our tests are comparable with respect to communications blackout and radar blackout, but he does not say that they are comparable with respect to nuclear weapons vulnerability. I assume such tests relate to an antiballistic missile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. A little later in the statement, at the bottom of page 530, after the paragraphs which relate to the "treaty's effect on development of ABM" Dr. Brown stated:

> In summary, my best judgment and the judgment of those of us who have the responsibility for antimissile development and those who have the responsibility for making intelligence estimates on Soviet missile elements, is that our ABM developments efforts are comparable in magnitude and in success with those of the Soviets. Any deployed system which the Soviets are likely to have now or in the near future does not appear to be as effective, almost certainly not more effective, than Nike-Zeus.

Mr. COOPER. Dr. Brown stated that in the three areas of communications blackout, radar blackout, and ABM development, the tests which the United States has conducted, though they may be different, are comparable in magnitude and success with the tests conducted by the Soviets. It this correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I think it is important, as does the Senator from Wisconsin, and all other Senators, that every fact be brought out in the debate, whether it is favorable or unfavorable, because we must consider every factor in determining the effect of the treaty on the security of our country.

In the statement made by General LeMay, he said he was not satisfied with the tests that had been undertaken by the United States. Would the Senator say that Dr. Brown, in his position, has access to every fact, every bit of information, in connection with these tests, and also, because of his scientific background and training, has the capacity to evaluate the tests, in a way superior to that of General LeMay? This is a difficult question, but I would like an opinion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I could not say whether or not he would have more than General LeMay, although I believe in the scientific field he would be in a better position to evaluate the scientific aspects. With relation to the scientific witnesses, there is no doubt that Dr. Brown was in a more advantageous position. In this connection, I wish to read the testimony of Dr. Kistiakowsky as it appears at page 855 of the hearings. Dr. Kistiakowsky said:

> I am not really intimately familiar with this important problem in all its technical details.

And he was referring to the ABM problem——

> Neither have been most of the other witnesses who have been heard. I would therefore urge that the committee give special weight to the testimony of Harold Brown, who, to my knowledge, is the only witness so far heard who can speak with real authority regarding the total ABM problem, and the related developments in offensive systems. He has access to all of the intelligence regarding Soviet activities and all of the expertise in the United States on our future capabilities that relate to the problem.

When Dr. Brown was before our committee, I asked the same question relating to this very point. I put the question directly to Dr. Brown. It was a little embarrassing and difficult for me to do it, but I thought we had to get down to cases. I read from page 578 of the hearings:

> Senator HUMPHREY. There is not any expertise on these matters and, may I say with all due respect to all the men who appeared before this committee, many men are making what are, I believe, statements which are not scientific facts. They have to deduce from certain facts that they have, and they have to presume and assume and say, "I believe and I hope or I would imagine" and I believe and I imagine that it will accelerate the arms race.

Here is the question:

> Finally, did Dr. Teller have access to information that is not available to you?
>
> Dr. BROWN. No, I do not believe so.
>
> Senator HUMPHREY. Does he have access to all the information that is available to you, intelligence information as well?
>
> Dr. BROWN. I believe not. In fact, I know not.
>
> Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, you have access to all the information that is available to Dr. Teller and there is no limitation upon your getting that information?
>
> Dr. BROWN. I have access to intelligence, not only to intelligence information that, I believe, that I know, is not available to him, Senator HUMPHREY, but I also have the benefit, and I believe it is a benefit, in drawing my conclusions not only on my years as a weapons laboratory member and director, but on my subsequent experience here considering the broad military research and development problems and the military capabilities involved in such matters as antiballistic missiles, missile design, and so on, which are part of my responsibility as Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Mr. COOPER. This is one of the points I wished to bring out. I recognize that our military leaders and scientists have individual views, but I thought it important to put in the RECORD that Dr. Brown had stated categorically in his testimony that the tests which had been carried out both by the United States and the Soviet Union, with respect to blackout and to nuclear weapon vulnerability connected with an ABM system, were comparable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I also had known that Dr. Kistiakowsky, who as the Senator said, was the scientific adviser to President Eisenhower, had testified that in his judgment Dr. Brown had more information upon all aspects of the antiballistic missile situation than any other person.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was his testimony.

Mr. COOPER. I make this statement because I think it bolsters the credibility, if it should be questioned, of the testimony of Dr. Brown. I think, also, that we must point out all the favorable and unfavorable factors relating both to tests which might have been made and to the possibility of tests by the Soviet Union.

As I read his testimony, Dr. Brown has stated that any attempt by the Soviet Union to conduct secret tests under water or in the atmosphere, of any size and scope, could be detected. I believe he stated, however, that there was a possibility that the Soviet Union could conduct tests of low yield, very near the surface, which might not be detected. I assume that would be because it might not be possible to determine whether they were underground or just above the ground.

He also said it might be possible to conduct a limited number of tests, of low yield, in the upper atmosphere, at heights of 10 to 20 kilometers, without detection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I said earlier, that is within the realm of possibility. I urge that Senators heed the suggestion of the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and read the secret testimony that was given by Dr. Northrup, if they have doubts on this point. This happens to be one of the most sensitive areas of our scientific knowledge. We have made improvements in our scientific system of detection. I do not think it would be well for me to do more than to suggest that Senators review the testimony within the confines of the committee room. Many of the Senators' doubts will be set at rest.

Mr. COOPER. Not doubts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Concerns.

Mr. COOPER. I am raising these questions because I think they should be raised. I believe Dr. Brown said it would be possible, for a time, at least until we had developed a satellite system, for the Soviet Union to conduct tests in outer space without discovery.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To the scientific mind all such things are possible. The problem is, How do we pay for them? That is a bit of a problem, even in a rich country like the United States. I think this point was alluded to in some testimony of other witnesses. We now know, for example, theoretically, that space platforms can be established, but the costs are tremendous, and it is a question of the commitment of resources, both human and material, to such projects. Furthermore, we have made decided improvements in the detection of explosions in outer space. The explosions that are rather difficult to detect in outer space are those many millions of miles, hundreds of millions of miles, away from earth.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator knows the purpose of my question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know. I want the record to be clear on this point. The Senator is pointing out potential risks, in a helpful discussion. I agree that we ought to get these matters into the public record. We ought to understand exactly what this treaty would and would not do. We ought to understand that without the treaty all the risks are still present, even to a greater degree.

Mr. COOPER. I believe it was made clear that if the tests were conducted in outer space, there could not be a blast. Therefore the effects of a nuclear blast could not be studied, and it would be purely a question of interception. Dr. Brown pointed out that there are inhibitions against this risk. First, there is the definite possibility of detection, and a second is cost. A third is that a good deal of the information that might be obtained from such tests could be obtained from underground testing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He emphasized that point. At page 541 of the hearings there appears Dr. Brown's testimony relating to his personal judgment on the extent of cheating that is possible and the funds and effort that have gone into the program of detection and monitoring of these situations. Later in his testimony Dr. Brown states:

> But in the worst possible case—that is, assuming as much cheating as I can possibly believe would go undetected with any confidence—I do not believe that the Soviets could obtain any substantial military gain relative to the United States compared with the situation in which both sides test without restriction.
>
> I do not believe that the Soviets can impair to an important degree our strategic superiority.
>
> I believe that such gains would be small.

He then lists the reasons why he feels the gains would be small.

Finally he points out:

> The limited effect of the treaty on our strategic superiority means that the benefits to our security in the broader sense, which Secretaries Rusk and McNamara have discussed in detail, will not be outweighed by the military-technological factors.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct to say that most of the scientists argued that even with the possibility of these risks, the greatest advance in nuclear weapons can be made in the penetrating weapons; that is, there are greater possibilities in offensive weapons than in the development of antiballistic missiles.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I believe all the scientific witnesses, except one or two, agreed to that point. We have the testimony of Dr. Bradbury, Dr. York, Dr. Kistiakowsky, Dr. Brown, and several others; and they all emphasized the advantages to be found in the offensive type of weapon and the improvement of the means of penetration.

Dr. Brown was questioned rather meticulously and specifically by the chairman of the committee with respect to the probable knowledge in the antiballistic missile area as it relates to the Soviet Union and the United States. The chairman asked Dr. Brown:

> The Chairman. Dr. Brown, do you think that the Soviets are more advanced in the realm of knowledge relevant to antimissile systems than we are?
>
> Dr. Brown. I do not. I think that we are roughly comparable. If I were forced to say one side or the other is ahead on knowledge, I would say that we were, but I don't think that is a very firm statement on my part.
>
> A better judgment, I think, is that we are about equal. I feel rather strongly that they are not substantially ahead of us, and I can adduce, I think, several reasons or examples of why I believe that is true.
>
> The Soviets have said that they have intercepted a missile with a missile.

That testimony is found at pages 542 and 543 of the hearings.

This witness, whom I must accept as a highly qualified witness, gave us the impression that in the area of knowledge of antiballistic missiles, we were about equal with the Soviet Union.

At page 542, Dr. Brown said:

> Having satisfied myself as completely as is humanly possible that the proposed treaty cannot substantially impair our strategic superiority if we take the steps which we can to continue our nuclear developments and remain prepared, and that indeed, it could enhance our strategic superiority compared with unlimited testing, I find the arguments for it on broader grounds persuasive, and I fully support its ratification.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has emphasized something which needs to be emphasized, that all of the types of tests which we are concerned may take place surreptitiously could occur openly if the treaty is not ratified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I believe the Senator will be reassured by one other statement, at page 273 of the hearings. In the conclusions reached by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, there is this conclusion:

> In the antiballistic missile field, development of the U.S. system does not depend on atmospheric testing and hence this treaty will not significantly influence any imbalance that may exist.

I point this out because the treaty relates to warheads and explosions, and does not relate to radar and computers and electronic devices, and so forth, all of which are part of an effective missile system.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff say:

> In the antiballistic missile field, development of the U.S. system does not depend on atmospheric testing and hence this treaty will not significantly influence any imbalance that may exist.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff did not draw the conclusion as to an imbalance that may exist, but they said it was not necessary to have atmospheric tests, the need for which had been referred to by one or two other witnesses prior to that time.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his questions. I hope that the discussion between us is worthy of the attention of our colleagues in the Senate and of the people of the country. We are trying to have the record made clear, so that the people may know what the treaty means and what its impact should be on our foreign policy, upon our military policy, and upon our general national security policy.

Mr. COOPER. I have one further question to ask. Is there anything in the treaty which would prohibit the United States conducting antiballistic missile tests with missiles not armed with nuclear warheads; for example, to test their ability for interception?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is nothing in the treaty which in any way limits, inhibits, or prohibits the testing of rockets or missiles so long as such missiles and rockets do not involve the explosion of a nuclear warhead. We could use conventional TNT, for example.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I was thinking of an antiballistic missile without a nuclear warhead which could be used to achieve the interception of an enemy missile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I have been listening with great interest to the exchange between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Kentucky.

This exchange has prompted to mind the strong emphasis which has been given to the possible risk that might be encountered, in the event that tests were conducted millions of miles in space, or in some other improbable situation, which would provide questionable information to the tester, and which, in all likelihood, would be detected by mechanisms that we now have or can perfect. There has been so much straining at the gnat to find grounds for saying that there are risks involved in the treaty, that we are in danger of losing sight of the risks that we would doubtlessly face without the treaty. Some of these are military risks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The questions raised by the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] were not questions in the form of opposition, but were questions, as the Senator from Idaho well knows, related to getting information into the Record.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. In that connection, the Senator from Kentucky has performed a real service. Would the distinguished Senator from Minnesota permit me to read into the Record an exchange I had with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Taylor, on the question of military risks that would definitely face us, if we were to continue unrestricted testing in the absence of this treaty with the Soviet Union?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. My exchange with General Taylor, when he appeared before the committee, begins at page 309 and continues to the bottom of page 310 of the printed record of hearings:

> No Guarantee United States Would Always Be First if Testing Continued
>
> Senator Church. Let us assume that there were no treaty and that unrestricted nuclear weapons testing continued on both sides. If such testing were to continue, is there any guarantee that you know of that would assure us that we, our side, would always be first in achieving new technological breakthroughs?
>
> General Taylor. No, there is no such assurance that I know of.
>
> Senator Church. In fact, the Russians have shown considerable competence in this field, have they not?
>
> General Taylor. Yes. I think that either side, in concentrating on a single sector and putting great resources behind it, could probably forge ahead.
>
> Senator Church. Then one danger which has military significance in continuing the testing would be the possibility that it would be the Russians rather than ourselves, who might achieve some important new breakthrough in this technology?
>
> General Taylor. If we did not test. That was our great objection to the comprehensive test ban treaty. We felt the Soviets could test clandestinely underground and we could not, and hence, there would be a serious difficulty.
>
> Senator Church. Yes. But even if we were both to test, as I understand your answer to my previous question, there is no guarantee——
>
> General Taylor. No positive guarantee.
>
> Senator Church. That the Russians might not be the first to achieve some significant breakthrough.
>
> General Taylor. Of course, I have personal confidence in our great scientific community, and am confident that we would make many or most of the breakthroughs, but I could not guarantee it.
>
> Senator Church. I do, too. Even our scientists would admit that there is no guarantee against this possibility. This would be one of the dangers we would have to face up to if we continued to test on both sides; is that not a fair statement?
>
> General Taylor. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator Church. Now, supposing that if both sides were to continue to test, it was the United States, as we would hope, that first achieved some important new technological advantage over the Soviet Union. Do you think it would be consistent with American policy or the mission of our Armed Forces, as you have stated that mission here today, to seize upon this advantage for the purpose of initiating some nuclear attack upon the Soviet Union?
>
> General Taylor. I can only point to the past when we had a complete monopoly in these weapons. We never contemplated such an attack then.
>
> Senator Church. That is right. When we had total advantage we did not contemplate nor initiate such an attack.
>
> General Taylor. That is right, sir.
>
> Senator Church. All right.
>
> Suppose the reverse. You have already indicated that it is a possibility that the Russians might make the first breakthrough, which would give them some new and important technological advantage over the United States. Assuming that, would you be confident that the Russians might not use this new-found advantage to imperil the security of this country or, perhaps, even to initiate an attack upon this country?
>
> General Taylor. I would say "no"; if it is possible to conceive of such a clear advantage that they could attack us without the certainty of a reprisal that would be completely

> destructive to them. Frankly, I cannot visualize that situation but obviously, one never visualizes all the possibilities of the future.
>
> Senator Church. But it is a possibility.
>
> General Taylor. As a conception, it could exist.
>
> Senator Church. And even if they were never to achieve through a new breakthrough so great or so preponderant an advantage, nevertheless, any substantial advance would be cause for concern with respect to our national security, would it not?
>
> General Taylor. Yes, sir; if made by the Soviets.
>
> Senator Church. Then, I see, General, that there are very definite military advantages for us which I think this exchange has spelled out, to limiting this testing at the present point, while our general position is a favorable one, and I want to thank you for your testimony.
>
> General Taylor. Thank you.

I think this exchange clearly demonstrates that there are no guarantees, should unrestricted testing continue, that the United States would always be first in achieving some new breakthrough that might give an advantage in the precarious balance of terror which is the nuclear arms race. It also demonstrates that one of the greatest risks of continuing such tests, in the absence of a treaty, would be that the Russian scientists, instead of our own scientists might pull ahead. After all, the Russians have demonstrated great competence in the field of nuclear research, in the field of nuclear warheads, in the field of space. Who can deny it? Therefore, I say that even from the military standpoint, a very strong argument can be made to the effect that the greater risk lies in rejecting the treaty, than in confining future testing to underground areas, where everyone concedes that the United States has had the most experience, is the most proficient, and is most likely, therefore, to keep ahead. The alternative is to expose us, it seems to me, to the very definite possibility of the kind of breakthrough that could one day give the Russians enormous leverage on the United States.

Since all the testimony before the committee indicated that our general nuclear position with respect to warheads, weapons systems, and technological knowledge, is favorable, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, the time to impose such a restriction upon testing is now. It seems to me that no better time is likely to come along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To my mind, the Senator's questioning of General Taylor was one of the most impressive cross-examinations I have witnessed in any committee. It brought forth information of great value to the committee. The Senator has read that cross-examination into the record. I am confident it did much to give a proper perspective to what we are discussing.

We repeatedly emphasize the risks involved in the treaty. There has been underemphasis of the risk in case there is no treaty. Several scientific witnesses testified to that effect, as well. The Senator from Idaho may again recall the testimony of Dr. York. I just noted in the record of the hearing some of that testimony on page 761. It fits in with what the cross-examination of General Taylor by the Senator from Idaho revealed. The testimony of Dr. York relates to the military power of the United States and the security of the United States.

Dr. York said:

> Ever since shortly after World War II, the military power of the United States has been steadily increasing; over the same period the national security of the United States has been rapidly and inexorably diminishing.
>
> In the early 1950's the Soviet Union, on the basis of its own sole unilateral decision, and if it had been willing to accept the inevitable retaliation, could have launched an attack against the United States with bombers carrying atomic or fission bombs.
>
> Some of these bombers would have penetrated our defenses and the number of American casualties would have been some millions.
>
> In the later 1950's, again on its own sole decision, and again if it had been willing to accept the inevitable massive retaliation, the Soviet Union could have launched an attack against the United States using more and better bombers, this time carrying hydrogen bombs.
>
> Some of these bombers would have penetrated our defenses and the number of American casualties could have been in the tens of millions.
>
> By the mid-1960's, the Soviet Union, again solely on the basis of its own decision, and again, if it were willing to accept the inevitable retaliation, could launch an attack upon the United States using intercontinental missiles and bombers carrying thermonuclear weapons.
>
> This time, the number of American casualties which would result from such an attack could be in the neighborhood of, perhaps, 100 million.
>
> This steady decrease in national security was not the result of any inaction on our part, but simply the result of the systematic exploitation of the products of modern science and technology by the Soviet Union.
>
> The air defenses we deployed during the 1950's would have reduced the number of casualties which we would have otherwise sustained, but their existence did not substantively modify this picture.
>
> Also, nothing else that we could have done in the defense area, but which for one reason or another we may not have done, would have significantly altered this picture further.
>
> I should add at this point that from the Soviet point of view the picture is similar, but much worse. The military power of the Soviet Union has, since it became an atomic power in 1949, been steadily increasing, but Soviet national security has been steadily decreasing.
>
> Hypothetically, the United States could unilaterally decide to destroy the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union would be absolutely powerless to prevent it; it could only, at best, seek to wreak revenge through whatever retaliatory capability it might have left.
>
> It is my view that the problem posed to both sides by this dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security has no technical solution. If we continue to look for solutions in the area of science and technology only, the result will be a steady and inexorable worsening of this situation.

Mr. President, Dr. York was saying that we did not spare on money. We poured hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars into our defense structure. We armed nations around the world. We have spent over $100 billion in foreign aid, most of it for military assistance. We have formed alliances. We have built the mightiest military machine the world has ever known. Today we have so much destructive power at our command that we could literally obliterate this earth.

But all that does not give us any security. Instead, we worry about whether the Soviets will get ahead of us. Today, we are more insecure that we were 10 years ago. So is the Soviet Union. We are spending money, at the rate of $14 million a minute, for arms throughout the world. This year we shall spend $135 billion for armaments throughout the world. Yet no one is more secure. We have given or spent several billion dollars in South Vietnam; yet that country is today no more secure. All over the world we find the same situation.

Dr. York was saying that something more than science and technology is required, in order to solve the problems of the world and to assure peace and security.

I read now from page 768 of the hearings:

> Senator Sparkman. You said the national security was diminishing while power, military power, was increasing. Do I understand correctly you mean that on both sides?
>
> Dr. York. Oh, yes.
>
> Senator Sparkman. Applicable to the U.S.S.R. as well as to the United States?
>
> Dr. York. Yes. It is worse in their case.
>
> Senator Sparkman. Would you elaborate on that?
>
> Dr. York. Yes. What I meant by that, and perhaps I have taken a somewhat special definition of national security, what I meant by that is what one side could do to another of its own sole volition and despite anything which the other side did; and, as I said, as time has gone on, the capability of the U.S.S.R. to unilaterally inflict damage on the United States, despite anything we might do, has steadily increased.
>
> Senator Sparkman. And vice versa?
>
> Dr. York. Similarly, the capability of the United States to inflict damage on the Soviet Union, despite anything the Soviet Union could do, has increased, and it has been worse from their point of view than ours; that is, what we could do to them has always been more severe than what they could do to us. We have always been way ahead of them in this matter.
>
> Senator Sparkman. Would a partial test ban treaty such as is proposed before us have an adverse effect on us or would it have any effect on them?
>
> Dr. York. It would, all by itself, at most, slightly diminish the rate at which our national security is diminishing.

Mr. President, we should study that statement by one of the world's foremost scientists.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the Senator has reached the crux of the situation, and I am very glad he stresses that point. I believe that too many try to "oversell" what the treaty will do. What Dr. York said—and he was right about it—is that the treaty would, at most, "slightly diminish the rate—at which our national security is diminishing."

In other words, we still will tend to lose our national security, as will the U.S.S.R., also. In short, this treaty is not the end of the arms race.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it is not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It slightly diminishes it; it slows it down. But it does not end it. So I believe that what the Senator is stressing is most important. Dr. York said the treaty will diminish the rate at which our national security is diminishing. It will not remove the need for further steps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin please read Dr. York's testimony on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. He said:

> If it leads to other steps in the same or similar directions, other steps in arms control and disarmament it might actually reverse this present trend. I mean, I think it would reverse it if we went far enough.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe Dr. York has given us one of the most thoughtful presentations—in terms of what is really happening to national security—that was given by any witness who came before us.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One point is bothering me a great deal, and I hope the Senator can help me on it. Dr. John S. Foster, who, I understand, is director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, at Livermore, Calif., and is considered to be one of the top men in this field, testified about what the treaty will do to our scientific capabilities, in terms of continuing to develop our skills in this area; and he testified against the treaty. I shall read brief excerpts from pages 614 and 615:

> In science just as in other specialties, one must practice continually to be effective. Ultimately the present generation of weapons technologists must be replaced by younger scientists who, through experiments and theoretical studies, will also develop the required skills. With a not too restrictive underground program I believe we can maintain our capability in warhead design.
>
> Without atmospheric tests, however, I doubt that we can develop and maintain the requisite skill in the important area of the effects of nuclear weapons.
>
> Even our theoretical effort in this area is likely to deteriorate without the incentive of meaningful experiments.
>
> Missile systems for offense or defense are extremely complex, yet must function not only under the ideal laboratory conditions in which they are usually tested, but also under the most adverse conditions—those of nuclear war.
>
> I know of simpler systems which have not performed as expected—or which have actually failed—when proof-tested in environments which are far better understood than that of a hostile nuclear situation.

On page 616 he concludes:

> To put it simply, the burden on the technical community is to provide the technology needed to maintain the military security of the United States in the face of both the secrecy of the Soviet Union and the explosive growth of scientific knowledge.

That is what makes the situation so difficult.

> Were it not for Soviet secrecy, we could—through continual assessment of their capability—determine what level of arms would be necessary to preserve our security.

Now I am skipping. Continuing—

> Moreover, we have to reckon with the fact that in an expanding technology vigorously pursued, there frequently result abrupt increases in scientific knowledge—rapidly reflected in military capability—which could upset the balance of power.
>
> While we cannot guarantee even without restrictions that these abrupt increases will occur on our side, it seems clear that we must provide a scientific climate which will not discourage such developments.
>
> The proposed treaty would limit not only our knowledge of the actual state of Soviet military development, but would also restrict our knowledge of what may even be technically possible. Specifically, this requires that the United States explore vigorously all areas of technology critical to our security. Failure to do this would add to the uncertainties concerning our relative strength, and force us to choose between either an increase in risk to our security or a further increase in our level of armament.
>
> Thus, from purely technical-military considerations, the proposed treaty appears to me disadvantageous.

That statement came from Dr. Foster, who is the head of the Livermore Laboratory. Perhaps the man most responsible in this Nation for giving us the superior of nuclear research that will protect our national security. He did not stress so much in his testimony though it seems to me to be very important—that we rely in our free system not only on monetary incentives but, more important, prestige, and even more important than that, opportunities for scientists to test and develop their skills and to make all kinds of breakthroughs in their areas without limitations on knowledge. On the other hand, the Soviet Union can command its scientific manpower, directing it and channeling it, because it is an authoritarian society. It seems to me that possibly in this area we have a very serious problem.

Dr. Foster has opposed the treaty. I understand that he operates for the agency that controls Plowshare as well as some vital military experiments. It seems to me that when we couple that with the fact that the Soviet Union has an advantage in directing and controlling their scientific manpower, the treaty might have some disadvantage for us. What is the Senator's answer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Dr. Seaborg responded to that question in relation to that very concern. Dr. Seaborg discussed it in his testimony. It was also discussed by Dr. Kistiakowsky. Dr. Kistiakowsky pointed out that during the moratorium period, which lasted a little over 2 years, there was no letdown in our scientific efforts. The team of scientists was maintained. Our laboratory facilities were increased. The number of scientists was expanded.

Dr. Seaborg also pointed out to us that it is the express contention that responsible officials of our Government, if the Congress will lend its cooperation and maintain laboratories, expand, develop and modernize facilities, will engage in underground testing to the degree that is needed—all of which will give scientific minds the opportunity for a good deal of experimentation. But I also add that the treaty is limited to nuclear explosions in the three environments listed—outer space, under water, and in the atmosphere. It does not apply to underground testing. It does not apply to laboratory experimentation. We shall be able to test missiles. We shall be able to test as to the effect of weapons, and to test certain sized weapons underground.

The judgment has been properly made that while the treaty imposes some limitations upon scientific inquiry in terms of analysis of weapons effect and analysis of explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, those are offset by the gains which are obtained in attempting to find some solution to our international problems—slowing down the arms race, inhibiting or slowing down the proliferation of weapons, slowing down, inhibiting, or preventing fallout of radioactive debris. All those concerns must be added up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With some modesty, I should like to inject into the RECORD the announcement that tomorrow, after our policy meeting, which will be roughly at 2 o'clock, I hope to obtain the floor and make some remarks on the treaty. At that time I expect to disclose the contents of a letter from the President of the United States with respect to certain misgivings and concerns that were entertained by some Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the minority leader for that announcement. We are looking forward to the letter from the President. I know that the minority leader and the majority leader have made a real contribution to the proper discussion of the treaty by their visit with the President and obtaining that statement from the President himself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My good friend the Senator from Minnesota went to Russia in relation to the treaty. On television I saw his report with Martin Agronsky about his connection with the treaty. I should like to ask the Senator a question about his trip to Gorky Park and his discussion of the problem with the Russians: Was that female blonde interpreter a Russian or an American?

Mr. HUMPHREY. She is the wife of an American political officer at the American Embassy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. She is an American?

Mr. HUMPHREY. She certainly is; and is very proud to be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to hear that. My general impression is that the Senator obtained more publicity out of his connection with Mr. Khrushchev than anyone else in the American Government. Can my friend state anyone in American history who has ever had more publicity in Life, Time magazine, and, in general, from his connections with the Russians and Mr. Khrushchev in particular, than the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have never tried to keep an accurate record of press clippings. But I have one unique distinction. The Premier of the Soviet Union, at one of the Communist Party conclaves a couple of years ago, took time out to denounce me as a vicious anti-Communist. He added a few other little adjectives.

I have always felt that if one travels and has an opportunity to visit with the people, and particularly the leaders as well as the citizenry of the countries, it can be of some advantage to the cause of freedom. The advantages in a rather closed society, such as the Soviet Union, are rather limited. I did have a wonderful experience in Gorky Park. Mrs. Humphrey and I journeyed there. We visited with a number of Soviet citizens and I tried to tell them the truth about America. I found considerable interest in the subject of the nuclear test ban treaty. I can honestly say that I found no hostility toward the United States.

The Senator may recall that in my report to the Senate I said that one of the things I found in the Soviet Union was the growth of a new force called the consumer. I believe I was one of the first to report that in this country. Now, I am happy to say, the newspapers are carrying headline stories such as "Lack of Quality in Goods Cited by Red Press."

I am not a newspaper reporter, nor a columnist, but I can ask questions. I did ask questions. I visited with the people. I looked at the stores. I found that the people were discontended about the quality and quantity of goods available. The pressures of consumer demand have been cited by many experts as contributing to Mr. Khrushchev's interest in the test ban.

I feel that these visits have been worthwhile. I would not wish to overestimate their value. One surely cannot learn too much in a short period of time, but one will not learn anything unless he tries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I say to the Senator, those people like you; they do not like me.

Frankly, if they like the Senator, I suggest that the Senator should be careful. If they like him, they may think they can captivate him or get close to him.

A man from the Russian Embassy came to see me last week. What he had to say was parallel to what the Senator has been saying. My reaction to this is, we cannot trust those men. I do not care how much we would like to think—and the whole world like to believe—that they are no longer bent on murder and capturing the world; the point is, when we look at them, we must keep in mind that we are not looking at Red Ridinghood's grandmother, but we are looking at the wolf that ate Red Ridinghood's grandmother.

We must be careful. Those characters have only one thing in mind, and that is to control the whole world. They have only one question in their quarrel with the Chinese Communists, and that is, "Which way can we better eat them up?"

Frankly, that is the whole dispute. The Russians have to prove to the Chinese Communists that they can destroy us better by this method than by the Chinese method. The Chinese says, "We must lose the life of the world to do it." The Russians say, "Oh, no; we can do this in a better way." The only way they can justify this position, under the Communist doctrine, is to prove that they can destroy the United States quicker and faster by their method.

I should like to ask my good friend a question about how they are to prove this. Why should we permit them to face their Communist allies and say that this is the best way to destroy free government? How can these people prove to their Communist allies that they will destroy free government better in this way, by ratifying the treaty?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator will remain in the Chamber, I will answer his question. Basically, I do not disagree with him. I do not think the Soviets have signed the treaty because they suddenly saw the light of peace, love, and kindness. I do not believe this means they have given up their effort to have the Communists dominate the world or to bury us. They may have a different shovel in mind.

I do not think they have made up their minds that they should ease off the contest; but, if they get the United States of America into an arms race only, forgetting the other aspects of life—the economic, cultural, educational, and other aspects—they may very well bury us.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is the point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We must prepare ourselves on all fronts, instead of going around playing "cops and robbers." There may be something else in the world. But we must not be lulled into a false sense of security.

If the Senator will permit, I should like to proceed with my statement. I have been yielding to Senators all afternoon. I would like to complete my presentation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will my friend permit me to ask one more question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Those fellows have given the Senator from Minnesota a billion dollars' worth of publicity. They have given the Senator more than anybody else on earth has received.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is speaking of Time, Life, and Fortune, I hope.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not admit that those people own all the intelligence in America.

I ask my friend, Is it not true that the Russians want the treaty? They have nothing to lose and everything to gain by the United States ratifying the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator will permit me, I will answer that question. I think I have an answer to it. We both have something to gain, I believe, and both countries in this instance have something to lose if the treaty is not ratified.

Mr. President, I should like to make some comments with reference to the risk of secret preparations and surprise abrogation of the nuclear test ban treaty by the Soviet Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he gets too far away from the question about which the Senator from Wisconsin was inquiring a while ago?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer to the maintenance of a state of readiness of our laboratories. The Senator from Minnesota correctly quoted Dr. Kistiakowsky as saying that during the moratorium our laboratories actually were expanded, in terms of numbers of scientists. I invite attention to the exact wording, because I think it is quite relevant. Dr. Kistiakowsky said that the laboratories increased both in quantity and in quality. In other words, there was not only an expansion of physical facilities, but also an increase in the quality of personnel and the type of work being done by them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator will remember that Dr. Kistiakowsky gave a figure with reference to testing prior to the explosion of the first bomb at Alamogordo. He said there were more than 10,000 laboratory tests and projects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He used that as an example of the importance of the laboratory, even apart from the testing. For the benefit of the Senator from Wisconsin, if he would like to read that portion of Dr. Kistiakowsky testimony, he will find it on pages 866 and 867 of the hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of the matter of the risk of secret preparations and surprise abrogation of the nuclear test ban treaty by the Soviet Union. There are some who are deeply concerned about it.

The risk of secret preparations for tests in the atmosphere and surprise abrogation of the nuclear test ban by the Soviet Union is one of the risks which we will assume when we enter into the treaty. I believe that the Soviet Union has entered into this treaty with the present intention of adhering to it. The treaty presently rests upon a mutuality of interests between ourselves and the Soviet Union in the avoidance of thermonuclear war, in the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons and in the reduction of radioactive fallout. Although a common interest does exist in these areas at present, a time may come in the future when the Soviet leadership may conclude that the treaty is no longer in their interests. We must be prepared for that eventuality.

In that event, there would be several courses of action the Soviets might pursue. We must be prepared for all of them. The Soviets could prepare in secret for an extensive series of tests in the atmosphere and then suddenly abrogate the treaty. Or they could attempt a program of clandestine tests in the atmosphere or in space. A third course would be for them to secretly prepare for a large-scale series of atmospheric tests while at the same time conducting very small clandestine tests with limited objectives in the atmosphere which they might feel had a good chance of escaping detection.

On balance, I think it is more likely that, if the Soviets decided that continued observance of the treaty was no longer in their interests they would secretly prepare and then openly abrogate the treaty on some pretext rather than make a concentrated effort to cheat. The risk of getting caught would not be worthwhile running in these circumstances. Moreover, prior Soviet conduct in bringing the 1958 to 1961 moratorium to an end would indicate such a course of action was probable.

The risks to our security from a sudden abrogation of the treaty by the Soviets are derived primarily from the leadtime the Soviets would gain over our own testing. The magnitude of this risk has been carefully weighed by the responsible officials of the Government. During the course of the hearings on the treaty before the Foreign Relations Committee, we heard extensive testimony by these officials concerning both the magnitude of the risks involved and the steps that would be taken to reduce them.

We have discussed this aspect this afternoon, and the RECORD of today is filled with quotations from the witnesses on this subject.

The President has assured the Nation that we will ourselves maintain a high state of readiness to resume testing in the atmosphere. In his television address on July 26, he announced:

> Secret preparations for a sudden withdrawal are possible, and, thus, our own vigilance and strength must be maintained, as we remain ready to withdraw and to resume all forms of testing, if we must.

In his message transmitting the treaty to the Senate the President stated:

> We will be ready to resume testing in the atmosphere if necessary.

Those testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, all indicated our determination to maintain a readiness to resume testing in the atmosphere. Secretary McNamara stated to the Committee on August 13:

> We have the determination to retain a readiness to test in every relevant environment. This is a firm national policy. Its existence will not only render the risk of abrogation minimal, but will also constitute a strong deterrent to abrogation.

I think it is important to emphasize both these aspects of the problem. Our own readiness to resume testing will in the first place act as a deterrent to sudden abrogation by the Soviets since there would be little to be gained by them. Second, this will minimize the risk to our security in the event the deterrent failed.

Based on this firm national policy of maintaining our own readiness to resume testing in the atmosphere, the Secretary of Defense has indicated that we should be able to conduct proof tests within 2 months from the decision to test, development tests within 3 months, and effects tests within 6 months. Therefore, we may safely conclude that the leadtime which the Soviets would gain by a sudden abrogation of the treaty would not in any way jeopardize our national security.

In spite of repeated and detailed assurances by the responsible administration officials and notwithstanding the unanimous conclusion of these same officials, concurred in by the Foreign Relations Committee, that the possible risks from secret preparations and sudden resumption of atmospheric tests by the Soviets were no reason for rejection of the treaty, we still hear of fears expressed on this subject. Perhaps these fears are prompted by our previous painful experience with the 1958–61 testing moratorium. However, the Soviet action in ending the moratorium at that time did not jeopardize our security. The Soviets resumed testing in the atmosphere on September 1, 1961. We resumed testing ourselves underground on September 15, 1961—a matter of only 2 weeks after the Soviets resumed testing. Then, after evaluating the results of the Soviet atmospheric series conducted in the fall of 1961 we carried out our own very successful series of atmospheric tests commencing April 5, 1962.

However, it is time for any fears, real or imagined, about what we can and will do to keep our guard up, to be finally laid to rest. The situation that existed at the end of the moratorium and as it will exist under the treaty are not the same. In the first place, under the treaty we will have a continued program of underground testing. It will be much easier for us to keep the weapons laboratories ready to resume testing in the atmosphere when they are still able to conduct tests underground than when no tests at all were permitted. Moreover, the administration has stated that the continuing laboratory programs will include development of those devices which may at some time require atmospheric testing. The laboratories will be encouraged to carry their ideas and studies to the point where final construction of the device to be tested can be achieved in a time comparable to the time necessary to implement an actual atmospheric test should such tests be authorized. Second, maintenance of a condition of readiness to resume atmospheric testing will, under the treaty, be a declared and open national policy. This was not the case during the moratorium. With such a policy in effect it will be much easier to take the steps necessary to maintain a high state of readiness.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, in a letter dated August 23 to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, stated that these steps will include improvement of test support facilities, the provision for an airborne nuclear test capability, provision for a high altitude nuclear effects test capability, and the maintenance intact of the AEC and Defense Department test organizations.

I am aware that President Kennedy on a previous occasion indicated that an atmospheric test ban would be vulnerable unless it included provision for inspection to guard against secret preparations for a surprise abrogation. Moreover, the President emphasized at that time the difficulties of keeping topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of experiments which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future.

These remarks were made early in 1962, shortly after the Soviet had completed an extensive series of atmospheric tests. They were in reply to critics who were opposing the resumption of atmospheric tests by the United States. They were also an attempt to forestall a possible Soviet proposal for a moratorium on atmospheric tests just before we resumed such tests ourselves.

I remember speaking in the Senate on that very subject, warning that once the Soviets had completed their tests, they would try to appeal to world public opinion and to the United Nations, saying, "Let us have no further tests," and try to foreclose us, by public opinion, from conducting tests. There were voices raised in the United States against testing. I was one of those who urged that testing be started, despite the Soviet trick of appealing to the world, or to the United Nations, or other instrumentalities, against our resumption of tests.

One of the reasons why the President made the statement he did was to alert the American people as to the importance of our resumption of tests.

The situation is far different now than it was in 1962:

We have completed a successful atmospheric series. We do not, therefore, have the same need to conduct such tests as we did in 1962.

We have shown that we will not let world opinion stand in our way if atmospheric tests are essential to our security. If we had not done so in 1962, there would have been real reason to doubt whether laboratory morale could be maintained under test ban.

Furthermore, Dr. Kistiakowsky testified that laboratory morale was good. As the Senator from Alabama pointed out, not only was laboratory morale good, but laboratory facilities increased, the number of scientists increased, and the quality of experimentation improved. This was the testimony, under oath, of the highest science adviser in this Government under the previous administration.

Our Government has made a thorough study of the problems of maintaining laboratory readiness and of inspecting laboratories for test preparations. The President has now concluded that laboratory readiness is quite realistic, but laboratory inspection is not—at least, not on terms which either we or the Soviets could accept.

The President has established a firm national policy of readiness to resume atmospheric tests in the event the treaty ends. It is up to us in the Congress to support that policy with funds, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] said earlier today.

THE REFUSAL TO EXAMINE BASIC ISSUES

If the treaty provided no more than a reasonable assurance that its ratification did not entail unacceptable military risks, it would hardly be worth the time and effort we have devoted in its behalf or the years of planning and negotiation that preceded its signing on August 5,

1963. This, however, is clearly not the case. The treaty does contain other features which are in our national interest; and it is precisely these features, in my opinion, which provide the basic reasons for advocating its ratification.

It is my deep hope that in this Senate debate we can examine these other features with care and discernment. For good and sufficient reasons the burden of the hearings dealt with military and scientific considerations. On the basis of the evidence compiled in these hearings, every Senator should be able to reach a determination about the relationship of this treaty and the military security of this country. Since none of us in this body are scientists, or directly involved with the military defense of the United States, I am doubtful whether we can make any significant addition to what has already been compiled. We can, however, make a number of definite contributions in considering the nonmilitary, that is, the foreign policy, the diplomatic, the political reasons for supporting the treaty.

Of course, the distinction between military and political issues is not absolute. In fact, the two are interrelated. It is a well-established axiom of international relations, particularly in the era of nuclear warfare, that military decisions concerning weapons systems have definite political overtones. That is, the capability of a particular weapons system, or the impact of a strategy of warfare, are important factors in determining a country's foreign policy. Used in this context there is a blending of military and political factors.

I have always been impressed by the statement of the famous French leader Clemenceau that "War is too important to be left to generals." I believe that is a relevant statement.

In the context of this treaty, however, the distinction can be somewhat sharper. When we speak of political considerations here, we refer to those considerations relating to United States-Soviet relations in their totality; we refer to the basic tides in international relations which determine the postures of alliances and the relationships among nations.

Mr. President, the Senate, and this Nation seldom have had such an opportunity to examine the fundamental issues relating to future United States-Soviet relations and the outlook for the cold war. Indeed, these are the issues which relate to the very future existence of our country and our democratic system. These decisions will, perhaps, even determine the fate of mankind itself.

Yet how we avoid them. How can we steadfastly refuse a frank, open and constructive debate on the factors of survival in the nuclear age?

I read in my mail such enlightening remarks as:

> Under our Constitution, the U.S. Senate can refuse ratification of the slick deal with Moscow * * * because this is a deal engineered by a Washington innercircle of the pseudosophisticated, pseudointellectuals who deride our Constitution as outdated.

On I read:

> If the treaty is ratified, there will be no consequences perceptible to the public. But there will be a violent rash of propaganda about the break in the cold war and the wisdom and hopefulness of further agreements to eliminate the danger and crushing burden of the armaments race. Step by step, Communist overlords will negotiate us into a state of total helplessness and then force us into total surrender.

Those are two quotations from many letters, some of which I brought with me to the Chamber today. These letters are highly emotional and irrational. My office has been flooded with cards, mimeographed on one side, identifying most of the Members of Congress as Communists or Communist sympathizers, dupes, dopes, renegades, and a few other things.

I hear such phrases as, "To ratify the treaty would mean collaboration with godless communism," or, "appeasement has escalated so rapidly that we have crawled on our knees to Moscow to obtain this Moscow nuclear test ban treaty."

As the Senator from Rhode Island said this afternoon, this treaty was not written in Moscow. It was signed there, but it was written in Washington, D.C. This is an American treaty, advanced by two American Presidents, negotiated by American representatives. We have no reason to be ashamed of it. We have reason to be proud of the fact that this Nation, which has always been dedicated to a just and honorable world and a just and honorable peace, continues to pursue that objective. It is to the eternal credit of the leaders of our country that they have kept uppermost in their feeling and attitude and policy the pursuit of a just and enduring peace, without sacrificing our security or sacrificing democratic principles.

In light of such statements of the radical rightwing, need one inquire, "Why such outspoken advocacy of this treaty?"

How long will we permit ourselves to fall into the fatal trap of debating such critical issues as national survival in the nuclear age merely on the basis of slogans, prejudices, and ill-informed and irrational notions of reality? For decades the Communists themselves have repeatedly fallen victim to their own penchant for viewing Western democracies through the twisted perspectives of Marxist dogma and slogans. They have repeatedly refused to see us as we really are. Are we willing to say that a proud and free people can do no better than ape the Communists by adopting similar tactics?

As long as I am permitted to stand on this floor and represent, in part, the State of Minnesota the answer will be, "No, never."

There are, of course, opponents of this treaty who are in no way associated with the fright peddlers, fear mongers, and professional anti-Communists who haunt this land.

Some honest doubts have been expressed, and they are in an entirely different category, and are not to be associated with the irresponsible emotionalism with which many of us are being flooded. Such doubts and opinions are the basis for what I hope will be a full and frank debate on the political merits of this treaty.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MILITARY POWER AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Why does this Senator place such importance on the political considerations of this treaty? Numerous witnesses before the Foreign Relations Committee—many of them who had come to testify on military considerations—emphasized that military power by itself was not sufficient to insure the security of the United States. Let me quote from the compelling testimony of the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk:

> For 18 years we have held the Communist drive in check largely by the deterrent force of our massive military strength. We shall maintain that overwhelming strength until we are certain that freedom can be assured by other means. But throughout we have known that a lasting peace could not be founded upon armed might alone. It can be secured only by durable international institutions, and by a respect for law and its procedures * * *. The most important thing about the treaty is, therefore, what it may symbolize and what new paths it may open. That, no one can now foretell * * *. But if the promise of this treaty can be realized, if we can take even this one small step along a new course, then frail and fearful mankind may find another step and another until confidence replaces terror and hope takes over from despair.

I believe those are powerful and wise words on the part of a dedicated public servant, the Secretary of State.

Dr. Kistiakowsky also testified eloquently on this point:

> I do not believe that we or any nation can find any real security in the continuing arms race. It is now evident that the United States and the Soviet Union each have the capability to deliver an utterly devastating attack on each other. To talk of winning such a conflict is to misuse the language; only a pyrrhic victory could be achieved in a nuclear war.

I have already quoted certain relevant passages from Dr. York's testimony. Beginning on page 761 of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings, Dr. York documents year-by-year the increase of U.S. military power and the concurrent decline in national security. He closes this analysis with these thoughtful words:

> It is my view that the problem posed to both sides by this dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security has no technical solution. If we continue to look for solutions in the area of science and technology only, the result will be a steady and inexorable worsening of this situation.

These words are particularly impressive since they were spoken by a man who has devoted his life and career in the pursuit of science, and who has been responsible for the development of much of this Nation's military power.

We are indebted to scientists for their recognition of the fact that the answer to our problems today is not to be found in the test tube or laboratory, but, instead, in the minds and hearts of men and in their capacity to learn to live together.

The dilemma we face is simply this: from the point after World War II when the United States held an absolute nuclear monopoly, this Nation's military power has continued to increase. Yet the overall security of the United States is obviously far less today than it was in 1946. For while our military power has surged ahead, the Soviet Union's nuclear capacity has done likewise.

Our Nation has never been stronger militarily; yet we have never been in graver danger. The identical situation prevails in the Soviet Union. A single command, in either country, could result in the utter destruction of both nations and many others.

The argument has been advanced in Congress, particularly by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], that wars have usually occurred when a nation has become weak, when its defenses have been permitted to deteriorate. I believe this is absolutely correct. We must maintain whatever strength our civilian and military leaders believe is essential to defend the vital interests of the United States. No one supporting this treaty had ever suggested otherwise. However, when we have achieved this level of military preparedness, we must then not shrink from exploring those nonmilitary questions which may disclose ways to increase the national security—as opposed to only the military power—of the United States.

In sum, we must first provide for whatever military strength is needed to deter the Communist nations from aggression and subversion. This provides, in effect, a protective umbrella or a shield under which or behind which we can then seek the kind of mutually advantageous political situations which serve to lessen the likelihood of nuclear annihilation. It is precisely such a situation of mutual advantage which we believe prevails in the treaty to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space.

I hope the United States of America, which is a citizen democracy, will never become a modern Sparta; otherwise we shall lose, as surely as the Spartans lost, despite their power. We have some rather tough questions to ask.

THE HARD FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

It seems to me that those persons who assert without qualification that the treaty must be rejected, that we cannot do business with the Russians under any condition, that we should seek total victory over communism, have a duty to answer the following questions:

First. Do they believe that the Soviet Union and other Communist nations are simply going to go away, fade away, and leave the world at peace? If not, is it the course of wisdom to pretend that the Soviet Union has ceased to exist?

Second. Do they believe the United States could survive—in any meaningful sense—a nuclear exchange with the Soviet Union? Could the Soviet Union survive?

Third. Do they believe that the Communist nations are impervious to the tides of history which have, since the dawn of man, kept relations among nations in a state of constant flux? Are they immune to internal and external forces and, therefore, eternally insulated from all change?

I will not attempt to say how other Senators would answer these questions. But I can say how the Senator from Minnesota answers them.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union possess sufficient nuclear power virtually to destroy each other. I hope Senators will consider the full ramifications of this grim reality.

We are not discussing soccer, rugby, or football. We are discussing the survival of the human race. We are discussing peace and war. Moreover, I see no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the Soviet Union and its allies intend suddenly to resign from active participation in the affairs of this world.

To the contrary, I see evidence that they intend to do quite a little about affairs in this world, and intend to do it their way. Nor do I conceive of any way that a nation possessing the power and influence of the Soviet Union can simply be ignored when they seek attention whether by abuse by voice or by the written word.

However, while the Soviet Union maintains a dedicated and unrelenting antagonism against the free nations of the West, against our political and economic systems, there appears to be a desire to avoid nuclear war and to pursue the competition with the West through other less lethal channels. Let us not decide ourselves on this point—and it was to this that I was referring earlier in my colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana:

> The Soviet Union still seeks the triumph of communism over capitalism and of totalitarianism over democracy.

They have not given up their goal or objective. But Chairman Khrushchev and his associates are sufficiently hardheaded to know that a triumph over capitalism through nuclear war, even if it were possible, would be a hollow triumph indeed. What the leaders of the Soviet Union do intend is a total offensive against our system in terms of economic and political competition, plus the military competition.

The Soviet Union knows that the United States will never initiate a nuclear war. Khrushchev also believes that he now possesses sufficient military power to protect the vital interests of his country. Therefore, he is seeking ways, as I see it, to divert resources from military pursuits into heightening the economic, industrial, scientific, and political competition.

The Soviet Union has problems in industry and agriculture. The recent visit by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to the Soviet Union revealed that the Soviet Union intends to plow into its agriculture hundreds of millions, yes, billions, of dollars for fertilizer and new equipment.

He also learned that the Soviet Union could not outproduce the United States in weapsons and missiles, even if the production of consumer goods was sacrificed.

One thing that I believe has been made clear in the past few years, particularly since 1961, is that by stepping up competition in the arms race in order to improve what we thought was our security posture, we have compelled the Soviet Union to divert vast amounts of its resources into the arms race, to produce weapons that it does not have in adequate supply. Khrushchev may well have come to the conclusion that this is a futile and losing effort.

He has not slackened his attack on the free institutions of the West. I do not think he will. In fact, we should be far more cognizant of the possible dangers from such a nonmilitary Communist offensive. In my opinion, the Senate has been overly hypnotized into giving almost total consideration to the military questions associated with the treaty. We have practically ignored these other challenges which are, in my opinion, far more likely to result from ratification of the treaty.

We rely chiefly on the testimony of generals, colonels, majors, and scientists. Yet we are supposed to understand the political, the economic, and the social forces. Paradoxically, Senators are trying to decide on the size of weapons and ballistic missiles, whereas they should be considering economics, history, and the social and political forces which are at work in America and throughout the world.

REASONS FOR SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF TREATY

Many persons, including myself, have pondered over the reasons for the decision of the Soviet Union to sign this test ban treaty, after rejecting similar opportunities for years. I believe that the answers are closely related to the reasons for the determination to steer the cold war—if only for a brief period of time—into the nonmilitary spheres of competition.

I believe Mr. Khrushchev feels that we know less about that area of the struggle than we do about the military area. He has respect for our generals. I know, for he has told me so. He also has respect for our scientists; but I am not sure he has much respect for our economic, political, and social judgments. Why? Because we do not spend much time working on them.

Mr. President, as I have said, I believe the answers to the Soviet decision can be found in four principal factors.

First. The Russians had become aware of the dramatic increase in U.S. military strength during the past 3 years; and it has been dramatic. They saw that the United States had effectively doubled its military power since 1960, particularly by equipping its strategic alert forces with nuclear warheads, by modernizing and accelerating naval ship construction, and by a 200-percent increase in the Nation's counter-guerrilla forces. Yet it was, and is, clear to the Russians that we will not use our military strength to attack them.

They have seen that we have many other programs in the process of being achieved. In fact, Congress will vote another $10 billion appropriation for defense in one-tenth the time it takes us to debate about this treaty; and in making that appropriation, all of us will say we know exactly what we are doing.

With all due respect for all Senators, I venture to assert that not one-tenth of us have studied in detail the defense budget, nor have we inquired into all the plans of the military.

Second. The Russian leadership was profoundly shaken by the resolution and determination displayed by President Kennedy over the 1961 Berlin situation, and most dramatically during the Cuban crisis of last October, when Soviet missiles were forced out of Cuba. In my discussions this month with Soviet leaders in Moscow, I was impressed by the chastening effect of the President's decision in the Cuban crisis on the thinking of Soviet leaders.

Third. The Soviet leaders have felt increasing pressure to divert resources away from the field of military production and into the domestic area, particularly into the field of agriculture.

Certainly we should know something about agriculture. But, Mr. President, do we ever hear Senators discuss what is happening to Soviet agriculture except its failures? It may not always be a failure. It may give us more competition in the agricultural Common Market and may cause us more concern in Latin America, Asia, and Africa than any present problem that we face. But in the Senate there is seldom thoughtful debate on these problems. The Soviets continued massive failure in the field of agriculture was all the more significant in the face of America's smashing triumphs in the production of food, not only for the Nation but for the hungry of the world.

Mr. President, do not think for a minute that Mr. Khrushchev does not understand the power of food. We look upon our abundance of food as a surplus; but Mr. Khrushchev looks upon it as a major asset in his total attempt to defeat freedom in the world. The day the Soviets create an abundance of food, they will put it to work "to bury us"; they will make it part of their policy of domination and control of the world.

We have the God-given blessing of an abundance of food and fiber; yet we worry about it as if it were the worst thing that ever happened to us.

I repeat, perhaps this is why Khrushchev would like to shift the emphasis away from the military—where he knows he cannot win—to the political, where he believes his chances are better. I hope his evaluation is wrong.

After 5 years of prodding by an Iowa farmer, Roswell Garst, Khrushchev has now acknowledged that the problems of Soviet agriculture cannot be solved without massive capital investment—particularly in commercial fertilizer. The need for such capital has had a considerable influence on the decision to slow down the production of military weapons.

When we appropriate more money for the military we have less to spend for schools. When Khrushchev appropriates more money for the military he has less money to spend on agriculture.

The Russian's need for capital for economic expansion, for agriculture, for industry, for housing, and for consumer goods has had a considerable influence, in my opinion, on the decision of the Soviets to slow down or attempt to slow down the production of weapons.

Fourth. The Soviet Union is deeply concerned about the conflict with Red China. During our talks with Premier Khrushchev, in Moscow, at the time of the signing of the treaty, the Soviet Premier left the unmistakable impression that the strongest reason causing him to support a test ban treaty was the conflict with China.

Some say the dispute is only make-believe. But if it is, then the newspapers of America are doing a great disservice to the American public, because every day they publish headline stories about the dispute with China. But I do not believe we are being misinformed.

Mr. President, you may recall that when I was in Moscow in December of 1958, I reported to our Government that even then Khrushchev had some unkind things to say about Communist China. Mr. President, you may also recall that at the Communist Party meeting in Moscow Premier Khrushchev attacked me personally; he said I lied, that I was a Baron Munchausen, or something of the sort. He said, "Why should I tell this known anti-Communist about our so-called problems with China?" But he did tell me; and I told the President, because I felt it was my duty to report accurately; and I also told our then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear that what I first reported has now become a fact of international politics. It is a fact that there is an ideological dispute between the Soviet Union and China. It is a fact, as the majority leader stated today, for the RECORD, that there are even border disputes between the Soviet Union and China. The Chinese Communists assail Khrushchev every day and call him an appeaser, a militarist, and a capitalist lackey because of the treaty.

Mr. President, I am convinced that fear of a nuclear armed China has been a major fact in creating Russian support for a test ban at this time. But equally important, the posture of peace is a popular platform for Khrushchev in his struggle for Soviet supremacy within the Communist world. Khrushchev needs more than military strength to restore unity to the Communist bloc, to extend this leadership to all Communist countries. The platform of peace is also a popular platform in competing for the allegiance of the nonalined nations of the world.

Have my colleagues thought why the signing of the treaty took place in Moscow? Have Senators considered the timing? I ask Senators if they have given some real thoughtful consideration to the circumstances. I should like to relate them.

In Moscow this summer were representatives of the Chinese Communists from Peiping, China. They were there to meet with representatives of the Soviet Union and other Communist leaders of Eastern Europe in an effort, supposedly or allegedly, to resolve the ideological differences between the two camps in the Communist sphere.

Mr. Khrushchev did not fight the struggle on the Chinese Communist terms. He decided to move into another area. He said, "What is the major issue in the world today? What is the issue that divides the Communist Chinese from the Russians at this particular time?"

One of those issues is peaceful coexistence. One of those issues is the fact that the Chinese Communists are aggressive. They have made clear through their spokesmen that they have no fear of nuclear war. They have even gone so far as to say they could lose 300 million people in a nuclear war and there would still be 400 million Chinese left.

Mr. Khrushchev knows something about arithmetic. He took a look at those figures and said, "That is exactly 75 million more dead than there are Russians living." So Mr. Khrushchev said, "I will take the peace issue." Mr. Khrushchev showed new interest in the treaty, not only because of the other factors that I have recited today, but because in the struggle with the Chinese Communists, which is a serious struggle today in the Communist bloc, he needed a platform upon which he could stand and around which he could rally support. He is not talking about the treaty in respect to how it strengthens his military posture but how it strengthens his peace posture in the world.

Mr. Khrushchev was getting nowhere in his effort. On the basis of ideology, Leninism, and Marxism, the Chinese, who were absolute purists on that question, and the newer Communist power, constantly condemned Mr. Khrushchev for being more of a pragmatist and a deviationist. What they said in simple terms was that Mr. Khrushchev is not a true Communist. Khrushchev has some bourgeois, capitalistic habits.

Mr. Khrushchev replied that the Chinese Communists want a war. They are aggressive. They know nothing about the dangers of nuclear war. They are irresponsible.

With all his limitations, Mr. Khrushchev has some understanding of political forces. He is no soft touch. He is no easy mark. He is clever. He is extremely able. He is subtle. He can be treacherous, and he knows how to fight. One could not become Chairman of the Council of Ministers in the Soviet Union and survive since 1917 by being stupid. Khrushchev has qualities of leadership. He ascertained quickly that if it came down to a strict interpretation of Leninism and Marxism, he would lose that struggle with his Chinese Communist brethren.

I say to my fellow Americans that I find it very ironical that a people who have been the users of force, abuse, and tyranny, and who have never really believed in peace, today make themselves the self-styled champions of peace because we let them.

Peace does not make one a weakling or an appeaser. One cannot get peace by being a weakling or an appeaser. The processes of peace require more courage than do the processes of war on the battlefield. The processes of peace require more statesmanship than military education alone.

OVERLAPPING INTERESTS

While the Soviet Union may have good and sufficient reasons for accepting the treaty at this time, it does not necessarily follow that a test ban is not also in the best interests of the United States.

I cannot imagine our country signing a treaty that would be to our disadvantage. If I thought the President of the United States would sign a treaty that he knew would be to our disadvantage, he should be impeached, and the result should not be merely a failure to ratify the treaty. We make treaties because we think there is good in them for us.

For example, we signed a treaty with the Japanese and in the treaty provided that Japan could not have a military establishment—because, we thought, it was to our advantage. We did the same with the Germans. We altered the treaty with the Germans. Why? Because we thought it might be to our advantage as a partner in NATO if the Germans had a powerful military establishment.

I repeat that any treaty that does not have a mutuality of advantage will never be kept. That is not the way things can be explained to people. It would be much easier to go on the stump and say, "This treaty is no good because the Russians will benefit." That would prove that the speaker is a vigorous anti-Communist. It would also prove that he would not know what he was talking about.

So I repeat, while the Soviet Union may have good and sufficient reasons for accepting the treaty at this time, it does not necessarily follow that a test ban is not also in the best interests of the United States. To the contrary, it appears to this Senator to be highly desirable to encourage a more moderate Soviet policy in relation to nuclear war and the arms race even if it means heightened competition in the nonmilitary spheres. We can do this by seeking areas of agreement which serve the interests of both the United States and the Soviet Union. I have listed what appear to be the principal motives for Soviet acceptance of the treaty.

I am sure there are others. The committee report recites some.

I would also note the four specific areas where the interests of the two nations appear to overlap.

First. I can think of no greater possible mutuality of interest on the part of the Soviet Union and the United States than in the prevention of thermonuclear war.

There is only one other nation with any of these bombs besides Russia and the United States; that is, Great Britain. If a thermonuclear war should break out, the first nations to suffer the unbelievable, indescribable, destructive tragedy would be the United States of America and the Soviet Union. We have some mutuality of interest in respect to preventing that.

The results of such a war would be grave destruction on both sides. President Kennedy has stated:

> A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere.

That is what we are talking about. We are talking about whether we can slow down the nuclear arms race a little to give us some breathing space, a little time to bring reason to bear upon these problems.

It is clear that Chairman Khrushchev agrees with the President's conclusion on this subject. He has, indeed, warned the Communist Chinese that in the event of a nuclear catastrophe "the survivors would envy the dead." That is a very impressive and perceptive statement.

The Cuban missile crisis served to heighten the awareness and sensitivity of both sides to this very grave risk.

Second, as the United States and the Soviet Union glower at each other from atop our separate stockpiles of nuclear destruction, we share a common interest in preventing the spread of these weapons of mass destruction to other countries which do not already have them. Both of us realize that the proliferation of nuclear weapons will, if permitted to continue over time, multiply the dangers of thermonuclear war. It will increase the danger of the use of nuclear weapons in local conflicts, either by accident or design, by governments substantially less stable and less responsible than our own.

The nuclear test ban treaty will not, of itself, stop the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. But the treaty will significantly reinforce present U.S. policies in this regard. These policies have been wisely and emphatically enunciated by the Congress in legislation dealing with atomic energy matters.

Third, both the United States and the Soviet Union share a common interest in the prevention of further contamination of the atmosphere by radioactive fallout. The radioactive pollution of the atmosphere from previous nuclear tests has created a health hazard which we share not only with the Soviet Union but also with all other countries of the world. Further testing will increase the danger and the nuclear test ban treaty will have a dramatic effect in reducing this risk.

Just how serious is this risk? This has been discussed a great deal. Although the matter is hotly debated, I have become quite concerned over certain recent reports. Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, professor of physiology at the University of Minnesota, and former president of the American Physiological Society—and, I might add, a close personal friend—said on August 20, 1963, that there are two facts which Senators "can ignore only at the risk of great damage to the people of the United States and the world."

These facts, according to Dr. Visscher, are: First, there is now good scientific evidence that radiation at the average levels already produced by fallout is capable of increasing the incidence of cancer by significant amounts, and second, fallout is not uniform and, as a consequence, some people are exposed to many times the average dose.

If the Senator from Utah or the Senators from Nevada were present today, perhaps they would be able to make a further contribution.

Should it give us any feeling of cheer to read in the newspapers that the University of Utah has demonstrated that the amount of strontium 90 in milk is double what it has ever been before in the recorded history of the testing of milk?

The speech made by the distinguished majority leader, soon after Labor Day, was one of the most concise, definitive, effective speeches ever delivered on this subject in this body.

For example, young children in Utah have been exposed to amounts of iodine 131 significantly above the levels where protective measures should be taken. Another example, residents of Palmer, Alaska have been exposed to amounts of iodine 131 above the acceptable level as established by the Federal Radiation Council.

I add, they keep raising the level.

Alaskan eskimos have absorbed unacceptable amounts of cesium 137. And so the story goes. It is not a pleasant story. This treaty gives us the opportunity to begin writing the final chapter of this story.

Why should the Nation not be concerned about the unknown hazards of radioactive fallout? What right has the Government of the United States or any other government to contaminate the atmosphere with products which have a serious and adverse effect upon the health of mankind, animals, and plantlife?

One might say, "Do you have enough facts to justify any indictment of radioactive fallout?" I have enough facts to know that it is not good for us. We all know that a sufficient dose of radioactivity is detrimental, and can be lethal. We know it affects the yet unborn.

There is another mutuality of interest.

Fourth, both the United States and the Soviet Union share a common interest in the prevention of war by accident, miscalculation or a mere failure of communications. I have already alluded to the fact that the treaty would, by inhibiting the spread of nuclear weapons, reduce the dangers of their accidental use. We should also reflect, however, upon what has gone before and what may come after the treaty. On June 20 the Soviet Union and the United States agreed upon the establishment of a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow. The "hot line" became operational on September 1. After the treaty we may look forward to further negotiations regarding measures to reduce the risk of war by unintended causes. For example, Chairman Khrushchev has recently indicated a revived Soviet interest in the establishment of ground observation posts located on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Such posts would reduce the dangers of surprise conventional attack. An agreement of this kind, if not linked to other unacceptable measures, would be in our interests to pursue.

Mr. President, when we think of the difficult and serious days of October 1962, we should meditate for a moment upon the fact that the communication between this country and the Soviet Union was so bad that we had to rely upon open radio. There was no real communication, in this world of computers in space travel, of speed and efficiency.

We did not get an agreement with the Soviet Union on the "hot line" because we love the Russians or because they love us, or because we have turned Communist or they have turned capitalist. We got that agreement because everybody was frightened half to death that unless there were better communications somebody might push the button and the nuclear war would be on.

All this nonsense about, "Do you trust them? Are you being taken in by them? Are you getting soft on the Russians or communism?" is sheer political nonsense. We do not trust them. They do not trust us.

The treaty is not based upon trust. It is based upon a mutuality of interest, and upon detection.

Prof. Marshall Shulman of the Fletcher School of Law and International Diplomacy, in a brilliant analysis of Soviet and United States policy relating to the test ban, pointed out that (a) there is this natural overlapping of Soviet and United States interests, and (b) there are other unintended effects of Soviet policy likely to be in the interests of the United States.

Let me quote from Dr. Shulman's testimony:

> Indeed, the most striking characteristics of recent Soviet foreign policy has been the way in which policies undertaken for short term, expediential purposes have tended to elongate in time, and become embedded in doctrine and political strategy. The shift to a "peaceful coexistence" emphasis, originally a tactical alternation, has been evolving and deepening into a policy directed to power bloc politics rather than toward social revolution.

In terms of the longrun security of the United States, it can be argued that this unintended effect has created an environment less likely to lead to nuclear war.

Peaceful coexistence does not mean that there is going to be peace and happiness in the world. It means only that the Soviet Union will emphasize the nonmilitary aspects of the competition and struggle in order to achieve its objectives.

As Dr. Shulman pointed out, these changes in Soviet strategy and doctrine have, at least in part, resulted from Western strength and determination. In short, it is possible to influence basic Soviet strategy in a way which raises the possibility of increasing U.S. national security.

We did that when we told Mr. Khrushchev to get his missiles out of Cuba.

Let me again quote from Dr. Shulman's testimony:

> It should be possible for us to recognize, without in the slightest minimizing the seriousness of our conflict with the Soviet Union or diminishing the vigor of our prosecution of this effort, that this does not preclude the search for some safeguards, although perhaps at this stage only marginal ones, which can be mutually advantageous.

I would like to give that statement great emphasis in this debate. It seems to me to sum up the basic argument of those who support this treaty. No one is talking about "crawling to Moscow on our knees," or, "selling out to Khrushchev." Everyone accepts the perfectly self-evident fact that America must remain militarily strong. But saying these things surely does not disqualify one from also saying that we must also search for other safeguards as well.

At this point in time we surely cannot overlook the vast implications of the Sino-Soviet struggle for the future of mankind.

I intend to discuss this matter in the Senate some time in the future. But for the present let me make these several brief observations.

Chairman Khrushchev has probably staked his personal political survival and perhaps the dominance of the Soviet Union among Communist nations on the policy of "peaceful coexistence." If one accepts the realities of the real world, as opposed to the fantasies of the radical right wing, it seems incontestable that the security of the United States does not lie with the bellicose, militarily aggressive, and comparatively irresponsible Communist Chinese. Nor does it lie with their allies within the Soviet military and government power structure. And, make no mistake about it, those forces do exist within the Soviet Union.

If the Soviet Union—in the context of its struggle with Communist China—can be encouraged to pursue those policies which have the perhaps unintended effect of increasing the overall security of the United States, we should do so. Rejection of this treaty would surely have the most profound impact on the Sino-Soviet struggle, with the strong possibility of a military reaction within both the Soviet Union and Communist China that would gravely threaten the long-term security of this Nation in terms of nuclear war.

If the treaty is rejected, there will be an arms race the likes of which the world has never known.

What we are really talking about is whether the United States can afford to take this small step toward building greater confidence between the two principal nuclear powers in the world. We do not enter this period with sanguine or foolish notions of what may eventually result. We have our powder ready, and it is very, very dry, and there is lots of it. If we find that the Soviet Union does not share our belief that the competition between these two great systems of power can be pursued in ways which exclude mutual annihilation, then we must face this fact grimly, resolutely, and courageously. We demonstrated our willingness and ability to assume this posture just 1 year ago this coming October.

On the other hand, can we now afford not to make this contribution to the "process of peace" which President Kennedy discussed so eloquently at American University in June.

The President said:

> There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

I wish this great message of our President were more fully understood and more often applied.

I have been an advocate of this treaty because it represented to me a beginning to the solution of the problem of the escalating arms race and the many dangers related to this competition. If this treaty is a feeble candle in the immense void of nuclear desolation, the feeble candle which our distinguished majority leader described so eloquently last week, then I think we have a sacred obligation to see that this candle is permitted to flicker, however weakly. I want no guilt on my hands for snuffing it out.

A candle provides little comfort in the black darkness of night. And so I see no strong assurances of comfort in this treaty. But I shall vote for it so that there will continue to be some light; so that we will not be in darkness; so that we can continue the search for other candles.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, so that Senators may have available to them various editorials and other materials which raise questions about or objections to the proposed Moscow test ban treaty, I have been placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some important materials from around the country which have come to my attention. As the Senate is now giving consideration to the ratification of this treaty in floor debate, I think it is particularly appropriate that some material that I have gathered together be made available for study and consideration in today's RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the following material printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

First. A letter from Mr. I. V. Horner, 125 East Woodward Boulevard, Tulsa, Okla., dated August 10, 1963.

Second. Two editorials from the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., dated August 23, 1963, entitled, "Be Kind to Communists" and "One Hundred New Frontier Accommodations (Concessions) Listed."

Third. An editorial from the Enquirer, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 4, 1963, entitled, "Here We Go Again."

Fourth. An article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Sunday Star on September 7, 1963, entitled "NATO and the Test Ban Treaty."

Fifth. An editorial from the Aiken Standard and Review, Aiken, S.C., September 3, 1963, entitled "Help Your Senator."

Sixth. An article written by Robert Morris on August 30, 1963, entitled "The Test Ban Treaty."

Seventh. An article which appeared in the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., on September 5, 1963, entitled "Strauss Lists Traps in Nuclear Test Ban Treaty."

Eighth. Two editorials from the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., September 7, 1963, "Will the Senate Yield" and September 9, 1963, "The Issue Is U.S. Security."

Ninth. The September 1, 1963, Economic Council Letter entitled "Russian Roulette."

Tenth. A letter to the editor of the Panama City Herald, Panama City, Fla., from Paul D. Conrad, Sr., Panama City.

Eleventh. The Manion Forum of September 1, 1963, entitled "The Test Ban Treaty, 'A Covenant With Death and an Agreement With Hell.' "

Twelfth. An editorial from the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., September 9, 1963, entitled "RUSSELL Is Opposed."

Thirteenth. An editorial from the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., September 6, 1963, entitled "Reservations Stipulated Essential to Treaty."

Fourteenth. Two radio editorials from Radio Station WDIX, Orangeburg, S.C. One was broadcast on August 17, 1963, the other on August 23, 1963.

Fifteenth. An editorial from the Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Ill., September 3, 1963, entitled "The Treaty in the Senate."

Sixteenth. An article written by Rev. Richard Ginder which was published in Our Sunday Visitor on August 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TULSA, OKLA.,
August 10, 1963.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senator, South Carolina, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: John Foster Dulles had this to say about a test ban treaty:

"A GREAT ACHIEVEMENT FOR PEACE

"Since a (test ban) treaty is what the Russians want, it wouldn't be difficult to come up with one which would look good on the surface. We could include in it all the fuzzy language of diplomacy—and believe me, I know some of the phrases—and present it to the world as a great achievement for peace. All of this would result in a relaxation of world tensions, generate a feeling of international good will, and probably elect a Republican President in 1960.

"But we're not going to do it. If we signed such a pact with the Soviets, there would develop a tremendous pressure to cut back on our defenses, reduce the size of our Armed Forces, and curtail our armaments. And we'd have only the word of the Russians that they were doing the same. Our NATO, SEATO, and other alliances would be endangered, perhaps to the point of deterioration. As a result, within a few years, we could be as a sitting duck for the Communists to pick off whenever they felt the time was ripe."

"THE WORKER SEEMS TO WANT YOUR VOTE, WHY?—PEOPLE'S VOICE CAN PUSH TEST BAN THROUGH SENATE

"(By Daniel Mason)

"Nose counting in the Senate last week revealed that, while only 10 to 20 of its Members had openly come out in opposition to the nuclear test ban treaty initialed in Moscow a week and a half ago, a majority have as yet refused to commit themselves, usually contenting themselves with stating that they would make up their minds after all the evidence was in.

"It is thus becoming apparent that it is too early to be optimistic about the ratification of the test ban treaty in the Senate by the two-thirds majority needed. It can be expected that in the next month, during which the pact will be debated in the Nation's upper House, enemies of peace will mobilize all their power to influence the Senate either to reject it or emasculate it.

"The appeal by President Kennedy on July 26 to the American people not to let the 'military, scientific, and political experts' monopolize the debate over the test ban treaty * * * telegrams to the President were running 12 to 1 favoring the treaty. The size of those backing the pact is extremely important as reflecting the trend of thinking by the Nation's ordinary citizens, since the usual tendency is for the opponents of a governmental action to get in the first licks with their expressions of disapproval. Those backing the action are then spurred into action.

"*Reaction in foreign lands*

"The impressive fact about reaction outside the United States is the eagerness with which the leaders of foreign governments are requesting the right to become signatories to the test ban agreement.

"Peiping newspapers last Monday continued the attack on the Soviet Union for having agreed to a test ban pact asserting that the U.S.S.R. was deceiving itself by welcoming the treaty as a step toward peace. The Chinese papers appeared to be disturbed by the fact such a treaty might halt the spread of nuclear weapons to countries not now possessing them. A note by the editor of Hsinhua the Chinese news agency, in explaining the pact, indicated this when he claimed it would restrict Socialist countries not now possessing nuclear weapons."

Sincerely,

I. V. HORNER.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Aug. 23, 1963]

BE KIND TO COMMUNISTS

The greater part of this page is devoted today to a listing of the concessions—under New Frontier semantics "accommodations"—which have been made by the Kennedy brothers during a little more than 2½ years in office.

We hope a few readers, at least, will take the time to wade through these listings because in the aggregate they make clear the adoption of a policy of appeasement into which the Khrushchev treaty now before the Senate fits perfectly. In other words, some such climatic "accommodation" to the aggressive character of world communism was to have been expected, now that we look back on this record, as a sort of capstone for a long succession of vital concessions.

It is noteworthy that the instances of "giving in" to communism are not confined to the Kremlin iself. The slogan of "Be Kind to Communists" has been lived up to not only where Moscow was directly concerned, but in numerous other parts of the globe where Communist dictatorships are operating their customary police state regimes, notably Cuba.

The adoption of a policy of appeasement was forecast by the London Times in 1961, shortly after Mr. Kennedy took office. A front-page story in that publication said President Kennedy had been advised by some of his special assistants that the Soviet Union was in an "accommodating" mood.

It does not require too much imagination to identify at least one of these advisers as Dr. Walt Whitman Rostow, Chairman of the Policy Planning Council of the State Department. Some months ago the news leaked out that Rostow had prepared a long memorandum for circulation only among the State Department elite defining just such a policy as is illustrated in the list on this page. He and others of the President's advisers also were responsible for the plan submitted to the United Nations to ultimately disarm this country completely. Thus it is apparent that the London Times' prediction was accurate and that we are on our way toward further gradual concession of world leadership to Moscow.

It was not surprising, but was certainly noteworthy that old Khrushchev, having put over his fast one on us in connection with his word-of-honor test ban treaty, didn't have the grace to wait until the U.S. Senate had approved it to begin bragging about his achievement.

In a communication aimed at Red China primarily but for the benefit of Communist countries everywhere, day before yesterday he laid claim to a great diplomatic victory, as well he might. He called his limited nuclear test ban a positive gain for communism, saying it would perpetuate the liquidation of the onetime American nuclear monopoly and freeze each side's nuclear power. The Khrushchev statement was no doubt embarrassing to the Kennedy brothers, but in the nature of the Russian dictator it certainly could not have been unexpected.

ONE HUNDRED NEW FRONTIER ACCOMMODATIONS (CONCESSIONS) LISTED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Shortly after John F. Kennedy was inaugurated in 1961, the London Times carried a front page story that President Kennedy had been advised by some of his special assistants that the Soviet Union was in an "accommodating mood." The record shows, the newspaper said, that the President accepted this assessment and set about trying to seek an "accommodation" with the Soviets. The "accommodations" affected by the Kennedy administration, beginning in its first months, have now become a substantial list. It will be noted that these "accommodations" in every case actually represent concessions made to world communism. This policy of appeasement is now to be capped off by agreement to a nuclear test ban treaty that depends solely upon the "word of honor" of the Russians. A list of these concessions, made within the almost 3 years of the Kennedy administration follows.

1. Three times refused to follow the directions of Congress to specify in the President's annual "Captive Nations" proclamations that formerly free nations taken over by the Communists be given their independence (on the grounds that the congressional wording would "offend" the Soviets); 2. Authorized the shipment and sale of subsidized farm products to Communist countries; 3. Approved the sale of grain unloading equipment to Red China through Canada in order to evade U.S. laws prohibiting trade with Communist Chinese; 4. Delayed for a full year the cutoff of remaining U.S. trade with Cuba, thereby helping to keep Castro's wobbly economy shored up.

5. Sucessfully pressed for greater aid for Communist Poland and Yugoslavia; 6. Refused an official greeting for the San Remo (Italy) Festival group appearing at Washington's Constitution Hall on March 21, 1963, but gave lavish White House reception to Poznan Choir from Communist Poland; 7. Ordered the issuance of passports, according to Passport Director Frances Knight, to known Communists to travel to the Soviet Union and other countries; 8. Allowed the release of military space information to the United Nations, including its Communist members, while barring it to the American people as "top secret"; 9. Financed construction of a highway in Afghanistan which will provide the Soviets with a first-class military route to the Indian subcontinent; 10. Initiated negotiations to establish diplomatic relations with Communist Outer Mongolia, halted them only when public protests mounted.

BOLSTERED ECONOMY

11. Bolstered the Soviet economy and cut into the market of American producers by lifting the ban on imports of Russian crabmeat; 12. Approved the Moscow-New York air route, which would give the Reds a "spy route" between the two nations but held up final implementation because of congressional protests; 13. Misled the U.S. public about President Kennedy's Vienna meeting with Khrushchev until the Soviet press revealed the Russian leader had laid down a 1-year ultimatum to settle the status of Berlin; 14. Actively supported the election of President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic, although he had the solid backing of four pro-Communist parties and since has permitted Communist exiles to return to the country.

15. Provided a red carpet reception and aid to the pro-Communist ruler of Algeria, Ben Bella, who then ordered confiscation of U.S. property; 16. Extended heavy foreign aid to Burma, U.N. Secretary General U Thant's native land, which was the first in Southeast

Asia to sign a "peaceful coexistence" pact with the Chinese Reds and ordered American businessmen expelled; 17. Granted a passport for travel to Communist Outer Mongolia to Owen Lattimore, who had been termed by a Senate committee as a "conscientious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy"; 18. Authorized the shipment of scrap metal, which can be used in the manufacture of arms, to Iron Curtain countries, including Russia; 19. Agreed to Khrushchev's demands to cut back Voice of America broadcasts to Iron Curtain countries in exchange for a Communist pledge to reduce jammings; 20. Refused to reveal the contents or subject matter of 40 secret messages exchanged between President Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev.

FAVORED TREATMENT

21. Ignored congressional prohibition and gave favored-nation treatment to trade with Communist Yugoslavia and Poland; 22. Trained, at U.S. taxpayer expense, Yugoslavian troops at the Army General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and Yugoslavian pilots at U.S. Air Force bases; 23. Shipped vast quantities of jetplanes to Yugoslavia; 24. Led the campaign to have U Thant appointed Secretary General of the U.N., a move hailed by Khrushchev as "better than the troika" plan he had proposed; 25. Banned the showing of House Un-American Activities film, "Operation Abolition," on military bases because of protests from leftist groups; 26. Turned over to Communist Poland a $2,500,000 steel galvanizing production line.

27. Reduced the Subversive Activities Control Board, which was charged with protecting the Government against disloyal persons, to the status of a "ghost agency"; 28. Indicated in statements by the President and other high administration officials that we would not defend offshore island of Quemoy and Matsu from a Red Chinese invasion; 29. Called for adoption of a "two-China" policy in a report which was quickly cloaked in official secrecy when public protests mounted; 30. Lifted U.S. travel restrictions on Soviet visitors and embassy personnel, although Russia still restricts movements of Americans there.

31. Drastically slashed economic assistance and military aid to Nationalist Chinese; 32. Successfully pressed for deletion of loyalty oath requirements in the law granting loans to students, thus making it possible for Communists to attend U.S. schools at taxpayer expense; 33. Tacitly approved the appointment by the Organization of American States of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer (who had been dismissed from the Government for security reasons) as "traveling professor" in Latin America and later approved Oppenheimer as recipient of the $50,000 Fermi Award.

34. Made an even-up swap of Soviet Master Spy Rudolf Abel for U–2 reconnaissance Pilot Francis Gary Powers; 35. Dropped legal actions against several Soviet agents picked up in this country for espionage, allowing them to return to Russia as an expression of our good will; 36. Ordered the release from prison of Communist Party Organizational Secretary Harry Winston, one of 11 Reds convicted of conspiring to overthrow the United States (on grounds he was dying of cancer, although 2 years later, as a citizen of the Soviet Union, he is still alive and actively attacking the United States); 37. Relaxed security provisions on Federal employment, ignoring security reports in order to appoint hundreds to high posts.

38. Proposed abolition of the Security Division of the Justice Department, but withdrew plan because of protests from public and press; 39. Sought funds to construct Government-operated steel mill in India to compete with privately owned facilities in that country; 40. Idly stood by while India took over Goa and other Portuguese enclaves; made only mild protest in U.N. concerning Nehru's aggression.

ATTACKS SUPPORTED

41. Supported the Communist-led attacks on Portuguese Angola, then sided with the Communist bloc in attacking Portugal in U.N. for colonialism; 42. Extended military aid to pro-Communist Cambodia, despite protests of its neighbor, anti-Red Thailand; 43. Provided U.S. materials to construct a Soviet hospital in Cambodia and dismissed from Government service the foreign aid investigator who uncovered the deal; 44. Pushed pro-Western Pakistan toward the Communists by extending to "neutralist" India heavy military aid which was then concentrated on Pakistan border.

45. Approved $37 million in aid for a Volta River dam and other economic assistance for pro-Communist Ghana, whose delegate to the U.N. promptly denounced the United States for its criticism of Fidel Castro; 46. Classified as "secret" information on U.S. military aid to Indonesia's pro-Communist dictator, Sukarno, and other Communist and pro-Communist rulers, while allowing release to public of similar statistics on non-Communist countries; 47. Refused aircraft landing permission on U.S. Pacific territories to our long-time ally the Netherlands, which was transporting replacements for Dutch under assault by Indonesians in West New Guinea.

48. Further offended the Dutch and Papuan natives of West New Guinea by refusing to send diplomatic representation to the first session of the native parliament; 49. played a leading role in forcing, against the will of the Papuan natives, the surrender of Dutch New Guinea to Indonesia; 50. Failed to protest moves by Indonesian President Sukarno obviously aimed at further territorial aggrandizement in Portuguese Timor and Borneo.

51. Negotiated with pro-Communist President Sukarno the installment-plan expropriation of U.S. oil properties in Indonesia and agreed to give him $19,700,000 more aid in addition to $700 million he has already received: 52. Used economic coercion to force a Red-dominated coalition government on pro-Western Laos, as Khrushchev had demanded, resulting in a near-complete takeover of the country by the Communists; 53. Allowed North Vietnamese and Red Chinese troops to move in on the northern and eastern flanks of anti-Communist Thailand by defaulting northern half of Laos to Reds; 54. Provided a red carpet reception at the White House to admitted Communist Premier Chedi Jagan of British Guinea and gave him vast sums in economic assistance, promised more if needed.

55. Abstained in the U.N. vote on recognition of the credentials for representatives of the bloody Kadar regime in Hungary. 56. Inaugurated discussions in Budapest meant to lead to the "normalization of relations" with the Communist Hungarian Government, in effect abandoning hopes of the people of that country for eventual freedom; 57. Allowed the Communists to erect the Berlin Wall in flagrant violation of Western rights obtained in five separate agreements with the Soviets, halting free access within the city, and issued only a mild and meaningless protest.

58. Touched off Berlin riots with a policy which forbade U.S. Army medical personnel from going to the assistance of a mortally wounded 18-year-old shot by Red soldiers while attempting to scale wall; 59. Ordered the public relations representative of pro-Western Katanga, who had registered as agent of that country, to leave United States, but allowed the firm representing the leftist Central Congolese Government to neglect registration until 20 days past legal limit; 60. Supported with U.S. equipment and funds Communist efforts to oust pro-Western Katanga leader, Moise Tshombe, and end that country's independence.

SUSPENDED BAN

61. Used its executive power to suspend the ban on free delivery of Communist propaganda through the U.S. mails, argued against congressional action to enforce the ban, and failed to halt the flow of Red mail even after Congress reinstituted the ban; 62. Programed the vast majority of aid under the Alliance for Progress to Latin American nations which sided with Fidel Castro and against the United States.

63. Tied Alliance for Progress funds to Castro-style "land reforms," Marxist tax programs and socialized projects which forced private capital investment to flee the continent; 64. Failed to protest to the Venezuelan Government the burning of U.S. military mission in Caracas and robbery and humiliation of American personnel by Communist terrorists; 65. Provided heavy U.S. aid to the pro-Communist Goulart government in Brazil, despite vast confiscations of U.S. property; 66. Apologized to the pro-Communist Brazilian Government for testimony of a State Department official who said that the Goulart administration was infiltrated by Reds; 67. Continued U.S. assistance to Great Britain, Greece, Italy and Norway, whose ships were engaged in the transportation of strategic materials to Cuba, and failed to advise Congress of U.S. aid given to 23 other nations, whose ships carried economic materials to Castro, in clear violation of the 1963 Foreign Aid Appropriation Act.

68. Sought to mislead the American people that equipment had been developed which could detect underground nuclear explosions, thus making on-site inspections unnecessary; 69. Prohibited criticism of communism or references to free world "victory" over Reds in speeches by U.S. military leaders; 70. Successfully bottled up through New Frontiersmen on House Committees legislation which would cut off the flow of Communist Chinese trade with Cuba through the Panama Canal; 71. Perpetuated a Communist base in this hemisphere by withdrawing promised air support of the Cuban invasion which military authorities maintain could have brought down the Castro government.

72. Renounced the Monroe Doctrine because it would have necessitated taking firm action against Cuba while Khrushchev declared his own "Moscow Doctrine" in which he pledged Soviet protection to the Castro regime; 73. Sponsored the "Tractors for Freedom Committee" to ransom Cuban invasion prisoners, and, after that failed, twisted the arms of U.S. drug producers to provide some $53 million in supplies to meet Castro's ransom demands; 74. Refused to recognize a Cuban Government in exile, admittedly for fear it would antagonize Castro into grabbing our Guantanamo base; 75. Misled the American people over the size of Russian forces in Cuba and the installation of Soviet missiles on the island; 76. Effected a "blockade" of Cuba and hastily withdrew it before obtaining on-site inspection to guarantee removal of the Soviet missiles and withdrawal of Russian troops.

77. Opposed firm economic sanctions and other actions against Castro during a meeting of Latin American presidents of San Jose, Costa Rica, in March 1963, and quieted protests with pledges of $600 million in aid; 78. Flatly rejected demands by representatives of Latin American governments of a meeting of the OAS Organ of Consultation that the U.S. order removal of Soviet troops from Cuba and called, instead, for "diplomatic" measures; 79. Banned exile raids on Cuba, and with British assistance, hunted down and seized exile vessels on high seas; 80. Refused to carry out pledge to "intervene" if Castro were to export communism to rest of hemisphere.

81. Forced the resignation of Miro Cardona, Cuban exile leader, and threatened to cutoff funds to refugee groups if Cardona

revealed that the administration had reneged on a promise to finance and support a second invasion of the island; 82. Financed, through the United Nations special funds, a variety of projects in Communist Cuba and helped, in effect, to pay much of Castro's overdue debt to the U.N.

83. Failed to take legal action against 73 American citizens who went to Cuba via Mexico in violation of U.S. law, studied subversion and sabotage techniques and returned in 1962; 84. Allowed Castro to personally select 50 percent of the Americans who could be repatriated and withheld the information from the public until exposed by GOP Representative WILLIAM CRAMER, of Florida; 85. Blocked GOP attempts to prove possible secret deals made with Castro in behalf of the Kennedy administration by Attorney James Donovan.

86. Pledged to Premier Khrushchev that the United States would not invade Cuba, thereby assuring communism a permanent base in this hemisphere; 87. Closed down at cost of $277 million, as Khrushchev had insisted, Jupiter missile bases in Italy and Turkey on the grounds they were obsolete, although later congressional testimony disclosed they could have been made practically invulnerable by emplacing them in hard sites; 88. Failed to develop a single new weapons system during first 31 months in office, while Russia pressed ahead in all defense areas; 89. Proposed to cut back nuclear stockpile for weaponry further than Russia if Reds would agree; 90. Proposed that the Soviets be allowed to develop a second strike force second to none in the world so that Communists could feel secure against attack by the West.

ABANDONED POLICY

91. Abandoned the Eisenhower policy of massive retaliation in the event of an enemy attack for one of "controlled response," meaning we would only fire on carefully selected targets and may even pass up strikes at Russian cities, no matter how large or devastating a Soviet attack might be; 92. Sought to scrap the RS-70 high altitude bomber program, in spite of the knowledge that the Soviets have continued to build up their bomber fleets.

93. Cut back on schedules of hard-site installation of Minuteman missiles, called by military experts our "ultimate weapon"; 94. Shut down B-47 and B-52 bases built around the Soviet periphery under the Eisenhower administration; 95. Canceled the Skybolt air-to-ground missile program, which would have given Great Britain nuclear striking power for defense against Russia; 96. Curtailed U.S. military space program despite Russia's 2 to 4 years lead in this area; 97. Ordered a reduction of radar defense installations which warn United States of enemy attack.

98. Declared unilaterally a moratorium on atmospheric tests well before the test ban treaty was concluded in spite of earlier pledges against such action; 99. Proposed as a next step to a test ban treaty the signing of a nonaggression pact with the Communists which would mean the abandonment of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain; 100. Canceled reconnaissance flights over Cuba and halted all anti-Castro activity by Cuban exiles to minimize the possibility of an incident before the nuclear test ban treaty was concluded.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Aug. 4, 1963]

Here We Go Again

Something for the books—the history books—is the assertion of W. Averell Harriman, who initialed the secretly arrived at partial atomic-test ban, that "if we don't ratify, there will be an uproar * * * we will lose our leadership in the world * * * I think we will lose our position everywhere."

Mr. Harriman was still warm from the enthusiastic embrace of Nikita Khrushchev, who played the United States for a sucker on the informal test moratorium, using the intervening time to set up new and more powerful atomic test explosions.

Mr. Harriman, of course, is a Russian "expert." (He was at Yalta.) But the men expert in the defense of this Nation—the Joint Chiefs of Staff—have, according to U.S. News & World Report, twice filed written, formal dissents from the proposal for the test ban. They have felt that a partial, unpoliced treaty—which Russia could and would violate at any time—will impair the development of our defense, and will effectively freeze our nuclear capacity while the Russians catch up or forge ahead.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara believes the gains will outweigh the risks. He and his staff of so-called whiz kids have halted or phased out a great bulk of American offensive and defensive weapons. We have effectively given up work on an antimissile missile, new long-range bombers, airborne intermediate-range missiles, atomic propulsion of aircraft, military spy satellites, Navy carriers oversea bases and production of new atomic bombs.

Mr. McNamara boasts that he hasn't made a mistake yet.

In his case, one would be enough. Or one too many.

President Kennedy has made a homely little appeal for the partial test ban—which gives up on our previous insistence for any on-site inspections.

He has said that the treaty is not the millenium, but that, in the words of the Chinese proverb, a journey of a thousand miles begins with but a single step.

So does a fall over a precipice.

The President said: "This treaty is in part the product of Western patience and vigilance. We have made clear—most recently in Berlin and Cuba—our deep resolve to protect our security and our freedom against any form of aggression."

The public should be indebted to Mr. Kennedy for this comparison—for the warning it unwittingly entails.

What did we make clear in Berlin? Since Khrushchev sized up Mr. Kennedy at Vienna, the Communists proceeded to build the infamous Berlin Wall in clear contravention of the occupation agreement. We have not touched a stone of that wall, despite murder after murder of those attempting to escape Communist despotism. In fact we have condoned this aggression by inaction.

What did we make clear in Cuba? That we would not support any attempt to restore the freedom of the island, and that we would tolerate its fortification and development as a prime Communist military base in the Western Hemisphere. The Post Office Department—on whose suggestion we can only guess—even stopped printing the 5-cent President Monroe stamp, lest it remind people of the forgotten Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. Harriman was kind enough to indicate that he was not trying to put a nuclear gun at the head of the U.S. Senate. However, he and the administration he represented have made it extremely awkward for the Senate to turn down this secretly negotiated treaty that suddenly sprang into existence after so many years of fruitless negotiations with the Russians.

But it is, we insist, a mere scrap of paper. It is no victory for us in the minds of men.

Wasn't it President Kennedy himself who said twice: "Let him who thinks we can do business with the Russians come to Berlin."

Why, so soon, was Mr. Harriman sent to do business with the Russians in Moscow?

With the political and psychological leverage it can command, the administration may achieve this new victory in the Senate. But we dread the thought that the security of this Nation and the free world is commanded by amateurs and political adventurers who have made blunder after blunder after blunder—and that the advice of knowledgeable military men is brushed aside so casually.

Already the sun never sets on the Soviet empire.

NATO AND THE TEST BAN TREATY—OBSERVERS FEAR THE FAILURE OF ALLIANCES WITH THIS AND OTHER ACCOMMODATIONS

(By Constantine Brown)

PARIS.—The nuclear test ban treaty and the inevitable subsequent accommodation steps such as inspection teams to prevent surprise attacks and the adoption of a slightly modified Rapacki plan continue to worry political circles in Bonn and Paris.

French sources close to the Elysee Palace intimate that the troubled internal conditions in the United States, coupled with our external difficulties, may have been the main reason which decided President Kennedy to yield to the advice of his advisers. These men firmly believe that coexistence with Russia—even on her own terms—is the only expedient solution for our present-day ills. Hence the signing of the Moscow Treaty without any quid pro quo from the Soviets and the likelihood that the next steps toward accommodation will follow suit.

"America is just not in a position to fight under existing conditions," said one of the French Elysee consultants. "As a consequence of your debilitated condition," he continued, "the Russian general staff has already won a spectacular victory which renders the NATO powerless."

He went on to trace the history of the Russian strategy since the end of World War II and the beginning of the cold war: "Even after the Soviets managed to explode the A- and H-bombs; even after they created a formidable nuclear force of their own (which in the opinion of the French specialists still does not match that of the United States), the Russian general staff from Zhukov to Malinovsky have been against a nuclear war."

These capable military men want to fight a war for gains and there can be no gain in a total destruction of the enemy as well as their own countries. The Soviet marshals have helped the Kremlin, and in particular, the shrewd and capable, rough diplomat, Khrushchev, in waging a campaign of terror in the free world. They have especially concentrated on the United States and Britain in the hope that their people would become sufficiently frightened to eventually accept the banning of all nuclear weapons. Once this is achieved, so the thinking here goes, Russia will become the foremost military power in the world because she will possess the greatest conventional force.

The power of the NATO—the shield of freedom as we like to describe it—has always rested on the American nuclear deterrent, not on its ground and conventional air forces. Its power rests on keeping the Russians guessing whether we shall use our nuclear deterrent in, say, a coup against Berlin. According to French intelligence, the Kremlin has now acquired the positive knowledge that America's ultimate weapon won't be used unless there is a major Soviet nuclear attack against United States territory.

Under these conditions, the power of NATO is almost laughable. The watch on the Rhine is composed of six American divisions, nine German, two understrength British, two equally understrength French and a couple of miscellaneous Benelux, Danish, and Norwegian divisions. The Italian, Greek, and Turkish armies which are counted among the NATO forces have specially assigned roles. They will join the battle only if the Mediterranean sector becomes involved.

Against this force between the Elbe and the Rhine the Russians have in East Germany alone 20 divisions with 4,000 tanks. The other satellites have a minimum of 60 divisions. And behind them at close quarters from the Russian border to the Ural mountains there are 147 battle-ready divisions.

How long, ask the French, could the NATO armies resist that formidable conventional force of the potential enemy even if we assume that the air forces of the two antagonists are about equal in quantity and quality? Granted that the Western forces are splendidly trained and equipped, how long could they resist such an avalanche?

The day has arrived when the Russian general staff knows positively that America's deterrent will not be used to protect Europe and the NATO has become a thin paper shield.

Yet, informed Frenchmen add, it is hard to see how America can move to another path than it has taken since the Cuban affair when it gained a short-lived victory. All the alliances which had been formulated since the end of the war to arrest the onward march of international communism at huge expense to the American taxpayer are now falling by the wayside. And the present accommodation policies of the administration are accelerating their disintegration.

[From the Aiken Standard & Review,
Sept. 3, 1963]

Help Your Senator

With the Treaty of Moscow successfully rammed through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for the consideration of the Senate as a whole, Chairman FULBRIGHT has said: "There is no disposition to rush this."

We hope the chairman is right and that all 100 Senators—which includes those who moved it out of the committee room onto the floor—will deliberate the points on which it is most suspect:

1. That the Reds (who have no constitutional obligation to respect treaties and a record of violating 50 out of 52 U.S. agreements) are eager for it.
2. That our top military advisers are not.
3. That its language is so foggy that the Secretary of State has had to explain to the committee that it does so permit us to defend ourselves with our nuclear weapons.
4. That it clearly and specifically constitutes step 1 of stage 1 of the 3-stage program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world as spelled out in Department of State Publication 7277 (presented to the 16th General Assembly of the U.N. and released September 1961) and which calls for the abandonment of our Army, Navy and Air Force to a "U.N. Peace Force."
5. That, contrary to tradition, and with scant respect for representative government, the signatures of some 70 nations were affixed to this document—obviously to give it fraudulent weight—before being presented to the Senate by whose "advice and consent" alone it can become an instrument of state.

Nor should the Senators forget the words of President Kennedy in November 1961 on our betrayal by the Russians in the first agreement to stop nuclear testing. He said "If they fooled us once, it is their fault, and if they fool us twice, it is our fault."

But the Senators themselves need and desperately want advice and consent—from their constituents; collectively, from the Nation. And those who withhold it now, in these final fateful hours, must feel the added pangs of conscience if they are called upon to share the consequences of that dreadful and tragic mistake that Dr. Edward Teller has warned us of.

The Test Ban Treaty

(By Robert Morris)

The hearings before the joint Senate committees on the test ban treaty have ended after the appearance of 44 witnesses. I happened to be the last one of these. With the hearings over, the scene now shifts to the Senate floor. It is the consensus in Washington that unless the people are heard from to the contrary, the treaty will be ratified by a clear margin.

The turning point in the hearings proved to be the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they could reconcile the treaty with national security on condition that certain safeguards such as "comprehensive and aggressive underground testing to the limit of the treaty" and a standby apparatus prepared to test in the atmosphere if necessary, be implemented. They earlier had opposed this treaty. The warning of Dr. Edward Teller, Generals Thomas S. Power, Nathan F. Twining and Admiral Arleigh Burke could not offset the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, during the hearings.

This test ban treaty is expressly made a first step toward "an agreement on general and complete disarmament." The preamble makes the point that the "principal aim" of the signatories is "disarmament." Moreover the outline of the treaty we have put on the table at Geneva specifically provides that the test ban treaty become an "annex" of that treaty when signed.

I believe that these safeguards will gradually be frittered away in the spirit of the U.N. and in the spirit of the disarmament negotiations that will now be commencing. That is the record of our performance in the past. The Communists are working on the assumption that, with disarmament, we will not be able to resist their "national liberation struggle."

The Soviets have a clearcut lead over us in high-yield testing. They now have time to translate their scientific discoveries from those tests into lethal weapons and carriers. We also know they will test again when they are ready. That probably will not be until after the 1964 election.

Much will be made in the weeks ahead of the so-called reservations. The treaty itself is clear. It outlaws "any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion" except underground when the nuclear explosions do not send radioactive debris outside one's borders. The President, moreover, in transmitting the treaty to the Senate, said that "this treaty is the whole agreement * * * the treaty speaks for itself."

The State Department contends that "any other nuclear explosion" does not mean any detonation on behalf of an ally attacked or in our own self-defense. This interpretation goes against the clear wording of the agreement. There is nothing in international law to support a contention that the rule of construction of a treaty is any different in this respect than the rule of construction of a statute or any legal document, namely if a document is clear on its face, recourse may not be had to any other source.

The State Department justifies its interpretation by consulting the minutes of discussions during the negotiations to justify its position. But then it does not make these available in their entirety to the Senate. It also comes up with the conclusion that detonations for peaceful purposes, such as canal building are proscribed.

A reservation on the part of the Senate is a unilateral act. Other nations have signed on the basis of a clearly worded treaty. This "reservation" is being considered to obviate renegotiation. By that very fact it is begging the central issue—the meeting of minds.

The other serious development stems from the wording of the preamble which says that "the principal aim" of the signatories (including the United States) is disarmament. When a treaty is ratified, according to article VI of our Constitution it becomes "the supreme law of the land" coequal with the Constitution.

What does the ratification of this principal aim "of disarmament" do to the law of our land? Does it provide authority for legal action not now authorized by the Constitution? Does it set the stage for executive action by the President to implement congressional grant of authority covering "disarmament"?

All in all, I firmly believe this treaty is fraught with dangers to our security and to our Constitution.

[From the Columbia Record, Sept. 5, 1963]

Strauss Lists Traps in Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—Former AEC Head: "We're Walking Into Them"

(NOTE.—Being in a minority is nothing new for Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and Secretary of Commerce. He was in the minority in 1945 when he urged that atomic bombs should not be dropped without warning on Japanese cities; in 1947 when he insisted on establishing a monitor system to see if the Soviets were testing nuclear weapons; in 1949 when he warned that unless we developed a hydrogen bomb the Soviets might do so first; in 1958 when he told the Senate that the Russians would probably violate a test ban moratorium. His past record of being in a minority that turned out to be right entitles his present views on a test ban treaty to a careful hearing by all Americans.)

(By Lewis L. Strauss)

WASHINGTON.—From time to time in the past, it has been said that the ultimate in nuclear weapons had been invented and nothing more could be expected to accrue from further research and test. The realities, however, have been otherwise.

Since 1948, testing has continually supplied military requirements for weapons of both far greater power and of substantially less power than the prototype atomic bombs of World War II. Also, as a result of testing, we now have weapons of more certain deliverability because of the decrease in size and weight; specialized weapons for specific military uses; a variety of tactical weapons; and weapons with dramatically reduced radioactive fallout.

In fact, with further testing, we are assured that fallout may be further reduced to something approaching zero.

At one time or another many of these advances were believed impossible. It was once said that the thermonuclear weapon, even if it could be built, could be gotten to a target only by oxcart. At that time, I was one of a small minority which included Dr. Edward Teller, the late Karl T. Compton, the late Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, a Nobel Prize winner, and the late Gordon Dean, subsequently Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. We believed the contrary and contended against great odds because of our conviction that world freedom would be forfeited if the Communist government perfected such a weapon before we did.

I wished with all my heart that the oxcart forecast would prove to be right and the hydrogen bomb impossible to make. It became a reality.

NO END

It was once said that the idea of a "clean" bomb—the nuclear weapon with reduced fallout and therefore with vast engineering potential for peace—was nonsense. But it, also, became a reality. The point is that weapons have undergone great changes that could not be demonstrated without tests. Without tests, they could not have been put into manufacture and added to our arsenals. There is no end to invention, and we have no monopoly on ingenuity.

There are other purposes in testing besides the specialization and improvement of weapons. We test to be sure that the weapon and its carrier will function together as a dependable system. Even if weapon development should be frozen in its present state, the carrier of the weapon most probably will be as revolutionary in the future as the guided missile and the Polaris submarine are today by comparison with the state of military art only 10 short years ago when neither of these existed.

When new devices are invented, they can only be dependably mated to the weapon by testing.

The coming months should also see marked development in antimissile systems so critical to our defense. These, to be dependable, can only be tested in the atmosphere.

RUSSIANS AHEAD

There are other reasons for conducting tests such as to determine the effects of very large enemy weapons on our military installations, on shelters for our civilian population, and on our communication system. The Soviets appear to be ahead of us in the area of large explosions. Without this knowledge, we will be operating in the dark should another war occur.

It has been asserted that we have maintained the nuclear superiority to the Soviets which we so clearly enjoyed prior to 1961 and there are other assertions to the contrary, particularly in respect of unit weapon power. I can throw no light on this difference, and it may be that an unequivocal comparison is not possible for anyone to make.

But of this we may be certain—

Inventiveness has not ceased and today's weapons are not as important as tomorrow's. Neither American scientists nor Russian scientists are likely to leave off thinking about the subject. The inevitable result of thinking about it is that new ideas for both weapons and countermeasures are sure to be born. Some of these new ideas may be proved by tests underground. Some will not be.

A radical new weapon breakthrough or a discovery in counter-measure systems, suddenly tested and found to work, could put the possessor nation in command of world events. We ourselves were twice in that position, first with our invention of the fission bomb and later of the fusion bomb. Of course, we never considered making such use of our advantage.

ONE TEST

But what if, in the future, the situation is reversed, as well it may be? For instance, it has been said that the Soviets might elect cheating with a single small atmospheric test which could even escape detection but that one test alone would not be of much significance. This statement, unfortunately, will not stand up in the light of history.

Only one test proved the atomic bomb and only one test proved the principle of the H bomb. If such a radical invention is made on our side of the Iron Curtain, provable only by testing it above ground, the test ban treaty firmly shackles our hands. Thus paralyzed to act, we can only file the idea away in a safe and pray fervently that the same invention will not occur to scientists on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Unfortunately, the well-recognized phenomenon of simultaneous invention may operate, against us.

If the breakthrough is made on the other side of the Iron Curtain, is there anything upon which to base an estimate of the consequences? Would the Soviets in that circumstance, or other circumstances favorable to them, clandestinely breach the treaty? There are some criteria upon which to form a judgment. It is not even necessary to refer to more than the 50 treaty violations in the past, often explained away as the actions of a Soviet regime which no longer exists.

SCIENTIST'S SHAME

Only 4 years ago, a distinguished scientist, who was a principal advisor to our team negotiating a test ban with the Russians, publicly stated that it fell to him to imply to the Russian scientists that we considered them capable of cheating. He wrote that he felt deeply embarrassed and thought they would have been justified if they had "considered this an insult and had walked out of the negotiations in disgust."

The Russian scientists for whose sensitivity our scientist had so admirable a regard were not so thin-skinned. At that very time they must have been engaged in massive preparations for cheating on a massive scale. In barely 12 months after his words were written, they staged a series of tests which, for number and size of weapons, astonished the world.

This "contemptuous" breach of faith, to use President Kennedy's appropriate adjective, seems already forgotten by many Americans. It took place 2 years ago, and we can shorten the focus still further.

Committing the good faith of his government to the test ban treaty, we find the name signed to it for the Soviet Government is that of the foreign minister, Mr. Gromyko. Less than 10 months ago, this same official, representing the same government, sat in the White House with our President and gave him other solemn assurances on behalf of his principal and his government.

Shortly afterward, on the night of October 22—less than 10 months ago—while a shocked Nation listened, the President, in tones of justified outrage, described the barefaced deceit to which he had been subjected. Twice in quoting Mr. Gromyko, the President interrupted his narrative to say, "that statement was also false."

CREDIBILITY

It is an interesting commentary on our times that we negotiate with a man who conducted himself in this manner toward our Chief Executive. However, since this is apparently standard procedures for the Soviet Government, the American people have a right to ask what our negotiators now feel endows this latest Soviet commitment with instant credibility.

Those who see a fundamental change in Soviet policy because of the differences which seem to have developed between the Russian and Chinese dictatorships might examine with profit photographs recently published showing the ardent embraces exchanged in Belgrade between Mr. Khrushchev and Marshal Tito. Their recent bitter ideological differences have apparently evaporated. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mao Tse-tung could become comrades again well before we ever knew of it. At any rate, their differences today are a shaky foundation for our confidence in the word of the Soviet Government.

In describing the treaty, several statements have been made to the effect that it is identical with a proposal made by President Eisenhower in 1959. Although the statements were undoubtedly made in good faith, President Eisenhower has pointed out their fundamental error. In 1959, we had reasonable evidence that we were well ahead of the Soviets in our nuclear armament. The Russian test program with which they surprised the world in 1961 altered that condition, and the situation today is not a parallel of that which prevailed when President Eisenhower's proposal was made. That is one of the two reasons why the treaty and his proposal cannot be represented as one and the same.

CURIOUS WORDS

More importantly, there was nothing in the Eisenhower proposal which would have prevented us from using tactical nuclear weapons to aid our allies or other free nations, if we elected to do so, in the event that they became the victims of Communist attack. As reported in the press, the text of article I of the proposed treaty reads: "Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion." And then comes these puzzling words, "or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control."

What these last 13 words are intended to accomplish is obscure. If they mean what they say, then should any of our NATO allies be attacked, or if, for instance, India should be invaded by Communist China, or Korea again invaded by the Reds, we will not be able to send to their aid any tactical nuclear weapons since, to do so, would be to permit or produce "other nuclear explosions." We could, of course, decide to withdraw from the treaty but only after giving 3 months' notice in advance. In terms of modern warfare, this would be far too late. This part of the treaty is an effective manacle upon our aid in time of crisis.

We have been told that this clause does not, in fact, mean what it appears to say and that a reservation to clear up this ambiguity will be unacceptable to the Soviets and that the treaty, in consequence, will be wrecked. The Eisenhower proposal was not designed to prevent us from coming to the aid of our allies, and it is not proper to equate his proposal of 1959 with the present treaty.

ANOTHER FALLACY

There is another fallacy connected with the advocacy of the treaty. It is the statement that it will prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations. This is an area of opinion which cannot be affirmatively supported, but it is not explained how the existence of the treaty will in the least inhibit the intent of China to secure atomic bombs. It is, of course, beyond the capability of the great majority of the nations which are now signatories to the treaty.

Early ratification of the treaty now appears probable on the premise that it is in the public interest on balance—a value judgment, insupportable by proof, and with which I wish that I could see my way to agree. I am concerned as a private citizen that there are risks to our country which the present Joint Chiefs of Staff and other treaty advocates concede to exist and which some former members of the joint chiefs, among them Admiral Radford, General Twining, and Admiral Burke, regard as inacceptable risks. To reduce these risks as far as possible, witnesses have proposed various reservations which the Senate might make and which do not require rejection of the treaty.

TWO RESERVATIONS

One of these reservations is to the effect that we should preserve the right to construct harbors, canals, and other peaceful works by the use of nuclear explosives, either within our own territory or on the territory of friendly nations requesting or permitting such peaceful applications of nuclear engineering.

Another and more important reservation offered by General Eisenhower would provide that in the event of any armed aggression endangering a vital interest of the United States, this Nation would be the sole judge of the kind and type of weaponry and equipment it would employ, as well as the timing of their use.

In conclusion, may I note that, because civilized man abhors war, he is attracted by any apparently reasonable proposal that bears the label of peace. Too often, however, and recognized too late, a pact hailed by a hopeful majority as signaling peace in our time actually turns out to be a first step on the path to disaster. Since the birth of our Nation, it has been our strength, which has preserved our freedom. As far as one can see ahead, our strength is our most dependable, if not our only, assurance of peace.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Sept. 9, 1963]

The Issue Is U.S. Security

Senator Richard B. Russell has placed the nuclear test ban issue back in proper perspective.

Before the test ban treaty was negotiated in Moscow in July, America's Joint Chiefs of Staff voiced their opposition to such a pact on military grounds. A treaty would not serve America's best interests, they said, because it would subject our national defense to unnecessary risks.

While the treaty was being negotiated and immediately after it was signed, other Americans well versed in the requirements of our defense structure and the status of the arms race came forth to oppose the treaty for security reasons. Imposing testimony was offered to support the view that the U.S. Senate should reject the treaty because of the military disadvantages it holds for the free world.

But then proponents of the treaty succeeded in shifting the spotlight away from military aspects of the pact. They hammered away at the diplomatic and political implications of the forthcoming Senate vote.

A public opinion poll taken in the wake of ebullient international spirits at the time of the treaty signing was produced to "prove" that 73 percent of the American people favored Senate ratification. Treaty advocates forecast reelection trouble for any Senator who voted against the treaty and dire international consequences for the United States, if the Senate failed to approve it.

Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff were persuaded to place political considerations ahead of military risks in their testimony before Senate committees. As a result, they gave their qualified approval to ratification, although one of them—Air Force Gen. Curtis LeMay—made it clear he would not have sanctioned the treaty before it was signed.

With most of the emphasis centered on international and domestic politics, the treaty appeared headed for smooth sailing through the Senate.

But now comes Senator Russell, with an assist from Senator John Stennis, of Mississippi, and Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, to get the test ban debate back on the track.

Speaking as the unquestioned leading Senate authority on national defense, the eminent Georgian has declared:

"I have studied this matter as carefully as I could and concluded that, in good conscience, I cannot support the treaty."

Stennis and Thurmond, two other members of Russell's Armed Services Committee, also formally announced their opposition to the treaty on the eve of the Senate floor debate, which begins today.

Stennis, in a short floor speech, cited the "serious and formidable" treaty. Russell said he would wait until this week to disclose his reasons in a detailed Senate speech, but he made it clear that national security is the basis for his opposition.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Russell for restoring the vital defense considerations to their proper place of prominence. Even as he announced his opposition—which automatically changed the voting outlook considerably, Russell conceded that treaty proponents probably have enough votes committed to insure ratification of the pact.

Whether they have or haven't, the Georgian has clarified what should be the paramount issue at stake. If as many as 33 Senators are not willing to join him in defeating the treaty when the vote comes, it will be because they placed political considerations ahead of maximum national security.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Sept. 7, 1963]

Will the Senate Yield?

Senator Hubert Humphrey advances as one of the principal reasons for the Senate to support the proposed nuclear test ban treaty the argument that if it were not in our national interest "our Government would not have worked for and then signed" it.

This reasoning by the liberal Democrat from Minnesota attributes to the White House and the State Department an omniscience which we doubt they deserve. But more importantly, it obviates the historic "advise and consent" role of the Senate in matters brought before it by the executive branch of the Government.

It presupposes that any treaty offered on any subject and with any nation is a flawless document and a consummate instrument and is to be blindly rubber-stamped by Members of the Senate.

To accept that premise is to negate that portion of the Constitution which gives to the Senate the responsibility and obligation to scrutinize all treaties negotiated in behalf of the United States, and to turn down any that it might feel is not in the national interest.

Humphrey's argument on this point is as specious, incidentally, as is another he advances. He claims it should be adopted because a poll has shown that the treaty is supported by 73 percent of the American people.

A cogent point raised by Senator Barry Goldwater in one of his statements answered that latter claim, so far as we are concerned.

The first week after the treaty was initialed in Moscow, said the Arizonian, a distinct volume of mail coming to the Senate favored the treaty proposal. As he said, that was natural. The negotiators, the President, Premier Khrushchev, all were pictured in such high spirits over the treaty. That spirit, said Goldwater, was contagious.

Last week, however, he said, another check of mail showed that support for the treaty was dwindling throughout the Nation.

We suspect a more current poll of people would show the same results.

In fact, a national poll most likely would, in our opinion, reflect strong support for Goldwater's suggestion that the United States require Russia to remove its troops from Cuba as a condition of the test ban treaty.

Admittedly, this should have been written into the treaty before it was initialed in Moscow, a suggestion which the Chronicle itself made at the time. That is wasn't, however, doesn't mean that the United States must always ignore its own self-interests, nor is the time too late now.

That many Americans seem willing to find fault with the proposal that this country place its welfare in the balance in its negotiations with the deceitful Soviet Union smacks of a timidity and a naivete ill befitting a nation of our strength and integrity.

[From the Economic Council Letter, Sept. 1 1963]

Russian Roulette

The Moscow Treaty, for cessation of nuclear testing, except underwater, is the first step in implementing the program for total disarmament usually referred to as 7277.

This program was approved in essence by President Kennedy before the U.N. Assembly in 1961. The detailed agreement for disarmament in three stages was submitted to the United Nations the same day by the U.S. Government as the official document recording the terms of the agreement accepted by our Government and the Soviet Union. It may, as we said recently, have the legal status of an executive agreement and therefore be part of the Constitution. The purpose of the present treaty then would be to get the Senate's approval on record.

On June 1 of this year we reported to you, in Council Letter 512, that some major agreement was in the offing between the Soviet Government and ours, with the climax set probably for a meeting in Rome between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. The death of the Pope made that timing impossible. But Mr. Harriman was immediately dispatched to Moscow and the Treaty of Moscow was brought forth.

Debate on this test ban treaty may be the most important debate ever held in the U.S. Senate.

DISSENTING OPINION

The executive branch today has an army of experts, political, military, scientific, virtually all of whom can be brought forward to testify that this treaty is a giant step toward peace. More important even, the American executive branch has over the last 30 years been transformed, from a loose representative structure, mirroring as many shades of opinion as there were in the country, to a tight monolithic structure, under which it is nearly impossible for dissenting opinions to reach the public. This control extends in fact to private firms dependent on Government contracts, and to university experts dependent upon Government subsidies for research. Near unanimity in favor of the treaty is therefore to be expected. The least expression of dissent is highly significant.

Hearings are being held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose chairman, Senator Fulbright (Democrat of Arkansas), is wholly committed to the philosophy of coexistence on which the treaty rests. The Senate Armed Services Committee and the Atomic Energy Committee were persuaded to hold joint hearings with Foreign Relations, under the chairmanship of Fulbright. These committees allotted 3 weeks for hearings, 2 weeks for supporters and a third week (the week of the civil rights march) for opponents. One Congressman who asked for an hour to present his objections was told that the limit was 10 minutes, but as a matter of congressional courtesy he could have 15 minutes.

Impressive military and technical testimony is now coming out against the treaty, even from Government experts. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, said that militarily he saw a great disadvantage but politically a net advantage. LeMay said Secretary McNamara had never consulted him—the Air Force Chief of Staff—on the treaty.

Air Force Gen. Thomas S. Powers, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, said the test ban treaty was not in the best interests of the United States. He did not have confidence that the United States would maintain its nuclear superiority if the treaty were signed, and our nuclear superiority was, he believed, "the only present deterrent to war."

All honor to General Powers and General LeMay. It takes almost unbelievable courage for any individual in high office to obey his conscience and take a stand against the Government monolith.

We call your attention to the fact that General LeMay was not appointed Air Chief for a full term, but only for 1 year. It is reported that Adm. Georg Anderson, former Chief of Naval Operations, was not reappointed because he was opposed to the test ban treaty. We will watch with interest to see how long it is before General Powers is promoted from command of SAC to some job which has prestige but no defense responsibilities.

If Congress served no other purpose, it would be a priceless safeguard for our country, because it delays and makes more difficult the punishment of Government officials who think they should tell the American people the dangerous truth.

The honor roll of good public servants must also include Dr. Teller, famous expert in nuclear science, who said the treaty would be a dreadful and tragic mistake for the United States. We wish we could name all the men of honor who are trying to give the American people their best judgment on these difficult matters.

THE POLITICAL ISSUE

We shall confine our analysis to one area which we think is least likely to be examined—the political. Our concern is this: Is the test ban treaty a complete package, to be judged in itself, or is it an innocent-appearing part in a carefully designed long-range plan for ends about which we are not told? We are certain the Senators will carefully examine the words of the treaty itself, but we are not so hopeful they will examine this treaty as a critical link in a much larger, more ambitious design for shaping American foreign and military policies. We shall try to define the questions, if not the answers.

If, as we believe, this treaty is only part of a grand design, then the other parts of it are already prepared and ready for adoption at a predetermined pace.

The architects of this grand design have really been quite frank about the next steps. It is obvious that this test ban treaty will be followed first by the successive steps listed in the United States-U.S.S.R. agreement, or 7277. These include further abandonment of military bases, demobilizing of missile-carrying equipment (the Strategic Air Command?), reduction of military training, and abolition of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.

We do not believe our Armed Forces are going to be seriously reduced. The services will be transformed into a gigantic peace corps to teach industrial and farming skills to underdeveloped nations. The Peace Corps idea is no naive one. Defense budgets will be cut only slightly because most of the funds will be spent in a greatly enlarged program for helping backward nations. Incredible as it sounds, we confidently predict we shall before long be engaged in a vast undertaking for aid to Red China, probably on the theory that that will soften Red China's rulers and make them willing to accept a ban on atomic war. What a strategic leap forward for Soviet military power.

THE WARSAW PACT

Another spoke in the wheel of which this treaty is an innocent-appearing part is the Warsaw Pact. That is the nonaggression treaty between the Communist States and the NATO countries. Note that such a pact is a commitment by the United States to the present deadly division which runs through the heart of Europe, including the Berlin wall. The new treaty will sanctify the Soviet conquest of the captive nations and end forever any chance for reunification of Germany.

On the Asian side, the same end as the Warsaw Pact will be achieved by cutting down military aid to anti-Communist nations, like free China and free Korea, and then making them into an atom-free or demilitarized zone. There is an air of contrived theatrical effects even in the troubles of Vietnam.

Warsaw Pact demilitarized zones—at our expense—have long been the policy of the leftists in England. They have been put forward subtly at many conferences by American delegates, but the time was not ripe. The minds of the American people had not been softened up enough. But we are getting nearer.

There has been much talk of why Khrushchev finally agreed to this treaty. Khrushchev has been for disarmament for years. The Soviet economy cannot stand the cost of keeping up with American defense spending. Khrushchev wishes to use that money for economic advancement. He knows he cannot "bury" us until his economy makes a better showing.

In addition, Khrushchev had two other aims. Soviet policies in Europe have been directed to keeping a grip on the captive nations and preventing the rearming of Germany with modern, especially nuclear, weapons. They have succeeded in both aims, but Western Europe is getting restless, as it gets more powerful. It must be checkmated before it knows its strength.

The Soviet quarrel with Red China has all the appearance of a Moscow Art Theater production. Khrushchev is not going to fight China. He would prefer to let us do it. One important suggestion, made by Philip Horton of the Reporter, is that the Soviet leaders wish to weaken Mao's regime so that they can replace it with a Communist leadership under strict Soviet control.

BLUEPRINT FOR SURRENDER

A curious effort is being made to blame the Kennedy administration for the test ban treaty. Why? Is this another red herring, the deadliest weapon of those who would destroy us?

The policy implicit in the Moscow treaty is the policy which has dominated our military and political decisions over many years.

This treaty must be considered in connection with other military policies with which it is interwoven. These include the abandonment of Nike-Zeus, the TFX plane contracts, abandonment of our oversea bases, gradual abandonment of manned bombers, the no-win policy in troop indoctrination, and many others. We should also include the President's curious statement that we cannot achieve an antimissile missile, no matter how much we test.

In this connection it is useful to read an article by Earl Ubell and Stuart H. Loory in the Saturday Evening Post for June 1, 1963, on how Secretary McNamara did away with the Nike-Zeus missile.

It is the fashion of the moment to tie these developments to the conference in Moscow at the end of 1960, when W. W. Rostow and Jerome Wiesner represented incoming President Kennedy. We apparently agreed to end the use of provocative weapons because they made the Communist leaders nervous.

We do not believe either of these men were principals or that the program of softening up our defenses originated with them. So subtle and effective a policy for the loss of American freedom was contrived by men with far more ability than they, over a much longer period.

President Eisenhower had an excellent Secretary of Defense in Charles Wilson, perhaps the ablest man in the world on the industrial side of war preparation. He also had a brilliant Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Admiral Radford. As a former military man, Eisenhower had many friends who could reach him outside of official channels and let him know what was going on. Nevertheless major steps were taken in the reduction of American military dependence on strength. The long-term policy of giving State Department officials top responsibility over the military professionals on military decisions went forward rapidly. State Department types moved into top positions in the highly centralized Defense Department and exerted their influence through financial, legal, and other cobwebs.

Parallel steps in weakening our military independence were the atoms-for-peace program urged by Senator HUMPHREY and the ADA, the invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States, the synthetic spirit of Camp David, the furor over the U-2 incident, and the craven advice to the President to give up a state visit to Japan because of Communist riots in Tokyo.

To these we might add the settlement of the fighting in Korea in such a way as to free the Communists to attack southeast Asia, the partition of Vietnam (moving the Communist frontier nearer to the free world), and the mutual defense treaty, barring free China from moving back onto the mainland without the consent of the Security Council. More disastrous was the decision to pretend Castro was not a Communist though his record was well known, and insist that the dictatorship of aging Batista, who supported us at the U.N. was more immoral and dangerous than the dictatorship of a ruthless Communist supported by Soviet power.

We should add to this list the destruction of Senator Joseph McCarthy with the help of our Government. Remember that Senator McCarthy had moved from his exposures of communism in the State Department to the horrified discovery that influences were powerful enough in the Defense Department to promote Dr. Peress and protect subversion at Fort Monmouth.

The same story runs through the Truman administration, beginning with the dismissal of the highest American military officer in the Pacific, in the midst of a war, because he wanted to fight the Communist Chinese.

There are many more examples. To sum up, the present pattern of American military policy, as illustrated today by the recommendations of Wiesner and Rostow, McNamara and Yarmolinsky, is not new. It is a continuation and fulfillment of the military policies followed under President Truman and in fact growing ever more powerful under President Eisenhower.

These apparently separate but closely interwoven threads are the same as the foreign policies carried on, behind the presidential facade, during all postwar administrations.

In other words, all of these foreign and military moves could be summed up as the Yalta program, or even better, the Teheran program, for peaceful coexistence. Under various aspects the design includes getting the American Nation tightly locked into world government, with a world military force stronger than that of any national state, world law, world government jurisdiction over the individual, world powers of taxation, and world control of the economy.

The institutions of the United States and the Soviet Union are to be gradually modified so they will look and function more and more alike while we are persuaded by people-to-people programs that the Soviet people—left alone—would not choose war. This is what Khrushchev means when he said he will "bury" us.

THE TURN TO LIBERTY

Those people should support the treaty who like the curious policies our Government has followed since Yalta and who like the policies projected for the immediate future. Those people who do not like the blueprint for coexistence should oppose the treaty or insist on amendments based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

We propose one such amendment. American interests can best be served by an amendment providing that before the treaty goes into effect, the Soviet Union grant free elections in all captive nations on the question whether they are for or against national independence free from Soviet or Iron Curtain military occupation. These votes will be conducted by the U.N. in the presence of the press of the world. In East Germany the question should be for or against reunion with West Germany.

President Roosevelt, President Truman, Republicans in Congress, and many of our distinguished men have said that the United States could never make an agreement with U.S.S.R. until the captive nations were free. Today we must add Cuba to the captive nations.

Some better amendments may be offered in the Senate, but this proposal will keep open the debate on our security as a nation.

Thirty-four Senators can save our country from disintegration. It will be a political miracle if the American people can arouse themselves and tell the Members of the Senate they will tolerate no surrender of American self-defense.

It will be a miracle. But we believe in miracles.

Ten Reasons To Oppose Treaty

To the Editor:

In regards to the test ban treaty now pending in Washington, D.C., I would like to say that I along with a lot of other people would like very much to have peace but not on Russian terms.

When Russia takes down the German wall and gives her slaves freedom, pulls out of Cuba and allows those people to elect their own leaders, get rid of Khrushchev, give up Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, etc.; then we could believe Russia really desired peace and it would be time for our leaders to start having peace talks with Russia.

However, nothing has changed; Russia is still the same with the same murderers who are dictators who are bent on world domination. Because of this and the following reasons I am bitterly opposed to the test ban treaty, which Khrushchev is so anxious to get passed.

1. Any treaty with Russia is not worth the paper that it is written on and can only do one thing—allow the Russians to arm and test while we stand still. The Russians have broken 50 out of 53 treaties and will surely break the other 3 when it is to their interest to do so. Remember the Russians had a test ban treaty with President Eisenhower. They broke that agreement and will also break this one. This treaty will further the Russians' ambition at our expense.

2. This agreement was not legally and properly brought about. It was written and signed before bringing it before our Senate. This automatically prevents our law body from changing any part of it, which is not in the best interest of the United States. It is a Russian course all the way.

3. Approving this treaty is like giving someone a filled out and signed check except for the amount, because I understand after we have signed this agreement and if it is passed then the majority of the nations, who have signed the treaty, can change it. Then we will still be obligated to abide by this change without the approval of the Senate and Congress. This is like buying something in a paper bag.

4. In the past each time we have met, talked or made agreements with Russia they have gained something and we have lost and experience has proved that when they are anxious for something it is the best sign that I know of that it is not good for us.

5. I am far more afraid of a sellout than I am a fallout.

6. How can you possibly do honorable business with dishonorable people such as gangsters, blackmailers, saboteurs, or people whose main ambition is to destroy you? It is suicide to try.

7. In my opinion no one in his right mind can be for this treaty and still be a patriotic American.

8. I am bitterly opposed to the campaign of pressure and fear being used by those who are wishing to pass this agreement. President Kennedy in his inaugural address said "Let us never negotiate out of fear"; now he is asking us to do just that.

9. Our Congress and Senate were not given the chance to participate in drawing up this agreement.

10. Russia could go ahead with her testing in China or some other Communist country which had not signed the treaty and say that she had nothing to do with it.

Approving this test ban treaty could go a long way in helping the downfall of the United States. People who give up their freedom for peace no longer have either.

An old-fashioned American,
Paul D. Conrad, Sr.

[From the Manion Forum, Sept. 1, 1963]

The Test Ban Treaty: A Covenant With Death and an Agreement With Hell

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

President Kennedy says that the test ban treaty is a step toward peace. The eminent scientist, Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb, calls it a step toward war. Over this microphone a few weeks ago, the distinguished military strategist, Adm. Chester Ward (Manion Forum broadcast No. 462) declared that the treaty is a plan for the certain destruction of the United States.

These three estimations of the practical effect of the treaty have all been amplified in newspaper reports. You may take your choice. But basically, and aside from its frightening practical implications, the test ban treaty raises an important moral issue, which is being all but completely obscured.

For the moral character of this made-in-Moscow contract we must go back to the prophet Isaiah: "We have made a covenant with death and an agreement with Hell. We have made lies our refuge and under falsehood we have hid ourselves" (Isaiah 28:15).

That, in words spoken 2,700 years ago, is precisely what our diplomatic representatives did at Moscow. That evil deed—over and beyond its practical consequences for peace, war and our national destruction—that is the thing that should disturb us now.

The evil of this treaty with the Communists is the basic evil involved in any agreement with militant activated atheism. Such an agreement on testing or on any other subject, creates moral obligations which we must and will observe because our Government is the end product of a moral climate, and our constitutions and laws the the projections of religious morality—whether we all realize it or not.

But the moral obligations created by this agreement have no meaning for the Communists because communism is, by its open profession and unbroken practice, an unmoral institution that recognizes no obligation except force.

A great many people are scandalized by the fact that the Communists have already broken 50 agreements that we have made with them. This record of Communist faithlessness is frequently cited as the reason why we should make no more agreements with Communist governments. The conclusion is correct but the reason for it is superficial. The Communists have broken these agreements when it suited their purpose to do so for the reason that being Communists they could not and cannot do otherwise.

Unless he is restrained by some Pavlovian perversion of his nature, a wolf will grab a piece of meat when he is hungry, and by the same token Communists must and will do what is immediately expedient for communism. When Communists cease to do that they are no longer Communists.

No human being in his right mind would hire a hungry wolf to guard his meat because human beings understand the nature of wolves. The fact that we made 50 agreements with Communists and are shocked because they broke them proves simply that we do not understand the nature of Communists and/or the nature of communism. The recent agreement made in Moscow underscores the persistence of that fatal misunderstanding.

Once upon a time our Government officials knew better. Back in 1920, the Italian Ambassador to this country asked our then Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, why the United States refused to recognize the Communist Government of Soviet Russia. Mr. Colby's reply is a classical explanation of the impossibility of establishing orderly treaty relationships with Communist governments.

Ask your Senator to get this masterpiece of truth from our State Department and read it into the Record during the debate on ratification of the Moscow Treaty.

Among other things, Secretary of State Colby said this:

"The undisputed facts have convinced the Government of the United States that the existing regime in Russia is based upon the (denial) negation of every principle of honor and good faith and every usage and convention underlying the whole structure of international law; the (denial) negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals.

"The responsible leaders of the (Communist) regime have freely and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

"This attitude of dishonoring obligations * * * they base upon the theory that no compact or agreement made with a (non-Communist) government can have any moral force for them. * * * In the view of the Government of the United States there cannot be any common ground upon which it can stand with a power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense."

That was said in 1920. Has the Soviet Government done anything since then to soften that official condemnation? Take a quick look at the record. Here are some highlights: Since 1920 the Communists have stolen our vital military secrets, perverted our public servants, counterfeited our currency, killed or imprisoned our soldiers, and finally, in Paris, Khrushchev publicly insulted the President of the United States to his face.

THE UNITED STATES UNLEASHED THE RED OFFENSIVE 30 YEARS AGO

In the process of violating its solemn agreements with this country and other countries (more than 1,000 violations all told), the Soviet Government has extended the boundaries of its ruthless unmoral and illegitimate control to the point where communism now rules more than 1 billion people. Millions of its most pitiful victims are now in our own hemisphere.

At the moment, the Red conquest is on the offensive everywhere. But the point to remember as you read this record is that the Communists were completely unable to get started on this victory march as long as the United States followed the official policy you have just heard expressed by our Secretary of State Colby in 1920.

Four successive Presidents of the United States adhered to that policy which was first established by Woodrow Wilson. As a result of its continuous enforcement, communism was literally dying on the Kremlin vine in 1933 when President Franklin Roosevelt reversed this Wilson policy and suddenly brought the Red criminal apparatus back to life with official American recognition.

From that day to this the moral, financial, and constitutional integrity of this country has been progressively weakened by the failure of four successive Presidents of the United States to read, understand, and apply the self-evident truth about communism that Secretary of State Colby wrote to the Italian Ambassador 43 years ago.

Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—each gambled the future of freedom here, and, therefore, the future of freedom everywhere, on the personal conviction that he could tame and civilise this chronically hungry Kremlin wolf to the point where it would no longer grab whatever meat it could reach.

What is the reason for the precarious state of the world today? That reason is embedded in the fact that since 1932 we have not had a President of the United States whose official actions reflected an understanding of the moral leprosy that is called communism.

There may have been excuses for the naivete of President Franklin Roosevelt in dealing with this deadly political disease. The complete record of Communist perfidy was not available to him in 1933 and, as he frankly told Congressman Martin Dies, "Several of the best friends I have are Communists." ("The Martin Dies Story," p. 144, Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y., $5.)

It is harder now to find similar excuses for President Kennedy. By his own admission, President Kennedy has had more direct experience with Communist perfidy than President Roosevelt had. In a dramatic television speech to the American people last October 22, the President announced that Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko had lied to him about the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba.

But the same Gromyko has just initialed the test ban treaty which President Kennedy is urging the Senate to ratify into a binding obligation upon the United States.

Will it be necessary for the President to make another dramatic speech, in October of 1964 perhaps, telling the American people that Mr. Gromyko was lying when he pledged that the Soviet Government would scrupulously observe the new Moscow atom test ban?

What assurance has Mr. Kennedy had since last October that causes him to believe that Gromyko, Khrushchev, and the other Communist functionaries have finally been won over to the side of truth?

Do the Communists still make an official point of the fact that their agreements are as worthless as Secretary Colby said they were in 1920?

Last March, Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei, had an audience with the late Pope John. A few days later he was interviewed by reporters in Vienna who asked him if agreements were contemplated between the Kremlin and the Vatican.

Adzhubei denied that he had made any promises to the Pope or that any agreements were to be expected. Said he, "I am an atheist. I could break my word to the Holy Father * * * as an atheist I would not be compelled to keep a promise. * * * There can never be peaceful coexistence between the Christian religion and our Communist doctrine." (David Lawrence, Buffalo Evening News, Mar. 22, 1963.)

This would seem to bring Secretary Colby's 1920 explanation up to date. That being so, we have made an agreement with hell which, if ratified, we must observe but which the atheistic Communists will not.

Among other things, the Moscow treaty forbids us to fire a nuclear explosion anywhere under any circumstances except underground, which means, obviously, that in our resistance to Communist aggression henceforth we will not be permitted to use nuclear weapons. Thus, we will have to match the massive Russian and Chinese armies bayonet to bayonet as we did in Korea.

WE ARE NOW ON ROAD TO DISARMAMENT—AND OBLIVION

This Moscow agreement is much more than a test ban. It is a unilateral undertaking by the United States to bring about universal disarmament and to invest the United Nations with sole control of all weapons and military forces in the world, including all of our nuclear laboratories, installations and stockpiles. This is the one inflexible purpose of this administration.

Secretary McNamara has the questionable distinction of being the first Defense Secretary in memory who has concerned himself primarily with the wholesale liquidation of American military striking power. General Bonner Fellers listed McNamara's accomplishments in this respect over this microphone last week.

The President has said that the treaty is a first step toward universal disarmament, which he confuses with "peace." He is already taking the second step in the disarmament conference at Geneva where our delegate has just offered to reduce our nuclear stockpile by donations to a pool to be used for peaceful purposes.

We officially offer to give away 60 tons for every 40 tons of nuclear material contributed by the Soviet Union. If there is anything left now of our once vaunted nuclear superiority, this proposed formula should wipe it out in short order.

Commenting upon this proposal, a Chicago Tribune editorial (August 18) says: "We sometimes wonder whether the Kennedy administration is committed to national suicide or whether it is conducting a planned drive into surrender to communism."

The answer is that the Kennedy administration is committed to suicide and surrender. It has made its covenant with death and its agreement with hell for the promise of a world without war in which Mr. U Thant will keep universal peace, using American soldiers who will wear United Nations uniforms.

But Isaiah prophesied that the promise will not be kept; that our agreement with hell will be broken and when the "overflowing scourge" shall pass through the land then all of us, including U.S. Senators, will be "trodden down by it." (Isaiah 29:18)

Let us pray that the Senators will remember that awful prophecy when the roll is called on the Moscow treaty.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Sept. 9, 1963]

RUSSELL IS OPPOSED

Announcement by Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that he will oppose ratification of the nuclear test ban is a tremendous blow to proponents of the Treaty of Moscow.

The senior Senator from Georgia has immense prestige in the Senate. His fellow Senators know that he has the deepest understanding of the Nation's defenses and is above any appeal to partisan advantage.

If anyone can persuade the Senate that the test ban contains danger to the United States, that individual is Senator RUSSELL.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Sept. 6, 1963]

RIGHT, SENATOR GOLDWATER—RESERVATIONS STIPULATED ESSENTIAL TO TREATY

There is a way—a forthright way—to correct a major disadvantage under which this Nation would find itself with the proposed nuclear test ban in force as drawn. That is by attaching two reservations as stipulated by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER yesterday.

They would:

1. Require Russia to remove all Soviet missiles and military forces from Cuba, before the pact became effective.

2. Provide in specific language, as former President Eisenhower has urged, that the treaty shall not impede America's right to use nuclear weapons in defense of its security.

The threat to which these provisos are addressed is not new.

Soviet-armed Cuba sets just 90 miles from the United States shore—still the staging area for subversion and potential attack in this hemisphere, substantially unaltered in that regard despite ceremonious gestures of "settlement" and withdrawal dating to the now deflated "showdown" of last October. While talking "peace" and "coexistence" and "disarmament" as fringe benefits of the Moscow treaty, Khrushchev has made no move to prove the claim of good faith by ordering a genuine withdrawal from there. Indeed, even the earlier references to on-site inspections gather dust on the policy shelf.

Certainly, America should assert the right—as the elementary right of security—to use whatever weapons are necessary if this Nation or its allies are attacked. President Eisenhower was right in asserting that major premise; and Senators likewise concerned for the future of their country are right in insisting on it.

The treaty is meaningless as an instrument of security if by omission or commission it is subject to nebulous interpretation.

Even many of those outwardly favoring it, mobilized as witnesses before Senate committees pondering it, have mentioned factors of doubt and of danger.

These defects must be corrected now. They could not possibly be corrected after it went into force, if ratified.

With these changes, America could, with some degree of safety—or at least a less degree of danger—accept the treaty. Without them, it would be taking a leap in the dark; a gamble on a piece of paper which the Soviet will violate on its own whim.

The document still would entail a risk, though reduced. The alterations proposed are essential to any ratification; without them, the Senate should reject it.

Senator GOLDWATER is a realist where national security—present and future—is concerned. He has spoken the sentiment, and voiced the judgment, of many colleagues in that body of ultimate decision; of many in positions of military command * * * and of millions, assuredly, comprising the body of citizenship whose national security is at stake.

[Editorial from Radio Station WDIX, Orangeburg, S.C.]

TEST BAN MERITS

The people of the United States are going to get a test ban treaty, not on its merits, but on the power of the administration to enforce its will on the witnesses. Defense Secretary McNamara reversed his earlier testimony that the Russians have developed an antimissile system. The Joint Chiefs of Staff reversed their earlier testimony that they oppose the test ban treaty. A reversal of testimony by men like Mr. McNamara and the top military leaders of the United States is a significant thing to behold.

In support of the test ban treaty, Secretary McNamara told the Senate on Tuesday (August 13, 1963) that the Communists had not developed an antimissile missile. Earlier he had admitted to the Armed Services Committee that the Russians had developed an antimissile missile. Senator THURMOND reminded Secretary McNamara of his earlier testimony (August 14, 1963). What Secretary McNamara was telling the Senate in support of the test ban treaty was a direct contradiction of what he had told the Armed Services Committee earlier that the Soviets do have an operational antimissile missile. The United States must have nuclear tests in the air to perfect our antimissile missile. To get a Senate approval of the treaty, Mr. McNamara reversed his earlier testimony.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had earlier testified to the Armed Services Committee that they were opposed to the test ban treaty. Now, the Joint Chiefs reverse their testimony. Allen and Scott report: "This dramatic backstage, about-face by the top military leaders was brought about by the President's using both his personal prestige and great power as commander-in-chief. (The President told the Joint Chiefs—) 'If by some chance the Senate would fail to ratify this treaty it would be the worst blow to this country's prestige since the Russians launched their sputnik.' Repeatedly the President assured the Joint Chiefs that he would not let the treaty undermine the country's military strength" (August 14, 1963). The result is that the top military leaders of the United States have reversed their earlier testimony. The President and his advisers did not consult the military before the test ban negotiations. After the deal is made they enforce the decision on all and override all opposition. The Nation will get a test ban treaty—not on its merits—but, on the power of the President.

[Editorial from radio station WDIX, Orangeburg, S.C.]

ACTS—NOT WORDS

The big guns of U.S. Government propaganda are turned loose on the U.S. Senate and the U.S. public. Reams of broadcast news and front page headlines come from the Government. Under Secretary of State Harriman says: "Khrushchev will abide by the limited test ban treaty to avoid the risks of nuclear war." The Associated Press reports Secretary Rusk: "The Soviet Union * * * has looked into the pit of the inferno and has a common interest." Mr. Rusk continues: "The limited test ban treaty is not based on trust of Russia." He said: "It will not lull the United States into relaxing its vigilance." The President of the United States has made similar assurances. We are told over and over again that Khrushchev is afraid that we don't trust Russia, that we will keep up our guard, and the whole thing has a most unrealistic press-agentry about it. It reminds the average man and woman of last November when our leaders were eye-ball-to-eye-ball, Cuban weapons were defensive, Russia would not dare to put missiles in Cuba, we demand on-site inspection, communism will not be exported and Castro will die on the vine.

It was Mr. Harriman who arranged the Laos deal with Khrushchev to keep the peace in Laos while we pay the bill which is no small thing—$3 million a month. But, the Communists are taking Laos and with Khrushchev's blessing. Worse, the Communists are using Laos as a sanctuary and supply route and flanking and killing U.S. citizens in uniform. We look at our country taking second place in the nuclear race, protecting Castro, financing Communist-leaning governments, refusing the contract of the aircraft carrier authorized by Congress, refusing to put into production Nike-Zeus and Skybolt—and, the average citizen is warranted in wondering if his leaders are competent to maintain the vigilance they say they will maintain. We have not stopped Castro, yet. We haven't even slowed him up. But, we stopped the Cuban patriots. Are the test ban assurances on any firmer foundation than the others? The test ban could be our last failure to meet our responsibilities with acts—not words.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 3, 1963]

THE TREATY IN THE SENATE

The 16 to 1 vote by which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee indorsed the Kennedy-Harriman partial nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union and sent it to the Senate floor for debate does not fully reflect the sentiments of the committee members. Several who entertain the gravest doubts about this undertaking were ready to move it out of committee without giving up their right to vote against it later.

Yet we expect that the Senate in the end will give its consent to ratification. As soon as the treaty was signed by the Secretary of State in Moscow, the Senate was presented with an accomplished fact. Then a whole raft of other countries signed up, and an administration which is always more concerned with the good opinion of bush league states than with the interests or security of the United States began arguing that we couldn't betray them.

Much emotional propaganda has been cranked up about how the treaty could be a step toward a new era of international good feeling, while the accommodation-with-Khrushchev lobby is busy magnifying the hazards of radioactivity in babies' milk—which, it is true, has yet to inconvenience any babies.

We certainly should not choose to deny Khrushchev the chance to indulge in a dance step or two when the treaty is ratified. After all, Hitler enjoyed that pleasure when he did a jig in 1940 at Compiegne when France collapsed.

But, lest joy be unconfined, there are a few sour notes. Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School, spoke on his radio forum Sunday, discussing the moral character of this made-in-Moscow contract. He cited the awesome words of the prophet Isaiah:

"We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves.

"And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.

"For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it."

Let the Senate ponder. Communism neither repents nor reforms, and of what use have its pledges ever been?

When Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei, had an audience with the late Pope John, he denied that any agreements had been made, saying, "I am an atheist, I could break my word to the Holy Father. As an atheist I would not be compelled to keep a promise. There can never be peaceful coexistence between the Christian religion and our Communist doctrine."

That is explicit enough, but there are the words of Lenin that a treaty "is the means of gaining strength." There are the words of Stalin that treaties, like nuts, are made to be cracked.

"A diplomat's words," said Stalin, "must have no relation to action—otherwise, what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

Let the Senators not say that they have not been forewarned. Let each Senator remember, in Isaiah's phrase, that "God doth instruct him to discretion."

[From Our Sunday Visitor, Aug. 11, 1963]

RIGHT OR WRONG—A FRESH FOCUS

(By Rev. Richard Ginder)

With all the discussion of the nuclear pact between Kennedy, Macmillan, and Khrushchev, it becomes necessary again to step back and focus on the whole picture.

De Gaulle did not join in the pact, but no one is alarmed, for he is not hostile. Adenauer did not sign, nor Franco. No—keep your eye on the short baldheaded man with the wart beside his nose. He is the enemy, the dictator of the U.S.S.R., the man who can break any pact any time he wants and send millions to their death. He has announced time and again that he is out to "get" us.

If you read your periodicals thoughtfully, you are bound to observe two very different points of view about this menace. The one holds Khrushchev for a cunning barbarian and demands immediate liberation of Russia and the captive nations.

The other counsels patience, believing that time is on our side: "All tyrannies pass away eventually. Granted Khrushchev is evil, he will die sooner or later. The Communist system is bound to mellow."

TIME IS AGAINST US

But time is not on the side of freedom. It is on Khrushchev's side and he well knows it. His system has, in a very short time, enslaved one-third of the earth, and now he wants the perpetuation of this outrage recognized by the free world as a stable affair. He wants the abnormal made normal.

Hence, although he is as wicked as and far more dangerous than the late unlamented A. Hitler, he walks about posing as a civilized person and inviting nice people in to dinner—people like Averell Harriman and Viscount Hailsham. These affairs are then played up in the Soviet press as proof of how the Western nations esteem this latterday Hitler, treating him as their equal and the freely chosen representative of a great nation.

"You see," he can tell the people of Hungary, "it is perfectly normal for your country to be garrisoned by Russian troops and run from the Kremlin. Otherwise, do you think the Governments of the United States and Great Britain would send their representatives to treat with me?"

To quote again what Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes wrote 40 years ago:

"Nothing should be done to place the seal of approval on the tyrannical measures that have been adopted in Russia, or to take any action which might retard the gradual reassertion of the Russian people of their right to life in freedom."

The cultural exchange is a similar feint. One silly balletomane, on viewing the Bolshoi, was heard to sigh: "Oh, it would be a pleasure to be bombed by dancers with such technique"—which is, of course, just the effect Khrushchev intended when he sent them over here. They are on the state payroll. They are conniving with the enslavement of their own people; otherwise, they would run off and seek sanctuary as did Rudolf Nureyev. They are the representatives and accomplices of murderers and assassins. Salesmen for Khrushchev. And they do their work well: "It would be a pleasure to be bombed by dancers with such technique."

NEUTRALITY IMPOSSIBLE

Back in 1917, President Woodrow Wilson told Congress:

"Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples—and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people.

"A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Now, instead of these futile discussions over nuclear weapons, proposals for summit talks, suggestions for the control of outer space, and the like, all of which imply that we have written off and forgotten about East Germany, the Baltic States, Poland, Hungary, and the rest of the Russian satellites—this attitude is known as being "realistic," as though Abraham Lincoln had just sat down one day in 1860 and said, "Well, there goes South Carolina"—suppose that, for a change, instead of always talking about what Khrushchev wants to talk about, we would concentrate world attention on Russian imperialism, slavery in the Baltic States, the wretched division of Germany, the Berlin wall—"and whatever happened to Rumania, Albania, Hungary, and Poland?"

BROKEN TREATY WEEK

We could have Broken Treaty Week, with a proclamation from President Kennedy, expressions of regret, and appropriate lists of all the treaties broken by the Bolsheviks since they came to power.

We could have exchange lecturers on democracy, with our men touring Russia and her colonies explaining the American system, and Russians touring the United States to tell us how they run their conventions, how they campaign, how they settle hotly contested elections, etc.

The possibilities are endless, but they are not likely to be exploited, for the other school of thought is in control: the let-bygones-be-bygones opinion, "accept the status quo." "We must assume that the Communist threat will continue into the distant future and that its removal is not within our control."

In the meantime, while the Communist dictators consolidate their grip over their respective conquests, acquiring recognition, a fictitious respectability, and in some cases our foreign aid, the zeal of the free world flags, and people become bored from the sheer duration of the problem.

But whether we are interested or not, it's there—the wolf at the door (does that make you think of Cuba?)—and we will have to face up to it sooner or later by positive action.

As for the nuclear pact: even if the Reds could be trusted, it would solve very little, for it does not affect the stock on hand. It only outlaws testing.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY JOBS AT $30,000 FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

As in legislative session,

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is an item in conference on the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, which inhibits consummation of the conference report on that appropriation bill. There is an understanding between the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware yesterday with reference to amendment No. 25, which appeared on page 25 of the appropriation bill. The amendment was numbered 25 and appears in italics on pages 25 and 26 of the bill, just as amendments are printed in appropriation bills.

The amendment was also printed on page 14233 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, 1963, which was the day before the Senate acted on the bill.

In his remarks yesterday, the Senator from Delaware stated frankly, as he is always candid in the Senate, that he had read the amendment before the bill was passed by the Senate. It was not the intention of the committee that the amendment should cover any such number of persons as the Senator from Delaware suggested yesterday. The information from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare furnished the Senator from Delaware was that the amendment would make 150 persons eligible. The intent and thought of the committee was that the number would be relatively few.

There is a compelling need for action to raise the salaries of scientists and medical men, not only at the NIH but in other branches of the Public Health Service. More and more of these fine, capable, outstanding, eminent scientists and medical men are being lost to the Government.

However, the amendment goes further than it was intended it should go. Therefore, I say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that when the conferees of the Senate and the House meet on the bill, I shall ask the Senate conferees to recede from the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement by the Senator from Alabama. It was Representative GROSS, of Iowa, who first raised the question, and I wish to compliment him for his diligence. I followed through and found that the amendment did give authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint 150 employees, a number of whom could be scientists and a substantial number of whom could be administrators, at salaries of $30,000 a year.

If there is to be any change in the salary scale, it certainly should be considered openly and on its merits rather than hidden in such a manner as was here proposed. I feel certain that the Senator from Alabama agrees with me on that point. I appreciate his assurance here today that the amendment will be deleted when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. HILL. I wish again to emphasize two propositions. First, it was never the intention to have the amendment to cover any such number as 150 positions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure of that.

Mr. HILL. The idea was to have it cover only a relatively few positions. I shall ask the conferees to recede, as I have said to the Senator from Delaware and to the Senate. However, there is a compelling need to act in this situation. More and more eminent scientists and outstanding men in the field of medicine and health are being lost to the Government. We shall continue to lose them unless something is done to provide better salaries, better remuneration, for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That may well be, but as I have said to the Senator, that problem should be considered on its merits, even if it affects only one employee.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Alabama, in his usual, fine manner, has agreed to do something that should be done, regardless of the need for increased salaries. I share that view. I hope his committee will refer this question to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which usually deals with questions of this kind.

As one member of that committee, I assure the Senator from Alabama that we shall be most anxious to do anything we can to assist in improving the conditions.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Kansas is not only a member of the committee; he is one of the strongest and most influential members of the committee. I am pleased to have the assurance he has given us.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I express my enthusiastic approval of the action taken by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. It seems to me that this is exactly what should be done under the circumstances.

As one Member of the Senate, I also feel that the Senate owes a debt to the distinguished Senator from Delaware for digging into this question. We study and vote on appropriation bills on the basis of committee reports, yet there was not one thing in the report on the bill on this point. When I read in the RECORD today the statement of the distinguished Senator from Delaware yesterday, I then turned to the report on the bill and found not one word about the action which had been taken to authorize the appointment, apparently, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of 150 persons to positions paying $30,000 a year. Perhaps every one of us could be said to be at fault for not having caught this item before. But the Senator from Delaware, with his characteristic ability and sticktoitiveness, has really performed a service for all of the Senate by bringing it up and clarifying it. I personally express my gratitude to him, because I—and I daresay every other Member of this body—had no idea when we voted for the appropriation bill that we were voting for any such proposal as was apparently contained in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. HILL. With reference to what the Senator from New York has said, beginning on page 35 and continuing on page 36 of the committee report on the bill, are nine paragraphs on the subject of the need for increased salaries. I wish to be fair and frank with the Senator. The amendment was not set forth in the report, but the subject was definitely raised. I said there are nine paragraphs in the report which deal with it. I shall read one of the paragraphs verbatim:

> The committee noted that an increasing number of the key research programs at the NIH are remaining leaderless for extended periods—several years in some cases—because of the inability of the NIH to bid effectively for outstanding talent. It was reported that efforts to fill these positions from the outside market are providing fruitless. Almost all of the candidates contacted indicate that the NIH salary offer—even at the $20,000 ceiling—would mean a substantial cut in income.

This paragraph is followed by another page and a half of comment in the report, emphasizing the need for an increase in the salaries. The amendment was not set forth in the report as it should have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is true that the report refers to the fact that NIH had testified before the committee as to what they thought was the need for such salary increases, but based on the report the committee took no action. There is nothing in the report which in any way indicates that the committee had given affirmative action to the request. That was the point I made, because the Senate depends upon reports to point out affirmative action of committees, not recommendations made in the testimony at the time of hearings. I am sure the Senator from Alabama will agree with me as to that.

The statement which I made yesterday, which has been repeated today by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], was to the effect that there was nothing in the report which would alert the Senate to the fact that any authority was being given to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint even one person to a position at $30,000 a year.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The amendment was not stated in the report, as it should have been stated.

I hope the distinguished Senator will join the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators in seeking to bring about some relief in a situation which is so critical and so acute at this time. We must provide some increase in the salaries if we are to keep at the National Institutes of Health and in other activities of the Public Health Service men of the type we should and must have.

Mr. KEATING. I am inclined to agree with the merits of the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama; but when I vote on such a matter, I should like to know what I am voting for, and should like to have it before me.

Mr. HILL. It is not set out in the report, as it should have been; but the report does call attention to the overall situation; and on page 25 of the bill the amendment was set out in full, as it should have been. It is printed there in italics. The amendments were also printed on pages 14232 and 14233 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 6, the day before the Senate voted on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But unless we follow through with an analysis of the amendment and relate it to the various sections it amends, we have no indication or cause for suspicion that it extends the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint 150 positions at $30,000 a year. Nothing in the amendment would alert us to that point; and, in the absence of such knowledge we accepted, on its face, the statement that the provision did not apply to new jobs.

Mr. HILL. Not more than 150 could get the salary increases. Very, very few would have gotten an increase.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But when we do vote a salary increase, I believe we need to know exactly and clearly what is being asked for. In this instance the Senate did not know this joker was in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for permitting this intrusion, because the conference could not be concluded until this matter was discussed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 10, 1963:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John A. Gronouski, of Wisconsin, to be Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Chronicles 20: 12: *O our God, neither know we what to do; but our eyes are upon Thee.*

Almighty God, we humbly acknowledge that in this time of world crisis our beloved country is facing the difficult decision of whether to vote to ratify or not to ratify the test ban treaty.

Many of our leaders and chosen representatives, whose judgment we greatly value and in whose integrity we have the utmost confidence, frankly confess that they fear that in voting for ratification they will be placing in jeopardy our national security.

Grant that in their hours of debate and deliberation they may gain a greater assurance of the leading of Thy divine spirit to transcend the tyrannies of fear, anxiety, and misgiving.

We earnestly beseech Thee that they may have their eyes upon Thee for Thou alone canst gird them with faith to face the unknown and the unpredictable.

May they become increasingly aware that the divine resources are available to them through faith in Thee and that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt provide the needed wisdom and strength for the welfare of our Nation.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, the captain of our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

USE OF CORPORATE FUNDS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it came to my attention yesterday that the Timken Roller Bearing Co. of Canton, Ohio, provided its company-owned French imported Morane-Saulnier jet plane No. N-122B along with a pilot to transport a distinguished political leader to Cleveland for the purpose of addressing a political rally.

This same company also provided its converted B-19, No. 9-760H to transport certain political dignitaries to the Cleveland event.

While certain nonbusiness uses of company equipment may be justified to advance community and civic enterprises, it seems to me that purely political uses of such equipment are indefensible. The use of corporate funds and assets for political purposes violates the spirit if not the letter of the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have therefore requested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to conduct an audit of the political use of aircraft by the Timken Roller Bearing Co. to assure that the use of such equipment is not passed off as an added tax burden upon the general public.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES BY THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Young Democrats of some 13 Western States adopted a statement of objectives. This statement includes some astonishingly misguided and almost cowardly positions.

These positions are so extremely anti-American, antiprinciple, antistrength, antinational security and so anti-United States that many people are asking, Is this the real New Frontier?

Can it be that the Democrat Party calls for recognition of Red Cuba, for nonaggression pacts with Communist countries, for abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and repeal of the Internal Security Act? Our people are entitled to an answer to this question.

It is only fair to call upon the Democrat national chairman in light of President Kennedy's recent gladhanding with Khrushchev, Averell Harriman's legbending to Moscow and New Frontier elbowbending with Communists all over the world; Mr. Bailey, is this the national Democrat program?

These Young Democrats ought to be ashamed to lend their support to such a platform. Their position is characterless, amoral, and incompatible with American traditions and patriotic values of liberty, freedom, and justice. I hope these resolutions will be completely rejected by the Democrat national chairman.

If this is the real New Frontier program, all true Americans throughout the United States in both parties should remember it well next November.

PRESERVING THE SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS HERITAGE OF OUR NATION

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, along with many of my colleagues, a joint resolution designed to preserve the spiritual and religious heritage of our Nation. This joint resolution would permit, on a voluntary basis, the use of prayers or Bible reading in schools and other public places. It would also permit a reference to God in any public document, on coins and currency, and in any other public proceeding or activity.

Since the first Supreme Court case decided in June of 1962, I have introduced two resolutions designed to permit voluntary prayers in public schools by way of constitutional amendment. In the original case, Justice William O. Douglas, in a concurring opinion, said that "the point for decision is whether the Government can constitutionally finance a religious exercise." He went on to list such governmental "aids" to religion, in his opinion, as the slogan "In God We Trust" used by the Treasury Department, and the phrase "under God" in the pledge of allegiance. Court suits have now been instigated to test the constitutionality of these uses. In addition, the Court has struck down Bible reading in schools.

I consider this new resolution, then, to be an appropriate new step to gain action through a joint effort. I believe this amendment will preserve what Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart in his dissenting opinion called "the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our Government." At the same time that we cultivate our spiritual heritage, we preserve voluntary action by those who wish to participate as well as those who do not.

JOHN GRONOUSKI

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, we of Wisconsin are very proud to note the President's announcement of yesterday of his nomination of a distinguished Wisconsin public servant, John Gronouski, to be the next Postmaster General of the United States. John Gronouski's eminent record as Commissioner of Taxation in the State of Wisconsin, particularly in terms of administrative experience, will qualify him superbly for the high office he will enter. It has been many years since the State of Wisconsin has been represented in the Cabinet of the President of the United States and, therefore, we are especially enthused over the impending appointment. I trust the other body will confirm John Gronouski without delay, and I am sure that he will continue to give the high level of leadership to the Post Office Department in this difficult period of technological transition as that given by his distinguished predecessor, J. Edward Day.

I wish to take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate my friend and my constituent, John Gronouski of Madison, Wis., on this memorable occasion.

MISS DONNA AXUM IS MISS AMERICA FOR 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, while many of the attractions and advantages of the State of Arkansas are well known, some have been accorded less recognition than is obviously called for. I consider it, therefore, my duty to take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues one of the greatest natural resources of our great State—our abundant crop of beautiful, gracious, and talented young ladies.

I must confess humbly to some small part in the development of this resource. Our daughter, Carolyn, who reigned as Cherry Blossom Princess 4 years ago, is evidence of my complicity.

Some 7 years ago the people of the Fourth District of Arkansas set about the business of focusing the country's attention on the beauty of their young ladies. It is interesting to note that since 1956 only one Miss Arkansas has come from outside the present Fourth District.

Last Saturday night, as a breathless nationwide television audience watched—I have not checked the rating but several million people at least—Miss Donna Axum of El Dorado, Ark., my hometown, was crowned Miss America for 1964.

Donna is the first Miss Arkansas to receive this coveted title. Arkansas served notice that it was after the crown in earnest in 1958 when Sally Miller, of Pine Bluff, was one of the 10 semifinalists and again in 1961 when Frances Jane Anderson, of Pine Bluff, was first runner-up. Incidentally two other native Arkansans received honors this year. Miss Hawaii, one of the finalists, was born in Fort Smith, Ark., and Miss Connecticut, who received a special scholarship for her classical dance, is a native of Little Rock.

The people of Arkansas and those of us from El Dorado in particular have proudly followed Donna's accomplishments for several years as she has won most of the major statewide contests emphasizing beauty, poise, and talent, preparing herself for this great achievement, a splendid example of womanhood of America.

It is becoming more apparent with each passing year, Mr. Speaker, that when Mr. Greeley spoke to the young men of America, he was misunderstood. He did not mean all the way west.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from Arkansas. I can understand very well his pride, but I should like to remind him, if I may, and also the other Members of the House, that Miss America from Arkansas succeeded Miss America from Ohio. It was the Ohio Miss America that placed the crown on the head of Miss Arkansas, the 1964 Miss America. We want to be generous to the State of Arkansas and especially the hometown of the distinguished gentleman who just addressed us.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to remind the gentleman from Arkansas that she was given a topic to speak about extemporaneously. She made a beautiful speech. The topic was "humility."

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that she gave one of the finest discourses as she bowed out that I have ever listened to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Not only do we have beautiful girls in Ohio but they are very intelligent also.

Mr. HARRIS. That is well recognized throughout the country.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. They must have picked a beautiful Arkansas lady to win this year's contest. The Ohio queen came from the great town of Akron, Ohio.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 140]

Adair
Arends
Ashley
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Buckley
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Dague
Derwinski
Diggs
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Flynt
Ford
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Griffin
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Laird
Lesinski
Long, La.
McLoskey
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mosher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Short
Staebler
Stephens
Stinson
Talcott
Taylor
Tollefson
Tupper
Ullman
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 343 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 513 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader such time as he may require.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding. I take this time, after conferring with the minority leader, to inform the House that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has advised that on tomorrow he will call up House Resolution 504 to create a Select Committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Federal research programs. This is in addition to the program previously announced for this week. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 513 makes in order consideration of S. 1576, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate and reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It also makes in order consideration of the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and provides for consideration of amendments to the substitute amendment, under the 5-minute rule, as in an original bill.

Mr. Speaker, as one who took especial interest in the needs and problems of our handicapped and of our so-called exceptional children while a member and chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am particularly pleased and honored to make this initial statement in behalf of the rule making in order the consideration of this bill, and in behalf of the bill itself. I would point out, however, that this legislation is primarily a health measure rather than an education measure.

In general, the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act can be divided into three parts:

Title I contains three grant authorizations for the construction of mental retardation facilities: $20 million in project grants to assist in constructing special centers for research in the field of mental retardation, to be operated by public and nonprofit institutions; $22.5 million in project grants for construction of college or university-associated mental retardation treatment and research facilities; and $27.5 million for grants-in-aid to the States for construction of public or nonprofit community facilities for the mentally retarded.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Title II contains an additional authorization of $115 million for the construction of community mental health centers. These centers, as would be the case in facilities for mental retardation, would provide services for a comprehensive attack on the problem including community services for diagnosis, prevention, inpatient and outpatient treatment and rehabilitation.

"BRICK AND MORTAR"

These construction programs are strictly "brick and mortar" authorizations; they are spread over 3 years. They are based on the patterns established in the Hill-Burton Act and the Health Research Facilities Construction Act.

TEACHERS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Title III of the act contains the only authorizations which are not for building construction. Basically, this title authorizes appropriations of $47 million, over 3 years, to extend and strengthen the existing programs for training teachers of mentally retarded children and deaf children and to expand that program to include training teachers of other handicapped children such as the visually handicapped, the speech impaired, the crippled, the emotionally disturbed and those children with special health problems such as epilepsy, cardiac conditions, or chronic illnesses. In addition, $6 million is provided over 3 years for grants for research or demonstration projects relating to the education of the handicapped.

In all, Mr. Speaker, the authorization for appropriations under this bill, as amended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, covers the fiscal years 1964 through 1966—a period of 3 years. The total authorization amounts to $238 million, with a maximum authorization of $117.5 million for any single year.

I might add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Rules gave attention to the possible overlapping of this bill's provisions with those of existing programs as did the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We noted that under the $2 billion, 6800 project, Hill-Burton program, only 42 projects costing $13 million have been approved for mental retardation facilities. We also noted that only seven projects amounting to a mere 3 percent of the expended funds under the Health Research Facilities Construction Act have been awarded for mental retardation facilities. In other words, I have satisfied myself, and I believe all members of the Committee on Rules have satisfied themselves that this legislation does not duplicate other existing programs including H.R. 7544, the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963, by the distinguished and able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. Speaker, for those of us, in and out of Congress, who have labored through the years in the field of special education for exceptional or handicapped children and in the fields of mental retardation and mental health, this legislation represents a forward looking and dramatic turning point. For while great strides have been made in the medical sciences and diagnostic arts to bring under control many of the physical diseases which kill and maim, relatively little has been accomplished in the mental health fields; while considerable progress has been made in learning to deal with the physically handicapped, little has been done for those with equally crippling, emotional or mental handicaps.

MENTAL ILLNESS: AMERICA'S MOST SERIOUS HEALTH PROBLEM

The fact is, of course, that mental illness, which runs up a $2 billion annual bill, is the most serious health problem which we in America face today. At one time or another during their lifetimes, 10 percent of our population require psychiatric attention. Another fact, which we are only beginning to come to grips with, is that mental patients now occupy half of our Nation's hospital beds.

COSTS OF LONG-TERM MENTAL ILLNESS PROHIBITIVE

The consequences of these facts are clear. For the relatively few who have the financial resources, private psychiatry and private institutions are available. The costs, particularly for long-term confinement, are virtually prohibitive even for this group. For most people, the alternative, once they overcome the long waiting periods, is the State mental hospital.

The State mental hospitals are, for the most part, custodial centers rather than treatment centers. This is true because they generally have too little and too obsolete equipment and facilities; and they have a critical shortage of trained psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, and social workers. In 1959, for instance, there were less than 1,000 psychiatrists caring for the more than half a million patients in the State mental institutions—a ratio of less than 1 psychiatrist for every 500 patients. About one-fifth of all State institutions for the insane are firetraps.

CAN'T TREAT MENTAL ILLNESS FOR $4.50 PER DAY

The amount of funds expended, per patient, in the State mental institutions is totally inadequate to support minimum requirements of board, room, and physical care let alone any kind of modern, individual, psychiatric or psychological treatment. We spend about $12 per patient day for care in our Veterans' Administration psychiatric hospitals; community general hospitals cost approximately $32 a day; some private institutions cost each psychiatric patient upward of $1,000 or more each week. In contrast to these costs, according to the committee report:

> The average expenditure per patient day in State mental institutions is about $4.50.

This figure is one-third of the VA expenditure and one-eighth of the expenditures at the average community hospital.

Under present conditions, Mr. Speaker, even the paltry sum of $4.50 per patient day is largely wasted in our big, centralized State institutions, when we consider the human costs of the system. The fact is that mental patients in our large State institutions benefit little from modern drugs and psychiatric techniques, get virtually no personal attention from qualified professional staff people, and languish in these institutions year after year.

Not only are these institutions too big, too crowded and too poor to afford these unfortunate souls even the bare minimum let alone proper care and treatment, but they are also too far removed from the patient's home and community to allow for many visits, even from members of their family. In other words, these patients are totally isolated from the realities and familiarities from which they have strayed and to which, it is hoped, they might some day return.

MENTAL PATIENTS STAY 11 YEARS IN STATE HOSPITALS

This has been the lot of the institutionalized mentally ill for centuries. Twentieth century advances in the field of psychiatry notwithstanding, patients of our State mental institutions suffering from schizophrenia—which is our most common mental disturbance—are remaining in these institutions, on the average, 11 years. Eleven nonproductive, horrible years of mental pain and suffering and agitation is a terrible enough fate for those who require it. But it is an inhuman price to pay for civic, community, and national neglect.

MENTAL PATIENTS NEED TREATMENT INSTEAD OF ROOM AND BOARD

The fact is that, today, most of these same patients could be returned to society and their loved ones in a matter of months. In modern, community clinics or the psychiatric wards of local, general hospitals, or in outpatient sections of local psychiatric clinics, in any one of a number of environments which offer therapy rather than mere custodial care, 80 percent of those same schizophrenic patients could be rehabilitated in far less than 11 years. Some studies show that upward of 70 percent could be discharged within the first year. Almost all studies indicate that we could measure the length of hospitalization in terms of weeks and months rather than years.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a golden age of science and we have the tools and resources and knowledge to combat most of the ills of mankind. We have spent fortunes in developing atomic and nuclear devices; we are spending vast sums to explore space; medical and biological scientists have wrought miracles in the detection, control and even complete cure of diseases which, a century ago, were our greatest killers. We have had, and continue to have, great programs to combat cancer, heart disease, polio, malaria, tuberculosis, and scores of other dread diseases. Our infant mortality is way down and our life expectancy is way up.

To a much more modest degree, we have also been working toward solutions to our mental health and mental retardation problems—to the problems of our handicapped. We have come to the point, in the past few years, where we know what the approach to the solution is for most of these sufferers. But we continue to put people into State institutions which were obsolete 20 years ago, and then we throw away the key. We say to them: "We are sorry; if you had enough money or if you were fortunate enough to live in one of the few communities which has adequate facilities, you could be treated and be back on the job or back with your family in a few months—but as it is, we are sorry and we will see you in 11 years."

SAM J. WATKINS

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but recall at this time that when I was making my first campaign for the Democratic nomination to Congress from the old Seventh Congressional District of Alabama that a friend named Sam J. Watkins, who then lived at Dora, Ala., told me that the greatest accomplishment that Congress could make for the people would be to see that mental health centers were established in each congressional district of America. He said that mental treatment was too costly, too far removed from the family of the patient, and that there was not near enough of it. He said that we must bring treatment for mentally ill people to their home areas. I have thought about that statement many times and it seems to me that in the bill before us we may be making a first step toward bringing the dream of my deceased friend to a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a dramatic start toward the solution of the problem of treating and rehabilitating our mentally ill, our mentally retarded and our handicapped people. It is a new approach to the problem but it is a tested approach. It is an approach which would put into effect and give to the people of our country the facilities which produced the dramatic accomplishments of which I spoke a moment ago. It is an approach—designed to serve the expressed needs of any community—which would be sufficiently flexible to make use of and build on to existing community facilities such as general hospitals, medical centers or mental centers or mental health clinics. It is a program which would be directed at the State and community levels.

THE MENTAL PATIENTS WOULD BE TREATED IN THEIR HOME AREAS

This program would begin the job of doing for one-half of our hospitalized community what the Hill-Burton program has done for the other half. It will help to phase out the 50-year-old, antiquated, overcrowed, and obsolete State mental institutions and bring the patients back into their own community to clinics or centers where they can be diagnosed, treated, and rehabilitated; where they can consult and obtain professional guidance; where their problems can be spotted early and nipped in the bud before institutionalizing becomes necessary; where local schools and institutions can come for advice; and where local doctors and psychiatrists can follow through with their own patients.

WE DO NOT KNOW THE CAUSES OF MENTAL RETARDATION

This provision for a comprehensive attack on mental illness, combining the techniques and services of diagnosis, treatment, residential care, day care, and outpatient care into a total program, is basically the same as the approach to the problem of mental retardation, only in the case of the retarded, education and training are added. The problems are largely the same for both but we have much more to learn about retardation. Our research is so far behind that we can ascribe causes for mental retardation in less than one-fourth of the cases. There is, however, much promising research being conducted and, with proper encouragement and help, our knowledge can and will improve.

EDUCATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED COSTS FOUR TIMES THAT OF THE NORMAL CHILD

State and local governments spend an annual $400 million in institutions for the care of the mentally retarded—care which is, again, mostly custodial rather than therapeutic. The education, training and care of a mentally retarded child costs, today, about four times that of a normal child. The costs of proper care are too great for States and communities to provide without our help. Without the help envisioned by this new program, the States will be unable to serve their people adequately.

THIS PROGRAM FASHIONED AFTER HILL-BURTON

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken mostly about titles I and II of this bill, the brick and mortar sections which are designed to help the States and localities to acquire the kind of facilities which will fit into their communities, and meet their needs for helping and treating their mentally ill and mentally retarded citizens. The program is fashioned after the eminently successful Hill-Burton program, which was pioneered by the creative legislative mind of LISTER HILL, because the needs are similar to medical facility needs and the financial burdens upon the States are equally great.

Let me speak, for a moment, about title III which expands current Federal programs providing training for teachers of the mentally retarded and the deaf to include teachers of other handicapped children as well.

TEACHER TRAINING FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

These provisions are similar to bills approved by the Education and Labor Committee in 1962 and 1963, which bills were, in turn, the product of extensive hearings in 1959 and 1960 which I was privileged to hold as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education. We held hearings in seven cities—New Haven, Conn.; New York, Chicago, Jersey City, Cullman, Ala.; Los Angeles, and Portland Oreg.—with more than 300 witnesses. Under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], further hearings were held in Washington, D.C., in August 1961 and March 1962. Testimony from these hearings, plus those held on these provisions of title III, all emphasized the need for more specially trained teachers for handicapped children.

The provisions of this bill build upon two existing laws which developed from the hearings I have just spoken of: Public Law 85-926, enacted in 1958, which provides $1 million annually to assist in training personnel who, in turn, train teachers of the mentally retarded; Public Law 87-276, enacted in 1961, which provided $1.5 million annually to train teachers of the deaf. The program for the deaf expired on June 30 of this year. Title III continues the law for 1 more year after which it would be merged into the overall bill.

WE NEED MANY MORE TEACHERS FOR MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

All the hearings indicated that, of the 5 million school-age handicapped children, only one-fourth of them are currently enrolled in special programs of our local public school systems or public and private residential schools. Our best estimate is that we need about 200,000 teachers with specialized training to work with these children and we now have only about one-quarter of that number. In other words, three-quarters of our handicapped children—the children with impaired vision or hearing, the speech impaired, the crippled, the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded—three-quarters of these children are receiving virtually no special kinds of rehabilitation or training because we have been unable to prepare teachers to do the job.

Title III provides for an expansion of our program to provide these specially trained teachers more quickly and in greater numbers. It also provides a little money for research into the problems of educating and training the handicapped. These programs need to be supported by everybody. Concern for the problems of all mentally retarded and handicapped children demand it.

I am reminded of the sentiments expressed by Dr. Leonard Mayo, of New York, in a piece he wrote several years ago entitled "A Creed for Exceptional Children." I have read it several times. The whole creed is a worthy "bill of rights" for the exceptional or handicapped child and I shall quote a small part of it:

> We believe that the Nation as a whole, every State and county, every city, town, and hamlet, and every citizen has an obligation to help in bringing to fruition in this generation the ideal of a full and useful life for every exceptional child in accordance with his capacity; the child who is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight, or of hearing, the child whose life may be adversely influenced by a crippling disease or condition, the child whose adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, and the child who is endowed with special gifts of mind and spirit. We believe that to this end the home of the exceptional child, the schools, the churches, and the health and social agencies in his community must work together effectively in his behalf.
>
> Above all, we believe in the exceptional child himself; in his capacity for development so frequently retarded by the limits of present knowledge; in his right to a full life too often denied him through lack of imagination and ingenuity on the part of his elders; in his passion for freedom and independence that can be his only when those who guide and teach him have learned the lessons of humility, and in whom there resides an effective confluence of the trained mind and the warm heart.

Mr. Speaker, the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act is in aid of the effective confluence of the trained mind and the warm heart, which confluence is required if we are to bring meaning into the lives of our 5 million handicapped and retarded young people and if we are going to bring under control the fiscal, emotional, and human drain associated with the mentally retarded and the mentally ill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 513.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 141]

Adair
Alger
Arends
Ashley
Avery
Baring
Barry
Berry
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Buckley
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Flynt
Ford
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grover
Hanna
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
Knox
Laird
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
McLoskey
Macdonald
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Short
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Tollefson
Tupper
Ullman
Vinson
Whalley
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. O'Brien of New York). On this rollcall 317 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as I was about to say when the question of a quorum was raised, my colleague on the Rules Committee [Mr. Elliott] has explained House Resolution 514, which makes in order the consideration of S. 1576, a bill dealing with the problems of mental health, which has already been passed by the other body. This bill was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was rewritten by that committee almost in its entirety.

The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, following which the amendment to the bill, as written and presented to us by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, shall be considered in order and open for amendment at any point under the 5-minute rule, the same as an original bill, and shall actually be considered as a substitute bill.

The bill as passed by the other body was quite different from the bill which we have before us today. It called for expenditures on a new program, of $850 million. That bill rather covered the waterfront, if I read it correctly. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in preparing this amendment or a substitute bill, eliminated certain provisions in the Senate measure entirely, and provided only for certain construction grants on a matching basis with the various States of the Nation.

I personally have been very much interested for a good many years in mental health problems and have been, until recently, a director of the Ohio Mental Health Association. Frankly, however, despite the rather limited experience I have had, this bill is not entirely clear to me as to just what it will do, or what it seeks to to, because it too is rather broad in its terms, and I refer to the substitute bill that will soon be before us. I note for instance, Mr. Speaker, that in referring to those who will be entitled to treatment, and to admission to these facilities, it mentions persons who are "emotionally disturbed." I must confess to the House, and I believe every other Member, if he is honest, will make the same confession, that at times I become a bit emotionally disturbed myself when I read certain newspapers, or certain reports of the activities of the Congress, which are not representative at all as to what actually goes on here. Sometimes I listen to, or watch, television programs that, perhaps, may raise my blood pressure a bit, and I am just wondering whether under the provisions of this bill everybody in the Congress of the United States—and perhaps all the American people might not, at times, qualify for treatment under some of the provisions of this bill; and, if so, whether or not we might not just as well convert this particular Chamber and some of the other facilities in Washington for the purposes of mental health treatment.

But, Mr. Speaker, to speak less facetiously of this measure, I do realize there is a great deal of emotional appeal in connection with this problem of mental illness, and the problem of retarded children, especially. Our hearts bleed for them, as we see them, and for the parents of these children. So there is a great deal of sentiment involved in considering a bill of this sort. Many people would like to do anything and everything possible to see that all of these mental problems are solved for the children of the country, and for the older people, as well, Mr. Speaker, and yet seemingly there is no agreement among many of the persons, organizations, or associations, dealing with mental health problems, as to just what steps the Federal Government can, or should, take and just what this legislation now before us should contain.

I have received communications from some five organizations in Ohio urging support for the House substitute bill as presented here. I have received communications from equally estimable organizations in Ohio, also interested in the mental health problem, demanding and insisting we restore all of the provisions of the Senate bill. I have received this morning from the American Mental Health Foundation, which is made up of a great many distinguished doctors, psychiatrists, and scientists in the mental health field, a letter saying that the pending legislation is not good, and urging that the approach to be taken to the whole mental health problem of this country should be a different one.

Frankly I am not "emotionally" disturbed for the moment, but I am confused, as I am sure many Members of this body are confused in their own minds as to just what sort of mental health legislation should be enacted, and whether this bill does just exactly what we want, and whether it goes far enough or goes too far. The bill does carry a cost tag, for a 3-year period, of $238 million, to the Federal Government. I understand a part of that amount is covered in the President's budget which was submitted for fiscal 1964. It does not include a great deal of the language and the purposes and the other material contained in the Senate measure. I believe this legislation, being what it is, is the type upon which to understand or to do what we believe is right. We all appreciate the serious problems which exist in the field of mental health. However, all of us should listen to the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as they explain this bill in the hope we may at least have some grasp and some knowledge of just exactly what can or cannot and what should or should not be done under this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Adair
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Buckley
Carey
Cederberg
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Daddario
Dague
Derwinski
Diggs
Flynt
Ford
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Harsha
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Knox
Laird
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Short
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Stephens
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Tupper
Ullman
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elliott].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], for a unanimous-consent request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Congressional Record and to include an address by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution and the fine legislation which it makes in order to consider.

There is one other aspect of the problem of mental retardation that I believe deserves the attention of the country and the Congress, namely, the crushing financial burden which parents of mentally retarded children suffer. They have a choice of putting a mentally retarded child in a public institution or in a private institution or caring for the retarded child at home. All of these are expensive and I believe some consideration should be given to some form of tax exemption or tax relief for the parents of mentally retarded children. For example, the State of Louisiana by its income tax law now provides for an exemption of $1,000 for the parents of mentally retarded children.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia mentioned that Louisiana provides an additional $1,000 exemption from income taxes for a retarded child. We do, and we are very proud of the fact that we do. I certainly hope that some day we will be afforded the opportunity of having Federal legislation that will provide an additional $600 for each retarded child.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana; and that is the suggestion which I hope this Congress will consider at some future date in connection with helping the parents of mentally retarded children.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank my colleague from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we live in a very complex, automated society, where training is becoming increasingly specialized; as a retarded child grows up, it becomes more and more difficult for him to obtain gainful employment. The care which parents must extend to retarded children at home often means one or the other parent cannot leave home to work, thus reducing the family income further. When a retarded child grows up, the parents may no longer be around and some funds are needed for further care of a mentally retarded adult. All of these factors point to the critical need for an additional tax exemption to enable parents to care for retarded children, and possibly to set aside something for their future care. These are vital human and personal problems which we in this Congress should tackle once we have passed the very beneficial legislation which we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the support of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and many other Members who have expressed interest in and support of legislation to provide tax exemption increases for parents of mentally retarded children.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for reconstruction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1576, with Mr. VANIK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I commend to the House this program to do something in the field of mental retardation, and for the mentally ill of our country. This bill comes to you after long and careful consideration by our committee. Extensive hearings were held. The subcommittee as well as the committee itself gave long, careful, and tedious consideration to the bill itself. I do not know of any legislation considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in recent years that has received more careful consideration and attention than this bill.

The President submitted a message earlier this year in which recommendations were made for a positive program to deal with the problems that are included in this proposed legislation. There were several bills that were submitted to implement this program. Two of the bills came to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. One of these had to do with mentally retarded and the other had to do with mentally ill people, fields which are recognized by everyone in this country as of great need.

I do not claim, Mr. Chairman, to be an expert in this subject. I wish I were. There are far from enough experts in this country. There are obsolete ways, methods, and facilities of dealing with the problems of the mentally retarded children of this country and the mentally ill. Listening to those few who have been working with them and to their tale of woe, gives me a feeling that this Nation has been sadly deficient in appropriately dealing with this subject involving human beings, children—something that we should have done something about long ago, in my judgment. I am convinced of that. And so we bring to you today a program designed to do something about it.

Very frankly, we recognize the problems which we face, being perfectly realistic. We recognize the continuing problem of the Federal Government's expanding programs. We recognize that this is another program of grants to assist the States—another program in which the Federal Government itself is promoting and encouraging programs within the States. We recognize that there is a fiscal problem involved.

There is nothing new, however, in this highly important problem because we face problems such as these time after time. And it is our responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to decide what we are capable of doing and what we should do. I would say to you that in my judgment, if any program must be dispensed with or reduced, we can well afford to reduce something else somewhere else in order to apply the savings to this program where the need is so great.

In my judgment we bring to you today one of the most important health measures that has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in many years, perhaps in my experience. It deals with two major health problems facing our country, as I have explained, mental health and mental retardation. After developing a complete, and one of the best records I have seen on any legislation, and working out the bill as reported, I commend to the attention of the Members the very fine and able report on the bill. The bill as amended was reported, I believe unanimously, from the committee.

On any given day we were told the total number of patients in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded in this country is about 800,000. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded persons in this country. Approximately half of the patients confined in hospitals on any given day are confined there through mental illness. The costs of caring for these afflicted people are huge. Expenditures from tax funds alone, apart from private and voluntary expenditures, are over $2.4 billion per year in direct outlays.

In addition, States and localities spend some $250 million annually for special education, rehabilitation, and other services for persons outside of public institutions.

This legislation, we believe, will eventually lead to a reduction in these social and economic costs.

The bill is designed to assist in reducing the incidence of mental retardation through research into its causes. The bill is designed to ameliorate the effects of mental retardation through providing for treatment and training of the mentally retarded. The bill is designed to change the pattern of treatment of mental illness in the United States leading to a reduction in the time patients are required to be hospitalized for mental illness and returning them to useful and productive lives sooner. So, in my judgment, the legislation is soundly conceived. The bill has been thoroughly considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and I am proud to bring it before the House today for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second piece of major health legislation that has been reported by our committee this year. The other bill, as the members of the committee will recall, was H.R. 12, which was proposed to provide assistance in the construction of schools for training of professional health personnel, and so forth. This bill today, another health measure, provides Federal assistance for the construction of these two types of facilities, regional and local facilities, relating to mental retardation and community facilities for the treatment of mental illness.

Mr. Chairman, the assistance furnished under the bill for these facilities is in the form of grants for construction only.

A third feature of the bill will provide assistance in the training of special teachers for handicapped children and will provide for research and demonstration projects in the education of handicapped children.

Mr. Chairman, as the bill was passed by the other body the bill would have provided for a 5-year program of construction for these purposes. This bill would also have provided Federal assistance in financing up to 75 percent of the cost of initial staffing of the community mental health centers. The bill also contained—that is the Senate bill—the provision already mentioned relating to the training of special teachers for handicapped children. It was not in the House bill as was originally introduced by me.

Mr. Chairman, the total authorization contained in the bill which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce amounted to $850 million over the life of the program. This bill was considered very carefully by the subcommittee and in great detail, as I have explained, in executive session. It was cut down to a maximum of 3 years' assistance. The authorization for Federal assistance in defraying the cost of initial staffing of community mental health centers was reduced in an amount and duration by the subcommittee from a total of $428 million, extending over a period of 8 years, to $169 million. Then the full committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, deleted all authorization for the financing of the cost of the staffing of these centers.

Mr. Chairman, that particular problem caused some controversy. The committee met it. I, personally, felt that under the circumstances as were developed during the course of the hearings and consideration of the measure, that there was justification for it. There is no new precedent established by it, but after a long and careful consideration, the majority of the committee said that they did not feel we should get into the staffing of these centers.

When the committee made that decision, as is usual, my position is to stay with the committee on it, and I am supporting the action of the committee and will oppose any effort or any attempt to offer amendments today to reestablish a program for staffing of personnel for these centers.

The bill is divided into four titles. Title I deals with the subject of mental retardation; title II deals with the subject of mental health; title III deals with the subject of training of teachers of handicapped children, and title IV contains definitions and miscellaneous provisions. I will discuss each of the three principal titles of the bill separately.

MENTAL RETARDATION

On October 17, 1961, the President appointed a 27-member panel of outstanding consultants with the mandate of preparing a national plan to combat mental retardation. The report of the panel was submitted to the President on October 16, 1962, after a yearlong intensive study of the problem of mental retardation.

The report of the panel, "A Proposed Program for National Action To Combat Mental Retardation," outlines the size and scope of the problem in this country and provides a blueprint for a comprehensive program for action to prevent mental retardation and minimize the effects of mental retardation on human development. Titles I and III of this bill would carry out a number of the recommendations resulting from urgent needs discovered by the panel.

The mentally retarded are children and adults who, as a result of inadequately developed intelligence, are significantly impaired in their ability to learn and to adapt to the demands of society. An estimated 3 percent of the population, or 5.4 million children and adults in the United States, are afflicted, some severely, most only mildly. Assuming this rate of prevalence, an estimated 126,000 babies born each year will be regarded as mentally retarded at some time in their lives.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem. It afflicts twice as many individuals as blindness, polio, cerebral palsy, and rheumatic heart disease, combined. Only four significant disabling conditions—mental illness, cardiac disease, arthritis, and cancer—have a higher prevalence, but they tend to come later in life while mental retardation comes early.

About 400,000 of the persons affected are so retarded that they require constant care or supervision, or are severely limited in their ability to care for themselves and to engage in productive work; the remaining 5 million are individuals with mild disabilities.

Over 200,000 adults and children, largely from the severe and profound mentally retarded groups, are cared for in residential institutions, mostly at public expense. States and localities spend $300 million a year in capital and operating expenses for their care. In addition, they spend perhaps $250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services for retarded individuals outside of public institutions. In the current fiscal year, the Federal Government will obligate more than $160 million for the mentally retarded, about three-fourths for income maintenance payments and the rest for research, training, and special services. Federal funds for this group have nearly doubled in 5 years.

The Nation is denied several billion dollars of economic output because of the underachievement, underproduction, and/or the complete incapability of the mentally retarded.

The untold human anguish and loss of happiness and well-being which result from mental retardation blight the future of millions of families in the United States. An estimated 15 to 20 million people live in families in which there is a mentally retarded individual. Economic costs cannot compare with the misery and frustration and realization that one's child will be incapable of living a normal life or fully contributing to the well-being of himself and to society in later life.

Whatever the causes, the failure of mentally retarded individuals to adjust successfully to social and economic conditions of our society constitutes a severe and growing handicap for the individual, for his family, and for the society. Moreover, as our competitive society becomes more complex and fast moving the demands for intellectual capacity and for adaptability increase. Thus in an age of automation, individuals with minimal skills and abilities become doubly handicapped. Not only do they face an increasingly competitive society, but, hampered as they are, they must keep pace with people of higher capacities. Thus they become more easily submerged by difficulties which others can handle without trouble.

The key to prevention and correction of mental retardation is an adequate understanding of its cause. Medical and social sciences have made a substantial beginning in this direction. Within the past decade several previously unknown causes have been identified and means for their prevention have been discovered. Rapidly growing interest in the problem of mental retardation is producing a growing accumulation of data on the general conditions with which mental retardation is associated, even though the specific causes may not yet be fully evident. But much of the long road to full understanding of the complex phenomena involved lies ahead and indeed is not clearly defined as to the directions it may lead.

Our present body of knowledge in the field of mental retardation is so limited that we can ascribe precise causes for the condition in only 15 to 25 percent of the cases. For the majority of the retarded individuals—from 75 to 85 percent of the cases—it is not yet possible to identify a specific cause for the retardation.

There are a great many diseases and conditions which affect the brain and result in retardation, including infections or poisons in the mother's system during pregnancy, infection of the central nervous system during infancy, injuries to the brain at birth, head injuries in childhood, metabolic disorders determined by heredity, and abnormal brain growths.

We have found perhaps a dozen treatable causes of mental retardation but these account for a very small percentage of the mentally retarded.

We need much more knowledge of the causes of mental retardation, but there has not been as concentrated an effort in research in this field as there has been in other areas.

For this reason, the bill now before the committee, in parts A and B of title I, provides for construction of facilities where research can be conducted in this field.

Part A of title I of the bill authorizes the appropriation of a total of $20 million over 3 fiscal years beginning with the current fiscal year for grants to pay up to 75 percent of the cost of constructing research facilities that will be operated by public and other nonprofit institutions to carry out research and research training in the field of mental retardation. Applicants must be public or nonprofit institutions competent to engage in the research for which the facilities are to be constructed.

In passing on applications, the Surgeon General is required to take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding national research capacity in the field of mental retardation. The Surgeon General is also required to assure that the facilities constructed will best serve the purpose of advancing knowledge in the field of mental retardation and related aspects of human development.

The committee intends that the Surgeon General provide for an equitable geographical distribution for the centers, taking into account the supply of research personnel and other resources available in areas of the United States.

Part B of title I provides a total authorization of $22.5 million over a 3-year period beginning with the current fiscal year for payment of up to 75 percent of the cost of constructing public or other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded which will be associated with colleges or universities. These facilities are intended to provide for clinical training of physicians and other specialized personnel needed for research, diagnosis, training, or care of the mentally retarded. The facilities that are to be constructed will serve three purposes. First, there will be clinical facilities providing a full range of services, both in-patient and out-patient, for the mentally retarded. Second, there will be facilities to aid in demonstrating specialized services for diagnosis, treatment, education, training, and care of the mentally retarded. Thirdly, these facilities will aid in the clinical training of physicians and other specialized personnel needed for care of the mentally retarded or for research in this field.

In order for an application to be approved, the facility will have to be associated with a college or university hospital or with some other part of a college or university.

Part C of title I provides for assistance to the States in the construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded. On page 10 of the committee report there is a table which sets out the amount that will be allocated to each of the States under this program. The program will last for 2 years, under the bill as reported, beginning with the fiscal year 1965, and provides for construction of facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, education, training, and care of the mentally retarded. The program follows, in general, the outlines of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, and allotments are made to the States on the basis of their population, the extent of the need for facilities in that State, and the financial need of the State.

One special feature is also included in this portion of the bill, under which a State may transfer a portion of its allotment under this part of the bill to the program under title II of the bill, dealing with the construction of community mental health centers, if the State can show that its need for mental health centers is substantially greater than its need for facilities for the mentally retarded. A similar feature with respect to transferability of funds to this program is contained in title II of the bill.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Title II of the bill authorizes Federal assistance for a 2-year period for the construction of community mental health centers.

Mental illness is our most serious health problem. The cost of caring for the mentally ill is about $2 billion annually. Half of our hospital beds are occupied by mental patients. At various times in their lives, about 1 person in every 10 is so severely mentally ill as to require professional help. The wages and productivity lost as a result of mental illness are great and yet even these additional billions are minor when viewed in the light of the anguish and suffering of the afflicted and their families.

In view of the magnitude of this problem, in 1955 Congress approved the Mental Health Study Act—Public Law 182 of the 84th Congress—to authorize an intensive, long-range study of the Nation's resources for coping with the mental health program. A 6-year study was carried out by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. The commission consisted of members from 36 national organizations representing the principal scientific and professional associations concerned with health, education, and welfare and the major nonprofessional citizens' organizations interested in many aspects of our Nation's welfare.

The report of the joint commission was submitted to the Congress on December 31, 1960, and recommends methods for carrying out badly needed reforms in the treatment of mental illness. The report recognizes our lack of progress in the field of treating the mentally ill and sets forth a series of recommendations that includes emphasis on research, the training of additional manpower, and a mobilization of treatment resources so that comprehensive mental health services can be made available to the mentally ill.

Mainly, mental illness is a disabler of individual life and a disrupter of family and social life, enough so that it is commonly classed as the No. 1 health problem, although neither the public nor the medical profession generally has treated it so.

Public interest in mental health became high during and following World War II. There appear to be two basic causes for this:

First. At the beginning of World War II, psychiatry was given the assignment of screening out all those young men who appeared psychologically unfit for military service. Huge numbers were rejected on the reasonable assumption that those with obvious neurotic symptoms or personality defects would break under the stress of adjustment to military life and to combat or become troublemakers and hence impose a tremendous drain on effective troop strength and morale. Some who were accepted later broke down in service, and a few who concealed rather serious defects, or were rejected and later accepted when standards were loosened, did well. It came to public attention as these men returned home, some to be hospitalized and others to make their own adjustment to civilian life. Compounding the problem was the fact that returnees who had successfully survived combat often displayed symptoms of anxiety neurosis during the letdown period.

Second. There was a second factor in the rise of public, and particularly official, interest in mental illness following World War II. The mental hospitals, it seems, are the first public health institutions to suffer in bad times and the last to benefit in good times. Our State hospitals began to deteriorate during the great depression of the early 1930's. They had not recovered from financial setbacks during this period when struck by another severe blow. World War II bled them of their never-plentiful professional and other personnel, their financial resources, and their institutional morale; it brought them to their lowest state, as houses of horror, in the last 50 years.

In general, we have witnessed some recent changes in the flow and whereabouts of mental patients, possibly reflecting in part the widely accepted conviction that, if at all possible, it is better for the patient and his prospects to keep him out of State hospitals, as well as definitely reflecting increased discharge rates for State hospitals. The desirability of this policy is reinforced, of course, by the fact that every patient not added to the State hospital population represents some savings in maintenance costs.

Mental health clinics, operated as outpatient extensions of mental hospitals or as independent service agencies in the community, have been advocated as both a supplementary and alternative approach to the hospital care of the mentally ill. Among recent gains, the increase in the professional man-hours of work in these clinics and the possibility that some patients who previously would have been part of the hospital population now are under treatment in these clinics while living at home or in foster homes. The outlook here promises no quick solution to the more effective operation of public mental hospitals. The clinics suffer from the same deficiencies that so long have plagued the hospitals—understaffing and overcrowding—except that in this case clinics do not come into being or continue to operate if professional personnel cannot be found for them, and the overcrowding is confined to their waiting lists rather than to hospital wards.

The present picture in the care of the mentally ill is quite disturbing though improvements have been made. The bill we have before us today provides for a new approach to this problem—an approach which has been demonstrated to be effective in the areas where it has been tried.

In the past, the mentally ill have, for all practical purposes, been put in a warehouse, and kept there with little professional help available to them. The new approach provided for in this bill is for the establishment of community mental health centers, which will be for mental illness somewhat the same as the community hospitals are for the treatment of other illnesses. These community mental health centers are intended to provide for a full range of services needed by the mentally ill. The services will include an emergency psychiatric unit, inpatient services, outpatient services, day and night care, foster home care, rehabilitation programs, and general diagnosis and evaluation services.

Testimony before the committee was convincing that treatment of patients in mental health centers close to their homes with intensive care being given to the individual, is much less costly than warehousing these patients in State mental hospitals currently is. For example, the average patient suffering from schizophrenia remains in a State mental institution for an average of nearly 11 years. Seven out of 10 of the same type of patients treated in facilities of the type provided for in this bill are discharged within a year of their admission.

Frequently, a person admitted to a State mental institution will remain there for a long period of time, sometimes for the remainder of his life. Yet, in cases where individuals receive treatment close to home, and receive intensive care, they can sometimes be discharged as cured within 16 days. In some programs, the length of stay of the patients averaged about 3 weeks. In another program, half of the psychotic patients who would have been admitted in a State institution were treated in community facilities; a large portion of these patients returned to their jobs within 6 weeks.

The evidence is clear. In order to deal with the problems of mental illness, it is necessary that we establish a program such as that provided for in title II of the bill.

This title provides authorization for 2 years for grants to the States for the construction of community mental health centers. The program is patterned very closely upon the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, and provides for allotments to the States on the basis of their population, need for the facilities and financial needs. Members who are interested in determining the amounts that will be alloted to their States can find the table on page 14 of the report setting out the allocations that will be made to the States under this title.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to issue regulations applicable uniformly to all the States prescribing the kinds of services needed to provide adequate mental health services for their residents; the general manner in which priority of projects will be approved; and general standards of construction and equipment.

State plans must be submitted to the Secretary, shall designate a single State agency to administer the plan, provide for designation of a State advisory council, set out a construction program based on a statewide inventory of existing facilities; set out relative need for projects; provide minimum standards—fixed in the discretion of the State—for the maintenance and operation of facilities; and provide for periodic review by the State of its plan. Other requirements follow generally the pattern of the Hill-Burton program.

When an application is submitted to the Secretary, he is required to approve the application if it conforms to the requirements in the bill and State plan, and is entitled to priority under the State priority system established pursuant to the State plan. An application cannot be disapproved by the Secretary until he has afforded the State agency an opportunity for a hearing.

This program will expire in 1966; however, I am sure that the administration will recommend its extension, and at that time the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will take a hard look at the operation of the program.

At this point it might be appropriate for me to point out to Members that all of the provisions of title I and II of the bill will expire on the same date, June 30, 1966, and the entire program will be reviewed and reassessed by the committee at that time.

There is another feature common to titles I and II of the bill that I would like to point out to Members. Our committee very carefully examined the relationship of this bill to existing law and to other measures pending before the Congress, and has added a number of amendments throughout the bill designed to insure that there will be no overlapping authority and no duplication of authority. For the period covered by the bill, this bill will be the sole source of authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for assistance in the construction of facilities described in titles I and II of the bill.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Title III of this bill deals with the training of teachers of mentally retarded and other handicapped children. This title was in the bill as passed by the Senate, and after the bill had been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by the Speaker, I requested that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety hold hearings on S. 1576 in order to develop additional information concerning the bill and to obtain testimony concerning title III.

There are 5 million school-age handicapped children in the Nation in need of special programs designed to meet their unique needs in the fields of education and training. Approximately one-fourth of these are enrolled in special programs in local public school systems and in public and private residential schools. They include children who are blind, partially blind, deaf, hard of hearing, speech impaired, crippled, emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, and children who have special health problems.

About 200,000 special educators of handicapped children are needed in the United States. Such persons are needed to instruct and supervise children, direct programs, and teach in colleges and universities that are training special educators to meet the unique needs of the handicapped. About 50,000 to 60,000 such persons are available. This lack of qualified personnel is the chief obstacle in the development of special education programs in the Nation.

Section 301 of the bill would amend the act of September 6, 1958, to extend it to all handicapped children, and to extend the grants to the institutions to include grants for training teachers—and supervisors of teachers—of all handicapped children along with other specialized and research personnel for work in this area. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, however, the act of September 6, 1958, would not include any grants with respect to teachers of deaf children. Instead, the act of September 22, 1961—Public Law 87–276—would be extended from its present expiration date of June 30, 1963, to June 30, 1964. Effective July 1, 1964, the act of September 6, 1958, would apply in the case of deaf children as well as other handicapped children and would further be amended to authorize grants to institutions of higher learning for scholarships for training teachers of the deaf.

The $1 million per year authorization of appropriations for carrying out the act of September 6, 1958, would be replaced by an authorization for $11.5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $14,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Section 302 of the bill would authorize appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the next 2 fiscal years, of $2 million for grants by the Commissioner of Education to States and public and nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations for research or demonstration projects relating to education of mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech-impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, and other health-impaired children. It would also authorize the Commissioner of Education to appoint special or technical advisory committees to advise him on matters of general policy in particular fields of education of handicapped children. We expect the Commissioner to follow the pattern now set in Public Law 87–276 for the use of advisory committees to review all applications for grants-in-aid in the various special areas of education for handicapped children. It would also authorize the Commissioner to appoint panels of experts to evaluate the various types of research or demonstration projects aided under this section. The advice and recommendations of such a panel would have to be secured before making a grant in the particular field in which the experts were competent. Members of any advisory committee or panel could be paid up to $50 per day plus allowances for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence.

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to delegate any of his functions under this section to any officer or employee of the Office of Education. This authority would not, however, extend to promulgation of regulations.

The remainder of the bill, set out in title IV provides general provisions, definitions and the like which, in general, follow the pattern of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been carefully considered both in subcommittee and in the full committee. The subcommittee went over the bill section by section, line by line, word by word. It was thoroughly considered by the subcommittee and then was thoroughly considered by the full committee. The bill was amended in many respects and in my opinion strengthened in many respects. As I have said, it was reported by our committee unanimously and I recommend its enactment.

Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my remarks, two tables, one showing a breakdown of the costs of the bill, as passed by the other body, and one showing a breakdown of the costs of the bill, as reported to the House.

S. 1576, as passed by Senate—Authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1964–73

[In millions of dollars]

Program	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	Total
Mental retardation:											
Research centers	6	8.0	6.0	6	4	------	------	------	------	------	30.0
Facilities:											
University grants	5	7.5	10.0	10	10	------	------	------	------	------	42.5
State grants	------	10.0	12.5	15	30	------	------	------	------	------	67.5
Subtotal, title I	11	25.5	28.5	31	44	------	------	------	------	------	140.0
Mental health centers:											
Construction	------	35.0	50.0	65	80	------	------	------	------	------	230.0
Initial staffing	------	------	10.0	34	62	93	99	69	42	18	427.0
Subtotal, title II	------	35.0	60.0	99	142	93	99	69	42	18	657.0
Teachers of handicapped:											
Training grants	13	14.5	19.5	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	47.0
Research and demonstrations	2	2.0	2.0	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	6.0
Subtotal, title III	15	16.5	21.5	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	53.0
Grand total	26	77.0	110.0	130	186	93	99	69	42	18	850.0

S. 1576, as amended by committee—Authorization for appropriations

[In millions of dollars]

Programs	Fiscal year—			Total
	1964	1965	1966	
Mental retardation:				
Research centers	6	8.0	6.0	20.0
Facilities:				
University grants	5	7.5	10.0	22.5
State grants	------	12.5	15.0	27.5
Subtotal, title I	11	28.0	31.0	70.0
Mental health centers: Construction	------	50.0	65.0	115.0
Subtotal, title II	------	50.0	65.0	115.0
Teachers of handicapped:				
Training grants	13	14.5	19.5	47.0
Research and demonstrations	2	2.0	2.0	6.0
Subtotal, title III	15	16.5	21.5	53.0
Grand total	26	94.5	117.5	238.0

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about title III, because it has to do with education legislation. Rather than object to the fact that the gentleman's committee is reporting out education legislation, I would merely like to ask a question about that title, since we evidentally cannot secure the passage of a training of teachers of the handicapped bill any other way.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I fully recognize the tremendous concern and the interest of the gentleman, of the gentlewoman who is chairman of the subcommittee on which the gentleman serves, and of the Committee on Education and Labor. I recognize the tremendous work you have done. You are to be complimented, and I here and now say in behalf of the entire Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that we appreciate your interest and concern, and thank you for the contribution you have made to the subject.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman. Now, a question as to a portion of the bill. In 1961 we passed legislation providing for training of teachers of the deaf, having passed legislation earlier than that for training of teachers of the mentally retarded. For the first time in that deaf bill it provided scholarships for undergraduate work. I understand from the Department that they have construed, on the most part, scholarships to mean fellowships. Practically all the money has been used for fellowships rather than scholarships, although a little has been used for scholarships. I can see the reason for extending 1 more year the present law, which provides for training teachers for the deaf, but after that you still provide special treatment of potential teachers of the deaf in that scholarships may be offered. In all the other handicapped groups persons going to an institution for training have only a fellowship or traineeship available, meaning they have finished their undergraduate work. Why is it the committee provides that this one group may receive grants for graduate work?

I might point out that page 81, subparagraph (b) of the bill is the provision for the continuation of scholarships for the potential teachers of the deaf. It seems to me one of the merits of the legislation is the fact that you put all of the handicapped groups together, they will all be treated alike, rather than to write separate laws to treat each of the handicapped. But here you have a separate provision in the bill for the treatment of the deaf.

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, as the gentleman so well knows, title III deals with providing a program of training teachers for this purpose. The gentleman is well aware of this. The thought developed in the course of the hearings that it would be necessary, in order to keep the program, to provide instructors for teachers for this purpose. I do not believe it was called to our attention that it should be stopped at this point. The gentleman may have information on that. I did not receive it.

Mr. QUIE. Perhaps I can talk to the gentleman about this a little later.

Mr. HARRIS. I should be glad to do so.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Would the gentleman give us some explanation of the program that is carried on now in the various States? Is it my understanding that the States themselves over a period of 10 years in this particular field have expended somewhere in the neighborhood of $11½ billion?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALEY. This then is for the so-called brick and mortar to build these facilities?

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

Mr. HALEY. What about the staffing of these facilities? I understand one of the great shortages is in people competent to staff these facilities.

Mr. HARRIS. As I previously explained, we considered that. We considered all the elements of it. It became a controversial question and the committee decided by a relatively close vote that we would not include staffing and, therefore, it was eliminated.

Now we have been importuned since then and I know I have, and every

Member of the Congress, I believe, has been importuned to reconsider this position and to offer an amendment to put it back in this legislation. But as I explained, the committee after so long and careful consideration decided that we should not get into this field. If the States could assume this responsibility in the next 3 or 4 years or whatever period of time it would be, why then the States ought to make their arrangements to start with. The majority of the committee felt that the States could do this, and that they would do it, if we would provide construction assistance in the manner in which it is provided here.

Mr. HALEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Do you think by the passage of this legislation that we are going to discourage some of the States that I understand are doing a very fine job in this particular field? Are we going to get into a situation here where we are discouraging people who are now doing a good job on the State level and who will be coming here to Washington saying, "Well, now, this is your job"?

Mr. HARRIS. On the contrary, we will encourage them to do a better job. As is explained throughout the hearings, we have heard from all of these people who come from the State institutions, the heads of State institutions and who have testified to us and brought to us their problems and explained them to us. It is recognized that these obsolete methods in many areas of the country need to be changed. The problem needs to be met boldly, especially because of the expansion of the population and in view of the services that are recognized to be necessary. New and untried methods are going to have to be tried, if this problem is to be met in the future.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What about the increased staffing for purposes of administration of this expanded program?

Mr. HARRIS. It is not contemplated that there will be any increase in staffing of the local offices, if that is what the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking of the entire program insofar as it relates to the Federal Government.

Mr. HARRIS. It is not contemplated that it will require any substantial increase in staffing, if it will require any increase at all. There may be some increase but it would be a relatively minor increase.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman this question: Is it proposed to set up regional offices?

Mr. HARRIS. No, it is not. You mean Federal offices?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. No, it is not contemplated at all.

Mr. GROSS. Any other regional offices, then? They would have to be Federal, would they not?

Mr. HARRIS. It is contemplated under this program in the mental retardation program, that we will set up regional facilities in an effort to meet this problem, but they will be local facilities sponsored through the State agency.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. YOUNGER. I, too, want to congratulate the distinguished chairman for a very fine explanation and join with him in support of the bill. I think we ought to make very clear, as far as the legislative history is concerned, that these regional clinics are to be dispersed all over the country. They are not to be located in any one State.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I appreciate the gentleman bringing that to the attention of the committee. It is the intention of the gentleman, myself, and every member of the committee that these regional mental retardation research facilities should be distributed geographically all over the country, so that the entire country can get the benefit of it. We will insist on that.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion that I will have on this bill I would like to limit it as nearly as possible to four principal problems that I think are connected with this program. First I would like to cover in detail, if I may, the cost of this program and the spread of the cost between the various parts contained in this bill.

There are three main titles. There is a fourth title dealing with definitions, but there are three principal titles, and two of those are divided into parts.

Title I has to do only, if you have the bill before you, with the construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded. Part A of title I deals with grants for the construction of centers for research on mental retardation and related aspects of human development.

This is a case where you have grants to public bodies and nonprofit institutions. In that section we set up $20 million over a 3-year period. These are just centers for research on mental retardation. It is $20 million over a 3-year period divided $6 million this fiscal year, $8 million in 1965, and $6 million again in 1966.

Now, you will say what share of these centers that are conducted for research do we, the Federal Government, pay? That is interesting. We pay 75 percent of the cost of construction. If in one of your communities you want to set up a mental retardation center for research which is not connected with a university, one which is separate, then you can get 75 percent of the cost. However, it must deal only with research.

Part B has to do with research projects, that is, grants for construction at university-affiliated places. In other words, it has to be either a public or a private institution. These will be probably in connection for the most part with university hospitals already established. I would guess in these first few years that 75 percent at least would be in connection with already existing hospital facilities at some university medical centers. I am just giving this as an estimate, but I believe it is about the way our committee felt it would work out. I think you can understand why the University of Southern California, the University of Colorado, the University of Illinois, Ohio State University, Yale University, or New York University would want to establish this kind of research center with an already existing university hospital.

In part B, on research centers for mental retardation, we set up $22.5 million divided $5 million in 1964, $7.5 million in 1965, and $10 million in 1966.

Now, part C is grants for the construction of facilities for the mentally retarded themselves. This means you may also set up in your own community a facility for the mentally retarded themselves.

A and B have to do only with research. But C has to do with grants for construction of facilities actually needed in the community for the mentally retarded, for both teaching them and housing. For this there is $27.5 million over a 2-year period; $12,500,000 in 1965. There is nothing provided in 1964 in this program. I think the evidence before the committee proved that it could not be used in 1964. In 1966 there will be $15 million for this particular series of projects for mentally retarded facilities in local communities.

Mr. Chairman, let me recapitulate: Part A is for grants for construction of centers for research on mental retardation in any community. Part B has to do with university-affiliated facilities. Part C has to do with construction of mental retardation facilities at the local community level.

Now I want to come to title II which has to do with construction of community health centers. This is what most of you have been hearing about in your mail. The plan is, as the chairman so well explained, that we will have treatment at the local level rather than in the central hospitals that you have in your States. In the State of Illinois we have three; one at Kankakee, one at Manteno, and one at Jacksonville, where all of our mental patients are now incarcerated.

I think there is a little diversity as to how many or what percentage of the patients will be taken care of at the local level, when this program is finished. It is not expected this will be a mere 3-year program. I believe the estimate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is that this will probably be more nearly a 10-year program than a 3-year program. But when it is finished, the estimate is that from possibly 30 or 50 or 60 percent of those who now go to State mental hospitals such as I have indicated will then be treated at the local mental facility during the day and return home at night.

Under title II, for "Construction of community mental health centers," there is $115 million over a 2-year period; $50 million for 1965. The committee heard evidence there which led us to believe that we could not get started in 1964, so we put it for 1965. In 1966 there will be $65 million for this purpose.

Title III of the bill is for the training of teachers for mentally retarded and other handicapped children, and if you read that section you will find that "other handicapped children" cover a very broad category. There are about eight different classifications from the mentally retarded, all the way to the blind and the deaf. So it covers more than the mentally retarded, although I think most of you have been hearing from people who have mentally retarded children, because most States do have presently a deaf program and a blind program but no program for the mentally retarded.

We have set up a 3-year program, because we believe that in the training of teachers for the mentally retarded we can get started in 1964, this fiscal year. There will be $11,500,000 for 1964; $14,500,000 for 1965, and $19,500,000 for 1966. This is for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded only. And may I say now, this is one of the most important and essential elements of this program, because teacher training is something that we have not done very much about up to the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a field which has really been only explored. Nothing concrete has been done in the way of accomplishing something in the way of getting teachers ready to take care of mentally retarded children. May I say too that this particular title III merely complements parts A, B, and C of title I, because this gets the personnel ready to do the job that is required to be done in title I.

Mr. Chairman, there is also $2 million which has largely been ignored here thus far, but $2 million is provided for 1964 and 1965 for demonstration projects. These are also very important because in these demonstration projects we may be able to do some things that will be helpful to the overall picture of mental retardation and in the field of other handicapped children.

May I come now, as to whether or not this program accomplishes what we set out to do. I think from a reading of this bill or a reading of this report the members of the Committee will see that this is a balanced program. In my opinion it is a program insofar as mental retardation and mentally handicapped children are concerned which goes all the way through to the whole question of mental health. We have fairly well balanced out the program and have allotted the money just about where we felt that the evidence before our committee indicated it ought to go.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I think in this particular feature of the bill we have done much better than the Senate version.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our Committee has come to the point now where we are not going to approve any program which goes beyond 3 years. We have seen some programs get out of control in this House where we have not had expenditure controls and where we have not put a limit on the authorization. I am just saying that we felt we would not have control of the program unless we examined it at least once every 3 years. It is my recollection that last year in the airport program we started on a 3-year basis and we have stayed with the 3-year limitation since then. They know when they go away that when they come back at the end of 3 years we expect them to give us a complete explanation of what they have done with the money which they have expended. In the meantime, if there has been any scandal in the program or anything wrong with it, it gives us an opportunity within a reasonable time to correct whatever is wrong in the program. Therefore, we believe 3 years is a wise limitation and the only kind of program that is reasonable and workable. Therefore, we put in the bill a limitation of 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the Committee probably wonder how this is paid for and how the money is allotted generally. In the subcommittee I know that I sat there and held the Hill-Burton Act in my hand and I followed it line by line as this bill was read. This bill almost exactly follows the Hill-Burton Act wherever the features can be made comparable. There is a slight difference, may I say, in the formula. I think under the Hill-Burton formula it gives the States which ordinarily do not contribute so much money to the National Treasury the best break. I do not believe there is a whole lot of difference in the formula. I believe that this formula will give the States which contribute the most a little better break than they had under the Hill-Burton Act. There are some of us who believe that is fair. I do not think that is a serious enough item for anyone to have serious concern about. But I do believe that this bill, overall, as brought to you here today should be passed. It is a bill that is reasonable and sound. We removed the features from the bill which we thought were unwise and not workable. We felt that the cost of the Senate bill was more than we ought to bite off at one time. We believe in 3 years that we will be able to take this program and move forward with it, and I think we intend to do that. But as of the present I believe the bill is reasonable. It has been well thought out. It has been well written. It has been modified in a lot of places where it should have been modified. I believe this is legislation in the public interest and ought to be passed.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman spoke about title III as being an important part of this legislation. There is provision in title III for research and demonstration projects in the education of handicapped children. A part of this is the same authorization as under the cooperative research program. However, I would like for the gentleman to answer two questions in regard to that.

One question is this: The grants are made to the States?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right.

Mr. QUIE. As well as State educational agencies?

Does this mean there are other agencies that may be involved, like the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that you would make grants to? Also, the second part of the question is, you provide that grants can be made to local education agencies?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. This is the first time Federal money goes direct to Federal education agencies in the form of grants. Prior to this whenever Federal money is given to local agencies, it goes through a State agency administered by the State school office. What is the reason for these two provisions?

Mr. SPRINGER. It might be possible that there would be set up no particular State agency for this, and I may say to the gentleman there may be some States that will not take advantage of the setup, or may not set up a State organization. As I understand it, it would be possible under those circumstances to make these grants to local communities where they did want to undertake this kind of project.

Mr. QUIE. I point out that every State does have a State education agency that in turn can utilize the money granted to them and contract with some other public or nonprofit organization to do the research for them and that has been done in the past with money that has been made available to the State education agency or institution of higher learning. That is the way it is provided in the education research programs. You have now set up a new principle?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, I believe we did; that is right, and I think we intended to do that in this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Can the gentleman tell us why? Can the gentleman tell us why you must have the Federal Government go directly to a local school district? The local school district is an agency set up by the State.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think we felt there would be instances where there would be requests of this kind that should not go through a State agency.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman feels the State would not accept the request of the local agency, so you are going to circumvent the State agency and go through the local school agencies; is that right?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not think that we have circumvented them. We have established a new principle.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to try, if the gentleman will permit, to clearly explain this position: The gentleman is correct in raising the question that the

Commissioner of Education does make the grants to the State or to the local applicant or to the institution; but I remind you again you must keep in mind this is a program to provide certain things. This is a demonstration program we are talking about in connection with this and other programs. It has, as the gentleman well knows, been the tradition and the pattern that such programs, as administered by the Commissioner of Education, will deal directly with the institutions involved instead of going through an agency of the State, as we did with reference to the hospital programs and grants for such purposes. So the traditional pattern for this particular type of project is provided here for the Commissioner of Education, as in the past, to deal with the institution involved.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman also that we are doing almost the same thing now in grants which we have in public institutions. They are grants under NIH with the University of Minnesota, for instance. They do not go through the Commissioner of Education in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I wonder if the school officers of the States involved were asked the question if it were wise for the Federal Government to deal directly with the school district in this case?

Mr. SPRINGER. We do have precedents for it. May I say that practically all of our university grants in the way of demonstrations did come directly from the Commissioner of Education to the State University.

Mr. QUIE. It is true that that provides for the grants to go straight to the institutions of higher learning, but this is a new precedent. It goes to the local institution.

Mr. SPRINGER. To that extent it is.

Mr. QUIE. I wonder about setting a new precedent here in education by this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not see anything wrong with it myself.

Mr. QUIE. Conversing with State school officials I could see why they would not want that, for in the past it has gone to the State school officials. Here you have it going through the local school officials, and there is this question of direct Federal control through the school district but not through the State. People say it is not Federal control as long as it goes through the State.

Mr. SPRINGER. In the Department of Agriculture we have demonstration grants direct from the Secretary of Agriculture to the State schools.

Mr. QUIE. It is traditional for the Federal Government to go direct to the institutions of higher learning, whether it be the State or other officials.

Mr. SPRINGER. If I understand the gentleman, we have, as far as I know, no objection from the State commissioners of education and that group; at least there was none reported. I do not believe there is any objection in the record on that particular matter.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. First of all, I want to congratulate the chairman and the gentleman from Illinois for the very clear and concise statements they have made with regard to the need in this field, and also outlining for the Members of the House the provisions of this bill.

I should like to invite the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to title II, which has to do, as he has so thoroughly outlined, with the construction of community mental health centers. In his discussion of the provisions of the bill he omitted comment on removal by the House committee of the Senate provision for staffing of these centers. I have had quite a bit of mail from constituents of mine who are authorities in this field in the State of New York. They have indicated that the need for the staffing of these facilities is the heart of this bill. They have indicated it is very important to have Federal assistance with regard to financing these facilities. Would the gentleman comment with regard to his opinion and also the thinking of the committee in this regard?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the committee felt this, that if the Federal Government provided the facilities—I am talking about title II—or a substantial part of these facilities, it should be the obligation of the State to provide the staffing. To go further, there are about $2 billion worth of staffing in programs which would be immediately back before this Congress asking for staffing. I do not believe it would be possible for this Congress to deny such staffing in other programs if we allowed staffing in this bill. In other words, we are setting a precedent that, if we allowed in this bill as it was in the Senate version, for $450 million, then we would have to come back and appropriate about $2 billion in staffing in other programs. All of this was under discussion. We came to the conclusion that our action was in line with what we have done in the Hill-Burton and other programs. We thought the State should provide the staffing.

There are some of us on the committee who felt, in view of the shortage of personnel, it would be better for us to spend the $450 million if we were going to spend at all—in getting personnel trained in nursing, psychology, and other fields, who could be drawn on by the States and paid for by the States. We have followed Hill-Burton in theory and practice.

Mr. HORTON. I would certainly subscribe to the gentleman's position and the position of the committee in regard to having the States handle this problem. But it does seem to me there is in this area a unique situation as contrasted with other programs in which the Federal Government might be involved; namely, the problem of finding adequate and competent personnel to staff this type of facility. I am wondering whether or not the uniqueness of the type of personnel we would have to provide here, would create a different situation than the normal request for Federal assistance.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think if we are going to spend additional money, we ought to spend it in the training of personnel and getting the personnel ready and still let the State employ them.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to affirm my support of the principle of providing Federal assistance in meeting critical national health problems. Implementing coordinated National, State, and local action designed to combat mental retardation and mental illness and train handicapped children deserves a high priority.

The fundamentals embodied by this bill offer a well-reasoned Federal approach. Directed at specific health problems and requiring participation by the States and localities, this bill will focus nationwide attention on these serious health problems.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has three principal provisions. It would authorize financial assistance in: First, the construction of research centers and facilities related to the mentally retarded; second, the construction of community health centers; and third, the training of teachers of children who are mentally retarded or mentally ill as well as other handicapped children.

The construction and training grants would be authorized over a 3-year period and total $238 million.

In two of its four titles, namely, title III—Training of Teachers for Mentally Retarded and Other Handicapped Children, and title IV—General Provisions and Definitions, this proposed legislation is virtually identical to that passed by the other body earlier this year. The remaining two titles, while similar in nature, are markedly different both for the length of time during which grant appropriations would be authorized, with the consequence of dollar amount differences, and the question of whether there should be included grants for the initial staffing of community mental health centers.

The amendments to S. 1576 made by the committee in reporting this bill affect title I—Construction of Research Centers and Facilities for the Mentally Retarded—and title II—Construction of Community Mental Health Centers. This action has resulted in a substantial reduction in the bill's authorization as it passed the other body. In dollars, this reduction is from $850 to $238 million—a cut of $612 million.

Most of this reduction—fully 70 percent—was made by the elimination of the authorization for Federal grants for initial staffing of community mental health centers. The balance of the dollar changes are found in the reduction of grants—from $230 million to $115 million—for construction of these centers and altering from 5 years to 3 years the authorization of construction grants for facilities for the mentally retarded. This alteration removes an additional $70 million from the measure.

I do not object to the amendments made to title I. Their effect, I believe, will benefit the purpose of the bill by assuring closer congressional interest. Certainly, if at the end of 3 years this program is proving of value, I am confident Congress would effect its continuation.

I am concerned, however, over the amendments to title II. Here is where the committee has excised $542 million. In the words of one of my constituents, Mr. Hilton O. Hedrick, director of the Mental Health Chapter of the Health Association of Rochester and Monroe County, N.Y., this action has "cut out the heart of the measure."

If allowed to stand, what will be the result of this reduction in construction grants and elimination of staffing provisions? I feel that question can best be answered by me again quoting Mr. Hedrick, an authority in this field of health:

> It is highly unlikely that the States will undertake a construction program without assurance of funds with which to staff the centers during their first years of operation. This is a disastrous blow to the hopes of millions who saw in the community health centers program the prospect for a smashing attack on the traditional neglect of the mentally ill.
>
> It has become increasingly obvious to both lay and professional in the mental health field that the need for services at the local level far outweighs the ability of the local community to pay for these services.

Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating the restoration of all the funds taken out by the committee for the initial staffing of these centers, since the $427 million figure was intended to embrace an 8-year period. Rather, I suggest that we seek a compromise which would permit this essential aspect of the program to be authorized for a somewhat shorter period in order that it be given a fair trial.

Failure to provide this staffing authorization, I feel, will affect the overall program we are attempting to launch in this nationwide fight against mental illness.

Mr. Chairman, I have based my support of such Federal assistance programs, regardless of the field for which they are intended, on their ability to stimulate State and local expenditures. Therefore, I should like to cite some of the mental health projects in Rochester, N.Y., a community that I have the privilege to represent in Congress, which are planned and waiting to be financed by local and State funds supplemented with Federal assistance.

They are: an inpatient-outpatient day hospital, a consultation center at Northside General Hospital, the expansion of the Residential Treatment Center for Emotionally Disturbed Children of the Convalescent Hospital from its existing capacity of 24 to a badly needed planned capacity of 40, the relocation of the Rochester Guidance Clinic from inadequate quarters in downtown Rochester to more appropriate quarters which will permit the operation of a more complete service, including a day treatment center.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to comment briefly on title III of this bill with respect to the training and education provisions for children with the handicap of deafness. I am personally aware of the merit of this program, adopted by the last Congress, through the work of the Rochester, N.Y., School for the Deaf. I commend the committee for its action in continuing this program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to comment further on the staffing problems in terms of the actual requirements? Was there any testimony as to what the requirements would be? What do we know about the staffing requirements under the program as it is being projected?

Mr. SPRINGER. Do you mean as to the supply?

Mr. COHELAN. Yes, how many people would it take?

Mr. SPRINGER. We do have this testimony and that is about all I can give the gentleman, that there is a shortage of personnel in all of these fields.

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman may well know, I am well aware of the shortage and that is the reason I asked the gentleman that question because this is a very serious part of this total problem and, in fact, perhaps the most serious. My question is, first, How many people will we need; and, second, Is there any testimony or any data to that effect in the hearings; and third, How long will it take to produce a unit of that kind of staff skill?

Mr. SPRINGER. All I can say to the gentleman is that there is a shortage. As to how many will be needed, I am not able to tell the gentleman for the simple reason we do not know how many States are going to take advantage of the program. Let me just point out a little further with reference to the training program for the unemployed which we entered on with such high hopes just a short time ago. We found what? Only four States took advantage of it. I think more than that will take advantage of this program because it is a problem that is pressing right on most of the States and there are more people than they can take care of and they would like to have additional hospitals, and if they can get them, I think more States would take them. Then it would more resemble the situation of the demand that there was under the Hill-Burton Act. Under the Hill-Burton Act we never quite had enough money to take care of everybody who wanted a hospital immediately. So I can answer the gentleman to that extent. I would just repeat that if we are going to put additional money in, let us put it into the training aspect of this such as you are doing in the training of teachers for the mentally retarded and in getting the personnel ready and then let the States hire them.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have two questions I would like to ask the gentleman. I would like to pursue the question raised by the gentleman from Minnesota. During the hearings, were any of the State school superintendents or people in the local districts called before the committee to testify on title III in this legislation?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, I do not think we called anyone, but we came out with a public notice that anyone who wished to appear would be heard by the committee. We heard everyone who requested to be heard. I think we heard everybody who wanted to be heard and did not turn down a single witness.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The second question I would like to ask the gentleman is this. When you provide under title III for research funds as well as money for demonstration projects, would the gentleman explain the difference in the kind of research you expect to carry on under this legislation and the research that is carried on under the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health and the Neurological and Blindness Institute and the Institute of Childhood Diseases?

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentlewoman will allow me, I will yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] who is more familiar with that than I am.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentlewoman from Oregon inquires about section 302 of the bill. I would refer you to page 24 of the report which has an explanation. It does say research and demonstration projects. What it refers to there is the carrying out of demonstration projects in which research is conducted along with the actual demonstration project itself.

So that it is not two kinds of projects, but one.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not true that under 3 or 4 or maybe 5 of the programs that are presently in existence, the same kind of research could be carried out?

Mr. HARRIS. The question has been raised from several sources, and because of that it should be abundantly clear there is no duplication. The committee adopted amendments to the effect that no funds under the Public Health Act can be used at all for purposes as outlined in titles I and II of the bill. The amendment was carried throughout the bill in order to make it clear that there would not be duplication. It was not put in title III, since it was not considered that there would be duplication.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not true, though, that at the present time under the legislation which is in existence the same kind of research is and could be carried out as is provided here?

Mr. HARRIS. As I explained in my general explanation of the legislation a moment ago, under the present bill, in the Research Facilities Act there is general broad authority for research programs. The authorization is limited. It was primarily established for a particular purpose and, for the purposes intended here, there is hardly any significance for this purpose. Therefore, since none of the funds are going for these purposes as it is with some of the other titles to this program, it was felt in order to carry out a well balanced program, as the gentleman from Illinois so well explained, it should be nailed down. The purpose would be in order that the Committee on Appropriations, which had done such a good job through the years in trying to provide funds for these programs, would have guidelines in order to make funds available for them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

TITLE III CARRIES OUT A 6-YEAR OBJECTIVE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the bill now before the House, and I particularly support—and am delighted to call attention to—title III provisions of this bill dealing with the training of special teachers for children having physical or emotional or other handicaps. These children often require specialized teaching, and we do not have even a fraction of the specially trained teachers we need in order to give our 6 million handicapped children the educational opportunities they are capable of utilizing.

For me, the provisions of title III, dealing with grants and scholarships and fellowships and traineeships for teachers going into the field of teaching exceptional children, carries out an objective I have had since 1957, when I introduced the first general bill ever introduced in Congress on this subject.

That bill, H.R. 9591 of the 85th Congress, was entitled "Exceptional Children Educational Assistance Bill." I have reintroduced it in every Congress since then, and it is H.R. 15 in the present Congress. It envisioned almost exactly the kind of approach to teacher-training for exceptional children now contained in S. 1576, and my only regret is that it has taken so long for this idea to be translated into legislation we can actually pass here in the House.

BILL BASED ON LIBRARY OF CONGRESS STUDY

The original bill was drafted on the basis of recommendations made to me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress following an outstanding research job for which I have always been grateful.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 12, pages 16348–16366, there is a complete account of the origin of this idea, stemming from correspondence originally with parents of handicapped children with others in the St. Louis area interested in the training of exceptional children. The material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28, 1957, running to 18 pages, includes the full text of the report to me from the Legislative Reference Service, prepared by Herman A. Sieber, research assistant in education and government, under the direction of Charles A. Quattlebaum, specialist in education.

I think that long insertion in the RECORD gave one of the best illustrations of how an idea is translated into legislation—and the legislation in question is now contained 6 years later in title III of S. 1576.

SULLIVAN BILL ALSO INCLUDED GIFTED CHILDREN

My bill as originally introduced, and as reintroduced in subsequent Congresses, also would encourage the training of teachers for gifted, as well as handicapped, children. I hope that in other legislation we can still accomplish that objective, because it would not be appropriate or germane to try to add it to this legislation today dealing with mental retardation facilities and community mental health centers. Otherwise, I would have offered such an amendment.

ORIGINAL BILL INTRODUCED AUGUST 30, 1957

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that we are going to provide more encouragement for experienced teachers to go back to school for advanced training in teaching exceptional children. I am proud to have been the sponsor of the first general bill ever introduced on this subject, and I submit, as part of my remarks, that original bill, as follows:

H.R. 9591—85TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(In the House of Representatives, August 30, 1957, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor)

A bill to provide for the establishment of a special $18,500,000 7-year program of Federal scholarship and fellowship grants to individuals, and a $2,500,000 program of grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education, to encourage and expand the training of teachers for the education of exceptional children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Exceptional Children Educational Assistance Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE OF ACT

SEC. 2. The Congress believes that the American promise of equality of opportunity extends to every child within our country, no matter what his gifts, his capacity or his handicaps, whether he is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight or of hearing, or crippling disease or condition, whether his adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, or whether, on the other hand, he is endowed with outstandingly brilliant gifts of mind and of spirit. All such exceptional children require special educational guidance for development of their total educational potential.

The Congress finds that the educational problems presented by such exceptional children are of national concern, and that there is an acute national shortage of, and urgent national need for, individuals professionally qualified to teach such children, to supervise the teachers of such children, to train such teachers and supervisors, and to conduct research into the problems relating to the education of exceptional children.

While the Congress recognizes that the primary responsibility for meeting these problems lies with the States and local communities, national interest in the training of self-reliant and useful citizens demands that the Federal Government assist and encourage and stimulate the initiation of adequate programs in the States to meet these problems.

Therefore, this Act provides on a temporary, seven-year basis, a program to further the training of teachers, supervisors of teachers, and researchers in special education for exceptional children, and to encourage and assist public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to expand their training work in these fields.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(3) The term "school-age population" means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce;

(4) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools in a State, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the governor or by State law;

(5) The term "nonprofit institution" means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

(6) The term "exceptional children" means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy); and (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4(a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; and $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; for grants to individuals for scholarships and fellowships in accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of this Act.

(b) There is also authorized the sum of $2,500,000 to be expended during the existence of this program in the form of grants to public and nonprofit institutions in accordance with the provisions of section 5(b) of this Act.

GRANTS BY THE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award scholarships and fellowships, with such stipends as he may determine, to individuals for the purpose of taking advanced training, at institutions selected by the recipients, for stated periods of time, in order to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train or supervise teachers in this field, or engage in research in the teaching of exceptional children: *Provided,* That, in his discretion, the Commissioner, in order to accomplish the objectives of this Act, may also make these awards for study at the undergraduate level.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to construct, install, improve, or expand specialized facilities and equipment in connection with courses of instruction for persons preparing to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train such teachers, or to supervise such teachers, or to engage in research in special education for exceptional children: *Provided,* That the Commissioner, in his discretion, may also make grants to establish specialized courses in this field in such institutions.

(c) The amount of scholarship and fellowship grants made in any fiscal year to residents of a State under section 5(a) shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds appropriated under authority of section 4(a) for such fiscal year as the school-age population of such State bears to the total school-age population of all the States.

(d) Payments of grants pursuant to this Act may be made by the Commissioner from time to time, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine, including conditions requiring public and other nonprofit institutions to make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and conditions requiring compliance with such provisions as the Commissioner may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(e) The Commissioner shall consult with an advisory committee as described in section 6(a) which shall assist him in determining the areas and priorities of need in the award of these grants, and in setting the standards for the granting of such fellowships, scholarships, and grants.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY PANELS

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioner shall appoint an advisory committee of not more than eight persons who shall be conversant with the overall educational needs of exceptional children and who shall assist the Commissioner in developing general policies under this Act. The Commissioner shall be ex officio a member of this committee and shall act as chairman thereof.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized from time to time to establish advisory panels of specialists in special education for any of the categories of exceptional children enumerated in this Act. Each such panel shall consist of not less than five persons, who shall meet at the call of the Commissioner.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 7. The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his functions under this Act except the making of regulations.

PUBLICIZING AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS

SEC. 8. The Commissioner shall take such steps as are practicable to publicize to the fullest extent possible the availability of fellowships, scholarships, and grants under this Act among teachers and prospective teachers, and among all colleges and universities offering accredited courses of study leading to advanced degrees in nursery, kindergarten, elementary, or secondary education.

COOPERATION WITH STATES

SEC. 9. In the administration of this Act, the Commissioner shall consult and advise with the various State educational agencies to determine the extent of need for teachers of exceptional children in the respective States and to keep the State educational agencies fully informed of all developments under this program in order to encourage them to establish special programs or special classes for exceptional children. In this connection, the Commissioner shall advise the State educational agencies of the names and home addresses of all individuals from their repective States who have received fellowships, scholarships, or grants for training in the field of education of exceptional children, and the particular field of study each is pursuing, so that the respective State educational agencies can then take appropriate steps to seek to attract such persons to positions in their home States in order to utilize the advanced education and skills which they have acquired under this program: *Provided*, That no individual receiving a scholarship, fellowship, or grant for advanced study under this Act shall be required, as a condition of such scholarship or fellowship or grant to promise to take employment subsequently in any State.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to yield now to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is indeed a milestone in our country's public health and education history. Although I am fully aware of the importance of and great need for all of the provisions of this bill, I wish to devote my time to title III, the provisions for the training of teachers of handicapped children.

In 1961 and 1962, the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, on which I formerly served, devoted much time and study to the problem of the handicapped child. The result of this study was H.R. 12070, a bill which I introduced in the 87th Congress and which was still pending before the Rules Committee at the end of that Congress.

This year, I have sponsored H.R. 7121, which has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and is now pending before the Rules Committee, the provisions of which are virtually identical to title III of the bill before us today. I will not dwell on the differences between the two proposals, since they are, in the main, ones of detail rather than overall intent. I do wish, however, to emphasize as strongly as possible the extreme importance of title III of the mental health bill.

Mr. Chairman, the pride that the American people take in their educational system, for some inexplicable reason, has tended to overlook the fact that we are neglecting the welfare of 4½ million Americans—the handicapped young people of this country. This represents to me the clay feet of the American idol of educational opportunity. There has been widespread public apathy and inexcusable indifference to the problems of this country's exceptional children. The provisions of the bill now before us mean that this country is beginning to become aware, is beginning to realize that it can no longer callously deprive these children of an adequate education—or, indeed, any education at all.

Americans applaud and support the work being done by our Government to educate the children of underdeveloped countries—but what of our own underdeveloped children? Our failure to face and deal realistically with the needs of our exceptional children has represented a paralysis in our social thinking. I do not know whether it stemmed from mere lack of knowledge or whether it is an atavistic outcropping of the same kind of public philosophy which used to leave blind children to die—which kept retarded relatives hidden from the eyes of the world—which regarded all accidents of birth and crippling disease as the punishment of a wrathful God. This paralysis, fortunately, is beginning to disappear.

The handicapped child—the blind, the deaf, the mentally retarded, the speech impaired, the emotionally disturbed, the crippled—has been subjected to at best an inadequate but often nonexistent education. This is not in keeping with America—with the bustling, sprawling country in which every man is, if not a king, at least a prince—where any boy can grow up to be President and any girl can marry a millionaire. The kind of America that dared everything to preserve freedom would not be frightened by the necessity, indeed the obligation, to guarantee education for the handicapped child. The kind of America that loves hot dogs, little girls with pony tails, and little boys with freckles should be ashamed of ignoring the handicapped child.

But we are now on the threshold of a significant, vital step toward meeting the problems of these children. Under the provisions of this bill, grants will be made for the training of teachers and the supervisors of teachers of all handicapped children. And the need for these teachers is overwhelming. In 1962, it was estimated that 252,657 teachers would be needed this year alone—and only 50,000 were available—only 1 teacher for every 120 handicapped children. Mentally retarded children alone need 75,000 teachers, or more than the entire present supply of teachers for children with all types of handicaps. Thirty-two thousand teachers are needed for crippled children; 49,000 for emotionally disturbed and maladjusted youngsters; 17,000 for children with speech impairments; 24,000 for those with special health problems; over 10,000 for the deaf and hard of hearing; and over 4,000 for the blind or partially sighted children.

Over the years, the frustrations of attempts to provide aid for the training of these teachers has caused mounting anger among those of us who are aware of the great problem involved. It has been easy to say, "How could there be any problem, any disagreement, any congressional opposition?" And, indeed, how could there? How could this or any other legislative body be so insensitive as to doom the blind to a life of intellectual as well as physical darkness; to deny the emotionally disturbed a modicum of security or to sentence the crippled to a half-life.

This is our opportunity to prove that we are acutely aware of the need for this legislation and that we are willing to provide the funds for the training of those who will bring life and learning into the world of handicapped.

I earnestly hope that this Congress will approve this legislation, for as important as the other provisions of this bill undoubtedly are, title III is the most important and vital step this Congress can possibly take.

Mr. Chairman, I commend our colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for his work on this bill, and I know that I voice the thoughts and dreams of millions of Americans when I urge its passage.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 143]

Adair
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton, Frances, P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Buckley
Cameron
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Daddario
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Diggs
Edmondson
Evins
Flynt
Ford
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gathings
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Laird
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDowell
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Michel
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Short
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Tupper
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 1576, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 344 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter and, I would like to say, as chairman of this subcommittee he did outstanding work in connection with the legislation in the course of this hearing, in developing the record and in the consideration of it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kind words of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of our committee. I would like to pay a personal tribute to all of the members of the subcommittee. We held, I believe, in all, 6 days of hearings and heard many, many witnesses. We were in executive session, I believe, three separate times on this bill. I feel that having lived with it for the past 3 months and having been associated with some of or most of the health legislation that has come from this committee in the past 13 years it is my feeling that this is a piece of landmark legislation. I know the hour is late and we have heard many fine speeches by Members today. The bill has been well explained by the chairman and by the ranking minority Member [Mr. SPRINGER] and I doubt if there is much that I can add to this explanation except to say this: Some people have brought up a question as to the amount of money that is spent by the States, which is considerable. Over $11 billion in the past decade has been spent by the States. As you look at the overall figures of the Senate bill you will see that there has been proposed $850 million in a 5-year program. You now have before you for your consideration a bill that calls for a 3-year program which eliminates staffing and provides an overall amount of about $238 million. I was frankly not happy about cutting the staffing, because I believe that this is the place where we may or may not get the results we would have gotten had the Federal Government gone in for a limited period of time and helped out with the staffing problem. However, to get back to the amount spent by the States and why the Federal Government is coming into this field with a minimum amount of money, we find that it is because of the fact that under the old type of arrangement we are providing merely for custodial care. We do not get the rate of recovery that we will get with a community mental health program where the stigma of being afflicted with mental illness will be removed and where these people will have the advantage of the friendships, the love and care of their own families and neighbors who are interested in seeing them restored to full and adequate health.

It was brought out in the hearings many times, and I think I would like to read what Dr. Ulett from Missouri, who is director of the Division of Mental Diseases, Department of Public Health, and Welfare of the State of Missouri, said on this subject. I think he points up the prime reason why we do need a bold new concept to tackle a disease which affects the lives of over 17 million Americans, not to mention the 5 million children who are affected and mentally retarded.

Quoting from pages 85 and 86 of the supplemental hearings, Dr. Ulett had this to say:

> We have 5 large hospitals averaging over 2,000 patients in each. Here we found patients spending needless months and years. I saw this to be true yet did not have the facts to bring this convincingly to the legislators of Missouri so we conducted a study. Within our own State we had two community mental health centers, one in Kansas City and one in St. Louis and were able to compare what happened to patients when they entered these community mental health centers as against when they entered one of our State hospitals. We found that when the same kinds of patients entered a community mental health center there was accomplished there in a matter of a month at about half the cost what was done for the same type of patients when they entered a State hospital and there required 9 months of treatment. We, thus, studied two groups of patients—all of the first admitted patients to these two types of hospitals that existed in our State. We found the average patient stay for a man coming for the first time to a community mental health center was 32 days. The same kind of patient in a State hospital stayed 255 days.

This same type of testimony was echoed many times throughout the hearings. I think that this is the least that we as a civilized nation can do. I think this program is long overdue. Most of the State mental institutions were built prior to 1900. Many of them are obsolete. Many of them are fire hazards.

In my sincere opinion this can be the most important piece of legislation that will be acted upon in the first session of this Congress. It reflects a dramatic advance in our capacity to cope with mental disability and a revolutionary change in emphasis in mental health programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one or two words about title I and title III where we try to do something for the first time in this special way for mentally retarded children. I would like to call attention to one part of the report, which I think is a splendid document, on page 8, under the title, "Our Lack of Knowledge."

OUR LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

> Our present body of knowledge in the field of mental retardation is so limited that we can ascribe precise causes for the condition in only 15 to 25 percent of the cases. For the majority of the retarded individuals—from 75 to 85 percent of the cases—it is not yet possible to identify a specific cause for the retardation.
>
> There are a great many diseases and conditions which affect the brain and result in retardation, including infections or poisons in the mother's system during pregnancy, infection of the central nervous system during infancy, injuries to the brain at birth, head injuries in childhood, metabolic disorders determined by heredity, and abnormal brain growths.
>
> Despite our lack of understanding with respect to the specific causes of mental retardation, we have made dramatic progress in research and this progress greatly encourages the further pursuit of new knowledge.

I say to you that even if there were only this one section, this one title, it would still be a great piece of legislation. I am hopeful that the House will endorse what our subcommittee and our committee have brought to the floor for your consideration.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation. I certainly wish to compliment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] on his excellent statement, and especially since the gentleman rendered such invaluable assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

Especially at this time do I want to commend my colleague, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and member of the Alabama delegation [Mr. ELLIOTT], for the contribution that he has made, not only today, in explaining the rule and bringing this bill to the floor, but also as a member of the committee of which it is my privilege now to be a member, where he sponsored and there followed the enactment of legislation providing funds to train teachers for the mentally retarded.

In this age of great technological advancement, specialization is certainly a very important aspect of the successful operation of any program. Specialization in the field of teaching is fundamental to the success of any teaching program. In the case of the hundreds of thousands of mentally retarded children in the United States it is essential that an adequate supply of highly trained instructors be made available in the time-consuming but important task of reducing the dependency of such persons. There are few families who are not affected and I, for one, am firmly convinced that the financial burden of society and individual families can be substantially minimized by the expansion of research and the construction and training which would be authorized by this legislation. But this is a coldblooded way of looking at legislation which as human beings in an organized society we should all be willing to wholeheartedly support.

I have been much impressed with the statistics presented during the debate and will not lengthen my remarks by reference to that. I urge the passage of the legislation.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to compliment the chairman of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], and to thank the gentleman who is now in the well of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] for bringing this very important bill to the floor of the House at this time. I would like to pose one or two questions to the gentleman from Alabama, in order to clear up a point which may relate to a condition that exists in my own congressional district and elsewhere. I would like to know if the bill is broad enough in its scope and intent to make grants to such broad-based medical care programs as the HIP in New York, the Group Health Association in Washington, D.C., or the Kaiser Foundation health plan which we have in my district and on the west coast?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that a reading of the bill and the report I think is clearly indicative of the intent of the committee to place the matter of planning in the jurisdiction of the States.

The gentleman will note that an applicant who is eligible for financial assistance under the act must be, of course, a State, a political subdivision, or a public or nonprofit agency. The priorities for construction are also set up by the State plan.

I will say to the gentleman that I am not thoroughly familiar with what the gentleman has in mind. I am in a general way. But I would say if this group meets the requirements of the State, either the health department or the State commission on mental health, as to whatever requirements they set up, they would certainly enjoy the benefits of this bill.

I do not think I could go to any greater length than to say that that was the intent in writing this legislation—that we would put as few Federal guidelines in as possible so that the States would be free to conduct these programs according to the desires of the particular State, because you have different situations in differing States.

Mr. COHELAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I realize that. I thank the gentleman again for his response.

The reason I asked the question is that these particular and very well-known group health programs in New York and other places throughout the country, and specifically in my own area—the Kaiser Foundation health plan—of course had some difficulty in interpretation under the Hill-Burton program. It is because of that that I want to make perfectly clear by this colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama that I am correct in assuming that an organization like HIP and the Kaiser Foundation health plans, if they meet the requirements, they could in fact participate in the program.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say so, if they meet the requirements set forth by the individual States affected. They would certainly be entitled to consideration.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman [Mr. Harris] for bringing this excellent bill to the floor today. I had the great privilege of appearing before the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] subcommittee on behalf of this bill and at that time the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] attended the hearing. On that occasion I exressed my strong support of the mental retardation facilities and community mental health centers of 1963. As an active supporter of programs in the areas of mental health and retardation, I feel that this legislation will go a long way in providing the kind of facilities so necessary to our society. At my appearance before Mr. Roberts' Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, I particularly stressed the advantages of title III of this legislation, which will provide for the training of teachers who will, in turn, train teachers of deaf students. Earlier this year the need for legislation in this area was made patently clear to me during discussions which I held at the famous Clarke School for the Deaf in Northampton, Mass., while I was there to give the commencement address, I saw the remarkable achievements made by these teachers. For this reason, title III is certainly a most important facet of this bill. While a number of my distinguished colleagues have talked this afternoon on other provisions, I simply want to say that Congress can perform a significant service to the porblems of handicapped children by enactment of this legislation. The money involved is not great, but the benefits are manifest.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know this has been raised since I spoke a minute ago—as to how this bill compares with the Senate bill on the cost of construction. May I say this: That title I, A, B, and C are exactly the same as the Senate, except they are for 3-year periods instead of 5-year periods. But the same years in the Senate are comparable to the bill in the House.

As to title II, for the 2-year period which we have set out, we provide $15 million more than the Senate bill provides in title II.

Title III is exactly the same for the 3-year period as the Senate version of the legislation.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that I stated in my overall remarks that there are some differences, I would agree with the gentleman as he pointed out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman if the State has complete control over the records of the patients treated in these institutions? In other words, is there anything in the bill that would prevent a high-level politician from using privileged patient reports from these mental institutions for the despicable purpose of smearing personally one of our fine American citizens, such as was done so contemptably the other day against the distinguished Governor of the great State of Alabama?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I do not think there is anything in this bill that would permit that to be done because many of these centers, I should say, will be under the jurisdiction of private institutions in the private facilities that qualify. All of these people will be under the care of a physician, and I would not think these records would be in any sense public records.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Insofar as this problem is concerned, the State law would prevail rather than any Federal act that might be enacted?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is my opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my opinion, that underhanded attack against Governor Wallace was also a gratuitous insult to every service-connected disabled veteran in this country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to commend the gentleman for the fine work he has done in holding hearings in connection with this bill and in bringing the bill to the floor for consideration. In connection with what the gentleman from Mississippi stated, I want to say I think it ill behooves a man who has never fired a gun in combat while in the service of his country to make a derogatory remark in an effort to smear our distinguished Governor, George Wallace. Governor

Wallace was a real combat hero in World War II, serving 4 years as a flight engineer on a B–29, which service as everyone knows was extremely hazardous. I am delighted that some veterans organizations of America have condemned such references.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I agree with the gentlemen from Mississippi and Alabama. I think it very unfair to use such tactics on a combat veteran who has distinguished himself in the face of enemy fire. He does not need my defense but I deplore such accusations.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this bill which is sorely needed. This bill is a distinct and necessary forward step in our desire to do something in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

The committee of which I am privileged to be a member has worked hard and diligently on this proposed legislation and I feel strongly that the bill which has resulted from those efforts is one that we can easily support.

The bill now being considered has several changes from the form of the bill as passed by the other body. I believe that such changes have made this a better bill.

Some may say that this is a grant-in-aid program to the States in a completely new field and may possibly question the need for it. It is true that this is a new field for the Federal Government, but I am convinced that there is every justification for such action. Certainly the lack of facilities for the care of this type of patient is tragic. The care and research in the type of treatment for the mentally retarded is a national problem and anything that the Federal Government can do toward contributing to the solution of this problem is a real contribution to the welfare of the country.

Looking toward the construction grants, we must also keep in mind that the procedure to be followed closely parallels the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act in hospital construction, which, as we all know, has proven to be very successful.

I urge the passage of S. 1576, as amended, and therefore add my voice to those supporting this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill many of us approach the problem having in mind that many times when a Federal Government moves into a program there is a natural tendency on the part of the communities and States to retard their effort. We then must weigh the losses against the gains. Having those things in mind, we carefully studied this bill and listened to testimony in hearings for many, many days. Throughout the hearings you will find reference made to the fact that this is a seeding program, an admission of the fact that the great burden of responsibility rests with the States. As a result our committee and our subcommittee held extensive hearings. The bill was reported to the full committee. It was sent back to the subcommittee for more hearings. Much of the language was changed, and many features of the bill were changed, in my judgment, to improve it. The original measure that we had before us provided $850 million. The present bill provides $238 million. In the original bill were extensive moneys for staffing. That has been eliminated.

I might point out one feature in our deliberations that I do not believe has been emphasized to the degree that it should be. We all fear duplication in Government services, but you will find in each title of the bill a provision termed "nonduplication of grants." In other words, if there are moneys presently being distributed under other sections of law that would apply to the very activity in this bill, this provision provides for nonduplication. I think it is a good provision.

Throughout this bill we have tried to make it a better piece of legislation and we have tried to consolidate the activities of the Government in this field.

In acting favorably on S. 1576, we will be taking a constructive step toward reducing the anguish of many families in dealing with the problems of mental health and mental retardation. We will, I believe, make it easier to restore both adults and children to useful places in society, and we will be reducing the tremendous cost of custodial care of mental patients in State hospitals.

The care of mentally ill, mostly in State institutions, is costing some $2 billion a year. Care of the mentally retarded is costing State and local governments some $400 million a year, and yet we all know that the problems confronting the family down the street are not being adequately met under present programs. Great strides have been made since these problems were hidden from sight in inadequate institutions, but much more needs to be done, can be done, and should be done in the areas of research and treatment.

Naturally, the bill before us is not going to change the picture overnight. We may hope, however, that it will do some of the things required to alleviate the problem, by providing community mental health centers, by developing research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded, and by more adequate training of the teachers needed to deal with handicapped children. It is the aim of our committee to move toward these objectives by providing grants and guidance for a limited period, along with insistence that State and local responsibility shall be paramount.

This program has been developed in keeping with the view that the prime responsibility rests in the communities, and it is our purpose to give it a start with Federal grants on a basis designed to assure that once established, the program will in fairly short order stand on its own feet. That is why, for example, the committee report rejects the proposal that staffing of these facilities be a part of the Federal contribution. Surely if the start is made by providing the needed facilities for research, care, and training, the staffing requirements should readily be the responsibility of the communities and States which will benefit.

The lengthy hearings held by the subcommittee clearly developed the need for action; they developed, too, the fact that in a substantial number of States and communities starts have already been made in providing mental health centers and facilities to deal with the mentally retarded. The hearings also developed the fact that local ingenuity and initiative are essential to continuing success. As an example, the experience in my own State of Minnesota points up the possibilities.

A mental health program has been in effect in my State for a number of years, including mental health centers and a start toward facilities to deal with mental retardation. As an illustration, the Minnesota Association for Retarded Children reported in a statement which is part of the subcommittee hearings that the Minnesota Legislature appropriated $155,000 this year to match local funds for day activity centers for the retarded unable to attend public schools and not needing institutional care. In a number of communities the local leadership found it possible to make use of school buildings which were not in use because of school district consolidations.

I would like to emphasize the latter—that existing buildings such as unused schoolhouses might well be adapted to the mental retardation educational program. For example, there are many such schoolhouses in my own county, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in response to my questions, expressed the view that while the bill does not provide for the purchase of buildings, it does authorize expansion, remodeling and alteration of existing buildings as part of the proposal to provide educational facilities for the mentally retarded.

While we are proposing grants-in-aid to provide the bricks and mortar for community mental health centers and for research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded, it is the belief of your committee, in which I concur, that assistance is required to train the personnel who will man these facilities. It has been estimated that some 55,000 people will need to be trained to provide adequate operations because the nature of these facilities will be such that tremendous numbers of people will be served by them. This specialized training is substantially different from the usual processes of education, since it is a combination of on-the-job training with guidance in the required psychiatric and other skills. The training provisions in title III of the bill are an integral part of the whole program and are therefore properly included in the broad scope of this measure as considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety.

As the committee report says, S. 1576 as amended is worthy of support.

> The evidence seems clear—

The committee declares—

> either we must develop the quantity and quality of community services which will

> ultimately replace these (State) institutions or we will have to undertake a massive program to strengthen the State mental hospitals. The committee believes that the development of new methods of treatment, the impressive evidence of the possibilities of rehabilitating the mentally ill, and a lessening of our disposition to reject and isolate the sufferers, all argue strongly for the treatment of mental illness in the community.

This, of course, is equally true—and probably even more so—with reference to the mentally retarded, where we have a chance to give these handicapped youngsters useful and happy lives.

But in all of this, let us not forget the committee's declaration that:

> Federal support should be so tailored as not to result in the Federal Government assuming the traditional responsibility of the States, localities, and the medical profession for the care and treatment of the mentally ill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rhodes], a member of the subcommittee, and of course a member of our great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety which studied this legislation, I heartily support the bill before us as an important step forward in the fight against mental retardation and mental illness.

I want to commend both the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], and the chairman of the full Commerce Committee, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], for the time, effort and leadership they have provided in the thoughtful consideration that has been given to this legislation and in bringing it to the House floor for a decision. There was bipartisan support in the committee for the bill except on the staffing issue.

It is unfortunate, I believe, that the full committee voted 15 to 12 to eliminate the staffing provision, which was included in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], and in the bill which was approved by the subcommittee and the measure which was passed by the other body with only one opposing vote.

Anyone who is acquainted with the shortage of doctors and professional people in various Federal and State hospitals and institutions knows of the difficulty in providing adequate staffing. And this will be even more true in regard to initial staffing for this program, which is extremely important to its success. The staffing provision has widespread national support and the endorsement of many local groups interested in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that S. 1576, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, fails to authorize funds for staffing of the proposed community mental health centers. This is a serious shortsighted omission. Any bill finally enacted should include provisions for financing the initial staffing of these centers, as provided in the version approved by the other body.

The overwhelming weight of professional opinion is recorded in the testimony on this legislation in strong support of the initial staffing funds.

Indeed, the view of those most competent within organized medicine to make a judgment on this issue was in favor of the staffing funds. As Dr. Lindsay E. Beaton, testifying on behalf of the AMA, told our committee:

> The Council on Mental Health of the American Medical Association voted to recommend to the board of trustees of the American Medical Association its favorable consideration of the staffing provision.

A political decision later resulted in the AMA's opposition to this provision. This body should not fail to note that the competent professionals, the experts on mental health, within the AMA recommended otherwise.

It is unfortunate that the majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce chose to follow the political views of the AMA leadership, rather than the professional views of the AMA's own expert body in this field.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is to establish a program which will meet the needs and the aspirations of the American people, it is essential that the language adopted by the other body, authorizing money for initial staffing, be included in the final bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MacDonald] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of S. 1576, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], as well as the other members of his subcommittee, and our chairman, Mr. Harris, on bringing out this bill before us today. This bill is aimed at one of the most persistent and most tragic evils in our Nation. The problems of mental health are too compelling to justify anything short of the cooperative, nationwide program contained in the bill before us today. Its accurate description was given by President Kennedy in his mental health message to the Congress, as "a bold new approach to mental illness."

Mental illness and mental retardation are afflictions which are far more widespread than commonly realized. About 800,000 patients now fill our Nation's mental institutions—600,000 for mental illness and over 200,000 for mental retardation. Approximately half of the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by mental patients.

Mental ills directly cost the taxpayers of the United States well over $1.8 billion a year. A measure of the economic impact of mental illness on the patients themselves and their families is the accumulated loss of income suffered by the patients resident in mental hospitals. The loss of wages for patients presently in mental hospitals has been estimated as exceeding $11 million. The loss of dollars tells only one part of the story. In terms of human suffering, in terms of loss of precious human talent, and in terms of family misery, the cost cannot be measured.

There is much that can be said about the fields of mental retardation and mental illness. The magnitude of the problem is dramatically and accurately set out in the fine report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member. I would like to take a few minutes to analyze the complexity of the problems of mental retardation.

More than 5,400,000 of our citizens are mentally retarded. Such a national statistic should be translated into more meaningful figures. Take 3 percent of your home State population, and you have the total of your mentally retarded. Now, for a still closer look, take 3 percent of your home community population, and you suddenly find the number of mentally retarded living in your midst. Some of these individuals are your friends and neighbors. Statistics are meaningless until they become the familiar faces—the Toms, Marys, and Harrys of your and my hometown. The problem of mental retardation is one which is of direct concern to every community and family in our Nation.

In most communities, our mentally retarded children are forced into a pattern of activity created for the so-called average or normal individual. They are forced to try to maintain a level that is far above their maximum ability. It is no wonder that these children are sometimes called problem children. A mentally handicapped person is one who does not have the native intelligence and ability to carry his own load in life. He is unable to compete on equal terms with normal individuals. He needs supervision and guidance in most tasks that he accomplishes.

A person with normal mental faculties may become disturbed mentally at any time during his life. Worry, frustration, shock, and a dozen other pressures, all too common in the present-day complexity of living, can cause any one of the many types of mental illnesses. Such illness may happen to a child as well as to an adult. If the condition is diagnosed soon enough, mentally ill patients can often be successfully treated. However, mentally retarded persons are quite different. Theirs is a case of incomplete mental development. So far, no treatment has been discovered which can promise to lift such persons to normal intelligence.

We know there are many causes of mental retardation. These vary from the numerous developmental causes in the prenatal period to causes by disease and injury in the postnatal period. Since present knowledge is limited, it is possible to identify precise causes in only 15 to 25 percent of the cases. It is important to note that studies indicate that there is less likelihood of mental retardation occurring if the mother receives adequate prenatal and delivery care and followup care is given the newborn infant.

For a problem so vast, there is no one answer that will solve it all. To have a complete and coordinated program for all types of retarded, we need the assistance, guidance, and help of all of our citizens. Services needed include State institutional care, special classes, sheltered workshops, day-care centers, and diagnostic services.

Parents of retarded children have a difficult time in accepting that their child is retarded. Their acceptance of this fact is even more difficult when the community fails to understand the problem. At all times, our goal should be to create a climate in our communities where the retarded can be happy and play a useful role based on their potential. I believe that the value of the community mental health centers has been most adequately explained. In a great many cases, an individual can receive psychiatric treatment near his home community and frequently on an out-patient basis. In this way, he can continue to be a contributing member of society, working at his job and assuming his family responsibilities.

Title III of this bill has also been explained fully, but I would like to emphasize that there is a tremendous need for trained professional people in the field of mental illness and mental retardation. I know in my home State of Massachusetts that such a shortage exists and I am sure that this is true in every other State in this great country. Title III will help initiate programs that will provide more and better trained professional people to work with all areas of the handicapped.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], our distinguished chairman who deserves high commendation for his outstanding leadership in the field of mental health and retardation, has explained in great detail the provisions for both the mentally ill and the mentally retarded and the training of personnel as provided for in S. 1576. Under title I of this bill, much can be accomplished through the development of the research centers for the mentally retarded. I firmly believe that through this research we can prevent some children from being born mentally retarded. There is so much more that we need to discover concerning the development of the human being in the prenatal areas. This research will not only allow us to increase our knowledge in the preventive areas, but it will further increase our knowledge in the education and training aspects in working with the retarded.

In my home State of Massachusetts, we have made some significant achievements in the advancement of services for both the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. But even with these achievements, we know so very little about new techniques and methods to combat mental illness and mental retardation. As President Kennedy stated in his message to the Congress on February 5 of this year:

> The situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience, but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution.

The bill before us today provides a giant step toward making up for years of neglect in this field. This program belongs neither to one party nor one State; it belongs to all Americans for its purpose is to help people who cannot help themselves.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment our distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for his diligent efforts to obtain passage of this legislation to help solve our serious mental health problems. I concur with his views and urge my colleagues to support S. 1576.

During our committee hearings on this measure, testimony was presented to show that there is a total absence of mental health workers and clinics in many communities throughout the country. And even where there is a clinic, patients often receive only a very small amount of help. Some of these facilities to care for the mentally ill resemble huge warehouses, yet they cost an average of $2,000 a year to maintain one patient, and only 1 of every 20 inmates can expect to be rehabilitated to some extent. If we pass this bill, it is estimated that the cost of each patient will be approximately $600 to $800 per year and we can expect to rehabilitate 9 out of 10 mental patients. These statistics alone make this program well worth the time, effort, and money authorized in S. 1576.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has pointed out that State mental hospitals, because of lack of funds, have become institutions for quarantining the mentally ill—not for treating them. Yet, mental illness is this Nation's No. 1 health problem. It is significant to note that more than half of all the hospital beds in the United States—702,000 are occupied by the mentally ill.

I think the program authorized in this bill will go a long way toward solving this critical health problem through its emphasis on care and treatment in the local environment and away from the old and antiquated concept of confinement in an isolated custodial institution. At the present time, only 20 percent of our State mental hospitals provide the minimum services necessary for treating mental illness. The other 80 percent are little more than custodial institutions.

As you know, this bill as reported by our committee differs from S. 1576 as it passed the Senate in that the staffing provisions have been deleted. I believe we are making a serious mistake in withholding funds to provide the necessary personnel to care for the mentally ill. As one prominent Maryland educator put it "without the staffing provision, we will have bricks without brains" and the program will lose its effectiveness. I think my colleagues will agree that it will serve no useful purpose to assist the States in constructing facilities to house the mentally ill unless we also provide the necessary funds to staff these institutions with qualified personnel. It is obvious that the mentally ill cannot recover simply by being placed in a new and adequate building. They must have the help of professional people if they are to ever resume their place in our society.

Therefore, I would urge my colleagues who are appointed as conferees on S. 1576 to adopt the staffing provisions contained in the Senate-passed bill. The problems of our mentally ill and mentally retarded citizens now cost us billions of dollars a year. Surely our Nation can afford a small percentage of that amount to pay professional personnel to rehabilitate 9 out of 10 mentally ill citizens.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important measures to come before the House in many years. We have too long ignored the seriousness of mental health and mental retardation problems and it is important to all our citizens that this legislation be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate the question was raised as to whether or not States which had pioneered in this field and which had devoted much of their wealth and attention to this great national problem would, in effect, be penalized because now the Federal Government was stepping into the problem presumably to help the States which had not done anything to help themselves to speak of.

The State of Connecticut, I am proud to report to this House, has in fact been in the vanguard of this movement to meet this great national need and has provided model facilities which have been studied by other States and, indeed, other countries for the treatment of the mental retardation problem. But despite this fact, the State of Connecticut which by relative standards is not a poor State, as you know, has not been able through its own resources to anywhere near meet the needs. The State of Connecticut like the other 49 States, I presume, has a great need for this legislation. So I urge its passage together with all other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on both sides of the aisle.

Another mention that was made which I recall in listening to the debate was the area of precedent.

It is true undoubtedly that this legislation does initiate some precedents. We are making a precedent today as we consider this legislation and hopefully will pass it, but the fact of the matter is that in this whole area it is important that precedents be made because so much remains to be done. Waiting lists, which really are a kind of cold words for human tragedy, to get into those institutions which presently do exist are long, and the heartache and concern which mothers and fathers of children have as they wait to be reached on these lists is something which we, in the turns of the debate on the floor of this House, cannot possibly translate adequately. So, my colleagues, I urge you to support this legislation. It has been cut down to the smallest common denominator possible. The original proposal, and as a matter of fact the proposal which passed the other body, as has been pointed out many times here, is far more ambitious in scope and encompasses a much wider range of program.

Therefore, those of us in the House, as we consider this legislation, can take some comfort in the fact that we are being perhaps as responsible as we can be in terms of the fiscal problems of this Nation and still do something in this area which is so necessary.

I think the question of staffing, which has been raised before, is one on which reasonable people can disagree, but the point is we have, as we have so often in the House, tried to limit our attack on this problem to those areas where the need is greatest and at the same time be responsible as we consider this program on balance with all of the various programs which are so costly and which the Congress has before it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as many Members of this body know, I have long held an active interest in the field of mental retardation as a private citizen and as a member of the Washington State Legislature and now as a Member of Congress. I am proud to have been privileged to have been an active member of our Washington Association for Retarded Children for over 10 years. I rise today in support of this bill, and I also wish to commend the committee for an excellent job.

We have had a number of remarks today, and I think they were well taken remarks, that a program such as this might discourage local efforts. I have long, as an active member in this field in my own State, felt it would be tragic if any participation by the Federal Government should result in this. Perhaps I can make a practical reference, and also a parochial one, to my own State to prove that we have made outstanding gains in our State by local efforts and that we have no intention of allowing those efforts to lessen regardless of what the Federal Government does.

The State of Washington, Mr. Chairman, is widely recognized as a leader in development of workable programs to effectively treat and help the mentally retarded. We in our State are proud of our record of improvement in institutional facilities for the retarded.

At the Rainier State School for the Mentally Retarded at Buckley and at Lakeland Village School near Spokane, a remarkable history of success is reported, especially in the training of retarded children who have been able to become active and useful members of society. An impressive record of success and progress has been made at Fircrest Institution near Seattle and at the Yakima Valley School at Selah, in my district, an institution for nontrainable retarded children.

The State of Washington has expended a total of nearly $65 million on mental retardation alone during the past 10-year period.

In spite of all of this, however, the program in the State of Washington is still woefully inadequate to meet needs. The four State institutions I have mentioned presently are at over capacity with 4,000 children. There is, today, a waiting list of more than 1,300 and some of these children have been waiting for more than 5 years to gain entrance.

With the enactment of S. 1576, Mr. Chairman, the State of Washington is ready to proceed with its next important step: The establishment at the University of Washington of a children's center for research and training in mental retardation. This research and training unit will be established in line with the recommendations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation and the necessary Federal participation will be authorized through enactment of the legislation before us today. The funding of this $8 million project will be accomplished through Federal participation, the issuance of bonds by the University of Washington under authority of the Washington State Legislature, and from private sources including the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation.

The new center, the first in the Nation to be built on a university campus, will combine four units—a diagnostic clinic, an experimental school, medical science research, and behavioral science research. It will be a statewide facility and consultation center for community diagnostic clinics and public schools. The primary aim will be to train people to work with the mentally retarded in their own communities, and along with this will come research on the causes of mental retardation, the prevention, and cures. In back of all of this, of course, is the proved workable theory that with proper care and training a much smaller percentage of our mentally retarded children will need to be institutionalized.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from the State of Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the interest of my colleague from the State of Washington in the whole subject of health and mental retardation is well recognized in the State of Washington. As a member of the legislature and I know since coming to Congress she has had some concern lest when the Federal Government got into this field it might diminish the interest of our own State. I am glad to have her confirm that our State is going right ahead and will not in any way diminish its effort. I know in my own case I sent a telegram to our State legislature urging that they provide funds in their budget so that they can go ahead with this work.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the very excellent remarks which my colleague has made on this occasion.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Washington and commend him for his interest and help. I would point out further that he and I would agree, I believe, that should there be any diminishing of our local effort we would be the first to lead the cry against it.

What I have outlined, Mr. Chairman, is the plan for only one State in our Union, and I am sure that many States have and will continue to develop plans which show every bit as much promise as do the plans in the State of Washington. Mental retardation and mental illness are national problems. They do not belong exclusively to the States alone because mental retardation and mental illness know no geographical boundary. The fulfillment of Federal responsibility in this field holds promise of substantial inroads in not only adequate treatment of mentally retarded children, but in substantially reducing the incidence of mental retardation through the provisions of title I of the committee bill pertaining to construction of centers for research on mental retardation and related aspects of human development.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1576 has my enthusiastic and wholehearted support and I urge its approval by this body.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois. I asked for this time in order to propound a question or two. I could not find in the report—and let me say that I want to commend the committee for this report and study. I think it is quite adequate. The question is—and I think I know the answer—but have these items been budgeted, I might ask the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SPRINGER. All of the 1964 items, totaling $26 million are budgeted, except $5 million that is contained therein which is for university-affiliated mental retardation facilities.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand there is a technical reason for that not being budgeted, which I do understand.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the statement needs a little further clarification. All of the items for the 1964 fiscal year are included in the bill, and, except for one item, are budgeted. That is a relatively small amount. We were advised that a supplemental budget would be made on that one item.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman. I again commend the committee. I think this is an excellent bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1576. I think that the committee should be particularly commended for part C of title I and also for title III. These sections are extremely important to those thousands of parents in the United States who have mentally retarded children. These provisions will be of assistance in meeting the problem which they have today.

Mr. Chairman, I have had occasion to meet with groups of such parents. They have tremendous problems. Many times they themselves have to raise the funds with which to obtain facilities in which their children can be given the type of training for which they can be adapted. Even if they get the facilities, they have an even worse time trying to get teachers who are adequately trained to help them.

Mr. Chairman, it has only been a few years back when this kind of limited child—limited from the standpoint of its abilities—was just written off, and the only possible future for it was to assign it to some State institution for life. But it has been my privilege to visit a number of custodial and day schools that have been designed to provide special training facilities for these youngsters. There are many things that these youngsters can actually be trained to do if they have the right kind of teachers and equipment. Some of them can be trained in the field of weaving and other comparable fields which can go far in enabling them to earn a livelihood in this field. Others can be given special help through special speech therapy. If they receive such speech training to an adequate extent they can make themselves understood, whereas before that time they were not even understandable by the normal individual.

So, Mr. Chairman, part C of title I and title III of this bill are going to be a great inspiration to those thousands of parents throughout the United States that have children who have these problems, because it gives tangible evidence that Congress feels there may be a means of helping such children rather than just assigning them to custodial institutions for their entire lives.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about title III, however, in the few minutes that I have here, because this legislation, in title III, is education legislation. We reported a similar bill out of our committee. We recently passed out of the House a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means which has to do with and is a part of this whole package of helping future mentally ill and mentally retarded and consideration was given by that committee by which they were able to report on the subject of the legislation that applied to them.

However, in this case the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee handles the education legislation and I think there are some parts that do not conform with the legislation as passed and seriously takes a new approach to education we were not unwilling to take in our committee. We have worked this out, I think, so that I can offer an amendment along this line.

The bill provides for the training of the personnel to train teachers as was done in the past. In the mentally retarded bill it provides for the training of teachers of the handicapped, and also supervisors of the teachers. In the past we only had legislation which provided for the training of the teachers of the mentally retarded and the training of teachers for the deaf. There are a number of other handicapped groups in this country that do not have as outspoken and as well organized supporters as these handicapped groups.

But the need for them is as great. I am happy that the legislation provides assistance for all the handicapped. I would have much preferred that our committee reported our own bill as the committee did, and have it considered on the floor of the House in order that it may be enacted. I think it is desirable that we do have that as title III of the bill that came out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce because the Senate had already passed similar legislation and it will enable us to enact legislation for the benefit of these people this year. I understand that there is little likelihood of additional new legislation coming out of our committee and reported to the House. In that case this is the only avenue we can take.

I think the need is great in this area, and that there is a need for a Federal role for the teachers of the handicapped because there are not a sufficient number of students in some handicapped groups to warrant a full-scale education program in every State of the Union. With the Federal assistance for the training of those teachers, assistance can be given in certain States so that it will have a regional effect and will be more economical to handle. In my opinion it is more economical to do this on a much larger scale basis. This will enable the States to work it out and develop their programs.

I will point out some questions I have in connection with this when I offer an amendment, but I would like at this moment to point out what is one serious fault in the bill. That is the inadvertent—I believe it was due to inadvertency—inclusion in the 1961 training of teachers for the deaf program in which we permitted scholarships to be provided.

The House took action last year in which we refused to go along with scholarships and grants for students in undergraduate work. This bill wisely provides all of the handicapped group teachers will receive only fellowships or traineeships; that is, grant assistance, after they have completed their undergraduate work, with the exception of the teachers of the deaf. I can see why we should extend for another year this program that expired last year, so that we may blend this program into the new proposal that is more wise. I do not think that we should permit the continuation of this special treatment for the training of teachers for the deaf, as is provided in this legislation. I think this should be corrected and can be corrected by merely striking out one section of the bill.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and will continue any further comments I have when the amendments are offered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of focusing attention in this bill upon the provision which incorporates and makes applicable the Davis-Bacon Act insofar as the payment of wages is concerned in connection with construction, and also for the purpose of establishing some legislative history.

The Davis-Bacon Act requires that wages to be paid to construct certain public buildings shall be not less than the prevailing wages paid to corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics employed on projects of a character similar to the contract work in the city, town, village, or other civil subdivision of the State in which the work is to be performed.

Under the clear language of the Davis-Bacon Act, the Department of Labor, in determining what are the prevailing wages applicable to a new project, is required to look only at projects of a similar character in the city, town, village, or other civil subdivisions of the State in which the new project is to be constructed.

In a number of Federal bills previously passed, it has been the intention of Congress, I believe, to have the Davis-Bacon Act apply, but by inserting language similar to language in this bill, Congress did not intend thereby to give the Department of Labor any expanded authority or to enlarge the scope of the Davis-Bacon Act.

In this bill, S. 1576, on page 75, the language beginning in line 14 speaks in terms of "similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act." I would presume, and I intend to ask the chairman of the committee in a few moments whether or not my presumption is correct, that in using the term "similar construction in the locality" the committee does not intend to enlarge or expand the scope of the Davis-Bacon law.

Before asking the question, let me point out why the question is necessary. In the application of a similar provision of the Housing Act in a case investigated by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt], it was found that the Labor Department had gone outside of Quantico, Va., where some housing was to be built, and, in fact, had gone outside the State of Virginia, to the city of Washington, D.C., and determined that wages paid on housing projects in Washington, D.C., were the prevailing rates applicable to a housing project to be constructed at Quantico, Va. In arguing before the Comptroller General as to why they did this, the Labor Department made the argument that the language of the Housing Act spoke in terms of prevailing wages in "the locality," and they were interpreting "locality" as justifying an expansion of the scope of the Davis-Bacon Act.

If Congress should want to do that it is my contention we should do so by amending the Davis-Bacon Act itself. So, with that background, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to this bill whether there is any intention of expanding the scope of the Davis-Bacon Act, or is it the intention of the committee that the Davis-Bacon Act should apply as it has been written?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would first want to say that I appreciate the gentleman's raising the question, because I think it should be made abundantly clear what is the intention. The provision of the Davis-Bacon Act to which the gentleman refers is a subject matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. There is no intention on the part of this committee of robbing the jurisdiction of that committee as far as that action is concerned. We merely incorporate the language, which we do as a general feature of bills that come before the House, to make it doubly clear that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, which the gentleman's committee reported, are carried out, and this committee approved. There is no intention to expand or change the provisions of that act whatsoever. This merely states that that act does apply.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Davis-Bacon Act, as I said before, refers to projects of a character similar to the contract work "in the city, town, village, or other civil subdivision of the State in which the work is to be performed." In the use of the term "locality" in line 14 on page 75, of this bill, and also where it appears on page 64, I assume from the comment made by the chairman that the language has no special significance and is not intended in any way to expand the scope of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. HARRIS. I can assure the gentleman again and again that there is no intention on the part of this committee, by this provision being in the bill, to modify or expand or otherwise change the provisions of the law or its applicability.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the chairman very much. In view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt], who is chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, and has gone into this matter very thoroughly, is on the floor, and because the legislative history on this point is very important, I should like to ask him if he would agree with the remarks I have made and if he would agree insofar as the assurance given by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I can just say I am in full agreement with what the gentleman has said up to this point and with the assurance given by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I would point out, of course, the subcommittee held hearings to which the gentleman has referred, which has raised a question as to the interpretation of the phrase as now existing Davis-Bacon Act. It is our intention, as the gentleman knows, as soon as possible and as time permits to review that interpretation; as I understand the distinguished chairman, his assurance is that this is our job and he is not undertaking to do our job.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me, and I want to say as a member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee, I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for going into this bill most thoroughly and for bringing to the House a bill unanimously. So often I think in legislation that we pass, we sometimes forget to relate it to the people whom it will affect. I think if we will spend a little time today thinking about the effect that this legislation can have on 17 million Americans and on the untold millions who will be affected in the years to come by mental illness and if we think of the 5 to 6 million mentally retarded children and the untold millions who will follow them—hopefully, fewer and fewer each year if we pass this legislation, then I think we can say that this legislation can be the same kind of breakthrough in the medical field in the treatment of mental illness and mental retardation that the orbital flight was for us in space and the undersea trip of the nuclear powered submarine around the world was for the submarine. This is the first step in a most exciting and far-reaching way of changing the treatment of mental illness and mental retardation from warehousing human beings, in huge hospitals, which we have done in State after State, to one of immediate treatment in their own communities for less cost, with the dramatic results of cure. I have listened to the testimony, and if you will read it, you will see that it is exciting and dramatic as to what can happen as a result of this legislation.

For instance, if a person were taken mentally ill, and these are proved statistics, as shown on pages 100 to 107 of the hearings, and such person spent 4 years in a mental hospital, for instance, in Missouri—and the average time is 13 years—there would be only one chance—think of that—only 1 chance out of 20 of recovering. Yet, if you go to one of these community mental health centers, as has been demonstrated in the State of Missouri, you have 9 chances out of 10 of recovering. Also, the time of treatment of the same type of patient is reduced from 255 days to 32 days. Think of what this means for our entire Nation.

As for the cost, with this new approach we can change it from the present cost now, which is $2,000 to $2,500 per patient, to $600 to $800 per patient per year.

Now, what about mental retardation? Have you ever thought of a parent who has a mentally retarded child and realizes it for the first time and goes to a hospital in his local community? When he gets there he sees a ward for cancer patients, a ward for heart patients, and a ward for the TB patients, but is there a ward for anyone who knows how to take care of the mentally retarded? No. The testimony has brought this out time after time. This legislation will change all of this—and bring hope at last to those afflicted.

My colleagues, this is one bill that will be the most sane act that this Congress can take in the year 1963. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this far-reaching legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today a most far-reaching piece of legislation—the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. S. 1576 represents what the President has called a "bold new approach" to the problems of mental health and mental retardation which are being confronted for the first time with a coordinated program for their treatment. I rise in support of the construction of community facilities and the intensification of research into the means of rehabilitating the mentally handicapped.

In the early days of this session President Kennedy sent to the Congress the first major executive message devoted exclusively to the problems of mental retardation and mental illness. In this statement he deplored the paradoxical situation of a society in which, although man has found means for controlling disease and ill health, "the public understanding, treatment, and prevention of mental disabilities have not made comparable progress since the earliest days of modern history." The mental health legislation pending before us gives us the opportunity to take the first steps toward alleviating these critical national problems, problems which, as described in the President's message:

> Occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families of the afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon both the public treasury and personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.

There is a changing legislative attitude toward the disturbing incidence of mental retardation and mental illness among Americans. The President deserves credit for bringing this matter into the prominence which it has long been denied and has long deserved.

No longer can we afford to shunt aside into overcrowded, understaffed custodial institutions the large number of Americans afflicted by mental illness or mental retardation. No longer can we, in all conscience, ignore the costs—in manpower, in dollars an in needless anguish—that these mental problems impose on our people. It has been estimated by the National Committee Against Mental Illness that about 1 in every 10 persons suffers from some form of mental illness. In addition to those approximately 17 million people, there are some 5,400,000 more children and adults who are mentally retarded, a group altogether comprising 13 percent of our total population. Thirteen percent, then, of our people are, in some way, directly afflicted with mental illness or retardation, and, as the President indicated in his message, the families of this 13 percent bear heavy emotional and economic burdens as well.

The national committee further estimates that mental illness and mental retardation annually cost the American public well in excess of $3½ billion. The astronomical cost includes not only maintenance expenses for mental hospitals and welfare payments to ill and defective people, but also, most significantly, dollar value of work-years lost by resident patients in mental hospitals and wages lost through absenteeism caused by mental illness. We must seek revision of our methods for assuring mental health and effective treatment to our citizens.

I would like to consider the ways in which S. 1576 will benefit the mentally ill. Title II provides for the construction of community mental health centers. Under title II $115 million in appropriations would be authorized during a 2-year period to be allocated among the States for the payment of between one-third to two-thirds of the construction costs of public or other nonprofit community mental health centers.

Late last year Parade magazine published an article entitled "Mental Patients in Jail—a National Disgrace." This article exposes the practice, in some communities, of jailing mentally disturbed people because of the inadequacy or lack of proper facilities for their care or because of the indifference of local and State hospitals. The article states:

> According to an admittedly "very conservative" estimate by the National Sheriffs Association, this type of barbaric treatment is meted out to 40,000 persons a year. Other sources say the number may range much higher—between 100,000 and 300,000. (Parade, Nov. 11, 1962, pp. 18–20.)

Had we a network of community centers, designed to handle these cases, the mentally ill need not have been accorded this indignity—need not have suffered the deleterious effects of such treatment. Through the legislation before us, members of a community afflicted with mental problems, and their families, will have the chance to function in an atmosphere approaching normality. The patient's treatment will combine the beneficial effects of a familiar environment and familiar people with all the advantages professional care and treatment can afford.

The creation of community centers emphasizes the importance of rehabilitation. These centers would not separate the mentally disabled citizen from his community. The mentally ill would feel that there is hope and confidence that they may still function in a near-normal capacity in their homes, on their jobs, and in their leisure. The existence of the centers would remove some of the stigma which has always, unfortunately, been attached to mental illness. Their existence would combat the theory underlying what has been called the "asylum position" by Professor of Social Work Martin B. Loeb:

> This position has developed an increasingly benevolent type of custodial care. This theory holds that most mentally ill people in mental hospitals will be there for a long time—many even for a lifetime—and, within budgetary limits, their life in the institution ought to be as comfortable, happy, and productive as possible. (The Nation, May 18, 1963, pp. 418–421.)

We must no longer work on the assumption that the mentally ill—their talents and skills—are permanently lost to society.

The stigma which has been associated with mental disorders, the resignation with which mental illness has been stoically accepted—are factors that have obstructed progress in effective treatment techniques; these are the reasons that as few as 40,000 or as many as 300,000 people per year are jailed for no crime except that of being mentally ill; these are the reasons that mentally ill people can look forward to life and death in an outdated mental institution when they might have had—or might still have—the opportunity to be reoriented to society.

Titles I and III of S. 1576 deal with construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded and with the training of teachers for the retarded and other handicapped children.

The problems of the retarded differ from those of the mentally ill in several vital respects. Retardation is, in its most severe forms, a birth defect, for which there is little or no hope of cure at the present time. The common characteristic of mental retardation is, as the report terms it, "inadequately developed intelligence" and not, as in mental illness, an inability to cope with the pressures and realities of normal life.

The President's Panel on Mental Retardation conducted an exhaustive yearlong study into all aspects of retardation and have produced a definitive report on national action to combat this problem. Many of its findings and conclusions are embodied in S. 1576. The report emphasizes—and this bill is designed to implement—the necessity and importance of establishing a "continuum of care" for the retarded.

In order to provide the "continuum" of services, it is essential to create centers for the coordination of all forces in a community which can be brought to bear in coping with retardation. The advantages of such a system are described in the report:

> Advantages of the area center as a major component in statewide programing for the retarded arise from the ease of coordination and administrative supervision and of referral from service to service within the center. There are fewer opportunities for interruption of the "continuum of care." Qualified professional staff can easily give guidance to a number of different ongoing activities, no one of which would merit full-time attention. By its high visibility the center fosters community awareness of the retarded and of the many positive things that can be done for them (pp. 170–171).

Research and training are the other areas on which S. 1576 concentrates. So little is known about the nature of retardation that it is possible to pinpoint the causes of retardation in only 15 to 25 percent of the cases. These, too, are the most severe cases in which organic pathology as a result of disease or injuries is often evident. Community centers alone—without the guidance and cooperation of research—can only be partially effective. For these reasons, a major provision of the bill applies to the construction of university associated facilities for the retarded so that new methods can be devised, tested and approved while benefiting the disabled.

Title III would expand existing programs for training teachers for the retarded and other handicapped children and provide for research or demonstration projects relating to the education of the handicapped. There is a critical need for a sufficient number of highly trained teachers to work with the retarded.

The logical succession of provisions for the handicapped in this bill—construction of community and university affiliated centers, provisions for research, and authorization for the training of qualified personnel—are inextricably connected. It is only in the creation of broadly effective programs that we may hope to decrease the burdens mental retardation has caused for so many Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the dollars spent so far for the mentally disabled have been primarily maintenance dollars—for welfare aid and for custodial care. In transferring the treatment of the mentally ill to community centers, our dollars will lead to the reduction of disability and to the successful reintegration of the mentally ill into the mainstream of community life. Further support for the community centers project comes from the director of the National Institute of Mental Health, Dr. Robert M. Felix. Dr. Felix has estimated that as many as 90 percent of the 500,000 patients now in public mental hospitals could be released and returned to their homes if communities had the facilities to provide for their continuing care—Business Week, February 9, 1963, pages 104–106. We have before us today a vehicle to put us on the road toward this goal.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee deleted the provisions of the bill which was passed by the other body to authorize Federal grants for initial staffing of community mental health centers. Grants for the initial staffing of centers owned or operated by public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations would be of great assistance in the inauguration of the centers.

I also want to call the attention of members of the committee to the language defining the term "community mental health center" in the bill before us at page 84 compared to the definition in the bill which passed the other body. Under title IV of the Senate version it is stated:

> And such term may include facilities for provision of such services for narcotic addicts if such facilities are part of facilities providing services for other mentally ill persons.

Section 401(c) of title IV of the bill before us omits that language.

The omission, I assume, does not mean that the committee intended to exclude services for narcotic addicts from the scope of the activities of the community mental health centers. Certainly that is the view of the administration. The committee report—House Report No. 694—includes at page 27 an agency report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On page 29 Secretary Celebrezze made the following observation:

> The definition of a "community mental health center" in section 401(c) of S. 1576 specifically provides that such centers may include facilities for the provision of services for narcotic addicts. While no corresponding provision is included in H.R. 3688, we believe that the provisions of the House bill could be so construed. We therefore believe that the language of S. 1576 is consistent with our proposal in this respect.

The committee used the definition of a community mental health center as written in H.R. 3688. There is no reason to believe that this indicates any hostility to services for narcotic addicts. The committee must have felt that the general language of the definition in H.R. 3688 adequately provided for such services in the centers established under the bill.

Qualified authorities seem to agree that narcotic addiction is a form of mental illness. Recognition of this is reflected in the large number of projects on addiction handled by and through the National Institute of Mental Health.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I urge the adoption of this forward looking legislation which will initiate a coordinated attack upon some of our Nation's major problems.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support the concept of Federal assistance for programs to aid the tragic victims of mental illness and mental retardation.

For too long we have been locking up those persons suffering from mental illness and figuratively throwing away the key. The measure under consideration is a step toward seeing that they get the type of treatment needed in order to rehabilitate them.

I am particularly pleased that the legislation provides for funds for research into the causes of mental retardation. This is a field in which our knowledge is woefully inadequate by 20th century standards. We must provide the research which may conceivably lead to prevention of mental retardation, and will probably lead to improved treatment of such cases.

The bill under consideration is a compassionate and humane one which attacks one of the great problems of our time. It is shocking but true that half of the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by victims of mental illness. At long last we are facing up to our responsibility in this area.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York, who had done such an outstanding job on the subcommittee and full committee in this and other fields, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I venture to intrude on the time of my colleagues at this late hour because I had the privilege of serving on the subcommittee and full committee which drafted this bill and because I have the human desire to contribute a few words in support of a bill which I regard as a legislative milestone.

Why is that so? Why, in my opinion, will history look back on the 1963 congressional record and place a gold star of accomplishment beside S. 1576?

The answer is simple. Through this legislation our States and our people will be helped across the threshold of a new and enlightened approach to mental health.

For many years, our States have been trapped by the existing costly, clumsy, and inefficient system of custodial care.

We cannot abandon such care, now or in the future.

But, we can gradually reduce the numbers of those exiled to factories of despair on windswept moors. And, as that reduction occurs, the States will be enabled to channel more and more of their money from the pipelines of hopelessness into the arteries of cure and hope and humanity.

Mr. Chairman, as a demonstration of the widespread and knowledgeable backing for this bill, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the following resolutions and tables:

Association of Counties Calls for Resolution of Enactment of Kennedy Mental Health Bill With 4-Year Construction Period—8 Years Staffing

Whereas in the last few years new and revolutionary methods have been developed for treatment of the mentally ill and retarded; and

Whereas these methods rely upon treatment of the ill in centers in, or near, the community in which they live; and

Whereas such methods embrace a philosophy of restoring responsibility to the local community, away from State and Federal control; and

Whereas the new "community center" treatment concepts promise radical cost-savings per patient to local and State government over present "custodial" methods; and

Whereas such "community mental health centers" are designed to serve populations of 100,000 and will thereby involve counties or clusters of counties; and

Whereas these new-type centers, containing about 75 beds, will provide our counties with comprehensive care of our mentally ill with diverse services such as: diagnostic services, inpatient services, day or night care, 24-hour emergency walk-in clinics, sheltered workshop, consultative services, supervision of foster home facilities; and

Whereas for the counties themselves to initiate such a comprehensive mental health program the financial burden would be staggering to an extent where it would be assumed only over a period of many decades, if ever; and

Whereas President Kennedy in his historic message to Congress proposed a new program to combat mental illness and retardation, wherein the Federal Government will provide, for a limited number of years, "seed" money for initial construction and initial staffing of comprehensive community mental health centers on a matching basis with counties, cities and States, with control at the local levels; and

Whereas the counties, financially hard pressed as they are to support a wide range of necessary services, recognize at the same time that the care of their mentally ill and retarded citizens is principally a State, local and private obligation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Counties endorses, and urges early passage this year, of President Kennedy's program, which will help get underway, at local levels, facilities for effective treatment of the mentally ill and retarded, by providing 4 years of Federal-State matching fund assistance in construction of community mental health and retardation centers and 8 years of assistance in staffing the centers with the minimum necessary trained personnel.

Adopted: Denver, Colo., July 31, 1963.

Resolution Adopted 30th Annual Conference of Mayors, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Honolulu, Hawaii, Wednesday, June 12, 1963

Whereas mental illness and mental retardation are among the Nation's most critical and complex health problems, afflicting millions of our citizens and placing heavy burdens on their families; and

Whereas overcrowding and inadequacy of many State hospitals and institutions, inadequate financial support and the shortage of professional personnel in both research and service efforts justify concerted action to end this tradition of neglect; and

Whereas many of the existing shortages and problems involving mental illness and mental retardation must be met at the community in which the patient lives requires that priority be given to a substantial construction program effected through Federal grants for community mental health centers, centers for comprehensive research in mental retardation, and facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally retarded; and

Whereas because few communities have the resources necessary to meet the full cost, responsibility for the support and development of community mental health programs must be shared by local, State, and Federal agencies; and

Whereas professional manpower needed to implement programs of community action is insufficient and must be expanded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Conference of Mayors urge prompt enactment of Federal legislation needed to initiate these programs.

States on Record Supporting the Proposed Legislation for Local-Federal Development of Community Mental Health and Retardation Centers

The following States are on record in either the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives as supporting the program in S. 755–756 and H.R. 3688–3689:

Alaska: Gov. William Egan.
Arkansas: Gov. Orval Faubus.
California: Gov. Edmund G. Brown.
Connecticut: Gov. John Dempsey.
Delaware: Gov. Elbert N. Carvel.
Georgia: Gov. Carl E. Sanders.
Guam: Gov. Manuel Flores Leon Guerrero.
Hawaii: Gov. John A. Burns.
Illinois: Gov. Otto Kerner.
Indiana: Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.
Iowa: Gov. Harold E. Hughes.
Kentucky: Gov. Bert Combs.
Minnesota: Gov. Karl Rolvaag.
Missouri: Gov. John M. Dalton.
Nebraska: Gov. Frank B. Morrison.
New Jersey: Gov. Richard J. Hughes.
New Mexico: Gov. Jack M. Campbell.
North Carolina: Gov. Terry Sanford.
Pennsylvania: Gov. William Scranton.
South Carolina: Gov. Donald S. Russell.

Tennessee: Gov. Frank G. Clement.

Washington: Gov. Albert D. Rosellini.

West Virginia: Gov. William Wallace Brown.

Wisconsin: Gov. John W. Reynolds.

Virgin Islands: Gov. Ralph Paiewonsky.

Alabama: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Arizona: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Colorado: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Kansas: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Louisiana: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Maine: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Maryland: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Minnesota: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

New Hampshire: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

New York: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

North Dakota: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Oregon: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Rhode Island: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Utah: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Vermont: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

Wyoming: Message of support from State authority other than the Governor.

STATES SUPPORT LOCAL-FEDERAL COMMUNITY CENTER PROGRAM

State support has been strong for the mental illness and retardation legislative program now being considered by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

A majority of the States and possessions (40) submitted expressions of support to the Congress.

Twenty-five Governors went on record in support of the program.

The Senate held hearings (on S. 755 and 756) on March 5, 6, and 7. The House held hearings (on H.R. 3688 and 3689 and similar bills) on March 26, 27, and 28. The bills provide for matching State-Federal funds for construction and operation of community mental health and retardation facilities.

The following States and possessions provided witnesses or sent messages to the Congress in support of the proposed legislation (in many cases to both the Senate and the House):

1. Alabama: State Senator Roland Cooper and State Representative Ashely Kemp, witnesses; J. S. Tarwater, M.D., superintendent, Alabama State hospitals.

2. Alaska: Gov. William A. Egan.

3. Arizona: Samuel A. Wick, M.D., acting director, division of mental health.

4. Arkansas: Gov. Orval E. Faubus, U.S. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, presented Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, adopted by the Arkansas General Assembly; George Jackson, M.D., superintendent, State hospital; David D. Ray, superintendent, Arkansas Children's Colony, Conway, Ark.

5. California: Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Daniel Blain, M.D., director, State department of mental hygiene, witness; Daniel Lieberman, M.D., chief deputy director, State department of mental hygiene, witness.

6. Colorado: David A. Hamil, director, department of institutions, Denver, Colo.

7. Connecticut: Gov. John Dempsey; Wilfred Bloomberg, M.D., commissioner, department of mental health.

8. Delaware: Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, witness; Charles Bush, M.D., superintendent, State hospital, witness.

9. Guam: Gov. Manuel Flores Leon Guerrero.

10. Georgia: Gov. Carl E. Sanders; John H. Venable, M.D., director, department of public health.

11. Hawaii: Gov. John A. Burns; Congressman Spark Matsunaga, and Congressman Thomas P. Gill.

12. Illinois: Gov. Otto Kerner; Francis J. Gerty, M.D., director, Department of mental health.

13. Indiana: Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.

14. Iowa: Gov. Harold E. Hughes; W. I. Conway, chairman, board of control of State institutions; J. W. Cromwell, M.D., State director of mental health.

15. Kansas: Robert A. Haines, M.D., director of institutions, department of social welfare.

16. Kentucky: Gov. Bert Combs; Harold L. McPheeters, M.D., commissioner, department of mental health, witness; Robert C. Cherry, mayor, city of Paducah.

17. Louisiana: Winborn E. Davis, director, State department of hospitals.

18. Maine: U.S. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH; William E. Schumacher, M.D., director, bureau of mental health.

19. Maryland: Isadore Tuerk, M.D., commissioner, department of mental hygiene.

20. Minnesota: Gov. Karl Rolvaag; David J. Vail, M.D., medical director, department of public welfare.

21. Missouri: Gov. John M. Dalton; George A. Ulett, M.D., director, division of mental diseases, department of health and welfare.

22. Nebraska: Gov. Frank B. Morrison; Cecil L. Whittson, M.D., director of mental health; Mrs. L. A. Enersen, chairman, Governors Interagency Committee on Mental Retardation.

23. New Hampshire: John L. Smalldon, M.D., director, division of mental health.

24. New Jersey: Gov. Richard J. Hughes; V. Terrell Davis, M.D., director, mental health and hospitals, department of institutions, witness.

25. New Mexico: Gov. Jack M. Campbell; Thomas Hogshead, M.D., supervisor, State hospital; Albert E. Ball, assistant supervisor, State hospital.

26. New York: Paul H. Hoch, M.D., commissioner, department of mental hygiene. Statement in support of President's program, issued with approval of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

27. North Carolina: Gov. Terry Sanford; Dr. Eugene A. Hargrove, commissioner of mental health.

28. North Dakota: Alfred F. Samuelson, M.D., director, mental health department.

29. Oregon: J. H. Treleaven, M.D., administrator, mental health division.

30. Pennsylvania: Gov. William W. Scranton.

31. Rhode Island: Augustine W. Riccio, director, department of social welfare.

32. South Carolina: Gov. Donald S. Russell; W. P. Beckman, M.D., director, mental health.

33. Tennessee: Gov. Frank G. Clement, witness; Joseph J. Baker, M.D., commissioner, department of mental health.

34. Utah: H. Edward Beaghler, M.D., associate superintendent, Utah State Hospital.

35. Vermont: R. A. Chittick, M.D., superintendent, State hospital.

36. Washington: Gov. Albert D. Rosellini; William R. Conte, M.D., supervisor, division of mental health; Garrett Heyns, director of institutions.

37. West Virginia: Gov. William Wallace Brown; Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, M.D., director, department of mental health.

38. Wisconsin: Gov. John W. Reynolds.

39. Wyoming: William M. Karns, Jr., M.D., superintendent, Wyoming State Hospital.

40. Virgin Islands: Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky.

State per capita expenditures for mental health as a percentage of per capita personal income during the past 10 years (1952–62)

Rank	State	Percent relationship, State expenditures to personal income	Per capita expenditures for 10 years [1]	Per capita income for 10 years [2]
1	Vermont	0.53	$86.54	$16,369
2	New Hampshire	.52	95.00	18,146
3	Massachusetts	.51	116.00	22,338
4	New York	.509	125.00	24,513
5	Kansas	.50	91.36	18,409
6	Minnesota	.47	85.53	18,362
7	Colorado	.46	91.91	19,776
8	Connecticut	.456	120.00	26,306
9	Alaska	[3] .44	56.00	12,849
10	Wisconsin	.42	82.34	19,396
11	Rhode Island	.419	84.40	20,133
12	North Dakota	.41	59.92	14,646
13	Wyoming	.40	81.50	20,126
14	New Jersey	.396	96.00	24,273
15	Oregon	.395	78.84	19,936
16	Michigan	.383	83.27	21,738
17	Mississippi	.382	39.03	10,224
18	North Carolina	.381	51.96	13,615
19	Maine	.380	62.54	16,446
20	Hawaii	[4] .37	25.31	6,833
21	Nebraska	.369	68.04	18,408
22	Pennsylvania	.35	71.83	20,486
23	Maryland	.347	74.75	21,482
24	Washington	.335	70.54	21,072
25	Virginia	.33	54.96	16,613
26	California	.323	78.84	24,367
27	South Dakota	.322	48.82	15,115
28	South Carolina	.321	39.43	12,265
29	Idaho	.320	52.93	16,517
30	Delaware	.31	87.20	27,794
31	Illinois	.30	71.64	24,006
32	Louisiana	.297	43.44	14,621
33	Indiana	.295	58.65	19,851
34	Montana	.292	55.52	19,007
35	Missouri	.28	54.63	19,386
36	Arkansas	.275	32.11	11,651
37	Oklahoma	.26	43.22	16,348
38	Ohio	.256	62.84	24,499
39	Iowa	.25	44.66	18,057
40	Georgia	[4] .247	11.91	4,817
41	Florida	.239	41.99	17,530
42	Alabama	.22	27.74	12,716
43	Tennessee	.215	29.50	13,659
44	Kentucky	.211	29.33	13,925
45	West Virginia	.210	31.42	14,937
46	Utah	[5] .20	34.43	17,009
47	Texas	.18	31.75	17,523
48	New Mexico	[5] .17	26.14	15,822
49	Nevada	.16	39.62	25,579
50	Arizona	[5] .14	26.14	18,087

[1] Operating and capital expenditures as reported by the States to this office (includes expenditures on both retardation and mental illness).

[2] Per capita personal income data furnished by Commerce Department.

[3] 5 years of data.

[4] 3 years of data.

[5] Expenditure figures for 3 States were not reported to this office. NIMH expenditure data was used.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, today we are focusing our attention on an area of vital interest to many—all too many—of our citizens. I speak of the victims, the families of victims, and the dedicated workers who have devoted their efforts to the national problems of mental illness and mental retardation.

These two disabling afflictions affect their victims in such a way that there is little hope for recovery. We know that the mentally retarded have no chance to develop a normal intelligence but they can be taught to work within their capacities. They are marked with their condition from birth. In recent years, there has been much excitement about new methods of curing the mentally ill—psychoanalysis, miracle drugs, group therapy—all these have helped some of the ill.

Yet, in the face of these discoveries we still have hundreds and thousands of the mentally ill incarcerated in antiquated institutions—institutions, some of which are not very far removed from the ones Charles Dickens so deplored. We have the drugs, but we still don't have the facilities in which to use them or the qualified people to administer them on any sizable scale. We have the psychiatrists and the psychologists, but not in sufficient numbers to cope with the numbers of patients.

It is because of this discrepancy—modern science competing with outmoded institutions—that the following statement could be made in 1963:

> A patient's first year in a mental hospital is a critical one. The patient has a 50-50 chance of recovering in the first 12 months of treatment. By the 2d year, his chances of getting out are 1 in 16, and if he doesn't respond, he is sent to a back ward in the hospital, where little is ever done for a patient.
>
> In the 5th year of his hospital stay, the odds are 99 to 1 that the patient will die there (Look, Feb. 26, 1963).

The patient in essence is left to fend for himself. He is treated, but inadequately. All of our institutions are overcrowded. Cruelty is not intended, but when the capacity of our institutions is exceeded the staff can do little but act as custodians.

I am deeply concerned that these conditions be remedied. I sincerely believe that, through House passage of S. 1576, we can assure that new, more effective programs will be created to deal with mental disabilities.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 3947 and H.R. 3948—identical to the administration bills H.R. 3689 and H.R. 3688 respectively. These two bills parallel the provisions of titles I and II of S. 1576. In the Senate these bills were consolidated and implemented by a section providing for the training of teachers of mentally retarded and other handicapped children, and for grants for research and demonstration projects. It is this bill we are debating today. I feel that the construction provisions of S. 1576 have been enhanced by this addition, an addition which can only lead to full and comprehensive use of the facilities to be constructed.

We have heard much about the advantages of the proposed community centers for mental health and mental retardation. One of the most eloquent statements in support of these provisions came in the House hearings last March. Mr. Charles H. Frazier, of the National Association for Mental Health, came before the Commerce Committee to speak in favor of H.R. 3688—the bill dealing with construction of community mental health centers. His words apply not only to mental illness, but to mental retardation as well. I would like to read to you from his testimony:

> The tragic story of the State custodial institutions has been too often told to warrant repetition in detail here. But if all the abandonment and neglect, all the indifference and apathy, all the understaffing and inadequacy of facilities—if all that were corrected by some miracle today, and it would truly take a miracle to do it—if all that were to happen, it would still not provide an ultimately satisfactory solution to the problem, nor an ultimately satisfactory answer to the needs of the mentally ill.
>
> There is one thing that physical change can never do for these hospitals, and that is to remove from them the quality of separateness and difference. Their isolation and their distance, their very identification as custodial institutions of the past, their very separateness from the community and hence from the mainstream of medicine serve to intensify and to make chronic the conditions which they are supposed to relieve. This is not just physical alienation. This is spiritual and philosophical alienation; and, even more important, it is medical alienation. So long as we continue to treat mental illness away from the community and away from community medical facilities, we will see the gigantic problem of mental illness intensify and grow worse.

We must not allow the separation Mr. Frazier speaks of to continue. It represents an injustice to the community, deprived of the services and talents of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded, as well as to the patient, deprived of the sense of accomplishment and usefulness and, more important, deprived of the chance to live an even nearly normal life.

By bringing the treatment of the mentally retarded into the community rather than relegating it to isolated suburban and rural sites, we are creating an entirely new atmosphere around the problem. In the past—and even in the enlightened 1960's—mental disabilities have been shrouded in misunderstanding and fears. Those who became ill were whisked out of sight. Now all forces of the community will be able to see the services for the rehabilitation of the mentally disabled. All sectors of the community will be able to join in the effort to accustom the ill and retarded to a normal life. It is hoped that these centers will be as well accepted, as well supported—by volunteers and private groups as well as local, State and Federal aid—as are the hospitals for the treatment of the physically ill.

Last Spring, as part of their comprehensive study on the problems of mental retardation, a committee from the President's Panel on Mental Retardation traveled through Denmark and Sweden. Their report should be of vital interest to us during the consideration of this bill since community treatment centers for the mentally retarded are well established in these two Scandinavian countries.

A statement from the group's summary shows, to our disadvantage, the difference in the programs they saw and the services available in this country:

> While the same democratic principles of the dignity and worth of the individual underlie programs for the retarded in the United States as well as Denmark and Sweden, the Scandinavians seem to have attained a fuller degree of implementation than we. Their total commitment in terms of state's responsibility toward the fullest development of each retarded individual by a continuum of educational, medical and social services, contrasts with many areas of this country where such services are spotty, uncoordinated, or unavailable (report of the mission to Denmark and Sweden by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, p. 30).

The emphasis in these two countries is on rehabilitation of the retarded so that they may be given the opportunity to function and be self-sufficient in society. The results of their systems—which include a variety of educational and vocational services and a diversity of facilities for housing and caring for the retarded—have had rather spectacular results. According to this report:

> A followup study in Sweden of children who left the special day schools during the years 1936–45 showed that one-third were completely self-supporting; one-third were partially capable of self-support; and one-third still needed care. A study of the years 1946–50 showed that 40 percent were capable of self-support and about 47 percent of partial self-support.

The evidence is that the constructive approach of these two Scandinavian countries has shown that people who have long been considered in this country incapable of functioning self-sufficiently can become useful citizens.

The Danish Government estimates that its costs for maintaining a patient in an institution are a little more than $9 a day. The comparable costs in the United States are $4 per day—with some States expending as little as $2. But the returns on the Danish investment have far exceeded the original investment.

By authorizing funds for the building of community mental health centers and facilities for the treatment and research into the problems of mental retardation, we are investing in the future of many Americans who have had all too little hope for a future.

I heartily urge House passage of S. 1576.

Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that as a nation, we have not provided adequately for the prevention and treatment of mental health and mental retardation. This fact is graphically illustrated by aging, hazardous mental institutions, inadequate individual care, and the presence of almost 6 million children and adults in America whose ability to learn and adapt to society is seriously impaired.

We have already passed legislation to extend Federal assistance to State and communities through the maternal and child health programs. The legislation before us is another indispensable part of our overall determination to prevent mental illness and mental retardation, to provide adequate care when it strikes, and to rehabilitate sufferers to a normal, productive life in their families and communities.

This bill introduces a new concept in our treatment of victims of mental illness: Community mental health centers. As obvious as it would seem that patients are more likely to respond to treatment in their own environments, surrounded by family and friends, too much of our effort in this field has involved isolated institutions where patients are not treated as those suffering from sickness and disease, but as strange, or peculiar people who must be kept from the rest of society. Of course, we have made tremendous strides in our knowledge and treatment of mental illness and mental retardation, but how far we have still to travel is indicated by the large number of victims. I hope that the House will approve this bill and take another step in the direction of eliminating the tragic waste in human talent and human happiness which the present levels of mental illness represent.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us deals in part with construction of research and service facilities for the mentally retarded and in part with construction of community service facilities for the mentally ill. It also has provisions for encouraging the training of special educators, who are much needed for work with mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and physically handicapped children, including the deaf.

The bill would implement certain specific recommendations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. It should be passed without further delay or deletion. Let no Member of Congress dwell under the illusion, however, that it is adequate for the task. I have stated publicly on numerous occasions that the report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation is good as far as it goes but it does not go far enough. The bill before us falls shockingly short, even of the very moderate recommendations of the Panel.

I am sure that no one in this House doubts the importance of either mental illness or mental retardation. However, the characteristic problems associated with each are distinct and I ask this House to consider each in its own right according to its own merit. To take a concrete example, the average number of weeks during which a mentally ill person requires intensive care and treatment is being dramatically reduced. This is a trend we can and should hasten through creation of community mental health centers. By contrast the average number of years during which a seriously mentally retarded person may require care, education and supervision is continuing to increase. In short, the mental retardation problem is going to get worse before it gets better. It will get better only if we take giant steps toward both prevention and rehabilitation.

We have no cure for mental retardation. Hence, prevention must be pushed on every front. Prevention depends upon research. Scientists tell us that they have spotted more than 100 causes of mental retardation, many quite unrelated to one another, yet the majority of cases remain "cause unknown."

The first part of S. 1576 offers grants-in-aid for construction of laobratories and other facilities for research related to the causes or amelioration of mental retardation and similar developmental disorders. The language of the bill is broad but the official testimony made clear that the amount authorized will be entirely absorbed in building and equipping eight special research centers. The President's Panel on Mental Retardation pointed to the acute shortage of space for research. It is now far easier to obtain support for research than to house it decently. Other kinds of facilities are needed also, especially to house research in the psychological and educational aspects of mental retardation.

These are not adequately provided for either in this bill or in existing legislation. In short, this bill makes a contribution but by no means meets the need.

Two weeks ago we passed an excellent bill here, H.R. 7544, one of whose objectives was prevention of certain forms of mental retardation which are associated with childbearing. This bill authorized some initial demonstration projects. What we learn from these pilot programs can have an important effect in the future, but we deceive ourselves and the public if we presuppose that our action will bring any immediate dramatic reduction in the urgent need for facilities and services for the mentally retarded. Those born last year, and those who will be born next year will be with us for many years to come.

THE PROBLEM IS COMPLEX

The problem of mental retardation is exceptionally complex. That simple statement has many implications for the families of the retarded, for physicians, nurses, educators, psychologists, rehabilitation personnel, social and welfare workers, lawyers, clergymen, and many others who are concerned with various kinds of human needs. It also has implications for this Congress.

Congress will not be able to dispose of this problem in a single bill or a single debate. Every major agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be, and, I am happy to say, is, at long last, giving attention to this problem, as it relates to each agency's own function. In addition, we must expect the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and even the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to concern themselves to some extent with aspects of this problem. Poor pasturage for cows, for example, may increase the concentration of strontium 90 in milk which, if allowed to proceed beyond minimum levels, may contribute to mental retardation in a future generation. This thought should be of concern to at least four Federal departments.

Mental retardation is a complex problem because it originates in childhood and continues throughout the lifespan. Thus, it affects more than 5 million people in all age groups in our population. Mental retardation is a complex problem because it occurs in so many forms and degrees. We have mildly retarded, moderately retarded, severely retarded, and profoundly retarded people whose medical, educational, social and economic needs are very different from one another.

Mental retardation is a complex problem for the individual who is retarded, and his family, because it affects all aspects of his living. A person who is less intelligent and whose mental processes are impaired finds it harder to learn, to work, to play, to travel, or to look out for his own interests as well as other people do. However, retarded children and retarded adults can be helped, and it is the duty of those of us to whom God has granted fuller faculties to extend this help through our personal efforts and through the efforts of Government.

LOCAL SERVICES ARE NOW DEVELOPING

In my home State of Rhode Island I have seen what this help can mean. I have seen children receiving the special instruction to which they can respond, from a well-trained and dedicated teacher. I have seen children who cannot sit still in an ordinary dentist's chair, getting their teeth attended to in a special dental clinic equipped for their requirements.

I am happy to say that by means of a very small grant from the Children's Bureau for a documentary film, it has been made possible to carry the message of the success of this clinic to other parts of the country, so that others might learn by our experience in Providence and thus, proceed more rapidly and efficiently toward the provision of such services in their own localities.

I have seen young adults too retarded to hold an ordinary job, nevertheless, contributing to the economy of our State and Nation through productive activities in a sheltered workshop supervised by people trained to understand their capabilities and limitations. We also have specialized facilities for residential care, public and private. I am sure that other Members of the House are familiar with an equal variety of activities in their own districts. I have not exhausted the list of kinds of services that can and should properly be provided by cooperative public and private effort, local, State, and Federal, and none of those I have mentioned are sufficiently available to reach all who need them.

RELATIONS OF MENTAL RETARDATION TO OTHER NEUROLOGICAL AND MENTAL DISORDERS

In many cases a particular aspect of the mental retardation problem is closely tied in with another problem of concern to this House. For example, the needs for specially trained teachers for the deaf and for the mentally retarded, are related but by no means identical. The problems of employment of the mentally retarded are related to but not identical with those of employment of other youths with minimal education. The problem of research into the causes of cerebral palsy is one which cannot be entirely separated from the problem of research into certain causes of mental retardation. The problem of providing a minimum decent level of subsistence for persons who cannot earn a living because of aging or other cause of disability is related to but not identical with the problem of the mentally retarded person who has never been able to contribute to his own support. The problem of mental incompetence arising from mental retardation is related to but not identical with the problem of incompetence arising from mental illness or mental deterioration.

As a result of these complex relationships and of the interest of Members of this Congress and others in this very serious national problem, we have had no less than seven distinct major pieces of legislation introduced this year each of which have bearing on some different aspect of this problem. I am not referring to identical or similar bills but to bills which do not in any sense duplicate each other's purpose or provisions.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN 1963

Seven months ago I had the honor to present to this body the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That bill will make possible some additional effort to combat mental retardation by modest expansion of programs which are permissible under existing statutory authority.

ACTION FOR PREVENTION AND MEDICAL CARE AND PLANNING

Two weeks ago the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee received overwhelming approval from this body for H.R. 7544, the Maternal and Child Health, and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963. That bill, as the House will recall, would amend the Social Security Act and is concerned with four significant aspects of this complex problem:

First. Prevention through more adequate prenatal and immediately postnatal care for mothers and babies who might otherwise be more likely to contribute to the toll of mental retardation.

Second. Diagnosis and treatment: Through increasing the ceiling on the existing—and very successful—maternal and child health and crippled children services, so that remedial assistance can be brought to those children among our increasing child population, who, despite efforts at prevention, do develop physical or mental handicaps. The object here is to render services which will prevent or reduce disability resulting from such handicaps as far as possible.

Third. Applied program research: Through authority to permit the Children's Bureau to finance applied research projects closely related to maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

Fourth. Planning: Through provision of token one-time grants to the States to promote much-needed planning and coordination on an interagency and interdepartmental basis in this very complex field of mental retardation.

None of the above in any way authorizes Federal participation in the construction of buildings to house either service or research of any kind. Nor, does the bill previously debated and passed in this House relate itself in any way to the urgent problem of increasing the supply of properly trained special educators to educate and train children with mental or physical handicaps.

ACTION FOR CONSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

These subjects are dealt with in S. 1576, the bill now before us, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. S. 1576 also incorporates, in title II, authorization for Federal grants to support the construction of community mental health centers. I agree, as does almost everyone who has studied these two bills, H.R. 7544 and S. 1576, in detail, and as has been repeatedly stated in previous debate, that there is no duplication between the construction act now before us and the amendments to the Social Security Act already passed by this House. It is, of course, possible that in the future a research worker or therapist whose salary is being paid in part out of a grant under H.R. 7544 might be carrying on his work in a building constructed with the funds which I hope we will make available under S. 1576. But that is not duplication. That is coordination.

THE BUGABOO OF DUPLICATION

As I review the record, it occurs to me that this House is a bit redundant in its concern for duplication. In a field as complex as this, one which is interrelated, by its very nature, with many others, yet not adequately covered under any existing authorities, there is more real danger from gaps than from overlaps or duplication.

No Members of this House can be more conscious of the possibilities of duplication than are the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Each year we hear the various agency heads describe their programs and it is quite clear that, where human needs are concerned, it is not possible to make complete and arbitrary distinctions between the welfare of a person and his health, for example, or between his vocational education and his vocational rehabilitation.

I share the conviction of other Members of this House that it is our obligation to review constantly the activities of our Federal agencies and to require that they work in a complementary rather than competitive manner and that they communicate and coordinate with one another on the common goal; namely, promoting the safety and well-being of our citizens. There are situations, however, where we should insist that this be brought about more by administrative accountability than by a statutory fiat which may do an injustice to a segment of our population.

Within the past 20 years, the mentally retarded have been the victims of just such a specific injustice in relation to the Hill-Burton program. Only since 1959 have any of the many productive millions of dollars expended under this excellent program been allocated for construction of any facilities specifically related to mental retardation. We are appropriating over $200 million annually for hospital construction alone and yet in 1962, the most favorable year, only $5.2 million was spent for mental retardation facilities. This meager allocation is attributable in part to a former narrow administrative interpretation of congressional intent and a misconception as to the ability of the mentally retarded to respond to medical attention. It is also due to inherent restrictions in the statutory authority which do not permit construction of many kinds of facilities which are essential parts of a comprehensive program to combat mental retardation.

The bill, S. 1576, makes some attempt to remediate this longstanding injustice by permitting grants for construction of a broader range of mental retardation facilities. Specifically, it defines a "facility for the mentally retarded" to mean "a facility especially designed for the diagnosis, treatment, education, training or custodial care of the mentally retarded, including facilities for training specialists and sheltered workshops for the mentally retarded, but only if such workshops are part of facilities which provide comprehensive services for the mentally retarded." The last phrase is designed to prevent possible duplication with authority which might later be granted by the Congress if and when it gets around to considering the pending vocational rehabilitation act.

Unfortunately, the amounts of money to be made available under S. 1576 are totally inadequate to the need. The only funds provided for distribution by the States in accordance with the State plans for construction of "facilities for the mentally retarded" are those authorized under part C of title I of S. 1756. The amounts authorized to be appropriated under this part are $12.5 million for fiscal 1965 and $15 million for fiscal 1966.

It is estimated that the current deficit of physical facilities for programs for the mentally retarded amounts to $3.2 billion. Needs occasioned by population growth, which will be particularly pronounced in the age groups among the mentally retarded which most critically require service, will bring this total to $4.6 billion or more by 1970. Construction undertaken in 1965 and 1966, must, of course, be aimed at needs of 1970 and beyond.

Obviously, if the deficit arising from past neglect and future population growth is to be met, construction of units for day care, residential care, adult activities centers, sheltered workshops, nursery school programs and the like must proceed at the rate of at least one-half billion dollars a year. The task force of the President's panel concerned with this matter recommended that Federal contribution to overcoming this tremendous barrier to progress be not less than $50 million annually, a modest fraction of the need. Against this need and this recommendation, S. 1756 proposes to appropriate a total of $27.5 million over a 2-year period.

It is true that I have not included in this amount the authority granted under part B for project grants, for construction of university affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded. This provision is important and valuable, but I do not believe that we should place too much reliance on it for meeting the basic needs for housing of service facilities for the mentally retarded of all ages. We are all acutely aware that many mentally retarded children and adults live, learn, and work in towns other than college towns. Moreover, the total appropriation contemplated, for the 3-year period, for construction of university related service facilities amounts to only $22.5 million.

Such university related facilities to accommodate model programs of hospital and clinical care and of training and rehabilitation of the retarded are urgently needed to add realistic experience to the training of physicians, nurses, and special educators of the retarded, among others, and to facilitate research. The U.S. Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau are already empowered to give grants for research projects or training of personnel in the health related fields, once the buildings are available.

There is not now, however, adequate authority for the training of personnel in the field of education of the mentally retarded and handicapped. The pioneer legislation which I sponsored in 1958 and in 1961 on behalf of the retarded and deaf has proven that many young people desire to enter this field of service and that scholarships, fellowships, traineeships, and teaching grants are needed to make it possible for them to prepare for this important life work. Title III of S. 1576, therefore, very appropriately complements the provisions for construction of university related service facilities, by providing such stipends and grants on a sounder basis than was possible in the initial legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that we are moving in the right direction in passing S. 1576—House Report No. 694—better known as the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act.

Those of us who have been interested in the serious problems of mental health legislation find that much remains to be done in this area of public health.

One thing we can be sure of and history will so record: This generation of lawmakers has moved further in their search for an answer to the age-old problems of mental diseases than any other generation in history.

Opposition to this legislation can only be from a misguided notion that we cannot afford expenditures in this field of endeavor. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Of all the moneys this Nation has spent in this decade, both here and abroad, none will bring more enduring and beneficial results.

To quote President Kennedy's views:

> Mental illness and mental retardation are among our most critical health problems. They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families of the afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon both the Public Treasury and the personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.
>
> If we launch a broad new mental health program now, it will be possible within a decade or two to reduce the number of patients now under custodial care by 50 percent or more. Many mentally ill can be helped to remain in their own homes without hardship to themselves or their families. Those who are hospitalized can be helped to return to their own communities. All but a small proportion can be restored to useful life. We can spare them and their families much of the misery which mental illness now entails. We can save public funds and we can conserve our manpower resources.

On February 5, 1963, President Kennedy became the first President to submit to the Congress a program to combat mental illness and retardation, our largest health problem. In his message the President set forth a broad program centered around the establishment of comprehensive community mental health centers designed to provide more rapid detention, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Presently about 800,000 persons are confined to mental institutions in the United States, 600,000 for mental illness and 200,000 for mental retardation.

Each year another 1.5 million persons receive treatment in mental institutions.

Almost 20 percent of the 278 State mental institutions are fire and health hazards. Two-thirds of these were opened prior to 1900.

Of the 530,000 persons in State institutions more than half are in overcrowded institutions housing over 3,000 patients. Under such conditions individual care is impossible.

The majority of these institutions have less than half the professional staff required, with less than 1 psychiatrist for every 360 mentally ill patients; 94 percent of our mental hospitals do not merit the full approval of the American Psychiatric Association; and 45 percent of the patients in these institutions have been there continuously for 10 years or more.

It has been proven that two out of three schizophrenics—the largest group of mentally ill—can be treated and released within 6 months, but, under present conditions the average stay in an institution for this illness is 11 years.

Of the 278 hospitals no more than 20 percent have participated in innovations to make them therapeutic rather than custodial institutions.

More than one-half of the 530,000 patients institutionalized in State hospitals receive no active treatment designed to improve their mental condition.

SENATE ACTION

On May 27, 1963, the Senate passed S. 1576 on a 72-to-1 rollcall vote—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1963, pages 9477–9479; pages 9503–9530. As passed, the bill contains the major provisions of the administration's program. The Senate version of the bill provides: first, $848.5 million for a 10-year program of grants to States and to public and private institutions for (a) construction of research centers and facilities for treatment of mental retardation; (b) construction of community centers for care and treatment of mental patients; (c) portion of staffing costs of community mental health centers; and (a) training teachers of mentally ill, retarded and handicapped children.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION (H. REPT. NO. 694)

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported an amended version of S. 1576 on August 21, 1963—House Report No. 694.

As reported the bill provides $238 million for a 3-year program of grants for the construction of mental retardation facilities and research centers; and community mental health centers; and to train teachers of the mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

The amended bill provides $610.5 million less than the 10-year program authorized by the Senate. The most substantial cut was the elimination by the committee of $427 million for an 8-year program of grants to help in the initial staffing cost of the community mental health centers.

As reported, S. 1576, as amended, provides—first, $70 million over 3 years in grants for construction of mental retardation research centers and facilities (a) $20 million for construction of research centers—grants to pay maximum of 75 percent of construction costs; (b) $22.5 million for construction of college or university associated facilities—grants to pay maximum of 75 percent of construction costs; (c) $27.7 million for construction of public and other nonprofit facilities—grants allocated among States and will pay 33⅓ to 66⅔ percent of costs; (d) $115 million over 2 years for construction of community mental health centers—grants allocated among the States and will pay 33⅓ to 66⅔ percent of costs; (e) $47 million for 3 years in grants for training teachers of mentally retarded and other handicapped children; and (f) $6 million for 3 years in grants for research or demonstration projects relating to education of the handicapped.

These facts must awaken in all of us a desire to strike a blow in behalf of a better program for a great number of hopeless and helpless victims of a terrible and destructive disease.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of S. 1576, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. It is the result of a recommendation made by President Kennedy for the establishment of comprehensive community health centers designed to provide more rapid detention, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill. It is a bold new approach to attack mental illness and mental retardation for they are among our most critical health problems.

When we stop and consider that presently about 800,000 persons are confined to mental institutions in the United States, 600,000 for mental illness and 200,000 for mental retardation, and that each year another 1.5 million persons receive treatment in mental institutions, it is time that action should be taken to provide adequate facilities to combat these diseases.

It is difficult to comprehend that this great Nation of ours, leaders in scientific achievements, leaders in discovering new products and means of making our way of life easier, has failed to make an all-out effort to seek out the causes of mental illness and of mental retardation and eradicate them. I wonder if we have failed in this area because we are ashamed to associate ourselves with these afflicted people and will hide this knowledge if it strikes in our own families. Up to now mental illness has been a stigma on society and we have tried to erase it by ignoring it. And we certainly have been successful in ignoring it.

Our State institutions for the mentally ill are greatly overcrowded, which makes it impossible to provide individual care for the unfortunate souls confined in these institutions. And of the 278 State mental institutions, 20 percent of them are fire and health hazards. Two-thirds of them were opened prior to 1900.

These institutions are understaffed, with the majority of them having only one psychiatrist for every 360 mentally ill patients. And yet facts show that two out of three schizophrenics—the largest group of mentally ill—can be treated and released within 6 months, but, under present conditions, the average stay in an institution for this illness is 11 years. More than one-half of the 530,000 patients institutionalized in State hospitals receive no active treatment designed to improve their mental condition. This is deplorable in this modern day and age. These are human beings and deserve to be treated as such. To allow these people to slowly deteriorate is a waste of human resources.

We have taken too long in acting to help these poor people. If we concentrate on providing proper care for these unfortunate, and research for new cures for their afflictions, we can return a number of them to society. Through concerted effort maybe one day we can check the disease and isolate it to a minimum of persons.

I am pleased that we are finally taking steps to remove the cloak of ignorance surrounding mental illness and mental retardation. This bill before us is a humanitarian measure. By approving it we can begin construction of mental retardation facilities and research centers; and community health centers; and to train teachers of the mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

S. 1576 is one of the most important bills that we will consider in this Congress. It deserves the full support of this body and I ask for its unanimous approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. On March 26, 1963, I appeared as the first witness before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety on this legislation, in support of this legislation.

During World War II I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which made a study of the problems and needs with respect to mental illness and mental ill health in the United States. That subcommittee held a number of hearings on the health needs of our veterans and our civilian population.

In January 1945 the subcommittee issued its interim report No. 3 in which the staggering extent of mental illness was first disclosed. For example, the report pointed out that of 4,212,000 young men 18 to 37 years of age who were rejected for military duty by the Selective Service as of June 1, 1944, 1,282,000 or over 25 percent of the total rejected were for mental diseases and deficiencies. The report stated:

> It has long been known that approximately two-thirds of the illness encountered in general medical practice is essentially neuropsychiatric in origin and that half of the patients in hospitals at any one time are there because of serious mental disorders. Indeed, one may safely predict that in any group of 15-year-olds 1 out of 22 will someday be committed to a mental institution.

Our subcommittee recommended the establishment of community psychiatric clinics, hospitals in planned medical centers, and for the training and education of professional personnel. The subcommittee said:

> From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child-guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments.

In 1946 the late Honorable Percy Priest, Representative from Tennessee, sponsored H.R. 4512, and I sponsored in the Senate S. 1160. These two bills were merged into Public Law 487 of the 79th Congress which authorized the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health at Bethesda, a broad national program of research into the causes and prevention of mental ill health, training of personnel in the treatment of psychiatric disorders with some experimental research in community mental health centers.

This act gave the impetus to Congress for a rapid growth in the appropriations for a national mental health program. This growth is reflected in the following figures of Federal funds provided in 1946, 1950, and 1963. Funds for this activity were $66,000 in 1946; $10,019,000 in 1950, and $143,599,000 in 1963.

My interest in this legislation is of long standing, and I strongly support it and urge its enactment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee has found it necessary to cut so deeply into the funds for the mental health bill, and particularly into the funds earmarked for the staffing of community mental health centers, which I feel is an essential part of the bill.

I hope very much that the legislation as finally enacted will authorize funds for staffing as well as for the other purposes in the bill. I might say that this is a hope which is shared by many physicians and mental health associations in the Third Congressional District of Indiana.

A sampling of my correspondence on this subject indicates that my constituents are fully aware of the need for this legislation. For example, Dr. Richard L. See, president of the Elkhart Country Association for Mental Health, wrote to me:

> The Elkhart Association for Mental Health has followed with great interest and concern the House action on S. 1576. We regret the slash by $258 million made by the subcommittee.

Mrs. Ray Swanson, president, La Porte County, Ind., Association for Mental Health, Inc., wrote:

> We of the La Porte County Association are proud of our record of dedicated service in the fight against the increasingly alarming problem of mental illness. Perhaps because we have, located in our county—in your district—the finest mental hospital in the State, we are more and more aware that the rising incidence of mental illness and mounting costs of custodial institutions such as Beatty Memorial Hospital, strongly indicate that present facilities are becoming inadequate for the rehabilitation of our mentally ill citizens. Indeed, it is now accepted by the enlightened leadership in this war against mental illness that custodial institutions are not the complete answer to the problem.
>
> We believe that the unanimity of support for the objectives of H.R. 3677 and 3678 by every mental health agency will have already recommended them to your best efforts. We add herewith our personal entreaty.

Mrs. Arthur L. Reed, executive secretary, St. Joseph County Association for Mental Health, Inc., wrote:

> Effective treatment for the mentally ill within the community can mean a long stride forward in our efforts to alleviate the suffering of the mentally ill and their families and offer a much better chance for early recovery and a return to productive living.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many other letters from physicians and organizations who are concerned with the treatment of the mentally ill, and in every instance their support for this legislation was enthusiastic. I am indeed hopeful that the final bill will more nearly reflect what I am sure is both a public recognition of the problem of mental illness and a public willingness to support legislation to enable us to deal effectively with the problem.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and facilities related to the mentally retarded; to provide financial assistance in the construction of community mental health centers; and financial assistance in the training of teachers of children who are mentally retarded or mentally ill as well as other handicapped children.

This legislation before us today embodies the substance of my two bills, H.R. 4622 and H.R. 4623, introduced on March 7, and based on the recommendations of President Kennedy to launch a major national effort in behalf of the mentally ill and retarded. I say "launch" to describe the purpose of these two bills, because I feel the President, himself, christened this national effort when he delivered his moving and comprehensive message to Congress on February 5 of this year outlining the breadth of the program he hopes we will enact today.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy did not mince his words in telling the Congress and the Nation that the twin problems of the mentally ill and retarded are the responsibility of everyone:

> The time has come for a bold new approach. New medical, scientific, and social

tools and insights are now available. A series of comprehensive studies initiated by the Congress, the executive branch and interested private groups have been completed and all point in the same direction.

Governments at every level—Federal, State, and local—private foundations and individual citizens must all face up to their responsibilities in this area.

The impact of President Kennedy's proposed program was heightened by the fact that it was sent to Congress in the form of a historic, "first time" special message on mental illness and mental retardation. Never before have these two problem areas been placed before the Congress and the American people by way of a special Presidential message. I am sure that it was done, in this way, to dramatize the magnitude and seriousness of the problem.

Mental illness and mental retardation are among our most critical health problems. They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon the Public Treasury and personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.

The backbone of the President's program is contained in the two bills I introduced, and has been incorporated into this bill before us now. This is a bold new approach to the problem of mental illness and mental retardation—the idea of having programs that are essentially community oriented and administered. Moreover, the legislation would provide for the construction of facilities where much of the future work in mental health and mental retardation will take place for years to come—the community level.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the foundation, and a good solid foundation, upon which future programs in this field can grow. Title III of the bill would authorize the appropriation of $47 million over 3 years beginning fiscal year 1964, to extend and strengthen the existing programs for training teachers of mentally retarded children, and to expand these programs to include the training of teachers of other handicapped children such as the visually handicapped, the speech impaired, and the emotionally disturbed.

I strongly favor this title which would also authorize the appropriation of $6 million over the 3 years beginning fiscal year 1964 to finance grants for research or demonstration projects relating to the education of the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I sponsored legislation which was enacted into law 2 years ago setting up the existing programs for training teachers of the deaf children, and I am very pleased that the extension of this program is embodied in this legislation.

I would like to see the provisions for staffing community mental health centers be restored to this legislation. I received a telegram today from Dr. Martha M. Eliot, chairman of the Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth in Boston, concerning this provision and ask that it be included with my remarks:

Re S. 1567.
Hon. Edward P. Boland,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge that provisions for staffing community mental health centers not only be restored to community mental health bill, but that bill be amended to provide continuing financial support for staffing at 75 percent level. Failure to provide for staffing will cripple or destroy this critically important legislation.

Martha M. Eliot, M.D.,
Chairman, Massachusetts Committee on Children and Youth.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to support a program in an area of health that is often overlooked or avoided. Nearly one-half of the Nation's hospital beds are occupied by patients suffering from mental illness. The efforts of many dedicated people have overcome the past public prejudices with respect to the mentally ill, and it is up to Congress to see that the needs that have been brought to light are adequately met.

Since this bill proposes new research centers, new clinical facilities, community mental health centers, and teacher training, all new Federal programs, I am pleased to see a limitation of 3 years on the program, in contrast to the 8-year program envisioned by the other body. There is a definite need to check on results, and on future needs before such a long period as 8 years goes by.

This limitation has also decreased the authorizations to manageable sizes, without prejudicing future needs. I hope, too, that the elimination of Federal payments for personnel at local clinics will remain in the bill in conference, since it places the responsibility on the local level for the conduct of the health care, where is belongs.

Twenty million dollars of the authorization would be allocated to pay the cost for new research centers designed to develop new knowledge for the prevention and cure of mental retardation. Coupled with the $53 million made available for training teachers and educating the handicapped, this bill meets needs that are particularly acute among the young. I consider S. 1576 to be an opportunity for the future that all Americans can be proud of today.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation, and wish to commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for having brought before the House this much needed legislation to bring relief from and assistance to mental retardation and mental illness.

This approach of supporting community facilities for the treatment of mental illness, and community facilities for training the mentally retarded, as well as clinics to investigate and combat the causes of mental retardation, will not only rescue the human lives involved, but reduce the cost in these fields. In the case of mental illness, the treatment at local community facilities is already known to be more successful—in such circumstances, the mental patient, by already established records, would have 9 chances in 10 of recovery, and in a much shorter period of time; whereas mental patients "warehoused" in a mental institution after 4 years would have less than 1 chance in 5 of recovery. The cost of local community-facility treatment is only one-third the cost of housing, feeding, and treating a mental patient in an institution. We have much less experience with the mentally retarded, but undoubtedly, it would follow the same pattern.

In this field, we suffer greatly from the lack of adequate facilities and the absence of a coordinated program. The care is largely of a custodial nature in crowded facilities. The cost of caring for the retarded person is three to four times the cost of educating and rearing the normal child.

I submit that with greater investigation and experience, we will reduce the per capita cost of treating and training the mentally retarded, and experience the pleasure of rescuing these human lives. I urge the adoption of the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, the care and treatment of those suffering from mental illness and mental retardation has long been a neglected area of medical research. For years society has virtually ostracized those suffering from mental illness and other handicaps, due to apathy, ignorance, fear, and a general lack of understanding of their condition. During the past few years there has been an increased effort to encourage research in this area and to better educate the general public on mental health problems and to make them more aware of the critical need in this field.

This bill, S. 1576, presents a unique opportunity for the Congress to accept its responsibility in the area of mental health. The program outlined in this legislation would be a full-scale assault on the entire mental health problem. This bill would authorize grants for the construction of research facilities to overcome our general lack of knowledge concerning the causes of mental retardation; it would authorize Federal participation in the construction of community mental health facilities, which have proved a valuable tool in the reduction in the number of mental patients requiring permanent institutional care; it would also provide scholarships for the training of teachers specially trained to teach mentally ill, mentally retarded, and otherwise handicapped children.

During several years' service as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with my colleagues I became aware of the pressing need for this legislation. I commend the committee and its able chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] on the presentation and explanation of this bill. They have done an outstanding piece of work and deserve the commendation of the House.

The National Association for Mental Health has pointed out that one of every 10 persons has some form of mental or emotional illness that needs psychiatric treatment. This dramatic statistic points to the vital need for immediate action in this field. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation and respectfully urge its approval by this body.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge unanimous approval of the fundamental objective contained in this measure before us, S. 1576, namely to provide for the cooperation of the Federal Government and the various States in fighting against two of our major national health problems, mental retardation and mental illness. I also very earnestly hope that provisions will be adopted here to permit the adequate staffing of the research centers and facilities involved, because it would appear obvious that the best facilities in the world cannot be used for maximum benefit unless and until they are adequately staffed by professionally trained people, particularly in the field of mental health.

Authoritative statistics reveal that approximately 800,000 individuals are now confined to this country's mental institutions; 600,000 for mental illness and over 200,000 for mental retardation. Each year nearly 1½ million people are treated in these institutions. Further statistics disclose that the average expenditure for care per patient in State facilities is not more than $4 a day, and in some the average is less than $2 per day. It would, indeed, be difficult to attempt to measure the immaterial cost in terms of family misery, personal tragedy, and loss of untold human talents.

This bill represents a recognition and an attempted correction of a dark shadow that has hovered over our American society for too long, namely the tendency to take mentally ill or disturbed individuals and remove them to some remote and questionable treatment institution, with the unfortunate and unhappy thought that there was no way to help them toward recovery.

Today, with modern psychiatry and treatment we realize that with proper care, guidance, and encouragement, a great many of these people can be cured and enabled to go back again into their communities to pursue useful lives.

Today, thank providence, we realize that many hundreds of our young boys and girls with some mental defects can, with patient care and modern treatment, be trained to regain confidence in themselves and obtain gainful employment; in other words their lives have been truly saved, and the Nation has been greatly benefited. I submit that we have now reached the point in our history where this national problem should be vigorously pursued in the public interest and this bill is the means through which we can accelerate that pursuit.

One of the main purposes of this measure is to provide centers for the mentally retarded and mentally ill so that such persons may be treated in the centers under ordinary living conditions. In many instances they will be able to remain within their own homes, with their own families in normal surroundings and be treated by psychiatrists in their own community.

Mr. Chairman, mental illness has no respect for income or social class; it can occur in rural areas as readily as in the metropolitan, in the richest regions as well as in the poorest.

Thankfully, we are today undergoing practically a revolution in the advanced professional and technological care of the mentally ill. Concepts of treatment and care have drastically changed in modern times, and they call for new types of community-based hospital facilities with adequate staffing. In order to speedily get under construction these vitally needed new community-based treatment centers a special financial impetus is required, and it is quite generally agreed among the authorities that Federal matching money offers the best means to expedite this program.

The various States have done a remarkable job in their war against mental retardation and illness, and I am certain there is no intention, now, on the part of any State to reduce this effort, but they need help to expand their effort and they need it now. I ask you to approve this measure, in the national interest, without delay.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, who is going to foot the bill? Of course, we are all for helping the mentally retarded. We should debate the merits of the Federal role, State and local governments' role, and private facilities.

But deficit financing once again overshadows the merits of legislation during our deliberations. How can we discuss the merits of any spending proposition when we do not have the money. So we charge the cost to the future. Can we take comfort from such refusal to face up to fiscal responsibility by assuring each other we want to help the mentally retarded.

If indeed the merits of this mentally retarded facilities construction are so worthy, why must we overlook how it will be paid for, as though cost does not matter.

We are told that the States and localities lack the financial means. Well, where do we get the Federal funds—from the same States and localities through individual and corporate taxes. There is no other or magical source of Federal funds for Federal programs.

In this bill we are talking about expenditures of $238 million or $850 million in the Senate version. Where is this money we are going to spend?

As to the merits of the legislation there is more to be said for Federal research projects as I see it than construction of other facilities in a matching grant. The latter can be done through existing State and local programs. So can teacher training and staffing.

The private sector must not be downgraded nor impoverished by competing Federal encroachment.

If the Federal Government would balance the budget, reduce taxes, and debt; the private sector and State and local government could do much more. Therein lies the answer as I see it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have been on duty today at the United Nations attending the session as one of the congressional observers on the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

I took a plane back, on notice from my office, but was delayed by traffic at the National Airport. If I had been present during the rollcall, I would have voted aye on S. 1576 this afternoon.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important legislation which will go a long way in helping the United States establish facilities to combat mental retardation.

This is a bold and imaginative program. It has drawn the support of outstanding Americans throughout the country who realize the tremendous need that exists today to deal with this problem of mental retardation.

Mr. Chairman, it has always seemed tragically paradoxical to me that during the past 2,000 years of civilized history, mankind has been able to make fantastic progress in virtually every single field of human endeavor except in the field of mental retardation.

Mankind has witnessed imposing medical breakthroughs; science has learned to harness the atom; we have spent billions of dollars in reaching for the moon, and yet, Mr. Speaker, throughout our land, hundreds of thousands of families have suffered the great pain of seeing one of their loved ones afflicted with mental retardation.

I should like to congratulate the committee for bringing this very important piece of legislation before us today. This bill proposes to meet the tragic problem of mental retardation with a vigor and determination unequaled in our history.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to call attention of the House to a letter which I recently received from Mr. Stuart List, publisher of Chicago's American, in support of this legislation.

Mr. List is known not only throughout Chicago but also throughout the entire United States for his dedicated interest in trying to help resolve our Nation's problem of mental retardation among young people. Mr. List is one of Chicago's most outstanding citizens who, as a working newspaperman all of his life, has had an opportunity to observe first hand the social erosion that follows in the wake of mental retardation among our citizens. Chicago's American, which Mr. List heads as publisher, has been in the forefront for many years in leading the fight in our community to establish adequate facilities to deal with this tragic problem of mental retardation. You can be certain that Mr. List has completely exhausted all local resources to deal with this problem and if he today supports Federal assistance, it is only because he has grasped the full magnitude of the challenge ahead. It is significant that this very responsible publisher of one of our Nation's most highly respected newspapers has recognized that local communities can no longer meet this problem with their own resources.

Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to be able to read Mr. List's letter to my colleagues.

Mr. List's letter follows:

CHICAGO'S AMERICAN,
Chicago, Ill., July 12, 1963.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is my firm opinion that the time has come for a bold new attack on the problems posed by mental illness.

We are familiar with the fact that half of our hospital beds are devoted to the care of the several mental illnesses. We are aware of the exorbitant dollar costs in private funds and the tax funds of local, State, and Federal Governments, not to mention the anguish of illness visited on individuals and their families.

In spite of the enormity of these problems, recent events have given us cause to be hopeful.

We now know that with an appropriate array of services in the community, many patients do not have to be hospitalized at all. It has been shown that intensive treatment by adequate staffs results in a shorter stay for those who must go to the hospital, and with less likelihood of readmission. Aftercare services help to keep ex-patients earning on the job, and with fewer returns to the hospital.

So it is prudent to provide a comprehensive array of services for diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, and community consultation and education near the patient's home and community.

Here in Illinois we are proud of the fine start we have made to provide six centers throughout the State in which comprehensive services may be provided. We see these centers as complying with the recommendations of the Congress-enacted Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. In these centers we expect to provide the services and leadership which, indeed, will constitute a bold and imaginative new approach to our mental illness problems. We also see this program as meeting the approval of the citizens of Illinois, who voted the funds for construction in referendum.

Our problem will be in staffing these centers—in supplying the brains for doing this job.

Without staff, these centers will degenerate into miniature models of large custodial State hospitals, which must be avoided.

Senate bill 1576 anticipates this problem by providing assistance to the States for staffing mental health centers over a period of time. While we endorse this bill in its entirety, we are particularly appreciative of the staffing provision. This will enable us to staff appropriately from the very beginning, assuring on optimal demonstration of the feasibility of the program. We believe that local support will come more easily after such a successful demonstration.

We feel that the intent of Senate bill 1576 is an important element of a bold attack on our unsolved problems in mental illness. We strongly urge its passage.

I would be most appreciative if you would be good enough to present my views to the committee.

Very sincerely,

STUART LIST,
Publisher.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963".

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH CENTERS AND FACILITIES FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Short title

SEC. 100. This title may be cited as the "Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act".

Part A—Grants for Construction of Centers for Research on Mental Retardation and Related Aspects of Human Development

SEC. 101. Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting immediately below the heading thereof "Part A—Grants for Construction of Health Research Facilities" and by changing the words "this title" to "this part" wherever they appear, and by adding at the end of such title the following new part:

"Part D—Centers for Research on Mental Retardation and Related Aspects of Human Development

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 761. There are authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for project grants to assist in meeting the costs of construction of facilities for research, or research and related purposes, relating to human development, whether biological, medical, social, or behavorial, which may assist in finding the causes, and means of prevention, of mental retardation, or in finding means of ameliorating the effects of mental retardation. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended for payments with respect to projects for which applications have been filed under this part before July 1, 1966, and approved by the Surgeon General thereunder before July 1, 1967.

"Applications

"SEC. 762. (a) Applications for grants under this part with respect to any facility may be approved by the Surgeon General only if—

"(1) the applicant is a public or nonprofit institution which the Surgeon General determines is competent to engage in the type of research for which the facility is to be constructed; and

"(2) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than 20 years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the research, or research and related purposes, for which it was constructed; (B) sufficient funds will be available for meeting the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility; (C) sufficient funds will be available, when the construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the research, or research and related purposes, for which it was constructed; and (D) all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of the center will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at rates not less than the rates determined in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause (D) the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(b) In acting on applications for grants, the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding the Nation's capacity for research and related purposes in the field of mental retardation and related aspects of human development, and such other factors as he, after consultation with the national advisory council or councils concerned with the field or fields of research involved, may by regulation prescribe in order to assure that the facilities constructed with such grants, severally and together, will best serve the purpose of advancing scientific knowledge pertaining to mental retardation and related aspects of human development.

"Amount of grants; payments

"SEC. 763. (a) The total of the grants with respect to any project for the construction of a facility under this part may not exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of construction of the center as determined by the Surgeon General.

"(b) Payments of grants under this part shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments consistent with construction progress, and on such conditions as the Surgeon General may determine.

"(c) No grant may be made under any provision of this Act other than this part, for any of the three fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1963, and ending June 30, 1966, for construction of any facility described in this part.

"Recapture of payments

"SEC. 764. If, within twenty years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for the research purposes, or research and related purposes, for which it was constructed, unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"Noninterference with administration of institutions

"SEC. 765. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, nothing contained in this part shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or condition with respect to, the research or related purposes conducted by, and the personnel or administration of, any institution.

"Definitions

"SEC. 766. As used in this part—

"(1) the terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered;

"(2) the term 'nonprofit institution' means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Part B—Project Grants for Construction of University-Affiliated Facilities for the Mentally Retarded

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 121. For the purpose of assisting in the construction of clinical facilities providing, as nearly as practicable, a full range of inpatient and outpatient services for the mentally retarded and facilities which will aid in demonstrating provision of specialized services for the diagnosis and treatment, education, training, or care of the mentally retarded or in the clinical training of physicians and other specialized personnel needed for research, diagnosis and treatment, education, training, or care of the mentally retarded, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. The sums so appropriated shall be used for project grants for construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded which are associated with a college or university.

Applications

SEC. 122. Applications for grants under this part with respect to any facility may be approved by the Secretary only if the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that—

(1) the facility will be associated, to the extent prescribed in regulations of the Secretary, with a college or university hospital (including affiliated hospitals), or with such other part of a college or university as the Secretary may find appropriate in the light of the purposes of this part;

(2) the plans and specifications are in accord with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under section 133(3);

(3) title to the site for the project is or will be vested in one or more of the agencies or institutions filing the application or in a public or other nonprofit agency or institution which is to operate the facility;

(4) adequate financial support will be available for construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed; and

(5) all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of the project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at rates not less than the rates determined in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Amounts of grants; payments

SEC. 123. (a) The total of the grants with respect to any project for the construction of a facility under this part may not exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of construction thereof as determined by the Secretary.

(b) Payments of grants under this part shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments consistent with construction progress, and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

Recovery

SEC. 124. If any facility with respect to which funds have been paid under this part shall, at any time within twenty years after the completion of construction—

(1) be sold or transferred to any person, agency, or organization which is not qualified to file an application under this part, or

(2) cease to be a public or other nonprofit facility for the mentally retarded, unless the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to continue as such a facility,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from either the transferor or the transferee (or, in the case of a facility which has ceased to be a public or other nonprofit facility for the mentally retarded, from the owners thereof) an amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by the agreement of the parties or by action brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the facility is situated) of so much of the facility as constituted an approved project or projects, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of the construction of such project or projects.

Nonduplication of grants

SEC. 125. No grant may be made under any provision of the Public Health Service Act, for any of the three fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1963, and ending June 30, 1966, for construction of any facility for the mentally retarded described in this part.

Part C—Grants for Construction of Facilities for the Mentally Retarded

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 131. There are authorized to be appropriated, for grants for construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded, $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Allotments to States

SEC. 132. (a) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in accordance with regulations, make allotments from the sums appropriated under section 131 to the several States on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the need for facilities for the mentally retarded, and (3) the financial need of the respective States; except that no such allotment to any State, other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam, for any fiscal year may be less than $100,000. Sums so allotted to a State for a fiscal year for construction and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such State for such purpose for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year.

(b) In accordance with regulations of the Secretary, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this part be added to the allotment of another State under this part for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of a project for the construction of a facility for the mentally retarded in such other State. If it is found by the Secretary that construction of the facility with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this part, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this part, to be used for the purposes referred to above.

(c) Upon the request of any State that a specified portion of its allotment under this part be added to the allotment of such State under title II, and upon (1) the simultaneous certification to the Secretary by the State agency designated as provided in the State plan approved under this part to the effect that it has afforded a reasonable opportunity to make applications for the portion so specified and there have been no approvable applications for such portion, or (2) a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that the need for the community mental health centers in such State is substantially greater than for the facilities for the mentally retarded, the Secretary shall, subject to such limitations as he may by regulation prescribe, promptly adjust the allotments of such State in accordance with such request and shall notify such State agency and the State agency designated under the State plan approved under title II, and thereafter the allotments as so adjusted shall be deemed the State's allotments for purposes of this part and title II.

Regulations

SEC. 133. Within six months after enactment of this Act the Secretary shall, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council (established by section 633 of the Public Health Service Act and hereinafter in this part referred to as the "Council"), by general regulations applicable uniformly to all the States prescribe—

(1) the kinds of services needed to provide adequate services for mentally retarded persons residing in a State;

(2) the general manner in which the State agency (designated as provided in the State plan approved under this part) shall determine the priority of projects based on the relative need of different areas, giving special consideration to facilities which will provide comprehensive services for a particular community or communities;

(3) general standards of construction and equipment for facilities of different classes and in different types of location; and

(4) that the State plan shall provide for adequate facilities for the mentally retarded for persons residing in the State, and shall provide for adequate facilities for the mentally retarded to furnish needed services for persons unable to pay therefor. Such regulations may require that before approval of an application for a facility or addition to a facility is recommended by a State agency, assurance shall be received by the State from the applicant that there will be made available in such facility or addition a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor, but an exception shall be made if such a requirement is not feasible from a financial viewpoint.

State plans

SEC. 134. (a) After such regulations have been issued, any State desiring to take advantage of this part shall submit a State plan for carrying out its purposes. Such State plan must—

(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for the administration of the plan, or designate such agency as the sole agency for supervising the administration of the plan;

(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) hereof will have authority to

carry out such plan in conformity with this part;

(3) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of State agencies concerned with planning, operation, or utilization of facilities for the mentally retarded and of nongovernment organizations or groups concerned with education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, and health, and including representatives of consumers of the services provided by such facilities;

(4) set forth a program for construction of facilities for the mentally retarded (A) which is based on a statewide inventory of existing facilities and survey of need; (B) which conforms with the regulations prescribed under section 133(1); and (C) which meets the requirements for furnishing needed services to persons unable to pay therefor, included in regulations prescribed under section 133(4);

(5) set forth the relative need, determined in accordance with the regulations prescribed under section 133(2), for the several projects included in such programs, and provide for the construction, insofar as financial resources available therefor and for maintenance and operation make possible, in the order of such relative need;

(6) provide such methods of administration of the State plan, including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis (except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods), as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

(7) provide minimum standards (to be fixed in the discretion of the State) for the maintenance and operation of facilities which receive Federal aid under this part;

(8) provide for affording to every applicant for a construction project an opportunity for hearing before the State agency;

(9) provide that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness aand verification of such reports; and

(10) provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its State plan and submit to the Secretary any modifications thereof which it considers necessary.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a). The Secretary shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State.

Approval of projects

SEC. 135. (a) For each project for construction pursuant to a State plan approved under this part, there shall be submitted to the Secretary through the State agency an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof or by a public or other nonprofit agency. If two or more such agencies join in the construction of the project, the application may be filed by one or more of such agencies. Such application shall set forth—

(1) a description of the site for such project;

(2) plans and specifications therefor in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under section 133(3);

(3) reasonable assurance that title to such site is or will be vested in one or more of the agencies filing the application or in a public or other nonprofit agency which is to operate the facility;

(4) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed;

(5) reasonable assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of the project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at rates not less than the rates determined in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c); and

(6) a certification by the State agency of the Federal share for the project.

The Secretary shall approve such application if sufficient funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project are available from the allotment to the State, and if the Secretary finds (A) that the application contains such reasonable assurance as to title, financial support, and payment of prevailing rates of wages; (B) that the plans and specifications are in accord with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 133; (C) that the application is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 134 and contains an assurance that in the operation of the facility there will be compliance with the applicable requirements of the State plan and of the regulations prescribed under section 133(4) for furnishing needed facilities for persons unable to pay therefor, and with State standards for operation and maintenance; and (D) that the application has been approved and recommended by the State agency and is entitled to priority over other projects within the State in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 133(2). No application shall be disapproved by the Secretary until he has afforded the State agency an opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Amendment of any approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application.

Withholding of payments

SEC. 136. Whenever the Secretary after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency designated as provided in section 134(a)(1), finds—

(1) that the State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required by section 134 to be included in its State plan or with regulations under this part;

(2) that any assurance required to be given in an application filed under section 135 is not being or cannot be carried out;

(3) that there is a substantial failure to carry out plans and specifications approved by the Secretary under section 135; or

(4) that adequate State funds are not being provided annually for the direct administration of the State plan,

the Secretary may forthwith notify the State agency that—

(5) no further payments will be made to the State from allotments under this part; or

(6) no further payments will be made from allotments under this part for any project or projects designated by the Secretary as being affected by the action or inaction referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this section,

as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances; and, except with regard to any project for which the application has already been approved and which is not directly affected, further payments from such allotments may be withheld, in whole or in part, until there is no longer any failure to comply (or to carry out the assurance or plans and specifications or to provide adequate State funds, as the case may be) or, if such compliance (or other action) is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys to which the recipient was not entitled.

Nonduplication of grants

SEC. 137. No grant may be made under any provision of the Public Health Service Act, for any of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1964, and ending June 30, 1966, for construction of any facility for the mentally retarded described in this part.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read and open for amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: On page 49, line 2, correct the spelling of the word "behavorial".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD, at which time I will pose a number of questions affecting this title and then answer them for the RECORD in order that the information may be available for the Members.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. These are the questions and answers to which I referred:

Question. What kinds of facilities will these construction grants help to build?

Answer. That question requires a three-part answer, because title I contains three separate but related construction grant authorizations.

Part A of title I authorizes grants for the construction of a limited number of regional research centers, where comprehensive programs of research relating to mental retardation can be conducted. The importance of building research centers is indicated by the fact that in 75 to 85 percent of the cases of mental retardation the specific cause is unknown.

Part B of title I authorizes construction grants specifically for certain kinds of university-affiliated facilities. These include:

First, clinical facilities providing a full range of medical services; second, facilities for demonstration of improved methods of diagnosis, treatment, training, or care of the mentally retarded; and third, facilities for the clinical training of physicians and other specialized personnel in matters pertaining to mental retardation.

Facilities built with grants under this part will help us to apply the results of research and to increase the number of professional personnel who know how to diagnose and treat mental retardation.

Part C of title I authorizes grants to help States and communities build the various kinds of facilities required by the approximately 5 million retarded persons. These will include special "homes" and other residential facilities for retarded children and adults who cannot be cared for at home. Also eligible for construction grants will be special clinics, schools, and training facilities for mentally retarded children who live at home but who need special training or treatment to improve their capacity to be self-sufficient—or in some cases to earn a living.

Question. Why are there three different construction programs in title I? Could not one grant program cover all facilities?

Answer. There are three different construction programs in title I because the purposes of each program differ and could not as effectively be covered under one program. Research centers would carry out a broad program of research in the biological, medical, and behavioral sciences focused on the developmental problems that are associated with the cause of mental retardation. The emphasis in the university-affiliated program would be on the training of personnel who provide specialized services for the diagnosis and treatment, education, training, or care of the mentally retarded. Grants for research centers and for university-affiliated facilities do not contemplate such facilities in every State, so direct Federal project grants are therefore provided for these programs.

On the other hand, facilities for the care and treatment of mentally retarded are needed more uniformly throughout the Nation, in greater numbers and in relation to specific local needs. These can best be aided through a formula grant program.

Question. Why do we need new grant programs; why not use the existing Hill-Burton program and the existing research facilities grant program?

Answer. While existing construction grant programs have helped to build a few of the mental retardation facilities we need, they are not well suited to the particular needs in this field.

The Hill-Burton program is concerned with hospitals and other medical care facilities. It does not permit grants for the construction of residential facilities or facilities for the education or training of retarded children.

Under the existing research facilities construction program, a few facilities have been built that will concentrate on mental retardation research, but none of these could be classified as a comprehensive research center of the type contemplated by part A of title I. Such comprehensive centers are costly to build. The best way to assure construction of these special regional research centers is to earmark grant funds for this purpose only, with more liberal matching terms as in part A.

Question. Have we not already helped to build many such facilities under existing programs?

Answer. We have built some, but not many.

Under the Hill-Burton program only 42 facilities for the retarded have been built, mostly rehabilitation facilities. Under the terms of the Hill-Burton Act only health facilities are eligible for grants. This means that residential and training facilities are ineligible—except perhaps for some part of the facility—such as an infirmary—that is to be used for health purposes.

Under the existing research facilities grant program, only seven facilities particularly for mental retardation research have been built. Some of the more generalized medical research facilities built under this program will, of course, help to some degree in advancing research relating to retardation. But there is a particularly urgent need, as pointed out by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, for several regional research centers where comprehensive programs of research relating to many aspects of retardation can be conducted. These comprehensive centers will do a great deal to accelerate the whole pace of retardation research and will help to train the research workers' needs by other research institutions.

Question. How much does it cost to build one of these mental retardation research centers? How many could be built with the funds authorized in title I?

Answer. The wording of the bill does not specify the number of facilities to be constructed. Although the cost of each research center will vary somewhat, it is anticipated that the average cost of construction will be approximately $4 to $5 million. It is estimated that this total authorization of $20 million over a 3-year period would provide for the construction of approximately five to seven such centers with 75 percent Federal participation.

Question. What will it cost to construct a community facility for care of the mentally retarded?

Answer. This will vary greatly by size of community and presently existing facilities. If, for example, a community decided it needed and constructed a mental retardation facility of 200 custodial beds, 50 beds for day care, space for 50 patients in a sheltered workshop, and a halfway house for 10 patients, the cost would be as follows:

Type of unit	Number of patients	Cost
Custodial	200	$2,400,000
Day care	50	115,000
Sheltered workshop	50	135,000
Halfway house	10	45,000
Total		2,695,000

Question. If we enact this new legislation, will it not overlap or duplicate our existing programs?

Answer. No, the bill contains specific provisions to prevent any duplication. Under these provisions no grant can be made under any other provision of the Public Health Service Act for any facility described under the authorizations in title I of S. 1576. This covers both the Hill-Burton program—title VI of the Public Health Service Act—and the research facilities construction grant program—title VII of the Public Health Service Act.

Question. How do the terms of the Federal grants authorized under title I compare with those under the existing Hill-Burton program? With the existing research facilities grant program? Why the differences?

Answer. In general, the grant provisions in title I are patterned after those in existing programs, with differences only to meet the particular needs with respect to mental retardation facilities.

Most of the grant terms and conditions in part C of title I parallel the Hill-Burton Act provisions—including the matching requirements. The principal differences—other than the kinds of facilities eligible for grants—are in the formula governing State allotments and in the priority provisions. The Hill-Burton provisions were specifically developed to fit the national distribution of hospital bed shortages, which required extra attention to low-income States and to rural areas. These provisions are not appropriate, however, to the distribution of mental retardation facilities.

The principal difference between the grant conditions in part A—research centers—and those in the existing research facilities grant program is that grants under part A may be made up to 75 percent of construction costs. There is a 50-percent ceiling under the existing program. There are two reasons for the more liberal matching provisions of part A:

First, these comprehensive research centers are comparatively costly to build, and few medical schools or other research centers are likely to undertake this burden without special inducements.

Second, these research centers will be, in effect, regional facilities. As such they warrant somewhat more liberal construction grant assistance than ordinary research facilities.

Since grants under part B will also go to colleges and universities—in some cases the same institutions—where a research center is to be located, these provisions also permit grants up to 75 percent of construction costs.

Question. Part C calls for a single State agency. Will that be the same agency that administers the Hill-Burton program? If not, should it not be in order to avoid overlapping or duplication?

Answer. The selection of the State administering agency will be left to the States to determine. The State Hill-Burton agency—ordinarily the State health department—could be chosen and undoubtedly will be in many cases. If the State so chooses, however, it can create or designate another agency for this purpose. It should be noted that many of the facilities to be built under this program will not be health facilities, as the term is used in the Hill-Burton program, and there are many public and voluntary agencies interested in mental retardation programs in addition to the health departments.

As far as duplication is concerned, that is taken care of by specific nonduplication provisions in the bill itself. It is not necessary, therefore, to have the same State agency in order to avoid duplication.

Question. The bill includes provisions to prevent overlapping or duplication, but are there any provisions to assure the necessary coordination with existing programs?

Answer. Yes, there are several provisions that will contribute to this end.

In the first place, the new grant authorizations closely parallel the provisions governing existing programs.

Second, the agencies administering the existing programs will be used in the administration of the new programs. For example, the Federal Hospital Council—which assists in administering the Hill-Burton program—will assist in administering the State grant program under part C of title I. Similarly existing NIH advisory councils will be utilized in administering the research center construction grants under part A. While the bill does not specifically specify this, all provisions of title I are expected to be administered through the Public Health Service, which administers the existing programs.

Question. Where will the mental retardation research centers—part A—get their operating budget funds—will this lead to another new institute at NIH?

Answer. There will be no standard or uniform source of research program support for all centers. Like most research centers in other fields, their research budgets will come in part from the parent institution, in part from foundations, and in part from Federal research grants.

There will be no need for another NIH institute, because existing institutes already have adequate authority. The newly established Institute of Child Health and Human Development will have the broadest interests in the field of mental retardation, but important support for certain aspects of research will also come from other institutes—including the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Question. Why do the grant authorizations in parts A and B start in 1964 and run for 3 years, while the grants under part C do not start until 1965 and run for only 2 years?

Answer. The reason for the different starting dates is that the grants under part C are to be made in accordance with a State plan—as in the case of the Hill-Burton program. Therefore, the actual construction grants are different for a year to allow the States to develop their plans and to have these plans reviewed and approved by the Federal agency. Grants under parts A and B, however, are direct project grants to the individual research agency or university, so this additional planning time is not needed.

In order to give the Congress an early opportunity to review and appraise these new programs it was determined that all of the grant authorizations should terminate at the end of 3 years. This leaves only 2 years of actual program operations for the part C grant program.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 18:

TITLE II—CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Short title

SEC. 200. This title may be cited as the "Community Mental Health Center Act".

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated, for grants for construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall, in accordance with regulations, make allotments from the sums appropriated under section 201 to the several States on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the need for community mental health centers, and (3) the financial need of the respective States; except that no such allotment to any State, other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam, for any fiscal year may be less than $100,000. Sums so allotted to a State for a fiscal year and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such State for such purpose for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), in addition to the sums allotted for such State for such next fiscal year.

(b) In accordance with regulations of the Secretary, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of a project for the construction of a community mental health center in such other State. If it is found by the Secretary that construction of the center with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this title, to be used for the purpose referred to above.

(c) Upon the request of any State that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of such State under part C of title I and upon (1) the simultaneous certification to the Secretary by the State agency designated as provided in the State plan approved under this title to the effect that it has afforded a reasonable opportunity to make applications for the portion so specified and there have been no approvable applications for such portion or (2) a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that the need for facilities for the mentally retarded in such State is substantially greater than for community mental health centers, the Secretary shall, subject to such limitations as he may by regulation prescribe, promptly adjust the allotments of such State in accordance with such request and shall notify such State agency and the State agency designated under the State plan approved under part C of title I, and thereafter the allotments as so adjusted shall be deemed the State's allotments for purposes of this title and part C of title I.

Regulations

SEC. 203. Within six months after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council (established by section 633 of the Public Health Service Act), by general regulation applicable uniformly to all the States prescribe—

(1) the kinds of community mental health services needed to provide adequate mental health services for persons residing in a State;

(2) the general manner in which the State agency (designated as provided in the State plan approved under this title) shall determine the priority of projects based on the relative need of different areas, giving special consideration to projects on the basis of the extent to which the centers to be constructed thereby will, alone or in conjunction with other facilities owned or operated by the applicant or affiliated or associated with the applicant, provide comprehensive mental health services (as determined by the Secretary in accordance with regulations) for mentally ill persons in a particular community or communities or which will be part of or closely associated with a general hospital;

(3) general standards of construction and equipment for centers of different classes and in different types of location; and

(4) that the State plan shall provide for adequate community mental health centers for people residing in the State, and shall provide for adequate community mental health centers to furnish needed services for persons unable to pay therefor. Such regulations may require that before approval of an application for a center or addition to a center is recommended by a State agency, assurance shall be received by the State from the applicant that there will be made available in such center or addition a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor, but an exception shall be made if such a requirement is not feasible from a financial viewpoint.

State plans

SEC. 204. (a) After such regulations have been issued, any State desiring to take advantage of this title shall submit a State plan for carrying out its purposes. Such State plan must—

(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for the administration of the plan, or designate such agency as the sole agency for supervising the administration of the plan;

(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) hereof will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this title;

(3) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of nongovernment organizations or groups, and of State agencies, concerned with planning, operation, or utilization of community mental health centers or other mental health facilities, including representatives of consumers of the services provided by such centers and facilities who are familiar with the need for such services; to consult with the State agency in carrying out such plan;

(4) set forth a program for construction of community mental health centers (A) which is based on a statewide inventory of existing facilities and survey of need; (B) which conforms with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under section 203 (1); and (C) which meets the requirements for furnishing needed services to persons unable to pay therefor, included in regulations prescribed under section 203(4);

(5) set forth the relative need determined in accordance with the regulations prescribed under section 203(2), for the several projects included in such programs, and provide for the construction, insofar as financial resources available therefor and for maintenance and operation make possible, in the order of such relative need;

(6) provide such methods of administration of the State plan, including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis (except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual

employed in accordance with such methods), as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

(7) provide minimum standards (to be fixed in the discretion of the State) for the maintenance and operation of centers which receive Federal aid under this title;

(8) provide for affording to every applicant for a construction project an opportunity for hearing before the State agency;

(9) provide that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(10) Provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its State plan and submit to the Secretary any modifications thereof which it considers necessary.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a). The Secretary shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State.

Approval of projects

Sec. 205. (a) For each project for construction pursuant to a State plan approved under this title, there shall be submitted to the Secretary through the State agency an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof or by a public or other nonprofit agency. If two or more such agencies join in the construction of the project, the application may be filed by one or more of such agencies. Such application shall set forth—

(1) a description of the site for such project;

(2) plans and specifications therefor in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under section 203(3);

(3) reasonable assurance that title to such site is or will be vested in one or more of the agencies filing the application or in a public or other nonprofit agency which is to operate the community mental health center;

(4) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed, including staffing;

(5) reasonable assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of the project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5), and will receive compensation at rates not less than the rates determined in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87–581); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c); and

(6) a certification by the State agency of the Federal share for the project.

The Secretary shall approve such application if sufficent funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project are available from the allotment to the State, and if the Secretary finds (A) that the application contains such reasonable assurance as to title, financial support, and payment of prevailing rates of wages and overtime pay; (B) that the plans and specifications are in accord with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 203; (C) that the application is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 204 and contains an assurance that in the operation of the center there will be compliance with the applicable requirements of the State plan and of the regulations prescribed under section 203(4) for furnishing needed services for persons unable to pay therefor, and with State standards for operation and maintenance; (D) that the services to be provided by the center, alone or in conjunction with other facilities owned or operated by the applicant or affiliated or associated with the applicant, will be part of a program providing, principally for persons residing in a particular community or communities in or near which such center is to be situated, at least those essential elements of comprehensive mental health services for mentally ill persons which are prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with regulations; and (E) that the application has been approved and recommended by the State agency and is entitled to priority over other projects within the State in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 203(2). No application shall be disapproved by the Secretary until he has afforded the State agency an opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Amendment of any approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application.

Withholding of payments

Sec. 206. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency designated as provided in section 204(a)(1), finds—

(1) that the State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required by section 204 to be included in its State plan, or with regulations under this title;

(2) that any assurance required to be given in an application filed under section 205 is not being or cannot be carried out;

(3) that there is a substantial failure to carry out plans and specifications approved by the Secretary under section 205; or

(4) that adequate State funds are not being provided annually for the direct administration of the State plan,

the Secretary may forthwith notify the State agency that—

(5) no further payments will be made to the State from allotments under this title; or

(6) no further payments will be made from allotments under this title for any project or projects designated by the Secretary as being affected by the action or inaction referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3) or (4) of this section,

as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances; and, except with regard to any project for which the application has already been approved and which is not directly affected, further payments from such allotments may be withheld, in whole or in part, until there is no longer any failure to comply (or to carry out the assurance or plans and specifications or to provide adequate State funds, as the case may be) or, if such compliance (or other action) is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys to which the recipient was not entitled.

Nonduplication of grants

Sec. 207. No grant may be made under any provision of the Public Health Service Act, for any of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1964, and ending June 30, 1966, for construction of any facility described in this title.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record, where I shall pose a number of questions and insert answers thereto for the information of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. These are the questions and answers to which I referred:

Question. What is a comprehensive community mental health center? What services will it provide?

Answer. A comprehensive community mental health center is a community facility that will provide a full range of services appropriate to all degrees and stages of mental illness. It will provide 24-hour-a-day intensive hospitalization for the very sick, part-time hospitalization during the night only for those who can work, and outpatient treatment, and followup services. The patient will be able to move freely from one service to another as the course of his illness determines.

The services and programs of the comprehensive community mental health center will usually include: A general diagnostic and evaluation service, an inpatient service for acute cases, an outpatient service, a day-care service, a night-care service, an emergency service available around the clock, rehabilitation services, consultation services, public information and education services, and supervision of foster homes, for both children and adults.

The primary consideration for any community is the provision of services rather than bricks and mortar. The buildings necessary will be those needed to provide such services. Special consideration will be given to rounding out facilities and services already in existence and a large proportion of the centers will, of course, be developed in conjunction with general hospitals. Facilities necessary include inpatient wards, outpatient treatment rooms, for groups and individuals, appropriate space for day and night care programs, and space for preventive and consultative activities.

Question. How does a comprehensive community mental health center differ from a State mental hospital? From a community mental health clinic?

Answer. The typical State mental hospital is a large institution, usually caring for several thousand patients admitted from communities all over the State. It is often located in a rural or outlying area. Because of its size, and because it is far from the homes of most of its patients, it gives primary emphasis to inpatient treatment and custodial care, although most hospitals include some diagnostic or outpatient services. Some hospitals provide transitional and followup services, but since most patients are far from home these services are limited to a small proportion of the patients served.

The typical community mental health clinic, on the other hand, concentrates on diagnostic and outpatient services, often limited to certain categories of patients. It is usually not equipped to provide inpatient care for the acutely ill, transitional services—day or night care only—or rehabilitation services for those recovering from a mental illness.

The comprehensive community mental health center will provide the whole spectrum of services for persons in one local community. Furthermore, these services will be provided in centralized or coordinated facilities, so that a patient can proceed from diagnosis to treatment, and to followup care without having to make new admissions arrangements to meet his changing needs.

Question. Will these centers be a part of or affiliated with a community hospital?

Answer. Yes, this will be the most common arrangement. If the hospital already has a psychiatric wing or services, additional construction for outpatient and day facilities will be necessary. Many general hospitals will, under impetus of this program, develop psychiatric inpatient services for the first time by construction of an additional wing, or renovation of existing facilities.

Other arrangements will include the establishment of centers as a part of or affiliated with a State hospital or health department facility. As for the community hospital, additional construction would be required where necessary to provide a comprehensive program of services. In all cases, maximum consideration will be given to existing resources in order to avoid duplication, to hold down costs, to achieve the best possible utilization of manpower.

Question. How much does it cost to build such a center?

Answer. Costs of construction will, of course, depend on the size of the facility and the range of services to be provided. A completely new comprehensive center providing a total spectrum of services will cost approximately $1,700,000. A lesser cost, of course, will be involved when one or two components are added to existing facilities to achieve comprehensiveness. On the average, it is estimated that projects will cost about $1.3 million. These costs include construction, fees, and all equipment but not the cost of the site.

There are total cost figures, including both the Federal grant and the local matching funds. The Federal grant will range from one-third to two-thirds of the construction costs—averaging one-half for the Nation as a whole.

Question. How many centers can be built with the funds authorized in title II?

Answer. It is estimated that a total of 177 centers could be constructed with the $115 million authorized for this purpose for the 2 years of the grant authorization. This estimate is based on an average total cost of $1.3 million for each center and an average Federal grant of one-half of the project cost.

Question. Why do we need a new grant program? Why not use the existing Hill-Burton program to build these mental health facilities?

Answer. The existing Hill-Burton program has helped to build some community mental health facilities—particularly psychiatric wings or units in general hospitals—but, over the life of the program, only about 3 percent of the total grant funds appropriated have been used to build mental health facilities.

There are many reasons for this lack of emphasis on mental health facilities under the Hill-Burton program. It provides no earmarking of funds for this purpose. The allotment and priority provisions are geared primarily to general bed shortages and to needs of rural areas and smaller cities. Furthermore, the existing categorical grant authorizations—for hospitals, nursing homes, diagnostic centers, et cetera—do not lend themselves readily to such multipurpose facilities as community mental health centers.

It would have been possible, of course, to add an entirely new categorical amendment to the existing program authority, but this would have required many revisions and amendments of existing provisions of law.

Furthermore, the existing Hill-Burton authority expires next June 30. The President has indicated that he intends to submit legislative recommendations to extend and modify this authority, but these recommendations have not yet been submitted.

Under these circumstances the simplest and most direct means of meeting the need for a grant program to build mental health facilities is to enact new program legislation embodying the tested concepts and provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, but specifically designed to meet the requirements for mental health facilities.

Question. Will the State agency required by title II be the same agency that administers the Hill-Burton program in the State?

Answer. The bill leaves the selection of the appropriate agency to the discretion of each State. In some cases the States will undoubtedly choose the agency now administering the Hill-Burton program, which is usually the State health agency. In other cases, particularly where there is a separate State mental health agency, another agency may be chosen.

Question. What provision does the bill make to prevent duplication with the Hill-Burton program?

Answer. In order to eliminate any duplication between the two programs, the committee has included language in the bill which would prohibit grants under any provision of the Public Health Service Act for the construction of facilities described in title II of the bill. This applies, of course, to title VI of the Public Health Service Act, which contains the statutory authority for the Hill-Burton program.

Question. What provision is made to assure the necessary coordination with the Hill-Burton program?

Answer. The bill provides for coordination with the Hill-Burton program through the Federal Hospital Council, which is the responsible advisory body to the Hill-Burton program. The Federal Hospital Council is expanded by the legislation to include a person of particular competence in the field of mental health. The regulations promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this bill, will require the approval of the Federal Hospital Council. This same group approves regulations for the Hill-Burton program.

Further, the bill requires a statewide inventory of existing facilities and a survey of need. Such a survey would necessarily take into account relevant existing and planned general medical facilities which might serve as a core facility for a community mental health center.

Question. Where will these new centers obtain their professional staff? Is not there already such a shortage of mental health specialists that existing facilities have manpower shortages?

Answer. The high priority currently being put on efforts at increasing manpower for the mental health professions will result in the production of increased manpower. Such efforts include increasing the number of medical schools, increased recruitment into the mental health professions, and increasing the scholarship funds available for those who are interested in such training.

There is a current shortage. However, experience has shown that professional personnel will seek employment in settings which challenge their professional skills and where continued professional development is likely. The new centers will attract not only newly trained personnel seeking this challenge, but also the more experienced personnel.

The presence of the centers within communities will attract personnel who previously were reluctant to work in geographically isolated State mental hospitals. In addition greater use will be made of family physicians by their having available the centers for the direct care of their patients.

Question. Why do we have to replace our State mental hospitals instead of improving what we already have?

Answer. In some cases it will be feasible and desirable to convert existing hospitals, at least in part, to the needs of the communities in which they are located. And for some years to come we will have to rely on what is already available. For the long run, however, there are many reasons why replacement will be required in most cases:

Two-thirds of our State mental hospitals were built before 1900; less than one-third are accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals; 18 percent of the beds are rated as nonacceptable, on the basis of fire and health hazards, by appropriate State agencies; a large majority are located far from the population centers they serve; the magnitude of renovation needed would be very costly in most cases; and in the long run, community centers will be more effective and more economical.

Question. Where will the operating funds for these centers come from?

Answer. In addition to fees from patients, the States and communities have varied plans for support of these centers. For example: First, some States have enacted community mental health acts with authorization of funds for support of community centers; second, additional funds will be provided through welfare payments; third, increasing numbers of mentally ill patients will be covered by insurance; fourth, after a few years of successful operation the effectiveness of a center will become an accepted fact within the community; and the center will be in a position to make effective demands for local tax support, and of equal importance, will be in a position to conduct effective fund raising campaigns; and fifth, because more emphasis can be given to early diagnosis and intensive shorttime treatment, many patients will be able to pay for all or part of their treatment—just as they do for physical illnesses and injuries.

Question. It is claimed that replacing State mental hospitals with community centers will save money in the long run. How can we save money by building and staffing new centers?

Answer. Services of the comprehensive community mental health center will make available early and prompt care of many cases that now remain untreated until prolonged State hospital care is necessary. The length of stay of psychiatric admissions in general hospitals now averages less than 30 days as contrasted with several months or years at State mental hospitals. Even with the higher per diem rates in general hospitals this results in a considerable saving of money during the illness. Prompt convenient care and treatment will rapidly return the majority of patients to their jobs and family responsibilities, keep them productive, and thus save money in the long run. The center will also serve as a base for preventive consultation and education programs, reducing the predictable increase in new cases of mental illness.

Question. If the States will be saving money, why can they not put these savings into the building of community mental health centers?

Answer. The savings to the State will not be immediate. When a number of communities are operating community mental health centers the number of new admissions to State hospitals will drop significantly, and this will reduce State expenditures for the administration of these hospitals.

For the immediate future, however, the States will continue to carry heavy financial burdens for the care of the mentally ill. Furthermore, to improve the quality of care to patients in existing State hospitals will in many cases require additional expenditures in the immediate future.

Under these circumstances, it is more reasonable for the communities to look to the States for some help in meeting the operating costs of local facilities than for the substantial outlays required for construction costs.

Question. Will the community mental health centers also take care of the mentally retarded?

Answer. Only to a limited extent. Diagnostic services will be available to them, because in many cases it is difficult to determine whether the lack of mental development is due to retardation or to an emotional problem. In addition, mentally retarded persons often develop emotional problems because of their handicaps, and they could go to a community mental health center for treatment of these problems, just as other people who have emotional problems.

Community mental health centers will not be used, however, to provide residential care or educational or training services for the mentally retarded.

Question. Will these centers be used for the compulsory treatment of mentally ill persons—that is, will people be committed to these institutions?

Answer. There will be some commitments—but far fewer than in the typical State mental hospital. The primary emphasis will be on early diagnosis and treatment, before the mental illness is so severe as to require commitment procedures.

As a rule, patients will be admitted voluntarily to the center and therefore legal commitments will be unnecessary. Only in exceptional circumstances as, for example, when the center offers diagnostic and treatment services to courts and child care agencies, may patients be under commitment.

Question. Is there anything in the bill, S. 1576, that will modify or require changes in State laws relating to the commitment or treatment of the mentally ill?

Answer. No, title II simply provides for Federal construction grants to help build community facilities. It leaves the administration of these facilities—and all matters relating to legal commitment—to the communities and to the States.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this time to comment briefly upon the provisions of this bill which establish requirements for a State plan and those which provide for judicial review in the event that a State plan is determined to be not satisfactory by the Secretary, or in the event that a project proposed is rejected by the Secretary.

The committee in this case, in this particular bill, has done a good job. From time to time, the Committee on Education and Labor deals with Federal grant-in-aid programs; most of them utilize a State plan. It is important, in my opinion, that such legislation set forth definite and meaningful criteria, and that the question of whether a proposed State plan or a project is satisfactory not be left completely to the discretion of an official in the executive branch.

If a State plan meets the criteria laid down in the legislation the Secretary or executive official should be required to approve it. I am happy to note that, in this legislation, the committee has done a very careful job in that respect. The legislation does not leave a great deal of discretion to the Secretary. It provides that if the plan meets the legislative criteria the Secretary shall be required to approve it.

I make these points because of an experience which the State of Michigan has had with another program, specifically the program of aid for dependent children of unemployed parents. That program is similar in some respects.

Under the ADC-U program, unfortunately—and I do not think it was deliberate on anyone's part—there are no requirements which compel the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to follow the letter and spirit of the law in passing upon State programs. After the Secretary refused to approve the program adopted by Michigan, there is little that the State can do because that particular law contained no provision for judicial review. Under that law, an arbitrary and unreasonable disapproval cannot be challenged.

In this bill and in the college construction bill which we recently passed, there is a provision for judicial review in the event the executive branch should decide that a plan is unsatisfactory.

I raise this matter at this time for another reason. There is a bill now pending before another committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I refer to H.R. 3846. That bill is designed to provide Federal funds to assist States in developing recreational areas. I have looked at the bill as it has gone to the committee. I hope some of the members of the committee will take note that H.R. 3846 contains no provision for judicial review, and it would establish practically no criteria or meaningful limitations on the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

That bill would vest the Secretary of the Department of the Interior with a great deal of discretion and arbitrary power.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that bill will be corrected along the lines of the one now before this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF MENTALLY RETARDED AND OTHER HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Training of teachers of handicapped children

SEC. 301. (a) (1) The second sentence of the first section of the Act of September 6, 1958 (Public Law 85-926), is amended by striking out "Such grants" and inserting in lieu thereof "Grants under this section" and by striking out "fellowships" and inserting in lieu thereof "fellowships or traineeships".

(2) Such section is further amended by inserting before the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "He is also authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing professional or advanced training for personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of handicapped children, as supervisors of such teachers, or as speech correctionists or other specialists providing special services for education of such children, or engaged or preparing to engage in research in fields related to education of such children."

(3) The first sentence of such section is amended by striking out "mentally retarded children" and inserting in lieu thereof "mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children (hereinafter in this Act referred to as 'handicapped children')". Section 2 of such Act is amended by striking out "mentally retarded children" and inserting in lieu thereof "handicapped children".

(4) The second sentence of section 3 of such Act is repealed. Section 7 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this Act $11,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $14,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and $19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966."

(5) The amendments made by this subsection shall apply in the case of fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, except that deaf children shall not be included as "handicapped children" for purposes of such amendments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

(b) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in establishing and maintaining scholarships, with such stipends as may be determined by the Commissioner, for training personnel preparing to engage in employment as teachers of the deaf."

(c)(1) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 6 of the Act of September 22, 1961 (Public Law 87-276, 20 U.S.C. 676) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 6 is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1964".

Research and demonstration projects in education of handicapped children

SEC. 302. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the next two fiscal years, the sum of $2,000,000 to enable the Commissioner of Education to make grants to States, State or local educational agencies, public and nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, and other public or nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations for research or demonstration projects relating to education for mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "handicapped children"). Such grants shall be made in installments, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and on such conditions as the Commissioner of Education may determine.

(b) The Commissioner of Education is authorized to appoint such special or technical advisory committees as he may deem necessary to advise him on matters of general policy relating to particular fields of education of handicapped children or relating to special services necessary thereto or special problems involved therein.

(c) The Commissioner of Education shall also from time to time appoint panels of experts who are competent to evaluate various type of research or demonstration projects under this section, and shall secure the advice and recommendations of such a panel before making any such grant in the field in which such experts are competent.

(d) Members of any committee or panel appointed under this section who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of such committee or panel, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Commissioner of Education is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this section, except the promulgation of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of title III). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read and printed at this point in the RECORD and open for amendment at any point. I also ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD questions and answers relating to title III of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the questions and answers to which I referred are as follows.

Estimate of allocation of funds by area of exceptionality: It is estimated that for the first year depending upon the demands and the advice of committees authorized by the law would be about as follows: 50 percent for the mentally retarded; 10 percent for the emotionally disturbed; 12 percent for the deaf; 15 percent for speech and hearing; 7 percent for the crippled and the health impaired; and 6 percent for the visually handicapped.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963—Title III: Training of Teachers of Handicapped Children (sec. 301)

FISCAL YEAR 1964

Category	Estimated number of grants	Estimated average cost per grant	Total cost
Grants for teachers and specialists	1,600	[1] 4,500	$7,200,000
Supervisors and program directors	500	[1] 6,000	3,000,000
Short-term trainees	4,000	[1] 500	2,000,000
Stimulation grants to institutions of higher education	16	50,000	800,000
Total			[2] 13,000,000

FISCAL YEAR 1965

Category	Estimated number of grants	Estimated average cost per grant	Total cost
Grants for teachers and specialists	1,700	[1] 4,500	$7,650,000
Supervisors and program directors	725	[1] 6,000	4,350,000
Short-term trainees	4,000	[1] 500	2,000,000
Stimulation grants to institutions of higher education	10	50,000	500,000
Total			14,500,000

FISCAL YEAR 1966

Category	Estimated number of grants	Estimated average cost per grant	Total cost
Grants for teachers and specialists	2,500	[1] 4,500	$11,250,000
Supervisors and program directors	1,000	[1] 6,000	6,000,000
Short-term trainees	3,500	[1] 500	1,750,000
Stimulation grants to institutions of higher education	10	50,000	500,000
Total			19,500,000

[1] Includes costs to institutions (tuition, fees, etc.) and living allowances to awardees and dependents.

[2] Includes $1,000,000 already authorized for expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded. Approximately 160 grants are supported.

Cooperative research funds expended for general and special education of handicapped

Fiscal year	Total budget	Amount expended for special education of handicapped [1]
1957	$1,000,000	$710,712
1958	2,300,000	1,304,792
1959	2,700,000	1,173,216
1960	3,200,000	868,179
1961	3,300,000	546,722
1962	4,600,000	529,033
1963	6,900,000	747,049
Total	24,000,000	5,879,703

[1] From pp. 162-166, hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 88th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1576.

SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

First. Who are considered handicapped children?

The categories used by the Office of Education in collecting national statistics on the education of handicapped children and understood generally by special educators, based as it is on continuous communication with the school systems maintaining programs for the handicapped children, probably represents a list which is as generally accepted and used among educators as one can find—see reference 1. This list includes:

1. Partially seeing.
2. Blind.
3. Deaf.
4. Hard of hearing.
5. Speech impaired.
6. Crippled.
7. Special health problems.
8. Emotionally disturbed.
9. Mentally retarded ("educable" and "trainable").

See reference 2 for definitions on some categories.

Second. How many children are there in need of special education?

There are a total of about 10 percent of the school-age population—or a little less than 6 million children—who require special education. For prevalence estimates according to area of exceptionality see reference No. 1, estimates of the number of school-age exceptional children in the United States who will need special education in 1963 and the number of special educational teachers that will be needed. For example, the prevalence of deafness among school-age children is about .075.

Third. What proportion of handicapped children are estimated to be receiving special education?

On the basis of fact and estimates, it appears that only about one-quarter or about 1¼ million of the school-age children in need of special education in the Nation are receiving it—see reference No. 3, page 3.

Fourth. Is there a shortage of profession personnel to instruct and to direct programs?

It is estimated that 200,000 are needed and only about 50,000 are available. Development of special education is hampered not only by shortages of teachers and speech correctionists but also by a shortage of experienced persons to organize and supervise programs in the schools and to conduct programs of teacher preparation in colleges and universities—see reference No. 4.

Fifth. Are there professional standards for teachers of handicapped children?

Every State educational agency has certification requirements for teachers. Within the last quarter of century special certification requirements have been developing for teachers of handicapped children. Every State has a special requirement in one or more areas, but in many States standards are still in a developmental stage. Furthermore, many teachers in special education have not fully met their certification requirements. To say that there is a shortage of special educators is to tell only a part of the story. These statistics on certification are based on preliminary Office of Education data on State certification standards for teachers of exceptional children.

Sixth. What is the Federal Government doing to contribute to the solution of the personnel problem?

The Office of Education conducts two fellowship grant programs. One, under Public Law 85-926 approved in 1958 for a 10-year period, is in the field of education of the mentally retarded and limited to $1 million appropriation per year. The other, under Public Law 87-276, is a grant-in-aid program for the training of teachers of the deaf which is limited to $1½ million appropriation each year. The latter program, approved in September 1961, expired on June 30 of this year. The Office also conducts a relevant information and consultative service.

Seventh. What has been done under Public Law 85-926, the graduate fellowship program in the education of the mentally retarded?

During the 4 years that the program has been in operation, about 667 fellowships have been awarded to nearly 470 individuals in every State except Vermont. It is estimated that, by the end of fiscal year 1964, a total of 835 fellowships will have been awarded to about 560 persons. Since there were some regions in the Nation where opportunities did not exist for individuals to study at the doctoral level under the program authorized by Public Law 85-926, stimulation grants of $10,500 each have been made in an effort to rectify this geographic inequity.

Twenty-five institutions have been allocated fellowships under section 1 of Public Law 85-926 from academic year 1959-60 to 1963-64. Seven institutions have received stimulation grants—see reference No. 5.

Information available on 172 former fellows shows that almost 90 percent are engaged in some type of special education activity and over 70 percent—of the 172 former fellows—are working specifically in the area of mental retardation. The majority of the 172 former fellows are currently employed in various types of leadership positions. There are, however, some former fellows who are, at present, teaching in special classes for mentally retarded children, but some of them will move into leadership positions as they develop.

When the program was initiated, those advising the Office of Education recommended that the funds be used for training leadership personnel in the field of education of the mentally retarded. At the present time, emphasis is on training college and university instructors and directors of educational programs. Teachers may be trained under section 2 of this program, but this has not been implemented although it is planned to do so.

Eighth. What has been done under Public Law 87-276, the program for training teachers of the deaf?

Public Law 87-276, the program for training teachers of the deaf, was enacted in September 1961. During its first year of operation, the 1962-63 academic year, there were 446 training grants allocated to 43 colleges and universities in 29 States and the District of Columbia. Although 370 students actually received support under Public Law 87-276 during 1962-63, there were 470 students preparing to become teachers of the deaf according to the American Annals for the Deaf. For the 1963-64 academic year there are 496 fellowships awarded to 46 institutions of higher education in 29 States and the District of Columbia. The increased number of scholarships represents more complete utilization of funds remaining from the 1962-63 academic year.

The favorable impact of Public Law 87-276 is evidenced by the doubling of first, student inquiries concerning the field; second, student applications and ultimately increased enrollments of higher caliber persons. The need has not been eliminated but progress such as this should substantially reduce the great shortage of well-trained personnel in the field of education of the deaf.

Ninth. In making these grants what are the Federal requirements?

They are minimal relating to citizenship and educational experience—see references 6 and 7.

Tenth. Are there colleges prepared to accept students?

The number of colleges and universities offering preparation in one or more areas has almost doubled between 1953-54 and 1961-62. According to the study on College and University Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children, the number of institutions of higher learning giving a minimum sequence in one or more areas of special education during academic year 1961-62 was about 225, compared to only 122 8 years earlier. A number of other institutions are involved in the preparation of special education personnel to a lesser degree or have initiated new programs since the completion of the study—see reference No. 8.

Eleventh. Is there a need for Federal fellowships in areas of special education where they are not now available?

Yes. It is estimated that only about one-fourth of the Nation's handicapped children now have access to special education they require. It appears that the greatest single obstacle to the initiation of new programs is the shortage of qualified teachers to direct and supervise school programs for them and to conduct university programs of teacher preparation. If the present rate of development of special education continues, by 1968 the Nation will be little more than holding its own. At the present rate of preparation, one-third of the handicapped children instead of one-fourth would have access to some kind of special education. Increased Federal support would help to close this gap more rapidly. Considerable progress was made in the number of degrees granted in special education from 1954 to 1961. The number more than doubled. Here again the progress is too slow—see references No. 8 and No. 9.

Twelfth. Would the Federal fellowships programs be completely federally supported?

It appears that the colleges and universities which train students under the Public Law 85-926 graduate fellowship program in the education of the mentally retarded, and under the Public Law 87-276, grants-in-aid program for training teachers of the deaf, are spending more for training such students than they are receiving from the Federal Government. The present programs, in effect, are being supported in part by the States and colleges and universities involved as well as by the Federal Government.

Thirteenth. What is the relationship between health and care and special education?

A team approach involving persons from many disciplines including health is essential in the education of handicapped children. Most of these children require frequent medical attention. The special teacher must be prepared to communicate with medical authorities, to utilize the information they provide and to understand the educational implications of each child's disabling condition. The close working relationship between special education and health is apparent. Many special teachers instruct children who are in hospitals or convalescent homes and those who are fitted with special prosthetic devices and hearing and optical aids.

Fourteenth. Why should there be a legally designated research and demonstration program for exceptional children?

In a new and developing field such as special education, research demonstration and program activities need to be closely related. Professional nurture is required to make sure that the most crucial issues are funded for research and demonstrations and that findings are quickly disseminated for field testing and application in the actual instruction of children.

Creative research in education today demands specialization of background on the part of the research worker combined with a long-time systematic program in that specialty. On this reasoning, a great deal of federally sponsored research has been channeled. A good illustration may be found in the NIH, where programs for such problems as cancer, heart diseases, or dental problems are set up under separate institutes.

The same reasoning applies to research in the education of exceptional children. Only by specific designation of the areas can effective research be done. Research, moreover, in areas as new and unexplored as these must be closely related to the practical problems and programs in the field. This is essential for the adequate identification of significant problems.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point a list of the references referred to in my preceding remarks:

1. Table of preliminary estimates of the number of special education teachers needed in 1963 to instruct each type of handicapped child included in S. 1576.
2. Memorandum on some categories of exceptional children in special education.
3. Mackie, Romaine P. and Robbins, Patricia P. "Exceptional Children and Youth: A Chart Book of Special Education Enrollments in Public Day Schools of the United States," OE-35019.
4. Mackie, Romaine P. "Education of Exceptional Children: Program, Progress, Problems," OE-35043; reprint from School Life, July 1962.
5. List of institutions allocated fellowships under section 1, Public Law 85-926, academic years 1959-60 and 1963-64.
6. "The Grants-in-Aid Program for the Training of Teachers of the Deaf, Under the Provisions of Public Law 87-276"; a leaflet.
7. "The Graduate Fellowship Program for the Preparation of Leadership Personnel in the Education of Mentally Retarded Children," OE-35001A; a leaflet.
8. Mackie, Romaine P., Neuber, Margaret A., and Hunter, Patricia P. "College and University Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children"; a reprint from School Life, March 1963.
9. Mackie, Romaine P., and Dunn, Lloyd M. "College and University Programs for the Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children," bulletin 1954, No. 13.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 80, line 10, insert the word "seriously" before "emotionally"; on line 11 after the word "children" insert "who by reason thereof require special education."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take long on this amendment. However, I would like to say that this is offered in an effort to make the description of the categories of handicapped children in conformity with the same descriptions contained in the bill that was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor. It pins it down to those who are seriously handicapped to such an extent that they require special education in order to make sure that the efforts placed on the specialists will be toward those who need special education.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Minnesota was very cordial and courteous in giving us on the committee an opportunity to observe the amendment. After analyzing it and discussing it with other members, we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 81, lines 4 through 12, strike out all of subsection (b); on line 13 strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to remove the special treatment for the teachers of the deaf. The program for the teachers of the deaf which has been in effect for the last 2 years provided for scholarship grants for undergraduate training. Under the provisions of the bill, if my amendment is adopted, this program would be continued for 1 more year. The law which expired on June 30 of this year would extend for 1 year, but that would be the end of it. After that a teacher of the deaf would be trained exactly the way in which the teachers of all the other handicapped are trained; that is, they would receive fellowships or traineeships for the people who had already completed their undergraduate training.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under this provision, the only reason why some people can say you need any scholarship money is to induce people to go into the training of these handicapped groups in their senior year, and if such could be worked out, I would be willing to accept this to be worked out in conference. However, I think we set a principle last year to the effect that the House would not accept scholarship grants for undergraduate training, that anyone suited in their undergraduate training by the Federal Government would be so helped by loans through this action of the Federal Government. Through the use of grants you induce someone into a special work and I think it is unwise for the Federal Government to induce someone into any occupation. I think the assistance ought to be rendered to all needing this because of the ability of the students. I think this amendment would bring all the handicapped groups, after a period of transition, into conformity with each other, because there would be a uniform standard for all.

Mr. Chairman, because of this I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I can fully realize the purposes the gentleman from Minnesota has in mind in offering the amendment. I fully realize that he has in mind the idea to make uniform the position of Congress with reference to the principle of scholarships in these various programs.

It will be recalled that when H.R. 12 was reported by our committee and passed the House the members of our committee, and I think it was unanimous in our committee, took the position that scholarships would not be provided, therefore we eliminated the provision on scholarships. I think that is the general position of the committee. However, I feel that in any broad general program there are exceptions that may be necessary, and I have a feeling this may be one of those exceptions.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am going to accept the gentleman's amendment at this time, but I want to make it clear that I do so with a feeling that more information is necessary before we conclude definitely what the situation should be in the application of the policy at this point. We will take it to conference and there we will undertake to obtain further information. We have a great deal of information which was developed in the course of the hearings which I think may justify an exception in this case. I do think there is a way it can be worked out. With that reservation, we will take it to conference and I will do my best to work it out accordingly.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think our two States are peculiarly affected by this amendment. I wish to go along with the same reservation that the gentleman makes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Where are the loans coming from? In lieu of scholarships the gentleman from Minnesota said it would be set up under the loan program, but where is the money coming from?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Minnesota has in mind that it is a training program and fellowships are applicable at the graduate level, is that true?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, special assistance for the teachers of the handicapped at the graduate level. We also have a program for loans for all teachers and their forgiveness of 50 percent of the loan for the teachers. If we can get the bill out and before the House it will pass. We should expand this and take the limit off, and I believe this would be quickly accepted by the House.

Mr. HARRIS. We were told during the course of the hearings that they had to look to the senior year of the undergraduate level to obtain people that would become interested in this program. It occurs to me if that is true, in conference we could work out some compromise on this that would permit these funds to be used at that level, instead of perhaps tying them down to the graduate level which the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. FOGARTY. The point I want to make is $90 million is authorized for student loans, which is not half enough at the present time. In my State 50 percent of the students applying for these loans are not going to get them because we are not appropriating sufficient funds. We do not have the authorization at this time.

Our committee gave the full amount of $90 million, but it is not half enough, and I do not think we should mislead anyone that in lieu of scholarships they are going to get loans.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct, but I believe he is talking about the budget for the National Defense Education Act program. This is a different program altogether.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Minnesota referred to it.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that. The gentleman makes the point no funds are available for this loan program which is correct. This, however, is a different program. I accept the gentleman's amendment with the reservation I have made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 81, line 25, strike "States,". On page 82, line 1, strike "or local"; line 3, strike "educational or"; line 6, insert the word "seriously" before "emotionally"; line 7, after the word "children" insert "who by reason thereof require special education."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do would be to require that grants for research or demonstration projects would be made only to State educational agencies, who in turn could engage the assistance of local educational agencies and school districts. They also could be made to public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, who in turn could turn to the local school districts, and other public or nonprofit private research agencies, so the commissioner would have the choice of these three agencies he could turn to.

The reason I say this is that it would set up a new principle, if this was continued without the amendment being adopted, of the Federal Government's going direct to the school districts or the local education agencies. At no time has this been permitted to be done. When people talk about Federal control of education, they are concerned about going to the local school districts. I think in a research and demonstration program it would be unwise to do that. It would be better to go through the State educational agency or the institution of higher learning to which the grant was made.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I can see only one phase of the gentleman's amendment that I seriously question. May I ask a question of the gentleman to see if I have proper understanding of it? Is it the intention of the gentleman to eliminate such projects on a local educational level?

Mr. QUIE. Not to eliminate them from taking part but to eliminate the authority for the commissioner to go direct to the local school district.

Mr. HARRIS. How are you going to get to the school district?

Mr. QUIE. By making a grant to the State educational agency, which in turn would make it to the local school district, or by making the grant to the institution of higher learning, which would make it available to the local school district.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman would have the university reallocate the grant? I do not know of anything that would prevent that. Would the commissioner have any authority over what the higher institution is going to do with the grant funds after the institution once gets them?

Mr. QUIE. It would be the same as in the cooperative research program now, where the commissioner makes his grants to the State educational agency or to the institution, who in turn works out its program in this way.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman does not intend to eliminate the local educational agencies if it seems to be appropriate to the commissioner?

Mr. QUIE. No, the local educational agency is not eliminated, but it must go through the State, either the higher educational institution or the State educational agency. He must do it through them, so he is not dealing directly with the local school district, circumventing the State educational agency.

Mr. HARRIS. The State educational agency then may arrange with a local educational agency for such projects?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. That is what I would expect.

Mr. HARRIS. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] a question with regard to title II of the bill. The committee in reporting this legislation to the House has deleted the authorization which was in the Senate version of this legislation for Federal assistance in the case of the initial staffing of these community health centers. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if, when this legislation goes to conference, the conferees will feel bound to stand by the House version of this bill, as reported by the committee, and not grant this money for the initial staffing of these centers.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, I have always believed it is the duty of the House Committee of Conference to adhere insofar as it can to the position of the House. That is generally my concept of the duty of a conference committee from the House that goes into session with the other body. I have already made it abundantly clear that the committee took a position against providing for initial staffing of the mental health centers. That is our committee's position, and now that position has been accepted by the Committee of the Whole. We will hold to that position just so long as we feel it is the appropriate thing to do. So far as I am personally concerned, I will not approve any provision that will include outright initial staffing. I cannot finally bind myself or the committee, however, because we know when we get into a conference we have to compromise—we have to do the best we can to get the best legislation out that is possible under the circumstances.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV of the bill be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD and open for amendment, and that I be permitted to insert a series of questions and answers concerning title IV.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the questions and answers to which I referred are as follows:

> Question. What is meant by "medical transportation facilities?" See page 85, line 2.
>
> Answer. "Medical transportation facilities" refers to ambulances or other vehicles needed for transporting patients to or from a health facility. This is the same definition of "initial equipment" that is in the Hill-Burton Act.
>
> Ambulances may be required by at least the larger community mental health centers. In the case of mental retardation facilities there will ordinarily be no need for an ambulance, but they may need station wagons or other conveyances to transport retarded children to and from the facility for rehabilitation or recreational purposes.
>
> Question. Can an applicant receive a grant for buying an existing building and remodeling it, rather than building a new one?
>
> Answer. Under the definition of "construction" in the bill, a grant could be made for a part of the costs of altering or remodeling a building. It could not, however, cover the costs of purchasing any land or existing building.
>
> This exclusion of land and building acquisition costs is the same as in the Hill-Burton authority.
>
> The reason for this exclusion of property acquisition costs is that it would be very difficult for the Federal agency administering the program to evaluate the reasonableness of such acquisition costs. In the case of actual construction costs it is relatively easy to check them with reliable construction cost data. But land costs are much more difficult to evaluate, and it is particularly difficult to distinguish between the value of land and the value of existing structures on such land.
>
> Question. Why is it that some of the authorities in the bill are vested in the Surgeon General or in the Commissioner of Education and others in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?
>
> Answer. The provisions of part A of title I—mental retardation research centers—amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act, which authorizes the existing research facilities grant program. Since the statutory authority under the existing law is vested in the Surgeon General, the proposed amendments follow this pattern.

The same situation prevails with respect to the provisions in title III of the bill, which would amend various statutes under which authority is now vested in the Commissioner of Education.

All of the other authorities, which are "new legislation" rather than amendments, are vested in the Secretary. It is expected, of course, that the Secretary will delegate most of these authorities—other than the promulgation of regulations—to existing agencies of his Department. The various construction grant programs for mental retardation and mental health facilities, for example, will be administered through the Public Health Service, where they can be coordinated with related construction grant programs.

Title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—GENERAL

Definitions

SEC. 401. For purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" includes Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "facility for the mentally retarded" means a facility specially designed for the diagnosis, treatment, education, training, or custodial care of the mentally retarded, including facilities for training specialists and sheltered workshops for the mentally retarded, but only if such workshops are part of facilities which provide or will provide comprehensive services for the mentally retarded.

(c) The term "community mental health center" means a facility providing services for the prevention or diagnosis of mental illness, or care and treatment of mentally ill patients, or rehabilitation of such persons, which services are provided principally for persons residing in a particular community or communities in or near which the facility is situated.

(d) The terms "nonprofit facility for the mentally retarded", "nonprofit community mental health center", and "nonprofit private institution of higher learning" mean, respectively, a facility for the mentally retarded, a community mental health center, and an institution of higher learning which is owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and the term nonprofit private agency or organization" means an agency or organization which is such a corporation or association or which is owned and operated by one or more of such corporations or associations.

(e) The term "construction" includes construction of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings (including medical transportation facilities); including architect's fees, but excluding the cost of off-site improvements and the cost of the acquisition of land.

(f) The term "cost of construction" means the amount found by the Secretary to be necessary for the construction of a project.

(g) The term "title", when used with reference to a site for a project, means a fee simple, or such other estate or interest (including a leasehold on which the rental does not exceed 4 per centum of the value of the land) as the Secretary finds sufficient to assure for a period of not less than fifty years undisturbed use and possession for the purposes of construction and operation of the project.

(h) The term "Federal share" with respect to any project means—

(1) if the State plan under which application for such project is filed contains, as of the date of approval of the project application, standards approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 402 the amount determined in accordance with such standards by the State agency designated under such plan; or

(2) if the State plan does not contain such standards, the amount (not less than 33⅓ per centum and not more than either 66⅔ per centum or the State's Federal percentage, whichever is the lower) established by such State agency for all projects in the State: *Provided*, That prior to the approval of the first such project in the State during any fiscal year such State agency shall give to the Secretary written notification of the Federal share established under this paragraph for such projects in such State to be approved by the Secretary during such fiscal year, and the Federal share for such projects in such State approved during such fiscal year shall not be changed after such approval.

(i) The Federal percentage for any State shall be 100 per centum less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States, except that the Federal percentage for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum.

(j)(1) The Federal percentages shall be promulgated by the Secretary as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1964, and ending June 30, 1966.

(2) The term "United States" means (but only for purposes of this subsection and subsection (i)) the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

(k) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

State standards for variable Federal share

SEC. 402. The State plan approved under part C of title I or title II may include standards for determination of the Federal share of the cost of projects approved in the State under such part or title, as the case may be. Such standards shall provide equitably (and, to the extent practicable, on the basis of objective criteria) for variations between projects or classes of projects on the basis of the economic status of areas and other relevant factors. No such standards shall provide for a Federal share of more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum of the cost of construction of any project. The Secretary shall approve any such standards and any modifications thereof which comply with the provisions of this section.

Payments for construction

SEC. 403. (a) Upon certification to the Secretary by the State agency, designated as provided in section 134 in the case of a facility for the mentally retarded, or section 204 in the case of a community mental health center, based upon inspection by it, that work has been performed upon a project, or purchases have been made, in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, and that payment of an installment is due to the applicant, such installment shall be paid to the State, from the applicable allotment of such State, except that (1) if the State is not authorized by law to make payments to the applicant, the payment shall be made directly to the applicant, (2) if the Secretary, after investigation or otherwise, has reason to believe that any act (or failure to act) has occurred requiring action pursuant to section 136 or section 206, as the case may be, payment may, after he has given the State agency so designated notice of opportunity for hearing pursuant to such section, be withheld, in whole or in part, pending corrective action or action based on such hearing, and (3) the total of payments under this subsection with respect to such project may not exceed an amount equal to the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project.

(b) In case an amendment to an approved application is approved as provided in section 135 or 205 or the estimated cost of a project is revised upward, any additional payment with respect thereto may be made from the applicable allotment of the State for the fiscal year in which such amendment or revision is approved.

Judicial review

SEC. 404. If the Secretary refuses to approve any application for a project submitted under section 135 or 205, the State agency through which such application was submitted, or if any State is dissatisfied with his action under section 134(b) or 204(b) or section 136 or 206, such State, may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Secretary's action.

Recovery

SEC. 405. If any facility or center with respect to which funds have been paid under section 403 shall, at any time within twenty years after the completion of construction—

(1) be sold or transferred to any person, agency, or organization (A) which is not qualified to file an application under section 135 or 205, or (B) which is not approved as a transferee by the State agency designated pursuant to section 134 (in the case of a facility for the mentally retarded) or section 204 (in the case of a community mental health center), or its successor; or

(2) cease to be a public of other nonprofit facility for the mentally retarded or community mental health center, as the case may be, unless the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to continue as such a facility or center, the United States shall be entitled to recover from either the transferor or the transferee (or, in the case of a facility or center which has ceased to be public or other nonprofit facility for the mentally retarded or community mental health center, from the owners thereof) an amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by the agreement of the parties or by action brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the center is situated) of so much of such facility or center as constituted an approved project or projects, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of the construction of such project or projects. Such right of recovery shall not constitute a lien upon such facility or center prior to judgment.

State control of operations

SEC. 406. Except as otherwise specifically provided, nothing in this Act shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee the right to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, maintenance, or operation of any facility for the mentally retarded or community mental health center with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended under this Act.

Conforming amendment

SEC. 407. (a) The first sentence of section 633(b) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "twelve". The second sentence thereof is amended to read: "Six of the twelve appointed members shall be persons who are outstanding in fields pertaining to medical facility and health activities, and three of these six shall be authorities in matters relating to the operation of hospitals or other medical facilities, one of them shall be an authority in matters relating to the mentally retarded and one of them shall be an authority in matters relating to mental health, and the other six members shall be appointed to represent the consumers of services provided by such facilities and shall be persons familiar with the need for such services in urban or rural areas."

(b) The terms of office of the additional members of the Federal Hospital Council authorized by the amendment made by subsection (a) who first take office after enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, one at the end of the first year, one at the end of the second year, one at the end of the third year, and one at the end of the fourth year after the date of appointment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the members of the Committee that at this hour I shall not take 5 minutes, but I do want to take long enough to commend this great committee not only for giving us a bill of great substance but for giving us a bill of great excellence in legislative language. You know sometimes in drawing legislation, it gets a little sloppy and I recall in many of our bills intended to apply to all Americans, there would be the description—"to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Territories, the District of Columbia and the Canal Zone."

If you will notice here, the definition of the term "States" include "Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia." It gives a dignity to Guam. It gives a dignity to the Virgin Islands.

May I ask the chairman this question. I notice the Canal Zone is not included. Was there a reason for that?

Mr. HARRIS. I regret to say I do not know there is any reason for it. The matter has not been raised heretofore.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am not raising the question, but I am commending you on your language here in giving dignity to the Virgin Islands and to Guam and to American Samoa. If by inadvertence you have eliminated the Canal Zone, perhaps, in conference you might want to think it over.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in further explanation to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, I would like to say on behalf of the committee that I appreciate his very fine accolade. We know of the gentleman's interest. I do not believe, however, that any of these construction programs of the type provided in this bill have been applicable to the Canal Zone. I think probably that is the reason why the Canal Zone was not included.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes the consideration of what I believe is one of the most important bills that we will pass on in this Congress. This bill affects many unfortunate people, people who need help. The members of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], have done a splendid job. I want to compliment them highly for the work they have done in working this program out. This is a program that is greatly needed and, in my judgment, is a program which should be acceptable to every Member of this House.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the entire membership of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the attention they have given to this matter, and for their outstanding achievements in working this bill out so as to do something effective in this field.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the distinguished chairman that I do not know anyone on the committee who has worked harder on this bill, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ROBERTS, or Mr. SCHENCK on this side. Even though I was not a member of the subcommittee, I was present on three occasions to be sure we were following the Hill-Burton Act. I think we have a precedent for this legislation in the Hill-Burton Act. It has worked over a long period of time during which time it has had good experience. Based on that I believe this is good legislation which is in the public interest and should pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 513, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 335, nays 18, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—335

Abele
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen,
 Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen. Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder

Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—18

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alger
Ashbrook
Beermann
Burleson
Dowdy
Foreman
Passman
Pillion
Pool
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—80

Adair
Arends
Avery
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Daddario
Dague
Derwinski
Flynt
Ford
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gathings
Green, Oreg.
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Laird
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Pepper
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Staggers
Stephens
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Hutchinson against.
Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Cooley with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Libonati with Mr. Collier.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Berry of South Dakota.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Short.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. O'Konski.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Scott.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I was listening when my name should have been called when the Clerk was calling the Members who did not respond on the first call. My name was not called and I am informed that I am recorded as having voted "Yes." I did not vote "Yes" and wish my vote to show originally as "No," Mr. Speaker.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction of community mental health centers, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H.R. 2332, A BILL TO INCREASE THE PENSIONS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced Discharge Petition No. 4 for the discharge of House Resolution 496, making in order the consideration of H.R. 2332. This is a bill which I introduced and which provides for an increase in pensions for the veterans of World War I. It applies to veterans who served for a period of 90 days and increases the pension to $100 per month.

At the present time there are two laws applicable to pensions for veterans of World War I. One is section 3 of the Economy Act, under which veterans over 65 years of age with a 10-percent disability received a pension of $78.75 monthly. The other is Public Law 86–211 which provides pensions varying between $40 and $85 monthly for veterans without dependents and $45 to $100 for veterans with three or more dependents. The same age and disability requirements hold for both laws.

My bill also provides for an increase in pensions for widows of veterans of World War I to $75. Under the Economy Act, section 3, they are entitled to $50.40 monthly and under Public Law 86–211 their pensions vary from $26 to $60 for a widow without children and from $50 to $75 for a widow with one child.

World War I ended nearly 45 years ago and I feel it is time that proper compensation is afforded its veterans.

It was George Washington who first proposed the pension—for veterans of the Revolutionary War as a reward for their services.

In regard to pensions, Abraham Lincoln said, "It is the duty of all of us to provide for those who bore the brunt of battle."

And Theodore Roosevelt said:

> No other citizen deserves so well of the Republic as the veteran. They did the one deed which if left undone, would have meant that all else in our history went for nothing. But for their steadfast promise all our annals would be meaningless and our great experiment in popular freedom and self-government a gloomy failure.

The platform of the Democratic Party, in 1960, contained the following statement:

> Veterans of World War I, whose Federal benefits have not matched those of subsequent service, will receive the special attention of the Democratic Party looking toward equitable adjustments.

It is now 1963. Let us put that promise behind us.

I am a veteran of both World War I and World War II and am fully cognizant of the disparity of benefits afforded veterans of the two conflicts. The veterans of World War II received mustering out pay immediately on being discharged from service. It took 18 years for the veterans of World War I to obtain mustering out payments.

In addition, veterans of World War II received unemployment insurance for 6 months after their separation, or until they were able to find employment on their return to civilian life; pay for terminal leave accrued before separation; social security credits for the time they were in service, and perhaps most important of all, the benefits from the GI bill of rights. The GI bill gave World War II veterans assistance in obtaining an academic education leading to a college degree, or vocational, on-the-job training which would prepare them for a civilian occupation. It provided guaranteed loans for homes, businesses, or farms, and provided protection and guarantees of the jobs the veterans left to enter the service.

The veterans of the Korean war received similar, although not quite as great, benefits.

The amount of money expended on veterans of World War II has been 30 times as great as that expended on the veterans of World War I. The number of veterans of World War II is much greater, of course, than that of World War I, but even so the per capita expenditure for World War II veterans has been four times that for World War I veterans.

I am confident that the promise of the Democratic platform did not mean that there should be on-the-job training; college training, or even guaranteed home loans for these World War I veterans, now of an average age between 69 and 70. The only adjustment that could have been meant for persons of that age group would be some form of pension or annuity.

There are currently statutes providing for pensions for World War I veterans, therefore the only way to meet this promise of equitable treatment would be for an increase in those pensions. This is what my bill proposes.

My bill provides for bringing the benefits of these veterans, small though they may be by comparison, into line with current modes of living.

Using the consumer prices of the years 1957-59 as a base of 100, let us analyze the pension status of World War I veterans. In 1933 a means clause was placed in the World War I veterans' pension law which allowed a single veteran a maximum of $1,000 annual income and a married veteran a maximum of $2,500 annual income to qualify for the pensions. In that year—using our agreed standards—45 cents bought a dollar's worth of goods. Today it takes $1.07 to buy that same dollar's worth of goods, indicating a shrinkage in the buying power of the dollar of 138 percent.

This loss of buying power, coupled with the fact that greater productivity in this country has brought about a higher standard of living, has caused many other changes in the laws of our country. It is now time to consider the World War I pensions.

Since 1939 when the first minimum wage law was enacted it has become necessary to increase that rate from 25 cents to $1.25—an increase of 400 percent.

In 1933 the jurisdictional amount for cases in the Federal courts, based on the diversity of citizenship, was a minimum of $3,000. Today it is $10,000—an increase of 233 percent.

Since that time the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has risen 73 percent; Associate Justices salaries have risen 75 percent, and Cabinet members' salaries have risen 66⅔ percent.

Similar increases have been granted our servicemen; other Federal employees; in retirement allowances; public assistance payments, and most all civilian salary schedules.

For example, in 1932 a private entering the Army received $21 per month. Today he receives $78—an increase of 271 percent. A civil servant in the equivalent grade of GS-2 made $1,440 annually in 1932. Today the salary is $3,560—an increase of 147 percent. In 1940 the average monthly benefit for a retired worker under the old-age and survivors insurance program was $22.10. Today it is $76.19—an increase of 244 percent. Under public assistance programs average monthly payments for old-age assistance in 1936 were $16.31. Today they are $77.89—an increase of 377 percent. Aid to dependent children payments were $8.13 in 1936. Today they are $31.24—an increase of 284 percent. Aid to the blind payments then were $21.42. Today they are $81.72—a 281-percent increase. Railroad retirement benefits have risen from an average of $26.47 in 1945 to $91.44 today—an increase of 245 percent.

The term applied to the reasons for these necessary increases is "the cost of living." The cost of living for veterans of World War I has not remained magically stationary. It, too, has increased.

The income limitation on which a veteran of World War I pension qualification is based was raised in 1952 to $1,400 for single veterans and $2,700 for married veterans, under section 3 of the Economy Act. Under Public Law 86-211 there are various limits—the highest being $1,800 for a single veteran and $3,000 for a married veteran.

Therefore the highest family income which a veteran may now receive and still be eligible for a pension is $3,000.

Mr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, this year, at Kansas City, said, "A family with an income below $3,000 a year is living in poverty status."

Certainly a veteran of World War I should not have to be in a poverty status to be eligible for a pension. The country owes a greater obligation than this to its veterans.

My bill would increase the maximum income a veteran could have to $2,400 and $3,600, respectively, for single and married veterans. At the same time it would allow them a maximum of $1,200 in additional income from public or private pensions or annuities before making them ineligible for pensions. I feel that the pensions or annuities that these men have paid for outside their service to the United States should not be held against their claim for just compensation for their service. The $1,200 limit in my bill is a compromise measure.

This proposed increase in allowances and pensions does not begin to equal those granted in other cases and is definitely justified by the increase in the cost of living.

It is true that World War I was of rather short duration. But that was because it was necessary to throw American troops into action before they were adequately trained and equipped, causing their casualties to be extremely high compared with other conflicts. By helping to bring that war to a speedy conclusion they saved the Federal Government many times the amount of money it would require to pay them a just compensation.

Now, turning to the cost of my bill. Whenever the question of just compensation for these veterans is raised, we always hear the cost estimated in astronomical figures. For some reason an estimate is always made through the year 2000, or for 37 years. If we were to forecast our national defense costs, our farm program costs, or our foreign aid expenditures for a period of 37 years they would be astounding.

No one knows what the condition of the country will be during the next 37 years, how conditions will affect the number of veterans eligible for the pension, or the number who will claim the pension. Further, no one knows what legislation might be enacted by future Congresses. Nor does anyone know for a certainty how long the remaining veterans of World War I will remain alive.

Last year I introduced a similar pension bill, H.R. 3745. The income limitation in that bill was more liberal than in this bill. In both bills the means test was $3,600 for a married veteran and $2,400 for a single veteran. In addition, under H.R. 3745, a veteran would have been permitted to receive any sum from public or private annuities.

Under this bill, the sum is limited to $1,200 from pensions or annuities. Nevertheless, the Veterans' Administration estimates that there will be more veterans drawing compensation under this bill, H.R. 2332, than under the former bill, H.R. 3745.

In addition to this fact, the pension is not as liberal under this bill as it was proposed under the previous bill, H.R. 3745. However, the Veterans' Administration estimates that this bill, H.R. 2332, with a more strict means test and lower payments, will cost nearly twice as much as they estimated for H.R. 3745.

It is true that the present bill provides for increased pensions for the widows of veterans of World War I, but by the Veterans' Administration's own figures this sum would not nearly account for this great discrepancy. It should be quite obvious that these figures set out by the Veterans' Administration do not even qualify for the title of a good "educated guess."

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the first year's cost of the program, for the veterans themselves, under H.R. 2332 would be approximately $1 billion. Naturally the amount would decline each year as death claims more and more of the veterans.

The Government is now paying out $5,300 million in veterans' payments. With this law it would be raised to about $6,300 million for the first year.

In 1947 the Government paid out $8,300 million to veterans. In that year the gross national product in this country was $234,300 million. The latest estimated gross national product for 1963 is $580 billion. Certainly if the Government could afford to pay the $8,300 million in 1947 it can afford to pay $6,300 million out of a more than doubled gross national product now.

As I said, the average age of veterans of World War I is 69 to 70 years. It is estimated that the greatest number of deaths among those now surviving will occur in the next 7 years. Figures given say there will be 841,000 World War I veterans die between now and 1970. That gives us an average of more than 329 veterans dying each day over the next 7 years.

Also, as I said before, World War I ended nearly 45 years ago. General pensions for Revolutionary War veterans were provided 35 years after the end of that conflict; pensions were provided 39 years after the Mexican War; between 26 and 53 years after various campaigns of the Indian Wars; 24 years after the Civil War, and 18 years after the Spanish-American War. There was a need clause in two instances—the Revolutionary War and the Mexican War—but in both cases it was removed. In all cases, pensions have not been considered as a charity, but as a delayed payment for services rendered.

That is what the veterans of World War I are asking—delayed payment, not charity.

The Department of Commerce has estimated that an annual income of $3,600 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple is necessary to maintain the average standard of living in this country. Those figures include all people and do not make allowances for the higher medical expenses of people whose average age is that of the veterans of World War I.

If we are ever going to equalize the benefits received by the veterans of World War I with those paid to veterans of other wars, now is the time.

If we fail to do it now there will be few veterans living to receive the promised equitable benefit adjustments.

WHO DETERMINES "INNOCENCE" OF RUSSIAN TRAWLERS?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to read in the Miami Herald of September 4, a statement by Admiral Stephens, commander of the 7th Coast Guard District in Miami, to the effect that the Russians have a legal right to run their trawlers within our territorial waters. This is apparently based on the "innocent passage" doctrine of international law.

"Passage" is legal only if it is in fact "innocent" and not detrimental to our national security. The admiral is presuming the passage to be innocent—a presumption without the slightest foundation and entirely in favor of the Russians.

In testimony before the Hardy subcommittee investigating the trawler activity, Chairman PORTER HARDY asked the Coast Guard:

> Have you made a determination, for instance, that they—the trawlers—are not actually conducting espionage? Have you made a determination that they are not mapping our defenses?

The Coast Guard witness replied:

> No, sir.

Congressman LANKFORD, of Maryland, asked Admiral Stephens:

> I asked you if you had a patrol in this area (southeast Florida) where the normal sealane would bring vessels within the 3-mile limit?

Admiral Stephens replied:

> We have no patrol in the area you are talking about.

Further testimony from the Coast Guard indicated they do not know for sure where the trawlers come from or go to, or why; have no idea of the makeup of the crews; if the trawlers carry fish or something else; the nature or purpose of the electronic equipment on board; a pattern of activity along our coastlines or much of anything at all which would lead to a presumption one way or the other.

To neglect the patrol of our own coastline, to say that there is "no evidence" that the Russians are up to something when there is nothing to indicate the Coast Guard or anyone else has done much to find out, and then to make all the assumptions in favor of the Russians is unrealistic.

A committee of the Congress has made recommendations against this Russian trawler traffic within our territorial waters and has asked for regular patrols. It has completely exposed this "innocent passage" nonsense by bringing out into the open that no one has any idea if the passage is in fact innocent or not.

It is interesting that the British say that Russian trawlers in the North Sea are spy ships. The naval officers in the recent NATO fleet operations in the Bay of Biscay say that the Russian trawlers who entered that area were spy ships. Only when these trawlers come within the territorial waters of the United States do they become "innocent."

The Russians are apparently not so careless about their own coastal defenses. When the U.S. Coast Guard oceanographic vessel was recently operating some 15 miles from the Russian coast, the Russians placed it under surveillance.

The statement by Admiral Stephens would not have been so disturbing if it had come before the congressional hearing. Coming after the results of the hearing and the request for regular patrols, and the pointed dangers in "presuming" in favor of the Russians, I would hope that these opinions are not those of the Coast Guard officially. In any event they are ill advised and ill conceived. The interest of the security of the United States demands that our coastline be protected. Any officer of the United States who does not believe this to be necessary might consider his position in light of the question and answer by Chairman Hardy and Admiral Stephens at the trawler investigation:

> Chairman HARDY. At the time that two Japs visited the Department of State on the morning of December 7, 1941, it was presumed that they were honest and that there wasn't anything going on that was prejudicial to the security of the United States. Isn't that so?
>
> Admiral STEPHENS. This is correct, sir.
>
> Chairman HARDY. Then we get ourselves in one awful mess by accepting at face value this kind of a presumption, and you are making the presumption all on the side of the Russians.

Now, no one is saying that the Russians are going to use these trawlers to launch a military attack, although we do not know. But they certainly are not just fishing. If anyone wants to make any presumptions, it might be wise and in the interest of our national security to presume that the trawlers are being used as radio relay points for spy activity in this country, that they are mapping our coastline, listening in on our military and civilian communications, carrying agents to or from Cuba or even the United States, or any number of other espionage activities. Any one of which would rule out "innocent" passage.

The point of all this, of course, is not whether Russian trawlers should be permitted within our 3-mile limit, or within 12 or 15 miles of our coast but rather whenever any Soviet vessel, trawler, freighter, or naval ship comes anywhere near our shores in our own waters or international waters it should immediately be placed under surveillance.

To do less is to invite trouble, and we cannot afford to gamble with our national security.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE ACTIVITIES OF THE CIA

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years ago I addressed the House and urged the prompt consideration of my bill to create a joint congressional committee to supervise the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. At that time there was a great hue and cry for an investigation of the CIA in the wake of the disaster of the Bay of Pigs. As so often happens, the furor over the abortive Cuban affair subsided and so did criticism of the CIA. The Cuban fiasco was the consequence of permitting a secret Government organization, which is not subject to the usual congressional scrutiny, to conduct its own foreign policy. There is a saying that those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

Now we have reports that the CIA is once more involved in policymaking—this time in South Vietnam. As we know, the South Vietnam Government has been engaged in suppressing its own people through a campaign of religious persecution. On August 21 this campaign resulted in a series of ruthless and bloody raids on Buddhist pagodas. These raids were carried out by the special forces of Col. Le Quang Tung. According to yesterday's New York Times, the CIA pays as "direct under-the-table aid" $3 million a year for the salaries and maintenance of these forces. Although these forces, under the direct control of South Vietnam's strong man, Ngo Dinh Nhu, are carrying out the policy of religious persecution, the New York Times reports that the CIA last week decided to continue the $250,000 monthly payments to these troops.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that the CIA is supporting the very forces in South Vietnam which are undermining U.S. policy. President Kennedy has pointed out that the campaign of religious persecution is not the way to win in that area.

The role of the CIA in South Vietnam again demonstrates that vital necessity of a congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. The operations of the CIA are not being scrutinized by the Congress. Even its budget is concealed from almost every Representative and Senator. The CIA has consistently overstepped its role as an intelligence-gathering agency by engaging in policy formulation and execution. It is in essence a secret government. The existence of a secret government is totally inconsistent with our democratic values and procedures. I again urge the adoption of my resolution—House Joint Resolution 145—calling for the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. It is time for Congress to make the CIA accountable for its actions.

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House well know, there are 57 Members of this body who introduced resolutions to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit prayer in public schools and Bible reading and to provide against further litigation in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the 57 Members who have introduced these resolutions appointed 6 Members—the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring], the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. Cramer and Mr. Fuqua], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay], and myself—to act as a committee to draw up an amendment which we could all support rather than having 57 different resolutions. That amendment is now prepared and has been approved not only by the 6 Members of the House acting as a committee, but many of the 57 Members who have introduced resolutions. We are introducing the joint resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of the resolution in the Record at this point so that every Member can read it and understand it and know when they sign the discharge petition that this is the one which will be substituted for House Joint Resolution 407 under discharge petition No. 3. All Members can now sign the discharge petition knowing just what the amendment will do.

The resolution referred to follows:

H. Res. 407

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

"Article —

"Section 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or biblical scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of, God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"Sec. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

RESOLUTION TO REFER THE ISSUE OF PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC GATHERINGS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to refer the issue of prayer and Bible reading in public schools and public gatherings to the people of the United States. Freedom does not just happen. If it is to survive men must be willing to live for it as well as to die for it. The service dead who sleep beneath the hallowed ground in our Nation's burying places bear silent yet vivid testimony that freedom is indeed costly. They did not die to give us freedom—they gave their lives to give us the opportunity to pursue freedom. In a sense they have said, "We have done what we could." It is now up to us. There are countless other numbers who sleep beneath the sod who also have given their lives for freedom's cause, making sacrifices as civilians matching those made by others in uniform.

Our political forefathers made it abundantly clear in many of their writings, some of which are now historic documents that God created man to be free; that He indeed intended every man whom He created to be endowed with certain unalienable rights, among which, but may I point out not the extent of which is, but among which is "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We cannot legislate freedom, since it is a gift of God by virtue of the fact that we are created by Him in His image with dignity. But we can and do legislate to limit freedom and in a sense legislation in this area is necessary to a degree in a society as complex as ours. We must, however, be extremely careful lest we go so far in the direction of limitations that we, created by God to be free, become slaves to a political state which to those who seek only material gain becomes a substitute for Almighty God who alone is the giver of life and bread. In creating a body of laws to limit freedom, how be it honorable our intent may be, we are always in danger of creating a Frankenstein that will become our master rather than our servant.

I am not a lawyer but I am sure that many who are would agree with me that an interpretation of the law may be technically correct and yet result in a moral wrong. I wonder whether we have not come to a point in our great and thrilling history at which we may find that in our own wisdom we have denied the wisdom of God. We are beginning to interpret out of existence by the very laws we have written, the foundation upon which that body of law rests—faith in Almighty God. How long can we nibble away at ourselves before we destroy ourselves?

Faith and freedom as we know it—or them—are inseparable. This Nation was built upon the principle that man should be free to approach his God and not that he should be denied the right to approach Him. Ours is historically the philosophy of "freedom of"—not "freedom from."

We are at a crucial point in history. We must not make legal technicalities to destroy moral foundations. Faith in God and the expression of it belongs to the people—not to Congress nor to the Supreme Court. If the Supreme Court has judged that our present law does not permit, because of a technicality, the official recognition of God in public schools and gatherings then we who make the laws have an obligation to the people to protect their moral rights.

CALL FOR CLOSER CHECK ON CUBAN REFUGEES COMING INTO THIS COUNTRY

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I expressed dismay over the fact that Castro had been given the right to select half of the refugees coming into the United States since the quarantine in October of 1962 and exposed the fact that some 2,000 refugees had thus been handpicked by Castro and all but 20 had been admitted to the United States.

The State Department in its admission that this was true said that it was "academic."

At the time I cautioned against Castro's opportunity as the result of this irresponsible and silly arrangement to infiltrate the entire refugee freedom fighter effort to oust the Communists from Cuba—and to carry on any other spy purpose desired by Castro in this country—by shipping in Castro Cuban spies.

Proof that this apprehension—and for calling this to the attention of the House—is well founded is contained in an article analyzing Castro's spy network in the United States, that appeared in the Miami Herald on September 8 in which it was exposed that more than 150 Cubans suspected of being Castro agents and hard-core Communists have been discovered and ordered out of the United States—and many more are suspected as the result of the efforts of the FBI.

It is high time that closer scrutinizing of all refugees coming into this country from Cuba be made to guarantee against such spy activities—a demand I made many months ago and which I renew today—and that more deals or accommodations be made with Castro—with regards to refugees or any other matter.

The article to which I referred, follows:

FBI Beefs Up Miami Staff—Castro's Spy Network Reaches Deep in United States

(By Dom Bonafede)

U.S. agencies dealing with internal security conceded Saturday that the long fingers of Fidel Castro's spy network reach into every facet of the Cuban exile movement.

More than 150 Cubans suspected of being Castro agents or hard-core Communists have been ordered to leave the United States or face indefinite detention. And the movements of many others are watched daily by Federal investigators.

To cope with the spy threat, the Miami office of the FBI has vastly expanded its staff—how much is unknown, since the Bureau follows a rigid policy of secrecy in such matters.

Nevertheless, Miami FBI Chief Wesley G. Grapp acknowledged, "The work ties up a lot of our manpower."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has underlined the menace declaring: "We have to be constantly alert that an individual who alleges to be a refugee, under severe pressure by Castro, who has had to leave his home and had his property confiscated, may in fact be a spy."

Federal officials agree there are very many Castro informers in the United States but are reluctant to estimate their numbers.

Their hesitation is based on the fact that most of Castro's fifth columnists are unschooled, nonprofessional informers without backgrounds in espionage. As a result, they are difficult to trace.

U.S. security officers are confident they can weed out the indoctrinated, well-trained Cuban agents.

"To the best of our knowledge, very few competent Castro agents have gotten past our screening," declared Joseph Minton, assistant director of the Miami office of the U.S. Immigration Service.

The so-called amateurs, for the most part zealous revolutionary sympathizers, form the bulk of Castro's spy corps.

This follows a definite pattern in Communist Cuba, since recruiting of the unskilled to perform skilled tasks is characteristic of Castro's revolution.

Fernando Fernandez, recently accused of being a Castro informer (he denied it) is a prime example of the untrained, unsophisticated possible spy. He attempted to send information to Carlos Lechuga, the "Cuban ambassador to Mexico."

Lechuga, it so happens, is the Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations and has been for more than a year.

The Fernandez case is a relatively minor footnote in the history of Cuban espionage in the United States. But it has served to point up the existence of Castro's intelligence operation—loose and untidy as it may be.

Earl E. T. Smith, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, maintains Castro was successful in planting espionage agents in the Cuban Embassy in Washington before he rode to power January 1, 1959.

These agents kept Castro, then in the Sierra Maestra, fully informed and brought anti-Batista pressure to bear on the State Department, according to Smith.

IN OTHER CASE HISTORIES

Castro has publicly boasted that he knew in advance of April 17, 1961, Bay of Pigs invasion: FBI officers in November, 1962, smashed a ring of pro-Castro terrorists, including several attached to the Cuban U.N. mission, who were plotting a wave of sabotage in New York and New Jersey; Pedro Riog, Castro diplomat who defected, disclosed that the commercial affairs section of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City was "devoted not to commerce but to espionage and Communist infiltration."

Refugees arriving in Miami have reported that "spy training camps" have been established in Cuba.

And more than one anti-Castro raid has been called off because it became apparent informers tipped off the Castro regime.

U.S. investigators contend that not all of Castro's "eyes and ears" are exiles, but include Cuban born nationalized citizens and Americans sympathetic to the Cuban revolution.

Members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and Prensa Latina, Castro's news service, are frequently under surveillance. Francisco Portela, a U.S. citizen who served as Prensa Latina's chief correspondent, was indicted in December 1961, for failure to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Prensa Latina subsequently entered a plea of nolo contendere and was fined $2,000.

The majority of suspected Castro agents are nabbed during screening by immigration officials at the Opa-locka Air Base.

In many instances, investigators have obtained a line on each refugee from inside Cuba. For an unexplained reason, female refugees are released after routine questioning at the point of entry but all males are required to remain overnight at Opa-locka and submit to an extensive interrogation.

Assisting the immigration officials are other Cuban exiles, who are experienced in anti-Communist security work and intimately acquainted with Castro's cadre of informants.

These exiles, as well as others who voluntarily aid in the detection of Castro spies, are paid out of a "confidential fund" made available to most U.S. security agencies.

One of the Immigration Service's most valuable spotters is a former high-ranking Cuban police officer, reputed to possess a dossier on almost every Communist or fellow traveler in Cuba.

Refugees believed to be loyal Castroites are sent to the Federal detention center at Tampa and given their choice of remaining in custody indefinitely or returning to Cuba or any other country that will have them.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, September 13, to file a report, including the separate minority views on H.R. 8363.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT ARA BECAUSE IT IS GOOD FOR THE COUNTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a speech delivered by me today to the Public Advisory Committee of the Area Redevelopment Administration at the Department of Commerce Building:

The president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce seems to have illicit sex on his mind.

A local community wishing to have a sewage system, or water system, has been seduced, he thinks.

Members of Congress who vote according to the wishes of the American people are immorally chasing voters, as he sees it, or chasing call girls—he can't see any difference.

He reminds me of the young man who was sent to see a psychiatrist. The psychiatrist showed him a picture of a schoolhouse and asked him what it suggested to him.

The young man said "sex."

The doctor then showed him a picture of a golf course and asked him what that reminded him of.

"Sex," he said.

Then the doctor pulled out a picture of a church and asked what that suggested.

The fellow said "sex."

The doctor said, "Don't you ever feel ashamed of yourself, being so dirty minded?"

The young man said, "Why, Doctor, it's you who ought to be ashamed; you are the one who's been showing all those dirty pictures."

Mr. Neilan seems to picture himself as the man who is going to put Senator Goldwater in the White House—with the help, of course, of Life magazine. But I don't think he will get 100 percent of the business people behind him in this ambition.

Fortunately for our country there are thousands of local business leaders all over America—in and out of the local chambers of commerce—who are working to better their communities and their country and welcome a helping hand in these efforts. I know personally of a great many leaders of local chambers of commerce who have given their energies and countless hours of hard work to the ARA program, with no hope of reward except the satisfaction of making their communities better places in which to live and helping create job opportunities where jobs are heartbreakingly scarce.

These are the kinds of people who have built America. These are the kinds of people who are building it today, and will in the future. They do not think it is a sin to help create productive jobs by which people can earn a living, educate their children, and enjoy the self-respect that goes with doing useful work.

Our country would be better off today if we had national leaders of the chamber of commerce who would worry about the 4½ million unemployed and would make suggestions putting these people back to work, rather than going about the country preaching that the principle of casting bread upon the water is immoral and that the Golden Rule is a form of corruption.

Is it really radical or wasteful to take every reasonable step we can take to put the unemployed back to work? I can think of nothing more offensive to the truly conservative mind than the staggering waste of America's resources, than our failure to provide jobs for the 4½ million men and women who are today actively looking for a job and cannot find a job. Nor can I think of any greater waste, except the waste of an unnecessary war.

If these 4½ million people were back at work, they would be producing more goods and services than a great many of the foreign countries we are trying to help; they would be earning income and paying taxes to help build the homes, schools, roads, and hospitals we need, and to help clean up the polluted air and water.

It is no answer to say that these people don't have enough training to be employed. Of course our whole work force needs better training. But the most important training is on-the-job training. A man doesn't learn how to be president of a bank simply by going to school. He usually must start in a clerk's job and work his way up as he learns. When several millions of our workers do not have jobs this year, how can we hope they will be better prepared for jobs next year and the year after?

I do not wish to draw comparisons between the few millions of dollars proposed to be spent under ARA to develop new industries in our distressed areas at home with the billions of dollars being spent for economic development abroad. I do not have the expertness to say that our efforts to aid the economically backward areas of the world are really successful, but in the case of Western Europe, after World War II, we were dealing with people who were already accustomed to modern economic organization; and here, certainly, our Marshall Plan and other aid has been spectacularly successful. With the helping hand we extended to them, the countries of Western Europe have not only rebuilt their economies but they have built beyond anything they had ever known before. In most of these countries unemployment is unknown—indeed the complaint is of a shortage of labor—and their rate of economic growth is one we can well aspire to.

The people in the economically distressed areas of the United States have also known better days. They have been a part of the modern economic organization. This is as much true of the farmers and the people in small towns as it is of those people living in industrial areas, now distressed because some natural resource has played out, or some industry has been made obsolete by the march of technology.

Of course Life magazine would have us believe that the American farmers are lazy spoiled by subsidies and handouts, and practically all have two new Cadillacs anyway. These are not the American farmers that I know, and I know a great many of them. The truth of the matter is that the farmers have been working themselves out of a job, by producing more and better products faster than the rest of the economy. Over the past 25 years farm productivity has increased about three times as fast as productivity in manufacturing.

What is to become of these people who are no longer needed on the farms and in the small towns? Are they all to move to the great cities?

No, the fact is that a great many of the unemployed will not pull up stakes and move, no matter how great the economic pressures become. Most people have strong ties to the local community, and obligations in the local community, which they cannot very well break. If these people are to be employed at all, they must be helped to develop new opportunities at home. They must have a chance to produce the kind of goods and services that the American people need and want.

Furthermore, forcing more and more people to pile up into a few great cities of the country is no answer to the problem. Over the past 20 years people have moved out of the farms and rural communities and into the cities at the rate of a million people a year. This has aggravated the problems of overcrowding, slums, air pollution, breakdown of municipal transportation, and a host of other problems.

Moving to the cities and becoming lost in the crowd, as it were, really does not hide the fact that many of these people are continuing to be unemployed. It is a direct cause, I suggest, of the increasing crime wave which is sweeping the American cities. You do not need to read the FBI reports on the mounting crimes in all brackets of crime, but only to live in one of the larger cities.

Most of these crimes are being committed by young people—the very young who all too often can neither find jobs nor complete their schooling. A newspaper columnist recently reviewed the horrifying statistics on this subject and ended up by saying that the only cure is to have more severe punishment of the guilty as an example to the others. I suggest to you that the only cure is to have more employment and schooling opportunities. As our fathers and grandfathers used to say, "Idle hands and idle minds are the devil's workshop."

When I was a young man living on a farm in east Texas, the ideas about extending a helping hand to a neighbor needing help was much less complicated than today. When a new family moved in, or a couple got married and set up farming, it was customary for the neighbors to pitch in and help the new family build a barn or clear a field. Those best able to help gave the most help, and in this way the new family was started on its way toward a productive life and self-sufficiency.

I do not believe that this basic American trait has disappeared. But some people have become confused because the community, as it were, has become so much larger; we lose the individual, firsthand contacts between the helpers and those being helped. Much of the opposition to ARA, and the criticism of ARA, results simply from the fact that Americans are suffering from growing pains.

In many respects it would be very pleasant if we could handle the problems of the local communities as we did when I was a boy and the farms and other businesses were mostly locally owned and the neighbors could do most of what was needed to be done by contributing work and payments in kind. But today we live in a money economy and one in which the sources of income may be geographically very remote from the places where the income goes. Most of the businesses along Main Street today are merely units in a national chain. Both the corporate persons and the individual persons who receive the lion's share of the income from these corporate activities are domiciled in places where most of the communities could not possibly tax the money income.

For example, because the very small State of Delaware in historic times offered exceptionally generous corporation laws, a very large percentage of our national corporations are today incorporated in Delaware. Thus if we were to return all of our distressed area problems back to the States and local communities these corporations could be taxed only by the State of Delaware. I might add that even the Federal Government is having a difficult time maintaining its tax jurisdiction, in view of the ability of large income individuals to move their residences to Rio or Switzerland and the increasing ability of the big corporations to hold and invest more and more of their incomes abroad.

Several years ago I had an opportunity to see at first hand how both an area and the whole country benefits from a new industry. At the end of World War II, I was rather closely associated with an effort to establish a steel works in my own area of the country. After many difficulties and several years of disappointing opposition, the people who were trying to establish this industry succeeded in doing so, by reason of a Government loan, from the RFC, amounting to some $75 million.

Today, that loan has been repaid to the Government in full and with interest. But in addition, at the end of last year the company and its employees had paid the Government some $70 million in taxes—approximately the original amount of the loan—and they will go on paying taxes in the years ahead. In other words, the Government has received to date at least 100 percent return on its investment. But the more important return has been to the workers, the company, and those who do business with the company. Productive jobs were created and, by reason of this, we have an expansion of markets for goods and services produced in all parts of the Nation.

The problem of ARA from a public relations standpoint is that not everybody is in a position to see at first hand a practical illustration of the new industries that have been brought into being. Our problem is to make a people realize the soundness of an idea which must be presented in a rather abstract way, because the people more often cannot themselves gather around to see a barn being built, or a field being cleared.

This is what you have been doing, I know, and I say you are on the right track—let's do more of it.

There will be cries of "subsidy" and "waste" and all that, of course. Violent and unfair criticism does not, of course, make a cause a good cause; but in all the years I have been in public life I have never known a good cause that was not a target for such criticisms. When some pipsqueak is elevated to a big job to speak for big business, he almost always goes a lot farther in his statements than the people he thinks he is speaking for actually think is right.

This is the kind of man who discovers a few rotten apples in the barrel and wants to chop down the whole apple orchard.

The idea that the American people give their support and their votes to legislative measures to line their pockets at public expense is I can assure you a very false notion of the American people.

During my 40 years in public life I have found an overwhelming majority of the American people give their votes and support to programs which they believe, right or wrong, to be good for the country, not for what they believe will be good for their individual pocketbook.

When you get back home, tell everybody about the ARA programs, and most of the people will support you. It's right, it's good for America.

TO EQUALIZE THE WITHHOLDING TREATMENT ON INVESTMENT INCOME EARNED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES BY NONRESIDENT ALIENS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend section 1441(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the withholding tax treatment of investment income of nonresident aliens earned from deposits in Federal- and State-chartered savings and loan associations on the one hand, and commercial banks and stock-owned savings and loan companies on the other.

Under existing law all investment income earned in the United States by nonresident aliens is subject to a withholding tax at a rate of 30 percent. The only exception to this withholding treatment is "interest on deposits with persons carrying on the banking business." Commercial banks are thus exempted. A revenue ruling in 1958—Revenue Ruling 58-34—has held that stock-owned savings and loan companies are also exempt. A 1954 revenue ruling has held that "savings accounts in Federal savings and loan associations are not deposits with persons carrying on the banking business"—Revenue Ruling 54-624, C. B. 1954-2, 16. State-chartered mutual savings and loan associations have not been exempted because their depositors are deemed to have received dividends on the operation of the association, and can exercise control over the operation of the association in the same manner as a holder of common stock in a corporation.

These interpretations have led to a competitive inequality in the banking business and make it more attractive for foreign investors to bank their money in commercial banks and stock-owned savings and loan associations. Currently the laws of 32 States provide for the chartering of only mutual savings and loans associations. Sixteen States have operating stock-owned savings and loan associations, and two States have authorized the chartering of this latter type but no charters have been issued. Thus, the Internal Revenue Code has forced an inequality in banking competition on the institutions of 32 of our States. Our tax laws should be aimed at creating competitive equality within a given industry rather than at destroying it. Indeed, this disparity in the market for foreign deposit funds, by reducing competition, is undoubtedly driving some foreign investors to deposit their money in other countries where greater competition has forced interest rates paid to depositors higher. This reduces, somewhat, the amount of capital that our banking system can pump into the economy and slows our economic growth. Further, the diminished flow of savings funds into the country has contributed to our balance-of-payments deficit. Therefore, I have introduced a measure today that will restore equal competitive conditions in the banking community, and will in the long run attract more deposits into our banking system.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE THAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOREIGN CHARITIES BE DEDUCTIBLE FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 170 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a charitable contribution made to a foreign charity by a U.S. taxpayer to be deductible for income tax purposes.

The nondeductibility of such contributions was brought to my attention by a constituent and his wife who during the past several years have made contributions to Protestant religious groups in Japan. The constituent's father established a mission in Japan in 1895 and this mission today is known as the "Church of Christ in Japan." A college classmate of his wife built a settlement house in Japan and both of these worthwhile organizations have received financial and moral support over the years from these two Americans. These Americans are quite interested in the progress and work of these Japanese organizations and have generated a great deal of good will and friendship for our people. Deductions or gifts to these two religious charities and similar organizations have been disallowed by the Internal Revenue Service for the reason that under the present law they do not qualify for such treatment.

Section 170 (c) of the 1954 Code provides in part that for the purposes of this section, the term "charitable contribution" means a contribution or gift to or for the use of:

> 2. A corporation, trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation—
>
> (A) created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States.

After I looked into this matter I wrote Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and he replied stating that the legislative background of section 170(c) (2) of the 1954 Code indicates the intent of Congress that only contributions made to "domestic" charities be deductible. He said this restriction which was first enacted into the law as section 23(c) of the Revenue Act of 1938 limits the deduction for contributions to those made to or for the use of a domestic charity. In his letter he quoted from the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on section 23(o) of the Revenue Act of 1938, H.R. 1860, 75th Congress, 3d session—1938—pages 19 and 20, as follows, to wit:

> Under the 1936 act, the deductions of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions (sec. 23(q)). The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burden which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derives no such benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization, the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionary and educational purposes) will not affect the deductibility of the gift.

The policy reasons cited for limiting the deduction to domestic organizations might have had some validity in 1938, but it sounds almost strange in 1963, particularly when we think in terms of our mutual security programs, the purposes of point 4, Peace Corps, student exchanges, and so forth. It seems to me that the time has come for the Ways and Means Committee to again consider these basic policy reasons established back in 1938 to determine whether or not they are still valid or whether or not some changes should be made to more accurately reflect our present policies and attitudes. There are a good many of us in Congress who believe that the people-to-people approach is extremely important if we are to achieve better understanding and closer friendships between our people and the peoples abroad. It is my feeling that such relationships should be encouraged rather than discouraged. We have written a great many tax incentives into our Internal Revenue Code to encourage the development of certain policies. This could well be an area where the Congress should take a long look to determine whether or not this impediment to contributions to foreign charities should be changed or eliminated. It may be time to replace the impediment by a policy of equality with other charitable gifts. I hope that my colleagues will give some thought to this suggestion and give the members of the Ways and Means Committee the benefit of their thinking on this matter.

PRESSURE GOVERNMENT

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders of the August 28 march on Washington, A. Philip Randolph, has declared:

> Legislation is enacted under pressure. You can't move Senators and Congressmen just because a measure is right.

Presumably, that is the premise and the reasoning behind the mass demonstration in Washington—and behind the demonstrations predicted for the weeks ahead both in Washington and throughout the country.

Certainly, "pressure," in myriad forms, is part of the legislative process—pressure, not only in such dramatic and hazardous forms as the August 28 massive rally, but in terms of letterwriting, in terms of organized lobbying, in terms of personal contacts with Congressmen.

I suppose the conference in Washington today of the newly formed "Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963"—which, unfortunately, does not put an equal emphasis on a spending cut in 1963—is a form of pressure, and a completely legitimate one, of course.

I suppose the visit of the Teamsters' wives to Congressmen—including a number from my own district—scheduled for later this month to discuss some 16 pending bills—is a form of pressure and, again, a completely legitimate one.

I am sure that the attempt of the President to go over the head of Congress—in an appeal for public support for a reversal of the House reduction in foreign aid—for which reduction I voted, by the way—is a form of pressure.

But it is a dim view of the legislative processes and of representative government, it seems to me, to suggest that pressure is the sole or even the principal factor in lawmaking.

If this were true, might would make right—in terms of whatever group or segment or interest of our society should muster the most pressure.

If this were true, laws would become merely the victor's spoils—and with a minimum assurance of their wisdom, or justice, or service to the general welfare.

Indeed, if this were true, the end result could well be chaos and anarchy because chaos and anarchy—not freedom or equal justice under law—must be the end result of everyone insisting upon having his own way.

The truth, of course, is that lawmaking under representative self-government must be—and indeed is—the product of much more than pressure and pressure tactics.

It is the product of accurate information, of reason, of persuasion, of conscience—something which even Members of Congress do possess—of mutual concessions and necessary compromises, of tolerance, and finally of a disciplined acceptance by the members of society of the end product of the legislative process.

All right-thinking Americans rejoice that the march on Washington passed without violence and untoward incident.

But I am deeply concerned that this technique of mass demonstrations as one of the forms of "pressure" is being promoted and planned as an established operating procedure. The demands of the August 28 demonstrators went beyond the sole issue of civil rights. Now it is suggested that this method be used to deal with numerous other issues and to promote other causes.

One must ask how long and to what extent this form of pressure can make any adequate or meaningful contribution to wise and just lawmaking.

Surely, the American people do not intend to rule themselves from the streets or reduce self-government to the warring of competing and conflicting pressure groups.

WE NEED MORE REPORTERS AND FEWER PROPAGANDISTS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has given me the benefit of his views on the new USDA market news service.

Here is the full text of his letter:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 26, 1963.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR PAUL: I saw your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning about the Market News Service in which you propose to introduce legislation to end this service. We certainly would be glad to consider any legislation you feel might be necessary.

However, I want to make sure that certain facts are in your hands which would help you in preparing this legislation. First, this is not "a newly created wire service." Market news service has been operated under congressional directive since 1915, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture since its inception has been required to gather and disseminate useful information to the people.

Second, this service is available to all press media, or anyone else, just as are all of the news releases of the Department. In one case, Department information is made available in mimeograph form. In another USDA information is made available to the public in bulletins and other printed matter. In the case at hand, public information on commodity markets is being made available through a system of leased wires linking over 200 farm markets and marketing regions. This system transmits daily the commodity prices and stocks data so essential to the business activities of farmers, processors, shippers and distributors.

Third, market news service has never competed with private news services. Rather, it supplies them with information which they could not obtain in any other way. We recently took steps to make this public information more widely available than before. The Government receives no revenue for this, nor does it add to the budgetary costs of the service.

Fourth, if a user of this system takes the data and rewords it or miswords it in an effort to deceive farmers or processors for his personal gain, the Congress would be the first to criticize the Department for not acting to cancel the service in order to protect the public from its misuse.

Frankly, I am surprised that you, as a newspaper publisher, would advocate legislation which would restrict public access to public information. The public should always enjoy full access to public information, and no one has the right to say that access to information gathered at public expense according to the public wish should be channeled through only select hands.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 8269, would prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from operating a news service in competition with private business.

Curiously, Mr. Freeman makes no reference whatever to the fundamental problem with which my bill deals: the threat to press freedom implicit in the growing influence of government in the preparation and distribution of news.

This threat is exemplified in the new market news service the USDA inaugurated August 1. Mr. Freeman's letter states it is not a newly created service, but I invite attention to the USDA publication, AMS 510 of July 1963, which announces the service with this headline: "A New Market News Service."

The information carried over the wires may follow the same pattern as in years past, but the service is both new and sinister.

Sinister because the price tag it carries makes it appealing to those who do not look beyond the dollar sign. To illustrate, a representative of a livestock association called recently to assure me that several of his members like the new market news service because it costs less than comparable private news service.

To them, it is simply a matter of dollars and cents. In that respect, they are like the farmers who voted in favor of the wheat certificate plan. Two-dollar wheat had strong appeal. Other farmers—a majority, fortunately—looked beyond the dollar sign, saw a threat to freedom in the Government-subsidized and Government-controlled scheme, and voted "no."

The leased-wire arrangement the USDA has authorized definitely has price tag appeal. The USDA wire network touches more than 200 points widely scattered throughout the United States, and carries an impressive volume of factual information, all of it gathered at public expense. No private news service can hope to match the Government-subsidized price which American Telephone & Telegraph Co. is now enabled to offer to tap-on customers.

To Secretary Freeman, and to those who are attracted by the price tag, I respectfully recommend a little review of history. Two chapters should be adequate: Peter Zenger's historic court battle against Government censorship in colonial days and Dr. Goebbels' use of government propaganda to make possible Hitler's Nazi regime in Germany in the 1930's.

These chapters underscore the fundamental importance of news gathering and news distribution that is independent of government. Unhappily, the new USDA market news service will strengthen rather than weaken Government influence in this field.

It eliminates the reporter—the fellow who has a nose for news, digs in deep, verifies the facts and writes them up without fear or favor. He has to be big enough to question and probe kings, presidents, secretaries, and Congressmen, strong enough to brush off bribes, tough enough to withstand pressure and threats, courageous enough to write the truth as he sees it—not slanted to official viewpoint but crisp with clarity and bristling with integrity.

Government employees, by the very nature of their employment, cannot possibly be reporters in the great tradition of the free press. They are writers, not reporters. There is a big difference. It is as big as the difference between dictatorship and freedom.

In the new USDA market news service, Government employees control the copy from front to back. They do the preparation, the rewrite, the editing. They even feed the copy into the wire circuits. Absent is any screening, checking, probing, digging, and evaluation by persons independent of Government control.

USDA's example is apt to be followed by others. Every department of Government is a source of news important to all Americans. As USDA's wire service becomes firmly entrenched—and useful to the Department in getting to the public the information and viewpoint it desires—other departments will be tempted to follow suit. Think of the possibilities: HEW, Interior, Commerce, Post Office, Defense, Treasury, State, Justice, and so on. Like Agriculture, each its own readymade communications system, linking widely scattered offices.

Then someone will have the bright idea of consolidating all these into a Federal news service—a sort of unification of the propaganda machines. It could even be promoted as an economy move.

What is wrong with all this?

First. Government is not always a reliable source of information. Government is inclined to tell what appears to be good for government—whether truthful or not. Arthur Sylvester, Under Secretary of Defense, declared recently that government has the "inherent right to lie."

During the past year I have documented several instances in which Secretary Freeman himself has used exaggerations, half-truths and misleading data to sell a viewpoint. The most glaring examples occurred just before the House of Representatives voted a 2-year extension of the feed grains program last spring.

Second. A government wire service, even on the specialized and limited scale now authorized, is a tempting propaganda weapon. No law limits it to statistical and strictly market data.

In fact, USDA's publication AMS 510—referred to above—announces on page 11:

> In addition, all circuits carry a variety of additional marketing information—as it is available—on crops and livestock production, storage holdings, meat production and various USDA new releases of importance to marketers.

The phrase "news releases of importance to marketers" is broad enough to cover about anything. Secretary Freeman and his successors could use the wire service to propagandize farmers in future referendums.

Third. Government has shown it will abuse propaganda opportunities. This year's prize example was the memorandum issued April 12 by Mr. Freeman's Deputy Administrator of ASCS, Ray Fitzgerald, in connection with the wheat referendum. In it, he informed State ASC committeemen of the dependence of radio and TV stations on Federal licensing, and urged them to act "aggressively" to get stations to carry USDA's viewpoint on the wheat referendum.

Government already does too much propagandizing of the American people.

To illustrate, today's mail brought the text of Secretary Freeman's September 8 address to a farmer meeting in Worthington, Minn. It was the 3,003d press release issued by the USDA in 1963.

We need more good reporters in Washington, and fewer propagandists.

Spoon-feeding Washington's press corps from a mountain of press releases is bad for reporters and bad for freedom. Like farmers who get dependent on Government checks, reporters get dependent on press releases. Farmers forget how to farm, and reporters forget how to dig for news.

Fourth. The new market service establishes the power of censorship. The USDA retains the right to discontinue service to any customer. This right is easily abused, and will enable a vindictive Secretary of Agriculture to retaliate effectively against media which fail to cooperate.

Fifth. Government domination of news gathering and distribution ends the discipline of competition. This discipline makes for quality, accuracy and integrity.

Governments do not rise and fall on the integrity of their press releases, but newspapers and other media do. If a reporter is inaccurate, warped, or slanted in his writing, he will lose his job. If a wire service—AP, UPI or otherwise—goes astray it will lose customers to its competitor. If newspapers and other media are not reliable, they will lose their audience.

But USDA writers, feeding copy into the leased wire network, risk their jobs only when they get out of tune with their boss.

We should work together to strengthen—not weaken—our free press. A good way to start is to abolish the new Market News Service arrangement.

PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78 is sometimes defended as a boon to the small farmer, but this is not so, because the family farmer, who does his own work, must compete with the big producers who use cheap foreign labor. Therefore, the family farmer's labor is worth no more than that of the bracero.

I have a letter from a California farmer, which illustrates my point very well. The man said in a letter to me:

> I am writing to thank you for the stand you have taken on the bracero program. I am sure that the big farmers from California have thrown a lot of money behind the fight to extend the program. As a farmer (375 acres, 140 irrigated) I want you to know that many of us small farmers don't have the time or money to fight for the end of the program. It is very difficult for a family-size farmer to compete with the large farmers when the big producers can import cheap labor. Here in California the big farmers import sheepherders from Spain and braceros from Mexico while domestic workers can't get work at a living wage.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one letter from one farmer, but I know that there are many farmers who feel the same as this man, and the same as the producer from McAllen, Tex., whose letter I read last week. I know my colleagues will stand by our May defeat of an extension of Public Law 78, despite the heavy pressures being exerted on them.

THE LATE ERIC JOHNSTON

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a notable figure in public life is often the occasion for a great outpouring of eulogies replete with repeated references to the accomplishments which marked the man's career. However, in rising to pay tribute to the late Eric Johnston, I need not enlarge upon what Mr. Johnston accomplished in his truly unique and remarkable life. His was a life of service and dedication to advancing the cause of democracy through cooperation and understanding. I need only to cite objectively the high regard in which he was held by all people with whom and for whom he labored so diligently and enthusiastically. Indeed, I need cite only the unusual quality and talent he displayed in affecting cooperation among people and nations of diverse political, social, economic, and religious backgrounds. Eric's rise to true greatness is a tribute both to the Nation, which offers opportunities to those of modest beginnings, and to his own determination to make full use of those opportunities in order that he might develop fully his innate potential.

Adversity which might have deterred a lesser man was not permitted to cloud the vision which the young Johnston had of the future. As a young school boy, Eric continued with his studies while helping to support his widowed mother. As a college student, he continued to work at a variety of jobs while pursuing a degree. In 1917 he was graduated with a law degree from the University of Washington. But Eric was destined not to practice law. His natural affinity for people, developed through close contact with diverse groups in a variety of jobs led him into the world of business.

His success as a businessman is well known. Equally well known are the qualities which characterized the farseeing Mr. Johnston. Notable among these qualities was his humility. In 1961 at a dinner given in his honor, he responded in typical Johnston fashion to the well-deserved tribute paid to him when he said:

> I believe your words, yet I do not believe myself worthy of them. In these 15 years, I know how far I have come. As president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, I had an office that looked out upon Lafayette Park. As President of the Motion Picture Association a decade and a half later, I am a block away still looking at that same park, same view. Few men can boast that they have taken so long to go one city block.

Equally notable was his realistic admonition to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce relative to the roles that Government and labor must play in the Nation's economy.

His dedication to principle was evidenced by his differences with those in his own political party. He never allowed partisan considerations to dictate what issues or programs he would support. Once convinced of the soundness of an idea or plan, he supported it without regard for personal popularity or gain. He was far above such considerations.

Mr. Johnston's dedication to principle, his integrity, his genuine concern for the well-being of all peoples, and his enormous capacity for projecting an image of enlightened capitalism was recognized by four Presidents of the United States who called on him repeatedly to perform services vital to the Nation. That these services, performed at times under adverse conditions and at other times in highly sensitive areas were invariably characterized by concrete results in further tribute to the greatness of Eric Johnston.

Of the many tributes to Eric Johnston let it be said that he was worthy. Indeed, no one tried harder to be worthy. For as he once said:

> I shall try * * * to administer (my) tasks with prudence and principle, under the laws of God and laws of man.

ERIC A. JOHNSTON: A TRIBUTE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Eric A. Johnston is a great loss to the entire Nation. His career in business and public service should be an inspiration to all Americans.

From a humble beginning as a door-to-door salesman, Mr. Johnston built a large network of corporate enterprises. At the age of 46, in 1941, he became the youngest man ever to hold the office of president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

His conception of capitalism as "a competitive economic system designed for the enrichment of the many and not to make a few men rich," shocked the old guard of the chamber. He was hailed by many as "the first breath of fresh air to blow through the chamber in 20 years."

Under his leadership, the chamber established cordial relations with labor and government. The membership of the chamber was impressed by his vigorous administration and he was reelected president three times.

Mr. Johnston's progressive views attracted the attention of President Roosevelt. The President sent him abroad several times as a special emissary and salesman for the free enterprise system. Later his diplomatic skills were utilized by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

Since 1945, Mr. Johnston had served as president of the Motion Picture Association of America. In this position he administered the industry's moral code of self-censorship. He performed this difficult job with statesmanship and discretion.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Eric Johnston is an irreparable loss to the motion picture industry. But more than this, America has lost one of its ablest spokesmen for our way of life.

YOUTH, TOO, CONCERNED OVER WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, on which I am privileged to serve, is currently conducting a series of regional hearings and on-spot inspections of river basins for the purpose of developing a file of information upon which we can predicate recommendations for the outlines of Federal assistance and cooperation with the several States, counties, and cities, which are endeavoring to cope with the expanding problem of water pollution.

The subcommittee has already conducted hearings in Trenton, N.J., and Chicago, Ill., and we are presently making plans for similar studies in Connecticut. We have scheduled hearings at Hartford, Conn., for next month with on-spot inspections of Connecticut areas scheduled at the same time.

It is encouraging to note that the problem is receiving attention at the several levels of Government and I was extremely interested in the enlightening article in the September 16 issue of the U.S. News & World Report entitled "Pollution of U.S. Air and Water—How Serious?"

The article consisted of an extensive interview with Dr. Luther L. Terry, head of the U.S. Public Health Service, in which he cited the growing menace and hazard to health in the United States created by air and water pollution. I recommend this article to my colleagues.

Of particular interest to me, however, was the revelation that the youngsters of our Nation are also aware of the water pollution problem and want something done about it. As evidence of this interest, I submit a letter addressed to the editor of the Waterbury (Conn.) American by a 13-year-old schoolboy, Paul Lesieur, who resides at 108 South Street, Waterbury, Conn. His letter, which was published in the September 3, 1963, edition of the Waterbury American, follows:

> YOUNG CITIZEN PROTESTS
> POLLUTION OF AREA STREAMS
>
> TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN:
>
> I would like you to put something in your newspaper about water pollution. Everybody throws beer cans, paper cups and everything they can find to dirty the clean or used-to-be-clean brooks, and lakes. It's not all the people, just some careless ones, Hop Brook is dirty, full of all kinds of trash. Last year my friends and I went to Hop Brook. We had a lot of fun walking in the water and just hopping stones, but now it isn't fun any more. The water is dirty and full of filth. I just wish you would print this so people would not be so careless and think twice before they dirtied any picnic area or stream.
>
> PAUL LESIEUR.
>
> AUGUST 29, 1963.

I hope that his intelligent expression of concern on the seriousness of our water pollution problem may be reflected in the thoughts and actions of our juveniles and our adults as well.

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation identical to that introduced by Senators BREWSTER and BEALL of Maryland, which provides for establishment of Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia.

As the Congressman at Large from Maryland, I am proud to have this beautiful, natural resource in my district, and to introduce legislation which would permit its maximum use not only by Marylanders, but by millions of other citizens on the eastern seaboard seeking recreational activity.

Yesterday, the influential Maryland Board of Public Works, of which Governor Tawes is a member, supported the concept of public development of the island. Prior to their decision, this matter has been given intensive study by interested agencies in the State of Maryland, and public hearings have been held at which all interested parties had an oportunity to express their views.

The concept of public development of Assateague Island has previously been supported by the Maryland State Department of Health, the Maryland Department of Forests and Parks, the Maryland Board of Natural Resources, the Maryland State Department of Planning, and the Maryland Economic Development Commission.

At the present time, much of our publicly owned parkland is located away from the great urban centers of our population. My bill, authorizing joint Federal-State development of Assateague Island, would preserve the valuable natural resource for public use that will be located where many of our people are located. I am sure this bill will be of particular interest to many of my Eastern colleagues because of the fact that one-fifth of the total population of the United States, almost 34 million people, live within a 250-mile radius of the proposed national seashore in my district.

My bill will: first, authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, waters, and other property, for purposes of establishing a seashore, providing that, " in the case of acquisition by negotiation purchase, the property owner shall be paid the fair market value by the Secretary;" second, permit the acquisition of the properties of the Chincoteague-Assateague Bridge and Beach Authority; third, allow the owners of improved property to occupy their holdings for a term of not more than 25 years; fourth, require the Federal Government to reimburse the State of Maryland for two-thirds of the cost of the bridge to the island; fifth, permit the State of Maryland to acquire lands in addition to the 2 miles of parkland it already owns on the island; and sixth, permit the Secretary of the Interior to regulate hunting and fishing in accordance with the appropriate State laws.

Public development of Assateague Island has been strongly supported by both Secretary of the Interior Udall and the newly formed Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I feel that it is a desirable course of action, both in terms of the economic benefits that will accrue to Worcester County and the State of Maryland, and in terms of the unique swimming, boating, hunting, and fishing opportunities it will provide for millions of our citizens.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSED TAX CUT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN of Georgia). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I would like to call to the attention of the House a rather significant resolution which was adopted today by the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. This committee is headed by Mr. Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co. and Mr. Stuart T. Saunders, the president of the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. It includes among its members as vice chairmen, Mr. Sam M. Fleming, president, Third National Bank of Nashville; Frazar B. Wilde, chairman, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; Frederick R. Kappel, chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; T. S. Petersen, retired president, Standard Oil Co. of California; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; Gardiner Symonds, chairman Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.; J. Harris Ward, chairman and president, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a list of the members of this group of businessmen.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION IN 1963

ALABAMA

Alexander, L. Morley, manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Blount, Winton M., president, Blount Brothers Corp.

Brock, Glen Porter, president, Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co.

Cummings, Milton K., chairman and president, Brown Engineering Co.

Daniel, R. Hugh, president and treasurer, Daniel Construction Co., Inc.

DeBardeleben, John, general manager (Montgomery), New York Life Insurance Co.

Dowd, Paul L., president, Loveman, Joseph & Loeb.

Eisenberg, M. E., president, Flagg-Utica Corp.

Finch, Robert E., special agent, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Garrett, Robert E., president, United States Pipe & Foundry Co.

Giddens, Kenneth R., president, WKRG-TV, Inc.

Harwood, John C., general agent, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Kennedy, Walter, president, the First National Bank of Montgomery.

Kershaw, Royce, president, Kershaw Manufacturing Co., Inc.

Levy, H. F., president, South Alabama Distributors, Inc.

McGowin, Earl M., vice president, W. T. Smith Lumber Co.

McLean, J. K., president, Waterman Steamship Corp.

McRae, J. Finley, chairman of the board, the Merchants National Bank of Mobile.

Michaels, A. C., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Thomas, R. R., superintendent, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Warner, Jack W., president, Gulf States Paper Corp.

ALASKA

Hossfeld, Walter E., Jr., general manager (Anchorage), New York Life Insurance Co.

Kennard, R. A., president, Alaska State Bank.

Stepp, John, Friendly Ford, Inc.

ARIZONA

Bartley, C. E., president, Rocket Power, Inc.

Bentson, K. G., president, Union Rock & Materials Corp.

Bimson, Carl A., vice chairman of the board, Valley National Bank.

Bimson, Walter R., chairman of the board, Valley National Bank.

Broad, Eli, president, Kaufman & Broad Building Co.

Felix, Louis J., senior vice chairman, Southern Arizona Bank & Trust Co.

Fickes, K. L., plant manager, Goodyear Aerospace Corp.

Hallett, C. H., president, Allison Steel Manufacturing Co.

Horne, M. Seth, president, James Stewart Co.

McGwire, Edwin D., C.L.U., inspector of agencies, Phoenix general office, New York Life Insurance Co.

ARIZONA

Murdock, David H., David H. Murdock Development Co.

O'Malley, E. V., president, Affiliated O'Malley Cos.

Pope, Robert E., Jr., general manager, Tucson General Office, New York Life Insurance Co.

ARKANSAS

Bellamy, J. W., president, National Bank of Commerce.

Bolton, Charles A., comptroller, The First Pyramid Life Insurance Co. of America.

Clark, T. A., Jr., president and chairman of the board, Buhrman-Pharr Hardware Co.

Flanders, Donald H., president and general manager, Flanders Manufacturing Co.

Gordon, Frank N., Participating Annuity Life Insurance Co.

Hamlen, James C., Jr., president and treasurer, J. H. Hamlen & Son, Inc.

Haun, Carl B., president, Ben Pearson, Inc.

Kinard, Curtis, Curtis Kinard Oil Co.

Kluglose, Ben, general manager, Gilman-Kosten and C. H. Briley Co.

Lewis, George A., vice president and general manager, ITT, Arkansas Division.

Nahas, Mike, partner, Joseph Nahas Co.

Ohlendorf, Harold G., Ohlendorf Farms.

Penick, Edward M., president, Worthen Bank & Trust Co.

Rebsamen, Raymond H., chairman of the board, Rebsamen & East, Inc.

Rosen, Louis, Williams & Rosen Insurance Agency.

Stephens, Wilton R., chairman and president, Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.

Sullivan, Dabbs, president, Bank of Arkansas.

Thomas, Herbert L., Jr., president, The First Pyramid Life Insurance Co. of America.

Vinson, B. Finley, president, First National Bank.

Ward, James A, III, president, Ward Furniture Manufacturing Co.

Winburn, H. L., president, Winburn Tile Manufacturing Co.

CALIFORNIA

Alen, William, district sales manager, Lincoln-Mercury Division, Ford Motor Co.

Allan, Thomas C., chairman, Servisoft of California.

Andrews, John J., C.L.U., general manager, (San Diego), New York Life Insurance Co.

Arbogast, Richard E., president, Newberry Electric Corp.

Arnett, M. E., executive vice president, Bullock's Inc.

Austin, Lloyd L., chairman, Security First National Bank.

Babich, Leo B., president, Hill & Richards Co.

Backstrand, J. H., division planning manager, Packing Equipment Division, F.M.C. Corp.

Baer, Francis S., chairman of the board, United California Bank.

Bannan, Thomas J., president, Western Gear Corp.

Barker, C. A., Jr., chairman, Finance Committee, Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

Barr, W. L., vice president and general manager, Jesse R. Ellico, Inc.

Beaumont, Allen B., partner, William R. Staats & Co.

Bechtel, Kenneth K., chairman of the board, Industrial Indemnity Co.

Bechtel, Stephen D., chairman, Bechtel Corp.

Beise, S. Clark, president, Bank of America.

Bell, Robert S., president, Packard-Bell Electronics Corp.

Benoist, Louis A., president, Lawrence Warehouse Co.

Bishopp, Robert T., general manager (Ventura), New York Life Insurance Co.

Black, James B., chairman of executive committee, Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Borthwick, Anderson, president, First National Bank of San Diego.

Boucher, S. L., division manager, Packing Equipment Division, FMC Corp.

Bradley, John L., attorney, Crimmins, Kent, Bradley & Burns.

Brady, Donley L., vice president and general manager, R. V. Dorweiler Co.

Brawner, A. Harry, San Francisco.

Brawner, W. P. F., president, W. P. Fuller Co.

Britt, Roy A., president, Citizens National Bank.

Brower, Horace W., president, Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California.

Bryant, George, president, ITT General Controls, Inc.

Burnett, T. S., vice chairman, Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Callaway, Harry E., president, Thearle Music Co.

Candy, Walter W., president, Bullocks, Inc.

Carter, Edward W., president, Broadway-Hale Stores, Inc.

Clary, Hugh L., chairman of the board, Clary Corp.

Cochran, Dwight M., president, Kern County Land Co.

Colburn, Graydon, president, Roos-Atkins.

Coldwell, Colbert, partner, Coldwell, Banker & Co.

Colefax, Peter, chairman, American Potash & Chemical Corp.

Cook, Ransom M., president, Wells Fargo Bank.

Coonan, James F., chairman and president, Mandrel Industries, Inc.

Cooper, Sheldon G., attorney, Cooper, White & Cooper.

Cooper, Walter J., regional sales manager, western region, Ford Division, Ford Motor Co.

Cornwall, F. E., president, Macco Corp.

Cover, John H., Aeronutronic Division, Philco Corp.

Creed, S. Howell, assistant chief engineer, Canning Machine Division, Western FMC Corp.

Cullen, John O'Brien, general manager (San Francisco), New York Life Insurance Co.

Darnell, D. W., vice chairman of the board, the Fluor Corp., Ltd.

Davies, Paul L., chairman, FMC Corp.

Davis, Charles T., general merchandising manager, H. C. Henshey Co.

Di Giorgio, Robert, Di Giorgio Fruit Corp.

Dinubilo, John J., Jr., partner, D. Dinubilo & Co.

Dolan, Arthur J., Jr., vice president, Blyth & Co., Inc.

Dornsife, H. W., president, Herrick Iron Works.

Douglas, Donald W., Jr., president, Douglas Aircraft Co.

Draper, William H., Jr., Draper, Gaither & Anderson.

Driver, Warren, president, C. W. Driver, Inc.

Eastwood, Joseph, Jr., president and chairman of the board, Pacific States Steel Corp.

Eaton, Lewis S., president, Fresno Guarantee Savings & Loan Association.

Eckis, Rollin, president, Richfield Oil Corp.

Edwards, Robert V., American Pipe & Construction Co.

Elsman, Ralph, president, San Jose Water Works.

Elworthy, Mark C., president, Elworthy & Co.

Emett, Robert L., president, Emett & Chandler.

Escobosa, Hector, president, I. Magnin & Co.

Essick, Bryant, president, Essick Manufacturing Co.

Ets-Hokin, Jeremy, president, Ets-Hokin & Galvan, Inc.

Fay, Charles W., partner, William R. Staats Co.

Ferguson, G. E., manager, western operations, FMC Corp.

Finch, Robert H., Finch, Bell, Duitsman & Margulis, Attorneys at Law.

Fluno, Gordon C., loan supervisor, Residential Mortgage Department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Fluor, J. R., president, the Fluor Corp., Ltd.

Forbes, John F., senior partner, John F. Forbes & Co.

Ford, John E., Jr., chairman of the board, United States Oil & Refining Co.

Fredrickson, O., president, Fredrickson & Watson Construction Co.

Gant, Charles G., director, reentry systems programs, Aeronutronic Division, Philco Corp.

Getty, George F., II, president, Tidewater Oil Co.

Goertz, Elmer A., president, Bakersfield Savings & Loan Association.

Goldback, Harold K., C.L.U., general manager, Pasadena General Office, New York Life Insurance Co.

Guterman, F. H., president, ITT, Industrial Production Division.

Haas, Walter A., Jr., president, Levi Strauss & Co.

Hadley, Everett P., president, Hadley Auto Transport.

Haff, Theodore L., Jr., Smith, Barney & Co.

Haines, Arthur C., assistant director, Shillelagh program, Aeronutronic Division, Philco Corp.

Halway, Darwin A., president, First Western Bank & Trust Co.

Hanseen, Robert B., general manager (Sunset Branch), New York Life Insurance Co.

Harling, J. E., president, Astro-Science Corp.

Harnois, Nelson C., executive vice president, Temec, Inc.

Harrison, William H., Los Angeles.

Harvey, Lawrence A., president, Harvey Aluminum, Inc.

Henderson, Pearson, president, Bridge Investment Co.

Hickey, F. D., research manager, FMC Corp.

Hill, James C., division manager, City Mortgage Department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Hillings, Patrick J., Ford Motor Co.

Hobbs, Charles S., Broadway-Hale Stores, Inc.

Hoeft, J. E., president, Glendale Federal Saving & Loan Association.

Hoffman, H. L., chairman of the board, Hoffman Electronics Corp.

Hogan, Joseph F., first vice president, Crocker-Anglo National Bank.

Hoover, Paul E., chairman of the board, Crocker-Anglo National Bank.

Horton, J. K., president, Southern California Edison Co.

Hotchkis, Preston, president, Fred H. Bixby Ranch Co.

Houdlette, Ernest S., San Francisco.

Houston, Norman, president, Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.

How, Jack. H., general partner, Edward R. Bacon Co.

Howard, Charles P., president, Howard Terminal.

Howard, J. B., plant manager, Ford Motor Co.

Hunt, Reed O., president, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

Jeffries, Allerton H., president, Jeffries Banknote Co.

Johnson, Duane R., general manager (San Bernardino), New York Life Insurance Co.

Johnson, Walter S., chairman, American Forest Products Corp.

Keith, Willard W., Los Angeles.

Kendrick, Charles, chairman of the board, Schlage Lock Co.

Kennedy, D. P., president, First American Title Insurance & Trust Co.

King, Frank L., chairman of the board, United California Bank.

Kroeter, James, Los Gatos.

Kroll, Clifton H., president, Atkins, Kroll & Co., Ltd.

Lawson, John B., Aeronutronic Division, Philco Corp.

Lichtwardt, G. R., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Lindeman, Carl O.,' president, Pacific Telephone-Telegraph Co.

Link, H. L., division manager, FMC Corp.

Littlefield, E. W., president and general manager, Utah Construction & Mining Co.

Loebbecke, Ernest J., chairman of the board, Title Insurance & Trust Co.

Long, E. Ronald, president, San Francisco Federal savings & Loan Association.

Lucks, Roy G., president, California Packing Corp.

Lundborg, Louis B., executive vice president, Bank of America.

Lytton, Bart, chairman of the board and president, Lytton Financial Corp.

Maclean, Donald, president, California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp.

Malliard, J. W., III, vice president, Malliard & Schmiedell.

McAllister, Elliott, chairman, the Bank of California National Association.

McBean, Atholl, chairman of the board, the Newhall Land & Farming Co.

McBean, Peter, vice president, the Newhall Land & Farming Co.

McEnerney, Garrett, II, San Francisco.

McLeod, Angus M., president, Hensley Co.

Mein, William Wallace, San Francisco.

Mejia, Arthur R., resident partner, Harris, Upham & Co.

Merrill, Fred H., president, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co.

Merritt, Ralph E., president, Coast Manufacturing & Supply Co.

Mettler, Ruben F., president, Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.

Miller, Robert W., chairman of the board, Pacific Lighting Corp.

Molloy, Ernest L., president, Macy's California.

Montgomery, George G., chairman of the board, Kern County Land Co.

Moore, Joseph A., Jr., president, Moore Dry Dock Co.

Moore, William E., Jr., president, Tejon Ranch Co.

Mudd, Henry T., president, Cyprus Mines Corp.

Murphy, George, vice president, Technicolor Corp.

Musick, Elvon, chairman of the board, Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii.

Nadal, R. R., Western regional sales manager, Lincoln-Mercury Division Ford Motor Co.

Nielsen, S. F., Nielsen Construction Co.

Norris, K. T., chairman of the board, Norris-Thermador.

Noyce, Dr. Robert N., vice president, Fairchild Semiconductor.

Okell, Jack, vice president, Alexander & Alexander, Inc.

Packard, David, president, Hewlett-Packard Co.

Peck, C. L., Los Angeles.

Pendleton, Morris B., president, Pendleton Tool Industries, Inc.

Petersen, T. S., retired president, Standard Oil Co. of California.

Philbin, John J., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Pike, Thomas P., chairman, the Republic Supply Co. of California.

Pomeroy, Robert N., president, J. H. Pomeroy & Co., Inc.

Ponting, A. E., chairman of the executive committee, Blyth & Co., Inc.

Quinton, Harold, chairman of the board, Southern California Edison Co.

Qvale, Kjell H., president, British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd.

Ramo, Simon, vice chairman of the board, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.

Ramsey, Neal D., president, Market Basket.

Ray, Philip A., counselor at law.

Ray, R. G., vice president and division general manager, ITT General Controls, Inc.

Ray, William A., president, ITT General Controls, Inc.

Riemer, Hugo, president, U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp.

Roberts, William E., president, Ampex Corp.

Rocca, B. T., Jr., president, Pacific Vegetable Oil Corp.

Rogers, Joseph, president, the First National Bank of San Jose.

Roush, Carroll J., president O.N.C. Motor Freight System.

Russell, D. J., president, Southern Pacific Co.

Ryan, Edward F., president, Capital Co.

Salik, Charles E., president, Electronics Investment Management Corp.

Sesnon, Porter, president, Porter Estate Co.

Sevier, Randolph, president, Matson Navigation Co.

Shanahan, Norman G., Leo J. Shanahan & Sons.

Sherman, O. M., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Shuman, J. Robert, partner, Shuman, Agnew & Co.

Simpson, William, Sr., president, William Simpson Construction Co.

Smith, Lloyd P., director, research laboratory, Aeronutronic Division, Philco Corp.

Smith, Richard S., general manager (Salinas), New York Life Insurance Co.

Smith, Ritchie C., City Transfer & Storage Co.

Sproul, Allan, Kentfield.

Stanford, Eric, executive vice president, I. Magnin & Co.

Stephens, Claude P., general manager (Riverside), New York Life Insurance Co.

Stewart, Richard R., general manager (Oakland), New York Life Insurance Co.

Stoneham, Horace, National Exhibition Co.

Tapp, Jesse W., chairman of the board, Bank of America.

Taylor, Howard L., president, Taylor & Co.

Tietjen, Melvin, general manager (Torrance), New York Life Insurance Co.

Tincher, William R., senior vice president, Purex Corp., Ltd.

Tobin, Joseph O., president, the Hibernia Bank.

Torrey, Peter, manager, S. F. Branch, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Townsend, Calvin K., chairman of the board, chief executive officer and treasurer, Jennings Radio Manufacturing Corp.

Trippet, Oscar A., Trippet, Yoakum & Ballantyne.

Trutanic, N. F., vice president, International Division, Van Camp Sea Food Co.

Tweter, Clifford, vice chairman of the board, Western Bancorporation.

Twist, G. F., division manager, Hydrodynamics Division, FMC Corp.

Veatch, Paul J., secretary, Santa Cruz Rental Owners Association, Inc.

Vener, Samuel S., president, Samuel S. Vener Co., Inc.

Volk, Harry J., president, Union Bank.

Walberg, Richard, chairman of the board, Swinerton & Walberg Co.

Walker, S. A., president, Farmers & Merchants Bank of Long Beach.

Walkup, Ward G., president, Walkup Drayage & Warehouse Co.

Walsh, Philip F., president, Southern California Water Co.

Walters, Lloyd A., chairman, board of directors, Apartment House Association of Santa Clara County, Inc.

Watson, J. J., manager, Product Assurance Office, Aeronutronic Division, Philco Corp.

Weaver, H. L., assistant plant manager, Union Carbide Chemicals Co.

Wellman, Charles A., president, First Charter Financial Corp.

Wells, Briant H., Jr., president, Title Insurance & Trust Co.

Whitman, F. B., president, the Western Pacific Railroad Co.

Whittle, H. F., president, Whittle Investment Co.

Wilbur, Brayton, Wilbur-Ellis Co.

Wild, H. F., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

William, H. J., plant controller (San Jose), Ford Motor Co.

Wittenberg, Carl H., partner, Twaits-Wittenberg Co.

Wyer, Rolfe, vice president and treasurer, Airtek Dynamics, Inc.

Zable, Walter J., president, Cubic Corp.

COLORADO

Adams, Eugene H., president, the First National Bank of Denver.

Benz, Dale, president, Western Elaterite Co.

Bromfield, A. J., president, Western Federal Savings & Loan Assn. of Denver.

Burns, Franklin L., president, the D. C. Burns Realty & Trust Co.

Cross, Earl F., president, the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co.

Dobbins, Chris, president, Ideal Cement Co.

Gates, Charles C., Jr., president, the Gates Rubber Co.

Hildt, Thomas, Jr., Bosworth, Sullivan & Co.

Hoyt, Palmer, editor and publisher, Denver Post.

Kemp, Frank A., president, the Great Western Sugar Co.

Knight, Roger D., Jr., chairman of the board, Denver U.S. National Bank.

Kountze, Harold, chairman of the board, Colorado National Bank.

Leonard, Wells C., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

McGrath, F. X., general manager (Denver Division), Philco Distributors, Inc.

McNeill, Harry L., president, General Iron Works Co.

Montague, J. E., president, American National Bank of Denver.

Murphy, Thomas J., division manager, city mortgage department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Nielsen, Aksel, chairman, the Title Guaranty Co.

Person, R. T., president, Public Service Co. of Colorado.

Roberts, Melvin J., president, Colorado National Bank.

Shaw, David B., trust officer, the First National Bank.

Shipley, D. M., manager, Denver parts depot, Ford Motor Co.

Shwayder, King D., president, Shwayder Brothers, Inc.

Wadley, Frederick H., president, the Colorado Builders' Supply Co.

Willard, E. Warren, Boettcher & Co.

CONNECTICUT

Alsop, John, Hartford.

Barnes, Carlyle F., president, Associated Spring Corp.

Barney, Austin D., chairman, the Hartford Electric Light Co.

Baruch, Eduard, president, Heli-Coil Corp.

Bell, William C., chairman of the board, United Illuminating Co.

Bennett, Gordon, president, the Whitlock Manufacturing Co.

Bent, James E., president, Hartford Federal Savings.

Berol, Emile Albert, president, Eagle Pencil Co.

Bitter, Jack T. F., president, the Parker-Hartford Corp.

Brainerd, Lyman B., president, Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection & Insurance Co.

Brown, Mark H., Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.

Burke, Kenneth K., publisher, the Hartford Times.

Camp, Orton P., president, the Platt Bros. & Co.

Cheney, A. Austin, chairman, Farrel Corp.

Colgate, S. Bayard, Darien.

Cook, Alan S., vice president, Royal McBee Corp.

Coolidge, John, Farmington.

Cooper, Everett A., president, Emhart Manufacturing Co.

Cooper, Stanley M., chairman, Fafnir Bearing Co.

Cott, John J., president, Cott Beverage Corp.

Cressy, Morton S., Jr., vice president, Emhart Manufacturing Co.

Day, Pomeroy, president, the Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.

DeWitt, J. Doyle, president, Travelers Insurance Cos.

Dibble, Lewis A., chairman of the board, the Risdon Mfg. Co.

Dolliver, E. P., vice president, Wallace Silversmith.

Douglas, John W., president, Republic Foil, Inc.

Ellsworth, John E., president, the Ensign-Bickford Co.

Enders, Ostrom, chairman, Hartford National Bank & Trust Co.

Fenn, Wilson Lee, president, Fenn Manufacturing Co.

Gagarin, Andrew, president, the Torrington Manufacturing Co.

Gibson, Raymond A., president, Hartford Electric Light Co.

Gilbert, James H., president, C. W. Blakeslee & Sons, Inc.

Goodyear, Austin, president, Hewitt-Robins, Inc.

Hallden, Karl W., president and treasurer, the Hallden Machine Co.

Hart, Ralph A., president, Heublein, Inc.

Horner, H. Mansfield, chairman, United Aircraft Corp.

Hullett, James C., chairman, Hartford Fire Insurance Co.

Jebb, William T., president, Hartford Gas Co.

Kaman, Charles H., president, Kaman Aircraft Corp.

Knapp, Sherman R., president, Connecticut Light & Power Co.

Lyons, William I., Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.

Martin, John G., chairman, Heublein, Inc.

McCarthy, Daniel C., president, Pratt & Whitney Co., Inc.

Mortensen, William H., managing director, Horace Bushnell Memorial Corp.

Mountain, Harry M., president, Aetna Insurance Co.

Muirhead, David, president, American Hardware Corp.

Murtha, John S., Shepherd, Murtha & Merritt.

North, John A., chairman of the board, Phoenix Insurance Co.

Pease, Julian C., chairman and president, New Britain Machine Co.

Rider, Harold E., president, Fairfield County Trust Co.

Roberts, Henry R., president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Rome, Lewis, Rome, Aronson & Case.

Rosenthal, Richard L., president, Citizens Utilities Co.

Shippee, Lester E., chairman, Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.

Silverstein, Saul M., president, Rogers Corp.

Simons, Thomas C., agency vice president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Smith, Lester C., president, the Spencer Turbine Co.

Smith, Olcott D., vice chairman, Aetna Life Insurance Co.

Stauble, Wilbur C., president, Veeder-Root, Inc.

Steinkraus, Herman W., former president, Bridgeport Brass Co.

Stewart, Sidney A., president, Chandler Evans Corp.

Stone, Lyndes B., president, Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Sullivan, P. J., president, the Arrow-Hart and Hageman Electric Co.

Tully, Daniel P., Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.

Welch, G. Harold, president, the Harwell Corp.

Wheeler, Walter H., Jr., chairman, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

Wilde, Frazar B., chairman of the board, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Williams, Selden T., chairman of the board, Scovill Mfg. Co.

Wollmar, Sixten F., chairman of the board, Emhart Manufacturing Co.

Zimmerman, Charles J., president, Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.

DELAWARE

Bell, Max S., president, Continental American Life Insurance Co.

Farquhar, Donald K., president, Garrett, Miller & Co.

Gottshall, Ralph K., chairman of the board and president, Atlas Chemical Industries, Inc.

Homsey, Samuel E., Victorine & Samuel Homsey.

Isaacson, Bernard B., Isaacson, Stolper & Co.

McGrath, Thomas A., president, Beneficial Finance Co.

Nowland, Paul J., Wilmington.

Paul, DeWitt J., chairman, Beneficial Finance Co.

Reese, Charles Lee, Jr., president, the News-Journal Co.

Workman, R. J., vice president, J. E. Workman, Inc.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Baker, Robert C., chairman and president, American Security & Trust Co.

Banner, Knox, executive director, Downtown Progress.

Briggs, William R., the Towers.

Bittinger, Donald S., president, Washington Gas Light Co.

Brosnan, D. W., president, Southern Railway System.

Burling, Edward, Jr., partner, Covington & Burling.

Carroll, Thoms H., president, the George Washington University.

Chalk, O. Roy, president, D. C. Transit Co.

Davidson, Lorimer A., president, Government Employees Insurance Cos.

Dickinson, William E., president, Calcium Chloride Inst.

Dunn, R. Roy, president, Potomac Electric Power Co.

Fleming, Robert V., advisory chairman of the board, the Riggs National Bank of Washington, D.C.

Foley, E. H., Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe.

Folger, John Clifford, senior partner, Folger, Nolan, Fleming & Co.

Gardiner, Joseph M., assistant to the president, Thiokol Chemical Corp.

Gardner, Arthur, chairman, Bundy Tubing Co.

Gore, Philip Larner, president, Security Storage Co. of Washington.

Gray, Robert K., vice president, Washington operations, Hill and Knowlton, Inc.

Hamm, E. F., Jr., president, the Traffic Service Corp.

Harrell, L. P., president, Union Trust Co.

Jagels, Charles H., president, Lansburgh's.

Johnston, James M., senior partner, Johnston, Lemon & Co.

Jones, Chester R., C.L.U., general agent, Chester R. Jones, C. L. U. & Associates.

Kacy, Howard W., president, Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Leith, William T., president, Peoples Life Insurance Co.

Levi, Robert H., president, the Hecht Co.

Morrison, Fred W., Gardner, Morrison & Rogers.

Mullikin, Kent R., regional vice president, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Olmsted, George H., Maj. Gen. USA (retired), president, International Bank.

Quinn, J. J., president, Burlington Refrigerator Express Co.

Robinson, T. Baker, Robinson and Lukens.

Rome, B. T., president, George Hyman Construction Co.

Schmuck, Edward J., vice president and general counsel, Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Smith, Douglas R., president, National Savings and Trust Co.

Watts, Philip H., partner, Alex. Brown & Sons.

Winston, Carey, president, the Carey Winston Co.

FLORIDA

Baker, T. S., president, Shands & Baker, Inc.

Bassett, Henry Hood, president, the First National Bank of Miami.

Bertram, Richard, president, Richard Bertram & Co.

Clapp, William J., president, Florida Power Corp.

Cronin, W. J., loan supervisor, residential mortgage department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Darragh, R. J., vice president and treasurer, Port Everglades Steel Corp.

Fletcher, Edwin H., president, Gibbs Shipyards, Inc.

Flom, S. L., president, Florida Steel Corp.

Gordon, Jack D., president, Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach.

Hairston, Joseph T., general manager (Miami), Philco Distributors, Inc.

Harper, Marvin, C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Johnson, J. N., president, Inter County Telephone and Telegraph Co.

Kerestes, Stanley H., C.L.U., general manager (Miami), New York Life Insurance Co.

Knabb, R. E., president, Guaranty Life Insurance Co. of Florida.

Kosman, Samuel, president, Seaboard Life Insurance Co. of America.

Lee, Scott M., general manager (Tampa), New York Life Insurance Co.

Litman, Bernard, C.L.U., Miami.

Lumpkins, James B., president, the State Bank of Jacksonville.

Middleton, William R., general manager (Miami), New York Life Insurance Co.

Rice, W. Thomas, president, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad.

Rucker, Tinsley W., president, Dixon-Powdermaker Furniture Co.

Sheen, Robert T., president, Milton Roy Co.

Smith, Earl E. T., Palm Beach.

Walker, Paul S., president, Richards.

Whatley, Brown L., chairman of the board, Stockton, Whatley, Davin & Co.

Wilburn, E. Thomas, president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Broward County.

GEORGIA

Anderson, Halstead T., president, Bankers Health & Life Insurance Co.

Baggs, Linton D., president, the Bibb Transit Co.

Barnes, A. E., III, Barnes & Barnes, Inc.

Barwick, E. T., president, E. T. Barwick Mills, Inc.

Blount, Roy A., president, Decatur Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Branch, Harllee, Jr., president, the Southern Co.

Bridges, S. Russell, Jr., president, Piedmont Southern Life Insurance Co.

Callaway, Cason J., Jr., Columbus.

Chiles, John O., president, Adams-Cates Co.

Connors, John F., Jr., regional sales manager, Lincoln-Mercury Division, Ford Motor Co.

Craft, George S., president, the Trust Co. of Georgia.

Creecy, H. L., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Daniel, Jack C., senior appraiser, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Domingos, Richard B., president, Burden, Smith & Co.

Fox, Paul H., president, Reynolds Aluminum Supply Co.

Gaultney, John O., regional vice president, New York Life Insurance Co.

Gilmer, Ben S., president, Southern Bell Telephone Co.

Hardin, Ira H., president, Ira H. Hardin Co.

Harris, Bryon P., A. M. Pullen & Co.

Johnsen, Stanley, regional group manager, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Jones, Alfred W., chairman of the board, Sea Island Co.

Lane, Mills B., Jr., president, the Citizens & Southern National Bank.

Lawton, G. Albert, president, Georgia International Life Insurance Co.

Lewis, Logan, chairman of the board, Georgia Bank & Trust Co.

Link, M. D., superintendent, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

May, Armand, president, American Associated Cos.

McKew, H. A., superintendent, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Moore, J. M., Jr., district sales manager, Ford Division, Ford Motor Co.

Morris, George W., assistant loan supervisor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Munford, Dillard, chairman, Atlantic Co.

Neuner, C. M., factory manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Noble, H. W., southeast regional manager, Autolite Division, Ford Motor Co.

O'Brien, E. P., manager, Atlanta Parts Depot, Ford Division, Ford Motor Co.

Owens, J. Walter, Columbus.

Pair, James H., president, James Pair Personnel Service, Inc.

Resler, A. E., manager, Macon, Ga., Tread Rubber Plant, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Robinson, James D., Jr., chairman, the First National Bank of Atlanta.

Rutland, Guy W., Jr., president, the Motor Convoy, Inc.

Thwaite, Charles E., Jr., chairman of the board, Trust Co. of Georgia.

Timberlake, J. E., Jr., president, Timberlake Grocery Co.

Tracy, Jack W., vice president, Personnel-Employee Relations, Colonial Stores, Inc.

Train, Robert, president, Bibb Manufacturing Co.

VanDenbergh, Robert, Jr., loan supervisor, Residential Mortgage Department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Watson, Al, National Life of Vermont.

HAWAII

Black, R. E., president, E. E. Black, Ltd.

Cameron, J. Walter, president, Maui Electric Co., Ltd.

Dillingham, Lowell S., president, Dillingham Corp.

Dorman, Dan E., president, First National Bank of Hawaii.

Gratz, H. Tucker, chairman, Better Brands, Ltd.

Guild, Douglas S., president, Hawaiian Telephone Co.

Ho, Chinn, president, Capital Investment Co., Ltd.

Johnson, Ralph B., president, the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd.

Kido, Hon. Mitsuyuki, director, Central Pacific Bank.

Mau, William K. H., chairman, American Security Bank.

McCoy, William E., vice president, Stubenberg Co., Ltd.

Morgan, Francis S., vice president, Kukaiau Ranch Co., Ltd.

Smith, C. Hutton, president, American Factors, Ltd.

Weidig, Harold D., president, Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd.

White, H. W. B., executive vice president, Hawaiian Housing Corp., Ltd.

IDAHO

Barnes, Arthur L., president, Erb Hardware Co.

Blanco, Joseph, president, Bank of Idaho.

Bonny, John B., president, Morrison-Knudsen Co.

Corlett, C. M., chairman of the board, Idaho Department Store Co.

Flake, Vernon H., general manager (Boise), New York Life Insurance Co.

Flandro, C. Ed, president, C. Ed Flandro, Inc.

Haight, L. E., J. R. Simplot Co.

Kilbourne, W. Grant, vice president and general manager, J. R. Simplot Co.

Long, J. J., cashier, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Magnuson, H. F., vice president, Golconda Mining Corp.

Montgomery, Robert L., executive vice president, Idaho Bank & Trust Co.

Nelson, Perry A., president, Idaho State Chamber of Commerce.

Rooney, F. S., resident manager, Inorganic Chemicals Division, FMC Corp.

Rose, Rogers K., president, Rogers Bros. Co.

Seelye, Frank D., dean, Idaho State University.

Timothy, Robert K., vice persident and general manager, the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co.

ILLINOIS

Ackerman, F. W., chairman of the board, the Greyhound Corp.

Allen, James L., chairman, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.

Amren, S. C., vice president of manufacturing, Charles Bruning Co., Inc.

Barber, H. A., president, Barber-Greene Co.

Barr, John A., chairman, Montgomery-Ward.

Bassett, Robert C., president, Haywood Publishing Co. of Illinois.

Beatty, Ross J., Jr., manager, Estate of Leander J. McCormick.

Behr, Philip, president, Joseph Behr & Sons, Inc.

Bensinger, Benjamin E., president, Brunswick Corp.

Bercher, Harry O., president, International Harvester Co.

Black, Roy M., president, Black & Co.

Blackie, William, president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Blake, T. M., president, Littelfuse, Inc.

Block, Joseph L., chairman, Inland Steel Co.

Brook, H. C., Lord, Bissell & Brook.

Brown, Cameron, president, George F. Brown & Sons, Inc.

Bruce, Gerald W, executive vice president, I. S. Berlin Press.

Burns, Robert P., Evanston.

Cain, George R., chairman and president, Abbott Laboratories.

Carry, Champ, chairman, Pullman, Inc.

Chandler, Marvin, president, Northern Illinois Gas Co.

Chasen, Robert E., executive vice president, ITT Kellogg Communications Systems.

Cherry, Clifford D., senior vice president, finance, Walter E. Heller & Co.

Clarage, Arthur T., chairman of the board, Columbia Tool Steel Co.

Clement, Franklin G., senior vice president, E. F. Hutton & Co., Inc.,

Coleman, W. C., chairman, Monon Railroad.

Cone, Fairfax M., chairman, executive committee, Foot, Cone & Belding.

Coulter, J. Russel, president, Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad.

Croft, William C., president, the Pyle-National Co.

Cummins, Nathan, chairman of the board, Consolidated Foods Corp.

Cummings, R. G., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Cummings, Tilden, president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

deButts, J. D., president, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.

Devine, Matthew L., president, Amphenol-Borg Electronics Corp.

Dick, Albert B., III, Chicago.

Dixon, Wesley M., chairman of the board, Container Corp. of America.

Donnelley, Gaylord, president, R. R. Donnelley & Sons, Co.

Elting, Winston, F.A.I.A., architect.

Fitzpatrick, C. J., president, Chicago & North Western Railway Co.

Galvin, Robert W., president, Motorola, Inc.

Gibson, Robert L., Jr., president, Libby, McNeill & Libby.

Giles, J. O., chairman, Millers National Insurance Co.

Graham, Donald M., vice chairman of the board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

Graham, W. L., Jr., David A. Noyes & Co.

Graham, William B., president, Baxter Laboratories, Inc.

Grube, Karl P., president, All-Steel Equipment, Inc.

Heineman, Ben W., chairman of the board, Chicago & North Western Railway Co.

Holabird, William, Holabird & Root.

Howlett, William, president, Consolidated Foods Corp.

Ingersoll, Robert S., chairman, Borg-Warner Corp.

James, David E., president, D. O. James Gear Manufacturing Co.

Jarvis, Porter M., president, Swift & Co.

Johnson, R. E., president, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad.

Jones, Paul, president, Cummins-American Corp.

Joynt, E. E., president, the Milliken National Bank of Decatur.

Kanter, Calvin D., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Kennedy, David M., chairman of the board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

Klutznick, Philip M., Klutznick Enterprises.

Korhumel, Newton F., president, Korhumel Steel & Aluminum Co.

Kramer, Ferd, president, Draper & Kramer.

Lang, Gordon, president, Spaulding & Co.

Lanterman, Joseph B., president, Amsted Industries, Inc.

Large, Judson, president, Western Power & Gas Co.

Loebl, Jerrold, Loebl, Schlossman & Bennett.

Lourie, Donald B., chairman of the board, the Quaker Oats Co.

Lunding, Franklin J., chairman of the board, Jewel Tea Co., Inc.

MacArthur, Alfred, chairman of the board, Central Standard Life Insurance Co.

Manuel, Leonard E., president, United Motor Coach Co.

Marsh, Ernest S., president, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway System.

Martin, C. V., president, Carson Pirie Scott & Co.

Mason, V. V., president and general manager, ITT Kellogg Telecommunications.

Matheson, W. A., Sr., president, Portable Elevator Manufacturing Co.

McCaffrey, John L., Chicago.

McGuirk, B. E., regional auditor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Milligan, Robert L., president, the Pure Oil Co.

Mosely, Spencer D., president, General American Transportation Corp.

Murphy, Charles F., Jr., partner, C. F. Murphy Associates.

Murphy, Harry C., chairman and president, Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy Railroad.

Orth, E. A., Jr., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Osborne, John S., president, Central and South West Corp.

Osborne, W. Irving, Jr., president, Pullman, Inc.

Patterson, William A., president, United Air Lines. Inc.

Percy, Charles H., chairman of the board, Bell & Howell Co.

Peterkin, Daniel, Jr., president, Morton Salt Co.

Phelan, J. M., partner, A. T. Kearney & Co.

Quinn, William J., president, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railway Co.

Ratner, Milton D., president, Midwest Emery Freight System, Inc.

Regan, T. W., president, General Box Co.

Riley, Earl K., the Earl K. Riley Co.

Robbins, F. J., president, Bliss & Laughlin.

Roberts, Louis F., Chicago district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Roe, Frederick, partner, Stein Roe & Farnham.

Ross, Walter W., Jr., Peterson, Lowry, Rall, Barber & Ross.

Rubloff, Arthur, chairman, Arthur Rubloff & Co.

Rust, Edward B., president, State Farm Insurance Co.

Seaman, Irving, Jr., president, National Boulevard Bank of Chicago.

Searle, John G., president, G. D. Searle & Co.

Sethness, Charles H., Jr., president, Sethness Products Co.

Shaver, C. H., chairman of the board, United States Gypsum Co.

Shaw, Alfred, F.A.I.A., Shaw Metz & Associates.

Sheldon, John W., president, Chas. A Stevens & Co.

Shere, Lewis, president, the Diversey Corp.

Shure, S. N., president and treasurer, Shure Brothers, Inc.

Singleton, Thomas B., president, the Murine Co., Inc.

Smith, Harold Byron, president, Illinois Tool Works, Inc.

Smith, John F., Jr., president, Inland Steel Co.

Spacek, Leonard, managing partner, Arthur Andersen Co.

Steinberg, Douglas S., president, National Confectioners Association of the United States, Inc.

Stephens, L. S., chairman, Stephens-Adamson Manufacturing Co.

Stone, Norman H., chairman and president, Stone Container Corp.

Stults, Allen P., president, American National Bank & Trust Co.

Sulzberger, Frank L., chairman of the board, Enterprise Paint Manufacturing Co.

Taylor, A. Thomas, chairman and president, International Packers, Ltd.

Taylor, E. R., executive vice president, Motorola, Inc.

Theobald, A. D., president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria.

Thompson, T. M., chairman, General American Transportation Corp.

Thorne, Bruce, partner, William Blair & Co.

Thurston, John F., president, Mueller Co.

Vanderwicken, E. P., vice president and treasurer, Motorola, Inc.

Veeder, Nicholas P., president, Granite City Steel Co.

Venema, Maynard P., chairman and president, Universal Oil Products Co.

Visin, R. J., vice president and division general manager, ITT General Controls, Inc.

Ward, J. Harris, chairman and president, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Warner, Rawleigh, chairman of the board, the Pure Oil Co.

Weldon, Fred E., vice president, ITT General Controls, Inc.

Wetterlund, R. J., chairman of the board, Washington National Insurance Co.

Wheeler, L. W., president, Hardware Products Co.

White, Samuel W., Jr., president, Oliver Corp.

Whitehead, Charles P., president, General Steel Industries, Inc.

Will, Philip, Jr., F.A.I.A., Perkins & Will.

Wilson, H. True, president, P & W Farm Machinery Co.

Witz, Leo W., president, Continental Electrical Construction Co.

Woods, F. H., president, Sahara Coal Co., Inc.

Zwiener, Kenneth V., president, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

INDIANA

Batman, Howard T., Marshall, Batman & Day.

Beardsley, Walter R., chairman, Miles Laboratories, Inc.

Beesley, Eugene N., president, Eli Lilly and Co.

Bender, C. P., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Binford, Thomas W., D–A Lubricant Co., Inc.

Book, William H., executive vice president, Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

Burkhart, John, president, College Life Insurance Co. of America.

Carmichael, O. C., Jr., chairman, Associates Investment Co.

Coty, Paul V., manager, Indianapolis Division, Paper Manufacturers Co.

Cronin, Robert P., president, Franklin Finance Co.

Doyle, R. E., Jr., vice president and general manager, Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.

Dustman, J. C., division superintendent, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Echols, Roy C., president, Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Inc.

Feigel, Leland M., president, Interstate Finance Corp.

Flynn, William P., chairman, the Indiana National Bank.

Furry, E. E., president, Indiana Motor Bus Co.

Garver, Howard M., industrial products division, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Gates, Ralph F., Gates & Gates.

Hamilton, Lucius O., chairman of the board, White Baking Co.

Handley, Harold W., Handley & Miller, Inc.

Herrick, A. L., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Johnson, Karl F., chairman of the board, Steel Parts Corp.

Kaye, Lester A., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

McKinney, Frank E., chairman, American Fletcher National Bank & Trust Co.

Menge, Walter O., president, Lincoln National Life Insurance.

Miller, J. Irwin, chairman, Cummins Engine Co., Inc.

Miller, Merle H., Ross McCord Ice & Miller.

Mitchell, Dean H., chairman and president, Northern Indiana Public Service Co.

Mueller, H. George, vice president, and treasurer, Mooney-Mueller-Ward Co., Inc.

Murphy, S. D., president, Thompson Industries, Inc.

Pfeil, Richard J., president, Koontz-Wagner Electric Co., Inc.

Ransburg, Harold, president, Ransburg Electro-Coating Corp.

Reis, John F., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Sams, Howard W., chairman of the board, Howard W. Sams & Co., Inc.

Shireman, A. G., president, Tower Federal Savings & Loan Association of South Bend.

Sutphin, Samuel Reid, chairman of the board, the Beverage Paper Co.

Tull, E. Don, president, Cummins Engine Co.

Wagner, Charles E., president, Burnet-Binford Lumber Co.

Watson, R. T., president, ITT, Industrial Laboratories Division.

IOWA

Bohen, Fred, chairman, Meredith Publishing Co.

Brenton, W. Harold, president, Brenton Co.'s, Inc.

Brown, John A., C.L.U., general manager (Waterloo), New York Life Insurance Co.

Bucknell, E. F., president, Bankers Life Co.

Cassat, George L., president, Interstate Finance Corp.

Ehlert, DeWayne A., general manager (Cedar Rapids), New York Life Insurance Co.

Fletcher, Jonathan M., president, Home Federal Savings and Loan Association of Des Moines.

Gaston, Donald D., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Grangaard, Bernard C., president, Central National Bank and Trust Co.

Gunn, John W., chairman, Employers Mutual Casualty Co.

Hamilton, John T., president, the Merchants National Bank.

Hoerner, R. N., chairman, Hoerner Boxes, Inc.

Klinger, W. A., W. A. Klinger & Co.

Levitt, Ellis I., chairman, Dial Finance Co.

McConachie, Harry S., president, American Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Nesmith, J. H., president, Plumbers Supply Co.

Norris, John W., president, Lennox Industries, Inc.

Quail, John J., president, Quail & Co., Inc.

Rosenfield, Joseph F., chairman, Younker Bros., Inc.

Shenk, John C., president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Davenport.

Swarzman, Roy L., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Walker, Russell T., president, A. Y. McDonald Manufacturing Co.

Warters, D. N., chairman of the board, Bankers Life Co.

Whitefield, Allen, Whitefield, Musgrave, Selvy & Kelly.

Whitmore, Charles H., president, Iowa Illinois Gas & Electric Co.

Windsor, J. H., president, Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa.

KANSAS

Abraham, J. H., chairman, Security Benefit Life Insurance Co.

Anderson, M. J., Jr., president, Hutchinson Bag Corp.

Barr, John J., Shawnee Mission.

Bryant, W. C., Visi-Meter, Inc.

Bubb, Henry A., president, Capitol Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Burnham, C. A., president, Burnham Products, Inc.

Cohen, David J., chairman and president, David's, Inc.

Conrad, F. B., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Farrell, Felix M., president and sales manager, Plastic Fabricating Co., Inc.

Fink, H. Bernard, president, C–G–F Grain Co., Inc.

Fleming, Ned N., president, the Fleming Co., Inc.

Garvey, Willard W., president, Builders, Inc.

Harris, John P., chairman of the board, Publishing Enterprises, Inc.

Hanna, George D., president, Central Securities, Inc.

McNally, Edward T., president, the McNally Pittsburg Manufacturing Corp.

Miller, Max H., president, United Cement Products Co.

Mingenbach, E. C., president, Farmers Alliance Mutual Insurance Co.

Potter, Harlan M., president, Mid-West Conveyor Co.

Reilly, Edw. F., chairman, First National Bank of Leavenworth.

Shrewder, R. V., president, Home Lumber & Supply Co.

Stark, G. M., resident manager, Inorganic Chemicals Division, FMC Corp.

Turner, Harry, president and chairman, Harry Turner & Associates, Inc.

Wurst, Henry E., president, the Henry Wurst Co.

Yost, Lyle E., president, Hesston Manufacturing Co., Inc.

KENTUCKY

Abell, William H., president, Commonwealth Life Insurance Co.

Acree, John T., Jr., president, Lincoln Income Life Insurance Co.

Anthony, Alan H., C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Baker, Arlie W., publisher and executive vice president, the Dunne Press, Inc.

Baker, F. M., vice president and general manager, Kentucky Power Co.

Boone, Hilary J., Jr., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Bringardner, Charles, president, Bringardner Lumber Co., Inc.

Brown, George Garvin, president, Brown & Forman Distillers Corp.

Brown, W. L. Lyons, chairman of the board, Brown-Forman Distillers Corp.

Browning, L. D., chairman and president, Elk Brand Manufacturing Co., Inc.

Clay, Horace M., C.L.U., president, Pension & Service Corp.

Cochran, Archibald P., chairman of the board, Anaconda Aluminum Co.

Cutchins, William S., president, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.

Dawson, R. R., partner, R. R. Dawson Bridge Co.

Evans, George E., Jr., president, Black Star Coal Corp.

Field, C. E., president, Field Packing Co., Inc.

Heuser, Henry V., president, Henry Vogt Machine Co.

Howlett, W. C., president, Caldwell Lace Leather Co.

Hurst, Ollie C., president, Hurst Printing Co.

Johnson, Joe E., representative, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Kendall, William H., president, Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

Kimball, Roger N., president, Auburn Hosiery Mills, Inc.

Kopmeyer, M. R., president and board chairman, Frank Fehr Brewing Co.

Lambert, Charles F., president and treasurer, Clayton & Lambert Manufacturing Co.

Mayo, Arnold J., president, Kaufman's of Kentucky.

Milward, W. Emmet, W. R. Milward Mortuaries.

Norman, J. V., Jr., president, First Kentucky Co.

Offut, Henry Y., chairman, First National Lincoln Bank of Louisville.

Parker, S. Alex, president, Parker Tobacco Co., Inc.

Paxton, Thomas A., president, Southern Textile Machinery Co.

Rawitzer, William S., president, Vogue Rattan Mfg. Co., Inc.

Rehm, Robert E., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Robertson, Merle E., chairman, Liberty National Bank & Trust Co.

Scott, R. T., president, the Auburn Mills, Inc.

Smith, T. Floyd, Jr., president, Louisville Paper & Manufacturing Co.

Smock, W. M., president, Vulcan-Hart Corp.

Sweets, Martin, chairman and president, Martin Sweets Co.

Tafel, Paul, Sr., chairman, Tafel Electric & Supply Co.

Tankersley, G. J., president, Western Kentucky Gas Co.

Tarrant, John E., Bullitt, Dawson & Tarrant.

Thomas, Lee B., Sr., chairman and president, Vermont America Corp.

Westerman, Samuel L., president and treasurer, T. W. Samuels Distillery, Inc.

Williams, E. Paul, president, Second National Bank.

Willett, Lambert, chairman, Willett Distilling Co.

Woods, John W., Jr., president, the Third National Bank of Ashland.

LOUISIANA

Ainsworth, Max M., chairman, Industrial Finance & Thrift Corp.

Arceneaux, Felix, C.L.U., general manager (Tulane), New York Life Insurance Co.

Baker, J. W., president, Commercial National Bank in Shreveport.

Barton, John W., president, Jack's Cookie Corp.

Berry, Keehn W., president, Whitney National Bank of New Orleans.

Blumenthal, Sidney E., president, Blumenthal Print Works, Inc.

Burkenroad, W. B., Jr., executive vice president, J. Aron & Co., Inc.

Carpenter, Paul G., president and general manager, Copolymer Rubber and Chemical Corp.

Carter, Henry Z., president, Avondale Shipyards, Inc.

Charbonnet, Harry N., secretary and treasurer, American Metal, Inc.

Crutcher, Albert B., Jr., New Orleans.

Dupont, C. M., district manager (New Orleans), the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Eaves, Mrs. Hettie Dawes, treasurer, Avondale Shipyards, Inc.

Favrot, Clifford F., president, Carondelet Realty Corp.

Friedler, Frank, C.L.U., manager (New Orleans), Home Life Insurance Co. of New York.

Gelpi, P. J., Jr., agency manager (New Orleans), the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Godchaux, Frank A., chairman, Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., Inc.

Gogreve, Charles, Jr., general manager (Baton Rouge), New York Life Insurance Co.

Gottlieb, Lewis, chairman, City National Bank of Baton Rouge.

Graham, Ford M., president, the Louisiana Land & Exploration Co.

Grundy, Maurice W., president, Riverland Hardwood Co., Inc.

Halsey, Donald H., senior vice president, Walker Saussy, Inc.

Hayne, F. B., president, Nola Oil Co., Inc.

Hemenway, Frank, Jr., president, Hemenway Furniture Co., Inc.

Howard, Alvin H., New Orleans.

Jahncke, Paul F., Sr., chairman of the board, Jahncke Service, Inc.

Jones, Eldridge P., president, Maison Blanche Co.

Jones, Lonnie L., inspector of agencies, New York Life Insurance Co.

Jones, Richard G., vice president and general manager, Jackson Brewing Co.

Keller, Charles, Jr., president, Keller Construction Corp.

Kemper, Wallace C., president, Southdown, Inc.

Langford, Stuart S., independent operator, Metairie.

Lyons, Charlton H., Shreveport.

Magnuson, Glen G., Kalvar Corp.

Mayer, George J., vice president, Whitney National Bank of New Orleans.

McCoy, Charles W., president, Louisiana National Bank.

Monroe, J. Edgar, president, Canal Assets, Inc.

Morris, Raymond S., partner and general manager, Shreveport Garment Manufacturers.

Ochsner, Alton, M.D., Ochsner Clinic.

Pitts, Joe W., Sr., president, Brown-Roberts Hardware & Supply Co., Ltd.

Roberts, Bruce M., president, J. I. Roberts Drilling Co.

Singletary, T. P., president, Commercial Securities Co., Inc.

Smither, Charles G., president, Smither & Co., Inc.

Strachan, Frank G., director, Strachan Shipping Co.

Strauss, Clifford M., chairman and president, F. Strauss & Son., Inc.

Trappey, Bernard, president, B. F. Trappey Sons, Inc.

Walker, J. Mort, Jr., Jones, Walker, Waechter, Poitevent, Carrere & Denegre.

Wallace, C. W., chairman of the board, the Union Oil Mill, Inc.

Wilson, Earl B., chairman of the board, Sterling Sugars, Inc.

Wray, George D., Jr., president, Wray Ford, Inc.

MAINE

Adam, Lincoln L., Portland.

Anderson, Peter A., president, Mecaw Industries.

Arnzen, Mrs. Jean G., president and publisher, Guy Gannett Publishing Co.

Baxter, John L., president, Snow Flake Canning Co.

Beith, Robert B., vice president, Guy Gannett Publishing Co.

Christensen, Paul B., vice president, North East Cold Storage Corp.

Cloutier, J. Arthur, vice president, Canal National Bank.

Dunham, William W., president, Central Maine Power Co.

Hutchins, Curtis M., chairman, Dead River Co.

Lane, Carleton G., president, Union Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Maxwell, Arthur F., president, the First National Bank.

Newell, John R., president, Bath Iron Works Corp.

Niss, William U., vice president, Bath Iron Works Corp.

MARYLAND

Black, Robert D., chairman of the board, the Black & Decker Manufacturing Co.

Borden, Sam W., president, Loyola Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Bunting, George Lloyd, chairman, Noxzema Chemical Co.

Garland, Charles S., partner, Alex Brown & Sons.

Greif, David L., 2d, president, L. Greif & Bros.

Grotz, W. Arthur, president, Western Maryland Railway Co.

Hall, William Purnell, president, Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.

Hobbs, Robert B., chairman, First National Bank of Maryland.

Hoffberger, Jerold C., president, the National Brewing Co.

Isherwood, Charles P., general manager (Towson), New York Life Insurance Co.

Lehmann, W. Kemp, president and chairman, the C. M. Kemp Manufacturing Co.

Luetkemeyer, John A., president, the Equitable Trust Co.

MacDonald, R. G., president, the Potomac Edison Co.

Martin, C. William, Jr., chairman of the board and president, Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co.

McCardell, Adrian L., president, First National Bank of Maryland.

Meyerhoff, Joseph, president, Joseph Meyerhoff Corp.

Newman, G. B., president, the Kelly-Springfield Tire Co.

Parker, Winslow H., president, the Parker Metal Decorating Co.

Penn, Austin E., chairman of the board, Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.

Price, T. Rowe, chairman of the board, T. Rowe Price & Associates, Inc.

Robertson, Earl C., secretary-treasurer, the Cumberland Contracting Co.

MASSACHUSETTS

Adams, Charles F., president, Raytheon Co.

Albrecht, E. L., president, Surprenant Manufacturing Co.

Anderson, O. Kelley, president, New England Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Anthony, Julian D., president, Hartford Life Insurance Co.

Beckwith, Leo M., president, Market Forge Co.

Bennett, George F., president, State Street Research & Management Co.

Brewster, Ellis W., director, Plymouth Cordage Co.

Broomfield, Harold A., executive head, R. H. White's.

Cabot, Louis W., president, Cabot Corp.

Carter, Lyndall F., president, the William Carter Co.

Cataldo, Frank H., president, Food Marts, Inc.

Chapman, Richard P., president, New England Merchants National Bank.

Choate, Robert B., president, Boston Herald-Traveler Corp.

Clark, Paul F., C.L.U., Boston.

Crocker, Alvah, president, Crocker, Burbank & Co. Association.

Dalton, Marshall B., chairman, executive committee, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Edmonds, W. R., truck tire manager, northeast district, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Erickson, Roland A., president, Guaranty Bank & Trust Co.

Fernandes, Joseph E., president, Fernandes Super Markets, Inc.

Fox, John M., executive vice president, United Fruit Co.

Gardner, George P., Jr., Boston.

Gavin, James M., president, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Gow, Ralph F., president, Norton Co.

Grahame, Orville F., vice president and general counsel, the Paul Revere Life Insurance Co.

Hanley, Paul J., assistant manager, Smith, Barney & Co.

Harding, Henry W., president, Laboratory for Electronics, Inc.

Harrington, Frank L., Sr., president, Massachusetts Protective Association, Inc.

Harris, Maynard L., chairman, Suffolk Franklin Savings Bank.

Henderson, Ernest, president, Sheraton Corp. of America.

Higgins, Carter C., president, Worcester Pressed Steel Co.

Higgins, Milton P., chairman, Norton Co.

Hodgkinson, Harold D., chairman, Wm. Filene's Sons Co.

Howe, Frederic W., Jr., president, Crompton & Knowles Corp.

Jeppson, John, executive vice president, Norton Co.

Kalmbach, Leland J., chairman of the board, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Kitzrow, V. C., assistant general manager, International Dryer Corp.

Lazarus, Maurice, president, Wm. Filene's Sons Co.

Lewis, Richmond, president, Charles C. Lewis Co.

Lippmann, William, general manager, Bolto Products Division, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Morgan, Philip M., president, Morgan Construction Co.

Patkin, Jordan E., Ferry Street Motor Sales, Inc.

Patterson, Theodore G., Preston, Moss & Co.

Perini, Louis R., president, Perini Corp.

Plumley, H. Ladd, chairman and president, State Mutual Life Assurance Co. of America.

Putnam, Roger L., chairman, Package Machinery Co.

Recker, Harry F., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Rodgers, A. L., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Rossi, Fred J., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Schaaff, Charles H., president, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Seal, George H., president, C. H. Sprague & Son Co.

Seybolt, George C., president, Wm. Underwood Co.

Spang, Joseph P., Jr., the Gillette Co.

Steele, Richard C., president and publisher, the Worcester Telegram Publishing Co.

Stevenson, Earl P., consultant, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Webster, William, president, New England Electric System.

Wellman, Arthur O., president, Nichols & Co., Inc.

White, Erskine N., president, New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.

MICHIGAN

Abernethy, Roy, president, American Motors Corp.

Adams, William M., president, Braun, Bosworth & Co.

Allen, Roger, Roger Allen & Associates.

Applegate, C. F., Applegate Chevrolet Co.

Ault, Thomas J., president and general manager, the Budd Co., Automotive Division.

Awrey, T. L., president, Awrey Bakeries, Inc.

Aymond, A. H., Jr., chairman of the board, Consumers Power Co.

Bahl, Gordon H., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Beaver, Lloyd W., president, Saginaw Distributors, Inc.

Berry, Louis, president, International Hotels, Inc.

Bolling, Baltzar, president, Anderson-Bolling Manufacturing Co.

Briggs, R. P., executive vice president, Consumers Power Co.

Bromley, John E., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Brown, Senator P. M., director, Detroit Edison Co.

Buell, J. Lawrence, Jr., president, Formsprag Co.

Carnahan, Paul, president, National Steel Corp.

Carrigan, Tracy, John Bean Division, F. M. C. Corp.

Cisler, Walker L., president, the Detroit Edison Co.

Cloud, Carl E., president, Michigan Gas Utilities Co.

Cole, Richard, executive vice president, White Pine Copper Co.

Coveney, Erwin Frank, registered civil engineer, Birmingham.

Cross, Richard E., chairman, American Motors Corp.

Cudlip, Merlin A., president, McLouth Steel Corp.

Cunningham, Harry B., president, S. S. Kresge Co.

Day, William M., president, Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

Defoe, Thomas J., president, Defoe Shipbuilding Co.

DeGroot, Robert P., agency manager, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

de Journo, Philip, president, the Wurzburg Co. of Grand Rapids.

Den Uyl, Simon D., chairman of the board, Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp.

Doan, Leland I., chairman, executive committee, the Dow Chemical Co.

Dow, Alden B., Alden B. Dow Associates.

Drake, Milton J., senior vice president, the Detroit Bank and Trust Co.

Eppert, Ray R., president, Burroughs Corp.

Erwin, John C., regional loan supervisor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Evans, Edward S., Jr., chairman of the board, Evans Products Co.

Evans, Robert B., Detroit.

Fletcher, R. W., Jr., president, the Soo Hardware Co.

Ford, Burdette E., president, Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc.

Ford, Henry, II, chairman, Ford Motor Co.

French, John H., Jr., president, City National Bank of Detroit.

Gaskin, Mervyn G., chairman of the board, Taylor & Gaskin, Inc.

Gerber, Daniel F., president, Gerber Products Co.

Gerstacker, Carl A., chairman, the Dow Chemical Co.

Glancy, Alfred R., Jr., Detroit.

Gray, Elisha, II, chairman, Whirlpool Corp.

Hansen, Z. C. R., president, Diamond T Motor Truck Co.

Harris, Robert V., president, Harris Milling Co.

Hass, Firman H., partner, Ernst & Ernst.

Heavenrich, Max P., Jr., president and general manager, Heavenrich's.

Hebert, S. E., president, Whitehead & Kales Co.

Hewitt, Charles H., president, the Detroit Bank & Trust Co.

Holley, George M., Jr., president, Holley Carburetor Co.

Honigman, Jason L., partner, Honigman Miller Schwartz and Cohn.

James, A. S., chairman and treasurer, James & Savage Corp.

Kenower, John L., Kenower, MacArthur & Co.

Kipp, Donald P., president, Kramer-Consolidated Freight Lines.

Knappen, Charles B., Jr., president and treasurer, Knappen Milling Co.

Kuhn, T. W., president, Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp.

Lackey, J. B., president, Ford Motor Credit Co.

Lee, Albert, Albert Lee & Co.

MacDonnell, W. D., president, Kelsey-Hayes Co.

Marentette, David S., president, Detroit Insurance Agency.

Martin, Roblee B., president, Dundee Cement Co.

Mayberry, William A., chairman of the board, Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit.

Maynard, Horace S., III, secretary, the Charles A. Strelinger Co.

McElvenny, Ralph T., president, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.

Merrell, Allen W., vice president, civic and governmental affairs, Ford Motor Co.

Miller, Arjay R., president, Ford Motor Co.

Moak, Eugene H., president, Moak Machine & Tool Co.

Mullen, J. Arthur, president, Sheller Manufacturing Corp.

Panchuck, John, secretary and general counsel, Federal Life & Casualty Co.

Parshall, Howard P., president, Bank of Commonwealth.

Peppiatt, Guy S., president, Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearings, Inc.

Platts, John H., president, Whirlpool Corp.

Reese, C. Jack, president, Continental Motors Corp.

Reichie, W. A., president, Reichie Supply Co.

Riggin, Fred L., Jr., president, Mueller Brass Co.

Riggin, Tyler L., president, Valley Metal Products Co.

Rote, F. B., vice president, operations, Mueller Brass Co.

Rowe, Fred N., chairman of the board, Valley City Milling Co.

Ruffner, E. T., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Sanden, B. Kenneth, partner, Price Waterhouse & Co.

Scherer, Robert P., Jr., president, R. P. Scherer Corp.

Schneider, Elwood H., president, E. H. Schneider Co.

Scialli, John L., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Searl, William C., Sr., president, Auto-Owners Insurance Co.

Seaton, D. W., president, Detroit & Northern Savings & Loan Association.

Semple, Robert B., president, Wyandotte Chemicals Corp.

Smith, J. Thomas, president, Dura Corp.

Spatta, George, chairman, Clark Equipment Co.

Stearns, R. Dewey, president, Peet Packing Co.

Stoddard, Howard J., chairman, Michigan National Bank.

Stoneking, R. T., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Taylor, Robert H., chairman, Taylor Engineering Corp.

Tompkins, J. A., regional vice president, American Airlines, Inc.

Townsend, Lynn A., president, Chrysler Corp.

Trader, William I., president, Peninsular Steel Co.

Valley, Donald F., chairman, National Bank of Detroit.

Warden, J. H., president, Upper Peninsula Power Co.

Wasson, R. A., president, Clarage Fan Co.

White, V. Hudson, partner, Hudson White & Co.

White, Robert C., treasurer, Ford Motor Credit Co.

Williams, Perry, vice chairman, Kelsey-Hayes Co.

Wittock, J. H., Wittock Supply Co.

Woodall, Herbert J., chairman, Woodall Industries, Inc.

Yntema, T. O., vice president and chairman, finance committee, Ford Motor Co.

MINNESOTA

Angle, Stacy L., vice president, Minneapolis-Moline, Inc.

Baird, Julian B., chairman, the First National Bank of St. Paul.

Bean, Atherton, president, International Milling Co.

Bemis, Judson, president, Bemis Bros. Bag Co.

Bezoier, R. A., president, First National Bank of Rochester.

Billington, Peter M., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Binger, James H., president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Budd, John M., president, Great Northern Railway Co.

Burnhart, Vincent N., president, E. J. Longyear Co.

Chapman, William R., president, Midland National Bank of Minneapolis.

Corey, H. H., chairman, George A. Hormel Co.

Cosgrove, Robert C., chairman of the board, Green Giant Co.

Costikyan, Granger, president, First Bank Stock Corp.

Cross, Bert S., president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.

Cummings, Harold J., president, the Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Daniels, John H., president, Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.

Felton, L. E., president, Green Giant Co.

Foss, William F., president, Minneapolis-Moline, Inc.

Fuller, C. E., partner, Thomson & McKinnon, brokers.

Gerot, Paul S., president, the Pillsbury Co.

Griggs, Milton W., former president, Griggs Cooper Co.

Harmon, Reuel D., president, Webb Publishing Co.

Herbert, A. H., president and general manager, Minnesota Power & Light Co.

Howland, G. S., Jr., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Joas, Kenneth C., resident manager, Smith, Barney & Co.

Koch, D. A., president, Gray Co., Inc.

Lang, W. H., president, Foley Bros., Inc.

McConnell, George D., president, Munsingwear, Inc.

Moore, Warren S., president, W. S. Moore & Co.

Moorhead, John A., president, Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis.

Murray, Gordon, president, First National Bank of Minneapolis.

Murray, Leonard H., president, Soo Line Railroad Co.

Naegele, Robert, president, Naegele Advertising Co.

Nason, Philip H., president, The First National Bank of St. Paul.

Nelson, W. C., president, Eberhardt Co.

Owen, Kenneth M., Dorsey, Owen, Barker, Scott & Barber.

Rawlings, General Edwin W., president, General Mills, Inc.

Ritz, Charles, chairman, International Milling Co.

Roch, F. E., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Smith, D. J., president, Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway Co.

Sweatt, H. W., chairman of finance committee, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Thomson, J. Cameron, Minneapolis.

Vincent, R. L., chairman and president, Vincent Brass & Aluminum Co.

Washburn, H. O., St. Paul.

Weyerhaeuser, Frederick K., chairman, Weyerhaeuser Co.

Wishart, P. B., chairman of the board, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Wyard, W. D., retired president, First American National Bank of Duluth.

Zinsmaster, Harry W., chairman, Zinsmaster Baking Co.

MISSISSIPPI

Caviness, Charles R., president, National Bank of Commerce.

Davis, B. H., manager, ITT Kellogg, Telecommunications.

Hearin, Robert M., president, First National Bank.

McMullan, W. P., Sr., chairman of the board, Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co.

Mieher, D. C., executive vice president, Southern Farm Bureau Life Insurance Co.

Rogers, N. S., president, Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co.

Self, William King, Riverside Industries.

MISSOURI

Akin, Willian M., president, Laclede Steel Co.

Alexander, M. Moss, Jr., president, Missouri Portland Cement Co.

Armstrong, William H., partner, Armstrong, Teasdale, Roos, Kramer & Vaughan.

Bartlett, F. W., chairman of the board, Bartlett & Co.

Bartlett, Paul D., Jr., president, Bartlett & Co.

Brown, George W., president, Wagner Electric Corp.

Chambers, Maurice R., president, International Shoe Co.

Cook, Howard, chairman, Central Missouri Trust Co.

Cox, Lester E., chairman, Ozarks Broadcasting Co.

Denton, John C., president, Spencer Chemical Co.

Dobson, Duncan C., president, Ludlow-Saylor Wire Cloth Co.

Ess, Henry N., Watson, Ess, Marshall & Enggas.

Forcade, Wayne A., president, Mid-Continent Grain Co.

Frazier, Adrian W., chairman, Frazier-Davis Construction Co.

Grant, W. D., president, Business Men's Assurance Co. of America.

Griesedieck, Joseph, president, Falstaff Brewing Corp.

Hayward, John T., Reinholdt & Gardner.

Hickey, J. F., chairman of the board, National Home Life Assurance Co.

Hickok, James P., chairman, First National Bank.

Hirschl, R. C., Hirschl & Bendheim.

Ingram, Robert P., Robert P. Ingram & Co.

Jenks, D. B., president, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

Kemper, James M., chairman, Commerce Trust Co.

Kemper, R. C., chairman of the board, City National Bank & Trust Co.

Kist, R. T., manager (St. Louis), the Equitable Life Insurance Society of the United States.

Langsdorf, Sam, Jr., president, Universal Printing Co.

Lowe, William S., president, A. P. Green Fire Brick Co.

Maestre, Sidney, chairman of the executive committee, Mercantile Trust Co.

May, Morton J., chairman, the May Department Stores Co.

McDonnell, William A., chairman, St. Louis-San Francisco Railway.

Meissner, Edwin B., Jr., president, St. Louis Car Division, General Steel Industries, Inc.

Menk, Louis Wilson, president, St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

Mitchell, John B., president, First National Bank in St. Louis.

Nussbaum, Stanley, president, the Berland Shoe Co.

Peirce, Frederic M., president, General American Life Insurance Co.

Persons, Wallace R., president, Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co.

Pevler, Herman H., president, Wabash Railroad System.

Pierson, John T., vice-chairman, the Vendo Co.

Rowland, Raymond E., president, Ralston Purina Co.

Selkirk, Bruce B., president, Midwest Curtain Co.

Shank, William Capen, Kansas City.

Shapleigh, A. Wessel, St. Louis.

Silvey, J. M., president, MFA Insurance Co.

Simon, John E., partner, I. M. Simon & Co.

Smith, Jack C., president, Kline's

Smith, Tom K., director, Boatmen's National Bank of St. Louis.

Souers, Sidney W., chairman, General American Life Insurance Co.

Stromdahl, Norman P., St. Louis district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Stupp, Erwin P., president, Stupp Bros. Bridge and Iron Co.

Sverdrup, Leif J., president, Sverdrup & Parcel & Associates, Inc.

Thomas, Charles Allen, chairman, Monsanto Chemical Co.

Waeckerly, Harold E., president, Parker, Eisen, Waeckerly, Adams & Purcell, Inc.

Weirath, W. C., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Wilson, Wilford C., president, Wilson Distributing Co.

MONTANA

Balsam, E. G., president, Northern Tank Line.

Conroy, W. F., president and general manager, Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway Co.

Corrett, J. E., president, Montana Power Co.

Flaherty, J. J., manager, Great Falls Paper Co.

Hendershott, Verne E., president, Montana Bank.

Jorgenson, O. M., chairman, Security Trust & Savings Bank.

Manley, John M., general manager (Billings), New York Life Insurance Co.

McCarty, Clyde N., president, Flint Engineering & Construction Co.

Redding, Austin, C.L.U., general manager (Butte), New York Life Insurance Co.

Waters, R. M., president, Security Trust & Savings Bank.

NEBRASKA

Campbell, Robert Erle, chairman, Miller & Paine, Inc.

Cook, George B., president, Bankers Life Insurance Co. of Nebraska.

Cunningham, Chester W., president, Cunningham-Kiewit Co.

Dobson, Robert A., president, Dobson Bros. Construction Co.

Edquist, E. D., chairman and chief executive officer, Fairmont Foods Co.

Hyde, A. Leicester, president, the Midwest Life Insurance Co.

Jacobson, A. F., president, Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

Jones, Wilbur A., president, Northrup Jones Co.

Kelley, Robert L., president, Chester B. Brown Co.

Korshoj, Simon, president, Korshoj Construction Co., Inc.

Landen, Clarence L., chairman of the board, the Central National Insurance Group of Omaha.

Lyman, Edward W., president, the United States National Bank of Omaha.

McDonald, J. M., Jr., chairman, J. M. McDonald Co.

Merriam, John F., chairman of the board, Northern Natural Gas Co.

Remigio, D. R., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Rullman, George B., president and treasurer, K & R, Inc.

Scott, Wray M., president and treasurer, Wray M. Scott Co., Inc.

Sick, T. A., president, Security Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Skinner, Lloyd E., president, Skinner Macaroni Co.

Yaussi, Glenn, president, National Bank of Commerce.

NEVADA

Bigelow, E. Thayer, administrative vice president, First National Bank of Nevada.

Geary, W. T., vice president and division manager, Central Telephone Co.

Gorman, H. S., president, First National Bank of Nevada.

Sweeney, M. M., chairman of the board, Pioneer Title Insurance Co. of Nevada.

Wingfield, George, Jr., Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bell, Philip D., plant manager, FMC Corp.

Carter, James R., president, Nashua Corp.

Gleason, Francis H., president, J. F. McElwain Co.

Hogan, Coleman F., president, Hogan Davidson Rubber Co.

Orr, Dudley W., chairman, Peerless Insurance Co.

Scranton, William M., president, Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc.

Whiting, Douglas B., president, United Life & Accident Insurance Co.

NEW JERSEY

Anton, Mark, president, Surburban Propane Gas Corp.

Banino, George A., president, ITT Federal Laboratories.

Barney, L. D., president, Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc.

Berg, John W., branch manager, Hardwick Standard Chemical Co. of New Jersey.

Berglund, E. H., president, Berglund Motors Co.

Berlin, Bernard A., president, Heinemann Electric Co.

Bradford, Dean C., president, ITT Electron Tube Division.

Browning, Robert T., president, Wallace & Tiernan, Inc.

Brundage, John D., president, Bankers National Life Insurance Co.

Buckles, B. D. vice president, Plastics Division, Allied Chemical Corp.

Burr, Edward B., chairman, Hugh W. Long & Co., Inc.

Butler, Thomas C., president, the Grand Union Co.

Connor, John T., president, Merck & Co., Inc.

Cooper, Robert E., Jr., chairman, Cooper-Jarrett, Inc.

Cowan, Robert G., chairman, National Newark & Essex Bank.

Davis, C. Malcolm, president, Fidelity Union Trust Co.

Dmochowski, T. L., president, ITT Information Systems Division.

Dreyfuss, Leonard, president, United Advertising Corp.

Dubilier, M. H., president, International Electric Corp.

Evans, Richard B., chairman of the board, the Colonial Life Insurance Co. of America.

Graves, Harold T., Jr., president, the Summit Trust Co.

Grote, H. W., president, the Trubeck Chemical Co.

Guilfoyle, J. W., president, Federal Electric Corp.

Hirsh, Allan M., Jr., president, International Pipe & Ceramics Corp.

Hofmann, Philip B., vice chairman, Johnson & Johnson.

Jones, Thomas Roy, vice chairman, Schlumberger Limited.

Kazan, George, director of sales, plastics division, Allied Chemical Corp.

Kelley, William F., president, Frank Briscoe Co., Inc.

Kidde, John F., chairman, Walter Kidde & Co., Inc.

Kislak, David, president, J. I. Kislack, Inc.

Klipstein, K. H., president, American Cyanamid Co.

Lizotte, Desmond J., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Longmaid, S. E., president and chairman, Esterbrook Pen Co.

Lynn, Roy H., president, ITT Communication Systems, Inc.

Meltzer, Arnold E., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Menger, Carl S., president, Triangle Conduit and Cable Co., Inc.

Montgomery, John L., Jr., Rumson.

Myers, John J., manager, Kuthe Laboratories, Inc.

Nelson, Richard D., president, the Colonial Life Insurance Company of America.

Nunlist, Frank J., president, Worthington Corp.

Polite, L. John, Jr., president, Essex Chemical Corp.

Roebling, Mrs. Mary, chairman and president, Trenton Trust Co.

Rudolph, W. H., president, Savory Equipment, Inc.

Scott, Robert E., president, R. E. Scott Mortgage Co.

Shanley, Bernard M., Shanley & Fisher.

Smith, Charles C., president, Smith Motor Co., Inc.

Smith, George Frederick, Johnson & Johnson.

Stewart, J. P., president, De Laval Turbine, Inc.

Stier, George G., president, Nopco Chemical Co.

Wasson, E. Hornsby, president, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.

Winner, Charles S., Ford dealer.

Wyer, William, president, Wyer, Dick & Co.

NEW MEXICO

Anderson, Robert O., president, Hondo Oil & Gas Co.

Armstrong, B. B., general partner, Armstrong & Armstrong.

Berger, Walter O., president, Berger, Briggs & Co.

Carson, Cale W., chairman of the board, First National Bank in Albuquerque.

Covington, David A., general manager (Albuquerque), New York Life Insurance Co.

Haley, George A., executive vice president, New Mexico Bank & Trust Co.

Hardin, Marion M., chairman of the board, American Gypsum Co.

Holder, Billie, publisher, Alamogordo Daily News.

McKinney, Robert, editor and publisher, the New Mexican.

Mitchell, Oscar D., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Young, James W., Pena Blanca.

NEW YORK

Alexander, Henry C., chairman of the board, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

Ammidon, Hoyt, chairman, United States Trust Co.

Anholt, Harry M., president, Realty Hotels, Inc.

Baker, Melvin H., chairman, National Gypsum Co.

Barnet, Herbert L., president, Pepsi-Cola Co.

Batten, William M., president, J. C. Penney Co.

Baum, Morton J., president, Hickey-Freeman Co.

Beinecke, William S., president, the Sperry & Hutchinson Co.

Bell, Elliott V., chairman, executive committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

Belmont, August, president, Dillon, Read & Co., Inc.

Benjamin, Richard N., president, Stone & Webster, Inc.

Bevis, Herman W., senior partner, Price Waterhouse & Co.

Bickmore, Lee S., president, National Biscuit Co.

Bierwirth, John E., chairman, National Distillers & Chemical Corp.

Black, Eugene R., New York.

Blancke, Harold, chairman and president, Celanese Corp. of America.

Blough, Roger M., chairman, U.S. Steel Corp.

Blum, Richard L., Jr., president, Julius Wile Sons & Company, Inc.

Bondurant, R. A., Jr., manager, Manufacturing Inorganic Chemicals Div., FMC Corp.

Bonomo, Victor A., Bonomo Candy Division, Gold Medal Candy Corp.

Borrasca, Dominic A., district manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Bower, Marvin, managing director, McKinsey & Co., Inc.

Boyd, James, president, Copper Range Co.

Brady, William T., chairman of the board, Corn Products Co.

Braislin, Gordon S., president, Braislin, Porter & Wheelock, Inc.

Brandi, Frederic H., chairman, Dillon, Read & Co., Inc.

Breech, Ernest R., chairman, Trans World Airlines, Inc.

Bronfman, Edgar M., president, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.

Brown, Chester M., president, Allied Chemical Corp.

Brown, Roy F., New York district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Bruce, James, New York.

Brumfield, W. H., president, Solvay Process Division, Allied Chemical Corp.

Bryant, F. Leonard, president, Hooker Chemical Corp.

Bunker, Arthur H., chairman, executive committee, American Metal Climax, Inc.

Bunker, George M., president, Martin Marietta Corp.

Bunn, Howard S., chairman of the executive committee, Union Carbide Corp.

Burgess, Carter L., president, American Machine & Foundry Co.

Burkhart, W. H., chairman of the board, Lever Brothers Co.

Burns, John L., New York.

Butcher, William L., chairman, the County Trust Co.

Bynum, William, president, Carrier Corp.

Calder, Alexander, Jr., president, Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp.

Cameron, John L., president, Guardian Life Insurance Co.

Cannon, Francis A., vice president, the First Boston Corp.

Casella, P. J., president, Endicott Johnson Corp.

Cheatham, Owen R., chairman, Georgia-Pacific Corp.

Chisholm, William H., president, Oxford Paper Co.

Clark, Howard L., president, American Express Co.

Cochrane, William H., president, Neptune Meter Co.

Coleman, Sylvan C., chairman, E. F. Hutton & Co., Inc.

Comerford, James, chairman of the board, Consolidated Natural Gas Co.

Comfort, Harold W., president, the Bordon Co.

Cook, Donald C., president, American Electric Power Co., Inc.

Cook, Robert S., president, A. E. Nettleton Co.

Cornelius, Adam E., Jr., chairman, American Steamship Co.

Cortney, Philip, president, Coty, Inc.

Couper, E. W., president, First-City National Bank of Binghamton.

Craig, Wilmot R., president, Lincoln Rochester Trust Co.

Cullman, Joseph F., III, president, Phillip Morris, Inc.

Custer, Merton D., C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Cutler, B. F., vice president and treasurer, Royal McBee Corp.

Davis, Shelby Cullom, Shelby Cullom Davis & Co.

Davis, Stuart G., district manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Deatly, William H., president, the Title Guarantee Co.

Dilworth, J. Richardson, president, Rockefeller Bros., Inc.

Dirr, Peter G., vice president, comptroller, McKesson & Robbins, Inc.

Donahue, A. J., president, Donahue Sales Corp.

Donner, Frederic G., chairman of the board, General Motors Corp.

Doolittle, Morgan O., chairman and chief executive officer, Empire State Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Douglas, L. W., New York.

Douglas, Percy L., president, Otis Elevator Co.

Dowell, Dudley, president, New York Life Insurance Co.

Dunn, Kempton, chairman of the board, American Brake Shoe Co.

Eble, Charles E., president, Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.

Emerson, William M., president, Dunn & McCarthy, Inc.

Engstrom, Elmer W., president, Radio Corp. of America.

Evans, Thomas M., chairman, Crane Co.

Feldmann, W. H., chairman, Worthington Corp.

Flershem, Rudolph B., retired chairman, Buffalo-Eclipse Corp.

Foley, J. W., president, Texaco, Inc.

Folsom, Marion B., Eastman Kodak Co.

Folsom, Richard G., president, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Fox, J. G., Jr., president, National Aniline Division, Allied Chemical Corp.

Francis, Clarence, New York.

Franklin, Gen. John M., chairman of the board, United States Lines Co.

Frische, Carl A., president, Sperry Gyroscope Co.

Galvin, John M., chairman of the Executive Committee, the Marine Trust Co. of Western New York.

Geneen, Harold S., president, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

Gimbel, Bruce, president, Gimbel Bros., Inc.

Ginna, Robert E., chairman of the board, Rochester Gas & Electric Corp.

Goldstein, Benjamin, president, Franklin Simon.

Goss, Bert C., president, Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

Grazier, Joseph A., president, American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.

Greer, Arthur F., vice president, Commercial Union Assurance Group.

Gregory, Richard H., Jr., Union Carbide Corp.

Gregory, Stewart E., president, Yates Drug Co., Inc.

Grunebaum, Kurt H., president, New York Hanseatic Corp.

Griffiin, Gerald L., C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Grimm, Peter, chairman of the board, Wm. A. White & Sons.

Hall, Bruce W., chairman, Hempstead Bank.

Hallauer, Carl, chairman of the board, Bausch & Lomb, Inc.

Hamill, Robert L., chairman, Sanders & Porter, Inc.

Hannan, Kenneth H., executive vice president, Union Carbide Corp.

Hanson, Alvin E., president, Farmers & Traders Life Insurance Co.

Harding, Charles B., senior partner, Smith, Barney & Co.

Harvey, I. J., Jr., chairman, Flintkote Co.

Hauge, Gabriel, vice chairman of the board, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.

Hendrickson, Milton A., president, Hendrickson Bros., Inc.

Herbert, John K., president, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc.

Hesse, William R., president, Benton & Bowles, Inc.

Hichcock, Ethan A., chairman of the board, Underwood Corp.

Hicklin, Wayne, president, Avon Products, Inc.

Higgins, Thomas G., senior partner, Arthur Young & Co.

Hill, John A., president, Air Reduction Co., Inc.

Hochschild, Walter, chairman of the board, American Metal Climax, Inc.

Hollister, R. Palmer, president, R. Hoe & Co., Inc.

Houghton, Amory, Jr., president, Corning Glass Works.

Huber, Melvyn Jay, C.L.U., M. J. Huber Agency, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Hull, Roger, president, Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York.

Humphreys, H. E., Jr., chairman of the board, United States Rubber Co.

Ihlfeld, August, president, Savings Banks Trust Co.

Ireland, R. L., III, partner, Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.

Johnston, Howard A., president, Marlin-Rockwell Corp.

Kahn, Ely Jacques, Kahn & Jacobs.

Kappel, Frederick R., chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Karp, J. S., C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Kelly, William T., Jr., vice president, American Brake Shoe Co.

Kenny, Charles F., president, Island Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Knoppers, Antonie T., president, Merck Sharp & Dohme, International.

Koessler, John W., president, Greater Buffalo Press, Inc.

Laing, Chester W., president, John Nuveen & Co.

Lazrus, Julian, president, Benrus Watch Co., Inc.

Leib, George, chairman of the board, Blyth & Co., Inc.

Leithead, Barry T., president, Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc.

Less, Leo H., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Lewis, Robert J., partner, Estabrook & Co.

Lienhard, J. W., president, ITT Export Corp.

Lightner, Milton C., retired president, Singer Manufacturing Co.

Locke, Edwin A., Jr., Westhampton Beach.

Lockwood, M. D., vice president, Sperry Gyroscope Co.

Loeb, John L., partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.

Long, Augustus C., chairman, Texaco, Inc.

Lovejoy, Thomas E., Jr., president, the Manhattan Life Insurance Co.

Luke, David L., III, chairman, West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.

Lundell, L. Walter, president, C.I.T. Financial Corp.

Lunt, Samuel D., S. D. Lunt & Co.

Lusk, Robert E., chairman of the board, Benton & Bowles, Inc.

Lustenberger, L. C., president, W. T. Grant Co.

Machold, Earle J., president, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.

Mallon, E. Lloyd, C.L.U., general agent, E. Lloyd Mallon & Associates.

Malott, R. H., asst. division mgr., Organic Chemicals Div., F M C Corp.

Manchester, F. H., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Martino, J. A., president, National Lead Co.

Mason, Birny, Jr., president, Union Carbide Corp.

Mathias, E. W., treasurer, Hooker Chemical Corp.

Maull, Baldwin, president, Marine Midland Corp.

Maust, J. Ray, chairman and president, Maust Coal & Coke Corp.

May, A. Wilfred, executive editor, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle.

Mazuca, Robert M., W. T. Grant Co.

McAulay, Archibald H., president, North American Reassurance Co.

McClinton, H. L., president, Reach, McClinton & Co., Inc.

McCormick, W. F., partner, Cresap, McCormick & Paget.

McKiernan, John F., president, National Coffee Association.

McKim, Robert J., chairman of the board, Associated Dry Goods Corp.

McNeil, W. J., president, Grace Line, Inc.

Meyer, Wallace W., general manager, P. D. I.—New York.

Mitchell, Joel S., chairman of the board, Standard Brands, Inc.

Moccia, A. J., treasurer, American Airlines, Inc.

Mooers, Edward A., president, the Hilliard Corp.

Moog, William C., Jr., president, Moog Servocontrols, Inc.

Moore, George S., president, First National City Bank.

Moore, William H., chairman, Bankers Trust Co.

Morrison, A. A., president, Buffalo Railway Equipment Co.

Mortimer, Charles G., chairman, General Foods Corp.

Mortlock, Eugene M., president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of New York.

Moss, A. P., vice president, Union Carbide Chemicals Co.

Munro, I. H., vice president, Allied Chemical Corp.

Murphy, George A., chairman, Irving Trust Co.

Murphy, Robert D., president, Corning Glass International.

Nager, Edward F., Nager Electric Co., Inc.

Neil, Allen E., president, Hens & Kelley.

Nesty, Glenn A., vice president, Allied Chemical Corp.

Newbury, George A., counsel, Hodgson, Russ, Andrews, Woods & Goodyear.

Newman, Isadore, II., president, City Stores Co.

Newman, J. Wilson, chairman of the board, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Nichols, Thomas S., chairman of the board, Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp.

Nickerson, A. L., chairman, Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.

Nielson, Morris, president, Babcock & Wilcox Co.

Norton, Frank M., president, Plastics Division Allied Chemicals Corp.

Novogrod, Leonard J., president, W. & J. Sloane, Inc.

Nye, R. S., partner, Georgeson & Co.

Oates, James F., Jr., chairman and president, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Oliver, W. F., president, American Sugar Refining Co.

Owen, Stephen C., president, Beacon Manufacturing Co.

Page, Robert G., president, Phelps Dodge Corp.

Parker, Karr, president, Buffalo Electric Co., Inc.

Pattberg, Emil J., president, the First Boston Corp.

Patterson, George S., president, the Buckeye Pipe Line Co.

Paynter, Richard K., Jr., chairman, New York Life Insurance Co.

Peach, Robert E., president, Mohawk Airlines, Inc.

Peale, Mundy I., president, Republic Aviation Corp.

Peo, Ralph F., chairman of the board, Houdaille Industries, Inc.

Perlman, A. E., president, New York Central System.

Peters, Leone J., president, Cushman & Wakefield, Inc.

Peterson, Karl J., C.L.U., field vice president, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Phalen, C. W., president, New York Telephone Co.

Philippe, G. L., president, General Electric Co.

Pierce, Edward J., president, Harlem Savings Bank.

Pille, Richard E., president, Security Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York.

Powell, Charles M., president, the American Agricultural Chemical Co.

Power, Donald C., chairman, General Telephone & Electronics Corp.

Purcell, R. W., chairman, International Basic Economy Corp.

Putnam, Henry W., partner, De Coppet & Doremus.

Quinlan, H. W., president, Lehigh & Hudson River Railway.

Raiff, Frederick K., president, Raylass Department Stores, Inc.

Reed, Philip D., New York.

Reed, Ralph T., chairman of executive committee, American Express Co.

Reid, W. J. W., senior vice president, Otis Elevator Co.

Renchard, William S., president, Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.

Repp, Herbert N., president, Discount Corp. of New York.

Revilock, Joseph F., National Carbon Co., division of Union Carbide Corp.

Rice, J. Lee, Jr., president, Allegheny Power System, Inc.

Roberts, Clifford, New York.

Rockefeller, David, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Rokahr, Theodore, chairman of the board, Marine Midland Trust Co. of the Mohawk Valley.

Romnes, H. I., president, Western Electric Co., Inc.

Ruffin, Peter B., president, Galbreath Ruffin Realty Co.

Rusciano, Anthony J., president, Rusciano & Son Corp.

Sawyer, H. A., chairman of the board, Lone Star Cement Corp.

Schlesinger, T., president, Allied Stores Corp.

Schwartz, Frederic N., president, Bristol-Myers Co.

Scott, Earle M., president, Scott Aviation Corp.

Shanks, Carrol M., president, Universal Controls, Inc.

Sharp, George C., New York.

Shepard, Lyle L., president, Columbian Carbon Co., Inc.

Snyder, Frank V., president, Moore & Munger, Inc.

Snyder, John I., Jr., chairman and president, U.S. Industries, Inc.

Spohr, Robert L., Garden City.

Sporn, Philip, chairman, system development committee, American Electric Power Co., Inc.

Stanton Frank, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

Stark, G. Harold, president, Marine Midland Trust Co. of the Mohawk Valley.

Staub, Marshal G., president, Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp.

Stelzer, Irwin M., president, National Economic Research Associates, Inc.

Stephens, Claude O., president, Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Inc.

Stevens, Robert T., chairman and president, J. P. Stevens & Co.

Stires, Hardwick, partner, Scudder, Stevens & Clark.

Stolk, William C., chairman of the board, American Can Co.

Stone, Whitney, chairman of the board, Stone & Webster, Inc.

Stroud, W. B. Dixon, president, International Basic Economy Corp.

Taylor, R. C., president, ACF Industries, Inc.

Tegen, A. F., president, General Public Utilities Corp.

Thomas, G. R., executive head, Hearn Department Stores.

Thomas, J. A., senior partner, Lehman Bros.

Thompson, Otis A., president, the National Bank & Trust Co. of Norwich.

Toor, H. O., president, Freeman-Toor Corp.

Tower, Bertram B., president, American Cable & Radio Corp.

Trubee, Frank C., Jr., partner, Trubee, Collins & Co.

Turner, H. C., Jr., president, Turner Construction Co.

Upson, Maxwell M., honorary chairman, Raymond International, Inc.

Uris, Percy, chairman of the board, Uris Buildings Corp.

Van Horn, Paul E., president, the American Life Insurance Co. of N.Y.

Van Patten, Cornelius C., president, the Binghamton Savings Bank.

Vedder, Lee N., president, White Mop Wringer Co.

Wadsworth, Arthur L., vice president, Dillon, Read & Co., Inc.

Walker, George G., president, Electric Bond & Share Co.

Walsh, C. S., president, States Marine Lines.

Wampler, Cloud, chairman of the board, Carrier Corp.

Warren, J. Ed., president, Cities Service Co., Inc.

Watson, Burl S., chairman of the board, Cities Service Co., Inc.

Weed, Clyde E., chairman, Anaconda Co.

Weicker, Lowell P., president, Bigelow-Sanford, Inc.

Weinberg, Sidney J., partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Wendel, W. H., president, the Carborundum Co.

West, Eric F., president, Aluminum Limited Sales, Inc.

Wetenhall, J. Huber, president, National Dairy Products Corp.

White, William, president, the Delaware & Hudson Co.

Wight, Charles A., vice chairman of the board, Freeport Sulphur Co.

Will, John M., chairman, American Export Lines, Inc.

Williams, Albert L., president, International Business Machines Corp.

Wilson, Joseph C., president and general manager, Xerox Corp.

Wilson, Kendrick R., Jr., chairman, AVCO Corp.

Wingate, Henry S., chairman, International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd.

Winkler, Patrick J., vice president, RKO General, Inc.

Wolflisberg, Hans J., president, the Nestle Co., Inc.

Worthington, William P., chairman, Home Life Insurance Co.

York, Miles F., president, Atlantic Mutual Insurance Corp.

NORTH CAROLINA

Abbott, E. B., divisional group manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Atkins, Leland G., president, Southern Dyestuff Co.

Barnhardt, William H., Charlotte.

Bowers, Frank L., president and treasurer, Drexel Knitting Mills Co., Inc.

Brock, J. Curtis, agent, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Coffey, Harold F., president, Kent-Coffey Mfg. Co.

Culler, William P., assistant divisional group manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Daesch, Carl E., regional appraiser, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Dalton, Robert I., vice president, Whitin Machine Works.

Davis, J. B., agency manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Dickerson, N. K., chairman, Dickerson, Inc.

Dickson, Rush S., chairman, R. S. Dickson & Co., Inc.

Dixson, William N., Jr., president, Brown-Rodgers-Dixson Co.

Dowd, Roddey, vice president, Charlotte Pipe & Foundry Co.

Erwin, F. S., cashier, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Galloway, A. H., president, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Goode, A. Lloyd, president, A. Lloyd Goode Contracting Co.

Hadley, Hunter B., Jr., manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Hardison, S. R., regional loan supervisor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Hayes, N. P., president, Carolina Steel Corp.

Hilbish, Frederick G., Hilbish Motor Co.

Holderness, H. Dail, president, Carolina Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Holderness, Howard, president, Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co.

Jennings, T. G., general manager, ITT Kellogg Telecommunications.

Jones, Halbert M., president and treasurer, Waverly Mills, Inc.

Joseph, Fred I., agency manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Kennedy, W. H., district sales manager, Ford Division, Ford Motor Co.

Kline, P. B., vice president, Edgcomb Steel Co.

Ledford, Hubert F., president, State Capital Life Insurance Co.

McGuire, W. B., president, Duke Power Co.

Mitchell, S. H., president, Hennis Freight Lines, Inc.

Moore, Dan K., Champion Papers.

Morris, E. A., president, Blue Bell, Inc.

Myers, Charles F., Jr., president, Burlington Industries.

Peden, James M., president, Peden Steel Co.

Phillips, D. L., D. L. Phillips.

Reese, Addison H., president, North Carolina National Bank.

Robinson, Joseph H., senior vice president, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.

Sherrill, Frank O., Charlotte.

Snyder, George C., president, the Charlotte Coca-Cola Bottling Co.

Spaugh, R. Arthur, president, Washington Mills Co.

Steele, J. C., Jr., president, J. C. Steele & Sons, Inc.

Street, C. P., McDevitt & Street Co.

Surtman, J. R., president, Carolina Ford Tractor Co.

Sutton, Louis V., president, Carolina Power & Light Co.

Teer, Nello L., Jr., president, Nello L. Teer Co.

Terrell, Edgar A., Jr., vice president, Terrell Machine Co.

Upchurch, T. A., vice president and treasurer, Durham Life Insurance Co.

Van Pelt, W. M., loan supervisor, residential mortgage department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Watlington, John F., Jr., president, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.

White, Harvey S., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Winter, J. W., vice president, Edgcomb Steel Co.

NORTH DAKOTA

Graves, W. F., president, the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Fargo.

McLellan, Adrian O., president, Merchants National Bank and Trust Co.

Palmer, D. W., president, the Fargo National Bank.

Thompson, J. L., Border States Electric Supply Co.

Weinhandl, A. R., president, the First National Bank in Minot.

Wright, W. E., president, Pioneer Mutual Life Insurance Co.

OHIO

Adams, J. E., executive vice president, manufacturing and development, White Motor Co.

Alpaugh, W. G., Jr., president, Inter-Ocean Insurance Co.

Anderson, Ralph H., president, Anderson Concrete Corp.

Anderson, William E., president, the Central Trust Co.

Ashman, Raymond D., Jr., president, Ric-Wil, Inc.

Bailey, Walter R., chairman of the board, the Warner & Swasey Co.

Baldwin E. Colin, president, Sherwin-Williams Co.

Barefoot, J. Roy, executive vice president, the McKay Machine Co.

Bauman, John N., president, White Motor Co.

Beam, Francis H., chairman, the National City Bank of Cleveland.

Beck, William M., president, the Akron Paint & Varnish Co.

Bell, Robert F., president, Baker Brothers, Inc.

Bendetsen, Karl R., president, Champion Papers.

Bensen, R. G., assistant vice president, finance and administration, White Motor Co.

Bentley, A. I., chairman, A. Bentley & Sons Co.

Besse, Ralph M., president, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Black, Robert F., chairman, White Motor Co.

Bloom, Ralph, president, the Cino Chemical Co.

Boeschenstein, Harold, president, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.

Bonds, A. B., Jr., president, Baldwin-Wallace College.

Bowman, B. W., owner, Burch Directory Co.

Boyer, W. B., vice president, finance, Republic Steel Corp.

Brams, Stewart L., president, Dayton Chemical Products Laboratories, Inc.

Breisford, E. C., vice president, finance, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.

Brewer, Wayne B., president, Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.

Bridgwater, Boyd E., president, Bridgwater Machine Division.

Brittain, George W., executive vice president, Akron Area Chamber of Commerce.

Brock, W. Megrue, president, Gem City Saving Association.

Brown, George V., secretary, White Motor Co.

Brown, J. A., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Buckingham, L. M., Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs.

Burge, J. D., Ball, Burge & Kraus.

Burrows, William F., vice president, Diesel Engine Division, White Motor Co.

Canaday, Ward M., president and chairman, the Overland Corp.

Carlson, William F., president, University of Toledo.

Carter, Warren, chairman, Carter Jones Lumber Co.

Chamberlain, J. M. W., president, Chamberlain Aviation, Inc.

Cobey, Ralph, president, the Perfection Steel Body Co.

Colclough, William F., president, Cincinnati Steel Products, Inc.

Coleman, William H., Cleveland.

Cox, W. Howard, chairman, Union Central Life Insurance Co.

Darsky, Julius, president, Golden Age Beverage Co.

Davis, John K., president, the Toledo Edison Co.

Dawes, Forrest L., chairman, Adamson United Co.

DeCoudres, R. A., superintendent, Union Carbide Plastics Co.

Doerge, J. O., president, Saunders, Stiver & Co.

Donohoo, J. G., president, Caribbean Container Co.

Douglas, Claude E., treasurer, White Motor Co.

Dowling, Emmett P., president, the Youngstown Steel Door Co.

Dragin, J. P., executive vice president, finance and administration, White Motor Co.

DuBois, Durwood, executive vice president, the Ohio Citizens Trust Co.

DuLaurence, Henry, chairman, legislative committee, National Apartment Owners Association, Inc.

Elliott, C. W., vice president, administration, Midland Ross Corp.

Ensign, G. E., regional superintendent of agencies, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Enyart, C. W., chairman, C. L. Gougler Machinery Co.

Esslinger, E. C., cashier, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Evans, D. R., retired chairman, Akron-Dime Bank.

Evans, Raymond F., chairman and president, Diamond Alkali Co.

Fawcett, Henry M., president, Mohawk Rubber Co.

Fawcett, Ralph M., president, Monarch Rubber Co.

Fewell, Donald W., regional superintendent of agencies, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Fiore, Louis R., president, the Ohio River Co.

Firestone, Harvey S., Jr., chairman, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Fitkin, A. E., president, National Gas & Oil Corp.

Ford, Laurence W., president, the A. L. Garber Co.

Frank, Paul, president, National Rubber Machinery Co.

Fries, V. W., chairman, White Sewing Machine Corp.

Galbreath, Daniel M., John M. Galbreath & Co.

Galbreath, John W., John W. Galbreath & Co.

Gibbons, Michael J., Jr., chairman of the board, M. J. Gibbons Supply Co.

Gibbs, Earl C., chairman of the board and president, Earl C. Gibbs, Inc.

Glossbrenner, A. S., president, the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.

Gorman, D. J., president, Federal Lime & Stone Co.

Graves, Harold, chairman, Brown Graves Co.

Gries, Lincoln, executive vice president, May Department Stores Co.

Gund, George, chairman, the Cleveland Trust Co.

Guthrie, William S., president, Buckeye Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Halle, W. M., president, Halle Brothers.

Harrison, H. Stuart, president, the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co.

Harter, F. S., chairman, Reiter & Harter, Inc.

Harwick, Mrs. V. L., chairman and treasurer, Harwick Standard Chemical Co.

Hauserman, W. F., president, Hauserman, Ltd.

Hazlett, C. B., president, Evans Savings.

Heller, Robert, president, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc.

Henke, R. H., Republic Steel Corp.

Herberich, C. G., president, Herberich-Hall-Harter Co.

Hill, G. Carlton, president, the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.

Holl, Barton A., president, the Logan Clay Products Co.

Hoover, H. W., Jr., president, Hoover Co.

Hower, J. P., president, Akron-Selle Co.

Hughes, James A., executive vice president, Diamond Alkali Co.

Hughes, Lloyd I., president, Kaighin & Hughes, Inc.

Humphrey, Gilbert W., chairman, the M. A. Hanna Co.

Hunkin, S. E., chairman, Hunkin-Conkey Construction Co.

Hunter, Robert L., president, Hunter Construction Co.

Hyde, Howard L., executive vice president, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Ireland, James D., president, Peters Creek Coal Co.

Ireland, R. L., Cleveland.

Ismond, Edward R., president, Hatfield Electric Co.

Jeffrey, Edwin T., chairman, W. S. Tyler Co.

Johnson, Claude W., Jr., president, the Johnson Electric Supply Co.

Johnston, John G., manager, Smith, Barney & Co.

Jordan, Roy E., Jr., president, the Mosaic Tile Co.

Jory, William H., president, the American Ship Building Co.

Juilfs, A. G., president, Senco Products, Inc.

Kaufman, J. J., president, Alside, Inc.

Keener, J. Ward, president, the B. F. Goodrich Co.

Kerr, John H., vice president, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.

Killin, A. M., manager, Union Carbide Metals Co.

Kissell, Carter, president, National Castings Co.

Knowles, Allen C., president and chairman, Cleveland Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Kuhn, H. H., president, Hardware & Supply Co.

Laffer, William G., president, Clevite Corp.

Lathrop, Walter W., Sr., president, the Lathrop Co.

Laundrie, Robert W., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Lavin, Leo B., chairman of the board, the Sugardale Provision Co.

Lavin, William, president the Sugardale Provision Co.

Law, A. H., Jr., treasurer, Republic Steel Corp.

Lazarus, Fred, Jr., chairman, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

Lazarus, Ralph, president, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

Levis, J. Preston, chairman, Owens-Illinois Glass Co.

Lindseth, Elmer L., chairman, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

MacDonell, A. D., president, Metropolitan Bank of Lima.

Mackenroth, D. R., vice president, assistant to president, Lawson Milk Co.

MacNichol, George P., Jr., president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

Martin, W. C., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

McBride, D. S., Wilson, McBride & Co.

McDonald, Charles B., partner, McDonald & Co.

McDowell, Robert C., president, McDowell Co.

Mead, H. T., vice president, finance, the Mead Corp.

Mell, D. C., president Fairlawn Supply & Concrete Co.

Mennel, Donald M., president, the Mennel Milling Co.

Meredith, Harold J., president, the City Loan & Savings Co.

Merryweather, G., president, Merryweather Foam Latex Co.

Meyer, H. Harold, president, the H. H. Meyer Packing Co.

Mintz, Alexander, president, Shaker Savings Association.

Morgan, W. H., Jr., president, Morgan Engineering Co.

Murphy, John P. chairman, the Higbee Co.

Murstein, William, president, Wilmur's Inc.

Nail, Charles E., president, the Lumbermen's Mutual Insurance Co.

Nance, J. J., president, Central National Bank of Cleveland.

Nave, Henry J., executive vice president, White Division, White Motor Co.

Nichols, Charles G., chairman of the board, the G. M. McKelvery Co.

Niedzwiecki, J. J., manager, tax department, White Motor Co.

Noble, Donald E., president, Rubbermaid, Inc.

Nordholt, J. B., Jr., president, Webster Manufacturing, Inc.

Oberlin, E. A., Jr., chairman the Firestone Bank.

Oelman, Robert S., chairman and president, the National Cash Register Co.

O'Neil, M. G., president, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Oxley, Kenneth G., vice president and associate general manager, the Dayton Power & Light Co.

Pace, S. C., vice president, Thompson Ramo, Wooldridge, Inc.

Paige, H. E., president, the First National Bank of Akron.

Palmer, C. A., honorary chairman, Burt Manufacturing Co.

Palmer, C. Paul, president, National Lime & Stone Co.

Parker, Raymond A., president, Spo, Inc.

Parmer, Jess H., Toledo.

Parsch, G. T., president, Mechanical Mold & Machine Co.

Patry, Maurice, president, Adjusta-Post Manufacturing Co.

Pease, John W., president, Pease Woodwork Co., Inc.

Persily, Joseph D., district manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Pflueger, John S., president and chairman, Enterprise Manufacturing Co.

Pipp, Henry J., controller, White Motor Co.

Pollock, William B., II, president, William B. Pollock Co.

Prentice, A. N., vice president and general manager, Ohio Power Co.

Price, Millard E., controller, Thompson Ramo, Wooldridge, Inc.

Pulley, Verlin L., president, Capitol Varsity Co.

Putnam, Paul, president, the AP Parts Corp.

Ramage, William C. H., president, Valley Mould & Iron Corp.

Ream, Louis H., president, First National Bank of Canton.

Reavis, John W., managing partner, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis.

Reese, Everett D., chairman, the City National Bank & Trust Co. of Columbus.

Rehagen, E. S., district manager, Westinghouse Electric Co.

Reiss, R. T., president-treasurer, R.C.A. Rubicon Co.

Richardson, M. S., president, Akron-Dime Bank.

Riley, E. P., vice president, Thompson Ramo, Wooldridge, Inc.

Roberts, Robert, president, the Roberts Toledo Rubber Co.

Rupert, E. J., president, the Broadview Savings & Loan Co.

Russell, Henry E., president, Carling Brewing Co.

Saalfield, H. R., president, Saalfield Publishing Co.

Safford, William C., president, the Western & Southern Life Insurance Co.

Safreed, Charles F., president, McNeil Machine & Engineering Co.

Saint-Amour, John D., president, Assembly Products, Inc.

Sammis, W. H., president, Ohio Edison Co.

Schafer, G. P., Schafer, Flynn & Associates.

Scherr, Joseph W., Jr., chairman, Inter-Ocean Insurance Co.

Schilling, L. R., president, the Gerson Stewart Corp.

Schloss, Milton J., president, the E. Kahn's Sons Co.

Schmidt, Henry C., president, North American Coal Corp.

Schrank, Harry P., president, Seiberling Rubber Co.

Schumacher, Carl E., president, the Schumacher Co.

Sedgwick, Ellery, Jr., president, Medusa Portland Cement Co.

Sheidler, Franklin E., C.L.U. Toledo.

Sherwin, John, Pickands Mather & Co.

Shouvlin, J. C., president, the Bauer Bros. Co.

Sloan, Edward W., Jr., president, Oglebay Norton Co.

Smith, C. H., Jr., president, the Steel Improvement & Forge Co.

Smith, T. W., Jr., president, Sun Rubber Co.

Snyder, John W., executive vice president, the Overland Corp.

Spahr, Charles E., president, Standard Oil Co. (Ohio).

Spencer, L. A., C.L.U., the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Stark, O. P., president, Hoosier Engineering Co.

Steere, F. W., Jr., president, Steere Enterprises, Inc.

Stern, Joseph S., Jr., vice president, the United States Shoe Corp.

Stewart, Harry B., Jr., chairman, Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railroad Co.

Stouffer, Vernon, chairman and president, Stouffer Corp.

Stranahan, R. A., president, Champion Spark Plug Co.

Strnad, James J., president, Lempco Products, Inc.

Strohmeier, H. G., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Strong, G. Gordon, president, the Brush-Moore Newspapers, Inc.

Sutton, D. H., executive director, Ohio Public Expenditure Council.

Taft, Charles P., Cincinnati.

Thomas, B. D., president, Battelle Memorial Institute.

Thomas, E. J., chairman, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Tillett, J. A., director, industrial accounting, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.

Timberman, F. C., district manager, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Timms, W. B., Jr., president, the Timms Spring Co.

Tippit, Hassel, managing partner, Ernst & Ernst.

Torley, John F., Dayton Malleable Iron Co.

Towson, S. K., Jr., president, the Elwell-Parker Electric Co.

Turben, Claude F., chairman, Merrill, Turben & Co., Inc.

Turner, Laurence C., president, the Great Lakes Towing Co.

Underman, F. B., president, Danner Press, Inc.

Virden, John C., chairman of the board and president, Eaton Manufacturing Co.

Voth, Walter P., president, the Akron Standard Mold Co.

Wall, John R., general traffic manager, Republic Steel Corp.

Ward, Ashley F., president, Ward Manufacturing, Inc.

Wean, Raymond J., Sr., president, the Wean Engineering Co., Inc.

Weatherhead, Albert J., Jr., president, the Weatherhead Co.

Weaver, C. I., director, Ohio Fuel Gas Co.

Weber, John A., division manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Weller, Harry D., vice president, marketing, White Division, White Motor Co.

White, Robert F., president, Robertson Sign Co.

Willey, A. O., president, the Lubrizol Corp.

Williams, Clyde, president, Clyde Williams & Co.

Williams, William, president, Akron Coca-Cola Bottling Co.

Wirtz, Kenneth U., chairman, the Electric Furnace Co.

Witt, J. C., president, the Witt Cornice Co.

Wolfe, Preston, president, the Columbus Dispatch.

Wright, J. D., chairman of the board, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.

Young, Herrick, president, Western College.

Zimmer, William H., president, the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.

OKLAHOMA

Breene, J. O., president, Winona Oil Co. of Delaware.

Crenshaw, Kirby E., president, Cities Service Gas Co.

Dew, O. V., Ford Motor Co., parts depot.

Dillard, William, president, Brown-Dunkin Co.

Fry, Arthur R., assistant divisional group manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Kennedy, Donald S., president, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.

Kidd, Robert L., chairman of the board, Cities Service Oil Co.

McGee, D. A., president, Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc.

Price, Harold C., Jr., president, H. C. Price Co.

Taliaferro, Paul E., president, Sunray DX Oil Co.

Westby, G. H., president Seismograph Service Corp.

Williams, John H., president, Williams Bros. Co.

OREGON

Adams, C. F., president, the Oregon Bank.

Bailey, Thomas H., president, Tillamook Motor Co.

Brandenthaler, Anthony, Burnt River Lumber Co.

Briggs, C. A., Portland district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Bruno, Thaddeus B.; Portland.

Carey, Robert R., Inland Machinery.

Chandler, Robert W., editor, the Bulletin.

Darby, Herbert J., vice president and general manager, Mailwell Envelope Co.

Graham, A. B., partner, Braley & Graham.

Gray, John D., president, Omark Industries, Inc.

Hayes, Edmund, director, United States National Bank.

Hill, Francis F., president, Northwest Natural Gas Co.

Jaques, Guy E., president, Portland Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Kane, Harry J., financial vice president, Georgia-Pacific Corp.

Keller, Ira C., president, Western Kraft Corp.

Kerr, Thomas, president, Kerr Grain Corp.

Kolar, E. J., president, United States National Bank.

Kuckenberg, Henry, president, Kuckenberg Construction Co., Inc.

McCaslin, Frank E., president, Oregon Portland Cement Co.

McCallum, Donald V., president, Title & Trust Co.

McKee, Paul, chairman, Pacific Power & Light Co.

McKinney, W. Verne, publisher, Hillsboro Argus.

Montgomery, Richard G., Advertising and Public Relations Co.

Pamplin, Robert B., president, Georgia-Pacific Corp.

Plunkett, Sam O., executive secretary, the Oregon Apartment House Association, Inc.

Reter, Raymond R., Reter Fruit Co.

Roberts, J. R., president, Roberts, Inc.

Rogers, Willard R., president, Rogers Construction Co.

Rossman, Gene W., executive director, Housing Authority of Portland.

Simpson, David B., president, Norris, Beggs & Simpson.

Slate, Fred H., general partner, Fred H. Slate Co., Oregon, Ltd.

Stadelman, George, Stadelman Fruit, Inc.

Stangler, Robert B., Stangler Bros.

Swigert, Ernest G., chairman of the board, Hyster Co.

Stewart, L. L., president, Bohemia Lumber Co.

Swindells, William, Willamette Valley Lumber Co.

Wilson, Robert B., president, Warm Springs Lumber Co., Inc.

Yaw, W. P., president, Yaws Top Notch Restaurant.

PENNSYLVANIA

Agnew, Frank E., Jr., chairman, Pittsburgh National Bank.

Armour, Frank, Jr., president, H. J. Heinz Co.

Ayella, Robert J., M.D., chief, department of radiology, nuclear medicine and oncology, J. C. Blair Memorial Hospital.

Ball, Russell C., Jr., president, Philadelphia Gear Corp.

Barnard, Boyd T., president, Jackson-Cross Co.

Beck, Carl A., president, Charles Beck Machine Corp.

Beck, Charles E., president, Philco Corp.

Beyer, H. Lloyd, Jr., president, Edgcomb Steel Co.

Blair, Oliver, E. H. Dau Co.

Bliss, L. G., president, Foote Mineral Co.

Broden, Edwin R., president and chairman of the board, SKF Industries, Inc.

Brossard, John J., president, American Industrial Life Insurance Co.

Brown, C. H., president, Colonial Assurance Co.

Brown, George H., Jr., president, Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank.

Budd, E. G., Jr., president, the Budd Co.

Burlingame, Gordon M., president, Title Insurance Corp. of Pennsylvania.

Busby, Jack K., president, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.

Byrom, Fletcher L., president, Koppers Co., Inc.

Cannava, Robert E., sales promotion manager, American Industrial Life Insurance Co.

Carr, D. J., plant manager, Corning Glass Works.

Cheney, F. E., Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp.

Clark, Norman E., president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of New Castle.

Clark W. E., president, Dravo Corp.

Cooper, Douglas D., Continental Motors, Inc.

Costello, E. R., assistant treasurer, Edgcomb Steel Co.

Cressman, Louis C., comanager, Smith, Barney & Co.

Culligan, Matthew J., president, the Curtis Publishing Co.

Daroff, Samuel H., secretary and treasurer, H. Daroff & Sons, Inc.

Dauler, Lee V., president, Neville Chemical Co.

Dilworth, Everett K., Patterson, Crawford, Arensberg & Dunn.

Dintino, Sandy, agency supervisor, American Industrial Life Insurance Co.

Douglass, Alfred E., Jr., president, Allentown Portland Cement Co.

Drexler, Joseph J., vice president, Edgcomb Steel Co.

Drumm, Streuby L., president, West Penn Power Co.

Edgcomb, Leslie, chairman of the board, Edgcomb Steel Co.

Ellis, Calvert N., president, Juniata College.

Evans, Harold G., president, American Casualty Co.

Feld, Aaron L., agency manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Fenn, Charles V., president, Elliott Co.

Firestone, Roger S., president, Firestone Plastics Co.

Foerderer, Percival E., Philadelphia.

Foulke, William G., president, Provident Tradesmen's Bank & Trust Co.

Foy, Fred C., chairman of the board, Koppers Co., Inc.

Fuller, Walter D., Walter D. Fuller Co.

Gallagher, Arthur A., president, E. A. Gallagher & Sons.

Gerstell, Robert S., chairman of the board, Alpha Portland Cement Co.

Gillen, Wilfred D., president, Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania.

Gilmore, G. E., office manager, American Industrial Life Insurance Co.

Glatfelter, P. H., III, president, P. H. Glatfelter Co.

Gramley, E. T., president, Milton Bank & Safe Deposit Co.

Hall, Noble, general manager and vice president, The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp.

Hallowell, H. Thomas, Jr., president, Standard Pressed Steel Co.

Hallowell, Henry R., partner, Hallowell, Sulzberger, Jenks, Kirkland & Co.

Hanley, E. J., chairman of the board and president, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp.

Herzoz, Leonard F., president, Nuclide Corp.

Hickok, Daniel H., president, W. O. Hickok Manufacturing Co.

Hodge, Edwin, Jr., chairman and president, Pittsburgh Forgings Co.

Homer, A. B., chairman, Bethlehem Steel Co.

Hunt, David M., David M. Hunt Construction Co.

Hunter, Joel, president, Crucible Steel Co. of America.

Huston, Charles L., Jr., president, Lukens Steel Co.

Ingersoll, C. Jared, Philadelphia.

Jackson, W. R., president, Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel Co.

Jansen, C. B., chairman, Dravo Corp.

Kaiser, Paul R., president, Tasty Baking Co.

Kelly, William F., president, the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co.

King, Ferris A., regional loan supervisor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Kraft, Raymond J., director, group annuities, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Kuebler, Chester A., president and general manager, Uniflow Manufacturing Co.

Lambert, R. B., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Litchfield, Lawrence, Jr., chairman of the board, Aluminum Co. of America.

Litvak, Bernard, chairman of the board, Lit Brothers.

Lott, John F., president, Fort Duquesne Steel Co.

Louderback, Lewis G., president, Louderback Transportation Co.

Love, George H., chairman, Chrysler Corp.

Lynch, Charles McK., Jr., partner, Moore, Leonard & Lynch.

Malone, James F., president, Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

Marcon, Frank L., president, Duggan & Marcon, Inc.

Markle, Donald, chairman of the board, Jeddo Highland Coal Co.

Martin, Edmund F., president, Bethlehem Steel Co.

Masland, F. E., III, president, C. H. Masland & Sons.

Maxwell, Allison R., Jr., president, Pittsburgh Steel Co.

McCabe, Thomas B., chairman, Scott Paper Co.

Millsop, T. E., chairman, National Steel Corp.

Nesbitt, Harry J., president, John J. Nesbitt, Inc.

Newburger, Frank L., Jr., partner, Newburger & Co.

Okie, F. W., president, Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad.

O'Neill, F. A., president, Paper Manufacturers Co.

Ostermayer, Robert W., Sr., chairman of the board, Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp.

Palmer, Frank R., chairman, the Carpenter Steel Co.

Passell, Leonard D., partner, Behrman & Passell.

Pivirotto, Richard R., president, Joseph Horne Co.

Potts, Frederic A., president, the Philadelphia National Bank.

Rackley, Frank B., chairman and president, Jessop Steel Co.

Ream, Louis M., Jr., financial vice president, the Atlantic Refining Co.

Reese, Joseph H., Jr., C.L.U., president, J. H. Reese, Jr. & Co., Inc.

Reilly, R. C., Philadelphia district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Robert, George A., president, Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.

Roesch, K. A., vice president, Autocar division, White Motor Co.

Rowe, R. G., executive vice president, Stroud & Co., Inc.

Rowland, R. W., president, New Castle Refractories Co.

Schilling, William R., president and chairman, William Friehofer Banking Co.

Schmertz, Robert C., president, Cunningham Schmertz & Co., Inc.

Schreiber, Leon, comanager, Smith, Barney & Co.

Schwartz, Walter M., Jr., president, Proctor-Silex Corp.

Schriber, J. M., senior partner, Singer, Deane & Scribner.

Shields, R. N., chairman and president, Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway.

Shope, R. Wesley, president, Educators Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Silverman, Samuel S., president, Silco Cut Price Stores, Inc.

Simpson, Joseph T., chairman and president, Harsco Corp.

Small, Clarence B., Jr., general manager, Bud Small Lincoln-Mercury.

Smith, Bradford, Jr., president, Insurance Co. of North America.

Smith, Geoffrey S., chairman, Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank.

Soracco, William E., secretary and treasurer, Caputo-Soracco Dodge, Inc.

Spears, John E., vice president, Koppers Co., Inc.

Stein, Lou, president, Food Fair Stores.

Straith, Lewis E., president, Castle Rubber Co.

Strotmeyer, George B., general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Struble, L. P., Jr., director, Union Barge Line.

Sweeney, M. J., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Symes, James M., chairman, Pennsylvania Railroad.

Tracy, Richard H., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Tyson, Charles R., president, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Wark, W. E., Jr., president, Wark & Co.

Weiss, Max, vice president, American Industrial Life Insurance Co.

Wertz, D. Frederick, president, Lycoming College.

White, John B., John B. White, Inc.

Williams, Everett D., president, S. E. Williams Supply Co.

Wolstoncroft, Herbert C., Jr., general agent, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Wood, Harleston R., chairman of the board and president, Alan Wood Steel Co.

Woods, William J., chairman, Pennsylvania Glass Sand Corp.

Workman, J. E., president, Latrobe Steel Co.

Yoh, Harold L., president, Day & Zimmermann, Inc.

RHODE ISLAND

Armitage, Russell, president and treasurer, Hi Hat Food Products.

Bailey, Glenn W., president, ITT Royal Electric Corp.

Barrows, Fred H., Jr., president, Irons & Russell Co.

Broadbent, Elliot, president, Sayles Finishing Plants, Inc.

Congdon, Johns H., II, president and treasurer, the Congdon & Carpenter Co.

Curran, John R., vice president and general manager, ITT General Controls, Inc.

Elliott, G. M., president and treasurer, Rhode Island Textile Co.

Gilbane, Thomas F., president, Gilbane Building Co.

Leonard, E. E., Jr., president and general manager, H. & H. Screw Products Manufacturing Co., Inc.

Pritchard, Edwin G., president, Washburn Wire Co.

Ross, James B., vice president, Puritan Life Insurance Co.

Thompson, Rupert C., Jr., chairman of the board, Textron, Inc.

Viall, Richmond, board chairman, Marshall & Williams Corp.

Watkins, John C. A., president, Providence Journal Co.

Williams, Frank O. H., president, Puritan Life Insurance Co.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Barnes, F. S., president, Rock Hill Telephone Co.

Belknap, P. A., president and treasurer, Charleston Rubber Co.

Cobb, Talmadge W., branch manager, Harwick Standard Chemical Co.

Daniel, Charles E., chairman, Daniel Construction Co.

Hewell, Marion M., president, Fidelity Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Lott, George D., Jr., president, Palmetto Quarries Co.

McEachern, W. W., president, the South Carolina National Bank.

Montgomery, Walter S., president and treasurer, Spartan Mills.

Pickens, J. W., J. W. Pickens Co.

Wiggins, A. L. M., chairman of the board (retired), Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.

Williams, O. W., president, Farmers National Life Insurance Co.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Egger, Albert E., president, Egger Steel Co.

Kellar, Kenneth C., chief counsel, Homestake Mining Co.

Kennedy, Lester R., president, Dakota Steel & Supply Co.

Schmitt, Henry J., editor and publisher, Aberdeen American-News.

Sexauer, E. H., president, Sexauer & Co.

Shoemaker, Robert H., president, Inter-City Bus Lines, Inc.

TENNESSEE

Alexander, Ridley, president, the Second National Bank.

Bridges, Lewis, general manager, Philco Distributors, Inc.

Brunskill, R. I., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Buckman, Stanley J., president, Buckman Laboratory Inc.

Condon, Martin J., III, president, American Snuff Co.

Cook, Edward W., president, Cook & Co., Inc.

Creighton, Wilbur F., Jr., president, Foster & Creighton Co.

DeGeorge, J. J., district sales manager, Lincoln-Mercury Division, Ford Motor Co.

Dudley, Guilford, Jr., president, Life & Casualty Insurance Co. of Tennessee.

Earthman, W. W., president, Young Timer Shoe Co.

Everett, Malone J., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Fleming, Sam M., president, Third National Bank in Nashville.

Fried, Stanley H., president, B. Lowenstein & Bros., Inc.

Frierson, J. Burton, president, Dixie Mercerizing Co.

Gentry, Fenton A. S., president, Southern Fire & Casualty Co.

Graham, Edward W., president, Jarman Shoe Co.

Gregory, G. Warren, president, General Adhesives & Chemical Co.

Hart, F. Donald, president, Temco, Inc.

Hitt, Travis, president, Farmers National Bank.

Howell, Owen, president, Flagg Bros.

Irons, Kenneth H., branch manager, Harwick Standard Chemical Co.

Jackson, Willis, C.L.U., manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Jarman, W. Maxey, chairman, Genesco, Inc.

Langstaff, George, Jr., president, Charm Step Shoes.

Madden, Herbert J., chairman of the board East Tennessee Packing Co.

Parsons, G. J., plant manager, ITT Kellogg Telecommunications.

Quick, W. Gregory, president, Kingsboro Mills.

Rose, Duke J., president, Johnston & Murphy.

Runyon, P. C., president, Bell Bros. Shoes.

Sanders, Charles J., Jr., president, Chas. J. Sanders Co.

Turner, Norfleet, chairman, the First National Bank of Memphis.

Vaughn, Houghton, vice president, Genesco, Inc.

Wolfe, R. E., depot manger, Memphis parts depot, Ford Motor Co.

Wright, J. E., vice president and general manager, Kingsport Utilities, Inc.

TEXAS

Alcorn, C. W., vice chairman of board, Falcon Seaboard Drilling Co.

Anfin, R. R., consultant, dealer community relations department, Ford Motor Co.

Aston, James W., president, Republic National Bank of Dallas.

Attridge, Thomas J., manager, southwestern department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Ball, Munger T., president, Sabine Towing & Transportation Co., Inc.

Beard, Charles E., president, Braniff International Airways.

Beasley, Theodore P., chairman of the board and chief executive officer, Republic National Life Insurance Co.

Beissner, Henry M., president, Maroney, Beissner & Co., Inc.

Betts, I. F., president, the American National Bank of Beaumont.

Bond, Lewis H., president, the Fort Worth National Bank.

Bond, Roland S., president, Bond Oil Corp.

Brachman, Malcolm K., president, Pioneer American Insurance Co.

Brinson, H. Keith, C.L.U., general manager, (Fort Worth), New York Life Insurance Co.

Burrow, Harold, president, Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.

Campbell, Raymond, Jr., C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Coleman, Albert S., Coleman & Rolfe.

Crow, Trammell, Dallas.

Dewar, H. H., partner, Dewar, Robertson & Pancoast.

Dillon, Robert, assistant plant manager, Union Carbide Chemicals Co.

Doell, James E., manager (Midland), Great National Life Insurance Co.

Doell, Oscar T., C.L.U., manager (Austin), Great National Life Insurance Co.

Dunn, J. H., chairman of the board, the Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp.

Elkins, J. A., Jr., president, First City National Bank of Houston.

Ellis, Sydney T., president, Petro-Tex Chemical Corp.

Fata, Frank F., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Fisher, Gordon H., president, General Minerals.

Foley, Charles L., vice president, First Mortgage Co. of Houston, Inc.

Fraley, Jeff J., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Fulton, Royce H., president, R. H. Fulton Co.

Goebel, Theodore R., consultant, Columbian Carbon Co.

Goldston, W. J., Goldston Oil Corp.

Gray, John E., president, First Security National Bank of Beaumont.

Green, E. L., Jr., vice president, Cabot Corp.

Greer, S. Marcus, president, First City National Bank of Houston.

Griffith, John M., president, the City National Bank.

Haggerty, P. E., president, Texas Instruments, Inc.

Hamm, W. Dow, vice president, producing, the Atlantic Refining Co.

Harrington, W. O., president, C. & H. Transportation Co., Inc.

Harris, H. C., Jr., assistant vice president, producing, the Atlantic Refining Co.

Harris, John W., chairman, First Hutchings-Sealy National Bank.

Hay, Stephen J., chairman, Great National Life Insurance Co.

Hemmick, Robert S., C.L.U., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Hester, Talmage A., Oklahoma Pipeline Constructors.

Howell, John E., director, Monsanto Chemical Co.

Huchton, Paul J., president, the First Title Insurance Co.

Jessee, Clifford F., Dallas.

Jonsson, John E., chairman, Texas Instruments, Inc.

King, H. B., regional sales manager, Ford Division of Ford Motor Co.

Knapp, Alfred J., president, Fannin Bank.

Knight, Harland L., president, Southwest Indemnity Life Insurance Co.

Korsmo, H. J., factory manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Kyger, Murray, president, the First National Bank of Fort Worth.

Lanotte, Loyd M., president, TIME Freight, Inc.

Lawrence, John, chairman of the board, Dresser Industries, Inc.

Lay, Herman W., chairman, executive committee, Frito-Lay, Inc.

Leach, Ed C., president, Jack Tar Hotels.

Lockwood, Lee, director, Farm and Home Savings & Loan Association.

Lynch, John F., senior vice president, Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.

Lynch, W. W., president, Texas Power & Light Co.

MacNaughton, Lewis W., DeGolyer & MacNaughton.

Marcus, Stanley, president, Neiman-Marcus.

Marshall, J. Howard, Houston.

Martin, Darroll M., general manager (Dallas), New York Life Insurance Co.

Martin, Joe R., president, Martin Sprocket and Gear, Inc.

Matkin, George G., president, the State National Bank of El Paso.

McCarthy, John F., district manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

McCreless, S. E., president, American Hospital & Life of San Antonio.

McCulloch, Robert, chairman of the board and chief executive officer, Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc.

McLean, J. W., president, Texas National Bank of Houston.

McNeese, A. G., Jr., president, Bank of the Southwest.

Murdock, E. C., Jr., district manager, Great National Bank Life Insurance Co.

Nelson, Strauder G., president, Scobey Fireproof Storage Co.

Oakes, Barry L., president, Republic National Life Insurance Co.

Odom, J. M., Austin.

Overton, William Ward, Jr., chairman and president, Texas Bank & Trust Co.

Parker, Wesby R., chairman and president, Dr. Pepper Co.

Patterson, V. P., president, the First National Bank of Amarillo.

Penrose, Neville G., Fort Worth.

Pitzer, P. W., Jr., Independent oil operator.

Paynor, W. J., manager, Life Department, Key-Rhoades & Jenkins.

Riley, J. Michael, president, Transport Insurance Co.

Rosinski, B. A., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Rotan, Edward, partner, Rotan, Mosle & Co.

Rupe D. Gordon, president, Dallas Rupe & Son, Inc.

Sawtelle, George, chairman of the board, Kirby Petroleum Co.

Schaehling, F. W., regional loan supervisor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Sines, Bernard S., vice president, Southern Pacific Co.

Sontag, H. R., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Sterling, W. Dawson, president, Southwestern Life Insurance Co.

Stevens, E. M., president, Great Western Loan & Trust Co.

Stewart, W. L., president, West Brook Thompson Holding Corp.

Sullivan, Howard, plant manager, Ford Motor Co.

Symonds, Gardiner, chairman, Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.

Tallent, Jimmy A., branch manager, Great National Life Insurance Co.

Tellepsen, Howard T., president, Tellepsen Construction Co.

Templeton, J. B., president, Austin Bridge Co.

Thwing, R. C., president, Lloyd W. Richardson Construction Co.

Towledge, George L., bonding manager, Dallas branch, Reliance Standard Insurance Group.

True, L. H., president, Magnolia Pipe Line Co.

Vaughn, Jack C., president, Vaughn Petroleum, Inc.

Wall, C. I., president, Pioneer Natural Gas Co.

Wallace, P. J., plant manager, the General Tire & Rubber Co.

Weichsel, Carl C., president, Great National Life Insurance Co.

Windfohr, R. F., Fort Worth.

Winters, W. G., Sr., president, Texas Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Wolff, W. A., president, Oil Center Tool Division, FMC Corp.

Zachry, H. B., president and chairman of the board, H. B. Zachry Co.

UTAH

Aaberg, Eric C., vice president and general manager, the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Arnold, R. L., Arnold Machinery Co., Inc.

Badger, A. J., regional manager, American Oil Co.

Bennett, Harold H., president, Zions Cooperative Mercantile Institution.

Black, L. F., manager, Utah operations, Columbia-Geneva Steel Division.

Browning, Frank M., president, Bank of Utah.

Carter, R. S., president, Interstate Motor Lines, Inc.

Dye, M. L., president, First Federal Savings & Loan.

Eccles, Willard L., vice president, First Security Corp.

Fidlear, M. M., president Mountain Fuel Supply Co.

Freed, Charles C., president, Freed Motor Co.

Gibbons, J. P., president, Gibbons & Reed Co.

Hogle, James E., managing partner, J. A. Hogle & Co.

Holt, Reed E., president, Walker Bank & Trust Co.

Horman, S. M., president, Horman Construction Co.

Hutchinson, P. H., retired operating official, Garfield Chemical Co.

Kelly, Lincoln G., certified public accountant.

Kennedy, Walker, president, Liberty Fuel Co.

Kihtle, Percy H., treasurer, Western Rock Bit Manufacturing Co.

Knight, Rey N., division manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Leete, J. J., division manager, Sperry Utah Co.

Love, Douglas W., president, Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.

Naughton, Edward M., president, Utah Power & Light Co.

O'Connor, William J., chairman, president, and general manager, Independent Coal & Coke Co.

Peterson, K. M., depot controller, Salt Lake City Parts Depot, Ford Division, Ford Motor Co.

Potts, John T., president, the Galigher Co.

Purcell, P. J., president, Continental Agency Co.

Rosenblatt, Joseph, president, the Eimco Corp.

Sill, Sterling W., C.L.U., inspector of agencies (Salt Lake City), New York Life Insurance Co.

Strike, N. L., Ajax Presses.

Wardlaw, Frank A., Jr., director, Walker Bank & Trust Co.

Winder, George, manager and partner, Winder Dairy Co.

VERMONT

Ballou, Paul H., chairman of the board, Vermont National and Savings Bank.

Bulk, C. C., III, president and treasurer, Champlain Container & Box Corp.

England, Heber G., president, Jones Bros. Co., Inc.

Hall, W. L., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Lewis, Samuel A., president, Robertson Paper Co., Inc.

Whitmore, H. H., president, Jones & Lamson Machine Co.

VIRGINIA

Albergotti, E. R., Roanoke.

Alfriend, John S., chairman, Virginia National Bank.

Arden, T. T., president, Robertshaw Controls Co.

Bear, Clay F., president, Double Envelope Corp.

Bramble, A. L., Jr., agency manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Burnette, O. S., loan supervisor, residential mortgage department, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Clark, Norvon, president, Wise Construction Co., Inc.

Clement, G. Frank, president, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Cookson, A. E., vice president and general manager, ITT Intelcom, Inc.

Dillard, David H., chairman, Old Dominion Box Co.

Easley, James S., South Boston.

Ford, Thomas A., agency manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Gardner, Joe Hume, president, Bingham, Taylor & Co.

Gills, J. P., vice president and general manager, Appalachian Power Co.

Gottwald, F. D., Sr., Ethyl Corp.

Hagan, John C., III, Mason Hagen & Co.

Hofheimer, H. C., II, chairman, Southern Materials Co., Inc.

Holloway, Benjamin D., supervisor, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Houser, Theodore V., Fredericksburg.

Hyde, Edwin, president, Miller & Rhoads Department Store.

Leftwich, Richard S., vice president, law, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Lemmon, Willard L., Marion.

Lockridge, Robert S., president, Craddock-Terry Shoe Corp.

Lynch, W. E., manager, Virginia parts depot, Ford division, Ford Motor Co.

McVeigh, Norman R., treasurer, Mick-or-Mack Stores Co., Inc.

Navas, Stanley R., president, Concrete Pipe & Products Co., Inc.

Neuhoff, Lorenz, Jr., president, Valleydale Packers, Inc.

Noland, Lloyd U., Jr., chairman of the board, Noland Co., Inc.

Ould, Edward H., president, the First National Exchange Bank of Virginia.

Peters, John A., plant manager, ITT Electron Tube Division.

Rawlings, George C., president, Lawyers Title Insurance Corp.

Reynolds, Richard S., Jr., president, Reynolds Metals Co.

Roper, John L., II, president and general manager, Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp.

Rutherford, Julian H., Jr., Roanoke.

Saunders, Stuart T., president, Norfolk & Western Railway Co.

Schwarzschild, W. Harry, Jr., president, the Central National Bank of Richmond.

Strader, Ludwell A., president, Strader & Co., Inc.

Thompson, Raymond L., manager, Shenandoah Life Insurance Co.

Tusing, Joseph M., president, Tusing Finance Co., Inc.

Will, Erwin H., chairman of the board, Virginia Electric Power Co.

Wyatt, John M., III, president, Wyatt-Cornick, Inc.

WASHINGTON

Baird, Harold L., chairman of the board, United Pacific Insurance Co.

Bez, Nick, chairman of the board, West Coast Airlines, Inc.

Cain, Charles Y., Hooker Chemical Corp.

Carlson, Edward E., president, Western International Hotels, Inc.

Chase, Goodwin, chairman of the board and president, National Bank of Washington.

Comstock, George K., president, Electrical Products Consolidated.

Davenny, F. O., cashier (Spokane), the Equitable Life Assurance Company of the United States.

Day, Hollis, president, Day's Tailor-d Clothing, Inc.

Dederer, Michael, president, the Seattle Fur Exchange.

Foss, Henry O., president, Foss Launch & Tug Co.

Gilpin, J. H., Northwest Chair Co.

Gleed, Thomas F., chairman, finance committee, Simpson Timber Co.

Green, Joshua, Jr., chairman, Peoples National Bank of Washington.

Grimes, Ralph E., C.L.U., agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Hull, W. Y., president, North Pacific Bank Note Co.

Haselton, William R., vice president, St. Regis Paper Co.

Jenkins, William M., chairman of the board, Seattle-First National Bank.

Jenkinson, R. W., plant manager, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Landon, L. Evert, president, Nalley's Inc.

Lindberg, W. H., president, Standard Grocery Co.

Long, Joe L., Jr., vice president and general manager, Atlas Foundry & Machine Co.

Martinac, J. S., J. M. Martinac Shipbuilding Co.

Nolan, Joseph E., executive vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co.

O'Brien, Robert D., president, Pacific Car & Foundry Co.

Polansky, Robert, resident manager, Inorganic Chemicals Division, FMC Corp.

Reed, William, chairman, Simpson Timber Co.

Richmond, Volney, Jr., president, Northern Commercial Co.

Robinson, Kinsey M., chairman, Washington Water Power Co.

Schmidt, Adolph D., Jr., president, Olympia Brewing Co.

Shanor, Richard E., general manager (Bellevue), New York Life Insurance Co.

Skinner, David E., president, Alaska Steamship Co.

Street, William S., president, United Pacific Corp.

Strom, Arne, Tacoma Boatbuilding Co., Inc.

Thorpe, Robert M., president, Educators Manufacturing Co.

Tinker, Dow H., division manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Will, James W., president, Tam Enginering Corp.

Williams, Luke, president, American Sign & Indicator Corp.

Williams, Walter, chairman, Continental, Inc.

WEST VIRGINIA

Amsbury, L. B., Amsbury & Johnson.

Anderson, William B., president, the Anderson-Newcomb Co.

Bannerot, Fred G., Jr., president, Elk Refining Co.

Bloch, Thomas M., president, the Bloch Bros. Tobacco Co.

Boggs, K. C., Minter Homes Corp.

Buechner, Robert F., Ravenswood.

Caperton, S. Austin, Sr., president, Slab Fork Coal Co.

Carlson, Oka, plant manger, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Cogswell, F. A., plant manager, American Cyanamid Co.

Diddle, D. Sterling, chairman and president, the Guaranty National Bank.

Elphick, Neil C., area resident manager, FMC Corp.

Ensign, Darwin A., president, Ensign Electric & Manufacturing Co.

Fields, John R., president, Logan & Kanawha Coal Co., Inc.

Fish, J. T., Logan.

Hansbarger, J. C., manager, Charleston Division, Appalachian Power Co.

Hieronymus, R. C., South Charleston.

Hinkle, Paul, president, the Charleston National Bank.

Jackson, George, Clarksburg.

James, Ernest K., Charleston.

Jones, Wilbur S., president and general manager, Stone & Thomas.

McThenia, A. W., president, Acme Limestone Co.

Phillips, James S., president, United Fuel Gas Co.

Salvati, Raymond E., chairman, Island Creek Coal Co.

Shell, Bernard, Jr., president, Guyan Machinery Co.

Steele, William A., chairman and president, Wheeling Steel Corp.

Stewart, W. J., vice president and general manager, Wheeling Electric Co.

Tierney, Laurence E., Jr., president, Eastern Coal Corp.

Warden, Henry P., Bluefield.

Wehrle, H. B., president, McJunkin Corp.

Wiseman, Marrs, secretary, West Virginia Manufacturers Association.

WISCONSIN

Carson, K. S., division manager, Bolens Division, FMC Corp.

Dahlman, John H., president, Dahlman Construction Co.

Dostal, Charles L., president, Thilmany Pulp & Paper Co.

Eikel, Charles F., Jr., executive vice president, Cuna Mutual Insurance Society.

Faude, C. W., president, Cramer-Krasselt Co.

Franke, Harold A., president, the Milwaukee Co.

Gilbert, Harlow D., general manager (Milwaukee), New York Life Insurance Co.

Hamilton, Robert L., president, the Dumore Co.

Johnston, Keith C., president, Robert A. Johnston Co.

Kenny, Delbert J., president, B. C. Ziegler & Co.

Kraut, Ralph J., president, Giddings & Lewis Machine Tool Co.

Krueger, Arch S., president, Alwin Manufacturing Co.

Lenfestey, Frederick J., president, F. Hurbut Co.

Nelson, William J., Jr., Milwaukee.

Packard, Howard M., president, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

Richter, Oscar A., president, A. M. Richter Sons Co.

Rinkle, John R., general agent, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Schwalenberg, Armand, the Central Garage, Inc.

Silverman, Albert A., president, Vilter Manufacturing Corp.

Simpson, Joseph W., Jr., president, First Wisconsin National Bank of Milwaukee.

Smith, L. B., president, A. O. Smith Corp.

Stevenson, R. S., president, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Sweitzer, J. M., president, Employers Mutual Liability Insurance Co. of Wisconsin.

Vermillion, Richards D., Smith, Barney & Co.

Wanding, Lee, agency manager, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

WYOMING

Correll, Don, president, Old Faithful Life Insurance Co.

Fisher, M. E., president, the First National Bank of Laramie.

Harshfield, Charles F., president, Sioux Oil Co.

Hofmann, R. J., president, American National Bank.

King, Jackson F., president, First National Bank of Casper.

PUERTO RICO

Goodner, W. W., president, Atlantic Southern Insurance Co.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen met here today and most of them—I would say that all of them—are distinguished members of their communities. They met in connection with the deliberations which have been going on in the Congress—principally, of course, in the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the necessity for a tax reduction this year. I might say that coincidentally—and it was coincidental—the committee completed its work on this proposed ligislation today and reported the bill to the floor by a vote of 15 to 8, if my memory serves me correctly.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is probably one of the most far-reaching bills that has ever been proposed. It carries with it, if enacted, the largest tax reduction in the history of the United States, totaling in the period of its operation over 2 years, or 24 months, a total of something over $11 billion, or $11.2 billion, I think is more or less the exact figure.

Mr. Speaker, that reduction is distributed about $8.5 billion to individual taxpayers on a graduated basis. The rest of it will go to the business enterprises of the United States and, again, on a basis which gives some preference to the smaller, more independent business establishments in the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some people have taken exception to the activities of this business committee which has been working in behalf of this bill. I think that all of our citizens, regardless of what segment of society from which they may come, whether it be business, labor, agriculture or whomever it may be, have the right to petition Congress, and I am glad these gentlemen came here today. I understand that the President made a very splendid address to the group. Because of the activities of the Committee on Ways and Means and the activity on the floor of the House this afternoon I was not able to be present. But I was very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in a resolution which was adopted by the committee, and if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] will bear with me for a few more minutes, I would like to read that resolution in full:

(The following statement was approved by the executive committee of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 at a meeting in Washington, D.C., Tuesday, September 10, 1963.)

In the past several days, members of your executive committee and many other members of the business committee have received letters from several members of the Ways and Means Committee relative to the tax measure currently before that committee.

I am happy to say that it is no longer before the committee. The committee has reported it.

These letters generally similar in nature, question the wisdom of tax reduction in 1963 in view of anticipated continuing deficits. They also question whether or not the Congress and the administration are adhering to rigid spending discipline.

Your executive committee has examined these letters and welcomes the opportunity to address itself to these questions.

We would first like to comment on the question as to whether or not the Congress and the administration are adhering to rigid spending discipline. From its inception, the business committee in its statement of principles has insisted that "economies in and prudent control of Federal expenditures" are essential and that "failure on the part of the Congress and the administration to establish and adhere to rigid expenditure discipline could well negate the good emanating from tax reduction." In addition, on May 28, your executive committee stated, "The committee believes that a reduction in the 1964 budget is reasonable and practicable. Furthermore, it believes there is no situation foreseeable which would necessarily require the 1965 and 1966 budgets to increase over that proposed for 1964."

We reaffirm these views.

Federal expenditures are, of course, a joint responsibility of the Congress in appropriating money and the administration in its expenditure. We have been heartened in recent months at tangible evidence that Congress is reducing appropriations so that expenditures can be held in check. Furthermore, President Kennedy in his letter of August 19 to Representative Wilbur Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee states "* * * tax reduction must also, therefore, be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need."

We, therefore, believe it possible to hold Federal expenditures in fiscal 1964 below the level set forth in the budget this January. We believe this would have been impossible without the current pressures for economies generated by a proposed tax reduction. We urge the Congress and the administration to work jointly to achieve this goal.

Secondly, with regard to the wisdom of tax reduction in 1963 in view of anticipated continuing deficits. The deficits in recent years have, in large part, been the product of the failure of our economy to achieve its full potential because of the burden of oppressive individual and corporate tax rates. If unemployment is to be reduced, if idle plant is to be put into production, and if we are to achieve meaningful long term economic growth, individual and corporate rates must be reduced.

We recognize that tax reduction in the magnitude contemplated by the measure before the Ways and Means Committee will add temporarily to an otherwise existing deficit. However, we believe that additional income flowing from the tax cut will bring the budget into a position of balance significantly sooner than if there were no tax cut at all.

We commend these Members of Congress for their concern and urge them to do everything possible to assure expenditure control. We also sincerely urge them to reconsider their position and to work aggressively for the passage of a tax reduction as soon as possible in 1963.

I should only like to add that, in my judgment, the President not only in this proposed bill but in a bill which we passed last year has recommended to the country measures which have got to be beneficial to the business community. I hear all this talk about the administration being antibusiness, yet when you look about you see evidence so contrary to that assertion it is hard for me to understand how anyone in good conscience can make these charges.

Last week the stock market in the United States reached the highest point in its whole history. This means 1929, 1947, 1948, the years through the Eisenhower administration, and so on. In addition to that, corporate profits are higher than they have ever been. There is more employment than we have ever had. I do not make this statement to say we have done enough. I say it in the spirit that we have not done enough.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I wonder if the gentleman from Louisiana can enlighten us with the unemployment figures along with the rest of the picture?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes. The unemployment rate has dropped from 6.7 percent to 5.5 percent, if my figures are correct. The point is there is too much unemployment. If that is the point the gentleman is making I agree with him completely and totally, and I will say to the gentleman that the recommendation in this tax bill is directed to that point of weakness in our economy with the hope that the gentleman, when the hour comes to make a decision on this legislation, along with his colleagues, will recognize this economic fact of life and will support this bill along with others on his side of the aisle.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have been able to yield to the distinguished majority whip of the House. I would like to congratulate him and commend him also for bringing this very important resolution to the attention of the House on the eve of the day when one of the most significant pieces of legislation to come before this entire session of the Congress is brought up.

I believe the gentlemen who arranged this meeting here in Washington, Henry Ford, Mr. Saunders, and all of the other gentlemen of the committee who are working for enactment of this legislation, have performed a great public service, not only to the United States but to the free people of the world. Certainly we can all agree that we in this country can maintain our effort for world peace and world justice only so long as we remain economically strong. These men who have been able to put aside partisan politics and join shoulder to shoulder to try and evolve a program to persuade Congress to understand the full significance of President Kennedy's proposal are to be commended.

The President proposed a program when he took office in 1961 to keep this country economically sound. He proposed basically a three-point program. Two of these things have already been accomplished, both by the Congress and through administrative action. One of these was the accelerated depreciation allowance. The other one was the 7-percent tax credit on new investment.

The President in bringing those two messages to the Congress said, after all, that if we closed the cycle and gave him the third of the three pylons which he proposed to keep America sound, the third pylon being an across-the-board tax cut, which has been described both by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and the committee that met here today headed by Mr. Ford, we can look forward to an era of sustained prosperity in this country. We can close the gap in the economic hills and valleys we have experienced during the last few years. Certainly when we are in a free economy there are going to be hills and valleys. This is a dynamic free economy. But we are often concerned when these valleys become too deep, as they did in 1949, 1954, 1958, and 1960. The President yesterday quite properly pointed out over a nationwide television program that the biggest peacetime deficit was recorded in this country in 1958 and 1959 because of the failure of the country's economy to reach expectations.

For this reason I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority whip of this House, and also with the resolution adopted by this distinguished group of American businessmen who have today demonstrated that we Americans, when it comes to working for the good of America, know how to put partisan politics aside. These men assembled here today, a distinguished group of more than 2,000 outstanding American businessmen—and I am sure many of them belong to the other party than mine—said that this is the program they want. I say we in Congress should take this third step that is being recommended by the businessmen's committee. Certainly I think if we in Congress will heed the advice of these businessmen we can serve the best interests of this country and of peace.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman commends this group on setting partisanship aside. I am happy that is the case. I hope that will be true of those who feel differently on these economic and political issues. President Truman has put partisanship aside and said it is ill advised to have a tax cut without having expenditure reform and move toward a balanced budget. I am very happy that many of the Democrats in this Congress feel very strongly on this same issue. I join the gentleman in saying that I hope partisanship is set aside, because after all the Democrats control this House. There are those who hold my view that this is very ill advised for the welfare of this country and is actually, although well-intended on the President's part, going to lead this country into more serious economic conditions than it presently finds itself. But let us leave it at this point, that we hope the people who join in the debate that will be here 2 weeks from tomorrow will do so on the basis of their beliefs in both economic and political science. Then we can see which viewpoint prevails for the benefit of our country.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, the very dynamics of our democracy is the fact that we certainly can disagree in our viewpoints and our philosophy without being disagreeable and while I have the highest respect and regard for former President Harry Truman, I would have to respectfully disagree with his analysis of the current situation. This does not in any way diminish my most profound respect and admiration for his judgment and for his ability as a great leader of this country and, certainly, one of the greatest Presidents America has ever had. The fact remains, if we are going to be confronted with a problem here in 2 weeks, it is my hope that we, as Americans, and not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans are going to be able to look at this legislation. We have already had two significant previews of what the President's program can do for America. We are, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] said a moment ago, today certainly witnessing the highest and most successful and healthiest condition of the stock market ever in the history of this country. We have witnessed a decline in the number of unemployed and certainly, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, we still have 3 million unemployed. But this is the great effort of a democracy. We are never going to be satisfied with mediocrity. We constantly work to improve the situation. We have today 3,900,000 people unemployed and certainly I am confident that if the President's proposals are enacted into law, and two of them are already operating, the third link we need now, if this Congress will set aside partisan politics and heed the advice of our President, speaking for the good of America and recognizing the fact that here, indeed, is an opportunity to sustain the economy of this country, then I think in that sort of atmosphere we can really make some history here in the 88th Congress.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made; and I think there are other speakers to follow.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AIRCRAFT USED BY SENATOR GOLDWATER TO FLY TO CLEVELAND IS PERSONAL PROPERTY OF H. H. TIMKEN, JR.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Hagan of Georgia). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] made some remarks relating to people in my own congressional district and I do not believe the day should go by without some reply to those remarks. I advised the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] that I intended to make these remarks on the floor this afternoon.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] should have checked his facts before he issued his bitter attack today upon the Timken Co., of Canton, Ohio, for allegedly using a company aircraft to take Senator Goldwater to Cleveland for a political engagement.

The aircraft used by Senator Goldwater to fly to Cleveland is a four-place jet that is the personal property of H. H. Timken, Jr., and not the property of the Timken Co.

This information was given to the individual, presumably Mr. Vanik's agent, who checked at the airport yesterday.

We have gone a long way from the fundamental precepts of individual liberty in this country if a man can be criticized for using his own personal property, be it an old Ford or a new jet aircraft, to carry his friends and associates wherever he wants to go at any time.

No tax writeoff is involved, the corporation is not involved, and Mr. VANIK could have learned this easily if he had wished to do so before he launched his unreasoned attack upon the Timken family.

Let me say at this point that no man in any community in this country is more civic minded than H. H. Timken, Jr. I have just returned from Canton where we dedicated last week the new Stark County Historical Society, the National Professional Football Hall of Fame and the new Canton City Plaza, in all of which Mr. Timken has had a leading role. That he should be subjected to unreasonable attack in the House today is a scandalous thing.

Let me add that when the gentleman from Ohio who spoke earlier today rises to criticize transportation, he might do well to begin in his own political party where, as the senior Senator from Virginia pointed out last week, the most extravagant President in the history of the United States has at his disposal and in almost constant use by himself, his brothers, sisters and other, 10 helicopters, a private $8 million fan-jet Boeing 707-320 airplane, three other Boeing 707's luxuriously appointed, one Air Force Douglas DC-6B for airports where jets cannot land, a 20-foot Lincoln Continental automobile in addition to three other family cars and the regular White House fleet, a special railroad car, two yachts, a third yacht available from the Navy, and a racing yawl supplied by the Coast Guard.

The Senator was kind enough to omit mention of the other Army and Air Force aircraft that are dispatched to Hyannis Port, Palm Beach, or wherever the Presidential family may be vacationing to carry the morning newspapers, the afternoon mail, and whatever else may be required for the comfort and convenience of the first family, all at the taxpayers' expense.

The matter I rise in objection to, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that in the case of the Timken Co., Mr. Timken spent his own money and bought the aircraft with his own money which he had earned, whereas these other things are being paid for by the taxpayers we have heard people speaking about here today and saying they are going to do so much for them. One other good way to cut down taxes and expenses is to cut down on some of these luxuries.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AYRES. I have known the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], for a long, long time. In fact, he is a little older than I am, having been born on April 7, 1913, but he is a gentleman who has learned through the years. He has a very sweet wife, Betty, and two children, a daughter and a son, and his son John I know. Mr. VANIK was a city councilman in 1938 in the great city of Cleveland and came to this body in November 1954. I would say to my colleague who adjoins my district, that I do not think Mr. VANIK, who was my college classmate at Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, meant anything derogatory in his statement, but I am surprised that Mr. VANIK would accept the word of someone else, because ordinarily Mr. VANIK is not the type to criticize someone without knowing the facts, and in this case apparently he did not.

Mr. BOW. There is no question but what the facts were not known, or else I am sure Mr. VANIK would not have made this statement. The point I make is it is unfortunate that the name of a great American such as this representative of the Timken Co., or any other person as far as that is concerned, should be bandied around on the floor of this House to the point where they are going to ask the Internal Revenue Service to make an investigation. It puts a cloud upon these people unnecessarily, without any facts back of it.

This is something that has been going on, I am afraid, in this country for too long, where statements of this kind are made which affect these people. It just seems to me most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this could happen in this great House of Representatives. We have too many important things to do here. This Congress has been going along, and if you look the record over it is not too impressive. It seems to me there are many things we could be doing rather than besmirching the name of fine citizens of our country. It is unfortunate that this has occurred.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LOCAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OFFICIALS SUPPORT FEDERAL GRANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, what the Congress finally does about ARA may be greatly influenced by the current controversy over a $250,000 Federal grant to Millsboro, Del., for sewer facilities.

Since this is distinctly possible, recent articles in the Washington (D.C.) Post, and the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, based on interviews with leaders in the Millsboro Chamber of Commerce, may be of considerable interest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as they consider the matter of ARA, which is before the Congress at this very moment.

The Washington Post, in a front-page article on September 6, reported that Clifford Thoroughgood, president of the Millsboro Chamber of Commerce, said of the Federal grant to provide needed sewer facilities:

> I think it's going to be a big help for Millsboro.
>
> The first question a new industry asks is whether there is sewer and water; the next thing is schools, and the next is churches.
>
> The telegram was our idea.

The Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin reported on September 8 that William A. Carter, a director of the Millsboro Chamber of Commerce, said that through the closing down of industries:

> Millsboro has lost more than 500 jobs in the last 3 years.

It would seem clear from these articles that local chamber of commerce officials at Millsboro, Del., are not mere rubber stamps, and do not accept without question the canned opinions of the national officials of that organization which are concocted in the chamber of commerce's Washington headquarters by hired writers and phrasemakers.

The laws of the State of Delaware, which have been enacted by the general assemblies of the first State, provide for the receipt and acceptance of grants from any Federal agency:

> For or in aid of the construction, acquisition, or operation of any project, and to receive and accept aid or contributions from any source of either money, property, labor or other things of value, to be held, used and applied only for the purposes for which such grants and contributions may be made.

The local chamber of commerce officials at Millsboro, Dela., in working to obtain the Federal grant for a sewer system, were doing so in consonance with the laws of Delaware. Furthermore, they were responding to such statements of policy by the Delaware Chamber of Commerce as the following which was published in the Intrastate Water Resources Survey, State of Delaware, 1959:

> It has been estimated that for each 100 industrial payroll jobs created, employment is afforded six other wage earners in retail and service establishments. This is an indication, therefore, that the primary payrolls of industry are the motivating factor in population growth.
>
> a. Collateral growth. When industry moves into an area there is a natural increase in the demand for all types of services such as wholesale and retail, all forms of transportation, electric power, gas, sewerage, and water. The supplying of these services generates additional payrolls and consequently is a contributing factor to population growth.

I include as part of my remarks the newspaper articles I have referred to.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1963]

TOWN DISSENTS FROM NEILAN CHARGE—LOCALLY: WILLING MILLSBORO DENIES SEDUCTION

(By Laurence Stern)

The good townfolk of Millsboro, Del., politely but firmly dissented yesterday from U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Edwin P. Neilan's description of their new sewer works as a case of Federal "seduction by subsidy."

Neilan twice this week singled out the Eastern Shore poultry town in his home State during roundhouse attacks on Federal depressed-area programs, which he has said are the U.S. equivalent of Britain's sex scandals.

The peppery Chamber president is waging a nationwide crusade against depressed-area legislation now being debated in the House.

$250,000 FEDERAL GRANT

What triggered Neilan's attack was a $250,000 Federal grant to Millsboro last July for a new sewerage system. The money was awarded under the accelerated public works program enacted by Congress to create new jobs in economically depressed areas.

Meanwhile, back in the grassroots, Neilan would be hard pressed to find support for his criticism of the Millsboro project.

Take, for example, the views of Millsboro Chamber of Commerce President Clifford Thoroughgood.

"I think it's going to be a big help for Millsboro," he said in a telephone interview. "The first question a new industry asks is whether there is sewer and water; the next thing is schools, and the next is churches."

TELEGRAM OUR IDEA

Thoroughgood also took issue with a charge by Neilan that a representative of the Area Redevelopment Administration, which helps run the depressed-area program, pressured local business leaders into sending a telegram to Washington praising the project.

"The telegram was our idea," he said.

The local chamber official is in the cement supply business and acknowledges that the big sewer project could mean more business for his firm. "If I can bid with the contractor, I certainly will," he explained. "But it will be open and competitive bidding."

"Mandatory" was the word used by retired businessman, town commissioner and chamber of commerce member, Wilbur Shockley, to describe the new sewerage plant. Without it, he said, Millsboro had no hopes of attracting new industries and new residents.

Did he consider the $250,000 grant an act of "seduction"—Neilan's description—by the Federal Government? "We decided to remain noncommittal about what Mr. Neilan said," Shockley answered.

MIGHT AS WELL GET BENEFIT

Elisha Steele, a director of the Millsboro Trust Co., conjectured that "the general feeling is that the money is available and we're helping to pay the bill—so we might as well get the benefit of the program."

Did he share Neilan's view that the Nation would be better off without the depressed area program?

"Well, Millsboro does need this," he replied. "But on the overall, I think they go too far. It's not needed everywhere."

Millsboro's economic woes stem in part from the recent closing down by two major employers, a poultry processing plant and a bag company, with a combined payroll of nearly 500.

Although the creation of immediate job opportunities is the main goal of the accelerated public works program, another objective is to create a base for economic growth.

In addition to the sewerage works, the town is also seeking ARA help for construction of a new water supply system with the combined cost of the projects—some $800,000—split approximately 50-50 between the town and the Federal Government.

One significant gage of community attitudes toward the aid that Neilan described as "immoral," was a vote last July by Millsboro residents on a bond referendum to match the Federal grant. The issue passed by a 4½-to-1 ratio.

In criticizing the Millsboro project, Neilan noted that the town's population was only 523. But it grew to 1,200 last March when an annexation proposal won approval by a 2-to-1 margin. Behind the vote was the expectation of a public sewer and water system.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Sept. 8, 1963]

NEILAN RAPPED FOR CRITICIZING MILLSBORO AID—C. OF C. HEAD SEEN JEOPARDIZING TOWN'S FUTURE GRANTS

MILLSBORO, September 7.—Edwin P. Neilan, Wilmington banker and president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, today was accused of distorting facts and generally "opening his mouth too wide," when he criticized the granting of Federal funds to the town of Millsboro.

In a speech on the west coast a few days ago, Neilan singled out a Federal grant of $250,000 to Millsboro as a prime example of the kind of "handout" or "giveaway" which has turned U.S. politicians into "bagmen" and created an "immoral" atmosphere in this Nation which is worse than that created in England by the sex-spy scandal.

The money is to be used to help finance a new sewage disposal system for the town.

$250,000 GRANT

William A. Carter, a director of the Millsboro Chamber of Commerce and the chief architect of a broad scale plan of civic improvement which is designed to bring new industry to town, denounced Neilan for failing to look more closely into the story behind the $250,000 grant before attacking it.

Carter said of Neilan:

"He's got an awfully big mouth, it seems to me, and a lot of the things he has been saying are just not true as far as Millsboro is concerned.

"We have an application in for another grant to help us improve our water system, and Neilan certainly hasn't improved our chances of getting it.

BACK ON OUR FEET

"If he had only sought the real facts before he sounded off, he would have found out that what we have here in Millsboro is an excellent example of local, State and Federal cooperation to try to put a community back on its feet."

Carter said that, through the closing down of industries, Millsboro has lost more than 500 jobs in the last 3 years.

Worried town officials, headed by Carter (who until a few months ago was president of the town commission), asked planning experts from the University of Delaware to help them draw up a long-range plan of economic improvement.

TO DOUBLE POPULATION

The final plan calls for a broad expansion of the town to triple its size and double its population.

It also calls for the creation of modern sewage and water facilities.

After the expansion has been approved by a referendum, townsfolk also gave their approval to a $600,000 bond issue.

But the town felt that it could not foot the full bill for adequate facilities without raising taxes to too high a level. Hence, application was made for Federal aid.

One grant of $87,000 was obtained from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Another of $250,000 came through the grant of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

NOT A GIVEAWAY

Speaking of the latter grant, Carter said:

Neilan implied that this was a giveaway from the Federal Government which the Federal Government came around and sold us on accepting.

"The fact is, we approached the Federal Government. This is no case of logrolling or pork barreling, or political immorality, or any of these other things that Neilan has been talking about.

"He just lowered the boom on everybody, without discrimination.

"Now, I am a dues paying member of the chamber of commerce, and I am against Neilan using his position as head of the U.S. Chamber to spout off his own opinions.

"Some of the things he is saying are just ridiculous."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT, through September 24, 1963, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN, for September 12, 1963, September 13, 1963, and September 16 to 21, 1963 inclusive, on account of District official business.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from September 10 to September 24, on account of official business as U.S. Representative to the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from September 10 to September 24, on account of official business as U.S. Representative to the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from September 10 to September 24, on account of official business as U.S. Representative to the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for the balance of the week, on account of official business as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 20 minutes, on Thursday, September 12, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BOW for 10 minutes today.

Mr. PILLION (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 1 hour on September 16.

Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 1 hour on September 16.

Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 1 hour on September 16.

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 1 hour on September 16.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. ALBERT and to include an address by the President of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS to revise and extend his remarks made in consideration of S. 1576 and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York in connection with his remarks on S. 1576 and to include extraneous matter and several resolutions and tables.

Mr. PHILBIN.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. FRASER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 495. An act for the relief of Evanthia Christon;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 657. An act for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Adham;

S. 909. An act for the relief of Marja Lovsin;

S. 1154. An act to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., in Minnesota;

S. 1185. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Co., Inc.;

S. 1230. An act for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson; and

S. 1489. An act for the relief of J. Arthur Fields.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1187. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1188. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 18, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Santa Margarita River and tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

1189. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 17, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Sioux Bayou and connecting waterways, Mississippi, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1190. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relating to the continuing review of voluntary agreements and programs established pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7194. A bill to amend the Copyright Act by repealing the jukebox exemption, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 733). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang and Mrs. Jeong S. Yang; with amendment (Rept. No. 724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1273. A bill for the relief of Bay Kow Jung; without amendment (Rept. No. 725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1566. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto; with amendment (Rept. No. 726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3366. A bill for the relief of Ferenc Molnar; with amendment (Rept. No. 727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3908. A bill for the relief of Chang Sheng (also known as Rafael Chang Sing); with amendment (Rept. No. 728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5902. A bill for the relief of Eric Voegelin; with amendment (Rept. No. 729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6316. A bill for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa; without amendment (Rept. No. 730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen; with amendment (Rept. No. 731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1542. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy; with amendment (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6038. A bill for the relief of Mariano Carrese; with amendment (Rept. No. 734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 8359. A bill to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 8360. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prevent unnecessary or excessive demolition of buildings in urban renewal projects, to require that housing constructed in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas be designated for middle and lower income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8361. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 8362. A bill to regulate archeological exploration in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8364. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8365. A bill to enact the interstate agreement on detainers into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 8366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the withholding of tax on nonresident aliens with respect to income derived from investments in mutual savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 8368. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8369. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 8370. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to protect the constitutional rights of mentally incompetent persons committed thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 8371. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an immediate deduction from gross income for losses sustained by depositors in the failure of certain Maryland savings and loan associations during 1961 and 1962, subject to adjustment if and when such losses or any part thereof are made good; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 8373. A bill to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 8374. A bill to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 8375. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 8376. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 8377. A bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8378. A bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 8379. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8380. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 8381. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8382. A bill to authorize the conveyance of excess Federal property at Donaldson Air Force Base to the city and county of Greenville, S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 8383. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 8384. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8385. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the offering of prayers or any other recognition of God shall be permitted in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 689. Joint resolution to establish a Stamp Act Congress Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 690. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 694. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 698. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 699. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 700. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.J. Res. 701. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.J. Res. 702. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.J. Res. 703. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 705. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.J. Res. 706. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 707. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.J. Res. 708. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 709. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 710. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.J. Res. 711. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 713. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 715. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 716. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.J. Res. 717. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 719. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 720. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 515. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 516. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the report submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means to accompany H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 8386. A bill to admit the widow of a U.S. citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 8387. A bill for the relief of Dr. Melecio H. Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 8388. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Demirakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8389. A bill for the relief of Dr. George E. Poulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 8390. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Camilla Incorvaia Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8391. A bill for the relief of Gaetano DiSotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8392. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, N.J., as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8393. A bill for the relief of Lenford A. Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 8394. A bill for the relief of Slovenka Perusko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8395. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vugane Krishna Sundararaja Iyengar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 8396. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Jean Petrou and Rachel Arbib Harari Petrou, husband and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8397. A bill for the relief of Elefteri Tarinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8398. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Meliha Caylioglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 8399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edeltraus Englisch Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 8400. A bill for the relief of Emilio Akitoshi Iguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8401. A bill for the relief of Deward E. Quarles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8402. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gerhild Hossfeld Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pay Adjustment for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the necessity for taking action on pay legislation before we adjourn this year. While we are not close to adjournment, we are confronted with many grave problems that have to be solved before we can adjourn.

I am sure that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives feel as I do—that we have a very serious responsibility that we must live up to—and that is to consider the adjustment in salary for our Federal workers that has been recommended by President Kennedy.

As you know, last year we passed legislation that provided for pay increases for those under the Classification Act and the Postal Field Service Schedules—but that bill did a little more than that.

It provided for a modern way of considering pay adjustments. It required the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make an annual analysis of the comparability of Federal pay with pay in outside industry, submit its findings to the President, and the President was required by the law to make a recommendation to the Congress.

The President has made such a recommendation. Together with other Members of the House of Representatives, I have introduced legislation that would put the President's recommendations into effect. My bill is H.R. 7659, introduced on July 18, 1963.

I feel that we have a moral obligation to live up to the commitment carried in Public Law 87-793. It was passed by the House with only 20 opposing, and by the Senate with only 3 negative votes.

I think we should also give consideration to the fact that the figures on which the Bureau of Labor Statistics study was made were based upon a study of salaries in outside industry made in late 1961 and early 1962. The comparability that has been proposed is 2 years old. We should give some consideration to adjustment of this lag.

Some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives have introduced legislation that would make such an adjustment. I want to urge the Members to bend their efforts to see that this legislation will be given favorable consideration in ample time before the Congress adjourns at the end of the year.

Preserve Peace and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I comment upon a recent, thoughtful editorial in Gist Research by Mr. Frederick Burdick, distinguished editor of that publication.

Mr. Burdick in his statement pointed out that the 1945 model U.N., like automobile models, needs improvement.

The most urgent requirement, he states, is an effective, comprehensive, objective U.N. international communications system to help "preserve international peace and security."

The main aim would be to distinguish between war and peace propaganda, fiction and fact, rumor and reality, treachery and truth. Mr. Burdick believes that the U.N. would be able to forestall crises which invite chances for hastily pushing humanity into modern war fought with diabolical weapons bringing widespread devastation.

I think that all thoughtful persons who are informed concerning the distressing potential of modern weapons are agreed that this Nation and all nations must devote every possible effort to the prevention of war and the maintenance of peace. Aggressive war in this time and age is truly unthinkable and would be consistent only with fanaticism or madness.

Time and time again our Nation has made it clear that its policy is predicated on the desire for peace and that we would never wage an aggressive war.

However, we do not have the same assurances from the Soviet Union and its satellites and for that reason, if the U.N. is to be a really effective instrumentality for maintaining the peace, it must take the initiative in coping with all, not just some, incidents in the world likely to lead to war.

We can have 100 test bans, but there will be no lasting peace in the world until the Soviet stops its conspiracy against free governments and agrees to proper, effective, international control of nuclear energy and weapons, universal disarmament, and realistic judicial institutions for maintaining the peace.

Compulsory Arbitration a Dangerous Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 102 by the House on August 28 has established for the first time in our Nation's history the dangerous precedent of compulsory arbitration as a means of settling labor disputes. I must concur with the railroad brotherhoods in finding this action "a regrettable and backward step," a violation of a hard-won and vital economic principle of our free society—the right to bargain collectively.

Although this resolution was aimed at one particular management-labor dispute—the work rules controversy over firemen on diesel locomotives and the manning of traincrews—the precedent of compulsory arbitration thereby established contains grave threats to the future of free collective bargaining in America.

We have tried to relieve the burden of the awful responsibility we have assumed by assuring ourselves that this measure does not, in fact, set any sort of precedent. Let us not deceive ourselves. The next time we are called upon to step in and arbitrate a dispute between labor and management, we shall most assuredly find the second step to be less painful and seem more legitimate than the first.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], clearly perceived the latent dangers of our action when he stated that "we are today constituting the Congress as the final board of arbitration for all major disputes in the country."

We should heed the warnings and the lessons of history. The first step taken by the fascist dictatorships of the 1930's in consolidating their power was the destruction of the economic freedom of workers and managers. The corporate state—the politico-economic system under fascism—called upon the government to settle all management-labor differences in the "overriding interest of the public and the state." Corporatism and compulsory arbitration were interdependent.

Considering the great responsibility we bear to keep the government from interfering with the free bargaining between employers and employees, there are at least two alternatives to compulsory arbitration which we should have seriously explored before even considering Senate Joint Resolution 102.

First, we should have waited until we were sure that the possibilities of collective bargaining in good faith had truly been exhausted. After several years of negotiations—first between the two parties themselves, then under the guidance of the Executive, it appeared that collective bargaining had completely broken down, that an impasse had been reached. However, throughout this period, each side had accused the other of dealing in bad faith. The Congress, then, should have taken time to observe the negotiations, and see whether or not the bargaining was, in fact, being conducted in an atmosphere of good faith. If one or both of the parties was dealing in bad faith, then there would be no way of assessing the capability of collective bargaining to deal with the problem.

However, the Congress reached its decision after several short weeks without ascertaining the validity of the charges and countercharges of the carriers and the brotherhoods. The Congress could, therefore, have established a joint overseeing committee to sit at the bargaining tables and determine whether an impasse truly existed, or whether there was evidence of bad faith, in which case collective bargaining could have continued, under congressional supervision and in good faith, toward a possible satisfactory compromise.

Secondly, we could have allowed the system of collective bargaining to take its course. A report from the Committee for Economic Develpoment recently noted that—

> Partial operation of a struck industry or facility may be all that is necessary to protect the public interest in continued availability of the goods or the services involved—

If, of course, there was union participation in such partial operation. The right to strike and the preservation of the public interest are not mutually exclusive.

The railroad brotherhoods had announced that, in the case of a strike, they would continue to operate commuter trains, move perishable freight, and handle all defense transportation. It seems very probable that a strike under these conditions would not have imperiled the public interest, and yet would have still allowed effective recourse for the brotherhoods in the form of economic pressure. This recourse is at the very heart of the rights guaranteed both labor and management in a free, democratic society.

Neither of the alternatives cited above was seriously considered by the Congress, and yet they are, in my opinion, highly preferable to a program of involuntary compulsory arbitration.

I believe we have instituted a dangerous precedent in this case. We must, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the democratic tradition of free, collective bargaining in a free society if we are to avert the grave dangers of reaffirming that precedent at some time in the future.

"The Role of Small Business in Foreign Trade," Television Address of Representative Samuel N. Friedel of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Representative SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, delivered an address a few days ago on "The Role of Small Business in Foreign Trade," which was broadcast by Baltimore television station WBAL–TV. In that speech he pointed out the importance of foreign trade and commerce to the port of Baltimore and made reference to hearings being held by the Small Business Committee dealing with export trade.

It should be noted, of course, that increasing American trade with foreign countries is not only of great value to our port cities, but is also of equal benefit to every section of our own country, for it helps solve our balance-of-payments problem and stimulates the sale of products manufactured in all parts of the United States to other lands.

I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to the excellent address of the gentleman from Maryland, Representative FRIEDEL, which is as follows:

THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN FOREIGN TRADE

(By Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland)

Ladies and gentlemen, many of you have probably heard me say at one time or another that I believe in trade—not aid. I do not mean that I am against giving aid to less fortunate and underdeveloped nations, but I firmly believe that the more we increase our trade with other nations—the more we can decrease our aid to many of them.

As you all know, one of Baltimore's greatest assets is its port, which is the Atlantic seaboard's gateway to the interior of the United States. Therefore, anything we do to increase business through our port benefits the economy of our entire State.

Foreign trade and commerce through our port has grown by leaps and bounds and now exceeds $1 billion a year, making Baltimore the second largest port in the United States in bulk cargo.

In a normal year, approximately 6,000 oceangoing vessels, loaded with more than 25 million tons of export-import cargo pass through our port. It is obvious that the economic health of the city of Baltimore and the entire State of Maryland is closely linked with foreign trade.

The more exports and imports that flow through our port, the better for all our citizens, and anything that stimulates such commerce, stimulates our economy.

However, I think too many of us tend to think of importing and exporting as something only big business can do but this is not the case. The House Select Committee on Small Business recently held hearings which should be of considerable interest to American businessmen and especially to so-called small business.

My very able colleague, the Honorable JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, is the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee. During the hearings, an imposing array of witnesses from various Government agencies testified for the purpose of ascertaining the plans of the administration under the Foreign Trade Expansion Act, its impact upon American business, how business may be affected, and what may be done to aid such businesses.

This testimony showed that various agencies and departments of our Government are vitally concerned with expanding our foreign trade and with increasing the opportunities for small business to participate in foreign trade.

One of the witnesses, who has the responsibility of coordinating all phases of the export expansion program, pointed out that through Government assistance and encouragement, 1,197 new exporters were introduced to international trade last year. He also stated that 36,000 businessmen attended export seminars in 1962 and he estimates that at least 85 percent of these were small businessmen.

Testimony also indicated that our Government agencies are doing a creditable job in expanding foreign trade, but more must be done. Expanding foreign trade so as to provide a stimulus to our economy and to help in solving our balance-of-payments problem is one of the most important tasks facing us today. Small business is being encouraged and helped to participate in foreign trade to the fullest extent possible.

Last year, the Congress gave the President extensive new trade negotiating power in the Trade Expansion Act. It is important that this authority in negotiations with the European Common Market and members of the European Free Trade Association be utilized to assist American business in securing access to these now prosperous markets. However, foreign trade is necessarily a two-way street. If we expect to sell more to foreign nations, it is only right that we should buy from them. At the same time, it is equally important that American suppliers and manufacturers and American labor be protected. This naturally involves a careful balancing of interests.

Under this same Trade Expansion Act, the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans up to $350,000 to assist firms to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from increased imports. In order to render the maximum assistance possible, a Foreign Trade Division was established in the Small Business Administration for the purpose of stimulating the interest of small businessmen in international trade and to assure that adequate consideration is given to small business interests in all of the Government programs relating to foreign trade.

We all hope that under the terms of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, a substantial reduction of tariffs will be made by the Common Market countries in order to improve the access of American goods and farm products to European markets. I would urge all businessmen who have a product to sell to give careful consideration to the opportunities open to him through exports. Remember, the more we trade—the less we will have to aid.

This is your Congressman, SAM FRIEDEL, speaking to you from Washington.

H.R. 7978—Frederick Douglass Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 7978, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring Frederick Douglass. At the time of its introduction, I pointed out my special interest in such a commemorative stamp related to the 17 years—1847-64—which Mr. Douglass spent in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., as publisher of the North Star, an antislavery newspaper.

I would like to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that encouragement and support for a special postage stamp honoring this famous abolitionist of the last century has come from a Rochesterian, Howard W. Coles, who has continued the Douglass tradition of publishing information for and about the American Negro. Since 1934, Mr. Coles has edited and published the Rochester Voice, a successor to the newspaper founded by Mr. Douglass.

Mr. Coles is a student of the life and works of Frederick Douglass and has conducted years of research on Mr. Douglass' activities. Mr. Coles also lectures on Mr. Douglass and has a collection of Douglass memorabilia which he exhibits in conjunction with his lectures.

Mr. Coles is active in maintaining public interest in the heritage left us by Frederick Douglass. In recent years, he has helped to direct memorial ceremonies at a statue of Mr. Douglass in Rochester's Highland Park. He participated in the christening of a World War II Liberty Ship named in honor of Mr. Douglass and was instrumental in the founding and formation of the Frederick Douglass League in Rochester.

Mr. Coles also is an author. In 1941 the Oxford Press published his history of the Negro in Rochester, western New York, and Canada under the title, "The Cradle of Freedom." A number of its chapters are devoted to Frederick Douglass.

In this volume Mr. Coles details the history of the Douglass publishing efforts and also presents a number of other historical facts about Mr. Douglass that are worthy of note. Among these is a description of Mr. Douglass' underground railroad activity. To further our appreciation of Mr. Douglass, I take pleasure in sharing the following excerpt from Mr. Coles' book:

> In addition to the writing and speaking against slavery that Frederick Douglass did in Rochester, there is one important phase which must not be forgotten. As "station master" on the underground, his position gave him the opportunity of hitting his old enemy, slavery, a telling blow in another direction. He was on the southern border of Lake Ontario and the Queen's dominions were right over the way. His own prominence as an abolitionist and editor of an antislavery paper naturally made him the station master and conductor of the underground railroad passing through what he called, the goodly city. During this same period, he attacked the Jim Crow public school system then in existence in the city. He was anxious to educate his children, but they were not allowed to attend the public schools in the district where he lived and owned property. His young daughter, Rosetta, who was the "apple of his eye" was so unkindly treated at Tracy Seminary, a school for girls, that she was forced to leave. Douglass decided to fight this system of discrimination with all the courage and stamina he possessed. On December 14, 1849, he addressed a mass meeting of Rochester citizens in the Monroe County Courthouse, protesting the segregation of colored children in the schools.
>
> He won again a signal victory and soon every barrier was removed. Since that year, children of black parents are freely admitted to all schools of the city.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Howard W. Coles and the Frederick Douglass League. Just as Frederick Douglass a century ago fought for the abolition of slavery, they today are fighting for equal rights for all American citizens.

Young Democrats and the Radical Left—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I continue the examination into the Young Democratic organization that I began last August 26.

Since that time I have received a letter from the State president of the California Young Democrats, and a copy of the resolutions and policy statements from the August 16 Western States Young Democratic Conference.

Mr. Speaker, after reading the complete text of these resolutions I am more disturbed than ever. Let me quote just one of the resolutions that so far has received little, if any, publicity.

Resolution follows:

> CONGRESSIONAL REFORM
>
> Whereas the 88th Congress to date has had a desultory record of accomplishment, and whereas its performance has been a disgrace to the Nation and a mockery of the democratic process: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Western States Conference YDCA supports Senators CLARK and CASE in their efforts to achieve congressional reform by modification of the rules and traditions of the Congress including defeat of the deadening seniority system and the tyrannical power of the committee chairmen, and limitations of the filibuster: And therefore, be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That we call upon the 1964 Democratic Convention to indicate its support for congressional reform by taking an uncompromising stand in the 1964 platform for such needed reforms regardless of the effect this would have on Southern States participation in the convention.

Mr. Speaker, examine the language of the resolution for a moment. This Democratic Party Congress is called a disgrace to the Nation and a mockery of the democratic process. Now we know what the Young Democrats think of us—perhaps our mistake has been in representing the American people and not the lunatic left.

The resolution also urges us to eject the Southern States from the next Democratic National Convention. The States that provided President Kennedy with his margin of victory in 1960 are no longer needed it seems. Any sane person would imagine that this resolution was written by Young Republicans rather than Young Democrats. Yet these people insist on calling themselves liberals. The tolerance and understanding of others that used to be the hallmark of the liberal has been swept away in the radical tide.

Other resolutions that have been overlooked so far include a demand for the lifting of travel restrictions to Cuba; a demand that Congress take no action in the present railroad dispute—this appears to conflict with their protest over congressional inaction; a demand for the repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act on the grounds that it establishes "concentration camps" in times of national emergency—presumably for Communists; and complete opposition to any Federal program for civil defense—presumably the Soviet Union is left free to safeguard its citizens; and last but not least a demand that the United States take no unilateral action on matters of international importance but rather work through the framework of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Soviet Union and Red China would be only too pleased to see us adopt the policy positions of the Western States Young Democrats. Must we sit idly by while the good name of our party is dragged through this political gutter? I do not believe we would be fulfilling our duty as members of the Democratic Party if we were to remain silent.

Therefore, I am today sending letters to John Bailey, national chairman of the Democratic Party, and Eugene Wyman, California State chairman of the Democratic Party, calling upon them to launch a full inquiry into the operation and activities of the Young Democratic organization. It is my belief that these radicals of the left should be deprived of the use of our honorable party name until some sign of maturity and responsibility becomes evident.

I have not yet received the complete text of the resolutions passed this last weekend by the California Young Democrats at their San Diego meeting. When these become available I may wish to address the House again on the subject.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I include for the further information of my colleagues the text of the letter sent to me by Josiah Beeman, State president of the California Young Democrats, and the text of my reply to him:

California Federation of
Young Democrats,
San Francisco, Calif., September 5, 1963.

Congressman Charles Wilson,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: With regard to your remarks in the Congressional Record on August 26, concerning the "Young Democrats and the radical left," it is quite obvious that you have not read the resolutions which you speak of, and your remarks indeed contain several errors in fact as to the content of these resolutions.

I do not know if it is your custom to make speeches denouncing conferences, the byproducts of these conferences, and Young Democratic leaders without first investigating what the facts involved are. Apparently, you have been misled by someone on your staff who seeks to discredit this organization for purposes of their own.

I specifically refer you to the resolution on South Vietnam, which calls for economic and social reforms by the Diem regime, posing as the possible alternative to these reforms the withdrawal of U.S. troops. It would seem to me that this is fast becoming the policy of our country in the face of the obvious persecution by the Diem regime of the Buddhists of that country. It would seem then that your denunciation is the point of view that is out of step with our Nation's policy rather than the resolution adopted by the Western States conference, which you erroneously referred to as a resolution calling for withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Far East.

May I say on behalf of the California Federation of Young Democrats (the correct title of our organization) that we feel that it is somewhat more of a disgrace to associate the honorable name of the Democratic Party with sordid campaign tactics in the past than it is a disgrace to be associated with resolutions which seek to look to the future. We can well recall the time when we were attacked by people who thought as you do, when we called for a nuclear test ban treaty many years ago. That treaty is today becoming a reality and is the policy of our Government. We can recall the time when we urged stronger action by this administration in the field of civil rights and were told by certain State and national leaders to "go slow." This administration has now wisely and correctly decided that it can do much more in the field of civil rights than it has done in the past 3 years. We trust that you too have reversed your position on these questions.

We do not intend to be intimidated from speaking the truth as we see it, and we will continue to urge the Democratic Party to present the American people with progressive and forward looking stands on the great issues of the day.

Sincerely,

Joe Beeman,
State President.

P.S.—I have enclosed a copy of the conference resolutions for your edification.

September 9, 1963.

Mr. Josiah Beeman,
President, California Federation of Young Democrats, San Francisco, Calif.

My Dear Mr. Beeman: I have received your letter of September 5 dealing with my August 26 remarks in the Congressional Record on the subject of "Young Democrats and the radical left."

I find your letter both arrogant and offensive in tone. My record in the California State Assembly and in the U.S. Congress is progressive and follows the best traditions of the Democratic Party. Your insolent attempt to brand me as a foe of civil rights legislation is not in accordance with the facts, and will only further demonstrate the desire of all radicals to smear and libel any criticism. For your information, I was a member of the small group of Congressmen that participated in the recent march on Washington activities, and I have authored a number of civil rights bills myself.

It is clear to me that my worst fears have been confirmed. Your organization serves no useful function to the Democratic Party, and in fact is a liability to the majority political party of this country. After 8 years of public service in California I am thoroughly acquainted with the role played by Young Democrats, and I can assure you that the platforms and policy positions of your organization have discredited you with all responsible elements of the party.

I readily admit that I did not study the complete text of the resolutions passed by the Western States Young Democratic Conference until you made a copy available to me. I find now that the extensive newspaper reports I previously based my remarks on did not do the conference justice. The resolutions are far more radical than I suspected, and your blistering attack upon this Democratic Party Congress lends weight to my call for a full scale inquiry into your organization.

Your resolution on South Vietnam presents us with a study in contrasts. You say, in effect, either they must cease to be neo-Fascist or they must be allowed to become Communist. The certainty of a Communist takeover after the withdrawal of U.S. troops and assistance seems to bother you little, and I am sure you can understand that our entire position in the Far East may be determined by developments in South Vietnam.

Your resolution on Cuba defies description. The President's policy of isolating this island has resulted in the Soviet Union incurring a liability instead of an asset. Over a million dollars a day is being spent by the Soviets to keep this ramshackle Red nation afloat. As the economic screws are further tightened the Soviet Union will be required to pour out even larger sums in aid and assistance. Your call for reopening of trade with Cuba will undo all that has so far been done to weaken the Communist stranglehold on the island.

I regret that space does not permit a discussion of other disgraceful resolutions from this so-called Young Democratic Conference. However, in answer to your comment on the nuclear test ban treaty I well recall that you demanded a nuclear test ban for the United States years ago. After the Soviet Union had broken its pledge and had resumed testing—exploding the largest bomb in history—your organization was in the forefront of the crusade waged by peace groups to prevent us from also resuming testing and perhaps keeping abreast of the Communists in nuclear development. The present test ban treaty bears no resemblance to your previous positions and you can take no credit for it.

Your assumption that the high school and lower division college students of the California Young Democrats are qualified to advise the Democratic Party or the Nation on domestic and foreign affairs is ridiculous and I will not attempt to answer it. However, I do intend to consult with the appropriate officials of the Democratic National Committee on the damage your use of our party name is causing. I repeat my words of August 26—I call for the national committee to launch a full-scale inquiry into the activities of the Young Democrats. If this organization is to have the privilege of using the name of our party, they must begin to show they have the necessary maturity to earn that privilege.

I have today seen the first press reports from your September 8 meeting in San Diego. It seems that your organization has surpassed itself in the field of resolutions. I trust you will supply me with a complete text of these latest resolutions and policy positions as soon as they become available.

It has always been a mystery to many of us in the party how an organization as vocal as yours can be so totally ineffective during campaign time. If the California Young Democrats would only work a quarter as much as they talk, we might be able to find some redeeming quality for your organization.

Very truly yours,

Charles H. Wilson.

Revenue Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States delivered a major address today before the National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. The President referred to the Revenue Act of 1963, H.R. 8363, which was introduced this afternoon as "the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in the past 15 years."

In his speech, the President not only outlined the provisions of the bill: he also pointed out the dangers of amendments which would tie tax reduction to extraneous contingencies. He emphasized the very great importance to the health and growth of our economy of enacting a tax reduction bill during this calendar year.

A tax reduction is a most important part of a balanced total program submitted by the President to the Congress. This program does not contemplate tax cuts at the expense of national defense, or of the space effort, or of programs designed to improve the health, education, and job opportunities of our people. To be of maximum benefit the reduction must be accompanied by the

enactment of other major recommendations of the President. H.R. 8363 is, however, an indispensable part and indeed the most important single factor in the President's program to move our economy forward.

The President's address manifests responsible leadership of the highest order, designed unselfishly for the good of our country. He has charted a course which all Americans, and certainly all Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation, should in the national interest follow.

The President's address follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION IN 1963, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction, participants in the National Conference on Tax Reduction, ladies and gentlemen, I admire your concern for our Nation's business as well as your own. The bill you are here to support is the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in the past 15 years. Its passage is essential to the health and growth of our economy during the past 15 years. Its benefits are not limited to any one segment of society. If it is defeated, diluted or unduly delayed, the adverse consequences would be felt by every family and business in the country. It is not a partisan measure—and this is not a partisan gathering. It is a bill which, if it is to be fully effective, must be passed this year, without restrictive amendments; and I believe, with your help, that it will.

There is no need before this audience to describe in detail the tax reduction features you already know so well. The essential figures to bear in mind are these:

The bill provides for a total net tax reduction of $11 billion a year, of which $8.7 billion would go to individuals and $2.3 billion to corporations. This is in addition to the $2¼ billion reduction in corporate tax liabilities brought about last year through depreciation reform and the investment tax credit. These proposed reductions would be effective in two stages. Two-thirds of the individual reduction—or $5.6 billion—and more than one-half of the corporate reduction—or $1.4 billion—or a total of $7 billion, would go into effect on January 1, 1964, less than 4 months from today. The balance would be effective a year later.

There is also no need to convince this group of the importance of this bill as a boost to the economy. Your presence here, the leadership provided by the Business Committee for Tax Reduction and the Statement of Principles adopted by its members, bear witness to your conviction that our present high tax rates hobble the economy, and that a prompt, substantial and broadly based cut in individual and corporate tax rates is necessary to give the private sector of our economy the extra strength our present tax structure now drains away.

Even after 2½ years of steady advance, manufacturing in this country today is still operating at only 87 percent of capacity—business fixed investment is still below 10 percent of our total output—and unemployment, for the 70th straight month, is still above 5 percent. You know as well as I what that has done to your market for goods and services. You know as well as I that this Nation must create new jobs—jobs for workers replaced by automation, jobs for those displaced from the farm, jobs for young people leaving school, jobs to ease the problems of race relations and youth delinquency and labor unrest. And this bill reflects a conscious decision to give a major responsibility and opportunity to American business to meet those needs through private means.

This bill is only a part—but an essential part—of an overall economic program. We are simultaneously taking steps designed ultimately to balance our international payments, to balance our budget and, above all, to balance our economy at levels of full employment and production.

Tax reduction is essential to the achievement of all of these goals. By increasing our productivity and competitive ability, and by increasing the attractiveness of investing at home instead of abroad, it will help us improve our balance of payments. By expanding consumption and investment, it will help us create more jobs. By removing a restrictive brake on national growth and income, it will work against the recurrent forces of recession. And by reducing the costly drain of unemployment and recession while expanding our national income and tax revenues, it will—combined with an ever stricter control of expenditures—reduce and eventually end the pattern of chronic budgetary deficits.

Despite all of these advantages—despite the fact that our economy today is advancing partly in anticipation of a substantial tax cut—there are those who, for reasons of their own, oppose this bill; and their opposition warrants our attention. If they are unable to defeat the bill openly, or to find enough Members of Congress willing to oppose it directly, their strategy apparently will be twofold:

First, to delay the bill's passage until some time next year; and,

Second, to amend it in such a way as to prevent it from becoming fully effective in the absence of some other fiscal event, such as a reduction in next June's estimated net debt.

Either one of these moves would seriously undermine the gains already made as well as those we hope to make. Either one of these moves would dilute, if not imperil, the benefits this bill offers the Nation.

The disadvantages of delay are apparent. I have said since last December that this was the year for tax reduction. Inflationary pressures are in check. No major military crisis strains our resources. Our most pressing economic problems are underinvestment, unemployment and our balance-of-payments deficit. The sooner this bill is enacted, the sooner it will begin stimulating investment, enlarging employment and improving our payments balance.

This bill, moreover, is insurance—recession insurance—and the prudent man does not tempt fate by unnecessarily delaying his acquisition of insurance. Excluding war years, this Nation has had a recession on the average every 42 months since the Second World War—or every 44 months since the First World War. By January, it will have been 44 months since the last recession began. I do not say that a recession next year is either inevitable without a tax cut or impossible with one. But I do know that the prompt enactment of this bill, making certain both immediate and prospective tax reductions, will improve business conditions, increase consumer and investment incentives and make the most of the antirecession thrust that this tax cut can provide.

To wait until next year—even though the effective date of January 1 could be retained on a retroactive basis—would be to court uncertainty, inadequacy, and perhaps total failure. For at the beginning of each year, even in a second session, the mills of the Congress grind slowly. Next year there may be new pressures to hold off until some new crisis has passed, or some new economic trend is made clear, or some other political event is behind us. For those opposed to this bill, the time will never be right. "Delay," said the ancient Romans, "is always fatal to those who are prepared"—and this Nation is prepared now for a substantial cut in taxes. The time to enact this bill is now—for the opportunity may not come again.

The second strategy of those opposed to this bill is to make it dependent by law on other fiscal developments—for example, in the form offered in committee, to deny to both individual and corporate taxpayers the $4 billion worth of second-stage tax cuts unless the net public debt on next June 30 is $304 billion or less. To some, this may sound harmless, inasmuch as this figure is only slightly less than that resulting from Treasury Secretary Dillon's own rough estimate of the current budget deficit. But this amendment was rejected in the House Ways and Means Committee, and should be rejected if offered again on the House floor, for four fundamental reasons:

1. The tax bill is needed on its own merits and should not be conditioned by any other event;

2. Should lagging Federal revenues next summer make fulfillment of this condition impossible, that would be a clear sign to proceed with, not prevent, the second stage of tax reduction;

3. Revenue, deficit and debt estimates for the end of this fiscal year are necessarily uncertain at this time, depending as they do upon dozens of unpredictable contingencies to which this bill should not be tied; and

4. This amendment would be self-defeating; for taxpayers, uncertain of receiving the full benefits of the bill, would hold back on their investment and expansion outlays, thus retarding revenues and enlarging the debt.

If tax reduction is essential to the progress of our economy—and I think it is—then it is essential whether Secretary Dillon's estimate turns out to be accurate or not. The need for more private demand—for more funds in the hands of consumers and investors—will exist in 1964 and 1965 regardless of whether the net public debt on next June 30th is $304 billion or $306 billion or $302 billion. History teaches us that the public debt unexpectedly rises when public revenues fall unexpectedly short—and they have been consistently falling short precisely because our tax rates, which were originally designed to meet wartime and post-war conditions, are now imposing a restrictive brake on national growth and income. Thus, this amendment could deny the Nation a tax cut at the very time it needs it most—when revenues are falling short of expectations because of a slowdown in business activity.

Secretary Dillon's rough estimate, moreover, is exactly that—a very rough estimate—made at a time when the Congress has not completed action on legislation and appropriations for the current year. To require, as this amendment requires, that 11 months later his estimate must prove wholly correct is wholly unrealistic. Actually, the Secretary forecast a deficit for this fiscal year of $9.2 billion—which would, on the basis of the existing public debt, mean a net debt on next June 30 of $304.2 billion. This is an estimate both of what the Congress will do and of what the economy will do. If it were exactly correct, the Nation would lose a $4 billion economic boost because of a $200 million difference.

Yet $200 million is not even one-tenth of 1 percent of our national debt—it is not even one-half of the amount we are likely to collect on June 30th alone—and, while I always expect great things of Mr. Dillon, I do not expect the impossible. In the last 11 years, revenue estimates made at this time of year have only three times—in fiscal years 1960, 1962 and 1963—come within a billion dollars of the final actual figure. To allow the fate of a vitally needed tax reduction to be decided by the accuracy or inaccuracy of a necessarily inexact prediction comes very close to resting the national welfare on a game of chance.

Under such circumstances, how can any businessman or investor plan for the future? How can he make even a reasonable guess as to how close this estimate will be, how much Federal revenue will be earned, how much the Congress will spend, whether the weather will bring a bigger farm surplus, whether buyers will be found for Federal mortgages and other assets at reasonable prices, or whether some technological breakthrough or raw material price increase or international crisis will suddenly augment our outlays for national defense? The cost of last fall's Cuban crisis alone, for example, was nearly $200 million.

A businessman attempting to formulate his spending plans in advance will regard that kind of second-stage tax cut promise as no promise at all. It will become a highly speculative matter—and concrete plans cannot be based on speculation. Being less certain of his market and profit, therefore, he will not undertake as much expansion now—and this will not only shortchange the national economy but increase the national debt. As former Treasury Secretaries Humphrey and Anderson pointed out during the last administration, the debt limit does not and cannot control expenditures—for they depend on the appropriations voted by the Congress and not on any arbitrary ceiling.

This is not, let me make clear, an argument over the desirability of expenditure control. This administration has pledged a tighter rein over expenditures, and we are fulfilling that pledge. Last January I submitted a budget for fiscal 1964 which—except for unavoidable defense, space, and interest charges on the national debt—was lower in expenditures than the prior year, despite a steady growth in the Nation's economy and population. Such a reduction had been attempted only three other times in the 12 preceding years—and, to help achieve it, we pared $6 billion from civilian agency budget requests. I have since recommended still further cuts to the Congress, and we now expect to conclude the fiscal year with a total well below that submitted last January.

This administration is not opposed to expenditure control. On the contrary, we take pride in the fact that our budget expenditures for civilian agencies in the fiscal year just ended were $1.7 billion below the January estimates. We take pride in the fact that our debt, in terms of both dollars and percentage, rose last year at a considerably slower pace than the indebtedness of our Nation's consumers, private business, and State and local governments. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the ratio of our Federal civilian expenditures to national output and to the expenditures of State and local government. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the postal deficit—we have reduced the cost of surplus food grain storage—we have reduced waste, duplication, and obsolescence in the Pentagon—and we have achieved noteworthy economies in every Government agency. And, finally, we take pride in the fact that—in each of the three budgets I have submitted, expenditures other than those required for defense, space, and interest increased less than they did in the last three budgets of my predecessors.

In addition to our efforts to restrict expenditures to those most urgently needed, we have pursued an intensive campaign to identify those existing Federal programs which could be effectively carried out by the private economy—for example, substituting private for public credit wherever feasible. In the last fiscal year over $1 billion of financial assets in Federal portfolios were transferred to private holders. We have also sought to initiate or increase user charges to cover a more equitable share of the costs of services provided by the Federal Government—to introduce modern equipment and management techniques for improving the productivity of all departments—and to control Federal civilian employment as well as expenditures.

Last year, if Federal civilian employment had increased at the same rate as population growth, it would have increased by 42,000 employees. It actually increased by only 5,600 persons—one-eighth the rate of population growth—so that we ended the year with far fewer Federal employees per 1,000 population than we began. To illustrate the significance of this accomplishment, let me point out that, during the same period, State and local government employment grew by about 300,000 persons.

Moreover, this administration's pledges on expenditure and debt control, unlike the amendment under discussion, have not been limited merely to the past and present fiscal years. In a recent letter to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, I repeated my pledge to achieve a balanced Federal budget in a balanced full-employment economy—to exercise an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need—and, consistent with these policies, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, to apply a substantial part of the increased tax revenues toward a reduction in our budgetary deficits.

Assuming enactment of the pending tax bill, I expect—in the absence of any unforeseen slowdown in the economy or any serious international contingency—to be able to submit next January a budget for fiscal 1965 envisioning an estimated deficit below that most recently forecast for fiscal 1964. And any increase in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product—so that the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced.

This is true expenditure control. It cannot be done automatically by erecting some arbitrary, artificial figure and declaring that a much-needed tax cut will not go ahead if the debt exceeds that figure. The imposition of such a device can only reduce the effectiveness of the tax bill and invite the higher levels of unemployment which require still greater expenditures and debt.

No one, in short, is calling for a retreat from fiscal responsibility—unless it is the opponents of this bill. For without a quick and assured tax cut, this country can look forward to more unemployment, to more lags in income, to more and larger budget deficits, and to more waste and weakness in the economy—and that course is the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

The Federal budget has been in deficit during 7 of the last 10 years, regardless of which party controlled the executive and legislative branches, regardless of where Congress set the debt ceiling, and regardless of what controls were placed on expenditures. Without a tax cut, there is at present no ascertainable prospect for reaching a balance. But with a tax cut, despite a temporary transitional increase in the deficit, this Nation can move within a very few years to an even higher trend of economic activity capable of sustaining both full employment and a balanced budget.

For all these reasons, the efforts of this organization and conference on behalf of the pending bill are vital to our Nation's future. I do not assume that every businessman here agrees with every provision of that bill. But after 7 months of intensive committee study, a fundamentally sound and strong program has been produced. It must be voted up or down on the floor of the House this month. Every month it is delayed costs this Nation dearly in lost output, jobs, profits and the increased danger of a downturn.

I do not promise that passage of this bill will achieve full employment on the following day or even in the following year. But I do know that we will never get there if we do not start moving—and the time to start is today.

Secretary Freeman Cites Need for Rural Areas Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the need for a strong conservation program is one of the most pressing problems we face. As population expands, resources must be developed to serve the varied needs of all people, both urban and rural. The challenges of creating an adequate program of land utilization are immense. Plans must be made and individuals convinced that our best interests are served when multiple use is made of private lands.

The Department of Agriculture, through its rural areas development program, is providing the financial assistance enabling individuals and groups to use their own local initiative to develop an expanding rural America. In this way, farming, resource development, and recreational facilities will all be substantially strengthened.

In a recent address to the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman explained the much needed program of rural areas development. This careful and thoughtful statement deserves to be read by all my colleagues.

The address follows:

I welcome this opportunity to join with you at your 53d annual convention—particularly since you are giving special emphasis this year to the growing demands upon the Nation's outdoor recreation resources.

I suspect that when all the reports are tabulated, the summer 1963 will have been a record year in the public's use of both private and public recreation facilities. The preliminary reports on recreation use of the national forests indicate this, and the Sunday Tribune a week ago carried a story reporting the glowing results of a banner year for resorts here in Minnesota. Each of you, I'm sure, could tell of the overwhelming number of visits to State parks and outdoor recreation facilities in your area.

These signs all confirm that the trend which was obvious when I served as Governor here in Minnesota is continuing at an accelerated pace. As Governor I was concerned that the efforts being made to meet this surging demand of the American people were not adequate * * * and I continue to have this same concern as Secretary of Agriculture.

It is gratifying to see in my own State that the programs for resource development—with particular emphasis on recreation—are being pushed vigorously by Governor Rolvaag. The long-range resource program enacted at his urging this year will enable the State park system to better meet the demands being placed on it. In addition, wetland areas for wildlife will continue to be acquired, the number of public access sites on lakes will continue to grow, and the program for seedling production and reforestation will be strengthened. These are programs which were dear to my heart as Governor, and they remain so today.

Now you may well ask why the Secretary of Agriculture should bother himself with outdoor recreation. Other than his responsibility in connection with national forests, what does he have to do with recreation?

Some people would say—and have said—he should stick to the problems of producing or avoiding production, of food and fiber. They say recreation is none of his business.

I can assure you that I have heard this from some Congressmen. They have snorted at me, "What does the farm have to do with recreation? All this talk about using land for other things than producing crops is crazy. You forget about hunting, fishing, camping, or picknicking and concentrate on corn, wheat, milk, cotton, and peanuts. You straighten out the farmers' problems before you start messing around with recreation."

Happily, I don't hear much comment like this today, for the realization is growing that the long-term solutions to both the agricultural problem and the recreation problem are closely related. In fact, I believe that in resolving the crisis of abundance in agriculture we also will resolve the crisis of scarcity in recreation.

Food and recreation are siamese twins, for the simple truth is that we require the use of land to enjoy both. In the past, as we have attempted to solve the farming problem of too much food we have isolated it from the concept of land use. Some have thought the answer was to idle land. That is wrong, because idling land, or retiring acres, is a waste of valuable and needed resources.

My recent visit to the Soviet Union and the Communist nations of Eastern Europe dramatizes the point I want to make.

In these countries, the government and the people alike are straining every resource to produce more food and fiber. In Russia, for example, an additional 150 million acres of land has been put into agricultural use since 1935. During the same period in the United States, we have taken some 75 million acres of land out of production.

Even with an increase of this size—equal to about a third our total cropland—agriculture still remains a serious problem for the Russians. Food costs in the Soviet Union take about 50 percent of the average family income, as compared to less than 19 percent in the United States. Over half of the work force in the Soviet Union is engaged in agriculture, as compared to about 8 percent here. The average Russian is not going hungry, but he has a monotonous, starchy diet—about 60 percent of his diet is in carbohydrates. Meat, milk, and dairy products, fruits and vegetables—goods we consider commonplace—are scarce in the Soviet Union.

From this standpoint, the production and distribution marvels of our family farm system of agriculture make me very proud—I hope more Americans will realize how fortunate we are to be struggling with the problem of abundance rather than scarcity. I'm sure that Khrushchev would much prefer our problem than the one with which he now wrestles.

Thus, the contrast between United States and Russian agriculture points up clearly that we use our cropland at an amazing level of efficiency. But we are not as efficient in the use of land we no longer need to produce food and fiber. In the past we have mistakenly assumed that we can solve our problem by idling land. Such a nonuse policy is not the answer for the long pull—it hasn't, and won't work.

Instead we are now beginning to apply another of nature's basic truths—that land serves many purposes, of which food production is only one. This is the natural law of multiple use—and by applying this principle of conservation to the use of private farmland we can begin to see that it is a significant part of the answer to the "twin problems" of overproduction in agriculture and underproduction of outdoor recreation.

With too much land in agricultural production and too little land producing recreation, we need only to convert cropland to meet the new demands of an urban age for outdoor recreation * * * and our twin problems will begin to disappear.

However, as most of you know, nothing happens quite that simply—you know the adage "it is easier said than done." However, I am encouraged by some of the recreation developments now occurring in farming areas, and I am confident that these activities, as they progress, can contribute substantially to the solution of the "twin problems."

One of the major difficulties I see at present is to convey to everyone concerned with the problem of too much food and not enough recreation that the solution to both problems is to be found in the classic definition of conservation—the wise use of land, water, air, wildlife, and forest resources for the fullest benefit of all people.

The application of this concept to our food and recreation problem is of vital importance. But so far it is little understood. Perhaps it is so simple and obvious that no one pays any attention to it. But we aren't going to be able to do much about it until people do understand it. I would like today to ask you as leaders in conservation to join with us in the Department to carry the message of multiple use of private land to the American people. That this is a difficult undertaking can be shown by reviewing the development of conservation in the public mind through three identifiable phases, each more complex than the last.

In the 1930's, the big conservation job was to halt the erosion of our land—to clear our streams and rivers of dirt and clean the air of our topsoil. Conservation then was described as wise use of our resources. What it meant was the protection of our resources from being further despoiled by man.

In retrospect, after 30 years of some success, this task was relatively simple. People can see the effects of erosion on the land, and they know something is wrong. They can see rivers come boiling up at flood stage, and deposit silt in the main street and on the parlor floor. They can see the duststorms blotting out the sun and taste the gritty dirt between their teeth. They know that if they feel the wasteful effects of misusing soil and water resources, then wild animals—fish and game—must have suffered even more.

The public didn't need to be convinced of the value of conservation, they could feel it.

The only limit on progress in this phase of conservation is how much will the American people invest. We are going ahead with this investment, with the strong leadership of President Kennedy. This administration has nearly doubled the volume of small watershed programs. The River Basin Survey program is now underway as a working interdepartmental action project. For the first time, national recreation areas are being developed in a cooperative program between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

We are aware, however, that the annual outlay of $650 million from public and private sources for resource conservation is not adequate. We are not keeping up with farm planning needs in soil and water conservation districts, and we are far behind in meeting the demand for watershed district planning and conservation. We are proceeding faster today, but it sometimes appears as though we are barely keeping up. We know how to protect our resources from man's misuse—but many of us are not yet willing to make the investment in our future.

The momentum of public support for this stage of conservation technology has carried well into the 1960's, and now overlaps a second dimension which is rapidly forcing its way into the public conscience. If the 1930's were characterized by technology to prevent misuse, then the early 1960's are characterized by technology to end the damage caused by chemicals and wastes we are adding to our environment.

The task at hand is not simple. It is reflected in growing public concern over pollution of water, air, and even the soil itself, by misuse of chemicals in agriculture, in industry, and in the households of the Nation. Here, too, with basic public support and understanding we are beginning to act vigorously.

We are expanding our research into pest controls to develop safer means for combating harmful insects and plants. And we have had notable examples of success. Control of screwworm flies in the Southwest by growing and releasing billions of sterile male flies and use of various selective insect attractants point the way toward practical and safe pest control.

USDA researchers also are developing fat-based detergents which could replace the chemical-based detergents that do not now break down under treatment. Then the housewife will have superior washing compounds and also will be able to get a glass of water without a foaming head on it.

The answers to questions raised by man's contamination of his environment lie not only in careful, controlled use, but increasingly in research to discover alternative materials and ways of using them. Science and technology can provide, I am confident, answers to these perplexing problems. But the price may be high and, once again, we will have to decide if we are willing to pay it.

Thus, we have learned how to protect resources from being despoiled by man, and we are learning how to protect man from himself in his environment.

The third phase of conservation, and the one most difficult because it is the hardest to understand, is the development and use of our resources to serve the needs of all people.

This is the great question facing conservation and conservationists today. How are we to use these resources to serve people in urban America and in rural America? In this decision, every American has a decided stake.

If we drift along as we have since the end of World War II, we could emerge from the decade of the 1960's with an aging rural population, gradually deteriorating natural resources and vigorous and growing urban areas with no room—with sharply inadequate outdoor recreation resources.

The President has proposed to constructively use the resources of soil and water to begin a new era in conservation technology to protect resources in ways that serve people.

We call it rural areas development, and it is an effort—based on the desire of the rural community to progress—to do three things:

Find the answer to overproduction through converting cropland to new uses to produce better incomes for people on the land by filling the unmet needs of people in the cities and urban areas.

Encourage a new alinement of the resources of land and water and people in rural America to expand the rural economy and strengthen income of rural people, both farm and nonfarm.

Infuse new capital into rural America.

We are committing the full resources of the Department to RAD because we believe that rural America—which has contributed hugely to the rise of this Nation to its position of world leadership—can be a vigorous expanding sector of our national economy.

We seek to move resources back into rural America—to recapitalize the rural economy, if you like. We want to encourage an economic revolution of expansion in rural America. We have several new tools which the Congress provided in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and I would like to list some of them very briefly:

The act authorizes a number of programs to assist farmers and rural groups in developing recreation, wildlife habitat, grazing, forests, water storage or other new uses on land now producing crops or hay, or land currently in Federal diversion programs. These include farm recreation loans—100 of which have been made thus far on a pilot basis; a cropland conversion program now being operated with pilot areas in 138 counties—2,800 agreements to divert 140,000 acres of cropland have been made; and, an expanded small watershed program to encourage recreation development and to provide for future municipal and industrial water uses in the planning of the watershed.

All of these new land-use programs seek to provide the farmer with a better source of income, to encourage rural communities to make better use of land and water resources and to expand the opportunities for outdoor recreation for city people. They apply to private land the very successful principle of multiple use by which we administer the Nation's forests.

The 1962 act also provided authority to initiate what we call resource conservation and development projects. They will enable farmers, city people, rural communities and private organizations to work together to improve land use patterns and to develop the natural resources of rural areas.

These projects will provide an exceptional opportunity for city and urban people living within easy reach of a conservation and development project to join with local people to create new recreational outlets. As members of a sportsmen's club, a church, a youth group or a neighborhood association, they can work with rural organizations, such as soil conservation districts, to help finance recreational facilities of many different kinds. In this way farmers could develop additional uses and incomes from their lands, and urban residents would have an outdoor recreation area reserved specifically for their use.

The RAD legislation also authorizes rural renewal projects designed to attack the entrenched poverty now found in many rural areas.

We envisage these projects will cover areas large enough to meet deep-seated economic problems, rather than nibble ineffectively on the fringes. Through rural renewal, we propose to work with legally constituted local bodies to make the land more productive, to construct water and sanitation facilities, to encourage the development of new industries and to stimulate the building of both private and public outdoor recreation facilities. This is a bold program similar in its intent and concept to the urban renewal and slum clearance projects which are helping our cities to renovate and rebuild their core areas.

There is more poverty in rural America with only one-third of our population than in all our cities combined and we need to think and act imaginatively and creatively to overcome it.

In addition to these specific programs enacted last year, the overall RAD program involves industrial loans through the Area Redevelopment Administration and through the Rural Electrification Administration; community facility loans and grants through ARA and, to a limited extent, through the Farmers Home Administration; rural housing loans, including a special program for financing housing construction for persons over 65; job training programs which provide rural people with the opportunity to learn new skills which can be used in the new plants being constructed as part of the RAD program.

These programs complement the ongoing programs being carried out by the other agencies of the Department—Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Forest Service, the Federal Extension Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—which are dedicated to building rural resources.

The one essential characteristic of RAD is that while it provides technical and financial assistance * * * the initiative for action must come from local groups * * * from the people who will benefit through better economic opportunity or through improved services, including recreation.

In this respect, I'm sure you will be interested to know that last year over 9,000 farmers in soil and water conservation districts throughout the country converted some or all of their cropland to outdoor recreation facilities.

Let me, in urging your support for this RAD program, make one important point. There is rising in the Nation today an attitude that portrays the Federal Government as an intruder—an outsider.

Yet, in the 1930's when floods along the Ohio made no distinction between communities or State boundaries—or when Kansas dust hung over New York—there was no question but that these disasters were national problems demanding the mobilization of the resources of a nation. And today, when pollution of a single river threatens the common water supply of hundreds of communities, there is no question but that this also is a national problem.

The outdoor recreation needs of an increasingly urban, highly mobile people—needs which can be met only outside their local community—are no different. Thus, as the demand grows for outdoor recreation—and it is rising to the flood stage now—we have the opportunity through RAD to cooperate with local, State, and Federal Governments and private citizens to use soil and water resources to satisfy this new appetite. And it will employ the same resources no longer needed to produce food.

Most of these resources are in private hands, and most hunting and fishing is presently on private land. As the need grows for additional hunting and fishing grounds—and other outdoor areas—those demands will have to be met for the most part on land that is owned and operated by farmers.

Public land just cannot do the job—despite multiple-use management. Neither the geographic distribution nor the characteristics of public land give it the flexibility to satisfy all of the recreational needs of the public. So the landowner really becomes the key in the development of recreation facilities for the future.

Farmers and ranchers have done more to improve conditions for wildlife development in the past 30 years than had ever been done before on the private lands of any country. These activities have increased supplies of some game and fish—to the point where they are more plentiful today than when white men first set foot on this continent.

But we are reaching the point where the farmer, in making his decision on land utilization, should be able to make wildlife as profitable a crop as any farm commodity, and sportsmen should recognize that if wildlife propagation is to be encouraged, it must we worth the price.

We cannot expect farmers and ranchers to invest time, money, and resources in game and fish production other than for their own enjoyment—unless they have some means to recover their investment. Government technical and cost-sharing aids have helped a great deal in this respect, but these are not enough to cover the full costs.

Let me read to you a statement made many years ago by a famous game management authority:

"We recommend that we recognize the landowner as the custodian of public game, protect him from the irresponsible shooter, and compensate him for putting his land in productive condition. Compensate him either publicly or privately, with either cash, service, or protection, for the use of his land and for his labor, on condition that he preserves the game seed and otherwise safeguards the public interest.

"In short, make game management a partnership enterprise to which the landholder, the sportsmen, and the public each contributes appropriate services and from which each derives appropriates rewards."

That quotation is from a speech made by the father of game management in this country * * * Dr. Aldo Leopold. The occasion was the 17th American Game Conference in New York City in March 1930. Those recommendations—made 33 years ago—might well provide, in 1963, a formula for the future.

Farmers are, and must become even more so, the guardians of our soil, water, timber, and wildlife resources. We must find ways to pay them not only for the food they produce—but for other services that we, the public, extract from these resources.

Thus, we approach the time when agricultural policy and conservation policy truly merge into one—giving fair consideration to farm income and farm levels of living and to the broader needs of the rural and urban community.

It is up to all Americans to decide the kind of country we want America to be. It is possible to preserve and develop for all of us the American heritage of rich resources and open spaces—provided we decide now that this is what we want. The land resources are presently great—yet in many instances, especially around cities, the pattern of use is being cast. To commit land to open green spaces—for the benefit of nature-starved city dwellers—calls for quick action before the concrete closes in. Let us vote for grass and water, as well as for concrete and asphalt.

I urge each of you to take a new look at opportunities in your own State. I suggest, specifically, that you investigate the services now beginning to become available under the rural areas development program. If the RAD program isn't operating effectively, pitch in and make it work.

The choice is ours. We can have productive land, clear streams, plentiful wildlife, ample water. We can make this a prosperous and beautiful and spacious America. I urge as our goal that we practice conservation as the art and science of using resources to serve all people.

"You Have To Suffer a Little Bit To Be Beautiful"—News Article Underscores Need for Safe Cosmetics Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Members of the House were surprised, and perhaps shocked, by an article on the front page of the Washington Post last Thursday, reporting on a lawsuit in Prince Georges County, Md., circuit court, in which the plaintiff was awarded $1,000 damages as a result of scalp injuries from a hair bleaching treatment. The surprise, or shock, would arise from the information contained in the article that women "should expect that sort of thing"—that is, such things as blistered scalps—"if they want to become beautiful."

I think it is generally known by Members of Congress, if not by most consumers, that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains some very glaring loopholes, particularly relating to the safety of cosmetics. Instead of requiring the pretesting for safety of any cosmetic item before it can be sold to the public, as we require in the case of drugs and food products, the law places the burden of proof on the Federal Government to establish that a cosmetic product is unsafe in order to remove it from public sale. This, of course, places the burden of proof on the wrong party. It should be placed on the manufacturer—to make sure no cosmetic item is placed on sale until and unless the manufacturer can prove to the satisfaction of the Food and Drug Administration that harm will not befall the user of such a product.

NEW DRUG LAW COVERED ONLY PART OF PROBLEM

This principle of placing the burden of proof for safety on the manufacturer prior to public sale has been a basic provision of our law covering new drug products since 1938, and was very substantially tightened and strengthened for all prescription drugs in the far-reaching drug control law we passed last year following the thalidomide disclosures. As the original sponsor in the Congress of legislation to close the loopholes in the drug provisions of the 1938 act, I am very proud of the fact that most of the far-reaching provisions of the 1962 drug control law were first proposed in legislative form in my omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, introduced on the opening day of the 87th Congress in January 1961, long before the thalidomide tragedy came to light. There were a great many other things included in that omnibus bill first introduced in the 87th Congress, all intended to close glaring loopholes which still exist in the laws for the protection of consumers purchasing foods, drugs, or cosmetics, therapeutic devices, and related products.

I, therefore, reintroduce H.R. 1235 in this Congress—substantially similar to the original bill and with the same number in this Congress as it had in the 87th Congress. The main change in the bill in the two Congresses reflects the fact that most of the prescription drug control provisions of the original bill have subsequently been written into law. But the remaining provisions of the original bill are as urgently needed as ever.

HAIR DYES EXEMPTED FROM REGULATION

One of the major sections of H.R. 1235, deals with the pretesting for safety of all cosmetic products subject to the act. In that connection I would like to point out that the present law—weak as it is in controlling the safety of cosmetics prior to their public sale—is devoid of any protections whatsoever for the consumer in the marketing and sale and use of hair coloring products regardless of how dangerous they may be to the individual consumer. The only thing which the present law requires in connection with hair dyes is that hair coloring products carry a label warning the user that they may be dangerous to her. Whether or not beauty parlor operators in all cases inform the customer of the dangers cited in the required label information varies, I imagine, from operator to operator and from shop to shop. Every woman using these products should certainly know about the hazards.

Mr. Speaker, following is the article which appeared on the front page of last Thursday's Washington Post reporting on the case of the beauty parlor customer who claimed damages for a blistered scalp which, the article states, is the sort of thing women "should expect" if they "want to become beautiful":

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 5, 1963]

"YOU HAVE TO SUFFER A LITTLE"—WOULD-BE BLOND AWARDED $1,000 FOR SCALP INJURY AT BEAUTY PARLOR

(By Donald L. Hymes)

The price of vanity often runs high, but yesterday in Prince Georges circuit court it was the beauty parlor that had to pay it.

Marjorie W. Wrenn, 29, had filed a $15,000 damage suit against a beauty salon charging that a 6-hour hair bleaching treatment left her with a blistered scalp.

The beauty parlor, Vincent et Vincent of 1163 University Boulevard East, Langley Park, claimed that women should expect that sort of thing if they want to become beautiful.

"In order to be a blond," testified partially bleached beautician Aimee Peridaens, 26, "you have to suffer a little bit."

Mrs. Peridaens, a petite Belgian with a streak bouffant hairdo, admitted on the stand, "It happens to me, too."

Dr. Murry M. Robinson, a dermatologist, confirmed the beautician's warning. "It's impossible to insult the scalp with these preparations without expecting some sort of irritation," he testified. "The matter of degree is the thing that varies."

But Mrs. Wrenn, who lives at 36–G Ridge Road, Greenbelt, and works at the District Post Office, testified that the blistering was so severe that she had to miss 3 weeks of work. Her physician, Dr. William C. Weintraub, testified that she had suffered "chemical burns with some infection."

The eight men and four women on the jury, none of whom was blond, took only 25 minutes to decide on a verdict of $1,000 for Mrs. Wrenn.

A PROBLEM FOR ALL BEAUTY SHOPS

In placing this news article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to point out that the particular firm involved in this episode has a very good reputation in the Washington area, and that what happened in the case of this one customer could happen, and I am sure does happen, from time to time throughout the country. We are dealing here with a dangerous situation attributable primarily to a serious gap in the law protecting consumers.

EXEMPTION IN LAW FOR HAIR DYES

Let me pinpoint that deficiency by quoting the act itself. Under present law, in section 601(a) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 1938 as amended, a cosmetic shall be deemed to be adulterated—and therefore illegal for sale in interstate commerce—

> If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to users under the conditions of use described in the labeling thereof, or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the law now states as to most cosmetic items—all cosmetic items with one exception. The exception is spelled out in the following proviso:

> *Provided,* That this provision shall not apply to coal-tar hair dye, the label of which bears the following legend, conspicuously displayed thereon: "Caution—This product contains ingredients which may cause skin irritation on certain individuals and a preliminary test according to accompanying directions should first be made. This product must not be used for dying the eyelashes or eyebrows; to do so may cause blindness," and the labeling of which bears adequate directions for such preliminary testing. For the purpose of this paragraph and paragraph (e), the term "hair dye" shall not include eyelash dyes or eyebrow dyes.

BILL WOULD NOT PUT BEAUTY PARLORS OUT OF BUSINESS

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the 1960 Color Additives Act requiring the pretesting for safety of any coloring material used in or on foods, drugs, or cosmetics did not affect or eliminate the exemption in the law for hair dyes. That is why hair dyes can be marketed which are not only unproved as to safety but which can actually be harmful, and which may be known to be harmful.

When I introduced H.R. 1235 in January 1961, containing a provision repealing the exemption for hair dyes so that any hair dye would have to be proved safe in the manner used, beauty parlor operators throughout the country were circularized and propagandized by the supply houses and manufacturers with alarming predictions that this provision of H.R. 1235 would put them out of business. Of course, it would do no such thing. It would merely require that only safe coloring preparations could be used.

That might not prevent allergic reactions for some women but it would certainly protect a great majority of women using hair coloring preparations. The validity of this provision of H.R. 1235 was subsequently upheld by the Kennedy administration nearly a year and a half later, when an administration safe cosmestics bill, virtually identical with the cosmetics sections of H.R. 1235, including the repeal of the present exemption for unsafe hair dyes, was submitted to the House by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

When I testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 20, 1962, during hearings on H.R. 1235, I made the following points on the cosmetic section of the bill:

COSMETICS NOT PRETESTED FOR SAFETY

Since 1938, when it first came under Government regulation, the cosmetic industry has had comparatively gentle treatment. Unlike drug manufacturers marketing a new product, or food manufacturers using a new ingredient, the cosmetic industry does not have to prove safety of a new product prior to marketing. If the product is believed unsafe, furthermore, the Government must furnish legal proof of danger to the consumer in order to force the item off the market. This is the situation which previously existed in connection with the use of food additives, and which we changed in 1958—relieving the Government of the obligation of proving a product dangerous in order to take it off the market. We now require, instead, that the manufacturer prove his additive is safe before putting it on the market.

As a result of our lax cosmetics controls there have been occasional cases of extremely painful injury to cosmetic users, and frequent cases of allergic reaction, because the cosmetic manufacturer is not required to pretest the product for safety or even to identify the ingredients in the product.

Of course, I do not maintain or believe that major cosmetic manufacturers are anxious to poison, or disfigure, or denail, or scalp, or burn, or otherwise injure the American consumer. Certainly, there is no profit in that, and these are firms anxious to make a profit by pleasing, not harming, the customer. But the competitive situation in the cosmetic industry is such, and the ease of entry of new firms into the field of processing cosmetics is such, that new products hit the market accompanied by a wave of high-pressure advertising and promotion, and each firm tries to beat the other to the drugstore or department store counter or supermarket shelf with the latest magic potion for making us attractive.

Cosmetics are as old as history, and the basic ingredients used are well known in the trade. So sales spurts must often depend upon mysterious "gimmick" additives—turtle oil to promote skin rejuvenation or tighten chin muscles (but did you ever see a turtle's skin?); shark oil, queen bee royal jelly; chick embryo extract; horse blood serum, pigskin extract—yes, these are all ingredients which have been introduced in face and skin creams to form the basis for extravagant claims of beauty in a jar.

INGREDIENTS NOT DISCLOSED EVEN TO FDA

They are seldom dangerous—but if they are, we never know about it until a lot of gullible consumers—or consumers who have assumed the product must be safe or it couldn't be sold—have been hurt. That has been the situation in cosmetic regulation for 24 years.

Since the 1938 Act does not even require cosmetic manufacturers to identify ingredients in their products, the Food and Drug Administration must analyze new products to determine their content, in case it suspects the presence of a dangerous ingredient. It cannot even go to the firm and legally demand to know what is in the product. Consequently, the consumer never knows—has no way of knowing except by painful trial and error—whether an attractive cosmetic product contains an ingredient to which she knows she is allergic. And, even worse, if a child swallows a cosmetic, the parents and the doctor have no way of knowing for sure what ingredients it contained and what antidote may be necessary.

These loopholes in the law applying to cosmetics should have been closed when we rescued the cosmetic industry from the color crisis in 1960. But we didn't do it then. We just dealt with color additives and nothing else.

It was after that experience—of seeing another blowout patch being placed on the old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to meet only a limited problem situation, just as we previously passed the factory inspection bill, and the pesticides bill and the food additives bill and the citrus red bill and so on, that I decided late in 1960 to draft a single bill to rewrite all of the obsolete provisions of the basic law. That resolve resulted in the introduction of H.R. 1235 the following January.

MANY OTHER LOOPHOLES IN FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act permitting unsafe cosmetics to be marketed without pretesting for safety, and permitting unsafe coal-tar hair dyes to be marketed without any restraint except as to their labeling, are by no means the only serious deficiencies in our basic consumer protection statute. H.R. 1235 covers many other important areas in the jurisdiction of that law, for instance:

First. It requires more informative labeling on all foods and all cosmetics and all drugs (not just the prescription drugs provided for in last year's drug control law) so as to give the consumer the information necessary to make a more intelligent choice among competing products and to eliminate some of the worst features of deceptive packaging, as well as to fortify the purchaser with information on the ingredients contained in any product in case the customer is allergic to or would be harmed by such ingredients.

Second. It would require, for the first time, the pretesting for safety and also efficacy of therapeutic devices which sometimes have been discovered to be harmful or dangerous when placed on the market without adequate pretesting, and which also are frequently useless for the purposes intended.

Third. It provides, for the first time, adequate controls over the distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and stimulant drugs—the so-called "pep" pills;

Fourth. It tightens up on the certification and use of veterinary antibiotics which could find their way into our food supply through meat animals.

Fifth. It permits a more effective crackdown on fake remedies of various kinds victimizing the ill and the aged;

Sixth. It would give the Federal Government sufficient power, which it does not have at the present time, to make complete and comprehensive factory inspections including access to the complaint files.

Seventh. It would repeal the rider agreed to last year in the Drug Control Act permitting manufacturers of animal feed to use cancer-inducing coloring matter in animal feeds merely for the purpose of permitting easier visual identification of one kind of animal feed from another. There is absolutely no reason in the world why any carcinogenic coloring matter has to be used for such a frivolous purpose, and it is a frivolous and indefensible purpose.

Eighth. Also, it authorizes the Federal Government to make factory inspections overseas of products imported into this country in very substantial quantities—we could bar any foreign manufacturer from shipping foods, drugs, or cosmetics into this country if he refused to permit inspection or if his plant sanitation and quality controls were not comparable to those we require from American manufacturers engaged in interstate commerce in the same fields.

H.R. 1235 SHOULD BE ENACTED

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the many things contained in H.R. 1235. All of them are important. The need for pretesting for safety of cosmetics has been known to us for many years as consumers have been poisoned or disfigured or denailed or scalped or burned or otherwise injured as a result of the use of unsafe products. I have called a number of such episodes to the attention of the Food and Drug Administration and to the attention of the House since coming to Congress in 1953, and until we change the law and tighten it, I am afraid there will be more such episodes and personal tragedies.

We all know of the frightful toll of lives lost on the highways as the result of the illicit sale of pep pills.

We are familiar with the many instances of victimization of the consumer because of deceptive packaging practices which are aided and abetted by the ineffective labeling requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1235 is substantially similar now to the bill of the same number in the last Congress on which I testified on June 20, 1962. Some of the provisions of H.R. 1235 of the 87th Congress, which should have been stronger, as indicated in my testimony last year, have now been improved in the new bill which I introduced in January of this year. Otherwise, and with the exception of the discussion about prescription drugs and certification of all antibiotics intended for human consumption, all of the arguments I made in behalf of this legislation last year are just as valid now as they were then. I, therefore, submit that testimony as part of my remarks in view of the importance of this legislation to all of the consumers of this country. Anyone reading the testimony which follows should read it with the understanding that the proposals I referred to last year dealing with the safety of drugs are now part of our law insofar as prescription drugs are concerned, but must still be enacted in connection with over-the-counter drug items. Also, the provisions of the original H.R. 1235, dealing with certification of all antibiotics for human use have similarly been enacted as part of last year's drug control law.

The statement referred to above is as follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1962, ON AN OMNIBUS BILL TO REWRITE THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

It is certainly no criticism of this committee when I say that this is a moment I have been waiting for—impatiently—for a year and a half, or at least since the opening day of the 87th Congress on January 3, 1961, when I introduced H.R. 1235, an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to bring it up to date in terms of today's needs and problems in protecting the American consumer. It is still the only measure pending in either House which would combine in one bill provisions for closing all of the major loopholes in consumer protections under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Chairman HARRIS and I discussed the importance of having the formal departmental reports from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other Government agencies affected by or interested in the many complex and technical provisions of the bill before hearings could be scheduled.

Unfortunately, except for a "no comment" report from the Federal Trade Commission (subsequently clarified in an exchange of correspondence between me and FTC Chairman Dixon), none of the executive departments or agencies directly or indirectly affected by H.R. 1235 ever did file the requested reports to this committee on the specific provisions of the bill.

PRESIDENT ENDORSES MANY PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN H.R. 1235

On March 15, however, the President sent his comprehensive consumer message to the Congress which contained a formal endorsement on behalf of the administration of many of the changes in the law which are contained in H.R. 1235; and last month, as you know, Chairman HARRIS on behalf of the administration introduced two separate bills directed to those recommendations—H.R. 11581 dealing with drugs, and H.R. 11582, dealing with cosmetics and therapeutic devices. Together, these bills contain many of the features of H.R. 1235, but not all of them, and also contain some provisions not in H.R. 1235.

I suppose I wouldn't have minded the long delay nearly as much if, after all this time, the administration had reported that the approach in H.R. 1235 was completely wrong and impractical. However, now that most of the provisions of the administration bill are shown to be identical to, or at least very similar to H.R. 1235, I am indeed sorry we couldn't have gotten to this matter a year or more ago, and thus with a better chance of final action in this Congress.

On Monday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a detailed breakdown prepared for me by Mr. Raymond J. Celada of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress showing in comparative tabular form all of the similarities and all of the differences when comparing H.R. 1235 with the two Harris bills, and also as compared with the widely discussed Kefauver-Celler bill. I felt it would be helpful to the committee and to all of your witnesses to have this material available prior to the start of the hearings for a better understanding of the technical points in the various bills. All of the bills share the one common objective of protecting the American consumer; all differ, however, in some significant respects.

The Kefauver-Celler bill is not before this committee, of course, since, as introduced, it is directed primarily at changes in the antitrust laws and the patent laws applying to drugs, and thus comes within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, even though it also contains many provisions amending the drug provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. But I thought it would be useful to have the comparative breakdown of the various bills including this one, too, even though it is not officially before you.

GREAT CHANGES IN FOOD, DRUG, COSMETIC TECHNOLOGY

You are faced here in this committee with an assignment of great magnitude, in an area of supreme importance to the lives and health and safety and well-being of the American people, in connection with the purchase and use of the most personal and intimate of products—all of the foods we eat, all of the drugs and devices we use for health purposes, all of the cosmetics used not only by women but in increasing numbers by men, as well. In many respects, you are facing the same problem which confronted your predecessors on this committee a quarter century ago when it became obvious that the Wiley Act of 1906—a great legislative achievement in its time—was woefully out of date and replete with loopholes permitting practices which visited fraud, deceit, poisoning, blinding, and death upon untold numbers of trusting American consumers.

From 1906 to 1938—a period of 32 years—Congress amended the Wiley law in a number of very important respects to protect consumers but never quite succeeded in making the law as effective as we know it should have been. Congress, in 1912, 1913, 1919, 1923, 1930, and 1934 closed loopholes as they became glaringly evident—just as this committee since 1938 has initiated many, tremendously important improvements in the 1938 act—the factory inspection bill, the pesticides bill, the food additives bill, etc. But the time has come now, just as it did in 1938, for a complete rewriting of outmoded provisions—a modernization and up-dating of the whole statute based on far-reaching changes in food, drug, and cosmetic technology and the dangers created for consumers by omissions in the law, or by court decisions, or by studied evasions and easy violations which are often almost impossible to prevent because of shortcomings in the law.

CATASTROPHE SHOULD NOT BE ONLY SPUR TO ACTION

So it is my hope, as I know it is the hope of every American consumer concerned about the health and safety of our people, that you will now do what was done in 1938—rewrite the statute from beginning to end, keeping what is good but replacing what is obsolete or ineffective. It required a series of horrible episodes to stir the 75th Congress finally to pass the basic statute now on the books, after the 73d and 74th Congresses had extensively discussed and debated similar legislation, but let it die in squabbles over special interest amendments and exemptions. By the time the 75th Congress finally acted, it had before it a sickening parade of horror cases—of young women blinded by eyelash blackeners; of many Americans paralyzed by a poisonous substance in Jamaica ginger—the infamous Ginger Jake scandal; of at least 73 Americans dying from the use of a new prescription drug, Elixer Sulfanilamide, at first considered a great medical breakthrough until horrified doctors watched many of their patients die in prolonged agony from its use.

No such mass poisoning or blinding or paralyzing or killing episodes have occurred, thank God, in recent years. I hope it never again requires such incidents to persuade Congress to act on a broad level to improve the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. However, as we all here know, most of the changes and improvements in the act since 1938 have been on a piecemeal, limited approach basis. I complained of this in 1960 when the color additives bill was being considered. I felt if we were going to "bail out" the lipstick makers on the use of other than "harmless" colors, we should insist on something for something—that is, on a requirement for pretesting for safety of all ingredients used in cosmetics, not just the coloring matter. In fact, I felt so strongly about that aspect of it that even after you agreed to amend the hastily passed Senate bill to include an anticancer clause, I voted against the bill in the House.

COSMETICS NOT PRETESTED FOR SAFETY

Since 1938, when it first came under Government regulation, the cosmetic industry has had comparatively gentle treatment. Unlike drug manufacturers marketing a new product, or food manufacturers using a new ingredient, the cosmetic industry does not have to prove safety of a new product prior to marketing. If the product is believed unsafe, furthermore, the Government must furnish legal proof of danger to the consumer in order to force the item off the market. This is the situation which previously existed in connection with the use of food additives, and which we changed in 1958—relieving the Government of the obligation of proving a product dangerous in order to take it off the market. We now require, instead, that the manufacturer prove his additive is safe before putting it on the market.

As a result of our lax cosmetics controls there have been occasional cases of extremely painful injury to cosmetic users, and frequent cases of allergic reaction, because the cosmetic manufacturer is not required to pretest the product for safety or even to identify the ingredients in the product.

Of course, I do not maintain or believe that major cosmetic manufacturers are anxious to poison, or disfigure, or denail, or scalp, or burn, or otherwise injure the American consumer. Certainly, there is no profit in that, and these are firms anxious to make a profit by pleasing, not harming, the customer. But the competitive situation in the cosmetic industry is such, and the ease of entry of new firms into the field of processing cosmetics is such, that new products hit the market accompanied by a wave of high-pressure advertising and promotion, and each firm tries to beat the other to the drugstore or department store counter or supermarket shelf with the latest magic potion for making us attractive.

Cosmetics are as old as history, and the basic ingredients used are well known in the trade. So sales spurts must often depend upon mysterious gimmick additives—turtle oil to promote skin rejuvenation or tighten chin muscles (but did you ever see a turtle's skin?); shark oil, queen bee royal jelly; chick embryo extract; horse blood serum, pigskin extract—yes, these are all ingredients which have been introduced in face and skin creams to form the basis for extravagant claims of beauty in a jar.

INGREDIENTS NOT DISCLOSED EVEN TO FDA

They are seldom dangerous—but if they are, we never know about it until a lot of gullible consumers—or consumers who have assumed the product must be safe or it couldn't be sold—have been hurt. That has been the situation in cosmetic regulation for 24 years.

Since the 1938 act does not even require cosmetic manufacturers to identify ingredients in their products, the Food and Drug Administration must analyze new products to determine their content, in case it suspects the presence of a dangerous ingredient. It cannot even go to the firm and legally demand to know what is in the product. Consequently, the consumer never knows—has no way of knowing except by painful trial and error—whether an attractive cosmetic product contains an ingredient to which she knows she is allergic. And, even worse, if a child swallows a cosmetic, the parents and doctor have no way of knowing for sure what ingredients it contained and what antidote may be necessary.

These loopholes in the law applying to cosmetics should have been closed when we rescued the cosmetic industry from the color crisis in 1960. But we didn't do it then. We just dealt with color additives and nothing else.

It was after that experience—of seeing another blowout patch being placed on the old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to meet only a limited problem situation, just as we previously passed the factory inspection bill, and the pesticides bill and the food additives bill and the citrus red bill and so on, that I decided late in 1960 to draft a single bill to rewrite all of the obsolete provisions of the basic law. That resolve resulted in the introduction of H.R. 1235 the following January.

WHILE DIFFERING, HARRIS AND SULLIVAN BILLS COVER SIMILAR GROUND

As the Legislative Reference Service report points out, the two administration bills, H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582, and my bill, H.R.

1235, cover substantially similar ground, while differing to some extent in language, approach, or, in a few instances, in content.

For instance, H.R. 1235 and H.R. 11581 both require more adequate controls over drug manufacturing to assure the quality of the product output, thus, for one thing, making it more likely that physicians would feel safe in prescribing by common names instead of the often more expensive trademark names; both require new drugs to be proved efficacious as well as safe for the purposes intended; both permit recall of previously approved drugs in case of substantial doubt of their safety; both require batch-by-batch testing and certification of all of the 30 or more groups of antibiotic drugs rather than just the 5 so-called wonder drugs in existence a dozen years ago; both call for extensive controls over the manufacture, distribution, sale, and possession of habit-forming barbiturates and stimulant drugs to curb the flagrant bootlegging of these powerful and dangerous and death-dealing drugs; both clarify the existing factory inspection laws as they apply not only to drugs but also to foods and cosmetics.

Similarly, H.R. 1235 and the other Harris bill, H.R. 11582, both require pretesting of cosmetics for safety before marketing, including a Delaney anticancer clause; both require that therapeutic devices be proved safe—closing a serious and dangerous loophole—and also that therapeutic devices be proved effective for the purposes for which they are offered for sale; both bills repeal the provision in the present law which permits the sale of coal-tar hair dyes containing poisonous or deleterious ingredients which may be injurious to the user (the present law merely requires a label warning of possible danger).

H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582 have some other provisions in them which are not contained in H.R. 1235 and which are worthwhile. For instance, there is a tighter provision in H.R. 11582 than in H.R. 1235 on the record-keeping requirements for cosmetic manufacturers after a new product has already been approved for sale, and in case consumer complaints or experience should indicate the existence of danger in the use of the product. H.R. 1235 contains such reporting and record-keeping requirements on drugs and should have included cosmetics.

H.R. 11581 has a provision amending the Public Health Service Act requiring tests for efficacy of biological drugs—the provision the President referred to when he said hogs, sheep, and cattle receive somewhat greater protection in this respect than humans.

The same bill also proposes the assignment of standardized names by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in cases where such names do not already exist or there is a dispute over a particular name. Of course, as I said earlier, many doctors will not use generic names in prescriptions unless and until factory inspection authority is so strong that there is no chance of fly-by-night operators turning out inferior drugs for sale in the prescription departments of pharmacies.

However, I have strong doubts, I must admit, over the retreat on the Delaney anticancer clause on feed additives, as contained in H.R. 11582, particularly in view of the Government's experience several years ago with the hormone-treated chickens. It cost us $10 million to remove from the market the fowl treated with a drug considered safe for the purpose—after it was learned that there were residues of the cancer-inducing substance in the skin of the chickens. Too often for complacency, new testing methods disclose the existence of harmful residues which had not shown up in earlier tests, but by then the damage is done.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES OF H.R. 1235

Now, I would like to discuss some of the provisions of H.R. 1235 which are not in either of the administration bills, and which I strongly believe should be made part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

First of all, there are the sections dealing with fake cancer remedies and useless dietary ingredients. If the law were strengthened in all other respects, as has been recommended, perhaps the FDA would then be able to reach the cancer quacks and put them out of business quickly. But I think the provisions of H.R. 1235 would be of invaluable assistance in this respect. As to the special dietary food section of H.R. 1235, it does not aim at legitimate dealers but at the charlatan who evades the law by making oral claims of special benefits to be derived from the inclusion of some exotic or unusual ingredient with no known nutritional value whatsoever.

H.R. 1235 also gets at an exemption in the law for common carriers responsible for causing an article in commerce to become misbranded or adulterated. Carriers should be held accountable, I believe, for violations of the law for which they are responsible. Under present law, they are apparently exempt from responsibility for adulterated products in transit, even if the carrier's own neglect caused the violation.

A very important provision of H.R. 1235 which is not included in either administration bill would facilitate oversea inspection by U.S. officials of factories shipping substantial quantities of foods, drugs, or cosmetics into the United States. Importation could be refused any product from a manufacturer who would not permit reasonable inspection of his facilities on request. According to the testimony of Commissioner Larrick on the FDA appropriation bill, we import about $6 billion worth of foods, drugs, and cosmetics a year, of which only a fraction can be inspected on arrival. It is significant that nearly one out of every three sample analyses and wharf examinations uncovered violations of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Mr. Larrick acknowledged that this high rate of violations results from the selective nature of the inspection work—in other words, the inspectors pick out those shipments they suspect of violations, rather than depending upon a random sample. While there is at present no elaborate plans for sending inspectors overseas, yet it seems to me the authority should be there to require those foreign firms which ship substantial amounts of food, drug, or cosmetic items to the United States to give our inspectors the same right of entry on request as an American firm is required to do.

SPECIAL INTEREST LOOPHOLES ADOPTED IN 1938

Another loophole H.R. 1235 alone among the pending bills would close involves the label exemption under the present law for butter, cheese, and ice cream in revealing the presence of artificial color. This was a deliberate special-interest provision written into the law in 1938 to quiet protests from the dairy interests, even though some Members of Congress said at the time there was no good reason for it. By law, coloring matter cannot be used unless it is safe, so why not let the consumer have this information if it means anything to him? Some people just don't like to buy artificially colored butter or cheese or ice cream—but at the present time, they have no way of indulging their wishes in this regard. All other food items must acknowledge on the label the existence of artificial coloring. So why not ice cream, butter, and cheese, too?

Another special interest exemption written into the 1938 act, and which H.R. 1235 would repeal, is the provision which declares that soap is not a cosmetic.

It is not a food, of course. Except in the relatively few instances in which certain therapeutic values are manufactured into—or claimed for—a soap product, it is not a drug, either. The law defines cosmetics as, among other things, "articles, including components of any such articles, intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to the human body or any part thereof for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance * * *."

Soap is certainly intended for cleansing, and it is used by most of us also, if not consciously for beautifying, at least for promoting attractiveness in the removal of dirt from face and hands. Some soaps presumably will do far more for our appearance than that. Nevertheless, by law, soap is not a cosmetic. Under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, then, it is a nothing—it is not subject to the law in any way unless therapeutic values are claimed for it as a drug.

I am not so much concerned over the money spent trustingly and hopefully by women who are led to expect beauty miracles from the soap they buy, although the economic waste may perhaps be significant. What I am concerned about is that a complexion soap can be adulterated with unsafe chemicals or unsafe color additives, and the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act cannot touch it. And regardless of how fraudulently it might be packaged, there is not even a requirement that the size or net weight or anything else of an informational nature be printed on the label for the consumer's guidance. Why should soap be above the law?

READ THE LABEL, IF YOU CAN FIND IT

Unlike soap, products subject to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act must carry certain label information, but the language of the law, and the rulings of the courts, are such that this information is often almost impossible to find. Just the other day, the FDA seized 16,000 plastic tubes of a well-known firm's deodorant product because, while the required information was printed somewhere on the product, the printed matter was the same color as the plastic container and was almost impossible to find and read.

H.R. 1235 provides for an effective attack on the labeling problem in foods, drugs, and cosmetics by providing the Government with authority to spell out, in regulations, the degree of prominence required for certain label statements, including statements of the quantity of contents of foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the common or usual names of drugs, and the ingredients in foods and cosmetics.

The present law prohibits labeling which is—

"Not prominently displayed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

But, as the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee hearings brought out last year, you often need a magnifying glass to find the required label information on quantity and contents—before you get out the slide rule to figure the cost-per-ounce. As a nonlawyer, the present law seems very strong, to me, but apparently the courts have held it to be vague. That is why we now need the same authority in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to specify size and location of labeling information as you provided in the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act.

PREFERENCE FOR A SINGLE OMNIBUS BILL

If we are going to change the law on food, drugs, and cosmetics, then let us write a model law and close all of these loopholes.

I believe H.R. 1235, or a similar omnibus bill, would best serve as the vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. I see no valid reason for having two separate bills—one on drugs and the other on cosmetics and devices. They are part of the same overall problem—and under the jurisdiction of one agency. If there are omissions in H.R. 1235 based on the administration's 18-month study of the issue since I introduced that bill, it should be an easy matter to incorporate them into a single omnibus measure along the lines of H.R. 1235.

For instance, while H.R. 11581 provides for requiring proof of the efficacy as well as the safety of all new drugs, a similar provision dealing with therapeutic devices is contained in the different Harris bill, H.R. 11582. Since the pretesting requirements for both drugs and devices would be similar, and are often intended for the same people, why not cover them in one piece of legislation? If you go through the detailed breakdown of H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582, you find that substantially similar provisions in those two bills deal separately with drugs and devices. I am not a lawyer, but I suspect lawyers would have a field day over the years finding hidden meanings and significance in the fact that Congress used duplicate wording but in separate bills applying to different products in providing for pretesting for efficacy as well as safety of drugs and therapeutic devices. Obviously, some lawyer, some day, will argue, and perhaps successfully, that Congress didn't really mean to have these products treated alike in their safety requirements, or it would have placed them in the same bill rather than passing separate bills. Do I just imagine this?

Furthermore, while H.R. 11581 applies primarily to drugs—every specific provision applies only to drugs—yet it also would have the effect of amending the factory inspection laws applying to "any articles subject to" the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including, of course, food and cosmetic products. I think this is to the good—our factory inspection laws need strengthening, for food products and cosmetics as well as drugs. But why put a food inspection provision in what is exclusively a drug law? Why put a cosmetic inspection provision in a drug law, and leave it out of the proposed new cosmetic law? Obviously, there must be some rhyme or reason for dividing up the proposed improvements in the law in separate bills in this fashion, but I do not understand the value of it.

The use of H.R. 11582, primarily a bill dealing with pretesting of cosmetics and therapeutic devices, as a vehicle for amending the Hazardous Products Labeling Act dealing with household products, and also to amend the animal feed additives and food additives laws is, I believe, further evidence that we should have a single omnibus bill and not two separate bills, each covering one major area and a variety of unrelated ones.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate your courtesy in hearing me. The subject matter of these hearings is of paramount importance to me from a legislative standpoint—and has been ever since I came to Congress in 1953 and introduced a safe cosmetic bill to carry out the recommendations of the Delaney investigation. I have introduced safe cosmetics bills in every Congress since then. I have supported this committee in every proposal it has made to strengthen the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and have opposed it in the few instances I thought the legislation would weaken consumer protections.

It would be a relatively simple matter for the committee at this late date in the final months of the life of the 87th Congress to pick out one of the many major areas of inadequacy in the law and recommend another blowout patch to tide us over temporarily. I hope you will not do that—that you will recommend legislation to close all of the major loopholes in the act.

In 1938, after attempts in two previous Congresses to replace the 1906 act had failed, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in a report filed in the House on April 14, 1938, said of the Wiley law of 1906:

"While the old law has been of incalculable benefit to American consumers, it contains serious loopholes and is not sufficiently broad in its scope to meet the requirements of consumer protection under modern conditions."

After two dozen years, the same words are exactly applicable today to the law passed in 1938. I hope this same committee will shortly file a report with the House containing those words, or similar words, in connection with a legislative accomplishment in 1962 as far reaching as that of 1938 in the field of consumer protection.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 3: 5: *Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.*

Almighty God, may this new day, upon which we have entered, be radiant with a glorious manifestation of a more filial trust in Thee and a more fraternal attitude toward all mankind.

May all the thoughts and feelings of our minds and hearts be brought under the spell and sway of Thy divine spirit and be touched to finer issues and nobler achievements.

Grant that our vision of a more blessed future for the whole human race may challenge the best that is within us of faith and fidelity, of effort and courage.

Fill us with a passion to hasten the dawning of that day when the world shall be forever free from the curse of strife and war and nations shall labor together to build the kingdom of peace.

Humbly we beseech Thee through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1007) entitled "An Act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Jackson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Allott to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES "REVENUE ACT OF 1963"

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 516, Rept. No. 735), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, two thousand and seven hundred additional copies of the report submitted by that committee to accompany H.R. 8363, the "Revenue Act of 1963".

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 516.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN DAY AND WEEK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 9, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It gives me pleasure to transmit the following message from Deputy Ranieri Mazzili, President of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, in acknowledgment of an enrolled, attested copy of House Resolution 316 regarding Pan American Day and Week:

"Request that you transmit to the U.S. House of Representatives the thanks of the Chamber of Deputies for its message of congratulations on the passage of Pan American Day, which will be entered in proceedings of this House of Congress. Cordial greetings."

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes, and ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the bill which we passed yesterday and which the other body passed some time ago?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We passed the bill in a considerably different form and for a fairly different amount of authorization.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. It is different in many, many ways.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I express the hope that the gentleman from Arkansas and his colleagues on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce representing the House will have the same firmness of character and courage that has always marked their actions in the past in connection with this particular conference report.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for his admonition and we shall certainly keep it in mind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, ROBERTS of Alabama, RHODES of Pennsylvania, O'BRIEN of New York, ROGERS of Florida, BENNETT of Michigan, SCHENCK, NELSEN, and BROTZMAN.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 145]

Abbitt
Adair
Albert
Ashbrook
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Bruce
Buckley
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Flynt
Ford
Gallagher
Gathings
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Pepper
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sisk
Slack
Snyder
Stafford
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tupper
Vinson
Whitten
Wickersham

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF AUGUST 1, 1939, TO PROVIDE THAT PROFESSIONAL NURSES SHALL BE REGISTERED AS STAFF OFFICERS IN THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That (a) the first sentence of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes', approved August 1, 1939 (46 U.S.C., sec. 242), is amended by striking out 'and (5) surgeon' and inserting in lieu thereof '(5) surgeon, and (6) professional nurse'.
>
> "(b) Section 2 of such Act of August 1, 1939, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Applicants for registry as surgeon or professional nurse shall be required to possess a valid license as physician and surgeon or registered nurse, respectively, issued under the authority of a State or territory of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia.'
>
> "Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to amend the Act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the United States Merchant Marine, and for other purposes.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—let me ask the gentleman one question: Are all amendments on the part of the other body germane to the subject matter of the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. GARMATZ. They are. There is merely a change of language, but there is no change in the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. But all amendments made by the other body are germane?

Mr. GARMATZ. They are.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5623) to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 46, line 10, strike out "for temporary service." and insert: "for temporary service".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the same question of the gentleman with reference to this bill. Are all amendments germane to the bill?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes, and they involve principally typographical errors in this particular section.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM REGULATIONS FOR PREVENTING COLLISIONS AT SEA

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6012) to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Page 2, line 23, strike out "vessel" and insert "vessels".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS TO BE HELD BY THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities has already announced that it will hold public hearings tomorrow. These hearings are a continuation of a series the committee has been holding over the last 4 months on the subject of travel to Cuba by American citizens in violation of State Department regulations and on pro-Castro propaganda activities in the United States. These hearings are all based on a committee investigation that, as of this time, has been underway for over a year. As a result of evidence produced in these hearings, I have already referred the cases of 18 witnesses who have appeared in them to the Department of Justice for prosecution on the grounds of violation of travel regulations.

A number of students who recently returned from a 2-month trip to Cuba have been subpenaed to testify in the hearings tomorrow. It is, of course, the committee's desire that all its hearings be orderly and conducted with the dignity that should mark all congressional proceedings. Usually, they are orderly. On some occasions in the past, however, they have not been—because Communists have planned disruptions and demonstrations in attempts not only to discredit the committee, but the Congress as a whole and the Government itself.

It is for this reason that I make these remarks. The committee has received information that a demonstration is planned during the course of its hearings which will be held in the caucus room of the Cannon House Office Building tomorrow morning. It is my hope that by giving advance notice of this, the plans for this demonstration might be called off and none will take place. If this happens, I, of course, will be accused of having tried to smear the students who have been subpenaed to testify tomorrow morning and their supporters. The fact will also be used to try to convince the public that I and the Committee on Un-American Activities are irresponsible and do not have reliable information. I realize all this; yet, I feel I should make this statement because I know with certainty that, as of now, this demonstration is planned. For this reason, I am willing to run the risk, should the demonstration be called off, of being attacked and discredited by some people.

Unfortunately, it is true that my giving public notice of this plan may not result in its cancellation. The demonstration may still take place. Those behind this planned operation are not too much concerned with public opinion. They have no respect for law and order as such. All I can say is that it is my hope in making this statement that, despite this, for tactical reasons if for no other, they may be influenced to alter their plans.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the committee, I rise to associate myself completely with the remarks of the very able chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Louisiana. I am most gratified that he has seen fit to bring this matter to the attention of the House. I applaud his purpose and efforts to see that the hearing of the committee will be marked by order and dignity and I support him totally in those efforts.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MENTALLY INCOMPETENT PERSONS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it was not mere coincidence that on yesterday I introduced H.R. 8370, which is a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to protect the constitutional rights of mentally incompetent or suspect persons retained or committed thereunder, and for other purposes. It has been in preparation for over 11 months.

These "other purposes" have resulted, and are a result of, my basic profession before coming to the Congress, and the fact that the Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents happens to be located in my home county in the district I have the honor to represent.

The bill defines "mental incompetency" and brings up to date and eliminates such old legal terms as "sanity" and it protects those who are arrested—before trial—from having the mental incompetency tag or assignment to Federal hospitals or other institutions under the Department of Justice without due process, the violation of their constitutional rights, the right to an attorney, the right to assist in any trial, and the right to have a fair examination by a competent physician.

It also changes other sections and amends title 18 of this code in order to bring about long-needed and much-studied revisions in the admission procedures to Federal hospitals for defective delinquents. I have coordinated it with Federal departments, experienced psychiatrists, wardens, the legal profession and the judicial council.

I urge all Members to be present tomorrow afternoon when I will explain this in some detail under a short special order, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day. The Committee on the Judiciary has been so notified.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The said committee is directed to make a complete, full, and thorough investigation of the numerous research programs being conducted by sundry departments and agencies of the Federal Government and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the commitee shall give special attention to the following: (1) the overall total amount of annual expenditures on research programs; (2) what departments and agencies of the Government are conducting research and at what costs; (3) the amounts being expended by the various agencies and departments in grants and contracts for research to colleges, private industry, and every form of student scholarships; (4) what facilities, if any, exist for coordinating the various and sundry research programs, including grants to colleges and universities as well as scholarship grants.

In order that this investigation of the numerous research programs may be better coordinated, without limiting the scope of the said committee's investigation, it is directed, among other investigative procedures, to make use of information currently available in the various committees of Congress which have legislative jurisdiction over Government research activities to the end that the said select committee may be able to recommend the necessary legislation to coordinate and prevent unjustifiable duplication in the numerous projects and activities of the Government relating to scientific research.

The committee shall report its findings to the House with such recommended legislation as the committee may deem appropriate to correct any deficiencies. The committee shall make such reports to the House prior to December 1, 1964, and may submit such interim reports as it deems advisable. Any reports submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as the committee deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 504 would create a select committee composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives who would be charged with examining the scope and effectiveness of federally sponsored research programs. The resolution requires that the committee submit a final report to the House by December 1, 1964, and directs that—and I am now quoting:

> The committee shall give special attention to the following:
>
> 1. The overall total amount of annual expenditures on research programs;
>
> 2. What departments and agencies of the Government are conducting research and at what costs;
>
> 3. The amounts being expended by the various agencies and departments in grants and contracts for research to colleges, private industry, and every form of student scholarships; and
>
> 4. What facilities, if any, exist for coordinating the various and sundry research programs, including grants to colleges and universities as well as scholarship grants.

Mr. Speaker, in 1945, as a result of basic, theoretical, scientific research conducted mostly in the 1920's and 1930's, we exploded a bomb whose mushrooming cloud symbolized the beginning of an era in which the state of mankind's knowledge was to grow and expand at a rate which staggers the imagination even today—nearly 20 years later. One way to measure this growth in knowledge is merely to note that the bomb we dropped on Hiroshima is but a pea shooter in today's modern military arsenal.

FOR RESEARCH IN 1964, $14 BILLION

Another way to measure the growth in our scientific knowledge is to look at what our Government has been spending on research over the years. In 1940, the Federal Government spent only $74 million on research and development programs. By 1953, we were spending about $2 billion. Over the past 10 years, we have increased our research and development costs at a rate of $1 billion each year so that, in fiscal year 1963, the administration budgeted $12.2 billion for research and development—a sum greater than is allocated to any department or agency of the Federal Government with the single exception of the Department of Defense. Budget estimates for this 1964 fiscal year increase this figure to approximately $14.9 billion.

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER

I recite these figures only to demonstrate the scope of the program with which this proposed committee would deal. They are not necessarily alarming figures. On the contrary, it is, on the surface at least, reassuring that we, as a nation, are pursuing the search for knowledge in such a dedicated and determined fashion. The history of all mankind proves that knowledge is power—and when scientific research lags, knowledge stagnates, and civilizations crumble.

CONGRESS MUST BE SURE THAT RESEARCH APPROPRIATIONS ARE SPENT WISELY AND IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

However, Mr. Speaker, it is my strong conviction that it is not enough that we recognize the undisputed need for scientific research by appropriating many billions of dollars to support it. We in the House of Representatives have the constitutional duty to initiate all revenue-raising measures and, by tradition, we also initiate all appropriations legislation as well. It is my conviction that with this duty goes the obligation to ourselves and to the taxpaying public to oversee the administration of these great sums, to inform ourselves as to how they are being spent, and to assure ourselves that they are being spent wisely and in the public interest.

NINETY PERCENT OF RESEARCH DOLLARS SPENT BY FIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

It will not be an easy task for such a committee to obtain the information we in the Congress need to have. The spending of 90 percent of our research and development dollars is spread over five agencies of Government—Department of Defense, NASA, HEW, AEC, and National Science Foundation—and the spending of substantial funds is further distributed among 8 other departments and 24 other independent agencies. A fact which further complicates the problem of investigating this program is that more than 75 percent of these research and development dollars are spent on projects conducted by private research organizations, institutions, and universities under Federal grants and contracts.

WE MUST DETERMINE WHETHER WE ARE GETTING A FULL RETURN ON OUR RESEARCH DOLLAR

The fact that such a study is a difficult task undoubtedly explains, in part, why no government-wide review has ever been attempted by this body and it explains why the last joint congressional committee established for such a purpose was the Allison Commission which functioned in the years 1884 to 1886. Difficult though it may be, however, it is a job that much be done—and must be done now—so that we may determine for ourselves and for the public whether we are getting a full return on our research investment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to describe the scope of the investigation which I envision for such a select committee, some of the objectives or questions about our research programs which come to my mind, and some goals to which I believe this committee, if established, should address itself.

WHO DOES RESEARCH FOR THE GOVERNMENT?

The first question we need to have answered is "Who is performing research for the Government?" We already know that, in general, virtually every department and independent agency of Government is performing, in the aggregate, about 23 percent of the dollar value of our Government research. We know that at least one quasi-public body, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, is involved.

We know, too, that the remaining 3 out of every 4 of our research dollars are being spent by the Government agencies to have research performed for the Government by private industry, research organizations, and universities under Government contract and research grants.

Of this amount, according to the National Science Foundation, in 1962 approximately 80 percent of the research and development grants and contracts were obligated to private, profitmaking organizations; 15 percent to colleges and universities; and the balance to other nonprofit research organizations.

MRS. GREEN'S REPORT

From the report of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] on "The Federal Government and Education," we learn that there are at least 100 institutions of higher learning which do $1 million worth of Government research annually; that these 100 colleges and universities receive 90 percent of the $631.1 million in Federal research spent by educational institutions. We also learn, on page 50 of that report, that the first 10 institutions receive 38 percent of all these funds and that the first 25 schools receive 59 percent.

The full answer to the first question, "Who is performing research for the Government," will raise several other, more searching and more important questions. For instance, how is it determined when the Government will perform its own research and when it will contract it out? How is it determined who, among the universities, private institutions, and private industry will perform research for the Government? What are the differences between the use of grants, fellowships, scholarships, contracts and "purchased service" procurements, and how do these differences affect the conduct of research or the public interest?

WHAT KIND OF RESEARCH IS BEING DONE?

Parallel to the question of "who" is the question, "What kind of research are we performing?" What is the scope of our research program? We know, in a general way, that research is being conducted in most phases of the physical, biological, and social sciences. We know that some of our projects, in the field of research and development, are not only global but also range from burrowing deep into the earth's crust and below the sea to exploring the expanding limits of outer space and the stars.

The 1963 budget provides us with some tables, in its "Special analysis G," which combine the "who" and the "what" to present a picture which raises certain further questions. We find, for instance, that there are the following:

Eleven departments and agencies performing research in the fields of health and medicine—AEC, FAA, NASA, NSF, Office of Emergency Planning, VA, Agriculture, Defense, HEW, Interior, and State.

Five agencies of Government are performing space research, exclusive of aircraft technology—NASA, Defense, AEC, Weather Bureau, and NSF.

Seven agencies are doing work on oceanography—Defense, Interior, HEW, Treasury, NSF, AEC, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Eight in water research and the performing of water surveys—Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, HEW, Interior, AEC, NSF, and TVA.

Fourteen are studying meteorology—Agriculture, AEC, Weather Bureau, Bureau of Standards, FAA, HEW, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, Interior, NASA, and NSF.

Other programs involving multiple agency interest and research include such broad categories as defense, environmental health, natural resources, nuclear energy, and more specific categories and scientific fields impossible to classify or identify at this time.

OVERLAPPING SHOULD BE CAREFULLY SCRUTINIZED FOR WASTE

The picture I have just presented is one of an apparent overlapping both of subject matter and of Government agencies. In many cases, perhaps all, this overlap can be explained and justified. In some cases, the overlap may be only apparent and not real—that is, they may be justifiable for any one of a number of possible reasons. I would hope that a committee such as the one I am proposing will scrutinize carefully the overlapping which exists and satisfy itself that the justifiable is permitted to continue but that wasteful and unnecessary overlapping is stopped.

I would think that in any $14-billion enterprise, wasteful overlapping and just plain needless duplication is bound to occur.

I would mistrust any claim to the contrary because this is the nature of all human endeavors. I would expect the proposed committee to painstakingly investigate each and every charge of waste and recommend corrective action whenever it may be necessary.

On the other hand, I would hope that a careful investigation would bring to light such inadequacies and such deficiencies as may exist in our research programming. I would hope that the committee might point to areas in which insufficient research attention has been paid. In this connection, I would want to see an analysis showing those areas of maximum and minimum research fund allocation, and the reasons for preferring one area over another.

I would want to know, also, the ratio of funds allocated to basic research as against applied research. In the 83d Congress, I was privileged to serve as ranking minority member of an Education and Labor Special Subcommittee to Study and Investigate Federal Activity in the Field of Education. In our report we noted that only about 30 percent of the funds spent on research in the universities in fiscal year 1955 was devoted to basic research. One of our conclusions at that time was that "the predominance given to applied research is a serious contradiction of the traditional emphasis heretofore placed on basic research by American institutions of higher learning."

Mr. Speaker, these last questions really raise the final broad area into which the select committee should, in my opinion, investigate. That is the area of policy or management. How are these vast research networks supervised? How are they coordinated both within each agency and among the agencies? How are projects and programs planned? Who selects them? What are the various criteria and how are priorities established?

The same questions can be raised, as well, with regard to the decisions on selection of institutions, universities, and private industry.

The most we can say at this time, I believe, is that we know where to start in answering some of these questions. Most, if not all, agencies have one or more offices charged with planning and coordinating their own programs. With respect to governmentwide, interagency planning and coordinating, there are several offices which, on paper, would appear to fulfill this role or a large part of it.

Within the White House establishment alone, there are several. Within the Office of Emergency Planning there is the National Resource Evaluation Center of the Research and Development Office. There is also the Federal Council for Science and Technology and the Office for Science and Technology which are headed by the President's science advisor. There are interagency committees such as the one on oceanography. In addition, the Smithsonian Institution has a Science Information Exchange and the National Science Foundation has its Science Information Service.

The question remains, Mr. Speaker, Who coordinates all of these coordinators? How are these tasks accomplished all the way down the line so as to adjust the delicate balance between the recordkeeping burdens imposed upon our scientists and the Government's need to know; between procurement-type timesheets or punch clocks and the Government's proper functioning as the steward of our public funds?

One final objective, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the committee would solicit information and opinions from all interested parties—from government and private institutions, legislative committees of Congress, universities, professional organizations and the scientists themselves. I would hope that the committee would seek to learn both the criticisms and recommendations concerning Federal policies and the administration of our various research programs.

AN ACROSS-THE-BOARD INVESTIGATION IS NECESSARY

Mr. Speaker, such an across-the-board investigation is a necessity if we are to inform ourselves. I doubt if anyone will question that our very survival as a civilization depends upon the quantity and quality of our national research programs. And yet, year in and year out, many of us who do not serve on the specialized committees vote for programs for every agency in Government without being fully aware of the nature of the research which is included in those programs.

AN AGE OF TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENTIFIC SPECIALIZATION

We live in an age of technology and scientific specialization and we let this fact allow us to drift dangerously toward an attitude which says, "This is too technical a subject for me to understand; let the experts decide." This is an attitude that we in the Congress often share with the general public. Let the experts decide what kind of Armed Forces we need.

Let the experts decide how much fallout our grandchildren can withstand. Let the experts decide how many times safety requires that we be able to blow up the entire world. Let the experts decide what kind and how much research we want and need.

When Clemenceau said that war is too important to be left to the generals, he was merely expounding a fundamental philosophy of democratic government. This is why, for example, our military has always been supervised by civilian leadership.

Two problems arise when we leave important decisions of policy to experts. First, experts seldom agree with each other. Second, the public elects public officials to make decisions, not so-called experts.

If we are to take back our responsibility for leadership and policymaking in these important fields, if we are to make public policy rather than merely ratify the decisions of experts, we must inform ourselves better. This investigating committee will not solve this problem but it will be of help.

One final question remains, Mr. Speaker, and that is, how will such a select committee operate; how will it function to successfully perform such a great task. My answer must, of necessity, be in general terms at this time. As every Member knows, the route of an investigation cannot be completely mapped out in advance. The committee must follow the turns wherever the investigation leads it.

GOOD STAFFING IMPORTANT

It has been my conviction from the start, and the testimony of many of our eminent committee chairmen who testified at the hearings has borne out that conviction, that good staffing will be one of the keys to success. Without technically competent staff, and access on occasion to recognized authorities in the various scientific fields, any report which comes out of such an investigation will be vulnerable to attack from the scientific community.

Second, the committee should be composed of—and I am sure will be composed of—dedicated, hard working, members, preferably those who are conversant with some area of research activity. For this reason, the Committee on Rules took the advice of many who testified and enlarged the committee from its original proposal of five to nine members.

Third, there is the question of the scope of the investigation. This will, of course, depend in part on the size of the staff available to the committee. As was pointed out in hearing, such a committee, in approximately 1 year, could never hope to function as a "project officer," evaluating each and every one of the thousands of research grants, contracts, and programs.

A realistic goal, in my opinion, would be this. First, the committee must build a staff and compile an inventory of Government research. To do this, it can solicit information from the agencies themselves; from the various legislative committees which have, I am happy to say, all volunteered their cooperation; and from the private sector of the Government programs, the grantees and contractees, the industries, universities and other research organizations.

Next, it must take this information and begin sorting it into meaningful categories—by agency, by research group, by subject matter. At the same time, it must be soliciting from the agencies and departments information relating to how they manage the selection and coordinating process, how they oversee their programs, and how they evaluate them.

Finally, the committee must, in broad terms, take the program apart, by agency and by subject, and make some general evaluations of its own. Where can procedures be improved? How can needless duplication be detected and eliminated? How can gaps, if any, be detected and filled? How can priorities be best designed to assure us of a fair return on our research dollar.

These goals are, I believe, well within the capabilities of such a select investigating committee. When the investigation is completed and the report submitted to the House, I should think it would constitute a valuable contribution to the knowledge of all of us and form the basis for a more thorough consideration of future research proposals.

BROAD SCALE INVESTIGATION LONG OVERDUE

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that such an investigation into our research programs is long overdue. The program has developed into tremendous proportions almost before our eyes. Everyone who even has thought about the question agrees that the problems of managing such a program are enormous and, to a great extent, unsolved.

Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons which I have here discussed, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 504.

For the information of the Members, I would like to state that I have talked to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], and he is in sympathy with the resolution and would support it if he were here today. As a matter of fact, when I talked to him last, he stated that he would want 5 minutes of time in which to express his support. I look forward to cooperating with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] and his committee and with all other committees concerned with this problem, if this investigation is approved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elliott], the author of this resolution, has explained the content and the purpose of the resolution so ably and so well that it would be repetitious for me to speak in detail on this resolution. However, I would like to say to the Members of the House that quite a number of us in this body, from both political parties, and from every hue and tint and color of political affiliation or belief, have at different times in the last few months introduced resolutions of this type for the purpose of creating some sort of a special or select committee of the House of Representatives to look into our many research projects, and the activities of our Federal Government in the field of research, which are now costing about $15 billion a year, in an attempt to coordinate, or to collate and to bring into one central place, all of the information available as to just what these research activities may be, the need for them, their cost, and whether or not they are repetitious; or whether different research agencies are trying to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, a great many of the legislative committees of the House have jurisdiction over some phase or phases of research, and have done a very good, workmanlike job of looking into the research activities that come under their jurisdiction. Yet, Mr. Speaker, no one committee has a complete or an overall picture of the research activities of the Federal Government. No one committee of the House knows what some other committee may know about certain research matters.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to create one central place, one central committee, to which can come, and be made available, the information obtained by all the different legislative committees of the House in connection with research projects. Also, to go into other research matters which are not covered by the jurisdiction of any particular legislative committee.

In other words, I think it should be made clear, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the purpose of this resolution, it is not the intent of those who are sponsoring and who are supporting this resolution, that this special committee shall in any way invade or take over the jurisdiction, or the rights or privileges, of the various legislative committees of the House, as set up under the general rules of the House.

But instead it shall in the end be a body which will be of service to those committees, as well as those committees being of service to this special committee, and through it to the entire House. I know of no opposition to the resolution on our side of the aisle. I hope there is no opposition to it on either side of this body because I do believe, from my conversations during the weeks past with different Members, that there is a great need for action of this kind.

There is a great responsibility on this Congress which handles $15 billion of the money of the American people, annually and spends it for research activities, to find out just exactly what is being done in research, as best we can, the necessity therefor, the value thereof, the conflicts involved between various agencies in the field of research, to make certain the several different agencies of the Federal Government are not doing exactly the same thing in the field of research when one agency, alone, could do just as good a job at less cost. There is indeed a great need for this kind of legislation.

I am rather proud of the fact I am known as the legislative father of the two Hoover Commissions and that I served as a member of both of these Commissions representing the House. I devoted some 5 years of my life to that work in double harness, serving here in the House and on the Commission as well. I feel this committee, if it can do the work it wants to do, and should be able to do, through cooperation with other Members and committees of this body, can perhaps prove to be of as great value to the Nation as the Hoover Commissions, and its various reports that brought large savings in the conduct of the public business. There is a truly great job to be done. I am satisfied that, with the support of the House, it will be done.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose this resolution. I expect to vote for it. I recognize the enormity of the task that lies before the proposed committee. Investigation into research and development has to begin some place, and perhaps this is as good a place as any. I believe it will serve notice on many activities of the Government that we are looking at their research and development program.

May I tell you, however, that the Committee on Science and Astronautics is given statutory jurisdiction over certain activities in the Federal Government. Under rule XI, section 17, the committee is given jurisdiction over astronautical research and development, including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities; Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures and the metric system; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; National Aeronautics and Space Council, National Science Foundation, outer space, including exploration and control thereof, science scholarships, and scientific research and development.

This is a broad jurisdiction. The committee has fulfilled its obligations in these jurisdictions. It is a new committee and, within the resources it has, the committee has done the job in getting at the responsibilities that have been given us by the Congress. My committee will cooperate with the new committee. I do want you to know, however, we have subcommittees working in several of the fields outlined in the resolution. I am very hopeful that the course of this committee will not violate one of the rules that we have set down for administrative agencies of the Government: that they avoid duplication of effort. Other committees of this House have jurisdiction in fields over which we have jurisdiction. We have always been able to work out our differences and have avoided duplication. I am certain the Committee on Science and Astronautics will cooperate with the new committee, but it will protect its own interests and will fight against any duplication of effort in those areas in which the House of Representatives has given it statutory jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price].

Mr. PRICE. I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to address myself to the resolution reported by the House Committee on Rules because it embraces a most important subject.

It is a literal fact that almost every facet of our daily lives is directly affected by research and development.

Certainly, within the Military Establishment, today's research and development will father tomorrow's weapons and will undoubtedly determine our capability to defend ourselves against the admittedly hostile forces on this earth which would destroy us as a Nation.

I do not rise in opposition to the pending resolution, rather I rise to make two points:

First. In the absence of Chairman Vinson, I wish to outline the major steps which the House Committee on Armed Services has taken to discharge its responsibilities in the field of research and development in the Defense Establishment; and

Second. To advise the Members, for reasons which I will subsequently state, that I will support the resolution.

At the invitation of the chairman of the House Committee on Rules, Chairman Vinson appeared before his committee on Tuesday, August 13, to discuss the resolution now below the House, and to outline its relationship to the current activities and responsibilities of the House Committee on Armed Services in the field of research and development.

It is pertinent that I now review for the Members of the House the principal points which he made in his appearance before the Rules Committee.

At the present time, the total annual Federal expenditure on research and development programs is approximately $14 billion, and that is the approximate figure submitted in the President's budget message for fiscal 1964.

Of this total sum, the allocation among Federal departments and agencies is as follows:

	In millions
Department of Defense	$7,583.6
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,641.0
Atomic Energy Commission	1,191.9
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	720.1
Department of Agriculture	179.6
National Science Foundation	116.0
Department of the Interior	112.1
Department of Commerce	63.2
Federal Aviation Agency	55.6
Veterans' Administration	27.8
Executive Office of the President	11.9
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	10.0
Post Office Department	8.6
Department of Labor	8.3
Smithsonian Institution	5.6
Tennessee Valley Authority	4.3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2.0
Treasury Department	1.8
Small Business Administration	.6
U.S. Information Agency	.5
Federal Communications Commission	.4
Federal Trade Commission	.2
Total	$13,745,200,000

So about 55 percent of the total Federal research and development appropriations are allocated to the Defense Establishment for defense purposes. Today, that amounts to more than $7 billion and it accurately reflects the technological explosion which has occurred in our society. This is further reflected in the fact that the appropriations for military research and development in 1948 was only $500 million. There was a gradual annual increase until about 4 years ago and, now, we find an annual expenditure of more than $7 billion for military research and development alone.

Chairman VINSON pointed out that this should not be construed as an unhealthy development. On the contrary, he said, it is undoubtedly the only way in which we can insure our defense in the future.

So, our objective must not be one which will unduly hamper and restrict research and development efforts. Rather, it is our responsibility to insure, as Chairman VINSON stated: First, that the funds are devoted to meaningful purposes; second, that the programs within and among the Federal agencies be properly coordinated to avoid unwarranted waste and duplication; and third, that basic research be timely terminated when it proves to be unproductive, or, if productive, gives way to the more meaningful application of applied research.

I believe this to be the overriding purpose of the pending resolution and that is why I could not, in good conscience, oppose it.

So far as the House Committee on Armed Services is concerned, it has grown increasingly apparent that the committee would have to take action with reference to military endeavors in the field of research and development. Members will recall that since the 86th Congress, the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate have been required by statute to report an authorization bill for the appropriation of funds for the procurement of all missiles, ships, and aircraft.

In the committee's consideration of that legislation, it became obvious that a large amount of money was involved for research, development, testing, and evaluation. We found that the research and development effort in support of missiles, ships, and aircraft amounted to more than $3 billion annually.

We did not make that discovery this year—we made it early in 1962.

As a consequence, the committee requested congressional authority, in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal 1963, to require an annual authorization for all research and development funds in support of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. That legislation was approved by the committee, by the House Rules Committee, by the House, and became public law on April 27, 1962—Public Law 86-436.

Under the provisions of that law, no funds could be appropriated after December 31, 1962, for research and development in support of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds had been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

In February of this year, when the committee was considering the annual authorization for missiles, ships, and aircraft, we found that the total research and development budget for the Defense Establishment was more than $7 billion annually.

So, it was apparent that while we had a statutory responsibility to authorize more than $3 billion of the research and development appropriations, an even greater sum required no similar authorization. Therefore, a decision was reached to do two things.

First, to appoint a permanent standing subcommittee to deal with research and development in the Defense Establishment. Chairman VINSON appointed such a committee on February 13 of this year, naming me as chairman, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. COHELAN, and Mr. PIKE for the majority; and, after consultation with Mr. ARENDS, Mr. BECKER, Mr. HALL, and Mr. STAFFORD for the minority.

Secondly, to seek statutory authority which would require an annual authorization for all of the research and development funds of the Defense Establishment.

I shall tell you in a moment what we have done with reference to this second action.

On March 8 of this year, Chairman VINSON appeared before the Rules Committee in support of a rule on H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize appropriations for the procurement of missiles, ships, and aircraft and all research and development associated therewith. The research and development involved the $3 billion to which I previously referred.

At that time, he advised the Rules Committee that when the military construction authorization bill was presented for a rule at a later date, he would seek additional statutory authority over all research and development funds in the Defense Establishment.

He did precisely that on June 4, 1963, when he appeared before the Rules Committee in behalf of H.R. 6500, the annual military construction authorization bill. Section 610 of the bill, which was discussed at length at that time, contained the authority which the committee sought. That bill passed the House on June 5, 1963. It is now pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

It is my conviction that the Senate committee is in complete harmony with that action and I fully anticipate that the House Committee on Armed Services will present a bill to the House next year which will require the authorization of all research and development funds in the Defense Establishment.

As I previously stated, Chairman VINSON appointed a permanent research and development subcommittee on February 13 of this year.

In June he appeared before the House Administration Committee, requesting authority for an additional professional staff member for the research and development subcommittee. That committee approved the resolution, House Resolution 393, and the House passed it on June 18. Thereafter, we canvassed the field of candidates and employed a new professional staff member who is now busily engaged in the work of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has previously met and organized. It has adopted an agenda outlining its future activities. It began the first of a long series of hearings with research and development officials in the Department of Defense on August 19. It has been meeting regularly since.

The work of this subcommittee will inevitably furnish the guidance which the full committee will need in the consideration of future authorizations for research and development appropriations for the Defense Establishment.

I have reviewed the committee's activities in the field of military research and development in order that the Members may realize two things: First, the House Committee on Armed Services has not only been aware of its responsibilities to the Congress and the public in this field, but it has taken positive steps to discharge that responsibility. It is significant to note that the first significant step occurred almost 18 months ago, on April 27, 1962; and second, regardless of the action which this body takes today on the pending resolution, the House Committee on Armed Services must continue to discharge its research and development responsibility because we are charged by law to do so.

This does not mean that the pending resolution should be defeated. However, it clearly points out the need for the closest cooperation and coordination of the activities of the Armed Services Committee, and those other committees of the House which have a direct responsibility in this area, either by law or under the rules of the House, and the select committee to be appointed under the pending resolution.

Regardless of the results of the committee endeavors, as well as the study envisaged in the pending resolution, it will be most healthy for this Nation to know that the Federal research and development program, involving an annual expenditure of $14 billion, is justified and in good order.

Having had some experience in this field, I certainly do not envy those who are appointed to this select committee. They have a monumental task and I doubt that the full implications of the effort are yet understood. But that is no reason why the effort should not be made.

On the contrary, the size and complexity of the programs and the difficulties involved in their proper control, offer the primary justification for passage of the resolution.

On the basis of the chronology of facts which I have presented, and they are a matter of record in the proceedings of this body, I think it entirely fair to say that the House Committee on Armed Services did not react as a consequence of the introduction of the pending resolution.

On the contrary, our actions started some 18 months ago and we have simply increased our activity as we better understood the importance of the problem.

This is not said in criticism of the resolution. On the contrary, I think it has had a salutary effect on the committees of the House.

It should produce renewed interest and activity among all committees of the House having a primary interest in the field of research and development. Perhaps it may even lead to legislation which would require the appropriate standing committees of the House to report an annual authorization bill covering research and development appropriation requests for those departments and agencies of the Government within their jurisdiction.

Such a result should prove to be beneficial to the Congress, the departments and agencies involved, and to the taxpayers who are paying the bills.

Rather than criticize the Rules Committee for this action, I applaud it. As Mr. VINSON told the Rules Committee on August 13:

> It conclusively proves that the research and development seeds which I had previously sown before that committee did not fall among the thorns and thistles.
>
> They fell on fertile ground.
>
> They produced the pending resolution.

In conclusion, I again wish to underscore my firm opinion that the select committee which would be appointed under the pending resolution faces a monumental task.

Certainly, I would not wish to dictate their procedure, but I would suggest that their principal undertaking be to examine the nature of the type of control and the degree of coordination between various agencies of the Government engaged in research and development, rather than any detailed examination of specific programs within the agencies.

In making this suggestion, I am mindful of the efforts which some of the committees already are making to examine the research and development programs within their jurisdiction, and I believe it incumbent upon such committees to give every possible assistance to the select committee.

To that end, I pledge the total cooperation of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services.

The results produced by the select committee must constitute a public service and must reflect credit upon this body. Nothing less than the total cooperation of all of us will produce such a result.

Within this spirit, and again pledging my cooperation, I wish to advise the Members that I support the approval of the resolution and commend its passage to all Members.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my reason for expressing a particular interest in this House Resolution—House Resolution 504—springs from my experience on the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power which is conducting a nationwide investigation on the subject of water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of water pollution abatement it is extremely important that duplication of research shall be avoided and that research activities shall be coordinated as fully as possible.

Not only is the research effort itself wasteful when we have duplication, but worse yet, the highly skilled and specially educated individuals who are essential to vital research in this field are in short supply. We need to utilize to the maximum the talents of each. We waste those talents when we assign them to useless research projects or projects which are being duplicated elsewhere.

At the present time there are reported to be 36 bureaus in 7 major departments and independent agencies engaged in water resource research.

A most startling document came to my attention a few weeks ago entitled quite simply, "Duplication of Water Resources Research, by U.S. Public Health Service." In addition to the broad categories of projected research by the U.S. Public Health Service with respect to which the U.S. Geological Survey has existing projects and experience there was a list of 23 work areas of U.S. Public Health Service research as set forth in the recent report on the Committee on Environmental Health Problems. This document shows that research on these 23 subjects result in needless duplication and undesirable competition with private interests. Some of the research effort appears to be duplicated by as many as eight other Federal agencies.

In addition to the duplication in the area of environmental health problems, this document notes the duplication of effort which is threatened by the Public Health Service interest in water quality and "pollution."

It is stated:

> While the above examples show extensive duplication of effort in research areas well removed from specific environmental health problems, they still do not show the full extent of encroachment of the USPHS program. Virtually every natural and cultural process involves water to some degree, and it is safe to say that all of these processes have some effect on water quality. These effects are labeled "pollution" by the Public Health Service and used to justify extrapolation of health interests into every phase of science related to the many processes. For example, it is asserted that forestry must be studied because deforestation increases sediment and sediment is pollution. Likewise USPHS research is said to be needed in control of corrosion and scaling of industrial water-handling equipment because water components (pollutants) are responsible for these effects.

My information is that more than $14 billion a year of the taxpayers' money is being spent by research and development. About two-thirds of this is in contracts with private enterprise; about 10 percent in grants to and contracts with universities; and the other 25 percent spent by our Federal departments and agencies.

The resolution of the gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], House Resolution 504, offers an excellent opportunity to the Congress to determine the wisdom of these large expenditures, the application of the funds, and the opportunity which may be available not only for saving money, but for securing an increased return from the necessary research which must be carried on. Perhaps most important is the opportunity for making maximum utilization of the limited number of skilled and scientific persons engaged in research work upon which the salvation of our Nation may well depend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, there is not the slightest question in my mind of the desirability of the purposes of this legislation. The program of financial assistance for educational institutions through research programs, the magnitude of our Federal research and development expenses totalling nearly $15 billion a year and growing, and the impact of the Federal research activities upon institutions of higher learning, are very knotty problems.

My approach to the proper solution of this problem is somewhat different from that of the resolution which creates a select committee of the House consisting of nine members.

I have a bill which is now pending before the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House which would create a Commission composed of Members from the Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and from private life, very similar to the Hoover

Commissions referred to earlier in the debate by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], who served on both of those Hoover Commissions.

The reason I prefer a commission approach to a congressional committee is that I think the problem is so great and so difficult to solve wisely it requires a more penetrating study than congressional committees have been able to make in the past.

It is my hope that if this resolution is adopted the House will not be niggardly in providing adequate funds for the Commission to acquire a really talented staff so that it can penetrate beneath the surface of this most important problem.

My interest in this subject was stimulated by the successful launching of the first sputnik in 1957.

I wondered why we appeared to be behind the Russians in space when the Federal Government was spending about $5 billion a year in scientific research and development.

I first thought of introducing a resolution, much like House Resolution 504. Then it occurred to me that the House Government Operations Committee already had jurisdiction to conduct Government-wide inquiries in this field.

On November 1, 1957, I requested the Honorable William Dawson of Illinois, chairman of our Committee on Government Operations, to appoint a special subcommittee to make "a sober, dispassionate, impartial but penetrating inquiry into the effectiveness of our research programs and the expenditure of appropriated research funds by agencies in the executive branch of the Government." I stated further:

> Under the rules of the House of Representatives and its Government Operations Committee, you have the authority to create a subcommittee which can commence at once to explore the facts and the very difficult problems in the field of Government-financed research. Such action will avoid any delay since a select committee of the House with broad enough authority to undertake this task cannot be created until Congress convenes next January.

A study was made, not by a special subcommittee with a special staff as I had requested, but by a standing subcommittee with the regular committee staff under the acting chairmanship of the Honorable John W. McCormack, now Speaker of the House.

While this committee did hold hearings and did issue a report in 1958, I felt it was far from exhaustive and that the penetrating analysis of present Government practices and the outlining of reforms and recommending future activities of the Federal Government in the field of scientific research and development still remained a goal to be achieved.

This experience led me reluctantly to the conclusion that the kind of study I believed needed to be made in this field was probably beyond the capacity of congressional committees and congressional committee staffs as currently constituted. I use the word "reluctantly" advisedly because in theory I believe factfinding studies should be made as closely as possible to the agency where ultimate decisions will be made, which is the Congress.

Accordingly, in the 87th Congress, I introduced H.R. 11377 to establish a Commission on Government Operations in Research and Development. It was referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In the Senate, Senator McClellan likewise had a bill, S. 2771, to establish a Commission on Science and Technology. That bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and I testified before that committee on May 10, 1962. My testimony appears on pages 37–50 of the Senate hearings. The Senate bill passed the Senate, but no final action was taken on either the House bill or the Senate bill in the House.

January 10, 1963, I introduced my Commission bill, H.R. 1661, in the 88th Congress. April 3, 1963, I wrote to Hon. George Miller, chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to which it was referred, as follows:

> April 3, 1963.
>
> Re H.R. 1661, Research Commission.
> Hon. George Miller,
> *House Office Building 506,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear George: You may recall that last fall shortly before adjournment, I spoke with you regarding the Science and Astronautics Committee holding hearings on legislation to create a commission on research and development.
>
> My bill, H.R. 13130 in the last Congress was pending before your committee, as was also S. 2771, Senator McClellan's bill. You indicated that the time was too short to take action before adjournment last year, but that early in the next session, you expected to hold hearings on these bills.
>
> I understand that the McClellan bill, S. 816, which passed the Senate March 8, is now pending before your committee and I would hope that the committee schedule is such that you can set an early date for hearings on this legislation and that I will have an opportunity to appear and make a statement to the committee.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> George Meader.

I had a reply from the committee on April 17, as follows:

> Committee on Science and Astronautics,
> House of Representatives,
> *Washington, D.C., April 17, 1963.*
>
> Hon. George Meader,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. Meader: The chairman has asked me to reply to your letter of April 3, 1963, concerning your bill, H.R. 1661 and S. 816, both of which are pending in the committee. You will recall that we discussed this matter over the telephone some time ago.
>
> The situation has not changed here in the committee and as I told you three subcommittees are still holding almost daily hearings on the NASA authorization bill. I thought you would like to know, however, that the chairman will try to schedule your bill just as soon as the NASA bill is out of the way. I am flagging the file on this legislation and you may be assured that I will notify you promptly when these bills are scheduled and you will certainly have an opportunity to appear before the committee.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Charles F. Ducander,
> *Executive Director, and Chief Counsel.*

S. 816, similar to my bill, was introduced in the Senate by Senator McClellan and passed the Senate March 8, 1963, and is pending before the Committee on Science and Astronautics which I hoped would schedule hearings on my bill and the McClellan bill in the near future.

I think the study needs to be made and I hope if this resolution passes, the select committee will conduct a successful and fruitful inquiry.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is no end to the research and development, consultant, adviser, analyst and management contracts being dished out with the greatest abandon by this Government.

Take for example the current technical service contracts by just one governmental outfit, the Agency for International Development. This one agency, as of March 31, 1963, listed 984 contracts in 72 foreign countries for a total of nearly a half billion dollars.

In the first few pages it lists more than 80 separate contracts under the heading of "worldwide"—no specific country—and for the purpose of providing "training," no specifics—just "training." It is probably logical to assume this means the "training" of humans in something or other, perhaps chauffeurs to drive the fleet of Cadillacs the King of Morocco bought in New York recently or a crew to operate the air-conditioned yacht that was furnished Emperor Haille Selassie out of military assistance funds.

And it might be interesting to know why American taxpayers have four motion picture advisers and consultants under contract in Vietnam.

In India, the beneficiary of millions of American gift dollars, there are two separate contracts apparently for the establishment of "investment centers," and a third consultant contract for "investment promotion." Morocco is being taught the fine art of "private investment" by a contract firm at a cost to U.S. taxpayers of $185,000.

In Panama, we have a "tourism consultant" under contract, and in Peru we have two savings and loan consultants. Incidentally, if the State of Maryland could qualify for foreign aid it might be able to obtain the services of a couple of savings and loan consultants.

Hurrying through this list we find the American Bar Association with two worldwide contracts totaling $440,000—one for a "legal study" and the other for "research agrarian planning."

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc. comes up with a worldwide contract for the purpose of "membership association"—whatever that is.

Then there is the Council for International Progress in Management, Inc. It holds nearly a dozen contracts in various countries to tell them how to manage their affairs.

International Voluntary Services, Inc., is being paid more than $2,300,000 to do the same thing in 5 more countries.

Riblet Tramway Co. holds a $3½ million engineering contract in Nepal, perhaps to build a tramway to help Secretary of the Interior Udall to the summit of another mountain.

Then a name familiar to all braintrusters, Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., comes to light. Nathan and his associates apparently are organizing the Government of El Salvador at a contract cost of $425,000 and bringing "organization and management" into Afghanistan at a cost of $475,000. Nathan and his associates are also providing "Cento"—whatever that is—with a "railway review" for $21,500.

Not even the hotel business is completely neglected when it comes to spending the American taxpayers' dollars, for the Hilton Hotels, International, Inc., holds a $55,000 hotel operations-training contract in Tunisia. This undoubtedly includes the training of Tunisian bellboys.

There are scores upon scores of other contracts that look interesting but I close with one more—the Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. There is an organization the foreign aiders ought to nurture for its title, "Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc." leaves nothing more to be desired. And it has a good start for it holds a half million dollar contract to provide "Health services" in Algeria, ruled by the world's newest Communist-addicted dictator, Ben Bella.

Yes, the committee to be established by this resolution can find plenty to investigate with some $14 billion now being spent annually at home and abroad on so-called think factories.

I support the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this resolution setting up this special committee to look into the research problem which has been of great concern to me, and I know to many other Members of this House, for a long, long time. I am sure that this committee if instituted will prove to be of great benefit to all.

Mr. Speaker, while we are spending upward of $15 billion for research carried on by almost every agency of Government, it is plain to see that this thing has gotten out of hand and it must be pulled together in accordance to the provision recommended in this resolution in order that we might, and I am sure will, bring out facts which will save millions possibly billions of dollars annually.

Now, Mr. Speaker, like every Member of Congress, I recognize the value of research. We must have research. But surely it is not necessary to have research carried on by agencies that overlap one another.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission has contracts with over 600 universities and colleges. I question the benefits which are derived from many of these contracts. The Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations on which I have the privilege of serving is looking into that situation.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] for bringing this resolution to the floor of the House. I listened very attentively to the gentleman's able explanation of the resolution. I know the Speaker will, in cooperation with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], appoint good men as members of this committee, a committee of nine. I urge those members to be diligent in getting the needed documented facts and submit those facts to the House in due time.

I hope the resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the purpose of this resolution. At present we are spending about 15 percent of our total national budget, or approximately $15 billion, on research of one kind or another. I have been alarmed over this fact because while I am a great advocate of the usefulness of research, it seems to me that the Government is largely preempting the field in which private enterprise itself should carry the biggest share of the load and would, I think, were it not for the fact that the Federal Government is preempting the field.

I would like to direct one question to the members of the committee. I note no provision in this resolution for making this a bipartisan committee. Could any of the members of the committee enlighten me in regard to that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I can explain that to the gentleman.

The select committee cannot be bipartisan if you have an odd number of members composing the committee, which is the usual procedure. So there will not be an equal division of the committee. Its composition will be 5 to 4, as I understand it.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 504 which provides for the creation of a select committee of nine Members of the House of Representatives to conduct a thorough investigation of the numerous research programs conducted by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

The President's 1964 budget includes requests for the expenditure of nearly $15 billion for research and development. This amount is nearly five times greater than similar expenditures 10 years ago; it is nearly double the amount expended in 1960.

Federal expenditures for research amounted to $3.148 billion in 1954. They had risen to $7.742 billion in 1960, and in 1963 amounted to $12.2 billion. Nearly half of the requested $14.9 billion for fiscal 1964 would be allocated for research activities in the Department of Defense with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration second with $4.2 billion requested.

The President's 1964 budget included $13.7 billion for the conduct of research and development and $1.2 billion for facilities in which to carry on these activities.

Through its programs the Federal Government now supports over two-thirds of the research and development of the Nation. Of these total expenditures, about two-thirds are made through contracts with private industry; over 10 percent through grants and contracts with universities and other nonprofit institutions; and the remainder by Government scientists in Federal facilities.

I was privileged to join with other colleagues in the House in introducing a resolution which would create such a select committee to make a complete and thorough investigation of Government research activities and expenditures.

Such an investigation would provide the Congress with much-needed information in its annual evaluation of Government research projects preliminary to making appropriations. It should prevent project duplication, and economy also would be an important result. We also should gain assurances that in making research and development contracts, or awarding research and development facilities to one area or another, that the American taxpayer is getting the primary and full benefit for the expenditure of his money.

Mr. Speaker, no one questions the importance and value of research whether it relates to the development of a new weapons system by the Department of Defense or the smallest basic research project in a college laboratory. However, the rapid increase in this phase of Federal expenditures warrants an intelligent and unbiased examination by the legislative branch which holds the purse strings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, other members of the House Rules Committee, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. BOLLING, as well as any other House Members who are sponsoring this resolution, to instigate a thorough investigation of the great number of research programs now being conducted by the Federal Government.

I have introduced a similar resolution, House Resolution 478.

When we consider that approximately $14 billion has been budgeted by the administration this year for those projects characterized as "research," it appears patently clear that there should be a most comprehensive examination made to determine just what is being done in every department and agency of Government of a research nature. Such an investigation is long overdue. Programs have grown like Topsy; the results will inevitably show instances of duplication and misdirection. It would not surprise me if the study shows that some vital programs have been woefully shortchanged while others have had difficulty in finding ways to spend allocated funds.

It has been alleged that certain standing committees of Congress have authority to examine this matter piecemeal.

In my opinion only an overall study of the research programs presently being conducted in the various bureaus and agencies will ferret out waste and duplication, and at the same time show us where we need to do more.

Research is a magic word, and it is far easier to initiate research studies than it is to conclude them after assembling the desired information.

I was not too surprised to learn last year from the staff of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that there were in existence 79 different studies relating to salmon. I might add one action program for salmon and other anadromous species should supplant all or most of these studies.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Oceanography, I have had the opportunity to brief myself on many Federal activities in this field of science so vital to our national defense and to the benefit of mankind. I think an impartial study of research programs will show oceanography to be one research field that needs more emphasis, but I am equally certain that greater coordination is possible between various agencies in this field.

If this ad hoc committee is created and does its job well, Congress should be apprised of the following: First, a description of each research study now being conducted; second, what the goals of each are; third, the status of each research investigation; fourth, conclusions, if any; fifth, whether any other agency of Government is performing identical or similar work; sixth, whether, in the ad hoc committee's opinion, further study of each particular program is warranted; and finally, seventh, whether more or less financial support for each study is recommended.

The American people have a right to know the facts. Excluding scientific studies bearing on military security, there is nothing so sacred about research programs that they should not have closer public scrutiny.

I have received letters from constituents, as I know all of you have, asking what is being done to protect the health of citizens from dangers arising from overuse of pesticides. Many responsible citizens want to know what progress is being made in determining what effect various derivatives in food have on the human body. The suspicion that our Federal Government is not moving fast enough to protect the public from harmful substances found in certain foods and drugs will continue until the Federal Government is more candid with the consumer.

The proposed House Investigating Committee will go a long way toward correcting this situation.

It is my hope that the House will adopt this resolution without delay.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and wish to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elliott] and other members of the Committee on Rules for initiating this action.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to serve as chairman of a subcommittee holding hearings on a proposal to amend the National Defense Education Act and permit the establishment of a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center. The proposed information center would provide a clearing house for the entire spectrum of scientific research.

During the course of our hearings I could not help but observe the tremendous duplication which now exists in the various Government-sponsored research programs. The duplication not only represents a fantastic waste of the taxpayers' money but also denies our Nation the full benefits of the scientific community.

I would like to cite some examples of waste called to the attention of our committee. Recently the General Accounting Office reported two Government agencies were working on the same type of missile for over a year before the duplication was discovered. The cost of duplication involving NASA's Atlas-Agena B and the Air Force Atlas-Vega was $18 million.

Another example of waste was one major U.S. company that spent more than $250,000 and 5 years of research in an effort to solve an electronic switching problem important to military communications. The team of topnotch mathematicians doing the research found the solution. However, they also discovered the solution was available in a manuscript 6 months before the research program started.

A cloud seeding experiment has recently been made at a cost of $3 million. Shortly after the completion of the experiment, it was discovered that the same experiment was performed at an earlier date, costing only $256,000.

In one of our ballistic missile programs a special valve was needed to solve a tricky fluid-handling problem. After several months of research, the solution was realized. In addition, it was discovered that the information on this valve existed before research was started. In the meantime, missile firings were held up for several months.

In my opinion, this resolution calls for an excellent committee. The committee can help all of us to bring order out of chaos in the research program, and I wish the committee success in its deliberations. It will complement the work of my committee. I should like to call attention to the fact that this proposed select committee will deal only with Government-financed research. My committee has been dealing with the entire spectrum of research—both privately financed and publicly financed. I am confident that whatever information the proposed select committee uncovers will help my own committee in its evaluation of proposals for a national information center. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the chairman of the Rules Committee, I appeared during the course of the hearings and made some comments on this resolution. I did not appear in opposition to the resolution but, as members of the committee will recall, I called to the attention of the Committee on Rules the fact if the select committee is going to devote its time to merely collecting information other committees have developed, in my opinion it would not accomplish the desired objectives. There is a tremendous job to be done.

As a matter of fact, the National Science Foundation is already engaged in the kind of program of collecting data and has gotten together in one booklet all information on our research programs. This booklet is readily available to every Member of the Congress.

In the second place, I approve this legislation as proposed, but I do want to call to the attention of the House that even though there is some concern about duplication—and where $14 or $15 billion is being spent in the field of research, it deserves attention—in scientific research and development we cannot proceed on the basis of merely preventing duplication. Research and development is something the mind is seeking, and we have programs as we do in our institutions, in our industry, in our agencies of government, because who knows but what an idea will come from some obscure place or corner in this Nation?

Therefore I would say with caution that we cannot expect a select committee to investigate on the basis that we arbitrarily should curtail our program of research and development.

Our committee is concerned with the regulatory agencies of the Government, the public health of the country, through the NIH, and so forth.

This select committee, in my judgment, can render a great service. I am sure it will do a good job. The Interstate Committee will be glad to cooperate toward this desired objective.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 504. There is a definite need for the creation of a select committee as proposed by the resolution, particularly in view of the tremendous amount of public funds involved and further, the present legislative mechanism that is available through the various standing committees of the Congress could at best result in only a piecemeal task in relation to the type of study envisioned by the resolution before the House.

There is no question but that such a study will be a difficult task. This will most assuredly be a challenge to the committee. But certainly we should no longer put off such a Government-wide review. According to information developed before the Rules Committee, the last joint congressional committee that had been established for a similar purpose was the Allison Commission which functioned in the years 1884 to 1886.

In any event, I am firmly convinced of the need for such a comprehensive study and I am sure that a majority of my colleagues share this same view, especially in view of the size and growth of research and development costs. In 1940 the Federal Government spent $74 million. By 1953, the rate of spending for this reached about $2 billion. Over the past 10 years Federal expenditures for research and development had grown at a rate of about a billion dollars a year, so that in fiscal year 1963, there was budgeted for this activity the sum of $12.2 billion. This is a greater sum than what is allocated to any department or agency of the Federal Government, excepting the Defense Department. And the fiscal year 1964 budget shows that this activity will approach $14.9 billion.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be given the unqualified support of every Member of this body irrespective of party affiliation.

We are now spending in the neighborhood of $15 billion for research—nearly 10 percent of the budget.

That scientific research is desirable, no one will deny. Whether every project is necessary and whether it should be pursued at this moment is another question.

There is not any doubt in my mind that waste and duplication is resulting; that research programs are being conducted at the Government's expense which would and should be carried on by private enterprise if Uncle Sam were not so liberal with the taxpayers' dollars; and that agency upon agency has sponsored research projects not because they are in the national interest but as a means of expending surplus funds before the close of a fiscal year.

This is the most important measure that has been before us this session. It is our duty to not only appropriate funds for research but to see that they are spent wisely. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, research is essential, but the cost of research is exceedingly high.

I am strongly in favor of adoption of the pending resolution, House Resolution 504, to create a select committee to make a complete, full, and thorough investigation of the numerous research programs being conducted by sundry departments and agencies of the Federal Government. I congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], the author of the pending resolution, for his leadership in presenting this resolution, and I wish him and his committee every success as they undertake the exceedingly important investigation proposed.

Today the Federal Government is spending vast sums for research all over the lot. This expenditure of the taxpayers' money is reaching the point where there must be a complete and accurate accounting and a proper coordination of the various programs for research financed by the funds appropriated by the Congress. It is estimated that some $15 billion in Federal funds will be spent on research during the current fiscal year. More than 20 different agencies and departments of the Government are involved in the administration and allocation of these research dollars.

The Committee on Appropriations almost daily is confronted with fund requests for research, and my own Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations receives the gigantic request for research funds from the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, and others. The Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations also must deal with the research request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

From my experience with these agencies and others, I believe the passage of this resolution and the establishment of a select committee to study and make recommendations regarding the allocation of Federal research funds will be most useful and a distinct public service.

In order to prevent duplication and waste, I feel that it is necessary that a complete and thorough investigation be made into all aspects of research and development programs in order that the Congress may have the benefit of the full picture—a coordinated and complete report on the entire cost of research and all its aspects.

This is not to criticize the present committees who must pass on research programs in their specific fields. Each in its own category is doing an excellent job; but the limitations of jurisdiction, time, and staff allow each committee only a partial view of the overall situation. Each committee does not, and is not, expected to be completely apprised of research and development spending by agencies in categories which do not come under the jurisdiction of the specific committee.

Concerning the question of duplication of committee jurisdiction, I do not feel that a select committee appointed for the overall purpose of coordinating research and development information would duplicate or usurp the jurisdiction of any present committee. The Select Committee on Small Business is interested in small business having an opportunity to participate in research and development contracts and has held hearings and made recommendations in this regard.

Let me assure you that, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I do not feel that the adoption of this resolution would in any way deprive the House Small Business Committee of its jurisdiction and its responsibility to protect the interest of small business. On the contrary, I feel that the facts which will be developed should be of great assistance to my committee and its staff in securing contract opportunities for small business. Moreover, the report should be of invaluable assistance to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be adopted. I am pleased to urge passage of the pending resolution.

In this connection, I wish to insert an editorial from the August 12, 1963, edition of the Murfreesboro, Tenn., Daily News Journal, pointing to the need for appropriate action in this area by the Congress:

QUESTION OF NECESSITY

> Research has become a magic word. To suggest that some of it may be a waste of time and money is to invite an accusation of anti-intellectualism. Since no one wants to be labeled a foe of progress, Congress has been generous in considering requests for research appropriations.
>
> But the Federal Government's expenditures for research have now climbed to $14 billion a year. And members of the House Rules Committee contend the time has come to ask some questions.
>
> Federal funds now pay for more than two-thirds of all research and development. Two-thirds go to private industry, 10 percent to universities and other nonprofit institutions and the remainder is used by Government scientists.
>
> Rules Committee members do not question the importance and value of research, but they are convinced Congress ought to have a clearer understanding of what the taxpayer is getting for all those billions.
>
> One of the aspects that troubles them is considerable evidence of duplicated effort, even within single agencies. The projected investigation will seek to discover whether there are any facilities for coordinating the various research programs, including grants to colleges and universities.
>
> Only a few weeks ago the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching raised some disturbing questions about the impact on the universities and colleges of vast grants for scientific research. And long before that educators were insisting that too much is being spent on research and not enough for improving the quality of teaching.
>
> It has been charged that Federal research grants have actually drawn many of the best teachers away from the classroom. These complaints presumably will be examined in the House investigation.
>
> In view of rising criticism, Congress is stepping in at an opportune moment. Research is of such fundamental importance in the advancement of knowledge, in the development of the Nation's economy and the strengthening of its security that frivolous, wasteful and misdirected projects which could discredit it should not be permitted to continue.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays 0, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—336

Abele
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell

Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clausen,
  Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney

Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten

Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—97

Abbitt
Adair
Ashbrook
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bromwell
Brotzman
Bruce
Buckley
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Derwinski
Diggs
Flynt
Ford
Gallagher
Gathings
Gilbert
Goodell
Green, Oreg.

Gubser
Hansen
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kilburn
Kirwan
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
McLoskey
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Monagan
Montoya
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski

Pepper
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
St. George
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sisk
Snyder
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Vinson
Watts
Whitten
Wickersham

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Berry.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Libonati with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Short.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Baring.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Leggett with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Gathings.

Mr. HAGEN of California and Mr. DINGELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just agreed to immediately prior to the vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERSHIP OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE RESEARCH PROGRAMS CONDUCTED BY OR SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 504, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Investigate Research Programs Conducted by or Sponsored by the Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government the following Members of the House: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN].

DROPOUTS TO STAY IN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues may know, the problem of dropouts in public schools has long been a severe one. Last spring, in an effort to counteract the situation, the Attorney General and a number of Members of Congress, myself included, visited a large number of high schools in the District of Columbia in order to persuade the students that it is in their best interests to stay in school to complete their education. Fall enrollment figures indicate that this effort was spectacularly successful, for the dropout rate fell sharply.

However, an equally serious problem has now arisen. With the resulting higher school enrollment, added to the increased numbers due to other factors, schools in the District of Columbia and surrounding area are crowded to the bursting point, and there exists a severe shortage of qualified teachers. Thus the number of pupils per class has risen far above educationally acceptable levels.

I submit that it is the responsibility of this Congress to assure that the faith these students have shown in us, by following our advice in such large numbers, has not been misplaced, and that these young people have not returned to school only to be disillusioned. This would make programs to reduce dropouts merely a cruel hoax, and would serve to increase despair and hopelessness.

We must move as quickly as possible to provide the necessary funds to enable the District of Columbia school system to meet its responsibilities successfully.

FINO PROPOSES MODERNIZED SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate my longtime concern with the purpose of bringing the American social security system up to date. We have, I suggest, allowed ourselves to revise the system in a piecemeal fashion through the years, patching it up here, and patching it up there. But we have still retained a stereotyped image of its purpose which dates back almost three decades. This image assumes that most people will be able to continue on their jobs until they reach age 65 and then, quite abruptly, will retire to make room for younger workers to take over their jobs. For some people this is possible. But, in a fast-moving atomic-automated world, this is not possible for very many older people.

Some of them are finding it possible to continue on in their jobs after 65—and for these people our social security plan provides a penalty in the form of the so-called earnings limitation. This provision reduces the amount of the benefit—to which they have become entitled on the basis of their contribution to the system—or cancels it entirely if they work after retirement age and earn too much money. Most of them are finding that they are prematurely retired before 65 because, if their job is moved to another part of the country, or swallowed up by automation, it is practically impossible for them to find another because they are stigmatized as "older workers."

It is, I believe, precisely because we have failed to recognize that the stereotyped pattern of the past is no longer appropriate for our social security system in today's world, that our present plan has, for too many people, become a sort of bingo game. If you happen to have hit the right number at the right age, you are in. If not, you are out. I would like today to outline my own proposals for a modernized social security plan which will recognize modern conditions by reaching down to take care of those people who are prematurely retired by "progress" in our industrial and economic structure, and by removing present penalties for those workers who are fortunate enough to continue as workers beyond their specified retirement age. I believe, too, that we must update the survivors and dependents provisions of our social security plan, round out the system's coverage to include practically all of our working population, and improve the protection provided by the present minimum benefit.

Here are my specific proposals toward this goal.

First, as to those older workers who find it impossible to continue on their jobs or to find jobs: The fact that times have changed in this respect is brought out in the most recent overall report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, "Developments in Aging, 1959–63." The report reads:

> In the context of health and welfare problems and services, the "older" person is usually thought of as a person at or beyond retirement age—generally speaking, 65 years of age or over. In the context of employment, however, the term "older workers" starts with those in the middle years. Thus the person who becomes unemployed as he approaches or enters the middle years finds himself in an increasingly unfavorable position.
>
> Arbitrary age barriers to employment result from the fact that employment practices have failed to accommodate themselves to profound population changes. While the increase in the number of persons 45 years of age and over has far outstripped the growth rate for the population as a whole, and while life expectancy has increased, worklife expectancy has decreased. At the same time, society itself has created unnecessary obstacles to employment of older people, which have no factual basis or moral justification* * *. Unfavorable beliefs and generalizations about older persons have grown up and have been translated into restrictive policies and practices * * *. In addition, extended unemployment at this stage of his working life can mean reduced social security pension benefits upon retirement, thus creating additional future problems not only for the worker himself but for the economy and society in general.

In the face of such conditions, our stereotyped social security plan still holds to age 65 as the appropriate retirement age, with a slight modification. If, for example, people apply at age 62 they can receive benefits but they will be penalized for doing so in that the amount of benefits they will receive for the rest of their life will be proportionately reduced because they have found it necessary, in the face of modern circumstances, to apply for benefits prior to age 65. Widows are the single exception. They can receive full benefits at age 62.

The very least we can do, Mr. Speaker, is to write into law the provision which was adopted by the House of Representatives back in 1955, and later, unfortunately, watered down by Senate action. I refer to the House action which made all women—wives and women workers as well as widows—eligible for full benefits at age 62. I find it particularly hard to explain to a woman worker, who has qualified for benefits on the basis of her own contributions, why she must be penalized by a reduced benefit because she finds it impossible to wait out the years until she reaches 65 in order to qualify for a full benefit. My bill, H.R. 3683, would reinstate the House action in 1956 by paying full benefits to all women at age 62.

But the problem of staying on the job until 65 is not, of course, limited to women. It is, perhaps, much graver in the case of the family breadwinner, who is usually a man worker. Existing law allows men to retire at age 62, but the penalty, in this case, is even greater than in the case of wives and women workers because his benefit is gaged to a 65-year worklife. It is therefore further reduced for any period between age 62 and 65 during which he receives benefits. It follows that the benefit his wife or any other dependents will receive is also reduced because they are based upon the amount of benefit he receives. Again, the very least we can do, it seems to me, is to make allowance for the fact that men may find themselves forced to apply for benefits at age 62—with full knowledge of the penalties they are incurring—because of acute unemployment conditions in this country: A circumstance which most severely affects men in their sixties. My bill, H.R. 4382, would specify that, when the President determines that such a period of acute unemployment exists, all individuals otherwise eligible may retire with full benefits at age 60. This is really a minor change, but it does, at least, recognize that unemployment, particularly in times of a depressed labor market, is a most serious problem for older men and women.

These proposals are, as I have said, very modest and very minimal first steps toward the updating of our social security plan. For I am convinced today, as I have been for many years, that ultimately the best way to modernize our social security system to meet contemporary conditions is to reduce the eligibility age to age 60 for men and age 55 for women so that they can qualify for full benefits at that time. My record will show that this is no new idea, as far as I am concerned, for I have repeatedly advocated this change in previous Congresses. My bill, H.R. 2005 in the present Congress, would bring about this important improvement in our social security plan.

Let me say, on this subject, that I have not disregarded the arguments which have been made in the past that this is a radical measure which would encourage all men at age 60 and all women at age 55 to rush to the social security office to apply for benefits, and therefore place a heavy burden on the fund. I have not disregarded them, but I have not been persuaded that this would result. It is hard to convince me that the present average old-age benefit of around $75 a month is sufficient inducement to lure people away from their jobs and into retirement. Most Americans, I have always been convinced, much prefer to stay on the job as long as they can. It is only when they are forced by circumstances beyond their control—notably unemployment or illness—to leave that job that they are penalized by our present age restrictions. Our unemployment insurance plans, which are geared to the concept that unemployment is a temporary phenomenon so that a benefit schedule limited to a certain number of weeks will suffice until the worker reenters the labor market, is almost totally obsolete as it applies to the "disemployed" and displaced older worker. By lowering the retirement age in our social security plan to age 55 for women and to age 60 for men, we will recognize—at least at those ages—that these people who qualify have, indeed, been forcibly retired by the facts of our times. For one startling fact that we must face, as the Senate Special Committee on Aging pointed out, is that work-life expectancy has been greatly reduced in the modern American economy, leaving in its wake very serious and tragic problems for many American families.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I believe we must also recognize that the stereotype that all workers continue to work until their 65th birthday and then abruptly retire must give way to the reality of our times by recognizing that current conditions call for a flexible retirement age allowing also for those people who are physically able to work, and are fortunate enough to be allowed to work, beyond age 65. Present social security penalizes these people in two ways: First, it reduces or cancels benefits to which they are otherwise entitled, because they continue to work; and, second, it continues to exact from them the social security tax upon their wages. My bills would remove this double penalty. H.R. 4724 would allow a worker over 65 to elect to have his wages not taxed for social security purposes. Another of my bills, H.R. 3177, would remove the present penalty for continuing to work beyond retirement age by canceling altogether the so-called earnings limitation which presently applies.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I realize that the Congress has, repeatedly in the past, recognized the inequities imposed by this earnings limitation and has attempted to overcome them by liberalizing the amounts which can be earned and mitigating, to some degree, the confiscation of benefit amounts. But I must say, in all frankness, that these liberalizations have produced such an unwieldy and complicated set of rules that it is almost impossible to explain to social security beneficiaries, what they can—and cannot—do within the law. Yet, if they fail to meet this very complex and quixotic set of rules they can find themselves, a year later, deprived of benefits at a time when they most need them because, at this point of time, they are without work. It is clear to me that the more we have tried to overcome inequities, in our attempts to achieve a more equitable adjustment to this situation, the more anomalies we have created because, in reality, the concept of an "earnings limitation" is beyond reason and beyond repair. I am convinced that the only equitable solution is to quit fiddling with a concept which is inherently wrong, and to remove it entirely from our social security plan.

I have said that I am also greatly concerned with updating certain of the provisions of our present social security law which affect the eligible survivors and dependents of workers who have died. I am, for example, particularly concerned with the provision which, since 1939, has stopped benefits for surviving and dependent children at age 18. At a time when we are, in the national interest and in their own interest, exerting every effort to encourage our young people to get as much schooling as they can possibly get, it seems to me that the least we can do with respect to our social security plan is to continue to pay benefits to the child—in theory entitled to a child's benefits because family income has been reduced by the death or retirement of the father—as long as he is regularly attending school. I am happy to see that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], has recognized the importance of updating our social security plan in this respect by providing in his bill, H.R. 6688, that benefits will be continued for a child attending school until age 22. I would applaud such legislation but my bill, H.R. 4239, would go a small step further to continue the benefits beyond 21, provided, of course, he is regularly attending school, and also by continuing to pay the full mother's benefit, not included in H.R. 6688, for this school period.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that existing law abruptly reduces family income when the youngest surviving or dependent child reaches age 18 because it not only cancels the child's benefit, but also the benefit paid on behalf of the mother of that child. In an uncertain labor market, the mother is thus thrust into the working world which she left many years ago to raise her family. My bill, H.R. 4438, would continue the mother's benefit at half of the amount she received while she had a child in her care—or three-eighths rather than three-fourths of the deceased husband's benefit amount—to mitigate, to some degree, this abrupt and unreasonable cutoff of all benefits. Again I must urge that this is a really modest proposal which fails of my full objective, in that it provides only a token payment, but this, I submit, is better than the existing arbitrary cancellation of all benefits.

I am also convinced that our present plan has failed to provide the protection they should have to a small, but very deserving group of men and women—such as those women who may have stayed at home to keep house in the motherless home of a widowed brother to care for his children. She is therefore dependent upon him, but cannot qualify for dependent's benefits after the children are grown and she reaches retirement age. My bill, H.R. 3857, would provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for such brothers, sisters, and other relatives of individuals who die fully insured, leaving no other eligible dependents, if these relatives had been receiving at least one-half of their support from him at the time of his death, and have not married since the individual's death.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, with those people who are receiving the minimum benefit under the social security system, often because their earnings were low during their working years—a fact which, of course, has also made it more difficult for them to make other provision for their years of retirement. The importance of providing an adequate minimum benefit has been recognized repeatedly by the Congress—its amount having been increased on five occasions in the past. The present administration took the position, early in 1961, that a substantial upward adjustment of the then minimum of $33 a month was one of five adjustments to existing circumstances which must be made. In his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 9, 1961, the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, stated:

> We propose that the present minimum monthly benefits of $33 be raised to $43. This change will provide additional income under the social security program to an estimated 2,455,000 people during the first 12 months of operation. The total additional benefits that will be paid out during this period will be $255 million.
>
> People who are getting benefits at the minimum not only have low old-age and survivors' insurance benefits but are less likely than other beneficiaries to have other retirement income. In a survey of beneficiaries made in 1957 it was found that at least half of the married couples had no other independent money retirement income in those cases where the insured worker's benefit was at the minimum. Generally, these are people who when the work they did was brought into the social security program were already old or ill and were not able to build up substantial benefit rights. An increase in the minimum to $43 will tend to compensate for the fact that their work was not covered when they were younger.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Secretary RIBICOFF that we are here concerned with a group of beneficiaries who have been penalized chiefly because they were specifically and compulsorily excluded from our social security system for many years. This occurred because we did not, until the 1950 amendments, make the decision as to whether we would confine our social security plan to workers in commerce and industry—roughly 6 out of 10—or whether we would make it a truly national system for all of the working people in the country. It is on behalf of the people Secretary RIBICOFF has described that my bill, H.R. 2006, is introduced. The Secretary recommended an increase in the minimum from $33 to $43 a month. The Congress adopted an increase to $40 a month in 1961. My bill, for the reasons specified above, would increase the minimum to $50 on behalf of some of the most needy and most deserving of our older citizens.

Finally, toward the end of closing the one large and gaping exclusion of coverage which remains in achieving the goal of making our social security plan truly national in scope, my bill, H.R. 4723, would, at long last, extend the protection of social security to employees of the Federal Government. It is a little ironic, it seems to me, that the Congress has, beginning with the 1950 amendments, found it possible and desirable to extend the coverage of the social security system to practically all the rest of our working population—the self-employed including most professional groups, employees of nonprofit institutions, farm and domestic workers, and employees of State and local governments. But it has not, in all this time, found it possible to include the employees who serve the Government itself—the Federal employee. I know that one reason is the fact that the Government has made provision for a separate retirement system for its employees, and I applaud this action. But it is hard for me to understand why our Federal employees should not also be able to enjoy the advantages which accrue in a reasonably similar situation to employees of State and local governments—also with their own State or local retirement plan—who have been able to combine the particular advantages of their own plan with the particular advantages of a plan which applies to all of the workers in the country, wherever they are. The net result, Mr. Speaker, is that the man or woman who works in Government for a number of years, and then returns to other employment—or, for that matter, the man or woman who leaves other employment to join the Government—is penalized. In one case he shows no earnings for this period and his average monthly wage, upon which his social security benefits are computed, is thereby reduced. In the other case he forfeits the money he has contributed to the social security program.

I recognize that there are some Government workers who would suffer from an abrupt and compulsory coverage of all Federal workers, and so my bill—as has been the case with many State and local employees in the same situation—allows an election upon the part of the individual Government worker, on the date the coverage becomes effective, as to whether or not he will choose social security coverage. This allows for the temporary inequities which can occur when two retirement systems are geared together for the better protection of everyone. At the same time, I am convinced that most Federal employees, now and in the future, will gain better and more complete protection against their retirement years, by incorporating their rights as Federal workers with their rights as American workers under the provisions of my bill.

Mr. Speaker, much as I would like to see my social security program enacted by this Congress, in this session, in its entirety, I realize that I may be disappointed in some respects at least. I have addressed the House in some detail as to the improvements which must, I genuinely believe, be made in our social security system. It has served us well in the past, but we must not be content with that. I am greatly concerned—and I shall continue to be concerned—that a system which is so intimately related to the security of practically every American family and every American worker is one which adjusts to the changing needs of our people as they are affected by the changing conditions in which they live and work. My overwhelming concern and my unswerving purpose in my legislative program with respect to the social security plan is that the Congress of the United States must always be willing to abandon the stereotypes of the past, and alert to the changing needs and changing times in which our people are living. In our goals for the social security of our people, as in all of our national goals, we must follow the course of enlightened courage, rather than craven caution. To this end, I submit my current program, and my call for action.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MELVIN J. MAAS

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **THOMPSON** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, oldtimers in the Congress will recall the service here of Melvin J. Maas, a Member from Minnesota, in the years between two World Wars. Oldtimers in the Marine Corps will also recall him as a pilot who made a splendid record in World War II.

Later, he came to Marine Corps headquarters where he and I served, side by side, and shared the responsibilities of the Marine Corps Reserve.

I like to think that we had much to do with the shaping of the Reserve as we now know it.

You could not know Mel in any capacity without being impressed with his tremendous vitality, his personal courage, his dynamic leadership, and his farsightedness. I have seen him plenty mad at times, but I have never seen him downhearted.

After the war, Mel was troubled by some ill health which, if he had not been so all-fired ornery, might well have killed him. He came through it all with his personal colors still flying high even though, among other things, he lost his eyesight. Blindness to him was a challenge; and if he ever regarded it as an adversity, nobody knows it.

To this day, he is busying himself with the affairs of the President's Commission for the Employment of the Handicapped, of which he is the Chairman.

In an article from the current issue of the American Legion magazine, a copy of which follows, Mel gives some mighty good advice to anyone who may be thrown into contact with blind people. There is a lesson in it of which you will be conscious as you read the lines and what is between the lines.

HOW NOT TO HELP THE BLIND

(By Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, retired)

The one thing the blind wish people with sight would remember is this: The blind cannot see.

Sight is so natural that those blessed with it accept it as a matter of course, not only for themselves but for everybody around them—including the blind.

So you have your sight, and you want to know how to help the blind? Well, close your eyes and think of the Golden Rule. If you were blind, how would you want to be helped?

This will put you in the proper frame of mind for the good intentions department, but it takes more than good intentions to help the blind. It takes certain techniques based on commonsense, with imagination and ingenuity thrown in for good measure.

Let's say you are going to escort a blind person. Please, don't grab him by the forearm and shove him ahead of you. This may give you the strong, good feeling of helping, but you're being anything but helpful.

When you "escort" us that way, we are out in front of you, and, therefore, we never know what's coming—curbstones, slopes, doorways, steps, trees, fire hydrants, telephone poles, people, dogs, cats, what-have-you.

The proper way is to have the blind person take your arm and follow slightly behind you. In this way, we will pretty well know everything you're going to do—start, stop, turn right, turn left, go upstairs, go downstairs, pause to eye a pretty blonde. An almost imperceptible movement of your arm telegraphs to us what's to come. You didn't know that, did you?

Soon after I lost my sight I attempted to educate everyone with whom I came in contact on the proper way to escort a blind person. I quickly gave up. A few moments after I had coaxed a friend into allowing me to take his arm, he would twist it out of my grasp, grip my arm hard, propel me ahead of him, and away we'd go.

On my travels I was usually with three or four different strangers each day, most of whom I knew I would never meet again. It was impossible to try to educate them all, so I shrugged my shoulders and decided to take my bruises like a man.

I recall returning from trips of 2 to 3 weeks—in a different city every day, being "led" by as many as 40 different people—with everything from bruised shins to broken ribs.

There are quite a few handy "tricks" in guiding the blind.

What about stairs?

Some sighted people count out loud—and so very, very loud—the number of steps, one by one. The counting is wasted. All it accomplishes is our complete mortification.

Whisper to us, in advance, your guess as to the number of steps and whether they go up or down. This is helpful, but not absolutely necessary. If you assist us the right way—with us taking your arm and following slightly behind—we will know when the top or bottom of the staircase is reached.

When we approach a flight of stairs or a curb, it's helpful if you "square around" so that you and we are both facing the steps or curb head on. Pardon the repetition, but remember, we can't see. It might surprise you to realize how easy it is to fall when we think we're at right angles with a step and we're not. Either we put our foot where there's no step, and boom, down we go; or our foot unexpectedly collides with a curb or step, and boom, up we go.

We blind often debate in private whether it's better to fall down or fall up. Personally, I prefer to fall down. It at least gives me the chance to regain my balance before I actually hit ground. I've been remarkably lucky in recovering balance in downward falls. I haven't been quite so lucky in upward falls and have had some lulus falling up flights of stairs. To tell the truth, the blind don't fall very gracefully up or down. So square us off in order that we won't have to make the choice.

Which arm, right or left?

Most of the blind who use canes have become accustomed to holding the cane in their right hands. I have. This being so, it's easier for us if you offer your right arm for our left hand.

Very often we don't need a cane at all, if we are being guided by an experienced person; nevertheless, we like to carry it to measure the height of curbs, steps and the like.

Now, what about elevators?

Do you like to dance? We blind do—but on a dance floor, not in an elevator. All too often, the most awkward "swing your partner" routine takes place in small, crowded elevators. Picture the scene: a sighted person leads a blind one into an elevator. They're facing the rear and, of course, they have to turn around to face the front. But what usually happens is the sighted person swings his blind companion around him, while he's standing in one spot. This can be quite a strain, not only for the blind person, but for all the other riders whose ribs are suddenly poked and whose toes are suddenly stepped on.

The right way is to place the blind person in a space in the elevator, so that he can turn around in the same spot. You, then, take the necessary steps to move around him and get back on his proper side. It's much easier for you to avoid toe-stepping than it is for him.

We face still another problem in self-operating elevators. Most folk—even those knowledgeable about helping the blind—think it's safer to shove us into the elevator ahead of them, so that the door won't suddenly close on us. We appreciate their thoughtfulness, but wish they'd let us follow rather than lead. Leading the way into a self-operating elevator can be terrifying: we've heard of instances of elevator doors opening when the elevator was not there.

How about going through doorways?

If you are guiding the blind person the right way, he is alongside you, a step or so behind. When you come to a door, he needs as much space to enter as you. Sometimes, without thinking, you walk in blithely, while he bumps suddenly into the door jamb. The proper thing to do is turn and step sideways, particularly if the doorway is rather narrow. The blind person will do likewise, even without being told. The upshot: no bruised bodies.

There may be occasions—narrow doorways, escalators, aisles of trains or airplanes—when it isn't practical for the blind person to follow you by taking your arm. In such cases he can get along by just touching your shoulder or back, if you don't move too fast. Don't crawl; just walk a tiny bit slower than usual.

Try an experiment. Have a friend face you and ask you to move to the right. Then do what he says; move to your right. Nine out of ten times, the friend will tell you you're wrong. He meant his right; you moved to your right. If he's facing you, his right is your left.

Now what if you were blind? What if directions to move to the right or left meant the difference between falling off a curb or not falling off a curb? Which way would you move—right or left?

After 10 years of blindness, I've learned to move to the left when a voice in front of me tells me to move to the right; and to move to the right when that voice tells me to move to the left (unless I recognize the voice as someone thoroughly used to working with the blind).

All of which is something else to keep in mind in your dealings with a blind person. The blind may not see you, but they hear you. So let's turn now to the matter of hearing.

Somehow, many people shout at us, rather than speak to us in a normal tone. We can't see, and somehow they think we can't hear, either. Please, don't shout; we can hear you.

Other people won't speak directly to us. They address themselves to our companions. The stewardess on a plane, for example, might ask the fellow next to me: "What's his name? How far is he going?" Or a waiter will ask my sighted friend: "What does he want to eat?"

You can speak to us; we won't bite you.

We do have our problems of determining exactly where you are when you're speaking. A voice directly in front of us sounds exactly the same as a voice directly in back of us. We tell the direction of sounds by the differential in the intensity in each ear. When the intensity is equal in both ears, we know the source is directly in front or directly in back of us. The problem is, which? You have to let us know.

We are trained to look directly at the source of a voice, but occasionally we do get crossed up. I recall many a time conducting an animated conversation with the amplifier of a loudspeaker, looking it squarely in the eye, thinking it was a person, while the person himself was away off in some other corner of the hall, talking into a microphone.

There are a few things you should remember when you attend a gathering with us.

Some of us (myself included) find it difficult to stand up for long periods of time without being able to touch something—a wall, a table, anything. We have a tendency to lose our balance if we can't keep a finger on a fixed object. You'd lose your balance, too, if you stood for a long while in absolute darkness. Your sight helps to give stability and maintain your equilibrium; since we have no sight, our touch maintains ours.

So it's thoughtful to ask a blind person if he would like to sit down, even at a party.

If he says, "Yes," it's not enough to tell him there's a chair "over there," and nod your head in the general direction. Nor is it enough to take his arm, lead him to the chair and tell him, "Okay, sit."

The proper way is to offer him your arm, lead him to the chair, gently turn him around, place his hand on the arm of the chair and let him know whether the chair seat is to the right or left of the chair arm (his right or left, not yours).

My over-6-foot son developed a sure-fire, if not very delicate, way of helping me sit. He takes hold of my shoulders from in front, pushes me backward until I reach the chair, then—still holding my shoulders so I don't sit down too soon—commands: "Now squat." It never fails.

All right, I'm seated. What next?

Don't ever put a glassful of liquid—spirituous or otherwise—in front of me without telling me. If I don't know it's there, I'm apt to knock it over. Also, don't refill my coffee cup with scalding hot coffee without informing me. I'm likely to take a big gulp, thinking it's as cool as when I last sipped it.

And now it's time for dinner. What in the world are you going to do now that the meal has started?

If the dinner includes steak or roast beef or somesuch, don't hesitate to offer to cut it up for us. Believe me, we won't be embarrassed, after all, we blind like to eat, too.

Many of us use the "clock" method for finding our food. We assume our plate is the face of a clock. Twelve o'clock is opposite and farthest away. All you need do is tell us, for instance, that our potatoes are from 12 to 3, our peas from 3 to 6, our meat from 6 to 12.

We find it handy to use a piece of bread or a roll as a pusher, to help us keep the food on the plate. So you might offer to butter us a roll before we start eating, and place it in our hand. And please, if you cut our meat, place the fork in our other hand. That way we won't have to grope for it and possibly come up with a handful of gravy instead.

The dinner is over; we're leaving the party; you graciously offer to drive us home. We'll need a little advice getting into your car. The standard advice seems to be, "Now, don't bump your head." That's not very helpful.

What you should do is place our hand on the edge of the open door, or on the top of the door frame of the open door, or even on the handle of the closed door. We can usually take it from there.

Also, it would aid us if you'd let us know which side of your car we're getting into. It's not enough to say, "On your right" or "On your left." What does that mean? That the car is on my right side? Or that I'm getting into the right side of the car? Be specific.

I prefer to sit in the back seat of a car for two reasons. First, I'm an inveterate cigar smoker and the front seat ashtray of most autos is on the dashboard near the driver. I'm always afraid of getting my hand tangled in the steering wheel. Second, if there are more than two of us in the car, it seems a pity to waste the view from the front seat, since I can't see it anyway. Let someone sit up there who can enjoy it.

If you're a poor parker and end up several feet from the curb, please tell us, so we can avoid stumbling when getting out of the car.

Do the blind get any fun out of going to a movie? We certainly do, and you can help heighten our enjoyment with just a little whispered explanation now and then.

It's frustrating to hear a sudden roar of laughter—yours included—caused by some action on the screen not apparent from the dialog. Tell us what's happening, between guffaws.

It's equally frustrating to sit through long, tense moments of silence, as the villain quietly sneaks up on the hero. Tell us, please.

The blind can find enjoyment in sightseeing, too—with a word of explanation now and then. Some time ago, I toured East Berlin with a State Department aid who gave me such a vivid description of the sights as we drove around that I fully "saw" them in my mind. When I returned to Washington, I was able to relay complete descriptions—even down to the way people were dressed and the expressions on their faces.

"Guess who, Mel?"

How I hate those words. Please, please, don't play games on the blind by walking up to us in front of others, and especially in crowded places where it's difficult to distinguish voices, and saying: "You know who I am."

The considerate thing to say in greeting anyone—even with sight—whom you haven't seen in a long time is, "Hello, I'm John Jones."

Once, while lunching with several of my brothers and close friends, a man I hadn't seen or talked to in over 10 years joined our group, not disclosing who he was. Finally he blurted out that irksome remark: "You know who I am, but tell me anyway."

I didn't get the voice, but I tried several names. After the seventh or eighth time he persisted: "Don't you know who I am?"

I was so nettled by then that I blurted out: "No. Furthermore, I don't give a d - - -." He hasn't spoken to me since. Maybe if he reads this, he'll understand, and we can patch up an old friendship.

I started off telling you that the blind can't see. Well, they can't read, either. Which leads me to some advice on reading to the blind.

If you are reading to us in public, do it as unobtrusively as you can. We don't appreciate your reading in such a way as to make clear to every passerby that you're doing a good deed for some helpless blind guy.

If you read the caption on a cartoon or comic strip, give us a short description of the picture as well as the words. It makes all the difference in the world in our enjoyment.

Among the best readers of comics I have ever met was an 11-year-old girl who sat next to me on a plane from Chicago to Washington. After we had become acquainted, she began reading her comic books to me. Thoughtfully, she gave me a brief but adequate description of each picture, and she read with remarkable feeling and interpretation. I enjoyed it immensely, and was sorry when the flight came to an end.

Airplane flights lead to travel; travel leads to hotel rooms. And that leads me to some suggestions about how you can help us orient ourselves to hotel rooms in strange cities.

At least in my case, I find it easier if you start orienting me at the door, and proceed with me as I make a complete circuit of the room.

I like to stop at the closet and "see" the arrangement of hooks, hangers, shelves, and the like. Then I proceed to whatever comes—desk, dresser, chairs, windows, radiator, air-conditioner controls. In the bathroom, I like to be shown the washbasin, tub or shower faucets, location of towels, electric outlet for my razor, and other details.

In one city I had a hair-raising experience that taught me a lesson. I was accompanied to my hotel room by a group that had met me at the airport. Thoughtfully, someone took my hat and coat, hung them up in the closet and steered me over to a chair. Only whoever it was forgot to tell me where the closet was. We had a lively discussion of what I was to talk about at a luncheon the next day, and I was never given the chance to familiarize myself with the room.

After all had gone, I prepared for bed. Before taking off my suit, I opened what I thought was the closet door. "My," I thought, what a large walk-in closet." As soon as I stepped in, the door snapped shut behind me. I couldn't open it. Imagine my consternation when I discovered that I was out in the hall, locked out of my room, without the key. Some other kind soul had placed the key on the dresser.

It was midnight, and not a soul was around. I felt my way up and down the hall, listening at doors in the hope that I would hear somebody not asleep whom I could ask for help. Not a sound.

I began to worry that somebody might see me and call the police to report a sneak thief, a prowler, or a Peeping Tom. By this time I had lost track of my own room. I looked for the elevators, but either I was too far from them to hear them, or they had stopped running for the night.

Then came one of those rare instances of good luck. I bumped into a table on which there was a house phone. I called the desk and explained my plight. Soon a bellboy arrived with another key. I greeted him like a long-lost brother.

Now I put the key in my pocket as soon as I check in; and I insist on a room near the elevator. This also enables me to navigate to the lobby by myself.

Very often I am asked what kind of people make the best guides or companions for the blind. That's easy.

Even without any particular training, the best companion is the person who is just naturally considerate, thoughtful and kind, and interested in others. He can project himself into the problems faced by anyone else. Therefore he's quick to anticipate the needs of the blind, such as adequate warning of danger, steps, and obstructions. He's quick to introduce you to people around you; to let you know when a newcomer joins the group and what his name is. If he's reading a newspaper, he will ask whether you would like to hear the headlines; and he will read the full story, in case you're interested. Since some of us don't particularly like excessive attention called to our lack of sight, our thoughtful companion will do what has to be done as inconspicuously as possible.

We blind may be handicapped in not being able to see our companions. But we can "see" them in other ways. We can gage them by their actions, their attitudes, the depth of their consideration. And we're seldom wrong. For 10 years I have been totally blind, and I have developed more of an insight into people in that short decade than in my entire previous 54 years.

However, we blind are not nearly as handicapped by the lack of sight as we are by community attitudes toward us. Too many folk think that all the blind are alike; a race apart. We are no more all alike than are all Frenchmen or all Irishmen or all Americans. We are, perhaps, even more individualistic than the average man who can see. Each of us has his own likes, his own moods, his own hopes, his own dreams. And no two of us are alike; no two.

We blind have our complaints and, to be fair about it, much of the fault is our own. Just as we want the sighted to remember that we cannot see, so should we remember that they are not blind, and cannot be expected to know what blindness is. Therefore, they do not always know exactly what we want of them.

My advice to the blind is—be patient with the sighted. Remember, we have a big advantage. We are not handicapped by eyesight.

STUDENTS, SO-CALLED, VISITING CUBA IN DEFIANCE OF OUR LAWS, MUST BE PROSECUTED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Communist-occupied Cuba has presented and continues to present a serious threat to the future of freedom, of law and order and of justice in the Western Hemisphere. Members of the House are keenly aware of that threat. The American people are aware of that threat and their growing concern about that Russian beachhead in the Western Hemisphere is also well known to Members of the House.

It is a grave error to measure the gravity of that threat by comparing the relative military strength of Communist-occupied Cuba with that of the United States. To do so produces an oversimplified and false equation of safety and security for the United States. Those who have engaged in the game of comparing the military strength of Communist-occupied Cuba with that of the United States have sought to paint the picture of a powerful giant confronted by a teenage pygmy. Some artists engaged in this game have gone so far as to paint the powerful giant as quaking in fear of the teenage pygmy. The obvious objective of this game is to heap ridicule upon those who understand the true nature of the threat from Cuba and who call out for purposeful action to meet that threat.

The threat from Communist-occupied Cuba is not primarily military. It is primarily nonmilitary in character. By nonmilitary I mean political, diplomatic, propaganda, economic, and subversive warfare which is being directed against the United States by the Communist regime in Cuba which in turn is aided, abetted, and fully supported by the Russian international conspiracy.

That kind of warfare cannot be met effectively by a complete dependence upon classical military power. At this stage of the contest with the international conspiracy classical military power serves as nothing more than a shield for the safe conduct of the nonmilitary warfare to which I refer. Let there be no mistake about imperial Russia providing the nuclear military shield for the nonmilitary warfare being conducted from their Cuban base of operations. One needs only to reflect upon the implications of the nuclear stalemate propaganda to understand the effectiveness of that Russian shield.

Accordingly, those who argue about "hitting the beaches" or "not hitting the beaches" are simply out of touch with the realities of the war being conducted against the United States and the present status of that war.

A revealing case in point on the nature of the warfare being fought against the United States is demonstrated by the recent, so-called student trip to Cuba. The facts in that case are most revealing. Here again it would be a grave error to equate that trip of 59 so-called students with the protesting antics of a crew of American beatniks or misfits. Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that trip was carefully conceived by agents of imperial Russia, skillfully organized by Russian agents in the United States and fully supported by organs of the international conspiracy. Those conclusions were reached by me after a full day of hearings by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, and based upon an inquiry to determine whether the laws governing issuance and use of a U.S. passport were adequate to protect the security of the United States. The witness before the subcommittee, Mr. Barry Hoffman, who accompanied the so-called student group on the trip to Cuba, provided the subcommittee with complete and indeed startling details about how the trip was organized, the motives of the organizers and participants, the role played by the Castro regime, the collaboration by the Czech Communist regime and the principal characters and organizations involved in the scheme. The subcommittee, on the basis of the evidence presented, reached the conclusion that the so-called student trip to Cuba was a willful, deliberate, and organized violation of law.

But the scheme does not end with this much-publicized trip. It was nothing more than a curtain raiser on a well organized plan to break the ban on unauthorized travel to Cuba by U.S. citizens. The long-range objective is to blackjack the United States into placing the Castro regime in a position of respectability and acceptance in the Western Hemisphere.

According to testimony taken by the subcommittee the Castro regime is prepared to welcome up to 2,000 more so-called students from the United States on January 1, 1964. It just happens that date corresponds with the fifth anniversary of the Castro takeover of Cuba. A well organized plan is in motion to make that invitation a reality.

Further, testimony taken by the subcommittee reveals the following facts:

First. The so-called students involved in this scheme were thoroughly conversant with the official prohibition on travel to Cuba before they departed the United States. They had notice of the prohibition in writing and were advised orally by the ringleaders of the scheme about the prohibition.

Second. The so-called students were warned by American officials along their way to Cuba about the penalties for violating the prohibition. These warnings took place in London, Paris and in Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Third. The so-called students carried on discussions on how to thwart the law and planned their legal defense while in Cuba.

Fourth. Members of this so-called student group made false, derogatory and inflammatory anti-American public speeches while in Cuba.

Fifth. Members of the so-called student group conferred with and consorted with Cuban officials in planning an organized public assault upon the U.S. prohibition against authorized travel to Cuba. These discussions noted the major objective was to break down the prohibition instituted by the United States and thereby to force all other countries to lift their travel and trade bans with Cuba.

Sixth. The so-called students activated while in Cuba a Permanent Student Committee for Travel to Cuba. The correct title of that organization should be the Permanent Student Committee To Violate U.S. Laws. That is the real purpose of the committee.

Seventh. The so-called students while in Cuba made extensive plans to infiltrate the campus of major colleges and universities from New England to California for the purpose of recruiting new law breakers and to encourage new acts of sedition on the American scene.

Eighth. Members of this so-called student group made public speeches while in Cuba indicating the United States as the source of guns and bullets which killed Cubans in an effort to incite hatred and motives of revenge against the Government and people of the United States.

This is but a part, but a highly significant part, of the facts in connection with the recent visit of the so-called students to Cuba. These facts caused the subcommittee to call upon the Attorney General to forthwith present the matter to a Federal grand jury with a view to obtaining indictments against those involved. Time is of the essence in meeting this organized effort to thwart, discredit, and break down the laws of our Nation. The press reports on the activities of these so-called students since their return to the United States make it clear they are losing no time in putting their conspiratorial plans into effect.

THE HONORABLE CARL ELLIOTT OF ALABAMA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in a rare display of unanimity the House of Representatives just passed House Resolution 504. This unanimous vote on the part of the House is a tribute to the distinguished author of this resolution, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elliott]. I know that the entire House notes with pride that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama will serve as chairman of this select committee, a very important and responsible assignment, indeed. He and his colleagues on his committee will do a much needed job for the Congress and the country.

I am sure all Members join with me in commending the gentleman on this very fine effort.

CORN TASSEL NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM OF UNITED STATES

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a proposal to designate the corn tassel as the national floral emblem of the United States. Please note at the outset that I am not suggesting a national flower. Such a selection would be an entirely different thing, and those who desire to designate a national flower may pursue their own course without interference. I am asking that the Congress declare the corn tassel the national floral emblem for the same reasons that the other, older nations of the world have taken such action—to denote that the story of corn belongs in the history and traditions of this Nation, to denote that this Nation owes a debt to the golden grain—to emphasize that the debt has grown from the first days the native Indians of this continent learned to sustain their existence with corn. That debt grows from the time corn was the salvation of our ancestors in Jamestown and Plymouth. The obligation will continue in the future. The place of corn in our history is fascinating and significant. These facts should be emphasized. While other nations have their fleur-de-lis, the thistle, the leek, and the maple leaf, we have no appropriate floral emblem. Those symbols mentioned were selected to memorialize the history and traditions of a particularly grateful nation, not to designate that in some popularity contest their emblem was chosen as the most beautiful thing that grows. In proposing this designation, I also propose that we honor the generations of men and their families who cleared the rocks and the trees from the fields, who first stirred the virgin soil to feed the Nation. Then, through the years, with their diligence and wisdom, and with opportunity offered by America's freedom and rich soil resources, they achieved an amazing productive capacity which is the envy of the world, all the while conserving and improving the native fertility for the benefit of future Americans and those abroad whom we help feed and clothe. We honor, too, those in the laboratories and industries who have discovered uses for a native grain of which our predecessors even a generation ago never dreamed. These are discoveries which gain new importance as we move from the utilization of extractive resources to utilization of annually renewable resources.

Corn is America. Archeologists are seemingly agreed that corn was first developed in some secluded valley of the Andes at least 10,000 years ago. It was probably not noticed by white man until 1492, although it has been written that Leif Erickson discovered the grain in Vinland in 1000 A.D. According to these reports, Erickson called Vinland "the land of maize."

When Christopher Columbus returned to Spain he took with him quantities of seed, reporting to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella that his brother had found "a dense population entirely agricultural, and at one place he passed through 18 miles of cornfields."

Miss Margo Cairns of Washington, D.C., a native midwesterner, has delved deeply into the history of corn and has written many beautiful and thought-provoking pieces on the subject. Among other things, she points out that the Incas called the grain maize. To them it meant "mother," she who sustains us. This "mother," through her amazing largess, gave the Incas freedom for a more urban life, freedom to build spectacular cities, great temples, fabulous roads, to mine the mountains for their ores, and to develop their artistic culture. Men freed from the nomadic life of hunters became agriculturists; others, skilled with their hands, worked with precious metals and dazzling jewels. Women became artists and weaving rare textiles. They hallowed the tassel by varied uses in their temple services. The exquisite replica of a full plant of maize, superbly wrought of gold in the Temple of Cuzco, was a symbol of their gratitude as well as a symbol of peace, industry, and affluence.

Other American Indians built large segments of their religion around the wondrous plant. Corn flour, corncakes, tortillas, gruel, were the staples of the Indian diet. Then came the white man.

The Pilgrims, wasted thin from a 2-month ship diet of salted beef, dried peas, smoked herring, cheese, and hardtack, stepped upon the shore of a lonely, wild, and beautiful land and began their search for food and water. Far back amidst the scrub oak and bayberry bushes they were miraculously led to a mound of sand tightly covered with a woven mat. Within that mound was found a cache of Indian corn. "The golden seed of our bread," William Bradford explained in reverential awe. They kneeled and thanked God. Later, in writing of the Pilgrims, Governor Bradford said:

> They began now highly to prize corn, more precious than silver, and those that had some to spare began to trade one with another for small things—for money they had none, and if they had, corn was preferred before it.

Taught by the Indians, our early settlers learned some of the multiple uses of corn. Grinding it they made cornmeal, and from the cornmeal made mush. They made the meal into journey cakes, or into pone which went with them on their hunting and exploring trips. Hominy was another satisfying novelty.

The settlers learned that the new grain was not wasteful. The amazing maize of the New World formed in neat, husk-wrapped packages. They learned, too, that maize would grow wherever they planted it. They could not contemplate that future scientists would develop better and better corn which would flourish in every section of the Nation with increasing abundance. Later at Valley Forge, a handful of parched corn was often the daily ration of the American patriot fighting for liberty. Dr. Kenneth Wells, president of the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge, has said:

> This Nation could not have fed itself through the years had it not been for maize, Indian corn. More than any other bloom in the beauty of God's garden, the corn tassel exemplifies the food by which Americans under our free system have been fed. May the means come to make this essential blossom the symbol of America, both fed and free.

The story of corn has not ended. In 1960 the farm value of the corn crop of this Nation was $4,229,099,000, based on farm value. These figures do not reflect benefits to the economy of the poultry, hogs, cattle, and sheep which are fed on corn or corn products. Nor is there an accurate reflection of the industrial uses of corn which is utilized for cellulose products, chemical, oil, plastics, abrasives, and its numerous uses for human food consumption.

The Corn Industry Research Foundation in its July 1963, publication, notes the unlocking of future developments in the field of corn research. There appears a new word, "Chemurgenetics", which describes the processes of breeding plants for specific industrial uses and which is derived from two words—chemurgy and genetics. It combines the meanings of each to emphasize the cooperative nature of a new field. New seed has been developed which changes the starch composition of corn, making it more attractive for diverse industrial uses. However, the research foundation notes that "changing the starch composition is not the only chemurgenetics area of interest in the corn kernel. Since corn is the most widely used agricultural raw material for industrial products and processes and since more is known about the genetics of corn than of any other crop, it is not surprising that many of the early developments of chemurgenetics are with corn. A number of programs are now underway to breed corn with special qualities."

The future holds great promise.

Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1963, with the four lady members of the Iowa House leading the way, that legislative body passed a resolution calling on Congress to designate the corn tassel as the floral emplem. The 104 house members present adopted that resolution unanimously. Representative Frances G. Hakes on that occasion said:

> The corn tassel is the symbol of Jamestown and Plymouth, of the War of Independence, of hearty pioneers who trod the wilderness road across our great Nation. The corn tassel is a symbol of this Nation's rapid progress and its present prosperity.

In presenting this bill, Mr. Speaker, I am joined in its support by other Members of the Iowa delegation, Mr. Jensen, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Gross, Mr. Schwengel, and Mr. Bromwell.

STEEL MILL AT BOKARO, INDIA

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, news reports indicate that the Government of India is withdrawing its request for American funds to construct a steel mill at Bokaro in India. Thus, the United States will not spend tax funds of American citizens for the construction of what the majority of the Congress believed was an inefficient, impractical, costly, and unwise installation.

It is my opinion that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield] had not proceeded so diligently with his work on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and had he not had the courage to pursue the subject when his information was first challenged, this project would have remained in the foreign aid authorization. Mr. Broomfield thus saved this Congress and the country from making a costly mistake.

Three of the major amendments in the authorization bill were authored by the gentleman from Michigan. In each of these instances there was full discussion on the floor of the House. Given the facts, this body supported these amendments.

Mr. Broomfield is not an obstructionist. He has supported the aid program. It is his desire to make this program work as a part of a constructive foreign policy which will serve this Nation and the free world. His fairness, his judgment, and his diligence should be commended by the House.

AMERICAN TASS, PART II

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of the threat to press freedom implicit in the new USDA Market News Service.

I had suggested earlier this may be the forerunner of an "American Tass," a Government-dominated wire news service with which no private service can compete.

I invite attention to an editorial published September 9 in the New York Journal of Commerce:

The American Tass, Part II

(By Eric Ridder, publisher)

> On August 19, 1963, I wrote a whimsey, suggesting the danger of the Federal Government putting the private dissemination of news by wire out of business by a new Federal Service (FNS). This whimsey was based on the Department of Agriculture's launching of a new wire service in competition with private services on agricultural news.
>
> The Federal Register of August 28 has a memorandum from President Kennedy to the heads of executive departments and agencies, directing them to cooperate and assist in establishing a unified governmental communications system to be called the National Communications System (NCS). The memorandum states that the new system shall be established and developed "by linking together, improving and extending, on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."
>
> "National Communications System" is a more euphemistic title than "Federal News Service." Will this advance my target date of 1970? August 28, 1963, is fairly close to August 19, 1963.

A BILL TO INCREASE ELDERLY HOUSING LOANS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the amount authorized for elderly housing loans from $225 million to $300 million. This additional $75 million would be made available for loans to nonprofit corporations, who will rent to elderly families with incomes ranging between $2,000 and $4,800.

In the housing field, the greatest need is for decent shelter available to the elderly. Present and foreseeable commitments by the Community Facilities Administration will shortly exhaust congressional authorizations. Consequently I am sponsoring this resolution to enable the agency to continue to process the applications it is now receiving.

The need is apparent. In my own State of New Jersey, for example, only one organization, located in Trenton, has become a successful sponsor for this type of elderly housing construction. This involves a loan from the Community Facilities Administration of $2.5 million to build a 225-unit project. Six additional applications are pending, however, that would total $14.6 million in funds. These projects would be located in East Orange, Jersey City, Long Branch, Paterson, and two in Atlantic City.

I am informed by the Community Facilities Administration that applications for this particular type of elderly housing come chiefly from church and religious groups, who to date make up more than half the sponsors for the total number of projects that the agency has underwritten. While it is possible for these groups to obtain tax abatement, approximately 60 percent are paying taxes on the properties built under the program.

There is no question of back-door spending involved in this program. It operates on funds directly appropriated from the Treasury and this bill would make no change in what I consider to be the proper method of financing Government programs.

To me, the best feature of this program is that more than 9,000 homes for the elderly have been assured by the work done so far. If this resolution passes, we can expect that close to 30,000 homes, suitable for probably twice that number of elderly citizens, would be constructed under the total appropriations thus available.

MICHIGAN—STILL A GREAT STATE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of my colleagues from the State of New York stated that "Michigan has truly become a gambler's paradise—a haven for the crime syndicates." He further stated:

> Organized crime has been strong and healthy in that State since prohibition, and gambling offers an even better source of funds to bankroll syndicate operations than did bootlegging.

This gentleman went further in making derogatory and defamatory remarks about our great State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if this gentleman has ever been to Michigan. It is not a gambler's paradise. Paradise it is, yes, veritably a tourist paradise surrounded almost by the blue waters of the Great Lakes.

I doubt very much if the gentleman took the time or made the effort to determine the true facts of our State of Michigan; rather than merely use someone's projections as to any amount of gambling; and then proceed to make a series of loose, erroneous inferences and deductions in an effort to support his totally false charges.

He would find that we do not have any organized crime or syndicates concerning the narcotic traffic or white slavery. He would find that slot machines are nonexistent in Michigan. That any illegal gambling is no greater in Michigan than in any other State, and in most instances, much less.

He would find that the percentage of crime in Michigan is lower than in other large States; that our Detroit Police Department has earned the title of the Nation's finest police department; that the law enforcement agency of other cities and especially our State police department are really outstanding in the Nation.

I say to this gentleman that he should not throw stones since he lives in a glass house; that he should look to his own State, and then he would realize how much better and cleaner is our State of Michigan.

DREW PEARSON BOOSTS SPAIN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, when Drew Pearson says good things about Franco Spain—that is news.

Yet, this is exactly what Mr. Pearson did in his column of September 10, 1963.

This column recognizes the gradual change that students of Spanish affairs have realized has taken place in that country over the years. The change has been particularly great in the last 3 or 4 years.

This change has involved the easing of restrictions against foreign investment; the relaxation of censorship; the loosening of curbs on Protestant churches, and the broadening of the role of labor unions.

All these things have been accompanied by an increase in economic activity and a rise in the level of the welfare of the average citizen.

I am happy to see that Mr. Pearson has been able to set aside impressions and opinions concerning Spain that might have been appropriate in other days and that he has truly assessed the beneficial currents that are flowing through this great country today.

As one of millions of Americans who admire the Spaniard as a man and revere the Spanish cultural tradition, I believe that we have a duty to encourage and applaud the direction that the Government of Spain has taken and is currently pursuing.

Drew Pearson's column, which follows, is a substantial step in the performance of this duty:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1963]

FRANCO ISN'T SO TOUGH ANYMORE

(By Drew Pearson)

MADRID.—Some of my readers will probably faint when I say anything good about Dictator Franco of Spain. And some critics who have claimed that I sold out to Khrushchev will now say that I sold out to Franco, too.

However, accurate reporting compels me to state that the onetime police state of Francisco Franco has changed a lot from the old days; and, just as tough Stalinism in Russia has given way to more moderation, so the dictatorship which once ruled Spain has relaxed considerably. The average Spaniard scarcely knows that it is there.

The political structure of Spain has not changed. And Franco is still the boss. But he's a very relaxed and somewhat aloof boss who has now become something of a legend. He is seldom seen by the Spanish people, except in photos, usually homey scenes playing with children. Sometimes these are shown in contrast to the pictures of troubled Vietnam and strife-torn Algeria.

Franco is now 70 years old and with this ripe age has come considerable complacency. Speculation as to who will be his successor is one of the favorite Spanish pastimes, and the consensus is that Gen. Munoz Grandes, now designated Vice President, will be the man.

Gen. Munoz Grandes also is a relaxed individual who rides in the front seat of his car alongside his chauffeur and told one Ambassador recently that he would like to invite him to lunch, "But I live in such a humble home that it would not be good enough for you."

Munoz Grandes is now 67. And since Franco's father lived to be 96, and Franco has been talking about his grandparents who died in their eighties and nineties, it may be that the Vice President will never succeed to the Presidency.

Meanwhile this callow youth of 70 has brought forward some younger men who are partly responsible for political relation in Spain. One of them, Minister of Commerce Alberto Ullastres, appeared on TV during the campaign to keep the Spanish cost of living down and announced that foreign products would be admitted to Spain at reduced tariffs if prices increased. Already some tariffs have been lowered.

Other Spanish New Frontiersmen are Navarro Rubio, Minister of Finance; Lopez Bravo, Minister of Industry; and Manuel Fraga, Minister of Information. The last has been relaxing press and motion picture censorship, though censorship has not actually been removed.

There has also been some easing up on Protestant churches, as will be described in a future column;and about one-fourth of the Government trade unions or syndicates now have bargaining clauses in their contracts.

Hitherto labor merely took the wage scale decreed by the Government. Strikes are still illegal, but the new wage contracts permit the right to bargain.

REASON FOR RELAXATION

Another change has been Franco's appointment of a straightforward Ambassador in Washington. Antonio Garrigues, who has refused to go in for backstage lobbying deals to influence Congress.

Finally, Spain is relatively prosperous and there has been a tremendous building program, especially in Madrid and the resort areas along the coast.

If you ask a Spanish Cabinet member the reason for this prosperity, as I did, he will reply: "Civil order." While this may be true, Italy, which has had its political ups-and-downs, is one of the most prosperous nations in Europe.

My own conclusion is that prosperity is linked to the new policy of moderation and that behind both are the following factors:

1. The tremendous influx of tourists. This has brought new contacts for the Spanish people and at the same time encouraged the Government to put its best foot forward.

2. Preparations to join the Common Market, which require a free economic and political exchange.

3. The migration of half a million Spaniards, who have sent back both money and ideas about progress in the rest of Europe.

4. The American military bases in Spain, which have brought both contacts with Americans and the help of about 1 billion U.S. dollars during the past 10 years. So while it may have been undemocratic for the United States to aid a dictatorship, the net result has been to make that dictatorship more democratic.

Last and perhaps most important has been education. People have been taught to read and write. A goal of 25,000 new school houses was set 3 years ago, and as of last week, 24,034 had been built. The more you educate people the more you have to give them in the way of intellectual and political freedom. This has been true of the Communist bloc and it's also true of Spain.

So, whether my critics like it or not, I am compelled to report that Franco has made definite progress toward a more democratic state.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, those who speak for the bracero program say that we do not have enough workers to harvest these crops, and that more must be brought into the country. Yet I doubt that many, if any, of them would favor increased immigration as a means to fill the gap they speak about.

In the first place, the gap might not be there at all; in the second place, immigrants are freemen, and I really doubt that many of them would perform stoop labor at stoop wages for very long.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the trouble with immigrants is that they are free, and can go wherever they please and work for whatever they can command, just like anybody else. The bracero has the advantage of not being able to go anywhere he pleases and not being able to earn whatever his labor is worth.

Because an immigrant is free, he probably does not fill the supplemental labor bill. But a bracero is not free, and so he obviously has the advantage in the eyes of the proponents of Public Law 78.

If we need more labor, let us use freemen. Those braceros would be glad to be free. Let them come in as immigrants, not as serfs, bound to their masters. Let them come in as men, not as units of a certain commodity needed for a short time and shipped back when used. They can come in as freemen, but not as long as Public Law 78 is on the books.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. Halleck), on September 10, 1963, and September 12, 1963, on account of official business as congressional adviser to the U.S. mission at the United Nations headquarters, New York City, in connection with sessions of the U.N. Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Mr. Mailliard, indefinitely, beginning September 16, 1963, on account of official business as a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. General Assembly.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Thompson of Texas, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include an article.

Mr. Feighan, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson, for 1 hour, on Monday next, September 16, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Burke and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Murphy of New York.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 330. An act to amend chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, to provide that after the expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program approval of courses under the war orphans' educational assistance program shall be by State approving agencies; and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1191. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1192. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a et seq.), for the purposes of aiding in the administration of the Pribilof Islands, in Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1193. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1194. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases in which the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 516. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the report submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means to accompany H.R. 8363, the "Revenue Act of 1963"; without amendment (Rept. No. 735). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1201. An act for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux; without amendment (Rept. No. 736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2811. A bill for the relief of Vernon E. Linth; with amendment (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4076. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4759. A bill for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, and Frank Grove; with amendment (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber; without amendment (Rept. No. 742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4681. A bill for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig; with amendment (Rept. No. 743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5746. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Bagby; with amendment (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6181. A bill for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6468. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Burke; without amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Ciccio; with amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 8404. A bill to provide for the free entry of a rheogoniometer for the use of the University of Tennessee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 8405. A bill to provide that until June 30, 1968, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 8406. A bill to establish a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8407. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 8408. A bill to improve the quality of education by broadening the scope of the Cooperative Research Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 8409. A bill to provide that the Mackinac Bridge shall be operated as a freeway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 8410. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from approving plans, specifications, and estimates for a portion of Interstate Route 78 in Newark, Essex County, N.J., and to prohibit further obligation or expenditure of Federal funds in connection therewith until a certain engineering study has been completed; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 725. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.J. Res. 726. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 727. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8411. A bill for the relief of Lai Har Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8412. A bill for the relief of Shu Wah Poon, Kwong Hung Poon, Kwong Wai Poon, and Kwong Keung Poon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 8413. A bill for the relief of Sotirios and Eugenia Salapatas; George and Pipina Salapatas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8414. A bill for the relief of Juana Kanashiro de Dias, Miguel Dias, and Anna Luisa Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8415. A bill for the relief of Maj. Keith K. Lund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, before each day's deliberations, we bow at this altar of prayer, because in our hearts we know that the destiny of this Nation is inseparably bound up with loyalty to its national heritage. That heritage is rooted in Thee. All our beginnings proclaim that creed. Apart from faith in spiritual verities, America has no meaning relevant to today's world situation.

Stab our spirits broad awake to a compelling realization that the greatest spiritual task that confronts the lawmaking bodies of the land is in interpreting for these times in which we are called to serve the awesome meaning of the motto, inscribed on the money which crosses our counters of trade, "In God We Trust," and in applying that stupendous trust to our national and international life.

So make our hearts strong whatever the future may hold. We ask in the spirit of Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 10, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, Mr. SCHENCK, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. BROTZMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 5623. An act to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6012. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 330. An act to amend chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, to provide that after the expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program approval of courses under the war orphan's educational assistance program shall be by State approving agencies; and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, despite the fact that the Senate is in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, there now be a morning hour, and that statements in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. JOHNSTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that the Senate not authorize any committee to meet today while the Senate is in session, unless I am first notified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair state the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has requested that no committee be authorized to meet today while the Senate is in session, without him being first notified.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** I should like to comply with the request of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has already graciously allowed one committee to meet; but I hope he will reconsider, and will not make that request at this time.

Mr. **JOHNSTON.** I asked that I first be notified, so that I would have an opportunity to exercise the privilege of objecting.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** If the Senator from South Carolina will reconsider his request, I assure him no further requests of that sort will be made without first notifying him.

Mr. **JOHNSTON.** That is all I requested.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** If the Senator from South Carolina will take my word for it, and will not act to set a precedent of this kind, I shall appreciate his courtesy. I assure him that he will first be notified.

Mr. **JOHNSTON.** I have always found that the Senator from Montana has carried out his word.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina withdraw his request?

Mr. **JOHNSTON.** Yes, I withdraw it, with the understanding that the majority leader has stated that he will notify me before requesting that any committee be permitted to meet while the Senate is in session.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Pursuant to the order, previously entered, for the transaction of morning-hour legislative business subject to a 3-minute limitation,

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Review of Voluntary Agreements and Programs

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of voluntary agreements and programs, as of August 9, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Establishment of Assateague Island National Seashore

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Administration of Pribilof Islands, Alaska

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a et seq.) for the purposes of aiding in the administration of the Pribilof Islands, in Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Disposition of Judgment Funds on Deposit to Credit of Kootenai Tribe, Idaho

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Classification of Status of Certain Aliens for First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the classification of status of certain aliens for first preference under the quota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **SPARKMAN**, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 1952. A bill to extend and broaden the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act (Rept. No. 487).

By Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the hearings on the nuclear test ban treaty for the Committee on Foreign Relations (Rept. No. 489);

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document and additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education" (Rept. No. 492);

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of selected excerpts relating to the 1963–64 national college debate topic, compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, as a House document, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 493);

S. Res. 182. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. Res. 190. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document and additional copies of the committee print entitled "The Ambassador and the Problem of Coordination" (Rept. No. 490); and

S. Res. 193. Resolution to print additional copies of certain hearings entitled "Castro Network in the United States" (Rept. No. 491).

REIMBURSEMENT OF EXTRA EXPENSES DUE TO ALLOCATION OF VESSEL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 486)

Mr. **BARTLETT.** Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 82) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses, and I submit a report thereon, together with the minority views of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

MILDRED F. STEGALL

Mr. **JORDAN** of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 194) to pay a gratuity to Mildred F. Stegall, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mildred F. Stegall, widow of Glynn D. Stegall, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

UNA M. HUSKEY SHARP JACKSON, LOUISE HUSKEY McNEER, AND TILLMAN B. HUSKEY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 195) to pay a gratuity to Una M. Huskey Sharp Jackson, Louise Huskey McNeer, and Tillman B. Huskey, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Una M. Huskey Sharp Jackson and Louise Huskey McNeer, daughters, and Tillman B. Huskey, Jr., son of Tillman B. Huskey, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to four months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2137. A bill for the relief of Meliha Caylioglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2138. A bill to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2139. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2140. A bill for the relief of Henry C. Okulicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTIONS

MILDRED F. STEGALL

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 194) to pay a gratuity to Mildred F. Stegall, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of committees.")

UNA M. HUSKEY SHARP JACKSON, LOUISE HUSKEY McNEER, AND TILLMAN B. HUSKEY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 195) to pay a gratuity to Una M. Huskey Sharp Jackson, Louise Huskey McNeer, and Tillman B. Huskey, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MELIHA CAYLIOGLU

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in behalf of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a private immigration bill for the relief of Miss Meliha Caylioglu.

Miss Caylioglu is a Turkish citizen. She has a son by a former marriage who is an American citizen by reason of his birth in New York. Miss Caylioglu, who last entered this country on a visitor's visa, has been found deportable by the Immigration and Naturalization Service on the ground of a technical violation of her visitor's status. We are advised there is no way under existing law by which she could adjust her status to permanent residence here. If she is required to leave the country and return to her native Turkey, her son, who would naturally accompany her, would become liable to military service there before reaching age 21 and, as a consequence of our own laws, probably lose his American citizenship.

My colleague from New York and I are particularly anxious to avoid, if at all possible, a situation in which a native-born American citizen, Miss Caylioglu's son, may lose his citizenship through absolutely no fault of his own. For this reason, Mr. President, we are introducing this bill today in behalf of the mother so that the equities of the case may be fully explored and the question of relief given careful consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2137) for the relief of Meliha Caylioglu, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA LANDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska.

The act of January 21, 1929, authorized the then Territory of Alaska to select 100,000 acres of land for the use and benefit of the agricultural college and school of mines. The Bureau of Land Management patented to the University of Alaska approximately 150 acres under the act. These lands were believed by the Bureau of Land Management to be nonmineral and unoccupied. As it turned out, however, the lands contained iron ore deposits and were within mining claims of the Klukwan Iron Ore Corp.

The Interior Department determined the patent held by the University of Alaska to be valid as transfer of the lands to the university had been without fraud and the United States was not adversely affected.

The Klukwan Iron Ore Corp. filed a suit in the State supreme court at Juneau, Alaska, to quiet its claim to the lands in question. Then, both the university and Klukwan decided to settle the matter out of court since both were faced with the expense of the legal proceedings and each stood to lose all interest in the land. Unfortunately, however, settling out of court involves an agreement of a type prohibited by the act granting the land to the university.

Mr. President, the bill I present today would allow the proposed agreement to take place, thus settling the land dispute amicably and doing so within the intent of the referenced act, that is, leasing of land under the grant for the benefit of the University of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2138) to provide that certain limitations shall not apply to certain land patented to the State of Alaska for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ON DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF KOOTENAI TRIBE OF INDIANS, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

The judgment moneys referred to in this bill are contained in Docket No. 154 in the Indian Claims Commission, which arose out of a claim based upon the value of the lands in Idaho and Montana that were taken by the United States under the treaty of July 16, 1855, without the consent of the Bonners Ferry Kootenai Band. The Bonners Ferry Band was not a party to, or represented in, the treaty of 1855. The Indian Claims Commission found that the Bonners Ferry Kootenai were entitled to the value of approximately 1,160,000 acres of land in northwest Idaho and northwest Montana, and determined as of March 8, 1859, the date of the actual taking of the lands.

On March 24, 1960, the parties in the case filed a joint motion for entry of a final judgment based upon a stipulated settlement of $425,000. The motion was granted. From this award, the attorneys representing the tribe were allowed fees and expenses in the total sum of $65,345.85, leaving a balance of $359,644.15 which is presently on deposit in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the

Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians and bears interest at 4 percent per annum. The principal and interest as of July 29, 1963, amounted to $379,898.46.

The so-called Kootenai Tribe was never a single political entity. The Kootenai Indians were divided into two cultural branches—the Upper Kootenai, composed of the eastern bands which were similar in culture to the Plains Indians, and the Lower Kootenai, which were more sedentary because their location to the north and west provided less contact with the Plains groups.

The judgment was in favor of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of the State of Idaho. The Bonners Ferry Kootenai are the successors in interest of this group and we believe the judgment funds should be made available to them, for use under the rules that apply to tribal funds generally. The money represents an asset derived from a disposition of tribal land, and should appropriately be controlled as if it had been paid to the Kootenai when their lands were taken.

The tribe has indicated it favors employment of the judgment fund for the socio-economic improvement of tribal members through a family-plan program and for other purposes. The proposed legislation will permit the Kootenai, subject to the approval of the Secretary, to decide precisely how they will program their judgment funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2139) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1276, which itself proposes to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. My amendment is identical to the Fascell-Rogers amendment to H.R. 7885, which has passed the House of Representatives. Its purpose is to prohibit assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act to any country which does not, within 60 days after the passage of the 1963 act, take steps to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba first, materiel of war; second, items of economic assistance; and third, any other equipment, materials, or commodities. The adoption of this amendment would, I am convinced, greatly strengthen the existing laws proscribing assistance to countries which provide transportation of commodities to Cuba.

This amendment would make it mandatory that military assistance, as well as economic assistance, be denied to countries which permit their ships or planes to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba. Unthinkable though it may be, such countries are, under existing law, allowed to receive military assistance from us. As an example of the effect of the amendment, free-world countries whose tankers carry Soviet-bloc crude oil to Cuba would be denied the military aid which they now are permitted to receive.

This amendment would also broaden the coverage of the law so as to prohibit aid to countries whose ships are now transporting commodities from Cuba. The existing law covers only shipments to Cuba.

Finally, my amendment would prohibit assistance in cases where the transportation of commodities to Cuba is by means of aircraft. The present law relates only to carriage by sea vessel.

While the present law prohibits economic assistance to countries which permit ships of their registry to transport items of economic assistance to Cuba, countries receiving only military assistance which permit their ships to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba are not denied such assistance. My amendment would plug this loophole, and would prohibit assistance to a country when ships of its registry carry, first, items of economic assistance; second, any other equipment, materials, or commodities to Cuba; or, third, Battle Act commodities. The experience since January 1, 1963, indicates that the following military aid program recipients would be affected by this tightened legislation if they have not taken or do not take the appropriate steps contemplated by the amendment: Great Britain, Lebanon, Italy, Norway, Denmark, and West Germany. It does not appear that Danish ships or West German ships are now involved in the Cuban trade. West Germany has taken legal action to prevent this.

While there is no evidence that any free world country has itself furnished any Battle Act commodities or "items of economic assistance" to Cuba, since January 1, 1963, some free world tankers have carried Soviet bloc crude oil to Cuba. Since crude oil has not been placed on the Battle Act list of embargoed commodities, military assistance is not prohibited to the countries which permit ships of their registry to transport this bloc crude oil. My amendment would correct this situation and would prohibit all assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to countries which do not take appropriate steps to prevent ships under their registry from carrying commodities of any nature to or from Cuba. Thus, this amendment would be an important step in imposing the burden of crude oil and other petroleum delivery on already burdened Soviet bloc transport capability.

My amendment, if adopted, would be permanent, since the proposed statutory language would be an amendment to the legislation, and would become a part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, rather than a limitation imposed each year in the annual appropriation bill.

Unfortunately, trade with Cuba through free-world ships has continued on a very large scale, although some steps have been taken in the direction of isolating Cuba from the economic life of the free world. Such steps include a ban on transportation of U.S.-financed goods by ships which have been to Cuba; an embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba; and steps to freeze Cuban assets in this country.

Notwithstanding all efforts, however, it appears that free-world shipping to Cuba has been increasing steadily throughout 1963. Since the beginning of this year through August 9, numerous free-world nations have allowed ships under their registry to carry Soviet-bloc goods to Cuba. Leaders in this shipping to Cuba have been as follows: Britain, 80 trips; Greece, 63 trips; Lebanon, 31 trips; Norway, 10 trips; and Italy, 10 trips. Preliminary estimates show that these five countries have been the recipients of approximately $480 million in military and economic assistance for fiscal year 1963, alone. By continuing to ship to Cuba, thus assisting in prolonging Red domination of that island, they have acted against the best interests of the United States. They should now be compelled to make their choice.

I am hopeful this amendment will be adopted. Its adoption will be a major step in the direction of a ban on trade with Cuba by free-world nations. It will hasten the elimination from our doorstep of the grim specter of communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 302. Section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba, is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert '(1)' immediately after '(a)'.

"(b) At the end thereof add the following new paragraph:

"'(2) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

"'(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

"'(i) any items of economic assistance,

"'(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

"'(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities.

"'(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.'"

HATE PROPAGANDA SHOULD BE CAUSE FOR AID SUSPENSION—AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the foreign aid bill, H.R. 7885, as recently passed by the House of Representatives, includes the following language:

> (i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—
>
> (1) the United States,
>
> (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or
>
> (3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,
>
> until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurance satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

This language is somewhat similar to that which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I originally introduced as a sense-of-Congress resolution last year, to oppose aid to nations diverting their own economic resources for the purchase of Soviet military equipment for use or threats against neighboring countries. That language is in the bill today. It is also similar to the mandatory language of the amendment the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I submitted earlier this year, cosponsored by a number of Senators, to stop aid to nations that spend their own meager resources in military or propaganda efforts.

The main way in which the House language differs from the intent of our language, is in the omission of the word propaganda. It refers only to military efforts or preparations, without asking any kind of consideration of propaganda offensives, which may require just as great a diversion of funds as military preparation and maneuvers.

In fact, Mr. President, in my view, spending by the underdeveloped nations on propaganda is just as inimical to the interests of peace as spending on actual weapons. In fact, it may be said that efforts to poison the minds of men, women, and children and to teach national hatreds may be more dangerous in the long run, and more conducive to hostilities.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the present propaganda outlay of certain nations, which also receive U.S. aid is wholly out of proportion to their budgets and is completely opposed to the interests of the United States and of any other nations which honestly seek to live in peace. Nothing militates more strongly against the possibilities of a negotiated settlement of outstanding issues both in the Middle East and elsewhere than continued hate propaganda that streams forth from such programs as the Voice of the Arabs.

The U.S. Government informs me that within the last 6 months there has been evidence of stepped-up United Arab Republic propaganda efforts against Israel in a number of different media.

Egyptian papers have revealed plans for a television relay station in Gaza, where it would obviously be designed to reach Israel and other Arab states with new force and clarity. In April, Nasser's government initiated a weekly newspaper, purported to speak for Palestinian Arabs. Called Palestine News, it is distributed throughout the Arab world and presumably also smuggled into Israel. In July, the Palestine radio, another new transmission coming from Gaza, also went on the air, with assistance from the Egyptian Government, and with Hebrew as well as Arabic language programs to publicize Nasser's views on the so-called Palestine problem throughout the area.

These new efforts are in addition to the longstanding Voice of the Arabs programs for Palestine refugees—nearly 20 hours a week—and Radio Cairo broadcasts in Hebrew and Palestinian Arabic—over 30 hours weekly—as well as Egyptian television programs partially viewable in Israel now.

It is very difficult for me to believe that all these new or old propaganda efforts on Nasser's part will lead to an acceptable settlement in the Middle East or will in any way reduce tensions. Quite the contrary. In fact, Nasser's solution of the Palestine problem seems to consist entirely of "exterminating Israel." Just last month, he further indicated that the present strength of the Egyptian economy made possible the expenditure of nearly 12 percent of Egypt's budget on military ventures.

Nasser is undoubtedly the main offender in the exploitation of hate propaganda, but he is by no means the only one. It is time for the people of the United States to express themselves on this matter, and for that reason I introduce for myself and Senators DOUGLAS, SCOTT, PROXMIRE, and KUCHEL, for appropriate reference, an amendment which would include intensive hate propaganda by a foreign government as well as military efforts as cause for suspension of aid.

I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks the text of a report on the latest efforts of President Nasser in his propaganda program and the text of the proposed Keating-Douglas amendment, I ask that this amendment lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment and report will be printed in the RECORD, and the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

On page 18, line 25, following "military" insert "or propaganda".

On page 19, line 7, following "military" insert "or propaganda".

On page 19, line 10, following "military" insert "or propaganda".

The report presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

EGYPTIAN PROPAGANDA DIRECTED TO ISRAEL

Overt Egyptian propaganda designed specifically for Israel is limited to radio broadcasts beamed to Israel by Radio Cairo. These are (a) Hebrew broadcasts, 24.5 hours weekly; and (b) colloquial (Palestine dialect) Arabic, 7 hours weekly.

Israel Jewish and Arab audiences are also exposed to other Egyptian radio broadcasts. Cairo's Voice of the Arabs includes a special beamed program for Palestine refugees (and Arabs in "Palestine") designated the "Palestine Radio"; weekly transmissions total 19 hours and 50 minutes. Radio Cairo also broadcasts a "European program," a medium wave program of music and news broadcasts, almost 100 hours weekly in English, French, Italian, Greek, and German. Although this program is intended primarily for foreign residents in Egypt, it is widely heard throughout the Mediterranean area, including Israel.

Television programs originating in Cairo are widely viewed in Israel, which has no TV station but reportedly has 10,000 TV sets. Through favorable atmospheric conditions, signals from TV-relay stations at Suez and Ismailia can be picked up in both Israel and Jordan. The composition of the Israel TV audience is not known but presumably includes both Jews and Arabs. Plans for an additional TV-relay station in Gaza (for direct transmissions to Israel) have been reported by the Egyptian press.

Egypt's Minister of Culture and National Guidance, Dr. Hatem, claimed in a recent interview with al-Gumhuria (Cairo, August 10, 1963) that Egyptian films are being exhibited in Israel. Presumably, any such films shown to Arab audiences in Israel have been closely censored by Israeli authorities.

Egyptian sponsored media in Gaza will eventually reach Israel. In addition to the planned TV-relay station, the Egyptian Government has made a direct investment of about $55,000 to found a weekly newspaper as the voice of the Palestinian Arabs. Named Akhbar Filistin (Palestine News), the newspaper began appearing in April 1963. Copies are distributed throughout the Arab world and, presumably, are being smuggled into Israel for Arab readers there. At Gaza the newly completed "Palestine Radio" (not to be confused with the Voice of the Arabs program of the same name) has been heard since early July with test transmissions. This station, subsidized in part by the Egyptian Government, plans Hebrew programs to Israel in addition to Arabic (and other) programs on the "Palestine problem."

Cost estimates for these programs are almost impossible to develop. A rough estimate of direct radio broadcast costs, based on Egyptian budget figures, is about $7,500 a week. This does not include capital investment (the Palestine News, "Palestine Radio," the planned Gaza TV-relay station, etc.), or the costs of indirect broadcasts. In addition, the Egyptian Government operates an extensive anti-Israel propaganda program by means of numerous "cultural centers" in most world capitals, materials regularly furnished Egyptian students abroad, participation in Arab League information programs, "Voice of the Arabs" broadcasts to African countries, etc. Cost estimates for these programs cannot be made from available information.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. COTTON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 11, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 330. An act to amend chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, to provide that after the expiration of the Korean Conflict veterans' education and training program approval of courses under the war orphan's educational assistance program shall be by State approving agencies; and

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution favoring the holding of the Olympic Games in America in 1968.

LOOSE MANAGEMENT IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another $10 million of the taxpayers' money that has been thrown away as the result of loose management in the Defense Department. This loss is called to our attention in three different reports recently submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress.

These letters are typical of the almost daily reports being submitted by the Comptroller General, calling our attention to the multimillion-dollar waste in the procurement division of the Defense Department; and the only response which we get from the Defense Department is that they will try to do better next time.

The first report—No. B–133226—calls our attention to a situation wherein the Department of Defense will incur unnecessary annual costs of about $8.2 million by insisting upon the continuance of separate operations of the Letterman Army and the Oakland Naval Hospitals, in the San Francisco Bay area.

The second report—No. B–146774—calls attention to a case wherein the Government will incur unnecessary costs of about $1.1 million as the result of the Defense Department's having purchased radar altimeters built to operate in an unauthorized frequency band, and the altimeters therefore could not be used for operational purposes. This report shows that the procurement officers were warned in advance that this equipment would not be acceptable, but that they paid no attention.

The third report—No. B–133102—charges that at seven military installations operation and maintenance funds amounting to about $1.1 million were illegally spent.

I call attention to one damaging statement from the Comptroller General's report concerning the illegal expenditures of these funds:

> The circumstances surrounding each violation of law were of such nature that the officials responsible for authorizing the illegal expenditure of funds should have known that their actions were highly questionable, if not illegal. Aside from the violations of law, the results of the improper actions by the authorizing officials for all intents and purposes circumvented or disregarded military construction authorization processes established by the Congress to control and limit the extent of military construction. The illegally financed projects included landscaping and the installation of storm windows, clotheslines, redwood fencing, and central television antennas.

All three of these reports are typical examples of the manner in which the procurement officers of the Defense Department handle the taxpayers' money, and these reports should be carefully examined by the Congress and taken into consideration when we act on the Defense Department's request for appropriations.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the three letters of the Comptroller General accompanying these reports be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comptroller General
of the United States,
Washington, June 28, 1963.

B–133226

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on unnecessary costs to be incurred under the military departments' proposals for continued operation of separate Army and Navy hospitals in the San Francisco Bay area, California.

Our review disclosed that the Department of Defense will incur unnecessary annual costs of about $8.2 million under a plan for the continued separate operation of Letterman Army and Oakland Naval Hospitals in the San Francisco Bay area. In addition, the plans being considered by the Department of Defense for construction of separate new hospitals at these locations will result in costs of about $10 million more than necessary to provide adequate hospital facilities for joint service use. These unnecessary expenditures can be avoided by constructing a single modern hospital in the Oakland-Alameda area and an addition to the Travis Air Force Hospital, and by effective joint use of these facilities. Effective joint use can be achieved by improved management of the patient workload through (1) eliminating the unnecessary transfers of patients to the San Francisco Bay area, (2) making greater use of available civilian hospitals for the care of dependents, and (3) eliminating the requirement for construction of facilities to care for retired personnel, their dependents, and others, entitled to treatment only if space is available.

We proposed to the Secretary of Defense that necessary replacement of military hospital facilities in the San Francisco Bay area be accomplished by a single replacement hospital of 1,000 beds and a 200-bed addition to the modern hospital at Travis Air Force Base in lieu of the services' proposals for replacement and separate operation of the present Letterman and Oakland hospitals. We proposed, also, that the Secretary of Defense require the military departments to provide more adequate data on the operation of military hospitals so that the real needs for military hospital facilities could be more accurately and consistently determined.

In its reply, the Department of Defense stated that a thorough analysis of the total requirements for hospital services and the best methods of satisfying them in the most economical manner was needed before authorization for either the Army or the Navy project would be requested from the Congress. The Department of Defense also agreed that bed space for retired personnel should not be included in computing hospital construction requirements and that more adequate data on the use of hospital facilities should be used in determining requirements.

Our discussions with the principal medical officials of the three services disclosed considerable reluctance on the part of the Army and Navy medical officers to make joint use of facilities, either presently available or planned for construction, although each of the services expressed full confidence in the quality of medical care provided by the other. Because of this attitude, the Department of Defense is likely to encounter the same lack of cooperative effort on the part of the individual services toward the more effective and economical joint use of medical activities as we disclosed in our reports on the duplication of development effort (B–146713 and B–146714, May 1962), on failure to standardize on certain common items (B–133177, October 1961), and on the interservice utilization of excess supplies of various items (B–133313, May 1960, and B–133336, November 1960).

In view of the magnitude of the possible savings, we are recommending that the Secretary of Defense take the necessary actions to consolidate military hospital services in the San Francisco Bay area into one modern replacement hospital of 1,000 beds in the Oakland-Alameda area and the modern facility at Travis Hospital with an addition of 200 beds. Further, we are recommending that the Secretary of Defense require the military departments to improve the management of the patient workload to accomplish more effective joint utilization of existing hospital facilities and to assure realistic planning of military hospital construction on the basis of full joint use of all available military hospital facilities.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Comptroller General of the
United States,
Washington, August 26, 1963.

B–146774

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of radar altimeters.

Our review disclosed that the Government incurred unnecessary costs of about $1,100,000 because the AN/APN–120 radar altimeter was built to operate in an unauthorized frequency band and the altimeters therefore could not be used for operational purposes. The Bureau of Aeronautics (now Bureau of Naval Weapons), the procurement agency for the Government in this case, did not obtain approved frequency bands for the AN/APN–120 radar altimeter prior to initiating its development despite written instructions from higher Navy echelons requiring that such approval be obtained. Instead, the Bureau simply left selection of the frequency bands to the discretion of the manufacturer.

When development of the altimeter was well underway, the Bureau found that it had failed to secure authorized frequency bands and attempted to obtain proper approval of the bands selected by the manufacturer. The director, Naval Communications, who was responsible for assigning frequency bands, informed the Bureau that the frequency band for the low altitude portion of the altimeter could not be used on a permanent basis and would have to be changed. The change in frequency band made it necessary to completely redesign the altimeter.

Despite the fact that use of the frequency band was not granted on a permanent basis, the Bureau allowed development of the altimeter to continue and even ordered production of additional units using the unauthorized band on the basis that these units would be needed to test the aircraft on which the altimeters were to be used. However, the aircraft manufacturer considered it impractical to test the aircraft with this altimeter since it was substantially different from the redesigned altimeter that was ultimately to be used. Therefore the altimeters with the unauthorized band were of no value in evaluating the aircraft. Had the Bureau obtained approval of the frequency bands prior to initiating development of the altimeter, the entire unnecessary cost of $1,100,000 would have been avoided; had further work been stopped when it was learned that the low-altitude band could not be permanently used, half that amount would have been saved.

The Navy agreed that the failure to obtain an approved frequency band resulted in unnecessary cost to the Government and advised us that appropriate action would be taken by the Navy to provide adequate control to prevent recurrence of the situation described in this report. Specifically, the Navy stated that the Chief of Naval Material would require that, prior to initiating procurement of electronic equipment, all procuring activities submit to the Office of Naval Material an approved radiofrequency allocation granted by the Director, Naval Communications. The Navy also advised that the findings in this case would be brought to the attention of individuals responsible making decisions for the development and procurement of electronic equipment.

It seems evident that the substantial unnecessary cost the Government incurred in this case could have been prevented if the responsible Government employees had used greater care in making both the decision involving approval of the altimeter specifications containing provision for the use of an unauthorized frequency band and the decision to continue production of the unacceptable altimeter for use in testing the aircraft. We believe that this case illustrates the need for a greater sense of individual responsibility on the part of Government employees for economy in Government operations. In our opinion, the manner in which that responsibility was met in this instance should be considered when making personnel evaluations and management assignments.

Not only should individual employees use greater care in making such decisions, but, in addition, effective controls should be established to provide assurance that authorized frequency bands are obtained before a contract is awarded for the development of electronic equipment. Accordingly, we are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that the Department of Defense evaluate the control procedures of the Army and the Air Force to determine whether these procedures provide the control necessary to prevent unnecessary costs resulting from development and production of electronic equipment using unauthorized frequency bands. Also, we are asking the Secretary of Defense to advise us of the action taken with regard to this recommendation, since we plan to give this matter further consideration in our continuing review of the activities of the military services.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 30, 1963.

B-133102

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Enclosed is our report on illegal use of operation and maintenance funds for rehabilitation and construction of family housing and construction of a related facility of the Department of Defense.

In our review at 32 Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps installations, we found that at 7 installations—Schilling Air Force Base, Kans.; Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.; Robins Air Force Base, Ga.; Chanute Air Force Base, Ill.; Fort Riley, Kans.; Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.; and William Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex.—operation and maintenance funds amounting to about $1.1 million were illegally spent (1) to finance rehabilitation work on Wherry housing ($800,000), (2) for supplemental work or additional features on Capehart housing projects ($190,000), and (3) for construction of a gas distribution system ($92,000). The illegal use of operation and maintenance funds involving Wherry housing violated section 3678, Revised Statutes. The illegal use of funds involving Capehart housing and the gas distribution system violated sections 3679, 3678, and 3733, Revised Statutes, and title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The circumstances surrounding each violation of law were of such nature that the officials responsible for authorizing the illegal expenditure of funds should have known that their actions were highly questionable, if not illegal. Aside from the violations of law, the results of the improper actions by the authorizing officials for all intents and purposes circumvented or disregarded military construction authorization processes established by the Congress to control and limit the extent of military construction. The illegally financed projects included landscaping and the installation of storm windows, clotheslines, redwood fencing, and central television antennas.

We have informed the Secretary of Defense that action must be taken to charge the costs applicable to Wherry housing to the family housing management account and to reimburse the operations and maintenance appropriations, as appropriate. In the cases of construction of additions and improvements to Capehart housing and construction of a gas distribution system, neither authority nor funds were available legally for such work. Therefore, as required by law, we are issuing notices of exception in settlement of the accounts of the disbursing officers for the amounts illegally disbursed. Also, since these disbursements constitute violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, they must be reported by the heads of the military departments involved to the President and the Congress to fix responsibility and disclose the disciplinary actions taken.

It is fully recognized that the illegal payments were caused by the actions of the authorizing officials—not the disbursing officers. With this in mind we are recommending that the Secretary of Defense bring the findings in this report and our reports on illegal or improper use of funds for construction of family housing (B-133259, January 13, 1960) and financing of an airfield (B-133316, January 24, 1961) to the attention of Defense officials responsible for expenditure of Government funds to show the need for determining the propriety of the expenditure before authorization. We believe that the officials responsible for the illegal expenditures cited in this report did not demonstrate a sense of individual responsibility necessary in the management of Government activities. Under these circumstances, we think it essential that the military departments consider the manner in which this responsibility was met in evaluating the performance of these officials and in making future management assignments.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SHIPMENT OF $32 MILLION WORTH OF GRAIN TO AUSTRIA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal there appears an editorial calling attention, first, to the $32 million worth of grain shipped by the Department of Agriculture to Austria that disappeared while en route and, second, to the $90 million which the Department of Agriculture paid for soybean oil, the bulk of which was shipped in containers so faulty that many countries refused to accept or handle the shipments and others condemned it as unfit for human consumption.

This editorial points up the glaring need for a thorough investigation of the Government's disposal of the surplus commodities. On July 16, 1963, I introduced Senate Resolution 171, the purpose of which was to authorize a full-scale investigation of the Department of Agriculture's disposal of surplus products under Public Law 480. It is with regret that I report that thus far no action has been taken toward approving this investigation.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "The Salad Oil Saga," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 11, 1963]

THE SALAD OIL SAGA

Now there can be added to the great grain robbery, disclosed in Washington some weeks ago, the no less incredible salad oil saga.

The grain mystery, it will be recalled, involved some 66 shiploads of American surplus feed grain, valued at about $32 million, sent to Austria over a 3-year period by the Agriculture Department in a barter deal. Somewhere along the line the grain disappeared.

Two things distinguish the salad oil business from the grain story. The Government stands to lose $70 million, or more than twice the value of the vanished grain. And in this case, the Government knows where the salad oil is.

The tale, according to Senator JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware, unfolds as follows: Two years ago the Agriculture Department contracted to buy, for about $90.4 million, 500 million pounds of refined salad oil and shortening—primarily soybean oil—on the ground that it needed to remove surplus oil from the market in order to support the domestic price. It was said also that the oil was needed to meet estimated requirements of the food-for-peace program.

As it turned out, though, at the time the purchase was authorized soybeans were in no need of support. Indeed, they were selling at 50 cents above the support price. Moreover, there was something amiss with the Government's estimates of the oil needed abroad. It developed that Korea, for instance, already had enough inventoried salad oil to last 2 years, India enough for 4 years.

Nevertheless, the Government shipped the oil, 400 million pounds of the total being bought from certain private contractors even though these people had been barred from participating in any programs financed by the Agriculture Department's Commodity Credit Corporation. Because the bulk of the 400 million pounds was shipped in containers so faulty that some countries refused to handle the shipments and others condemned the oil as unfit for human consumption, $70 million worth is turning rancid in warehouses around the world.

Certainly such operations ought to stir a full-scale inquiry into the Government's disposal of surplus commodities. Missing grain and spoiling oil make a highly malodorous salad.

STRATEGY TO PREVENT DEATH OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, following a colloquy with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], it was stated that an effort would be made to attach to an appropriation bill or some other appropriate measure an amendment to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission prior to the end of this month. As a result of that statement, I indicated that I would not offer an amendment for this purpose to the bill which will be before the Senate tomorrow.

I believe the majority leader is entitled to assurance that this effort to prevent the Commission from expiring will not be prejudiced by those of us who have a deep interest in this matter and in proposed civil rights legislation by any effort to broaden the scope of the amendment. Of course we are anxious to expedite consideration of general civil rights legislation, but the Commission's predicament is unique and we all recognize that its early extension will be in the nature of stopgap action. I hope that every Senator will cooperate in making it possible for the Senate to take this necessary action without undue delay.

There will have to be cooperation on all sides and I shall certainly do whatever I can as an individual Senator to enable the majority leader to fulfill his pledge.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON H.R. 12, ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the unanimous-consent agreement reached in the Senate yesterday it is stated that "at the conclusion of routine morning business" the time limitation will begin. It was my understanding when I made the request that the time limitation would begin at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow; with, of course, the reasonable assumption that before action was taken, there would be a quorum call, regardless of the time involved.

I wish to modify the unanimous-consent request and ask that the agreement on the time limitation be entered to begin at 12 o'clock noon rather than at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is the second-ranking minority member of the committee which reported the bill, H.R. 12, visited with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and me yesterday, at which time he expressed his concern about the agreement because he had not been notified. He should have been notified. We assumed he had been notified.

The Senator from New York also stated that it had been his possible intention to offer a nongermane amendment. We could not give him any assurance yesterday as to what we would do. After meeting with him and after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader, I now ask unanimous consent that under the unanimous-consent agreement there be allowed, under the same stipulation as made with reference to other amendments, the offering of a nongermane amendment by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that the time limitation will start at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership at that time to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time not to be counted against the time allowed for consideration of the bill, so that Senators will have a reasonable opportunity to be present in the Chamber and discuss H.R. 12.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield, I think it would be helpful if he could advise what the program is likely to be for Friday and the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator raised that question, because that was an important matter which escaped my mind.

Because of the fact that the pending business is the very important test ban treaty, if consideration of any other measure which is brought up—as we intend to bring up the proposal tomorrow to aid medical and dental schools—requires too long, the leadership informs the Senate that it will feel free to set aside such proposed legislation, because our most important business is the pending treaty. I think that should be understood. That is why the Senate is to operate under a time limitation.

So far as I know, the next bill which may come before the Senate on that basis—which should not take too long for consideration—is the Defense Department appropriation bill.

I should also like to discuss with the Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the very real possibility of meeting Saturday of this week so that speeches both pro and con on the treaty may be undertaken by interested Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield further, I should like to inquire whether he proposes to present the resolution of ratification today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. At the conclusion of the morning hour the Senate will resume consideration of the nuclear test ban treaty. At that time there will be a quorum call. At the conclusion of the quorum call we will again, together, seek to have that resolution presented.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would it be possible—perhaps this is exactly what the distinguished Senator may have in mind—that the resolution or provision to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission might be made a part of the Defense Department appropriation bill when that bill comes before the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would hope that the Senator would not push me too far on that particular bill. If he did, I would have to say, in all honesty, that I would be loath to bring up the Defense Department appropriation bill until the treaty is out of the way. There is another bill I have my eye on—but I only have my eye on it.

Mr. KEATING. The only thing that concerns the Senator from New York is that it is apparently the disposition of the leadership—and I have no quarrel with it—that the debate on the test ban treaty will be interrupted from time to time for consideration of other legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not for very long in any case.

Mr. KEATING. The thing I am seeking to avoid, as the leader can see, is coming to the eve of September 30 without any bill before the Senate which would be a proper vehicle to which to attach the provision.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the distinguished Senator that the leadership has a bill in mind which it thinks might come up before that date. If it does not, some other bill might suffice. While we cannot make a definite, hard and fast commitment, I assure the Senator again that it is our intention to try to do something about this situation before the end of this month, at which time the Commission will expire.

Mr. KEATING. I do not wish to press the leader at this time, but I was laboring under the impression, when I withdrew my notice of intention to offer an amendment with regard to the Civil Rights Commission to the bill which will come before the Senate tomorrow, that the leader was giving assurance that there would be some bill to which this provision could be attached before the end of the month.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I say, we have in mind a bill, but I would hope that the Senator would always allow the leadership a little discretion, because our intentions are good. We want to do what the Senator suggests, but sometimes things happen over which we have no control, and our crystal ball of the future turns a little cloudy at times. That is our intention, I can assure the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I know the intentions of the majority leader are always honorable, and that he will make every effort to carry them out.

MAYOR WALSH, OF SYRACUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, William F. Walsh, mayor of Syracuse, N.Y., came to Washington to testify before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in behalf of the extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act. Under the provisions of that act, Federal funds have financed a program of research and demonstration projects in the area of juvenile delinquency. The city of Syracuse has received a grant of $152,532 to plan such a project, and the youth commission has made a commendable start in outlining and proposing methods of attack on the delinquency problem. Mayor Walsh, a former social worker, made an effective plea before the committee and explained the importance of this bill at a meeting of New York Congressmen, which I was happy to arrange.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles appearing in the Syracuse Herald-Journal and the Syracuse Post-Standard regarding Mayor Walsh's efforts be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal, Aug. 13, 1963]

Walsh Urges Senate To Continue Juvenile Delinquency Project—Mayor Points to Syracuse Aim of Starting Careers for Young People

Washington.—Mayor William F. Walsh, of Syracuse, told a committee here today that it makes little sense to spend millions trying to teach residents of foreign nations the American way of life when we have thousands of our own young people who are neglected.

The mayor made this remark while testifying before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in a plea for extension of a bill that would continue a major juvenile delinquency project.

The 3-year bill ends this year unless an extension is granted. Under the original bill Syracuse, Walsh said, received a grant of $152,532 to plan its project.

A total of $30 million was appropriated and all but $16 million of this has been used in some 16 key cities throughout the country.

Later in the day the Syracuse mayor will brief the New York State Republican congressional delegation on the need for an extension of the legislation. It has the backing of Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

Walsh delved into every facet of the juvenile problem and what is being done in Syracuse and what is planned.

"It is my personal conviction that the youth problems that concern us so deeply today are symptomatic of some of our most serious problems," Walsh told the committee members, adding "our present situation is the paradox of the affluent society. In the midst of plenty and of tremendous individual opportunities, we have people who for many and diverse reasons do not have the training, education or the motivation to successfully compete in our complex society."

"If we are truly dedicated to the preservation of the American way of life," Walsh continued, "we must find ways and means of dealing with this paradox at all levels of government. I believe this bill provides these means."

He spoke of the growth of the Negro population in Syracuse and said, "It is our responsibility to take steps that will help insure a way for these citizens to develop their potential to the fullest."

He told of the welfare child, the product of a family on relief, who grows up only to remain a recipient of public assistance and the costs that become astronomical.

On juvenile delinquency he said the average cost per day for each child in New York State institutions averages $15.22 or $5,566.25 a year which is far more than it costs to send a boy or girl to college.

Walsh spoke of the work done in Syracuse during the past 7 months under a planning grant—from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

He said more than 150 professional, business, industrial, church, labor, and other community leaders have joined to tackle the problem through the mayor's commission on youth.

He spoke of a program of job opportunities and said Syracuse is presently considering a conservation corps to be employed in the parks system and other city departments to provide youth with training in landscaping, handling of heavy equipment, and soil problems.

"Our aim here," Walsh said, "is not only to find or create jobs for youngsters but to start them on what may be a career with expanding opportunities."

He told the committee of work being done on neighborhood development, the rehabilitation of delinquents and the like.

He also told the committee that the Syracuse metropolitan area received slightly more than $14 million in Federal aid in 1962 and 1963 for welfare, urban renewal, airport, and housing development.

"This money was used wisely and well," Walsh said, and he then asked the committee, "but are these projects more important than our youth?"

[From the Syracuse Post-Standard, Aug. 14, 1963]

Walsh Wins Praise in Plea for Federal Funds for Juvenile Delinquency

Washington.—Mayor William Walsh drew praise from his GOP colleagues in the House and Senate for an impassioned plea for more Federal funds to study and combat juvenile delinquency he made Tuesday to a Senate group.

Drawing on his background as a social worker, the mayor said Syracuse and communities like it need the funds for further studies on ways to combat costly juvenile crime.

Last year, he said, 72 delinquents from Syracuse were institutionalized at a cost to the taxpayer of $400,700 a year.

New York State, Walsh told the Senate unit, pays about $15.25 a day or $5,566 a year for each juvenile delinquent it institutionalizes.

"Can we write (the juvenile delinquents) off, and thousands like him, or do we spend, as we are in our city, $140,000 this year on planning and much more on action programs in succeeding years to permit him to have the opportunity of really growing up and maturing into a decent, self-sufficient, responsible citizen."

JAVITS PRAISES

Senator Jacob K. Javits, who attended the hearing, warmly praised Walsh, saying, "You have made us all proud to have such a mayor from New York State."

Keating reported Walsh also received praise from committee Democrats for his brisk answers to the lengthy questioning session the committee put him through.

In reply to questions from Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, head of the Senate group, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Walsh said Syracuse could not afford the program without Federal aid.

Currently, he said, the city is operating on a 15-month Federal grant of $140,000.

PILOT PROJECT

The funds come from a $30 million pilot project involving 16 cities that Congress approved under the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961.

The mayor said that in his opinion many welfare and corrective programs are not effectively combating juvenile delinquency.

He said this was why such projects as that in Syracuse are needed.

"If I was told I could have $1 million to spend tomorrow in this area, I am afraid I would have to refuse it." Walsh said, "I just wouldn't know where or how to spend it."

The mayor called for an extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act which would mean more funds for Syracuse, at the request of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

ONLY GOP MAYOR

Of the 16 pilot cities, Syracuse is the only one with a Republican mayor.

Walsh later told a meeting of New York Republicans, hosted by Onondaga's Representative R. Walter Riehlman and Senator Kenneth B. Keating, that Syracuse's $14 million budget is already within $191,000 of the constitutional ceiling set by the State.

"While I strongly believe in home rule, I want to see Syracuse get Federal funds in view of the large amount Syracuse pays in Federal taxes," Walsh said.

[From the Syracuse Post-Standard, Aug. 14, 1963]

Mayor Walsh Presents Strong Case to Senate

Mayor Walsh wants to keep the city of Syracuse in the business of fighting its juvenile delinquency.

He so informed the Senate Employment and Manpower Subcommittee yesterday.

In doing this, the mayor scored these illuminating points:

We spend $5,566.25 a year to send a youngster to a corrective or penal-type institution.

For as much money, we could train that youngster, if originally oriented in the right direction, to serve his community as a doctor, an accountant, a social worker, a farmer. It costs less, each year, to take a vocational training course.

Secondly, Mayor Walsh pointed out that we have spent, in this community, more than $14 million in the last fiscal year for welfare services, for urban renewal planning and projects, for airport construction, for public housing and then he asked parenthetically: "Isn't it worth spending some of these funds (the Syracuse grant amounts to $152,532) on the community's youth?"

We think so.

So do the more than 150 members of the mayor's committee for youth.

The Senate should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

SYMBOL OF PEACE AND CYMBAL OF WAR

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in discussing the test ban treaty, the Senate must decide whether to advise and and consent to a symbol of peace while there is still heard the cymbal of war.

The symbol of peace is linked to the noblest yearnings and aspirations of mankind, but it does not represent their fulfillment.

I shall vote for the symbol, knowing full well that it may never take root and flourish in my lifetime.

Still, I can do no less.

It should never be said of this country that America is too proud for peace or too weak for war. Such a pride could lead to tyranny, such a weakness to slavery. There are other avenues to pursue and we shall follow them.

Let us not be moved, whatever we decide, by the weight of our mail. Rather, let us be impelled by the force of our conscience.

If I were convinced that the nuclear test ban treaty was a stake in the heart of America, I would oppose its every line and protest its every paragraph even if I could find no companion in the endeavor.

Not many months ago I cast the only vote against the Cuban resolution. I did so without fear or trepidation because it failed to mark our course so that Mr. Khrushchev knows and the world knows what our intentions are and where we really stand.

Had America established a policy of firmness, of will, and of resolution, there would not be thousands of Soviet troops on the island of Cuba today—and perhaps missiles as well.

Yet, with all the tragedy that the Cuba issue portends, the treaty is not the proper vehicle for its disposal. If indeed it were, then it would be a vehicle for correcting every blunder that has haunted us for 18 years—including Hungary and Yalta.

It is written that to everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven. This is a time to heal; a time to plant; a time to build up. It is a time when we pray for peace as we prepare for war, recognizing that without such preparation our prayer for the universal freedom and safety of man is likely to go unanswered.

Whatever judgments may be leveled against the nuclear test ban treaty, at least this much can be said in its behalf: It will serve to discourage, for days or months or perhaps years, the contamination of air, water, and food which threatens every form of life.

To say that it does more is to confuse hope with reality and to find in the mere wish its fulfillment.

Underground nuclear testing, research and development on antimissile defense, preparation for a series of standby tests in the atmosphere—all these things must continue despite the symbol we are about to approve.

I shall vote for the nuclear test ban treaty with the clear understanding that if war should descend upon any of the free peoples of the earth, or upon any ally of the United States, or upon the United States itself, we are absolutely free to use and employ each and every nuclear weapon in our arsenal.

I shall vote for the treaty without reservation because the treaty is a reservation in and of itself whenever the supreme interests of this country are jeopardized.

Finally, I shall vote for the treaty with the unswerving conviction that it places no moratorium whatsoever on the power of Congress to declare war, or on the power of the executive branch to repudiate the agreement upon the slightest breach thereof.

THE CALUMET SKYWAY BRIDGE AND THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the wrong which is sought to be perpetrated upon the whole American people by the effort which is being made in the Congress of the United States to persuade the United States to assume the defaulted indebtedness of the Calumet Skyway Bridge which is the solemn obligation to pay investors by the city of Chicago.

It is sought by a subtle device of asserting that the placement of this highway on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways makes it ex post facto eligible for the immediate payment of 90 percent of that portion of its cost which the United States might have borne had it been placed in proper time on the Interstate System.

In my State of Ohio during my term as Governor, a highway 241 miles in length was built across the State at a cost of $326 million which by proper management and honest construction is being operated as a paying, solvent venture which will repay its investors every cent of the $326 million from its own earnings. Of the total length, 206 miles are now in the Interstate System.

I want to ask this body whether or not my State is to be immediately reimbursed for the 206 miles of the Ohio Turnpike which are on the Interstate System.

Our State undertook the construction and operation of the Ohio Turnpike as a business risk and a good business risk it has been proved to be. The city of Chicago undertook the construction and operation of the 7.5-mile Calumet Skyway also as a business risk and offered securities to the public with its assurance that it was a good business risk. Through poor judgment and overenthusiasm, the officials of the city of Chicago declared what was in fact a bad risk to be a good risk and now that it has been proved to be a bad risk, ask the taxpayers of the United States to pay off the obligation of $63,838,000 and thus make right that which in the beginning was wrong.

The State of West Virginia in good faith undertook to construct and operate a toll highway. It has proved to be a financial failure. Will that highway not be sought to be made eligible for 90 percent of the cost of construction of that highway project which once offered the high hope of success as a good business risk because it too is on the Interstate System and is unable fully to meet the obligations of its indebtedness?

Mr. President, what incentive is left to the State and local governments which have constructed toll facilities to keep them successful if it is apparent that the Congress of the United States is ready and willing to bail out all bad ventures? Let Pennsylvania look forward to reimbursement for the 360 miles of the Pennsylvania Turnpike which are on the Interstate System. Let Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Maine, Kentucky, Kansas, and Oklahoma—whose toll highways all or in part are on the Interstate System—look forward to reimbursement.

Public reaction to this outrage is well-reflected in an editorial carried in the Cincinnati, Ohio, Post and Times-Star, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, on August 1, 1963, entitled "Protect the Highway Fund." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECT THE HIGHWAY FUND

Every since the $41 billion Interstate Highway fund was set up in 1956, the State politicians have been trying to milk it like a Jersey cow.

Public money of that importance is a direct challenge to a certain type of operator in the political and political contract field. He feels that if he can't lay hands on a chunk of it he must be slipping.

Substandard construction and kickbacks on right-of-way deals are among the familiar devices to tap the fund. Now spokesmen for the city of Chicago have come up with a perfectly legal but equally effective method to the same end.

The city built, financed by $101 million in revenue bonds, a toll road linking downtown Chicago with the Indiana toll road. It never has paid even the interest on the bonds. The reason given is parallel free roads. The toll road builders knew the location of these free roads when they picked their route.

Chicago paid the deficits for a while but finally defaulted on the bonds, which now are rated at about 56 cents on the dollar. Now a Chicago delegation led by Mayor Daley has had the happy idea of sticking the highway fund for $87 million to pay off insurance and trust companies which hold the bonds, and to build some new ramps.

Some other toll roads are in similar predicament. Representative WILLIAM CRAMER, of

Florida, told a House Roads Subcommittee that if a precedent were established in Chicago it eventually would cost the road fund $4.3 billion. Since the new highways cost about $1 million a mile, that is the price of 4,300 miles of new highway.

We trust Congress will turn this scheme down, permitting the Chicago builders to get out the same way they got in.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the fallacy in which the Congress might indulge itself by declaring an already constructed and bankrupt road an ex post facto part of the Interstate Highway System is just that; a fallacious and subtle device.

For the Congress to go on public record as handing out monetary rewards for poor judgment and poor management while good management and judgment are penalized by having to help defray the careless and costly errors of others; for the Congress to accede to this ridiculous request to bail out the Calumet Skyway Bridge with taxpayers money, would be a deliberate and wanton breach of trust. I hope that the Congress will not be guilty of such an act.

COST TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter which I received yesterday from the Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia. Mr. Tobriner enclosed with his letter a memorandum of the cost, to the District of Columbia, of the civil rights Washington march on August 28, 1963. I also wish to include the memorandum at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am pleased to enclose herewith copy of a report prepared by the District budget officer setting forth the cost to the District Government for the civil rights rally held August 28, 1963.

While this report refers to the figures as being estimated, nevertheless I have been informed by Mr. Herman that any future deviation would not be substantial.

The District of course will make reference to these costs when we appear before you for the formal budget hearings so that you might have them for the record.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, BUDGET OFFICE,
September 10, 1963.

Memorandum for Commissioner Tobriner.
Subject: Estimated cost of civil rights rally, August 28, 1963.

Listed below are tentative figures of actual out-of-pocket costs of the civil rights rally of August 28, 1963, as well as the estimated cost to the District resulting from diversion of staff time to this rally. A formal report from each agency involved in this rally is due in this office September 15, 1963. From these reports, a final consolidated report will be furnished you.

Agency	Estimated cost of diversion of staff time	Estimated out-of-pocket costs	Total
Fire Department	$1,448	$14,453	$15,901
Department of Corrections	84	3,061	3,145
Department of Sanitary Engineering	1,274	[1] 17,457	[1] 18,731
Department of Highways and Traffic	255	11,102	11,357
Metropolitan Police	76,147	[2] 23,103	[2] 99,250
Public Health	9,657	3,712	13,369
National Guard	133	1,908	2,041
Total	88,998	74,796	163,794

[1] Includes $6,500 for portable sanitation which may be a reimbursable item.

[2] Does not include $5,000 for box lunches for police. This item is still in controversy.

D. P. HERMAN,
Budget Officer.

DAVID K. ENOMOTO, OF KAHULUI, MAUI

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on July 10, 1963, the Navy recognized the unusual and meritorious service rendered by Mr. David K. Enomoto, of Kahului, Maui, Hawaii, to his country—service which began on December 7 and lasted for 15 months following the attack on Pearl Harbor. For 15 months Mr. Enomoto established the sole radio contact between the Naval Air Station at Puunene, Maui, and Pearl Harbor, the U.S. west coast, and the Far East. His contribution during those critical days of World War II was kept under wraps of defense security until July 10, 1963. On that day, nearly 22 years after his meritorious service Mr. Enomoto received from the U.S. Navy a certificate designating him an Honorary Naval Communicator, and a letter of citation. It was at that time that his full story was told.

I take great pride in bringing this story to the attention of my colleagues as it marks one of the many shining lights of service rendered by U.S. citizens during their country's hour of need.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles, one from the June 22, 1963, issue of the Maui News and the other from the 73d issue of the 1963 Navy Communications Bulletin, which cite the dedicated service rendered by Mr. David K. Enomoto, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Maui News, June 22, 1963]

MAUI WORLD WAR II SAGA IS TOLD AFTER 22 YEARS

A 20-year-old Maui saga of World War II that has remained in the classified file until this week, may now be told.

While the smoke was still hovering ominously over Pearl Harbor and the Nation was still in a state of shock, Maui's sole small Navy squadron, VJ-3, commanded by then Lt. Thomas South, was immediately cut off in communications with Pearl Harbor. The squadron at Puunene Airport, which quickly became Naval Air Station Puunene (NASP) had no transmitter capable of reaching out to the outside.

Top-ranking ham operator on Maui was David Kiyo Enomoto * * * but Kiyo was of Japanese ancestry and at that terrible moment in American history there was deep suspicion. However, Tommy South made his own decision.

Kiyo was his man.

So an armed guard appeared at the Enomoto home where his big transmitter was stored. He was told to pack up and be ready to move to Puunene. It was all on the highly classified side, totally hush-hush. That evening, Kiyo and his transmitter quietly moved out in a Navy truck and to all intents and purposes, disappeared.

His boss, William Walsh, long-time general manager, now retired, and his wife Mary were the only civilians to know his whereabouts, and they did not know the full story.

Those first few moments as he passed through the gate in the blackout were ones that Kiyo will never forget. The Marines on gate guard were ready to shoot anyone of Japanese ancestry who came near the base but Kiyo's guards got him through safely and upstairs to Lieutenant South's office.

There he became the first citizen on Maui to raise his right hand and take the oath of allegiance to his country and the Commander in Chief, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

"I was proud but I was also scared," Kiyo said. "I didn't know from one minute to the next whether some trigger happy Marine wouldn't take a pot shot at me, but my guards, who were always with me, took good care."

There were rumors about Kiyo's whereabouts, one had him rendezvousing with a Japanese submarine off Kahului, others had him in the hills relaying messages to Japan. It was fantastic. Meanwhile, those in the know remained silent and the mystery ran its course.

Meanwhile, Kiyo went to work putting his transmitter in order, grinding crystals to the various frequencies needed by the Navy to communicate with the west coast, Pearl, and the Far East. Enlisted men were assigned to him to help grind the crystals and do the other intricate operations prior to putting the transmitter on the air * * * but it went on in quick order and NASP was once more in close touch with headquarters and the outside world.

Kiyo Enomoto was the man of the hour * * * but only those on the inside knew it.

He worked under the cloak of deep secrecy for 15 months before adequate communications were set up by the Navy and Army on Maui, serving both branches in communicating with Pearl and Fort Shafter.

His transmitter was powerful enough to reach out to Corregidor and the Far East as well as the west coast.

During all this time, Kiyo Enomoto ostensibly had disappeared from the Maui scene.

Now, some 22 years later, the Navy has recognized Kiyo Enomoto's vital part in the early days of World War II when the fate of the United States was delicately balanced in an area of uncertainty.

On July 10 at 10 a.m. Capt. Glover T. Ferguson, the Chief of Staff, 14th Naval District, on behalf of the Department of Defense, will come to Maui to present David Kiyo Enomoto with the highest citation that his country can award to one of its citizens.

The simple ceremony will be conducted in Studio A, KMVI and will be broadcast as well as televised by KMVI and KMVI–TV.

Among those who participated in the communications with the Navy in setting out the facts of this unselfish devotion by Kiyo Enomoto to his country was Ezra J. Crane, who at the time was military intelligence and counterintelligence officer in Maui district and worked in close cooperation with Kiyo in transmitting important Army messages to the Pacific Command.

Capt. John L. Murphy, first Navy commander at NASP, William Walsh, general manager of Kahului Railroad and Lt. now Capt. Tom South were others who sent forward testimonials to the Navy.

The old historic transmitter has been decommissioned but it is still on hand to remind heroic Kiyo of his big part in the early defense of his country. It rests in a place of honor in the Enomoto garage.

In its place is a brand new high-powered transmitter.

Koyo Enomoto is still Maui's No. 1 ham.

[From the Navy Communications Bulletin No. 73, 1963]

Mr. Enomoto Honored for Vital Wartime Work

David Kiyo Enomoto, of Kahului, Maui, Hawaii, ham radio operator, patriot, and good citizen, has received Navy recognition for unusual service to his country nearly 22 years ago, in the critical early days of World War II.

After the Pearl Harbor attack, Mr. Enomoto operated his own high-powered amateur radio transmitter and receiver to enable Naval Air Station Puunene, on Maui, to communicate with Pearl, the U.S. west coast, Corregidor, and the Far East. He reestablished radio contact between Puunene and the outside world, staying on the job for 15 months before the Navy and Army set up adequate communications on the island.

Mr. Enomoto's vital contribution to the war effort was shrouded in secrecy at the time, and remained unpublicized until it was recently brought to the attention of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Office of Naval Communications.

On July 10, Maui's "No. 1 ham," with approximately 100 friends and relatives in attendance, received a certificate designating him an honorary naval communicator, and an accompanying letter of citation signed by Rear Adm. B. F. Roeder, U.S. Navy, Director, Naval Communications. The presentation was made by Capt. G. T. Ferguson, U.S. Navy, chief of staff, 14th Naval District.

After calling attention to Mr. Enomoto's volunteer wartime work, Admiral Roeder's letter continued, in part: "Since those dark days you have continued to serve your country by being an exemplary citizen, an active participant in the civic activities of your community and by public service through amateur radio.

"Your use of your amateur radio privileges in the public interest is in the highest traditions of the amateur radio fraternity and is in keeping with the acts of patriotism and humanity that have become legion with you and your associated hobbyists."

FISHING INDUSTRY NEEDS ASSISTANCE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last week the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries completed hearings on my bill, S. 1988, cosponsored by 12 Senators from coastal States, on the grave problem of increasing intrusions into our territorial waters of foreign fishing vessels. It is my hope that the Commerce Committee will soon be able to report that measure.

S. 1988 would, for the first time, provide legal ammunition to the Federal Government to seize such vessels and carries procedures for court action involving possible imprisonment and fines.

Witness after witness at the hearings stressed other vital problems, too, which have played havoc with our domestic fishing industry to the end that the United States has slipped from second to fifth place in the world's fish market.

Foreign fishing efforts have been assisted through acquisition of huge fleets of modern fishing vessels and equipment, and many of the foreign catches on the high seas are not made in the best interests of conservation.

These problems—and others—are graphically highlighted in the article which appeared in the September 10 issue of the Evening Star written by Charles Bartlett. Mr. Bartlett gives needed attention to a number of legislative proposals which are of paramount national interest.

Senator Magnuson's bill to give assistance in the construction of fishing vessels, S. 1006, has been reported to the Senate, and I am hopeful its passage will come soon.

My bill, S. 627, which would provide the machinery for increased efforts among the States in the development and research of fishery projects, has passed the Senate. These are some of the answers to this serious problem facing many thousands of Americans who make their living from the sea. We are searching for more answers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Bartlett be printed in the Record at this point:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Counteracting Red Fishing Fleets—Congress Expected To Act Soon on Bill, but Basic Illness of Industry Remains

(By Charles Bartlett)

The reaction to the Soviet fishing armadas off both coasts seems likely to stimulate this country's concern with its fishing industry in somewhat the same way that sputnik brought attention to bear on the space effort.

The intrusion of these fleets within the 3-mile territorial limits has prompted Congress to a move, with the support of the State Department, that would attach stiff penalties to such poaching. Concurrence on the inadequacy of the present prohibitions is broad enough to portend that the bill will be passed swiftly.

This country will decide soon whether to follow the example of some 40 nations, including Canada, in extending the fishing restrictions in its territorial waters from the traditional 3 to 12 miles. In either case, the new law will serve to keep these visiting fleets a respectable distance offshore and lessen the immediate concern.

But the new law will not, as its sponsors concede, answer the basic threat to the American fishing industry that is implicit in these foreign fleets with their great mother ships, advanced trawling equipment, and coordinated efficiency. The clear implication of these fleets is a present in which the American fishing industry is falling behind and a future in which it will be unable to compete at all.

It is not merely a matter of Russia, although that country's expansion of its fleet has been the most dramatic fact of the new era. Nations like Japan, Canada, Peru, and even Ghana have also been launching modern fishing vessels during a period of steady decline in new construction in the United States. Subsequently the fish catch has risen only slightly in the United States while it was doubling in the world as a whole.

This country now relies with increasing emphasis on imports for its fish supply. Established processing plants are obliged to turn to foreign sources or face the shortages which now afflict processors in traditional centers like Gloucester and Boston. The number of fishermen and fishing boats is decreasing and the industry as a whole is a dwindling operation.

The essential cause of the decline is the unavailability of capital necessary to acquire modern boats and equipment. Fishing flourished in this country as a rugged exercise of private initiative, but the cost of the new equipment is beyond the reach of the small entrepreneurs and unappealing to the large corporate investors. Uncompetitive labor costs and the high insurance charges on crewmembers have been factors in this lack of investment appeal.

A major deterrent to new contruction has been a law, on the books since 1792, which forbids the landing of fish in American ports from vessels that were not built in American shipyards. Since modern steel boats can be obtained abroad at savings as high as 50 percent, the fishermen confront a unique handicap.

The U.S. costs of new construction are $450,000 for a modern trawler, $740,000 for a tuna clipper, and up to $8 million for a factory processing ship. These are awesome figures, and the rate of new construction has declined steadily since the war. When new boats are built, the tendency is to build them along conventional lines without modern improvement.

The impact of the foreign fleets has spurred a congressional move to correct the construction handicap. The Senate Commerce Committee is preparing to report a bill that would offer $10 million a year in subsidies for new fishing vessels. Payments up to 55 percent of the cost of a boat would be made directly to the shipyard under the supervision of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Another proposal, which has gained less momentum, would enable the Government to build two modern stern-ramp trawlers at a probable cost of $7 million each. These vessels would be leased to established fishing companies with the purpose of proving their worth and inducing private investors to contemplate similar construction.

The case for these bills, and for a further proposal to grant $5 million a year to the States for fisheries research, rests upon a proposition that the American fishing industry is worth saving at the price of Government subsidy. This is a knotty issue because the fisherman's tradition of self-reliance is strong, but his prospects have been severely limited by the aggressive fishing policies of other governments.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S DEAN ELLIOTT EXPLAINS NEED FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received under date of September 5, 1963, a letter from Frank N. Elliott, associate dean of Columbia University, in the city of New York, endorsing S. 5, the cold war GI bill. Dean Elliott writes that the same benefits should be provided veterans of the cold war period as were extended to veterans of World War II and the Korean war. Dean Elliott states:

> I am sure that the observers in South Vietnam, those who observe the truce line in Korea, and those who are stationed along the Berlin wall are in every bit as much danger as I was while I was in the States, training to go overseas, or while I was sitting in Okinawa, doing occupation duty.

I, and many like me, did benefit from the GI bill—to which I will be everlastingly grateful—but we did not, as a matter of fact, face any great danger. Despite the fact that the opportunity for active service was very much before us and the fact that we were prepared to render such service, we were not called upon to do so any more than these young men have been called on even though they are, I am sure, ready should the call be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dean Elliott's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, SCHOOL OF GENERAL STUDIES,
New York, N.Y., September 5, 1963.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing in support of bill S. 5 which relates to providing benefits for veterans of the cold war comparable to those that were provided for veterans of World War II and the Korean war. Most of the reasons that made the passage of the GI bill for World War II and the Korean war sound apply to the passage of a bill that would aid the veterans of the cold war. Lives have been disrupted by service to the country and it is important to help these cold war veterans readjust in meaningful fashion to civilian life. To deny the veterans of the cold war the benefits of a bill of this sort because they did not face the dangers of war is not in every instance a valid argument. I am sure that the observers in South Vietnam, those who observe the truce line in Korea and those who are stationed along the Berlin wall are in every bit as much danger as I was while in the States training to go overseas or while I was sitting on Okinawa doing occupation duty. I and many like me did benefit from the GI bill—to which I will be everlastingly grateful—but we did not, as a matter of fact, face any great danger. Despite the fact that the opportunity for active service was very much before us and the fact that we were prepared to render such service, we were not called upon to do so any more than these young men have been called on even though they are, I am sure, ready should the call be made.

I believe that this bill deserves very careful consideration.

Sincerely,

FRANK N. ELLIOTT,
Associate Dean.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this is one of many letters that have been received from leading educators of America. The GI cold war bill has the support of the educators of America. They realize the importance of the readjustment of veterans for civilian living, and strongly favor the GI cold war bill.

I observe the majority leader in Chamber. I call his attention to the fact that the bill is Order No. 319 and has been on the calendar since July 2, 1963. I trust the GI cold war bill will soon be ready for action by the Senate, and the hopes of these 5 million Americans no longer deferred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I again thank the Senator from Texas for calling the bill to my attention.

PREJUDICE AND COURAGE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the able director of the Michigan Regional Office of the Anti-Defamation League, Sol I. Littman, wrote a story which appeared in the ADL Bulletin of June 1963.

It is a true story with live heroes, Joseph Megdell and Will Roberts. Michigan is the setting. Prejudice and courage are described. It is a story with a happy ending, much as one regrets acknowledging the existence of the prejudice described.

It is a story I want to share with my colleagues and people across this country, for I feel it has a timely and important message. It is for this reason that I ask for unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in full.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the ADL Bulletin, June 1963]

I REFUSE TO CATER TO PREJUDICE—JOSEPH MEGDELL SHOWS FLINT THAT STICKING TO PRINCIPLE IS GOOD BUSINESS

(By Sol I. Littman)

Taking chances comes naturally to Joseph Megdell of Flint, Mich. So too does fighting for human rights.

"Thirteen years ago, Will Roberts and I scraped together $6,000 to open our first store in Flint. Neither of us had any retailing experience. We couldn't afford help, so we started the first self-service store in the area.

"We hired our first two employees within the year. We didn't realize it, but we were setting another precedent in the Flint area—one of the first two salespeople was a Negro. Now we have approximately 600 employees, and an office staff of close to 50. Negroes hold many of our most important positions, and they make up about one half of our clerical and sales staff."

Today, Megdell and Robert's Yankee Stores is the second largest retail firm in the Flint area.

"It is no longer news that sticking to principle is also good business," Megdell said. "My private secretary ranks second to none. I'm lucky because the discriminatory employment policy in this community brought her to work for me. She is qualified to be secretary to the president of General Motors."

Yankee Stores now have six outlets in the Flint area and 14 in Michigan. One would expect Megdell and Roberts to have grown more cautious in order to protect their investment. But they haven't.

Three years ago, the mayor of Flint attempted to set up a Human Rights Commission to deal with some of the interracial problems that confront this northern industrial community. The mayor approached a number of community leaders to chair the new commission. None would accept. Finally, he came to Joe Megdell. Joe knew the pressure exerted on community leaders to reject the post, but he felt Flint needed a Human Rights Commission badly. He accepted.

The commission held only one meeting. The community's realtors feared the commission might pave the way for an open occupancy housing ordinance. It was decided to hold a referendum on the commission. There was a record turnout on election day. The commission was defeated by a vote of almost 8 to 1.

"The moderates did not vote—as usual," Megdell commented wryly.

Flint, with a population of 200,000, has one of the toughest problems in intergroup relations in Michigan. The city is almost entirely dedicated to the manufacture of automobiles, and like other cities based on the auto industry, it has large numbers of southerners, both white and Negro. Outside the factory walls, there is little communication between the races. The political undercurrents are treacherous, and radical right groups have always found plenty of recruits in Flint.

The race question is not the only one to disturb Genesee County, where Flint is situated. The community's 900 Jewish families are aware that they are barred from the Downtown Club and from almost all of the golf and country clubs. The Atlas Valley Country Club is the only one in the area which permits Jewish membership—but under a strict quota.

"You have to wait your turn. One Jewish member has to die before another Jew is admitted," declared Megdell. "I accepted a position on the board of directors. I hoped I could influence a change in policy. But I was just kidding myself. I resigned in 1959 as a protest against the quota."

Some people were unhappy about Megdell's making an issue of social discrimination. But he refused to demean himself or his religion by remaining a party to the quota system.

His partner, Will Roberts, stands alongside Joe Megdell in all his battles. Joe Megdell is 49, married, and has three children.

Early in 1963, the two partners initiated plans to open another Yankee Store, this one in Owosso, Mich., 60 miles north of Detroit. Construction was already underway when Megdell was visited by a member of the local chamber of commerce. After welcoming Megdell to this community of 17,000, the visitor suggested that Yankee Stores follow local custom in its hiring practices. He pointed out that there were no Negroes living in Owosso and there would be local resistance to hiring them.

Megdell's reply was abrupt. He stopped construction and announced that Owosso would have to do without a Yankee Store.

"We just aren't going to have one policy in Flint and another in Owosso, 25 miles away," Megdell said. "We aren't in business to cater to people's prejudices."

Megdell has also fought the radical right. Last October, small green, white and pink cards were found concealed in merchandise in some of the Yankee Stores. They bore the sarcastic message: "Always buy your Communist imports in Yankee Stores."

Megdell was not surprised. The month before he had received a letter from a so-called Committee To Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene. The CWACMLBS had spot-checked his stores for merchandise manufactured in Communist countries. The letter was signed by a young factory worker at the AC Spark Plug Division of General Motors who, according to the Detroit Free News, was a member of the John Birch Society.

When the "card party" hit him, Megdell knew he was pretty much alone. Some 18 stores in the Flint area had agreed to stop selling items from behind the Iron Curtain. Megdell knew that some of the major chains—Arlan's, Sears Roebuck, Kresge—were planning to remove dog baskets from Czechoslovakia and hatracks from Poland rather than risk radical right boycott.

But Joe Megdell also knew that trade with certain Iron Curtain countries was being sanctioned by the U.S. State Department. "This Government welcomes the expansion of contacts which flows from increased trade in peaceful goods with Eastern Europe," a State Department spokesman had made clear. And Megdell refused to be intimidated

"In a nutshell," Megdell said, "I told them to go to hell. I object to anybody walking up to a legitimate businessman and telling him what merchandise to carry and what not to carry. As long as we operate within the law, and according to State Department policy, we are not going to be afraid just because some punks threaten us with boycott. My stores carry less than 1 percent of their stock in Communist-made imports.

"I told my store managers that when they come in to distribute those cards, to throw them out."

Again, the Flint community looked in wonder at Joe Megdell to see how he would make out this time.

There were six or seven card parties in Yankee Stores after that. But they did not work—Joe Megdell refused to be cowed. The Committee To Warn of the Arrival, etc. took to distributing pamphlets door to door, urging people to boycott Yankee Stores. Megdell got dozens of phone calls from people who had gotten pamphlets. All of them urged Yankee Stores not to give in.

How did the radical right pressure affect business?

"Retail sales in the Flint area have been way down generally in the last quarter," Megdell said seriously. Then, smiling, "Except for Yankee Stores, that is. Our volume is way up"

CRITICISM OF U.S. TARIFF POLICY BY GERMAN CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I was surprised to see on August 8 an advertisement which was published in the New York Times. It consisted of a statement by the chairman of the board of one of the largest chemical companies of the world located in Germany. I was particularly interested in the fact that this gentleman criticized the U.S. tariff policy and went on to say that he would like "to repeat my appeal for a free and fair exchange of goods and services throughout the world." In my opinion, this advice would best be given to the German Government and the Common Market organization, not to the U.S. public.

This statement from the German chemical industry was surprising to me because of the recent actions of the Common Market involving poultry, a product of considerable importance to the State of Arkansas. I need not go into the details of the poultry controversy because this situation is well known by the Members of this body. Suffice it to say that it is estimated that about $46 million a year of U.S. poultry exports to Europe have been shut off in spite of repeated efforts by the United States to negotiate an equitable settlement of the problem.

The United States is preparing to withdraw a number of previous concessions to balance the Common Market action on poultry. This is very much in compliance with GATT procedures and I, for one, heartily endorse this action if the poultry matter cannot be settled to a state of mutual satisfaction.

Many of us were wary of the possible effects of the Trade Expansion Act as it was being debated last year. The likely growth of imports over exports was a frequently mentioned possibility. Nevertheless, the Trade Expansion Act was passed and work is now underway to implement the tariff reduction negotiations. On June 11, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] warned of some of the problems and dangers involved in these negotiations. I was particularly impressed with his statement that:

> The United States must be absolutely certain that the Trade Expansion Act is used wisely to accomplish the basic objective—to maintain, if not improve, the U.S. trade position.

The New York Times advertisement I previously mentioned took particular aim, of course, at U.S. chemical tariffs and the consequent inability of the German chemical industry to export more to the United States. The U.S. chemical industry is an important asset to the State of Arkansas and to the Nation. My knowledge shows it to be a highly efficient, research-minded and highly competitive industry. As in the case of shoes, textiles, and many other manufactured goods, the manufacture of chemicals with highly paid labor results, in many cases, in higher costs and selling prices. For this reason, tariffs cannot be drastically reduced on chemicals to satisfy the German chemical industry's desire for our chemical markets. In two meetings this spring, the U.S. chemical industry has told the Department of Commerce the many reasons why U.S. chemical exports are unlikely to increase. Among these were nontariff barriers blocking more exports to Germany and the Common Market.

All of this causes me to urge extreme caution in exercising the right to reduce U.S. tariffs conferred under the Trade Expansion Act. We must make certain that the Common Market does not export more to the United States while protecting its own industries and agriculture. While the tariff reduction negotiations present us with many opportunities, they also may present us with a number of problems. For this reason, I believe that the U.S. trade program should be watched closely by the Senate and that all developments should be discussed fully on the floor as they occur.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a scholarly and reflective editorial on Vietnam appeared this morning in the Washington Post. I wish to call special attention to the following lines:

> There are surely limits to our toleration. If there are no limits at all, then our policy is the prisoner of every client government, however arbitrary and extreme. And if the client governments get sufficiently arbitrary and extreme, no amount of economic or military aid, in the end, will rescue them from the disaffection of their own people, to say nothing of rescuing them from Communist aggression. It is true that South Vietnam might be lost to communism if we withdrew; but it is also true that it may be lost to communism in spite of the fact that we remain—if our remaining in the face of all kinds of folly perpetuates a regime incapable of mobilizing the country in its behalf.

Mr. President, there seems to be something of an ossification of opinion about our situation in South Vietnam. Too often, we seem to consider only two alternatives: to support the repressive Diem regime, or to pull out. I think there are two other more promising alternatives: First, to support a reformed Diem regime; or, second, to support another non-Communist regime in South Vietnam which can elicit the support of the people to overcome the Communist Vietcong guerrillas.

To illustrate the strength of the non-Communist opposition to Diem in South Vietnam, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an article by Erich Wulff, which appeared in the New Republic of August 31, 1963. The article is entitled "The Buddhist Revolt: Diem's New Opponents Deserve U.S. Support." Mr. Wulff flatly declares:

> As for the argument that there is no alternative to Diem, it is absurd.

In this position, Mr. Wulff agrees with the statement of the recently resigned Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Tran Van Chuong.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial published in the Washington Post, and the article published in the New Republic.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1963]

PATRON AND CLIENT

Our relations with South Vietnam, on which the President dwelt in his broadcast remarks on Monday, demonstrate anew the limitations of great power and the inevitable embarrassments of the patron-client relationship in international affairs. This is equally true of our relations with a dozen other governments around the globe.

Reinhold Niebuhr pointed out in 1952: "The same strength which has extended our power beyond a continent has also interwoven our destiny with the destiny of many peoples and brought us into a vast web of history in which other wills, running in oblique and contrasting directions to our own, inevitably hinder or contradict what we most fervently desire."

To some extent, these frustrations are the inevitable accompaniment of the exercise of worldwide political power. We could not escape them by withdrawing from this or that country, but only by withdrawing from the great power role that has descended upon us. And perhaps we could not even escape that way, because the power we declined would be exerted by others and would soon find us only exchanging the frustrations of a client for those of a patron.

The President rightly reminded us: "We cannot expect these countries to do everything the way we want to do them. They have their own interest, their own personalities, their own tradition. We can't make everyone in our image, and there are a good many people who don't want to go in our image."

The President recalled one of the Nation's earlier experiences with this dilemma—in China, where a weak government lost the country to the Communists. President Eisenhower once reviewed our mistakes in China in almost the same language that President Kennedy used to describe our relations with South Vietnam. At an informal meeting in January 1951, he looked back on the China episode and said of Chiang Kai-shek: "It was an error to expect that we could make him over in our image. We cannot apply in a land governed by war lords for generations the democratic principles that flourish in the United States. You can't go back to the general's childhood and replace the images and impressions of his youth with those that each of us got at his mother's knee. We have to accept him as he is and go from there."

The Kennedy and the Eisenhower cautions are well put and ought to be kept in mind. Even if we embrace this tolerant philosophy, however, there surely are limits to our toleration. If there are no limits at all, then our policy is the prisoner of every client government, however arbitrary and extreme. And if the client governments get sufficiently arbitrary and extreme, no amount of economic or military aid, in the end, will rescue them from the dissaffection of their own people to say nothing of rescuing them from Communist aggression. It is true that South Vietnam might be lost to communism if we withdrew; but it is also true that it may be lost to communism in spite of the fact that we remain—if our remaining in the face of all kinds of folly perpetuates a regime incapable of mobilizing the country in its own behalf.

It is the President's present decision that we should not now withdraw from South Vietnam. It is a decision that may be right, now, but it is one that he must keep in a state of day-to-day review. There must be some limit even to a policy of toleration that takes the fullest account of the diverse policies, customs, habits, and philosophies of the varied peoples and governments who have little more in common than a hostility to communism.

[From the New Republic, Aug. 31, 1963]

THE BUDDHIST REVOLT: DIEM'S NEW OPPONENTS DESERVE U.S. SUPPORT

(By Erich Wulff)

(NOTE.—Dr. Erich Wulff is head of the psychiatric division at the University of Freiburg hospital in Germany. On leave to establish a new psychiatric program at the University of Hue in Vietnam, he became an involuntary eyewitness of the May 8 massacre of Buddhist demonstrators there. He and two colleagues resigned from Hue University in protest against the government's torture of students and refusal to allow treatment of injured demonstrators. He was charged with instigating a student riot and distributing poison gas to students, and expelled from Vietnam.)

Ngo Dinh Diem has never been able to tolerate any force—political, military, or religious—which was independent of him. In driving the Hoa Hao, Cao Dai, and Binh Xuyen sects underground, in robbing the political opposition of its leadership, in transferring overly popular commanders to desk jobs, Diem's objective has always been the same: those who might oppose him for whatever reasons, had to be destroyed or neutralized. So when Vietnamese Buddhism unexpectedly awakened last May to become the only power in Vietnam independent of Diem, his reaction was predictable: he set out to crush it.

Actually, the emergence of the Buddhists as a political force was unexpected only by those who had not followed recent Vietnamese history. Certainly it is hard to believe that Diem was taken altogether by surprise. The Buddhists actually had begun to adapt to modern political realities several years ago. Buddhist youth societies and student and trade organizations were formed and attracted a large following, particularly in central Vietnam. Young monks streamed to the universities. The pagodas gave up being merely homes, schools and places of devotion for monks, and once again became spiritual centers for the whole people.

Although there was no indication that this Buddhist revival was political in purpose, Diem from the first carried on a campaign of discrimination, intimidation and persecution against it. The legal basis for all this was "ordinance 10," a vestige of French colonialism. This law had been designed to help Christianize Vietnam by improving the competitive position of the missionaries. It put Vietnamese Buddhism on the same legal basis, and made it subject to the same organizational restrictions, as a private club. The Buddhists had to obtain a permit in advance (e.g., the purchase of land on which to build schools had to be authorized by the provincial administration). Everything depended on official good will.

Once the Buddhist revival began, this good will evaporated. Ambitious functionaries did all they could to make things hard for the Buddhists, assuming this would put them in the good graces of the Roman Catholic President and his family. Some delayed acting on requests for permits until it was too late. Others refused permits entirely. Some went so far as to put traditional Buddhist holy places like Thien-But, in Quang Ngai Province, at the disposal of Catholic priests as building sites.

In remote provinces, such as Phu Yen and Binh Dinh, which foreigners seldom visit, the Buddhists were subjected not merely to legalized discrimination but to a thoroughgoing religious persecution. At Phu Yen, for instance, a Buddhist monk named Thich Tam Chon protested in his pagoda against religious discrimination. He was murdered. The Government blames the Vietcong, of course. The Buddhists have considerable evidence pointing to the Vietnamese secret police. In other rural areas Government officials tried to win Catholic converts by mixing intimidation and promises. The cook for one of my German colleagues gave me a detailed account of such proselytizing. He assured me, however, with great emotion, that he would rather die than worship the cross.

Many Buddhist officers, officials, and university teachers in Hue, the capital of central Vietnam, were given to understand they had better attend mass on national holidays. Some Catholic officers even forbade their men to take part in Buddhist ceremonies. Among this group of officers is Maj. Dang Sy, the man responsible for the Hue massacre of May 8. Dang Sy had to be transferred from two commands because his religious discrimination drove the soldiers to the brink of mutiny. Yet that is how he got promoted to deputy chief of the province.

During those same years of increasing harassment of the Buddhists, the Catholic Church kept acquiring more privileges, especially in central Vietnam where the archbishop of Hue is Diem's older brother, Ngo Dinh Thuc. I have no reason to believe that Diem ordered these privileges. On the other hand, what officer would refuse to loan a president's brother (or his agent) military vehicles and soldiers for work on a Catholic building project? What commander would object when President Diem personally ordered a piece of military property handed over for construction of a Catholic seminary, school, or hospital?

As a result of such favors Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thue has managed to turn his archdiocese into a going business concern. His goal is to make it financially independent of foreign aid. The tuberculosis ward of the Hue hospital, for example, is directed but not financed by archdiocese. It requires advance payment from even the poorest peasant. These who cannot pay are not admitted, unless they have a powerful advocate. The fees go to the archdiocese. The archbishop also has a monopoly on the import of textbooks. This not only provides an opportunity for censorship but is profitable as well. Thuc's main source of income, however, is his share of the profits from the Government's program for lumbering virgin land. Of course, privileges of this kind are enjoyed only by the politically loyal. The neutral priest in a remote village may have no privileges at all. Nevertheless, such practices give rise to less well founded rumors. The Buddhists, having no faith in Diem's controlled press, believe anything they hear by the grapevine.

In addition, Diem and his family seem convinced that they have the unconditional support of the Catholics but not the Buddhists. As a result, Catholics advance faster in administrative and military careers. Buddhists first have to prove their loyalty. One result is a large number of opportunistic converts among officers and other officials.

THE BIRTHDAY MASSACRE

All this had been going on quietly for years—so quietly that American diplomats appear to have been genuinely surprised when trouble erupted late in May 1963. It all seems to have begun when Thich Tri Quang, president of the Buddhist organization in central Vietnam, decided not to send Archbishop Thuc a congratulatory telegram on the occasion on his 25th year in the priesthood. Soon after, on May 6, Saigon issued an order forbidding the Buddhists to fly their flags. May 8 is the Buddha's birthday and a most important holiday.

Future historians will have to decide whether Diem ordered the ban simply in line with general policy on religion—on the assumption that the Buddhists would suffer the humiliation in silence—or whether the regime deliberately sought an open conflict expecting to crush the Buddhists as it had earlier crushed the other sects.

Whatever the intention, the result was that the Buddhist masses, though inclined to pacifism and accustomed to misery, began spontaneous protest demonstrations. At first the Buddhist leaders simply acquiesced in these demonstrations; then they began to lead them.

At the start, the demonstrators had the limited objective of a return to the status quo ante; they wanted Diem's new restrictions on the celebration of the Buddhist holiday rescinded. The Hue crowd on which Dang Sy's tanks opened fire May 8, for instance, was asking Saigon to allow the Buddhist leaders to give the traditional annual radio address. Up to now, it is still not clear who gave Dang Sy the order to open fire. Seven children and one woman died on the spot. Painted on the tanks, in big white letters, was the name of the President's brother, Ngo Dinh Khoi, murdered in 1945.

And so the Buddhist Christmas became a day of mourning, and the Buddhist leaders decided not only to demand compensation for the victims but to raise the long-latent issue of religious discrimination and persecution. On May 12 the Buddhists requested that the Government lift the flag ban, revoke ordinance 10, permit the unimpeded dissemination of Buddhist teachings, free Buddhists under arrest, punish those responsible for the massacre and provide financial recompense to the families of the victims. Demonstrations spread to several other provinces, but their objective remained unpolitical, limited to the putting through of this program.

After the Hue massacre the regime had one chance to pull itself out of the affair undamaged: to dissociate itself from Maj. Dang Sy and admit responsibility for the tragedy. Instead, it designated the Vietcong, as the criminal. In the ensuing weeks, hard and soft tendencies seem to have struggled with one another. Beginning in June the President's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, and his wife Madame Nhu, incited and supported an anti-Buddhist campaign, ranging in my observation from loyalty telegrams to the employment of poison gas against young girls and the torture of students who refused to brand their Buddhist leaders as Communists.

Madame Nhu also launched a political drive to denounce Buddhism as a Communist-infiltrated international conspiracy. Pagodas were surrounded with barbed wire, and women and children trying to bring water to the monks were clubbed to the ground. This was all quite open, without any effort at concealment. The regime swiftly did everything it could to sharpen the conflict until, immediately after the sacrificial death by burning of Thich Quang Duc, the danger of a popular uprising became so great that an interministerial committee, formed on June 16 under American pressure, accepted some Buddhist demands.

On the day after the agreement, however, a leading article in the Nhu-financed Times of Vietnam spoke of extortion by the Buddhists. The efforts, suspended during the negotiations, to play off dissident sects of lesser significance against the Buddhist All-Vietnam Union, were vociferously resumed. Contrary to official promises, a great number of Buddhists remained under arrest. The Buddhists came into possession of Government plans for suppressing their organization "once the present storm has subsided." The Republican Youth group, under Ngo Dinh Nhu's command, published a petition in the Times of Vietnam asking that the discriminatory ordinance 10 be kept in force.

Within 2 weeks the Buddhist leaders lost faith in the good faith of the Government and President Diem, and ordered new protest demonstrations. Though forbidding a third public suicide attempt and calling off a planned demonstration in Hue, the leaders sent Diem a strongly worded letter attacking the activities of his sister-in-law, Madame Nhu. "Many empires have crumbled and regimes been toppled," the letter warned, "because the laws were not enforced, power was abused, and above all because women were allowed to meddle with the affairs of state." The letter expressed the hope that Madame Nhu's charge of "ignoble treason" did not "reflect the policy of the Government."

Meanwhile, the Buddhist monks developed an increasingly efficient national organization. Their intelligence from inside the Diem government is excellent. They also have been able to synchronize their actions in the various provinces. By the end of June, Saigon's Xa Loi Pagoda resembled a GHQ. Nevertheless, the problem of transmitting news to the rural pagodas has not been solved. If it is, my guess is that the Buddhists will follow their leaders to the last village. Certainly the crowds I watched in Hue displayed great courage. Young girls remained sitting on the sidewalk, for example, even when soldiers charged them with bayonets. The crowds were also distinguished by their discipline. During the June 1 demonstrations, at the monks' orders, not a single offensive word was uttered against the government. Excesses occurred only when the Buddhist leaders had not arranged the demonstrations, as in Hue on June 3 and Saigon on June 16.

Among the monks who guide the movement, one in particular stands out a born leader. He is Thich Tri Quang, president of the Buddhist organization in central Vietnam and the man whose refusal to congratulate Archbishop Thuc is thought to have caused the ban on the display of Buddhist flags. In private conversation with Thich Tri Quang I was struck by his precise grasp of the situation, the modesty of his appearance, and the mixture of tolerance and determination which he embodies. Addressing a crowd, he produces an electrifying effect. His audience clearly is ready to obey his every command. He has that direct access to the heart of the people which Diem so completely lacks. In central Vietnam he is venerated almost as a saint by students and peasants alike. Were he not a monk he would be a logical successor to Diem. As it is, he could be a kingmaker—and that is why his life is reckoned in constant danger.

What next? In the present tense situation the most important unknown is the attitude of the army. There is an unmistakable discontent among the junior officers. "Just what are we fighting for anyway?" asked a young captain with whom I was discussing the crisis. "For Diem and his family? If the physical and spiritual terror here gets much worse, there will be nothing to choose between us and the North." His opinion is shared by many younger officers of the middle grades. As for the recruits, I myself saw 10 truckloads of troops, sent out against a crowd of students in Hue, signaling encouragement to them. The regime stabilized the situation in Hue only by flying in military police from Danang and part of the Presidential guard from Saigon. In critical situations the government can apparently rely only on special troops.

NOLTING AND DIEM

A second critical factor is the attitude of the civilian opportunists and time servers, whose only concern is to protect their careers. As in any regime these men are the majority. As the crisis reached its first climax in mid-June, individuals who had followed the regime for years began to indulge in more or less candid criticism of Diem. They had, they said, always been against the regime at heart. I talked to officials, secret officers, and university professors who wavered this way. Friends in Saigon and Hue told me of many similar experiences. These were people with an inborn sense of the balance of power. If they are deserting Diem his ship is doomed.

The third factor is America. During the first act of the religious crisis, from the May 8 massacre to the short-lived June 16 agreement, the United States took a hands-off position. Thereafter, however, the United States resumed active support for Diem. Ambassador Frederick Nolting returned hastily to Saigon and made a public statement to the effect that Diem was resolutely working toward democratization and had the support of the people, especially in rural areas. He added that in his 2 years as American Ambassador to Vietnam he had not seen any sign of religious discrimination. Who knows? Perhaps he hadn't.

At the same time American military advisers ordered their subordinates to emphasize the "positive" and play down the "negative." The religious crisis was not to impair the battleworthiness of the Vietnamese army. The Buddhist movement was described as an urban affair which would meet with little response in the country, where the war is fought. I do not know who is expected to believe such nonsense. Certainly the men who are actually fighting in the Buddhist sections of rural Vietnam are not likely to be fooled. Even the Americans in Saigon presumably don't believe it, since they also urge the Buddhist leaders to stop demonstrations lest the religious dispute help the Communists.

Even if one ignores the moral implications of U.S. support for Diem's dictatorship, the present policy is shortsighted. In the past, American officials have usually admitted privately that Diem is a rather unsavory character and have then argued that nevertheless, there is no alternative to supporting him—that "a change in the leadership would plunge the country into chaos." Recent events indicate the contrary. Vietnam will fall into chaos if Diem does not resign, and soon. Already, an important military base, Rang Rang, has been given up so that more troops could be deployed to Saigon to protect Diem. And the psychological damage of Diem's private war against the Buddhists is only beginning to be perceptible. The peasantry reacts slowly but imperturbably. U.S. aid will not make them accept discrimination against their religion. They are imbued with human dignity and cannot be bought so cheaply.

As for the argument that there is no alternative to Diem, it is absurd. Any honest non-Communist politician in Saigon would be a better choice. The hopes of the people would be raised, and they would give the new government a choice. Of the various opposition groups, however, the nationalist Dai Viet has in the past gotten the most sympathy from the United States. Between 1959 and 1962 the Dai Viet had the same difficulty vis-a-vis Diem that it had had earlier with Bao Dai and the French. Every action against Diem indirectly gave aid and comfort to the Communists. Since most Dai Viet supporters are as anti-Communist as they are anti-Diem, they were paralyzed and the group atrophied. Last year, made desperate by Diem's incompetence, the old group began to reassemble. Today it is the focus of a broad front of non-Communist politicians, determined to work together for the removal of Diem. For obvious reasons, I cannot report either its composition or present organization.

At the moment, the Buddhists openly express the hope that by continuing their protest they may become the catalyst for the formation of a new government—a government which would give them a better break. Only in this sense can one say that their movement has turned political. If no new government is forthcoming, however, the Buddhists may rally their followers in the countryside and in the army to passive resistance. They might even take the path of the Hoa Hao and Cao Dai sects, which support the so-called National Liberation Front run by the Communists in the hope that this will topple the Diem dictatorship and bring about a neutralized Vietnam.

Rightly used, on the other hand, Buddhist movement could give a new government mass support, allowing the kind of radical reforms needed to undermine the Vietcong. I know intelligent politicians prepared to attempt this in collaboration with the Buddhists. The Vietcong would need time to adapt its propaganda to the new situation. Many who now support the Vietcong might rally to the Government or at least adopt a wait-and-see attitude. It is uncertain how Hanoi would react to a change of government in Saigon. There might be possibilities for negotiation with the North.

The Vietnamese do not ask very much from America. They are responsive to the slightest suggestion of a change in the U.S. policy of all-out support for Diem. It might even suffice if the new Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, were to invite the few Vietnamese opposition leaders who are still out of jail to a dinner party. Should diplomatic strategems of this type show no perceptible result, however, the situation would call for a declaration, on highest authority, that the United States dissociates itself from the Diem regime and will in the future be neutral between him and the non-Communist opposition.

SHORTAGE OF HORSE TRAINERS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I call attention to a very serious situation that has developed in my State.

I have been advised, by a legal firm in my hometown of Helena, that one of its clients, a rancher, is unable to obtain a competent horsebreaker or trainer.

The rancher has been in touch with an Australian, with impressive qualifications, who seeks to enter this country to engage in the storied profession of "bronc peeling."

Under the rules of the Immigration Department, in order for the Australian to enter this country there must be a certification by the Labor Department that there is not an American supply of horse trainers who are unemployed.

The Department of Labor did indeed certify that "qualified workers are not available within the United States for referral to the employer by the Employment Service."

Mr. President, what will the American image be abroad if it becomes known that the Nation of cowboys and Indians, which exports hundreds of western movies, where even former Presidents read western novels, has to import a horse wrangler from the other side of the world?

I certainly will not stand in the way of any Australian who seeks to come to our shores to follow his profession. But I wish to let my colleagues know that employment opportunities, for which some of their constituents may possibly qualify, do exist in my State.

The shortage of competent wranglers in Montana—the land of the great Greenoughs, Lindermans, and Reynolds, derives from the fact that Montana wranglers are busy picking up top money in rodeos in other States.

CAN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT SURVIVE IN THE JET AGE?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, to be effective in this space age of change and challenge, the Federal Government must be capable of strong action and strong leadership, if our democracy is to survive. The legislative process cannot be allowed to become an exercise in futility.

Recently, Members of this body, notably the distinguished senior Senators from Pennsylvania and New Jersey [Mr. Clark and Mr. Case] and the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] have offered constructive suggestions as to what they feel should be done if Congress is to maintain its effectiveness in this fast-moving age of political and social developments.

George Jenks, Washington correspondent for the Toledo Blade, one of the great newspapers of Ohio and the Nation, recently wrote a very thought-provoking article entitled "Can American Government Survive in the Jet Age?" The article appeared in the Toledo Blade on August 25. George Jenks is one of the outstanding newspapermen in Washington today, and this fine article further attests to that fact. He has carefully and thoughtfully reviewed the entire problem of congressional reform, and has come up with some concrete solutions. I believe that this article merits the attention of all Senators, and I commend it to them.

An excellent editorial, which deals with this same subject, appeared along with Mr. Jenks' article. In the editorial, the publisher of the Toledo Blade, Paul Block, Jr., has again taken leadership in the field of journalism, in calling for a public discussion of a serious, but little publicized, problem facing our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Aug. 25, 1963]

Can American Government Survive in the Jet Age?—Critics Charge Traditional Procedures Are Obsolete

(Note.—Are Americans saddled with a horse-and-buggy Federal Government structure in a jet age of fast-moving political and social developments? Here is a critical appraisal of some of the shortcomings in the democratic process and the reforms that are being advocated to improve it.)

(By George Jenks)

Washington.—Winston Churchill is quoted as once having remarked that democracy is the worst form of government men have ever devised, except for every other form.

Sir Winston is not the only statesman and scholar of the free world to express exasperation with the contradictions, confusions, and cumbersome nature of the democratic process.

Large numbers of Americans—from university campuses down to workers on the production line and the Negroes seeking their constitutional rights—are today watching the spectacle of their Government stalled on dead center during fast-moving world events. And they are wondering how long the stalemate between Congress and the President is going to last.

One of the eggheads of Congress, Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, former university president, Phi Beta Kappa and Rhodes scholar—was taking part recently in a Fund for the Republic symposium on how government by the people can be made to work efficiently and effectively.

He led off with the dour statement that "Government by the people is possible but highly improbable."

"It may well be questioned whether the enormously complex and slow-moving procedures of the American Government are adequate to meet both the dangers and the opportunities of our foreign relations," he wrote.

Senator Fulbright has grounds for his pessimism. The stubborn, quarrelsome Congress in which he sits is setting new records for doing nothing. It has yet to take final action on any major administration legislative proposals it has received since January and has broken away from its own as well as White House leadership.

In the third year of the term in which he promised voters he would get the country moving agan, President Kennedy, like former President Eisenhower before him, is being accused of inaction, indecision, and timidity.

The Supreme Court is faced by the possibility—even though a remote one—that it could be stripped of a substantial part of its authority by proposed constitutional amendments, backed nationally by those who resent the recent school prayer decision and sectionally by those who resent the Court's rulings in civil rights and legislative reapportionment cases.

These amendments would give the States the right to propose and ratify amendments to the Constitution without congressional approval; prohibit the Supreme Court or any other Federal court from assuming jurisdiction in State legislative apportionment cases; and establish a "Court of the Union" made up of 50 State supreme court chief justices, which would have power to review Supreme Court decisions dealing with Federal-State relations.

Cries for basic structural governmental reforms have been and are still being heard across the land. They come from earnest citizens who argue that at a juncture when the heads of the world's two greatest powers feel it essential to maintain a "hot line" between the White House and the Kremlin, it is time to reexamine 19th century procedures.

Can the traditional system go on forever unchanged, they are asking, in the jet and nuclear age and still insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?

When the authors of the Constitution began their deliberations in Independence Hall in 1787, they shared a common apprehension which some latter-day Americans believe to have rendered them overly cautious and conservative.

As men who lately had risked their lives and fortunes in revolt against the mother country for what they regarded as a denial of their rights, they were determined to leave no loopholes in the document they were about to write, through which the new Republic could be debauched by tyranny or oppression of minorities.

That they succeeded in that objective is a matter of history. The system of checks and balances, the careful distribution of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, devised by James Madison and his associates, has withstood the test of the years.

The matter for concern today, however, is not over threats of possible usurpation of power but rather over whether the Government is close to being checked and balanced into paralysis.

There have been many remedies suggested for relief of sleeping sickness in Government. Most would involve the freeing of Congress from the shackles of its own rules and its committee and seniority system.

Others would give the President broader powers to act in emergencies, particularly in foreign affairs.

There have been no serious suggestions that the Constitution itself be extensively overhauled or rewritten. That venerable document has been enshrined in the national tradition and it would be a bold reformer who would propose that the original 18th century framework be altered.

President Kennedy is one who shares the view that the Constitution can be made to work as beneficially in the 20th as in the 18th century.

Speaking to a group of college students last year, he told them to dismiss the idea that the Constitution "gives us an automatic light to the future, guides our way, and that all we have to do is follow the very clear precepts it lays down for us.

"The Constitution has served us extremely well. But all of its clauses, the general welfare and due process and all the rest, had to be interpreted by man and had to be made to work by men," he said.

"And it has to be made to work today in an entirely different world from the days in which it was written, both at home and abroad."

One fundamental alteration of the Constitution would be required, however, under a proposal made by Senator Fulbright in his contribution to the Fund for the Republic symposium.

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Arkansas Democrat carries more weight in foreign affairs than any other Member of Congress, yet he is convinced that the President must be given broader powers to act in the world arena.

Congress, he pointed out, cannot initiate or shape foreign policy, although it can and does modify or thwart Presidential proposals. Furtherfore, he added, Congressmen, much more than a President, are apt to yield to the whims and prejudices of uninformed public opinion on such matters as foreign aid.

Senator Fulbright did not spell out what he had in mind in recommending enhancement of Presidential authority in foreign affairs but certainly one of the steps required would be modification of the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds approving vote by the Senate for ratification of a treaty with other powers.

"The prospect is a disagreeable and perhaps a dangerous one, but the alternative is immobility and paralysis of national policy in a revolutionary world, which can only lead to consequences immeasurably more disagreeable and dangerous," he said.

Senator Fulbright confined his reform proposals to the field of foreign policy. Being an influential committee chairman and being possessed of ample seniority, he found no reason to be critical of congressional handling of homefront problems.

"In domestic matters, it seems to me, the Congress is as well qualified to shape policy as the Executive, and in some respects more so because of the freedom of at least some Members from the particular electoral pressures that operate on the President," he said.

On this point Senator FULBRIGHT came into direct disagreement with another congressional participant in that symposium—Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Senator CLARK, a former mayor of Philadelphia, pointed an accusing finger at Congress, the State legislatures and city councils as "the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

He painted a dismal picture of what goes on in the Nation's Legislative Chambers. There, he said, is "where the vested interest lobbies run riot, where conflict of interest rides unchecked, where demagoguery knows few bounds, where political lag keeps needed action a generation behind the times, where ignorance is often at a premium and wisdom at a discount, where the evil influence of arrogant and corrupt political machines ignores most successfully the public interest, where the lust for patronage and favors for the faithful do the greatest damage to the public interest."

Those are strong words and they did not endear Senator CLARK to his colleagues in Congress. Nor did the reforms he urged to correct the legislative evils he sees. These are:

Strengthening the executive at the expense of the legislative branch. Specifically he proposed 4-year terms for Members of both the House and Senate so that they all would be elected in presidential campaign years and thus committed to the national platform.

Amendment of the Constitution to allow the President to make Executive appointments without Senate confirmation, doing away with "the need to satisfy legislative parochialism."

Election of congressional committee chairman by secret ballot rather than by seniority.

Outlawing of delaying tactics such as the filibuster and the bottling up of proposed legislation in committee. He would require that all bills sent to the Capitol by the White House be brought to a vote on their merits regardless of committee action.

Fair reapportionment of congressional and State legislative districts in all States.

Stronger laws governing campaign contributions, including tax inducements to small contributors.

Another entry in the national debate over what's wrong in Washington came from the political scientist and author, James MacGregor Burns, in his recent book, "The Deadlock of Democracy—Four-Party Politics in America."

He finds both Democrats and Republicans guilty of misrepresenting themselves.

It is Professor Burns' contention that actually there are two Republican and two Democratic Parties. Each, he says, confuses and deceives the public by maintaining separate presidential and congressional wings which stand apart like separate sovereign powers.

At each national convention in recent years, he points out, the GOP has nominated a political moderate who ran on a platform with broad appeal to moderates and independents as well as conservatives.

Once those presidential elections are over, he writes, control of Republican policy has tended to shift back to the standpat, conservative leadership of the party's conservative wing, currently personified by such men as House Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, and Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER.

It is much the same on the Democratic side, his argument goes. The convention nominates a John F. Kennedy, an Adlai E. Stevenson or a Harry S. Truman to run on a national liberal platform of glowing promises.

Then, when the tumult of the campaign dies down, the congressional wing of the party resumes its old stand on the right under the brass-knuckle leadership of such Democratic moguls as Virginians Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, boss of the House Rules Committee.

Professor Burns lays the blame for drift and delay in present-day Government to what he calls the four-party system "that compels government by consensus and coalition rather than a two-party system that allows the winning party to govern and the losers to oppose."

He would do away with the congressional wings of the two parties by absorbing them into the national parties, largely through most of the congressional reforms proposed by Senator CLARK.

He nominates for oblivion the seniority system in Congress, minority devices such as the Rules Committee veto, the filibuster, malapportionment and one-party districts.

One of the most penetrating of the recent discussions of Government reform and of the declining prestige of Congress came from a freshman Member of the House, Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., in an address at the American Bar Association convention in Chicago this month.

Mr. TAFT told his fellow lawyers that Congress is the weak link in the Federal Government and that it must be revitalized if there is to be a halt to the mounting assumption of power by the executive and judicial branches at the expense of the legislative branch and of State and local governments.

Unlike his late father, Mr. TAFT looks for no resurgence of States rights. He defined the Federal system as "a governmental organization which permits continued existence of lesser subdivisions for limited purposes" and said recent Supreme Court decisions have made argument over States rights more and more academic.

Some of the reform suggestions Mr. TAFT threw out at the bar convention were familiar. Others are new and bold.

For instance, he proposed a voluntary redrawing of State boundaries to relate them to the "economic and practical realities and necessities" of modern industrial civilization.

This revision of State lines is particularly desirable for coping with the increasing complexities and contradictions involved in large multi-State metropolitan areas, he said.

Among the other reforms suggested by Mr. TAFT were:

Elimination of the electoral college system to head off a possible fiasco in a presidential election.

Solving the legislative reapportionment problem by taking it out of the hands of the courts and enacting a constitutional amendment defining clearly the requirements for guaranteeing the principle of representative government.

Changing the process of amending the Constitution by providing for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the people of two-thirds of the States as well as by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. This limitation of the power of the State legislatures would offer "more flexibility" to the process, he said.

Action by State and local governments to eliminate duplication of governmental units and to eliminate the "balkanization" of metropolitan areas by county and State lines.

A shift in the Federal tax base to give the States and local government more revenues to deal with health, education, welfare, and other such programs.

Turning to the question of the House, Mr. TAFT traced most of its ineptitude to the wide dispersion of leadership on both the majority and minority sides and took his stand with those who favor trimming the powers of the Rules Committee.

"Because of the power of the Rules Committee, along with the seniority feature in connection with committees, the selection of committee chairman and the right of committee chairmen to schedule or refuse to schedule legislation for hearing, the centers of power within the parties in Congress are multiple, with no one being in a position to direct even the procedural aspects of the legislative body," he said. Mr. TAFT suggested the undoing of the 1960 reform which stripped the Speaker of the House—then Joseph G. (Uncle Joe) Cannon—of many of his arbitrary powers.

He said that reform was made at a time when the legislative dominated the executive branch and that now with the executive firmly in the saddle and Congress the underdog, the time has come to build up the power of the Speaker and centralize the sources of procedural power within the two parties.

Discussions about the shortcomings of the Federal Government usually wind up with the finger of accusation pointed at Congress.

On the 535 Members of the House and Senate falls the responsibility of overseeing the vast Federal establishment of nearly 2.5 million employees and 2,300 executive departments, agencies, offices, and bureaus.

They are called upon to review and authorize Federal spending at a rate approaching $100 billion a year and to pass upon the programs submitted by the White House.

In trying to cope with this formidable burden of work, the legislative branch is employing substantially the same loose organization and the same ivy-covered ground rules it developed by stops and starts between 1789 and the outbreak of World War I.

Taking their cue from the authors of the Constitution, successive generations of congressional leaders have erected their own elaborate system of checks and balances which enables the minority to frustrate the majority and clog the legislative machinery.

Attempts to grease the wheels of Congress have been frequent in the past. The last serious effort came in the Reorganization Act of 1946 passed after the legislators were warned by a blue-ribbon committee of the American Political Science Association that it "must modernize its machinery and methods to fit modern conditions if it is to keep the pace with a greatly enlarged and active executive branch."

The 1946 act, however, failed to produce any lasting changes beyond a boost in congressional salaries. It did reduce the number of standing committees from 81 to 34, but that cut eventually was nullified by the creation of equally large numbers of standing subcommittees.

Now, 17 years later, growing public distaste for "do-nothing" Congresses is applying pressure for a new stab at rewriting some of the archaic rules of procedure.

Proposals to name a joint House-Senate reform study group to draw up reorganization recommendations are now resting in committee in both Houses, backed by bipartisan groups of liberals.

The towering logjam of unfinished business, mounting since early January, probably will prohibit action on any reform committee resolution this year, but the handwriting is on the wall and it will come eventually.

Disclosures of unethical conduct by Congressmen, including nepotism, padded payrolls, junketing, conflicts of interest, to say nothing of the extravagance displayed in the building of the stately new House Office Building, have aroused the ire of at least some of the Nation's voters.

It is likely that there will be a reform group named next year but the results are uncertain. The only thing sure about a reorganization program is that it is likely to include a congressional pay increase.

In the past, senior Members have been able to consistently beat down efforts to make the House Rules Committee a conduit rather than a blockade against pending legislation; and set a time limit on debate in the Senate; to delegate authority for disposing of some of the trivia that now takes up valuable time, or to write a new code of ethics for Congressmen.

Reform is overdue. Reform is inevitable. But before it can come, it appears that there will have to be a landslide election to give one or the other of the two parties enough new members and the overwhelming majority needed to rout the entrenched senior members and ram through a meaningful reform program.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Aug. 25, 1963]

Call To Reform

The crisis in government described on this page is neither unprecedented nor revolutionary. The history of government can be recorded as one crisis after another, each defined in its own debate and possessed of its own timeliness.

Usually these crises—the run-of-the-mill type, so to speak—center upon specific issues or proposals: a tariff policy, a tax bill, a treaty. What sets today's debate apart is that it probes to the vitals of the governmental system itself, the process by which other crises are resolved.

Even this aspect of the crisis discussed here is not unprecedented. But its crucial nature is the more emphasized by the fact that similar crises-in-depth have occurred previously only when the Nation's very existence was at stake, when the alternatives were to change or to die. Thus the Founding Fathers threw out the Articles of Confederation in 1787 to convert 13 rival entities into a viable sovereignty, and the Civil War was fought to free the national impulse to expand from the restraining bonds of provincialism.

The urgency of the current crisis is further highlighted by the fact that those who recognize and define it are not all detached bystanders. With the exception of Professor Burns, each of the men whose views are outlined here is involved in the governmental process. Together, they represent a broad range of geographic, economic, social, and political interests.

It is significant that none of these men belong to the school of skeptics which sees the crisis as heralding the collapse of American democracy. All are confident that the United States can continue to build on its present constitutional foundation. That they find some of the superstructure in dire need of renovation actually testifies to their faith. Just as the superstructure they condemn was originally erected to replace an earlier outworn one, so they want now to remodel the procedures and powers of government to give new vitality to the old framework.

The crisis, then, is one of dynamic politics. This can be seen in the fact that so much of today's controversy is sparked by decisions of the Supreme Court. As Justice Harlan told the American Bar Association this month, it is a "serious mischief" to conclude that "all deficiencies in our society which have failed of correction by other means should find a cure in the courts." But resort to the courts is inevitable when normal political methods become so fossilized that they deny the Negro the opportunity to obtain his rights or deprive millions of citizens of fair representation in their State and National legislatures.

The 1963 crisis in American Government marks another turning point in our development. History teaches us that there is no cause for despair. But it also teaches us that it could be disastrous to ignore the summons to reform.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PEARSON FOR HIS SPEECH ON CUBA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week I was privileged to hear a part of the fine speech on Cuba delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. Unfortunately, I was called from the Chamber before I could make any comment on his speech. So I take this opportunity to compliment and commend him for the forward-looking ideas he expressed in the speech he delivered on that occasion.

I am impressed by the fact that he has considered the possibilities as to what might be done in the future when Cuba once again is free. He also emphasized the part the Organization of American States should take in planning for this possibility, which without question will become a fact. He then enumerated five essential elements of a free society which should be considered by this inter-American organization.

In his conclusion, he outlined three reasons why we should now prepare for the rehabilitation of Cuba; and he went into some detail in explaining them.

Toward the end of this speech he made this pertinent comment:

> Mr. President, I have tried to see beyond the curve of the horizon, to the day when Cuba once again will be free.

I wish to take this occasion to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas for making a distinct contribution to our understanding of the Cuban problem, and also for attempting—as he stated so succinctly—to see beyond the curve of the horizon, into the future, and to make plans accordingly.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Montana yield briefly to me, to enable me to comment on that subject?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was my privilege also to be seated in this Chamber throughout the great speech the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] made last week.

I desire to pay my respect to the junior Senator from Kansas. Indeed, I feel that by his speech, he made a great contribution, and he deserves the congratulations of all Senators for the leadership he has demonstrated so soon after becoming a Member of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive M (88th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, after weeks of studying the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee—having listened to testimony before our committee and having read the lengthy arguments on both sides—I have come to the conclusion that it is in the best interest of the American people to ratify the treaty.

In doing so, I am laboring under no illusions about the character of the chief cosigner, the Soviets, or about the limitations of the treaty. It is a matter of balancing the risks.

I favor our making every possible effort to achieve agreements on nuclear testing—and on disarmament and peace—with the Soviets so long as these agreements incorporate adequate safeguards.

We in the Senate will ratify the nuclear test ban treaty without any illusions as to its limitations. We know full well that the leopard has not changed his spots.

Even during the final negotiations at Moscow, Khrushchev joined in a public declaration calling for the "liberation of South Korea" from the U.S. "imperialists." No doubt, the Soviets still intend to "bury" us.

As President Kennedy said in his address to the Nation on July 26:

> Nations cannot afford in these matters to rely simply on the good faith of their adversaries.

We are not deceiving ourselves about our adversary. Neither are we deceiving ourselves about this treaty. It is not the millennium, as the President said.

And, as he said further, it does not "mean an end to the threat of nuclear war. It will not reduce nuclear stockpiles; it will not halt the production of nuclear weapons; it will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions."

Let me say, further, that I firmly believe that the Soviets will not hesitate to break this treaty when it serves their purpose to do so. We are fully aware of Russia's record of broken agreements.

I have been furnished with some interesting statistics on our past negotiations with the Soviets. I have no reason to doubt these figures. During the last 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Soviets—including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words—100 volumes. All this talk led to 52 major agreements, and the Soviets have broken 50 of them.

We are not the only victims. The Soviets have a special fondness for nonaggression pacts; they have gone into these treaties in a big way—with Poland, Finland, Rumania, the Baltic States, among others—and have violated nearly every one of them.

Mr. President, the goal of civilized people is peace. What is the best way to maintain peace?

The nuclear test ban treaty, submitted by the President to the Senate, is believed by many conscientious people to be in the interest of peace.

The treaty we are asked to ratify is, I believe, in the interest of every American if it does not endanger our people's safety or security.

Notwithstanding our justifiable distrust of the Soviets and our awareness of the limitations of the treaty, we are mindful of the grave danger of nuclear war and the advantage of keeping open any channel, however remote, for the avoidance of nuclear worldwide destruction.

I wish to insert another point right here.

One of the reasons most commonly offered for a nuclear test ban has to do with the danger of fallout contamination. Most of my mail favoring the test ban treaty has referred to fallout from atmospheric testing.

I regret to say I have not heard or read any conclusive testimony on this point. Regardless of how the vote on ratification goes, I think the responsible officials of the executive branch of the Government owe the public a frank and adequate answer on this point.

Either there is real danger from fallout incidental to atmospheric testing or there is not, and this point should be settled.

It is the position of many of our officials—and sincerely believed by a great majority of our citizens—that this treaty represents the first step made in 18 years toward permanent peace.

On the other hand, I am mindful of the fact that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee has filed a report stating that the treaty will adversely affect the future quality of the Nation's arms and that it will result in serious military disadvantages.

Some witnesses questioned the safeguards to protect the national security of the United States.

On this point, I joined with colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in offering a resolution requesting that the administration furnish full information. The administration furnished the desired information. It gives us assurance that we can make the progress necessary to protect and maintain our deterrent within the limitations of the treaty. We are assured that the development of our arsenal will continue unhampered.

Incidentally, if we should fail to ratify, it would possibly shake the confidence of the 88 other nations who have signed, believing in our steadfastness of purpose and our devotion to peace.

There are two possible roads to peace. One is the proved road of strength and vigilance. The other is the unproved road of negotiation. We must travel both roads. I feel that to forsake either path would be to court war and invite destruction.

Let us place our trust in the path of strength and our hope in the path of negotiation.

Mr. President, after careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that the treaty does not sacrifice anything vital to our security and does offer some hope. Therefore, I will vote for ratification—even though it must be with more hope than trust.

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, for the purpose of submitting a request to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the leadership, in conformity with the rules of the Senate, endeavored to move to the next step in the consideration of the resolution of ratification. This is the normal procedure. However, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who expressed no opposition whatever to the procedure which the leadership was attempting to follow, we agreed with him to put it over until today.

Under the rules of the Senate the procedural situation is such that reservations, interpretations, and understandings with respect to the treaty are not in order at this stage of the proceedings. At this time only actual amendments to the language of the treaty itself may be offered. In the past, the traditional method by which the Senate expressed its reservation to, or its understanding of, the meaning of the treaty was by adding such reservation or understanding to the resolution of ratification. This is the proper procedure and the one which the leadership understands is intended to be followed now. I therefore now ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having passed through the several parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification. The granting of this request, if it is granted, will not deny any Senator the right to speak on any part of the treaty, the treaty as a whole, or for that matter on any other subject. The only effect procedurally will be to foreclose the offering of amendments and to allow the offering of proposed reservations and understandings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THURMOND. Reserving the right to object, amendments may be offered. I would not wish that the Senate be bound by such an agreement. Therefore, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I say to the Senator from South Carolina that this is an action which can be taken at any time. I would hope that the Senator, in his understanding of the situation, would understand also the position in which the leadership finds itself. We are not trying to rush the treaty to completion. We are making it as easy as possible for every Senator to make his views known, either for or against the proposed treaty. It is the usual procedure which we are requesting at this time, and only the usual procedure. It will not preclude the offering of reservations or understandings by any Senator who wishes to do so. To the best of the knowledge of the leadership—the combined leadership—no amendments are at the desk, nor has the leadership been informed of any amendments to be considered. The Senate cannot consider reservations or understandings until this step has been taken.

Mr. THURMOND. I reassert my desire to cooperate with the leadership in every way I can. This is an important subject. I see no need to foreclose the question of amendments, if it is decided that amendments should be offered. I shall have to insist on my objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from South Carolina himself have any amendments he wishes to offer? The reason I ask is that we know of no amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. I do not care to give a final answer to that question at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Idaho for yielding.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a treaty in which all signatories have agreed to refrain from nuclear testing in the air, underwater, and in outer space, has finally come before us for ratification. It is here because the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have at last recognized that it may be better to try to halt the nuclear arms race than to try to win it.

For years we have known in our bones that there was no way to win this race. The longer it has gone on, the closer both sides have come to nuclear parity. As our respective atomic stockpiles have grown more immense, the more certain it has become that it will be suicidal to use them. The combined American and Russian nuclear arsenals are now estimated to contain an explosive power of some 60 billion tons of TNT—enough to put a 20-ton bomb at the head of every human being on earth.

Small wonder that the President has said:

> Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.
>
> Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—10 million times more powerful than anything the world has every seen, and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror, and discord, and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes—for disarmament must be a part of any final settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness—for in a spiralling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

We know this treaty is only the first step on the long, uncertain journey toward arms control. Many steps must follow if we are ever to grope our way out from under the somber shadow of the mushroom cloud. But the treaty represents our first chance to embark upon the journey since the burst of that fateful fireball above Hiroshima 18 years ago. It may be a small step, and it comes very late, but it proffers some hope of being the commencement of that long pilgrimage to avert what the President has aptly described as "the world's slide toward final annihilation."

As the first nation to have developed the atomic bomb, we have always felt a special responsibility for the control of such weapons. Less than a year after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the United States offered its original plan for the internationalization of atomic energy. Bernard Baruch, as spokesman for President Truman, appeared before the United Nations in support of the American proposal, saying:

> We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead. That is our business. Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves. We must elect world peace or world destruction.

Tragically, our proposal was rejected by a suspicious Stalin who believed, with his generals, that Russia could never be secure without first securing the bomb. Thus began the nuclear arms race. Never has a competition occurred more frightening or more futile. Never have the energies of two great nations been so largely absorbed in so frantic a pursuit of the Devil's arts.

At first, we followed the grim statistics of the race with horrified fascination. Warheads were soon perfected that were 10 to 20 times as powerful as the bomb which inflicted 140,000 casualties on Hiroshima. But this was only the beginning. As fusion followed fission, hydrogen weapons were added to the American and Russian arsenals which were hundreds—even thousands—of times more powerful still. To our disbelief, we learned there were no upper limits to the size of the explosions that could be contrived.

New words were needed to measure the forces being released in the testing—kilotons, megatons, the very terms began to turn sour on our tongues. And as the years passed, as the costs mounted ever higher, as our weapons systems became ever more sophisticated, as our missilemen went underwater and underground, it became increasingly evident that national defense, in the sense of shielding our homeland and our way of life, had gone the way of the musket and the powderhorn. The term itself has nearly disappeared from the lexicon of contemporary military usage. Against nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missiles, we have no defense. Instead, we maintain an enormous deterrent which alone may survive a full-scale nuclear attack upon us. Its purpose is not to defend, but to avenge. The frenzied search for national security through nuclear armament has failed.

Indeed, it was foredoomed from the outset. Instinctively, we have known this from the time we first detonated the hydrogen weapon that sank an island in the Pacific. In those days it was Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, the chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, who was impelled to introduce a resolution concerning "the overriding problem of our time—how to stop the armaments race and establish a just peace." In sponsoring this resolution, McMahon was joined by several men who are still Members of the Senate—Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama; Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington; Senator MORSE, of Oregon; and Senator, then Representative, JACKSON, of Washington. The stirring summation of one of McMahon's addresses should suffice to show the depth of his concern, even then, that the world must find a way to deal with the split atom before the atom split the world. He said:

> Mr. President, the clock is ticking, ticking, and with each swing of the pendulum the time to save civilization grows shorter. When shall we get about this business? Now, or when Russia and the United States glower at one another from atop competing stacks of hydrogen bombs. Senators, destiny will not grant us the gift of indifference. If we do not act, the atom will.
>
> If we do not act, we may be profaned forever by the inheritors of a ravished planet. We will be reviled, not as fools—even a fool can sense the massive danger. We will be reviled as cowards—and rightly, for only a coward can flee the awesome facts which command us to act with fortitude.

But the United States and the Soviet Union were too caught up in the momentum of their grisly competition to heed McMahon's warnings. With little interruption, the clock has continued to tick away for the 13 years that followed until we found ourselves—true to his prediction—glowering at one another from atop our respective hydrogen stockpiles, in the course of the two terrible showdowns of 1962—one over Berlin and the other over Cuba.

An implacable fate has not granted us the gift of indifference. What American parent in the dark hours of the Berlin confrontation or the Cuban missile crisis failed to look at his children and shudder at the thought of the catastrophic consequences of nuclear war? As we were forced to peer over the brink of the abyss where is a sane and honest man who would deny that we were not "the slaves of fear?" And who among us would contend that the Russians felt no panic? However, wrongminded we believe them to be, the Russians are human, too.

How close are we today to the end of the rope? No one can say for sure. If other showdowns lie ahead, we must face them bravely, and pray ,that nuclear holocaust is averted. But sure it is that we cannot slide down the rope indefinitely. Somewhere it has a frazzled end which will drop us into a witchfire of incredible destruction. This treaty is one pull back on the rope, the first pull of a long climb which could lead to a safer and saner world.

From Truman forward, our Presidents have sensed the futility of continued, unrestricted testing, and our need to somehow temper and then to harness the nuclear arms race itself. Less than 3 months after President Eisenhower took office in 1953, he renewed the American offer for international control of atomic energy to promote its use for peaceful purposes only and to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons. In 1958, Eisenhower ordered a cessation of this country's nuclear testing, and his administration, in cooperation with the British Government, commenced negotiations with the Soviet Union in an attempt to reach agreement on a comprehensive test ban, applicable to all environments, including underground testing.

Perhaps the effort was premature; perhaps the objective sought was too ambitious for the times. The inclusion of underground testing greatly complicated the problem of working out an adequate system of inspection and control. We contended, rightly I think, that seismographs alone could not always distinguish between certain kinds of underground nuclear explosions and earthquakes, and that onsite inspections of suspicious events would therefore be required, if covert violations of the proposed treaty were to be safeguarded against. The Russians contended that a static control system would suffice, and that our motive in demanding roving inspections was actually a guise to permit hostile reconnaissance and espionage within the Soviet Union. On this issue, the negotiations dragged on inconclusively for many months.

Thinking it impossible, at that time, to obtain Russian consent to onsite inspections, which were in my view indispensable to any workable comprehensive treaty, I myself proposed on the floor of the Senate, in April of 1959, that the United States seek a limited test ban agreement to stop further nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

Later that year, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan joined in offering Khrushchev a limited ban on atmospheric tests up to an altitude of 50 kilometers. In 1961, President Kennedy, again with Macmillan, proposed a ban on atmospheric tests. Both of these proposals were rejected by the Soviet Government as insufficient.

All of us know the sorry story of how the stalemated negotiations for a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty ended in dismal failure; we recall how the Soviet Union, after quiet preparations, suddenly resumed testing on a most extensive scale, forcing the United States to do likewise. We remember, too, how the testing was accompanied by a new round of bellicose speechmaking in the Soviet Union, coupled with a hardening of Russian attitudes on every cold war front. And we shall never forget how the era culminated in a daring thrust by Khrushchev to install missile bases in Cuba, at our very doorstep. In this reckless gambit, Khrushchev in effect was asking: "If her vital interests are challenged, is the United States really willing to risk all in a nuclear war?" President Kennedy's response, coming swift and sure, gave Khrushchev his answer. The world watched breathlessly as Kennedy ordered the Navy to turn back Russian ships on the high seas, even as he laid down his ultimatum that the Cuban bases must be dismantled and the Russian missiles withdrawn. Khrushchev had his answer, and he backed away under circumstances which surely inflicted the most serious reversal on the Communist cause since the end of the second war.

I suppose Khrushchev's question had to be asked—and answered—somewhere, sometime, if a turning point in the nuclear arms race was ever to be reached. The Russians had to know whether, in a showdown situation, we actually stood ready to suffer a full-scale nuclear exchange—whether, in effect, we would sooner choose to be dead than Red. Had Kennedy allowed the Russian missile bases to remain in Cuba, then Khrushchev would have known that he could win his points, one by one, through the threat of nuclear war—that he could bluff his way to world dominion. Under such circumstances, the Russian nuclear arsenal would have had utility, after all, in advancing the objectives of Soviet foreign policy. The Russians would doubtlessly have then intensified the nuclear arms race, and we would have no test ban treaty before us today.

So the tense and terrifying days of last October may well be recorded by historians of the future as a time of destiny for the whole human race, when the fortitude of an American President won for us another chance to harness the nuclear monster, or, as Kennedy himself has put it, to stuff the genie back in the bottle, while there is still time.

Those days of danger last October are like yesterday to me. I remember talking with the Secretary of State in the midst of the crisis. For days and nights he had not left his office, except to confer with the President. The awful strain of having set the United States on collision course with the Soviet Union was written in his face, and I thought of how lonely the President must be.

The agony dwelt also in the Kremlin. Those of us who serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have learned something of Khrushchev's ordeal during those tense hours, when the knot of war had to be untied even as events tightened it around both countries. The feat was accomplished in the 11th hour by men whose involvement will chasten them all their lives through.

So the stage was set for the President to renew the American effort to temper the nuclear arms race by another attempt to reach an agreement on a nuclear test ban. In June of this year, before leaving on his triumphal trip to Europe, Kennedy judged the time to be ripe for another overture to the Soviet Union. At American University, in a remarkable speech that I regard as the highwater mark of his first term in office, the President addressed himself to the conscience and good sense of the American people, with these memorable words:

> I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.
>
> I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost 10 times the explosive force delivered by all of the allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by the wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.
>
> Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles—which can only destroy and never create—is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.
>
> I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war—and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task.
>
> Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament—and that it will be useless until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a nation—for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the course of the cold war and toward freedom and peace here at home.

With a candor as refreshing as it is uncommon to men in high station, the President went on to say:

> No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage.
>
> Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. Almost unique, among the major world powers, we have never been at war with each other. And no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of the Second World War. At least 20 million lost their lives. Countless millions of homes and farms were burned or sacked. A third of the nation's territory, including nearly two-thirds of its industrial base, was turned into a wasteland—a loss equivalent to the devastation of this country east of Chicago.
>
> Today, should total war ever break out again—no matter how—our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironical but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours. And even in the cold war, which brings burdens and dangers to so many countries, including this Nation's closest allies—our two countries bear the heaviest burdens. For we are both devoting massive sums of money to weapons that could be better devoted to combating ignorance, poverty, and disease. We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.
>
> In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.
>
> So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

Then the President focused upon the one place where a beginning might be made. Said he:

> The one major area of these negotiations where the end is in sight—yet where a fresh start is badly needed—is in a treaty to outlaw nuclear tests. The conclusion of such a treaty—so near and yet so far—would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms. It would increase our security—it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

In this great address at American University, the President correctly assessed the changing temper of the Kremlin strategists in the aftermath of their Cuban misadventure. His renewed invitation to Khrushchev to rethink things through was superbly timed. Logic is the same, whether pursued in English or Russian, and our refusal to yield to the Red missile threat in Cuba led to one inescapable conclusion: The issues between the United States and the Soviet Union could not be settled by nuclear intimidation.

Once this conclusion is reached, it becomes possible for both sides to consider ways for tempering the precarious risks inherent in what has been aptly described as the nuclear "balance of terror." A partial test ban treaty was a reachable first step in easing tensions and slowing down the feverish arms race. Once again, Kennedy offered it; this time, Khrushchev accepted it.

So we have before us a treaty which was negotiated—once the time was ripe—with extraordinary ease and speed. It has been examined with the utmost care by the members of the Senate Foreign Relations, Armed Forces, and Atomic Energy Committees. We have heard expert testimony ranging from the technical military consequences of the treaty to its broadest implications in world politics and long-range cold war strategy. When all of the testimony is taken into account, the overwhelming consensus has supported the treaty. Our leading statesmen, the Chiefs of Staff of our Armed Forces, the directors of our intelligences and atomic energy programs, the great majority of our nuclear scientists, endorsed the treaty. It was the preponderant judgment of the expert witnesses called from many different fields of study, scientific, military, and political, that the risks to which we will be exposed without such a treaty far exceed the risks we assume with it. The case was strongly made that the best interests of the United States would be served by our ratification of this treaty without reservation.

There was, of course, testimony against the treaty, and there will be votes against it in the Senate. Not one among us lacks suspicion of the Russian Government, and it comes easily to reason that, since we and they are opposites, no adjustments between us are possible, that whatever is good for them must be bad for us.

If this is true, then cohabitation of this plant must ultimately give way to coannihilation, tensions will grow ever greater as the spiraling arms race heightens the common danger, and there will be no escape from a fiery oblivion.

Yet is not this treaty itself a rebuttal to so dismal an outlook? Both sides have signed it, because each side has separately concluded that it serves its own interests to do so.

Decidedly, this does not mean that we believe we can now trust the Russians. No element of trust is involved in this treaty. It is limited to testing in those environments where we ourselves can detect any significant violations, without having to depend on any sort of Communist disclosure.

It has been said that we can expect the Russians to keep this treaty only so long as they find it in their interest to do so. I agree. And I would add that is all the longer we intend to keep it.

As the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has suggested the typical course of a sovereign nation, throughout the whole path of diplomatic history, is to keep a treaty only so long as it remains in its national interest to do so.

Both sides have carefully included an escape clause for this very purpose, drawn as broad as language can make it.

Article IV reads, in part:

> Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country.

But there are good reasons to suppose that both the Soviet Union and the United States may well find it in their mutual interest to keep this treaty. The two nuclear giants bear the weight of certain common problems which this treaty should serve to lighten.

First, the two nuclear giants have most at stake in avoiding a nuclear war. The United States and Russia would be the principal targets of a nuclear exchange. Each has trained its missiles upon the launching sites, the cities, the industries of the other. The consequences we Americans would suffer were succinctly summarized by Mr. Sanford Gottlieb, who testified that our "homeland population and way of life would be pulverized, and the survivors would have the unenviable job of trying to refashion civilization out of the radioactive rubble. Freedom would not walk among the survivors." Khrushchev, on his part, has commented that the survivors would envy the dead. It is little solace, either for the Russians or for us, that Mao Tse-tung has already sensed that nuclear war today would be an Armageddon for the West, making the world safe for the Chinese. The treaty does not end the nuclear competition between us and the Soviet Union, but, as Walter Lippmann has observed, "limiting the experiments will remove the hysteria, the violence, and the poison from the competitive search for absolute supremacy," and thus should contribute toward the avoidance of a nuclear war.

Second, it is the two nuclear giants, as matters now stand, which have the most to lose by the spread of nuclear weapons technology to other countries. Each new nation added to the ranks of the nuclear powers holds up another match to the fuse of nuclear disaster for all. And if nuclear arsenals spread to nations with unstable governments, or come into the possession of regimes afflicted with a "rule or ruin" philosophy, then the risks to which we are now exposed would quickly multiply beyond calculation. This treaty alone will not prevent, but it will retard, the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Third, the treaty, by imposing limitations on future tests, will slow down the development of ever more costly and complicated nuclear weapon systems—on both sides. Huge nuclear arms budgets have imposed a disproportionate burden upon the United States and Russia, as compared with our respective allies. It is now costing us, in this country, more than $50 billion a year to maintain our Armed Forces, which is over half our total Federal budget. The cost has increased fivefold in the last 15 years. Testimony was given that it is likely to double again by 1970, if present trends continue. The Soviet Union, drawing upon lesser wealth, spends an even higher percentage of her national income for arms.

While the United States and Russia have been thus increasing their military budgets, their non-nuclear allies have been able to devote a bigger part of their wealth toward improving their economies. Within the Soviet bloc, countries like Czechoslovakia, Poland, and even Rumania, boast higher living standards and more consumer goods than Russia, a fact which has embarrassed Khrushchev during his recent visits. As for the United States, we still maintain the highest living standards in the world, but our country is beginning to fall behind some of our non-nuclear allies in certain crucial respects. Since we are required to spend twice as much proportionately on military defense than our NATO partners in Western Europe, or Japan, our peacetime steel, shipbuilding, and machine tool industries are becoming increasingly obsolescent, in comparison with theirs, a factor which weakens our competitive position in the world market. More pertinent still, while 65 percent of our research and development funds go into weapons systems, only 15 percent of the research mark or yen in countries like Germany and Japan need be devoted to military purposes.

The staggering expense of the unrestricted nuclear arms race has forced us to give insufficient attention to the severe problems which are building up here at home—the problems of diminished industrial competitiveness, of automation, of education, of air and water pollution, of pockets of chronic unemployment, of mass transit, of urban renewal—all of which demand major new steps for solution.

And the same problem plagues the Soviet Union. Khrushchev has been unable to hide the increasing demand of the Russian people for a better life. I have seen enough of Russia with my own eyes to understand the popular appeal for a larger diversion of the nation's resources to consumer goods, food, clothing, and adequate housing. Their demands are far from met, and cannot be, unless the nuclear arms race can be slowed down, and resources diverted from the sword to the plow.

Finally, the United States and the Soviet Union, despite their profound differences, share one further inducement for keeping this treaty. They have a common need for ending the physical and psychological consequences of continued nuclear fallout. Internationally, this fallout has proved prejudicial to both countries. Other nations, with much justification, angrily demand: "By what right do you slowly poison the air we all must breathe?" Internally, the physical dangers of fallout are most severe in the United States and the Soviet Union themselves.

Senator BARTLETT of Alaska has called our attention several times to the high radiation levels in the areas inhabited by Eskimos in his State. Swedish scientists have also noted high radiation levels in the Arctic areas of Scandinavia; one would suppose that Soviet scientists are similarly concerned about their own Arctic regions.

But it is not only in the Arctic areas that high radiation levels are injurious to life. On June 7 of this year, the Federation of American Scientists issued a press release stating that:

> The release of large amounts of radioactive debris comparable to that resulting from the 1962 U.S.S.R.-U.S. test series must be regarded as producing a definite increase in cancer mortality among children born within 1 to 2 years following that test series.

Articles in the Washington Post and New York Times of August 22 called attention to the findings of the St. Louis Committee on Nuclear Information headed by Dr. Eric Reiss, associate professor of Medicine at Washington University. These articles stated that about 3,000 children, mostly in the intermountain West, had received excessive doses of radiation from the tests conducted at the southern Nevada test site. The committee estimated that 10 to 12 cases of thyroid cancer would result as a consequence of this exposure. The article in the Washington Post stated that:

> The committee said its analysis of the data shows that past tests exposed a number of local populations in Utah, Nevada, Idaho, and probably other communities as far away as Troy, N.Y., to fallout so intense as to represent a medically unacceptable hazard to children who may drink fresh locally produced milk.

Continued unrestricted testing by Russia and the United States, joined in time by other nations, will increasingly poison the air all of us must breathe. Even then, as the President has observed:

> The number of children and grandchildren with cancer in their bones, with leukemia in their blood, or with poison in their lungs might seem statistically small to some, in comparison with natural health hazards. But this is not a natural health hazard, and it is not a statistical issue.
>
> Nor does this affect the nuclear powers alone. These tests befoul the air of all men and all nations, the committed and the uncommitted alike, without their knowledge and without their consent. That is why the continuation of atmospheric testing causes so many countries to regard all nuclear powers as equally evil; and we can hope that its prevention will enable those countries to see the world more clearly, while enabling all the world to breathe more easily.

These are some of the reasons, then, that give us plausible grounds for hope that this treaty will be kept by the Soviet Union, as well as by the United States. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of past experience in dealing with the Kremlin, and we must remain prepared to resume our own testing, if ever the Russians default. In the meantime, the treaty itself will not change Communist ambitions, or eliminate the possibility of nuclear war; it will not, in itself, reduce our need for arms or allies, or programs of assistance to others. But it is an important first step toward a more rational relationship between the Soviet Union and the Western World. Given the pressures of a deepening split between Moscow and Peking, this treaty could open the way to other settlements with Russia of far-reaching significance. To these possibilities we must remain alert and prudently responsive.

For nothing is more urgent than for the two nuclear giants to find a way out of their atomic dilemma. Today we confront one another like two oldtime Western gunmen standing face to face, pistols drawn, aimed and cocked, near the center of a log, lying across a yawning chasm. Neither can fire his pistol, because of the certainty that the other, even with a dying reflex, will also squeeze off a fatal shot. Neither can advance upon the other, because of the danger that a point will come when his adversary, from fear or uncertainty, may tighten his pressure upon the hair trigger of doom for both. Each is afraid to lower his weapon, or even to allow it to waver, because each expects that a momentary opportunity for victory and escape will then be seized by the other.

Meanwhile, both protagonists grow tired. The hot sun beats down, and sweat forms around the tensely squinting eyes. Each wonders when—not if, but when—the other, fearing that he may be the first to weaken, will decide to take the deceptively smaller risk of getting off the first shot. Each feels that he must inch closer to his adversary, so it will be certain that the reflex shot, too, cannot miss.

Each knows in his heart that the situation cannot continue indefinitely, but must be resolved, in some way, before nightfall.

Is there not a likeness between this situation and our own dreadful dilemma with respect to the Russians? Now, with this test ban treaty, it is as if both parties had agreed that, on signal, each would take one step backward. Each can afford to do this. If he takes the step, and his opponent does likewise, there will be time to consider what the next step might be. Trust is not involved, only a true instinct for self-preservation.

Mr. President, it has been said that this treaty is a symptom of a "no win" policy. I say there can be no winners—not the Russians, not the Americans, not Western civilization itself—unless the atom is tamed. So let us begin here and now. We are a hundred men and women, clothed at this moment with a fateful responsibility. Let it not be said that it was the U.S. Senate, heir and custodian of the longest tradition of freedom in the history of man, which lacked the courage to take the first step back from the commitment to violence which offers only the specter of eventual extermination for our people, our country, and all we cherish.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Today Senators have heard one of the most persuasive and penetrating speeches on the proposed nuclear test ban treaty which will be heard in the Senate as this important subject is discussed. The senior Senator from Idaho, with his usual penetrating attention to detail, his broad background of knowledge of this subject, and his eloquence in expressing himself, has given the Senate an outline, a prospectus, or a viewpoint that I personally deeply appreciate. I call on Senators to read carefully in the printed RECORD what has been said today. I thank the Senator from Idaho for affording me the opportunity to hear a good part of what he said today.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I, too, wish to say that the Senator from Idaho has made a valuable contribution to the discussion of the treaty. The Senator was most attentive in the hearings and followed them diligently. He is as well qualified to discuss the merits of the treaty as any other Member of this body. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I appreciate his taking the pains to present his excellent speech, which was so well organized and presented to the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho upon an able address. It is a cogent analysis of the issue before the Senate.

But I wish also to recall, as the RECORD will disclose, that the senior Senator from Idaho, speaking in 1959 as the junior Senator from Idaho, made another eloquent speech on the floor of the Senate. Standing at his own desk in the rear of the Chamber, he urged just such a treaty as is now before the Senate. So I congratulate the Senator for his prescience and vision, as well as upon the delivery of an able speech.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. At that time I drew much inspiration from the thinking of the Senator from Tennessee, who was one of the first to suggest that the United States might suspend further atmospheric testing unilaterally and challenge Russia to do likewise. This was most significant in contributing toward the position taken by the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom in the negotiations which led to the offering to the Russian Government of a treaty limited to the atmospheric areas.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the generous references made by the Senator. If I recall correctly, I suggested that the United States take this step unilaterally, if necessary, but in the hope that it would be an invitation to the Soviet Union to join in the concert.

Mr. CHURCH. That is exactly so. I know the Senator from Tennessee shares with me the feeling of accomplishment that finally a treaty such as this has come before the Senate for ratification.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in expressing thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho for the speech he has just delivered. For a long time the Senator from Idaho has been a student of the subjects he has discussed today. His contribution to the debate will be most enlightening, and will result in a better understanding of the difficult problems which confront all Senators in the consideration of a treaty of such importance as this.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield without losing the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Objection is heard; and the clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 156 Ex.]

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper

Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business to attend a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I envy Senators who have time to commit words to paper and to present a formal speech to the Senate. I make that statement in all modesty. First, I wish I had the talent for it; second, I wish I had time for it, because it makes an infinitely better RECORD. But, because of the pressures of a variety of work, I discover that I must be content with something of a synopsis that I had to dictate between telephone calls yesterday, and which Senators will find on their desks. So I apologize for the meager material that I have presented to Senators in a formal fashion.

As Senators know, I do not read a manuscript very well; and I believe it is incumbent on me to search my heart and my mind and to talk topically as well as I can on the subject at hand.

At the outset, let me say that I shall support the treaty. It is no easy vote. In my office are probably 40,000 letters, and on my Capitol desk are petitions containing 10,000 names in opposition to the treaty. But I must equate those against the whole number of electors in my State. Moreover, I have admonished them over and over again that, regardless of the entreaties and presentations that have been made to me, I feel that I must follow a type of formula laid down by Edmund Burke, the great parliamentarian and Prime Minister of Britain, when he said it was his business to consult with his people, but it would be a betrayal of his conscience and a disservice to them if he failed to exercise his independent judgment.

So today my statement that I shall support the treaty is an exercise of my independent judgment based upon what I think is best for my country.

I have been drenched by all the correspondence and material that have come to my desk. I have gone over 100 pounds of pamphlets, brochures, letters, and all types of printed material that had a bearing upon the issue that is before the Senate.

I doubt whether at any other time—except three—in nearly 30 years of experience in the House and in the Senate, I have been so beset with the views and expressions of people everywhere.

I believe the first occasion was in 1940. If I am in error by a year, I shall have to ask my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] whether that was the year of the "cash and carry" neutrality debate. I think it was. I remember the intensity of feeling which existed everywhere in the country and how emotionally and passionately people committed their feelings to paper. That was one occasion.

The second occasion was the dismissal of Douglas MacArthur. That happened in the Truman administration. The commentators and others had managed to excite the country. At that time I received about 200,000 letters.

The third time was when I was a member of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, the committee of which the late Senator McCarthy was the chairman. That committee conducted the trial. I was a member of the committee. On that occasion, the country was excited. Senators will remember that it was late at night when the Senate voted on the question. As the proceeding had been under the klieg lights and television cameras for 7 weeks, obviously it evoked a tremendous interest everywhere in the land. I believe there are still thousands of letters which I received, which have not been opened. My office staff indicated that more than 250,000 letters were received.

Senators can conceive what it is to have someone "smite you hip and thigh," in an angry mood, and say, "I demand a personal answer."

I do not know how one could answer people personally under those circumstances without resorting to the robot machines and other devices which are designed to diminish the workload upon the shoulders of Senators.

So I find, under all circumstances, that this is one of such occasions. On the other occasions—one under Frankin Roosevelt, one under Truman, and one under Eisenhower—we managed to survive, and we went our own way.

I believe perhaps Shakespeare was essentially correct when he said, in "Hamlet":

> There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough-hew them how we will.

He might well have used the word "destiny." This could be, conceivably, a time of destiny for the country and for the world. Who am I to judge? Time and history will have to render that judgment.

But this is an important matter that engrosses our attention. I pray that I may be on the right side. I accept this assignment, and I accept the responsibility for my vote with a sense of gravity and concern.

Before the treaty was initialed, I was privileged to see a thermofax copy. I examined it as best I could. I rendered some offhand opinions at the time, some of which did not stand up. I saw them recited in an editorial the other day. One must expect that sort of thing in public life. But I do not let it bother me.

I said to my people, I said to the country publicly, and I said in the press gallery that I would take a hard look at the treaty. I said I would be diligent in examining its every implication, and that there would be only one standard by which to come to a vote, and that would be: What is best for the present and for the future of the United States of America, which has been so good to me as a citizen?

In pursuance of the assurance that I would take a hard look, I wanted to look at both sides, and I did look at both sides. I was concerned about a treaty with the Soviet Union. Who would not be?

I am no novice at the business of examining into the Soviet history and its record with respect to treaties. As a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary I have had abundant opportunity to look. I referred even to the old Army data known as "Alert No. 5: Soviet Treaty Violations."

I examined the violation of an understanding with the Georgian Republic, now absorbed into the Soviet Union, as early as 1920.

I examined into the trade agreement with Britain, when there was assurance against propaganda. It was violated, and the trade agreement with Britain fell.

In 1922 there was a treaty of assurance and friendship with the country of Czechoslovakia, yet later it was violated, and Czechoslovakia was forced to cede territory to the Soviet Union.

There was a nonaggression pact with Turkey in 1925, and ultimately a tremendous effort to secure rights from Turkey on the Black Sea Straits.

There was a treaty with Afghanistan in 1926. We have recently been host to the Afghan royal King. Yet the Soviets made Afghanistan cede a piece of territory.

I have a special interest in Lithuania, because there are literally thousands of Baltic people—Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians—in Chicago. A treaty with Lithuania not only was made but also was extended, yet it did not prevent the Soviet Union from annexing Lithuania.

So I have gone through the whole lesson book to get that side of the story. I went further than that. I referred to the records of 1933, when, during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, the Soviet Union was recognized, on the 16th of November, 1933.

It intrigues me some to read Maxim Litvinov's letter. He was the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs. The letter was written in Washington. It was written to Franklin Roosevelt.

In the first paragraph he said:

> It will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—
>
> 1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its territories or possessions.

Paragraph 2 is worthy of recording, because at times we forget these things. In paragraph 2 Mr. Litvinov wrote:

> To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including the organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions, and in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

These assurances go on and on. They were the foundation for the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States in the first administration of Franklin Roosevelt, in November 1933.

I want those people who send me all this documentation and literature to know that sources of information are available. I want them to know that I have been rather diligent in carrying out the pledge I made to them.

Second, I was curious about the sudden change on the part of the Soviet Union. When Mr. Dean was still our representative to Geneva—and then there had been 400 sessions—I was still a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The day Mr. Dean left for Geneva, I said, "Mr. Dean, come back with something worth while and I will support it. Come back with something else and I will fight, and I will resist as best I can." So I served notice at that time.

Who would not be curious about the sudden change of heart? Is it China and the reported difficulties with the Soviet Union that have had some impact on Mr. Khrushchev? I do not know. But while I am about it, I want to give my own opinion of what I expect is a part of the Chinese situation. In 1953 China took a census. Probably a mistake was made. It took a little while to obtain corrected figures, and when that was done it announced to the world that the population of Red China was 583 million and that it was growing at a rate of 15 million or more each year. At that rate, China today has 730 million people. In 15 years she will have 1 billion people. Those 1 billion people will have to be fed.

A great many headaches, difficulties, and responsibilities have arisen, and will arise.

When I was in Burma, I visited about 10 miles down the Irrawaddy River and I was shown a great storage of rice. I was told that the rice was full of weevils. Then I was told that we sold 250,000 tons of Louisiana rice to Japan, and that it was their market. That is a surplus rice bowl. I flew over Thailand. I know the rice bowl in that area. I know the Laotian rice bowl. I remember being in that area when the French were fighting at Dien Bien Phu.

That is a large area; and the population of 1 billion must be fed. There is the pressure. Perhaps Mr. Khrushchev knows of that pressure. It may well be. Difficulties have been referred to with respect to these countries. There may be something real about it. It may be what was written on the parchments of history long ago when it was said, "It shall come to pass that when man is hungry he shall feed himself, and when he does he shall curse his king and his God."

There is nothing worse than a population pressure. What is to be done about it? Many countries have been through great hunger, and they have been impelled by a force that drove people not only to desperation, but to action.

That, of course, is a diversion; but I want people to know that I have tried to take a hard look. I have tried to fortify myself. I believe I have been diligent. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee can well say that I was present to listen to the testimony. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi can say that I was present to listen to Dr. Teller. In addition, Dr. Teller came to my office for a long visit. I sat with the Atomic Energy Commission under Director McCone. I have proceeded with diligence. I say that in modesty. I have tried to explore everything involved. I wanted to get the whole story.

I make that statement as I try to explain the question of treaty violations, evidences of lack of faith on the part of the Soviet Union, and the testimony of our leaders, like Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, Dr. Teller, John McCone, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There is no question about the anxiety and concern on one side, and the counsel and advice stressed by those to whom we have committed the security and defense of our country.

Where do we turn in our difficulty if it is not to General Wheeler? Where do we turn to if it is not to Admiral McDonald? Where do we turn to if not to General Shoup, of the Marine Corps? Where do we turn to if not to the Chief of Staff of the Navy? They have been educated in our own schools, supported at public expense. We not only expect them to become competent in their field, but we also expect fidelity to duty, and we get it. They are ranged on one side, and history is ranged on the other. What choice does one take in the case of the treaty under those circumstances?

I detected one thing in every committee hearing I attended. I have detected it in much of the material that has come to my desk. I detected it in the letter that is attached to the 10,000 signatures that lie at the desk in my Capitol office. It was an overlay of concern, of anxiety, and of fear. It could be detected in the questions which arose, namely Where are we vis-a-vis the Soviet Union? Where are we in respect to heavy yield weapons? Where are we in respect to light yield weapons? What is the strategy? What is the pattern? What is the formula? Have we a readiness posture? Are we prepared to resume testing if necessary? What shall we do in the event of abrogation? What shall we do if there is evidence of deviation from the treaty?

All these questions arise in anxious minds and hearts. One cannot hear such questions without having some sense of apprehension and concern, himself. What do we do about it?

I began to toy with the idea of a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Senate and the House. I conferred with the Parliamentarian. It had no place here, but it had only one purpose. It was to allay the sense of anxiety and fear I had detected on every ground.

I went to my friend the distinguished majority leader, and discussed the question with him. After thinking about it some more, I thought this was not the approach. Someone said, "Why did you include the House of Representatives?" After all, we must ascertain whether to implement the treaty or whether to implement a program. That was set out in the concurrent resolution. I drafted the resolution. I had it perfected, I thought. But I did not submit it. Then subsequently I went to the majority leader again. I said, "Mike, there is fear in the country. Why do people call at all hours of the night?"

One of the roughest scoldings I ever received was at 2 o'clock in the morning from a constituent of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I could not get him off the telephone. He said, "Don't you hang up on me. I am a taxpayer, and I am going to tell you off."

The number of telephone calls was legion. They came at the most awkward hours. I tried to accept all of them. Some of the callers would not wait, and it was a little difficult.

At long last I had two more discussions with the distinguished majority leader. I said, "Mike, there is only one place where this question can be discussed at the top echelon, and that is with the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States." I said, "I have read the capitulation of Dr. Seaborg in the hearings. I thought it was excellent. But suppose the President had other ideas. I heard the Joint Chiefs of Staff when they expressed the hope that this would be done or that would be done or the other would be done."

I went to the upper office. It is rather difficult to get into that office. Sometimes I think it is easier to get a charge account at Tiffany's than to get into the upper office, where the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy meets. There I saw John McCone, who served as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy under Eisenhower, and who now serves as Director of Intelligence.

I listened keenly. He had certain recommendations, as the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee, the

Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], so well knows.

I followed through on this matter because of the fear that continued to beset me.

Then I had another meeting with the distinguished majority leader. I said, "MIKE, I think you ought to contact the President." The letter which I shall read a little later is not the result of the President calling me. It is the result of the work of the majority leader and the minority leader, who expressed a common fear, and who felt that they ought to talk with the Commander in Chief, because if there were to be assurances, they ought to come from the highest and most authoritative source, the President of the United States.

That was the foundation and background.

I should like to recite a few of the considerations which move me to support the treaty, not the least of which, of course, is the party position. I am a little old fashioned. I was here when Wendell Willkie appeared before a Senate committee, and when Tom Connally asked him a rather sharp question, Wendell Willkie said, "Oh, that is only campaign oratory." I was here as a public servant at that time. It is no campaign oratory in my book, when one's party goes to the country and asks the country to give to it the direction of the affairs of the country. That is either a covenant or it is not. If it is a covenant, it is made to be kept.

This was my party's platform in 1960:

> We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement

Listen to that—

> We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit. We support the President in any decision he may make to reevaluate the question of resumption of underground nuclear explosions testing, if the Geneva Conference fails to produce a satisfactory agreement.

That is what my party said to the country, as we rallied behind Richard Nixon. Out of 69 million votes we came within 113,000 of victory. Oh, yes, we have a party in this country. I do not subscribe lightly to party platforms. I have served on the platform committee of my party when such solemn words were indited. They become lures to get the people into one's corner. There is something grave and solemn about it. I accepted the platform plank in that spirit. We said:

> We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

That is what we seek in the treaty today.

Second, 89 nations are now signatories to the treaty. Think of the propaganda weapon that we would give Nikita Khrushchev if we failed to stand up and ratify the treaty. He could go into all the areas of the world and say to their leaders, "Did I not tell you for many years that they are imperialists, capitalists, and warmongers? Here is the proof. They refused to subscribe to a cessation of testing of the hideous weapons that can snuff out so much life."

That would be a consideration in itself for supporting the treaty. Our arsenal of weapons is available. I shall touch on that later. It will be remembered that on the 23d of August former President Eisenhower sent a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I have read it several times. He used the word "reservation." It bothered me. I decided to pursue it. I did so. Through one of his assistants I contacted him at Gettysburg. Was it an inadvertent use of the word, which is a word of art in this business, or did he really mean it? Did he know what a reservation really meant? It was not the significant thing in the mind of President Eisenhower. What he wanted to be sure of was that there would be an ironclad assurance that our nuclear arsenal would be available for ourselves and for our allies if the need ever arose. I will deal with that point at a little greater length in connection with the President's letter.

Suppose there is deviation. Suppose there is abrogation. Will we be ready, and would we move into it? That was another point on which I wanted some assurances.

The President in his message to the Senate said it was a first step. So it is. The Chinese—and perhaps it comes from Confucius himself—have a saying: "The longest journey begins with the first step." A step must be made somehow, because a whole generation of Americans has grown up in the atmosphere and intensity of the cold war.

The bombs fell in August 1945. Suppose a youngster was 12 years old. Add 18 to that. That is 30 years. Consider the generation that has not known anything except the cold war.

We are devoting hundreds of millions of dollars to studies of mental retardation and mental health. Does anyone mean to tell me that those pressures do not have an effect upon a nation? When I was in Britain, and the V-1's and V-2's were falling during the late war, a prominent member of the House of Commons said, "If it keeps up, it will break the nervous system of our people."

Some think this is all remote. But it is not remote. There is an impingement of all these pressures, all these considerations, that are a part of the cold war. Yet a whole generation has grown up under them. How many more generations will grow up before we receive an answer to the question? That is a concern of mine; it must be a concern of every other Member of this body.

There has been some sentiment about the heavy-yield, high-megaton weapons as distinguished from those that we have; and one could detect a certain defeatism. I am not an expert in the field. I have never served on the Committee on Armed Services, which has the benefit of such information. I readily sit at the feet of those who are members of the committee, when I seek advice, information, and instruction. But I remember that in the war in which I was a soldier on the Western Front, our strength was on paper, but our cause was good, and we prevailed.

I remember when I helped to vote this country into World War II. Our air power was on paper. We made close distinctions between weapons that were in being and those that were being planned. So much was not in being. But our cause was good and we triumphed. Let it never be said that the Senator from Illinois has any spark of defeatism in his soul, no matter what the equation is as between weapon strengths, because I am pretty sure that our thermonuclear strength, coupled with our cause, will abide and prevail, as it has and as it must.

One other thing the President said: Do not expect too much of this treaty. I thought it sounded biased in the message, which contains 10 specifics. But the treaty will not necessarily stop war. We hope it will. We hope it is in the direction of peace. What else can we do except hope? But is there assurance? None. There are many things that the treaty will not do, and it is necessary to go back to what the President said in his message.

Abraham Lincoln had a rule, and I think it was a great rule. I jotted it down, so that I would have it correct. This is what he said:

> The true rule in determining to embrace or reject anything is not whether it have any evil in it but whether it have more of evil than of good. There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything especially of Government policy is an inseparable compound of the two so that our best judgment of the preponderance between them is continuously demanded.

That is the case in this instance. I have not heard anyone deny that there are risks in the treaty. But, as Lincoln said, every policy is a compound of risk and nonrisk, of good and evil. Which is the preponderant quality? That is why our judgment is demanded. So I must rationalize the problem in that fashion and on that basis predicate judgment.

With those concerns in my mind, and with those concerns in the mind of our distinguished majority leader, we spent 45 minutes with the President and expressed our concern. We made certain suggestions to him. In response, on September 10, he sent this letter, which reached me by hand last night at half-past 6. Let me read it to the Senate:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, D.C., September 10, 1963.*
>
> Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
> Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD AND SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am deeply appreciative of the suggestion which you made to me on Monday morning that it would be helpful to have a further clarifying statement about the policy of this administration toward certain aspects of our nuclear weapons defenses, under the proposed test ban treaty now before the Senate. I share your view that it is desirable to dispel any fears or concerns in the minds of Senators or of the people of our country on these matters. And while I believe that fully adequate statements have been made on these matters before the various committees of the Senate by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Chair-

man of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nevertheless I am happy to accept your judgment that it would be helpful if I restated what has already been said so that there may be no misapprehension.

In confidence that the Congress will share and support the policies of the administration in this field, I am happy to give these unqualified and unequivocal assurances to the Members of the Senate, to the entire Congress, and to the country:

1. Underground nuclear testing, which is permitted under the treaty, will be vigorously and diligently carried forward, and the equipment, facilities, personnel, and funds necessary for that purpose will be provided. As the Senate knows, such testing is now going on. While we must all hope that at some future time a more comprehensive treaty may become possible by changes in the policies of other nations, until that time our underground testing program will continue.

2. The United States will maintain a posture of readiness to resume testing in the environments prohibited by the present treaty, and it will take all the necessary steps to safeguard our national security in the event that there should be an abrogation or violation of any treaty provision. In particular, the United States retains the right to resume atmospheric testing forthwith—

That was a point I made with the President. I said, "It has got to be made"; and he put it in his letter—

if the Soviet Union should conduct tests in violation of the treaty.

3. Our facilities for the detection of possible violations of this treaty will be expanded and improved as required to increase our assurance against clandestine violation by others.

I hope particular attention will be given to this paragraph:

4. In response to the suggestion made by President Eisenhower to the Foreign Relations Committee on August 23, 1963, and in conformity with the opinion of the legal adviser of the Department of State, set forth in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am glad to emphasize again that the treaty in no way limits the authority of the Commander in Chief to use nuclear weapons for the defense of the United States and its allies, if a situation should develop requiring such a grave decision. Any decision to use such weapons would be made by the United States in accordance with its constitutional processes and would in no way be affected by the terms of the nuclear test ban treaty.

5. While the abnormal and dangerous presence of Soviet military personnel in the neighboring island of Cuba is not a matter which can be dealt with through the instrumentality of this treaty, I am able to assure the Senate that if that unhappy island should be used either directly or indirectly to circumvent or nullify this treaty, the United States will take all necessary action in response.

6. The treaty in no way changes the status of the authorities in East Germany. As the Secretary of State has made clear, "We do not recognize, and we do not intend to recognize, the Soviet occupation zone of East Germany as a state or as an entity possessing national sovereignty, or to recognize the local authorities as a government. Those authorities cannot alter these facts by the act of subscribing to the test ban treaty."

7. This Government will maintain strong weapons laboratories in a vigorous program of weapons development, in order to ensure that the United States will continue to have in the future a strength fully adequate for an effective national defense. In particular, as the Secretary of Defense has made clear, we will maintain strategic forces fully ensuring that this Nation will continue to be in a position to destroy any aggressor, even after absorbing a first strike by a surprise attack.

8. The United States will diligently pursue its programs for the further development of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes by underground tests within the terms of the treaty, and as and when such developments make possible constructive uses of atmospheric nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, the United States will seek international agreement under the treaty to permit such explosions.

I trust that these assurances may be helpful in dispelling any concern or misgivings which any member of the Senate or any citizen may have as to our determination to maintain the interests and security of the United States. It is not only safe but necessary, in the interest of this country and the interest of mankind, that this treaty should now be approved, and the hope for peace which it offers firmly sustained, by the Senate of the United States.

Once more, let me express my appreciation to you both for your visit and for your suggestions.

Sincerely,

JOHN KENNEDY.

Mr. President, late the other night I went back to refresh myself on a little history. One of the classic reports made in our generation was the one made by John Hersey, to the New Yorker, on what happened at Hiroshima. It makes one think. It came as an account from a Japanese preacher who long ago was educated at Emory University, in Atlanta, Ga. He did his undergraduate work there and developed great fluency in English. He was one of the principal witnesses when John Hersey went to Hiroshima to write that almost deathless account.

The B–29's had bombed nearly every Japanese town except Kyoto and Hiroshima. The Japanese called the B–29 "Mr. B," out of respect for the might and the power of that great wartime bomber.

As he relates the story, it was 8:15 in the morning of a bright, sunny day. The weather was a little humid and warm. At 8:15, things happened. Out of the 20th Air Wing, Col. Paul W. Tibbetts, Jr., flying that B–29, and with two escort observation planes, flew over the center of Hiroshima, a town of probably 375,000 persons. Then, for the first time, the whole bosom of God's earth was ruptured by a manmade contrivance that we call a nuclear weapon.

Oh, the tragedy. Oh, the dismay. Oh, the blood. Oh, the anguish. When the statisticians came to put the cold figures on paper, they were as follows: As a result of 1 bomb—66,000 killed; 69,000 injured; 62,000 structures destroyed. That was the result of that one bomb, made by man in the hope of stopping that war. Little did he realize what this thermonuclear weapon would do, and the anguish that would be brought into the hearts of men, women, and children. At Hiroshima it caused a mass incineration such as never before had been witnessed in the history of the whole wide world. The result was almost too catastrophic to contemplate.

In the accelerated march of history, how quickly we forget. But there is the account, for all to read; and it all happened at 8:15, on a bright and shining morning, when God's day began, and when, I suppose, hundreds of thousands of people were thinking that, despite the war, they had been privileged to live another day.

Mr. President, that happened 18 years ago last month. Since then, what have we done? What steps have we taken? How far have we moved?

The President calls this treaty a first step. What sort of steps have we taken, except steps to make the bombs that fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki look like veritable toys when compared to the heavy-duty, heavy-yield weapons of today.

I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man; I am almost as old as the oldest Member of the Senate, certainly am older than a great many Senators. One of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have written on my tombstone, "He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

God willing, Mr. President, and in the frame of my own party's platform and with the knowledge that the Soviet Union has violated treaties, there must still be enough faith, and enough confidence to make us willing to take a first step in this field.

If it fails, we will still be here. We have not forfeited caution. We have forfeited nothing. The President has given us assurances in regard to what is proposed to be done in underground testing in these and other environments and in regard to developing all the equipment necessary in order to maintain our strength against any aggressor on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, I believe it is just as well to conclude this slightly rambling discourse by reverting to the Chinese proverb. "The longest journey begins with a single step."

This is a first, single step. It is for destiny to write the answer. It is for history to render judgment. But with consummate faith and some determination, this may be the step that can spell a grander destiny for our country and for the world.

If there be risks, Mr. President, I am willing to assume them for my country.

So I support the treaty; and I will vote for approval of the treaty with no reservations whatsoever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me congratulate the Senator from Illinois on his magnificent speech.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator. I trust that he will be willing to answer a few questions.

Mr. President, I love and admire the distinguished Senator from Illinois. He is most persuasive. He is patriotic. He is fair in the conduct of his office as a Senator. I listened intently as the Senator from Illinois recited the testimony he had heard, the documents that he had read, and the interviews that he had had. Does the Senator intend to imply that it would not be possible for another

Senator to attend the same meetings, hear the same testimony, read the same documents, possess an equal sincerity of purpose, and yet arrive at a different conclusion from that reached by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Absolutely. That is what makes the world the great world that it is. We can listen to testimony, come to different conclusions about it, and do so honestly and sincerely. I would not for a moment reflect upon the integrity, the honor, the honesty, the sincerity, or the conviction of any other Member of this body.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Senator is so charming and so persuasive——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Should I disclaim that?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is dangerous. He can lead us astray.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not do so wittingly or knowingly.

Mr. CURTIS. I know that. The Senator spoke at length about fears that have been expressed in various places. Then he told of this great effort—and it was a great effort—to allay those fears. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that those fears came from the unlearned people of the country or those who did not honestly desire the right answer in the cause of peace?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can answer only with respect to my own misgivings. Those arose in such large measure from the fact that I was not fully informed as to what our readiness posture was, how diligently and vigorously we were going to pursue it, to make sure that at no time and under no eventuality would our country be other than strong and equal to any aggressive effort that could be made against us.

Mr. CURTIS. Perhaps I have not made my question clear. The Senator talked at length about the fears that exist. Then he spoke of his diligent efforts to allay those fears. My question is as follows: Do those fears exist only among people whose intentions toward our country and toward a peaceful world are not good and people who do not know?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly not. I recognize them as honest views springing from the consciences of people.

Mr. CURTIS. That leads me to my next question, which is this: I listened intently as the Senator told of his great efforts to allay those fears. It seems to me that we would have been helped greatly if, rather than allaying the fears, the possible justification for the fears might have been ascertained. Is that not the responsibility of the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a highly complicated field.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that not our responsibility?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was thinking of those who testified. In all kindliness, I refer to them as the second echelon in Government. But I like to hear from the President and the Commander in Chief who is at the top and who in that capacity can push the button, move forward, sideways, or pull back. That is the reason for the letter. The reason was to make sure that, as we move forward, we shall be ready at all times for any eventuality that might arise under the treaty.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall state the point a bit crudely. If someone should fear that his house was afire, would it be better to allay such fear, or to ascertain whether the house was afire?

Mr. DIRKSEN. One ascertains whether the house is afire. That is a physical thing that is easily ascertained.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. The distinguished Senator spoke at length of the treaty violations of the Soviet Union, which seem to be nondebatable. Do I correctly understand the Senator to express an opinion that the Soviet Union has changed in that regard?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps so. There is a risk. We must take a chance.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator believe that the Soviet has changed in regard to adherence to treaties?

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the Soviet Union became flexible enough to be willing to entertain the negotiation of a treaty, I would earnestly hope that there had been some change in its attitude. On that basis, I believe that while there is risk, it is a risk that we can accept with safety.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Minnesota stated on television that the treaty was not based upon trust, but on hope. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that he hopes the Soviet Union has changed, or that he believes that it has?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who does not have hope? Does not the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not believe they have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say that. I asked if the Senator from Nebraska did not hope.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Soviet Union has changed. I do not believe it has.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Hope springs eternal. As the great salesman, Paul, said long ago, "Faith, hope, and charity"—those are the great virtues.

What would mankind be like without hope? What can we say to this generation that has been so steeped in cold war for more than 18 years if we say there is no hope, and no chance?

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Senator is generous and kind. He has led me to my next question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Good.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator spoke at length about the horrors of the cold war and how it has affected our people and the youth of our country. The effect is brought about by the actions of the Soviet Union moving forward in Cuba and many other places in the Western Hemisphere. It may be affected by our own defense program. The existence or nonexistence of nuclear testing will probably have no effect on the advances made by the Soviet Union in taking over territory and millions of people.

The Senator has read a letter from the President stating that our testing will continue, and that we shall be prepared. Now the Senator has aroused in our hearts a desire to end the cold war. Is it the intention of the Senator to present any evidence that the treaty would end the cold war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no evidence that it would end any kind of war. Did not the President make manifest in the statement that accompanied the treaty that there is no assurance that even nuclear war, let alone cold war, will end? We hope for those desirable goals. That is the best we can do.

Mr. CURTIS. Why not hope that it will cure cancer or do some other very noble things? A message goes out to the Nation telling us of the horrors of the cold war. I want to know whether we are presented with a treaty that will end the cold war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, let us not let the analogy of cancer get too far away. Cancer is something over which human volition has no control. But where human decisions are involved, they concern operations of the mind. That is what we are dealing with when we talk about inhibitions on testing in the atmosphere and under the water. So there is not the slightest analogy between the two.

Mr. CURTIS. All right. We will erase that analogy. But is it the intention of the Senator from Illinois to suggest to the country that the treaty is a treaty to end the cold war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not say that.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not say that the Senator made that statement. I asked if it was his intention to give that impression.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I only hope that, first, tensions will subside and, second, that perhaps we will say, as Solomon said to the Lord, "Give therefore Thy servant an understanding heart."

It may be that if we ease the tension little by little a better understanding will develop. If that understanding should come, we would have a good predicate on which to fashion the second, third, and fourth steps.

Mr. CURTIS. Where will we ease tension? In this country or in the Soviet Union?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Anywhere that tensions exist. May it never be said of us that we are the ones to excite and peddle tensions all over the world.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct. Tensions are a weapon of the Soviet Union. The tensions will go on in this country and in that country, with one act of subversion after another. Whether or not we should end testing in the atmosphere should be decided on the merits of the question, rather than a possibility that it will end the tensions of the cold war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After 400 abortive sessions at Geneva, at long last when there is an opportunity for an expression and a demonstration of a little faith, I do not wish to be found wanting in that faith, in the hope that good fruit may come of it.

Mr. CURTIS. I am aware of the difference between the position of the Senator from Illinois, who has faith in this regard, and the position of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who said that the treaty was not based on trust.

I shall hurry on. The Senator has been most generous in yielding time.

The Senator from Illinois mentioned that we would have a posture of readiness to test. May I ask the distinguished Senator whether that was President Eisenhower's position during the moratorium?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I rather think so.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well. Was it possible to carry it out?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is possible to carry it out.

Mr. CURTIS. Was it? Not, "is it"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; it is.

Mr. CURTIS. My question relates to what happened in the past. Was it possible, and did the United States carry out successfully a readiness to test?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Senator has the seat I formerly held. I would rather ask some Senator who serves on that committee, who is familiar with what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was doing at that time, because that would be a source of information.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe it is true that Johnston Island was permitted to go down. I believe it is true that tests were hurried. I do not care to go into any classified information as to how effective the tests were, but they were hurried, and, in a measure, very disappointing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is no reason why they had to be hurried. If the Congress and the President cooperate, if the request comes from the Atomic Energy Commission for equipment, for laboratory requirements, for personnel and for funds, and there is evidenced not only a desire but also a determination to move ahead and to maintain an immediate readiness posture, there is not the slightest reason why it cannot be done.

Mr. CURTIS. Other than that it was tried once and did not work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That does not prove it cannot be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. CURTIS. I have almost concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to comment on that point. We did test underground 2 weeks after the time the Russians broke the moratorium, and for about 6 months in the atmosphere.

Mr. CURTIS. Those are the tests to which I referred, which were not very effective.

The Senator from Illinois spoke at length about Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Such occurrences tear the hearts of everyone; but does it follow that someone whose position with respect to the treaty might differ from that of the Senator from Illinois would wish for a recurrence of those things?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Under the circumstances, with bigger and more destructive weapons being built all the time, with armament burdens upon every country in the world, unless we take a step in the whole domain of faith, what will be left except gloom and defeatism against the day when some careless person will pull the trigger?

Mr. CURTIS. I would rather have gloom than to slumber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not hear the Senator's word. The Senator would rather have gloom than what?

Mr. CURTIS. Slumber, as a national posture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says "slumber"?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there any reason why we should be complacent or incautious?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is nothing in the treaty to that effect.

Mr. CURTIS. I know; but the Joint Chiefs of Staff have warned against it. Certainly there was a sound reason for their warning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When I heard them at the committee meetings, they supported the treaty. They gave some attention to various things which I have recited, which were summarized in the record, but they supported the treaty.

Mr. CURTIS. General Power did not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But he is not a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. CURTIS. No; but I read his testimony before the deletions were made. It is rather revealing.

Is there anything in the treaty which would outlaw—or give any assurance against—an atomic attack on any city in the world?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. And no one said there was. The President made that as clear as crystal.

Mr. CURTIS. I could not understand the reason for the description of the attack on those two Japanese cities unless the Senator was offering something which would stop similar occurrences.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is necessary to advance to that kind of goal a little at a time. There was no misrepresentation when it was said that this treaty is a first step.

Mr. CURTIS. No one has said what step it is. The Chinese proverb, "The journey of a thousand miles begins with one step," is true, but I am concerned about the direction in which the journey will proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When we stop testing underwater, in the atmosphere, and in all the environments except underground, it seems to me that is a long step. The Republicans appreciated that fact in 1960, because that is precisely the way we set it out in our own party platform when we went to the voters for their suffrage.

Mr. CURTIS. I remind the Senator that since then the Soviets have tested. Many well-qualified people believe that they have acquired information which is very valuable, which we do not have; and that although they refused to agree at one time there is a likelihood that they will wish to agree now because there is some advantage in it, secret or otherwise.

We do not have the same set of facts before us. It is not a question of keeping faith with the treaty since there was a certain ratio of power and knowledge which existed then which does not exist now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The best comment I could make is that a very distinguished former President of the United States and General of the Armies, Dwight D. Eisenhower, keeps abreast of developments and has not fractured his relationships with his former military associates. He has a very active mind. He expressed some concern on one point, which I think the President's letter cures, but he does support the treaty. One would believe that he is conversant with the advances made in that field by the Soviet Union, and the question of whether we are maintaining a superior strength.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has been more than generous. I did not intend to consume this much time. I merely wished to inquire into certain of the Senator's intentions in reference to the position he intended to portray to the country through the speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has a large admixture of faith, and I hope it will always be there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would rather yield the floor. I promised my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] that I would not occupy the floor for more than 45 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This will take only a few minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I congratulate the Senator. He has made a magnificent speech. I do not think he talked at length on any aspect of his speech. It was all very concise.

There was one aspect that the minority leader mentioned that I thought he had not developed fully. He said he would come back to it. It was General Eisenhower's letter, in which he used the word "reservation." I wonder if the minority leader will go further into that point. I thought he said he intended to refer to it later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I became very curious about that word when I saw it. I have read General Eisenhower's letter several times. So I took it on myself to make indirect inquiries and get the story in such fashion that I could disclose it. He was not interested in reservations to the treaty; he was interested in an assurance that our nuclear arsenal would be available for our security and the security of our allies; and that is made abundantly clear in one paragraph of the President's letter. In addition, there is an addendum note in the committee report that has a bearing on that point. It is generally recognized that such weapons would be so used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's view that that entirely satisfies the view of General Eisenhower as to what should be the reservation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that has been made clear.

General Power was mentioned. General Power is one of nine who have what are called field commands in various parts of the world. He felt he could not approve the treaty. General Gerhart refused to give an opinion because, he said, he was not sufficiently informed, and it was beyond his competence. General Power is the only one who actually took a position in opposition to the treaty.

I was present when that matter was discussed with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That information came through the Joint Chiefs, not by direct communication with me. General Gerhart did not wish to take a position. General Power was the only one who took a position against the treaty.

Counting General Eisenhower with the other active members of the military forces, including the Secretary of Defense, there are 14 prominent, leading men in this field in favor of the treaty, against 2 who have taken the other position. That is a pretty good average in connection with any controversial subject of this kind.

One other question which the Senator mentioned related to the possibility of change in Russia. The Senator alluded to a so-called alert No. 5, issued some time ago by the military. I do not question the fact. However, in the violations cited—and this information begins at page 132 of the record of the hearings—it will be noted that there has been some change in the tempo of repudiation of agreements since the decease of Mr. Stalin in 1953. The record of hearing shows that since 1953 there were four instances of violations of agreements, two of them being with Yugoslavia concerning loans, not unlike what I notice we are contemplating doing, in view of certain difficulties, in the case of Pakistan. It has been noted in the press that we are contemplating a change in our decision with regard to an airport.

In the case of two of these violations, one in January 1956 and one in August 1956, they related to matters in which we have no great interest. The only one really seriously affecting us is that relating to the Berlin wall, in which we have a great interest. We have no interest in the other two, and I do not know that they were quite in the spirit of violation of treaties as we think of this treaty. They related to two loan agreements with Yugoslavia.

I do not say that this treaty is based on trust; I think it is more applicable to individual action and interest of the nations involved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned that to establish the thesis that we are not unmindful of what has happened.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am bringing this point up only to show that nations do change. Merely because there have been violations does not mean that the Soviets will violate this treaty. As the Senator properly stated, I think they will avoid doing it, because it is in their interest to abide by the treaty, or it is not in their interest at all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am very proud that we have in this country a fully operative two-party system. I again congratulate the distinguished minority leader, the leader of the Republicans in this body, for the position he has taken, not in behalf of party, but in behalf of the Nation, which includes both parties. He has done so without imputing to any Senator any base or ulterior motive if he happens to want to vote against the treaty, or wants to offer understandings or reservations, because he realizes, first of all, that, so far as each individual Member of this body is concerned, the time is fast approaching when we, as elected officials, in line with our constitutional obligations, must decide, each in his own mind, what he thinks is best for his country.

I am glad the distinguished minority leader brought out the plank in the Republican platform of 1960, on the particular subject of atomic testing, which was a stronger plank than the one contained in the Democratic platform of that year.

Like the distinguished minority leader, I question the motives of no Member of this body. I only hope that, in our collective wisdom, in the long run, we will be enabled to show that what we have done will be in the best interests of our country and the course which another elected official, the President of the United States, sought to follow in carrying out his duty.

Of course, there are diverse views in this body. I am glad there are. If every Senator were in favor of a treaty of this magnitude, I would then be truly worried.

There are doubts on the part of Senators who are in favor of the treaty, as well as those who are opposed to it. I am not surprised that there are fears and anxieties, because these are good in the consideration of a treaty of this kind.

I would hope also, as the distinguished minority leader has brought out, that we would not brush off what happened at Nagasaki and Hiroshima. I hope the figures will be repeated time and time and time again—66,000 killed, 69,000 injured, 62,000 buildings destroyed, in Hiroshima. And what caused that destruction? One bomb, allegedly equivalent to 15,000 to 20,000 tons of TNT. Now we are talking about bombs of the equivalent of 100 million tons of TNT in one 100-megaton bomb.

I hope we will consider all the factors inherent in a study of this treaty, not only genetic and physical, not only military, not only political, but the combination of all these and any others which may be worth consideration.

I point out once more, because there seems to be a question in the minds of some people in this country that some sort of pressure was used to get the Joint Chiefs of Staff to come along, that the record will show that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asked each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff if any pressure was exerted, and the answer was, unequivocally, "No."

Of course, they said that, in their opinion, a combination of factors determined their judgment. But when they were asked the direct question if they favored the ratification of the treaty—and it is in the record of the hearings, a copy of which is on every Senator's desk—the answer was yes, provided the safeguards which they advocated were contained herein and which, to the best of my knowledge, no Senator disagrees with.

We have been given assurance by the President of the United States, and that assurance has once again been brought to the attention of the Senate because of the initiative of the distinguished minority leader, who, in my opinion, has once again performed a real public service, for which I hope he gets the credit he deserves and not the condemnation which sometimes comes his way. I salute a great American.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this has been one of the finest hours in the history of the Senate. We listened to a great American today. We listened to a leader of one of the great political parties, who discharged his responsibility of leadership. He brought to the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which answered some of the questions lurking in the minds of certain Members of the Senate.

Beyond all that, based upon a unique lifetime of experience and devotion to his country, in uniform and in Congress, EVERETT DIRKSEN made all of us proud of the lucidity of his assertion, and an eloquence that is unmatched in the Senate. With it all he added overwhelmingly to the reasons why this country needs to be united and why, as I see the light, his advice and recommendation should be followed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President of the United States has characterized the three-environmental test ban treaty as a first step, and if he says it is a first step, I, for one, am quite willing to take his word for it; for the President is the one who controls the negotiation of agreements with foreign nations, and he is in a position to know, from discussions which have taken place, what are the terms to which other powers will agree, or are likely to agree.

The fact that this treaty is a first step, and the contemplation—fond or foreboding—of what the succeeding steps may be, in no way detracts from the fact that the treaty which the Senate is now considering is, in and of itself, important—even vital; for this treaty bears significantly on the fundamental issues of liberty or subjugation, peace or war.

The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which recommends that the Senate ratify this treaty, while recognizing that the treaty does have military implications, minimizes the military aspects and states that the main thrust of the treaty is political. In view of the report's warning to the Senate that excessive reliance on military considerations could undermine national security, it is particularly interesting to note that the majority of the space in the report is devoted to explaining away the military implications of the treaty.

In its discussion of the military aspects of the treaty, the Foreign Relations Committee report quite accurately points out in some detail that the United States now has a clear and overwhelming superiority in strategic nuclear power. Drawing from the specifics of our arsenal which Secretary McNamara made public for the first time during his testimony, the report cites the strength of the Strategic Air Command at more than 500 SAC bombers on quick alert, and more than 500 missiles—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris—new in the U.S. force. Even without accepting these rather loosely rounded off numbers as precisely accurate, no one can seriously doubt the present clear superiority of the U.S. strategic nuclear power. As has been the case since World War II, the United States still has strategic power that can and does, as it has in the past, effectively deter any would-be aggressor.

It is precisely this significant imbalance of strategic power that has prevented the occurrence of a nuclear war for almost two decades. Our policy of deterrence, based on an overwhelming superiority of nuclear power, has proved to be an effective preventative of nuclear war. Gen. Thomas Power, commander of the Strategic Air Command, put the matter most succinctly in his testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. He stated:

> I am seriously concerned about losing our military superiority, because I think that this superiority has resulted in a peaceful world as far as nuclear war is concerned, and I can't think of anything more important than to keep the world safe from a nuclear war.
>
> I think if we get into one, there will be no winners, only losers, and I think mankind will have reached its highest plateau of stupidity if it tries to reach its aims and goals or settle its differences with nuclear weapons.
>
> However, I think that our formula to prevent this has been a successful one to date, and it is a real simple formula. We have had overwhelming military superiority to the point where it is ridiculous for Mr. Khrushchev to even seriously contemplate attacking this country. Now I maintain that it is possible to hold this type of lead, and that is what I recommend.

As stated by General Power, that great SAC commander, we have found by experience that a policy of deterrence can and does prevent nuclear war. There are two essential ingredients of a successful policy of deterrence. The first is the actual strategic superiority, which in this day and age, means nuclear superiority. Second, a potential aggressor must be convinced that we have such overwhelming superiority that it would be utterly foolish to seriously contemplate an attack and that such power would be unleashed if attacked.

The very fact that there has been no nuclear war is convincing evidence that we have had, and still have, overwhelming nuclear superiority, and that the Soviets are convinced that we have that superiority. No further back than last fall, when Khrushchev made his bold gamble in Cuba, it was our overwhelming strategic nuclear power, and Khrushchev's knowledge of that superiority, that prevented a nuclear war.

It is not enough to say that we now have a clear nuclear superiority in weaponry, however. If our policy of deterrence of nuclear war is to continue, and we intend to prevent a nuclear war in the future as we have in the past, we must either continue to maintain an overwhelming superiority, or turn to some untried and untested formula for preventing nuclear war. This requires a closer look at our strategic force structure.

In assessing either the present or the future balance of strategic military power, a most distorted picture will result from any oversimplified comparison of weapon for weapon, or weapon for target, on a simple numerical basis. A realistic view will result only if the comparison includes a qualitative analysis of the weapons, together with an analysis of the strategies which control the use and employment of such weapons.

Today, for the first time in many years, the United States does not have a manned bomber aircraft in production. Our weapons production is concentrated on ballistic missiles. Whatever the merits of the differing opinions as to the advisability of putting almost sole reliance on missiles, the dramatic shift in emphasis from manned aircraft to missiles demonstrates the fact that military superiority depends on the quality of weapons more than it depends on numbers. It is the qualitative factor of weaponry that accounts for obsolescence. For example, right now we are in the process of dismantling the Texas towers, which comprised a part of the obsolete-before-deployed SAGE system, the aborted brainchild of Dr. Jerome Wiesner. No matter how much of the SAGE system we still have deployed, it is immaterial; for its existence makes no difference to the balance of strategic military power. No numerical increase can substitute for qualitative improvement. There is nothing you need so much of as something which is not very good.

It is the qualitative factor that makes it impossible to judge tomorrow's or next year's balance of power by the number of weapons we have deployed today, or by the number of today's weapons we will be able to produce tomorrow. Today's weapons will be obsolete tomorrow, and the number we have or can produce will be increasingly irrelevant with the passage of time. If, therefore, we want a realistic idea of the probable balance of strategic power in the future, we must consider primarily the question, What are the relative levels of weapons technology today? More than any other factor, it is the level of technology today that will determine the balance of strategic power in the future.

The second fallacy of numerical comparisons of weapons, and weapons against potential targets, is most apparent in the arguments of those who dwell on what they mistakenly call the overkill capability of the United States. Those who expound the theory of overkill seem to believe that only one weapon per target is needed, and that the number of weapons which exceeds the numbers of potential targets is surplus to needs, or overkill.

The fallacy of such reasoning is the omission from consideration of the realities of the strategy which determines the use or possible use of the weapons.

By this time, it surely should be clear that the United States is committed to a second strike nuclear force. Our strategic weapons are to be used only after we are attacked. This means that we must rely for deterrence, not on the total number of weapons in our arsenal, but only on those weapons which would remain operative after an all-out nuclear attack against the United States. Since we do adhere strictly to a second strike strategy, we must rely, in fact on the number of our weapons which a potential aggressor believes would survive the most destructive nuclear barrage he could launch. In making an assessment of this deterrent force, a potential aggressor will, of course, take into account the quality and reliability of our weapons system.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator a member of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee?

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from South Carolina is a member of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then the Senator is familiar with the report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which states that in eight major ways the treaty would prejudice the defense of the United States.

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct. I discuss those ways later in my speech.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Those eight ways are set forth on pages 7 and 8 of the interim report of that subcommittee.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator agree that in some ways the treaty could adversely affect the United States to the extent that we would probably never be able to develop a reliable defense against enemy missiles so long as we abided by the provisions of the treaty?

Mr. THURMOND. I certainly do, and this feeling is shared by the military men and the scientists, who, I feel, are best equipped to make an appraisal of that subject. In developing an antiballistic missile system, the only way definitely to determine if such a system would be successful and would really produce results and operate, is to test it in the environment in which it would have to operate. That would be the atmosphere.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One simple problem that is easy enough for a person to appreciate is this: If we are to develop a reliable defense against enemy missiles—not merely a defense that could shoot down the first missile; I would presume that we already have the capability to develop such a defense—but the ability to continue shooting down the 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, or even the 100th missile fired at us, aimed at the same point, we must develop an ability to locate and track such enemy missiles headed for our country, even though the atmosphere would be disturbed by the exploding missiles we are sending out, and recognize the possibility that even enemy missiles may be exploding out in the atmosphere and creating what is known as a radar blackout.

At present, we do not know how to solve that problem. It has been suggested that we "design around it." I assume that means we would hope, if the radar were blacked out at New York, that we might be able to pick up enemy missiles by radar at Philadelphia, for example. But if one is trying to defend against a barrage of 300 or 400 enemy missiles fired against us simultaneously—perhaps a thousand fired simultaneously—with more coming, we must be able to continue to track with all the radar equipment and continue to shoot missiles down, even though some of our defenses will be destroyed simultaneously with the defending of them. There is no way in which that kind of defense can be developed without atmospheric testing.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is eminently correct. It would be impossible to develop a type of antiballistic missile system upon which this country could place complete reliance until such a system had been tested in the atmosphere, which is the environment in which the system would have to operate if an exchange should take place.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that some of those who advocate the treaty undertake to say that it cannot be done; that no one will ever be able to develop a successful missile defense? Where would this country be now if we had taken the attitude 30 years ago, or even 20 year ago, that it could not be done? Where would we be if we had taken the attitude that the atom could not be cracked; that the atom was something that could not be harnessed? Where would we be if we had taken the attitude that a proximity fuse could not be developed? Where would we be if we had taken the attitude that the airplane could not be developed, and that men would never be able to fly? Where would we be if we had taken the attitude that space could not be conquered? We would be far behind our potential adversaries. They would be in a position to hand us an ultimatum to which we would either have to surrender, or else be destroyed.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

I recall that one of the scientists—I believe it was Dr. Teller—testified that several years ago he was doubtful about this system; but he is now convinced that it can be successful.

Consider what the Russians have done. This information is now public. When I spoke on this subject before, much of the information was disclosed in secret session. But it has now been made public and has appeared in the newspapers. I do not think there is any question now that the Russians have developed a system which our intelligence says will knock down medium-range missiles, those calculated to go to 1,200 miles, and intermediate-range missiles, those calculated to go to 2,500 miles, and, under certain favorable conditions, intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Immeasurable progress has been made. I was talking with one of our military men a few days ago about the Nike-Zeus, which is our best anti-ballistic-missile development to date. He says that 8 shots out of 12 have been successfully made. This shows that the system can be and is being developed. We know the Russians have made great progress in that field. Not only have they developed a system, but they have deployed a system function around a certain city in Russia.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us assume for a moment that the Russians already have the information they need in order to develop a successful missile defense. Is it not correct to assume that they have been ahead of us in missile development all the time; and if they have succeeded in developing what they need for a successful missile defense, and we by this treaty make it impossible for our Nation to develop a successful missile defense, will we not, by ratifying and confirming the treaty, have placed our Nation in a position in which it could be destroyed?

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from Louisiana is a man of vision on that point. He certainly sees the facts as they exist. The Communists have made great advances in this field. Some of their tests were obviously dictated by antiballistic missile requirements, as the Preparedness Subcommittee points out in its report.

From September 1961, in 1962, and this year, they have been conducting extensive high-yield-weapons tests. They have obtained vast amounts of knowledge and information which we do not possess. In order to gain such knowledge, we would have to make tests in the atmosphere; but this treaty would not permit us to make tests in the atmosphere. Therefore, if this treaty is ratified, the gains the Communists have made in recent years in connection with the development of an anti-ballistic-missile system and the development of high-yield weapons will be beyond our reach. The gains they have made in the recent tests will thus be frozen, and we shall never be able to obtain the knowledge that we need.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator from South Carolina also aware of the fact that no one has ever been able to rely on the Soviets to keep their word? I know he realizes that the only time when the Soviets have kept a treaty or an agreement was when it served their immediate interest to do so.

Mr. THURMOND. Yes. The able Senator from Louisiana is certainly familiar with the record of the Communists in connection with keeping treaties and keeping their word. I believe the Defense Department issued a pamphlet last November on broken treaties; it can be obtained from the Department. In one column, the treaties are listed; in the next, is a statement of how each treaty was broken and when it was broken.

The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has compiled a report on Communist treaties; and I understand that the subcommittee has recently released a supplement to that report. It shows clearly that the Communists cannot be relied upon to keep their word. They will not keep their word. Their goal is world enslavement and domination. They are driving toward it every day. To them, truth is anything that promotes communism; and they feel they are warranted in saying anything and doing anything to accomplish that goal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator from South Carolina familiar with the fact that the Communists teach that anything that will promote the spread of communism is justified?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From the point of view of a Communist, if he tells the truth or if he fails to cheat or fails to victimize us, to his own advantage, then he has committed an unpardonable and treasonable act. Does not the Senator know that if a Communist is asked how far a certain paved road continues, we can be sure that whatever he tells us will be wrong. If the road happens to be 50 miles in length, he will say it is 5 miles in length or 1 mile in length. One can be sure that whatever a Communist tells us will be wrong. The reason for that is that he is unwilling to tell us the truth, and he realizes that if he does not reply at all, we may find the truth. From the Communist point of view, it is much better that we be misinformed, rather than that we be ignorant.

When we are dealing with the Communists, we must realize that they are seeking to subjugate our country. They want to take charge; they want to make us bend to their will; and they want to find a way to victimize us. That is their entire purpose. That is why they are willing to sign an agreement of this sort.

I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether he agrees that their dedicated purpose is to destroy us—without war, if they can; but with war, if they must.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct. When Lenin took over Russia in 1917, he said the aim of the Soviets was to dig the graves of all other governments, and to be the heirs and successors to all the other governments in the world. The present Communist leaders have not departed from that philosophy. That was Stalin's goal; and that is Khrushchev's goal. That is the goal of all Communists. They have not abandoned that goal. Even since this treaty has been signed, the Communists have said this treaty is in their interest. They have tried to assure the people of Yugoslavia that this treaty is in the interests of the Communist world. They have tried to assure the Red Chinese that this treaty is in the interests of communism and for the benefit of the Communist world, and that it will hasten what the Communists call the final stage of the revolution.

Anyone who studies and reads enough to understand communism knows that the only time when the Communists will enter into an agreement with another country is when they feel it will be to their advantage to do so. They will not hesitate to enter into a treaty, because, as Stalin said, they believe treaties are like pie crusts, and are made to be broken. They will not hesitate to break them when it is in their interest. They will observe them only when it is to their benefit to do so.

In 1958, they observed the moratorium only until they had made the necessary preparations for resumption of testing. So, after extensive preparations, in September 1961, they overtly broke the moratorium and resumed testing. As a result, they have gained great knowledge which we do not have. But we must have it if we are to be able to manufacture the weapons necessary to deter war.

Because they have gained significant knowledge, they are willing to sign this treaty, so as to give them a breathing spell in which they can now manufacture their weapons in accordance with that knowledge. We should have that knowledge, too; but we can gain it only by testing in the atmosphere and in space.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not wish to point the finger of scorn at any of the fine men who serve in our Military Establishment. But is it not true that the military men who have testified in favor of this treaty serve under the President, are part of the executive branch, and are expected to support the major policy decisions of the administration?

Is it not also true that it is expected when the President appoints the Joint Chiefs or others who hold high, policymaking positions, he is entitled to insist that when final decisions on important policy matters are made, they support the President's position?

Mr. THURMOND. Of course. An able former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told me that those in that position feel they should support the President's decisions if they possibly can, because he is their Commander in Chief and is the President. So they believe that they should either support his decisions or should state outright to the President that they cannot do so—so that if he then wishes to relieve them from their duties, he can then proceed to do so.

But, as military men, they have been trained to take orders; and in this case they were told to consider the political implications, as well as the military implications. I understand they were further told that in considering the political implications, they should consider the information furnished them by the State Department, and should also consider that that information was correct.

If that is true—and that information came to me—then they had to weigh the political considerations along with the military considerations. But, of course, they are military men, not political men. General LeMay gave us a clue when he said that if this treaty were today in its proposal stage, he would not recommend that it be signed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a practical matter, is it not more or less traditional that if one who holds the position of Chief of Staff of one of the armed services feels that he must oppose the President, the Commander in Chief, and if he believes he should advise Members of Congress to vote against the recommendations of the Commander in Chief, he should then tender his resignation?

Mr. THURMOND. I believe the Senator is probably correct. It is quite interesting to note that when General Twining—a former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but not now directly "under the gun"—after recently studying this question for the Air Force, testified before us in secret session, the effect of his testimony was that this treaty is not in the best interests of our national security.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, who is a former Chief of Naval Operations and a former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made a similar statement to the effect that it would be a great mistake to ratify the treaty.

Admiral Radford filed a statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is not now under the gun directly. He made a strong statement against the treaty which every Senator should read.

In addition, other generals who are still in service, but who are not members of the Joint Chiefs and not in top positions, came in and testified. I admire them greatly for their courage in doing so. I wonder if their testimony will affect them in the positions to which they have been assigned. I hope it will not. It is also worthy of note that the Air Force Association today issued a statement against the treaty.

I do not believe any objective person who heard the statement of General Power would be inclined to favor ratification of the treaty. General Power has charge of our delivery systems to send the missiles or the bombers to drop the bombs in case we get into a war. He is the man who, if he received orders from the President to drop nuclear weapons, would press the button which would command the planes or missiles to go.

General Power must know every detail and implication relating to the military and pertaining to nuclear warfare and nuclear development. He is an expert on the subject. He is also chairman of the group that targets all of our strategic weapons.

General Schriever, who has charge of our testing, development, and missile program, is also an expert.

Both those men feel that the treaty would not be in the best interest of our national security. They do not take into consideration any of the so-called political factors. They look at the question from the standpoint of the security of the United States.

I should like to hear those who maintain that we must consider the problem primarily from a political angle say to what political angle they refer. What is the politics involved which is worrying them? What is the political angle? I should like to hear any Senator who thinks there is an overriding political consideration tell the Senate and the people of our country what political aspect overrides the military disadvantages and risks. I ask that question in the face of testimony of military men who are not now under the gun, and who are free and able to say that to ratify the treaty would not be in the best interest of our national security, and who point out that we are risking the only deterrent that has to date prevented a nuclear war—our strategic nuclear force.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I was not in a position to hear all of the witnesses who testified before the Foreign Relations Committee. However, I did have the opportunity to read most of the statements and also to hear the testimony of Dr. Teller, who in my opinion gave us some very enlightening information in this field.

It seemed to the Senator from Louisiana that we should keep two things in mind: First, what effect will the treaty have upon the defense of the United States? Will it affect us adversely or will it affect us favorably?

Second, what effect will it have upon our international relations? In my mind, there is no doubt that, all things being equal, it would be desirable to have some sort of test ban treaty with all the nations of the world. But, on the other hand, if by doing so we would greatly imperil the future defenses of the United States, we should ratify no such treaty as the one before the Senate.

Dr. Teller pointed out various ways in which the treaty could prejudice the development of the new weapons needed to defend our country. So far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, that testimony was not successfully refuted. Dr. Teller further said that there is additional information that he could give us to show us why the treaty would prejudice the United States, and why it would prejudice us even worse than was indicated in his public statement. The Senator might be interested to know that our committee thought so little of the man who was correct about the hydrogen bomb, and without whom we probably would not have been preeminent in that field, that we did not even call him back to tell us in full session the classified and secret information which he communicated to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which the Senator from South Carolina is a member.

Some Senators wished to wait at least until the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee had made its report. Those are men who should be experts in that field. Senators have been talking about the foreign aid bill, and how much money we might give to some backward countries. The Senator is a member of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which is discussing the development of new weapons, how much they will cost, how long it will take to acquire them, and so forth. So some members of the committee thought we should wait until the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which had heard a considerable amount of expert testimony from the defense point of view which we had not heard in the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported.

As the Senator knows, we did not have the benefit of that information. On the morning we voted, the junior Senator from Louisiana placed a telephone call to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is a man whom I greatly admire and one whom I once supported for the nomination for President of the United States. I voted for the Senator from South Carolina for President.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Both Senators serve on the Committee on Armed Services. The junior Senator from Louisiana placed a call to a man who perhaps for 20 years has been a member of the Committee on Armed Services. He has been chairman for a long period of time. He is a man whom President Truman once said was probably the best qualified Democrat to be President, and a man who probably would have been President except for the fact that he was a Southerner. The Senator from Louisiana desired to know what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] thought about the question after that able statesman had had an opportunity to receive information that the Senator from Louisiana did not possess.

I regret to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations did not see fit to wait until those who are experts in the field of atomic power and who would be our best experts in the field of preparedness, could give their advice.

It seems to me that we are rushing things very gravely and dangerously, when we proceed to rush ahead and try to ratify a treaty of the sort proposed without having carefully considered the best advice that we can get, which would indicate that the treaty would prejudice the defense of the United States.

I say to the Senator that I shall vote against the treaty. Perhaps I shall have more to say on the question later in the debate. I shall vote against the treaty because, as a former member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am fully convinced that the treaty would be a very good deal for the Soviet Union and would very seriously prejudice the future defense of our country.

I know that some people are concerned about the fallout problem. The best experts on that subject have told me that we should not let that question control our thinking in this field, and that it is a minor problem compared to the other major, weighty problems, such as the ability of our Nation to defend itself from destruction by enemy nations.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator has spoken of the problem of radiation fallout. Dr. Foster, who has charge of one of our nuclear laboratories, testified that a man living in the mountains of Colorado would get more additional radiation from living in that area due to the height than he would get from fallout resulting from nuclear testing.

Also the Senator might be interested in knowing that a recent book has been written by Earl Voss, entitled "Nuclear Ambush: Test Ban Trap," which is concurred in by scientists and experts. This book brought out the fact that a man wearing a wrist watch with a luminous dial will receive 10 times more radiation than he would receive from fallout from testing. A man living in a brick home would get 20 times more radiation than he would get from the fallout testing.

Much of what we hear about fallout is bugaboo. It simply does not exist. Dr. Seaborg, upon being questioned by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], brought out very clearly the fact that the amount of radiation now is not dangerous. There is no danger.

Of course, if there should be a nuclear exchange, and if fallout should result from it, the radiation which would occur would be dangerous, and lethal.

Certain people would like to stop testing to reduce the dangers of radioactive fallout. The point is that it is not necessary to stop testing, because we can now test with clean weapons and devices. The manner in which we test is such that we can test without the dangers of fallout. We have been doing it. The scientists say we can continue to do it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand the situation, all of the testing which has been done by all the powers on earth which have atomic weapons is estimated to have increased radioactivity in the atmosphere by about 10 percent. That increase in radioactivity will gradually dissipate itself. It will gradually decay, in some 70 years from now or perhaps a longer period of time. Eventually it will decay and dissipate itself from the atmosphere, and will make no difference. But the radioactivity in total has been increased by about 10 percent.

The sister of the junior Senator from Louisiana moved from Baton Rouge, La., to Boulder, Colo. When she did so, though she did not know it—she liked the atmosphere there and the family thought it would be good for their health—she subjected herself to 70 percent more radioactivity, because the atmosphere in Boulder is less dense than that in Baton Rouge.

The family thought it would improve health. Probably it did. The more arid atmosphere probably improved her health to a greater extent than the detriment caused by an increase in radioactivity.

If a person were born and reared in the state of Kerala in India, because of various mineral deposits, that person would be subjected to an increase of radioactivity of 1,000 percent, compared to the radioactivity in Washington, D.C. Nobody in Kerala ever knew there was a problem. Nobody there knows it now. How could those people have survived, if they were subjected to an increase of a thousandfold above what we are now talking about; that is, the amount of radioactivity which would result from the explosion of these bombs in tests?

The practical approach is that such a contention should not control our thinking. I regret to say that most people who believe we ought to ratify the treaty are inclined to so believe for that reason. Sometimes I have a feeling that that might have been the reason why the Russians exploded a 57-megaton bomb, to try to terrify the world into agreeing to a treaty like this.

Mr. THURMOND. That could have been the reason, or at least, one of the reasons. I agree with the Senator that radiation from fallout is a big "bugaboo" which is being played up today, with some people saying that is one of the reasons why we should ratify the treaty. In my judgment that contention has no merit; just as other reasons given for wanting to ratify the treaty are without merit.

I think this country will take a dangerous step if the treaty is ratified.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, when one reads the testimony by the Secretary of Defense—upon which the administration relies for its case—one finds that his argument breaks down to this: That the United States is extremely strong, that we presently are ahead of the Soviet Union in a number of respects, and that this treaty would tend to maintain the advantage we possess.

I should like to ask the Senator if we are ahead of the Soviets with regard to the big bombs.

Mr. THURMOND. We are not ahead of the Soviets with regard to the high-yield weapons. The Soviets have a lead. It is assumed that we are ahead of the Soviets with respect to the low-yield weapons. At a later point in my speech today I shall cover that point in greater detail.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The witnesses testified before us about the respects in which they believe we are ahead of the Soviets. I ask the Senator, how could they know such things? Has the Senator any reason to believe that our people know what the Russians know about atomic weapons? Would it seem more likely that the Russians have a way of keeping those things secret?

Mr. THURMOND. The testimony given before the Preparedness Subcommittee by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are on the other side of this question, with respect to various points is very clear that in certain fields the Communists are ahead. When one looks at those points, relating to where they are ahead, it is frightening. Our information of Soviet technology is limited, but through analysis of radioactive debris from Soviet tests, we have some information.

I suggest, if the Senator has time, that he read the testimony given by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on that point. The staff has it available. It has been summarized. I believe that seven or eight different points are covered. It is well worthwhile reading.

Today in my speech I shall bring out as well as I can, without violating the rule against divulging classified material, what is involved. A little later I shall come to the disadvantages of the treaty.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator explored in his mind the possibility that if the Soviets wished to do more testing it could be done on Chinese territory? So long as we were not able to prove that the Russians were doing it, so long as we merely suspected and were unable to prove it, we would be bound by the treaty to continue to refrain from testing.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator has brought out a key point. That is a question which I propounded to some of the military and scientific witnesses who testified before the Preparedness Subcommittee. I asked, "What would keep the Russians from shifting their equipment and scientists just over the Chinese line, thousands of miles away from where we can reach, so that we would never know whether the testing was done in China or in Russia?"

That is exactly what they could do. The evidence which was brought out in the investigation showed that it could be the case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not be easier to arrange to do the testing on Chinese territory than to go to the expense, small though it might be, of providing an adequate underground tunnel to conduct explosions?

Mr. THURMOND. That could be done by the Russians. With the instruments which we have today we might be able to pick up those tests, but we would not be able to tell whether they were conducted in Chinese or Russian territory if they were conducted near the line. It would be impossible to tell that. The Russians could go near to the line and carry out a series of tests, and then the Russians could deny that they had anything to do with them, and it would be difficult to tell on which side of the line the tests were being conducted. If the Chinese were conducting the tests, that still would not be a violation of the treaty, technically speaking, yet it would be an effort inspired by, prescribed by, supervised by, and under the leadership of the Russians.

We could not even be sure who was testing if we determined the detonation was of an advanced device.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From the Communist point of view, would that not be a fine, patriotic thing for them to do, for the benefit of their nation?

Mr. THURMOND. There is no doubt about it. They would not hesitate to do that, if they thought it to their advantage.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Communist doctrine teach that it is the duty of Communists to do that sort of thing?

Mr. THURMOND. Absolutely. That brings up the next question, about the rift. It has been claimed that there is a rift between Russia and Red China. I asked the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "If there were a showdown today with Russia, on whose side would China be?" They answered, "On the side of Russia," in their opinion.

I asked, "If there were a showdown today with China, on whose side would Russia be?" and they answered, in their opinion, "On the side of China."

If the showdown is coming between our Nation and Russia or between our Nation and China, and if those nations will be, as the Joint Chiefs of Staff think they will be, standing together, what difference does it make if there is any rift?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not also correct that all those people really argue about is, "Which is the better way to destroy the United States?"

Mr. THURMOND. That is the whole question. The Senator has put his finger on the point. They ask only, "Which is the best way to destroy the United States?"

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From the Russian point of view, it is by entering into this treaty. They think this is the best way to conquer the world.

Mr. THURMOND. Russia appears to feel that is the best way to proceed. Russia feels that it should proceed gradually to take over the world by subversion, deceit, and deception; by getting us into traps and placing us in such a position that we will either be destroyed or have to surrender.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Meanwhile, they obtain every military advantage they can. If the result of this treaty should be to retard us from developing modern weapons of the future, while the Communists rushed pell-mell ahead, using the information that they may now have, would that not be advancing the doctrine for which Russia is contending, namely, that this is the better way to subjugate the Western nations?

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am grateful to the Senator for permitting me to trespass upon his time. I have been very much troubled about this treaty, and I believe the majority of the members of the Preparedness Subcommittee, of which the Senator is one, have rendered a great service to this country in pointing out in the report how the treaty would prejudice our defense. I congratulate the Senator for the speech he is making.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished and able Senator for the questions propounded. They have been information-seeking questions. They have brought out information that I hope will be of value to the American people.

On the Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, all members but one agreed to the report. The ranking Republican member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], did not agree. One member, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] had additional views, however. The others were all in accord on the report, and even the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] went along with the report with the addition of individual views.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If a Senator concludes, as I do, that this treaty would prejudice the defense of the United States, and that it would result in this Nation being second best as compared with the Soviet Union in weapons of the future, would it not be his duty, as well as the duty of the rest of us, no matter how much the political repercussions might affect this Nation, to vote to continue to develop the most modern weapons, and to reject the treaty, if we concluded that the treaty would adversely affect our defenses?

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct. Furthermore, in my judgment, the only thing that has prevented the Russians from using nuclear weapons in their aggressions and their efforts to take over this country is our tremendously superior nuclear striking power. It has been the deterrent that has hindered and kept the Russians from starting a nuclear war. Now, since the Russians have gained this vast knowledge from recent tests, and their advantages will be frozen if the treaty is ratified, we are going to be greatly handicapped, because the Russians have scientific knowledge about high-yield weapons, weapon effects, and antiballistic missiles, which are vital to us and our future, that we do not have; and the only way we can obtain it is to test in the atmosphere.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator very much. I shall listen with interest to the remainder of his speech. I regret to say that few Senators are present to hear the speech this afternoon. What the Senator from South Carolina is presenting should be heard and studied by every Member of the Senate before he votes on the treaty.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Obviously, therefore, we cannot credit ourselves with strategic superiority sufficient for a credible deterrent force if we merely possess a numerical advantage in weapons of roughly equivalent quality to those of a potential aggressor. Our announced second strike strategy—or our public renunciation of a first strike—places a burden upon us to maintain an overwhelming superiority in quality and quantity of strategic weapons. It is a heavy burden from many standpoints, and puts us at a distinct disadvantage. In the past, and even now, we have managed to carry that burden, and since it has effectively prevented a nuclear war, it has been worth the extra effort required.

In assessing our ability to deter a would-be aggressor in the future, we must, therefore, examine the relative levels of technology today, and the prospect for relative technological progress in the near future, always keeping in mind that our self-imposed second strike strategy requires far more than a numerical and qualitative parity to maintain a credible and effective deterrent.

With these two factors in mind, it should be clear that our current superiority in nuclear weaponry, standing alone, or even combined with our capability to produce greater quantities of today's weapons in the future, offers little comfort that we can maintain an effective deterrent force in the future. As impressive as is our weapons array at the moment, it is sobering to recall that we have not begun production of a strategic weapons system of later vintage than 1957. To be sure, existing weapons systems are constantly being improved, but the absence of any new strategic weapons system for more than 6 years is an invitation to obsolescence.

The most pertinent issue on the question of our capability to maintain a sufficient strategic nuclear force to insure that we can deter a nuclear war in future years is the relative levels of nuclear technology in the United States and in the Soviet Union at present. Since the three environmental test ban will inhibit the development of technology in certain areas, if observed, the existing level of technology when this treaty would go into effect is particularly pertinent in those areas.

The Preparedness Subcommittee has studied for months the relative balance of nuclear technology between the United States and the Soviet Union. The investigation included the compilation and comparison in detail of each and every nuclear test conducted by the United States and the knowledge gained therefrom, together with the best information available in this country on each of the Soviet tests on which we have information.

The conclusions drawn from this comparison, to the extent permitted by security considerations, are presented in the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee. Admittedly, estimates of the Soviet achievements are conservative, and are by no means based on the sound rule of military intelligence that the most pessimistic judgment as to a potential enemy's capabilities should be drawn.

In general, the comparative rates of testing by the United States and by the Soviet Union in the past 2 years is significant. In 1958, when the test moratorium began, the United States held a clear superiority over the Soviet Union in the yield-to-weight ratio over the entire range of deliverable weights for weapons. One-fifth of the U.S. tests had been in yield ranges above 10 megatons, and the Soviets had conducted no tests above 10 megatons.

During 1961 and 1962, the Soviet Union conducted more than twice the number of tests of yields above 10 megatons that the United States has ever conducted, and more than four times the number of tests the United States conducted in the same yield range in the same period. The Soviet Union has demonstrated in these tests, capabilities for a clearly superior performance to the United States above about 15-megaton yield. The last U.S. experience in this yield range was in 1954, almost a decade ago. Our uncertainty about the design of such Soviet weapons is most disturbing.

In the multimegaton yield ranges, it is quite obvious that the Soviets now hold a clear superiority in technology.

In the yield ranges below a few megatons, available evidence indicates that the United States continues to hold a lead in weapons design and performance. This is the precise area in which the United States has concentrated. Even this lead is not positive enough to be too reassuring, however. Prior to the moratorium, the United States had conducted more than twice as many tests in this yield range as had been detected in the Soviet Union. The number of tests in this yield range that we know the Soviets conducted in 1962 and 1963 indicates clearly that the Soviets are intent on challenging the U.S. position in this range, and this is an area in which continued testing underground, permitted by the treaty, can contribute to further advancements of technology.

In the lower yield ranges, we know far less of the Soviets' testing experience, for our detection, identification, and analytical capabilities are degraded at the lower end of the yield range spectrum. The Atomic Energy Commission indicated that available evidence would not permit a comprehensive comparison of U.S. and U.S.S.R. capabilities in this yield range, and recommended that a development capability for the U.S.S.R. comparable to that of the United States be assumed.

Under present circumstances, the acquisition of knowledge concerning weapons effects is as crucial, if not more so, than knowledge of weapons design. In answer to questions, General LeMay stated that knowledge of weapons effects was clearly more crucial at this juncture. Unfortunately, this is one area in which the Soviets almost assuredly hold a lead. Judging from the knowledge which we have of Soviet multimegaton weapons tests, we must assume that the Soviet Union amassed a significant and valuable body of data on high yield blast, shock, communications blackout, and the exotic effects of radiation and electromagnetic phenomena which are not now available to the United States, and which we cannot acquire with underground testing.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. In 1962, the Soviet Union made tests of an extremely large type of weapon, as I recall, of perhaps 50 or 60 megatons. Is that correct?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. Have we any information as to what effect such tests would have on systems that might be used for our own missiles fired from submarines or land bases?

Mr. THURMOND. The evidence before the Preparedness Subcommittee indicated that it could be very serious. In other words, the blast, shock, communications blackout, and the exotic effects of radiation and electromagnetic phenomena must all be taken into consideration. It is felt that the high-yield tests have been very beneficial to the Communists, in that they now know how to go about constructing the weapons they need, which could turn the tide in the cold war.

Mr. TALMADGE. I take it that we have made tests with some of our own weapons in the 10- and 15-megaton range.

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct. They are much smaller than those of the Communists. We have not tested above 15 megatons since 1954, and the state of the art has advanced significantly since then.

Mr. TALMADGE. When those weapons are fired, are our firing systems still operating accurately?

Mr. THURMOND. We still have far less weapons effects knowledge than we need. I do not wish to go into classified information, but we are very much concerned about the high-yield weapons, which the Communists are now able to produce with the knowledge they have gained. In my judgment this is one of the reasons for their wanting the test treaty, to get a breathing spell so that they can manufacture these weapons based on the knowledge which they have gained from their tests. Their production capabilities are poor. They will then be able to say to us, "Either surrender, or be destroyed."

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the able Senator's view, then, that if they were to hurl bombs of great magnitude at us, say, in the 50-, 60-, and even 100-megaton range, the effects of the explosion might be felt by our firing mechanisms and therefore we would be unable to retaliate? Is that the thrust of the Senator's argument?

Mr. THURMOND. That is a distinct possibility, but our knowledge is limited. That is the opinion of some of the scientists and military experts. Furthermore, the Senator has put his finger on a key point, because we would not be able to hold tests to determine what the exact results would be.

Mr. TALMADGE. Was that fear supported by the majority of the scientists and the military, or by a minority of the scientists and the military?

Mr. THURMOND. I do not recall exactly about the number who testified, but they were all concerned about the effects of the firing of the high-yield missiles which could be dropped on us, and the effect it could have on the question of whether we would be able to get our missiles off, or whether our guidance systems and control systems would be destroyed, or whether the exotic effects of the nuclear explosion would play such a part that we could not direct our missiles to the target, or whether they could even take off from the ground. There was serious concern about these things, and it is necessary for us to obtain further information on whether our systems would be able to penetrate the enemy's antimissile defense; and whether our antimissile defense system, which we ought to be developing, and which I hope someday we will be deploying would be able to withstand the enormous missiles that would be fired at us as well as the effects of our own defensive missiles. The only way that can be determined is through actual tests in the environment in which these weapons are actually to operate, in order to determine the exact results.

Mr. TALMADGE. From what the Senator has said, the testimony of the scientists displayed a fear of the unknown—that we did not know what the reaction would be, while at the same time the Soviets probably know, through their tests, what the reaction would be.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator has expressed that point correctly, except that we do have some knowledge on the matter, which provides a very real basis for the concern, although that knowledge is limited. The evidence indicates the Soviets know more, though probably not everything.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator very much for permitting me to ask these questions of him. He is delivering a very able speech. I wish I could stay for the remainder of it, but I must keep an appointment. I assure the Senator that I will read it with great benefit in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the able Senator for his kind remarks.

Since the United States does not know the results of the Soviet experience in testing multimegaton weapons, we are not capable of evaluating the military effectiveness of such multimegaton weapons.

We are further handicapped by the fact that we have not subjected most of our major missile weapons systems to operational proof tests. Only the Polaris system has been subjected to a full-scale systems test. Atlas, Minuteman, and Titan have had no such tests. At this point, we must estimate, without full knowledge, the reliability of these weapons systems, even in the absence of enemy attack. This makes it even more difficult, if not wholly speculative, to estimate the reliability of such weapons systems in the nuclear environment of attack.

Even more important, in assessing our deterrent capability, we cannot with any degree of confidence know what the Soviets believe the reliability of our weapons systems to be, since we do not have their weapons effects knowledge upon which they base their judgment.

A particularly vital area of technology is the antiballistic missile field. Despite the generalized statements of conclusions by some witnesses, which have had the tendency to confuse the relative levels of technology in this field, a specific analysis of the tests themselves is the best indicator of the facts. The Preparedness Subcommittee thoroughly examined the details of all the tests relating to this subject. While the specifics of information on both our tests and those of the Soviets are classified, the subcommittee summarized the situation as follows:

> In the field of weapons effects experiments related to the design and development of an effective antiballistic missile (ABM) system the evidence, although less conclusive, indicates that the Soviet Union in 1961 and 1962 conducted a series of complex high-altitude operations which, if properly instrumented, could have provided substantial and important data on various types of radar blackout and nuclear effects. These Soviet experiments were clearly dictated by an ABM development program.
>
> The United States has conducted no experiments comparable in complexity to those Soviet operations and a disturbing number of the U.S. high-altitude-effects experiments which were conducted were compromised either by considerations unrelated to the technical objectives of the test program, by inadequate or faulty instrumentation, or by operational inadequacies.

Only the limitations of security classification prevent the presentation of more specific proof of the obvious Soviet lead in technology in the ABM field.

As is shown by the chart of U.S. test requirements on page 6 of the Preparedness Subcommittee's report, those areas in which we have the most vital deficiencies of knowledge are the precise areas where we cannot acquire significant advances with underground tests.

There is an additional disturbing feature which must be taken into consideration in any comparison of United States and Soviet nuclear testing experience. A large number of the U.S. tests have been devoted to the purpose of developing capabilities for detecting, identifying and analyzing nuclear tests and other nuclear detonations carried out by other nations. This was a very essential program, and has given us a more realistic estimate of our own detection capabilities, although here, as in other areas, large uncertainties still exist. Apparently the Soviets have devoted few of their tests to such purposes. Any comparison of numbers of tests designed to evaluate the relative levels of technology for weapons design and weapons effects in the United States and the Soviet Union must be qualified by the disparity of numbers of tests for the purpose of developing and improving detection techniques.

Equally important to a realistic appraisal of comparative tests is the fact that the Soviets, who do not adhere to a second-strike policy, can concentrate their tests on a more narrow spectrum of interests than can the United States. Because of our second-strike policy, a substantial number of our tests must be devoted to ascertaining the capability of our own weapons systems to survive a nuclear attack. The Soviets, who do not plan to await an attack before launching their nuclear forces, do not need to test so extensively on the ability of their own systems to withstand nuclear attacks. Their technology can concentrate on the vulnerabilities of U.S. systems and the means to exploit those vulnerabilities.

On the basis of comprehensive study and comparisons of Soviet and United States nuclear technology, the Preparedness Subcommittee found the military disadvantages to the United States to be as follows:

> 1. The United States probably will be unable to duplicate Soviet achievements in very high yield weapon technology.
>
> 2. The United States will be unable to acquire necessary data on the effects of very high yield atmospheric explosions.
>
> 3. The United States will be unable to acquire data on high altitude nuclear weapons effects.
>
> 4. The United States will be unable to determine with confidence the performance and reliability of any ABM system developed without benefit of atmospheric operational system tests.
>
> 5. The United States will be unable to verify the ability of its hardened underground second-strike missile systems to survive close-in, high-yield nuclear explosions.
>
> 6. The United States will be unable to verify the ability of its missile reentry bodies under defensive nuclear attack to survive and penetrate to the target without the opportunity to test nose cone and warhead designs in a nuclear environment under dynamic reentry conditions.
>
> 7. The treaty will provide the Soviet Union an opportunity to equal U.S. accomplishments in submegaton weapon technology.

As is obvious, most of these disadvantages result from the absence of a capability by the United States under the treaty to acquire knowledge of weapons design and weapons effects in areas in which there is at least a probability that the Soviets have more knowledge than do we.

In addition—and this is the eighth disadvantage in the report—the treaty would diminish our capability to learn of Soviet advancements in technology. With testing limited to underground, we would be denied the knowledge we can gain from analysis of radioactive debris from Soviet tests. With the passage of time, our knowledge, or basis for estimates of the state of the art of nuclear weaponry in the Soviet Union, will be materially degraded.

The military aspects of the treaty can be placed in perspective only if translated into the effects on our capability to maintain the overwhelming superiority of strategic power essential to an effective deterrent of nuclear war in the years to come.

We know that the Soviets now have a clear superiority in the technology of multimegaton weapons design, and under this treaty the United States could not surpass or even duplicate that knowledge. In the absence of such knowledge, we cannot realistically evaluate the military value of such multimegaton weapons.

We know that the Soviets have performed tests, which, if properly instrumented, have given them a lead in high-yield weapons effects technology. This knowledge, if now possessed by the Soviets, cannot be acquired by the United States under the terms of the test ban treaty. We cannot, therefore, realistically assess the vulnerabilities of our own weapons systems to the high-yield blast, shock, communications blackout, and exotic radiation and electromagnetic phenomena. The Soviets, from the tests they have already conducted, could know both the vulnerabilities of our weapons systems and their own capabilities with multimegaton weapons to exploit those vulnerabilities. Since it is the potential enemy's estimate of the survivability of our second-strike force after their attack which determines the effectiveness of our deterrent force, the importance of our lack of knowledge of what the Soviets know assumes critical proportions.

The importance of the relative levels of technology in the ABM field derives from the fact that deployment of an effective ABM system could seriously degrade, if not nullify, the deterrent capability of a nuclear force composed of ballistic missiles. An ABM system which falls short of perfection can nevertheless seriously degrade the credibility of a missile force deterrent, especially when combined with an offensive force designed to exploit vulnerabilities of a second-strike force with a first attack.

In summary, the facts developed by the Preparedness Subcommittee over a period of 5 months of investigations and hearings, which included a detailed study of tests by both sides, show a bleak, dismal and doubt-pervaded prospect, if this treaty is ratified, for the U.S. capability to maintain the overwhelming strategic power essential to deter nuclear war.

Intimations have been heard, and some of them not very subtly put, that the conclusions of the Preparedness Subcommittee are overly pessimistic. Surely no one can charge, however, that the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee is more pessimistic than the report of the Foreign Relations Committee is optimistic. Indeed, the Foreign Relations Committee report has one characteristic in common with U.S. intelligence estimates of the situation in Cuba prior to

October 1962. They both adopted the most optimistic conclusion from the standpoint of the United States that the facts, or any presentation of the facts, would possibly support.

However, even accepting the conclusions of the report of the Foreign Relations Committee as correct, for the sake of argument, the prospects for maintaining an effective deterrent if this treaty is ratified are most discouraging.

The report of the Foreign Relations Committee, in discussing the probable motivations of the Soviets, states:

> Soviet scientists presumably are confident that in many critical areas of nuclear weaponry they have achieved a rough technical parity with the United States.

If Soviet scientists are confident that the Soviets have achieved a rough technical parity with the United States in many critical areas of nuclear weaponry, as the Foreign Relations Committee says, the days of continued credibility of the U.S. deterrent force are numbered, and the one thing that has prevented nuclear war for so many years is doomed. Regardless of how wrong the Soviet scientists may be in their judgment—and we do not know the technological information on which they base their judgment—our nuclear force will no longer constitute a deterrent, if they do not believe in its superiority. Their plans are based on a first-strike strategy, and under conditions of parity from other standpoints, this gives them a very distinct edge. There is small consolation that the Soviet scientists may be overconfident, and that the optimistic conclusions of the Foreign Relations Committee as to the relative levels of technology may be correct, thus making it possible for us to retaliate effectively after a Soviet nuclear attack. We might even bring more destruction on the enemy than was visited upon us, but we would have failed in our primary purpose in creating and maintaining our strategic forces—to prevent a nuclear war through deterrence.

Quite obviously, the Foreign Relations Committee report refers to the judgment of Soviet scientists that a parity exists in nuclear weapons technology, rather than a nuclear weapons parity, although the report does not specifically so state. There is little doubt that the United States today has a clear superiority in strategic nuclear forces—that is, in quality and quantity of weapons in place. There is small comfort in this distinction, however, for, as Dr. Edward Teller so accurately and succinctly stated:

> A disparity of knowledge today is a disparity of power tomorrow.

When the serious military disadvantages to the United States as a result of this treaty are pointed out, there is often a response made that only one side of the picture is being considered. This argument maintains that if both sides continue testing, nuclear parity will surely result. Another version of the same rationale is that further testing by the United States may stimulate testing by others who will thereby overtake U.S. technology. This argument is based on the false premise that there has been an all-out arms race in nuclear testing by the United States and the Soviets.

Unquestionably, in the 1961 and 1962 series of tests, the Soviets tested at a rate which was probably near the maximum of their capability. It takes two to make a race, however. The United States, unfortunately, was not even running. In the period since the test moratorium was overtly broken by the Soviets in September 1961, the Soviets have conducted approximately three times the number of tests that the United States has conducted, and this includes, of course, only the Soviet tests of which we have knowledge. Again, even this disparity must be expanded in view of the fact that some of the U.S. tests were for the purpose of improving detection techniques, that others were related to the peaceful uses of nuclear detonations, and the fact that the first-strike strategy of the U.S.S.R. permits the Soviets to concentrate more on weapons design and effects—the most pertinent technology to strategic power. In terms of average yield, the Soviet tests of 1961 and 1962 were a high multiple of the average yield of U.S. tests.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the able Senator from South Carolina agree that we shall never be able to develop a dependable atomic missile defense without testing in the atmosphere?

Mr. THURMOND. That is my opinion. During their recent tests, the Russians made tests in the atmosphere that showed that they were testing for the development of an antimissile system; and it is clear that they have gained knowledge which they can use now in manufacturing weapons to perfect a more advanced ABM system. Unless we test in the atmosphere, we shall not be able to determine what will actually occur when such a weapon is used in the environment in which it is designed to be used.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator from South Carolina heard the arguments to the effect that we can develop a practical, workable missile defense without ever testing it under actual trial conditions?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes. Today, we have an antimissile program. We have not produced or deployed it, but we have an antimissile designed that has in tests knocked down 8 out of 12 shots, as I have already stated. However, it would be impossible to perfect this system and develop it to a point where we would feel we could rely upon it, because testing underground will not be the same as testing in the environment in which it will actually have to operate. No one can tell what results will be forthcoming when tests are actually made in the atmosphere.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from South Carolina knows, of course, that at present we have no dependable answer to the problem of destroying a missile which is accompanied by a number of decoys. In other words, the Russians may have, or get, large missiles with multiple warheads and multiple decoys. If one is fired at us, it can be expected to explode, while on its way, and to separate into 25 or 30 components—perhaps 25 dummies and 5 actual bombs.

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We have no present answer to that problem. We also know that if we try to shoot them down with an atomic missile, there will be a communications blackout—for which we have no answer at present. The blackout caused by the first explosion would make it impossible to see the following missile.

Some contend that perhaps we can "design around" this problem. As I understand, the idea is to have at other places a number of radar systems which perhaps could spot the missiles. But in that event, if war broke out between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, we would be confronted with probably hundreds of missiles fired simultaneously; and therefore it might not be possible to "design around" that problem.

In addition, is the Senator from South Carolina familiar with the fact that early in World War II our naval forces were using torpedoes that would not explode? They had been tested under simulated conditions, for prior to the war, "economize" was the order of the day, and our naval chiefs were unwilling to use torpedoes in actual deepwater tests against ships. So the tests were made under simulated conditions. They were made with deepwater torpedoes. We had not then developed shallow-water torpedoes. It was believed that when the torpedo passed beneath a ship, the magnetic field of the ship would explode the torpedo.

When tested under simulated conditions, the torpedoes worked perfectly; but under actual war conditions they went about 10 feet deeper than planned, with the result that they did not pick up sufficient magnetic impulse to make them explode; and nothing happened.

Some people thought our submarine commanders perhaps lacked the courage to move close enough to the ships to be sure the torpedoes would hit them. Others thought the sailors were drinking the alcohol in the gyroscopic mechanism of the torpedoes, and thus causing them to malfunction. Then it was found that the firing pins of the torpedoes were too brittle, and were not sufficiently viable to withstand the shock of a direct hit. So our torpedoes would not explode.

One commander reported that it was a waste of time and money to send a submarine 8,500 miles, only to find that the torpedoes were no good. It was clear that actual use under war conditions was required.

The Japanese, who did not have that problem, sank practically all our Pacific Fleet. Their torpedoes were designed to work in shallow water. And the British had developed a good one, which they used to excellent effect when they raided the Italian naval base at Taranto.

Developing a contact torpedo is a simple problem. I believe I could build one myself, by reason of knowing a little about fulminate of mercury and TNT. But that problem would be simple, compared to the intricacies involved developing a missile that would be accurate enough to shoot down 100, 200, 500, or 1,000 other missiles. However, to fail in that task would be to mortgage our future survival, because the scientists have proved that these things can be done.

Someone will develop a successful missile defense. I hope and pray that this Nation, rather than the Soviet Union, develops it first.

But I say to the Senator from South Carolina that in my judgment—and I believe it is also the judgment of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee—we shall never have a successful missile defense so long as we abide by the terms of the treaty.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. He was a distinguished naval officer in World War II, and he has very interestingly related the experience with our torpedoes. I believe his illustration is apropos. We must test this weapon in the environment in which it will actually be used, in order definitely to determine whether it will be successful.

I feel that our stockpile of warheads should also be tested, for it is quite possible that duds are among them.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from the Cowboy State.

Mr. SIMPSON. Is not that the gist of the testimony of Dr. Teller?

Mr. THURMOND. Dr. Teller's testimony was to that effect, as was the testimony of other scientists and military experts.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the able Senator from South Carolina for his magnificent exposition. Because of his great ability and his long military experience, he should be carefully listened to by the people of America. I believe history will record that he is entirely correct.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his kind remarks.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have referred to a certain amount of information which has not otherwise been available to us. Does the Senator share the opinion of General Twining and Admiral Radford—both of whom at one time were Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—that we would not be able to develop an atomic missile defense without testing?

Mr. THURMOND. I am not sure that they expressed an opinion on that particular point, but General Twining testified in secret session and gave us extremely valuable information that was most helpful. Almost any person present would have been convinced by his statement that the treaty would not be in our best interests.

Incidentally, as I stated earlier, General Twining has been with a group known as the Twining Committee, which is carrying on research and work for the Air Force, as I understand. He is probably in as favorable a position as anyone to know what the situation is and whether or not the treaty would be helpful to us. Some may say that these former chairmen or chiefs are now out and are not familiar with the latest information, but this is not necessarily the case.

General Twining has been briefed recently on intelligence. He is informed of what is going on. That is one reason he could not testify in open session and give all the information that he possessed.

Admiral Radford made a very strong statement, which is in the record of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which, although brief, is against the treaty on the ground that it would not be in our best national interest. Admiral Burke, a former Chief of Naval Operations, shares that opinion.

Mr. President, the sum and substance of the matter is that there has been no race. The reasons for the U.S. failure to test more aggressively are difficult to pinpoint, but were political, psychological, and technical in nature. Not the least of the reasons why the U.S. test programs lagged was the state of unpreparedness to test which resulted from the moratorium. Some of the first tests which the United States conducted after the Soviets openly breached the moratorium were of little or no value, for they were hastily and ill prepared. This, too, contributed to the relative gains in nuclear technology which the Soviets achieved in the past 2 years.

In those areas of testing where the United States has concentrated, the United States still holds a probable lead in technology, despite our lack of aggressiveness in testing. This is the case in the low megatonnage weapons design technology, where we are still ahead.

There is every reason to believe that if the United States tested seriously, after planning and scheduling carefully, without an off-again, on-again approach that has so often characterized the U.S. approach to testing, we could maintain an overwhelming superiority. Our scientists are more imaginative and capable, our laboratories are more efficient, and our military planners more sound in judgment of weapons requirements than those of the Soviets. Our capabilities are superior to those of the Soviets, not inferior. But superior capabilities cannot avail the United States of superior strategic power, and thereby an assured deterrent to nuclear war, unless there is a will and policy for these capabilities to be realized to the maximum. Had we tested to the extent of our capabilities since September 1961, the superiority of technology held by the United States on that date would not have diminished or disappeared, but would have increased despite the comprehensive Soviet series of tests.

The requirements for testing which are listed in the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee are not substantially different in nature than they were in September 1961. Had these requirements been met by serious and diligent U.S. testing in the period since that date, the United States would probably now have a commanding lead in nuclear technology; and a treaty, such as the one now before the Senate, which tends to freeze certain levels of technology, could have assisted in protecting this commanding lead in nuclear technology. As it is, we are in the position of considering a treaty which may at best tend to freeze a rough technological parity overall and freezes a technological inferiority of the United States in certain crucial areas.

In reaching their conclusion that the "Soviet scientists presumably are confident that in many critical areas of nuclear weaponry they have achieved a rough technical parity with the United States," the Foreign Relations Committee was attempting to assess the probable motives of the Soviet Union in now accepting what heretofore it has consistently rejected. While attempts to assess the motives of the Soviet Union are necessarily conjectural and highly speculative, as pointed out by the Foreign Relations Committee, none of the probabilities of Soviet motivations should be excluded from consideration.

The Foreign Relations Committee has omitted from consideration in its report one quite possible, and I am convinced, probable, motive of the Soviets in suddenly signing this treaty. Admittedly, this probable motive is of a military nature, which may account for the lack of consideration accorded it in the Foreign Relations Committee report.

It is possible, even probable, that the Soviet scientists have concluded, as a result of the series of tests conducted by the Soviets in 1961 and 1962, that they have achieved a technological breakthrough in discovering vulnerabilities in the U.S. strategic nuclear force and in learning enough about multimegaton weapon design to exploit those vulnerabilities. The vulnerability which they may have concluded that they have discovered may pertain solely to some feature of our missiles in silos, or in the circuitry which controls the launching or guidance of the missile. Such vulnerability could be in the warheads. There is such a large area of lack of knowledge in the United States, and the Soviet tests were sufficiently comprehensive, that the vulnerability could lie in any one of a number of areas. It could be in our missile control circuits, or in our warning system. The means to exploit such a vulnerability could lie in the very size of the blast or in the shock effects of their monster bomb, for which they have the technology to produce delivery vehicles, if they do not now have the vehicles themselves. The means of exploiting the vulnerability could well lie in the exotic effects produced by the 100-megaton bomb.

If the Soviets have achieved a technological breakthrough by which they could produce weapons to neutralize or destroy our land-based missile force, they would, of course, still have to deal with the Polaris system. This is where even a less than perfect ABM system could contribute substantially to downgrading the credibility of the U.S. second strike force. One of the principal problems in ABM development is providing a capability of dealing with saturation attacks. A relatively unsophisticated ABM system can be very effective against single missiles fired at single targets. The Polaris system does not fire salvos. There can be no simultaneous saturation attack on a large number of targets by a Polaris system. Even if the Polaris carried up to five warheads on each missile, an ABM system of limited capability could provide a substantial and highly effective defense. If Soviet detection and counterfire capabilities have also been substantially improved, they might be persuaded that the Polaris submarine could be knocked out before many of its missiles were launched. We do not have much knowledge on the radius of kill of a multimegaton weapon when employed against a submarine.

If, indeed, the Soviets achieved such knowledge from their 1961 and 1962 series of tests, they would still have a problem, of course. There is always a chance, in the absence of a test ban treaty, that the United States would test and discover knowledge which could be used to remove vulnerabilities in our systems and design new counterweapons. The relative Soviet productive capacity is so poor, that even if the United States obtained the pertinent and needed information 2 years after the Soviets—say in 1965—there would be a distinct possibility that the United States, through its superior production, could correct the vulnerabilities in its weapons systems and deploy new weapons systems before the Soviets could complete their production and deployment.

If, indeed, these were the circumstances in which the Soviets found themselves following their evaluation of their series of tests, what would be a more logical solution than to seek a treaty banning testing, and thereby freezing the level of knowledge in those critical areas where the Soviets judged themselves to have a distinct advantage, while leaving themselves free to test in that area of testing where they still felt they could make gains on the United States? Such circumstances are quite possible, and not in the least inconsistent with the knowledge which we now possess. Indeed, the facts to support such a theory of motivation are much more cogent and persuasive than is the basis for any of the possible motivations discussed by the Foreign Relations Committee in its report.

This theory of motivation may well not be accurate, but that only puts it at the top of the category of the possible motivations suggested by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There is one vital difference, however. If the motivation which I have suggested proves to be the correct one—and I am convinced that it is—ratification of this treaty will leave the United States with alternatives only of submitting to nuclear blackmail, nuclear war, or surrender; for, we will have no credible deterrent to nuclear war when the Soviets have managed to translate their nuclear knowledge into nuclear weapons, a period which could take from 3 to 5 years or possibly a little longer.

Thus, even in the absence of the consideration of the questions of the possibilities of clandestine testing by the Soviet Union or a second surprise abrogation of the treaty with a new series of tests by the Soviet Union, the military risks inherent in this treaty are formidable—even fearsome. The crux of the military disadvantages is the fact that, unlike the conditions that existed in early 1961, we no longer have a clear superiority in nuclear technology, and in many areas of weapons design and effect all the evidence supports a conclusion that the Soviets now enjoy a superiority in nuclear technology.

The test ban treaty tends strongly to freeze the Soviet advantages in nuclear technology. Such a freeze could be used to compensate for their relatively slow productive capacity, so that they could, in time, confront us with deployed weapons systems which could, at least in their own judgment, give the Soviets a clear superiority in strategic power, especially if this power is used to carry out a first strike against us.

At the very least, it gives the Soviets time to convert their knowledge into weaponry, so that they end up with a qualitative and quantitative parity of strategic weapons with the United States. Again, in view of the differing strategies, this would give them the advantage which might well be the basis for a decision to carry out a first strike resulting in nuclear war.

Under existing circumstances, even if the treaty is observed by the Soviets according to the letter of the treaty, the military effect is to diminish, if not entirely negate, the possibility that the United States can continue to maintain the overwhelming strategic nuclear power which will deter and prevent a nuclear war as it has in the past.

As serious as these military aspects of the treaty are for the United States, there are other factors which add to the number and magnitude of the risks. These factors are the possibilities of undetected or unidentified clandestine tests by the Soviet Union, and of another surprise abrogation of the test ban by the Soviet Union.

Our existing capabilities to detect and identify nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, underwater and in space are the best now existing in the world. These capabilities are not the best the state of the art in this country will permit. However, if the treaty is ratified, substantial improvement would be very costly and unavoidable.

There are many uncertainties about our detection and identification capabilities. There are obviously thresholds below which the capabilities are degraded seriously, and in some cases, disappear. Future developments by the Soviet Union could quite conceivably degrade substantially our existing detection and identification capabilities. These uncertainties exist, in varying degrees and under differing circumstances, in all environments covered by the test ban treaty.

The potential dangers of clandestine testing by the Soviet Union in the three environments covered by the test ban treaty do not rank among the major military disadvantages to the United States resulting from the treaty, nor even as one of the major risks should the treaty be ratified. There are, however, certain elements of risk flowing from the possibility of clandestine testing which should be noted even though they pose minimum hazards and dangers to the United States in and of themselves, since these elements of risk are in some respects cumulative to the military disadvantages above noted.

First, there is little probability that relatively low-yield, low-altitude, or surface nuclear detonations in the Soviet Union would and could be both detected and identified under all circumstances by the United States. Although there are different opinions in scientific testimony as to the degree to which isolated tests of this type could influence the strategic balance of power, there is no question that such additions to Soviet technology derived from such tests would be cumulative in areas of technology where the Soviets now either have, or possibly have, a lead; thereby increasing the military disadvantages of this treaty.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he is familiar with the statement by Adm. Lewis Strauss? I believe Admiral Strauss served as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission for a number of years.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that Admiral Strauss' testimony is worthy of being considered by the Senate. He stated:

> A radical new weapon discovery or a breakthrough in countermeasure systems, suddenly tested and found workable, could put the possessor nation in command of world events.
>
> We ourselves were twice in that position, first with our invention of the fission bomb and later of the fusion bomb.

Mr. THURMOND. The atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

I continue to read his testimony:

> Of course, we never considered making such use of our advantage, but what if in the future the situation is reversed, as well it may be?

Suppose it were the other way around? Suppose the Communists had the advantage, instead of us?

Mr. THURMOND. We are dealing with an enemy whose goal is the domination of the world. There can be no question that the Communists would use the breakthrough for conquest, either by blackmail or sneak attack.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am reading the testimony given by a man who had the responsibility to think about the problem for a number of years. I read further:

> For instance, it has been said that the Soviets might elect cheating with a single test which might even escape detection; that we could surely detect a series of tests but that one test by itself alone would be of little significance. This unfortunately will not stand up in the light of history.
>
> We cannot forget, we should not forget, that only one single test proved the atomic bomb, and one test proved the principle of the H-bomb. If such radical invention is made on our side of the Iron Curtain, one that is provable only by testing it above ground, the treaty will firmly bind our hands.
>
> Thus paralyzed, we can only file the idea away in a safe and pray fervently that the same invention will not occur to scientists on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Unfortunately, there is a well-recognized and

> frequently experienced phenomenon known as simultaneous invention. It may operate against us.
>
> If the discovery—the breakthrough—is made on the other side of the Iron Curtain, is there anything upon which to base an estimate of the situation? Would the Soviets, in that circumstance, or other circumstances favorable to them, clandestinely breach the treaty?

The Senator knows as well as I that if the Soviets should come forth with a fantastic new weapon they would develop it. If there were some breakthrough—certainly we would make some, and so would they—if we should make the breakthrough which would provide, as an example, a fantastically successful missile defense, we would be barred from testing it. We would not know whether it would work or not. We would not know how to overcome the many imperfections which might be involved, or any problems which might develop in connection with it.

Has the Senator the least doubt that if the Soviets made a similar breakthrough they would develop it? Would they not test the weapon to make sure it worked? The simplest way to do so would be to take it to China where, even if we detected the explosion, they could say, "That is terrible. Those Chinese Communists are awful. We deplore this. We are very sorry about it. We have sent them a note protesting it."

For lack of proof, this Nation's hands would be tied.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is absolutely correct. Admiral Strauss was a distinguished naval officer during World War II. Later he served as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in a highly competent manner. He has rendered this country great service. He is a true patriot and a great American. His testimony should carry great weight with the Senate of the United States.

I am very glad the Senator from Louisiana called attention to the excerpt from his statement. I have a copy of his complete statement in my office. I was very much impressed by it.

If we have any new inventions or weapons that might involve or require testing in the atmosphere, we would be prohibited, under the treaty, from testing in the atmosphere, and we would never know for certain whether or not they would be successful until they were tested in the environment in which they would have to be used. The Senator is absolutely correct on that point.

If the Russians developed a new weapon—which they undoubtedly will—from the recent tests, the Senator can rest assured they would abrogate the treaty and test, or test it clandestinely. Their word is nothing. Their goal is domination of the world. They would not live by the treaty. Or they could go next door to China and the test could be conducted on the Chinese side.

So, from any angle we may approach this issue, from any viewpoint we may look at it, all the advantages in this treaty are on the side of the Russians, and against our best interests. The United States is an honorable nation. It will observe its word and will keep a treaty or contract. The Communists will not. The Communist leaders cannot be trusted, and we must not rely upon them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it has been said that this treaty is but a small step, the inference being that there will be additional steps.

Mr. THURMOND. That is what I believe the President of the United States said, and it gives me great concern. This first step is far too much, and I fear that if it is ratified, the following steps would be similar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If a Senator is firmly convinced that the treaty would prevent us from developing weapons we need for our defense, that it would permit our adversary to remain ahead in areas where it is ahead, that it would permit it to catch up in the areas where we are ahead, and that the treaty would be used by our adversary to obtain at least a year's leadtime, in one respect or another, I ask the Senator if we should not be careful about steps in that direction.

Much as we would like to have some way of living with the Russians, I ask the Senator if this fact does not remain: Our Nation will continue to be imperiled so long as the Communist doctrine of advocating complete domination of the world is the theory and the political motivation of great powers like the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Mr THURMOND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. If Russia asserts that it is signing the treaty now to work for peace, let her first show her good faith. Let her withdraw her technicians and troops from Cuba. Let her stop the war in Laos and Vietnam. Let her tear down the Berlin wall. Let her release from behind the Iron Curtain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, and the other nations that are now subjugated behind the Iron Curtain. Let the Soviets show some deeds of good faith.

The Senator and I, and every other right thinking person in America, want to live in peace. The Senator from Louisiana, who has fought in a war and knows the horrors of war, does not want another war. Others who have fought in wars abhor war. But the treaty is not calculated to bring peace. In my judgment, it is calculated to bring us war, or subjugation.

Therefore, I think it is clearly not in our best interests to ratify the treaty.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the President made his statement about Cuba, which amounted to a virtual ultimatum with regard to missiles there, the Senator from Louisiana predicted, with complete confidence, that there would be no war between the United States and the Soviet Union, at least not at that time because the Senator from Louisiana was convinced that this country was so very strong, and so well abreast of developments in weapons, that the damage which would be inflicted would be completely unacceptable to the Soviet Union, and that she would not accept the damage which would be visited on her in the event of war.

So long as we are dealing with the kind of people that control the Soviet Union and Communist China, the only real safety will lie in our ability to defend ourselves and in the preeminence and superiority of our modern weapons.

The sooner we recognize that there can be no safety or security in a treaty, and that we must rely on our ability to fight and defend ourselves, the better off we shall be. As Patrick Henry said in his memorable speech, "Gentlemen shout for peace, but there is no peace." A cold war is in progress, and it will continue for a long time. We may as well recognize the fact that the only way we can defend ourselves is to have the most preeminent weapons possible. We hope we shall not have to use them. The only way to be sure of that is to have the best weapons.

I agree with the Senator from South Carolina. The treaty means that now or at any time in the future this Nation would be second best in its ability to defend itself, and would greatly increase the prospect of warfare.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. In my judgment, the only thing that has kept the Communists from attacking us, and the reason for our not having been attacked, is our vastly superior striking power. The only language the Communists know is power. Because of the great nuclear power that we have, and which the Communists fear, we have been able to avoid war. We have been strong.

We are a peace-loving Nation. Unlike the Communists, we do not commit aggressions. We have no worldwide goals or aspirations involving aggression. They are grasping and working day and night to dominate the world. We must remain stronger than the Communists. We cannot do so if we tie our hands behind our backs by such means as this treaty. The treaty would prevent us from gaining the knowledge we need in the higher yield weapon field, or weapons effects, and in the development and employment of an anti-ballistic-missile weapons system it would prevent us from testing our weapons systems and warheads to make sure they are workable. Either one of those fields could prove to be the very thing that would save this country from destruction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I call the Senator's attention to the statement of the President in his letter to the distinguished leaders of the two parties in the Senate. He said this in paragraph 5 of the letter:

> While the abnormal and dangerous presence of Soviet military personnel in the neighboring island of Cuba is not a matter which can be dealt with through the instrumentality of this treaty, I am able to assure the Senate that if that unhappy island should be used either directly or indirectly to circumvent or nullify this treaty, the United States will take all necessary action in response.

In the light of conditions in Cuba and the apparent lack of action on the part of the administration, does the Senator from South Carolina believe any credence should be accorded this particular paragraph in the President's letter?

Mr. THURMOND. I cannot see that it should. We were told we were to have onsite inspection in Cuba so that we could say definitely that the missiles and weapons had been removed. That has not occurred.

Mr. SIMPSON. Nor do we know whether or not the Russian military personnel have been removed.

Mr. THURMOND. They are still there, and the technicians are still there in great numbers. How long will we allow them to remain there, 90 miles from our shore? We want to see some deeds of good faith before we enter into a contract that affects our security so vitally.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the Senator yield for one further inquiry?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I attended many of the hearings, both in the Senator's committee and as an observer at the other committee hearings. I gathered the impression from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Dr. Teller and others that they were agreed that the Soviet Union would not keep the treaty, and that the probability, at this time, was that the Russians were ahead of us in the anti-ballistic-missile field. Did the Senator from South Carolina gain the same impression?

Mr. THURMOND. The testimony of the military experts and of the scientists was to the effect that it is general knowledge that the Communists will not keep a treaty any longer than it is to their advantage to do so. That was generally acknowledged, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff so stated, that the Communists are ahead of us in the anti-ballistic-missile field.

Another potential danger from clandestine testing flows from the possibility that the Soviets will conduct underwater tests in inland lakes in the Soviet Union. If such tests were of very low yield, they would fall below the threshold of U.S. detection and identification capabilities. Even if such nuclear explosions underwater were of sufficient yield to be detectable, the signals received would be seismic, and indistinguishable from signals which would be received from underground tests, which are legal under the provisions of the treaty. There are, of course, no onsite inspections provided for in the treaty, so that verification is out of the question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe both the proponents and the opponents of the treaty can agree that the Communists will lie whenever it suits their purpose to do so. We are discussing a treaty which states that we will not test in the sea. Russia is not the only Communist power. China is a Communist power. Albania is a Communist power. Yugoslavia is a Communist power. Rumania and Hungary and East Germany are Communist powers. We do not even recognize East Germany. Suppose the Communists wish to find out what the effect of an atomic explosion would be on one of our Polaris submarines. They could go out and make that test in a submarine in the South Pacific somewhere. They could do that and lie, "We did not explode that." How are we going to prove who did explode it?

Suppose there is an explosion somewhere in the South Pacific or somewhere near the South Pole, and suppose they say, "We know nothing whatever about it."

Suppose we say, "Who was the awful fellow who did it?" Supposing Albania says, "We did it," just to play the game with the Communists. They can say, "We did not sign the treaty. We did it."

Suppose Red China lies and says, "We did it."

It is standard Communist procedure to lie to us when it hurts us and helps them. Red China could say, "We did it." How are we going to say that a Russian submarine did it? We would be bound by the treaty. One government would say, "We do not know anything about it." Another would say, "We did it." How would we know who did it, unless we were told in advance? No one believes that they would tell us in advance about an explosion some 500 miles south of Tasmania. They could do that. How would we know who caused the explosion?

Mr. THURMOND. The Communists are known to be guilty of deceit and deception. They will do what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana said they might do. They would not hesitate to do so if they felt it was to their advantage to do it. The Chinese Reds might make the underwater tests, assisted by Soviet technicians.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we did something like that, a member of the crew would come back and tell about it, and there would be an investigation. Some people probably would want to impeach the President for breaking the solemn obligation of the country under the treaty. The Communists are not bound by any such considerations. It is a part of their doctrine and idealism to act the way they have been acting right along. That is what they believe in. For the life of me I cannot understand how anyone could prove that the explosion was not set off by the Communist Chinese, or perhaps even by Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam. How could we prove who was responsible? All we would know would be that there was a big blast.

Mr. THURMOND. Much could be learned about weapons effects from underwater detonations. Among other things, the vulnerabilities of submarines and estimates of the radius of kill of nuclear devices exploded underwater for antisubmarine warfare purposes could be ascertained.

Currently, our detection capabilities are largely degraded in the distances of outer space. Should our capabilities be improved to the extent which the probable state of the art would now permit, there would probably be little likelihood that the Soviets would attempt to clandestinely test for weapons effects in space. Weapons effects tests require considerable instrumentation and preparation, and therefore, would be subject to detection from normal intelligence, as well as technical detection devices. Proof tests of warheads and total systems, however, require less preparation and considerably less instrumentation, and the possibility of infrequent, but highly significant, clandestine proof tests by the Soviet Union constitutes a distinct risk. The risk, again in this case, is decidedly cumulative; for it could serve to confirm a weapons design which was based on technology derived from the Soviets 1961 and 1962 series of tests.

Of even more serious import than that flowing from the risk of successful Soviet clandestine tests is the potential for a sudden and surprise abrogation of the treaty by the Soviet Union in the form of a comprehensive series of tests.

Despite the promised safeguards, and even under circumstances where the promised safeguards of readiness to test are carried out vigorously by the executive branch, a surprise abrogation by the Soviets would still catch the United States unprepared to test meaningfully and comprehensively in the environments in which testing had been prohibited by the treaty.

For one thing, the Soviets would control the timing and could, therefore, set precise target dates for their series of tests. Such target dates are as important to preparations for testing as a countdown is to a missile launching. The United States, being unaware, as it would, of the time when the abrogation would occur, could not maintain specific target dates repeatedly without seriously degrading both the morale of the personnel involved and the state of preparedness of the United States to test.

On March 2, 1962, approximately 6 months after the Soviets overtly abrogated the test moratorium, and in a period when the United States was still attempting to make its testing meaningful, President Kennedy, fresh in the knowledge and experience of the lack of preparedness in which this country found itself after the Soviets started testing, stated:

> But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution.

Perhaps the President's recollection of the difficulties we experienced have become dim with the passage of time. I believe the President's assessment on March 2, 1962, was correct. I agreed with his assessment then, and I still agree with that assessment.

If, as the Foreign Relations Committee concludes, the Soviet scientists are confident that in many critical areas of nuclear weaponry they have achieved a rough technical parity with the United States, that achievement is a direct result of the premeditated, deceitful, and sudden overt abrogation by the Soviets of the test moratorium in September 1961. If the Soviets achieved a rough technical parity by such a devious means the first time they tried, there is every reason to believe that they will attempt the same thing again. And there is no reason not to believe that if they achieved parity the first time, they could achieve a clear superiority in technology the next go-around.

Thus, if the Soviets have not already achieved sufficient technological advantage with which to overpower the U.S. strategic forces as a result of their 1961 and 1962 series of tests, or if subsequent determinations by Soviet scientists reveal to them that they have achieved less than the necessary technological advancement to make the risk of nuclear blackmail or nuclear war acceptable, they can always, under this treaty, repeat the surprise abrogation technique and place their bets on another cycle of weaponry.

The possibilities of another surprise abrogation by the Soviets is distinctly cumulative to the military disadvantages to the United States inherent in the treaty. It is in the nature of an insurance policy to the Soviets. The potential for further relative gains in nuclear technology which flow from the surprise abrogation potential, when considered together with the military disadvantages and risks to the United States which stem from the freezing of technology in certain vital areas, characterizes this treaty for the United States, from the military standpoint, as a matter of "heads, they win, and tails, we lose."

At this point, Mr. President, I am reminded of a quotation from a reconstruction of what Patrick Henry probably said at one point in his famous "Liberty or Death" speech on March 20, 1775. The quotation is as follows:

> The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself as guilty of treason toward my country, and of an act of disloyalty toward the majesty of Heaven, which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, conceivably it could be true under some circumstances, as stated by the Foreign Relations Committee in its report, that excessive reliance on military considerations could undermine the national security. I am not so persuaded, however, particularly in this instance.

The military disadvantages and military risks, as they are so labeled in the context of this debate, are not disadvantages and risks just to our military forces, nor should they be so confined. What are referred to as military disadvantages and risks, are, in fact, disadvantages and risks to the continuation of the one proven method which we have found to prevent nuclear war. They are jeopardies of serious and formidable import to our ability to save the lives of a large percentage of the American public and possibly a sizable portion of the world's population. In the alternative, they are jeopardies of serious and formidable import to our ability to protect the continued liberty of all Americans from Communist domination.

There are no more serious risks than these.

What are the alternative paths to prevention of nuclear war?

Are the alternative ways to prevent nuclear war proven or speculative?

We are told that the principal thrust of this treaty is "political," and that the "political considerations" outweigh the military disadvantages.

The military disadvantages and risks, which are actually risks to our deterrent of nuclear war or slavery, are finite. They are specific and quantitative. They can be numbered and weighed. They are real, practical, and, when understood, awesome.

The political considerations which have been mentioned, have been, at most, vague generalizations, such as references to "peace" and "relaxed tensions." There is no specificity to the so-called political considerations. At best, the political considerations which we have heard fail to provide any credible means for replacing our finite deterrence as a means to prevent nuclear war.

It is my sincere hope that the proponents of ratification can, in the course of the debate, define and explain the political considerations and aspects of this treaty, and precisely how these political aspects will prevent nuclear war in the absence of an overwhelming superiority of strategic power in the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is near the conclusion of his remarks. In my judgment, he has presented us with an absolutely masterly analysis of this problem. It is my judgment that the Senator from South Carolina is 100 percent correct in his position.

On the day I attended the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations when the treaty was ordered reported, I did not know how I would vote. But the military aspects of the treaty were not adequately explored, in my judgment, by the Committee on Foreign Relations. If I had to be the Senate's lawyer, and advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty, I would never have voted to report it without having called before the committee Dr. Teller, one of the ablest scientists in the world, to tell the Committee on Foreign Relations in secret session what he wanted to say. Of course, that information was made available to the Senator from South Carolina and his committee, because they undertook to explore these matters.

The Senator well knows that the two great military advisers who have the responsibility to defend this country and to fight and die for the country at the drop of a hat did not increase their prospects for promotion when they went before the Senator's committee and gave their honest judgment about the treaty.

It is my belief that if the decision had not already been made, and if one had asked General LeMay what he thought about the treaty, and had let him study it and reach his conclusion prior to the time the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, had signed it, General LeMay would have said, "Do not take this action."

I remember when the Humphrey Disarmament Subcommittee was in full operation. I was a member of that subcommittee. President Eisenhower was in the White House. Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff came to us, one by one, and each one said "Before you start to disarm this country, you had better let us arm it. We are not well enough armed as things now stand."

That condition has been corrected to some extent. Today the Nation is much stronger than it was at that time. But as the Senator from South Carolina has so well pointed, out, the weapons of the future are being constantly developed, and our only security lies in being preeminently the strongest—in being first with the best.

I might cite a statement by a man who was once described by General Lee as being the greatest cavalry officer, to his knowledge, at the time—old Nathan Bedford Forrest. General Lee had never met him, but he felt that General Forrest was perhaps the greatest cavalry officer on either side. He was famous for his simple principle of warfare which, if either side had adopted it, might have caused the war to proceed differently. General Forrest used to say, "Get there fustest with the mostest"—meaning men. Today, the idea is to get there first with the latest developments in weapons; with something superior to what the other country has.

Hundreds of millions of people live under the Communist yoke. They can be twisted by a single command. So we must have the best weapons.

The Senator from South Carolina; the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who has been a member of that committee for more than 20 years, and is one of the ablest students in the entire world in this field; and men who have the responsibility of defending the country, and who spend most of their time thinking about this subject, have concluded that this treaty could cause us to be placed in a position where we could no longer defend ourselves adequately. For this reason, it seems to me it is our duty to vote to reject the treaty.

I realize that it would be highly embarrassing to the President of the United States in his position of leadership in the world if the treaty were to be rejected. I realize that it would embarrass the President domestically if the treaty were to be rejected. When I voted for the establishment of the Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament, I stated that I was not voting to disarm the United States; and that everything that Agency did would have to be approved by the Senate.

So I cannot in good conscience vote to ratify the treaty merely because the reputation of the President is at stake or the President's prestige is at stake, for I have told the people of my State that I will not vote to disarm my country unilaterally.

I am not going to vote for approval of a treaty which might prejudice the security of this Nation. I believe the Senator from South Carolina has spelled out a case that cannot be answered. I have carefully read the statements of the very able and patriotic Secretary of Defense; and his statement simply does not meet these arguments. He says, basically, that we are very strong. Everyone agrees that we are. But then he proceeds to say that this treaty will tend to perpetuate our advantage. The Senator from South Carolina knows that statement is just eyewash; it is ridiculous. In the area in which the Russians are ahead, we will not—under the treaty—make tests. In the area in which the Russians are ahead with their very large bombs, we have not exploded a missile of more than 15 megatons. The Russians have exploded 57-megaton missiles—three times as large as ours. They have all the information they need in order to explode that large a missile. They have the benefit of a very complicated series of tests. We cannot make such tests underground. The area in which the Russians are ahead is the area in which they should not remain ahead. But under this treaty, in that one area—now one of Soviet superiority—they will remain ahead, for under the treaty we will bind our hands to so great an extent that we shall find it impossible to catch up in that field.

In the area where we are ahead—in the use of the smaller warheads, we—and the Soviets—can acquire much valuable information by testing underground. In addition, as the Senator well knows, our Nation would not give its word to abide by a treaty of this kind if it did not expect to keep it. Even if we tried to cheat, as an open nation we would soon be caught. A police state, such as the Soviet Union, would have a better chance of getting away with cheating.

However, the Russians do not need to cheat, for they can use China for their cheating. They can explode weapons over the high seas, and then can blame Albania, Yugoslavia, East Germany, or some other country, or can just say that they do not know how it happened, and that they have no idea how those explosions in the South Pacific occurred. So it is very easy for them to be successful in their attempts to lie to us and cheat and defraud us. There are a multitude of ways in which they can get ahead of us in the development of nuclear weapons—and a multitude of ways in which this treaty would prevent us from developing the weapons we need in order to defend ourselves against attack.

Finally we come to the question, Are we willing to trust the murdering Communists? The answer is "No." We must never trust them.

For 20 years, or perhaps a little longer, our defense policy has been based on the theory that the way to achieve peace is through preparedness; and before the world we have offered to share our atomic secrets, provided there would be fool-proof inspection, so as to be sure we would not be victimized.

After pursuing that policy and seeking that objective—which is disarmament, with foolproof inspections—now we are asked to approve a treaty which to a certain degree does amount to disarmament; but insofar as it amounts to disarmament, it would be unilateral disarmament, without the benefit of inspection.

Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that if this is to be the first step, I shall hate to see the next one, because by steps of this type we would render our Nation incapable of relying upon its defenses.

So long as we remain strong, I believe we shall remain free—but only so long as we have sufficient strength to conduct a successful defense. That is what the very able Senator from South Carolina has well pointed out. I agree with him. Certainly he has rendered a great service in bringing to us the benefit of his wide experience. I sincerely hope that all Senators will read carefully every word of his most valuable speech.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the able Senator from Louisiana for his kind remarks; and I wish to commend him for his fine comprehension of this problem. He has asked very penetrating questions. I hope all Senators will read them, and thus will benefit from them.

Again I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the great service he has rendered.

Mr. President, hypotheses and abstract theories do not prevent wars. If these are what we propose to substitute for a proven deterrent to nuclear war, only heaven can save us. In that case, we can only hope that, in this instance, God will help those who refuse to help themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] wishes to ask a few questions.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SIMPSON in the chair). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have the floor. I thought the Senator from Indiana wished to ask some questions.

Mr. HARTKE. I do. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I am sure Senators have received from their constituents large numbers of letters on the test ban treaty. Since the treaty was initialed on Tuesday afternoon, I have received from the citizens of Indiana approximately 4,500 expressions of opinion. These expressions run about 2 to 1 in favor of ratification. In the letters from those of my constituents who oppose ratification, several specific objections are repeated over and over. I have prepared a list of the most frequently mentioned objections. I believe it would be interesting and profitable if the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has heard and considered all the pros and the cons at great length, would agree to provide some answers to those objections, even though probably in one form or another he has heretofore expressed his opinion upon them.

The most frequent objection mentioned is that there is no assurance that the Russians will respect the treaty, since they have already broken 50 out of the 52 treaties with the West. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would comment upon that objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be very glad to. I say to the Senator from Indiana that it is clear that the Soviet Union in its short history has violated a large number of international treaties, including such important political agreements as the nonaggression pacts with Lithuania, entered into September 28, 1926, Latvia, February 5, 1932, and Estonia, May 4, 1932, the arrangements for access to Berlin, and the Potsdam Declaration relating to the establishment of a central German Government. However, it should also be noted that the Soviet Union has to all appearances satisfactorily observed a significant number of multilateral and bilateral agreements to which it has been a party. A list of 27 of those agreements appears on page 967 of the printed hearings of the committee.

In that connection I also draw the Senator's attention to pages 132 to 135 of the hearings. At that point he will find a list of agreements, some of which are treaties and some not so formal, which the Russians have violated. That material was inserted in the record during the hearings.

With respect to these documents I should like to make the following comment: While some of the agreements listed on page 967 are of real substance and importance, a number of them are more or less minor in nature. So one must discriminate to some extent in judging the nature of those agreements.

Further, with regard to this list of broken agreements, the Senator will note the significance of the fact that since Stalin's death in 1953 there have been relatively few breaches of agreements. The most important one, from our point of view, relates to the Berlin wall and access to Berlin.

To illustrate how nebulous and inconsequential some of these agreements are, though cited as being significant treaty violations, two of the last four are agreements that the U.S.S.R. had with Yugoslavia with regard to credits and grants. It would be somewhat similar to our agreements in connection with foreign aid. We always consider such agreements rather tentative in nature. We decide that we will do so much for a certain country, usually with reciprocal obligations. Two of those cases are ones in which the U.S.S.R. withdrew or, rather, postponed for 5 years a grant to Yugoslavia of $285 million. That was a bilateral agreement. I do not believe it was in the nature of a treaty or a solemn undertaking. It was an agreement between those two countries. I only mention that point so that we do not swallow the declaration that 50 out of 52 agreements have been broken, but we should consider the nature of the agreement.

Insofar as concerns solemn treaty undertakings of a dignity and a substantive importance comparable to the one now before the Senate, outside the Berlin problem and since the death of Stalin, the number of treaties violated has been relatively few. Many more of equal dignity have been adhered to without violation. For example, I cite the Antarctic Treaty and the Austrian Treaty. So far as I know, no violation of these treaties has taken place.

These things are not quite as black and white as they appear.

Further with regard to the present treaty, the very least one can say with regard to what distinguishes the treaties that have been observed from those violated—which applies in all cases, I think—in that the treaties that have been observed are those which were in the interest of the Soviet Union. It was for that reason that the committee was concerned in its hearings, and set forth in its report, the considerations which, it appears, have led the Soviet Union to enter into this agreement. Insofar as those considerations can be relied on to be continuing factors in Soviet policy, they provide some guarantee against future violations of this treaty.

First, it is apparent that the 1961–62 tests have led Soviet scientists to believe that in many critical areas of nuclear weaponry they have achieved a rough technical parity with the United States.

Of course, it is speculative as to how they feel, but it is very probable that they feel a certain assurance as to their capacity, which from their point of view is their deterrent.

Second, the Cuban missile crisis is likely to remain in the minds of the present Soviet leadership as a sobering glimpse at the implications of nuclear war.

That point was developed at considerable length, and I believe quite persuasively, by the Secretary of State in his testimony at the hearing.

Third, is the Sino-Soviet schism. The depth of that schism as it is progressively revealed, indicates, I believe, the extent of the commitment which the Russians have been willing to make for the sake of agreement in this case. It seems hardly likely that such consequences as the Soviet Union has already incurred from the mere signing of this document would be incurred for the sake of a document which they do not intend to abide by.

An example of that break was set forth in this morning's newspaper. The bitterness of the exchange between the two countries indicates that there has been a great change in that relationship, and it also has had a sobering effect upon the Russians.

Fourth, the possibility of diverting resources away from nuclear weapons development and into the consumer goods area in which they are sorely needed has probably motivated the Soviet leaders. Once the diversion is made it seems possible that this will have a cumulative effect in creating a Soviet Union with interests in other areas than weaponry.

For several years we have heard about the difficulties of Russia in respect to agriculture. It is quite reasonable to believe that these difficulties may have contributed to the Soviets desire to decelerate the rate in the field of nuclear weapons in order to enable them to devote more of their resources to things such as agriculture and the production of other consumer goods.

Finally, there is the interest which the Soviet Union must share with this country in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This interest can only increase with time.

All these things are questions which the committee believes—and I believe—the treaty effects in a way which is in the self-interest of the Soviets. We rely upon such self-interest for the observance by the Soviets of the treaty. It is in their interest. It seems to me that it is quite possible that great countries, with the kind of power that we both possess, could have a common interest in certain fields. These fields may be different. We do not have the same incentives, for example, insofar as consumer goods are concerned, although I think we have a great need in the field of education, urban renewal, and other things to divert some of the exorbitant cost of armaments to meeting those needs. They are not the same interests as those of the Russians, but they are in that general area.

Insofar as these considerations lead the Soviet Union to enter upon the treaty, they will to a greater or lesser extent, I believe, bind them to the treaty in the future.

In addition to self-interest, some general statements can be made as to the likelihood of Soviet treaty violation on the basis of an analysis of the treaties adhered to and violated in that Government in the past.

For one thing, the greater the number of parties adhering to the treaty, the greater seems the assurance that the Soviet Union will not blatantly abrogate the understanding reached. To date in excess of 80 parties have adhered to the treaty

While it would not be prudent to predict any change of Soviet policy in this regard based on the personalities of the Soviet leadership, it is noteworthy that recent treaty violations have sought the color of legal justification in place of the cynical statements of Marxist dogma which accompanied the about-faces of the Stalin period. Perhaps the need for legal arguments to support their position will eventually lead the Soviets to conform their conduct to international law.

However, the most persuasive argument for not permitting past violations to dictate our present relations with the Soviet Union on this matter is that a violation in this case will not pass unnoticed or put the United States at a disadvantage. The treaty is self-policing. The United States can safely rely on its own ability to detect Soviet violations and to maintain a military and scientific posture that will assure that no gains will accrue to the Soviet Union from violation of the treaty.

That latter statement is based to a considerable degree upon testimony taken in executive session, which is available to the Senator if he wishes to look at it, with regard to our country's capacity for detection.

Mr. HARTKE. I think I shall do that. I should do it, in all sincerity, for the benefit of my own constituency and for my own satisfaction.

Secondly, many have alleged that the treaty is advantageous only to Russia. The Senator has indicated that there were certain benefits from the treaty to Russia; otherwise, the Russians would not have signed it. It has been said that the Russian goal is to dominate the world, and that the Russians would not agree to a pact which would not aid them in obtaining this objective. I am sure my constituents would be interested in the chairman's view of this question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If that statement has any validity, it could be said about any agreement. To put it another way, no agreement could ever be signed, because obviously the parties who signed it each believe, at the least, that it is to their advantage.

We think the treaty is to our advantage, also. In this particular case, the limited test ban treaty is an American proposal, going back to 1959, as has already been stated, and as the Senator knows.

Its purpose is to decelerate the arms race which, if allowed to proceed unchecked and unlimited, would represent a hazard for both the United States and for the Soviet Union. So this hazard faces both of us equally.

I have already given certain reasons why we believe the Soviets can be relied upon to some extent—perhaps to a great extent—to abide by the treaty, because it is in their self-interest. It is also in our self-interest. I think our interests are mutual in many respects with regard to this particular treaty. Many of the reasons why the Soviets will abide by the treaty, which I have mentioned, are also applicable to and relevant to this question. It is in their interest. It is also in our interest.

I emphasize that this is an American proposal by the previous administration, supported by this administration.

It is inconceivable to me that both administrations, together with the vast majority of the present military leaders of this country and a clear majority of the scientific brains not only of the present administration but also of the past one, could all be mistaken in their assessment as to where the advantage lies.

Mr. HARTKE. Many people also believe that the Russians will test secretly. We have heard this in the debate repeatedly on the Senate floor. Many people believe that, because there will be no onsite inspections, we shall be unable to detect such tests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The onsite inspections, as the Senator knows, which occupied so much of the discussions in Geneva, related to underground testing, which is not to be covered by this treaty. In the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, it is the belief of our best experts—the ones to whom I have already referred—that our capacity for detection is adequate. Not only was this the testimony in executive session, but it was also stated in open session, without going into details.

The Director of the CIA; the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Dr. Brown, the chief scientific adviser; and the Secretary of Defense all stated in general terms that they believe our detection capacity is adequate to detect any significant violations of this treaty in the environments covered by it.

I think everyone would recognize that there could be tests small enough in size that they might go undetected, but they would be quite small and would not be significant with regard to the balance of power between the countries.

Mr. HARTKE. It is also said that even if the Russians do not test in their own country there is nothing to prevent them from providing a nonsignatory nation, such as Red China, with nuclear weapons which would then be tested under Russian supervision.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would be a clear violation of the treaty. If it were done, the treaty would be abrogated and would end. The language of the treaty prohibits such acts.

The signatories undertake to discourage or to prevent testing by other nations, by allies or by any other nations.

That would be a clear violation of the treaty. Our experts have no doubt that we would know that they were doing it, and therefore it would amount to an abrogation of the treaty. We could of course withdraw from the treaty. Section 4 has a very lenient withdrawal clause.

(At this point Mr. CLARK took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HARTKE. Another often-repeated objection is that entering into a test ban agreement now would prevent the United States from conducting the atmospheric tests necessary to develop very large yield weapons as a counter to the Soviet superweapons, which are now supposedly 100 times more powerful than the U.S. Polaris and Minuteman missiles, on which our future defense depends. It has also been contended that it would freeze our development of an antimissile defense system; and that, therefore, we must continue testing to maintain and to increase our nuclear deterrent power, for if we do not test we shall lose.

This is also apparently the view which has been expressed on the floor of the Senate by the Preparedness Subcommittee.

I wonder if the chairman of the committee would care to comment upon this point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was testimony to that effect, but the great weight of the testimony was contrary to that view. I should say that the testimony indicated the premises of the question are false.

The committee was informed by expert witnesses that the United States, without further testing, could develop a 50- to 60-megaton weapon for B-52 delivery. But these same witnesses assigned very little importance to such a weapon. For example, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Taylor, replying to a question on this point, said:

> I attach very little importance to this, frankly, Senator. The whole very high yield weapons field is one which has very little, if any, military significance.

I interpolate that as long ago as 1954 this question was discussed by the leading military and civilian experts, and they decided against the development of high-yield weapons. The concept of a 50- or 60-megaton weapon, as opposed to a 5- or 10-megaton weapon, rather loses its meaning, because the 5- or 10-megaton weapon suitably deployed is so powerful as to be capable of destroying any city in the world. That is why the experts did not feel there was any point in going into the extremely high-yield weapons.

General Taylor's comment was supported by the combined statement of the Joint Chiefs. As the Secretary of Defense and these other witnesses pointed out, the United States could have developed such weapons but has concentrated instead on the more useful, flexible, and deliverable low- and intermediate-yield weapons.

With regard to ABM development, the committee took exhaustive testimony, some of which is quoted on pages 12–15 of the report, on this question. The burden of expert opinion is that development of an ABM system sufficiently effective to justify deployment would be exceedingly difficult, if only because offensive capability in the nuclear field is likely to remain far ahead of defensive capability.

Dr. York, one of the leading scientists in the past administration, who headed the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., said:

> The race between offense and defense is a race between a tortoise and a hare and if only the hare does not go to sleep, the tortoise has no chance.

To interpret that, he was saying that the offense can always be kept ahead of the antiballistic missile, or defense, if we are at all alert. Of course we must be alert, whether there is a treaty or not.

But whether development of an effective ABM system is a feasible prospect or not will not depend on testing its warhead, according to Secretary McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Dr. Brown, and most of the other expert witnesses.

As the committee report observed:

> The United States has a number of nuclear warheads of suitable design and performance for anti-ballistic-missile systems under development. Still others of larger yield can be developed underground. However, the development of a high performance ABM system is a composite of staggering technical problems, largely unrelated to the warhead, a relatively simple and manageable part of the whole system.

Secretary McNamara said:

> An ABM system consists of several types of radars, the interceptor missile and the very complex computing equipment at a ground station to control the radars and to direct the interceptor missile. The various radars serve to detect incoming objects in nearby space, to track the incoming warhead, and to track and control the interceptor missile, which is targeted on the incoming warhead by the computing equipment.

That testimony demonstrates that the real problem, the difficult problem, in the ABM system is not the warheads—we have many—but the system that directs and computes, which the treaty does not affect. We can pursue the experimental projects in this field and in experimenting and developing computers and all that goes with them, without the inhibitions of the treaty.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we all know that the Soviets broke the 1958 moratorium and in so doing gained superiority over us in nuclear weaponry. If they should break this treaty, it would take us several months to resume testing, and therefore they would gain an additional advantage.

What has the chairman of the committee to say in reply to that question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is true that the Russians obviously learned a great deal from those tests. I have already said that this is one of the considerations we think encouraged or led the Soviets to sign this treaty. We have already discussed many of the other reasons. All of the witnesses but one appearing before the committee believe the United States now has superiority in nuclear weapons, and that the risks implicit in the treaty are outweighed by the advantages. Dr. Teller would not agree with that testimony; but Dr. Teller is Dr. Teller. His testimony is there for the Senator to see. But all the other witnesses, of equal reputation and capacity, testified directly to the contrary.

The committee was assured that the executive branch intends to maintain our superiority by intensive underground testing programs; by maintaining the vitality of our weapons laboratories; by remaining in a high state of readiness to test in the atmosphere in the event of violations; and by improving the various systems by which the United States can detect and identify the nuclear activities of other powers.

The President's letter, which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] read today, reaffirms, at least from the highest authority, the statements made before the committee.

A great deal has been said with regard to the moratorium on testing. It is well to remember the record on this point, because it has been somewhat misunderstood.

In March 1958, the Soviet Union announced a moratorium on nuclear testing, provided the Western Powers did not test.

In August of 1958, foreseeing the end of our own test series, President Eisenhower announced our willingness to suspend tests for 1 year.

These were unilateral statements. They were not treaties. They were not formal agreements. One side made a statement. President Eisenhower announced our willingness to suspend tests for 1 year, beginning on October 31, if the Soviets agreed to do likewise. We conducted tests through the end of October. The Soviets tested on November 1 and 2, and then stopped. That was all they tested. President Eisenhower said those tests freed us from our pledge, but that we would continue the suspension "for the time being."

In 1959, the Soviet Government said again it would not test unless the Western Powers did so first.

In December 1959, President Eisenhower said the United States considered itself "free to resume nuclear weapons testing," subject to advance notification of such intention.

France, which is a Western power, began testing in 1960. She had not been under any commitment. There were statements by our Government, our President; but France had not made any such agreement, so she considered herself free.

The Soviet Government declared that the continuance of tests by France might compel the Soviet Union to resume tests. There were no further tests by France before the Soviet Union began testing again on September 1, 1961.

This is quite different from a formal treaty not to test. These were exchanges of intentions.

Thus, no formal agreement existed. It was merely a de facto suspension, which was broken by the Soviet Union, after long preparations. However, the United States had not stopped working on nuclear weapons. There was testimony that our laboratories were maintained in a high state of efficiency. The staffs of the laboratories were increased during this period. We obviously must have been making some preparations for resumption of tests underground, because it was only 2 weeks after the Russians started testing and broke the moratorium that we conducted our first test.

It is too bad that the Russians broke the moratorium, as they did, but it was somewhat different from a violation of a treaty.

Mr. HARTKE. Another allegation is that this treaty is the first step in international control by the United Nations. Does the chairman of the committee agree?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do not. We all look forward to a lessening of the arms race and to diminishing armaments. We use the phrases of "disarmament" and "complete disarmament" loosely. I do not think the committee foresees any such development. Certainly I do not.

So far as United Nations control is concerned, the treaty does not in any way relate to control by the United Nations.

There is nothing in the treaty or anything associated with it, in my view, that could justify any such statements. It is in no way a disarmament treaty. Today there was a discussion of President Eisenhower's suggestions and understanding. It is in no way a disarmament treaty, and it does not in any way inhibit the use of armaments in any way.

It is difficult to answer the question other than to say it is absolutely irrelevant to the treaty.

Mr. HARTKE. Finally, some people fear that if the treaty were ratified, we would not be able to use nuclear weapons in case of war—either in our own defense or in defense of the nations we are committed to defend. I would be interested in the comments of the chairman of the committee on this question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I refer the Senator to pages 5 and 6 of the committee report. I do not believe I should take the time of the Senator or of the Senate to read it all. A nuclear explosion or any other explosion in the event of hostilities is not affected by the treaty. President Kennedy, in his letter, made this very clear.

The important testimony on this question, given by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, among others, was that the treaty would not affect the use of weapons in wartime. It is only a test ban. It is not a ban-the-bomb treaty. In the case of hostilities, either directly affecting us or one of our allies, we feel it is in our interest to defend, there is no inhibition upon the use of weapons.

In fortifying that statement, the Senator will see on page 5 of the committee report, a statement by the Russian Government in response to a somewhat similar criticism by the Chinese. I shall read only the last part of it:

> Second, the treaty also does not prohibit the Soviet Union, if need be, from holding underground nuclear tests, from increasing the stockpiles of its nuclear arms, and even from using these weapons against the imperialist aggressors if they unleash a war in a fit of insanity.

In other words, aside from what our people who negotiated the treaty have told us, and the President's interpretation, the Russian Government itself has said the treaty does not inhibit them from using the weapons in case of war started by the so-called imperialist aggressors.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have just posed a series of questions to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—questions which have been posed to me by the people who have sent me to the Senate. The chairman has replied with forthrightness, with great sincerity and clarity.

We have, moreover, the assurances of the President of the United States on matters of serious concern and reservations of many of us. Chiefly these concerns are whether or not secret or hidden concessions have been made to the Soviet Union; whether or not we shall lay so much reliance upon the words of the document that we ignore the possibility that the treaty may be broken. The President has assured us that no additional concessions or agreements have been made or implied. He has further assured us that we will continue tests that are legal under the treaty; namely, those underground—and that we shall continue in readiness to resume tests in the air and the sea so that, if the treaty should be broken, we shall not endanger our security.

Mr. President, I believe this treaty serves a purpose. It is a hopeful sign—a slim crack of sunshine in the cloudy skies of world tension and cold war. But we also feel that it is to our advantage and the advantage of mankind.

I view the treaty as a way to cease the pollution of the air, our food, and our drink from the poisons of radioactive elements. I believe that the cessation of tests may save infants from death and crippling. Thus, if it is kept for just a day or a week or a month, it will have served a useful purpose.

We must look at the test from this angle. Potentially, it can be a device that may lead to additional concrete benefits for all mankind. Perhaps through this instrument the highest goals and ambitions of all of us for permanent peace on earth may be attained. The treaty itself does not guarantee this. It does not even give us the hope for this lofty ambition.

The treaty will not end the arms race. It may—I repeat—may lead to some moves to limit the arms race. And this, in turn, may help to thaw the cold war or lead to peaceful ends.

But this, too, is more than we can expect. We can just hope.

But while we hope, we must view with realism. The past performance of our adversaries in the cold war is such that they have broken treaties virtually as fast as they have made them. We must, then, expect this treaty to be broken even though we have hopes that it will be kept and that it will lead to further gains for all of mankind in this eternal quest for peace.

The world is watching. Every mother in our land and throughout the world who has concern for the health of her babies and their babies looks to us in the Senate to help insure that they will not be killed or maimed by the poisons of radioactivity. But just as surely, death is preferable to capitulation to slavery.

But we hold in our hands the vote that can give mankind new hope.

The treaty will not end war or cold war or an arms race. It may not even long end the threat of the poisoning from radioactivity.

Should Russia break this agreement as she has others, the force of world opinion will be mighty. It will come crashing on the heads of the Russians.

But this is not enough. We shall remain ready to resume our tests for we are determined to maintain the security of this Nation and of the free world—forever.

Let Russia take warning here and now. Behind a breaking of this treaty she will find a strong iron fist of the strongest Nation in the world, the mightiest nuclear power—these United States.

The world wants this treaty because it it in the world's best interests. Should Russia break its solemn word again, the world will react.

And the instrument of this reaction will be our own country.

Firm in this knowledge and warm in the comfort of my own convictions that the world deserves hope, I shall support this treaty.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me at this time.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—UNDERSTANDINGS

Mr. DODD submitted understandings intended to be proposed by him to the resolution of ratification of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CIVIL RIGHTS

As in legislative session,

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article from Newsweek, issue of September 16, 1963, written by Walter Lippmann, on "The Negroes' Grievances," and also today's editorial in the New York Times on desegregation of Alabama's public schools. The crying need for a standard of law and fidelity to it remains a constant reminder that the price of a slow pace on civil rights legislation in the Congress is to add measurably to the jeopardy to public order and tranquillity in the meantime.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, Sept. 16, 1963]

THE NEGROES' GRIEVANCES

(By Walter Lippmann)

Since the afternoon of the march in Washington, the first question in everyone's mind has been whether the demonstration—so big, so disciplined and so moving—would make any difference in Congress. A cool answer would have to begin, I think, by noting that it will be easier for Congress to promote freedom than to provide jobs.

To many of the marchers it is, I realize, a dusty answer to say that their economic grievances are not primarily or peculiarly due to racial discrimination. Admittedly, in the hiring and firing of labor, the chances of the Negroes are poorer than of the whites. Nevertheless, there can be no solution of the Negro labor problem even if hiring and firing could be equalized. For we have a chronic lack of demand for about 5½ percent of the people wanting jobs. With jobs scarce, the problem cannot be solved by establishing quotas for Negroes at the expense of the whites. All that could do would be to embitter race relations.

A real solution can be had only in an upsurge of the American economy which will increase the demand for labor, white and black, by some 2 to 3 million jobs. This will take care of almost all but the unemployable, for whom special treatment, such as retraining, will be needed.

The economic grievances of the Negroes cannot be redressed on a racial basis. They are an inseparable part of the national problem of how to stimulate the American economy—how to provide that much higher standard of life which is within the capacity of our technology, our resources, our capital reserves, and our labor force. Here there is no near prospect of a big advance. In the Congress the conservative coalition opposes the measures which in the experience of the more advanced countries of the world are conducive to rapid and sustained economic growth. To this opposing coalition a preponderant mass of the voters are giving at least tacit assent—some because they agree with the conservative coalition and some because they do not understand the alternatives.

HEARTS AND MINDS

Where the most can be done most quickly is in the civil rights measures directed at the disfranchisement of Negroes, their segregation in public education, and discrimination against them in public accommodations. It is quite true that laws passed by Congress cannot change the hearts and minds of whites or blacks, and that the problems of the two races living in the same community will not soon disappear. But it is false to argue that nothing can be done because everything cannot be done. It will do a great deal if the denial of civil rights is outlawed emphatically with the stamp of the authority of the Nation.

The quickest practical results are likely to come from that section of the civil rights bill which would outlaw racial discrimination in public accommodations. For this kind of discrimination is a public humiliation based solely on color. It is a public declaration that the descendants of the slaves are not full American citizens. The victims of this discrimination are for the most part the very Negroes who are the natural leaders of the Negro people. They are the ones who can afford to travel, and it is they who have begun to be part of the American public way of life. They suffer acutely from the stigma put upon them when they want a room in a motel or a sandwich at a lunch counter or a glass of water. This stigma injects poison continuously into the relations of whites and blacks.

DESPOTIC THEORY

Of all the grievances, this one is the most blatant. It is also the most easily redressed. It is said, however, by Senator GOLDWATER, for example, that to make it unlawful for the owner of a lunch counter to discriminate is to deprive him of his right of private property. This is a conception of private property which Blackstone described as the "sole and despotic dominion * * * over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe."

No civilized society has long tolerated the despotic theory of private property. This conception of property is alien to the central truths of Christendom, which have always held that property is not absolute but is a system of rights and duties that are determined by society. A man's property, says Blackstone, "consists in the free use, enjoyment and disposal of all his acquisitions, without any control or diminution, save only by the laws of the land."

Private property is, in fact, the creation of the laws of the land—the laws of ownership, sale, and inheritance, the zoning laws, the sanitary laws, the laws of eminent domain. It is a primitive, naive, and false view of private property to urge that it is not subject to the laws which express the national purpose and the national conscience—among which have been for a hundred years the abolition of slavery and the admission of the Negroes to the rights of American citizenship.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 11, 1963]

WALLACE'S DEFEAT IN "VICTORY"

Governor Wallace finally achieved what he had been seeking for a week—Federal intervention. President Kennedy, after exercising monumental forebearance in the hope that the clear will of Alabama's own citizens would make their Governor cease his reckless defiance of law, had no choice but to use his powers to enforce Federal court orders for school integration in Birmingham, Mobile, and Tuskegee.

Governor Wallace thus has his "victory." But at what a price. By his actions, his vain posturings, his cries that he was standing up for the people of Alabama against a dictatorial Federal Government, by his mobilizing of State troopers to spurn court orders and chase Federal marshals off the capitol grounds in Montgomery, he has undermined respect for lawful process and stirred up a devil's brew of racial hatred that can erupt any minute into further violence, perhaps more bombings, more riots.

The unruly students at Birmingham who yelled "Nigger, go home" at fellow students had been given an example in folly by their Governor. The racial activists who attempted to break police lines and paraded in horn-blowing motorcades through Birmingham streets could point to that same example.

Had Governor Wallace accepted the inevitable last week—as the officials and the school board of Birmingham, Mobile, Tuskegee, and Huntsville had done—it is probable that there would have been no trouble at all. Certainly none with which the police forces of those cities could not have coped. Huntsville supports that conclusion. So do all the other southern areas where public school integration proceeded quietly last week.

By his conduct Governor Wallace has degraded himself, his State and its people. And in some measure all of us. He has won a "victory," but the price of victory, as he must have known it would be, is eventual total defeat. Not only for Governor Wallace personally, but for all those like him who preach racial supremacy and then by their own absurd actions show the absurdity of their thesis. The condemnation the Governor has already received from the responsible white citizens of Alabama is proof of how completely he has cut himself adrift from the new political reality in the South. The country will hope that, in the desperation of their final repudiation, he and his extremist followers will not provide the spark for new violence.

POTENTIAL LAPSE OF AUTHORITY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION CONSTITUTES DEATH BY ATTRITION

As in legislative session,

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Chief Justice Marshall once described the Constitution as a document "intended to endure for ages to come and, consequently, to be adopted to the various crises of human affairs."

Today our system of democracy is in the throes of a most serious crisis. The Congress, the Nation, and the entire world scrutinize the problem of providing to every American citizen the rights accorded him under the Constitution. Of utmost concern in this connection is the proposed civil rights legislation, S. 1731, which is designed to make equality a reality to the American Negro.

While concern over the eventual passage of this critically needed legislation is exceedingly important, we may be overlooking the crucial fact that the existing Civil Rights Commission will be defunct by November 30.

The Civil Rights Commission has played a vital role in the struggle for equal justice for every citizen. Before we can act intelligently to correct the many injustices which still persist in America, we must be informed, accurately and impartially. The great body of evidence gathered by the Civil Rights Commission has been an invaluable aid in preparing effective civil rights legislation. The activities of the Commission have thrown a powerful spotlight on racial injustice and have shown where it exists and how it operates. Even more important, this Commission, established by Congress as an arm of the Government, has demonstrated our determination as a people to live up to the high ideals of the Constitution.

Given the acknowledged value of the Civil Rights Commission, there would seem little doubt that the Commission's life will be extended with the passage of the President's civil rights bill. However, it is quite possible that the civil rights legislation will not be brought to a successful fruition before November 30, the expiration date of the Civil Rights Commission.

Under the law establishing the Civil Rights Commission, its phasing out must begin on September 30 and terminate on November 30 of this year. My information indicates that, because of the potential hiatus in authority, the Commission is confronted by a number of serious administrative and personnel problems. One cannot expect the highly qualified staff of the Commission, which has developed the expertise and experience for which the Commission has become so rightly esteemed, to stay with the Commission rather than look for other employment.

Moreover, and more importantly, if the Commission which expires by November 30 is subsequently revived with the passage of the civil rights bill, the attendant hiatus will create not only hardship among the staff, but also constitute an unnecessary waste of taxpayer money. Clearly, it would be absurd to require the Commission to close its doors, release its personnel, vacate its buildings and then, within a short time expect it to go through the burdensome, costly task of hiring new personnel and undertaking the other administrative tasks involved with reactivating the Commission.

Mr. President, the Civil Rights Commission is in danger of falling into total disrepair and demoralization, at the precise time when it is needed the most and when its ardent supporters seek to extend its life. To prevent this, my colleagues and I are considering a proposal which would alleviate this problem by extending the life of the present Commission for 90 days.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, that a 90-day extension does not go to the merits of the pending bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but rather is designed to avoid unnecessary, burdensome administrative costs and hardships on personnel, which might result if the Commission becomes defunct on November 30, 1963.

I hope that Members of the Senate, who have supported civil rights generally and, in particular, have supported the proposed extension of the Civil Rights Commission, will support this modest effort to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. This proposal would avoid an unnecessary hiatus in the Commission's authority and would diminish the hardships on the Commission, its staff, the taxpayers, and most importantly, on the American Negro, who, for too long, has been denied the blessing of unqualified American citizenship.

McNAMARA'S "WHIZ KIDS"

As in legislative session,

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe that the activities of the Secretary of Defense, for whose ability and capacity in this position I have the very highest regard, are well described in an editorial entitled "McNamara's 'Whiz Kids.'" I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which was published yesterday in the Washington Evening Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McNAMARA'S "WHIZ KIDS"

In the dispute between some senior military men and the McNamara "whiz kids," we side with the youngsters. This does not take away any of the respect that Adm. George W. Anderson and his gray-haired colleagues have earned, nor does it deny that their frustrations are real.

It means only that in the nuclear age any responsible Secretary of Defense will try to run things the whiz-kid way, not the Anderson way.

The issue really is this: Should the Secretary of Defense use more of the authority that is legally his when the limited defense budget is divided up or should he rely more on the judgment and recommendations of the Chiefs of Staff?

We believe Congress was wise to give great power to the Secretary of Defense, and we are glad that Mr. McNamara is using it. The so-called whiz kids, the economists and scientists who supervise analyses of weapons and strategies, are merely tools at Mr. McNamara's disposal. He needs them.

Without this help he could not sort fact from fancy; he could not judge the interservice disputes that have plagued the country since unification in 1948, and he could not provide the positive leadership of the Defense Department which was missed in the terms of most former Secretaries.

Admiral Anderson, who was dropped August 1 as Chief of Naval Operations after a single 2-year term, said in his Press Club speech that military experience and judgment are being pushed aside by the technical studies of the whiz kids. The analysts are all right, he said, but they should be the servants of the officers, not the bosses. Well, of course, they are not the bosses. Mr. McNamara is the boss. The analysts can and do serve both military men and civilian officials.

These technical studies may be painful for military men, but senior officers must face the facts of 1963. Defense money, as always, is limited, but the needs of defense are great. The service Chiefs have demonstrated over the past 15 years that they cannot divvy up the funds themselves in a way that best serves the United States. Some superior must do it. That superior is, by law, Mr. McNamara. He needs technical advice in order to reduce the guesswork and judgment inherent in his job. The whiz kids help provide this advice.

Mr. McNamara did not invent either the problems or the tools of solution. The cold war and a limited budget create the problems, and he is merely expanding management techniques developed by past Defense officials, particularly his predecessor for 1 short year, Thomas S. Gates. We believe Mr. McNamara's successors will continue to use whiz kids and their studies. The days are gone when the American Military Establishment can fly by the seat of its pants.

PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

As in legislative session,

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 2 years ago, I submitted to the Secretary of Defense a memorandum on propaganda activities of military personnel. In it, I sought to make the point that it is not a proper function of the military to educate the public on political issues, but that that was being done, in contravention of tradition and constitutional principles.

The memorandum aroused some misunderstanding and opposition, and quite some discussion by some of my colleagues and certain groups of civilians.

On August 22 of this year, in writing to the Secretary of Defense, I objected—on similar grounds—to the content of a directive of the Department of Defense, dated July 26, 1963, on the subject of "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces."

I have received from the Secretary of Defense a reply which is somewhat reassuring. From the Secretary's letter, it is obvious that he appreciates the dangers of military intervention in civilian affairs, and that he is concerned with the proper role of the Military Establishment in our national life.

However, I am still concerned about the language of the directive, because I believe it is so broad and general that it very likely will give rise to abuse. I take this opportunity to urge that the Department of Defense reconsider this language.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary of Defense and his reply be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 22, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You may recall that 2 years ago I objected to a directive issued by the previous administration which made it the policy of the U.S. Government to use military personnel and facilities to "arouse the public to the menace of the cold war." At that time, I sought to point out some of the dangers involved in education and propaganda activities by the military, directed at the public.

My attention has been called to a directive of the Department of Defense dated July 26, 1963, on the subject of "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces." The directive contains the following language:

"B. THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

"1. The military departments shall, with the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), issue appropriate instructions, manuals, and regulations in connection with the leadership responsibility for equal opportunity, on and off base, and containing guidance for its discharge.

"2. The military departments shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunity on and off base.

"C. MILITARY COMMANDERS

"Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in offduty hours. In discharging that responsibility a commander shall not, except with the prior approval of the Secretary of his military department, use the offlimits sanction in discrimination cases arising within the United States."

Frankly, I am not certain of the exact intent of this language because of its broad and general terms. But this very fact emphasizes the potential dangers involved.

It is not necessary for me to tell you of the vast power of our Military Establishment in the economic, political, and social life of the Nation. Even when the Military Establishment is confined to its own proper role, its power is considerable. When it steps outside that role and intervenes in political, economic, or social matters, the potentialities for abuse are great.

My concern about the dangers of military intervention in civil and political affairs is not satisfied by the fact that such intervention may be done under authority of civilian superiors. The more important question is, What is the proper role of the military in our national life? In other words, the fact that the military is engaged in activities only at the direction of the civil authorities does not itself justify the activities. It rather gives them the color of authority and enhances their power.

The fact that these particular activities may be popular at the moment or may coincide with the administration's program does not vitiate the principle involved nor the fact that it sets a very bad precedent for future use of the power of the Military Establishment to influence the civil population in one way or the other. The precedent is a dangerous one, beyond any question of racial discrimination on or off base.

Not the least of my objections to the directive is the fact that it would appear to give the Military Establishment authority to use its great powers as a means of accomplishing what the administration is at the same time seeking enactment of by the Congress—the so-called public accommodations feature of the administration's program.

I am aware of the fact that the military departments have used the offlimits sanction to safeguard the health and welfare of personnel, and do not question the propriety of limited use of this power. The directive appears to go far beyond this normal and limited use, to make it the affirmative duty of military commanders to seek changes in local custom or even laws, in one of the most delicate and sensitive areas of our national life, putting the military back in the buisness of "educating" or even coercing the public. There are many defects in our society, I agree, and many of them may have some bearing upon the health and welfare of military personnel. Racial discrimination may have this effect on some members of the armed services. But the cure for these social defects is not use of the military, either by force or the threat of boycott.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: In your letter of August 22, 1963, you questioned whether the Defense Department program for obtaining equal opportunity for members of the Armed Forces is consistent with the proper role of the military in our national life.

I strongly agree that military personnel and military resources are provided for purposes of national security and are not instruments of social change. It was for this reason that the directive, issued on July 26, 1963, on the subject of "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces," contained language insuring that I would be consulted with respect to a determination of those cases wherein racial discrimination against military personnel and their dependents is harmful to military effectiveness.

It is my hope that such cases will not arise. Where they do, military commanders will be charged to work with and through local civilian community leaders with the object, not of desegregating the community, but of insuring that discriminatory practices bearing upon the effectiveness of men and women in uniform are eliminated in a reasonable, responsible manner.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

FILMS AND FREEDOM

As in legislative session,

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, beneath the placid surface of today's Russia, an intellectual and political ferment appears to be taking place—one which could have wide repercussions on the future relations between Russia and the West. The Sino-Soviet dispute and the consequent decision by the Kremlin to seek a limited accommodation with the West, through a test ban treaty, constitute one aspect of this change. Another aspect lies in the changes that are taking place within the Soviet society itself. Having attacked the brutality of Stalinist repression, Premier Khrushchev is now finding it extraordinarily difficult to maintain on Russian artists the rigid line of conformity. A little liberty merely whets the appetite. As a result, censorship appears to be in a fluid state—tight one day, loose the next; but over the past few months there has been a gradual liberalization that indicates that Soviet artists may be losing a few of their chains.

The young poet Evtushenko is allowed to read his poems in Red Square, and to publish in Paris his "Precocious Autobiography." A survivor of Stalin's forced-labor camps is permitted to recount his sufferings in the novel "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch"; and now Russian painters are beginning to turn away from the mass production of Lenin's portraits, and to turn toward the kind of abstractionism that long has been common in the Western art world. The human heart may at last be replacing the collective farm as the source of artistic inspiration in the Soviet Union.

A society in which the artist can find his own truth, even while criticizing his government or his neighbors, is a free society. A society in which the artist must parrot a line of conformity—whether laid down by a government bureaucracy or laid down by informal censorship or vigilante groups—is a society in chains. We Americans, blessed by a long tradition of artistic freedom of expression, can only welcome the efforts of Russian artists to shake themselves loose from the censors who repress them.

The intellectual ferment now taking place among Russian artists and writers was dramatically revealed during the recent International Film Festival held in Moscow. Films from all over the world, including many from the United States, were exhibited. When the Russians saw these films, they wanted to know why they were not allowed the same freedom of artistic innovation that they witnessed in the films from other countries. But most remarkable of all was the fact that the grand prize of the Moscow Festival was—for the first time—not given to a dreary piece of "Socialist realism" of the genre in which the happy worker exceeds his quota and meets his love on the collective farm, but, rather, to a film from the West which is the exact opposite of "Socialist realism"—a film which deals with the vagaries, the doubts, and the apprehensions of the human spirit. That film was Frederico Fellini's "Eight and One-Half," a brilliant and almost surrealistic account of an artist's struggle with his creative use. The awarding of the grand prize to this film is no doubt a small thing in a world in which people's thoughts are preoccupied with test ban treaties, civil rights marches, and military coups; but it is a sign that the Russian artist may at last be moving toward the same freedom of expression in his country that Signor Fellini enjoys in Italy and our own filmmakers enjoy in Hollywood and New York. If this should prove to be true, then the awarding of this prize will have been no small thing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an account of the Moscow festival, written by Mr. Stanley Kramer, the distinguished American film director, who served as one of the judges. In his account, which was published in the Washington Post, Mr. Kramer expresses the extraordinary impact of the American films upon the Russian audiences—and particularly of films in which we comment on our own shortcomings, in order to correct them. As Mr. Kramer comments:

> One simply cannot underestimate the impact of this fact upon a people who know that their creators are simply not free to make any comment of this nature in the first place.

This is the lesson all of us may learn from such events as this festival: that a free society is free to criticize itself. If the Russian artists are able to compete with us in this area, the world may yet be a more hopeful place in which to live.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 22, 1963]

FILMS CAN IMPROVE U.S. IMAGE ABROAD

(By Stanley Kramer)

HOLLYWOOD.—I don't think an 18-day visit to Moscow entitles anyone to write a book—nor even to pontificate. A little knowledge is still dangerous, if only because it is so little.

Perhaps the justification for this piece is in its limitation to a discussion of the impact of American films at the Moscow Film Festival. Yes, I am aware that even in this limitation there is a potential danger—because film is a primary force in mass communication and it spills over into the political arena, like it or not.

Last month's Moscow Festival was the scene of the greatest American film invasion ever undertaken. And it was highly experimental besides.

Instead of indulging in an exchange of cliches and giving lip service to the ideal of peace and understanding, we were able to screen films out of competition which were controversial and provocative. The Soviet reaction to these films was worth more than one could imagine in understanding their aims, prejudices, and sensitivities.

First, the official American entry was "The Great Escape." It was an entertainment not topped by any other film in the festival. Unfortunately, it could not be considered seriously for the Grand Prix since the jurors from all European countries, as a result of their own national experiences, are unable to consider the theme of a prison camp in a light vein; it is something to be shown in terms of serious drama only.

The films shown out of competition, however, covered a broad spectrum. They included "West Side Story," "Judgment at Nuremberg," "The Defiant Ones," "Some Like It Hot," "David and Lisa," and "Ben-Hur."

Since there was no control, "West Side Story" was screened three times at a deluxe theater before the American delegation heard about it. It was shown in English, with a Russian translation blaring out over loudspeakers. The Soviets are accustomed to this kind of translation and dial down the sound to accommodate the translator. We suggested that the sound be turned up during the musical numbers so that the audience might enjoy the song and dance routining. Izvestia promptly ran a front page story asking "What have the Americans to hide?"

The following night, I was asked to introduce the picture before its screening at the Kremlin Palace. To set the record straight I read aloud the lyrics to the song "America" and commented that the picture deals with a problem in America and showed that we were quite able to criticize ourselves—even better than Izvestia might do it. The audience reaction exceeded our expectations. They literally cheered at this reference to Izvestia—and 2 days later, that newspaper published a retraction.

In introducing "The Defiant Ones" and "Judgment at Nuremberg" on successive nights, we mentioned that we did not come flying any flags of virtue.

"The Defiant Ones," we pointed out, had to do with what we thought were flaws in the American social structure, as commented upon by American film makers. "We do have some faults," it was added, "and we presume you have a few." Again, there was a tremendous, and favorable, reaction to an American suggesting that the Soviet system had its own faults.

With both "The Defiant Ones" and "Judgment at Nuremberg," there were some specific reactions that were unexpected. In the former, there is a line in which Sidney Poitier says to Tony Curtis, "You live all your life—and you never make a sound—until you die."

Nowhere in the world has that line evoked any particular reaction—except in Moscow. The audience broke into applause that lasted long enough to drown out the following dialogue.

In "Judgment at Nuremberg," there was excited and audible—if somewhat shocked—response on two occasions, first when an American Army officer comments that "the Russians are making their move in Czechoslovakia" and again when Maximilian Schell, as the defense attorney, suggests that if the German defendants are guilty, some of the guilt must be shared by the Soviet Union because its 1939 pact with Hitler gave the Germans time to launch a war in the West.

The reaction to these films lead to a remarkable conclusion: The Soviet people, bathed in daily newspaper and radio propaganda, actually believe that most Americans subscribe to racial inequality. Suddenly, they witness films, made by Americans in America which make comment on the situation. So—after all—they come to realize we are aware and desire to change the injustices.

One simply cannot underestimate the impact of this fact upon a people who know that their creators are simply not free to make any comment of this nature in the first place.

How truly mistaken we have been to insist upon only the innocuous being shown in the Eastern orbit. Our power—our one great power—is in the full demonstration of real freedom in film making. The argument about endangering the American image is ridiculous—the image has already been endangered in press, radio, and television coverage of the American scene.

I discovered that an American filmmaker who visits Russia must expect to be asked about all phases of American life. At one press conference I was asked, "What about Cuba?"

Naturally, I emphasized that I was not an expert on world affairs, and could speak only for myself. But, I added, "We Americans aren't good at this sort of thing. We are either there too little or we come too late or we don't make adequate preparations. As an individual, it seems to me that perhaps—only perhaps on moral grounds—we should have handled it the way you handled Hungary—send the whole army in and get the job over with."

The comment brought appreciative if not enthusiastic laughter from the assembled Communist newspapermen.

Similarly, they responded, and quoted fairly, the answer to a question regarding the Negro "revolution" (as they phrased it) in the United States. I pointed out that the current situation is the result of 30 years of progress toward a clear, just and constitutional status for the Negro.

They listened attentively to the theory that violence only comes at the end of a long struggle such as this and is caused by the last-ditch struggle of the dwindling number of diehards who would preserve that status quo. They have not regarded the American scene in this light before.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn, as in legislative session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) under the previous order, the Senate adjourned, as in legislative session, until tomorrow, Thursday, September 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 11, 1963:

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Conrad, Robert L.
Boyd, Kenneth B.
Wyckoff, Don P.
Shifflett, Edwin E.
Chase, Norman S.
Fields, Thomas M.
Harbin, Fred F.
Spanjer, Ralph H.
Boag, Arthur R.
Hughes, Stanley S.
Case, William N.
Hays, John E.
Simpson, Archie D.
Claude, Eugene P.
Hogan, John K.
Loy, John I.
Caldwell, Frank C.
Conway, John A.
McFarland, David W.
Schmidt, Maynard W.
Mosteller, Michael
Card, Horace W., Jr.
Haigler, Wilson D.
Wilson, Robert W.
McCartney, Henry A.
Davis, Clyde H., Jr.
Titterud, Stanley V.
Hartsock, Edmond P.
Finn, Howard J.
Leu, Reinhardt
Eubank, William L.
Snoddy, Lawrence F., Jr.
Bennett, William R.
Scarborough, Hartwell V., Jr.
Hannah, Samuel A.
Zimmer, Andrew M.
Dickinson, Harry E.
Stockman, James R.
Sullivan, William J.
Tosdal, Orlando S.
Olson, Donald T.
Thomas, Franklin C., Jr.
Merritt, Thomas R.
Robertson, Charles S.
Taft, Howland G.
Bristow, John B.
Sexton, Martin J.
Sims, William L.
Robichaud, Clifford J., Jr.
Hill, Jake B.
Crossfield, Charles C., III
Mallory, Donald L.
Steele, Fred A.
Beale, Charles H., Jr.
Hull, Milton A.
Thompson, Robert A.
Linnan, James K.
Dwyer, Ross T., Jr.
Jaskilka, Samuel
Lindsay, John A.
Smith, Franklin L.
Jenkins, Robert M.
Houghton, Kenneth J.
Wood, Roy I., Jr.
Kicklighter, Edward C.
Faw, Duane L.
McLeod, Stanley N.
Noren, Wesley C.
Daddazio, Armand G.
Bosshard, Lawrence H.
Reid, George K.
Holmgrain, Eric S.
Steman, Louis H.
Williamson, Harold P.
O'Donnell, John J.
Boress, Bernard M.
Hunt, Richard M.
Mentzer, John F.
Schumaker, David W.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 11, 1963:

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Armstead L. Hayes, Notasulga.
Merle Wilson, Union Grove.
Larry C. Clark, Weaver.

ALASKA

Theodore Samuelson, Bethel.
Lyman E. McBride, Kenai.

ARIZONA

Mary M. McCarrell, Chambers.
William E. Wood, Douglas.
Edward I. Kacer, Palo Verde.
Charles F. Adams, San Carlos.
Ara O. Sparks, Whiteriver.
William R. Rowley, Yarnell.

ARKANSAS

James L. Thrash, Ashdown.
Barney R. Adams, Banks.
Raymond J. Robinson, Garfield.
Austin A. Stovall, Imboden.
Donald L. Ray, McNeil.
Floyd L. Kelley, Portland.
Max O. Weathers, Salem.

CALIFORNIA

Robert M. Heighway, Altaville.
Mazie A. Thornton, Auberry.
Leland K. Pauly, Camptonville.
Joseph L. Causey, Compton.
Juanita S. Roberts, Kerman.
Joyce A. Thomas, Kettleman City.
Albert L. Cox, Jr., Ojai.
Loyd J. Swycaffer, Santa Ysabel.
Earle H. Flaws, Seaside.
Leroy J. Rust, Yosemite National Park.

COLORADO

George A. Cavender, Denver.

FLORIDA

Edgar R. Sitler, Sr., Casselberry.
William H. Melton, Fernandina Beach.
Gladys A. Tillis, Keystone Heights.
Dyle R. Johnson, Mayport.
Joseph E. Arnold, Pinellas Park.

GEORGIA

Andrew J. Casey, Jr., Cave Spring.
Guy Freeman, Jr., Evans.
Rudolph B. Kellett, Powder Springs.
Billie L. Hamrick, Ranger.
George H. Hunt, Thomson.

IDAHO

Grant A. Patterson, Hailey.

INDIANA

Gayle A. Smith, Boston.
Margaret F. Moss, Harlan.
Charles H. Boswell, Indianapolis.
Mary E. Liedtky, La Crosse.
Paul Davidson, Leiters Ford.
Chalmers A. King, Muncie.
Eurvon W. Adkins, New Salisbury.
Helen K. Galbraith, Oakville.
Marvin M. Wright, Parker.
Marinus H. Brackman, Rockport.
Ivan R. Love, Seymour.
David F. McGuire, Solsberry.
Margery E. Brenner, Whiteland.

IOWA

Max M. Brewster, Albion.
Stanford R. Warner, Blakesburg.
Robert L. Falcon, Central City.
Warren L. Lehman, Doon.

Wayne E. Brinton, Ellsworth.
Ruth M. Kopel, Haverhill.
Robert M. Fishel, Lockridge.
Dorothy H. Schuck, New Hartford.
Delores A. Kunkel, Oyens.
Anna V. Beuse, Princeton.
Marcus A. Neppl, Wall Lake.
Harry D. Levy, Washington.

KANSAS

Francis E. Kunkel, Burden.
Raymond Peters, Lehigh.
Winford J. Broadfoot, Montezuma.
Richard N. Van Scyoc, Osborne.
Gerard P. Ketter, Pauline.
Ralph A. Schweitzer, Penokee.
Gerald B. Trautwein, Udall.

KENTUCKY

Benjamin P. Boyd, Boaz.
Edna L. Peters, Lily.
Elmer B. Arnett, Salyersville.

LOUISIANA

Rodney C. Deshotels, Washington.

MAINE

Margaret M. Evans, Center Lovell.
John E. Mains, Gray.
Malcom R. Packard, Locke Mills.

MARYLAND

Wilbur T. Messick, Bivalve.

MASSACHUSETTS

Agnes H. Cone, Haydenville.
Rita L. Mournighan, Hebronville.
Michael F. O'Rourke, North Attleboro.
Carl T. Sherman, Raynham.
Marian B. Shepard, Still River.

MICHIGAN

Ethel M. Linskey, Atlas.
James E. Pryal, Escanaba.
Louis C. Russell, Greenville.
Robert L. Cooper, Kalamazoo.
Delbert S. Lee, Metamora.
James W. Marshall, Otisville.

MINNESOTA

Donald W. Nielsen, Alpha.
Clarence J. Peterson, Badger.
Victor J. Humeniuk, Baudette.
Willard G. DeGroat, Hector.
John D. Miller, Hinckley.
Carl E. Hoover, Racine.
Louis J. Sauvageau, Stillwater.
Albert F. Kellen, Woodstock.

MISSISSIPPI

Norman E. Snowden, Collinsville.

MISSOURI

Raymond M. Herr, Asbury.
Edwin L. Goodrich, Grain Valley.
James H. Shearrer, Patterson.
Christian A. Greminger, Ste. Genevieve.
Dorian M. Alexander, Shelbyville.
Roger L. Funkenbusch, Taylor.

MONTANA

Elsie P. Garbe, Pablo.
Fred A. Geisser, Townsend.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Norman E. Vittum, Ossipee.
Lorraine M. Callaghan, Rochester.
Harold J. Wright, Twin Mountain.
Marlene M. Leger, West Swanzey.

NEW JERSEY

Calvin L. Naylor, Blackwood.
Helen M. Emley, Creamridge.
Thelma C. Cooper, Navesink.

NEW YORK

Jessie Bradley, Barryville.
Ruth I. Robl, Black River.
Helen C. Miller, Cadyville.
Walter A. Kansas, East Moriches.
Sidney Schorr, Far Rockaway.
Evelyn M. Cassara, Highland Lake.
Glenn W. Sickles, Mumford.
Walter J. Janik, Niagara Falls.
Gerald M. McGinnis, Norwood.
Clarence R. Ford, St. Bonaventure.
Walter S. Eckel, Schodack Landing.
Lavina M. Kubler, South Cairo.

NORTH CAROLINA

Harold E. Davis, Bryson City.
James L. Morris, Jr., Cherokee.
Thelma J. Johnson, Ferguson.
Willifred M. Farris, Gastonia.
Jane L. Humphrey, Kelford.
James H. Ross, Lincolnton.
Carlene D. Bailey, Penland.
R. Guy Sutton, Sylva.

NORTH DAKOTA

Vernon D. Jacobson, Maxbass.

OHIO

Robert C. Plassman, Bloomdale.
Henry L. Hanson, Chesterland.
Norman G. Betz, Duncan Falls.
Harold W. Kaderly, Galloway.
Eugene O. Place, Leipsic.
Orville C. Ruedebusch, New Bremen.
Richard H. Taylor, New Haven.
Harry R. Smith, Paulding.
Edgar E. Arnold, Pomeroy.
Arthur F. Strauss, Strasburg.
Freeman A. Enoch, Syracuse.
Richard L. Hostetler, Walnut Creek.
Philip E. Foster, Winchester.

OKLAHOMA

Doyle V. Strong, Beaver.
Leslie K. Smedley, Davenport.
Dorothy J. Orton, Fort Towson.
Charlie D. Payne, Lawton.
Leta M. Brock, Mansville.
James T. Hughston, Valliant.

OREGON

Anna C. Allen, Elgin.
Bernice B. Muller, Wolf Creek.

PENNSYLVANIA

Herman E. Schwirian, Buena Vista.
Merle C. Bamat, Lanse.
Charles E. Wise, Lebanon.
Chester W. Marburger, Mars.

RHODE ISLAND

Luther W. Andrews, Greene.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry Summerall, Aiken.
Ruby G. Hodge, Alcolu.
Joseph G. Orvin, Manning.
Clara M. Mason, Varnville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Floyd L. Leibbert, Bryant.
Mary E. Ewoldt Piedmont.

TEXAS

Frank A. Yeager, Galveston.
Bobby L. Raspberry, Keller.
Andrew J. Hayes, Plains.
William R. Saunders, Wimberley.
Cecil E. Garner, Yorktown.

UTAH

Clarence A. Bundy, Washington.

VERMONT

James R. Hudson, East Montpelier.
Stanley R. Beauregard, St. Albans.
Paul W. Rivait, Salisbury.
Herman W. Mercier Swanton.

VIRGINIA

Robert W. Buntin, Blackstone.
Clarence M. Vassar, Charlotte Court House.
Byron A. Pepper, Colonial Beach.

WASHINGTON

Laverne M. Deane, Anacortes.
Edward O. Riechman, Carnation.
Vernell B. Shepler, Coulee Dam.
Lynn I. Sauve, Moxee City.
Jennie F. Snider, Rainier.
George C. Hale, St. John.
William E. Mitchell, Vashon.
Vada P. McMullan, Wenatchee.

WEST VIRGINIA

Melvin C. Stemple, Aurora.
Robert A. Underwood, Ellenboro.
Billy J. Blankenship, Itmann.
Hal S. Findley, Flemington.
Thomas E. Roberts, Keystone.
Edward C. Pastilong, Moundsville.
Jack L. Dotson, Richwood.
Lanelle W. Michael, Sinks Grove.

WISCONSIN

John M. Stauffacher, Darlington.
John Weinberg, Gleason.
Charles W. Larson, Mauston.
Leona N. Stahl, Newburg.
Fredean P. Miller, Powers Lake.
Jerome M. Kowaleski, Wild Rose.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Brooklyn Philharmonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many, the departure for points west of the Brooklyn Dodgers left the borough bereft of any organization in which its citizens could take singular pride. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Indeed, Brooklyn is a community which can boast of numerous cultural and educational organizations which would compare favorably with those in cities of similar size. One of the most distinguished of these is the Brooklyn Philharmonia, the borough's own professional symphony orchestra, which this coming season celebrates its 10th anniversary.

The growth of the Philharmonia over the years has been amazing. From a handful of subscribers in its first year, each concert now draws near capacity houses of 2,200 at the Brooklyn Academy of Music.

This rapid growth can be attributed to the leadership provided by the officers and board members of the Philharmonia and to the excellence of its musical director, Siegfried Landau, and the outstanding artists who comprise this magnificent musical aggregation.

From its very beginnings, those who directed the destinies of the Brooklyn Philharmonia recognized the need to bring symphonic music to our young people, boys and girls who could derive enormous cultural benefits from exposure to virtuoso presentations.

The Philharmonia gives a Saturday matinee Youth Concert series for children of elementary school age and conducts an annual Youth Music Contest for brilliant young instrumentalists in the borough. Both programs are sponsored by the Women's Committee of the Philharmonia.

In 1962, New York City took cognizance of the Philharmonia's efforts in this area by awarding the organization a grant of $40,000 which enabled the orchestra to give a special series of nine free concerts, attended by more than 20,000 junior high and high school students.

These presentations were eminently successful, and again this year, the city has awarded the orchestra a like amount for a second series for young people. As was the case last year, the concert program will be arranged in cooperation with the New York City Board of Education.

The Philharmonia serves the musical needs of the borough on other levels as well. For example, through the Brooklyn Philharmonia Choral Society, it encourages community participation in musicmaking, and through its Junior Patrons it brings the teenager into direct contact with the cultural life of the borough.

The Philharmonia's 10th anniversary season will be exciting in more ways than one. On December 2, the orchestra has been invited to appear in Philharmonic Hall at Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts to give a concert for the benefit of the Lincoln Center Student Fund.

In furnishing pleasure to tens of thousands of persons—young and old—the Philharmonia has made its mark in the cultural life of Brooklyn, and the support the community has given this great organization has been richly deserved.

I would like to offer my personal tribute to Max L. Koeppel, president of the Brooklyn Philharmonia, and the other officers of the symphony: David Teitelbaum, chairman of the board; Bernard S. Barr, John C. Hilly, the Honorable Leonard P. Moore and Rabbi Eugene J. Sack, all vice presidents; Morris Kirsch, treasurer and Dr. Henry H. Mouradian, secretary; Siegfried Landau, a musician of great stature who conducts the Philharmonia and the many devoted citizens of Brooklyn whose interest and support have made "an orchestra grow in Brooklyn."

As the Brooklyn Philharmonia marks its 10th anniversary year, I am confident that the orchestra will continue to enhance its already notable reputation in the years ahead.

Robert E. Jones, of Alabama, Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones] has been singularly honored by the National Association of Counties.

The association, at its 28th annual conference in Denver, adopted a resolution commending our friend. Since this is one of the very few times the organization has singled out an individual Member of Congress for commendation, the honor to the distinguished gentleman represents high, but deserved, praise.

Those of us who know Bob Jones and his service, however, are not surprised, and I am sure we share with the Nation's county officials their appreciation of his splendid service.

The resolution follows:

> The National Association of Counties commends the House of Representatives, Government Operations Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Robert E. Jones, Jr., of Alabama, for their continuing and effective leadership in studying and appraising the national water pollution control program.

The Practical Nurse: An Indispensable Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I introduced a joint resolution which would have given much needed recognition to this country's licensed practical nurses by designating the second week in September as Licensed Practical Nurses Week. Unfortunately this resolution was tabled. I want to express my appreciation, and that of the country as a whole, for the dedicated service of this group of women. The practical nurse is often underrated and forgotten by the public until they are brought directly into contact with her through the wonderful nursing care some member of their family has received from her. The practical nurse has been called an "indispensable woman" in our hospitals and nursing homes, and this designation is fully justified.

At present there are over 236,000 licensed practical nurses and it is estimated that by 1970 at least 350,000 will be needed. Every year new responsibilities and duties are given to the practical nurse as she becomes more experienced, and she has a permanent, important role to play in the medical team. Perhaps it is only when we become patients that we are fully aware of the practical nurse; she performs a high percentage of bedside nursing and is the one who makes the patient comfortable and shows him that the whole activity of the hospital is essentially built around him.

Hospital doctors and registered nurses have realized the value of practical nurses to them. She makes it possible for the doctor and registered nurse to concentrate on more technical, impersonal duties which are vital for the wellbeing of patients but are not effective unless the patient is given adequate bed care. The practical nurse is also much in demand for private nursing. During 1961 there were 89,135 calls for practical nurses in the area of private home care alone.

Practical nursing programs were first introduced in 1897, but it is only in quite recent times that the status of the practical nurse has been defined and full use made of her capabilities. Everyone knows of the experienced, kindly neighbor woman who was called to help in emergencies. Over time she became a wise midwife and general nurse who often took full responsibility for the family of a sick woman as well as giving competent nursing care. She was not well paid for her services but she was greatly appreciated and loved.

It was during the nursing crises of World War II that the importance of the practical nurse was first recognized, but serious efforts to establish training schools were made during the thirties. Many hospitals were understaffed and it was felt that an educated practical nurse could take some of the burden off the shoulders of the registered nurses. Gradually the vocational program for practical nursing has grown in scope until at present there are 693 approved schools of practical nursing and every State issues licenses which entail examinations. The Federal Government has recognized the importance of this program and done a great deal to encourage it. Under the George-Barden Vocational Education Act as amended in 1956 an expenditure of $5 million per year is authorized to train practical nurses. The Federal Government matches State payments for teaching facilities and instruction under this law.

Today's practical nurse has completed a year's training program in a school which has been inspected and approved by the State board of nursing. She has spent 4 months at classroom and laboratory work, and 8 months doing full-time clinical work in a hospital under careful supervision. After she obtains her license she has further on-the-job training which prepares her for the responsibility of nursing those who are not in a critical condition: New mothers and babies, the chronically ill, the convalescent, and the aged.

The ever increasing demand for medical services has strained our hospitals and training facilities to the utmost and placed a tremendous burden on the doctors and registered nurses. We are all glad that more people are aware of the benefits of medical attention, and that because of pre-paid health plans more people are able to obtain necessary treatment. These are not the only reasons for the need for more medical services. Today people live much longer than they did even 30 years ago, and they naturally require more care as they grow older and develop the various diseases of the aged. The elderly spend two and one-half as much time in our hospitals as any other age group. Other fields where the need for nursing care has increased are psychiatry, rehabilitation programs, and maternity care. The practical nurse is of vital importance in every one of these fields. She can take over a great deal of the general nursing, which is often not of a specialized nature.

It is difficult to supply enough doctors and registered nurses to keep up with the demand, and because of the tremendous increase in scientific knowledge these doctors and nurses have such complex, specialized duties that it is impossible for them to give patients the constant personal attention which they need. The doctor must delegate responsibilities to the registered nurse which force her to spend more time away from the patient. Medical science has shown how important the patient's attitude is in reaching full recovery after a serious illness or operation; the practical nurse, who spends more time with the patient than any other member of the health team, will often notice a change in the patient's attitute or general condition before anyone else does. She can reassure the patient who is worried by personal problems or the nature of his illness, and if something serious is wrong she can often give the doctor the information he needs to improve the situation.

The licensed practical nurse competently fills the gap between the specialists and technicians and the patient himself. She assists the registered nurse in giving nursing care and performs routine functions independently, which relieves the registered nurse for other duties. She is, to the patient, the most important member of the nursing team which enables the hospital to give adequate patient care. The nursing team consists of three units: the registered nurse, the practical nurse, and the nurse's aid. The registered nurse charts the nursing program and attends to the patient's preliminary needs. The practical nurse takes over most of the routine bedside care when the initial emergency situation is controlled. The nurse's aid is a volunteer who assists both nurses. This system, when properly organized, enables the nursing team to care for all their patients efficiently and sympathetically. It is obvious that without the help and technical knowledge of the practical nurse the system would not work at all.

Once a practical nurse has been licensed her learning does not stop. Many hospitals have post-graduate courses to give these nurses a degree of expertise which enables them to help in the operating theater, and gives them a good knowledge of such fields as obstetrics, medications, recovery room and emergency room techniques, and psychiatric nursing. Hospitals have found that the practical nurse is capable of helping out registered nurses in emergency situations either in the ward or in surgery.

Through the practical nursing program we obtain many excellent nurses who would otherwise be unable to serve the community in such a worthwhile way. Practical nurses run in age from 17 to 50; thus both girls who have been unable to complete high school for one reason or another, and women whose children are grown, are able to fulfill their nursing ambitions. These are women who have a real interest in people and in helping them, and who get a great deal of satisfaction from nursing. Practical nursing is an excellent career for one who wishes to be a nurse but is unable to undertake the more extensive responsibilities and preparations of the registered nurse. I can think of few better ways to serve the community in a personal way.

The registered nurse could not cope with both the greater number of patients and the increasingly technical and scientific nature of nursing treatment without the help of the practical nurse. It has been estimated that there should be at least one practical nurse for every registered nurse in order for the registered nurse to perform her complicated work most efficiently. At present there are 464,138 registered nurses; by 1970 at least 680,000 will be needed. If the current shortage of registered nurses persists it is obvious that more practical nurses will become necessary.

The practical nurse is truly indispensable; not only does she carry out important duties during the day, but the whole hospital relies on her for service at night, weekends and holidays. Her selfless devotion to duty is an example for the whole country. I would like to see the licensed practical nurse given official recognition. She is a dedicated worker in a field which at some time in our lives concerns each one of us deeply; without her help the whole hospital service to each individual would suffer. It is not only in the hospital that her services are needed and appreciated. Nursing homes, mental hospitals, public health facilities and private homes value and use licensed practical nurses. The demand for practical nurses today is greater than the supply. In 1962 one out of every five calls for practical nurses in private homes went unanswered, and 18 percent of the budgeted vacancies for practical nurses in our hospitals went unfilled in 1962. All these figures show that the practical nurse has become an important figure in the whole scheme of medical care. She is a permanent link between the patient and the rest of the health team in most nursing situations today. She deserves our heartfelt thanks.

Tribute to a Fine American Sailor: Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker. Today I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great American—Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., who retired August 31 from the U.S. Navy. I should also like to include in my tribute a heartfelt "well done" and a "thank you" not only from the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma, but from all the American people.

Although I am fully aware that Admiral Raborn has his official residence in the great State of Texas, I am sure my colleagues from that State will not mind my tribute to this fine sailor when I remind them that it was in the Sixth Congressional District that Admiral Raborn attended grade and high school, and it was an Oklahoma Senator, Elmer Thomas, who appointed him to the U.S. Naval Academy 39 years ago, an appointment which launched him on his great naval career. From Ryan and Marlow, Okla., came Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., who after leaving Oklahoma gave 39 distinguished years to his country and to the U.S. Navy. We Oklahomans, like all Americans, have reason to be proud of him, a boy from the land who went down to the sea.

The facts attest to his brilliant and distinguished career as a first-class sailor, officer, aviator, commander, administrator, and leader. He was all of these as he built respect for his personal qualities and professional abilities, not only among the thousands of men he has commanded, but among his colleagues and his superior officers.

In the 39 years of serving his country, often at great danger to himself, he has shown that kind of heroism and personal integrity that this country has produced in abundance.

Admiral Raborn has taken a personal part in a great human drama. I speak of the evolution of the U.S. Navy. The role of the Navy was the same 40 years ago, nay 140 years ago, as it is today: To maintain the freedom of the seas and the protection of the American homeland. Over the years freedom of the seas has become synonymous with the freedom of the free world.

But when Ensign Raborn first went to sea the old coal burners still protected America. Today that same Navy, still magnificantly doing its task, has nuclear ships above and below the surface, guided missiles and the most modern aircraft. That the Navy has kept pace with the best in modern technology is a further tribute to the imagination of men like Admiral Raborn.

Ensign William F. Raborn, Jr., was graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy on June 7, 1928. Thirty-two years later, in 1960, he was promoted to his present rank of vice admiral. In those intervening years lies a great American story of dedication, integrity, service, and patriotic fidelity.

In his naval career, Admiral Raborn has served at sea in many types of vessels, most notably battleships, destroyers, and carriers. As an integral part of the development of the air arm of the U.S. Navy, Admiral Raborn flew from carriers in their early years of development, later served as an executive officer—U.S.S. *Hancock*—and later as commanding officer—U.S.S. *Bennington*, CVA-2. He has instructed fliers; served as Chief of Staff of Task Force 38; commanded Carrier Division 2; served with the U.S. Navy Bureau of Ordinance; served at the Naval War College. Admiral Raborn also served in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations as Assistant Director of Guided Missiles;

served on the staff of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; and crowned his career as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Development.

Both in time of war as in time of peace, he has distinguished himself. For example, he has earned: The Commendation Ribbon—for work with the U.S. Pacific Fleet; the Navy Unit Citation; the Bronze Star—for operations against the Japanese in 1944–45; the Silver Star Medal—for service in the Pacific in 1945; a Gold Star—in lieu of a second Bronze Star; a second Commendation Ribbon; a Distinguished Service Medal; the American Defense Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign—with one silver and one bronze star; National Defense; Korean Service; World War Two Victory Medal; United Nations Service; Philippine Defense Ribbon.

So today it is with great pride that I say on behalf of the people of my district to Admiral Raborn: Thank you, and well done. May you and Mrs. Raborn enjoy your years of retirement, which you both so richly deserve.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. HERBERT S. WALTERS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of light and truth, from the baseness of our own hearts we turn to the crystal purity of Thy own holiness.

From the vain deceits of the uncertain world in which we live, we would turn from the tyranny of drab details to the shining splendor of the heavenly vision which haunts us, and to which we dare not be disobedient. As we bow in Thy presence, there steals into our hearts the calm confidence that Thou holdest the whole world in Thy hand in the firm clasp of a love that never faileth.

In that assurance—not of our feeble hold of Thee, but of Thy mighty grasp of us—may we march with conquering tread in the gathering armies of understanding and friendship whose armor is the shield of Thy truth and whose sword is the might of Thy love which will not let us go, and against which all the spears of hate cannot ultimately prevail.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HERBERT S. WALTERS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALTERS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of W. True Davis, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Switzerland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5081) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5781) to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday last, as modified, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, with respect to which there is a limitation on debate.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of a factor which has arisen, but of which the leadership was not previously aware—and I assure Senators that we were acting in good faith—I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, Senators be allowed to have 10 minutes, regardless of the time limitation, for the purpose of clearing up this matter, if that is at all possible.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What has happened to the morning hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement, there will be no morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the request by the majority leader been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a question, because the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] tells me he needs more time for the presentation of an amendment which he proposes to offer.

I must say, for the majority leader and for myself, that when the unanimous-consent agreement was proposed, it was entered into after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; I believe he dictated a limitation which finally was included in the unanimous-consent agreement. At that time we were given to understand that only one amendment, or perhaps two amendments, would be offered.

At any rate, the time limitations which were included in the agreement were set in conformity with the suggestions of the minority member of the committee. I think that statement should be made, in fairness to both the majority leader and myself. Let me also state that the majority leader was quite willing to make any reasonable arrangement for the time, so that every Senator might be accommodated.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, is it in order for me to propound at this time a parliamentary inquiry?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. COTTON. My inquiry is as follows: Is it a fact that because of the unanimous-consent agreement—which was presented and adopted after many of us had been told that no business except the test ban treaty would be taken up in the Senate this week—Senators are now precluded from objecting; that the leadership does not have to ask that the morning hour be dispensed with, and does not have to ask that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with; that a Member of the Senate is completely impotent and gagged; and there is no means—dilatory or otherwise—by which a Senator can obtain a stay of execution from the order, because the order takes effect immediately? Am I correct in that understanding of the situation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I be heard in connection with that inquiry?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I am embarrassed by what has happened; and if the Senator from New Hampshire desires to have additional time, we shall ask that he have it, and he will get it. But if that will not settle the problem, I shall ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be rescinded, and will have the Senate resume its consideration of the treaty.

However, before the Senator from New Hampshire gives me his reaction to that suggestion, let me say that I believe I stated that if there were gaps during the consideration of the treaty, at least some appropriation bills—I had in mind the Defense appropriation bill, when it was reported—might be brought up, provided there was agreement all around as to that.

But I am willing to have the unanimous-consent agreement rescinded, if the Senator from New Hampshire desires to have that done, and to have the Senate resume consideration of the treaty.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished majority leader will agree that through the years I have tried not to be disagreeable or not to make things difficult for the leadership.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I most certainly will agree.

Mr. COTTON. Of course every Senator is responsible for knowing what is done in the Senate; but during the past few days and weeks, I have been serving on a committee which has had before it the impending railroad strike, the civil-rights bill, and the Northeast Airlines problem. Those problems have required our close attention morning, noon, and night. I knew I had to offer an amendment of extreme importance and significance to many of the people of my State. It involves a life or death matter.

I know that if I have 30 minutes in which to present that amendment, thereafter, when the bells ring, Senators will come into the Chamber; and then the amendment will be rejected. But if I could present my amendment in a way which would result in bringing it adequately to the attention of the Senate, I believe it would be adopted. However, to have only 30 minutes simply means that then, when Senators enter the Chamber and ask somebody at the door, "What is the amendment?" They are simply told that the committee is against it; and then it will be voted down, and that will mean that the people in many sections of my State will not even be able to receive medical attention.

The amendment does not relate to civil rights; it deals with human needs. But, Mr. President, to have the leadership give me—out of the kindness of their hearts—another 15 minutes, 30 minutes, or even another hour, will not suffice.

This amendment was presented to and approved by members of the House committee from which this bill was reported.

I appealed to the chairman of the committee; but what was the answer that I got? He is my good friend, and he answered most courteously and sweetly; but he said this amendment must not be adopted, because—so he said—the Senate must pass the bill in exactly the form in which it was passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, consider how low the Senate has fallen when Senators are told that a bill before them must be passed word for word in the form in which it was passed by the House, because—so they are told—to send the bill to conference would require too much time. We have wasted 8 months, in this session; yet we are told there is not time for a conference.

So far as I am concerned, I am not asking for any special consideration. I do not ask that the order be rescinded. I have on my desk a number of amendments which I can offer, one after another, and can take 30 minutes on each one, and then can withdraw them.

I am going to get my amendment considered, but not by only five Senators, six Senators, or eight Senators. I am going to use my time to have a live quorum. I am going to get my amendment before the Senate. That is how strongly I feel. I do not want anything given to me. I want the rights of a Senator.

While I am speaking on this subject, I should like to say that there is nothing funnier than that every 2 years we sweat big drops of blood about rule XXII. We try to decide whether debate will be ended by two-thirds of the Senate. Shall it be by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting? Shall it be by three-fifths of the Senators? Shall it be by a majority?

Then after going through all of those beautiful exercises the business of the Senate is conducted under a unanimous-consent arrangement with five or six Senators present in the Chamber. A quorum call is requested. It is allowed to proceed about 2 minutes. A Senator could not get over to the Capitol if he had a bicycle. A Senator has a staff, and he has a responsibility. But in this case it was my understanding that the test ban treaty was to be considered all this week. I shall get my amendment before the Senate if it is humanly possible to do so, and no one will prevent it. That is my attitude.

I speak with all friendliness to the majority leader and the minority leader. I do not desire them, through the sweetness of their dispositions and the kindness and generosity of their souls, to give me 10 minutes, 15 minutes, or 1 hour.

Mr. President, in 2 or 3 weeks the Senate will be engaged in a civil rights debate. I should like to see any Senator chop off debate at that time with a unanimous-consent agreement. Now I am going to see that Senators have sufficient time at least to learn what my amendment is, so that it may be considered. It is of vital importance to a great many people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the senior Senator from New Hampshire. I am sorry that the leadership did not consult him. He knows, as he has stated, that the leadership acted in good faith.

Mr. President, there is only one way out of the dilemma in which the Senate finds itself. I take this action in good heart and good spirit, even though personally I am disappointed after two attempts to get the bill before the Senate. I thought the roadblocks had been cleared. I now find that that is not so. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. COTTON. I ask the majority leader not to withdraw the unanimous-consent agreement. If I can have time enough to obtain a live quorum and present my amendment so that it will not be handled by only a few Senators present in the Chamber, I do not want to upset the entire arrangement. But I want a sufficient amount of time. Fifteen minutes or a half hour will not be sufficient.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator give the leadership any idea how much time he desires on his amendment?

Mr. COTTON. The distinguished majority leader has had long experience in this body. He knows that when a committee is unanimously of the opinion that a House bill must be passed, and that no amendments should be adopted in the Senate, a Senator who offers an amendment can talk to only a few Senators in the Chamber. Senators receive telephone calls, and must leave. That will happen, unless we can prolong the consideration of the bill long enough until its importance is apparent and the amendment is given some real attention.

Last night I talked with my own leader—perhaps not as sweetly as I should have. If I did not, I apologize. Does the Senate know what my leader said? I love him. He made one of the greatest speeches yesterday that I have ever heard. He said to me, "NORRIS, I will get you an hour."

What good would an hour be to the people in New Hampshire who cannot have a doctor? We are talking about a bill that provides for an authorization of $200 million. All we desire is a few thousand dollars earmarked to be used on the same basis that we have provided in relation to teachers under the National Education Act. We would forgive, if not year by year, then 10 percent a year, half of the loans of those who enter into practice in the small communities. There are 99 counties in our country in which there is no resident physician.

I knew of a woman in the county in which I was born who was loaded into a car with a heart attack and carried 25 miles to the county seat to a hospital. She was dead when she arrived there, because no doctor was available.

All we want out of the $200 million authorization is a few thousand dollars for some of the rural areas.

If the people of whom I am speaking were members of the colored race, we would not take the action suggested. The bleeding hearts in the Senate would take care of those people.

If my people lived in Pakistan, India, or Burma our great foreign aid program would stretch out its healing hands to help provide hospitals, doctors, nurses, and technicians.

If my people were organized and could come to Washington and hold mass meetings, we would not do it to them. If there were millions of them packed away in the metropolitan areas of our country we would not do it to them. The people of whom I speak are humble, ordinary folks who have no organization or anyone to talk for them except their Senator. And their Senator wakes up and finds that he has 30 minutes—Mr. President, I repeat, 30 minutes—to try to attract the attention of 99 Senators to something that is of vital importance. That is my plea. I do not wish to withdraw the agreement, but I desire time enough for a live quorum. I wish time enough to present my case to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield, if I have the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know to whose time the present colloquy is being charged under the unanimous-consent agreement. I understand from the Senator's statement and his demeanor that this is a matter of the utmost moment and magnitude. Indeed, it is a matter of life and death. It would have to be a matter of that gravity for a Senator to speak as he has.

If the Senator intends to make that sort of fight, he had better become unshackled from the unanimous-consent request, because no Senator can, within the limitations of the time prescribed in the unanimous-consent agreement, make the kind of effort in behalf of proposed legislation that the Senator from New Hampshire indicates he intends to make in this case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the present discussion be extended 5 minutes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that, in addition to the agreement already entered into, on the amendment to be offered by the Senator from New Hampshire there be an hour and a half of debate, with 1 hour and 10 minutes——

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator permit me to say that I wish to be sure that I have an hour, because I may wish a live quorum, and the time necessary to call the quorum would be charged to my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that 1 hour and 15 minutes be allocated to the Senator from New Hampshire, and 15 minutes be allocated to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the Senator from New Hampshire would give us another entertaining exercise like the one we have had, perhaps we would be assured of a full attendance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement be further modified to the extent that the time necessary to obtain a live quorum be not charged to the time of either side.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I shall not object—I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that other Senators approached me this morning on the question of what they would like to do this afternoon.

I gave them as good a commitment as I could, on the basis of the knowledge which I had. If they will go along, with tolerance and an understanding of the situation in which we find ourselves, I shall not object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before this arrangement is concluded, I say in behalf of the majority leader that frankly I do not know how any leader could keep the work of the Senate going except in the same frame the majority leader has always followed.

This bill came from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. What was more natural than to go first to the chairman of the committee and ask him about a time limitation, and then to the ranking minority member of the committee, who in fact dictated the terms of the consent request which was agreed to? I do not know what the majority leader could do other than that. I do not know how anyone could consult with all the Members of the Senate.

I do not know how to keep Senators in the Chamber. I have noted many times that, after a live quorum call, within the space of 5 minutes attendance in the Senate Chamber thins out. Senators go back to their offices, where they are loaded with work; they go back to their committees; and they go back to seeing constituents and other people; discharging their many responsibilties.

The majority leader has always been exceedingly kind and generous and circumspect in trying to accommodate Senators and to be attentive to the desires of all Senators.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to join in everything the minority leader has said about the majority leader. No man who ever served in the Senate was more fair and honorable than the Senator from Montana. I would resent anyone suggesting anything else. I have not suggested anything else.

But when a Senator has a cause which is just—I will even guarantee that the chairman of the committee will not say it is not needed—and when a Senator finds himself in this situation, though it is perfectly true that he cannot chain Senators to the floor, it is likewise true that if he is able to hold up the proceedings long enough the majority leader and the minority leader will finally come around to look at his amendment to see whether it is worth adopting, to see whether it is a just and fair amendment worth adopting for the sake of getting the business done. As a practical matter, that is about the only weapon available to an ordinary garden variety of Senator who has not been anointed with leadership, if he wishes to represent his people. That is the only practical weapon he has.

We cannot bring Senators to the Chamber and make them remain and listen to any other Senator, but if a Senator has unlimited time, the time will come when the majority leader and the minority leader will come around to look at his amendment—and they might even help him to have it adopted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first I thank the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for their kind remarks. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that when he looks at the majority leader and the minority leader he is looking at the real garden type or variety of Senator. We have been through this mill a good many times. We have tried to do things. Any other Senator can, in his wisdom, circumvent us—and sometimes they do.

The Senator from New Hampshire, as always, is acting in good faith. He has a real reason for desiring the time for which he has asked. I am delighted that it has been possible to arrive at an amicable settlement. I am only sorry we did not know about this previously, because had we known we would, of course, have avoided this situation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment and yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. As the distinguished majority leader knows, I wish to present a resolution concerning South Vietnam today, and I should like to oblige the majority leader with reference to his control of procedures. I should appreciate knowing at about what time, in the estimate of the majority leader, it may be possible to do so.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me, with reference to the question asked by the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. My able friend will remember that I consulted with him earlier this week. I have some comments to make on the treaty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I understand that they can be made at some time after conclusion of consideration of the pending business. I should like to be accommodated to that extent, and to make my comments when the pending business is set aside.

Mr. CHURCH. I anticipate that I shall need only about 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate will agree with the leadership in this matter, I believe we can accommodate the Senator. When the question was raised earlier this afternoon I was looking at the Senator from Idaho, with whom I discussed the matter earlier, at his request, and to whom I had given an answer in good faith.

I know that it is permissible under the rules to allow the Senator from Idaho some time during the course of the debate—say 10 minutes from the time on the bill—so that he can meet his commitment. In that way no Senator would be disadvantaged.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate that.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent that my name may be entered as a cosponsor of the resolution to be offered by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time for the call of the roll not exceed 5 minutes, before the time limitation on the bill goes into effect.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the modification of the unanimous consent agreement been entered?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has not been.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer put the request?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification of the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the modification is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason the quorum call is made at this time is that yesterday we informed the Senate that there would be one. I hope that, before the bells begin to ring and before the first Senator answers to his name, the attachés on both sides of the aisle will see that every individual Senator is called. I hope they will tell each Senator personally that his presence is needed—and that includes all Members of this body.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time allowed for the quorum call has expired.

The bill is now open to amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I yield myself 10 minutes.

The pending bill, H.R. 12, the Health Professions Education Assistance Act of 1963, was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 288 to 122 and approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a vote of 13 to 2. The legislation is soundly conceived, and I urge its passage in the Senate without amendment.

SUMMARY

The legislation would authorize a 3-year program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for the training of physicians, dentists, nurses, and professional public health personnel, as well as for optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists.

A total of $105 million for a 3-year period would be authorized for grants for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, nurses, professional public health personnel, and for optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists.

Thirty-five million dollars for a 3-year period would be authorized for grants for the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists.

Finally, $35 million for a 3-year period would be authorized for replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for all of the foregoing categories.

Matching grants would not exceed 50 percent, but in the case of new schools and for major expansions of existing schools, 66⅔ percent of the construction costs could be provided by Federal funds. For schools of public health, however, a ceiling of 75 percent would be established.

The legislation would also authorize a 3-year program of loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. Loans would be repayable within 10 years beginning 3 years following graduation. The rate of interest would be 3 percent per annum, or the "going Federal rate," on the basis of market prices of long-term Federal obligations, whichever is higher.

PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Needs in the fields of medicine and dentistry have been studied carefully in recent years by six major committees of eminent citizens from private life, including the Bayne-Jones committee, the Bane committee, and the Jones committee. All of these committees urged immediate steps to increase the Nation's output of physicians and dentists.

The testimony received by the committee indicates that the shortage of physicians is particularly acute in small communities and rural areas of the Nation. A study of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare points out that there were 145 physicians per 100,000 population in metropolitan counties but only 46 per 100,000 in isolated rural counties.

In all sections of the country we must now depend to a significant extent on foreign medical schools for physicians. Of the total number of physicians first licensed by the States to practice last year, 19 percent, or nearly 1 out of every 5, were graduates of foreign medical schools. Approximately 25 percent of the interns and residents on duty in our hospitals are graduates of foreign medical schools.

About 98 percent of these graduates of foreign schools are still not citizens of the United States; they are citizens of some foreign country.

Even to hold the present ratio of physicians and dentists to population, we must sharply increase the number of new students. We must increase the number of young people who enter medicine and dentistry from the present 12,500 to 19,000 a year. This will mean an increase in total medical and dental school enrollment from 46,000 today to 75,000 in 1970.

Since osteopathic physicians in some States account for a substantial share of the practicing doctors, it is essential that schools of osteopathy be considered along with schools of medicine in authorizing Federal aid for an expansion in capacity.

The American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Association of Dental Schools, and the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges support the Federal assistance proposed in H.R. 12 for the construction of teaching facilities for their respective professions.

PUBLIC HEALTH PERSONNEL

All government levels in the 50 States and the Federal Government are dependent upon the 12 schools of public health for adequately trained professional public health personnel. These 12 schools have an enrollment of less than 1,500 at present, but there is an urgent need to accommodate a minimum of 2,500 students at the present time. The needs in the future will be even greater. The committee is pleased to have received assurance from spokesmen for the 12 graduate schools of public health in this country that, if Federal assistance were available, they would seek to expand their training facilities to permit an increase of approximately 60 percent in the total number of students enrolled.

So if there is any one category of schools that needs Federal assistance, it is the schools that must provide for that type of personnel for all the States.

The American Public Health Association and the Association of Schools of Public Health support the Federal assistance proposed in H.R. 12 for the construction of teaching facilities at schools of public health.

NURSES

The need for an increased supply of all types of nurses is admittedly urgent, but the committee recommends that the formulation of a general program of support for nurse education be deferred until the committee has had the opportunity to evaluate the report, "Toward Quality in Nursing," prepared by the Eurich Committee for the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

However, one field in which there is clear evidence of a bottleneck is the limited capacity of the 167 collegiate schools of nursing which must provide the teachers and administrators required for the expansion of all types of professional and practical nurse training. The Eurich Committee has recommended that we double the capacity of collegiate nursing schools by 1970.

The committee, therefore, has included in the bill construction grants for collegiate schools of nursing which offer basic programs of nursing leading to baccalaureate degrees or advanced programs leading to a master's or doctor's degree.

The American Nurses Association supports the Federal assistance proposed in H.R. 12 for the construction of collegiate teaching facilities for nurses.

OPTOMETRISTS, PHARMACISTS, PODIATRISTS

Representatives of three other health professions—optometry, pharmacy, and podiatry—presented evidence of a decreasing supply of trained manpower in their respective professions. The committee has, therefore, included these three professions insofar as construction grants are concerned, but such grants will be made available only if the need for increased enrollment and the availability of qualified students in sufficient numbers to fill the new or enlarged schools to capacity is demonstrated.

STUDENT LOANS

The hearings have clearly demonstrated that even to maintain present ratios of physicians to population in the face of a rapidly expanding population, the number of physician graduates must be increased by 50 percent by 1975, and the output of dental schools must be doubled. The high cost of medical and dental education and the length of the period of study exclude many students well qualified intellectually to compete for admission to the schools.

A prospective physician or dentist must plan for a period of training that is both long and expensive. Following 4 years of undergraduate college work, he can expect an additional 4 years at medical, dental, or osteopathic school, and if he chooses to specialize he must spend another 2 to 5 years in a residency.

An average student who wishes to become a physician or a dentist must see his way clear to invest from $16,000 to $20,000 in his education. Thus, many able students from low-income families are precluded from entering the fields of medicine and dentistry.

The loans under the National Defense Education Act program are not well suited to the needs of medical and dental students for several reasons: First, under the National Defense Education Act a student may borrow not more than $1,000 a year, or $5,000 in total. The high cost of medical and dental education requires a substantially higher loan ceiling. Second, under the National Defense Education Act program loan repayment begins 1 year after completion of college education. Since medical students have a long period of postgraduate hospital training, the longer grace period allowed under H.R. 12 is more realistic.

The loans under the program proposed by H.R. 12 could not exceed $2,000 for any academic year and would be repayable over a 10-year period beginning 3 years after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at a medical, dental, or osteopathic school.

The Student American Medical Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Dental Association, the American Association of Dental Schools, the American Osteopathic Association, and the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges are among the organizations supporting the student loan provisions of H.R. 12.

In concluding, I would again urge the favorable consideration of H.R. 12 in the Senate that we may expand our capacity for training health personnel. This is a compelling need.

As we all know, we have added as much to our medical knowledge over the past 10 years as we previously have in the history of mankind. Unless we have the personnel to assure the practical application of our findings, however, our increased knowledge will avail us little.

Even now, we have evidences that our health needs are not being met as they could be. Let me cite some examples:

Cancer takes 75,000 lives each year that could be saved if all current knowledge about control, detection, and prevention were applied.

Heart diseases take 20,000 lives each year through rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease. All of these deaths could be prevented by early and intensive treatment.

Blindness could be prevented in the 20 percent of all cases that are due to glaucoma and diabetes. Both conditions can be easily detected and controlled if caught in time.

Infant mortality rates in the United States are higher than they are in 10 other major countries. We have 25 infant deaths per 1,000 live births while Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Australia all report under 20 infant deaths per 1,000 live births.

If we are to keep pace with the growth in population it is absolutely necessary that we take steps now to increase our capacity for training physicians, dentists, nurses and professional health personnel. I strongly urge the approval of H.R. 12 without amendment.

Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute so that I may answer a question of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator's position. I congratulate him on his statement. I wish to make it clear that his position with regard to the bill is that the adoption of any amendment, no matter how meritorious, might prejudice the passage of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. It was the very definite conclusion and determination of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the wise, practical, and compelling course was to pass the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, to get the basic legislation on the statute books, and then to consider amendments separately to the extent that we feel such amendments should be enacted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, amendments could be offered subsequently, if it were felt necessary to do so, but they should not be offered to the bill before us. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HILL. I yield myself 1 additional minute, so that I may reply to a question of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that there was some discussion in committee about the inclusion of optometry schools in the student loan provision of the bill, but that as it comes before the Senate now, such schools have been excluded.

I have been advised also that in the case of Illinois, Texas, and other States, quite a number of students could not take advantage of attendance at these schools because they did not have the necessary means to stay in the schools.

I also understand the distinguished Senator from Alabama has or will have a bill under contemplation very shortly, and that it is his intention to give expeditious consideration to that bill. Am I correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. It was agreed in committee that no amendments would be offered to the pending bill, and that we would try to have this basic legislation enacted into law, which we have been trying unsuccessfully to do for the past 12 years; and further, that forthwith, without delay, such amendments would be considered and expedited, to take care of students in the field of optometry.

I yield myself 1 more minute, so that I may reply to questions of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Can the Senator tell us what the vote was in the House on the pending bill?

Mr. HILL. The vote was 288 to 122.

Mr. COTTON. With that kind of vote, did the committee feel that it would jeopardize the passage of the bill in the Senate if there had to be a conference on it with the House?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the committee felt that if the proposed legislation were amended and it had to go back to the House, it would probably be necessary to go to the Rules Committee to obtain a rule to send it to conference. There might be, as a result, a great deal of delay, which might even encompass defeat of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator and I have been Members of the House of Representatives. It is not necessary to go to the Rules Committee to send a bill to conference.

Mr. HILL. Under the rules of the House, 1 objection on the part of 1 Member of the House out of the 435 Members will defeat a request that the bill go to conference, and it is then necessary to go to the Rules Committee.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HILL. I yield myself a half minute.

Mr. COTTON. If a technical amendment is made to a bill, that amendment has to be corrected in conference, unless unanimous consent is obtained for the correction of a technical error.

Mr. HILL. The correction of a technical error is in a different category.

Mr. COTTON. But it must go to conference, unless the error is corrected by unanimous consent. Does it not have to go to conference?

Mr. HILL. Not necessarily. Both Houses, by unanimous consent, could rectify the error.

Mr. COTTON. Yes. I can tell the Senator that he will not obtain unanimous consent. On page 3 of the bill there is a technical error, which I shall be glad to call to the attention of the Senator from Alabama. Therefore, the bill must go to conference, anyway.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to have the Senator point the error out to me.

Mr. COTTON. The Senate should be allowed to consider a justified amendment without having the threat held over it that it must take the bill as the House passed it, especially when there is already an error in it that must go to conference.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield, if I have the time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that 1 additional minute be granted to the Senator from Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was on the House committee which considered the pending bill in 1962. One of the things that we are trying to find out—and I wonder whether the Senator's committee gave it any consideration—was the amount of money that was available for assistance to students in medical schools in other legislation and bills, such as the vocational education bill, the National Defense Education Act, the proposals for Federal aid to education, and the other avenues of assistance. Did the Senator's committee go into that subject?

Mr. HILL. Yes. We considered those factors. One reason why the loan provision is important for students in medical and dental schools is that the loan provision under the National Defense Education Act does not accommodate itself to the needs of students in medical and dental and osteopathic schools.

Mr. DOMINICK. But the provisions are applicable to such schools.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but they do not meet the needs in those schools.

Mr. DOMINICK. Did the Senator's committee consider amending the National Defense Education Act, to meet those needs?

Mr. HILL. We did not consider that because that is a separate act. This proposal deals with additional personnel. This bill is the place for it. Here we are dealing with medical schools, dental schools, osteopathic schools, and other schools of learning. This is the place to deal with students, as well. The amendments would have to be the same, whether made to this act or some other act.

Mr. DOMINICK. Did the committee take into consideration the loan program of the American Medical Association?

Mr. HILL. The committee did so; and at some point in the debate, the Senator from Alabama expects to discuss that point. I am glad the American Medical Association has such a loan program; but I do not believe that that loan program meets the needs of the situation today. It is helpful; it will play a part in the provision for more doctors, dentists, and osteopaths; but it does not meet the needs as those needs must be met today.

DISCONTINUANCE OF AID TO DIEM REGIME IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous agreement, I yield 10 minutes—and 10 minutes only—to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the U.S. Government to uphold the independence of other governments struggling against Communist subversion. To this end, we have given massive and prolonged assistance to the present Government of South Vietnam, even though this country is small and as remote from us as any in the world.

As long as the Government of South Vietnam seemed willing to follow internal policies worthy of retaining for it the support and good will of the Vietnamese people, and as long as that Government pursued military policies against Communist infiltration which had reasonable prospect of success, the United States has given hugely of life and treasure to sustain and assist this Government in its self-defense. Over a hundred American lives have been lost and nearly $3 billion have been spent. Our outlays have continued to rise until there are now 14,000 American troops in South Vietnam engaged in an assistance program which is costing us more than a million dollars a day.

Our efforts have increased, the situation has worsened. The Diem regime in South Vietnam has adopted policies of cruel repression. We have been dismayed by its persecution of the Buddhists, who are in the large majority, by the desecration of their temples, and by the brutality of the attacks upon them. Too horrified to look, we have turned our eyes away from the sacrificial protests of Buddhist monks burning themselves alive on the streets of Saigon. Such grisly scenes have not been witnessed since the Christian martyrs marched hand in hand into the Roman arenas.

Neither an outraged world opinion, a special appeal from Pope Paul, nor our own indignant protests have prevailed upon the Government of South Vietnam to change its course. Instead, we have been denounced by the very members of the ruling family we have helped to keep in power, and arrogant demand has been made upon us to forsake certain Buddhist monks who have sought the sanctuary of our Embassy. To persist in the support of such a regime can only serve to identify the United States with the cause of religious persecution, undermining our moral position throughout the world.

The American people will not long tolerate continued support of a government which lives in total contradiction of those sacred principles for which our country stands. Among them, none is more central to our belief, or nearer to our hearts, or more fundamental to our national purpose, than that of religious freedom.

It is urged upon us that the Communist presence in South Vietnam requires us to support the Diem regime, regardless of how repugnant it becomes, and irrespective of its contemptuous refusal to respond to our entreaties. To accept such an argument is to concede that the great American Republic is no longer the master of her own course in South Vietnam, but has become the servant of the mandarin autocracy which governs there.

The loss of South Vietnam to communism would be deplorable, and particularly bitter after so long and agonizing an effort there, but, in the end, the country will fall victim to the relentless Communist penetration, unless the Diem regime abandons its policies of repression, or another non-Communist regime emerges to rally the people. The recent mass protests in the cities of South Vietnam demonstrate that there is a mighty reservoir of anti-Communist feeling which could yet give great popular support to the war against the Vietcong.

But a paralysis of will on our part will be as self-defeating as it is ignoble. The continued persecution of the Buddhists will condemn the Diem regime either to displacement by decent leadership, or to eventual defeat by the Communists. President Kennedy himself has acknowledged that, unless changes in policy and perhaps personnel are forthcoming, the present Government of South Vietnam will lose its war. The time for hard decisions is at hand.

Persecution of the Buddhists by the present Government of South Vietnam is an affront to the good conscience of the American people. If these cruel repressions are not abandoned, further American aid to this Government should be terminated, and American personnel withdrawn.

Accordingly, I send to the desk a resolution which reads:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that unless the Government of South Vietnam abandons policies of repression against its own people and makes a determined and effective effort to regain their support, military, and economic assistance to that Government should not be continued.

The resolution is submitted for myself and on behalf of 22 other Senators: the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the senior Senator from Kansasa [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may lie at the desk for a week to permit cosponsorship by other Senators. It is my hope that the resolution may then be referred to committee and that the Senate may soon thereafter act upon it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The resolution (S. Res. 196) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that unless the Government of South Vietnam abandons policies of repression against its own people and makes a determined and effective effort to regain their support, mili-

tary and economic assistance to that Government should not be continued.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I support the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] with regard to our foreign aid to South Vietnam. This resolution would put the Senate on record against such assistance until the South Vietnam Government regains the support of its people.

I support this resolution because I am alarmed at the way some of our foreign aid money is being spent.

In South Vietnam we are spending at the rate of more than $1 million a day for a government that publicly represses its own citizens and obviously does not have their support. Not only is this a poor investment, but it is a complete contradiction of our concepts of personal freedom and individual liberty.

I believe that foreign aid can be helpful in many ways in the battle against communism. It is particularly helpful when the government receiving our aid has the strong support of all its citizens. This is not the case in South Vietnam.

Therefore, we should make clear to the Government of South Vietnam that we will not continue to provide American dollars for military and economic assistance unless that Government makes an honest and determined effort to regain the support of its citizens, and can assure us that our assistance will benefit all the people of South Vietnam. A united country is our best ally in the worldwide struggle against communism.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCHOOLS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 13, it is proposed to delete "and" and insert in lieu thereof a comma, and on line 24, to delete the period and insert the following: "and (C) not discriminatory on grounds of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin in its admissions practices."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on this amendment, I yield myself 10 minutes.

May I ask the majority leader whether he desires that Senators be informed that the amendment is before the Senate for consideration? If so, the quorum bells could be rung for a minute, and unanimous consent could then be obtained to rescind the quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the limitation agreed to, there be a quorum call for 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for the quorum call has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I submit this amendment with the greatest reluctance. I am not happy about the need for it; but I offer it because I believe it is essential that such an amendment be offered to this bill, because it represents, in my opinion, one of the most callous disregards that I have seen of the obligations which Congress is entitled to have from the Government departments, in connection with a new program.

The pending medical education bill provides a new, much-needed program of assistance in the form of matching grants for construction of teaching facilities and in the form of loans for students. Two conditions are imposed for the receipt of such aid: The institution must be a public or other nonprofit school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health; and it must be accredited by a recognized body. I am proposing an amendment which would add a third condition for the receipt of Federal tax moneys which are collected from all citizens regardless of color: that the recipient institutions do not discriminate in admission of students on the ground of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin.

It should not have been necessary to submit this amendment, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should have expressed very clearly in the hearings before the committee, and, in response to my request, should have constantly reiterated to the Congress the exact policy proposed to be pursued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with this new program.

But it has not done that, notwithstanding requests, both oral and in writing.

Hence, we must ascertain for ourselves exactly what will happen if we pass this bill in its present form. Under these circumstances, and in view of the factual record I shall present to the Senate, there seemed to be no alternative but to submit this amendment.

I believe this is an extremely important bill. I am thoroughly devoted to it, and I want to see it enacted into law. But in connection with new programs, including the mental health program, about which I had to take a similar position, one must equate the equities according to one's conscience. So I believe that this desirable bill and the new program under it should be administered in accordance with the policies and laws of the United States and should not be used to support segregation.

Yet that is precisely what will happen in the absence of any assurance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare if we pass the bill in its present form.

Mr. President, there is a critical need for this additional statutory condition for two reasons: one, there exists intolerable discrimination in fact in admissions policy on racial grounds among the institutions to be benefited; and two, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, based upon its interpretation of other acts similar to this bill, would if it were passed in its present form, feel obliged to aid these discriminating institutions. Under these circumstances there is no alternative but to press this amendment.

The factual issue is an open record and a shocking one: of the approximately 87 accredited medical schools in the United States, at this time there are 6 which continue to maintain a policy of not admitting Negroes: the University of Mississippi, Baylor University, the Medical College of Alabama, the Medical College of South Carolina, the Medical College of Georgia, and Louisiana State University. This group represents the hard core of resistance to the desegregation trend which began in higher education long before the elementary and high school cases involved in the historic Brown against Board of Education decision in 1954, which ended the separate-but-equal doctrine.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. In the past, Baylor University has had no qualified Negro applicants, and thus has not admitted Negroes. But Baylor University is now open to Negroes, and will admit any qualified applicants.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very glad to have that assurance. Naturally, we have shown a sense of responsibility in checking the list; but it apparently has been impossible to get from Baylor University the information obtained from other universities in a similar status which also have not admitted Negroes—to wit, a statement that it would admit them. I would be very much pleased if the Senator from Texas would, at his convenience, obtain such a statement from Baylor University, and would have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TOWER. I shall be very glad to do so. I assure the Senator from New York that Baylor University is now open to qualified Negro applicants.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to have that assurance. We did check; and other universities in a similar position made declarations of policy that Negroes would be admitted if they were found to be qualified. At the time, that was not the case with Baylor. So I am delighted to have that assurance from the Senator from Texas, and I suggest that such a declaration would be most helpful to have.

Mr. TOWER. A number of the colleges in Texas which are privately supported and are open to Negro applicants, often have had no applications from Negroes for admission to graduate programs or professional programs of this sort. So the fact that no Negro is enrolled there at this time does not mean that there is discrimination there against Negroes, but only means that no applications from qualified Negroes have been received.

Mr. JAVITS. As I have said, we checked on this point, and tried to check it thoroughly. Of course, I accept the assurance of the Senator from Texas that he will obtain such a declaration from Baylor University and at an appropriate time will have it incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from New York. Of course, I wished to vindicate Baylor University.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Texas is doing more than vindicate Baylor University. Two years ago I submitted a similar amendment, and in that connection I referred to the policy of Johns Hopkins University, which then promptly changed its policy.

Mr. President, the object of these amendments is to get an open admissions policy. So if the Senator from Texas has obtained that from Baylor University, I congratulate him for having done so.

Mr. TOWER. I do not take personal credit for that. Baylor did it.

Mr. JAVITS. But it is being done, and I am delighted to know it.

Mr. President, a turning point in the higher education field was reached in 1948 with the decision in Sipuel against Oklahoma, in which the Supreme Court held that even under the separate-but-equal doctrine a State had an obligation to provide legal education for a qualified Negro applicant as soon as it did for applicants of any other group. Because the cost of establishing separate schools of higher education was so great, a number of States instead opened their universities and, since that decision, some 23 formerly all-white southern medical schools have been opened to Negroes, at least as a matter of announced policy: the University of Arkansas, the University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins University, George Washington University, Georgetown University, the Medical College of Virginia, the University of Virginia, Duke University, the University of North Carolina, Emory University, the University of Florida, the University of Miami, the University of Texas, the University of Oklahoma, the University of Missouri, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis University, the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt University, the University of Louisville, Kentucky, the University of Kentucky, the University of West Virginia, Bowman-Gray Medical School in Winston-Salem, N.C.

An even more widespread pattern of racial discrimination is presented in the field of professional nursing schools, which would also benefit from this bill. The Public Health Service estimated in its testimony on the bill that approximately 243 collegiate schools of nursing would be covered by the new program. The Committee on Careers of the National League for Nursing published a pamphlet entitled "Schools of Professional Nursing 1962" which lists all schools of nursing and designates those which admit Negroes.

Mr. President, we find that in this day and age, this pamphlet used a special code—the letter "N"—to refer to the schools which do admit Negroes. In other words, on the list, the names of the schools which do not admit Negroes are not followed by the "N." The pamphlet includes the following definition:

> SCHOOLS ADMITTING NEGRO STUDENTS
>
> The symbol "N" indicates schools which accept Negro students in all States except Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington. These six States have fair educational practice acts which make illegal the practice of discrimination in educational institutions.

Of the 243 collegiate schools of nursing which would be benefited under the bill, 32 are designated as not admitting Negroes. They include collegiate nursing schools in the following States: Alabama, where there is one such school; Florida, where there are nine; Georgia, where there are five; Louisiana, three; Mississippi, three; North Carolina, three; South Carolina, two; Tennessee, two; and Texas, four.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], I very much hope that he will look into the nursing school situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

According to the authoritative digest of schools which I hold in my hand, the list shows that of the 32 schools—out of 243 covered by the bill—there are 4 in Texas which do not admit Negroes. We shall give the names of those schools to the Senator. They are contained in the pamphlet to which I have referred. I know that the Senator would wish to have a look at that situation himself, whatever conclusion he might come to.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. It should be noted that the pamphlet lists approximately 1,100 schools of professional nursing of all types and among those which are not now covered by the bill—because they are hospital-connected, not college-connected schools—the percentage of schools designated as not admitting Negroes is even higher than that which I have shown above. It should also be noted that in testimony on the bill the Department stated that it intended to extend the program at a later date to the hospital-connected schools.

Thus even without regard to all the other types of school which would be covered by the bill, the medical and nursing school patterns alone show significant discrimination problems as a matter of plain fact. The even more insidious problem, of racial and religious quotas in schools which do not openly maintain a policy against admission, must be added to the equation, too.

The second major point is that, although there is an abundance of legal authority to the effect that executive departments and agencies have not only the legal right but a constitutional duty to withhold Federal funds from segregated or discriminatory activities, and although most of the departments and agencies acknowledge that right and duty in connection with most of their activities, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, along with the Department of Agriculture, refuses to acknowledge such power. In April and May of this year, along with Senator PHILIP A. HART, I sent carefully prepared letters to each of the departments and agencies asking whether they believed further legislation was necessary in order to prevent the use of Federal funds in violation of the Constitution in the programs administered by them. On July 10, 1963, I placed the answers I received in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and analyzed them; in almost all cases the answer was that sufficient authority already exists to cut off such funds.

But the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will administer this new program, did not answer and at this point has still not answered the policy question. They have recently stated, in a letter to me, that in various programs which they administer they believe they do have such authority and are exercising it. As to the remaining programs they are silent. However, in testimony this year before a House subcommittee on a bill to cut off Federal funds under existing educational programs from segregated institutions, the Department's spokesman quite clearly stated that the Department feels it must pick and choose between statutory language in different acts which it administers—in some cases the statutory language suggests to them that they have no discretion as to the way in which the funds are used and in some cases it suggests the contrary. The crux of the problem, apparently, is the very kind of language which again appears in this new medical education bill in section 726, which prohibits interference by the Federal Government in the administration of any institution. It is just this sort of language which the Department has repeatedly relied upon in refusing to exercise what many legal experts believe is firmly based upon constitutional authority—the right to deny funds to segregated institutions. And the Congress would again, at this momentous time in the civil rights struggle, set the clock back by letting stand this same language in the new program which is now before the Senate and failing to make its intentions clear with regard to it.

I think the Department is completely wrong as a matter of law in its interpretation of this language, because the bill provides that they shall not interfere in the administration of an institution if they are giving aid. But we are talking about whether they shall give aid at all. If they deny aid, they are not interfering in any way. Nevertheless, this completely false interpretation of law—and I make that statement advisedly as a lawyer of considerable experience—persists in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Therefore, if we are to make clear the intention of Congress in this particular case, that we will not accept an administration of the statute which will pay money to aid discrimination on racial grounds, the only way we can do it is by so declaring in the law itself, because of the position taken by this particular Government department.

Mr. President, I have asked the Department to state its position. If it has any position other than that which we glean from its testimony on a number of other statutes and from its testimony before this particular committee, it should say so.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare dated September 5, asking the question specifically, which has had no reply, notwithstanding a number of oral requests that it should be replied to in advance of this date, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

September 5, 1963.

Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In the discussion on H.R. 12, the bill to provide for a program of aid to increase the opportunities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported favorably, the question arose of possible discriminatory admissions practices by some institutions which would be eligible to participate in the program.

Does the Department have a record of medical and health educational institutions which practice discrimination?

Can your Department provide assurances that it will administer the program in such a way that Federal funds will be withheld from educational institutions which discriminate on the basis of race or creed in their admissions practices?

Since H.R. 12 will come before the Senate very soon, a prompt reply will be appreciated.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I should like to answer two arguments, if I may. It will be said that we will take care of this whole matter in due course when we pass a generic bill to deal with the authority of Government departments in this connection as part of the omnibus civil rights bill. The difficulty with that suggestion is that we are now initiating a totally new program. It is not a program that is on the books at the present time. It is a program in which the Government department concerned will take no position now, thus leaving us to the very clear implication, I believe, that it intends to take a brand new program developed today and administer it contrary to the policy laid down by the President. The President has made very clear his policy that there shall be no use of funds of this character to aid discrimination on racial grounds.

I do not think that in good conscience we can allow a statute to go out from the Congress providing for a new program which we know will be administered in violation of policies of the United States, without stopping to change the situation.

The second point is the very obvious one that we do not know what will happen to the omnibus bill. We may have to rely upon that bill with respect to existing programs. One might argue that such an amendment is less pressing with respect to an ongoing program. But the proposal before the Senate is a brand new program. The question is whether, with the civil rights situation as incendiary in the country as it is today—we all know that it is the No. 1 domestic issue, not only of policy but of public order—we have no right to appropriate or authorize the appropriation of large sums of money for totally new programs that we know will be administered in aid of segregation.

Finally, no one is more sympathetic to the bill than I am. The point has been made that, if the amendment were agreed to, the bill would be killed. This is an administration bill. I cannot understand why the President of the United States cannot get from the head of his own Government Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a declaration of policy as to how the bill would be administered, since it is an administration bill, but would rather run the risk of having it killed if a civil rights rider is put on it. That is beyond my understanding. It seems to me that such action imposes a duty upon people like myself, who feel seriously and deeply about this subject at a time like the present in our Nation's history, to bring the issue forward in the Senate in the way I have done.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am prepared to make my motion to table.

Mr. JAVITS. Before the Senator makes his motion, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the consciences of many of us have been deeply troubled by motions to table the amendments of the Senator from New York. For some years I have supported his amendments to specifically put into the statute provisions against discrimination on the ground of race, creed or color. Every time that he has offered such amendments, it has been said that if they are adopted, our friends from the South will prevent the bill from going into effect. I am in favor of the bill. I intend to vote for it.

At some time this implicit blackmail must cease. We should find out if the representatives of the South will refuse these measures—which, incidentally, are largely designed to help them—merely because there is to be no discrimination.

Second, it would be most interesting to establish the probability as to what would happen if aid were withdrawn.

We must deal with this question at some time. Prior to the Civil War Members of the Senate postponed acting on these issues in the hope that if they did not act the problem would go away. It did not go away.

I congratulate the Senator from New York for the patience and courage with which he has pursued this subject. I express the hope that many of us from the North who say we believe in civil rights on this occasion will vote with him.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

As I understand, the Senator from Montana will move to table the amendment. As that is rather quick and episodic, I ask the majority leader to join with me in requesting the yeas and nays on the motion which he will make.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are on the same old treadmill we have trod five or six times this year. All I can do is offer the same threadworn arguments, because they are as good now as they were when first offered. If Senators wish to have the bill passed, they will vote to table the amendment of the Senator from New York. If they do not want the bill passed, they will vote to uphold the position of the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana to table the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DODD. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are absent on official business to attend a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 157 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Long, Mo.
Long, La
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—37

Aiken
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McIntyre
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Prouty
Proxmire
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—24

Allott
Anderson
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Dodd
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Gruening
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
McGee
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Pearson
Randolph
Ribicoff

So Mr. Mansfield's motion to lay on the table Mr. Javits' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to appeal to Senators to remain in the Chamber, certainly until the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] has submitted a very important amendment. He will discuss it, which will not take too long, but there will be a yea-and-nay vote on it. Under the unanimous-consent request, he would be entitled to a live quorum call. I think Senators can save themselves much time if they remain in the Chamber to hear his presentation of the amendment and for the vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I second the statement made by the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendments numbered 192. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments may be dispensed with, and that I may be permitted to explain it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] are as follows:

On page 21, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"(f) Where any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists, then 10 per centum of the total of such loans, plus accrued interest on such amount, which are unpaid as of the date such practice begins, shall be canceled thereafter for each year of such practice, up to a total of 50 per centum of such total, plus accrued interest thereon."

On page 21, line 14, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)".

On page 21, line 19, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)".

On page 21, line 25, strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)".

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the suggestion of the majority and minority leaders. I shall try to live up to their statement that this is an important amendment.

This is an extremely important matter to a large number of people. No Senator has said he did not believe in the amendment. It merely provides that, in the case of loans under the bill, which are to go to those who are studying medicine, after graduation and after they are admitted to practice medicine if any of the physicians or dentists are willing to practice their profession in counties and sections of the country which are certified by a proper and appropriate health official of a State as being in need of a physician they shall be forgiven 10 percent of the loan and the interest on 10 percent of it each year during which such a physician remains, up to a period of 5 years. Therefore, if he should remain in the county for 5 years, he would be forgiven 50 percent of the loan. That is the limit. If he does not remain, he is forgiven for such time as he does remain.

The amendment is exactly the same as the provisions contained in the National Defense Education Act for the training of teachers. This is exactly the same provision that applies to teachers who have received loans and who are willing to teach in elementary schools where there is a scarcity of teachers.

Strange as it may seem, and although we may not realize it, in this Nation there are 99 counties in which there is not 1 resident physician. None of those counties are in my State. However, there are large areas in certain parts of my State, notably in the northern part, where there are many towns and hamlets in which a physician is not obtainable for 25 or 30 miles.

In the little mountain village in which I was born and reared, I have seen poor people struggle to get a resident doctor. Senators would be amazed at the sacrifices those people have made. They raised money and bought the old railroad station when the railroad line gave it up. They remodeled the old station into a suite of offices for a doctor, and they equipped it with X-ray machines, and made it into a medical center, and then constructed a modern apartment above it, rent free.

In addition, they have paid a bonus from time to time, in order to keep a young doctor there. Ultimately the doctors go off to larger cities. I suppose it is to be expected. I am not trying to tell Senators a sob story, but I have seen a case of a woman with a coronary condition put into an automobile and driven 25 miles to the county seat, to a hospital, and arrive there dead, because there was not a doctor within 25 miles to administer the immediately necessary treatment which might have saved her life. That is not an isolated case. There are many similar cases.

As I said earlier, with perhaps more emphasis than I should have used, we would not stand for that situation with respect to people who live in Pakistan, India, Burma, Turkey, or Brazil. This great Nation would send hospitals and doctors and technicians and nurses to take care of them. The people in need of these services live in many States. They are small in number. They cannot stage great demonstrations. If we want to talk about civil rights, here is something that goes further than that. This is a case of human rights, of human needs, of life and death.

Incidentally, the same provision was contained in the House bill, but was taken out of the bill in the other body. It was taken out of the bill with two other provisions. They provided that physicians and dentists who, after graduation, are inducted into the armed services, or who are employed by a Federal or State health service, should have the same forgiveness of a percentage up to one-half of their loans. I believe the other body very rightly took those provisions out of the bill.

We are confronted with a different situation. The other people go there of their own choice. They earn a living, and they risk nothing. However, a young doctor who is willing to get his experience in the way that I have demonstrated is in a different category. I am proud of the medical schools in my State, and I have great sympathy for it. However, there is a tendency in the medical schools to send young doctors to the big cities, to clinics, and into laboratories, to become specialists.

I wish the medical profession would spread out. It does not do a young doctor any harm to learn something about human nature and human suffering for a few years, at the start of his medical career.

My amendment leaves out of the bill the last two provisions in the House bill, and merely provides that physicians and dentists shall have this privilege if they are willing to practice in communities where the appropriate State authorities say there is a desperate need for them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I correctly understand the Senator's amendment, it merely allows the same privileges to doctors, to go to communities where there are not adequate medical services, that are allowed to schoolteachers who go to communities where their services are needed to teach in schools.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are small rural communities in my State which make almost unbelievable sacrifices in their efforts to obtain a resident physician. The State has recognized this situation by allowing scholarships in our great medical college at Augusta, Ga., to physicians who have practiced in rural communities for 5 years.

So I believe the Senator's amendment has great merit, and I shall be glad to support it.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his excellent amendment. My State has many communities where a doctor is not available in a radius of 30 or 40 miles.

I have had a constant problem, year after year, in trying to help small communities to try to find doctors. My hometown, having a population of about 1,000, has had to depend, for the most part, on doctors from Canada. Many small cities in my State have to rely on Canada for doctors, despite the fact that year after year young men, some of them from my hometown, are graduated from medical schools and have gone on to become noted physicians and surgeons. Naturally, their desire is to go to the biggest centers to practice; but there is a great need for doctors in the smaller communities.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I am in deep sympathy with the purpose of the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. My father and late mother resided for years in a small town, having a population of 800, but were not able to obtain the services of a resident doctor. It was some time before it was possible to obtain a resident dentist.

Also, it has been my observation, because I have come in contact with many doctors and dentists in small communities having populations of 500, 800, 1,000, or 1,500, whose annual income is quite good; it is better than the income of many of their counterparts in the larger cities.

I am wondering about the equity of permitting the forgiveness of a loan for someone who will be producing a large income, as most of them probably will be able to do. I should like to see something done to encourage the location of doctors and dentists in small communities. My reaction was that perhaps instead of providing a windfall as a means of attracting doctors and dentists to the small communities, a provision might be included in the bill to make certain that preference would be given to loan applicants who agreed to enter private practice in such areas as the Senator from New Hampshire has set forth in his amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I understand and sympathize with the logic of the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. However, the Senator from Alabama might perhaps be justified in saying that such a proposal would jeopardize the bill, because such a suggestion would be opposed. I know it would be opposed by many medical schools and would raise a controversy that does not now exist.

Many young doctors are admitted to practice when they graduate. They like to marry early and become located. A sacrifice must be made. If they spend even the first 3 or 4 years of their lives in rather remote or rural communities, their incomes will be small. From long and bitter experience, I have learned that for even the 2 or 3 years they spend in a small town, the rewards are well worth the sacrifices made to obtain their service.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to comment on that point. I am sure the Senator is aware that some communities, in order to obtain the services of a doctor or a dentist—particularly a doctor—go to a considerable expense in providing an office, and—even a clinic.

Mr. COTTON. I have just described that procedure.

Mr. MILLER. To me, that means that in such situations we would add to that contribution the forgiveness of half of a loan. It sounds to me as though it would be a windfall. I am not certain that I followed the Senator's statement when he said that if we changed the loan provision to give preference to students who agreed to locate in rural areas, that would cause some of the difficulty. I wish he would explain that point.

Mr. COTTON. I shall do so. I promised the Senator that I would present my amendment expeditiously.

The bill provides $31 million during a span of 3 years for the loans. My amendment would mean the diversion of the use of only a very few thousand dollars. I am talking on behalf of the people who need this assistance. I do not want to embark on some rather hopeless quest when there is a prospect of obtaining this amount of money.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I am aware of the need for this amendment. I intend to support it. Some of the 99 counties to which the Senator referred are in my State, although I do not know exactly how many.

This has been a constant problem for me and, I am sure, for my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and also for our colleagues in the other body who come from Kentucky. We are frequently asked to have physicians deferred from military service, or discharged from the armed services, if they will agree to return to one of the small communities. We are asked to have the visas of some of the exchange professional people in the field of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry extended.

In my State, unlike the situation which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] stated obtains in his State, the small towns cannot, notwithstanding the fact that a clinic may be furnished, obtain enough doctors, because they go to other areas. In many of the towns or county seats in what we call the "pauper" counties half the people are on relief today. What could they pay a doctor or a dentist? Very little. In my State there are county seats in which doctors and dentists are being paid in kind—paid with corn, potatoes, or something of that kind.

I intend to support the Senator's amendment. I think his point is well taken.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. Following what the Senator from Kentucky said, I read in the press several months ago that a number of physicians who were refugees from Cuba were in Florida. Within a week of the time that small news item was published, I received letters from at least a dozen communities in my State, asking me to get busy and see if one of those Cuban doctors could not be obtained for my State. I had to reply that it would be some time before the Cuban doctors could be granted licenses to practice, and there would be a long delay. That shows the need for medical assistance in the small communities.

The only objection I have heard advanced to this provision has been it was included in other bills, in other years, and the entire bills failed. I discussed this question with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], of whom I am fond, and who has always been most kind to me, as he is now. He would do anything he could to help me, as I would to help him. We serve together on the same Subcommittee on Appropriations.

I urged him to accept the amendment. He said, quite sincerely, that he regretted that he could not do so because, as he said on the floor of the Senate earlier today, the bill must be passed exactly as it passed the other body; otherwise it would go to conference and might have to be returned to the other body, where the whole bill might fail. I am glad the Senator from Alabama did not say it was a question of time or delay, because we shall have time enough for conferences. However, that was the reason the Senator from Alabama gave me, and he said that was the reason why his committee unanimously insisted that the Senate pass the bill word for word, line for line, and section for section, as it passed the House, and not change the dot of an "i" or the cross of a "t."

But the vote on this bill in the other body was 288 to 122. That is more than 2 to 1. My amendment provides, at a smaller cost, for a greater need than any other amendment that could be offered. I cannot bring myself to believe that the House of Representatives would reject a bill that passed by a vote of 288 to 122 merely because it included an amendment to satisfy a crying need. But if it would, I cannot help asking—and I do not say this to challenge anyone—What has the Senate come to if we cannot include in a bill something that is right, fair, not costly, and satisfies a crying need? Why must we take a bill just as it comes from the other body because, it is said, something may happen to it? Has something gone out of the traditions, the strength, and the potency of the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator from New Hampshire asked for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to his amendments?

Mr. COTTON. Not yet. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I join in the request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I find myself in considerable sympathy with the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire. Many years ago, when I was on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I proposed a similar amendment in connection with the bill for medical colleges. It is my present disposition to vote in favor of the adoption of these amendments.

I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not think me impertinent if I make an inquiry—which of course he is privileged to disregard—namely, if his amendment were adopted, would he vote for passage of the bill as thus amended?

Mr. COTTON. Yes. I intend to vote for the bill, regardless of whether my amendments are adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. I am glad the Senator from Illinois asked that question.

I believe this program is much needed. So the bill is a worthy one; and my amendment is not offered in any sense as a stumbling block. I do not believe it will be regarded as such by either the Senate or the House.

I believe that the Senator from Iowa has offered a very constructive suggestion; but the Senator from Alabama and his committee might well be justified in feeling that if we add a complicating amendment to the bill, its enactment will be endangered.

However, this amendment was in the House bill. Although I do not know all the circumstances, my guess is that this one provision went out with the other two, which I believe the House was amply justified in rejecting.

In closing, Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the minority leader for their consideration. If I was too impassioned earlier today, when I discovered that the Senate had entered into a unanimous-consent agreement which I thought would limit my opportunity to place my cause before the Senate, I beg their forgiveness.

I appreciate the courtesy of Senators in listening to me. With all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Alabama and his committee, I sincerely hope the Senate will not turn its back on people who literally are suffering and dying—that statement is not an exaggeration—and that there will go out from the Senate the assurance that we are willing to help the small numbers of people in remote communities; that we do not respond only to the great pressure groups; and that we will not hesitate to help those in the remote communities because of fear of what the House of Representatives will do—particularly in view of the fact that the House of Representatives has, by an overwhelming vote, shown its support of the bill. I cannot believe that the Members of the House are so fickle that they would change their opinion just because of the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HILL. I very much regret to find myself in disagreement with the Senator from New Hampshire. He and I serve together on the Committee on Appropriations. At the present time, I happen to be chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and he is its ranking minority member. We have very close relationships and we work very close together. He is always most considerate and most helpful.

As I have said, I hate to have to oppose the amendment; but the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am chairman, considered the matter of amendments, and reached the conclusion that it should oppose all amendments and should seek to have the bill passed in the same form in which it was passed by the House of Representatives. One of the main reasons for that decision by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was the fact that we have had this proposed legislation before us for many years. I can recall that some 12 years ago—in 1951—when the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] had charge of this proposed legislation, after it was reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he stood on this floor and made a brilliant fight in an effort to get that bill passed by the Senate. But it was not passed; and for 12 years it has not been passed by either the House or the Senate, or, because of complications following its passage by both bodies, its enactment has been impossible.

Mr. President, there is a compelling need for more doctors and dentists in the United States. Nineteen percent of all doctors licensed to practice the past year in the United States were graduates of foreign schools. Probably many of them were not citizens of the United States. Today, one out of every four doctors serving as interns or residents in hospitals in the United States, is a graduate of a foreign medical school.

Committee after committee, starting in the Truman administration, and three committees in the Eisenhower administration—some six altogether—have studied this problem. Each has strongly recommended, in its reports, that we make provision for more doctors and dentists, that we take steps to help our existing medical and dental schools, and also that we take the necessary action to bring about the establishment in the United States of more medical and dental schools.

The problem is to pass this basic legislation now. It is in our power to pass this bill in the form in which it was passed by the House. It will then go to the President of the United States, for his signature; and after he signs it, it will be on the statute books. Then we shall have enacted this basic program, and we shall then be in a position to propose any changes or any amendments that we see fit to propose.

But if we adopt an amendment, and send the bill as thus amended to the House of Representatives, we must realize that—meritorious though the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire may be—that amendment was rejected by the House of Representatives.

Personally, I would favor his amendment if it were in the form of a bill on this subject. But the compelling thing is to get this great new program on the statute books, rather than to encounter delay and perhaps defeat. Certainly if we now adopt an amendment to the bill, it will have to be returned to the House; and that action will cause interminable delays, if not final defeat, for—among other difficulties—a rule would have to be obtained from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. President, we need to enact this bill now.

I assure to the Senator from New Hampshire that if he will introduce his amendment in the form of a bill, I, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will do everything in my power to get that bill reported from that committee and placed on the Senate Calendar; and I have the assurance of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] that if the bill is placed on the calendar, there will be no intentional delay in getting it expeditiously considered by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. My time is limited, but I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one else in Congress has done as much as the Senator from Alabama has done in the cause of public health. I well remember the struggles we had in 1951 to pass the Pastore bill.

Is it not true that the opposition to the Pastore bill to give aid to medical schools, to enable them to train additional doctors, came primarily from the American Medical Association?

Mr. HILL. It has been some 12 years since that event, and I do not now remember whether the opposition then was much different from some of the questions which have been raised now, to be frank about the matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But is it not true that the American Medical Association was then the chief opponent?

Mr. HILL. I would say that the American Medical Association certainly had no enthusiasm for that bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the older and richer medical schools opposed it because they felt it would create new medical schools which would train new doctors?

Mr. HILL. I do not recall; but I do know that the Association of American Colleges strongly supported that bill, just today as the Association of Medical Colleges strongly supports this bill and urges its passage. Witness after witness came before the committee to urge the passage of the proposed legislation in the same form in which it passed the House. They asked that there be no amendments or changes. They asked only that the proposed legislation be placed on the statute books and that this great program be started now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of what is the Senator from Alabama afraid should the bill return to the House of Representatives? Is he afraid that the American Medical Association would kill the bill?

Mr. HILL. I shall not engage in speculation or the drawing of indictments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of what is the Senator from Alabama afraid?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Illinois knows that time and again the Senate passes legislation and it dies in the other body. Also, the House has passed legislation which has died in this body.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. At times legislation goes through with lightning speed. Will the Senator from Alabama be frank? Where does the opposition to the Cotton amendments come from? The amendments seem to me to be eminently sensible.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will look at the record of the debate and consideration of the bill in the House, he will see that the provision contained in the Cotton amendments went out on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but who caused its removal?

Mr. HILL. The House of Representatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who was behind the action of Members of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HILL. It would not do for me to engage in speculation of that type.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is one of the most sophisticated Members of this body.

Mr. HILL. That provision went out on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Senator can draw on his own imagination.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Alabama deny that the American Medical Association had a part in eliminating that provision?

Mr. HILL. I honestly do not know. I heard that it was eliminated. The record will show that it went out on the floor of the House of Representatives. Who had what part and who had some other part I do not know. The record shows that that provision went out on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to pass the bill. Let us not endanger a program that we have been working and fighting for, and which has been urged all these years, by adopting amendments now. Let us pass the bill. That was the sense of the committee. The committee carefully considered the matter and urged that the bill be passed as it was passed in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HILL. I will reserve that time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 52 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. I shall use 2 minutes. If the Senator from Alabama desires 2 or 3 minutes, I shall give him that much time. I will give him anything in the world if he will only support my amendment.

I hope that Senators who represent small towns in their States will not be deluded by the statement, "If you do not get something today, introduce it in a separate bill and some day we will do something for you."

I wish I had $100 for every time in the 17 years that I have served in the House and the Senate when I have had some smooth, sincere, lovable party leader say, "Oh, no. Wait a minute. Don't tie that provision to this bill. Introduce it as a separate measure and I will help you."

I cannot remember a single instance when that approach has been effective. I urge the younger Members of this body, never to be deluded into voting against something that they believe in today on somebody's promise that they will get action next year.

If the bill is passed without amendment, and I should introduce my amendment as a separate bill, I know that the Senator from Alabama would keep his promise. He is a man of great integrity. He would report the bill from the committee. Then it would die on the calendar of the Senate or the House, or expire at the end of a Congress.

That is not sensible. The only way a Senator can obtain consideration for some of the people in our country who are not represented by powerful lobbies and are not members of great pressure groups is to tie the provision to some bill that will be passed.

I wish to correct one erroneous impression. I was told, "The House threw out that provision." I repeat that the House did not throw out this provision alone. In the House the bill contained a provision for forgiveness of the loans of young physicians and dentists who are in the armed services and those who are working for public health associations and agencies, either Federal or State, and the House was justified in throwing out those provisions. The provision contained in my amendment went with it.

I have information from my friends on the other side of the Capitol—and I do not have many influential friends anywhere, but I have even some Democratic friends over there—that the House will accept the amendment, because it is cognizant of the need.

We are proud of our medical schools; but I urge the Senate to include in the bill something for those who need help so badly—$200 million would be authorized in the bill—I ask for only a few thousand dollars for certain communities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I regret that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has so little faith that at another time perhaps his idea would be accepted. I proposed an amendment in the committee and then withdrew it. It would have included optometrists under the loan provisions. I withdrew the amendment because the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], assured me that it would be considered separately. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama at this time whether what I have said is not the fact?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. Of course.

Mr. HILL. It is the understanding of the chairman and the members of the committee that the committee will give expeditious consideration to the proposed amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and report that amendment. I have talked with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He has assured me that when that bill comes up, it will have expeditious consideration and action on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the saying true—"Faith, hope, and charity, but the greatest of these is faith?"

Mr. HILL. "Charity."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have faith.

Mr. HILL. Faith removes mountains and subdues kingdoms.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have faith in my friend from Alabama. I have complete charity and love for him.

But I have very little hope. Of course, he will consider the proposal. Of course, he will do all he can for it. He is a man of his word. We shall obtain consideration. But I point out to Senators that in my 17 years of experience, the thinnest soup I ever ate was consideration. What we desire is action; and if we do not get it today in the consideration of the bill before the Senate, we will never get it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. One part of the Senator's amendments troubles me somewhat. I would appreciate it if the Senator would address himself to that subject. The amendment provides that a person may qualify for forgiveness if he practices in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists. Is there any standard throughout the country, or would there be competition between health authorities in the various States for the establishment of numerous areas in their own States which could take advantage of that provision? I can see broad latitude as to what individual States might do under the wording of the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. The interpretation of the language would be such that it would have to be very clear to the Federal Department administering the loans that the State agency whose word was being taken was the correct agency. If there were any competition in that regard, or any failure of a State to select a certain agency, the Federal Department would have to wait and insist that the question to be settled before the State would be eligible for a loan.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator interpret the language—and I would appreciate it if the chairman of the committee also would address himself to this point—as making it possible for a Federal administrator of the program to deny this privilege when it is felt that a State has improperly found a shortage of physicians to exist in a particular area? I may be mistaken, but as I interpret the provision, the Federal authorities would have no such power and would be bound completely to act upon the finding by the State health authority, which might be administered one way in New Hampshire, another way in Alabama, and a third way in New York. It seems to me that might lead to some abuse.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New York is a much better lawyer than I. I should say this language would not confer power on the Federal Government to pick and choose. The Federal Government, in administering the loans and granting the forgiveness, would have power to act, but it would be extremely reprehensible if the Federal agency did did not wait until the State had completely determined the agency involved, if there were a conflict between authorities. The State, by its Governor, or legislature, would have to make that crystal clear. This is the authority on which the Federal Department should rely.

Mr. KEATING. I agree.

Mr. COTTON. The reason for the wording of the amendment, first, is that this is the way the provision was worded in the House bill; and, second, it is precisely the same language provided under the National Defense Education Act with regard to teachers. So far as I know, there has been no difficulty in the administration of that act.

Mr. KEATING. I do not remember that teachers to be eligible for forgiveness under the National Defense Education Act were required to teach in specific areas.

Mr. COTTON. The provision applied to elementary schools.

Mr. KEATING. My difficulty with respect to the wording of the amendment is that the health authorities in New Hampshire might say that every area in New Hampshire had a shortage of physicians, while in the State of New York it might be said only two villages had a shortage of physicians. The standards might be quite different. This might lead to authorities in some States taking action to accord forgiveness based on their own set of criteria when really they were not entitled to do so. That is my fear about the language.

Mr. COTTON. I have confidence in this regard, particularly in a situation of this kind. The medical schools in the State will have their eyes on it. With due apologies to the Senator from Illinois, the medical associations will have their eyes upon it. The legislatures of the States will know where the help is going. I have confidence, when the decision is left to the appropriate authorities of the State, that there are sufficient guiding factors, and a sufficient conscience in every State, to see to it that the program is not abused.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to surrender the remainder of my time, so that the Senate can vote, if the Senator from Alabama will do likewise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The Senator said that he did not want consideration, but wanted action. What I have sought to give the Senator is action by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also action under the leadership of the distinguished majority leader in the Senate.

The Senator has faith in regard to House action on the bill. The Senator says the House will accept his amendment. The fact remains that the provision went to the floor of the House. It was rejected by the House of Representatives.

If the Senator has faith, if the Senate passes his amendment in the form of a separate bill, according to his view and his faith, he need have no worry about what the House will do. So let us have action now and start this great program, which is so compellingly needed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this particular provision was not eliminated by the House. It was a part of a much more far reaching provision.

Second, the other body has indicated overwhelmingly, by a vote of more than 2 to 1, that it wants this bill. I say that we can have this bill and also have this just provision.

As to whether we should wait to pass the amendment in the form of a bill, losing the force and drive involved, though I do not doubt that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished majority leader will bring the bill to the Senate—and perhaps the Senate will pass it—I merely ask the Senator whether he has heard that there is to be consideration of a civil rights measure pretty soon.

The curtain will be coming down soon as to what can be done in the Senate, and Christmas Eve will be too late for me to get some help for these people.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield back his remaining time?

Mr. COTTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute from the time on the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to corroborate what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare said. I honor him as a man of his word, as I honor every other Senator. When the Senator says he will do something, he will do it.

So far as the majority leader is concerned, if the bill is introduced and later reported by the committee and placed on the calendar, it will be given as speedy consideration as possible.

There are other factors involved, as the Senator from New Hampshire has brought out.

Before the vote is taken I wish to state that if the Senator's amendment is agreed to, that will be it; but if the amendment is not agreed to, the pledge will still hold.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business to attend a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 158 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Morton
Mundt
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—43

Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Clark
Dodd
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Long, Mo.
Long, La
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
Miller
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—18

Allott
Anderson
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Eastland
Engle
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
McGee
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Pearson
Ribicoff

So Mr. COTTON's amendments were rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], I send an amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, beginning on line 13, it is proposed to strike out everything down through line 25 on page 24, as follows:

"PART C—STUDENT LOANS

"LOAN AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 740. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to enter into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund in accordance with this part with any public or other nonprofit school of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry (as defined in section 724) which is located in a State and is accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B).

"(b) Each agreement entered into under this section shall—

"(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by the school;

"(2) provide for deposit in the fund of (A) the amounts allocated under this part to the school by the Secretary, (B) an additional amount from other sources equal to not less than one-ninth of amounts deposited pursuant to clause (A), (C) collections of principal and interest on loans made from the fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

"(3) provide that the fund shall be used only for loans to students of the school in accordance with the agreement and for costs of collection of such loans and interest thereon;

"(4) provide that loans may be made from such fund only to students pursuing a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, or doctor of osteopathy, and that while the agreement remains in effect no such student who has attended such school before July 1, 1966, shall receive a loan from a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and

"(5) contain such other provisions as are necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States.

"LOAN PROVISIONS

"SEC. 741. (a) Loans from a loan fund established under this part may not exceed $2,000 for any student for any academic year or its equivalent. In the granting of such loans, a school shall give preference to persons who enter as first-year students after June 30, 1963.

"(b) Any such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine, but may be made only to a student in need of the amount thereof to pursue a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, or doctor of osteopathy.

"(c) Such loans shall be repayable in equal or graduated periodic installments (with the right of the borrower to accelerate repayment) over the ten-year period which begins three years after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at a school of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry, excluding from such ten-year period all periods (up to three years) of (1) active duty performed by the borrower as a member of a uniformed service, or (2) service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act.

"(d) The liability to repay the unpaid balance of such a loan and accrued interest thereon shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if the Secretary determines that he has become permanently and totally disabled.

"(e) Such loans shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, computed only for periods during which the loan is repayable, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, or the going Federal rate at the time the loan is made, whichever rate is the greater. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'going Federal rate' means the rate of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury specifies during June of each year for purposes of loans made during the fiscal year beginning on the next July 1, determined by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market quotations or prices during the preceding May on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by rounding off such estimated average annual yield to the next higher multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(f) Loans shall be made under this part without security or endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required.

"(g) No note or other evidence of a loan made under this part may be transferred or assigned by the school making the loan except that, if the borrower transfers to another school participating in the program under this part, such note or other evidence of a loan may be transferred to such other school.

"(h) Where all or any part of a loan, or interest, is canceled under this section, the Secretary shall pay to the school an amount equal to the school's proportionate share of the canceled portion, as determined by the Secretary.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 742. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out this part $5,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $10,200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $15,400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any academic year ending before July 1, 1966, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be allotted among loan funds at schools which have established loan funds under this part.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall from time to time set dates by which schools with which he has in effect agreements under this part must file applications for allotments to their loan funds.

"(2) If the total of the amounts requested for any fiscal year in such applications exceeds the amounts appropriated under this part for that fiscal year, the allotment to the loan fund of each such school shall be reduced to whichever of the following is the smaller: (A) the amount requested in its application or (B) an amount which bears the same ratio to the amounts appropriated as the number of students estimated by the

Secretary to be enrolled in such school during such fiscal year bears to the estimated total number of students in all such schools during such year. Amounts remaining after allotment under the preceding sentence shall be reallotted in accordance with clause (B) of such sentence among schools whose applications requested more than the amounts so allotted to their loan funds, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the total allotted to any such school's loan fund from exceeding the total so requested by it.

"(3) Allotments to a loan fund of a school shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Secretary determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the loan fund at such school.

"DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS FROM LOAN FUNDS

"SEC. 743. (a) After June 30, 1969, and not later than September 30, 1969, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the loan fund established under this part by each school as follows:

"(1) The Secretary shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1969, as the total amount of the allotments to such fund by the Secretary under this part bears to the total amounts in such fund derived from such allotments and from funds deposited therein pursuant to section 740(b)(2)(B).

"(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the school.

"(b) After September 30, 1969, each school with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this part shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the school after June 30, 1969, in payment of principal or interest on loans made from the loan fund established pursuant to such agreement as was determined for the Secretary under subsection (a).

"LOANS TO SCHOOLS

"SEC. 744. Upon application by any school with which he has made an agreement under this part, the Secretary may make a loan to such school for the purpose of helping to finance deposits required by section 740(b)(2)(B) in a loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Such loan may be made only if the school shows it is unable to secure such funds upon reasonable terms and conditions from non-Federal sources. Loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate sufficient to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Arizona yield to himself?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The minority views on the pending bill were submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and myself. They are printed at the conclusion of the committee report, and I believe they speak for themselves.

I should like to refer briefly to the minority views. The amendment would strike out the section providing for the student loan program. The inclusion of the student loan program in the proposed legislation presupposes that many young men and women desiring to enter the field of medicine are prevented from doing so due to lack of financial resources; that there are no private programs in existence to lend assistance to young people in need and thus it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to make available low interest loans.

In order to relieve the financial burden of students and to attract more of them to medical school who might otherwise be deterred for financial considerations, the American Medical Association instituted a medical education loan guarantee program.

It is our contention that the American Medical Association program is adequately taking care of the problem, and that we should not now enter the Federal Government into this field.

The Senator from Texas and I—and I believe I speak for him also—do not preclude the idea that it might become necessary in the future to provide for Federal Government assistance. I should like to read from the hearings before the Subcommittee on Health a description of the AMA loan program. It appears at page 95 of the hearings, and is as follows:

> Loans are made to students through normal banking channels. For each approved loan the AMA's Education and Research Foundation countersigns the borrower's note. This serves as a surety that the loan will be repaid since the foundation agrees to buy any defaulted note at face value plus accrued interest. To demonstrate its ability to perform under this contractual agreement, the foundation agrees to place on deposit guarantee funds equal to 8 percent of the credit extended to borrowers. Criteria for eligibility under this program were established according to our evaluation of the facts available when the program was planned and inaugurated. These criteria are subject to review from time to time and are not inflexible. For example, it was determined that a ceiling of $1,500 per year should be placed on extent of borrowing by any one medical student, intern or resident. It is believed that this amount represents that proportion of a trainee's annual direct education and essential living expenses that we can reasonably expect him to finance through loan sources. Over a 7-year training period, we have limited the total principal which may be borrowed to $10,000 from this loan source and $15,000 for educational purposes from all loan sources. While we have no immediate plans to alter these limits, we are prepared to do so if future conditions warrant it.
>
> To build the loan guarantee fund, contributions have been sought from America's physicians, medical organizations, and private industry. This phase of the program has been so successful that we would like to emphasize that at no time has an applicant who met the minimum qualifications described above, been denied a loan. Our experience leads us to expect that substantial and adequate contributions to the guarantee fund will continue since donors have indicated their willingness to contribute whenever need for their assistance is made known to them.
>
> Powerful incentives for contributors are found in their realization that each donated dollar releases $12.50 in total credit, and in the fact that these dollars are not exhausted but return to work again after the original loans are repaid, to assist others who experience financial hardship during their medical training years. Also worth noting is the added incentive to contributors provided by the enterprising and self-reliant attitude of the young people who demonstrate their desire to be responsible for themselves in financing their education.
>
> We have, of course, experienced a small percentage of rejections, principally because the applicant could not demonstrate the need for funds or wished them for purposes other than to meet essential training or living expenses. For every 100 applications, on the average, 94 have been approved for loans.

I do not believe it has been clearly shown that the loan program is needed in Federal legislation. Should the time come when it appears to be needed, I believe both the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and I will be glad to take another look at it.

Mr. President, to date, after 18 months of operation of the AMA program, 7,904 loans have been made to students in 84 medical schools, and interns and residents in training in 504 hospitals, with the average loan amounting to $1,120. Less than 7 percent of all applications have been rejected, and the principal reasons for rejection were that funds were to be used for purposes other than the pursuit of a medical education or for meeting the direct expenses relating thereto.

We are discussing an expenditure of $30 million. It is an amount of money that does not seem to be large in these days of rather exorbitant expenditures. Nevertheless the $30 million would add to our deficit troubles.

It would be much wiser for Congress to allow the American Medical Association program to be given a thorough trial.

I invite the attention of Senators to the important part of the bill, which is the authorization of funds for the construction of medical schools. I have had some personal experience in this field. A son-in-law was trying to enter a medical school. After trying 18 schools, he was finally able to get into one. Our problem is not the inability of a young man to be financed in a medical school, although I admit that this does happen in some cases, and that is why the AMA has established its fund. The principal reason for our problem in educating doctors in the categories of interest covered in the bill is that we do not have the necessary physical facilities in the schools to provide the education.

Medical education seems to be the most expensive education that a college can engage in. I am sure I speak for the Senator from Texas also—and if I am not, he can correct me—when I say that we do not object to the building part of the bill, but that it is unnecessary to support the student loan program at this time.

I have nothing more to say on the subject. Our proposal is simple. The AMA is already taking care of the problem, as are also other groups, such as foundations. Therefore, we do not understand why the Federal Government should engage in a $30 million program, when the money could be used to better advantage in other areas.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my voice to that of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I served in the House on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1962, when this question was raised. This proposal was considered at considerable length. Originally, the bill provided grants to students in medical schools. The bill before the Senate would shift the practice to loans. However, the bill never passed the House.

The whole purpose of the program to provide loans to students, as I understand—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—is to provide incentive to attract more and better qualified persons to the medical schools. It becomes very plain, if anyone wishes to examine the table on page 93 of the hearings, that this motive is no longer valid. The students who apply for admission to medical schools today are applying in large numbers, and the numbers are increasing. The quality of the applicants is as high as anyone could possibly hope for.

In addition to the American Medical Association fund, which is available for loans to students at this point, funds are also available, as was developed in my colloquy with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], under the National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation.

At present, the Federal Government is spending $710.2 million in only four departments of the Government to help graduate-level activities in the educational and medical field. The Federal Government is providing a vast amount of funds already. When a group in excess of 94 percent of the applicants who qualify under the program is obtaining loans from the Government, I cannot understand why we should begin this type of program, particularly when the Nation is in a desperate budgetary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator from Arizona have expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes more.

Mr. DOMINICK. It might be worthwhile to include in the remarks of the Senator from Arizona or my own remarks a table which appears on page 93 of the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The table points out the conclusion of the American Medical Association that there is no present likelihood of a decline in the quantity or quality of medical school applicants.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table entitled "Data on Quantity and Quality of Applicants to American Medical Schools, 1952–63" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Data on quantity and quality of applicants to American medical schools, 1952–63*

Year (1)	Verbal ability (2)	Quantitive ability (3)	Modern society (4)	Science (5)	Number taking medical college admission test (6)	Total number of applicants (7)
1952–53	493	492	493	491	14,744	16,763
1953–54	494	495	501	499	13,227	14,678
1954–55	491	493	506	501	[1] 13,188	14,538
1955–56	497	496	503	490	[1] 14,340	14,937
1956–57	496	494	502	485	14,871	15,917
1957–58	500	487	502	482	15,063	15,791
1958–59	499	499	497	488	14,606	15,170
1959–60	504	497	505	494	14,468	14,952
1960–61	503	501	506	500	13,962	14,397
1961–62	509	510	501	507	13,973	14,381
1962–63	515	506	517	509	15,435	15,847

[1] Estimated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Arizona that the American Medical Association is opposed to the bill as a whole?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I understand that the American Medical Association favors the passage of the bill. The association does not believe it is necessary to provide student loans, because it is already providing what appear to be adequate funds. I refer the Senator to the statement of Dr. Norman A. Welch, on page 91 of the hearings. Dr. Welch is president-elect of the American Medical Association, and indicates the feeling of the association toward the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the intention of the Senator from Arizona or his associates to offer amendments to eliminate the loan feature?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is what my amendment would do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator offered such an amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; it would eliminate the loan feature. The bill does not cover the internship or residency—a very important part of a young doctor's education.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator from Arizona has made an able presentation. I associate myself with his remarks. I further point out that in at least two-thirds of the States many county medical schools also provide special funds for this purpose. Also, State and local agencies in many States provide such loan opportunities. The American Medical Association's loan fund is not the only one in operation; others more local in character are proliferating throughout the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The tables to be found on page 76 of the hearings indicate that, since 1950, the number of medical schools has risen from 79 to 87. In that time, the enrollment has risen by approximately 5,000.

In osteopathy, there is one school fewer than in 1955. Today there are five, as compared with six in 1950–51.

The enrollment in schools of osteopathy has dropped approximately 300.

In 1950–51, there were 42 schools of dentistry; today there are 43. Enrollment in schools of dentistry has risen, roughly, by 2,000.

Referring to the table on page 93, the number of applicants taking medical college admission tests in 1952–53 was 14,744. The number taking such tests in 1962–63 was 15,435; and the total number of applicants has decreased since 1952–53.

So if what we find in the explanation on pages 93 and 94 of the hearings is correct—and I think we must accept it as correct—the number of students applying for admission to medical schools has risen substantially.

As the Senator from Colorado knows, the University of Colorado has a reciprocal agreement with other colleges in the Rocky Mountain area which requires the very highest of grades. If there are grades higher than straight A's, they would be required for admission to the Medical School of the University of Colorado. This is also true of other colleges in the West; and I believe it holds true all over the country.

This indicates that the quality of the applicants is improving, and that we may expect both quality and quantity to remain at a high level.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been impressed by the number of individuals and organizations contributing to the American Medical Association guarantee fund, which is referred to on page 107 of the hearings.

Are not the loan provisions set forth in the bill an inducement to continue the program for many years after the need for brick and mortar has been met, if the bill passes in its present form?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I can only call upon my relatively short experience in Congress and say that I have yet to see a program ended. I suppose that at the end of 3 years, the program would be extended for 3 more years. Not only would the program cost the Government $30 million for the first 3 years; it would probably cost a great deal more in the following 3 years. The interest to be paid on the money would be supported, in part, by the taxpayers. So, in effect, the taxpayers would be supporting a program which is already being financed by private enterprise.

Mr. CURTIS. Among those taxpayers are students who are working their way through college, their parents, and others. Is that not correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CURTIS. How many States have seriously undertaken to build facilities needed for schools and have found it impossible to proceed because they do not have the funds?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe I can answer the Senator's question. I can cite one State, my own State of Arizona. Arizona authorized the construction of a medical school a year and a half or 2 years ago, and is just now embarking on a fund-raising program. I think the money can be raised, although it will be difficult to do so.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. This question was considered in the House at the time when I was a member of the House committee which considered this program. At that time, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said that 20 new schools were needed in the seventh decade—that is, the decade between 1960 and 1970. It was reported that by early 1962, 7 of the schools had been financed fully, either through State or local or private contributions, and that at the time of the hearing 18 more were under negotiation. That included participation by private institutions in the great State of Arizona, as well as some additional work in Colorado.

It is interesting to note that since the Federal program was considered and engineered, very little progress has been made in trying to complete the remaining 18, because they are all waiting for the Federal tax funds to come into their laps.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In what areas of the country could such schools not be built if this program were not enacted?

Mr. DOMINICK. None, that I know of.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In reply to the question, let me say I doubt that that could be documented in any way. I have made a similar attempt to document the ability of the States to provide more adequate education at the elementary level; and we get involved with local tax practices, county tax practices, and State tax laws. So it becomes an impossibility. We have had no testimony to that effect.

I would say a great deal of foundation money is available for this type of construction. It is not the easiest kind of money to get. But it is available; and inasmuch as we have authorized the establishment of foundations for that purpose, I believe we should exhaust that possibility before we provide for Federal aid.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe the Senator will agree that once we embark on a Federal program and make it available for some, we must make it available for all. That is just a matter of practical politics.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am aiming my recommendation, of course, at the student aid program.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suspect that once it was established, it would be continued. But I see no need to establish it when there are now available adequate programs, both those under the American Medical Association and those of a more local nature.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HRUSKA. Will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Ten minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there are two distinct questions before the Senate in connection with this bill. One concerns financial aid for the construction of new medical training facilities and expansion and improvement of existing facilities. This is the so-called "brick and mortar" section. The other revolves around the necessity of another student loan program.

I am keenly sympathetic with the faculties, administrators, and alumni of colleges and universities in their efforts to provide adequate facilities for training aspirants to the medical professions. The rapid increase in applicants to fill an even faster growing need for doctors is a persuasive argument for expanding existing facilities and for building new ones.

I support this portion of the bill because of the problems that threaten to overwhelm our colleges and universities soon in providing adequate training facilities.

The majority report accurately notes that the need for more practitioners in the healing arts have been well studied and well documented over the past several years. There can be no serious argument about the fact that our expanding population simply requires more and better trained physicians, dentists, nurses, public health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists.

The need is particularly acute in my own section of America and in my own State. The Nebraska Legislature has sought to meet its own responsibility by appropriating proceeds from a special levy to assist the University of Nebraska in its dental college construction program, contingent upon provision of Federal funds.

The University of Nebraska and Creighton University in Omaha would benefit by passage of the construction sections. The administration and friends of these institutions have expressed a keen interest in H.R. 12.

The proponents of this legislation are unfortunately asking us to accept the bad with the good by tacking on the student loan provision. Ostensibly this loan plan appears to be a $30.7 million program, scheduled to last 3 years. Actually, it is a $61.4 million program with a life of 6 years. The American Medical Association estimates that it will cost at least $17 million to administer. The AMA should have a pretty good idea of the cost of such a program; it has successfully operated its own loan program for 18 months. This estimate was based on the fact that the program would last only 3 years and cost only $30.7 million. Obviously it would cost a great deal more to administer $61.4 million for 6 years.

A need for a program under such terms and conditions simply has not been adequately demonstrated.

About the strongest argument that could be mustered was that a physician starting his practice in debt would "place great emphasis on the income aspect of practice." Aside from the obvious superficiality of this idea, one must ask, Would he not have the same debt whether he borrowed the money from the Government or from a fund such as the American Medical Association's?

As the minority report points out:

> H.R. 12 would require the individual to begin repayment of his loan during his internship or residency, when his income is very low and his expenses, if married, are high. In contrast, a student borrower under the AMA program has the advantage of deferring repayment until he is either in private practice or teaching; in either case his income will be well in excess of that earned as an intern or resident.

Any student in need of financial assistance can obtain it from numerous sources. A release this week from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare contains a statement that the Department has paid out $800 million to strengthen American education at all levels since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act on September 2, 1958—just 5 years ago. This amount was spread throughout 1,534 colleges and universities to assist approximately 490,000 students.

Not all of this money was spent on students aspiring to the medical profession, but a substantial part of it was. And, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is not the only Federal agency helping to finance college students. A recent report of the House Committee on Education and Labor, entitled, "A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loan, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States," indicates that 20 different agencies of the Federal Government were making student loans as of 1959, the last year reported on. These 20 agencies spent $2,413,186,000 on student aid.

Of these agencies, several were and are presently engaged in aiding medical students. In 1 year the Navy Department's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery assisted 679 students with $2,850,000. The Veterans' Administration, through its Department of Medicine and Surgery, used $17,277,000 in assisting 18,300 students, in that same year.

Reference has already been made to the American Medical Association's medical education loan guarantee program. In the past 18 months 7,904 loans have been made to students in 84 medical schools and interns and residents in training in 504 hospitals.

There are, of course, numerous other scholarship and loan programs spread throughout the country.

Until we provide the additional facilities contemplated by parts A and B of this bill, I do not think we can make a sound determination that those facilities will go begging for students. It will take a certain number of years to construct these new facilities. In the meantime if we keep the student loan provision in this bill, we shall be providing assistance to students who are trying to get into institutions that are already overcrowded. This does not seem to be a sound way to approach the problem.

I hope the Senate will take the logical course and delete the student loan provisions from this bill. It will be a vast improvement.

Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in support of the Senator's argument, I should like to point out that actually the number of doctors in proportion to the population is increasing.

The number of first-year medical students has risen from 7,177, in 1950, to 8,298, in 1960; to 8,642, in 1962.

The number of medical school graduates has increased from 6,135, in 1950, to 6,994, in 1960; to 7,324, in 1962.

More first-year licenses are being issued. There were 6,002 in 1950, and 8,005 in 1962.

Last year, the physician population was increased by 4,500 based on the number of licentiates, minus the number of deaths. In 1950, the increase was only 2,208.

This shows that the number of physicians is growing, while the ratio of patients to doctors is diminishing, largely because there is a slightly declining birth rate in this country. If this continues through 1970, we shall have 207,500 doctors, which would actually mean 147.8 physicians per 100,000 people. So that is a very favorable ratio.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Texas for this information.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and in support of all parts of the bill.

The pending amendment deals with the very heart of the bill. I cannot understand how any Senator can say more doctors are not needed in America or that it is not necessary to expand the graduate facilities. I recall that one of the first responsibilities assigned to me in 1951, when I first came to the Senate—in December 1950—and became a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was to be in charge, on the floor, of the bill which had to do with grants in order to expand the graduate facilities.

I need not tell the Senate what happened to that bill. It was very vigorously opposed by the American Medical Association. As a result, the bill was recommitted; and that is about where it has stood until this proposed legislation has come before us.

I know from my own experience that we have had to recommend to young men who wish to become doctors that they study in medical schools in countries to which we are giving foreign aid, because in their own country there was no place for them to study. If any Senator wishes me to document that fact, I can document it in detail.

Today, a very good amendment was proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire. It is regrettable that, because of the timing, we could not accept it.

Much of the trouble in the rural communities arises from the lack of a sufficient number of doctors.

The medical profession is not competitive enough. That is one of the causes that plagues our society today.

I hope that the bill will pass.

I strongly support H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. I urge my colleagues to give it the same overwhelming and bipartisan support it received from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of this Senate.

The legislation before us is part of the President's health program and its enactment is absolutely essential if we are to keep faith with our people in securing for them an adequate recruitment of trained health personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HILL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Alabama had better give me 4 minutes. The way I am going, I may need that amount of time.

Mr. HILL. I yield 4 additional minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. In 1970, our population growth will demand an increase by 50 percent in our physician and dentist graduates by that time.

This is no new enthusiasm for me. In my freshman year in this Senate I sponsored and floor managed a similar measure, the Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1951. It perished by a recommitment vote. Through the years I have continued, with many of my colleagues, to support legislation to permit an expansion of our training capacity of health personnel.

We are closer today to success than we have ever been in the past. The House has passed H.R. 12 by a resounding vote. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has approved it without amendment. I urge that this Senate now pass it without amendment so that it can go directly to the President for his signature.

Federal funds have been of enormous benefit in strengthening and expanding medical research. Federal matching grants have stimulated programs for the construction of health research facilities, hospitals, and other health facilities. But in the crucial area of medical and dental education there is no such Federal support now available.

There is no doubt that the availability of Federal funds for medical and dental education can produce the same dramatic effects which such funds have brought about in the case of medical research, hospitals, and other health facilities.

My own State of Rhode Island is 1 of the 11 States that does not have a medical school and 1 of the 24 States that does not have a dental school. But we do have plans to establish a medical school at Brown University and I know that the enactment of H.R. 12 would greatly assist us in construction through the matching grant provisions and in the recruitment of qualified students through the loan provisions.

I commend to your attention at page 305 of the Senate committee hearings on H.R. 12, the statement on the Brown University program by the distinguished president of that university, Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney. It is a clear exposition of our needs and our schools' readiness to cope with the crisis in medical education.

I could cite many evidences of the shortage of health personnel but I know we are all familiar with the shortage in our respective States.

The family physician today is usually a general practitioner. But specialists in internal medicine and pediatrics often serve in this capacity. In 1950, there were 1,300 people in the United States for each family physician—general practitioner, internist, pediatrician. By 1960, the number had risen to 1,700 per family physician. The present outlook is for something like 2,000 per family physician by 1975.

I would conclude these remarks by bringing to your attention the closing words of the President's message on health:

> Good health for all our people is a continuing goal. In a democratic society where every human life is precious, we can aspire to no less. Healthy people build a stronger nation, and make a maximum contribution to its growth and development.
>
> This national need calls for a national effort—an effort which involves individuals and families, States and communities, professional and voluntary groups, in every part of the country. The role of the Federal Government, although a substantial one, is essentially supportive and stimulatory. The task is one which all of us share—to improve our own health, and that of generations to come.

It is true that the American Medical Association has a loan program. But what do they charge? They charge 6½ percent interest. That is how generous they are.

I urge Senators to defeat the amendment. The bill is for a better America. The bill is designed to help professional America. The bill will help a great many of our young people who desire to become doctors and dentists to be trained in their professions. It will see them through an education period. To do what? Not to have the money by grant, but to be able to borrow the money. They must prove the need. They must show a need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one-half minute?

Mr. HILL. I yield one-half minute.

Mr. PASTORE. After the students have obtained their education they must pay back the loans.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. I hope that the Senate will pass the bill as it was recommended by the committee.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health. The Senator from Alabama has contributed more to the advancement of public health and public medicine in the United States than any other man now living. I thank him for his kindness in yielding a few minutes to me.

In the few months that I have been a member of the committee, I have diligently supported measures for the advancement of medical education in the United States. To buttress what has been so ably said by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, I point out that even the American Medical Association is supporting the bill.

As shown by the report, last year 19 percent, or nearly one out of five doctors licensed to practice in the United States, were graduates of foreign medical schools. In previous years, 1958 and 1959, out of 8,000 licensed to practice, 6,300 were graduates of American medical schools and 1,700 were graduates of foreign medical schools.

The disadvantage is that the European medical schools and, to a greater degree, other medical schools, have a different pharmacopoeia from that of the United States. In those countries different drugs are prescribed for the same ailment from those contained in the stock of the normal American drugstore or pharmacy. A doctor trained in a foreign country has to learn in the United States what kind of drugs are prescribed in the American practice for the same results. They are obtained from different places. They have slightly different effects on human beings. The operating technique is different in foreign hospitals from what it is here. The technique in foreign hospitals is slow and methodical. They do not pay as much attention to shock. In American hospitals great attention is given to shock and to the care of a person to relieve him from pain. There is a difference of technique. One discovers that is true when he talks with doctors who have practiced both here and abroad.

The need of any society for medical care is too obvious to warrant discussion here. Adequate medical care is as basic a human need as food, clothing, and shelter.

The question which faces us in connection with the consideration of H.R. 12 is, What will be the needs for medical care in the next decade, and what steps are we going to take to meet these needs?

The Senator from Rhode Island has stated the percentages. Basically, in 1950, there were 1,300 people for each practicing physician. By 1960, there were 1,700 people for each medical doctor. By 1970, at that rate, there will be over 2,000 people for each practicing doctor in the country.

The answer to the question I posed is that medical needs will increase greatly in the near future. Demand for medical care is, in general, already straining our present capacity to provide such services, and the imbalance will become greater in the future unless steps are taken to deal with the problem directly.

More medical manpower is needed. Hospitals can provide for the prevention and treatment of illness only through the hands of trained medical personnel. The training of doctors, nurses, and dentists depends primarily upon three factors: An adequate teaching faculty, adequate teaching and research facilities, and intelligent and properly motivated students. The provisions of H.R. 12 deal with the latter two of these three factors.

CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHING FACILITIES

Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified before our subcommittee that just to keep pace with population growth will require a 50-percent expansion in the number of physicians in training by 1975 and a 100-percent expansion in dental school enrollments. Twenty to twenty-four new medical schools and an equal number of dental schools will thus be needed in the next decade.

It is not possible to expand medical classes as a law class might be expanded. Medical classes must be kept small, in order to afford proper training in surgery and other techniques. So, while it might be possible to enlarge a room for a class in economics, in the case of a medical school new personnel are required.

Such a huge increase in medical and dental school capacity in a period of 10 short years will require an unprecedented effort. The financial outlay will be staggering. Medical schools are expensive: $10 million for basic science facilities and $15 million if a new teaching hospital is required. Such an outlay is beyond the means of most universities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from Texas 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Therefore, Mr. President, the problem boils down to two ingredients. On the one hand, an investment in teaching facilities is unquestionably needed. On the other hand, the private organizations which would ordinarily provide the funds for such an investment cannot by themselves afford the outlay. Therefore, it is both appropriate and necessary that the agent of the people—the Federal Government—provide the requisite financial resources for this program, the purpose of which is to benefit the people.

I will give a specific example, from my own State. A medical school is badly needed in San Antonio, which is the 17th largest city in America. It is in the southern part of our State. There are 1½ million Spanish-speaking people there.

The people of San Antonio voted for a $5 million bond issue to build a new medical school. The Legislature of the State of Texas has already appropriated $6 million more, in cash, this year, to add to the amount available.

We have heard that it requires about $20 to $25 million to build a medical school. The bill under consideration would provide either a 50–50, or a two-thirds, or a three-fourths matching. For a conventional medical school it would be a 50–50 matching. That would provide $11 million more, under the terms of the bill, to reach the $22 million necessary to build the medical school at San Antonio.

It takes the combined unified help of all three governments—city, State, and Federal—working together, to build a modern medical school for the needs of modern medical teaching and research. This practical example illustrates the impetus this bill would give to our lagging—in numbers—medical education.

STUDENT LOANS

There is a strange paradox at work in our educational system. The financial expense involved in becoming a doctor or a dentist is the highest that exists for any profession, yet the financial assistance available to such students is just about the lowest.

Testimony before our subcommittee revealed that last year 9 out of every 10 high-ability students in the biological and physical sciences received stipends, but only 4 out of every 10 high-ability medical students. Only 33 percent of the first-year medical students and a small percent of the dental students received any kind of scholarship stipend. This compares with 53 percent of the first-year engineering students, 67 percent of the students in the biological sciences, and 70 percent of the students in the physical sciences. In the face of this paucity of financial assistance, the cost of 4 years of college, 4 years of medical school, 1 year of internship, and 2 or 3 years of residency will generally run in excess of $20,000.

The estimate stated before the committee was that $30,000 is a more reasonable figure as to the costs to be incurred by a young man who seeks a medical education.

These figures make it perfectly clear that if our supply of trained medical personnel is to meet the demand which will be generated in the next decade, then there must be an increased amount of financial assistance available to students in the medical professions. Non-Federal loans, such as those available through the National Defense Education Act student loan program and the American Medical Association loan guarantee program, make a valuable contribution. Yet these alone will not suffice to meet the need, since borrowing under the National Defense Education Act is limited to $1,000 a year and interest payments on the AMA program, including refinancing, run as high as 8½ percent.

This is the only matter as to which I have a slight difference of opinion with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has again expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if careers in the health professions are not to be limited to the sons and daughters of the wealthy, a substantial amount of low-cost loans must be made available.

PROVISIONS OF H.R. 12

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act would provide a constructive program of student loans and of grants for the construction of teaching facilities to enable the health professions to expand to meet the demands of the coming decade. One hundred and seventy-five million dollars is authorized for the construction of new medical schools and the replacement and rehabilitation of existing facilities over the next 3 years—$30.7 million is authorized for a 3-year student loan program.

Mr. President, of all the problems we face today the problem of providing adequate health care to our expanding Nation is one of the most basic. All our efforts in other areas will have gone for naught if, upon their being realized, our citizens are not in a state of physical health to enjoy the freedom, justice, and prosperity for which we are working.

Therefore, Mr. President, I strongly support H.R. 12. I have earnestly supported this legislation for medical education in past sessions of the Congress. I had hoped that the pending bill would be more extended as to time, and more liberal with grants than it is. I had hoped that there would be a forgiveness provision for part of the student loan, if the young graduate practitioner would practice for a few of his early years in a rural area without such healing art service, or in a city slum area, similarly disadvantaged. I had hoped that the loans to medical, dental, and osteopathic students could be extended to students of optometry and podiatry. The House bill does none of these things, but I will support the House bill as is, in the hope that a long deferred beginning may be made, and that needed extensions might be made in future years.

At a time when we are spending over $50 billion a year on defense, on weapons which destroy life, $69 million a year is a woefully small amount to spend on training for the preservation of life.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am happy indeed to have come before the Senate a bill to extend Federal assistance to education to which I can give my wholehearted support.

It so happens that I was one of the coauthors of the bill referred to by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] which was recommitted in 1950. That bill was coauthored jointly by me and by the late eminent Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft. After the bill was introduced the Senator from Ohio did something he did not often do; he changed his mind. He so stated on the floor of the Senate, and moved to recommit the bill. That was done.

I have long felt that the Federal Government has a direct responsibility in this area because of the large numbers of doctors being drawn from the civilian life of this Nation to administer to the needs of those who serve in the armed services. That was behind my support and authorship of the bill in 1950. Doctors were being taken away from the people. The rural areas were being stripped—a situation to which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire related.

Incidentally, I supported the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire; and I believe the Senate made a mistake when it failed to adopt the amendment.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to the people, when it draws those with certain skills into the armed services—particularly in such a vital area as this—to do something to replace those who are taken.

There is an unusually small population per doctor in the armed services. In my opinion, the difficulties we are encountering because of a shortage of doctors largely result from the fact that the Government drafts doctors and dentists. Those are the only skills in the Nation which are subject to a draft.

Every young doctor who is physically qualified must serve at least 4 years in the Armed Forces. We tried to keep the doctors in service by paying them more than was paid to other officers of equal rank, but no scheme we have been able to devise has worked. We have been compelled to continue the draft.

Unless we are seized by the euphoria of which we hear so much and disband our Armed Forces, for many years to come a vast reservoir of medical talent and skill will be required in the hospitals of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. I feel that the Federal Government has a direct responsibility to the people to make good the resulting deficiency.

I shall vote against the amendment and vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. I realize that Senators wish to vote. I shall not detain the Senate long.

The statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia was emphasized before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill, with the loan provisions, was strongly urged upon the committee by the Student American Medical Association, the American Association of Medical Colleges, the American Dental Association, the American Association of Dental Schools, the American Osteopathic Association, the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges, the American Public Health Association, and the Association of Schools of Public Health.

Under our American system, those are the people who have the direct responsibility for educating, training, and preparing the doctors, dentists, and medical men who are so badly needed.

There is no group that could speak with greater authority or more compelling reasons than the associations which I have just named.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am a little puzzled. I heard the Senator from Arizona say that the American Medical Association was opposed to the loan features. Now the Senator from Alabama is quoting the American Medical Association in support of the bill.

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator from Alabama did not quote the American Medical Association in support of the bill. The Senator from Alabama referred to the Student American Medical Association, which is composed of students who are now in medical schools throughout the country, those who are undergoing the ordeal and carrying the burden of trying to educate themselves to be doctors and physicians for the American people.

As I stated earlier, every prospective student of medicine or dentistry can expect to invest in his education—he must invest in his education—according to all the testimony before our committee, between $16,000 and $20,000. The high cost of education has eliminated many talented young men and women from entering the health professions.

Today, only 12 percent of American families have an annual income of $10,000 or more. Yet we find that this 12 percent of the families must supply some 40 percent of the medical and dental students.

Much has been said to the effect that scholarships are available. There are Federal scholarships available through the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Space Administration, and other agencies or institutions, but these Federal scholarships, some 10,000 of them, are to support graduate study in the natural and physical sciences. However, no such scholarships are available for medical and dental students.

As the testimony before the committee clearly showed, three factors have contributed to the loss of attractiveness of medicine and dentistry as careers:

First, the great length and cost of training. It requires a long time to be educated in this field. One must have 4 years in a premedical school to get a B.S. degree. Then he must have 4 years more to get his M.D. degree. Then he must spend 3 to 5 or 6 years in internship or residency. Such a student has a long road ahead of him.

The second fact is that other intellectually stimulating and financially rewarding careers have developed in many scientific fields. When a young man graduates today with an engineering degree in chemistry, physics, electronics, or any other physical science, he has no trouble obtaining a good position. When he graduates, the representatives of some of our finest and best private companies are watching at the gate to offer him a remunerative job. They need him and want him. No such thing is true in the case of the doctor. After he has spent many years in educational training, he must establish an office at his own expense. He must buy equipment at his own expense. He has no assured income of any kind, as has a young man who obtains a good job with one of the private companies.

They are two of the reasons why, over the past 10 years, there has been a sharp increase in the number of college graduates. While the number of college graduates has continued to increase, the number of medical and dental graduates has been declining.

Between 1955 and 1962 the percentage of applications of college graduates in the United States for admission to medical schools decreased from 5.2 to 3.5 percent.

I also invite the attention of Senators to the fact that not only are young men and women needed as doctors and physicians to take care of American families, our children, and loved ones; but the most talented, the ablest, those whom God Almighty has endowed with the best brains, are needed to render the best and finest service.

But what has happened? The Association of American Colleges, whose representatives appeared before the committee, reported that the percentage of students entering medical school with an average college grade of 80 declined from 40 percent in 1950–51 to 15 percent in 1959–60, and to 12 percent in 1961–62.

In a period of 10 years, grade A students wishing to enter medical school declined from 40 percent to 12 percent.

We must make the road for the better, able, and more intellectual college students entering these professions more attractive to them, rather than have other fields made much more attractive and remunerative.

I am glad that the American Medical Association has a loan program. There is a place for that loan program. But there also is a very compelling need for the loan program provided in the bill. Under the American Medical Association loan program, if a medical student borrowed $1,500 for each of the 4 years of school, and he began repayment of the loan in 1970, and completed the payment in 1980, he would have to pay a total of $10,500. In contrast, under the program provided by the bill, he would have to repay a total of approximately $7,200. In other words, he would have to pay $3,200 less than he would under the American Medical Association loan program.

I do not consider these programs in juxtaposition. Under the program provided by the bill, it is only for 4 years, while the student is working for his M.D. degree. When he gets the degree under the bill, if he then has an internship or residency to serve, and he wants to take further education, if he is willing to pay the interest on the loan, he can get an American Medical Association loan. But the AMA loan is not a substitute for the loans provided in the bill.

Much has been said about the National Defense Education Act. I had the honor of being one of the authors of that bill. The successes under that program have been satisfying and rewarding. But the National Defense Education Act loans do not fit the needs of students in dentistry or medicine. To begin with, such loans are limited to $1,000, and students in medicine and dentistry need more than $1,000 loans. The loan provisions under the bill provide for loans of up to $2,000.

Under the National Defense Education Act loan program, the student must start paying 1 year after he finishes, whereas under the provisions of the pending bill he has 3 years before he must start paying back the loan. So the National Defense Education Act does not fit the situation for the student in dentistry or medicine. The pending bill would provide a loan program which is complementary to the National Defense Education Act program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Arizona has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Alabama a question or two?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield time on the bill. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. MILLER. Three minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have some concluding remarks to make, and I do not want to use all my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama two questions. The first question is, if there are defects in the National Defense Education Act provisions insofar as dental, medical, and osteopathic students are concerned, why would it not be more proper for us to amend the National Defense Education Act rather than to do it by enacting a large section of this bill, so far as the loans are concerned?

Mr. HILL. This bill would provide grants for construction of physical facilities to give aid to doctors, dentists, and health personnel. There could not be a more appropriate or germane place to have loan provisions than in this bill.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator recognizes, does he not, that we could amend the National Defense Education Act, so far as the loan provisions of that act are concerned, which are being utilized by medical students, liberalize them somewhat, and gear them a little more into the actual needs of medical and dental students?

Mr. HILL. If that were done, we would have to write into that act the very provisions we are now writing into the pending bill.

Mr. MILLER. The point I am making is that by doing so, we would perhaps insure the passage of this bill a little more than we would with the loan provisions in it. That point was made by a previous speaker.

Mr. HILL. The bill will be passed in a few minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask one more question of the chairman. How would the proposed loan provisions affect the American Medical Association loan program? Has the Senator received any testimony on that point?

Mr. HILL. As I have said, the loans under the bill would be made only for undergraduate work, that is, the 4 years spent in getting the M.D. degree. Under the AMA program the loans are available not only for 4 years of undergraduate work, but also for internship or further training. As the Senator knows, no doctor today who gets his M.D. degree starts immediately to practice medicine. He must get other training.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Has the Senator from Alabama received any testimony before his committee as to whether, if the bill passes, the American Medical Association will adapt its program to cover only graduate work, rather than have two conflicting programs going at the same time, as would be the case if the bill passes?

Mr. HILL. There has been no testimony from the AMA to the effect that they will change their program one way or another. I do not know of any reason why they should. They have a certain amount of money to be loaned; and I believe the Senator will find that the money will be borrowed, just as I am quite certain that under the bill the money will be borrowed.

Mr. MILLER. Why would a medical student borrow from the AMA program instead of the program covered in the bill?

Mr. HILL. Under the proposed program he could obtain a loan only for the first 4 years of undergraduate work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. HILL. Under the AMA program he can obtain a loan for additional training.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself my remaining 4 minutes. I am convinced that Senators who oppose my amendment miss my point. The Senator from Texas and I are not opposing the building part of the bill. I believe we are putting the cart before the horse. We are providing scholarships at the Federal level, when, at the same time, we admit that we do not have enough classroom facilities in this particular field.

The reason for my amendment is to prevent the spending of $30 million of taxpayers' money in the next 3 years, and to see how the AMA program will work. There are those who need the loans which the AMA provides. Three years after the loans under the pending bill are made, after a student graduates from medical school, he must start paying back those loans, at a time when he is in a residency or internship, and when he is making the astronomical sum of $250 to $350 a month. He must pay back the loans at 3 percent. I believe this will be a very difficult thing for him to do.

I have supported other loan and grant programs for these purposes. I suggest that we are getting ahead of ourselves. There are not enough medical schools in the country. We admit it. Therefore there are not enough classrooms. There are not enough facilities to take care of the 50-percent expansion the chairman says will be needed during this decade.

On page 93 of the hearing record, it is shown that there has been a decrease in applicants. I do not know whether this arises from the difficulty of getting into a school, or from a lack of space, or because of higher requirements needed for getting into a school. Contrary to what the chairman has stated, the quality of the applicants has increased over the past decade.

If the bill is passed, I believe it will involve spending $30½ million of taxpayers' money that need not be spent. We would have great difficulty spending it, because not sufficient classrooms are available. I know from bitter experience that this is true. That is why we support the building part of the bill and are opposed to the loan provisions.

The American Medical Association supports the bill in the same way. It would like to see the loan provision taken out of the bill. I urge my colleagues seriously to consider our amendment. I do not believe this particular section is needed. It may be that in the future it will be needed, but there is no demonstrable need for it at this time.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The yeas and nays on the amendment have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland].

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are absent on official business to attend a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 159 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Lausche
Miller
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—63

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Allott
Anderson
Brewster
Case
Cooper
Dirksen
Eastland
Engle
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Mansfield
McGee
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Pearson
Ribicoff

So Mr. Goldwater's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before the third reading, I understand there is a possibility that another amendment may be offered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 20, at the end of line 9, it is proposed to strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", and upon agreement by the student (if insurable) to carry an amount of life insurance under a policy which will enable the loan to be repaid in event of his death."

On line 21, after "borrower", insert the following: "unless the borrower was insurable".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly on the amendment and then withdraw it.

I believe it should be brought to the attention of Senators, particularly the attention of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], with whom I have previously discussed the amendment, that in connection with the loan provisions, in the event of the death of a borrower, the United States, under the bill, would stand to lose the entire loan.

On page 20, line 19, the bill provides:

> (d) The liability to repay the unpaid balance of such a loan and accrued interest thereon shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if the Secretary determines that he has become permanently and totally disabled.

None of us wishes to work a hardship on a borrower.

But it seems to me there could have been added to the bill a provision which would alleviate this problem in the way my amendment would do, would provide for loans to insurable students, and would provide for life insurance, so as to guarantee that the loans would be repaid if they died. The amount of such insurance would not have to be large, and the premiums on it would be such that I am quite sure it could be carried without undue difficulty. That would protect the interest of the United States.

I hope that if this bill is passed by the Senate and becomes law, the Senator from Alabama will undertake to evaluate a bill on this particular point—one in line with my amendment—which would protect the interests of the U.S. Government in case of the death of such students. I shall appreciate his comments on that situation.

Mr. HILL. Under the loan program the Government provides today, I know of no such condition with reference to taking out a life insurance policy. Before such a revision was written into a bill, certainly it should be considered by the committee, testimony should be taken, and we should obtain the opinions of both those who administer the loan program and those who administer other loan programs of the U.S. Government.

Mr. MILLER. My point is that such an amendment could well apply to this loan provision, but not to other loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act. The ceilings under the program will be higher. The ceiling under the National Defense Education Act is $5,000. There is no ceiling, under this bill, except one of $2,000 a year. So the stake of the Federal Government could be considerably larger. In any event, I believe this proposal has some merit. I believe it should be studied; and that is why I am bringing it to the attention of the Senate, and particularly to the attention of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment: On page 1 of the bill, strike out lines 5 to 8, which constitute the title of section 2.

Mr. President, it is not my intention that, eventually, the title be eliminated; I offer the amendment only in order to have time in which to ask the chairman of the committee several questions about the bill.

The bill provides for grants of up to 50 percent of the cost of construction to medical schools which are willing to expand, and for up to 66⅔ percent of the cost to medical schools which undertake what is called major expansion. The word "expansion" is specifically defined as an enrollment 5 percent greater than the enrollment in any of the 5 preceding years; but the phrase "major expansion" is not defined.

I wish to ask the chairman of the committee how it is anticipated that the administrator will determine when a school will become eligible for the larger grants by undertaking a major expansion.

Mr. HILL. That will be a matter for the council which is set up in the bill to determine, in cooperation with the Surgeon General, who is the head of the Public Health Service.

Mr. KEATING. Was there some reason why the committee failed to define the phrase "major expansion," although it did define the word "expansion"?

Mr. HILL. Sixty-six and two-thirds percent is the ceiling which cannot be exceeded. The bill places in the council and in the Surgeon General some discretion; they must pass on the nature of the expansion, on what it will mean, and on the assistance it will give to the graduation of increased numbers of doctors and dentists.

Mr. KEATING. Why was the word "expansion" defined in a specific manner, while no effort was made to define the phrase "major expansion," which would make it possible for the larger grants to be received?

Mr. HILL. Of course there could be an expansion which would not be a major one and would not permit the graduation of increased numbers of doctors and dentists.

Mr. KEATING. Inasmuch as "expansion" means 5 percent, does "major expansion" mean 40 percent or 50 percent—or what percentage?

Mr. HILL. Certainly it will be a minimum of 15 percent.

Mr. KEATING. A minimum of 15 percent?

Mr. HILL. Yes, a minimum of 15 percent.

Mr. KEATING. Is it intended that under the bill a preference will be given to the needs of medical schools, over and above those of schools of pharmacy, optometry, and podiatry, in the administration of the program?

Mr. HILL. All of them are eligible to be considered for grants of these funds; but the testimony showed there is a much greater need for expansion by medical schools, dental schools and schools of osteopathy than there is on the part of some of the other schools.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Did the committee consider allowing the schools to apply for funds under section 720, subsection (3) to be used for the replacement of obsolete laboratory equipment?

Mr. HILL. Yes. They can secure funds for that purpose.

Mr. KEATING. They can now?

Mr. HILL. They can under the bill.

Mr. KEATING. So, in the opinion of the Senator from Alabama, there is no need to amend the bill so as to provide authority for them to obtain those funds?

Mr. HILL. What authority?

Mr. KEATING. The bill, as now worded, provides, as I understand, that they can apply for funds under section 720, subsection (3), to be used for the replacement of obsolete laboratory equipment.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. As distinguished from funds for the construction of facilities themselves? Can they also apply for funds with which to replace obsolete laboratory equipment?

Mr. HILL. Yes, when it is needed to carry on the work of the schools in the process of education and training.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, the bill we are considering today is vitally important to the future of our Nation and to the health of our people. By providing this 3-year program of construction grants and loans to medical students we are purchasing a form of health insurance for the entire Nation, and we are protecting the generations to come against the serious problem of insufficient medical personnel. The old medical homily that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" has a special meaning for us here today because with foresight and the careful planning embodied in this program, we can act now to provide for future needs.

Recent statistics in my own State of New York emphasize the need for a concentrated national effort to provide for America's medical needs. Our State is one of the most progressive in the Nation. It is a leader in education and in the provision of health services for its citizens. And yet, in 1961–62, the State licensed 88 fewer doctors than in the previous year. And the State medical society, which in 1960 reported that 60 communities in New York needed physicians, finds that figure is now over 70. The State mental hygiene department had vacancies for 184 psychiatrists last spring compared with 145 in mid-1960. With our population growing each year, we cannot afford to sit by while the number of medical men diminishes in proportion.

The existing situation can be attributed to a number of factors. One is a shortage of facilities for training doctors. Another is the extremely high cost of medical education which has risen to more than $20,000 per student. The bill we consider today will help to remedy both situations. Congress cannot, of course, by simply passing a law, instill in men the desire or the ability to become doctors. They must be personally devoted to their work, humane, diligent, and of superior intelligence. My fear, however, is that young men and women who possess these qualities and who have the desire, the ability and the stamina to study medicine will be unable to do so because existing medical schools are filled to capacity, and further, because they simply cannot afford the luxury of 6, 8, or 10 years of additional study. It is indeed regrettable that only 14 percent of today's medical students come from the 50 percent of American families with incomes below $5,000.

The Association of American Medical Colleges has estimated that the number of trained physicians who become available each year must be increased 50 percent by 1975 if the present ratio of doctors to the population is to be maintained. We cannot, therefore, tolerate the exclusion of students on economic grounds alone, nor can we expect the medical schools themselves to absorb the losses of an extensive scholarship program.

In 1958, we passed the National Defense Education Act, operating under the theory that trained scientists, teachers, and guidance counselors for our schools were matters of interest to the Nation as a whole, and particularly vital to the defense effort. Have we not the moral responsibility to provide a similar program of aid to medical education in an attempt to insure long-range health care of continued excellence for all our citizens? Because I believe that this is a shared responsibility of all Americans—not solely the burden of a few families or a small group of educators—I strongly support this bill today.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York is withdrawn.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I call for the third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, how much time remains available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes remain available to the proponents; 26 minutes remain available to the opponents.

MORTAR AND BRAINS: THE NEED FOR BOTH IN MEDICAL AND DENTAL TRAINING

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the enactment of H.R. 12, both in providing construction grants and student loans will be of significant help in meeting the long-range health needs of the Nation.

The need for such assistance can be dramatically demonstrated in many instances in my own State of California. However, I should like to cite just one instance and that is the plight of a long-respected dental college in San Franciso, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, one of many professional schools in California meeting an indispensable need to train men and women in one of the several health professions.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons has maintained a reputation over the years of being one of the fine dental schools of the country. However, because of the obsolescence of its existing physical facility, the school's academic accreditation is currently in jeopardy and, further, there are indications that local authorities may condemn the present building as unsafe for occupancy.

As I understand it, school authorities have succeeded in raising from private sources over the last few years about $1.5 million for the building. The alumni is attempting to raise an additional million dollars, seven-hundred thousand of which is already pledged. In addition, the dental students now at the school have pledged themselves to contribute $222,000 over a period of 10 years. A new school, however, will cost in the neighborhood of $5 million to $6 million and it is unlikely that the remaining funds can be raised from voluntary contributors.

The college has completed negotiations to become affiliated with the University of the Pacific, which will assure the school's accreditation status if a new building can be constructed. Ground space for the building has been arranged at the Presbyterian Medical Center, and additional building funds now appear to be the only substantial block to the school's continuing success.

At the present time, the existing dental schools in California are graduating from 275 to 300 dentists a year, while the State is licensing from 500 to 600 dentists a year. It is obvious, therefore, that California is drawing heavily on the schools of other States to provide the dentists it needs. I am sure I need not recite to you the figures relating to the rapid increase in population in California. A new State dental school will accept its first class this year, but continuation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, a private institution, is also essential.

As indicated above, the College of Physicians and Surgeons has raised the amount which would be necessary to match the Federal funds which would be provided if H.R. 12 is enacted, and construction of a new and expanded facility could thus be begun immediately.

To emphasize the importance with which the community views the pressing need in San Francisco, I should like to state that the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco endorse this measure to "provide matching Federal funds for construction and alteration of medical and dental schools, and do hereby urge the Congress to enact said measures into law at the earliest possible date in order that the people of the United States may have the advantage of the benefits inherent therein."

The case of the College of Physicians and Surgeons is paralleled in southern California by the California College of Medicine, a small medical school, privately endowed, which is seeking to render quality medical training to meet the increasing demand for skilled practitioners in the health field. But it is not only the smaller private and public schools but the larger ones as well which need to expand their facilities and attract qualified students, regardless of their financial resources, to their student bodies if our country is to fulfill the demand for qualified doctors and dentists.

The deans of large State medical schools—such as the University of California and UCLA—and large private medical schools—such as Stanford and the University of Southern California—have all told me of the need for this legislation.

California now seeks 80 percent of its doctors and 50 percent of its dentists from institutions outside the State. The distinguished president of the University of California, Clark Kerr, has informed me that in the next decade California must spend approximately $300 million on both public and private medical and dental training facilities to keep up with the growing demand and decrease this dependence on other States by as much as 15 percent.

Mr. President, this bill will help provide mortar and brains. Both are needed. I hope this bill will be enacted into law now. The passage of this measure will be a long overdue and necessary step in maintaining and furthering the health and dental needs of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask consent that several of the hundreds of communications I have received in favor of this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., April 17, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Last year when H.R. 4999, the medical aid bill, was under consideration by Congress I sent a communication to California's Representatives and Senators urging close consideration of the measure and support of its major provisions as a matter of great importance to the State. I would like to assure you that the comments I made then apply with equal force to the current proposal in this area, H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963.

Any State which is obliged to import 80 percent of the physicians it needs and 50 percent of the dentists it needs to offer minimum standard services to its people is in a precarious position. That is the case in California at present. Furthermore, the best population forecasts we can get indicate that we must spend upward of $300 million in the next 10 years on medical and dental training facilities, public and private, to keep up with the growing demand and decrease this dependence on other States by as much as 15 percent.

As you know the University of California is in process of expanding its medical center facilities at San Francisco and Los Angeles, has acquired a site for a medical center in San Diego, and is surveying the needs elsewhere in the State. The San Diego development alone will involve construction and equipment expenditures of $50 million. The State of California is aware of the problem that confronts us and has done its best to find the necessary funds from current revenues and by issuing bonds. But when we consider other educational needs, and the multitudinous institutions and services which must serve the public welfare, it seems clear that we cannot carry this construction program in the high cost medical field without outside help. This is a national problem by its nature, and it happens to be one in which California is involved heavily, not through past neglect of needs, but in spite of all we have been able to do, because of unprecedented migration of people, and the birth rate.

I hope that you will be able to indicate your interest in H.R. 12 reaching the floor, and will do your best to have it passed.

Sincerely,

CLARK KERR.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
September 11, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Programs authorized by Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, H.R. 12 and S. 911, of vital importance to future health of all citizens. I hope you will vote for the bill as reported by the committee without amendment.

ROBERT H. ALWAY, M.D.,
Dean, Stanford Medical School.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 9, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As dean of the School of Medicine of the University of Southern California, I am writing to urge your support of Senate bill S. 911 to increase the opportunities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, etc.

As you know, the University of Southern California is a private university. Its medical school was organized in 1885 and has made distinguished contributions since this time in training physicians.

The USC School of Medicine is in the process of building a new campus by the Los Angeles County General Hospital. It needs matching funds desperately to complete its building program. If passed, S. 911 will make it possible for the USC School of Medicine to construct facilities which will enable it to increase its annual output of physicians 50 percent, from 68 to 96.

We have a distinguished faculty and fine program of instruction as indicated by the large number of applicants who apply (over 720 last year) annually from all parts of the United States, especially California. Many of the excellently qualified students, who apply, need financial help, and I hope you will support that part of S. 911 which provides loans for the students.

With great appreciation for your concern for the health and welfare of our citizens, I am yours,

Most sincerely,

Clayton G. Loosli, M.D.,
Dean, University of Southern California.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
September 11, 1963.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage H.R. 12 without amendment.

W. Ballentine Henley,
President,
California College of Medicine.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 19, 1963.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your support of H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. Most essential for maintenance and development of dental education. Please also transmit your support of H.R. 12 to Senator Lister Hill.

R. W. McNulty, D.D.S.,
Dean, School of Dentistry, University of Southern California.

West Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 19, 1963.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
U.S. Congress, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

I urge your support of all provisions of H.R. 12 relating to dental health education including student loan program to enable qualified students to finance an expensive education.

Reidar F. Sognnaes,
Dean, School of Dentistry, UCLA Health Sciences Center.

California Nurses' Association,
San Francisco, Calif., September 5, 1963.

Re H.R. 12, Health Professions Education Assistance Act.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: In your consideration of H.R. 12, please know that the California Nurses' Association, the professional association for registered nurses of California, earnestly hopes for its passage.

There is a great shortage in supply of registered nurses. To educate more and more registered nurses, additional faculty and more schools of nursing will be needed.

More collegiate schools of nursing will enable more students to enroll and gradually help to meet the great need for additional faculty in all schools of nursing.

H.R. 12 offers a real protection to the public, and we hope you can support this legislation.

Sincerely,

Marian Alford,
Executive Director.

Sacramento, Calif.,
August 19, 1963.

Hon. Thomas Kuchel,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand that Subcommittee on Health of Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will commence hearings next Wednesday, August 22, on H.R. 12 and S. 911, Health Professions Education Assistance Act. California Optometric Association strongly feels profession of optometry should be included in either bill covering student loan provisions. Senators Javits and Tower are on subcommittee. Will deeply appreciate any assistance you may give us in calling this important amendment to their attention.

Thanks for your cooperation.

George I. Deane, Jr.,
Chairman, Legislative Committee, California Optometric Association.

Paul Yarwood,
Administrative Director and Legislative Advocate, California Optometric Association.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to speak in opposition to the bill, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. HILL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, legislation is absolutely necessary to solve the serious problem of the shortage of physicians and dentists in our country today.

In order to facilitate enactment of this legislation the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has reported a bill identical to that passed by the House of Representatives earlier this year. This bill authorizes $175 million for construction grants over a 3-year period for medical, dental, pharmaceutical and other related teaching facilities. It also authorizes $30,700,000 for a loan program for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy for a period of 3 years. Although the junior Senator from Ohio feels that much more could have been done in this field, I fervently believe that prompt enactment of the bill reported by the Senate committee would be of great benefit to the Nation.

Mr. President, there is a desperate need for doctors in our Nation. In hundreds, perhaps thousands, of our communities the missing general practitioner has become a nightmare for the average family needing a doctor in a personal relationship.

The health of the American people concerns the entire nation. We must never forget the fact that our greatest resource is our people.

The American Medical Association takes pride in listing some 218,000 licensed physicians in the American medical directory, but it does not mention how many of them are immediately accessible to patients.

Ten years ago, there were more than 143 doctors for every 100,000 Americans. Today there are 141. To maintain the present ratio medical schools must by 1975 increase their output by 50 percent, graduating 11,000 annually instead of 7,400. The present accelerated expansion rate, if continued without Federal help, would turn out only 9,000 doctors a year by 1975. The U.S. public health service's consultant group on medical education feels moreover that the present ratio is not high enough.

The first line of defense against illness for most Americans is the general practitioner. Since 1930, the proportion of general practitioners to all doctors has dropped 30 percent. At the present time there is only one family doctor for every 1,600 people in this country. The outlook—unless steps are taken now—is for more than 2,000 people per family physician by 1970. In small communities, the general practitioner is becoming less and less available. The October 1960 issue of Johns Hopkins magazine notes that unless immediate action is taken by private and public agencies the number and quality of American physicians "will decline to a point where the Nation's health is endangered."

Even these figures do not tell the true story. The proportion of doctors engaged in private practice has dropped from 86 to 69 percent in the past 30 years. The others are engaged in teaching, research, medical administration, public health work, clinical publishing, or retired. I might add that a few—the leaders of the American Medical Association—are busy in medical politics and making a good living at it at the expense of the thousands of dues-paying fine American physicians and surgeons who devote their time to curing and caring for the sick.

As the President has pointed out, only six schools of medicine have opened in the last 10 years and the number of graduates has risen over that period a scant 15 percent. To maintain only the present ratio of physicians to the total population, he estimates at least 20 additional medical schools and 20 new dental schools need to be built. Medical educators agree that these could be filled readily with able students and staffed adequately by available medical manpower.

The fact is that any graduate of any medical school in the United States need not fear for his economic future. Any number of well-paying positions are waiting for him. Probably in no other field or profession is there such excellent opportunity for employment. This alone indicates a shortage of doctors in the United States. Our hospitals have been forced in many instances to turn to foreign-trained physicians.

In spite of this fact, the Nation's medical schools, always under careful watch by the monopoly-minded dictators of the American Medical Association, are desperately trying to attract talented young people into medicine. Never before has there been such an effort to recruit our brighter college students into our medical schools.

Mr. President, conservative estimates have priced the overall cost of medical training anywhere from $20,000 to $30,000. Few American families can afford this kind of outlay for their youngsters. Even for the most talented, there are few scholarships that even approach the necessary sum to provide for 4 years of medical school. It is not surprising then, as the President has stated, that 40 percent of all medical students come from the 12 percent of families with incomes of $10,000 a year or more.

The great length and cost of medical training, the comparatively small number of scholarships available, competition from other scientific careers and the lack of part-time jobs for medical students all tend to discourage our talented youth from entering the medical field regardless of the great financial rewards society offers to the physician and surgeon.

More and more the average American family is simply unable to bear the complete burden of paying for a medical education. We will spend $20,000 a year to train, maintain, and equip a soldier. Why can we not provide $3,000 to $4,000 a year for a promising medical student who has the intelligence but lacks the money to become a fighter for life?

It is vital to our democracy and to the well-being of our Nation that medical education should be open to any well qualified young man or woman.

In the Soviet Union they are graduating 12,000 new doctors every year as compared to our 7,400. Their doctors are not as well trained as ours, but so urgent are the needs of new and underdeveloped nations that the availability of Soviet physicians regardless of their caliber, may become an important weapon against us in the cold war.

Mr. President, naturally the ruling clique of the American Medical Association has always opposed a permanent Federal program of aid to medical schools, just as they have opposed all progressive legislation ranging from social security to the National Tuberculosis Act which, incidentally, Congress passed unanimously. These progress-haters would agree to one-time grants but stubbornly oppose the long term Federal program that is needed. Again they hurl the tired old charge of socialism to discredit something they are against. Americans are beginning to tire of this old dodge.

Mr. President, there are many farseeing physicians and surgeons who are aware of the needs of their profession and the Nation—medical care for the aged under social security, aid to medical schools, and others. More and more, American doctors are beginning to resent the dictatorial leadership of the political doctors who control the American Medical Association and spend their dues. It is my fervent hope that eventually these enlightened physicians and surgeons will make others in their professions see what the true goals of American medicine should be and take leadership in bringing them about.

Mr. President, as one of his first acts in office President Kennedy proposed to the Congress an all-inclusive plan to help cure the health needs of the Nation. Included within it are plans for medical care for the aged under the social security system, grants for nursing home construction and service, hospital research and development, increasing the number of our doctors and dentists, and improving health care of our children and youth.

It is my belief that this is one of the best investments we, as legislators, can make for the benefit of all Americans and for the greater good of the country. I doubt that any other will return a greater dividend to our national wellbeing.

Mr. President, the health of Americans should be a responsibility of their Government second to none. In great part the maintenance of present standards and their betterment depends upon more well-trained American physicians and surgeons. We must provide an adequate program of aid to medical schools and of Federal scholarships which would enable any talented American boy or girl who wishes to become a doctor to do so.

Mr. President, in this atomic and space age of challenge, America must make up its mind whether it will prescribe more tranquilizers and sleeping pills or give more real medical security for its people.

Mr. HILL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the bill we are considering today, to provide construction assistance for medical and dental teaching facilities, and to set up a loan program for medical, dental, and osteopath students, is a most important one.

There is a critical shortage in our country of trained doctors, dentists and other professional health personnel.

Each year the shortage becomes more acute, as is shown by the decline between 1950 and 1960 in the ratio of doctors to the general population. In 1950, there was a family doctor for every 1,300 people. By 1960, the ratio was 1 to 1,700, and reliable estimates indicate that in 1975 the figure will be 1 family doctor for every 2,000 persons.

In my State, the ratio is 1 physician for 640 people, well above the national average. But as my able colleague from Connecticut, Senator RIBICOFF, pointed out earlier this year, when he introduced a bill along the lines of the one we are voting on today, this ratio has worsened in certain areas of the State. In one county, Tolland County, it is as high as 2,200 patients for 1 doctor.

If this is the case in a State as prosperous as Connecticut, it is obvious that there are many communities throughout the country where the health and wellbeing of families, while not necessarily in jeopardy, are suffering from neglect.

I am not an alarmist who contends that it will be too late to meet this problem if we do not take action immediately. But I do regret that it has taken us so long to make provision for the Federal Government to play its rightful, indeed essential role in helping to insure that in the years to come the American people will have an adequate number of doctors and other health specialists.

I believe the statistics I have cited make a compelling argument in support of Federal assistance.

I have had an especially deep interest in this field for a number of years because of the project that is underway in Connecticut to start a medical-dental school as a part of the University of Connecticut.

The State legislature has appropriated the sum of $2 million toward this goal, a site has been selected and the land has been purchased. But even though good progress has been made to date, under State initiative, Federal assistance would be most helpful, so that the eventual training capacity of this medical-dental school can be expanded.

Year after year Congress appropriates millions of dollars for medical research and for the construction of hospitals, and this is certainly a proper and worthwhile thing for us to do.

Let us today pass and send to the President this House bill, so that we can take an important first step toward insuring an adequate supply of professionally trained persons, to pass on to all of our people the knowledge and techniques that have been developed by modern medicine.

Mr. HILL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the bill presently under consideration, has received long and exhaustive study by both this body and the House. In fact as my senior colleague, Senator PASTORE said earlier, he helped lead this same fight a dozen years ago. This bill's provisions have been scrutinized and weighed with care and deliberation. The final result of these labors, is a conclusion that a great need exists for more medical facilities and more adequate loan moneys available to the students who qualify for this training.

Only a short while ago, on August 23, 1963, I received a letter from Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, which is included on page 305 of the hearings before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. President Keeney amply illustrated the importance of Federal legislation in the medical and related fields. He discussed this medical education program, the first in modern times in the State of Rhode Island, that Brown University is undertaking. It is a commendable effort, and one for which a definite need exists. It is also something of an innovation in the field of medical study, for it is predicated upon a 6-year curriculum. This is calculated to provide both a sound and substantial medical education, while at the same time lessening the time and cost of educating its participants.

Should we fail to look ahead, to count the future needs of this country in an area that affects us all at one time or another, we shall be doing less than meeting the needs of our citizens; we shall be failing to provide that important ounce of prevention. If we do fail to act as the House has done on this legislation, I can only surmise what that future pound of cure may cost.

Mr. HILL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as an original cosponsor of this bill in earlier Congresses, it is indeed a pleasure to witness its passage this afternoon. The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act will provide badly needed help in alleviating critical shortages of professional health personnel throughout the Nation.

The Senator from Minnesota wants the record to be clear that the existing parliamentary situation necessitated his voting against several perfecting amendments that otherwise should have been adopted. In particular, the Cotton amendment to provide forgiveness of student loans where the graduate agrees to practice in rural areas was a constructive suggestion. But its adoption would have placed the entire measure in serious jeopardy. I could not vote to take this risk.

Let the Senator from New Hampshire know that this Senator would welcome the opportunity to vote for this feature once the program is established and is in operation. Many rural areas of Minnesota are faced with a growing shortage of doctors and other health personnel and this proposal would help meet this shortage. I hope this amendment will be adopted at a future time.

There is no possible excuse for every resident of this Nation not to have the finest medical and health care available. But, unfortunately, this is not the case. We are all quite familiar with the grave problem faced by many senior citizens and this Senator hopes that matter will be resolved before the 88th Congress adjourns next year. The legislation we consider today represents a good beginning to insure that we will train an adequate supply of health personnel to meet the expanding population of the coming decades. Now let us also enact legislation to insure that our elementary schools, secondary schools, and colleges and universities are able to train the students we need to enter medical school. The challenge of education is a comprehensive challenge. We must meet it with a comprehensive program such as President Kennedy has presented to us.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the most able chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for his masterful guidance of this legislation. No public servant in the history of America has done so much to see that this Nation has the finest health and medical facilities on earth.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act represents another major accomplishment in the health field which has been possible due to the wise and skillful leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. He has the profound thanks and admiration of this Senator and, in fact, all the people of this Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] and the Senator from Kanasas [Mr. Pearson] are absent on official business to attend a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—71 yeas, 9 nays, as follows:

[No. 160 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—9

Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—20

Allott
Anderson
Brewster
Case
Cooper
Dirksen
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Gruening
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
McGee
McNamara
Mechem
Monroney
Nelson
Pearson
Ribicoff
Walters

So the bill (H.R. 12) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

EXTENSION AND BROADENING OF AUTHORITY TO INSURE MORTGAGES UNDER THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the Senate, I move at this time that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 463, S. 1952, which the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] will explain, as well as the reason for having it considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1952) to extend and broaden the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 3, line 8, after the word "section", to insert "and"; after line 8, to strike out:

(3) by striking out "five thousand" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "ten thousand"; and

And, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 809 of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "October 1, 1963" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1965";

(2) by striking out the first sentence of subsection (g)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person (i) employed or assigned to duty at or in connection with any research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, or (ii) employed at any research or development installation of the Atomic Energy Commission and which is located at or near such installation, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section."; and

(3) by striking out clause (B) in subsection (g)(2)(iii) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) persons employed at or in connection with any research or development installation of the Atomic Energy Commission, as the case may be;".

Sec. 2. Section 810 of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out clause (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(1) the housing which is covered by the insured mortgage is necessary in the interest of national security in order to provide adequate housing for (A) military personnel and essential civilian personnel serving or employed in connection with any installation of one of the armed services of the United States, or (B) essential personnel employed or assigned to duty at or in connection with any research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or of the Atomic Energy Commission,";

(2) by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (d) "and employees of contractors for the armed services", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "employees of contractors for the armed services, and persons described in clause (1)(B) of subsection (b) of this section"; and

(3) by striking out "October 1, 1963" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1965".

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill would extend sections 809 and 810, already existing in the Housing Act, which make special provision for home building in areas of research and development of the armed services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and our space effort. It represents a continuation of existing programs, due to expire September 30, and is supported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 1952

1. Extend section 809 of the National Housing Act (sales housing for essential civilian employees of the armed services, NASA and AEC) for 2 years, from October 1, 1963, to October 1, 1965;

2. Broaden section 809 to cover housing for essential civilian employees of NASA and AEC at any NASA or AEC research and development installation;

3. Extend section 810 of the National Housing Act (primarily rental housing, single-family and multifamily, for military personnel and essential civilian employees of the armed services) for 2 years, from October 1, 1963, to October 1, 1965; and

4. Broaden section 810 to cover housing for essential employees of NASA and AEC.

The establishment of the section 809 program was necessary because in some instances homes built for essential civilian employees of the armed services, NASA, and AEC in communities near or adjacent to research or development installations of these agencies were considered to be above and beyond those needed for the normal economic growth of the communities. In the opinion of the FHA, homes built in excess of the normal growth of the communities do not meet the test of economic soundness required by the statute as a prerequisite of FHA mortgage insurance. Section 809 permits the economic soundness test to be waived in such cases in order that essential civilian employees of these agencies may obtain decent and adequate sales housing.

Similarly, section 810 was established in order to provide decent and adequate sales and rental housing for personnel and civilian employees of the armed services near or adjacent to any military installation where adequate housing did not exist and where the FHA believes that the economic soundness prerequisite of the regular programs could not be met.

Section 809 insofar as NASA and AEC activities are concerned was limited in its application when the law was established. These limitations prohibit the program from being used at newly designated or developed NASA research and development installations or in the case of AEC outside of Los Alamos County, N. Mex. Because of these limitations many essential civilian employees of these agencies are unable to obtain adequate housing. For example, NASA is developing a new research and development installation in Hancock County, Miss. It is anticipated that by 1967, some 2,500 persons will be employed at this site. Communities near or adjacent to the site do not have a sufficient inventory of adequate housing for this influx of population. At present housing constructed in these communities to meet this need would not, in the opinion of the FHA, meet the prerequisite economic soundness test of the regular programs. Thus, in order to overcome this situation, section 809 would be broadened to take care of the housing needs in this area as well as in other areas where similar conditions exist.

FHA section 810 would also be broadened to cover AEC and NASA activities where similar conditions prevail.

Letters to the Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee from the housing Agency, NASA, and AEC support the provisions of the bill.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed and lie on the table an amendment I intend to propose to the resolution of ratification of the test ban agreement. The amendment is in language identical with that which was appended to the resolution of ratification of the Atomic Energy Act. My amendment would make perfectly clear that any future amendments to this treaty must be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, as in the case of the original treaty.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall speak only about 3 minutes. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am trying to have the pending bill passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a right to discuss the bill. The Senator cannot cut me off. I have my rights.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no desire to do so. I thought the Senator was under the impression that action on the bill had been completed.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I am speaking in my own right, on my own time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well. The Senator is entitled to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the test ban treaty is very unusual in its scope. It is said to be the first step in a program of disarmament. With all the emotions which have been stirred about the pending treaty, we have overlooked the comprehensive nature of the preamble and article II of the treaty, which do not touch the ban on nuclear testing as proposed in article I.

The preamble to the treaty contains the following language, which is about as far reaching and sweeping as the mind of man could devise to describe the objective of the signatory states:

> Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,
>
> Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances—

Then follows the language of the test ban provision found in article I, which has thus far been the sole subject of debate.

Article II is rather unique, in that it stipulates a method of amending the treaty, of carrying the first step on to include the banning of nuclear weapons and indeed of conventional weapons. It reads: "Any party may propose amendments to this treaty."

Mr. President, there are a number of parties to the treaty already. I noticed yesterday in the press that Gabon had signed the pact, making a total of 91 signatories, each of whom would have the same right to offer amendments to the treaty as would the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What nation was that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Gabon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How is that spelled?

Mr. RUSSELL. G-a-b-o-n. That is one of the newly emerging states.

I continue to read:

> The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

I think it is perfectly clear that the procedure for amendments of the treaty will provide a forum which will soon capture much more attention throughout the world than the United Nations. In this very brief language we would be establishing a new assembly of nations and a new method of arriving at agreements with respect to the most important question before the human family today, which is the limitation of or prohibition of the explosion of nuclear weapons as well as general disarmament.

Subsection 2 of article II reads:

> Any amendment to this treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the parties to this treaty, including the votes of all of the original parties.

That would, of course, give the executive branch of the Government the right to veto, since the United States was one of the three original signatories and would have a right of veto, but it would not protect the right of the legislative branch of the Government to pass on suggested amendments, which could be more far reaching than the original treaty. The language is:

> The amendment shall enter into force for all parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the original parties.

Mr. President, this amendment would not affect the terms of the treaty. It would not require any renegotiation with other nations. It would be an amendment to the resolution of ratification, which would make it perfectly clear that the Senate's constitutional duty and right to advise and consent to treaties will not be bypassed by executive agreement or in any other way by the executive branch of the Government.

I do not see how there could be any valid objection to clearing up this matter beyond any peradventure. Many are talking about this being a small step down the road to disarmament. There will be a great many steps of various lengths proposed by 91 nations that have already signed, and others that will sign; and it would not be very difficult to get one-third of the signatories to call a conference and consider all the amendments.

We have done very little to enhance the prestige and power of the Senate and the Congress of the United States in the past several years. Indeed, in many instances we have done things that have contributed to making us subservient to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Earlier, prior to the Senator's submission of this amendment, which I feel has a very worthy purpose, the Senator from Georgia was discussing with me the testimony of the distinguished Secretary of State. The Senator was saying, and I also was saying, that we thought the Secretary of State had made comments on this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought he had, but I have not been able to find them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the staff director, Dr. Marcy, if he could be of help to us. I am glad to say he was.

On page 13, of the hearings, at the bottom of the page, relating to article II, the Secretary of State made the following statement:

> Article II provides a procedure for amending the treaty. Amendments may be proposed by any party and are approved by a majority vote. The majority must include the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. Amendments do not enter into force until instruments of ratification have been deposited by a majority of the parties, "including the instruments of ratification of all the original parties."

The Senator from Georgia read that part.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is the important line:

> Thus, no amendment to the treaty can enter into force until it has been considered and approved by the Senate.

That is the testimony of the Secretary of State. I do not see that that obviates the proposal of the Senator from Georgia. I merely wanted it clear that somewhere in the testimony, as I had recollected, the Secretary of State deemed this as the process of ratification, which, in the instance of the United States, includes advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator located that statement. The committee, in its report, states that the Senate will have a right to consider and pass on amendments that will be coming in from time to time for the next generation or more, if we are to achieve progress in disarmament. But I think we should write it into the resolution of ratification, just as we did in the case of the Atomic Energy Act, which provided for amendment. It was written into the ratification of that statute that any amendments to the atomic energy statute should be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

I think it should be made perfectly clear in this instance that amendments to this treaty would be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only contribution at this point is to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that this matter was referred to by the Secretary.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. He had better help than I had. I have been searching for the reference. I did not have the very able help of the staff director for the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is one of the ablest staff men on the Hill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With which statement I fully concur. I merely followed the example of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was sure the Secretary of State had made the statement, but I could not find it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yesterday, or the day before, reference was made to a memorandum that had been read into the RECORD, bearing on the constitutional authority of the Senate to act in that capacity. In the event any Senator has not seen it, I think it would be a good idea to refer to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The reference to the amendments to the atomic energy statute appears in the memorandum submitted by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in undertaking to explain the very complex procedure which must be followed when opposition develops to a treaty. I had been concerned about amendments to the treaty, but when I found that precedent in the memorandum submitted by the Senator from Arkansas, it cleared the matter in my own mind as to the approach which might properly be followed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As appears on page 63 of the hearings, Secretary Rusk also had this to say:

> Certainly any arrangement for amendment to this treaty would be a treaty submitted to the Senate. It is our plan in the disarmament field and the general disarmament field to move forward on that by way of treaty where that would be the appropriate means of doing so.

Mr. RUSSELL. The resolution of ratification has not yet been submitted. I express the hope that the Senator from Arkansas would include this provision in the resolution when he submits it to the Senate. It could not do any harm.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, with regard to the precedent in the Atomic Energy Act, in that case, two-thirds of the member States could ratify an amendment, and it did not require the approval of this country by instrument of ratification. The only way this country could, in effect, veto an amendment, would be to withdraw from the treaty. There was a valid reason for inserting that understanding in the Atomic Energy Act, because we did not want to be faced with the alternative of either accepting amendments to the statute or, if we did not like them, withdrawing from the agency; whereas in the instance of this treaty, the words which have been inserted in article 2 are, "including the instruments of ratification of all the original parties." These instruments must be obtained in addition to a two-thirds vote in order to amend the treaty before the Senate.

I ask the Senator what the instrument of ratification would be if it would not be the instrument which had been approved by the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Hundreds of executive agreements with other nations have been ratified by the Executive. I do not think the word "ratification" appears in the Constitution of the United States. I have no recollection of having seen it there, though I have not checked it in this instance. The executive branch might well say that the President had signed an Executive agreement. When the Executive signs it, does he not ratify it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The way this is written——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am talking about the Constitution. I do not recall that the word "ratify" appears in the Constitution. The language is "advise and consent." That is a process of ratification. But when the President signs an Executive agreement, he ratifies that agreement. This proposal is an amendment to a treaty. It does not provide for a new treaty. It provides that the treaty may be amended. This is of much greater importance than the atomic energy statute, which required two-thirds of those voting to approve the statute, but in this case a majority can amend the treaty in any area of disarmament so long as the majority includes the original parties.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Which includes ourselves.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the executive branch. That is action by the executive branch. I am undertaking—and I realize it is almost a forlorn hope, because some Senators have lost interest—to protect the rights of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why the Senator from Georgia should say that all Senators have lost interest in the Senate. I have not lost interest in the Senate. If he says that, perhaps he is speaking for himself. He has that right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why he should say that all Senators have lost interest in the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that. I did not say all Senators. I said some Senators. I stand on that statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was the Senator referring to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not specifically. If the Senator wishes to crawl under that mantle, he may do so. The Senate rules prohibit me from referring to the Senator directly by name in that regard. However, there is no rule of the Senate which prohibits the Senator from assuming that role.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as my knowledge is concerned, an executive agreement is not considered an amendment to a treaty, but is a separate instrument. However, I consulted the Secretary of State 2 days ago about this possibility, and, with the Senator's permission, I should like to read the reply of the Secretary of State.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The letter reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1963.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In response to your inquiry, I am glad to explain how the ratifying procedure for amendments to the test ban treaty would operate.

Paragraph 2 of article II of the treaty provides that an amendment "shall enter into force for all parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the original parties." The United States is an "original party" by the force of the preamble and article II, paragraph 2. Thus, no amendment to the treaty can enter into force unless and until the United States has deposited an instrument of ratification.

The Constitution of the United States, in article II, section 2, requires that the Senate, by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, shall "advise and consent" to the making of all treaties. An "instrument of ratification" of an amendment to this treaty could not be executed by the President unless the Senate had given its advice and consent in accordance with article II, section 2, of the Constitution. Therefore, an amendment to the test ban treaty could enter into force only if the Senate consented to the amendment by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present.

As you will recall, I stated in my testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "no amendment to the treaty can enter into force until it has been considered and approved by the Senate." The message from the President transmitting the test ban treaty also states that it cannot be amended without the consent of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a very able letter. It elaborates on what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] read from the Secretary's testimony. I do not doubt that that is the present view of the Secretary of State, and that he will hold to that view.

We do not usually legislate on a matter of this vital importance, a matter that refers to a permanent treaty, in connection with which the Senate will be confronted with amendments from year to year, from angle to angle, in finding new approaches to disarmament. It is too important to entrust the interpretation to any one man. The Senate can put its own interpretation on this subject, and it should give careful consideration to the proposal.

My amendment does not interfere with the treaty. It does not delay it. It does not have to go back to any of the signatories. This is an amendment proposed to the resolution of ratification, a domestic assertion, of the right of the Senate to advise and consent to any amendment to the treaty. It cannot possibly hurt in any way if Secretary Rusk intends to pursue the course he outlines in his letter, which the Senator from Montana has read, but it would help if he should pass from the scene and another man should become Secretary of State and if he felt that the signature of the President of the United States was sufficient ratification of an agreement to reduce armaments and vitally affect the security of the country.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. What the Senator is proposing does not mean that it would have to go back to any other country, as I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; of course not.

Mr. MORTON. It is not a reservation.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is not a reservation.

Mr. MORTON. All that the Senator from Georgia is trying to do is to have the Senate affirm what the Secretary of State and other spokesmen of the administration, and others who are in favor of the treaty, have said we mean.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator wants the Senate to settle this question, so that there cannot possibly be any doubt about it. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. So that there cannot be any doubt about it, today or tomorrow, or after all who are assembled here have passed from the scene. This is a permanent treaty. In my opinion, the operations under the procedures prescribed in the treaty will soon practically supplant the United Nations, because it gives the various parties so much more power for a direct approach to amendment by calling a meeting and by approving it by majority vote if they can get the three original signatories.

Mr. MORTON. How could this in any way embarrass the 93 or so countries which have signed the treaty?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could not in any way embarrass any other nation. It is not a reflection on any of them. It is not a reflection on the President or on the Secretary of State. It is merely a statement by the Senate: "We wish to remind you that we have the right to have these agreements submitted to us for advice and consent." Senators have called this treaty the first short step. The next step will be much farther in the field of disarmament. The treaty not only looks to nuclear disarmament, but also disarmament in conventional weapons. In my opinion, the Senate would be derelict if it did not make clear its position and assert its right in this respect.

Mr. MORTON. Is it not also our approval of the interpretation of the administration—our stamp of approval on it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. It puts the stamp of approval of the Senate of the United States upon the interpretation of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course none of us could imagine any Senator being at variance in his views in the interpretation of the right of the Senate to be called on, under its constitutional responsibility, to advise and consent, on a two-thirds basis, to any amendment offered to any treaty to which we are a party. The question I am raising—and it may be a technical one—is this: Would not the Senator think that, instead of being considered as an amendment, this proposal should perhaps be considered an understanding, as I believe it was at the time the International Atomic Energy Agency Act was passed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I copied the language in the International Atomic Energy Act verbatim. It is identically the same language as that which appears in the atomic energy statute. It has been approved by the Senate. I followed it to the letter and to the last comma.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is not the word "understanding" used there?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is in there, as well as the other language.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

EXTENSION AND BROADENING OF AUTHORITY TO INSURE MORTGAGES UNDER THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1952) to extend and broaden the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may we have action on the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand the purpose of the bill to be that employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be put in the same position for purposes of insuring mortgages as is the case now with members of the armed services?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; in the area of research and development. The same is true of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill would extend the act for 2 years. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It includes not only military personnel but also space and atomic energy personnel.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is because the people have to live in out-of-the-way places where they cannot ordinarily obtain housing. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Where there are obstacles to getting adequate housing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the only purpose of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

As in executive session,

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has been held on the proposed understanding or amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and which he has submitted for consideration, or to lie on the table, I should like to refer to page 63 of the hearings, and to read one or two sentences, because I believe this is important to the subject under discussion.

In response to a question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], Secretary Rusk replied:

> Senator, I would not wish to give a comprehensive commitment that any kind of agreement or understanding with the Soviet Union would necessarily take the form of a treaty. We do expect, and we certainly follow the practice of consulting with the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee and other appropriate committees on any important developments.
>
> Certainly any arrangement for amendment to this treaty would be a treaty submitted to the Senate. It is our plan in the disarmament field and the general disarmament field to move forward on that by way of treaty where that would be the appropriate means of doing so.
>
> But I would not think it would be wise to say that any subject we take up with the Soviet Union should take the form of a treaty.

I thought that statement should be a part of the RECORD, in view of the discussion that has just taken place.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this subject, I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

I have only one or two questions to ask, and I believe the Senator from Georgia desires to leave the Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCLUSION OF LABOR UNIONS WITHIN PURVIEW OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the members of the Committee on Commerce today adopted, by a vote of 9 to 6, an amendment to the public accommodations bill, bringing labor unions within its purview.

If this decision is allowed to stand and finally becomes law, it will be a great step forward in utilizing the skills of minority groups in industry and especially in the construction field, where craftsmen are hired.

The amendment, in effect, states that no person shall be denied membership in a labor organization because of his race, color, religion, or national origin.

The bill as pending covered the whole gamut of operation in which services, accommodations, facilities, goods, food, and entertainment are either sold or served. It did not cover labor unions.

I deeply hope that the decision made today through the adoption of this amendment will not be changed hereafter.

THE CALUMET SKYWAY BRIDGE IN THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday I called the attention of the Senate to efforts that are being made to induce the U.S. Government to pick up the tab for the payment of a $63 million indebtedness of the Calumet Skyway and Bridge Commission, the indebtedness having been incurred in the building of a toll bridge in Chicago. The toll bridge has become a failure. The interest payment due has not been made.

Someone conceived the clever idea of asking the U.S. Government to pick up the tab. In the House, initial action has been taken by a committee which has recommended that the United States declare the Calumet Skyway and Bridge to be a part of the Interstate Highway System, and pay off the $63 million debt.

There are many other toll roads. West Virginia has one that has failed. Ohio has one that has succeeded. Kansas, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Oklahoma, and other States have toll roads.

If the Federal Government pays off the Calumet Skyway and Bridge indebtedness, why should not the U.S. Government pay off the indebtedness of every other similar project in the country?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Chicago Daily Calumet of July 30, 1963, and an article which was published in the same newspaper on August 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Calumet,
July 30, 1963]

SKYWAY'S FLOP PREDICTED BY ALDERMAN BOHLING IN 1954

Alderman Nicholas J. Bohling (seventh) has joined the city officials supporting purchase of the Chicago Skyway by the Federal Government.

In 1954, Bohling opposed construction of the skyway as unneeded—and doomed it to financial failure. His original stand now dramatically justified, the alderman now says that the only solution to the skyway's financial problem is sale to the Federal Government.

"The whole thing has been a big flop," Bohling said. "It's just a matter of time before the Federal Government has to buy it. And it might as well be now as later."

Bohling said the surveys presented in 1954 did not adequately show need for the huge toll bridge, but the city went through with the plan anyway.

Skyway manager Jim McDonough said there was a definite and very great need for the skyway in 1954, but agrees with Bohling that the only solution to present problems is Federal purchase.

McDonough predicted that commuter traffic on the road would increase substantially if the Federal Government buys the skyway for use as a freeway.

Referring to the Chicago area transportation study report last year, McDonough said total usage would probably double in 10 years if tolls were discontinued. During the past year, skyway traffic has averaged about 20,000 vehicles per day.

McDonough said the bridge is capable of handling 60,000 vehicles a day under the toll setup, but would be able to handle nearly 100,000 per day if toll gates were removed in conversion to a freeway.

Whatever the case, the skyway will not be used near full capacity in the foreseeable future as are the Dan Ryan, Congress, and Northwest Expressways.

At the time of construction, it was thought that 40,000 vehicles would use the bridge each day. The present financial setup was organized on this basis, and bonds were sold. But traffic on the skyway has never approached this for the daily average at the end of a year.

Opened in 1958, toll collections on the skyway have never been sufficient to pay the interest on the $100,700,000 in bonds sold to finance its construction. The city is in default of the bond interest due July 1 and foreclosure is a possibility.

Nevertheless, McDonough said the skyway is a very important traffic artery. "It was built to relieve the congestion caused by cars coming off the Indiana toll road at Indianapolis Boulevard and has done well in doing so," he said.

"The city was forced to build the skyway because there was no interstate highway act at that time and something had to be done to relieve the traffic," he said. "A toll bridge was the only answer at the time."

McDonough said construction of the Dan Ray Expressway and Interstate 94 under the Federal Highway Act substantially hurt the skyway and the Indiana toll road because it allowed for construction of freeways generally parallel to the toll systems. He said 65 to 70 percent of skyway traffic comes from the Indiana toll road.

If the bridge is eventually turned into a freeway, McDonough said it would clear the way for construction of at least two additional ramps.

He said ramps built at 79th and Stony Island and 87th and Anthony would allow vehicles to travel north from these points to the Dan Ryan Expressway connection at 67th Street.

These ramps were not originally included in the skyway because the 1953 Municipal Toll Bridge Act enacted by the Illinois General Assembly allowed toll charges—in cities—only on bridges over water.

Thus, tolls paid on the skyway are for crossing the Calumet River. Since no water would be crossed by vehicles going north from 87th or 79th Streets on the skyway, no ramps could be included.

[From the Chicago Daily Calumet, Aug. 17, 1963]

CLAIM SKYWAY A FLOP BEFORE OPENING—REALTOR ASKS HOW ENGINEERS MADE ESTIMATES

Begun in 1954, the Chicago Skyway toll bridge has never produced the revenue predicted for it. Default on interest payments due July 1 has passed control of the structure from the city to holders of $101 million in revenue bonds issued to finance construction.

The following article, predicting financial failure for the skyway, appeared in the November 1957 edition of the Survey, a monthly newsletter published by the Charles Ringer Co. It was written by Morgan L. Fitch, prominent area realtor and board chairman of the Ringer Co.

"As the last beams swing into place on the 125-foot-high Calumet Skyway river bridge and workers swarm the streets building approach ramps, South Chicago citizens who are to help pay for the $101 million-plus bridge are speculating about the amount of money needed to pay off the elevated highway. (Which will, incidentally, cost more than the recently opened Mackinac Bridge although the big Michigan bridge is about 3 miles longer in length.)

"INVESTORS WERE CURIOUS

"Investors in skyway bonds are also curious. They are interested in knowing the answers to three questions:

"1. Will traffic on the elevated roadway provide sufficient revenue to pay operation costs, interest, and bond retirement?

"2. Are maintenance and operating expenses correctly computed for the 36-year period during which the bonds are to be paid off?

"3. Will the Northern Illinois Toll Highway eventually link up with the Indiana Toll Road and, if so, will this connection decrease skyward traffic and revenue?

"When complete, the 7¾-mile elevated road will carry cars and trucks between the Indiana Toll Road terminus in southeast Chicago and 63d and State Streets. Eastern engineers, who set up probable traffic loads, see 15,959,000 vehicles on the skyway in 1960, probably the first year of full-fledged operation.

"THIRTY CARS PER MINUTE

"On the basis of a passenger car charge of 25 cents and an average toll of 32 cents per vehicle, this amounts to 43,723 cars per day, 30 cars per minute, or 1 every 2 seconds, day and night, 7 days a week, providing better than $5 million in revenue that year.

"Thus to pay its way, according to present calculations, the skyway must generate in 1960 traffic more than two-thirds the current volume of the Congress Street Expressway and a little less than half of today's flow on Lake Shore Drive, one of the world's heaviest traveled roadways. The skyway vehicular load is due to increase by 1987 to 27 million cars per year, according to the traffic engineers.

"During the 30 years while traffic is to nearly double in volume, maintenance and administrative expenses, according to the planners, are to remain absolutely static. Every item of the $135,000 in administrative costs for 1958, including salaries, is exactly duplicated in 1987, a generation later.

"Every item of maintenance, amounting to $187,000 is unchanged for 30 years. Operating costs vary only in the addition of 30 toll collectors—but their $4,200 annual salary is to be the same in 1987 as in 1958.

"NEEDED SECOND BOND ISSUE

"The $10,000 annual fee for the consulting engineers is unchanged from 1958 to 1987 although this is presumably to be the firm which saw increases of as much as 497 percent in some construction costs and an overall increase of 37 percent in their cost estimates during 2 years of preliminary surveys, an increase which forced a second bond issue to cover $13 million in added skyway charges.

"While the prospectus for the skyway bonds and that for Northern Illinois Toll Highway bonds avoid showing any connection with the Indiana Toll Road, it seems unreasonable to expect the tri-state highway to be built without some link to toll roads running to New York City.

"Just in case, the literature for the skyway carries a denial from Indiana that such a connection is planned, and the engineers have provided a statement that such a road will probably not be completed until the skyway has been open a number of years and the advantages of the skyway route well established.

"Bond buyers can only hope that the engineers' estimates as to traffic, revenues, and operating expense are more accurate than their computations of construction cost, that there will be a car every 2 seconds to pay off the 7-mile bridge from revenue."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, these articles point out that examination of the fiscal feasibility reports made in 1954 shows something was wrong with the engineering recommendations. I have a letter from the editor of this newspaper; he suggests that I ask who are the holders of the bonds that will be paid by the taxpayers.

When that issue comes before the Senate committee, I hope a probe will be made on this aspect.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 11, 1963, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason (Rept. No. 495);

H.R. 5250. An act to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities (Rept. No. 494); and

H.R. 6246. An act relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay (Rept. No. 488).

By Mr. MORTON, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to designate "Bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States (Rept. No. 496).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 497)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for the Senate Committee on Appropriations I send forward the report on H.R. 6754, the bill making appropriations for 1964 for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. I do so in open session because I wish Senators to know that the printed reports will be available to all Senators in the morning, as I am advised, and I desire the leadership on both sides to know also that at the convenience of the leadership, and in the appropriate time permitted by the rules, this measure will be ready for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, and the bill be placed on the calendar.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT TO CONGRESS BY AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ENTITLED "PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR EXPANDING RESEARCH IN FOOD AND NUTRITION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 35)

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report an original resolution providing that the report entitled "Proposed Program for Expanding Research in Food and Nutrition" be printed as a Senate document. This request was approved by the Committee on Appropriations.

I wish to make a few comments in regard to this report.

In the Senate Committee Report No. 1908, accompanying the agricultural appropriation bill, 1963, the following statement was made on page 5:

> The committee has given consideration to the long-range needs for an accelerated nutrition and consumer research program and $25,000 is included in the bill to enable the Department to make a thorough study of nutritional research programs conducted in the Department in cooperation with the States and by private industry. The committee recommends that after careful evaluation of present work and future requirements the Department submit a report on this which will embody long-range needs projected over a 3-year period development program.

On March 5, 1963, Secretary Freeman submitted to the committee a report entitled "Proposed Program for Expanding Research in Food and Nutrition," pursuant to the committee's request cited above.

Last year during the course of the Senate hearings, the committee received testimony which brought to its attention the needs of a long-range program of accelerated research in human nutrition and in consumer use of food products. The report submitted by Secretary Freeman on March 5, 1963, sets forth in summary form information of significant importance to the Senate and for the American public. The report embodies a comprehensive statement—which is of value to all Americans—of the need for accelerating scientific research in food and nutrition. The present scale of the Federal research effort is inadequate to meet the needs of our expanding population or to permit the Department of Agriculture to fulfill its responsibilities to the American public for the development of adequate and timely nutritional research findings.

For example, in spite of our food abundance and the increasing use of protective foods—such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and green and yellow vegetables—our people today are more anxious about proper eating and good nutrition than ever before. We worry about overweight. We wonder if we should avoid some kinds of fats in our diets. These are only two nutritional problems that have created widespread public concern. Many aspects of nutrition need further study.

Scientists today are asking whether proper diets can slow down the aging process. Research with experimental animals, carried on through 90 generations, has demonstrated that diet modification could extend the average lifespan substantially. Can human beings get a similar benefit from improved diets? We simply don't know.

The only way to get answers to such vital questions is to strengthen our research in food and nutrition. The Department's report describes how this can be done.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 197) was read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a report to Congress by the United States Department of Agriculture entitled "Proposed Program for Expanded Research in Food and Nutrition", prepared by the Agricultural Research Service, and that there be printed one thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency;

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America to the seventh session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, John Gorham Palfrey, of New York, James T. Ramey, of Illinois, and Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the seventh session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, Edna F. Kelly, U.S. Representative from the State of New York, William S. Mailliard, U.S. Representative from the State of California, Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, and Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and

Mercer Cook, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Niger, Charles C. Stelle, of Maryland, Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, and Mrs. Jane Warner Dick, of Illinois, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2141. A bill for the relief of Celedonia Libunao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2142. A bill for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2143. A bill to promote the development of improved local-service aircraft by providing for temporary Federal assistance for such development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. McIntyre when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2144. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 13th of September of each year as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

DISCONTINUANCE OF AID TO DIEM REGIME IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Senators Bayh, Bartlett, Beall, Bible, Burdick, Cannon, Carlson, Clark, Gruening, Johnston, McGovern, Morse, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Pell, Simpson, Yarborough, Young of Ohio, and Long of Louisiana) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 196) opposing conditional continuation of military and economic assistance to the Government of South Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Church, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ENTITLED "PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR EXPANDED RESEARCH IN FOOD AND NUTRITION"

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 197) to print as a Senate document a report entitled "Proposed Program for Expanded Research in Food and Nutrition," with additional copies, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Young of North Dakota, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

LOCAL SERVICE AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the development of a small, short-haul, subsidy-saving transport aircraft. The French and the Dutch are pressing vigorously ahead with 18- to 30-seat passenger aircraft and I have been surprised to discover how little attention our domestic manufacturers have been devoting to this concept.

I first recommended the development of a small passenger aircraft as a successor to the DC–3 in my testimony before the Aviation Subcommittee on the Northeast Airlines crisis on August 15. I am confident that higher load factors in local service airlines could lead to lower break-even points for them, eliminating the need for many local aviation subsidies. Thus, the development of an effective small passenger aircraft would not only improve service but save the taxpayer money. Regions of the country like northern New England would benefit solidly from the use of such airplanes. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the many desirable consequences which would accompany the development of a small passenger aircraft: a contribution to our export potential in markets all over the world, the improvement of air service, partial elimination of aviation subsidies, expanded opportunity for the domestic airframe industry, and a real boost to the less densely settled parts of this country.

As I observed in the Senate the other day, FAA has the authority to move forward with the development of such an aircraft. But to do so may involve the Agency in new program requirements and I would like to guarantee that the Administrator has all the authority he will need. The introduction of a bill also gives Congress the opportunity to participate in this worthwhile development program. The very able Congressman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] has introduced such a bill in the House of Representatives and I am pleased to do so in the Senate today.

Precedent for such a program can be found in Public Law 867 of the 81st Congress, adopted in 1950, by which Congress urged the development of turbine-powered transport aircraft. The bill would supplement the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency in three ways. First, the FAA would draft specifications for such an airplane. Second, it would provide for tests under actual operating conditions. Third, it would empower the FAA to contribute directly to the development of such an aircraft. I am sure that the CAB and FAA would contribute willingly to working out the details of the legislation and providing cost estimates once we know precisely what the domestic manufacturers plan to do. The bill would give Congress the opportunity to declare itself firmly in favor of local service aircraft development, as a district contribution to economic and transportation progress. Of course, the introduction or passage of this bill would have no discouraging effect on the efforts of our domestic manufacturers, whether in securing licenses to manufacture new planes developed overseas or in proceeding with their own plans. The bill I am introducing today would match these private initiatives with appropriate responses at the level of Government.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I send the local service aircraft development bill to the desk and request that it be held open for additional sponsors until Wednesday, September 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 2143) to promote the development of improved local-service aircraft by providing for temporary Federal assistance for such development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McIntyre, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress last year in Public Law 87–793, the Postal and Federal Salary Act of 1962, wisely liberalized survivorship costs for future retirees. Under terms of this law a Federal employee can provide survivorship benefits by having his annuity reduced by 2½ percent of the first $3,600 of the annual annuity and 10 percent of any amount in excess of this sum. The survivor would be entitled to 55 percent of the basic annuity.

This provision is applicable only to those who have retired after October 10, 1962, and elected survivorship benefits.

Mr. President, it seems only simple justice that the liberalized survivorship provisions should also apply to existing retirees who have elected a reduction in their annuities to provide survivorship benefits.

Mr. President, a vast and complicated pattern of annuity reductions takes place for those who retired previously. In all instances the cost of annuity reductions to provide survivorship benefits is vastly higher than that given by law last year to future retirees.

According to information supplied to me by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, the four major categories of retirees who have elected survivorship benefits, depending on date of retirement, are:

A. Retired prior to April 1, 1948, with the reduction based on the ages of both the retiring employee and spouse, and calculated on an actuarially equivalent basis; i.e., the value of the joint and survivor annuity was equal to the value of the single life annuity at retirement. The annuity to the survivor was 100 percent or 50 percent of the employee's reduced annuity, as elected by him.

B. Retired in the period April 1, 1948–September 29, 1949. The reduction was 10 percent of the single life annuity, plus three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year the wife was under age 60. (The election was available to men only.) The total reduction could not exceed 25 percent, and the widow's annuity was 50 percent of the unreduced annuity.

C. Retired in the period September 30, 1949–September 30, 1956. Same as B, except (1) the election was available to both men and women; and (2) the flat 10-percent reduction was liberalized to 5 percent on the first $1,500 of single life annuity, plus 10 percent on any excess.

D. Retired October 1, 1956, and later. The retiring employee could choose any portion of his life annuity (excluding any increase under the minimum disability provisions) as a base. The survivor annuity was 50 percent of this base. The reduction was 2½ percent of the first $2,400 of the base, plus 10 percent of any excess.

Mr. President, I am introducing legislation to provide a uniform basis for figuring survivorship benefits for all retirees who have elected such benefits. Under the terms of the legislation I am introducing, the benefits would be identical to Public Law 87–793, for those who retired on October 11, 1962, or after. This provides a simplified and uniform procedure in figuring all costs of survivorship benefits, and extends to those who retired prior to October 11, 1962, the benefits provided by Congress for those who retired after that date. Some 192,911 retirees, plus their survivors, will benefit under the terms of this legislation.

It is all too easy to overlook the needs of retired Federal employees who have devoted a lifetime to Government service. Their annuities in most cases are all too small. There is no reason why they should not have the same benefits which were provided last year by law to those who retired after October 10, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2144) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the annuity of each retired employee who retired prior to October 11, 1962, and who elected a reduction in his annuity to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse, shall be recomputed under the formula enacted in section 1103 of Public Law 87–793 applicable to annuities of employees who retired on and after October 11, 1962.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits provided by this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Sec. 3. This Act shall be effective on the first day of January 1964.

JOHN BARRY DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, tomorrow, September 13, is the day on which one of our truly great naval heroes was born.

In the history of the U.S. Navy, there have been few officers more brilliant, more resourceful, more patriotic than Commodore John Barry.

He was born in Ireland in 1745, of poor parents at a time when famine and strife beset that island.

John Barry went to sea as a young boy, as was the custom during his times. At the age of 15 he came to Philadelphia, which he called home for the rest of a life that was devoted almost entirely to the American Navy.

And he became a naval hero second only to John Paul Jones, by his outstanding service during the Revolutionary War and the difficult first years of our nationhood.

A brief recounting of some of his exploits will amply illustrate why Commodore John Barry holds and fully deserves a high place in our naval history.

At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, he immediately offered his services to his country. As commander of the brig *Lexington*, he captured the British tender *Edward* on April 17, 1776. In that same year he was, by resolution of Congress, placed seventh on the list of captains, and placed in command of the *Effingham*. With four small boats, he isolated a British schooner from a superior enemy naval force in the lower Delaware, at the same time capturing a number of transports and substantial supplies intended for the British Army, without the loss of a man.

In 1781, in command of the *Alliance*, he boarded and captured the British vessels *Atlanta* and *Trepassy*, and the next year carried the Marquis de Lafayette to France, continuing the capture of enemy vessels during the crossing.

In 1794, he was placed in command of the *United States*, the flagship of six frigates built to deal with Algerian pirates, and 1798 was put in command of the American ships in the West Indies during the hostilities with France.

President Kennedy, during his sentimental journey to Ireland this summer, went to Wexford to pay tribute to Commodore Barry by placing a wreath on his monument there on Crescent Quay.

When people saw pictures of this ceremony on television, or read about it in the papers, many of them no doubt wondered about who Commodore John Barry was.

This is because many history books pass over Commodore Barry's illustrious career and the fine service he rendered his country for many years, until his death in 1803.

It is fitting therefore that September 13, the birthday of Commodore John Barry, be remembered by the American people as an important date in our history.

We should pay honor to this man, and try to make up for the many years that his name and record have been neglected.

To help accomplish this, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim September 13 of each year as Commodore John Barry Day, in commemoration of his life and many years of service to our country. I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 119) to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 13th of September of each year as Commodore John Barry Day, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the 13th of September of each year as Commodore John Barry Day in commemoration of the life and service of Commodore John Barry, Father of the American Navy and calling on the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and exercises.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, there is justifiable unrest among dairy farmers. Their economic position has steadily declined. The very large surplus of dairy products is a heavy drag on the dairy market, and there is little hope for improvement of their situation unless we take steps to reduce that surplus.

The unfortunate fact is that the present dairy support program is inadequate and that dairy farmers are not receiving the benefits from it that they might.

The Department of Agriculture figures show that last year the surplus of milk was 8.9 billion pounds out of the 118 billion pounds marketed. Net costs to the Government for the support program were $480 million.

Last year critics blamed the excess production on the higher price supports which were in effect until April 1, 1962. It is now more than 17 months since the support level was dropped from about $3.40 for milk for manufacturing purposes to $3.11 per hundred—adjusted to $3.14 since last April. Despite this sharp cutback in support price, production has continued at a high level and for the first 7 months of 1963 it declined less than 1 percent from the same period of the previous year.

The Department estimates show that for the present marketing year the surplus will be 8.8 billion pounds of the 118.4 billion pounds to be marketed, and net costs to the Government will be $435 million.

The committee bill (S. 1915) is now on the calendar. It would permit producers in a Federal order market to make an adjustment in their pricing system by removing the blend price mechanism. It is said that over a period of time this change, if adopted by producers in a sufficient number of the 83 Federal order markets, would discourage additional expansion, since a producer could retain his share of the premium-priced class I sales even though he cut back or did not expand on production of "excess" milk used for manufacturing purposes.

There is no evidence that the committee bill (S. 1915) can solve the present dairy crisis by making any substantial increase in dairy farm income or reduction of the great surpluses. Estimates made by the Department show that next year, if the authority provided in the committee bill were available to the Federal markets, production would be cut by only 600 million pounds and net income of dairy producers would increase by only $7 million. Government costs for the support program would be $427 million.

I do not believe that we should any longer delay taking action to meet the serious dairy problem. In behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], I submit an amendment proposed to be offered to S. 1915 when it becomes the pending business of the Senate, and I ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the amendment we propose to offer provides for a voluntary program of surplus reduction payments, to be effective until April 1, 1965. It is the same language as section 2 of the bill I previously introduced (S. 1961) on which the Department of Agriculture reported favorably.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department report on my bill (S. 1961) be printed at this point in the RECORD. If the proposed amendment were added to the committee bill (S. 1915), the effect would be to provide the same program as outlined in the Department report on S. 1961.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table compiled by the Department on the estimated program results of the committee bill (S. 1915) and of my bill (S. 1961), as compared to the present program.

There being no objection, the report and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 20, 1963.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of August 1 for a report on S. 1961, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage adjustments in milk marketing and for other purposes.

This bill would authorize two significant changes in our existing dairy price programs:

1. Based excess pricing plans designed to encourage surplus adjustment in Federal milk marketing orders, and

2. A program of incentive payments to encourage surplus adjustment to be operated in conjunction with the dairy price support activities under the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Section 1 of the bill would authorize provisions in Federal milk marketing orders under which each producer under an order might be allocated a pro rata share of the sales of milk in the marketing area for the higher valued fluid uses, including a portion of the reserves which are essential to the market, in proportion to his deliveries during a prior representative marketing period. Such provisions would make specific allowances for allocations to new producers and to dairy farmers who were not producers under an order at the time the initial allocations were made. Order provisions would also prescribe the terms upon which allocations or marketing history might be transferred among producers and the manner in which individual producers might obtain a review of their allocation or base.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to dairy farmers to encourage adjustments in the marketing of milk and butterfat so as to reduce the amount of surplus dairy products acquired by the Government under the dairy price support program. This section provides for two types of payments:

1. Payments on milk marketed for manufacturing usage of up to 50 cents per hundredweight to producers who agree to restrict their marketings to the same level they marketed in a prior period or to some percentage of that level; and

2. Payments to producers under Federal milk marketing orders of not to exceed $2.50 per hundred pounds for each hundred pounds by which they reduce marketings from the level they marketed during a prior period.

The bill further provides, with respect to the payments on milk for manufacturing usages, that more than one level of payment may be established for producers outside the Federal milk marketing orders. This would authorize making payments at one level to those producers who did not reduce but restricted their marketings to the level of the prior period, while a higher level of payment, not to exceed 50 cents per hundredweight, might be made to producers who did reduce their marketings by some given percentage. Payments to producers under Federal milk marketing orders would be at a uniform rate for each hundred pounds reduction in marketings. Payments in either case would be established at such levels as the Secretary determined appropriate to accomplish the objective of surplus reduction within the prescribed limits.

This bill would not improve the dairy price support program as much as the proposals presented before your committee on April 3 of this year and still preferred by this Department. Nevertheless, the bill would:

1. Increase the income of dairy farmers;
2. Reduce Government costs; and
3. Reduce Government stocks of surplus dairy products.

It could also lead to improvement in the performance of milk marketing orders by reducing the incentive to market milk in excess of the quantities needed for fluid purposes. Thus, passage of S. 1961 would be a decided improvement over the present situation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Estimated program results of S. 1915 and S. 1961 for 1963–64 compared to present program.

Item	Unit (1)	Present program: 1962–63 marketing year (2)	Present program: 1963–64 marketing year (3)	S. 1915 class I base plan (4)	S. 1961 McCarthy program with 20- and 40-cent payments[1] (5)
Support level, by purchases	Hundredweight	3.11	3.14	3.14	3.14
Milk production	Billion pounds	125.5	125.5	124.9	120.9
Marketings (milk equivalent):					
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	64.0	64.0	63.4	59.4
Total	do	118.0	118.4	117.8	113.8
Commercial demand (milk equivalent):					
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	55.1	55.2	55.2	55.2
Total	do	109.1	109.6	109.6	109.6
Surplus[2]	do	8.9	8.8	8.2	4.2
CCC purchases:					
Butter	Million pounds	355	350	320	113.5
Cheese	do	140	140	145	180
Nonfat dry milk	do	1,270	1,200	1,150	848
CCC purchase price:					
Butter	Cents per pound	58	58	58	58
Cheese	do	34.6	35.6	35.6	35.6
Nonfat dry milk	do	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4
CCC net expenditures, purchases (gross)	Million dollars	511	484	458	296
Reduction payments:[3]					
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds				2
Rate per hundredweight	Dollar				2
Total	Million dollars				40
Production payments:[4]					
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds				37.3
Rate per hundredweight	Dollar				0.20–0.40
Total	Million dollars				111
Total outlay	do	511	484	458	447
Sales proceeds	do	31	31	31	31
Total net program expenditures	do	480	453	427	416
Dairy farm cash receipts:					
From marketings	do	4,836	4,871	4,865	4,775
Payments	do				151
Total receipts	do	4,836	4,871	4,865	4,926
Effect on net producer income	do		0	+7	+150

[1] 20-cent payments to manufacturing milk producers who do not exceed their base period marketings and 40-cent payments to those who reduce 5 percent. This estimate assumes 50 percent of manufacturing milk producers participate with 20 percent reducing 5 percent to receive the higher payment. Variations in the percentage of producers reducing do not significantly affect program cost though larger participation would significantly increase net producer income.

[2] Milk equivalent milkfat basis.

[3] Payment on reduction below base in Federal order markets.

[4] Payment on manufacturing grade milk.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Department figures show that a program of surplus reduction payments as permitted under the amendment we propose to offer would:

First. Reduce Government costs by $37 million as compared to costs under the present program.

Second. Cut the surplus of milk by over 50 percent, from 8.8 billion pounds to 4.2 billion pounds.

Third. Increase the net income of dairy farmers by $150 million.

Mr. President, the situation is similar to that in respect to feed grains before we passed the emergency bill of 1961. We need to take action to reduce the surplus and to restore the market to some degree of balance. We propose a voluntary program of surplus reduction payments to do this.

In the case of milk we can achieve the needed reduction of surpluses and still cut Government costs at the same time. The cost of processing and storing a hundred pounds of dairy products is about the same as that of producing them. The savings made in reducing the surplus can more than offset the costs of a surplus reduction payment program—and dairy farmers will get a higher net income.

The decision the Senate will be called upon to make is not one of whether to provide price supports for another farm product. A program exists, but it is inadequate. The question will be whether we are to let this program continue to drift, without reducing excessive surpluses and without providing adequate income for dairy farmers, or whether we are to take a small step as provided by the committee bill, or whether we are to meet the problem directly and effectively. We will have an unusual opportunity by which we can cut Government costs of a farm program and at the same time cut surpluses in half—and all this while improving the net income of dairy farmers by $150 million.

The program which we intend to propose has the support of the Secretary of Agriculture. It has also been recommended by the heads of two national farm organizations, Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, and Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union. I ask unanimous consent that their letters on proposed dairy legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR: About one-third of all farm income in the United States is derived from milk. Yet the dairy situation in the Nation continues to be critical, especially in the Federal milk marketing order areas, which have seen a 4-percent increase in production over last year.

The National Grange believes that the passage of the Proxmire bill (S. 1915) is imperative if the market orders are to be permitted to set their own houses in order. The alternative is the collapse of the Federal order system with its resultant chaos.

We believe that the incentive reduction payments and subsidy program in section 2 of the McCarthy bill (S. 1961) will cut Government costs, improve farm income and provide for an orderly transition to a better system permitted by S. 1915.

Your favorable consideration of these bills will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM, *Master.*

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
September 3, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR: At hearings before the Senate Agricultural Committee on May 14 and 15, 1963, Farmers Union witnesses, Mr. Edwin Christianson, president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Mr. Gilbert Rohde, president of Wisconsin Farmers Union and Mr. Reuben Johnson, director of Farmers Union's division of legislative services, stated our case in behalf of Senator MCCARTHY's bill, S. 1961. Farmers Union support of S. 1961 is grounded in the following facts:

1. Producers of manufacturing milk who receive prices based on a support of $3.11 are in serious need for a program which will substantially raise their net income. Proof of this statement is found in the diminishing number of manufacturing milk producers in many formerly prosperous dairy communities.

2. To deal with surplus milk in market order areas while ignoring surplus production in manufacturing milk areas constitutes a piecemeal approach to the need for supply adjustment nationally.

3. A program solely for producers of class I milk in which bases are established discriminates against producers of manufacturing milk.

4. The class I base plan (Senator PROXMIRE's bill, S. 1915) would go into effect only on the amending of market orders through referendum. Therefore, such a proposal would have little immediate effect on excess production. On the other hand, the section 2 of Senator MCCARTHY's bill, S. 1961, provides an immediate solution to the need for supply adjustment in manufacturing milk areas.

Farmers Union contends that dairy legislation this year should be national in its application. Moreover, Department of Agriculture analysts determined that S. 1961 would (1) cut production; (2) cut Government cost and (3) increase farm income.

I, therefore, respectfully urge your support of and vote for Senator MCCARTHY's amendment (section 2 of S. 1961).

The position of Farmers Union in behalf of dairy farmers both in market order and manufacturing milk areas is well-established. I have publicly proclaimed this position on a number of occasions. However, I cannot in good conscience support any legislation which ignores the economic welfare of producers of manufacturing milk and the very survival of many good farm communities such as are found in manufacturing milk areas.

Sincerely,

James G. Patton, *President*.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REPORTS ON RESEARCH PROGRAM NEEDS SUBMITTED BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 415 AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT NO. 1908, ACCOMPANYING THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963 (S. DOC. NO. 34)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last October 13, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 415 which requested the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to the Director of the Budget and to the Congress the most effective program available for research to discover new uses for agricultural commodities. The Senate resolution further requested that the proposed program cost not in excess of $35 million annually above the current allowances for 1963 for utilization research and development to discover new uses for agricultural commodities.

On March 20, 1963, Secretary Freeman transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack, a program outline of accelerated utilization research and development.

The program outlined by the Department would somewhat more than double the present research effort. It is believed that the program proposal offers many potential benefits, and here are a few examples:

New markets for starch—which makes up 70 percent of cereal grains—can be found in paper, films, fibers, plastics, and coatings, and in new adhesives that resist water and have great holding power.

Entirely new organic chemicals, created through fermentation of grain, can be used by industry in a wide variety of processes.

Our winter wheats can be modified to make them more acceptable in world markets. Low-cost wheat products—such as parboiled, pearled, and fermented wheat foods—can be developed for use in low-income countries, where markets will increase as the standard of living rises.

Byproducts of wheat milling can be upgraded into concentrates that are rich in vitamins, antibiotics, hormones, and growth-promoting substances.

New poultry, dairy, and animal products—desirable and attractively priced—can give our people better diets and also increase the profitable use of crops and acres. Freeze-dried meat and poultry are other new possibilities.

A fully acceptable dry whole milk could lower milk costs enough to increase consumption by 10 percent. Surplus animal fats can be turned into improved detergents, lubricants, and plastics.

Chemical modification can improve cotton for hundreds of different uses. Our scientists foresee comfortable cotton garments that hold their appearance and truly need no ironing; attractive, durable cotton fabrics for our homes that resist soiling and staining; extra-strong cotton fabrics that are needed for industrial use. Research can help to reverse the decline in cotton's markets in the face of continuing competition from synthetic fibers.

Wool can also meet the challenge of synthetics if its desirable characteristics are improved and new characteristics are imparted. This is already being done through utilization research.

With the unique chemical properties that nature has built into vegetable oils, research can help them obtain a much greater share of today's growing markets for industrial chemicals. Plastics, elastomers, surface-active agents, and other products are potential outlets.

A good processed food that is convenient to prepare and acceptable in price can revolutionize the production and distribution of a commodity—as we have seen in the case of citrus fruits and potatoes. Many other commodities can benefit from research on dehydration and development of new products.

Exploration for new crops can have far-reaching results, as we have seen in the case of soybeans. Seeds containing unique oils are of particular interest. This is a vast field—only about 3,500 of the 250,000 known species of plants have so far been analyzed.

In two decades of operation, the Department's effort in utilization research and development added over $2.5 billion to the value of farm commodities, at a research cost of less than $175 million. This is a benefit-to-cost ratio of nearly 15 to 1. Each succeeding year has seen a greater return per year for the total research expenditure. During the past 5 years, the benefit-to-cost ratio has increased to 25 to 1. With adequate support, the rate of return should continue to rise.

The country cannot afford to pass up the opportunity of dividends like these.

In view of the results achieved to date from the present modest program of utilization research and development carried out by the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it is evident that there is a great opportunity for finding new uses and markets for agricultural commodities through an accelerated and expanded scientific research program.

Mr. President, the details of the research proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture are contained in the report entitled "Strengthening Research on Utilization of Agricultural Commodities." On behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I congratulate the Senator from Georgia. He has been a leader in the effort to have this study made by the Secretary of Agriculture. I am glad the proposal has progressed this far and that a Senate document is to be printed expressing the results of the study.

This morning, the full Committee on Appropriations, I believe without a single dissent, passed upon this question and expressed the feeling that the subject was one of great importance to the country. Obviously, it involves possible ways of reducing farm surpluses. We already have problems of producing surpluses on less and less land, so research that will probably develop additional uses and byproducts of surplus agricultural products is of inestimable importance to the agriculture of our country.

I commend the Senator from Georgia for his continuing leadership in this field.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida. No Member of this body can accomplish anything whatever on his own. With the assistance of such stalwart friends and persons of commonsense as the Senator from Florida, who have enabled us to proceed this far, I hope we shall be able to develop a program that will eliminate the enormous waste of billions of dollars by this country as a result of the storage of huge quantities of surplus agricultural products, and will make those products available for uses for the benefit of the taxpayers, who today pay for the losses.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES AND LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 4, 1963, the names of Mr. Nelson and Mr. Proxmire were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2114) to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government, introduced by Mr. Muskie (for himself and other Senators) on September 4, 1963.

PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING THE FIRST WEEK IN MARCH EACH YEAR AS "SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 113, to authorize the President to proclaim and dedicate the first week of March as "Save Your Vision Week," and that their names be included at the next printing of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Excerpts from radio broadcast related to the alertness of Helen Delich Bentley of the Baltimore Sun.

GI BILL NEED FOR REGULARS AS WELL AS DRAFTEES SHOWN BY WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the various articles and speeches which have dealt with the cold war GI bill, we have usually discussed the readjustment problems which face our servicemen who have served from 3 to 4 years in the Armed Forces. However, there is one group of servicemen whose length of service has been considerably longer and whose readjustment problems are correspondingly greater. I am speaking of those men who have made military service their career. It has been estimated by the Department of Labor that over 14,500 officers and more than 43,500 enlisted men, all of whom have served at least 20 years in the Armed Forces, will retire and return to civilian life during 1963. At the present time some 141,000 officers and 193,000 enlisted men are receiving retirement pay after 20 or more years in the Armed Forces. These figures are expected to rise to 208,400 officers and 407,000 enlisted men by 1970.

The vast majority of these men will require additional training and education in order to satisfy civilian job requirements. However, with the possible exception of a few high ranking officers, the financial resources of our military personnel will not enable them to obtain this additional training and education in the absence of outside financial assistance. This is especially true in the case of the enlisted man. This is graphically illustrated in an informative article by Fred S. Hoffman which appeared in the Washington Post on August 7. Mr. Hoffman reveals that thousands upon thousands of our servicemen have had to resort to public and private assistance in order to adequately feed their families. As an example, he notes that some 7 percent of the soldiers stationed in the State of Washington qualify for free food from the State due to their low income. Mr. Hoffman also reveals that untold thousands of our servicemen have had to moonlight by taking off-duty civilian jobs in service stations, bowling alleys, and grocery stores in order to "keep their heads above water." Even with the pay raise bill which the Senate has just passed, it is obvious that the vast majority of our servicemen will be unable to finance additional civilian training and education from their own resources.

The realization of the plight which faces these career servicemen who wish to obtain additional education in order to fulfill the requirements for adequate civilian jobs is enhanced when it is realized that most of these men have children who are themselves approaching college age.

The Congress has recognized the service of these career personnel by providing for pensions when they retire. But it is obvious that a pension which is itself lower than service pay will be inadequate to meet the financial requirements of a veteran's family while he is seeking to increase his earning power and to qualify for civilian positions by obtaining additional training and education.

The loyal service which these men have rendered to their country in the Armed Forces together with the valuable contributions which they can render in business, teaching, and in other aspects of American life are two more compelling reasons why this Congress should provide readjustment assistance to these men by passing the cold war GI bill. Dr. Hoffman's article is a service to servicemen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoffman's article titled "Service Pay Inadequate, Thousands Take Charity," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 7, 1963]

SERVICE PAY INADEQUATE, THOUSANDS TAKE CHARITY

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

Thousands of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps enlisted men have had to turn to charity because they are unable to make ends meet on their service incomes.

An Associated Press survey of the military services and service-affiliated relief organizations indicated that the relief agencies have paid out millions of dollars to help provide military families with such basic needs as food and clothing.

Some families have been reduced to accepting free food—surplus packages. Others, particularly those with many children, have been able to draw State welfare payments.

Armed Forces personnel specialists said many men take jobs in bowling alleys, filling stations, groceries and other private businesses to add to their service pay. Their wives often work.

TERMED "DISGRACEFUL"

One marine welfare officer called it "disgraceful" that senior noncommissioned officers living in the Washington area should have to "moonlight"—take off-duty civilian jobs—to keep their heads above water.

"They just can't make ends meet," the officer said. "You wonder how in the world they get by."

A check with the armed services showed they do not know even approximately how many of their men have been drawing some form of relief.

That is because hard-pressed servicemen often apply to State and local agencies for help and those agencies generally keep such cases in confidence.

However, a hint of the scope comes from figures supplied by the semiofficial military relief organizations that operate on voluntary contributions. These groups were set up because regulations bar the services from using Government funds to furnish emergency aid.

RELIEF FIGURES GIVEN

Army Emergency Relief gave out $4,178,661 in loans and grants last year. One-third of this went to 12,215 cases to ease what was called "privation of dependents"—that is, to pay for food, rent, and utilities.

The Navy Relief Society distributed $4,056,570 in 1962, with about half going to avert want among the bluejackets, marines, their wives and children.

The Air Force Aid Society paid out more than $750,000 between December and May. No breakdown was available of the portion devoted to staving off destitution.

An incident that recently drew public attention demonstrates how servicemen may find themselves in money troubles when they are stationed far from where civilian jobs are available.

This happened at the Whidbey Island Naval Air Station in Washington State. About 150 Navy families there received surplus food under a State aid program. Asked why this was necessary, the Navy replied:

NUMBER NOT KNOWN

"Whidbey Island is located in an area remote from business or industry centers. It is difficult for a serviceman to get a job during off-duty hours or for his wife to find employment, thus providing additional income to supplement military pay."

The exact number of Navy men and marines getting this or some other kind of aid is "not known since assistance authorities do not make this information public," the Navy said.

However, it added, "We do know that some Navy families in New York and New England qualify for public assistance due to the size of the family and their relatively low income."

The Army said standards set by Washington State are such that about 7 percent of the 25,000 soldiers stationed there qualify for free food because of low income. This comes to about 1,750 men.

The help furnished by the service relief societies is generally of a one-shot variety. For long-term help, the services are banking on a $1.2 billion military pay bill now before Congress. It would provide the first military pay boost in 5 years, but would not provide more money for privates and seamen.

One version has passed the House.

Pentagon leaders headed by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara have been urging passage of the bill to correct the situation, which they contend is damaging morale among the 2.7 million persons in the Armed Forces and driving men with valuable skills out of uniform.

CALLS FOR PRIORITY

McNamara has termed the pay bill "the highest priority item of defense legislation now before Congress."

Vice Adm. W. R. Smedberg III, Chief of Naval Personnel, told the Associated Press it is because of situations like that at Whidbey Island that he has sought to impress on Congress and the American people how Armed Forces pay has shrunk in comparison with the incomes of all other segments of the U.S. economy.

Since 1958, Smedberg said, "everyone has had increases in pay but the military."

President Kennedy told a news conference last May 8 that inadequate pay and housing are among the problems involved in military morale.

"THE SALMON ARE OURS"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the words above constitute the title of an editorial which appeared in the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, September 3. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the people of Alaska are aroused. The people of all the Pacific Coast States are aroused. Ten years ago a treaty became effective in which the United States, Canada, and Japan were the participants. Then little, far too little, was known of the migratory habits and life of the Pacific salmon. The treaty provided that the Japanese should not take salmon of North American origin west of 175° west longitude. The conclusion of fishery biologists was that few, if any, salmon spawned in North American streams or lakes migrated west of that line. There is no evidence that Japanese scientists thought otherwise. Now we know much better. We know not only by reason of intensive research undertaken since that time but more particularly we know because each year the Japanese take a substantial part of all the Bristol Bay red salmon which have gone out to sea to mature before returning to their spawning grounds. The Japanese have caught these fish with nets, although Canadian and American fishermen are not permitted to take salmon on the high seas with nets.

Now the Japanese are insisting that the principle of abstention written into the treaty is abhorrent to them and must be erased. Abstention, simply put, means that fishermen of other nations must refrain from taking fish originating in or near a country which, through wise policies of conservation, necessarily including severe restrictions upon the country's own fishermen, has built up and maintained a fishery resource. No nation in the world has been more prudent in respect to conservation than the United States. Mr. President, thousands of my constituents dependent upon the Bristol Bay fishery exclusively for their livelihood, are already dependent upon Government assistance, including surplus food, because the 1963 run of red salmon back to Bristol Bay was almost a total failure. I do not assert that this was only because of the Japanese taking of fish on the high seas; what I do assert is that it doubtless was an important factor. Just as Alaskans are suffering now from the lack of fish in Bristol Bay, so are the constituents of Senators Magnuson and Jackson of Washington State, of Morse and Neuberger of Oregon, and of Kuchel and Engle of California. For many of their fishermen and many who are employed in the shore plants of Bristol Bay likewise found themselves with empty pocketbooks at the end of the season.

Mr. President, the Japanese may abhor the principle of abstention; we abhor the decimation of our fishery resource. The News-Miner editorial states an effective case.

Exhibit 1

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, Sept. 3, 1963]

The Salmon Are Ours

On September 16, representatives of the United States, Canada, and Japan will meet in Tokyo to decide an issue that is of paramount importance to the people of Fairbanks and the rest of Alaska.

This Tokyo meeting is a continuation of negotiations that were held in Washington, D.C., last June. On that date Japanese representatives announced that they opposed renewal of the so-called abstention principle as it applies to North American salmon. This principle actually goes back to the period prior to World War II. At that time the Japanese were catching about twice as much fish of all kinds on their side of the Pacific, including the Siberian coast, as we were on our side. Their ships came across to the U.S. side and seriously threatened our coastal fisheries.

The Alaska salmon industry took an aggressive lead in demanding protection and sent their representatives to Washington to plead their case. As a result of these representations, Secretary of State Cordell Hull formulated a historic rights policy that has become the basis of the present abstention policy.

Stated simply, the historic rights policy said that any nation that has investigated and regulated one of its fisheries for the purpose of conserving the fishery and is making full use of that resource, has an exclusive right to that fishery as far off shore as it extends.

Secretary Hull induced the Japanese to agree temporarily to leave the Bristol Bay salmon alone. Shortly thereafter, the "historic rights" policy was formulated into a proclamation signed by President Truman and today known as the Truman proclamation. After the war, the United States, Canada, and Japan met to negotiate the Tripartite North Pacific Fisheries Treaty. This treaty required the Japanese to abstain entirely from entering our salmon, halibut, and herring fisheries for at least 5 years and then for an additional 5 years if we keep up our conservation work and utilization as well as we were then doing.

We in Alaska are especially interested in the fact that the Japaneses agreed not to fish for salmon around the western end of the Aleutian chain of islands east of a provisional line set at 175 degrees west longitude.

There are many people today who feel that this provisional line wasn't tough enough. Scientific studies have indicated that this line should have been established further westward to afford protection to our salmon. The treaty was negotiated in 1951 and went into effect 2 years later. This brings us up to last June when the Japanese representatives opposed renewal of the abstention formula with the argument that it provides the United States and Canadian fishermen with a monopoly. These negotiations will be continued in Tokyo on September 16.

The monopoly theory is absolutely ridiculous. Figures of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission show that the Japanese catch of fish far exceeds that of any other nation and is constantly growing. In 1958 the Japanese caught 12 billion pounds of fish and the estimates for 1962 approximate 16 billion pounds. During that period of time the catch by U.S. fishermen has remained at about 6 billion pounds—or less than half that of the Japanese. The United States ranks fifth in annual catch and Canada ranks seventh. It appears to us that monopoly isn't paying off for the United States and Canadian fishermen.

The catching, processing, and sale of salmon has long been vital to the economy of Alaska. Actually, it precedes the discovery of gold as a vital economic factor in our State. Gov. John G. Brady spoke of the importance of salmon to Alaska in 1897. He said: "Alaska is the aquarium of the North Pacific * * * It is a vast food preserve and will be more and more drawn upon as the central line of population of the United States moves westward. By 1886, eight salmon canneries and nine salteries were in operation and the product was valued at $500,000 in San Francisco. In 1896, 10 years later, we have 29 canneries and 14 salteries, producing 949,645 cases of fish and 10,000 barrels, the combined value amounting to $2,383,753."

By 1897, a total of 7½ million cases of salmon had been caught and processed in Alaska. The value of this salmon far surpassed the original price paid to Russia for Alaska. The value of the total catch to date exceeds $2 billion or three times the value of Alaska's gold production. Today the value of canned salmon alone approximates $100 million annually. Thousands of people in and out of Alaska depend upon salmon for their livelihood.

Furthermore, the salmon industry has long been the backbone of Alaska's tax structure and the canneries' investment runs into the millions.

We hope that some of the Japanese representatives who are going to negotiate the fisheries treaty in Tokyo in a few weeks spend some of their spare time watching old westerns on television. In the days of the Old West, the ranchers raised their cattle and turned them loose to graze on the open range. These cattle were branded and ownership rights were recognized no matter how far the cattle wandered. Thousands and thousands of words have been written about what happened to the cattle rustler who ignored the brand mark on these wandering cattle.

As far as we Americans are concerned, the salmon are ours. They were born in our streams, and millions and millions of dollars have been spent to protect the salmon on their way both to the sea and their trip home where they spawn and die. Because they wander on the "open range" of the high seas doesn't make them the property of another country. We feel that it is just as immoral for Japan to catch these salmon as it was for outlaws to take branded cattle in the days of the Old West.

To us in Alaska, this is of grave concern. Thousands of people would suffer for many generations to come if the abstention principle isn't continued. We hope that the negotiators will take these facts into consideration when they meet in Tokyo September 16.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE WILFRED C. TSUKIYAMA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a high honor has been bestowed by the Government of Japan upon an outstanding citizen of Hawaii. Wilfred C. Tsukiyama, first chief justice of the State of Hawaii, was presented last week with the Order of the Sacred Treasure, second class, the highest honor ever conferred by Japan on an American of Japanese ancestry. The award was made in Tokyo by Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda in recognition of Justice Tsukiyama's contributions toward promotion of United States-Japan relations and a lifetime of distinguished service to his fellow men.

As a personal friend of Justice Tsukiyama of many years standing, and as one who has worked closely with him in the affairs of my State, I as speaker of the house of representatives and he as president of the senate, I cannot speak too highly of the superlative qualities that have made him one of the most highly respected citizens of the State of Hawaii. The eminent regard in which he is held by all the people of the 50th State is reflected in the outpouring of public tributes on the occasion of the latest honor conferred on him.

Editorials in the Hawaii newspapers have recalled the rise of this descendant of immigrant parents to his present office as chief justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court. As one of the editorials noted:

> If the American system made it possible for the son of immigrants to rise to the heights, consider also how that rise has enriched his community. Judge Tsukiyama's fellow AJA's (Americans of Japanese ances-

try) must share his pride in the award. And so do all other Americans of Hawaii who find in it, once again, confirmation of the rightness of equal opportunity for all men.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Lifetime Honored," which appeared in the September 6, 1963, edition of the Honolulu Advertiser, and the editorial entitled "Honors Well Earned," which appeared in the September 5, 1963, edition of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 6, 1963]

A LIFETIME HONORED

Wilfred C. Tsukiyama is a short, stocky, distinguished-looking man who all his life has taken things seriously and who has worked hard.

Knowing Judge Tsukiyama from years of observation of his public career we can well imagine the impact on him of the honor he received in Tokyo this week.

Japan's Prime Minister Ikeda presented him the Order of the Sacred Treasure, second class, in recognition of his distinguished career in Hawaii. It is the highest award ever presented to an American of Japanese ancestry by the Government of Japan.

We suspect that Judge Tsukiyama was deeply moved, for this recognition of his own success is also recognition, once again, of the American success story. And that story is closest to Judge Tsukiyama's heart. Not only has he lived it, he has belived in it most fervently. He is what you might call a good, old-fashioned patriot and proud of it.

This man, this first chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii, like so many of Hawaii's other prominent Americans of Japanese ancesty, was born of humble parents who came to the islands from Japan to work on a plantation.

The young Wilfred worked his way through McKinley High School in Honolulu, then attended Coe College in Iowa and subsequently won his law degree from the University of Chicago.

After Chicago he joined the Honolulu law firm of Huber, Kemp & Stainback. In 1929 he became a deputy city-county attorney, and in 1933 he was the first appointed city-county attorney, a post he held until 1940.

Judge Tsukiyama entered the Territorial senate in 1946. He served as president of that body from 1949 through 1953. When Hawaii achieved statehood he ran unsuccessfully against Oren E. Long for the U.S. Senate. Shortly after that election he was appointed the State's first chief justice.

The award from the Government of Japan reflects that Hawaii—and America—have been good to Judge Tsukiyama. But equally important, he has been good to them in his outstanding public service.

If the American system made it possible for the son of immigrants to rise to the heights, consider also how that rise has enriched his community.

Judge Tsukiyama's fellow Americans of Japanese ancestry must share his pride in the award. And so do all other Americans of Hawaii who find in it, once again, confirmation of the rightness of equal opportunity for all men.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 5, 1963]

HONORS WELL EARNED

Wilfred Tsukiyama, chief justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court, has received the Order of the Sacred Treasure, second class, the highest honor ever given by Japan to an American of Japanese ancestry.

The award, with approval of Emperor Hirohito, was made Tuesday in Tokyo by Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda in recognition of Justice Tsukiyama's contributions toward promotion of United States-Japan relations.

The white-haired chief justice is in Japan as a guest of the Tokyo West Rotary Club.

To those who know Hawaii's quiet-spoken Tsukiyama there is no doubt that Japan chose wisely in awarding this unprecedented honor to an islander. Those who know him know, too, that a dozen similar awards—if they existed—could well be made to this unobtrusive, scholarly little man for promoting good relations with almost any racial group you could name, either in Hawaii or anywhere he has traveled.

His qualities are such that he achieves this simply by being himself and talking with anyone he meets, not as a chief justice, or a lawyer, or a former legislator, but as an alert, friendly fellow with sparkling eyes, faultless diction, real interest in the other fellow's ideas and problems, and a vast store of information about Hawaii and its American heritage.

Hawaii is delighted that the Emperor and the Prime Minister have honored Chief Justice Tsukiyama from Honolulu—but Honolulans of all races are proud of him regardless of the Order of the Sacred Treasure.

DAVID E. BELL ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine of September 1, 1963, contains a timely article on foreign aid by David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. Mr. Bell raises four questions most commonly asked in Congress and throughout the country about our foreign aid programs:

Has our economic and military assistance been getting us anywhere; is it worth the cost?

Is foreign aid a major cause of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit?

Should not the other well-to-do countries carry more of the burden of helping the underdeveloped countries?

Can we not operate our foreign aid programs more efficiently?

Mr. President, the answers given by Mr. Bell are strong and clear. His statements are constructive, and deserve the thoughtful attention of Members of Congress and citizens across the country. Without additional comment, I commend Mr. Bell's article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine, Sept. 1, 1963]

A REPLY TO OPPONENTS OF FOREIGN AID—THE HEAD OF THE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GIVES HIS ANSWERS TO FOUR BASIC QUESTIONS ABOUT IT

(By David E. Bell)

Since I joined the Agency for International Development last December, I have had the opportunity to see the U.S. foreign aid program in action in countries as widely different, and as distant from each other, as Korea and Ecuador, Vietnam and Venezuela, Pakistan, and Chile. I have also traveled and spoken in many parts of the United States. The questions I have been asked in San Francisco, New York, Little Rock and other cities, as well as those asked by congressional committees, seem to reflect the main concerns held by American taxpayers about our economic and military assistance to other countries.

If I understand them correctly, the American people are asking four principal questions about our foreign aid programs:

Has our economic and military assistance been getting us anywhere; is it worth the cost?

Is foreign aid a major cause of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit?

Should not the other well-to-do countries carry more of the burden of helping the underdeveloped countries?

Can we not operate our foreign aid programs more efficiently?

The following answers to these questions have grown from my own observations in Washington and in underdeveloped countries around the world.

IS FOREIGN AID ACHIEVING WORTHWHILE RESULTS?

Although the merits of the Marshall plan were vigorously disputed at the time it was undertaken, there is no disagreement today that our economic assistance to Europe and our parallel help to postwar Japan were highly successful. Our economic aid to those countries ended years ago. The Western European countries and Japan today are thriving economies, themselves contributing between $2 and $3 billion each year in foreign aid to the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Nor is there serious dispute over the value of our military aid to Europe and Japan, which has continued longer. This has helped to build defense forces of great significance to us, forces which would not exist but for our help.

But aid to Western Europe and Japan is essentially past. Our present military assistance to these countries is simply the winding up of commitments made some years ago.

Over the last 10 years our foreign aid has been increasingly concentrated in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. What can we show for results?

There are many spectacular gains in human terms. U.S. aid—skills, equipment, chemicals—has been largely responsible for great advances in the worldwide war on malaria. For example, in 1953 India suffered 1 million deaths from a total of 75 million malaria cases, but in 1962 reported fewer than 2,000 cases of malaria all told. In 1950, there were 1.2 million cases of malaria on the island of Taiwan; in 1961, only 61. There were 12,000 deaths in 1950—none in 1961.

Foreign aid is attacking illiteracy. In Nigeria, American university teams financed through AID funds in the last 3 years have trained 150 instructors who, in turn, have passed on their training to 5,000 teachers. In Latin America, 18,000 classrooms have been built or are under construction with U.S. help. Four million textbooks are being distributed.

Foreign aid is feeding hungry people. The U.S. food-for-peace program, administered jointly by the Department of Agriculture, AID, and the President's food-for-peace director, Mr. Richard Reuter, is now benefiting more than 90 million people around the world. Under one aspect of this program, surplus food that would otherwise lie in storage at a cost to U.S. taxpayers is being used for part payment of wages for reforestation and for school, hospital and housing construction in many countries. Under another, the United States in the next school year will be providing ingredients for a hot lunch for approximately one-third of the schoolchildren of Latin America—for most of them their only hot meal each day.

Foreign aid is helping people build decent places in which to live. In Chile, several thousand people have built their own houses with materials financed by the United States. In Peru, a little more than a year ago, a desert area 11 miles north of Lima was an arid waste. Today, 1,500 families are living there in a satellite city, complete with schools, shopping center, and water and sewage facilities, financed by a U.S. loan under the Alliance for Progress.

Illustrations of this type could be cited in great numbers, but it would be a mistake to think that, by themselves, they measure the success or failure of the foreign aid program.

For the United States is aiming at something more than an improvement in the material welfare of the less developed nations—important as that is. We want to see them stand on their own feet, independent of our help or anyone else's. We believe that the fundamental security of the United States rests on the successful establishment of independent, self-supporting countries around the world, countries that are prepared to join in defending their own freedom against Communist—or any other—aggression. It is this concept of U.S. security interests that has guided our foreign policy consistently since the end of World War II.

The test of the foreign aid program, therefore, is not merely in numbers of children fed, schools built and business firms established. It is whether the countries we are helping are enlarging their resources of skill and capital, and relying increasingly on their own resources and less on our gifts and soft loans to achieve economic development and, where necessary, military strength.

Assessing results against this standard, two kinds of evidence can be cited.

One is statistical. The AID recently analyzed the economic growth of the 41 countries that have received substantial amounts of economic assistance from the United States since 1945. (This includes Europe and Japan. "Substantial" aid was defined as $300 million or more for a country, or at least $30 per capita for some of the smaller countries.) It was found that 33 of the 41 countries had rates of economic growth of at least 1.5 percent per capita for at least 5 years. These gains are encouraging but we should not overlook the fact that our standard, arbitrarily chosen, is a modest one and that several countries did not reach it.

A second type of evidence is the progress toward economic independence that has been achieved. Since economic aid was ended some years ago for the 14 Western European nations and Japan, it has also been terminated for 2 more countries—Spain and Lebanon. Technical assistance (though not capital assistance) has been ended in Greece and Israel. In several countries, progress has been so satisfactory that we are making definite plans to terminate economic aid in the next 2 to 5 years. These include Greece, Israel, free China (Taiwan), Mexico, Venezuela, and the Philippines.

With luck, several other countries could join this group.

It should be noted that, after economic aid on soft terms has been ended, these countries will be able to borrow from the Export-Import Bank, which charges an interest rate high enough to cover all costs—currently about 5¾ percent. We will no doubt also wish to continue for some time longer military assistance to some of these countries—such as Greece and free China—which will be sustaining military forces larger than they could support by themselves.

Some of these countries are already beginning to provide technical assistance to other countries, thus following the same transitional route from recipient to donor countries previously followed by the European countries and Japan. In recognition of the increased economic strength of these transitional countries, we have already hardened our loan terms to some of them. The most recent loans to Greece and to free China, for example, were at 3½ percent interest and 20-year maturities, rather than the three-fourths of 1 percent, 40-year terms, which are used for countries with less immediately favorable economic prospects.

A number of other countries are making solid economic progress although they are not yet near the end of their need for outside aid. India and Pakistan are examples, as are Nigeria and Turkey. In these countries the annual growth in output is substantial—higher than the rates of population growth—and the competence of the society to mobilize and manage resources, through public and private institutions, is growing steadily. These countries are on the right road, and in dollar terms, the bulk of our economic aid today is going to them.

But we also seek to advance the U.S. interest in situations where circumstances are not so favorable. Some countries are plainly not doing all they could for themselves. We have no wish to leave them with only the Communist bloc to turn to for support. But we have no intention of providing assistance that would let them avoid solving their own problems. Increasingly, we are working with such cases on a contingent basis, standing ready to help them when they undertake—and stick to—the hard measures necessary to help themselves.

Then there are countries in which military security is of first priority at present—Korea, Vietnam, and Laos are examples. Here the first objective is to achieve some degree of internal security and stability and on that base to build toward economic independence. These situations can be painful, risky, and costly, as witness Vietnam today. But it would be fatal to our objectives to give up the struggle. The great successes we have had since 1945—Western Europe, Greece and Turkey, Japan, Korea, free China—were achieved precisely because we did not give up when the going got tough.

Therefore, I believe it a fair assessment that U.S. foreign aid has achieved a great deal that is of fundamental importance to our national interests: Many countries have graduated from the need for aid; a number more can be expected to join them soon. Others are making strong and steady progress. At the same time, we should recognize that there are countries, most conspicuously in southeast Asia and in Latin America, where the Communist threat is grave and immediate and where we are not making nearly as much progress as we should like.

IS FOREIGN AID A MAJOR CAUSE OF THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT?

This question can be answered categorically: Under present policies, the U.S. programs of economic and military assistance are not major contributors to the deficit.

Ten years ago, under different policies, foreign aid dollars were spent abroad in large part. Beginning in 1959, however, under the Eisenhower administration, those earlier policies began to be radically changed. Today's policies result in the commitment of more than 90 percent of all assistance to U.S.-produced goods and services. In these circumstances a cut of $1 billion in appropriations for foreign assistance would slice something under $100 million from the deficit in the balance of payments but something over $900 million from U.S. export of goods and services.

Even if surplus agricultural commodities, military equipment, and Export-Import Bank loans were omitted from these calculations, leaving only the soft loans and grants commonly called economic aid, the proportions would change only slightly—from 90 percent of U.S.-produced goods and services to 80 percent. The main point would remain valid: An appropriation cut intended to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit would in fact mainly reduce U.S. exports.

It is sometimes argued that foreign aid, whether or not it is tied to U.S. procurement, has an adverse effect on the balance of payments because it makes goods and services available to other countries that might otherwise be bought with their own funds. The evidence shows, however, that U.S. assistance helps countries add to their regular imports, rather than substitute for them. Commercial imports from the United States have grown, and the U.S. share of the local market has improved, in countries assisted by our economic aid programs. (The only exceptions are in some countries in Latin America where the normal foreign-exchange earnings have dropped sharply for reasons having nothing to do with our aid program.)

The long-run benefits to us from successful aid programs can be very great. U.S. exports to Europe, for example, doubled between 1950 and 1962; our exports to Japan tripled between 1953 and 1962. Cutting foreign aid in a largely futile effort to trim our payments deficit would seem to be plainly unwise, even in the narrowest of commercial terms.

SHOULD OTHER NATIONS SHARE MORE OF THE LOAD?

On inspection, this question turns out to be rather complicated to analyze, although in summary my response is: Yes, other advanced nations should do more to help the less developed countries.

Contrary to popular opinion, the burden of foreign aid to the United States has declined over the past 15 years. As a share of the gross national product, direct economic and military assistance has dropped from 2 percent at the start of the Marshall plan to about seven-tenths of 1 percent. As a share of the Federal budget, foreign aid declined from 11.5 percent in 1948 to 4.1 percent in 1963.

In recent years, Western Europe and Japan have doubled the amount of their economic aid, from $1.2 billion in 1956 to $2.4 billion in 1962. In 1962, of total governmental economic aid from all the advanced countries, the United States provided about 60 percent, and the other countries about 40 percent. This was approximately the same proportion as the ratio of the U.S. national product to the national product of all the other countries. (There are, indeed, three or four countries which are putting a larger share of their national product into foreign aid than we are.)

In some 40 countries, including most of those in Africa, U.S. participation is quite limited. The bulk of the outside help for many of these nations comes from some other country—France or the United Kingdom, in most instances. In a number of such countries, the U.S. aid program may consist of only a single technical assistance project, the value of which is to demonstrate the U.S. concern and show that the country is not wholly dependent for assistance on its former colonial ties.

Recognizing all this, however, there are important respects in which we believe other countries can and should do more. We feel, for example, that there are several countries which, in view of their economic strength, balance-of-payments positions, and trade and security interests, ought to increase their aid programs substantially.

A second point—our major concern at present—relates to the terms on which other advanced countries provide that part of their aid which is in the form of loans. In 1962, the average terms of all U.S. economic aid loans were 2.6 percent interest and 30 years' maturity. The average of all other countries was about 5 percent interest and 19 years' maturity. Last April, the Development Assistance Committee (representing the Western European countries, Japan, Canada, and the United States) agreed that the terms on which aid is made available should be adapted to the balance-of-payments prospects of the recipient country, and that at present this required the harder lenders to soften their terms.

There had been some considerable softening by some countries prior to this agreement, and there has been some additional change since. The United Kingdom, for example, has cut the effective rate of interest on aid loans nearly in half.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Government believes that there is a considerable distance still to go before there will be what we would consider an equitable sharing of foreign aid costs among the advanced countries.

CAN WE NOT OPERATE OUR AID PROGRAMS MORE EFFICIENTLY?

The effort we are making to persuade the other developed nations to assume more responsibility is a part of our continuing endeavor to make economic assistance increasingly effective, to speed the day when we can retire from the foreign aid business.

One way in which this is being done is through a policy of careful selectivity. We are stressing aid to those countries where the U.S. interest is most urgent, which are in a position to make the best use of our help, and where other donors cannot supply all the aid needed. As a result, of the $2.2 billion committed to 82 countries by AID in fiscal 1963, four-fifths went to only 20 countries. (Military assistance is even more concentrated.)

Another way in which we seek to obtain maximum results is through stressing self-help measures. As we know from our experience under the Marshall plan, the most important ingredient for achieving economic progress is what a country does for itself. If it asks its people to make major sacrifices, undertakes necessary reforms, and follows sound budget and fiscal policies, then—and only then—can outside help have large and lasting effects.

The corollary is a readiness on our part to hold back some of the funds made available for foreign aid if potential recipients do not do all we think they should to help themselves. The result of such a policy was evident in the fiscal year just ended. Largely because some of the recipient countries did not meet our criteria for self-help and reform, we left uncommitted on June 30, 1963, over $100 million of available loan funds (and requested that much less in new funds for the next fiscal year).

Another change in recent years has been to place increasing emphasis on loans, as against grants. In the Marshall plan days, more than 90 percent of our aid was in the form of grants; as late as 1957 loans were only 18 percent of the total. The percentage recently has been rising rapidly. In the fiscal year 1964, more than 60 percent of all economic aid funds will be in the form of loans.

In addition, AID is working to improve conditions that will encourage private enterprise in the less developed countries—not only private businesses, but cooperatives, trade unions, savings and loan associations, and the many other forms in which private energies can be organized to serve common needs. We do not seek to impose our particular forms of social organization on others, but we believe that a society which calls on the initiative and skills of its citizens through many different types of private organizations will be more likely to achieve rapid economic and social progress.

In this connection, we have a varied program to assist U.S. private business investment abroad, which typically provides not only capital but badly needed managerial and technical know-how in countries where the investment is made.

Let me close with one important qualification. It would be a mistake to think that our aid efforts will automatically make friends for us. In Harlan Cleveland's famous phrase, we are seeking "not popularity or gratitude, but respect and results."

The object of foreign aid is to help create a community of free and independent nations. If we are sincere about independence, we plainly should not expect the countries we are aiding to become satellites. We want them to be strong, not servile.

For the great majority of the people in the world, regardless of what some transitory leaders may say or do, the United States is the standard bearer of world peace, prosperity, humanitarianism, and freedom in the competition with communism. They look to us for help against aggression and the poverty of centuries. Our response must be more than words of concern. There must be deeds to back them up.

I would not wish to overstate the importance of our assistance to the underdeveloped nations. Foreign aid is a limited instrument. It is only one of the means for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States, along with military activities, information programs, diplomatic negotiation, participation in the United Nations and the Organization of American States. Recognizing these limitations, however, I believe that of all the implements employed by the United States in its international relations, none offers a better hope for making a positive contribution to peace and building a better world for ourselves and our children.

THE RED CROSS—A CENTURY OF DEDICATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the centenary of the Red Cross is being commemorated throughout the world this year. To mark this occasion, an article by Joseph Wechsberg appeared in the New York Times magazine of August 25, 1963. The article is informative and thoughtful in singling out five incidents in recent history to describe the humanitarian objectives, the efficient efforts and effective results of the International Red Cross movement.

Mankind owes the Red Cross a great deal. It has rendered the international community a distinct service in easing the suffering and supplying the needs of victims of natural disaster and political strife. As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, I have come to know the splendid work of the Red Cross in refugee problems all over the world.

Mr. President, the International Red Cross movement deserves our thanks and appreciation. It deserves our continued support and best wishes in the years ahead. I commend to my colleagues the article by Mr. Wechsberg, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine, Aug. 25, 1963]

THE RED CROSS—A CENTURY OF DEDICATION

(NOTE.—Joseph Wechsberg is the author of several books of fact and fiction, including "Looking for a Bluebird" and "Avalanche.")

(By Joseph Wechsberg)

GENEVA.—Tonight an emergency may occur somewhere on earth, and the lights will go on in a large building on a hill overlooking the peaceful countryside around Geneva. The bucolic charm is deceiving. At the former Carlton Hotel, now the headquarters of the ICRC, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the repercussions of calamity are always known early and action is often taken at once.

It may be a large-scale emergency—a rebellion, an earthquake, a war—or a private tragedy. While I was there one day recently, a telegram from the Polish Red Cross arrived requesting a special drug to save a child's life. It would have taken the Poles two weeks to get the drug through bureaucratic channels in neighboring Germany. The Red Cross in Geneva got it in one hour and the child's life was saved.

At the Berlin wall a Red Cross delegate is patiently trying to establish contacts between people in distress on both sides. In India another delegate is trying to trace prisoners taken by the Chinese. Elsewhere, Red Cross delegates are helping to evacuate civilians, to reunite dispersed families, to assist political detainees, to distribute relief supplies. Last year's annual report concerns ICRC activities in Algeria, Laos, Nepal, the Congo, Indonesia, Bizerte, Angola. It assisted 14,000 stateless persons, most of them Jews, to leave Egypt, continued the repatriation of Koreans residing in Japan, and renewed its attempts to send a delegate to Cuba to visit detainees—attempts which the Castro regime has thus far rejected.

On the whole the Red Cross, which will mark its 100th anniversary next Sunday, is doing well. "On the eve of the centenary," writes president Léopold Boissier, "the Geneva institution has continued to increase in vigor, authority and effectiveness. * * * Vires acquirit eundo. By advancing it gains new strength."

The Red Cross has come a long way since the evening of June 24, 1859, when Henri Dunant, a citizen of Geneva, happened to be in Solferino, Italy, after the bloody battle between the Austrians, and the French and Piedmontese. Dunant was so shocked by the sight of thousands of wounded, abandoned soldiers lying there helpless that he organized a relief action on the spot with the help of the local population. In his book, "Un Souvenir de Solférino," an immediate best seller, he advocated the establishment of relief societies and the conclusion of an international convention to protect the wounded, and hospitals and their staffs.

On February 17, 1863, four prominent international citizens of Geneva joined Dunant and later formed the International Committee of the Red Cross. The following year 12 nations signed the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded in Armies in the Field. Since 1870 the Red Cross has come to the aid of prisoners of war; since 1914 it has carried out work that has no relation to war—relief to populations struck by natural disaster, care for the sick, improvement of public health. It has become the principal artisan of the "Geneva Law," international humanitarian law.

Its emblem is a red cross on white ground (the reverse of the Swiss federal colors, a white cross on red ground, as a tribute to the birthplace of the organization); the cross is made of five red squares representing the four primary objectives of the Red Cross: (1) care of the sick and wounded, (2) improvement of health, (3) prevention of disease, and (4) mitigation of suffering—all held together by (5) the spirit of good will and service.

Today the Red Cross has 87 national societies with over 153 million members. In the Moslem world they are called Red Crescent Societies, and Iran has its Red Lion and Sun Society. It has become the foremost international, neutral, private organization on earth, a pioneer in the humanitarian field. It doesn't have to wait until it's asked for help. The Geneva Conventions recognize "the right of the ICRC to undertake any humanitarian initiative consistent with its traditions and principles."

The ICRC is nonpolitical and nonideological. It is composed of Swiss citizens, masters of the difficult technique of neutrality. Its delegates—men trained in law, diplomacy, medicine, or simply businessmen—go to trouble spots in civilian clothes, wearing the red cross emblem on their arms or over their breast pockets. They make it clear that the international character of the ICRC is based on its mission, not on its composition. They often take considerable chances. Red Cross delegates have been killed while performing their duty. On December 13, 1961, Georges Olivet, the ICRC delegate in Elisabethville, in the middle of fighting between Katangese and U.N. troops, made several attempts to cross the battle lines to save the victims of heavy firing. "He did not succeed," the ICRC later reported in its customarily laconic style. "He tried once more and that was the end."

How does the ICRC accomplish its objectives? Perhaps this can best be illustrated by describing it in action. What follows, then, are accounts of five incidents in the organization's more recent history which will help to answer the question.

LIFELINE TO BUDAPEST

I remember the utter confusion at the Austro-Hungarian frontier near Nickelsdorf the night of October 31, 1956, just 8 days after the Hungarians rose against Communist rule. A light rain was falling and a long line of trucks stood waiting with supplies for the people of Budapest. The day before, some Red Cross trucks had been able to get through with blood plasma and dressings. But now the barrier across the border at Hegyeshalom was down and Hungary's last lifeline was cut.

A refugee from Budapest said the situation was getting critical there. "There's a general strike and no food gets into the capital. There is no milk for the children and people freeze in their homes because so many windows were broken by shells. They need blankets, food, everything."

The report was confirmed by a delegate of the ICRC who had managed to reach Budapest with an Austrian Red Cross convoy and had come back the same day. He said the Hungarian Red Cross had lost all of its vehicles. They needed ambulances, surgical instruments, medicaments, food, and blankets.

A high-ranking Austrian gendarmery officer was consulted. He said there were Hungarian soldiers at the barrier who threatened to shoot if people approached. There was nothing he could do, he said. Austria was, after all, a neutral country. Somebody started to argue with him. An Austrian newspaperman said angrily that this was no time to think of neutrality. The people of Vienna who took Hungarian refugees into their homes were not worried about violating Austria's neutrality. They wanted to help.

Suddenly, people near the highway shouted with excitement. The barrier was up for a moment and we saw a car approaching from Hungary. It was another Red Cross delegate who had been in the Györ area, where the chaos was complete. Freedom fighters had been killed, summary executions went on. The delegate had approached the fighting groups and had obtained a written promise that they would respect the Geneva Conventions. Now he said, "We ought to get back there with supplies."

Somebody answered, "They won't let us through. Why don't you try? They won't stop the Red Cross."

"They have stopped the Red Cross," said the Austrian officer. "We've just heard that they no longer let the ICRC chartered Swissair plane land in Budapest. It was turned back. And those soldiers over there will shoot at everybody who gets near the barrier."

"I'm going back," the delegate said. And he walked into the darkness. A few of us wanted to follow, but the Austrian officer told us to stay. "If he gets there alone, he's got a chance. If you all go, they will certainly shoot." So we waited, and after a few tense minutes a small car with the Hungarian flag approached. The delegate sat in the car with two Hungarian soldiers.

"All right," he said. "They'll let all Red Cross supplies through, but no one else."

A few minutes later, the trucks started rolling. For the next 3 days relief columns from various countries crossed the border. On November 4, when the Red army reoccupied Budapest, the barrier at Hegyeshalom went down again. Hundreds of tons of relief supplies piled up in Vienna, thousands of bottles of penicillin, morphine, blood plasma, and ether had to be quickly unloaded. All over town motorized convoys were standing and waiting.

Then, on November 11, at 11 p.m. the barrier went up again and the white trucks with the Red Cross emblem started rolling. For months you could see them, day and night, on the highway to Budapest.

EVACUATING CUBA'S WOUNDED

After civil war broke out in Cuba on July 26, 1953, the ICRC tried for 4 years, to get permission to send its delegates there "to assist all victims of the conflict." When it succeeded at last, it carried out one of its most dramatic missions.

On July 4, 1958, a cable arrived at the ICRC offices in Geneva. It came from Caracas, Venezuela, and was signed "Fidel Castro," then leader of the rebel forces. Castro stated that he had a number of wounded prisoners of the regular Cuban Army but was unable to give them medical care for lack of supplies. He suggested that the prisoners be handed over "unconditionally" to the Cuban Red Cross.

After an exchange of messages, Pierre Jequier, an ICRC delegate, departed for Havana the next day, conferred with Cuban Red Cross officials and notified Geneva that the Batista government had agreed to the transfer of prisoners while he was present. It would take place the following Tuesday near the town of Bayamo in Oriente Province.

Since Jequier couldn't reach Castro directly in Cuba, he had to contact him by way of Havana to Geneva to Caracas to somewhere in the mountains of Cuba. The ICRC delegate made clear that the humanitarian mission had to be carried out "with all security measures taken on both sides."

Castro replied 2 days later. He was not opposed to the idea, but it was impossible to transport the wounded men to Bayamo, a 4 days' walk through the mountains. He proposed another meeting place in a remote area in the Sierra Maestra Mountains. It turned out that this would make a 10-day expedition necessary, but Jequier agreed after receiving promises from both sides that they would carry no arms. Geneva dispatched a second delegate, J. P. Schoenholzer, to Cuba. More messages were exchanged. At last, on July 23, the wounded men were handed over at Las Vegas de Jibacoa, in the presence of the two Red Cross delegates.

"They were brought there by an unarmed convoy of the Castro forces showing a large white flag," the delegates later reported. "The regular Cuban Army convoy was flying the Red Cross flag. The truce was respected by both sides throughout the operation. Fifty-seven badly wounded men were evacuated by helicopter, the others by truck. The transfer of 253 men was carried out without incident. It was the first time that the opposing forces met face to face to effect such a transfer under the direct auspices of the ICRC."

But since Castro came to power, he has never let the Red Cross delegates in. In Geneva they consider this their biggest failure in recent history.

DISASTER IN IRAN

"When word reached us in the morning of last September 2 that a terrible earthquake had occurred some 125 miles west of Teheran we did not wait for details," an official at the League of Red Cross Societies in Geneva remembers. The league, which was founded in 1919 as a federation of all national Red Cross societies, deals with natural disasters.

"The first message from the Iranian Red Lion and Sun Society asked for antiseptics, antibiotics, vitamins, dressings, tents and blankets. We always have some emergency supplies here and they went off by air a few hours later. We did not have much news. Four thousand people were said to have been killed, but later the number of dead was found to be much higher. While we radioed messages to all member societies asking them to send relief to Iran by air, the first gifts were announced. The Netherlands Red Cross telephoned that they would send 500 plasma sets, blankets, foodstuffs and clothing. The British Red Cross received £10,000 from the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief. By the next day, 23 of our member societies had sent or announced gifts. Our Under Secretary General got ready to leave for Teheran.

"By that time the terrifying scope of the disaster had become apparent; 122 villages had suffered, 20 were completely destroyed, 70,000 people were homeless. Our Under Secretary went to the disaster area with the President of the Iranian Red Lion and Sun Society. He telephoned that the dead were being buried and there was no danger of epidemics. But the real problem was still to come. Winter was approaching and the devastated region has a very cold climate. People would have to be resettled. They needed tents, prefabricated houses, lamps, and stoves.

"One of our relief experts remained on the spot and supervised the distribution of supplies. The American Air Force flew 4,000 tents to Teheran. Our delegate told us that trucks were urgently needed, and small plywood houses, two for each village, which would serve as milk stations, and as dispensaries.

"Four weeks after the tragedy, 43 different Red Cross societies had donated $2 million worth of relief supplies. For us here it was just another operation, but we couldn't have carried it out without the impulses of generosity all over the world. Take a look at this list. It begins with Afghanistan and ends with Yugoslavia, and its proof of the fellowship that unites our members when there is tragedy."

RELIEF FOR ALGERIA

The relief action in Algeria, which started 7 years ago and is still going on, is the biggest in the hundred-year-old history of the Red Cross. Too big a job for any one relief organization, it is carried out jointly by the League of the Red Cross Societies and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

After trouble started in Algeria on November 1, 1954, appeals from prisoners on both sides and from displaced civilians reached the ICRC, but since one side in the conflict didn't recognize the opposing side, the ICRC action had to be based on the famed article 3 of the Geneva Conventions: "In the case of armed conflict not of an international character * * * persons taking no active part, including members of armed forces placed hors de combat by sickness, wounds, detention shall be treated humanely, without adverse distinction founded on race, color, religion."

There was a long delay until the Red Cross was able to help. Eventually, however, the French Government agreed to let ICRC delegates visit camps and prisons in Algeria, provided their reports would be communicated "to the French Government alone." It wasn't a perfect solution, but at least Paris had implicitly recognized article 3. The first ICRC mission went to Algeria on February 28, 1955.

Between 1955 and 1962, nine ICRC missions made over 500 visits to prisons and internment camps, talking "without witnesses" with prisoners, and suggesting to camp commanders various improvements which in most cases were accepted. After 1958 the ICRC extended its assistance to political detainees in France. (Red Cross reports avoid the word "prisoner.")

"Considerable improvements were made by adoption of the special penal treatment for political detainees," a delegate remembers. "This treatment exempts detainees from work, recognizes their right to have a spokesman, enable them to practice their religion, read newspapers and have radio sets." Under prodding by the ICRC the French gave up the systematic prosecution in court of members of the Algerian National Liberation Front who had been captured while armed, and promised that "attacks upon the dignity of the prisoners" were to be avoided.

With traditional impartiality, the ICRC also brought aid to French "detainees" in the hands of the Algerians. The FLN agreed to transmit news of detainees, which the ICRC sent on to France, and in some cases French prisoners were handed over to the ICRC delegates. Much remains to be done, however. In 1962 over a thousand Europeans were reported missing in Algeria and the ICRC has been unable to get any news of them.

This was only part of the operation. Other delegates organized relief actions, Red Cross surgeons performed operations in hospitals where the French doctors had been forced to leave, and when serious disturbances broke out in Algiers in May 1962, the Red Cross dispatched doctors and nurses, and ICRC delegates set up blood banks, soup kitchens, and emergency hospitals in the midst of fighting. They helped French settlers who were waiting to be repatriated and they helped Algerian civilians who were hungry.

Today 2 million people in Algeria are getting emergency supplies (wheat, beans, oil, sugar, soap), and the league plans to establish milk stations, to operate simple dispensaries and distribute clothing. "Before the end of the year over 5 million people will receive help," Henrik Beer, the league's Secretary General reports. "Children make up at least half of those in need of assistance. Though the action no longer has any dramatic news value and has therefore lost some of the public's attention, its very continuity increases the urgency of need."

TRACING THE MISSING

Eighteen years after the end of the Second World War, hundreds of letters still arrive every week from all parts of the world at Red Cross headquarters asking to trace a missing person or members of a family separated by war and its aftermath. The letters are taken to a long building next to ICRC headquarters which contains on several floors 45 million multicolored index cards referring to 15 million individual cases. Every card is a tragedy, it means that somewhere somebody is missing.

This is the Central Tracing Agency whose archives go back to the war of 1864 between Prussia and Denmark. It contains complete prisoner-of-war lists sent by the belligerents during the two World Wars, a Red Cross index of displaced civilians, and lists of refugees, stateless persons and political prisoners drawn up from official and private sources.

The agency delivers hundreds of certificates every year to people needing proof they were detained or sick during their captivity so they can claim pensions or relief allowances. In wartime the agency transmits messages between belligerent countries. By 1944, over 100,000 letters were arriving daily at the Palais de Conseil General in Geneva and were forwarded; 3,000 people working with vast card indexes and data-processing machines, handled 93 million letters during the entire war. (Some of these letters were written by me, then a technical sergeant in the American Army, to my mother, who was living in Czechoslovakia. They took time but they arrived.)

Today the Central Tracing Agency is the last resort for many people who are anxious to find out what has happened to relatives and friends. Every new war—Korea, Algeria, the Congo, India—brings more work. (It was this agency which obtained information on missing American soldiers from Nazi Germany—information which was then sent on to Washington and resulted in the tragic telegrams from the War Department.) Such information may come from belligerent or "detaining" powers or from national Red Cross societies. Or it may come from scraps of paper that somebody in a prison train handed to an Italian priest, or from the back of a package of Bulgarian cigarettes thrown out of a truck, with names hastily scribbled down. People who disappeared during the Spanish Civil War are still being sought, as are families separated during the Russian revolution.

It takes patience and ingenuity to trace the missing. Card-perforating machines won't help when the name of an Israel prisoner has been phonetically misspelled by an Arab, or when a man named Hans Müller is traced. There are 50,000 Müllers in the card index, and 5,000 of them are called Hans. Investigation by semantics experts is necessary to trace a name transcribed by a person speaking another language. For years the Russians refused to give any information on missing persons, but since the death of Stalin the agency's inquiries have often been answered. Now the Red Chinese are uncooperative. Requests sent to Peiping for information on missing Indian soldiers have not been answered to this date.

The difficult job of tracing and searching for clues is done by quiet, patient Swiss women who never give up no matter how hopeless a case seems. "Once in a while one of them comes to my office, looking happy," an official says. "She's just brought some people together. During 1960, we received 50,000 requests for information and opened 25,000 inquiries. Thirty-one percent of the results were positive—the persons could be traced, or valid death certificates could be delivered. But once in a while we have a case like that of the German soldier who became a prisoner of war and spent 2 years in an American camp. In 1945 he returned to Europe, but for reasons best known to himself stayed in France. Last year his wife in Germany asked us to trace him. We found him, but he said that he didn't want anything to do with her. We didn't transmit that message—instead we have an innocuous formula—'the case is still being investigated'."

In the large hall of the ICRC headquarters there are three framed documents on the wall: the Nobel Peace Prizes awarded in 1901 to Henri Dunant and in 1917 and 1944 to the International Committee of the Red Cross.

They are deserved.

U.S. AND EUROPEAN PAYMENTS PROBLEMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an article entitled, "Europe Terms Payments Woes Most Urgent Trading Problem" dated September 11, informs us that the principal financial officials of the European Common Market agreed that before a new international payments machinery is developed the United States should solve its own balance-of-payments problems.

I find the attitude of the Continent's central bankers rather puzzling. They fully understand that the existing international monetary system has serious flaws and that the new liquidity added to the system comes from the U.S. payments deficit. To the extent that we succeed in stemming our balance-of-payments deficit—which we can do at will—we withdraw an equivalent amount of liquidity from the system. The principal losers will be Western European countries who as a result of our deficit position are accumulating substantial dollar and gold reserves.

A recent study by the Executive Commission of the EEC indicates that the surplus of exports over imports enjoyed by the Community is fast disappearing. While capital inflows from the United States have in the past offset EEC trade deficits, the EEC cannot depend on this source for relief for very long as this Government is now developing a program which fully intends to bring a halt to this major contribution to our imbalance of international payments.

Thus, to my mind, it is as much in the interest of Western Europe as to that of the United States that an examination of the adequacy of the existing world monetary system be undertaken as soon as possible with the view to institutionalizing the series of measures taken jointly by Western Europe and the United States during the post-Bretton Woods period and to tackle the question of international liquidity on a careful and constructive basis.

I believe this problem to be an extremely crucial one and have outlined by analysis of the situation during a Senate debate on this very question on September 3. My own recommendation—which is embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution 53—is that the IMF's annual meeting in October should mark the beginning of serious discussions of world monetary reform. I am most heartened to note that in addition to the British, who have been the foremost advocates of world monetary reform, proponents of reform are gaining adherents on the Continent as well as among key administration officials.

According to a New York Times article of this morning a decision is expected to be made at next month's annual meeting of the IMF to conduct a formal study of the "liquidity" problem, and to decide whether reform of the international monetary system might be necessary to keep the world economy growing and trade expanding. I am most heartened by this news. It represents a tremendous forward step since the early part of this year when we were told by the Secretary of the Treasury that there is no urgency in this matter and European central bankers went on record against consideration of the international liquidity problem and denied the theory that a world shortage of monetary reserves exists.

The reported decision to undertake a study of this problem, possibly by the "Paris club" of 10 leading industrial countries, represents a recognition on the part of the United States and other leading industrial countries of the West that there exists a world balance-of-payments problem.

I ask unanimous consent that both New York Times articles be inserted in the Record at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Europe Terms Payments Woes Most Urgent Trading Problem

(By Richard E. Mooney)

Paris, September 10.—The principal financial officials of the European Common Market agreed today that solution of the U.S. balance-of-payments problem should take priority over the development of new international payments machinery.

These views reported at a press conference by the French Finance Minister, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, indicated that this important bloc of financial powers would not be among the enthusiastic proponents of new machinery at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund later this month.

The finance ministers and the heads of the central banks of the six Common Market countries—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—discussed international problems today at the concluding sessions of the ministers' regular quarterly meeting.

The purpose of the discussion was to prepare positions for the Fund meeting in Washington September 30, at which these men will be their countries' delegates.

The Fund is a $15 billion pool of gold and the currencies of its 93-member countries. Members borrow each others currencies from the Fund to tide themselves over payments difficulties, when—like the United States now—one or another has a problem of more money flowing out of the country than into it.

At the end of today's talks, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing told reporters that the group believed that one problem took priority—the unbalanced international payments of "certain countries," particularly the United States. Perfection of the international payments mechanism can be studied afterward, he said.

The prime movers for some new machinery, or an expansion of the role of the Fund, are the British, themselves in continual payments difficulties. There are some advocates in the U.S. Government, but the principal financial officials there are not.

The dominant continental view, reaffirmed today, has been that countries with payments problems can and should solve them largely by self-discipline, rather than relying on others to help them out.

This position is not so strongly held here as it was before, however. Some authorities have swung to the feeling that new international machinery is, or will be, needed. It is commonly speculated that the Fund meeting will conclude with a resolution calling for specific intensive study of the question.

Another session of the finance ministers' meeting here was devoted to European economic conditions, particularly to the price inflation that has occurred in France and Italy.

World Liquidity To Be Examined: Global Monetary Fund Is Seen Reaching Accord at Meeting Next Month

Washington, September 11.—An agreement is shaping up on a compromise solution of the hotly debated issue of "international liquidity." The compromise is expected at next month's annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

The compromise would be a decision to conduct a formal study of the problem possibly by the "Paris club" of the 10 leading industrial countries.

The aim of the study would be to decide whether reforms in the international monetary system might be necessary to keep the world economy growing and trade expanding.

International liquidity is the reserves of gold and foreign exchange held by countries, plus their automatic or semiautomatic access to credit. The big debate has centered on whether international liquidity will grow sufficiently.

STUDY WOULD BE COMPROMISE

A decision to make a formal study of the problem would be a compromise of the two basic positions that exist among the leading countries and an approach to the middle ground presently held by the United States.

It would meet the British demand to "do something" and not let the problem drop. Britain has been, by far, the most eager advocate of reform.

It would mark a step by the continental countries toward acceptance that a problem might exist, without committing them to any specific reforms. They have been the most cautious about the various proposals for a change in the monetary system.

It would reflect the middle position of the United States. The U.S. view is that improvements in the system will quite likely be needed eventually although there is no hurry and there are flaws in all proposals.

NO FORMULA EXPECTED

Financial officials have said for some time that this year's International Monetary Fund meeting would not settle on any specific reform or formula.

The only concrete proposal is one submitted last year by Reginald Maudling, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, and this has been quietly shelved, even by the British.

There is general agreement that no urgent liquidity problem exists. It could arise, however, when the United States at last ends its deficit in its balance of international payments. U.S. deficits have added to liquidity by adding to other countries' holdings of dollars.

The balance of payments is the relationship between total payments to foreigners and total receipts from foreigners.

United States Denies Payments Link

Washington, September 11.—Most American officials also see the liquidity problem as a possbile hazard not directly related to this country's current balance-of-payments deficit.

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently told Congress that foreseeable world gold production was insufficient to generate the needed new reserves.

"The development of an improved international monetary system is important to the longrun expansion of the world economy," he said.

"The elimination of the current U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will not mean the end of world balance-of-payments problems. Other countries will have deficits when we get into surplus, and we ourselves can expect the periodic recurrence of deficits."

Because it would take years to plan, adopt, and institute a major alteration of world payments machinery, Mr. Heller and others have urged that formal discussions be started promptly.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon argued a year ago that there was no urgency in the matter.

However, he is understood to have come around to the view that preliminary inquiries might well be begun—especially because the Government's forceful balance-of-payments measures have shown the world that the United States would not simply be trying to use international machinery to bail itself out of its payments difficulties.

The question of which international body might conduct the study remains open.

Some officials have suggested the Fund, but there is precedent for having major problems of payments policy conducted, with the Fund's support and sponsorship, by smaller groups representing the industrial "creditor" countries most directly involved.

THE CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives a significant development concerning authorization of Knowles Dam.

The Knowles project, on the Flathead River in western Montana, was one of the projects added by the Senate to the omnibus bill, which has now been returned to the House of Representatives.

During the hearings on this project before the Senate Committee on Public Works last year, it became clear that there could be three possible developments. One possibility could be the Knowles storage project, which I favor. Another could be construction of two run-of-the-river dams, at Buffalo Rapids sites 2 and 4, by the Montana Power Co. The third possibility could be construction of the two run-of-the-river dams at the Buffalo Rapids sites by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, which have applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit, as has the Montana Power Co.

At the hearing, the desire of the tribes to construct the dams was emphasized by John Cragun, counsel for the tribes, in these words:

> It is legally impossible for (the tribes) to get as good a deal from Montana Power Co. as they could get from building the dams themselves. There would be a sharing of benefits with Montana Power Co. which would cut in half the exploitable value of those sites to the tribes. Those sites are so valuable in comparison with any other sites, probably, in the whole United States that the matter of the tribe's financing and building them presents no problem, and they could get the entire value from them, which they could not do if Montana Power Co. builds them. The tribes have definitely instructed me to oppose the Montana Power Co. application with every means at our hands. We have done considerable engineering work in preparation for that.

Mr. President, the Flathead tribes took a similar position at the hearings on Knowles conducted by the House Public Works Committee this year.

The prepared statement of Walter W. McDonald, official delegate and former chairman of the Flathead Tribal Council, refers to the tribes "own Development of the Buffalo Rapids sites."

The prepared statement of Counsel Cragun concludes that the tribes "wish to rely on their own applications before the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to build their own damsites."

Additionally, Mr. Cragun placed in the hearing record a resolution of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, adopted August 18, 1962, and signed by its president, the same Walter McDonald who appeared as a witness for tribal development of the sites. The resolution states that "the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes intend to develop these damsites and have filed an application for preliminary permit on these sites with the Federal Power Commission."

Mr. President, I am aware that many of my colleagues, in both the Senate and House, have had the impression, as I have until now, that three developments were possible—the Federal Knowles Dam, construction of Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4 by the Montana Power Co., or construction of Buffalo Rapids 2 and 4 by the Confederated Flathead and Salish Tribes.

It now appears that the alternatives have been reduced to two, that a deal has been made between the Montana Power Co., and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes.

I have been privileged to receive a copy of the memorandum which is being distributed to editors in the Northwest by Mr. Walter McDonald. This memorandum is written in his capacity as president of the Northwest Affiliated Indian Tribes. It accompanies an editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune. The Tribune, discussing the run-of-the-river alternatives to Knowles, reveals that the Flathead Indians "plan this development in connection with the Montana Power Co."

Mr. McDonald, in sending this editorial to newspaper editors, asks them to "please reprint it, condense it, comment on it, or write one of your own."

Mr. President, the cat is out of the bag. The expensive cultivation of Flathead Indian officials by the Montana Power Co., has succeeded. The tribe's and its counsel's strong statements to Congress about opposition to the Montana Power Co., that tribal "financing and building—the dams—presents no problem," are now meaningless.

And so, Mr. President, we now have but two alternatives, full development of the Federal Knowles project, or underdevelopment by the Montana Power Co., which charges exorbitant rates and ships its millions of dollars in annual overcharges to the out-of-State stockholders.

HOME STUDY MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I was delighted to attend a reception last month given by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] in honor of Dan Kimball. Mr. Kimball, chairman of the board of Aerojet-General Corp., has just been named "Home Study Man of the Year for 1963" by International Correspondence School.

This honor, which in the past has gone to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges and Arthur Godfrey, was awarded to a man worthy of the citation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the award and news release about it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the award and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAN ABLE KIMBALL—HOME STUDY MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1963

For his steadfast dedication to the task of strengthening our national defenses in today's chaotic world, and his outstanding record of public service to the Nation in many capacities including Secretary of the Navy;

For his vigorous leadership along the frontier of outer space where the industrial might and scientific genius of our free society is directed at peaceful exploration;

For demonstrating to the Nation's work force, the value of teaming job-related home study with resident training to produce the skills essential in forging America's future; and

For serving as a constant inspiration to the millions of Americans currently studying via correspondence courses, to Dan Kimball, his alma mater, International Correspondence Schools, presents its award as Home Study Man of the Year, 1963.

JOHN C. VILLAUME,
President, International Correspondence Schools.

AUGUST 21, 1963.

DAN KIMBALL TO RECEIVE HOME STUDY'S TOP AWARD

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The head of a $600 million corporation who traces the start of his career to a correspondence course in engineering has been named Home Study Man of the Year for 1963 by his alma mater, International Correspondence Schools.

He is Dan Able Kimball who, after dropping out of high school before graduation, took job-related home study, achieved business success and served as Secretary of the Navy under President Truman. He is now board chairman of Aerojet-General Corp., largest manufacturer of rocket engines for missiles, and spacecraft in the United States. Like both previous winners, Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges and Arthur Godfrey, Kimball is 1 of the 7 million Americans who have studied with International Correspondence Schools.

Senator and Mrs. Stuart Symington will be the official hosts at a reception today (Aug. 21) in Washington, D.C., at the Madison when home study's highest award will be presented to Kimball by John C. Villaume, International Correspondence Schools president. SYMINGTON, a fellow Missourian and Truman Cabinet member along with Kimball, also studied the same International Correspondence Schools course, electrical engineering.

An auto mechanic when he first signed up for correspondence instruction, Kimball was a straight "A" student until World War I interrupted his studies. This early training still proves valuable, he reports, in reviewing technical progress of such projects as the Titan II engine, which Aerojet is building to help launch project Gemini into space next year, preliminary to exploration of the moon.

In announcing the award, Villaume noted that although Kimball never completed his formal schooling, "he is among the most education-conscious chief executives in America." Of Aerojet's nearly 35,000 workers, 12,000 have professional skills. Five thousand are college graduates and an additional 1,000 have master's or doctor's degrees, many earned with financial aid from the company.

"Today, several hundred Aerojet employees are following in their boss' footsteps by taking ICS courses in engineering," Villaume said. "This is a field which demonstrates the role home study can play in helping to meet critical manpower shortages. The Labor Department has consistently reported that the number of job openings in engineering categories top any of the others. At the same time, engineering is by far the most popular technical training program at ICS where some 30,000 adults are currently enrolled in some phase of it."

Aerojet reimburses 80 percent of tuition costs upon the successful completion of correspondence studies under its Cooperative Training Agreement with ICS. It is one among 7,000 such agreements which the school has with government groups, unions and companies, including nearly 300 of 500 leading corporations in the United States.

"Many of America's most famous companies were founded by men who never completed high school," Villaume said, "and today, many more have top executives who have combined job training via correspondence with resident schooling." Among such firms are the Chrysler Corp., Ford Motor Co., E. I. duPont, Curtis Publishing, Armco Steel, Inland Steel, North American Aviation, Eastern Air Lines and General Electric.

"To the young man or woman who dropped out of high school before graduation, and now feels wedged into a deadend job," Villaume added, "the Dan Kimballs of this country are an inspiration. Their success is a beacon for the 2 million Americans currently taking job-related home study to up-date their know-how and up-grade their jobs. And companies like Aerojet epitomize the opportunities awaiting those with the ambition and drive to acquire the technical skills demanded in this aerospace age."

URBAN RENEWAL IN DOWNTOWN BUSINESS DISTRICTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on June 28 of this year, Mr. Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, sent to the Congress a report criticizing the Urban Renewal Administration on its premature approval of a large-scale demolition project in downtown Cleveland, Ohio.

This project, involving over $10 million of Federal grants and over $33 million of Federal loans, covers an area of 96 acres containing 118 buildings of which 105 are to be demolished.

Although the basic criticism of the report evolved around the classification of substandard buildings and the Urban Renewal Administration's approval to demolish structurally sound buildings worth millions of dollars, I believe the basic issue here is much more fundamental than the details of a definition of substandard buildings.

The more important issue involves the extent to which Federal funds should be used and criteria for approving projects involving wholesale demolition in central business districts of our cities. As the urban renewal program was originally conceived in 1949, the primary emphasis was on the clearance of slum dwellings and, in fact, a specific limitation was placed in the law regarding the use of Federal funds for nonresidential areas. Subsequently, however, this limitation was modified by the Congress indicating approval for more activity by the agency in the renewal of commercial and other nonresidential areas.

In recent months, applications to the URA have indicated more and more interest in the use of urban renewal funds in the clearance of downtown busines districts. The agency has been approving many of these projects, but

the GAO seems to disagree with the criteria the agency uses in permitting wholesale clearance of these areas.

In the next session of Congress, it may be necessary that we pass on the further extension of the urban renewal program to downtown business districts and the criteria for the use of Federal funds in the clearance of expensive office buildings, department stores, and other large commercial buildings.

In anticipation of this issue coming before us, I have had an exchange of correspondence with Mr. William L. Slayton, Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, on the Cleveland project.

The Urban Renewal Administration has submitted some very persuasive arguments on the use of Federal funds in doing an effective job of rebuilding blighted downtown areas. Undoubtedly, the downtown business districts are vital to the economic health and continued growth of our cities and warrant special attention.

I should like to encourage the attention of the Members of Congress to this issue, and I believe Mr. Slayton's latest report to me which I received yesterday would be of interest. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Housing and Home
Finance Agency,
Urban Renewal Administration,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1963.

Hon. John J. Sparkman,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Sparkman: As previously indicated to the subcommittee staff, we have delayed replying to your letter of August 20 pending completion of our detailed analysis of the Comptroller General's report of June 1963 on the Erieview I urban renewal project in Cleveland, Ohio.

One of the basic principles raised by the GAO report is whether cities through the Federal urban renewal program should be permitted to do an effective job of rebuilding slum and blighted downtown areas of such vital importance as the Erieview area is to Cleveland. If Federal renewal aid is to be narrowly circumscribed, as some suggest, cities will be confined to limited objectives and patchwork jobs.

That the central city has been losing population is demonstrated by the fact that during the period 1950–60, 8 of our 10 largest cities actually lost population. That the downtown area has been losing business and industry to outlying areas, where land is relatively cheap and easy to assemble, is demonstrated by a summary analysis of a recent 6-year period showing that in retail sections of 45 metropolitan areas, retail sales rose 32 percent—but only 1.6 percent in central business districts.

Yet, it is in these central business districts that the cities have their greatest capital investment in physical facilities and public improvements. These central business districts also yield the greatest tax returns per acre of land and if properly redeveloped should yield even greater returns.

To remedy the loss of population, usually the middle and upper income groups, and to develop a truly new and revitalized downtown area, a city must do more than merely build more parking garages and replace old buildings with new ones.

Experience has shown that because of mixed ownership of land and the high cost of land assembly private interests alone cannot do the job, except in limited instances. Effective redevelopment of downtown areas through urban renewal will be stymied in nearly every community unless obsolete buildings with wornout equipment and facilities can be cleared and other structures razed where essential to the orderly development of the area as determined by the locality's governing body.

The Urban Renewal Administration believes that as to downtown renewal under the title I program, it had a sound policy at the time the Erieview project was approved and continues to have a sound position; and I believe it acted in accordance with these policies in approving the project. It is essential that Federal policy permit an effective rebuilding job, and that existing policies, which permit these objectives to be achieved, be continued. One lesson that has been learned from urban renewal is that substantial rebuilding is often required if an area is to be transformed into a real asset to the city. To require a much more limited approach to rebuilding an area such as Erieview would, in fact, doom it from the start. The blighting influences of obsolete and incompatible existing structures; the difficulty of hedge-hopping development around existing buildings; the inability to replan the area to meet present-day needs for traffic, commerce, and residence; the inadequacy of existing street patterns and unusable size lots—these restrictions that result from development at a time when present day needs were unforeseen can effectively stifle the city's vital struggle to survive.

This very point was emphasized by the court of common pleas of Cuyahoga County in upholding the validity of the Erieview project, when it said: "The engineers of the past did a good job of planning for a little city then of small consequence. But is a large part of the downtown area of the great metropolis of Cleveland to lie moribund in the cocoon which was woven for it when a village more than a century ago?"[1]

We agree wholeheartedly with the court. It is imperative to make it possible for cities to rebuild themselves to meet the needs of today.

I would like now to turn to the GAO report itself. The criticisms in this report fall into two general categories: those dealing with classification of structures, and those dealing with demolition of sound buildings. To make clear our understanding of the report on the first point, we understand it to be charging that the criteria established by the Urban Renewal Administration to define substandard buildings warranting clearance are too vague and our review procedures inadequate.

The Urban Renewal Administration's criteria for clearance and redevelopment, set forth in section 10–1 of the Urban Renewal Manual, pages 2 and 3, are as follows:

"The necessity for clearance of a project area, or of any part thereof, must be satisfactorily demonstrated in all cases. If conditions warranting clearance do not exist, the appropriate treatment will be conservation and rehabilitation which may include spot clearance.

"In a builtup project area or sizable portion thereof which is proposed for clearance, one of the following conditions must exist: (1) More than 50 percent of the buildings, not including accessory outbuildings, must, by reasonable criteria, be substandard to a degree warranting clearance; and (2) more than 20 percent of the buildings must be substandard requiring clearance, and substantial other clearance must be warranted to effectively remove blighting influences such as: (a) inadequate street layout, (b) incompatible uses or land use relationships, (c) overcrowding of buildings on the land, (d) excessive dwelling unit density, (e) obsolete buildings not suitable for improvement or conversion, and (f) other identified hazards to health and safety and to the general well-being of the community.

"The LPA must also (1) show that the extent of clearance proposed is warranted, and (2) fully justify the acquisition of individual parcels of basically sound property which involves high acquisition costs and might not be incompatible with land use proposals. Every possibility must be explored to develop an Urban Renewal Plan which permits a maximum number of sound structures to remain in the area.

"HHFA will not concur in the acquisition for demolition of property that is: (1) Of such quality and potential use that its retention is compatible with the achievement of the Urban Renewal Plan objectives for the project area; and (2) capable of being improved and successfully integrated into the project."

It is important to make clear that the final GAO report does not challenge the eligibility of the Erieview area for urban renewal nor its eligibility for clearance. The draft report did challenge the eligibility of the project. The final report thus embodies a significant change apparently made as a result of our comments. It should also be pointed out that the eligibility of the project under Ohio law has been upheld in the courts. In sustaining the project, the Ohio Court of Appeals stated as follows:

"The extensive evidence here shows that the legislative body of the city had before it a great mass of factual data upon which to make its legislative judgment that the area in question is, in fact, a blighted area, deteriorated and deteriorating, and, as a consequence, detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare. Thus, we conclude from all the documentary evidence above described and all other evidence contained in the record that the findings of the trial court (sustaining the city's determination of blight) must be sustained."[2]

The first major concern expressed in the GAO report is the basis upon which an area is found to be qualified for clearance. This agency has established one of two alternative requirements to be satisfied before an area can qualify for clearance treatment. Under one alternative, more than 50 percent of the buildings must be structurally substandard to a degree warranting clearance without considering other factors. Under the other alternative, more than 20 percent of the buildings must be structurally substandard to a degree warranting clearance without considering other factors, and in addition the blighting influences specifically listed in the Urban Renewal Manual must be present in the area to such a degree to make substantial other clearance necessary. GAO apparently contends that the Urban Renewal Administration has permitted buildings that are structurally sound to be classified as "substandard requiring clearance." GAO fears that a city may, with the Urban Renewal Administration's approval, arrive at the 20 percent figure permitting clearance even though 20 percent of the buildings in the project area are not in fact structurally unsound.

GAO's concern about the problem would certainly be justified if the Urban Renewal Administration in fact permitted a city to undertake clearance on the basis of this approach. In fact, we do not. The 50- and 20-percent requirements relate only to those buildings that are structurally substandard. No other buildings may be included in these categories. While we believe this rule is stated with reasonable clarity in the Urban Renewal Manual, we have ordered a redrafting of the appropriate sections to prevent any possibility of misunderstanding on this point.

---

[1] *Grisanti* v. *City of Cleveland,* 179 N.E. 2d 798, 812 (1961).

[2] *Grisanti* v. *City of Cleveland,* 89 Ohio L. Abs. 1, 181 N.E. 2d 299 (1962), appeal dismissed, 173 Ohio 368, 182 N.E. 2d 568 (1962), appeal dismissed, 371 U.S. 68 (1963).

There were 118 buildings in the Erieview project area. In the loan and grant application which was approved by the Urban Renewal Administration, the city classified 84 of these buildings as "substandard." The GAO auditors, however, with an HHFA employee who had been requested to accompany them, inspected 77 buildings and characterized 24 as structurally substandard. In instances where, because of long neglect and abuse, a building had been reduced to a state that the aggregate cost of repairs would be unreasonable (as compared to new construction), the GAO team still took the position that the building could not be classed as substandard.

The GAO count of 24 buildings represents too narrow a view of what is structurally substandard. It is my opinion that the practical limits beyond which no prudent owner or buyer would go in attempting repairs should be taken into consideration in classifying a building as substandard.

After the GAO draft report was issued, the Chicago Regional Office of the Urban Renewal Administration reevaluated the inspection reports of all buildings and concluded again that 84 buildings were substandard and should be removed. It is essential to note, however, that this figure was broken down into two parts: 50 buildings that were structurally substandard and 34 buildings that warranted clearance because of other blighting influences. Unfortunately the language in the report by the regional office which characterized 84 buildings as "substandard" was misleading. The use of this term for all 84 buildings was incorrect, and we are taking steps to insure that future analyses will be made and tabulated in such a way as to eliminate the possibility of this kind of misunderstanding.

It should be noted that even under the GAO count of 24, 20 percent of the buildings in the area were found to be structurally substandard, and thus, when considered along with blighting influences, qualified the area for clearance under Urban Renewal Administration criteria. Again, we emphasize that GAO does not now challenge the eligibility of the project area for renewal through clearance and redevelopment.

Let me state again: In order for a project area to qualify for clearance, the Urban Renewal Administration requires one of two alternative requirements to be met. More than 50 percent of the buildings must be structurally substandard to a degree warranting clearance without considering other factors. Or, in the alternative, more than 20 percent of the buildings must be structurally substandard to a degree warranting clearance without considering other factors, and in addition the blighting influences specifically listed in our manual must be present in the area to such a degree so as to make substantial other clearance necessary. The Erieview project clearly qualified.

It is important at this point to understand that compliance with the 50- or 20-percent structural substandard criteria, which is necessary to qualify an area as a clearance area, does not mean that the city has the approval of the Urban Renewal Administration for total clearance of the area. Once the eligibility of the area for clearance has been established, the city has the responsibility to support the extent of the clearance that it proposes to undertake. The city prepares a renewal plan for the area, and it is in the review of this plan with its documentation that the clearance proposed must be justified.

This brings us to the second major question raised by the GAO report, namely, the demolition of buildings that are structurally sound. The report emphasizes the fact that a number of structurally sound buildings, several of which are quite expensive, will be acquired and cleared in the Erieview project and states that several of these structures might have been improved and successfully integrated into the project. It refers to the Urban Renewal Administration policies, set forth below, that encourage the development of plans providing for maximum retention of sound structures and questions the adequacy of the Urban Renewal Administration implementation of these policies. GAO recommends, in effect, that the Urban Renewal Administration determine, after inspection of the premises, whether each such building should be demolished or retained and integrated into the project.

In order to justify large-scale clearance, our policies provide as follows: "The LPA must also (1) show that the extent of clearance proposed is warranted, and (2) fully justify the acquisition of individual parcels of basically sound property which involves high acquisition costs and might not be incompatible with land use proposals. Every possibility must be explored to develop an urban renewal plan which permits a maximum number of sound structures to remain in the area.

"HHFA will not concur in the acquisition for demolition of property that is: (1) Of such quality and potential use that its retention is compatible with the achievement of the urban renewal plan objectives for the project areas; and (2) capable of being improved and successfully integrated into the project."

This policy was in fact carried out in the approval of the urban renewal plan for this project. Indeed, it should be noted that 13 buildings in the Erieview project area will be saved under the city's plan. Thirty buildings not structurally substandard must be taken because they are obsolete and cannot be converted to a suitable use; they exert blighting influence on the surrounding area, and would continue to blight any new development. Four buildings were scheduled for demolition because they constituted hazards to health and safety. Four are to be taken to widen streets and relieve traffic congestion. Two structures are being taken to create a plaza, which will provide essential public open space and serve as a buffer between intensive commercial uses and areas for new downtown apartment living. Fifteen structurally standard buildings are being taken in order to provide large enough parcels of land to attract sound, new development.

GAO has stated that the Urban Renewal Administration did not have sufficient information at the time the project was approved "to make a realistic judgment that large-scale demolition was warranted, to the complete exclusion of less costly alternative methods of urban renewal treatment." We cannot agree with this statement.

The tour of the project site by regional office officials on the afternoon of November 15, 1960, and the following morning was not, as indicated in the report, the "principal basis for the determination that the area met URA requirements for clearance." In fact, regional office staff visited the project area many times—before the project application was filed and during project planning. The regional office had adequate knowledge of the area to evaluate data submitted by the city in terms of the presence of a sufficient percentage of structurally substandard buildings and also of other blighting factors such as incompatible or deleterious uses, obsolescence or incompatible land use relationships, all of which are recognized under the Urban Renewal Administration policy as conditions which may warrant clearance.

In our opinion, there was sufficient basis for the approval of the project by the Urban Renewal Administration: the inspections, review of the data in the city's application and related documents, together with the knowledge on the part of regional office staff of the planning activities of the city.

It would have been most unwise, furthermore, for the Urban Renewal Administration to have taken a position that would have prevented achievement of the plan by insisting on the retention of additional structures. Upon re-review of the Erieview plan, we again concluded the necessity of acquiring these structures and have determined that the city in submitting the present plan had given adequate consideration to alternative plans that might have permitted the retention of some of these structures.

We do feel, however, that the GAO report has revealed the need for strengthening the documentation required to demonstrate that adequate consideration has been given to alternate plans that would result in the retention of a greater number of structurally sound structures. Our requirements are being strengthened in this respect. At the same time, we feel that in the Urban Renewal Administration's review of these plans, a basic principle is involved that requires emphasis. This principle applies to GAO's recommendation that the Urban Renewal Administration inspect each building and itself make the determination as to whether it should be retained.

A basic principle of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is that the urban renewal program is a local program, locally conceived, locally planned, and locally carried out. Federal financial assistance is provided to aid localities in the carrying out of these local plans and programs. Within this framework, the Federal Government makes every effort to assure that the objectives of the locality are accomplished in the most effective and most economical manner consistent with sound planning. The Housing Act of 1949, as amended, was not written and in our opinion should not be administered to provide absolute Federal dominance over the type of development that a city chooses as appropriate for a project area. So long as the requirements of the Federal legislation and policies are met, the Urban Renewal Administration should not block the achievement of locally determined renewal objectives by interposing its judgment as to which buildings are and which buildings are not to be made part of a final project plan.

There is no question that several of the buildings scheduled for clearance in the Erieview area were structurally sound. But the urban renewal plan that the city developed for the Erieview area calls for a different character of land use and development than would have been permitted by retention of these additional buildings. The retention of these buildings would have prevented achievement of an urban renewal plan that was the result of the city's intensive study of its own needs, dating back to the adoption of the general plan of Cleveland in 1949, and it would have accorded with neither law nor public policy for the Urban Renewal Administration to have overruled the city's carefully considered plans. The bond issue which raised the local funds necessary to launch the Erieview project was approved by 66 percent of the voters. The Erieview plan was adopted by a unanimous vote of the 33 members of the city council after review by the planning commission, after frequent hearings by a committee of the council, and after a series of public hearings attended by more than 500 people lasting for 12 hours. Even though the urban renewal plan entailed substantial changes in existing land uses, the role of the Federal Government was not to substitute its judgment for that of the locality, but rather to determine whether the locality had complied with applicable law and with our regulations in its adoption of the plan.

So long as a city's objectives are sound and realistic and so long as the city has complied with Federal law and regulations as well as with local laws, the Federal Government should, I believe, approve the plan that is developed and proposed by the locality.

Although the Urban Renewal Administration has taken exception to the findings of the GAO report, the report has proved of value in identifying some possibilities of misinterpretation of our policies as to classification of buildings in meeting our criteria for clearance treatment and in raising the question of further written documentation of the efforts of the local public agency to explore alternative plans. As mentioned previously, we are further clarifying these provisions of the Urban Renewal Manual so as to remove any possible ambiguities. We also intend to reexamine our review procedures and to consider any additional measures which may be necessary or desirable to assure careful regional office review of proposals made by local public agencies.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a statement prepared by the Cleveland Urban Renewal Agency that discusses the various aspects of the Erieview I project in detail.

Also, in accordance with your request of August 20, a report on S. 2045 is being prepared and will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Please let me know if you desire any further information with respect to either the GAO report or the Erieview I project.

Sincerely yours,

William L. Slayton,
Urban Renewal Commissioner.

ADDITIONAL HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 118 which would increase the authorization for direct loans for housing for the elderly under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959. Senate Joint Resolution 118 would increase the authorization by $75 million, from $225 to $300 million. This is in accordance with the recommendations made by the President in his message of February 21, 1963, to the Congress "relative to the elderly citizens of our Nation."

Under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to make direct loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies and bodies for the provision of housing designed especially for the elderly. This program is administered by the Community Facilities Administration in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The loans are currently being made at an interest rate of 3⅝ percent per annum and may run for as long as 50 years. Applicants are required to show that they are unable to secure private loans on equally favorable terms. The program is designed for elderly persons in the lower middle-income bracket. Local income limits for admission have been established by the HHFA and initial rent schedules and changes in rent schedules must be approved by the Community Facilities Administration.

Senate Joint Resolution 118 would increase the present authorization of $225 million for appropriations for loans by $75 million. To date, $150 million has been appropriated and an additional $125 million has been requested by the President to be appropriated for fiscal 1964 subject to new authority being provided in a prior legislative act. The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 118 is to provide the necessary authority so that the full amount needed can be appropriated in the 1964 Appropriations Act.

I have been told by the administration that, at the rate applications for loans are being submitted to the Agency, the program will be out of funds some time next spring unless action is taken on additional authorization.

GOLDWATER-KENNEDY RACE IN WISCONSIN MIGHT BE CLOSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senator Goldwater might give President Kennedy a surprisingly close race in Wisconsin.

I have just completed the most comprehensive poll I have ever conducted in Wisconsin. More than 40,000 questionnaires were mailed out in a way calculated to secure as representative a sample of opinion as possible.

Names were selected at random from telephone books and rural boxholder lists. Each of Wisconsin's 72 counties and its urban and rural population was polled in proportion to population.

The poll actually recorded a 3—60.3 percent—to 2—39.7 percent—Kennedy advantage over Goldwater. But the poll also showed only 21.4 percent of the respondents considered themselves Republicans, compared to 37.5 percent Democrats and 41.1 percent independents. This response bias is understandable since the poll was conducted by a Democratic Senator.

Furthermore, the President has the advantage of being far better known at the present time in Wisconsin. A presidential campaign would greatly increase Wisconsin familiarity with Senator Goldwater.

Allowing for the Democratic bias in the poll and the President's present advantage in being better known, it would seem that a Kennedy-Goldwater race in Wisconsin in November of 1964 could be a real horserace.

Governor Rockefeller fared more poorly than Goldwater in the poll. Kennedy received about 68 percent of the vote compared to 32 percent for the New York Governor.

On four other questions involving crucial issues now pending before the Congress, we are still tabulating the results of the questionnaire. We expect to be able to report these results within the next few days.

A breakdown of the replies in the Kennedy-Goldwater and Kennedy-Rockefeller races by Wisconsin congressional district follows:

Question 1. If the presidential election were held today between Barry Goldwater and John F. Kennedy, would you vote for Goldwater or Kennedy?

District	Largest city	Goldwater	Kennedy
1st	Racine	45.5	54.5
2d	Madison	38.7	61.3
3d	La Crosse	53.5	46.5
4th and 5th	Milwaukee	32.5	67.5
6th	Sheboygan	45.1	54.9
7th	Wausau	51.6	48.4
8th	Green Bay	43.5	56.5
9th (old)	Eau Claire	40.5	59.5
10th	Superior	42.8	57.2
Statewide		39.7	60.3

Question 2. If the presidential election were held today between Nelson Rockefeller and John F. Kennedy, would you vote for Rockefeller or Kennedy?

	Rockefeller	Kennedy
1st	34.4	65.6
2d	36.4	63.6
3d	42.4	57.6
4th and 5th	27.7	72.3
6th	32.4	67.6
7th	36.1	63.9
8th	31.1	68.9
9th (old)	34.9	65.1
10th	37.8	62.2
Statewide	32.2	67.8

Question 7. Do you regard yourself as a Democrat, Republican, or independent?

	Democrat	Republican	Independent
1st	36.7	25.5	37.8
2d	37.3	19.6	43.1
3d	28.6	29.1	42.3
4th and 5th	41.6	17.6	40.8
6th	34.0	26.0	40.0
7th	32.0	26.4	41.6
8th	33.5	21.7	44.8
9th (old)	35.8	23.8	40.4
10th	40.9	20.2	38.9
Statewide	37.6	21.4	41.0

NATIONAL DISGRACE—STARVED CAPITAL SCHOOLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, any American who read the Washington Post this morning must have been shocked to see a picture of 97 high school students jammed like cattle into a classroom designed to hold only 40 pupils. Pupils are standing against the walls, squeezed on top of desks, perched on radiators. Obviously they cannot have a real opportunity to learn under these disgraceful circumstances.

And Mr. President, this school overcrowding is not unusual in this Nation's Capital.

This, Mr. President, is our responsibility. We Senators and Congressmen are responsible for the schools of Washington. This is our disgrace. It is up to us to act.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Teachers Can't Teach, Students Can't Learn

(By Maurine Hoffman)

The teachers say they can't teach. The pupils say they can't learn. Both groups agree that conditions are horrible at Spingarn High School where 97 pupils are packed into one 10th grade English class.

Picture this class, conducted by Theodore R. Hudson, an experienced teacher. The pupils crowd into a classroom that should hold only 40, according to fire regulations. Dozens of students squeeze together on the tops of desks jammed against the wall. Others sit on the radiator and the library table. Three girls share two seats. Some students stand. Only a few, who arrive early, are fortunate enough to have a desk and a chair.

Such a scene is not uncommon this year at the school, 24th and Benning Road NE. A lack of teachers has resulted in a sizable number of giant-sized classes like Hudson's.

For example at Springarm, there are 81 students in another class taught by Hudson, 85 in one world history class, 80 in an 11th grade English class, 93 in one 10th grade English class, 83 girls in a 10th grade health and physical education class, and 59 pupils in a physical science class. Enrollments of more than 60 students per class are not unusual in other English and history classes. But that's not all. The teacher shortage also has—

Forced teachers to take over classes in subjects with which they are unfamiliar; a Latin teacher has a geometry class, an art teacher an algebra class and a music teacher a math class.

Compelled 20 teachers to give up their free periods for preparation to teach classes.

Made it impossible for 25 students who are preparing for college to take second year Spanish.

Led to situations in which a teacher keeps only one lesson ahead of her pupils—a French teacher trying to instruct a Spanish I class.

Caused problems in the business department where a teacher has 43 pupils in typing and only 35 typewriters; 10 do not work.

Imposed a hardship on pupils who are not in the giant-sized classes. For instance, one teacher has 34 pupils in a slow-learning English class where there should be fewer than 20 to meet Board of Education standards.

Forced teachers to teach many courses instead of the usual one or two.

The teacher storage stems from inaction on the District 1964 budget calling for 344 new teachers this year to meet an estimated increase of 5,125 new public school pupils.

At Springarn this lack of new teachers means that there are 10 fewer senior high school teachers than there were last year. At the same time the senior high enrollment is almost 1,700, compared to 1,463 last year.

Hearings on the District budget will begin in the Senate next week before the Appropriations Subcommittee headed by Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia. He has said the subcommittee will hear a presentation of the overall budget by the District Commissioners, then hold hearings on school needs.

However, funds to hire the additional teachers cannot be approved before action is taken on the entire District budget. There is a possibility Congress might give school officials permission to hire extra teachers at once. School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen asked for such permission before school started last week but was turned down on the grounds that the budget had not yet been submitted to the Byrd subcommittee.

Meanwhile, teachers like Hudson face huge classes. How does he teach 97 sophomores English? The answer—he can't, although he tries.

POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI OUTSPOKEN, STRAIGHTFORWARD SUCCESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this body will soon pass on the nomination of the next Postmaster General. The President has nominated John Gronouski, of Madison, Wis.

The Senate should know that John Gronouski is a remarkably straightforward, as well as able Democrat.

He has had a brilliant career in our State and I ask unanimous consent that an article by Aldric Revell, an excellent political reporter, on John Gronouski be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gronouski Shows Outspoken Man Can Succeed in Political Life

(By Aldric Revell)

John Austin Gronouski, Wisconsin's tax commissioner, has disproved the belief that if a man speaks his mind frankly at all times he won't get very far in life, and especially, in politics.

Gronouski, who will be 44 on October 26, has been an outspoken, partisan Democrat all his adult life. His reward is that he now goes to Washington, D.C., to a Cabinet post in the Kennedy administration.

While the greater part of his mental efforts has been in the technical field of economics and finance, Gronouski has been a strong and guiding voice in Wisconsin's Democratic Party for years.

His advice has been sought, and often followed, by former Governor Nelson, Governor Reynolds, and Patrick J. Lucey, former State chairman.

A dedicated foe of sales taxes, Gronouski tried his best to steer Wisconsin away from this field of taxation. But because of the Republican-dominated legislature, he had to compromise on selective sales taxes to prevent fiscal chaos.

He still opposes any form of sales taxes, selective or general, and in the 1962 campaign he provided the material for all of Governor Reynolds' speeches against sales taxes and for income taxes based on ability to pay.

An example of his dislike of sales taxes and the lengths he will go to avoid them came during the Democratic State convention at Sheboygan in 1962, when he made a ripsnorting speech on the convention floor criticizing sales taxes and urging the delegates to oppose both selective and general sales taxes.

His attitude at the convention was not a contradiction, even though he had devised the selective sales taxes which Governor Nelson used in his compromise tax program.

The fact is that Gronouski, an intellectual politician, had to compromise in the 1961 legislature and did so by advocating selective sales taxes in order to avoid what he considered a worse evil of general sales taxes.

In the 1962 campaign, in the hopes that the Democrats would win and thus control taxation, he strongly opposed both selective and sales taxes.

Gronouski was born of Polish parents on October 26, 1919, in Dunbar, Wis., and was raised in Oshkosh. He graduated from St. Peter's High School in Oshkosh and attended Oshkosh State College.

He is a husky, pipe-smoking, left-handed extrovert.

He got three degrees from the University of Wisconsin. In 1942 he got his B.A.; in 1947, his M.A.; and in 1955, his Ph. D. His doctoral dissertation was on "Valuation of Railroads for Ad Valorem Tax Purposes."

From February 1948 to June 1950, he taught public finance, money, and banking at the University of Maine. From 1953 to 1956 he taught statistics at Roosevelt University in Chicago at nights, at the same time he was holding down the job of research associate for the Federation of Tax Administrators.

From September 1956 to August 1957, he was research associate at the University of Wisconsin, directing under Prof. Harold Groves, a study of Wisconsin income tax administration.

From September 1957 to July 1958, he was on the research staff of the Michigan tax study while teaching public finance and banking at Wayne State University, Detroit.

Gronouski returned to Wisconsin in February 1959 after winning a civil service examination as research director of the State tax department. He served as executive director of Governor Nelson's blue ribbon committee on tax revision.

He was named to a 6-year term as tax commissioner by Governor Nelson in 1959 and confirmed by the Republican-controlled senate.

Since 1962 he has been Governor Reynolds' closest financial advisor and close personal friend.

Gronouski has published more than 20 articles in technical tax journals on all fields of taxation.

During World War II he was a first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps and served as navigator in 24 combat missions in the European theater from April 1942 to October 1945.

He is married and has two girls, Stacy, 10, and Julie Kay, 7. He lives at 5013 Barton Road.

WISCONSIN HAILS THE GREAT ATHLETE WARREN SPAHN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our Governor has declared next Tuesday Warren Spahn Day in our State. This magnificent pitcher—in my book baseball's greatest—is not only a great athlete but a marvelously clean-living, gentlemanly example to the youth of our State and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article about Wisconsin's honor to Warren Spahn and a column paying tribute to Spahn by the Milwaukee Journal's Oliver Kuechle be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

All Wisconsin To Hail Spahn

Madison, Wis., September 9.—A declaration from the Governor today proclaimed September 17 "Warren Spahn Day" in Wisconsin, in tribute to the Braves' incomparable left-hander.

Spahn became a 20-game winner for the 13th time in his career Sunday with a 3-to-2 victory over Philadelphia. The feat tied a mark Christy Mathewson put in the National League annals.

Gov. John W. Reynolds called the 42-year-old left-handler "a symbol of athletic excellence to the people of Milwaukee and baseball fans all over America.

"At a time of life when other men complain about mowing the lawn he continues to display a physical vigor that is the envy of all.

"He has inspired the youth of * * * the Nation with his conduct as an outstanding gentleman and sportsman on and off the playing field."

The Governor made Spahn an honorary lifetime citizen of the State and titled him "Wisconsin's first gentleman of baseball."

The Braves will play the Giants September 17 in Milwaukee County Stadium. Fans are expected from all sections of the State.

ANYBODY AT 42 FOR A GAME OF BRIDGE?

(By Oliver E. Kuechle)

What can a guy say about Warren Spahn that has not been said before? The superlatives with which his pitching has been described for years have lost their force. The "amazing" Spahn, the "incredible" Spahn, the "fabulous" Spahn—where does one go from there except to repeat himself? So it must be today: The "amazing, incredible, fabulous" Spahn and whatever other words the thesaurus may have to fit a pitcher of "extraordinary, brilliant, sparkling" working skill. Oh, those weary superlatives.

Spahn Sunday won his 20th game of a season for the 13th time. Spahn Sunday was also 42 years and 139 days old. He'll be 43 April 23, 1964. There are grandfathers that old.

NOT AN ECHO

Here is the "incredible, amazing, fabulous" thing about the man. He is doing it, and apparently losing nothing, at an age that most pitchers, however great in youth, stand in the coaching box or run a bowling alley.

Spahn at 42 is not only pitching and winning, he is winning as only the greatest in youth ever do.

A few years ago, there was common talk that any year might see the beginning of the end if not the end itself. The man just couldn't go on. Today there isn't even an echo of such talk. Spahn himself speaks modestly of another 3 or 4 years—and why not?

And if it is another 3 or 4 years, the records that must further fall to him will fill a book not the least of which will be those of longevity as a pitcher and longevity with one club.

FOUR MORE

Spahn today is in his 19th season. Four more years and he will equal John Pincus Quinn's record of 23 in the majors. Three more and he will equal Herb Pennock's, Sam Jones', Red Ruffing's, and Early Wynn's of 22 in one league—all in the American by the way. And 2 more years and he will equal Walter Johnson's and Teddy Lyons' of 21 with one club—Johnson with the Washington Senators and Lyons with the Chicago Sox.

Having spent his 19 seasons with the Braves, he already holds the National league pitching record in this.

One can't help but speculate what his achievement chart today might be except for his 3 years of military service (1943, 1944, and 1945). They were years of youth after he had joined the Braves from Hartford for a few games in 1942. It was not until he returned from the war, in 1946, and at the age of 25, that he won his first big league game.

If his three lost seasons had been as good as the first three full ones, he would be knocking loudly at the door of 400 victories today—loudly. He won 8 and lost 5 in 1946, 21 and 10 in 1947, and 15 and 12 in 1948. He would have 391 victories today.

"Amazing, incredible, fabulous" Warren Spahn.

Anybody at 42 for a rousing game of bridge today?

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, some time ago one of my Senate colleagues and myself were on nationwide television discussing the proposed treaty outlawing nuclear explosions under certain conditions. Our joint appearance followed by a few days the comments of the President that the children of our Nation had no lobbyist in Washington to look after their interests. The implication was quite plain.

On the television program I took issue, rather mildly, I must say, with the President's comments. It was, and is, my position that the Congress of the United States is one complete lobby for the interests of our children. In the three separate branches of Government we might not be as effective at all times as we would like to be, but nevertheless, I believe that in the Congress of the United States we speak for the people, the parents, the grandparents, and the children.

Subsequent to our joint appearance, my opposite number placed a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that he had received from a 9-year-old child endorsing his position in favor of the test ban treaty. It seems the child had talked the matter over with his mother, and the mother had agreed that the child was right—that the treaty should be ratified. The floor comments here followed the general line that even a 9-year-old child knows the proposed test ban treaty is in the best interests of this country.

I have received a great deal of mail on this subject, some of it from scientists, from educators, from housewives, farmers, laborers. I am reminded here that the other night a citizen called from the Texas gulf coast to say, "Senator, I'm just a working stiff, but I believe that treaty is bad, and if things keep going the way they are now going in this country we are going to end up with a dictatorship." And I might add that contrary to the much publicized ratio of 12 to 1 in favor of the treaty that was reported by the President, my own mail has been running about 5 to 1 against it.

But recently I received a letter that somehow seems completely appropriate to the situation and to the time. Responsible bodies of the Senate are now seeking all the information they can get from responsible citizens of our Republic as to the possible and probable effect of the treaty. In the final analysis, the Senate itself will have to make the determination. In that determination the Senate will not, or should not, vote as Democrats and Republicans, but as individual and responsible guardians of our Republic and its institutions.

When that time comes, or perhaps before that time comes, I shall have more to say on this matter. But for the moment, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from a 17-year-old youngster in Texas, a graduate of Pasadena High School.

In passing I might say that in the logic of the 9-year-old mentioned above, we ought to ratify this treaty. In the logic of 17-year-old Dick McDonald, we ought not to ratify this treaty.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter entered, and call it to the attention of my fellow Senators:

PASADENA, TEX.,
August 5, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR TOWER: I heard you say on television a few days ago that you are a lobbyist for young people. I'm young. I'm 17. I graduated from Pasadena High School this year.

I am writing essentially this same letter to Senator YARBOROUGH in hopes that one of you will hear me.

I have never written a politician and I may never again. I'm simply not the type to become that emotionally stirred over political issues, however, I feel that the Nation you represent is about to make some grave mistakes.

When young people ask their teachers why we study history, we are told that history is studied that one might profit from the mistakes of his predecessors. I am swiftly coming to the conclusion that this is only a convenient answer, and that in reality few actually learn by observing previous blunders.

Adolf Hitler wrote "Mein Kampf" before he became a world power. Many have since woefully cried out, "If only we had believed he would do what he said he would do."

The Senate represents the people of our Nation. It seems that under the burden of responsibility for the lives of 180 millions of people our Representatives have a tendency to see peaceful intentions where none lie.

I hope that you, sir, recognize the senselessness of ignoring the Communist "Mein Kampf," the chapters of which have been written by many men. Lenin in 1919 in the "Report of the Central Committee at the eighth Party Congress": "The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable." The truth of that last statement we have already witnessed.

The Thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International: "The proletariat in the Soviet Union harbours no illusions as to the possibility of a durable peace with the imperialists."

Stated in a lecture on political warfare in 1931 by Dimitry Z. Manuilsky: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable."

Are we to ignore this as so many ignored Hitler's stated intent so few years ago?

Stated by Manuilsky in the same lecture: "Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will jump at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

We shall soon apparently ratify a treaty promising to limit our nuclear testing drastically, a treaty which, of course, is valid only from the time our Senate approves until the Soviet Union feels it is no longer expedient to remain true to it. But Red China has signed nothing. What good is a treaty which diminishes our progress while the Soviets, already far ahead, may go on testing in the name of Red China? Certainly it appears Red China and the Soviet Union are not on good terms, but who outside the Kremlin can be sure? Communists have never hesitated to employ deception in their bid for world conquest.

I had wondered for some time why Red China and the Soviet Union were outwardly splitting, but now it becomes obvious, at least to me, that the split is a maneuver for a favorable political and military advantage over the West for the Soviet Union. We are to be put to sleep with treaties of peace by a "friendly" Soviet Union while the Soviets continue to forge their "peaceful weapons" behind the Bamboo Curtain, while Red China remains antagonistic toward the West.

I hope, sir, that you will not discount my oversimplified interpretation of the world situation because of my age, but that you will examine it openmindedly in the light of these few portions of the Communist "Mein Kampf."

Very truly yours,

Dick McDonald.

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the great march on Washington is now behind us. The blisters on the feet of the marchers are probably well healed by now; the news commentators are finding joy in speculating about the effect on Congress of the march; and I recently read that you can now buy lapel pins that state that "I was there."

Mr. President, the march may be history, but the thoughts of this great event continue to live on. The perseverance with which the marchers came to Washington, the good will and dignity they showed upon arrival are still in the minds of all who witnessed the occasion. Never before in the history of mankind has there been such a gathering.

I was particularly proud of the large delegations from my State of New Jersey. I met some of these groups when they arrived here at Union Station. I was greatly impressed by the great conviction with which they came to Washington. Many of my fellow citizens gave up a day of wages and paid for the trip to Washington in order to participate in the events. These people pride themselves on being Americans and ask only that they be given the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should be aware of the grassroots support behind this great civil rights movement. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have a number of articles from various New Jersey papers printed in the Record. These articles represent a sampling of the opinions found in all the papers of the State and I think are worthy of note. Some deal with the private citizen's views and others are the thoughts of the editorial boards. I ask that the articles be placed in the following order:

From the August 30 Trentonian of Trenton, an editorial entitled, "An Impressive Performance," "Weary But Proud," an article from the Newark Evening News of August 29, the article entitled "Dignity, Spirit Impressed Marchers from Plainfield," from the August 29 Plainfield Courier-News, from the September 6 issue of the Jewish News of Newark, an interview with Dr. Joachim Prinz entitled, "It Was in the Best Tradition of America," from the September 5 Advocate, the Newark Archdiocese paper, an editorial entitled, "The March on Washington," "Nation's Conscience," an editorial from the Paterson Morning Call of September 4, "The March Has Just Begun," an editorial from the Bergen Record of August 30, and finally, from the Asbury Park Sunday Press of September 1, the editorial entitled, "The Civil Rights Battle Will Be Over When Good Citizens, Who Outnumber Bigots, Rise Up and Show Their Power."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Trentonian, Trenton, N.J., Aug. 30, 1963]

An Impressive Performance

The great "March on Washington" is over; and the apprehensions of those who feared that such a massive demonstration of discontent could not remain peaceful have been proven groundless.

The most impressive thing about the march was its dignity and restraint. Even friends of the Negroes' cause had been apprehensive; and the Government took many precautions, which—unnecessary as they proved to be—were nevertheless well advised.

But the complete absence of anything resembling "mob psychology," in a throng of more than 200,000 persons, is remarkable. It cannot help but have an immense impact upon the country as a whole. It is difficult for even the most thoughtless to persist in a casual contempt for a people capable of such an exercise of dignity and self-discipline. And we must bear in mind that this was in no way a "select" group, but comprised of persons from all social levels and walks of life.

The direct effect upon Congress, we have been told by those on the scene, was slight. Senate majority whip Hubert H. Humphrey, certainly no foe to the civil rights cause, opined that "it probably hasn't changed any votes on the civil rights bill."

Nevertheless, it has had its effect upon the country; and that, we must assume, will eventually be reflected in the Congress. And—what may well be more important—it cannot fail to have an effect upon personal attitudes of the citizenry. The Negroes have gained not only sympathy for their cause as a group, but respect for themselves as individuals.

Weary but Proud

(By Douglas Eldridge)

Negroes and whites flocking wearily back to New Jersey from the march on Washington agreed last night that part of their historic mission has already been accomplished—and splendidly so.

Their dusty shoes kicked off and their placards rolled up, many of the 600 northern New Jersey residents aboard the northbound "Newark Freedom Train" expressed a common belief that the day's events had made a profound impact on their own hearts and wills—and a common hope that it would make an equally profound impact on their friends and enemies throughout the land.

Between their sporadic naps and their increasingly hoarse choruses of "We Shall Overcome," the special train's passengers—black and white, young and old, high and low—again and again made these claims in appraising the unprecedented outpouring:

The march served notice on white America that the Negro cannot accept his lot any longer, and that he can seek to change it with vigor—and order—of awesome proportions. It gave to the Nation an unmistakable awareness of the depth and breadth of the civil rights revolution.

At the same time, the march showed to Negro America that its voice can be heard—and that its voice can be swollen significantly by many concerned whites. The demonstration gave to the Negro a new pride, and a new determination to combat injustices locally as well as nationally.

While those aboard the train last night spoke with varying eloquence on these points, and on the amazement at the size and smoothness of the great protest, many had to grope for words to describe the might and the beauty they had found in it.

"It was so glorious," exclaimed Mrs. Inez Jennings, a Newark teacher of beauty culture. "Words will never describe it—but I know, because I feel it." A friend, Mrs. Bertha Gibson, a Newark housewife, chimed in: "I'd come back next week if I had to, and next time I'd bring my children."

"All I can say is, I was very proud," observed Harvey Oliver, 19, a Rutgers University freshman who hopes to become an English teacher. "Some persons may have gone to Washington just for the ride," he said, "but if a person is human, it had to make an impression on him." He suggested that the march would do much to end apathy and disunity among Negroes.

Another student from Newark, Othello Jones, 20, a prelaw sophomore at Howard University, commented quietly: "I was really inspired. It makes you feel that someone else cares about the Negro."

"It was wonderful to see so many of my people turn out," asserted another beautician, Mrs. Shirley Hayes of Newark. "It shows that the Negro does care." Echoing her view was a Newark truck driver, Ernest Ward, who said the demonstration "proved our determination and our willingness to continue the fight."

To Adelbert Brown of East Orange, vice president of the Newark branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the march symbolized the unity and the order that the civil rights movement has achieved. At the same time, he continued, the demonstration provided "the shot in the arm this movement really needs. Up till now, in many cases, it's just been words."

Raymond Padgett, a Newark lather, said the demonstration had helped give the drive for civil rights a momentum that could not be halted. "This was the first time that the Negro ever did anything really big," he commented. "It touched a lot of people." And Dr. Eustace L. Blake, pastor of St. James A.M.E. church, said: "This was a march on the conscience of America."

Many of the returning marchers emphasized the interracial nature of yesterday's outpouring. "This was the most orderly demonstration of complete brotherhood that I have ever seen," declared Rev. George R. Hardy, Jr., of North Orange Baptist Church.

In a similar vein, C. B. Freeman, a Newark electronics technician, insisted that "what moved me the most was that this was being supported not only by Negroes, but also by our white brothers." And Louis S. Pitts, a member of the Newark Human Rights Commission, said he was most impressed by "the merging of the races."

The same point was underscored by a white minister, Rev. Sharon Scholten, of Bradley Gardens Community Church, Somerville. "What was most important," he declared, "was the total harmony in an integrated group in a southern city."

However, one of the Negro members, Richard Currey, of Union, an aviation plant assembler, said he was disappointed that whites were not a vast majority of the demonstrators, as they are of the population. "I think this showed this is not a Negro problem; it's an American problem," he said. "But the turnout should have been 90 percent white."

Rev. Homer J. Tucker, Negro pastor of Newark's integrated Mt. Zion Baptist Church, said the march had "showed whites they could work with Negroes, and enjoy it." On the other hand, he added, "nothing can give more encouragement to the Negro than to see white men making sacrifices for this." The march gave Negroes a unique opportunity, he said, "to prove to white folks and to the world what we can do."

But, Mr. Tucker warned, the Negro may be driven to abandon his traditional restraint if the same kind of inetrracial cooperation cannot be achieved in local affairs.

Mack Ivory of Jersey City, an Internal Revenue Service clerk, said the demonstration proved persons of all races can be rallied "when humanity is threatened with a loss of dignity." He conceded that some people may have gone to Washington because it was a comparatively safe and easy way to support civil rights, but he insisted the march "made a few of them a little more resolute."

Others emphasized the basic seriousness of nearly all the demonstrators. "They weren't sightseers," said Jerome Wilson, a Newark Housing Authority relocation worker. "These were dedicated people," added Leonard Wilkinson, of East Orange, a postal employee. "They came here for a purpose, not just for a day's outing."

Several of the marchers said they were encouraged to try to awaken their friends and fellow workers. "I'd rather see them caring, even if it's against us," said Mrs. Juanita Spain, of Newark, an insurance company clerk.

"I'll take this back to my shop," said Mrs. Johnnie Johnson, of Newark, an official of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

Some of those returning from the trek said they had gained their own new insights into the problem. "It made me realize for the first time the need for our people to stick together and do something about this situation," asserted Mrs. Geraldine Smith, of Newark, another IRS employee. Asked if she felt a little more pride in her race last night than yesterday morning, she replied without hesitation: "Yes, I feel much prouder."

But perhaps the most significant statement of what the march had done came from Mr. Tucker. As the train sped through the gathering darkness toward Newark, the minister said that his experience yesterday had "thrilled me almost into a new sense of the person.

"I don't feel alone or left out any more," he said slowly. "Now I feel almost like a person * * * like an American."

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier News, Aug. 29, 1963]

Dignity, Spirit Impressed Marchers From Plainfield

(By Marty Robins)

"The most glorious experience in my life," Mrs. Rosalyn W. Fueller sighed. "There was such unity, no trouble, and no disturbance."

Mrs. Fuller was typical of the 150 weary, but smiling, Plainfielders who arrived late last night at Shiloh Baptist Church from the historic march on Washington for jobs and freedom yesterday.

All agreed the march would accomplish its goals.

The church-sponsored bus returned shortly before 11 p.m. An hour later the two NAACP buses arrived with their elated marchers.

Most Plainfield marchers joined Kenneth Jones in calling the demonstration "very dignified" and "very quiet." All were glad that the march had gone peacefully.

"There was tremendous spirit," a man carrying the march's message related. "It showed Plainfield what it must do."

Sixteen-year-old Patricia Ruggles said the speech by the Reverend Martin Luther King, who was acknowledged at the Lincoln Memorial as "the spiritual leader of America," was the highlight of the day.

"After he spoke everybody stood up and hollered," the teenager said. "On the way back to the bus you could still see the tears in many people's eyes,"

The Reverend Frank Allen, local NAACP president, said the march "showed the Nation that Negro citizens are in earnest in their nationwide campaign for freedom and jobs.

"It only impressed me more deeply than before that the movement will succeed."

The Reverend Allen was highly impressed at the number of demonstrators, which Washington police estimated at more than 200,000.

If many were tired from the ride, none complained of severe hardships.

"It was a little crowded and a little warm," Mary Smith said. "But it was just fine."

There were no reports of ill health or injuries in the Plainfield bus loads. No one missed a meal.

Many were impressed with the considerable representation and organization of labor unions at the march.

"Wherever you looked you saw autoworkers, steelworkers, or garmentworkers," Pat Ruggles recalled.

What was the highlight of the day? Many, of course, preferred the Reverend King's speech. Others thought that Mahalia Jackson, the noted gospel singer, was responsible for rousing the throng. Walter Reuther's speech drew praise. Still others thought the march was best.

But two women, Mrs. Polly Chichester, of Washington, D.C., and her sister, Mrs. Aston L. Thompson, Jr., of 726 East Front Street, Plainfield, said it was dignity—the dignity of both races marching together that touched them most.

"The singing brought tears to my eyes," Mrs. Thompson said.

"It was," said the two white women, "one of the most magnificent days of our lives."

[From the Newark (N.J.) Jewish News, Sept. 6, 1963]

It Was in the Best Tradition of America

(Following is the text of an exclusive, tape-recorded interview with Dr. Joachim Prinz, rabbi of Temple B'nai Abraham, Newark, and president of the American Jewish Congress. Dr. Prinz was 1 of 10 national leaders of the August 28 civil rights demonstration in Washington.

This interview, obtained the day after the ceremonies in Washington, was conducted by Arnold Harris, executive secretary of the Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Community Council of Essex County.)

Question. You have attended rallies before, here and even in Nazi Germany. What to you are the important differences in what you saw before and what you saw in Washington?

Answer. If you have a crowd of 210,000 people and you live in a totalitarian state, you make use of these people and the people become your objects. You whip them into some sort of frenzy and there develops very easily a mass hysteria of 210,000 people.

That could have been done yesterday. It wasn't done at all. It was a very American meeting. It was very typical of America and in the best tradition of America because there was nobody who tried to use, and therefore abuse, the people.

There was a spirit not merely of dedication but also of festivity. It was the happiest mass meeting I ever attended in my life. The happiness of the people, to me at least, consisted of the fact that they were very happy to express the best that is in America and the best that is in human beings.

That expressed itself in their orderliness—the fact that there were no riots, no incidents, the fact that everybody behaved like a gentleman and a lady. There was no pushing whatsoever; there was no incident where someone wanted to take the seat or standing place of somebody else—of 210,000 people—many of them simple people.

The second thing was that suddenly people lost the sense of color. It didn't matter any more to men whether somebody was black or white. The mingling of the races, that is, the desegregation, was a very organic, a very natural thing.

There was altogether nothing artificial about the meeting in the speeches, songs, entertainment. Nothing was cheap. It was on a very high level artistically as well as intellectually, and what came through was that we were dealing with a problem not merely of legislation and of political maneuvering or of trying to exert pressure of the legislature. What came through was that behind all that was a moral issue.

PROPHETIC RELIGION

It had in the broadest sense a kind of religious fervor which was not denominational. It was a 20th century religion. It did not have the humbug or the superficiality of ritual religion. It was suddenly prophetic religion. It said "do I—that is, religion—do I have to say something to the people which makes sense in the 20th century?"

And it was a great reaffirmation of the dignity of man, and so I say it was not an exciting, but a stirring meeting. Anybody who cares, anybody who had any feeling, who had anything left in his soul that could not be expressed in superficial terms felt that.

The religious fervor was an attempt to translate everything we said and prayed and preached about into the reality of the America of 1963.

Question. What to you yesterday was the most stirring element in the experience of yesterday's march?

Answer. Everything that happened there was, to me, stirring. It stirred me when the people sang together, when I, as one of the 10 chairmen, walked ahead of the group and they began to sing the song of freedom—that I must tell you was a moment of shattering experience.

I had never before seen a mass of people sing with so much earnest determination, and it was suddenly a service, a religious service done on the streets with nearly a quarter of a million people.

THE PEOPLE LED

And then we began to realize that we were not leading the people, but the people were leading us. The beauty of the thing was that it was not a managed meeting; it was the natural and enthusiastic response on the part of the people to that which the leaders said to them.

What they said to them was what the people themselves felt. They articulated that which was on the minds and in the hearts of 210,000 people.

Among the 210,000 people, 30 percent of them, at least, were white people. The best of America was there, in person, and the best of America, also, in spirit.

We began to realize that the Negro, although he has his own culture which he brought from Africa, is so totally American and so totally and genuinely and organically American that the Black Muslims had not the faintest chance in this whole thing.

They looked ridiculous. You know they tried to influence people—they staged some sort of a slight demonstration in front of the hotel that looked and sounded ridiculous, because these people who came there demanded their rights not merely as human beings but also as Americans, and everybody responded to that.

Question. You spoke a moment ago, Dr. Prinz, about the political objectives. How do you feel about the reaction of the Congressmen and Senators to the appearance of the mass of people in Washington? You were 1 of the 10 leaders who called upon some of the Congressmen and Senators, some who oppose the civil rights legislation and some who favor it.

Answer. The 10 of us went to see the majority leader, Mr. Mansfield, and we went to see the minority leader, Mr. Dirksen, and we saw Mr. McCormack, Speaker of the House. We were suddenly transplanted into a completely different atmosphere because these people were far removed from what I called the fervor.

These people were politicians who had political axes to grind, who had to preserve and protect the party interests. The man who impressed us most was the one who had no formal education, and never went to high school, Mr. McCORMACK.

MOST ENCOURAGING

He began the discussion by stating that to him politics must be governed and motivated by his conscience. This was the most encouraging of the three meetings, because he thought there was no doubt in his mind that he could get legislation through the House, that there are enough votes to get it through the House.

This was encouraging because, in addition to the excitement and fervor there are some cold political facts to consider. These are people who count noses and votes. DIRKSEN who, as you know, is not completely sold on the bill has, however, assured the President, as he told us, that he would "buy" seven of the eight points of the legislation. He would not accept the public accommodations part of it. Besides, we stressed the point that the legislation would not make sense without FEPC. The trouble with that is that the President had separated the two because he thought that he could get legislation through more efficiently and more rapidly by not adding FEPC. I am hopeful that as a result of our discussion with the President his viewpoint may change.

Question. Can you tell us something about your discussion with the President? This took place much later, didn't it, after the events at Lincoln Memorial?

Answer. Yes. We came to the White House at 5 o'clock. There was a careful check to see that no one but the 10 chairmen went into the White House. We were greeted by an enthusiastic group of people who apparently knew when we would go to the White House and we were applauded wildly by all the people as we got out of our cars. The President was in a marvelously relaxed mood although this was a very tough day for him—the rail strike, you know.

But that is the way I have seen him now four times in the White House and this is the way the man operates. He is always relaxed and unbelievably well informed.

ASKED FOR FOOD

We came there, and since we hadn't eaten all day we asked for food and it was immediately provided and served in the manner in which you get food at the White House.

I don't think I am at liberty to report on our discussion with the President other than saying that the President had watched the proceedings on television almost constantly and commented on some of the speeches, including mine.

Question. What did he say about your speech?

Answer. He was apparently not unhappy about it. He was very happy about the fact that the meeting took place in such an orderly and dignified fashion and I asked him if he thought this would make an impression upon Congress because, as you know, many Members of the Senate and the House had attended the meeting on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

He said he had no doubt that this had made a tremendous impression because nobody thought it possible. Everybody had predicted that we would not get more than 60,000 or 70,000 people. He said, pointing to the Vice President who sat next to me, that after all, both of them knew how tough it was to get crowds, and the fact that we got 210,000 people was an enormous achievement.

He then read to us the statement which he intended to publish, and which was then issued, and which I think is a very good statement. I know that the President is wholeheartedly in back of the bill.

EXAMPLE OF JEWS

The President made a very interesting comment. He said to the Negro civil rights leaders that they should follow the example of the Jewish people who had made education the central issue of their existence and that the Negro community should know that the road to jobs and the road to playing the role in the American community which the Negro ought to play is via education.

We discussed that and the difficulties of that, because it is not an easy matter for a Negro living in a slum district to get the same education that a middle-class person living comfortably gets.

My impression is that the President was guardedly optimistic. I emphasize guardedly because he is not a naive politician. He is a man who is politically astute and therefore to him it was important that many things be done in order to get the kind of vote in the Senate and the House which will guarantee passage of the bill.

Question. Rabbi Prinz, you are a leader in Essex County and in the Nation. Do you have any suggestions or comments about the role that the Jewish laity should be playing or ought to play in the next months or year or two with respect to the entire problem of civil rights in America?

Answer. I think that we must play an important role if we do not want to forfeit our role as an important factor in American life. I am not talking about our parochial role. If we want to play a role in American life we must understand that we are engaged in a social revolution, albeit a quiet and nonviolent revolution, and that because of our tradition and history we must play that role.

I said in my speech that we have two things to bring to this great debate—which is so much more than a debate—in America.

One thing is the fact that after all it is the Jewish people who created the revolutionary concept of man, man with his potential and with his dignity. We have always emphasized that Adam, the first man, was created from earth that was brought, according to Jewish legend, from every corner of the world.

HUMAN POTENTIAL

So that we know he was not distinguished by color; he was distinguished by his human potential, by the ability to distinguish between right and wrong. Now, I realize that American Jews are not always aware of this tradition.

But if we want Judaism to survive in earnest, we cannot remain silent on this issue. As a matter of fact, the religious and lay leaders of American Jewry have made that quite plain.

The second thing which has been often overlooked, but which I emphasize, is that we ourselves have a history parallel to the history of the Negro. We started with slavery. We freed ourselves. We lived in ghettos.

We were freed by a proclamation of emancipation. It did not work. It took a very long time before it became a reality. It is still short of that because there is still discrimination against Jews in jobs and in housing. It took the lives of 6 million people. I didn't say that because I thought it was too strong and I didn't want to bring that into the public debate there.

But we must say it to ourselves. The death of the 6 million Jews under the Hitler regime is a cruel and gruesome and bloody witness of the failure of Jewish emancipation. So there was a time when Jews lived in segregated places and went to segregated schools.

It is also overlooked that Hitler introduced into Jewish life segregated Jewish schools, that Jewish children were not allowed to attend public schools. So, if anybody can understand the situation of the Negro emphatically and sympathetically, it is the Jew.

CAN RELIVE HISTORY

In the history of the Negro and the plight of the Negro and the fight of the Negro we can relive the history of the Jewish people. Therefore the Jews must be in it; they must not be out of it. All of this might sound like a lot of phraseology which can be said from the pulpit but I am in favor of translating that into the reality of the grassroots.

Question. Talk then, if you will, about the grassroots in South Orange and in Montclair and in Newark, and all over America—what do you see that the Jewish community needs to do, in the light of its history and its future, right here in Essex County?

Answer. I think, as they say, that charity begins at home. So does the fight for civil rights begin in the home community. Here in our own community we have a tremendous problem and I am afraid the Jewish community, although it participated in this battle on the local scene through some of its leadership group, has not reached its own grassroots, its own people.

I think that the rabbis of this community and of all communities ought to participate much more actively as a group and as individuals.

They have a tremendous job of educating their own people from the pulpit and in their personal contacts, to their responsibilities in the community. That cannot be done merely by demonstrations.

It must be done by making the powers that be in government and in the field of education to understand that we will not stand for segregation in schools and we will be adamant in our demand for desegration in housing as well, and for an opportunity for the Negro to get jobs.

LIBERTY PLUS GROCERIES

In this field the Jews can play an important role because they have jobs to give. Somebody once defined democracy as liberty plus groceries. It is very easy to talk about liberty and many beautiful sermons can be delivered and nice poems can be written.

But nobody can take liberty into a bakery shop and buy a loaf of bread with it. We need groceries. We need the opportunity for the Negro to work. If he has a job he will have decent housing and if he has decent housing he will have decent schools.

So that we are dealing here with a package, with an entity, with a whole thing the parts of which cannot be separated.

Fair employment means also full employment. Good jobs for Negroes will mean a solution of their social problems because if enough money is earned by the head of the family and the members of the family they can establish for themselves the kind of life in decent neighborhoods which will enable them to become an integral part of the community.

In all of that, in housing, in industry and in shops and in offices over which Jews have their own control we can play that kind of a quiet role. The time for shouting is over and the time for quiet constructive work has begun.

[From the Advocate, Sept. 3, 1963]

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

August 28, 1963, will long be remembered by freedom-loving Americans. History books will mark it as the date when the conscience of the country was finally aroused to the fact that, while "all men are created equal," not all have been given equal opportunities.

The 200,000 Negro and white marchers declared in a dignified, inspiring manner that a forceful beginning for equal rights has been made from which there is no turning back.

Whether Congressmen were impressed—impressed enough to vote for the President's civil rights bill—is not so important. What is, is the impression made on the millions of voting Americans whose voices will bear more weight in the Halls of Congress than the marching feet of the 200,000.

No one expected the die-hard segregationists to change their minds, and they didn't. Their sentiments were expressed in a statement by Senator Long of Louisiana who ridiculed the march as unnecessary. Unnecessary, he said, missing the point, because the Negro in the United States is treated better and is more free than he is any place in the world. Someone should have reminded the Senator that the Negro is demonstrating for the same treatment the Senator expects and for the same freedom he enjoys in this country.

In one way, however, we do agree with Senator Long—such demonstrations should not be necessary. The march did portray to the world the image of a country unable to legislate equal rights without the intimidation of a mass demonstration.

However, history has shown that often a just cause must first gain attention before it receives approval and support, especially from the prejudiced. As an attention-gainer we prefer a bloodless march to a bloody revolution.

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call, Sept. 4, 1963]

NATION'S CONSCIENCE

It has been widely supposed that the march on Washington had the central purpose of influencing Congress to approve civil rights legislation. As a corollary, the judgment has been that the success or failure of the march depends on how many votes it changes on Capitol Hill.

The march's immediate impact on Congress is of secondary importance. This does not mean that the ceremonies were unimpressive; legislators are always impressed by the sight of massed constituents, and the dignity and eloquence of this concerted petition for rights long denied cannot have failed to have an effect. But it is a fair guess that most Members of Congress already have well defined views on basic civil rights questions, and that these views were little changed by the assemblage.

Far greater importance must be attached to the general public reaction throughout the country. This biggest of all popular demonstrations in Washington was intensively covered by the press, radio and television. Millions of Americans were distant witnesses; millions of others read detailed accounts of what transpired.

What did they see and hear, what did they read about? Not the actions of a trampling mob whipped up by rabble-rousers, as some had feared. Not outbreaks of violence, not a rush on Capitol Hill to subject Congress to shouts and pressure. What occurred in Washington was a deeply sincere, dignified, restrained and well behaved crowd of some 200,000 American citizens appealing to the conscience of their fellow citizens everywhere in the land.

The effect of that appeal remains to be seen. The chances seem good that Americans in great number will respond favorably. This, in the end, may have a decisive effect on the kind of civil rights legislation Congress enacts.

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, Aug. 30, 1963]

THE MARCH HAS JUST BEGUN

Perhaps, as most people say, the most impressive event in the massive civil rights march in Washington was the dignity and orderliness of the occasion. Perhaps it was.

But this was not the most important event of the day. The significance to be attached to the day was the march itself, the expression of 20 million people to be free from the shame and humiliation and poverty they have suffered with a patience that finally has been exhausted.

The march was an outpouring of the longings people in every age have known and felt. It was spiritual in tone, calling up the pleadings of Moses to set his people free, reminding all men that the human spirit will never be shackled or chained or imprisoned, telling us that this Nation will not endure half slave and half free.

Congress had better understand this. It had better not mistake nonviolence for meekness, orderliness for submission, dignity for false pride.

Segregationists in the Capital—the diehards who represent some of our Southern States and rightwing Republicans—said they were not impressed or swayed by the march. This is tragic. Their song is tired and off-key and outdated. Congress has no more urgent business before it than passage of the civil rights bill. It is the absolute minimum, and any watering down of the public accommodations section will be a setback for man everywhere, man already free and man marching forward on the rugged road to emancipation and equality. It will be a disastrous day for the United States if these Senators and Representatives block or alter this bill.

Appropriate this day are the words of Abraham Lincoln, to whose memorial the 200,000 marched:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds."

These words ring down through a hundred years of struggle and pain, but today there is hope that they will have meaning, that a new dawn will find Negro and white living in one nation, equal in the eyes of all men.

It isn't too much to hope for.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Sunday Press, Sept. 1, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS BATTLE WILL BE OVER WHEN GOOD CITIZENS, WHO OUTNUMBER BIGOTS, RISE UP AND SHOW THEIR POWER

Now that the freedom march on Washington is over, it is time to assess its impact upon the cause of civil rights or, to be specific, upon the civil rights bill now pending in Congress.

There can be no doubt but that the march was the largest, best organized and most orderly ever to journey to Washington. It evoked nothing but praise from one end of the Nation to the other. Even in the Southland brave voices were raised to applaud the conduct of the marchers.

Whatever effect the march had upon congressional opinion will be determined by how effectively the Nation's favorable reaction to the march is communicated to individual Representatives and Senators. Except in the case of a few obstinate legislators whose mental processes have hardened beyond recovery, the Members of Congress strive to follow the wishes of their constituents. It is good politics to do so if one wishes to remain at a legislative post from which, it has been said, few die and none resign. As James Reston, distinguished Washington correspondent, observes, some of the legislators either won't read or can't, but they all want to be reelected.

This theme was touched upon by speakers who addressed the marchers at the Lincoln Memorial. A leading Protestant clergyman, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, accurately declared that if all the communicants of the churches he represented, and all the communicants of the Roman Catholic Church, and all the members of the Nation's Jewish synagogues would stand up for justice for the Negro people, the battle for civil rights and dignity would be quickly won. Another speaker, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, who witnessed events leading to the ascendancy of Hitler in Germany, advanced the basic truth that bigotry and hatred are not the immediate problem confronting the Nation. The "shameful and tragic problem is silence."

If all the people who pay lip-service to any cause, in this case justice for the Negro, were to stand up and be counted the battle, as Dr. Blake says, would be quickly won. It is the great mass of silent advocates, not the noisy opponents, who are responsible for the defeat of many just causes. These are the good people whose sterile convictions produce inaction. They are that vast majority of citizens who, left to themselves, would take a stand for decency but who are afraid to be different. They do not dare stand alone, a virtue given high priority by the holy men of old. They go with the crowd reluctantly as do many other members of the crowd, mistaking mass silence for approval of a crowd's verdict which, actually, is only the verdict of a demagogic leader. These human sheep are led to a course of action by being convinced that they stand alone. These are the people who made up the cruel mob in Mark Twain's "Mysterious Stranger." They stoned to death a kindly old woman accused of being a witch. Each one who threw a stone did so only for fear his companions would think him in league with witches if he restrained himself.

This need to stand up and be counted confronts the United States today. The need affects every level of government. Every municipality from village to metropolis would have better government if people of competence and capability would speak up along with the demagogs. A majority of the citizens of the United States recognize the justice of the Negro cause. But while they sit back and fail to make their sentiments known the Faubuses, the Barnetts, the Wallaces, and the George Lincoln Rockwells pour out their vitriol. And so brazen do these apostles of bigotry become that they scare more rational citizens into silence.

When will the civil rights issue be settled? Only when decent citizens stand up and show to the world that they far outnumber the racists who, by their vehemence, give the impression that they speak for the Nation.

REPORT AND REVIEW MEETINGS WITH FARMERS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Secretary Freeman is undertaking a series of 13 report and review meetings with farmers and other rural citizens across the Nation.

The first of these meetings was held last Sunday at Worthington, Minn. In his address Secretary Freeman summarized some of the problems and achievements of the Department. His remarks reflect the conscientious effort made by Secretary Freeman to administer and develop the farm program. I ask unanimous consent that his address, together with a statement outlining the purposes of these meetings, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, "REPORT AND REVIEW" FARMER MEETING, WORTHINGTON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, WORTHINGTON, MINN., SEPTEMBER 8, 1963

As Secretary of Agriculture I have learned a number of things that I did not anticipate when I went to Washington.

First, and most important, I have found the distance from my desk to your farm cannot be described adequately by measuring it in miles.

Second, I have found that when people say the Secretary of Agriculture has an impossible job, they also are describing the conditions under which the individual farmer is working today. If a farmer's head aches with worry, mine aches too, for the problems which individual farmers find they cannot successfully cope with, often become the property of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I am here tonight to listen. I will be hearing from farmers across the country in the weeks ahead—because your problems are my problems. I want to hear what you have to say, to hear your questions and to answer them if I can. I want to see—not so much agricultural problems—but farm problems. I want to look at farming through your eyes, and to give you in return, a glimpse of agriculture from where I sit in the Nation's Capitol. Though we look through somewhat different windows, we must finally have the same view if we are to solve problems and make progress.

Thus, although we approach the problems of the farmer and farming from different positions—I from my desk and you from your field—we both seek workable solutions.

I want you to know too, that I think and feel not only in national and international terms but also in terms of the farm my grandfather homesteaded at Zumbrota, Minn., where I worked as a boy and which I dearly love. It is always difficult to maintain adequate communications. I am sure this meeting will help me. I hope it will help you too.

You know and I know that American agriculture is passing through one of the most rapid and trying periods of change which any group has ever experienced. Changes are occurring in 10 years which match the events that once required centuries.

This kind of experience is hard to adapt to—and hard to put into words. So we tend to communicate our frustrations instead of our ideas. Somehow, even though we cannot find adequate words, we must also communicate our ideas about our problems if we are to formulate consistent and workable policies for action. This can best be done as we are doing it here—face to face, openly and honestly.

Let me illustrate. As far as I know, no one yet has adequately portrayed the dilemma of the farmer who feels he must plant all his land to crops if he is to survive—and who knows that if he and his neighbors do this, together they will produce more than can be sold at a fair profit.

When this is reported, it usually comes out that the farmer wants to have his cake and eat it too. How many times have you heard or read that the farmer wants to produce all he can and to have the public pay a higher price for it either in the market or through price support programs? This is a cynical distortion—a quick, flippant way of describing a problem that you feel and I feel as a hard knot in the pit of our stomach.

I see and hear distortions like this every day, and when I do, I know that it widens rather than narrows the gap of understanding we must close if the American people are going to deal adequately with the challenge of abundance. It is a challenge to us all—farmer, lawyer, merchant, mechanic, engineer, and housewife.

Thus, I am here not only to shorten the distance between my desk and your farm, but also through the press, radio, and television to encourage other people to listen to what you have to say. Out of this can come further progress toward better farm incomes, better rural communities, and a better farm-city relationship.

This has worked in the past. I recall that before going to Washington in 1961, I talked with many farmers here in Minnesota who said that something must be done soon or else they would have to quit farming.

What they were talking about in very simple and direct terms was this: By 1961, feed grain supplies had built up to a record 85 million tons; we were nearing the danger point where this massive supply would break out and flood the market. The signs were all there—feed grain prices had trended lower each succeeding year; we were entering a new crop year with all available storage space in use; storage costs were becoming intolerable. Unless we could get swift and effective legislation, stocks would increase further. The consequences for the grain producer, the livestock farmer, and eventually the grain storage industry were going to be disastrous.

As you remember, we barely got the emergency feed grain bill through the Congress early in 1961. But it did pass, and in record time, too. It was the first major piece of legislation which President Kennedy signed, and in its first year, because of your cooperation, it was a far greater success than we had anticipated.

The emergency feed grain program would have been a success if it had simply balanced production in 1961 with consumption. We didn't expect much of a reduction in surpluses, but the program actually reduced feed grain stocks by some 13 million tons, about 400 million bushels. The downward pressure on grain prices eased, and the threat to livestock growers was eased, as well.

This program, continued in 1961 and 1963 with relatively minor changes, is now in effect through 1965. It has reduced feed grain stocks by almost a third—and promises to wipe out the stored surplus by 1965. We have moved a substantial amount of grain into use—and out of storage—while boosting farm income. And the program has decidedly reversed the downward trend in feed grain prices. Corn prices this summer have been the highest since 1958. It is, in addition, the best possible insurance against any break in the price of cattle and hogs, and against demands for support programs for cattle and hogs.

From your farms early in 1961 you probably saw the feed grain problem as low corn prices in a period of rising costs, and as a threatening flood of grain which could wreck your hog and cattle markets if it ever broke loose. Individually, there wasn't much any one of you could have done about it except to sit and watch things go from bad to worse.

I saw the problem also as a threat to farm income, and thus to your prosperity and that of rural communities. It was compounded by the total lack of storage space for an additional 300-400 million bushels of grain which would be added to surpluses from a crop that was going to be planted within a few weeks.

I remember my initial deep worry that the first thing the new Secretary of Agriculture would face would be grain on the ground because there was no storage space for it. I no longer have that concern, at least, for today we have about 1 billion bushels of space—formerly filled by CCC grain—available to farmers and the trade, in addition to expanded grain storage facilities on farms.

The problem in wheat wasn't too different; wheat farmers did have a program that called for acreage allotments with price supports, while the feed grain producer had low price supports and no acreage allotments. But bigger surpluses and eventual price disaster were built into both programs.

Over the years, as yields improved, it had become clear that the wheat program—which was enacted in 1938—could no longer cope with a problem of expanding production in a domestic market which required about the same amount of wheat in 1961 as in 1938. As a result, we had 1.4 billion bushels of wheat in storage in 1961—enough to fill our domestic needs for more than 2 years.

From your farm, the problem must have looked somewhat different. A 2-year supply of wheat, while isolated from the market through the price-support program, was a constant but remote threat to wheat prices. It did act as a damper on prices, but supports maintained prices fairly well. Your acreage was already cut one-third below 1953, and you wanted acreage to go up—not down.

Another reason you see the problem different is that there are many different types and classes of wheat grown throughout the country. Producers in every area are told that "your wheat is the best there is, and there will always be a demand for it." Since there was little that an individual farmer could do about the overall surplus, it seemed realistic to believe that the problem really belonged to someone else.

So on my doorstep in January 1961, I found twins—feed grains and wheat. The two problems were similar. Like feed grains, the wheat surplus wouldn't simply go away; it could only get worse as it had done nearly every year in the 1950's. It was, and is, a threat to farm income, and thus to the prosperity of the rural community. Wheat supplies also filled all available storage space. But even more serious, unless changes were made, we could expect 100 to 200 million bushels of wheat to be added to already record stocks each year.

The course which had been set for wheat as well as for feed grains in the 1950's could not be continued. So an emergency program was developed for wheat also. Together with expanded exports, this program has reduced wheat stocks by about 250 million bushels. A further sharp reduction is assured by mid-1964.

In addition to the emergency acreage diversion programs for wheat, Congress approved a long-range program. Failure in the referendum to secure approval of the 1964 wheat program enacted by Congress has dimmed the prospects both for supporting wheat incomes and for reducing wheat stocks in 1964. However, I am confident that with an expanded feed grain program we can avoid further increases in wheat stocks. And we will do everything possible within existing authority to hold up wheat prices in 1964.

Overall, the programs in wheat and feed grains since 1960 have reduced stocks by about 1 billion bushels, contributing to a better balance between supply and demand. They have helped to raise net farm income by nearly $1 billion above 1960 levels in both 1961 and 1962, and they are providing savings in storage costs and shipping charges of more than $800,000 a day.

This, I believe, shows one way in which the commodity programs can work to help the farmer and the public. I'd like to cite another example of the manner in which our efforts to reduce the surpluses have worked to the benefit of the farmer.

Do you remember in early 1961 how soybean prices shot up—after most farmers had sold their beans? You lost potential income, and the United States lost dollar markets abroad because there were not enough beans to meet the demand. In order to correct this situation, I raised soybean price supports from $1.80 to $2.30 a bushel for the 1961–62 marketing year. I wanted to insure that farmers got a better price for their beans, and also I wanted to insure we would have the beans to sell in a rapidly expanding world market.

I doubt that anything I have done as Secretary has brought a louder or more immediate critical outcry. But when the results were totaled, the farmers had earned $400 million more from soybeans grown in 1961 than they did from the 1960 crop. We expanded export markets, the soybean carryover was minimal, and all the criers of doom and gloom had long red faces.

This, too, is an example of price support as a positive instrument used to help improve the economic position of farmers.

Farmers responded to good prices and to price supports to produce more soybeans—an example of positive and personal supply management in the best tradition of a free agriculture.

With each commodity—wheat, feed grains, and soybeans—you have seen the problems and the opportunities in a somewhat different way than I have had to view them. But the programs established and actions taken are succeeding because they are solutions which you from your farm and I from my desk can recognize as workable answers.

I am here today not only to discuss where we have been—but where we are going. I know and you know that we continue to face critical and serious problems. We need to discuss them and I want to listen to what you have to say about them. You know the problem from your point of view as well as I do. It is simply that the total capacity of agriculture to produce has outrun the ability of the American people and our export markets and our food-for-peace program to consume what can be produced. It is a problem that can't be pushed under the bed. We have to look at it together, and I have to look at it from the standpoint that if everyone produces all they can, no one is going to get a good price for what they produce.

Now, when I point to the initial improvement—the first steps away from potential disaster—I am constantly mindful that some of these gains have been bought at a high price.

Under the voluntary feed grain program, for example, about 20 million acres formerly in corn, sorghum, and barley will need to be taken out of production each year for an indefinite time if present levels of income are to be maintained and if new surpluses are to be avoided. This will require large expenditures—perhaps three-quarters of a billion dollars per year for payments to insure voluntary participation. Once the surplus is gone, we can spend less than we have been spending, and far less than some other approaches would cost. But the feed grain program will still cost a lot of money.

From where I sit, I realize that there is a limit to what we can spend for farm programs. We deserve and can expect fair treatment, but we deal with an urban society—and a Congress made up increasingly of city Congressmen.

Today in the House of Representatives there are about 300 Members without a major farm producing interest in their district—against perhaps 135 Members who can be classed as farm or rural. Only 30 years ago it was just the reverse. Farmers can expect a sympathetic hearing from the Congress, but more and more, our interests must be geared to urban and consumer and taxpayer interests also. An urban Congress will not be impressed by a divided agriculture, or an agriculture not attuned to the rest of the economy. It is very clear that we must persuade, and no longer can expect to get Congress to respond to the power of, what was once called the farm bloc.

Another major factor in the unfinished business of agricultural policy is the wheat situation. In May the farmers rejected a wheat program which would have continued the surplus reduction, maintained incomes at recent levels, and gradually reduced costs to the Government. As a result, wheat farmers this fall are planting a crop for which the price support will be about $1.25 per bushel and for which market prices are expected to be very low.

We have heard little from farmers about wheat since the referendum. Members of Congress report that their mail has been light with respect to wheat this year. Some say that this means that the wheat farmers are satisfied with the program which is in effect as a result of the referendum. Others say that the wheat farmers will not realize the implications of the new situation until next harvest when the crop is big and the price is low. I am here because I want to hear what you have to say.

I also want to hear what you have to say about some of the noncommodity programs and ideas that we are using to help resolve the rural dilemma we face together. We have begun a broad and basic program to encourage and assist local leadership in the rural community to develop new job opportunities for farmers and nonfarmers—and for their sons and daughters. This is the rural areas development program. All the resources and agencies of the Department are contributing to this effort. It emphasizes the use, not idling, of land; the development of communities, not their stagnation and decline. Its aim is a rural renaissance through a host of new opportunities in rural areas—ranging from onfarm recreation for pay to new industry; from improved housing to modern community water systems; from new ways to utilize what the land produces to more adequate supplies of water needed for industrial development. RAD seeks in effect, to help the rural community compete not only for a fair share of our growing economy, but also for the affection of its own sons and daughters.

I also am eager to hear what you have to say about the substantial efforts being made to share more widely the food you produce so abundantly, with the people both at home and abroad. We have since 1961 more than doubled the size and quality of the program which provides food directly to needy people at home. We have launched a new food stamp program on a pilot basis in 43 areas around the country, helping 358,000 persons in low-income families to increase their purchases of food products they need. More than 6 million needy people are aided by the Department's food distribution program each month, and this week, 18 million schoolchildren will once more benefit from the school lunch program.

The food-for-peace program is doing the same job overseas—and more. I have personally traveled where I saw the enormous benefits which have come from this program. We are today providing food for some 77.3 million persons in 112 nations through our foreign donation program. We are pioneering in the use of food as capital in helping to develop needed public facilities in many countries. School lunch programs are reaching over 40 million schoolchildren—and for most of them, the school lunch is the most nutritious meal they get. If history remembers our Nation kindly, the willingness of the American people—and American farmers—to share their abundance will be a major reason.

These are some of the problems and opportunities, then, which have been constantly on my mind during the past 2½ years. These problems and opportunities have been your concern, too. It is good that we meet to discuss them together.

Thank you for listening to me.

Freeman Schedules 13 Rural Report and Review Meetings Throughout Nation

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman will begin Sunday, September 8, a series of 13 "report and review" meetings with farmers and other citizens in rural America in nearly every section of the country during the next 2 months.

"I intend to get out and talk with dirt farmers throughout the country. I want to listen to what farmers are saying and thinking, and to find out what individual attitudes are toward the way programs are being administered, toward farm legislation, and toward the Department of Agriculture," Secretary Freeman said.

"Here in Washington, the grassroots thinking from rural America is being drowned in a babble of voices. Farm organizations disagree as to what the farmer is saying as well as the kind of program—or absence of program—he wants. The Congress is sharply divided on legislation, and has been for years. Newspapers and magazines claim they know what the farmer is thinking and what is good for him, but you can get almost as many different opinions as there are magazines and newspapers.

"As a result, we are hearing more today from those who say they know what the farmer wants than we are from the farmer himself. Since I have been in public life, I have learned the best way to find the most practical program is to go to the people directly. Personally, I look forward to these meetings with great pleasure and expectation.

"And I hope that as I listen to farmers, other people also will listen to what the farmer on the land is thinking and saying. The farmers of this Nation—who feed us better and cheaper in proportion to our income than in any nation today or in history—have earned the sympathetic attention of the American people.

"We are moving through a period of profound and irreversible change in American history, not only in the city and factory, but in the towns and on the farms as well.

"These changes flow from the same root cause—automation and mechanization, products of an age of science and technology—but the meaning and impact of these changes on the farmer are even less well understood than the changes in the industrial segment of our society.

"Few Americans understand the dilemma of a farmer who wants to use all his land efficiently and to produce food to his maximum ability—and yet who knows that if he does, he will produce more than can be sold at a fair profit. Yet this dilemma is being distorted, for the farmer is far too often pictured not in relation to the economic crisis he faces, but rather as a man who wants to be subsidized and pampered. The farmer wants to resolve his dilemma—and he wants to do this even more strongly than do those who enjoy the benefits of our superefficient agriculture."

The Secretary said the meetings are being arranged in small communities in 11 States selected geographically to reach nearly every major agricultural area in the Nation.

The first meeting will be in the Secretary's home State of Minnesota on September 8 in Worthington, a community of 15,000 located near northwestern Iowa and southeastern South Dakota.

"The meetings will be geared toward dirt farmer participation. The program will be organized both to encourage questions from farmers which I will try to answer and to provide time for farmers to give me their advice and recommendations."

The schedule of the rural report and review meetings, together with location and meeting times, is listed below:

Sunday, September 8: Worthington Junior High School Memorial Auditorium, Worthington, Minn., 7:30 p.m. (All times local.)

Wednesday, September 18: Fair Grounds, Youth Building, Monticello, Iowa, 2 p.m.

Wednesday, September 18: Memorial Hall, Salina, Kans., 8 p.m.

Saturday, September 21: High School Auditorium, Hannibal, Mo., 8 p.m.

Tuesday, October 1: New York State, time and place to be announced.

Tuesday, October 1: Press Club Auditorium, Syracuse, N.Y., 8 p.m.

Wednesday, October 9: High School Auditorium, North Platte, Nebr., 10:30 a.m.

Wednesday, October 9: ASC conference; USDA agency representatives. Terry's Arena, Scotts Bluff, Nebr., 2 p.m.

Wednesday, October 9: Rainbow Hotel, Great Falls, Mont., 8 p.m.

Thursday, October 10: Capitol Theatre, Walla Walla, Wash., 2 p.m.

Tuesday, October 15: Community Building, Lapeer, Mich., 2 p.m.

Tuesday, October 15: Putnam County High School Auditorium, Columbus Grove, Ohio, 8 p.m.

Monday, November 4: Municipal Auditorium, Lubbock, Tex., 2 p.m.

UNCLE SAM DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, tomorrow New York State celebrates "Uncle Sam Day." On this day, New Yorkers will give recognition to that wonderful gentleman in his red, white, and blue suit who seems to capture the American spirit.

I am very proud to have played a part in the enactment of a law in the 87th Congress with regard to Uncle Sam. Sponsored by the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam, this law acknowledges Sam Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the forefather of "Uncle Sam"—an image which traditionally in our country and even beyond our borders has become the symbol of the United States of America. Governor Rockefeller of New York has officially proclaimed September 13 as "Uncle Sam Day" in New York State. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this proclamation be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proclamation of the State of New York

The name "Uncle Sam" is recognized in all corners of the world as a symbol of the United States of America. The determined, kindly gentleman with the striped pants and star-studded hat is recognized as the embodiment of our American spirit.

The 87th Congress, in a bill sponsored by the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam, recognized Samuel Wilson, born in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, later a resident of Mason, N.H., and of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of our American national symbol of "Uncle Sam" and it is fitting that we honor the memory of Samuel Wilson who by tradition has come to represent our way of life, our ideals, our strength, and character: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim September 13, 1963, as "Uncle Sam Day" in New York State.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

Attest:

William J. Ronan,
Secretary to the Governor.

ADDRESS BY JOHN W. MACY, CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, BEFORE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an address delivered recently by John W. Macy, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, dealing with equal opportunity for the handicapped under the merit system.

It is my belief that our Government should lead the way in providing employment opportunities for disabled men and women who are qualified by talents and training to function capably and successfully in the Government service.

Chairman Macy's address, delivered to an audience of more than 600 blind persons, assembled in Philadelphia at the national convention of the National Federation of the Blind, describes the efforts of the Civil Service Commission to encourage and assist impaired persons to seek employment with the Federal Government, and to assist them to obtain positions for which they are qualified in spite of their disabilities.

This address also enumerates the laws passed by Congress, the policies and procedures established by the Civil Service Commission, to give meaning to fine purpose—it outlines the actual steps which have been taken to assure men and women, with impairments, a fair and equal opportunity to compete for and secure Civil Service positions.

I highly commend Chairman Macy for his fine leadership in this most important aspect of our Government's work. It is indeed encouraging to learn of the efforts being made by our Government to help impaired persons to work and live in equality with others. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Chairman Macy be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Equal Employment Opportunity Under the Merit System

I am very glad to be able to meet with you and to have this opportunity to express my admiration for the fine, constructive work you are doing to gain improved economic opportunities and a better life for blind citizens throughout the Nation.

We in the Civil Service Commission believe that the Federal Government, as the Nation's largest employer, has an obligation to set an example to other employers in providing equality of employment opportunity to all qualified citizens. One of our most urgent concerns at present is a vigorous effort to wipe out all forms of unfair discrimination in employment and advancement throughout the Federal service.

That effort is progressing—well enough, in fact, to be noted by certain Washington wits, whose favorite current witticism is that you can't get into the civil service if you are "a nonhandicapped white male under 40." We don't mind the joke; but the campaign itself is no joke. We are very serious about it.

Personally, I think this campaign is especially timely during our observance of the 80th anniversary of the Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission. The principle of equality of employment opportunity is firmly rooted in the civil service merit system that was established by Congress 80 years ago. Under the terms of the Civil Service Act of 1883, competition for Federal employment is open to all citizens. But it is one thing to establish a principle and it is quite another thing to make it effective in practice. For a great many years, equality of opportunity was more passive than active with respect to some groups of citizens—minority groups of certain kinds, older workers, and the physically handicapped, among others.

Some of these people were actually prevented from taking civil service examinations—for example, by arbitrary age limits, restrictions of many positions to men only, or unrealistic physical ability requirements. Even where there were no such limitations—and I am glad to say that all of them have now been removed—there was not much in the way of positive effort to encourage or assist applicants to compete under adverse circumstances, or to assure that they received really fair consideration for employment after they qualified in competition.

Within the last few years, however, a highly significant change in attitude has taken place in the Federal civil service—a change from allowing equal opportunity to insisting upon it. Today, under positive leadership and direction from President Kennedy, we are taking strong and specific measures to wipe out the last traces of discrimination.

Some of these measures are only a few months old and still have a long, hard road to travel. The program to provide true equality of opportunity for the physically handicapped, however, had its beginnings some 20 years ago, during World War II. At that time, when the desperate manpower shortage forced the agencies of Government to hire practically anybody who could do the necessary work, it became obvious that the previous high physical-ability standards for Federal employment were unrealistic and in many cases absurd.

The 165,000 physically handicapped workers of World War II demonstrated emphatically that a physical handicap is not necessarily a vocational handicap. They produced as much as their nonhandicapped counterparts, and sometimes more. They were seldom absent, and were not inclined to go job hopping. They seemed to thrive on hard work.

Two extremely important improvements came out of that wartime experience. One was an amendment to the Civil Service Act specifically prohibiting discrimination on the basis of physical handicap. The other was an exhaustive survey of Federal jobs by medical officers of the Civil Service Commission, to determine exactly what physical abilities were actually needed in each job—and thereby to establish truly realistic minimum standards for specific jobs in place of the prewar practically perfect physical requirement. Some 15,000 different types of Government jobs have been examined in this way.

But something else remained to be done before we could really provide equal opportunity for the handicapped. Some were still prevented from taking civil service examinations—not by any arbitrary rules, but simply by their own physical handicaps. We therefore undertook the modification of many of our standard competitive tests to meet those cases in which a certain kind of physical disability would prevent a competitor from demonstrating his real competence to do the job.

It is important to understand that these modified tests are not easier tests. They are changed simply to make them fair to all competitors. Under the merit system we are looking for the best qualified person for each job, and the handicapped applicant must qualify according to exactly the same standards of training, ability, and performance that the nonhandicapped must meet. But if the regular test requires the use of some faculty that the job itself does not require, we eliminate the use of that faculty from the test for the handicapped. A very simple example is the typing test: all competitors are rated on the same scale of speed and accuracy, but blind competitors are given dictating-machine records to type from in place of printed sheets of paper. We have made many modifications of this kind, some of them highly ingenious.

I'd like to try to describe a couple of them for you. We have a test for accuracy that requires the competitor to match a little measuring gage, printed on a card, with rectangles of various sizes printed on sheets of paper. For this test the blind competitor is given a sheet of heavy plastic with raised shapes on it, and a small metal bar. He matches the bar with the raised figures, and tells the examiner which ones are the same size.

A similar device is used in a test we call abstract reasoning, in which the regular competitor must examine matched groups of small abstract figures on a printed page, and identify what makes them alike and what makes them different. This test is used in some of our most difficult examinations. The figures are things like circles with tangents in different positions, arcs of circles with dots inside or outside the curve, pairs of lines that touch and don't touch, and so on. We have had these figures embossed, in a much larger size, on heavy mats similar to the stereotypes used by newspapers. The blind competitor reads them with his fingers and dictates his answers to the examiner.

One of our best tests is a wooden board set with map pins in groups of 5 horizontal and 5 vertical rows. The heads of the pins are blue, except for one pin in each row, which is yellow. The examiner instructs the blind competitor to remove a certain pin in each row—pin C in row 2—in rapid succession. The correct pin in each case is the yellow one, so the total number of yellow pins removed is the correct score. This replaces a printed test for speed and precision in following instructions.

Above all, there is one thing that all these tests have in common with each other, and with the other parts of examinations in which questions are read and answers written down by the examiner. Maybe you have noticed it; it is simply that in every case there is one competitor and one examiner. Sighted competitors are examined in groups—sometimes very large groups—with a single examiner, but every blind competitor has an examiner all to himself. I think this is perhaps the most important of all our test modifications for the blind.

Six years ago we inaugurated the last and most effective phase of our program for hiring the handicapped. Since selective placement plays such an important part in the success of this program, we became convinced that personal attention to the process of matching men and jobs was needed on a much broader scale than the Civil Service Commission alone could provide. For this purpose the coordinator system was devised, and it is now the backbone of our program. I am sure many of you have heard of this system, and some of you have no doubt had direct dealings with agency coordinators.

Briefly, the plan requires that the manager of a Federal establishment designate some regular employee, fairly high in the organization, to act as coordinator for employment of the physically handicapped. He operates as a middleman between the handicapped applicant and the possible job. It is his responsibility to know what jobs in his agency can be performed efficiently by persons with certain kinds of handicaps, to convince supervisors of the merits of hiring the handicapped, and to see to it that a handicapped applicant who is qualified for a job really gets full and fair consideration.

The coordinator also works with others in the community—in other Government agencies, industry, institutions, and organizations for the handicapped. Thus if he is unable to place in his own agency a handicapped applicant whose ability has been proved under tough civil-service standards, the coordinator is frequently able to arrange a suitable placement with some other employer. His primary task, however, is to overcome prejudice and ignorance in his own agency, and to give the personal, individual attention that is required for matching men and jobs.

I became personally impressed with the extreme importance of individual attention of this kind several years ago, when I was Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission. I was visited by a young man who had all the qualifications that Government agencies were looking for—he was a college graduate, a veteran, and had passed our hardest entrance examination for beginning professional and management positions. But he couldn't get a job, and for just one reason: he was blind. Ray Goldstein had lost his sight in the Battle of the Bulge.

The Commission made a real issue of this case, and pretty well turned the Government agencies in Washington inside out to find a suitable position and a responsive appointing officer. Mr. Goldstein was eventually hired by the U.S. Information Agency where, after a brief period of training, he became an editor of radio tapes—a complex and exacting job which he performed with outstanding success. The Agency was not merely satisfied, it was delighted to have him.

Without personal attention to his case, however, Ray Goldstein might never have got a chance to show what he could do; and without personal attention in many other cases—for no two are quite alike—we cannot honestly say we are providing equal employment opportunity. This is the need that the coordinators are now filling.

We have statistics to show how well they are filling it. In 1957, when the coordinator program began, only 6 out of every 1,000 persons hired by the Government were handicapped. By 1961, when there were 2,500 coordinators (in addition to the 35,000 postmasters who are also designated as coordinators), the proportion had risen to 15 handicapped out of every 1,000 appointed. Last year, with 3,500 coordinators appointed, the handicapped accounted for more than 19 of every 1,000 appointed. Thus in 5 years we more than tripled the percentage of handicapped persons, hired, and the record is still improving.

The problem of overcoming the skepticism of employers as to what the handicapped can really do on the job is a continuing one, and is particularly acute, I think, in cases where the handicap is blindness, even though we have some astonishing examples of accomplishment by blind employees. Probably you have all heard the name of Thomas Atkeson, for his is a rather celebrated case. A talented and dedicated employee of the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Service prior to World War II, "Tommy" Atkeson was a captain in the Army when a land mine explosion cost him both eyes and both hands. After such a disaster, he could of course have been "taken care of" for the rest of his life—but this was not Tommy's idea at all. He was determined to go back to his job as biologist with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Interior Department, the Veterans Administration, and the Civil Service Commission all worked on the problem of Tommy Atkeson's physical qualifications for restoration to his former job. With vocational rehabilitation training, he met the requirements and went back to work. This was some 16 years ago; and you will be happy to hear that his progress as a "most valuable employee" of the Wheeler National Wildlife Refuge at Decatur, Ala., culminated last year in his appointment as manager of that refuge.

The reason I introduced this story with a remark about employers' skepticism is that if this had not been a case of reemployment after military service there might have been no story at all. Many, if not most, employers are reluctant to take a chance on the handicapped applicant who comes to them as a complete stranger. In order to help meet this problem, the Civil Service Commission last year authorized Federal agencies to employ handicapped persons on a 700-hour temporary trial basis. This procedure overcomes the element of risk envisioned by many appointing officers. If the employee fails to make the grade, he can be released without fanfare or humiliation after completing his trial period; and if he does measure up, and meets the competitive standards, he can be retained under a more permanent type of appointment.

Another important advance was made last year when Congress enacted a law authorizing Federal agencies to hire readers for blind employees, at no cost to the Government. The readers may be paid by the blind employees, or by persons or organizations outside Government. This law removed some obstacles that had previously restricted equal employment opportunity for the blind.

You will notice that I keep repeating the words "equal employment opportunity." I do so deliberately, because this is the essence of the Government's program. Not special favors—not handouts—but an opportunity for every citizen to prove himself in genuinely equal competition.

We have enough evidence to convince almost anyone of what the handicapped can do when given a fair opportunity. There is Mary Baron, for example, a blind secretary in the Federal Aviation Agency, who takes dictation with a machine that makes a Braille tape. The Agency reports: "Mrs. Baron's keen sense of humor, wholesome outlook on life, and competence have dispelled any thought that a handicapped person would be a burden rather than an asset."

There is Alvin Saile, who can read typed material with magnification for short periods only, but who nevertheless earned both bachelor's and master's degrees and passed the very difficult Federal service entrance examination and labor economist examination, and is now an economist in the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor.

There is Thelma Quesenberry, a telephone switchboard operator in the Department of Commerce, who had only partial vision since childhood and has been totally blind since 1955. This is a particularly interesting case in that it is a "first"—the first blind switchboard operator employed by the Federal Government under civil service. Although the Civil Service Commission approved the employment of blind switchboard operators more than 4 years ago, none was appointed until early this year. There will undoubtedly be many more appointments as more people learn to use the special switchboards.

Incidentally, one of the people responsible for Miss Quesenberry's placement was a man known to many of you, and also blind: Louis H. Rives, Jr., Chief of the Division of Services for the Blind in HEW's Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

Then there is David Krause, totally blind since the age of 5, who is assistant to the administrative officer of a department of the District of Columbia government. Also a member of your organization, Mr. Krause wrote an article a few years ago for the Braille Monitor in praise of the Government's coordinator program; you may remember it. There is a lesson in Mr. Krause's experience that should not be overlooked. Although eligible for appointment at grade 7 through the Federal service entrance examination, and at grade 9 through the information specialist examination, he made the difficult decision to accept a grade 3 clerk-typist job in order to "get his foot in the door." After 2 days on the job he was given a chance to try his hand at writing regulations, and just 6 months later he was made regulations analyst at grade 7.

Equality of opportunity: that is what the handicapped want, and that is what we want them to have. Paul Kirton, totally blind, honor graduate of the University of Texas Law School, attorney in the Office of the Solicitor of the Interior Department, and also a member of your organization, has said it better than I can. "Any person with a handicap wants only the chance to do a job," said Mr. Kirton. "If he can't do the job, you fire him, but he needs the chance."

We are proud of the thousands of people in the Federal civil service who, like the few examples I have cited, have been given that chance and have proved that they can do the job. We are proud of what our program has accomplished. At the same time, however, we are fully aware that we have made only a beginning, and that much more remains to be done.

The Government's drive for equal employment opportunity is of the utmost importance to the national welfare. President Kennedy has said: "Utilization of physically handicapped persons in productive employment is sound and necessary, both for the contribution handicapped citizens can make to our national productivity and for the sense of independence and well-being which they can derive from doing a job." The contribution they can make to our national productivity is something we simply cannot afford to waste.

My position as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission gives me primary responsibility for leadership in the Government's quest for quality manpower. This, as well as concern for the handicapped, makes it imperative for me to see that the principles of the merit system are enforced.

Any citizen who reads his daily newspaper must realize that in the face of the enormous demands which are made on Government today—in national defense, in international relations, in scientific research, in services to the people—every position in Government must be staffed by the person best qualified. The need for quality manpower is so critical that we dare not permit any nonmerit considerations to influence our judgment in selecting the applicant who is clearly the best qualified under competitive standards.

We offer employment to the handicapped applicant when we establish the fact that he is best qualified. In short, we place a premium on quality, wherever it may be found. And it will not be found, in many cases, unless complete equality of employment opportunity is fully realized in practice as well as principle.

Thus our program for hiring the handicapped, while necessarily personal and specialized, is not an isolated activity nor an end in itself. It is an integral part of the larger drive for equal employment opportunity, which in turn is an essential aspect of the quest for quality.

Because of the way the competitive system operates, there are some very fundamental differences between offering equal employment opportunity and enforcing it. With respect to any group or class of citizens—whether they be the physically handicapped, or racial minorities, or older workers, or women, or anyone else—we must ask, "When is equal opportunity not equal?" There are four basic facts we must recognize and act on.

1. It isn't really equal unless they know about it. This fact calls for active communication with all possible sources of qualified applicants, in place of the passive announcement which they may never hear of or which—in the light of past experience—they may very well believe does not include them.

2. It isn't really equal unless they have equality in competition. This fact calls for modifying tests for the handicapped, and for scheduling tests at appropriate times and places (at Negro as well as white colleges, for example).

3. It isn't really equal unless they receive equal consideration when eligible for appointment. This fact calls for the activities of coordinators, for the ban on arbitrary agency requests for "men only," and for positive attention to the selection of Negroes, older persons, and other underutilized groups, when qualified and eligible.

4. It isn't really equal unless they receive equal treatment after they are employed. This fact calls for the present requirement that selection of employees for training, career development, or promotion, be made in all agencies strictly on merit considerations—a requirement we are supporting through the Civil Service Commission's regular agency inspections, rather than waiting for employees to come to us with complaints.

In some quarters the charge has been made that this emphasis on equal opportunity damages the merit system and gives preference to this or that special group. This is a serious accusation. It deserves a serious answer.

We are in no sense violating the merit system. No one is appointed to a civil service position who is not qualified for that position.

The truth is that the actions we are taking, such as those I have enumerated, are taken not to weaken the merit system, but to perfect it.

The perfecting of the merit system is necessary to assure that America's future draws upon the talents of all the American people. We must see that the moral obligation of equality of opportunity is fully reflected in employment in the public interest.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of Executive M (88th Cong., 1st sess.), the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Article I is open to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the question of the constitutional right of the Senate in regard to treaties, let me say I do not believe I understood the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to assert that in the absence of the provision he is proposing, an amendment to the treaty would not require approval by the Senate. I thought that had always been understood, and there was no question about it.

Does the Senator from Georgia believe this right of the Senate is not derived from the Constitution itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course I believe it is derived from the Constitution itself; but I know of no way in which we could assert that right if the President of the United States were to undertake to ratify, as an executive agreement, an amendment to the treaty. Of course I have no fear that President Kennedy will take any such action as that; but this is to be a permanent treaty, and its permanence and its projection into the future are stressed. I know of no way by which the Senate could assert its constitutional right to advise and consent if a President were to use such an executive agreement. Senators might go to the House and lobby with the Members of the House and try to get them to institute a resolution of impeachment, but that would be a very farfetched procedure. Such a resolution could not be instituted in the Senate.

What harm could such a provision do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the necessity for Senate approval of an amendment to the treaty comes from the Constitution. However, if we accept the proposal of the Senator from Georgia—particularly when the treaty reads as it does in section 2—I see no way to escape the necessity of doing that in every case; and the Senator from Georgia would thereby establish a precedent for maintaining that the right of the Senate to approve an amendment to a treaty comes, not from the Constitution, but from a provision which we would insert in each subsequent treaty.

I believe the action the Senator from Georgia proposes would not be strengthening the Constitution, but, instead, would be a derogation from the Constitution and from the existing right of the Senate. I believe that by the adoption of such a precedent, we would be saying, in effect, that the Senate does not have any such constitutional right, and that therefore we believe we should include such a provision in the form of a reservation. That is the way the situation appears to me. In my opinion, such a provision would only state the obvious.

So I hope that Senators will consider carefully the precedent which would thus be established.

In the precedents to which reference has been made, there was no necessity for the submission of a resolution of ratification to be filed or even for assent by the Senate. But this provision would require that we include in the treaty an amendment similar in effect to the amendment which was adopted in connection with the International Atomic Energy Agency. In other words, we already have in this treaty a provision similar to the amendment the Senator from Georgia uses as a precedent, which was put into the other treaty. That was perfectly proper in that case, because in it there was no way for the Senate to veto or to advise and consent. But that is not the case with this treaty. Any amendment to this treaty would have to be dealt with under the constitutional provision. The Senator from Georgia says we have no way to enforce it, but that is simply to say that the President is not going to do his duty. As a matter of fact, the President, being the Commander in Chief, will be obeyed by the Armed Forces; and in that respect we have to assume that every President will discharge his constitutional duties. A President could thus stop all tests; and if he did, there would be nothing the Senate could do about it. A President could violate many provisions of law; but if he did, the Senate could not take forcible action about his action. However, normally we do not have to proceed in that way.

I do believe, however—and I ask the Senator from Georgia to consider this point seriously—that a provision of this sort would be in derogation of a constitutional right which already exists under the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not expect the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to embrace this suggestion. It is very difficult for parents to find much wrong with their children; and generally it is true that Members of the Senate strongly oppose any change—even in the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t"—in any legislation which they may propose. However, I hope that after further reflection, the Senator from Arkansas will come forward with a more substantial argument.

He says because the veto power is retained by the treaty in the Executive, the Senate does not need to insist on its right to advise and consent. I do not say the Senate does not have a right to advise and consent. I am asserting the right of the Senate to advise and consent to all amendments to the treaty. I do not believe it at all relevant to assert that in this instance we have the veto power, because the Senator from Arkansas knows that power is lodged solely in the executive branch. The Senate has no right to veto an amendment which might subsequently be proposed.

The President or his representative at this conference—not the Senate—would have that right. So the Senate would not have a right to veto any such amendment, except after its representatives at the conference approved it, and when it was then submitted to the Senate, for its advice and consent.

The Senate has no representative at the conference to consider an amendment, but the President does have a representative there to consider it. He might approve it. So we should, of course, make certain that the provision will be submitted to the Senate, and that the Senate will have a right, under its constitutional obligation and responsibility, to advise and consent to the amendment.

I do not believe the veto power, which is vested in the executive branch of the Government, has the slightest relationship to the constitutional power of the Senate to advise and consent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It requires the filing and deposit of an instrument of ratification, for Senate approval, in connection with a treaty.

All I am saying is that this right inheres in the Senate by means of the Constitution, not because of any statement a Senator might propose for inclusion. So I think our reliance on such a provision would certainly place us in a weaker position than our position when we rely on the Constitution. Such a statement by the Senate could not be stronger than the Constitution. The Constitution already contains a provision relating to that point. So in doing what the Senator has suggested, we would raise doubt as to whether the Constitution does so provide.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an excerpt from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on Executive I, 85th Congress, 1st session, on the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency—Executive Report No. 3, 85th Congress, 1st session—appearing on pages 15 to 17, under the heading, "Committee Understanding and the Problems of U.S. Withdrawal." I do not wish to read that section now. It is too late. But I wish to have it in the Record for the information of the Senate because it bears upon the amendment which the Senator has submitted and which he cites as a precedent.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

12. THE COMMITTEE UNDERSTANDING AND THE PROBLEM OF UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL

By virtue of article XVIII C, as already mentioned in this report, amendments to the statute which have been accepted by two-thirds of the member states in accordance with their constitutional processes, come into force for all members, even those who fail to ratify such amendments. On the other hand, should a member be unwilling to accept a proposed amendment, it may withdraw from the Agency by appropriate notice in writing. Should such member fail to exercise this right to withdraw and remain in the Agency, it would be bound in exactly the same way as if it had approved the amendment.

Inherent in the statute, therefore, is the possibility that the United States may be bound by a provision which the Senate rejects unless affirmative action is taken by the executive branch, through withdrawal, to protect the national interest. A similar result conceivably could follow with respect to a provision which the draftsmen of the statute might have intentionally omitted because of the apprehension that such a provision would have rendered the treaty unacceptable to the Senate at the outset. In short, the hazard of the amendment procedure in article XVIII as viewed by some of the members of the committee, lies in a potential difference of views concerning the acceptability of a given amendment as between the Senate and the executive branch. Should the Senate reject an amendment which the executive branch did not consider sufficiently repugnant to warrant withdrawal, the net effect would be a flouting of the constitutional requirement that the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate be obtained before an affirmative treaty commitment might be imposed on the United States.

This feature of the amendment procedure received a most penetrating examination in the committee. The dilemma presented by article XVIII, of course, arises from the relative authority of the President and the Senate in the treaty process, and the consideration that denunciation of a treaty is an executive act, even though termination be effected pursuant to congressional resolution. (Cf. Hackworth, Digest of International Law, pp. 330–331.)

Testimony furnished by administration witnesses tended to minimize the risks which the amendatory procedure of article XVIII might create for the United States. Since, according to that testimony, the new Agency will remain dependent upon the United States for survival for a long while to come, the likelihood of any amendment being adopted against the determined opposition of the United States is extremely remote. In the words of Secretary of State Dulles:

"In view of the preponderant role which the United States will play, and I have testified that in my opinion it could not get started without the United States, I am equally prepared to testify that for the foreseeable future it could not continue without the United States. We, in effect, have control over the amendments in that if there was an amendment which the Senate did not approve, we would then withdraw.

"Anything less than that * * * would mean that any member country would have a veto power over amendments which in the course of time might be found to be desirable by the United States and other important countries. Rather than give any one of 80 nations a complete veto power over what we might want to see done * * * it seemed preferable to set it up so that if a qualified majority wanted the amendment, it would be effective, but if we did not like it, we would get out, and thereby have in effect a practical veto power over amendments."

Administration testimony further emphasized that in the unlikely event that any amendment is adopted which would place the national interest of the United States in jeopardy, there is no question but that Congress and the President would move swiftly to withdraw from the Agency. Any conflicts in viewpoint which might develop between the two branches of our Government over future amendments, it was urged, are more likely to relate to points which, though rejected by the Senate for whatever reason, are not such as to outweigh the disadvantages of being outside the Agency.

To assure the Senate what the policy and intention of the administration would be under article XVIII, Secretary Dulles, as noted earlier in this report, informed the committee that in the event of an amendment rejected by the Senate, the President would and should withdraw, if a majority of the Congress took the position that the amendment rendered continued American participation in the Agency contrary to the best interests of this country.

The committee is not impervious to the force of these considerations. It recognizes that, as a practical reality, any prejudice to the national interest which might arise from the operation of article XVIII would doubtless be effaced in any future contingency by the privilege of withdrawal from the Agency, exercised by the executive branch with the support of the Congress.

Nevertheless, the committee is not persuaded that the withdrawal procedure is sufficient to cure what it regards as a potential hazard for the constitutional division of responsibility between the Senate and the Chief Executive in the treaty process. For the statute creates a legal possibility that this Nation might find itself bound by a treaty obligation which had failed upon submission to the Senate. The suggestion that executive action pursuant to a majority vote of the Congress would afford adequate assurance of a protective withdrawal is no answer to this possibility. Such an abrogation of its constitutional duty by the Senate, through a kind of advance acquiescence in amendments to the statute unless disapproved by congressional resolution, is not countenanced by the fundamental safeguards of article II, section 2, of the Constitution, which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate for treaties to be approved.

To the committee it appears essential that no uncertainty be permitted to subsist as to whether the United States, through continued participation in the Agency, would be obligated by some future amendment which the Senate saw fit to reject. For these reasons, in reporting the statute to the Senate, the committee recommends that the Senate's advice and consent to ratification be made subject to an interpretation and understanding to be made a part and condition of ratification. The resolution of advice and consent would thus read as follows:

"*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive I, 85th Congress, 1st session * * * subject to the interpretation and understanding, which is hereby made a part and condition of the resolution of ratification, that (1) any amendment to the Statute shall be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, as in the case of the Statute itself, and (2) the United States will not remain a member of the Agency in the event of an amendment to the Statute being adopted to which the Senate by a formal vote shall refuse its advice and consent."

The language of this resolution will thus insure an automatic termination of U.S. membership should two-thirds of the Agency's members approve an amendment which is rejected by the Senate in the exercise of its prerogatives under article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

The committee desires at this time to record its concern with the practice, infrequent as it may be, of including in treaties a provision which has the effect of inhibiting the Senate from attaching reservations deemed necessary in the national interest or of preventing the Senate from exercising its constitutional duty to give its advice and consent to all treaty commitments before they can in any way have a binding effect on the United States. Whatever justifications may have existed for inclusion of such a prohibition in the Universal Copyright Convention of 1952 (Ex. M, 83d Cong., 1st sess., art. XX) in view of the peculiar circumstances there present, the Senate's approval of that treaty should not be construed as a precedent for such clauses in future agreements with other nations requiring the Senate's advice and consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad that the Senator has asked to have that section printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will be in the RECORD for every Senator to read.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate place in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of State concerning the proposal submitted by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked for the views of the executive branch on a proposal to amend the Senate resolution consenting to ratification of the test ban treaty to include an understanding that the Senate must consent to any amendment to the treaty.

The executive branch believes that this understanding is unnecessary and that it would not be in the interests of the United States to include it in a Senate resolution consenting to ratification of the treaty.

If the treaty were ambiguous as to the participation of the Senate in the amending process, and understanding could be desirable. However, there is no ambiguity. This very matter was dealt with by the President today in his press conference. He said: "I can give a categorical assurance that the treaty cannot be amended without the agreement of the three basic signatories. The treaty cannot be changed in any way by the three basic signatories and the others, without the consent of the Senate. Any proposal to change the treaty would be submitted to the usual ratification procedure, followed by or prescribed by the Constitution. In addition, there would be no executive action, which would permit us to in any way limit or circumscribe the basic understandings of the treaty. This is a commitment which is made by the Executive and by the Senate, operating under one of the most important provisions of the Constitution, and no President of the United States would seek to, even if he could—and I strongly doubt that he could, by stretching the law to the furthest—seek in any way to break the bond and the understanding which exists between the Senate and the Executive and, in a very deep sense, the American people, in this issue."

In my testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I stated that "no amendment to the treaty can enter into force until it has been considered and approved by the Senate." The treaty requires that "instruments of ratification" of the original parties be deposited before any amendment can go into effect. Under the Constitution, the President cannot execute an instrument of ratification without first obtaining the advice and consent of the Senate under article II, section 2, of the Constitution. In my letter of September 12 to Senator MANSFIELD, I pointed out how this language of the treaty, as well as the Constitutional provision, expressly requires the consent of the Senate to any treaty amendment.

As you pointed out, the Senate resolution consenting to ratification of the statute of International Atomic Energy Agency contained an understanding with respect to the consent of the Senate in the amending process. But the cases are not parallel. Unlike the test ban treaty, which expressly provides that no amendment can become effective until it has been ratified by all three original parties—the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—the IAEA statute permitted amendment by a two-thirds vote of all members of the Agency. Thus, amendments could have become effective without the concurrence of the United States. The statute also provided that any member unwilling to accept an amendment could withdraw from the Agency.

The Senate was concerned that the statute might be amended without its consent and the Executive might not withdraw from the Agency, leaving the United States committed to a treaty which the Senate might not have been willing to approve. (See Senate Ex. Rept. No. 3, 85th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 15–17.) In this context, the Senate approved the statute, "subject to the interpretation and understanding, which is hereby made a part and condition of the resolution of ratification, that (1) any amendment to the statute shall be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, as in the case of the statute itself, and (2) the United States will not remain a member of the Agency in the event of an amendment to the statute being adopted to which the Senate by a formal vote shall refuse its advice and consent."

The qualification in the resolution consenting to ratification of the statute of the IAEA had a real purpose, which would not be served by a similar understanding in the present case. On the contrary, since an understanding implies that the provisions of the treaty were previously unclear, the adoption of such a proposal with respect to the test ban treaty would tend to cast doubt on the prerogatives of the Senate under the Constitution.

For these reasons, it is the position of the executive branch that the interests of the United States would best be served by ratification of the proposed test ban treaty without the understanding referred to in your inquiry.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall. But I wish to point out to the Senator that the Senate will need more study and more reflection before it resolves what to do in this instance. I have been waiting for a long time to make my speech. Of course, I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to propound an interrogation to the junior Senator from Arkansas. Would not an amendment to the treaty be, in fact, a new treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would. For all practical legal purposes it would. I do not believe that a treaty could be amended except by following the same procedures which the treaty itself must follow.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said, "For all practical and legal purposes." Without any qualification, is not an amendment to a treaty a treaty ab initio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is. I apologize for that slip of the tongue. It would be a new treaty. It must follow the same procedure, in my opinion.

Mr. GORE. To assert by legislative amendment or resolution the right of the Senate to ratify an amendment to the treaty, or to advise and consent—two-thirds of the Senate concurring, if we wish to be specific—is but to restate what is already in the Constitution. In no possible way could a resolution of the Senate strengthen those provisions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. By implication, by agreeing to such an amendment, the Senate would raise an inference that such is not the fact.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator recall that former President Eisenhower suspended nuclear weapons tests without the obligation of a treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that any President, by his executive action, could do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. If a President wished to enter into an executive agreement, no provision in the Constitution would forbid him from doing so. But an executive agreement could not be an amendment to a treaty because, as the Senator has said, an amendment to a treaty is a treaty in and of itself, and must therefore be subjected to the constitutional procedures.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And since the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, such an amendment would become a treaty under the Constitution.

Mr. GORE. If this reservation or amendment is to be accepted and adopted by the Senate, what argument is there against many other resolutions of the same type?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is none.

All sorts of things could be included. In my view, such a provision would be unnecessary.

Mr. President, I have just been informed that Mr. Charles Bevans, treaty adviser of the Department of State, has informed the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> The U.S. Government has never deposited an instrument of approval of an amendment to a treaty without first going back to the Senate.

WE HAVE PONDERED—NOW LET US PAUSE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the genesis of this issue occurred 18 years ago when American men of science discovered and put to use the secrets of a new and awesome power. In the closing weeks of the Second World War, American-made atomic bombs were dropped upon two enemy cities, pulverizing their homes and buildings and incinerating their people, with a sudden and devastating fury never before known to man. Surrender, and a peace of sorts, followed almost at once.

It was thus that the world and its people, armed with growing scientific knowledge by which to construct new tools of instantaneous destruction, over an ever-widening area, and with growing ranges of delivery, stumbled forward into the nuclear age. Wonderful, peaceful uses of the new energy were found. Many others were anticipated. But nuclear power was primarily dedicated, as, indeed, it needed to be, to the defensive might of the people of the United States. Our attempts to dedicate it exclusively to peaceful purposes, on a multination basis, consistently met with failure.

Scientific brainpower is not solely indigenous to the West, nor to free peoples alone. And so, alas, the Soviet Union, aided by Nazi rocket experts whom it had captured, and by information which its far-flung system of espionage had obtained, embarked, also, on a long-range program to test and to manufacture thermonuclear warheads and intricate systems for speeding them on their way, even across the seas. So did the United Kingdom. So, now, has France. And so, too, has the inhuman and wanton regime of the Red Chinese. Others could, and some would, unquestionably follow.

I say to my colleagues that America's nuclear arsenal has been a profound deterrent against a potential Soviet surprise H-bomb aggression against our country and the West. Our Secretary of Defense, during the hearings on the treaty, has reiterated that—

> Our strategic retaliatory forces are fully capable of destroying the Soviet target system, even after absorbing an initial surprise attack. Allowing for losses from an initial enemy attack and attrition en route to target, we calculate that our forces today could still destroy the Soviet Union without any help from the deployed tactical air units or carrier task forces or Thor or Jupiter IRBM's.

The Secretary of Defense has testified at that same hearing that the United States "has nuclear superiority." After listening to all the testimony, Mr. President, I sincerely believe that statement. He testified that "we are determined to maintain superiority." And that, Mr. President, we must unfailingly accomplish.

The American people are devotedly dedicated to the cause of a just peace. We are not a warlike nation. When we have been attacked, we have fought wars, and we have won. We are not going to abandon our liberty, nor will we ever, ever, suffer it to be taken from us, whatever the cost. We continue to seek a continuing security for our country, as we continue to seek an honorable peace in the world. This is not a confession of weakness. It comes rather, from a strength of spirit, and from the knowledge that anyone who would try to hurt us would suffer, swiftly and surely, an annihilating retribution.

An arms race—particularly a nuclear arms race—cannot and would not provide permanent security. Peace does not rest on military power alone. In an arms race, do we not increase the danger of war by mistake or miscalculation as well as by design? And, in a nuclear arms race, free of all restraints, do we not, as we undertake repeated and competitive testing in the atmosphere, finally reach the point where radioactive fallout would surely become a hideous danger to the survival of the human race?

It is to the everlasting credit of the leaders of America that, from the dawn of the nuclear era, they have earnestly sought agreement to control nuclear testing, and to dedicate nuclear power to the betterment of man. That grand old American, Bernard Baruch, early told the nations of the world that the choice they had to make was "between the quick and the dead." In 1957, President Eisenhower offered the Soviet Union what he termed "a cessation of tests as an integral part of what we call a general first step toward disarmament."

Two years later, in a letter to Chairman Khrushchev, dated April 20, 1959, President Eisenhower said:

> The United States strongly seeks a lasting agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. We believe that this would be an important step toward reduction of international tensions and would open the way to further agreements on substantial measures of disarmament.

On January 11, 1960, President Eisenhower spoke of America's proposal for a nuclear test ban agreement in the atmosphere and in the oceans. He said:

> These are initial, but far-reaching and yet readily attainable steps toward a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests. If adopted, they will prevent increases in the level of radioactivity in the atmosphere and so allay worldwide concern.

The United Kingdom joined President Eisenhower in his limited proposal. It has continued to agree with our country's position under President Kennedy.

Finally, last July 25, representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union initialed an agreement for a limited test ban. Since then, 91 other nations have approved it, without qualification.

The issue, thus, 18 years after the first atomic explosion, is now before the U.S. Senate. It is our duty under the Constitution, to determine whether or not we shall advise and consent to the treaty agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the treaty and the agreed communique be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, also, that the Department of State letter of transmittal to the President, dated August 8, 1963, and the text of the President's letter of the same date to the Senate be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the transcript of a number of questions I asked of witnesses during the hearings and the answers I received may also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from California. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, by the terms of the treaty the parties agree to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out, nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, or under water.

Underground nuclear explosions are permitted so long as radioactive debris is not vented outside the territory of the nation conducting such explosions. Weapons testing underground or explosions underground for peaceful purposes are equally permissible.

The nations agree not to encourage or participate in the carrying out of the prohibited testing and explosions anywhere by anyone.

The treaty is open to any nation to join. It may be amended but only if a majority of the members—specifically including the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—agree. That simply means that the treaty cannot be amended unless the executive branch of our Government agrees, and unless the Senate, by a two-thirds recorded vote, also agrees.

The treaty is of unlimited duration, but it permits any signatory to withdraw on 3 months' notice if the signatory itself, and by itself alone, determines that "extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests" of the signatory. And, obviously, under international law, if a signatory were to abrogate the treaty, secretly or otherwise, the treaty would be at an end, and any other signatory could proceed immediately to test at will.

Does the treaty, in any way, restrict the use of nuclear weapons by any signatory nation in the event of war or in the event of an aggressive act against it? The answer is in the negative. The treaty, by its own terms, is specifically designed to prevent test explosions in the three enumerated environments. That is what it does. That is what it is intended to do. The agreed communique of the three powers, issued simultaneously with the initialing of the treaty clearly relates the treaty to the problem of "the discontinuance of nuclear tests." It refers to the treaty as "the test ban treaty." The Department of State, in transmitting the treaty to the President refers to the treaty, particularly the article referring to prohibiting nuclear explosions, and says:

> The article does not prohibit the use of nuclear weapons in the event of war nor restrict the exercise of the right of self-defense recognized in article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

In his message to the Senate, the President of the United States clearly stated that the treaty "will not end the threat of nuclear war or outlaw the use of nuclear weapons."

The clear issue before the Senate is whether a limited nuclear test ban agreement is in the interests of the American people. The treaty has nothing to do with the manufacture and stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons. It has nothing to do with our country using our nuclear arsenal if the President, as Commander in Chief, determines that American security requires its use. And, I repeat, the limitation on test explosions does not apply to testing underground for any purpose.

Will the treaty, in any way, require any signatory nation to recognize any other signatory nation if it does not desire to do so? It will not. International law is clear on this. The precedents, over the years, are unequivocal. The right of the United States to determine, by herself, what countries to recognize and what countries not to recognize, continues unimpaired. And I feel completely assured that West Germany would never have signed the treaty if she had felt that there was the slightest implication that her signature would require her to recognize Communist East Germany.

In the committee hearings, I asked each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whether he, individually, approved the treaty. Each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff answered in the affirmative. It was their unanimous, collective judgment that, under the terms of the treaty, our country should immediately proceed with an underground testing program designed to improve our weapons. Glenn T. Seaborg, the distinguished nuclear scientist, now Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in his testimony on the treaty, described the Commission's responsibility as follows:

> To develop atomic energy so as to make the maximum contributions to the common defense and security of the United States. We will continue to vigorously support research and development in our weapons laboratories; the terms of the treaty permit us to carry out an active underground testing program and we are doing so.

Yesterday, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], read to the Senate a letter from the President of the United States reaffirming the testimony, indeed, the pledge, of all responsible Government officials, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission who testified on this treaty that the readiness of our nuclear testing facilities would be maintained.

Our military leaders vigorously advocate that we be constantly able to resume atmospheric testing if the Soviet Union cheats on its treaty obligations. Seaborg firmly promises that—

> We will maintain a state of readiness for conducting tests in the atmosphere and other media. This readiness posture has been stated as national policy by the President.

What are the hazards of clandestine cheating by the Soviet Union? I believe, by the testimony given to us by scientific and military personnel during closed committee sessions, that our skills and techniques to detect cheating in the prohibited environments are surprisingly efficient; and that there is a high probability that any Soviet illegal test would be discovered. If such illegal explosions occurred, the treaty would be breached, and, as I say, were it in our national interests, under the decision of the President, we would have the immediate right to test at once in the environments covered by the treaty.

Mr. President, I have little, if any, faith in the word of the Soviet Union. Her record of breaking her word is long and sordid. If she is in good faith in this instance, it is only and solely because the treaty is in her interests. I do not, in the slightest, believe that the Soviet Union has abandoned its goal of worldwide Communist domination. The Soviet Union knows that if, God forbid, the United States were the victim of a surprise nuclear attack, our retaliatory nuclear blow would incinerate the land of the aggressor. I believe the U.S.S.R. knows that our capacity to retaliate is sufficiently large and dispersed and secured that no surprise attack against us could wipe out the fiery vengeance which we could and would wreak on a nuclear aggressor. Her leaders know the full fury of thermonuclear bombs. But if such weapons were to proliferate around the world, to become the property of an increasing number of nations, large and small, irresponsible or not, would not the hazards to all mankind—including the Soviet Union—proliferate, too?

Suppose, for example, the nations in the Middle East all possessed nuclear arsenals. Would we not be inching toward the abyss of nuclear conflict?

Is it not, therefore, in the self-interest of humanity, including the U.S.S.R., to accept a multilateral policy designed at least to inhibit, if not prevent, the development of nuclear bombs by more and more nations? Is it not in the interest of humanity, including the Soviet Union, that the atmosphere which all people, including its own, breathe, should be freed, if only for a while, from additional radioactive poison, no matter how far away, or how near, an actual level of immediate danger might be?

These are the considerations which from the very first have impelled our country to try to reach even a first-step agreement in the field of nuclear testing. And now, at long last, the U.S.S.R. has accepted our proposal. It should be rejected by the Senate only if it were to find that the security of our country is endangered by what both Eisenhower and Kennedy have been contending for over the years.

Where is such evidence? Eisenhower and Kennedy recommend it. The military Joint Chiefs of Staff support it. Out of nine top American military commanders, spread all around the world, eight approve it. Of all the nuclear physicists who testified before the committee, the predominant view was that this treaty represented a step away from an age of darkness and desolation, and that the accompanying risks of agreement and breach would be outweighed by the measure of hope given to mankind, and by an America—ever alert and standing guard—representing in her continuing military power, and in the strength of her dedication to a just peace, once again, the last, best hope of earth.

And even the great American scientist, Dr. Edward Teller, a brilliant patriot from my own State of California, in answer to my questions, suggested that the fears which prompted his opposition might be ameliorated, and that the treaty "might still be compatible with our safety"—his words—by suitable and available expansion in some of our present defense systems.

Later in the hearings, I asked Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering of the Department of Defense, if the treaty restrictions would not crucially affect our capacity to develop a defensive antiballistic missile system. He replied, "I would go further than that and say it would not seriously affect our capacity. I don't want to say that it is not useful information but it will not seriously hamper our development."

Both the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, relying on both their military judgment and the advice of the distinguished scientists who hold positions of responsibility in the Pentagon, moreover, made it clear that, in their opinions, development of an antiballistic missile system does not depend on atmospheric testing. As Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, testified:

> As the Joint Chiefs have pointed out there are limitations in the sense that we can never have complete weapons effects tests which would involve atmospheric testing. That is a disability, but not a critical one. We can, indeed, develop, fabricate, and deploy an antiballistic missile system if we so choose.

At another point in the hearings, I also asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff for their individual reasons for supporting the treaty.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, replied:

> Well, the political advantages that might accrue from this are a great number. Some of them are (1) the cleavage that now exists between Russia and China. Another one is that if we can satisfy Mr. Khrushchev as to our nonaggressive designs, and we can get him to pull back into the Soviet Union and concentrate a great number of his resources on consumer goods, on his agricultural program, and things of that sort, rather than going off on excursions to further communism worldwide, this would be a political advantage.

Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, replied:

> I would go a step further in merely calling this political. It is politicomilitary. If a reduction in tensions can be achieved—although I would certainly argue whether weapons cause tensions or tensions cause weapons—perhaps we will have an opportunity to deal with some of the very sticky problems such as Berlin, Cuba, and others which plague us.

And General Wheeler continued:

> The matter of proliferation has been put forward as being a military advantage. I would certainly say this: If we can restrict

> the proliferation of nuclear weapons, this is a military advantage as well as a political advantage.

Mr. President, as one who does not customarily sit on the major committees dealing with test ban affairs, I did not have the background or the prescience of wisdom to become immediately either an advocate or a critic of the treaty when it was first announced. I have seen my role as have the majority of my colleagues: to wait and see, to listen and to question, to advise and consent or to dissent, as each one of us sees the light.

Let me recall the solemn pledge of the 1960 Republican national platform, which reads:

> We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit.

Yesterday in debate the Republican leader in the Senate likewise quoted that platform as constituting a commitment by my party to the people of the United States.

Nonetheless, I told the Senate on August 2 that I would vote in favor of the treaty only if, after all the questions were asked and all the answers were given, it then appeared to be abundantly clear that ratification of the treaty would be in the interest of the American people and, beyond that, in the interest of the cause of a just peace on this globe.

Mr. President, the questions have been asked, the answers have been given, and I think the conclusion is abundantly clear.

I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. But I regarded—and now regard—the responsibility of the Senate, in judging this treaty as so crucially important that I participated in the committee hearings, both public and private, and with the approval of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I participated in the examination of witnesses. My sole concern was to cast my vote—for or against the treaty—on the single basis of what I believed would be best for my country. I listened to the evidence, pro and con. As carefully as I could, I examined the exhibits and the charts of the Military Establishment.

All of my original reservations concerning the treaty have been answered. I have reached my decision. As an American, whose prime concern is for his own country, I shall support the treaty, for I believe it to be in the interest of the people of the United States as well as in the interest of world peace.

The treaty may not halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons entirely, but it constitutes a drive to impede it. The treaty may, but for a short time, halt the danger of fallout. Should the Soviet Union break the treaty, we will, as we must, be ready immediately to resume testing ourselves. We shall hope for the best, but we shall prepare for the worst.

But most important of all, I believe, for the first time the major nations of the world have taken a small step toward reality and common sense and sanity in a world laden with thermonuclear bombs.

I recall the words of the great Churchill:

> Mankind has never been in this position before. Without having improved appreciably in virtue or enjoying wiser guidance, it has got into its hands for the first time the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of men have at last led them. They would do well to pause and ponder upon their new responsibilities.

Mr. President, we have pondered. Now let us pause.

EXHIBIT 1

TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE AND UNDERWATER

The Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hereinafter referred to as the "Original Parties",

Proclaiming as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons,

Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end, and desiring to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

(a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

(b) in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusion of which, as the Parties have stated in the Preamble to this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

2. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this Article.

ARTICLE II

1. Any Party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depositary Governments which shall circulate it to all Parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the Parties, the Depositary Governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the Parties, to consider such amendment.

2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all the Parties to this Treaty, including the votes of all the Original Parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the Parties, including the instruments of ratification of all of the Original Parties.

ARTICLE III

1. This Treaty shall be open to all States for signature. Any State which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article may accede to it at any time.

2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Governments of the Original Parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the Depositary Governments.

3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the Original Parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

4. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

5. The Depositary Governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding States of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

6. This Treaty shall be registered by the Depositary Governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty, of which the English and Russian texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Depositary Governments. Duly certified copies of this Treaty shall be transmitted by the Depositary Governments to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Treaty.

DONE in triplicate at the city of Moscow the fifth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DEAN RUSK
WAH

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

HOME
H

For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

A. GROMYKO
A.G.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere in outer space and under water, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963 in the English and Russian languages, a signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, George W. Ball, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this eighth day of August, 1963.

[SEAL] GEORGE W. BALL
Acting Secretary of State
By BARBARA HARTMAN
Authentication Officer,
Department of State

(Released on July 25, 1963)

AGREED COMMUNIQUE

The special representatives of the President of the United States of America and of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs of the United States, and Lord Hailsham, Lord President of the Council and Minister of Science for the United Kingdom, visited Moscow together with their advisers on July 14. Mr. Harriman and Lord Hailsham were received by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, N. S. Khrushchev, who presided on July 15 at the first of a series of meetings to discuss questions relating to the discontinuance of nuclear tests, and other questions of mutual interest. The discussions were continued from July 16 to July 25 with A. A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. During these discussions each principal was assisted by his advisers.

The discussions took place in a businesslike, cordial atmosphere. Agreement was reached on the text of a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. This text is being published separately and simultaneously with this communique. It was initialed on July 25 by A. A. Gromyko, Mr. Harriman and Lord Hailsham. Mr. Harriman and Lord Hailsham together with their advisers will leave Moscow shortly to report and bring back the initialed texts to their respective Governments. Signature of the treaty is expected to take place in the near future in Moscow.

The heads of the three delegations agreed that the test ban treaty constituted an important first step toward the reduction of international tension and the strengthening of peace, and they look forward to further progress in this direction.

The heads of the three delegations discussed the Soviet proposal relating to a pact of non-aggression between the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the participants in the Warsaw Treaty. The three Governments have agreed fully to inform their respective allies in the two organizations concerning these talks and to consult with them about continuing discussions on this question with the purpose of achieving agreement satisfactory to all participants. A brief exchange of views also took place with regard to other measures, directed at a relaxation of tension.

EXHIBIT 2

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING THE TREATY BANNING NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS IN THE ATMOSPHERE, IN OUTER SPACE, AND UNDERWATER, SIGNED AT MOSCOW ON AUGUST 5, 1963, ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
August 8, 1963.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This treaty is the first concrete result of 18 years of effort by the United States to impose limits on the nuclear arms race. There is hope that it may lead to further measures to arrest and control the dangerous competition for increasingly destructive weapons.

The provisions of the treaty are explained in the report of the Acting Secretary of State, transmitted herewith. Essentially it prohibits only those nuclear tests that we ourselves can police. It permits nuclear tests and explosions underground so long as all fallout is contained within the country where the test or explosion is conducted.

In the weeks before and after the test ban negotiations, the hopes of the world have been focused on this treaty. Especially in America, where nuclear energy was first unlocked, where the danger of nuclear war and the meaning of radioactive fallout are so clearly recognized, there has been understanding and support for this effort. Now the treaty comes before the Senate, for that careful study which is the constitutional obligation of the Members of that body. As that study begins I wish to urge that the following considerations be kept clearly in mind:

First. This treaty is the whole agreement. U.S. negotiators in Moscow were instructed not to make this agreement conditioned upon any other understanding; and they made none. The treaty speaks for itself.

Second. This treaty advances, though it does not assure, world peace; and it will inhibit, though it does not prohibit, the nuclear arms race.

While it does not prohibit the United States and the Soviet Union from engaging in all nuclear tests, it will radically limit the testing in which both nations would otherwise engage.

While it will not halt the production or reduce the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, it is a first step toward limiting the nuclear arms race.

While it will not end the threat of nuclear war or outlaw the use of nuclear weapons, it can reduce world tensions, open a way to further agreements, and thereby help to ease the threat of war.

While it cannot wholly prevent the spread of nuclear arms to nations not now possessing them, it prohibits assistance to testing in these environments by others; it will be signed by many other potential testers; and it is thus an important opening wedge in our effort to "get the genie back in the bottle."

Third. The treaty will curb the pollution of our atmosphere. While it does not assure the world that it will be forever free from the fears and dangers of radioactive fallout from atmospheric tests, it will greatly reduce the numbers and dangers of such tests.

Fourth. This treaty protects our rights in the future. It cannot be amended without the consent of the United States, including the consent of the Senate; and any party to the treaty has the right to withdraw, upon 3 months' notice, if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests.

Fifth. This treaty does not alter the status of unrecognized regimes. The provisions relating to ratification by others, and the precedents of international law, make it clear that our adherence to this treaty, and the adherence of any other party, can in no way accord or even imply recognition by the United States or any other nation of any regime which is not now accorded such recognition.

Sixth. This treaty does not halt American nuclear progress. The United States has more experience in underground testing than any other nation; and we intend to use this capacity to maintain the adequacy of our arsenal. Our atomic laboratories will maintain an active development program, including underground testing, and we will be ready to resume testing in the atmosphere if necessary. Continued research on developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be possible through underground testing.

Seventh. This treaty is not a substitute for, and does not diminish the need for, continued Western and American military strength to meet all contingencies. It will not prevent us from building all the strength that we need; and it is not a justification for unilaterally cutting our defensive strength at this time. Our choice is not between a limited treaty and effective strategic strength—we need and can have both. The continuous buildup in the power and invulnerability of our nuclear arsenal in recent years has been an important factor in persuading others that the time for a limitation has arrived.

Eighth. This treaty will assure the security of the United States better than continued unlimited testing on both sides. According to a comprehensive report prepared by the responsible agencies of Government for the National Security Council, the tests conducted by both the Soviet Union and the United States since President Eisenhower first proposed this kind of treaty in 1959 have not resulted in any substantial alteration in the strategic balance. In 1959 our relative nuclear position was strong enough to make a limited test ban desirable, and it remains so today. Under this treaty any gains in nuclear strength and knowledge which could be made by the tests of any other power—including not only underground tests but even any illegal tests which might escape detection—could not be sufficient to offset the ability of our strategic forces to deter or survive a nuclear attack and to penetrate and destroy an aggressor's homeland. We have, and under this treaty we will continue to have, the nuclear strength that we need. On the other hand, unrestricted testing—by which other powers could develop all kinds of weapons through atmospheric tests more cheaply and quickly than they could underground—might well lead to a weakening of our security. It is true that the United States would be able to make further progress if atmospheric tests were continued—but so would the Soviet Union and indeed, so could other nations. It should be remembered that only one atomic test was required to complete the development of the Hiroshima bomb. Clearly the security of the United States—the security of all mankind—is increased if such tests are prohibited.

Ninth. The risks in clandestine violations under this treaty are far smaller than the risks in unlimited testing. Underground tests will still be available for weapons development; and other tests, to be significant, must run substantial risks of detection. No nation tempted to violate the treaty can be certain that an attempted violation will go undetected, given the many means of detecting nuclear explosions. The risks of detection outweigh the potential gains from violation, and the risk to the United States from such violation is outweighed by the risk of a continued unlimited nuclear arms race. There is further assurance against clandestine testing in our ability to develop and deploy additional means of detection, in our determination to maintain our own arsenal through underground tests, and in our readiness to resume atmospheric testing if the actions of others so require.

Tenth. This treaty is the product of the steady effort of the U.S. Government in two administrations, and its principles have had the explicit support of both great political parties. It grows out of the proposal made by President Eisenhower in 1959 and the resolution passed by the Senate in that same year; and it carries out the explicit pledges contained in the platforms of both parties in

1960. Nothing has happened since then to alter its importance to our security. It is also consistent with the proposals this administration put forward in 1961 and 1962—and with the resolution introduced in the Senate, with wide bipartisan support, in May of 1963.

This treaty is in our national interest. While experience teaches us to be cautious in our expectations and ever vigilant in our preparations, there is no reason to oppose this hopeful step. It is rarely possible to recapture missed opportunities to achieve a more secure and peaceful world. To govern is to choose; and it is my judgment that the United States should move swiftly to make the most of the present opportunity and approve the pending treaty. I strongly recommend that the Senate of the United States advise and consent to its ratification.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 8, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

I have the honor to submit to you, with the recommendation that it be transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification, a certified copy of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

On October 31, 1958, the United States and the United Kingdom began negotiations with the Soviet Union at Geneva for an effectively controlled nuclear test cessation agreement. As you are aware, continued studies and assessments of the technical, political, military, and other aspects of this subject have been conducted since that time in connection with the negotiations.

The Senate has followed the test ban negotiations with close attention, holding many hearings and enacting a resolution in support of the efforts of the executive branch (S. Res. 96, 86th Cong., 1st sess.). Congressional advisers have attended the negotiations at Geneva at various times since 1958.

The first proposal for a limited test ban treaty was advanced by the United States and the United Kingdom on April 13, 1959. On that date, supported by Prime Minister Macmillan, President Eisenhower proposed in a letter to Chairman Khrushchev a ban on tests above ground and up to 50 kilometers. On September 3, 1961, you and Prime Minister Macmillan proposed to Chairman Khrushchev that the three Governments agree immediately not to conduct "nuclear tests which take place in the atmosphere and produce radioactive fallout."

On August 27, 1962, the United States and the United Kingdom submitted to the Conference of the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament, a draft treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. Both proposals have been renewed by the United States and the United Kingdom at various times since then.

On May 27, 1963, Senators DODD and HUMPHREY introduced in the Senate a resolution (S. Res. 148, 88th Cong., 1st sess.). This resolution, cosponsored by 32 other Senators, urged negotiation of a treaty banning tests in the atmosphere and the oceans.

On June 10, 1963, in a speech at American University, you announced further negotiations with the Soviet Union for a nuclear test ban, and a suspension of U.S. tests in the atmosphere so long as other nations did not conduct them.

On July 2, 1963, Chairman Khrushchev expressed the willingness of the Soviet Government "to conclude an agreement banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater."

Commencing July 15, 1963, negotiations were held in Moscow between W. Averell Harriman, representing the United States, Lord Hailsham, representing the United Kingdom, and A. A. Gromyko, representing the Soviet Union, looking toward the possibility of concluding a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in three environments, but not underground. On July 25, 1963, these negotiations resulted in an agreed draft initialed by the representatives of each of the parties. On August 5, 1963, the treaty was signed in Moscow by Secretary Rusk on behalf of the United States, by A. A. Gromyko on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and by Lord Home on behalf of the United Kingdom.

The treaty consists of a preamble and five articles.

The preamble indicates the relationship of this treaty to the much broader aim of achieving an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control, as well as to the more specific aims of eventually preventing nuclear weapons tests in all environments, meanwhile stopping the contamination of the atmosphere by radioactive fallout.

Article I contains the principal substantive obligations of the parties. Under its first paragraph the parties undertake to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out, at any place under their jurisdiction or control, nuclear weapons tests or other nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, or underwater. In the context of provisions devoted to obtaining a complete, verifiable ban on tests in these three environments, the treaty language relates "any nuclear weapon test explosion" to "any other nuclear explosion," thus preventing evasion based on the contention that a particular detonation was not a weapon test but the explosion of an already tested device. The phrase "any other nuclear explosion" includes explosions for peaceful purposes. Such explosions are prohibited by the treaty because of the difficulty of differentiating between weapon test explosions and peaceful explosions without additional controls. The article does not prohibit the use of nuclear weapons in the event of war nor restrict the exercise of the right of self-defense recognized in article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Underground nuclear explosions are not prohibited so long as they do not cause radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosions are conducted. Thus, so long as adequate precautions are taken to prevent such spread or radioactive debris, the treaty will not prohibit the United States from conducting underground nuclear weapons tests or underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

The second paragraph of article I contains an undertaking by the parties to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of the prohibited tests and explosions anywhere by anyone. This provision prevents a party from doing indirectly what it has agreed to refrain from doing directly.

Article II contains a procedure for amending the treaty. Any party may propose an amendment, and a conference to consider such an amendment must be called if requested by one-third or more of the parties although a conference would not be necessary for the adoption of an amendment. To be effective, an amendment must be approved and ratified by a majority of all the parties which must include the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. Thus, no amendment can become effective without the advice and consent of the Senate.

Article III provides that the treaty shall enter into force upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by all three original parties and specifies how other states may become parties. It designates the three original parties as depositary governments and contains other provisions of a formal nature relating to ratification, accession, and registration with the United Nations.

An increasing number of countries have indicated their intention of becoming parties to the treaty and of thus broadening its effectiveness. The provisions for signature and accession have been designed to permit the widest possible application of the treaty. At the same time adherence to the treaty will in no way imply recognition or change in status of regimes the United States does not now recognize. Nor will it in any way result in according recognition or change in status to any regime not now recognized by any other party.

Article IV provides that the treaty shall be of unlimited duration. It also creates a special right of withdrawal, upon 3 months' notice, if a party finds that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized its supreme interests.

Article V provides that the English and Russian texts of the treaty are equally authoritative and makes provision for the deposit of the original treaty instruments and the transmittal of certified copies to signatory and acceding states.

There is transmitted for your information, and for that of the Senate, the agreed communique issued by the representatives of the original parties on July 25, 1963, at the conclusion of the Conference in Moscow at which the treaty was formulated.

I believe that the signing of this treaty is a significant achievement. Its ratification by the three original parties and by such other states as may sign or accede to it will be an important and hopeful step toward the reduction of international tensions, alleviation of the fears and dangers caused by radioactive fallout, and the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons capability. I believe it will promote the security of the United States and of the entire free world.

In view of these advantages, and of the hopes and expectations of virtually every nation in the world, it is my sincere hope that the United States will promptly ratify this treaty.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE W. BALL.

EXHIBIT 3

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Senator KUCHEL. Mr. Secretary, first your statement earlier this morning was excellent; your answers have been likewise. They are most useful to those of us, like myself, who have not been in a position to draw on any background and experience in this field.

DIFFICULTIES IN MAINTAINING A STATE OF CONSTANT READINESS TO RESUME TESTING

In March of 1962 President Kennedy, after the Soviet Union had abruptly announced the termination of its unilateral moratorium, had this to say, in part:

"We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium. Some may urge us to try it again, keeping our preparations to test in a constant state of readiness. But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient. We have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

Now that we have an agreement before us, how would you seek to dispel any apprehension which the Members of the Senate and the people of our country may have—I say parenthetically I think you have covered this in part—first, with respect to a breach of the agreement and, secondly, with respect to the question of technical laboratories and scientific brains being kept on the alert under the agreement?

Secretary Rusk. In the first instance, on the first question, there is a difference, I believe, between a solemn treaty solemnly entered into, and in the case of this treaty, endorsed by the signatures and the adherence of almost every nation of the world, on the one side, and the kind of moratorium which we had between 1958 and 1961.

That moratorium was based, in effect, upon unilateral declarations. It was not a contractual relationship between the parties.

I have tried myself, in fairness and in accuracy, to refer to the fact that the Soviet Union terminated or broke the moratorium, but it did not break an agreement when it resumed its atmospheric tests. That is, that had not been formalized as a transaction among the governments. I do think that a formal treaty is more significant.

Now, on the second question, sir, I think that this would be a much more important problem and difficulty for us, quite frankly, if we were talking about a comprehensive treaty which eliminated tests of all sorts, and which could be subject to speedy violation by one or the other parties.

We do believe that with underground testing proceeding that some of the most advanced work will be done there; that the laboratories will be fully engaged in that, the preparations for the resumption of atmospheric testing and the keeping up to date of plans for such tests in the event of violation, would go a long way toward preventing the degration of our laboratory capabilities.

We would also expect to keep in operating condition the actual test sites and not demobilize those to the extent that they were before or turn them over to other use.

So that we believe it would be possible, and Dr. Seaborg will be able to address himself to that question specifically, that it will be possible for us to go ahead with our program, with our laboratories functioning, and be in a good position to take care of our interests if this treaty is violated.

TREATY'S EFFECT ON DEVELOPMENT OF ANTIMISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Senator Kuchel. Referring once again to the President's address to the people a year ago he said, in part:

"While apparently seeking information on the effects of nuclear blast on radar and communication, which is important in developing an antimissile defense system, these tests—"

referring to the Soviet tests—

"did not, in our judgment, reflect a developed system."

Perhaps this question should be directed more properly to either Glenn Seaborg or Robert McNamara. But would it be your testimony that the development of defensive systems, including an anti-missile-missile system by the United States would not be inhibited by our agreement not to explode in the atmosphere?

Secretary Rusk. Secretary McNamara will address himself to that point in considerable detail, Senator Kuchel. But let me just comment very briefly. That the central problems of an anti-missile-missile defense system lie generally outside of the warhead problem itself.

This has to do with radar capabilities, with missile capabilities, with guidance systems, with things that can proceed in experimentation and development without inhibition by this treaty.

There are one or two aspects of that which are related to the possibilities of atmospheric testing which my colleagues may wish to take up in executive session, because it does involve some fairly delicate matters.

WHO IS BENEFITED MORE BY TEST BAN?

Senator Kuchel. I paraphrase comments made by some Californians in the press when I say "Russia can continue testing in her area of weakness while we will be denied the chance to catch up in her area of strength."

Sir, speaking for the Government, you would deny that. Would you elaborate on such a denial?

Secretary Rusk. Again, sir, this is a matter which ought to be taken up in connection with weaponry and with highly technical as well as some classified material. But it is quite true that the Soviet Union has exploded, for example, a larger weapon from the megaton point of view than have we, and they, therefore, perhaps, have both some knowledge and capability in that field that we have not yet demonstrated or prooftested, although we do have a capacity for very substantial weapons.

In other respects, and in other aspects of the spectrum in these three environments here, I think that it will be shown we feel that we are ahead, and to that extent the cessation of testing will impose some limitations on the Soviet side.

On the underground side, I think that our experience has been much more fertile. It is much larger in number. I think we feel we have a significant advantage in the underground field, and we can continue to develop the state of the art through the underground testing with full protection of American interests.

So it is not quite as simple a problem as saying they are ahead at this point, we are ahead at the other. They can test where they need to catch up, we cannot test where we need to catch up. But this is a great oversimplification, and I think as a conclusion would not be correct.

CONSULTATIONS WITH JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Senator Kuchel. Just one more question. You stated this morning in answer to a question by Senator Stennis, that only the General Counsel of the Defense Department accompanied our delegation to Moscow. Did the State Department and the White House consult with the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff prior to our participating in the negotiations in Moscow?

Secretary Rusk. Senator, the procedure by which we developed positions in disarmament culminates in what is called the Committee of Principals, which is a Cabinet-level committee which was organized soon after the present administration came into office. That is made up of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Secretary of Defense, from the beginning, was normally accompanied by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I myself was accompanied by the Director of the Disarmament Agency.

Back, I think, in April both of those were made full members of the Committee of Principals, although they had been at all meetings previously in the last 2 or 3 years.

All of these disarmament questions are discussed there, debated there, reviewed there. The Committee of Principals then meets periodically with the President for full discussion there with all those who participated at the Committee level sitting in on those discussions with the President. So that there has been the fullest opportunity for an exchange of views among any of the agencies there or any of the individuals there, as we have discussed these various issues.

* * * * * *

Senator Kuchel. Mr. Secretary, first let me permit the record to show that I greatly appreciate being here and listening to you. I think your statement was most helpful to Senators like myself.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF TREATY TERMS

Is it fair to say that, as you appear here urging the Senate to advise and consent to this treaty, that in your opinion the intent of the treaty is to prohibit nuclear test explosions in the three enumerated environments by the original signatories and by those other nations or states which hereafter may approve it?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir; it is.

Senator Kuchel. And is it your statement to this committee that the intention of the parties in drafting it is not to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons on the part of any nation which finds its security involved to the point that it would determine it necessary to use them?

Secretary McNamara. That is the clear intent of the parties.

DISCUSSION OF DEFINITION OF "OR ANY OTHER NUCLEAR EXPLOSION"

Senator Kuchel. I turn to the language of the treaty, Mr. Secretary, and I read in article I:

"Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control—"

Then it describes the areas to be covered in (a) and (b). I refer particularly to the phrase, "or any other nuclear explosion."

What is your opinion of the intention of the parties in utilizing that series of words?

Secretary McNamara. Again I speak as Secretary of Defense and not as an experienced international lawyer. But it is certainly my understanding of the intent of the parties that the term "any other nuclear explosion" was inserted in order to prohibit so-called peaceful use explosions which met the conditions outlined in the following two subparagraphs, A and B.

Senator Kuchel. That phrase also appears in section 2 of article I:

"Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any other way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this article."

Would your statement be to the committee that that phrase again, "or any other nuclear explosion," is restricted to peaceful nuclear test explosions?

Secretary McNamara. I believe that was the purpose and intent—to apply only to peaceful explosions.

Senator Kuchel. Would you feel it reasonable for anyone to try to contend that this phrase would apply across the board and prohibit any other nuclear explosion of any kind or character?

Secretary McNamara. No, sir; I do not believe so. As I say, I based my conclusion on two points: (a) I am quite familiar with the background that led to the introduction of the language and it is clearly the intent of the parties that the phrase would not apply to a prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in the event of war. And, second, I am told by my legal counsel that it is quite customary so to interpret international treaties unless they quite specifically state the contrary.

Senator Kuchel. Your General Counsel was present in Moscow at the time of the negotiations?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir; he was. Perhaps you would like to hear him speak on this point.

Senator Kuchel. I would like to ask him this question for the record, because it has bothered people with whom I have spoken. When the words are used "or any other nuclear explosions," would it be the statement of the General Counsel that that should be interpreted as any other "nuclear test" explosion?

CLARIFICATION OF "OR ANY OTHER NUCLEAR EXPLOSION"

Mr. McNaughton. No—a peaceful use explosion might not be a test explosion. For example, a peaceful use explosion, digging a new canal, would scarcely be a test explosion. So the word "test" is not in there for that reason. As you may recall, the approved U.S. draft had an article II permitting peaceful uses under certain circumstances.

Senator Kuchel. I remember.

Mr. McNaughton. When that article was deleted, this language, as the Secretary pointed out, was inserted to prevent peaceful use explosions, whether tests or otherwise, in the peaceful three environments; and the reliance was placed on the commonly accepted legal rule of interpretation that such a limitation does not apply in time of war or hostilities unless it clearly so states.

Senator Kuchel. Give me the first part of that statement again. It does not apply in time of war?

TREATY NOT APPLY IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. McNaughton. It is a commonly accepted rule of interpretation in international law that provisions of a treaty do not apply in time of war, or hostilities unless the treaty clearly indicates to that effect. Now I am not an international lawyer. But this is my understanding of this subject from the international lawyers. This is clearly the case.

NEED FOR FULL UNDERSTANDING OF TREATY LANGUAGE

Senator Kuchel. In the interest of time then might this hearing have for the purpose of establishing intent on this point not simply that that is the understanding of our participants in the discussion but also an explanation of your statement that in time of war treaties do not apply specifically referring to who is at war.

(The explanation referred to is as follows:)

"General Counsel of the
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

"Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
"Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
"U.S. Senate.

"Dear Mr. Chairman: During the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the proposed Nuclear Test Ban Treaty on August 13, 1963, Senator Kuchel raised the question whether the treaty prohibits the use of nuclear weapons in time of war.

"It is my opinion, shared by the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, that the treaty cannot properly be so construed.

"As is the case with contracts between private parties, it is a familiar principle of international law that in ascertaining the meaning of a treaty we may look beyond its written words to the negotiations and diplomatic correspondence of the contracting parties and to the interpretation made of the treaty by the parties. Compare, *Factor* v. *Laubenheimer*, 290 U.S. 276, 294–295; *Cook* v. *United States*, 288 U.S. 102, 112; *Nielsen* v. *Johnson*, 279 U.S. 47, 52; Lauterpacht, *Some Observations on Preparatory Work in the Interpretation of Treaties*, 48 Harv. L. Rev. 549. It is equally fundamental that a treaty is to be interpreted in the light of the general purpose which it is intended to serve. Compare, advisory opinion of July 20, 1962, of the International Court of Justice on certain expenses of the United Nations, page 20.

"The preamble of the treaty states that the parties seek to achieve the discontinuance of test explosions of nuclear weapons. The title of the treaty proclaims that the agreement is a Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water. Similarly, the communique accompanying the treaty announces that agreement was reached on the text of a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. Surely, if it had been intended to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons in wartime, some mention of that important purpose would be found in the communique, the title, and the preamble. Not only is no such purpose stated, but the communique and the preamble make it clear that the treaty is only an important first step in the achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament and, specifically, on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons.

"Further, if it had been intended to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons in war, one would expect to find some provisions in the text calling for the cessation of production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons for the reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and for the progressive destruction of existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery. No such provisions appear. They do not appear because the treaty was not intended to deal with the use of nuclear weapons in war.

"This conclusion is further substantiated by the historical background of the treaty. The language of article I of the treaty has its origin in article I of the draft treaty banning nuclear weapon tests tabled in Geneva by the United States and the United Kingdom on August 27, 1962. The major point of difference between article I of this treaty and article I of the 1962 draft treaty is that the present article I also prohibits 'any other nuclear explosion' in the specified environments. The quoted words stem from the existence of article II of the 1962 United States-United Kingdom draft, which authorized the explosion of nuclear devices for peaceful purposes in the specified environments if unanimously agreed to by the 'original parties.' This limited exception was unacceptable to the Soviet Union. The words 'or any other nuclear explosion' were accordingly inserted in article I of the present draft treaty for the purpose of banning peaceful use explosions as well as test explosions in the three environments.

"Except for this change with respect to explosions for peaceful purposes, the present draft and the earlier draft are substantially identical. The preamble of the earlier draft, its title, and the accompanying statement of the U.S. delegate, Ambassador Dean, make it plain that the draft did not have as an objective the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in war. See Department of State Bulletin, volume XLVII, No. 1212, September 17, 1962, pages 404–410; 415–416. Indeed, it is apparent from the 'Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World,' which was presented by the United States in Geneva on April 18, 1962, that the proposed test ban treaty was only one element of the overall problem of disarmament. See U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, publication 4, general series 3 (May 1962).

"In addition to this historical background, there is the contemporaneous interpretation openly given to the current draft by the parties. In his speech of July 26, 1963, President Kennedy stated that the treaty 'will not restrict their (nuclear weapons) use in time of war.' See New York Times, July 27, 1963, page 2, column 1. Significantly, this construction was not unilateral. Earlier, on July 2, Mr. Khrushchev in his speech in Berlin expressed a similar understanding. After stating the willingness of the Soviet Government to conclude a limited agreement banning nuclear tests, he said: 'Of course, an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests, notwithstanding all the importance of this major act, cannot stop the arms race, and cannot avert or even substantially weaken the danger of thermonuclear war.' In a press conference of July 27, 1963, Ambassador Harriman, the U.S. delegate at the Moscow talks, revealed that the possible interpretation of article I as interfering with use of nuclear weapons had been discussed by the three parties during the negotiations and that it was 'perfectly plain that this language in no way inhibits any country, the United States or any country, from using nuclear weapons, should the need require in war.' See the Washington Post, July 28, 1963, page A8, column 2.

"Finally, it should be noted that it is standard practice in treaties outlawing the use of specified weapons or actions in time of war for the treaties to state expressly that they apply in time of war, in order to prevent possible application of the rule that war may suspend or annul the operation of treaties between the warring parties. (Cf. *Karmuth* v. *United States*, 279 U.S. 231, 236–239; Oppenheim's 'International Law,' vol. II, 7th ed., pp. 302–306.) See, e.g.:

" 'International Declaration Renouncing the Use in Time of War of Explosive Projectiles Under 400 Grammes Weight (St. Petersburg, November 29, December 11, 1868).'

" 'International Declaration Respecting Asphyxiating Gases, Hague, July 29, 1899; International Declaration Respecting Expanding Bullets, Hague, July 29, 1899.'

" 'International Convention Concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land, Hague, October 18, 1907.'

" 'Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous, or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. Geneva, June 17, 1925.'

" 'Geneva Conventions on Wounded and Sick, 1949 (art. 2); POW's (art. 2); Civilians (art. 2).'

"In the present case, language specifically prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons in wartime does not appear; it must, therefore, be presumed that no such prohibition would apply.

"Senator Kuchel also asked whether the entire treaty would be abrogated if one of the parties thereto was at war either with a second party or a state not a party. The answer is that the operation of the treaty would be annulled only with respect to the specific parties at war. For example, if the hypothetical war did not involve the United States and the Soviet Union, and their respective allies, the war would have no effect on the application of the treaty to the United States and the Soviet Union. It should be noted, however, that depending on the circumstances, the United States or the Soviet Union might unilaterally decide to invoke the withdrawal clause of article IV.

"Sincerely,

"John T. McNaughton."

Senator Kuchel. Let us suppose that 1 of the signatories of 50 would be engaged in conflict. Would this abrogate the entire treaty? I do think that it is most important—particularly since Senator Morse earlier referred to the word "encourage." It raises a dreadful problem with respect to at least one of our allies. Senator Case also brought up the question of what "underground" means. I would not want to restrict my Government by having this record indicate that "underground" must mean something more than an inch or 2 inches or a foot. I think it terribly important if this is the only hearing which is available to legal minds—maybe after the fact has occurred—as to what is intended. Then you must scrupulously indicate what "underground" means, and what it doesn't mean, what "encourage" means and what it doesn't mean. And in this case, what the words "or any other nuclear explosion" means: That it does not mean a nuclear detonation of a defensive weapon in our arsenal when the Commander in Chief deems that to be necessary.

Mr. McNaughton. That is correct.

Senator Kuchel. And I must say I think the agreed communique of the three parties bears on the intention. But when the Secretary mentions the phrase "intention of the parties" all I know is what we develop in these hearings by questions and answers. This is the only thing that not only the Senate, but the American people, will have to determine the intention of the specific language used. This is extremely important, because very dedicated Americans do raise these questions and have raised them to me orally and in writing.

MAINTENANCE AND CONTINUATION OF ABM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Secretary, are we taking steps in research and development of an antiballistic missile system?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir; we are. We have spent something on the order of $800 million, if I recall, to date, and we are requesting funds be appropriated in fiscal 1964 of $450 million for that purpose.

Senator Kuchel. When President Eisenhower announced his unilateral moratorium, it was an across-the-board moratorium; was it not?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, sir.

Senator Kuchel. I asked this question yesterday. President Kennedy, in his speech to the Nation of over a year ago, indicated that we would never be caught short again, as you and I hope and pray, and we are assuming that we are taking arrangements we will not be caught short again. Secondly, he indicated that there would not be a stable of American scientific brainpower available if tests could not be seen down toward the end of the road.

Would it be your statement that since underground testing is not prohibited in this treaty that the statement of the President ought not to apply here?

Secretary McNamara. Yes, Senator Kuchel. I think it is quite a different situation where we will be able to carry on a large number of development projects through underground tests on the one hand, versus complete prohibition of tests in all environments on the other hand. In the latter case, it would be far more difficult to maintain the vitality of the laboratories than it would be in the former case.

CALL FOR PRESENTATION OF ALL POSSIBLE INFORMATION

Senator Kuchel. Just this statement and then I am through, Mr. Chairman.

I am most grateful, sir, that you share the views of some of us that to as great an extent as possible this record may disclose all the pros and all the cons involved in this treaty—not, of course, violating a sensitive security question. This is going to be important, not simply for the Senate, but for the people we represent in endeavoring, (a) to find the proper answer, and (b) to have the people approve what is done here.

Secretary McNamara. I strongly support that position. Even though, as I say, Dr. Teller's statement recommends against support of the treaty, I will make every effort to declassify every possible element, including all his arguments against the treaty, so that the committee and the public may be informed of the opposite point of view.

Senator Kuchel. And the question of intent, as I have enumerated it here, I think is most important. And I understand, then, sir, that the administration will supply for this record——

Secretary McNamara. Yes; we will be happy to do so.

* * * * *

CHIEF'S AGREEMENT WITH GENERAL TAYLOR'S STATEMENT

Senator Kuchel. General LeMay, in the statement which General Taylor read to this committee several days ago, he said in part, and I quote:

"The broader advantages of the test ban treaty have led the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conclude that it is compatible with the security interests of the United States and to support its ratification."

Is that a correct statement of the position of the Joint Chiefs?

General LeMay. I believe so; yes, sir.

Senator Kuchel. It is fair to say that every member of the Joint Chiefs does support the ratification of the treaty?

General LeMay. That is correct.

Senator Kuchel. Every day letters have come into my office from people who have on a number of occasions (as have all of us) read statements in the public press to the effect that in reality the Joint Chiefs of Staff opposed the treaty; that, and I apologize for repeating this statement into the record, that they have been "brainwashed," and that this proposal does not have their approval but rather their opposition.

I think the American people, and the men and women in the Senate, share a very great respect for you and for your colleagues in the Joint Chiefs, and, therefore, while it is repetition, I think it completely necessary for all of us to understand that there are risks involved which will, I take it, be explored in greater detail in an executive session because of the security factors involved.

But for the record, for the benefit of the people of the country, it is then true without any qualification that in acting simply and solely to determine the best interests of the people of the United States, it is true that every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff supports the ratification of the treaty.

General LeMay. I would like to amplify a little bit on your question, Senator.

NO BRAINWASHING

First of all, as to the brainwashing. I would resent very much any attempt to put pressure on me to come up with an answer either way on this treaty. I recognize that I have not only a responsibility to the President and the administration but that I have one to the Congress and to the people of the United States also.

So, I say again that there has been no pressure applied to me in this matter, and I have come up with the best possible answer that I could give based on all of the knowledge that I have in the military profession in nuclear science, and with all of the input that I could get from everyone who could talk intelligently on this subject.

As to the decision itself, we all feel that there are possibly some political gains that might accrue to the country that would be very important if this test ban treaty were ratified. I think each of us in the Joint Chiefs attaches importance to these political gains. As to how great they might be or how much benefit might accrue from them, I am somewhat more pessimistic than the other Chiefs are in this regard.

But if we provide the safeguards we mentioned in our paper, I believe that the military and technical disadvantages that the treaty would bring about could be offset to a point where they would be acceptable and the country should have a chance to make these political gains if, in fact, they could materialize.

Perhaps the other Chiefs would want to amplify my remarks a little on that.

INDEPENDENT DECISION ON TREATY

General Wheeler. Senator, my position as regards pressure is exactly that of General LeMay. I, too, would resent any pressure being put upon me.

Of course, every official is subject to pressure. He has the pressure of his conscience, the pressure of his professional integrity, and the pressures of his duty to the President, the Congress and to the people of the United States. I arrived at this conclusion independently, and at the same time arrived at the same point as did my colleagues.

All of us have reservations in this area. I think the reservations are well spelled out in the paper which we presented to the Congress. In the purest sense of the term any agreement or treaty which limits the manner in which we develop our weapons systems represents a military disadvantage.

On the other hand, there can also be military advantages, and certainly there can be political advantages, to the overall good of the country. I think General LeMay is correct in saying that each of us probably assessed the various risks and the various advantages with a slightly different weight.

However, the net result you can read. We all agreed that in toto the treaty is acceptable.

Senator Kuchel. Even more than that, however, sir, is it fair to say that each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff used the language of the Chairman, "Supports its ratification"?

General Wheeler. That is correct, sir.

Senator Kuchel. Any further comment, Admiral?

Admiral McDonald. I have nothing to add to what General LeMay and General Wheeler have stated other than to say for myself that no pressure whatsoever was put upon me.

Senator Kuchel. Thank you, sir.

General Shoup?

NO PRESSURE FELT

General Shoup. I agree with that statement. I would like to—I suppose this is the time, if I came back here to say something this is the time to say it.

I hold a very unique position amongst the other service Chiefs inasmuch as the likely value of my views and counsel has been limited by legislation to the matters in which I declare the interests of the Marine Corps are directly involved.

In this particular item I did not take the position of direct concern. However, I did avail myself of the opportunity and privilege of being present during all the discussions.

In addition I was called for by the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense in person and in private and I presume that if pressure was being used I would have found it out.

There was no such indication whatsoever.

I would like to make one other statement: That I believe that there is a possibility of getting our orientation too closely frozen to this business of a nuclear exchange.

Obviously, we want to avoid nuclear blackmail, and it is by these safeguards that are stated here that is intended to be provided for.

FIFTH SAFEGUARD TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

Nevertheless, I would like to point out that I believe one of the main purposes of our Government is to prevent the spread of communism and the Communist system.

Then I would like to call your attention to the fact that communism has not yet been spread by the use of nuclear weapons, and I think a fifth safeguard is an essential one at this time and that is our efforts should be tripled against the spread of communism by methods other than the use or the threat of nuclear weapons.

Senator Kuchel. Thank you, sir. Both you and Admiral McDonald do then support the ratification of the treaty?

General Shoup. I do.

Admiral McDonald. I do.

Senator Kuchel. I thank you very much, because, and I repeat this, you gentlemen and the Chairman are held in the greatest of respect by the American people. I think it is a very wicked insult to a man in uniform operating in the seat of responsibility as each of you do, to say publicly that you are not reflecting what your own views are. I very much appreciate your assurances for the record.

That is all I have now, Mr. Chairman.

* * * * *

Senator Kuchel. We have got some Senators who said they were for this treaty almost immediately. We have got some others who said they were against it almost immediately. I think the rest of us are the great majority. I think we would like to approve the treaty but we don't want to make a mistake.

I don't think there is a scientist in the crowd. God knows there is not a military expert in the crowd.

Now, I think most of us would feel far more comfortable if, as has now been the case, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have indicated they favor the treaty, subject, however, to certain things which to my lay mind simply must be done.

GENERAL LE MAY'S POSITION ON TREATY HAD HE BEEN ASKED DURING NEGOTIATING STAGE

As I left the Senate a few minutes ago to come down here, on the ticker, General LeMay, there was a paragraph, which said that had this treaty been in the negotiation stage and you were asked your own opinion, you would have objected to it. You would have felt that it should not be entered into.

Was that a correct quotation?

General LeMay. I think I said that. Maybe I didn't qualify my statement now. I said I thought I would probably be against it. But I have spent a lot of midnight oil on this particular question, on the treaty, we had in our hands that we could look at, looking at the disadvantages, looking at the advantages, and trying to come up in my own mind with a recommendation that I would give to you people, I have spent a lot of time.

I haven't spent as much time on any other subject that has ever come before the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it has worried me a great deal as to whether I came up with the right answer or not.

Now, with all of that time that I have spent trying to come up with a specific recommendation on a specific treaty, then to be asked some hypothetical question of what I would do, I don't know exactly. I just say I think I would, but I am not sure.

Senator Kuchel. I wish maybe on the open record that type of answer might be put in because that is the sort of thing many people——

General LeMay. I have no objection to that answer going in the open record. We all like to have a second time, Senator. I wish I had said it then.

Senator Mansfield. Will the Senator yield?

I think General LeMay has a very valid point. No one would have known what they would have done 2 or 3 weeks ago. At the time no one could have known. How could you give a definite answer?

Senator Kuchel. All I say is I noticed the ticker upstairs says that. It is the sort of thing that will make people in the country wonder.

The Chairman. Let the record show that the general thinks this answer is appropriate for giving it to the public.

Is that correct?

General LeMay. I have no objection to it.

The Chairman. Elaborate on it so we can have it clarified.

Without objection, that will be made available.

EFFECTIVENESS OF DETECTION METHODS

Senator Kuchel. General, just in lay terms, is our detection system with respect to atmospheric nuclear explosions sufficiently efficient so that we would know if there were an attempted clandestine breach by the Soviet Union?

General LeMay. The answer to that has to be "No," because I don't think we can detect every explosion that they may attempt in the atmosphere anyplace in the world.

Now, we have some figures; I am sure you are familiar with them as well as I am, but we cannot guarantee to detect every explosion; no, sir.

[Deleted.]

EFFECT OF LARGE MEGATON WEAPON ON A SUBMARINE

Senator Kuchel. I wanted to clear up, Admiral, your answer to Senator Pastore this morning, and I am not a member of the Atomic Energy Committee. I think he raised a question with respect to the impact of an extremely large nuclear warhead upon the capability of a Polaris missile [deleted].

Admiral McDonald. I believe the question was what impact would it have; would it have an adverse impact upon the communications of the Polaris submarine?

My answer was——

Senator Pastore. With the permission of Mr. Kuchel, I think we ought to read General Taylor's answer to that question. That is the reason I asked it so that you would have the full context of it.

"General Taylor. Admiral McDonald really should answer the question. I would say from what I know we have so many duplicating pairs for communications that we would have no problem communicating with any one of our weapons systems or the essential elements of those systems, although, obviously, some fraction might be lost."

Admiral McDonald. May I go ahead, sir?

Senator Pastore. Yes.

Admiral McDonald. When the question was asked this morning my immediate thought was the effect that a megaton bomb would have upon the communications system of the submarine were the bomb applied to the submarine, in other words, a megaton underwater burst near the submarine, and that is the reason I said "Quite likely." I had studied earlier this morning something that Admiral Anderson had worked up because of a question that was asked him in the spring [deleted].

Now, if we are speaking, as I understand now, of the communications, not of the submarine but to the submarine from the shore, I doubt very much if it would adversely affect them, because we do have duplicating systems [deleted] I realize that there are some who ask, What will happen if these megaton bombs create a communications blackout?

Well, I don't know, and I am not certain that our scientists know positively that such a thing will happen.

But if it does, I think it would have less effect upon the Polaris system than any other because the Polaris system does not have to be as immediately responsive.

Senator Kuchel. So when you answered across the street this morning "quite likely," you now qualify that?

Admiral McDonald. Very definitely, and the "quite likely" would apply to the communications of the submarine if a megaton bomb was exploded in the water close to the sub.

Senator Kuchel. To the extent that that answer could be stated in a nonclassified fashion, I think that, too, ought to go in the record that is going to be printed and distributed.

The Chairman. I think it would be well to do this, although the admiral clarified his statement at the end of the meeting. Were you there?

Senator Kuchel. No; I was not.

The Chairman. At the end of the meeting, he clarified his statement quite clearly.

Admiral McDonald. I don't believe we would like to have unclassified the distance at which we calculate——

The Chairman. No.

Admiral McDonald (continuing). We calculate this will destroy the submarine.

The Chairman. I believe when you see what he said at the end it is pretty well taken care of.

Senator Kuchel. Yes, sir.

Just one more question.

REASONS FOR FAVORING RATIFICATION

On the plus side, General LeMay, could you outline what, in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs, are the reasons which impel you to favor the treaty, reasons particularly that affect the potential security of our people, if there are any?

General LeMay. Well, the political advantages that might accrue from this are a great number. We have talked at great length with Ambassador Harriman and Secretary Rusk on the advantages. Some of them are, one, the cleavage that now exists between Russia and China——

Senator Kuchel. Yes, sir.

General LeMay. [Deleted.]

Another one is that if we can satisfy Mr. Khrushchev as to our nonaggressive designs, and we can get him to pull back into the Soviet Union and concentrate a greater number of his resources on consumer goods, on his agricultural program, and things of that sort, rather than going off on excursions to further communism worldwide, this would be a political advantage.

Those are the two main things, that I would attach the most importance to.

Perhaps the others would recall others.

General Wheeler. I certainly agree with General LeMay so far as he has gone [deleted]. I would go a step further in merely calling this political. It is politico-military.

I think this matter of tensions is important. If a reduction in tensions can be achieved—although I would certainly argue whether weapons cause tensions or tensions cause weapons—perhaps we will have an opportunity to deal with some of the very sticky problems such as Berlin, Cuba, and others which plague us.

The matter of proliferation has been put forward as being a military advantage. I would certainly say this: If we can restrict the proliferation of nuclear weapons, this is a military advantage as well as a political advantage.

Now, I certainly do not have any idea, gentlemen, that the Chinese Communists or the French are going to be deterred in any degree in moving forward to become nuclear powers. However, I think Mr. Khrushchev is right when he points out that their capability is negligible, will be negligible for any foreseeable future that many affect us.

Certainly the smaller the nuclear club the better, particularly if you can keep these weapons out of the hands of more irresponsible and perhaps more adventurous nations. I would characterize these items as being military advantages as well as political advantages if they can be achieved, Senator.

Admiral McDonald. I believe it has been pointed out that we all place different emphasis on various things even though we all came to the same final conclusion.

While I agree with General Wheeler that some of these things are normally considered political by some people, they really have great military advantages. I think perhaps we might have some other military advantages, too, purely technical military advantages.

It is generally accepted, I think, that we are ahead in our underground testing techniques. In that connection, General LeMay says that we aren't sure the Soviets didn't conduct a rather thorough underground program. The fact remains, however, that some of our scientists have said the knowledge which we do have of the status of Soviet [deleted] weapons leads us to believe that [deleted] would have been much more efficient. That is one reason we think we are ahead in underground testing.

We are both permitted to conduct rather unlimited, really unlimited, underground tests under the treaty. I believe we can use this additional knowledge that we already have to great advantage provided we don't agree that there is an end of progress in sight.

Once again, I agree with General LeMay, I am not sure there is an end, and if we are way ahead of them in underground testing

I am not sure they will ever catch up, at least we will have a few years to watch them.

Senator **Kuchel**. Is it not reasonable to assume, however, that scientific brains on both sides of the Iron Curtain and with two conflicting forces using those scientific brains, that the one that is behind is going to have a tendency to catch up and the one that is behind in one particular field where atmospheric testing is important is going to be restricted in going ahead with that?

Admiral **McDonald**. I think the tendency is for the gap to be closed; yes, sir.

Senator **Kuchel**. It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, and then I am through, that General LeMay's point of view reflecting those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in recommending this treaty, is on the basis of hope for the best but prepare for the worst. With the specifications they suggest which unquestionably, I feel, will be carried on, the risks that you outline in your judgment would be held at what you would call an acceptable minimum.

Thank you, sir.

DOES TREATY LIMIT U.S. RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE?

Senator **Kuchel**. First, sir, I was very deeply moved by a remarkable presentation of your viewpoint, because you have enriched this country by your citizenship, and you have added to the sinews of strength of this Nation to maintain its freedom. All I can say is that I was quite honored to listen to you this morning. The points you raised which are complex, difficult for a layman to understand, simply add to the burden that a hundred Senators are going to have.

First, I want to point out, however, that in one comment you made: in your judgment this treaty is something more than a test ban; in your judgment, sir, this treaty would restrict or tend to interdict the use of America's nuclear arsenal in time of war.

On that point I begin to feel somewhat qualified to disagree for until this morning, and I observe parenthetically I have had an opportunity to speak with you and to enjoy and try to listen and to absorb your thinking on that point, none who has come here thus far has hesitated for a moment in stating that this is a test ban in three environments, period.

And I sincerely believe if the Senate were to approve the treaty it would be on a full and complete understanding that the American Government would take the position that this proposal now before us is a proposal to prohibit the testing of nuclear explosions in three environments. It would not prevent the man in the White House, whoever he would be, to act as Commander in Chief in the defense of our country or in the fulfillment of our collective security commitments in determining what part of our defensive arsenal should be used for that purpose.

But since you have raised it, I think the question should be made abundantly clear and it should be answered unequivocally.

DIFFERENT OPINIONS AMONG SCIENTISTS

Dr. Teller, in the group of uniquely skilled and qualified nuclear physicists in our country, it is true, is it not, that there are divergencies of view from those you have expressed this morning?

Dr. **Teller**. There certainly are.

Senator **Kuchel**. So that for a common layman the difficulties which face them when they become Senators, in this instance, are dreadful.

EFFECTIVENESS OF POLARIS SYSTEM

I try to find some things that I can tie to in making up my own mind, which I have not done so far. At any rate in the technical arguments you raised this morning which are powerful and pointed, would those arguments apply to such defensive systems as the Polaris defensive systems?

In other words, you have suggested that the treaty would restrict our creation of an ABM system, and that it might damage, if not destroy, our capacity to retaliate. Is it your statement that it might damage and destroy the capacity to retaliate now possessed by the Polaris system or simply to the hardened missile sites which you described and to those other segments of our defense?

Dr. **Teller**. I could answer this question very much better in executive session.

Senator **Kuchel**. Then I would like to have you do that this afternoon.

Dr. **Teller**. I would like to say that I believe—this much I can say in open session—that by expanding and perfecting our Polaris system, we could ameliorate the situation. This is one phase of the general situation where—to which I have referred when I said it, that this treaty might still be compatible with our safety, if we make up in money what we haven't acquired in knowledge, and that in this sense it is a step toward the arms race rather than away from it.

SCOPE OF TREATY QUESTIONED

I would also like to say with respect to your remarks something that is an appeal rather than a statement, and I would like to preface it by telling you of an occurrence which deeply disturbed me, which occurred actually the day after I saw you.

I met with Mr. Foster from the Disarmament Agency, and I mentioned to him my worries about our using these instruments in case of real need, invasion of India or something of that kind. He assured me that it is clearly understood between the Soviet Union and ourselves that in case of war these things do not apply.

Then privately, as we were walking out to the elevator I asked him, well, if this is so, would it not be good for the sake of clarity, to spell this out in the treaty as a reservation or something?

He said, "The Soviets would never agree to that."

(The following supplemental information was subsequently furnished:)

U.S. Arms Control and
Disarmament Agency,
Washington, August 22, 1963.

Hon. J. W. **Fulbright**,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In the course of his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee on August 20, 1963, Dr. Teller, in suggesting that the test ban treaty should have contained language clarifying the fact that it does not restrict the use of our nuclear arsenal in time of war, alluded as follows to a recent conversation he had with me:

"I met with Mr. Foster from the Disarmament Agency, and I mentioned to him my worries about our using these instruments in case of real need, invasion of India or something of that kind. He assured me that it is clearly understood between the Soviet Union and ourselves that in case of war these things do not apply.

"Then, privately, as we were walking out to the elevator I asked him, 'Well, if this is so * * * would it not be good for the sake of clarity, to spell this out in the treaty as a reservation or something?'

"He said, 'The Soviets would never agree to that' " (transcript, p. 766).

I would like to make the record clear as to what I meant by this casual remark.

First, since it was clear to me that the Soviets understood the treaty in the same way that we did (as I had just told Dr. Teller), I was convinced that they would not agree that any clarification was needed. Much of the evidence on which I based this conclusion is set forth in the opinion of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, dated August 14, 1963, entitled "Meaning of the Words 'Or Any Other Nuclear Explosion' appearing in article I, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Underwater."

Second, since the treaty had already been initialed and signed by the three original parties, and, at the urgent invitation of the Soviets as well as ourselves, by a large number of other nations, it seems clear to me that the Soviets would not agree to reopen the negotiations, require resignature or reconsideration by all of such parties, and defer the date on which the treaty can become effective, merely for the purpose of adding more words to clarify an intention which they did not consider required any clarification.

Third, my experience in negotiating with the Soviets over the years had convinced me that they would oppose legalistic qualifications in the treaty language which were not absolutely necessary, because of their belief that such qualifications would tend to reduce the directness of the appeal of the treaty to the mass audiences on which they would like it to have an impact.

Sincerely yours,
William C. Foster.

Dr. **Teller**. I should say that those of us who are trying to testify from different points of view about technical subjects should try to make things on the technical side as clear to you as possible, so that you should not make your decision under the authority of so and so, but on the basis of the objective evidence that you culled from our partly contradictory testimony.

I would be much happier if a similar attempt would be made in the legal field because in this legal question I am utterly confused. We don't mean it but we must say it. I don't see why.

Senator **Kuchel**. The only document or writing which bears on the intent of the parties, if we try to analyze the legal aspects of this compact, was the agreed-upon communique which was issued at the time the treaty was initialed. It appears to me that the whole essence of that agreed-upon communique was to restrict the area of the agreement to nuclear testing in the environments mentioned.

But I must say, as I have listened here these last 7, 8 days, there are questions of the intent of the parties in other fields that require additional testimony. However, I say with profound respect, that I would disagree with you on that point in your statement.

VIOLATION OF TELLER PROPOSAL POSSIBLE

Dr. Teller, in the Teller-Libby proposal for a test ban of several years ago, would there have been any possibility for a clandestine breach by the Soviet Union of your proposal without the United States discovering the breach?

Dr. **Teller**. I think the answer is "Yes." But I do not think that this probability would be at all great.

Let me tell you what kind of a breach could occur, and this example in itself might tell you the quality of my confidence in this treaty.

This treaty might—should—prohibit a test in the atmosphere, in the ocean, and the Russians could send a ship to the South Atlantic, launch a big explosion from there, which makes a sizable contribution to this megaton fission product, and then say it was the United States.

We would know about it. In this sense they may cheat. Or they might say it was the French. Wherever there is a treaty there is at least some chance of a breach, but I don't think that this breach would be so much a clandestine breach. It would be sort of a brazen breach.

Senator **Kuchel**. Insidious.

PROBLEMS OF ABM DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT TESTING

President Kennedy, in his news conference several days ago, indicated that those upon whom he was relying rather felt that the problems of developing a missile defense were almost insurmountable.

This Congress, if I recall, has appropriated about half a million dollars to commence the studies. I asked the Secretary, Secretary McNamara, and Chairman Seaborg if we were proceeding under that appropriation and they both said, "Of course, yes"; which I assume would be completely correct.

Your statement is that we can proceed toward the development of a missile defense system but that, in your opinion, in the absence of testing in the atmosphere you would be unable to guarantee the efficiency of such a system.

Dr. TELLER. That is right, and furthermore, in the absence of such experimentation statements like that of the President could be more easily made and could have more easily an effect.

EISENHOWER MORATORIUM

Senator KUCHEL. We are all Americans. I thrilled to General Eisenhower's statements as I did to President Kennedy's address at his inauguration. All of us in this country seek peace with justice. All of us, I think, have hoped over these last many years that we might be able to inch ahead in prohibiting or in restricting and confining the development of these horrible weapons of destruction.

We prayed that time would be on our side. President Eisenhower's unilateral decision for a moratorium across the board, I think most of us in this room, as laymen and as people seeking peace, felt was right.

I know you, sir, felt that from the standpoint of the security of our country, that decision was wrong. Nevertheless, we were astounded when the Soviet Union first accepted it on its own and then broke it.

TELLER RECOMMENDATIONS ON ARMS CONTROL

One question: How would you as an American citizen suggest to your Government that the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, be controlled and be made to subside and how would you recommend that proliferation be prohibited?

Dr. TELLER. I would recommend three measures. One I have already mentioned to you—the proposal of Libby and myself.

The second goes more closely to the heart of the matter. Arms limitations are not possible unless there is openness. What is the real preventive of any arms limitation is secrecy.

Senator KUCHEL. Is what?

Dr. TELLER. Secrecy, the enormous weight of Soviet secrecy. This is what we have to fight.

Now, we can do something to fight it. We have secrets, too. The Russians know all our secrets, I believe, all our important secrets. Sometimes I fear that the Russians know all the secrets we are going to discover in the next 2 years. But we don't tell it to our people. We don't tell it to our allies, and by having some secrecy we have a harder time to convince the Russians, individual Russian scientists and Russian people, some of whom don't like secrecy either. We should try to convince them that this is the heart of the matter. Here is another thing where unilateral action could do a lot of good.

Abandon as much of secrecy, particularly technological secrecy as possible. Nobody needs to know where our Polaris submarines are going, that is proper, that is operations. But technological secrecy only leads to confusion, and is not in agreement with the basic institutions of the United States.

The third thing that I recommend is that we strengthen the ties within the Atlantic Community, strengthen them to the point where we can feel that we can act as a unit, as a strong unit within which there are no secrets, and which can act in concert. The best deterrent to De Gaulle is if he does not need a nuclear explosive.

Senator KUCHEL. Thank you, sir.

* * * * *

Senator KUCHEL. Dr. Brown, your statement was very excellent. I find it very useful. As a scientist, you have a facility to express yourself in relatively understandable English although I must say that when you speak of the "fourth power," you lose me.

Dr. BROWN. That was an interpolation, sir.

CAN ABM SYSTEM BE DEVELOPED WITHOUT TESTS?

Senator KUCHEL. Yes, sir; Dr. Teller, in opposing ratification of the treaty, described it in his opinion as a step toward war.

Generally speaking, in his opinion, the treaty would restrict or prevent the development of an operational ABM system, and it would undermine the credibility of our retaliatory capability.

Do you agree with that or disagree?

Dr. BROWN. I disagree, Senator KUCHEL. I have known Edward Teller for a dozen years. I have been not only a close professional associate but he has been a dear personal friend of mine. I have had, and do have, the greatest respect for him, and I have had, and do have, a deep personal affection for him.

On this matter we disagree. He thinks I am wrong. I obviously think he is wrong.

Senator KUCHEL. Would it be your testimony that it is not necessary in the construction or the fabrication or the manufacture of an antimissile defense system for atmospheric testing in order to provide a creditable defense system.

Dr. BROWN. I am not sure that an effective system can be provided at all, but if it can, the degradation by not being able to do atmospheric tests will be a small part of the problem—will be a small degradation.

In all of these meetings that I have mentioned in connection with Senator MANSFIELD's question, when the people who are working on ballistic-missile defense talk about the main problems, or the main new and exciting ideas, almost everything that they say has nothing to do with nuclear testing.

Senator LAUSCHE. Nothing to do with what?

Dr. BROWN. Nuclear testing at all, and of what does have to do with nuclear testing, only a fraction of it has to do with nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

Senator KUCHEL. So that in your judgment the restriction of the treaty would not crucially affect our capacity, whatever it may be, to develop an antimissile system?

Dr. BROWN. I would go further than that and say it would not seriously affect our capacity. I don't want to say that it is not useful information but it will not seriously hamper our development.

UNCERTAINTIES REDUCED AS RESULT OF HARD SITE TESTS

Senator KUCHEL. In your statement on page 3 you say, in part:

"The effects of surface bursts on hardened structures such as missile sites have been studied in the United States by means of several low-yield explosions."

Later on:

"Some uncertainty remains in our minds about the effects on hard sites. The Soviet Union appears to be in the same situation regarding the effects of surface bursts."

And then later on:

"The separation and numbers of our projected Minuteman force in addition to their hardening certainly provide adequate margin against these uncertainties as well as the uncertainty in the precise distance at which a given yield can destroy a site."

Again referring to the testimony of Dr. Teller yesterday he seriously questions the treaty specifically because in his judgment nuclear testing in the atmosphere is vital to the security interests with respect to this problem about which I have just quoted you.

When you describe the several low-yield explosions which we have undertaken to determine an effect on the hardened missile sites now in an operational status, are your conclusions that they are in a satisfactory security status—again in derogation or in opposition of what Dr. Teller's position is?

Dr. BROWN. I think that here we may not be in opposition so much on the facts but perhaps on the conclusions. I believe that our past tests have reduced uncertainties in how close an incoming missile has to land in order to knock out our base by a substantial amount. Some uncertainty remains.

On the other hand we know if they hit close enough they are going to destroy our hardened bases; that is why we have separated them and that is why we have hardened them and that is why we have so many of them.

The uncertainties in the accuracy and the uncertainties in the yield of the Soviet attack that might be launched in 1970 have had to be compensated by these various measures.

These same measures automatically compensate for the remaining uncertainty, in the vulnerability of our sites.

For example, supposing that our sites aren't as hard as we say, as we think—although the Soviets, if they have any sense, will asume them to be even harder than that in their targeting—it might be that if they could only withstand one-fifth or one-sixth or one-tenth the shock, a missile could land twice as far away and still knock out the missile system. But we have separated them enough and can separate them still farther so that they can't knock out many at once.

Senator KUCHEL. You use the words "low yield" in describing the explosions that were made.

HIGH-YIELD TESTS WOULD HAVE REDUCED UNCERTAINTIES

Would it have been better to have any additional tests of high yield?

Dr. BROWN. Yes; I believe that the uncertainties could have been reduced still further by high-yield tests, and some of the projected tests that we could do would be high-yield tests; these would be so high—in order to do any good beyond what we now know, that they would certainly be detectable if the Russians did them. We have not and we know that the Soviets have not, done much high-yield tests near the ground.

Senator KUCHEL. Is it important whether it is near the ground or not near the ground?

Dr. BROWN. Oh, yes, if you are going to find the effect on a hardened missile site on the earth shock you have to do the test near the ground.

Senator KUCHEL. Then your statement on the Soviet history in this field is based upon your intelligence reports?

Dr. BROWN. Yes.

HIGH-YIELD EXPLOSIONS—DIFFICULT TO PREPARE SAFELY

Senator KUCHEL. I wonder why we didn't have any high-yield explosions close to the ground in our last testing?

Dr. BROWN. Well, in the first place, we had some before, but as has been pointed out, that was a time when we didn't have hard sites to test them on.

It turns out that in order to do a decent hard-site vulnerability test you need to do it in the same kind of ground as your missile sites, and the area in the Pacific that was available to us isn't that kind.

In the second place, carrying them out close to the ground produces large amounts of local fallout, and can, therefore, be fairly dangerous to the inhabitants in the vicinity. In order to get ready for something like that would take quite a long time.

Senator Kuchel. Dr. Brown, I don't think we are going to have any disagreement on this statement by anyone here at the table or by you or anyone seated here.

WEAPONS—FOR DEFENSE ONLY

The goal, the basic goal, of the United States is the security of the people of the United States in a world at peace with justice. That is what our leaders have said, that is what I am sure we believe. We are a peaceful people.

We maintain a defense, we maintain a nuclear arsenal, not for purposes of aggression but for purposes of potential defense. We oppose proliferation of nuclear nations even by statute in one instance.

You say at the conclusion of your paper:

"The limited effect of the treaty on our strategic superiority means that the benefits to our security in the broader sense will not be outweighed by military technological factors. Having satisfied myself as completely as humanly possible that the proposed treaty cannot substantially impair our strategic superiority if we take the steps outlined, I find the arguments for it on broader grounds persuasive, and I fully support its ratification."

Now forgetting all the technical aspects of your paper and the disagreements which exist between scientists who appear here and testify for it and against it, will you tell this committee as an American citizen, why you believe this treaty ought to be approved by the U.S. Senate on broad grounds?

Dr. Brown. I should point out that in doing so, I speak——

Senator Kuchel. For yourself.

Dr. Brown. Not as a broad expert, not as an expert on the broad picture, although I have been involved in this now for 5 years, very deeply. I come to it with whatever biases a technical person automatically has, and I have that view of things.

ARMS LIMITATION TREATY—ONE STEP TO SECURITY

The arms race has not provided anyone with permanent security. Arms limitation will not automatically provide anyone with permanent security. But I believe that we must pursue both our own military strength and whatever we can achieve in the way of enforcible arms limitation agreements.

Otherwise the hopes, I am quite sure the hopes of many people that somehow we will be able technologically to invent ourselves out of the arms race are not going to succeed.

Senator Kuchel. Do you regard this as an arms limitation treaty in any respect?

Dr. Brown. It does limit arms development. It does not reduce armaments but it does reduce arms development. I believe that unless we get some kind of arms limitation as well as maintaining our own military capability the next 10 years are going to see further degradation in everyone's security as other nations obtain nuclear weapons, less responsible ones than have them now. I think that will make everyone less secure.

I don't say this treaty is going to solve that or produce the millenium but I think in the absence of this treaty, which has represented the first step, no one can go on to anything else.

I think that we, having taken this first step, have to consider other arms limitation possibilities, reject them if they are not in our security interests. I believe in only that way can we do something to keep our security from getting worse.

I don't think this is a panacea, but having satisfied myself that it is not going substantially to reduce our strategic superiority, if we do everything that also we can and should do, I believe that the treaty should be approved for these broader reasons.

RISKS—BUT NOT SUBSTANTIAL

Senator Kuchel. You do not believe that it constitutes a risk to American security?

Dr. Brown. I believe that there are risks in the treaty. I think if the Soviets cheat as much as they can, and then make a surprise test, even if we are as ready as we can be, that they will make certain gains.

I don't consider them to be substantial.

Senator Sparkman. Senator, your time is up.

Senator Kuchel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. LIBBY'S POSITION ON MORATORIUM DURING AEC CHAIRMANSHIP

Senator Kuchel. Dr. Libby, first the committee is honored to listen to you, and I certainly have enjoyed listening to your answers.

Did you participate, Dr. Libby, in the discussions that I assume took place before General Eisenhower announced his unilateral moratorium?

Dr. Libby. Yes, I was on the Commission, Senator.

Senator Kuchel. Did you recommend such a moratorium by General Eisenhower?

Dr. Libby. Well, we had many, many discussions and I think it is fair to say that the Commission was worried about this but went along with it. I should remind you that the Commissioners are not individually in the Presidential confidence. It is usually managed through the Chairman.

Senator Kuchel. Did you make your own views known, Doctor?

Dr. Libby. My own views were not in any essential disagreement with the action which the President took.

SUPPORT IN PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S DECISION FOR MORATORIUM

Senator Kuchel. Would it be fair then to say that you supported the President, President Eisenhower's decision?

Dr. Libby. I was worried but went along, shall we say.

This is a feeling that, well, we can detect and we can be prepared. This latter point was a source of some disappointment to me. It does prove rather difficult to keep the laboratories right on instant notice or coming out with meaningful or very important new things to do, you know, without the scientists knowing that they could carry them forward, and the things they had on tap were useful, but I think there is no doubt that the significance of the Soviet series, as they undertook it in 1961 far outshadowed the significance of our testing in 1961. We were caught off base, to put it bluntly.

Senator Kuchel. It is fair to say you did approve President Eisenhower's decision on the moratorium, but——

Dr. Libby. Went along with it.

Senator Kuchel. But you were worried about it. Is that about your position on this treaty that you approve it, but you are worried about it?

Dr. Libby. That is it more or less. You see when you consider everything, not just the technical aspects, it is more or less a worried reluctant acquiescence, I would say would be the best way to describe it.

DISTINCTION IN CONDITIONS UNDER MORATORIUM AND TREATY

Senator Kuchel. Is it fair for this committee and for the Senate to make this distinction between the situation under the moratorium and this proposed treaty, to wit: That under the moratorium there was no testing as you have just suggested, but under this treaty there is underground testing so that the stable of scientific brains can remain active under this treaty whereas it could not under the moratorium, is that a fair statement?

Dr. Libby. I certainly agree with that. It seems to me there are enough opportunities for testing out things in principle, and I would point out, Senator Kuchel, that by and large Los Alamos and Livermore are not what you would call effects laboratories.

They do effects, but by and large they are after the principle of the explosion and how the thing works, and so except for this all-important area of the—this very important area in my mind—of the very large weapon they can carry this forward.

Now, they can be in good scientific fettle and have good ideas and plans on the basis of this, I believe.

DETONATION OF 65 MEGATON ENABLES DEVELOPMENT OF 100 MEGATON

Senator Kuchel. Now, Doctor, do we know whether the Soviet Union detonated a hundred-megaton device?

Dr. Libby. Well, I think we are sure they did not, and that the one they shot was somewhere around 65, I forget the exact announced number.

Senator Kuchel. Is it feasible for a nation in testing a 65-megaton bomb automatically to construct a 100-megaton bomb?

Dr. Libby. Yes, sir.

Senator Kuchel. Is it feasible for this country to construct a 100-megaton bomb on the basis of the tests that we have had?

Dr. Libby. I do not believe so. The extrapolation is too great.

DIVERGENCE OF VIEWS PRESENTED

Senator Kuchel. Now, you suggest, Dr. Libby, in your statement, "to your fullest satisfaction the facts as presently known on the point of whether the possession of this weapon"—referring to the 100-megaton bomb—"is a commanding advantage to the Soviet."

I read into the problem for these Senators two basic issues, among others: One is the security of the American people, and two, it is the prayer of the American people, and the people of the world, for world peace.

There isn't a nuclear physicist in the bunch here, and in spite of some of the comments occasionally, I doubt that there are any military experts in the U.S. Senate. There are some political experts, my friend from Nebraska suggests; I think that is probably true.

So in order to make our decision we call the scientific experts; you are one of them. We call the military experts. We call the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Every one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommends that this treaty be adopted providing we do certain things on our part.

In the scientific community, with very great regret I observe that there is a cleavage. Later on today we are going to have a very able American, one of your friends, and coworkers, Admiral Strauss, who will oppose the treaty; a very great scientist, Dr. Teller, at great length and with great eloquence, opposed it.

We have others yesterday who approved it.

Now, let me put my tattered senatorial toga over your shoulders for a moment. [Laughter.]

Senator Gore. That is dangerous.

Senator Kuchel. Well, just on a temporary basis. [Laughter.]

How would you make a decision when some scientists urge that we approve this, that others with equal and no greater patriotism urge we disapprove it, when the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff approve it, and when other renowned military leaders now on active duty disapprove it?

Dr. Libby. Well, Senator, it seems to me you have no choice but to make up your own mind by careful investigation. [Laughter.]

Senator Kuchel. You give me my toga back. [Laughter.]

This committee, I am going to say, is going to make up its own mind.

Senator Hickenlooper. If the Senator will yield to me.

Senator Kuchel. I yield to my senior colleague.

Senator Hickenlooper. May I call his attention to the philosophy stated by one Senator a few years ago? He said, "Some of my friends are for it, some of my friends are against it, and I always stay with my friends."

QUESTION OF ADVISABILITY OF ATTACHING A RESERVATION

Senator Kuchel. Doctor, what the Senate can do with this treaty, I take it, is approve it, ratify it, advise, and consent. It can disapprove it or, I suppose, some Members of the Senate may offer, what I think may be the correct legal term, reservations by way of amendment which, of course, would destroy the meeting of the minds which did take place in Moscow.

TACIT UNDERSTANDING REGARDING PEACFUL USES

You suggest in your second paragraph of observation that some tacit understanding ought to exist with respect to the possible peaceful uses of nuclear energy. You do not suggest that the Senate write in any kind of an amendment, do you, Doctor, in considering this treaty?

Dr. Libby. Well, I am a little bit—I am poorly informed as to what kind of conversation went on in this treaty. I know, because I was on the AEC when negotiations first started in 1958, that the original delegations were instructed to make clear to the Soviets that Plowshare was a very important thing, and it was our concern to be sure that we could go forward with this kind of activity.

So it is more or less in that context that I suggest that insofar as you can, and agree that you should, or conclude that you should, you should make it very clear that if, for example, a Panama canal should be—we should dig one with atomic explosives, that some clear answer or some precedent for the conversation will be on record.

Senator Kuchel. By that, I take it you mean that, in the discussion in the Senate?

Dr. Libby. That is right, sir.

Senator Kuchel. Some time ought to be given to the hopes or the aspirations that if the treaty were approved peaceful uses requiring detonation in space might subsequently be negotiated into an agreement?

Dr. Libby. For example, I am not a lawyer, but I can well see the difficulty of carrying out the treaty literally where you say the, let's see, an atmospheric test is one that gives radioactivity beyond the boundaries. Well, this takes some defining technically.

You know we can detect very minute amounts if we want to be fussy about it. So I think this is going to be a technical question, a practical question of your judgment in any case and it might be that in the administrative handling of the practical problem there would be an opportunity to come up with a workable Plowshare definition, you see.

This is the kind of thing which might save Plowshare.

The Chairman. The Senator's time is up.

Senator Kuchel. Does that include the time I yielded to Senator Hickenlooper?

The Chairman. I will give the Senator a half minute.

Senator Hickenlooper. I yield it back to you.

The Chairman. The Senator can have a half minute.

Senator Kuchel. I think, Doctor, your third point is very well taken. I can understand it. I think it, however, is answered, that is to say from the President down the caveats of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which you reflect are going to be met, at least that is what they tell us, and we must rely on that, and to that extent do you not agree that your point 3 is made and satisfactorily answered?

Dr. Libby. I would think so, yes.

Senator Kuchel. Thank you.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I compliment the Senator on his very thoughtful speech. I need not tell him that I approve of his analysis of the present situation. I should like to ask him one or two questions. He recounted the history of the test ban treaty, going back to Mr. Baruch's proposal, which was in a sense an effort to control the development of nuclear weapons, on down through the Eisenhower proposal. This is essentially an American proposal, is it not; it originated with the American Government, not with the Soviet Government?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct. From the very first, when American scientists first made the discovery, our Government has been intensely interested in having it devoted to peaceful purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They were also intensely interested in trying to control the proliferation, the danger of fallout, and the actual use in warfare. That was the original Baruch proposal, as I believe it was called. It had various forms; but it was an effort to restrain the development. We are not in the position of acceding to a request of the Russians. We have put forth a proposal. If there is anything to that argument, after many rejections and after the modifications with regard to underground testing, the Russians are acceding to our proposal. Is that not true?

Mr. KUCHEL. Again the Senator is correct. As an American, I would be embittered if, at any point in the past many years since nuclear power came upon the earth, our Government had failed in trying to formulate find the point at which an agreement could be reached in this field.

Therefore, both under Eisenhower and under Kennedy I have approved the position of my Government, as the Senator has, in painstaking negotiation and in trying to formulate such an agreement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it is our proposal, are we in a position to demand a price for the other parties to join the proposal?

Mr. KUCHEL. Not at all. In my judgment any attempt to exact such a price would be exceedingly regrettable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any business transaction, if a person makes an offer, and is the moving party, that person is in no position to demand any additional favors, is he?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct. Equally important, however, is this point: I listened to the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, including that of the men who wear our American military uniforms, the top military personnel, whose responsibility it is to defend this country. All of them approved the treaty, as did the great majority of the other witnesses who appeared before the committee—witnesses representing both the Government and private individuals, and scientists. On that basis I say to the Senator that to demand any additional price in order to have the treaty approved would result in weakening the votes that I trust it will receive when the roll is called on it. To do so would be a disservice, in my judgment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's comment. From a historical point of view, President Eisenhower offered a proposal solely with regard to atmospheric testing, I believe. Later we got into the other elements, and I believe at one point there was a proposal, which the Russians rejected, merely to stop testing in the atmosphere. We also engaged in long-drawn-out discussions on underground testing. However, we could never agree on inspections for underground testing. Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes; that is my understanding of the situation. I quoted from President Eisenhower's statement, in which, early in his tenure, he specifically asked the Soviet Union to agree to prohibit tests not only in the atmosphere, but also under oceans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentioned the fact that West Germany would never have acceded to the treaty if there had been any question of recognition of East Germany. We have made it clear that we do not recognize East Germany. Does not the precise question confront the Soviet Union with regard to Taiwan?

Mr. KUCHEL. Of course it does.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Taiwan accedes to the treaty. The Russians have clearly stated that that does not mean recognition of Taiwan. Therefore we have a case involving similar conditions. It ought to be reassuring to those who have any doubts about whether the treaty is a recognition of East Germany. I have no doubt, and I do not believe anyone should have. The Secretary of State dealt at great length with the point that recognition is primarily a matter of intent. There are already in existence multilateral agreements to which both West Germany and East Germany have acceded, and none of them has ever been considered as recognition.

I compliment the Senator on his diligent attendance at the hearings. Although he is not a member of the committee, in view of his important position as assistant minority leader, I thought it incumbent upon me to invite him, and he responded and attended much more assiduously than some members of the committee. He followed the proceedings of the hearings very diligently.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The pending treaty is frequently referred to as a limited test ban treaty. Were not the proposals advanced by Messrs. Baruch and Stassen as representatives of the U.S. Government considerably more comprehensive than those contained in the pending treaty?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct. I recall reading some of the text of the deliberations when Governor Stassen, representing President Eisenhower, was in London, with members of the Atlantic Alliance, trying to arrive at a nuclear agreement. The Senator is correct. It was far less limited than the proposal before us.

Mr. GORE. Were not the proposals made in Geneva by Ambassador Wadsworth, representing former President Eisenhower, and by Ambassador Dean, representing President Kennedy, considerably more far reaching than what is contained in the pending treaty, the pending treaty being all that it appeared possible to accomplish at this time?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. The Senator, in colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, referred to the U.S. initiative in this field of understanding.

Is it not a fact that the existence of atomic weapons is a feat of accomplishment for which the United States can take pride, but for the creation of which she has some responsibility, too?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. The fact that our country took the lead in the creation of nuclear weapons, and later development of nuclear weapons, seems to me to place upon our country some burden of responsibility, if not for initiation, in reaching agreements to bring this awful might of destruction under control.

Mr. KUCHEL. In answer to that most intriguing statement, the Senator from Tennessee and I, and all other Americans, are grateful that these discoveries were first made by our fellow Americans in the free world; but intellectual power in this or any other field, as I tried to say in my speech, is not indigenous to one side of the Iron Curtain or the other. Those responsible for the government of the United States were appalled at the unbelievable might of the power which had been discovered, and to their everlasting credit have consistently taken the lead in trying to arrive at agreements by which the cloud which hangs over mankind by reason of those discoveries might be dissipated.

Mr. GORE. So this undertaking, as the junior Senator from Arkansas described it, is an American proposal; but it is, in addition, as purely nonpartisan in its historic development as it is possible to achieve.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. President Eisenhower sent distinguished representatives to Geneva. It was my privilege to be a delegate representing the U.S. Senate the day the conference convened on October 30, 1958.

I served again during the Kennedy administration in such a capacity. President Kennedy sent to Geneva not one of his own partisan political faith, but a distinguished lawyer having affiliation with the Republican Party, a former law partner of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Mr. Arthur Dean. I served with Mr. Dean. He served well. So in consonance with this responsibility devolving upon our country, because it brought into being fissionable weapons, three successive administrations and eminent members of both political parties have striven to bring into being an international agreement to bring this awful destructive power under international control. Now that this objective has been finally achieved, although in a very limited sense, the question is finally before the Senate.

I know that many persons raise questions about military risks. There are military risks in many of the decisions the Senate makes, such as when it votes upon an amendment to build an aircraft carrier. We take a military risk when the Government, and the Congress, by appropriation, decide whether to build 12 or 20 additional atomic submarines. There is a military risk involved in the decision as to whether we will have enough or not quite enough. There is an economic risk involved in whether we overspend ourselves or live within our means. So every day in this Chamber we live with risks of many sorts.

I believe there would be a greater risk in the rejection of the treaty than in the approval of the treaty. I doubt whether the treaty can be viewed solely from the narrow standpoint of military aspects or of scientific aspects. More than 90 nations have subscribed to the treaty. They are rapidly acceding to the treaty. It has become an international concert of great portent.

So there is at test the capacity and the will of the United States to initiate and sustain international leadership in a delicate field, but a very important field, in which it has been the leader both in the creation of the problem and in the search for a solution of the problem. The last act now is for the U.S. Senate, and the test is before this body.

I shall join the senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the able Senator from Tennessee. Every Member of this body, no matter how he casts his vote, is thinking about his country and will cast his vote as he sees the light. I hope and pray that when the roll is called the U.S. Senate, by an overwhelming vote, will approve the treaty.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the distinguished Senator from California for the thoughtful, concise analysis he has made of this problem. Speaking Senatewise, he has succinctly stated the essential arguments in favor of the ratification of the treaty. He has done so carefully and eloquently, and has again performed a notable service.

I was impressed with the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the senior Senator from California, with his manifold other duties, had attended most of the hearings, although he is not a member of the committee. That is most commendable and helpful to us who did not have the benefit of hearing the testimony as members of the committee. I believe there has been no statement in support of the treaty which has been more compelling or persuasive than that so ably presented today by the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am most grateful to my able friend from New York for his kindness.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I apologize to the Senate for delaying until now to make them.

I, too, commend the able Senator from California for his eloquent presentation of his views. While I find myself in disagreement with him, I have respect for the processes through which he reached his conclusion.

Mr. President, on Monday of this week the Senate began the debate on the proposed partial nuclear test ban treaty. The idea, I had assumed, would be to lay before this body and before the American people all of the facts, to weigh them, deliberate them, debate them, and prepare for one of the most fateful decisions the Senate ever has been called upon to make.

On the same day, the Preparedness Subcommittee presented an interim report based upon many months of hearings. On the same day it became apparent in the press of the Nation that the months of hearings would not be permitted to weigh heavily in this debate. In fact, it has become clear to anyone viewing this situation that the proponents feel that no argument against the treaty should be forwarded.

It has become obvious that debate is not the objective of the exercise in which we are engaged. For every point of debate, for every argument, for every doubt, the answer is that we must look but not touch; we must consent, but not advise; we must approve, but not revise. Those who would exercise their responsibility as Members of the Senate and who seek debate on, and possible adoption of, reservations or amendments to the treaty are called irresponsible. Is that an invitation to debate?

The same ones who speak of irresponsibility admit the risks of the treaty, but deny the right of the Senate to guard against those risks in its own way and through its own powers. How responsible is that position?

How responsible is it to question the devotion to duty, to country, and to the families of America of any Senator who seeks in the Senate to question, to advise, or to suggest changes in the treaty? If there can be no changes, if there is no possibility of a vote other than one of approval, what would be the meaning of debate? Would debate even be needed?

Any appeal to emotion, rather than to fact; any recourse to name-calling, rather than to truth seeking, does this body and its Members a disservice. Far worse, it does the cause of peace and freedom a disservice. It stifles freedom; and it makes discussion of peace an exclusive preserve, rather than an open forum.

If the Senate has no choice in this matter, if it has no chance to responsibly advise that changes be made, then it should have no role at all in foreign policy. To follow the dictates of those who want no advice, we might consider amending the Constitution so as to do away with the Senate's right and responsibility to advise and consent on treaties. That would merely formalize what we have heard every time we hear that we have no choice and that there can be no change. Choice and change are the essence of freedom. If the exercise of either is irresponsible, so is freedom.

What sort of atmosphere for debate in this body has been created?

When we raise doubts as to the long-range effects of the treaty, we are told that only its immediate impact must be considered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I prefer to finish my remarks; but I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me to say so, I respectfully state that he has made a serious indictment upon the Senate and upon the conduct of the debate. I have listened to a great deal of it, and have contributed in a small way to it. He has just said:

> When we raise doubts as to the long-range effects of the treaty, we are told that only its immediate impact must be considered.

I should like to ask who said that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator from Tennessee will allow me to conclude my remarks, I believe he will be able to figure that out.

Mr. GORE. I have read a copy of the Senator's statement, and the answer to that question is not in it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. During the course of the debate I held with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]—it was 2 weeks ago, I believe—we discussed the problem of the immediate impact and the long-range impact. In this speech, I do not confine my remarks to statements by Members of the Senate. I refer, for example, to Mr. Harriman's statement that by means of the reservation I proposed, I was trying to make a political issue of the pact. The statements to which I refer have been accumulated from many sources; not all of them necessarily come from Senators.

I am merely trying to set the stage for debate that will not be acrimonious. I know the Senator from Tennessee differs with me; and I differ with him; but I suggest that the Senator from California made an excellent statement when he said that we should arrive at our decisions honestly and on the basis of the exercise of our conscience; that we propose our reservations and make our suggestions honestly; that we do not wish to be called irresponsible, or to have our suggestions referred to as mischievous toyings with the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States. I do not believe the Senator from Tennessee would seek to accuse me of improper procedure.

Mr. GORE. I certainly do not. I recognize the right of every Senator to reach his own conclusions by whatever process he chooses. But I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that if he will carefully reconsider the statements he has made in the last few minutes, he will find in them a serious reflection, in my humble opinion, on the quality, the purpose, and the sincerity of the debate in the Senate.

I think the debate has been good and constructive. Yesterday, my 15-year-old son was present, to hear the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], who spoke so eloquently and so thoughtfully. Forty or fifty Senators listened carefully to his speech; and I was proud to have my son see the Senate in action. I thought it was a fine hour for the Senate.

I regret that now after 6 p.m., when the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona is speaking, most of the other Members of the Senate have gone to dinner—as I am sure both he and I would also like to do.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is not by my choice, I may say, that I speak at this hour. I have been waiting a long time to speak.

Mr. GORE. I realize that.

The debate has been diligent, and has been reasonably well attended. Yet the Senator from Arizona has said:

> If the Senate has no choice in this matter.

Why should the Senator from Arizona raise that question? The Senate does have a choice. That is the issue before the Senate; it is the subject on which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I feel very deeply about this matter. The other day I discussed it with the Senator from Minnesota. I said that if, in effect, we are to be knocked down because we do not agree, if we are to be referred to as irresponsible, as toying mischievously with the lives of the American people, such statements would indicate that any change would be resisted. So I merely wish to discuss this point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arizona may recall that both of us fully agreed that this matter requires debate, and that there should be debate on it. In my presentation on Tuesday, I made quite clear—under questioning by the distinguished Senator from Iowa—that, first of all, this is not partisan matter. I referred particularly to the then announced position of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen]; and prior to the delivery of his magnificent address, I commended him for his forthrightness, his courage, and his statesmanship, because I had heard and had read that after he and the majority leader had visited with the President, at the White House, the distinguished Senator from Illinois had announced his support of the treaty.

I also pointed out—under questioning by the Senator from Iowa, who had some doubts, and expressed concern that Senators who favor the treaty were attempting to stifle debate, or at least to make it appear that when questions were asked, a disservice was being performed—that the Constitution requires the advice and consent of the Senate; that the Senate is composed of 100 Senators; that under the constitutional process, each Senator has a political and a moral responsibility to make his or her decision according to his or her own conscience; and that that is the primary duty and the highest duty of a Senator.

Regardless of how a Senator may vote, certainly that duty is the highest duty a Senator can perform—namely, to make his own decision.

So I wish to make it crystal clear—and I know the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] feels this way, too—that debate on the treaty is not only desirable, it is also required under the constitutional requirement for Senate advice and consent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Minnesota and I agree completely.

I am trying to lead us away from charges of irresponsibility and of making a political issue out of the treaty.

I could not agree more that politics should not enter into this treaty. I do not know how it could be interjected if someone tried to figure out how to do so. I merely plead that, during the short presentation of my reservation, we continue in this way.

We raise doubts about the immediate military impact of the treaty, and we are told that only its long-range hope must be considered.

We are told to debate, and then we are told that the rest of the world already has decided for us and that we cannot risk offending them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot recall that any Senator has made a statement about offending them. I believe that I and others have stated that it would be a very great disappointment, which I believe is quite different from offense. It would be a great disappointment to the other members of the society of nations, not only the original parties but the others, if we rejected the treaty. But that is quite different from offense. I am not a bit concerned about offending those people. The word has a connotation of our being servile and afraid of them. That is not the point at all. If the Senator has reference to anything that I have said or heard, will not the Senator agree that Senators who are for the treaty are not for it because they do not wish to offend another nation? I do believe that statement to be accurate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has performed a great service. I have understood it in that way. If I have understood it in the way I have said it, I have understood it wrong. We were concerned about an offense that the treaty might bring to the other 90 nations that have signed the treaty. In the course of the complimentary remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] to the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], I heard reference to the 91 nations that have signed the treaty. Frankly, while we all have concern for all nations of the world, I do not think that, when the chips are really down, what we do or do not do with the treaty should be affected by what any of those nations might think about us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly not from the point of view of offending them. I think it is proper to observe that, since we, the most powerful Nation in the world, and the second most powerful, which, I suppose, would be Russia, are the principal parties, if we reject this effort it would be a disappointment. I do not think it would offend anyone in that sense. I am not afraid of giving offense. That would not disturb me at all in voting for the ratification of the treaty or not voting for it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for clearing up that point.

We suggest changes in the treaty and we are told that they are unnecessary because of agreements and assurances beyond the treaty.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator would allow me to finish, I would appreciate it. I have been waiting all day. I yield once more to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I shall desist. The Senator has said, if I understood him correctly, "We suggest changes in the treaty and we are told that they are unnecessary because of agreements and assurances beyond the treaty." In fact, during the hearings, time after time, Senators were told that there were no side agreements or additional agreements, and that the total of the agreement between the United States, Russia, and Great Britain on this subject was contained in the treaty. Who made the statement to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That was brought out in the early part of the testimony.

It was stated not once, but several times. We asked the witnesses what the next step would be, and that is the area in which the statements were made. Yesterday, I admit, the President reaffirmed what the Senator has said. Once before he did so. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], asked to see the letters and correspondence pursuant to the treaty. I do not know whether they were ever made available to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I apologize to him for intruding on his speech at this late hour. But feeling so strongly in disagreement with some of the statements that the able Senator has made, I did ask him to yield. I thank him for the courtesy of his doing so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the next sentence would have solidified the point.

We raise questions about implications beyond the wording of the treaty and we are told that everything is contained in the wording of the treaty, that no implications beyond it should be drawn.

We hear witnesses who spell out in great detail the military disadvantages and then we are told that the Secretary of Defense will turn the disadvantages to advantages.

We hear witnesses who warn of future diplomatic difficulties because of the treaty and then we are told that the Secretary of State and the President will turn those difficulties to assets.

We hear witnesses who warn of future steps along this path and we are told that we must think only of this first step.

The chairman of the committee will remember that I attended the hearings rather assiduously. The next step is the point about which I have most doubt in my mind. I know it could be any one of a number of things. I would think that during the course of the debate that would be a point which the Senator would wish to spell out very carefully. In discussing the treaty with Senators who agree with me on my stand on the treaty, I find that they agree that such points as principal political advantages have not been spelled out, at least to our satisfaction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may respond to that statement, in all good faith I do not believe anyone has affirmed that there will be a next step. It is hoped that there will be a next step. Our Government quite positively stated that we would not consider a nonaggression pact as a part of the treaty. Our representatives said, "That is out. If you insist on such a pact, we might as well stop now."

On the other hand, we do not take a position which would foreclose any further movement. We hope that as a result of a favorable experience under the treaty, and after some tangible evidence of performance by the parties to the treaty, then further steps would be possible, reasonable, and would be submitted to this body. The Senator surely would not want to take a position which would exclude any further steps.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Senator does not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sure he does not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But tonight the Senator from Georgia voiced the feelings of those of us who find ourselves in opposition to the treaty. He spoke not about the fear or the concern about disarmament. I think all of us want disarmament, but we wish to make sure that we are not the only ones disarming. I think the Senator right now has said what the Senator from Georgia was trying to elicit, namely, that any changes in the treaty would have to be approved by two-thirds of this body.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely. I am convinced of that. I am very dubious about those who speak of disarmament. That word is used much too loosely. The preamble of the treaty, as with many preambles, is a statement in rather fine language of aspirations. Such aspirations occur in many documents.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Such as the Constitution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As my friend the Senator from Minnesota has said, it is not a little unlike some of the expressions in our Constitution and Declaration of Independence. We are far from achieving some of those aspirations. We are struggling toward them. I do not think that that statement about disarmament is one which must be taken seriously and for the foreseeable future. It is merely a rather broad statement of a vague aspiration that we hope we could at least limit armaments. Personally I cannot imagine a world without any armaments at all.

That should not be taken in such a literal sense. I do not believe it is intended that way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the exchange I had about the preamble of the treaty a short quotation from Isaiah, as follows:

> And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

I think that is rather appropriate as to the preamble to the treaty, which was discussed earlier this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it might be well to place in the RECORD the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

> We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

That is a great statement of purpose, to which every article of the Constitution is dedicated, and to which yet unborn generations will have to dedicate their efforts for its ultimate fulfillment.

I believe preambles have a particular place in all great documents, primarily the place of challenging the future.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One of the reasons why I have an apprehension on this subject relates to the work of the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency. The Senator will recall my interrogation of Mr. Foster, which occurred probably in January or February of this year, in regard to the reported proposal that we should destroy 30 B-47's a year and that Russia would destroy 30 Badgers. Since, I have learned, the figure was to be 30 a month.

I wrote to Mr. Foster some time ago, probably in July. While he made no assertive statement, he said that was still under consideration.

This is the type of thing about which we have concern. So long as these things are being considered by the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency, it causes concern. We are all vitally interested in the military strength of our country. We are concerned because we realize that one of the ambitions expressed by the statement of September 26, 1961—I believe it was 1961—was the reduction of the number of vehicles capable of carrying nuclear weapons.

I explain this to the Senator so that he may understand our apprehension about this general field of disarmament. I must follow that immediately by saying that every American is interested in disarmament, so long as we are not the only nation engaging in it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. There happens to be a B-47 base at Little Rock, which is a rather large one. I have not followed the matter too closely, but I have read the newspapers. What they are doing is phasing out the B-47's and putting in the B-58's, which I believe are called the Hustlers. That to me does not mean disarming. By taking out the B-47's they are merely improving the striking capacity and quality of the weapons. I thought that was the reason why they might be destroying the B-47's. It is the same reason why they are getting rid of some of the old missiles which are now obsolete. I was told that the missiles were obsolete in Turkey and in Italy because the Polaris is the much better missile.

I never consider things like that disarmament. I say quite frankly to the Senator that I am not pleading for disarmament in this country, and certainly not for unilateral disarmament.

I would question, in the present state of the world, even whether multilateral disarmament is very wise.

The treaty is not a disarmament treaty. This will be merely a slowing down of the acceleration of the proliferation of weapons. It seems to me that is quite different from disarmament.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The B-47's will naturally be out of the inventory by 1968 or 1969. If we enter into any agreement such as that which has been proposed, the B-47's will be out of inventory by 1965 or 1966.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that not a matter of judgment to be made by the military people themselves, as to whether those are efficient instruments?

Mr. GOLDWATER. They are quite efficient, but they are old.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And slower.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Like many of us, they are wearing out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree. I thought the reason they were taking the planes out was that better ones were available.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We do have better ones, but we do not have enough of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is well known that the military has made some plans for phasing out the B-47's. The question is, do we wish to phase them out all alone, or would we like to get the Russians to phase out some comparable aircraft?

These are similar to the oversea bases. Everybody knows that we shall have to give up our bases in North Africa one day, or else it will be necessary to pay for them about 10 times. Do we wish to give up the bases all by ourselves, or would we like to negotiate with the Russians and have them give up some bases?

I am sure the Senator, who is a distinguished military officer in his own right, knows full well that since we are to phase out the B-47's it might not be a bad idea to try to get the Russians to phase out something, also. That seems to be sensible to me.

The point is that we are not phasing out our military strength. Our airpower today is more than it was a year ago. Our Polaris strength today is more than it was a year ago today. Our missile strength today is more than it was a year ago.

So all of the strawmen that are raised—as to the fact that we are engaging in some kind of a "sellout" on a unilateral basis of disarming—are plain strawmen, and are easily knocked over.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator wants to call them strawmen, I suggest that we get a denial from Mr. Foster that this is being contemplated. It does not involve the obsolete aircraft that are taken to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona and destroyed. This involves the removal of the B-47's which are operable. I should like to have some assurance in that regard.

I am not saying that the proponents of this plan are engaged in unilateral disarmament. I merely mention what bothers some of us who have studied this problem more from the military side than from the political side. We are concerned. I think the day is ahead when we shall not have enough bases overseas to put in our hat. That is entirely beside the point. That will be a natural phaseout. I do not wish to see a speedup of the phaseout, with no followon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we can get that phaseout along with getting the Russians to phaseout under some agreement, we would not alter the balance of power. If we can get 25 planes comparable to the B-47's phased out by the Soviet Union at the same time 25 B-47's are phased out in the United States—which were going to be phased out anyway, Russia or no Russia—it seems to me that would be sensible.

Interestingly enough, we are not doing that now. There was merely some thinking out loud. Apparently there is an unwritten law in this country that one should not think out loud. If the Pentagon or the Disarmament and Arms Control Agency expresses such a proposal publicly, it is suddenly attacked. If it is negotiated secretly, it is called a "secret deal."

Whenever we negotiate for any type of arms control, we negotiate only in an effort to improve our own position or to keep on an equal plane the balance-of-power structure as it now exists. For example, if we can get the Soviet Union to give up 5 intercontinental ballistic missiles—and if we could be sure that they gave them up, and we could inspect to find out that they gave them up—then we could give up 5 intercontinental ballistic missiles and possibly we would not alter the balance of power at all, yet it might help the world a bit. At least it would save a little money, and that ought to please some Members of this body.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is getting into the realm of the impossible now, because we have tried to do that.

The basis of most of our concern is military. I hope that during the debate—I intend to be present as often as I can—it will be possible to have developed the political advantages which seemingly overweigh the military advantages. I mention this field. I have been interested in it for nearly a year. I have not kept in constant touch, but in touch once in a while with the agency; and the plan still is under consideration. I for one do not agree with it. I do not think it would work to our advantage.

This is extraneous to the particular debate before the Senate, but it might be informational. If we depended upon the bomb bays in SAC for 75 percent of our nuclear striking force and we diminished that capability before we planned to under a natural phaseout of the weapon, I do not see that reducing our nuclear strategic striking capability would be of any great advantage to us. This is, as I say, beside the treaty entirely.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it is beside the treaty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator interjected it, and I merely wanted to get these remarks in so that we might refer to them some time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator will permit, I did not interject the B-47 issue; the Senator from Arizona interjected the B-47 issue. All I say is that the proposal was merely a proposal for discussion. It makes more sense than casting aside B-47's while letting the Russians keep theirs. If we are to cast aside the B-47's we should try to get the Russians to take similar action.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If they had a fleet comparable to ours in size, I think I might be in agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If they do not have a fleet which is so big, what are we worried about?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not worry about them so much. I am worried about us.

We suggest caution about this first step and we are warned that we must think only of the next steps.

We hear witnesses who speak of practical dangers and we are told of theoretical hopes. We question theoretical hopes and we are told that the treaty is all practicality, not based on trust.

We hear that the sheer numbers of our nuclear weapons outweigh any qualitative gains that the Soviets may make under the treaty and then we read that the Department of Defense is studying a cutback in our weapons procurement.

We hear that the dangers of radioactive fallout are the main thing guarded against by the treaty and then we read that smog is a far more serious peril, that testing could be quadrupled without danger.

We heard last year that maintenance of our readiness to test on an indefinite standby basis would be impossible. Now we hear that such readiness is guaranteed. What has changed?

I have listened to colleague after distinguished colleague warn of the treaty, question the treaty, worry over the treaty and then say "but we must vote for it." I have heard colleague after distinguished colleague say that the people demand this treaty and then report a flood of mail running heavily against the treaty.

I have read the constitutional requirement that the Senate advise and consent on treaties but what I have heard so far assures me that all that is wanted is consent. God knows we have been advising in such honorable hearings as that of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and God knows we have heard that advice accorded all the respect of a Sunday supplement mystery story.

It is obvious from the thousands of words of testimony and questioning that there are all of the doubts and reservations that I and others have mentioned on this floor, and it is obvious that these are sincere and reasoned.

And yet are we sincerely preparing to debate changes in the treaty that would help resolve the doubts? Instead, again, and again, and again we have only verbal assurances. And again, and again, and again even the idea of changes in the treaty have been derided as mischief or precluded as unnecessary, because of more and ever more verbal assurances.

It is because I have seen this body swamped by those assurances and increasingly committed to them—no matter the doubts, no matter the dangers, no matter the real will of the people—that I have suggested one reservation which would, at least, exact a price for this treaty that we are told we must ratify. We know of the price in preparedness that we are paying. We have asked no price of the Soviet.

The other day I discussed a reservation to the treaty. That is what brought up this whole thing, because I have been accused of various approaches on this.

The reservation that I have suggested, which would make the effectiveness of the treaty contingent upon the removal of the Soviet military presence in Cuba, would set a price. It would at least salvage something from the Senate's decision to accept this treaty regardless of doubt and danger.

I want to make this perfectly clear: It would not make the treaty one ounce more acceptable to me for I cannot accept it because of the peril in which it places our security over all the world. But such a reservation would return to the American people at least one portion of purpose and meaning. It would, at least, force this treaty to be weighed on a realistic balance, against a realistic testing of Soviet intentions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had understood his statement about the same matter, the nuclear test ban treaty, which the Senator made, as appears at page 16409 of the RECORD for September 5, to be as follows:

> A reservation embodying this needed demonstration of Soviet intent could make the treaty proposal perfectly acceptable even to its harshest critics.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may not be its harshest critic. I want to make it perfectly clear that, even if this condition were to be accepted—and I am not naive enough to think it will be—it would not make the treaty any more acceptable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was reading the speech anticipating the Senator's speech of today, and it struck me as being quite inconsistent with the Senator's position. I wondered what had caused the Senator to change his mind.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have not. I merely said "harshest critic." I am not the harshest critic.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is not a harsh critic, perhaps it will take something less to change his mind.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted to make it clear that if this were the point, making acceptance of the Senator's idea a part of the bargain, I think then the Senator could inject the charge of politics, and I do not care to do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What really interests me about the point the Senator is making on his proposed amendment is that it seems to me to be based on the assumption that if the Russians have come to us with a proposal and are begging us to take it, we can demand any kind of terms we like, or terms the Senator suggests, whereas it occurs to me, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from California, that this is an American proposal; we urged it in past administrations.

How are we in a position to ask for extraneous and additional concessions when it is our own proposal? Are we interested in it or not? It seems to me it is an irrelevant consideration. The only relevant consideration is, Is this particular treaty in our interest, as written? If it is not, we ought to reject it, even if Russia should get out of Cuba. If it is in our interest, we ought to accept it regardless of what is done in Cuba or anywhere else.

I do not see how the Senator thinks this is an appropriate reservation. When I say "appropriate," I mean wise. Of course, he is within his rights to offer it; but is it a wise reservation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think it is wise, for this reason: We have tried for a long time to get this kind of limited test ban treaty with the Russians, and suddenly there is evidence that she is desirous of having it. If this is so, and if the major purpose of the treaty is to ease world tensions, what would be better than erasing one of the greatest tensions in the world and forcing the world to recognize that the creator of the tensions is not the United States, but the Soviet Union? This is why I feel this reservation, and frankly, other reservations to this treaty are not unwise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In all honesty, I cannot follow that line of reasoning. If we refuse to ratify the treaty if they did not do something, we would be the ones accused of creating, or at least prolonging, tensions by refusing to go forward with our own proposal. I cannot help thinking that if we made such a condition, or any such unacceptable condition, a part of the treaty, it would provide the Russians with the greatest kind of propaganda against us. They would say, "The Americans made a proposal to us. We accepted it. Now they will not consider it."

I do not wish to prolong this debate; but would any kind of agreement with the Russians be acceptable to the Senator from Arizona—that is, a proposal in this field—other than one which would ask them to lay down and play dead and say, "I am sorry"? Would it be within reason? Or does he think the Russians are so bad that we should not attempt to do any business with them?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I think the treaty we worked at for so many years at Geneva—a complete test ban treaty with on-site inspections—was the answer to our problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator approve that?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona has said many times that he would. However, that discussion gets far afield from this evening's discussion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In just a moment. We find ourselves in a position of making a treaty that says, in effect, to our potential enemies that "We feel we are well ahead of anybody in nuclear tactical weapons, but we are going to let you continue to develop them underground, and we can develop them, too."

So, frankly, I do not see a promise of peace in this treaty. I see a proliferation of weapons. I am concerned about that particular point. Again, it is a military concern, and has nothing particularly to do with what I am saying tonight. I shall address myself, in a formal speech, more to these points.

The whole purpose of introducing this matter is to give the Russians an opportunity to do what they promised to do and to do what the President of the United States has demanded that they do on two occasions. We are merely testing them. This does not become an amendment to the treaty. It merely says, "We will withhold the date of depositing the resolution and do it later." We say, further, "You do this, and we will have proof by third party inspection."

It does not change the wording of the treaty; it merely puts in the resolution that it is the sense of the Senate, and the American people, that this treaty will not be put into effect until we have assurances that the Russians will comply with what she has already said she would do and what the President has asked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has acknowledged that the proposal now before the Senate in the nature of a test ban treaty was, in its original draft, a U.S. initiative and a U.S. proposal.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would suppose so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We initiated the proposal. We discussed this proposal with the Russians. Mr. Khrushchev, when he was speaking in East Berlin, said, "Yes; this is pretty good, but we want to be sure that it is tied in with a nonaggression pact."

We said, "No deals. No tie-in, Mr. Khrushchev. We will discuss this proposal. We will not discuss the rest of the world. We are discussing this proposal. No deals. No tie-ins."

Now we say, "We have discussed this proposal. We want to tie in. We want you to get out of Cuba."

I think they ought to get out of Cuba, and I do not think anybody ought to commit acts of aggression. If the Americans have been able to impress anything on the minds of the Russian people, it is that we do not believe in aggression anywhere. So it was rather difficult to say, "We will not discuss a nonaggression pact, except that nonaggression related to the recognition of certain satellite countries and the power of the Communist Party in those countries." But that does not mean we are for aggression. It means we are against aggression.

Having once taken the Russians into the woodshed, so to speak, we have said, "If you want to discuss a nuclear test ban treaty, here it is. We will negotiate it with you. But do not go into anything else and start a long talk about some side deals. Do not bring in a nonaggression pact that we would have to sign as a part of the test ban agreement."

We took that position. Now the Senator from Arizona says, "Maybe we were wrong. I think we were wrong in principle, because we really ought to have a tie-in. Let us tie in Cuba."

Khrushchev says, "Let us tie in a nonaggression pact."

The Senator from Arizona says, "Let us tie in Cuba."

We ought to try to tie the treaty down. We can tie the treaty down, and if there is a sense of honest performance of the treaty, then perhaps there will be some chance to negotiate the Cuba matter and to get these troops out.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I get back to my first contention. I am not accusing the Senator. However, there are certain difficulties in our situation which are not uncommon to legislative bodies of the world, because I believe most of them must ratify treaties. We are given the charge of advising and consenting. If the treaty, which was not negotiated by the Senate or by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, comes to us and we feel that it is not in our best interest, we have the right to reject it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If any one of us, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and other Senators have indicated, feels that there could be some improvement in it, I believe the Senator would admit that it would be our duty to ourselves and to the constitutional charge to try to bring about the improvement that we felt was needed.

I have read many of the debates on treaties. There has been prolonged and intelligent debate on some of them. The Treaty of Versailles got into trouble. Perhaps that was well. Who can tell? The League of Nations got into trouble because of reservations that Senators proposed. The Connally reservation on the World Court has been debated at length as to whether it was wise or unwise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was not a treaty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely suggest that this is a negotiating point. I am going to offer the reservation. As I said earlier, I do not believe it has any more chance of succeeding than an ice cream cone has on the corner of Washington and Central in Phoenix, Ariz., on the 4th of July.

At least I can say that I have done what in my conscience needed to be done to the resolution, not to the treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senator does not misunderstand me. He has every right to offer any understanding and any amendment and any reservation that his conscience and his experience and his political judgment compel him to do. That is his duty, as well as his right. All I am saying is that possibly the Soviets felt the same way. Perhaps Mr. Khrushchev—I will not say it was in his conscience, because some people would doubt it—felt that politically he had to insist on a nonaggression pact and tie it into the treaty on the limitation of nuclear weapons. Our Government representatives said, "If you do that, there will be no treaty; the game is over; we are going home." That was our right.

If the Senator's reservation is adopted—and he has given us some assurance that it will not be, for which I am grateful to him——

Mr. GOLDWATER. I could not imagine that it would be adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Incidentally, I hope that it is not cold on the 4th of July in Phoenix, Ariz., because the analogy the Senator has used makes me hope that the temperature will remain at the customary 4th of July temperature not only in Phoenix but also in Minneapolis.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We are consistent out there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I hope the Senator's prediction is consistent, with respect to the fate of his reservation. What the adoption of the Senator's reservation would do to the treaty is what would have been done to the treaty by the nonaggression reservation of the Russians during the negotiations. That would be the end of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator absolutely sure about that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. One is never absolutely certain of anything. I suppose the word "never" should never be used. However the Senator is a man of sound judgment, and he knows that the odds are that if we should adopt his reservation, it would not accelerate the acceptance of the treaty. I have a feeling that it might very well impede it for several generations.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us suppose it will put it off for several months further, and the Russians keep their promise and the President achieves what he so courageously set out to achieve a year ago? Other reservations are to be proposed, in other areas. However, the one I am proposing, inasmuch as the treaty is said to be directed toward easing world tensions, is an easer of tensions, a diplomatic "Miltown"; and it might possibly work.

But what have we heard of this attempt to give Americans some measure of profit in this excursion into the never-never land of communism's grand design?

We have heard that if we demand that the Soviets get out of Cuba they will demand that we get out of Germany, that Egypt will demand Israel get out of the Middle East, and so forth. By what poor and tortured stretch of what feverish imagination is our presence in Germany or Israel's in the Middle East similar to the Soviet presence in Cuba? Our demand is made with justice and in keeping with, not in violation of, international law and order. If the Soviet should, in fact, make such demands because of our stand on Cuba then we would see communism as it is and not as we may come to regard it through a haze of treaty-bred optimism.

Cuba can be a test of all the hopes and fears of this treaty. Why should we fail to make such a test?

We hear, however, that such a reservation would require renegotiation with all the nations that have signed it. That simply is not true.

It is a reservation not to the treaty but to our instrument of ratification. It does not permit our ratification to be deposited until the Soviets have cleared out of Cuba. It does not involve other nations—just the Soviet. It does not involve the treaty—just the time of its ratification. There would be no worldwide renegotiation—just a pause while the peaceful intent of the Soviet is put to the test.

But, of course, it is the recognition in the State Department and on the floor of this Chamber that the Soviet purpose cannot be trusted—it is that very recognition, that very truth that causes such anguished cries when someone asks only to claim our share of justice, our price of justice in giving to the Kremlin this paper pie-in-the-sky, this abandonment of half-a-decade's work to achieve a system of arms control under unshakeable terms of international inspection.

But we are told also that the Cuban price is not appropriate to place upon this treaty, it is not pertinent, it is an extraneous matter, it opens up other areas of the cold war.

What other areas? Since when has the cold war been a series of compartments? Since when has worldwide Communist aggression and treachery been divisible into little bureaucratic pigeonholes?

The suggested reservation goes to the very heart of the treaty and is in no way extraneous because it goes to the very heart of the causes of tension. And what is this treaty proposal if not related to world tensions? Of course, Cuba is pertinent. Nothing is more pertinent.

State Department hairsplitters may want to bend this treaty away from reality and from all connection with the real war in which we stand challenged by a real enemy. But ask the American people if Cuba is pertinent.

Ask them if Cuba is too high a price to set on this treaty. Ask them if we should only give, and get nothing.

I am confident that their reply would be firm where some replies I have heard recently are frightened and fearful.

We hear that the proposal to remove Soviet troops and weapons from Cuba merely is partisan. Has it been merely partisan every time the administration itself has said that the matter of Soviet troops in Cuba is not negotiable? Is it partisan to say that this treaty should not be negotiated while nonnegotiable Soviet aggression haunts our southern shoreline? Is everyone who speaks for his beliefs in this treaty consideration to be called partisan? Is conscience partisan? Are the voices we hear in opposition to the treaty or in support of safeguards and changes, voices on both sides of the aisle, merely partisan? No. There is in this consideration only the partisanship of each Member's own soul-searching decision, the partisanship of principle, the partisanship of duty and responsibility.

Mr. President, as I have said before, I intend to offer a reservation regarding Cuba. I will ask that it be considered and debated at the appropriate moment.

I will ask that the Senate, which has placed so small a price upon its deliberation of this treaty so far, will at the moment of final decision at least place upon the treaty itself a price which the Soviet can and must pay.

I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair. I should like to inquire whether under rule XXXVII a reservation to the resolution of ratification may at this time be sent to the desk to be printed and to lie on the table until called up by the mover of the reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. A reservation may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I send it to the desk and ask to have it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reservation will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will call it up in due time.

BOMB TESTING REAPS WHIRLWIND OF POISON

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there are risks for our Nation with or without the treaty, which has been the subject of lively debate. Absolute security cannot be achieved. No nation in the history of this world, at least for long, has been able to reach and maintain a position of absolute supremacy.

A few days ago I received from Mr. Alexander P. de Seversky a statement sent to each Member of the U.S. Senate in which opposition to the treaty was forcibly expressed by this eminent American. Mr. de Seversky states bluntly that the Soviet Government has "nuclear superiority." He believes Russia is ahead of us in many areas in the field of nuclear weaponry and defense.

My reaction to this is, I suppose, that of the average American. If scientists devoting their lifework to this cannot agree, how can I know? If military men cannot agree, how can I decide?

However, I am convinced absolutely that there is a basic fault in the argument made that we must have more testing—without treaty—in order to catch up.

If we are behind—and the burden of testimony and the accumulative evidence suggests we are not—then what makes anyone think we are going to catch up if there is unrestricted testing in the atmosphere, in the water, underground, everywhere, by everyone?

We had the A-bomb first.

We had the H-bomb first.

We have been spending fantastic sums on our defense structure. In this effort we are spending about $50 billion each year, 50 times more than our entire Federal Government cost a half century ago.

We have sought to create a massive deterrent. In my opinion, we have achieved this.

There has been no restriction, of consequence, of expenditure of funds in the field of nuclear weapons and deterrents so far as the United States is concerned.

Yet it is suggested that in spite of our great expenditure and effort we not only have failed to retain our lead, but have positively lost it.

These arguments would have us believe, first, that although we have been running as fast as we can run, the Russians have outstripped us; second, that if the treaty is rejected and the arms race continues unabated, the American people can be confident that we shall recapture the lead and surpass the Russians. I fail to be convinced by the validity of any such argument.

Would it not be just as easy to argue that, if the treaty were not ratified, that if both nations continued to have freedom to spread fallout all over the world in search for perfect weapons and for perfect deterrents, then we might find ourselves even farther behind than some of the opponents of the treaty claim we now are?

As every other Senator has, I have received many, many letters from treaty opponents asking me if we can trust Khrushchev.

I do not see what that has to do with the situation.

If I as one Senator believed the Communist side of the world did not present a clear danger to our life here and the life of those elsewhere joined with us, I would never vote year after year as I do vote for these tremendous defense appropriations. I would be infinitely happier to be voting instead for appropriations to improve the well-being of our own people, to provide a better life for our own citizens and, to the extent of our abilities and our desires, for people elsewhere. It is precisely because I believe the peril which confronts us and haunts us is not a fantasy of the imagination that I vote for those appropriations and shall continue to do so for so long as they are needed and so long as I am here. The proposition of trusting Khrushchev does not enter into this at all, so far as my own analysis and my own conclusions are concerned.

I trust the President of the United States.

I trust the Secretary of State.

I trust the leaders of our Armed Forces who have testified for the treaty. Much has been said, much has been made, of warning signals which have been raised by some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Too little emphasis has been placed on the fact that each of them did endorse the treaty. I take comfort in this. I would expect any military leader of this Nation to resign from his service rather than to endorse a proposition which on balance he thought absolutely detrimental to the security of the United States. Does any one of us for one minute believe that the honesty and integrity and patriotism of these men would not have brought about their resignations almost automatically if they had thought the arguments against the treaty were prevailing in a military sense?

I trust the predominant testimony given in favor of the treaty.

I am a layman. I must take the judgments of others, analyze them, balance them, and then make up my own mind as every other Senator must make up his or her mind, and then vote accordingly.

In considering the many aspects of this treaty Senators should give attention to the importance which ratification would have on the dangers caused by radioactive contamination.

A cessation of atomic testing in the atmosphere would mean, in time, an end to fallout.

The hazards of fallout, the radioactive residue from atomic blasts which poisons the air we breathe, the ground we walk, the food we eat, are still largely unknown to science and to civilization. They are not understood, they are underestimated, and largely ignored.

Federal officials charged with the protection of American citizens from radioactive hazards have consistently, from Hiroshima to the present day, placed the most optimistic interpretation upon these hazards. The Russian officials, with similar responsibilities to the Russian people, have always denied, resolutely, that such hazards even exist in the Soviet Union. There can be no doubt, however, that they do exist. There can be no doubt they are more dangerous than past American interpretations would make them seem. That fallout does exist, that it does now constitute a peril to children and to children yet unborn is undeniable. Equally undeniable is that should testing continue unbridled, it will constitute a truly substantial risk. This will be a risk to American children, to Russian children, to European and, yes, to Chinese children. This is a fact which the world must recognize; this is a fact which is, I believe, recognized in the test ban treaty.

I have repeatedly called the attention of the Senate to the inadequacy of our Nation's research efforts in the field of radiological health, to the confusion which now exists in the determination of acceptable levels of contamination for large population groups, and to the sparse, hit-or-miss nature of our radiation monitoring and surveillance activities.

We are capable, apparently, of determining the size of a Russian atmospheric test the day it is shot; we are unable, however, to determine the amount of iodine 131 in a child's glass of milk in St. George, Utah, 3 days after a shot of our own in Las Vegas.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Division of Radiological Health of the Public Health Service have seldom, to my knowledge, acted upon their own initiative to step up their research and surveillance activities. Consistently they have but reacted to public or scientific outcry. This is truer today than it has ever been for there has been much recently to react to.

Slowly and painstakingly our knowledge of the effects of radioactive contamination is increased.

Step by step our too-optimistic estimate of acceptable levels must be scaled downward.

There have been several important scientific studies published recently. I shall attempt to summarize them. In so doing, I cannot avoid simplifying; I cannot include all the many qualifications, the ifs, the perhaps, the assumptions which must be added if these comparatively small-scale studies are to be meaningfully applied for large population groups.

In the August 1963 issue of the Canadian Medical Association Journal, Dr.

L. J. le Vann, of Alberta, publishes a statistical analysis of birth deformities in that Province. In 1959 there was no atomic testing. In 1961 there was. In 1959 there was a ratio of 7.76 physical abnormalities per 1,000 children born. In 1961 there was a ratio of 13.8 physical abnormalities per 1,000 children born. Dr. le Vann breaks down these figures into area groups and finds that the greatest increase in the abnormality ratio is in the areas which experienced the greatest precipitation. As Senators know, it is the rain which brings radiation contaminants. Dr. le Vann attributes the increase in birth deformities to the increase in fallout between the two time periods.

In Edmonton, with an average precipitation of 20.9 inches, there were 16.76 abnormal births per thousand. In Leftbridge, with a precipitation level of 12.9 inches, the abnormal birth rate was 13.07 per thousand.

Dr. le Vann's thesis has a post hoc propter hoc aura to it; he may not be right. The size of his sample was but slightly more than 30,000 infants. His data were but for 2 years. It will be necessary to have additional data for additional years before his work can be verified. It is, however, undeniable that indications of such importance to us all should be followed up with more extensive studies.

Dr. E. J. Sternglass, in an article published in Science June 7, 1963, comments upon Dr. Bryan MacMahon's report in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 28: 1173—91, 1962.

Hitherto our knowledge of cancer and leukemia resulting from radiation exposure has been limited to cases in which individuals received massive doses, doses as high as a thousand roentgens. Estimates of cancer and leukemia incidence among large population groups from the relative small amounts of radioactivity carried by fallout have been based until now upon interpretation of these cases.

Dr. MacMahon ran a statistical check on 734,243 children born in 37 maternity hospitals in New England during the years 1937–54. He found 10.6 percent of the mothers had received X-ray exposures which would have had the effect of subjecting the unborn infant to some radiation. Dr. MacMahon compared the exposed group of infants with a control group made up of children whose mothers had not been X-rayed.

Present X-ray exposures now averages between 75 and 100 milliroentgens. In early years of the test periods, exposure levels of X-ray were higher—4 to 8 times higher.

Dr. MacMahon's results were startling: The death rate from leukemia and cancer was 40 percent higher for the children whose mothers had been X-rayed than for those who had not. This appears to be direct, hard, evidence that small levels of radiation can cause serious harm. It also offers evidence that the human foetus is between 20 to 60 times more sensitive to radiation than an adult.

Dr. Sternglass in his Science article, suggests that MacMahon's data also indicate a direct, linear relationship between cancer deaths and radiation dose increases.

Utilizing these new statistics, Dr. Sternglass estimates that the effect of the 1962 test series will be—as a result of the short-lived contamination alone—materials such as I^{131}—a 2.5 to 10 percent increase in childhood cancer for children born in this year. Put a different way, 4,000 out of the 4 million children born in the United States in the last year may die of cancer and leukemia. In evaluating this staggering interpretation, we must remember that it is based on fairly complicated assumptions and interpolations. As such, it may be very wrong. However, Consumer Reports, a journal with a good deal of knowledge in this field, has said with respect to the Sternglass article that its results are "apparently generally although not unanimously accepted." And lead "one to conclude that present radiation tolerance may have to be revised downward."

The conclusions of Drs. le Vann, MacMahon, and Sternglass become of greater concern when we turn to recent reports of detailed monitoring in Utah and Nevada.

During the month of July 1962, five test shots were set off at Yucca Flats in Nevada. All five carried substantial amounts of I^{131} into Utah. Shortly after one of these tests, Dr. Robert C. Pendleton, radiation safety officer at the University of Utah, while demonstrating monitoring procedures to a class of students, discovered, purely by accident, extraordinary background radiation levels. Because of this discovery, the Utah State Department of Health decided to collect milk samples on a regular basis from 39 stations located across the State. The levels of I^{131} in the milk discovered were extraordinary.

The Radiation Protection Guide sets 100 micromicrocuries of I^{131} as an acceptable level of exposure for large population groups. Anything higher than this, if caused by "peacetime uses of atomic energy," would call for the possible application of countermeasures and increased surveillance.

Utah officials determined that if it is assumed the average Utah citizen consumes 1 litre of milk a day (1.06 quarts), he would, in 1962, have received 58 thousand micromicrocuries of I^{131}. This is almost one and a half times the acceptable RPG limit. It was found that contamination levels varied widely from dairy to dairy, from cold spot to hot spot. Some sample areas had undetectable levels of radionuclide contamination. Other areas had average intake levels ranging as high as 800 thousand micromicrocuries. This level is almost 10 times higher than the highest levels ever before reported in the United States. The above figures are based upon a daily consumption of one litre of milk.

Studies undertaken by the Public Health Service indicate that 10 percent of all male infants under 1 year of age drink 1.3 litres of milk a day or more. Such children receive, of course 1.3 times more radiation than the average citizen referred to above.

A recent study by R. T. Morrison indicates that a young child has a I^{131} thyroid uptake of 50 percent, 20 percent more than that previously assumed. This means that 20 percent more radioactive material is absorbed by the thyroid than scientists have calculated in the past. Usually I^{131} milk samples have been taken on a pooled daily basis. Figures released weekly by the Division of Radiological Health report contamination levels of a composite quart made up of carefully derived contributions from the major dairies in the area of testing. The Utah report makes clear what I have long suspected:

> Milk pool values can be misleading indexes of group exposure. Our measurements of milk from one major Salt Lake dairy indicated total intake of 117,000 micromicrocuries of I^{131} for individuals consuming 1 liter of milk per day. Whereas at a second major Salt Lake dairy, the total intake was only 3,400 micromicrocuries of I^{131}. For comparison, the current yearly radiation protection guide of 0.5 rad to the thyroid gland of members of the general population is considered to correspond to the intake of about 29,000 micromicrocuries of I^{131} by the young child.

Mr. President, if we assume the average infant thyroid of 2-gram weight absorbs a conservative 30 percent of the I^{131} intake, the average child in Utah received a dose of 1 rad in 1962 during the month of July, and the range of exposure stretches from 0 to 14 rads. The seriousness of this contamination is seen when it is noted that the radiation protection guide sets 0.5 rad as the maximum acceptable amount of contamination permissible on an average basis to large population groups. This, in turn, is based upon an acceptable 30-year exposure of 0.5 rad.

These Utah figures presented to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, indicate that some children in the month of July of last year received almost three times as much radiation exposure from I^{131} as is considered acceptable over a 30-year period from all radiation sources.

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Research Development and Radiation, Dr. Charles Mays made some rough estimates of the total thyroid dose received by Utah children from tests previous to the 1962 series. These figures are general. Information on the 80 or more aboveground nuclear test shots at Yucca Flats between 1951 and 1958 is still difficult to obtain. The AEC has been slow to release data for the earliest tests in Nevada. According to Dr. Pendleton, at least one of these tests—May 7, 1952—released more I^{131} in Utah than the tests in 1962. It is only recently that the importance of I^{131} has become generally recognized. The Government did not begin monitoring the I^{131} levels surrounding the Nevada test site until 1962. Dr. Charles Dunham, Director of the AEC Division of Biology and Medicine, has explained this lapse with "we were too busy chasing strontium 90."

Dr. Mays summarizes his estimate of infant radiation dosages as follows:

> Recognizing that some children were exposed at age 0–1 and again at age 1–2, approximately 250,000 Utah children have been exposed to crudely estimated average thyroid doses of 4.4 rad prior to age 2. Individual doses, of course, range from much higher to much lower.

A study, similar to that of Dr. Mays and the Utah State Department of Health, but completely independent of it, was conducted by the Technical Division of the Greater St. Louis Citizens Committee for Nuclear Information. I cannot here do more than summarize the contents of this scholarly 50-page study presented to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Perhaps the most important point made by the St. Louis study is that current AEC measurements of fallout levels after Nevada test shots are measurements of external radioactivity—that is, the total beta-radioactivity deposited on a gummed film placed on the ground or of beta activity in the air. This does not take into accord the effect of radiation in the ecological food chain. Let me explain this:

Iodine 131 is a radio contaminant with a very short half life—no more than 8 days. This means that within the first 8 days of its existence, it loses over one-half of its potency. It is really dangerous to man for only these 8 days. After a test shot, it falls to earth fairly quickly, where it falls determined by wind and weather. If it falls on wheat or grains or pasturage which is cut and stored for longer than 8 days, it is harmless. If, however, it falls on grass which is eaten by milk cows, it is far from harmless. It reappears, and very quickly, in the milk produced by these cows. This milk in turn, if it is pasteurized and kept for a week or two, is harmless. If, however, the milk is pasteurized and immediately sold, it is far from harmless. It can be, and from time to time is, heavily contaminated with I^{131}. Young children drinking this milk are particularly susceptible to dosages for three reasons: First, the small size of the child's thyroid; second, its greater sensitivity to radiation; third, the long, post irradiation lifespan during which effects may appear. These effects may take as long as 10 to 20 years to appear. We will not know for many years to come what the full effect of atomic testing has been upon us and our progeny.

The St. Louis study, like the Utah study, is per force but a reputable estimate. According to the St. Louis report:

> At least seven times since 1952, Washington County, Utah, children received thyroid doses in the 5 to 100 rad range or higher. Gamma radiation taken May 19, 1953, from "Shot Henry" indicate that a child at that time would have received 50 rads.

It is the belief of the St. Louis scientists that contamination levels far, far exceeding radiation guides, have been experienced repeatedly across the country in places as far afield as Troy, N.Y.; Roswell, N. Mex.; and Rock Springs, Wyo. Quoting Beach and Dolphin of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, on the average 35 cases of thyroid cancer may be experienced per million persons exposed to 1 rad of thyroid radiation:

> In terms relevant to the present testimony, one in 286 children exposed to 100 rad thyroid radiation may develop thyroid cancer. By any standard, this is an unacceptable risk.

Concurrently with the release of the Utah report, the Atomic Energy Commission made public a study which it had commissioned by Dr. H. A. Knapp, Fallout Studies Branch, Division of Biology and Medicine, AEC. This report attempts to formulate an acceptable procedure for the calculation of I^{131} levels in milk on the basis of other measurements of fallout contamination on the ground. In his report Dr. Knapp speaks of I^{131} levels as high as 78,000 to 96,000 micromicrocuries per liter of milk. This is, as we have seen, over twice the yearly, and I emphasize yearly, acceptable amount of I^{131} for a child to consume under the terms of the radiation protection guide.

The Knapp report has stirred up a good deal of controversy both within and without the AEC. Again, his methods and his assumptions are debatable. They are debatable but they are not absurd. Their implications are very grave and they must be seriously considered.

Each of the six papers to which I have referred, utilize methods and procedures and hypotheses open to question. This I grant. There is no field more spongy than that of radiological health. No two scientists agree on any detail. Increasingly, however, almost all scientists agree that the field is an extremely important one. The problem is a national one. The responsibility is a Federal one. I regret that I must say, as I have said before, that the Federal Government is ducking its responsibility. Last year we spent but a total of $18 million in the field of radiological health research monitoring and surveillance. This is not enough to protect the lives of 180 million Americans now alive, to say nothing of our children's children and their children.

As Senators will recall, the hazards of radioactive contamination are of particular import to my own State of Alaska. Time and time again I have pointed out the dangers which continued and increased contamination of the Arctic food chain could mean to Alaska native citizens.

The Arctic food chain is not unlike the grass, cow, milk chain which I have just described. On the Arctic slopes of Alaska there are great herds of caribou numbering into the thousands. These roam back and forth across the northern part of the State. During the winter they exist largely on lichens, mosses, and sedges. These plants, unlike most plants, draw their nutrients directly from the air. They sift the air and in this process, absorb large quantities of radioactive materials. These in turn are taken up by the caribou when they eat the lichens. The Arctic caribou are heavily radioactive. The Eskimos, who live north of the Arctic Circle, in turn depend during the winter months on caribou meat as their principal food. As a result, there is the very real and present danger that the Eskimos themselves may obtain high and unacceptable levels of radioactive contamination from their food supply.

That this is a real problem has only recently been recognized. Figures are sketchy and inadequate. The only really useful figures we have were taken last year when whole body counts of Alaska natives were taken at several points in Alaska by a team of scientists from the Hanford Laboratories. The levels of strontium 90 and cesium 137 contamination found were fairly high. Higher than any found anywhere else in the United States. They were, however, still largely within range 2—or acceptable—levels as determined under the RPG.

Earlier this year I insisted that more extensive and comprehensive monitoring be done in the Arctic. I am pleased that this summer the Hanford team was able to take whole body counts all the way across Alaska. It was expected that contamination levels would rise, and they have, substantially.

In testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last month, the manager of the Hanford Laboratories, Dr. H. M. Parker, verified that cesium 137 body burdens have increased over 1962 burdens by as much as 50 percent. In 1962 cesium 137 levels in several cases bordered on the so-called maximum acceptable limit of the radiation protection guide. It is fair to assume that this year they will have exceeded this level.

The problems of radioactive contamination of the Arctic are different in kind and degree from those of more temperate zones. We know very little about them. Earlier this year officials of the Radiological Health Division, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Arctic Health Research Center joined in proposing a study of the contamination of the Arctic flora and fauna. This proposal is of very substantial importance. It has not as yet received final approval from the Atomic Energy Commission. I am determined that it will soon receive such approval. Arctic Alaska is America. Alaskan natives are American citizens. They are being exposed to hazards about which we know little. It is our responsibility to insure their protection.

My speech today makes grim listening. The recital of these new findings and studies in Canada, in Utah, in St. Louis, and in Alaska is not pleasant work. It is, however, I believe, important that the Senate should have this information and that it should have it now as we debate the test ban treaty.

To continue atomic testing, to continue to step up the frequency and intensity of these tests, to make no effort to prevent the proliferation of atomic weapons—this surely is the path of madness and despair.

Already this year fallout levels are twice what they were last year. And still but one-third of the contamination in the atmosphere has fallen to earth. Even without the resumption of tests, fallout will be a public health hazard for years to come.

The resumption of tests would bring for us all, free and Communist alike, a whirlwind of poison.

When we, as U.S. Senators, vote on the ratification of the treaty, we must consider many things. We must consider the strength and continued strength of our Nation and of the free world; the effect a cessation of testing would have on this strength; the guarantees given that the terms of the treaty will be enforced; the assurances that we shall have adequate protection should the treaty be violated.

These we must consider; let us also consider what continued testing, continued fallout, would mean, now and in future years.

In this atomic age there are great risks—risks with and without treaties. I believe this treaty is an acceptable risk. I believe it can be an important step toward the goal which all men everywhere must desire and long for and should work for. I intend to vote for its ratification. I urge its ratification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the minority whip, delivered a remarkable address in the Senate. I was not privileged to be present during his presentation, but he was thoughtful enough to supply me with a copy of his prepared remarks. I join other Senators in their commendation of his address.

The senior Senator from California, like his own leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], demonstrated the finest qualities of bipartisan statesmanship in this remarkable address. He has analyzed the treaty item by item and article by article, and has brought to our attention once again, not only the text of the treaty, but the President's message to the Senate in submitting the treaty. He has reminded us of our duties and obligations under the treaty. He has again called to our attention the assurances that have been given to the Senate by the President of the United States.

The Senator from California emphasized in his address what the senior Senator from Minnesota sought to emphasize; that is, that the overwhelming body of evidence presented to the three committees that listened to the witnesses supports the ratification of the treaty and underscores the fact that the treaty is in our interest and the interest of the world.

The Senator from California has also reminded us of the limitations of the treaty, which I believe are important to bear in mind.

But once having noted the limitations, the initial step, as it has been called, is of the utmost importance to the relationship among nations as they struggle to relieve the tension on the international scene and to find ways and means of establishing a peaceful world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial, published today in the Washington Post, entitled "The Treaty's Great Boon"; a letter, written by Prof. Walter Selove, on the subject of an adequate missile defense; and the remarks, by Dr. Frank Graham, on the test ban treaty, as published in the Chapel Hill Weekly of August 28, 1963. Dr. Graham's remarks were made on August 26, at the Southern Baptist Assembly Grounds, at Ridgecrest, N.C. Dr. Graham, formerly president of the University of North Carolina, was, as we know, a few years ago one of the most distinguished and dedicated Members of the Senate. We are privileged to have the benefit of his remarks. I know of no one more dedicated to a just and enduring peace than this great citizen of the United States, who is so much loved by peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

There being no objection, the editorial, the letter, and the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1963]

THE TREATY'S GREAT BOON

Debate over the test ban treaty has been so crowded with examination of its purely military consequences that the virtue of eliminating radioactive fallout sometimes seems almost to be lost sight of in the overall discussion.

Senator HOLLAND and Senator PASTORE, among some others, have brought this forcibly to the attention of the Senate. The Senate and the country must not be allowed to minimize this very tangible boon. In the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and in the debate, there have been frequent allusions to the relatively minor risks to health involved in testing. It has been stated frequently that the added hazards involved in testing can be tolerated, that the risks are not considerable, that they are in fact less menacing than many other sorts of environmental pollution.

The somatic and genetic damage that will flow from the tests already conducted, by any standard of measurement, are terrible and horrifying. This damage might be multiplied were indiscriminate tests by many nations to take place in the future. The consequences of testing alone, to say nothing of the risk of war itself, might well work an alteration upon the environment of this planet that would work dreadful injury to the health of all mankind.

Scientists have had to proceed with caution into this unknown area and they have stated their anxieties conservatively but there is no mistaking their apprehensions. The report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the effects of atomic radiation, last September, ought to be consulted anew. These scientists asked that great attention be given this risk because, they said: "The effects of any increase in radiation exposure may not be fully manifested for several decades in the case of somatic disease, and for many generations in the case of genetic damage." This report, like the reports of many other groups, emphasized that there is no threshold of added exposure up to which the tests are harmless. It stated: "Geneticists have consistently found both in mammals and other animals that the frequency of mutations is affected by radiation throughout the range of doses and dose rates investigated."

This committee pointed out, as has been so frequently observed in the debate, that testing has increased fractionally radiation risks due to natural sources. It put the increase in hereditary effects due to testing up to 1961 at 11 percent and the increase in somatic effects from 15 to 23 percent. The U.N. group found that the concentration of carbon 14, with its afterlife of thousands of years, is now 25 percent above the concentrations resulting from natural processes. This nuclide will continue to irradiate future generations for thousands of years. Only after 20,000 years will 90 percent of the total dose due to carbon 14 be delivered.

Dr. Herman J. Muller, of Indiana, who won the Nobel Prize in 1946 for discovering that X-rays cause changes in our genes, has calculated that the fallout radiation resulting from the above-ground testing of a single 100-megaton bomb would be likely to induce more than 100,000 cases of leukemia, bone cancer, and other fatal ills to the present population of the world and a million harmful mutations in the next generation. Against the total population of the world, in terms of percentages, these casualties are not great. They are staggering in terms of the total human suffering conjured up in the mind of any sensitive man.

There has been a great deal of political conjecture about why the Soviet Union wished to sign the test ban treaty. The reason may be much more simple than our conjectures. As early as December 1961, N. P. Dubinen of the Institute of Cytology and Genetics wrote in a Soviet scientific journal an article on the "Analysis of the Effect of Radiation on Cellular Nuclei of the Culture of Embryonal Human Tissues." He concluded: "The effect of ionizing radiation in the range of small doses, starting with fractions of roentgens and higher, acting on humanity as a whole, represents a real danger to future generations and threatens the irradiated individuals themselves as possible causes of malignant tumors."

The weight of the world's scientific opinion is that radioactive fallout from testing has increased (and future testing would further increase) the hazards due to natural radiation; that any increase is likely to cause some additional somatic and genetic damage.

When this country had to weigh unilateral suspension of testing it was required to place this hazard in the scales against the risk that a failure to test (while others were testing) might handicap this country to the point that it would increase the likelihood of thermonuclear war with its calamitous radioactive fallout, to say nothing of its direct effects on human life. The test ban treaty committing others to refrain from testing, greatly diminishes this hazard. The suspension of atmospheric testing, in these altered circumstances, becomes an affirmative gain of the most enormous consequences to the human race.

Events may disappoint the hopes and expectations of those who have proposed this treaty. It does not, by itself, and for all time, automatically preclude the resumption of atmospheric testing, but it may well result in that most desirable end. And if it does, its adoption may spare unnumbered thousands of our own countrymen, and perhaps millions, around the world, the pain and sorrow of terrible, wasting, lifelong injury. And it may lift from mankind the dread menace and dire threat of damage to the genetic integrity of the human family that would cast its dark shadow forward through the generations down to children born 20,000 years from now.

LETTER BY PROF. WALTER SELOVE, ASPEN, COLO.

The opponents of the test ban have made very misleading statements about the possibility of creating an effective defense against massive nuclear attack. By any technique that one can now imagine pursuing, neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. can expect to develop a defense system capable of preventing destruction of a major part of its population and industrial establishment.

Let me review some of the technical problems which make a real defense impractical. Imagine a heavy attack launched by each side against the other. (Let us not be unnecessarily paranoid—we may suppose a mutual large-scale attack, triggered against the real desire of both sides.) Consider first the problem of a defense for the United States. We may reasonably imagine that the attack, if it occurred say 2 or 3 years from now, would include:

1. Several hundred submarine-launched missiles (time, launch-to-delivery, about 5 minutes or less for most targets).
2. Several hundred large ICBM's, of 50 megatons each, with a number of decoys.
3. Several hundred large ICBM's, each one fragmenting (at various distances from target) to several live 5 megaton bombs.

What are some of the defense problems against such an attack? First, lack of time to identify and intercept the attacking missiles. For the heavily settled east coast region, for example, many submarine-launched bombs could arrive within 3 minutes from launch time, and within seconds, or minutes, or (after initial destruction of defense installations) tens of minutes from each other. If 10 to 20 such bombs, out of perhaps hundreds launched, reached their targets, the toll would probably reach 10 to 20 million dead on the east coast alone, and there would be vast destruction of cities, including industry and transport facilities—the ports of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore would probably be destroyed, for example.

So far I have spoken only of the east coast, only of submarine-launched missiles, and only of 10 percent penetration of a defense system. Let us next consider the second item of the attack volley listed above. If one 50-megaton bomb penetrated the defenses of New York (remember that perhaps 10 such bombs might be aimed there, and that they could come in a saturating volley, together with hundreds of simultaneous decoys or with scores of the fragmentation-type, live bombs of item 3)—if one such bomb reached New York, New York would be obliterated, with everything destroyed by blast and fire out to tens of miles distance, and with shelters within that area being completely useless unless equipped with independent air supply.

It is not necessary to go into many further possibilities that one can think of (except for one that is probably worth mentioning, and that is to have a 100-megaton bomb set off in a ship 5 miles off New York Harbor, or fired toward the city from such a ship) to begin to realize the basic point. A defense which would be even 90 percent effective (the very first time it had to be used) and which would be that effective even though called upon to deal with decoy and other deceptive techniques of a type probably not anticipated—even such a "defense" could not hope to prevent the killing of many tens of millions of people, and the destruction of a vast part of the industry and the entire civilization of the country.

And what about the Soviet Union? The attack on them would involve several times as many missiles. Could the U.S.S.R. protect its people? Even Dr. Teller, the foremost arguer for a continued bomb contest, has said not only that the United States would probably not be able to save its cities, but also that "it is not likely that the Russians will develop a foolproof missile defense." What then does Dr. Teller mean when he states his guess that the Russians "know how to defend against oncoming missiles"? Does he mean that he believes they have, or can build, a 90-percent effective defense? Does he mean that he believes the Soviets might be willing to accept 10 percent penetration, and to correspondingly suffer destruction of a major part of their civilization? Does he mean that he thinks that no matter how much the United States develops the penetration ability of its own missiles (by decoy techniques, for example) the U.S.S.R. can still realistically expect to actually achieve an interception rate as high as 90 percent? Does he mean that he believes the offense cannot keep ahead of the defense? Is it not clear that if either side were to engage in the installation of a massive antimissile system, the other side could nullify that system by merely sealing up its attacking force?

Arguments that the Soviet Union probably knows how to build an effective defense, arguments that the United States must pour enormous energies into the pursuit of a good defense system that can protect the country—such arguments are completely meaningless, and dangerously misleading, unless one spells out the quantitative performance one is talking about.

I am not speaking for a policy of discouragement. I am not speaking for a policy of futility. I am not speaking for a policy of laying down our arms. I am speaking for a policy of clear, balanced examination of the technical facts. I am speaking for a clear understanding that our only real security depends on the ultimately rational behavior of the Soviets (and theirs on ours). I am speaking for the understanding that the pursuit of a defense against massive nuclear attack is, on the basis of the technical facts, most likely the pursuit of a mirage. The dangers from a continued bomb contest are not a mirage—they are very real and urgent, and have been spelled out well enough not to require repeating here.

To say that there is extremely little hope that an effective defense can be developed is not to say that work on an ABM (antiballistic missile) should be abandoned. In the present uneasy state of the world no one could realistically recommend that work on an ABM should be dropped.

The Senate has the great and proper responsibility to examine minutely the reasons for or against the test ban treaty. I hope there will remain no question, when the Senate finally votes, that the idea of a defense is illusory, and that it is the true interest of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. that has brought this treaty to be signed.

[From the Chapel Hill Weekly, Aug. 28, 1963]

WHICH WAY AMERICA AND THE WORLD

(Remarks by Dr. Frank P. Graham on August 26 at the Southern Baptist Assembly Grounds at Ridgecrest. Dr. Graham, former president of the university here and U.S. Senator from North Carolina, is now a United Nations mediator)

In this kind of a world, a war or a depression anywhere involves all people everywhere. There can never again be any isolation from the skies above, the seas around or the continents beyond. The splendid American isolation behind the two great ocean moats did not keep America out of the First World War. Staying out of the League of Nations did not keep the United States out of the Second World War. The American people learned the hard way and then decided that, instead of staying on the outside and being drawn into the World Wars after they start, they would join the United Nations and seek more effectively on the inside to prevent the third world war which would cost millions of American lives, hundreds of billions of American dollars and mayhap all people on the earth.

The very year, 1945, in which atomic power made its entrance into history the United Nations made its entrance on the stage of the world. With all its weakness and frustrations, the United Nations has cooled off seven hotspots where a local fire might have become a global conflagration. By its very existence as an open forum of the world and as a safety valve for grievances and the release of tensions, the United Nations has so far prevented the beginning of the third world war.

THE TEST BAN TREATY

Which way America and which way the world in this fatefully interdependent world? For the first time in human history, through the scientific and technological revolutions, man and his accumulated civilization can be destroyed overnight. Also for the first time man has the capacity and opportunity in this creative age to provide progressively for all people on the earth their needs for food, clothing, shelter, education, health, well-being and the opportunities for more beautiful creations of the human spirit and nobler mansions of the human soul.

On this earth where the essential atmosphere may be poisoned for generations and the panicked press of a button may end the human race, there is, in the midst of its fast accelerating and inevitably fateful arms race, the moral imperative for a beginning step toward ending the race whose goal line is human suicide.

The ratification of the test ban treaty would be a beginning step of a reciprocally developing faith toward a progressive and effective universal disarmament. This beginning step would be without any appeasement of totalitarian tyranny or any surrender of the great democratic goals and hopes of the equal freedom, justice, and peace for all the people on the earth. We have faith and hope in the physical descent and spiritual ascent of man toward the family of man and the Kingdom of God.

Yet we must also realize that, with man's moral freedom of choice of good and evil, the present potential juncture of the explosive power deep in primitive inheritance and subconscious natures of man and the explosive destructive power deep in the nature of thermonuclear force, may break through the thin crust of civilization and quickly end the human species long slowly evolved on this planet.

Great decisions in historic times are often made in the smaller decisions of the days and the years of accumulative time. The present accumulative decisions carry in themselves the fateful alternative between a beginning step in the test ban treaty toward slowing down the arms race and the accumulative steps toward totally ending the human race.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

In this interdependent world with its accumulating decisions, the crucial alternative is between this accumulating downward drift toward universal annihilation and the patient upward struggle toward more effective international cooperation through the United Nations. Hundreds of millions of people looking east and west for signs of humane hopes must not in this hour find a negative approach toward a beginning step in the test ban treaty or a prolonged filibuster against the program for the equalization of the basic freedoms and rights for all Americans in the progressive fulfillment of our Hebraic-Christian heritage and our American revolutionary hopes.

In the midst of the American Revolution, because of their own values and out of a decent respect for the opinion of mankind the great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, declared for all the American principle of equal freedom, opportunity and self-determination of all people.

This was the first universal declaration of human rights ever adopted by the chosen delegates of any people.

Immortally declared by Jefferson, heroically embodied by Lincoln, and universally proclaimed by Wilson and Roosevelt, these revolutionary principles went winging around the earth, ringing down the years and are still singing in the minds and hearts of the people of two hemispheres.

They have come home again and must not be rejected in the house of the Founding Fathers.

America, the haven of the disinherited of the earth and the home of a great revolutionary faith in the days of her infant weakness should not, in the times of her great power, become the home of a paralyzing fear and a destructive intolerance.

The sons and daughters of the American Revolution must not become the fathers and mothers of the American reaction against the very principles of the American Revolution.

This reaction would abdicate the leadership of equal freedom in a hopeful world desperately in need of the best which America has to give in this time of hazard and hope for all people.

Rather we must make clear to ourselves and the world that the great declarations of faith and freedom for progressive fulfillment are not merely the historic and professed sources, but are the present and living sources of America's faith in herself, the world's faith in America and America's moral influence and power in the world.

The long unfulfilled but yet onrolling ideals of the American Revolution have progressively opened doors of political equality which had long been closed to Jews, Catholics, landless people, colored people and women. The most disinherited people in America are the migrant workers, mostly colored, who wander in search of work, rootless, homeless, sometimes defenseless and often hopeless pilgrims in the land of the Pilgrims' pride. They are on the unfinished American agenda today.

At the end of the 18th century Thomas Jefferson victoriously led the people in making States rights—a theory nobly conceived and sometimes ignobly used—the sword of liberty against the national hysteria and Federal tyranny of the alien and sedition laws. These laws out of fear of the French Revolution and the lack of faith in robustness of our own American freedom, sought to subvert the American Bill of Rights. Later States rights became for a time, the shield of slavery in the South; and later, the weapon of exploitation of women and children in the sweatshops of great cities in the North; and today the armament of massive resistances to the law of the land for the equal freedom of all Americans.

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

The present American revolution of the Negro people did not get its impulse or its impetus from Moscow but in such centers of the ex-Confederate South as Montgomery and Greensboro. Its older sources are in Carpenters' Hall and Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in the revolutionary rendezvous of the American people for equal freedom and human dignity. Their farther headwaters insurgently arise in the Judean Hills and resurgently flow from the Sea of Gallilee where the Carpenter's Son lived, taught, suffered, died and triumphed over the death for the sacredness of all persons as children of one God and brothers of all people.

The youth, in their movement for the same service for the same price, in sitting down, are standing up for the American dream. They are not trying to overthrow the Republic but fulfill the promise of the Republic. With the Bible and Constitution in their hands, hymns and prayers on their lips and nonviolence and brotherhood in their hearts, they are in many ways the most religious in their faith and the most American in their hopes.

Martin Luther King is not consciously or unconsciously an agent or ally of fascism or communism. He is one of the great American bulwarks for freedom against totalitarianism, racism and colonialism in the world today.

The question these August days is not whether there will be the people's pilgrimage to Washington with their petition under the Bill of Rights for the redress of grievances, but whether it will be unruly, violent and self-defeating or nonviolent and impressive in personal dignity, human decency and public influence. The spiritual quality of the leadership and the patriotic spirit of the volunteer pilgrims reinforce our faith that this pilgrimage and petition of the people will be influential in the meaning of America at home and in the image of America in the world in her leadership in the partnership of nations for equal freedom, justice and peace under law and human brotherhood under God in this time of mortal peril and immortal hope for all mankind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post editorial, entitled, "The Treaty's Great Boon," is more than an editorial; it is a dissertation upon the benefits of the treaty. It relates in large measure, of course, to the fact that the treaty will make a great contribution in one area, in particular: the reduction of nuclear radioactive fallout.

This itself would be enough to benefit mankind; and the fact that in this debate, we have not stressed this benefit, indicates, to me, that Congress has more or less mesmerized itself in the process of considering the wonders and the mysticism of nuclear weaponry and strategy, and has failed to take into consideration the potential danger that does exist—and is shown by scientific evidence to exist—in the continuation, growth, and the acceleration of radioactive fallout.

Today, many people in this country are deeply concerned about this development—particularly people in the Midwest and Far West, who today, as we know, are witnessing a doubling of strontium 90 in their milk supply, and are finding a dangerous quantity of iodine in food particles, with a consequent increased possibility of leukemia and other forms of malignancy or cancer.

These facts cannot be denied; and the fact that the treaty is directed toward reducing the danger of radioactive fallout should not be minimized. I have been asked repeatedly to state the benefits of the treaty. One of the benefits is that it may save lives. I believe that question is as important as the question of whether the treaty will limit scientific exploration in regard to how to destroy lives. The Senate should try to find ways and means to make the lot of mankind happier and the continuity of life surer, rather than simply to dedicate its efforts to the ascertainment of how to overkill or how to destroy larger numbers of people or greater amounts of property.

This is our opportunity to fulfill one of the real purposes of democratic citizenship: to secure the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—AMENDMENT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution of ratification of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY—RESERVATION

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted a reservation, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution of ratification of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, September 13, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 12, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. True Davis, Jr., of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 18: 1: *Men ought always to pray.*

O Thou prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, may we realize more fully that by cultivating the habit of daily prayer we learn the secret of knowing how to pray with conquering power when the way of life leads through trials and tribulations.

Bless us with such a clear and commanding vision of the splendor of a life dedicated and devoted to Thy will that we shall make it the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors.

When we stand with faltering and hesitant steps at life's crossroads, may we hear and heed Thy voice saying unto us, "This is the way and he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness."

Grant that when our national and international problems seem so very difficult and complex we may know that we were never meant or expected to meet them alone and unaided for Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week and whether he can tell us about the probable time for the consideration of the tax reduction bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the minority leader, the program is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

There are three suspensions. The first is S. 1952, to extend and broaden the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act.

Second, H.R. 8100, amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and other acts, to increase the creditable and taxable compensation.

Third, H.R. 8009, nursing home care for veterans.

Tuesday and the balance of the week. Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

H.R. 8200, providing for fallout protection in Federal structures and nonprofit institutions, which will be taken up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to advise the Members there will be no legislative business on Thursday and Friday because of the Jewish holy days.

Also, I would like to advise the Members that H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963 will be programed for Tuesday, September 24, 1963. I think it is important that we give out this notice at this time so that Members may be advised accordingly.

Also, I would note that this announcement, of course, is made with the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

I would also advise that there is a distinct possibility, I would say almost a probability, that one or more of the suspensions may involve a rollcall vote.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman. I would like to make an observation that from some of the inquiries I have made and some of the information that has come to me, in connection with the revenue bill, as I understand it, it is expected that there will be probably 8 hours of debate and probably a closed rule and very likely the vote would come on Wednesday, September 25.

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is a fair statement. Of course the rule will undoubtedly be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that by the time the revenue bill comes up the Congressmen who are now junketing abroad will be back, so that they can participate in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I assume that every Member would want to be present regardless of any other factor, unless his health prevents, when the revenue bill comes up; and that is the reason we are giving the Members ample notice.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that it will not interfere with their foreign travel pleasure.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman will have to take that up with them.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, since we are proceeding down the road toward Thanksgiving. Some of us did not have very much advance notice of the vacation or recess around Labor Day. If it is proposed to have a couple of weeks of Thanksgiving recess, I would like to suggest to the distinguished majority leader that we have a little more notice so that we can at least make preparations to get our suitcases packed and our office affairs in order.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. We never take them lightly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TO SELL A PORTION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAINING SCHOOL GROUNDS, LAUREL, MD.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5081) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "Maryland" insert ", for the purpose of installing thereon and maintaining a high voltage transmission line on towers to be constructed by said company".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "of this Act." and insert "of this Act: *Provided*, That whenever the said right-of-way no longer is maintained by said company for the purpose specified in the preceding sentence, all right, title, and interest of the said company in and to such right-of-way shall revert to the United States.".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman one question? I assume all of the amendments placed in this bill by the other body are germane to the bill as it was passed by the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the two Senate amendments is self-explanatory, namely:

First. The purpose of authorizing the Commissioners to sell a right-of-way—66 feet wide and 4,900 feet long—across part of the District of Columbia Training School grounds is to enable the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. to install and maintain a high-voltage transmission line on towers to be constructed by said company.

Second. This amendment provides for reversion of the right-of-way to the United States whenever the right-of-way is no longer maintained by the company for the purposes specified.

This bill passed the House without objection and the House District Committee concurs in the Senate amendments, as indicated.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATIONS TO METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT CHIEF ROBERT V. MURRAY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House of Representatives, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Chief Robert V. Murray, who is chief of the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington, D.C., on the magnificent job he and his assistants did in arranging, planning and keeping order here in the Nation's Capital during the August 28 march.

I realize there is a question as to whether this march was necessary or should have ever been scheduled; however, this was no responsibility of the police chief. The people here in Washington and throughout the country I am certain are grateful to Chief Murray for keeping order during the time we had all these visitors in the Nation's Capital.

I realize that this march was a financial strain on the District and the Nation and caused the police department and other interested persons to work hours, days and weeks overtime in preparation to prevent any violence during this unusual march. I think we will all agree that this could have been an explosive affair if it had not been known that we have one of the finest and most outstanding police departments in the country here in the Nation's Capital. I am certain that as long as the provisions of the Constitution are carried out whereby the police department shall be directly responsible to the Congress of the United States that we can keep order and peace here under any circumstances. No interference with the police chief and his officials should be permitted from any source. At the present time we have too many people trying to advise the police department and trying to tell the chief who to promote and who to assign to certain jobs when it is the individual responsibility of the chief to see that the police department functions efficiently. I believe every Member of Congress will agree with me that the average policeman on the Metropolitan Police Department force is courteous and is trying to enforce the law to the best of his ability. There should not be any interference from any organization and I am certain the Commissioners would not try to tell the police chief or any other police official how they should transact their business since they are not trained in police affairs.

We are only interested in keeping the Nation's Capital a decent and safe place for the permanent residents who reside here and the millions of visitors from every State in the Union who come to see their Capital and Government in operation each year.

The city of Washington was set aside as a Federal site to house the seat of the Nation's Government, and it is necessary for the police department to be responsible to the Federal officials whose duty it is to transact the Government business including the executive, legislative and judicial departments of the Government. Certainly the police department affairs should not be interrupted by any private organizations or even the appointed Commissioners.

Again I want to take this opportunity as chairman of the House District Committee to thank Chief Murray for performing an outstanding job in keeping peace here in the Nation's Capital on August 28.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUGUST 1963

During August 1963 a total of 2,512 part I offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 437 offenses or 21.1 percent from August 1962. These increases gave August an all time high of crime for a single month.

This was the 15th consecutive month with an increase in crime for this city. During this month increases occurred in each category except rape, which dropped by one-third.

The increase for this month brought the trend of serious offenses—number of offenses for the past 12 months—to 24,352, an increase of 3.1 percent from the fiscal year 1963, and an increase of 9.6 percent from the comparable total of last August.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you will note the alarming increase in crime here in the Nation's Capital, and it seems to me that this is sufficient proof to everyone who believes in law and order that some of the recent Executive orders, rules, and regulations issued by the District Commissioners and possibly by the President should be repealed immediately. The House, as everyone knows, recently passed a strong anticrime bill, and it is now pending before the other body. I hope the above report will be sufficient evidence for the other body to take immediate action on this most urgent and important legislation.

Metropolitan Police Department—Part 1 offenses reported, August 1962 and 1963

Classification [1]	August		Change	
	1962	1963	Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	5	9	+4	+80.0
Rape	21	14	−7	−33.3
Robbery	187	192	+5	+2.7
Aggravated assault	291	328	+37	+12.7
Housebreaking	427	654	+227	+53.2
Grand larceny	92	123	+31	+33.7
Petit larceny	796	872	+76	+9.5
Auto theft	256	320	+64	+25.0
Total	2,075	2,512	+437	+21.1

[1] Includes attempts.

Metropolitan Police Department—Index offenses reported, August 1962 and 1963

Classification [1]	August		Change	
	1962	1963	Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	5	5	None	None
Rape by force	14	11	−3	−21.4
Robbery	187	192	+5	+2.7
Aggravated assault	291	328	+37	+12.7
Housebreaking	427	654	+227	+53.2
Grand larceny	92	123	+31	+33.7
Petit larceny $50 to $99.99	127	160	+33	+26.0
Auto theft	256	320	+64	+25.0
Total	1,399	1,793	+394	+28.2

Index offenses are part 1 offenses in which—

1. Negligent homicides are not counted in criminal homicide.
2. All grades of rape without force are not counted in rape.
3. Larcenies under $50 are not counted in petit larceny.

[1] Includes attempts.

PART 1 OFFENSES, AUGUST 1963

	Offenses reported including unfounded	Unfounded false or baseless complaints	Number actual offenses	Offenses cleared [1]	Not cleared pending inactive
1. Criminal homicide:					
a. Murder	5		5	7	
b. Manslaughter					
c. Negligent homicide [2]	4		4	4	
2. Rape	11		11	10	2
a. Attempt rape	3		3	4	
3. Robbery	173	4	169	78	108
a. Attempt robbery	23		23	14	12
4. Aggravated assault	331	3	328	276	92
5. Housebreaking	637	4	633	138	543
a. Attempt housebreaking	22	1	21	13	11
6. Larceny—theft:					
a. $100 and over	126	3	123	26	104
b. Under $100	889	17	872	251	683
7. Auto theft	358	38	320	72	283
Total, part 1	2,582	70	2,512	893	1,838

PART 2 OFFENSES, AUGUST 1963

	Offenses reported including unfounded	Unfounded false or baseless complaints	Number actual offenses	Offenses cleared [1]	Not cleared pending inactive
8. Other assaults	6		6	7	
a. Other assaults [2]	245	1	244	179	104
9. Forgery and counterfeiting	89		89	68	22
10. Embezzlement and fraud	18		18	13	10
a. Embezzlement and fraud [2]	100		100	71	46
11. Stolen property (receiving, etc.)	6		6	6	
a. Stolen property (receiving, etc.) [2]	5		5	5	
12. Weapons:					
a. Weapons [2]	56		56	55	1
13. Prostitution	1		1	1	
a. Prostitution [2]	17		17	17	
14. Sex offenses	8		8	7	1
a. Sex offenses [2]	15		15	13	2
15. Offenses against the family [2]					
16. Drug laws	94		94	94	
a. Drug laws	27		27	27	
17. Liquor laws:					
a. Liquor laws [2]	78		78	78	
20. Vagrancy [2]	35		35	35	
21. Gambling	25		25	25	
a. Gambling	27		27	27	
26. All other offenses	36	1	35	15	21
a. All other offenses	310		310	90	223
27. Fugitive from justice	57		57	54	15
Total, part 2	1,255	2	1,253	887	445
Grand total	3,837	72	3,765	1,780	2,283

RECAPULATION OF OFFENSES REPORTED AUGUST 1963

Part 1 offenses	2,582	70	2,512	893	1,838
Part 2 offenses	1,255	2	1,253	887	445
Total offenses	3,837	72	3,765	1,780	2,283
Felonies	1,950	53	1,897	861	1,198
Misdemeanors	1,887	19	1,868	919	1,085
Total offenses	3,837	72	3,765	1,780	2,283

[1] Includes previously reported offenses, closed this month.

[2] Misdemeanors.

MODERNIZATION OF THE RULES OF CONGRESS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, while there are many things about which I would not presume to advise the House, there is one matter today upon which I hope I may be able to give some food for thought to my colleagues.

Action by the Rules Committee in the other body seeking a joint House-Senate conference on "modernization" of Congress is undoubtedly another step which sooner or later will bring the matter before the House for decision. It is not my purpose to oppose this program or to minimize its importance.

The proposal would have the joint committee consider such matters as organization and operation, relations between the two Houses, staffing, pay of employees and legislators, scheduling of measures for action, legislative oversight, operation and effectiveness of the lobbying laws, and strengthening of congressional control over spending. All these are worthy objectives.

But before the House enters into such an arrangement, it seems to me it would be most wise if we gave some serious thought to current conditions and recent history. Tucked away in this nice package could be a situation that could result in entrapment of the House.

Let us consider, for instance, the item which provides for "relations between the two Houses." Most of you are aware of some difficulties that have faced the House in recent months and years, all seeking to curb or curtail the prerogatives and powers of the House, and all stemming from Members of the other body. Some of you may not be aware of the most recent situation in this regard.

On June 26 last, by a rollcall vote, and in opposition to the advice of its own Appropriations Committee, the other body adopted an amendment to the legislative appropriations bill placing a limitation upon the House in the most flagrant violation of the rule of comity in modern history. This amendment was approved by a substantial margin and in its discussion of the amendment, Members of the other body made it quite clear that their right to dictate housekeeping rules to the House of Representatives was one upon which they insisted. Even after many weeks for reflection, there is no evidence that this sentiment in the other body has changed in the slightest.

Before this session of Congress is ended, a decision that could have far-reaching and permanent repercussions may have to be made. Unless the other body relents in its position and goes back to the letter and spirit of the rule of comity, there is bound to be a most serious conflict. Insistence of the other body upon its adopted position, if such resulted in an ultimate acceptance by the House, would for all practical purposes end the rule of comity, and this would end the historic coequal positions of the two Houses of Congress. I leave it to you to say what the dominance of one body over the other would mean to our form of government.

Knowing this growing sentiment in the other body of its determination to impose its will upon matters which are purely the prerogatives of the House, I felt I could do no less than to make these remarks and to encourage my colleagues to think about this whole situation.

I surely hope, Mr. Speaker, that whatever our decision, we will not someday find ourselves in the position of the missionary who, when invited to the cannibal's home for a duck dinner, discovered all too late that he was the duck.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO CUBA STILL ON INCREASE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the latest figures on free world shipping to Cuba, just released by the Maritime Administration in Report No. 16, show that free world shipping to Cuba during July totaled 45 trips. This compares to 43 for the month of June. On August 30 the then reported figure for June was 37. So you can see the increase we are still having in free world shipping to Cuba.

And who are the major offenders? Still our old friends, the British, who in July had 14 trips, and the Greeks, who had 17 trips to Cuba. In August, the tentative figures are 11 British ships already and 16 Greek ships, for a total of 27. I am very hopeful that the amendment we passed to the foreign aid bill adopted by this body will be approved by the Senate which will add pressure to cut off this free world shipping to Cuba. And if not, I hope we can pass a bill that I have introduced, H.R. 7687, which would in effect close the ports of this Nation to any country which allows any of its ships to go into Cuba. This should be done.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over 52,047 people in the Sixth District of Florida replied to my annual questionnaire this year, a return which I believe to be one of the largest to such a poll in the Congress, and certainly a sufficient number to give a good indication of public opinion. Since our district, located in southern Florida which has benefited from great growth in population from all over the country, is in itself a cross section of the citizenship of the United States, its significance is readily seen.

Because of its interest to all Members and those in the Government responsible for planning Federal programs, I ask that the results of this questionnaire be printed at this point in the RECORD:

Question	Percent		
	Yes	No	Blank
1. Would you favor a tax cut—			
(a) If Federal spending is cut?	83.6	6.0	10.4
(b) If tied to tax law revision?	36.2	20.4	43.4
2. Do you support my plan for systematic reduction of the national debt?	93.4	1.8	4.8
3. Do you favor an increased social security tax to provide medical care for the aged?	38.7	57.8	3.5
4. Would you favor Federal aid to elementary and secondary public schools?	30.4	64.0	5.6
5. Should foreign aid be cut?	89.8	6.1	4.1
6. Do you believe the United States should work for a nuclear text ban treaty with adequate controls?	81.6	13.4	5.0
7. Do you believe the United States should abandon the United Nations?	38.8	54.1	7.1
8. Do you favor my proposal to close U.S. ports to any of our allies who are aiding Cuba?	91.4	5.6	2.7

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AMENDMENT

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, visiting in my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., during the Labor Day recess I was deeply impressed and, at the same time, troubled by the fact that a majority of my constituents feel bitterly that they have not had their day in court on the present-day movement for compulsory social integration led by the judicial and executive branches of our Government and possibly in the near future by the legislative branch. They feel, as do I, that this situation of compulsion and harassment has its roots in an unjustified misconstruction of the U.S. Constitution, the 1954 Supreme Court decision on schools and its aftermath.

They do not want to resort to the use of mobs, anarchy, and threats of violence in defiance of law and order. Indeed, my home district, which comprises Duval County, on September 3, integrated under court order, six formerly all white elementary schools. The New York Times reported "integration has been carried out quietly and with little publicity." They feel that U.S. troops have been used to sustain mobs seeking to accomplish by threats what the law does not provide, even as the Constitution has been construed by the courts. They deplore the theory of mass demonstrations, violence, and lawlessness as a means of influencing the adoption of decisions by the judicial, executive, or legislative branches of Government. They do not understand that it is all right to break established laws and to disobey proper authorities to gain improper or proper ends. In a word they feel frustrated.

They have asked me what can be done to allow them their day in court—their right to state their case and seek redress and consideration.

I advised them that the only course I know was to seek the passage of a constitutional amendment. So I have drafted an amendment and introduced it and I believe it represents what their objectives are.

This amendment to the Constitution of the United States relates to the preservation of the freedom of association. It involves three fields of social and private endeavor by the individual citizen: education, housing, and private business, and deals with them in a practical and humane manner, I believe.

This amendment recognizes the right of freedom of association and prohibits the Federal Government from injecting itself into private decisions of persons conducting their own business or in the sacredness of their homes or in the field of education. States are permitted to provide equal and separate schools on the basis of sex or race as the public interests in the particular locality may be found to require. This will allow parents in all income levels to provide the area of association they wish for their children, based on the majority decision in the State in which they reside.

By the terms of the amendment, separate schools would only be permissible if found to be in fact equal by the courts. Also by the terms of the amendment the Federal Government may assist, by Federal programs, to assure all citizens equal opportunities in the fields of private business, housing, and education, the only areas involved in the amendment. This amendment does not apply to parks, city auditoriums, ball parks, recreational facilities, and other areas where attendance is voluntary and where no private rights of association are infringed upon. There is specific provision for the withdrawal of Federal funds where equal facilities are not provided. The amendment is as follows:

ARTICLE —

Freedom of association shall be preserved. The Federal Government shall not compel association of persons in private businesses or in housing or in educational institutions; but may assist in programs to provide equal accommodations and facilities for all, including withdrawal of such Federal assistance when equal facilities are not in fact provided. Each State shall have exclusive jurisdiction over its public educational institutions and may separate students therein on the basis of sex or race when this is decided by it to be in the best public interest or to assist in preserving freedom of choice in individual associations, provided that equal facilities shall be maintained at all times.

THE MOSCOW TEST BAN AGREEMENT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Moscow test ban agreement with Khrushchev will greatly aid the cause of world communism. I can think of no advantage to the United States, but on the other hand many advantages to Communist Russia and Communist China.

The test ban treaty is a step toward war. It is a step toward misery, hardship, slavery, and destruction. It is a step toward certain war with Red China—a war in which we cannot use our nuclear superiority. With Russia on the sidelines threatening to use her nuclear potential, the United States would become involved with the land masses of China.

The only hope for survival for the United States is to develop at every opportunity, to the fullest, our science and technology. The test ban treaty with Khrushchev would tie our military hands and shackle us to primitive military concepts where we cannot win. I urge the other body and the American people to reject the test ban waltz with Khrushchev.

Mr. Speaker, the following text is from a statement issued by the Air Force Association yesterday opposing the test ban treaty.

We, of the Air Force Association, are particularly troubled both by the substance of the proposed test ban treaty and the manner in which it has been thrust upon the Congress, our military leadership, and upon the American people. Much of the basic information pertinent to a prudent decision remains in contention.

We are keenly aware of the military risks which are inherent in this treaty. The political gains which are supposed to outweigh these risks are not so clear. Whenever a nation limits its freedom of technical initiative in any important field, its security is endangered.

It is our conviction therefore that even if the promised safeguards should materialize, ratification of the proposed test ban treaty would entail unacceptable risks to the security of this Nation and of the free world.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, my son attends a Washington, D.C., high school and I am, of course, watching the operation of our school system with considerable interest.

The teachers and administrators of our schools are skillful and devoted. The children are anxious to be led along the educational road that will allow them to someday be participating adults in this complex world.

This legislative body, the House of Representatives, however, refuses to allow the school system to operate in the American way. I would like to know why.

School opened last week with an increase of 4,743 students over last year. Congress, however, has refused so far to authorize the District budget request for 344 new teachers.

In one high school a 10th grade English class has 97 students in a classroom with a capacity for 40—50, 60, or 70 students in classes are common.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why we are not allowed to vote on this matter. Where is the legislation that would appropriate the money for our schools? Why are hearings to begin next week instead of last January?

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the House of Representatives to cease its persecution of the schoolchildren of Washington, D.C.

PHONY RIGHT-TO-WORK POLL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a new and vicious propaganda attack on our Federal collective bargaining law and its administration by President John F. Kennedy.

I refer to a so-called poll of newspaper editorial writers by the self-styled National Right To Work Committee. This organization is supported and directed by a minority of wealthy and powerful big business reactionaries for the sole purpose of further promoting the discredited right-to-work laws. The freedom and right of working people to organize and bargain collectively for fair wages and decent working conditions is recognized by everybody.

This so-called poll purports to show that 91 percent of the Nation's newspaper editors condemn the right of labor and management to agree, or disagree, on the inclusion of a union shop provision in contracts arrived at through collective bargaining.

Our Federal labor-management law makes provision for negotiation of the union shop arrangement through collective bargaining—a provision that was recommended and supported without reservation by the late Senator Robert Taft, the chief author of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act of 1947. This freedom of contract provision has been supported not only by the administration of President Kennedy but by every administration—Republican and Democratic—since the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted by the Congress. In this connection, I commend Secretary Wirtz and the Department of Labor for their unequivocal statement to the so-called National Right to Work Committee that it is the policy of his Department that "right-to-work laws are unwise laws." Former President Eisenhower's Secretary of Labor James Mitchell is to be commended for his statement in 1958 that he would "vote against right-to-work legislation."

UNION SHOP

The union shop arrangement is a provision of the great majority of the Nation's labor-management contracts and as such is accepted and desired by the preponderance of our responsible and forward-thinking leaders of business and industry. It is an arrangement through which responsible trade unions are provided the stability they need to carry out their responsibilities of representing working people in collective bargaining. It is a widely-accepted arrangement by which working people have a voice that can be heard at the collective-bargaining table. It is the balance wheel in assuring equality between labor, on one hand, and management, on the other, when collective-bargaining contracts are negotiated.

FAKE POLL

The self-styled National Right To Work Committee has set itself up as the judge and arbiter of what the U.S. Congress should decide is right and just legislation for the benefit of the majority of Americans and how our Federal laws should be administered by the executive branch. By a publicity stunt, this propaganda outfit seeks to undermine our Federal law and its lawful administration by the President.

This so-called poll by the self-appointed "right-to-workers" is a contrived propaganda gimmick deliberately devised with loaded questions in a cynical attempt to subvert collective-bargaining legislation and turn the industrial clock back to the last century.

This present poll is even more questionable than another such device which the National Right To Work Committee employed by using a professional pollster, who submitted a series of loaded antilabor questions to only 1,413 selected persons, and then published the results with elaborate postulations that they represented the considered opinion of 180 million Americans.

I believe my colleagues in the House and, indeed, all the American people are entitled to know the nature of this propaganda contrivance.

How was this purported poll of editorial opinion arrived at and what is the background of its perpetrators?

RIGHT TO WORK MISNOMER

The self-styled National Right To Work Committee is a "front" for the reactionary segment of big business. It was set up as an instrument of obstruction after passage of the Taft-Hartley Act to organize satellite "committees" and propagandize for so-called right-to-work laws in individual States. Its purpose is to achieve the outlawing of the union shop by State law, and by doing so weaken membership of trade unions, and ultimately to destroy labor-management collective bargaining. Its staff, other than clerical help, consists of a handful of professional organizers and propagandists.

A RACKET PROMOTION

They operate from an office at 1025 Connecticut Avenue in Washington, D.C. As one source of its funds for propaganda operations, it preys on the business community with a persistent direct-by-mail campaign pleading for contributions, operated by a professional fund-raising organization. As I informed the House earlier, the National Better Business Bureau of New York, which investigates such activities for the information of the business community, reported that this propaganda group in a single year spent 42 cents of every dollar collected to plead for still more contributions. This report stated that the National Right To Work Committee paid its firm of professional fundraisers $3,000 a month, plus 33⅓ percent commission on the net income from all membership fees and contributions received through their efforts.

LABOR DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATES

The National Right To Work Committee is being investigated by the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports of the Department of Labor in connection with right-to-work and other antilabor activities in Florida. Press Associates, Inc., reported in a newsletter of August 26 that the BLMR has ruled the committee has violated the Landrum-Griffin Act by failing to file as a middleman, or management consultant, in connection with these activities. It may be purely coincidental but it is interesting to note that this alleged "poll" attacking President Kennedy and the Department of Labor has been conducted at the same time that their antilabor activities are under investigation by the BLMR.

OKLAHOMA REJECTS RIGHT-TO-WORK ORGANIZATION

In Oklahoma, a satellite "committee" set up by the National Right To Work Committee, circulated an initiative petition after the Oklahoma Legislature repeatedly rejected the right-to-work law, seeking to force the issue onto the ballot at a special election. An exhaustive and costly signature-by-signature investigation of this petition has been conducted and the findings laid before a special referee appointed by the Oklahoma Supreme Court. And what were the findings? The investigation turned up evidence of fraud and forgery of signatures on a massive scale. Of the 213,000 names on the petition, a total of 104,806 have been challenged as being improper. As an illustration of the methods used to obtain many of the names on the petition, an operator of a nursing home admitted in testimony before the supreme court referee that he had signed the names of 15 elderly patients in his nursing home to the petition at the instigation of the president of the Oklahoma Right To Work Committee, a violation of the petition law.

The chief propagandist of the National Right To Work Committee, who dreamed up this alleged poll, received his training at the so-called national education program propaganda center at Searcy, Ark., where much of the radical right material that has been inundating the Nation for the past several years originated. In addition to these affiliations, he was quoted by Newsweek magazine in the issue of May 1, 1961, as stating that he was a member of the John Birch Society and had been "for about 17 months."

This group's John Birch Society member and chief propagandist signed a publicity release on July 29 addressed to editors of editorial pages of newspapers announcing the purported poll the honesty and integrity of which I am questioning.

Then, on September 2, a news release on the letterhead of the National Right To Work Committee announced that "approximately 91 percent of the editors who responded" were critical. And, a little further on, it watered the whole grandiloquent claim down considerably further by admitting that only 10 percent of the newspapers polled had responded.

We do not know how many newspapers responded. The Right To Work Committee's own release about its alleged poll only contained statements from six newspapers—the Indianapolis Star, the Oregonian, the Tulsa World, the Columbia (S.C.) State, the Grand Island (Nebr.) Independent, and the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic—all of which have been consistent antilabor newspapers.

The poll questions were loaded, worded, contrived, and so stated as to evoke the kind of reply the National Right To Work Committee sought to obtain. This was an ax-grinding operation throughout.

NEWSPAPERS DENOUNCE POLL

A newspaper editor in Idaho, where the right-to-work proposal was rejected by voters at the polls in 1958 and where the Idaho Legislature has repeatedly voted down such legislation, put this alleged poll in the proper context when he replied:

> I think your questions are loaded. Another way to phrase the issue: Do officials of the U.S. Department of Labor have a right to take a stand publicly on the right-to-work issue?

And a California editor, where voters rejected the right-to-work law by 1 million votes in 1958, responded:

> Management has never indicated any responsible attitude toward workers in most cases when they remain unorganized, and until there is a change, unions are the only answer for decent wages and hours and fair treatment.

NINETY-ONE PERCENT OF HOW MANY?

As to this alleged and watered-down 91 percent. We have to take it or leave it on its face, and I leave it. Was it 91 percent of 6 newspapers, or the 20 others listed anonymously in the publicity handout, of the more than 2,000 daily newspapers in the United States? Obviously it is not 91 percent of any of these.

I say again, this purported poll is a propaganda stunt, dishonest on the face of it.

I have not conducted a poll on newspaper opinion on the destructive nature of the so-called right-to-work laws. The opposition to these laws throughout the Nation is amply clear from the tremendous number of unsolicited editorials that can be found without difficulty in the Nation's press. Among these are recent editorials in respected newspapers in right-to-work States which have pointed out that this legislation has proved harmful to the economy. Repeal demands, for instance, have been voiced by eminent newspapers in the right-to-work States of Georgia, Kansas, and Indiana.

LEADING NEWSPAPERS VERSUS RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

To set the record straight, I would like to cite and quote briefly from a few of these representative and respected journals from coast to coast:

The Washington Post:

> Some of the most reactionary forces in the country have seized on the [right-to-work] amendment, not as a guarantee of liberty, but as a union busting weapon.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

> A right-to-work law does not in fact protect anybody's right to work. A right-to-work law prohibits the union shop, even if a large majority of employees favor them. It weakens unions * * * it restricts collective bargaining.

Detroit Free Press:

> When we speak of the right-to-work, none of us must overlook the point that an organization is a group of individuals and that they, too, have a right—the right to express themselves through their organization and to benefit by that expression of will so far as collective negotiation will permit.

The Denver Post:

> What is the need for a right-to-work law here? It can accomplish little or nothing, except to stir up old disputes and ill feelings on both sides.

The Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun:

> Right-to-work legislation is not needed, it will not bring about the panacea which its ardent supporters expect, and it will bring the State a lot of trouble.

The Idaho Sunday Statesman:

> A right-to-work law has no place in the Idaho picture.

The Louisville Courier-Journal:

> Large employers have passed the trial-and-error period in their relationships with unions and prefer to deal with unions under contract than to return to the old guerrilla warfare.

New York Daily News:

> A right-to-work law does not guarantee anybody a job or a right to a job.

Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution:

> Suspect as a barrier to the more rapid growth and diffusion of prosperity in Georgia is the right-to-work law * * * (which) may be crippling the State's economy. If so, its repeal is long overdue.

South Bend (Ind.) Tribune:

> Indiana's 6-year-old law banning union shops has failed to right any wrongs and, worse, has increased labor tensions in Indiana's industry. We favor its repeal.

Wichita (Kans.) Eagle:

> Its effect has been negligible in the State: it has not proved to be the "open sesame" for industrial growth.

Hutchinson (Kans.) News:

> One of the promises of those who promoted the right-to-work law was that it would lure new industries to the State. It hasn't worked out that way * * * everyone is crying that Kansas is missing the boat so far as the Nation's industrial expansion is concerned.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond in the New York Herald Tribune:

> The effect is to deprive management of the right to sign a contract with a union for a union shop of any lesser degree of union security. The effect is to deprive the employees of the right to negotiate for a union shop.

The Purcell (Okla.) Register:

> The right-to-work slogan is grossly deceptive because the real purpose, hidden behind a screen of alluring representations, is to weaken and if possible, outlaw labor unions, and deny laboring people freedom to organize.

Portland (Maine) Evening Express:

> The more farsighted legislators who killed the right-to-work bill in the Maine House by that action actively promoted the State's campaign to attract new industry to Maine.

New Mexico Register:

> The smelliest part of the whole business is the hypocrisy of many of the backers of these laws * * * many of the informed in these groups snicker privately over the simplicity of the dupes who have been taken in by the arguments they use in favor of right-to-work laws.

Time magazine:

> Significant, as a sign of how U.S.-style enlightened capitalism looks at labor-management relations, was the unpublicized opposition to right-to-work of several big Indiana businessmen.

The Drumright (Okla.) Derrick:

> The so-called right-to-work law is the greatest fraud of the modern day.

Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune:

> Since its enactment by the assembly in 1957, the right-to-work law has served little purpose except to stir political tempers * * * we suggest it would be good for the Hoosier political climate if a repealer were passed.

Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer:

> North Carolina (a right-to-work State since 1947) has been hovering around the bottom of the list of States on the basis of average earnings of employees in manufacturing establishments for several years. This is a situation which should shame every North Carolinian.

Toledo (Ohio) Blade:

> If social justice in the economic sphere is to be promoted * * * then all workers who get better wages and working conditions and fringe benefits through organization should contribute to the support of the union.

These are but a few of the newspapers throughout the Nation that consistently oppose the right-to-work laws. There are many others.

We, in the Congress, are all too familiar with the pressures brought to bear on us by special-interest groups for self-seeking purposes that so often are contrary to and harmful to the common good. Publicity stunts are not uncommon to such pressure.

This propaganda stunt of an alleged opinion "poll" however is one of the most blatant that has come to my attention. I am sure that my knowledgeable and experienced colleagues in the House recognize its inherent dishonesty, as I do. My concern is for the great mass of the American people who, exposed to this fraud through high-pressure publicity efforts, may see only one side of the coin and not be able to recognize that it is counterfeit.

That is why I have looked into this matter thoroughly, and that is why I bring it to your attention today.

SURVEILLANCE OF SOVIET TRAWLERS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last week I requested the Defense Department to take appropriate steps to prevent Soviet trawlers from entering our coastal waters and pointed out that many of these Soviet ships were equipped for electronic spying.

I want to report to the House that my protest has been promptly acted upon by the Department of Defense and I have received assurance that we will step up our defense against this type of spying activity.

I would like to quote from the communication that I have received from the Department of the Navy:

> It is considered that a Soviet trawler especially configured for electronic intelligence collection proceeding in the territorial waters of the United States would not be engaged in innocent passage and the Navy consequently would take measures as called for by the circumstances if any such vessels were so observed. The Navy plans to keep more trawlers under closer surveillance when close inshore. The Navy will emphasize greater use of ships and aircraft to perform patrol functions along the Florida coast.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this assurance and appreciate the prompt response that my request received by the Department of Defense.

OPEN SPACE EAST OF CANNON BUILDING SHOULD BE KNOWN AS McCORMACK PARK

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, my suggestion that the open space east of the Cannon Office Building be maintained as a green spot and known as McCormack Park was received with something less than overwhelming enthusiasm.

Perhaps a portion of this lack of response may have been due to the fact that the Speaker, himself, unwittingly gaveled me to silence under the 1-minute rule before I could mention the proposed name of this project.

However, the fact remains that other proposals for the use of this area are contradictory and indefinite. At the same time, the need for the preservation of a green area near the House office buildings increases with every brick and stone that are placed together in the vicinity.

Why not dedicate this space as a park, maintaining an area with grass, trees, birds, and perhaps a splashing fountain, to provide a place of refreshment in the warm Washington weather?

And why not call it McCormack Park?

I have today filed a bill authorizing the transfer of this land to the Secretary of the Interior for use as a public park to be known as McCormack Park and I commend this legislation to my colleagues for their support.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY PROGRAM OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, and for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax. This legislation is very similar to other extended compensation measures passed by the Congress in 1958 and in 1961.

This is, first and foremost, a program of self-help on a self-supporting basis. An additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits will be made available to workers who have exhausted their payment rights under State and Federal unemployment laws. Reimbursement will also be provided to certain States bearing a heavy long-term unemployment cost burden.

Extension of unemployment compensation benefits for a third temporary period is necessary and justified, because few of the States are prepared to deal with long-term unemployment and protracted periods spent by many workers in seeking reemployment. Under normal conditions, an unemployed person actively seeking a job should be able to secure one before the expiration of his State benefits—national average: 24½ weeks. At present, however, unemployment remains high and widespread. Unemployed persons need a longer time to ferret out new jobs. Thirteen additional weeks of assistance may in many cases mean the difference between new jobs and permanent failure and discouragement.

The benefit amount under this temporary extension would be the same as a worker drew under the permanent benefit period of his State law. These payments would be made only in those States which would want to participate in the program. Therefore, the additional funds will be channeled into the areas where they are most needed.

The financing of this program for persons under State unemployment compensation systems would be handled through advances by the Treasury to be repaid by a slightly increased Federal unemployment tax on the existing wage base. Any additional costs borne by employers would be tax deductible.

Our productive workers are our Nation's greatest current asset. They seek—not handouts—but only the opportunity to help themselves. This extended unemployment compensation legislation gives them that opportunity.

This legislation is urgent, and I hope the Committee on Ways and Means will give my bill priority.

NONPROFIT BLOOD BANKS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that the refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of physicians to obtain blood or blood plasma from other blood banks shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade. In other words the bill exempts physicians who may agree not to patronize a blood bank because of evidence of impurities or for other reasons, from the provisions of law against restraint of trade.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to make it plain that I have always supported antitrust legislation and most acts in restraint of trade should be promptly investigated by the Federal Trade Commission. But human blood should be made an exception.

The reason blood should be exempted is because of the danger to the donor and to the recipient when profit becomes a motive in the handling of blood. Possible impurities may be one reason but may not be the only reason that the medical profession and others oppose a commercial blood bank. The reasons are: Blood is not and should not be morally considered in the same category of items of trade such as food and clothing. Blood is a living tissue. A transfusion is a surgical operation and qualified physicians should not be endangered in exercising professional judgment by fear of prosecution under antitrust or possible antimonopoly violations.

Surely Congress did not consider a community project such as a nonprofit blood bank the proper target for antitrust legislation when it was enacted. Our present bill merely makes specific or spells out what I am sure is the present intent of the Congress and was the intent of the Congress when existing statutes were enacted. Recent events all across the country have emphasized the importance of strict professional control of the source and processing of human blood.

Mr. Speaker, in my home district in Missouri hearings are in progress under the direction of the Federal Trade Commission. These have been continuing for several months and have cost a large sum of money in cash outlay and time consumed. The total cost to the community has been estimated at nearly $150,000 in attorney fees and the cost of developing evidence with no estimate by the time lost by the mass of respondents. It is my hope that committee hearings can be scheduled soon and a favorable report rendered at an early date.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF EXPORT LICENSES FOR EXPORTATION OF AUTOMATED POTASH MINING MACHINERY

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote to the President and to the Secretary of Commerce requesting the withdrawal of export licenses issued by the Department of Commerce authorizing exportation to the U.S.S.R. of automated potash mining machinery valued at in excess of $9.5 million.

The mining machinery authorized to be shipped under those export licenses is of such size and productiveness that the Department of Commerce itself has admitted it will make a significant contribution to the economic buildup of the Soviet Union.

Just shortly before he left on his current trip to Europe, during which he has visited trade fairs in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the Secretary of Commerce on behalf of the President and the Department replied to my request.

The response, turning down my request, is basically nothing more than a rehash of the old arguments and cliches heard over and over again by those attempting to justify trade with the Communists. It seems tragically clear that those responsible for the decision are determined to force through a gross weakening of the barriers on shipments of goods to the Communist bloc.

Because of the interest that has been expressed in this matter, which I discussed previously with the House in statements which appear in the RECORD on August 23, page 15682; August 27, page 16046; August 28, page 16160, I am including here the initial letter received from the Department of Commerce advising of the decision to grant the export licenses, and the letter dated August 30, 1963, advising the licenses will not be withdrawn:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1963.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: In your letter of August 15 to Mr. Sweeney of this Office, you asked to be advised as soon as a decision was made with regard to the proposed exportation by a Pittsburgh firm of mining machinery to the U.S.S.R. The Department has just decided to authorize the export to which you refer. It is anticipated that the approval will be announced in the daily license list of August 21, 1963.

The machinery in question, which involves several export license applications, is for the mining of potash which is used almost exclusively in the manufacture of potassium fertilizers. While the Soviet Union is far short of its goals in the production of potassium fertilizers for its own indigenous use, nevertheless it is also an exporter of such fertilizers.

The case was one of considerable interest. In view of the size of the order and the productivity of the equipment, there was little doubt but that the export would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the Soviet Union. Accordingly, the question of whether such a contribution would be detrimental to the U.S. security and welfare had to be pursued. It was studied in great detail and, of course, advice was sought from other interested U.S. Government Departments and from industry. Our decision to license was heavily weighted by the fact that potassium fertilizer can best be characterized as peaceful goods. Increased use throughout the world of potassium fertilizer will undoubtedly increase food production. It is our conviction that increased food production throughout the world, thereby relieving hunger and human suffering, is consistent with and in furtherance of U.S. overall objectives.

Sincerely yours,
FORREST D. HOCKERSMITH,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, following receipt of that letter, I wrote to both the President and the Secretary of Commerce requesting that the export licenses issued to authorize shipment of this mining equipment be reversed. The reply follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1963.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: Thank you for your letter of August 23, which arrived simultaneously with a similar letter of August 27 from you to the President. I am glad to have the opportunity to respond to both of your communications, as it affords me the opportunity to explain the reasons why the Department decided to approve several export license applications for the shipment of potash mining equipment, accessories and parts, to the Soviet Union. Your letters request that the export licenses be revoked. I regret that in the light of the factors considered prior to our approval, I feel that acquiescence to your request would not be in the U.S. overall interest, either from a military or economic standpoint. In support of this position let me state the following:

1. The export license applications were originally submitted to the Department many months ago—in February and March 1963. The fact that final action was taken only on August 21, 1963, is indicative of the careful analysis and evaluation which the applications received.

2. As was indicated in Mr. Hockersmith's letter to you of August 21, 1963, the Department in cooperation with other technically competent agencies and departments of the U.S. Government, as well as with U.S. industry representatives, first, determined that the equipment was not of such a character as to be considered strategic from a military potential standpoint, and second, that there was little doubt that the equipment would make a significant contribution to the production of potash in the Soviet bloc.

3. As a result of this latter determination and in compliance with the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, the question of whether or not such a significant contribution to the bloc economic potential would be detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States was fully explored with the assistance of technically competent personnel from Government and industry. It was determined that the contribution would not be so detrimental for the following reasons:

(a) The equipment, because of specific design and engineering characteristics, would be utilized, as stated by the foreign consignee, in the mining of potash.

(b) The annual increment of production of potash made possible by the acquisition of the equipment, even though large in comparison with the current indigenous production, would still be materially less than the bloc's domestic requirements for potash for fertilizer production.

(c) That it was highly unlikely that the bloc would make itself dependent upon the United States for continuous and uninterrupted production of potash to be utilized for the several possible minor uses of potash in strategic applications mentioned in your speech before the House of Representatives on August 23.

(d) That equipment capable of achieving the same quantitative and qualitative production of potash in the Soviet bloc is produced abroad and is not controlled as to exports by the governments of the producing countries.

(e) That the increased utilization of potash for purposes of food production, i.e., mining of potash for production of potassium—containing fertilizers, was consistent with and in furtherance of U.S. overall policy objectives for the alleviation of human suffering and starvation.

On the basis of these determinations, the Department concluded that the overall best interests of the United States, including the military and economic aspects, warranted the approval of the applications with the resulting contribution to the overall economy and the resolution of the balance of payments and unemployment problems.

Let me assure you that the decision reached in these cases was given most careful thought and evaluation at the highest levels of the administration, as is done in all cases where exports to any nation or group of nations threatening the national security of the United States might be involved.

Sincerely yours,
LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that Secretary Hodges indicates that the applications for the export licenses were submitted to the Department of Commerce in February and March of 1963, and that final action was not taken until August 21, 1963. This it is claimed is due to the fact that the matter was carefully analyzed and evaluated prior to the final decision. I would say that the American people expect no less than that matters like this are to be carefully analyzed and evaluated because they bear importantly on our national security and welfare. I would also point out that during the intervening time the proposed nuclear test ban treaty was negotiated and initialed. It was also during this time that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman toured the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc nations and returned telling of the need to cooperate with and help the Communists on agricultural matters.

The Secretary states in paragraph No. 2 of his letter that the U.S. industry representatives were consulted in connection with the administration evaluation of the license applications to ship mining equipment to the U.S.S.R. What was the position of those representatives? It seems inconceivable that representatives of the potash industry would favor an action which will place the U.S.S.R. in an improved position to compete in world potash markets through price cutting. In my opinion the potash industry should have been anything but favorably inclined toward the granting of the licenses. Yet, the letter appears to be so phrased to attempt to give the impression that industry representatives were agreeable.

In my view the reasons outlined by the Secretary in sections (a) through (e) of the letter as to why shipment of the automated mining machinery to the U.S.S.R. would not be detrimental to our welfare are almost wholly devoid of merit.

In reason (a) of the Secretary's letter it is merely repeated that the machinery is intended for use in the mining of potash in the Soviet Union. Paragraph (b) indicates:

> The annual increment of production of potash made possible by the acquisition of the equipment, even though large in comparison with the current indigenous production, would still be materially less than the bloc's domestic requirements for potash for fertilizer production.

Is one supposed to deduce from that that any further potash production which would be possible if this machinery is shipped would be used domestically? If that is its purpose, it is seriously misleading. The Department itself indicated in the letter of August 21, 1963, which is set forth above, that though the U.S.S.R. does not produce sufficient potassium fertilizer for its own use, it is an exporter of such fertilizer. In my statement to the House on August 27 I presented figures showing that through its price-cutting practices, the U.S.S.R. during the years 1958 to the present has raised its share of the Japanese market of potassium fertilizer from 17 to 32 percent. The Japanese market is only one example. The U.S.S.R. through similar tactics is attempting to infiltrate and capture potash markets in many other areas, such as in Latin America.

Reason (c) in the Secretary's letter reads:

> That it was highly unlikely that the bloc would make itself dependent upon the United States for continuous and uninterrupted production of potash to be utilized for the several possible minor uses of potash in strategic applications mentioned in your speech before the House of Representatives on August 23.

The sense of this paragraph defies detection. Obviously since my first speech to the House of Representatives on this particular case occurred on August 23, 1963, my comments did not figure in the Commerce Department's August 21, 1963, decision to grant the licenses. I did not state or imply that the Soviet bloc would make itself dependent on the United States for continuous and uninterrupted production of potash. To the contrary, an important element in the Soviet trade effort is its desire to buy whole factories, technologies, and advanced equipment to enable it to build up its economy independent of the West.

The next reason, (d), states:

> That equipment capable of achieving the same quantitative and qualitative production of potash in the Soviet bloc is produced abroad and is not controlled as to exports by the governments of the producing countries.

This is a well-worn argument presented, as usual, without supporting details, in an attempt to justify selling to the Soviets on the basis that they are able to acquire like equipment elsewhere. One of the obvious questions raised is: Why do the Soviets attempt to buy here if they can get the same thing elsewhere? In many cases American automated equipment is far superior than that otherwise obtainable, and in addition there are such factors as the favorable delivery schedules, services and parts available from American suppliers. The export license list for September 5, 1963, contains a listing of an export license granted by the Department of Commerce authorizing the sale to the U.S.S.R. of technical data on a complete fertilizer plant. This all appears to be part of a gigantic campaign by the administration to help bolster the Soviet economy. Where will it stop?

The next reason states:

> (e) That the increased utilization of potash for purposes of food production, i.e., mining of potash for production of potassium-containing fertilizers, was consistent with and in furtherance of U.S. overall policy objectives for the alleviation of human suffering and starvation.

Naturally we have absolutely no assurances that the potash mined with this equipment would be used for food production rather than for other purposes. Behind the high-sounding phrases is the fact that building up the Soviet economy through the exportation of such equipment would help make them stronger economically and in a better position to pursue their goals of conquest under the Communist banner. Have the repeated statements of Communist leaders over the years of their intention to overcome the West economically been forgotten? Are we ignoring Khrushchev's statement as recently as August 24, 1963, in Yugoslavia when he urged Communist workers to strive hard to help bury the West economically?

The Secretary in his letter then states that it has been concluded that the overall best interests of the United States warranted the approval of the applications to ship the mining equipment to the U.S.S.R. The paragraph reads:

> On the basis of these determinations, the Department concluded that the overall best interests of the United States, including the military and economic aspects, warranted the approval of the applications with the resulting contribution to the overall economy and the resolution of the balance of payments and unemployment problems.

I would invite close attention to the phrasing of that statement. Have we indeed reached the point where, as Secretary Hodges states, it is in the "best interests of the United States" to allow the Soviets to buy over $9.5 million of highly automated mining equipment which will add significantly to the Soviet economy? And this in complete disregard of the Export Control Act which was strengthened by the Congress last year. I believe the answer must be an emphatic "No." It is a tragically shortsighted decision. It shows the great need for strong action by the Congress to help put a stop to policies of accommodating the Communists through, among other things, selling them strategic goods and equipment.

THE NEED IS NOW FOR NEW COLLEGE LOAN FUNDS

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 years, 490,000 students in 1,534 colleges and universities around the Nation have benefited from the student loan program provided by the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This coming year, however, thousands of qualified students will be frustrated in their efforts to gain a college education, unless Congress acts immediately on new authorizations and appropriations for the program. According to the U.S. Office of Education, requests totaling $35 million can not be met due to the fact that the present ceiling of $90 million has not been raised as promised in the President's education package sent to Congress in January.

There is absolutely no excuse for the situation the students find themselves in today. Here is a program which was begun under the administration of a Republican President, passed with bipartisan support and little opposition, and renewed again only last year. Although the students have 11 years in which to repay their loans, these funds are being repaid at twice the scheduled rate, which is a tribute to the young people of this Nation. And here Congress sits, with nothing to do for months, while college careers go out the window.

As long ago as January of this year, when the Kennedy administration introduced its omnibus education package, Republican leaders warned of just such a delay if the noncontroversial parts of the bill were not divorced from new programs which had little backing. I know that many of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle have expressed similar views. Yet a separate bill, H.R. 6061, was not introduced for nearly 5 months.

We can see the results today. My own State of New Jersey has been allocated only $1,738,850 of its $2,095,966 request, or roughly 83 percent. Part of the reason for the lesser amount can also be traced to a provision presently in the act which places a limit of $250,000 on any one institution's share, which directly affects requests from Princeton and Rutgers—the State university. Yet, New Jersey is fairly well off. In South Dakota, for example, less than 50 percent of the needs have been met. In New Jersey alone, however, an estimate based on an average of $500 a loan indicates that over 600 students will suffer.

Recently I have received many communications from students in my district requesting assistance. As each day passes they see their hopes for continuing or beginning their academic careers disappearing. All I can tell them is that the committee responsible for a new authorization bill, which would provide an additional $45 million and eliminate the $250,000 institutional limitation, hopes to have the measure before Congress in the near future.

As Dr. Stout, the Director of the Office of Education's student financial aid branch has observed, however, the critical point in time is right now. Any further delay would make it administratively impossible to aid students before the beginning of the next semester in January. I urge the leadership, therefore, to make this a priority "must" item and to bring the bill to a vote before another week is up.

U.S. CULTURAL EXPORT DECLARED LOW GRADE

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this week witnesses told a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee headed by our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], that, instead of sending abroad its finest performers the U.S. Government's cultural exports at the present time are of little help in dispelling America's image as that of a people unconcerned with the arts.

Hal Holbrook, who toured 12 countries in East and West Europe with his one-man show, "An Evening With Mark Twain," urged that better theater productions be sent abroad, and that some theater productions sent overseas have been "thrown together like an oldtimers' benefit team."

Angus Duncan, executive secretary of Actors' Equity Association, said:

> To overcome the widespread notion of America as a cultural desert we expend the price of one grade A movie—$2.5 million a year.

Theodore Bikel, actor and folk singer, who recently toured New Zealand and Australia for the State Department, said:

> You cannot answer an appearance by Oistrakh in an uncommitted country by anything less than an appearance by Isaac Stern.

Stanley Ballard, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, said that as early as 1959 Great Britain spent $65 million on cultural exports, France $50 million, and West Germany $13 million. Soviet expenditures on cultural exports, he said, while not known exactly, are very high.

Melissa Hayden, prima ballerina with the New York City Ballet, said her company had been very successful in its tour of Western Europe, Japan, and Russia under the cultural exchange program for the State Department, and added:

> I detect a growing tendency to send the wrong groups to the wrong places.
>
> I am told that certain companies are sent abroad simply because they are in existence. But can we afford to send less than the best to Russia? Do they send us other than their best? If companies are not sufficiently stimulating to the New York City public they are not sufficiently stimulating to the Moscow public.

Mr. Speaker, early this year the Department of State reorganized its cultural exchange program. Soothing statements were issued at that time about the past inadequacies of this program, and glowing promises were made about how the reorganization would strengthen and improve it. Apparently, however, the situation at the State Department leaves much to be desired. I have spoken several times about this cultural exchange program and now call attention to my statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, 1963, page 11024; August 8, page 14621; and August 14, page 15009. Also January 10, 1963, page 120.

I include at this point some interesting and significant letters I have received regarding some of the points I have been making in these speeches, about such things as the need to implement the "reverse flow" provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and the need to counter the cultural drive of Cuba, and the Soviet Union, in South America. In addition, I include a news item on the formation of a committee of drama experts to advise the Department of State regarding the presentation of theater programs abroad.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
July 16, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Thank you so much for your letter and the copy of your speech, which is excellent. I am planning to attend the meeting of the Appropriations Committee, and will do what I can to persuade the members to include some money for this activity.

I was very disappointed at the extent of the cut in the administration's request imposed by the House. We seem to have unlimited funds for going to the moon and other questionable activities, but it always seems difficult to find money for this field.

I do appreciate your interest and the fine job you have done in presenting the case.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY,
New Brunswick, N.J., September 4, 1963.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Your very interesting material came in while I was on vacation. I share your concern over the way in which the Congress has cut the administration's recommendations concerning the Inter-American Music Festival and similar enterprises. There is a kind of false realism which prompts this kind of false economy, and I am very glad to see that you are protesting against it.

Yours very sincerely,

MASON W. GROSS.

CARNEGIE CORP. OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., August 20, 1963.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: Thank you for sending me the copy of your important speech on the State Department's cultural presentations program. I particularly appreciated your emphasis upon maintaining the quality of the program.

With respect to Miss Lulu Porter, I do not have enough information to pass judgment on the merits of the case, but I shall make every effort to learn more about it. It is my understanding that she was not selected under the program which we reorganized last winter and which is now under the direction of Mr. Glenn Wolfe in the State Department. She was selected, I believe, by the people in the Department who are concerned with exchange of persons with eastern Europe.

I intend to make further inquiries on this matter, because it is my hope that eventually all exchanges which have cultural or artistic implications will be cleared through Mr. Wolfe.

I heartily share your concern for standards. The reorganization efforts of last winter were earnestly directed to that end.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. GARDNER.

EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS,
New York, N.Y., August 13, 1963.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Thank you for forwarding the enclosure with your August 12 letter.

I believe that you are probably quite correct in stating that our cultural exchange program, particularly with Latin America, is out of all proportion to the strategic interest of our southern neighbors. There are, however, two events which should help to evaluate our overall program in Latin America which I would like to bring to your attention.

A very excellent summary of all activities of American organizations, governmental and private, within individual countries in Latin America is currently being prepared by a Mrs. Young in the State Department. I have reviewed a draft of the Brazilian summary and judge it to be a thorough and most useful piece of work. It is impressive for the range of interest and assistance which it indicates. I suggest that when these summaries are completed and studied, perhaps for the first time one can assess our overall national involvement with Latin America and areas which need additional commitment.

Second, the meeting in Bogotá of Ministers of Education which was just concluded proposed that the ministers reconvene this week to study cultural exchanges. If this was done, the interest and feelings of the South Americans about the matter will be expressed I presume.

I hope that your continued attention to the strengthening of our cultural exchange programs will eventually find the needed governmental and private suport.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER H. SHELDON.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1963.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Thank you for the transmittal, under date of August 12, of the materials on the cultural relations program.

As you know, the Commission on International Education has followed with great interest the development of this program. I think it fair to say that the Commission remains of the view, recently expressed in the Gardner report, that underfinancing has been a chronic limitation on U.S. effectiveness in this important field.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. HUMPHREY,
Director.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 1, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT FORMS PANEL ON EXPORTING OF CULTURE

The State Department yesterday announced the formation of a committee of drama experts and said it is suspending export of theatrical productions until the expert advice of members of the panel can be obtained.

The 15 members of the committee will study problems of presenting theatrical entertainment abroad under the U.S. cultural affairs program.

They are being asked to give their views on problems of cost as related to production, scenery, lighting, and transportation and on innovations and economies that may be achieved through advanced planning.

"The committee will also be asked," the announcement said, "to suggest criteria for determining play content that will be effective abroad even though not performed in the local language."

Actress Nan Martin, of New York, was named chairman of the group and Producer Robert Whitehead, of New York, vice chairman.

Other members: Richard L. Coe, drama critic of the Washington Post; Robert Dowling, of New York, chairman of the board of directors of the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA); Hal Holbrook, New York, actor; Edward Kook, New York, lighting expert; Jerome Lawrence, Malibu, Calif., writer; E. G. Marshall, New York, actor; Kevin McCarthy, Beverly Hills, Calif., actor.

Also, Jo Mielziner, New York, stage designer; Dick Moore, New York, actor and editor of Equity; Chester Morris, New York, actor; Donald Oenslager, New York, scene designer; Alan Schneider, New York, stage director; Peggy Wood, New York, actress and president of ANTA.

Mr. Speaker, the concentration of the Soviet Union and its satellite nations, including Cuba, on cultural matters, especially the arts, is of the utmost importance as an increasing number of people all over our country recognize. Certainly, the support which the Congress has given, in appropriating funds, and in other ways, to the administration in art exchanges—which began under President Eisenhower—proves that there is overwhelming recognition here, and in the country at large, that a far-reaching counterstrategy is an absolute must.

What we do in cultural matters is of paramount importance and, for this reason, many people have become genuinely alarmed at reports of the imminent appointment of Richard Goodwin to the post which August Heckscher graced until recently as special consultant on the arts to the President.

The fact that being a troubleshooter, votegetter, and sometime speechwriter for the President does not automatically qualify a person to fill the most important art and culture post in the Federal Government is apparent to practically everyone, and therefore should be apparent to this administration which prides itself on its concern for the arts. This is particularly true, since this administration has been plagued with more than its share of unfortunate and lackluster appointments.

Let us hope, therefore, that the President will find a way to fill this important post with a man or woman who is distinguished in the arts and who is a cultural leader of note.

I would like, at this time, to speak a word of encouragement also to those who have worked so hard to preserve the Capitol Theater for the presentation of America's great artists, and of opera, ballet, and other performing arts groups, as well as young and aspiring artists of merit, from this and other countries.

The destruction of the Capitol Theater, and the conversion of its space to offices, will deprive the Nation's Capital of the only stage it has, or is likely to have for many, many years, if ever, which is suitable for the presentation of the larger productions from this and other countries.

According to the newspapers yesterday, and today, the Washington Post, the Evening Star, and the Washington Daily News, the seats and the stage equipment have been thoughtlessly ripped out of the Capitol Theater, and its furnishings yesterday auctioned off to the highest bidder. Despite these unfortunate developments there is still every reason to hope that this great theater can and will be saved for the benefit of all of our people. Surely the House acted forthrightly and in the highest national interest in passing H.R. 7399 on August 26, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS demonstrated and acted in the best interest of all of our citizens when he introduced this bill in the Senate with a much-needed amendment which provides for the full compensation of the National Press Club and the National Press Building Corp., the owners and managers of the National Press Building of which the Capitol Theater is such an integral part. Senator DOUGLAS sent me the following letter on this matter:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Thank you for your letter of August 27 concerning the legislation to rescue the Capitol and Keith's Theaters. I was happy to introduce the bill on September 5 and I enclose the tearsheet from the RECORD of my Senate speech.

I have written Senator BIBLE, chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, asking if his committee would be able to consider this matter as soon as possible.

With best wishes,
Faithfully yours,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. Speaker, now that the complete destruction of the Capitol Theater is possible, and proved to be so imminent, it is my hope that Senator ALAN BIBLE and his colleagues who are members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia will move quickly to hold hearings on the House-passed bill, H.R. 7399, and Senator DOUGLAS' highly important amendment, and approve it without delay.

I include as part of my remarks, House Report No. 702, which accompanied H.R. 7399:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7399) to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of certain buildings in the District of Columbia for municipal purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than February 15, 1964, a feasible plan for the acquisition of Loew's Capitol Theater and Keith's Theater by purchase, lease or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters. It is further stipulated that no permit shall be granted for the destruction of those theaters or for their conversion to other uses, until 60 days after the date on which the above-mentioned plan is submitted to the 88th Congress.

The motivation for this bill is the report that these two privately owned theaters are scheduled for conversion into use for business offices.

Keith's Theater, located in the Albee Building at 619 15th Street NW., has a seating capacity of 1,600 and is reputed to be one of the most beautiful and acoustically perfect theaters in the world. Loew's Capitol Theater is in the National Press Building, at 1326 F Street NW., and is the largest theater in the city, with a seating capacity of 3,600 persons. We are informed that Loew's Capitol is the only theater in Washington with stage facilities large enough to accommodate the presentation of the larger types of ballet and grand opera productions.

A joint resolution identical to this bill, House Joint Resolution 865, passed the House of Representatives on September 24, 1962, but failed of action in the Senate. At a public hearing held last year in connection with House Joint Resolution 865, spokesmen for a number of local organizations devoted to the performing arts, including the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, the Washington Ballet Guild, the Hayes Concert Bureau, and the Washington Civic Opera and Washington Civic Symphony, testified as to the need for the continuance of these two theaters as irreplacable centers for live theatrical exhibits.

We were informed that the performing arts, such as ballet, grand opera, and theater, are more lively today than ever before, and that throughout the United States enthusiasm, activity, and patronage are on the increase. Under these circumstances, it would certainly be a most serious setback to this movement if the principal showcase of the Nation, a city now acclaimed in many circles as the capital of the world were unable to accommodate major musical, dance, and opera companies, including some which come from abroad as official visitors in implementation of international agreements undertaken by our Government. Any step reasonably calculated to assist in averting such an unfortunate development will certainly constitute a significant contribution to the cultural life of this city and of the Nation.

In recent years, some 15 to 18 live shows which could have been accommodated on no other stage in the District of Columbia have been presented each year at the Capitol Theater, and it has been planned to increase this number in the future. These presentations have included such internationally acclaimed performers as the Gala Royal Danish Ballet and the Bolshoi Ballet.

The Cultural Center which is now in the planning stage for the District of Columbia will not offer a solution to the problem posed by the threatened loss of the Capitol and Keith's Theaters. In the first place, the most optimistic timetable calls for the completion of this Center in 1966; and also, plans for the Center include provisions for a theater which will seat only 1,200 persons.

A Citizens' Committee To Save the Capitol Theater, composed of prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, attempted to negotiate a lease with the owners of the Capitol Theater, without success.

Also, within the past 2 months, a group of investors submitted a very substantial offer, reported to be some $8 million, for the purchase of the building in which the Capitol Theater is located, for the purpose of leasing the theater to keep a "much-needed entertainment and cultural center for our Nation's Capitol." Despite this offer, however, the National Press Club Corp., which owns both the building and the theater, has proceeded with plans to convert the building into offices. This plan necessitated an application to the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment for a zoning variance, because the officers would create a greater density than now exists inside the building. On June 26, 1963, it was announced that the Zoning Board had granted this variance, and apparently the corporation intends to proceed with its plan.

It thus appears that citizens' efforts to accomplish the continued operation of these theaters are doomed to failure, and that the only feasible solution must involve the District of Columbia government, as proposed in this legislation.

Public hearing on H.R. 7399 and H.R. 7390, identical bills, was held on July 26, 1963.

HEAVY PREPONDERANCE OF PUBLIC OPINION ON ONE SIDE OF A PUBLIC ISSUE

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is rare, I believe, when every evidence—congressional mail, personal contact with voters, and public polls—points to a heavy preponderance of public opinion on one side of a public issue.

Yet, this is undoubtedly the case when the question involved is whether taxes should be cut without first bringing Federal spending under control. The majority of American people, to their everlasting credit, are unwilling to accept the undeniable benefits of a cut in their taxes unless they have concrete evidence that the administration is either willing to discipline its spending urge or is forced to do so.

As one evidence of this deep belief of the American people, I include, as part of my remarks, a press release I issued yesterday which points to results of polls on this question conducted by Republican Members this year.

The average poll of these 38 Members shows that, among those expressing an opinion on whether taxes should be cut without spending reductions, 85 percent voted "no" and only 15 percent voted "yes."

The press release follows:

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN W. BYRNES, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN

Constituent polls by Republican Congressmen from all parts of the country show a vast majority of voters oppose President Kennedy's program to cut taxes and increase Federal spending, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee, disclosed today.

The Wisconsin Congressman said the average Republican Congressman's poll of his constituents showed that 85 percent of those responding opposed tax cuts without more control over spending and 15 percent favored tax reductions whether or not proposed expenditures were reduced. The polls included samplings of voter opinion by 39 Congressmen from all parts of the country.

"These polls prove once again that Americans still cling to the basic Puritan ethic for which the Kennedy administration has such contempt," BYRNES said. "The people of America, in effect, are telling the administration that they want action to control spending before taxes are cut and they are saying it in no uncertain terms."

BYRNES, who also is chairman of the House Republican policy committee, noted that President Kennedy has consistently ignored the fact that "voters have not been seduced by the attraction of a tax cut without regard to the deficits it will insure."

The polls were conducted over the past few months and covered a wide variety of subjects, but all included a question on tax policy. Although the question was phrased differently in each questionnaire, it boiled down to this: Do you favor tax cuts without spending cuts? Here is the breakdown in percentages:

Summary of GOP congressional polls on tax reduction [1]

[Percent]

Member and State	Yes	No
Alger (Texas)	12.0	80.0
Anderson (Illinois)	13.0	86.0
Baldwin (California)	10.0	85.0
Berry (South Dakota)	10.0	88.0
Bolton, F. (Ohio)	10.0	75.0
Bolton, O. (Ohio)	13.7	65.4
Bow (Ohio)	14.0	86.0
Broomfield (Michigan)	15.0	85.0
Burton (Utah)	29.0	71.0
Chamberlain (Michigan)	8.0	83.0
Clancy (Ohio)	26.0	74.0
Corbett (Pennsylvania)	10.0	90.0
Devine (Ohio)	26.0	74.0
Dwyer (New Jersey)	25.8	74.2
Findley (Illinois)	20.0	80.0
Foreman (Texas)	6.3	93.7
Harvey (Indiana)	16.0	84.0
Hoeven (Iowa)	4.0	89.0
Hosmer (California)	11.6	88.0
Kyl (Iowa)	16.0	79.0
Lindsay (New York)	15.3	51.2
McClory (Illinois)	15.0	85.0
McIntire (Maine)	29.1	70.9
McLoskey (Illinois)	7.5	89.5
Martin (Nebraska)	22.0	72.0
Nelsen (Minnesota)	15.0	85.0
Poff (Virginia)	17.0	77.0
Quie (Minnesota)	9.0	84.0
Quillen (Tennessee)	12.0	79.0
Reifel (South Dakota)	11.0	84.0
Schneebeli (Pennsylvania)	9.0	72.0
Shriver (Kansas)	11.9	84.0
Snyder (Kentucky)	13.8	80.4
Springer (Illinois)	18.9	76.6
Stinson (Washington)	12.5	82.0
Thomson (Wisconsin)	17.0	75.0
Tollefson (Washington)	10.0	83.0
Younger (California)	12.1	82.0

---

[1] Where percentage totals do not add up to 100, the difference represents the "undecided" or "no opinion" vote.

STATEMENT OF POLICY BY THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Air Force Association meeting here in Washington, adopted their 1963 statement of policy.

Last night at their dinner honoring this year's outstanding airman, a constituent of mine, Mr. A. P. Phillips, of Orlando, Fla., vice president of the Air Force Association, gave me a copy of this statement of policy.

I find it eminently worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement points out certain basic facts concerning the state of world affairs and this Nation's approach to them, that in my opinion, represents the thinking of many citizens of this country. Of particular significance is their recognition that communism is the primary threat to peace and freedom, and that the only sound way to meet it, is by maintaining military superiority over the Communist nations.

Worthy of particular note is the association's statement on the proposed test ban treaty. Their statement of policy says:

> It is our conviction, therefore, that even if the promised safeguards should materialize, ratification of the proposed test ban treaty would entail unacceptable risks to the security of this Nation and of the free world.

I think it well to point out that a large majority of the membership of the Air Force Association consists of former Air Force people who are not in the active Military Establishment, but are civilians who are an integral part of the busy communities where they live. They are not only active but prominent in business and civic affairs, and geographically, reside in all parts of our Nation. They represent the thinking of a sizable cross section of America.

It is refreshing to see the Air Force Association take such an objective stand of vital issues facing this Nation.

The Air Force Association's 1963 statement is as follows:

AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION, 1963 STATEMENT OF POLICY, AS SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

The views of the Air Force Association, as set forth in this 1963 statement of policy, are offered as the collective judgment of a large body of men and women who represent a broad cross-section of the American people. In the degree that we constitute an organization, it is by reason of our experience, interest, knowledge, and concern in, of, and about national security. Here we believe our views can make a substantial contribution to the national policy dialog. We present these views herewith:

The Communist system, whether dominated by Moscow or divided between Moscow and Peiping, continues to stand as the primary threat to the peace of the world and the freedom of mankind. We find no evidence that the Communist goal of world domination has changed.

It is now more important than ever before to emphasize this reality. The search for peace is taking new and perilous turnings. Our strength has thus far deterred a nuclear war. Yet, a paralyzing fear of such a war is leading to a preoccupation with dismantling the very strategic tools that have served us—and mankind on both sides of the Iron Curtain—so well thus far. There is abroad an atmosphere of relief, relaxation, and false security ominously reminiscent of events that led to the Yalta accommodation with one totalitarian power and the Munich accommodation with another. Once again, hope may outweigh reason.

Today the nuclear test ban treaty is hailed as a first step toward the relaxation of world tensions and eventual world peace. The desire for peace is one we share. Remembering as we do the false accommodations of the past, we must ask "Does the test ban treaty truly advance the cause of peace?"

In cold truth the balance between the debits and credits attaching to this accommodation has not yet been satisfactorily struck. Within the Government, the majority of the senior officials who support the treaty acknowledge that technical and military risks are being knowingly incurred. There is, in fact, among the weapon experts who are privy to the technical intelligence a clear disagreement as to whether the nuclear advantage still remains with us or has passed, or is passing, to the Soviet Union.

We note the testimony of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the effect that Soviet cheating is to be expected.

We note the Government's promises to maintain constant readiness to resume tests, in event of a Soviet violation in those environments prohibited by the treaty.

We note the Government's promises to make the most of the opportunities afforded by underground testing.

We note that promised safeguards are not now in being. This circumstance is a cause for grave concern among those familiar with all the technical considerations.

We note that responsible nuclear authorities consider it possible that certain atmospheric tests conducted by the Russians may have already provided them information on missile vulnerability which we do not have. The United States had programed such tests but these would be forbidden under the treaty. Thus, even if the Soviets do not cheat, and even if the promised safeguards are fully exploited, the Russians may already possess the information necessary to neutralize our missile force.

Finally, we note the statement of the one Senate committee which examined all the classified data—the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee—which reported: "We are compelled to conclude that serious—perhaps even formidable—military and technical disadvantages to the United States will follow from the ratification of the treaty. At the very least it will prevent the United States from providing our military forces with the highest quality of weapons of which our science and technology is capable."

It is argued, nonetheless, that the technical considerations are necessarily subordinate to the political ones. The treaty's "thrust," we are told, is political. Yet, beyond the vague expectation that the United States will now be able somehow to transact business with the Soviet Union on easier terms, the political advantages that have overpowered the technical disadvantages have not been made clear.

The Soviet political system remains closed. We and our allies still are confronted by a militarily powerful state where policy and the means of action remain locked in secrecy. This is what has bred tension. So long as the real sources of danger remain unapproached and unopened, where are the political advantages? In the past 3 years, communism has been on the move as never before. The Berlin wall has been built, the assault on South Vietnam has intensified, Chinese Communist forces have moved into India, and Soviet forces have moved into Cuba.

We are not impressed by the contention that the schism in the Communst camp will necessarily lead to a lessening of peril to the free world. The Soviet military intervention in Cuba, as well as the Red Chinese thrust against India, came well after the breach between Moscow and Peiping had developed. The fact that we face not one but two centers of Soviet power has only complicated, without solving, the central problems besetting the free world. In any event, we are not now persuaded that it is to the long-range interest of this Nation to make easier the lot of the senior partner of the Communist conspiracy. Logic, in our judgment, argues for maintaining the technological and economic pressures from which the Soviet system under Khrushchev is trying to escape, and for which the system appears to have no effective counter.

In the long run, and we owe it to our descendants to think in the long run, the drive of totalitarian communism, whether in its Russian or Red Chinese manifestations—or even in other forms in Latin America, Asia, or Africa—will end only when the Communist leadership becomes convinced that its aims are demonstrably unworkable and unwanted.

Until recently the keystone of the defense of the free world has been the clear superiority in nuclear striking power of the United States and its allies. Now the pursuit of nuclear superiority is being replaced by the pursuit of a nuclear stalemate. Manned strategic systems, both offensive and defensive, are being abandoned. Under present programs, within a relatively few years our strategic nuclear force will consist entirely of missiles, either buried underground or moving about in the depths of the sea. The stated official hope is that the Soviet Union will similarly recast its own strategic nuclear forces. The opposing missile forces presumably will cancel out each other, like opposing factors in equation. The decisive element in such a balance of power, if achieved, then would revert to traditional air, sea, and ground forces—armed with conventional weapons.

We believe that adherence to a policy of nuclear stalemate is an open invitation to Soviet aggression on terms which the free world cannot meet and is not prepared to meet.

Such aggression could take one of two paths, or both paths could be pursued simultaneously. The first path would be for the Soviets to endorse the theory of stalemate while working clandestinely to upset it. The closer the balance, the easier it can be upset. Technology remains dynamic. Strategy must be responsive to its dynamism. Nor can it be politically frozen at a wishfully convenient level. A breakthrough in only one of several technological areas could upset a stalemate decisively. The potentially decisive areas are many—nuclear weapon technology, military space systems, antisubmarine warfare techniques, antimissile defense systems. A significant Communist breakthrough in only one of these areas could put the free world at the mercy of a Soviet ultimatum.

The Air Force Association believes that a stalemate strategy is illusory on both political and technological grounds. We believe that strong measures must be taken to ensure that our strategic superiority, in the meaningful area of nuclear striking forces, is preserved.

Should, however, the Soviets accept nuclear stalemate in fact, then another path to world domination opens up to them. Exploitation of technological advantage has been the free world's greatest military asset to date. It is an asset that would be surrendered should a nuclear stalemate be accepted. For hand in hand with the theory of nuclear stalemate goes political pressure for nuclear disengagement across the board, tactical as well as strategic. This pressure stems from a belief in the inevitability of the expansion of nuclear warfare. The nuclear escalation theory holds that use of even small tactical nuclear weapons will invite automatic reprisal in kind and on a larger scale, forcing the tempo of the war up the nuclear escalator toward an all-out exchange. Fear of the expansion of nuclear war is so great among those who hold this view that complete elimination of nuclear weapons from the battlefield is deemed preferable.

Should the theory of strategic nuclear stalemate be accepted, should the West's tactical advantage in nuclear weapons be nullified by fear of an expanding nuclear war and by politically inspired nuclear disengagement, then the prospective battlefield might be left to air, sea and ground forces armed with conventional weapons. The Communists also would retain the option of introducing tactical nuclear weapons to gain a quick decision by surprise. Our allies in Western Europe are quite aware of these factors and are reluctant to supply conventional forces in meaningful quantities, a reluctance bolstered by the certain knowledge that a conventional war would be fought in their homelands. The United States has begun to expand its own conventional capability but has not yet admitted, at least publicly, the immense numbers of men and huge sums of money that will be required to support conventional forces of almost World War II size over an indefinite number of years. If we commit the folly of degrading our tactical nuclear capability, the Communists will have every incentive to improve their own. The Communists then could present us with a choice between capitulation and certain defeat by tactical nuclear weapons.

The Air Force Association believes that strategic nuclear stalemate, coupled with tactical nuclear disengagement, would dangerously compromise the technological and strategic advantage now held by the free world. Further, the association believes the inititaive in world affairs would pass to the Soviets under such an alinement of forces. And, most unpleasant of all, this country would face the prospect of conscripting its young men for military duty on a scale comparable to World War II.

The consequences of these notions of technological freeze, strategic nuclear stalemate, tactical nuclear disengagement and, finally, a worldwide confrontation with conventional arms, can already be seen. Manned offensive strategic systems are likely to be phased out completely. No follow-on manned systems, either offensive or defensive, are currently being programed. Complete strategic dependence is passing to a missile force of uncertain and untried reliability, with no strong provision made to exercise the force to determine its effectiveness or readiness. The percentage of the military budget devoted to strategic systems is dropping in both the relative and the absolute sense. Tactical nuclear weapons are beginning to be evacuated from Europe. The number of options available to our strategists and national policymakers is shrinking when it should be expanding. Strategic rigidity is replacing true flexibility. In trying to avoid a choice between holocaust or humiliation the nation is in danger of passing to a strategic posture in which any choice at all may well be eliminated.

It is said that these changes in our strategy are dictated by the dangers inherent in onrushing military technology and that the admitted risks involved in attempting to freeze technology are preferred to those involved in an ever-quickening arms race. The implication is that unless nuclear competition is dramatically halted, the two world colossi are on a collision course headed for inevitable disaster.

We of the Air Force Association submit that this is both an overstatement and an oversimplification. We submit that there are less dangerous alternatives which can lead to an eventual termination of the arms competition on terms that are acceptable to our national standards of justice and honor. Against this background we present our firmly held beliefs and convictions:

THE THREAT HAS NOT CHANGED

1. The nature and the extent of the Communist threat must first be acknowledged and treated for what it is. The goal is ultimate world domination. The essential threat is Communist military power. That power has been, and no doubt will continue to be, exercised in guile and secrecy.

MILITARY POWER—THE ONLY SAFE ANSWER

2. The only safe and realistic deterrent to the Communist threat is superior military power and the demonstrated willingness to employ it in defense of the free world.

STRATEGIC NUCLEAR SUPERIORITY ESSENTIAL

3. The threat to our survival as a nation and leader of the free world is most critical

at the high-intensity end of the spectrum of conflict, that involving exchange of multimegaton warheads between the major combatants, including our allies. The threat diminishes in immediate danger, although not necessarily in terms of likelihood, as one goes across the conflict spectrum toward low-intensity, counterinsurgency type operations. It is important not to confuse the likelihood of a given type of military confrontation with the extent of the threat it imposes. Conventional operations may be more likely than a thermonuclear exchange but they are also much less damaging. A meaningful conventional capability can only supplement nuclear superiority. It cannot substitute for it.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE

4. Technological advance cannot be wished away or stopped at a point that may appear to be convenient or desirable. Technology will work for any master who has the wit and the will to exploit it. This country must employ technology with imagination and daring in a search both for new means of defense and, equally important, new ways of preventing war.

SPACE

5. One area of military technological potential in which this Nation obviously is making less than a maximum effort is military space. As we noted last year, space provides a new pivot for military capability. We must exploit military space to extend and preserve our deterrent strength, to control and inhibit those who would use their power aggressively to dominate life on earth. All of our national space efforts, including purely scientific exploratory programs, must be measured first against this yardstick. The national interest must be the prime purpose of every national program.

STRATEGIC OPTIONS

6. This Nation must avoid sterile strategic doctrine that strives for a stalemate that would be as difficult for us to maintain as it would be easy for the enemy to upset. Hence, we of the Air Force Association reiterate our firm belief in the need for a mixture of forces and weapons tailored to the job to be done. While the new strategy purports to widen our strategic options, it has in fact limited these options by phasing out manned strategic systems. Only such a mix, of manned and unmanned systems, airborne and spaceborne, offensive and defensive, can give our planners the number of options, the variety of choice, they need to match wits as well as weapons with a determined enemy. Specifically, we call for development and production of advanced bomber and interceptor systems in order to avoid a dangerous overreliance on missile systems.

ARMS COMPETITION

7. We of the Air Force Association hold that this Nation need feel neither a sense of guilt nor of apology in engaging in an arms competition that it did not seek, a competition that was thrust upon it by those who seek to dominate all men. We submit that this Nation and its allies have a solemn obligation to prevail in this competition.

TEST BAN

8. Holding these beliefs, we of the Air Force Association are particularly troubled both by the substance of the proposed test ban treaty and the manner in which it has been thrust upon the Congress, our military leadership, and upon the American people. Much of the basic information pertinent to a prudent decision remains in contention.

We are keenly aware of the military risks which are inherent in this treaty. The political gains which are supposed to outweigh these risks are not so clear. Whenever a nation limits its freedom of technical initiative in any important field, its security is endangered.

It is our conviction, therefore, that even if the promised safeguards should materialize, ratification of the proposed test ban treaty would entail unacceptable risks to the security of this Nation and of the free world.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the August 12 issue of Medical Economics there appears a report of the impressive progress being made in the private sector of our economy to provide adequate health care for the aged of this Nation. Slightly more than a year ago, I inserted an article in the daily Congressional Record of August 30, 1962, page A6555, to show the great strides made by the Connecticut insurance industry in providing more than 85 percent of that State's residents over the age of 65 with some form of hospital-medical insurance under the Connecticut 65 program. Legislation permitting this sort of risk pooling by the insurance industry as exempt from antitrust laws has been passed by 5 States and is now pending in 11 others.

Private health insurance has moved forward at a more rapid pace in the past 10 years in both quality and quantity coverage than probably any other division in our economy.

WHEN POLL MEETS POLL—MAKE MINE GALLUP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the September 9 issue of the Washington Post carried an article by its hothouse homegrown Post-Newsweek pollster—the Harris survey. The poll purported to show the current sentiment in the Nation on aid to education and the concomitant issues of fair and equal aid for the 7 million children in the nonsupported schools and the children of Negro parents.

On February 9 the same newspaper published the results of the Gallup poll under the heading: "Sentiment Shifts On Federal Aid to Catholics and Private Schools."

The Harris poll article states:

> The clear weight of public opinion is opposed to Federal aid to parochial schools.

The Gallup poll article states:

> As of today the weight of opinion throughout the country, 49 percent, holds that Federal aid should go to help not only public but Catholic and private schools as well, while a slightly smaller proportion, 44 percent, feel that financial aid should be limited to public schools.

Mr. Harris, meet Mr. Gallup. The dissimilarities are arresting.

The Harris poll seems to identify parallels of either antipathy or indifference by the majority of Americans toward every 7th child in the nonsupported schools and the children of every 10th American of Negro ancestry as follows:

> The clear weight of public opinion is opposed to Federal aid to parochial schools. A parallel division exists on the issue of not allowing Federal aid to go to schools which segregate children by race. Once again, while Negroes favor Federal aid by a 4-to-1 margin, they also want funds withheld from segregated schools by an 8-to-1 count. Still, the vast majority of whites are not with the Negro group on this issue.

In their response to Harris there is at least a consistency of dubious virtue.

Supposedly the same percentage of persons polled, who are dispassionate about having Federal funds go to systems which perpetuate segregation, would condone the companion injustice of accentuating the financial hardship of the nonsupported schools by assisting the public systems only.

One is moved to inquire whether those polled speak clearly and think fairly for the majority of Americans or is it possible that some of their voices were muffled under hoods as they stood with their sheets blowing in the wind?

I am constrained to believe that the majority of Americans will not long divide on the principle of fairness and equality and that, as indicated by the Gallup poll, the day is soon at hand when children in all the schools, regardless of their color or the creed they follow, will participate equally in the national effort.

I assure my colleagues that I mean in no way to impugn the record of consistencies of the Harris system. The margin of differential appears to be approximately 12 percent. This is in keeping with past performance. I recall a recent State election when a Harris poll helped select a sure-fire candidate to sweep the State. Some of the ticket came in second by as little as 12 percent. Soon after this organization dropped political forecasting and went the way of the Literary Digest. On this record in the light of its latest effort in education, poll to poll, I will take Gallup. For the information and interest of the House, I am pleased to insert the Gallup poll result of February 9 followed by the Harris survey result of September 9:

The Gallup Poll: Sentiment Shifts on Federal Aid to Catholic and Private Schools

Princeton, N.J., February 9.—There has been a sizable shift in sentiment over the last 2 years on whether Federal funds to aid education should go only to public schools or to Catholic and private schools as well.

As of today, the weight of opinion throughout the country (49 percent) holds that any Federal aid should go to help not only public, but Catholic and private schools as well, while a slightly smaller proportion (44 percent) feels that financial aid should be limited to public schools.

To see how the public stands on the school aid issue at this time, Gallup poll reporters asked the identical question of a representative sample of the Nation's adults that was asked nearly 2 years ago: "If the Federal Government in Washington decides to give money to aid education, should the money go only to public schools, or should the money go to help Catholic and other private schools as well?"

Two years ago, 57 percent of Americans polled felt that Federal aid should go only to public schools.

Here are the current results—with persons of the major religious faiths represented in proportion to the population:

	Percent
Public schools only	44
Catholic, private schools as well	49
No opinion	7

Following are the survey figures of March 1961:

	Percent
Public schools only	57
Catholic, private schools as well	36
No opinion	7

In taking a stand on the controversial issue 2 years ago, President Kennedy held that Federal aid to parochial schools is unconstitutional, stating that "it is prohibited by the Constitution and the Supreme Court has made that very clear."

Mr. Kennedy, the first Roman Catholic to be elected to the Presidency, took that position in the face of opposition not only of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, but also that of a majority of his fellow Catholic laymen.

The Nation's Protestant voters at that time supported the President's position.

Present survey findings indicate that the change in sentiment on the issue has come largely from Protestants.

Although 50 percent of voters of the Protestant faith feel today that any Federal aid should be limited to public schools, this represents a marked drop from the figure of 63 percent of Protestants who held this view 2 years ago.

Among voters of the Protestant faith reached in the present survey, the vote today on school aid as compared with the vote in March 1961, is as follows:

	Percent
February 1963:	
Public schools only	50
Catholic, private schools as well	42
No opinion	8
March 1961:	
Public schools only	63
Catholic, private schools as well	29
No opinion	8

Although proportionately more Catholics in the present survey favor Government aid for both public and Catholic and other private schools than was the case 2 years ago, the change is less marked than that found among Protestant voters.

The vote of Catholics only:

	Percent
February 1963:	
Public schools only	23
Catholic, private schools as well	71
No opinion	6
March 1961:	Percent
Public schools only	28
Catholic, private schools as well	66
No opinion	6

THE HARRIS SURVEYS VOTERS REPLY 2 TO 1 IN FAVOR OF U.S. AID TO EDUCATION

(By Louis Harris)

With community after community across the land beset by high local taxes and bonded debt, there is growing unanimity among the American people that Congress should provide massive Federal aid to public schools.

Among those expressing views on the issue, the division of opinion is 70 to 30 percent in favor of Federal legislation now to aid education.

The chief stumbling blocks to congressional passage of school-aid legislation have been: (1) Conservative opposition to any Federal assistance to local education; (2) Catholic opposition to Federal aid unless it is given to parochial as well as to public schools; and (3) Negro groups who want no Federal aid to go to segregated schools.

Yet our latest survey of a cross section of American voters shows clearly that a majority of the public does not want either the parochial school or integration questions to stand in the way of Federal aid to education. By approximately a 3-to-2 count, the American people reject the idea of offering Federal aid to parochial schools and reject proposals to withhold such aid from schools that segregate children by race.

The clear consensus among the people today is for Federal aid to public schools with no complications or riders attached. What is more, this will be a high-priority issue when voters are deciding to cast their ballots in 1964.

When asked directly if they oppose or favor enactment of Federal aid to education by Congress, people expressed support better than 2 to 1.

Federal aid to education

[In percent]

	Total voters	Without undecided
Favor Federal aid	59	70
Oppose Federal aid	27	30
Not sure	14	

Among those with opinions, 66 percent of the Protestants and an even higher 83 percent of Catholics favor Federal aid to education. However, when it comes to aid to parochial schools, the two religious groups sharply part company, with 71 percent of the Protestants opposing such aid, while 67 percent of Catholics favor it. Here is the overall division on the parochial school aid question:

Federal aid to parochial schools

[In percent]

	Total voters	Without undecided
Favor Federal aid	33	38
Oppose Federal aid	54	62
Not sure	13	

The clear weight of public opinion is opposed to Federal aid to parochial schools. A parallel division exists on the issue of not allowing Federal aid to go to schools which segregate children by race. Once again, while Negroes favor Federal aid by a 4-to-1 margin, they also want funds withheld from segregated schools by an 8-to-1 count. Still, the vast majority of whites are not with the Negro groups on this issue;

Withholding Federal aid from segregated schools

[In percent]

	Total voters	Without undecided
Favor withholding funds	34	40
Oppose withholding funds	50	60
Not sure	16	

The American people seem to be saying to Congress and the President that they rather desperately want direct Federal aid to education now. What is more, they add, despite election year sensitivities, concessions to minority interests should not be allowed to jeopardize a program that they feel will benefit the majority.

A MINIMUM WAGE FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

The bill is intended to remedy some of the unfair and inequitable wage and hour conditions in Washington. In the summer of 1962, the Bureau of Labor Statistics conducted a survey of nearly 87,000 nonsupervisory workers in retail stores, restaurants, real estate operations, and in selective industries, such as hotels, building services, laundries, automobile repair and services, motion picture theaters, and hospitals.

The Bureau selected these industries because they are generally not covered by Federal minimum wage legislation and because they employ people in unskilled occupations not covered by the existing District of Columbia minimum wage.

Of those covered by the survey, 45 percent were employed in retail trade; 18 percent in eating and drinking establishments; 12 percent in real estate; 5 to 10 percent in hospitals, hotels, and laundries; and less than 3 percent in automobile repair, parking and services, building services, and motion picture theaters. The average hourly wage—not including overtime or tips—range from $1.02 in automobile services to $1.82 in automobile repair shops. Substantial proportions of these were found to be in the lower pay levels. More than a half of them earned less than a $1.25 an hour in each of these industries except automobile repair shops, retail stores, and hospitals. In most of the industries included in the survey at least one-third of the workers earned less than $1.15 an hour.

Of the workers within the survey, 46 percent were women. At least one-quarter of these women earned less than $1.15 an hour in each of the industries groups. The proportions of women earning less than $1.25 an hour ranged from about two-fifths in retail trade and hospital to more than four-fifths in building services and motion picture theaters. While men's earnings exceed those of women by an average of as much as 46 cents an hour, in the majority of industries studied more than 50 percent of the men earned less than $1.25 an hour.

Most of the industries included in the survey at least one-third of the employees work more than 40 hours a week, and from one-fifth to almost one-half worked more than 38 hours a week. Only in hospitals were a majority of employees working a 35- or 40-hour week. Weekly earnings did not average more than $65—except automobile repair shops—in spite of overtime. Those employed in most of the industries who worked between 15 and 35 hours a week had earnings which ranged from $25 to $40 a week.

The Bureau's survey also shows that if there had been a $1.25 an hour minimum wage at the time of the survey—aggregate weekly wages would have been 1 to 6 percent higher in automobile repair shops, retail trade, building services, hospital, and laundries; 10 to 15 higher in automobile parking, hotels, real estate, and motion picture theaters; 25 percent higher in eating and drinking places; and 33 percent higher in automobile services.

I am convinced that the Congress has a moral obligation to see that an adequate minimum wage bill is enacted for the District of Columbia. Substandard wages produces substandard living conditions, which breeds slums and many of the social problems we find in Washington. An adequate minimum wage is not a cure-all but it is a step in the right direction. I hope that the Congress will quickly enact this bill.

EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS OF MEXICAN AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has a special subcommittee which is investigating the employment problems of various groups of people in the United States.

Mr. Dionisio Morales was among the witnesses today, and he spoke about the employment problems of Mexican American workers in California. With reference to the bracero law, Mr. Morales said:

> Every canon of justice is outraged so long as employers in a great American industry, and agencies of the American Government, extend benefits to foreign contract workers which they deny American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the bracero program provides minimum wages, insurance, minimum standards of housing, sanitation, and transportation. At the same time, American farmworkers are left out of the law when it comes to providing such elementary protections as are offered by wage and hour legislation, and other forms of legal protection for workers.

Mr. Speaker, how can we continue to endorse legislation which discriminates against our own people? Yet, if we extend Public Law 78, that is exactly what we will be doing. I urge my colleagues to stand by our earlier decision to let Public Law 78 expire on December 31.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MENTALLY INCOMPETENT PERSONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this week I have introduced a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to protect the constitutional rights of persons retained by law and considered for commitment thereunder, as possible mental incompetents.

The problem to which I have addressed the provisions of these amendments is a matter of particular concern to me because the U.S. Federal hospital and prison for defective delinquents, is located in the district which I am privileged to represent.

The bill is not motivated by any single occurrence or by any specific example of lack of due process, insofar as commitment to a Federal prison because of lack of mental competency is concerned, although I should point out that many examples have been called to my attention by judges and lawyers.

Rather, it has been prompted by what I believe to be a serious loophole in the present law which provides an opportunity for persons to be committed to a Federal mental institution or prison without due process, if those in highest authority wish to take advantage of that loophole.

In seeking to prepare corrective legislation I have sought the best advice available from a number of outstanding national authorities including members of the bar, the Judicial Conference, the Bureau of Prisons, wardens and physicians from the U.S. Medical Center in Springfield, as it is known, personal friends in both the legal and medical professions and in governmental agencies, and also a previous superintendent and first assistant physician, at St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington, D.C., which is under comparable status, where I served a 2-year internship as a young physician early in my own medical career.

This bill has also been reviewed by the Greene County, Mo., Bar Association and has its complete approval.

The heart of the bill involves an amendment of section 4244 of title 18, United States Code. The existing section provides that whenever, after arrest and prior to sentence, the U.S. attorney or one acting on behalf of the accused or the court itself has reasonable cause to believe that the accused may be insane or otherwise so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the proceedings against him or properly to assist in his own defense, they shall file a motion with the trial court for a judicial determination of such mental incompetency of the accused, setting forth the grounds for such a belief.

Our amendment would first of all eliminate insanity as an alternative condition for filing the motion since mental incompetency is broadly defined and encompasses every condition of mental disease.

Second, my amendment would require that a motion filed under this action shall be accompanied by a sworn written statement, based on personal observation, of a responsible adult as to the mental condition of the accused. The court, hearing the motion, needs some modicum of evidence to aid it in carrying out the requirements of the section, and local courts have long required affidavits of this nature to accompany mental incompetency motions. While it may be presumed that many Federal courts presently require a similar type of evidence, it is not required by law and should, I believe, be written into the statutes.

Under existing law, section 4244 provides that, after the motion is filed with the court, the court shall cause the accused to be examined as to his mental condition by at least one qualified psychiatrist, who shall report to the court.

Under my proposed amendment, there is a provision that, after the filing of the motion, the court shall order a hearing at which the accused and his attorney shall be present. Upon such a hearing, if the court determines that there is reasonable cause to doubt the mental competency of the accused, it shall cause the accused to be examined by at least one physician skilled in the diagnosis of mental disease.

The significant addition to the existing language of the section involves the specifically directed requirement that the court conduct a hearing upon the motion and arrive at the conclusion that reasonable cause exists, before the accused is ordered to submit himself to an examination and, of course, before he is committed to a Federal prison or institution.

While this is most often the practice, it is not always the case, and I believe it is desirable to build the requirement of a mandatory hearing into the statutory procedures so as to support a judge's action in ordering examinations only when reasonable cause exists to doubt mental competency. And equally important, it seems desirable to prescribe that the accused and his counsel shall have the right to be present at such a hearing, a basic American right, which he does not now possess under a strict interpretation of the law.

The existing law—again under section 4244—provides that for the purpose of the examination the court may order the accused committed to a suitable hospital or other facility to be designated by the court.

My amendment would circumscribe the rather broad authority of the court in this area by requiring that the commitment may only be made for a period not to exceed 30 days.

I believe this limitation to be most justified, since, without it, the Federal judiciary and Federal executive are given authority to detain persons without a trial for unreasonably long periods of time. This is happening today.

The amendment also proposes that the accused, or one acting in his behalf, must concur in any commitment for examination which would take the accused out of the jurisdiction within which he is charged.

Again under present law, the examining phychiatrist is required to submit a report to the court, and if the report indicates a state of mental incompetency, the court shall hold a hearing at which evidence as to the mental condition of the accused may be submitted, and the court must make a finding thereto.

Under my amendment, the same procedure would be followed, except that provision is made, as in the case of the preliminary hearing, that the accused and his attorney shall be present during such a hearing.

Aside from amending section 4244, I have proposed that a new section 4250 be added which would authorize any person committed or his attorney, relative, guardian, or spouse, to request and have granted by the administrator of the place of his commitment, a new mental examination every 6 months.

Existing law does not provide a direct means for a person committed under Federal law to establish his mental competency after a finding of incompetency. Habeas corpus is the vehicle most commonly used today, but it is not a satisfactory process. A number of decisions have indicated, I am told, that a judge in a habeas corpus proceeding does not have the authority to determine whether, in fact, the accused is mentally competent or his status has changed to incompetency or vice versa.

The bill I propose also would provide that any person committed under the mental defectives chapter shall be entitled to transmit mail to and receive mail from his attorneys and his personal physicians without such mail being censored. There are also provisions providing that court-appointed physicians or attorneys under the mental defectives chapter shall be compensated by the court if the person accused or committed is indigent.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any pride of authorship and I realize that this problem has been the object of continued study by many distinguished groups including the Judicial Conference. But sometimes studies can be used to prolong the status quo rather than to hasten justice and equity or to correct injustice. All the studies have not led to any concrete legislative proposals in the last 20 years, and I do not believe we can indefinitely postpone corrective action where the legal rights of the individual are involved. All research must eventually be halted and production begun.

I am not a lawyer, and certainly I leave the legal judgment to the wisdom and experience of those who serve on the House Committee on the Judiciary. I am sure they want to study and perfect any legislation which may be called to their attention.

I do have experience in the medical aspect of this problem and I am certain that the medical and legal aspects can be evolved into a workable bill which will protect society from the potential dangers committed by mental incompetents, but at the same time will also protect individuals from the potential dangers committed by an arbitrary society or by those upon whom society bestows great authority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand your bill would restrict or prohibit such things as the sordid, highhanded action of the Attorney General in committing a citizen of this country to a Federal prison on the basis of a statement issued by a psychiatrist who had never talked to the individual and had never had any contact in any way with the individual in question? Would your bill prohibit this sort of highhanded actions?

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, it would specifically prohibit that type of action although I would recall to his fertile mind and his perceptive reasoning the fact that I stated in the beginning, this bill is not motivated by any single occurrence or specific example of lack of due process. But it does, sir, I will say to you, specifically preclude any person who is overvested in authority from—quote "Shanghaiing" unquote—or as I said again in the statement, using the loophole and thereby transferring out of the jurisdiction in which the person was retained to another area of the United States or our territories or possessions without being examined and found incompetent first at the source of the alleged crime.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend from Missouri for the statement he has made and for his diligence in bringing to Congress a bill which will have the purpose he suggests. It is badly needed legislation, and I assure him of my support.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I appreciate his comments.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I now yield to the Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania, Dr. WEAVER.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman HALL, for this fine presentation on a loophole in the Federal law. I feel very strongly, as he does, that this loophole should be closed. It does at the present time permit the indiscriminate use of medical facilities for political purposes if desired and for indeterminate periods of time, but there is another thing that can occur under the present law. It also permits Federal medical facilities to be used as a hideaway for individuals subject to court charges or Federal prosecution. Therefore I commend the gentleman for trying to protect the individual's rights through this new amendment. I feel his amendment should be passed by this House.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I appreciate his valuable contribution based on his experience and judgment. I would expect to make this an amendment to the United States Code which will be entirely applicable and completely nonpartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Judiciary Committee has a heavy workload in this particularly troublous time in the history of our Nation and that it may not be possible to hold hearings on this bill even during this extended session of Congress. However, I am hopeful that the Members will have an opportunity to study the legislation, and toward that end I supplied a copy of the bill to each Member of the Committee on the Judiciary and I have written them a note about this special order. I hope they will read these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I have offered, and I believe that when the hearings of the committee are held, they will be supported by much of the evidence we have in hand. We hope for a favorable report on the part of the Department, and if they are held at an early date in the second session of the Congress, we will do everything we can to bring it before the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, the distinguished jurist from Wichita.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman and specifically as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to assure him there will be urgings in the committee for full consideration of the bill that the gentleman from Missouri has so well discussed in the past few minutes.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this has been discussed with other members of the Judiciary Committee and with the distinguished counsel of that committee. I believe I can safely say it is nonpartisan and it is to the point. It is relatively simple and basic. It is not based on any single incident nor is it predicated on any one principle, but it is something that has needed doing for a long time. I hope we can get on with the job.

I realize that the Judiciary Committee has a heavy workload and that it may not be possible to hold hearings upon this bill during this session. But I am hopeful that the members will have an opportunity to study the legislation I have offered and that hearings will be held at an early date during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON AUTOMATION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are on the threshold of an economic revolution whose achievements, consequences, and social upheaval may be as great as the achievements and social upheaval which originally flowed from the industrial revolution.

That revolution, more than 150 years ago, brought great riches. But it also brought inhuman horror and terrors, child labor, disease, blackened landscapes, bloodshed, polluted air and water, slums, and often brutal working conditions.

The steam engine, the use of coal and iron, shook the society of the early 1800's. Then the technology of electricity and steel stirred society even more and invigorated the whole purpose of nations. More recently, the new technologies in nuclear energy, plastics, new metals, and electronics have stirred industrial society again, particularly with automation—the use of systems, machines, and computers to operate information and production processes.

Actually, of course, automation in a sense has been with us since the very beginning of the industrial revolution. But now our modern technologies have accelerated enormously its impact. And the core of automation, the computer, has become so swift and capable that its predecessors of less than a decade ago are as obsolete as James Watt's steam engine.

In the years ahead, as automation sweeps through the factories and farms of America, it is not going to be just another problem or phase of the industrial revolution.

In its effects on society, on the lives of men, and on the future of our Nation, automation may well have as much impact as the industrial revolution itself had in the first half of the eighteen hundreds.

Linked to new sources of energy and new technology, automation promises riches beyond our fathers' fondest dreams. It promises that now, for the first time in the history of mankind, we may no longer face a basic problem of achieving subsistence. But automation will bring new problems along with the abundance.

As it brings abundance, automation threatens all of us with vast unemployment, with useless human beings and unwanted hands, with poverty in the midst of plenty.

Automation creeps; it does not run. It strikes selectively, not generally. One by one, it may bring each company or industry to greater productivity and lesser employment, leaving the rest of the economy seemingly untouched. Automation nibbles; it does not gulp. But it may devour all the same.

Historically, of course, every economic transformation has been accompanied by revolution, hysteria, and untold waste and bitterness.

Now, as we face the nibbling transformation to a truly automated industrial economy, the question before us is whether we shall do nothing until it is too late, until hysteria, waste and bitterness are upon us.

Or whether we shall seek to meet the problem, deal with it, and perhaps win decent, productive lives for ourselves and all our children.

The problem of automation is not ahead on some dim and distant horizon. It is with us now.

A recent Department of Labor report has noted that in the years between 1947 and 1961, the private economy increased its real output by 59 percent. But business achieved this great increase in output not by using more workers. More than four-fifths of this increase was achieved through greater productivity, through greater output per man-hour.

That same Labor Department report notes that in the years betwen 1947 and 1961, employment increased 11 percent. But the labor force increased by about 20 percent.

Our unemployment continues brutally high with more than four million men and women, one out of every 20 Americans, unable to find a job.

And according to the Labor Department:

> If in the next 5 years we provide new employment at the pace of the last 5, by 1967 unemployment will come to over 5½ million or more than 7 percent of the 1967 labor force. (From Department of Labor, "Manpower Report of the President," transmitted to the Congress, March 1963.)

In part because of automation we Americans today have the most productive economy the world has ever known. Yet in part because of automation we also have poverty in the midst of our wealth. As of 1961 some ten and a half million American families had total annual incomes of less than $4,000.

Recently the long, nibbling effect of automation on the railroads came to a head. For years railroad management, unions and the Government had done little, while spreading automation affected the industry. Automation swept the railroads into the crisis. Unprepared, frightened but determined, both management and labor faced the Nation with an emergency.

It should not have happened, for responsible foresight, planning and work over the years could have eased the entry of automation. But it did happen, and it should teach us a lesson: we must prepare for automation.

Traditionally our society has proposed two major means to deal with the effects of automation: using both management and workers in unnecessary jobs; or creating massive public works programs to absorb the unemployed white and blue collar workers. Both are short-term stop gap solutions only; both are unproductive ways of coping with the problem.

We must find a more meaningful alternative; we must investigate and map the problem and seek answers and solutions; we must plan ahead.

The President recognized the need for planning in his message of July 22, 1963, to the Congress on the railroad crisis when he proposed the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Automation. I believe the Congress should create an automation commission which would have permanent status and carry out the President's objectives. On April 30 Senator WAYNE MORSE suggested to the Secretaries of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and Agriculture that they recommend to the President the appointment of a National Commission on Automation. Since then a joint resolution has been introduced in the other body to implement this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to establish a full-time, working Federal Commission on Automation. The Commission would first, study the economic, governmental, and social effects of automation on employment, education, leisure time, politics, social relations, economic structures, foreign affairs, and any other area affected; second, conduct and arrange continuing seminars, discussions, meetings, and similar activities bringing together representatives from management, labor, education, and government; third, correlate all governmental studies on automation and act as the agency for the dissemination of automation studies and information to the public; and, fourth, submit interim and annual reports of its activities, findings, and recommendations to the Congress and the President.

The Commission would study all the broad problems which automation engenders: The long-term industrial-occupational shifts with accompanying problems of unemployment; the great increase in leisure time and the need to find constructive uses for this time; and the greater and greater standardization in everything from the size of envelopes and packages which machines can handle to the kind of homes which automated machines can most easily construct.

In addition to its own studies, the Commission would survey, use and correlate all the work and studies being done on automation and intimately related matters throughout the Government. It would draw on the valuable work being done, for instance, by the Office of Manpower Training in the Department of Labor, by similar groups in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and others.

The Commission would bring labor and management together on a continuous basis in planning sessions preparing for automation, seeking solutions to future problems long before the problems reach the crisis stage.

The Commission would also serve to alert all Americans to the fact that automation, perhaps not yet generally seen, will eventually affect all segments of the economy. For in the long run we can neither prepare for nor deal with the problems of automation unless all Americans are aware of both its threats and its promises.

The Federal Commission on Automation would be a permanent body of five full-time members solely concerned with the problems of automation.

The President would appoint all five Commissioners, each for a 5-year term. One of the Commissioners would be from labor, one from management, and three from the general public.

This permanent, small, full-time Commission would be able to work effectively on a longe-range basis in seeking solutions to what may be the greatest economic problem of our time.

Mr. Speaker, every day this problem is growing larger. Our inaction in meeting automation is a decision for hysteria, crisis and perhaps tremendous social upheaval in the not-too-distant future.

We must act now if we are going to find solutions to the problem. The first step in such action should be the creation of a Federal Commission on Automation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from New York has brought to the attention of the House today a very important matter, the question of automation. It seems to me that we have one question which is even greater than the question of automation itself, and that is the general question of unemployment in the Nation.

I have said before on the floor of the House that I think this is the No. 1 question facing our country today, the question of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that we must go further than just the question of automation? I have pending before the House now a resolution before the Committee on Rules to set up a select committee made up of members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and other Members, where we may bring together in one select committee Members of the House who are well informed on the various aspects which go into the question of unemployment in the country, and this includes dropouts from school, automation, taxation, the effect of imports on unemployment. It seems to me there are so many things that are contributing to the question of unemployment in the country that we should consider more than just the one question of automation.

I am wondering if this is not, really, rather than the creation of a new commission by the President with a staff—and the gentleman knows as I do that when we create small commissions, the commissions grow and make reports which do not receive so much consideration—whether this is not actually a responsibility of the House of Representatives and that we by a select committee making a specific study of the question of unemployment which would encompass what the gentleman has in mind, would make some substantial contribution to this problem, one which I consider to be the No. 1 problem in the country today, that of unemployment?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concern about the question of unemployment. I think there is no doubt that the question of achieving full employment is the No. 1 economic problem facing this Nation. However, intimately related to this question is the whole question of automation and whether we are going to face it now or wait until it is upon us, as we did in the railroad situation.

I feel that there is an area in which a Federal automation commission, working full time on this problem, can anticipate and can look ahead and can plan. This does not mean I do not believe it is important for the various committees of Congress not only to investigate this question, but all related questions. Whether a select committee, as the gentleman suggests, is the answer I do not know. But I do believe that the Congress itself must take action to fulfill the intent of the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman, and I appreciate the gentleman's views. The point I make is I should like to have the gentleman and others join with me in this effort for a study of unemployment because of automation. One of the reasons we are in this situation of unemployment is that automation requires special skill to operate these machines of automation. We are not training people for that purpose today. The school dropouts come into this picture also. There are many other things that are included in the matter of automation and it seems to me to be the responsibility of those of us who are to make a complete study that the gentleman's commission would be of great value. A select committee in the House would be perhaps well to have. But I am hoping that the House will accept this responsibility on this whole question of unemployment and not keep creating something for the executive department to go into. It is our responsibility here to make a complete and full study in order to try to solve the question of unemployment in this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Also I believe it is our responsibility to support the President in his efforts to meet the problems of unemployment, school dropouts, manpower retraining, and the youth problems of our country through the various bills which the President has proposed. I hope the gentleman will support these measures when they come before the House for consideration.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. MONAGAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, with the Rosh Hashana high holidays approaching, we hear disquieting news that while the main Moscow synagogue will be packed, smaller communities of Soviet Jewish citizens will find their synagogues closed, or find an insufficiency of prayer shawls, prayer books and other religious artifacts essential to the proper observance of this most holy of all Jewish holidays. Attempts by American, British, and French Jewish religious leaders to get these into the hands of Soviet Jews have met with no success.

Although the Soviet Union has agreed that they will not pollute the air with their superbombs, and loudly publicize their desire for peaceful coexistence with the peoples of the world, there continues within the Soviet Union itself practiced persecution of its Jewish population. Apparently this country has been successful in persuading Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts that it is uncivilized to explode poisonous ingredients in the atmosphere—we have been unable to convince him that the subtle harassment of Soviet Jewry is similarly uncivilized and closely parallels the initial actions of Germany's Hitler against the Jews which resulted in the worst, barbaric crimes in all human history and the extermination of millions of Jews.

Only 2 days ago, the Soviet authorities in Minsk, capital of Byelorussia, closed down the last synagogue in that city. Minsk, once a great Jewish religious and cultural center, with about 50,000 Jews, will thus be without a Jewish house of worship for this year's high holy days.

Last month, after authorities in Moscow had declared the old Jewish cemetery in that city closed to further burials, a similar order was issued in this same city of Minsk. While a new cemetery was opened, and Jews were allowed to consecrate the grounds, the consecration has since been nullified.

For the past 2 years, the Soviet Government has refused to allow public bakeries to produce matzos which are symbolic of the observance of the ancient festival of Passover—the celebration of the exodus of the Jews from bondage in Egypt. In the guise of its evidence of religious freedom, the baking of matzos in the home was permitted. Now we learn of the conviction of three Moscow Jews on charges of selling matzos.

The Soviet Union refused to allow Israel investigators, seeking information on Nazi Adolf Eichmann to examine their captured Nazi records.

In January of this year, the Attorney General in a statement in an address before the 10th anniversary conference of the fund for the Republic declared that over 100 persons were executed in the past year in the Soviet Union, most of them Jews, for alleged economic crimes.

The Soviet-controlled press, the instrument of communication to the Soviet citizens, is utilized to inflame the populace against their Jewish neighbors.

The recent Soviet exhibition in the United Nations of alliance with the forces of Nasser and his former Nazi hierarchy of scientists and military aides shows that the Soviets believe that their path is going to be paved over the bones of the 6 million Jews who perished in Nazi crematories.

Apologists for the Soviets are always quick to point out that the Soviet Constitution specifically bans anti-Semitism. This same Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, press, religion, employment, housing, and so forth, yet any objective student of Soviet history knows there has been a liquidation of numerous of the men who helped draft this same Constitution.

Soviet actions belie its pledge to the universal declaration of human rights. Until the Soviet Government reestablishes Jewish seminaries and synagogues; sets free imprisoned synagogue leaders; rescinds its ban on matzos; makes available ritual articles and prayer books; restores freedom of worship and the teaching of the Hebrew language, it will continue to forfeit the confidence of the democratic peoples of the world.

For years I have called upon the Congress of this country and the United Nations to protest the Soviet Union's anti-Semitic practices. As a nation whose proudest achievement is a concern for the liberty and freedom of all people, as recognized leaders of the free world, as a nation which serves as a symbol of religious freedom, this country has an obligation to speak out on behalf of the oppressed Jews of the U.S.S.R.; and I again call upon this Congress to seek early adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of my resolution condemning these continuing manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and the adoption by the Soviet Union of such measures as may be necessary to guarantee these human rights to its Jewish citizens.

THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL 1964 IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET FOR 1964 AND THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR LAST YEAR

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have more than once heard knowledgeable observers of the legislative scene—men in a position to know—say that the longer Congress stays in session the more it costs the Treasury; that when we stay here during the summer and into the fall, as we unfortunately have fallen into the habit of late, the departments think of more things the Government ought to be doing and additional projects are urged with a gilt-edged guarantee to make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before.

Many of my colleagues have not only heard it; but have seen it. And too often much of it gets through. The closing supplemental appropriation bill of the session is invariably burdened with additional appropriations to finance last-minute authorization legislation, some of which has not even reached the White House for the President's approval. They cannot even wait for orderly consideration in the regular bills or the next budget—nor defer altogether until the budget is in balance. And so insistent are such demands that, not infrequently, an item denied after full consideration in the regular bill is reinserted in the last supplemental bill. In consequence the appropriations are higher and the drain on the Treasury, the draft on the taxpayers, continues to mount.

And Mr. Speaker, if we may judge from the past, this session may see more—perhaps more and even more—of the same. Today is September 12, 2 months and 12 days after the beginning of the fiscal year 1964, with every indication of at least 2 additional months and 12 more days to go, and—perhaps another 30 days in addition. And except for three departments, all the appropriations of the session are pending. Except for the three, every department and agency has been operating since July 1 under continuing resolutions and will continue to do so until their regular appropriations are eventually enacted. Had we disposed of all bills promptly, continuing resolutions would have been unnecessary. But since we did not, and still have not, and will not for some weeks, here is a situation, contrary to the old truism, where the longer these bills are delayed the more the possibilities of further reducing them and, in consequence, the less the drain on the Treasury, rather than the other way around.

May I call particular attention to this situation because it involves a not inconsiderable sum of money. And when we have operated the Government in the red in 27 of the last 33 years; when we are operating in the red—operating on borrowed money—again this year—the 28th year—and especially when we are told that we will also operate in the red next year, and with every prospect for even the year after that, no sum, however small, is inconsiderable or inconsequential even in the context of $100 billion budgets. Every dollar counts, and a dollar not appropriated is a dollar not borrowed and not spent and on which future generations will not be paying interest. So we should take advantage of every opportunity to make every reduction, in every place possible. There is ample time in which to do it and I trust we will do it. There is no legitimate excuse not to do it. And there are certainly plenty of opportunities.

TWO BILLS ENACTED FOR 1964

All except two of the regular bills for 1964 are pending. The Interior and the Treasury-Post Office bills were approved at the beginning of the fiscal year, disposing of $7,145,000,000 of the budget requests. In those two bills, Congress made reductions of $148,000,000 below the requests but appropriated $407,000,000 more than last year's appropriations, mostly for Post Office operations. Characteristically, the Senate appropriated more than the House and more than the final conference agreement.

But all other agencies are still operating under the continuing resolution and in countless instances that indicates they are operating at a rate below that contemplated by the budget. Continuing resolutions are, of course, designed to permit interim operation at the lower of one of several permissible rates and where the budget or the pending bill is higher than last year's appropriation it generally involves operating at last year's lower level. And since budgets are designed for a 12-month period, delays in enactment such as now experienced render the requests excessive on that account alone.

SIX OTHER BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE

Two of the six other 1964 bills passed by the House are at the conference stage and four are in the Senate. All were passed by the House before the fiscal year began and the individual appropriation amounts were set without discounts due to subsequent delay. Thus to some extent further reductions can be made on this account in the two bills in conference and the Senate has opportunity to take full account of the delay in processing the other four bills now pending there. It is to be hoped they will not overlook the opportunity.

Budget estimates of $5,941,000,000 are involved in the two bills now in conference—the Labor-HEW bill and the legislative bill, and the Senate totals for the two bills are below the budget and also below last year's appropriation. But the continuing resolution operates as to individual items rather than as to totals. Within the totals, there are many opportunities for reductions. The House versions of the two bills are below the budget by $351,000,000 and below last year by $132,000,000. The Senate versions are below the budget by $278,000,000 and below last year by $58,000,000. They will in the aggregate, wind up below both the budget and last year's appropriation, with, however, some basis for uncertainty as to the durability of one or two items not appreciably subject to discretionary control in the appropriations process.

The four bills pending in the Senate involve many appropriations and agencies and budget estimates of $57,595,000,000. They embrace Defense, Agriculture, State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, District of Columbia, and a host of independent agencies. The House totals were $2,650,000,000 below the budget and $1,103,000,000 below last year, but not all the reductions would implicitly render immediate and certain expenditure savings. And within the totals, many individual increases above last year were allowed, so that, as noted, the Senate has opportunity to enter reductions arising from delay in enactment of the bills. We cannot of course anticipate with any degree of precision what the other body will do as to each item but we trust they will avail themselves of every opportunity. Doubtless they too are hearing from the people back home who insist on serious and significant spending restraints before further unbalancing the budgets with much hoped-for tax reduction. All things considered, and without detailed enumeration, we can at this point see a reasonable basis for speculating that these four bills will emerge from the Senate below both the budget and below last year's totals. Of course they ought to be lower than even the House totals; if they merely apply discounts for slippage due to delays in enactment they would be under the House amounts.

FOUR BILLS IN HOUSE COMMITTEE

Approximately $25,972,000,000 in budget requests now pending are yet to be reported to the House from the Committee on Appropriations. They are the public works bill, the military construction bill, the foreign aid bill, and the independent offices bill, which includes the colossal space budget. We have been marking time. All hearings have been completed, some of them several weeks ago. But we have had to wait for the necessary annual authorization legislation. And it looks now as if it may be weeks before we get the all-clear signal to report all bills. As every Member is aware, the rules preclude reporting any appropriation not authorized by law. We will report promptly as soon as we are authorized to do so.

I do not know what the Committee on Appropriations will recommend in these bills—except that the budgets will be cut—and likely still be too high under the circumstances. But here the House will have, at least as to these bills, opportunity to maximize the reductions where they ought to be made on account of delays in enactment; I would hazard the guess that 5 months or more of the fiscal year may have gone by before these bills are enacted. And they ought to be cut several billions in addition—there are some programs in them that ought to be heavily reduced, even expunged altogether. I am certain the national interest would not suffer. On the contrary, I am equally confident it would benefit—if these bills were carefully cut, as they could be, to secure reductions of at least $4 to $5 billion. Anything less than $3 billion would be disappointing. An aggregate cut of this magnitude would put these bills well below last year's corresponding totals including the nonrecurring IMF appropriation and even some below without counting it.

Of course, in time of peace and record national revenues we use the wrong figures, the wrong criteria, the wrong measurement in arriving at the amount of the appropriations. We reduce the budget requests, the asking price, but all too often allow more than the previous year with the result that total appropriations and total spending are higher each year than the year before. It is an ever-ascending spiral.

That is the general pattern. But measuring against the previous year is the more accurate and informative, because while you need to know what disposition has been made of the budget requests, you never really retrench when you cut a budget level that has never before been appropriated.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we have repeatedly insisted, in time of peace and record national revenues, the only sane, the only sensible and businesslike way to write the budgets and the appropriations is to begin with the revenues, the annual income of the Treasury as the ceiling. And within that ceiling, as a first priority, make a start, however nominal, on a systematic program of reduction of the national debt. That seems to be the embodiment of the amendment just written into the tax bill by the Committee on Ways and Means. Short of adherence to such a program, history strongly suggests that additional spending demands consume the additional hoped-for revenues, no matter how great, for as once so well said:

> Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody.

But to make good on the devoutly to be desired objectives of living within income, making a start on paying off the debt, and restraining Government spending, Congress as a whole will have to stop hacking at the branches and start hacking at the roots. Stop initiating new nondefense projects which unbalance the budgets. Cut down or drop some of the old outmoded activities. And there is universal agreement as to waste and duplication in the defense programs. It will require the collaboration of the executive branch, and on a continuing basis. Congress has long displayed a disposition to yield to the importunities of departments and agencies. The President will have to submit lower budgets. The machinery is at hand. All we need is the will. Stop authorizing new and enlarged programs. Stop appropriating. Cut the nonessentials. There is no other way. Every gimmick the mind of man can contrive to reduce spending without cutting has probably been tried at one time or another but the only way to restrain spending is to stop authorizing more and stop appropriating more.

THE CLOSING SUPPLEMENTAL

In addition to the four regular bills to be reported, we will be asked to process the usual closing supplemental near the end of this session but we have no idea what amounts will be presented by the Executive. There are usually a few legitimate supplementary requests but, as noted earlier, the last supplemental is sometimes heavily burdened with unwarranted last-minute demands either because of last-minute new legislation that ought to wait for consideration in the next budget or because of attempts to recover something denied in the regular bill. That was mainly why I insisted on killing the closing supplemental last year. And by rejecting it we saved a quarter billion dollars that was never resubmitted in subsequent budgets—incontrovertible proof that these bills are too often encumbered with unnecessary items and amounts.

PROSPECTS FOR OVERALL APPROPRIATION REDUCTIONS FOR FISCAL 1964

Mr. Speaker, aside from the closing supplemental for which, as just noted, we have not yet received requests, and which therefore could be either large or small in totals, the appropriations schedule of the session has progressed far enough to give us a rough indication of the general probabilities.

The eight regular bills for fiscal 1964 passed by the House to date involve budget requests of $70,681,000,000. The House totals were $3,228,000,000 below the requests and approximately $906,000,000 below the corresponding appropriations for last year, fiscal 1963.

The four regular bills yet to be reported to the House entail pending budget requests of $25,972,000,000. We cannot of course know what the House will do, nor for that matter what the committee will report, but reasonable hypotheses suggest the probability of cuts on the general order of $3,300,000,000 below the requests, and if so, the four bills would also be, in total, about $3,000,000,000 below corresponding appropriations of last year which, however, include a nonrecurring item of $2 billion for the IMF.

Thus, in summary, we can visualize the possibility of House reductions on the 12 regular bills of about $6,500,000,000 below the budget and something like $3,900,000,000 below last year's appropriation figures. Again I emphasize the uncertainties because of course neither the committee nor the House has acted on four of the bills.

It is of course even more uncertain as to what the final results will be after all 12 bills pass the Senate and the conference committees, but a partial, though necessarily rough, approximation is reasonably discernible on the 8 bills passed by the House, because 4 of them have also passed the other body. In summary, it seems not unreasonable, all things considered, to venture the suggestion that on the eight bills, the conferences could result in final budget cuts of about $2,800,000,000 and perhaps $500,000,000 below the corresponding fiscal 1963 appropriations. In the four other bills, it seems certain there will be substantial cuts below the budget and a lesser reduction, but a reduction nonetheless, below the corresponding appropriations of last year.

In the light of known factors, past experience, and the general probabilities of the moment, it is admittedly tenuous to suggest any end results but we may say that it looks as if Congress could wind up by cutting the 12 bills something like $5,400,000,000 below the budget requests and about $2,900,000,000 below last year's corresponding appropriations.

Of course, as is always the case, not every dollar cut from appropriation requests for a given year results in an equivalent reduction in expenditures estimated for that same year; the rough rule of thumb, for the budget as a whole, is that from 33 to 40 percent of an appropriation is not expended in the first year. However that is essentially immaterial here. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar not taken from the Treasury.

Two additional factors bearing on the situation should be noted. Roughly $12,000,000,000 of general budget appropriations recur automatically under permanent law and therefore are not carried in the annual bills. But they are a charge on the Treasury, are included in the general budget totals, and they have to be included in any summary of appropriation results. The largest item is interest on the public debt; it was estimated in the January budget for 1964 at $10,020,000,000. No official updating of the item is at hand, but it now seems clear it will be several hundred million dollars higher, and to that extent automatically operate to increase appropriations and spending beyond the original estimates and in turn is an offset to that extent against reductions made by Congress in the annual bills for 1964.

Another factor affecting any summary of results of congressional action on the budget is the matter of inaction on any propositions of legislation for new or enlarged programs included in the President's budget. The January budget for 1964 estimated, and included in the new obligational authority total, some $2,727,000,000 for fiscal 1964 on this account. To the extent such propositions are not enacted, or enacted in lesser amounts, the Congress thereby effects a cut in the obligational authority budget request and, usually to a lesser extent, also in the $98.8 billion spending budget estimate.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the general historical pattern of higher and higher appropriation totals, it seems reasonable, as noted, to venture the suggestion that in this session, for the first time in some years, the regular appropriation bills, where not all but in any event most of the spending authority is annually provided, may aggregate less than last year. That in itself is important. It would represent, at least for this year, a change in direction, a shift in the trend, although many individual appropriations are higher, not lower.

But in the aggregate, if the closing supplemental does not reverse the now indicated lower totals, there would be some basis for hoping future budgets from the President would follow the lead and reverse the direction in every possible instance. As the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] related on the floor earlier this year when he quoted a famous evangelist:

> I would rather be standing one step from hell headed toward heaven than be a thousand miles away headed in the wrong direction.

If we could effectively restrain Government spending, if the Executive and the Congress would collaborate in a continuing program to this end, we would reinforce and enhance the stability of the dollar, lay the groundwork for stopping the decline in its buying power, further stabilize the cost of living, and halt the erosion of bonds, savings accounts, and pensions. That both branches adopt such a program and, most important, adhere to it, is an urgent and imperative national necessity. We simply cannot afford to keep on and on, indefinitely appropriating and spending beyond what we take in without ultimate debasement of our currency. Neither we nor the free world can afford that.

As Thomas Jefferson admonished:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared * * *. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt * * *. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude * * *. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements * * *. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has brought to the floor of the House good news today when he stated that there is a possibility that we will end this Congress by the passing of a budget that will be smaller than the budget of the last session of the Congress.

The gentleman has materially contributed to this effort that is being made to reduce the budget of the Congress. It is to be hoped that the other body will join with us in this attempt to eliminate the unnecessary spending that has been going on. The gentleman is to be congratulated, and the Members of the House are to be congratulated, for this is an effort that has been made, not on any partisan basis, but rather the work of Members on both sides of the aisle and those who have accepted the responsibility with the knowledge that these high budgets and high deficits over the years will eventually result in the destruction of our Republic.

I am glad to hear the gentleman say that he feels that we will probably have a budget smaller this year than the previous budget. I sincerely hope that this will come to pass with the cooperation of the other body, and I congratulate the gentleman. I hope we on both sides of the aisle can continue to work together for a further reduction as the gentleman has pointed out because of the continuing resolution. There is no reason why we cannot cut this budget several hundred million dollars—even billions—more. When we started this session of the Congress there were some of us who believed a $10 billion reduction could be made in the budget. If we reach six we will have done a good job, and I hope we may go further.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. CANNON. I much appreciate the attitude of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. He is one of the most active and able members of the Committee on Appropriations and knows whereof he speaks.

Of course, as he has well said, the Committee on Appropriations is not a partisan committee. It deals with national finance and economics and not with politics. It is a business committee.

Congress can make this reduction, if it will—and I trust it has the will. Time is running out. We must cut every dollar we can, and keep cutting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE 45TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN LEGION AT MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I join in complimenting the eminent chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House for his characteristically able and thought-provoking address.

Mr. Speaker, since Sunday of this week the 45th Annual National Convention of the American Legion has been in progress in Miami Beach, embracing my district and the district of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell]. On Sunday, the Legion had a very outstanding program in my district—a panel discussion participated in by distinguished speakers—on the critical question of communism in Cuba and its threat to our country and to our hemisphere. I attended this panel discussion and profited greatly by it.

On Monday I was privileged to appear before the resolutions committee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Legion Convention also in my district and to lay before the committee some resolutions which I have introduced in this House dealing with the critical subject of the danger of Castro and communism to our country and to our hemisphere. I, unfortunately, was unable to stay here for the vote on Tuesday afternoon because I accompanied our eminent Secretary of State from here to Miami Beach to attend the national commander's annual dinner in my district as part of this convention, and returned here the following day.

Now I have just been informed by telephone that the American Legion has adopted its resolution on the subject of communism in Cuba. Everyone respects the National American Legion Convention and gives earnest consideration to what it says. There is no more patriotic group of men that exists in this country. They have worn or they are now wearing the uniform of their country. There is no group of men more solicitous for the security, strength, and welfare of our Nation than the members of the American Legion. They have adopted a very strong series of resolutions on the subject of Castro and communism in Cuba and what our country should do to meet that threat. I commend to the thoughtful consideration of the President, the Secretary of State, the Congress, and the country those resolutions which this 45th Annual Convention of the American Legion has adopted.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday when the House meets next, I propose to offer legislation to implement certain aspects of this program which I deem to be appropriate subjects for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I lay before the House for the record of this body, following my remarks, the resolution adopted by this great patriotic organization at its 45th annual national convention:

The resolution referred to follows:

> Whereas the American Legion, in national convention at Miami Beach, Fla., in 1960, at Denver, Colo., in 1961, and again at Las Vegas, Nev., in 1962, called upon our Government to institute and forcefully prosecute a positive policy of economic sanctions and, if necessary, to place a total embargo around Cuba, and to take all necessary action to make available and to apply our military supplies and force, including unilateral military action if required, so as to enable the people of Cuba to establish their own non-Communist government; and
>
> Whereas the occupation of Cuba by a Communist regime—directed, supported, and sustained by Soviet Russia—constitutes the most serious invasion of the Western Hemisphere by a foreign power since the Monroe Doctrine was first proclaimed by the fifth President of the United States, James Monroe; and
>
> Whereas the said occupation of Cuba, 90 miles from our shores, constitutes a present and continuing grave danger to the peace and freedom of this Nation; and
>
> Whereas the toleration of this continuing menace on our very doorstep presents the image of the United States to the whole world as a nation without courage to take the steps necessary to remove this danger, and this image is projected despite the fact that the American people themselves are not lacking in courage to meet and master this threat to our freedom; and
>
> Whereas from the travesty of the Bay of Pigs to the shattered promises that we were led to believe that Khrushchev had made to withdraw his men, material, and control from this hemisphere, our policy seems to have been "talk firm and retreat" while the Communist forces dig in and strengthen their hold on their base on this continent; and
>
> Whereas despite the bold action of our Government last year which temporarily seemed to halt the missile buildup, the advantage was not followed up, and reliable reports indicate that Soviet Russia still maintains formidable personnel and military installations with offensive capability in Cuba with the toleration, if not the passive con-

sent, of our Government in disregard of the fact that a 90-mile-range gun or missile could destroy our naval base at Key West, and any kind of weapon could be used to attack our base at Guantanamo, and the timidity and vacillation of our Government have gravely injured the prestige of the United States and has brought humiliation and embarrassment to the American people; and

Whereas we are firmly convinced that Soviet Russia will never attack this Nation, unless and until it has become convinced that it can win over us at a minimum cost to Russia itself, and once convinced that it has the power to win, if that time shall ever come, no amount of groveling at the feet of the dictator will save us from the wrath of the aggressor; and

Whereas we are as firmly convinced that the only way to remove the aggressors from this continent is to remove them by the exertion of sufficient firmness backed up with sufficient strength: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 45th Annual National Convention of the American Legion (assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., September 12, 1963), That the American Legion—

1. Deplores the failure of our Government to take the necessary action to accomplish these objectives and its failure to implement our recommendations prior to and after January 1961;

2. Strongly disapproves the lack of effective action by our Government since the establishment of the Castro regime, which constituted the first Communist government in the Western Hemisphere;

3. Calls upon the President of the United States and all those in authority to demand the immediate removal from this hemisphere of all foreign troops deemed hostile by the United States or by the Organization of American States (whether designated as technicians or otherwise);

4. Calls upon our Government to intensify its efforts to bring about cooperative action on the part of all free American nations to impose effective economic sanctions against Cuba, but if none shall join with us in this effort, to proceed boldly alone, and further to implement this demand with just so much power as may be required to enforce our demands, and to this end to employ whatever weapons become necessary, including boycott of all shipments of any kind to Cuba, quarantine, blockade and if need be employment of armed forces if that be deemed necessary, or any other appropriate means to free Cuba and this hemisphere from foreign Communist domination; and calls upon the Congress to give full support to this undertaking;

5. Calls upon our Government to aid, assist, encourage, and guide Cuban refugees to form a Government-in-exile and to recognize such Government as the legitimate provisional Government of Cuba, and to give material aid and assistance to such Government in its efforts to rescue Cuba from Communist control, and to establish a free republic in Cuba that will afford Cubans the right to choose their government by free elections;

6. Ask that the Monroe Doctrine be reasserted and implemented with the might of this Nation and that our Government employ the fullest efforts of our diplomatic resources to encourage and persuade all other nations in this hemisphere to join in that assertion and in that implementation, making it convincingly clear that we seek no advantage over any other American nation but that the Monroe Doctrine shall be a shield to protect every nation in this hemisphere from foreign domination, to the mutual benefit of all but shall never be a weapon to be used by us or anyone else to impose the laws, customs, or philosophy of any American nation or group of nations on the people of any other American nation or to impede or thwart their freedom of self-determination;

7. Calls upon our Government to increase its efforts to prevent any trade between Cuba and other American states, and that our Government deny access to all U.S.-controlled ports to any vessel of any shipping line that engages in trade with Cuba, whether that particular vessel has been used in the Cuban trade or not; and

8. Urges our Government to maintain the integrity of the treaty authorizing our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, and to defend that lease with whatever force may be necessary to maintain it as an essential instrument of our national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion asserts that we can never peacefully coexist in this hemisphere with communism and that we urge our Government to be unrelenting in its efforts to destroy the Communist government in Cuba, both as a base from which to spew forth Communist propaganda and as a military base from which to threaten our security, and that there can be no relaxation of our efforts until the sovereignty of Cuba again rests securely in the hands of the Cuban people and is exercised by a government of their free choice.

MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, there lies to the south of the United States a great nation of over 760,000 square miles and approximately 40 million persons. Next Monday, September 16, 1963, marks the 153d anniversary of independence of the great Estados Unidos Mexicanos.

It was 153 years ago—when, I might add, our own Republic was only 21 years old and our people were making routes into the West—that the people of Mexico attempted to rid themselves of over 3 centuries of oppressive misrule.

On September 16, 1810, Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla gathered the simple people of his parish before him and gave the shout—el grito—that was to start a revolution that would last many years and see thousands die before the people would call themselves free men and women.

From the meeting between this simple priest and his flock came the cry—grito de Dolores—of the war of independence:

> Long live our Lady of Guadelupe. Down with bad government. Death to the Spaniards.

On that day Mexico became the first Spanish colony in the New World to rise from oppression, to seek a better government where men and women are free.

The years that followed were not easy ones for the Mexican peasants and Indians. There was bitterness and death. Independence, freedom, and self-rule cost the Mexicans lives and fortunes, but it brought them pride and dignity.

Today that country is a Federal Democratic Republic of 29 States whose three branches of government are elected by universal suffrage. Today, Mexico gives every evidence of being willing to accept the duties and responsibilities of a peace-loving member of the community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, few people in either of our countries realize that although Mexico and the United States have had their differences over the years, these two great Republics have developed side by side to such an extent that their respective national histories have been indissolubly influenced by the other. We need not mention here the depth and magnitude of these mutual influences.

I would only mention that our two countries share every day of our lives an unusual experience. I am speaking of a 1,500-mile transcontinental boundary that bisects the North American Continent between the Pacific and Atlantic. And I might add, that border is an unfortified one—just as it should be between friends. Across that border every moment of every day flows ideas, culture, men, goods. To the geographer that border is the line between two countries. To the Mexican people and the American people, that border is a symbol of a link that ties these two countries—past, present, and future. The border is also the door and the window to all of Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, Californians have a special tie with the Mexican peoples. We join with all Mexican-Americans—indeed, Americans of all national groupings—in sending to our good friends to the south, our warmest and most sincere good wishes on this the 153d anniversary of their independence.

CONGRESS NEGLECTS ITS MINORITY

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of many who look at the issue only superficially, the question of minority staffing may appear to be a partisan one, reflecting an effort by the minority party to contend more successfully against the majority party.

As our distinguished colleague from Iowa, the Honorable Fred Schwengel, has pointed out, however, the issue has a far deeper and more fundamental significance—involving the health and vigor of our two-party system and its continuing ability to serve our free society.

Congressman Schwengel has summarized the case for a more equitable division of committee staffs between the majority and minority in a most persuasive article published on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune of September 10, and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed as a part of my remarks in the Record.

It is fair, factual, and very much to the point, and I hope especially that our colleagues from across the aisle will read it in the spirit of concern for the public interest with which it was written.

As Congressman Schwengel suggests, Republicans plan to be the majority party in the Congress in the not too distant future. Our concern today is with strengthening the Congress and equipping ourselves to play a more constructive and effective role in our representative system of government regardless of which party is in the majority. We are not seeking some special advantage for ourselves alone. We seek it for the country.

Congressman SCHWENGEL's important article follows:

CONGRESS NEGLECTS ITS MINORITY

(By Representative FRED SCHWENGEL)

(NOTE.—Mr. SCHWENGEL, who represents Iowa's First District in the U.S. House of Representatives, is the chairman of the House Republican Conference Committee on Increased Minority Staffing.)

For all the talk about minorities, a shocking situation exists in the Halls of Congress which is receiving remarkably little attention. The majority party (Democrats) outnumbers the minority (Republicans) 3 to 2 in the House of Representatives and 2 to 1 in the Senate. Yet professional committee staff members responsible to the majority outnumber staff responsible to the minority 10 to 1 in the House and 12 to 1 in the Senate.

Much of the important work of Congress is done in the committees. Their professional staffs do research, draft bills, arrange for witnesses to attend hearings and do other tasks for which Congressmen have neither the time nor, in some cases, the specialized knowledge. Most of them are hired, promoted and assigned work by the chairman—a member of the Democratic majority—of each committee. Naturally their allegiance is to the majority. Minority projects and reports tend to be neglected.

This weakens the two-party system—the basis of our Government. The "loyal opposition" must present clear, constructive alternatives to majority legislation. Without adequate staff it cannot do this and the distinction between the parties blurs in the public mind as the two sides of an issue fail to be presented forcefully to the voters.

This situation makes it impossible for Congress to adequately check the work of the executive branch—its constitutional task. The executive branch today is the Nation's largest pressure group. Each department and agency has a vested interest in acquiring more and larger appropriations. Executive staffs unavoidably reflect this bias, especially when, as now, the Presidency and both Houses of Congress are controlled by the same party.

The present situation is a tremendous waste of the taxpayer's money. Without adequate staff the minority cannot pare all the "fat" of the executive budget, nor can it conduct necessary investigations to expose inefficiency or prevent another Billie Sol Estes scandal.

The relatively small cost of more professional staff responsible to the minority would soon be repaid by savings in proposed and existing programs.

Only Republicans in Congress are taking steps to remedy this abuse. We have formed the House Republican Conference and Senate-House Joint Ad Hoc Committees on Increased Minority Staffing. Also we have proposed measures in both Houses to provide an equitable solution.

Yet minority staffing should not be a partisan issue. Republicans will not always be the minority and Democrats the majority. Regardless of which party is the minority, it is in the public interest that the minority position have sound research behind it and be clearly presented. It is strange that the Democrats, who claim to speak for all minorities, neglect so sadly the cause of the minority in Congress.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO FINANCE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the membership of the House to a situation which is making it difficult for many of our able college students to continue their education. I refer to the need for additional funds to finance the national defense student loan programs in some 1,500 colleges and universities throughout the country. Because the present law limits the amount that can be appropriated to $90 million for the year 1963–64, the amount now pending in the fiscal year 1964 appropriation bill will be insufficient to meet the needs of all eligible students.

I am sure that a great many Members of this House are presently receiving the same kind of desperate appeals, which are reaching me, from deserving young men and women who had counted on a national defense student loan to enter upon or continue their college studies. Now, on the very eve of the new academic year, they are being notified by their colleges that sufficient loan funds are not available. One letter was received by the Office of Education from a Pennsylvania youth who had received a $700 loan for each of his 3 years in college, thereby supplementing what he and his widowed mother have been able to contribute to his education from their earnings. This summer he was obliged to attend ROTC camp and could earn nothing, and at the 11th hour the college has now told him that a severe cut in its allocation of Federal funds places his loan in doubt for his senior year. And here is an excerpt from a letter addressed to the President of the United States by a young lady who is editor of her college paper:

> I am one of thousands of students who are finding it impossible to continue their higher education without financial aid. Many of us have found employment impossible this summer, and now we are informed that the colleges haven't the loan funds to help us. Does our country no longer need educated young people?

I am deeply disturbed by the increasing number and sincerity of these letters, and I am sure that my colleagues share my concern. What is happening to this excellent student loan program which we established by title II of the National Defense Education Act? Many of us have taken real pride in its accomplishments, as evidenced by the approximately 500,000 young Americans who have been helped to obtain a college education since the spring of 1959. It is only reasonable to ask why the Federal funding of this program should be held down, and in many States seriously cut back, when the need for student loans is now greater than ever, due both to the increasing number of college-age youths who plan to continue their studies, and to the rising costs of higher education.

Members will recall that 2 years ago, when we realized that the National Defense Education Act would expire on June 30, 1962, the Congress promptly acted—Public Law 87–344—to extend this legislation for 2 additional years. We also authorized for each of the fiscal years 1963 and 1964 the same maximum appropriation in support of title II as was provided in the original act for fiscal 1962; namely, $90 million. However, it is my recollection that legislative pressures at that time permitted us little opportunity to make a careful appraisal of the projected requirements of the student loan program. Furthermore, I believe that it was the assumption of many of us that by this time we would have been able to consider the several technical amendments to title II which have been recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opportunity to review the needs of the loan program has not arisen, and we now discover a crisis affecting many thousands of students.

This crisis has two aspects, the first being the absolute shortage of funds required to meet approved institutional requests for the 1963–64 college year. After painstaking review of all institutional requests for reasonableness by the Office of Education, the total requests of the institutions amount to approximately $122 million. A reduction of these approved requests has been made in accordance with the statutory provision that no institution may receive more than $250,000 in 1 fiscal year so that a minimum of $106,952,309 is now required to fund the program for 1963–64 with this limitation in effect for the larger institutions. This, however, is nearly $17 million more than the $90 million authorized by present legislation. This shortage can be translated into a denial of average loans of about $500 each to approximately 34,000 needy students throughout the Nation. The shortage amounts to $32 million if the present ceiling on institutional payments is removed; this amount would provide for 64,000 students at an average loan of $500.

The second aspect of the present crisis concerns the gross inequalities between the States which arise from application of the statutory provisions governing the distribution of the appropriated funds. Section 202 sets forth a formula for determining the allotment which each State shall receive; namely, that amount which bears the same ratio to the appropriation as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis bears to the total of such persons in all States. It should be noted that when appropriated funds are equal to, or exceed, the aggregate approved requests, the State allotments as derived by this formula are not significant, since the Commissioner's authority to reallot surpluses from those States whose allotments exceed their requests enables him to provide each State the amount of funds required to meet its requests in full. However, as at present, when an appropriation is insufficient to meet the aggregate approved requests, the State allotments calculated by the formula vary widely in the percentages by which they meet institutional requests within those States. Section 203 at this point becomes determinative by providing that each institutional request within a State shall receive its proportionate share of the funds available in that State's allotment.

For fiscal year 1964 the application of the statutory allotment formula to the $90 million appropriation has produced adverse effects on participating institutions and their needy students in a majority of the States. Although 16 States receive allotments which will permit 100-percent payment on their institutional requests, in 7 States institutions will receive between 90 and 99 percent, 5 between 80 and 89 percent, 7 between 70 and 79 percent, 8 between 60 and 69 percent, and 8 between 50 and 59 percent. Institutions in the two States of Mississippi and South Dakota will be paid only 49.74 and 43.46 percent, respectively.

All institutions in my State of Rhode Island will receive only 55-percent payment on their approved requests. What this will mean, for example, to one small liberal arts college for women—Salve Regina—is shown by a cut of $11,735 in their modest request of $26,077. As a result, 18 or 20 deserving girls in this single college will be denied an opportunity to continue their education. One of these students has written me to say:

> In view of what other countries are doing for their students, I feel that we are not asking too much in requesting that we be allowed merely to borrow from our Government.

Or let us look for a moment at another liberal arts college—Cumberland—located in a depressed area of Kentucky. It had requested $123,300 to make loans averaging $500 each to 280 students, but it can now assist only about 160 because it will receive merely a 57-percent payment on its approved request. This college actually made loans to 261 students during the 1962-63 college year, and its president now reports that close to 100 students will be obliged to withdraw because of the lack of loan funds. Comparably distressing situations exist in State after State—in Arkansas with only 52.68 percent, in Iowa with 56.4, in the District of Columbia with 55.7, and so on.

As a result of improved counseling and guidance services, many superior but needy high school students have learned about the national defense student loan program and have been persuaded to make use of its loans to continue their education. It is disheartening that some of these are among the entering freshmen students who are now being told that the loans are not available, because many of them will be obliged to seek jobs and give up all hope of attending college. And this occurs at a time when we are making strenuous efforts to increase the highly trained manpower resources of our Nation. May I remind Members of this House that a major purpose of the National Defense Education Act, as stated in its declaration of policy, was to "give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need?"

Furthermore, the cutback in the loan program in many States will seriously affect the finances of participating institutions. Although the program was intended to assist deserving students, it has obviously been of great benefit to many colleges because the proceeds of most loans go directly to the payment of tuition, fees, and charges for board and room. Colleges which for several years have had a sizable proportion of their students benefiting from the loan program are thus going to feel keenly the sharp reduction in student enrollment caused by the lack of loan funds. The financial shock will be more acute because it has come just prior to the opening of college when plans for the instruction and housing of a given student body, including expected loan recipients, have been completed. The success of the student loan program has been due in large measure to an effective partnership between the Government and participating colleges, but in many States whose institutions will suffer from the present drastic retrenchment in loan operations this cooperative relationship may be impaired.

It is my understanding that the Education and Labor Committee now has under consideration amendments to the National Defense Education Act which would alleviate the situation now facing the student loan program and would make other desired improvements in the National Defense Education Act. I would like to state my position on this matter as being firmly in favor of passing a bill at the current session of the Congress which will make the necessary improvements in the National Defense Education Act which would permit it to fulfill its purpose of strengthening American education. This act has become an established and accepted part of our educational system, and it is essential that we make improvements without further delay so that educational programs in the institutions can be effectively planned and students will not be jeopardized in their educational pursuits.

I am encouraging every Member of the House to take special note of the table I am inserting in the RECORD showing how the Federal funds for the student loan program will be distributed this year:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, defense educational activities—Title II: Student Loan Program, Fiscal Year 1964

	Unadjusted allotment based on formula prescribed by act (A)	Total revised requests from institutions (B)	Allotment based on $250,000 limitation and adjustment for reasonableness (C)	Allotment further adjusted to $90,000,000 appropriation ceiling (D)	State percentage, col. (D) to col. (C) [1] (E)	Institution percentage [1] (F)
Total	$90,000,000	$121,955,470	$106,952,309	$90,000,000	84.1	
10. Alabama	1,416,062	1,882,587	1,805,748	1,487,921	82.4	79.2
11. Alaska	24,611	50,667	50,667	25,860	51.0	51.0
12. Arizona	766,778	761,495	650,485	650,485	100.0	100.0
13. Arkansas	783,739	1,563,068	1,563,068	823,510	52.7	52.7
14. California	8,885,826	8,605,016	7,505,843	7,505,843	100.0	100.0
15. Colorado	1,254,910	1,704,988	1,532,400	1,318,591	86.0	79.3
16. Connecticut	1,192,396	1,571,710	1,238,710	1,238,710	100.0	100.0
17. Delaware	149,059	128,400	128,400	128,400	100.0	100.0
18. District of Columbia	776,475	1,464,609	1,220,282	815,878	66.9	55.7
19. Florida	1,801,768	2,343,843	1,841,134	1,841,134	100.0	100.0
20. Georgia	1,528,301	1,704,472	1,579,598	1,579,598	100.0	100.0
21. Hawaii	273,430	167,071	167,071	167,071	100.0	100.0
22. Idaho	355,145	391,821	391,821	373,167	95.2	95.2
23. Illinois	4,481,820	5,744,078	4,865,060	4,709,252	96.8	95.0
24. Indiana	2,529,987	3,510,175	2,636,976	2,636,976	100.0	100.7
25. Iowa	1,773,410	3,516,506	3,009,810	1,863,403	61.9	56.4
26. Kansas	1,493,527	2,853,009	2,136,615	1,569,317	73.4	60.4
27. Kentucky	1,261,748	2,307,978	2,123,685	1,325,776	62.4	57.4
28. Louisiana	1,707,651	2,289,655	2,023,914	1,794,307	88.7	84.9
29. Maine	389,609	672,153	672,153	409,380	60.9	60.9
30. Maryland	1,200,316	1,490,999	1,266,890	1,266,890	100.0	100.0
31. Massachusetts	3,635,297	4,280,807	3,780,873	3,780,873	100.0	100.0
32. Michigan	3,960,963	4,046,513	3,123,066	3,123,066	100.0	100.0
33. Minnesota	2,195,976	3,980,478	3,139,793	2,307,412	73.5	69.4
34. Mississippi	1,112,225	2,349,424	2,009,139	1,168,665	58.2	49.7
35. Missouri	2,257,214	3,826,245	3,190,217	2,371,757	74.3	64.9
36. Montana	410,782	572,761	572,761	431,627	75.4	75.4
37. Nebraska	865,570	1,033,363	1,018,763	909,494	89.3	88.0
38. Nevada	90,332	99,000	99,000	94,916	95.9	95.9
39. New Hampshire	374,117	672,251	659,451	393,102	59.6	58.5
40. New Jersey	1,654,873	2,073,652	2,034,203	1,738,850	85.5	83.9
41. New Mexico	403,596	537,170	537,170	424,077	78.9	78.9
42. New York	7,153,602	12,414,412	10,273,498	7,516,615	73.2	63.3
43. North Carolina	2,202,313	3,139,538	3,034,200	2,314,070	76.3	73.7
44. North Dakota	443,700	700,586	689,778	466,216	67.6	66.5
45. Ohio	4,281,451	4,960,837	4,636,563	4,498,715	97.0	96.3
46. Oklahoma	1,711,746	2,312,210	2,058,843	1,798,609	87.4	83.3
47. Oregon	1,137,648	1,480,167	1,268,601	1,195,379	94.2	90.5
48. Pennsylvania	4,899,982	7,523,200	6,493,764	5,148,634	79.3	75.5
64. Puerto Rico	598,786	501,617	492,980	492,980	100.0	100.0
49. Rhode Island	491,686	939,199	921,899	516,637	56.0	55.0
50. South Carolina	999,175	1,593,108	1,593,108	1,049,878	65.9	65.9
51. South Dakota	453,785	1,096,959	1,096,959	476,813	43.5	43.5
52. Tennessee	1,783,223	2,636,135	2,540,127	1,873,713	73.8	71.1
53. Texas	5,080,567	5,632,622	5,458,081	5,338,383	97.8	97.6
54. Utah	1,013,084	455,363	455,363	455,363	100.0	100.0
55. Vermont	333,587	651,533	622,658	350,515	56.3	53.8
56. Virginia	1,532,280	1,618,955	1,517,390	1,517,390	100.0	100.0
57. Washington	1,729,287	2,406,547	1,905,297	1,817,041	95.4	93.7
58. West Virginia	837,946	1,336,268	1,274,418	880,468	69.1	65.9
59. Wisconsin	2,120,480	2,141,469	1,825,235	1,825,235	100.0	100.0
60. Wyoming	178,461	214,260	214,260	187,517	87.5	87.5
61. Canal Zone	5,177					
62. Guam	4,521	4,521	4,521	4,521	100.0	100.0
63. Virgin Islands						

---

[1] The difference in percentage is a result of the $250,000 limitation to any one institution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Aspinall, for September 16 to 21, inclusive, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Weltner (at the request of Mr. Tuten), on Thursday, September 19, for 60 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Foreman and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Carey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Sibal.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Griffin (at the request of Mr. Bow) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5781. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1939, to provide that professional nurses shall be registered as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1195. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1196. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on increased costs resulting from failure to procure ships spare parts competitively or directly from the manufacturer. These procurements were made by the Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1197. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Warren A. Jeffers and Francis H. Leik"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1198. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8100. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8416. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to restore the granting of step increases on the basis of performance ratings of satisfactory in lieu of the standard of acceptable level of competence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8417. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8418. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to premarketing clearance of new cosmetics; and to amend such act with respect to cautionary labeling; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 8419. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 8420. A bill to fix certain fees payable to the Commissioner of Patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 8421. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain land in the District of Columbia to the Secretary of the Interior for use as a public park to be known as McCormack Park; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8422. A bill to amend the National Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8423. A bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8424. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide that registration with State authorities shall not be required in the case of securities registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8425. A bill to provide Federal assistance to the States to enable them to initiate or improve their programs for compiling, evaluating, and disseminating the results of education research and experimentation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 8426. A bill to provide that the refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of physicians to obtain blood and blood plasma from other blood banks shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8427. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 8428. A bill to establish a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8429. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Automation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 8430. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes, contingent upon approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the conveyance to the United States of certain real property now used by such city for public airport purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 8431. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.J. Res. 728. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the preservation of the freedom of association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 729. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 730. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.J. Res. 731. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 732. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in (1) the Hague Conference on Private International Law and (2) the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law; and authorizing respectively appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.J. Res. 733. Joint resolution to designate the powerhouse on Clear Creek at the head of Whiskeytown Reservoir, in the State of California, as Judge Francis Carr Powerhouse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8432. A bill for the relief of Maria Louisa Vampore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 8433. A bill for the relief of Peter George Raptakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 8434. A bill for the relief of Maria Pilar Abad Cambra, Encarnacion Armendariz Penagaricano, and Maria Pons Delgago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8435. A bill for the relief of John Houmis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 8436. A bill for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 8437. A bill for the relief of Jolan Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lea Beatus and her children, Josef and Tauba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8439. A bill for the relief of David Gutman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 8440. A bill for the relief of Elvira Alonso Canedo, Maria del Pilar Alonso Canedo, and Gloria Canedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8441. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Della Vecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8442. A bill for the relief of Giacoma Salerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8443. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Roth Domonkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8444. A bill for the relief of Josip Szrentic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

290. Mr. ROOSEVELT presented a petition of members of Community Service Organization of Los Angeles, Calif., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

George A. McLachlan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent, most untimely death of George A. McLachlan at the age of 56, has taken from the communities of Danbury and Newtown, Conn., a major force for good and is deeply lamented by all citizens of the area.

Mr. McLachlan was a former hat manufacturer, a banker, a civic worker, a fine amateur golfer and a prominent Catholic layman.

After he returned from World War II, in which he served as a member of the Army Air Force, he was chosen first president of the Danbury War Memorial Association which raised the funds to build the War Memorial Community Center as a living monument to the men and women of Danbury who served their country in the war.

In Newtown, where he lived for the last 15 years of his life, he was chairman of the Newtown High Junior School Building Committee and later chairman of the parish committee which raised funds to establish St. Rose School.

In recognition of his service to his church, he was created a Knight in the Order of St. Gregory the Great. For his contributions to the community at large, his memory is held in honor and gratitude by thousands of his fellow citizens. I am proud to take this means of paying tribute to him and expressing my condolences to his family.

Nebraska: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the House, more particularly to the members of the Nebraska delegation, the vast amounts that are gambled legally and illegally in that State.

From the size of attendance figures at the Nebraska racetracks—over 800,000 paid admissions—it is apparent that residents of neighboring States have stopped in to place a bet now and then.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the parimutuel turnover in that State hit a level of almost $42 million with close to a million dollars going legally into the State treasury. However, most of the gambling in Nebraska is done illegally. Wide open spaces and long distances make local bookie joints more necessary and convenient than in the East.

Nebraska's share of the national offtrack betting figure presented to the McClellan committee came to about $390 million last year. This is only half the story. According to expert testimony, this figure can be doubled in order to arrive at an estimate of all illegal gambling in that State. Simple arithmetic tells us that illegal gambling in Nebraska is an $800 million a year tax-free business.

About $80 million a year—10 percent of the total turnover—goes right into the coffers of the gambling syndicates. This represents a healthy bankroll for the underworld.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Nebraska congressional delegation realizes it but their State is subsidizing the treasury of organized crime with every dollar illegally wagered in that State.

Commonsense pleads for an end to this tragic state of affairs. Only proper Government control and regulation of gambling can keep out the racketeers. In my opinion, a national lottery in the United States would bring this money into the Public Treasury rather than into the exchequers of the crime syndicates.

Commending Helen Delich Bentley of Baltimore Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Baltimore Sun and one of its staff of writers deserves special commendation for an unusual public service. In this week's radio report to the people of Maryland, I tell of this public service, which was the bringing to light of a Navy ship-repair-cost report which had been made unavailable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that part of my radio broadcast which refers to this public service on the part of the alert reporter and her paper.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Senator Beall's Radio Broadcast on 24 Maryland Stations

An item of national importance which has special interest for Maryland has to do with Navy shipbuilding.

Had it not been for the alertness of the Baltimore Sun's Helen Delich Bentley, a significant ship-repair-cost report would have remained hidden in the files of the U.S. Navy.

You will recall that in the preceding Congress we were able to get through a law requiring the Navy to hand over no less than 35 percent of its repair jobs to private shipyards. We understand that the Navy then hired a consulting firm to analyze ship repair costs—apparently in the hope it would show that Navy costs were lower. The report showed just the opposite; it showed that private shipyard repairs were cheaper.

The Navy then—it appears—made the report unavailable.

It would have remained in hiding had it not been for the alertness of a Baltimore Sun reporter—Helen Delich Bentley. Miss Bentley dug it out of hiding—and only then did the Defense Department make the report public.

The report shows that it costs 16 to 35 percent more to build or repair Navy ships in Navy shipyards than in private shipyards. This should surprise no one. The competitive private enterprise system cannot be beat.

Our shipyards in Baltimore (and the people of Maryland in general) are profiting—and will continue to profit—from the law we got through—requiring the Navy to hand over no less than 35 percent of its repair jobs to private shipyards.

And, Miss Bentley and the Baltimore Sun are to be commended for their service to the public.

Congressman Broomfield Helps To Redirect Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid program is often criticized as being wasteful and misdirected, and the critics are often correct. However, it has been encouraging in this session to follow the outstanding work of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield], who has been providing important leadership in an effort to redirect some aspects of our aid program and to point it toward the target.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield] sponsored three major amendments to the foreign aid authorization bill which recently passed the House. Each of the amendments, which were adopted, tightens up the program and tends, in my opinion, to make it more effective.

One amendment requires prior congressional authorization for any foreign aid project exceeding $100 million. Under this provision of the bill, the administration will be precluded, in the absence of specific congressional approval, from committing any funds to construct the proposed Bokaro steel plant in India, a commitment which could eventually cost the U.S. taxpayers more than $900 million.

It is interesting to note that, subsequent to the adoption by the House of the Broomfield amendment, the Government of India has announced withdrawal of its request for U.S. funds for this project. Based upon studies made to date, it was very doubtful that the project as proposed would have represented a sound or a wise investment of our funds.

Another of the amendments to the bill offered by Mr. Broomfield was aimed toward keeping Africa out of the East-West arms race by providing that military assistance grants to African nations should be limited to those arms necessary for internal security or certain civil works projects.

The third amendment offered by Mr. Broomfield, and adopted by the committee, requires a Presidential finding with respect to our national interest before aid to Indonesia can be continued.

I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield] for his outstanding and determined efforts to provide more meaningful guidelines for the foreign aid program. Not only will his amendments save the taxpayers money, but I think they will help to assure that aid dollars are spent with more efficiency and with greater impact.

Whatever Happened to Uncle Sam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, you remember Uncle Sam, do you not? Quite a man was Sam.

There was a lean, hard look to his face, the kind of look that even whiskers did not soften much.

And a steely sort of look to his eyes. We used to wonder if the artists who first drew Uncle Sam somehow had the American eagle in mind.

He spoke softly, but he carried a big stick. Other nations very early learned they could not get away with any monkey business when they dealt with Uncle Sam.

He stood squarely for what America was—both feet rooted firmly in the soil and toil of American tradition.

No one ever knew for sure just where Uncle Sam came from. Some think he rode with Paul Revere. His feet bloodied the snow at Valley Forge. He was looking on when they signed the Declaration.

He stood with Lincoln at the crossroads of a nation's destiny. And wept a strong man's tear with Lee and Grant at Appomattox.

He went "over there" with Pershing and the boys. He thirsted and bled and endured with those who made the long march called Bataan. He was there at Bastogne when they wrote another American saga with the single word—"Nuts." He wept again with all of us on the V-days that signaled the end of a terrible threat to our country.

Yes, quite a man, Sam. Our kind of man. The kind we need so desperately now to keep our country strong and alert and tough and independent and honest with itself and with its world. But what has happened to him? Where has he gone? Have you felt him around recently?

No. He for sure was not at the Bay of Pigs. Whatever the reason, Uncle Sam, as we know him, is a little out of focus. Perhaps some of our new-day thinkers have sort of put him out to pasture as something we needed once but find a little old fashioned now. Perhaps they do not feel comfortable with his gaze beating into their consciences.

We believe he is just waiting in the wings thinking and watching, waiting to be called again because he is so deeply needed. We think it is high time Uncle Sam was brought out of retirement.

We Republicans want him back in action. Not because he belongs to us more than to any other good American. But because he needs a place to live and think and speak and work. Because America needs him and our party has a home for him.

Ambassador Alberto Zuleta Angel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to pay homage today to Ambassador Alberto Zuleta Angel, who since April 8, 1961 has served as Representative of Colombia on the Council of the Organization of American States.

Ambassador Zuleta will be leaving the OAS Council soon—to take up new duties as his country's Ambassador to Belgium. But he leaves behind an enviable record in that extremely important hemispheric organization.

During his 2½ years on the Council, Ambassador Zuleta has rendered distinguished service, not only to Colombia, but to the entire hemisphere as well. For in addition to his duties as Representative of his nation on the Council, he likewise served the Council as its chairman during the period from November 1961 to November 1962—certainly a critical year.

As Council Chairman, Ambassador Zuleta became widely known throughout the hemisphere for his excellent leadership, his devotion to the time-honored traditions of the inter-American system, and his absolute dedication to the enduring principles of freedom and individual liberty upon which our American Republics were founded.

Ambassador Zuleta is a native of Medillin, Colombia, and can look back upon a distinguished career as an educator, jurist, and public servant.

He has served as a professor of law at the Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario in Bogotá, the Universidad Nacional, the Universidad Javeriana, and the Universidad Libre. From 1950 to 1952, he served as dean of the school of Law and Political Science of the Universidad Nacional of Colombia.

He began his career in the public service in 1938 when he held the post of counselor of the Colombian Legation in Venezuela.

From 1954 to 1955—and again in 1957—he served as minister of the advisory committee of his country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In 1954 and 1955, he also served as magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Colombia, and in 1957 and 1958 as his country's Ambassador to the United Nations.

Before assuming his present post, he served as a minister of government in Colombia.

We regret to see Ambassador Zuleta leave his post with the Organization of American States. But all of us who are privileged to know him can say with assurance that, in his new capacity, he will continue to render distinguished and dedicated service to the great nation of Colombia and to the Western Hemisphere.

We extend to him our thanks for a job well done—and our warmest best wishes to him and Mrs. Zuleta for continued health, happiness, and success in their new post.

Outstanding Airmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my hometown and district of San Antonio, Tex., has long been known as the "mother-in-law of the Army," and with good reason. San Antonio is also known as the "cradle of the Air Force," for the city has been in the forefront of our military aviation activities from the beginning.

All of my colleagues know that San Antonio's Randolph Field was the "West Point of the Air" during World War II. Now, Lackland Air Force Base, on the opposite side of town, is known as the "Gateway to the Air Force," because all airmen pass through basic training at Lackland. There are other bases, and other activities, all of which go into my contention that San Antonio is still the cradle of the Air Force.

Each year, the various commands of the Air Force select one enlisted man, who is outstanding in his command. No fewer than three of the outstanding airmen of 1963 have close ties to San Antonio. One of them is a hometown product, one stationed there now, and one other has just recently been stationed there. So, Mr. Speaker, I can say without exaggeration that San Antonio has close ties to three of the outstanding airmen of 1963.

M. Sgt. Corliss C. Miller, the outstanding airman of the Air Training Command, was born in San Antonio, joined the Air Force in San Antonio, and is now stationed there, so we can safely say that he is exclusively a local product.

M. Sgt. Samuel C. Akin spent some of his school years in San Antonio, but he was born in Henderson, Ky. Like about everybody in the Air Force, though, he went through basic training at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio. Today he is the outstanding airman of 1963 for the Continental Air Command. It is only natural that he is stationed at Randolph Air Force Base, right in San Antonio.

The outstanding airman of 1963 for the U.S. Air Force Security Service is Chief M. Sgt. Joshua H. Ruderman, and he is stationed at Kelly Air Force Base now—just next door to Lackland. It is inevitable that Sergeant Ruderman came to San Antonio during his career, and sure enough he was stationed at Kelly Air Force Base for the first time in 1955. While at Kelly, he was named as the outstanding NCO of his group and picked up 18 hours of graduate credit at Trinity University besides. Sergeant Ruderman left San Antonio in 1958 and spent the next 4 years in various places around the world. But now he is safely back in the fold.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that the Air Force select outstanding men to honor each year. I take what I think is justifiable pride in these men and what they have done for their respective commands, for the Air Force, and for the country as a whole. We owe them a debt of gratitude far beyond what we can pay.

These men are the epitome of the millions of men in uniform today, and represent the finest men that this Nation can offer.

I am proud, too, of the contribution my district has made to the military aviation field since the very inception of the Air Force. San Antonio has Kelly Air Force Base, and Kelly is the home of the outstanding airman of the Security Service. It happens, too, that the base of the outstanding airman of the Air Training Command is at Lackland—next door to Kelly, and that this man is a native of my city. And, it happens that the outstanding airman of the Continental Air Command is also stationed in San Antonio, at Randolph Air Force Base.

These men are proud, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud of them. I know that all my colleagues will join me in saluting them.

Commodore John Barry: Father of the American Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1803, a magnificent American died in Philadelphia at the age of 58 years. An entire nation mourned his death. He was buried with all the honors his Government could give to him. Today on the 160th anniversary of his death I join with all Americans in paying tribute to this fine and heroic gentleman.

Born in County Wexford, Ireland, in 1745, he spent the major portion of his life at sea, and dedicated his energies and convictions toward American freedom. Seldom in the register of human courage has this man been equaled.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not here deal with the battles and engagements and victories of Commodore Barry, that are legendary wherever sailors gather. But permit me a few words in general about his life and his dedication to the American Revolutionary ideal.

In all of American naval history there is scarcely an officer who can equal the gallantry and achievements of Commodore Barry. In battle he was absolutely fearless, attacking and capturing—usually while outnumbered. Indeed, as we all know, during the Revolutionary War for independence our Navy was seldom equal in strength to the British. America made up for this inequality with men such as Barry. I should also mention that the honor fell to Barry to fight the last engagement of the Revolutionary War when he engaged and whipped three British frigates in the Gulf of Florida on March 10, 1783.

After the war Barry took an active interest and part in seeing that the Constitution of the United States, written in his hometown of Philadelphia in 1789, was ratified by the American colonies. His interest in American democracy went far beyond the U.S. Navy.

In 1794 the commodore was called back to serve his nation by General Washington. Sometime after this the American Congress appropriated the moneys necessary to outfit the beginnings of a new navy to sail to the Mediterranean to overpower the Algerian pirates. At this time Commodore Barry was listed by General Washington as the new country's No. 1 captain. In 1802 he was notified by the Secretary of the Navy that he was the senior officer of the Navy.

He was asked again to return to active duty to help his new struggling nation, but this time he could not answer the clarion call. His health rapidly failing, he died in his country home at Strawberry Hill, Philadelphia.

Because John Barry had so much success in training future naval officers who had served with him at sea, men whose names are an integral part of U.S. naval history, Barry has affectionately and properly been called "Father of Our Navy."

Like so many Irishmen in all of America's wars, Commodore Barry gave devotedly, gallantly, and bravely for the American ideal. He is an example to all of us, whatever our station of life, that to make American democracy work requires dedication, work, courage, love of liberty.

May his example point the way. It is fitting therefore that we pause ever so briefly today to pay tribute to the memory of a fine American.